



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Rabbi Zeira remarked: From the words of all these authorities we may infer that a conscientious man should not indulge in intercourse twice in succession.¹ Rava said: One may indulge in intercourse twice in succession, for that ruling² was taught only in respect of taharos.³ So it was also taught: This⁴ applies only to tahor objects but to her husband she is permitted.⁵ This, however, applies only where he had left her in a state of presumptive taharah, but if he left her in a state of presumptive tumah she is presumed to be in that state forever until she tells him, ‘I am tahor’.

Rabbi Abba citing Rabbi Chiya bar Ashi who had it from Rav ruled: If a woman examined herself with a testing-rag which was subsequently lost she is forbidden intercourse until she had reexamined herself. Rabbi Ila demurred: If it had not been lost would she not have been allowed intercourse even though she is unaware [whether there was or there was not a discharge], why then should she not now also be allowed intercourse? — Rava replied: In the former case her proof is in existence,⁶ but in the latter case her proof is not in existence.⁷

Rabbi Yochanan stated: It is forbidden to perform marital relations in the day-time. What is the Scriptural proof? That it is said: Let the day perish wherein I was born, and the night wherein it was said: ‘A man-child is brought forth’. The night is thus set aside for conception but the day is not set aside for

conception. Rish Lakish stated: [The proof is] from here: But he that degrades His ways shall die. As to Rish Lakish, how does he expound Rabbi Yochanan's text? — He requires it for the same exposition as that made by Rabbi Chanina bar Pappa. For Rabbi Chanina bar Pappa made the following exposition: The name of the angel who is in charge of conception is ‘Night’, and he takes up a drop and places it in the presence of the Holy One, Blessed be He, saying, ‘Sovereign of the universe, what shall be the fate of this drop? Shall it produce a strong man or a weak man, a wise man or a fool, a rich man or a poor man?’ Whereas ‘wicked man’ or ‘righteous one’ he does not mention, in agreement with the view of Rabbi Chanina. For Rabbi Chanina stated: Everything is in the hands of heaven except the fear of God, as it is said: And now, Israel, what does the Lord your God require of you, but to fear etc. And Rabbi Yochanan? — If that were the only meaning, Scripture should have written: ‘A man-child is brought forth’ why then was it stated, ‘was brought forth a man-child’? To indicate that the night is set aside for conception but the day is not set aside for conception. As to Rabbi Yochanan how does he expound the text of Rish Lakish? — He requires it for [an application to the same types] as those described in the Book of Ben Sira: ‘There are three [types] that I hate, and a fourth that I do not love: A scholar who frequents wine-shops [or, as others say, a scholar that is a gossip], a person who sets up a college in

¹ If there was no examination after the first act.

² That each or, at least, the last intercourse must be followed by an examination.

³ Sc. to make sure that the woman did not convey to them tumah when handling them. As regards intercourse, however, when a woman is in a presumptive state of cleanness no examination is necessary.

⁴ That each or, at least, the last intercourse must be followed by an examination.

⁵ Even in the absence of an examination.

⁶ And it may well be examined in the morning to ascertain, regarding tahor objects the woman had handled, whether she is tahor or tamei. As regards intercourse too, should it be found that her tumah began prior to the act, she should bring a chatas.

⁷ Were intercourse to be allowed in such a case there would be no possible means of ascertaining the condition of the woman any more than if there had been no examination at all. Hence Rav's prohibition.

the high parts of a town,⁸ one who holds his organ when making water and one who enters his friend's house suddenly'. Rabbi Yochanan observed: Even his own house.

Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai observed: There are four [types] which the Holy One, Blessed be He, hates, and as for me, I do not love them: The man who enters his house suddenly and much more so [if he so enters] his friend's house, the man who holds his organ when he makes water, the man who when naked makes water in front of his bed, and the man who has intercourse in the presence of any living creature. 'Even', said Rav Yehudah to Shmuel, 'in the presence of mice?' 'Sharp one', the other replied, 'no; but [the reference is to] a house like that of So and so where they have intercourse in the presence of their men-servants and maidservants. But what was the exposition they made?⁹ — Stay here by yourselves with the donkeys, implies: people that are like a donkey. Rabbah son of Rav Huna used to chase away the wasps from his curtained bed. Abaye drove away the flies. Rava chased away the mosquitoes.

Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai stated: There are five things which [cause the man] who does them to forfeit his life and his blood is upon his own head: Eating peeled garlic, a peeled onion or a peeled egg, or drinking diluted liquids that were kept overnight; spending a night in a graveyard; removing one's nails and throwing them away in a public thoroughfare; and blood-letting followed immediately by intercourse.

'Eating peeled garlic etc.' Even though they are deposited in a basket and tied up and sealed, an evil spirit rests upon them. This, however, has been said only where their roots or peel did not remain with them, but if their roots or peel remained with them there can be no objection.

