



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

Childbirth Tumah

Rava inquired: Does labor (*bleeding*) render all previous counting (*of clean days*) in *zivah* void? [*If a woman was tahor, the labor bleeding does not cause her to become a zavah. If she was a zavah, however, does the bleeding of labor cancel the required seven clean days, or not?*] The *Gemora* elaborates: Does any discharge that causes *tumah* render all previous counting void, and therefore, this also would, since it causes *tumah* during the days of *niddah*; or perhaps, only that which causes the *tumah* of *zivah* renders all the previous counting void, and this is not a cause of such *tumah* (*and therefore, it will not void the counted days*)?

Abaye replied: A *zivah* that is caused by a stimulus (*for a man*) provides the answer, for this does not cause the *tumah* of *zivah*, and yet, it renders all previous counting (*of the clean days*) void.

Rava retorted: Indeed, this also may be a cause for the *tumah* of *zivah*, for we have learned in a *Mishna*: If he experienced a first discharge, he must be examined (*to determine its cause*), upon the second discharge, he must be examined, but if he observed a third, he need not be examined (*for he is tamei regardless*). [*We see that a zivah caused by a stimulus can cause a tumah of zivah, and that is why it can void the count.*]

Abaye asks: But according to Rabbi Eliezer who ruled that even after a third discharge he must be examined, would you maintain that since it is not a cause of the *tumah* of *zivah*, it does not render the previous counting void?

Rava replied: According to Rabbi Eliezer, the law is so indeed.

Abaya asks from the following *braisa*: Rabbi Eliezer said: Even after a third discharge, he must be examined, but after a fourth one, he need not be examined. Does not this mean that if such a discharge occurred

during the seven clean days, all the counted days will be void and he must begin to count again?

Rava answers: No; it means that a drop of it can become *tamei* that it may be conveyed through carrying (and not only through contact).

Abaya asks from the following *braisa*: After a third discharge, Rabbi Eliezer said that he must be examined, but after a fourth one, he need not be examined; and it is in regard to a sacrifice that I said this (*for if the third one was caused by a stimulus, he would not be liable for an offering*), but not in regard to the rendering void of all previous counting (*for any discharge, even one caused by a stimulus will cancel the count*).

Rather, said Rava, according to Rabbi Eliezer, you may well resolve from here that even that which does not cause a *tumah* of *zivah* will render all previous counting void. What, however, is the *halachah* according to the Rabbis?

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the *braisa* which the father of Rabbi Avin taught: What does his (*initial discharges of*) *zivah* cause him? Seven days. [*He must observe seven clean days after two discharges of zivah.*] Therefore, it (*a zivah discharge*) renders void the counting of seven (*clean*) days. What does his emission of semen cause him? The (*tumah of*) one day. Therefore it renders void the counting of one day (*and if he would have a seminal emission during the seven clean days after zivah, it would render void only one day, and he can continue counting from where he was holding on the next day*). Now, what is meant when the *braisa* stated ‘seven days’? It cannot mean that the *zivah* discharges cause him to be *tamei* for seven days, for then, the *braisa* should have simply said: On account of his *zivah*, he is *tamei* for seven days. It must therefore mean as follows: Only that which causes the *tumah* of *zivah* may render void the counting of the seven days, but that which does not cause the *tumah* of *zivah*, does not render void all previous counting. This indeed is conclusive. [*This proves that bleeding in labor during the eleven days of zivah will not cancel a count which began before the labor, for bleeding during this*



time will not cause her to become a zavah; it, nevertheless, cannot be included in the days of counting, just as a seminal emission cannot be included.]

Abaye said: We have an accepted tradition that labor does not render void all previous counting in *zivah*, and should you find a *Tanna* who said that it does render the counting void, that must be Rabbi Eliezer (who maintains that *zivah* due to a stimulus renders void all previous counting although it does not cause a *zivah tumah*).

It was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Marinus said: A birth does not render void the counting after a *zivah* (as long as the counting began before the birth).

The *Gemora* inquired: Are those days (if she did not bleed) included in the counting (of seven clean days)?

Abaye said: It neither renders void the days that were previously counted, nor is it counted towards her clean days. Rava said: It does not render void the days counted, and it is counted towards her clean days.

Rava provides proof for his opinion, for it was taught in a *braisa*: *And afterwards she shall purify herself*. 'Afterwards' means after all of them, implying that no *tumah* may intervene between them (and if it does, it will cancel the days already counted). Now, if you hold (like R' Marinus) that these days (the days of *tumah* following childbirth) are included (in the counting), one can well see the justification for saying that the (days of) *tumah* does not intervene between them, but if you contend that these days are not included (in the counting of the clean days), surely then, they should cause an interruption between them (and render the days already counted void; this proves that the days of *tumah* following childbirth actually count towards the clean days).

The *Gemora* answers that Abaye could say that the meaning (of the verse) is that the *tumah* of *zivah* shall not intervene between them (but the *tumah* of childbirth is of no consequence).

Rava said: I derive this from that which was taught in the following *braisa*: *From her discharge*. This implies that she needs to be cleansed from her discharge, but not from her *tzara'as* affliction, or from her childbirth.

Abaye understands that this verse only teaches us that she does not need to be cleansed from her *tzara'as* affliction, but she does need to

be cleansed from her childbirth (for we only learn one law from the verse, not two).

Abaye said: I derive this (that the *tumah* days following childbirth do not count towards the clean days) from what was taught in the following *braisa*: [When a woman gives birth to a male, she shall be *tamei* for seven days] as during the days of her *niddah* infirmity shall she be *tamei*. This includes a man who cohabited with her (that he is *tamei* like a *niddah*); it also includes the nights (and not only by day); it also includes a woman who gave birth in *zivah*, who is required to observe seven clean. Now, does not this mean that these days must be clean from the *tumah* of childbirth as well?

The *Gemora* disagrees and says that the days must be clean from that of blood. [Only those days on which a discharge occurred may not be included in the counting, but where the birth was free from bleeding, the days following it may well be included in the counting of the clean days.]

Abaye cites a different *braisa* as alternative source for his ruling: As are the days of her *niddah* state, so are the days of her childbirth. Just as the days while she is a *niddah* are not suitable for the *tumah* of *zivah*, and they cannot be included in the counting of the prescribed seven days (for the eleven days of *zivah* begin upon the conclusion of the seven days of *niddah*), so also the days following her childbirth, which are not suitable for the *tumah* of *zivah*, may not be included in the counting of the seven cleandays.

Rava explains that this *braisa* is in accordance with Rabbi Eliezer, who ruled that the *tumah* of childbirth also renders void all previous counting (of clean days). (37a – 37b)