



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

Rav Sheishes citing Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Abba who had it from Rav stated: If a niddah has ascertained her separation to a state of taharah on her third day,<sup>1</sup> she may count it in the number of the seven clean days.<sup>2</sup> ‘A niddah!’ What need has she for counting?<sup>3</sup> — Rather read: If a zavah has ascertained her separation to a state of taharah on her third day, she may count it in the number of the seven clean days. Said Rav Sheishes to Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Abba: Did then Rav pronounce his ruling in agreement with the view of the Cutheans who ruled that the day on which a woman ceases to have her discharge may be counted by her in the number of the prescribed seven days? — When Rav spoke he meant: Exclusive of the third day.<sup>4</sup> But if ‘exclusive of the third day’ isn’t the ruling obvious? — The ruling was necessary only in a case, for instance, where the woman<sup>5</sup> did not examine herself until the seventh day,<sup>6</sup> so that<sup>7</sup> we were informed there<sup>8</sup> that an examination at the beginning<sup>9</sup> suffices although there was none at the end,<sup>10</sup> while here<sup>11</sup> we were informed that an examination at the end suffices<sup>12</sup> even though there was none at the

beginning. As it might have been presumed that only where there was an examination at the beginning, though there was none at the end, do we assume [the days to be clean], because we regard them as remaining in their presumptive state,<sup>13</sup> but not where the examination was held at their conclusion and<sup>14</sup> not at their beginning, hence we were informed [that in either case the days are regarded as clean]. But can this be correct seeing that when Ravin came he stated, ‘Rabbi Yosi ben Chanina raised an objection [from a Baraisa dealing with] a forgetful woman but I do not know what his objection was’, and we have an established rule that during the first week of her appearance before us we require her to undergo immersion in the nights<sup>15</sup> but we do not require her to undergo immersion in the day time. Now if it could be entertained that it is not necessary that the days<sup>16</sup> be counted in our presence, she<sup>17</sup> should have been made to undergo immersion in the day time also, since it is possible that she gave birth during a zivah period and had completed the counting on that day. Must it not consequently be inferred from the ruling that it is

<sup>1</sup> Since her discharge first appeared.

<sup>2</sup> Sc. the clean days may begin to be counted from that day.

<sup>3</sup> None, since a niddah becomes tahor after seven days irrespective of whether these were clean or not.

<sup>4</sup> The counting beginning from the following day.

<sup>5</sup> Though her discharge ceased on the third day.

<sup>6</sup> So that the beginning of the counting was not in a condition of ascertained taharah.

<sup>7</sup> Rav adopting two relaxations of the law.

<sup>8</sup> Where Rav stated that Rabbi Eliezer holds the woman tahor if she examined herself on the first and the eighth.

<sup>9</sup> On the first day.

<sup>10</sup> On the seventh.

<sup>11</sup> In the last cited ruling of Rav.

<sup>12</sup> To justify the assumption that all the six preceding days were also clean.

<sup>13</sup> Which, owing to the examination, was known to be one of taharah.

<sup>14</sup> Rav’s ruling that it is not necessary to make sure that each of the seven days individually has been a clean one.

<sup>15</sup> Since of each night it might be said that it is the one following the seventh day of the period of tumah prescribed after the birth of a male child.

<sup>16</sup> Following zivah.

<sup>17</sup> Since a zavah undergoes immersion on her seventh clean day.

necessary for the counting to take place in our presence?<sup>18</sup> — But have we not explained this ruling to be in agreement with the view of Rabbi Akiva who ruled that it was necessary for the counting to take place in our presence?<sup>19</sup> — And from where do you infer that according to the Rabbis it is not necessary for the counting to take place in our presence? — From what was taught: 'If a forgetful woman stated, "I observed some tumah on a certain day",<sup>20</sup> she<sup>21</sup> is expected to undergo nine immersions, seven<sup>22</sup> in respect of menstruation and two<sup>23</sup> in respect of zivah.<sup>24</sup> If she states, "I observed some tumah at twilight", she is to undergo eleven immersions'. 'Eleven! For what purpose?<sup>25</sup> — Rabbi Yirmiyah of Difti replied: This is a case, for instance, where the woman<sup>26</sup> actually appeared before us at twilight,<sup>27</sup> so that provision has to be made for eight immersions in respect of menstruation<sup>28</sup> and for three in respect of zivah.<sup>29</sup> 'If she states, "I observed no discharge whatsoever", she is to undergo fifteen immersions'.

<sup>18</sup> Apparently it must; and thus an objection arises against Rav.

<sup>19</sup> And, since the Rabbis differ from Rabbi Akiva, Rav may follow their view.

<sup>20</sup> But she is unable to say whether it happened on the same, or on any other day, or whether that day was one of the days of her menstruation or of her zivah.

<sup>21</sup> In order to perform the precept of immersion at the proper time and at the earliest possible moment.

<sup>22</sup> On the following seven nights, if she arrived in the day time.

<sup>23</sup> In the day time.

