



off. [Scripture] has [thus] made more cases that convey food-uncleanness than those that convey nevelah-uncleanness.

1:5 Food that contracted uncleanness from a "father of uncleanness" and one that contracted uncleanness from a derived uncleanness may be combined together to convey uncleanness according to the lighter grade of the two. How so? If the amount of half an egg of food that has first grade uncleanness and the amount of half an egg of food that has second grade uncleanness were mixed together, the two are regarded having second grade uncleanness. And if the amount of half of an egg of food that has second grade uncleanness and the amount of half an egg of food that has third grade uncleanness were mixed together, the two are regarded as having third grade of uncleanness. If the amount of an egg of food having first grade uncleanness and the amount of an egg of food having second grade uncleanness were mixed together, both are regarded as having first grade uncleanness; But if they were then divided, each part is regarded as having second grade uncleanness. If each part separately fell on a loaf of terumah, they cause it to become unfit. But if the two fell together they cause it to have second grade uncleanness.

1:6 An egg's worth of food that has second degree uncleanness and an egg's worth of food that has third degree uncleanness that were mixed together are regarded as having second degree uncleanness. If they were then divided, each part is regarded as having only third degree uncleanness. If each part separately fell on a loaf of terumah they do not render it invalid. But if the two fell together they convey to it third degree uncleanness. An egg's worth of food that has first degree uncleanness and an egg's worth of food that has third degree uncleanness that were mixed together are regarded as having first degree uncleanness. If they were then divided, each part is regarded as having only second grade uncleanness, for even the third grade that touched the first has become only a second grade. If two eggs worth of food that have first degree uncleanness and two eggs worth of food that have second degree uncleanness were mixed together they are regarded as having first degree uncleanness. If they were then divided, each part is still regarded as having first degree uncleanness. But if they were divided into three or four parts, each is regarded as having second grade. If two eggs worth of food having second degree uncleanness and two eggs worth of food having third degree uncleanness were mixed together, they are regarded as having second degree uncleanness. If they were then divided, each part is still regarded as having second degree uncleanness. But if they were divided into three or four parts, each is regarded as having only third degree uncleanness.

1:7 Pieces of dough which are stuck to each other or loaves stuck to each other, if one of them was defiled from a sheretz, they all become unclean in the first degree; If they were then separated they are still regarded as having first degree uncleanness. If one of them was defiled by a liquid they all have second degree uncleanness; If they were then separated they are still regarded as have second degree uncleanness. If one of them was defiled from the hands, they all become have third degree uncleanness; If they were then separated they are still regarded as having third degree of uncleanness.

1:8 A piece of dough that had first degree uncleanness, and then others became

stuck to it, they all become unclean in the first degree. If they were separated, it still remains unclean in the first degree but all the others are have only second degree uncleanness. If [the original piece] had second degree uncleanness and then others became stuck to it, they all become unclean in the second degree; If they were separated, it still remains unclean in the second degree but all the others are only unclean in the third degree. If [the original piece] had third degree uncleanness, and then other became stuck to it, it remains unclean in the third degree but all the others remain clean, whether they were subsequently separated from it or whether they were not separated.

1:9 Holy loaves in whose hollows there was holy water, if one contracted uncleanness from a sheretz, they all become unclean. In the case of loaves of terumah, uncleanness is conveyed to two loaves and one is invalidated. If there was dripping liquid between them, even in the case of terumah all become unclean.

2:1 A woman who was preserving vegetables in a pot and touched a leaf outside the pot on a dry spot, even though the leaf had an egg's bulk of volume, it alone becomes unclean while all the rest remains clean. If she touched it at a wet spot: If there was an egg's bulk in the leaf, everything becomes unclean. If there was not an egg's bulk in it, it alone becomes unclean but all the rest remains clean. If it is returned into the pot, everything becomes unclean. If the woman was unclean due to contact with one who had corpse uncleanness, and she touched the leaf either at a wet spot or at a dry spot: If there was an egg's bulk in the leaf, everything becomes unclean; If there was not an egg's bulk in it, it alone becomes unclean but all the rest remains clean. If a woman who was a tevulat yom emptied out the pot with unwashed hands, and she observed some liquid on her hands, and it is uncertain whether it was splashed from the pot or whether a stalk had touched her hands, the vegetables are invalid but the pot remains clean.

2:2 Rabbi Eliezer says: he who eats food with first degree uncleanness contracts first degree uncleanness; [He who eats food with] second [degree uncleanness contracts] second [degree uncleanness]; With third [degree uncleanness contracts] third [degree uncleanness]. Rabbi Joshua says: he who eats food with first [degree] or with second [degree uncleanness contracts] second [degree uncleanness]; With third [degree uncleanness, he contracts] second [degree uncleanness] in regard to holy things but not in regard to terumah. All this applies to common food that was prepared in condition of cleanness that is appropriate for terumah.

