

# IX

---

## BAVLI NIDDAH CHAPTER NINE

### FOLIOS 59B-64B

#### 9:1

- A. The woman who was doing her needs [urinating] and who saw blood [with the urine] —
- B. R. Meir says, “If she is standing, she is unclean, and if she is sitting, she is clean.”
- C. R. Yosé says, “One way or the other she is clean.”

#### 9:2

- A. A man and a woman who did their needs [urinated] into a pot, and blood was found on the water —
  - B. R. Yosé declares clean.
  - C. And R. Simeon declares unclean,
  - D. for it is not the way of the man to produce blood, but the assumption concerning blood [is that it derives] from the woman.
- I.1** A. *How come the case where the woman **was standing** differs from one in which she was sitting?*
- B. *It is because we say, the urine reverts to the source and brings back blood with it from the source [of menstrual blood].*
  - C. *But if she is sitting, also, we should be able to say that the urine reverts to the source and brings back blood with it from the source [of menstrual blood].*
  - D. Said Samuel, “The Mishnah speaks of a woman who discharges urine in a gush [and there is no strain.]” [Slotki: only when a strain is involved is it likely for the urine to return to the source and reissue mixed with blood, but not where the discharge is flowing normally and easily.]
  - E. *Even if the discharge gushes, is it not possible that the blood from the menstrual source issued forth after the urine had ceased to flow [so why should she be regarded as clean]?*

- F. *Said R. Abba, "We deal with a woman who is sitting on the edge of the bowl and discharging urine into the bowl, and blood is found in the bowl. If it were the fact that the blood had issued after the water had ceased to flow, it should have been found on the rim of the bowl."*
- G. *Said Samuel, and some say, said R. Judah said Samuel, "The decided law is in accord with the opinion of R. Yosé."*
- H. *And so R. Abba instructed Qala, "The decided law is in accord with the opinion of R. Yosé."*

**II.1 A. A man and a woman who did their needs [urinated] into a pot, and blood was found on the water — R. Yosé declares clean. And R. Simeon declares unclean, for it is not the way of the man to produce blood, but the assumption concerning blood [is that it derives] from the woman:**

- B. *The question was raised: if the man and the woman were standing [when urinating, and blood was found in the bowl], what is the position of R. Meir? When R. Meir ruled as he did, was it only in a case in which a single doubt is involved [namely, whether the blood emanated from the menstrual source or from a wound in the bladder], but here where there is a doubt as to what is already in doubt [the doubt that the blood came from the man or the woman, and the doubt concerning the source of the blood even if it came from the woman], he would not declare the blood to be unclean? Or perhaps there is no difference?*
- C. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, "The ruling is the same in both cases."*
- D. *And how do we know that?*
- E. *Since it has not been stated as the Tannaite formulation, "R. Meir and R. Yosé declare clean," [but only: **A man and a woman who did their needs [urinated] into a pot, and blood was found on the water — R. Yosé declares clean**].*
- F. *But if it is the case, then, that R. Meir takes the view that a woman is unclean even where there is a doubt concerning a doubt, is there any requirement to spell out his position where only a single doubt is involved?*
- G. *Indeed so, for it shows you just how far R. Yosé will go, for even if there is a single doubt, R. Yosé declares the woman to be clean. And since he takes issue in the case of a single doubt to show you how far R. Yosé will go, then why not instead have the dispute stated in terms of the case involving a doubt about a doubt, to show you how far R. Meir will go?*
- H. *It is preferable to show the full extent of a lenient view.*
- I. *And [opposing R. Simeon b. Laqish's view,] R. Yohanan said, "When R. Meir made his ruling, it had to do with a case in which there is only a single matter of doubt, but in a case in which there is a doubt about what is already in doubt, he made no such statement."*
- J. *If that is the case, then the framer of the passage should have repeated on Tannaite authority:: **A man and a woman who did their needs [urinated] into a pot, and blood was found on the water — R. Meir and R. Yosé declare clean.***
- K. *Quite true, but since he had left off dealing with R. Yosé, he commenced with R. Yosé.*

- L. Now as to the position of R. Yosé, if where there is only a single, fundamental doubt, he still declares a woman to be clean, if there is a doubt concerning a doubt, can there be any question as to his position?
- M. What might you otherwise have thought [had this matter not been made explicit]? That ruling of his applies after the fact, but to begin with, it would not be his position. So we are informed to the contrary.
- O. It has been taught on Tannaite authority in agreement with the position of R. Yohanan: **A man and a woman who made into the pot, and blood was found in the water in the pot — R. Meir and R. Yosé say, “She is clean,” and R. Simeon says, She is unclean” [T. Nid. 7:8A-B].**

**II.2.** A. *The question was raised: if the woman was sitting, what is the position of R. Simeon? When R. Simeon took the position that he did [R. Simeon declares unclean, for it is not the way of the man to produce blood, but the assumption concerning blood is that it derives from the woman], that was where the woman was standing up, since her passage is then compressed [Slotki: as a result of the narrowness of the passage, blood from the menstrual source might well be presumed to issue together with the returned urine, and since this presumption almost amounts to a certainty, there remains no more than one doubt, as to whether the blood emanated from the man or the woman, which justifies Simeon’s ruling that the blood is unclean], but if she was sitting down, that is not the case, or perhaps there is no difference?*

- B. Come and take note of what has been taught on Tannaite authority:
- C. **The woman who is doing her needs and saw blood — “if she is standing she is unclean, and if she is sitting, she attributes the blood to a sore in the bladder and is clean,” the words of R. Meir.**
- D. **And R. Yosé says, “One way or the other, she attributes it to a clean source and is clean.”**
- E. **And R. Simeon says, “One way or the other, she does not attribute it to a clean source, and she is unclean” [T. Nid. 7:6A-D].**

**II.3.** A. *The question was raised: if the man and the woman were sitting down, what is the position of R. Simeon?*

- B. *When R. Simeon took the position that he did, it had to do with the woman’s standing, at which point her passage is compressed, or when she was sitting, since in either case, only a single doubt is involved, but where both were sitting, and there is a doubt concerning a doubt, that would not be his position, or perhaps there is no difference?*
- C. *Come and take note: since R. Simeon has said, “The assumption concerning blood is that it derives from the woman,” there can be no difference in his ruling whether they were standing or whether they were sitting.*

I.1 provides a fine explanation for the Mishnah’s distinction between standing and sitting. II.1 clarifies the presentation of the Mishnah and shows the underlying considerations behind the rulings of the several parties. No. 2 complements No. 1, raising the same question as before. No. 3 completes No. 2.

