

Niddah (the menstruant), and her days of separation

(*Responsum* of Rabbi Yehiya Badihi, from the book "Hen Tov." Rabbi Yehiya Badihi was one of the prominent figures in the Academy known as the synagogue of "*Beith Saleh*" in San'a more than one and fifty years ago. He was born in 1808 C.E., and died in 1888 C.E.)

You asked: Is there any legal basis on which to rely regarding that custom of women who see [blood] for [only] two or three days [during their monthly period] and then cease [from having menstruation], yet who continue their separation until seven days [are fully completed], and they will not [begin] counting the seven clean days until after the [first] seven days [have been expired]; and what is the reason they have [for doing so]? Also, can the husband compel his wife to cancel this custom which has now spread amongst the majority of women?

Answer: The [author of] *Beit Yoseph*, of blessed memory, has written in section # 196 [of *Yoreh De'ah, Hilkoth Niddah*], that the majority of women continue to see [blood] five or six days. So far his words. According to this, even if we should say that women at ease who do not continue to see [blood five or six days], they were led to act stringently upon themselves after the [manner of the] majority of women who must wait until they cease [from their flow of blood before beginning to count] in purity, and afterwards [they begin] counting seven clean days. Now we must ascertain whether or not it is fitting to act in such a manner, or whether or not [it is better] to do away with this practice. Behold! From a pure *halachic* standpoint, Maran, of blessed memory, has written in section # 196 [of *Yoreh De'ah, Hilkoth Niddah*]: "Had she seen blood for [only] one day, and she ceased [from having the flow] on that very same day, she checks herself with a soft swab that is snugly inserted [within her privy place] close to the time of dusk, and on the next day she begins to count seven clean days. But she who co-habits [with her husband] and sees [blood] afterwards,¹ yet [forthwith] ceases [from having the flow], she does not begin to count seven clean [days] until six complete [twelve-hour] periods² have passed over her, making up [three consecutive] twenty-four hour [days].³ Therefore, she does not begin to count except from the fifth night since her co-habitation [with her husband]. But if she wants to count from the following day after her

¹ i.e., During that same night of intercourse.

² The Hebrew word, "*'onoth*," implies a 12-hour period. Six twelve-hour periods means three consecutive days.

³ The time of three days allows for all residue of semen to discharge from her womb, in the event that the semen became mixed with the blood of her menstrual cycle during the time of intercourse, and would return to make herself unclean again.

having seen [blood],⁴ let her wipe herself thoroughly with a soft swab, or bathe [herself] in warm water, and doing so will dislodge all semen, and then she may [begin] counting seven clean [days] starting with the night following her seeing [blood]." So far his words, using brevity.

Now although there are those [exponents] who practice leniency with regard to the woman who co-habits [with her husband] and sees [blood during the act of intercourse], and they have written that nowhere have they said that she requires waiting six [twelve-hour] periods, or three [twelve-hour] periods according to Maimonides, of blessed memory, except where it might pertain [to her eating or touching] things requiring ritual purity. However, where it [only] involves her husband, she is not required to wait. [Notwithstanding], the custom has already spread [itself] in all places according to the decisive ruling of Maran, of blessed memory, in the *Beit Yoseph* and *Shulchan Arukh*, in accordance with the majority of the exponents of our laws, [viz.], that she be required to wait six [twelve-hour] periods, or to wash herself thoroughly in warm water. Likewise did Maimonides, of blessed memory, write, that on the day in which she ceases [from seeing blood], she checks herself and begins to count on the following day.

Now Maharitz (acronym for: *Moreinu Harav Yehiya Saleh*), of blessed memory, who is expert in the customs of the cities of Yemen, has written in his [book] "*Seder Taharah*,"⁵ section # 1, *halacha* # 6, whose exact wording is herewith copied down, "that there was someone who made it a practice that the menstruant refrain from counting seven clean [days] except after seven days [have passed] since her [first] having seen [blood], even though she did not see [blood] except [only] one day, but this is none other but an errant practice; and just as Maimonides, of blessed memory, has written [in] the eleventh chapter of *Hilkoth Isurei Bi'ah*." So far [his words].