2:3 First [degree uncleanness] in common food is unclean and conveys uncleanness; Second [degree uncleanness] invalidates but does not convey uncleanness. And third [degree uncleanness] may be eaten in a dish mixed with terumah.

2:4 First [degree] and second [degree uncleanness] in terumah are unclean and convey uncleanness; Third [degree uncleanness] causes invalidity but does not convey uncleanness. And fourth [degree uncleanness] may be eaten in a dish containing holy food.

2:5 First, second and third [degrees of uncleanness] in holy foods are unclean

and convey uncleanness; Fourth [degree of uncleanness] is invalid and causes no uncleanness; And fifth [degree of uncleanness] may be eaten in a dish containing holy food.

2:6 Second [degree of uncleanness] in common food conveys uncleanness to unconsecrated liquids and causes invalidity to terumah food. Third [degree of uncleanness] in terumah conveys uncleanness to consecrated liquids and causes invalidity to holy food that was prepared in conditions of cleanness appropriate to holy food; But if it was only prepared under conditions of cleanness appropriate to terumah, it conveys uncleanness at a first and at a second remove, and causes invalidity to holy food at one additional remove.

2:7 Rabbi Eliezer says: the three of them are equivalent. The first degree of uncleanness in holy food, in terumah or in common food: conveys uncleanness at two removes and causes invalidity at one additional remove in the case of holy food; conveys uncleanness at one remove and causes invalidity at one additional remove in the case of terumah; and causes invalidity in common food. The second [degree of uncleanness] in the case of all of them: conveys uncleanness at one remove and causes invalidity at one additional remove in the case of holy food; it conveys uncleanness to common liquids and causes invalidity of terumah food. The third degree of uncleanness in the case of all them: conveys uncleanness to holy liquids and causes invalidity to holy food.

2:8 If one eats food with second [degree of uncleanness] he must not work in an olive-press. Common food that was prepared under conditions proper to the cleanness of consecrated food is still regarded as common food. Rabbi Elazar bar Zadok says: it is regarded as terumah to convey uncleanness at two removes and to render terumah invalid at one additional remove.

3:1 Sauce, bean-mash and milk, when in a condition of fluidity, are unclean in the first degree. If they turned solid they become unclean in the second degree. If they again melted: If their bulk was exactly that of an egg, they are clean. But if it was more than the bulk of an egg they remain unclean, for as soon as the first drop issued forth it became unclean by contact with an egg's bulk.

3:2 Rabbi Meir says: oil always remains unclean in the first degree. And the sages say: honey also. Rabbi Shimon Shezuri says: also wine. A mass of olives that fell into an oven that was heated: If [the olives] were exactly the size of an egg it [the oven] remains pure; But if it was more than that of an egg the oven becomes unclean, for as soon as the first drop came out it became unclean by contact with an egg's bulk. If the olives were separated even if there was a se'ah of them, it remains clean.

3:3 A man who had corpse uncleanness who pressed olives or grapes: If its bulk was exactly that of an egg, the juice remains clean provided he does not touch the place on which the liquid is; But [if the bulk was] more than that of an egg, the juice becomes unclean, for as soon as the first drop came out, it became unclean by contact with an egg's bulk. If the person was a zav or a zavah [the juice] becomes unclean even if only one berry [was pressed out], for as soon as the first drop came out it became unclean by carrying. If a zav milked a goat, the milk becomes unclean, for as soon as the first drop comes out it becomes unclean by carrying.

3:4 If an egg's bulk of food was left in the sun and it was lessened, and so also in the case of an olive's bulk of corpse, an olive's bulk of carrion, a lentil's bulk of a sheretz, an olive's bulk of piggul, an olive's bulk of notar, or an olive's bulk of forbidden fat they become clean; Nor is one liable on account of these for transgressing the law of piggul, notar or forbidden fat. If they were then left out in the rain and they swelled, they become unclean and guilt is incurred on account of them for transgressing the law of piggul, notar or forbidden fat.

3:5 All cases of uncleanness are determined according to their appearance at the time they are found: If they were then unclean they are assumed to have been unclean [all the time]; And if clean they are assumed to have been clean [all the time]. If they were then covered they are assumed to have been covered [all the time]; And if uncovered they are assumed to have been uncovered [all the time]. If a needle was found full of rust or broken it is clean, for all doubtful cases of uncleanness are determined according to their appearance at the time they are found.

3:6 If a deaf-mute, a person not of sound senses, or a minor was found in an alley way that contained something that was unclean, he is presumed to be clean. But any one of sound senses is presumed to be unclean. And anyone/anything that lacks understanding to be inquired of is in a case of doubtful uncleanness presumed to be clean.

3:7 A child who was found at the side of a graveyard with lilies in his hand, and the lilies grew only in a place of uncleanness, he is nevertheless clean, for I could say that another person gathered them and gave them to him. So also a donkey that was in a graveyard, his harness remains clean.

