



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

## ***Shades of Blood***

The *Mishna* says that five shades of blood make a woman impure as a *niddah*:

1. Red
2. Black
3. Like the color of the corner of *karkom* herb
4. Like water mixed with soil
5. Like diluted wine

Beis Shammai adds the shade of water in which *tiltan* – fenugreek is mixed, and the shade of gravy that drips off roasting meat, while Beis Hillel says these are pure.

Akavya ben Mehalalel adds green, but the Sages say it is pure.

Rabbi Meir says that if green does not make a woman impure as a stain of blood would, it should make her impure like a liquid would, but Rabbi Yossi says that it does not make her impure in any way.

The *Mishna* defines the shades listed earlier:

1. Red – like the color of blood of a wound.
2. Black – like the color of the black material used for ink.
3. Like the corner of *karkom* – like the clear leaves (*which are brightest*)
4. Like soil in water – like the soil of *bais kerem*, covered and mixed with water
5. Like diluted wine – a mixture of 2 parts water, and one part wine from the Sharon region

The *Gemora* notes that the *Mishna* assumes that not all blood makes a woman impure, and asks how we know this.

Rabbi Chama bar Yosef says that the verse about the authority of the grand *Sanhedrin* refers to a situation when there will be a dispute between “blood and blood” (*i.e., types of blood*), implying that some bloods are impure, and some are pure.

The *Gemora* challenges this, from the continuation of the verse, which refers to a dispute between “*a nega - plague and a nega*,” even though there is no *nega* which is pure. Even though a person whose body is completely covered by a plague is pure, that is because it is classified as *bohak* – whiteness, but not a plague. Rather, the verse about the plague must refer to different types of impure plagues, such as plagues on a person, on clothing, or on a house. Similarly, the verse about blood may refer to different types of impure blood, such as the blood of a *niddah* and the blood of a *zavah*.

The *Gemora* challenges this parallel, as in all the cases of plagues, we can find a dispute about whether it is pure or impure, but if all blood is impure, there is no room for a dispute about blood to arise, needing the grand *Sanhedrin*.

The *Gemora* lists the following disputes about each type of plague:

1. Plagues on a person: white hair makes a plague impure only if it appeared after the skin turned white. If it is unknown when it appeared, the Sages rule that it is impure, while Rabbi Yehoshua rules it is pure.
2. Plagues on a house: Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon says that a house is impure only if there are two contiguous *gris* – bean size spots at a corner (*one gris on each side*), as the verse refers both to “the wall” and “the walls.” A corner is the one spot that is two walls that are one (*as they are connected*). The Sages say it is impure once there is one *gris* anywhere in the house.
3. Plagues on clothing: Rabbi Yonasan ben Avtolmos says that clothing that is completely covered with a plague is pure, just like a person is. Since the verse uses the words *karachas* – back and *gabachas* – front in the context of a person and in the context of clothing, we learn that clothing has the same exception as a person. The Sages say that it is pure.

Therefore, the verse about blood does prove that there are bloods that are impure.

The *Gemora* asks how we know which ones are impure.



Rabbi Avahu says that the verse says that the people of Moav saw the water “red like blood,” indicating that bona fide blood is red.

Rabbi Avahu explains that we don’t limit the impurity to truly red blood, as the verses about a woman becoming impure twice refers to *dameha* – her bloods. Each verse includes two types of blood (*the minimum of the plural form*), giving a total of four types of impure blood. Although the *Mishna* listed 5 types, Rabbi Chanina explains that black is actually a spoiled form of red.

The *Gemora* supports this with a *braisa*, which discusses the rules of black blood. The definition of black is like the black ingredient in ink or darker. Anything weaker, even as strong as eye makeup, is pure. The *braisa* concludes by saying that black blood was originally red, like red blood from a wound which spoils and turns black.

The *Gemora* asks how Beis Shammai can add to the list of bloods, as there are only four in the verse. The *Gemora* says that either they don’t agree that there are only four, or they say that these other shades are other derivatives of red, just like black is.

The *Mishna* said that Beis Hillel rules that the bloods added by Beis Shammai are pure.

The *Gemora* explains that Beis Hillel considers these shades pure, while the first opinion in the *Mishna* does not consider them impure, but considers them a doubtful impurity, and therefore *terumah* food which came in contact with a woman who saw such blood would not be eaten or burnt. (19a)

## Green Blood

The *Gemora* explains that Akavia, who also lists green blood, either does not agree that only four shades are impure, or says that green is another spoiled variant of red, just like black is.

The *Mishna* said that the Sages consider green blood pure. The *Gemora* explains that these Sages consider it pure, while the first opinion considers it a doubtful impurity.

