

# IX.

---

## BAVLI HULLIN CHAPTER NINE

### FOLIOS 117B-129B

#### 9:1

- A. The (1) hide, and (2) grease, and (3) sediment, and (4) flayed-off meat, and (5) bones, and (6) sinews, and (7) horns and (8) hooves join together [with the meat to which they are attached to form the requisite volume] to impart food uncleanness, but [they do] not [join together to impart] uncleanness of carrion.
- B. Similarly:
- C. He who slaughters unclean cattle for a gentile —
- D. while it yet is writhing, it imparts food uncleanness, but [it does] not [impart] uncleanness of carrion —
- E. (1) until it dies,
- F. or (2) until one cuts off its head.
- G. [Scripture thus] has [prescribed] more [conditions] to impart food uncleanness than uncleanness of carrion.
- H. R. Judah says, “Flayed-off meat which was collected together, if there is the volume of an olive’s bulk in one place — one is liable on its account [if one touched it and then entered the Temple].”
- I.1 A. *We taught on Tannaite authority [in our Mishnah] that which our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: Protectors [i.e., husks, peels, shells, hides, count to make up the minimum quantity needed for] less severe forms of uncleanness. But protectors do not [count] for more severe forms of uncleanness.*
- B. *What is the source of the assertion: Protectors [count to make up the minimum quantity needed for] less severe forms of uncleanness?*
- C. *For taught the House of R. Ishmael: “[And if any part of their carcass falls upon] any seed for sowing that is to be sown, [it is clean]” (Lev. 11:37). [This implies they become unclean when they are found] in the manner in which people take them out for planting: a grain of wheat with its husk, a grain of barley with its husk, a lentil with its husk.*

- D. *What is the source of the assertion:* But protectors do not [count] for more severe forms of uncleanness?
- E. *For our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* “[And if any animal of which you may eat dies, he who touches] its carcass [shall be unclean until the evening]” (Lev. 11:39) [means uncleanness is transferred by hide that has flesh attached but] not by hide that does not have on it an olive’s bulk of flesh. **[118a]** You might infer that one who touches that part of the hide opposite flesh that is attached underneath would not become unclean. It comes to teach [that it], “shall be unclean.”
- F. *How do we reconcile these statements?*
- G. *Said Raba (and some say Kadi), “There is a lacuna in the text and this is how you should teach the matter:* “[He who touches] its carcass” — [means uncleanness is transferred by hide that has flesh attached but] not by hide that does not have on it an olive’s bulk of flesh, [even if by counting] the hide it yields an olive’s bulk. m You might infer that I exclude even a hide that has on it an olive’s bulk of flesh, that one who touches it opposite the flesh that is attached underneath. You might infer he is not unclean because it [the hide] does not serve as a handle [to transmit uncleanness]. It comes to teach [that it], “shall be unclean.”

### **The Sources of the Law Governing the Relationship of Attachments, e.g., Handles, to That to Which They are Attached, thus, Hide to Carcass**

This composite serves M. Uqsin 1:1 and is parachuted down here because of the foregoing discussion about touching handles and the affect upon the things to which the handles or protectors are attached.

**I.2 A.** *It was taught on Tannaite authority there [in a Mishnah-passage]:* **Whatever is a handle but not a protector contracts uncleanness and imparts uncleanness but does not join together [with that which it protects to form the minimum volume to be subject to uncleanness]. [If] it protects even though it is not a handle, it contracts uncleanness and imparts uncleanness and joins together [with that which it protects to form the minimum volume to be subject to uncleanness]. [If] it is not a protector and not a handle, it does not contract uncleanness and does not impart uncleanness [M. Uqsin 1:1].**

- B. *Handles — where is it written in the Torah concerning them? As it is written, “But if water is put on the seed and any part of their carcass falls on it, it is unclean to you” (Lev. 11:38). “To you” [implies] to all that is needed by you. This includes [in the rule for contracting uncleanness] handles.*
- C. *And it is written, “And if any animal of which you may eat dies, [he who touches its carcass shall be unclean until the evening]” (Lev. 11:39). “Which you” [implies] to all that is*

needed by you. This includes [in the rule for imparting uncleanness] handles.

- D. [Accordingly we have scriptural sources for the rule that] a handle contracts and imparts [uncleanness]. [To derive the rule that] a protector contracts and imparts uncleanness, *we do not need a verse*. We may derive it a fortiori from [the rule for] a handle. What is the case concerning a handle that does not protect? It contracts and imparts [uncleanness]. It is surely logical to conclude the same rule applies to protectors [that are more integrally a part of the food].
- E. *Why was it necessary then for the Torah to write concerning protectors? You may derive from this [that the verse teaches us that we may] combine [the handles with the food to comprise the minimum quantity].*
- F. *But it might make sense to maintain that a handle can contract but not impart [uncleanness] but a protector can both contract and impart [uncleanness]. But [it would make sense to maintain further] that we do not say that a handle can impart [uncleanness] and [we do not say that] a protector combines [with the food to comprise the minimum].*
- G. [This argument is not tenable because] *we cannot logically maintain that a handle can contract but not impart [uncleanness]. Let us consider: if it brings [uncleanness to a food], do we need to specify that it imparts [uncleanness to another object]?*
- H. *But it might make sense to maintain that a handle can contract but not impart [uncleanness] but a protector can both contract and impart [uncleanness]. But [it would make sense to maintain further] that we do not say that a handle can contract [uncleanness] and [we do not say that] a protector combines [with the food to comprise the minimum].*
- I. [This argument is not tenable because] *there is an extra verse concerning the handle: “[And everything upon which any part of their carcass falls shall be unclean;] whether oven or stove, it shall be broken in pieces; they are unclean, and shall be unclean to you” (Lev. 11:35). “To you” [implies] to all that is needed by you. This includes [in the rule for contracting uncleanness] handles.*
- J. *Which one of these [verses] is the extra one? The Torah could have written [the rule] concerning seeds (11:38) and we could have derived those others from it. [But you may refute this as follows.] What is the case concerning seeds? They have many levels of uncleanness. [Thus they are different from*

*carrion and from an oven and we cannot derive the rule for them from that.]*

- K. *The Torah could have written [the rule] concerning an oven (11:35) and we could have derived those others from it. [But you may refute this as follows.] What is the case concerning ovens? They do contract uncleanness from their air space. [Thus they are different from seeds and carrion and we cannot derive the rule for them from that.]*
- L. *The Torah could have written [the rule] concerning carrion (11:39) and we could have derived those others from it. [But you may refute this as follows.] What is the case concerning carrion? It can impart uncleanness to a person, it can impart uncleanness to one who carries it, and uncleanness issues from it [as a source]. [Thus it is different from seeds and ovens and we cannot derive the rule from that.]*
- M. *[Accordingly], from each one on its own we cannot derive the rule for the other two. But let us derive the rule for one of them from the other two. How shall we derive it? Let the Torah not write the rule for seeds and we will derive it from the others. [But you may refute this as follows.] What is the case concerning the others? They contract uncleanness without being rendered susceptible [by liquid being put on them]. We may say that seeds [are different from these] because they cannot contract uncleanness unless they are first rendered susceptible.*
- N. Said R. Huna the son of R. Joshua, “Produce that was not rendered susceptible to uncleanness is similar [with regard to the law of contracting uncleanness] to an oven that was not a finished product.” [Accordingly, the rules are parallel and you should be able to derive the rule for seeds from the others.]
- O. *But you may refute [the comparison] in the following manner: What is the case concerning the others? They contract uncleanness without contact. We may say that seeds [are different from these] because they can contract uncleanness only through contact. [This reasoning then has been refuted.]*
- P. *[Let us try another line of reasoning.] Let the Torah not write the rule for ovens and we*

*will derive it from the others. [But you may refute this as follows.] What is the case concerning the others? They are foodstuffs. [The reasoning has been refuted.]*

- Q. *[Let us try another line of reasoning.] Let the Torah not write the rule for carrion and we will derive it from the others. Indeed you may argue this.*
- R. *Why then do I need the rule for a handle stated with regard to carrion [if we can derive the rule from the other two]? If it does not pertain to the rule for a handle for carrion, let it pertain then to the rule for handles in general. [Accordingly, we have means to derive the rules for] a handle to contract [uncleanness], for a handle to impart [uncleanness] and for a protector to combine [to form the minimum quantity].*
- S. *And yet [in spite of these arguments] it is necessary to state the rule for a handle for the case of carrion. For if the Torah had not written the rule for handles in the case of carrion, I would have reasoned that in the case for which you logically deduce a rule from another source, that case is in other respects with regard to the law identical to the other source. What is the case concerning the others [i.e., ovens and seeds]? They do not render a person unclean. So even carrion does not render a person unclean. [And we know that this is not the case.]*
- T. *Rather we need to teach the rule for a handle for the case of carrion. We do not need to teach the rule for a protector for the case of carrion. To teach what [other] law did the Torah state that rule? If to teach that [a protector] combines [to form the minimum quantity], we say that it does not combine! [If you say it teaches that carrion] imparts [uncleanness], we derive this a fortiori from the rule for a handle.*
- U. *Rather if it does not pertain to the rule for a protector for carrion, let it pertain then to the rule for handles for carrion. And if it does not pertain to the rule for a handle for*

*carrion, let it pertain then to the rule for handles in general. [Accordingly, we have means to derive the rules for] a handle to contract [uncleanness], for a handle to impart [uncleanness] and for a protector to combine [to form the minimum quantity].*

- V. **[118b]** *But it makes [more] sense to maintain that if it does not pertain to the rule for a protector for the case of carrion, let it pertain then to the rule for protectors in general. [Accordingly, we have means to derive the rules for] a protector to contract [uncleanness] and for a protector to combine [to form the minimum quantity]. But we do not have [a means to derive the rule for] a handle to contract [uncleanness].*
- W. *But from the outset when the rule for handles is written, it is written to specify the rule for contracting [uncleanness]. Rather then why do I need to specify the rule for a protector for the case of carrion? For the case itself. What then is the conclusion? If it teaches that [a protector] combines [for the minimum], it was stated that it does not combine. If it teaches the rule for contracting and imparting [uncleanness], we may derive this a fortiori from the rule for a handle. [In this instance then] a matter that may be derived a fortiori, scripture went to the trouble of stating [anyway].*
- X. *If this is the case, then concerning protectors in general, it makes sense to maintain that the rules for contracting and imparting [uncleanness by a protector apply]. Although it is a matter that may be derived a fortiori, scripture went to the trouble of stating it [anyway].*
- Y. *Anytime we can, we derive another interpretation from the verse.*
- Z. *R. Habiba said, “The rule is different for a protector of carrion. Since it acts as if it were a handle [with regard to the law] let us apply it to the rule for handles [and not as suggested to the rule for protectors in general].”*

- AA. *R. Judah bar Samuel raised an objection to this, saying, Lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: **The nipple of the pomegranate joins together. And its sprouting hair does not join together** [M. Uqsin 2:3 C-D]. And why is this the case [that the nipple joins]? Recite here, “[And if any part of their carcass falls] upon any seed for sowing [that is to be sown, it is clean]” (Lev. 11:37) and we do not have that here [i.e., the nipple is not sown when the pomegranate is planted].*
- BB. *And furthermore, lo it was taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah: **The (1) hide, and (2) grease, and (3) sediment, and (4) flayed-off meat, and (5) bones, and (6) sinews, and (7) horns and (8) hooves join together [with the meat to which they are attached to form the requisite volume] to impart food uncleanness** [M. 9:1 A]. What is the source of this assertion? [How do we derive this from rules that pertain to seeds?]*
- CC. *Rather [here is how we explain things]: It is written three times in the verse: (1) “upon any seed”; (2) “for sowing”; (3) “that is to be sown” — one applies to the protectors of seeds, one applies to the protectors of [fruits from] trees, and the other one applies to the protectors of meat, eggs and fish.*

- I.3 A.** Said R. Hiyya bar Ashi, said Rab, “The rule of a handle pertains with regard to [the transfer of] uncleanness. But the rule of a handle does not apply with regard to rendering the object susceptible [to uncleanness].”
- B. Said R. Yohanan, “The rule of a handle pertains with regard to [the transfer of] uncleanness and with regard to rendering the object susceptible [to uncleanness].”
- C. *One what basis do they dispute this matter?*
- D. *If you prefer, [they dispute] on the basis of logic.*
- E. *And if you prefer, [they dispute] on the basis of a verse.*

- F. *And if you prefer, [they dispute] on the basis of a verse. One master reasons in accord with the view that they may interpret that a verse refers to the matter preceding it, but not to the matter preceding the preceding. And one master reasons in accord with the view that they may interpret that a verse refers to the matter preceding it, and to the matter preceding the preceding [“but if water is put” i.e., rendering it susceptible].*
- G. *And if you prefer, [they dispute] on the basis of logic. One master reasons in accord with the view that rendering it susceptible is the beginning of the process of rendering it unclean. And the other master reasons in accord with the view that rendering it susceptible is not the beginning of the process of rendering it unclean.*
- H. *There is a Tannaite teaching that supports the view of R. Yohanan: Just as the rule of handles pertains with regard to [the transfer of] uncleanness, it also pertains with regard to rendering the object susceptible [to uncleanness]. And just as it cannot become unclean unless it is detached, so too it cannot become susceptible unless it is detached.*

- I.4 A.** Said Rab, “There is no rule of a handle for anything less than an olive’s bulk. And there is no rule of a protector for anything less than the bulk of a pulse.”
- B. And R. Yohanan said, “There is a rule of a handle for something less than an olive’s bulk. And there is a rule of a protector for something less than the bulk of a pulse.”
  - C. *They raised an objection: **Two bones and on them [at one end] are two half olive’s bulks, and one brought their tips [at the other end] inside,** and the house overshadows them, the house is unclean. **Judah b. Naqosa says in the name of R. Jacob, “[Even if both of them are attached by Heaven, the house is clean,] for two bones do not join together to form two half-olive’s bulks” [T. Ahilot 4:8 A-B]. [119a]** How does this conform with the view of Rab? If he deems [the bone] a handle, then the first text [of C] is a problem [because it then implies there is a handle for less than an olive’s bulk]. And if he deems [the bone] a protector, then the last text is a problem [because it then implies that there is no protector for less than an olive’s bulk and Rab says that for more than the bulk of a pulse there is a protector].*
  - D. *If you prefer it makes sense to deem it a protector. Or if you prefer it makes sense to deem it a handle. If you prefer it makes sense to deem it a handle and he [Rab] states his view in accord with the*



view of Judah b. Naqosa [that there is a protector for less than an olive's bulk]. Or if you prefer it makes sense to deem it a protector and he [Rab] states his view in accord with the view of the first Tannaite authority [in T., i.e., there is no handle for less than an olive's bulk].

- E. And R. Yohanan would say all views [in T.] deem it a handle and he states his view in accord with the first Tannaite authority [in T., i.e., there is a handle for less than an olive's bulk].
- F. Come and take note: **R. Judah says, "A thigh-bone on which is an olive's bulk of meat, it leads the whole to [become] susceptible to uncleanness."** And sages [b. here: others] say, **"Even though there is on it only so much as a bean, it leads the whole thing to become susceptible to uncleanness [T. 2:5 A-B]."** How does this conform with the view of Rab? If he deems [the bone] a handle, then the last text [of A] is a problem [because it then implies there is a handle for less than an olive's bulk]. And if he deems [the bone] a protector, then the first text is a problem [because it then implies that there is no protector for less than an olive's bulk and Rab says that for more than the bulk of a pulse there is a protector].
- G. If you prefer it makes sense to deem it a handle and he [Rab] states his view in accord with the view of Judah. Or if you prefer it makes sense to deem it a protector and he [Rab] states his view in accord with the view of the others.
- H. And R. Yohanan would say all views [in T.] deem it a protector and he states his view in accord with the others. [But how can this be?] The others state their view that [the rule applies to] **"so much as a bean"** [contrary to the view of R. Yohanan]. Since the first Tannaite authority stated a quantity for his view, they also stated a quantity for their view. [But it need not be the size of a bean.]

- I. Raba said, "You may derive as well from the way it was taught that we are dealing [in T.] with [the rule for a] protector. For it taught, **"a thigh-bone"** [which ordinarily is a protector for the marrow contained within it]. We may derive this conclusion.

