



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

**A Zav’s discharges**

[A zav is a man who has an emission similar but not identical to a seminal discharge; he is tamei and he transmits tumah only through contact. He immerses in a mikvah on the same day and he is tahor by nightfall. If he experiences two emissions, he is classified as an av hatumah; he transmits tumah through contact and by being carried. He must observe seven clean days and then he immerses in spring water.]

Rav Yosef said: When Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish discoursed on the zav he raised the following inquiry: Does the first discharge of a zav who was a minor convey tumah through contact? The Torah said: *This is the law regarding a zav and one from whom the flow of seed emerged.* Therefore, only if his semen causes tumah does his first discharge also cause tumah, but the minor, since his semen does not convey tumah, his first discharge also does not convey tumah; or is it possible that since if he experienced two discharges (of zivah) the two are combined (to make him a zav), it (the first discharge) will produce tumah?

Rava said: Come and hear from the following: *This is the law concerning the zav;* this implies that whether he is an adult or a minor (he is subject to the laws of zav). Just as in the case of an adult his first discharge conveys tumah so also in that of a minor a first discharge conveys tumah.

Rav Yosef inquired: Does the blood of a first zivah discharge of a metzora convey tumah by contact? Is the place of the zivah a source of secretion (for it gathers inside the body and then it is discharged), and therefore it produces tumah (through being carried, for all secretions of a metzora produce tumah), or perhaps, it is not a source of secretion (for as soon as the zivah

is produced inside the body, it is discharged) and therefore it will not produce tumah (through being carried, like any first zivah discharge)?

Rava said that the following braisa may resolve this: *His discharge (the second one) is tamei.* This teaches us concerning a discharge of a zav that it is tamei (through being carried). Now, of what kind of zav has this been said? If it would be suggested that it is referring to a zav (where he has experienced two discharges), the question can be asked: If it (the discharge) causes the tumah of others (that anything that the zav carries is tamei), is it not obvious that it itself is tamei? It is consequently obvious that this has been said of a zav who is a metzora. [And since he is tamei on account of being a metzora, the inference of the kal vachomer cannot be applied.] And since a Scriptural verse was required to include him in the category of tumah after a second discharge, it may be inferred that the place of the zivah is not a source of secretions (for otherwise, it would not need a separate verse; this proves that the first discharge will not be one that will cause tumah through carrying).

Rav Yehudah of Diskarta said to Rava: What is the proof? Is it not still possible to maintain that the verse deals with one who is only a zav; and as to your objection that it (the discharge) causes the tumah of others (that anything that the zav carries is tamei), is it not obvious that it itself is tamei, we can reply that the case of the Azazel goat (the goat on Yom Kippur which is sent to wilderness and thrown off a cliff to its death) proves the invalidity of your argument, for it causes tumah to others (the one who sends the goat out), while it itself remains tahor (like any other living animal).

Abaye asked: Why did Rav Yosef even raise such an inquiry, seeing that he himself stated that the verse, ‘this is the law of

the zav' implies that he is subject to the laws of a zav whether he is an adult or whether he is a minor, and since this law has been derived by him from that verse, the expression of 'whether it is a male' remains free for the purpose of including a *metzora* in regard to his secretions, and 'or a female' serves to include a female *metzora* in regard to her secretions; and the Torah has compared the *metzora* to the confirmed *zav*: Just as the confirmed *zav* conveys *tumah* through carrying, so does the first discharge of a *metzora* convey *tumah* by carrying.

Rav Huna ruled: The first discharge of a *zav* conveys *tumah* even when caused by a stimulus, for it is written: This is the law of a *zav*, and one from whom the flow of semen emerged. Just as the flow of semen conveys *tumah* even when caused by a stimulus, so does the first discharge of a *zav* convey *tumah* even when caused by a stimulus.

The *Gemora* asks on this from the following *Mishna*: If he experienced a first discharge, he must be examined (to determine its cause). Is not this done to determine his *tumah*? [By ascertaining that the discharge was caused by a stimulus, it would be deemed *tahor*; this is in contradiction to Rav Huna!?!]

The *Gemora* answers: He is examined in regard to a sacrifice. [A sacrifice must be brought after three discharges. In a case when the first one was caused by a stimulus, the discharge is not counted as one of the three.]