3:8 A child was found next to dough with a piece of dough in his hand: Rabbi Meir says that the dough is clean; But the sages say that it is unclean, since it is the nature of a child to slap dough. Dough that bears traces of hens' pickings and there is unclean liquid in the same house: if there was distance enough between the liquid and the loaves for the hens to dry their mouths on the ground, the dough is clean. And in the case of a cow or a dog, if there was distance enough for it to lick its tongue. And in the case of all other beasts, if there was distance enough for their tongue to dry. Rabbi Eliezer ben Jacob holds the dough to be clean in the case of a dog who is smart; for it is not its habit to leave food and go after the water.

4:1 One who throws an unclean object from one place to another: [for instance] a loaf among keys or a key among loaves, [that which was clean remains] clean. Rabbi Judah says: if a loaf was thrown among keys the former becomes unclean, but if a key was thrown among loaves the latter remain clean.

4:2 A dead sheretz that was held in the mouth of a weasel that was passing over loaves of terumah and it is doubtful whether the sheretz did or did not touch them, in such condition of doubt [the loaves] are clean.

4:3 A weasel that had in its mouth a [dead] sheretz or a dog that had carrion in its mouth and they passed between clean [persons] or if clean persons passed between them, their condition of doubt is deemed clean, since the uncleanness, had no resting place. If they were picking at them while these lay on the ground, and a person stated, "I went to that place but I do not know whether I

did or did not touch it," his condition of doubt is deemed unclean, since the uncleanness had a resting place.

4:4 An olive's bulk of corpse was held in a raven's mouth and it is doubtful whether it overshadowed a person or vessels in a private domain: The person's condition of doubt is deemed to be unclean But the vessels' condition of doubt is deemed clean. One who drew water in ten buckets and a dead sheretz was found in one of them, it alone is deemed unclean but all the others remain clean. If one poured out from one vessel into another and a dead sheretz was found in the lower vessel, the upper one remains clean.

4:5 On account of six doubtful cases of uncleanness terumah is burned: On account of the doubt of a bet ha-peras [grave area], On account of earth about which there is doubt whether it came from the land of the gentiles, On account of a doubt about the garments of an 'am ha-arez; On account of a doubt about found vessels found by chance; On account of found spit, On account of a doubt about human urine that was near the urine of a beast. On account of a certainty of having touched these which causes the doubtful uncleanness, terumah is burned. Rabbi Yose says: also on account of their doubtful contact in a private domain; But the sages say: in a private domain the terumah is only held in suspense and in a public domain it is deemed clean.

4:6 Two kinds spittle, one of which was [possibly] unclean and the other was definitely clean: [Terumah] is to be held in suspense if [touched by one who] touched or carried or shifted [one of the two kinds of spittle] while they were in a private domain; Or who touched one of them in a public domain while it was still moist; Or who carried it whether it was moist or dry. If there was but one [kind of possibly] unclean spittle and a person touched, carried or shifted it in a public domain, terumah is burned on account of it; And one does not even need to say that this is the case if it was in a private domain.

4:7 These are the cases of doubtful uncleanness that the sages declared to be clean: A doubt concerning drawn water for a mikveh, A doubt concerning an object of uncleanness that floated upon the water. A doubt concerning liquids as to whether they have contracted uncleanness it is deemed unclean, but if it was whether uncleanness has been conveyed it is deemed clean. A doubt concerning the hands as to whether they have contracted uncleanness, have conveyed uncleanness or have attained cleanness, they are deemed clean. A doubt that arose in a public domain; A doubt concerning an ordinance of the scribes; A doubt concerning non-sacred food; A doubt concerning a sheretz; A doubt concerning negaim; A doubt concerning a nazirite vow; A doubt concerning a first-born; A doubt concerning sacrifices.

4:8 "A doubt concerning an object of uncleanness that floated upon water:" [It is clean] whether the water was in vessels or in the ground. Rabbi Shimon says: if in vessels he is deemed unclean but if in the ground he is deemed clean. Rabbi Judah says: if the doubt arose when the man went down into the water he is deemed unclean, but if when he came up he is deemed clean. Rabbi Yose says: even if there is only enough room for a man and the uncleanness the former remains clean.

4:9 "In the case of a doubt concerning liquids as to whether they have contracted uncleanness it is deemed unclean:" How so? If an unclean person

stretched his foot between clean liquids and there is doubt whether he touched them or not, such a condition of doubt is deemed to be unclean. If a man had an unclean loaf in his hand and he stretched it out between clean liquids, and there is doubt whether it touched them or not, such a condition of doubt is deemed to be unclean. "But if it was whether uncleanness has been conveyed, it is deemed clean." How so? If a man had in his hand a stick on the end of which there was an unclean liquid and he threw it among clean loaves and there is doubt whether it touched them or not, such a condition of doubt is deemed clean.

