

VIII

BAVLI NIDDAH CHAPTER EIGHT

FOLIOS 57B-59A

8:1

- A. She who sees a bloodstain on her body —
 - B. [if] it was near the pudenda, she is unclean.
 - C. And [if] it was not near the pudenda, she is clean.
 - D. [If it was] on her heel or on the end of her big toe, she is unclean.
 - E. [If it was] on her thigh or on her feet on the inside, she is unclean.
 - F. [And if it was] on the outside, she is clean.
 - G. [If it was] on both sides, she is clean.
 - H. [If] she saw it on her garment, [if it is] from the belt and downward, she is unclean; from the belt and upward, she is clean.
 - I. [If] she saw it on the sleeve of her garment,
 - J. if it reaches to opposite the pudenda, she is unclean, and if not, she is clean.
 - K. [If] she had stripped it off or put it on during the night,
 - L. wherever a bloodstain is located, she is unclean,
 - M. since it can have been turned about.
 - N. And so in the case of a pallium.
- I.1** A. Said Samuel, “If a woman examined the ground and then sat down on it, and found blood on it, she is clean, as it is said,^m ‘in her flesh’ (Lev. 15:19) — [the woman is unclean only] if she feels the discharge in her flesh.”
- B. *But this phrase, “in her flesh,” is required to prove that she imparts uncleanness inside as much as outside [while the blood is inside her body as much as after it exudes].*
 - C. *If that were so, Scripture could have said, “in the flesh.” Why say “in her flesh”? That bears the inference that [the woman is unclean only] if she feels the discharge in her flesh.*
 - D. *And still, is not the expression “in her flesh” required to make the point, “in her flesh and not in the sac or in a lump of flesh [Slotki: if the blood is found within any of these abortions but not on the woman’s person, she remains clean]?”*
 - E. *The expression yields both propositions.*

- F. *Come and take note: The woman who was doing her needs [urinating] and who saw blood [with the urine] — R. Meir says, “If she is standing, she is unclean, and if she is sitting, she is clean.” R. Yosé says, “One way or the other she is clean” [M. Nid. 9:1A-C]. Now how shall we imagine the circumstances of this case? If she was sitting down, why should she be clean? Rather, is it not that she did not feel the discharge, and yet it is taught, “If she is standing, she is unclean.*
- G. *In point of fact, she did feel the discharge, but she thought that it was a discharge of urine. When she stands, the urine may return to the interior of the womb and carry some blood with it, but if she is sitting, she will remain clean.*
- H. *Come and take note: “A testing rag which is placed under the pillow, and blood was found on it — if it is round it is clean. If it is elongated, it is unclean,” the words of R. Eliezer b. R. Sadoq [M. 8:4]. Now how shall we imagine the circumstances of this case? If she felt the discharge, then why should the round bloodspot be clean? But is it not a case in which she felt nothing, and yet, it is taught, **If it is elongated, it is unclean.***
- I. *No. in point of fact she did feel the discharge, but she thought that it was the feeling of the testing rag. If it is elongated, it certainly issued from her body, but if it is round [Slotki: and therefore likely to be the result of some wound], it is clean [because it cannot be the result of the test that would produce an elongated patch].*
- J. *Come and take note: **If it [a drop of blood] is found on his, they are unclean and liable for a sacrifice. If it is found on hers at the time itself, they are unclean [for seven days] and liable for a sacrifice. If it is found on hers after a while, their uncleanness remains in doubt, and they are exempt from an offering [M. Nid. 2:2A-C].** Now how shall we imagine the circumstances of this case? If she felt the discharge, then **after a while** why should she be exempt from bringing an offering? Rather, we deal with a case in which she did not feel a discharge, and yet it is taught, **If it is found on hers after a while, their uncleanness remains in doubt, and they are exempt from an offering.***
- K. *In point of fact she felt the discharge but thought that it was the feeling of “the attendant” [penis in the vagina].*
- L. *Come and take note: You turn out to rule: there are three cases of doubt that affect a woman. If blood is found on her body, it is a matter of doubt whether it is unclean or clean, the blood is deemed unclean; if it is found on her shirt, if it is a matter of doubt whether it is unclean or clean, the blood is deemed clean; and in matters of transferring uncleanness through contact or through shifting the position of something without actually touching it, you follow the majority.*
- M. *Now what is the sense of, “you follow the majority”? Is it not that, if on most days she is unclean, then this is a source of uncleanness, *even if she felt no discharge?**
- N. *No, the sense is, if on most days when she discharges blood, she feels the discharge, she is unclean, since we take for granted that this time too she felt the discharge but did not happen to pay attention to it.*

