שים לאTRL וימצאה חותם ו稠ר
לעות מתים אוכלים מכות בצ {[תהליך
ולופארה – אוכלים מתו ארבעה – רוחי.
יאמה: של חותם ו稠ר, היא
סימпатיה עלולה להיות קלה לירוד – לקחים.
שורש קל – חותם.

if it was expressed unintentionally, as the blood of its wound is ritually pure,7 meaning that it does not render food susceptible to ritual impurity. Rabbi Akiva said to them: I am more stringent with regard to milk than with regard to blood,8 as if one milks an animal for medicinal purposes, the milk renders food susceptible to ritual impurity, and if one lets blood for medicinal purposes,9 the status of the blood is not that of a liquid and is ritually pure,10 in the sense that it does not render food susceptible to ritual impurity. They said to him: The case of baskets of olives and grapes will prove that there is a difference between liquids that emerge of his own volition and those that do not, as liquid that seeps from them11 volitionally renders food susceptible to ritual impurity.12 However, liquid that seeps from them unvolitionally13 is ritually pure, i.e., it does not render food susceptible to ritual impurity. Apparently, liquid renders food susceptible to ritual impurity only if it emerged of its own volition.

The Gemara analyzes the terms of that mishna: What, it is not true that the term volitionally is referring to a situation where one is pleased with the emergence of liquids, and the term unvolitionally is referring to an indeterminate situation, where he expressed no preference? This leads to a conclusion with regard to our original topic of discussion. Just as in the case of olives and grapes, which are primarily designated for squeezing in order to extract oil and wine respectively, if liquid leaked from them unvolitionally, in the sense that one did not intend for the liquid to emerge, it has no significance and does not render food susceptible to ritual impurity, in the case of mulberries and pomegranates, which are not typically designated for squeezing, is it not all the more so that liquid that seeps from them unvolitionally does not render food susceptible to ritual impurity?

The Gemara refutes this argument: No, the term volitionally is referring even to a situation where one's preference is indeterminate, and the term unvolitionally is referring to a situation where one revealed his mind-set explicitly and said: I am not pleased if liquid emerges. And if you wish, say instead that baskets of olives and grapes are different; since the liquid that leaks from them stands to be lost, one renounces it from the outset. No proof can be cited from this mishna. Generally speaking, however, the legal status of liquids that are not designated to be lost from the outset is that of liquids, even if one did not express pleasure with their emergence.

We have found in the baraita cited above that Rabbi Yehuda conceded to the Rabbis with regard to olives and grapes, that liquid that seeps from them on its own on Shabbat, both volitionally and unvolitionally, is prohibited during Shabbat. From where do we conclude that the Rabbis concede to Rabbi Yehuda with regard to other fruits and distinguish between fruits designated for eating and those designated for juicing? As it was taught in a baraita: One may squeeze.

HALAKHA

As the blood of its wound is ritually pure – בָּלָם מַצְוָה לֹא תְּלִי
Blood from an animal’s wound does not render food susceptible to ritual impurity when it comes into contact with food (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin 10:3).

If one lets blood for medicinal purposes – מַצְוָה לֹא תְּלִי
Blood that was drawn from a person for medicinal purposes is not considered a liquid and does not render food susceptible to ritual impurity (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin 10:3).

Liquid from olives and grapes – מַצְוָה לֹא תְּלִי
Olive oil and grape juice render food susceptible to ritual impurity if the owner of the fruit desires that they emerge from the fruit (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin 12).
Food crops in a vineyard – halakha

The Torah states: “Do not sow your vineyard with two kinds of seed, lest the fullness of the seed which you have sown be rendered forbidden together with the yield of the vineyard” (Deuteronomy 22:9). The Sages derived from this verse that crops planted in a vineyard are forbidden and render the yield of the vineyard itself forbidden. The application of this halakha depends on the question of which plants constitute a forbidden food crop in a vineyard.

Arabia is a place – Rashba adds that Arabia is a place where people commonly raise camels, and therefore their personal preferences are irrelevant in determining general halakhic norms.

