

15 Adar 5773
Feb. 25, 2013



Shabbos Daf 145

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"n

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul 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.

One can squeeze grapes into a pot of food on Shabbos to enhance the flavor of the food, 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. One cannot squeeze grapes into a bowl, however, 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. (144b)

A Zav who milks a goat, the milk is *tamei*.

A Zav, who is *tamei* because of an emission that he experiences, causes *tumah* to milk when he milks an animal. The reason for this is because of *tumas heset*, where an object becomes *tamei* because of the weight of the Zav on the object. Although a liquid that is extracted into food is rendered food itself, in the case of the Zav, 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*. (144b)

There is a dispute regarding a baker who smears his bread with grapes whether the juice from the grapes is susceptible to *tumah* or not.

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*. The Gemara rejects this assumption and states that the dispute is based on the rule of liquid that will go to waste, where the Chachamim maintain that a liquid that will go to waste is not considered a liquid and rabbi Yehudah maintains that liquid that will go to waste is still considered a liquid. A dissenting opinion maintains that the dispute between the Chachamim and rabbi Yehudah centers on the rule that a liquid that gives a shine to the food is

considered a liquid. 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. (145a)

There is a dispute regarding the susceptibility to tumah when one bruises olives and his hands are not clean.

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, because even though the person wanted the oil to come out, the oil is not considered a liquid because it will go to waste. Rabbi Yehudah, however, maintains that the olives do become susceptible to tumah, because Rabbi Yehudah maintains that even a liquid that that will go to waste is considered a liquid. (145a)

One can squeeze a fish for its brine on Shabbos, and this squeezing can be done even into a bowl.

We learned that one can squeeze grapes into a pot of food on Shabbos but one cannot

squeeze grapes into a bowl on Shabbos. One can, however, squeeze fish even into a bowl for its brine. Fish brine is considered a food and not a liquid, so it is permitted to squeeze the brine even into a bowl. (145a)

There is a dispute regarding squeezing pickled vegetables on Shabbos.

Rav maintains that one can squeeze pickled vegetables on Shabbos if the squeezing is for the vegetables themselves, i.e. to prepare them to eat. One is forbidden Rabinically to squeeze pickled vegetables for their liquid. 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 Rabinically forbidden to squeeze both pickled and boiled vegetables for their liquid. A third opinion is that of Rabbi Yochanan, who maintains that one can squeeze both pickled and boiled vegetables for themselves, but one who squeezes either pickled or boiled vegetables for their liquid would be liable a chatas. (145a)

One is only liable biblically for pressing olives or grapes.

One will only be biblically liable for squeezing olives or grapes. The reason for this ruling is that squeezing olives and grapes for their liquid is considered the normal manner of obtaining the juice, and therefore one is liable biblically for squeezing olives or grapes. With regard to other fruits, however, one normally does not squeeze these fruits for



their juice, so one would not be liable biblically for squeezing other fruits. (145a)

A witness can only offer testimony from another witness with regard to a woman whose husband has died.

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. (145a -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.

Any food that was cooked before Shabbos can be soaked in hot water on Shabbos, 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. Food that was not placed in hot water before Shabbos can be rinsed with hot water on Shabbos, 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. (145b)

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

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba maintains that Babylonian birds are fatter than birds from Eretz Yisroel, and Rabbi Assi responded that birds in the Gaza Desert, which is part of Eretz Yisroel, are fatter than Babylonian birds. Rabbi Assi also held that Babylonian festivals are celebrated with more joy than the festivals in Eretz Yisroel because the Babylonian Jews are poor and they reserve their period of joy and relaxation for the festivals. Rabbi Assi also said that Torah scholars in Babylonia are dressed nicer than their counterparts in Eretz Yisroel because the Babylonian scholars are not on par with the scholars from Eretz Yisroel in scholarship. The reason idolaters are impure is because they eat abominable creatures and crawling creatures. Rabbi Yochanan offered alternative reasons for these distinctions. According to Rabbi Yochanan, the Babylonian birds were fatter than birds from Eretz Yisroel, because the Babylonian birds did not suffer from exile, unlike the birds from Eretz Yisroel, who were exiled with the people and all other animals. The reason the Babylonians celebrate the festival more joyously than the Jews in Eretz Yisroel is because the Jews from Eretz Yisroel were cursed that their festivals would be less joyous, and the Babylonian Jews were not included in that curse. The reason that the Babylonian Torah scholars

wore nicer clothing than their counterparts in Eretz Yisroel, is because the Babylonian scholars were exiled to Babylonia, and when one is not a native of his area, his clothing what makes him distinguished. When one is in his own city, his name alone is what honors him. The reason why idolaters are impure is because they do not receive the Torah at Har Sinai. The snake seduced Chava and injected her with impurity, and this impurity existed until the Jewish People received the Torah. At that point, the impurity left the Jewish People and they were pure, while the idolaters who did not receive the Torah remained impure. (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 Rashash¹ 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 Eiger².

The *Shav Shmattsa*³ 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*.

¹ Shavuot 30a

² Siman 179

³ Shmattsa 7:1