



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 following query was put forward: What is Rabbi Yehudah's view with reference to tumah?<sup>1</sup> Shall we say, Rabbi Yehudah holds that the second birth is not taken into account only with regard to offerings, because it took place before the offering for the first birth was due, and consequently the second birth is not taken into account; but with reference to taharah and tumah, I might say that the second birth is taken into account in that the period of impurity<sup>2</sup> thereof interrupts [the period of taharah of the first], and that the latter period is afterwards completed and the period of taharah of the second birth commences thereafter? Or does Rabbi Yehudah uphold his view only if it leads to greater stringency,<sup>3</sup> but here,<sup>4</sup> since it leads to greater leniency,<sup>5</sup> he does not uphold his view? —Rav Huna of Sura said: Come and hear: For a woman after confinement, one may slaughter the Pesach sacrifice and sprinkle the blood on the fortieth day after the birth of a male, and on the eightieth day after the birth of a girl? [Whereon it was asked:] Is she not still tamei?<sup>6</sup> And Rav Chisda answered: This is in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah, who holds that the second birth is not taken into account.<sup>7</sup> Now, if you assume that with

reference to tumah Rabbi Yehudah agrees that the second birth is taken into account, how can the Pesach sacrifice be slaughtered for her on the fortieth day, seeing that even in the evening she will not be permitted to partake of it? You must, therefore, conclude that also with reference to taharah and tumah does Rabbi Yehudah hold that the second birth is not taken into account! — No, I may still maintain that with reference to taharah and tumah Rabbi Yehudah agrees that the second birth is taken into account, but that law refers to a Pesach sacrifice that is offered in tumah.<sup>8</sup>

But is she then permitted to partake of it, have we not learned: A Pesach sacrifice that is offered in tumah may not be eaten by a zav or a zavah, or by a niddah or by a woman after confinement? — These may not eat if they have not immersed; the law, however, which states that one may slaughter and sprinkle for her refers to a woman who has immersed.<sup>9</sup> If so,<sup>10</sup> she is fit for the Pesach sacrifice from the eighth day onward!<sup>11</sup> — She is not fit from the eighth day onward, for it is held that a zav who immersed by day has still the status of a zav.<sup>12</sup> If so, she is unfit even on the fortieth

<sup>1</sup> I.e., whether a period of taharah, during which the discharge of blood does not render tumah, is provided for the second birth or not.

<sup>2</sup> I.e., the first seven days after the birth of a male and fourteen days after the birth of a female, during which she is regarded as tamei.

<sup>3</sup> As in the Mishnah where two offerings are imposed.

<sup>4</sup> I.e., with reference to tumah.

<sup>5</sup> In that the period of taharah is extended.

<sup>6</sup> The offering is not brought until the forty-first or eighty-first day.

<sup>7</sup> I.e., this law refers to a woman who gave birth to twins on two consecutive days. The fortieth day of the second birth is thus the forty-first day of the first. On this day she may join the Passover celebration, because the time is due for the offerings which will affect her purification, although they have not been offered yet. The Pesach sacrifice is consumed in the evening

and the offerings of purification may still be offered. This holds good only according to Rabbi Yehudah, who says the second birth is not taken into account, for according to the Sages it being the fortieth day of the second birth she would still be unfit for the Pesach sacrifice.

<sup>8</sup> When the majority of the community are tamei the Pesach sacrifice may, contrary to the general rule, be offered also for the people who are tamei. With this reply we depart from Rabbi Chisda's interpretation.

<sup>9</sup> For the immersion takes place after the seven days of impurity that follow the birth.

<sup>10</sup> That the immersion is decisive and not the completion of the period.

<sup>11</sup> Why state 'the fortieth day'?

<sup>12</sup> In order to achieve complete taharah he must immerse and wait till sunset. If the immersion has taken place, but the required spell of time has

day! — No, on the fortieth day she is regarded fit, for it is held that a zav who lacks but offerings<sup>13</sup> is not considered a zav.

