

הַתָּם בְּיָוֵן דְּמִסְרַח – דַּעֲתִיהָ עִלְיָהּ
מֵאֲתָמוֹל.

הָכִי נִמְי מִסֵּתְבָרָא. דְּרָבָא כְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה
סְבִירָא לֵיהּ. דְּדָרְשׁ רַבָּא: אִשָּׁה לֹא תִכְנֵס
לְבַיִת הָעֵצִים לִישׁוֹל מִהֵן אוֹד, וְאוֹד
שׁוֹנֶשֶׁבֶר – אָסוּר לְהַסִּיקוֹ בְּיוֹם טוֹב, לְפִי
שְׂמִיָּקִין בְּכָלִים וְאִין מִסִּיקִין בְּשִׁבְרֵי
כָּלִים. שְׂמַע מִיָּנָה.

מִתְנִי בֵּית שְׁמַאי אוֹמְרִים: מַעֲבִירִין
מֵעַל הַשְּׁלֶחָן עֲצָמוֹת וְקִלְפֵינִין, וּבֵית
הַלֵּל אוֹמְרִים: מִסְּלַק אֶת הַטְּבֵלָא כּוֹלָה
וּמְנַעְרָה.

מַעֲבִירִין מִלְפְּנֵי הַשְּׁלֶחָן פִּירוּרִין פְּחוֹת
מִבֵּינֵיהֶן, וְשִׁעָר שֶׁל אֶפּוֹנִין, וְשִׁעָר עֲדָשִׁים –
מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהוּא מֵאֲכָל בְּהֵמָה.

סְפוּג, אִם יֵשׁ לוֹ עוֹר בֵּית אַחֲזִיָּה – מִקְּנָחִין
בוֹ, וְאִם לֹא – אִין מִקְּנָחִין בוֹ. (וְחֻכְמֵיהֶם
אוֹמְרִים): בֵּין כֶּךָ וּבֵין כֶּךָ נִשְׁטַל בְּשַׁבָּת,
וְאִינוּ מְקַבְּלִין טוֹמְאָה.

גַּמְ' אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן: אֲנִי אִין לְנֹי אֵלָּא
בֵּית שְׁמַאי כְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה, וּבֵית הַלֵּל כְּרַבִּי
שִׁמְעוֹן.

"מַעֲבִירִין מִלְפְּנֵי הַשְּׁלֶחָן פִּירוּרִין". מִסִּיעַ
לֵיהּ לְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן, דְּאָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: פִּירוּרִין
שְׂאִין בְּהֵן כּוֹיֵת – אָסוּר לְאַבְדֵן בְּיָד.

"שִׁעָר שֶׁל אֶפּוֹנִין". מִנֵּי רַבִּי שְׂמַעוֹן הִיא,
דְּלִית לֵיהּ מוֹקְפָה.

אֵימָא סִיפָא: סְפוּג, אִם יֵשׁ לוֹ בֵּית
אַחֲזִיָּה – מִקְּנָחִין בוֹ, וְאִם לֹא – אִין
מִקְּנָחִין בוֹ. אֶתְאָר לְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה, דְּאָמַר
דְּבַר שְׂאִין מִתְבָּוִין – אָסוּר!"

בְּהָא אֶפִּילוּ רַבִּי שְׂמַעוֹן מוֹדָה, דְּאִבִּי
וְרַבָּא דְּאָמְרֵי תְרוּוִיָּהוּ: מוֹדָה רַבִּי שְׂמַעוֹן
בְּפִסְקֵי רִישֵׁיהּ וְלֹא יָמוּת.

The Gemara answers: **There**, since the intestines will putrefy as time passes, they are **on his mind from yesterday**. Since Shabbat eve, he has had in mind to feed them to the cat.

