



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

**One can squeeze grapes into a pot of food on Shabbos but not into a bowl.**

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: One can squeeze grapes into a pot of food on Shabbos (to enhance the flavor of the food),<sup>1</sup> but he cannot squeeze grapes into a bowl.<sup>2</sup>

Rav Chisda observed: From our master's words we may learn [that] one may milk a goat into a pot [of food], but not into a bowl.

This (Shmuel's ruling) proves that he holds: a liquid that unites with a [solid] foodstuff is [accounted] a foodstuff.

Rami bar Chama objected, by citing the following Mishnah: A Zav, who is tamei because of an emission that he experiences, causes tumah to milk when he milks an animal.<sup>3</sup> But if you say that a liquid that unites with a [solid] foodstuff is a foodstuff, from where did it become susceptible?<sup>4</sup> – This is as Rabbi Yochanan said: Although a liquid that is extracted into food is rendered food itself, since the first drop of milk that issues from the animal's udder is smeared on the nipple to allow for better milking, that drop causes all subsequent drops to be susceptible to tumah. Here too, we refer to a case where it came into contact with the first drop of milk that issued from the animal's udder which is smeared on the nipple.

<sup>1</sup> Because the prohibition of extracting is only said with regard to extracting a liquid from a food. When one squeezes a grape into a pot of food, he is essentially squeezing from one food to another food, and this does not violate the prohibition of extracting.

<sup>2</sup> Because a bowl is sometimes used for drinking, and although a person generally does not drink from a bowl, it will appear that he is squeezing the grapes for their juice, and this is a violation of Shabbos.

<sup>3</sup> The reason for this is because of *tumas heset*, where an object becomes tamei because of the weight of the Zav on the object.

Ravina asked from the next part of that Mishnah: If a person who is tamei through a corpse squeezes out olives or grapes exactly as much as an egg [in quantity] it is tahor.<sup>5</sup> Hence if more than an egg [in quantity] it [the juice] is tamei; but if you say that a liquid that unites with a [solid] foodstuff is a foodstuff, from where did it become susceptible? He raised the objection and he himself answered it: It refers to squeezing out into a bowl.

Rabbi Yirmiyah said: This is dependent on Tannaim: If a baker smears his breads with juice from grapes to make the loaves shine, the Chachamim maintain that the grapes are not susceptible to tumah, whereas Rabbi Yehudah maintains that they do become susceptible to tumah. The Gemara assumed that the Chachamim hold that liquid that is extracted into food is rendered a food, and Rabbi Yehudah holds that a liquid that is extracted into food is still considered a liquid, and therefore the liquid causes susceptibility to tumah. Rav Pappa rejects this assumption, for indeed everyone holds that a liquid that is extracted into food is not regarded as a food and here the dispute is based on the rule of liquid that will go to waste, where Rabbi Yehudah maintains that liquid that will go to waste is still considered a liquid, and the Chachamim maintain that a liquid that will go to waste is not considered a liquid. And this disagreement is bound up in a

<sup>4</sup> To tumah, for no foodstuff can be rendered tamei unless a liquid has previously fallen upon it. — The law is stated generally- which implies that it is so even if he milks it into a pot of food.

<sup>5</sup> This person renders food tamei, and in turn the food, if not less than the size of an egg in quantity, renders liquids tamei. Here the man does not touch the expressed juice. Now from the very first drop that issues the residue is less than the necessary minimum, and therefore it cannot render tamei the liquid that follows.

different dispute of Tannaim, for it was taught in a Baraisa: One who bruises olives (with the intention of improving the flavor of the olives) while his hands are unclean, causes the olives to be susceptible to tumah. [If he the olives are hard and salt will not stick to them] and he bruises the olives to make them soft, the olives will not be susceptible to tumah. The reason for this rule is that the person does not care for the oil, so it is not considered a liquid. If he bruises the olives to determine if the olives are ready to be picked, the Chachamim maintain that the olives do not become susceptible to tumah, whereas Rabbi Yehudah maintains that the olives do become susceptible to tumah. Regarding what do they disagree? Rabbi Yehudah maintains that even a liquid that that will go to waste is considered a liquid, whereas the Chachamim hold the oil is not considered a liquid because it is meant to be discarded.

