

IV

BAVLI NIDDAH CHAPTER FOUR

FOLIOS 31B-39B

4:1

- A. Samaritan women are deemed menstruants from their cradle.
 - B. And Samaritans convey uncleanness to a couch beneath as to a cover above,
 - C. because [by the Israelite method of reckoning the period of menstrual uncleanness] they have intercourse with menstruating women,
 - D. and continue unclean for any sort of blood [not differentiating unclean from clean].
 - E. But those [who have contact] with them are not liable for entering the sanctuary and do not burn heave offering on their account,
 - F. because the uncleanness affecting them is a matter of doubt.
- I.1** A. *To what sort of circumstance is reference made [when the Mishnah states, Samaritan women are deemed menstruants from their cradle]? If they have, in point of fact, produced blood, then even our women also [are unclean as menstruants], and if they did not produce blood, then their woman also [are not unclean as menstruants]!*
- B. *Said Raba b. R. Aha b. R. Huna said R. Sheshet, "With what sort of a case do we deal here? With a case lacking any sort of explanation. Since there is a minority that does produce blood, there is the possibility of such a discharge, and it is taken into account."*
 - C. *And who is the Tannaite authority who takes account of the state of the minority [in imposing such restrictions]?*
 - D. **[32A]** *It is R. Meir, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - E. *"A minor male and a minor female do not go through the rite of removing the shoe and do not enter into Levirate marriage," the words of R. Meir.*
 - F. *They said to R. Meir, "You have made a perfectly valid statement that they do not carry out the rite of removing the shoe. Scripture refers in the pertinent passage to 'a man,' and we draw an analogy from the woman to the man. But what is the reason that they do not enter into levirate marriage?"*

- G. He said to them, “In the case of a minor male, he may turn out to be a eunuch [and so the levirate marriage retroactively will be proven to be null, since he cannot produce a child with his deceased childless brother’s widow], and in the case of a minor female, she may turn out to be barren, so in these two cases they will turn out to override the law against incest [that otherwise would apply to such marriage] not by reason of a religious duty to do so.”
- H. *And the position of rabbis?*
- I. *Follow the status of the majority of minors, and the majority of minor males are not eunuchs; follow the status of the majority of minor females, and the majority of minor females are not barren.*
- J. *Admittedly, you have derived the position of R. Meir that he takes the minority only into consideration in a case in which the minority is, at least, not uncommon; but as to a minority that is entirely uncommon, have you evidence that he takes such a position? And this is a minority that is at least not uncommon, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: said R. Yosé, “There was a case in En Bol that they immersed a minor before her mother [to protect priestly rations that may be touched by her. The mother’s immersion was on the fourteenth day. The menstruant is immersed on the seventh, this means that the baby girl had menstruated right from the cradle.]” And Rabbi said, “There was a case in Bet Shearim that they immersed a minor before her mother.” And said R. Joseph, “There was a case in Pumbedita that they immersed a minor before her mother.”*
- K. *Now with reference to R. Yosé and Rabbi, this was on account of priestly rations of the Land of Israel [which must be protected from the cultic uncleanness that a woman unclean with menstrual uncleanness imparts, and these were daughters of priests, in whose households priestly rations were commonplace]. But as to R. Joseph, why should they have done any such thing? And has not Samuel said, “There is no consideration of prohibition in connection with food designated as priestly rations outside of the land except in contact with a person whose uncleanness exuded from his own body, and this pertains only to eating such food but not even to touching it”?*
- L. *Said Mar Zutra, “The point of reference is to anointing her with oil in the status of priestly rations. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: “And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel that they set apart for the Lord” (Lev. 22:15) — this serves to encompass one who anoints oneself or drinks [food in the status of priestly rations. Now why make reference to a verse in particular to make that point concerning drinking, when drinking is covered by references to eating? But it serves to treat one who anoints in the same classification with one who drinks.”*
- M. *If you wish, I shall say that proof of the same proposition derives from here: “And it is come into his inward parts like water and like oil into his bones” (Psa. 109:18).*
- I.2.** A. *But if it is so [that in imposing a restriction, a minority also is taken into account], our women also should be subject to menstrual considerations right from birth!*
- B. *We who, who derive a lesson from the use of “and if a woman” (Lev. 15:19 [which shows that menstrual uncleanness can begin in infancy], [take account of*

that possibility,] so that should infants produce menstrual blood, they are kept away [from holy things for the menstrual period], so rabbis made no decree in that regard. But as to them, who do not derive a lesson from the use of “and if a woman” (Lev. 15:19), should infants produce menstrual blood, they are not kept away [from holy things for the menstrual period], so rabbis made no decree in that regard.

- I.3. A. What is the exegesis concerning “and if a woman” (Lev. 15:19) [which shows that menstrual uncleanness can begin in infancy]?
- B. *It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “...a woman...” (Lev. 15:19) — I know only that a woman [is subject to the law of menstrual uncleanness. How do I know that the same law pertains even to an infant a day old, that she too may be subject to menstrual uncleanness?
- D. Scripture says, “and if a woman....”
- E. *Therefore it follows that when Scripture included a child, it was one even one day old.*
- F. *But an objection was raised: “...and a woman...” (Lev. 15:19) — I know only that a woman is subject to the law. How do I know that the same law pertains even to a girl three years and a day old, that she too may be subject to the laws covering sexual relations?*
- G. Scripture says, “and if a woman....”
- H. *Said Raba, “These are matters of received law, and rabbis found support for them in Scripture.”*
- I. *Which of the two derives from a scriptural verse, and which is a received law [Slotki: since Scripture uses the same expression— “and if a woman” — in Lev. 15:19 and Lev. 15:18, in both cases what age is implied, the one a day old or the one three years and a day old]?*
- J. *If we should say that the rule governing the one a day old is the received law, and the one three years and a day old rests on Scripture, then is not the text written in [Slotki:] general terms [Slotki: and since there is no reason that the age of three years and a day should be meant rather than that of two or of four years, the lowest possible age, one day, obviously should be the one intended]?*
- K. *Rather, the reference to the girl three years and a day old is the received law, and the rule for the girl a day old rests on the authority of Scripture.*
- L. *But if the one is traditional, then what need is there for a verse of Scripture [that is, the further reference to ‘and if a woman’] at all?*
- M. **[32B]** It serves to exclude a man from uncleanness should he produce a red secretion. [Slotki: Only a woman’s discharge of red fluid is subject to uncleanness, not a man’s.]
- N. *And lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- O. “...woman...” (Lev. 15:25) [with reference to flux] — I know only that a woman is subject to the uncleanness of flux. How do I know that a female child ten days old also is subject to the possibility of uncleanness by reason of flux? Scripture states, “and if a woman....”

- P. *What need do I have to derive this rule from the reference to “and if a woman,” when, after all, I could derive the same fact from the simple proposition that a girl one day old is subject to uncleanness by reason of menstruation [so naturally, if ten days later, she should produce flux, she would likewise be subject to uncleanness by reason of the flux of Lev. 15]?*
- Q. *Such a demonstration was quite necessary. For if the All-Merciful had written in Scripture the rule covering menstruation, I would have said that it is specifically with reference to menstruation, for when she produced blood on one day, she has to observe seven, but as to flux, since, if she should see flux on one day, she is only in the status of waiting day against day, and that status would suffice for her [and she need not be considered unclean except on a day to day basis], so I might say that she is not subject to any further uncleanness by reason of flux.*
- R. *And if the All-Merciful had made explicit reference only to the uncleanness by reason of flux and made no reference to uncleanness by reason of menstrual uncleanness, so that I might draw the conclusion that there can be no uncleanness by reason of flux unless there is the possibility of uncleanness by reason of menstruation, surely one could have drawn the proper conclusion. So what need do I have for an explicit reference in Scripture to the matter of uncleanness by reason of menstruation with respect to a girl a day old?*
- S. *It serves to eliminate a man from the possibility of contracting uncleanness by reason of a flow of red flux.*
- T. *But that has already been excluded once!*
- U. *One serves to exclude a discharge of red semen, the other a discharge of blood [and in both cases, a discharge in the case of a man is not a mark of uncleanness].*

I.4. A. And the same is the rule for males [that males a day old are subject to uncleanness just as are adult males]. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. *“‘A man, a man’ (Lev. 15:2) [with reference to the laws concerning flux uncleanness] — what is the intent of Scripture here in repeating the reference to “a man”? It serves to extend the law to an infant male a day old, who can contract uncleanness through flux,” the words of R. Judah.*
- C. R. Ishmael, son of R. Yohanan b. Beroqah says, “Proof of that sort is hardly required, since Scripture explicitly stated, ‘whether it be a man or a woman’ (Lev. 15:33). ‘Whether it be a man’ [means] of any age at all, a male, whether adult or minor. ‘...or a woman...’ likewise means, of any age at all, a female, whether adult or minor. Then why has Scripture said, ‘a man, a man’? It is because Scripture utilizes the forms of common speech.”
- D. *It follows that Scripture encompasses the infant a day old.*
- E. *An objection was raised [on the basis of Lev. 15:16, which speaks of an emission of semen]: “A man” (Lev. 15:16) — I know only that the law of contamination by flux applies to a man. How do I know that it applies also to a boy nine years and one day old? Scripture states, “and a man,” [which serves to extend the law]. [As*

before, we find a proof from the language of the same context, but now for a different proposition.]

- F. *Said Raba, "These are matters of received law, and rabbis found support for them in Scripture."*
- G. *Which of the two derives from a scriptural verse, and which is a received law? If I say that the rule for the infant a day old is the received law, and the rule for the boy nine years and a day old derives from Scripture, it is the simple fact that Scripture is written in general terms? Rather, the case of the boy nine years and a day old is the received law, and the rule for the infant a day old derives from Scripture.*
- H. *But since we have one of the cases as a received law, what need do I have for a verse of Scripture at all?*
- I. *It serves to exclude a woman from the rule of contracting uncleanness from a white flux.*

I.5. A. *What need do I have for Scripture to have made explicit reference to both males and females?*

- B. *It was necessary for Scripture to make reference to them both, for had the All-Merciful made reference only to males, I would have thought that the reason was that they contract uncleanness by reason of three appearances of flux on the same day as much as by three appearances of flux on three successive days [Lev. 15:33], but females, who do not contract uncleanness by reason of three appearances of flux on the same day as much as by three appearances of flux on three successive days, I might have said are not subject to the law. And if the All-Merciful had made reference in Scripture to females, I might have thought that that is because they contract uncleanness even willy-nilly, but males, who do not contract uncleanness even willy-nilly, I might have said are not subject to the law. Accordingly, it was necessary for Scripture to make reference to them both.*

II.1 A. **And Samaritans convey uncleanness to a couch beneath as to a cover above, because they have intercourse with menstruating women:**

- B. *What is the meaning of **convey uncleanness to a couch beneath as to a cover above**?*
- C. *If I say that the meaning is, if there are ten spreads and he sat on the top one of them, all of them become unclean, that is, in point of fact, self-evident, since he has exerted pressure on all of them.*
- D. *Rather, the meaning is that a couch that is under one who has had sexual relations with a menstruating woman is in the classification of a cover that is above one afflicted by a flux. [The cover underneath one afflicted by a *zab* imparts uncleanness to human beings. The one above the *zab* is affected with uncleanness in such a way that it imparts uncleanness to food and drink that are in contact with it, but not to human beings.] So just as what is above one afflicted by flux imparts uncleanness only to food and drink, so what is beneath one who has had sexual relations with a menstruating woman imparts uncleanness only to food and drink.*

II.2. A. *And how on the basis of Scripture do we know the rule covering the cover that is above one afflicted with flux?*

- B. As it is written, “And whoever touches any thing that was under him shall be unclean” (Lev. 15:10). *Now what can be the meaning of “under him”? [33A] If I say that it means “underneath one afflicted by flux,” in point of fact, that forms a kind of pressure-uncleanness and derives from the statement, “And whoever touches his bed” (Lev. 15: 5). It follows that the meaning must be, whoever touches anything under which one afflicted by flux has been, and what is that? It is the cover that has been above the one afflicted by flux. Now Scripture has detached that from the context of a most severe uncleanness [the pressure-uncleanness to which reference has just now been made], and introduced it, rather, in the context of a less severe form of uncleanness, to tell you that what is above one afflicted by flux imparts uncleanness only to food and drink.*
- C. *Might I say, rather, that Scripture has detached that item from the context of a most severe form of uncleanness, to indicate that it does not impart uncleanness to man in such a way that the man thereupon imparts uncleanness to the clothing that he is wearing, but a man or clothing directly subject to the one afflicted by flux should themselves be made unclean by him?*
- D. Scripture has said, “...shall be unclean...” (Lev. 15:10), *and that bears the meaning of a minor form of uncleanness.*
- E. *And how on the basis of Scripture do we know the rule governing that which lies beneath one who has had sexual relations with a menstruating woman?*
- F. *It is in accord with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- G. “And her menstrual condition will be upon him” (Lev. 15:24) — is it possible to suppose that, when she emerges from her condition of uncleanness [at the end of her period, so immediately he is released from his condition of uncleanness, he may contract uncleanness through sexual relations with her]?
- H. Scripture says, “he will be unclean for seven days” (Lev. 15:24) [and that is without regard to when her period comes to an end, e.g., even if he had sexual relations on the final day of her period].
- I. And what is the meaning of Scripture’s statement, “And her menstrual condition will be upon him” (Lev. 15:24)?
- J. One might have thought that he should not impart uncleanness to another human being or to clay utensils, but Scripture says, “And her menstrual condition will be upon him” (Lev. 15:24). Just as she imparts uncleanness to another human being and to clay utensils, so he imparts uncleanness to another human being and to clay utensils.
- K. Then might one say, just as she imparts uncleanness to that upon which she lies and sits so that such objects likewise impart uncleanness to human beings, who then impart uncleanness to the clothing that they are wearing, so he imparts uncleanness to that upon which she lies and sits so that such objects likewise impart uncleanness to human beings, who then impart uncleanness to the clothing that they are wearing?
- L. Scripture states, “And every bed on which he lies will be unclean” (Lev. 15:24). Now it was hardly necessary for Scripture to make that statement, “And every bed on which he lies will be unclean” (Lev. 15:24), so why does Scripture say, “And every bed on which he lies will be unclean” (Lev. 15:24)?

