

CHAVRUTA

SHABBAT – DAF KUF MEM GIMEL

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

The Gemara resolves the difficulty: **There**, the intestines were prepared for the cat during twilight, as Rava's intent was to slaughter the young goose on Yom Tov. And **since** he knew that **it** (the meat of the intestines) **would rot** by the end of Yom Tov and it would no longer be edible by humans, **his mind was on it** already **from the previous day** to throw it to the cat.

And we say: **It also stands to reason that Rava holds the view of Rabbi Yehudah.**

As Rava expounded: A woman may not enter the firewood storeroom on Yom Tov, **in order to take from them a firebrand.** This is because the wood is set aside for burning, and when one changes their purpose to a firebrand, which is a kind of utensil, they become *muktzeh*, as it is *nolad*¹.

And a firebrand that broke on Yom Tov, **it is prohibited to burn it on Yom Tov, since one may burn utensils but one may not burn broken utensils.**

This is because a utensil that was broken on Yom Tov can no longer be used for the use it had during twilight. It is therefore categorized as *nolad*, and is *muktzeh* according to Rabbi Yehudah. But a complete utensil has not changed its purpose, even if its owner wishes to burn it. It is thus permitted to move it, even for a use that is not its primary purpose.

The Gemara concludes: **Here from this** a proof that Rava follows the view of Rabbi Yehudah.

¹ An item that only came into existence in its present form during Shabbat.

PEREK 21 – 143A

MISHNAH

Beit Shammai say: One may remove bones and shells by hand from the table, despite the fact that they are not suitable to be eaten by a dog. This is because they are not *muktzeh*.

And Beit Hillel say: It is prohibited to move them by themselves. Rather, **one should remove the entire tray** (such a tray would rest on the table and had the status of a utensil), with the bones and shells, and move it away **and shake it off**.

And all agree: **One may remove, by hand, crumbs of bread from the table that are smaller than a kazayit²**, as they are animal food. **And pea pods and lentil pods**, from which they removed the peas or the lentils, **since it is animal food**. Anything that has a use on Shabbat is not *muktzeh*, despite the fact that during twilight it was not designated to be used for this purpose.

A sponge, if it has leather that is used as **a handle, one may wipe the tray with it**. This is because when it is held by a leather handle, the sponge will not be squeezed out during use. **And if not, one may not wipe with it**, as it is squeezed in the place where it is held.

This way or that way, it (the sponge) **may be moved on Shabbat**. Despite the fact that the sponge does not have a handle, it has the status of a utensil (albeit whose primary purpose is for prohibited use), and as such, it may be moved for a permitted use i.e. to wipe with it when it is dry.

² Kazayit: 0.9 fluid oz. or 28 cu.cm.

PEREK 21 – 143A

And even though the sponge is a utensil, **it is not susceptible to impurity**. This is because it is not produced from one of the materials that can receive impurity, such as wood, metal or cloth.

GEMARA

It was stated in the Mishnah: Beit Shammai says: One may remove bones and shells from the table. And Beit Hillel says: One should remove the tray.

Said Rav Nachman: We do not have this text in our Mishnah, wherein Beit Shammai are lenient in *muktzeh* like Rabbi Shimon, and Beit Hillel are stringent like Rabbi Yehudah. **Rather**, our text is reversed, that **Beit Shammai** are stringent and prohibit moving shells that are suitable for an animal, **like Rabbi Yehudah, and Beit Hillel are lenient like Rabbi Shimon.**

It was stated in the Mishnah: **One may remove crumbs from the table.**

And the Gemara says: **It** (that which it says “one may remove”, rather than “one may throw”) **is a support for Rabbi Yochanan.**

As said Rabbi Yochanan: Crumbs that are not the size of a *kazayit*, it is prohibited to directly destroy them.

PEREK 21 – 143A

It was stated in the Mishnah: One may remove **pea pods...**as it is animal food.

The Gemara says: **Who is** the Tanna of the Mishnah? **It is Rabbi Shimon, who does not hold of** the wider application of the laws of *muktzeh*.