**I.5 A.** It was stated:

- B. R. Hanina said, "This [bean-bulk in T. above] is the minimum quantity."
- C. And R. Yohanan, said, "This is not the minimum quantity."
- D. [But how can you say,] "This is not the minimum quantity"? Lo it teaches, **"As much as a bean."**
- E. Since the first Tannaite authority stated a quantity for his view, they also stated a quantity for their view. [But it need not be the size of a bean.]

- F. *Come and take note:* **R. Eleazar b. Azariah declares [a pod] clean in the case of that of the bean, and declares [a pod] unclean in the case of [other] pulse, because one wants [to make use of them] in handling them [M. Uqsin 1:5 J-K].** [This implies that there are protectors for less than an olive's bulk.]
- G. *In accord with what R. Aha the son of Raba said [elsewhere], "The rule refers to] the stalk and it is [unclean] because it serves as a handle." Here too [we can say], "[The rule in M. refers to] the stalk and it is [unclean] because it serves as a handle."*
- H. *What then does it mean by, "[to make use of them] in handling them"?*
- I. [It means, "to make use of them] in carrying them."
- J. *For taught the House of R. Ishmael: "[And if any part of their carcass falls upon] any seed for sowing that is to be sown, [it is clean]" (Lev. 11:37). [This implies they become unclean when they are found] in the manner in which people take them out for planting: a grain of wheat with its husk, a grain of barley with its husk, a lentil with its husk. [Apparently the husks serve as protectors for the grains. Hence there are protectors for less than an olive's bulk.] [The rule regarding a complete] object [i.e., a grain or lentil] is different.*

**I.6 A.** *R. Oshaia posed a question concerning the protector of a food that [partially] split. Since this part does not protect the other part [of the food], and the other part does not protect this part [do we say that] they do not combine [together with the food to constitute the minimum quantity for uncleanness]? Or perhaps, since this part protects one part [of the food], and the other part protects its part [of the food], they do combine together.*

- B. *How can we imagine the situation at hand? Should we say that it is a case in which one is on top of the other? But then is there a consideration of a protector when one is on top of the other? And have we not learned in the Mishnah: R. Judah says, "There are three skins in an onion: (1) The inner one, whether whole or perforated, joins together; (2) the middle one, when whole, joins together, and when perforated, does not join together; (3) and the outer one, one way or the other, is insusceptible to uncleanness." [M. Uqsin 2:4 B-E]. [The*

outermost is a protector on top of a protector and is not susceptible.]

- C. *R. Oshaia means to raise the question of a Protector for food that has been split. Since this part does not afford protection for that part, and that part for this part, [the matter of combination does not arise]. Or perhaps, since this one affords protection for its part and that part for its part, they still join together.*
- D. *Come and take note: R. Eleazar b. Azariah declares [a pod] clean in the case of that of the bean, and declares [a pod] unclean in the case of [other] pulse, because one wants [to make use of them] in handling them [M. Uqsin 1:5 J-K]. [This implies that protectors combine together.]*
- E. *Said R. Aha the son of Raba, “[The rule refers to] the stalk and it is [unclean] because it serves as a handle.” Here too [we can say], “[The rule in M. refers to] the stalk and it is [unclean] because it serves as a handle.” What then does it mean by, “[to make use of them] in handling them”? [It means, “to make use of them] in carrying them.”*
- E. *Come and take note of that which has been taught by the House of R. Ishmael: “[And if any part of their carcass falls upon] any seed for sowing that is to be sown, [it is clean]” (Lev. 11:37). [This implies that protectors combine together.] In accord with what R. Aha the son of Raba said [elsewhere], “[The rule refers to] the stalk and it is [unclean] because it serves as a handle.” Here too [we can say], “[The rule refers to] the [wheat] stem and it is [unclean] because it serves as a protector.”*
- F. *This makes perfect sense if we refer to the upper grains because they need the lower [to protect them]. But do the lower grains need the upper ones [to protect them]? [This could be a case of a stem with] one row. But can there be an egg’s bulk of food in one row [of wheat grains]? [There could be] in the [giant] wheat of Simeon b. Shetah [cf. b. Taan. 23a]. Let us consider then, as long as we have come this far, [that we refer to a case] of one grain of [the giant] wheat of Simeon B. Shetah.*

**I.7 A.** *Reverting to the body of the prior text [I.5 C]: Two bones and on them [at one end] are two half-olive’s bulks, and one brought their tips [at the other end] inside, and the house overshadows them, the house is unclean. Judah b. Naqosa says in the name of R. Jacob, “[Even if both of them are attached by Heaven, the house is clean,] for*

**two bones do not join together to form two half-olive's bulks" [T. Ahilot 4:8 A-B].**

- B. *Said Resh Laqish, "They taught this matter only with regard to a bone, that it may be deemed a handle. But hair is not deemed a handle."*
- C. *And R. Yohanan said, "Even hair may be deemed a handle."*
- D. *R. Yohanan raised an objection to Resh Laqish: **Hide on which is an olive's bulk of [carrion] meat — that which touches the shred which juts forth from it, or hair which is on the opposite side, is unclean [M. 9:4A-B].** Is it not the case [that it is unclean] on account of it [the hair] being deemed a handle?*
- E. *No [it is unclean] on account of it being deemed a protector.*
- F. *But do we recognize a protector on top of a protector [i.e., that the hair on top of the hide can be deemed a protector with regard to uncleanness]? [This must refer to a case where the hair] penetrates [through to the flesh, so it is deemed to be one protector with regard to uncleanness].*
- G. *R. Aha bar Jacob posed by way of contradiction to this: But on this basis we should infer that there is no way that we can write [proper] tefillin. For lo we need to have perfect writing and this is lacking [because the holes where the hair was penetrate the parchment].*
- H. *[Aha] must have forgotten this [teaching]: They said in the West, "Any hole over which the ink passes, is not deemed to be a hole [to invalidate the writing]."*
- I. *And if you prefer [another possible explanation]: It is entirely [possible that the hair is deemed] a handle. In accord with what R. Ila said, "A bristle among bristles." Here too you may refer to a hair among hairs.*
- J. *And concerning what did R. Ila make his statement? Concerning this: **And the outer husks of ears of corn, lo, these contract uncleanness and impart uncleanness but do not join together [M. Uqsin 1:3 K-L].** How can one husk serve [as a handle? It will break right off.] Said R. Ila, "[It refers to a case of] a bristle among bristles."*

*[Where one grasps many together they do not break off.]*

- K. *Another version: Here too it makes more sense to conclude that it is deemed a protector. For if you concluded in accord with the view that holds it is deemed a handle, then what purpose can one hair serve? In accord with what R. Ila said, "A bristle among bristles." Here too you may refer to a hair among hairs.*
- L. *And concerning what did R. Ila make his statement? Concerning this: **And the outer husks of ears of corn, lo, these contract uncleanness and impart uncleanness but do not join together [M. Uqsin 1:3 K-L].** How can a husk serve [as a handle? It will break right off.] Said R. Ila, "[It refers to a case of] a bristle among bristles." *[Where one grasps many together they do not break off.]**
- M. *And there are those who teach [this dispute between Yohanan and Resh Laqish at B-C] [120a] pertaining to our Mishnah: **The (1) hide, and (2) grease, and (3) sediment, and (4) flayed-off meat, and (5) bones, and (6) sinews, and (7) horns and (8) hooves join together [with the meat to which they are attached to form the requisite volume] to impart food uncleanness, but [they do] not [join together to impart] uncleanness of carrion [M. 9:1 A].** [What follows draws on the preceding and presents it in an alternative order.]*
- N. *Said Resh Laqish, "They taught this matter only with regard to a bone, that it may be deemed a protector. But hair is not deemed a protector."*
- O. *And R. Yohanan said, "Even hair may be deemed a protector."*
- P. *But do we recognize a protector on top of a protector [i.e., that the hair on top of the hide can be deemed a protector with regard to*

*uncleanness]? [This must refer to a case where the hair] penetrates [through to the flesh, so it is deemed to be one protector with regard to uncleanness].*

Q. *R. Aha bar Jacob posed by way of contradiction to this: But on this basis we should infer that there is no way that we can write [proper] tefillin. For lo we need to have perfect writing and this is lacking [because the holes where the hair was penetrate the parchment].*

R. *[Aha] must have forgotten this [teaching]: They said in the West, "Any hole over which the ink passes, is not deemed to be a hole [to invalidate the writing]."*

S. *R. Yohanan raised an objection to Resh Laqish: **Hide on which is an olive's bulk of [carrion] meat — that which touches the shred which juts forth from it, or hair which is on the opposite side, is unclean [M. 9:4 A-B].** Is it not the case [that it is unclean] on account of it [the hair] being deemed a protector? No [it is unclean] on account of it being deemed a handle.*

T. *What purpose can one hair serve? In accord with what R. Ila said, "A bristle among bristles." Here too you may refer to a hair among hairs.*

U. *And concerning what did R. Ila make his statement? Concerning this: **And the outer husks of ears of corn, lo, these contract uncleanness and impart uncleanness but do not join together [M. Uqsin 1:3 K-L].** How can a husk serve [as a handle? It will break right*

*off.] Said R. Ila, "[It refers to a case of] a bristle among bristles." [Where one grasps many together they do not break off.]*

## **II.1 A. And grease [M. 9:1 A] — What is grease?**

- B. *Said Raba, "The fat."*
- C. *Said to him Abbayye, "That by itself would render unclean by virtue of the uncleanness of foods. Rather it [grease] is the gel that congeals [after seeping from the meat]."*
- D. *Why specify that it congeals? If it does not congeal it also [would combine in accord with the rules of Mishnah]. As Resh Laqish said, "The juice that is upon the vegetables combines to make up the quantity of a date's bulk on the Day of Atonement [to render a person liable for eating on the fast day]."*
- E. *[No, these cases are judged by different criteria.] There [regarding eating on the Day of Atonement] the criterion is the need to satisfy his hunger. Anything at all will satisfy his hunger. Here the criterion is combining [to form the requisite volume for uncleanness, for which it needs to be a solid]. If it gels, it combines. If it does not gel, it does not combine.*

## **III.1 A. And sediment [M. 9:1 A] — What is sediment?**

- B. *Said Raba, "The particles of meat that form a mush [Jastrow, s.v. pyrm', p. 1172]."*
- C. *Said to him Abbayye, "That by itself would render unclean by virtue of the uncleanness of foods. Rather [it is in accord with what] R. Pappa said, 'The spices.'"*
- D. *It was taught there on Tannaite authority: If someone coagulated blood and ate it, or dissolved forbidden fat and gulped it down, he is liable [b. Men. 21a].*
- E. *Now it makes perfect sense that, if someone coagulated blood and ate it, since he ate it, he conferred upon it the status [of food]. But where he dissolved forbidden fat and gulped it down, [why is he liable]? It is written concerning this that he [is liable only if he] eats. And lo this [gulping] is not eating.*
- F. *Said Resh Laqish, "Scripture stated, 'For every person [who eats of the fat of an animal of which an offering by fire is made to the Lord shall be cut off from his people]' (Lev. 7:25). [The specific language] serves to include in the rule one who drinks it."*
- G. *It was taught on Tannaite authority also with regard to leaven this very matter: If one dissolved it and swallowed it, if it is leaven, he is subject to the penalty of extirpation, but if it is unleavened, someone will not be able to carry out the obligation of eating unleavened bread on Passover with it [b. Pes. 35a].*
- H. *Now it makes perfect sense that, if it is not leavened, someone will not be able to carry out the obligation of eating unleavened bread on Passover with it. The Torah said [that it must be], "[You shall eat no leavened bread with it; seven days you shall eat it with unleavened bread,] the bread of affliction [— for you came out of the land of Egypt in hurried flight — that all the days of your life you may*



remember the day when you came out of the land of Egypt]" (Deu. 16: 3). *And this is not, "the bread of affliction."*

- I. *But [it does not make sense that], if it is leaven, he is subject to the penalty of extirpation. It is written concerning this that he [is liable only if he] eats.*
- J. *Said Resh Laqish, "Scripture stated, 'For every person [who eats of the fat of an animal of which an offering by fire is made to the Lord shall be cut off from his people]' (Lev. 7:25). [The specific language] serves to include in the rule one who drinks it."*
- K. *It was taught on Tannaite authority also with regard to carrion of a clean bird this very matter: If he melted it with a fire [and drank it], he is unclean. In the sun, he is clean. And we may bring up the question: It is written concerning this that he [is liable only if he] eats it.*
- L. *Said Resh Laqish, "Scripture stated, 'For every person [who eats of the fat of an animal of which an offering by fire is made to the Lord shall be cut off from his people]' (Lev. 7:25). [The specific language] serves to include in the rule one who drinks it."*
- M. *If this is the case, then [if he melted it] in the sun also [let him be unclean]. [If he melts it] in the sun it putrefies.*
- N. *And it is necessary [for scripture to teach all these cases, i.e., liquid fat, leaven and carrion of a bird]. For if the Torah had written the rule only for fat, the rule for leaven could not be derived from it. For [fat] never had a interval when it was valid [for eating and leaven did]. And the rule for carrion of a bird could not be derived from it. For [fat] carries the punishment of extirpation [for one who eats it and carrion does not].*
- O. *And if the Torah had written the rule only for leaven, the rule for fat could not be derived from it. For [leaven] there are no permitted exceptions [but there are for some fats]. And the rule for carrion of a bird could not be derived from it. For [leaven] carries the punishment of extirpation [for one who eats it and carrion does not].*
- P. *And if the Torah had written the rule only for carrion of a bird, neither of these could be derived from it. For [carrion] renders unclean through contact [and the others do not].*
- Q. *Okay. We cannot derive the other ones from one [rule stated in the Torah]. Let us derive one of them from the other two. Which two? Let the Torah not state the rule with regard to carrion of a clean bird and let us derive it from the other two. But [this will not work because] what is the rule for the other two? They carry the punishment of extirpation [for one who eats them, and carrion does not].*
- R. *Let the Torah not state the rule with regard to leaven and let us derive it from the other two. But [this will not work because] what is the rule for the other two? For [they] never had a interval when they were valid [for eating and leaven did].*
- S. *Let the Torah not state the rule with regard to fat and let us derive it from the other two. But [this will not work because] what is the rule for the*



*other two? For them, there are no permitted exceptions [but there are for some fats].*

- T. *And what are those [exceptions]? If you say it is the fat of an animal that is sacrificed that is permitted to be brought on the altar, [then consider regarding] carrion of a bird [a similar exception] is also permitted, [viz.] the bird killed by wringing the neck for a sacrifice on the altar. Rather [the exception must be] wild-animal-fat [that is permitted] to an ordinary person, [then consider regarding] carrion of a bird [a similar exception] is also permitted, [viz.] a bird killed by wringing the neck for a sin offering [is permitted] to the priests.*
- U. *Invariably [the exception for fat must be] wild-animal-fat that is permitted to an ordinary person. And the objection [that carrion of a bird is permitted to] priests [is not an effective objection]. When the priests receive [their portion of the sacrifices], they receive it from the table of the Most High [as a special gift, b. Bes. 21a].*

**III.2 A.** *Now lo it was taught on Tannaite authority: [The verse says,] “These are unclean [to you among all that swarm; whoever touches them when they are dead shall be unclean until the evening]” (Lev. 11:31). This specification prohibits [also] the fluids and gravy and froth from them [b. Hul. 112b].*

- B. *Why do I need to teach this derivation? Let us derive [the rule for these] from those [three rules relating to fat, leaven and carrion of a bird, above].*
- C. *It is necessary [to teach a separate derivation]. For if the Torah had not written this I would have reasoned that in the case for which you logically deduce a rule from another source, that case is in other respects with regard to the law identical to the other source. What is the case there [in the three cases]? There must be an olive’s bulk [for liability]. So too here [regarding swarming things], there must be an olive’s bulk [for liability. An the law is in fact that a lentil’s bulk is enough.]*
- D. **[120b]** *But [consider that] the Torah could have written [the rule] for swarming things and let us then derive these [other three] from it. [This cannot be done] because you could refute [the derivation on these grounds]: What is the case regarding swarming things? They are unclean in any amount at all. [And the minimum for the other three is an olive’s bulk.]*

**III.3 A.** *And lo it was taught on Tannaite authority: Untithed produce, new produce, consecrated produce, produce of the seventh year, produce of mixed kinds — for all of these, the liquids that ooze from them have the same status as the produce itself.*

- B. *What is the source of this rule? If you maintain that we derive it from these three [i.e., fat, leaven, carrion of a*

*bird, above, this will not work because we can object]. What is the case regarding these [three]? They are all prohibited by virtue of their self-defined status.*

- C. *We may grant [that you may derive the rule] wherever they are prohibited by virtue of their self-definition. But where they are not prohibited by virtue of their own self-definition [as in the case of consecrated produce], what is the source of the rule [that they are prohibited]? We may derive that from the case of first fruits.*
- D. For R. Yosé taught: “[You shall bring of the] fruit [of the ground]” (Deu. 26: 2) means] that you may bring fruit, but not juice. If [nonetheless] one brought grapes but then pressed them, how do we know [that he has carried out his obligation]? Scripture states, “Which you will bring,” [implying that you need only bring the fruit, but once you have brought it, you may press it into wine] [b. Arakhin 11a].
- E. *But you can refute this [as follows]. What is the case regarding first fruits? They need [when they are brought to perform the rites of] recitation and setting down. [Not so in the other instances.]*
- F. *Rather we may derive [the rule for produce not prohibited by its own self-definition] from the case of heave-offering. [That also must be defined by the owner.] And what is the source of the rule for heave-offering itself? It is juxtaposed in scripture to the [rule for] first fruits. And a master has said, “...the offering [trmh] of your hand’ (Deu. 12:17) refers to first fruits” [b. Meilah 16b]. [The word for heave-offering is used there in the sense of ordinary offering to refer to first fruits.] [But you can refute this derivation.] What is the case with regard to heave-offering? You are indeed [if you eat it] liable to the death penalty and to [the payment of] an added fifth [which is not the case with regard to consecrated things]. Rather we may derive [the rule for consecrated produce] from both of them [i.e.,] heave-offering and first fruits. [But you can refute this derivation as well.] What is the case with regard to heave-offering and first fruits? You are indeed [if you eat it] liable to the death penalty and to [the payment of] an added fifth [which is not the case with regard to consecrated things].*
- G. *Rather you may derive this [rule for consecrated things] from the rules for heave-offering and one of these [other three] or from the rules for first fruits and one of these [other three].*
- H. *And lo what was taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah: [As regards any of the following which have*

the status of heave-offering:] (1) honey made from dates, (2) wine made from apples, (3) vinegar made from winter grapes or (4) any other fruit juice in the status of heave-offering — R. Eliezer obligates [a nonpriest who unintentionally drinks any of these] to [payment of] the principal and [added] fifth. But R. Joshua exempts [M. [Terumot 11:2 A-C](#)].