- I.2.** A. A master has said, “If blood is found on her body, it is a matter of doubt whether she is unclean or clean, the blood is deemed unclean; if it is found on her shirt, if it is a matter of doubt whether it is unclean or clean, the blood is deemed clean.”
- B. *Now how are we to imagine the case at hand? If the bloodspot was located below her belt, when then, when it is on her shirt, is it deemed clean, since we have learned in the Mishnah, [If] she saw it on her garment, [if it is] from the belt and downward, she is unclean; from the belt and upward, she is clean? And if it was above the belt, then, when it is on her body, why is it regarded as unclean, since we have learned in the Mishnah that if she saw blood on her body, if it reaches to opposite the pudenda, she is unclean, and if not, she is clean?*
- C. *If you wish, I shall say that it was below the belt, and if you wish, I shall say that it was above the belt.*
- D. *If you wish, I shall say that it was below the belt, for instance, if the woman had walked through the marketplace of butchers. If the bloodstain was on her body, then, it must have come from herself, since if it had come from some other source, it would have been located on her garment. If it was on her garment, then it had to have come from some other source, since, if it had come from her body, it would have been located on her own flesh.*
- E. *If you wish, I shall say that it was above the belt, for instance, if she had jumped backward. Then if it was found on her flesh, it assuredly came from her body, for if it had come from some other source, it would have had to have been located on her garment. If it was located on her garment, then it surely would have had to have come from some other source, for if it had come from her body, then it would have had to have been found on her own flesh.*
- I.3.** A. *Still, it has been stated in the Tannaite passage “If blood is found on her body, it is a matter of doubt whether she is unclean or clean, the blood is deemed unclean”! And that is the case even though she did not feel the discharge! And furthermore, we have learned in the Mishnah: **She who sees a bloodstain on her body — [if] it was near the pudenda, she is unclean. And [if] it was not near the pudenda, she is clean. And that is the case even though she did not feel the discharge!***
- B. Said R. Jeremiah of Difti, “Samuel concedes that she is unclean **[58A]** by reason of the authority of rabbis. [Slotki: it is possible that she was so much preoccupied at the time of the discharge that she was unconscious of her sensation.]”
- C. *R. Ashi said, “Samuel made his statement within the framework of the position of R. Nehemiah, for we have learned in the Mishnah: **[If they sat on a stone bench, or on the bench in a bathhouse [and blood was found on it] — R. Nehemiah declares clean.]** For R. Nehemiah did say, “Anything which is not susceptible to receive uncleanness does not receive uncleanness through bloodstains” [M. Nid. 9:2].” [Slotki: as the ground on which the woman sat is not susceptible to uncleanness, the woman, despite the stain, remains clean. All the rulings in objection to Samuel’s based on the principle of feeling are irrelevant.]*
- D. *Now with reference to the view of R. Ashi, we can understand the reference to her sitting down on the ground [which is insusceptible to uncleanness]. But from the*

viewpoint of R. Jeremiah, why make explicit mention of her sitting down on the ground? He could as well have made reference to her sitting down on a cloak!

