

שְׁלֵא לְרִצּוֹן – שְׂדֵם מִגְּפֶתֶה טְהוֹר! אָמַר לְהֵן מַחְמִיר אֲנִי בְּחֶלֶב מִבְּדָם, שֶׁהַחֹלֵב לְרִפּוּאָה – טָמֵא, וְהַמִּקְוִי לְרִפּוּאָה – טְהוֹר. אָמְרוּ לוֹ: סְלִי זֵיתִים וְעֵנָבִים יוֹכִיחוּ, שֶׁהַמִּשְׁקִין הַיּוֹצְאִין מִהֵן לְרִצּוֹן – טָמֵאִין, שְׁלֵא לְרִצּוֹן – טְהוֹרִים.

מֵאִי לָאוּ לְרִצּוֹן? – דְּנִחָא לִיה, "שְׁלֵא לְרִצּוֹן" בְּסֵתְמָא, וּמָה זֵיתִים וְעֵנָבִים דְּבִנֵי סְחִיטָה נִינְהוּ – שְׁלֵא לְרִצּוֹן וְלֹא בְּלוּם, תּוֹתִים וְרַמּוּנִים דְּלֹא בְּנֵי סְחִיטָה נִינְהוּ לֹא כָּל שְׁבִין?

לֹא, "לְרִצּוֹן" – בְּסֵתְמָא, "שְׁלֵא לְרִצּוֹן" – דְּגִלִי אֲדַעְתִּיהּ, דְּאָמַר "לֹא נִחָא לִי". וְאִיבְעִית אֵימָא: שְׂאֲנִי סְלִי זֵיתִים וְעֵנָבִים, בֵּין דְּלֵאִיבּוֹד קָיִימִי – מַעֲיָקְרָא אֶפְקוּרִי מִפְּקָרִי לְהֵן.

אֲשַׁבְּחֵן רַבִּי יְהוּדָה דְּמוּדֵי לְרִבְנָן בְּזֵיתִים וְבְעֵנָבִים. רַבְּנָן דְּמוּדוּ לִיה לְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה בְּשַׂר פִּירוֹת מְנָלָן? – דְּתַנְיָא: סוֹחֲטִין

if it was expressed **unintentionally**, as the **blood of its wound is ritually pure**,<sup>H</sup> 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**,<sup>N</sup> 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**,<sup>H</sup> the status of the blood is not that of a liquid and is **ritually pure**,<sup>N</sup> 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 them**<sup>H</sup> **volitionally** renders food susceptible to **ritual impurity**.<sup>N</sup> However, liquid that seeps from them **unvolitionally**<sup>N</sup> 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, is it 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**

NOTES

**Blood and milk – דָּם וְחֹלֵב** – The Sages listed seven liquids that render susceptible to ritual impurity foods with which they come into contact: Water, dew, wine, blood, oil, honey, and milk. The inclusion of each liquid on this list is derived either from explicit verses or by means of the hermeneutic principles. The Sages included milk because it is similar to blood in that both emerge from people. Indeed, the Sages taught that in certain cases blood becomes turbid and becomes milk. However, Rabbi Akiva stated that there is a specific verse that proves milk is a liquid in this regard and that there is no connection between the *halakhot* of milk and blood. His proof is that there are cases where milk is treated more stringently than blood. Therefore, milk is not considered a type of blood.

**If one lets blood for medicinal purposes, the blood is ritually pure – הַמִּקְוִי לְרִפּוּאָה טְהוֹר** – The *Me'iri* explains that these *halakhot* apply to human blood as well. According to this opinion, not all blood renders food susceptible to ritual impurity. Only blood from a corpse renders food susceptible to ritual impurity.

**Baskets of olives and grapes...liquid that seeps from them volitionally renders food susceptible to ritual impurity – סְלִי זֵיתִים וְעֵנָבִים...שֶׁהַמִּשְׁקִין הַיּוֹצְאִין מִהֵן לְרִצּוֹן – טָמֵאִין**: Although the Sages taught that liquid that seeps from baskets of grapes renders food susceptible to ritual impurity, this was an additional rabbinic decree dealing with situations where one harvests grapes in baskets lined with tar, from which the liquid does not escape. It is only due to this consideration that the decree was issued (Rashba).

