



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

Scrubbing Right Before Immersing

The *Gemora* inquires whether a woman may scrub herself on the same night that she immerses in the *mikvah* (for perhaps she will be rushed, which will lead to an improper scrubbing). Mar Zutra says she may not, and Rav Chinena from Sura says she may.

Rav Adda supported Rav Chinena’s position from the story of the wife of Aba Mari the exilarch, who was in a fight with her husband, and therefore didn’t plan to immerse. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak went to persuade her to immerse in the *mikvah*, and she asked him why he came that night, as he could have just come tomorrow. Rav Nachman understood that she was saying that she couldn’t immerse tonight, since she hadn’t scrubbed, so he asked her whether she was missing the materials necessary for washing and scrubbing (pots to heat the water, a seat to sit on, servants to wash her), as she can still scrub tonight.

Rava taught that a woman who is immersing after *Shabbos* scrubs before *Shabbos*.

Rav Pappa challenged Rava, as Ravin sent a ruling in a letter that a woman should not scrub before *Shabbos* for immersing after *Shabbos*, as we want her scrubbing to be as close as possible to the immersion, for perhaps, even scrubbing on the day before immersion should be avoided.

Rava then announced to everyone that his original ruling was erroneous, as we require the scrubbing to be as close as possible to immersion. A woman therefore may not scrub before *Shabbos* for immersion after *Shabbos*.

The *Gemora* rules that a woman may scrub in the day before the night when she immerses, and she must scrub at night.

The *Gemora* explains that although these seem to contradict, the rulings mean that when she can scrub in the day before she should, but if she cannot (e.g., when immersing after *Shabbos*), she scrubs the same night that she immerses. (67b – 68a)

Checking After Seeing Blood

The *Mishna* discusses the rules of a woman examining herself after seeing blood. If she was a *niddah*, she may start counting after the seventh day, as long as she stops seeing. If she checked on the seventh day and found that she was clean, but she didn’t examine herself at the end of that day, and then later checked and found that she was unclean, we assume that she was clean until the last checking. Alternately, if she checked on the seventh day, and found herself clean, she didn’t check at the end of that day, and then later checked and found herself clean, we assume she was unclean until the last checking.

In the first case, as we learned at the start of *Niddah*, she is considered unclean before her last checking, for 24 hours, or until the last checking that was clean (whichever came later), but if she has a fixed period when she sees, she is only unclean from the last checking forward.

Rabbi Yehudah says that only a checking at the end of the day establishes an assumption of purity, and therefore even in the first case, we assume she was unclean throughout.

The Sages say that even if she checked on the second day and found herself clean, we assume that she was clean (*from the time she immersed*) until she found otherwise. (68a)

Definite or Possible Zavah

The *Gemora* cites a dispute of Rav and Levi about a woman's status. Rav says that she is assumed to be a *zavah*, but Levi says she we only consider her possibly a *zavah*.

The *Gemora* explains that they are not discussing the first case of the *Mishna*, as it says that she is assumed clean. Although we can understand Levi's position to apply to the second case, but Rav's position cannot be about it, as she found herself clean, giving us no reason to consider her to definitely be a *zavah*.

The *Gemora* therefore says that their dispute is about a different case, when a *niddah* checked on the seventh day, and found herself unclean, then didn't check at the end of the day, and then checked three days later, and found herself unclean. Rav says that since she found herself unclean before the three days and after the three days, we assume she was unclean throughout, making her a definite *zavah*. Levi says that she may have stopped seeing sometime during the three days, so we can only consider her a possible *zavah*.

Levi similarly taught a *braisa* that in the second case of the *Mishna*, whether she ultimately found herself clean or unclean, she is a possible *zavah*. (68a – 68b)

Retroactive Impurity for a Zavah

The *Gemora* suggests that the *Mishna's* statement that the woman who found herself unclean after seven *niddah* days is retroactively considered unclean for a period before the checking disproves Rava, who says that retroactive impurity does not apply to *zavah*. Although we already disproved Rava, the *Gemora* suggests that this should be another disproof.

