

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) A pregnant woman (cont.)

The Gemara presents two resolutions to the challenge to the Beraisa's assertion that carrying a non-fetus is considered a pregnancy.

R' Yirmiyah inquires about the halacha in a case of a woman who saw blood and then her fetus became noticeable. Is she *temei'ah* retroactively for twenty-four hours or not?

R' Zeira answers that she is.

R' Yochanan was asked about a woman who during pregnancy did not examine herself when her fixed period arrived. Is she required to examine herself?

R' Yochanan proved that she is not required to examine herself.

### 2) A nursing woman

A Beraisa elaborates on the topic of a nursing woman.

The Gemara explains the disagreement between R' Meir on the one hand and R' Yosi, R' Yehudah and R' Shimon on the other hand.

A phrase in the Beraisa is explained.

A related Beraisa is cited.

R' Ilai presents the source for R' Meir's ruling.

Rabanan's response is recorded.

R' Elazar's interpretation of the phrase is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 3) An old woman

Different interpretations of the Mishnah's phrase "near her old age" are presented.

The difference between two of the explanations is noted.

Two different definitions of the term *onah* are presented and the Gemara explains that they do not contradict one another.

A Beraisa related to the case of an older woman is quoted.

A phrase in the Beraisa is clarified.

### 4) Three periods without a discharge

A Beraisa records a discussion between R' Eliezer and Chachamim regarding R' Eliezer's ruling concerning a woman who had three periods without a discharge.

A phrase in the Beraisa is clarified.

Another related Beraisa is cited and clarified.

### 5) A girl's first discharge

The Gemara cites a Beraisa related to a girl who experiences a discharge for the first time. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

The view that the arrival of the *וסת* is from the Torah

וסתות דאורייתא

A certain old man asked R' Yochanan regarding what the halacha would be if the expected time for a woman to see (*veses*) arrives after it has been determined that she is pregnant, and the woman did not check herself. The questioner clarified that his inquiry was based upon the view that holds *וסתות דאורייתא*. Rashi explains that this means that when the time for a woman to see arrives, the halacha from Moshe at Sinai tells us that it predictably occurs as expected, and if the woman does not check herself to ascertain otherwise, she is *temi'ah*. The question is whether we say that this is true even during her pregnancy, and she would be *temi'ah*, or would we say that "her blood is removed" during pregnancy, and that there is no need for her to even check?

Pischei Niddah asks why Rashi says that this view is based upon a halacha from Moshe at Sinai. The Gemara later (63b) discusses the requirement for a couple to remain apart from each other during the time the *veses* is anticipated, and it cites the source for this halacha from the *posuk* (Vayikra 15:31), "Warn Bnei Yisrael regarding their impurities." The Rishonim note that this *posuk* is the Torah source for this law as understood according to the view which says that the anticipated time of the *veses* is, in fact, a Torah rule. But according to the opinion that this concept is only rabbinic we have to say that the *posuk* brought is just an *asmachta*, a hint or reminder of a rabbinic law. We do see, however, that the view that holds that the anticipated arrival of the *veses* is a Torah law learns this from a *posuk*, so why does Rashi say that it is a halacha from Moshe at Sinai?

Furthermore, why does Rashi say that the opinion that says that this is a Torah law is the one that holds that the woman must examine herself to ascertain that she is still *tehorah*, while an equally important aspect of this halacha could be noted, and that is that the couple must remain apart from each other in anticipation of the arrival of the *veses*, which the Torah recognizes as necessary?

Pischei Niddah answers, in the name of his rebbe, the Noda B'Yehuda, that all opinions agree that the requirement for a couple to abstain during the time the *veses* should occur is a Torah expectation. The practical difference between whether *vesstos* are from the Torah or only rabbinic is only in regard to the woman's status after the *veses* arrives and the woman did not check herself. The view that says this is rabbinic holds that the woman's previous status remains unchanged even against the assumption that the *veses* comes on time. The view that *vesstos* are from the Torah overrides the woman's status, and, as Rashi says, this is due to a halacha from Moshe at Sinai that the *veses* arrives in its time. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated

לזכר נשמת

R' Elazar ben R' Meir HaLevi Apfeldorf

by Mechi and Sharon Apfeldorf, Jerusalem Israel

# HALACHA Highlight

## Washing after touching a yavam's shoe

שהמזה ומזין עליו טהור

One who sprinkles and is sprinkled upon is tahor

Rav Chaim Falagi<sup>1</sup> rules that after a chalutzah removes the shoe of her yavam she must wash her hands before she recites the pesukim that are part of the next step of the ceremony. The reason is that Shulchan Aruch<sup>2</sup> rules that one who removes his shoe must wash his hand. Magen Avrohom<sup>3</sup> adds that even if one touches someone else's shoe he must wash his hands. Teshuvos Kapei Aharon<sup>4</sup> notes that he has never seen this in any Beis Din, nor is such a requirement recorded in any of the works that describe in detail the procedure for chalitzah. He then explains that the reason one is required to wash his hands after touching his shoe is that it is dirty. If, however, one touches a covered part of the body that is clean one is not required to wash his hands. Therefore, since the foot of the yavam is washed before the chalitzah ceremony begins and the shoe is worn for just a moment by the yavam whose foot is clean, the shoe is also assumed to be clean and one who touches it is not required to wash.

Sefer Ruach Chaim<sup>5</sup>, written by Rav Chaim Falagi's son, wrote that the obligation to wash one's hands after touching a shoe is that the shoe has ruach ra'ah. According to this reason even if one's shoe is clean it is necessary to wash one's hands. Teshuvos Devar Yehoshua<sup>6</sup> wondered why according to the explanation of Sefer Ruach Chaim we do not find any of the Poskim write that there is an obligation for the chalutzah to

# REVIEW and Remember

1. What is it about pregnancy that causes a woman to not bleed ?
2. How much of the "sprinkling waters" must one carry to become tamei ?
3. How long is an average "onah" ?
4. When is it acceptable to rely upon a minority opinion which disagrees with the majority opinion ?

wash her hands. He answered by citing our Gemara that teaches that one who sprinkles the mixture of parah adumah ashes mixed with spring water is tahor but one who touches this mixture is tamei. Tosafos<sup>7</sup> explains that the reason one who sprinkles the mixture is tahor is that it is logical to assume that the Torah would not instruct someone to do a mitzvah so that he should become tamei. Similarly, it is logical to assume that when the Torah instructs a woman to remove the yavam's shoe that the Torah did not intend to make her teme'ah while performing the mitzvah. ■

<sup>1</sup> שו"ת חיים ושלוים ח"ב סי' ק"ו.  
<sup>2</sup> שו"ת ארי"ח סי' די' סעי' י"ח.  
<sup>3</sup> מג"א שם סי' ק"י.  
<sup>4</sup> שו"ת כפי אהרן ח"א אהע"ז סי' כ"א.  
<sup>5</sup> ספר רוח חיים ח"ב עמ' קנ"ט.  
<sup>6</sup> שו"ת דבר יהושע ח"א סי' ע"ה.  
<sup>7</sup> תוס' ד"ה מאי. ■

# STORIES off the Daf

## Bad Blood

"חרדה מסלקת הדמים..."

The Divrei Yisrael of Modzhitz, zt"l, teaches important lessons in avodah from a statement on today's daf. "On Niddah 9 we find that fear makes the blood drain. In terms of avodah, חרדה, fear can be understood to allude to yir'as shamayim. The word דמים also means money. In this context we see that one who has yir'as shamayim will not have money on his mind. As the verse states: 'כי אין מחסור ליראיו.' Or we can understand

this the opposite way. 'Money worries' alludes to one who is worried about money. Sadly, such apprehensions can cause סילוק דמים, that he will not have enough money, chas v'shalom.

"My father said that this is the way of the miser. One who is worried about money will lose money. In his words, 'If one is worried while holding a spoon its contents will spill.'"<sup>1</sup>

The Toras Avos, zt"l, offers another explanation. "On Niddah 9 we find that one who fears causes דמים to become distanced from him. דמים means actual blood here. This statement can be understood to mean that through fear of heaven one removes the heated blood that causes all illicit desires."<sup>2</sup> It is surely curi-

ous that the Torah was given to us in fear and trembling. Why was it not given from love? The answer can be understood from the Gemara in Niddah 9. There we find that fear "removes blood." God gave us the Torah through trembling because that is the only way to remove the bad blood that compels us to sin!<sup>3</sup> ■

<sup>1</sup> דברי ישראל, כללי אורייתא, דף י"ז  
<sup>2</sup> תורת אבות, ע' ר'  
<sup>3</sup> אוצרותיהם של צדיקים, פרשת עקב ■

