



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

Attributing to other Bloods

Mishnah: If she lent her shirt to a gentile woman or to a *niddah*, she may attribute a stain (*found after she wore it herself*) to the borrower (*and she is therefore tahor*). [*Such a presumption is permitted since this ruling will not have any negative effect upon the gentile woman or the niddah, for they are already in a state of tumah. If a Jewish woman borrowed it, she would also be ruled to be tamei, for we have no grounds to attribute the stain to one more than the other.*]

If three (*tahor*) women had worn the same shirt (*one after the other*), or had sat on the same wooden bench and subsequently blood was found on it, all are regarded as *tamei*. If they had sat on a stone bench (*which is not susceptible to tumah*) or on the projection of a bathhouse (*which, due to its attachment to the ground, is not susceptible to tumah*), Rabbi Nechemiah rules that they are *tahor*; for Rabbi Nechemiah has said that anything that is not susceptible to *tumah* is not susceptible to stains. (59b)

Rav said: The reference is to a gentile woman who menstruates (*who has reached an age of puberty and has once experienced a discharge*). He derives this from the fact that she is placed on a par with a *niddah*. Just as the *niddah* is a woman who menstruates, so must the gentile woman be one who menstruates.

Rav Sheishes remarked: I say that Rav declared this tradition when he was dozing (*for otherwise, he would not have said it*). [*Rav Sheishes explains:*] for it was taught in a *braisa*: She may attribute it to the gentile woman. Rabbi Meir said: To the gentile woman who is capable of a menstruating. Now, even Rabbi Meir only spoke of one who is fit to menstruate, but did not require one who actually menstruated already.

Rava asked: But do you understand Rabbi Meir to be stringent? Rabbi Meir in fact is lenient, for it was taught in a *braisa*: She may not attribute it to the gentile woman. Rabbi Meir ruled: She may attribute it to her.

The *Gemora* retorts: But then, doesn't a difficulty arise from the former (*which implies that R' Meir issues a stringent ruling*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: Explain (*the first braisa*) as follows: Only when she menstruated once before; and Rabbi Meir said: If she is capable of menstruating, even though she never yet menstruated. (59b – 60a)

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: A woman may attribute a stain¹ to another woman² who was awaiting a day for a day, if it³ was the latter's second day,⁴ and to a woman who counted seven days⁵ before she had performed ritual immersion.⁶ Hence she is at an advantage⁷ while her friend is at a disadvantage; so

¹ Found on her underclothing.

² To whom she had previously lent it.

³ The day on which the latter had worn it.

⁴ Sc. the day during a zivah period following the one on which she observed a discharge, though on that day none had been observed. This assumption in favor of the former is permitted (despite the slight

disadvantage to the latter of having to wait another day) because of the latter's known condition of *tumah*.

⁵ After an established zivah.

⁶ Though the latter would in consequence have to count again a new period of seven days.

⁷ Sc. she remains *tahor*.

said Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel. Rebbe ruled: She⁸ may not so attribute it.⁹ Hence both are at a disadvantage. They agree, however, that she may attribute a stain to a woman who was awaiting a day for a day if it¹⁰ was the latter's first day,¹¹ and to a woman who was abiding in her *tahor* blood,¹² and to a virgin whose blood is *tahor*.

Why was it necessary to state the 'hence' of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel?¹³ — On account of the ruling of Rebbe.¹⁴ Why was it necessary to state the 'hence' of Rebbe? — It might have been presumed that only the woman on whom the stain was found shall be at a disadvantage while the other shall not be disadvantaged, hence we were informed that both are at a disadvantage.

Rav Chisda stated: If a *tahor* and a *tamei* person walked respectively in two paths one of which was *tahor* and the other *tamei*,¹⁵ we arrive at the dispute between Rebbe and Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel.¹⁶

Rav Adda demurred: Rebbe may have maintained his view only there, because both are in similar conditions,¹⁷ but what difference [to the *tamei* person in this case] could our assumption make?¹⁸ And Rav Chisda? — After all¹⁹ she has yet to perform the immersion.²⁰ (60a)

⁸ Since her attribution would be a disadvantage to her friend.

