The Laws of *Bishul* (Shiur 2)

**Bishul After Bishul**

**Shiur #14**

In the previous shiur we discussed the different stages of *bishul* and their halachic significance. We distinguished between the stages of *Ben Drusai* and food that is fully cooked, and discussed the halachic definition of the different stages. We will now learn whether there is a prohibition to reheat food to a certain temperature after it is already considered fully cooked.

In the previous Shiur we saw several sources that hold that the prohibition of *bishul* no longer applies after the food has been cooked to a certain stage. For example:

> "תלמוד בבלי מסכת שבת דף לט עמוד א"כל בשא חומץ ממלוכ חומץ - שורית אוחז מבכות שבת."

Upon further examination, however, this understanding of the Mishna is not that simple. Chazal forbade *hatmana*, completely covering and insulating a food, even in materials that will not cause the food to become hotter, if the *hatmana* is performed on Shabbat. This type of *hatmana* is forbidden only after *tzeit hakochavim* (when stars are visible), but not during *bein hashemashot* (the time between *shekia*, sundown, and *tzeit hakochavim*). We will discuss *hatmana* in more detail later on; meanwhile, from the reason behind the prohibition of *hatmana*, we can learn something about *bishul*:

> "תלמוד בבלי מסכת שבת דף לד עמוד א"אמר רava: מפני מה אמרו: אין טומנין בדבר שאינו מוסיף הבל משחשכה - גזרה שמא יירתוח. אמר ליה אביי: אי הכי, בין השמשות נמי ניגזר! - אמר ליה: סתם קדירות רותחות הן.

Rashi explains Rava’s explanation behind the prohibition in the following way: One prepares food for Shabbat on Friday afternoon. Now, as Shabbat is beginning, he wants to perform *hatmana* on the hot pot of food in order to help it maintain its heat. If, when he is preparing the pot for *hatmana*, he realizes that it isn’t sufficiently hot, he may come to heat it up. *Hatmana* is therefore forbidden on Shabbat as a precaution against heating up the food. However, one may ask: if the food has already been cooked on Friday afternoon, why should it be forbidden to heat it up again on Shabbat, since we see from the Gemara (39a) that reheating is permitted?

The Rosh explains:
The Rosh explains that Rashi draws a distinction between a dry food, where there is no prohibition to reheat it after it underwent bishul, and food with liquid, where the prohibition of bishul becomes relevant again once the food cools off. That is also the position of the Tur, the son of the Rosh:

The Ritvah explains that the reason behind the prohibition of hatmana is that one may come to reheat the food directly on the fire, which will give the appearance of bishul, and is therefore an issur d'Rabbanan.

Other Rishonim, however, explain the Gemara about hatmana differently, and they reject the Rosh’s distinction (which the following Ritvah refers to as the position of Tosafot):

When Reheating Improves Food - מצטמק ויפה לו

The Rambam and Rashba do not distinguish between dry foods and foods with liquid:

בינת יוסי איגו היה电脑シン שיח

When the food cools off, some Rishonim suggest that the prohibition of hatmana does not apply because the food is no longer hot.

The following Ritvah explains:

The Ritvah explains that the reason behind the prohibition of hatmana is that one may come to reheat the food directly on the fire, which will give the appearance of bishul, and is therefore an issur d'Rabbanan.
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The Rambam and Rashba do not distinguish between dry foods and foods with liquid:
Shiur #14 – Bishul after bishul

The Bach understands that Rabbeinu Yona also believes that there is no issur d’Oraita of bishul after a liquid already underwent bishul. But he means that Chazal only forbade heating liquid up if it will be beneficial (i.e.–it is is מצטמק יפה ל, literally, the additional “shriveling”= reduction, will benefit it).

The Taz raises the following fundamental question: Why would there be bishul after bishul for a liquid?

How does cooking affect food? a) It becomes heated. b) The heating cooks it (effects a change in the food’s composition).

Once a solid food has become cooked, additional heating can, at most, cause the food to become heated, but it cannot effect a significant change in its composition. Heating alone is not enough to violate the melacha of bishul. However, in the case of liquid, even if it was previously cooked, heating it up again can cause a significant qualitative change to the liquid. Therefore, there is the possibility for bishul after bishul for liquids. The Taz therefore suggests that any qualitative change in the liquid is considered a violation of bishul. However, if the heating will merely harm the quality of the liquid (aside from the warmth itself, which one does want), the person has no intention of causing a qualitative change in the liquid, and he will therefore not violate the melacha d’Oraita of bishul.

