



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its unsuccessful challenge to the assertion that an uncertainty does not remove something from its certain status.

2) Suspecting the onset of a woman's period

R' Nachman was asked whether one is Biblically or Rabbinically obligated to suspect the onset of a woman's period.

R' Nachman cited proof that it is Biblical.

According to a second version he proved that it is Rabbinic.

Rav and Shmuel disagree regarding a woman who examined herself after the suspected time of the onset of her period and found herself to be tehorah. According to Rav she is tehorah whereas according to Shmuel she is temei'ah.

An explanation of the dispute is suggested but rejected.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok offers another explanation of the dispute.

R' Sheishes asserts that the dispute is subject to a dispute between Tannaim.

A second set of Tannaim debate the same issue.

Abaye cites additional support that R' Meir maintains that suspecting the onset of a woman's period is Biblical.

It is suggested that a dispute between Tannaim relates to whether vestos are Biblical or Rabbinic.

Ravina rejects the explanation in favor of another explanation.

3) **MISHNAH:** Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel disagree whether two exams suffice for the entire night or two exams are necessary for each time the husband and wife are together.

4) The dispute between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the the difference whether vestos are Biblical or Rabbinic?

2. What is the point of dispute between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel?

3. What explanation did R" Yehoshua give for ruling in accordance with Beis Shammai?

4. What determines whether something is smart or foolish?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Are vestos from the Torah or are they rabbinic?

י"ח חשוון תשע"ט

The Gemara on 15a noted that there is a dispute among the Amoraim whether a woman's regular period is a Torah-recognized entity or if it is rabbinic. Rashi explains that the issue is that we know that a woman with a regular period must perform an inspection when that time arrives, and the question would be what is the halacha if that moment arrives and the woman did not check herself. If vestos are from the Torah, we would have to consider the woman temei'ah at this point. The assumption is that the regular period arrived, and unless we have compelling evidence otherwise, we say that the blood was there when expected. If we do not find it later, it is because it must have fallen out and was lost. If vestos are only rabbinic, the halacha demands that the woman check herself, but if she did not, she would still retain her status of remaining tehorah.

The Achronim note that Rashi addresses the dispute whether vestos are from the Torah or rabbinic in terms of the status of a woman who did not check herself when she should have done so. Rashi does not address this issue in terms of whether a husband and wife are required to abstain from relations during the time the period is anticipated, because all opinions hold that a woman is prohibited from having relations during the anticipated time of the period. Our sages (Sh'vuos 18b) derive this from Vayikra (15:31), "You shall separate Bnei Yisrael from their tum'ah."

In his Meromei Sadeh (to 15a), the Netzi"v notes that according to Tosafos it might not be agreed upon by all that a woman must check herself at the moment her period is expected. Tosafos says that according to the view that vestos are rabbinic, a woman should check herself, but that this is not a demand of the halacha. Accordingly, Tosafos would understand that the practical difference whether vestos is from the Torah or if it is rabbinic is regarding the need for the husband and wife to abstain from relations during the moment the period is expected.

Sefer Pri De'ah (Intro., Sha'ar 7) asks why a woman would be considered temei'ah even according to the view that vestos are from the Torah and the niddah woman did not check herself. We learn (later 57b) that a woman is not temei'ah unless the blood leaving her womb is accompanied by her feeling the sensation of this happening (הרגשה). Without this awareness, the woman is not temei'ah from the Torah. Chavos Da'as (184:#10) explains that if the woman did not check herself we would only assume that she might have seen blood without feeling it, and the tum'ah to which we refer is only in regard to taharos. The blood that might have appeared has tum'ah, and it would cause the woman to be temei'ah and restricted from handling taharos. Or else, she is prohibited from her husband, but only rabbinically. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Davening for fear of Heaven

