

בימי לבונית¹ מהו אצלך – Was he by you during your 'white' days

OVERVIEW

The גמרא relates that אליהו asked the woman (who was complaining why the הקב"ה took away her husband who was such a great scholar, etc.); 'was your husband together with you during the [seven] clean days [(after the זיבה), before you went to the מקוה].' It may appear from the questioning that there is a difference in the severity of the prohibition between ימי נדות and ימי ליבון;² our תוספות rejects this notion.

- ימי ליבונה אליהו asked her regarding תוספות explains:

לא משום שיש לחלק בין נדות לליבון³ –

Is not because there is a distinction between the days of נדות (the first seven days after she discharged blood) **and the seven clean** days, afterwards -

דהא אמר רבי עקיבא בפרק במה אשה יוצאה (לקמן דף סז,ב) –

For **הרי היא בנדתה עד שתבא במים** **היא** **נדה** **state until she immerses herself in a מקוה** **She** **retains her same state of טומאה until she is טובל**; therefore since there is no difference between ימי נדות and ימי ליבון, the reason אליהו asked here regarding ימי ליבון

– **הרי היא בנדתה עד שתבא במים**

That she remains in her נדה state until she immerses herself in a מקוה. She retains her same state of טומאה until she is טובל; therefore since there is no difference between ימי נדות and ימי ליבון, the reason אליהו asked here regarding ימי ליבון

– **אלא לפי שידע אליהו שכך היה המעשה**

Was only rather because אליהו was aware that indeed this is what occurred, that they were in close physical contact during ימי ליבונה (and not נדות), but not because of any leniency regarding ימי ליבון.

תוספות cites a differing opinion:

¹ When a woman secretes דם during her regular menstruation period she is a נדה and is טמאה for seven days, regardless whether she saw דם one day or all seven days; as long as she stopped seeing blood before the end of the seventh day she is טובל that night, after the seven days, and she is טהורה. If she sees דם in the ensuing eleven days (after the seven days), it depends; if she saw for one or two days, she can become טהורה if she sees no דם the following day; however if she sees דם three consecutive days then she is a זבה (גדולה) and can become טהורה only if she has seven consecutive clean days. These seven days are referred to as ימי ליבונה. This is the תורה law. However, because of the various complications involved, the prevailing custom was and is that whenever a woman sees דם, she needs seven clean days to become טהורה.

² If there is no difference between נדות and ליבון, so after she answered אליהו that בימי נדות he never touched her, why did he ask her concerning ימי ליבון?!

³ See (ד"ה בא"ד ומהכא) that תוספות is negating the custom by some that during ליבונה the couple would eat together (but not during נדות). See footnote # 12.

⁴ ויקרא (מצורע) טז,לג.

ורבינו חננאל ורש"י פירשו בפרק אף על פי (כתובות דף סא, ושם) גבי שמואל –

And the ר"ח and רש"י explained in פ"א regarding פרק אף על פי –

מחלפא ליה דביתהו בידא דשמאלא היינו בימי ליבונה –

That his wife. when she was prohibited from pouring wine for him, **would change** her usual manner **and pour** the wine for שמואל **with her left hand**; they explained that this 'leniency' occurred **בימי ליבונה**, but not נדותה, so **בימי נדותה**, so **בימי נדותה** concludes that their explanation –

אין נראה כדפירשתי –

Is not acceptable, as I explained that there is no difference between **בימי נדותה** and **בימי נדותה**, and she did this change even **בימי נדותה**.

Tosfos offers another explanation in our story:

ורבינו תם פירש שהיו רגילים לטבול שתי טבילות –

And the ר"ת explained that it was customary for them in the times of the גמרא for the נדות **to immerse themselves twice** in a מקוה –

אחת לסוף שבעה לראייתה שהיא טהורה מדאורייתא בהך טבילה⁵ –

Once after seven days from her initial discharge, **where she is טהורה** **with this טבילה** even if there was no **שבעה נקיים⁶** –

ואחת לסוף ימי ליבון לכך היה מיקל אותו האיש⁷ –

And she would make another טבילה after the seven **clean days** (whereupon she would be **טהורה** even **מדרבנן**); **therefore that person** (in our גמרא) **was lenient** **בימי ליבונה** because she was a **טהורה מדאורייתא**.