Thorns in a vineyard – halakha

It was taught in the baraita cited above that people from the house of Menashya bar Menaĥem would squeeze pomegranates on weekdays. This indicates that it is typical for people to squeeze pomegranates, and therefore it is prohibited to do so on Shabbat. Rav Naĥman said: The halakha is in accordance with the practice of the people from the house of Menashya bar Menaĥem. In other words, squeezing pomegranates is considered typical, and therefore it is prohibited on Shabbat.

Rava said to Rav Naĥman: Is Menashya ben Menaĥem a tanna that you say the halakha is in accordance with his opinion? And if you say that Rav Naĥman meant that the halakha is in accordance with this tanna, who held in accordance with the practice of the people from the house of Menashya ben Menaĥem, there is still room to ask: Does it make sense that because he held in accordance with the practice of the people from the house of Menashya ben Menaĥem, the halakha is in accordance with his opinion? Does Menashya ben Menaĥem constitute the majority of the world? Since most people do not squeeze pomegranates, the practice of the people from the house of Menashya ben Menaĥem should be irrelevant relative to the typical practice of others.

Rav Naĥman answered: Yes, in cases of this kind, halakhic rulings are based even on practices that are not universal, as we learned in a mishna that addresses the prohibition of diverse kinds, particularly forbidden food crops in a vineyard. With regard to one who maintains thorns in a vineyard, Rabbi Eliezer says: He rendered the crops a forbidden mixture of food crops in a vineyard. And the Rabbis say: Only a crop that people typically maintain renders a vineyard forbidden. And Rabbi Hanina said: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer? Because in Arabia they maintain the thorns of the fields to feed them to their camels. There, thorns are treated as a bona fide crop. According to this opinion, since thorns are maintained in one place, they are considered to be significant everywhere. The same reasoning applies to the issue of juicing pomegranates.

The Gemara rejects this answer: Is this comparable? Arabia is a place, and a custom practiced in an entire country is significant. Here, with regard to the practice of the house of Menashya bar Menaĥem, who was an individual, his opinion is rendered irrelevant by the opinions of all other men.
Rather, this is the reason for Rav Nahman’s statement: It is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Hisdai, as Rav Hisdai said: In the case of beets that one squeezed and then placed their juice in a ritual bath, the juice invalidates the ritual bath if it causes a change of appearance. Any liquid that causes the water of a ritual bath to change color invalidates the ritual bath. Rav Hisdai elaborated: Aren’t beets typically not designated for squeezing? Rather, what have you to say? Since he ascribed it significance, it is considered a liquid. Here, too, with regard to pomegranates, since he ascribed it significance, it is considered a liquid. Even if one person ascribes significance to a liquid, it assumes for him the status of a liquid and is prohibited on Shabbat.

We learned in a mishna there, in tractate Mikvaot: If wine or vinegar or olive discharge, i.e., the liquid that comes from olives but is not oil, fell into a ritual bath and changed its appearance, the ritual bath is invalid.1 The Gemara asks: Who is the tanna who holds that olive discharge is considered liquid? Abaye said: It is Rabbi Yaakov, as it was taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yaakov says: The legal status of olive discharge is like that of a liquid.2 And what is the reason the Sages said that olive discharge that emerges at the outset, before one begins to press the olives for their oil, is ritually pure, meaning that it does not render food susceptible to ritual impurity? It is not because the olive discharge is not considered a liquid but because he does not want its existence; the owner would prefer that the olive discharge not yet emerge and instead emerge together with and mix with the oil.

Rabbi Shimon says: The legal status of olive discharge is not like that of a liquid. And what is the reason the Sages said that the olive sap that emerges from the bale of the olive press after the olives were pressed is capable of rendering foods susceptible to become ritually impure? Because it is impossible that it will not contain drops of oil that come with it from the olives.

The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference between them? They both agree that olive discharge that emerges at the outset is incapable of rendering foods susceptible to ritual impurity and that olive discharge that emerges from the bale of the olive press is capable of rendering food susceptible to ritual impurity. The Gemara answers: There is a practical difference between them with regard to olive discharge that comes after extensive pressing; according to Rabbi Yaakov, it is considered a liquid and renders food susceptible to ritual impurity, and according to Rabbi Shimon, it is not a liquid and does not render food susceptible to ritual impurity. Rava said: The reason that olive discharge invalidates a ritual bath is not because it is a liquid, but rather, because it is something with which one may not make a ritual bath ab initio, and it therefore invalidates a ritual bath if it causes a change of appearance.

Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: A person may squeeze a cluster of grapes on Shabbat into a pot with food in it,3 and it is not considered squeezing a liquid but rather adding one food to another; however, he may not squeeze the liquid into an empty bowl.4 Rav Hisdai said: From the statement of our Rabbi, Shmuel, we learn that one may milk a goat into a pot of food5 on Shabbat, because it is not considered to be the manner of squeezing that is prohibited as a subcategory of the labor of threshing; however, one may not do so into an empty bowl. The Gemara deduces: Apparently, he holds that liquid that comes into food is not considered liquid, but rather, it is food.

Invalidateing a ritual bath – חטאת מים: There are two ways that liquids that fall into a ritual bath can invalidate it. The first way is if the ritual bath does not contain its requisite volume of forty sa’ot, and three log or more of dramed water, or any other liquid like water, falls into it. The second way is if a liquid that cannot be used in a ritual bath is poured into a ritual bath that contains the requisite forty sa’ot and alters the color of the water.

A person may squeeze a cluster of grapes into a pot; however, he may not squeeze the liquid into an empty bowl – אל רמא רבא: בר אברך קדש לש עצים לים ו 국회 יין. The commentaries explain that the prohibition against squeezing juice, which is a subcategory of the labor of threshing, primarily involves separating food from waste. However, the parts of the grapes that remain after juicing are considered waste only if the intent was to use the grapes exclusively for their juice. Therefore, if one squeezes juice from grapes into another food, it is merely considered a form of food preparation in which one transmutes food, i.e., the grapes, into another dish. The difference between squeezing juice into a pot or into a bowl is that there is food in the pot. When the juice is squeezed into a pot of food, the juice becomes part of that food. It is considered food that was merely separated from its original source. On the other hand, if one squeezes the juice into an empty bowl, it is clear that the purpose is to remove the liquid from the fruit, which is prohibited (see Rav HAI Gaon).

NOTES

1. See Hilkhot Maftir 7:22.

2. See Hilkhot Maftir 7:22.


5. See Hilkhot Mikvaot 8:10; Sefer Tahara 320:4.

HALAKHA

Anything with which one may not make a ritual bath ab initio invalidates the ritual bath – מים גם בקערה אינן מתכוונות לזרע מיםدبש מים. If a substance that cannot be used to make a ritual bath, such as wine, falls into a ritual bath and alters the appearance of the water, the ritual bath is invalid (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Mikvaot 7:1).

Liquids that invalidate a ritual bath – מים ו械זון: Wine, vinegar, and olive discharge that fall into a ritual bath and alter its appearance invalidate it (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Mikvaot 7:9; Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De’ah 201:25).

The legal status of olive discharge is like that of a liquid – מים جميعו אינן גזירה: Olive discharge that emerges from olives after they are pressed has the legal status of oil and is considered a liquid. It can become ritually impure and can render food susceptible to ritual impurity like other liquids. The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yaakov (Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumah Oidah 10:13).

A person may squeeze a cluster of grapes into a pot with food in it – בר אברך קדש לש עצים לים וحكوم: It is permitted to squeeze juice from grapes into a pot of food on Shabbat in order to improve the flavor of the food, as liquid that is squeezed from fruit directly into food is considered food. However, it is prohibited to squeeze grapes into a bowl without food, or into a vessel that contains only liquids (Shabbos 18:10; Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayim 320:4).

One may milk a goat into a pot of food – בר אברך קדש לים וحكوم: It is prohibited to milk an animal into an empty bowl on Shabbat and on a Festival. However, on a Festival, it is permitted to milk an animal designated for eating, provided the milk goes directly into a bowl of food to improve the food, or into a bowl with breadcrumbs that will absorb the milk. However, one may not milk all one’s animals into a bowl with just one piece of bread in it. Nowadays, several authorities take into consideration the discomfort animals experience when they are not milked and allow milking into utensils containing just one piece of bread (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 18:10; Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayim 320:5).
A zav who milks a goat, the milk is ritually impure – מָלֵא בִּגיְרָה. If a zav milks a goat, the milk is ritually impure from the very first drop (Rambam, Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Oholin 9:2).

