

CHAVRUTA

SHABBAT – DAF KUF MEM HEH

Translated by: *Chavruta staff of scholars*
Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

(Ravina posed a contradiction, from a Baraita: Someone impure from a corpse who squeezed olives and grapes) that had like an exact volume of an egg, the juice that comes from them is pure.

The case is that the impure person did not touch the juice itself, but only the olives or grapes which became impure. The moment the first drop emerged, the impure fruit no longer had an egg volume, and therefore it could not impart impurity to the juice coming out.¹

But if the olives and grapes **are more than exactly like an egg** volume, the juice that comes from them is **impure**. Because then the fruit has an egg-volume even after the juice begins to come out, and makes the emerging juice impure.

But if you say that liquid that comes into food is considered food and not liquid, this is problematic. Because **with what did it** (the juice that comes out) **become prepared** (*huchshar*) to contract impurity? Apparently, nothing that is considered a liquid touched it, to make it susceptible to impurity.

He (Ravina) **asked** the contradiction, **and he answered it:** The case **concerns squeezing into an empty plate**. Thus the liquid is not coming onto food, and is indeed considered a liquid.

Said Rabbi Yirmeyah: The issue of whether liquid squeezed onto food is considered as food or not is a **disagreement between Tanna'im:**

¹ Because only food of at least an egg-volume can impart impurity to other food and drink.

PEREK 22 – 145A

Because it is taught in the Mishnah (disagreement #1): **Someone** (a baker) **who smoothes** the surface of dough **with** juice of **grapes**, it (the dough) **is not prepared** (*huchshar*) by this to contract impurity.²

Rabbi Yehudah says: It is prepared to contract impurity. (End of disagreement #1)

Do they not differ over this: That **one master** (the first Tanna) **holds** that **a liquid that comes onto food is** considered **food**, and therefore the grape juice here cannot prepare the dough to contract impurity. **And** the other **master** (Rabbi Yehudah) **holds that** liquid that comes onto food **it is not** considered **food** but liquid. And therefore it does prepare the dough.

Said Rav Papa: No! We can say that **they all hold that a liquid that comes onto food is not** considered **food**. **And here they are arguing about liquid** (for example the grape juice here) **that will go to waste**. For the fire baking the dough draws out the grape juice and burns it.

One master (Rabbi Yehudah) **holds that it is** considered a **liquid**. **And one master** (the first Tanna) **holds that it is not** considered a **liquid**.

*

And they (in disagreement #1) are differing over **the same disagreement of these other Tannaim** of the following Baraita (disagreement #2):

Because it was taught in a Baraita (disagreement #2): **Someone who softens olives with impure hands, they** (the olives) **are prepared** to contract impurity through the liquid that comes out from them and becomes impure from his hands, because the person wants that liquid, since it adds taste to the olives. (The rule is that liquid only prepares food for impurity if one wants the liquid to be on the food).

But if he softens the olives in order **to cover them with salt** because salt sticks better on soft olives, **they** (the olives) **do not become prepared** to contract impurity, because the

² And the dough was needed with something that does not prepare it for impurity, e.g. fruit juice.

PEREK 22 – 145A

person does not want the liquid to come out, since it does not make the salt stick on better.

And if he softened the olives **to know if his olives reached** enough ripeness **to harvest** them **or not, they do not become prepared** to contract impurity.

Rabbi Yehudah says: In the last case **it** (the olive) **is prepared** to contract impurity. (End of disagreement #2)

Are they (the first Tanna and Rabbi Yehudah in disagreement #2) **not differing over this?** For one **master** (Rabbi Yehudah) **holds that liquid that will go to waste** (since the liquid that comes out when the person examines the olives will never be used) **is considered liquid.**

And one master (the first Tanna) **holds that it is not a liquid.** And this is the same as disagreement #1.

Said Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua: No! Disagreements # 1 and #2 are not the same.

Although **these Tannaim** of disagreement #2 are differing **about liquid that will go to waste**, as you said, **those Tannaim** of disagreement #1 are not arguing about liquid that will go to waste. For the grape juice on the dough does not get completely burnt. **They are differing over liquid that is used to make something** (the dough) **shiny**—whether is considered liquid or not.

The first Tanna holds that even if liquid that comes onto food is considered liquid, that is because one is using it to moisten the food, Thus the juice is being used as a liquid. But if one uses liquid merely to make food shiny, it is considered like food and does not prepare food to contract impurity.