- A. [If a woman] lent her garment to a gentile woman, or to a menstruating woman [and blood was found on the garment after it was returned and worn by the owner] —
  - B. lo, this one blames it on her.
  - C. Three women who wore a single garment,
  - D. or who sat on a single [wooden] bench,
  - E. and blood was found on it —
  - F, they are all unclean.
  - G. [If] they sat on a stone bench, or on the bench in a bathhouse [and blood was found on it] —
  - H. R. Nehemiah declares clean.
  - I. For R. Nehemiah did say, “Anything which is not susceptible to receive uncleanness does not receive [uncleanness through] bloodstains.”
- I.1** A. Said Rab, “The allusion to a **gentile woman [60A]** is to one who had produced a discharge. *How come? Because she is comparable to a menstruating woman. Just as a menstruating woman has produced a discharge, so the gentile also has produced a discharge.*”
- B. Said R. Sheshet, “When Rab made this statement, he must have been lying down and dozing, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: **she may assign it to a gentile woman [and so will be clean].** R. Meir says, ‘**To a gentile woman who is old enough to produce a menstrual discharge**’ [T. Nid. 617H-I]. And even R. Meir made this statement only concerning one who is old enough to produce a discharge, but he did not impose the requirement that she actually have produced a discharge [and rabbis certainly would not require that the woman have actually have produced a discharge before, so Rab’s condition is hardly well founded].”
  - C. Said Raba, “But do you take the view that R. Meir’s position was made so as to impose a strict ruling? R. Meir in fact imposed a lenient ruling, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: She may not attribute the blood to a gentile woman. R. Meir says, ‘She may assign it to a gentile woman.’”
  - D. Then is there not a contradiction between the two versions [which have Meir in restrictive and lenient positions]?
  - E. This is the sense of the matter: And that rule applies when the woman had experienced a discharge before. But R. Meir says, “If she is of age to produce a menstrual discharge, even though she had never yet experienced one [the same rule applies].”
- I.2.** A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:
- B. “She may blame her stain on a woman to whom she had previously lent the garment who was awaiting day for day, and this is the case if it was the latter’s second day, and to a woman who had counted seven days prior to performing immersion after her menstrual period. Therefore this one is in good estate, though the other is in disarray,” the words of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel.

- C. Rabbi says, “She may not blame her bloodstain on the other, to whom she had lent the garment, and therefore they are both in disarray.
- D. They concur, however, that she may assign it to a woman to whom she lent the garment who is watching day against day on the first day, or to a woman who is sitting out the blood of cleanness after having given birth, or to a virgin, whose blood is clean [T. **Nid. 6:18C-G**].
- E. *Why was it necessary to say “therefore” with reference to the formulation of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel?*
- F. *It was because of the “therefore” of Rabbi.*
- G. *Why was it necessary to say “therefore” with reference to the formulation of Rabbi?*
- H. *What might you have thought? Only the woman on whom the stain was found is going to be in disarray, while the other will not be in disarray? Hence we are informed that both are in disarray.*

- I.3.** A. Said R. Hisda, “In the case in which an unclean person and a clean person walked in two distinct paths, one of which was clean, the other unclean [and we do not know which walked in which], we have come to the dispute of Rabbi and Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel [Slotki: according to the latter, who ruled that a stain found on a clean woman may be attributed by her to a woman known to be unclean while she herself remains clean, it may here be assumed that the clean person walked in the clean path, the unclean in the unclean; while according to Rabbi, no such assumption could be allowed, and both must be regarded as unclean].
- B. *R. Ada objected, “Rabbi took the position that he did there only because both are in similar circumstances [Slotki: since even the woman who was hitherto unclean could immerse and attain cleanness on the day the stain was found; the assumption would place her at an undeserved disadvantage]. But here what difference would our assumption make to the unclean person?”*
  - C. And R. Hisda?
  - D. *“In any event she has not yet immersed.*

**I.4.** A. *It has been stated:*

- B. Said R. Yosé b. R. Hanina, “An unclean person and a clean person, and even a clean person and a person whose condition was held in suspense, who walked in two paths, one unclean and one clean — one assigns the passage through the unclean person to the person whose condition was held in suspense, and the passage through the clean passage to the clean person —
- C. “and this is the opinion of all parties.”

**I.5.** A. *The question was addressed to R. Yohanan by R. Judah bar Livai, “What is the law as to assigning a stain attributed to another woman who was unclean already by reason of having produced a stain?*

- B. *“From the perspective of the position of Rabbi, there is, of course, no question. If in that case, in which the woman has produced an excretion of blood from her own body, you have said that one may not attribute a bloodstain to that other woman’s blood, in this case, in which the blood has come from some other source, is it not an argument a fortiori that one may not do so? Where the*

*question is plausible, it is within the premise of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel: there we deal with a case in which the woman has produced the blood from her own body, so one may indeed assign the bloodstain to that cause, but here, since it comes from some other source, one may not assign it — or perhaps there is no difference between the two cases?”*

- C. He said to him, “One may not attribute [a stain attributed to another woman who was unclean already by reason of having produced a stain]. What is the operative consideration? The reason is that one may not so attribute it [and both women are unclean].”
- D. *An objection was raised:* do they not assign a bloodstain to another woman who was unclean by reason of a bloodstain? But if a woman lent her garment to a gentile, or to a woman who was sitting out the days of cleanness by reason of a blood stain, lo, this one may attribute the bloodstain on the garment to that cause.
- E. *Now there is a contradiction between the two clauses of this statement. To begin with you have said,* “One may not attribute [a stain attributed to another woman who was unclean already by reason of having produced a stain]. And then you have said, “lo, this one may attribute the bloodstain on the garment to that cause.”
- F. *No, there is no contradiction, the one [that we do not attribute the blood to such an exculpatory factor] represents the opinion of Rabbi, the other [that we do] that of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel.*
- G. *There are those who say,* “Both represent the views of Rabbi, the former standing for the rule governing her first day [that is, the stain was discovered by the woman on the same day on which the other, to whom the garment had been lent, had found a stain on an undergarment of hers, which caused her to be unclean on that day and also imposed upon her the restriction of remaining unclean until a second day had passed; since she has in any case to lose a second day, the attribution does not cause her any disadvantage (Slotki)], the other pertains to her second day [when the attribution would place her under a disadvantage by extending her uncleanness to the third day (Slotki)].”
- H. *R. Ashi said,* “Both represent the position of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, but still there is no contradiction. **[60B]** *Here we rule concerning retroactive uncleanness* [Slotki: a case where the owner of the shirt discovered the stain on it before the other, to whom she had lent it, had discovered the stain on her own undergarment. Though the other subsequently discovered the stain, she cannot be regarded as unclean retroactively, from the time the owner of the shirt had discovered the stain, since at that time she was still in a condition of cleanness], *and the latter ruling applies to future uncleanness* [Slotki: the stain on the shirt having been discovered after the woman who borrowed it had discovered hers].”
- I. *One way or the other, there is a contradiction!*
- J. *Said Rabina,* “There is no contradiction. This is the sense of the statement: if she lent a garment to a gentile, the one who discovered the stain [the Israelite] may attribute it to her [the gentile] [Slotki: who loses nothing, and the Israelite woman remains clean].”
- K. *But lo, the passage refers explicitly to* or to a woman who was sitting out the days of cleanness by reason of a blood stain!