The *Gemora* says that Rava can deflect this *Mishna's* statement by saying that it is referring to the case of a virgin who began menstruating before marriage and then saw blood from her first relations with her husband. Since she interrupted her regular menstrual cycle with blood which is clean (*for the wedding night*), we may have thought that the next time she menstruates is like the first time she did, and therefore has no retroactive impurity. The *Mishna* therefore teaches that she does have retroactive impurity the next time she menstruates. (68b)

Regular Cycles & Retroactive Impurity

The *Gemora* suggests that the *Mishna's* statement that a woman who sees after *niddah* (*in zivah*) with a regular cycle isn't retroactively unclean disproves Rav Huna bar Chiya's quote from Shmuel that a woman doesn't establish a regular cycle during a *zivah* period.

The *Gemora* says that Rav Huna can deflect this, by saying that Shmuel's statement was only insofar as not needing three times to undo a pattern, as it isn't common for her to see at all during *zivah*. However, he agrees that if she does see three times in a pattern, she is considered regular, and has no retroactive impurity. (68b)

When Can a Clean Status be Established?

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* about Rabbi Yehudah's position that only checking at the end of the day can establish purity. The Sages challenged Rabbi Yehudah, saying that his position would be tenable if she would be checking for the full duration of twilight, from the day until definite nightfall. But, if all that is necessary is checking at the end of the last day, we still don't know for certain that she has stopped seeing. If so, finding herself clean at the end of the last day should be no better than finding herself clean on the first day.

The *Gemora* asks why the Sages mentioned the first day, as we assumed that no one that checking on the first day can establish purity.



The *Gemora* answers that the Sages do say that checking on the first day can establish purity, and cites a supporting *braisa*. In the *braisa*, Rebbe, while walking with Rabbi Yossi and Rabbi Shimon, asked them about a *niddah* who examined herself on the seventh day and found herself clean, but didn't check at the end of the day, and later checked and found herself unclean. They said that she is assumed clean until the last checking. He then asked them if this is true even if she first checked on the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, or second day, and they said it is. Afterwards, he said that he erred in not asking about the first day, as they would have said that it's still true. In all the later days, even though she started with an unclean status, once she finds herself clean, we assume she has stopped seeing. The same logic applies just as equally to finding herself clean on the first day.

The *Gemora* explains that originally he thought that on a day where there was a flow, we assume the flow continued, and therefore he didn't ask about the first day, but he then realized that the first day is no different. (68b)

Checking Seven Clean Days

The *Mishna* talks about a *zav* and *zavah's* checking who checked only on the first and seventh days of their required seven clean days and found themselves clean. Rabbi Eliezer says that they may count all seven days as clean, Rabbi Yehoshua says that they may only count these two clean days, and Rabbi Akiva says that they can only count the seventh day.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* about this dispute. Rabbi Eliezer challenges Rabbi Yehoshua, as he is allowing them to count their seven days intermittently, but the verse about the *zavah* says that "after [the seven clean days] she will be pure," requiring that purity follow the full consecutive seven clean days, with no intervening unclean days. Rabbi Yehoshua replies that there are cases of clean days punctuated by unclean ones that even Rabbi Eliezer agrees to, such as a *zav* who sees semen or a *nazir* who went under trees or ledges overhanging from structure containing a corpse, even though the verse states that impurity of a *nazir* resets his count.