Tosfos discusses a Halachic issue:

ורש"י היה נוהג איסור להושיט מפתח מידו לידה בימי נדותה⁸ –

And s' custom was to prohibit passing a key from the man's hand to the woman's hand during the נדה days⁹

ונראה לרבינו יצחק שיש סמך מסדר אליהו –

And the ר"י maintains that there is support for this prohibition from the סדר אליהו where this story is recounted in greater detail –

⁵ The reason they did this (even though they were not **טהורה לבעלה**) is (perhaps) in order to do **טבילה בזמנה** because it would prevent her from being **טהורה** (see **מנחת איש**).

⁶ See footnote # 1.

⁷ See however **ליבונך** (where it seems) that we are discussing an actual **זבה** where she is **טהורה** **ז' נקיים** during her **מאוריתא**.

⁸ This prohibition applied even if they did not touch each other when passing the key.

⁹ See **בא"ד ומהכא** that since **רש"י** maintains that **בימי נדותה**, passing is forbidden even without touching, so that **שמואל's** wife would not have given him the cup even with her left hand **בימי נדותה**, therefore **רש"י** explained that it was **בימי ליבונה** (where it may be permitted to pass items without touching).

דקתני¹⁰ אמר לה שמא הבאת לו את השמן שמא הבאת לו את הפך –

For it states there that אליהו said to her perhaps you brought him oil; perhaps you brought him a jug; indicating that merely handing over an object is prohibited –

Tosfos rejects this proof -

ומיהו התם מסיים¹¹ ונגע ביד באצבע הקטנה –

However he concludes there, that אליהו said regarding the bringing of the oil, **'and he touched you with a small finger,'** indicating that passing an object without touching may not be prohibited.

Tosfos cites other places which seem to support רש"י and negates them:

ומפרק אף על פי (שם) דאמר אביי מנחא ליה אפומיה דכוכא ורבא מנחא ליה אבי סדיא-

And from פרק אע"פ where the גמרא relates that s' אביי's wife placed the cup of wine she poured for her husband **on the rim of the wine cask** and s' רבא's wife **placed it by his head board** indicating that they did not hand it to their husbands directly, which would seem to support רש"י, nevertheless -

אין ראיה כי שמא דוקא במזיגת הכוס שיש חיבה יותר כדאמר התם –

There is no proof that they may not pass to each other (without touching) **because perhaps this conduct was only by pouring a cup** of wine for the husband, **for in this act there is an increased dearness** as the גמרא states **there -**

אבל שאר דברים לא –

However regarding passing **other items, there is no** prohibition of passing to each other if they do not touch each other.

ומהכא דקאמר אכל עמי ושתי עמי¹² יכול להיות שלא הקפיד אלא על השכיבה:

And from the story here where she said he ate with me and drank with me, it is possible that אליהו was concerned only regarding the lying

¹⁰ See תנא דבי אליהו פ' (טו) טז.

¹¹ states slightly differently, that she answered אליהו (whether she brought him oil, etc.) that he did not even touch me with a small finger, but she did not say she did not bring the oil, indicating that the intention of אליהו was to ask her if her husband touched her when she gave him the oil.

¹² See footnote # 3. Tosfos states here that seemingly one can prove from our גמרא that it is forbidden to eat together even ליבונה, since she said 'אכל עמי וכו', and אליהו responded המקום ברוך. However, Tosfos negates this proof, because אליהו was referring only to עמי שכב which is certainly prohibited, but not necessarily to אכל עמי (which may be permitted according to the aforementioned custom). [Alternately Tosfos is negating that we cannot prove from this גמרא רש"י maintains that it is forbidden to pass items to each other (even ליבונה); for it is inevitable if they ate and drank together that they passed various items to each other. It is no proof, however for possibly אליהו was only concerned regarding the שכיבה (see שפ"א).]

together but not the eating together if they were not touching each other.

SUMMARY

ימי apply to נדות ימי apply to ימי maintain that all prohibitions which apply to תוספות as well. ליבונה בימי rules that a man may not hand over a key to his wife רש"י. נדותה even if they do not touch. The ר"ת states that it was customary to be ז' נקיים after נדות ימי and again after טובל.

THINKING IT OVER

Does שיטת רש"י, which states that they were טובל twice, support שיטת ר"ת that there is a difference between נדותה ימי and ליבונה ימי, or not?¹³

¹³ See מנחת איש and מהרש"א הארוך.