<sup>24</sup> On the first day of her arrival she must undergo immersion since it is possible that the previous day was one of her zivah period and her discharge appeared that day (a woman who experienced a discharge on one of the days of her zivah period awaits one day, viz., the following one, and on that day she undergoes immersion in the day time). On the second day of her arrival she again undergoes immersion for a similar reason, since it is possible that the day on which her discharge had appeared was not the previous one but the day of her arrival. On the third day no immersion is necessary since it is certain that on the second there was no discharge.

<sup>25</sup> Sc. why should more immersions be required in this case, where she states that her discharge took place at twilight, than in the former where she does not specify the time of day.

Rava observed: 'This kind of law that is a negation of all reason is in vogue at Galhi where there is a law that one who owns a bull must feed the town's cattle one day while one who owns no bull must feed them on two days. Once they had occasion to deal with an orphan the son of a widow. Having been entrusted with the bulls [to feed] he proceeded to kill them, saying to the people, "He who owned a bull shall receive one hide and he who owned no bull shall receive two hides". "What", they said to him, "is this that you say?" "The conclusion of this process", he answered them, "follows the same principle as the beginning of the process. Was it not the case with the beginning of this process that one who owned nothing was better off? Well, at the conclusion of the process too, one who owned nothing is better off". Here also: If where a woman states, "I observed a discharge", it suffices for her to undergo either nine immersions or eleven immersions, should it be necessary for her, where she states, "I observed no discharge whatsoever", to undergo fifteen immersions?' — Rather read thus: If she states, 'I observed a discharge and I do not know how long it continued<sup>30</sup> and

<sup>26</sup> Who did not merely state during the day that her discharge took place at twilight.

<sup>27</sup> And stated that her discharge occurred either earlier or possibly at that very moment when it is doubtful whether it was day or night.

<sup>28</sup> In addition to the seven immersions as in the former case (beginning on the night that followed the twilight at which she arrived) there must be one on the eighth night because it is possible that her discharge took place actually at the twilight of her arrival which was part of the following night, so that the menstruation period did not terminate until the seven following days have passed and her taharah is attained by her immersion on the last, which is the eighth night after her arrival.

<sup>29</sup> She performs the first two immersions for the same reason as in the former case, since it is possible that her discharge in zivah took place on the day prior to her arrival (so that immersion must be performed immediately at the twilight when she arrived) or on that day (so that immersion has to be performed on the following day). She must also undergo immersion on the third day since it is possible that the discharge occurred at the twilight at which she arrived and that that time was a part of the night, so that she was unclean on the day following, and having waited the second day she becomes clean on the third when the immersion is performed.

<sup>30</sup> Sc. whether it appeared on one day only or on three days.

whether I observed it during a menstruation period or a zivah one', she is to undergo fifteen immersions. For if she appeared before us in the day-time we allow her seven days in respect of menstruation and eight in respect of zivah;<sup>31</sup> and if she appeared before us at night we allow her eight in respect of niddah<sup>32</sup> and seven in respect of zivah. But doesn't niddah require eight days? — Rather say: In either case<sup>33</sup> seven in respect of niddah and eight in respect of zivah. But if she appeared at night, does she not require eight in respect of niddah?<sup>34</sup> — In respect of zivah where the number of immersions is fixed, since it does not vary whether she appeared before us in the day time or at night, [the eighth immersion] was counted, but in respect of niddah where the number is not fixed, for only where she appeared before us at night does she require eight immersions while if she appeared before us in the day time she does not require eight [the eighth immersion] was not counted. Now, if it could be entertained that it is necessary for all the counting to take place in our presence, what need is there<sup>35</sup> for all these immersions?<sup>36</sup> Should she not rather count the seven days and then undergo immersion?<sup>37</sup> Consequently it may be inferred from here that it is the Rabbis<sup>38</sup> who hold that it is not necessary for the counting to take place in our presence.

<sup>31</sup> Because each of the eight days might be the last of the seven clean days that followed a zivah discharge that had extended over three days. No immersion is necessary on the ninth day because even if the very day of the woman's arrival had been the last of the three days on which her zivah discharge had been making its appearance seven clean days have elapsed since that day.

<sup>32</sup> On the first night of her arrival and on the following six nights immersion is necessary because each might be the night following the seventh day, while on the eighth immersion is required on account of the possibility of the discharge having appeared on the very night of her arrival which caused the day following to be regarded as the first of the prescribed seven days of niddah.

<sup>33</sup> Whether the woman arrived at night or in the day time.

<sup>34</sup> Of course she does.

<sup>35</sup> In respect of zivah.

<sup>36</sup> That the woman is expected to perform in the day time.

<sup>37</sup> But not before; since even if her seven clean days have terminated she, owing to her neglect of examining herself, is not fit for immersion.

