



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

Man’s Emissions

The *Mishna* had stated: But a *zav* and one who emitted semen convey no *tumah* (until the discharge exits their body). The *Gemora* cites the Scriptural sources for these *halachos*.

The *Mishna* had stated: If a man was eating *terumah*, and then felt his body shaking [due to semen exiting, he must hold his organ to prevent it from exiting (he is therefore not regarded as *tamei*), and then swallow the *terumah*].

The *Gemora* asks: May he take hold of his organ? But, it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Eliezer said: Whoever holds his organ while urinating is as though he had brought a flood upon the world? To this Abaye replied that he should take hold of his organ with a thick cloth.

Rava had answered: It may even be referring to a soft cloth, (but it is permitted) for once the semen has been uprooted, it is uprooted (and the semen will have been wasted anyway).

Abaye disagrees, for he is concerned that additional semen might be wasted (if he becomes aroused).

Rava, the *Gemora* notes, is not concerned about the increase of semen.

The *Gemora* asks: But does he not concern himself for this, seeing that it was taught in a *braisa*: To what may this (the way in which the semen leaves the body) be compared? It is to the putting of a finger into the eye where, as long as the finger remains in it, the eye continues to tear? [Evidently, additional semen can be emitted!]

The *Gemora* answers: Rava holds that it is quite uncommon for one to get aroused twice in the same time frame (and since that *Mishna*

was referring to a case where he began to ejaculate, it is uncommon for it to happen again).

Shmuel said: Any semen - the emission of which is not felt throughout one’s body, causes no *tumah*. The *Gemora* cites a scriptural verse as the source for this.

The *Gemora* asks from a *Mishna*: If a man had unchaste thoughts in the night and when he rose up he found his flesh (*organ*) heated, he is *tamei*. [This is so because he probably emitted some semen. And since this would presumably occur without his being aware of it, and his entire body did not feel it, an objection arises against Shmuel!]

Rav Huna answered that this applies to a man who dreamt of indulging in cohabitation – and it is impossible to indulge in the act without experiencing the sensation.

The *Gemora* cites a different version: Shmuel said: Any semen which does not shoot forth like an arrow causes no *tumah*.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the practical difference between the two versions?

The *Gemora* answers: The practical difference between them is the case where the dislodging of the semen was perceived but the emergence was not felt. [According to the first version, it would convey *tumah*, for it was dislodged from its source with a sensation, but according to the latter version, *tumah* would not be caused, for the semen did not shoot out from his body.]

The *Gemora* notes that this ruling, which was quite obvious to Shmuel, was a matter of inquiry for Rava, for Rava inquired: What is the law where the dislodging of the semen was perceived but its emergence was not felt?



The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the following *Mishna*: If a man who was a *baal keri* (one who experiences a seminal emission), immersed himself (in a *mikvah*), but did not first urinate, when he does urinate, he becomes *tamei* again (for there is a possibility that some drops of semen still remained in his organ and pass out together with the urine).

The *Gemora* deflects the proof, for there it is different, since the emergence of most of the semen was perceived (the remainder that exited without sensation also causes *tumah*).

The *Gemora* cites a third version: Shmuel said: Any semen which does not shoot forth like an arrow cannot cause fertilization.

The *Gemora* infers from here that it is only fertilization that it does not cause, but it does cause *tumah*.

Rava inquired: What is the law where an idolater indulged in sexual thoughts (as a result of which semen had been dislodged but did not emerge), and then he went down and immersed in a *mikvah* (for the purpose of converting)? Even if in the previous case, we follow the time of dislodgement, perhaps this would only apply where the law is a stringency (by a Jew that he is rendered *tamei*), but not here, where the law would be a lenient one (for at that time he was a gentile, and he therefore would not become *tamei*); or perhaps no distinction should be made? The *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved.

Rava inquired: What is the law where the urine of an idolatress (who is regarded as a *zavah*) had been dislodged from the source, and then she went down and immersed in a *mikvah* (for the purpose of converting)? [Is the urine, which she later releases, *tamei*?] Perhaps we follow the time of the detachment - even though it can be restrained - by a Jewish woman only, who is Biblically *tamei*, but not to an idolatress a *zavah*, since she is only Rabbinically *tamei*, or perhaps no distinction should be made? The *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved.

The *Mishna* had stated: And the discharges (of a *niddah*, *zav* and one who emitted semen) convey *tumah* however small the quantity.

Shmuel said: The discharge of a *zav* is *tamei* only when the quantity of semen discharged suffices to close up the orifice of the organ.

The *Gemora* asks: But have we not learned in our *Mishna*: And the discharges convey *tumah* however small the quantity?

The *Gemora* answers: He maintains the same view as Rabbi Nassan, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Nassan said in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: The discharge of a *zav* is *tamei* only when the quantity of semen discharged suffices to close up the orifice of the organ; but the Rabbis did not agree with him. (43a – 43b)

DAILY MASHAL

Rain and a Flood

Chazal said about different sins that he who commits them is as if “he brings a Flood to the world”. The following story was commonly heard in European communities.

A person who was known to be unworthy led the prayers on a fast for rain and to everyone’s surprise, rain began to fall immediately after the prayer. The town’s rabbi completely negated the “miracle”: “People like him can also bring a flood on the world.”

A Chupah Before Good Deeds

Rabbi Shlomo HaKohen, author of *Cheshek Shlomo*, writes in his preface to his Responsa *Binyan Shlomo*: “My brother, Rabbi Betzalel HaKohen, author of *Reishis Bikurim* and *Mareh Kohen*, married before he became bar-mitzvah. Our father said about this that he grew up to ‘Torah, *chupah* and good deeds’. At first, at the age of three, he began to learn Torah, then to the *chupah* and only afterwards, at the age of 13, he achieved good deeds.”