The Gemara adds: **So too, it is reasonable to say that Rava holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as Rava taught: A woman may not enter the wood storehouse to take a wooden poker to stoke a fire on a Festival.**¹⁴ **And with regard to a poker that broke, it is prohibited to kindle a fire with it on a Festival, as one may kindle a fire on a Festival with vessels that may be moved, but one may not kindle a fire with broken vessels that broke during the Festival.** They are set-aside and prohibited. **Conclude from it that Rava ruled in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda with regard to the halakhot of set-aside.**

MISHNA Beit Shammai say: One may clear bones and shells left from the Shabbat meal from the table¹⁵ with his hand. **And Beit Hillel say: One may remove the entire board [tavla]¹⁶ that is the table surface and shake the bones and shells off of it, but he may not lift them with his hand because they are set-aside and may not be moved.**

One may clear bread crumbs from the table, even if they are less than an olive-bulk, and pea and lentil pods. Even though it is not fit for human consumption, it may be moved because it is animal fodder.

With regard to a sponge, if it has leather as a handle, one may wipe the table with it, and if not, one may not wipe the table with it¹⁷ lest he come to squeeze liquid from it. **And the Rabbis say: Both this, a dry sponge with a handle, and that, one without a handle, may be moved on Shabbat and it does not become ritually impure.** A sponge is not among the substances that can become ritually impure,¹⁸ neither by Torah law nor by rabbinic decree.

GEMARA Rav Nahman said: Reverse the two opinions, as we have only Beit Shammai in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who prohibits moving set-aside items, and Beit Hillel in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who permits doing so.

We learned in the mishna: **One may clear bread crumbs from the table.** The Gemara comments: **This supports the opinion of Rabbi Yohanan, as Rabbi Yohanan said: With regard to crumbs that are less than an olive-bulk,¹⁹ it is prohibited to destroy them by hand²⁰ in deference to the food.**

We learned in the mishna: One may clear **pea and lentil pods** from the table on Shabbat. The Gemara asks: **Whose opinion is it in the mishna? It is the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who is not of the opinion that there is a prohibition of set-aside.**

Say the latter clause of the mishna: With regard to a sponge, if it has leather as a handle, one may wipe the table with it, and if not, one may not wipe the table with it. **We have arrived at the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who said: An unintentional act is prohibited,** as he certainly does not intend to squeeze liquid from the sponge.

The Gemara answers: **In that case, even Rabbi Shimon agrees that it is prohibited, as it is Abaye and Rava who both say: Rabbi Shimon agrees in a case of: Cut off its head will it not die, i.e., inevitable consequences.** When the prohibited outcome that ensues from the unintentional action is inevitable, Rabbi Shimon agrees that it is prohibited. Squeezing liquid from a sponge is an inevitable consequence.

HALAKHA

אוד – אוד – A wooden poker to stoke the fire on a Festival – **ביום טוב**: On a Festival, it is prohibited to take a piece of wood, whether damp or dry (*Mishna Berura*), from a pile of wood and utilize it as a poker to stoke a fire in an oven. This is because it is considered as if one was completing the production process of a vessel (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Yom Tov* 4:11; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 507:3).

One may clear bones and shells from the table – מעבירין מעל השלחן קליפות ועצמות: On Shabbat, it is permitted to move bones fit for dogs and shells fit for use as animal fodder from the table. However, if they are not even suitable for use as animal fodder, one may only shake the table so they fall off, as per the opinion of Beit Hillel, according to *Tosafot* (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 26:16; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 308:27).

קנינה בקפוג – קנינה בקפוג: One may not wipe a surface with a sponge on Shabbat unless the sponge has a handle. If it does not, the concern is that one might squeeze liquid from the sponge (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 22:15; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 320:17).

פירוורין שאין – פירוורין שאין – **בהן כוית**: It is permitted to destroy crumbs that are less than an olive-bulk, in accordance with the version of this *halakha* in tractate *Berakhot*. Nevertheless, it is customary to do so in a respectful manner. Failure to do so leads to poverty (see *Magen Avraham*; Rambam *Sefer Ahava, Hilkhot Berakhot* 7:11; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 180:4).

LANGUAGE

Board [tavla] – טבילה: From the Latin word *tabula*, meaning a board, especially a wooden board that serves as a cover for a table and a writing tablet.

NOTES

כפוג לענין – כפוג לענין – **קבלת טומאה**: Although the Torah lists materials and vessels that can become ritually impure, the list is not comprehensive. The Sages decreed that certain items that do not appear on the Torah's list, e.g., glass vessels, can also become ritually impure. One of their guiding principles is that materials coming from the sea, e.g., fish skin and bones, cannot become impure. Therefore, a sponge, which is from the sea and is not a vessel, cannot become impure.

