

X

BAVLI NIDDAH CHAPTER TEN

FOLIOS 64B-73A

10:1

- A. A girl whose time for seeing [blood] [age of menstruation] had not yet come and who was married —
- B. the House of Shammai say, “They give her four nights [during which all blood is classified as hymeneal; after that point, blood is classified as menstrual].”
- C. And the House of Hillel say, “Until the wound will heal.”
- D. [If] her time for seeing [blood] came and she was married —
- E. the House of Shammai say, “They give her the first night.”
- F. And the House of Hillel say, “Until the end of the Sabbath day,
- G. “[which is to say,] four nights.”
- H. [If] she saw blood [before marriage] and still was in her father’s house [when married] —
- I. the House of Shammai say, “They give her [only] the coition of obligation.”
- J. And the House of Hillel say, “All the night is hers.”
- I.1** A. Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “[**And the House of Hillel say, “Until the wound will heal”**] and even if she has already produced a flow of blood [before marriage, since she has not reached the age of menstruation, the House of Hillel assign that entire span of time (Slotki)].”
- B. *On what basis is this judgment reached?*
- C. *Since, in the concluding clause, there is a distinction between a girl who has menstruated and one who has not, it follows that in the opening rule, no such distinction is to be drawn.*
- D. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. **The House of Hillel say, Until the wound will heal** — whether or not she had earlier produced a discharge of blood.”

II.1 A. Until the wound will heal:

- B. How long is that?
- C. Said R. Judah said Rab, “So long as it discharges matter. *But when I reported that opinion before Samuel*, he said to me, ‘I do not know precisely what ‘discharging’ means. Rather: “so long as ‘spittle is abundant in the mouth’ on account of intercourse [when the intercourse is accompanied by bleeding].””
- D. *As to the “discharging of matter” of which Rab spoke, what is the meaning?*
- E. Said R. Samuel bar R. Isaac, “*It was explained to me by Rab*: when she is standing and produces blood, while sitting she does not, one may be certain that wound has not healed. If she is sitting on the ground and produces blood, on pillows or bolsters and she does not produce blood, one may be certain that the wound has not yet healed. If she is sitting on top of any of them and produces blood, or on top of any of them and does not produce blood, one may be certain that the wound has healed.”

III.1 A. [If] her time for seeing [blood] came and she was married — the House of Shammai say, “They give her the first night.” And the House of Hillel say, “Until the end of the Sabbath day, [which is to say,] four nights [since the virgin is married on Wednesday]:”

- B. *It has been stated:*
- C. If she had sexual relations by day,
- D. Rab said, “She has not lost the use of the nights.”
- E. And Levi said, “She has lost the use of the nights.”
- F. Rab said, “She has not lost the use of the nights — **until the end of the Sabbath** is what we have learned in the Mishnah.”
- G. And Levi said, “She has lost the use of the nights” — for the meaning of **four nights** is four periods [of a day or a night].
- H. *Now from the viewpoint of Rab, why make mention of **four nights**?*
- I. *This is a reference to acceptable practice, specifically, that it is proper for sexual relations to take place by night.*
- J. *But from Levi’s viewpoint, it should have said only, **four nights**. Why say, **Until the end of the Sabbath day**?*
- K. *The formulation teaches us that to begin with it is permitted to have the first act of sexual relations on the Sabbath, and that is in accord with the position of Samuel, who has said, “It is permitted to enter through a narrow breach on the Sabbath, even though one causes pebbles to fall.”*

III.2. A. It has been stated:

- B. If one had sexual relations with a virgin and found no blood, and then went and had sexual relations a second time and found blood —
- C. R. Hanina said, “She is unclean [since this is now treated as menstrual blood].”
- D. And R. Assi said, “She is clean [since this is hymeneal blood].”
- E. R. Hanina said, “She is unclean [since this is now treated as menstrual blood],” *for if this really were hymeneal blood, it would have flowed to begin with.*
- F. And R. Assi said, “She is clean [since this is hymeneal blood],” *for perhaps something odd took place, in line with the position of Samuel.*

- G. For Samuel said, "I can have sexual relations a number of times [with a virgin] without producing a drop of blood."
 - H. *And the other party?*
 - I. *Samuel was exceptional, because his capacity was great [and his penis was small].*
- III.3.** A. Said Rab, "As to a woman who has reached maturity, she is assigned the first night. And that is the case if she has never had a flow of menstrual blood, but if she has already had a period, she is given only the initial act of sexual relations, which fulfills the religious duty of consummating the marriage, alone, *and no further act* [since further blood will be attributed to menstruation]."
- B. *An objection was raised:* There was a case in which Rabbi assigned to her four nights in [the first] twelve months [of her marriage]. [Slotki: the husband having departed for three months after each of the first three acts of intercourse, everyone of which was accompanied by bleeding; despite the length of time, Rabbi regarded the bleeding as due to virginity.]
 - C. *Now how is his ruling to be understood? If we say that he assigned to her all of those nights during the time in which she was yet a minor [not having reached the age in which her period was expected to commence,] [65A] have we not learned, **Until the wound will heal?** Rather, he assigned all of those nights to her during the period of girlhood [between twelve and thirteen years of age]. But does that period of time extend over twelve months, in light of the statement of Samuel, who has said, "The period of girlhood until the period of maturity is never more than six months"? And should you claim that the sense is, it is never less than that span of time, but it can be more than that span of time, the language that has been used is, is never more than six months.*
 - D. *So in point of fact, is it then that he assigned her two of those nights during her minority, and two of those nights during her girlhood? But lo, R. Hinena bar Shelamia asked Rab, "If she reached the time at which her menstrual period should begin when she is married, what is the law?" He said to him, "All of the acts of sexual relations that you have are treated as a single act alone, and the other ones [after she has reached that time] make up the other four nights."*
 - E. So in point of fact, it must be a case in which he assigned her one night when she was a minor, two during the period of girlhood, and one during the time of her maturity.
 - F. *Now, if in general you take the view that a mature woman ordinarily is assigned more than one night [two nights at a minimum], then we may see the basis for the ruling [that Rabbi has made, giving one night during the period of maturity], since, because all the acts of intercourse during the minority are treated as a single such action, during the period of girlhood that intervenes, all acts of intercourse likewise are treated as a single night. But if you take the view that a woman who is mature ordinarily is allowed only one night, then should he not have assigned to her only one act of the required marital relationship to consummate the marriage and no more? [Slotki: how could he ignore completely all previous acts of intercourse and allow her a full night?]*

- G. *In point of fact, he assigned her one night for the days of her minority, three for the days of her girlhood. Do you think that every three months represented a period? Every two months represented a period.*

III.4. A. *Minyamin of Saqsanah was going on a journey to the town of Samuel. He considered making a practical ruling in accord with the position of Rab even in a case in which the woman had already produced a flow of blood, in the assumption that Rab made no distinction between one who had produced blood already and one who had not. But he died while on the journey.*

- B. *In regard to Rab Samuel cited the verse, "There shall no mischief befall the righteous" (Pro. 12:21).*

C. Said R. Hinena bar Shelamaya in the name of Rab, "As soon as a person's teeth fall out, his earning power is reduced: 'And I also have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities and want of bread in all your places' (Amo. 4: 6)."

IV.1 A. **[If] she saw blood [before marriage] and still was in her father's house [when married] — the House of Shammai say, "They give her [only] the coition of obligation." And the House of Hillel say, "All the night is hers:"**

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. **[If] she saw blood [before marriage] and still was in her father's house [when married] — the House of Hillel say, "All the night is hers and she is given a full period [of a day or a night]."**

- C. *And how long is that complete period of a day or a night?*

D. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel spelled it out: "A night and half a day."

E. *But do we require that the full period extend for so long? And an objection was raised: He whose wine vats and olive presses were unclean, and who wants to clean them — as to the boards and the two posts supporting the beams of the press and the troughs, he dries them and they are clean. The cylinders of twigs and of hemp he has to dry out. [65B] The cylinders of bast and of reeds he has to leave unused. And how long does he leave them unused? Twelve months. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "From one wine vintage to the next, and from one pressing season of olives to the next. (But is this ruling of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel not the same as that of the initial authority? At issue between them is the case of early or late ripening fruit.) R. Yosé says, "If one wants to clean them forthwith, he should pour over them boiling water or scald them with water of olives." Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says in the name of R. Yosé, "He places them in a river whose waters flow a whole season or under the spout whose waters flow." And for how long? For one fixed period of time. And just as he dries for cleanness, so he dries for wine used for idolatrous purposes [T. **Tohorot 11:16A-M**]. (But is the order of that statement not reversed, since we are dealing with rules of cleanness? Rather, read: as these rules were applied to cleanness, so they were applied to libation-wine.)*

- F. *Now how long is a fixed period of time?*

G. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, "A day or a night."

- H. R. Hannah Sheunah, and some say, R. Hannah bar Sheunah said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan said, "A half day and a half night."
- I. Said R. Samuel b. R. Isaac, "And there is no conflict. The one speaks of the spring equinox and autumn equinox, the other to the summer solstice and the winter solstice." [Slotki: since the days and the nights are unequal, a fixed period of twelve hours is half a day and half a night. In view of this definition, how could Simeon b. Gamaliel hold that a fixed period is a night and half a day?]
- J. *Here also, in the case of the menstruating woman, read, "half a day and half a night."*
- K. *But is it not stated explicitly, "a night and half a day"?*
- L. *Rather read, "Either a night in spring or fall equinox, or a half day and a half night in the winter or summer solstice."*
- M. *And if you prefer, I shall say, "The case of a marriage-settlement is exceptional, since considerable negotiation takes place before it is signed [Slotki: so it was necessary to extend the fixed period to a full night and half a day]."*

- IV.2.** A. Rab and Samuel both say, "The decided law is that one has sexual relations one time in fulfillment of the religious duty of consummating the marriage and then one separates [and has no further sexual relations until it is clear that the woman is not menstruating]."
- B. R. Hisda objected, "There was a case in which Rabbi assigned to her four nights in [the first] twelve months [of her marriage]. [Slotki: the husband having departed for three months after each of the first three acts of intercourse, everyone of which was accompanied by bleeding; despite the length of time, Rabbi regarded the bleeding as due to virginity.]"
 - C. *Said Rabbah to him, "Why bother going over the same objection? Rather raise one from our Mishnah-paragraph [which allows more than a single act of sexual relations]?"*
 - D. *He takes the view that a concrete decision bears greater weight.*
 - E. *One way or the other, is this not a contradiction of the ruling of Rab and Samuel?*
 - F. *They acted in accord with our rabbis, as it was taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - G. Our rabbis went and voted: one has sexual relations one time in fulfillment of the religious duty of consummating the marriage and then one separates [and has no further sexual relations until it is clear that the woman is not menstruating]."
 - H. *Said Ulla, "When R. Yohanan and R. Simeon b. Laqish were engaged in discussions on the chapter of **A girl whose time for seeing [blood] [age of menstruation] had not yet come and who was married**, all they took away from it was what a fox takes off a ploughed field. They concluded their study with the statement, 'one has sexual relations one time in fulfillment of the religious duty of consummating the marriage and then one separates [and has no further sexual relations until it is clear that the woman is not menstruating].'"*
 - I. Said R. Abba to R. Ashi, "Then maybe a meticulous person should not even complete the act of sexual relations [since the initial entry suffices for consummating the marriage]?"
 - J. He said to him, "If so, one's conscience would trouble him and he would not have sexual relations at all."

