



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Rabbi Akiva suggests a kal vachomer to posit that animal milk and human milk are equivalent with regard to causing susceptibility to tumah.

The Chachamim maintained that milk of a woman will cause susceptibility to tumah whether she or the infant desire the milk or not, whereas animal’s milk only causes susceptibility to tumah if one desires the milk, i.e. if he milked the animal to use its milk. If one does not desire the milk from the animal, however, then that milk is not a liquid and will not cause susceptibility to tumah. Rabbi Akiva presents a kal vachomer as follows: If the woman’s milk is unique for children will cause susceptibility to tumah whether the person desired the milk or not, certainly animal’s milk which is for young and old should cause susceptibility to tumah whether the person desired the milk or not. (143b)

The blood of a woman’s wound causes susceptibility to tumah whereas the blood of an animal’s wound does not cause susceptibility to tumah.

The Chachamim countered to the kal vachomer of Rabbi Akiva that the reason the torah states that a woman’s milk causes susceptibility to tumah even if one did not desire the milk is because the blood of a woman’s wound causes susceptibility to tumah, and even though the woman does not desire the blood, it still has the status of a liquid. The milk of an animal will not cause susceptibility to tumah if one did not desire the milk,

because an animal’s blood is not considered a liquid. The Chachamim base their reasoning on the premise that a woman’s milk is really blood, whereas an animal’s blood is not a liquid at all. (143b-144a)

Rabbi Akiva maintains that milking an animal for medicinal purposes cause susceptibility to tumah whereas letting the blood of animal for medicinal purposes does not cause susceptibility to tumah.

Rabbi Akiva responded to the Chachamim by stating that he is more stringent with regard to milk causing susceptibility to tumah than blood because if a person milks an animal for medical purposes, he desires the milk and therefore the milk causes susceptibility to tumah, whereas if one lets the blood of an animal for medicinal purposes, the blood will not cause susceptibility to tumah. From this distinction it is evident that an animal’s milk has a stringency that its blood does not have. This is why Rabbi Akiva maintains that an animal’s milk will cause susceptibility to tumah even if the person does not desire the milk. (144a)

The words “for his satisfaction” mean that the person had no intent for the fruit, and the words “not to his satisfaction” mean that he has not expressed his intentions.

The Chachamim countered back to Rabbi Akiva that we would learn from liquid that oozes out from olives or



grapes that there is a distinction between liquid that one desires and liquid that is emitted unintentionally. With regard to liquids that ooze from the baskets of olives or grapes and one desires the liquid, they will cause susceptibility to tumah. Of one does not desire the liquid that comes out, they are not considered liquids and they will not cause susceptibility to tumah. The Gemara assumes that the words “for his satisfaction” mean that the person desires the liquid coming out of the fruit, and the words “not to his satisfaction” mean that he has not expressed his intention, i.e. he is not desirous of the liquid that came out of the fruit. (144a)

Liquid that oozes from olives or grapes that are placed in baskets will seep through the basket and the owner of the fruits renounces ownership of the juice from the outset.

The Gemara concludes that what the Mishnah meant by the words “for his satisfaction” was that he expressed no intention regarding the juice. The words “not to his satisfaction” mean that he stated explicitly that he does not desire the juice. Alternatively, the Gemara states that the Mishnah that refers to olives or grapes in baskets is discussing a case where the person does not desire the juice, because the juice will seep through the basket. The owner of the fruit therefore renounces ownership from the juice, so even if he does not explicitly declare that he does not desire the juice, it is assumed that he does not want the juice. (144a)

One can squeeze plums, quinces, or sorb-apples on Shabbos with the intention of drinking their juice but one cannot squeeze pomegranates on Shabbos with the intention of drinking their juice.

We learned previously that Rabbi Yehudah agrees with the Chachamim regarding liquids that ooze from olives

or grapes that even if the fruits were stored for eating, their juices are prohibited on Shabbos. The Chachamim agree with Rabbi Yehudah regarding liquid that oozes from other fruits. The source for the Chachamim agreeing with Rabbi Yehudah regarding other fruits is from a Baraisa that states that plums, quinces, or sorb-apples can be squeezed on Shabbos for their juice, because these fruits are not normally used for squeezing, whereas one cannot squeeze pomegranates on Shabbos as they are usually used for squeezing. The household of Menashya bar Menachem squeezed pomegranates during the week (so everyone else is forbidden to squeeze them on Shabbos). And how do you know that this is the [ruling of] the Chachamim: perhaps it is Rabbi Yehudah [‘s view]? - Even granted that it is Rabbi Yehudah [‘s]: when have you heard Rabbi Yehudah [to permit the juice], when it exudes of itself: have you heard him [to rule that] we may express it at the very outset? But what you must answer is since they are not intended for pressing, [it is permitted] even at the outset; consequently even if it is assumed to be the ruling of the Chachamim, since they are not intended for pressing [it is permitted] at the very outset. Hence it follows that this [agrees with] the Chachamim [too]. This proves it. [Whether the Chachamim or Rabbi Yehudah authors this Baraisa, it is clear that one can squeeze other fruits on Shabbos besides for pomegranates.] (144a-144b)

One person or place that practices a certain custom can set the standard for everyone else regarding that practice.