The *Gemora* discusses Rabbi Meir’s statement that although green does not cause impurity as a stain, it is impure as a liquid.

Rabbi Yochanan suggests that Rabbi Meir follows Akavia ben Mehalalel, but only when she bleeds green blood itself, but not a stain, as it may not be blood at all.

The *Gemora* rejects this, as Rabbi Meir should have then said that it is impure “when she sees.”

The *Gemora* therefore suggests that Rabbi Meir means that although green blood does not make a woman a *niddah*, if she is already a *niddah*, any discharge, including green blood, should be impure, like the bodily fluids (e.g., *saliva and urine*) of a *zav* and *zavah*. The Sages dispute this, as the only bodily fluids which are impure are those that collect in the body and then exit, like saliva and urine, as opposed to such discharge, which just flows directly out of the body.

The *Gemora* says that this is indeed a good argument, and therefore revises the explanation, suggesting that Rabbi Meir simply says that such blood should be considered blood for the purposes of enabling food it touches to become impure. The Sages dispute this, as the verse refers to the blood of corpses, limiting such enabling to blood on which life depends, but not such green discharge.

The *Gemora* accepts this argument, but says that Rabbi Meir learns that such blood enables impurity due to the similar word used in the context of menstrual discharge and in the context of water. The verse about menstrual discharge refers to it as *shelachayich* – *what you release*, and the verse about water refers to Hashem as *sholeach* – *sends* water on the land. The Sages dispute this, as one can independently argue a logical argument, but not a *gezeirah shavah*, which is based on similar language.

The *Gemora* explains that Rabbi Yossi, who says that green blood has no impurity, is the first opinion in the *Mishna*. The *Mishna* cites him by name, as one who correctly attributes a statement brings redemption to the world. (19b)

## What Type of Wound?

The *Mishna* said red is the color of blood of a wound.

The *Gemora* lists the following options for the type of wound:

1. Like the blood of a slaughtered ox (Rav Yehudah in the name of Shmuel). The *Gemora* explains that the *Mishna* did not simply define it as “the blood of slaughtering,” as that would imply any of the blood due to slaughtering. Rather, the

- Mishna* referred to it as blood of a wound, teaching that only the blood of the slaughter wound is included.
2. Like the blood of a wound of a live bird (Ulla). The *Gemora* asks whether “a live bird” is meant to exclude a slaughtered one, or a weak one, and leaves this as an unresolved *teiku*.
  3. Like the blood of a head louse (Ze’iri in the name of Rabbi Chanina). The *Gemora* challenges this from the *Mishna*, which says that if a woman killed a louse, and then found blood on her clothing, she can assume it came from the louse. The *Gemora* assumes that this *Mishna* includes any louse, implying that the red of *niddah* is equivalent to the blood of any louse. The *Gemora* deflects this, saying that the *Mishna* is only referring to a woman killing a head louse.
  4. Like the blood of a pinky of someone single below 20, which was wounded, healed, and then wounded again (Ami Vardina in the name of Rabbi Avahu). The *Gemora* challenges this from a *Mishna*, which says that if a woman found blood on herself after sleeping in a bed with her son or husband, she may assume the blood came from them. Although her son may fit this category, her husband is married, and therefore isn’t included, yet the *Mishna* considers his blood as a possibility. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak deflects this, saying that the *Mishna* is referring to a couple who have technically married, but not consummated their marriage, making the husband not fully married, and therefore included in this category.
  5. Like the blood of bloodletting (Rav Nachman).

The *Gemora* challenges the narrow definitions of strong red from a *braisa* which says that Rabbi Meir once assumed blood brought to him was from an eye bandage, and Rebbe once assumed blood brought to him was from the sap of a sycamore.

The *Gemora* assumed that they were ruling about blood that fell under the category of red, yet they were lenient, due to possibilities that are not a strong red.

The *Gemora* deflects this by saying that those cases were blood that fell under the other categories in the *Mishna*. (19b – 20a)

#### Discerning Different Shades

Ameimar, Mar Zutra, and Rav Ashi were in front of a blood letter. He began letting Ameimar’s blood, and Ameimar remarked that the first blood drawn is what the *Mishna* refers to as red like a wound. When the blood letter drew blood a second time, Ameimar remarked that this blood is a different shade. Rav Ashi said that since he didn’t discern any difference between them, he can’t rule on blood stains. (20a)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### Colors

The *Mishna* (19a) lists the four shades of blood which are impure.