- E. *The formulation was one of ça va sans dire: it is not necessary to make reference to a cloak, which was not examined, for one may well say that the stain came from an external source, but even if she had sat down on the ground, which can be thoroughly examined, in which case one may assume that the blood had emanated from her body, she still is deemed clean.*

II.1 A. [If it was] on her heel or on the end of her big toe, she is unclean:

- B. *Now there is no problem with the rule governing **the heel**, since that is likely to come into contact with that place, but how come uncleanness is attributed to a stain **on the end of her big toe**? And if you should say that sometimes it might touch the heel, do we assume that uncleanness is transferred from one place to another? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: **If a woman had a wound on her neck in a position in which the blood stain might be attributed to blood from the wound, she may so assign it; but if it was on her shoulder, in which case she cannot assign bloodstains to such a wound, she may not do so, and we do not suggest that it is possible that she had taken the blood with her hand and transferred it to some other place** [ct. T. **Nid. 6:18B-E**]. [So how can we suppose here that the blood can have been moved from heel to toe? (Slotki)]*
- C. *In point of fact, the end of her big toe is exceptional, because the blood can have directly dropped on it while she was walking.*
- D. *But do we not assume that uncleanness is transferred from one place to another? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: **If blood was found on her finger joints, she is unclean, because the hands are always busy** [T. **Nid. 6:18E**].*
- E. *What is the operative consideration? Is it not that we maintain that she examined herself with one hand and it touched her other hand?*
- F. *No, the case of the hand is difference, since all of it might have come into direct contact with the source of menstrual blood.*

III.1 A. If it was on her thigh or on her feet on the inside, she is unclean. And if it was on the outside, she is clean. If it was on both sides, she is clean:

- B. **inside: how far?**
- C. *The household of R. Yannai say, "As far as the sinews that connect the thigh and the leg."*

III.2. A. The question was raised: is the place as far as the sinews that connect the thigh and the leg classified as the inside or the outside?

- B. *Come and take note of that which R. Qattina repeated on Tannaite authority: "Up to the place as far as the sinews that connect the thigh and the leg, and that place is classified as the inside."*
- C. *R. Hiyya b. R. Avia repeated this on Tannaite authority in an explicit way.*
- D. *The household of R. Yannai say, "Up to the place as far as the sinews that connect the thigh and the leg, and that place is classified as the inside."*

III.3. A. *R. Jeremiah raised this question: “What is the ruling where a bloodstain is shaped like a ring, like a straight line of drops, like a splash of drops, or where it runs across the breadth of the woman’s thigh?”*

B. *Come and take note of the following:* If blood is found on her body, it is a matter of doubt whether it is unclean or clean, the blood is deemed unclean; [if it is found on her shirt, if it is a matter of doubt whether it is unclean or clean, the blood is deemed clean; and in matters of transferring uncleanness through contact or through shifting the position of something without actually touching it, you follow the majority]. *Now what is the sense of “on her body”? Is it not stains of the shapes just now catalogued?*

C. *No, perhaps it is in a long straight line like a strap.*

III.4. A. *A woman once found blood on her web. She came to R. Yannai. He said to her, “Go and jump forward and backward.”*

B. *But have we not learned on Tannaite authority:* In issues of cultic cleanness, we do not repeat an action [to clarify how matters take place]?

C. *When we invoke the principle,* In issues of cultic cleanness, we do not repeat an action [to clarify how matters take place], *it is so as to yield a lenient ruling, but where it is to yield a strict ruling, we do invoke the principle,* In issues of cultic cleanness, we do not repeat an action [to clarify how matters take place].

IV.1. A. **If she had stripped it off or put it on during the night, wherever a bloodstain is located, she is unclean, since it can have been turned about. And so in the case of a pallium:**

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

C. **Said R. Eleazar b. R. Yosé, “This law did I teach in Rome, declaring her unclean, and when I came to my colleagues, they said to me, ‘You have taught well’” [T. Nid. 7:1B].**

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

B. **A short girl who put on the garment of a tall girl, and a tall girl who put on the garment of a short girl — if blood is found near the pudenda of the tall girl, they are both unclean; if it is found near the pudenda of the short girl, she is unclean but the tall girl is clean [T. Nid. 7:3A-C].**

C. *There is a further teaching on Tannaite authority:*

D. If she examined her garment and then lent it to her friend [and a bloodstain was found on the garment], she is clean, and her friend may nonetheless assign the blood to her.