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

- B. And all these women, if they were discharging blood continually throughout the four nights and after the four nights or during the night and after it must examine themselves [Slotki: to ascertain from the color of the blood whether it is menstrual or hymeneal blood].
- C. And in all cases, R. Meir imposes a strict rule, in accordance with the position of the House of Shammai.
- D. And as to other appearances of blood which are at issue between the House of Shammai [Slotki: who hold the blood to be unclean without regard to the character of the color and whether the color changed] and the House of Hillel [who maintain that blood is clean even if the color had changed], he followed the color of the blood.
- E. **For R. Meir would say, “The colors of blood are different from one another. How so? The blood of menstruation is red, hymeneal blood is dim, blood of menstruation is from the source [the uterus], hymeneal blood is from the sides” [T. Nid. 9:10A-C].**
- F. Said R. Isaac b. R. Yosé said R. Yohanan, “This is the view of R. Meir, but sages say, ‘All colors of blood are the same.’”

IV.4. A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. She who produces blood on account of having sexual relations may have sexual relations once, twice, and a third time. From that point onward, she may have sexual relations only if she is divorced [66A] and married to someone else.
- C. If she remarried and then produced blood on account of having sexual relations, she may have sexual relations once, twice, and a third time. From that point onward, she may have sexual relations only if she is divorced and married to someone else.
- D. If she remarried and then produced blood on account of having sexual relations, she may have sexual relations once, twice, and a third time. From that point onward, she may have sexual relations only if she examines herself.
- E. How does she examine herself?
- F. She brings a tube, with a paint stick within, and an absorbent at the top. If blood is found on the top of the absorbent, then it is known that the blood comes from the source [the uterus]. If blood is not found on the top, then it is known that the blood comes from the sides of the womb. And if she has a sore on that spot, then the blood is attributed to her sore. And if she has a fixed period, she attributes the blood to her fixed period. And if the blood of her wound is different from the blood that she produces in her menstrual period, she does not attribute the blood to the wound.
- G. “A woman is believed to testify, ‘I have a wound on the source [the uterus], from which blood is flowing,’” the words of Rabbi.
- H. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “Blood of a wound that comes from the source [the uterus] is unclean, and our rabbis are the ones who have given testimony that blood of a wound that comes from the source [the uterus] is clean.”
- I. *What is at issue between [Rabbi and our rabbis, on the one side, and Simeon, on the other]?*

- J. Said Ulla, "At issue between them is whether the interior of the source [the uterus] is unclean."
- K. Will the tube not bruise her [so why will this examination yield a reliable result]?
- L. Said Samuel, "The tube is one made of lead, with the edge bent inwards."
- M. [With reference to C, above,] said R. Simeon b. Laqish to R. Yohanan, "And let her examine herself after the third act of sexual relations with her first husband!?"
- N. He said to him, "The reason is that not all 'fingers' are alike."
- O. He said to him, "Then let her examine herself after the first act of intercourse with the third husband."
- P. "The reason is that not all ejaculations are the same."

IV.5. A. *A certain woman came to Rabbi [who suffered from bleeding on account of intercourse]. He said to Abdan, "Go and frighten her." He came and frightened her, and a clot of blood dropped from her.*

- B. Said Rabbi, "This woman is healed."

IV.6. A. *A certain woman came to Mar Samuel [who suffered from bleeding on account of intercourse]. He said to R. Dimi bar Joseph, "Go, frighten her." He came and frightened her, but nothing dropped from her.*

- B. Said Samuel, "This woman is full of blood, which she scatters, and any woman who is full of blood she scatters has no remedy."

IV.7. A. *A certain woman came before R. Yohanan, who, whenever she came up out of the immersion pool, produced a discharge of blood. He said to her, "Perhaps [Slotki:] the gossip of your townfolk has gone against you. Go, have intercourse with your husband near the side of the river [and avoid gossip]."*

- B. *There are those who say that he said to her, "Go and show your affliction to your girl-friends, so that, as astonished as they were on the one side [because of her husband's ardent love for her], they will be astonished on the other side [by reason of your affliction]."*

- C. *There are those who say that he said to her, "Go and show your affliction to your girl-friends, so that they will seek mercy for you."*

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

- E. "He shall cry out, 'Unclean, unclean'" (Lev. 13:45) — he has to celebrate his anguish in public, so that the public will seek mercy for him.

- F. Said R. Joseph, "There was such a case in Pumbedita and she was healed."

IV.8. A. Said R. Joseph said R. Judah said Rab, "Rabbi ordained in Sadot: 'if a woman saw a discharge on one day, she should count six more days in addition [before having sexual relations, assuming that her period has begun]. If she produced blood for that day and another, she should wait out six days in addition; if she observed a discharge on three, she must wait seven clean days.'"

- B. Said R. Zira, "Israelite women imposed a strict rule on themselves, for even if they produce a drop of blood as small as a mustard seed, they wait out on its account for seven clean days."

IV.9. A. *Raba led R. Samuel out [for a stroll] and expounded, “If a woman was in hard labor for two days, and on the third day she aborted, she must observe seven clean days.”*

B. *He takes the view that the remission of the rule that blood produced in hard labor is clean does not apply to hard labor prior to a miscarriage, and it is not possible for the “grave” to open without blood.*

C. *Said R. Pappa to Raba, “Why specify ‘If a woman was in hard labor for two days’? Even if it was any span of time at all [the same rule should apply]! For lo, said R. Zira, ‘Israelite women imposed a strict rule on themselves, for even if they produce a drop of blood as small as a mustard seed, they wait out on its account for seven clean days.’”*

D. *He said to him, “I speak to you of a prohibition, and you talk to me of a custom, which pertains only when the prohibition has been adopted.”*

IV.10. A. *Said Raba, “If a woman was asked to get married and agreed, she has to allow seven clean days to pass [to make sure she is menstrually clean].”*

IV.11. A. *Rabina was engaged in preparing for his son’s marriage at R. Hanina’s household. He said to him, “Does the master plan to write the marriage-contract in four days?”*

B. *He said to him, “Yes.”*

C. *But when the fourth day came, he waited for four more days, so the delay turned out to have been for seven days after the initial inquiry. He said to him, “What’s going on?”*

D. *He said to him, “Does not the master concur with that which Raba said, for Raba said, ‘If a woman was asked to get married and agreed, she has to allow seven clean days to pass [to make sure she is menstrually clean]’?”*

E. *He said to him, “True enough, Raba made such a statement, but it concerns an adult, who has already had a menstrual period. But as to a minor, who has not yet had a menstrual period, has Raba made such a statement?”*

F. *He said to him, “Raba explicitly made the statement, “There is no difference between an adult and a minor. What is the operative consideration? Because just as the adult has sexual desire, so too does the minor.”*

IV.12. A. *Said Raba, “A woman [66B] should not wash her hair with natron or with ohal, with natron, because it removes hair, and with ahal, because it makes the hair cling.”*

B. *And said Amemar in the name of Raba, “A woman should wash her hair only in warm water, and should do it even with water warmed by the sun, but not with cold water. Why not? Because cold water loosens the hair.”*

C. *And Raba said, “A man should always given instructions in his household that a woman should rinse the folds of the flesh in water.”*

D. *An objection was raised: [In immersing for cleanness in an immersion pool] it is not necessary for the water to penetrate into the folds of the flesh or into the concealed parts.*

E. *Granted that we do not require the water to penetrated into those parts, still, it is necessary that it be able to do so, and this concurs with the statement of R. Zira,*

for said R. Zira, “Whenever proper mingling is possible [in the case of flour and oil in a meal offering], actual mingling is not required, but where proper mingling is not possible, actual mingling is required.”

IV.13. A. Said Rabin bar R. Ada said R. Isaac, “There is the case of the slave-girl of Rabbi, who immersed, and when she came up out of the water, a bone that constitute interposition between her body and the water was founded between her teeth, so Rabbi required her to immerse a second time.”

IV.14. A. And said Raba, “If a woman immersed and came up out of the water, and on her was found something that interposes between herself and the water, she does not have to wash her head or immerse again if the immersion was done right after washing her head; otherwise she has to wash her head and immerse again.”

B. *There are those who say, “If on that day she washed her head and immersed, she does not have to wash her head or immerse again if the immersion was done right after washing her head; otherwise she has to wash her head and immerse again.”*

C. *What is at issue between these two versions?*

D. *At issue is whether or not one has to juxtapose washing the hair and immersion, and whether a woman may wash her hair by day and immerse by night.*

IV.15. A. Said Raba, “A woman should not stand on a clay utensil when she is immersing.”

B. *R. Kahana considered making the statement, “What is the operative consideration? It is a measure enacted to prevent using bath houses [Slotki: where the benches on which people stand when bathing are made of earth and are thus similar to clay utensils; were a woman allowed to stand on earthenware when performing ritual immersion in a ritually valid bath, she might assume that the ritual immersion is also valid when she stand son an earthen bench in a bath house]. But it is acceptable for her to stand on a block of wood.”*

C. *Said to him R. Hanan of Nehardea, “What is the operative consideration [in connection with immersion in a proper immersion pool? It is because she might be frightened [that she might fall and not do the immersion right]. Here too, she should not stand on a chip of wood since she might be frightened.”*

IV.16. A. Said R. Samuel b. R. Isaac, “A woman should not immerse [67A] in a harbor [where there is stirred up mud because of the ships’ passage, which might cling to her body and interpose between her body and the water]. *Even though now there may not be mud, I might say that it fell off with the drippings.*”

B. *Samuel’s father made for his daughters immersion pools in Nisan [Slotki: when the flowing river, swollen by rainwater, could not be used for the purpose, since immersion may not be performed in rainwater that is not collected and stationary], and he made mats for them in the days of Tishré [so as to protect their feet from the river mud].*

IV.17. A. Said R. Giddal said Rab, “If a woman gave food to her child and then immersed and came up out of the water, her immersion does not count for her. *Even though there now may not be food, I might say that it fell off with the drippings [and had interposed when she immersed].*”

IV.18. A. Said Rami bar Abba, “Scars do not constitute an interposition during the first three days [after their formation and bleeding; they are still part of the body]. From that point on, they are regarded as an interposition.”