The *Gemora* (20a), in discussing the blood of a wound, tells the story of Ameimar, who noticed the difference in the shades of blood in various stages of blood-letting. Rav Ashi remarked that since he didn’t discern this difference, he would not rule on shades of blood.

Based on this story, the Rosh (4) says that we do not attempt to rule whether a specific blood is pure or impure based on its shade. Rather, any blood which has any shade of red or black is assumed impure. We only permit discharge which is white or green, which the *Mishna* explicitly enumerates as pure. This is true even if the discharge has a thick consistency. Furthermore, green includes the color of grass, but also the color of an esrog or egg yolk (yellow) and blue.

Rav Yaakov Emden (She’ailas Yaavetz 1:44) raises the question of brown (like coffee), and is inclined to permit it, as it does not tilt to red.

## DAILY MASHAL

### Feitel, the Wagon Driver

Over the years Feitel the wagon-driver became an integral part of the city of Shklov in White Russia (Belorus). Shklov was no ordinary town at all. In that era it was brimming with Torah luminaries and *talmidei chachamim*. The Vilna Gaon’s sons recount in the preface to their father’s commentary on *Shulchan Aruch* that the town was instructed by him in all matters concerning the study of Torah.

Just as everyone was familiar with the house in ruins at the edge of town, where hundreds of years ago a king stayed overnight and died, thus they were familiar with Feitel and his wagon. His horses were old but with them he roamed the streets searching for a livelihood, maybe someone not in a rush would request a short trip, not too far. He and his horses could no longer withstand the tribulations of a long journey. Every 20 minutes or so they would stop for a brief rest, to catch their breaths and drink some water. Feitel would throw them some hay and carry on. People said that more than Feitel and his old horses



transported the residents of Shklov, the residents had to tow Feitel and his carriage. More than once it happened that the animals' creaking bones didn't react in time to their driver's feeble rein-pulling and the result was inevitable – indeed, plunging off the road or sinking into thick mud was no rare event for Feitel and his horses. It's no wonder, then, that Feitel, his shabby wagon and weary horses were well-known to all the town's residents.

One day, something happened in Shklov. Feitel's horses were seen idling in his yard. The old wagon stood in a corner but Feitel was nowhere to be seen. The morning passed, the bustling of the merchants was replaced with boisterous *cheider* children but where was Feitel?

After a while the rumor spread that Feitel had abandoned his wagon and horses. Two years passed until he returned to climb on his wagon. What happened? Why did he leave his horses and why did he return as though nothing had happened? Just listen.

In the mornings Feitel would huddle with the other drivers in the local tavern to drink something strong before their exhausting work. Feitel would come early. He would sit alone on the bench near the stove, rub his hands and drink slowly. His companions would soon enter, each with his stories and habits. Between drinks there developed a fascinating conversation: someone would say something while others objected strongly, others interrupted and often the company would disband without a conclusion.

That day something terrible happened to Feitel, which caused him to leave his work for two years. As they were wont, the drivers began to converse. If you think that the wagon-drivers of Shklov would argue about the size of axels or the cheapest hay, you're making a dire mistake. At the start of the day these precious people would argue about Talmudic *sugyos*! The same happened on that day...

"And if the bird would be fit by thought to become *tamei*?"

"But concerning *tumah* by swallowing, after all..."

"However, that which eventually will become *tamei* with severe impurity..." "It's not so simple. The Raavad disagrees with Rambam..."

Everyone avidly joined the conversation. At a certain stage, Feitel expressed his opinion about the question but they immediately remarked that his statement was contradicted by an explicit *Mishnah* in Seder Teharos! Feitel was stunned, shaken to the depths of his soul. How could he be a wagon-driver, involved with horses and bridles, if he forgot an explicit *Mishnah*?! An explicit ***Mishnah***, Feitel. See how far you've lapsed, he castigated mercilessly.

At that moment he left his profession and for two years learnt in the *beis midrash*, reviewing Seder Teharos till he knew all the *Mishnayos* by heart. Now, after two years, he calmed down. Now he could return to his work and join his wagon-driver companions at the tavern, now that he'd attained their level. Feitel also knows the entire Seder Teharos by heart!

HaGaon Rabbi Shlomo Zalman Auerbach zt"l told this wonderful tale and ultimately his son, Rabbi Shmuel, told the story when he lamented his father: "Thus father would say: Do you hear? Not to know a *Mishnah*!!! There could be no greater disaster!"

\*\*\*\*\*

Dear beloved brother,  
Join a Daf HaYomi *shi'ur* now. Another *Mishnah*, another *daf*. Quench your soul with the dew of life and you and your home will be blessed with happiness.

**7 weeks Yes, 7. 7 !!!**