Rabboh said, Rabi Yosi maintains, etc. - אמר רבה קסבר רבי יוסי כולי

Overview

רבה explained that even in a case where ראוה שנבעלה, nevertheless ר' יוסי that she is permitted to marry immediately (because she is תוספות.). תוספות clarifies that it is possible that according to רבה no explanation is needed to justify the ruling of ר' יוסי.

אליבא דרבי יוחנן משני¹ -

is answering for רבה, according to the view of ר' יהודה that ה' יהודה that ר' יהודה that ר' יהודה a שבויה is שבויה and is בחזקת בתולה and therefore she receives -

- זלדידיה דמפרש טעמא דרבי יהודה שלא יהא חוטא נשכר לא קשיא מידי² For according to רבה himself, who explains the reason why דיי maintains that a שבויה receives קנס, is so that a sinner should not profit, there is no question at all –

תוספות cautions:

ומיהו רבה לא קאמר אלא דלמא³]:

[However, 727 merely only said, 'perhaps'.]

Summary

Seemingly the contradiction between the rulings of ר' יהודה is only according to 'ר' יוחנן, but not according to רבה.

Thinking it over

Why was this bracketed insert not mentioned previously (on לו,ב תוס' ד"ה מכל) where תוספות also stated, אבל לרבה וכו' לא קשיא מידי'?

ר יהודה ' maintains in our משנה (לו,ב no) that one is הייב בקנס if he is שבויה α מאנס/מפתה. According to ר' יוחנן reason is because she remains קימא בחולה, בקדושתה This led us to the contradiction from the הגיורת 6ס ברייתא where היהדה where בי 'maintains she has to wait three months. The גמרא had to answer שראה שנבעלה. We then had the question א"ה מ"ט דר' יוסי, and רבה gave his answer.

² According to בהוא שבויה is not a בתולה (and she receives קנס only because שבר שבויה א חוטא נשכר) so therefore there is no contradiction from the בחזקת where הגיורת והשבויה or maintains they have to wait (since she is בחזקת , so we are not discussing a case of א"ה מ"ט דר' יוסי, therefore there is no question of א"ה מ"ט דר' יוסי, for he can maintains that she is not בחזקת שנבעלה.

stated clearly that הדומה במודי היוחנן לי who maintains that a שבויה can (even) eat הי יהודה; that is how certain he was that she is בחזקת שלא נבעלה. To this רבה responded, we cannot be sure that ר' יהודה (who grants her כן) agrees with ר"ד, perhaps the reason he grants her קנס ושלא יהא הוטא נשכר א לא יהא himself was not sure; it is possible that ר' יהודה did agree with ר' and the contradiction from the ברייתא would be valid and we would need to resolve the view of רבה, even according to רבה. See 'Thinking it over'.