- I. *What is the basis of their dispute? They dispute over the principle of whether when we draw an inference, it pertains throughout, or whether an inference is restricted to its original terms. [That is to say, the words used for establishing this analogy based on verbal correspondence are available for this particular purpose and no other, b. Yeb. 78b.]*
- J. *R. Eliezer reasons in accord with the view that when we draw an inference [it pertains throughout] — [i.e.,] what is the case regarding first fruits? Liquids that ooze from them have the same status as the produce itself. So also regarding heave-offering, liquids that ooze from them have the same status as the produce itself. And it pertains throughout — so what is the case regarding first fruits? Even other kinds [of liquids that ooze from them have the same status as the produce itself]. So too for heave-offering, even other kinds.*
- K. *And R. Joshua reasons in accord with the view that an inference is restricted to its original terms. [That is to say, the words used for establishing this analogy based on verbal correspondence are available for this particular purpose and no other.] What is the case regarding first fruits? Liquids that ooze from them have the same status as the produce itself. So also regarding heave-offering, liquids that ooze from them have the same status as the produce itself. And it is restricted to its own terms. What are the liquids that are holy with regard to heave-offering? Oil and wine, yes; other liquids, no. So too with regard to the rule that liquids that ooze from them have the same status as the produce itself — [this] applies to oil and wine, yes; to other liquids, no.*
- L. *And lo that which was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: **And they may not bring first fruits in the form of liquids, except for that which is produced from olives or grapes** [M. [Ter. 11:3 E-F](#)]. In accord with whose view is this? It accords with R. Joshua who said, “An inference is restricted to its original terms.” And he derives the rule for first fruits from that of heave-offering.*
- M. *And lo that which was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: **They do not receive the forty stripes for [drinking liquids made from produce which is] from the***

first three years of growth of a vineyard or orchard (see Lev. 19:23), except for [drinking] that which is produced from olives or grapes [M. Ter. 11:3 C-D]. *In accord with whose view is this? It accords with R. Joshua who said, “An inference is restricted to its original terms.” And he derives the rule for first fruits from that of heave-offering.*

- N. **[121a]** *And after that he extends it [the limitation to the liquids, oil and wine] to orlah based on the common use of the word “fruit” [in Lev. 19:23, “When you come into the land and plant all kinds of trees for food, then you shall count their fruit as forbidden; three years it shall be forbidden to you, it must not be eaten”] and in the rules for first fruits [in Deu. 26:1-2, “When you come into the land which the Lord your God gives you for an inheritance, and have taken possession of it, and live in it, you shall take some of the first of all the fruit of the ground, which you harvest from your land that the Lord your God gives you, and you shall put it in a basket, and you shall go to the place which the Lord your God will choose, to make his name to dwell there”].*

#### **IV.1 A. And flayed-off meat [‘lyl] [M. 9:1 A]:**

- B. *What is flayed-off meat?*
- C. R. Yohanan says, “Dead meat.”
- D. And Resh Laqish said, “Meat flayed-off by a knife.”
- E. *They posed an objection: “As for you, you whitewash with lies; worthless [‘lyl] physicians are you all” (Job. 13: 4). This [description] makes perfect sense according to the authority who holds the view that it is dead meat. That [kind of meat] is not subject to healing. But according to the authority who holds the view that it is meat flayed-off by a knife — it is subject to healing. [Accordingly we must say that] regarding the meaning of ‘ll in scripture there is a consensus [that it means dead meat]. Where is there a dispute? With regard to the meaning of ‘lyl in the Mishnah.*
- F. *Come and take note: R. Judah says, “The flayed-off meat which was collected together, if there is the volume of an olive’s bulk in one place — one is liable on its account [if one touched it and entered the Temple]” [M. 9:1 H]. And said R. Huna, “As long as he collected it himself [thus demonstrating his intent to use it].”*
- G. *This [rule] makes perfect sense according to the authority who holds the view that it is flayed-off meat. Concerning that, where there is an olive’s bulk he is liable. But according to the authority who holds the view that it is dead meat, where there is an olive’s bulk what does it matter? It is like wood [and should convey no uncleanness]!*
- H. *Regarding the view of R. Judah there is no dispute [that he holds ‘ll is flayed-off meat]. Where is there a dispute? According to the view of the rabbis. R. Yohanan*

says, “Dead meat also combines [together to make up an olive’s bulk with regard to uncleanness].” And Resh Laqish said, “Only in the specific case of meat played-off by a knife [does it combine]. But dead meat does not combine.”

- I. This “meat played-off by a knife” — what is the situation? If he treated it as a significant entity, then even by itself it should be subject to uncleanness. And if he did not treat it a significant entity, then it is surely considered a null entity.
- J. R. Abin and R. Meyasha [disputed the interpretation of this matter]. One said, “He treated part of [the played-off meat] as a significant entity. [By itself, it would not be subject to uncleanness. But it would combine together with other meat, to be subject to uncleanness.]” And one said, “Part of the meat was played-off by a wild animal and part of the meat was played-off by a knife. [The part played by an animal would be subject to uncleanness if combined with other meat.]”

**IV.2 A. It was taught there in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: The beak and the claws are susceptible to uncleanness and convey uncleanness and join together [M. Toh. 1:2C].**

- B. But the beak is like wood [and should not be subject to uncleanness].
- C. Said R. Eleazar, “It means the lower section of the beak.”
- D. But the lower section of the beak is also like wood.
- E. Said R. Pappa, “It means the lower [membrane (Cashdan)] of the upper section [of the beak].”
- F. **The claws** — Said R. Eleazar, “It means the part embedded in the flesh.”
- G. **Horns [M. 9:1A]** — Said R. Pappa, “[It means the part] at the place where if they cut them, they bleed.”

**V.1 A. Similarly: He who slaughters unclean cattle for a gentile, while it yet is writhing — it imparts food uncleanness, but [it does] not [impart] uncleanness of carrion — until it dies, or until one will cut off its head. [Scripture] has [prescribed] more [conditions] to impart food uncleanness than uncleanness of carrion [M. 9:1 B-G]:**

- B. Said R. Assi, “They teach: [Concerning] an Israelite [who slaughtered] an unclean animal and a gentile [who slaughtered] a clean animal — [in order that the meat be susceptible to uncleanness] they must deliberately [treat it as a food] and it must be rendered susceptible [to uncleanness] by liquid from another source.”
- C. Why do I need to specify “it must be rendered susceptible [to uncleanness]”? It subsequently will be subject to a more severe uncleanness [of carrion]. And [we have a principle that] anything that subsequently will be subject to a more severe form of uncleanness *does not need to be rendered susceptible [to be subject to a less severe form of uncleanness]*.
- D. For taught R. Ishmael: “But if water is put on the seed [and any part of their carcass falls on it, it is unclean to you]” (Lev. 11:38) — What is the case with regard to seeds? They will not subsequently be subject to a more severe uncleanness. They need to be rendered susceptible [before they become unclean by a less severe form of uncleanness]. Accordingly, anything that will not

subsequently be subject to a more severe uncleanness needs to be rendered susceptible [before it becomes unclean by a less severe form of uncleanness].

- E. *And it was taught on Tannaite authority:* Why did they say that the carrion of a clean bird — they must deliberately [treat it as a food] and it need not be rendered susceptible [to uncleanness by liquid]? Because **[121b]** it will subsequently be subject to a more severe form of uncleanness. [Why then the rule of our Mishnah?]
- F. Said Hezekiah, “Since [there is the possibility in the case of meat that] one could scrape off thin slices [before the animal dies], limiting each to less than an olive’s bulk [so that it never becomes unclean in a more severe form as carrion].” [Thus the principle does not apply to it and it has to be rendered susceptible.]
- G. *Said R. Jeremiah to R. Zira, “But how could Hezekiah say this? For, lo it was stated:* If one slaughtered the two organs [of the throat] or the major portion of the two organs and it is still writhing —
- H. Hezekiah said, “It is not subject to [the prohibition for gentiles against eating] limbs [from a live animal].”
- I. And R. Yohanan said, “It is subject to [the prohibition for gentiles against eating] limbs [from a live animal].”
- J. Hezekiah said, “It is not subject to [the prohibition for gentiles against eating] limbs [from a live animal].” For it is dead.
- K. And R. Yohanan said, “It is subject to [the prohibition for gentiles against eating] limbs [from a live animal].” For it is not dead.
- L. He [Zira] said to him, “It is no longer categorized as a live animal. But it is not yet categorized as a dead animal.”

**V.2 A.** *Reverting to the body of the prior text [G]:* If one slaughtered the two organs [of the throat] or the major portion of the two organs and it is still writhing —

- B. Hezekiah said, “It is not subject to [the prohibition for gentiles against eating] limbs [from a live animal].”
- C. And R. Yohanan said, “It is subject to [the prohibition for gentiles against eating] limbs [from a live animal].”

D. *Said R. Eleazar, “Take the statement of R. Yohanan in your hand. For R. Oshaia taught the law in accord with his view.” For taught R. Oshaia: **An Israelite who slaughtered an unclean animal for a gentile and slaughtered in it two or the greater part of two [organs of the throat], and it is still jerking — it contaminates with the uncleanness of foods but not with the uncleanness of carrion.***

E. **A limb which separates from it is as if it separated from the living creature, and flesh which separates from it is as if it separated from a living creature. And it is prohibited [for use] by the children of Noah, and even if the beast died. [If] one (T.: killed it by stabbing), slaughtered in it one or the greater part of one [organ of the throat], it does not contaminate through the uncleanness**

of foods. [If] he (T.: cut so much as renders it *terefah*) killed it by stabbing, there is no uncleanness pertaining to it at all.

- F. And a gentile who slaughtered a clean beast for an Israelite and slaughtered in it two or the greater part of two [organs of the throat], and it is still jerking — it renders unclean as does food, but does not render unclean as does carrion, and a limb which separates from it is as if it separates from a living creature, and flesh which separates from it is as if it separates from a living creature. And it is prohibited [for use] by the children of Noah, and even if the beast dies. [If] (T.: he killed it by stabbing) he slaughtered in it one [organ of the throat] or the greater part of one, it does not render unclean as foods convey uncleanness. [If] (T.: he slaughtered in it one [organ of the throat] or the greater part of one) he killed it by stabbing, no uncleanness pertains to it at all. [If] a gentile cut only so much as does not render *terefah*, and an Israelite came and completed it [the slaughtering], it is permitted for eating [T. *Ahilot* 2:1A-C].
- G. If an idolater slaughtered [part of the organ] at a place which would not render the animal *terefah* and an Israelite came and finished [slaughtering it], it is valid. If an Israelite slaughtered [part of the organ] whether at a place which would render the animal *terefah*, or at a place which would not render the animal *terefah*, and an idolater came and finished [slaughtering it], the act of slaughter is invalid.
- H. [It was taught on Tannaite authority]: If he wants to eat [meat] from an animal before its soul departs, he cuts an olive's bulk of meat from the place of the slaughter, and he salts it well, and he rinses it well, and he waits until the soul departs, and he eats it. Either an Israelite or an idolater is permitted to do this.
- I. This supports the view of R. Idi bar Abin. For said R. Idi bar Abin, said R. Isaac bar Ashian, "If he wants to become healthy, he cuts an olive's bulk of meat from the place of the slaughter of the beast, and he salts it well, and he rinses it well, and he waits until the soul departs, and he eats it. Either an Israelite or an idolater is permitted to do this." [F-G = b. Hul. 33a].
- J. R. Eleazar posed a question: If he [the gentile] delayed [while slaughtering] it, or if he pressed [while slaughtering] it, what is the law?



- K. *Said to him an old man, "This is what R. Yohanan said, 'He needs to perform a valid act of slaughter just as he would for a clean animal.'"*
- L. *How far [must he go to make it] valid? Said R. Samuel bar Isaac, "[He even needs] to inspect the knife [for defects]."*
- M. *R. Zira posed a question of R. Sheshet, "What is the law as to whether the animal saves objects that are inside it from contracting uncleanness?"*
- N. *He said to him, "How can it be unclean on account of the uncleanness of foods and yet save [objects inside it from contracting uncleanness]?"*
- O. *He said to him, "Since it is not unclean as carrion, why should it not save [objects inside it from contracting uncleanness]?"*
- P. *Said Abbaye, "It does not save objects that are inside it for lo it is unclean on account of the uncleanness of foods. But a person who engages in bestiality with it is liable for lo it is not unclean as carrion."*

**VI.1 A. R. Judah says, "The flayed-off meat which was collected together, if there is the volume of an olive's bulk in one place — one is liable on its account [if one touched it and entered the Temple]" [M. 9:1H].**

- B. *Said R. Huna, "And only if he collected it."*
- C. *And said R. Huna, "Two half-olive bulks [of meat] that were stuck to the hide, the hide nullifies them."*
- D. **[122a]** *In accord with which authority [did Huna state his view]? If we say in accord with R. Ishmael, lo he said that the hide does not nullify them [viz., "If there were on it two half-olive's bulks, it imparts uncleanness to the one who carries it, but not to the one who touched it," the words of R. Ishmael (M. 9:4C)].*
- E. *And if in accord with R. Aqiba, this is obvious. Lo he says [explicitly] that the hide nullifies them [viz., R. Aqiba says, "Neither to the one who touches it nor to the one who carried it..."] And on what account does R. Aqiba declare clean in the case of hide? Because the hide nullifies them (M. 9:4 D-H)].*
- F. *Invariably it must be in accord with R. Ishmael. And where Ishmael said that the hide does not nullify them, that concern applies where a wild beast tore off [the hide with the flesh attached]. But where a knife removed [the hide, the pieces attached to it] are nullified.*
- G. *Come and take note: R. Judah says, "The flayed-off meat which was collected together, if there is the volume of an olive's bulk in one place — one is liable on its account [if one touched it and entered the Temple]" [M. 9:1 H]. Said R. Huna, "And only if he collected it."*
- H. *If you wish you may say it makes perfect sense [if you hold the view that] where a knife removed it, according to R. Ishmael it also is not nullified. R. Huna then states the matter in accord with the view of R. Ishmael. But if you wish to say that*



*[you hold the view that] where a knife removed it, according to R. Ishmael it is nullified, then in accord with whose view does R. Huna state the matter?*