- M. Now Scripture has detached that from the context of a most severe uncleanness [the pressure-uncleanness to which reference has just now been made], and introduced it, rather, in the context of a less severe form of uncleanness, to tell you that what is above one afflicted by flux imparts uncleanness only to food and drink.
- N. *R. Ahai raised an objection, "Might I propose that Scripture has detached that from the context of a most severe uncleanness [the pressure-uncleanness to which reference has just now been made], and introduced it, rather, in the context of a less severe form of uncleanness, to indicate that while he does not impart uncleanness to man so that the man then imparts uncleanness to the clothing that he is wearing, still, he himself does impart uncleanness to both man and clothing?"*
- O. Said R. Assi, "'...shall be unclean...' bears the implication of a lesser form of uncleanness."
- P. *Might I then propose the following: "And her menstrual uncleanness shall be upon him" (Lev. 15:24) is an encompassing rule, and "and every bed" (Lev. 15:24) then is a particularization of that encompassing rule. Where you have an encompassing rule followed by a particularization of the encompassing rule, covered by the encompassing rule is only what is made explicit in the particularization of the encompassing rule. So things upon which she sits or lies are subject to her uncleanness, but are things are not!*
- Q. Said Abbaye, "'He shall be unclean for seven days' (Lev. 15:24) forms a break in the passage, and, consequently, there is here an encompassing rule followed only at a considerable distance by a particularization, and in every case in which there is an encompassing rule followed only at a considerable distance by a particularization, we do not invoke the principle of an encompassing rule followed by a particularization of the encompassing rule, [in which covered by the encompassing rule is only what is made explicit in the particularization of the encompassing rule]."
- R. Raba said, "Indeed we do invoke that principle [of an encompassing rule followed by a particularization of the encompassing rule, in which covered by the encompassing rule is only what is made explicit in the particularization of the encompassing rule], but the expression 'and every' (Lev. 15:24) forms an extension."
- S. *An objection was raised by R. Jacob, "Might I say that he is in the category of the woman herself? Just as in her case, the law has not distinguished the contaminating effects of her touching from the contaminating effects of her lying on that which is used for sitting or lying, so that that object that she has touched or lain upon imparts uncleanness to man, so that he imparts uncleanness to the clothing that he is wearing, so forming a strict and severe form of uncleanness, so in his case, you should not distinguish the contaminating effects of his touching from the contaminating effects of her lying on that which is used for sitting or lying, so that that object that she has touched or lain upon imparts uncleanness to man, so that he imparts uncleanness to the clothing that he is wearing, so [by contrast] forming a lenient form of uncleanness?" [Slotki: Neither his person nor his clothes will contract uncleanness at all.]*

- T. Said Raba, “‘upon him’ means, ‘to put a load on him’ [and the strict path is followed in his case as well].”

III.1 A. because they have intercourse with menstruating women:

- B. *Are all of them assumed to have intercourse with menstruating women?*
C. Said R. Isaac Magdelaah, “The law refers to those who are married.”

IV.1 A. and continue unclean for any sort of blood:

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
C. Said R. Meir, “If they continue to regard themselves as unclean for seven days on account of exuding any sort of blood at all [whether it is by our lights clean or unclean], is this not an enormous safeguard for them? But it is because when they see red blood, they treat it as supplementary to a prior discharge of yellow blood. [Slotki: should a discharge of clean blood on one day be followed by one of unclean blood on the following day, the Samaritan woman would count the seven days of uncleanness from the first day, regarding the second discharge as having occurred within the seven days of menstruation, so that on the eighth day she regards herself as clean. But as a matter of fact her uncleanness only began on the second day and then continues for seven days, the last of which is the eighth from the first discharge, on which she is still menstrually unclean.]
D. “Another consideration: **the day on which the flow stops she counts among the seven clean days** [T. Nid. 5:1D].”
E. *An objection was raised by Rammi bar Hama, “But let her count it — and we too should count it, since we have it as an accepted fact that part of the day is tantamount to the whole of a day!”*
F. *Said Raba, “If so, then how will you ever find a case in which the emission of semen, which ought to render void the prior clean days following a flux, actually takes place? For lo, part of the day is tantamount to the whole of a day!”*
G. *If one produced it in mid-day, that would be the rule. But here with what sort of a case do we deal? With one in which the discharge came near sunset [so that there was no part of the day left anyhow].*
H. *Now are we supposed to believe that Scripture has presented a verse to deal only with a discharge near sunset?*
I. *Indeed so, that is how you have to permit the Scriptural verse to be explained, for [in light of the rule that part of the day is tantamount to the whole of a day], that is the rule that we are forced to accept.*

IV.2. A. R. Ammi bar Hama raised the question, “If while counting her clean days after her flux had terminated, a woman expelled some semen, what is the law as to her losing the prior clean days after her flux? Is she in the class of one who has produced an emission of semen and so loses the prior clean days counted after her flux? [33B] Or perhaps she is classified as one who has simply had contact with it, so that she has not lost the prior clean days?”

- B. *Said Raba, “He is too clever by half! Granting that she renders void the previously counted clean days, but how many clean days should she lose? Should she lose seven? It is sufficient for her to be in the condition of him*

with whom she has had sexual relations, and so she should lose only a single day [as he does].”

- C. “And after that she shall be clean” (Lev. 15:28) — “after” means, after all of them, and no uncleanness [even a single day] may intervene between the clean days.
- D. *“But according to your reasoning, how could a person afflicted with flux even produce uncleanness that would cause the counting of only one clean day to be lost [rather than all seven], since Scripture has said, “He shall count for himself seven days for his cleaning” (Lev. 15:13), meaning that no uncleanness [even a single day] may intervene between the clean days? What then have you to say? That uncleanness by reason of flux should not intervene among them? Here too uncleanness by reason of flux should not intervene among them. [But the uncleanness of a seminal emission is not flux and is not an intervention.]”*

V.1 A. But those [who have contact] with them are not liable for entering the sanctuary and do not burn heave offering on their account, because their uncleanness is a matter of doubt:

- B. *R. Pappa happened to visit Tawakh. He said, “If there is a representative of rabbis here, I shall go and greet him.”*
- C. *Said to him a certain old lady, “There is a representative of rabbis here, R. Samuel by name, and he repeats Tannaite versions. May it be God’s will that you be like him.”*
- D. *He said, “Since she blessed me by him, I infer that he is God-fearing.”*
- E. *He visited him. He set before him a bull [for a meal!], and he set before him a conflict between Tannaite traditions: “We have learned in the Mishnah, **But those [who have contact] with them are not liable for entering the sanctuary and do not burn priestly rations [heave offering] on their account, because their uncleanness is a matter of doubt.** Therefore, it follows, by reason of doubt we do not burn priestly rations. But by contrast note the following: **On account of six matters of doubt do they burn heave offering: concerning a doubt in regard to a grave area; and concerning a doubt in regard to dirt which comes from abroad; because of a doubt concerning the clothing of an am haares [who does not observe cultic cleanness in eating everyday food]; and because of a doubt concerning utensils which were found; because of a doubt concerning drops of spit which were found; because of a doubt concerning human urine that was nearby the urine of a beast — because of certainly touching them, which is a matter of doubt in respect to their [imparting] uncleanness, they burn the heave offering [M. Toh. 4:5A-C]. [Therefore, it follows, by reason of doubt we do not burn priestly rations.]”***
- F. *Said R. Pappa, “May it be God’s will that this bull may be eaten in peace. Here with what sort of case do we deal [in the Mishnah which implies that we do not burn priestly rations in this context by reason of doubt]? With a Samaritan who is an associate [in that he observes the rules of cultic cleanness even in connection with ordinary food].”*

- G. *“But would a Samaritan who is an associate then have sexual relations with a menstruating woman?!”*
- H. *He left him and went before R. Shimi bar Ashi. He said to him, “How come you did not reply to him, ‘we deal here with the case of a Samaritan who immersed and came up out of the immersion pool and read on the cloak of an associate, and the clothing of this associate came into contact with food in the status of priestly rations, so that, if the food were to be treated as unclean by reason of the uncleanness of the unobservant person, one may object, but he has immersed [and so should be regarded as clean at that moment]! And if we were to assign the uncleanness to his having had sexual relations with a menstruating woman, one could object that we are not sure that the intercourse took place just now or some time ago [before he performed immersion, so he still is clean.’ And if you propose that he had had sexual relations in the recent past, still, it is a matter of doubt whether the woman has assigned yellow blood to the completion of the days of uncleanness or has not done so. So what you really have are mountains of doubts, and on account of one doubt piled onto another, we do not burn priestly rations.”*
- I. *But should one not treat as certain that the uncleanness of the priestly rations was certain by reason of its having touched the garments of a non-observant person? For a master has said, “The clothing of an unobservant person are in the classification of pressure-uncleanness to separatists [Pharisees], [that is, those who meticulously observe the laws of cultic cleanness].”*
- J. He said to him, “We deal with a Samaritan without clothing at all.”

I.1 provides a valuable analysis of the sense of the statement of the Mishnah. The answer is worked out quite nicely at A-I. It seems to me that J-K lose the thread of argument and that the composition is truncated. No.2 reverts to the issue raised at I.1.B. No. 3, 4, 5, a continuous and beautifully matched set, serve as footnotes to No. 2. II.1 explains a fundamental category of conveying uncleanness to which the Mishnah makes reference. No. 2 then provides information taken for granted at No. 1. I find this composition extremely satisfying, a beautiful example of the power of the framers of compositions to say everything that was required in an economical and compelling way; anyone in command of the details of the rules of uncleanness will appreciate the aesthetics of what may appear somewhat arcane. III.1 is a minor gloss. IV.1 explains what is at stake in the Mishnah’s rule. No. 2 then expands the foregoing through a theoretical question, which is not required in context. V.1 irons out the obvious conflict between two Mishnah-rules.

4:2

- A. **When Sadducean women are accustomed to follow in the way of their fathers, lo, they are like Samaritan women.**
- B. **[If] they left [those ways] to walk in the ways of Israel, lo, they are like Israel.**
- C. **R. Yosé says, “They always are like Israel, until they leave to walk in the ways of their fathers.”**
- I.1** A. *The question was raised: what is the rule in a case in which matters are not made explicit [one way or the other]?*

- B. *Come and taken note: When Sadducean women are accustomed to follow in the way of their fathers, lo, they are like Samaritan women. Lo, if matters are not made explicit one way or the other, they are in the status of Israelite women.*
- C. *Then note the following clause: [If] they left [those ways] to walk in the ways of Israel, lo, they are like Israel. Lo, if matters are not made explicit one way or the other, they are in the status of Samaritan women.*
- D. *So no inferences are to be drawn from this passage one way or the other.*
- E. *Come and taken note of what we have learned in the Mishnah: R. Yosé says, “They always are like Israel, until they leave to walk in the ways of their fathers.” So we may infer that the initial Tannaite authority takes the view that if matters are not made explicit one way or the other, they are in the status of Samaritan women.*
- F. *That proves the point.*

I.2. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **There was a case in which a Sadducean was chatting with a high priest, and spit spurted from his mouth and fell on the garments of the high priest, and the high priest paled. Then he came and asked the Sadducee’s wife, and she said, “My lord, high priest, even though we are Sadducean women, we fear the Pharisees and we bring all of our inquiries to a sage.”**
- C. **Said R. Yosé, “We are more expert in the Sadducean women than anybody. They all bring their questions to a sage, except for one in our neighborhood, who did not show her blood to sages, but she died” [T. [Nid. 5:2A-C](#)].**
- D. *But why was the high priest not concerned about the uncleanness that derived from the spit of a person who did not observe cultic cleanness [even if he did not have sexual relations with a menstruating woman]?*
- E. *Said Abbaye, “The case involved a Sadducee who was an associate and so observant of cultic cleanness.”*
- F. *Said Raba, “And will a Sadducee who is an associate and so observant of cultic cleanness have sexual relations with a menstruating woman anyhow?”*
- G. *Rather, said Raba, [\[34A\]](#) “It was a festival, and the uncleanness of a person not observant of cultic cleanness has been treated on a festival as though it were clean, for it is written, ‘So all the men of Israel were gathered again against the city, associated together as one man’ (Judges 20:11), thus treated all of them as associated.”*

The clarification of the excluded middle is accomplished at I.1. No. 2 proceeds to Tosefta’s complement.