IV.19. A. Said Mar Uqba, “Pus in the eye is not classified as an interposition when it is running; when it is dry, it is classified as an interposition.

B. “When is it deemed dry? When it begins to turn yellow.”

C. Said Samuel, “Blue dye within the eye is not classified as an interposition when it is running; that which is outside of the eye is classified as an interposition.

D. “If a woman’s eyes were twitching, that is not classified as an interposition, even outside of the eye.”

IV.20. A. Said R. Yohanan, “If a woman opened her eyes too wide or shut them too tightly, her immersion does not count.”

IV.21. A. Said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “A woman should immerse only in her [Slotki:] natural position.

B. “*For we have learned in the Mishnah, How is the examination of the plague [indicating the presence of the skin ailment of Lev. 13-14] carried out? , The man is examined (1) like one who hoes, and (2) like one who harvests olives. The woman [is examined] (1) like one who rolls out bread, and (2) like one who gives suck to her child, and (3) like one who weaves at an upright loom, for the right hand. R. Judah says, “Also like one who spins flax, for the left [armpit].” Just as one is examined for his plague, so is he examined for his shaving [M. Neg. 2:4A-F].*”

IV.22. A. Said Rabbah bar R. Huna, “As single knotted hair is classified as an interposition. [67B] Three are not classified as an interposition. As to the case of two, I do not know the rule.”

B. And R. Yohanan said, “We have only one [statement that gives guidance]: said R. Isaac, ‘As a matter of the law of the Torah, interposition of hair as to the larger part [when a single hair is knotted] of which one objects is classified as an interposition, but one to which one does not object is not classified as an interposition. And rabbis have made a decree concerning one the greater part of which one does not find objectionable on account of the one the greater part of which one does find objectionable, and they have further made a decree concerning the minor part, to which a man objects, holding that that constitutes an interposition as a preventive measure against the possibility of accepting an interposition on a major part, which one finds objectionable.’”

C. *Then why not make a decree in respect to the smaller part, against which one has no objection, on account of the smaller part, against which one objects?*

D. *The ruling itself [forbidding as interposition the lesser part to which one objects] itself constitutes a rabbinical decree, and should we then go and make another decree to attach to that one?*

IV.23. A. Said Rab, “A woman at the end of her menstrual period, if she immersed at the proper time, she immerses only by night. But if it is not at the proper time but only afterward [on the eighth day], she may immerse either by day or by night.”

- B. R. Yohanan said, “Whether it is at the proper time or not at the proper time, she may immerse only by night, on account of the possibility that her daughter may follow her bad example [Slotki: not knowing the difference between an immersion on the seventh and one on the eighth day, she may follow the example of her mother, and would immerse in the day time even on the seventh day].”
- C. *And so Rab retracted*, for R. Hiyya bar Ashi said Rab said, “Whether it is at the proper time or not at the proper time, she may immerse only by night, on account of the possibility that her daughter may follow her bad example.”
- D. *R. Idi at Nersh ordained that immersion should take place in daytime on the eighth day on account of the fear of lions.*
- E. *R. Aha bar Jacob did the same in Pappunia because of thieves.*
- F. *R. Judah did the same at Pumbedita because of the cold.*
- G. *Rabbah did the same at Mahoza because of the guards at the city gates.*
- H. *Said R. Pappa to Raba, “Now at the present time, when rabbis have classified all menstruants in the same classification as women afflicted with flux-uncleanness [who must permit seven days without a flow to pass before they can become clean], why not permit them to immerse in day time on the seventh day [for ordinarily the uncleanness will have ended seven full days earlier]?”*
- I. *[He said to him,] “It is on account of R. Simeon. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- J. *“And after that she shall be clean” (Lev. 15:28) — “after” means, after all of them, and no uncleanness [even a single day] may intervene between the clean days.*
- K. R. Simeon says, “‘And after that she shall be clean’ — ‘after’ means, after the deed of counting the seventh day, even before the end of the day, she shall be clean. But it is sages who ruled that it is forbidden to do so, since she may end up in a situation of doubt.” [In the context of B. Niddah 29B, 30A, this is to be explained: she may not have sexual relations on the seventh clean day, for she may suffer a discharge later in that day, after she has sexual relations. Then she would be subject to doubt as to whether or not she is unclean by reason of flux. A discharge on the seventh day at the end of a zibah-period nullifies the prior clean days, since seven clean days must have passed; she will not have had seven complete clean days, only six and a fraction (Slotki)].

IV.24. A. Said R. Huna, “A woman washes her head on a Sunday and immerse on Tuesday, for so she may wash her head on Friday and immerse Saturday night. A woman may wash her hair on Sunday and immerse on Wednesday, since she may wash her hair on Friday and immerse on the night following a festival that fell on a Sunday. A woman may wash her hair on Sunday and immerse on Thursday, since she may wash her hair on Friday and immerse on the night following the two festival days of the New Year that commenced Saturday night.”

- B. *And R. Hisda said, “In all these cases we indeed rule, but we do not invoke the reasoning invested in the language, ‘for so,’ for where one can avoid an interval,*

one should do so, and only where it is impossible do we allow such a space of time to intervene.

- C. *And R. Yemar said, "We even invoke the reasoning invested in the language, 'for so,' except for the case in which a woman may wash her hair on Sunday and immerse on Thursday, since she may wash her hair on Friday and immerse on the night following the two festival days of the New Year that commenced Saturday night, for that is not pertinent, since a woman may wash her hair and immerse on the same night [in such a case, that is, the night following the second festival day of the New Year].]"* [Slotki: Had she been allowed to wash her head on the preceding Friday, the interval between the washing and immersion would have been too long; hence it is preferable that the washing be done on the same night as the immersion.]
- D. *Maremar expounded, "The decided law is in accord with R. Hisda, within the limits of the interpretation of R. Yemar."*

IV.25. A. *The question was raised: as to a woman, what is the law on her washing her hair by night and immersing on the same night?* [Slotki: Is she likely to pay scant attention to the former on account of her hurry to get through with her immersion?]

- B. *Mar Zutra forbids doing so, and R. Hinena of Sura permits doing so.*
- C. *Said R. Ada to R. Hinena of Sura, "Was there not the following case involving the wife of the exilarch, Abba Mari: because of an argument [with her husband, she refused to immerse and have sexual relations with him], so R. Nahman b. Isaac went to appease her, and when she said to him, 'What's the hurry now? [68A] There will be plenty of time tomorrow,' he grasped her sense* [Slotki: that she had not washed her head before nightfall], *and he replied, 'Are you short of kettles? Are you short of buckets? Are you short of slaves?'"* [Slotki: this proves that washing the had may take place the same night as immersion.]

IV.26. A. *Raba gave the following exposition, "A woman may wash her hair on Friday and immerse Saturday night."*

- B. *Said R. Pappa to Raba, "But lo, Rabin sent word by epistle: 'A woman should not wash her hair on Friday and immerse Saturday night.' And moreover, are you not surprised that a woman should be allowed to wash her hair by day and immerse by night, for lo, we require that immediately following the shampoo should come immersion, and that is not the case here!"*
- C. *So Raba went and appointed an Amoraic loudspeaker in this matter and expounded as follows: "The things that I have said before you are an error, but this is what was stated in the name of R. Yohanan, 'A woman should not shampoo her hair on Friday and immerse on Saturday night. For you should be surprised if a woman should shampoo by day and immerse herself by night, for lo, we require that immediately following the shampoo should come immersion, and that is not the case here!"*
- D. *And the decided law is that a woman should wash her hair only by night.*
- E. *Then is there not a contradiction between one decided law and another?*

- F. *There is no such contradiction. The one law refers to a case in which it is possible to do so [that is, to wash in day time and immerse by night] and the other speaks of a case in which it is not possible to do so.*

I.1 asks a necessary question and finds both analytical and traditional proof for the answer. The gloss of II.1 is necessary. III.1 provides a quibble, based on the Mishnah's reference to night, not day. No. 2 proceeds to a speculative case, invited by the Mishnah's rule. It is invited by the contents of Samuel's statement. No. 3 pursues the established subject, but with fresh perspectives and cases. No. 4 continues No. 3. IV.1 complements the Mishnah and then goes its own way. No. 2 explains the way in which one conforms to the rule at hand. Nos. 3, 4 proceed to a further complement to the Mishnah's rule. Nos. 5, 6, 7 provide footnotes to No. 4. No. 8 seems to me rather general, and I do not know why it belongs at just this particular point; it seems to me we have moved into a mere mélange of thematically relevant materials, generally focussed upon immersion in an immersion-pool. No. 9 follows that same pattern, so too Nos. 10, 11, 12 with its footnote at No. 13, 14, 15, 16 and its footnote at No. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26. If the present Mishnah pertained to the problems of Mishnah-tractate Miqvaot, we could understand how this rather well-crafted composite has been assembled for the purpose of amplification of the Mishnah. In its present position and condition, it has to be classified as merely a thematic composite.

10:2

- A. **A menstruating woman who examined herself on the seventh day at dawn and found herself to be clean —**
B. **at twilight she did not mark her separation [by immersion] —**
C. **and after some days examined herself and found herself unclean —**
D. **lo, she is assumed to be clean.**
E. **[If] she examined herself on the seventh day at dawn and found herself unclean, and at twilight she did not mark her separation, and after a time she examined herself and found herself clean, lo, this one is in the assumption of being unclean.**
F. **And she imparts uncleanness [to articles that she had touched] during the preceding twenty-four hours and from one examination to the preceding examination.**
G. **And if she has a fixed period, sufficient for her is her time.**
H. **R. Judah says, "Anyone who did not mark her separation in a state of cleanness from the afternoon-twilight and thereafter, lo, this one is in the assumption of being unclean."**
I. **And sages say, "Even [if] she examined herself on the second day of her menstrual period and found herself clean, and at twilight [of the seventh day] she did not mark her separation, and after a time she examined herself and found herself unclean,**
J. **"lo, this one is in the assumption of being clean."**

I.1 A. *It has been stated:*

- B. Rab said, "She is confirmed as unclean with flux-uncleanness."

