

VII

BAVLI NIDDAH CHAPTER SEVEN

FOLIOS 54B-57A

7:1

- A. The blood of the menstruating woman and the flesh of a corpse (1) impart uncleanness when they are wet,
- B. and (2) impart uncleanness when they are dry.
- C. But the [Zab's] flux, phlegm, spit, and the dead creeping thing, carrion, and semen (3) impart uncleanness when they are wet,
- D. and (4) do not impart uncleanness when they are dry.
- E. And if they can be soaked and return to their former condition, they (5) impart uncleanness when they are wet,
- F. and they (6) impart uncleanness when they are dry.
- G. And how long are they to be soaked?
- H. In lukewarm water, for twenty-four hours.
- I. R. Yosé says, "The flesh of the corpse [which] is dry and cannot be soaked and returned to its former bulk is clean."
- I.1 A. *What is the source of this ruling [that the blood of the menstruating woman and the flesh of a corpse impart uncleanness when they are wet, and impart uncleanness when they are dry]?*
- B. Said Hezekiah, "It is because Scripture has said, 'And of her that is sick with her impurity' (Lev. 15:33) — her impurity [menstrual blood] is equivalent to her: just as she conveys uncleanness, so her menstrual blood conveys uncleanness.
- C. *We therefore have found the rule that the blood of the menstruating woman imparts uncleanness when it is wet. How do we know that it does so when it is dry?*
- D. Said R. Isaac, "It is because Scripture has said, '...be...' (Lev. 15:19: "her issue...be blood") — it shall be as is [and so unclean even when it is dry."
- E. *Might I say that that ruling applies to blood that was wet but then dried up. How do we know that what was to begin with dry also imparts uncleanness? And furthermore, with reference to that which we have learned in the Mishnah, She who produces [an abortion] like a rind, like a hair, like dust, like red flies —*

let her put them into water. If they dissolve [into blood], she is unclean [as a menstruant], and if not she is clean [M. Nid. 3:2A-C], what is the source of that rule in Scripture?

- F. "...be..." (Lev. 15:19: "her issue...be blood") — [it shall be as is] — serves as an extension of the law.
- G. Might one argue, just as she imparts uncleanness to beds and chairs on which she lies or sits, so that they impart uncleanness to a human being in such wise as to impart uncleanness also to the garments that a human being is wearing, so too her blood also imparts uncleanness to beds and chairs, so that they impart uncleanness to a human being in such wise as to impart uncleanness also to the garments that a human being is wearing?
- H. *But is her blood in the category of that which may lie or sit?*
- I. *But according to your reasoning. is a stone that is afflicted with the skin ailment capable of using a couch or a seat, that a verse of Scripture should be required to exclude it from the category of that which imparts uncleanness to bed or chair? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. Might one suppose that a stone that is afflicted with the skin ailment should impart uncleanness to a bed or chair in such wise as these will impart uncleanness to a human being so as to make unclean even the clothing that such a person is wearing? And it is a matter of logic that that should be the case: if a person afflicted with flux-uncleanness, who does not impart uncleanness when he simply enters a room [so that a clean person in the same room is unclean by reason of the unclean person's presence] impart uncleanness to a human being so as to make unclean even the clothing that such a person is wearing, a stone that is afflicted with the skin ailment, which does impart uncleanness when it simply is brought into a room [so that a clean person in the same room is unclean by reason of the unclean stone's presence] surely should impart uncleanness to a human being so as to make unclean even the clothing that such a person is wearing!
- K. Because of that argument, it is necessary for Scripture to state, "He who has an issue of unclean flux" (Lev. 15: 4) — he who is unclean by flux but not a stone that is afflicted with the skin ailment.
- L. *Thus the operative consideration is that Scripture has eliminated it, so lo, if it were not for that fact, it would have imparted uncleanness [even though it is not within the category of that which utilizes a bed or a chair]!*
- M. From the very statement itself a reply is to be derived, for have you not said, "'He who has an issue of unclean flux' (Lev. 15: 4) — he who is unclean by flux but not a stone that is afflicted with the skin ailment"? Here too, Scripture also has said, 'Whereon she sits' (Lev. 15: 2) — she, but not her blood.
- N. **[55A]** Might one suppose that, just as she by her weight conveys uncleanness to objects under a heavy stone, so her blood conveys uncleanness to objects under a heavy stone?
- O. Said R. Ashi, "Scripture has said, 'He who carries those things' (Lev. 15:10) [referring to the couch of a person afflicted with flux, which, when carried on top of a heavy stone, conveys uncleanness to objects under the stone] — them serves as an exclusionary clause [thus eliminating the blood]."