⁹ Though she herself would in consequence be regarded as *tamei*.

¹⁰ The day on which the latter had worn it.

¹¹ When the assumption that the stain was due to her would impose no additional *tumah* upon her.

¹² From the eighth to the fortieth day after the birth of a male child and from the fifteenth to the eightieth after the birth of a female child.

¹³ Sc. in view of his specific statement that the stain may be attributed to the other woman who was already in a state of *tumah*, is it not obvious that the former is at an advantage while the latter is at a disadvantage?

¹⁴ According to which both women are at a disadvantage.

¹⁵ And it is unknown who walked in which.

¹⁶ According to the latter, who ruled that a stain found on a *tahor* woman may be attributed by her to a woman who was known to be *tamei* while she herself remains *tahor*, it may be here assumed that the *tahor* person walked in the *tahor* path and the *tamei* walked in the *tamei* one; while according to Rebbe no such assumption could be allowed and both persons must be regarded as *tamei*.

¹⁷ Since even the woman who was hitherto *tamei* could, by performing immersion, attain cleanness on the day the stain was found. The

It was stated:²¹ Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Chanina ruled: If a *tahor* and an *tamei* person, and even if a *tahor*, and a doubtfully *tahor* person walked respectively in two paths one of which was *tamei* and the other *tahor*, it may be assumed, according to the opinion of all, that the *tamei* path was taken by the doubtfully *tahor* person and the *tahor* path by the *tahor* one.

Rabbi Yochanan enquired of Rabbi Yehudah ben Livai: May a stain²² be attributed to [another woman²³ who was *tamei* on account of] a stain? So far as Rebbe's view is concerned the question does not arise; for, since in that case where the woman had observed a discharge from her own body²⁴ you said [that the other woman's stain] may not be attributed [to her], how much less then may this be done in this case where the stain may have originated from an external cause. The question arises only in connection with the view of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel: Is it only in that case, where the woman had observed a discharge from her own body, that the other woman's stain may be attributed to her, but here, where the stain may have originated from an external cause, she may not so attribute it,²⁵ or is it possible that no difference is made between the two cases? — The other replied: One may not so attribute it. What is the reason? — Because [there is a tradition that]²⁶ one may not so attribute it.²⁷

assumption would consequently place her at an undeserved disadvantage.

¹⁸ None; since whatever the assumption he is *tamei*. As the assumption would not place him under any disadvantage Rebbe in this case may well agree with Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel.

¹⁹ Granted the woman could attain taharah by immersion.

²⁰ Before doing which she is still *tamei* in all respects. As Rebbe nevertheless rules out the assumption that the stain was due to her, it is obvious that he would equally rule out the assumption that it was the *tamei* person who walked in the *tamei* path.

²¹ In agreement with Rav Adda's view that even according to Rebbe it may be assumed that the *tahor* person walked in the *tahor* path and the *tamei* person in the *tamei* one.

²² Found on the under garment of a woman who was known to be *tahor*.

²³ Who had previously worn that garment.

²⁴ A case of certain *tumah*.

²⁵ And both women are, therefore, *tamei*.

²⁶ Since the *tumah* that is due to a stain is merely of a doubtful nature, it being possible that the stain originated from an external cause, and the woman cannot in consequence be regarded as prone to a discharge.

²⁷ And both women are, therefore, *tamei*.

He pointed out to him the following objection: 'Is it not permissible to attribute a stain²⁸ to [another woman²⁹ who was *tamei* on account of] a stain. If a woman³⁰ had lent her shirt to a gentile woman or to one who was observing tumah by reason of a stain, she may attribute it to her.