- L. *“This is the sense of the matter: or to one who continued clean owing to clean blood [either to a gentile woman free of uncleanness or an Israelite woman who is exempt from uncleanness], the one who discovered the stain [the Israelite] may attribute it to her [the gentile or the Israelite sitting out the days of cleanness after childbirth] [Slotki: who loses nothing, and the Israelite woman remains clean].”*

**II.1 A. 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.”**

- B. *Said R. Mattenah, “What is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Nehemiah? Scripture states, ‘And clean she shall sit on the ground’ (Isa. 3:26) — since she was sitting on the ground, she is clean [so the stain found on the ground does not mark her as unclean].”*
- C. *Said R. Huna said R. Hanina, “R. Nehemiah would declare clean even if she sat down on the back side of a clay utensil [and found a bloodstain there].”*
- D. *But that is self-evident [since the backside of an earthenware utensil is not susceptible to uncleanness]!*
- E. *What might you have thought? That a decree concerning the uncleanness of a bloodstain on the backside of the clay utensil should be made on account of the contrary rule that covers the inside of the same clay utensil? So we are informed that that is not the fact.*
- F. *Said Abbaye, “R. Nehemiah would declare a woman clean who got up and found a bloodstain on strips of cloth that were less than three by three fingerbreadths in size, since such a size of cloth is not suitable for use by either poor or rich [and so is insusceptible to uncleanness].”*

**II.2. A. R. Hiyya bar R. Mattenah in the name of Rab expounded, “The law is in accord with R. Nehemiah.”**

- B. *Said to him R. Nahman, “Abba [Rab] repeated on Tannaite authority: ‘A case came before sages, and they declared them unclean,’ and you have said, ‘The law is in accord with the position of R. Nehemiah’!”*
- C. *What is the case?*
- D. *It is that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. **Two women who were grinding with a handmill and blood was found on the foot of the inner one— they both are unclean. If it is found on the foot of the outer one, she is unclean and her girl-friend is clean. If it is found between them both are unclean. There was a case in which it happened that blood was found on the edge of a bath, and on an olive leaf with which she was lighting the oven. The case came before sages, and they declared them unclean [T. Nid. 7:3D-K].**
- F. *This is a problem of diverse Tannaite formulations, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- G. *R. Jacob declared unclean, and R. Nehemiah declared clean, but sages gave instructions in accord with the position of R. Nehemiah.*

I.1 clarifies the Mishnah’s rule, by dealing with a condition on the status of the gentile woman. No. 2 cites and clarifies the pertinent passage of the Tosefta. No.

3 forms a continuation of No. 2, and Nos. 4, 5, of No. 3. II.1 clarifies and expands upon the Mishnah's statement of Nehemiah's position. No. 2 extends the foregoing.

## 9:4

- A. **Three women who were sleeping in one bed, and blood was found under one of them —**
- B. **they all are unclean.**
- C. **[If] one of them examined herself and was found unclean —she is unclean. And the [other] two of them are clean.**
- D. **And they attribute it [the blood] to one another.**
- E. **And if they were not apt to see a flow of blood, they regard them as if they were apt to see a flow of blood.**

- I.1** A. Said R. Judah said Rab, “But this rule [**If one of them examined herself and was found unclean —she is unclean. And the other two of them are clean**] applies only to a case in which she examined herself immediately [after discovering the blood [Slotki: but if it was later than that, the others are unclean as well]].”
- B. *He takes the same view as Bar Peda, who has said, “In any case in which her husband is liable to a sin offering [for inadvertently having had sexual relations when she was menstruating, for instance, when she discovered menstrual blood right after intercourse, so it is assumed that the blood came during intercourse (Slotki)], the foods requiring cultic cleanness that she has prepared are unclean; if her husband is liable to a suspensive guilt offering, the foods she has prepared in conditions of cultic cleanness are kept in suspense. If her husband is exempt from a sin offering altogether, then the food requiring preparation in cultic cleanness that she has prepared is deemed to remain cultically clean.”*
- C. And R. Oshaia said, “Even if her husband is liable to a sin-offering, the food that she has prepared in conditions of cultic clean is merely kept in suspense.” [Slotki: it follows that our Mishnah, which has ruled that only the woman who found herself on examination to be unclean is regarded as the cause of the blood while the two others remain clean, upholds the opinion of Bar Pada, who, where the examination took place immediately after the clean things had been handled, regards the things as definitely unclean; it must be contrary to the view of Oshaia, who, even in such a case, an examination after the shortest interval, regards the clean things as being merely in a suspended state].
- D. *Now in that case, I might say that it is the “attendant” [the penis] that has obstructed the blood, but in this case if the blood really was there [so the discharge had occurred earlier] what would have obstructed it? [Slotki: nothing, hence only in the case of intercourse does the husband become liable for a sin offering, but in the case of clean things, no certain uncleanness may be presumed].*
- E. Said R. Jeremiah, “The parable that serves R. Oshaia is as follows: to what the matter to be compared? To a child and an old man walking along the way. So long as they are walking on the way, the child lags behind [following the lead of the old man]. When they enter town, the child hurries up [knowing his way home].”



- F. And said Abbayye, “The parable that serves R. Oshaia is as follows: to what the matter to be compared? To a man who puts his finger in his eye. So long as the finger is on the eye, tears are held back, but as soon as the finger is removed, the tears quickly gush forth.”

**II.1 A. And they attribute it [the blood] to one another:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. How do they attribute the blood to one another?
- D. If one of the women was pregnant and the other was not, the one who was pregnant blames the bloodstain on the one who was not. If one was nursing and the other was not, the one who was nursing blames it on the one who was not. If one of them was superannuated and the other was not, the one who was superannuated blames it on the one who was not. If one was a virgin and the other was not, the one who was a virgin may blame it on the one who was not.
- E. If both of them were pregnant, nursing, superannuated, or virgins — this is the case to which applies the statement, **And if they were not apt to see a flow of blood, they regard them [61A] as if they were apt to see a flow of blood.**
- The clarification of the rule, I.1, yields a discussion of the conflict between Bar Peda and Oshaia. But the relevance to the clarification and amplification of the Mishnah’s rule is obvious. II.1 clarifies the rule of the Mishnah.

**9:5**

- A. **Three women who were sleeping in one bed, and blood was found under the middle one —**
- B. **they all are unclean.**
- C. **[If it was found] under the one on the inside, the two on the inside are unclean. But the outer one is clean.**
- D. **[If it was found] under the one on the outside, the two on the outside are unclean, and the one on the inside is clean.**
- E. **Said R. Judah, “Under what circumstances? When they got into bed via the foot of the bed. But if the three of them passed across [the bed], they all are unclean.”**
- F. **“[If] one of them examined herself and was found to be clean, she is clean, and the other two are unclean.**
- G. **“[If] two of them examined themselves and found themselves to be clean, they are clean, and the third is unclean.**
- H. **“[If] the three of them examined themselves and found themselves to be clean, they are all unclean.**
- I. **“To what is the matter comparable?**
- J. **“To an unclean heap [containing a bit of corpse matter] that was confused with two clean heaps, and they examined one of them and found it to be clean, it is clean, and the other two are unclean. [If] the two were examined and found to be clean, they are clean, and the third is unclean. [If] three were examined and found to be clean, they are all unclean,” the words of R. Meir.**