II.1 A. and the flesh of a corpse imparts uncleanness when wet, and imparts uncleanness when dry:

- B. *What is the scriptural basis of this statement?*
- C. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “Said Scripture, ‘Whatsoever uncleanness he has’ (Lev. 22: 5) — any form of uncleanness that exudes from him.”
- D. R. Yohanan said, “‘or a bone of a man or a grave’ (Num. 19:16) — a man is compared to a bone. Just as a bone that is dry [imparts uncleanness] so does a man[‘s corpse do the same].”
- E. *What is at issue between them?*
- F. *At issue between them is the case of crumbling flesh [which is extremely dry].* [Simeon b. Laqish declares it unclean, Yohanan will regarded it as not a solid piece like a bone, hence not unclean].
- G. *An objection was raised:* The flesh of a corpse that has crumbled is no longer a source of uncleanness.
- H. *That is a case in which it has been pulverized and turned into dust.*
- I. *An objection was raised: **Whatever pertains to the corpse is unclean, except for the teeth, the hair, and the nails. And when connected, everything is unclean** [M. Oh. 3:3F-G].* [Slotki: teeth are on a par with bones, and yet it is stated that when detached from the corpse, they are clean, an objection against both authorities’ positions.]
- J. *Said R. Ada bar Ahbah, “[To convey uncleanness, something must be] precisely like a bone. Just as it is a bone that is created along with the person’s body [but not something that grows later on], so whatever is created along with the person’s body [conveys uncleanness, excluding the teeth].”*
- K. *And lo, there are hair and fingernails, which are created along with the person and are clean!*
- L. *Rather, said R. Ada bar Ahbah, “[To convey uncleanness, something must be] precisely like a bone. Just as it is a bone that is created along with the person’s body, and if one cuts it off, it does not grow back, so are excluded the teeth, which were not created with the person’s body but grow later, and excluded also are hair and nails, which, while created with the person’s body, when cut off grow back.”*
- M. *And lo, there is the case of the skin, which, if cut off, grows back, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **An animal that has lost its hide, having been flayed — R. Meir declares valid. And sages declare invalid** [M. Hul. 3:2E-G]. Now even rabbis invalidated the beasts only because in the meantime the air affects the beast, which would die, but the skin would grow again. And we have learned: **In the case of the following, their skin is equivalent to their flesh: the skin of a human being. and the skin of a domesticated pig...and all of them which one tanned, or on which one trampled so that they are fit for use, are clean, and do not impart food uncleanness, except for the skin of man** [M. Hul. 9:2A, B, F-G].*
- N. *Lo, in this connection it has been stated, said Ulla, “As a matter of the law of the Torah, the skin of a human being is insusceptible to uncleanness. And what is the consideration that led sages to declare it unclean? It is a decree to take account*

of the possibility that someone will turn the skin of his father and mother into spreads for an ass.”

- O. *And there are those who state matters as follows:*
- P. Lo, there is skin, which when cut off does not grow back again, *for we have learned in the Mishnah: **An animal that has lost its hide, having been flayed — R. Meir declares valid. And sages declare invalid** [M. Hul. 3:2E-G]. And even R. Meir took the position that the beast is valid only because the flesh hardens, so the animal recovers its health, but as a matter of fact if cut off the skin does not grow back.*
- Q. *Lo, in this connection it has been stated, said Ulla, “As a matter of the law of the Torah, the skin of a human being is insusceptible to uncleanness.”*
- R. *When the statement of Ulla was made, it was made in connection with the concluding passage of the same Mishnah-paragraph: **and all of them which one tanned, or on which one trampled so that they are fit for use, are clean, and do not impart food uncleanness, except for the skin of man** [M. Hul. 9:2A, B, F-G]. And said Ulla, “As a matter of the law of the Torah, the skin of a human being if one has worked it is insusceptible to uncleanness. And what is the consideration that led sages to declare it unclean? It is a decree to take account of the possibility that someone will turn the skin of his father and mother into spreads for an ass.”*
- S. And lo, there is the case of flesh, which, if cut off, grows back, and it is unclean!
- T. Said Mar bar R. Ashi, “The place of missing flesh turns into a scar [Slotki: and does not grow back again to its original shape, as is the case with hair or nails].”

