mishna - Mas. Yadayim Chapter

MISHNAH . [A MINIMUM OF] A QUARTER [OF A LOG] OF WATER MUST BE POURED OVER THE HANDS [TO BE SUFFICIENT] FOR ONE [PERSON] AND IS EVEN [SUFFICIENT] FOR TWO; A MINIMUM OF HALF A LOG MUST BE POURED OVER THE HANDS [TO BE SUFFICIENT] FOR THREE OR FOUR PERSONS; ONE LOG OR MORE [IS SUFFICIENT] FOR FIVE, TEN, OR ONE HUNDRED PERSONS. R. JOSE SAYS: BUT PROVIDED ONLY THERE IS NOT LESS THAN A QUARTER OF A LOG LEFT FOR THE LAST PERSON AMONG THEM. MORE [WATER] MAY BE ADDED TO THE SECOND WATER, BUT MORE MAY NOT BE ADDED TO THE FIRST WATER.

MISHNAH . WATER MAY BE POURED OVER THE HANDS OUT OF ANY KIND OF VESSEL, EVEN OUT OF VESSELS MADE OF ANIMAL ORDURE, OUT OF VESSELS MADE OF STONE OR OUT OF VESSELS MADE OF CLAY. WATER MAY NOT BE POURED FROM THE SIDES OF [BROKEN] VESSELS OR FROM THE BOTTOM OF A LADLE OR FROM THE BUNG OF A BARREL. NOR MAY ANYONE POUR [WATER] OVER THE HANDS OF HIS FELLOW OUT OF HIS CUPPED HANDS BECAUSE ONE MAY NOT DRAW, NOR SANCTIFY, NOR SPRINKLE THE WATER OF PURIFICATION, NOR POUR WATER OVER THE HANDS EXCEPT IN A VESSEL. AND ONLY VESSELS CLOSELY COVERED WITH A LID PROTECT [THEIR CONTENTS FROM UNCLEANNESS] AND ONLY VESSELS PROTECT [THEIR CONTENTS FROM UNCLEANNESS] FROM EARTHENWARE VESSELS.

MISHNAH . IF WATER HAS BECOME SO UNFIT THAT IT CANNOT BE DRUNK BY CATTLE, IF IT WAS IN A VESSEL IT IS INVALID, BUT IF IT WAS IN THE GROUND IT IS VALID. IF THERE FELL INTO IT INK, RESIN, OR VITRIOL AND ITS COLOUR CHANGED, IT IS INVALID. IF A PERSON DID ANY WORK WITH IT OR SOAKED HIS BREAD THEREIN, IT IS INVALID. SIMEON OF TEMAN SAYS: EVEN IF HE INTENDED TO SOAK HIS BREAD IN ONE WATER AND IT FELL IN ANOTHER WATER [DO YOU STILL CONSIDER THE OTHER WATER TO BE INVALID? IN SUCH A CASE I CONSIDER THAT THE OTHER WATER] IS VALID.

MISHNAH . IF HE CLEANSED VESSELS THEREIN OR SCRUBBED MEASURES THEREIN, [THE WATER] IS INVALID; IF HE RINSED THEREIN VESSELS WHICH HAD ALREADY BEEN RINSED OR NEW VESSELS, IT IS VALID. R. JOSE DECLARES IT TO BE INVALID IF THEY WERE NEW VESSELS.

MISHNAH . WATER IN WHICH THE BAKER DIPS GELUSK N IS INVALID; BUT IF HE [MERELY] MOISTENED HIS HANDS THEREIN IT IS VALID. ALL ARE FIT TO POUR WATER OVER THE HANDS, EVEN A DEAF-MUTE, AN IMBECILE, OR A MINOR. A PERSON MAY PLACE THE BARREL BETWEEN HIS KNEES AND POUR OUT THE WATER OR HE MAY TURN THE BARREL ON ITS SIDE AND POUR IT OUT. AN APE MAY POUR WATER OVER THE HANDS. R. JOSE DECLARES THESE [LATTER] TWO CASES INVALID.

MISHNAH . IF A PERSON POURS WATER OVER ONE OF HIS HANDS WITH A SINGLE RINSING HIS HAND BECOMES CLEAN. IF OVER BOTH HIS HANDS WITH A SINGLE RINSING, R. MEIR DECLARES THEM TO BE UNCLEAN UNTIL HE POURS A MINIMUM OF A QUARTER OF A LOG OF WATER OVER THEM. IF A LOAF OF TERUMAH FELL ON THE WATER THE LOAF IS CLEAN. R. JOSE DECLARES IT TO BE UNCLEAN.

MISHNAH . IF HE POURED THE FIRST WATER OVER HIS HANDS [WHILST STANDING] IN ONE PLACE, AND THE SECOND WATER OVER HIS HANDS [WHILST STANDING] IN ANOTHER PLACE, AND A LOAF OF TERUMAH FELL ON THE FIRST WATER, THE LOAF BECOMES UNCLEAN. BUT IF IT FELL ON THE SECOND WATER IT REMAINS CLEAN. IF HE POURED THE FIRST AND THE SECOND WATER [WHILST STANDING] IN ONE PLACE, AND A LOAF OF TERUMAH FELL THEREON, THE LOAF BECOMES UNCLEAN. IF HE POURED THE FIRST WATER OVER HIS HANDS AND A SPLINTER OR A PIECE OF GRAVEL IS FOUND ON HIS HANDS, THEY REMAIN UNCLEAN, BECAUSE THE LATTER WATER ONLY MAKES THE FIRST WATER ON THE HANDS CLEAN. R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL. SAYS: IF ANY WATER-CREATURE [FALLS ON THE HANDS WHILST THEY ARE BEING CLEANED] THEY NEVERTHELESS BECOME CLEAN.

MISHNAH . HANDS BECOME UNCLEAN AND ARE MADE CLEAN AS FAR AS THE WRIST. HOW SO? IF HE POURED THE FIRST WATER OVER THE HANDS AS FAR AS THE WRIST AND POURED THE SECOND WATER OVER THE HANDS BEYOND THE WRIST AND THE LATTER FLOWED BACK TO THE HANDS, THE HANDS NEVERTHELESS BECOME CLEAN. IF HE POURED THE FIRST AND THE SECOND WATER OVER THE HANDS BEYOND THE WRIST AND THEY FLOWED BACK TO THE HANDS, THE HANDS REMAIN UNCLEAN. IF HE POURED THE FIRST WATER OVER ONE OF HIS HANDS AND THEN CHANGED HIS MIND AND POURED THE SECOND WATER OVER BOTH HIS HANDS, THEY REMAIN UNCLEAN. IF HE POURED THE FIRST WATER OVER BOTH HIS HANDS AND THEN CHANGED HIS MIND AND POURED THE SECOND WATER OVER ONE OF HIS HANDS, HIS ONE HAND BECOMES CLEAN. IF HE POURED WATER OVER ONE OF HIS HANDS AND RUBBED IT ON THE OTHER HAND IT REMAINS UNCLEAN. IF HE RUBBED IT ON HIS HEAD OR ON THE WALL IT BECOMES CLEAN. WATER MAY BE POURED OVER THE HANDS OF FOUR OR FIVE PERSONS, EACH HAND BEING BY THE SIDE OF THE OTHER, OR BEING ONE ABOVE THE OTHER, PROVIDED THAT THE HANDS ARE HELD LOOSELY SO THAT THE WATER FLOWS BETWEEN THEM.

MISHNAH . IF THERE WAS A DOUBT WHETHER ANY WORK HAS BEEN DONE WITH THE WATER OR NOT, OR WHETHER THE WATER CONTAINS THE REQUISITE QUANTITY OR NOT, OR WHETHER IT IS UNCLEAN OR CLEAN, THEN WHERE THERE IS SUCH A DOUBT THE WATER IS CONSIDERED TO BE CLEAN. BECAUSE THEY HAVE SAID IN A CASE OF DOUBT CONCERNING HANDS AS TO WHETHER THEY HAVE BECOME UNCLEAN OR HAVE CONVEYED UNCLEANNESS OR HAVE BECOME CLEAN, THEY ARE CONSIDERED TO BE CLEAN. R. JOSE SAYS: IN A CASE [OF DOUBT AS TO] WHETHER THEY HAVE BECOME CLEAN THEY ARE CONSIDERED TO BE UNCLEAN. HOW SO? IF HIS HANDS WERE CLEAN AND THERE WERE TWO UNCLEAN LOAVES BEFORE HIM AND THERE WAS A DOUBT WHETHER HE TOUCHED THEM OR NOT; OR IF HIS HANDS WERE UNCLEAN AND THERE WERE TWO CLEAN LOAVES BEFORE HIM AND THERE WAS A DOUBT WHETHER HE TOUCHED THEM OR NOT; OR IF ONE OF HIS HANDS WAS UNCLEAN AND THE OTHER CLEAN AND THERE WERE TWO CLEAN LOAVES BEFORE HIM AND HE TOUCHED ONE OF THEM AND THERE WAS A DOUBT WHETHER HE TOUCHED IT WITH THE UNCLEAN HAND OR WITH THE CLEAN HAND; OR IF HIS HANDS WERE CLEAN AND THERE WERE TWO LOAVES BEFORE HIM ONE OF WHICH WAS UNCLEAN AND THE OTHER CLEAN AND HE TOUCHED ONE OF THEM AND THERE WAS A DOUBT WHETHER HE TOUCHED THE UNCLEAN ONE OR THE CLEAN ONE; OR IF ONE OF HIS HANDS WAS UNCLEAN AND THE OTHER CLEAN AND THERE WERE TWO LOAVES BEFORE HIM ONE OF WHICH WAS UNCLEAN AND THE OTHER CLEAN, AND HE TOUCHED BOTH OF THEM, AND THERE IS A DOUBT WHETHER THE UNCLEAN HAND TOUCHED THE UNCLEAN LOAF OR WHETHER THE CLEAN HAND TOUCHED THE CLEAN LOAF OR WHETHER THE CLEAN HAND TOUCHED THE UNCLEAN LOAF OR WHETHER THE UNCLEAN HAND TOUCHED THE CLEAN LOAF, THE HANDS REMAIN IN THE SAME STATE AS THEY WERE BEFORE AND THE LOAVES REMAIN IN THE SAME STATE AS THEY WERE BEFORE.

MISHNAH . IF A PERSON PUTS HIS HANDS INSIDE A HOUSE SMITTEN WITH LEPROSY, HIS HANDS BECOME UNCLEAN IN THE FIRST DEGREE. [THESE ARE] THE WORDS OF R. AKIBA. BUT THE SAGES SAY: HIS HANDS BECOME UNCLEAN IN THE SECOND DEGREE. WHOEVER CONVEYS UNCLEANNESS TO THE GARMENTS AT THE TIME WHEN HE TOUCHES [THE UNCLEANNESS] CONVEYS A FIRST DEGREE OF UNCLEANNESS TO THE HANDS. [THESE] ARE THE WORDS OF R. AKIBA. BUT THE SAGES SAY: IN SUCH A CASE HE CONVEYS A SECOND DEGREE OF UNCLEANNESS. THEY SAID TO R. AKIBA: WHERE DO WE FIND ANYWHERE THAT THE HANDS BECOME UNCLEAN IN THE FIRST DEGREE? HE SAID TO THEM: BUT HOW IS IT POSSIBLE FOR THEM TO BECOME UNCLEAN IN THE FIRST DEGREE WITHOUT HIS WHOLE BODY BECOMING UNCLEAN, SAVE ONLY IN THESE CASES? FOODSTUFFS AND VESSELS WHICH HAVE BEEN RENDERED UNCLEAN BY LIQUIDS CONVEY A SECOND DEGREE OF UNCLEANNESS TO THE HANDS. [THESE ARE] THE WORDS OF R. JOSHUA. BUT THE SAGES SAY: THAT WHICH HAS BEEN RENDERED UNCLEAN BY A FATHER OF UNCLEANNESS CONVEYS UNCLEANNESS TO THE HANDS, BUT THAT WHICH HAS BEEN RENDERED UNCLEAN BY AN OFFSPRING OF UNCLEANNESS DOES NOT CONVEY UNCLEAN NESS TO THE HANDS. R. SIMEON B. GAMALIEL SAID: A PRACTICAL INSTANCE OCCURRED WHEN A CERTAIN WOMAN CAME BEFORE MY FATHER AND SAID TO HIM, MY HANDS PROTRUDED INTO THE AIR-SPACE INSIDE AN EARTHENWARE VESSEL. HE SAID TO HER: MY DAUGHTER, WHAT WAS THE CAUSE OF ITS UNCLEANNESS? BUT I DID NOT HEAR WHAT SHE SAID TO HIM. THE SAGES SAID: THE MATTER IS CLEAR. THAT WHICH HAS BEEN RENDERED UNCLEAN BY A ‘FATHER OF UNCLEANNESS’ CONVEYS UNCLEANNESS TO THE HANDS, BUT IF BY AN OFFSPRING OF UNCLEANNESS’ IT DOES NOT CONVEY UNCLEANNESS TO THE HANDS.

MISHNAH . EVERYTHING WHICH RENDERS TERUMAH UNFIT CONVEYS A SECOND DEGREE OF UNCLEANNESS TO THE HANDS. ONE [UNWASHED] HAND CAN CONVEY UNCLEANNESS TO THE OTHER HAND. [THESE ARE] THE WORDS OF R. JOSHUA. BUT THE SAGES SAY: THAT WHICH IS IN THE SECOND DEGREE OF UNCLEANNESS CANNOT CONVEY A SECOND DEGREE OF UNCLEANNESS. HE SAID TO THEM: BUT DO NOT THE HOLY SCRIPTURES WHICH ARE IN THE SECOND DEGREE OF UNCLEANNESS RENDER UNCLEAN THE HANDS? THEY SAID TO HIM: THE LAWS OF THE TORAH MAY NOT BE ARGUED FROM THE LAWS OF THE SCRIBES, NOR MAY THE LAWS OF THE SCRIBES BE ARGUED FROM THE LAWS OF THE TORAH, NOR MAY THE LAWS OF THE SCRIBES BE ARGUED FROM [OTHER] LAWS OF THE SCRIBES.

MISHNAH . THE STRAPS OF THE TEFILLIN [WHEN CONNECTED] WITH THE TEFILLIN RENDER UNCLEAN THE HANDS. R. SIMEON SAYS: THE STRAPS OF THE TEFILLIN DO NOT RENDER UNCLEAN THE HANDS.

MISHNAH . THE MARGIN ON A SCROLL WHICH IS ABOVE OR BELOW OR AT THE BEGINNING OR AT THE END RENDERS UNCLEAN THE HANDS. R. JUDAH SAYS: THE MARGIN AT THE END DOES NOT RENDER UNCLEAN [THE HANDS] UNTIL A HANDLE IS FASTENED TO IT.

MISHNAH . A SCROLL ON WHICH THE WRITING HAS BECOME ERASED AND EIGHTY-FIVE LETTERS REMAIN THEREON, AS MANY AS ARE IN THE SECTION BEGINNING, ‘AND IT CAME TO PASS WHEN THE ARK SET FORWARD’,ETC. RENDERS UNCLEAN THE HANDS. A SINGLE SHEET ON WHICH THERE ARE WRITTEN EIGHTY-FIVE LETTERS, AS MANY AS ARE IN THE SECTION BEGINNING, ‘AND IT CAME TO PASS WHEN THE ARK SET FORWARD’, RENDERS UNCLEAN THE HANDS. ALL THE HOLY WRITINGS RENDER UNCLEAN THE HANDS. THE SONG OF SONGS AND ECCLESIASTES RENDER UNCLEAN THE HANDS. R. JUDAH SAYS: THE SONG OF SONGS RENDERS UNCLEAN THE HANDS, BUT THERE IS A DISPUTE ABOUT ECCLESIASTES. R. JOSE SAYS: ECCLESIASTES DOES NOT RENDER UNCLEAN THE HANDS, BUT THERE IS A DISPUTE ABOUT THE SONG OF SONGS. R. SIMEON SAYS: [THE RULING ABOUT] ECCLESIASTES IS ONE OF THE LENIENCIES OF BETH SHAMMAI AND ONE OF THE STRINGENCIES OF BETH HILLEL. R. SIMEON B. AZZAI SAID: I RECEIVED A TRADITION FROM THE SEVENTY-TWO ELDERS ON THE DAY WHEN THEY APPOINTED R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH HEAD OF THE ACADEMY THAT THE SONG OF SONGS AND ECCLESIASTES RENDER UNCLEAN THE HANDS. R. AKIBA SAID: FAR BE IT! NO MAN IN ISRAEL DISPUTED ABOUT THE SONG OF SONGS [BY SAYING] THAT IT DOES NOT RENDER UNCLEAN THE HANDS. FOR THE WHOLE WORLD IS NOT AS WORTHY AS THE DAY ON WHICH THE SONG OF SONGS WAS GIVEN TO ISRAEL; FOR ALL THE WRITINGS ARE HOLY BUT THE SONG OF SONGS IS THE HOLY OF HOLIES. SO THAT IF THEY HAD A DISPUTE, THEY HAD A DISPUTE ONLY ABOUT ECCLESIASTES. A. JOHANAN B. JOSHUA THE SON OF THE FATHER-IN-LAW OF R. AKIBA SAID: IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE WORDS OF BEN AZZAI SO THEY DISPUTED, AND SO THEY REACHED A DECISION.