- K.** For R. Meir said, “Anything which is assumed to be unclean remains perpetually in its status of uncleanness until it will be known to you where the uncleanness is.”
- L.** And sages say, “One examines until one reaches rock or virgin soil.”
- I.1 A.** *What is the distinction between the initial rule [Three women who were sleeping in one bed, and blood was found under one of them — they all are unclean. If one of them examined herself and was found unclean —she is unclean. And the [other] two of them are clean], in which no distinction is made between blood found in the middle, inner, or outer positions, and the present case [If it was found] under the one on the inside, the two on the inside are unclean. But the outer one is clean. If it was found under the one on the outside, the two on the outside are unclean, and the one on the inside is clean], in which such a distinction is made?*
- B.** Said R. Ammi, “The former is a case in which the women were interlocked [so it is not possible to distinguish among them].”
- II.1 A.** [If] one of them examined herself [and was found to be clean, she is clean, and the other two are unclean. If two of them examined themselves and found themselves to be clean, they are clean, and the third is unclean. If the three of them examined themselves and found themselves to be clean, they are all unclean. To what is the matter comparable? To an unclean heap containing a bit of corpse matter that was confused with two clean heaps, and they examined one of them and found it to be clean, it is clean, and the other two are unclean. If the two were examined and found to be clean, they are clean, and the third is unclean. If three were examined and found to be clean, they are all unclean];
- B.** *What is the point of including in the Tannaite formulation, To what is the matter comparable?*
- C.** *This is the sense of what R. Meir said to rabbis, “What is the difference between blood, in which you do not differ from me, and the case of that in a heap, in which you do differ [Slotki: maintaining that, if the examination was continued down to bedrock or virgin soil and no trace of a corpse was found, the heap may be regarded as clean despite the presumptive existence of a piece of corpse in one of the heaps]?*
- D.** *And rabbis?*
- E.** *In that case, to be sure, I might say that a raven has carried away the piece of corpse, but in this case, [if all the women are clean] from whence did the blood come anyhow?*
- II.2. A.** *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B.** Said R. Meir, “There was the case of a sycamore in Kefar Saba, under which people took for granted uncleanness was located. They searched it out and found nothing under it. One time the wind came and blew it down from the roots, and the skull of a corpse was found cleaving to the roots” [T. **Nid. 8:5C**].
- C.** They said to him, “Is there proof from that case? I may simply say that they did not search it out to the full extent that was necessary.”

- D. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. **Said R. Yosé, “There was the case of a cave in Shehin, in which people took for granted uncleanness was located. They examined it until the ground was smooth as a fingernail. One time the workers went into it because of the rain, and when they were chopping with the spades that were in their hands, they found a mortar full of bones” [T. Nid. 8:6A-B].**
- F. They said to him, “Is there proof from that case? I may simply say that they did not search it out to the full extent that was necessary.”
- G. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. **Abba Saul says, “There was the case of a rock clod in Bet Horon, in which they took for granted was uncleanness, but they were unable to inspect it because it was too extensive an area. But there was a certain elder, named R. Joshua b. Hanania, who said to them, ‘Bring me a sheet.’ They brought on to him, and they soaked it in water and spread it over the clod, and it turned out that at the sides it was wet, but at the center it was dry. They examined it, and found there a large cistern full of corpses” [T. Nid. 8:7A-B].**

**II.3.** A. *A Tannaite version stated:*

- B. It was the pit that Ishmael, son of Nethaniah, had filled with slaughtered people: “Now the pit wherein Ishmael cast all the dead bodies of the men whom he had slain by the hand of Gedaliah” (Jer. 41: 9).
- C. But was it Gedaliah who killed them? Was it not in fact Ishmael who killed them?
- D. But since he should have taken into account the advice of Yohanan, son of Kareah, but did not do so [Jer. 40:13ff.], Scripture regards it as though he had killed him.

**II.4.** A. *Said Raba, “Gossip, even though one should not accept it, still, one should take note of it.”*

- B. *There were some Galileans, concerning whom word went out that they killed somebody. They came to R. Tarfon, saying to him, “Will the master hide us?”*
- C. *He said, “What should I do? If I do not hide you, people will see you. If I hide you, I will be violating the statement of rabbis, ‘Gossip, even though one should not accept it, still, one should take note of it..’ So go and hide yourselves.”*

**II.5.** A. “And the Lord said to Moses, Do not fear him” (Num. 21:34):

- B. *Were not Sihon and Og brothers, for a master said, “Sihon and Og were sons of Ahijah, son of Shehazai,” so why did he fear Og but not Sihon?*
- C. Said R. Yohanan said R. Simeon b. Yohai, “From the answer of that righteous man, you may know what was in his heard, for he thought, ‘Perhaps the merit of our father, Abraham, will support him, for it is said, “And there came one who had escaped and told Abram the Hebrew” (Gen. 14:13).’”

- D. And said R. Yohanan, “This speaks of Og, who had escaped the fate of the generation of the blood.”

## Composite Serving M. 9:6

### II.6. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. A garment in which a bloodstain was lost — one applies to it the seven substances [Seven substances do they pass over the bloodstain [to see whether it is blood or dye (M. 9:6A)] ]and so neutralizes it.
- C. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, [61B] “One examines it section by section.”
- D. If semen was lost in it, if it is new, one examines the garment with a needle, and if it is worn it, one examines it in sunlight.”
- E. *A Tannaite authority [stated], “A strip may not be less than three fingerbreadths.”*

## Appendix on a garment in which there is another source of prohibition, namely, mixed fabrics

### II.7. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. A garment in which there is lost a mixture of linen and flax — lo, one may not sell it to a gentile or make it into a packsaddle for an ass, but one may make it into a shroud for a corpse.
- C. Said R. Joseph, “That implies that the religious duties are nullified in the age to come.”
- D. *Said to him Abbaye, and some say, R. Dimi, “But has not R. Mani said R. Yannai said, ‘This rule [concerning the use of the mixed substances for a shroud] only applies to the shroud that is used for the funeral, but for use for burial, it is forbidden’?”*
- E. *He said to him, “Has it not been stated in that connection, ‘Said R. Yohanan, ‘It may be used even for burial’?”*
- F. *And R. Yohanan is consistent with positions expressed elsewhere, for said R. Yohanan, “‘What is the meaning of the following verse: ‘Free among the dead’ (Psa. 88: 6)? When a person dies, he is free of religious duties.”*

### II.8. A. Rafram b. Pappa in the name of R. Hisda said, “A garment in which there is lost a mixture of linen and flax — lo, one may dye it, and then it is permitted [for routine use].”

- B. *Said Raba to Rafram b. Pappa, “How does the elder know this?”*
- C. *He said to him, “It is in accord with our Mishnah, for we have learned in the Mishnah: One examines until one reaches rock or virgin soil. If it is not there, then we assume that a raven carried it away. Here too, dye does not have the same affect on wool that it does on flax, and since there is no difference to be discerned, we assume that the threads that should not be there have dropped out.”*

### II.9. A. Said R. Aha b. R. Yeba in the name of Mar Zutra, “If someone inserted flaxen threads into his woolen garment and then pulled them out but is not certain

*whether or not he has pulled all of them out, he may wear the garment. What is the operative consideration? Since in Scripture it is written, ‘mingled stuff,’ the law of the Pentateuch applies only if the material was hackled, spun, and woven [M. Kil. 9:8], and only rabbis have imposed a prohibition on it [if it was not hackled, spun, and woven]. Since the man is not sure that he has pulled out all the threads, the garment is permitted.”*

- B. *R. Ashi objected, “But perhaps the sense is, either hackled, or spun, or woven?”*
- C. *The decided law accords with the position of Mar Zutra, for the All-Merciful has put all three classifications of weaving into a single word.*

