



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

‘Rebbe stated: Rabbi Yehudah ben Agra’s ruling<sup>1</sup> is acceptable where she did not examine’. Now<sup>2</sup> what is meant by ‘she did not examine’? If it be suggested that she examined herself in the twilight of Rabbi Yehudah<sup>3</sup> but did not examine herself in the twilight of Rabbi Yosi<sup>4</sup> [the difficulty would arise]: From this<sup>5</sup> it follows that Rabbi Yehudah holds that even where she examined herself both times,<sup>6</sup> the possibility of zivah must be considered; [but why should this be so] seeing that she did examine herself?<sup>7</sup> It is obvious then [that the meaning is] that she did not examine herself either in the twilight of Rabbi Yehudah or in that of Rabbi Yosi,<sup>8</sup> but if she had examined herself in Rabbi Yehudah’s twilight<sup>9</sup> and did not examine herself in Rabbi Yosi’s<sup>10</sup> there is no need for her to consider the possibility [of

zivah].<sup>11</sup> It is thus clear that the twilight of Rabbi Yosi is according to Rebbe regarded as night. Now read the final clause: ‘And the ruling of the Sages where she did examine’ — What is meant by ‘she did examine’? If it be suggested that she examined herself in the twilight of Rabbi Yehudah but did not examine herself in that of Rabbi Yosi,<sup>12</sup> it would follow that the Rabbis are of the opinion that even if she did not examine herself in either<sup>13</sup> there is no need to consider the possibility of zivah [but why should this be so] seeing that she did not examine herself?<sup>14</sup> It is obvious then that [the meaning<sup>15</sup> is] that she examined herself both in the twilight of Rabbi Yehudah and in that of Rabbi Yosi, but that if she had examined herself in the twilight of Rabbi Yehudah and not in that of Rabbi Yosi the possibility of zivah<sup>16</sup> must be considered.<sup>17</sup> It is thus clear that the twilight of Rabbi Yosi is

<sup>1</sup> That the possibility of zivah is to be considered even where a stain is not big enough to be divided into three parts, each of the prescribed minimum.

<sup>2</sup> Since Rebbe stated that only in this case he accepted the ruling of Rabbi Yehudah ben Agra, it follows that where she did examine herself he does not accept his ruling though Rabbi Yehudah himself maintains that the possibility of zivah must be considered even in the latter case.

<sup>3</sup> Which extends after sunset for a time during which one can walk a distance of a thousand cubits.

<sup>4</sup> Which lasts no longer than a ‘wink of the eye’, beginning and ending later than Rabbi Yehudah’s twilight.

<sup>5</sup> Since ‘no examination’ only means the absence of one in Rabbi Yosi’s twilight though one did take place in Rabbi Yehudah’s twilight.

<sup>6</sup> The twilight of Rabbi Yehudah and the twilight of Rabbi Yosi.

<sup>7</sup> Making sure that on that day there was no discharge. How then could one subsequent possible discharge in the night be counted as two?

<sup>8</sup> So that the possibility must be considered that she may have experienced a discharge in Rabbi Yehudah’s twilight.

<sup>9</sup> Thus ascertaining that she was clean on that day.

<sup>10</sup> Which is regarded as night.

<sup>11</sup> Since one discharge in the night cannot possibly be counted as two discharges.

<sup>12</sup> And it is in this case only that Rebbe stated that the ruling of the Sages is acceptable but, it follows, where she examined herself in neither, though the Rabbis still maintain that the possibility of zivah need not be considered he holds that it must be taken into consideration.

<sup>13</sup> Lit., ‘in the two’. The twilights of Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Yosi respectively.

<sup>14</sup> In consequence of which she may have experienced a discharge at twilight when the one discharge is counted as two. How then could the possibility of zivah be ruled out?

<sup>15</sup> Of the expression ‘she did examine’, in Rebbe’s approval of the ruling of the Sages.

<sup>16</sup> According to Rebbe who in this case disagrees with the Sages’ ruling.