4:3

- A. **The blood of a gentile woman,**
- B. **and the blood of purifying of a woman with sara’at [the skin ailment of Lev. 13] —**
- C. **the House of Shammai declare clean.**
- D. **And the House of Hillel say, “It is in the classification of her spit and urine [which convey uncleanness when wet but not when dried up].”**
- E. **The blood of a woman who has not immersed after childbirth —**

- F. The House of Shammai say, “It is like her spit and her urine [which convey uncleanness when wet but not when dried up].”
- G. And the House of Hillel say, “It imparts uncleanness wet and dry.”
- H. And they agree concerning a woman who has given birth while in the status of one who has a flux, that it [her spit and her urine] conveys uncleanness whether wet or dry.

I.1 A. *But do the House of Shammai not accept the exegesis that follows?*

- B. “Speak to the children of Israel and say to them, When any man has a flux” (Lev. 15: 2) — the children of Israel contract uncleanness through flux, and gentiles do not contract uncleanness through flux, but sages have made the decree concerning them that they should be regarded for all purposes as tantamount to those afflicted with flux.
- C. *[How therefore can the House of Shammai declare clean the blood of a gentile woman?] The House of Shammai can say to you, “How should the matter be treated? If it should be classified as imparting uncleanness whether wet or dry, you have treated it as if it were uncleanness dictated by the Torah. And if you classify it as imparting uncleanness when it is wet but not dry, then you make the same distinction as you would in the case of uncleanness that derives from the Torah [specifically, the Israelite woman’s.]”*
- D. *If so, her spit and urine should also be treated in the same way!*
- E. *Since we have made a clear distinction as to her blood, people will know that the uncleanness affecting her spit and urine derives only from the rabbis.*
- F. *Then how about making an equivalently clear distinction as to her spit and urine, while her blood is unclean?*
- G. *Her spit and urine are commonplace, so rabbis made a decree concerning them; her blood, which is not commonplace, has not been subjected by a decree of rabbis.*

I.2. A. Said Raba, “The gentile’s flux is unclean, even in the view of the House of Shammai. His semen is clean, even in the view of the House of Hillel.

- B. “The gentile’s flux is unclean, even in the view of the House of Shammai: *for lo, a clear-cut distinction can be established [so the fact that the uncleanness is merely by reason of a rabbinical decree will be known] in connection with his semen.*
- C. “His semen is clean, even in the view of the House of Hillel: *rabbis have established a distinguishing mark, so that priestly rations and Holy Things will not be burned on account of contamination by it [Slotki: in the absence of the distinction it might have been presumed that the uncleanness is Pentateuchal and that even priestly rations and Holy Things would be burned if they were to touch it].”*
- D. *Then why not make some sort of distinguishing mark with respect to his flux, while his discharge of semen also will be deemed unclean?*
- E. *As to his flux, which does not depend on a deed of his, rabbis have made such a decree, but as to his semen, which does depend on an act of his [sexually], rabbis have made no such decree.*

I.3. A. *May one say that the following supports Raba's ruling [that the gentile's semen is clean]: A gentile woman who discharged semen from an Israelite is unclean. An Israelite woman who discharged semen from a gentile is clean [M. Miq. 8:4A-B].*

- B. *Does this not mean that she is entirely clean?*
- C. *No, it means that she is clean so far as the law of the Torah is concerned, but she is unclean so far as the decree of rabbis is concerned.*
- D. *Come and take note: you turn out to rule that an Israelite's semen is unclean under all circumstances [34B] and even when in the womb of a gentile, and that of a gentile is clean under all circumstances, and even in the womb of an Israelite, except for any urine of hers that gets mixed up with that semen [and this would support Raba's ruling that the gentile's semen is clean].*
- E. *And should you say that that is the rule so far as the law of the Torah is concerned, but it is unclean so far as the decree of rabbis is concerned, is her urine declared unclean by the law of the Torah? So it must follow that the semen of a gentile is clean even by the law of rabbis.*
- F. *That proves the point.*

I.4. A. A master has said, "An Israelite's semen is unclean under all circumstances and even when in the womb of a gentile."

- B. *On that basis one may solve the problem raised by R. Pappa, for R. Pappa asked, "What is the status of an Israelite's semen when in the womb of a gentile?"*
- C. *It was not concerning the status of the semen within three days that R. Pappa raised his question. Where he raised his question, it concerned the status after three days? Israelites, who bestir themselves to carry out religious duties, are active and their bodies heat up so the semen rots, but gentiles, who do not bestir themselves to carry out religious duties, and are not active so their bodies do not heat up, and the semen does not rot. Or perhaps that because they eat abominations and creeping things, their bodies heat up too, so the semen rots?*
- D. *The question stands.*

II.1 A. ...and the blood of purifying of a woman with *sara'at* — the House of Shammai declare clean. And the House of Hillel say, "It is like her spit and urine:"

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of the House of Hillel?*
- C. *Said R. Isaac, "“Whether it be a man” (Lev. 15:33) — this encompasses a male afflicted with the skin disease, so that sources of fluid on his body are unclean [not only his body, but his spit in his mouth produces uncleanness]. “Or a woman” (Lev. 15:33) — this encompasses a female afflicted with the skin disease, so that sources of fluid in her body are unclean [not only her body, but her spit in her mouth produces uncleanness].”*
- D. *What is the meaning of “sources of fluid in her body”?*
- E. *If I should say, “other sources of fluid in her body,” that could be inferred from the case of the male [and we need no special proof for that proposition].*

*Consequently at issue must be the uncleanness of her blood [which will not pertain to the male], with the intent of declaring that **the blood of purifying unclean.***

F. And the House of Shammai?

G. *The rules governing a female do not derive from the rules governing the male, for one could raise the following objection: the distinguishing trait of a male in this context is that if he is afflicted with the skin disease, he is required to uncover his head and tear his clothing and forbidden to have sexual relations [Lev. 13:45], but how can his condition be compared with that of the female, who is not subject to these restrictions [when both male and female are afflicted by the skin disease]!*

H. And the House of Hillel?

I. *The All-Merciful could have specified the restriction in the case of the female, and it would not have been necessary to repeat them in respect to the male, for one could have presented the following argument a fortiori: if a female, who is not subject to the requirements to uncover his head and tear his clothing and forbidden to have sexual relations [Lev. 13:45] has been subjected by the All-Merciful to the extended rule that her sources of body fluids are unclean, the male all the more so should be subject to that same rule! Now if the language of Scripture therefore is hardly required to specify the rule for the male, then apply it to the female, and since it furthermore serves no useful purpose for her other sources of body fluid are concerned [that is, that discharge not blood but spit or urine], apply it to her blood, thus declaring her blood of purifying to be unclean.*

J. And the House of Shammai?

K. *A rule covering the male cannot derive from the rule covering the female, for one can raise the following problem: if a female, who contract uncleanness even willy-nilly, is subject to the law at hand, will you say the same of males, who do not contract uncleanness even willy-nilly?*

L. And the House of Hillel?

M. *While we are discussing the laws of the skin-disease will you raise questions based on the facts that pertain to flux?*

N. And the House of Shammai?

O. *The questions that are raised concern uncleanness [of one sort or another].*

P. *And if you prefer, I shall say, “The House of Shammai will say to you, ‘The phrase, “whether it be a man” (Lev. 15:33) is required for this exposition:*

Q. *““whether it be a man” — whoever is a man, whether adult or minor [and since the text is required for that point, it cannot serve the purpose for which the House of Hillel employed it (Slotki)].”*

R. And the House of Hillel?

S. *They derive that ruling from “This is the law of him who has an issue” (Lev. 15:32) — whether adult or minor.*

II.2. A. *Said R. Joseph, “When R. Simeon presented an account of the subject of the one afflicted with flux [of Lev. 15], he raised the following question: As to the first appearance of flux in a minor, what is the law as its imparting uncleanness through contact? ‘This is the Torah of him who has a flux and of him from whom the flow of seed goes out’ (Lev. 15:32), the Torah has said, [meaning] the initial*

appearance of flux of any one who produces semen that has the power to impart uncleanness also has the power to impart uncleanness, *and in the case of this one, since his semen does not have the power to impart uncleanness, so too the initial appearance of flux that he produces also does not have the power to impart uncleanness. Or perhaps, since he were to produce two successive emissions of flux, they would join together, [so confirming his status as one unclean by reason of flux for a span of seven days, just as if he were an adult], [the initial appearance of flux that he produces also does have the power to impart uncleanness].*”

- B. *Said Raba, “Come and take note: ‘This is the Torah of him who has a flux and of him from whom the flow of seed goes out’ (Lev. 15:32) — whether an adult or a minor. Just as in the case of an adult, the initial emission of flux has the power to impart uncleanness, so in the case of a minor, the initial emission of flux has the power to impart uncleanness.’”*

II.3. A. *R. Joseph raised the question, “As to the initial emission [of flux] of one who is already afflicted by the skin disease impart uncleanness, what is the law on its imparting uncleanness to one who carries it [without actually touching it]? Do we classify the place from which the flux exudes as a source, and therefore the flux conveys uncleanness, or perhaps it is not classified as a source?”*

- B. *Said Raba, “Come and take note: “...his flux is unclean” (Lev. 15: 2) [referring to a second emission of flux]. In this way Scripture teaches that the flux of one afflicted with the uncleanness of the zab [described in Lev. 15] is unclean.’ Now in what regard is this statement made? If we say that it reference is to one who is afflicted with flux-uncleanness alone [and not one afflicted already with the skin disease], [35A] then we must point out, if the flux imparts uncleanness to others, will it not all the more so impart uncleanness to the man himself? Rather, it is self evident, the passage refers to one afflicted by flux who also is afflicted by the skin disease. And since it was necessary for Scripture to extend the law explicitly to the second appearance of flux that such a one suffers, it must follow that the place from which the flux exudes is not classified as a source.”*

- C. *Said R. Judah of Disqarta to Raba, “How so? Perhaps I may say to you that it indeed speaks only of one who is unclean solely by reason of flux. And as to your objection to that thesis, ‘if the flux imparts uncleanness to others, will it not all the more so impart uncleanness to the man himself?’ the scapegoat provides a fine answer to that objection, for it causes other people to be unclean, while it itself is clean [so there is nothing out of bounds in such a phenomenon].”*

- D. *Said Abbaye, “Why raise that problem, since he himself has said, “This is the Torah of him who has a flux” (Lev. 15:32) — all the same whether an adult or a minor,’ and since this law has been adduced by him from that source, the expression ‘whether man’ remains available for the purpose of encompassing within the law the person afflicted with the skin ailment, so that his sources of fluid impart uncleanness, and ‘or a woman’ along these same lines shows that her sources of fluid impart uncleanness [so that in both cases that the place from which the flux exudes is classified as a source]. And the All-Merciful has furthermore establish an analogy between the person afflicted with the skin ailment and the person classified as fully unclean by reason of flux. Just as a person fully unclean*

by reason of flux imparts uncleanness to someone who carries him, so a person afflicted with the skin disease who has produced a single issue of flux likewise imparts uncleanness to someone who carries him.”