On the other hand, whoever sees [blood] and ceases [from her flow] on the selfsame day, or on the second day, and waits five days from the time she first saw [blood] and then begins to count on the sixth day, this [practice] is in accordance with the custom of the cities of Ashkenaz⁶ – for Rabbi Moshe Iserlisch (*RAMA*), of blessed memory, has written in section # 196, item # 11, that "nowadays, we do not make a distinction between she that co-habited [with her husband when she saw blood], and

⁴ i.e. After having co-habited with her husband on the night when she saw blood, and then ceased from her flow.

⁵ The book is also known as "*Sefer Sha'arei Taharah*," and is found in most Baladi-rite prayer books based on Maharitz's commentary "*Etz Hayim*."

⁶ Women from Ashkenazi backgrounds will **always** wait 13 days, counting from the day of their cessation of blood to the time when they go to the ritual bath (*miqwah*) – whether they had accompanied with their husbands or not. Yemenite women, on the other hand, will wait 12 days, counting from the day of their cessation of blood to the time when they go to the ritual bath, yet this applies only to those women who accompanied with their husbands when they discovered blood.

she that did not co-habit [when she saw blood]. [Rather], *any* woman who sees even a [blood] stain must wait five days and then conclude [her period of waiting] until the evening, and [only] then [begin to] count seven clean [days]." So far [his words]. Now the reason for this stricture, as reported in the name of the *Lavush*, is "because a woman that co-habited [with her husband] and saw [blood] afterwards during that very same day, etc., we [take the following precautionary measures and] decree that [even] she who has not had connexion [with her husband is likewise to be deemed unclean for the same number of days], on account of that woman who has had connexion [with her husband], in order that she ⁷ make no mistake [thereby] and come to [violate] that prohibition which would warrant the extirpation [of her husband]." So far [his words]. If so, it is probable that those women who practice doing so, [only do so after] some scholar saw those words of Rabbi Moshe Iserlisch (*RAMA*) and took upon himself [this] stringency, and instructed his wife to act [accordingly], whilst a few women were drawn after her. But this custom has not spread amongst all women in our places, and the majority of them rely on the quintessential law (*halacha*) about which Maimonides and Maran, of blessed memories, have [both] written. Thus has [this practice] also been refuted by the words of Maharitz, of blessed memory, who did not take up those words of Rabbi Moshe Iserlisch (*RAMA*) in his "*Seder Taharah*." [Hereby] it is proven that they did not practice this stricture. Also in [his] Responsa, volume I, *responsum* # 34, he differed with Rabbi Moshe Iserlisch (*RAMA*), of blessed memory, where he wrote "that we are not expert at this present age concerning the [required] washing in warm water about which Maran, of blessed memory, has written." Rabbi Moshe Iserlisch (*RAMA*) has written, furthermore, that "behold, they have it as a practice to wait," etc., and "anyone who should make a breach in the fence where it was once customary to be stringent," etc. Concerning which Maharitz has written that "our [own] custom is not so, but rather, is based on the essential *halacha*." Moreover, at the end of that *responsum* he concludes in the name of "*Hagahoth Maimoniyoth*" that "she who wishes to clear herself from all doubts, let her wash herself also in warm water along with the wiping made by a [soft] swab, or a soft piece of cloth, etc., but let him look [there] at the *Beit Yoseph*, *ibid*. Therefore, he who is stringent, let him be as stringent as the "*Hagahoth Maimoniyoth*," and no further. Now as for Rabbi Moshe Iserlisch's stricture, we have not so much as heard about it, here, in these places – for what expertise is needed [by having her wash in warm water]!? Let him teach them well, and no more is needed." So far [his words].

⁷ i.e., that woman who did not co-habit with her husband when she saw blood.

From this you are able to learn that whenever she has had no connexion [with her husband when she sees blood], the custom is [such] that she is not required to wait, except [the time needed for her to wait until dusk falls] when she ceases [from her blood flow and waits to begin her count] in purity, whether she had seen [blood] for one day or more [than one day], she is to check herself according to *halacha*, and to wear white panties from the evening of that same day, and on the following day to count seven clean [days] – without any need to wait five days as the custom of the cities of Rabbi Moshe Iserlisch (*RAMA*); But he who wishes to act stringently [in this regard], let him be strict upon himself [alone], while he who is lenient is rewarded by proceeding ahead with the commandment.