III.1 A. But the [Zab’s] flux...[impart uncleanness when they are wet:]

- B. *How do we know the rule for the Zab’s flux?*
- C. *As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. “...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.’
- E. But is this not a matter of logic? If the flux imparts uncleanness to others, will it not all the more so impart uncleanness to the man himself?
- F. 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]. So you should not be surprised concerning this one, who, even though it may cause uncleanness to others, itself is not unclean.
- G. Accordingly, Scripture is required to state, “...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.’
- H. *But might I say that while the flux imparts uncleanness through contact, it does not impart uncleanness when it is carried [but not actually touched], along the lines of a dead creeping thing [which imparts uncleanness only if it is touched but not if it is merely carried]?*
- I. *Said R. Bibi bar Abbaye, “To show that it conveys uncleanness through being touched does not require an explicit verse of Scripture, for it is not of lesser*

consequence than mere semen. [55B] *Where a verse of Scripture is required, it has to do with its imparting uncleanness when it is carried.*"

- J. *Then might I propose that* when it is carried, it imparts uncleanness to a human being and to his clothing, but when it is merely touched, it conveys uncleanness to a human being but not to his clothing, *along the lines of touching carrion?*
- K. *Perish the thought! For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- L. Others say, "'Of those who have an issue, whether man or woman' (Lev. 15:33) — Scripture treats as comparable the man's flux and the man himself. Just as in his case, you have made no distinction between what he touches and what he carries, treating as unclean the man that he touches and the clothing that is worn by such a person, so his flux is subject to the same rule of conveying uncleanness."
- M. *Now that you have derived the rule from the verse*, "Of those who have an issue, whether man or woman," *what need was there for the proof from the verse*, "his flux is unclean"?
- N. *Said R. Judah of Disqarta*, "It was necessary. For you might have made the following argument [against the proposition '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."
- O. And as to the deduction from the verse, "This is the Torah of him who has a flux" (Lev. 15:32) — *it can have served the purpose of explaining how many fluxes are at issue*: "issue," one; "his issue," two; and after the third issue, the All-Merciful compares him to the woman [who becomes unclean even in the case of an issue that comes willy-nilly, while in the case of a man, he does not become unclean after two issues if the issue was intentional]. So it was necessary for Scripture to state, "His issue is unclean."
- P. *And now that the All-Merciful has also written*, "His issue is unclean," *you may apply to the other text [from which the prescribed number of issues has been deduced (Slotki)] this exposition [that no distinction is to be made between contact and carrying] as well.*

IV.1 A. [But the Zab's] spit, [...impart uncleanness when they are wet:]

- B. *How do we derive from Scripture the rule governing his spit?*
- C. *As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. "And if [a Zab] spit" (Lev. 15: 8) — might one suppose that that is so even if the spit did not actually touch [the clean person at whom it was thrown]?
- E. Scripture states, "...on him that is clean" — only if the spit touched him who is clean.
- F. I know only the rule governing his spit. How do I know the rule for his mucus, phlegm, and snot?
- G. Scripture states, "And if [a Zab] spit" (Lev. 15: 8).

IV.2. A. A master has said, "...might one suppose that that is so even if the spit did not actually touch [the clean person at whom it was thrown]?"

- B. *But why not prove that proposition from the case of the levirate wife in the rite of removing the shoe, where we find reference to her spitting as well. Just as in that*

case, the act of spitting is effective even though it does not touch the deceased childless man's brother, so here too, the act is valid even though the spit does not actually touch the clean person.

C. *So we are informed that that proposition is invalid.*

IV.3. A. *And might I say that this rule [that the spit of the Zab imparts uncleanness] applies only to direct contact with the spit, but as to merely carrying it, no uncleanness would be conveyed, along the lines of the dead creeping thing?*

B. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "*A Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [said,] 'Scripture has said, 'upon that which is with the clean' (Lev. 15: 8) — what is in the hand of the one who is clean I have declared unclean for you.'*"

C. *And might I say that if it is carried, it imparts uncleanness to both the human being and also to the clothing that he is wearing, while through contact the man is made unclean, but the clothing that he is wearing is not made unclean, along the lines of contact with carrion?*

D. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, *and so a Tannaite authority of the household of R. Ishmael [said,] "Scripture has said, 'upon that which is with the clean' (Lev. 15: 8) — That which I have declared clean for you in another context, I have declared unclean for you in the present context, and what is that? It is contact with carrion."*

E. *And might I say that this is parallel to carrying a dead creeping thing [the garments of the one who carries a dead creeping thing are clean, but would be unclean in this case? How then do we know that contact in this case is not like contact with carrion, which causes uncleanness for the man but not for the garments (Slotki)]?*

F. *If so, Scripture should have written, "Upon that which is with a man." Why did it write, "Upon that which is with the clean"? That yields two points.*

IV.4. A. Snot:

B. *[Since Scripture speaks only of spit,] why should snot be regarded as unclean?*

C. Said Rab, "*The rule pertains to what is drawn and discharged through the mouth [and the uncleanness derives from the spit, not the snot], since it is not possible for snot to flow without drops of spit.*"

D. And R. Yohanan said, "*The rule pertains even to what is drawn and discharged through the nose as well.*"

E. *Therefore he takes the view that [the nose also] constitutes a source [of unclean flux], and Scripture has encompassed it within the law.*

IV.5. A. *And should Rab [Slotki: who does not regard the nose as a source and attributes the uncleanness of discharge from it to particles of spit that get mixed up with it when it passes through the mouth] not regard the tears of a Zab's eyes to be included among unclean discharges?*

B. *For Rab said, "Who wants to blind his eye should have it painted by a gentile."*

C. *And Levi said, "He who wants to die should have his eyes painted by a gentile."*

D. *In this connection said R. Hiyya bar Guria, "What is the operative consideration for the position of Rab in not saying, 'he who wants to die'? It is because one*

might sniff them up and discharge them through the mouth [and avoid swallowing the poison].”