- II.4.** A. Said R. Huna, “A person afflicted by flux who produces an initial emission of flux imparts uncleanness [by contact, and is unclean for one day; if there is a second flux he is confirmed as unclean by reason of flux and has to count seven days that are unclean] even willy-nilly, as it is said, ‘This is the Torah of him who has flux and of him from whom semen goes out’ (Lev. 15:32) — just as an emission of semen causes the man to be unclean willy-nilly, so the first emission of flux causes the man to be unclean willy-nilly.”
- B. [To the contrary, let us see whether or not it is willy-nilly:] *come and hear: **If one produces a first appearance of flux, he is examined [M. Zab. 2:1].** Does this not mean, as examined to whether or not he is unclean [to find out whether the flux was due only to constraint, in which case he would be clean, contrary to Huna’s view]?*
- C. No, it is whether or not he is required to bring a sacrifice [Slotki: after the first discharge, if it is under constraint, it is not counted toward the three that impose the obligation to bring an offering].
- D. [To the contrary, let us see whether or not it is willy-nilly:] *come and hear: **At the second appearance of flux, he must be examined [M. Zab. 2:1].** For what purpose? If I say that it is for a sacrifice but not to find out whether or not he is unclean [by reason of a major uncleanness], then recite the verse, “out of his flesh” (Lev. 15: 2), [which refers to someone who has had two fluxes], — thus “out of his flesh” and not under constraint [contrary to Huna’s thesis]! So is this not with reference to whether or not he is unclean, and since the latter part of the Mishnah-paragraph refers to an examination to find out whether or not he is unclean, the former part of the same paragraph likewise must refer to an examination to find out whether or not he is unclean!*
- E. *What makes you say so? This may refer to an examination for the one purpose, that for the other!*
- F. *Come and hear: **R. Eliezer says, “Even for the third flux he is examined, to find out whether or not he is liable to bring the sacrifice of a confirmed Zab” [M. Zab. 2:2].** Does this not imply that the purpose in the case of the contrary Tannaite’s ruling [in opposition to Eliezer] was to say that the first examination is on account of uncleanness?*
- G. *No, all parties concur that the examination is for an offering, but what is at issue here is whether or not we expound the accusative particle [at Lev. 15:33: “he who has a flux,” as will now be explained]. Rabbis do not propose to expound the accusative particle, while R. Eliezer does expound the accusative particle. Rabbis do not expound the accusative particle:.*
- H. *Rabbis do not propose to expound the accusative particle: “He who has a flux” — this now refers to one such experience; “his flux” — the second; “for the man” — And as to the third, Scripture has linked him to the female [so that even in the case of a flux under constraint, he is unclean].*

- I. *R. Eliezer does expound the accusative particle: “he who has a flux,” stands for the first flux; the accusative particle then stands for a second; “his issue” stands for a third; and at the fourth discharge, Scripture has linked him to the female [so that even in the case of a flux under constraint, he is unclean].*
- J. *Come and hear: R. Isaac says, “Was the man afflicted with flux not included within the classification of one who has had a seminal emission? Why was he singled out by Scripture? To impose a lenient rule on him and also to impose a stringent rule on him. To impose a lenient rule on him, to indicate that, unlike one who experiences a seminal emission, he may not contract uncleanness through flux willy-nilly; and to impose a strict rule on him, [35B] to indicate that the uncleanness to which he is subject makes him impart uncleanness to bed and couch [on which he lies or sits, through exerting pressure even without direct physical contact].” Now under what circumstances does this ruling apply? If we say after the second appearance of flux, how can he still be classified as merely one who has had a seminal emission! Rather, it is obvious, it pertains to the situation when he has experienced a first appearance of flux, and yet it has been repeated, To impose a lenient rule on him, to indicate that, unlike one who experiences a seminal emission, he may not contract uncleanness through flux willy-nilly [contrary to Huna’s position].*
- K. *And do you find it entirely reasonable to say, upon the appearance of the first flux, and to impose a strict rule on him, to indicate that the uncleanness to which he is subject makes him impart uncleanness to bed and couch [on which he lies or sits, through exerting pressure even without direct physical contact]! Is he really subject to the rule governing imparting uncleanness to bed and chair [at such an early stage in the process of the formation of the bodily contamination]? Rather, this is the sense of the passage: R. Isaac says, “Was the man afflicted with flux not included within the classification of one who has had a seminal emission at the time of the first emission? Why was he singled out by Scripture on the occasion of the second emission? To impose a lenient rule on him and also to impose a stringent rule on him. To impose a lenient rule on him, to indicate that, unlike one who experiences a seminal emission, he may not contract uncleanness through flux willy-nilly; and to impose a strict rule on him, to indicate that the uncleanness to which he is subject makes him impart uncleanness to bed and couch [on which he lies or sits, through exerting pressure even without direct physical contact].”*

II.5. A. Said R. Huna, “Flux is like dough water of barley. Flux comes from the flaccid penis, semen comes from the erect penis. Flux is watery and looks like the white of a crushed egg, and semen is viscous and looks like the white of a whole egg.”

III.1 A. **The blood of a woman who has not immersed after childbirth — The House of Shammai say, “It is in the same classification as her spit and her urine.” And the House of Hillel say, “It imparts uncleanness wet and dry.” And they agree concerning a woman who has given birth while in the status of one who has a flux, that [her blood] conveys uncleanness whether wet or dry.**

B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- C. Said the House of Hillel to the House of Shammai, “Do you not agree concerning the menstruating woman, that if her time to immerse has come and she did not immerse, and she produced blood, she is still unclean?”
- D. Said to them the House of Shammai, “No. If you have said so concerning a menstruating woman, who, if she immerses today and sees a drop of blood tomorrow, is unclean, will you say the same of a woman who has given birth, who, if she immerses today and produces a drop of blood tomorrow is nonetheless deemed clean [since this is the blood of purifying, after the seven or fourteen days of uncleanness]?”
- E. The House of Hillel said to them, “One who gives birth while in the status of a woman unclean with flux will prove the matter. For if she immersed and then produced a drop of blood after the days of counting clean days, she is clean, but if she did not immerse and then saw a drop of blood, she is unclean.”
- F. “The House of Shammai said to them, “If you bring evidence from the one who has given birth while unclean with a flux, that is the law and that is the very answer to your claim” [T. **Nid. 5:4E-H**]. [Slotki: the same rule is applicable to a woman after childbirth if she does not produce flux. The woman is clean, if the discharge occurred after the seven unclean days of childbirth and the seven clean days after the flux have been counted — even though she has not immersed!].
- G. *Does this then bear the implication that they differ? But have we not learned in the Mishnah: And they agree concerning a woman who has given birth while in the status of one who has a flux, that [her blood] conveys uncleanness whether wet or dry.*
- H. *There is no contradiction, for the latter [the Tosefta’s amplification] speaks of a case in which she has counted the prescribed clean days, while our Mishnah refers to a case in which she has not counted the prescribed clean days* [Slotki: for the discharge occurred before the lapse of seven clean days after the flux. Since she is then still afflicted with flux and unclean, her discharge is unclean whether wet or dry; that is unlike the case of a woman in childbirth, whose discharge is unclean only if it is wet]. *And so also it has been taught on Tannaite authority: One who gives birth while afflicted with flux uncleanness who has counted out the clean days but not yet immersed, and who saw a drop of blood — the House of Shammai follow their theory [even prior to immersion, the discharge is clean if the clean days have been counted out], and the House of Hillel follow their theory [the cleanness is attained only through immersion as well as the counting of clean days].*

- III.2. A.** *It has been stated:* Rab Said, “The discharge of blood after childbirth during both the unclean and the clean days derives from the same source, but the Torah has declared the blood unclean and the Torah has declared the blood clean.”
- B. And Levi said, “They are two distinct sources of blood. When the source for unclean blood is closed, the source for the clean blood is opened, and when the source for the clean blood is closed, the source for the unclean blood is opened.”
 - C. *What is at stake in this dispute?*

- D. *At stake is the case of a woman who produces a flow of blood from the seven unclean days after the birth of a male into the next seven days, or from the fourteen unclean days after the birth of a female into the next fourteen days, or from the forty days of purifying into the period thereafter, or from the eighty days into the period thereafter. From the view of Rab, we rule leniently in the first instances [so that while the discharge was continuous, after the seventh or the fourteenth day, it becomes clean], and we rule strictly in the latter instances [so that while the discharge during the forty or eighty days was clean, it is thereafter clean]. From the viewpoint of Levi, the initial period yields a strict ruling and the later period yields a lenient ruling.*
- E. *An objection was raised: **The blood of a woman who has not immersed after childbirth — The House of Shammai say, “It is in the same classification as her spit and her urine.” And the House of Hillel say, “It imparts uncleanness wet and dry.”***
- F. *In the assumption that the case involves the termination of the unclean days, when there was a break in the continuity of the discharge, then from the viewpoint of Rab, who has said, “The discharge of blood after childbirth during both the unclean and the clean days derives from the same source, but the Torah has declared the blood unclean and the Torah has declared the blood clean,” that is why the blood imparts uncleanness whether wet or dry. But from the viewpoint of Levi, who has said, “They are two distinct sources of blood. When the source for unclean blood is closed, the source for the clean blood is opened, and when the source for the clean blood is closed, the source for the unclean blood is opened,” why should the blood impart uncleanness both wet and dry? [At the end of the unclean days, the clean source opens up!]*
- G. *Levi may reply to you, “Here with what case do we deal? With a case in which the flow is continuous [so the unclean source has not closed up yet].”*
- H. *If the flow is continuous, then what is the reason behind the position of the House of Shammai?*
- I. *The House of Shammai take the position that the discharge of blood after childbirth during both the unclean and the clean days derives from the same source.*
- J. *Now from the viewpoint of Levi, we can understand what is at issue between the House of Shammai and the House of Hillel, but from the viewpoint of Rab, what can there possibly be at stake between them? [If they both agree that there is only one source for clean and unclean blood, what can be the point of the dispute?]*
- K. *At issue is whether [to mark the woman as clean] we require both the conclusion of the required number of days in which no flow has taken place and also the actual immersion in an immersion pool. The House of Shammai take the position that the All-Merciful has made the entry into a state of cultic cleanness to depend solely on the passage of the clean days, and the House of Hillel take the view that reentry into a state of cultic cleanness depends on both the passage of clean days and also the act of immersion.*
- L. *Come and hear: **And they agree concerning a woman who has given birth while in the status of one who has a flux, that [her blood] conveys uncleanness whether wet or dry.***

- M. *In the assumption that the case involves the termination of the unclean days, when there was a break in the continuity of the discharge, then from the viewpoint of Rab, who has said, "The discharge of blood after childbirth during both the unclean and the clean days derives from the same source, but the Torah has declared the blood unclean and the Torah has declared the blood clean," that is why the blood imparts uncleanness whether wet or dry. But from the viewpoint of Levi, who has said, "They are two distinct sources of blood. When the source for unclean blood is closed, the source for the clean blood is opened, and when the source for the clean blood is closed, the source for the unclean blood is opened," why should the blood impart uncleanness both wet and dry? [At the end of the unclean days, the clean source opens up!]*
- N. *He may say to you, "Here too we deal with a case in which the flow is continuous."*
- O. *If the flow was continuous, then for what purpose was it necessary to take the law [that her blood] conveys uncleanness whether wet or dry?]*
- P. *It was necessary to state that viewpoint on account of the position of the House of Shammai. For even though the House of Shammai maintain, "The discharge of blood after childbirth during both the unclean and the clean days derives from the same source, but the Torah has declared the blood unclean and the Torah has declared the blood clean," and, further, that it is on the passage of the clean days that the Torah has made the matter of reentering a state of cultic cleanness to depend, nonetheless, that is the case only for a woman who has given birth in an ordinary way, for whom the prescribed number of unclean days has passed. But it is not the rule for the woman who gave birth while in flux-uncleanness, who has to count seven clean days [after the end of the flux; and so long as she has not counted out these clean days, she is still subject to uncleanness by reason of flux].*
- Q. *Come and take note: "Her sickness shall be unclean" (Lev. 12: 2) — the extend the law to cover him who has sexual relations with her [while she is menstruating].*
- R. *"Her sickness shall be unclean" (Lev. 12: 2) — to extend the law of uncleanness to cover the nights [so she is unclean by night as well as by day, even though Scripture has spoken of "days"].*
- S. *"Her sickness shall be unclean" (Lev. 12: 2) — to extend the law to cover a woman who gives birth while afflicted with flux uncleanness, indicating that she has to wait out seven clean days.*
- T. *Now from the viewpoint of Rab, who has said, "The discharge of blood after childbirth during both the unclean and the clean days derives from the same source, but the Torah has declared the blood unclean and the Torah has declared the blood clean," that is why she has to wait out seven clean days. But [36A] from the viewpoint of Levi, who has said, "They are two distinct sources of blood. When the source for unclean blood is closed, the source for the clean blood is opened, and when the source for the clean blood is closed, the source for the unclean blood is opened," why should she require seven clean days? Surely it would suffice that there be the slightest break [in the blood flow, to mark the closing of the one and the opening of the other source]!*
- U. *This is the intent of the passage: it is necessary that there been some sort of break in the flow of blood, for the seven clean days to go to her credit.*