Nevertheless, those women who wait until the seventh day [in order to begin their count] after seeing [blood], it is fitting to rebuke them, and to cancel this practice, seeing that they cause sorrow to their husbands, and they are bound, at some day, to give an account for their actions. Now even Rabbi Moshe Iserlisch (*RAMA*), of blessed memory, has written about this [in his glosses], in item # 11 of section # 196, whose words are as follows: "There are women who practice [even] more stringency by waiting until seven days [have expired], but there is no explanation for the matter, [while he that is stringent, let him be stringent upon himself alone],⁸ and he that is lenient [here] is rewarded by proceeding ahead with the commandment." So far [his words]. Now even though the Rabbi of the *Beit Hadash* has brought down an explanation for this custom, the *Turei Zahav* has already rejected it and has agreed to that opinion of Rabbi Moshe Iserlisch (*RAMA*), [saying] that there is no basis for this custom. Let him look there [for a more thorough discussion on this subject].

There are also women who argue that they wait [until] seven days [have been expired before beginning their count] because after the discharge [of blood] from her natural purgation, she still sees [blood] during the days succeeding [her] menstrual cycle, [which is usually] thick and viscous, and discoloured, which [blood] continues to grow lighter, day after day, until [at length] it comes forth on the seventh day when it is white and pure, without any discolouration, in consideration of which they wait seven days before commencing their count. But in my most humble opinion, this argument does not suffice [if it causes her] to wait, for although we are not expert in determining what [blood-like] appearances are attributed to clean stains, the exponents of our laws have already written that any appearance which leans towards a reddish colour is [considered] unclean, and they have [likewise] rendered fit any

⁸ The phrase carried here in brackets appears in Rabbi Moshe Iserlisch's glosses, *ad. loc.*, but was omitted by our author.

appearance wherein there is no doubt whatsoever about [a suspected] reddish colour.

But what is worthy and fitting to emulate with [all] stringency is that which Maran and Rabbi Moshe Iserlisch (*RAMA*) have, [both], written about in the name of several exponents of our laws, [*viz.*], regarding the checking that is done on that day [immediately following] the cessation [of all blood, while waiting to begin her count] in purity (**Heb.** *hefsek taharah*⁹), which must be done with a soft swab, and during the seven clean [days] either with cotton or a clean white cloth, inserting it deep within that place, into the depths [of her privy place] and the labial folds (labium), and not that she inserts it merely a little ways [within] in order to wipe herself, but rather, as far as the place where the "custodian threshes" (a euphemism for: "as far as the place where her husband's *virile membrum* reaches."). And if she has not done this, but has only checked herself very well, deep within the depths [of her privy place] and labial folds, according to her ability, even though she has not reached as far as the place where the "custodian threshes," it suffices as a thing meeting minimal requirements, at least on the day of cessation [of all blood, while waiting to begin her count] in purity (**Heb.** *hefsek taharah*), and on the first day and seventh [day] of the seven days.

Now although there are those who are lenient with regards to this checking, just as the Rabbi of "*Pithei Teshuva*" has written, in section # 196, item # 7, whose words are as follows: "Let him refer to the Responsa of '*Noda Biyehudah*,'¹⁰ the volume of *Yoeh De'ah*, *responsum* # 46, who went to great lengths to prove that the opinion of many exponents of our laws is to relax [all strictures] with the manner in which she checks [herself], but he did not dare try to release all strictures altogether, seeing that there are many exponents of our laws who are still quite stringent [about it]. But what the *Shulchan Arukh* has written concerning the check [that she makes immediately following] the cessation [of all blood, while waiting to begin her count] in purity (**Heb.** *hefsek taharah*), and the check [that she makes] on the first day [of the seven days], etc., it seems to be his opinion to relax [all] strictures [and] to rely upon *Ramban*

⁹ "*Hefsek Taharah*," lit. "a break in uncleanness." The word "taharah," although it has the meaning of "purity" or "cleanness," is used here as a euphemism for "uncleanness" or "impurity." The sense here is to that intermediate period, never more than 12 hours, between a woman's cessation of blood and the time when she begins to count seven clean days. For example: If a woman ceased from her flow of blood around 3: o'clock P.M. (in the late afternoon), she will wait until that upcoming evening to begin her first day of counting. Already at dusk, she will bathe herself in warm water, and insert a cotton swab into her privy place in order to check for blood. If, on the other hand, she ceased from her flow of blood after midnight, she will wait until the upcoming morning's light of dawn to begin her first day of counting, during which time, she inserts within herself a cotton swab, etc. The period of waiting, from the moment she ceases from seeing blood to the time when she begins to count seven clean days, is never more than 12 hours.