But what will be your answer according to Rava who holds that a zav who lacks but offerings is still considered a zav? — Said Rav Ashi: Rava will interpret the law as referring to the fortieth day of the conception of a male and the eightieth day of the conception of a female,<sup>14</sup> and as being in accordance with Rabbi Yishmael who holds the limit for a male to be forty-one days and for a female eighty-one days.<sup>15</sup>

But is she not, after all, tumah as a niddah?<sup>16</sup> — It deals with a dry birth.<sup>17</sup> If so, is the law not obvious? — I might have thought that the opening of the uterus cannot take place without discharge of blood,<sup>18</sup> therefore he lets us know that the uterus can open without a discharge of blood.

Rabbi Shemayah said, Come and hear: 'Sixty'<sup>19</sup> may convey both a connected and a disconnected<sup>20</sup> spell of time;

not passed, he is, according to this view, still tamei. Similarly, if the woman has immersed after the eighth day and has to wait for the completion of the forty days in order to offer the sacrifice, she is still regarded as unfit for sacred things.

<sup>13</sup> I.e., one who has even completed the requisite time but has not offered his sacrifices. Similarly, the woman is considered fit for the Pesach sacrifice on the fortieth day.

<sup>14</sup> The law does not refer, as we assumed above, to the forty days of the period of taharah, but to an abortion which took place forty or eighty days respectively after the conception. She is permitted to join the Passover celebration because the embryo is considered too immature to cause tumah.

<sup>15</sup> I.e., the formation of a male embryo lasts forty-one days and that of a female eighty-one days.

<sup>16</sup> The blood discharged at birth renders her a niddah. How then is she permitted to be counted for a Pesach sacrifice?

<sup>17</sup> Without any discharge of blood.

<sup>18</sup> So that the woman is tamei even if nobody has actually perceived any blood, for it is assumed that the blood is hidden.

<sup>19</sup> It refers to the sixty-six days of taharah which follow the fourteen days of tumah after the birth of a female.

<sup>20</sup> Viz., by another birth within the eighty days.

therefore it is written 'days':<sup>21</sup> as the day is a connected spell of time, so also the sixty days. With whom does this conform? Shall I say with the Rabbis? Surely, according to them, a disconnected spell of time is an impossibility!<sup>22</sup> It must thus be in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah; and since it is stated that the time must be connected, we are led to decide that he upholds his view only if it leads to greater stringency but not if it leads to greater leniency!<sup>23</sup> — No, it may conform with the view of the Rabbis, but it refers to a woman who brought forth a male abortion within the eighty days of a female birth.<sup>24</sup>

But, then, after all, is it not so that the days of the first birth finish before those of the second<sup>25</sup> and the Rabbis hold that the second birth is taken into account?<sup>26</sup> According to the Rabbis the law can be realized in the case of a birth of twins, a female first and a male afterwards, and where the male was, e.g., born after twenty days of the period of taharah had

<sup>21</sup> The text reads, sixty days and six days; the repetition of the word 'days' and the fact that the first time it is actually used in the singular implies that the period is to be like one day.

<sup>22</sup> For the Rabbis hold that in the case of an abortion within eighty days of a birth the period of taharah of the birth is regarded as annulled and a new period is to start. According to Rabbi Yehudah on the other hand the period of the first birth still holds good.

<sup>23</sup> For according to the first alternative of the query above there is a case of a disconnected spell of time, as described in the query.

<sup>24</sup> So that the forty days of the male, namely seven days of impurity and thirty-three days of taharah, finish before the eighty days of the female. In this case even the Rabbis admit that the second, shorter period of taharah does not abolish the first, longer one, which is to be resumed. The text conveys that the seven days of impurity caused by the abortion are not to be made up after the eighty days have passed.