<sup>17</sup> It being possible that she experienced a discharge in Rabbi Yosi’s twilight when one discharge is counted as two.

according to Rebbe regarded as doubtful time. Does not this then present a contradiction between two statements of Rebbe?<sup>18</sup> — It is this that he meant: The view of Rabbi Yehudah ben Agra<sup>19</sup> is acceptable to the Rabbis<sup>20</sup> when she did not examine herself at all either in Rabbi Yehudah's twilight or in that of Rabbi Yosi's, for even the Sages differed from him only when she has examined herself in Rabbi Yehudah's twilight<sup>21</sup> and did not examine herself in that of Rabbi Yosi,<sup>22</sup> but where she did not examine herself at all they agree with him,<sup>23</sup>

But doesn't the following show incongruity?<sup>24</sup> [For it was taught:] If a woman observed a bloodstain, the observation being one of a large one,<sup>25</sup> she must take into consideration the possibility of a discharge at twilight,<sup>26</sup> but if the observation was one of a small stain<sup>27</sup> she should not take the possibility into consideration. This is the ruling of Rabbi Yehudah ben Agra who cited it in the name of Rabbi Yosi. Said Rebbe: I heard from him<sup>28</sup> that in both cases must the possibility be taken into consideration; 'and', he said to me, 'it is for this reason: What if she had been a niddah who did not<sup>29</sup> make sure of her cleanness from the minchah time<sup>30</sup>

and onwards, would she not<sup>31</sup> have been regarded as being in a presumptive state of tumah?<sup>32</sup> And his ruling is acceptable to me where she has examined herself. Now what is meant by 'she has examined herself'? If it be suggested that she has examined herself in the twilight of Rabbi Yehudah and did not examine herself in that of Rabbi Yosi, it would follow that Rabbi Yehudah ben Agra holds that even though she did not examine herself either in the twilight of Rabbi Yehudah or in that of Rabbi Yosi the possibility need not be considered; but why should this be so seeing that she did not examine herself? It must be obvious then that she did examine herself both in the twilight of Rabbi Yehudah and in that of Rabbi Yosi. Thus it follows that Rabbi Yehudah ben Agra holds that if she examined herself in the twilight of Rabbi Yehudah and not in that of Rabbi Yosi she need not consider the possibility. It is thus clear that the twilight of Rabbi Yosi is according to Rabbi Yehudah ben Agra regarded as night. Doesn't this then present a contradiction between two rulings of Rabbi Yehudah ben Agra?<sup>33</sup> In the absence of Rebbe's interpretations there would well be no difficulty, since the former ruling might refer to a case where she has examined herself in Rabbi Yehudah's twilight and not in that

<sup>18</sup> Lit., 'a difficulty of Rebbe on Rebbe'. According to the inference from the first clause Rabbi Yosi's twilight is regarded by him as right while according to the inference from the final clause it is doubtful whether it is day or night.

<sup>19</sup> That the possibility of a discharge at twilight is to be considered.

<sup>20</sup> Not to himself; sc. Rebbe did not express any opinion as to what view he accepted and with whom he agreed (as was previously assumed when the contradiction was pointed out) but merely explained the extent and limits of the dispute between the Sages and Rabbi Yehudah ben Agra.

<sup>21</sup> Thus ascertaining that there was no discharge at twilight.

<sup>22</sup> Which in their opinion is regarded as night.

<sup>23</sup> Rabbi Yosi, however, who holds his twilight to be a doubtful time, takes into consideration the possibility of a discharge in his twilight which would be regarded as two, one of which must be attributed to the passing, and the other to the incoming day.

<sup>24</sup> With what had been said previously that according to Rabbi Yehudah ben Agra it is not certain whether the twilight of Rabbi Yosi is night or day.

<sup>25</sup> One that can be divided into three stains each of which is slightly bigger than the size of a bean.

<sup>26</sup> Which counts as two.

<sup>27</sup> Sc. one not bigger than a little more than the size of two beans, so that it can only be divided into two stains of the prescribed minimum.

<sup>28</sup> Rabbi Yosi.

