

## And perhaps to exclude a Zov from days – ודלמא למעוטי זב מימים –

### OVERVIEW

<sup>1</sup> The בימים cites the פסוק of וזאת to teach us that a זבה is not בראיות, מטמא בראיות only בימים. <sup>2</sup> The תוספות discusses the ימים of וזאת excludes a זב from זב. <sup>3</sup> The מקשן of the intent of the

clarifies the intent of the גמרא's question:

ולא בעי למימר אבל לא זבה מראיות<sup>4</sup> דאם כן לשתוק מוזאת<sup>5</sup> –

And the גמרא does not want to say, 'but the וזאת does not exclude a זבה from ראיית', for if a זבה is not excluded from ראיית (but becomes a זבה either from ימים or ראיית), let the פסוק be silent from 'וזאת'; we do not need the exclusion of וזאת.

מקשן offers an alternate understanding of the תוספות:

אי נמי המקשה סמך אהיקשא<sup>6</sup> וכדפריך בסמוך<sup>7</sup> מה ראיית:

<sup>1</sup> She becomes a זבה גדולה (which requires ז' נקיים and a קרבן) only if her three ראיית were on three (consecutive) days (this is referred to as ימים), but not if the three ראיית took place in one day (this is referred to as ראיית).

<sup>2</sup> One becomes a זב if he sees three ראיית (in one day). According to the conclusion of the גמרא he also becomes a זב if the three ראיית were in three days. At this point the גמרא asks that the וזאת should exclude the זב from becoming זב, טמא בימים, he should become a זב only בראיות (three on one day).

<sup>3</sup> The question can either be a) that the וזאת exclude only a זב from ימים, but it does not exclude a זבה from ראיית (which would make her a זבה either by ימים or ראיית), or the question may be b) that in addition to excluding a זבה from ראיית it should also exclude a זב from ימים (which would make a זב only by ראיית and a זבה only by ימים). [According to this option (b) it will be necessary to interpret that which the גמרא states וזאת למעוטי זבה to mean how do we know that וזאת is מעט exclusively a מראיות perhaps it is also מעט.]

<sup>4</sup> The question is negating option 'a' (mentioned in footnote # 3), but rather the question is let וזאת also exclude a זב in addition to excluding a זבה מראיות (option 'b'). [It seems (from this תוס') that the question of 'ודלמא וכו'', is not referring back to refute the answer of ר"מ, but rather the גמרא is now discussing the דרשה of 'וזאת'.]

<sup>5</sup> If the intent of the וזאת is only to exclude a זב מימים, there is no need for this exclusion for why will I think that a זב is מטמא בימים; since all we know from the פסוק is that a זב is מטמא בראיות (which is a case of קירב), why would we think that he is מטמא also by ימים (which is ריחוק)! However if we assume option 'b' that וזאת excludes both זבה (from ראיית) and זב (from ימים), it is understood that וזאת is necessary to exclude זבה from ראיית (even though she is טמאה by ריחוק, nevertheless she is not טמאה by קירב), and we also need וזאת to exclude a זב from ראיית, for without the וזאת we can argue that if ראיית which are טהור by a זבה (from וזאת) are nevertheless טמא by a זב (proving that a זב is more severe than a זבה), therefore ימים which are טמא by a זבה should certainly be טמא by a זב; the וזאת teaches that notwithstanding this וזאת is not מטמא by ק"ו.

<sup>6</sup> The question is indeed that וזאת should exclude only a זב מימים and not a זבה מראיות (option 'a'), and the reason we need a מעוט (see footnote # 5) is because there is a היקש of ולקבה which could teach us that just as a זבה is מטמא בימים, so too a זב can be מטמא בימים, therefore the מעוט of וזאת is necessary to exclude a זב from ימים. See 'Thinking it over'.

<sup>7</sup> The גמרא asks why we use the מעוט of וזאת to exclude a זבה from ראיית and the היקש to include a זב for ימים, let us say the opposite that וזאת excludes a זב from ימים and the היקש includes the זבה for ראיית. Similarly here the מקשן asks that since there is a היקש, we need וזאת to exclude זב from ימים.

**Or you may also say; that the מקשן depended on the היקש, and as the גמרא asks later, 'why did you see', etc.**

### **SUMMARY**

The question of זב מימים זב ודילמא למעוטי זב can mean to also exclude זב, or to only exclude זב.

### **THINKING IT OVER**

The גמרא asks מה ראית וזאת; why don't we say that וזאת excludes a זב from ימים and the היקש includes a זבה for ראיות. However according to תוספות that the only reason we may have assumed that a זב is מטמא בראיות is on account of the היקש,<sup>8</sup> it is obvious that the וזאת is not excluding a זב from ראיות, for if that is the intent of the פסוק, let it not write the היקש<sup>9</sup> so there will be no way to assume that a זב is מטמא בימים (since it is ריחק) and we will not need the exclusion of וזאת.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> See footnote # 6.

<sup>9</sup> We do not need the היקש to teach us זבה בראיות, for we can derive that from a ק"ו if ריחק then קירב!

<sup>10</sup> See מהרש"א הארוך.