**Volitionally and unvolitionally – לְרִצּוֹן וְשְׁלֵא לְרִצּוֹן**: There are two aspects to the concept of volition with regard to rendering food susceptible to ritual impurity. The first aspect is the owner's approval at the time that the liquid renders the food susceptible to ritual impurity. The liquid has this effect only if it makes contact with the food with the owner's knowledge and approval. If it fell on the food accidentally, without the owner's knowledge, it does not render food ritually impure. The second aspect concerns liquids other than water. The Torah only mentions water, and all other liquids render food susceptible to ritual impurity due to their similarity to water based on derivations from verses. Therefore, all other liquids have the legal status of water only if they became liquids through the owner's volition. If that is not the case, their legal status is not that of water and they do not render food susceptible to ritual impurity. The dispute between Rabbi Akiva and the Rabbis relates to this second requirement.

HALAKHA

**שְׂדֵם מִגְּפֶתֶה טְהוֹר** – 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 – הַמִּקְוִי לְרִפּוּאָה**: 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 – מִשְׁקֵי זֵיתִים וְעֵנָבִים**: 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* 1:2).

NOTES

Does Menashya ben Menaḥem constitute the majority of the world – מְנַשְׂיָא בֶּן מְנַחֵם הוּא רִבְיָא דְעָלְמָא: The discussion concerns the following question: Is the behavior of individuals, e.g., those who squeeze pomegranates, irrelevant in determining *halakha* for the general population? Or is the fact that some individuals act in a certain way enough of a factor to determine that that conduct or practice is normative?

Food crops in a vineyard – כִּלְאֵי הַכֶּרֶם: 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 – דְּעֵרְבֵיָא אַרְבִּיא: Rashba adds that Arabia is a place where people commonly raise camels, and their custom is to cultivate thorns as camel fodder. Consequently, the custom in Arabia should impact the assessment of normative behavior in places where people raise camels. On the other hand, there was no particular reason for the custom of the people of the house of Menashya bar Menaḥem, and therefore their personal preferences are irrelevant in determining general halakhic norms.

HALAKHA

Thorns in a vineyard – קוֹצִים בַּכֶּרֶם: If plants that are not generally cultivated grow on their own in a vineyard, and most people in that area do not sustain those plants, they do not constitute a forbidden food crop in a vineyard. This is so even if the owner of the vineyard wants to use them to feed his animals and the like, in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Kilayim* 5:18; *Shulḥan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 296:14).

בְּפִגְעֵינוּ וּבְפִרְשֵׁינוּ וּבְעוֹרְרֵינוּ, אֲבָל לֹא בְּרִמּוֹנִים. וְשֵׁל בֵּית מְנַשְׂיָא בְּרִמּוֹנִים הִי סוֹחֲטִין בְּרִמּוֹנִים.

וּמֵמַאי דְרַבְנָן הִיא, דִּילְמָא רַבִּי יְהוּדָה הִיא? וְתַהּוּי נַמְי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, אִימַר דְּשִׁמְעַתָּ לִיה לְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה יֵצְאוּ מֵעֲצָמָן, סוֹחֲטִין לְכַתְחִילָהּ מִי שִׁמְעַתָּ לִיה? אֲלֵא מָאִי אֵית לָךְ לְמִימַר – בִּין דְּלָאוּ בְּנֵי סַחֲיטָה נִגְהוּ – אֲפִילוּ לְכַתְחִילָהּ; אֲפִילוּ תִימָא רַבְנָן, בִּין דְּלָאוּ בְּנֵי סַחֲיטָה נִגְהוּ – אֲפִילוּ לְכַתְחִילָהּ. שְׁמַע מִינָהּ: רַבְנָן הִיא, שְׁמַע מִינָהּ.

”שֵׁל בֵּית מְנַשְׂיָא בְּרִמּוֹנִים הִי סוֹחֲטִין בְּרִמּוֹנִים.” אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן: הֲלֹכָה בְּשֵׁל בֵּית מְנַשְׂיָא בְּרִמּוֹנִים.

אָמַר לִיה רַבָּא לְרַב נַחֲמָן: מְנַשְׂיָא בֶּן מְנַחֵם תִּנְא הוּא?! וְכִי תִימָא “הֲלֹכָה כִּי הִיא תִנְא דְסָבַר לָהּ כְּשֵׁל מְנַשְׂיָא בֶּן מְנַחֵם”, וּמִשׁוּם דְּסָבַר כְּמְנַשְׂיָא בֶּן מְנַחֵם הֲלֹכָה כְּמוֹתוֹ? מְנַשְׂיָא בֶּן מְנַחֵם הוּא רִבְיָא דְעָלְמָא?!