We learned that the household of Menashya bar Menachem would squeeze pomegranates during the week. Rav Nachman said: The halachah is in accordance with the household of Menashya bar Menachem (and therefore one cannot squeeze pomegranates on Shabbos). Said Rava to Rav Nachman: Was then



Menashya bar Menachem a Tanna? And should you say [that you mean], The halachah is as this Tanna because he agrees with the [practice of] Menashya bar Menachem: just because he agrees with Menashya bar Menachem, the halachah is as he! Does Menashya bar Menachem represent the majority of people? Yes. For we learned in a Mishnah that if one maintains thorns in a vineyard, Rabbi Eliezer holds that one cannot benefit from the grapevines, because one is forbidden to plant even thorns in a vineyard. The Chachamim disagree and they maintain that the vineyard is not forbidden unless one plants with a specie that he would plant in his field, and people do not plant thorns. And Rabbi Chanina said: Rabbi Eliezer's rationale is that in Arabia people plant thorns for camel food. [We derive from this that if even one group of people practices a certain custom, that practice sets the standard for the rest of the world. Similarly, the household of Menashya bar Menachem squeezing pomegranates during the week set the standard for everyone else, and one cannot squeeze pomegranates on Shabbos.] How compare! Arabia is a [whole] region, but here his practice counts as nothing in relation to that of all [other] people! — Rather this is the reason, as Rav Chisda. For Rav Chisda said: One who squeezes beets and places the juice in a Mikvah has rendered the Mikvah invalid, because the beet juice changes the appearance of the water. [A Mikvah is required to contain only water, and the Mikvah must appear like water and not any other color. Even the minutest amount of other color renders the Mikvah invalid.] The Gemara asks: One normally does not squeeze beets for their juice, and their juice is not considered a liquid (so how can they invalidate a Mikvah)!? — Rather, it must be said: Since one person squeezed the beets for their juice, he has rendered the beet juice significant, and now it is considered a liquid. With regard to squeezing fruit on Shabbos, when one squeezes the fruit, he renders them significant, and one is liable for squeezing

the fruit on Shabbos. [Even with regard to squeezing plums, quinces, and sorb-apples, one cannot squeeze them for their juices, because this would be forbidden. One would only be permitted to squeeze these fruits in order to sweeten them, whereas one cannot squeeze pomegranates even to sweeten them. The Chachamim were concerned that if one were permitted to squeeze pomegranates for the purpose of sweetening them, he would come to squeeze them for their juice also. This concern was based on the practice of Menashya bar Menachem's household to squeeze pomegranates during the week.]

Rav Pappa said: The reason is that it is something that a Mikvah may not be made in the first place, and everything that a Mikvah may not be made in the first place renders a Mikvah unfit through changed appearance. (144b)

There is a dispute as to whether olive-water is considered a liquid or not.

The Mishnah had stated that if wine or vinegar or olive-water fell into the Mikvah, thus changing the Mikvah's appearance, the Mikvah is rendered invalid. Who is the Tanna that maintains that olive-water is considered a liquid? Abaya said: This is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yaakov, for it was taught in a Baraisa: Rabbi Yaakov said: Olive-water is akin to a liquid, and is susceptible to tumah. And why is the olive-water that is emitted at the beginning of the olive press not susceptible to tumah? Because the person does not desire such olive-water, and it is not considered a liquid. Rabbi Shimon, however, maintains that olive-water is not like a liquid (and therefore will not be susceptible to tumah). And what is the reason that the olive-water that oozes from the olive press is susceptible to tumah? Because there is also some real oil mixed in with the olive-water, and oil is a liquid that is susceptible to



tumah. And where practically do they differ? They differ in respect to what oozes after [the olives have been subject to their own] pressure.

Rava said: The reason is because it is something that a Mikvah may not be made, and such renders a Mikvah unfit through change of color. [That is why the olive-water makes the Mikvah unfit; accordingly that ruling agrees with all.] (144b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Squeezing Fruit

We know that one is forbidden to squeeze certain fruits on shabbos because of the prohibition of *dash*, threshing. According to the conclusion of the Gemara, it emerges that there are various stages regarding the prohibition of squeezing fruits. Concerning olives and grapes, since their juices are true liquids and these fruits are designated for their juices, one is biblically forbidden to squeeze olives or grapes on Shabbos. Most Rishonim maintain that one would be allowed to squeeze an olive or a grape into food, but the Mishnah Berurah quotes the Rosh who forbids this, and one who is stringent in this matter will be blessed. With regard to mulberries and pomegranates that are sometimes squeezed, they are only Rabbinically forbidden to be squeezed. One can, however, squeeze a mulberry or pomegranates in to food, and the Chaye Adam is of the opinion that one does not even have to be stringent in this matter. There are opinions that disagree with the Chaye Adam in this matter. Fruits that are not usually squeezed can be squeezed on Shabbos. There is a controversy concerning using a lemon. From the words of the Bais Yosef it appears that in the time of the Rosh people did not squeeze lemons, so the Rosh permitted one to squeeze lemons in Shabbos. Over time the custom changed and people, were squeezing lemons.

The Chaye Adam and the Mishnah Berurah rule that one is forbidden to squeeze a lemon into a plate. One can, however, squeeze a lemon into food. The Biur Halacha writes that even according to the opinions of the Rosh and Rabbeinu Chananel that one who is stringent with regard to squeezing fruits into food will be blessed, one can nonetheless be lenient and squeeze a lemon into food. One must bear in mind the words of the Biur Halacha that the permit is only to squeeze into food, but one is forbidden to squeeze into a liquid. One would not be able to squeeze a lemon into tea on Shabbos.