



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

The Mishnah had stated: On her heel or on the tip of her great toe, she is tamei etc. One can well concede that her heel<sup>1</sup> is likely to come in contact with that place,<sup>2</sup> but what is the reason for the tumah in the case of a stain on the tip of her great toe? And should you reply: It might sometimes touch her heel [the objection would arise]: Do we [as regards] tumah presume transfer from place to place? Was it not in fact taught: If she<sup>3</sup> had a wound on her neck in a position to which the blood stain might be attributed,<sup>4</sup> she may so attribute it; if it was on her shoulder, in which case she cannot so attribute it,<sup>5</sup> she must not so attribute it; and we do not suggest that it is possible that she had taken it with her hand and transferred it there?<sup>6</sup> — The fact rather is that the tip of her toe is in a different category, because [direct dropping of blood] might occur while she is walking.

But do we not [as regards] tumah presume transfer from place to place? Was it not in fact taught: If it was found on her finger joints,<sup>7</sup> she is tamei, because hands are active.<sup>8</sup>

Now what is the reason?<sup>9</sup> Is it not this: That we assume that she had examined herself with one hand<sup>10</sup> and then touched it with her other hand?<sup>11</sup> — No, her hand is different since all of it might come in direct contact [with the menstrual source].

The Mishnah had stated: On her thigh or on her feet, if on their inner side etc. How far on their inner side?<sup>12</sup> — The school of Rabbi Yannai replied: As far as the place of the hamstring.<sup>13</sup>

The question was asked: Is the place of the hamstring regarded as the inner, or as the outer side? — Come and hear what Rav Kattina learned: As far as the place of the hamstring, and the hamstring itself is regarded as the inner side. Rav Chiya son of Rav Avya taught this explicitly: The School of Rabbi Yannai ruled: As far as the place of the hamstring and the hamstring itself is regarded as in the inner side.

<sup>1</sup> When she sits with her legs folded under her body in eastern fashion.

<sup>2</sup> A euphemism for the genitals.

<sup>3</sup> A woman who discovered a bloodstain near her genitals.

<sup>4</sup> Sc. if the position of the wound was such that when the woman bends down some blood might drop from it on to the spot where the stain was discovered.

<sup>5</sup> Because even when she bends her head low the blood from the shoulder would not fall on the spot where the stain was discovered.

<sup>6</sup> How then could it be suggested here that the blood might have been transferred from the heel to the toe?

<sup>7</sup> On the back of her hand.

<sup>8</sup> And might, though the woman was not conscious of the fact, have touched menstrual blood.

<sup>9</sup> That blood on the back of the hand, which one would not expect to come in contact with the menstrual source, even in the course of an examination, should be regarded as tamei.

<sup>10</sup> The palm of which became soiled in the process.

<sup>11</sup> Which proves, does it not, that we do presume transfer as regards tumah?

<sup>12</sup> Sc. at what distance from their front and back is a stain regarded as being on their inner side.

<sup>13</sup> The sinews that connect the thigh and the leg. The part of the leg beneath this junction and the part of the thigh above it are regarded as the inner side.

Rabbi Yirmiyah enquired: What is the ruling where a bloodstain had the shape of a ring, of a straight line of drops, or of a splash of drops, or where it runs across the breadth of her thigh? — Come and hear: 'A bloodstain on her body concerning which there is doubt whether it is tamei or tahor, is regarded as tamei'. Now does not 'on her body' imply stains of such shapes? — No, it might only refer to one that is shaped like a stripe.<sup>14</sup>

A woman once found blood on her warp thread. When she came to Rabbi Yannai he told her to experiment by repeating<sup>15</sup> her forward and backward movements.<sup>16</sup> But was it not taught: No repetition [test is recognized] in questions of taharah? — We say that no repetition test is recognized only where the law would thereby be relaxed, but where it is thereby restricted we do recognize a test of repetition.<sup>17</sup>

The Mishnah had stated: If she takes it off etc. It was taught: Rabbi Elozar son of Rabbi Yosi stated: In such a case I gave a ruling in the city of Rome imposing a prohibition,<sup>18</sup> and when I came to the Sages of the South they said to me, 'You have given the right decision.

Our Rabbis taught: Where a tall woman put on the shirt<sup>19</sup> of a short woman or if a short one put on the shirt of a tall one, if [a blood stain]<sup>20</sup> corresponds to the position of the genitals of the tall one, they are both tamei, but if it does

not correspond to it,<sup>21</sup> the tall one is tahor while the short one is tamei. Another Baraisa taught: If a woman examined her shirt and then<sup>22</sup> lent it to her friend,<sup>23</sup> she is tahor, but her friend may attribute it to her. Rav Sheishes explained: This was learned only in regard to the civil law,<sup>24</sup> but as regards the law of tumah the lender is tahor while her friend is tamei.