Said Rabbi Zeira said Rabbi Chiya bar Ashi said Rav: A man may squeeze a bunch of grapes into a pot of food, **but not into a plate** without food (as was learnt on the

PEREK 22 – 145A

previous *daf*). **But** one may squeeze out a **fish from its brine even into a plate** because the brine is considered food and not liquid. And removing food from food is not included in the prohibition of separating.

*

Rav Dimi sat and said this ruling.

Said Abaye to Rav Dimi: You teach it in Rav's name, and therefore it is not difficult for you. There is no contradiction.

But **we teach it in Shmuel's name, and therefore it is difficult for us** to explain, because it leads to a contradiction.

Did Shmuel really say that one may squeeze out a **fish from its brine even into a plate?**

But it was stated: If someone squeezed pickled vegetables, Rav says: If this is done for the purpose of the vegetable **itself**, that it should be less soggy, it is **permitted**. Since one does not want the liquid this is not considered separating.

But if one squeezed them **for their liquid**, indeed one is **exempt** from bringing a sin offering (because Torah-forbidden separating only applies to liquid that grew inside a fruit etc., since it is derived from the work of Threshing, where one removes wheat from its husk). But **it is** nevertheless Rabbinically **forbidden** to squeeze pickles for their juice, because people might end up squeezing olives and grapes.

And stewed vegetables, whether one squeezes them **for themselves, or for their liquid**, it is **permitted**, because the liquid inside is not considered liquid but food (since cooking makes the liquid more a part of the food than pickling does), and separating does not apply to food from food.

And Shmuel said: Both pickled vegetables and stewed vegetables, for themselves it is **permitted**, whereas **for their liquid** one is **exempt** but it is Rabbinically **forbidden**. This is because in Shmuel's view, even liquid inside cooked vegetables is considered liquid.

PEREK 22 – 145A

The contradiction that emerges is: Abaye previously said according to Shmuel that one may squeeze out brine in which fish was cooked. But this brine is exactly the same as the liquid in stewed vegetables that Shmuel forbids one to squeeze out. Thus Shmuel seemingly contradicts himself.

*

He (Rav Dimi) **said to him** (Abaye): You are right that if the statement concerning fish brine was in Shmuel's name, there is a contradiction. But I swear **by G-d** that “**my eyes saw and not the eyes of a stranger**” that **Rav** made the statement about fish brine, and not Shmuel.

Because **I heard it** (this statement) **from the mouth of Rabbi Yirmeyah, and Rabbi Yirmeyah** heard it **from Rabbi Zeira, and Rabbi Zeira from Rav Chiya bar Ashi, and Rav Chiya bar Ashi from Rav**. And Rav holds that stewed vegetables (to which we compared fish brine) can be squeezed for themselves or for their liquid, because their juice is not considered liquid.

Regarding the above-mentioned statement **itself**:

If someone squeezed pickled vegetables: 1) **Rav says:** If this is done **for** the purpose of the vegetable **itself**, it is **permitted**. Since one does not want the liquid, this is not considered separating.

But if one squeezed them **for their liquid**, although one is **exempt** from bringing a sin offering, **it is nevertheless forbidden** by the Sages so that people don't end up squeezing olives and grapes.

And stewed vegetables, whether one squeezes them **for themselves or for their liquid**, it is **permitted**.

2) **And Shmuel said: Both pickled vegetables and stewed vegetables, for themselves** it is **permitted, for their liquid** one is **exempt** from a sin offering **but** it is **forbidden**.

PEREK 22 – 145A

3) **Rabbi Yochanan said: Both pickled vegetables and stewed vegetables, for themselves it is permitted** because one is not interested in the liquid, but **for their liquid** one is **liable to bring a sin offering**.

Rabbi Yochanan agrees here with Shmuel that the liquid of cooked vegetables is considered liquid and not food. But he disagrees with both Rav and Shmuel, and holds that separating applies even when the liquid originally entered the food from elsewhere. Therefore he holds that one must bring a sin offering if one wanted the liquid the was squeezed out.

*

They the scholars of the study hall **contradicted them** all, from a Baraita that says: **One may squeeze pickled vegetables on Shabbat for Shabbat needs, but not for the needs of the evening after Shabbat**, because one is not allowed to prepare on Shabbat for a weekday.

And one may not squeeze olives and grapes even for Shabbat, and if one did squeeze them one is liable to bring a sin offering.

The Baraita seems to say that one can squeeze pickled vegetables for Shabbat, no matter whether one does this for the vegetable itself or for its liquid. This is **difficult for Rav, difficult for Shmuel, and difficult for Rabbi Yochanan** because they all forbid squeezing pickled vegetables for liquid.