אִין, דְתַנְן: הַמְקַיִּים קוֹצִים בַּכֶּרֶם, רַבִּי אֶלְיעֶזֶר אוֹמַר: קִדְשׁ, וְחֻכְמִים אוֹמְרִים: אִינוּ מְקַדְּשׁ אֲלֵא דְבַר שְׂכֻמוֹהוּ מְקַיִּימִין. וְאָמַר רַבִּי חֲנִינָא: מָאִי טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי אֶלְיעֶזֶר – שְׁבִין בְּעֵרְבֵיָא מְקַיִּימִין קוֹצֵי שְׂדוֹת לְגַמְלֵיהֶם.

מִדֵּי אִירָיָא; דְּעֵרְבֵיָא – אַתְרָא, הָכָא – בְּטִלָּה דְעֵתוֹ אֲצֵל בָּל אָדָם!

plums and quinces and crab apples. However, one may not squeeze pomegranates, because they are typically squeezed for their juice, as people from the house of Menashya bar Menaḥem would squeeze pomegranates during the week. Apparently, the Rabbis concede to Rabbi Yehuda with regard to fruits other than pomegranates and mulberries.

The Gemara objects: **And from where** is it ascertained that this *baraita* is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis? **Perhaps it is** in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. The Gemara answers: **And let this baraita also be the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda: Say that you heard that according to Rabbi Yehuda, juice that seeped out on its own is permitted; did you hear that squeezing it is permitted *ab initio*? Rather, what have you to say? Since they are not fruits that are generally designated for squeezing, it is permitted to squeeze them even *ab initio*.** That being the case, **even if you say** the *baraita* is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, the same reasoning applies: **Since they are not generally designated for squeezing, it is permitted to squeeze them even *ab initio*.** Even the Rabbis would permit squeezing fruits such as plums, quinces, and crab apples. Since the *baraita* does not permit squeezing pomegranates, **learn from it** that the *baraita* is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis. The Gemara concludes: **Indeed, learn from it.**

It was taught in the *baraita* cited above that people from the house of Menashya bar Menaḥem 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 Naḥman said: The halakha is in accordance with the practice of the people from the house of Menashya bar Menaḥem.** In other words, squeezing pomegranates is considered typical, and therefore it is prohibited on Shabbat.

Rava said to Rav Naḥman: Is Menashya ben Menaḥem a *tanna* that you say the *halakha* is in accordance with his opinion? **And if you say** that Rav Naḥman 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 Menaḥem, 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 Menaḥem, the halakha is in accordance with his opinion?** Does Menashya ben Menaḥem constitute the majority of the world?<sup>N</sup> Since most people do not squeeze pomegranates, the practice of the people from the house of Menashya ben Menaḥem should be irrelevant relative to the typical practice of others.

Rav Naḥman 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,<sup>H</sup> **Rabbi Eliezer says: He rendered the crops a forbidden mixture of food crops in a vineyard.**<sup>N</sup> **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,<sup>N</sup> and a custom practiced in an entire country is significant. Here,** with regard to the practice of the house of Menashya bar Menaḥem, who was an individual, **his opinion is rendered irrelevant by the opinions of all other men.**

**Invalidating a ritual bath – פְּסִילַת הַמְּקוּהָ:** 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 *se'a*, and three *log* or more of drawn 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 *se'a* 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 – **סוּחַט אֲדָם אֲשֶׁבּוּל שֶׁל עֵנְבִים לְתוֹךְ הַקֶּדְרָה, אֲבָל לֹא – לְתוֹךְ הַקְּעָרָה:** 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 transfers 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).

## HALAKHA

Anything with which one may not make a ritual bath *ab initio* invalidates the ritual bath – **וְכָל דְּבַר שְׂאִין עוֹשִׂין מִמֶּנּוּ – מְקוּהָ לְכַתְּחִילָה פּוֹסֵל אֶת הַמְּקוּהָ:** 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, Hilkhhot Mikvaot* 7:1).

**Liquids that invalidate a ritual bath – מְשָׁקִים הַפּוֹסְלִים – מְקוּהָ:** Wine, vinegar, and olive discharge that fall into a ritual bath and alter its appearance invalidate it (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Mikvaot* 7:9; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 201:25).

The legal status of olive discharge is like that of a liquid – **מוֹחַל הָרִי הוּא כְּמִשְׁקָה:** 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 Ya'akov (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhhot Tumat Okhalin* 10:13).

