



unclean even when touched by a tevil yom, and there is no need to say [when they have come into contact] with other sources of impurity.

2:1 Liquids that come out of a tevil yom are like those which he has touched: neither of them causes defilement. With regard to all others that are unclean, be they of minor or major [degree], the liquids that come out of them are like those they touch; both have first degree impurity. Except for liquid that is a "father of impurity."

2:2 A pot which was full of liquid and a tevil yom touched it: If it is terumah, the liquid is disqualified, but the pot is clean. But if the liquid is non-sacred [hullin] then all remains clean. If his hands were defiled [and he touched the liquids in the pot], all becomes unclean. This is a case defiled hands are treated more stringently than a tevil yom. But a greater stringency is applied to a tevil yom than to defiled hands, since a doubtful tevil yom disqualifies terumah, but doubts with regard to defiled hands are clean.

2:3 If the porridge was of terumah and the garlic or oil [it contained] was of hullin, and a tevil yom touched part of them, he has disqualified the whole thing; But if the porridge was of hullin and the garlic or oil it contained was of terumah, and a tevil yom touched part of them, he disqualifies only the part he has touched. If the greater part was garlic then they go after the majority. Rabbi Judah said: When is this so? When it formed one cohesive mass in the pot, but if it was scattered small in the mortar, then it is clean, since he wishes that it should be scattered. [Similarly] with all other mashed foods which were mashed with liquids. But those 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.

2:4 If the porridge and batter-cake were of hullin and oil of terumah was floating above them, and a tevil yom touched the oil, he disqualifies only the oil. If he stirred it altogether, all the places where the oil goes are disqualified.

2:5 Sanctified meat over which the porridge crusted, and a tevil yom touched the crust, the slices [of meat] are permitted. But if he touched one of the slices, that slice and all [the crust] that comes up with it form a connective with the other. Rabbi Yohanan ben 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 or other foods cooked in a pot: when 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 masses, they are to be counted. If oil floats on wine and a tevil yom touched the oil, only the oil is disqualified. But Rabbi Yohanan ben Nuri says: each serves as a connective with the other.

2:6 A jug which sunk into a cistern containing wine, and a tevil yom touched it: If [he touched it] from the rim and inwards, it serves as a connective; If from the rim and outwards, it does not serve as a connective. Rabbi Yohanan ben Nuri 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.

2:7 If a jug had a hole either at its neck, bottom or sides, and a tevil yom

touched it [at the hole], it becomes unclean. Rabbi Judah says: 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 tevil yom touched the stream, and there was something within the vessel, then [whatsoever he touches] is neutralized in a hundred and one.

2:8 A bubble on a jug which was pierced with holes on its inner side and on its outer side, whether above or below: If [the holes are] opposite one another, it becomes unclean [if touched] by a "father of uncleanness" and it becomes unclean if it is in a tent in which there is 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 in which 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 in which there is a corpse.

3:1 Handles to food, which count as connectives when touched by a "father of uncleanness," also count as connectives when touched by a tevil yom. If a food was divided into two yet a small part was still attached: Rabbi Meir says: if one takes hold of the larger part and the smaller part is pulled away with it, behold it is like it. Rabbi Judah says: if one takes hold of the smaller part and the greater is also pulled away with it, then behold it is like it. Rabbi Nehemiah says: [this refers] to the case of the clean portion. But the sages say: [it refers] to the unclean portion. In the case of all other foods, 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.

3:2 If a beaten egg was on top of vegetables of terumah, and a tevil yom touches the egg, then he disqualifies only that stalk [of the vegetables] that is opposite the part [of the egg] he touched. Rabbi Yose says: the entire upper layer. But if it was arranged like a cap it does not serve as a connective.

3:3 The streak of an egg that had become congealed on the side of a pan and a tevil yom touched it: If within the rim [of the pan] it serves as a connective; But if outside the rim, it does not serve as a connective. Rabbi Yose says that the streak and the part that can be peeled away with it [serves as a connective]. The same applies to beans that had congealed on the rim of the pot.