- V. *Come and take note: [It has been taught on Tannaite authority:] the days of pregnancy supplement those in which she is nursing, and those of nursing supplement those of the pregnancy. How is this the case? If there was an interruption in the menstrual cycle of two periods during her pregnancy, and of one during her nursing period, or of two during her nursing period and one during her pregnancy, or of one and a half during her pregnancy and one and a half during her nursing, they join together to form a three-time interruption. [The passage is spelled out at B. Nid. 10B as follows: Now there is no problem in understanding why the days of pregnancy supplement those in which she is nursing, for such a thing can happen when she is nursing. But how is it possible that those of nursing supplement those of the pregnancy? If you wish, I shall explain that it could happen in the case of a dry birth [without bleeding], and if you prefer, I shall explain that menstrual blood and birth blood are to be distinguished [and the latter does not interrupt the interval of the former (Slotki)], and if you wish, I shall explain, read only the initial clause about the days of pregnancy supplementing those of nursing, and delete the other].*
- W. *Now from the viewpoint of Rab, who has said, "The discharge of blood after childbirth during both the unclean and the clean days derives from the same source, but the Torah has declared the blood unclean and the Torah has declared the blood clean," that is why she has to have a break of three periods. But from the viewpoint of Levi, who has said, "They are two distinct sources of blood. When the source for unclean blood is closed, the source for the clean blood is opened, and when the source for the clean blood is closed, the source for the unclean blood is opened," why should she have to have a break of three periods? Surely it would suffice that there be the slightest break [in the blood flow, to mark the closing of the one and the opening of the other source]!*
- Y. *This is the sense of the passage: there has to be a break of some sort so that the following days shall go to her credit as three periods.*
- Z. *Come and take note: They concur in the case of a woman who produces a discharge after her clean blood period, that it suffices for her to reckon retroactive uncleanness from the time of her producing the blood.*
- AA. *Now from the viewpoint of Levi, who has said, "They are two distinct sources of blood. When the source for unclean blood is closed, the source for the clean blood is opened, and when the source for the clean blood is closed, the source for the unclean blood is opened," that is why it suffices for her to reckon retroactive uncleanness from the time of her producing the blood. But from the viewpoint of Rab, who has said, "The discharge of blood after childbirth during both the unclean and the clean days derives from the same source, but the Torah has declared the blood unclean and the Torah has declared the blood clean," why should it be the case that it suffices for her to reckon retroactive uncleanness from the time of her producing the blood? She should impart uncleanness during the prior twenty-four hours, retroactively.*
- BB. *It is a case in which there is no interval [of twenty-four hours between the end of the clean period and the new discharge. Even if the blood discharged had been in the outer chamber twenty-four hours previously, the woman could not be deemed unclean, since the blood at that time was still clean (Slotki)].*

- CC. Then let her impart uncleanness from the present examination retroactively to the last examination?
- DD. *Since the consideration of the prior twenty-four hours does not pertain, the rule that she impart uncleanness from the present examination retroactively to the last examination likewise does not apply by reason of rabbis' decree.*
- EE. *Come and take note:* One who gives birth while afflicted with flux uncleanness who has counted out the clean days but not yet immersed, and who saw a drop of blood — the House of Shammai follow their theory [even prior to immersion, the discharge is clean if the clean days have been counted out], and the House of Hillel follow their theory [the cleanness is attained only through immersion as well as the counting of clean days].
- FF. *Now from the viewpoint of Rab, who has said, "The discharge of blood after childbirth during both the unclean and the clean days derives from the same source, but the Torah has declared the blood unclean and the Torah has declared the blood clean," that is why the blood imparts uncleanness whether wet or dry. But from the viewpoint of Levi, who has said, "They are two distinct sources of blood. When the source for unclean blood is closed, the source for the clean blood is opened, and when the source for the clean blood is closed, the source for the unclean blood is opened," why should the blood impart uncleanness whether wet or dry?*
- GG. *Levi will say to you, "I make my ruling in accord with the Tannaite version that represents them in agreement [that if there was a discharge after the end of the clean blood period, even though more than twenty-four hours have passed, it suffices for the woman to be unclean from the time that she observed a discharge, so he holds that there are two sources]."*
- HH. *If you prefer, I shall say, we deal with a case in which the discharge is continuous.*
- II. *But the framer of the passage has stated, "she counted out the clean days"!*
- JJ. *Here we deal with the case of a woman who has given birth to a female, and has done so while suffering uncleanness by reason of flux, for whom the flow of blood ceased in the first week, but continued in the second week. He takes the view that the unclean days after childbirth when no discharge flows are counted as clean days in her zibah-period. [Slotki: hence the statement that "she had counted" is explained. In the second week the discharge began again and continued into the third week; in the view of the House of Hillel, it conveys uncleanness both wet and dry, since it comes from an unclean source, which the Torah did not treat as clean prior to the counting of the prescribed number of clean days and the performance of immersion.]*
- III.3.** A. *Said Rabina to R. Ashi, "R. Shemen of Sikhra said to us, 'Mar Zutra happened to visit our locality and gave an exposition: "The decided law follows Rab when his position yields a strict decision, and the decided law follows Levi when his position yields a strict decision."'"*
- B. *R. Ashi said, "The decided law follows Rab, whether the upshot is a lenient decision or a strict decision."*

- C. *Maremar made the exposition: "The decided law follows Rab, whether the upshot is a lenient decision or a strict decision."*
- D. *And the decided law indeed follows Rab, whether the upshot is a lenient decision or a strict decision.*

I.1 spells out the foundations for the Houses' dispute, focusing upon the position of the House of Shammai; but the analysis accounts also for the position of the House of Hillel. No. 2 then extends the inquiry to the male gentile, not treated by the Mishnah but surely called for. No. 3 complements No. 2, and No. 4 is a footnote to No. 3. II.1 spells out the scriptural foundations for the dispute in the Mishnah, and, as before, at No. 2, 3 we find an extension of the discussion begun with the Mishnah-commentary. No. 4 addresses yet another thesis that is only tangentially relevant to our Mishnah's rule; but it is important in exploring the theme of the effect of an initial flow of a contaminating body fluid. These compositions, so beautifully crafted in themselves, have not been made up for the purpose of expanding on the rule of the Mishnah; they are free-standing and investigate theoretical points, through practical cases. They form the Talmud's own statement. No. 5 forms a footnote to the foregoing. III.1 begins by citing Tosefta's rich amplification of the issues at stake here. The distinction between one kind of blood and another leads the framer to introduce a free-standing issue on whether there is a single source of all blood or more than one. That is the problem addressed at No. 2. The reason the composition is inserted here appears at 2.E. In a contemporary book, No. 2 would be preserved as a very long footnote or as an appendix, but it would not be set into the same framework of discourse as No. 1. No. 3 is a complement to No. 2.

4:4-5

4:4

- A. **[36B] A woman in labor is deemed to be a menstruant.**
- B. **[If] a woman was in hard travail for three days during the eleven days,**
- C. **and [if] she enjoyed a respite for twenty-four hours and [then] gave birth**
- D. **"lo, this one is one who has given birth as a Zabah [while in the status of one who has a flux] ," the words of R. Eliezer.**
- E. **R. Joshua says, "A night and a day, like the eve of the Sabbath and its day."**
- F. **For she has had relief from the pain and not from the blood.**

4:5

- A. **And how long is her protracted labor?**
- B. **R. Meir says, "Even forty or fifty days."**
- C. **R. Judah says, "Sufficient for her is her [ninth] month."**
- D. **R. Yosé and R. Simeon say, "Hard labor continues no longer than for two weeks."**

- I.1** A. **[A woman in labor is deemed to be a menstruant:]** *Is it the fact that every woman in labor is deemed to be a menstruant?* [That cannot be the fact, since during the eleven zibah-days between one menstrual period and the next, blood that is discharged marks her as not a menstruant but unclean by reason of flux!]

- B. *Said Rab, "She is held to be a menstruant for one day [even if this was during her eleven zibah-days]." [When she is immersed in the evening, she is clean. If a women were not in labor had such a discharge, she would have to wait for another day to pass free of discharge before she is immersed (Slotki).]*
- C. *And Samuel said, "We take account of the possibility that she will have a remission of pain prior to childbirth" [Slotki: as a result it would be evident that the discharge was zibah-blood, and the woman who produces uncleanness during the zibah-days has to wait for another day to pass free of further discharge].*
- D. *And R. Isaac said, "As to a woman in labor — a discharge is null [it is labor-blood, and the woman is clean on the selfsame day]."*
- E. *But has it not been taught as a Tannaite version: **A woman in labor is deemed to be a menstruant?***
- F. *Said Raba, "If this is during the days of her menstrual period, then **A woman in labor is deemed to be a menstruant**, but if it is during her zibah-days, then she is deemed clean."*
- G. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. ***She who is in protracted labor — if this is during the days of her menstrual period, then she is deemed to be a menstruant, but if it is during her zibah-days, then she is deemed clean. How so? If she was in hard labor for one day and had remission for two, or was in hard labor for two days and had remission for one, or had remission and then was in hard labor and then had remission, lo, this one gives birth as unclean by reason of flux-uncleanness. But if she had remission for one day and had hard labor for two, or had remission for two days but had hard labor for one, or had hard labor and then had remission and then had hard labor, this is not one who gave birth while unclean by reason of flux uncleanness. The upshot of the matter is that if there is hard labor immediately prior to her actually giving birth, this is not a case of one who gives birth while afflicted with flux uncleanness. But if there was remission from labor immediately prior to giving birth, lo, this is one who has given birth while unclean with flux-uncleanness [T. Nid. 5:8A-D].***
- I. *Hananiah, the son of R. Joshua's brother, says, "In the case of any women who had hard labor [even if briefly] on her third day [Slotki: ordinarily it is the discharge on the third day that causes a woman to be confirmed as one who is completely unclean by reason of flux; a discharge on one or two days does not confirm that status definitively], even though she had remission from pain the rest of the day, is not regarded as having given birth when subject to flux."*
- J. *What is the sense of the statement, **The upshot of the matter is that if there is hard labor immediately prior to her actually giving birth, this is not a case of one who gives birth while afflicted with flux uncleanness. But if there was remission from labor immediately prior to giving birth, lo, this is one who has given birth while unclean with flux-uncleanness?***
- K. *It serves to encompass the clarification of Hananiah.*
- I.2.** A. *What is the scriptural basis for the rule just now set forth?*
- B. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- C. “Her blood” (Lev. 15:25: “If a woman has a discharge of her blood for many days, not at the time of her impurity, or if she has a discharge beyond the time of her impurity, all the days of the discharge she shall continue in uncleanness; as in the days of her impurity she shall be unclean”) — it must be blood produced on her own account, and not on account of child birth.
- D. You say, on account of the childbirth. But perhaps the reference is to blood that is produced willy-nilly?
- E. When Scripture says, “If a woman has a discharge of ...blood,” lo, I find a reference to blood that is produced willy-nilly [which is clean]. So how shall I interpret the reference to “her blood”? It must be blood produced on her own account, and not on account of child birth.
- F. But how come you declare clean the blood that derives from the process of child birth and declare unclean that which comes willy-nilly? I shall, rather, declare clean the blood that derives from childbirth, which is followed by clean blood, and I shall declare unclean blood that comes willy-nilly, which is not followed by clean blood!
- G. To the contrary, I shall declare clean blood that is willy-nilly, for flux that comes willy-nilly in the case of the male afflicted with flux is clean.
- H. *But still, we are dealing with a woman, and a blood that derives from a woman willy-nilly is something that we do not ever find [to be clean].*
- I. *If you prefer, I shall say: what choice do you have? To you propose to declare clean blood that flows willy-nilly and to declare unclean blood that flows with childbirth? But you have no more compelling case of blood that flows willy-nilly than the blood of childbirth!*
- J. *Then why not invoke the same reasoning in connection with a menstruating woman: say, “her issue” (Lev. 15:19) refers to a flux that comes on her own account, and not on account of the process of parturition!*
- K. You say that it is not blood that derives from the process of parturition, but perhaps the blood that is excluded is blood that flows willy-nilly?
- L. When Scripture says, “And if a woman has an issue” (Lev. 15:19), lo, there is an explicit reference to blood that flows willy-nilly. Then how am I to interpret the reference to “her issue” (Lev. 15:19)? It surely refers to a flux that comes on her own account, and not on account of the process of parturition.
- M. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Scripture has said, ‘She shall continue for thirty three days in the blood of her purifying’ (Lev. 12: 4) — you have another continuation which is classified like this one [that is, in which the discharge is clean]. And what might it be? It is the continuation of blood during the protracted labor that takes place in the zibah-days.”
- N. And might I say that this refers to protracted labor that occurs during the days on which the flow of blood is deemed menstrual?
- O. Rather, said the father of Samuel, “Scripture has said, ‘And she shall be unclean for two weeks, as in her menstruation’ (Lev. 12: 5) — but not ‘as in her zibah-days,’ from which it follows that blood that flows in the zibah-days is clean. And what blood would that be? It is the blood that flows on account of protracted labor during the zibah-days.”

P. And since it is written, “And she shall be unclean for two weeks, as in her menstruation” (Lev. 12: 5), what need do I have for the references to “Her blood” (Lev. 15:25: “If a woman has a discharge of her blood for many days, not at the time of her impurity, or if she has a discharge beyond the time of her impurity, all the days of the discharge she shall continue in uncleanness; as in the days of her impurity she shall be unclean”)?