Crumbs that are less than an olive-bulk, it is prohibited to destroy them by hand – כוית – **כוית**: The version of this passage that appears in *Rabbeinu Hananel* is the version that appears in *Tosafot*: Crumbs that are less than an olive-bulk may be destroyed by hand. That is the reading in tractate *Berakhot* as well. According to that reading, in this context the phrase one may clear means that one may throw away the small crumbs, and one need not make certain to keep them on the table. According to *Tosafot* in tractate *Berakhot*, even if it is permitted to throw away small crumbs, it is customary to do so in a respectful manner.

HALAKHA

Pits of Aramean dates – גרעיני תמרים ארמית: It is permitted to move date pits in a place where they are fed to animals. A prominent person should be stringent and move them only in an unusual manner, as per the custom of Rabbi Zekharya ben Avkolas (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhhot Shabbat* 26:16; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 308:30).

A man may perform all his needs with bread – עושה בפת: Bread may be used for all of a person's needs provided that the bread is not ruined, as per the opinion of Shmuel and the Gemara in tractate *Berakhot* (Rambam *Sefer Ahava, Hilkhhot Berakhot* 7:9; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 171:1).

And may one create a chamber pot of excrement *ab initio* – וכי עושין גרף של ריעי לכתחילה: One may not cause a container to assume the legal status of a chamber pot of excrement *ab initio*, so that it will become so repulsive that it will be permitted to move it (see *Magen Avraham and Mishna Berura*), as per the opinion of Rav Ashi (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhhot Shabbat* 25:24; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 308:36).

NOTES

Aramean...and Persian – ארמיתא...ודפרסייתא: Some explain that Aramean date pits are soft and can be eaten by people, whereas Persian date pits are entirely unfit to be eaten by people (Rabbeinu Hananel). In addition, vestiges of the fruit remain attached to Aramean date pits, and therefore, they may be moved on Shabbat. That is not the case with the pits of Persian dates (*Me'iri*). Others explain that Persian date pits are typically used for burning and therefore may not be moved, as opposed to Aramean date pits, which are softer and fit for use as animal feed (Rashba).

Carrying along with bread – טלטול אגב להם: The question arises with regard to this statement and with regard to the mishna as well: According to the opinion that permits the carrying of crumbs along with a board, why don't the bread and the board become a base for a prohibited object? *Tosafot* answer that an object only becomes a base for a prohibited object if the prohibited object was placed on it with the intention of leaving it there throughout Shabbat. However, if the intention was to leave it there only for part of the day, the base does not assume the status of the base for a prohibited object. Others explain that since the bread crumbs or the date pits are insignificant, they are negated relative to the board or the slice of bread on which they are placed. Therefore, they do not become a base for a prohibited object (Ra'avad).

הני גרעינין דתמרי ארמיתא שרו לטלטולינהו, הואיל וחזיין אגב אמן. ודפרסייתא – אסור.

שמואל מטלטיל להו אגב ריפתא. (שונים שפ"ז סימן). שמואל לטעמיה, דאמר שמואל: עושה אדם כל צרכו בפת.

רבה מטלטיל להו אגב לקנא דמא. רב הונא בריה דרב יהושע עביד להו בגרף של ריעי. אמר ליה רב אשי לאמימר: וכי עושין גרף של ריעי לכתחילה?

רב ששת זריק להו בלישניה. רב פפא זריק להו אחורי המטה. אמרו עליו על רבי זכריה בן אבוקולם שהיה מחזיר פניו אחורי המטה וזרקו.

הדרן עלך נוטל אדם את בנו

With regard to those pits of Aramean dates,^h which are low quality and occasionally fed to animals, it is permitted to move the pits since they are fit for use due to their origin, i.e., the dates that were prepared as animal feed beforehand. And moving pits of Persianⁿ dates is prohibited. Since those dates are high quality and are not prepared for animals, their pits, too, are not prepared for that use.