The Gemara interjects: But isn't this Baraisa self-contradictory: In the first clause you stated, 'it is not permissible to attribute' while in the final clause you stated that it was permissible to attribute? — This is no difficulty: The former is the view of Rebbe while the latter is that of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel. There are some who read: The latter as well as the former represents the view of Rebbe, but the latter applies to her first day³¹ while the former³² applies to her second day.³³ Rav Ashi replied: The former as well as the latter represents the view of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel and yet there is no difficulty, for the former applies to retrospective tumah³⁴ while the latter applies to future tumah.³⁵

At all events does not a difficulty arise?³⁶ — Ravina replied: This is no difficulty for it is this that was meant: If she had lent her shirt to a gentile woman,³⁷ she who discovered the stain may attribute it to her.³⁸

But was it not stated, 'or to one who was observing tumah by reason of a stain'?³⁹ — It is this that was meant: Or to one

who was observing her days of tohar blood,⁴⁰ she who discovered the stain may attribute it to her.⁴¹ (60a – 60b)

The Mishnah had stated: If three women had worn etc. For Rabbi Nechemiah has etc. Rav Masneh stated: What is Rabbi Nechemiah's reason? That it is written: As soon as she shall sit upon the ground, she is cleansed.⁴² Rav Huna citing Rabbi Chanina stated: Rabbi Nechemiah rules that they are *tahor* if they sat even on the back of an earthenware vessel. But is not this obvious?⁴³ — It might have been presumed that a restriction shall be imposed on its back as a preventive measure against the possible relaxation of the law in regard to its inside,⁴⁴ hence we were informed that on the back of an earthenware vessel they are *tahor*.

Abaye stated: Rabbi Nechemiah holds them to be *tahor* if they sat on strips of cloth that were less than three by three fingerbreadths, since such are unsuitable for use either by the poor or the rich.⁴⁵

Rav Chiya son of Rav Masneh citing Rav stated in his discourse: The halachah is in agreement with Rabbi Nechemiah. Said Rav Nachman to him: Abba learned, 'A case was once submitted to the Sages and they declared the woman concerned to be *tamei*' and you state, 'the halachah is in agreement with Rabbi Nechemiah'? — What was that case? — The one concerning which it was taught: If two

²⁸ Found on the under garment of a woman who was known to be *tahor*.

²⁹ Who had previously worn that garment.

³⁰ Who discovered the stain.

³¹ Sc. the stain was discovered by the woman on the same day on which the other (to whom the garment had been lent) had found a stain on an under garment of hers which caused her to be *tamei* on that day and also imposed upon her the restriction of remaining *tamei* until a second day (a day for a day) had passed. Since she has in any case to lose a second day, the attribution does not cause her any disadvantage.

³² Which does not allow the attribution.

³³ When the attribution would place her under a disadvantage by extending her tumah to the third day.

³⁴ Sc. to a case where the owner of the shirt discovered the stain on it before the other to whom she had lent it had discovered the stain on her own under garment, Though the other subsequently discovered the stain, she cannot be regarded as *tamei* retrospectively (from the time the owner of the shirt had discovered the stain) since at that time she was still in a condition of taharah.

³⁵ The stain on the lent shirt having been discovered after the woman who borrowed it had discovered hers.

³⁶ Apparently it does; for since, according to the Baraisa cited, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel allows the attribution how could Rabbi Yehudah ben Livai maintain that he does not.

³⁷ Who experienced a discharge.

³⁸ The gentile, who loses thereby nothing, while the Jewish woman remains *tahor*.

³⁹ Of course it was. Now if the reference is to the woman who just discovered the stain, how could the expression 'continued' (which implies that the counting of the *tahor* days had already begun) be used?

⁴⁰ I.e., either to a gentile woman who is free from the restrictions of tumah or to a Jewish woman who for the reason stated is exempt from tumah.

⁴¹ Since neither would thereby be adversely affected while she remains *tahor* in consequence.

⁴² I.e., a stain found on the ground does not render her *tamei*.

⁴³ Apparently it is, since like a stone bench, the back of an earthenware vessel is not susceptible to tumah.

⁴⁴ Which is susceptible to tumah, and a stain on which would in accordance with Rebbenic law subject a woman to tumah.