A person may squeeze a cluster of grapes into a pot with food in it – **סוּחַט אֲדָם אֲשֶׁבּוּל שֶׁל עֵנְבִים לְתוֹךְ הַקֶּדְרָה –** 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 (*Hashlama; Me'iri*; Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhhot Shabbat* 8:10; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 320:4).

**חֹלֵב אֲדָם עַל – לְתוֹךְ הַקֶּדְרָה:** 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, Hilkhhot Shabbat* 8:10; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 505).

אֶלָּא, הֵינּוּ טַעְמָא כְּדַרְבַּי חֲסִידָא; דְּאָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: תְּרִדִין שְׂסַחֲטִין וְנִתְּנָן בְּמִקְוֵה – פּוֹסְלִין אֶת הַמְּקוּהָ בְּשִׁינוּי מְרָאָה. וְהָא לֹא בְּנִי סְחִיטָה נִיגְוָה! אֶלָּא מֵאֵי אֵיִת לָךְ לְמִימַר – כִּינּוּ דְאַחֲשָׁבִינְהוּ – הָוֵה לְהוּ מִשְׁקָה. הֲכֵא נִמְי כִּינּוּ דְאַחֲשָׁבִינְהוּ הָוֵה לְהוּ מִשְׁקָה.

רַב פַּפָּא אָמַר: מִשּׁוּם דְּהוּי דְּבַר שְׂאִין עוֹשִׂין מִמֶּנּוּ מְקוּהָ לְכַתְּחִילָה, וְכָל דְּבַר שְׂאִין עוֹשִׂין מִמֶּנּוּ מְקוּהָ לְכַתְּחִילָה – פּוֹסֵל אֶת הַמְּקוּהָ בְּשִׁינוּי מְרָאָה.

תַּנּוּן הָתָם: נִפְּל לְתוֹכוֹ יַיִן אוֹ חוֹמֶץ וּמוֹחַל וְשִׁינוּי מְרָאָיו – פְּסוּל. מֵאֵן תֵּנָא דְמוֹחַל מִשְׁקָה הוּא? אָמַר אַבְי: רַבִּי יַעֲקֹב הִיא. דְּתַנְיָא, רַבִּי יַעֲקֹב אוֹמַר: מוֹחַל הָרִי הוּא כְּמִשְׁקָה. וְכֵּן טַעַם אָמְרוּ "מוֹחַל הַיּוֹצֵא בְּתַחֲלָה טָהוֹר" – לְפִי שְׂאִינוֹ רוֹצֵה בְּקִיּוּמוֹ.

רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אוֹמַר: מוֹחַל אֵינוֹ כְּמִשְׁקָה, וְכֵּן טַעַם אָמְרוּ "מוֹחַל הַיּוֹצֵא מִעִיקוּל בֵּית הַבַּד טָמֵא" – לְפִי שְׂאִי אֲפָשָׁר לוֹ בְּלֹא צִיחָצוּחֵי שְׁמֹן.

מֵאֵי בִינְיָהוּ? אֵיכָא בִינְיָהוּ דְאֵתִי בְּתַר אֵיצְצָתָא. רַבָּא אָמַר: מִשּׁוּם דְּהוּי דְּבַר שְׂאִין עוֹשִׂין הֵימְנוּ מְקוּהָ, וּפּוֹסֵל אֶת הַמְּקוּהָ בְּשִׁינוּי מְרָאָה.

אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׂמוּאֵל: סוּחַט אֲדָם אֲשֶׁבּוּל שֶׁל עֵנְבִים לְתוֹךְ הַקֶּדְרָה, אֲבָל לֹא לְתוֹךְ הַקְּעָרָה. אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא, מְדַבְּרֵי רַבִּינוּ גַּלְמֹד: חֹלֵב אֲדָם עַל לְתוֹךְ הַקֶּדְרָה, אֲבָל לֹא לְתוֹךְ הַקְּעָרָה. אֲלֵמָא קִסְבַּר: מִשְׁקָה הֲבֵא לְאוֹכֵל – אוֹכֵל הוּא.

Rather, this is the reason for Rav Naḥman's statement: It is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Hisda, as Rav Hisda said: In the case of beets that one squeezed and then placed their juice in a ritual bath, the juice invalidates the ritual bath<sup>n</sup> 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 Hisda 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.

Rav Pappa said that the reason Rav Hisda ruled that beet juice invalidates the ritual bath is because it is something with which one may not make a ritual bath *ab initio*, and there is a principle: Anything with which one may not make a ritual bath *ab initio*, i.e., anything other than water, snow, or ice, invalidates the ritual bath<sup>h</sup> if it causes a change of appearance, even if it does not have the legal status of a liquid.