Q. *If it were not for the reference to “her blood,” I would have thought that the deduction, “as in her menstruation” and not “as in her zibah-days” bears the implication that the discharge is clean even where the woman has had remission from pain. So we are informed that the discharge is clean only where it is on account of having given birth.*

I.3. A. *Shila bar Abina made a practical decision in accord with the position of Rab [a woman in labor during the relevant zibah-days who discharged blood is unclean on that day]. When Rab was dying, he said to R. Issi, “Go and stop him [from following that opinion of mine, for I have changed my mind,] and if he does not obey, then try to persuade him.”*

B. *He thought he said not “persuade” but “excommunicate him” [since the difference between the one word and the other is in a single letter, from R to D].*

C. *After Rab had died, he said to him, “Reverse yourself, for Rab has reversed himself.”*

D. *He said to him, “If he had reversed himself, he would have informed me.”*

E. *Since he did not obey, the other excommunicated him.*

F. *He said to him, “Are you not afraid of the fire [for such a high-handed action]?”*

G. *He said to him, “I am Issi b. Judah, who is Issi the son of the Crouching Lion, who is Issi b. Gamaliel, who is Issi b. Mahallel, the brazen mortar, over which even rust has no power.”*

H. *He said to him, “And I am Shila bar Abina, the iron pestle that breaks the brazen mortar.”*

I. *R. Issi got sick, and they put him into hot blankets to relieve the chills, and in cold compresses to relieve the fever. But he went to his rest.*

J. **[37A]** *Shila went and said to his wife, “Make up my shroud, so that he will not be able to go to Rab and say bad things about him.”*

K. *She made up his shroud, and when the soul of Shila had come to its rest, people saw a myrtle flying from one bier to the other. They said, “It follows that rabbis have made peace among themselves.”*

I.4. A. *Raba raised this question: “What is the law as to hard labor’s blood causing the loss of prior zibah-days [being counted for the seven clean days] that had passed in cleanness [without a blood flow]? It is something that is unclean that causes the loss of prior clean days, and this too imparts uncleanness as in her menstrual period, or perhaps something that causes the uncleanness of flux is what renders the previous counting null, and this blood does not cause flux-uncleanness and so would not cause the loss of the prior clean days?”*

B. *Said Abbaye to him, “The matter of a blood flow willy-nilly in the case of flux will settle the question, for it is not a cause of flux-uncleanness, but it nonetheless causes the loss of prior clean days.”*

- C. *He said to him, “In point of fact, zibah-flux that is caused willy-nilly also forms a cause of flux-uncleanness, for we have learned in the Mishnah: [If] he saw the first [flow of flux], they do examine him. [In the case of] the second, they do examine him. In [the case of the] third, they do not examine him. R. Eliezer says, ‘Even in [the case of the] third they do examine him, on account of the [question of whether or not he has to bring] the sacrifice’ [M. Zab. 2:2L-N].”*
- D. *And from the perspective of R. Eliezer, who has said, “Even in [the case of the] third they do examine him, on account of the [question of whether or not he has to bring] the sacrifice,” here too, since the flow is not a cause of flux-uncleanness, will it also not have caused the loss of the clean days already observed?*
- E. *He said to him, “In the view of R. Eliezer, that is in fact the law.”*
- F. *Come and take note: R. Eliezer says, “Even on the occasion of the third appearance of flux, they examine him, but on the occasion of the fourth, they do not.” Is this not with reference to rendering void the previously counted clean days? [This would be an objection to Raba, who held that that which does not cause the flux-uncleanness does not render void the clean days that have already been counted.]*
- G. *No, it is to consider declaring the drop unclean so that it conveys uncleanness to someone who carries it [even without touching it].*
- H. *Come and take note: As to the third day, R. Eliezer says, “They examine him. As to the fourth day, they do not examine him — and it is in respect to whether or not he has to bring a sacrifice that I made that statement [that it is necessary to examine him], but it is not in respect to whether or not the previously counted clean days are rendered void [Slotki: the counting is always void, and is in no way dependent on an examination. Does this not prove that even that which causes no uncleanness by reason of flux renders counting void?]*
- I. *Now — it follows from the foregoing — according to R. Eliezer’s position, you may work out the problem, that even that which does not cause flux-uncleanness renders the previously counted clean days null. But how can we solve the problem from the viewpoint of rabbis who differ from here?*
- J. *Come and take note, for the father of R. Abin repeated as a Tannaite tradition: What had his flux caused him? Seven days. Therefore he loses the seven previously counted clean days. What had his emission of seven caused him? It was a day of uncleanness. Therefore he loses one previously counted clean day. Now what is the meaning of “seven”? If we say that he is deemed unclean for seven days, then what the passage should have stated is, “What uncleanness had his flux caused him? Seven days....” So it follows that only what causes the uncleanness of flux causes the loss of seven clean days that have already been counted, while that which does not cause flux-uncleanness does not cause the loss of seven clean days that have already been counted.*
- K. *That proves the point.*
- L. *Said Abbaye, “We hold as a tradition that hard labor does not cause the loss of previously counted clean days in connection with flux, and if you find a Tannaite version who maintains that it does render the prior clean days null, then it must*

be R. Eliezer [Slotki: who holds that the flux due to an accident, though it causes no zibah-uncleanness, does render void all previously-counted clean days].

I.5. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Merinos says, “The advent of a birth does not render void the previously counted clean days after a flux-uncleanness [so if the counting was interrupted by a birth, it may be continued afterward (Slotki)].”
- C. *The question was raised: what about counting the birth-date in the counting of the clean days?* [Slotki: if the birth took place during the seven days following flux, and the days following it were free from all discharge, are these days counted as clean ones to make up the required number of seven clean days?]
- D. Abbayye said, “The bleeding on the day of birth neither causes the loss of the previously counted clean days, nor does it count among the prescribed days.”
- E. Raba said, “It does not cause the loss of the previously counted clean days, and it does count among the prescribed days.”
- F. *Said Raba, “On what basis do I make that statement? Because it has been taught on Tannaite authority: “and after that she shall be clean” (Lev. 15:28) — “after” means after all of them, that no uncleanness may intervene among them.’ Now, if you take the position that the birth-day counts, that explains why no uncleanness has intervened among the clean days, but if you hold the view that it does not count, then the birth has indeed intervened!”*
- G. And Abbayye?
- H. He will say to you, “The meaning is that the uncleanness deriving in particular from flux may not intervene among the clean days.”
- I. *Said Raba, “On what basis do I make that statement? Because it has been taught on Tannaite authority: “And when she who has a discharge is cleansed of her discharge, then she shall count for herself seven days for her cleaning” (Lev. 15:13) — “of her issue” but not of her sara’at [the skin disease of Lev. 13], “of her issue,” but not of the blood that has accrued in childbirth’ [so as soon as she is free from her flux, she begins to count the seven days and need not wait until the unclean days of childbirth had passed. [It is thus obvious that a birth during the days of flux does not render void the previously counted clean days, and that the days following birth are included in the counting (Slotki)].”*
- J. And Abbayye?
- K. *He will say to you, “Repeat as the Tannaite version, ““of her issue” but not of her sara’at [the skin disease of Lev. 13].’ But do not repeat as a Tannaite version, ““of her issue,” but not of the blood that has accrued in childbirth.”*
- L. *And Raba?*
- M. *“What’s going on here? If you invoke the reading, ‘of her issue’ but not of her childbirth, then since it was necessary to make the point about childbirth, the sara’at-disease was also mentioned in that same context. But if you hold that ‘of her issue’ means only, ‘but not of her sara’at,’ one may ask: but this can be deduced from ‘when who has an issue is clean of his issue’ (Lev. 15:13) — and not of leprosy!”*
- N. And Abbayye?

- O. *“One of the two cited texts refers to the male afflicted with flux, and the other refers to the female. And both were required, for if the All-Merciful had made reference only [37B] to the male afflicted by flux, that would be because he does not contract uncleanness by a flux that appears willy-nilly, but a female afflicted by flux, who does contract uncleanness willy-nilly, I might say is not within the law. So it was necessary to make an explicit reference to her. And if the All-Merciful had made reference only to the female afflicted with flux, that is because she does not become unclean through the appearance of flux on less than three days as she does on three days’ occasions, while it would not refer to a male afflicted by flux, who does become unclean through three appearances of flux, all on a single day, as much as he does through the appearances of flux on three distinct days. So it was necessary for Scripture to make reference explicitly to both categories, male and female flux uncleanness.*
- P. *Said Abbaye, “On what basis do I derive the rule [that the bleeding on the day of birth neither causes the loss of the previously counted clean days, not does it count among the prescribed days]? As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- Q. *“‘Her sickness shall be unclean’ (Lev. 12: 2) — the extend the law to cover him who has sexual relations with her [while she is menstruating].*
- R. *“‘Her sickness shall be unclean’ (Lev. 12: 2) — to extend the law of uncleanness to cover the nights [so she is unclean by night as well as by day, even though Scripture has spoken of ‘days’].*
- S. *“‘Her sickness shall be unclean’ (Lev. 12: 2) — to extend the law to cover a woman who gives birth while afflicted with flux uncleanness, indicating that she has to wait out seven clean days.’*
- T. *“Now does this not mean, seven clean days by reason of having given birth? [Slotki: so no birth must intervene; from which it follows that if it did intervene, the days following it may not be included in the prescribed seven days]?”*
- U. *No, it means, clear of that blood [Slotki: only those days on which a discharge occurred may not be included in the counting, but where the birth was free from bleeding, the days following it may well be included.]*
- V. *And said Abbaye, “On what basis do I derive the rule [that the bleeding on the day of birth neither causes the loss of the previously counted clean days, not does it count among the prescribed days]? As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- W. *“‘As are the days of her menstrual period, so are the days of her parturition: just as the days of her menstrual period are not appropriate for the appearance of flux, and, consequently, the counting of seven clean days does not count on them, so in the days of her parturition, these days are likewise inappropriate for the appearance of flux, but the counting of the seven clean days does not encompass them either.’”*
- X. *And Raba?*
- Y. *Who is the Tannaite authority behind that formulation? It is R. Eliezer, who has said, “Childbirth does indeed render void all the previously counted clean days.” [Slotki: From this it is self-evident that the days following cannot be included in the counting of the seven days. According to the rabbis, however, whose view*

Raba follows, birth does not render void the previously counted clean days, and the days following it may well be included in the prescribed seven days.]

- Z. And do we draw an analogy for what is possible from what is not possible [Slotki: menstruation during the zibah-days]?
- AA. Said R. Ahadboy bar Ammi, “It is the position of R. Eliezer, who has said, ‘We do draw an analogy for what is possible from what is not possible.’”
- BB. Said R. Sheshet, “Like it or not, it is Scripture that has drawn the analogy between them.”
- CC. Some say, “Said R. Ahadboy bar Ammi said R. Sheshet, “It is the position of R. Eliezer, who has said, ‘We do draw an analogy for what is possible from what is not possible.’”
- DD. R. Pappa said, ““Like it or not, it is Scripture that has drawn the analogy between them.”

II.1 A. “If a woman was in hard travail for three days during the eleven days, and if she enjoyed a respite for twenty-four hours and [then] gave birth — lo, this one is one who has given birth as a Zabah [while in the status of one who has a flux],” the words of R. Eliezer. R. Joshua says, “A night and a day, like the eve of the Sabbath and its day. For she has had relief from the pain and not from the blood [of childbirth].”

- B. *The question was raised:* “If she had relief from both this and that [pain and blood], what is the law?”
- C. R. Hisda said, “She is unclean” [Slotki: since at any rate she had relief from pain, the previous bleeding was not due to childbirth].
- D. R. Hanina said, “She is clean” [Slotki: the relief from both is an indication that the bleeding also was due to childbirth; only where the bleeding continued and the pain ceased is it manifest that the bleeding was not due to labor].
- E. Said R. Hisda, “The matter may be compared to a king who went forth with his troops in the lead. It is known that the troops are those of the king” [Slotki: similarly, the pains and bleeding that precede childbirth must be ascribed to it despite the interval of time between them].
- F. *And R. Hisda said, “All the more so he would require more troops”* [Slotki: as the bleeding ceased, it must be obvious that the childbirth had no connection with it].
- G. *We have learned in the Mishnah: R. Joshua says, “A night and a day, like the eve of the Sabbath and its day. For she has had relief from the pain and not from the blood [of childbirth].” The operative consideration, then, is that she has had relief from the pain and not from the bleeding. It follows that if she has had relief from this and that, she will be clean. And that refutes the position of R. Hisda.*
- H. *R. Hisda will say to you, “It was not necessary to make it explicit that if the woman had relief from both pain and bleeding, she is unclean, since ‘the troops had completely gone their way.’ But even if she had relief from pain but not from bleeding, where one might have supposed that since she had not ceased to bleed, she also has not ended her labor, so it is merely stupor that has seized her, — we are unformed — she is unclean.”*

- I. *We have learned in the Mishnah: If a woman was in hard travail for three days during the eleven days, and if she enjoyed a respite for twenty-four hours and [then] gave birth — lo, this one is one who has given birth as a Zabah [while in the status of one who has a flux]. Now under what conditions does this rule apply? If I say, it is as spelled out [in hard travail for three days, then a respite for twenty-four hours, with bleeding throughout], why specify three days? It would suffice if there were two days of labor and a day of relief. [Slotki: since at any rate she had relief from pain, it is obvious that the previous bleeding was not due to childbirth. The relief from both pain and bleeding indicates that the bleeding also was due to childbirth. Only where the bleeding continued and the pain ceased is it manifest that the bleeding was not due to labor.] But is this not the sense of the passage: if she had hard labor for three days and relief from both pain and bleeding, or if she had hard labor for two days and had relief for twenty-four hours, lo, this one gives birth while in a condition of flux-uncleanness, and that represents a refutation of the position of R. Hanina [who holds that the relief from both is an indication that the bleeding also was due to childbirth; only where the bleeding continued and the pain ceased is it manifest that the bleeding was not due to labor].*
- K. *R. Hanina can say to you, “No, in point of fact matters are precisely as spelled out. And thus we are informed that even though labor continued for only part of the third day, and she was relieved from her pain for twenty-four hours [and not for a full night and a full day], she is unclean, contrary to the position of R. Hananiah, [the son of R. Joshua’s brother, who says, “In the case of any women who had hard labor [even if briefly] on her third day, even though she had remission from pain the rest of the day, is not regarded as having given birth when subject to flux.”]*

III.1 A. And how long is her protracted labor? R. Meir says, “Even forty or fifty days:”

- B. *Now that there is an explicit reference to **fifty days**’ hard labor, why do we need to mention **forty days**?*
- C. *Said R. Hisda “That is no problem. The one refers to a sickly woman [who can labor for fifty days], the other to a healthy one.”*

III.2. A. Said R. Levi, “The birth of a child marks the advent of a period in which the blood is deemed clean only of those days on which a woman may otherwise become unclean by flux if she should produce blood [but if the birth of a child takes place on the days that ordinarily would be the menstrual period, that is not the case].”