<sup>25</sup> Intercourse could not have taken place before the first fourteen days of impurity have passed, during which she is not allowed to her husband. As the embryo must be at least forty days old, the abortion cannot have taken place before the fifty-fourth day after the birth of the female, so that the forty days of the second birth must of necessity end after the eighty days of the first.

<sup>26</sup> The period of taharah will continue beyond the eighty days of the first birth. This instance can therefore no longer be regarded as an example of a disjointed period of eighty days, mentioned in the statement quoted.

passed,<sup>27</sup> so that she must keep of the days relating to the female birth seven days of impurity. The discussion, then, is thus: I might think that when twins are born, the female first and the male afterwards, the days of impurity of the latter cause an interruption<sup>28</sup> so that the sixty-six days are counted disjointedly; therefore it is written 'days': as the day is a connected spell of time, so also the sixty days must be connected.<sup>29</sup>

Abaye said: Come and hear, 'Thirty'<sup>30</sup> may convey both a connected and a disconnected spell of time,<sup>31</sup> therefore it is written, 'days': as the day is a connected spell of time, so also the thirty days. With whom does this conform? Shall I say with the Rabbis? Surely, according to the Rabbis a disconnected spell of time is an impossibility, for they hold that it is the second birth that is of avail.<sup>32</sup> It must, therefore, be in accordance with the view of Rabbi Yehudah; and it proves that he upholds his view only if it leads to greater stringency, but not if it leads to greater leniency.

Rav Ashi, too, said: Come and hear: 'Six days' may mean both a connected and disconnected spell of time;<sup>33</sup> therefore it is

written 'sixty': as the sixty days are connected, so also the six. With whom does this conform? Shall I say with the Rabbis? Surely, according to the Rabbis a disconnected spell of time is an impossibility, for they hold it is the second birth that is of avail. It must therefore be according to Rabbi Yehudah, and this proves that he upholds his view only if it leads to greater stringency but not if it leads to greater leniency. This is indeed proved.

MISHNAH: The following people bring an offering of higher or lesser Value:<sup>34</sup> one who refuses to give evidence,<sup>35</sup> one who has broken the word of his lips [supported by an oath],<sup>36</sup> one who while tumah has entered the sanctuary or has partaken of holy things,<sup>37</sup> a woman after confinement<sup>38</sup> and a metzora.<sup>39</sup>

GEMARA: Our Rabbis taught: Some bring the offering of the poor and of the rich, some of the poor, and some of the poorest. A woman after confinement brings the offering of the poor and of the rich,<sup>40</sup> a metzora that of the poor,<sup>41</sup> while one who refuses to give evidence, or breaks his word, or

<sup>27</sup> Even the Rabbis who hold the second birth is decisive agree here that the period of taharah of the first birth is not abolished by that of the second, since the latter finishes before the former.

<sup>28</sup> I.e., the seven days of impurity caused by the second of the twins were to be made up after the eighty days of the first birth.

<sup>29</sup> I.e., the seven days of impurity do not cause an interruption of the period of taharah of the first birth, though the woman is indeed tumah during these seven days.

<sup>30</sup> It refers to the thirty-three days of taharah which follow the seven days of impurity after the birth of a male.

<sup>31</sup> I.e., if two male twins were born one, say, thirty days after the other, so that the seven days of impurity of the second supersede seven of the days of taharah of the first birth. If we said that these seven days are to be made up, we should find the period of taharah of the first birth disconnected. The text lets us know that the seven days are not to be made up.

<sup>32</sup> She will thus have to count the forty days from the second birth and the period of taharah of the first is completely abolished.

<sup>33</sup> I.e., if an abortion took place e.g., on the seventy-seventh day of the birth of a female, so that the days of impurity of the second birth supersede three of the days of the period of taharah of the first birth. The

question is again whether these three days are to be made up or not. The rest of the discussion is similar to that of the two previous ones.

<sup>34</sup> I.e., one which varies according to the monetary position of the owners; a rich person offers a lamb or goat, a poor person pigeons or turtle-doves, and a very poor person a meal-offering.

