

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Defining the cooking times

The Mishnah ruled that one may not put meat, onions or eggs onto a fire unless there is enough time before Shabbos for the food to become roasted. The Gemara defines that as reaching the level of edibility of Ben Drosai (according to Rashi when a food is cooked one-third the normal cooking time.)

R' Elazar ruled that bottom surface of the dough must bake into a crust before Shabbos begins. The Gemara demonstrates that he was referring to the surface that is against the oven.

### 2) Roasting the korbon Pesach

The reason it is permitted to begin roasting a goat before Shabbos even though it is not cut up is because the members of the Pesach group are assumed to be careful and will not stoke the coals.

### 3) Lighting the fire in the Beis Mokeid

The reason the fire may be lit in the Beis Mokeid shortly before Shabbos is because the lighting is done by the kohanim who are assumed to be careful not to stoke the coals.

### 4) Lighting fires

Rav and Shmuel disagree what is considered "most of the fire" that must be lit before Shabbos. According to Rav it means most of each piece and according to Shmuel it means the fire is lit sufficiently that additional wood is not needed. A Baraisa supports Shmuel's position.

Regarding a single piece of wood there are different versions of what Rav ruled leading R' Pappa to require both criteria, i.e. the fire must penetrate most of its thickness and most of its circumference.

R' Huna and R' Chisda disagree regarding the circumstances when it is permitted to light different fires before Shabbos.

R' Yosef quoted a Baraisa regarding certain fuels that don't require the fire to take hold of most the fuel before Shabbos. A Baraisa and R' Yochanan add other fuels to the list.

### הדרן עלך יציאות השבת

**5) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah lists different materials that may not be used for wicks or fuel for the Shabbos lights.

### 6) Defining the terms in the Mishnah

The Gemara translates and identifies the different materials that may not be used as wicks.

A Baraisa adds to the disqualified wick list wool and hair.

The Gemara begins to define and identify the materials that may not be used for fuel. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Leniencies in Rabbinic Decrees

כל שהוא כמאכל בן דרוסאי אין בו משום בישול נכרים

The ruling of the Shulchan Aruch (Yoreh De'ah 113:8) is that if a Jew put a pot on the fire, but he then removed it, and a gentile came and replaced it and the cooking was completed, the food is only kosher if the Jew had let it cook at least one-third before removing it. We see that once the food has surpassed the minimal cooking of **מאכל בן דרוסאי**, there is no problem of a gentile cooking it further. Yet, even though the limit of one third is a factor for bishul akum, we know that by Shabbos, even if a food is already cooked one third of its being fully done, if someone continues to cook it further, from one-third and beyond, he has definitely violated the labor of cooking. In other words, the process of cooking does continue past the one-third amount. How can we resolve this with the halachos of bishul akum?

We have to say that the laws of bishul akum are rabbinic in nature, and they are lenient in certain matters. Therefore, if a Jew cooks food past the one-third limit, we allow a gentile to complete the process. In fact, this approach is mentioned by the Darkei Teshuva (O.C. 118:#61). There he presents the famous disagreement in defining **מאכל בן דרוסאי**; Rashi and Rashba say that it is one-third cooked, while Rambam holds that it is one-half. Darkei Teshuva writes that since bishul akum is only rabbinic, we can rely upon Rashi and Rashba, who are lenient, and once the food has been cooked one-third of its amount, the Jew can allow the gentile to finish the process. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Regarding which three halachos is **מאכל בן דרוסאי** significant?
2. How did Ravin teach Abaye two halachos?
3. Why was it necessary for the Tanna of the Baraisa to spell out the difference between the disqualified wicks and the disqualified oils?
4. E.C. Where else did R' Pappa combine two different opinions into one ruling?

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Creating a flame with a magnifying glass

משנה: ובגבולין - כדי שתאחוז האור ברובו.