- E. *[Responding now to A:] Granting that the poison is charged [through the mouth], the tears themselves are not discharged [through the mouth].*

IV.6. A. *Come and take note:* There are nine categories of liquid that exude in the case of Zob [the excretion described in Lev. 15]: sweat, pus, and excrement are clean in all regards [and do not impart uncleanness through contact]. His tear and the blood of his wound and the milk of a woman impart uncleanness as liquid in the volume of a quarter-log. His spit, flux, and urine impart most severe uncleanness in any volume at all. *Now there is no reference here to snot!*

- B. *Now from the viewpoint of Rab, it is not included in the Tannaite formulation, because it is not subject to a well-defined rule, since sometimes it exudes through the mouth and sometimes it exudes through the nose. But from the viewpoint of R. Yohanan, it should be included!*

- C. *And according to your reasoning, why should there be no mention of his mucus and phlegm [which are in the same category as his spit]? But the point is that the Tannaite framer of the passage made reference to spit and the same law then pertains to all other excretions, the uncleanness of which derives from the Pentateuchal extension of the law. Here too, spit is mentioned, and all other secretions the uncleanness of which derives from the scriptural extension of the law are included as well.*

IV.7. A. His tear: as it is written, “And given them tears to drink in large measure” (Psa. 80: 6).

- B. “and the blood of his wound:” as it is written, “And drink the blood of the slain” (Num. 23:24), and there is no difference between striking one down outright and in part.

- C. “and the milk of a woman:” as it is written, “And she opened a bottle of milk and gave him something to drink” (Jud. 4:19).

- D. *How do we know on the basis of Scripture that his urine is a fluid in the definition of the law? As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- E. “His issue is unclean and this” (Lev. 15: 2) — that encompasses his urine, regarding it as unclean.

- F. But is this not merely a matter of logic? If spit, which derives from an area of cleanness, is unclean, urine, which derives [56A] from an area that in any event yields unclean fluid [the flux itself] surely should be unclean!

- G. Blood that exudes from the hole of the penis will prove the contrary, for it derives from a place from which unclean fluid may come, and yet it is clean. So do not be surprised concerning this, for, even though it derives from a place from which unclean fluid may come, it nonetheless will be clean.

- H. Accordingly, Scripture is required to state matters in the way it does: “His issue is unclean and this” (Lev. 15: 2) — that encompasses his urine, regarding it as unclean.

IV.8. A. *How do we know that blood that exudes from the hole of the penis is clean? As has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Might one suppose that blood that issues from his mouth or from the hole of his penis might be unclean?
- C. Scripture states, “As to his issue it is unclean” (Lev. 15: 2) — it is unclean, but blood that issues from his mouth or from the hole of his penis is not unclean but clean.
- D. *And might I turn matters upside down [Slotki: “and this” includes blood that issues from his mouth or penis, and ‘as to his issue’ excludes urine]?*
- E. Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, “The analogy is to be drawn to spit: just as spit forms into globules when it is discharged, so any other liquid that is unclean will be one that forms into globules when it is charged; blood is excluded, since when it is discharged, it does not form globules.”
- F. And lo, there is the case of a woman’s milk, which forms into globules when it is discharged, and a master has said, “A woman’s milk imparts uncleanness as liquid,” meaning, “only uncleanness as liquid, but not a major uncleanness!
- G. Rather, said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, “The analogy is to be drawn to spit: just as spit forms into globules when it is discharged but may be reabsorbed, so any other fluid to be unclean must be one that forms into globules when it is discharged but may be reabsorbed. That then excludes blood, since it is not formed into globules when it is discharged; and it further includes a woman’s milk, since, though it is formed into globules when it is discharged, it cannot be reabsorbed.”
- H. And why not derive the rule from the issue of the Zab: as his flux, which is not formed into globules when it is discharged causes uncleanness, so does any other fluid that has the same traits?
- I. *Said Raba, “One cannot derive the rule from the flux of a Zab, for that causes uncleanness to others as well [namely, the Zab].”*

V.1 A. and the dead creeping thing [...impart uncleanness when they are wet]:

- B. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “A dead creeping thing that dried up, but the shape of which is retained, is unclean.”
- C. *And have we not learned in the Mishnah: ...impart uncleanness when they are wet, and do not impart uncleanness when they are dry...?*
- D. *Said R. Zira, There is no contradiction, since the statement of R. Simeon b. Laqish speaks of a whole dead creeping thing, which is unclean even when dry, while the Mishnah’s rule speaks of only part of a dead creeping thing.”*
- E. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. Said R. Isaac b. R. Bisna said R. Simeon b. Yohai, “‘...in them...’ (Lev. 11:31) — might one suppose that for them to be treated as unclean, one has to touch the whole of the dead creeping thing? Scripture explicitly states, ‘of them.’ If only ‘of them’ had been written, one might have supposed that it is sufficient to touch a part. So it was stated, ‘in them.’ How are the two to be harmonized? Uncleanness through touching only part of a dead creeping thing is incurred if it is wet, while uncleanness through contact with a whole dead creeping thing is incurred even if the dead creeping thing is dry.”

G. *Said Raba, "The lizards of Mahuza, if they retain their shape, are unclean."*

V.2. A. And said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "A dead creeping thing that burned up, but the shape of which is retained, is unclean."

B. *An objection was raised from the following: If a burned creeping thing was found on olives, or a filthy rag was found on them, it is deemed clean [we assume the creeping thing or rag was burned before touching the olives and so not unclean at the moment of contact] since in all questions of uncleanness, we settle matters in accord with the condition that pertains at the moment at which they were found [M. Toh. 3:5].*

C. Said R. Zira, There is no contradiction, since the statement of R. Simeon b. Laqish speaks of a whole dead creeping thing, which is unclean even when dry, while the Mishnah's rule speaks of only part of a dead creeping thing."

D. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

E. Said R. Isaac b. R. Bisna said R. Simeon b. Yohai, "'...in them...' (Lev. 11:31) — might one suppose that for them to be treated as unclean, one has to touch the whole of the dead creeping thing? Scripture explicitly states, 'of them.' If only 'of them' had been written, one might have supposed that it is sufficient to touch a part. So it was stated, 'in them.' How are the two to be harmonized? The one statement refers to one that has been burned up, the other, to one that has not been burned up."

VI.1 A. **...impart uncleanness when they are wet:**

B. **flux:**

C. As it is written: "his flesh run" (Lev. 15: 3).

VI.2. A. **Mucus, phlegm, and spit:**

B. As it is written: "'If he who has the issue spit" (Lev. 15: 8) — any fluid like spit.

VI.3. A. **Dead creeping thing:**

B. The All-Merciful has said, "When they are dead" (Lev. 11:31), meaning, when they look dead [while still wet].

VI.4. A. **Semen:**

B. It must still have the power to fertilize.

VI.5. A. **Carrion:**

B. As it is written: "If...die" (Lev. 11:39), meaning, when they look dead [while still wet].

VII.1 A. **And if they can be soaked and return to their former condition,**

they impart uncleanness when they are wet, and they impart uncleanness when they are dry. And how long are they to be soaked? In lukewarm water, for twenty-four hours:

B. *R. Jeremiah raised the question, "Does the process of soaking have to be from beginning to end [for twenty-four hours]? Or perhaps it may be at the beginning even if not so at the end [Slotki: they are regarded as clean if they have not resumed their original condition after being soaked in water that was at first lukewarm and then turned cold, though they would have resumed that condition if they had been soaked all the time in lukewarm water]?"*

- C. *Come and take note of that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. **And how much is it to be soaked in lukewarm water? Judah b. Naqosa says, “Until it will be in lukewarm water for twenty-four hours” [T. Nid. 6:11D-E]** — the water being lukewarm at the beginning though not at the end.
- E. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, **““Until it will be in lukewarm water for twenty-four hours.”**

VIII.1 A. R. Yosé says, “The flesh of the corpse [which] is dry and cannot be soaked and returned to its former bulk is clean:”

- B. Said Samuel, “The sense of ‘clean’ is that it does not convey uncleanness if it is of the bulk of an olive, but it still conveys uncleanness as corpse mould.”
- C. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. **R. Yosé says, “The flesh of the corpse [which] is dry and cannot be soaked and returned to its former bulk is clean** in that it does not convey uncleanness if it is of the bulk of an olive, but it still conveys uncleanness as corpse mould.”