The *Gemora* asks on Rav Huna from the next ruling of that *Mishna*: Upon the second discharge he must be examined. Now, what is the purpose of that examination? It cannot be for that of a sacrifice, but not for that of *tumah*, for we apply here the Scriptural verse, 'from his flesh,' which implies (that the second discharge will only produce *tumah* when it is discharged in a usual manner), but not when it was caused by a stimulus). Consequently, the examination must be for the purpose of *tumah*. And since the later ruling (of the *Mishna*) refers to an examination in regard to *tumah*, mustn't the first ruling also refer to one for *tumah* (proving that the first discharge produces *tumah* only when it was not caused by a stimulus, which is in contradiction to Rav Huna)!?

The *Gemora* answers: Your argument is not sound! Each clause may refer to an examination for a different purpose. [The examination by the first discharge is in regards to the *korban*, and the examination by the second is to determine if it produced *tumah*.]

The *Gemora* asks on Rav Huna from a different *Mishna*: Rabbi Eliezer said: Even at the third discharge, he must be examined on account of the sacrifice. [The *Tanna Kamma*, however, maintains that no examination is necessary by the third discharge.] From which it follows, does it not, that the *Tanna Kamma* requires an examination – even by the first discharge – on account of the *tumah*?

The *Gemora* answers: They agree that the examination is necessary only on account of the sacrifice. They argue regarding the word "Es" – "the." The word "Es," according to Rabbi Eliezer, indicates a third time that must be examined, while the *Tanna Kamma* does not give significance to that word as signifying an extra time the person saw an emission. The *Tanna Kamma* holds that the Torah compares the third discharge to that of a woman. [Just as a woman is *tamei* even if her discharge was caused by a stimulus, so too, a man's third discharge will be valid to make him liable to a sacrifice even if it was caused by a stimulus.] Rabbi Eliezer maintains that the Torah compares the fourth discharge to that of a woman. [If such a discharge occurred during the seven clean days, all the counted days will be void and he must begin to count again.]

The *Gemora* asks on Rav Huna from the following *braisa*: Rabbi Yitzchak said: A *zav* was included in the same law of *tumah* as one who emitted semen; why then was he excluded? It was in order to make the law for him lenient in one respect and to make it strict for him in another respect. The law is lenient for him in that he does not become *tamei* if the discharge was caused by a stimulus, and it was strict for him in that he causes a couch and a seat to be *tamei* (as an *av hatumah*, when he rests his weight upon them). Now, when does this ruling apply? It cannot be referring to a second discharge, for a *zav* of a second discharge was never included in the same law of *tumah* as one

who emitted semen. It is consequently obvious that it is referring to a *zav* of a first discharge, and yet it was stated that the law is lenient for him in that he does not become *tamei* if the discharge was caused by a stimulus (*in contradiction to the ruling of Rav Huna*)!?

The *Gemora* counters that this is not a reasonable explanation, for a *zav* of a first discharge will not cause a couch and a seat to be *tamei*! Rather, this is what was meant: Rabbi Yitzchak said: A *zav* by his first discharge was included in the same law of *tumah* as one who emitted semen; why then was he excluded by his second discharge? It was in order to make the law for him lenient in one respect and to make it strict for him in another respect. The law is lenient for him in that he does not become *tamei* if the discharge was caused by a stimulus, and it was strict for him in that he causes a couch and a seat to be *tamei* (*as an av hatumah, when he rests his weight upon them*).

Rav Huna said: The discharge of a *zav* resembles the dough water of barley. The discharge of the *zav* issues from dead flesh (*a limp organ*) while semen issues from live flesh (*an erect organ*). The discharge of a *zav* is watery and resembles the white of a spoiled egg, while semen is viscous and resembles the white of a sound egg.

