



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

Attributing to other Bloods

It was stated: If on the body of a woman was found a stain - the size of a split bean plus some addition (*for the ruling is that if it is merely the size of a split bean, she would be tahor*), and a louse was squashed onto that addition, Rabbi Chanina ruled: She is *tamei*, and Rabbi Yannai ruled that she is *tahor*.

Rabbi Chanina ruled that she is *tamei*, since we may attribute a stain to a louse only where the stain is of the size of a split bean, but not where it is of the size of a split bean plus. Rabbi Yannai ruled that she is *tahor*, since this restriction applies only where no louse was squashed onto the addition, but where a louse is squashed on it, it is quite clear that the addition is the blood of a louse, so that only a stain of the size of a split bean remains; and since such a size may elsewhere be attributed to a louse, it may also here be so attributed.

Rabbi Yirmiyah inquired: What is the ruling where a woman handled some blood in the amount of a split bean, and on her body was found a bloodstain of the size of a split bean and a little more (*proving that some blood, at least, came from another source*)? The *Gemora* explains that this question arises according to Rabbi Chanina and it also arises according to Rabbi Yannai. It arises according to Rabbi Chanina, since Rabbi Chanina may have maintained his view there (*by the louse*) that the woman was *tamei*, only because she did not handle any blood, but here, where she did handle some, we may well attribute (*the stain in the amount of a split bean to the blood which she handled, and the addition to an extraneous cause*); or perhaps, even according to Rabbi Yannai who ruled that she was *tahor*, the ruling applies only where a louse was squashed onto the stain, but where no

louse was squashed on it, the stain may not be attributed to it?

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the following *braisa*: If she was handling red blood, she may not attribute to it a black stain; if she was handling a small quantity, she may not attribute to it a large stain. Now, what are the circumstances of the case? Would you not agree that they were of the same case (*of R' Yirmiyah*)? The *Gemora* deflects the proof by saying that this might be the case, for instance, where she handled a quantity of blood of the bulk of a split bean, while on her body was found a stain of the size of two split beans and a little more in excess (*and since the excess over the size of a split bean amounts to more than a split bean, it cannot possibly be all attributed to the louse; that is why she is tamei*).

The *Gemora* asks: But if so, what was the necessity of mentioning it? The *Gemora* answers: One might have thought that one takes the part of the stain that may be attributed to the blood of the bird to be in the middle, so that there remains less than the prescribed minimum on either of its sides (*and therefore she would be tahor*); therefore, we were informed that the stain cannot be attributed to it at all.

Rava ruled: If one kind of material (*collyrium or sap, for instance, which leaves a stain after it is removed, but it was definitely not her blood*) was found upon a woman, she may attribute (*any other stains*) to it any kind of stain (*although they might be her blood*).

The *Gemora* asks from the *braisa* (*mentioned above*): If she was handling red blood, she may not attribute to it a black stain! The *Gemora* answers: A case where she had handled

the stuff is different. [In that case, unknown to herself, something had clung to her body. Since she was unaware of the particular stuff that clung to her, she may well be presumed to have been unaware also of the presence upon her of the substance from which the stain had originated. In Rava's case, however, where she had handled a red substance and was fully aware of it, no ground for such an assumption exists.] There are some who say that Rava ruled that if a woman was handling one kind of material, she may attribute to it any kinds of stain.

The *Gemora* asks from the *braisa*: If she was handling red blood, she may not attribute to it a black stain!? The *Gemora* answers: When Rava ruled, he was referring to a woman who was handling a hen which contains several kinds of blood.

The *Mishna* had stated that if an examination cloth was placed under her pillow and blood was found upon it, Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Tzadok said that if the stain is round in appearance, it is *tahor*, but if it is elongated, it is *tamei*. The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which states that the *halachah* is in accordance with Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Tzadok, proving that the Rabbis disagree with him. [The reason why he rules that an elongated stain is *tamei* is because it was found on an examination cloth, which came about as a result of a wiping motion that she used while she examined herself.] (59a)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, HAROAH KESEM

CHAPTER IX

MISHNAH: If a woman when attending to her needs observed an issue of blood,¹ Rabbi Meir ruled: if she was standing she

¹ Where the question arises whether the blood originated in the menstrual source or in a wound in the bladder.

² Since in addition to the doubt mentioned there is also the one whether the blood issued from the woman or from the man.

³ Sc. in the natural manner, no strain being involved in the process. Only when a strain is involved (as where the woman is standing or where the discharge is slow) is it likely for the urine to return to the source and to re-issue mixed with blood, but not where the discharge is flowing normally and easily.

⁴ Though the urine does not return to the source.

⁵ From the menstrual source, independently of the other discharge.

is *tamei* but if she was sitting she remains *tahor*. Rabbi Yosi ruled: in either case she remains *tahor*. If a man and a woman attended to their needs in the same bowl and blood was found on the urine, Rabbi Yosi ruled that it was *tahor*,² while Rabbi Shimon ruled that it was *tamei*, since it is not usual for a man to discharge blood, but the presumption is that blood issues from the woman.