I.1 provides a fine exercise in both identifying the scriptural basis for the rule and also clarifying its provisions. II.1 does the same. III.1 goes through the same inquiry of finding a scriptural basis for the Mishnah’s rule. IV.1 follows the same pattern, and Nos. 2, 3, 4 then extend the discussion, principally through the inquiry into relevant verses of Scripture. No. 5 is a footnote to No. 4. No. 6 then reverts to the dispute of No. 4. No. 7 is a footnote to No. 6. No. 8 is a footnote to No. 7. V.1, 2 take a different tack, now simply amplifying the rule, rather than investigating the source for it in Scripture. VI.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 all provide a scriptural basis for the Mishnah’s catalogue. VII.1 clarifies the rule at hand. VIII.1 clarifies the language of the Mishnah.

7:2

- A. **The creeping thing which is found in the alleyway imparts uncleanness retroactively,**
- B. **until one will state “I inspected this alleyway and there was no creeping thing in it,”**
- C. **or until the time that it [last] was cleaned.**
- D. **And so: a bloodstain which is found on a garment imparts uncleanness retroactively,**
- E. **until one will state, “I inspected this garment, and there was no bloodstain on it,”**
- F. **or until such time as it was [last] washed.**
- G. **And it imparts uncleanness whether wet or dry.**
- H. **R. Simeon says, “The dry imparts uncleanness retroactively, and the wet imparts uncleanness only so long as it can have been wet.”**

I.1 A. *The question was raised: when we refer, with regard to the alley, to **until the time that it [last] was cleaned**, is the meaning, that it is assumed to have been properly examined [Slotki: by the person who swept it, who thus had definitely ascertained that there was no unclean object in it at the time], or is it assumed that it was properly swept only [so that if any unclean object had been there, it would have been swept away]?*

- B. *And what difference is there between these two readings of the matter?*
- C. *A case in which one has said that it was swept but not examined. If you say, it is assumed to have been properly examined, lo, here he has not made an examination. But if you say, it is assumed that it was properly swept only [so that if any unclean object had been there, it would have been swept away], lo, it has been swept properly!*
- D. **[56B]** *Or, further, the practical difference would arise in a case in which a dead creeping thing was found in a hole. If you say, it is assumed to have been properly examined, one who makes an inspection will also look into a hole. But if you say, it is assumed that it was properly swept only [so that if any unclean object had been there, it would have been swept away], a hole will not have been swept out.*

II.1 A. And so: a bloodstain which is found on a garment imparts uncleanness retroactively, until one will state, “I inspected this garment, and there was no bloodstain on it,” or until such time as it was last washed:

- B. *The question was raised: when we refer, with regard to the shirt to **until the time that it [last] was washed**, is the meaning, that it is assumed to have been properly examined [Slotki: by the person who washed it, who thus had definitely ascertained that there was no unclean object in it at the time], or is the sense that it is assumed that it was properly washed only [so that if any unclean object had been there, it would have been washed away]?*
- C. *And what difference is there between these two readings of the matter?*
- D. *A case in which a person said that he had laundered the garment but did not examine it. If you say that it is assumed to have been properly examined, lo, he has not examined it. But if you say that it is assumed that it was properly washed only, lo, it has been washed.*
- E. *Or, also, there can be a practical difference where the stain was discovered in a fold.*
- F. *If you say that it is assumed to have been properly examined, one who examines also examines the folds, but if you say that it is assumed that it was properly washed only, then in a fold it will not have been washed away. What is the ruling?*
- G. *Come and take note, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. Said R. Meir, “On what account have sages stated, ‘**The creeping thing which is found in the alleyway imparts uncleanness retroactively, until one will state “I inspected this alleyway and there was no creeping thing in it,” or until the time that it [last] was cleaned**’? It is because it is assumed that Israelites examine their alleyways when they clean them out. But if they did not examine them, they have lost the retroactive uncleanness.
- I. **“And on what account did they say of a blood stain, ‘a bloodstain which is found on a garment imparts uncleanness retroactively, until one will state, “I inspected this garment, and there was no bloodstain on it,” or until such time as it was [last] washed’? For it is the way of Israelite women to examine their bloodstains when they wash them. If she did not examine her blood stain, it imparts uncleanness retroactively” [T. Nid. 6:11C-E].**

- J. **R. Aha says, “Let her launder it again. If the color fades, it imparts uncleanness retroactively. If it does not fade, it does not impart uncleanness retroactively.”**
- K. **Rabbi says, “The blood stain before washing is not like the blood stain after washing. That before washing penetrates, and that after washing remains clotted on the surface” [T. Nid. 6:13A-B].**
- L. *What follows [from Meir’s statement] is that we assume that it has been duly examined.*
- M. *That indeed follows.*

III.1 A. And it imparts uncleanness whether wet or dry. R. Simeon says, “The dry imparts uncleanness retroactively, and the wet imparts uncleanness only so long as it can have been wet”:

- B. Said R. Eleazar, “This [ruling of Simeon] has been repeated only in the case of a dead creeping thing, but in the case of a wet bloodstain, it causes uncleanness retroactively [to the time of the last washing].
 - C. *“I say that it had dried but water had fallen upon it.”*
 - D. *In the case of a dead creeping thing also, may I not say that it had dried up but water had fallen on it?*
 - E. *If that were so, it would have completely crumbled.*
- I.1 provides an amplificatory question for the explanation of the Mishnah’s rule.
 II.1 goes through the same exercise. III.1 provides a minor clarification.