<sup>29</sup> On the seventh day after menstruation.

<sup>30</sup> Two and a half seasonal hours before nightfall.

<sup>31</sup> Though in the morning she made sure of her cleanness.

<sup>32</sup> Of course she would, and in consequence she would not be allowed to undergo immersion in the evening. Thus it follows that in the absence of an examination, the possibility of a discharge is considered. Similarly in the case of the stain under discussion, since no examination was held at twilight, the possibility of a discharge that must be counted as two must be taken into consideration.

<sup>33</sup> According to his first ruling supra the twilight of Rabbi Yosi is only a doubtful time while according to his present ruling it is definitely night.

of Rabbi Yosi while here it is a case where she has examined herself in Rabbi Yosi's twilight as in that of Rabbi Yehudah's; but with Rebbe's interpretations<sup>34</sup> does not the contradiction arise? — Two Tannas expressed different views as to the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah ben Agra. The first Tanna holds that the twilight of Rabbi Yehudah ends first and then begins the twilight of Rabbi Yosi,<sup>35</sup> while the second Tanna holds that the twilight of Rabbi Yosi is absorbed in that of Rabbi Yehudah.<sup>36</sup>

Our Rabbis taught: A woman who observes a bloodstain causes tumah to herself and to consecrated things retrospectively;<sup>37</sup> so said Rebbe. Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar ruled: She causes tumah to consecrated things but does not cause tumah to herself, since her bloodstain cannot be subject to greater restrictions than her observation.<sup>38</sup> But<sup>39</sup> do we not find that her bloodstain is subject to greater restrictions in regard to consecrated things? — Read rather thus: Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar ruled: Even to consecrated things she conveys no tumah, since her bloodstain should in

no case be subject to greater restrictions than her observation.

Our Rabbis taught: If a woman observed first a bloodstain and then<sup>40</sup> she observed a discharge of blood she may for a period of twenty-four hours ascribe her stain to her observation;<sup>41</sup> so said Rebbe. Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar ruled: Only during the same day.<sup>42</sup> Said Rebbe: His view seems more acceptable than mine, since he improves her position while I make it worse. 'He improves it'! Does he not in fact<sup>43</sup> make it worse? — Ravina replied: Reverse the statement, Rabbi Nachman said: You need not really reverse it, [the meaning being:] Since he improves her position in regard to the laws of zivah while I make her position worse as regards the laws of zivah.<sup>44</sup>

Rabbi Zeira enquired of Rabbi Assi: Do stains<sup>45</sup> necessitate an interval of taharah<sup>46</sup> or not? The other remained silent, answering him nothing at all. Once he found him as he was sitting at his studies and discoursing as follows: 'She may for

<sup>34</sup> Which inevitably lead to the conclusion that, according to the first ruling, Rabbi Yehudah ben Agra holds Rabbi Yosi's twilight to be a doubtful time, while according to his second ruling, it is definitely night.

<sup>35</sup> Hence it is uncertain whether it still belongs to the day or to the following night.

<sup>36</sup> And since in his opinion the examination must extend over all the twilight of the latter it obviously covers also the twilight of the former, so that the examination took place in both twilights.

<sup>37</sup> To the time the article on which the stain was found had been washed.

<sup>38</sup> In the latter case the tumah is retrospective for twenty-four hours only, while in the former it would go back to the time the article had been washed.

<sup>39</sup> Since Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar agrees with Rebbe in the case of consecrated things.

<sup>40</sup> Within twenty-four hours.

<sup>41</sup> Sc. her tumah does not extend retrospectively to the time the article had been washed but begins at the time the stain was found.

<sup>42</sup> Sc. only where the stain was observed on the same day as the discharge of the blood may the former be ascribed to the latter; but if

the stain was discovered in the daytime while the blood was not observed until after sunset, though this took place within twenty-four hours, the former cannot be ascribed to the latter.

<sup>43</sup> By reducing the period of twenty-four hours.