The Gemara asks: But why is this case different from the following where it was taught: If two women were engaged in the preparation of one bird which contained no more than one sela of blood, and then a stain of the size of a sela was found on each, they are both tamei?<sup>25</sup> — There the law is different since there was an additional sela.<sup>26</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: Where a woman put on three shirts that she had previously examined [and then found blood on one of them], if she is in a position to attribute [the blood to an external source] she may do so even though [the blood was found] on the lowest shirt, but if she is not in a position to attribute [it to an external cause] she may not do so even though [the blood was found] on the uppermost shirt. How so? If she passed through a butchers' market she may attribute the blood to it even though it was found on the lowest shirt, but if she did not pass through a butchers' market she may not attribute the blood to it even if it was found on the uppermost.

<sup>14</sup> Running downwards, which is the natural shape that may be expected if the blood was menstrual.

<sup>15</sup> At the loom.

<sup>16</sup> By repeating the process several times she would be able to ascertain whether the thread comes sometimes in contact with the menstrual source.

<sup>17</sup> Because here, since it was found neither on her body nor shirt, in the absence of evidence we assume her to be tahor.

<sup>18</sup> Sc. that the blood is regarded as menstrual and that the woman is consequently tamei.

<sup>19</sup> Without previously examining it.

<sup>20</sup> Discovered subsequently.

<sup>21</sup> Not reaching so low.

<sup>22</sup> Having made sure it was tahor.

<sup>23</sup> And subsequently a stain was found on it.

<sup>24</sup> Sc. the lender, having no valid proof that the shirt was tahor when she had lent it to the other, has no legal claim on the other for the cost of washing.

<sup>25</sup> Sc. as in this case, though one stain could well be attributed to the bird, both women are tamei, so also in the former case, since it is possible that the lender did not properly examine her shirt, both lender and borrower should be tamei.

<sup>26</sup> Which cannot possibly be attributed to the bird. As the stain of one woman at least must be an tamei one, and since it cannot be ascertained which one it is, tumah must be imposed on both women. In the former case, however, where one woman examined the shirt and the other did not, tumah may well be imposed on the latter only.

MISHNAH: [A woman] may attribute [a bloodstain] to any [external] cause to which she can possibly attribute it.<sup>27</sup> If [for instance] she had slain a domestic animal, a wild animal or a bird, if she was handling bloodstains or sat beside those who handled them, or if she killed a louse, she may attribute the bloodstain to it. How large a stain may be attributed to a louse? Rabbi Chanina ben Antigonus replied: One up to the size of a split bean; [and it may be attributed to a louse] even though she did not kill it.<sup>28</sup> She may also attribute it to her son or to her husband.<sup>29</sup> If she herself had a wound that could open again and bleed she may attribute it to it. A woman once came to Rabbi Akiva and said to him: I have observed a bloodstain'. 'Had you perhaps', he said to her, 'a wound?' 'Yes', she replied, 'but it has healed'. 'Is it possible', he again asked her, 'that it could open again and bleed?' 'Yes', she replied; and Rabbi Akiva declared her tahor. Observing that his disciples looked at each other in astonishment, he said to them, 'why do you find this difficult, seeing that the sages did not lay down the rule in order to impose restrictions but rather to relax them, for it is said in scripture, and if a woman has an issue, and her issue in her flesh be blood, only blood but not a bloodstain. If on a testing rag that was placed under a pillow some blood was found, if the stain is round it is tahor, but if it is elongated it is tamei; so said Rabbi Eliezer son of Rabbi Tzadok.

GEMARA: Thus we have here learned what our Rabbis taught elsewhere: It once happened that Rabbi Meir attributed it to collyrium,<sup>30</sup> and Rabbi attributed it to the sap of a sycamore.

The Mishnah had stated: Or sat. Only where she sat but not [where she believes that] she did not sit.<sup>31</sup> Thus we

have here learned what our Rabbis taught elsewhere: If a woman passed through a butchers' market, and it is a matter of doubt whether any blood was or was not squirted on her she may attribute [any bloodstain on her to a possible contingency]; but if it is doubtful whether she did or did not pass the market she<sup>32</sup> is tamei. (58b)

The Mishnah had stated: If she killed a louse. Only where she killed but not where she did not kill any. Whose view then does our Mishnah represent? — That of Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel. For it was taught: If she killed a louse she may attribute a bloodstain to it, but if she did not kill any she may not so attribute it; so said Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel. But the Sages ruled: In either case she may attribute the one to the other. Said Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel: According to my view there is no limit and according to the view of my colleagues there is no end. 'According to my view there is no limit' since you could hardly find a woman who could be regarded as tahor for her husband, seeing that there is hardly a bed that does not contain ever so many drops of louse blood.<sup>33</sup> 'According to the view of my colleagues there is no end', since there is hardly a woman who could be regarded as tamei for her husband, seeing that there is hardly a sheet on which there are not ever so many drops of blood;<sup>34</sup> but the view of Rabbi Chanina ben Antigonus is more feasible than mine and theirs, for he has laid down, 'How large a stain may be attributed to a louse? One not bigger than the size of a split bean',<sup>35</sup> and we rule in agreement with his view. But according to the Rabbis who ruled, she may attribute,<sup>36</sup> how large may be the stain?<sup>37</sup> — Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak replied: She may attribute it to a bed-bug even if it is as big as a lupine. (58b)

<sup>27</sup> And thus regard herself as tahor.

