

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Cooked foods (cont.)

The Gemara concludes that the prohibition against eating food cooked by non-Jews is Rabbinic and the verse cited is just a support for the Rabbinic decree.

R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchok in the name of Rav asserts that the prohibition against eating foods cooked by non-Jews does not apply to foods that are eaten raw.

According to a second version the prohibition does not apply to foods that are not eaten with bread at a royal table.

The difference between these two versions is identified.

R' Assi in the name of Rav teaches that this law does not apply to small salted fish.

R' Yosef discusses another application of this halacha and explains the novelty of his ruling.

R' Bruna in the name of Rav prohibits grasshoppers that are roasted when a non-Jew lights a field on fire.

The circumstances of this ruling are explored.

Two examples are discussed regarding food cooked by a non-Jew unintentionally.

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel rules that meat put on coals by a Jew and turned over by a non-Jew is permitted.

This ruling is analyzed.

A Baraisa is cited in support of the Gemara's explanation of this halacha.

The Gemara inquires whether food placed on the fire by a non-Jew and turned over by a Jew may be eaten.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok answers that it may be eaten

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

Foods that are not prohibited due to בישולי נכרי

כל שאינו נאכל על שולחן מלכים ללפת בו את הפת

Our Gemara defines the types of foods which are prohibited based upon the halacha of בישולי נכרי—foods cooked by a non-Jew. According to one version, Rav Shmuel b. R' Yitzchok in the name of Rav says that anything that can be eaten raw, without being cooked, will not be prohibited if it is cooked by a non-Jew. The reason for this is that the cooking done by the non-Jew does not result in a significant improvement of the food, which was edible even beforehand. According to a second version of Rav Shmuel's statement is that any side dish which is not brought to "a table of a king" to enhance the bread is not prohibited, even if it is cooked by a non-Jew. This food's lack of inclusion in this manner indicates that it is not an important type of food, and it is unlikely that the idolater will invite the Jew to his house to partake of this type of food.

Rashba (Toras HaBayis 2:7) explains that the criteria given to prohibit a side-dish that it be brought to the table is specifically a law regarding a side dish. People only socialize and grow close when sharing foods that are important. A side dish type of food that enhances the bread of a meal would have to be very significant to be brought to such a table. However, foods that are main dishes are important by definition, and they do not have to be the type that are only eaten together with bread. Rashba uses this distinction to explain why the Gemara says that דייסא (grits from pounded grain) is prohibited due to the halacha of בישולי נכרי. Yet, this is not the type of food that an important dignitary uses to enhance his bread. In fact, the Gemara (Beitza 16a) says that the Babylonians are fools for eating grits together with bread. Nevertheless, says Rashba, grits are not prohibited because they enhance bread as a side dish, but rather because they are a main course in and of themselves.

Rambam (Ma'achalos Asuros 17:15) writes that the reason to permit foods that are not brought on a dignitary's table is that the main problem with a non-Jew's cooking is that it might lead to socializing with the non-Jews and ultimately to intermarriage. Foods that are not important enough to be brought to a dignitary's table are those items which are served when no guests are present. Tur explains that these important foods are enjoyed in good company, and a social atmosphere is created, which might lead to intermarriage. Simple foods are not eaten in extended social settings, and they are permitted. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Are small fish subject to the restriction against food cooked by non-Jews?

2. Why is meat placed on a fire by a Jew but turned over by a non-Jew permitted?

3. What part of the baking process must be done by a Jew for the bread to be permitted?

4. Explain נותן טעם לפגם.

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 In loving memory of the yahrzeit of
 ביילא בת אפרים זלמן הלוי ע"ה
 by Mr. and Mrs. Alan Jay and Helene Gerber

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 לע"נ ר' אלחנן בן ר' יהודה ע"ה
 By the Schwabacher Family

HALACHAH Highlight

Eating food cooked by an apostate

אלא מדרבנן וקרא אסמכתא בעלמא

Rather the prohibition [against eating food cooked by non-Jews] is Rabbinic and the verse merely provides support for the injunction

Beis Yosef¹ takes note that Rashi² in one place writes that the reason Chazal prohibited food cooked by non-Jews is out of concern that it could lead to intermarriage. In our Gemara, however, Rashi³ explains that the reason Chazal prohibited eating food cooked by non-Jews is out of concern that the non-Jew may feed him non-kosher food.