3:4 Dough that had been mixed [with dough of terumah] or that had been leavened with yeast of terumah, is not disqualified by tevil yom. Rabbi Yose and Rabbi Shimon declare it unfit. Dough that had become susceptible [to uncleanness] by a liquid, and it was kneaded with produce juice, and later touched by a tevil yom: Rabbi Elazar ben Judah of Bartota says in the name of Rabbi Joshua: he disqualifies all of it. Rabbi Akiva says in his name: he disqualifies only the part that he touched.

3:5 Vegetables of hullin were cooked with oil of terumah and a tevil yom touched it: Rabbi Elazar ben Judah of Bartota says in the name of Rabbi Joshua: he has disqualified the whole thing. Rabbi Akiva says in his name: he disqualifies only the part that he touched.

3:6 A clean person who chewed food and it fell on his garments and on a loaf of terumah, it [the loaf] is not susceptible to uncleanness. If he ate crushed

olives or moist dates, [or] if his intention was to suck out the pit, and it fell on his garments and on a loaf of terumah, it is susceptible to uncleanness. If he ate dried olives, or dried figs or it was not his intention to suck out the pit, and they fell on his garments and on a loaf of terumah, it is not susceptible to uncleanness. This is the case irrespective of whether it was a clean person or a tevil yom [who was eating]. Rabbi Meir says: in either case it becomes susceptible to uncleanness in the case of a tevil yom, since liquids issuing from unclean persons render anything susceptible whether it was to his liking or not. But the sages say: a tevil yom is not regarded as an unclean person.

4:1 If food that was tithed had been rendered susceptible to impurity by a liquid, and a tevil yom or one with unwashed hands touched it, terumah of tithed may still be removed from it in purity, since it only has third degree uncleanness, and third degree uncleanness counts as clean in hullin.

4:2 A woman who is a tevilat yom may knead dough, cut off the hallah, and set it apart, and she should arrange it on an Egyptian basket, or on a tray, and then bring it near and call it by its name. For it [the dough] has third degree uncleanness and third degree uncleanness is clean in hullin.

4:3 A trough which is a tevilat yom, one may knead dough in it and cut off the portion for hallah and bring it near and call it by name [as hallah]; for it [the trough] has third degree uncleanness and third degree uncleanness is clean in hullin.

4:4 A flagon was a tevil yom and they filled it from a cask containing tithes from which terumah had not yet been taken: If one said, let this be terumah of tithed after nightfall, it becomes terumah of tithed. But if he said: let this be the food for the eruv, he has said nothing. If the cask was broken, the contents of the flagon still remain tithed from which terumah had not yet been taken. If the flagon was broken, then what is in the cask still remains tithed from which terumah had not yet been taken.

4:5 Originally they said: one may redeem [second tithed] for the produce of an am ha-arez. Later they reconsidered and said: also for money of his. Originally they said that if a man was being led out to execution and said, "Write a get for my wife", they may write a get and give [it to her]. Later they reconsidered and said, even if he were leaving on a sea voyage or on a caravan journey. Rabbi Shimon Shezuri says: even if he were dangerously ill.

4:6 If Ashkelon grappling-irons were broken but their hooks remained, they remain susceptible to impurity. If a pitch-fork, winnowing-fan, or rake, and the same applies to a hair-comb, lost one of its teeth and it was replaced by one of metal, it is susceptible to impurity. And concerning all these Rabbi Joshua said: the scribes have here introduced a new principle of law, and I have no explanation to offer.

4:7 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 becoming impure; But Rabbi Shimon says: also from impurity. 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 [the contents of the cistern] subject to terumah

restrictions? Only so far that if it rolls back, it can reach the cistern.

Rabbi Yose says: even if one had the intention of making such a stipulation, but did not do so, and it broke, it does not make the [contents of the cistern] subject to terumah restrictions, for this is a stipulation laid down by the court.

— Mishnah Tevul Yom — (Sefaria merged English versions) (Public Domain or CC-BY (per Sefaria source data))