<sup>28</sup> Contrary to the view of the Rabbis.

<sup>29</sup> If any of them had a wound.

<sup>30</sup> A medicinal eye plaster that is used to heal eyes that tear excessively.

<sup>31</sup> Though it might well be possible that she did sit there without being conscious of the fact.

<sup>32</sup> If any bloodstain was found on her.

<sup>33</sup> So that the woman, unless she was certain that she killed one, would always be tamei, however minute the speck of blood.

<sup>34</sup> And these can be attributed to lice, however big the stain.

<sup>35</sup> Even if she killed nothing; while if it is bigger it is tamei even though a louse was killed.

<sup>36</sup> Even if she is not aware of killing anything.

<sup>37</sup> To be regarded as tahor. If it is very big it could not obviously be attributed to a louse.

Our Rabbis taught: A bed-bug is of the same length and breadth and the taste of it is like its odor. Whoever crushes it cannot help smelling it. It was stated to be of 'the same length and breadth' in regard to bloodstains.<sup>38</sup> 'The taste of it is like its odor' has been stated in regard to terumah. For we have learned: 'Or if he tasted the flavor of a bed-bug in his mouth he must spit it out. But how could he know this? Because 'the taste of it is like its odor'. But still, from where could he know this? [Because] 'whoever crushes it cannot help smelling it'.

Rav Ashi ruled: In a town in which there are pigs there is no need to consider the possibility of menstrual bloodstains.<sup>39</sup> Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak stated: The condition of Dodokart is<sup>40</sup> like that of a town in which there are pigs.

The Mishnah had stated: How large a stain may be attributed etc. Rav Huna explained: If the stain is equal in size to a split bean it may not be attributed to a louse; if it is smaller in size than a split bean it may be attributed to it. Rav Chisda, however, explained: If it was of the same size as a split bean it may be attributed to it, but if it was bigger than the size of a split bean it may not be attributed to it. Must it be assumed that they differ on the question whether 'until' is meant to connote 'include and including,' Rav Huna<sup>41</sup> holding the opinion that 'until' does not connote 'include and including,' while Rav Chisda<sup>42</sup> holds that 'until' is meant to connote 'include and including'?<sup>43</sup> — Rav Huna can answer you: 'Until' may sometimes connote 'include and including,' and sometimes exclude it, but in either case the meaning must be one that leads to a restriction, while Rav Chisda can answer you: Elsewhere I agree with you that we adopt a meaning that leads to a

restriction and not one that leads to a relaxation, but here the meaning must be in agreement with a ruling of Rabbi Avahu, Rabbi Avahu having ruled: All prescribed minima of the Sages are intended to impose restrictions, except the prescribed size of a split bean in the case of bloodstains which is intended to relax the law.

There are others who give this tradition as an independent statement: Rav Huna ruled: A bloodstain of the size of a split bean is treated as one bigger than the size of a split bean; while Rav Chisda ruled: One of the size of a split bean is treated as one that is less than the size of a split bean; but they differ on the interpretation of 'until' here, as has just been explained.<sup>44</sup>

An objection was raised: If a woman had drops of blood on her body below her belt<sup>1</sup> and drops of blood above it, she may attribute [the former to the blood that is assumed to be the cause of the drops] on the latter up to the size of a split bean. Now does not this mean a stain of the size of a split bean below her belt? — No, a stain of the size of a split bean above the belt. (58b – 59a)

<sup>38</sup> A stain, though bigger than a split bean, may be regarded as tahor if its length is equal to its breadth since it may be attributed to a bug.

<sup>39</sup> Since the pigs, eating all sorts of creeping things and vermin, scatter about their blood.

<sup>40</sup> Since it had many butchers' shops and swarmed with dung hills and vermin.

<sup>41</sup> Who holds that a stain that is equal in size to a split bean may not be attributed to vermin.

<sup>42</sup> Who maintains that a stain of the size of a split bean may be attributed to vermin.

<sup>43</sup> But if so how could each respectively reconcile his view with the cases to the contrary?

<sup>44</sup> Rav Huna, here as elsewhere, adopting the meaning that leads to a restriction while Rav Chisda regards the meaning here as an exception in agreement with Rabbi Avahu's ruling.