7:3

- A. **All the bloodstains which come from Reqem are clean.**
- B. **R. Judah declares unclean, because they are converts and err.**
- C. **Those which come from among the gentiles are clean.**
- D. **Those which come from among Israelites and from among Samaritans —**
- E. **R. Meir declares unclean.**
- F. **And sages declare clean, because they are not suspect in regard to their bloodstains.**

- I.1 A.** Since the statement [**Those which come from among the gentiles are clean**] is made categorically, it follows that the rule applies even to those that come from Tarmod [who are supposed to derive from intermarriages. But Jewish menstrual blood is unclean!]
- B. Said R. Yohanan, “This proves that proselytes may be accepted from Tarmod.”
- C. *Is this really true? And lo, R. Yohanan and Sabya both say, “We do not accept proselytes from Tarmod”! And should you maintain that R. Yohanan only said, ‘This proves...,’ but he himself does not maintain that view, has not R. Yohanan said, “The decided law follows the anonymous Mishnah [and since the statement, **those which come from among the gentiles are clean**, is made categorically, it follows that the rule applies even to those that come from Tarmod who are supposed to derive from intermarriages]!”*
- D. *What we are dealing with here is a dispute among Amoraic authorities concerning what R. Yohanan actually said.*

- II.1** A. Those which come among Israelites and among Samaritans — R. Meir declares unclean. And sages declare clean, because they are not suspect in regard to their bloodstains:
- B. *Now as to the position of rabbis, if they declare those that derive from Israelites to be clean, then whose will they ever deem unclean?*
- C. *The formulation of the Mishnah contains a lacuna, and this is the sense of the statement:*
- D. Those that come from among Israelites are unclean. **As to those that come from among Samaritans, R. Meir declares unclean**, since Samaritans are honest proselytes. **And sages declare clean**, since Samaritans are proselytes **only by reason of their fear of the wild animals** [that had congregated in the land of Israel during the exile].
- E. *If that were the case, then, instead of saying, because they are not suspect in regard to their bloodstains, the passage should have read*, since Samaritans are proselytes **only by reason of their fear of the wild animals** [that had congregated in the land of Israel during the exile].
- F. *Rather, this is the sense of the passage:* **Those which come among Israelites and among Samaritans are unclean**. Samaritans are honest proselytes. **Those that are found in towns occupied by Israelites are clean**, since they are not suspect of leaving their bloodstains lying around, but keep them in private. **And those that are found in Samaritan towns — R. Meir declares unclean**, since Samaritans are assumed to leave their bloodstains lying around. **And sages declare clean, because they are not suspect in regard to their bloodstains**.

What is clarified at I.1 seems to me trivial. II.1, by contrast, gives us a clarification of fundamental importance.

7:4

- A. **All bloodstains that are found anywhere are clean, except for those which are found in the rooms or around places of uncleanness.**
- B. **The place of uncleanness of Samaritans imparts uncleanness by overshadowing, because they are assumed to bury their miscarriages there.**
- C. **R. Judah says, “They did not bury their abortions, but they toss them out, and the beast drags them off.”**

7:5

- A. **They are believed to say, “We buried the abortions there,” or, “We did not bury [abortions there].”**
- B. **They are believed to say concerning a beast whether it had born a firstling or had not born a firstling.**
- C. **They are believed concerning the marking out of graves.**
- D. **But they are not believed either about interlaced foliage or protruding stones or about a bet haperas [a grave area, that is, an area possibly contaminated by corpse matter].**
- E. **This is the principle: [Concerning] something about which they are suspect they are not believed.**

I.1 A. [57A] *What is the exposition on which they relied [in not burying abortions]?*

- B. “You shall not remove your neighbor’s landmark, which they of old time have set, in your inheritance” (Deu. 19:14).
- C. Whoever has an inheritance has a right to a landmark, and whoever does not have an inheritance has no right to a landmark [and consequently, they do not bury an abortion, which has no right to a landmark].”