To Rabbi Yehudah, pods are *muktzeh*, since only after the peas have been removed on Shabbat, then the pods become available as animal food. But while it is still day, when they contain peas, they are secondary to the peas, and it is considered as if they are designated as human food. Thus on Shabbat, they are in the category of *nolad*.

*

The Gemara raises a difficulty: I will **say** to you **the end clause: A sponge, if it has a handle one may wipe with it; and if not, one may not wipe with it.** This is because through wiping, he squeezes the sponge unintentionally. And surely **it** this law **is brought according to Rabbi Yehudah who said: Something that is unintentional is prohibited,** and it is not like Rabbi Shimon!

The Gemara resolves the difficulty: **In this, even Rabbi Shimon agrees.**

As Abaye and Rava both said: Rabbi Shimon agrees in *pesik reisha velo yamut*³, for when they wipe with the sponge, it will certainly be squeezed between his fingers.

The Gemara states the law concerning date pits according to Rabbi Yehudah, and how the Amoraim would behave with them:

³ Lit. “Detach the head and it will not die?” This refers to a situation where he will inevitably do a forbidden action, even without intending to do so. This is similar to a child that wishes the head to be cut off of a chicken so that he can use it as a toy, but he has no intention to kill it. Therefore even according to the opinion that holds that he is not liable for doing an action that is not intended, nevertheless if it is “pesik reisha” i.e. inevitable, he is liable.

PEREK 21 – 143A

Aramaean date pits may be moved on Shabbat. This is despite the fact that during twilight, these dates were suitable for human consumption and the pits were secondary to them; and on Shabbat, the pits were only suitable as animal food. Nevertheless, they are not categorized as *nolad*. The reason: **since they are suitable for an animal by way of their “mothers”**. Since these dates are of inferior quality, people usually give them to animals and they were not set aside for human consumption alone.

And pits of Persian dates, since they do not feed these dates to animals, **it is prohibited** to move their pits, because of the prohibition of *nolad*.

Shmuel would place the Persian date pits on bread and **would move them by way of the bread**.

Sharnam Shapaz is its sign.

Shmuel follows his rationale, for he holds that such a use of bread does not involve disrespecting food, for said Shmuel: **One may do all that he needs with bread**.

Rava would move them by way of a cup of water.

Rav Huna son of Rav Yehoshua would amass pits until they would be disgusting and then **he would treat them like a bedpan**. I.e. since they were repellent, they could be removed directly. He would move them by themselves, as the law is that a bedpan used for urine or excrement may be removed for disposal, as taught in Tractate *Beitzah* (36b).

Rav Ashi said to Ameimar: And may one make a bedpan in the first place? Surely, one may not cause it to be disgusting just in order to permit remove it.

Rav Sheshet would be stringent and **would throw them with his tongue** to the table. He would not take them by hand and place them on the table.

PEREK 21 – 143A

Rav Pappa would throw them by hand **behind the bed** on which he was reclining. He would not place them on the table, in order that he would not then need to shake them off from the table.

They said about Rabbi Zecharia son of Avkulas that he would turn his face away behind the bed and spit them from his mouth.

HADRAN ALACH NOTEL

We Will Return to You, Perek Notel

Ammud Bet

PEREK 22 – 143B

Perek Chavit

MISHNAH

1) A barrel that became broken on Shabbat, and its contents are going to waste, **one may save from it food for three meals**. But the Sages decreed that one may not save more than this. This is because a person is distraught due to his loss of money, and the Sages were concerned that he may come to bring a utensil through a public domain. Thus they placed limitations on what he may do to save the food, thereby reminding him of the Shabbat prohibitions.

One may save food for three meals, even in several utensils. In one utensil he may save as much as he wishes, as stated earlier (120a).

And he may even **say to guests: “Come and save for yourselves”** from the barrel for three meals. This is because each person is permitted to save this amount.

And it is permitted for him to save from it, **as long as he does not sponge up** the wine using a sponge, with intention to let it then drip into another utensil. It is a decree lest he squeeze out the wine from the sponge.