Pischei Teshuvah⁴ in the name of Tiferes Moshe writes that according to the explanation that Chazal's concern was intermarriage it is permitted to eat food that is cooked by a Jewish apostate since it is not prohibited to marry the daughter of an apostate. According to the approach that Chazal's concern was that the non-Jew might feed the Jew non-kosher food the prohibition will apply to a Jewish apostate since the concern of him feeding the Jew non-kosher food is present.

Mahari Assad⁵ writes that it is clear that one may not eat food that was cooked by a Jewish apostate according to the approach that is concerned with the possibility of one being fed non-kosher food. He adds that even according to the approach that is concerned about intermarriage it would be prohibited to eat food cooked by a Jewish apostate. Although it is true that there is no Biblical prohibition against marrying a Jewish apostate, nevertheless there is a Rabbinic injunction against marrying one. The Gemara earlier (36b) taught that even though it is only Rabbinically prohibited to marry a gentile woman who is not from the seven nations indigenous to

(Overview...continued from page 1)

and the Gemara further confirms this ruling.

The issue of bread baked by non-Jews as well as other foods prepared by non-Jews is presented.

A related incident is recorded.

A Baraisa discusses how this restriction affects other foods.

The identity of the food שיעתא is discussed.

A Baraisa discusses the consumption of date refuse used to make beer that was cooked by a non-Jew.

Details related to this halacha are clarified.

The Gemara discusses how this restriction applies to different particular foods.

2) Preserves that contain wine or vinegar

Chizkiyah asserts that the Mishnah's restriction against eating preserved foods is limited to where there is only a concern that it may contain wine or vinegar but if it is known with certainty that it contains wine or vinegar it is prohibited even from benefit.

R' Yochanan disagrees and maintains that even if it is known with certainty it is permitted for benefit.

R' Yochanan's position is unsuccessfully challenged. ■

Eretz Yisroel, nevertheless, Chazal prohibited the wine and food of these gentiles. Accordingly, since one who is an apostate or public desecrator of Shabbos is considered by Chazal to be akin to a non-Jew it will be Rabbinically prohibited to marry them and thus the food-related restrictions will apply to them as well. ■

1. בי"י יו"ד סי קי"ג.
2. רש"י ל"ה: ד"ה והשלוקת.
3. רש"י בסוגיין ד"ה מדרבנן.
4. פתחי תשובה יו"ד סי קי"ג סק"א.
5. שו"ת מהר"י אסאד יו"ד סי ל"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Food of Ben Drusai

"כל שהוא כמאכל בן דרוסאי..."

Rav Gamliel Rabinowitz, shlit"a, taught a very inspiring lesson from a well-known expression on today's daf. "On Avodah Zarah 38 we find that something less cooked than ma'achal ben Drusai, which is either one-half or one-third cooked, is not prohibited if cooked by a non-Jew. It is very interesting that when the gemara describes something not well-cooked—both in hilchos Shabbos and in hilchos bishul nochri—it uses this expres-

sion. Why should it quantify the minimal state of cooking according to ben Drusai, a notorious wanted man?

"In my humble opinion, the answer can be understood from Eruvin 54. There we find that if one really wants to remember what he learns he must make himself like a beast which tears at its food. Others say he must be like a beast who eats food that is half-spoiled. Rashi explains that this expression means someone who does not act haughty by rejecting foods which are not normally considered acceptable.

"This shows that the sages ascribed importance to willingness to eat food not completely cooked to rush back to one's

learning. This teaches that one who wants to learn should not make a big deal about what he eats. Since he is not preoccupied with his food because he eats whatever is available, he has more time to learn and retains his learning.

"Ben Drusai, for all of his sinfulness, had this positive characteristic. He was notorious for never having time to wait for his food to finish cooking. For this reason our sages mention him specifically as the paradigm of food not fully cooked. Although Rashi explains that he was a bandit, he is the example since we must all learn to be like him in this regard."¹ ■

1. המאור, כסליו תשס"ח, ע"י ס"ד. ■