Said av Acha son of Rav Yosef to Rav Ashi: Have we not had recourse to explanations of this ruling?<sup>39</sup> Explain it then in the following manner and read thus: If a woman states, 'I counted<sup>40</sup> and know not how many days I counted and whether I counted them during the period of niddah or during that of zivah', she is to undergo fifteen immersions. But if she stated, 'I counted and know not how many days I counted', it is at any rate impossible that she should not have counted one day, at least, is she then not short of one immersion?<sup>41</sup> Rather read: If she states, 'I know not whether I did or did not count'.<sup>42</sup> (69a – 69b)

MISHNAH: If a zav, a zavah, a niddah, a woman after childbirth or a metzora have died [their corpses] convey tumah by carriage until the flesh has decayed. If an idolater has died he conveys no tumah. Beis Shammai ruled: All women die as niddahs; but Beis Hillel ruled: a woman<sup>43</sup> cannot be regarded as a niddah unless she died while she was a niddah.

GEMARA: What is the meaning of by carriage? If it be suggested: By actual carriage, [the objection would arise:] Doesn't in fact every corpse convey tumah by carriage?<sup>44</sup> — Rather say that by carriage means through a heavy stone,<sup>45</sup> for it is written, And a stone was brought, and laid upon the mouth of the den. What is the reason?<sup>46</sup> — Rav

<sup>38</sup> Who differ from Rabbi Akiva.

<sup>39</sup> We had; since in the absence of explanations it bristles with difficulties.

<sup>40</sup> Sc. she examined herself on certain days and ascertained that she was then clean.

<sup>41</sup> Obviously she is; why then was the number given fifteen and not fourteen?

<sup>42</sup> So that it is possible that she did not count even one clean day.

<sup>43</sup> Who died.

<sup>44</sup> Of course it does; why then did our Mishnah restrict it to the classes specified?

<sup>45</sup> One used for closing up a pit. If the corpse lay on such a heavy stone, and certain objects rested under it, the latter contract the tumah though the weight of the corpse can hardly be perceptible.

<sup>46</sup> Why the corpses enumerated in our Mishnah convey tumah through the stone mentioned while others do not.

replied: This<sup>47</sup> is a preventive measure against the case where they swoon.<sup>48</sup>

One taught: In the name of Rabbi Eliezer it was stated, This possibility must be taken into consideration until his stomach bursts.

If an idolater has died etc. It was taught: Rebbe stated, On what ground did they rule that if an idolater has died he does not convey by carriage? Because his tumah when alive<sup>49</sup> is not Biblical, but Rabbinical.

Our Rabbis taught: Twelve questions did the Alexandrians address to Rabbi Yehoshua ben Chananyah: Three were of a scientific nature, three were matters of Aggadah, three were mere nonsense and three were matters of conduct. 'Three were of a scientific nature': If a zav, a zavah, a niddah, a woman after childbirth or a metzora have died, how long do their corpses convey tumah by carriage? He replied: Until the flesh has decayed. Is the daughter of a woman that was divorced and remarried by her first husband<sup>50</sup> allowed to marry a Kohen? Do we say that this might be inferred through a kal vachomer: If the son of a widow who was married to a Kohen Gadol, who is not forbidden to all,<sup>51</sup> is nevertheless tainted,<sup>52</sup> how much more so the offspring of her<sup>53</sup> who is forbidden to all;<sup>54</sup> or is it possible to refute the argument, thus: The case of a widow married to a Kohen Gadol is different because she herself is profaned?<sup>55</sup> He replied: She is an abomination, but her children are no abomination. (69b – 70a)

<sup>47</sup> The enactment that the corpses enumerated in our Mishnah shall convey tumah even through a heavy stone.

<sup>48</sup> As such persons when alive, if they sit on such a stone, convey tumah to objects under it, in accordance with Biblical law, a Rabbinic enactment has imposed a similar restriction when they are dead in case they might be merely in a swoon and mistaken for a corpse. Were the objects to be deemed clean in 'the case of a corpse they might erroneously be deemed clean even when the person is alive.

<sup>49</sup> Through zivah, for instance.

<sup>50</sup> After she had been married and divorced by a second husband. Such a marriage is forbidden.

<sup>51</sup> As a widow is forbidden only to a Kohen Gadol, not to an ordinary Kohen.

<sup>52</sup> Though not actually a mamzer, he would be, if a Kohen, disqualified from the Kehunah as a challal.

<sup>53</sup> A remarried divorcee after she had been married and divorced by another man.

<sup>54</sup> Even those who are not Kohanim.

<sup>55</sup> If the Kohen Gadol to whom she was unlawfully married dies she may not marry even a common Kohen, and if she was a Kohen's daughter she is henceforth forbidden to eat terumah. No such restrictions are imposed on the woman who was remarried after her divorcement.

## DAILY MASHAL

### Others' Ignorance Is Worse

Once a student came to HaGaon Rav C. Shmuelevitz and said words of Torah. Rav Shmuelevitz waved his hand to dismiss him: "These are words of ignorance."

The student apologized and said, "These words are not my own. I heard them from my friend."

The Gaon raised his voice: "That is much worse! I can accept it if you say your own words of ignorance but others' ignorance?"