GEMARA: Wherein does the case where the woman was standing differ [from that of sitting]? [Obviously] in that we presume that the urine had returned to the source and brought back blood with it. But then, even where she was sitting why should it not also be assumed that the urine had returned to the source and brought back blood with it? — Shmuel replied: The reference is to a woman who discharges in a gush.³ But even where a discharge is gushing is it not possible that⁴ the blood issued⁵ after the urine had ceased to flow?⁶ — Rabbi Abba replied. The reference is to a woman who sat on the rim of a bowl, discharging into the bowl, and blood was found within the bowl, [in which case it is obvious] that if the blood had issued after the urine had ceased to flow it⁷ should have been found on the rim of the bowl.⁸ Shmuel ruled or, as some say, Rav Yehudah citing Shmuel ruled: The *halachah* is in agreement with Rabbi Yosi; and also Rabbi Abba gave a ruling to Kala:⁹ The *halachah* is in agreement with Rabbi Yosi. (59b)

The *Mishnah* had stated: If a man and a woman etc. The question was asked: Where both the man and the woman were standing, what, pray tell me, is the ruling of Rabbi Meir? Did Rabbi Meir maintain his view only where one doubt¹⁰ is involved, but where a double doubt¹¹ is involved he does not hold the woman to be *tamei*, or is it possible that there is no difference? — Rish Lakish replied: His ruling¹² is the same in

⁶ Why then is the woman regarded as *tahor*?

⁷ Since the discharge of blood is not bow-shaped.

⁸ As, however, it was found within the bowl it must be assumed to have found its way there together with the urine.

⁹ A person who sought 'his opinion on the question.

¹⁰ Whether the blood emanated from the menstrual source or from a wound in the bladder.

¹¹ Firstly there is the doubt whether the blood emanated from the woman or from the man; and secondly, even if it emanated from the woman, there remains the doubt previously mentioned.

¹² That the woman is *tamei*.

both. From where is this inferred? — Since it was not stated: Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yosi ruled that she remains tahor'. If so,¹³ [the difficulty arises:] Now that Rabbi Meir holds the woman to be tamei where a double doubt is involved, was there any need for his ruling where only one doubt is involved?¹⁴ — Yes, in order to inform you how far reaching is the ruling of Rabbi Yosi who laid down that the woman is tahor even where only one doubt is involved. The Gemara counters: But, instead of disputing about such a case involving only one doubt in order to inform you how far reaching is the ruling of Rabbi Yosi, why should they not dispute about a case involving a double doubt in order to inform you how far reaching is the ruling of Rabbi Meir?¹⁵ The power of a lenient view is preferred.¹⁶

Rabbi Yochanan, however, replied: Rabbi Meir gave his ruling only where one doubt is involved, but where a double doubt is involved he did not maintain his view. But if so, why was it not stated: Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yosi ruled that she remains tahor? — This should indeed have been done, but since he had just left Rabbi Yosi he also began with Rabbi Yosi. As to Rabbi Yosi, however, since he holds the woman tahor where only one doubt is involved, was there any need for his ruling where a double doubt is involved? — As it might have been presumed that his ruling applied only *ex post facto*¹⁷ but not initially,¹⁸ we were informed that the ruling applied even initially.

It was taught in agreement with Rabbi Yochanan: If a man and a woman attended to their needs in the same bowl and blood

was found on the urine, Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yosi declared it tahor and Rabbi Shimon declared it tamei.

The question was raised: Where a woman was sitting,¹⁹ what, pray tell me, is the ruling of Rabbi Shimon? Did Rabbi Shimon maintain his view only where she is standing, since her passage is then compressed,²⁰ but not where she was sitting;²¹ or is it possible that there is no difference? — Come and hear what was taught: If she was sitting she may attribute [any discharge of blood to an internal wound], but if she was standing she may not attribute [it to it]; so said Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yosi ruled: In either case she may attribute [it to it]. Rabbi Shimon ruled: In either case she may not attribute [it to it].

The question was raised: Where a man and a woman were sitting, what, pray tell me, is the ruling of Rabbi Shimon? Did Rabbi Shimon maintain his view only where the woman was standing, since her passage is then compressed,²² or where she was sitting, since only one doubt is involved, but not where a double doubt is involved;²³ or is it possible that there is no difference? — Come and hear: Since Rabbi Shimon ruled, the presumption is that blood issues from the woman,²⁴ no distinction is to be made between an issue when they were standing and one when they were sitting.

¹³ That even in the latter case, where a double doubt is involved. Rabbi Meir holds the woman to be tamei.

¹⁴ Apparently not. For if the woman is tamei in the case of a double doubt it is obvious that she is tamei in the case of one doubt. Why then was Rabbi Meir's ruling given in the first clause, from which the second cannot be derived, instead of in the second clause from which the first would be self-evident?

¹⁵ Who even in such a case regards the woman as tamei.

¹⁶ To that which is more restrictive. While the former must be the result of careful study and conviction the latter may be due to mere indecision and doubt.

¹⁷ Where the woman, for instance, had already handled tahor things.

¹⁸ Sc. if she had not yet come in contact with tahor things she is to be ordered to keep away from them.

¹⁹ When attending to her needs; and blood was found in the bowl.

²⁰ As a result of the narrowness of the passage blood from the menstrual source might well be presumed to issue together with the returned urine, and since this presumption almost amounts to a certainty there remains no more than one doubt, as to whether the blood emanated from the man or the woman, which well justifies Rabbi Shimon's ruling that the blood is tamei.

²¹ And the passage allowed of the free movement of the urine. Any blood discharged in this case might well be attributed to a wound in the bladder, and, therefore, regarded as tahor.

²² And the presumption that the blood emanated from the menstrual source is then so strong that, despite the double doubt involved, Rabbi Shimon, disregarding one of the doubts, maintains his view.

²³ Whether (a) the blood issued from the woman or the man and (b) if from the woman whether from the menstrual source or from some internal wound.

²⁴ Which clearly indicates that he never attributes it to the man.