¹⁰ Written by Rabbi Yechezkel Landa

(Nachmanides) [who said] that only the checking which comes [immediately following] the cessation [of all blood, while waiting to begin her count] in purity (**Heb. hefsek taharah**), must [be with the insertion of a soft swab deep within] the depths [of her privy place] and labial folds. Yet, the other checks belonging to the first day [of her seven day count], etc. [only require] a superficial check.

After the *Shulchan Arukh* has written that "a man ought to teach [these things] within his own household," etc., and wrote, [moreover], that "it be placed for the entire duration of dusk (between day and nightfall)," behold, such a checking accounts for that check made also on the first day [of her seven day count], seeing that the soft swab remains within her until nightfall, etc., and the count made on the night is considered a [valid] count as far as this is concerned. So far his words.

Now the Rabbi of "*Hawath Da'ath*" has replied to the words of the "*Noda Biyehidah*," and has proven by the words of the exponents of our laws brought down by the *Beit Yoseph* that she requires checking [herself in order to accommodate herself] for her husband, from the standpoint of the Law [itself]! For it has in it the prohibition warranting the extirpation [of her husband], lest perhaps the walls of her womb have withheld [the blood's release], and [so] requiring [her] to check the depths [of her privy place] and the labial folds (labium), particularly, and not [to be satisfied with mere] wiping. Thus has he proven from the words of Maimonides, of blessed memory, who employed the word "checking" with regard to the check [that she makes] at her cessation [of blood, while waiting to begin her count] in purity (**Heb. hefsek taharah**), and while checking [herself] during [the days of] cleanness. Yet, where he has treated on the check [that she makes] before her actual co-habitation [with her husband], he has employed the word "wiping." Lo! "Checking" is not the same as "wiping." For "checking" is in the depths [of her privy place] and in the labial folds from within, while "wiping" is from without. Let him look there for a more thorough discussion [on this subject].

Therefore, one must teach the common sort of the people about this, that they might teach their wives not to view leniently what should be treated stringently, or [that they might not] act with stringency over that which is not written [at all].

The gist of the matter [is this]: During this time and age, the women in our place are divided over their practices one from another. There are women who practice in accordance with [strict], proper conduct and equity, that if she had not co-habited [with her husband] and, [yet], saw blood and [forthwith] ceased [from her flow], on the day in which she ceases [to see blood] – even on that [very] day when she saw [blood] – she checks herself within the depths [of her privy place] and labial folds (labium), according to her ability, and then counts seven clean [days]

beginning with the following day. This is the good and proper course of conduct, even though she cannot insert the soft swab in that place on account of [some] danger due to weakness, it suffices for her to check [herself] in the depths [of her privy place] and labium as far as the place where she is able to insert the cloth by her finger.

There are also women who act stringently and wait four days from the day that they saw [blood], even though she might have ceased [from her flow of blood] on the same day that she saw [blood], and then will proceed to check herself in the depths [of her privy place] and labium, according to her ability, and begins to count on the fifth day thence. Now this is that practice which is in accordance with that stringency brought down by Rabbi Moshe Iserlisch (*RAMA*), of blessed memory, and this custom has on which they may rely, based on the explanation we have written above, and it is not right to blame them, while he that is stringent [in this regard], let him be strict upon himself [alone].

