



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

MISHNAH: Seven substances are applied to a stain (*in order to determine if it is blood*): tasteless saliva, the liquid exuded by chewed beans, urine, niter, soapwort, *kimulia*, and *ashlag*. If one immersed it¹ and, having handled tahir things on it, applied to it the seven substances and the stain did not fade away it must be a dye; and the tahir things remain tahir and there is no need to immerse it again. If the stain faded away or grew fainter,² it must be a bloodstain and the tahir things are tamei and it is necessary³ to perform immersion again.⁴ What is meant by tasteless saliva? That of a man who on that day tasted nothing. The liquid of chewed beans? Paste made of chewed beans that were naturally peeled off. Urine? This refers to such as has fermented. One must scour the stain three times with each of the substances. If they were not applied in the prescribed order, or if the seven substances were applied simultaneously, nothing useful has thereby been done.

GEMARA: One taught: The Alexandrian natron and not the Antipatrian one.

Boris: Rav Yehudah stated: This means ahala.⁵ But was it not taught: The boris and the ahal?⁶ — The fact is that boris means sulphur. An incongruity was pointed out: They

added to them⁷ the bulb of ornithogalum and garden-orache, the boris and the ahal. Now if ‘boris’ means sulphur [the objection would arise:] Is it subject to the restrictions of the Shemittah year, seeing that it was taught: This is the general rule, Whatever has a root⁸ is subject to the restrictions of the Shemittah year and whatever has no root is not subject to the restrictions of the Shemittah year? — What then do you suggest: That boris means ahala? But was it not taught: ‘The boris and the ahal’? — There are two kinds of ahala.

Kimunia: Rav Yehudah explained: Shelof-dutz. And eshlag. Shmuel stated: I enquired of the seamen and they told me that its name was eshлага, that it was to be found between the cracks of pearls and that it was extracted with an iron nail. (61b – 62a)

The Mishnah had stated: If one immersed it and, having handled etc. Our Rabbis taught: If one applied to it⁹ the seven substances and it did not fade away and then applied to it soap and it disappeared, one's tahir things

¹ The garment with the suspicious stain.

² As a result of the application of the seven substances.

³ Now that the stain had disappeared.

⁴ The first immersion when the stain was still on the garment being of no avail.

⁵ An alcalic plant used as soap.

⁶ Ahal and ahala being the same, how could Rav Yehudah maintain that ahala is synonymous with boris seeing that the latter is placed in juxtaposition with ahal?

⁷ The fruits that are subject to the restrictions of the Shemittah year.

⁸ By means of which it draws its nourishment from the ground.

⁹ A stain on a woman's garment.

are tamei.¹⁰ But does not soap remove dye also?¹¹ — Rather read: If one applied to it six of the substances and it did not fade away and when soap had been applied it disappeared, his tahor things are tamei, since it is possible that if one had first applied to it the seventh substance it might also have disappeared.¹²

Another [Baraisa] taught: If one applied to it the seven substances and it did not fade away but when one applied them a second time it disappeared, one's tahor things remain tahor.¹³ Rabbi Zeira stated: This was taught only in regard to tahor things that were handled between the first and the second wash; but the tahor things that were handled after the second wash¹⁴ are tamei, since the person was particular about it¹⁵ and it had disappeared.¹⁶ Said Rabbi Abba to Rav Ashi: Does then the tumah depend on whether one is particular? — Yes, the other replied, for it was taught, 'Rabbi Chiya ruled: To that which is certain menstrual blood one may apply the seven substances and¹⁷ thereby¹⁸ neutralize it'.¹⁹ But why should this be so, seeing that it is menstrual blood? It is obvious then that

¹⁰ Because the disappearance of the stain under the application is evidence that it was one of blood.

¹¹ It does. What proof then is there that the stain was not one of dye?

¹² And any stain that disappears under an application of the seven substances can only be a bloodstain.

¹³ Since the stain must be one of dye. Had it been a bloodstain it would have disappeared after the first application.

¹⁴ Sc. the application of the substances.

¹⁵ The stain; as is evidenced by his second attempt to remove it.

¹⁶ As a result of the second application, which brings it within the category of bloodstains that disappear under the application of the seven substances.

¹⁷ Though the stain is still slightly visible.

¹⁸ Since the application of the substances destroys its natural and original appearance.

¹⁹ Since no one minds such a faint stain it becomes tahor.

²⁰ And thus rendered tamei.

²¹ Without touching the oven itself.

²² Which was an earthen vessel, that contracts tumah through its air-space.

tumah depends on whether one is particular. Here also then tumah may depend on whether one is particular.

