



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

Shmuel's father made ritual baths for his daughters in the days of Nissan¹ and mats² in the days of Tishrei.³ (67a)

Rav Giddal citing Rav ruled: If a woman gave to her child some cooked food and then performed her ritual immersion and ascended from the water,⁴ her immersion has no validity,⁵ because, though there may be no food⁶ now,⁷ it may well be assumed that it had fallen off with the drippings.

Rami bar Abba ruled: Scars⁸ constitute no interposition during the first three days;⁹ henceforth they constitute an interposition.

Mar Ukva ruled: Pus within the eye constitutes no interposition when it is moist, but when it is dry it constitutes one. When is it called ‘dry’? — From the time it begins to turn yellow.

Shmuel ruled: Blue powder within the eye constitutes no interposition but on the outside of the eye it constitutes one. If a woman's eyes were twitching it constitutes no interposition even if it is on the outside of the eye.¹⁰

Rabbi Yochanan ruled: If a woman opened her eyes too wide¹¹ or shut them too closely,¹² her immersion has no validity.

Rish Lakish ruled: A woman must perform immersion only when standing in her natural position;¹³ as we have learned: A man¹⁴ is inspected¹⁵ in the same position as when he hoes¹⁶ or¹⁷ gathers olives;¹⁸ and a woman is inspected in the same position as when she weaves¹⁹ or suckles her child.

¹ When the flowing river, swollen by rainwater, could not be used for the purpose since no ritual immersion may be performed in rainwater that is not collected and stationary.

² To spread under the feet of the bathers so as to protect them from the river mud which might cling to their feet and constitute an interposition. Alternatively: He hung up mats on the river shore, to serve as screens for the bathers.

³ When the river contained its normal flow.

⁴ With nothing of the food clinging to it.

⁵ Since it is possible that some of the food clung to her body during the immersion when it constitutes an interposition.

⁶ On the woman's body.

⁷ After she has emerged from the water.

⁸ The marks of the punctures.

⁹ Following the bleeding. Being tender they are regarded as a part of the body.

¹⁰ Because the frequent movement of the eye-lids prevents the accumulation of the matter and no interposition can be formed.

¹¹ Thus forming above the eye a fold that prevents the water from penetrating to every part of that region.

¹² Forming a fold below the eye.

¹³ Sc. she must neither press her arms to her body nor her legs or feet to each other, since thereby she prevents the water from reaching parts that are normally exposed; nor need she stretch any natural fold or expose any concealed part to enable the water to reach every part of it, since these regions are normally concealed.

¹⁴ Afflicted with tzara'as.

¹⁵ By the examining Kohen.

¹⁶ Sc. if the eruption is high in his arm-pit there is no need for the man to raise his arm higher than he does when hoeing. If, as a result, the Kohen cannot see it the man must be declared tahor.

¹⁷ In the case of an eruption in the concealed region of the genitals.

¹⁸ When one does not bend too low.

¹⁹ In the case of an eruption in her arm-pit.

Rabbah bar Rav Huna stated, 'One knotted hair constitutes an interposition,²⁰ three hairs²¹ constitute no interposition;²² but I do not know the ruling in the case of two'. Rabbi Yochanan, however, stated, 'We have only this one principle:

Rabbi Yitzchak said, According to Torah law an interposition on its²³ major part²⁴ to which a man objects constitutes an interposition but one which he does not mind constitutes no interposition; but the Rabbis ruled that an interposition on its greater part shall constitute an interposition, even when the man does not mind it, as a preventive measure against the possibility of allowing an interposition on its major part to which the man does object; and they also ruled that an interposition on its minor part to which a man objects shall constitute an interposition as a preventive measure against the possibility of allowing an interposition on its major part to which a man objects.²⁵ But why should no prohibition be enacted also against an interposition on its lesser part, to which one does not object, as a preventive measure against the possibility of allowing an interposition over the lesser part to which one does object?²⁶ — This ruling itself²⁷ is but a preventive measure, shall we go so far as to institute a preventive measure against the possibility of infringing a preventive measure?²⁸ (67a – 67b)

Rav ruled: If a niddah performs immersion at 'the proper time²⁹ she may do it only at night³⁰ but if she performs it after the proper time³¹ she may do it either in the day time or at

night. Rabbi Yochanan ruled: Whether at the proper time or after the proper time a niddah may perform immersion only at night, on account of the possibility of her daughter's following her lead.³² Rav, moreover, also withdrew his ruling; for Rabbi Chiya bar Ashi citing Rav laid down: Whether at the proper time or after the proper time a niddah may perform immersion only at night on account of the possibility of her daughter's following her lead.

Rav Idi ordained at Narash that immersion shall be performed on the eighth day³³ on account of lions.³⁴ Rav Aha bar Yaakov issued a similar ordinance at Papunia on account of thieves. Rav Yehudah did the same at Pumbedisa on account of the cold. Rava (Rabbah) acted similarly at Mechoza on account of the guards of the city gates.³⁵

Said Rav Pappa to Rava, Consider: At the present time the Rabbis have put all niddahs on the same level as zavahs,³⁶ why then should they not allow them³⁷ to perform immersion in the daytime of the seventh day?³⁸ — This cannot be allowed on account of the following ruling of Rabbi Shimon. For it was taught: After that she shall be tahor, 'after' means after all of them, implying that no tumah may intervene between them; but Rabbi Shimon stated: After that she shall be tahor implies that after the act³⁹ she shall⁴⁰ be clean, but the Sages have ruled that it was forbidden to do so in case she might thereby land in a doubtful situation.⁴¹ (67b)

²⁰ Since it is possible to tie it so closely that no water could penetrate to all its parts.