The Gemara answers: **Rav answers according to his rationale, and Shmuel answers according to his rationale, and Rabbi Yochanan answers according to his rationale.**

*

Rav answers according to his rationale, that this is what the Baraita is saying:

One may squeeze pickled vegetables on Shabbat for the purpose of Shabbat, but not for the evening after Shabbat. When is this said? If one squeezes them **for the sake of the vegetables themselves. But** if one squeezes them for **their liquid**, one is **exempt but** it is Rabbinically **forbidden**.

PEREK 22 – 145A

And stewed vegetables, whether for themselves or whether for their liquid, it is permitted.

And one may not squeeze olives and grapes even for Shabbat, and if one did squeeze them, one is liable to bring a sin offering.

*

And Shmuel answers according to his rationale, that this is what the Baraita is saying:

One may squeeze pickled vegetables on Shabbat for the purpose of Shabbat, and the same thing applies to stewed vegetables.

When is this said? If one squeezes them **for** the vegetables **themselves**. **But** if one squeezes them for **their liquid**, one is **exempt**, **but** it is Rabbinically **forbidden**.

And one may not squeeze olives and grapes even for Shabbat, and if one did squeeze them, one is liable to bring a sin offering.

*

And Rabbi Yochanan answers according to his rationale, that this is what the Baraita is saying:

One may squeeze pickled vegetables on Shabbat for Shabbat, but not for the evening after Shabbat. Both pickled vegetables and stewed vegetables are the same regarding this.

When is this said? If one squeezes them **for** the vegetables **themselves**. **But one may not squeeze them for their liquid. And if one did squeeze them for their liquid, it is considered as if one squeezed olives and grapes, and one is liable to bring a sin offering.**

Said Rav Chiya bar Ashi said Rav: According to the Torah, one is only liable³ for transgressing the Torah prohibition of separating **for squeezing olives and grapes. But**

³ I.e. obligated to bring a sin-offering.

PEREK 22 – 145B

concerning other fruits, it is not usual to squeeze them for juice, so there is only a Rabbinical prohibition.

And so it was taught in the House of Menashya: According to the Torah, one is only liable for squeezing olives and grapes.

Ammud Bet

And it was also taught in the House of Menashya: **A witness** testifying **from** what he heard another **witness** say outside the Court, **is only valid for testimony** concerning a **woman**. He is only valid for this case **alone**, to testify that her husband died.⁴

*

Introduction: A firstborn (*bechor*) of a cow, sheep or goat has to be given to a kohen and the kohen sacrifices it in the Temple and eats its meat. Although a firstborn with a blemish reverts to being like a regular animal, if a kohen made the blemish to save himself the trouble of sacrificing the animal, the Sages penalized him that he may not eat it, because it is forbidden to make blemishes on sacrifices.

If the animal is found to have a blemish after it was given to the kohen, the kohen must produce witnesses to testify that the blemish came of itself and that he did not inflict it deliberately. For this purpose even one witness, even who is normally disqualified to testify (for example a woman), is sufficient.

*

Thus **they posed an inquiry: What is the law of a witness** saying what he heard **from the mouth of another witness, concerning a firstborn** that was given to a kohen and found to have a blemish? Are we lenient concerning this, just as we are lenient to allow one witness and a woman witness?

⁴ So that women should not be left in limbo due to a missing husband, the Sages ordained—even though the Torah requires two witnesses to testify, and even though the Torah invalidates a witness testifying what he heard from another witness—that we waive these two requirements. This is a special leniency.

PEREK 22 – 145B

The Gemara answers: **Rav forbids** such a firstborn.

And Rav Asi permits it.

Said Rav Ami to Rav Asi: But it was taught in the House of Menashya: A witness from the mouth of a witness is only valid for the testimony of a woman. He is only valid for this case *alone*, to testify that her husband died.

Rav Asi answered: **Say** that this is what the House of Menashya mean: **A witness from the mouth of a witness is only valid for testimony that a woman is valid for, alone.** And a woman *is* allowed to testify concerning the blemished firstborn of a kohen, thus a witness from the mouth of a witness should be the same.

*

Rav Yeimar validated a witness from the mouth of a witness, for testimony of a firstborn, like Rav Asi's view.