Elsewhere we learned: If shards or earthenware vessels which a zav has used²⁰ absorbed liquids and then fell into the air-space of an oven,²¹ and the oven²² was heated, the oven becomes tamei, because the liquid²³ would²⁴ ultimately emerge.²⁵ Rish Lakish stated: This²⁶ was learned only in regard to liquids of a minor tumah²⁷ but in the case of liquids of a major tumah²⁸ the oven becomes tamei even though it was not heated.²⁹ Rabbi Yochanan stated: Whether the liquids were subject to a minor or a major tumah the oven is tamei only if it was heated but not otherwise.³⁰

Rabbi Yochanan raised an objection against Rish Lakish: If one immersed it and, having handled tahor things on it, applied to it the seven substances and the stain did not fade away, it must be a dye; and the tahor things remain tahor and there is no need to immerse it again.³¹ The other replied: Leave alone the laws of stains which are merely

²³ Which has contracted tumah from the tamei shards into which it was absorbed.

²⁴ Owing to the heat of the oven which warms up the shards.

²⁵ Into the air-space and thus convey tumah to the oven.

²⁶ That tumah is conveyed to the oven only where it was heated, but if it was not heated the absorbed liquids convey no tumah to it.

²⁷ Sc. that are not 'father of tumah' as for instance, a zav's tears. Since the tumah that such liquids convey to a vessel is only Rabbinical the oven remains tahor when the liquids are in an absorbed state.

²⁸ Which convey tumah to a vessel even according to Biblical law.

²⁹ And no liquid has emerged. Since heat causes it to emerge the liquid cannot be regarded as an absorbed tumah.

³⁰ Lit., 'if the oven was heated yes; if not, not', since an absorbed tumah conveys no tumah.

³¹ Now if it be granted (with Rabbi Yochanan) that an absorbed tumah, though it emerges under certain special conditions, is treated as clean, the assumption here that the stain was one of dye and, therefore, clean is well justified; for even though it was blood it would (being absorbed) convey no tumah. But if it is



Rabbinical.³² But [Rabbi Yochanan objected] didn't Rabbi Chiya teach, 'To that which is certain menstrual blood one may apply the seven substances and thereby neutralize it'?³³ — The other replied: If Rebbe has not taught it, from where could Rabbi Chiya know it?³⁴

Rabbi Yochanan pointed out another objection against Rish Lakish: 'If a quarter of a log of blood³⁵ was absorbed in the floor of a house [all that is in] the house becomes tamei,³⁶ but others say: [All that is in] the house remains tahor. These two versions, however, do not essentially differ, since the former refers to vessels that were there originally³⁷ while the latter refers to vessels that were brought in subsequently.³⁸ Where blood was absorbed in a garment, and on being washed, a quarter of a log of blood would emerge from it, it is tamei, but otherwise it is tahor!³⁹ — Rav Kahana replied: Here they have learned some of the more lenient rulings concerning quarters of a log [both referring to a mixture of tahor and tamei blood]; [and the law of] mixed blood is different since it is only Rabbinical.

Rish Lakish raised an objection against Rabbi Yochanan: Any absorbed tumah that cannot emerge is regarded as tahor. Thus it follows, does it not, that if it can emerge it is tamei even though it had not yet emerged? — Rav Pappa replied: Wherever it cannot emerge and the owner did not mind absorption, all agree that it is regarded as tahor. If it

maintained (with Rish Lakish) that even an absorbed tumah, wherever it would emerge under certain conditions, conveys tumah, how could the law be relaxed in this case where the possibility of blood cannot be ruled out?

³² And may be relaxed. Biblically no tumah is involved unless blood was found on the woman's body.

³³ This shows that even actual blood, if it is in an absorbed state, though it would emerge under an application of soap, is regarded as clean. How then could Rish Lakish maintain that where the oven was not heated, tumah is conveyed by the absorbed liquids?

³⁴ It is obvious that he could not. The Baraisa cited must, therefore, be treated as spurious.

can emerge and the owner does mind the absorption, all agree that it is tamei. They only differ where it can emerge but the owner does not mind its absorption. One Master holds the view that since it can emerge [it is tamei], though the owner did not mind its absorption; and the other Master holds that although it can emerge it is tamei only if the owner minds the absorption, but not otherwise. (62b – 63a)

DAILY MASHAL

The other replied: If Rebbe has not taught it, from where could Rabbi Chiya know it? If Rebbe, who redacted the Mishnah did not know of such a law, how possibly could Rabbi Chiya, his disciple, know of it!?

Rebbe Leizer HaKohen from Tveryasaid: "If Rebbe has not taught it" – if you have not learned by your teacher – "From will you have Chiya?" – where will you draw your nourishment from? One needs a Rebbe/teacher, for otherwise, he has no life!

³⁵ Of a corpse.

³⁶ Because the blood of a corpse of the quantity prescribed conveys tumah by overshadowing as the corpse itself.

³⁷ Before the blood was absorbed, and thus contracted tumah by overshadowing.

³⁸ After the blood had been absorbed, when it conveys tumah no longer.

³⁹ Though a full quarter of a log of blood is absorbed in it. Those two rulings prove that an absorbed tumah, though it would emerge under special conditions, is regarded as clean. An objection against Rish Lakish.