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.<sup>h</sup> The Gemara asks: Who is the *tanna* who holds that olive discharge is considered liquid? Abaye said: It is Rabbi Ya'akov, as it was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Ya'akov says: The legal status of olive discharge is like that of a liquid.<sup>h</sup> 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 food 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 Ya'akov, 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,<sup>h</sup> 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.<sup>n</sup> Rav Hisda said: From the statement of our Rabbi, Shmuel, we learn that one may milk a goat into a pot of food<sup>h</sup> 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.

**HALAKHA**

A *zav* who milks a goat, the milk is ritually impure – **הַחֵלֵב טָמֵא וְזֶבֶד שְׁחֹלֵב אֶת הָעֵז**: If a *zav* milks a goat, the milk is ritually impure from the very first drop (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Okhalin* 9:2).

מְתִיב רַמִּי בַר חָמָא: זֶבֶד שְׁחֹלֵב אֶת הָעֵז – הַחֵלֵב טָמֵא וְאִי אָמַרְתָּ “מִשְׁקָה הֵבֵא לְאוֹכְלֵי אֹכֵל הוּא – בְּמֵאֵי אֵיִתְבָּשֵׂר?

כְּדָאֵמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: בְּטִיפָה הַמְּלוֹכֶלֶת עַל פִּי הַדֵּד. הֵבֵא נְמִי: בְּטִיפָה הַמְּלוֹכֶלֶת עַל פִּי הַדֵּד.

מְתִיב רַבִּינָא: טָמֵא מֵת שְׁפָחַט זֵיתִים וְעֵנָבִים.

Rami bar Ḥama raised an objection from the following mishna: In the case of a *zav* who milks a goat, the milk is ritually impure<sup>h</sup> 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 teat** 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 teat**. 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**

Perek XXII  
Daf 145 Amud a

**NOTES**

One who smooths by squeezing grapes – **הַמְחֲלִיק** – **דְּכוּלֵי עֵלְמָא... לֹא אוֹכֵל** – The *ge'onim* 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 commentaries 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 – **דְּכוּלֵי עֵלְמָא... לֹא אוֹכֵל** – The *ge'onim* 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 *ge'onim* (Rashba).

**HALAKHA**

One who cuts olives – **הַמְפַצֵּעַ בְּזֵיתִים** – 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 Okhalin* 11:14).

כְּבִיצָה מְכוּוֹנֶת – טָהוּר. הָא אֵי יוֹתֵר מְכַבֵּיצָה – טָמֵא. וְאִי אָמַרְתָּ “מִשְׁקָה הֵבֵא לְאוֹכְלֵי אֹכֵל הוּא” בְּמֵאֵי אֵיִתְבָּשֵׂר? הוּא מוֹתֵיב לָהּ וְהוּא מְפָרֵק לָהּ: בְּסוֹחֵט לְתוֹךְ הַקַּעֲרָה.

אָמַר רַבִּי יִרְמְיָה: כִּתְנָאִי: הַמְחֲלִיק בְּעֵנָבִים – לֹא הוֹכֵשֵׁר, רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר: הוֹכֵשֵׁר. מֵאֵי לֹא בָּהֵא קָמִיפְלִגִּי. מִרְ סָבַר: מִשְׁקָה הֵבֵא לְאוֹכֵל – אוֹכֵל הוּא, וְיָמַר סָבַר: לֹא אוֹכֵל הוּא.

אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא: דְּכוּלֵי עֵלְמָא – מִשְׁקָה הֵבֵא לְאוֹכֵל – לֹא אוֹכֵל הוּא. וְהָכֵא – בְּמִשְׁקָה הֵבֵא לְאֵיבוּד קָמִיפְלִגִּי. מִרְ סָבַר: מִשְׁקָה הוּא, וְיָמַר סָבַר: לֹא מִשְׁקָה הוּא. וּבְפִלְגֵי תַּנְיָא דְהֵי תַנְיָא, דְתַנְיָא: הַמְפַצֵּעַ בְּזֵיתִים בְּיָדִים מְסוּאָבוֹת – הוֹכֵשֵׁר, לְסוֹפְתָן בְּמִלְחָה – לֹא הוֹכֵשֵׁר.

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.

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<sup>n</sup> 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.**

Rav Pappa said that the disputes are not necessarily parallel; it can be explained that **everyone agrees that liquid that comes into food is not food,<sup>n</sup> 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<sup>h</sup> 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.**