E. Said R. Sheshet, “This ruling pertains only to civil law [Slotki: the lender, having no valid proof that the shirt was clean when she had lent it to the other, has no legal claim on the other for the cost of washing], but as to uncleanness, the lender is clean while the borrower is unclean.”

F. **[58B]** *And how is this different from the following case, taught on Tannaite authority: Two women who were engaged in preparing a bird which can yield only a sela of blood — after a while on this one a sela of blood is found, and on the other one a sela of blood is found — both of them are in disarray [T. Miqvaot 2:12]? [Slotki: One stain could well be attributed to the bird, but*

both women are unclean; so also in the case before us, since it is possible that the lender did not properly examine her shirt, both lender and borrower should be unclean.]

- G. *That case is exceptional, because there is an additional sela of blood [which cannot possibly be attributed to the bird].*

IV.3. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **If a woman put on three garments that had been examined for her, if she can attribute blood, she does so, and even to the undergarment. If she cannot attribute the blood to any external source, she does not do so, and even if the blood is on the outermost garment [T. Nid. 7:2A-D].**
- C. How is this so? If she had gone through the marketplace of butchers, she assigns the blood to that cause, and even if it is found on the undergarment.
- D. If she had not passed through the marketplace of the butchers, even if blood is found on the outermost garment, she does not assign the blood to some external cause.

I.1 works on Samuel's proposition, which is essential to the clarification of the Mishnah's law. What is important is the systematic review of other rules that bear on his theory. No. 2 forms a footnote to No. 1, clarifying an item that was integral to the foregoing composition. No. 3 then reverts to the analysis of Samuel's statement. II.1 clarifies the language of the Mishnah. III.1 clarifies the Mishnah's rule, and No. 2 then amplifies the answer of No. 1. No. 3 continues the problem of I.1, and No. 4 provides a practical case. None of this is unusually coherent. The gloss at IV.1 is minor. No. 2 cites Tosefta's statement, which in this case, I have given in Tosefta's formulation. No. 3 follows suit.

8:2-4

8:2

- A. **And she blames it on any thing on which she can blame it:**
- B. **[if] she slaughtered a beast, a wild animal, or a bird,**
- C. **or if she was busy with [anything which causes] bloodstains,**
- D. **or if she sat down beside people who were engaged in them [anything that produces bloodstains].**
- E. **[If] she killed a louse,**
- F. **lo, this one blames [blood that may turn up] on it.**
- G. **How much may she blame on it?**
- H. **R. Haninah b. Antigonus says, "Up to the size of the split bean."**
- I. **And [it may be attributed to a louse] even though she did not kill it.**
- J. **And she blames it on her son or her husband.**
- K. **If there is a wound [covered by a scab] on her and it can open again and bleed she may blame it on that.**

8:3

- A. **M'SH B: One woman came before R. Aqiba. She said to him, "I have seen a bloodstain."**

- B. He said to her, “Perhaps there was a wound on you?”
- C. She said to him, “Yes, but it has healed.”
- D. He said to her, “Perhaps it can open and bleed?”
- E. She said to him, “Yes.”
- F. And R. Aqiba declared her clean.
- G. His disciples did he see staring at one another. He said to them, “Why is this matter hard in your eyes? For the sages stated the rule not to produce a strict ruling but to produce a lenient ruling, as it is said, ‘And if a woman have an issue and her issue in her flesh be blood’ (Lev. 15:19) — blood and not a stain.”