4:10 Rabbi Yose says: a condition of doubt in the case of liquids is deemed unclean in respect of food and clean in respect of vessels. How so? If there were two jars, the one unclean and the other clean, and he made dough with the contents of one of them and a doubt arose as to whether he prepared it with the contents of the unclean, or of the clean one, such is "a condition of doubt in the case of liquids [which] is deemed unclean in respect of food and clean in respect of vessels."

4:11 "If there is doubt concerning the hands as to whether they have contracted uncleanness, have conveyed uncleanness or have attained cleanness, they are deemed clean." "Any doubt that arose in a public domain is deemed clean." "A condition of doubt concerning an ordinance of the scribes": [For instance, he is uncertain whether] he ate unclean food or drank unclean liquids, whether he immersed his head and the greater part of his body in drawn water, or whether there fell on his head and the greater part of his body three log of drawn water, such a condition of doubt is deemed clean. But if a condition of doubt arose concerning a father of uncleanness even though it was only rabbinical, it is deemed unclean.

4:12 "A condition of doubt concerning non-sacred food"--this refers to the cleanness practiced by Pharisees. "A condition of doubt concerning a sheretz" --according [to their condition at] the time they are found. "A condition of doubt concerning negaim" it is deemed clean in the beginning before it had been determined to be unclean, but after it had been determined to be unclean, a condition of doubt is deemed unclean. "A condition of doubt concerning a nazirite vow" [in such a condition of doubt he] is permitted [all that is forbidden to a nazirite]. "A condition of doubt concerning first-borns" whether they are human firstborn or firstborn of cattle, whether the firstborn of an unclean beast or a clean one, for the one who wishes to extract from his fellow bears the burden of proof.

4:13 "And a condition of doubt concerning sacrifices" if a woman has experienced five doubtful cases of miscarriage or five discharges of doubtful zivah she brings only one sacrifice and may then eat other sacrifices, she being under no obligation to bring the remainder.

5:1 A [dead] sheretz and a [dead] frog in a public domain, And so also [if there was there] an olive's bulk of a corpse and an olive's bulk of carrion, A bone of a corpse and a bone of carrion; A clod of clean earth and a clod from a doubtful grave area A clod of clean earth and a clod from the land of the Gentiles, Or if there were two paths, the one unclean and the other clean, and a man walked through one of them but it is not known which, Or if overshadowed

one of them but it is not known which, or he shifted one of them but it is not known which: Rabbi Akiva rules that he is unclean, But the sages rule that he is clean.

5:2 One who said, "I touched an object but I do not know whether it was unclean or clean," or "I touched one but I do not know which of the two I touched":

Rabbi Akiva rules that he is unclean, But the sages rule that he is clean.

Rabbi Yose says that he is unclean in every case and clean only in that of the path, since it is the usual custom for people to walk but it is not their usual practice to touch.

5:3 If there were two paths, the one unclean and the other clean, and one walked on one of them and then prepared clean foods which were then eaten and, then he was sprinkled upon once and a second time and he performed immersion and became clean, then he walked on the second path and then prepared clean foods, the latter are clean. If the first foods were still in existence both must be held in suspense. If he had not become clean in the meantime, the first is held in suspense and the second must be burnt.

5:4 If there was a sheretz and a frog in a public domain and a man touched one of them and then prepared clean foods which were subsequently consumed; and then he immersed, and then he touched the other and then prepared clean foods, the latter are deemed clean. If the first foods were still in existence both must be held in suspense. If he did not immerse in the meanwhile, the first are held in suspense and the second must be burnt .

5:5 If there were two paths, the one unclean and the other clean, and a man walked by one of them and then prepared clean food, and subsequently another man came and walked by the second path and then prepared clean foods: Rabbi Judah rules: if each by himself asked for a ruling they are both to be declared clean. But if they asked for a ruling simultaneously, both are to be declared unclean. Rabbi Yose ruled: in either case they are both unclean.

5:6 If there were two loaves, the one unclean and the other clean, and a man ate one of them and then prepared clean food, and afterwards another man came and ate the second loaf and then prepared clean food: Rabbi Judah ruled: if each by himself asked for a ruling they are both to be declared clean, but if they asked simultaneously both are to be declared unclean. Rabbi Yose ruled: in either case they are both unclean.

5:7 If a man sat in a public domain and someone came and trod on his clothes, or spat and he touched his spit, on account of the spit terumah must be burnt, but on account of the clothes the majority principle is followed. If a man slept in the public domain, when he rises his clothes have midras uncleanness, the words of Rabbi Meir. But the sages say that they are clean. If a man touched someone in the night and it is not known whether it was one who was alive or dead, but in the morning when he got up he found him to be dead: Rabbi Meir says that he is clean. But the sages rule that he is unclean, since all doubtful cases of uncleanness are [determined] in accordance with [their appearance at] the time they are discovered.

5:8 If there was in the town one who was not of sound sense, a Gentile, or a Samaritan woman, all spit encountered in the town is deemed unclean. If a woman trod on a man's clothes or sat with him in a boat: If she knew that he was one

who eats terumah, his clothes remain clean: But if not, he must ask her.

5:9 If one witness says, "You have become unclean," but he says, "I have not become unclean," he is regarded as clean. If two witnesses say, "You have become unclean," and he says, "I have not become unclean," Rabbi Meir says: he is unclean. But the sages say: he may be believed on his own evidence. If one witness says, "You have become unclean," and two witnesses say, "He has not become unclean," whether in a private domain or in a public domain, he is regarded as clean. If two witnesses say, "He has become unclean", and one witness says, "He has not become unclean," whether in a private domain or in a public domain, he is regarded as unclean. If one witness says, "He has become unclean," and another says, "He has not become unclean," or if one woman says, "He has become unclean", and another woman says, "He has not become unclean," he is regarded as unclean if in the private domain, but if in a public domain he is regarded as clean.

6:1 A place that was a private domain and then became a public domain and then was turned again into a private domain: while it is a private domain any condition of doubt arising in it is unclean but while it is a public domain any condition of doubt arising in it is deemed clean. If a man who was dangerously ill in a private domain was taken out into a public domain and then brought back into a private domain, while he is in the private domain any condition of doubt arising through him is deemed unclean but while he is in the public domain any condition of doubt arising through him is deemed clean. Rabbi Shimon says: the public domain causes a break.

6:2 There are four cases of doubt which Rabbi Joshua ruled are unclean and the sages rule are clean. How so? If an unclean man stood and a clean man passed by or the clean man stood and the unclean one passed by; or if an unclean object was in a private domain and a clean one in the public domain or the clean object was in the private domain and the unclean one in the public domain, and there is doubt whether there was contact or not, or whether there was overshadowing or not, or whether there was shifting or not: Rabbi Joshua rules that the clean becomes unclean, But the sages rule that the clean remains clean.

6:3 If a tree standing in a public domain had within it an object of uncleanness and a man climbed to the top of it, and a doubt arose as to whether he did or did not touch the object of uncleanness, such a condition of doubt is unclean. If one put his hand into a hole [in the wall] in which there was an object of uncleanness and there is doubt whether he did or did not touch it, such a condition of doubt is unclean. If a shop that was unclean was open toward a public domain and there is doubt whether a man did or did not enter it, such a condition of doubt is clean. If there is doubt whether he did or did not touch anything, such a condition of doubt is deemed clean. If there were two shops, the one unclean and the other clean, and a man entered into one of them, and a doubt arose as to whether he entered the unclean, or the clean one, such a condition of doubt is deemed unclean.

6:4 However many doubts and doubts about doubts that you can multiply, a condition of doubt in a private domain is unclean, and in a public domain it is deemed clean. How so? If a man entered an alley and an unclean object was in

the courtyard, and a doubt arose as to whether he entered or did not enter [the courtyard]; Or if an object of uncleanness was in a house and there is doubt whether he entered or not; Or even if he entered, there is doubt whether the uncleanness was there or not; Or even if it was there, there is doubt whether it consisted of the prescribed minimum or not; Or even if it consisted of the prescribed minimum, there is doubt whether it was unclean or clean; Or even if it was unclean, there is doubt whether he touched it or not; Any such condition of doubt is deemed unclean. Rabbi Elazar says: if there is a doubt whether he entered, he is clean, but if there is a doubt whether he touched it, he is unclean.

6:5 If a man entered a valley in the rainy season and there was an uncleanness in a certain field, and he stated, "I went into that place but I do not know whether I entered that field or not: Rabbi Elazar rules that he is clean; But the sages rule that he is unclean.

6:6 A condition of doubt in a private domain is unclean unless he says, "I did not touch the unclean thing." A condition of doubt in a public domain is clean unless he can say, "I did touch the unclean thing." What is regarded as a public domain? The paths of Bet Gilgul and similar places are regarded as a private domain in respect of the laws of Shabbat, and a public domain in respect of those of uncleanness. Rabbi Elazar says: they only mentioned the paths of Bet Gilgul because they are regarded as a private domain in both respects. Paths that open out towards cisterns, pits, caverns or wine-presses are regarded as a private domain in respect of the laws of Shabbat and as a public domain in respect of those of uncleanness.

6:7 A valley: in summer time is a private domain in respect of the laws of Shabbat, but as a public domain in respect of those of uncleanness; And in the rainy season it is regarded as a private domain in both respects.

6:8 A basilica: is a private domain in respect of the laws of Shabbat but as a public domain in respect of those of uncleanness. Rabbi Judah says: if one is standing at one door can see those that enter and leave at the other door, it is regarded as a private domain in both respects; otherwise it is regarded as a private domain in respect of Shabbat and as a public domain in respect of uncleanness.

6:9 A covered forum:: is a private domain in respect of Shabbat and a public domain in respect of the laws of uncleanness; And so too the sides. Rabbi Meir says: the sides are regarded as a private domain in both respects.

6:10 Colonnades: are a private domain in respect of Shabbat and a public domain in respect of the laws of uncleanness. A courtyard into which many people enter by one door and leave by another, is a private domain in respect of Shabbat and a public domain in respect of the laws of cleanness

7:1 A potter who left his pots and went down to drink: the innermost pots remain clean but the outer ones are unclean. Rabbi Yose says: When is this so? When they are not tied together, but when they are tied together, all the pots are clean. One who gave over his key to an "am haaretz" the house remains clean, since he only gave him the guarding of the key.

7:2 If he left an am haaretz in his house awake and found him awake, or asleep and found him asleep, or awake and found him asleep, the house remains clean.

If he left him asleep and found him awake, the house is unclean, the words of Rabbi Meir. But the sages say: the only part that is unclean is where he can stretch out his hand and touch it.

7:3 One who left craftsmen in his house, the house is unclean, the words of Rabbi Meir. But the sages say: the only part that is unclean is where they can stretch out their hand and touch it.

7:4 If the wife of a haver left the wife of an am haaretz grinding grain in her house, if the handmill stopped turning, the house is unclean. But if the handmill did not stop turning, that part of the house which she can stretch out her hand and touch is unclean. If there were two women, the house is unclean in either case, since while the one is grinding, the other can go about touching, the words of Meir. But the sages say: the only part that is unclean is where she can stretch out her hand and touch it.

7:5 One who left am haaretz in his house to guard him, if he can see those that enter and leave, only food and liquids and uncovered earthenware are unclean, but couches and seats and earthenware that have tightly fitting covers remain clean. And if he cannot see either those who enter or those who leave, even though the am haaretz has to be led and even though he was bound, all is unclean.

7:6 If tax collectors entered a house, the house is unclean. If a Gentile was with them they are believed if they say, "we did not enter" but they are not believed if they say "we didn't touch anything." If thieves entered a house, only that part in which the feet of the thieves have stepped is unclean. And what do they cause to be unclean? Food and liquids and open earthenware, but couches and seats and earthenware that have tightly fitting covers remain clean. If a Gentile or a woman was with them, all is unclean.

7:7 One who left his clothes in the cubbies of the bath house attendants: Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah says that they are clean, But the sages say: [they are not clean] unless he gives him the key or the seal or unless he left some sign on them. One who left his clothes from one wine-pressing to the next, his clothes remain clean. If he left them with an Israelite [the clothes are unclean] unless he says, "I have watched over them carefully."

7:8 One who was clean and had given up the thought of eating [pure food]: Rabbi Judah says that it remains clean, since it is usual for unclean persons to keep away from it. But the sages say that it is deemed unclean. If his hands were clean and he had given up the thought of eating [pure food], even though he says, "I know that my hands have not become unclean," his hands are unclean, since the hands are always busy.

7:9 A woman entered her house to bring out some bread for a poor man and when she came out she found him standing at the side of loaves of terumah; Similarly a woman went out and found her friend raking out coals under a cooking pot of terumah: Rabbi Akiva says that they are unclean, But the sages say that they are clean. Rabbi Eliezer ben Pila: but why does Rabbi Akiva rule that they are unclean and the sages rule that they are clean? Because women are gluttonous and each may be suspected of uncovering her neighbor's cooking pot to get to know what she is cooking.

8:1 One who dwells in a courtyard with an am haaretz and forgot some vessels in

the courtyard, even though they were jars with tightly fitting lids, or an oven with a tightly fitting cover, they are unclean. Rabbi Judah says that an oven is clean if it has a tightly fitting lid. Rabbi Yose says: even an oven is unclean unless he made for it a partition ten handbreadths high.

8:2 One who deposited vessels with an am haaretz they are unclean with corpse uncleanness and with midras uncleanness. If he knew that he eats terumah, they are free from corpse uncleanness but are unclean with midras uncleanness. Rabbi Yose says: if he deposited with him a chest full of clothes, they are deemed to be unclean with midras when they are tightly packed, but if they are not tightly packed they are only unclean with madaf uncleanness, even though the key is in the possession of the owner.

8:3 One who loses something during the day and finds it on the same day it remains clean. If it was lost during the daytime and found in the night, or if it was lost in the night and found during the day or if it was lost on one day and found on the next day, it is unclean. This is the general rule: if the night or part of the night has passed over it, it is unclean. One who spreads out his clothes: If in a public domain, they remain clean; But if in a private domain they are unclean. If he kept watch over them, they remain clean. If they fell down and he went to bring them, they are unclean. If one's bucket fell into the cistern of an 'am ha-arez and he went to bring something to draw it up with, it is unclean, since it was left for a time in the domain of an am haaretz.

8:4 One who left his house open and found it open, or locked and found it locked, or open and found it locked, it remains clean. But if he left it closed and found it open: Rabbi Meir says that it is unclean; But the sages say that it remains clean, since, though thieves had been there, they may have changed their mind and gone away.

8:5 If the wife of an am haaretz entered a haver's house to take out his son or his daughter or his cattle, the house remains clean, since she had entered it without permission.

8:6 They said a general rule with regard to clean food: whatever is designated as food for human consumption is susceptible to uncleanness unless it is rendered unfit to be food for a dog; And whatever is not designated as food for human consumption is not susceptible to uncleanness unless it is designated for human consumption. How so? If a pigeon fell into a wine-press and one intended to pick it out for an idolater, it becomes susceptible to uncleanness; but if he intended it for a dog it is not susceptible to uncleanness. Rabbi Yohanan ben Nuri rules that it is susceptible to uncleanness. If a deaf mute, one not of sound senses or a minor intended it as food, it remains insusceptible. But if they picked it up it becomes susceptible; since only an act of theirs is effective while their intention is of no consequence.

8:7 The outer parts of vessels that have contracted uncleanness from liquids: Rabbi Eliezer says: they defile liquids but they do not disqualify foods. Rabbi Joshua says: they defile liquids and also disqualify foods. Shimon the brother of Azariah says: neither this nor that. Rather, liquids that were defiled from the outer parts of vessels defile at one remove and disqualify at a second remove. It is as if it say, "that which defiled you did not defile me but you

have defiled me."

8:8 If a kneading trough was sloping downwards and there was dough in the higher part and dripping moisture in the lower part, then three pieces that jointly make up the bulk of an egg cannot be combined together, but two are combined. Rabbi Yose says: the two also cannot be combined unless they compress liquid between them. If the liquid was level, even though the piece was the size of a mustard seed they are combined together. Rabbi Dosa says: crumbled food cannot be combined together.

8:9 If a stick is completely covered with unclean liquid, as soon as it has touched the [water in the] mikveh, it becomes clean, the words of Rabbi Joshua. But the sages say: only when the whole of it is immersed. A flow from one vessel to the other or a slope of dripping moisture does not serve as a connective either for uncleanness or for cleanness. A pool of water serves as a connective in respect both of uncleanness and cleanness.

9:1 At what stage do olives become susceptible to uncleanness? When they exude the moisture [produced] by [their lying in] the vat but not the one [produced while they are still] in the basket, according to the words of Bet Shammai. Rabbi Shimon says: the minimum time prescribed for proper exudation is three days. Bet Hillel says: as soon as three olives stick together. Rabban Gamaliel says: as soon as their preparation is finished, and the sages agree with his view.

9:2 If he finished the gathering but intended to buy some more, or if he had finished buying but intended to borrow some more, or if a time of mourning, a wedding feast or some other hindrance befell him then even if zavim and zavot trampled over them they remain clean. If any unclean liquids fell upon them, only the place where it touched them becomes unclean. Any liquid that comes out of them is clean.

9:3 When their preparation is finished behold they are susceptible to uncleanness. If an unclean liquid fell upon them they become unclean. The sap that issues from them: Rabbi Eliezer says it is clean, But the sages say that it is unclean. Rabbi Shimon says: they did not dispute the ruling that sap that issues from olives is clean. But about what did they dispute? About that which comes from the vat: That Rabbi Eliezer says is clean And the sages say is unclean.

9:4 One who had finished [the gathering of his olives] and put aside one basketful, let him put it [in the container] in front of a priest, the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Judah says: he must hand him over the key immediately. Rabbi Shimon says: within twenty-four hours.

9:5 One who put his olives in a basket that they might be softened so that they will be easy to press, they become susceptible to uncleanness; [If he put them in a basket] to be softened so that they may be salted: Bet Shammai says: they become susceptible. Bet Hillel says: they do not become susceptible. One who splits his olives with unwashed hands, he causes them to be unclean.

9:6 If one put his olives on a roof to dry, even though they are piled up to the height of a cubit, they do not become susceptible to uncleanness. If he put them in the house to putrify, even though he intends to take them up on the roof, or if he put them on the roof so that they might open so that they could

be salted, they become susceptible to uncleanness. If he put them in the house while he secured his roof or until he could take them elsewhere, they do not become susceptible to uncleanness.

9:7 If one wants to take from them [a quantity sufficient for] one pressing or for two pressings: Bet Shammai says: he may scrape off [what he requires] in a condition of uncleanness, but he must cover up [what he takes] in a condition of cleanness. Bet Hillel says: he may also cover it up in a condition of uncleanness. Rabbi Yose says: he may dig out [what he requires] with metal axes and carry it to the press in a condition of uncleanness.

9:8 If a [dead] sheretz was found in the milling stones, only the place that it has touched becomes unclean. But if moisture was running, all become unclean. If it was found on the leaves, the olive-press men shall be asked whether they can say, "we did not touch it." If it touched the mass [of olives], even by as little as the bulk of a barley grain, [the mass becomes] unclean.

9:9 If it was found on broken off pieces but it touched as much as an egg's bulk, [the entire mass] becomes unclean. If it was found on broken off pieces that lay upon other broken off pieces, even though it touched as much as an egg's bulk, only the place it touched becomes unclean. If it was found between the wall and the olives, they remain clean. If it was found [on olives that were lying] on the roof, [the olives in] the vat remain clean. If it was found in the vat, [the olives on] the roof are [also] regarded as unclean. If it was found burnt upon the olives, and so also in the case of a rag that was completely worn out, [the olives remain] clean, because all cases of uncleanness are determined in accordance with their appearance at the time they are found.

10:1 If one locked in olive-workers in the olive-press and there were objects in there that had midras uncleanness: Rabbi Meir says: the olive-press is deemed to be unclean. Rabbi Judah says: the olive-press remains clean. Rabbi Shimon says: if they regard them as clean, the olive-press is deemed unclean; but if they regard them as unclean, the olive-press remains clean. Rabbi Yose: why are they unclean? Only because the am ha'aretz is not an expert in the laws of hesset.

10:2 If the olive-workers in an olive-press went in and out, and in the olive-press there was unclean liquid, if there is space enough [on the ground] between the liquid and the olives for their feet to be dried on the ground, the olive workers remain clean. If something unclean was found in front of olive-workers in the olive-press or grape harvesters, they are believed to say, "We have not touched it." And the same law applies also to the young children among them. They may go outside the door of the olive-press and relieve themselves behind the wall, and still be deemed clean. How far may they go and still be deemed clean? As far as they can be seen.

10:3 If the olive-workers or the grape harvesters were only brought within the domain of the cavern, it is sufficient, the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yose says: he should stand over them until they immerse. Rabbi Shimon says: if they regard the vessels as clean, one must stand over them until they immerse; but if they regard them as unclean, it is not necessary to stand over them until they immerse.

10:4 One who puts his grapes [into the wine-press] from the baskets or from what was spread out on the ground: Bet Shammai says: he must put them in with clean hands, and if he puts them in with unclean hands he defiles them. Bet Hillel says: he may put them in with unclean hands and then he may set aside his terumah in a condition of cleanness. [If they are taken] from the grape-pot or from what was spread out on leaves, all agree that they must be put in with clean hands, and if they are put in with unclean hands they become unclean.

10:5 One who eats grapes out of the baskets or from what is spread out on the ground, even though they burst and dripped into the wine-press, the wine-press remains clean. If he eats the grapes out of a grape-basket or from what was spread out on leaves, and a single berry dropped into the vat: If it has a seal all in the vat remains clean; But if it has no seal, all in the vat becomes unclean. If he dropped some of the grapes and trod upon them in an empty part of the wine-press: If the bulk of the grapes was exactly that of an egg, the contents remain clean; But if it was more than the bulk of an egg, the contents become unclean, for so soon as the first drop came out it contracted uncleanness from the remainder whose bulk is that of an egg.

10:6 One who was standing and speaking by the edge of the cistern and some spittle squirted from his mouth, and there arises the doubt whether it reached the cistern or not, the condition of doubt is regarded as clean.

10:7 If one is emptying out the cistern [into jars] and a [dead] sheretz was found in the first jar, all the other jars are deemed unclean; but if it was found in the last, only that one is unclean but all the others remain clean.

When does this apply? When the wine was drawn directly with each jar, but if it was drawn with a ladle and a [dead] creeping thing was found in one of the jars, it alone is unclean. When does this apply? Only when the man examined [the jars] but did not cover them up or covered them up but did not examine them; But if he both examined them and covered them up and a [dead] creeping thing was found: If in one jar, all the contents of the cistern are deemed unclean. If it was found in the cistern, all its contents are deemed unclean. And if it was found in the ladle all the contents of the cistern are deemed unclean.

10:8 [The space] between the rollers and grape skins is regarded as a public domain. A vineyard in front of the grape harvesters is deemed to be a private domain and one which is behind the harvesters is deemed to be a public domain. When is this so? When the public enter at one end and go out at the other. The vessels of the olive-press, the wine-press and the basket-press, if they are of wood, need only be dried and they become clean; But if they are of reed grass they must be left unused for twelve months, or they must be scalded in hot water. Rabbi Yose says: if he put them in the current of the river, it is sufficient.