<sup>44</sup> According to Rebbe who for a period of twenty-four hours ascribes the stain to the observation of the blood the woman is deemed to have been unclean on the day of her observation as well as on the previous day. If, therefore, she were to observe some blood on the next day following she would be regarded as a confirmed zavah, while according to Rabbi Shimon who ascribes a stain to blood observed during the same day only the woman would be deemed tamei on one day only and could not become a confirmed zavah unless blood was observed on the two following days also.

<sup>45</sup> According to Rebbe who attributes a stain to an observation of blood if the latter took place within twenty-four hours, and does not regard the woman's tumah as having begun at the time the article (on which the stain was found) had been washed.

<sup>46</sup> Sc. must the woman have examined herself between the time the article had been washed and the discovery of the stain?

twenty-four hours ascribe her stain to her observation. This is the ruling of Rebbe. In connection with this Rish Lakish explained that it applied only where she has examined herself,<sup>47</sup> while Rabbi Yochanan explained: Even though she did not examine herself.<sup>48</sup> 'Thus it follows', he said to him, 'that stains necessitate an interval of cleanness'. 'Yes', the other replied. 'But did I not ask you this question many a time and you gave me no answer at all? It is likely that you recalled the tradition in the rapidity of your reviewing?' — 'Yes', the other replied, 'in the rapidity of my reviewing I recalled it'.

**MISHNAH:** If a woman observed a discharge of blood on the eleventh day<sup>49</sup> at twilight,<sup>50</sup> at the beginning of a menstruation period and at the end of a menstruation period, at the beginning of a zivah period and at the end of a zivah period, on the fortieth day after the birth of a male<sup>51</sup> or on the eightieth day after the birth of a female,<sup>52</sup> [the discharge having been observed] at twilight in all these cases, behold women in such circumstances are in a state of perplexity.<sup>53</sup> Said Rabbi Yehoshua: before you make provision for the foolish women come and make provision for the wise ones.<sup>54</sup>

**GEMARA:** At the beginning of a menstruation period and at the end of a menstruation period! Is it not<sup>55</sup> rather the beginning of a menstruation period and the end of a zivah period?<sup>56</sup> — Rav Chisda replied: It is this that was meant: If a woman observed a discharge of blood on the eleventh day at twilight a time which is the beginning of a menstruation period and the end of a zivah period, or on the seventh day of her menstruation when it is the end of a menstruation period and the beginning of a zivah period.

<sup>47</sup> Near the time of discovering the stain, within twenty-four hours; but if twenty-four hours have passed between the examination and the discovery of the stain the woman is deemed tamei retrospectively from the time of the examination

<sup>48</sup> Sc. near the examination between which and the discovery of the stain an interval of twenty-four hours had been allowed to pass. Despite this interval the woman's tumah is not retrospective since less than twenty-four hours have passed between the time the article had been washed and the discovery on it of the stain. As the tumah in such a case is not retrospective to the time of the washing of the article, it is equally not retrospective over the twenty-four hours' period.

<sup>49</sup> After the termination of a menstruation period. Any issue of blood within the eleven days is deemed to be zivah.

<sup>50</sup> A time which is neither certain day nor certain night, so that it is doubtful whether the issue was one of zivah or one of menstruation. If the time were certain day the issue would be zivah and if it were certain night (when a new menstruation period commences) it would be menstrual.

<sup>51</sup> All discharges of blood from the eighth to the fortieth day after the birth of a male is regarded as clean and after that begins the menstruation period of seven days followed by the zivah one of eleven days.

<sup>52</sup> From the fifteenth to the eightieth day after the birth of a female all discharges of blood are clean and after the eightieth day the menstruation period followed by that of zivah begins.

<sup>53</sup> Lit., 'erring', as regards the counting of the clean and unclean days prescribed in the various cases mentioned; because they are unable to determine on which of the 'two days involved they had observed the discharge.

<sup>54</sup> Women who observed their discharges in the day or the night when no doubt arises.

<sup>55</sup> The twilight of the eleventh day.

<sup>56</sup> Since the zivah period which began after the seventh day of the menstruation period terminated at the conclusion of the eleventh day when a second menstruation period begins.