



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara continues its search for the ruling of R' Yehudah that would explain why meat from an animal slaughtered on Shabbos is prohibited that day.

The Gemara finally succeeds at proving that our Mishnah follows R' Yehudah's position.

2) Cooking on Shabbos

Someone quoted a Baraisa before Rav that stated that if one cooks on Shabbos inadvertently he may eat what he cooked but if he cooked deliberately he may not eat what he cooked and Rav silenced him.

The Gemara searched for the explanation why Rav silenced the person.

The conclusion is that Rav silenced him because he misrepresented R' Meir's position. R' Meir's position applies only to cooking on Shabbos but the one who cited the Baraisa assumed that it applied even to slaughtering.

This conclusion is consistent with a statement cited in the name of Rav related to the difference between cooking for someone who is ill on Shabbos and slaughtering for someone who is ill on Shabbos.

R' Pappa notes some exceptions to Rav's rulings.

R' Dimi of Nehardea issues final rulings related to these matters.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses instruments that may be used for slaughtering and instruments that may not be used for slaughtering.

4) Clarifying the Mishnah

It is noted that the Mishnah begins with a word that indicates that the ruling is only **בדיעבד**. A Baraisa is cited that indicates that one may slaughter using some of the instruments mentioned in the Mishnah even **לכתחילה**.

The contradiction is reconciled.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

Additional challenges and resolutions are presented.

A Baraisa is cited that differentiates between something that has always been attached to the ground and that which had been detached and then attached. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Adding volume for the sake of the healthy

המבשל לחולה בשבת אסור לבריא גזירה שמא ירבה בשבילו

Cooking is prohibited on Shabbos, but it is permitted if it is necessary for the sake of someone who is seriously ill. Rav Dimi of Nehardea ruled that if food was cooked on Shabbos for the behalf of an ill person, that food may not be eaten by a healthy person. Even though the cooking on Shabbos was not prohibited, we do not allow a healthy person to partake of it because if it were permitted, we are concerned that there would be a tendency for the one who is doing the cooking to increase the amount of food cooked for the sick person.

Rashba, in the name of Rabeinu Yona, explains that this does not mean that we are concerned that more pieces of meat, for example, would be added to the pot before it is placed on the fire. The scenario of placing a pot on the fire with more pieces than needed for the sake of the patient would not be a Torah violation. The act of placing the pot on the fire is permitted due to the dispensation of caring for the sick, and the single act of placing the pot with more pieces would only be a rabbinic violation. Therefore, we would not find a rabbinic rule to restrict a healthy person from eating a piece of food cooked for a sick person due to the concern that one might add extra pieces next time before cooking, which is itself a rabbinic prohibition. Rather, the concern is that if a healthy person is allowed to eat this piece, we are afraid that a cook may add food to the pot which is already in the process of being cooked. The act of placing more food into a pot that is on the fire is a new act of cooking, and it is a Torah violation.

The opinion of R"an, however, is that the very act of putting a pot with more pieces than necessary for the sick person is a Torah violation of the Shabbos. The placement of the pot on the fire is only allowed to the extent that the contents are needed, and any extra pieces of food above and beyond that amount cause that very placement of the pot, to that degree, to be a Torah prohibited act.

According to this, we can analyze a case where two figs are needed for a sick person, and we have two branches, one with two figs and another with three figs on it. If the branch with three figs is cut, R"an holds that a Torah violation has been committed, while Rashba contends that this one act of cutting for the sake of the ill is not a Torah violation, but rather a rabbinic infringement. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Buying merchandise from Shabbos desecrators

המבשל בשבת וכו'

One who cooks on Shabbos etc.

Magen Avrohom¹ concludes that if Reuven cooked for Shimon on Shabbos, Shimon is permitted to eat that food after Shabbos. Teshuvus Kesav Sofer² notes that this ruling is limited to where Reuven cooked for Shimon by chance but if Reuven regularly cooks for people on Shabbos, for example, if he owns an inn and regularly cooks for his guests on Shabbos it is prohibited for the one for whom the food was cooked to eat that food even after Shabbos. This is a penalty imposed by Chazal and even someone other than the one for whom the food was cooked may not eat the food. This seemingly indicates that it is prohibited to eat food that was manufactured on Shabbos. Sefer Chut HaShani³ comments that if one does not know with certainty that the food was manufactured on Shabbos it is permitted. Therefore, although there may be Jewish-owned food factories that produce food on Shabbos, since there is no way to tell whether an item was made on Shabbos or during the week one may be lenient and eat that food.

He then goes on to note that according to Kesav Sofer even when the prohibition against benefitting from food cooked on Shabbos does not apply it is prohibited due to the prohibition against placing a stumbling block or assisting

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the status of food that was cooked on Shabbos?

2. Why did Rav publicly teach the teachings of R' Yehudah if he subscribed to R' Meir's position?

3. Is a healthy permitted to eat food that was cooked for someone ill on Shabbos?

4. What is the reason that a saw may not be used to slaughter an animal?

someone commit a transgression. He references a responsum written by the Stepiler Gaon⁴ who ruled that one may not purchase merchandise from a Jewish-owned factory that remains open on Shabbos since the company would refrain from violating Shabbos if all of their religious customers would refrain from purchasing their merchandise. Chut HaShani adds that this ruling applies only when it is clear that refraining from purchasing from that company would lessen chillul Shabbos but if refraining from buying from that company will not have any effect on their chillul Shabbos it is permitted to purchase merchandise from them. ■

1. מג"א ס"י ש"י"ח סק"ב ומובא במ"ב שם סק"ה.
2. שו"ת כתב סופר א"י"ח ס"י נ"י.
3. ספר חוט השני ח"ב עמ' מ"א.
4. ליקוטים ח"ב ס"י ז'.

STORIES Off the Daf

Two Patients

"השוחרט לחולה בשבת..."

Today's daf discusses the halachos of slaughtering an animal for a sick man on Shabbos.

A certain man was exceedingly ill. The family quickly summoned the doctor who diagnosed this man's condition as life-threatening and—aside from medicine—prescribed freshly cooked meat. Although it was Shabbos, a shochet was called in and slaughtered a cow, since danger overrides Shabbos. Since no non-Jew was readily available, a Jewish man quickly cooked some meat. As it turned

out, this ill man could not eat much and there was plenty left over. Another man was also ill, but when he was diagnosed the doctor declared that his illness was not life-threatening, but that meat would help his recovery. This second man's relatives heard about the fresh meat which was unneeded for the other sick man and wondered if they could give it to their own relative.

When the Rashbah, זת"ל, was consulted about this question he ruled that using the freshly cooked meat for the second patient was forbidden. "Although it is permitted to feed a Jew who is not deathly ill food cooked by a non-Jew, food cooked by a Jew—even for a fellow Jew who is deathly ill—is forbidden to him. One may wonder why this

should be forbidden. After all, why do forbidden labor through a non-Jew if there is meat that had been cooked by a Jew for a permitted case available? The answer is that we are worried about another time. What if there is no non-Jew available and a Jew is required to cook for a sick man who is deathly ill? If a second man is not deathly ill but the Jewish cook knows that anything left over will be used to heal him won't he likely cook enough for both men? Although what was cooked for the man who is deathly ill is a mitzvah, what is cooked for a Jew whose condition is not life-threatening, even in the same action, is a chiyuv karres!"¹ ■

1. שו"ת רשב"א, ח"א, ס' תתי"ד