8:4

- A. “A testing rag which is placed under the pillow, and blood was found on it —
 - B. “if it [the bloodstain] is round it is clean.”
 - C. “If it is elongated, it is unclean,” the words of R. Eliezer b. R. Sadoq.
- I.1** A. *Here we have learned as a Tannaite version that which we have learned on Tannaite authority, for our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. There was a case in which R. Meir blamed it on collyrium. And Rabbi blamed it on the sap of a sycamore [T. **Nid. 6:17B-C**].
- II.1** A. or if she sat down beside people who were engaged in them [anything that produces bloodstains]:
- B. *The rule applies only to the place at which she sat, but not to a place where she did not sit.*
 - C. *Here we have learned as a Tannaite version that which we have learned on Tannaite authority, for our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - D. If there is a matter of doubt whether or not she has passed through the market of the butchers, lo, this one does not blame it on the blood of slaughtered animals. But if she passed through and it is a matter of doubt whether blood spurted n her or did not spurt on her, lo, this one blames it on the blood that has spurted on her [T. **Nid. 6:17D-E**] [in Tosefta’s version].
- III.1** A. [If] she killed a louse, lo, this one blames [blood that may turn up] on it.
- B. *The rule applies only to a case in which she killed a louse, but not to one in which she did not kill a louse.*
 - C. *Then who is the authority behind our Mishnah-paragraph? It is Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - D. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “If she killed a louse, she blames a bloodstain on it, but if she did not kill a louse, she does not blame it on it.
 - E. And sages say, “In either case, she blames it on it.”
 - F. Said Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, “I say one thing and they say one thing. In accord with my opinion, there is no limit to the matter, and in accord with their opinion, there is no limit to the matter. In accord with my opinion, there is no woman who is not clean, for there is no bed on which there is no loss. And in accord with their opinion, there is no limit, for there is no bed which is not unclean, for there is no sheet on which there are not found drops

of blood. But I accept the view of R. Hanina b. Gamaliel [Bavli: Antigonus] as more compelling than my opinion and their opinion alike, for he says, ‘One blames it on the louse if it is the size of a split bean. Even though she did not kill it, one blames it on her son and on her husband.’ And in accord with his opinion do we agree” [T. Nid. 7:4B-C, 7:5A-E].

- G. *Now according to rabbis, who ruled, she blames it on it, how large may the stain be [to be regarded as clean] If it is very big, it obviously cannot be assigned to a louse (Slotki)].*
- H. Said R. Nahman b. Isaac, “She may attribute it to a louse even though the blood stain is as big as a beet.”

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

- B. A bed bug — its length is the same as its breadth, and it tastes like its smell. Whoever crushes it cannot help smelling it.
- C. “its length is the same as its breadth.” so far as bloodstains are concerned.
- D. “and it tastes like its smell.” so far as heave-offering is concerned. *For we have learned in the Mishnah: Or if he tasted the flavor of a bed-bug in his mouth, he has to spit it out [M. Ter. 8:2]. Now how is he going to know? The reason is that it tastes like its smell.*
- E. *Still, how will he know it?*
- F. Because: “Whoever crushes it cannot help smelling it.”

III.3. A. Said R. Ashi, “A town in which pigs are located is a place in which one does not take account of the possibility of bloodstains.”

- B. *Said R. Nahman b. Isaac, “The town of Doqeret is in the classification of a town in which pigs are located.”*

IV.1 A. How much may she blame on it? R. Haninah b. Antigonus says, “Up to the size of the split bean:”

- B. Said R. Huna, “If the stain is of the size of a split bean, one may not assign the stain to a louse; if it is small than a split bean, one may attribute the bloodstain to a crushed louse.”
- C. And R. Hisda said, “If it is exactly the size of a split bean, one may assign the blood to a louse; if it is large than a split bean, one may not assign the matter in such a way.”
- D. *May we then say that at issue is whether the language of “up to” is meant to be inclusive or exclusive, R. Huna maintaining that the language “up to” is not inclusive, and R. Hisda maintaining that “up to” is inclusive?*
- E. *R. Huna may say to you, “There are cases in which the language of ‘up to’ is inclusive, and there are cases in which that language is exclusive, but in either case, the meaning is such that it produces a strict ruling.”*
- F. *R. Hisda may say to you, “In general I may concur with you that when we have a more stringent ruling, we do invoke that principle, while where we have a lenient ruling, we do not invoke that principle. But here what is at stake is that which R. Abbahu said, for R. Abbahu said, ‘All the prescribed measurements that sages have laid down are meant to produce a more strict ruling, except for the matter of*

the bloodstain the size of a split bean in the case of bloodstains, which measurement is meant to yield a lenient ruling.”

