



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Tohar blood (cont.)

Another unsuccessful challenge is presented against Levi's position that a woman has two sources of blood.

Rav's position that a woman has a single source of blood is unsuccessfully challenged.

Another unsuccessful challenge to Levi's position is recorded.

After presenting a disagreement between Amoraim how to rule in this dispute, the Gemara declares that the halacha follows Rav regardless of whether it leads to a stringency or a leniency

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah elaborates on a woman's status if she bleeds during labor and what happens if she had relief from labor before she finally delivered her baby.

### 3) Clarifying the Mishnah

Rav, Shmuel and R' Yitzchok offer different explanations for the Mishnah that implies that every woman that bleeds in labor is considered a niddah.

Rava further clarifies R' Yitzchok's explanation of the Mishnah.

A Baraisa is cited in support of R' Yitzchok's explanation.

A point in the Baraisa is clarified.

A Baraisa is cited that provides the source that bleeding in labor does not have bearing on a woman's state of zivah.

Points in the Baraisa are clarified.

The Gemara questions why the same exposition cannot be made regarding a niddah.

Reish Lakish cites an exposition that differentiates between a niddah and a zavah.

*(Continued on page 2)*

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *Birth pains during the days of tohar*

כיצד קשתה יום אחד ושפתה שנים או שקשתה שנים ושפתה יום אחד ששפתה וקשתה וחזרה ושפתה הרי זו יולדת בזוב

If a pregnant woman begins to experience labor pains and she sees blood before delivering the baby, this blood is called "blood of labor." The Mishnah teaches the halachos of this blood regarding when it is tamei.

If a woman saw blood due to the onset of labor, if it occurred during her days of niddah the woman is *tamei'ah* as a niddah.

If this flow due to labor occurred during her days of zivah, the Torah does not consider this blood to be tamei, because it is seen as part of the process of labor. The Torah states (Vayikra 15:25) that zivah is only tamei when it is a result of itself, but not when it is caused by an external factor.

The Gemara brings various opinions regarding blood due to labor during the woman's zivah days. Rav explains that although the Torah considers this woman to be *tehorah*, the rabbis considered her to be a niddah for the one day during zivah when she saw blood. She is prohibited to her husband for that day, and she may immerse in a mikveh and is permitted that night.

Shmuel says that the woman is prohibited to be with her husband that night, because we are concerned that she might not have any labor pains the next day, thus indicating that the one day of seeing blood due to labor was actually due to being a minor zavah and not due to labor. She would be required to observe a clean day corresponding to that one day of sighting. Finally, R' Yitzchak explains that a woman who experiences blood due to birth pains during the days of zivah is completely permitted to her husband. Rava explains that the Mishnah's ruling that "labor blood is niddah" only applies to blood seen during days which are days of niddah, not during those of zivah.

A Baraisa is brought to support the view of R' Yitzchak. A woman saw blood for three days before giving birth. Among the cases listed is where she had labor pains for two days but no pain on the third day, or if she saw blood with no pains on the first day and third day, but on the second day she had labor pains. In these cases we rule that she has given birth in the midst of being a zavah. The day of respite from pain one day before birth indicates that the blood was not only due to labor and birth.

*(Continued on page 2)*

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why doesn't the appearance of blood after a woman's tohar days render her a niddah retroactively?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. How does the Gemara rule in the dispute between Rav and Levi?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. How long can a woman's labor last?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Why wasn't R' Assi fearful of banning Shilla bar Avina?  
\_\_\_\_\_

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Following stringent opinions that conflict with one another

הילכתא כוותיה דרב לחומרא

The halacha follows Rav when it produces a stringency

The Gemara records a dispute between Rav and Levi whether a woman possesses one source of blood or two sources of blood. Ravina then reports in the name of R' Shemen of Sukra that Mar Zutra once visited their town and ruled that the halacha follows Rav when his position produces a stringency and the halacha follows Levi when his position generates a stringency. Tosafos<sup>1</sup> wonders how Mar Zutra could rule in accordance with the stringent positions when they contradict one another. Seemingly Tosafos is referring to the Gemara in Eiruvim (6b) that teaches that one who follows Beis Shamai's stringencies and Beis Hillel's stringencies is a fool. Rather, one is supposed to follow a school of thought both in its stringencies as well as its leniencies. Tosafos answers that in this case the halacha remains in doubt, therefore Mar Zutra ruled in accordance with their combined stringent positions and this does not make one a fool.

Teshuvos Mishneh Halachos<sup>2</sup> elaborated on Tosafos's comment based on an explanation of Rosh<sup>3</sup>. Rosh writes

*(Insight...continued from page 1)*

Tosafos asks what is added with the example of one day of labor pains, preceded and followed by painless days? Tosafos explains that perhaps the Baraisa is elaborating without any particular novelty in this case, or it may be teaching that any pain at all, even early in the third day, avoids the birth's being in zivah. ■

that when there is no definitive ruling about a matter, any time there is a question about how one should proceed he should adopt the stringent approach. In other words, explains Mishneh Halachos, whenever there is an uncertainty about the halacha one is not a fool for adopting the stringent approach. It is only when the halacha was decided and one wants to follow the stringent opinion that is not accepted by the halacha that one is considered to be a fool. He then further explains that when the halacha was decided in accordance with a particular opinion and one decides to be stringent in accordance with the other opinion he is in violation of halacha. Although the Gemara only mentions that one following this course of action is a fool, the truth is that it is prohibited to behave like a fool. This is in line with the same Gemara's criticism of one who chooses to follow the lenient outcome of two conflicting positions. ■

1. תוס' ד"ה הלכתא כרב לחומרא
2. שו"ת משנה הלכות ה"י סי' ער
3. שו"ת הרא"ש כ"ל כ' סי' ט"ז ד"ה דע לך בני ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The Birth Pains of Moshiach

שפתה מן הצער

Today's daf discusses birth pains.

Tisha B'Av is a very confusing holiday for many people, simple folk and scholars alike. What is the point of the kinnos, which appear to be complaints directed toward God? One great Jewish thinker of the last generation postulated that these kinnos are a permitted way of asking God questions that we cannot answer. In his worldview, Tisha B'Av is a day on which our respectfully tendered arguments and laments can be offered.

But the author of the Otzar

HaYirah disagreed. "Tisha B'Av is a day when we mention how difficult things were and are for us in our long exile. But the underlying message of Tisha B'Av is one of hope. We hope and pray to God that our travails during exile will suffice and He will finally redeem the Jewish people as He promised us."<sup>1</sup>

Rav Yitzchak Zilberstein, shlit"a, offers a similar explanation of one of the kinnos. "During the kinnos of Tisha B'Av we say, **אלי ציון ועריה כמו**, **אשה בצריה**. One may well wonder why Tzion and her districts are adjured to mourn specifically like a woman.

"The answer lies in a special experience of pain that only women endure: childbirth. We are saying that we are just like a woman who knows even before her labor has ended that it has a

wonderful purpose. Everything will be fine and she will give birth to a new baby, an event which deserves a hearty mazal tov. Similarly, we need to know that our mourning for the destruction of Yerushalayim and the Beis HaMikdash has a grand purpose. In the merit of our mourning and yearning, the Beis HaMikdash will be rebuilt!"<sup>2</sup> ■

1. אוצר היראה בין המצרים
2. תורת היולדה

*(Overview...continued from page 1)*

This explanation is rejected and Shmuel's father suggests another explanation. The meaning of another related word is explained. An incident related to the dispute between Rav, Shmuel and R' Yitzchok is recorded ■

