Perhaps she will go to them

דלמא אזלא איהי לגבייהו -

OVERVIEW

The גמרא differentiates that when the (unidentified) בועל goes to the woman the rule of רוב applies¹ since he is פריש; however if the woman goes to the (unidentified) then the rule of בועל מחצה על מחצה על מחצה will first clarify what is the meaning of going to him or going to her. Then תוספות will discuss whether the rule of כל דפריש applies to people.

פירוש לתוך ביתם דאפילו בתוך העיר לא חשיב קבוע -

The explanation of the term אזלא איהי לגבייהו is that she is going into their houses; but not merely into the city; for even is she goes to them, but only into the city, it will not be considered that the קבוע איסור – established –

תוספות proves that לתוך העיר is not considered קבוע:

דדמי לנמצא בין החנויות דלא חשיב קבוע -

For it is similar to the case where the meat was found between the butcher stores, where it is also not considered קבוע. It is only considered קבוע if the person bought the meat in the store. Similarly here in order to consider it קבוע, she must enter his house.

תוספות offers an additional proof that לתוך העיר is not considered קבוע:

יכן גבי תינוק מושלך בעיר² לא חשיב קבוע הואיל ולא נמצא בבית - And similarly concerning the case of a child who was cast away in the city, it is not considered קבוע since he was not found in the house –

ולכך פירש בקונטרס³ שפירש בועל מביתו -

And therefore רש"י explained that the phrase 'if they went to her' means that the left his house. That is considered מרובא פריש). It is not necessary for him to go to her (outside the city). If he leaves his house, it is considered פירש, even if she meets him in the city.

asks: תוספות

-

¹ Most of the people from where the בועל comes are כשר. Some however are פוסל the woman מכהונה. The place of origin of the בועל is where the קבוע is where the בועל. If the בועל leave his place of origin, he is considered מרובא פריש and will not disqualify the woman. If the woman goes to the place of origin then the במקום הקביעות is איסור לכהונה איסור לכהונה.

² See further שׁר,ב. The question there is concerning the status of this castaway child; is he treated as a ישראל or as an עכו"ם. See 'Thinking it over' # 3.

 $^{^3}$ בד"ה ופרכינו.

ואם תאמר דבנזיר פרק ב' (דף יב,א ושם) פריך -

And if you will say that in the second ברק of ריש לקיש, נזיר challenges -

- אהא דאמר האומר צא וקדש לי אשה סתם אסור בכל הנשים שבעולם

That which רבי יוחנן said 'whoever says to a שליה, go and be שלים for me an (unspecified) woman (the משלה did not specify which woman the שליה should be מקדש he rule is that the משלה is forbidden to marry any woman in the world'. We assume that שליה a woman. Any (other) woman whom the שליה wishes to marry now, may be a relative to the woman whom the שליה she may be her mother, daughter, sister, etc. "ל challenges this ruling –

מקן סתומה 5 -

from the משנה of 'an unspecified 'nest''. When the doves fly away from the קנים, we should be concerned that someone else may use these birds for their own ק. This is not permitted; for these doves were already specified for another individual, and one cannot fulfill his obligation with a קרבן that was already designated for a different obligation. Just as by the woman we are concerned that the woman he wishes to marry may be related to the woman whom his שליה here too let us be concerned that the dove he wishes to use was the one that flew away from its original אַק.

The גמרא there answers:

ומסיק אמינא לך אשה דלא ניידא ואת אמרת לי איסורא דנייד -

And the גמרא there concludes, 'I am speaking to you about a woman who is not roaming, and you wish to contradict me from an קור of a איסור of a מקדש of a מקדש of a מקדש of a איסור of a מקדש of a איסור. The woman whom the man wishes to be מקדש is in her place, she is considered a קבוע; however the bird was פריש and left its place of אסור of marry any woman for אסור אסור סל קבוע כמחצה על מחצה דמי of קבוע כמחצה על מחצה דמי of דפריש. but anyone may use any dove that he finds since מרובא פריש מרובא פריש.

 $^{^4}$ If, however, it can be ascertained that from the time the שלים left the משלח, this woman had no unmarried relatives, then the משלח may marry her.

⁵ There are certain individuals (זב, זבה, יולדת, ומצורע) who are obligated to bring two doves (one חטאת and one עולה for their purification process. These two birds together are called a קן. There are two types of קן מפורשת are the owner designated which bird is the חטאת and which is the און, and a חטאת and which is the און, and a עבודה where the owner did not as yet designate the birds. The שוו מאון שוו לאון מפורשת בודה will designate them when he performs the עבודות מחומה and cannot be intermingled. If one of the birds of a עבודות קן מפורשת flies away the owner can take another dove and join it with the remaining dove for his און, then he must take two new doves for his און. He cannot use the remaining dove.