Now there are [other] women who, even though they have not seen [blood] except [only] one day, they wait seven days from the time of their having seen [blood], and then check themselves by wiping superficially from without, concerning which the Rabbi of "*Noda Biyehudah*"¹¹ did not dare to [contradict by saying they may] relax strictures [in this case] on that day of their cessation [of blood, while waiting to begin their count] in purity (**Heb.** *hefsek taharah*), [that is], to be lenient in this check. The argument of these women is that the waiting period of seven days removes all traces of doubt, instead of having to check the depths [of her privy place] and labial folds (labium). But this argument falls when we consider that sometimes their seeing [of blood] continues until the sixth day, and she then checks herself on the seventh day from without. If so, what hath she done to remove herself from all traces of doubt?! They, moreover, rely upon those who are lenient with regard to this check, against whom the majority of our laws' exponents are dissonant. Now this happens to be the worst of all those customs found amongst the other women. Certainly, she that has within her the ability to check herself in the depths [of her privy place] and in the labial folds (labium) but waits seven days without any sight [of blood], and [only] afterwards begins her count, this is an errant practice and is worthy of being cancelled. Yet, may the blessed G-d show us wonders out of His [divine] Law, and instruct us in the way of truth. Amen, may it be His will.

המקור:

שו"ת מוהר"ר יחיא בדיחי – סי' מ"א, בעניין נידות

¹¹ Rabbi Yechezkel Landa

(מתוך הספר "חן טוב")

שאלת, אם יש סמך למנהג נשים הרואות ב' או ג' ימים ופוסקות, ומשלימות ריחוקם עד ז' ימים, ואינם סופרות שבעה נקיים עד ז' ימים. ומה טעם יש להם. גם אם יכול הבעל להכריח אשתו לבטל מנהג זה שפשט ברוב הנשים.

תשובה. כ' הב"י ז"ל בס"י קצ"ו, דרוב הנשים נמשכת ראייתן חמשה וששה ימים עכ"ל. לפ"ז אפ' לומר דנשים שאננות שאין ראייתן נמשכת, נגררו להחמיר על עצמן אחר רוב הנשים שצריכות להמתין עד שתפסוק בטהרה, ואח"כ סופרת ז' נקיים. וצריכים אנו לידע אם ראוי לנהוג כן, או אם ראוי לבטל מנהג זה. והנה בעיקר הדין כ' מרן ז"ל בס"י קצ"ו, ראתה יום א' ופסקה בו ביום בודקת עצמה במוך דחוק סמוך לבהש"מ, ומיום המחרת תתחיל לספור ז' נקיים. והמשמשת מטתה וראתה אח"כ ופסקה, אינה מתחלת לספור ז' נקיים עד שיעברו עליה ו' עונות שלימות מעת לעת. לפי אינה מתחלת לספור אלא מליל ה' לשימושה. ואם רוצה לספור מיום מחרת ראייתה, תקנח יפה יפה במוך, או תרחוץ במים חמין והם יפליטו כל הזרע, ותספור ז' נקיים מליל מחרת ראייתה ע"כ בקיצור. ואעפ"י שיש מקילין במשמשת וראתה, כתבו שלא אמרו שצריכה להמתין ו' עונות או ג' עונות לד' הרמב"ם ז"ל, אלא לטהרות. אבל לבעלה אינה צריכה להמתין, כבר פשט המנהג בכל המקומות כהכרעת מרן ז"ל בב"י וש"ע עפ"י רוב הפוס', שצריכה להמתין ו' עונות או תרחוץ בחמין יפה. וכ"כ הרמב"ם ז"ל, דביום שפסקה בודקת עצמה ותתחיל לספור מיום המחרת. וכ' מהרי"ץ ז"ל הבקי במנהגי ערי תימן בס' טהרה שלו סי' א' דין ו' וז"ל מועתק, שיש מי שנהג שהנדה לא תמנה ז' נקיים אלא אחר ז' ימים לראייתה, אעפ"י שלא ראתה אלא יום אחד, וזה אינו אלא מנהג טעות. וכמ"ש הרמב"ם ז"ל פ' י"א מהלכות איסורי ביאה ע"כ.