- I. *But invariably [you hold the view that] where a knife removed it, according to R. Ishmael it also is not nullified. And R. Huna states the matter in accord with the view of R. Aqiba.*
- J. *But this is obvious!*
- K. *[No.] What might you have maintained? When did R. Aqiba state [his view]? His concern applies only where a knife removed it. But where a wild beast tore off [the hide] it is not nullified. It comes to teach us the novel point that the basis for the view of R. Aqiba is that the hide nullifies them. It makes no difference whether a knife removed it or whether a wild beast tore off [the hide]. [It is nullified]. As it is taught in the latter text of the Mishnah: **And on what account does R. Aqiba declare clean in the case of the hide? Because the hide nullifies them.***

## 9:2

- A. **[In the case of] these, their skin [hide] is deemed equivalent to their meat:**
  - B. **(1) the skin of man, and (2) skin of a domesticated pig —**
  - C. **R. Yosé says, “Also: The hide of a wild boar” —**
  - D. **and (3) skin of the hump of a young camel, and (4) the skin of the head of a young calf, and (5) the skin of the hooves, and (6) the skin of the genitals, and (7) the skin of the foetus, and (8) the skin which is under the fat tail, and (9) the skin of the hedgehog, and the chameleon, and the lizard, and the snail.**
  - E. **R. Judah says, “The lizard is equivalent to the weasel.”**
  - F. **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],**
  - G. **except for the skin of man.**
  - H. **R. Yohanan b. Nuri says, “The eight creeping things (Lev. 11:29-30) have hides.”**
- I.1** A. 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.”
- B. *And there are those who taught [that 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. 9:2 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” [b. Nid. 55a].
- C. *The authority who taught that it pertains to the former text of the Mishnah-paragraph most certainly applies the same principle to the latter text of the Mishnah-paragraph. But the authority who taught that it pertains to the latter text of the Mishnah-paragraph [would say that only*

*there is prohibition based on the declaration of the sages]. But in the case of the former text of the Mishnah-paragraph, the uncleanness is based on the authority of the Torah itself.*

**II.1 A. The skin of a domesticated pig — R. Yosé says, “Also: The hide of a wild boar” [M. 9:2 B-C]:**

- B. *What is the basis for this dispute? One master [the anonymous Tannaite authority] reasons in accord with the view that [the skin of] this one [the wild boar] is hard and [the skin of] this one [a domesticated pig] is soft. And one master [Yosé] reasons in accord with the view that [the skin of] this one [the wild boar] is also soft.*

**III.1 A. [The] skin of the hump of a young camel [M. 9:2 D]:**

- B. And until when is it **a young camel**?
- C. Said Ulla, said R. Joshua b. Levi, “As long as it has not carried [a load].”
- D. *R. Jeremiah posed a question: If it matured to the stage where it could carry and it did not yet actually carry [a load], what is the law [with regard to the status of its skin]?*
- E. *Abbaye posed a question: If it had not matured to the stage where it could carry and it did actually carry [a load], what is the law [with regard to the status of its skin]?*
- F. *The questions stand unresolved.*
- G. *Resh Laqish sat in session and posed the question: And until when is it a young camel? Said to him R. Ishmael bar Abba, “This is what R. Joshua b. Levi said, ‘As long as it has not carried [a load].’”*
- H. *He [Resh Laqish] said to him, “Sit next to me.”*
- I. *R. Zira sat in session and posed the question: And until when is it a young camel?*
- J. *Said to him Rabin bar Hinnena, “This is what Ulla said that R. Joshua b. Levi said, ‘As long as it has not carried [a load].’”*
- K. *He [Rabin] then repeated this [to Zira]. He [Zira] said to him, “You’ve got one [rule to teach us] and you’ve already said it!” Come and see [from the contrast between the actions of these masters] what is the difference between [Resh Laqish who supposedly was one of] the brawny men of the Land of Israel [who acted properly] and [R. Zira who supposedly was one of] the pious men of Babylonia [who acted improperly].*

**IV.1 A. The skin of the head of a young calf [M. 9:2 D]:**

- B. And until when is it **A young calf**?
- C. Ulla said, “Until it is one year old.”
- D. R. Yohanan said, “As long as it suckles.”
- E. *A question was posed to him: What did Ulla mean to say? Until it is one year old and only if it suckles? [122b] And R. Yohanan said to him [age makes no difference] as long as it suckles [it is a young calf]. Or perhaps [Ulla meant] until it is one year old whether or not it continues to suckle? And R. Yohanan said*

to him [it can be deemed young] until it is one year old, only if it suckles [but not if it stops suckling before a year passed].

- F. Come and take note: R. Yohanan said, “As long as it suckles.” And if it were [in accord with the latter that he requires both], then he should have stated, “Only if it suckles.” We may derive from this the conclusion [that the interpretation accords with the former view that the only criterion for Yohanan is whether it suckles].

**IV.2 A. Resh Laqish posed a question to R. Yohanan, “The skin of the head of a young calf — what is its status regarding the transfer of uncleanness?”**

- B. He said to him, “It does not render unclean [other objects through contact].” He said to him, “Did not our rabbi teach us [in the Mishnah-passage], [In the case of] these, their skin [hide] is deemed equivalent to their meat: ... the skin of the head of a young calf?
- C. He said to them, “Stop annoying me. For I teach this as my personal view.”
- D. For it was taught on Tannaite authority, He who slaughters the burnt-offering [with the intention] to eat an olive’s bulk of the hide from under the tail outside of its proper place [M. Zeb. 2:2 E], it is unfit and there is for this no punishment of extirpation. [If he did so with intention to eat it] after its proper time, it is refuse. And they are liable on its account to the punishment of extirpation [T. Zeb. 2:3 A-D].
- E. Eliezer b. Judah of Eiblayim said in the name of R. Jacob, and so R. Simeon b. Judah of Kefar Akkum says in the name of R. Simeon, “The same applies to the hide of the hooves, or the soft skin of the head of a calf, or the skin under the tail, or all [the places] that were listed by the sages regarding uncleanness whose hide has the same status as the flesh [of those places] [cf. T. Zeb. 2:3 F-G].”
- F. This includes [by inference] the skin of the pudenda [of an animal that he slaughtered with intention to eat it] outside of its proper place, it is invalid but there is for this no punishment on account of extirpation. [If he did so with intention to offer it] after its proper time, it is refuse and they are liable to punishment on account of extirpation [cf. T. Zeb. 2:3 H-I].

**V.1 A. The skin of the hooves [M. 9:2 D] —**

- B. What is the skin of the hooves?
- C. Rab said, “The actual skin of the hooves.”
- D. R. Hanina said, “The metatarsus which is sold with the head [as offal] (Cashdan).”

**VI.1 A. And the skin of the hedgehog [M. 9:2D] — Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: “[These] are unclean [to you among all that swarm; whoever touches them when they are dead shall be unclean until the evening]” (Lev. 11:31) — which encompasses their hides in the classification of their flesh. You might infer [that this inference applies to] all of them [i.e., the creatures mentioned in verses 29-30: “And these are unclean to you among the swarming things that swarm upon the earth: the weasel, the mouse, the great lizard according to its kind, the gecko, the land crocodile, the lizard, the sand lizard, and the chameleon.”] It comes to inform us that, “These” [mentioned in verse 30 are subsumed under the rule].**

- B. *But lo “These” is written concerning all of them [mentioned in verses 29-30]. Said Rab, [The language] “According to its kind” separates the matters [in the two verses from one another].*
- C. *But why not treat the chameleon as a member of the same class [of creatures]? Said R. Samuel bar Isaac, “Rab has the authority of a Tannaite authority and he taught [that we include] the chameleon.” But lo, our Tannaite authority did not teach [that we include] the chameleon!*
- D. *Said R. Sheshet the son of R. Idi bar Abin [Arukh: said R. Ashi], “Our Tannaite authority reasons in accord with the view of R. Judah who bases his view on the texture [of the skin]. And they disputed regarding the texture of the lizard.” [M. 9:2 D-E: And the lizard, and the snail. R. Judah says, “The lizard is equivalent to the weasel.”]*

**VII.1** A. *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. R. Yohanan b. Nuri says, “The eight creeping things (Lev. 11:29-30) have hides” [M. 9:2 F-H]. [This implies that] If he trampled upon them, yes [they are clean]. If he did not trample on them, no [they are not clean]. But lo taught R. Hiyya, “The ear of an ass that he patched onto his basket is clean.” [This implies that] if he patched it on, it is clean even though he did not trample upon it. If he did not patch it on, then if he trampled upon it, yes [it is clean]. If he did not trample upon it, no [it is not clean, in accord with our rule].*

- B. *How much trampling constitutes processing? Said R. Huna, said R. Yannai, “Four miles worth [of trampling].”*

**VII.2** A. *Said R. Abbahu, said Resh Laqish, “For [the purposes of] kneading dough [in cleanness], praying [together with a congregation], and [procuring water for] washing one’s hands [one must go out of his way up to] four miles.”*

- B. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, [123a] “Aybo said this. And he stated four [things in his list] and one of them was [the amount of trampling needed for] processing.”*
- C. *Said R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, “They only taught this rule [that he must go four miles out of his way] if that means he would have to go forward. But if it means he would have to go backward, then they do not make him backtrack even one mile.”*
- D. *R. Aha bar Jacob said, “Based on this [I would infer] that he does not have to backtrack one mile. Lo, less than one mile he would have to backtrack [for the stated purposes].”*

**VIII.1** A. **[Except for the skin of man:]**

- B. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority [in T.]: **A legion that is going from place to place and enters a house, the house is unclean. [T.: he who overshadows it is unclean]. For every legion has with it some [human] scalps [T. 8:16 B-D].***
- C. *And do not be astonished at this. For we know that the scalp of R. Ishmael rested on the head of kings.*

## 9:3

- A. **He who flays**
- B. **a beast or a wild animal, whether clean or unclean,**

- C. whether large or small
- D. for the purpose [of making] a covering — [the skin is deemed connected to the carcass so that it contracts from, and conveys uncleanness to, the carcass, as long as there is not yet flayed] enough for a hold [on the carcass];
- E. for the purpose of a water-skin — [the skin is deemed connected to the carcass] until he will flay the breast.
- F. [He who flays] from the feet upwards — it is wholly connected for uncleanness,
- G. for contracting uncleanness and for imparting uncleanness.
- H. [If he did not yet flay the] hide which is on the neck —
- I. R. Yohanan b. Nuri says, “It is not connected.”
- J. And sages say, “It is connected,
- K. “until he will flay off the whole of it.”

- I.1 A. *Beyond this point [i.e., if he flayed, leaving less than enough for a hold] what is the case?*
- B. *Said Rab, “Whatever was flayed off is clean.”*
- C. *R. Assi said, “[The skin] within a handbreadth of the flesh [of the animal is a handle and if it comes into contact with uncleanness it renders the animal] unclean.”*
- D. *They raised an objection: He who flays this much [as specified in the Mishnah-passage, leaving enough for a hold, the skin is deemed connected to the carcass]. [He who flays] beyond this point — he who touches the flayed off part is clean [because the remainder does not serve as a handle to connect the skin to the carcass]. Is it not the case [that this rule includes] even [the skin] within a handbreadth of the flesh [in contradiction to the statement in A]? No, excluding [the skin] within a handbreadth of the flesh.*
- E. *Come and take note [in support of this interpretation]: [He who touches] the skin opposite the flesh [of a carcass] is unclean. [This states only that he who touches] the skin opposite the flesh is unclean. Lo, [it implies that he who touches the skin] within a handbreadth of the flesh is clean. [No, this is not a valid inference.] The Tannaite authority could be calling “[the skin] within a handbreadth of the flesh” “the skin opposite the flesh [thus including it in the rule].”*
- F. *Come and take note: **He who flays a beast or a wild animal, whether clean or unclean, whether large or small for the purpose [of making] a covering — [the skin is deemed connected to the carcass so that it contracts from, and conveys uncleanness to, the carcass, as long as there is not yet flayed] enough for a hold [on the carcass] [M. 9:3 A-D] and [the skin] within a handbreadth of the flesh is clean. [Cf. T. 8:18 A-C: And how much is enough for a hold? The area of a handbreadth, doubled.]***
- G. *In that case what are we dealing with? With the first handbreadth [nearest the flesh].*
- H. *It was taught: How much constitutes **enough for a hold**? A handbreadth. But lo it was taught on Tannaite authority: Two handbreadths.*
- I. *Said Abbaye, “[It meant to say] **within a handbreadth, doubled.**”*

- J. *There is a Tannaite teaching also that accords with this: And how much is enough for a hold? The area of a handbreadth, doubled [T. 8:18 B-C].*

**The following serves M. Kel. 28:8B and is inserted here because it draws upon our Mishnah-paragraph in the corpus of evidence used in the analytical process.**

- I.2 A.** *It was taught there in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: A cloak that one began to tear, once one has torn the greater part, is not connected [M. Kel. 28:8 B] and it is clean.*
- B. *Said R. Nahman, said Rabbah bar Abbuha, "They only taught this matter with regard to a cloak that had been immersed on that same day. For since he did not care for it enough to refrain from immersing it, he will not care for it enough to refrain from tearing the greater part of it. But concerning a cloak that had not been immersed on that same day, they did not decree [the rule that it is clean because] perhaps he will not come to tear the greater part of [what remains of] it."*
- C. *Said Rabbah, "I can offer two responses to the matter [that you stated that the rule applies only to a cloak immersed on that day]. First, [we cannot restrict the rule in that way] lest people say that immersion of an article suffices for it on that day [to render it clean, and they need not wait until evening]. And furthermore, [123b] [consider by analogy the rule with regard to] the whole burnt-offering of a bird according to the view of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon [i.e., the priest must cut the major part of the two organs for it to be valid]. Let them decree [regarding that case that it is not valid] lest perhaps he not come to cut the major part of two [organs for fear that he will sever the head entirely and thus render the bird invalid]."*
- D. *Said to him R. Joseph, "Concerning [the first objection] that you stated, [i.e.,] lest people say that immersion of an article suffices for it on that day, [I argue that] the tear itself will suffice as proof [and no one will make the incorrect assumption]. [And concerning the second objection] that you stated, [i.e.,] the whole burnt-offering of a bird according to the view of R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon, [I argue that] priests are meticulous [in what they do and thus will not fear making an error that will invalidate the sacrifice]."*
- E. *Come and take note: He who flays a beast or a wild animal, whether clean or unclean, whether large or small for the purpose [of making] a covering — [the skin is deemed connected to the carcass so that it contracts from, and conveys uncleanness to, the carcass, as long as there is not yet flayed] enough for a hold [on the carcass] [M. 9:3 A-D]. Lo [this implies that if he flayed] more than [that so there remained less than] enough for a hold, it is clean [because there is no handle connecting the skin to the carcass]. Why is this the case? Let them decree [that it is unclean] lest perhaps he does [flay] only [exactly] enough for a hold and he touches the unclean [carcass by touching the skin] and we declare that he is clean.*



- F. *If we are dealing with a case of uncleanness based on the authority of the Torah, that would indeed be the case [that we decree it to be unclean]. But in that case what are we dealing with? With uncleanness based on the authority of the rabbis. [The person was unclean by virtue of a rabbinic decree and the animal was a Holy Thing. So we do not decree the animal unclean under these circumstances.]*
- G. *This settles the matter with regard to an unclean person [who comes into contact in this manner] with a clean carcass. But what about a clean person [who comes into contact in this manner] with an unclean carcass? The uncleanness [of carrion] is based on the authority of the Torah. [So we should decree the person unclean under these circumstances.]*
- H. *[We can say that we are dealing with a carcass of a] terefah-animal. But is a terefah-animal able to transmit uncleanness? Yes. In accord with the rule of the father of Samuel. For said the father of Samuel, “A terefah-animal that one slaughtered renders Holy Things unclean.”*
- I. *[With reference to the following, **If he did not yet flay the] hide which is on the neck — R. Yohanan b. Nuri says, “It is not connected.” And sages say, “It is connected, until he will flay off the whole of it” (M. 9:3 H-K)], Come and take note: R. Dosetai b. Judah says in the name of R. Simeon, “He who flays [the skin] in the case of creeping things — the whole is deemed connected” [cf. M. 9:2 H, 9:3 J-K] [T. 8:19 A]. Lo in the case of [one who flays the skin off] a camel, it is not connected.***
- J. *Do not maintain: Lo in the case of [one who flays the skin off] a camel, **it is not connected**. Rather, maintain: [In the case of one who flays the skin of a camel] except for the skin which is on the neck, **it is not connected**. And this accords with the view of R. Yohanan b. Nuri.*
- I.3** A. *Said R. Huna in the name of R. Simeon b. R. Yosé, “They learned the rule [that once torn a garment is clean of prior uncleanness, referring back to I.2 A] only if one has not left enough of the cloth to be used as an apron, but if one has left enough of the cloth not torn to be used as an apron, it is deemed joined [to the rest and therefore the garment remains unclean] [b. Zeb. 94b].”*
- B. *Said Resh Laqish, “They learned the rule only with regard to a cloak. But with regard to [one who tears up an unclean garment made of] leather — it is sturdy [and if they piece it back together it regains its original status including its uncleanness].”*
- C. *And R. Yohanan said, “Even leather is not sturdy [enough. And if it is torn to shreds and pieced together it does not regain its original status].”*
- D. *R. Yohanan raised an objection to Resh Laqish: **A hide that is unclean with midras uncleanness and that one intended [to use] for straps and sandals — “Once one has placed the knife on it, it is clean,” the words of R. Judah. And sages say, “Until one will diminish it [to] less than five handbreadths [it is still unclean] [M. Kel. 26:9 A-C].” Once he diminishes it [to less than that size], behold it is clean! Why is this the case? Let him maintain that it is sturdy [in accord with the view of Resh Laqish]!***