**II.10.** *A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **A dyed garment may become unclean by reason of the presence of a bloodstain.**
- C. **And R. Nathan b. Joseph says, “It is made unclean by reason of the presence of a bloodstain [T. Nid. 8:12B-C],**
- D. *“For sages ordained the use of dyed garments for women only in order to remit the law in regard to bloodstains.”*
- E. *“ordained”? Who ordained them?*
- F. *Rather, “the use of dyed garments for women was permitted only in order to remit the law in regard to bloodstains.”*
- G. *“...were permitted”? Then does that mean to imply that they had been forbidden earlier?*
- H. *Indeed so, for we have learned in the Mishnah: In the war against Vespasian they decreed against the wearing of wreaths by bridegrooms and against the wedding drum. In the war against Titus they decreed against the wearing of wreaths by brides, And [they decreed] that a man should not teach Greek to his son. In the last war [Bar Kokhba’s] they decreed that a bride should not go out in a palanquin inside the town. But our rabbis [thereafter] permitted the bride to go out in a palanquin inside the town [M. Sot. 9:14].*
- I. *They wanted furthermore to make a decree against wearing dyed garments, but they held, “It is better not to do so, so as to remit the law in regard to bloodstains [by making it more difficult to identify bloodstains under some circumstances].”*

I.1 begins with the contrast between two distinct Mishnah-rules. II.1 provides an explanation of what purpose the parable serves here. No. 2 proceeds to Tosefta’s materials pertinent to the dispute at hand. It is a free-standing response to the Mishnah’s dispute, not a continuation of No. 1. No. 3 is a footnote to No. 2. No. 4 then forms a comment on the subject matter of No. 3, and No. 5 serves the same purpose.

Now we come to the odd but obvious problem that No. 6 moves us on to the next Mishnah-paragraph. It is out of place here, as is No. 7, but No. 8 explains why the whole — already formed — was situated here rather than after the Mishnah to come. Slotki explains, along these same lines: “The following Baraitas have been suggested to the compiler by the law *supra* concerning heaps in which an unclean object had been lost beyond recovery.” No. 10 is placed by Tosefta into the context of the following Mishnah. I have kept matters where they are located by

the available version of the Bavli, for the convenience of the reader; a “critical text” presumably would relocate these materials.

## 9:6-7

### 9:6

- A. Seven substances do they pass over the bloodstain [to see whether it is blood or dye]:
- B. (1) tasteless spit, and (2) water from boiled grits, and (3) urine, and (4) niter, and (5) lye-soap, [62A] (6) Cimolian earth, and (7) lion’s leaf.
- C. [If] one immersed it and prepared things requiring cleanness depending upon it,
- D. [if] one rubbed on it these seven substances and it did not disappear, (1) lo, this is dye.
- E. (2) The things requiring cleanness are deemed clean, and (3) one does not have to immerse.
- F. [If] it passed away or became faded, (1) lo, this is a bloodstain, and (2) the things requiring cleanness are deemed unclean, and (3) one has to immerse.

### 9:7

- A. What is tasteless spit? That of one who has eaten nothing.
- B. What is water from boiled grits? Paste made from grits of peeled beans.
- C. Urine? That which has fermented.
- D. And one must scour [the stain] with each of the seven substances three times.
- E. [If] one rubbed them on not in order, or [if] one rubbed in all seven substances at once, he has done nothing whatsoever.

**I.1** A. [Niter:] *It is taught by a Tannaite authority:*

- B. the Alexandrian natron, not the Antipatrian one.

### **II.1** A. Lye:

- B. Said R. Judah, “This is *ahala*.”
- C. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority, “Borit and ahala “ [so the two are the same thing.]”*
- D. *Rather, what is borit ? It is sulphur.*
- E. *An objection was raised:* [Sages] added to the list [Slotki:] the bulb of ornithogalum and garden-orache, *borit* and *ahal* .
- F. *Now if borit were sulphur, would it be subject to the law of the Seventh Year, since it has been taught:* This is the encompassing rule: whatever has a root is subject to the law of the Seventh Year, and whatever has no root is exempt from the law of the Seventh Year.
- G. *Then what? Is borit the same as ahala?* But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority, “*Borit and ahala “ [so the two are the same thing.]”*
- H. There are two kinds of *ahala*.

### **III.1** A. Cimolian earth:

- B. Said R. Judah, “This is ‘pull-out-stick-in.’”



#### **IV.1 A. lion's leaf:**

- B. *Said Samuel, "I asked those who go down to the sea, and they told me, [Slotki:] 'It is called ashлага, and it is found between the cracks of pearls and is extracted with an iron nail.'"*

#### **V.1 A. [If] one immersed it and prepared things requiring cleanness depending upon it, [if] one rubbed on it these seven substances and it did not disappear, (1) lo, this is dye:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **If one passed the seven substances on it and it did not go away, and then put soap on it and it disappeared, foods that he has prepared requiring conditions of cleanness are unclean [T. Nid. 8:11C].**
- D. *But soap also removes dye!*
- E. **Rather: If one passed over it six substances and it did not go away, and then one passed over it soap as well, it disappeared, then foods that he has prepared requiring conditions of cleanness are unclean. For if he had first applied the seventh substance to it, it might also have disappeared [Slotki: and any stain that disappears under an application of the seven substances can only be a bloodstain].**
- F. *There is a further teaching on Tannaite authority:*
- G. **If one passed the seven substances on it and it did not pass away, and one did it a second time and then it did pass away, then foods prepared under conditions of cleanness are deemed to remain clean [T. Nid. 8:11A-B].**
- H. *Said R. Zira, "This rule pertains only to foods requiring adherence to the rules of cleanness that were prepared between the first laundering and the second. But as to foods requiring adherence to the rules of cleanness after the second laundering, those foods are unclean, since lo, the person had been meticulous about the bloodstain [as shown by his attempt to remove it twice] and it has indeed disappeared."*
- I. **[62B]** *Said R. Abba to R. Ashi, "Does the matter depend on whether or not one is meticulous?"*
- J. *He said to him, "Indeed so, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Hiyya says, 'To what is certainly menstrual blood one applies the seven substances, so as to neutralize the blood.' But why should this be the case? It is menstrual blood! It must follow, therefore, that the matter does depend on whether or not one is meticulous. Here too the matter does depend on whether or not one is meticulous."*

#### **Free-standing Composition, Serving M. Kelim 9:5. Inserted because our Mishnah-Paragraph contributes to the discussion.**

**V.2. A. There we have learned in the Mishnah:** [As to] sherds which have been used [Bavli: by a person unclean with flux uncleanness] [Mishnah:] unclean liquids and absorbed liquid and fell into the airspace of the oven, [if] the oven was heated, [the oven is] unclean, for liquid eventually exudes. [And so with new olive peat. But with

old [olive peat], [the oven is] clean. And if it is known that liquids exude from them even after three years, it is made unclean] [M. Kel. 9:5A-E].

B. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “That rule [that uncleanness is imparted to the oven only if the oven was heated, but if it was not heated, the absorbed liquids do not impart uncleanness] pertains only in the case of liquid that has been subjected to a minor uncleanness [such as the tears of a zab (Slotki)]. But in the case of liquid that has been subjected to uncleanness of a major order, the oven is unclean even though it has not been heated.”

C. R. Yohanan said, “Whether the liquids were unclean with a minor uncleanness or with a major one, if the oven was heated, it is unclean, if not, not.”