- C. And Levi said, “She is treated as subject by reason only of doubt to flux-uncleanness.”
- D. *To what clause of the Mishnah-paragraph do they refer?*
- E. *If I should say, “It is to the first clause [A menstruating woman who examined herself on the seventh day at dawn and found herself to be clean — at twilight she did not mark her separation [by immersion] — and after some days examined herself and found herself unclean],” lo, what the passage says, is, lo, she is assumed to be clean! Rather, at issue must be the final clause [If she examined herself on the seventh day at dawn and found herself unclean, and at twilight she did not mark her separation, and after a time she examined herself and found herself clean, lo, this one is in the assumption of being unclean].*
- F. *Now there is no difficulty in maintaining that she is treated as subject by reason only of doubt to flux-uncleanness. But why also see here as confirmed as unclean with flux-uncleanness, since she had earlier examined herself and found herself to be clean?*
- G. *Rather, when the dispute of Rab and Levi was set forth, it was stated as a free-standing tradition on its own, namely:*
- H. A menstruating woman who examined herself on the seventh day at dawn and found herself unclean, and at dusk did not mark the end of her period [by immersion] but after some days [which now are the eleven zibah-days, during which any blood that flows is classified as not menstrual blood but flux] examined herself and found herself unclean —
- I. Rab said, “She is confirmed as unclean with flux-uncleanness.”
- J. And Levi said, “She is treated as subject by reason only of doubt to flux-uncleanness.”
- K. Rab said, “She is confirmed as unclean with flux-uncleanness:” *since to begin with she turned out to be unclean and now she has turned out to be unclean, she is confirmed as unclean.*
- L. And Levi said, “She is treated as subject by reason only of doubt to flux-uncleanness:” *I say that the flow of blood had ceased in the interim.*
- M. **[68B]** *And so did Levi teach as a Tannaite version: after these days, whether she examined herself and found herself to be clean, whether she examined herself and found herself unclean, lo, she is treated as subject by reason only of doubt to flux-uncleanness.”*

II.1 A. [If she examined herself on the seventh day at dawn and found herself unclean, and at twilight she did not mark her separation, and after a time she examined herself and found herself clean, lo, this one is in the assumption of being unclean.] And she imparts uncleanness during the preceding twenty-four hours and from one examination to the preceding examination:

- B. *May I say that this refutes the position of Raba?*
- C. For Raba has said, “This rule [All the eleven days that follow the seven days of menstruation] a woman is in the assumption of being clean] was meant to tell you that she does not impart uncleanness to objects that she has touched during the twenty-four hours prior to her discovery of the blood.”

- D. *But was not objection raised once before: [namely: a menstruating woman, a woman unclean with flux, and a woman who awaits day against day or who is in child birth impart uncleanness retroactively for twenty-four hours to objects they have touched]?*
- C. *This is what I meant: may I say that a refutation of the position of Raba also derives from this passage [in addition to the other]?*
- D. *Raba may say to you, "When the passage states, **And she imparts uncleanness during the preceding twenty-four hours**, it makes reference to the opening clause of this chapter: [If] she saw blood [before marriage] and still was in her father's house [when married] — the House of Shammai say, "They give her [only] the coition of obligation." And the House of Hillel say, "All the night is hers." [The House of Hillel ruled that intercourse is permitted all night, and to this our passage adds that if the woman subsequently found that she was unclean, her uncleanness is retroactive for twenty-four hours (Slotki)]. You might have thought that one might say, since clean days have intervened, the excretion should be classified as marking the onset of menstruation, so she should not convey retroactive uncleanness for the prior twenty-four hours; so we are informed to the contrary.*

III.1 A. And if she has a fixed period, sufficient for her is her time:

- B. *May I say that this refutes the position of R. Huna bar Hiyya stated by Samuel, for said R. Huna bar Hiyya said Samuel, "This rule [**All the eleven days that follow the seven days of menstruation] a woman is in the assumption of being clean**] is meant to tell you that a woman cannot establish for herself a regular period during the *zibah*-days [even though menstruation should begin on the same day for three successive months (Slotki)]."*
- C. *R. Huna bar Hiyya may say to you, "When we made the statement, a woman cannot establish for herself a regular period during the *zibah*-days, what we meant is that it is not required that she experience a change in the time of her period three times in order to abolish a settled period, because we hold that her blood is suspended, and, since her blood is suspended, **if she has a fixed period, sufficient for her is her time.**"*

IV.1 A. R. Judah says, "Anyone who did not mark her separation in a state of cleanness from afternoon and thereafter, lo, this one is in the assumption of being unclean:"

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. **They said to R. Judah, "Even if you had said, 'Let her hand be in her eyes all day long,' you would have stated a valid rule. But now, since it might be supposed that she produced the discharge as soon as she had removed her hand, what difference does it make to me whether she marked the separation to cleanness at the afternoon and thereafter, or whether she marked that separation to cleanness on the first day, in which case she is clean?" [T. **Nid. 9:12B-C**].**
- D. **on the first day?!** *Is there an authority who holds that position [Slotki: that an examination whereby uncleanness was established on the first day has the same validity as one on the seventh day]?*

- E. *Indeed so, for has it not been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. Said Rabbi, “I asked R. Yosé and R. Simeon as they were walking on the way: **A menstruating woman who examined herself on the seventh day at dawn and found herself to be clean — at twilight she did not mark her separation [by immersion] — and after some days examined herself and found herself unclean — what is the law?**”
- G. They said to him, “Lo, this one is assumed to be clean.”
- H. “And if she examined herself on the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, or second days?”
- I. They said to him, “There is no difference.”
- J. “As to the first day, I did not ask, and I erred in not asking. *For since on all those other days is she not assumed to be unclean? And yet as soon as the discharge ceases, it is assumed completely to have ceased. So also in respect too the first day, as soon as the excretion ends, it is assumed completely to have ended!*”
- K. *And to begin with what had he been thinking?*
- L. *Since it was assumed that the source was open, [we assume the woman is unclean].*

I.1 presents an interesting analysis of a dispute that is conceivably pertinent to the interpretation of our Mishnah-passage but proves to stand on its own ground. II.1 moves away from the Mishnah-paragraph to a rather subordinate question. III.1 does the same, but we see that the two in fact produce a comparison of our Mishnah-paragraph with that under discussion elsewhere, a rather subtle way of accomplishing an important exegetical task. IV.1 introduces Tosefta’s amplification of what is at issue in the Mishnah-paragraph.

10:3

- A. **The Zab and the Zabah who examined themselves on the first day and found themselves to be clean,**
- B. **[and who examined themselves] on the seventh day and found themselves to be clean,**
- C. **and on the remaining, intervening days did not examine themselves —**
- D. **R. Eliezer says, “Lo, they are in the assumption of being clean.”**
- E. **R. Joshua says, “They have only the first day and the seventh day alone [as clean days].”**
- F. **R. Aqiba says, “They have only the seventh day alone [as a clean day].”**

I.1 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. **Said R. Eliezer to R. Joshua, “How can you say that the first day and the seventh day are clean, but the intervening days are unclean? In your opinion, you are counting clean days even though they are interrupted by unclean days, but the Torah has said, ‘After that she shall be clean’ (Lev. 15:28), meaning, after all of them, meaning, uncleanness may not intervene among the clean days.”**
- C. **R. Joshua said to him, “Do you not also concur that one counts with interruptions [of intervening days] in the case of the Nazirite who sits underneath overhanging branches [under which corpse matter is also located], or in the case of a Zab who produces a flux during the days of his counting — these too count clean days even though the clean days are**

interrupted with unclean days, though the Torah has said, ‘But the former days shall be void’ (Num. 6:12)” [T. Nid. 9:13A-B].

- D. *Now, to be sure, from R. Eliezer’s viewpoint, [the case of the Zab who had a flux, in which case the sequence of clean days is interrupted,] there is no problem, for Scripture has said, “so that he is unclean thereby” (Lev. 15:32), meaning, the flux renders one day alone void. And if you say that on account of the possibility of mistaking one form of uncleanness for another [and as a result such interrupted counting would also be allowed in the case of a discharge of flux, not semen], we should make a decree, it is easy to reply: a flux is not going to be mistaken for semen. Not only so, but there also is no problem with regard to the Nazirite who sits underneath overhanging branches [under which corpse matter is also located], for the law of the Torah is that the overshadowing tent has to be a real one, and it is only rabbis who made a decree concerning overhanging branches as a preventative measure, and no one would confuse a rabbinic for a Pentateuchal law. But here, if we were to take into the consideration the possibility of a doubtful observation [Slotki: on the days on which no examination took place, in consequence of which those days would not be counted], people might confuse this case for one on which there was a certain flow of flux [and assuming that on the uncounted days the woman was definitely unclean, one would also allow interrupted counting in the case of the intervention of uncleanness about which there was no doubt (Slotki)].*
- E. *A Tannaite statement: R. Yosé and R. Simeon say, “The opinion of R. Eliezer seems to us better than the opinion of R. Joshua, but the opinion of R. Aqiba is better than the opinions of both of them; but the law follows R. Eliezer” [T. Nid. 9:13C-D]*
- I.2.** A. *The question was raised: A male or a female afflicted with flux uncleanness who examined themselves on the first day and then on the eighth day thereafter and found themselves clean, but on the intervening days they did not examine themselves [69A] — from the viewpoint of R. Eliezer, what is the law? Is it required that an examination be made on both the beginning and ending of the prescribed days, [so the days here are unclean], since there was an examination at the beginning only but not at the end [on the seventh day, for the examination was done on the eighth], or perhaps an examination at the outset suffices, even though there was none at the end [on the seventh day]?*
- B. *Said Rab, “The law is the same in both instances, that is, an examination on the beginning day affecting them, even though there was no examination at the end, suffices.”*
- C. *And R. Hanina said, “We require an examination on the beginning of the days and on the end, and here we have had an examination on the opening day but not on the closing day.”*
- D. *An objection was raised: And they concur that a male or a female afflicted with flux who examined themselves on the first day and then on the eighth day and found themselves clean have to their credit only the eighth day alone. Now who are they who concur? Are they not R. Eliezer and R. Joshua?*
- E. *No, they are R. Joshua and R. Aqiba.*