הכל בידי שמים חוץ מיראת שמים

Everything is in the hands of Heaven except for fear of Heaven

R' Chanina declares that everything is in the hands of Heaven except for fear of Heaven. Although the Gemara is clear that fear of Heaven is in man's hands nevertheless, we find numerous tefilos in which we ask God for fear of Heaven. For example, in the beracha before krias shema we say, **ויחד** **לברכה לאהבה וליראה את שמך** – unify our hearts to love and fear Your Name. How could we ask God for assistance in our fear of Heaven when it is in our hands rather than in His hands? Rambam¹ writes that pious people and prophets ask in their tefilos for assistance to remain on the path of truth. In other words, they pray that their sins should not cause them to deviate from the path of truth which will lead them to God. Since it is possible for a person's sins or sin to stand as an impediment from doing teshuvah so that the person should die with those sins it is appropriate for one to daven that his sins should not create this barrier which keeps him from realigning himself with God. In other words, we are not asking God to grant us fear of Heaven; rather we are asking God that our sins should not prevent us from doing teshuvah so that we could repent and get ourselves back on the path of truth.

Chazon Ish² explains that God leaves free choice in man's hands, however, it is possible for one person to compel his friend to properly serve God, whether by force or by tricking him into doing it. When a person is compelled to serve God it is not considered as though the action was done without free choice since it was someone's free choice that led to the perfor-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

One Baraisa presents the positions of Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel and a second Baraisa presents the discussion between them regarding their respective opinions.

A Baraisa records a discussion between R' Yehoshua and his students regarding his ruling in favor of Beis Shammai's position.

R' Zeira draws a conclusion from the above discussion.

Rava rejects that conclusion and a Baraisa is cited in favor of Rava's position.

5) Lost bedikah cloth

R' Abba in the name of Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav ruled that if the bedikah cloth was lost before the couple was together they may not be together.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

6) Relations while it is light

R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish present different pesukim for the source that a couple may not have relations while it is light.

The exchange between Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan concerning their respective expositions is recorded.

R' Shimon ben Yochai enumerates four people that God despises. ■

mance of that mitzvah. What is lacking in this case is the closeness that the one who performed the mitzvah should feel as a result of the mitzvah. If a person davens for love and fear of God he then opens the window to experience the closeness that could be generated by the performance of a mitzvah that he was forced to fulfill since he has now contributed through his free choice to have that closeness to God. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"ו מהל' תשובה ה"ג וד'.

2. חזון איש הוספות בסוף סדר טהרות עמ' רצ"ט. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Sensitivity Training

הנכנס לביתו פתאום

In Meseches Derech Eretz Rabbah we find an interesting story about a statement on today's daf. "One should never enter his friend's house suddenly. People should learn derech eretz in this matter from God. After Adam and Chava sinned, God first stood at the entrance to Gan Eden and called Adam, saying, 'איכה — Where are you?'

"Rabban Gamliel, Rabbi Yehoshua,

Rabbi Elazer ben Azarya, and Rabbi Akiva were in the area of those close to the king. There was a philosopher there with whom they were friends. The day they arrived, Rabbi Yehoshua asked Rabban Gamliel if he wished to visit the philosopher. 'No,' was his simple reply.

"The next day, when Rabbi Yehoshua asked Rabban Gamliel the same question, he agreed to pay their friend a visit. When they arrived, they immediately knocked on the door. 'I have been paid a visit by wise men,' said the philosopher."¹

The Alter of Kelm explained, "The philosopher understood that they were

wise because they knocked on his door in a gentle manner, befitting one who is wise."²

The Torah Temimah, zt"l, explains the reasoning behind this practice. "In Niddah 16 we find that one should also knock before entering his own home. The reason one should knock first should be obvious to all. One knocks to show sensitivity to the members of his household. It is only proper modesty, giving them a chance to prepare for him to enter so they can receive him as is fitting."³ ■

1. מסכת דרך ארץ רבה, פ"ה, ב"ג.

2. בית קלם

3. תורה תמימה, בראשית, ג' ט"ו. ■