Rav Huna the son of Rabbi Yehoshua said: These [latter] Tannaim [indeed] differ in respect of a liquid that stands to be discarded, while the former Tannaim differ in respect of liquid whose purpose is to shine [the dough].<sup>6</sup>

Rabbi Zeira said in Rav Chiya bar Ashi's name in Rav's name: A man may squeeze a bunch of grapes into a pot [of food], but not into a bowl; but [one may squeeze] a fish for its brine even into a bowl. Now, Rav Dimi sat and stated this ruling. Said Abaye to Rav Dimi: You recite it in Rav's name, hence it presents no difficulty to you; [but] we recite it in Shmuel's name, so it presents a difficulty to us. Did Shmuel say, '[One may squeeze] a fish for its brine even into a bowl'? Surely it was stated: If one presses out [pickled] preserves, Rav maintains that if the squeezing is for the vegetables themselves, (i.e. to prepare them to eat), it is permitted to do so. But if it is for their liquid, he is exempt but it is prohibited [Rabbinically]. One can, however, squeeze boiled vegetables for themselves or for their liquid. Shmuel disagrees and maintains that one can squeeze both pickled and boiled vegetables for themselves, but one is Rabbinically forbidden to squeeze both pickled and boiled vegetables for their liquid. Rav Dimi said to him: By God! 'My eyes have beheld, and not a stranger': I heard it from Rabbi Yirmiyah's mouth, and Rabbi

Yirmiyah from Rabbi Zeira, and Rabbi Zeira from Rav Chiya bar Ashi, and Rav Chiya bar Ashi from Rav. (144b – 145a)

To turn to [the main] text: 'If one presses out [pickled] preserves, — Rav said: If for their own sake, it is permitted; if for their fluid, he is not culpable, nevertheless it is forbidden. But with boiled preserves, whether for their own sake or for their fluid, it is permitted. While Shmuel ruled: Both with [pickled] preserves and boiled preserves, if for their own sake, it is permitted; if for their fluid, he is not culpable, yet it is forbidden. Rabbi Yochanan said: Both with [pickled] and boiled preserves, if for their own sake, it is permitted; if for their fluid, he is liable to a chatas'.

An objection is raised: One may squeeze [pickled] preserves on the Shabbos for the requirements of the Shabbos, but not against the termination of the Shabbos; but one must not express olives and grapes, and if he does, he is liable to a chatas: this is a difficulty according to Rav, Shmuel, and Rabbi Yochanan?

Rav reconciles it with his view, Shmuel with his, and Rabbi Yochanan with his.

'Rav reconciles it with his view': One may squeeze [pickled] preserves on the Shabbos for the requirements of the Shabbos, but not against the termination of the Shabbos. When is this said? When it is [done] for their own sake; but if for their fluid, he is not culpable, yet it is forbidden; while [as for] boiled preserves, whether [done] for their own sake or for their fluid, it is permitted. But one must not express olives and grapes, and if he does he is liable to a sin-offering.

'Shmuel explains it according to his view': One may squeeze [pickled] preserves on the Shabbos for the requirements of the Shabbos, [and] the same applies to boiled preserves. When is this said? When it is for their own sakes; but if for their fluid, he is not culpable, yet it is forbidden. And one must not express olives and grapes, and if he does, he is liable to a chatas.

<sup>6</sup> The Chachamim maintain that such a liquid is not considered a liquid and will not cause the grapes to be susceptible to tumah, whereas Rabbi

Yehudah holds that such a liquid is still considered a liquid and the grapes will be susceptible to tumah.



'Rabbi Yochanan explains it according to his view': One may squeeze [pickled] preserves for the requirements of the Shabbos, but not against the termination of the Shabbos. This applies to both [pickled] and boiled preserves. When is that said? When it is for their own sake; but he must not squeeze them for their fluid, and if he does, it is as though he squeezed olives and grapes, and he is liable to a chatas. (145a)

Rav Chiya bar Ashi said in Rav's name: By the words of the Torah one is culpable for the treading out of olives and grapes alone. And the School of Menasheh taught likewise: By the words of the Torah one is culpable for the treading out of olives and grapes alone. And a witness [attesting] what he heard from another witness is valid in evidence concerning a woman alone.<sup>7</sup>

The scholars asked: What about a witness [attesting] what he heard from another witness in evidence relating to a bechor?<sup>8</sup> — Rav Ammi forbids [the admission of his testimony]; while Rav Assi permits it. Said Rav Ammi to Rav Ashi, But the School of Menasheh taught: A witness testifying what he heard from another witness is valid in testimony concerning a woman alone? — Say: Only in testimony for which a woman is valid.<sup>9</sup>

Rav Yeimar recognized as fit a witness [testifying] from the mouth of another witness in respect to a bechor, [whereupon] Mereimar called him 'Yeimar who permits bechoros.' Yet the law is, A witness [testifying] from the mouth of another witness is valid in respect to bechoros. (145a – 145b)

HONEYCOMBS: When Rav Hoshaya came from Nehardea, he came and brought a Baraisa with him: If one crushes olives

<sup>7</sup> If a person testifies that someone else witnessed the death of a man overseas, we accept the testimony of the second witness to allow the wife to remarry. Although the second person's testimony is not biblically valid, the Chachamim were lenient so the woman should not remain an *agunah*, a woman who is left in limbo regarding her marital status. Furthermore, every Jewish marriage is contingent on rabbinical protocol, and the Chachamim reserved the right to invalidate a marriage where a person offers hearsay testimony that the woman's husband died overseas.