<sup>35</sup> Lit. 'one who heard the call (of an oath).' A person who refuses to give evidence, though called upon to do so by oath, or swearing falsely himself that he does not know the facts.

<sup>36</sup> Lit., 'utterance of lips'; viz., a promise with reference to his own person, such as to fast, or an assurance of facts of the past, also with reference to his own person, e.g., that he fasted.

<sup>37</sup> The transgression was committed in error. That an offering of higher or lesser value is offered in these three instances is stated in the text. A rich person offers one lamb, a poor person two doves, a very poor person a meal-offering.

<sup>38</sup> A rich person offers one lamb and one dove, a poor person two doves.

<sup>39</sup> A rich person offers three lambs, a poor person one lamb and two doves.

<sup>40</sup> Viz., one lamb and one dove.

<sup>41</sup> Viz., two birds, prior to the other sacrifices.

defiles the Sanctuary or holy things offers the offering of the poor and of the poorest.<sup>42</sup>

Another [Baraisa] taught: Sometimes one offering replaces<sup>43</sup> one, sometimes two replace two, sometimes two replace one and sometimes one replaces two; this teaches that the tenth of an eifah<sup>44</sup> is worth a perutah. The woman after confinement offers one instead of one, namely a single bird in the place of the lamb<sup>45</sup>; a metzora offers two birds in the place of two lambs; one who refuses to give evidence or one who breaks his word or one who defiles the Sanctuary or holy things offers two birds instead of one lamb, and in the case of direst poverty one tenth of an eifah in the place of two birds.

It says: 'This teaches that the tenth of an eifah is worth a perutah'. From where do we know this? — Our Rabbis have taught: If one says, I vow an offering for the altar worth a sela', he offers a lamb, for no offering can be offered for a sela' but a lamb. From where do we know this? — Since the Divine Law stated that the ram of the asham is valued at two shekels, from this we learn that a one-year old lamb is valued at one sela', for it is said: A lamb of the first year, [from which follows that] a ram is of the second year. Then we have learned: 'The pair of sacrificial birds on that day stood at a quarter [of a dinar]'. We thus see that the Divine Law has spared the poor and has fixed their sacrifice at the sixteenth part of that of the rich; we may then assume that the sacrifice of the poorest is to be the sixteenth part of that of the poor. Consequently the offering of the poor is worth a quarter of a dinar. Since a quarter of a dinar has forty-eight perutahs, a sixteenth thereof would be three perutahs, while it has been stated: 'This teaches that the tenth of an eifah is worth a perutah'. Why a perutah? Did you not say the tenth of an eifah is the offering of the poorest and that this offering is

worth one sixteenth part of that of the poor, which we found was three perutahs? — The Tanna derives his proportions from the instance of the woman after confinement, who offers in the place of a lamb one bird, the value of which is one thirty-second part of that of a lamb. But is not the offering of the poorest still the sixteenth part of the poor, as it is inferred from the comparison of the lamb and the ram? The eifah should then be valued at a perutah and a half! — Said Rava, All is derived from the instance of the woman after confinement in the following manner: Since the Divine Law has spared the poor and has fixed their sacrifice at one thirty-second part of that of the rich, as we find in the instance of the woman after confinement, so we assume that the Divine Law has spared the poorest in fixing their sacrifice at the thirty-second part of that of the poor. If so, the eifah should be valued at three-quarters of a perutah! — Indeed, so it is, except that it is not becoming to offer to the Lord less than a perutah.

<sup>42</sup> In these three cases the provision is made that the poorest offer but a meal-offering.

<sup>43</sup> In case of poverty.

<sup>44</sup> Eifah is a measure. A tenth thereof is the quantity of the meal-offering offered by the poorest.

<sup>45</sup> For her olah. As for her chatas, a woman after confinement always brought a dove or a pigeon.