

39.4.2; 32b (בכותי ערום) → 33b (הכותים מטמאין)

1. וְכָל הַנֶּגַע בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר יְהִי תַחְתּוֹ יִטְמָא עַד הָעָרֶב וְהַנוֹשֵׂא אוֹתָם יִכְבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְרַחַץ בְּמֵיִם וְטָמְא עַד הָעָרֶב: וַיִּקְרָא טו, י'
 2. וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יֵגַע בְּמִשְׁכְּבוֹ יִכְבֵּס בְּגָדָיו וְרַחַץ בְּמֵיִם וְטָמְא עַד הָעָרֶב: וַיִּקְרָא טו, ה'
 3. וְאִם שָׁכַב יִשְׁכַּב אִישׁ אֶתָּה וְתַהִי נִדְתָּה עָלָיו וְטָמְא שְׁבַעַת יָמִים וְכָל הַמִּשְׁכָּב אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכַּב עָלָיו יִטְמָא: וַיִּקְרָא טו, כד
 4. וְאִם שָׁרָה מְזוּבָה וְסָפְרָה לָּהּ שְׁבַעַת יָמִים וְאַחַר תִּטְהַר: וַיִּקְרָא טו, כח

I Revisiting 2nd clause in משנה –

- a *Men*: have status of נדה בועל (because the women observe all דם as נדה) → are כעליון
- b *Meaning*: of משכב תחתון כעליון
- i *Cannot mean*: that if there were a number of mats underneath him that they are all טמאים – that is obvious
- ii *Must mean*: the תחתון (מדרס) of a בועל נדה is equated to the עליון (e.g. garment) of a זב
- 1 *Just as*: the text של זב עליונו is only מטמא food/drink, not בגדים; same with נדה בועל מדרס
- iii *Premise*: מטמא של זב is v. 1; תחתיו must mean “something which the זב is under” (הזב covered in v. 2)
- 1 *Therefore*: the text “moved” it away from מדרס to establish a lighter טומאה – only foods, not people or garments
- 2 *Counter*: perhaps the text only moved it from אדם → בגדים to אדם OR בגדים
- (a) *Answer*: (v. 1) implies the lightest form of טומאה
- iv *Source*: for בועל נדה only being מטמא food/drink – ברייתא expounding v. 3
- 1 *תהי נדתה עליו*: could mean that he “joins” her count (e.g. if they had ביאה on her 7th day, he’d be on his 7th day)
- (a) *Therefore*: it states שבעת ימים – a full seven from the time of ביאה
- (b) *תהי נדתה עליו*: gives him equal “infectious power” to נדה – he is מטמא people and חרס
- (c) *However*: מטמא...יטמא (unnecessary; נדה already has מדרס) – moves it to the קלה טומאה (only food/drink)
- (i) *Challenge (ר' אחאי)*: perhaps it only moved it to אדם and בגדים (but not אדם → בגדים)
- (ii) *Answer (ר' אסי)*: (v. 3) implies “light” טומאה
- 2 *Challenge*: why not read v. 3 as כלל (אם שכב ישכב) & פרט (ותהי נדתה עליו) → as נדה – only מושב ומושב (per ... המשכב)
- (a) *Answer1 (אביי)*: interrupts – makes כלל פרט and כלל with gap – no rule of פרט
- (b) *Answer2 (רבא)*: we do use כלל ופרט with gap; but כלל extends his טומאה to include מגע
- (i) *Challenge*: why not equate him to her (ותהי נדתה עליו)
1. *Just as*: she has one rule for מגע and מושב ומושב (both can be מטמא אדם → בגדים)
2. *So too*: same with him – both should be lenient
3. *Answer (רבא)*: “עליו” implies a stringency

II Status of all כותים as כותים נדות – limited to married כותים

III Examination of reasoning – כותי women observe all דמים

- a *Question*: isn't that a more stringent position?
- b *Answer*: they see “red” and have it complete 7 days begun with “off-color” (e.g. green)
- i *In addition*: as זבות, they count day of טהרה as first day of נקיים
- ii *Challenge*: why don't we do that – after all, we hold היום ככולו
- 1 *Answer (רבא)*: then ש"ז would never cancel its own day (for זב counting נקיים) – we would employ ככולו היום
- 2 *Block*: perhaps פסוק is only referring to a case where he saw ש"ז at end of day: if earlier, we would employ מקצת...
- iii *Related question (רב"ח)*: if a woman is פולטת ש"ז (while counting נקיים) does that interrupt her count?
- 1 *Clarification*: is she considered רואה – and it cancels; or נוגעת, and it doesn't (as if she touched שרץ)
- 2 *block (רבא)*: can't work; if cancelling all 7; can't be more than her בועל; if 1 – v. 4 implies that she may have no טומאה
- 3 *Defense*: how does it cancel (that day) for זב – he needs no טומאה in the middle of his נקיים
- (a) *Rather*: in both cases, the requirement is not to have טומאה interrupting (רמי בר חמא) question remains

IV Analysis of final clause – no liability for contact with כותים

- a *Story*: ר"פ met ר"פ, he challenged our משנה with ruling that we do burn תרומה for contact with הארץ בגדי עם
- i *כותי חבר*: resolved – our משנה is referring to ר"פ
- ii *Challenge*: how can we consider a כותי חבר to be בועל נדה?
- 1 *Rather*: must be כותי ע"ה who was טובל in our presence, walked on חבר, which then touched תרומה
- (a) *No consideration*: of בגדי ע"ה (he was טובל in our presence)
- (b) *Mild consideration*: of בועל נדה; perhaps he was בועל a while ago; even if recently, perhaps she didn't count ריוק
- (i) *Therefore*: ספק ספיקא – for which we do not burn תרומה
- (ii) *Challenge*: why not have it be burned due to בגדי ע"ה (which are considered לפרושים)?
- (iii) *Answer*: case could be where he remained naked after מקוה