2) **One may not squeeze fruits** on Shabbat in order to remove the juices from them. Squeezing is prohibited because of the *melachah* of “separating”, i.e. separating the juice from the pulp, which is a secondary form of “Threshing”.

PEREK 22 – 143B

And if they (the juices) **came out** from the fruits **by themselves, they are prohibited** to drink during the course of that Shabbat, as they decreed lest he come to squeeze the fruits himself.

Rabbi Yehudah says: If the fruits were collected **for eating** as they are, **that which comes out** naturally **from them** on Shabbat **is permitted**. This is because he does not wish these juices to flow from them, since that is not his use for these fruits. Therefore, one need not be concerned that he might come to squeeze them.

And just as there is a prohibition of “separating” in squeezing fruits, there is also the prohibition of “separating” when crushing honeycombs on Shabbat in order to obtain their honey. Therefore, even honey that flowed naturally is prohibited, as they decreed lest he come to crush them.

And even **honeycombs that he** already **crushed them before Shabbat, and they** (its honey) **came out naturally** on Shabbat, they are **prohibited**. This is despite the fact that they were already crushed before Shabbat and it is no longer the normal procedure to squeeze them further, thus there is no concern lest he squeeze them. Nevertheless, the Sages decreed this extended prohibition due to the case of honeycombs that were *not* crushed before Shabbat.

And Rabbi Elazar permits it, as there is no concern lest he squeeze, and we do not apply such an extensive decree.

GEMARA

PEREK 22 – 143B

It was taught in a Baraita: A barrel that became broken and he comes to save food for three meals from it, **he should not sponge up** its wine into a sponge by placing the sponge **in the wine** and then allowing it to drip into a utensil. It is a decree lest he come to squeeze it.

And if it is a barrel of oil, **he may not** moisten his palms **in oil** in order that he can then wipe them on the inside of the lip of a utensil.

The reason for this prohibition is in order **that he not do** on Shabbat **in the way that he does on a weekday**, as weekday actions are prohibited on Shabbat.

The Rabbis taught in a Baraita: If **his fruit became scattered in the courtyard**, he may collect a small amount at a time and eat.

But he may not collect **into a basket, nor into a box**, in order **that he not do** on Shabbat **in the way that he does on a weekday**.

It was taught in the Mishnah: **One may not squeeze fruits...** Rabbi Yehudah says: If it (the fruit) is for food, it is permitted.

Said Rav Yehudah, said Shmuel: Rabbi Yehudah would agree to the Sages **in** the case of **olives and grapes**, that when they are collected for food rather than drink, the juices that flow from them are also prohibited.

What is the reason? Since most are for squeezing, he will put his mind on the juice that flows even from the ones he set aside to be eaten as is, and will be pleased about it.

PEREK 22 – 143B

And Ula said in the name of **Rav: Rabbi Yehudah would disagree** with the Sages **even over olives and grapes**, and say that if they are for eating, he is not pleased with the juices that flow out from them. Thus, there is no concern that he might come to squeeze them.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: Rabbi Yehudah and the Sages disagreed both over other kinds of fruits and over olives and grapes, like Rav said. **And the Halachah follows Rabbi Yehudah regarding other fruits, and the Halachah does not follow Rabbi Yehudah regarding olives and grapes.** Rather, the Halachah follows the Sages there. Since most are for squeezing, he is always pleased with the juices that flow out and there is a concern lest he come to squeeze them.

Said Rabbah, said Rav Yehudah, said Shmuel: Rabbi Yehudah would agree to the Sages in the case of olives and grapes. And the Sages would agree to Rabbi Yehudah in the case of other fruits that are to be eaten, that the juice that flows from them naturally is permitted. Since they are not usually for squeezing, if they are collected for eating, there is no concern lest he come to squeeze them.

Rabbi Yirmeyah said to Rabbi Abba: But if so, over what are they disagreeing? For we are now saying that for olives and grapes, all agree that it is prohibited, and for other fruits, all agree that it is permitted.

