



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Caesarean Section (cont.)

R' Chiya the son of R' Huna in the name of Rava concludes his proof from the Baraisa for R' Yochanan's assertion that an animal delivered by caesarean section does not become sanctified.

R' Huna the son of R' Nosson rejects this proof and this leads to a discussion between them with the conclusion being that the Baraisa is a support for R' Yochanan.

A Baraisa presents two disputes between Rabbanan and R' Shimon, the first relates to a woman who delivers caesarean section after three days of labor and the second is the status of blood discharged from there.

The Gemara inquires about the point of dispute between Rabbanan and R' Shimon in the Baraisa's second case.

Ravina offers an explanation of the Baraisa.

R' Yosef rejects this explanation and offers another explanation.

Reish Lakish suggests another explanation of the dispute.

R' Yochanan disagrees with this explanation and the Gemara demonstrates that R' Yochanan maintains a consistent position about this matter.

2) Uterus

Reish Lakish in the name of R' Yehudah Nesi'ah rules that a uterus is *temei'ah* and clarifies the type of *tum'ah* it will transmit.

R' Yochanan rules that if a woman's uterus discharges two drops that resemble pearls she is *temei'ah*.

The type of *tum'ah* and rationale for this ruling is clarified.

3) The "outer room"

Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan dispute the location of the "outer room."

The Gemara inquires whether the area "between the teeth" is considered inside or outside.

A Baraisa of R' Zakkai proves that "between the teeth" is considered inside.

A Baraisa provides another definition of the "outer room."

4) Uterine blood

A Baraisa discusses the status of uterine blood that has not left the body.

A contradiction is noted between R' Shimon's statement in the Baraisa and another statement of R' Shimon.

The contradiction is resolved.

R' Shimon's ruling in the Baraisa is further explained.

This explanation is rejected based on a teaching of Rava and another explanation is suggested.

Rava's position is challenged. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The uterus is a place which is tamei

מקור מקומו טמא

A Baraisa presented a disagreement regarding blood which flows from the uterus. Tanna Kamma holds that it is *tamei*, while R' Shimon holds that it is *tahor*. In the Gemara, R' Yosef explains that the circumstance of this disagreement is where a caesarean birth took place, and both the child and the blood were discharged through the wall of the abdomen of the mother. The basis for the difference of opinion between the Tannaim is that Chachamim hold that the uterus itself is a source of *tum'ah*, so the blood that flows from it is *tamei*, even if it exits the woman's body through her abdomen. R' Shimon holds that we do not say that the uterus of a woman is *tamei*, so the blood that flows from it directly out of the body is not *tamei*.

It is interesting to note that although R' Shimon holds that the baby's being delivered in this manner is considered to be a *bona fide* birth in that the mother must observe days of *tum'ah* and *taharah*, nevertheless the blood which accompanies the birth is not blood of birth which is *tamei*, but it is considered blood of a wound, which is not *tamei*.

Regarding the explanation of R' Yosef, Rashi says that according to Chachamim, as the blood comes in contact with the uterus, the blood becomes *tamei*, and if it later comes in contact with *taharos* (*terumah* or *kodoshim*), these items will become *temei'im*. This is also how Ritva understands the opinion of Chachamim. Ramban and Ra"n, however, question this approach, because the uterus is an internal organ, and the rule is that *tum'ah* cannot be transferred in a *בית הסתרים*, in a place which is concealed. Additionally, the

Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that an animal delivered by caesarean section is not a *bechor*?

2. What are the two issues debated by Rabbanan and R' Shimon?

3. What effect does blood that exits a woman from an abdominal incision have on a woman?

4. Why is a woman prohibited from eating *terumah* after she had relations with her husband?

HALACHAH Highlight

Erasing the suffix to God's Name that was written in error

שהיה פסולן במקדש

That became invalidated in the Beis HaMikdash

Shulchan Aruch¹ rules that it is prohibited to erase even a single letter from God's seven Names. It is also prohibited for one to erase a suffix to God's Name even if it was written in error. For example, it is prohibited to erase the "ד" of the Name א לוקיך or the "נו" of the Name א-לוקינו. It happened once that while writing Parshas Ha'azinu instead of writing ויטש א-לוה the scribe wrote א-לוקי with an additional "י" at the end of the word. The question was whether it is permitted to erase the extra "י" at the end of the word or perhaps it is considered a suffix to God's Name and cannot be erased.