The Gemara relates that Shmuel would carry them along with bread.ⁿ The letters *shin, resh, nun, mem, shin, peh, zayin* are a mnemonic of the Sages whose opinions are cited below: Shmuel, Rabba, Huna, Ameimar, Sheshet, Pappa, Zekharya. The Gemara comments: Shmuel's statement is consistent with his reasoning, as Shmuel said: A man may perform all his needs with bread.^h As long as the bread remains edible, he need not be concerned that he is treating the bread contemptuously.

Rabba would move them along with a pitcher of water. Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehoshua, would render them a chamber pot with excrement. The Sages permitted moving repulsive vessels. Here, too, he would collect all the date pits and then move them out because they were disgusting. Rav Ashi said to Ameimar: And may one create a chamber pot with excrement *ab initio*?^h Although the Sages permitted moving a container of excrement, they did not permit creating one *ab initio* so that it would be permitted to move it.

Rav Sheshet would dispose of the pits with his tongue. Rav Pappa would dispose of them behind the divan on which he sat while eating because he did not want to move them in another manner. They said about Rabbi Zekharya ben Avkolas that he would turn his face toward the back of the divan and dispose of them.

Summary of **Perek XXI**

Most of the Sages accepted the *halakha* that one is forbidden on Shabbat to handle a base of a forbidden article. However, this chapter clarified that the rule applies only to moving the item in a normal fashion; when necessary, there is room for leniency with regard to moving such items in an unusual or indirect fashion. Similarly, when there is a need to move something connected to a set-aside item, such as a child who is holding a set-aside item, or a barrel upon which a set-aside item is resting, the Sages allowed it and did not apply the prohibition of a base for a forbidden article. It was also explained in this chapter that the *halakha* is generally not highly stringent with regard to the laws of set-aside on Shabbat, and it is permitted to move something in order to protect the honor of Shabbat or to remove an item that people find repulsive. This is especially true according to the view of Rabbi Shimon, which was accepted as normative.

Introduction to Perek XXII

This chapter also deals with different types of prohibitions subsumed under the category of *shevut*. Here, too, there is no single theme that unites all the topics addressed, although most of them deal with food preparation on Shabbat. Arranging the chapter's contents in a different order than is presented in the Mishna would allow us to identify several general questions that serve as the basis for the details that are discussed in this chapter.

One of these issues relates to the laws of squeezing on Shabbat. Squeezing is not listed as a primary category of prohibited labor. Its prohibition is not based on the act of squeezing alone; indeed, squeezing can be a subcategory of at least two primary categories of labor, depending on the circumstances: It can be a subcategory of the labor of threshing, which is defined abstractly as removing the desired contents from within an unwanted wrapping or shell, and it can be a subcategory of the labor of whitening, when the squeezing is performed in the process of washing.

However, the relationship between squeezing and threshing is not completely clear and uniform. For example, in the practical discussions regarding milking animals on Shabbat, the question arises as to the extent to which one should understand milking as a form or subcategory of squeezing or threshing. This leads to the question of whether milking should be viewed as a Torah prohibition or a rabbinic decree. Similarly, it is necessary to delineate the fine differences between types of squeezing that can be viewed as a subcategory of threshing and other types of squeezing that are externally similar to the first type but differ with regard to the intent of the person squeezing or the purpose of the act itself.

Also discussed in this chapter is breaking a barrel in order to remove food from inside it. The chapter likewise deals with various kinds of food preparation. These forms of food preparation all involve actions that are similar to squeezing and require one to identify the fine line separating a prohibited labor from actions that are externally similar to it but are different because of the intent of the person performing the action. Examples of this include heating up, soaking, and cooling foods on Shabbat: Are these acts forbidden because of their similarity to cooking, or are they perhaps totally permitted and not prohibited even by rabbinic decree? This chapter also comes to conclusions regarding some issues that the Gemara began to address in previous chapters but had not yet resolved.

מתני' חבית שנשברה מצילין הימנה מוון שלש סעודות, ואומר לאחרים: באו והצילו לכם, ובלבד שלא יספוג. אין סוחטין את הפירות להוציא מהן משקין, ואם יצאו מעצמן – אסורין. רבי יהודה אומר: אם לאוכלין – היוצא מהן מותר, ואם למשקין – היוצא מהן אסור. חלות דבש שריסקן מערב שבת ויצאו מעצמן – אסורין, ורבי אליעזר מתיר.