⁴⁵ And hence unsuitable to tumah.

women were grinding with a hand mill and blood was found under the inner one, both are *tamei*.⁴⁶ If it was found under the outer one,⁴⁷ the outer one is *tamei*⁴⁸ but the inner one remains *tahor*. If it was found between the two, both are *tamei*. It once happened that blood was found on the edge of a bath,⁴⁹ and on an olive leaf while they were making a fire in an oven, and when the case was submitted to the Sages they declared them to be *tamei*.⁵⁰ This⁵¹ is a point at issue between Tannaim. For it was taught: Rabbi Yaakov ruled that they were *tamei* and Rabbi Nechemiah ruled that they were *tahor*, and the Sages ruled in agreement with Rabbi Nechemiah. (60b)

MISHNAH: If three women slept in one bed and blood was found under one of them, they are all *tamei*. If one of them examined herself and was found to be *tamei*, she alone is *tamei* while the two others are *tahor*. They may also attribute the blood to one another, and if they were not likely to observe a discharge, they must be regarded as though they were likely to observe one.

⁴⁶ Since the other who sits behind her would naturally shift her position towards the mill and, assuming sometimes the same position as the inner one, would be as likely as she to be the cause of the stain in that spot. As it is thus uncertain which of the two was the cause both must be regarded as *tamei*.

⁴⁷ A position which the inner one would never occupy, the tendency being to come up as close as possible to the mill.

⁴⁸ Since she may have been the cause of the stain.

⁴⁹ Which two women were using.

⁵⁰ Now an olive leaf is not susceptible to *tumah* and yet the Sages (the majority) ruled that a stain on it causes *tumah*. How then could it be said that the halachah agrees with Rabbi Nechemiah who was only an individual?

⁵¹ Whether Rabbi Nechemiah is opposed by an individual authority or by a majority.

⁵² If, however, her examination had been delayed the others too are *tamei*.

⁵³ In the case, for instance, where she discovered menstrual blood immediately after their intercourse, when it is assumed that the discharge had occurred during intercourse.

⁵⁴ Terumah, for instance, which may be eaten only when *tahor*.

⁵⁵ If she discovered menstrual blood immediately after her contact with them.

⁵⁶ It being assumed that the discharge occurred while she was still handling the *tahor* things. In such a case the *tumah* is regarded as certain and the things she handled must be burnt.

⁵⁷ This is the case where she discovered the blood after an interval had elapsed during which she could descend from the bed and wash her genitals it being doubtful whether the discharge had occurred during or after intercourse.

GEMARA: Rav Yehudah citing Rav explained: But this applies only where she examined herself immediately [after the discovery of the blood],⁵² he is of the same opinion as Bar Pada who laid down: Whenever her husband is liable to a chatas,⁵³ her *tahor* things⁵⁴ are⁵⁵ to be *tamei*;⁵⁶ where her husband is liable to a suspensive asham,⁵⁷ her *tahor* things⁵⁸ are regarded as being in a suspended state of *tumah*;⁵⁹ and where her husband is exempt,⁶⁰ her *tahor* things⁶¹ remain *tahor*. But Rabbi Oshaya⁶² ruled: Even where her husband is liable to a chatas, her *tahor* things are deemed to be in a suspended state.⁶³ One can see the reason⁶⁴ there, since it might well be assumed that the male organ had caused the obstruction of the blood; but, in this case,⁶⁵ if it were a fact that the blood was there,⁶⁶ what could have caused its obstruction?⁶⁷

Rabbi Yirmiyah observed: As to Rabbi Oshaya's metaphor to what may this be compared? To an old man and a child who were walking together on a road. While they are underway

⁵⁸ If she discovered the blood after such an interval had passed since she handled them.

⁵⁹ Sc. they may be neither eaten nor burnt.

⁶⁰ In the case where the longer interval had passed before the blood was discovered, when it is regarded as certain that the discharge occurred after intercourse.

⁶¹ If a similar interval had elapsed between the time she has handled them and the discovery of the blood.

⁶² Maintaining that even if a discovery of blood was made immediately after she handled the *tahor* things one cannot be sure that the discharge had occurred earlier when she was still handling them.