- E. *[But we could argue that] where do we say it is sturdy? Where he cut it straight in one direction. In that case [in M. Kel.] what are we dealing with? Where he cut it in all directions [and it can no longer be pieced back in a sturdy manner].*
- F. *R. Jeremiah objected [varying I.3 A]: **He who flays a beast or a wild animal, whether clean or unclean, whether large or small for the purpose [of making] a covering — [the skin is deemed connected to the carcass so that it contracts from, and conveys uncleanness to, the carcass, as long as there is not yet flayed] enough for a hold [on the carcass] [M. 9:3 A-D].** Lo [this implies that if he flayed] more than [that so there remained less than] enough for a hold, it is clean [because there is no handle connecting the skin to the carcass]. Why is this the case? Let him maintain that it is sturdy [and can be put back]!*
- G. *R. Abin interpreted the matter: One by one [as the pieces of skin are flayed] they fall off [and cannot be restored to the flesh].*
- H. *R. Joseph objected [varying II.1 A]: **[If he did not yet flay the] hide which is on the neck — R. Yohanan b. Nuri says, “It is not connected” [M. 9:3H-I].** Why is this the case? Let him maintain that it is sturdy [and can be put back]!*
- I. *Said to him Abbaye, “Consider the latter text of the Mishnah-passage: **And sages say, ‘It is connected, [until he will flay off the whole of it].’**” Rather, said Abbaye, “They disputed regarding the status of a protector that was about to fall off on its own. One master reasoned in accord with the view that it is a valid protector. And the other master reasoned in accord with the view that it is not a valid protector.”*
- J. *R. Jeremiah objected: **[As to] an oven which was made unclean — how do they clean it? One divides it in three [equal] parts and scrapes off the plastering [124a] so that it is on the ground. R. Meir says, “One does not need to scrape off the plastering, and not down to the earth. But one cuts it down [to] within four handbreadths” [M. Kel. 5:7 A-C].** But if he cuts it down [to] within four handbreadths behold it is clean! Why is this the case? Let him maintain that it is sturdy [and can be put back together]!*
- K. *Said to him Raba, “Consider the view of the rabbis that he **scrapes off the plastering so that it is on the ground.**” Rather said Raba, “Here is how you should state the matter: **[As to] an oven which was made unclean — how do they clean it? All parties agree that one divides it in three [equal] parts and scrapes off the plastering so that it is on the ground.***
- L. *And one who wants to make sure that his oven does not become unclean, what does he do? **One divides it in three [equal] parts and scrapes off the plastering so that it is on the ground. R. Meir says, “One does not need to scrape off the plastering, and not down to the earth. But one cuts it down [to] within four handbreadths.”***
- M. *And they raised a contradiction: **A baking oven — “Its beginning [is] four [handbreadths]. And its remnants [are] four [handbreadths],”** the words of R. Meir. And sages say, “Under*



**what circumstances? In the case of a large one, but in the case of a small one — its beginning is any size at all, and its remnants [to remain susceptible] are the larger part [of the original oven]” [M. Kel. 5:1 A-E].**

- N. And how much is **any size at all**? Said the House of R. Yannai, “A handbreadth. For they make ovens a handbreadth [as a toy (Rashi), and larger for practical use].”
- O. *The basis [for it to remain unclean] is that its remnants [are] four [handbreadths]. But lo, [from this we may draw the inference that] if its remnants are not four [handbreadths], it is clean.* [This is contrary to M. Kel. 5:7 that prescribes that one must break the oven into three parts and makes no reference to the minimum size of four handbreadths.]
- P. *They said [in response]: there [in 5:1 the case is that] he broke it widthwise [and if the parts are less than four it is not usable and therefore clean]. Here [in 5:7 the case is that] he broke it lengthwise [and he must divide it at least into thirds so that no single part is a major portion of the oven.]*
- Q. *Said the master: **And its remnants [to remain susceptible] are the larger part [of the original oven].** Of what use is the greater part of [a small oven the size of] a handbreadth?*
- R. *Said Abbaye, “The remnants of a large oven are the larger part [of the original oven].” But lo, the rabbis said, **[And its remnants are] four [handbreadths].** There is no contradiction. This one [view of the rabbis in the Mishnah passage] refers to an oven that is [originally] nine [handbreadths]. And this one [Abbaye’s statement of the rule] refers to an oven that is [originally] seven [handbreadths]. [And in both instances the statements result in potentially lenient interpretations of the law.]*

- I.4 A.** *There is another textual version: R. Huna said in the name of R. Ishmael b. R. Yosé, “They learned the rule [that once torn a garment is clean of prior uncleanness, referring back to I.2 A] even if one has left enough of the cloth to be used as an apron, [it is not deemed joined to the rest and therefore the garment remains clean] [cf. b. Zeb. 94b].”*
- B. *Said Resh Laqish, “They learned the rule only with regard to a cloak. But with regard to [one who tears up an unclean garment made of] leather — it is sturdy [and if they piece it back together it regains its original status including its uncleanness].”*
- C. *And R. Yohanan said, “Even leather is not sturdy [enough. And if it is torn to shreds and pieced together it does not regain its original status].”*
- D. *R. Yohanan raised an objection to Resh Laqish: **A hide that is unclean with midras uncleanness and that one intended [to use] for straps and sandals — “Once one has placed the knife on it, it is clean,”** the words of R. Judah. And sages say, “Until one will diminish it [to] less than five handbreadths [it is still unclean] [M. Kel. 26:9 A-C].” Once he*

*diminishes it [to less than that size], behold it is clean! Why is this the case? Let him maintain that it is sturdy [in accord with the view of Resh Laqish]!*

- E. *In that case [in M. Kel.] what are we dealing with? Where he needed it for a seat for a zab. [Jastrow: a leather seat of a folding chair. If he cut it to a size too small for this purpose it no longer had any value to him.]*

## 9:4

- A. **Hide on which is an olive's bulk of [carrion] meat —**  
B. **he who [or that which] touches the shred which juts forth from it or hair which is on the opposite side is unclean.**  
C. **"[If] there were on it two half-olive's bulks, it imparts uncleanness to the one who carries it, but not to the one who touched it," the words of R. Ishmael.**  
D. **R. Aqiba says, "Neither to the one who touches it nor to the one who carried it."**  
E. **And R. Aqiba agrees in the case of two half-olive's bulks [of meat] which one stuck onto a spindle and moved,**  
F. **that he is unclean.**  
G. **And on what account does R. Aqiba declare clean in the case of hide?**  
H. **Because the hide renders them negligible.**
- I.1** A. Said Ulla, said R. Yohanan, "They only taught the matter where a wild beast [tore the animal and] exposed it [i.e., the **shred which juts forth**]. But where the knife [of the butcher] exposed it, it is a null entity [with regard to the transmission of uncleanness]."  
B. *Said R. Nahman to Ulla, "Did R. Yohanan say [this is the status of the meat] even [if the piece cut by a knife that juts out is as large as] the size of a tirta [i.e., a quarter of a qab, or the size of a scale (Rashi)]?"*  
C. *He said to him, "Yes."*  
D. *"Even the size of a sieve?"*  
E. *He said to him, "Yes."*  
F. *He [Nahman] said to him, "By God! If R. Yohanan had told me this himself, I would not have heeded him."*  
G. *When R. Oshaia went off to the land of Israel he found R. Ammi. He stated this tradition before him: "This is what Ulla said and this is what R. Nahman answered."*  
H. *He [Ammi] said to him, "And because R. Nahman is the son-in-law of the Exilarch does this permit him to mock the tradition of R. Yohanan?"*  
I. *Another time [R. Oshaia] found [R. Ammi] sitting in session and stating concerning the latter text of the Mishnah-passage: "[If] there were on it two half-olive's bulks, it imparts uncleanness to the one who carries it, but not to the one who touched it," the words of R. Ishmael. R. Aqiba says, "Neither to the one who touches it nor to the one who carried it."*  
J. *[And said R. Ammi], said R. Yohanan, "They only taught the matter where a wild beast [tore the animal and] exposed it [i.e., the **shred which juts forth**]. But*

where the knife [of the butcher] exposed it, it is a null entity [with regard to the transmission of uncleanness].”

- K. He [Oshaia] said to him, “Does the master connect this teaching [of Yohanan] to the latter text of the Mishnah-passage?”
- L. He said to him, “Yes.”
- M. [He said to him,] “But Ulla connects this teaching to the former text of the Mishnah-passage.”
- N. He said to him, “Yes.”
- O. He [Oshaia] said to him, “By God! If Joshua the son of Nun had told me this himself in [Moses’] name, I would not have heeded him.”
- P. When Rabin came [to Babylonia] with the travellers from Israel, he stated this [teaching of Yohanan] in connection with the former text of the Mishnah passage.
- Q. But then this poses a question [in accord with Nahman, that a piece of meat the size of a scale or sieve would be accounted as negligible].
- R. [We might explain] as R. Pappa said, **[124b]** “[It refers to] a flattened piece.” Here too [in our Mishnah-passage the piece that was cut refers to] a flattened piece [that in fact does not amount to an olive’s bulk].”

**II.1 A.** “[If] there were on it [two half-olive’s bulks, it imparts uncleanness to the one who carries it, but not to the one who touched it,” the words of R. Ishmael] **[M. 9:4 C]**.

- B. Said Bar Padda, “They only taught the matter regarding a case where they were behind [where the person touched]. But if they were in the front [where he touched them], there could be [an instance] where he touched one and then touched the other [and they combine to render him unclean].”
- C. And R. Yohanan said, “There is no [instance] where he touched one and then touched the other [and they combine to render him unclean].”
- D. And R. Yohanan follows in accord with his own view [elsewhere]. For said R. Yohanan, “R. Ishmael and R. Dosa b. Hyrcanus said the same thing.”
- E. R. Ishmael — this is the one we stated **[M. 9:4 C]**.
- F. And R. Dosa b. Hyrcanus — as it was taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah: **All things which contaminate in the Tent, which were divided and which one brought into the house — R. Dosa b. Hyrcanus declares clean. And sages declare unclean [M. Ohalot 3:1A-C]**.
- G. Said R. Dosa b. Hyrcanus, “There we do not [employ the principle that] it [the house] overshadowed one part and then overshadowed the other [and they combine to render unclean in the enclosed space]. Here too we do not [employ the principle that] he could touch one [piece of meat] and then touch the other [and they combine to render him unclean].”
- H. And since the view of R. Dosa b. Hyrcanus [in M. Ohalot] corresponds to the view of R. Ishmael [in our Mishnah-passage], then the view of the rabbis [sages, there] corresponds to the view of R. Aqiba [here]. But lo, R. Aqiba declares clean [a person who touches the item in question] and sages declare unclean [the house in question].

- I. *On this point [we must insist that] R. Aqiba declares clean only the [case of two pieces of meat stuck to] a hide. But in general he declares [analogous cases] unclean. As it is taught in the latter text of our Mishnah-passage [E-H]: And R. Aqiba agrees in the case of two half-olive's bulks [of meat] which one stuck onto a spindle and moved, that he is unclean. And on what account does R. Aqiba declare clean in the case of a hide? Because the hide renders them negligible.*
- J. *R. Uqba bar Hama posed an objection [based on the language in these verses: "And if any animal of which you may eat dies, he who touches its carcass shall be unclean until the evening and he who eats of its carcass shall wash his clothes and be unclean until the evening; he also who carries the carcass shall wash his clothes and be unclean until the evening" (Lev. 11:39-40)]. "[He who touches] its carcass" — and not [who touches] a hide that had **on it two half-olive's bulks**. You might infer that even if he carries [the hide he does not become unclean]. It comes to teach, "He also who carries the carcass shall... be unclean," the words of R. Ishmael. R. Aqiba says, "**He who touches... and he who carries...**" — **whatever is subsumed under the rule of touching [and deemed unclean] is subsumed under the rule of carrying [and deemed unclean in that regard]. Whatever is not subsumed under the rule of touching is not subsumed under the rule of carrying**" [=M. 9:5M]. *And if you accept [the interpretation of the case of a piece of hide with two half-olive-bulks of meat on it in accord with Bar Padda above at II.1 A] then behold it is subsumed under the rule of touching [when the meat is stuck on] if they were in the front [where he touched them, there could be an instance where he touched one and then touched the other and they combine to render him unclean].**
- K. *Said Raba, "Here is how you should state the matter [of Aqiba's generalization]: Whatever is subsumed under the rule of touching when it is on either side [of the hide and is deemed unclean] is subsumed under the rule of carrying [and deemed unclean in that regard]. Whatever is not subsumed under the rule of touching on either side, is not subsumed under the rule of carrying."*

**II.2 A.** *R. Avya the Elder posed a question to Rabbah bar R. Huna, "A marrow bone that is stopped up — in accord with the view of R. Ishmael what is the law as to whether it renders unclean through carrying? Does R. Ishmael hold in accord with [the principle]: **That which enters the category of touching enters the category of carrying. That which does not enter the category of touching does not enter the category of carrying** [M. 9:5 M]? And here the basis for our reasoning [that the pieces of meat render unclean] is that they were subsumed in the rule of touching in the front [but you cannot touch the unclean part in a marrow bone that is stopped up]. Or perhaps he does not [hold in accord with that principle at all, in which case you could argue that a marrow*

*bone renders unclean through carrying even though it cannot do so through touching].”*

- B. *He [Rabbah] said to him, “Look at the raven flying.” [He changed the subject and did not answer.]*
- C. *Said to him Raba his son, “Is that not R. Ayya the Elder from Pumbedita whom the master lauded as a great person?” [Why did you dismiss him so rudely?]*
- D. *He said to him, “Today I [felt weak and dismissed him in accord with the verse], ‘Sustain me with raisins, [refresh me with apples; for I am faint with love]’ (Son. 2: 5). And he had posed before me a matter that demanded [complex] reasoning.”*

**II.3** A. Said Ulla, **“Two half-olive’s bulks [of meat] which one stuck onto a spindle** and even if he waved them back and forth all day long, he is clean. *What is the basis in scripture for this rule? It is written, “He also who carries [the carcass shall wash his clothes and be unclean until the evening]” (Lev. 11:40). We read it “carries” [even though it is written “carried”]. [This implies that] we need to have a case where he carries what can be carried together [i.e., in one and not in two pieces].*

- B. *It was taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah: “[If] there were on it two half-olive’s bulks, it imparts uncleanness to the one who carries it, but not to the one who touched it,” the words of R. Ishmael [M. 9:4C]. But why is this the case? Lo, it cannot be carried together [in one and not in two pieces]?*
- C. *Said R. Pappa, “We deal with a case of a flattened piece [of meat that connects the two half-olive-bulks (Rashi)]”*
- D. *Come and take note: And R. Aqiba agrees in the case of two half-olive’s bulks [of meat] which one stuck onto a spindle and moved, that he is unclean [M. 9:4 E-F]. But why is this the case? Lo, it cannot be carried together [in one and not in two pieces]?*
- E. *Here also we deal with a case of a flattened piece of meat [that connects them].*
- F. *This accords with a Tannaite dispute: It is the same whether one touches them or moved them [with a stick]. R. Eliezer says, “It is even [the same] if he carries them.”*
- G. *Is not carrying also moving them? Rather here is what you should say: It is the same whether one touches them or moved them [with a stick] without carrying them.*
- H. *And R. Eliezer comes to say, “It is [the same] if he carries them.” What about the language, “Even”? You may maintain that it should say, “It is [the same] if he carries them.”*