Teshuvos Even Yikara² rejected the reasons to be lenient suggested to him by the questioner and then offered his own rationale why it should be permitted to erase the extra "י". He noted that whenever the name א-לקי is written it is always without a "י" after the "ל". Since the Name as written does not exist elsewhere it is permitted to erase the "י" so that it should spell a Name of God that is found elsewhere. The rationale for this ruling is based on the parallel drawn between the sanctification of suffixes to God's Name written by mistake and korbanos that become invalidated in the Beis HaMikdash where the halacha is that if it was mistakenly put on the Alter it is permitted to stay. Suffixes also become sanctified by their connection to God's Name even if written in error. However, Tosafos³ writes that if the invalidated korban is never fit to be brought as a korban than it is does not become sanctified even when placed

(Insight...continued from page 1)

blood itself is not a food or beverage, and as such it cannot contract tum'ah.

Therefore, Ramban and Ra'n explain that the blood from the uterus does not become tamei through contact with the uterus. Rather, we understand that the Torah declares that all blood from the uterus is tamei in and of itself, even before it flows out. Therefore, even if it exits through the wall of the woman's abdomen with the birth of a caesarean section, it is tamei just like niddah blood. This rule is also indicated from the Gemara later (71a), where the view that holds that the uterus is tamei also says that blood which flows even after a woman has died is also tamei, because it originated in the uterus, and it is tamei even in the smallest amount, as we find regarding blood of niddah. If it were tamei only due to being from a dead body it would be tamei only if it was the volume of a revi'is or more.

Aruch LaNer explains a practical difference between the explanation of Rashi and that of Ramban. According to Rashi, this blood is a rishon of tum'ah, having become tamei through contact with the uterus. Ramban holds the blood is an av hatum'ah, as the Torah declares it tamei just like niddah blood. ■

on the altar. Similarly, opines Even Yikara, suffixes are sanctified even when mistakenly written only when they spell a Name of God but if they spell a Name that is never used the suffix does not become sanctified. Since there is no spelling of God's Name of א-לוקי the "י" may be erased since it was never sanctified. ■

1. שו"ע יו"ד סי רע"ו סעי ט"ו.
2. שו"ת אבן יקרה ח"ג סי פ"ז.
3. תוס' ד"ה שהיה פסולן. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Ultimate Artist

On today's daf we find some of the halachos that relate to the mother of a newborn.

The Chazon Ish, זת"ל, teaches how we should relate to a new baby. "The astounding miracles of matrimony, birth and raising a child open a person's heart and eyes and his ears to see that nothing 'just happens.' This experience should awaken any thinking person's ability to be emotionally moved.

"This is the meaning of the Midrash

יולדת

Tanchuma on the verse 'וילדה זכר'—And she birthed a male.' The Midrash applies the verse, 'ואין צור כאלוקינו' to this. It explains there that the word צור can be understood to refer to צייר which means one who fashions. In this context the verse is saying that there is none who can fashion like God does. A human makes a picture on the wall. Can it move? Can it breathe? Can it speak? God creates man who moves, breathes and speaks. An expert painter has many types of paint to create a picture. God can create a human from one drop.

"We see from here that one who sees a child should be filled with wonder. Studying a child should bring one to contemplate the works of God. Giving this any thought should lead one to the same

conclusion as the Midrash: "There is no צייר, no artist like God."

Rav Yechiel Michel Stern pointed out the obvious question on this midrash: "It seems strange that our sages took the verse 'ואין צור כאלוקינו' out of the simple meaning. Usually the word צור, literally rock, means forceful or powerful, and does not refer to an artist or fashioner.

"The Maharsha in Berachos answers this question. Since the verse tells us that there is no צור like God it implies that there are others which should be referred to as צור, but they cannot be compared to God. Clearly, here we are speaking not of the one and only Rock, but of a different meaning related to the root צור!"¹ ■

■ האוצר הידיעות, ח"א, ע' קנייג-קנייד