גמ' תנא: לא יספוג ביין, ולא יטפח בשמן, שלא יעשה בדרך שהוא עושה בחול. תנו רבנן: נתפזרו לו פירות בחצר – מלקט על יד על יד ואוכל. אבל לא לתוך הסל ולא לתוך הקופה, שלא יעשה בדרך שהוא עושה בחול.

"אין סוחטין את הפירות". אומר רב יהודה אומר שמואל: מודה היה רבי יהודה לחכמים בזיתים וענבים. מאי טעמא – בין דלסחיטה נינהו יתיב דעתיה. ועולא אומר רב: חלוק היה רבי יהודה אף בזיתים וענבים, ורבי יוחנן אומר: הלכה כרבי יהודה בשאר פירות, ואין הלכה כרבי יהודה בזיתים וענבים.

אמר רבה אומר רב יהודה אומר שמואל: מודה היה רבי יהודה לחכמים בזיתים וענבים, ומודים חכמים לרבי יהודה בשאר פירות.

אמר ליה רבי ירמיה לרבי אבא: אלא במאי פליגי? אומר ליה: לכי תשבתי. אומר רב נחמן בר יצחק: מסתברא, בתותים ורמונים פליגי.

MISHNA From a barrel of wine or oil that broke on Shabbat, one may rescue from it^H food sufficient for three meals, and one may also say to others: Come and rescue food for yourselves. This applies provided that one does not soak up the wine or oil with a sponge or rag, due to the prohibition of squeezing. One may not squeeze fruits on Shabbat in order to extract liquids from them. And if liquids seeped out on their own, it is prohibited to use them on Shabbat. Rabbi Yehuda says: If the fruits were designated for eating, the liquid that seeps from them on Shabbat is permitted. There is no concern lest one purposely squeeze liquids from fruit that is designated for eating. And if the fruits were originally designated for liquids,^N the liquids that seep from them on Shabbat are prohibited. In the case of honeycombs that one crushed on Shabbat eve, and honey and wax seeped from them on their own on Shabbat, they are prohibited, and Rabbi Eliezer permits using them.

GEMARA It was taught in the *Tosefta*: One may not soak up wine and one may not collect oil in his hand, so that one will not conduct himself on Shabbat in the manner that he conducts himself during the week. The Sages taught in a *baraita*: If one's fruit was scattered in a courtyard^{NH} on Shabbat, one may collect them from hand to hand, a little at a time, and eat them immediately. However, one may not collect them into a basket or into a box, so that one will not conduct himself on Shabbat in the manner that he conducts himself during the week.

We learned in the mishna: One may not squeeze fruit on Shabbat, and the liquid that seeps from fruit on its own is prohibited. Rabbi Yehuda, however, distinguishes between fruit that is designated for eating, in which case the liquid that seeps out on its own is permitted, and fruit that is designated for juicing, in which case the liquid that seeps out on its own on Shabbat is prohibited. Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: Rabbi Yehuda concedes to the Rabbis with regard to olives and grapes. Even if they were designated for eating, the liquid that seeps from them on its own on Shabbat is prohibited. What is the reason for this? Since they are generally used for squeezing, one had in mind from the outset that these would serve that purpose as well, even if he designated them for eating. And Ulla said that Rav said: Rabbi Yehuda was in disagreement even with regard to olives and grapes. And Rabbi Yohanan said: The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda with regard to other fruits, and the *halakha* is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda with regard to olives and grapes.

Rabba said that Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said as follows: Rabbi Yehuda would concede to the Rabbis with regard to olives and grapes, and the Rabbis would concede to Rabbi Yehuda with regard to other fruit.

Rabbi Yirmeya said to Rabbi Abba: If it is true that they agree with each other, with regard to what do they disagree? He said to him: When you find it, i.e., examine this matter and you will find areas in which they disagree. Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: It stands to reason that they disagree with regard to mulberries and pomegranates, which have intermediate status, between olives and grapes, which are always considered designated for juicing, and other fruits, which are not.