- G. *There are those who set this matter forth in its own terms:*
- H. R. Huna said, “A bloodstain the size of a split bean is treated as one that is larger than the size of a split bean,” and R. Hisda said, “A bloodstain exactly the size of a split bean is treated as one that is smaller than a split bean.”
- I. *And at issue is whether the language of “up to” is meant to be inclusive or exclusive, R. Huna maintaining that the language “up to” is not inclusive, and R. Hisda maintaining that “up to” is inclusive, as we have just now said.*
- J. *An objection was raised: [59A] If there were on her two bloodstains, one above and one below, even if the one below is large and the one above is small, she blames the lower one on the upper one, up to the size of a split bean, for I say, “From the place from which the upper one came, the lower one came also” [T. Nid. 6:20A-D].*
- K. *Now is the meaning not, a stain the size of a split bean below her belt? [Slotki: but if so, it would follow that only where there are bloodstains above the belt are stains of the size of a split bean below it regarded as originating from the same extraneous source as those above, and, therefore, treated as clean, but that where there are no drops of blood above the belt, even a stain of the size of a split bean below it is regarded as unclean. This is then an objection against Hisda, who ruled that a stain of such size is invariably attributed to vermin and is therefore clean.]*
- L. No, the meaning is, a stain of the size of a split bean above the belt [Slotki: so long as the stain above is not smaller than the size of a split bean, the stain below, though bigger than that size, may be attributed to the same cause as that of the stain above. When the stain below, however, is no bigger than the size of a split bean, it is invariably clean, without regard to whether the body above was or was not stained with drops of blood.]

IV.2. A. *It has been stated:*

- B. If on the body of a woman was found a stain the size of a split bean and a bit more, and to that bit more clung a louse,
- C. R. Hanina says, “The blood is deemed unclean [as menstrual blood].”
- D. R. Yannai says, “The blood is clean [being attributed to the louse].”
- E. R. Hanina says, “The blood is deemed unclean [as menstrual blood]” — *when blood is assigned in such a way, it is to a bloodstain the size of a split bean, but if the bloodstain is the size of a split bean and a bit more, we do not attribute the blood to a louse.*
- F. R. Yannai says, “The blood is clean [being attributed to the louse]” — *[when blood is assigned in such a way, it is to a bloodstain the size of a split bean, but if the bloodstain is the size of a split bean and a bit more, we do not attribute the blood to a louse] that is the case when to that bit more no louse is clinging, but if to that bit more a louse is clinging, the fact is proven that the additional blood derives from the louse, and only a stain the size of a split bean remains, and since such a size elsewhere is attributed to a louse, here to it is attributed to a louse.*

- IV.3.** A. R. Jeremiah raised the following question: “If a woman was handling some blood of the bulk of a split bean, and on her body was found a bloodstain the size of a split bean and a bit more, what is the rule?”
- B. *That question is to be addressed to the position of R. Hanina, and that same question is to be addressed to the position of R. Yannai.*
- C. *That question is to be addressed to the position of R. Hanina: R. Hanina took the position there that she was unclean since she was not engaged in handling blood, but here, where she was engaged in handling blood, she may assign the blood to that other cause.*
- D. *[Supply: and that same question is to be addressed to the position of R. Yannai.] Or perhaps, even from the viewpoint of R. Yannai, who has said that she is clean, that ruling applies to a case in which a louse was clinging to the blood spot, but here, where there is no louse clinging to the bloodspot, we do not attribute the additional blood to a louse [and rather hold that it is menstrual blood]?*
- E. *Come and take note: **If she was handling things that are red, she does not blame on those things a stain that is black. If she was handling a small quantity of blood, she does not blame on it a large quantity of blood [T. Nid. 6:17F-G].** Now how can we imagine such a case? Is it not along the lines of the problem before us?*
- F. No, rather, we deal with a case in which she was involved in handling blood of the bulk of a split bean, and on her body was found blood of the quantity of two split beans and a bit more [Slotki: as the excess over the size of a split bean amounts to more than a split bean, it cannot possibly be attributed to vermin, hence the uncleanness].
- G. *If so, then what’s the point?*
- H. *What might you have thought? The part of the stain that may be attributed to the blood of a bird to be in the middle, so that along the sides there remains blood of less than the prescribed minimum? So we are informed that the stain cannot be attributed to the blood of the bird at all.*