Mereimar disagreed and disparagingly **called him** (Rav Yeimar): **“Yeimar, the one who permits firstborns.”**

Nevertheless, the Gemara concludes: **And the Halachah is: A witness from the mouth of a witness is valid for a firstborn animal.**

We learnt in our Mishnah: **“Honeycombs** that one crushed on Friday and it (the honey) came out by itself on Shabbat, it (the honey) is forbidden. And Rabbi Eliezer permits (it).”

When Rav Hoshaya came from Nahardea, he came and brought a Baraita in his hand that taught as follows:

Olives and grapes that one crushed on Friday, and it (the liquid) **went out by itself** on Shabbat, the liquid is Rabbinically **forbidden** to use that Shabbat.⁵

⁵ Even though it is not usual to squeeze crushed olives etc. and there seems no reason to make this decree out of the fear that people will squeeze olives and grapes on Shabbat, the rabbis decreed not to use juice that comes from crushed olives etc. because people might end up squeezing even non-crushed olives and grapes.

PEREK 22 – 145B

And Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Shimon permit using the juice because they hold that there is no such Rabbinical decree.

Said Rav Yosef to Rav Hoshaya: **Do you come to bring extra views** (lit. people)? We already have exactly the same disagreement in the Mishnah concerning honeycombs, and all you have done is add that Rabbi Shimon holds like Rabbi Eliezer.

Abaye said to him (Rav Yosef): **He** (Rav Hoshaya) **tells us a lot** with this Baraita, **because if** I would have known this only **from the Mishnah, I would have said** that only **there** does Rabbi Eliezer permit the honey, because **from the beginning**, even in the comb, the honey was **food, and in the end**, when it comes out, **it is food**. And separating food from food is not considered separating, as said earlier.

But **here** with olives and grapes, **that in the beginning** the juice inside the fruit is considered **food, and in the end** after it comes out it is **liquid, I would say** that Rabbi Eliezer does **not** allow one to use the liquid, and agrees with the Rabbis who forbid using the liquid that comes out on Shabbat, because people might end up being separating.

So he (Rabbi Hoshaya) **informs us** that there is no such Rabbinical decree, according to Rabbi Eliezer, because squeezing crushed olives etc. even on Shabbat is only Rabbinical since it is not usual to squeeze crushed olives and grapes for their liquid.

Mishnah

Everything that came into hot water on Friday and is already cooked, **one may soak it in hot water on Shabbat** because there is no cooking after cooking. I.e. the second act of “cooking” is not true cooking, since the food is already cooked, and the person is doing this merely to soften the food and not to cook it.

PEREK 22 – 145B

And whatever food did not come into hot water on Friday, for example, dry meat that is eaten raw, may not be put into hot water on Shabbat. But **one may nevertheless wash it in hot water on Shabbat** by pouring the water on it, because poured water is not considered a *kli rishon*⁶ and does not cook this type of meat.

Except for old small salted fish and Spanish *Kulias*. Both of them are fish that are so salty that they cannot be eaten without first being washed, thus one may not pour hot water over them. **Because by washing them, this is completion of their preparation** and therefore it is considered like cooking.

Gemara

The Mishnah said: “Everything that came into hot water on Friday, one may soak it in hot water on Shabbat.”

For example what?

Said Rav Safra: Like the chicken of Rabbi Abba that was soaked for many days after being cooked so that it would dissolve, and it was eaten as a remedy.

And said Rav Safra: I once paid a visit there (Rabbi Abba’s place in the land of Israel) **and ate from it** (that chicken). **And if Rabbi Abba had not made me drink wine of three years vintage, I would have been forced** to vomit it out in disgust.

Rabbi Yochanan who was from the land of Israel **spat at** (the mention of) **Babylonian *kutach***⁷ because he was revolted by it.

⁶ The “first vessel” that the food was cooked in, on the fire. Although it is considered “pouring from a *kli rishon*,” which can cook to a certain extent, this is permitted in this particular case.

⁷ A Babylonian dip made of old bread, salt and fermented milk.

PEREK 22 – 145B

Said Rav Yosef: Just as people from the land of Israel are disgusted by some of our food, we (Babylonians) **should spit from** the mention of **the chicken of Rabbi Abba** who is in the land of Israel.

And furthermore, Rav Giza said: I visited there (the land of Israel) **and made Babylonian *kutach*,** and **all the sick people** of the **West** (the land of Israel) **asked** me to give them to eat **from it**.

The Mishnah said: “And **whatever did not come into hot water** on Friday, one may nevertheless wash it in hot water on Shabbat. Except for old salted fish and Spanish *Kulias*.”