⁶³ Thus it follows that our Mishnah which ruled that only the woman who found herself on examination to be *tamei* is regarded as the cause of the blood while the two others remain *tahor*, upholds the opinion of Bar Pada who, where the examination took place immediately after the *tahor* things had been handled, regards the things as definitely *tamei*. It must be contrary to the view of Rabbi Oshaya who, even in such a case (an examination after the shortest interval), regards the *tahor* things as being merely in a suspected state.

⁶⁴ Why it may be assumed that the discharge occurred earlier during intercourse.

⁶⁵ The handling of *tahor* things.

⁶⁶ Sc. that the discharge occurred earlier.

⁶⁷ Obviously nothing. Hence it is only in the case of intercourse (where the assumption is possible) that the husband becomes liable for a sin-offering, but in the case of *tahor* things (where no such assumption is possible) no certain *tumah* may be presumed and only that of a doubtful nature may be imposed upon them Rabbinically for twenty-four hours retrospectively.

the child restrains his gait,⁶⁸ but after they enter the town⁶⁹ the child accelerates his pace.

Abaye on the other hand observed: As to the metaphor of Rabbi Oshaya, to what may this be compared? To a man who puts his finger on his eye. While the finger is on the eye the tears are held back, but as soon as the finger is removed the tears quickly come forth.

The Mishnah had stated: They may also attribute the blood to one another. Our Rabbis taught: In what manner do they attribute it to one another? If one was a pregnant woman and the other was not pregnant, the former may attribute the blood to the latter. If one was a nursing woman⁷⁰ and the other was not a nursing woman, the former may attribute the blood to the latter. If one was an old woman and the other was not an old woman, the former may attribute the blood to the latter. If one was a virgin⁷¹ and the other was no virgin, the former may attribute the blood to the latter. If both were pregnant, nursing, old or virgins — it is [a case like] this concerning which we have learnt: If they were not likely to observe a discharge, they must be regarded as they were fit to menstruate. (60b – 61a)

DAILY MASHAL

Learning while Sleeping

Rav Sheishes said: I say that it was only when he was drifting into sleep that Rav could have made such a statement. The commentators ask: How could Rav Sheishes talk about Rav in such a demeaning way? Doesn't it say in Koheles [9:17]: The words of the wise are heard when spoken softly, more than the shout of a ruler of fools? The Mishna in Pirkei Avos [2:10] says: Rabbi Eliezer said: Let the honor of your fellow be as precious to you as your own. Why did Rav Sheishes degrade Rav in such a manner?

The Chavos Yair (152) answers: Rav Sheishes understood that Rav was a tremendous Torah scholar, and it wasn't possible for him to err unless he was drifting into sleep.

In Margaliyos Hashas it is written, and in a slightly different version, it is cited in Parshablog: "There was an incident in which my teacher, zal {=the Arizal} was sleeping and Rabbi Avraham HaLevi entered and found that he was moving his lips. After a while, the rav awoke. [He {=Rabbi Avraham} said to him, 'may my master forgive me for waking him from his slumber.] He {=Rabbi Avraham} asked him, 'what was my master mumbling in his sleep?' He {=the Arizal} said to him, 'I was just now engaged in the *yeshiva* above in *parashat Balak* and *Bilaam*, wondrous things.' And he said to him, 'let the loftiness of the honor of his Torah say from these lofty words. He said to him, 'If I were to expound for 80 consecutive **years**, day and night, that which I just now heard, I would not be able to complete it.' And so was his custom, za"l, that when he would sleep they would bring him before etc. [it is written there the name of the angel] the Sar HaPanim, and he would ask him which *yeshiva* he wished to go to, and they would convey him. And sometimes he would choose the *yeshiva* of Hakadosh Baruch Hu, sometimes the *yeshiva* of Rabbi Akiva, sometimes the *yeshiva* of Moshe Rabbenu, and sometimes the *yeshiva* of Rabbi Meir. And so, in this manner, in any place he would want to go."

⁶⁸ Lit., 'delays to come', waiting for the lead of the old man.

⁶⁹ When they walk in different directions to their own respective homes.

⁷⁰ Who usually loses her menstrual flow.

⁷¹ Sc. a young woman (whether unmarried or married) who had not yet experienced any menstrual discharge.