*Outside the Temple, a bonfire may be lit before Shabbos only if there is enough time for the fire to catch most of it before the onset of Shabbos.*

Rav Yitzchak Zilberstein<sup>1</sup> שליט"א discusses whether using a magnifying glass to start a flame is prohibited as an act of **מבעיר** (creating a fire). The Chavas Yair<sup>2</sup> writes that if one lit a candle during the day of Shabbos, according to the Rambam he would be liable of an interdiction of Scriptural origin. This is because the Rambam follows the view of Rebbe Yehuda that a **מלאכה שאינה צריכה לגופה** (an act performed for a purpose other than the Biblically defined purpose) is still prohibited by the Torah. Hence, here, where there is no need for the light itself being that it is daytime, the person would still have transgressed a prohibition of Torah origin according to the Rambam. However, one authority<sup>3</sup> comments on the Chavas Yair that even the Rambam would agree that there could be no Biblical liability if a person has no benefit from the prohibited action, such as in this case where he lit the candle during daylight hours and the act is one of a destructive nature. Still, if it is a very cold day, and the person utilizes a magnifying glass to set some wood on fire to warm the house, surely this would constitute a Torah level transgression.

Rav Chaim Falaji<sup>4</sup>, the Rav of Izmir, Turkey, writes that if on Friday one arranged a magnifying glass in such a position that on Shabbos morning the rising sun would create a fire, he has not transgressed a Torah interdiction. Yet, it would

probably be included in the Rabbinic prohibition of our passage<sup>5</sup>, being that the newly begun flame would likely require to be stirred and tended, and thus there is the concern that maybe the person will come to stir the flame and by such contravene a Torah prohibition. But, if a person set this up on Shabbos itself in order to derive benefit from the fire, than the person would have contravened a Torah prohibition.

Rav Shmuel Vozner<sup>6</sup> challenges the position of Rav Chaim Falaji. Rav Vozner questions Rav Falaji's statement that setting up the magnifying glass such on Friday in a way that it will kindle a flame on Shabbos morning would be included in the Rabbinic interdiction of our passage. Rav Vozner writes that possibly the Rabbis only decreed this forbiddance upon a person who himself begins a fire before Shabbos, however, this would appear dissimilar to our case where the fire happens of its own on Shabbos morning.

Rav Vozner differs as well in regard to the matter of one who set up a magnifying glass on Shabbos itself in such a way that a fire would begin on Shabbos proper. Rav Chaim Falaji, as previously mentioned, had ruled that this would be a Biblical level offense. Rav Vozner however is of the opinion that it is surely not a Biblical level offense since the action is solely causative in nature (**גרמא**) and a causative action would be of Rabbinic interdiction. Yet, Rav Vozner would agree that if the person held the magnifying glass in his hand, and angled it from side to side, and in such a way began a fire, then there may be a Biblical transgression. ■

1. חשוקי חמד כאן (עמ' קלו)

2. שו"ת חות יאיר (סי' קפח)

3. טל אורות (מלאכת מבעיר ד"ה לפי זה)

4. שו"ת לב חיים ח"ג (סי' סח)

5. ונפסק להלכה בסי' רנה ס"א

6. שו"ת שבט הלוי ח"ד (סי' לו) ■

## STORIES off the Daf

### שמן קיק Never too busy for

שאלתינו לכל נחותי ימא מאי שמן קיק

One Friday evening after the Shabbos meal, R' Yechezkel Abramski, as a youth, appeared to be very excited. His mother noticed, and asked him the reason for his enthusiasm. He told his mother that he had just learned the Gemara in Shabbos where Shmuel asked all the sailors if they were familiar with **שמן קיק** and they were able to identify it for him.

The young R' Abramski noted that Shmuel was not a foreigner to the beis midrash. He was among the most prominent sages, as well as a judge and the head of a yeshiva. He also maintained connections with the government, and he regularly visited with **שבור מלכה**. He was also a talented doctor, and familiar with astronomy. He once said (Berachos 58b), "I am familiar with all the roads in Nehardea as I am familiar with the routes of the stars in the heavens." Apparently, in order to best serve the sick people of Nehardea, he needed to know how to get around the entire city.

R' Yechezkel then explained to his

mother, "It seems that Shmuel was an extremely busy person. Yet, when it came to finding out the correct meaning of a single word in the Mishnah or Gemara, he found time to question every sailor as he arrived in port. He tracked down each sailor and asked him if he knew what **שמן קיק** was. He did not ask them for news or for current events, but he did ask them if they were familiar with this oil and from where it came. And if he spent so much time analyzing the translation of a word in this Mishnah, there is no question that he pursued every word of Torah to clarify it to his best ability." ■