## 9:5

- A. **The marrow bone of the corpse [125a] and the marrow bone of [invalidated] consecrated animals —**
- B. **he who touches them,**
- C. **whether [they are] stopped up or hollowed out,**

- D. is unclean.
  - E. The marrow bone of carrion and the marrow bone of a creeping thing —
  - F. he who touches them,
  - G. [if they are] stopped up,
  - H. is clean.
  - I. [If they are] hollowed out in any amount at all —
  - J. they impart uncleanness to the one who touches them.
  - K. How do we know that also to the one who carries them [the marrow bones of carrion that they do impart uncleanness]?
  - L. Scripture states, “He who touches” and “he who carries” (Lev. 11:39, 40).
  - M. That which enters the category of touching enters the category of carrying. That which does not enter the category of touching does not enter the category of carrying.
- I.1 A.** If one **touches them**, yes [he is unclean]. But if one overshadows it, no [he is not unclean].
- B. *What is the situation? If there is an olive’s bulk of flesh [on the bone] in the [contained space of the] tent [created when one overshadows it], let him be made unclean [by it]. [So it must be that] there is not an olive’s bulk of flesh on it.*
  - C. *And if there is an olive’s bulk of marrow inside [the bone, then we know the principle is that] uncleanness breaks forth and rises up into the [contained space of a] tent. There too, let him be made unclean [by it]. [So it must be that] there is not an olive’s bulk of marrow inside [the bone].*
  - D. *But if [you hold the principle that] marrow inside revitalizes the flesh outside [and therefore any amount of bone, without marrow or flesh, will render unclean, cf. M. Ohalot 1:7 (Rashi)], then it is a perfectly fine limb. There too, let him be made unclean [by it].*
  - E. Said R. Judah the son of R. Hiyya, “That means [we must hold the principle that] marrow inside does not revitalize the flesh outside.”
  - F. *With which view does the Mishnah-passage conform? That there is no olive’s bulk [of flesh or marrow]. If so, why does **the marrow bone of [invalidated] consecrated animals [M. 9:4A]** render unclean [there is no flesh on it to become invalidated]? And furthermore, [why do] **the marrow bone of carrion and the marrow bone of a creeping thing** render unclean [if they are] hollowed out [M. 9:4 E, I]?*
  - G. *Lo this is not a problem. The former text of the Mishnah-passage [addresses a circumstance] where there is not an olive’s bulk [of marrow or flesh]. And the latter text of the Mishnah-passage [addresses a circumstance] where there is an olive’s bulk [of marrow or flesh].*
    - H. *And what novel point does [the Mishnah-passage] make?*
    - I. *Each clause makes a novel point [of its own]. The former text makes the novel point that marrow inside does not revitalize the flesh outside.*
    - J. **[The marrow bone of invalidated] consecrated animals [M. 9:4 A] —** *what novel point does that make? That [an appendage] serving a purpose*



for invalidated [meat of consecrated animals, i.e. the bone] has [the same] status [as the invalidated meat itself].

K. For said Mari bar Abbuha, said R. Isaac, “The bones of consecrated animals that serve a purpose for invalidated meat render the hands unclean because they became a base for something prohibited.” [Neusner (b. Pes. 83a): bones of Holy Things that served as the container for left-over sacrificial material. Freedman (*ad. loc.*): Marrow left in them after the time permitted for eating the sacrifice having become left-over, for which the bones served as a container].

L. **The marrow bone of carrion [M. 9:4E]** — [what novel point does that make]? That even though there is an olive’s bulk [of marrow], **[if they are] hollowed out**, yes [they impart uncleanness]. **[If they are not] hollowed out**, no [they do not impart uncleanness].

M. Abbayye said, “Invariably [we hold the view that] marrow inside does revitalize the flesh outside. But in that case [in M.] what are we dealing with? Where he cleaved it [Cashdan: transversely]. And this accords with the view of R. Eleazar.”

N. For said R. Eleazar, “A marrow bone that one cleaved lengthwise is unclean. [If he cleaved it] transversely, it is clean. And a visual [analogy] for this [rule] is a palm tree. [If one strips off bark lengthwise it will grow. If one strips off bark transversely, it will wither.]”

O. And R. Yohanan said, “Invariably [we hold the view that] there is an olive’s bulk [of flesh on it] and that marrow inside does revitalize the flesh outside. And what does **he who touches** that was taught [in the Mishnah-passage mean]? [It means he who] overshadows.” [This view recalls A, above and contradicts it.]

P. But if [we hold the view that] marrow inside does revitalize the flesh outside then [regarding] **The marrow bone of carrion and the marrow bone of a creeping thing** if they were not hollowed out, why are they clean?

Q. Said R. Benjamin bar Giddal, said R. Yohanan, “In that case what are we dealing with? The case in question may be one where there is an olive’s bulk of [dried] marrow that rattles around [inside the bone]. With regard to [its status in the bone of a] corpse, [we follow the rule that] the uncleanness breaks forth and rises up [into a contained space, cf. C above]. But with regard to [its status in the bone of] carrion, because it rattles around, [if the bone] is hollowed out, then yes [it imparts uncleanness]. If it is not hollowed out, then no [it does not].”

**I.2 A.** Said R. Abin, and some maintain it was R. Yosé bar Abin, “We have been taught: **He who touches half an olive’s bulk and overshadows half an olive’s bulk, or touches half an olive’s bulk, and half an olive’s bulk overshadows him [M. Ohalot 3:1 G-H]** is unclean. It makes perfect sense if you say [uncleanness imparted by touching and that imparted by overshadowing] have the same status, then on that basis they combine [the act of touching half a measure and overshadowing half a measure to make up a full measure for uncleanness]. But if you say they have two [distinct] statuses, would they then combine? But lo it was

*taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: This is the general rule: Every case [in which contamination is] because of one mode of contamination is unclean; because of two categories is unclean [M. **Ohalot 3:1 R**].”*

- B. *What then is the case? Do they [i.e., touching and overshadowing] have the same status [for imparting uncleanness]? Consider the latter text of the Mishnah-passage: **[125b] But he who touches half an olive’s bulk, and something else overshadows him and half an olive’s bulk [M. **Ohalot 3:1 M, O**] is clean.** And if they are the same status, why is he clean? Rather, this contradicts the [rule in the] former text of the Mishnah-passage!*
- C. *But said R. Zira, “We are dealing with [a case of] an unclean object hanging between two closets and where there is not even an opening of a handbreadth [between them]. The entire concern [in that case] is with touching. [Hence we learn nothing from that as to whether touching and overshadowing have the same status.]”*
- D. *And who is the Tannaite authority who holds the view that we consider [a case of] overshadowing [to be equivalent to] a case of touching? It is R. Yosé. As it was taught on Tannaite authority: **R. Yosé says, “A ladleful of corpse mould renders unclean through touching, and carrying and overshadowing” [T. **Ahilot 4:1 A**].** Now this makes perfect sense [that it render unclean] through carrying or overshadowing for lo, he carries all of it [i.e., the corpse mould in the ladle] or overshadows all of it [at once]. But [as far as it rendering unclean through] touching, lo he did not touch all of it [at once]. Rather here is what you must derive from this. What does touching mean [in this circumstance]? [It means] overshadowing.*
- E. *But lo [you may object to this explanation because] it teaches, **through touching... and overshadowing.***
- F. *Said Abbaye, “In less than a handbreadth of space, overshadowing is equivalent to touching. In more than a handbreadth of space, overshadowing is simply overshadowing.”*
- G. *Raba said, “Even in more than a handbreath of space, overshadowing is equivalent to touching. And in what circumstance is overshadowing simply overshadowing? [Not in a case where the person overshadows the source of uncleanness directly.] Where [a covering hangs over both the person and the unclean object and conveys the uncleanness within the covered space] by extension.”*
- H. *Said Raba, “On what basis do I maintain this view? As was taught on Tannaite authority: **R. Yosé says, ‘The ropes of the bed and the webbing of the windows interpose between the house and the upper room, lest uncleanness pass to the second side. [If] they were placed on top of the corpse in the open air, that which overshadows the perforation is unclean, and that which is not over the perforation is clean, because the uncleanness exudes by the way which it enters.’ [T. **Ahilot 9:5 A-B**].** What is the circumstance? If you maintain that there is less than a handbreadth [between the objects and the corpse] then why is **that which is not over the perforation... clean?** It is like the corpse in its shroud [i.e., the ropes and webbing]. And the corpse and its shroud impart uncleanness. [The ropes and webbing should impart uncleanness not*



*interpose before it.] Rather, what then is the circumstance? [You must maintain that] there is more than a handbreadth [between the objects and the corpse]. Then why call it touching?"*

- I. *Said Abbaye, "Invariably [the case is that there is] less than a handbreadth. And what you stated by way of objection that it is like a corpse in its shroud, well a corpse nullifies [the power of interposition of] its shroud. But a corpse does not nullify [the power of interposition of] these [ropes and webs]."*
- J. *But let this accord with the rule of covered uncleanness, [i.e.,] that it breaks forth and rises. [No we cannot say this because] R. Yosé holds in accord with the view that covered uncleanness does not break forth.*
- K. *And on what basis do you maintain this? As was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: **A drawer of the cupboard — there is in it a cubic handbreadth, but there is not in its outlet a cubic handbreadth — uncleanness is in it, the house is unclean. Uncleanness is in the house, what is in it is clean, for the way of uncleanness is to exude, and its way is not to seep in. R. Yosé declares clean, because one can remove it in halves or burn it in its place [M. Ohalot 4:2].***
- L. *And the latter text of the Mishnah taught on Tannaite authority: [If] it [the cupboard] was standing in the doorway and opened outward, uncleanness is in it, the house is clean. Uncleanness is in the house, what is in it [M. Ohalot 4:3] should be clean. [126a] And it was taught regarding this: **R. Yosé declares clean. To which case does this apply? If you say to the case in the latter text, the first Tannaite authority also declares it clean. Rather it applies to what the first Tannaite authority stated: uncleanness is in it, the house is unclean** either because [he held the view that] **the way of uncleanness is to exude** or because [he held the view that] covered uncleanness does break forth.*
- M. *And what R. Yosé said to him [was as follows], "What you stated, "**the way of uncleanness is to exude**" [does not apply] **because one can remove it in halves or burn it in its place.** And what you stated, "covered uncleanness does break forth" [does not apply because in fact] covered uncleanness does not break forth.*
- N. *And one view of R. Yosé contradicts another: For it was taught in the Mishnah on Tannaite authority: **A dog which ate the flesh of the corpse, and the dog died and was lying on the threshold — R. Meir says, "If his neck is a handbreadth wide, he brings the uncleanness, and if not, he does not bring the uncleanness."** R. Yosé says, "We examine the uncleanness. [If the dog's belly is] from directly beneath the lintel and inside, [toward the house], the house is unclean. [If it is] from directly beneath the lintel and [towards the] outside, the house is clean." R. Eleazar says, "[If] his mouth is inside, the house is clean; [if] his mouth is outside, the house is unclean, for the uncleanness exudes through his hindparts." R. Judah b. Beterah says, "One way or the other, the house is unclean" [M. Ohalot 11:7 A-E]. *Is it not the case that, If his neck is not a handbreadth wide is the view that R. Yosé disputes? And we derive from this [that Yosé holds the view that] hidden uncleanness does break forth.**

O. *Said Raba, “We examine the space that contains the uncleanness, is what was taught [in the Mishnah in Yosé’s name]. And R. Yosé disputes on two accounts. And he says to R. Meir: What you stated, If his neck is a handbreadth wide, he brings the uncleanness, we [dispute because to determine the matter] we follow the location of the space [that contains the uncleanness]. And what you stated [that the dog] was lying on the threshold, that all of the house is unclean, [we dispute and hold that], [If the dog’s belly is] from directly beneath the lintel and inside, [toward the house], the house is unclean. [If it is] from directly beneath the lintel and [towards the] outside, the house is clean.”*

P. *R. Aha the son of Raba taught [that the Mishnah stated] plainly: R. Yosé says, “We examine the space that contains the uncleanness...”*

**I.3 A.** [Returning now to the earlier statement that R. Yosé holds the view that with regard to imparting uncleanness, a case of overshadowing is equivalent to a case of touching]: *And who is the Tannaite authority who disputes his view? It is R. Simeon. For it was taught on Tannaite authority: R. Simeon says, [126b] “Three [cases] of uncleanness that derive from a corpse — two forms [of imparting uncleanness pertain] to each one and the third form [of imparting uncleanness] does not pertain to them. And they are: (1) a ladleful of corpse mould, (2) and a bone the size of a barleycorn, and (3) the upper-stone and edge-stones [of a grave].”*

B. A ladleful of corpse mould imparts uncleanness through carrying and through overshadowing but not through touching. And where does imparting uncleanness through touching pertain? To either of the other two [cases].

C. A bone the size of a barleycorn imparts uncleanness through touching and through carrying. And where does imparting uncleanness through overshadowing pertain? To either of the other two [cases].

D. The upper-stone and edge-stones [of a grave] impart uncleanness through touching and overshadowing. And where does imparting uncleanness through carrying pertain? To either of the other two [cases].

**II.1 A. The marrow bone of carrion and the marrow bone of a creeping thing [M. 9:5 E]** — *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: “[And if any animal of which you may eat dies, he who touches] its carcass [shall be unclean until the evening]” (Lev. 11:39) — but not [if he touches] a stopped up marrow bone. You might infer that even if they are hollowed out [he who touches it is not unclean]. It comes to teach, “He who touches [its carcass] shall be unclean.” [That implies]: What is possible to touch is unclean. What is not possible to touch is clean.*

- B. *Said R. Zira to Abbaye, "But on this basis we should infer that an animal in its hide would not impart uncleanness."*
- C. *[Said Abbaye,] "Come and take a look at how many hollowed openings it has!"*
- D. *Said R. Pappa to Raba, "But on this basis we should infer that a kidney [from carrion] encased in its fatty tissue would not impart uncleanness."*
- E. *[Said Raba,] "Come and take a look at how many strands issue from it."*
- F. *R. Oshaia posed a question: If one thought about hollowing it [a marrow bone] and did not hollow it, what is the law [as to whether it imparts uncleanness]? Is the failure to [actually] hollow it analogous to the failure to perform an action or not? [Does the thought suffice?]*
- G. *He then answered his question: Failure to hollow it is not analogous to the failure to perform an action. [And the thought alone suffices to make it capable of imparting uncleanness.]*

## 9:6

- A. **The egg of a creeping thing [in which the foetus is] formed is clean.**
  - B. **[If] it was pierced in any measure at all, it is unclean.**
  - C. **A mouse, half of which is flesh and half dirt —**
  - D. **he who touches the flesh is unclean.**
  - E. **[He who touches] the dirt is clean.**
  - F. **R. Judah says, "Also: He who touches the dirt which is over against the flesh is unclean."**
- I.1** A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority: "[These are the] unclean [to you among all that swarm; whoever touches them when they are dead shall be unclean until the evening]" (Lev. 11:31) — [this language is used] to include [in the law] **the egg of a creeping thing** and the thigh-bone of a creeping thing.*
- B. *You might infer that [we include] even [an egg in which the foetus] is not formed. It comes to teach [to the contrary by using the definite article,] "the unclean." What is the case regarding the creeping thing [that is subsumed in the rule]? It is formed. So even the egg of a creeping thing [to be included, the foetus in it must be] formed.*
  - C. *You might infer that even if it was not pierced [it is unclean]. It comes to teach, "Whoever touches them when they are dead shall be unclean." Whatever you can touch shall be unclean. Whatever you cannot touch shall not be unclean.*
  - D. *And how much must it be pierced [in order for it to be unclean]? The breadth of a strand of hair — so that it is possible to touch it [inside] with a strand of hair.*
- II.1** A. **A mouse, half of which [is flesh and half dirt — he who touches the flesh is unclean] [M. 9:6 C-D].**
- B. *Said R. Joshua b. Levi, "This is so if it turned into a creeping thing along the whole length [of its body]."*
  - C. *There are those that teach [this view of R. Joshua b. Levi] pertains to the latter text of the Mishnah [F as follows]:*
  - D. **R. Judah says, "Also: He who touches the dirt which is over against the flesh is unclean."**