NOTES

לְאוֹכְלִין...לְמִשְׁקִין – For eating...for liquids: The prohibition against squeezing is a subcategory of the prohibited labor of threshing, which entails removing the edible, inside part from the insignificant outer shell. Therefore, liquid that seeps from fruit designated for consumption cannot be considered threshing, since the fruit itself is significant. The liquid is considered food that separated from other food, which is permitted like any other food item that was divided into smaller parts.

If one's fruit was scattered in a courtyard – נתפזרו לו פירות בחצר: Some commentaries explain that the discussion is limited to a case where the fruit was scattered throughout the courtyard. However, if the fruit fell in one place, it is permitted to gather it into a basket in the standard manner (Rabbeinu Yona). An alternate interpretation is that the fruit is mixed with pebbles and dirt, and therefore there is concern that one may perform the prohibited labor of selecting the waste from the edible (Ramban). The Rambam states that the concern is that one will press the fruit together in the basket and thereby violate the prohibited labor of gathering sheaves into a pile.

HALAKHA

Rescuing from a broken barrel – הצלה מחבית שבורה: If a barrel breaks on Shabbat, one may rescue the measure of wine or oil that one requires for three meals. If one uses a single utensil, he may collect even more. It is also permitted to tell others to rescue wine or oil for themselves. However, it is prohibited to soak up wine or oil with an absorbent material, because one might come to squeeze it (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhhot Shabbat* 22:16; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 335:1).

נתפזרו לו פירות בחצר – If one's fruit was scattered in a courtyard on Shabbat, he may pick up a small amount at a time and eat it. However, one may not collect large quantities of fruit in a basket, because that is conduct identical to the manner that he conducts himself during the week (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhhot Shabbat* 21:11; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 335:5).

דְּתַנִּיא: זֵיתִים שְׁמֶשֶׁךְ מֵהֶן שָׁמוֹ, וְעִנְבִים שְׁמֶשֶׁךְ מֵהֶן יַיִן, וְהִכְנִיסֶן בֵּין לְאוֹכֵל בֵּין לְמִשְׁקִין – הַיּוֹצֵא מֵהֶן אֶסוּר. תּוֹתִים שְׁמֶשֶׁךְ מֵהֶן מִים, וְרִמוֹנִים שְׁמֶשֶׁךְ מֵהֶן יַיִן, וְהִכְנִיסֶן לְאוֹכְלִין – הַיּוֹצֵא מֵהֶן מוֹתֵר, לְמִשְׁקִין וְלִסְתָם – הַיּוֹצֵא מֵהֶן אֶסוּר, דְּבִרְי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה. וְחֻכְמִים אוֹמְרִים: בֵּין לְאוֹכְלִין בֵּין לְמִשְׁקִין – הַיּוֹצֵא מֵהֶן אֶסוּר.

As it was taught in a *baraita*: With regard to olives from which one squeezed oil^h and grapes from which one squeezed wine before Shabbat (*Tosafot*), and he subsequently brought them into his house, whether he brought them in for use as food or whether he brought them in for use of their liquids, that which seeps from them on its own on Shabbat is prohibited. However, with regard to mulberries from which one squeezed water, i.e., juice, and pomegranates from which one squeezed wine, i.e., pomegranate juice, and he brought them into the house, if he originally brought them in for use as food, what seeps from them is permitted. And if he brought them in for use of their liquids, and similarly, if he brought them in without specifying his intention, what seeps from them is prohibited. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. And the Rabbis say: Whether he brought them into the house for use as food or whether he brought them in for use of their liquids, what seeps from them is prohibited.

וְסָבַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה סֵתֵם אֶסוּר?! וְהֵתֵן: חֵלֶב הָאִשָּׁה מְטֵמָא לְרִצּוֹן וְשֵׁלָא לְרִצּוֹן, חֵלֶב בְּהֵמָה אֵינּוּ מְטֵמָא אֶלָּא לְרִצּוֹן.