D. *An objection was raised by R. Yohanan to R. Simeon b. Laqish: [If] one immersed it and prepared things requiring cleanness depending upon it, [if] one rubbed on it these seven substances and it did not disappear, lo, this is dye. The things requiring cleanness are deemed clean, and one does not have to immerse.* [Slotki: Now if it be granted with Yohanan that an absorbed uncleanness, though it emerges under special conditions, is treated as clean, the assumption here that the stain was one of dye and therefore clean is justified; for even though it was blood, it would, being absorbed, convey no uncleanness. But if it is maintained, with Simeon b. Laqish, that even an absorbed uncleanness, wherever it would emerge under certain conditions, conveys uncleanness, how could the law be related in this case, where the possibility of blood cannot be ruled out?]

E. *He said to him, “Forget about bloodstains, which are in any case only on the authority of rabbis.”*

F. *[Yohanan replied,] “But has not R. Hiyya taught on Tannaite authority: ‘To what is certainly menstrual blood one applies the seven substances, so as to neutralize the blood?’”* [Slotki: this shows that even actual blood, if it is in an absorbed state, though it would emerge under an application of soap, is regarded as clean. How could Simeon b. Laqish maintain that where the oven was not heated, uncleanness is conveyed by the absorbed liquid?]

G. *He said to him, “Rabbi [Judah the Patriarch] did not teach that rule [in the Mishnah], so whence could R. Hiyya have known it as a valid rule?”* [It is not a valid rule.]

H. *An objection was raised by R. Yohanan to R. Simeon b. Laqish: A quarter-log of blood which was absorbed in [the ground] of a house — the house is clean* [M. Oh. 3:2D].

I. *And some say, “The house is clean.”*

J. *But there is no contradiction, the one refers to utensils that were there to begin with, the other to utensils that were there later on.*

K. [If] it was absorbed in clothing — if it is washed and a quarter-log of blood exudes from it, it is unclean; and if not, it is clean. For whatever is absorbed which cannot exude is clean [M. Oh. 3:2E-G]. [Slotki: An absorbed uncleanness, though it would emerge under special conditions, is regarded as clean.]

L. Said R. Kahana, “What they have repeated here are rules that apply a lenient law to a quarter-log [speaking of a mixture of clean and unclean blood]. *But the law of mixed blood is exceptional, since it is based only on the authority of rabbis [and that disposes of Yohanan’s precedent].*”

M. R. Simeon b. Laqish objected to R. Yohanan: “**For whatever is absorbed which cannot exude is clean** [M. Oh. 3:2G]. Lo, if it can exude, it is unclean! *And that is the case, even if it does not actually exude.*”

N. Said R. Pappa, “*In any case in which it cannot exude and one is not meticulous about it, all parties concur that it is clean. If it can exude and one is meticulous about it, all parties concur that it is unclean. Where there is a dispute, it concerns a case in which it can exude and one is not meticulous about it. One party maintains that even though it can exude, [63A] if one is meticulous about it, it is unclean, but otherwise, it is not.*” [Slotki: The inference from the passage cited by Simeon b. Laqish, from which it follows that if it can emerge, it is unclean, even though it had not yet emerged, applies to a case where the owner minded the absorption.]

**VI.1** A. What is tasteless spit? That of one who has eaten nothing:

- B. *It has been taught by a Tannaite authority: What is tasteless spit? It is spit of anyone who has tasted nothing since the preceding evening, [even the entire day. If one slept for the entire day, he does not produce tasteless spit. If one was awake all night, he does produce tasteless spit] [T. Nid. 8:8A-D].*
- C. *R. Pappa considered explaining before Raba, “This with one who has said, ‘he has eaten nothing the preceding evening.’”*
- D. *Said Raba to him, “Does it say, in the evening? What is says is, since the preceding evening. This excludes the case of one who got up early and ate.”*

**VI.2.** A. Said Rabbah b. b. Hannah said R. Yohanan, “What is tasteless spit? It is spit of anyone who spent half the night in sleep.”

- B. *Does that then imply that the matter depends on whether or not one has slept? But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: If one slept for the entire day, he does not produce tasteless spit. If one was awake all night, he does produce tasteless spit [T. Nid. 8:8A-D].*
- C. *There we deal with one who was drowsy.*
- D. *What can be the definition of one who was drowsy?*
- E. *Said R. Ashi, “Sleeping but not sleeping, awake and not awake. If they call him, he answers, but he does not know how to answer, but when he is reminded of something, he can remember it.”*

**VI.3.** A. *It has been taught by a Tannaite authority:*

- B. If one got up early in the morning and repeated his chapter, this one cannot produce tasteless spit.
- C. To what extent?
- D. Said R. Judah bar Shila said R. Ashi said R. Eleazar, "It is any case in which the greater part of one's lesson can be [repeated] in three hours."

**VII.1 A. What is water from boiled grits? Paste made from grits of peeled beans:**

- B. *May I say that this sustains the position of R. Simeon b. Laqish, for R. Simeon b. Laqish has said, "There must be tasteless spittle with each of the other substances"?*
- C. *Perhaps it is enough to make use of the breath of one's mouth [to make the paste].*

**VII.2.** A. *Our Mishnah's [definition of the water from boiled grits] does not concur with the position of R. Judah, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, "Boiling liquid of crushed beans before salt is put into it [since salt would weaken the mixture]."*

**VII.3.** A. *How do we know that the word translated "before" bears the meaning, "prior"?*

- B. Said R. Nahman b. Isaac, "Scripture says, 'Then Ahimaaz ran by way of the plain and overran the Cushite' (2Sa. 18:23) [and the word translated 'overran' bears the same letters, hence, came prior to]."
- B. *Abbaye said, "Proof comes from here: 'And he himself passed over before them' (Gen. 33: 3), and if you prefer, 'And their king is passed on before them, and the Lord is before them' (Mic. 2:13)."*

**VIII.1 A. Urine? That which has fermented:**

- B. *It has been taught by a Tannaite authority:*
- C. **How long must be the fermentation? Three days [T. Nid. 8:9C].**
- D. Said R. Yohanan "Every definition of a standard measure given by sages with respect to bloodstains require further definitions of standards as well: is it the urine of a minor or an old man, man or woman, covered or not covered, summer or winter?"

**IX.1 A. And one must scour [the stain] with each of the seven substances three times:**

- B. *R. Jeremiah raised the question, "Do we count the forward and backward movement as one or as two? What is the law?"*
- C. *The question stands.*

**X.1 A. [If] one rubbed them on not in order, or [if] one rubbed in all seven substances at once, he has done nothing whatsoever:**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. If the items listed in our Mishnah last, the final four of the seven, were applied before the three items listed first —
- C. *one Tannaite version teaches, the latter set counts, the former does not count [T. Nid. 8:10D].*

- D. *And another Tannaite version teaches, the first set counts, the latter does not count*
- E. *Said Abbaye, "According to both statements, the latter group count and the former does not, but 'former' means, first in order, even though applied second in the process of application."*

What we have at I, II, III, and IV are light glosses of the items of the Mishnah's paragraph. V.1 turns to Tosefta's complement to the same. No. 2 is tacked on because it cites our Mishnah. But there is a general congruence between its problem and the rule of our Mishnah, so the net effect is to amplify what is before us. VI.1,2 gloss the Mishnah through the Tosefta's complement. No. 3 continues this process. VII.1, 2 gloss in yet another way, by extending the framework of the Mishnah's rule. No. 3 glosses No. 2.