<sup>8</sup> A bechor may not be eaten until it receives a blemish accidentally, which must be proved by witnesses.

and grapes on the eve of the Shabbos, and they [their juices] ooze out of themselves, they are forbidden; but Rabbi Elozar and Rabbi Shimon permit them.

Rav Yosef observed: Does he come to inform us of another person? — Said Abaye to him, He comes to tell us much. For if [we learnt] from our Mishnah [alone], I would argue, Only there [is it thus], since it [the honey] was a [solid] foodstuff originally and is now a foodstuff; but here that they [the grapes, etc.] were originally a foodstuff but now a fluid, I would say, it is not so. Hence he informs us [otherwise]. (145b)

**Anything that was cooked before Shabbos can be soaked in hot water on Shabbos, and anything that was not cooked before Shabbos can be only rinsed with hot water on Shabbos, except for certain types of fish.**

MISHNAH: Any food that was placed in hot water (i.e., cooked) before Shabbos can be soaked in hot water on Shabbos.<sup>10</sup> Food that was not placed in hot water before Shabbos can be rinsed with hot water on Shabbos,<sup>11</sup> except old salted [pickled] fish, [small salted fish], or a (salted) Spanish mackerel, because their rinsing completes their preparation. (145b)

GEMARA: What, for example? Rav Safra said: E.g., Rabbi Abba's fowl[s].<sup>12</sup>

Rav Safra also said: I once paid a visit there [Eretz Yisroel] and ate from this dish, and but for Rabbi Abba who made me drink three-year-old wine, I would have been in danger. Rabbi Yochanan spit at [the mention of] Babylonian kutach. Said Rav Yosef: Then we [Babylonians] should spit at Rabbi Abba's

<sup>9</sup> A woman is a valid witness only in certain matters, which includes a bechor's blemish, and in these hearsay too is admissible.

<sup>10</sup> And one can even cook the food in a *kli rishon*, the utensil that the food was cooked in. The reason for this is the food was cooked already, and soaking it in hot water does not add to the cooking process.

<sup>11</sup> Because we do not say that rinsing the food is considered cooking it. Nonetheless, one cannot soak the food in hot water even in a *kli sheini*, because soaking food in hot water is akin to cooking.

<sup>12</sup> Which he boiled and kept many days in hot water until they dissolved; then he ate them as a remedy.



fowl! Moreover, Rav Gaza has related, I once paid a visit there [in Eretz Yisroel] and prepared some Babylonian kutach, and all the invalids of the West asked me for it. (145b)

Whatever was not put into hot water, etc. What if one does rinse [them]? Rav Yosef said: If one rinses them, he incurs a chatas. Mar the son of Ravina said: We too learnt thus: except old salted [pickled] fish, [small salted fish], or a (salted) Spanish mackerel, because their rinsing completes their preparation; this proves it. (145b)

**There are distinctions between the birds, the festivals celebrated, and the Torah scholars in Babylonia and Eretz Yisroel.**

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba and Rabbi Assi were sitting before Rabbi Yochanan, while Rabbi Yochanan was sitting and dozing. Now, Rabbi Chiya bar Abba asked Rabbi Assi: Why are the Babylonian birds fatter than birds from Eretz Yisroel? Rabbi Assi responded: Go to the Gaza Desert (which is part of Eretz Yisroel), and I will show you birds that are fatter than them! [Rabbi Chiya bar Abba asked further:] Why are the Babylonian festivals celebrated with more joy than the festivals in Eretz Yisroel? [Rabbi Assi responded:] It is because the Babylonian Jews are poor and they reserve their period of joy and relaxation for the festivals. Why are the Torah scholars in Babylonia dressed nicer than their counterparts in Eretz Yisroel? It is because the Babylonian scholars are not on par with the scholars from Eretz Yisroel in scholarship. Why are the idolaters impure? It is because they eat abominable creatures and crawling creatures.