אמנם מי שראתה ופסקה בו ביום או ביום ב', וממתנת ה' ימים מיום תחלת ראייתה ומתחלת לספור מיום ו', הוא עפ"י מנהג מדינות אשכנז שכל רמ"א ז"ל בס"י קצ"ו סי' י"א, שעכשיו אין לחלק בין שמשלה ללא שמשלה. וכל אשה שרואה אפ"י כתם, צריכה להמתין ה' ימים ותפסוק לעת ערב ותספור ז' נקיים ע"כ. וטעם חומרא זו בשם הלבוש הוא, משום אשה שמשלה וראתה אח"כ בו ביום וכו', דגזרינן לא שמשלה אטו שמשלה, כדי שלא תטעה ותבא לידי איסור כרת ע"כ. וא"כ, אפשר שהנשים הנוהגות כן, איזה חכם ראה דברי רמ"א אלו והחמיר על עצמו והורה לאשתו שתעשה, ונגררו קצת נשים אחריה. אבל לא פשט המנהג בכל הנשים במקומותינו, ורובן סומכים על עיקר הדין שכתב הרמב"ם ומרן ז"ל. וכן מוכח מדברי מהרי"ץ ז"ל שלא העלה דברי רמ"א אלו בסדר טהרה שלו. מוכח, שלא נהגו בחומרא זו. וגם בתשובה חלק א' סי' ל"ד חלק על רמ"א ז"ל במ"ש, שאין אנו בקיאים בזה"ז ברחיצת מים חמין שכתב מרן ז"ל. וכתב רמ"א שהרי נוהגין להמתין וכו', וכל הפורץ גדר במקום שנהגו להחמיר וכו'. וכתב עליו מהרי"ץ דאין מנהגינו כן, אלא על עיקר הדין. וסוף התשובה סיים בשם הגמ"י, ואם רוצה לצאת מכל ספיקות תרחוץ גם בחמין עם הקינוח במוך או בגד רך וכו' ועיין ב"י סי' זה. ע"כ המחמיר יחמיר כהגמ"י ותו לא. וחומרת רמ"א לא שמענוה כאן באלו המקומות, דמה בקיאות צריך, ילמדם יפה ותו לא צריך ע"כ. מזה אתה למד, דכשלא שמשלה, שהמנהג שאין צריכה להמתין אלא כשתפסוק בטהרה, בין ראתה יום אחד או יותר, תבדוק עצמה כפי הדין ותלבש לבנים מעת ערב של אותו יום, וממחרתו תמנה ז' נקיים, ואין צריך להמתין ה' ימים כמנהג מדינות רמ"א. והמחמיר יחמיר לעצמו והמיקל נשכר להקדים במצוה.

אמנם אלו הנשים הממתינות עד יום ז' לראייתה, ראוי להוכיחן ולבטל זה המנהג, שמצערות את בעליהן ועתידות ליתן את הדין. ואפילו רמ"א ז"ל כתב על זה בסי' קצ"ו ס"ק י"א וז"ל: ויש נשים שנהגו להחמיר עוד להמתין עד ז' ימים, ואין טעם בדבר והמיקל נשכר להקדים עצמו למצוה ע"כ. ואעפ"י שהרב ב"ח הביא טעם למנהג זה, כבר דחה אותו ט"ז והסכים לדעת רמ"א, שאין להן למנהג זה טעם יעו"ש. ויש נשים שטוענות שהן ממתינות ז' ימים, מפני שאחר יציאת דם ראייתה רואה עוד בימים שאחר הוסת, עב וסמך ועכור והולך וכוהה יום אחר יום, עד שיצא ביום ז' לבן וזך שאין בו עכירות, ולכך הם ממתינות ז' ימים קודם הספירה. ולפי ענ"ד שאין טענה זו מספקת להמתין, שאעפ"י שאין אנו בקיאים במראות הטהורין, כבר כתבו הפוס' שכל מראה הנוטה לאדמימות טמא והכשירו כל מראה שאין לספקו באדמימות כלל.