- I.3.** A. Said R. Sheshet said R. Jeremiah bar Abba said Rab, “A menstruating woman who noted her separation to a condition of cleanness on the third day [after the beginning of her period] may count it in the number of seven clean days” [Slotki: the clean days may begin to be counted from that day].
- B. Why in the world does a menstruating woman have to count clean days [since a menstruant is clean after seven days, without regard to whether the days are marked by a flow or not marked by a flow]!
- C. *Rather, I should say, “A woman afflicted with flux-uncleanness who noted her separation to a condition of cleanness on the third day [after the beginning of her period] may count it in the number of seven clean days” [Slotki: the clean days may begin to be counted from that day].*
- D. *Said R. Sheshet to R. Jeremiah bar Abba, “Did Rab then concur in making this ruling with the opinion of the Samaritans, who hold that the day on which the flow of blood ceases is counted in the number of seven clean days?”*
- E. *When Rab made that statement, he meant, excluding the third day.*
- F. *Excluding the third day?! That is self-evident.*
- G. *No, it was necessary to make it explicit, for example, to deal with a case in which she did not examine herself until the seventh day, so that we were informed there [in Rab’s statement that Eliezer holds the woman is clean if she examined herself on the first day and on the eighth day] that an examination at the beginning is sufficient, even though there was none at the end. Here he lets us know that an examination at the end is sufficient even though there was none at the beginning. One might have supposed that only where there was an examination at the beginning, though there was none at the end, we assume that the intervening days are clean, because we confirm them in their presumptive state of cleanness, but where the examination was held at the end and not at the beginning, we might not make that assumption. Here we are told that in either case the intervening days are deemed clean.*
- H. *Is this really true? Now lo, when Rabin came, he said, “R. Yosé b. R. Hanina objected, but I do not know what contrary evidence he presented in the case of the forgetful woman who does not know on which date she produced the child.”” And we have established in that context the rule that during the first week of her appearance before us, we require her to immerse at night [since each night it might be said that it is the one following the seventh day of the period of uncleanness prescribed after the birth of a male child] but we do not require her to undergo immersion in the day time. Now if you should take the view that it is not necessary that the days following flux be counted in our presence, she should have been made to undergo immersion in the day time also, since it is possible that she gave birth during a zibah period and had completed the counting on that day. Does it not follow from that ruling that it is necessary for the counting to take place in our presence [and this would refute Rab’s position]?*
- I. *And have we not established [at B. Nid. 30A] that this ruling concurs with the position of R. Aqiba, who maintains that it is necessary for counting to take place in our presence [and Rab may concur with Aqiba’s opposition]?*

- J. *And how do you know that according to rabbis, it is not necessary for counting to take place in our presence?*
- K. *It is on the basis of that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- L. If a woman erred and said, "I have produced an unclean flow on a certain day," [but she does not know whether this happened on that day or on any other day, whether it was on a menstrual day or on an intervening zibah-day], she immerses [in order to immerse at the proper time and as soon as possible] nine times, seven [on the following seven nights, if she came by day] in regard to menstruation, and two in regard to flux-uncleanness [Slotki: on the first day of her arrival she must undergo immersion, since it is possible that the previous day was one of her zibah-period days, and her discharge appeared that day. On the second day of her arrival she again undergoes immersion for a similar reason, since it is possible that the day on which her discharge had appeared was not the previous one, but the day of her arrival. On the third day no immersion is necessary, since it is certain that on the second day there was no discharge.] If she stated, "I produced some unclean flow at twilight," she is to immerse eleven times."
- M. *Eleven times?! Whatever for?*
- N. *Said R. Jeremiah of Difti, "For instance, if she came before us at twilight, so that we have to provide for eight immersions in regard to menstruation and three in regard to zibah [since we do not know to which day the flux at twilight is to be assigned]."*
- O. If she said, "I produced no flow at all," she is to immerse fifteen times."
- P. *Said Raba, "This is a law that is no law, like the kind at Galhi, where they have a law that if you own a bull, you have to feed the town's cattle for one day, but if you own no bull, you have to feed them for two days. They had a dealing with an orphan, son of a widow. When he took over the bulls, he went and killed them, saying to the people, 'He who owns one bull gets one hide, and he who owns no bulls gets two hides.' They said to him, 'What are you saying?' He said to them, 'The end of the process follows the same principle as the beginning: is it not the fact that, to begin with, the one who owned nothing was better off? Well, at the end, the one who owns nothing is better off.' Here too: if a woman says, I had a discharge at all, she immerses nine times or eleven times, but if she says she had no discharge at all, she has to immerse fifteen times!"*
- Q. *"Rather, this is how the rule should read: if she said, 'I have produced a flow, but I do not know how long it went on, and I do not know whether it came during the days on which a flow is classified as menstrual or days on which a flow is classified as flux,' she is to immerse fifteen times. For if she had appeared to us in day time, we should assign her seven days on account of the possibility that it was menstrual blood, [69B], and eight immersions on account of the possibility that it was flux; and if she appeared before us by night, we should assign her eight*

immersions on account of menstruation and seven on account of the possibility that it was flux."

- R. *But does not menstruation involve eight days?*
- S. *Rather, read as follows: in either case [whether by day or by night] seven in regard to menstruation and eight in regard to flux.*
- T. *But if she appeared at night, does she not require eight days in regard to menstruation?*
- U. *In regard to flux, in which case, the number of immersions is fixed, since there is no variation whether the woman appeared before us by day or by night, the eighth immersion was counted. In regard to menstruation, where the number is not fixed, only if she appeared before us by night does she require eight immersions, but if she came before us by day, she does not require eight [so the eighth immersion] was not counted.*
- V. *But if you take seriously the possibility that all of the counting of clean days must take place in our presence, then what need is therefore all these immersions? Can the woman simply not count seven clean days and then immerse? It must follow from here that rabbis take the position that it is not necessary for the counting to take place in our presence [and Rab accords with their view].*
- W. *Said R. Aha b. R. Joseph to R. Ashi, "But have we not responded to this matter in respect to too many problems? [Of course we have!] Rather, this is how it should be explained and presented: If the erring woman said, 'I have counted [out a variety of clean days], but I don't know how many I counted, or whether I was counting out the clean days during the seven days on which blood is classified as menstrual or during the eleven days in which blood is classified as flux, she is required to immerse fifteen times."*
- X. *"If she said, 'I counted out clean days and I do not know how many I counted,'" — she surely must have counted at least one clean day, so is she not then short one immersion?*
- Y. *Read: "If she said, 'I do not know whether I counted or not.'"*

Tosefta's amplification of the debate at I.1 once again allows us to expand our grasp of what is at issue. No. 2 develops the analysis of Eliezer's position. No. 3 carries forward the treatment of the principle, introducing a parallel problem and expanding the foregoing. The expansion of the matter at No. 3, continuing the foregoing, draws this passage together with that at B. Nid. 29B-30A; I in no way claim to have done justice to this very difficult composition.

10:4

- A. **(1) The Zab, (2) the Zabah, (3) the menstruating woman, (4) the woman who has given birth, and (5) the person afflicted with the skin ailment [Lev. 13-14], who died**

- B. **impart uncleanness through being carried [even without contact]**
- C. **until the flesh has decayed.**
- D. **A gentile who dies is clean in respect to imparting uncleanness through being carried.**
- E. **The House of Shammai say, “All women die in the status of menstruating women.”**
- F. **And the House of Hillel say, “A menstruating woman is only one who dies during her menstrual period.”**

I.1 A. *What is the meaning of **impart uncleanness through being carried [even without contact]**?*

- B. *If we say, really by being carried, is it not the simple fact that every sort of corpse imparts uncleanness when it is carried, so what is the meaning of **impart uncleanness through being carried [even without contact]**?*
- C. *It means, even through a heavy stone [used to close the pit. If a corpse lay on such a stone, and objects were located under the stone, those objects are unclean by reason of the weight of the corpse, even though the corpse’s weight is negligible in this context].*
- D. *For it is written, “And a stone was brought and laid upon the mouth of the den”(Dan. 6:18).*

I.2. A. *What is the operative consideration [that these corpses convey uncleanness through the weight that they impose on a heavy stone, while other corpses do not do so]?*

- B. *Said Rab, “It is a decree to take account of the possibility that such persons may have merely fainted.” [Slotki: When alive, if such persons sit on a stone, they convey uncleanness to objects under it; that is in accord with the Pentateuchal law. A rabbinic enactment has imposed a similar restriction when they are dead, in case they might be merely in a swoon and be mistaken for a corpse. Where the objects to be deemed clean in the case of a corpse, they might erroneously be deemed clean even when the person really was alive but only in a faint.]*
- C. *A Tannaite authority stated in the name of R. Eliezer, “This possibility must be taken into account until the corpse’s stomach actually bursts.”*

II.1 A. **A gentile who dies is clean in respect to imparting uncleanness through being carried:**

- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *Said Rabbi, “How come they have said, ‘**A gentile who dies is clean in respect to imparting uncleanness through being carried?**’ It is because the uncleanness pertaining to him when he is alive is not based on the authority of the Torah but on the authority of scribes.”*

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

- B. *Twelve matters did the Alexandrians ask R. Joshua b. Hananiah, [1] three involving matters of wisdom, [2] three matters of lore, [3] three silly things, and [4] three matters of proper conduct.*
- C. *[1] three involving matters of wisdom:*

- D. **(1) The Zab, (2) the Zabah, (3) the menstruating woman, (4) the woman who has given birth, and (5) the person afflicted with the skin ailment [Lev. 13-14], who died — how long do their corpses impart uncleanness through being carried [even without contact]?**
- E. He said to them, **“until the flesh has decayed.”**
- F. “Is the daughter of a woman who was divorced and remarried by her original husband permitted to marry a priest? Do we rule that this might be inferred from an argument a fortiori: if the son of a widow who was married to a high priest, who is not subject to a prohibition to all [a widow cannot marry only a high priest, not an ordinary priest], is tainted, how much more the offspring of this one, who is forbidden to all, should be forbidden? Or do we maintain a refutation in this way: the case of a widow married to a high priest is exceptional, because she herself is profaned?
- G. He said to them, **[70A]** **“‘She is an abomination’ (Deu. 24: 4), but her children are not.”**
- H. **“Two lepers, the offerings of whom were mixed up, and the offering of one of whom was brought, and one of whom died — what is the other to do?”**
- I. **He said to them, “Let him write his property over to some one else so that he is poor, and let him bring a sin offering in the form of a bird, which is presented by reason of doubt [M.: and bring a poor man’s offering” [M. Neg. 14:13].**
- J. *But what about the guilt offering?*
- K. Said Samuel, “The case speaks of a situation in which his guilt offering has already been presented.”
- L. *Said R. Sheshet, “Can a major authority like Samuel make a statement of that sort? In agreement with whose view has his answer been given [when he said, The case speaks of a situation in which his guilt offering had already been presented]? It accords with the position of R. Judah, who has said, ‘The status of a person at the time the guilt offering is presented is what defines a person’s status, so that, since the guilt offering has determined for him the status of a wealthy man, he can no longer bring a sin offering as though he were a poor man’! For we have learned in the Mishnah: ‘A leper who brought the offering while a poor man and then became rich, or as a rich man and then became poor — everything follows according to [his status at the time of] the sin offering,’ the words of R. Simeon. R. Judah says, ‘After [at the time of] the guilt offering’ [M. Neg. 14:11A-C]. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says, ‘All depends upon the man’s status at the time of the bird offering.’ Now if Samuel has responded along the lines of the opinion of R. Simeon, who ruled that it is the man’s status at the time of the sin offering that is determinative, then why should he not bring another sacrifice, even if the guilt offering had not been offered? For surely we have heard R. Simeon say, ‘Let him bring one and make a proper stipulation.’ For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Said R. Simeon, ‘On the next day [after immersion, when the sacrifices have to be presented], let him bring his guilt offering and the log of oil with it and set it up at Nicanor’s gate and make the following stipulation: if he is a leper, behold his guilt offering and its*

log of oil with it, and if not, let this guilt offering be a freewill peace offering. As to this guilt offering, it is to be slaughtered at the north side of the altar, and it is subject to the requirements of applying blood to the thumbs, laying on of hands, drink offerings, waving, and presentation of the breast and shoulder to the priest. It may be eaten by the males of the priesthood on the same day and on the following night. But sages did not concur with R. Simeon because this might lead to Holy Things being brought to the place in which disqualified sacrifices are disposed of.” [Slotki: since Samuel follows Simeon and the latter allows a conditional sacrifice, why was it necessary to explain that the guilt offering had been offered while the man was rich?]

- M. *Samuel concurs with R. Simeon in one matter [that the status of the man at the time the guilt offering is offered does not determine his financial status in regard to the other two sacrifices] and he differs from him in another [and holds that the guilt offering may not be offered conditionally].*
- O. [2] three matters of lore:
- P. One verse of Scripture states, “For I have no pleasure in the death of him who dies” (Eze. 18:32),
- Q. while another verse of Scripture says, “Because the Lord would slay them” (1Sa. 2:25).
- R. The one verse speaks of those who repent, while the other verse refers to those who do not repent.
- S. One verse of Scripture states, “Who regards not persons, nor takes reward” (Deu. 10:17),
- T. while another verse of Scripture says, “The Lord lift up his countenance to you” (Num. 6:26).
- U. The one verse speaks of the period before sentence has been passed, while the other verse refers to the time after sentence has been passed.
- V. One verse of Scripture states, “For the Lord has chosen Zion” (Psa. 132:13),
- W. while another verse of Scripture says, “For this city has been to me a provocation of my anger and of my fury from the day that they built it even to this day” (Jer. 32:31).
- X. The one verse speaks of the age before Solomon had married the daughter of Pharaoh, while the other verse refers to the time after Solomon had married the daughter of Pharaoh.
- Y. [3] three silly things:
- Z. “Does the wife of Lot’s corpse convey corpse-uncleanness?”
- AA. He said to them, “A corpse conveys uncleanness, but a pillar of salt does not.”
- BB. “Does the son of the Shunamite [resurrected to life, 2Ki. 4:35] convey uncleanness?”
- CC. He said to them, “A corpse conveys uncleanness, but a living person does not.”
- DD. “Will the dead in the age to come [of resurrection] have to be sprinkled upon on the third and on the seventh day [of the seven days that are counted after one has

contracted corpse uncleanness, since the resurrected dead will have contracted corpse uncleanness from themselves when they were in their prior condition] or will this not be necessary?"

EE. He said to them, "When they are resurrected, we shall be smart enough to answer the question."

FF. Others say, "When our lord, Moses, will come with them [we shall find out]."

GG. and [4] three matters of proper conduct:

HH. "What does someone have to do to become wise?"

II. He said to them, "Let him spend a lot of time in session and only a little time in commerce."

JJ. They said to him, "Plenty of people did just that and it did them no good at all."

KK. "Rather, let them seek mercy from him to whom wisdom belongs: 'For the Lord gives wisdom and out of his mouth comes knowledge and discernment' (Pro. 2: 6)."

LL. R. Hiyya taught on Tannaite authority: "The matter ['out of his mouth comes knowledge and discernment'] may be compared to the case of a mortal king who made a banquet for his servants, and to his friends he sent food out of what he had in front of himself."

MM. *So what's the point?*

NN. *One without the other cannot suffice.*

OO. "What does someone have to do to become rich?"

PP. He said to them, "Let him spend a lot of time in commerce and do business in good faith."

QQ. They said to him, "Plenty of people did just that and it did them no good at all."

RR. "Rather, let them seek mercy from him to whom wealth belongs: 'Mine is the silver and mine is the gold' (Hag. 2: 8)."

SS. *So what's the point?*

TT. *One without the other cannot suffice.*

UU. "What does someone have to do to have male children?"

VV. He said to them, "Let him marry a woman who is appropriate to him [71A] and consecrate himself when he has sexual relations."

WW. They said to him, "Plenty of people did just that and it did them no good at all."

XX. "Rather, let them seek mercy from him to whom children belong: 'Lo, children are a heritage of the Lord, the fruit of the womb is a reward' (Psa. 127: 3)."

YY. *So what's the point?*

ZZ. *One without the other cannot suffice.*

AAA. *What is the meaning of the phrase, "...the fruit of the womb is a reward' (Psa. 127: 3)?*

BBB. Said R. Hama b. R. Hanina, "As a reward for self-restraint during sexual relations in the womb, so that one's wife may reach orgasm first, the Holy One, blessed be he, gives the reward of [male] fruit of the womb."

III.1 A. The House of Shammai say, “All women die in the status of menstruating women:”

- B. *What is the scriptural basis for the position of the House of Shammai?*
- C. “And the queen was exceedingly pained” (Est. 4: 4), which Rab explained, “This teaches that she had a menstrual flow.”
- D. *Here too, because of fright of the angel of death, she experiences a menstrual discharge.*
- E. *But lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: because fright suspends the blood [M. 4:9I].*
- F. *That is no contradiction, fright holds it in, sudden fright loosens it.*
- G. *And what about that which has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- H. The House of Shammai say, “All men die in the status of persons unclean with flux-uncleanness.”
- I. And the House of Hillel say, “Only one who dies in the status of one unclean with flux-uncleanness is such.”
- J. *But why not invoke here the verse, “out of his flesh” (Lev. 15: 2) — and not willy-nilly? [This upsets the explanation of the House of Shammai’s position.]*
- K. *Rather, the operative consideration behind the position of the House of Shammai is in accord with that which we have learned on Tannaite authority:*
- L. **At first they would immerse objects on account of contact with women who had died while in their menstrual period. They reverted to immerse because of every one of them, whether they had died menstruating or not, because of the respect due to women [T. Nid. 9:16A-B].**
- M. At first they would immerse utensils used by those who were dying while unclean with flux uncleanness, but since those yet alive felt ashamed, they decreed that utensils used by all those who were dying should be immersed, because of the respect due to those afflicted with flux-uncleanness who were yet alive.
I.1 clarifies the sense of the Mishnah’s language. No. 2 explains the reason for the rule. II.1 explains the rule before us. Because this rule figures in the composition that follows, the entire thing is inserted here at No. 2. III.1 reverts to the Mishnah’s rule and explains the basis for it.

10:5

- A. **The woman who died and from whom a quarter-log of blood exuded — it [a drop of blood] imparts uncleanness by reason of producing a bloodstain, and it [a quarter-log] imparts uncleanness by means of overshadowing.**
- B. **R. Judah says, “It does not impart uncleanness because of the bloodstain, because it was detached after she died.”**
- C. **And R. Judah agrees concerning the woman who was sitting on the travailing stool and died and from whom a quarter-log of blood exuded that it [a drop] imparts uncleanness by reason of the bloodstain.**
- D. **Said R. Yosé, “On that account [since it was detached while the woman was still alive] it does not impart uncleanness through overshadowing.”**

I.1 A. *Shall we then conclude that the initial authority [who holds that **the woman who died and from whom a quarter-log of blood exuded — it [a drop of blood] imparts uncleanness by reason of producing a bloodstain**] takes the view that even though the blood was detached after the woman died, it still imparts uncleanness by reason of producing a bloodstain?*

B. Said Zeiri, “At issue between the two authorities is whether the interior of the uterus is unclean [and the initial authority holds that it is, so the blood is unclean within the uterus when the woman is alive, though when it came out the woman had died and was no longer subject to menstrual uncleanness].”

II.1 A. **And R. Judah agrees concerning the woman who was sitting on the travailing stool and died and from whom a quarter-log of blood exuded that it [a drop] imparts uncleanness by reason of the bloodstain.**

B. *Shall we then conclude that the initial authority [who holds that **the woman who died and from whom a quarter-log of blood exuded — it [a quarter-log] imparts uncleanness by means of overshadowing**] takes the view that that it also imparts uncleanness by means of overshadowing too* [Slotki: but how could uncleanness be conveyed in this manner, seeing that the blood issued when the woman was still alive?]

C. Said R. Judah, “At issue between them is the status of mingled blood [blood of a corpse mingled with that of a living person].”

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

E. **What is the definition of mingled blood?**

F. **R. Eleazar b. Judah says, “One who was slain, from whom a quarter-log of blood exuded both while he was alive and after he died — if there is doubt as to whether a full quarter-log exuded while he was alive, or whether it exuded after he died, this is ‘mingled blood.’”**

G. **And sages say, “If the incident took place in private domain, the matter of doubt is resolved as unclean. If it took place in public domain, such a matter of doubt is resolved as clean. Rather, what is mingled blood? One who was slain, from whom a quarter-log of blood exuded while he was alive and after his death, and it still has not ceased to flow — if there is doubt concerning whether the greater part exuded in his lifetime and the smaller part after he died or whether the greater part exuded after he died and the smaller part in his lifetime — this is mingled blood.”**

H. **R. Judah says, “One who was slain who was placed on a bier and his blood dripped out into the hole — it is unclean, because the drop of blood of death is mingled in the remainder.”**

I. **And sages declare clean, because [71B] each single drop is detached from the other.**

J. *But did not rabbis give a good reply to R. Judah?*

K. *R. Judah is consistent with views expressed elsewhere, for he has said, “Blood does not neutralize other blood.”*

L. **R. Simeon says, “One who was crucified, whose blood gushed forth, and under whom is found a quarter-log of blood — it is clean. But a corpse**

whose blood drips forth and under whom is found a quarter-log of blood — it is unclean.”

- M. **And R. Judah declares it clean, “For I say that the final drop of blood, marking death, remained on the wood”**] [T. **Ahilot 4:10A-C, 4:11A-D**].
 - N. *But why should R. Judah not say to himself, “For I say, the drop of blood of death remained on the bed”?*
 - O. *The case of a bed is exceptional, since [Slotki:] it percolates [Slotki: through the bed to the ground].*
- I.1 clarifies the thinking of both authorities, and II.1 goes over the same issue.

10:6

- A. **At first did they say, “She who is sitting out the blood of purifying did pour water out for washing the Passover offering.”**
- B. **They reverted to rule, “Lo, she is like one who has touched one who is unclean by reason of corpse uncleanness, so far as Holy Things are concerned,”**
- C. **in accord with the words of the House of Hillel.**
- D. **The House of Shammai say, “Also: she is like one who is unclean by reason of corpse uncleanness.”**

I.1 A. **...pour water out** — [pouring out] yes, but touching, no. *It follows that unconsecrated food that is prepared in accord with the rules of cleanness pertaining to Holy Things is in the classification of Holy Things.*

B. *But then I call attention to the concluding part of the same matter: **They reverted to rule, “Lo, she is like one who has touched one who is unclean by reason of corpse uncleanness, so far as Holy Things are concerned”** — thus, it follows, so far as Holy Things are concerned yes, but so far as unconsecrated food is concerned, no. It follows that unconsecrated food that is prepared in accord with the rules of cleanness pertaining to Holy Things is not in the classification of Holy Things.*

C. *In accord with whom is our Mishnah-paragraph? It accords with the view of Abba Saul. For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

D. **Abba Saul says, “One who has immersed on the selfsame day and awaits sunset for the completion of the rite of purification is in the first remove so far as Holy Things are concerned [T. **Tohorot 1:4A**], so as to impart uncleanness at two further removes and to render Holy Things unfit at yet one more remove beyond.”**

I.1 provides a close reading of the Mishnah-paragraph, directing our attention toward what appears to be an internal contradiction.

10:7

- A. **And they agree that she eats tithe and sets apart dough offering and brings near [to the other dough the vessel in which she has put the portion set apart as dough offering] to designate it as dough offering,**
- B. **and if some of her spit and blood of purifying fell on a loaf of heave offering, that it is clean.**

- C. **The House of Shammai say, “She requires immersion at the end.”**
- D. **And the House of Hillel say, “She does not require immersion at the end.”**

I.1 A. [And they agree that she eats tithe] for a master has said, “One who has immersed and come up from the immersion pool may eat tithe. If his son has set, he may eat food in the status of priestly rations.

II.1 A. ...and sets apart dough offering:

B. *unconsecrated dough that is as yet not properly prepared so far as setting aside dough offering is concerned is not classified as dough-offering [even though a part of the dough is going to be deemed dough offering].*

III.1 A. ...and brings near [to the other dough the vessel in which she has put the portion set apart as dough offering]:

B. for a master has said, “It is a religious duty to designate offering from dough that is right near to that for which the dough offering is designated.”

IV.1 A. to designate it as dough offering:

B. *For one might have supposed that we may a decree that she not do so, on account of the possibility that she might touch the dough from the outside.*

C. *So we are informed that that is not the case.*

V.1 A. and if some of her spit and blood of purifying fell on a loaf of heave offering, that it is clean:

B. *For we have learned on Tannaite authority: the excretions of one who has immersed on the selfsame day and awaits sunset for the completion of his rite of purification is in the category of liquid that he touches — neither this nor that imparts uncleanness.*

C. The exception is the excretion of a person who has been unclean by reason of flux, which is a generative source of uncleanness.

VI.1 A. The House of Shammai say, “She requires immersion at the end.” And the House of Hillel say, “She does not require immersion at the end:”

B. *What is at stake between them?*

C. Said R. Qattina, “At issue between them is whether or not it is necessary to immerse at the end of a long day [if the initial immersion had been done earlier in the same day. [The House of Shammai hold that that must be done, the House of Hillel do not concur.]”

The Talmud systematically glosses the clauses of the Mishnah; were the Bavli only a Mishnah-commentary, this would typify its main literary traits and intellectual program. In the case of II, III, IV, V, VI, what we have is a commentary on the process of designating dough-offering, not a solution to any problems in our Mishnah.

10:8

A. **She who sees [blood] on the eleventh day [the last day of the eleven days of the zibah-period, during which all flow of blood is classified as flux, and the next day is the first day of the menstrual period] and immersed in the evening and had intercourse —**

- B. [since in their view the woman is obligated to allow a clean day to pass after a day of uncleanness,] the House of Shammai say, “They [both sexual partners] impart uncleanness to things upon which one may lie and sit and are liable for a sacrifice.”
- C. [72A] The House of Hillel say, “They are free of the obligation to bring the sacrifice.”
- D. [If] she immersed on the day after it [the first day of her menstrual cycle of seven days] and had intercourse and afterward saw a drop of blood —
- E. the House of Shammai say, “They impart uncleanness to objects which are used for lying and sitting and are free of the requirement to bring the sacrifice [since part of the day passed in cleanness; the discharge later on has no bearing on the prior flux, since the day is assigned to the menstrual period].”
- F. And the House of Hillel say, “Lo, such a one is a glutton [but in no way culpable].”
- G. And they agree concerning the woman who sees a drop of blood during the [first ten of the] eleven [zibah-] days and immersed in the evening and had intercourse,
- H. that [since as one who has experienced a discharge on a zibah-day, she has to allow a clean day to pass before she can regard herself as clean (Slotki)] they impart uncleanness to objects which are used for sitting and lying and are liable for a sacrifice.
- I. If she immersed on the day afterward [so that part of the day had passed without flux] and had intercourse, lo, this is bad conduct,
- J. but [whether] things which they touch [are made unclean] or [whether] their sexual intercourse [is culpable] are matters which are left in suspense.

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

- B. They agree concerning a woman who immerses at night by reason of a flux [during the prior day, which ended at sunset] that the immersion is null.
- C. And they agree concerning the woman who sees a drop of blood during the [first ten of the] eleven [zibah-] days and immersed in the evening and had intercourse, that [since as one who has experienced a discharge on a zibah-day, she has to allow a clean day to pass before she can regard herself as clean (Slotki)] they impart uncleanness to objects which are used for sitting and lying and are liable for a sacrifice.
- D. They differ only concerning the status of such an action on the eleventh of the eleven zibah-days.
- E. For [since in their view the woman is obligated to allow a clean day to pass after a day of uncleanness,] the House of Shammai say, “They [both sexual partners] impart uncleanness to things upon which one may lie and sit and are liable for a sacrifice.” And the House of Hillel say, “They are free of the obligation to bring the sacrifice.”
- F. Said the House of Shammai to the House of Hillel, “What is the difference between the eleventh of the zibah-days and the prior ten days of the eleven

zibah-days? If the upshot of that eleventh day is the same as to uncleanness, should it not be the same as to the requirement to bring an offering?"

- G. Said the House of Hillel to the House of Shammai, "No. If you say so concerning her who sees blood during the eleven days, in which case the day after it joins with it to impose uncleanness due to the uncleanness of flux, will you say so in the case of the one who produces a drop of blood on the eleventh day, in which case the day afterward [on which flux is classified as menstrual] does not join together with that same day in regard to imposing upon the woman the status of being unclean with flux?"
- H. Said to them the House of Shammai, "Be consistent! If so, she also should not impart uncleanness to objects used for sitting and lying [since she is in no way unclean by reason of flux]!"
- I. Said to them the House of Hillel, "If we have broadened the rule in respect to uncleanness imparted to objects used for lying and sitting, which is a stringency imposed by us, we should not impose upon him the obligation of bringing a sacrifice, which might produce a leniency [since he will offer what is in fact an unconsecrated beast]? [T. [Nid. 9:19B-E](#)].
- J. "And furthermore, on the basis of your own statements you are refuted. For you say, 'If she immersed on the day after it [the first day of her menstrual cycle of seven days] and had intercourse and afterward saw a drop of blood — they impart uncleanness to objects which are used for lying and sitting and are free of the requirement to bring the sacrifice.' So you too should be consistent! If the one is equivalent to the other in respect to uncleanness, it should also be like it in regard to the requirement to bring a sacrifice, and if it is not like it in regard to the sacrifice, it should not be like it in regard to uncleanness either.
- K. "But rather, the point is to impose a strict ruling and not to impose a lenient ruling, and here too, the point is to impose a strict ruling and not to impose a lenient ruling."
- I.2.** A. Said R. Huna, "As to the bed on which she lies and the chair on which she sits on the second day [Slotki: the day following one of the intermediate days of the zibah-period, on which she experienced a discharge] are held by the House of Shammai to be unclean, even though on the second day she immersed, and even though on the second day she produced no discharge. *What is their operative consideration? Since, if she had produced blood that day, she would have been unclean [retroactively, since the flux on the second day joins with that on the first to mark an on-going flux], now too she is unclean.*"
- B. Said R. Joseph, "What can he possibly have thought to tell us that we did not know? Lo, we have learned that rule in the following: [If] she immersed on the day after it [the first day of her menstrual cycle of seven days] and had intercourse and afterward saw a drop of blood — the House of Shammai say, 'They impart uncleanness to objects which are used for lying and sitting and are free of the requirement to bring the sacrifice [since part of the day passed in cleanness; the discharge later on has no bearing on the prior flux, since the day is assigned to the menstrual period].'"

- C. *Said R. Kahana, "The case of her actually producing the blood can have been different [so I have explained that it is treated in the same way]."*
- D. *Said R. Joseph, "And if she produced blood that day, what difference does it make? It is blood of menstruation [and not of flux] anyhow!"*
- E. *Said Abbaye to R. Joseph, "[When R. Kahana stated, the case of her actually producing the blood can have been different], this is what troubled him: now in a case in which she produced blood, we decree uncleanness, since producing menstrual blood had to be declared unclean as a preventive measure against the possibility of producing zibah-blood. But where there is no discharge, what is the possibility concerning which a decree would have had to be made? And furthermore, we have learned in the Mishnah: **He who sees one appearance of flux — the House of Shammai say, "He is like a woman who awaits day against day."** And the House of Hillel say, "He is like one who has had a seminal emission" [M. Zab. 1:1A-C].*
- F. *"[72B] And it has been taught on Tannaite authority: [In respect to a person afflicted with flux who had experienced only a single discharge] if he caused the shaking of the first observed flux, the House of Shammai say, 'His status is held in suspense. And the House of Hillel declare him clean. As to the status of the beds and chairs on which he lay or sat during the span of time between the first and the second appearance of flux, the House of Shammai declare their status to be held in suspect, and the House of Hillel declare that they are clean [T. Zab. 1:2A-F].*
- G. *"Now in the opening clause it is taught as the Tannaite version, **He who sees one appearance of flux — the House of Shammai say, 'He is like a woman who awaits day against day,'** from which it follows that in the case of a woman who waits day against day, in the opinion of the House of Shammai matters of uncleanness are held in suspense [Slotki: and if she experiences no second discharge she is clean]!"*
- H. *"Do not say, 'a woman awaiting day against day,' but rather, 'like a man who had intercourse with a woman who waits day against day.'" [Slotki: Huna agrees in the case of the man that, if the intercourse took place on the second day after the woman's immersion, the question of his uncleanness must be held in suspense, and before a second discharge appears, he is free from uncleanness as a matter of certainty].*
- I. *"Then how come he does not impart uncleanness to the bed and chair on which he lies or sits, while she does impart uncleanness to them?"*
- J. *"In his regard, since it is not common for him to bleed, rabbis have made no decree, but as to her, who usually does produce blood, rabbis have made a decree."*
- K. *"And how come she imparts uncleanness to the bed and chair on which she lies or sits but does not convey uncleanness to the man who has intercourse with her?"*
- L. *"To beds or chairs, which she commonly uses, she imparts uncleanness, but to the man who has intercourse with her, which will not be common under these conditions, she does not convey uncleanness."*

II.1 A. *We have learned in the Mishnah:* If she immersed on the day afterward [so that part of the day had passed without flux] and had intercourse, lo, this is bad conduct, but [whether] things which they touch [are made unclean] or [whether] their sexual intercourse [is culpable] are matters which are left in suspense.