Rabbi Eliezer deflects these examples, as the verse explicitly accounts for these interruptions. The verse about a *zav* refers to one who sees semen "to become impure to it," limiting its impurity to that one day, and not to restarting the clean count. Since semen and the *zivah* flow are different, we are not concerned that one will confuse the two, and mistakenly not stop their count when they see *zivah* flow. In the case of *nazir*, only a bona fide roof makes him impure at a Torah level, but these overhangs only make him impure Rabbinically. People do not confuse the two levels, and we are therefore not concerned someone will mistakenly not restart when he becomes impure at the Torah level. However, if we allow the *zav* or *zavah* to continue their count even though they *may* have seen a flow which would restart the count, they may mistakenly continue it even if they *do* see such a flow.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* in which Rabbi Yosi and Rabbi Shimon say that Rabbi Eliezer's position is more logical than Rabbi Yehoshua's and Rabbi Akiva's is the most logical, but we rule like Rabbi Eliezer. (68b)

First and Eighth Days

The *Gemora* discusses Rabbi Eliezer's position on a *zav* or *zavah* who only checked on the first and eighth day and found themselves clean. Does Rabbi Eliezer require the start and end to be clean, making this case unclean, or does he only require the start to be clean, making this case clean? Rav says that a start is sufficient, and therefore this case is pure, and Rabbi Chanina says that a start and end are necessary, and therefore this case is impure.

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this with a *braisa* which says that all agree that if the *zav* or *zavah* checked only the first and eighth days and found them clean that they only can count the eighth day. The *Gemora* assumes that the *braisa* is referring to Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua, proving Rabbi Chanina's position.

The *Gemora* deflects this, saying the *braisa* is only referring to Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Akiva, who don't count

intervening days, but Rabbi Eliezer may say that the first clean day suffices to make them pure. (68b – 69a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Scrubbing Before Immersing

The *Gemora* discusses the timing of scrubbing that a woman must do before immersing in the *mikvah*. The *Gemora* cites two rulings which seem to contradict – that a woman should scrub in the daytime before immersing at night, and that she should scrub at night – and resolves them by saying that it depends on what is possible.

Rashi explains that optimally a woman should scrub in the daytime right before the night she immerses, since we are concerned that if she scrubs at night she will rush too much, in her haste to get back to her husband. However, if the day before immersing is a *Shabbos* or *Yom Tov*, when she cannot scrub, we allow her to scrub at night. This is preferable to scrubbing the earliest day before, since that will be too long before immersing.

The She'altos explains the distinction reversely. Optimally, a woman should scrub in the night that she immerses, to scrub as soon as possible before immersing. However, when she immerses on *Shabbos* or *Yom Tov*, and therefore cannot scrub at night, she may scrub the day before.

Tosfos cites another explanation that the *Gemora* rulings and distinction are limited to the case of immersing the night after *Shabbos*. The ruling that says that she should scrub in the night refers to a *Shabbos*, followed by a regular weekday. However, when the Sunday is a *Yom Tov*, she scrubs before *Shabbos*, since she has no option of scrubbing the night she immerses.

The Shulchan Aruch (YD 199:3) rules like Rashi, but says (based on the Rosh) that the correct practice to fulfill all opinions is to begin scrubbing in the daytime, and continue until the night time, and then immerse.

Similarly (based on Tosfos 68a Kach), another correct practice is for a woman who has finished scrubbing at home to take along a comb to the *mikvah* and comb her hair before immersing.

The Shulchan Aruch (4) rules that if she immerses after *Shabbos*, she should scrub that night, but the Rama adds that it's proper for her to also scrub before *Shabbos*.

If she immerses Friday night, she must scrub before *Shabbos* (5) and if she immerse on a night when she cannot scrub that night nor the day before (e.g., the night after *Shabbos* which is Yom Tov, or a Friday night after two days of Yom Tov), she scrubs at the latest possible day before immersing, and is careful to keep her hair tied to avoid any tangling. Before immersing, she must inspect and clean herself as much as possible, within the confines of the restrictions of *Shabbos* or Yom Tov (6).

DAILY MASHAL

He Didn't Worry about Admitting to a Mistake

HaGaon Rav Y. Kaminetzki zt"l said: The Chazon Ish zt"l was famous for ruling *halachos* concerning saving lives. What was his special power? There are many who could competently rule these serious questions but they worry lest they should err and subsequently be forced to admit it and what a dreadful embarrassment that would be. The Chazon Ish did not worry about admitting to an error and was clean of this personal *negi'ah* (partiality). Thus he ruled such questions just as he ruled other simple questions.