The Gemara questions this *baraita*: And does Rabbi Yehuda maintain that in the case of undesignated fruit that was not designated for a specific purpose, the liquid that seeps on its own is prohibited? Didn't we learn in a mishna: A woman's milk is considered a liquid and therefore renders food susceptible to ritual impurity,^{HN} whether the milk was expressed volitionally and whether it was expressed unvolitionally? On the other hand, milk of an animal only renders food susceptible to ritual impurity if it was milked volitionally but not if it drips out on its own.

אָמַר רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא: קָל וְחוֹמֵר הוּא, וּמָה חֵלֶב הָאִשָּׁה שְׂאִינוּ מְיֻחָד אֶלָּא לְקִטְנִים – מְטֵמָא לְרִצּוֹן וְשֵׁלָא לְרִצּוֹן, חֵלֶב הַבְּהֵמָה שְׂמִיּוּחָד בֵּין לְקִטְנִים בֵּין לְגְדוּלִים – אֵינּוּ דִין שְׂיֵטְמָא בֵּין לְרִצּוֹן וּבֵין שֵׁלָא לְרִצּוֹן? אָמְרוּ לוֹ: אִם טֵמָא חֵלֶב הָאִשָּׁה שֵׁלָא לְרִצּוֹן – שְׂדֵם מִגְּפָתָה טֵמָא, יֵטְמָא חֵלֶב הַבְּהֵמָה

Rabbi Akiva said: It is an *a fortiori* inference that this is incorrect: Just as a woman's milk, which is intended only for young children, is considered a liquid and renders food susceptible to ritual impurity both if the milk is expressed volitionally and if it is expressed unvolitionally, the milk of an animal, which is intended for both young and old, is it not logical that it should render food susceptible to ritual impurity, both if it was expressed volitionally and if it was expressed unvolitionally? They said to him that this *a fortiori* inference can be refuted in the following way: If a woman's milk renders food susceptible to ritual impurity even when the milk was expressed unvolitionally, as the status of the blood of her wound is also that of a liquid that renders food susceptible to ritual impurity,^{HN} that does not mean that the milk of an animal renders food susceptible to ritual impurity

HALAKHA

Squeezing fruit – סְחִיטַת פְּרוֹת: It is prohibited to squeeze liquid from olives and grapes on Shabbat. If juice seeps from them on its own, it is prohibited to drink or use the juice on Shabbat. It is also prohibited to squeeze mulberries and pomegranates on Shabbat. If juice seeps from them, it is prohibited to drink the juice if the fruit was designated for juicing. However, if the fruit was designated for eating the juice is permitted. The *halakha* is in accordance with the mishna according to the explanation of Shmuel (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhhot Shabbat* 21:12; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 320:1).

Ritual impurity of a woman's milk – טֵמַאת חֵלֶב אִשָּׁה: Mother's milk is always considered a liquid and renders food susceptible to ritual impurity, whether or not the milk was expressed intentionally (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Okhalin* 10:4).

As the blood of her wound renders food susceptible to ritual impurity – שְׂדֵם מִגְּפָתָה טֵמָא: Blood from a wound in a person with a severe form of ritual impurity renders food susceptible to ritual impurity and renders it ritually impure simultaneously (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Okhalin* 10:5).

NOTES

Renders food susceptible to ritual impurity – מְטֵמָא: Food can become ritually impure only if it was rendered susceptible to impurity through contact with liquid (see Leviticus 11:38). Although the only liquid mentioned in the Torah in this regard is water, the Sages debate whether other liquids are also capable of rendering fruit susceptible to impurity. Inclusion in the group of liquids that confer susceptibility to ritual impurity depends on the particular liquid's similarity to water based on derivations from the verses. Therefore, only a derivation like an *a fortiori* inference or a verbal analogy can determine a liquid's status in this regard.

As the blood of her wound renders food susceptible to ritual impurity – שְׂדֵם מִגְּפָתָה טֵמָא: There is a special derivation cited by Rashi that teaches that human blood is considered a liquid. Therefore, if it comes into contact with food, it renders the food susceptible to ritual impurity. There is no distinction in this regard between different kinds of human blood; any kind of human blood renders food susceptible to ritual impurity. Animal blood that flows when the animal is slaughtered is also considered a liquid and renders food susceptible to ritual impurity; however, other kinds of animal blood are not considered to be liquids.