- IV.4.** A. Said Raba, “If a given kind of material was found on a woman, she may attribute to it any sort of stain [that she finds later on, even though it is not of the same color as the material to which it is attributed].”
- B. *An objection was raised: **If she was handling things that are red, she does not blame on those things a stain that is black [T. Nid. 6:17F-G].***
- C. *A case where she was handling the stuff is different [from a case in which, unknown to herself, something had clung to her body; in the latter case, since she was unaware of the particular stuff that clung to her, she may well be assumed to have been unaware also of the presence upon her body of the substance from which the stain had originated. In the former case, however, where she had handled a red substance and was fully aware of it, no ground for such an assumption exists (Slotki)].*
- D. *There are those who state the matter in this way:*

- E. Said Raba, "If a given kind of material was found on a woman, she may attribute to it any sort of stain [that she finds later on, even though it is not of the same color as the material to which it is attributed]."
- F. *An objection was raised: If she was handling things that are red, she does not blame on those things a stain that is black [T. Nid. 6:17F-G].*
- G. *When Raba made the statement that he made, he spoke of a woman who was involved with a hen, in which there are many different kinds of blood.*

V.1 A. M'SH B: One woman [came before R. Aqiba. She said to him, "I have seen a bloodstain." He said to her, "Perhaps there was a wound on you?" She said to him, "Yes, but it has healed." He said to her, "Perhaps it can open and bleed?" She said to him, "Yes." And R. Aqiba declared her clean. His disciples did he see staring at one another. He said to them, "Why is this matter hard in your eyes? For the sages stated the rule not to produce a strict ruling but to produce a lenient ruling, as it is said, 'And if a woman have an issue and her issue in her flesh be blood' (Lev. 15:19) — *blood* and not a stain]:

- B. *And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: sages made their ruling not to produce a lenient decision but to produce a stringent one?*
- C. Said Rabina, "It was not to produce a lenient ruling in such a way as to relax the laws of the Torah, but to add restrictions to them; but the uncleanness of bloodstains is wholly based upon the authority of rabbis.

VI.1 A. "A testing rag which is placed under the pillow, and blood was found on it — if it is round it is clean. If it is elongated, it is unclean," the words of R. Eliezer b. R. Sadoq:

- B. *The question was raised: do rabbis differ from R. Eliezer b. R. Sadoq or do they not differ from him?*
- C. *Come and take note: -an elongated bloodstain is treated as compact in respect to the prescribed size of a split bean, but scattered drops are not combined [to form the requisite size].*
- D. *Now who can be the authority for that statement? It cannot be R. Eliezer b. R. Sadoq, for what difference does it make to me whether or not we rule on the combining of the crops, since he has ruled that even if a stain is only slightly elongated, the blood is unclean. It must follow that the ruling at hand represents the position of rabbis. And that bears the inference that rabbis differ from his position.*
- E. *No, in point of fact it does represent the position of R. Eliezer b. R. Sadoq, and when R. Eliezer b. R. Sadoq made his ruling, it had reference to a testing rag, not to a bloodstain.*
- F. *Come and take note: for said R. Judah said Samuel, "The decided law follows the position of R. Eliezer b. R. Sadoq."*
- G. *Now since a decision was required as to the law, it follows that others differed from his position.*
- H. *That is decisive.*

I.1 cites Tosefta's complement. II.1 follows the same pattern. III.1 does the same. No. 2 adds yet another Tannaite amplification. No. 3 is tacked on. IV.1

amplifies the Mishnah's rule, asking the question of the rule that applies when the stain is precisely the size of a split bean, a common mode of clarifying what is left slightly ambiguous by the Mishnah's formulation. No. 2 develops the same theme, but is no longer devoted to Mishnah-commentary. No. 3 raises a pertinent question of clarification of No. 2. No. 4 forms a footnote to the foregoing. V.1 makes an important clarification. VI.1 raises a minor question.