'And drinking diluted liquids that were kept overnight'. Rav Yehudah citing Shmuel explained: This applies only where they were kept overnight in a metal vessel. Rav Pappa stated: Vessels made of alum crystals are the same in this respect as vessels made of metal. So also said Rabbi Yochanan: This applies only

where they were kept in a metal vessel; and vessels made of alum crystals are the same in this respect as vessels made of metal.

'Spending a night in a graveyard', in order that a spirit of tumah may rest upon him. [This should not be done] since in consequence he might sometimes be exposed to danger.

'Removing one's nails and throwing them away in a public thoroughfare'. [This is dangerous] because a pregnant woman passing over them would miscarry. This, however, has been said only of a case where one removes them with a pair of scissors. Furthermore, this has been said only of a case where one removes the nails of both hands and feet. Furthermore, this has been said only in the case where one did not cut anything immediately after cutting them but if something was cut immediately after they were cut there can be no danger. This, however, is not [to be relied upon]. One should be on his guard in all the cases mentioned. Our Rabbis taught: Three things have been said about the disposal of nails: He who burns them is a pious man, he who buries them is a righteous man, and he who throws them away is a wicked man.

'And blood-letting followed immediately by intercourse'. [This should be avoided] because a Master said: If a man has intercourse immediately after being bled, he will have feeble children; and if intercourse took place after both husband and wife have been bled, they will have children afflicted with ra'asan.¹⁰ Rav stated: This has been said only in the case where nothing was tasted after the bleeding but if something was tasted after it there can be no harm.

Rav Chisda ruled: A man is forbidden to engage in marital relations in the day-time, for it is said: But you shall love your neighbor as yourself. But what is the proof? — Abaye replied: He might observe something repulsive in her and she would thereby become loathsome to him. Rav Huna said: Israel are holy and do not engage in marital relations in the day-time. Rava said: But in a dark house this is permitted; and a scholar may

⁸ A manifestation of arrogance.

⁹ To justify their actions.

¹⁰ Ra'asan is one of the skin diseases causing extreme debility and nervous trembling.

darken a room with his cloak and engage in marital relations.

[But] we have learned: Or she must perform it in the light of a lamp? — Read: She must examine it in the light of a lamp.

Come and hear: Although [the Sages] have said: He who has intercourse in the light of a lamp is loathsome [etc.]. — Read: He who examines his bed in the light of a lamp is loathsome.¹¹

Come and hear: And the people of King Munbaz's family did three things, and on account of these they were honorably mentioned: They engaged in marital relations in the day-time, they examined their beds with cotton, and they observed the rules of tumah and taharah in the case of snow. At all events, was it not here stated, 'They engaged in marital relations in the day-time'? Read: They examined their beds in the day-time. This may also be supported by logical argument. For if one were to imagine [that the reading is] 'engaged in marital relations', would they have been 'honorably mentioned'? — Yes, indeed; because owing to the prevalence of sleep she is likely to become repulsive to him.

'They examined their beds with cotton.' This provides support for a ruling of Shmuel. For Shmuel ruled: The bed may be examined only with cotton tufts or with clean and soft wool. Rav observed: This explains what they said in Israel on Sabbath eves, when I was there, 'Who requires cotton tufts for his bread', and I did not understand at the time what they meant.

Rava stated: Old flax garments are admirably suited for examination purposes. But can this be correct, seeing that the school of Menasheh taught: The bed may not be examined either with a red rag or with a black one or with flax, but only with cotton tufts or with clean and soft wool? This is no

¹¹ Since no proper examination can be made in its dim light.

¹² Because each particle of snow is regarded as a separate entity; and only that entity that had directly been touched by the tamei object contracts the tumah.

¹³ So that only those seeds that are actually round the sides of the oven could possibly come into direct contact with the oven.

¹⁴ Which proves that, in the case of an earthenware oven, tumah is

difficulty, since the latter refers to flax while the former refers to garments of flax. And if you prefer I might reply: Both refer to garments of flax but the latter deals with new ones while the former deals with old ones.

'They observed the rules of tumah and taharah in the case of snow.' We learned elsewhere: Snow is neither a food nor a drink. Though one intended to use it as food it is not subject to the laws of the tumah of foodstuffs, [but if one intended to use it] as a drink it is subject to the laws of the tumah of drinks. If a part of it contracted tumah all of it does not become tamei,¹² but if a part of it became tahor all of it becomes tahor. Now is not this self-contradictory? You first said, 'If a part of it contracted tumah all of it does not become tamei', and then you said, 'If a part of it became tahor all of it becomes tahor', which implies, does it not, that all of it was previously tamei? — Abaye replied: This is a case, for instance, where it was carried across the air-space of an oven, [in which case all the snow is tamei] because the Torah testified concerning an earthen vessel that even if it was full of mustard seed¹³ [all within it is tamei].¹⁴

MISHNAH: The sages spoke of a woman in metaphor: [there is in her] room¹⁵ the corridor¹⁶ and an upper room.¹⁷ The blood of the room is tamei, that of the upper chamber is tahor. If blood is found in the corridor, and there arises a doubt about its character, it is deemed tamei, because it is presumed to have come from the source.