²¹ Which cannot be tied very closely.

²² Though they were knotted.

²³ One's hair.

²⁴ When each single hair is knotted.

²⁵ Sc. while Torah law restricts a disqualifying interposition to (a) its extension over the major part of one's hair and (b) the man's objection to it, the Rabbis regard (a) without (b) or (b) without (a) also as a disqualifying interposition.

²⁶ Both cases involving a lesser part.

²⁷ The one forbidding an interposition over the lesser part to which one objects.

²⁸ Certainly not.

²⁹ On the seventh day.

³⁰ Before nightfall the seven prescribed unclean days have not been completed.

³¹ On the eighth day.

³² Not knowing the difference between an immersion on the seventh and one on the eighth she, following the example of her mother on an eighth day, would perform immersion in the day time on a seventh also.

³³ Instead of the night following the seventh day.

³⁴ That the woman might encounter at night.

³⁵ Who were men of doubtful morality. Alternatively: Dangerous caverns on the road to the ritual bath.

³⁶ Who must allow seven clean days to pass before they can attain taharah.

³⁷ As in the case of a zavah.

³⁸ And should one happen to be not a zavah but a niddah her tumah had in fact terminated seven days earlier.

³⁹ Of counting the seventh day, even before the day had ended.

⁴⁰ On performing immersion.

⁴¹ Of taharah. She might have intercourse on that day and experience a discharge subsequently before its termination, in which case her

Rav Huna ruled: A woman⁴² may wash her head on a Sunday and perform immersion on the following Tuesday,⁴³ since similarly she⁴⁴ is allowed to wash her head⁴⁵ on a Friday and undergo immersion on the following Saturday night.⁴⁶ A woman may wash her head on a Sunday and undergo immersion on the following Wednesday, since similarly she is allowed to wash her head on a Friday and undergo immersion in the night following a festival that occurred on a Sunday. A woman may wash her head on a Sunday and undergo immersion on the following Thursday, since similarly she may wash her head on a Friday and undergo immersion in the night following the two festival days of the New Year that happened to fall immediately after a Saturday. Rav Chisda, however, stated: In all these cases⁴⁷ we rule as mentioned⁴⁸ but we do not draw the inference of 'since similarly'; for where [the avoidance of an interval] is possible an interval must be avoided, and only where this is impossible⁴⁹ may an interval be allowed. Rav Yeimar, however, stated: We may even draw the inferences of 'since similarly'⁵⁰ except in the case where a woman is permitted to wash her head on a Sunday and undergo immersion on the following Thursday, for the parallel of the night following the two festival days of the New Year that happened to fall immediately after a Saturday does not hold, since it is possible for the woman to wash her head and undergo immersion in the same night.⁵¹

counting as well as her immersion must be deemed invalid, and her intercourse has thus taken place during a period of doubtful taharah.

⁴² About to undergo immersion.

⁴³ Sc. an interval of a day may be allowed between the washing of her head and her immersion.

⁴⁴ Whose immersion is due on a Saturday night.

⁴⁵ An act forbidden on a Saturday which is the Shabbos. This question is asked on the view that the washing of the head may not be performed on the same night as the immersion.

⁴⁶ Lit., at the goings out of the Shabbos'. As an interval of one day must inevitably be allowed in this case it is also allowed where the interval is merely a matter of the woman's convenience.

⁴⁷ Where immersion is due on a night that followed a Shabbos or a festival day on which the washing of one's head is forbidden.

⁴⁸ That an interval of a day or more is permitted between the time of the washing of the head and immersion.

⁴⁹ As in the cases where the days preceding the nights of immersion are ones on which the washing of the head is forbidden.

⁵⁰ Sc. an interval may be allowed even on account of a woman's personal convenience, since she is allowed a similar interval when the day

Mereimar in his discourse laid down: The law is in agreement with Rav Chisda⁵² but⁵³ in accordance with the interpretation of Rav Yeimar.⁵⁴ (67b)

preceding the night of her immersion is one on which it is forbidden to wash one's head.

⁵¹ The one following the second festival day of the New Year. Had she been allowed to wash her head on the preceding Friday the interval between the washing and the immersion would have been too long; hence it is preferable that the washing be done in the same night as the immersion. As a long interval of three day is not allowed even in such a case, where the washing of the head on the day preceding the night of the immersion is impossible, it cannot be allowed, with much more reason, where the interval is no necessity but a matter of convenience.

⁵² That 'we do not draw the inference of since similarly' and that, consequently, no interval for the sake of a woman's personal convenience may be allowed between the washing of her head and her immersion.

⁵³ Though Rav Chisda allows an interval where the day preceding the immersion is one on which labor is forbidden.

⁵⁴ Who allows the interval only in the first two cases but not in the third case where the immersion is due on the termination of the New Year festival that happened to fall on a Sunday and a Monday.