- B. *And Rab said, “Even on the days that are appropriate for counting the clean days prescribed for a woman affected by flux [if labor began during the clean days of zibah, not only are those days clean, but also the seven days that follow them; only when the bleeding continued beyond these seven days does the woman become unclean as a menstruant (Slotki).”*
- C. *Said R. Ada bar Ahbah, “According to the reasoning of Rab, **[38A]** even days that serve for counting clean days after days previously counted clean had been rendered voice also are clean.” [Slotki: Even days following the zibah-period are*

clean, if the labor began during the zibah-days. Once labor began within the eleven days of zibah, all subsequent days are clean unless the woman was relieved from her pain for the prescribed period, prior to the birth of the child.]

- D. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **And how long is her protracted labor? R. Meir says, “Even forty or fifty days.”***
- E. *Now from the viewpoint of Rab as interpreted by R. Ada bar Ahbah, we can find such a case [Slotki: since the counting of the days may sometimes continue for a very long time], but from the viewpoint of Levi [Slotki: who restricts the labor and birth to the eleven days of zibah] this represents a problem [Slotki: namely, how is it possible for a woman to be clean when labor is protracted for forty or fifty days]!*
- F. Levi can say to you, “*Does the passage state* that she is clean throughout the entire sequence of days? During the days when she would be unclean as a menstruant, she is unclean as a menstruant [by reason of the blood that flows during the childbirth], and during the days when the flow of blood would mark her as unclean by reason of flux, during childbirth she is clean.” [Slotki: the purpose of Meir’s ruling is that there is no obligation to bring a sacrifice or to count the prescribed number of clean days even though labor continued for forty or fifty days; but the woman remains clean only where the birth occurred in the days of zibah. If it occurs, however, in the days of menstruation, she becomes unclean.]
- G. *Another version of the same matter:*
- H. Said R. Levi, “Said R. Levi, “The birth of a child marks the advent of a period in which the blood is deemed clean [so the woman does not have to bring a sacrifice and does not have to count seven clean days] only of those days on which a woman may otherwise become unclean by a major flux [Slotki: where she experienced a discharge on three consecutive days in the course of the eleven days’ period] if she should produce blood [but if the birth of a child takes place on the days that ordinarily would be the menstrual period, that is not the case].” [Slotki: If the discharge appeared only on one day, she need not wait more than one clean day corresponding to the one unclean day.]
- I. *What is the scriptural basis for this position?* “Her blood many days” (Lev. 15:25) [“many days” meaning flux on three days, yielding a major flux].
- J. Abba Saul in the name of Rab[bi] said, “Even on the days on which she may ordinarily enter into uncleanness by reason of a minor flux.”
- K. *What is the scriptural basis for this position?* “Days” Lev. 15:25 [“all the days” yields the law covering uncleanness by reason of a minor flux], and “all the days” (Lev. 15:25) are written in context.
- L. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **And how long is her protracted labor? R. Meir says, “Even forty or fifty days.”** This passage presents a problem to both parties.*
- M. *Does the passage state* that she is clean throughout the entire sequence of days? During the days when she would be unclean as a menstruant, she is unclean as a menstruant [by reason of the blood that flows during the childbirth], and during the days when the flow of blood would mark her as unclean by reason of flux, during childbirth she is clean.” [Slotki: the purpose of Meir’s ruling is that there is no

obligation to bring a sacrifice or to count the prescribed number of clean days even though labor continued for forty or fifty days; but the woman remains clean only where the birth occurred in the days of zibah. If it occurs, however, in the days of menstruation, she becomes unclean.]

III.3. A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **R. Meir says, “There can be a case of a woman who produces blood on a hundred and fifty days, and she will not be deemed unclean by reason of flux [a Zabah] on that account: two not at her time, seven during her menstrual cycle, two after her menstrual cycle, eighty days of purifying of a female and seven of her menstrual cycle and two after her menstrual cycle and fifty that are attributed to the child.”**
- C. **They said to him, “In accord with your view, she can be in labor her entire life and never be a Zabah on those days” [T. Nid. 5:11A, C-E].**
- D. He said to them, *“What are you thinking? Is it because of frequent abortions? The law covering protracted labor [when childbirth renders all blood clean] does not apply when what emerges is only an abortion.”*
- E. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. **There can be a case of a woman who sees blood on a hundred days and is not deemed unclean by reason of flux on that account: two not at her time, seven during her menstrual period, two after her menstrual period, eighty after having given birth to a female, seven during her menstrual cycle, and two after her menstrual cycle [T. Nid. 5:11A-B].**
- G. *What does this statement teach us?*
- H. *It serves to dismiss the view of him who has said that it is not possible for the ‘grave’ [the uterus] to open without bleeding. So we are informed that it is possible for the ‘grave’ to open without bleeding.*

IV.1 A. **R. Yosé and R. Simeon say, “Hard labor continues no longer than for two weeks:”**

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **R. Judah says in the name of R. Tarfon, “Sufficient for her is her month. And there is the possibility of giving a lenient or a strict ruling. How so? [Tosefta’s version: If she had had labor two days of the eighth month and one day of the ninth, she has not given birth while subject to flux-uncleanness. If it was three of the eighth month and one of the ninth, she has given birth while unclean with flux-uncleanness” (T. Nid. 5:9C-F)]. [Bavli’s version:] if she had hard labor for two days at the end of the eighth month and one at the beginning of the ninth month, even though she gave birth at the beginning of the ninth month, she is regarded as having given birth while subject to flux-uncleanness [Slotki: since the greater part of the duration of the labor, two days out of three, was in the eighth month, when labor is no cause of cleanness]. But if she was in labor for one day at the end of the eighth month and two at the beginning of the ninth month, even though she bore the child at the end of the ninth month, she is not regarded as having given birth while afflicted with flux-uncleanness.”**

- D. *Said R. Ada bar Ahbah, "This implies that R. Judah takes the view that it is the shofar that announces the advent of the new month that is the cause [of the birth of the child]. [Slotki: as soon as the ninth month begins, the process of bearing begins, without regard to when the birth actually took place; hence all the blood of labor in that month must be attributed to the process of childbirth, however long the interval of relief may have lasted]."*
- E. *Is that true? And lo, said Samuel, "A woman can conceive and bear only on the two hundred and seventh-first day [a full nine months of thirty days each plus one day after intercourse], or the two hundred and seventy-second, or on the two hundred and seventy-third day."*
- F. *[Samuel, who differs from Judah's reckoning,] rules in accord with the pious men of old. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: the pious men of old had sexual relations only on Wednesday, so that their wives would not [38B] turn out to violate the sanctity of the Sabbath [e.g., require work that would otherwise be forbidden on the Sabbath]."*
- G. *On Wednesday but no later? [Why not, if conception on a Thursday, Friday, or Saturday would produce a birth on a weekday? (Slotki)]*
- H. *Read: from Wednesday onwards.*
 - I. *Said Mar Zutra, "What is the scriptural evidence for the position of the pious men of old? It is as has been written, 'And the Lord gave her conception' (Rut. 4:13), and the numerical value of the letters of the word conception is two hundred seventy-one."*
- J. *Said Mar Zutra, "Even in accord with the opinion of the one who has said that a woman who gives birth in nine months does not give birth before the full number of months has been completed, one who gives birth seven months after conception does give birth before the full number of months has been completed: 'And it came to pass after the cycles of days that Hannah conceived and bore a son' (1Sa. 1:20), and the minimum of 'cycles' is two, and the minimum of days is two [so the viable child may be born in the seventh month after a short pregnancy of six months and two days (Slotki)]."*

V.1 A. R. Yosé and R. Simeon say, "Hard labor continues no longer than for two weeks:"

- B. *Said Samuel, "What is the scriptural basis for the ruling of rabbis? 'Then she shall be unclean for two weeks, as in her menstruation' (Lev. 12: 5), which implies, 'only as in her menstruation,' but not as in her zibah-period, so it follows that her flux will be classified as clean for two weeks."*

V.2. A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. **There can be a case in which a woman is in hard labor for twenty-five days and yet not be unclean with flux-uncleanness [as a Zabah]:**
- C. **How so? Two not at her time, seven of menstruation, two after her menstrual period, fourteen days which giving birth to a female child causes to be clean. But it is not possible for her to be in labor for twenty-six days where there is no child at the end, for then she gives birth [to an abortion] as a Zabah [T. [Nid. 5:10A-F](#)].**

- D. *But if there was no birth of a child, would not three days suffice [to make her unclean with a major flux]?*
- E. *Said R. Sheshet, "Read: where there is a child."*
- F. *Said to him Raba, "Lo, the passage is explicit: where there is no child at the end!"*
- G. Rather, said Raba, "This is the sense of the passage: **But it is not possible for her to be in labor for twenty-six days where there is no child at the end, for then she gives birth [to an abortion] as a Zabah.** But in a case in which there is no viable birth at the end but rather an abortion, there three days suffice to mark her as unclean with a major flux. *Why is that the case? Because the law of protracted labor does not apply to abortions.*"

I.1 immediately clarifies the language and rule of the Mishnah, leading us to Tosefta's clarification of the sense of the Mishnah's passage, which, as a matter of fact, completely revises matters. No. 2 presents the scriptural basis for the rule of the Mishnah, a natural next step, and No. 3 complements No. 2. The theoretical problems begin with No. 4, Rab's question about the impact of hard labor's blood on previous counting of the prescribed clean days. This is not demanded for the interpretation of the Mishnah's rules, but it is certainly a pertinent question, invited by them. II.1 moves us forward by asking yet another question not required by the Mishnah's ruling but precipitated by it. In finding out the relationship between bleeding and pain in childbirth, we of course clarify precisely what is at issue in the Mishnah's rule itself. III.1 provides a minor gloss. The question raised at No. 2 is of fundamental interest to this entire topic. The composition certainly was not framed to serve as a comment on our passage. The reason it is inserted here is only because at D this passage is cited. This is not an uncommon principle of ordering completed compositions within a larger framework. No. 3 introduces two amplifications from Tosefta. IV.1 provides Tosefta's ample clarification of what is at issue in the Mishnah's abbreviated statement. V.1 provides a scriptural basis for the rule of the Mishnah, and No. 2 reverts to Tosefta's complement. So the basic pattern throughout is uniform.

