- כגון שקידש ובעל לאלתר

For instance, he was בעל immediately after the Kidushin

OVERVIEW

רב שרביא explained the reason there is no concern שמא תחתיו זינתה (where she would be שמא [and lose her בעילה took place immediately after the בעילה, so it is not possible that she was זינתה תחתיו.

יכן צריך נמי להעמיד שהראשון אחר שקידש כנסה לאלתר ומת מיד

And similarly it is also necessary to establish that the first husband took her in (נישואין) immediately after the קידושין and died immediately after - כנסה

ועדים² מעידים שלא זינתה תחתיו -

And [or] עדים testify that she was not מזנה תחתיו of the first husband -

דאם נבעלה תחת הראשון הרי נבעלה לפסול לה³ ואסורה לכהונה:

For if she was נבעלה לפסול while with the first husband, so she was מבעלה לפסול and she is אסורה לכהונה (so if the second husband is a סהן she is אסורה לכהונה to him, and the question of still remains regarding that she was מזנה by the first husband and is אסורה to the second husband if he is a (כהן).

SUMMARY

Both husbands were מקדש ובעל לאלתר so there is no possibility of זינתה תחתיו.

THINKING IT OVER

- 1. תוספות writes that we must also know that there was no תוספות by the first husband. Seemingly the ברייתא already stated this by saying that ויש לה עדים שלא נסתרה וכו' what is תוספות adding to the ברייתא?!
- 2. Why should we suspect that there was זנות by the first husband, since we do not know that she is a בעולה (as we do by the second husband)? We should rely on her and and assume that if anything she was בעלה as late as possible!⁴

-

¹ See previous תוס' ד"ה וניחוש.

² The רש"ש amends this to read או עדים (instead of ועדים).

³ She was an אשת איש then, and any בעילה with a stranger is forbidden to her and makes her a זונה (even if she is an אשה ישראל שנאנסה), whom a כהן is forbidden to marry as the פסוק states (ויקרא [אמור] לא יקחו that ויקרא [אמור] אשה ישראל שנאנסה.

⁴ See מהר"ם שי"ף (בד"ה אבל בזה) and פרדס יצחק אות סב.