OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses when a woman has a presumption of being tehorah and when she has a presumption of being temei'ah.

2) The presumption of taharah
   R’ Yehudah gives a practical outcome of the fact that a woman is presumed tehorah.
   This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.
   R’ Chisda suggests another practical outcome of the fact that a woman is presumed tehorah.
   This explanation is also unsuccessfully challenged.
   Rava offers a third practical outcome of the fact that a woman is presumed tehorah.
   This explanation is successfully challenged.
   R’ Huna bar Chiya in the name of Shmuel gives a fourth interpretation of the Mishnah.
   R’ Yosef states that he was not familiar with the teaching of R’ Huna bar Chiya in the name of Shmuel, but Abaye reminds him that he himself taught this teaching.
   R’ Pappa inquires whether it is necessary for a woman to be concerned with establishing a pattern of bleeding during her zivah days.
   After R’ Yehudah of Diskarta is unable to answer the question, R’ Pappa attempts on his own to resolve the question.
   R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehoshua questions R’ Pappa’s reasoning.
   R’ Pappa suggests a source for his position.
   R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehoshua rejects this source.
   The Gemara concludes that the position of R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehoshua was the favored explanation.

Distinctive INSIGHT

A woman is “lacking in blood” when subject to fear

R’ Meir teaches that the fear of being in hiding causes the blood to cease its normal cycle. Therefore, if the time for a woman’s expected period arrives and the woman fails to examine herself, she is still tehorah, because we rely upon the rule that the fear she is experiencing causes the blood to cease.

The Rishonim discuss whether this rule applies only after the fact, and that the woman would be tehorah if she failed to check herself as she should have done. Or, perhaps application of this rule means that under these conditions she need not check herself in the first place.

Ra’aved (Ba’al HaNefesh, Tikun HaVestos1:16) and Ramban write that a woman in hiding must try to check herself, but if she cannot or does not do so, she is tehorah.

Rashba, however, writes that a woman in this situation need not make an effort to check herself. The wording of the Mishnah suggests that she should check as it states that “if she did not check herself, she is nevertheless tehorah.” However, Rashba explains that this expression is not precise, and it is only a stylistic extension of the beginning of the Mishnah which stated that R’ Meir holds that a woman should check herself during her days of zivah, but she is tehorah if she did not do so. A woman in hiding need not even make the effort to check herself in the first place.

These Rishonim also disagree regarding the need for a pregnant woman to check herself when the day of her period arrives, although she is also in the category of “lacking blood.” Ra’aved and Ramban say that she should check herself, while Rashba says that she need not check herself while pregnant.

Tur (Y.D. 184:8) rules according to Ramban, that a woman who is hiding and living in fear should check herself when the day of her period arrives. Yet, in regard to a pregnant woman, Tur (ibid., #7) rules that she need not check herself in the first place, and she remains tehorah, because she is “lacking blood.” Beis Yosef asks the obvious question, why in regard to fear does the Tur rule that the woman should check herself, but in regard to pregnancy he rules that she need not conduct this procedure?

Beis Yosef answers that according to the view that holds that the need for women to anticipate vestos is a To-
HALACHAH Highlight

The effect of fear on the body

The Gemara teaches that fear suspends the discharge of blood. Therefore, if the time for a woman to experience a discharge arrives and at that time she is in hiding out of fear of being caught by the authorities and is unable to perform an exam to confirm that she is tehorah she need not be concerned that she saw blood since fear suspends the discharge of blood. Teshuvas Yehudah Ya’aleh¹ asked whether there is a difference in this halacha between fear of people and fear that comes from the heavens. The basis of his question is that such a distinction is made with regards to an animal’s lung that shriveled. The Gemara in Chullin (55b) teaches that if an animal’s lungs shrivel as a result of fear of a person it will not heal and the animal is a tereifah. On the other hand if the animal’s lungs shrivel out of fear of lightening, thunder or some other heavenly source the animal is not a tereifah, since the animal’s lungs will heal. This demonstrates that fear of a human is a greater and more intense fear than something that is heavenly. Consequently, if we accept that the fear of heaven is less intense in order to generate a leniency, i.e. to eat an animal whose lungs shriveled from a heavenly fear, certainly we should assume that fear of heaven is less intense when that produces a stringency. Accordingly, if a woman experienced a heavenly fear at the time she was expecting a discharge and did not perform an exam she should adopt a stringent position and is prohibited to her husband until she performs an exam.

He concludes that rather than distinguish between fear of a person and fear of something heavenly it is more logical to distinguish between an ongoing fear and a sudden fear. Most times that a person becomes frightened from something heavenly it is a sudden fear that comes and goes. Such a fear does not suspend the discharge of blood. On the other hand when one experiences an ongoing fear, generally occurring when one is afraid of a person, the body goes through a change and that fear suspends the discharge of blood.

STORIES Off the Daf

A Fearful Time

Today’s daf discusses special halachos that apply when a person is in a dangerous situation that causes extreme fear.

We are very fortunate to live in such relatively docile times. Not too long ago, danger was the normal character of life for Jews throughout much of the world, with calm periods punctuated by truly terrifying episodes. In the 1920s a Jew could be beaten on any street of Poland and had little recourse to the law. Often, appealing to the police was a waste of time. And in Russia, murderous soldiers of both "red" communists and white Czars felt that the Jews were against them and these thugs were ready to do anything to punish them. Things were not much better in earlier times. Whenever there was war, the Jew was the first victim.

One prevalent question that emerged out of such dangers was what course of action should an endangered town take regarding its own rabbi. Although it was often impossible for too many people to escape a violent mob, the people could usually spirit out a few if they chose to do so. Should they send their rabbi away to save him their suffering, or should the rabbi endure the troubles of his flock?

When this question reached the Chasam Sofer, z”l, he explained that there were varying minhagim. “When Prague was under siege, the Noda B’Ye- hudah, z”l, wished to leave the city but the notables of the community prevented this. They argued that if he left the city, its residents would lose his vast merits and be more likely to succumb to their enemies. The Noda B’Yehudah held that staying would surely remove his merits, while if he went elsewhere he could daven for them and his merits would also protect them. But in truth it is fitting for a true leader of the Jewish people to remain with his congregation and not abandon them to save himself when they are beset by danger.

“But when the city of Mainz was under siege they sent away their leader, Rav Noach Chaim Hirch Berlin, author of the Atzei Arazim and Atzei Almogim. And when Frankfurt was under siege they sent away my teacher, the Hafla’ah. They reasoned that he would be able to daven better if he was away from the difficulty. So why should they subject him to such pain if it is avoidable?”¹

¹ ספר זיכרון, ע’ ל"ו

Daf Digest is published by the Chicago Center for Torah and Chesed, under the leadership of HaRav Yehoshua Eichenstein, shlit”a
HaRav Pinchas Eichenstein, Nas”i; HoRav Zalmen L. Eichenstein, RoV; Rabbi Tzvi Bider, Executive Director, edited by Rabbi Ben-Zion Rand.

Daf Yomi Digest has been made possible through the generosity of Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben.