Mishnah . If a corpse fell into it or an unclean person walked in it, and a clean person drank of it, he continues clean. The same rule applies to the water of pits, the water of cisterns, the water of ditches, the water of caverns, the water of rain drippings which have stopped, and mikwehs of less than forty se'ahs: they are all clean during the time of rain; when the rain has stopped those near to a city or to a road are unclean, and those distant remain clean until the majority of people pass [that way].

Mishnah . When are they accounted clean again? Beth shammai say: when their contents have been increased [by more than the original quantity] and they overflow. Beth hillel say: when their contents have been increased [by more than their original quantity] although they do not overflow. R. Simeon says: when they overflow although their contents have not been so increased. [all such pit- water] is valid [for preparing dough] for hallah and for the washing of the hands.

Mishnah . Superior to such [water] is the water of rain drippings which have not stopped. If an unclean person drank of it and then a clean person drank of it, he continues clean; if an unclean person drank of it and water was then drawn from it in a clean vessel, it continues clean; if an unclean person drank of it and a loaf of terumah fell in, even if it was washed in it, it continues clean; if one drew water from it in an unclean vessel and then a clean person drank [out of the pool]. He continues clean; if one drew water from it in an unclean vessel and a loaf of terumah fell [into the pool]. Even if it was washed in it, it continues clean; if unclean water fell into it and a clean person drank of it, he continues clean; if unclean water fell into it and one drew water from it in a clean vessel, it continues clean; if unclean water fell into it and a loaf of terumah fell in, even if it was washed in it, it continues clean. [all such water] is valid for terumah and for the washing of the hands.

Mishnah . Superior to such [water] is [the water of] the mikweh containing forty se'ahs, for in it persons may immerse themselves and immerse others. Superior again is [the water of] a fountain whose own water is little but has been increased by a greater quantity of drawn water; it is equivalent to the mikweh in as much as it may render clean by standing water, and to an [ordinary] fountain in as much as one may immerse in it whatever the quantity of its contents.

Mishnah . Superior again are ‘smitten waters’ which can render clean even when flowing. Superior again are ‘living waters’ which serve for the immersion of persons who have a running issue and for the sprinkling of lepers, and are valid for the preparation of the water of purification.

Mishnah . If an unclean man went down to immerse himself and it is doubtful whether he did immerse himself or not, or even if he did immerse himself, it is doubtful whether the mikweh contained forty se'ahs or not, or if there were two mikwehs, one containing forty se'ahs but not the other, and he immersed himself in one of them but he does not know in which of them he immersed himself, in such a doubt he is accounted unclean.

Mishnah . If a mikweh was measured and was found lacking [in its prescribed quantity], all things which had been purified in it hitherto, whether in private premises or in public premises, are accounted unclean. To what does this rule apply? To a serious uncleanness. But in the case of a lesser uncleanness, namely if one ate unclean foods or drank unclean liquids, or if his head and the greater part of his body entered into drawn water, or if three logs of drawn water fell on his head and the greater part of his body, and he then went down to immerse himself and he is in doubt whether he immersed himself or not, or even if he did immerse himself there is [still] a doubt whether the mikweh contained forty se'ahs or not, or if there were two mikwehs, one containing forty se'ahs and not the other, and he immersed himself in one of them but does not know in which of them he immersed himself, in such a doubt he is accounted clean. R. Jose considers him unclean, for r jose says: anything which is presumptively unclean always remains in a condition of unfitness until it is known that it has become clean; but if there is a doubt whether a person became unclean or caused uncleanness, it is to be accounted clean.

Mishnah . In the case of a doubt about drawn water which the sages have declared clean, when there is a doubt whether [three logs of drawn water] fell into the mikweh or not, or if, though they did fall in, there is a doubt whether [the mikweh] contained forty se'ahs or not, or if there were two mikwehs of which one contained forty se'ahs and the other did not, and drawn water fell into one of them and it is not known into which of them it fell, in such a doubt it is accounted clean, because there exists [a possibility] on which we may depend [in declaring it clean]. If they both contained less than forty se'ahs, and [drawn water] fell into one of them and it is not known into which of them it fell, in such a doubt it is accounted unclean, because there exists no [possibility] on which we may depend [in declaring it clean].

Mishnah . R. Eliezer says: a quarter-log of drawn water in the beginning makes the mikweh invalid, and three logs on the surface of the water. But the sages say: both in the beginning and at the end, the measure [which makes the mikweh invalid] is three logs.

Mishnah . If there were three cavities in a mikweh each holding a log of drawn water, if it is known that there fell therein forty se'ahs of valid water before reaching the third cavity, [such a mikweh is] valid; otherwise it is invalid. But r. Simeon declares it valid, since it resembles a mikweh adjoining another mikweh.

Mishnah . If the mud had been moved to the sides and then three logs [of water] were drawn out from it, [the mikweh is still] valid. But if the mud had been removed away and three logs were drawn from it [into the mikweh]. It becomes invalid. But r. Simeon pronounces it valid, since there was no intention to draw [the water].

Mishnah . If one had left wine-jars on the roof to dry and they became filled with water, r. Eliezer says: if it was the season of rain and there was [in the cistern] a little water, one may break the jars; otherwise one may not break them. R. Joshua says: in either case one may break them or tilt them over, but one may not empty [them into the cistern].

Mishnah . If a plasterer forgot his lime-tub in a cistern and it became filled with water, if water flowed above it however little, it may be broken; otherwise it may not be broken. This is the opinion of r. Eliezer. But r. Joshua says: in either case it may be broken.

Mishnah . If one had arranged wine-jars in a cistern and they became filled with water, even though the water of the cistern was all soaked up, they may be broken.

Mishnah . If a mikweh contained forty se'ahs of water and mud [combined]. R. Eliezer says: one may immerse objects in the water but one may not immerse them in the mud. But r. Joshua says: in the water and also in the mud. In what kind of mud may objects be immersed? Mud over which water floats. If the water was on the one side only. R. Joshua admits that objects may be immersed in the water but may not be immersed in the mud. Of what kind of mud have they spoken? Mud into which a reed will sink of itself. This is the opinion of r. Meir. R. Judah says: [mud] in which a measuring-rod will not stand upright. Abba eleazar b. Dula'i says: [mud] into which a plummet will sink. R. Eliezer says: such as will go down into the mouth of a jar. R. Simeon says: such as will enter into the tube of a water- skin. R. Eleazar b. Zadok says: such as can be measured in a log measure.

Mishnah . R. Jose says: if there are two mikwehs neither of which contains forty se'ahs, and a log and a half [of drawn water] fell into each, and they are mingled together, they remain valid, since they had never been explicitly accounted as invalid; but if there is a mikweh holding less than forty se'ahs, and three logs [of drawn water] fell into it, and it was then divided into two, it is invalid, since it had already been explicitly accounted as invalid. R. Joshua declares it valid; for r. Joshua used to say: any mikweh containing less than forty se'ahs into which three logs [of drawn water] fell and from which a kortob was withdrawn becomes valid, since the three logs have also been diminished. But the sages say: it always remains invalid until the former contents thereof are removed and a little more.

Mishnah . In what manner? If there was a cistern in a courtyard and three logs [of drawn water] fell into it, it will always remain invalid until the whole of it is removed and a little more, or until [another mikweh containing] forty se'ahs is placed in the courtyard, so that the higher mikweh is rendered valid by the lower. R. Eliezer b. Azariah declares it invalid unless the [new mikweh] is stopped up.

Mishnah . If there was a cistern full of drawn water and a channel led into it and out of it, it continues invalid until it can be reckoned that there does not remain in it three logs of the former [water]. If two men poured each a log and a half [of drawn water] into a mikweh, or if one wrung out his clothes and so poured in [water] from several places, or if one emptied out a water-cooler and so poured in [water] from several, places, r. Akiba declares it valid, but the sages declare it invalid. R. Akiba said: they did not say ‘if they poured in’, but ‘if one poured in’. But they said: they said neither thus nor thus, but only if there fell therein three logs [of drawn water]’.

Mishnah . [if the three logs of drawn water fell in] from one vessel or from two or from three, they combine together; but if from four, they do not combine together. If a man who had a seminal issue was sick and nine kabs of water fell on him, or if there fell on the head and the greater part of the body of a clean person three logs of drawn water from one vessel or from two or from three, they combine together; but if from four, they do not combine together. In what case does this apply? When the second began before the first finished. And in what other case does [the other statement] apply? When there was no intention to increase it. But if there was an intention to increase it, if only a kortob in a whole year, they combine together to add up to the three logs.

Mishnah . If one put vessels under a water-spout, whether they be large vessels or small vessels or even vessels of dung, vessels of stone or earthen vessels, they make the mikweh invalid. It is all alike whether they were put there [purposely] or were [merely] forgotten. This is according to the opinion of beth shammai. But beth hillel declare it clean in the case of one who forgets. R. Meir said: they voted and beth shammai had a majority over beth hillel; yet they agree in the case of one who forgets [and leaves vessels] in a courtyard that the mikweh remains clean. R. Jose said: the controversy still remains as it was.

Mishnah . If one put a board under a water-spout and it had a rim to it, it makes the mikweh invalid; otherwise it does not make the mikweh invalid. If he made it stand upright to be rinsed, in neither case does it make the mikweh invalid.

Mishnah . If one makes a hollow in a water-spout to collect the gravel, it makes the mikweh invalid in the case of a wooden [spout] if it holds however little, but in the case of an earthenware [spout] if it will hold a quarter-log. R. Jose says: also in the case of an earthenware [spout] if it holds however little: they have spoken of ‘a quarter-log’ only in the case of broken sherds of an earthenware utensil. If the pieces of gravel moved about inside [the hollow]. It makes the mikweh invalid. If earth came down into it and was pressed down, [the mikweh continues] valid. If the spout was narrow at each end and wide in the middle, it does not make [the mikweh] invalid, because it had not been fashioned for gathering [anything in it].

Mishnah . If drawn water and rain water were mingled together in a courtyard or in a cavity or on the steps of a cave, if the greater part was valid, the whole is valid; and if the greater part was invalid, the whole is invalid. If they were equal in quantity. The whole is invalid. When [does this apply]? When they were mingled together before they arrived at the mikweh. But if they flowed [each one direct] into the water [of the mikweh]. If it was known that there fell in forty se'ahs of valid water before there came down three logs of drawn water, [the mikweh is] valid; otherwise it is invalid.

Mishnah . In the case of a trough in the rock, water may not be gathered in it, nor may the water of purification be consecrated therein, nor may one sprinkle therefrom; and it does not require a tightly stopped-up covering, and it does not make the mikweh invalid. If it was a [movable] vessel and had been joined to the ground with lime, water may be gathered in it, and the water of purification may be consecrated therein, and one may sprinkle therefrom, and it requires a tightly stopped-up covering, and it makes the mikweh invalid. If a hole was made in it below or at the side so that it could not contain water in however small a quantity, it is valid. And how great should be the hole? Like the tube of a water-skin. R. Judah b. Bathyra said: it happened in the case of the trough of jehu in jerusalem that there was a hole in it like the tube of a water-skin, and it was used for all things in jerusalem which needed a state of purity. But beth shammai sent and broke it down, for beth shammai say: [it remains a vessel] unless the greater part of it is broken down.

Mishnah . [water from] a fountain which is made to pass over into a trough becomes invalid; if it was made to pass over the edge in any quantity, [what is] outside [the trough] is valid, for [the water of] a fountain purifies however little its quantity. If it is made to pass over into a pool and then is stopped, the pool counts as a mikweh; if it is made to flow again, it is still invalid for persons with a running issue and for lepers and for the preparation of the water of purification until it is known that the former [water] is gone.

Mishnah . If it was made to pass over the outside of vessels or over a bench, r. Judah says: lo, it remains as it was before. R. Jose says: lo, it is like a mikweh, except that one may not immerse anything above the bench.

Mishnah .if [water from] a fountain that flows into many channels was increased in quantity so that it was made to flow in abundance, it remains as it was before. If it was a standing fountain and its quantity was increased so that it was made to flow, it becomes equal to a mikweh in that it can purify in standing water, and to a fountain in that one may immerse [objects] therein however small its quantity.

Mishnah . All seas are deemed valid as a mikweh, for it is written, ‘and the mikweh of the waters called he seas’, this is the opinion of r. Meir. R. Judah says: the great sea alone is a valid mikweh, for the reason that scripture says ‘seas’ is because in it are many kinds of seas. R. Jose says: all seas purify as flowing waters, but they are invalid for persons with a running issue and for lepers and for the preparation of the water of purification.

Mishnah .flowing water is as water of a fountain and dripping water is as a mikweh. R. Zadok testified that if flowing water exceeded dripping water [with which it was mixed] it was valid [as flowing water]. If dripping water became flowing water, its flow may be blocked by a stick or by a reed or even by a man or a woman who has a running issue, and then one may go down and immerse oneself therein. This is the opinion of r. Judah. R. Jose says: one may not stop the flow of water with anything which is liable to uncleanness.

Mishnah . If a wave was separated [from the sea] and comprised forty se'ahs, and it fell on a man or on vessels, they become clean. Any place containing forty se'ahs is valid for immersing oneself and for immersing others. One may immerse in trenches or in ditches or even in a donkey-track the water of which is joined [with a valid mikweh] in a valley. Beth shammai say: one may immerse in a rain torrent. But beth hillel say: one may not immerse. They admit, however, that one may block its flow with vessels and immerse oneself therein, but the vessels with which the flow is blocked are not thereby [validly] immersed.

Mishnah . Any [gathering of water]. Which is joined with [the water of] a mikweh is as valid as the mikweh [itself]. One may immerse in holes of a cavern and in crevices of a cavern just as they are; but one may not immerse in the pit of a cavern except it had a hole as big as the tube of a water-skin. R. Judah said: when [is this the case]? When it stands by itself; but if it does not stand by itself, one may immerse therein just as it is.

Mishnah . If a bucket was full of utensils and they were immersed, lo, they become clean; but if [the bucket] was not immersed [for its own sake] . The water in the bucket is not reckoned as joined [with the water of the mikweh] unless it be joined [by means of the neck of the bucket which is as big] as the tube of a water-skin.

Mishnah . If there were three mikwehs, two of which held twenty se'ahs [of valid water] and the third held twenty se'ahs of drawn water, and that holding drawn water was at the side. If three persons went down and immersed themselves therein and [the water of the three mikwehs] joined, the mikwehs are clean and they that immersed themselves become clean. If the one holding the drawn water was in the middle and three persons went down and immersed themselves therein and [the water of the three mikwehs] joined, the mikwehs continue as they were before and they that immersed themselves are as they were before.

Mishnah . If a sponge or a bucket containing three logs of water fell into a mikweh, they do not make it invalid, because they have only said: ‘if three logs felL IN’.

Mishnah . One may not immerse in a coffer or in a box which is in the sea except it has a hole as large as the tube of a water-skin. R. Judah says: in the case of a large vessel [the hole should be] four handbreadths, and in a small one [the hole should be as large as] the greater part of it. If there is in the sea a sack or a basket, one may immerse therein as it is. Since the water [in the sea and in the sack or basket] is joined together. If they are placed under a water-spout, they do not make the mikweh invalid, and they may be immersed and brought out in the ordinary way.

Mishnah . If there was a defective [earthenware] vessel in the mikweh and utensils were immersed therein, they become clean from their [former] uncleanness but are again rendered unclean because of the earthenware vessel; but if water flowed above it in any quantity. They will remain clean. If [water of] a fountain issued from an oven and a man went down and immersed himself, he is clean but his hands become unclean; but if [the water was as] high above the oven as the height of his hands, his hands also are clean.

Mishnah . Mikwehs can be joined together [as one if their connection is as big] as the tube of a water-skin in thickness and in capacity, in which two fingers can be turned round in full. If there is a doubt [whether it is as big] as the tube of a water skin or not, it is invalid, because [the rule concerning immersion] is a command of the torah. The same applies also to the olive's bulk of a corpse and the olive's bulk of carrion and the lentil's bulk of a creeping thing. Anything which remains in [the space measuring] the tube of a water-skin lessens [its measure]. Rabban simeon b. Gamaliel says: if it is any water creature whatsoever, [the mikwehs] remain clean.

Mishnah . Mikwehs may be made clean [by joining drawn water from] a higher [mikweh to valid water] from a lower [mikweh or drawn water from] a distant [mikweh to valid water] in a [mikweh] near at hand. In what manner? One brings a tube of earthenware or of lead and puts his hand beneath it till it is filled with water; then he draws it along till [the two waters] touch — even if it be by a hair's breadth it is sufficient. If in the higher [mikweh] there were forty se'ahs and nothing in the lower, one may draw water and carry it on the shoulder and place it in the higher [mikweh] till forty se'ahs have flowed down into the lower [mikweh].

Mishnah . If a wall between two mikwehs had a perpendicular crack, [their waters] may be reckoned together [to make up the required quantity]; [if it was cracked] lengthwise, they cannot be reckoned together, unless there is at one place [a hole as big] as the tube of a water-skin. R. Judah says: the rule is just the reverse. If there is a breach [on the top of the wall] from one [mikweh] to the other, [they can be reckoned together] if the height is as [the thickness of] the skin of garlic and the breadth like the tube of a water-skin.

Mishnah . The outlet of a bath, if it is in the centre, renders [the bath] invalid [as a mikweh]; but if it is at the side, it does not render it invalid, because then it is like one mikweh adjoining another mikweh. This is the opinion of r. Meir. But the sages say: if the bath- basin can contain a quarter-log before [the water] reaches the outlet, it is valid; but if not, it is not valid. R. Eleazar b. Zadok says: if the outlet can contain [water]. It is invalid in any position whatever.

Mishnah . If in the bath's ‘purifier’ the bottom [pipe] was full of drawn [water] and the top [pipe] full of valid [water]. If [the space] in front of the hole can contain three logs it is invalid [as a mikweh]. How large need the hole be to contain three logs? A threehundred- and-twentieth part of the pool. This is the opinion of r. Jose. But r. Eleazar says: even though the bottom [pipe] were full of valid [water] and the top [pipe] full of drawn [water] and by the hole's side were three logs, [the bath is] valid, for they have only said: ‘if three logs fell in’.

Mishnah . Some materials make up the mikweh [to the required quantity] and do not make it invalid; some make it invalid and do not make up [the required quantity] and some neither make up [the required quantity] nor make it invalid. These make up the required quantity and do not make the mikweh invalid: snow, hail, hoarfrost, ice, salt, and thin mud. R. Akiba said: r. Ishmael once argued against me saying; snow does not make up the mikweh [to its required quantity]. But the men of madeba testified in his name that he had once told them: go and bring snow and with it from the first prepare a mikweh. R. Johanan b. Nuri says: hailstones are like drawn water. In what manner do they make up [the required quantity] and do not render it invalid? If the mikweh contained forty se'ahs less one, and a se'ah of them fell in and made up [the required quantity], they thus make up [the required quantity] but do not render it invalid.

Mishnah . These render the mikweh invalid and do not make up [the required quantity]: drawn water, whether clean or unclean, water that has been used for pickling or for seething, and grape-skin wine still unfermented. In what manner do they make the mikweh invalid and do not make up [the required quantity]? If a mikweh contained forty se'ahs less a kortob, and a kortob of these fell into it, it does not make up [the required quantity]; and if there were three logs of any of these, they would render the mikweh invalid. But the other liquids, and the juice of fruits, brine, and liquid in which fish has been pickled, and grape-skin wine that has fermented at times make up [the required quantity] and at times do not make it up. How is this? If a mikweh contained forty se'ahs less one, and a se'ah of any of these fell in it, this does not make up [the required quantity]. But if the mikweh contained forty se'ahs and a se'ah of any of these was put in and one se'ah was removed, lo, the mikweh is still valid.

Mishnah . If baskets of olives or baskets of grapes were washed in the mikweh and they changed its colour, it continues valid. R. Jose says: dye-water renders it invalid by a quantity of three logs, but not through changing its colour. If wine or the sap of olives fell into it and changed its colour, it becomes invalid. What should one do [to make it valid again]? One should wait with it till the rain falls and the colour reverts to the colour of water. If it contained forty se'ahs, water may be drawn and carried on the shoulder and put therein until the colour reverts to that of water.

Mishnah . If wine or the sap of olives fell into the mikweh and changed the colour of a portion of the water, one may not immerse oneself therein if it has not forty se'ahs with the colour of water.

Mishnah . If a kortob of wine fell into three logs of water and its colour became like that of wine, and the water then fell into a mikweh, it does not render it invalid. If there were three logs of water less a kortob into which a kortob of milk fell, and their colour remained like the colour of water, and then they fell into a mikweh, they do not render it invalid. R. Johanan b. Nuri says: all goes by the colour.

Mishnah . If a mikweh contained forty se'ahs exactly and two persons went down and immersed themselves one after the other, the first becomes clean but the second remains unclean. R. Judah says: if the feet of the first were still touching the water, the second also becomes clean. If one immersed a thick cloak and when he drew it out a part was still in contact with the water [and then another person immersed himself in the mikweh], he becomes clean. If a bolster or a cushion of leather was immersed, as soon as it is taken out of the water by its open ends the water which still remains in it is drawn water. How should one do it? One should immerse them and draw them up by their lower edges.

Mishnah . If a bed was immersed therein, although its feet sink into the thick mud, it still becomes clean because the water touched them before [the mud]. If the water of a mikweh is too shallow, one may press down even bundles of sticks, even bundles of reeds, so that the level of the water may rise, and then go down and immerse oneself. If an [unclean] needle is placed on the step [leading down to a mikweh] in a cavern, and the water is put in motion, once a wave has passed over it, [the needle] becomes clean.

Mishnah . The land of israel is clean and its mikwehs are clean. The mikwehs of the nations outside the land are valid for those who had a seminal issue even though they are filled with a swipe-beam; those in the land of israel when outside the entrance [to the city] are valid also for menstruants, and those within the entrance [to the city] are valid for those who had a seminal issue but invalid for all [others] who are unclean. R. Eliezer says: those which are near to a city or to a road are unclean because of the washing [of clothes therein]; but those at a distance are clean.

Mishnah . These are the persons that had a seminal issue who require immersion: if he noticed that his urine issued in drops or was muddy, at the beginning he is clean; in the middle and at the end, he is unclean; from the beginning to the end, he is clean. If it was white and viscous, he is unclean. R. Jose says: what is white counts like what is muddy.

Mishnah . If he emitted thick drops from the member, he is unclean. This is the opinion of r. Eleazar hisma. If one had impure dreams in the night and arose and found his flesh heated, he is unclean. If a woman discharged semen on the third day, she is clean. This is the opinion of r. Eleazar b. Azariah. R. Ishmael says: sometimes there are four ‘onahs, and sometimes five, and sometimes six. R. Akiba says: there are always five.

Mishnah . If a gentile woman discharged semen from an israelite, it is unclean. If an israelite woman discharged semen from a gentile, it is clean. If a woman had intercourse and then went down and immersed herself but did not sweep out the house, it is as though she had not immersed herself. If a man who had a seminal issue immersed himself but did not first pass urine, he again becomes unclean when he passes urine. R. Jose says: if he was sick or old he is unclean, but if he was young and healthy he remains clean.

Mishnah . If a menstruant placed coins in her mouth and went down and immersed herself, she becomes clean from her [former] uncleanness, but she becomes unclean on account of her spittle. If she put her hair in her mouth or closed her hand or pressed her lips tightly, it is as though she had not immersed herself. If a person held on to another man or to vessels and immersed them, they remain unclean; but if he had washed his hand before in the water, they become clean. R. Simeon says: he should hold them loosely that water may enter into them. The secret and wrinkled parts of the body do not need that water should enter into them.

Mishnah . The following interpose in the case of a person: threads of wool and threads of flax and the ribbons on the heads of girls. R. Judah says: those of wool or of hair do not interpose, because water enters through them.

Mishnah . The matted hair on the heart and on the beard and on a woman's secret parts; pus outside the eye, hardened pus outside a wound and the plaster over it, dried-up juice, clots of excrement on the body, dough under the finger nail, sweat-crumbs, miry clay, potter's clay, and road-clay. What is meant by ‘miry clay’? This means the clay in pits, for it is written: ‘he brought me up out of a horrible pit, out of the miry clay’. ‘potter's clay’ is according to its literal sense. R. Jose declares potter's clay clean, but clay for putty unclean. ‘road-clay’ is clay which becomes like road-side pegs. In these [kinds of clay] one may not immerse oneself nor immerse with them; but in all other clay one may immerse when it is wet. One may not immerse oneself with dust [still] on one's feet. One may not immerse a kettle with soot [on it] except it has been scraped.

Mishnah . The following do not interpose: the matted hair of the head and of the armpits and of a man's secret parts. R. Eliezer says: it is the same with a man or a woman: if it is something which one finds annoying, it interposes; but if it is something which one does not find annoying, it does not interpose.

Mishnah . Pus within the eye, hardened pus within a wound, juice that is moist, moist excrement on the body, excrement inside the finger nail, and a dangling finger nail. The downy hair of a child is not liable to uncleanness and does not cause uncleanness. The skin which forms over a wound is liable to uncleanness and causes uncleanness.

Mishnah .in the case of articles the following interpose: pitch and myrrh in the case of glass vessels, whether inside or outside; they interpose [when found] on a table or on a board or on a couch that are [usually] kept clean, but they do not interpose [when found] on these articles if allowed to remain dirty. They interpose in the case of beds belonging to householders, but they do not interpose on beds belonging to a poor person. They interpose on the saddle of a house-holder, but they do not interpose on the saddle of a dealer in water-skins. They interpose in the case of a pack-saddle. Rabban simeon b. Gamaliel says: [only if the stain is as big] as an italian issar.

Mishnah . They do not interpose [if found] on clothing on one side [only]. But [if found] on two sides they interpose. R. Judah says in the name of r. Ishmael: on one side also. R. Jose says: in the case of banna'im they interpose also if on one side, but in the case of the uncultured only if on both sides.

Mishnah . They do not interpose in the case of aprons belonging to workers in pitch, potters, or trimmers of trees. R. Judah says: the same applies also to summer fruit-driers. This is the general rule: if it is something which causes annoyance, it interposes; but if it is something which does not cause annoyance, it does not interpose.

Mishnah . Any handles of vessels which have been fixed not in their customary manner, or, if fixed in their customary manner, have not been fixed firmly, or, if fixed firmly, have been broken, lo, they interpose. If a vessel is immersed with its mouth downwards, it is as though it had not been immersed. If immersed in the regular manner but without the attachment, [it becomes clean] only if turned on its side. If a vessel is narrow at each end and broad in the centre, it becomes clean only if turned on its side. A flask which has its mouth turned inwards becomes clean only if a hole is made at the side. An inkpot of laymen becomes clean only if a hole is made at the side. The inkpot of joseph the priest had a hole at its side.

Mishnah . In the case of a bolster and a cushion of leather it is necessary that the water enter inside them; but in the case of a round cushion or a ball or a bootmaker's last or an amulet or a phylactery, it is not necessary that the water enter inside them. This is the general rule: any article the filling of which is not habitually taken out and put in may be immersed unopened.

Mishnah . The following do not require that the water shall enter inside them: knots [in the clothes] of a poor man, or in tassels, or in the thong of a sandal, or in a head-phylactery if it is fastened tightly, or in an arm-phylactery if it does not move up or down, or in the handles of a water-skin, or in the handles of a wallet.

Mishnah . The following require that water shall enter inside them: the knot in an undergarment which is tied to the shoulder, (likewise the hem of a sheet must be stretched out), and the knot of a headphylactery if it is not fastened tightly, or of the arm-phylactery if it moves up and down, and the laces of a sandal. Clothes which are immersed when they have just been washed must be kept immersed until they throw up bubbles, but if they are immersed when already dry, they must be kept immersed until they throw up bubbles and then cease to throw up bubbles.

Mishnah . Any handles of vessels which are too long and which will be cut short, need only be immersed up to the point of their proper measure. R. Judah says: [they are unclean] until the whole of them is immersed. As for the chain of a large bucket, to the length of four handbreadths, and a small bucket, to the length of ten handbreadths; and they need only be immersed up to the point of their proper measure. R. Tarfon says: it is not clean unless the whole of the ring is immersed. The rope bound to a basket is not counted as a connection unless it has been sewn on.

Mishnah . Beth shammai say: hot water may not be immersed in cold, or cold in hot, foul in fresh or fresh in foul. But beth hillel say: it may be immersed. If one immersed a vessel full of liquids. It is as though it had not been immersed; if it was full of urine, this is reckoned as water; if it contained water of purification, [it is unclean] unless the water [of the mikweh which enters the vessel] exceeds the water of purification. R. Jose says: even if a vessel with the capacity of a kor contains but a quarter-log. It is as though it had not been immersed.

Mishnah . All foods combine together to make up the half of a half-loaf which makes the body unfit. All liquids combine together to make up the quarter-log which makes the body unfit. This forms a rule of greater stringency in the case of one who drinks unclean liquids than in the case of the mikweh, for in his case they have made all other liquids like water.

Mishnah . If one ate unclean foods or drank unclean liquids. And he immersed himself and then vomited them up, they are still unclean because they did not become clean in the body. If one drank unclean water and immersed himself and then vomited it up, it is clean because it became clean in the body. If one swallowed a clean ring and then went into the tent of a corpse, if he sprinkled himself once and twice and immersed himself and then vomited it up, lo, it remains as it was before. If one swallowed an unclean ring, he may immerse himself and eat terumah; if he vomited it up, it is unclean and it renders him unclean. If an arrow was stuck into a man, it interposes so long as it is visible; but if it is not visible, he may immerse himself and eat terumah.

Mishnah . Any liquid which was desired at the beginning though it was not desired at the end, or which was desired at the end though it was not desired at the beginning, comes under the law of ‘if water be put’. Unclean liquids render unclean whether [their action] is desired or is not desired.

Mishnah . If one shook a tree in order to cause food or an unclean thing to drop down from it, [the rain water dropping down from it] does not come under the law of ‘if water be put’. If [he shook the tree] in order to cause liquids to drop down from it, beth shammai say: both [the liquids] THAT DROP DOWN AND [THE LIQUIDS] THAT REMAIN [ON THE TREE] COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: [THE LIQUIDS] THAT DROP DOWN COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’, BUT [THE LIQUIDS] THAT REMAIN [ON THE TREE] DO NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’, BECAUSE HIS INTENTION WAS THAT [THE LIQUIDS] SHOULD DROP DOWN FROM ALL THE TREE.

MISHNAH . IF ONE SHOOK A TREE AND IT FELL ON ANOTHER TREE, OR A BRANCH AND IT FELL ON ANOTHER BRANCH, AND UNDER THEM WERE SEEDS OR VEGETABLES [STILL] JOINED TO THE GROUND, BETH SHAMMAI SAY: THIS COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: THIS DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. R. JOSHUA SAID IN THE NAME OF ABBA JOSE CHOLIKOFRI, A CITIZEN OF TIBEON: MARVEL AT THYSELF IF THERE IS ANYTHING IN THE TORAH ABOUT A LIQUID CAUSING SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS EXCEPT ONE PUT IT ON WITH INTENTION, FOR IT IS SAID: ‘IF WATER BE PUT UPON THE SEED’.

MISHNAH . IF ONE SHOOK A BUNDLE OF VEGETABLES AND [WATER] DROPPED DOWN FROM THE UPPER [SIDE] TO THE LOWER [SIDE], BETH SHAMMAI SAY: THIS COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: THIS DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. BETH HILLEL SAID TO BETH SHAMMAI: IF ONE SHAKES A STALK, DO WE APPREHEND LEST WATER DROPS FROM ONE LEAF ON THE OTHER LEAF? BETH SHAMMAI SAID TO THEM: A STALK IS ONLY ONE, BUT A BUNDLE HAS MANY STALKS. BETH HILLEL SAID TO THEM: LO, IF ONE LIFTED A SACK FULL OF FRUIT AND PUT IT BESIDE THE RIVER, DO WE APPREHEND LEST WATER DROPS FROM THE UPPER [SIDE] TO THE LOWER [SIDE]? IF, HOWEVER, HE LIFTED TWO SACKS AND PLACED THEM ONE UPON THE OTHER, THE LOWER [SACK] COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. R. JOSE SAYS: THE LOWER [SACK] ALSO REMAINS INSUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS.

MISHNAH . IF ONE RUBBED A LEAK OR PRESSED HIS HAIR WITH HIS GARMENT, R. JOSE SAYS: THE LIQUID WHICH CAME OUT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’, BUT THE LIQUID THAT REMAINED DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’, BECAUSE HIS INTENTION WAS THAT THE LIQUID SHOULD COME OUT OF ALL OF IT.

MISHNAH . IF ONE BLEW ON LENTILS IN ORDER TO TRY WHETHER THEY WERE GOOD, R. SIMEON SAYS: THIS DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. BUT THE SAGES SAY: THIS DOES COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE ATE SESAME WITH HIS FINGER AND LIQUID CAME ON HIS HAND, R. SIMEON SAYS: THIS DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. BUT THE SAGES SAY: THIS DOES COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE HID HIS FRUIT IN WATER FROM THIEVES, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. ONCE IT HAPPENED THAT THE MEN OF JERUSALEM HID THEIR FIG CAKES IN WATER FROM THE ROBBERS, AND THE SAGES DECLARED THAT THEY WERE NOT SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS. IF ONE PUT HIS FRUIT IN THE STREAM OF A RIVER TO MAKE IT COME DOWN WITH HIM, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’.

MISHNAH . THE EXUDATION OF HOUSES, OF CISTERNS, OF DITCHES AND CAVERNS DOES NOT CAUSE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS. A MAN'S PERSPIRATION DOES NOT CAUSE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS. IF A MAN DRANK UNCLEAN WATER AND PERSPIRED, HIS PERSPIRATION DOES NOT CAUSE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS. IF HE ENTERED INTO DRAWN WATER AND PERSPIRED, HIS PERSPIRATION CAUSES SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS. IF HE DRIED HIMSELF AND THEN PERSPIRED, HIS PERSPIRATION DOES NOT CAUSE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS.

MISHNAH . THE EXUDATION OF AN UNCLEAN BATH IS UNCLEAN, BUT THAT OF A CLEAN BATH COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF THERE WAS A POOL IN A HOUSE WHICH CAUSED THE HOUSE TO EXUDE AND THE POOL WAS UNCLEAN, THE EXUDATION OF ALL THE HOUSE WHICH WAS CAUSED BY THE POOL IS UNCLEAN.

MISHNAH . IF THERE WERE TWO POOLS, THE ONE CLEAN AND THE OTHER UNCLEAN, WHAT EXUDES NEAR THE UNCLEAN POOL IS UNCLEAN, AND WHAT EXUDES NEAR THE CLEAN POOL IS CLEAN, AND WHAT IS AT EQUAL DISTANCE [FROM BOTH POOLS] IS UNCLEAN. IF UNCLEAN IRON WAS SMELTED WITH CLEAN IRON AND THE GREATER PART [CAME] FROM THE UNCLEAN IRON, IT IS UNCLEAN; IF THE GREATER PART [CAME] FROM THE CLEAN IRON, IT IS CLEAN; BUT IF THERE WAS HALF OF EACH, IT IS UNCLEAN. IF IN POTS WHICH ISRAELITES AND HEATHENS USED FOR PASSING WATER THE GREATER PART [OF THE CONTENTS CONSISTED] OF UNCLEAN [URINE], IT IS UNCLEAN; IF THE GREATER PART [OF THE CONTENTS CONSISTED] OF CLEAN [URINE], IT IS CLEAN; BUT IF THERE WAS HALF OF EACH, IT IS UNCLEAN. IF IN SLOP-WATER, IN WHICH RAIN HAD FALLEN, THE GREATER PART CONSISTED OF THE UNCLEAN WATER, IT IS UNCLEAN; IF THE GREATER PART CONSISTED OF CLEAN WATER, IT IS CLEAN; BUT IF THERE WAS HALF OF EACH, IT IS UNCLEAN. WHEN [IS THIS THE CASE]? WHEN THE SLOP-WATER CAME FIRST; BUT IF THE RAIN WATER CAME BEFORE [THE SLOP-WATER]. IT IS UNCLEAN WHATEVER THE QUANTITY [OF THE RAIN WATER].

MISHNAH . IF ONE SECURED HIS ROOF OR WASHED HIS GARMENT AND RAIN CAME DOWN UPON IT, IF THE GREATER PART CONSISTED OF THE UNCLEAN WATER, IT IS UNCLEAN; IF THE GREATER PART CONSISTED OF THE CLEAN WATER, IT IS CLEAN; BUT IF THERE WAS HALF OF EACH, IT IS UNCLEAN. R. JUDAH SAYS: IF THE DRIPPING INCREASED, [IT IS CLEAN].

MISHNAH . IF IN A CITY IN WHICH ISRAELITES AND HEATHENS DWELT TOGETHER THERE WAS A BATH WORKING ON THE SABBATH, IF THE MAJORITY [OF THE INHABITANTS] WERE HEATHENS, ONE MAY BATHE THEREIN IMMEDIATELY [AFTER THE CONCLUSION OF THE SABBATH]; IF THE MAJORITY WERE ISRAELITES, ONE MUST WAIT UNTIL THE WATER CAN BE HEATED; IF THEY WERE HALF AND HALF, ONE MUST [ALSO] WAIT UNTIL THE WATER CAN BE HEATED. R. JUDAH SAYS: IF THE BATH-BASIN WAS SMALL AND THERE WAS THERE A [HEATHEN] AUTHORITY, ONE MAY BATHE THEREIN IMMEDIATELY [AFTER THE CONCLUSION OF THE SABBATH].

MISHNAH . IF ONE FOUND VEGETABLES SOLD THEREIN [ON THE SABBATH]. IF THE MAJORITY [OF THE INHABITANTS] WERE HEATHENS, ONE MAY BUY THEREOF IMMEDIATELY [AFTER THE CONCLUSION OF THE SABBATH]; IF THE MAJORITY WERE ISRAELITES, ONE MUST WAIT UNTIL [VEGETABLES] CAN ARRIVE FROM THE NEAREST PLACE; IF THEY WERE HALF AND HALF, ONE MUST [ALSO] WAIT UNTIL [VEGETABLES] CAN ARRIVE FROM THE NEAREST PLACE; BUT IF THERE WAS THERE A [HEATHEN] AUTHORITY, ONE MAY BUY IMMEDIATELY [AFTER THE CONCLUSION OF THE SABBATH].

MISHNAH . IF AN ABANDONED CHILD WAS FOUND THERE, IF THE MAJORITY [OF THE INHABITANTS] WERE HEATHENS, IT MAY BE DEEMED A HEATHEN; IF THE MAJORITY WERE ISRAELITES, IT MUST BE DEEMED AN ISRAELITE; IF THEY WERE HALF AND HALF, IT MUST [ALSO] BE DEEMED AN ISRAELITE. R. JUDAH SAYS: WE MUST CONSIDER WHO FORM THE MAJORITY OF THOSE WHO ABANDON THEIR CHILDREN.

MISHNAH . IF ONE FOUND THERE LOST PROPERTY, IF THE MAJORITY [OF THE INHABITANTS] WERE HEATHENS, HE NEED NOT PROCLAIM IT; IF THE MAJORITY WERE ISRAELITES, HE MUST PROCLAIM IT; IF THEY WERE HALF AND HALF, HE MUST [ALSO] PROCLAIM IT. IF ONE FOUND BREAD THERE, WE MUST CONSIDER WHO FORM THE MAJORITY OF THE BAKERS. IF IT WAS BREAD OF PURE FLOUR, WE MUST CONSIDER WHO FORM THE MAJORITY OF THOSE WHO EAT BREAD OF PURE FLOUR. R. JUDAH SAYS: IF IT WAS COARSE BREAD, WE MUST CONSIDER WHO FORM THE MAJORITY OF THOSE WHO EAT COARSE BREAD.

MISHNAH . IF ONE FOUND MEAT THERE, WE MUST CONSIDER WHO FORM THE MAJORITY OF THE BUTCHERS. IF IT WAS COOKED MEAT, WE MUST CONSIDER WHO FORM THE MAJORITY OF THOSE WHO EAT COOKED MEAT.

MISHNAH . IF ONE FOUND FRUIT BY THE WAYSIDE, IF THE MAJORITY [OF THE INHABITANTS] GATHERED FRUIT FOR THEIR HOMES, HE IS ABSOLVED [FROM TITHES]; IF [THE MAJORITY GATHERED IT] FOR SELLING IN THE MARKET, HE IS LIABLE [TO TITHES]; BUT IF THEY WERE HALF AND HALF, THE FRUIT IS DEMAI. IF THERE WAS A GRANARY INTO WHICH BOTH ISRAELITES AND HEATHENS LAID IN THEIR PRODUCE, IF THE MAJORITY WERE HEATHENS, [THE PRODUCE MUST BE CONSIDERED] CERTAINLY UNTITHED; IF THE MAJORITY WERE ISRAELITES, [IT MUST BE CONSIDERED] DEMAI; IF THEY WERE HALF AND HALF, [IT MUST BE CONSIDERED] CERTAINLY UNTITHED. THIS IS THE OPINION OF R. MEIR. BUT THE SAGES SAY: EVEN IF THEY WERE ALL HEATHENS, AND ONLY ONE ISRAELITE LAID HIS PRODUCE INTO THE GRANARY, [IT MUST BE CONSIDERED] DEMAI.

MISHNAH . IF THE FRUIT OF THE SECOND YEAR EXCEEDED IN QUANTITY THE FRUIT OF THE THIRD YEAR, OR THE FRUIT OF THE THIRD YEAR EXCEEDED THE FRUIT OF THE FOURTH YEAR, OR THE FRUIT OF THE FOURTH YEAR EXCEEDED THE FRUIT OF THE FIFTH YEAR, OR THE FRUIT OF THE FIFTH YEAR EXCEEDED THE FRUIT OF THE SIXTH YEAR, OR THE FRUIT OF THE SIXTH YEAR EXCEEDED THE FRUIT OF THE SEVENTH YEAR, OR THE FRUIT OF THE SEVENTH YEAR EXCEEDED THE FRUIT OF THE YEAR AFTER THE CONCLUSION OF THE SEVENTH YEAR, WE MUST CONSIDER WHAT FORMS THE GREATER PART; IF THEY ARE HALF AND HALF, WE MUST DECIDE ACCORDING TO THE MORE STRINGENT ALTERNATIVE.

MISHNAH . IF A SACK FULL OF FRUIT WAS PUT BY THE SIDE OF A RIVER OR BY THE SIDE OF THE MOUTH OF A CISTERN OR ON THE STEPS OF A CAVERN, AND [THE FRUIT] ABSORBED WATER, ALL [THE FRUIT] WHICH ABSORBED THE WATER COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. R. JUDAH SAYS: ALL [THE FRUIT] WHICH FACED THE WATER COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’, BUT ALL [THE FRUIT] WHICH DID NOT FACE THE WATER DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’.

MISHNAH . IF A JAR FULL OF FRUIT WAS PUT INTO LIQUIDS, OR IF A JAR FULL OF LIQUIDS WAS PUT INTO FRUIT AND [THE FRUIT] ABSORBED WATER, ALL [THE FRUIT] WHICH ABSORBED THE WATER COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. OF WHAT LIQUIDS HAVE THEY SAID IT? OF WATER, WINE AND VINEGAR; BUT ALL THE OTHER LIQUIDS DO NOT CAUSE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS. R. NEHEMIAH DECLARES PULSE INSUSCEPTIBLE, BECAUSE PULSE DOES NOT ABSORB [LIQUIDS].

MISHNAH . IF ONE DREW OFF HOT BREAD AND PUT IT UPON THE MOUTH OF A JAR OF WINE, R. MEIR DECLARES IT SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS; BUT R. JUDAH DECLARES IT INSUSCEPTIBLE. R. JOSE DECLARES IT INSUSCEPTIBLE IN THE CASE OF WHEATEN BREAD AND SUSCEPTIBLE IN THE CASE OF BARLEY BREAD, BECAUSE BARLEY ABSORBS [LIQUIDS].

MISHNAH . IF ONE SPRINKLED HIS HOUSE [WITH WATER] AND PUT WHEAT THEREIN AND IT BECAME MOIST, IF [THE MOISTURE CAME] FROM THE WATER, IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF [THE MOISTURE CAME] FROM THE STONY FLOOR, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE WASHED HIS GARMENT IN A TUB AND PUT WHEAT THEREIN AND IT BECAME MOIST, IF [THE MOISTURE CAME] FROM THE WATER, IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF [THE MOISTURE CAME] OF ITSELF, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE MOISTENED [PRODUCE] WITH SAND, THIS COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IT HAPPENED WITH THE MEN OF MAHOZ THAT THEY USED TO MOISTEN [THEIR PRODUCE] WITH SAND, AND THE SAGES SAID TO THEM: IF YOU HAVE ALWAYS DONE THUS, YOU HAVE NEVER PREPARED YOUR FOOD IN PURITY.

MISHNAH . IF ONE MOISTENED [PRODUCE] WITH DRYING CLAY, R. SIMEON SAYS: IF THERE WAS STILL IN IT DRIPPING LIQUID, IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF THERE WAS NOT, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE SPRINKLED HIS THRESHING-FLOOR WITH WATER, HE NEED NOT APPREHEND LEST WHEAT BE PUT THERE AND IT BECOME MOIST. IF ONE GATHERED GRASS WITH THE DEW STILL ON IT IN ORDER TO MOISTEN WHEAT THEREWITH, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF HIS INTENTION WAS FOR THIS PURPOSE, IT DOES COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE CARRIED WHEAT TO BE MILLED AND RAIN CAME DOWN UPON IT AND HE WAS GLAD OF IT, IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. R. JUDAH SAID: ONE CANNOT HELP BEING GLAD OF IT; NAY, [IT COMES UNDER THE LAW] ONLY IF HE STOPPED [ON HIS WAY].

MISHNAH . IF HIS OLIVES WERE PUT ON THE ROOF AND RAIN CAME DOWN UPON THEM AND HE WAS GLAD OF IT, IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. R. JUDAH SAYS: ONE CANNOT HELP BEING GLAD; NAY, [IT COMES UNDER THE LAW] ONLY IF HE STOPPED UP THE RAIN-PIPE OR IF HE SHOOK [THE OLIVES] THEREIN.

MISHNAH . IF ASS-DRIVERS WERE CROSSING A RIVER AND THEIR SACKS [FILLED WITH PRODUCE] FELL INTO THE WATER AND THEY WERE GLAD OF IT, IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. R. JUDAH SAYS: ONE CANNOT HELP BEING GLAD OF IT; NAY, [IT COMES UNDER THE LAW] ONLY IF THEY TURNED OVER [THE SACKS]. IF ONE'S FEET WERE FULL OF CLAY (LIKEWISE, TOO, THE FEET OF HIS BEAST) AND HE CROSSED A RIVER AND HE WAS GLAD OF IT, THIS COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. R. JUDAH SAYS: ONE CANNOT HELP BEING GLAD OF IT; NAY, [IT COMES UNDER THE LAW] ONLY IF HE STOPPED AND RINSED [THE FEET]. BUT IN THE CASE OF A MAN OR AN UNCLEAN BEAST IT ALWAYS CAUSES SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS.

MISHNAH . IF ONE LOWERED INTO WATER WHEELS OR GEAR OF OXEN AT THE TIME OF THE EAST WIND IN ORDER THAT THEY MIGHT BECOME TIGHTENED, THIS COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE TOOK DOWN A BEAST TO DRINK, THE WATER WHICH CAME UP ON ITS MOUTH COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’, BUT THAT WHICH CAME UP ON ITS FEET DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF, HOWEVER, HE INTENDED THAT ITS FEET SHOULD BE WASHED, ALSO THE WATER THAT CAME UP ON ITS FEET COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. AT THE TIME OF FOOTSORENESS OR OF THRESHING IT ALWAYS CAUSES SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS. IF A DEAF-MUTE OR AN IDIOT OR A MINOR TOOK IT DOWN, EVEN THOUGH HIS INTENTION WAS THAT ITS FEET SHOULD BE WASHED, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’, BECAUSE WITH THESE THE ACT ALONE COUNTS, BUT NOT THE INTENTION.

MISHNAH . IF ONE STOOPED DOWN TO DRINK, THE WATER WHICH CAME UP ON HIS MOUTH OR ON HIS MOUSTACHE COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT [WHAT CAME UP] ON HIS NOSE OR ON HIS HEAD OR ON HIS BEARD DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE DREW WATER WITH A JAR, THE WATER WHICH CAME UP ON THE BACK THEREOF, OR ON THE ROPE WHICH WAS WOUND ROUND ITS NECK, OR ON THE ROPE WHICH WAS NEEDED FOR ITS USE, COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. HOW MUCH ROPE IS NEEDED FOR ITS USE? R. SIMEON B. ELEAZAR SAYS: A HANDBREADTH. IF HE PUT THE JAR UNDER THE RAIN-PIPE, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’.

MISHNAH . IF RAIN CAME DOWN UPON A PERSON, EVEN IF HE WAS UNCLEAN WITH A PRINCIPAL DEFILEMENT, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF HE SHOOK IT OFF, IT DOES COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE STOOD UNDER A RAIN-PIPE TO COOL HIMSELF OR TO WASH HIMSELF, [THE WATER FALLING ON HIM] IS UNCLEAN IF HE IS UNCLEAN; BUT IF HE IS CLEAN, IT [ONLY] COMES UNDER THE LAW OF IF WATER BE PUT.

MISHNAH . IF ONE INCLINED A DISH AGAINST A WALL THAT IT MIGHT BE RINSED, IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF IN ORDER THAT THE WALL MIGHT NOT BE DAMAGED, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’.

MISHNAH . IF DRIPPINGS [FROM A ROOF] FELL INTO A JAR, BETH SHAMMAI SAY: IT SHOULD BE BROKEN. BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: IT MAY BE EMPTIED OUT. BUT THEY AGREE THAT ONE MAY PUT OUT HIS HAND AND TAKE FRUIT THEREFROM AND LEAVE IT INSUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS.

MISHNAH . IF DRIPPINGS [FROM A ROOF] FELL INTO A TUB, THE WATER WHICH SPLASHED OUT OR RAN OVER DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE MOVED THE TUB IN ORDER TO POUR OUT THE WATER, BETH SHAMMAI SAY: IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE PLACED THE TUB IN ORDER THAT THE DRIPPINGS [FROM THE ROOF] SHOULD FALL INTO IT, BETH SHAMMAI SAY: THE WATER THAT SPLASHES OUT OR RUNS OVER COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’, BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE MOVED THE TUB IN ORDER TO POUR OUT THE WATER, BOTH AGREE THAT IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE IMMERSED VESSELS OR WASHED HIS GARMENT IN A CAVERN, THE WATER THAT CAME UP ON HIS HANDS COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT WHAT CAME UP ON HIS FEET DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. R. ELIEZER SAYS: IF IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE FOR HIM TO GO DOWN INTO THE CAVERN WITHOUT SOILING HIS FEET, WHAT CAME UP ON HIS FEET ALSO COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’.

MISHNAH . IF A BASKET FULL OF LUPINES WAS PLACED IN A MIKWEH, ONE MAY PUT OUT HIS HAND AND TAKE LUPINES THEREFROM AND LEAVE THEM CLEAN. BUT IF HE LIFTED THEM OUT OF THE WATER, THOSE THAT TOUCH THE BASKET ARE UNCLEAN, BUT THE REST OF THE LUPINES ARE CLEAN. IF THERE WAS A RADISH IN A CAVERN, A MENSTRUANT WOMAN MAY RINSE IT AND LEAVE IT CLEAN. BUT IF SHE LIFTED IT, HOWEVER LITTLE, OUT OF THE WATER, IT BECOMES UNCLEAN.

MISHNAH . IF FRUIT FELL INTO A CHANNEL OF WATER, AND ONE WHOSE HANDS WERE UNCLEAN PUT OUT HIS HANDS AND TOOK IT, HIS HANDS BECOME CLEAN AND THE FRUIT [ALSO] REMAINS CLEAN. BUT IF HIS INTENTION WAS THAT HIS HANDS SHOULD BE RINSED, HIS HANDS BECOME CLEAN AND THE FRUIT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT.’

MISHNAH . IF A POT FULL OF WATER WAS PLACED IN A MIKWEH, AND A MAN WHO WAS UNCLEAN WITH A PRINCIPAL DEFILEMENT PUT HIS HAND INTO THE POT, IT BECOMES UNCLEAN. BUT IF [HE WAS UNCLEAN] BY THE TOUCH OF A DEFILEMENT, THE POT REMAINS CLEAN, BUT ANY OF THE OTHER LIQUIDS [CONTAINED IN THE POT] BECOMES UNCLEAN, FOR WATER CANNOT PURIFY THE OTHER LIQUIDS.

MISHNAH . IF ONE DREW WATER THROUGH A CHANNEL, IT CAUSES SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS FOR THREE DAYS. R. AKIBA SAYS: IF THE CHANNEL WAS DRIED, IT AT ONCE DOES NOT CAUSE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS; BUT IF IT WAS NOT DRIED, IT CAUSES SUSCEPTIBILITY EVEN FOR THIRTY DAYS.

MISHNAH . IF UNCLEAN LIQUIDS FELL UPON WOOD AND RAIN CAME DOWN UPON IT AND [THE RAIN WATER] EXCEEDED [THE LIQUIDS] IN QUANTITY. THEY BECOME CLEAN; BUT IF THE WOOD HAD BEEN TAKEN OUTSIDE IN ORDER THAT RAIN SHOULD COME DOWN UPON IT, THEY ARE UNCLEAN EVEN THOUGH [THE RAIN WATER] EXCEEDED IN QUANTITY. IF [THE WOOD] HAD ABSORBED UNCLEAN LIQUIDS, THEY BECOME CLEAN EVEN THOUGH THE WOOD HAD BEEN CARRIED OUTSIDE IN ORDER THAT RAIN SHOULD COME DOWN UPON IT. BUT ONE MAY NOT LIGHT THE WOOD IN AN OVEN EXCEPT WITH CLEAN HANDS. R. SIMEON SAYS: IF THE WOOD WAS FRESHLY-CUT WHEN IT WAS LIGHTED, AND THE LIQUIDS THAT CAME OUT OF IT EXCEEDED IN QUANTITY THE LIQUIDS WHICH IT HAD ABSORBED, THEY BECOME CLEAN.

MISHNAH . IF A MAN IMMERSED HIMSELF IN A RIVER AND THERE WAS IN FRONT OF HIM ANOTHER RIVER AND HE CROSSED IT, THE SECOND [WATER] PURIFIES THE FIRST [WATER]. IF HIS FELLOW WHO WAS INTOXICATED PUSHED HIM IN OR HIS BEAST, THE SECOND [WATER] PURIFIES THE FIRST [WATER]; BUT IF [HE DID IT] OUT OF PLAYFULNESS, IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’.

MISHNAH . IF A MAN SWAM IN WATER, THE WATER THAT SPLASHED OUT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF IT WAS HIS INTENTION TO SPLASH HIS FELLOW, THIS COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE MADE A ‘Blrd’ IN THE WATER, NEITHER [THE WATER] THAT SPLASHED OUT NOR WHAT REMAINED IN IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’.

MISHNAH . IF DRIPPINGS [FROM A ROOF] CAME DOWN INTO FRUIT AND IT WAS MIXED UP IN ORDER THAT IT MIGHT BECOME DRY [QUICKLY]. R. SIMEON SAYS: IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. BUT THE SAGES SAY: IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’.

MISHNAH . IF A CISTERN WAS MEASURED WHETHER FOR ITS DEPTH OF FOR ITS BREADTH, IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. THIS IS THE OPINION OF R. TARFON. BUT R. AKIBA SAYS: IF [IT WAS MEASURED] FOR ITS DEPTH, IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF FOR ITS BREADTH, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’.

MISHNAH . IF ONE PUT HIS HAND OR HIS FOOT OR A REED INTO A CISTERN IN ORDER TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER IT HAD ANY WATER, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF TO ASCERTAIN HOW MUCH WATER IT HAD, THIS COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF ONE THREW A STONE INTO A CISTERN TO ASCERTAIN WHETHER IT HAD ANY WATER, [THE WATER] THAT WAS SPLASHED DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’, AND ALSO [THE WATER] THAT IS ON THE STONE IS CLEAN.

MISHNAH . IF ONE BEAT UPON A HIDE OUTSIDE THE WATER, IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF [HE BEAT IT] INSIDE THE WATER, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. R. JOSE SAYS: IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’ ALSO IF [HE BEAT IT] INSIDE THE WATER, BECAUSE HIS INTENTION WAS THAT THE WATER SHOULD COME OFF TOGETHER WITH THE FILTH.

MISHNAH . THE WATER THAT COMES UP INTO A SHIP OR INTO THE BILGE OR ON THE OARS DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. THE WATER THAT COMES UP IN SNARES, NETS, OR GINS, DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF THEY WERE SHAKEN, IT DOES COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF A SHIP WAS LED OUT INTO THE GREAT SEA IN ORDER TO TIGHTEN IT, OR IF A NAIL WAS TAKEN OUT INTO THE RAIN IN ORDER TO TEMPER IT. OR IF A BRAND WAS LEFT IN THE RAIN IN ORDER TO EXTINGUISH IT, THIS COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’.

MISHNAH . [WATER ON] THE COVERING OF TABLES OR ON THE MATTING OF BRICKS DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF THEY WERE SHAKEN, IT DOES COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IT WATER BE PUT’.

MISHNAH . ANY UNINTERRUPTED FLOW OF LIQUID IS CLEAN, EXCEPT [THE FLOW] OF HONEY OF ZIPHIM AND OF BATTER. BETH SHAMMAI SAY: ALSO [THE FLOW OF] THICK POTTAGE OF GRITS, OR OF BEANS, BECAUSE IT BOUNDS BACKWARDS.

MISHNAH . [THE FLOW] OF HOT WATER POURED INTO HOT WATER, OF COLD WATER [POURED] INTO COLD WATER, OF HOT WATER [POURED] INTO COLD WATER REMAINS CLEAN; BUT [THE FLOW] OF COLD WATER [POURED] INTO HOT WATER BECOMES UNCLEAN. R. SIMEON SAYS: ALSO [THE FLOW] OF NOT WATER POURED INTO NOT WATER BECOMES UNCLEAN IF THE STRENGTH OF THE HEAT OF THE LOWER [WATER] IS GREATER THAN THAT OF THE UPPER [WATER].

MISHNAH . IF A WOMAN WHOSE HANDS WERE CLEAN STIRRED AN UNCLEAN POT AND HER HANDS PERSPIRED, THEY BECOME UNCLEAN. IF HER HANDS WERE UNCLEAN AND SHE STIRRED A CLEAN POT AND HER HANDS PERSPIRED THE POT BECOMES UNCLEAN. R. JOSE SAYS: ONLY IF HER HANDS DRIPPED. IF GRAPES WERE WEIGHED IN THE SCALE OF A BALANCE, THE WINE IN THE SCALE IS CLEAN UNTIL IT IS POURED INTO A VESSEL. LO, THIS IS LIKE BASKETS OF OLIVES AND GRAPES WHEN THEY ARE DRIPPING [WITH SAP].

MISHNAH . IF ONE CARRIED UP HIS FRUIT TO THE ROOF BECAUSE OF MAGGOTS, AND DEW CAME DOWN UPON IT, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’; BUT IF HIS INTENTION WAS FOR THIS PURPOSE, IT COMES UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. IF A DEAF-MUTE, OR AN IDIOT, OR A MINOR CARRIED IT UP, ALTHOUGH HE EXPECTED THAT DEW SHOULD COME DOWN UPON IT, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’, BECAUSE WITH THESE THE ACT ALONE COUNTS, BUT NOT THE INTENTION.

MISHNAH . IF ONE CARRIED UP TO THE ROOF BUNDLES [OF VEGETABLES] OR CAKES OF FIGS OR GARLIC SO AS TO KEEP THEM FRESH, IT DOES NOT COME UNDER THE LAW OF ‘IF WATER BE PUT’. ALL BUNDLES [OF VEGETABLES] IN THE MARKET PLACES ARE UNCLEAN. R. JUDAH DECLARES THEM CLEAN IF THEY ARE FRESH. R. MEIR SAID: WHEREFORE HAVE THEY DECLARED THEM UNCLEAN? ONLY BECAUSE OF LIQUID FROM THE MOUTH. ALL COARSE AND FINE FLOURS OF THE MARKET PLACES ARE UNCLEAN. CRUSHED WHEAT, GROATS, AND PEARL- BARLEY ARE UNCLEAN EVERYWHERE.

MISHNAH . ALL EGGS MAY BE PRESUMED CLEAN EXCEPT THOSE OF DEALERS IN LIQUIDS; BUT IF THEY SOLD WITH THEM DRY FRUIT, THEY ARE CLEAN. ALL FISH MAY BE PRESUMED UNCLEAN. R. JUDAH SAYS: PIECES OF ILTITH, EGYPTIAN FISH WHICH ARRIVES IN A BASKET, AND SPANISH TUNNY, THESE MAY BE PRESUMED CLEAN. ALL KINDS OF BRINE MAY BE PRESUMED UNCLEAN. CONCERNING ALL THESE AN ‘AM HA-AREZ MAY BE TRUSTED WHEN HE DECLARES THEM TO BE CLEAN, EXCEPT IN THE CASE OF FISH, SINCE THEY ARE USUALLY STORED WITH ANY ‘AM HA-AREZ. R. ELIEZER B. JACOB SAYS: CLEAN BRINE INTO WHICH WATER FELL IN ANY QUANTITY MUST BE DEEMED UNCLEAN.

MISHNAH . THERE ARE SEVEN LIQUIDS: DEW, WATER, WINE, OIL, BLOOD, MILK AND BEES’ HONEY. HORNETS’ HONEY DOES NOT CAUSE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS AND MAY BE EATEN.

MISHNAH .A SUB-SPECIES OF WATER ARE THE LIQUIDS THAT COME FORTH FROM THE EYE, FROM THE EAR, FROM THE NOSE AND FROM THE MOUTH, AND URINE, WHETHER OF ADULTS OR OF CHILDREN, WHETHER [ITS FLOW IS] CONSCIOUS OR UNCONSCIOUS. A SUB-SPECIES OF BLOOD ARE BLOOD FROM THE SLAUGHTERING OF CATTLE AND WILD ANIMALS AND BIRDS THAT ARE CLEAN, AND BLOOD FROM BLOOD LETTING FOR DRINKING. WHEY IS DEEMED LIKE MILK, AND THE SAP OF OLIVES IS DEEMED LIKE OIL, SINCE IT IS NEVER FREE FROM OIL. THIS IS THE OPINION OF R. SIMEON. R. MEIR SAYS: EVEN THOUGH IT CONTAINS NO OIL. THE BLOOD OF A CREEPING THING IS DEEMED LIKE ITS FLESH, IT CAUSES UNCLEANNESS BUT DOES NOT CAUSE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS, AND WE HAVE NOTHING LIKE IT.

MISHNAH . THE FOLLOWING CAUSE UNCLEANNESS AND ALSO SUSCEPTIBILITY [TO UNCLEANNESS]; THE ISSUE OF A PERSON WHO HAS A RUNNING ISSUE, HIS SPITTLE, HIS SEMEN AND HIS URINE, A QUARTER-LOG FROM A CORPSE, AND THE BLOOD OF A MENSTRUANT WOMAN. R. ELIEZER SAYS: SEMEN DOES NOT CAUSE SUSCEPTIBILITY. R. ELEAZAR B. ‘AZARIAH SAYS: THE BLOOD OF A MENSTRUANT WOMAN DOES NOT CAUSE SUSCEPTIBILITY. R. SIMEON SAYS: THE BLOOD OF A CORPSE DOES NOT CAUSE SUSCEPTIBILITY, AND IF IT FELL ON A GOURD, IT SHOULD BE SCRAPED OFF, AND IT REMAINS CLEAN.

MISHNAH .THE FOLLOWING CAUSE NEITHER UNCLEANNESS NOR SUSCEPTIBILITY TO UNCLEANNESS: SWEAT, ILL-SMELLING SECRETION, EXCREMENT, BLOOD ISSUING WITH ANY OF THESE, LIQUID [ISSUING FROM A STILL-BORN CHILD] OF EIGHT MONTHS (R. JOSE SAYS: EXCEPT ITS BLOOD). [THE DISCHARGE FROM THE BOWELS OF] ONE WHO DRINKS THE WATER OF TIBERIAS EVEN THOUGH IT COMES OUT CLEAN, BLOOD FROM THE SLAUGHTERING OF CATTLE AND WILD ANIMALS AND BIRDS THAT ARE UNCLEAN, AND BLOOD FROM BLOODLETTING FOR HEALING. R. ELIEZER DECLARES THESE UNCLEAN. R. SIMEON B. ELEAZAR SAYS: THE MILK OF A MALE IS CLEAN.

MISHNAH . A WOMAN'S MILK RENDERS UNCLEAN WHETHER [ITS FLOW IS] DESIRED OR IS NOT DESIRED, BUT THE MILK OF CATTLE RENDERS UNCLEAN ONLY IF [ITS FLOW IS] DESIRED. R. AKIBA SAID: THE MATTER CAN BE PROVED BY AN INFERENCE FROM MINOR TO MAJOR: IF A WOMAN'S MILK, THE USE OF WHICH IS CONFINED TO INFANTS, CAN RENDER UNCLEAN WHETHER [ITS FLOW IS] DESIRED OR IS NOT DESIRED, ALL THE MORE SHOULD THE MILK OF CATTLE, THE USE OF WHICH IS COMMON TO INFANTS AND TO ADULTS, RENDER UNCLEAN BOTH WHEN [ITS FLOW IS] DESIRED AND WHEN IT IS NOT DESIRED. BUT THEY SAID TO HIM: NO; A WOMAN'S MILK RENDERS UNCLEAN WHEN [ITS FLOW IS] NOT DESIRED, BECAUSE THE BLOOD ISSUING FROM HER WOUND IS UNCLEAN; BUT HOW COULD THE MILK OF CATTLE RENDER UNCLEAN WHEN [ITS FLOW IS] NOT DESIRED, SEEING THAT THE BLOOD ISSUING FROM ITS WOUND IS CLEAN? HE SAID TO THEM: I ADOPT A MORE RIGOROUS RULING IN THE CASE OF MILK THAN IN THE CASE OF BLOOD, FOR IF ONE MILKS FOR HEALING, [THE MILK] IS UNCLEAN, WHEREAS IF ONE LETS BLOOD FOR HEALING, [THE BLOOD] IS CLEAN. THEY SAID TO HIM: LET BASKETS OF OLIVES AND GRAPES PROVE IT; FOR LIQUIDS FLOWING FROM THEM ARE UNCLEAN ONLY WHEN [THE FLOW IS] DESIRED, BUT WHEN [THE FLOW IS] NOT DESIRED THEY ARE CLEAN. HE SAID TO THEM: NO; IF YOU SAY [THUS] OF BASKETS OF OLIVES AND GRAPES WHICH ARE AT FIRST A SOLID FOOD AND AT THE END BECOME A LIQUID, COULD YOU SAY [THE SAME] OF MILK WHICH REMAINS A LIQUID FROM BEGINNING TO END? THUS FAR WAS THE ARGUMENT. R. SIMEON SAID: FROM THENCEFORWARD WE USED TO ARGUE BEFORE HIM: LET RAIN WATER PROVE IT, FOR IT REMAINS A LIQUID FROM BEGINNING TO END, AND RENDERS UNCLEAN ONLY WHEN [ITS FLOW IS] DESIRED. BUT HE SAID TO US: NO; IF YOU SAY [THUS] OF RAIN WATER, IT IS BECAUSE MOST OF IT IS INTENDED NOT FOR MAN BUT FOR THE SOIL AND FOR TREES, WHEREAS MOST MILK IS INTENDED FOR MAN.

MISHNAH . IF A MAN HAS SEEN ONE ISSUE OF THE FLUX, BETH SHAMMAI SAY: HE IS TO BE COMPARED TO [A WOMAN] WHO AWAITS DAY AGAINST DAY; BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: HE IS TO BE COMPARED TO ONE WHO HAS SUFFERED [NOCTURNAL] POLLUTION. SHOULD HE SEE AN ISSUE [ONE DAY]. AND ON THE SECOND IT STOPPED, AND ON THE THIRD DAY HE SAW TWO [ISSUES], OR ONE [ISSUE] THAT WAS AS COPIOUS AS TWO, BETH SHAMMAI SAY: HE IS A REAL ZAB; BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: HE DEFILES THOSE OBJECTS ON WHICH HE SITS OR LIES, AND MUST ALSO OBTAIN IMMERSION IN RUNNING WATER, BUT HE IS EXEMPT FROM THE OFFERING. R. ELEAZAR B. JUDAH SAID: BETH SHAMMAI CONCUR THAT IN SUCH A CASE HE CANNOT BE DEEMED A REAL ZAB; WHERE THEY DO DISPUTE IS IN THE CASE OF ONE WHO HAD SUFFERED TWO [ISSUES], OR ONE [ISSUE] THAT WAS AS COPIOUS AS TWO [ON ONE DAY], AND STOPPED ON THE SECOND DAY, AND ON THE THIRD DAY HE SAW ANOTHER [ISSUE]. IN SUCH A CASE BETH SHAMMAI SAY: HE IS A REAL ZAB; BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: HE ONLY DEFILES THOSE OBJECTS ON WHICH HE SITS OR LIES, AND MUST OBTAIN IMMERSION IN RUNNING WATER, BUT IS EXEMPT FROM THE OFFERING.

MISHNAH . IF ONE SUFFERS AN ISSUE OF SEMEN ON THE THIRD DAY OF COUNTING AFTER HIS FLUX, BETH SHAMMAI SAY: IT RENDERS VOID THE TWO CLEAN DAYS THAT HAVE PRECEDED; BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: IT RENDERS VOID ONLY THAT DAY. R. ISHMAEL SAYS: IF HE SUFFERED IT ON THE SECOND DAY, IT RENDERS VOID THE PRECEDING DAY; BUT R. AKIBA SAYS: IT MATTERS NOT WHETHER HE SUFFERED IT ON THE SECOND OR THIRD DAY — [IN EITHER CASE] BETH SHAMMAI SAY, IT RENDERS VOID THE TWO PRECEDING DAYS, AND BETH HILLEL SAY, IT RENDERS VOID ONLY THAT DAY ITSELF. BUT THEY CONCUR THAT IF HE SUFFERED IT ON THE FOURTH DAY [OF COUNTING] IT RENDERS VOID ONLY THAT DAY [OF THE COUNTING], PROVIDED IT WAS A DISCHARGE OF SEMEN; BUT IF IT HAD BEEN AN ISSUE OF FLUX, THEN EVEN IF THIS HAD OCCURRED ON THE SEVENTH DAY, IT RENDERS VOID ALL THE DAYS THAT HAD PRECEDED.

MISHNAH . IF HE SAW ONE ISSUE ON ONE DAY AND TWO ON THE NEXT DAY, OR TWO ON ONE DAY AND ONE ON THE MORROW, OR THREE ON THREE [CONSECUTIVE] DAYS, OR THREE NIGHTS, HE IS DEEMED A REAL ZAB.

MISHNAH . IF HE SAW ONE [ISSUE] AND A PAUSE TOOK PLACE OF SUFFICIENT DURATION TO ALLOW AN IMMERSION AND A DRYING, AND AFTER THAT HE SAW TWO ISSUES, OR ONE AS COPIOUS AS TWO, OR IF HE SAW TWO [ISSUES] OR ONE AS COPIOUS AS TWO, AND AN INTERVAL TOOK PLACE OF SUFFICIENT DURATION TO ALLOW AN IMMERSION AND A DRYING, AND AFTER THAT HE AGAIN SAW AN ISSUE, HE IS A REAL ZAB.

MISHNAH . IF HE SAW ONE ISSUE WHICH WAS AS COPIOUS AS THREE, LASTING AS LONG [AS IT TAKES TO GO] FROM GAD-YAWAN TO SILOAH, IN WHICH TIME ONE CAN BATHE AND DRY TWICE, HE BECOMES A REAL ZAB. IF HE SAW ONE ISSUE WHICH WAS AS COPIOUS AS TWO, HE DEFILES [OBJECTS] ON WHICH HE LIES OR SITS AND MUST OBTAIN IMMERSION IN RUNNING WATER, BUT IS EXEMPT FROM BRINGING A SACRIFICE. R. JOSE SAID: THEY HAVE NOT SPOKEN OF ONE ISSUE AS COPIOUS UNLESS THERE WAS SUFFICIENT THEREIN TO MAKE UP THREE.

MISHNAH . IF HE BEHELD ONE ISSUE AT DAY-TIME AND ANOTHER AT TWILIGHT, OR ONE AT TWILIGHT AND THE OTHER ON THE MORROW, THEN IF IT WERE KNOWN THAT PART OF THE ISSUE OCCURRED AT DAY-TIME AND PART THEREOF ON THE MORROW, HIS STATUS IS CERTAIN IN RESPECT OF A SACRIFICE AND UNCLEANNESS; BUT IF IT IS IN DOUBT WHETHER PART [OF THE ISSUE] OCCURRED DURING THE DAY AND PART THERE OF [ON WHAT IS] THE DAY FOLLOWING, HE IS IN A STATUS OF CERTAINTY IN RESPECT OF DEFILEMENT, BUT IN ONE OF DOUBT IN RESPECT OF A SACRIFICE. IF HE HAD SEEN ISSUES ON TWO SEPARATE DAYS AT TWILIGHT, HIS STATUS IS IN DOUBT BOTH IN RESPECT OF DEFILEMENT AND IN RESPECT OF A SACRIFICE. IF [HE HAD SEEN ONLY] ONE ISSUE AT TWILIGHT, THERE IS A DOUBT [ALSO] IN RESPECT OF [HIS] DEFILEMENT.

MISHNAH . ALL PERSONS BECOME UNCLEAN THROUGH A FLUX, ALSO PROSELYTES AND SLAVES WHETHER FREED OR NOT, A DEAF-MUTE, AN IMBECILE OR MINOR, A EUNUCH WHETHER [HE HAD BEEN EMASCULATED] BY MAN, OR WAS A EUNUCH FROM [THE TIME OF SEEING] THE SUN. UPON ONE WHOSE SEX WAS UNKNOWN, OR UPON A HERMAPHRODITE, THE STRINGENCIES APPERTAINING TO BOTH MAN AND WOMAN ARE IMPOSED: THEY DEFILE THROUGH BLOOD LIKE A WOMAN, AND THROUGH FLUX LIKE A MAN. THEIR UNCLEANNESS, HOWEVER, STILL REMAINS IN DOUBT.

MISHNAH . ALONG [THE FOLLOWING] SEVEN LINES IS A ZAB EXAMINED AS LONG AS HE HAD NOT ENTERED THE BOUNDS OF ZIBAH: [ENQUIRIES] AS TO [WHAT WAS] HIS FOOD, DRINK, AS [TO WHAT] HE HAD BORNE, WHETHER HE HAD JUMPED, WHETHER HE HAD BEEN ILL, WHAT HE HAD SEEN, OR [WHETHER HE HAD] OBSCENE REFLECTIONS. [IT DIFFERED LITTLE] WHETHER HE HAD REFLECTED [OBSCENELY] PRIOR TO SEEING [A WOMAN], OR WHETHER HE HAD SEEN [A WOMAN] PRIOR TO HIS [OBSCENE] REFLECTIONS. R. JUDAH ADDS: EVEN IF HE HAD WATCHED BEASTS, WILD ANIMALS OR BIRDS HAVING INTERCOURSE WITH EACH OTHER, AND EVEN WHEN HE HAD SEEN A WOMAN'S DYED GARMENTS. R. AKIBA ADDED: EVEN IF HE HAD EATEN ANY KIND OF FOOD, BE IT GOOD OR BAD, OR HAD DRUNK ANY KIND OF LIQUID. WHEREUPON THEY EXCLAIMED TO HIM: [‘ACCORDING TO YOUR VIEW] THERE WILL BE NO ZABIM IN THE WORLD HENCEFORTH!’ HIS RETORT TO THEM WAS: YOU ARE NOT HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF ZABIM!’ AS SOON, HOWEVER, AS IT HAD ENTERED THE BOUNDS OF ZIBAH, NO FURTHER EXAMINATION TOOK PLACE. [HIS FLUX] RESULTING FROM AN ACCIDENT, OR THAT WAS AT ALL DOUBTFUL, OR AN ISSUE OF SEMEN, THESE ARE UNCLEAN, SINCE THERE IS WHEREON TO RELY. IF HE BEHELD A FIRST [ISSUE] HE IS EXAMINED; ON THE SECOND [ISSUE] HE IS EXAMINED, BUT ON THE THIRD [ISSUE] NO EXAMINATION TAKES PLACE. R. ELIEZER SAYS: ALSO ON THE THIRD [ISSUE] HE IS EXAMINED TO ASCERTAIN HIS LIABILITY TO A SACRIFICE.

MISHNAH . IF ONE SUFFERED [A DISCHARGE OF] SEMEN HE DOES NOT CONVEY UNCLEANNESS BY REASON OF A FLUX FOR TWENTY-FOUR HOURS. R. JOSE SAYS: [ONLY] THAT DAY. IF A GENTILE EXPERIENCED A DISCHARGE OF SEMEN, AND HE BECAME A PROSELYTE, HE BECOMES IMMEDIATELY UNCLEAN BY REASON OF A FLUX. IF [A WOMAN] HAD [AN ISSUE] OF BLOOD, OR HAD EXPERIENCED DIFFICULTY [IN CHILDBIRTH], [THE TIME PRESCRIBED] IS TWENTY-FOUR HOURS. IF ONE SMITES HIS SERVANT, THE ‘DAY OR TWO’ IS TWENTY-FOUR HOURS. IF A DOG ATE A CORPSE'S FLESH, THE THREE DAYS [DURING WHICH IT CONTINUES WITHIN] IN A NATURAL STATE ARE OF TWENTY-FOUR HOURS.

MISHNAH . A ZAB DEFILES THOSE OBJECTS ON WHICH HE LIES BY FIVE WAYS, WITH THE RESULT THAT THEY [IN TURN] DEFILE MEN AND GARMENTS. [THESE ARE:] BY STANDING, SITTING, LYING, LOUNGING OR LEANING. WHAT HE LIES UPON DEFILES MAN BY SEVEN WAYS, SO THAT HE [IN TURN] DEFILES GARMENTS. [THESE ARE:] BY STANDING, SITTING, LYING, LOUNGING, OR LEANING UPON IT, OR BY TOUCHING OR CARRYING IT.

MISHNAH . IF A ZAB AND ONE THAT WAS CLEAN SAT TOGETHER IN A BOAT, OR ON A RAFT, OR RODE TOGETHER ON A BEAST, THEY, THOUGH THEIR GARMENTS HAD NOT ACTUALLY TOUCHED, SUFFER MIDRAS UNCLEANNESS. IF THEY SAT TOGETHER ON A PLANK, A BENCH OR A BEDFRAME, OR ON A BEAM, WHEN THESE WERE NOT FIXED TIGHTLY, [OR] IF THEY HAD BOTH CLIMBED A TREE OF INFERIOR STRENGTH, OR [WERE SWAYING] ON A BRANCH OF INFERIOR STRENGTH OF A FIRM TREE; OR IF THEY WERE BOTH [CLIMBING] ON AN EGYPTIAN LADDER, NOT SECURED BY A NAIL, OR IF THEY SAT TOGETHER ON A BRIDGE, RAFTER OR DOOR, NOT SECURED BY CLAY, THEY ARE UNCLEAN. ACCORDING TO R. JUDAH THEY ARE CLEAN.

MISHNAH . IF THEY WERE BOTH CLOSING OR OPENING [A DOOR], [HE THAT WAS CLEAN AND HIS GARMENTS BECOME UNCLEAN]. BUT THE SAGES SAY: [UNCLEANNESS IS NOT CONVEYED] UNLESS ONE WAS SHUTTING AND THE OTHER OPENING [IT]. IF ONE WAS LIFTING THE OTHER OUT OF A PIT [UN CLEANNESS IS CONVEYED]. BUT R. JUDAH SAID, ONLY IF HE THAT WAS CLEAN WAS PULLING OUT HIM THAT WAS UNCLEAN. IF THEY WERE TWISTING ROPES TOGETHER [UNCLEANNESS IS CONVEYED]. BUT THE SAGES SAY, UNLESS THE ONE PULLED ONE WAY AND THE OTHER PULLED THE OTHER WAY. IF THEY WERE BOTH WEAVING TOGETHER, WHETHER THEY WERE STANDING OR SITTING, OR GRINDING WHEAT, [UNCLEANNESS IS CONVEYED]. R. SIMEON DECLARES [THE CLEAN MAN] IN EVERY CASE UNDEFILED, EXCEPT WHERE THEY [BOTH] WERE GRINDING WITH A HAND-MILL. IF THEY [BOTH] WERE UNLOADING OR LOADING AN ASS, THEY ARE UNCLEAN IF THE LOAD WAS HEAVY, BUT CLEAN IF THE LOAD WAS LIGHT. IN BOTH CASES, HOWEVER, THEY ARE CLEAN FOR MEMBERS OF THE SYNAGOGUE, BUT ARE UNCLEAN FOR HEAVE-OFFERING.

MISHNAH . IF THE ZAB AND THE CLEAN PERSON SAT TOGETHER IN A LARGE BOAT (WHAT IS A LARGE BOAT? R. JUDAH SAID: ONE THAT DOES NOT SWAY WITH A MAN'S WEIGHT), OR IF THEY SAT ON A PLANK, BENCH, BED-FRAME, OR BEAM WHEN THESE WERE FIRMLY SECURED; OR IF THEY BOTH CLIMBED A STRONG TREE, A FIRM BRANCH, OR A TYRIAN LADDER, OR AN EGYPTIAN LADDER FIXED BY A NAIL; OR IF THEY SAT ON A BRIDGE, RAFTER OR DOOR, WHEN THESE WERE FASTENED WITH CLAY, IF ONLY AT ONE END, THEY REMAIN CLEAN. IF THE CLEAN MAN STRUCK THE UNCLEAN, HE STILL REMAINS CLEAN; BUT IF THE UNCLEAN STRUCK HIM THAT WAS CLEAN, HE BECOMES DEFILED; FOR [IN THAT CASE] IF HE THAT WAS CLEAN DREW BACK, THE UNCLEAN WOULD HAVE FALLEN.

MISHNAH . R. JOSHUA SAID: IF A MENSTRUANT SAT IN ONE BED WITH ONE THAT WAS CLEAN, [EVEN] THE CAP ON HER HEAD SUFFERS MIDRAS UNCLEANNESS; AND IF SHE SAT IN A BOAT, THE VESSELS ON THE TOP OF THE MAST [ALSO] CONTRACT MIDRAS UNCLEANNESS. IF SHE TOOK A TUB FULL OF CLOTHES AND THEIR WEIGHT WAS HEAVY, THEY BECOME UNCLEAN, BUT IF THEIR WEIGHT WAS LIGHT, THEY REMAIN CLEAN. IF A ZAB KNOCKED AGAINST A BALCONY AND THEREBY CAUSED A LOAF OF TERUMAH TO FALL DOWN, IT REMAINS CLEAN.

MISHNAH . IF HE KNOCKED AGAINST A JOIST, A RAFTER-FRAME, WATER-SPOUT, OR SHELF, THOUGH FIXED WITH ROPES, OR IF [HE KNOCKED AGAINST] AN OVEN, OR A FLOUR CONTAINER, OR THE LOWER MILL-STONE, OR THE JACK OF A HAND-MILL, OR THE SE'AH MEASURE OF AN OLIVE-GRINDER, [THE LOAF REMAINS CLEAN]. R. JOSE ADDS: ALSO [IF HE KNOCKS] AGAINST THE BEAM OF THE BATH-KEEPER. IT REMAINS CLEAN.

MISHNAH . IF HE KNOCKED AGAINST A DOOR, DOORBOLT, LOCK, OAR, MILL-STONE FRAME, OR AGAINST A WEAK TREE, OR WEAK BRANCH OF A STRONG TREE, OR AGAINST AN EGYPTIAN LADDER UNSECURED BY NAILS, OR AGAINST A BRIDGE, BEAM OR DOOR, NOT MADE SECURE WITH CLAY, THEY BECOME UNCLEAN. [IF HE KNOCKED] AGAINST A CHEST, BOX OR CUPBOARD, THEY BECOME UNCLEAN. R. NEHEMIAH AND R. SIMEON, HOWEVER, PRONOUNCE THEM CLEAN IN SUCH CASES.

MISHNAH . A ZAB WHO LAY LENGTHWISE ACROSS FIVE BENCHES, OR FIVE MONEY-BAGS, [MAKES THEM] UNCLEAN, BUT [IF HE LAY ACROSS] THEIR BREADTH, THEY ARE CLEAN. IF HE SLEPT [ON THEM], AND IT WAS FEARED LEST HE HAD TURNED HIMSELF ABOUT ON THEM, THEY ARE UNCLEAN. IF HE WAS LYING ON SIX SEATS, WITH TWO HANDS ON TWO [SEATS]. TWO FEET ON ANOTHER TWO, HIS HEAD ON ONE, WITH HIS BODY ON ANOTHER ONE, ONLY THAT ONE ON WHICH HIS BODY LAY IS RENDERED UNCLEAN. IF [A ZAB] STOOD ON TWO SEATS, R. SIMEON SAYS: IF THESE WERE DISTANT ONE FROM THE OTHER, THEY REMAIN CLEAN.

MISHNAH . IF THERE WERE PILED TEN CLOAKS ONE ON TOP OF THE OTHER AND HE SAT ON THE UPPERMOST ONE, ALL ARE UNCLEAN. IF THE ZAB WAS IN ONE SCALE OF THE BALANCE AND IN THE OTHER SCALE OPPOSITE THERE WERE OBJECTS FIT TO SIT OR LIE UPON, AND THE ZAB OVERWEIGHED, THEY ARE CLEAN; BUT IF THEY OVERWEIGHED, THEY ARE UNCLEAN. R. SIMEON SAYS: IF THERE WAS BUT ONE [PLACE] IT BECOMES UNCLEAN; BUT IF THERE WERE MANY THEY REMAIN CLEAN, SINCE NONE OF THEM HAD BORNE THE GREATER PART [OF THE ZAB'S WEIGHT].

MISHNAH . IF A ZAB [SAT] IN ONE SCALE OF THE BALANCE, WHILST FOOD AND LIQUIDS WERE IN THE OTHER SCALE, [THE LATTER BECOME] UNCLEAN; IN THE CASE OF A CORPSE, HOWEVER, EVERYTHING REMAINS CLEAN, SAVE A MAN. THIS IS [AN EXAMPLE OF] THE GREATER STRINGENCY APPLYING TO A ZAB THAN TO A CORPSE; AND THERE IS ALSO ANOTHER INSTANCE OF GREATER STRINGENCY IN THE CASE OF A ZAB THAN A CORPSE. FOR WHEREAS THE ZAB DEFILES ALL OBJECTS ON WHICH HE SITS OR LIES UPON, SO THAT THESE LIKEWISE CONVEY UNCLEANNESS TO MEN AND GARMENTS, AND CONVEY, MOREOVER. TO WHAT IS ABOVE HIM A MIDDAF UNCLEANNESS, SO THAT THESE IN TURN DEFILE FOOD AND LIQUIDS. IN THE CASE OF A CORPSE NO SUCH UNCLEANNESS TAKES PLACE. GREATER STRINGENCY IS ALSO FOUND IN THE CASE OF A CORPSE, SINCE IT CAN CONVEY UNCLEANNESS BY OVERSHADOWING, AND IMPOSES SEVEN DAYS’ DEFILEMENT, WHEREAS IN THE CASE OF A ZAB NO SUCH UNCLEANNESS IS CONVEYED.

MISHNAH . IF HE SAT ON A BED AND THERE WERE FOUR CLOAKS UNDER THE FOUR LEGS OF THE BED, ALL BECOME UNCLEAN, SINCE THE BED CANNOT STAND ON THREE LEGS; BUT R. SIMEON DECLARES THEM CLEAN. IF HE RODE ON A BEAST AND THERE WERE FOUR CLOAKS UNDER THE LEGS OF THE BEAST, THEY ARE CLEAN, SINCE THE BEAST CAN STAND UPON THREE LEGS. IF THERE WAS ONE CLOAK UNDER ITS TWO FORELEGS OR ITS TWO HINDLEGS, OR UNDER A FORELEG AND A HINDLEG, IT BECOMES UNCLEAN. R. JOSE SAYS: A HORSE CONVEYS UNCLEANNESS THROUGH ITS HINDLEGS. BUT AN ASS THROUGH ITS FORELEGS, SINCE A HORSE LEANS UPON ITS HINDLEGS AND AN ASS UPON ITS FORELEGS. IF HE SAT ON A BEAM OF AN OLIVE-PRESS, THE VESSELS IN THE OLIVE-PRESS ARE UNCLEAN; BUT IF HE SAT ON A FULLER'S PRESS, THE GARMENTS BENEATH IT ARE CLEAN; R. NEHEMIAH, HOWEVER, DECLARES THEM UNCLEAN.

MISHNAH . HE WHO TOUCHES A ZAB, OR WHOM A ZAB TOUCHES, WHO MOVES OR WHOM A ZAB MOVES, DEFILES FOOD AND LIQUIDS AND VESSELS THAT ARE RINSED BY TOUCH, BUT NOT BY CARRIAGE. THIS WAS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE WHICH R. JOSHUA FORMULATED: ALL THOSE THAT DEFILE GARMENTS WHILE STILL IN CONTACT [WITH THEIR SOURCE OF UNCLEANNESS] ALSO DEFILE FOODS AND LIQUIDS SO AS TO BECOME [UNCLEAN] IN THE FIRST GRADE, AND THE HANDS SO THAT THEY BECOME [UNCLEAN] IN THE SECOND GRADE; BUT THEY DO NOT DEFILE MEN OR EARTHENWARE VESSELS. ONCE, HOWEVER, THEY HAVE BEEN SEPARATED FROM THEIR SOURCE OF UNCLEANNESS THEY DEFILE LIQUIDS SO AS TO BECOME [UNCLEAN] IN THE FIRST GRADE, AND FOOD AND THE HANDS SO THAT THEY BECOME [UNCLEAN] IN THE SECOND GRADE, BUT THEY DO NOT DEFILE GARMENTS.

MISHNAH . YET ANOTHER GENERAL PRINCIPLE DID THEY FORMULATE: ALL THAT IS CARRIED ABOVE A ZAB BECOMES DEFILED, BUT ALL THOSE THINGS ABOVE WHICH HE IS CARRIED ARE CLEAN; EXCLUDING SUCH OBJECTS ON WHICH HE CAN SIT OR LIE UPON, AND A MAN. HOW SO? IF A ZAB HAD HIS FINGER BENEATH A LAYER OF STONES AND ONE THAT WAS CLEAN WAS ABOVE, HE CONVEYS UNCLEANNESS AT TWO [REMOVES]. AND RENDERS UNFIT [TERUMAH] AT ONE [FURTHER REMOVE]. IF HE SEPARATED [FROM THE SOURCE OF UNCLEANNESS]. HE STILL DEFILES WITH FIRST-GRADE UNCLEANNESS AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT YET ONE [FURTHER REMOVE]. IF THE UNCLEAN WAS ABOVE, AND THE CLEAN PERSON BELOW, HE CONVEYS UNCLEANNESS AT TWO [REMOVES], AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT YET ONE [FURTHER REMOVE]. IF HE SEPARATED [FROM THE SOURCE OF UNCLEANNESS], HE DEFILES AT ONE [REMOVE] AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT YET ONE [MORE REMOVE]. IF FOODS OR LIQUIDS, OR OBJECTS ON WHICH HE COULD SIT OR LIE UPON OR OTHER ARTICLES WERE ABOVE, THEY DEFILE AT THE TWO REMOVES, AND RENDER [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [FURTHER REMOVE]. IF THEY HAD BECOME SEPARATED [FROM THE SOURCE OF UNCLEANNESS], THEY DEFILE AT ONE [REMOVE] AND RENDER [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE]. ALL OBJECTS FIT TO SIT OR LIE UPON THAT WERE BELOW DEFILE AT TWO [REMOVES], AND RENDER [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE]. FOODS AND LIQUIDS AND OTHER ARTICLES THAT ARE BELOW, REMAIN CLEAN.

MISHNAH . SINCE IT WAS SAID THAT WHATSOEVER CARRIES OR IS CARRIED BY OBJECTS ON WHICH ONE SITS OR LIES UPON REMAIN CLEAN, EXCLUDING THE CASE OF A MAN; WHATSOEVER CARRIES OR IS CARRIED BY CARRION IS CLEAN, SAVE HIM THAT MOVES IT. R. ELIEZER ADDS: ALSO HE THAT CARRIES IT. HE WHO CARRIES OR IS CARRIED UPON A CORPSE REMAINS CLEAN, SAVE WHEN OVERSHADOWING TAKES PLACE, OR A MAN WHEN HE MOVES IT.

MISHNAH . IF PART OF AN UNCLEAN PERSON RESTS UPON A CLEAN PERSON, OR PART OF A CLEAN PERSON RESTS UPON AN UNCLEAN PERSON, OR IF THE CONNECTIVES OF AN UNCLEAN PERSON REST UPON A CLEAN PERSON, OR THE CONNECTIVES OF A CLEAN PERSON UPON ONE UNCLEAN, HE BECOMES UNCLEAN. R. SIMEON SAYS: IF PART OF AN UNCLEAN PERSON IS UPON A CLEAN PERSON, HE IS UNCLEAN; BUT IF PART OF A CLEAN PERSON IS UPON ONE THAT IS UNCLEAN, HE IS CLEAN.

MISHNAH . IF AN UNCLEAN PERSON RESTS UPON PART OF AN OBJECT FIT TO LIE UPON, OR A CLEAN PERSON RESTS UPON PART OF AN OBJECT FIT TO LIE UPON, IT BECOMES UNCLEAN. IF PART OF AN UNCLEAN PERSON RESTS ON AN OBJECT FIT TO LIE UPON, OR PART OF A CLEAN PERSON RESTS UPON SUCH AN OBJECT, IT REMAINS CLEAN. THUS WE FIND THAT UNCLEANNESS IS CONTRACTED AND CONVEYED BY THE LESSER PART THEREOF. SIMILARLY, IF A LOAF OF TERUMAH WAS PLACED UPON AN OBJECT FIT TO LIE UPON [THAT WAS UNCLEAN]. AND THERE WAS A LAYER OF PAPER BETWEEN, WHETHER IT WAS ABOVE OR BELOW, IT REMAINS CLEAN. SIMILARLY, IN THE CASE OF A STONE SMITTEN WITH LEPROSY IT REMAINS CLEAN; BUT R. SIMEON PRONOUNCED SUCH A CASE UNCLEAN.

MISHNAH . HE WHO TOUCHES A ZAB, OR A ZABAH, A MENSTRUANT, OR A WOMAN AFTER CHILDBIRTH, OR A LEPER, OR ANY OBJECT ON WHICH THESE HAD BEEN SITTING OR LYING, CONVEYS UNCLEANNESS AT TWO [REMOVES]. AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [FURTHER REMOVE]. IF HE HAD BECOME SEPARATED, HE STILL CONVEYS UNCLEANNESS AT ONE [REMOVE], AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [FURTHER REMOVE]. THIS IS THE CASE WHETHER HE HAD TOUCHED, OR HAD MOVED, OR HAD CARRIED, OR WAS CARRIED.

MISHNAH . IF ONE TOUCHES THE FLUX OF A ZAB, HIS SPITTLE, SEMEN OR URINE, OR THE BLOOD OF A MENSTRUANT, HE CONVEYS UNCLEANNESS AT TWO [REMOVES], AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE]; BUT IF HE BECAME SEPARATED, HE DEFILES AT ONE [REMOVE] AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE]. THIS IS THE CASE WHETHER HE HAD TOUCHED OR MOVED IT. R. ELIEZER SAID: ALSO IF HE HAD LIFTED IT.

MISHNAH . IF HE CARRIED THAT WHICH WAS RIDDEN UPON, OR IF HE WAS CARRIED THEREON, OR HAD MOVED IT, HE DEFILES AT TWO [REMOVES], AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE]; BUT IF HE BECAME SEPARATED [FROM THE UNCLEANNESS], HE DEFILES AT ONE [REMOVE] AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE]. IF HE CARRIES CARRION, OR THE WATER OF THE SIN-OFFERING OF WHICH THERE WAS SUFFICIENT FOR A SPRINKLING, HE DEFILES AT TWO [REMOVES], AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE]; BUT IF HE BECAME SEPARATED, HE DEFILES AT ONE [REMOVE] AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE].

MISHNAH . HE WHO ATE OF THE CARRION OF A CLEAN BIRD, AND IT STILL IS IN HIS GULLET, HE DEFILES AT TWO [REMOVES], AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE]. IF HE PUT HIS HEAD WITHIN THE AIR-SPACE OF AN OVEN, BOTH HE AND THE OVEN ARE CLEAN; BUT IF HE VOMITED OR SWALLOWED IT, HE DEFILES AT ONE [REMOVE] AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE]. BUT AS LONG AS IT IS STILL IN HIS MOUTH, THAT IS PRIOR TO SWALLOWING IT, HE REMAINS CLEAN.

MISHNAH . HE WHO TOUCHES A DEAD REPTILE, OR SEMEN, OR HIM THAT HAS SUFFERED CORPSE UNCLEANNESS, OR A LEPER DURING HIS DAYS OF COUNTING, OR WATER OF SIN-OFFERING OF INSUFFICIENT QUANTITY WITH WHICH TO PERFORM THE SPRINKLING, OR CARRION, OR AN OBJECT RIDDEN UPON, DEFILES AT ONE [REMOVE] AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE]. THIS IS THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE: ALL WHO TOUCH ANY OBJECT REGARDED BY THE TORAH AS A ‘FATHER OF UNCLEANNESS’ DEFILE AT ONE [REMOVE] AND RENDER [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE], WITH THE EXCLUSION [OF THE CORPSE] OF A MAN. IF HE HAD BECOME SEPARATED, HE DEFILES AT ONE [REMOVE] AND RENDERS [TERUMAH] UNFIT AT ONE [MORE REMOVE].

MISHNAH . HE WHO HAS SUFFERED A [NOCTURNAL] POLLUTION IS LIKE ONE WHO HAS TOUCHED A DEAD REPTILE, AND HE THAT HAS HAD CONNECTION WITH A MENSTRUANT IS LIKE ONE WHO HAS SUFFERED CORPSE UNCLEANNESS. HE WHO HAS HAD CONNECTION WITH A MENSTRUANT, HOWEVER, HAS THE MORE STRINGENT IMPOSITION IN THAT HE CONVEYS MINOR GRADES OF UNCLEANNESS TO WHAT HE LIES OR SITS UPON, SO AS TO MAKE FOODS AND LIQUIDS UNCLEAN.

MISHNAH . THE FOLLOWING RENDER TERUMAH UNFIT: ONE WHO EATS FOODS OF FIRST OR SECOND GRADE UNCLEANNESS, AND WHO DRINKS UNCLEAN LIQUIDS, AND THE ONE WHO HAS IMMERSED HIS HEAD AND THE GREATER PART OF HIM IN WATER WHICH HAD BEEN DRAWN, AND A CLEAN PERSON UPON WHOSE HEAD AND GREATER PART OF HIM THERE FELL THREE LOGS OF DRAWN WATER, AND A SCROLL [OF SCRIPTURES], AND [UNWASHED] HANDS, AND ONE THAT HAS HAD IMMERSION THAT SAME DAY, AND FOODS AND VESSELS WHICH HAVE BECOME DEFILED BY LIQUIDS. **Mishna - Mas. Tevul Yom Chapter**

MISHNAH . IF ONE HAD COLLECTED DOUGH-OFFERING [PORTIONS] WITH THE INTENTION OF SEGREGATING THEM AFTERWARDS AGAIN, BUT IN THE MEANTIME THEY HAD BECOME STUCK TOGETHER, BETH SHAMMAI SAY: THEY SERVE AS CONNECTIVES IN THE CASE OF A TEBUL YOM. BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: THEY DO NOT SERVE AS CONNECTIVES. PIECES OF DOUGH THAT HAD BECOME STUCK TOGETHER, OR LOAVES THAT HAD BECOME JOINED, OR A BATTER-CAKE THAT HAD BEEN BAKED ON TOP OF ANOTHER BATTER-CAKE BEFORE IT COULD FORM A CRUST IN THE OVEN, OR IF THERE WAS FROTH ON THE WATER THAT WAS BUBBLING, OR THE FIRST SCUM THAT RISES WHEN BOILING GROATS OF BEANS, OR THE SCUM OF NEW WINE (R. JUDAH SAYS: ALSO THAT OF RICE) BETH SHAMMAI SAY: ALL SERVE AS CONNECTIVES IN THE CASE OF THE TEBUL YOM. BUT BETH HILLEL SAY: THEY DO NOT SERVE AS CONNECTIVES. THEY CONCUR, HOWEVER, [THAT THEY SERVE AS CONNECTIVES] IF THEY COME INTO CONTACT WITH OTHER KINDS OF UNCLEANNESS, WHETHER THEY BE OF MINOR OR MAJOR GRADES.

MISHNAH . IF ONE HAD COLLECTED PIECES OF DOUGH-OFFERING NOT WITH THE INTENTION OF SEGREGATING THEM AFTERWARDS, OR A BATTER-CAKE THAT HAD BEEN BAKED ON ANOTHER AFTER A CRUST HAD FORMED IN THE OVEN, OR A FROTH HAD APPEARED IN THE WATER PRIOR TO ITS BUBBLING UP, OR THE SECOND SCUM THAT APPEARED IN THE BOILING OF GROATS OF BEANS, OR THE SCUM OF OLD WINE, OR THAT OF OIL OF ALL KINDS, OR OF LENTILS (R. JUDAH SAYS: ALSO THAT OF BEANS ) — ALL THESE ARE RENDERED UNCLEAN WHEN TOUCHED BY A TEBUL YOM. AND NEEDLESS TO SAY, [THIS IS THE CASE IF TOUCHED] BY OTHER SOURCES OF UNCLEANNESS.

MISHNAH . THE KNOB ON THE BACK OF THE LOAF, OR THE SMALL GLOBULE OF SALT, OR THE BURNT CRUST LESS THAN A FINGER'S BREADTH — R. JOSE SAYS: WHATSOEVER IS EATEN WITH THE LOAF BECOMES UNCLEAN [WHEN TOUCHED BY THE TEBUL YOM]. AND NEEDLESS TO SAY, THIS IS SO [WHEN TOUCHED] BY OTHER UNCLEAN THINGS.

MISHNAH . A PEBBLE IN A LOAF OR A LARGE GLOBULE OF SALT, OR A LUPINE, OR A BURNT CRUST LARGER THAN A FINGER'S BREADTH, [DO NOT SERVE AS CONNECTIVES]. BUT R. JOSE SAYS: [ONLY] WHATSOEVER THAT IS NOT EATEN WITH THE LOAF REMAINS CLEAN EVEN WHEN TOUCHED BY A FATHER OF UNCLEANNESS’; AND NEED LESS TO SAY [IS THIS SO WHEN TOUCHED] BY A TEBUL YOM.

MISHNAH . UNSHELLED BARLEY OR SPELT, ROOT OF CROWFOOT, ASAFOETIDA, SILRHIUM (R. JUDAH SAYS: BLACK BEANS) REMAIN CLEAN EVEN [WHEN COMING INTO CONTACT] WITH A ‘FATHER OF UNCLEANNESS’, LET ALONE [IF TOUCHED] BY A TEBUL YOM. SO R. MEIR: BUT THE SAGES SAY: THEY ARE CLEAN IF TOUCHED BY A TEBUL YOM, BUT UNCLEAN [WHEN TOUCHED] BY OTHER SOURCES OF DEFILEMENT. IN THE CASE OF SHELLED BARLEY OR SPELT, OR WHEAT EITHER WITH THE HUSK ON OR WITHOUT IT, OR BLACK CUMMIN, OR SESAME OR PEPPER (R. JUDAH SAYS: ALSO WHITE BEANS), THEY BECOME UNCLEAN EVEN WHEN TOUCHED BY A TEBUL YOM, LET ALONE [WHEN THEY HAVE COME INTO CONTACT] WITH OTHER SOURCES OF UNCLEANNESS.

MISHNAH . LIQUIDS THAT ISSUE FROM A TEBUL YOM ARE LIKE THOSE WHICH HE HAS TOUCHED: NEITHER OF THEM HAS POWER TO DEFILE. WITH REGARD TO ALL OTHERS THAT ARE UNCLEAN, BE THEY OF MINOR OR MAJOR [DEGREE]. THE LIQUIDS ISSUING FROM THEM ARE LIKE THOSE THEY TOUCH; BOTH ARE CONSIDERED OF FIRST GRADE UNCLEANNESS. THE SOLE EXCEPTION BEING SUCH LIQUID THAT IS IN ITSELF A ‘FATHER OF UNCLEANNESS .

MISHNAH . IF A POT WAS FULL OF LIQUID AND A TEBUL YOM TOUCHED IT, THE LIQUID BECOMES UNFIT IF IT IS TERUMAH, BUT THE POT IS CLEAN. BUT IF THE LIQUID IS COMMON FOOD [HULLIN] THEN ALL REMAINS CLEAN. IF HIS HANDS WERE SOILED, ALL BECOMES UNCLEAN. HERE GREATER STRINGENCY IS APPLIED TO SOILED HANDS THAN TO A TEBUL YOM; BUT GREATER STRINGENCY IS APPLIED TO A TEBUL YOM THAN TO SOILED HANDS, SINCE ANY DOUBT RESPECTING THE TEBUL YOM RENDERS TERUMAH UNFIT, BUT ANY DOUBT CONCERNING [SOILED] HANDS IS DEEMED CLEAN.

MISHNAH . IF THE PORRIDGE WAS OF TERUMAH AND THE GARLIC OR OIL [IT CONTAINED] WAS OF HULLIN, AND A TEBUL YOM TOUCHED PART OF THEM, THEN THE WHOLE BECOMES UNFIT; BUT IF THE PORRIDGE WAS OF HULLIN AND THE GARLIC OR OIL IT CONTAINED WAS OF TERUMAH, AND A TEBUL YOM TOUCHED PART OF THEM, HE RENDERS UNFIT ONLY THE PART HE HAS TOUCHED. IF THE GREATER PART WAS GARLIC THEN THEY GO AFTER THE MAJORITY. WHEN IS IT SO? SAID R. JUDAH: WHEN IT FORMED ONE COHESIVE MASS IN THE POT, BUT IF IT WAS SCATTERED SMALL IN THE MORTAR, THEN IT IS CLEAN, SINCE IT IS HIS WISH THAT IT SHOULD BE SO SCATTERED. [SIMILARLY] WITH ALL OTHER MASHED FOODS WHICH WERE MASHED WITH LIQUIDS; THOSE, HOWEVER, WHICH ARE USUALLY MASHED WITH LIQUIDS AND YET WERE MASHED WITHOUT LIQUIDS, THOUGH THEY FORMED ONE COHESIVE MASS IN THE POT, ARE REGARDED AS A CAKE OF PRESERVED FIGS.

MISHNAH . IF THE PORRIDGE AND BATTER-CAKE WERE OF HULLIN AND THE OIL OF TERUMAH WAS FLOATING ABOVE THEM, AND A TEBUL YOM TOUCHED THE OIL, HE RENDERS UNFIT ONLY THE OIL. IF, HOWEVER, HE STIRRED IT ALTOGETHER, ALL THE PLACES WHITHER THE OIL GOES BECOME UNFIT.

MISHNAH . IF A FILM OF JELLY HAD FORMED OVER THE FLESH OF HALLOWED THINGS, AND A TEBUL YOM HAD TOUCHED THE JELLY, THE SLICES [OF FLESH] ARE CLEAN; BUT IF HE TOUCHED ONE OF THE SLICES, THAT SLICE AND ALL [THE JELLY] THAT COMES UP WITH IT FORM A CONNECTIVE THE ONE WITH THE OTHER. R. JOHANAN B. NURI SAYS: THE TWO OF THEM SERVE AS CONNECTIVES TO EACH OTHER. SIMILARLY, WITH [COOKED] BEANS THAT HAVE FORMED A LAYER OVER PIECES OF BREAD. BEANS COOKED IN A POT, AS LONG AS THEY ARE STILL SEPARATE, DO NOT SERVE AS CONNECTIVES; BUT WHEN THEY BECOME A SOLID PULP, THEY DO ACT AS CONNECTIVES. IF THEY FORMED SEVERAL SOLID PULPS, THEY ARE TO BE COUNTED. IF OIL FLOATS ON WINE AND A TEBUL YOM TOUCHED THE OIL, ONLY THE OIL IS RENDERED UNFIT; BUT R. JOHANAN B. NURI SAYS: EACH SERVES AS A CONNECTIVE WITH THE OTHER.

MISHNAH . IF A JAR HAD SUNK INTO A CISTERN CONTAINING WINE, AND A TEBUL YOM TOUCHED IT, AND [HE TOUCHED IT] WITHIN THE RIM, IT SERVES AS A CONNECTIVE; BUT IF OUTSIDE THE RIM, IT DOES NOT ACT AS A CONNECTIVE. R. JOHANAN B. NURI, HOWEVER, SAYS: EVEN THOUGH [THE LEVEL OF WINE IN THE CISTERN] IS THE HEIGHT OF A MAN [ABOVE THE SUNKEN JAR], AND HE TOUCHED [THE WINE] DIRECTLY ABOVE THE MOUTH OF THE JAR, IT SERVES AS A CONNECTIVE.

MISHNAH . IF A JAR HAD A HOLE EITHER AT ITS NECK, BOTTOM OR SIDES, AND A TEBUL YOM TOUCHED IT [AT THE HOLE], IT BECOMES UNCLEAN. R. JUDAH SAYS: ONLY IF THE HOLE IS AT ITS NECK OR BOTTOM IT BECOMES UNCLEAN; BUT IF ON ITS SIDES, ON THIS SIDE OR ON THAT, IT REMAINS CLEAN. IF ONE POURED [LIQUID] FROM ONE VESSEL INTO ANOTHER, AND A TEBUL YOM TOUCHED THE STREAM, AND THERE WAS SOMETHING WITHIN THE VESSEL, THEN [WHATSOEVER HE TOUCHES] IS NEUTRALIZED IN A HUNDRED AND ONE.

MISHNAH . IF A BUBBLE OF A JUG WAS PIERCED WITH HOLES ON ITS INNER SIDE AND ON ITS OUTER SIDE, WHETHER ABOVE OR BELOW, [AND THE HOLES ARE] OPPOSITE ONE ANOTHER, IT BECOMES UNCLEAN [IF TOUCHED] BY A ‘FATHER OF UNCLEANNESS’; AND IT [LIKEWISE] BECOMES UNCLEAN IF IT IS IN A TENT WHEREIN LIES A CORPSE. IF THE INNER HOLE IS BELOW AND THE OUTER ABOVE, IT BECOMES UNCLEAN [IF TOUCHED] BY A ‘FATHER OF UNCLEANNESS’, AND IT BECOMES UNCLEAN IN A TENT WHEREIN THERE IS A CORPSE; IF THE INNER HOLE IS ABOVE AND THE OUTER BELOW, IT REMAINS CLEAN IF TOUCHED BY A ‘FATHER OF UNCLEANNESS’, BUT IT BECOMES UNCLEAN IN A TENT WHEREIN THERE IS A CORPSE.

MISHNAH . ALL [STALKS THAT SERVE AS] HANDLES TO FRUITS, WHICH COUNT AS CONNECTIVES WHEN TOUCHED BY A ‘FATHER OF UNCLEANNESS’, ALSO COUNT AS CONNECTIVES WHEN TOUCHED BY A TEBUL YOM. IF A FOODSTUFF WAS SEVERED YET A SMALL PART WAS STILL ATTACHED, R. MEIR SAYS: IF ONE TAKES HOLD OF THE LARGER PART AND THE SMALLER PART IS PULLED AWAY WITH IT, THEN THE LATTER IS REGARDED AS THE FORMER. R. JUDAH. HOWEVER, SAYS: IF ONE TAKES HOLD OF THE SMALLER PART FIND THE GREATER IS ALSO PULLED AWAY WITH IT, THEN THE LATTER IS LIKE THE FORMER. R. NEHEMIAH SAYS: [THIS REFERS ONLY] TO THE CASE OF THE CLEAN PORTION, BUT THE SAGES SAY: [IT REFERS ONLY] TO THE UNCLEAN PORTION. IN THE CASE OF ALL OTHER FRUITS, THOSE USUALLY HELD BY THE LEAF SHOULD BE TAKEN BY THE LEAF, AND THOSE USUALLY HELD BY THE STALK SHOULD BE TAKEN BY THE STALK.

MISHNAH . IF A BEATEN EGG WAS ON TOP OF VEGETABLES OF TERUMAH, AND A TEBUL YOM TOUCHES THE EGG, THEN HE RENDERS UNFIT ONLY THAT STALK [OF THE VEGE TABLES] THAT IS OPPOSITE THE PART [OF THE EGG] HE TOUCHED. R. JOSE, HOWEVER, SAYS: IT AFFECTS THE WHOLE OF THE UPPER LAYER; AND IF IT WAS ARRANGED LIKE A CAP IT DOES NOT SERVE AS A CONNECTIVE.

MISHNAH . THE STREAK OF AN EGG THAT HAD BECOME CONGEALED ON THE SIDE OF A PAN THAT HAD BEEN TOUCHED BY A TEBUL YOM WITHIN THE RIM [OF THE PAN]. SERVES AS A CONNECTIVE; BUT IF OUTSIDE THE RIM, IT DOES NOT SERVE AS A CONNECTIVE. R. JOSE MAINTAINS THAT ONLY THE STREAK AND THE PART THAT CAN BE PEELED AWAY WITH IT [SERVES AS A CONNECTIVE]. THE SAME APPLIES TO BEANS THAT HAD FORMED A LAYER OF JELLY ON THE RIM OF THE POT.

MISHNAH . DOUGH THAT HAD BEEN MIXED [WITH DOUGH OF TERUMAH]. OR THAT HAD BEEN LEAVENED WITH YEAST OF TERUMAH, IS NOT RENDERED UNFIT BY [THE TOUCH OF] A TEBUL YOM; R. JOSE AND R. SIMEON, HOWEVER, PRONOUNCE IT UNFIT. DOUGH THAT HAD BECOME SUSCEPTIBLE [TO UNCLEANNESS] BY A LIQUID, AND IT WAS KNEADED WITH FRUIT JUICE, AND LATER TOUCHED BY A TEBUL YOM, R. ELEAZAR B. JUDAH OF BARTHOTHA SAYS IN THE NAME OF R. JOSHUA: IT BECOMES TOTALLY UNFIT. R. AKIBA, HOWEVER, SAYS IN HIS NAME: HE RENDERS UNFIT ONLY THE PART THAT HE TOUCHED.

MISHNAH . IF VEGETABLES OF HULLIN WERE COOKED WITH OIL OF TERUMAH AND A TEBUL YOM TOUCHED IT, R. ELEAZAR B. JUDAH OF BARTHOTHA SAYS IN THE NAME OF R. JOSHUA: IT BECOMES TOTALLY UNFIT. R. AKIBA, HOWEVER, SAYS IN HIS NAME: HE RENDERS UNFIT ONLY THE PART THAT HE TOUCHED.

MISHNAH . IF A CLEAN PERSON CHEWED FOOD AND IT FELL ON HIS GARMENTS AND ON A LOAF OF TERUMAH, IT IS NOT RENDERED SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS. IF HE ATE CRUSHED OLIVES OR MOIST DATES WITH THE INTENTION OF SUCKING THE STONE THEREOF, AND IT FELL ON HIS GARMENTS AND ON A LOAF OF TERUMAH, [THE LATTER] BECOMES SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS. . IF, HOWEVER, HE ATE DRIED OLIVES, OR DRIED FIGS WITHOUT THE INTENTION OF SUCKING THE STONE THEREOF, AND THEY FELL ON HIS GARMENTS AND ON A LOAF OF TERUMAH, THE LATTER IS NOT RENDERED SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS. THIS IS THE CASE IRRESPECTIVE OF THE FACT WHETHER IT WAS A CLEAN MAN OR A TEBUL YOM [WHO WAS EATING]. R. MEIR SAYS: IN EITHER CASE IT BECOMES SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS IN THE CASE OF A TEBUL YOM, SINCE LIQUIDS ISSUING FROM UNCLEAN PERSONS RENDER ANYTHING SUSCEPTIBLE REGARDLESS OF THE ACCEPTABILITY OF THEIR PRESENCE OR NOT. BUT THE SAGES SAY: A TEBUL YOM IS NOT REGARDED AS AN UNCLEAN PERSON.

MISHNAH . IF FOOD THAT WAS TITHE-OFFERING HAD BEEN RENDERED SUSCEPTIBLE BY A LIQUID, AND A TEBUL YOM OR UNWASHED HANDS TOUCHED IT, TERUMAH OF TITHE MAY STILL BE SET APART FROM IT IN PURITY, SINCE IT ONLY SUFFERED THIRD GRADE UNCLEANNESS, AND THIRD GRADE UNCLEANNESS COUNTS AS CLEAN IN HULLIN.

MISHNAH . A WOMAN THAT HAD IMMERSED HERSELF THE SAME DAY MAY KNEAD DOUGH, CUT OFF THE DOUGH-OFFERING, AND SET IT APART, BUT MUST PLACE IT ON AN INVERTED BASKET OF TWIGS, OR ON A TRAY , AND THEN BRING IT NEAR AND DECLARE IT BY ITS NAME. FOR IT SUFFERED ONLY THIRD GRADE UNCLEANNESS, AND THIRD GRADE UNCLEANNESS IS DEEMED AS CLEAN IN HULLIN.

MISHNAH . IN A TROUGH WHICH HAD BEEN IMMERSED THAT VERY DAY, ONE MAY KNEAD DOUGH AND CUT OFF THE PORTION FOR HALLAH AND BRING IT NEAR AND EVEN PRO NOUNCE IT BY NAME [AS HALLAH]; FOR IT SUFFERS ONLY THIRD GRADE UNCLEANNESS AND A THIRD GRADE COUNTS AS CLEAN IN HULLIN.

MISHNAH . IF A FLAGON THAT HAD BEEN IMMERSED THE SAME DAY AND HAD BEEN FILLED OUT OF A CASK CONTAINING TITHES FROM WHICH THE HEAVE-OFFERING HAD NOT YET BEEN TAKEN, AND ONE SAID, LET THIS BE HEAVE-OFFERING OF TITHE AFTER NIGHTFALL, IT BECOMES HEAVE-OFFERING OF TITHE. BUT IF HE SAID: LET THIS BE THE FOOD FOR THE [SABBATH] ‘ERUB, HIS REMARKS ARE NOT VALID AT ALL. IF THE CASK WAS BROKEN, THE CONTENTS OF THE FLAGON STILL REMAIN TITHE FROM WHICH HEAVE-OFFERING HAD NOT YET BEEN TAKEN; IF THE FLAGON IS BROKEN, THEN WHAT IS IN THE CASK STILL REMAINS TITHE FROM WHICH HEAVE-OFFERING HAD NOT YET BEEN TAKEN.

MISHNAH . FORMERLY THEY USED TO SAY: ONE MAY REDEEM FOR THE PRODUCE OF AN AM HA-AREZ. LATER THEY RECONSIDERED AND SAID: ALSO FOR MONEY OF HIS. FORMERLY THEY USED TO SAY: IF A MAN IS LED OUT IN CHAINS AND COMMANDS: WRITE A BILL OF DIVORCE FOR MY WIFE’, IT HAD TO BE WRITTEN AND DELIVERED; BUT AFTER CONSIDERATION THEY ADDED THE CASE OF A MAN UNDERTAKING A SEA VOYAGE, OR SETTING OUT WITH A CARAVAN. R. SIMEON OF SHEZUR ADDED THE CASE OF ONE WHO WAS AT THE POINT OF DEATH.

MISHNAH . ASHKELON LEVERS THAT HAD BECOME BROKEN, ONLY THEIR HOOKS STILL REMAINING, ARE SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS. A PITCH-FORK, WINNOWING-FAN, RAKE [SO-TOO, A HAIR COMB]. WHICH HAD LOST ONE OF ITS TEETH, AND ANOTHER OF METAL WAS CONSTRUCTED FOR IT, ARE ALL SUSCEPTIBLE TO UNCLEANNESS. CONCERNING ALL THESE, R. JOSHUA SAID: THIS IS A NEW THING WHICH THE SCRIBES HAVE MADE AND I HAVE NOTHING TO REPLY.

MISHNAH . IF ONE WAS TAKING TERUMAH FROM A CISTERN AND SAID: ‘LET THIS BE TERUMAH PROVIDED IT COMES UP SAFELY’, [IT IS IMPLIED THAT HE MEANT] SAFELY FROM BEING BROKEN OR SPILLED, BUT NOT FROM CONTRACTING UNCLEANNESS; BUT R. SIMEON DECLARES: ALSO FROM UNCLEANNESS. IF IT WERE BROKEN, IT DOES NOT RENDER [THE CONTENTS OF THE CISTERN] SUBJECT TO THE RESTRICTIONS OF TERUMAH. HOW FAR AWAY CAN IT BE BROKEN AND STILL NOT MAKE IT SUBJECT TO TERUMAH RESTRICTIONS? ONLY SO FAR THAT IF IT ROLLS BACK, IT CAN REACH THE CISTERN. R. JOSE ADDS: EVEN IF ONE HAD THE INTENTION OF MAKING SUCH A STIPULATION, BUT DID NOT DO SO, AND IT GOT BROKEN, IT DOES NOT NEVERTHELESS MAKE IT SUBJECT TO TERUMAH RESTRICTIONS, FOR THIS IS A STIPULATION LAID DOWN BY THE BETH DIN.

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.

MISHNAH . ON THAT DAY THE VOTES WERE COUNTED AND THEY DECIDED THAT A FOOTBATH HOLDING FROM TWO LOGS TO NINE KABS WHICH WAS CRACKED COULD CONTRACT MIDRAS UNCLEANNESS. BECAUSE R. AKIBA SAID A FOOTBATH [MUST BE CONSIDERED] ACCORDING TO ITS DESIGNATION.

MISHNAH . ON THAT DAY THEY SAID: ALL ANIMAL SACRIFICES WHICH HAVE BEEN SACRIFICED UNDER THE NAME OF SOME OTHER OFFERING ARE [NEVERTHELESS] VALID, BUT THEY ARE NOT ACCOUNTED TO THEIR OWNERS AS A FULFILMENT OF THEIR OBLIGATIONS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE PASCHAL-OFFERING AND THE SIN-OFFERING. [THIS APPLIES TO] THE PASCHAL-OFFERING IN ITS DUE TIME AND TO THE SIN-OFFERING AT ANY TIME. R. ELIEZER SAYS: [WITH THE EXCEPTION] ALSO OF THE GUILT-OFFERING. [SO THAT THIS APPLIES TO] THE PASCHAL-OFFERING IN ITS DUE TIME AND TO THE SIN- AND GUILT-OFFERINGS AT ANY TIME. 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 COLLEGE THAT ALL ANIMAL SACRIFICES WHICH ARE EATEN AND WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN SACRIFICED UNDER THEIR OWN NAME ARE NEVERTHELESS VALID, BUT THEY ARE NOT ACCOUNTED TO THEIR OWNERS AS A FULFILMENT OF THEIR OBLIGATIONS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE PASCHAL-OFFERING AND THE SIN-OFFERING. BEN AZZAI ONLY ADDED [TO THESE EXCEPTIONS] THE BURNT-OFFERING, BUT THE SAGES DID NOT AGREE WITH HIM.

MISHNAH . ON THAT DAY THEY SAID: WHAT IS THE LAW APPLYING TO AMMON AND MOAB IN THE SEVENTH YEAR? R. TARFON DECREED TITHE FOR THE POOR; AND R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH DECREED SECOND TITHE. R. ISHMAEL SAID: ELEAZAR B. ‘AZARIAH, THE ONUS IS UPON YOU TO PRODUCE YOUR PROOF BECAUSE YOU ARE EXPRESSING THE STRICTER VIEW; FOR THE ONUS IS UPON THE PERSON WHO EXPRESSES A STRICTER VIEW TO PRODUCE THE PROOF. R. ELEAZAR B. AZARIAH SAID TO HIM: ISHMAEL, MY BROTHER, I HAVE NOT DEVIATED FROM THE SEQUENCE OF YEARS, TARFON, MY BROTHER, HAS DEVIATED THEREFROM AND THE ONUS IS UPON HIM TO PRODUCE THE PROOF. R. TARFON ANSWERED: EGYPT IS OUTSIDE THE LAND OF ISRAEL, AMMON AND MOAB ARE OUTSIDE THE LAND OF ISRAEL: JUST AS EGYPT MUST GIVE TITHE FOR THE POOR IN THE SEVENTH YEAR, SO MUST AMMON AND MOAB GIVE TITHE FOR THE POOR IN THE SEVENTH YEAR. R. ELEAZAR B. ‘AZARIAH ANSWERED: BABYLON IS OUTSIDE THE LAND OF ISRAEL, AMMON AND MOAB ARE OUTSIDE THE LAND OF ISRAEL: JUST AS BABYLON MUST GIVE SECOND TITHE IN THE SEVENTH YEAR, SO MUST AMMON AND MOAB GIVE SECOND TITHE IN THE SEVENTH YEAR. R. TARFON SAID: ON EGYPT WHICH IS NEAR, THEY IMPOSED TITHE FOR THE POOR SO THAT THE POOR OF ISRAEL MIGHT BE SUPPORTED THEREBY DURING THE SEVENTH YEAR; SO ON AMMON AND MOAB WHICH ARE NEAR, WE SHOULD IMPOSE TITHE FOR THE POOR SO THAT THE POOR OF ISRAEL MAY BE SUPPORTED THEREBY DURING THE SEVENTH YEAR. R. ELEAZAR B. ‘AZARIAH SAID TO HIM: BEHOLD, THOU ART LIKE A PERSON WHO WOULD BENEFIT THEM WITH GAIN, YET THOU ART REALLY AS ONE WHO CAUSES SOULS TO PERISH. WOULDST THOU ROB THE HEAVENS SO THAT DEW OR RAIN SHOULD NOT DESCEND? AS IT IS SAID, WILL A MAN ROB GOD? YET YE ROB ME. BUT YE SAY WHEREIN HAVE WE ROBBED THEE? IN TITHES AND HEAVE-OFFERINGS. R. JOSHUA SAID: BEHOLD, I SHALL BE AS ONE WHO REPLIES ON BEHALF OF TARFON, MY BROTHER, BUT NOT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SUBJECT MATTER OF HIS ARGUMENTS. THE LAW REGARDING EGYPT IS A NEW ACT AND THE LAW REGARDING BABYLON IS AN OLD ACT, AND THE LAW WHICH IS BEING ARGUED BEFORE US IS A NEW ACT. A NEW ACT SHOULD BE ARGUED FROM [ANOTHER] NEW ACT, BUT A NEW ACT SHOULD NOT BE ARGUED FROM AN OLD ACT. THE LAW REGARDING EGYPT IS THE ACT OF THE ELDERS AND THE LAW REGARDING BABYLON IS THE ACT OF THE PROPHETS, AND THE LAW WHICH IS BEING ARGUED BEFORE US IS THE ACT OF THE ELDERS. LET ONE ACT OF THE ELDERS BE ARGUED FROM [ANOTHER] ACT OF THE ELDERS, BUT LET NOT AN ACT OF THE ELDERS BE ARGUED FROM AN ACT OF THE PROPHETS. THE VOTES WERE COUNTED AND THEY DECIDED THAT AMMON AND MOAB SHOULD GIVE TITHE FOR THE POOR IN THE SEVENTH YEAR. AND WHEN R. JOSE B. DURMASKITH VISITED R. ELIEZER IN LYDDA HE SAID TO HIM: WHAT NEW THING DID YOU HAVE IN THE HOUSE OF STUDY TO-DAY? HE SAID TO HIM: THEIR VOTES WERE COUNTED AND THEY DECIDED THAT AMMON AND MOAB MUST GIVE TITHE FOR THE POOR IN THE SEVENTH YEAR. R. ELIEZER WEPT AND SAID: THE COUNSEL OF THE LORD IS WITH THEM THAT FEAR HIM: AND HIS COVENANT, TO MAKE THEM KNOW IT. GO AND TELL THEM: DO NOT HAVE ANY APPREHENSION ON ACCOUNT OF YOUR VOTING. I RECEIVED A TRADITION FROM R. JOHANAN B. ZAKKAI WHO HEARD IT FROM HIS TEACHER, AND HIS TEACHER FROM HIS TEACHER, AND SO BACK TO AN HALACHAH GIVEN TO MOSES FROM SINAI, THAT AMMON AND MOAB MUST GIVE TITHE FOR THE POOR IN THE SEVENTH YEAR.

MISHNAH . ON THAT DAY JUDAH, AN AMMONITE PROSELYTE, CAME AND STOOD BEFORE THEM IN THE HOUSE OF STUDY. HE SAID TO THEM: HAVE I THE RIGHT TO ENTER INTO THE ASSEMBLY? RABBAN GAMALIEL SAID TO HIM: THOU ART FORBIDDEN. R. JOSHUA SAID TO HIM: THOU ART PERMITTED. RABBAN GAMALIEL SAID TO HIM: THE SCRIPTURAL VERSE SAYS, AN AMMONITE OR A MOABITE SHALL NOT ENTER INTO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE LORD: EVEN TO THE TENTH GENERATION, ETC. R. JOSHUA SAID TO HIM: BUT ARE THE AMMONITES AND MOABITES STILL IN THEIR OWN TERRITORY? SENNACHERIB, THE KING OF ASSYRIA, HAS LONG SINCE COME UP AND MINGLED ALL THE NATIONS, AS IT IS SAID: IN THAT I HAVE REMOVED THE BOUNDS OF THE PEOPLES, AND HAVE ROBBED THEIR TREASURES, AND HAVE BROUGHT DOWN AS ONE MIGHTY THE INHABITANTS. RABBAN GAMALIEL SAID TO HIM: THE SCRIPTURAL VERSE SAYS, BUT AFTERWARD I WILL BRING BACK THE CAPTIVITY OF THE CHILDREN OF AMMON, SO THAT THEY HAVE ALREADY RETURNED. R. JOSHUA SAID TO HIM: THE SCRIPTURAL VERSE SAYS, I WILL TURN THE CAPTIVITY OF MY PEOPLE ISRAEL AND JUDAH. YET THEY HAVE NOT ALREADY RETURNED. SO THEY PERMITTED HIM TO ENTER THE ASSEMBLY.

MISHNAH . THE ARAMAIC SECTIONS IN EZRA AND DANIEL RENDER UNCLEAN THE HANDS. IF AN ARAMAIC SECTION WAS WRITTEN IN HEBREW, OR A HEBREW SECTION WAS WRITTEN IN ARAMAIC, OR HEBREW SCRIPT, IT DOES NOT RENDER UNCLEAN THE HANDS. IT NEVER RENDERS UNCLEAN THE HANDS UNTIL IT IS WRITTEN IN THE ASSYRIAN SCRIPT, ON HIDE, AND IN INK.

MISHNAH . THE SADDUCEES SAY: WE COMPLAIN AGAINST YOU, O YE PHARISEES, BECAUSE YOU SAY THAT THE HOLY SCRIPTURES RENDER UNCLEAN THE HANDS, BUT THE BOOKS OF HAMIRAM DO NOT CONVEY UNCLEANNESS TO THE HANDS. R. JOHANAN B. ZAKKAI SAID: HAVE WE NOTHING AGAINST THE PHARISEES EXCEPTING THIS? BEHOLD THEY SAY THAT THE BONES OF AN ASS ARE CLEAN, YET THE BONES OF JOHANAN THE HIGH PRIEST ARE UNCLEAN. THEY SAID TO HIM: PROPORTIONATE TO THE LOVE FOR THEM, SO IS THEIR UNCLEANNESS, SO THAT NOBODY SHOULD MAKE SPOONS OUT OF THE BONES OF HIS FATHER OR MOTHER. HE SAID TO THEM: SO ALSO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES; PROPORTIONATE TO THE LOVE FOR THEM, SO IS THEIR UNCLEANNESS. THE BOOKS OF HAMIRAM WHICH ARE NOT PRECIOUS DO NOT CONVEY UNCLEANNESS TO THE HANDS.

MISHNAH . THE SADDUCEES SAY: WE COMPLAIN AGAINST YOU, O YE PHARISEES, THAT YOU DECLARE AN UNINTERRUPTED FLOW OF A LIQUID TO BE CLEAN. THE PHARISEES SAY: [DO] WE COMPLAIN AGAINST YOU, O YE SADDUCEES, THAT YOU DECLARE A STREAM OF WATER WHICH FLOWS FROM THE BURIAL-GROUND TO BE CLEAN? THE SADDUCEES SAY: WE COMPLAIN AGAINST YOU, O YE PHARISEES, IN THAT YOU SAY, MY OX OR ASS WHICH HAS DONE INJURY IS LIABLE, YET MY MANSERVANT OR MAIDSERVANT WHO HAS DONE INJURY IS NOT LIABLE’. NOW IF IN THE CASE OF MY OX OR MY ASS’ FOR WHICH I AM NOT RESPONSIBLE IF THEY DO NOT FULFIL RELIGIOUS DUTIES, YET I AM RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR DAMAGE, IN THE CASE OF MY MANSERVANT OR MAIDSERVANT FOR WHOM I AM RESPONSIBLE TO SEE THAT THEY FULFIL RELIGIOUS DUTIES, HOW MUCH MORE SO THAT I SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR DAMAGE? THEY SAID TO THEM: NO, IF YOU ARGUE ABOUT MY OX OR MY ASS’ WHICH HAVE NO UNDERSTANDING, CAN YOU DEDUCE ANYTHING THEREFROM CONCERNING MY MANSERVANT OR MAIDSERVANT WHO HAVE UNDERSTANDING? SO THAT IF I WERE TO ANGER EITHER OF THEM THEY WOULD GO AND BURN ANOTHER PERSON'S STACK AND I SHOULD BE LIABLE TO MAKE RESTITUTION?

MISHNAH . A GALILEAN SADDUCEE SAID: I COMPLAIN AGAINST YOU, O YE PHARISEES, THAT YOU WRITE THE NAME OF THE RULER AND THE NAME OF MOSES TOGETHER ON A BILL OF DIVORCEMENT. THE PHARISEES SAID: [DO] WE COMPLAIN AGAINST YOU, O GALILEAN SADDUCEE, THAT YOU WRITE THE NAME OF THE RULER TOGETHER WITH THE DIVINE NAME ON A SINGLE PAGE? AND FURTHERMORE THAT YOU WRITE THE NAME OF THE RULER ABOVE AND THE DIVINE NAME BELOW? AS IT IS SAID, AND PHAROAH SAID, WHO IS THE LORD THAT I SHOULD HEARKEN UNTO HIS VOICE TO LET ISRAEL GO? BUT WHEN HE WAS SMITTEN WHAT DID HE SAY? THE LORD IS RIGHTEOUS.