II.1 A. They are believed to say, “We buried the abortions there,” or, “We did not bury [abortions there]:”

- B. *But surely they do not affirm the rule, “nor put a stumbling block before the blind” (Lev. 19:14) [meaning, you shall not supply misleading information, to lead an unwary person into sin (Slotki)]?*
- C. Said R. Abbahu, “The rule [**that they are believed to say, “We buried the abortions there,” or, “We did not bury abortions there]** applies when a Samaritan priest is standing there [whom they will not mislead].”
- D. *But perhaps he was an unclean priest?*
- E. *It is one who is holding in his hand food in the status of priestly rations.*
- F. *But perhaps the food in the status of priestly rations was unclean?*
- G. *It is a case in which he is eating the food.*
- H. *If so, what’s the point of the rule?*
- I. *What might you have thought? They are not all that expert in the stages of the formation of the embryo [Slotki: so that a mature one might be mistaken by them for an abortion and in consequence they would declare a place to be free from corpse matter in when in fact it was not clean]? So we are informed that that is not the case.*

III.1 A. They are believed to say concerning a beast whether it had born a firstling or had not born a firstling:

- B. *But surely they do not affirm the rule, “nor put a stumbling block before the blind” (Lev. 19:14) [meaning, you shall not supply misleading information, to lead an unwary person into sin (Slotki)]?*
- C. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “This is a case in which a beast is shorn and is doing work [which the Samaritan would not do if it were a firstborn].”
- D. *If so, what’s the point of the rule?*
- E. *What might you have thought? They are not all that expert in the rules governing the discharge of the womb, and so we are informed that that is not the case and they are to be believed.*

IV.1 A. They are believed concerning the marking out of graves:

- B. *And even though this is a rule that derives only from the authority of rabbis, they are meticulous about keeping it, for it is written in Scripture: “And any who sees a man’s bone shall set up a sign by it” (Eze. 39:15).*

V.1 A. But they are not believed either about interlaced foliage or protruding stones:

- B. As to interlaced foliage, we have learned in the Mishnah:

- C. What is regarded as interlaced foliage? The foliage of a tree that affords a covering for the ground [M. **Oh. 8:2**].
- D. As to protruding stones, we have learned:
- E. **Protruding stones that project from a wall** [T. **Oh. 9:2**].

VI.1 A. or about the *Beth haperas* [a grave area, an area possibly contaminated by corpse matter]:

- B. Said R. Judah said Samuel, “One [who wants to remain uncontaminated by corpse matter] in a *beth haperas* [a grave area, an area possibly contaminated by corpse matter] blows away the earth and goes along his way.”
- C. R. Judah bar Ammi in the name of R. Judah said, “A *beth haperas* [a grave area, an area possibly contaminated by corpse matter] that has been trodden down is no longer a source of uncleanness.”
- D. *And a Tannaite authority [states]: He who ploughs a graveyard, lo, such a one creates a beth haperas [a grave area, an area possibly contaminated by corpse matter]. And to what extent does he do so? The full length of a furrow, which is a hundred cubits squared, covering an area of four beth seahs. R. Yosé says, “Five” [cf. T. **Ahilot 17:1A**].*

VI.2. A. And is it the fact that Samaritans are not believed concerning an area possibly contaminated by corpse-matter? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority?

- B. **A field in which a grave has been lost — a Samaritan is believed to say, “There is no grave there,” since he gives testimony only concerning the grave itself. And he is believed if he says of a tree that overshadows a grave, “There is no grave beneath it,” for he testifies only about the grave itself** [T. **Nid. 6:16A-D**].
- C. Said R. Yohanan, “The rule speaks of a case in which he is walking backward and forward through the entirety of the area [Slotki: while our Mishnah speaks of a case in which a Samaritan walks only across part of the field, so we suspect he knows there is a grave there, and his evidence on the doubtful part is intended to mislead Israelites, so that they may become subject to an uncleanness in which he himself does not believe].”
- D. *If so, then what’s the point of the rule?*
- E. What might you have supposed? That there was a narrow strip that jutted out [Slotki: from the field, and he assumed the grave was located within that strip. As the rest of the field is still a suspected area, the doubtful uncleanness of which Samaritans disregard, his evidence ought not to be relied upon]?
- F. *So we are informed that that is not the case.*

VII.1 A. This is the principle: [Concerning] something about which they are suspect they are not believed:

- B. *What is encompassed within the generalization?*
- C. *What is included* are the laws covering the Sabbath limits [which Samaritans do not observe, so they are not believed if they tell a Jew where the Sabbath limit is] and also the matter of libation-wine [Samaritans do not regard wine touched by an idolator as forbidden, and they cannot testify about such matters].

I.1 provides an exegetical basis for the action of the Samaritan. II.1 pursues its own question on why Samaritans are believed in the case at hand. III.1 goes over the same ground. IV.1, V.1 provide minor clarifications. VI.1 provides some irrelevant information on the contaminated ground, but No. 2 is right to the point. VII.1 provides an important clarification of the law, and the examples, of course, yield the principle that is in play throughout.