4:6

- A. **She who is in protracted labor during the eighty days [of cleanness] after the birth of a female —**
- B. **any blood which she sees is clean,**
- C. **until the child emerges.**
- D. **And R. Eliezer declares [it] unclean.**
- E. **They said to R. Eliezer, "Now in a situation in which the law is stringent, in the case of blood which appears during a period of respite, the law rules leniently in the matter of blood produced by hard labor,**
- F. **"in a situation in which the law ruled leniently [to begin with], concerning blood which is produced during a period of respite, is it not logical that we should rule leniently in connection with blood produced through hard labor?"**
- G. **He said to them, "It is sufficient if the inferred law is as strict as that from which it is inferred.**

H. **“In what respect has the law ruled leniently for her? In respect to the uncleanness of her flux. But she is unclean in respect to the uncleanness of a menstruant.”**

I.1 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “She shall continue in the blood of her purification” (Lev. 12: 4) encompasses a woman who has hard labor during the eighty days following the birth of a female, indicating that any sort of blood that she produces is clean until the baby is born.”
- C. And R. Eliezer declares it unclean.
- D. They said to R. Eliezer, “Now in a case in which the law has imposed a strict ruling [declaring blood to be unclean], namely, during a respite from pain prior to the birth of the child, the law has imposed a lenient ruling, namely, during a respite from pain after the birth of the child [during the sixty-six days after the birth of a female], in a case in which the law has imposed a lenient ruling to begin with, namely, upon blood that comes during hard labor that is prior to the birth of the child, is it not logical that we should impose a lenient ruling upon the blood that emerges during hard labor after the birth of the child [that is, during those sixty-six days]?”
- E. He said to them, **“It is sufficient if the inferred law is as strict as that from which it is inferred.** In what aspect has the law imposed a lenient ruling on her? It is in the aspect of the uncleanness by reason of flux. But she is still subject to uncleanness by reason of menstruation.”
- F. They said to him, “Lo, we shall reply to you with another statement. If in a case in which the law has imposed a strict ruling, in regard to the blood that flows during a respect that is prior to the birth of the child, the law has imposed a lenient ruling, namely, on the blood that flows during hard labor of that same period, in a case in which to begin with the law has imposed a lenient ruling, namely, during a period of respite after the birth of the child, is it not logical that we should impose a lenient ruling on the hard labor that may accompany that period?”
- G. He said to them, “Even if you were to compose replies to me the entire day, **it still is sufficient if the inferred law is as strict as that from which it is inferred.** In what aspect has the law imposed a lenient ruling on her? It is in the aspect of the uncleanness by reason of flux. But she is still subject to uncleanness by reason of menstruation.”
- H. *Said Raba, “In this argument, R. Eliezer could still have won over rabbis: ‘have you not said the following: “‘Her blood” (Lev. 15:25) — her blood that is normally discharged, but not blood that is due to childbirth’? Here too, ‘And she shall be cleaned from the fountain of her blood’ (Lev. 12: 7) — ‘her blood’ that is normally discharged, but not blood that is due to childbirth.”*
- I. Might one say [as before], “Blood that flows during the menstrual period marks her as unclean by reason of menstruation, and that she flows during the zibah-days is clean?”
- J. Scripture states, “...she will sit...,” meaning, continuously throughout all of these days.

The amplification of the Mishnah’s rule through the restatement occupies I.1. The issues are clarified.

- A. All the eleven days that follow the seven days of menstruation] a woman is in the assumption of being clean.
- B. [39A] [If] she sat down and did not examine herself
- C. accidentally,
- D. under constraint,
- E. [or if] willfully she did not examine herself,
- F. she is clean.
- G. [Once] the time of her period has come and she has not examined herself, lo, this one is deemed unclean.
- H. R. Meir says, “If she was in hiding and the time of her period came and she did not examine herself, lo, this one is deemed clean,
- I. “because fright suspends the blood.”
- J. But during the [seven clean] days [that must be counted by the] man or woman that has a flux,
- K. or [the one day of cleanness to be counted] by her that awaits day against day —
- L. [during that time,] lo, these are in the assumption of being unclean.

- I.1 A. *For what purpose was this law set forth [All the eleven days that follow the seven days of menstruation] a woman is in the assumption of being clean]?*
- B. Said R. Judah, “It is to indicate that she does not have to have an examination.”
- C. *And lo, since in the concluding clause it is stated, [If after the fact] she sat down and did not examine herself, it follows that to begin with she does have to have an examination!*
- D. *The concluding clause refers to the menstrual cycle, and this is the sense of the passage: during the eleven [zibah days, intervening between menstrual periods], she is assumed to be clean and does not have to examine herself, but during the menstrual days, she does require an examination. [If] she sat down and did not examine herself, accidentally, under constraint, [or if] willfully she did not examine herself, she is clean.*
- I.2. A. *R. Hisda said, “This rule [All the eleven days that follow the seven days of menstruation] a woman is in the assumption of being clean] was required only from the viewpoint of R. Meir, who has said, “‘A woman who does not have a fixed time for her period is forbidden to have sexual relations.’ That applies to the days of her menstrual cycle, but as to the zibah-days, she is assumed to be clean.”*
- B. *If that were the case, then why is it that R. Meir proceeds to rule, “...and has no claim on a marriage-settlement nor on the usufruct of property administered by her husband nor to support nor to compensation for worn-out clothes, and the husband must divorce her and may not remarry her forever”?*
- C. *Because she might come to disarray during the menstrual days.*
- D. *But since the concluding clause of our Mishnah states, [Once] the time of her period has come and she has not examined herself, lo, this one is deemed*

unclean, may we not assume that here we deal with a woman who really does have a fixed menstrual period?

- E. *The passage contains a lacuna, and this is how it should be repeated: **All the eleven days that follow the seven days of menstruation] a woman is in the assumption of being clean, and she is permitted to have sexual relations with her husband.** During the days of her menstrual period, she is forbidden to have sexual relations with him. Under what circumstances? This refers to a woman who does not have a fixed period. But if she does have a fixed period, she is permitted to do so. And she has to have an examination. **[If] she sat down and did not examine herself accidentally, under constraint, [or if] willfully she did not examine herself, she is clean. [Once] the time of her period has come and she has not examined herself, lo, this one is deemed unclean.***
- F. *But since the concluding clause represents the view of R. Meir, how can the opening clause also represent the views of R. Meir?*
- G. *The whole of the passage presents the view of R. Meir, and this is the sense of the passage: If she was not in hiding and the time of her period came and she did not examine herself, lo, this one is deemed unclean, for R. Meir says, “**If she was in hiding and the time of her period came and she did not examine herself, lo, this one is deemed clean, because fright suspends the blood.**”*

- I.3.** A. Raba said, “This rule **[All the eleven days that follow the seven days of menstruation] a woman is in the assumption of being clean]** was meant to tell you that she does not impart uncleanness to objects that she has touched during the twenty-four hours prior to her discovery of the blood.”
- B. *An objection was raised: a menstruating woman, a woman unclean with flux, and a woman who awaits day against day or who is in child birth impart uncleanness retroactively for twenty-four hours to objects they have touched.*
- C. *That refutes Raba’s view.*

- I.4.** A. R. Huna b. Hiyya said Samuel said, “This rule **[All the eleven days that follow the seven days of menstruation] a woman is in the assumption of being clean]** is meant to tell you that a woman cannot establish for herself a regular period during the zibah-days [even though menstruation should begin on the same day for three successive months (Slotki)].”
- B. *Said R. Joseph, “I did not hear this tradition.”*
- C. *Said Abbaye to him, “You are the one who told it to us! And in what connection did you tell it to us? It is in the following context: **If she habitually saw blood on the fifteenth day of the month and changed her pattern and saw blood on the twentieth day, [sexual relations on] this day and that day are prohibited. If she twice changed to the twentieth day, this day and that day are prohibited. If she three times changed to the twentieth day, the fifteenth day is now permitted, and she has established for herself a fixed period on the twentieth day. For a woman does not establish for herself a fixed period until she has established it three times. And she is not cleaned from [uncleanness imposed by] a fixed period until it will have been uprooted from her three times [M. Nid. 9:10A-G].** And in this regard you said to us, ‘Said R. Judah said Samuel, “This rule [Slotki: that the fifteenth day is regarded as a regular period*

that cannot be altered unless the discharge appeared three times in three consecutive months respectively on a different day] applies only when she was accustomed to see blood on the fifteenth day after her immersion, which is the twenty-second day after she originally produced the discharge, for on that day, she is already within the days of her menstrual period; but the fifteenth day after she originally produced blood, on which she is still within the zibah-days, that cannot be regarded as establishing a regular period.””

- D. *Said R. Pappa, “I repeated this tradition before R. Judah of Disqarta, asking, “While she cannot establish a regular period, do we take into consideration the possibility that such a regular period exists [Slotki: so that where a woman produced blood on the fifteenth day in each of three consecutive months, intercourse on that day would be forbidden in the fourth month, on the ground that, even though it is the zibah period in which the fifteenth day falls, a regular period may have been established, and the discharge might again appear on that date]?”*
- E. *He remained silent and said nothing at all.*
- F. *Said R. Pappa, “Let us see for ourselves: **If she habitually saw blood on the fifteenth day of the month and changed her pattern and saw blood on the twentieth day, [sexual relations on] this day and that day are prohibited. [39B]** And in this regard said R. Judah said Samuel, “This rule [Slotki: that the fifteenth day is regarded as a regular period that cannot be altered unless the discharge appeared three times in three consecutive months respectively on a different day] applies only when she was accustomed to see blood on the fifteenth day after her immersion, which is the twenty-second day after she originally produced the discharge, for on that day, she is already within the days of her menstrual period; but the fifteenth day after she originally produced blood, on which she is still within the zibah-days, that cannot be regarded as establishing a regular period.’ And it is made explicit that **[sexual relations on] this day and that day are prohibited.** So we do take into consideration the possibility that such a regular period exists.”*
- G. *[Slotki: since Papa regards the twenty-second day as one of the days of the zibah-period] R. Pappa takes for granted, then, that twenty-two days [Slotki: on which intercourse is forbidden] are reckoned from the twenty-second day, [the days on which formerly the discharge usually made its appearance, and not from the twenty-seventh day] while the beginning of the menstrual period and the zibah period [Slotki: at the conclusion of the menstrual period, seven days later] is reckoned from the twenty-seventh day [Slotki: The twenty-second day after the twenty-second is only the seventh day twenty-seventh.*
- H. *Said R. Huna b. R. Joshua to R. Pappa, “How come? Perhaps the twenty-second day also is reckoned from the twenty-seventh day [on which the discharge last appeared], so that, when the twenty-second days comes around again, the woman is within the days of her menstrual period [Slotki: the twenty two days consisting of seven for menstruation and eleven for zibah and for of the seven of the present menstrual period’s days]. And that stands to reason, [Slotki: that the reckoning should begin from the day of the last discharge, rather than from the day on which the discharge should have appeared]. For if you do not take this view, then what*

about the following case: a hen laid eggs one day, then held back the next, and once she stopped laying for two days and then laid on the following day. When it then goes back to laying on alternate does, is this in accord with the present pattern [laying on alternative days beginning with the last day, the sixth in the case, refraining on the seventh, laying on the eighth (Slotki)], or is this in accord with the past pattern [Slotki: of alternative with the day on which laying should have taken place, the fifth in the case submitted, thus laying on both the seventh and on the sixth days]? You must say that it would be in accord with the present pattern [Slotki: since alternation with the day on which laying should have taken place would only result in a new disturbance of the regularity, laying on two consecutive days. Similarly in the case of the woman, a reversion to her regular periods can only be effected by counting the days from the one on which her discharge last appeared, from the twenty-seventh day.]

- I. *Said to him R. Pappa, "But note what R. Simeon b. Laqish said, 'A woman may establish for herself a fixed period during the zibah-days [the eleven days between menstrual periods, in which any flow of blood is deemed to be classified as the flux to which reference is made in Lev. 15]. [Slotki: if she suffered a menstrual flow on the first day of two consecutive months and also on the fifteenth day, which is one of the eleven days of the zibah-period of the same months, while on the first of the third month she had no flow and on the fifteenth of that month she again observed a flow, on account of the three observations on the fifteenth of the successive month she establishes for herself a settled period, which will be on the fifteenth of the subsequent months. That is so even though the first two observations had taken place during the eleven zibah-days.] But a woman may not establish for herself a fixed period during the menstrual days' [so there is no reason to conduct an examination during her menstrual days], while R. Yohanan said, 'A woman may establish for herself a fixed period during the menstrual days,' — now how is such a case to be envisioned? Is it not along these lines: she produced blood on the first of the month, on the fifth, on the first and on the first, and now on the fifth, but on the first of that [third month in sequence] she produced no blood? And yet it is set forth that "A woman may establish for herself a fixed period during the menstrual days,' from which it follows that we reckon the days from the first day of the month [Slotki: though on that day no discharge had appeared. From this it follows that the counting of the days begins from the day on which the discharge should have appeared and not from that on which it appeared the last time.]"*
- J. *He said to him, "This is the sense of R. Yohanan's statement: 'For example, if a woman saw blood on the first of the month and on the first of the next month and on the twenty-fifth of the next month and on the first of the next month, we rule that she has experienced an influx of additional blood [Slotki: and as a result the discharge the regular time of the appearance of which was still the first of the month made its appearance a little earlier; the first day of the month being within seven days from the twenty-fifth of the previous month, on which the discharge appeared, may well be described as within the days of menstruation]."*
- K. *And so when Rabin came and all the seafarers, they stated this in accord with the view of R. Huna b. R. Joshua.*

I.1 clarifies the context in which the law is set forth. No. 2 deepens the analysis of the Mishnah's rule. No. 3, 4 also answer the question with which we commenced. For No. 4 I rely more heavily than usual on Slotki's fine exposition, following Rashi as always.