B. *Is this not the opinion of both parties?*

C. *No, it represents only the opinion of the House of Hillel, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* Said R. Judah to the House of Hillel, “Is such what you call bad conduct, in light of the fact that this man had the intention only of having sexual relations with a menstruating woman?” [cf. T. **Nid. 9:19A**].

D. **A menstruating woman?! How could you think so!**

E. Rather, **“of having intercourse with a woman unclean by flux.”**

F. **of having intercourse with a woman unclean by flux?! How could you think so!**

G. Rather, **of having intercourse with a woman who is waiting day against day [watching for clean days in succession].**

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

B. As to the status of the tenth day [on which a first discharge takes place; such a discharge can never develop into a major cause of flux uncleanness, since the tenth day is followed by one day only of the zibah-period, the eleventh, for the twelfth is the first day of the menstrual period (Slotki)] —

C. *R. Yohanan said, “The tenth day is classified like the ninth day. Just as the ninth day [on which a flux takes place] requires a watch [on the next day], so the tenth day must be followed by a watch [on the eleventh, though a repeated discharge on the eleventh still would not yield confirmed status as unclean by reason of flux for the woman who has it (Slotki)].”*

D. *And R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “The tenth day is classified like the eleventh day. Just as the eleventh day does not require a watch [since flux on the next day is menstrual anyhow], so the tenth day does not require a watch [for flux on the next day].”*

E. *There are those who teach this dispute with respect to the following:*

F. Said R. Eleazar b. Azariah to R. Aqiba, “Even if you were to draw inferences all day long from the repetition of the words, ‘with oil,’ [claiming that every time Scripture says, ‘with oil,’ in connection with a thanksgiving offering, there is an addition to the quantity that is specified], I will not listen to you, for it is the simple fact that the required volume of half a log of oil for a thanksgiving offering, a quarter of a log of wine for a Nazirite’s offering, and the eleven days that intervene between one menstrual period and the next — all are revealed law given to Moses at Sinai.”

G. *What is the revealed law that is mentioned?*

H. R. Yohanan said, “The revealed law applicable to the eleventh day of the zibah-period.”

I. R. Simeon b. Laqish said, “The revealed laws applicable to the eleventh day of the Zibah-period.”

- J. R. Yohanan said, "The revealed law applicable to the eleventh day of the zibah-period:" *it is the eleventh day that does not require a watch [for blood, since the next day will be the menstrual cycle's blood anyhow], lo, for other, prior days, a watch is to be carried out.*
- K. R. Simeon b. Laqish said, "The revealed laws applicable to the eleventh day of the Zibah-period:" *the eleventh day is not followed by a day or observation, nor does it serve as a day of observation for the tenth.*
- L. *But are these revealed laws? Do they not derive from explicit statements of Scripture [so they are not in the status of laws that are revealed and handed on outside of the medium of the written Torah]?*
- M. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- N. Might one suppose that if a woman produced a discharge on the three consecutive days at the outset of the menstrual period, she shall be treated as unclean with flux-uncleanness, and the verse, "If a woman have an issue and her issue in her flesh be blood": (Lev. 15:19) [which implies neither the counting of seven days nor the requirement of sacrifice] speaks of a woman who has produced a flux on only one day alone [following Slotki]?
- O. Scripture to the contrary states, **[73A]** "Not in the time of her menstruation" (Lev. 15:25), meaning, near the time of her menstruation. [Slotki: the three consecutive days on which a discharge appears and which subject the woman to the restrictions of a major uncleanness by reason of flux must be close to, but not within the seven days of the menstruation period, that is, the first three days of the eleven zibah-days].
- P. I know only that the rule applies near the time of her menstruation. How do I know that the same rule applies to a day that is separated from her menstrual period by a day?
- Q. Scripture states, "or if she have an issue" (Lev. 15:25).
- R. I know only that that rule applies to a single day distant from the days adjacent to the menstrual cycle. How do I know that the same rule applies to the days that are two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, and ten days away from her menstrual cycle?
- S. Say the following: just as we find in the case of the fourth day [after the menstrual cycle] that it is suitable for counting [clean days, if there was a discharge on the first three days after the menstrual cycle, which then has ceased], and it is also suitable for counting as a zibah-day [if a flux first appeared on the second day following menstruation and was repeated on the third and the fourth], so I shall encompass under the same law the tenth day, which is it is suitable for counting [clean days], and also suitable for counting as a zibah-day.
- T. And how do I know that I should encompass the eleventh day as well?
- U. Scripture states, "not at the time of her menstruation" (Lev. 15:25).
- V. Is it possible that I should encompass within the law the twelfth day as well?
- W. You must say, not at all.
- X. How come you encompass the eleventh day but you omit the twelfth day?

- Y. I encompass the eleventh day, which is suitable for being counted as one of the clean days following the one that is deduced from “or if she have an issue” [Slotki: the seven days following a discharge on the fourth terminating on the eleventh], but I exclude the twelfth day, since it is not appropriately counted as one of the clean days following the one that is deduced from “or if she have an issue” [since this is the first day of menstruation].
- Z. I know thus far only that the flux uncleanness that imparts uncleanness to bed and chair is proven after a discharge on three successive days. How do I know that the same restrictions apply if the discharge has taken place on only two days?
- AA. Scripture is explicit in stating, “days.”
- BB. And how do I know that the same applies to a discharge that has taken place on only one day?
- CC. Scripture is explicit in stating, “all the days” (Lev. 15:25). This teaches that she imparts uncleanness to the man who has sexual relations with her just as does a menstruating woman.
- DD. “She” means, she imparts uncleanness to the man who has sexual relations with her, but the man afflicted with flux-uncleanness does not convey uncleanness to the woman with whom he has sexual relations.
- EE. But is there not an argument *a fortiori* that he should indeed do so? If the woman, who is not made unclean only on account of producing blood [that is, three fluxes on a single day] in the way in which is made unclean when she produces blood on successive days [if she produces three fluxes on one day, she is affected only by the uncleanness of that day, however many fluxes she has produced, but if she produces three fluxes on three successive days, then she is confirmed as unclean with flux-uncleanness], nonetheless imparts uncleanness to the man with whom she has sexual relations, he, who is made unclean by three appearances of flux on a single day as much as by three appearances of flux on three successive days, surely should impart uncleanness to her with whom he has sexual relations!
- FF. Scripture is required to say, “She” meaning, she imparts uncleanness to the man who has sexual relations with her, but the man afflicted with flux-uncleanness does not convey uncleanness to the woman with whom he has sexual relations.
- GG. And how on the basis of Scripture do I know that he imparts uncleanness to the beds and chairs on which he sits or lies?
- HH. Scripture states, “as the bed of her menstruation” (Lev. 15:26).
- II. From this statement, I should know only that the man who has experienced a discharge [is subject to that rule]. How do I know that if he has produced flux on two successive days, the same rule applies?
- JJ. Scripture says, “days.”
- KK. And how do I know that if he has produced flux on a single day, the same rule applies?
- LL. Scripture says, “all the days.”

- MM. And how do we know that a woman counts one day that is clear of flux to correspond to one day on which a flux appeared [and only then may be regarded as clean]?
- NN. Scripture says, “She shall be” (Lev. 15:25).
- OO. Might one suppose that she should have to count seven clean days after she has had a discharge on only two days? For this conclusion would be yielded by the following argument: if he, who does not have to count one clean day to correspond to one day [on which he has suffered a flux, for after a discharge of one flux on one day, he immerses in the evening and is then clean], after a discharge on two days must count seven clean days, a woman, who does have to count one day that is without flux to correspond to one day of flux, surely should have to count seven clean days after a discharge of two days [and not only three days]?
- PP. Scripture says, “She shall be,” proving that she counts one day only.
- QQ. [Reverting to L:] *this then proves that the laws on the eleventh day are derived from Scriptural verses and do not constitute laws handed on orally at Mount Sinai.*
- RR. *In the opinion of R. Aqiba, the rules derive from Scripture, while in the opinion of R. Eleazar b. Azariah, they constitute a law handed down from Sinai.*
- II.3.** A. *Said R. Shemaiah to R. Abba, “May I say that, on account of a discharge during the day [since the verses adduced in evidence on flux speak only of days, as at Lev. 15:25], what flows should be classified as flux, while if it flows by night, it should be classified as menstrual blood?”*
- B. He said to him, “In regard to your question Scripture has said, ‘By the time of her menstruation’ meaning, a discharge that is close to the time of her menstruation. Now which is a discharge that is close to the time of her menstruation? It is one that has occurred by night [since the menstrual period ends at sunset of the seventh day (Slotki)], and yet Scripture has referred to her as unclean with flux uncleanness.”

Homiletical conclusion to the tractate

- II.4.** A. *The Tannaite authority of the household of Elijah [said], “Whoever repeats laws every day is guaranteed to belong to the world to come, for it is said, ‘his ways — the world is his’ (Hab. 3: 6). Read not, ‘his ways,’ but ‘his laws,’ [meaning, the one who makes the laws his own will belong to the world to come].”*
- I.1 goes over the ground of our Mishnah and restates the materials, proceeding to the Tosefta’s complement. No. 2 then builds on the foregoing. II.1 continues the exposition of the Mishnah’s rule. No. 2 opens a new issue, generated by our materials but not required for expounding them. From 2.M through 4.QQ we have footnote-materials. Then No. 3 is a footnote to No. 4. No. 6 serves satisfactorily as a formal conclusion to this or any other tractate, but because of the prior discussion of “law” in the sense of “revealed law, not resting on Scripture” the passage may have been found pertinent in particular to this context.