ומה שראוי וכשר הדבר להחמיר, הוא כמ"ש מרן ורמ"א ב' כמה פוסקים בענין הבדיקה ביום הפסק טהרה, שצריך שתהיה במוך. ובכל הז' נקיים בצמר גפן או בגד לבן ונקי, ותכניסהו באותו מקום בעומק לחורין ולסדקין, ולא שתכניסהו מעט לקנח עצמה, אלא עד מקום שהשמש דש. ואם לא עשתה כן, רק שבדקה עצמה יפה בחורין ובסדקין בעומק כפי כחה, אעפ"י שלא הגיע עד מקום שהשמש דש סגי לה בדיעבד, ולפחות ביום הפסק טהרה וביום א' וז' מהז' ימים. ואעפ"י שיש מקילין בבדיקה זו כמ"ש הר' פתחי תשובה בסי' קצ"ו ס"ק ז' וז"ל: עי' בתשו' נו"ב הי"ד סי' מ"ו שהאריך להוכיח, דד' הרבה פוס' להקל בבדיקה אלא שלא מלאו לבו להקל לגמרי כיון שיש הרבה פוסקים מחמירים. אך כמ"ש הש"ע בבדיקה של הפסק טהרה ובדיקה של יום א' וכו', נראה לו להקל לסמוך על הרמב"ן דרק בדיקה של הפסק טהרה צריכה לחורין ולסדקין. אבל שאר בדיקות של יום א' וכו' בבדיקה קלה. אחרי שכ"ע שילמד אדם בתוך ביתו וכו', וכ' שיהא שם כל ביה"ש, הרי בבדיקה זו כוללת גם בדיקת יום א', שהרי המוך אצלה עד הלילה וכו' וספירת לילה מיקרי ספירה לענין זה עכ"ל. והר' חות דעת השיב על דברי נו"ב, והוכיח מדברי הפוסקים שהביא הב"י דבעיא בבדיקה לבעלה מדאורייתא, דיש בזה איסור כרת שמא העמידוהו כותלי בית הרחם, ובעי בדיקת חורין וסדקין דוקא ולא קינוח. וכן הוכיח מדברי הרמב"ם ז"ל, דכ' ל' בבדיקה גבי בדיקת הפסק טהרה ובדיקת נקיים. אבל גבי בבדיקה דלפני תשמיש, כ' ל' קינוח. הרי דקינוח לא הוי בבדיקה. דבדיקה בחורין ובסדקין מבפנים, וקינוח מבחוץ יעו"ש ב'. ע"כ צריך ללמד להמון בזה, שילמדו נשותיהם שלא יהיו מקילין בחמור, ומחמירין באשר לא כתוב.

כללא דמילתא, דבזה"ז הנשים במקומינו זה, חלוקות במנהגותיהן זמ"ז. יש נשים שנוהגות כדין וכשורה, שאם לא שמשה וראתה ופסקה, ביום שפוסקת אפ"ל ביום שראתה, בודקת עצמה בחורין ובסדקין כפי כחה ומונה ז' נקיים מיום המחרת. וזה המנהג הטוב והישר, אעפ"י שאינה יכולה להכניס מוך לאותו מקום מפני הסכנה מחמת חולשה, סגי לה בבדיקת חורין וסדקין עד מקום שיכולה להכניס הבגד באצבעה. ויש נשים מחמירות וממתינות ז' ימים מיום ראייתה אעפ"י שפסקה ביום שראתה, ובודקת עצמה בחורין ובסדקין כפי כחה ומתחלת למנות מיום ה', וזה המנהג כחומרת רמ"א ז"ל, וזה המנהג יש להם על מה שיסמוכו מצד הטעם שכתבנו לעיל, ואין להאשימם והמחמיר יחמיר לעצמו. ויש נשים שאפ"ל לא ראתה אלא יום א' ממתינות ז' ימים מיום ראייתה, ובודקת עצמה בקינוח בעלמא מבחוץ, אשר לא מלאו לבו הר' נו"ב להקל ביום הפסק טהרה להקל בבדיקה זו. וטענת נשים אלו, שהמתנת ז' ימים מוציאה מידי כל ספק במקום בדיקת חורין וסדקין. וסתירת טענה זו, ממה שלפעמים נמשכת ראייתן עד יום ו', ובודקת עצמה ביום ז' בקינוח מבחוץ.

א"כ מה הוציאה מכל ספק, וסומכות על המקילין בבדיקה זו שחלקו עליהם רוב הפוסקים. וזה מנהג גרוע מכל מנהג שאר הנשים. אמנם מי שיש יכולת בה לבדוק עצמה בחורין ובסדקין, וממתנת ז' ימים בלא ראות ואח"כ סופרת, זהו מנהג טעות וראוי לבטלו. והש"י יראנו נפלאות מתורתו ויורנו דרך האמת אכ"ר.