Rabbi Yochanan awoke and said to them: Children! Have I not said to you as follows: Say unto wisdom, You are my sister: if the matter is as clear to you as that your sister is forbidden to you, say it; but if not do not say it? They said to him, Then let the Master tell us some of these? Why are the birds of Babylonia fat? Because they were not sent into exile, as it is said, Moav has been at ease from his youth, and he has settled on his lees...neither has he gone into exile: [therefore his taste remained in him, and his scent is not changed]. And how do we know that they suffered exile here [in Eretz Yisroel]? Because it was taught: Rabbi Yehudah said: For fifty-

two years no man passed through Judea, as it is said: For the mountains will I take up a weeping and wailing, and for the pastures of the wilderness a lamentation, because they are burned up, so that none passed through...both the birds of the heavens and the beast [beheimah] are fled, they are gone: the numerical value of beheimah is fifty-two. Rabbi Yaakov said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: They all returned save the Spanish mackerel. For Rav said: The water courses of Babylonia carry back the water to the fountain of Eitam; but these, since their spine is not firm, could not go up.

Why are the festivals in Babylonia joyous? Because they were not subject to that curse, whereof it is written: I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feasts, her new moons, her Shabbasos, and all her solemn assemblies,' and it is written: Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hates: they are a trouble unto me. What does 'they are a trouble unto me' mean? — Said Rabbi Elozar: The Holy One, Blessed be He, said, Not enough is it for Israel that they sin before Me, but that they trouble Me to know which evil decree I am to bring upon them. Rabbi Yitzchak said: There is no single festival when troops did not come to Sephoris. Rabbi Chanina said: There is no single festival when there did not come to Tiberias a general with his suite and centurions.

Why are the scholars of Babylonia distinguished [in dress]? Because they are not in their [original] homes, as People say, In my own town my name [is sufficient]; away from home, my dress. In days to come shall Jacob take root, Israel shall blossom [yatztiz] and bud [ufarach]. Rav Yosef recited, This refers to scholars in Babylonia who wreath blossoms [tzitzin] and flowers [perachim] around the Torah.

Why are idolaters lustful? Because they did not stand at Mount Sinai. For when the serpent came upon Eve he injected a lust into her: [as for] the Israelites who stood at Mount Sinai, their lustfulness departed; the idolaters, who did not stand at Mount Sinai, their lustfulness did not depart.

Rav Acha son of Rava asked Rav Ashi. What about converts? He said to him: Though they themselves did not stand at Har Sinai, their *Mazal*, i.e. the heavenly advocate, was there, as it is said: *those who are standing here with us today before*



*Hashem our G-d, and those who are not here etc. with us today.*

The statement that the impurities left the Jewish People at Sinai is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Abba Bar Kahana, for Rabbi Abba Bar Kahana said: Until three generations the impurity did not disappear from our Patriarchs. Avraham sired Yishmael (who was impure), Yitzchak sired Esav (who was impure), and Yaakov sired the twelve tribes, who had no impurities in them. [Rabbi Abba bar Kahana is thus of the opinion that the Jewish People had the impurities removed from them many years prior to the revelation at Har Sinai.] (145b – 146a)

#### **INSIGHTS TO THE DAF**

##### ***Testimony of a Woman***

The Gemara states that regarding testimony for a woman whose husband died overseas, we accept testimony from a witness who heard testimony from another witness, although we normally do not accept such testimony. Similarly, even the testimony of a person who is normally invalidated for testimony, such as a woman, a slave and the like their testimony will be accepted to allow a woman to remarry.

The Rashash<sup>13</sup> asks, the Mishnah states that there is no liability of a *Korban Shevuas Haeidus*, if one takes an oath that he does not know testimony regarding a woman. The question is, if regarding testimony on behalf of a woman, even a woman's testimony is acceptable, then one should, be liable a *Korban shevuas haeidus* for testimony regarding a woman.

The Rashash answers that the testimony of woman is not considered a testimony. Even if she is a "kosher" witness, she is not considered to be "kosher" with regard to the laws of testimony, only that she can reveal what happened in a certain situation. This answer is corroborated by Rabbi Akiva Eiger<sup>14</sup>.

The *Shav Shmattsa*<sup>15</sup> answers that what we believed the words of a woman is not because of testimony, but rather because we assume that her words are the facts. If so, regarding the liability of a *Korban Shevuas Haeidus*, Rashi writes that we require that the person was fit to testify. So it follows that a woman and anyone else who is invalidated from testifying will not fall under the category of liability for a *Korban Shevuas Haeidus*.

<sup>13</sup> Shavuos 30a

<sup>14</sup> Siman 179

<sup>15</sup> Shmattsa 7:1