The Gemara inquires: If **one washed** old salted fish, **what** is the halachah?

Said Rav Yosef: He is liable to bring a sin offering because this is regarded as actually cooking it.

Said Mar the son of Ravina: We also learnt so in our Mishnah, which states: **Except for old salted fish and Spanish *Kulias*. Because by washing them, this is completion of their preparation** and is considered like cooking.

Hear from this that it is a Torah transgression.

Rav Chiyya bar Abba and Rabbi Asi were sitting before Rabbi Yochanan, and Rav Yochanan was sitting and dozing.

Said Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba to Rabbi Asi: Why are the fowls in Babylonia fat?

Rabbi Asi said to him: Go to the desert of Gaza (which is part of the land of Israel) **and I will show you fowls fatter than them.**

PEREK 22 – 145B

He also asked: **Why are the Festivals in Babylon more joyous** than in the land of Israel?

He answered: **Because they are poor** in Babylon. Therefore they appreciate eating and resting on the Festivals.

Why are the Torah scholars in Babylonia distinguished in their dress?

Because they are not well learned. Therefore they need to dress elegantly to be respected.

Why are idolaters odorous? Because they eat abominable and creeping things.

*

Then **Rabbi Yochanan woke up. He said to them: Children! Did I not tell you to fulfill the verse: “Say to wisdom, ‘You are my sister.’”**⁸ **If the matter is as clear to you as is the fact that your sister is forbidden to you in marriage, say it. But if not, do not say it.**

They said to him: Then let the master tell us proper answers to some of these questions.

*

They asked: **Why are the fowls of Babylonia fat?**

He answered: **Because they were not exiled, as it says: “Moav has been at ease from his youth, and he has settled on his lees... and he has not gone into exile,”** and the end of the verse says: “Therefore his taste remains in him, and his scent is not changed.” Thus we see that not going into exile helps one retain fatness and taste. Similarly, the birds of Babylon are fat because they too did not go into exile.

And the birds here in the land of Israel, from where do we know that they were exiled?

⁸ *Mishlei 7:4*

PEREK 22 – 145B

Because it was taught in a Baraita: Rabbi Yehudah says: For 52 years, no man passed through Judah, as it is says, “For the mountains I will I take up weeping and wailing, and for the pastures of the wilderness a lamentation, because they are burned up, so that none pass through... from the fowl of the heaven to the beast (*beheimah*) they fled, they are gone.”

And the numerical value of *beheimah* is 52.

Although the Babylonian exile lasted 70 years from the exile of King Tzidkiyahu⁹ until the second Temple was built, King Coresh allowed the Jews to start returning to the Land 18 years before the Temple was built. Thus the land was absolutely desolate for only 52 years.

*

Said Rabbi Yaakov said Rabbi Yochanan: All the animals returned to the land of Israel except the Spanish Kulias fish.

Because Rav said: The water-courses of Babylonia carry back water to the Spring of Etam in the land of Israel, through underground tunnels. But these Kulias fish, because their spine is not firm, could not go up.

*

They asked him: **Why are the Festivals in Babylon joyous? Because they were not subject to that curse, that it is written concerning the land of Israel: “I will cease all her joy, her festival, her new moons, her Shabbats, and all her appointed times (*mo’adim*).**

And it is written: “My soul hates your new moons and your appointed times (*mo’adim*), they are a bother to me.”

What does “they are a bother to me” mean?

⁹ Zedekiah

PEREK 22 – 145B

Said Rav Elazar: The Holy One said: Is it not enough for Israel that they sin before Me, but not only that, they also bother Me to know which evil decree I will bring on them.

The Gemara shows how the land of Israel is cursed not to be able to rejoice properly on the Festivals:

Said Rabbi Yitzchak: There is no single Festival when troops did not come to Tzipori.

And Rabbi Chanina said: There is no single Festival when a general with his suite and centurions did not come to Teveriah.

*

They also asked him:

Why are the scholars of Babylonia distinguished in dress?

Because they are not in their original place but in exile.

As people say: In my own town, my name is sufficient. Without my town, my dress brings me honor.

The Gemara now proves, contrary to what Rabbi Asi said earlier, that the people of Babylon are indeed learned.

It is written: **“(In days) to come Jacob shall take root, Israel shall blossom and flower.”**

Rav Yosef taught: These are the Torah scholars who will come in Babylon, who make blossoms and flowers (beautiful insights) for the Torah.

*

They also asked him: **Why are idolaters odorous?**

Because they did not stand at Mount Sinai. Because when...