VIII.1 glosses the Mishnah by appeal to the Tosefta. IX.1 contributes a question of clarification, which is not answered, and X.1 appeals once again to Tosefta's complement.

## 9:8

- A. **Any woman who has a fixed period — [it is] sufficient for her [to reckon her period of uncleanness, thus of having imparted uncleanness to objects she touched from] her [set] time.**
- B. **And these are [the tokens] of fixed periods [premenstrual syndrome]:**
- C. **[if before discharging menstrual blood] she (1) yawns, or (2) sneezed, or (3) felt pain in the top of her stomach or the bottom of her bowels or (4) discharges, or (5) a kind of shuddering takes hold of her.**
- D. **And so with similar phenomena.**
- E. **And any woman who has established [that the presence of one of these tokens signals the onset of her period] three times, lo, this is a fixed period.**

- I.1** A. *We have learned this rule already: Every woman who has a fixed period — sufficient for her is her time [M. 1:1G].*
- B. *That period is settled by the number of days [e.g., the day of the lunar calendar], while the period here is settled by the attributes of her body's premenstrual syndrome, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **[if before discharging menstrual blood] she (1) yawns, or (2) sneezed, or (3) felt pain in the top of her stomach or the bottom of her bowels or (4) discharges...**

### **II.1** A. [discharges:]

- B. *But does she not continually discharge?*
- C. Said Ulla b. R. Ilai, **[63B]** "This is a case where she discharges unclean blood from the midst of clean blood [Slotki: that is not menstrual, as can be ascertained by an examination of its color. A settled period is established where menstrual discharge is preceded by one of clean blood]."

### **III.1** A. **a kind of shuddering takes hold of her. And so with similar phenomena:**

- B. *What is encompassed in addition by the language, " And so with similar phenomena"?*

- C. *Said Rabbah b. Ulla, "To encompass a woman whose head feels heavy, or whose limbs feel heavy, who shivers or burps."*

**III.2.** A. Said R. Huna bar Hiyya said Samuel, "Lo, they have said, 'As to the settled period established by days, two such occurrences are required; as to settled periods that are established by premenstrual syndrome, one such occurrence is enough; for settled periods involving conditions that sages have not enumerated, there must be three occurrences.' *But I do not know what is encompassed under 'settled periods involving conditions that sages have not enumerated.'*"

- B. *Said R. Joseph, "To encompass a woman whose head feels heavy, or whose limbs feel heavy, who shivers or burps."*

- C. *Said Abbaye to him, "What then does he propose to infer for us, since this is the sense of the Mishnah-paragraph, for lo, Rabbah bar Ulla has explained it."*

- D. *Rather, said Abbaye, "It is meant to encompass someone who ate garlic and produced a discharge, who ate onions and produced a discharge, or who chewed pepper and produced a discharge."*

- E. *Said R. Joseph, "I have not heard this tradition."*

- F. *Said to him Abbaye, "You are the one who said it to us: if she ordinarily produced blood on the fifteenth of the month and changed to the twentieth, this and that day are forbidden. If it happened three times that the blood flowed on the twentieth day, the fifteenth day is permitted, and she has established for herself a fixed period on the twentieth, for a woman can establish a period only does so if the discharge appears three times on the same date [cf. T. Nid. 9:3A]. And in this connection you said to us, said R. Judah said Samuel, 'This is the ruling of R. Gamaliel b. Rabbi, who said it in the name of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, but sages say, "If she produced blood, she does not have to repeat it a second and a third time.'" And we said to you, "Since you said, "She does not have to repeat it a second," was there any need to add, "and a third time," and you replied to us, 'As to settled periods determined by the premenstrual syndrome affecting her body, she does not have to repeat it a second time, and as to settled period determined by the number of days, she does not have to repeat it a third time.'"*

- G. *But why not say, "...the words of Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel'?"*

- H. In this way Samuel tells us that R. Gamaliel b. Rabbi shares the view as Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel.

I.1 asks the obvious and necessary question, why the rule is repeated. II.1's clarification is important. No. 2 reverts to our original treatment of the relationship of the laws of two parallel Mishnah-paragraphs.

## 9:9

- A. [If] she habitually saw blood at the beginning of [symptoms of] periods, all things requiring cleanness which she prepared while the [symptoms of] periods are in progress are unclean.

- B. [If she usually saw blood] at the end of [symptoms of] periods, all the things requiring cleanness which she prepared while [the symptoms of] the periods lasted are deemed clean.



- C. R. Yosé says, “Settled periods [are also determined by] even the days and hours.
- D. “If she habitually saw blood with the sunrise, she is prohibited only at sunrise.”
- E. R. Judah says, “The entire day belongs to her.”

**I.1** A. *A Tannaite authority stated, In what way did R. Yosé say, “Settled periods [are also determined by] even the days and hours”?*

- B. “If she ordinarily produced blood on the twentieth day of the month, at the sixth hour of the twentieth day, and the twentieth day came and she did not see blood, she is forbidden to have sexual relations the first six hours of the day,” the words of R. Judah.
- C. And R. Yosé permits the period through the sixth hour, but then takes account of the possibility that she may produce blood from that time.
- D. “If the six hours passed and she did not produce blood, she is forbidden to have sexual relations that entire day,” the words of R. Judah.
- E. And R. Yosé permits from dusk onward [T. [Nid. 9:2A-G](#)].

**II.1** A. “If she habitually saw blood with the sunrise, she is prohibited only at sunrise.” R. Judah says, “The entire day belongs to her.”

- B. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, “The entire night is hers”?*
- C. *There is no contradiction. The one rule pertains to a woman who ordinarily produces blood at the beginning of the day, the other to a woman who ordinarily produces blood at the end of the night.*

**II.2.** A. *One Tannaite version states, “R. Judah forbids her from having sexual relations prior to her fixed time but permits her to do so afterward.”*

- B. *And another Tannaite version states, “He forbids her from having sexual relations after the arrival of her fixed time, but permits her to do so prior to the arrival of her fixed time.”*
- C. *There is no contradiction. The one rule pertains to a woman who ordinarily produces blood at the end of the night, the other to a woman who ordinarily produces blood at the beginning of the day.*

**II.3.** A. Said Raba, “The decided law accords with the position of R. Judah.”

- B. *Now has Raba made such a statement? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “‘Thus shall you separate the children of Israel from their uncleanness” (Lev. 15:31) —
- D. in this connection said R. Jeremiah, “This is an admonition to the children of Israel to separate from their wives near their periods.”
- E. And for how long?
- F. Said Raba, “For one period of a day or a night.”
- G. *Does this not mean, for an addition period of a day or a night?*
- H. *No, it means, for the same period of a day or a night.*
- I. *Then why say the same thing twice?*

J. *It was necessary to do so, for if we had heard only the former statement, one might have supposed that that rule pertains only to clean things but not to a woman's being permitted to have sexual relations with her husband; so we are given the latter statement as well.*

J. *And if we had in hand only the latter statement, one might have thought that near her settled period an additional span of a day or a night is required, so we are informed that only one such spell is required.*

I.1 complements the Mishnah with Tosefta's clarification, and II.1 contrasts several versions of the same rule. No. 2 follows suit. No. 3 proceeds to a familiar process.