The *Mishna* had stated: The blood of a woman after childbirth who (*completed her days of tumah, but*) did not immerse in a *mikvah* [*Beis Shammai ruled, is like her saliva or her urine (which conveys tumah when they are moist, but not when they are dry; they maintain that legally the blood discharged in these days is tahor, for it is not dependent on her immersion, but rather, it is contingent on the amount of days after childbirth; the Sages, however, did not want people to err and believe that blood discharged even during her days of tumah is also tahor, they therefore decreed that her blood is tamei, and in order that people should realize that this is merely Rabbinic in nature and terumah and kodashim cannot be burned on its account, they declared that her blood is tamei only when moist and not like the tamei blood discharged after childbirth which conveys tumah when moist and when dry), but Beis Hillel ruled that it conveys tumah both when moist and when dry*].

It was taught in a *braisa*: Beis Hillel said to Beis Shammai: Do you not agree that if a *niddah*, who did not immerse in a *mikvah*, discharged some blood, she is *tamei*?

Beis Shammai replied to them: This is not a comparison, for you can apply this law to a *niddah*, who, even after she had immersed in a *mikvah* is *tamei* if she discharged some blood, would you also apply it to a woman after childbirth, who, if she had immersed in a *mikvah* and then discharged some blood, is *tahor*?

Beis Hillel retorted: The case of one who gave birth during *zivah* proves our case; for if such a woman had immersed in a *mikvah*, and then discharged some blood after the counted days, she is *tahor*, while if she did not immerse in a *mikvah*, and then discharged some blood, she is *tamei*.

Beis Shammai responded: The same law (*that is applicable to a woman after childbirth in the absence of zivah*) applies (*to a woman after childbirth in zivah; she is also tahor, if the discharge occurred after the tamei days of childbirth and the seven clean days after zivah had been counted, even though she did not immerse in a mikvah*), and the same reply (*that we said before is applicable here*).

The *Gemora* asks: This then implies that they are in disagreement (*regarding the tumah of one who was in childbirth during zivah*). But have we not learned in our *Mishna*: They agree, however, that if she gave birth while in a state of *zivah* that it conveys *tumah* both when moist and when dry!?

The *Gemora* answers: This is no difficulty, since the *braisa* refers to a case where she already counted the prescribed days, while the *Mishna* refers to a case where she did not count them. The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* proving this distinction.

It was stated: Rav holds that it (*tamei and tahor blood*) all emanates from the same source - which the Torah declared to be *tamei* during a certain period and *tahor* during another period. Levi maintains that it emanates from two different



sources – when the *tamei* source is closed up, the *tahor* source opens, and when the *tahor* source closes up, the *tamei* source opens. The *Gemora* discusses the practical difference between them. (34b – 35b)

## DAILY MASHAL

### *Keri on yom Kippur*

By: Daf Digest

The Maharil, zt”l, brings the story of a certain unfortunate man who saw *keri* on Yom Kippur. Understandably, this worried him to no end. The *Gemora* at the end of Yoma states that one who sees *keri* on Yom Kippur will die that very year unless he has big merits. He was so worried that he had trouble learning or doing much of anything.

He consulted with the Maharash, zt”l, who replied, “Search your deeds and weed out any unseemly things. And don’t forget, the *Gemora* says that one who does live through the year is guaranteed *olam habah!* You should definitely not allow your learning to be affected adversely by this. Many great people had this problem and lived for many years. You should be very meticulous to learn as much as possible since the Torah one learns will atone for this blemish.”

When a different case came before the Maharil himself, he replied, “He should do *teshuvah* as best he can. So I heard from *ba’alei hora’ah*. It is important to recall that such a thing can happen for other reasons, since we check a *zav* in seven ways to see if an emission occurred on account of one of these seven causes as we find on *Nazir* 65. Even the *kohen gadol* was monitored to ensure that he didn’t eat a food that could cause this problem and disqualify him from the *avodah*. Let this man bear in mind the possible punishment, but let him also recall Hashem’s boundless mercy.”

When the same question was asked of the *Imrei Eish*, zt”l, he said, “It seems clear to me that if this happened on account of

any of the seven things which often cause this, the person needn’t worry about the possible punishment nor should he feel he earned the reward when he lives out the year.

The *Chidah* in *Birkei Yosef*, also writes this, but he says only possibly. But I don’t see any possible doubt in this.”

The *Chayei Adam*, zt”l, similarly writes that if the sufferer experienced one of the seven causes, he has neither punishment nor reward. As the *Steipler* would say, “Should someone who was defiled by his own inappropriate thoughts receive a reward?!”