- E. Said R. Joshua b. Levi, “This is so if it turned into a creeping thing along the whole length [of its body].”
- F. *The authority who teaches that it pertains to the former text of the Mishnah-passage [C-D, would hold the view that] it certainly pertains to the latter text of the Mishnah-passage [F]. And the authority who teaches that it pertains to the latter text of the Mishnah-passage [would hold the view that he limits his opinion to that case]. But with regard to the case of the former text of the Mishnah-passage, even if it did not yet turn [along the length of its body] into a creeping thing [— **he who touches the flesh is unclean**].*

- II.2 A.** *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* Because [the rule] was stated for **a mouse**, I derive from this that [the rule applies] to even the mouse of the sea because its name has in it “mouse.” But it is logical [to argue that this is not the case as follows]: [The Torah] declared the weasel unclean and declared the mouse unclean. What is the case regarding the weasel? [The rule applies only to] a species that inhabits the land. So too [regarding the mouse the rule must apply only to] a species that inhabits the land.
- B. Or you may follow this line of reasoning: [The Torah] declared the weasel unclean and declared the mouse unclean. What is the case regarding the weasel? [The rule applies to] all that are called “weasel.” So too [regarding the] mouse [the rule applies to] all that are called “mouse.”
- C. It comes to teach us, “[And these are unclean to you among the creeping things that creep] upon the earth: [the weasel, the mouse, the great lizard according to its kind] (Lev. 11:29). If [it taught only], “upon the earth” you might infer that when it was “upon the earth” it could render unclean [but] if it went down to the sea it could not render unclean. **[127a]** It comes to teach, “that creep.” Wherever it creeps to [it can render unclean].
- D. Or perhaps it is only [correct to interpret as follows]: “That creeps” — all [creatures] that reproduce, render unclean. [Creatures] that do not reproduce, do not render unclean. I will exclude from this **a mouse, half of which is flesh and half dirt** that does not reproduce by breeding.
- E. But it is logical [to argue that this is not the case as follows]: [The Torah] declared the weasel unclean and declared the mouse unclean. What is the case regarding the weasel? [The rule applies to] all that are called “weasel.” So too [regarding the] mouse [the rule applies to] all that are called “mouse.” I will include [on this basis] **a mouse, half of which is flesh and half dirt**.
- F. Or you may follow this line of reasoning: What is the case regarding a weasel? It reproduces by breeding. So too [regarding the] mouse [the rule applies to those] that reproduce by breeding. It comes to teach us, “Among the creeping things” [to include in the rule **a mouse, half of which is flesh and half dirt**].
- G. *Said one of the rabbis to Raba: You may maintain that, “Among the creeping things” encompasses in the rule **a mouse, half of which is flesh and half dirt**. “That creeps” [encompasses in the rule] anything that creeps *which encompasses in the rule* even the mouse of the sea. And if you [argue that I should exclude that] because of [the language] “upon the earth” [I will say that implies that] while it is*

“on the earth” it renders unclean. When it goes down to the sea it does not render unclean.

H. *He [Raba] said to him, “After you depict the sea as a place of uncleanness [since the sea mouse is unclean], what difference does it make to me if [a creature] is here [on land] or there [in the sea]? [It should render unclean in any instance!] And we need this [language] ‘upon the earth’ to exclude [from the rule the case of] doubt about uncleanness [caused by a creeping thing] that is floating [in the sea].”*

I. For said R. Isaac bar Abdimi, “‘Upon the earth’ excludes [from the rule the case of] doubt about uncleanness [caused by a creeping thing] that is floating [in the sea].”

J. [The rabbi could respond to Raba]: “‘On the earth’ *is written twice* [i.e., and could be used once to teach your exclusion and once to teach mine. Cf. Lev. 11:29 and 11:41: “Every swarming thing that swarms upon the earth is an abomination; it shall not be eaten.”]

**II.3 A.** *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* “[And these are unclean to you among the swarming things that swarm upon the earth: the weasel, the mouse,] the great lizard according to its kind” (Lev. 11:29) — this includes in the rule the water snake, the skunk, and the salamander (Cashdan, citing Lewysohn).”

B. And when R. Aqiba reached this verse he used to say, “‘O Lord, how manifold are thy works! In wisdom hast thou made them all; the earth is full of thy creatures’ (Psa. 104:24). You have creatures that grow in the sea and you have creatures that grow on the dry land. Those that are in the sea, if they ever come up on dry land they immediately die. And those that are on dry land, if they ever go down into the sea they immediately die. You have creatures that grow in the fire and creatures that grow in the air. Those that are in the fire, if they ever go out to the air they immediately die. Those that are in the air, if they ever go down to the fire they immediately die. ‘O Lord, how manifold are thy works!’”

**II.4 A.** *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* Every [kind of creature] that there is on dry land, there is a counterpart in the sea except for the weasel.

B. *Said R. Zira, “What scriptural basis is there for this? ‘Hear this, all you peoples; give ear, all inhabitants of the world (hld)’ (Psa. 49: 1).” [The similarity of the words for world and weasel (hld) suggests that the creature lives only on dry land.]*

C. *Said R. Huna the son of R. Joshua, “The beavers of Naresh do not make their habitat in the settlement [i.e., on land].”*

D. *Said R. Pappa, “A ban is in effect for [products from] Naresh — its fat, its hide and its tails.”*

E. “O land, land, land, hear the word of the Lord!” (Jer. 22:29). Said R. Pappa, “The residents of Naresh were not able to hear the word of the Lord.”

F. *Said R. Giddal, said Rab, “If a Nareshite kissed you, count your teeth. If a person from Nehar Pegod comes along with you, it is on account of the fine cloak he sees you wearing [that he wants to*

*steal from you]. If a person from Pumbedita comes along with you, change your accommodations [before he steals from you].”*

G. Said R. Huna bar Torta, “One time I went to Wa’ad and I saw a snake coiled around a great lizard [crossbreeding]. After some days a water snake came forth from them. And when I came before R. Simeon the Pious, he said to me, ‘The Holy One, blessed be He, said, “They brought a creature that I did not create into my world [by crossbreeding]. Hence I will bring upon them that creature that I did not create in my world. [The water snake is poisonous and a danger to them.]”’”

H. *But lo did not the master say, “All creatures whose copulation and gestation are identical may breed with one another. And all creatures whose copulation and gestation are not identical may not breed with one another.”* [Cashdan: the gestation periods of the two creatures differed so they should not have been able to breed.]

I. *Said Rab, “It was a miracle in a miracle [that they were able to crossbreed].”*

J. *But this was a punishment [for the people. How can you call it a miracle?] What then does it mean when you say, “A miracle in a miracle”? It means it was for punishment [that the miracle happened].*

## 9:7

A. **The dangling limb and flesh in the case of cattle impart food uncleanness [when they are] in their place [attached].**

B. **And they require preparation [i.e., wetting down, to receive uncleanness].**

C. [127b] **“[If] the cattle is slaughtered, they are deemed prepared through its blood [to receive uncleanness],” the words of R. Meir.**

D. **And R. Simeon says, “They are not deemed prepared [to receive uncleanness, since the act of slaughter, not blood, renders meat susceptible, and these are unaffected by slaughter (M. 2: 5)].”**

E. **“[If] the cattle died,**

F. **“the flesh requires preparation [to receive uncleanness].**

G. **“The limb imparts uncleanness as a limb cut from a living beast, and it does not impart uncleanness as a limb of carrion,” the words of R. Meir.**

H. **And R. Simeon declares clean.**

**I.1 A.** [According to the passage, a dangling limb is subject to] uncleanness of foods, yes. Uncleanness of carrion, no. [Why not?]

B. *What are the circumstances? If they will form a scab and heal up [if put back], then they should not even be subject to food uncleanness. And if they will not form a scab and heal up, then they should be subject to the uncleanness of carrion.*

C. *Invariably [the case is that] they will not form a scab and heal up. And the [rule for] the uncleanness of carrion is special. For the Torah stated, “And if any part*



of their carcass falls upon [any seed for sowing that is to be sown, it is clean]" (Lev. 11:37) — [it is not subject to the uncleanness of carrion] until it falls off [the animal].

- D. *There is another Tannaite tradition in accord with this rule:* The limb and flesh that are dangling from an animal and are connected with a skin the breadth of a strand of hair — you might infer that they are subject to the uncleanness of carrion. It comes to teach, "And if any part of their carcass falls upon [any seed for sowing that is to be sown, it is clean]" (Lev. 11:37) — [it is not subject to the uncleanness of carrion] until it falls off [the animal].
- E. And even so they are subject to food uncleanness.
- F. *And this supports to view of R. Hiyya bar Ashi. For said R. Hiyya bar Ashi, said Samuel, "Figs that dried out on their branches are subject to the uncleanness of foods. But one who plucks them off on the Sabbath is liable to bring a sin-offering."*
- G. *Let us say this supports his view: **Vegetables that dried up in their roots, such as, the carob and the gourd that dried up in their roots [while still attached to the ground-root], do not receive uncleanness as food. [If] one gathered them in, and they then dried out, they do (not) receive uncleanness as food [T. Uqsin 2:11].***
- H. **[If] one gathered them in, and they then dried out** — *can you conclude that this is the case? They would have the status of ordinary wood [and not be considered food at all]! And said R. Isaac, "[The case is one where he gathered them] so as to dry them." [But they are not yet dried out.] The basis [for this caveat is] that carobs and gourds, as soon as you dry them out, they are no longer edible. Lo, other produce is subject to uncleanness [after it is dried out].*
- I. *What are the circumstances? If they themselves dried out and their stems [also dried out], it is obvious [that they are subject to food uncleanness and considered plucked with regard to the Sabbath prohibition].*
- J. *Rather it is the case that [they dried out but] their stems did not. [No.] Invariably they themselves dried out and their stems [also dried out]. And [for the rule for where] he gathered them in order to dry them out it was necessary to teach [that in this case they are subject to food uncleanness].*
- K. *Come and take note: A tree whose limb broke off and on it were fruits, lo they are like plucked fruits. If they dried out, lo they are like fruit that is attached. Is it not the case that just as [in the former case] they are deemed plucked in all respects, so too [in the latter case] they are deemed attached in all respects [contrary to Samuel at F]?*
- L. *Is this a basis on which to specify that conclusion? [We must explain] this one [case of a broken limb] as it stands on its merits and this one [case of dried attached produce] as it stands on its merits [and in accord with the view of Samuel].*

**II.1 A. "[If] the cattle is slaughtered, they are deemed prepared through its blood [to receive uncleanness]," the words of R. Meir. And R. Simeon says, "They are not deemed prepared [to receive uncleanness]" [M. 9:7 C-D].**



- B. *Concerning what principle do they dispute?*
- C. *Said Rabbah, "They dispute concerning the principle of whether the animal becomes a handle to the limb. One master [Meir] reasons in accord with the view that the animal does not become a handle to the limb. And the other master [Simeon] reasons in accord with the view that the animal does become a handle to the limb."*
- D. *Abbayye said, "They dispute concerning the principle of whether [the parts have the same status even where] one may take hold of the smaller section and the larger section does not come along with it. One master [Meir] reasons in accord with the view that where one may take hold of the smaller section and the larger section does not come along with it, but lo it has the same status. And the other master [Simeon] reasons in accord with the view that it does not have the same status."*
- E. *And even R. Yohanan reasons in accord with the view that they dispute concerning the principle of whether [the parts have the same status even where] one may take hold of the smaller section and the larger section does not come along with it. But R. Yohanan raised a contradiction between one view of R. Meir and another view of R. Meir. Does R. Meir [in fact] say that where one may take hold of the smaller section and the larger section does not come along with it, but lo it has the same status?*
- F. *It was cited in contradiction to this: **Produce which was severed but which is attached in part — [128a] R. Meir says, "If one holds the larger part and the smaller part is pulled up with it, lo, this is deemed equivalent to it." R. Judah says, "If one holds the smaller part and the larger is pulled up with it, lo, it is deemed equivalent to it" [M. Tebul Yom 3:1B-D].** [And the implication is] if not, it is not deemed equivalent to it.*
- G. *And said R. Yohanan, "Reverse the opinions [of Meir and Judah so there is no contradiction]."*
- H. *But what is the problem [if you do not reverse the opinions]? Perhaps R. Meir differentiated [the uncleanness of a] tebul yom from other forms of uncleanness.*
- I. *It was taught on Tannaite authority [that this is not the case]: Rabbi says, "The same goes for a tebul yom as for other forms of uncleanness."*
- J. *But perhaps Rabbi did not differentiate and R. Meir did differentiate.*
- K. *Said R. Josiah, "Here is what R. Yohanan said, 'In accord with the words of Rabbi, reverse the opinions.'"*
- L. *Raba said, "[They agree that the animal is a handle of the limb.] They dispute concerning whether a handle imparts uncleanness [to an attached object] and [preparation of a] handle does not serve as preparation [for an attached object]. One authority [Simeon] reasons in accord with the view that a handle imparts uncleanness [to an attached object] and [preparation of a] handle does not serve as preparation [for an attached object]. And one authority [Meir] reasons in accord with the view that a handle imparts uncleanness [to an attached object] and [preparation of a handle does serve as] preparation [for an attached object]."*
- M. *R. Pappa said, "They dispute concerning whether there can be preparation [for uncleanness for the limb] before there is deliberation [that it is food]." For it was*

*taught on Tannaite authority: [Fat of a slaughtered beast in the villages requires deliberation and preparation.] Said R. Judah, “This is how R. Aqiba taught: Fat of a slaughtered beast in the villages requires deliberation but does not require preparation because it was already prepared [to be susceptible to uncleanness] when it was slaughtered. I said before him, ‘Rabbi you have taught us: Endives that one gathered and washed for cattle and afterward one gave thought [concerning them] for human consumption do [b. omits: not] require a second preparation...’ And R. Aqiba reverted to teach in accord with the opinion of R. Judah [T. Uqsin 3:1 E-3:2]. One authority [Meir] reasons in accord with the original [opinion of R. Aqiba that there can be preparation without deliberation]. And one authority [Simeon] reasons in accord with the revised [opinion of R. Aqiba that there cannot be preparation without deliberation].*

- N. *R. Aha the son of R. Iqa said, “They dispute concerning [the status of the animal] where the blood was wiped off [the throat] between [the slaughter of one] organ and [the slaughter of the other] organ. One authority [Meir] reasons in accord with the view that we call it ‘slaughtering’ from the start to the finish. And this [liquid has the status of] blood produced by the act of slaughter [that renders susceptible]. And one authority [Simeon] reasons in accord with the view that we do not call it ‘slaughtering’ until the finish [of the act]. And this [liquid has the status of] blood produced by a wound [that does not render susceptible].”*
- O. *Said R. Ashi, “They dispute [whether] they are rendered susceptible to uncleanness by the act of slaughter itself [=M. 2:5 E] and not by the blood.” [Simeon holds the view in M. that the act must be completed. And the act of slaughter does not serve this limb. Meir would hold that the blood rendered it susceptible.]*

**II.2 A.** *Rabbah posed a question: Does a live animal serve as a handle [to convey uncleanness] to its limb? The question stands unresolved.*

- B. *Said Abbayye, “Behold they said: A cucumber which one planted in a pot and which grew and [the root of which] went outside of the pot is insusceptible to uncleanness. Said R. Simeon, ‘What is its character that it should be insusceptible to uncleanness? But that which is susceptible to uncleanness remains in its status of susceptibility to uncleanness, and that which is insusceptible to uncleanness is eaten’ [M. Uqsin 2:9].” [b’s text varies.]*
- C. *Abbayye posed a question [based on that view of Simeon]: Does it serve as a handle [to convey uncleanness] to the remainder [of the plant]? The question stands unresolved.*

**II.3 A.** *Said R. Jeremiah, “Behold they said: One who bows down to half a gourd rendered it prohibited [as idolatry].”*

- B. *R. Jeremiah posed a question [based on this]: [128b] Does it serve as a handle [to convey the uncleanness of idolatry] to the remainder [of the gourd]? The question stands unresolved.*

**II.4 A.** *Said R. Pappa, “Behold they said: The branch of a fig tree which was broken off but was still attached by its bark — R. Judah declares clean. And sages say, ‘If it can live [it is clean; and if not it is unclean]’ [M. Uqsin 3:8 E-G].*