He (Rabbi Abba) said to him: Delve into it and you will find the case that they disagree.

Said Rav Nachman son of Yitzchak, to explain the case: It stands to reason that they disagree over strawberries and pomegranates. This is a middle case, for there are some people who collect them for their juices and some who collect them for eating. The Sages hold that since they are also used for squeezing, he is pleased with the juices that flow from them, even when he did not collect them for this purpose. And Rabbi Yehudah disagrees in this case.

PEREK 22 – 143B

As it was taught in a Baraita: **Olives that oil flowed from them** naturally on Shabbat, **and grapes that wine flowed from them** naturally, **and he had collected them** (these olives and grapes) **whether to eat or for its juices**: The oil and the wine **that flows from them is prohibited** since most of them are set aside for squeezing.

Strawberries from which juice flowed naturally, **and pomegranates from which wine flowed** naturally (pomegranate juice is also called wine since it has a sharpness to it), **if he had collected them for eating**, the juice **that comes from them is permitted**. Since it is not set aside for its juices, he is not pleased with the juice that flows from them and he will not come to squeeze them.

And if he collected them **for their juices**, or he collected them **without specifying** their purpose, the juice **that flows from them is prohibited** as he is pleased with the juice and we are concerned lest he come to squeeze them. **These are the words of Rabbi Yehudah.**

And the Sages say: Whether he collected the strawberries and pomegranates **for eating** or **whether** he collected them **for their juices**, the juices **that flow from them are prohibited**. Since they are sometimes set aside for squeezing, he is pleased with the juice that flows even though he did not collect them for this purpose.

We can see from here that they disagree over strawberries and pomegranates that he collected for eating. But concerning other fruit, which nobody collects for their juices, the Sages would agree to Rabbi Yehudah.

*

It was stated in the Baraita: Strawberries and pomegranates that he collected without specifying their purpose, the juice that flows from them is prohibited. These are the words of Rabbi Yehudah.

PEREK 22 – 143B

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And does Rabbi Yehudah hold that when collected without specifying, it is also prohibited?**

A contradiction to this emerges from the following rule and what was stated about it. The rule is: foods do not receive impurity unless they were made susceptible to receive impurity by liquids falling on them.

And surely it was taught in a Baraita: Mother's milk, which is a liquid, causes susceptibility to impurity, whether it flowed from her willingly or whether it flowed from her unwillingly. The reason for this will be clarified shortly.

But **animal's milk does not cause** susceptibility to **impurity unless** it flowed out **willingly** (i.e. according to the will of the animal's owner). And without this, it is not classified as a liquid that can make a food fit to receive impurity.

And similarly, such milk does not receive the impurity of liquids if the milk was touched by a *sheretz* (a creeping creature).

Said Rabbi Akiva: To the contrary, it is a *kal vechomer*⁴:

If mother's milk, that is only for children, causes susceptibility to impurity whether willingly or unwillingly; animal's milk that is for both children and adults, surely it should cause susceptibility to impurity both willingly and unwillingly, since it has the status of a liquid more than does mother's milk!

They (the Sages) said to him: It is not a *kal vechomer*. For **if mother's milk causes impurity** when it flowed **unwillingly**, this is only because **blood** that flows **from her wound** (on her leg or hand) **causes impurity**, since blood has the status of a liquid. This follows the Gemara (*Niddah* 55b) that expounds the verse "he shall drink the blood of corpses" to mean that the blood of one who is killed is called a liquid. And even blood

PEREK 22 – 143B

that flows from a living person is called “the blood of corpses”, as the blood itself is considered dead after it has separated from the body

And since the blood of a woman is considered a liquid even if it flows from her unwillingly (as blood usually flows from the body unwillingly), so too her milk that flows unwillingly is considered a liquid. This is because the ultimate source of mother’s milk is her blood. (This concept is referred to in Tractate *Niddah* where it states that “the blood becomes murky and turns to milk”).

⁴ A fortiori reasoning.