GEMARA: Rami bar Shmuel and Rav Yitzchak son of Rav Yehudah learned the tractate of Niddah at Rav Huna's. Rabbah son of Rav Huna once found them while they were sitting at their studies and saying: The room is within, the corridor is without and the upper room is built above them, and a duct communicates between the upper room and the corridor.¹⁸ If blood is found

conveyed to objects within it, even though these had not come in direct contact with it.

¹⁵ The womb.

¹⁶ The vaginal canal.

¹⁷ The urinary bladder (from the point of view of a woman lying on her back).

¹⁸ So that blood from the former may trickle down into the latter.

anywhere from the duct inwards, and there is any doubt about its character, it is deemed tamei,¹⁹ but if it is found anywhere from the duct outwards, and there is a doubt about its character, it is deemed tahor.²⁰ He thereupon proceeded to his father and said to him, 'You told them, Master, that "if there is any doubt about its character²¹ it is deemed tamei", but have we not learned: Because it is presumed to have come from the source?'²² 'I', the other replied, 'meant this: [Blood found anywhere] from the duct inwards is undoubtedly tamei, [but if it was found anywhere] from the duct outwards, it is deemed to be doubtfully tamei'.²³

Said Abaye: Why is it [that if blood is found anywhere] from the duct outwards it is deemed to be doubtfully tamei? Obviously because it is possible that she bowed down and the blood flowed down from the room. [But, then, why in the case where blood is found anywhere] from the duct inwards, is it not also assumed that she might have staggered backwards and the blood originated from the upper room?²⁴

Rather, said Abaye, if you follow possibilities the tumah is doubtful in either case,²⁵ and if you follow presumption [blood found anywhere] from the duct inwards is undoubtedly tamei,²⁶ [but if it was found anywhere] from the duct outwards it is undoubtedly tahor.²⁷

Rabbi Chiya taught: Blood found in the corridor renders [the

woman] liable [for a chatas] if she enters the Sanctuary,²⁸ and terumah must be burnt on its account. Rav Katina, however, ruled: No chatas is incurred if she enters the Sanctuary,²⁹ and terumah is not burnt on its account. According to the first alternative which Abaye mentioned, viz., 'If you follow possibilities',³⁰ support is available for the ruling of Rav Katina,³¹ but³² a divergence of view is presented against Rabbi Chiya. According to the second alternative you mentioned, viz., 'If you follow presumption',³³ support is provided for the ruling of Rabbi Chiya³⁴ but a divergence of view is presented against Rav Katina. According to the ruling of Rav Huna neither of them differs from the other, since one might deal with blood found anywhere from the duct inwards while the other might deal with such as was found anywhere from the duct outwards. According to Rami bar Shmuel and Rav Yitzchak the son of Rav Yehudah, however, who ruled, 'From the duct outwards, and there is a doubt about its character, it is deemed tahor' and 'from the duct inwards, and there is a doubt about its character, it is deemed tamei', how are these rulings to be explained? Obviously [as referring to blood found] anywhere from the duct inwards. Must it then be assumed that their ruling differs from that of Rabbi Chiya? — This is no difficulty, since one refers to blood found on the floor of the corridor while the others refer to blood found on the roof of the corridor.

¹⁹ Since it is obvious that it came from the room. Had it come from the upper room it could not in the natural course have made its way backwards to the spot where it was discovered.

²⁰ Because it is presumed to have originated from the upper room.

²¹ The expression of 'doubt' obviously implying that there was no proof whatsoever that the blood originated in the room.

²² Emphasis on *presumed*. If it is presumed to originate from the source (sc. the room) the tumah could not be described as a matter of 'doubt' but as one of certainty.

²³ It being impossible to decide whether it originated in the room or in the upper room.

²⁴ Since this is obviously a possibility the tumah should only be a matter of doubt and not, as Rav Huna asserted, a certainty.

²⁵ Whether the blood is found on the one or on the other side of the duct, since in either case two possibilities may be equally assumed.

²⁶ Since it may well be presumed to have originated in the room. Had it

originated in the upper room it would have made its way to the outer side of the duct only. Our Mishnah's ruling, 'it is deemed tamei etc.' may thus refer to such a case.

²⁷ Since in that place it is presumed to have come from the upper room, and the possibility of bending forward is disregarded.

²⁸ Because the blood is certainly tamei.

²⁹ Since the character of her blood cannot be determined with any degree of certainty.

³⁰ That the tumah is merely a matter of doubt.

³¹ Who also regards the tumah as doubtful. Rav Katina might thus refer to both cases, where the blood was found on the one, or on the other side of the duct.

³² Since no certain tumah is recognized.

³³ In accordance with which a distinction is drawn between blood found from the duct inwards or outwards.

³⁴ Whose ruling would thus refer to blood found from the duct inwards.