- B. *R. Pappa posed a question [based on this]: Does it serve as a handle [to convey uncleanness] to the remainder [of the tree]? The question stands unresolved.*

**II.5** A. Said R. Zira, “Behold they said: **The stone [with a plague] which is in the corner [shared by two walls, one serving one house, the other serving the neighbor’s house — when he takes [it] out, he takes the whole [stone] out. And when he tears [it] down, he tears down that which is his, but leaves that which belongs to his neighbor [M. Neg. 13:2 A-C].**”

- B. *R. Zira posed a question [based on this]: Does it serve as a handle [to convey uncleanness] to the remainder [of the house]? The question stands unresolved.*

**III.1** A. **[If] the cattle died, [the flesh requires preparation to receive uncleanness] [M. 9:7E-F].** *What distinction is there [with regard to rules of uncleanness] between a limb [severed] from a live animal and a limb [severed] from carrion.*

- B. *The difference between them is [apparent in the status of] flesh that is separated from them, from the limb of an animal. Flesh that is separated from a limb [severed] from a live animal does not render unclean [other objects]. [Flesh that is separated] from a limb [severed] from carrion does render unclean.*

- C. *What is the source in scripture that a limb [severed] from a live animal renders unclean?*

- D. *Said R. Judah, said Rab, “And if from among any animal of which [you may eat dies, he who touches its carcass shall be unclean until the evening]” (Lev. 11:39) [i.e., the language implies a limb severed from it]. But this [language in the verse] is needed for another inference of R. Judah in the name of Rab [as follows].*

- E. *For said R. Judah, said Rab, and some say that this was taught in a Tannaite teaching: Scripture stated, “And if from among any animal [of which you may eat dies, he who touches its carcass shall be unclean until the evening (Lev. 11:39). “From among” implies] some of the animals render unclean and some of the animals do not render unclean. And which is it [that does not render unclean]? It is a terefah-animal that was slaughtered.*

- F. *If this is the case [that scripture wished to teach only this rule] it should have written, “From any animal.” Why [does it write], “From among any animal”? We can derive from this two inferences [i.e., those of both B and C].*

- G. *If this is the case, then flesh [separated from it] also [should be included in the inference].*

- H. *No, you cannot have concluded that. For it was taught on Tannaite authority: “You might infer that flesh that is separated from a live animal is unclean. It comes to teach, ‘And if from among any animal [of which you may eat dies.’ What is the case with regard to death? It cannot be reversed. So anything that cannot be reversed [comes under the rule of scripture]. [The flesh may grow back,]” the words of R. Yosé [the Galilean].*

- I. *R. Aqiba says, “[The word] ‘Animal’ [implies as follows]: What is the case with regard to an animal? It is made up of sinews and bones, so too all [parts of an animal made up of] sinews and bones [are subject to uncleanness].”*

- J. *Rabbi says, “[The word] ‘Animal’ [implies as follows]: What is the case with regard to an animal? It is made up of flesh and sinews and bones, so too all [parts of an animal made up of] flesh and sinews and bones [are subject to uncleanness].”*

- K. *What is the case in dispute between Rabbi and R. Aqiba? The dispute between them is in regard to the joint [Cashdan: the nethermost joint of the leg, the metatarsus or the metacarpus, i.e. without flesh].*
- L. *What are the cases in dispute between R. Aqiba and R. Yosé the Galilean? Said R. Pappa, "The kidney and the upper lip are the cases in dispute between them." [They do not have bones but will not heal back.]*
- M. *It was taught on Tannaite authority also with regard to [the uncleanness of] creeping things in the same matter: "You might infer that flesh that separates from [the unclean] creeping things is unclean. It comes to teach, '[These are unclean to you among all that swarm; whoever touches them] when they are dead [shall be unclean until the evening]' (Lev. 11:31). What is the case with regard to death? It cannot be reversed. So anything that cannot be reversed [comes under the rule of scripture]. [The flesh may grow back,]" the words of R. Yosé [the Galilean].*
- N. *R. Aqiba says, "[The language] 'Creeping thing' [implies as follows]: what is the case with regard to a creeping thing? It is made up of sinews and bones, so too all [parts of a creeping thing made up of] sinews and bones [are subject to uncleanness]."*
- O. *Rabbi says, "[The language] 'Creeping thing' [implies as follows]: what is the case with regard to a creeping thing? It is made up of flesh and sinews and bones, so too all [parts of a creeping thing made up of] flesh and sinews and bones [are subject to uncleanness]."*
- P. *What is the case in dispute between Rabbi and R. Aqiba? The dispute between them is in regard to the joint [Cashdan: the nethermost joint of the leg, the metatarsus or the metacarpus, i.e. without flesh].*
- Q. *What are the cases in dispute between R. Aqiba and R. Yosé the Galilean? Said R. Pappa, "The kidney and the upper lip are the cases in dispute between them." [They do not have bones but will not heal back.]*
- R. *And it was necessary [to teach the dispute regarding both the flesh of an animal and of a creeping thing]. For if we had been instructed regarding an animal [we might have concluded that] the basis for holding the view that [flesh separated] from a live animal does not render unclean is because [flesh of an animal] does not render unclean in the quantity the size of a lentil. But [because the flesh of] a creeping thing does render unclean in the quantity the size of a lentil it makes sense to maintain that [flesh separated] from a live creeping thing does render unclean.*
- S. *And if we had been instructed regarding a creeping thing [we might have concluded that] because it does not render unclean through carrying, [flesh separated] from a live creeping thing does not render unclean. But regarding an animal that does render unclean through carrying it makes sense to maintain that [flesh separated] from it when it is alive does render unclean. It is therefore necessary [to state both disputes].*

- III.2** A. *Our rabbis taught on Tannaite authority:* One who cuts an olive's bulk of flesh from a limb [severed] from a live animal — if he cut it and afterward deliberated on it [as food for a gentile], it is clean; if he deliberated on it, and afterward cut it, it is unclean.
- B. *R. Assi did not attend the House of Study.*
- C. *He met R. Zira. He said to him, "What was stated in the House of Study?"*
- D. *He said to him, "What problem bothers you?"*
- E. *He said to him, "That which was taught on Tannaite authority: If he deliberated on it, and afterward cut it, it is unclean. [129a] This should come under the principle of uncleanness that is concealed from view. And uncleanness that is concealed from view does not render unclean."*
- F. *He [Zira] said to him, "This problem also bothered me. And I asked R. Abba bar Mamal about it. And he said to me, 'In accord with whose view is this? It is in accord with the view of R. Meir, who said that uncleanness that is concealed from view does render unclean.'"*
- G. *He [Assi] said to him, "And did he not many times state this before me? And I said to him that R. Meir differentiated uncleanness that requires preparation [i.e., our case here] from uncleanness that does not require preparation." [The principle is stated earlier in the tractate at 72b, Zahavy, Hullin, vol. II, p. 181, to explain why the foetus in the case there is rendered unclean by the protruding limb.]*
- H. *Said Raba, "Why is this a problem? Perhaps [we are dealing with a case] where it was rendered susceptible [with liquid]."*
- I. *Said Rabbah bar Hanan to Raba, "Why do I need [to concern myself at all with] preparation? Lo, it is subject to a more severe form of uncleanness on account of its source [i.e., it was a father of uncleanness when still attached to the limb. And we have a principle that anything that will subsequently be subject to a more severe form of uncleanness does not need to be rendered susceptible to be subject to a less severe form of uncleanness (Rashi)]."*
- J. *He [Raba] said to him, "[The case here is one where the flesh on the limb] served as a piece of wood [i.e., as inert matter attached to sinews and bones. Afterward it becomes food and takes on a new identity. On account of that it is not subject to the stated principle.]"*
- K. *Said Abbaye, "Behold they said: But a mass of yeast that one put aside for storage is treated as null, since the owner has nullified it [so Neusner, b. Pes. 45b; Freedman, ad loc.: He gave up the nominal use of it as leaven and hence it no longer counts as leaven]. Its uncleanness cannot be based on the authority of the Torah. For if you concluded that it is based on the authority of the Torah, then we find here [a case of] foodstuffs that will subsequently be subject to a more severe form of uncleanness [and yet that has no impact on our determination of its status]. [Accordingly, the same response serves this case:] It served as a piece of wood [i.e., it was inert matter and afterward becomes food and takes on a new*

*identity. On account of that it is not subject to the stated principle.]”*

- L. *Said Abbaye, “Behold they said: Foodstuffs that were offered up in service of idolatry render unclean by overshadowing [objects that are in the same enclosure]. Its uncleanness cannot be based on the authority of the Torah. For if you concluded that it is based on the authority of the Torah, then we find here [a case of] foodstuffs that will subsequently be subject to a more severe form of uncleanness [and yet that has no impact on our determination of its status]. [Accordingly, the same response serves this case:] It served as a piece of wood [i.e., it was inert matter and afterward becomes food and takes on a new identity. On account of that it is not subject to the stated principle.]”*
- M. *Said Abbaye, “Behold they said: Foods attached to utensils have the same status as the utensils to which they are attached. Its uncleanness cannot be based on the authority of the Torah. For if you concluded that it is based on the authority of the Torah, then we find here [a case of] foodstuffs that will subsequently be subject to a more severe form of uncleanness [and yet that has no impact on our determination of its status]. [Accordingly, the same response serves this case:] It served as a piece of wood [i.e., it was inert matter and afterward becomes food and takes on a new identity. On account of that it is not subject to the stated principle.]”*
- N. *Said R. Pappa to Raba, “Lo, it was taught on Tannaite authority: **Fat in the villages... lo, these require intention and preparation [M. Uqsin 3:2 C, I].** Its uncleanness incidental to its kidney [inside the fat] cannot be based on the authority of the Torah. For if you concluded that it is based on the authority of the Torah, then we find here [a case of] foodstuffs that will subsequently be subject to a more severe form of uncleanness [and yet that has no impact on our determination of its status]. [Accordingly, the same response serves this case:] It served as a piece of wood [i.e., it was inert matter and afterward becomes food and takes on a new identity. On account of that it is not subject to the stated principle.]”*
- O. *Said R. Matna, “Behold they said: A house whose roof was thatched with stalks [doing so renders them clean since they no longer serve as foodstuff]. Their uncleanness [resulting from a plague in the house] cannot be based on the authority of the Torah. For if you concluded that it is based on the authority of the Torah, then we find here [a case of] stalks that will subsequently be subject to a more severe form of uncleanness [and yet that has no impact on our determination of its status]. [Accordingly, the same response serves this case:] It served as a piece of wood [i.e., it was inert matter and afterward becomes food and takes on a new*



identity. On account of that it is not subject to the stated principle.]”

- IV.1 A. And R. Simeon declares clean [M. 9:7 H].** *Anyway you wish to look at the matter [the dangling limb should be unclean]. If you hold the view that regarding an animal that dies that [the dangling flesh] is considered to be detached — let it be subject to uncleanness as a limb [severed] from a live animal. If you hold the view that regarding an animal that dies that [the dangling flesh] is not considered to be detached — let it be subject to uncleanness as a limb [severed] from carrion.*
- B. *[Accordingly we must say that the view of] R. Simeon pertains to the first text of the Mishnah-passage: **The dangling limb and flesh in the case of cattle impart food uncleanness [when they are] in their place [attached]. And they require preparation [A-B]... And R. Simeon declares clean [H].***
- C. *Said R. Assi, said R. Yohanan, “What is the basis for the view of R. Simeon? Scripture said, ‘Any food in it which may be eaten, [upon which water may come, shall be unclean; and all drink which may be drunk from every such vessel shall be unclean]’ (Lev. 11:34). [From this language you infer that] food that you can feed to others [i.e., gentiles] is called food. Food that you cannot feed **[129b]** to others is not called food.”*
- D. *Said R. Zira to R. Assi, “Perhaps the basis for the view of R. Simeon is that there since it is attached in the slightest way, it is still deemed to be attached. As it was taught on Tannaite authority: **The branch of a fig tree which was broken off but was still attached by its bark — R. Judah declares clean. And sages say, “If it can live” [M. Uqsin 3:8 E-G]** it is clean; and if not it is unclean. And we said, “What is the basis for the view of R. Judah?” And he stated to us, ‘Since it is attached in the slightest way, it is still deemed to be attached.’”*
- E. *He said to him, “[The view of R. Simeon] pertains to the middle text of the Mishnah-passage: ‘**[If] the cattle is slaughtered, they are deemed prepared through its blood [to receive uncleanness],**’ the words of R. Meir... R. Simeon says, ‘**They are not deemed prepared.**’”*
- F. *Said R. Assi, said R. Yohanan, “What is the basis for the view of R. Simeon? Scripture said, ‘Any food in it which may be eaten, [upon which water may come, shall be unclean; and all drink which may be drunk from every such vessel shall be unclean]’ (Lev. 11:34). [From this language you infer that] food that you can feed to others [i.e., gentiles] is called food. Food that you cannot feed to others is not called food.”*
- G. *And perhaps the basis for the view of R. Simeon in this matter is in accord with the opinion of Rabbah [as above, 127b] or in accord with the opinion of R. Yohanan [as above, 127b].*
- H. *Rather, invariably [the view of R. Simeon must] pertain to the last text of the Mishnah-passage. But it does not pertain to the [case of the] limb. Rather it pertains to the [subject of the] flesh.*
- I. **[If] the cattle died, the flesh requires preparation... And R. Simeon declares clean.** *Said R. Yohanan, “What is the basis for the view of R. Simeon? Scripture said, ‘Any food in it which may be eaten, [upon which water may come, shall be unclean; and all drink which may be drunk from every such vessel shall be*



unclean]’ (Lev. 11:34). [From this language you infer that] food that you can feed to others [i.e., gentiles] is called food. Food that you cannot feed to others is not called food.”

## 9:8

- A. **The dangling limb and flesh in the case of man are clean.**
- B. **[If] the man died, the flesh is clean.**
- C. **“The limb imparts uncleanness as a limb cut from a living creature, and it does not impart uncleanness as a limb of a corpse,” the words of R. Meir.**
- D. **And R. Simeon declares clean.**

**I.1 A. And R. Simeon [declares clean]:** *Anyway you wish to look at the matter [the dangling limb should be unclean]. If you hold the view that regarding a being that dies that [the dangling flesh] is considered to be detached — let it be subject to uncleanness as a limb [severed] from a live being. If you hold the view that regarding a being that dies that [the dangling flesh] is not considered to be detached — let it be subject to uncleanness as a limb [severed] from a corpse. [Cf. above IV.1]*

B. *R. Simeon’s view pertains invariably [to all instances]. For the first Tannaite authority stated: “The limb imparts uncleanness as a limb cut from a living creature, and it does not impart uncleanness as a limb of a corpse [C].” It seems [logical to conclude] that a limb of a corpse invariably imparts uncleanness. And R. Simeon said to him, “The limb of a corpse invariably does not impart uncleanness.”*

C. *As it was taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Eliezer, “I heard that a limb from a living creature imparts uncleanness.” Said to him R. Joshua, “From a living creature and not from a corpse? Let us deduce this matter a fortiori. What is the case with regard to a living creature that is [to begin with] clean? A limb that is severed from it is deemed unclean. With regard to a corpse that is [to begin with] unclean, certainly [a limb that is severed from it is deemed unclean].”*

D. *[Analogously] it is written in Megillat Taanit: On the secondary Passover [in Iyyar] one should not eulogize. Do they eulogize on the primary Passover [festival]? Rather, certainly [they do not]. Here too, certainly [a limb from a corpse is unclean]. He [Eliezer] said to him, “I have heard this.”*

**I.2 A. And what difference is there [regarding the transmission of uncleanness] between a limb cut from a living creature and a limb from a corpse? The difference is in the case of an olive’s bulk of flesh or a barley’s bulk of bone that is severed from a limb cut from a living creature.**

B. *As it was taught on Tannaite authority in the Mishnah: An olive’s bulk of flesh which separates from a limb from a living being — R. Eliezer declares unclean [in a Tent, as if it were from a corpse]. And R. Joshua and R. Nehunya declare it clean. A bone about a barley seed in bulk which separates from a limb from a living being — R. Nehunya declares unclean [in contact and carrying, like that from a corpse]. And R. Eliezer and R. Joshua declare [it] clean [M. Eduyyot 6:3 A-F].*

- C. *Let us now consider that we have come to this conclusion. The difference between the first Tannaite authority and R. Simeon is in the case of an olive's bulk of flesh or a barley's bulk of bone.*