

ולדרוש להו דאונס שרי -

And they should teach them that by coercion it is permitted

OVERVIEW

The גמרא taught that from the סכנה onwards the בתולות would get married on Tuesday, instead of Wednesday (as the חכמים were מתקן). The גמרא explained that the סכנה was the decree that a בתולה must be תחלה נבעל. The גמרא asked this is an אונס not a סכנה; to which the גמרא replied that it is a סכנה for the צנועות who will sacrifice their lives not to be נבעל even באונס. The גמרא then asked so let us teach them (the צנועות) that by אונס it is permitted (so there will be no סכנה). The גמרא replied, 'we are concerned for the פרוצות (and the כהנות)'. Our תוספות clarifies this exchange in the גמרא.

אין לפרש¹ דפריך הכי לדרוש כולי דשוב לא יהא סכנה אלא אונס -

We cannot explain that the גמרא is asking as follows; let us teach them, etc. that אונס is permissible, so there will no longer be any danger (for the women will oblige), **only coercion** (they are being נבעל against their will by the הגמון) and the question therefore is -

ואמאי קאמר ומסכנה ואילך הוה ליה למימר ומן האונס ואילך -

So why does the ברייתא state, 'and from the סכנה onwards the custom was to marry on Tuesday', the ברייתא should have said, 'and from the אונס onwards the custom was to marry on Tuesday. תוספות rejects this explanation -

דאם כן מאי משני משום פרוצות -

For if indeed this is the explanation, what does the גמרא answer that the חכמים did not want to teach that אונס שרי, because of the פרוצות (who will [seemingly] be מזנה);² this is no answer -

דהא אפילו לא דרשינן להו דאונס שרי לא מסרי נפשיה³ -

¹ The גמרא initially asked, this is an אונס, not a סכנה. The reply was it is a סכנה (because of the צנועות). The גמרא asked back ולדרוש להו דאונס שרי; seemingly this is a refutation to the answer on the initial question; you say it is not an אונס but rather a סכנה because of the צנועות, that is not so; the צנועות should be taught that אונס שרי, there will be no more סכנה; why does the ברייתא write מן הסכנה וכו'. This is why we may have entertained the אין לפרש (which is merely a question of semantics) which תוספות negates.

² See רש"י ד"ה איכא. Our תוספות will argue with this. See footnote # 3.

³ Nothing is accomplished (regarding the פרוצות) by not teaching them that אונס שרי. If we do not teach שרי אונס, they will acquiesce (and since they think that אונס is also אסור, they may not distinguish between אונס ורצון, and be נבעל [to the הגמון] even ברצון since [in their mistaken view] אונס ורצון are the same). However if we teach that only שרי אונס, even the פרוצות will realize that there is a difference between אונס and רצון, so perhaps (even though [when they did not distinguish between אונס ורצון, they were willing even ברצון [since they are both the same איסור] now they will

For even if we do not teach them that אונס שרי they will not sacrifice their lives
(and refuse to be נבעל) -

דדוקא צנועות אמרינן דמסרי נפשיהו -

For the גמרא states that only the צנועות sacrifice their lives but not the פרוצות -

An additional difficulty why it is irrational not to teach שרי אונס:

ועוד וכי משום פרוצות יניחו להרוג הצנועות⁴ -

And furthermore; and can it be that because of the concern for the פרוצות (that if we will teach שרי אונס, they will be ברצון), **we should allow the צנועות to be killed?!**

תוספות offers the proper interpretation:

אלא הכי פירושו ולדרוש להו דאונס שרי וכיון דליכא סכנה אמאי לא מיחו בידם חכמים -

But rather this is the explanation, 'and let us teach them that שרי אונס', and since there is no longer a סכנה (even for the צנועות, for they will allow themselves to be נבעל באונס), **why did not the חכמים protest against** the מנהג to get married on Tuesday -

ומשני⁵ משום פרוצות לא מיחו בידם אי נמי משום כהנות:

And the גמרא answered that the חכמים did not protest the Tuesday marriages because of the פרוצות, or because of the wives of the כהנים.

SUMMARY

The גמרא ask that since אונס שרי, they should insist on marrying on Wednesday.

THINKING IT OVER

תוספות explains that the גמרא preferred that the חכמים should not allow the Tuesday weddings and instead to be married on Wednesday (and be להגמון נבעל) in order to uphold the תק"ה of 'ד' בתולה נשאת ליום ד'. How can we say that in order to uphold the תק"ה we will permit the בתולות to be תחלה?⁶

not be נבעל ברצון (see שטמ"ק). See [הארוך] א מהרש"א for an alternate explanation.

⁴ If we teach שרי אונס, it is possible that the פרוצות will be נבעל ברצון (which may happen even if we do not teach שרי אונס, but at least the צנועות will be spared (they will acquiesce to be נבעל באונס); however if we do not teach שרי אונס, the צנועות will certainly be killed (for they will not agree to be נבעל even באונס) and the פרוצות will do as they please (perhaps [even] being ברצון).

⁵ Had the חכמים protested the Tuesday marriages and insisted that they continue being married on Wednesday (and that שרי אונס), the פרוצות would be נבעל ברצון (on Wednesday) and the כהנים אשת would (sacrifice themselves since they) become אסורות לבעליהן even though it was באונס.

⁶ See סוכ"ד אות מא.