⁶ The concern may be that he himself may find the 'lost' bird and use it for a קן of a different obligation, which is also prohibited.

⁷ The thrust of the question is that according to ד"י it will be virtually impossible to bring a קן. There is always the concern that it flew away from another previously designated.

The גמרא there continues:

וכי תימא הכא נמי בשוקא אשכחיה וקדיש -

And if you will say, that by קידושין also, the משלה should be permitted to marry her in a situation where he found her in the marketplace and was מקדש her. In this situation, seemingly, she is no longer a פרישוף but rather a פרישף; for she left her place of קביעות and was שוק in the מקודשת. Nevertheless, even in this instance he may not marry her, for -

התם הדרא לניחותא -

There, in the case of the woman she returns to her resting place. When she returns home she is deemed to be a קבוע. The birds however never return to their (original) place, therefore they are considered פֿריש. This concludes the נזיך חו גמרא.

תוספות surmises:

– משמע לגבי אדם לא שייך כל דפריש מרובא פריש משום דהדר לניחותיה

It seems from that גמרא, that concerning a person the rule of כל דפריש מרובא פריש מרובא פריש מרובא פריש does not apply, since he returns to his 'resting place', as that גמרא clearly stated concerning the woman. She is not considered פריש even though he was א הדר מקדש her בשוק, since (eventually) she is הדרא לניחותא. However, here in our גמרא it states that if the (suspected) man leaves his house, he is considered a פריש, even though that later he will be הדר לניחותיה. What is the difference between our case where the man is considered a פריש, and the מכריש where the woman is considered מבויר, since א לניחותא?!

מוספות answers:

ולאו פירכא היא דהתם בשעת האיסור כשזה בא על שום אשה -

And there is no contradiction between the two גמרות, for there at the time of the suspected transgression, which means when this משלה has relations with any woman; and we are concerned that perhaps this woman is related to the woman the שליה was then at that very same time it is possible that –

הדרא לניחותא האשה שקידש השליח -

The woman whom the מקדש was מקדש returned to her resting place, and she retains her קביעות. The woman, that was מקודשת ע"י השליח, is the source of the איסור. איסור פרוע, 19 שיסור כמחצה של ווא פרוע, 19 הדרא לניחותא. The term איסור כמחצה על מחצה ווא איסור כמחצה של הדרא לניחותא.

⁸ It would seem from the beginning of תוספות that the question is (also) on the case of אזלא איהי לגבייהו that if she did not go into the house it is not considered קבוע even though he is הדר לניהותיה. However the question is (also) certainly on what the מהר"ם שי"ף. See פריש. פריש.

⁹ Let us assume that the משלים wants to marry איסור. רחל אוס היהל. We are unsure whether the מקדש was שליה. The source of the (possible) משליח, for איסור, for משלח on her own would be permitted to the מקודש. Ordinarily we would assume that איסור was not שליה by the שליה, since all the women of the world were not מקודש by the מקודש by the מקום הקביעות, and החל is now at her מקום הקביעות, then the rule of מקודש says that the probability that the מקודש says that the probability that any of the other women of the world combined were "דווא". See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

is not concerning the woman whom the משלח wishes to marry, but rather the woman who was through the שליח. She may be קבוע at the time of the איסור.

אבל הכא כי אזלי אינהו לגבה בשעה שאסרה הרי הוא נייד:

However here, in our גמרא, when the unidentified people go to her he is נייד at the time of the איסור. There is no קבוע at all. We assume that he was פריש from the תרי) רובי from the כשרים. The defining factor is if there is a קביעות at the time of the (suspected) איסור (regardless whether later the פריש will return to his קבוע status).

SUMMARY

The איסור is considered איסור only if the איסור took place in his house.

The concept of איסור is limited to the source of the איסור at the time of the איסור. Otherwise it is considered פריש, even if after the מעשה it is מעשה it is הדרא לניחותא.

THINKING IT OVER

- 1. תוספות explains that since the תוספות ע"י השליח אשה המקודשת ווספות הדרא לניחותא is אשה המקודשת ע"י השליח, she is considered אסור בכל הנשים and therefore the משלה is בכל הנשים בכל הנשים. Seemingly it is not understood. In the case of תשע חנויות are the איסור are the חנויות. They are איסור However if something was found outside the חנויות, it is מקודשת are מותר קבוע are המקודשת. פירש פירש פירש. The same should apply here. Granted the מקודשת בשוק should be valid, since she was פריש should be valid, since she was פריש and the women?!¹¹
- 2. Is there any connection between the opening remarks of תוספות, and the ensuing question and answer?
- 3. What would be the ruling if the תינוק is found in a house; 12 is it considered קבוע and he is a ישראל לחומרא or not? 13

¹¹ See (ואילך) סוכ"ד אות ט.

¹⁰ See footnote # 9.

¹² See footnote # 2.

¹³ See אילת השחר.