



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the opinions (cont.)

The Gemara relates that Rabanan and R' Shimon cited in a Mishnah and Baraisa respectively derive their positions from the same source.

- Rabanan's reasoning is explained.
- This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.
- R' Shimon's rationale is presented.
- This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.
- An alternative explanation of the dispute between Rabanan and R' Shimon is suggested.
- Another unsuccessful challenge to Shamai's position is presented.
- An alternative explanation of Shamai's and Hillel's respective positions are suggested.

- Shamai's position according to this explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.
- A third explanation of the dispute is recorded.
- This explanation is challenged and Abaye and Rava offer alternative explanations for the challenge.
- The differences between the different explanations are presented.
- A Baraisa is cited in support of the third explanation of the dispute.
- Rava suggests another explanation of Shamai's position.
- A Baraisa is cited that supports this explanation.
- The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges the fourth explanation from the Baraisa that was cited to support the third explanation and unsuccessfully challenges the third explanation from the Baraisa cited to support the fourth explanation.

2) Discovering a sheretz in a box that contained tohoros

- Chizkiyah rules that if a sheretz is discovered in a box that contained tohoros the tohoros are t'horim whereas R' Yochanan rules that they are temei'im.
- Chizkiyah's position is unsuccessfully challenged from Shamai's and Hillel's opinion recorded in the Baraisa above.
- Chizkiyah's position is challenged from a Baraisa.
- One resolution to this challenge is recorded.
- The Gemara begins a second defense of Chizkiyah's position. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Why does Shamai not add a precaution?

ומיהו עשה סייג לדבריק דמאי שנא מכל התורה כולה דעבדין סייג

The Gemara brought three explanations for the opinion of Shamai who holds that when a woman finds blood we only consider items she has been handling to be t'mei'im from that moment and onward, but not previously. One reason is that the woman's status was that she was t'horah until now, and that status is only changed from the moment we have a reason to declare her to be t'mei'ah, and not before that. The second reason is that if the blood had come earlier, the woman could have felt something. Her not having felt anything leads us to say that the blood only came now, and not earlier. The third explanation was that if the blood had flowed from the womb earlier, it would have been seen then, and it would not have tarried to exit. A Baraisa is cited to support this final explanation.

Rava offers yet another reason for Shamai's view that we do not declare a woman t'mei'ah any earlier than from when she actually saw blood. If we were to rule the holy items which she handled in the previous day to be t'mei'im, her husband would come to believe that the halacha considers that blood had appeared earlier in the outer chamber. The husband will always suspect that this may occur again, and he will abstain from being intimate with his wife in the future, and this will result in a decrease in the mitzvah of פרו ורבו. A Baraisa is brought that shows that this explanation for Shamai is correct.

The Gemara asks how to understand the Baraisos which present differing explanations of Shamai. The Gemara answers that the first explanation is correct, that if the blood

Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What tum'ah halachos are derived from the case of the Sotah?

2. What are the different explanations the Gemara offers for Shamai's position?

3. According to the Baraisa, what was Shamai's criticism of Hillel's position?

4. What is the point of dispute between Chizkiya and R' Yochanan?

HALACHAH Highlight

Assuring the potential for pru u'rvu

אי"כ בטלת בנות ישראל מפריה ורביה

If so you have prevented Jewish women from procreating

The Gemara teaches that according to Shamaï the reason a woman who saw blood is not teme'ah retroactively is that it could lead to an abolition of the mitzvah of procreation. Rashi¹ explains that people will be concerned that a woman may already be a niddah and will refrain from procreating. Although generally in halacha safeguards are adopted to keep a person from inadvertent transgressions, when such a safeguard will lead to the abolition of the mitzvah of procreation it is not adopted. Hillel asserts that his ruling that she is retroactively teme'ah applies only to matters of taharos and not to a woman's relationship with her husband but Shamaï responds that once it applies for taharos a couple will become concerned and will refrain from procreating.

Maharik² addresses the case of a mikvah about which there are slight concerns that it may be invalid and if invalid it would not be easy to fix the issue. If one was going to adopt a stringent position it would delay a woman's immersion by a day. Is it necessary to be stringent? Maharik answered that one should not be concerned that it may be invalid if it will cause a delay of the mitzvah of procreation. Shelah³ warned that someone who issues halachic rulings for others must be careful not to issue an erroneous ruling that causes others to sin. However, he should not jump to the opposite extreme and decide to be stringent in all matters since one is not called a moreh hora'ah by just issuing stringent rulings. Issuing stringent rulings that are incorrect is not the correct approach

(Insight...continued from page 1)

had appeared that it would have come out earlier. Yet, Hillel argued that it is still appropriate to establish a rabbinic guard and declare the woman t'meiah as a precaution. Shamaï then responded that it is impossible to do so here and add to the law of the Torah, because ruling the items handled by the woman to be t'mei'im will interfere with פרו ורבו.

The very first question of the Gemara on 2a was "What is the reason for Shamaï?" Tosafos HaRosh explained that the Gemara's question was why does Shamaï not establish an added rabbinic precaution, and the answer was that we do not do this when the woman has a status of being tehorah. Tosafos HaRosh cites R' Moshe from Ivra who asks why does Hillel again ask Shamaï about setting a precaution, when this issue was already settled on 2a, and Shamaï explained that the status of the woman of being tehorah is adequate?

He answers that Shamaï's response is addressed to Hillel. Although the rabbis often establish precautions, as Hillel notes, Shamaï notes that here it would be counter-productive to do so, as it would diminish the mitzvah of פרו ורבו. ■

when issuing halachic rulings. The Gemara in Berachos (4a) relates that Dovid HaMelech's hands were filled with blood as a result of his efforts to assure that wives would be permitted to their husbands. The specific language in the Gemara indicates that Dovid HaMelech was not attempting to determine whether a woman is tehorah or teme'ah; rather the wording indicates that his intent was to assure that wives would be tehoros. ■

1. רש"י ד"ה מפריה.

2. שו"ת מהרי"ק שורש נ"ו.

3. שלי"ה מסכת שבועות פרק נר מצוה אות פ"ט צ'. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Laws of Niddah

אי בעית אימא היינו טעמא דשמאי

Today's daf continues to discuss the complex opinions of Shamaï and Hillel regarding one who saw impurity.

The Beis Yisrael explained, "For those who think that there is little need to learn the complex and, presently, theoretical laws found in Maseches Niddah, we find a powerful response in the words of the Maharsha. He asked rhetorically, 'Why does Maseches Niddah

conclude with the famous dictum, that all who learn halachah every day are guaranteed a place in the next world? It seems as though, since people were careful to act as though even a drop of blood definitely renders one impure, one no longer needs to know the many distinctions discussed in this tractate. One who works hard, despite this, to know the halachos brought here demonstrates his belief in Moshiach and the rebuilding of the Beis HaMikdash, and truly waits for him every single day."

The Rebbe of Mattersdorf, zt"l, brings this Maharsha and adds, "When

we had a Beis HaMikdash, it is clear that the halachos brought in Maseches Niddah were very important to know well. As we find in Avos, 'Rabbi Elazar the son of Chasmah said, 'Niddah and Kinin are the corpus of halachah.' Besides the centrality of these halachos in determining how many sacrifices must be brought, one had to be very careful not to err in the calculation of various times. One slight slip in the calculation could place a person in the category of doubtful kareis. What could be a more important focus of study than that! ■

1. בית ישראל, מאטסדורף, פרשת מצורע