HALAKHA

Rami bar Hama raised an objection from the following mishna: In the case of a zav who milks a goat, the milk is ritually impure whether or not the zav actually touched it, as a zav renders items ritually impure simply by moving them, or being moved by them, even without direct contact. And if you say that liquid that comes directly into food is food and not liquid, in the case of one who milked directly into a pot of food, the milk should be considered food. The halakha is that food cannot become ritually impure unless it is rendered susceptible to ritual impurity through contact with a liquid. With what liquid was this milk rendered susceptible to ritual impurity?

The Gemara answers: As Rabbi Yoḥanan said in a different context, that a particular statement is referring to the first drop, which is smeared on the top of the matzah in order to moisten it and facilitate nursing or milking, here too, it is rendered susceptible to ritual impurity by means of the drop which is smeared on the top of the matzah. This drop was not intended to fall into the pot of food and is therefore considered a liquid and renders the food susceptible to ritual impurity.

Ravina raised an objection based on what we learned in another mishna: In the case of one who is ritually impure with impurity imparted by a corpse who squeezed olives or grapes in the exact amount of an egg-bulk, the liquid is ritually pure. Even though the person touched the food, less than an egg-bulk of food cannot become ritually impure. Once the first drop of liquid is squeezed out, less than an egg-bulk of food remains, and it cannot render the liquid impure. By inference, if he squeezed more than an egg-bulk, the liquid is ritually impure. And if you say that liquid that comes into food is considered food, in what manner was this liquid rendered susceptible to ritual impurity? He raised the objection and he resolved it: It is referring to a case where one squeezes into an empty bowl, in which case the juice is considered a liquid.

HALAKHA

One who smooths by squeezing grapes – הַמְחֲלִי. Most of the commentaries on the Mishna explain the case differently, and a similar approach appears in the Jerusalem Talmud: The mishna is not discussing loaves of bread but cakes of pressed figs onto which one would pour grape juice. Some commentators state that most of this liquid is lost, since it is not absorbed by the figs. Other authorities explain that the juice is intended to provide the figs with a polished sheen rather than to be consumed (see Rambam’s Commentary on the Mishna, and other commentaries).

Everyone agrees… is not food – לָאוֹכֶל. The gemara had a variant text with an opposite formulation: Everyone agrees that… is food. Most commentaries agree that the Gemara reads better according to Rashi’s version. However, the halakha is in accordance with the text of the gemara (Rashi).

One who cuts olives – הַמְלַכְלֶכֶת. If one cuts olives with ritually impure hands, the olives are rendered susceptible to ritual impurity by the liquid that seeps out. They also become ritually impure, because cutting them completes their processing and they are then considered food, which can become ritually impure. However, if one cut them to salt them or to check if they have oil, they are not rendered susceptible to ritual impurity (Rambam, Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Oholin 1:14).

HALAKHA

Rabbi Yirmeya said: The question of whether liquid squeezed directly from one food into another is considered liquid or food is parallel to the following dispute between tanna’im. We learned in a mishna: In the case of one who smooths bread before baking it by squeezing grapes onto it, the bread was not rendered susceptible to ritual impurity. Rabbi Yehuda says: It was rendered susceptible to ritual impurity. What, do they not disagree about this? One Sage held that liquid that comes into food is food, and therefore it cannot render bread susceptible to ritual impurity, and one Sage held that it is not food but rather a liquid, and therefore it renders the bread susceptible to ritual impurity.

Rabbi Pappa said that the disputes are not necessarily parallel; it can be explained that everyone agrees that liquid that comes into food is food, and here they disagree with regard to liquid that goes to waste, as the liquid that dripped onto the bread eventually evaporates due to the heat of the oven. One Sage, Rabbi Yehuda, held that it is nonetheless a liquid and therefore can render the bread susceptible to ritual impurity, and one Sage held that it is not a liquid. And they disagree in the dispute between these tanna’im, as it was taught in a baraita: In the case of one who cuts olives with soiled, i.e., ritually impure, hands, the olives are rendered susceptible to ritual impurity through the liquid that comes from them, and his hands render the olives ritually impure. If he cut them in order to dip them in salt, the olives are not rendered susceptible to ritual impurity, because if that liquid emerged from the olives against the owner’s will, the liquid cannot render food susceptible to ritual impurity.