## 9:10

A. **[If] she habitually saw blood on the fifteenth day of the month and changed her pattern and saw blood on the twentieth day,**

B. **[sexual relations on] this day and that day are prohibited.**

C. **[If] she twice changed to the twentieth day, this day and that day are prohibited.**

D. **[If] she three times changed to the twentieth day, the fifteenth day is now permitted,**

E. **and she has established for herself a fixed period on the twentieth day.**

F. **For a woman does not establish for herself a fixed period until she has established it three times.**

G. **And she is not cleaned from [uncleanness imposed by] a fixed period until it will have been uprooted from her three times.**

**I.1** A. **[64A]** *It has been stated:*

B. *If a woman produced blood on the fifteenth day of this month, on the sixteenth day of the next month, and on the seventeenth day of the third month —*

C. *Rab said, "She has established a fixed period for herself [Slotki:] in arithmetical progression [Slotki: the eighteenth day of the fourth month, the nineteenth of the fifth, and so on are consequently forbidden days]."*

D. *And Samuel said, "She does so only when she will have repeated the arithmetical progression for a third time." [Slotki: the appearance on the fifteenth is not counted, since it was the first of the series, when the process of progression had not yet been apparent.]*

E. *May we say that Rab and Samuel are engaged in the same dispute as Rabbi and Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

F. **"If a woman was married to a first husband who died, to a second who died, to a third she should not be wed," the words of Rabbi.**

G. **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "To a third she may be married, but to a fourth she should not be married. [If she produces males and they were circumcised and died, if the first was circumcised and died, the second and he died, the third may be circumcised, but the fourth should not be circumcised]" [T. **Shab. 15:8A-C**].**

H. *No, all parties concur with Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel's position, but in this case, what is at stake is the following: Rab takes the position that the fifteenth is*

*counted, and Samuel takes the view that since it was not in arithmetic progression that that menstrual period began, it does not count.*

- I. *An objection was raised: If a woman habitually saw blood on the fifteenth day and she changed her pattern to the seventeenth [Bavli: sixteenth] day, this and that are prohibited. If she changed to the sixteenth [Bavli: seventeenth] day, the fifteenth and the seventeenth [Bavli: sixteenth] are unclean, the sixteenth is clean. If she changed to the eighteenth day, the three of them are clean, and unclean is only the eighteenth day alone [T. Nid. 9:3A, 9:4A]. Now does this not contradict the principle of Rab?*
- J. *Rab can say to you, "A case in which a woman habitually produces a discharge on a given date is different" [Slotki: from that dealt with by Rab. In the former case the first of the dates under discussion might well be added to the similar dates in the previous months and could not be counted as the first in the arithmetical progression. In the case dealt with by Rab, however, either the first of the dates under discussion was one on which the woman observed a discharge for the very first time, or the woman was one who had never before had a settled period or one whose settled period was on a day other than the first of those under discussion. The first day therefore may well be counted as one of the three days that establish a settled period.]*
- K. *But as to the one who introduced the issue, on what basis did he do so? [Slotki: did he not know the difference between a settled and an unsettled period?]*
- L. *[Though the same law applies to one who had no settled period,] it was necessary to raise the issue. For otherwise, what might you have supposed? Since she was habitually used to produced her discharge on a given date and this has now changed, the change is effective even if it occurred only twice? So we have to be informed that the change must take place three times.*
- M. *An objection was raised: If a woman produced blood on the twenty-first day of this month, on the twenty-second day of the next, and on the twenty-third of the next, she has established a fixed period for herself. If she skipped over from the twenty-second to the twenty-fourth day of the month, she has not established a settled period for herself [Slotki: since the difference between the dates of the first and second month was only one day, while that between the second and the third was two days]. Is this not a refutation of the position of Samuel?*
- N. *Samuel can say to you, "With what sort of a case do we deal here? n who was used to producing blood on the twentieth and changed to the twenty-first [Slotki: so that the change actually occurred three times, the twenty-first, twenty-second, and twenty-third, on dates in arithmetical progression, exclusive of the first date, which was the twentieth]. Examine the language, for example, to see this, for the twentieth day is omitted, and the twenty-first is mentioned."*
- O. *That proves it.*

**II.1 A. For a woman does not establish for herself a fixed period until she has established it three times:**

- B. *Said R. Pappa, "This statement applies only so far as defining a fixed period, but as to whether or not one should take into consideration the appearance of a discharge, a single occurrence suffices."*

- C. *What news is this? We have learned this rule already: [If] she habitually saw blood on the fifteenth day of the month and changed her pattern and saw blood on the twentieth day, [sexual relations on] this day and that day are prohibited.*
- D. *Had I to rely only on that statement, I might have drawn the conclusion that that rule applies only when the woman is still within her menstrual period, but if she is not within her menstrual period, she does not have to take into account the possibility of a discharge. So we are informed to the contrary.*

**III.1 A. And she is not cleaned from [uncleanness imposed by] a fixed period until it will have been uprooted from her three times:**

- B. *Said R. Pappa, "This statement applies only the settled period was established by three regular occurrences, in which case it is uprooted by three occurrences as well, but if the settled period had been established by only two recurrences, it may be uprooted by a single change."*
- C. *What news is this? We have learned this rule already: For a woman does not establish for herself a fixed period until she has established it three times.*
- D. *What might you have thought? One occurrence is required to abolish a fixed period established by one flow, two for two, three for three? So we are told that even for a settled period established by two occurrences, only a single miss is necessary to uproot the period.*
- E. *There is a Tannaite teaching in accord with the position of R. Pappa: If a woman usually produced blood on the twentieth day and changed to the thirtieth day, this one and that one are prohibited, [but she is permitted to have intercourse from the twentieth day to the thirtieth day. And if she saw blood on the twentieth day, she is permitted to have intercourse on the thirtieth day, because her period comes in good order.] If she did not see on the twentieth day, she is prohibited to have intercourse on the thirtieth day [T. Nid. 9:4B-E]. But she takes account of the possibility of producing blood on the thirtieth day. If the thirtieth day came and she produced blood, then the twentieth and she did not produce blood, then the thirtieth and she did not produce blood, then the twentieth and she did, then the thirtieth is permitted [64B] and the twentieth is forbidden, because the guest is now coming in his usual time.*

I.1's clarification of the Mishnah's rule via the dispute of Rab and Samuel is a subtle and rich one. II.1, III.1 amplify our Mishnah's rule in a consistent way.

### 9:11

- A. **Woman as regards [the blood of] virginity are like vines. (1) There is a vine whose wine is red, and (2) there is a vine whose wine is black, and (3) there is a vine whose wine is abundant, and (4) there is a vine whose wine is sparse.**
- B. **R. Judah says, "Every vine has its wine, and that which does not have wine, lo, this is a durketi vine."**

**I.1 A. [Durketi,] a Tannaite authority [stated, means,] "a generation that is cut off."**

- B. *R. Hiyya taught on Tannaite authority: "Just as leaven is good for dough, so blood is good for a woman."*

C. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in the name of R. Meir, “Any woman who has a substantial menstrual flow has a large number of children.”*

The glosses are minor.