What we learn from the Taz is that “heating” is not bishul, while “effecting a qualitative change” is. Interestingly, the accepted understanding of why there is bishul after bishul for liquids is that, for liquids, there is no qualitative change at all, and therefore the definition of bishul for liquids can only be “heating”, which is the exact opposite of the Taz’s explanation! The Mishna Berura writes:

משנה ברורה סימן שיח ס”ק כט

The Chazon Ish writes that these different perspectives - whether bishul of liquids is defined as heating or causing a qualitative change - is a machloket Rishonim:

chodzą איזו ארוחה חיסמ סימן לא ס”ק ג’

One should note that the Bach accepts the Taz’s reasoning, but only d’Rabbanan. The Bach seemingly admits that additional heating of a liquid, which causes it to become tastier, is a qualitative change, but not a sufficient change to be considered bishul d’Oraita, and is therefore forbidden only d’Rabbanan.

In sif 4 the Shulchan Aruch rules like Rashi and the Tur, and the Rema cites Rabbeinu Yona, but, in sif 8, the Shulchan Aruch himself cites Rabbeinu Yona!
The Magen Avraham suggests that the Shulchan Aruch also accepts Rabbeinu Yona’s opinion, but he only deems it necessary to say so once, in sif 8. That is the ruling of Rav Ovadiah as well:

The Mishna Berura writes that the Shulchan Aruch in sif 8 is merely quoting from Rabbeinu Yerucham who follows Rabbeinu Yona, but that does not necessarily mean that Halacha follows his opinion:

As we saw earlier, the Mishna Berura believes that the reason why there is bishul after bishul for liquids is because for liquids, bishul is defined as heating. He therefore does not distinguish between whether the heating will be qualitatively beneficial or not and is always stringent:

Food that has Cooled Down

We have already seen that the Shulchan Aruch rules that there is bishul after bishul for liquids that have cooled down:

To summarize, the Rambam, Rashba, and Ritvah rule that there can be no bishul after bishul for both solids and liquids. Other Rishonim, however, do draw a distinction, and explain that the rule that there is no bishul after bishul applies only to solids, not liquids. Why?

One possibility is that, for liquids, additional cooking can cause a positive change to the food.

That is how Rabbeinu Yona and Rabbeinu Yerucham rule (see the aforementioned Taz and Chazon Ish, as well as the Bach, who explains that this opinion is only an issur d’Rabbanan). They therefore write that if the additional cooking will be detrimental to the quality of the food then it is not considered bishul after bishul. The Rema brings their opinion.

A second possibility is that once liquid that has been cooked cools down, the effect of the cooking disappears (at least to a great extent), so we therefore define bishul for liquids as being the act of heating it up.

This appears to be the opinion of Rashi, the Rosh (and other Baalei Tosafot who are brought in the Ritvah), the Tur, Bach, Gra, and Mishna Berura. They therefore forbid reheating liquids even if the additional cooking will be detrimental to its quality.

The Shulchan Aruch in sif 4 (which is the primary sif that deals with bishul after bishul) does not mention Rabbeinu Yona’s opinion there, but he does in sif 8.

The Magen Avraham suggests that in sif 4, the Shulchan Aruch was relying on what he writes in sif 8, and he does rule like Rabbeinu Yona, and this is Rav Ovadiah’s position as well. The Mishna Berura suggests the opposite: that the Shulchan Aruch rules against Rabbeinu Yona, and therefore does not quote his opinion of sif 4, while, in sif 8, he was merely quoting from Rabbeinu Yerucham, but he does not mean to accept his opinion about detrimental cooking.
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When is a liquid considered to have cooled off for the purposes of bishul? In the previous Shiur we saw the Shulchan Aruch that allows placing hot food on top of a hot pot. At the end of that halacha, he writes:

The Shulchan Aruch implies that it is forbidden to place food on the hot pot if it might reach yad soledet even if the food has not yet cooled down. That is how the Poskim explain his intention:

But the Rema seems to disagree:

Based on the Rema (here and elsewhere) the Poskim infer that he holds that bishul after bishul applies only if it the liquid has completely cooled down. Let us consider the Rema’s position further:

This is how the Shemirat Shabbat Kehilchata rules:

The Chazon Ish explains:

We saw earlier that the Rema accepts Rabbeinu Yona’s position, and distinguishes between reheating liquids that will improve with heating and those that will not. The Bach writes that heating liquids that will not improve with heating would only be allowed if bishul after bishul is only a chumra d’Rabbanan. The Chazon Ish explains that the Rema does believe that Rabbeinu Yona’s logic is relevant even if it is considered d’Oraita, because then one will only violate bishul d’Oraita when reheating a liquid if the reheating improves the liquid. Still, here the Chazon Ish suggests that the Rema’s leniency must show that the Rema himself believes that the entire notion of being obligated for bishul after bishul for liquids is only a stringency. Therefore, the transgression of bishul after bishul (as a stringency), would only apply if both – 1. The second heating must be beneficial to the food, and 2. The liquid was actually cool in between.
This is in contrast to the Baal Hatanya in the Shulchan Aruch Harav:

שוחל לו הר ארבא חכם ברו טו רשע לכל

This is in contrast to the Baal Hatanya in the Shulchan Aruch Harav:

If the liquid is completely cooled off, then one does not violate bishul d'Oraita. Similarly, the Iglei Tal explains the Rema as follows:

The Baal Hatanya is based on the Rema, and he writes that according to this opinion, one could be obligated to bring a chatat (a sin offering in the Beit Hamikdash, meaning that it is an issur d’Oraita) if he reheats liquids that have completely cooled off. This implies that if it has not cooled off completely, then one does not violate bishul d’Oraita. Similarly, the Iglei Tal explains the Rema as follows:

Earlier we mentioned two possible reasons why bishul should apply to liquids even after they already underwent bishul: 1) For liquids, the primary benefit of cooking, and therefore the definition of bishul, is being heated. 2) Liquids can be qualitatively changed by reheating. The Iglei Tal explains that the d’Oraita definition of bishul is the first one. Therefore, if the food still has enough warmth to be eaten, it has not yet lost the effects of the bishul on a d’Oraita level. Although there should still theoretically be an issur d’Rabbanan of bishul as long as the liquid is not yad soledet, one can be lenient about the issur d’Rabbanan and rely on the opinions that there is no bishul after bishul for liquids.

From our examination of the Rema we have seen that he has two significant leniencies in regard to bishul after bishul for liquids: the prohibition applies only if the second cooking will benefit the liquid and only if the liquid has completely cooled off.

These two leniencies have led the Bach and Chazon Ish to conclude that the Rema believes that the prohibition of bishul after bishul for liquids is only d’Rabbanan. In contrast, the Taz and Iglei Tal believe, and the Shulchan Aruch Harav implies, that the Rema believes that it is an issur d’Oraita. Let us now examine the scope of these leniencies:

The liquid must be completely cooled off: The following Maharam Shik discusses bishul after bishul regarding sugar. Raw sugar undergoes heating during processing. While that is true regarding dry sugar; what about the sugar once it becomes dissolved and liquefied? The Maharam Shik writes:

The Tehilla L’David, however, seems to reject this approach:

The Tehilla L’David argues that the Rama’s leniency only applies if the food has not yet cooled off from its initial bishul. The Chazon Ish writes a similar idea:
The Chazon Ish explains that once the liquid was cold at any point on Shabbat, it becomes forbidden for it to be heated again.

The Shemirat Shabbat Kihilchita seems to rule against the Maharam Shik:

**Shemirat Shabbat Kihilchita (Mekorot Hashulchan Ravei) פרק א סעיף טו**

דבר לו שהאני מובוט כל זכרו ולא כלראיה כלא מבריא...

It should be noted that the Tehilla Le’David and the Chazon Ish address the question, but they do not explain their ruling. It seems that they saw this as a categorical distinction.

What does the Rema consider “completely cooled off”?

**שולחן ערוך הרב אורי חיים סימן שיח סעיף ט**

What is considered “completely cooled off”? Here, the Shalach Ha’Am says that the food can be eaten if it is still warm enough to be eaten. The Rema is lenient as long as the liquid is still warm enough to be eaten (that is, warm enough to be eaten by someone who wants to eat it warm). The Rema’s opinion is accepted by the Shemirat Shabbat Kehilchita.

The Chazon Ish, among other Poskim, explains that the Rema fundamentally believes that there is no bishul after bishul even for liquids, but we are stringent if the liquid has completely cooled off. The Iglei Tal and Shulchan Aruch Harav explain that the d’Oraita definition of bishul for liquids is the heating of the liquid. Therefore, if the food still has enough warmth to be eaten, it has not yet lost the effects of the bishul on a d’Oraita level.

The Tehilla L’David explains that the Rema is lenient only if the food has not yet cooled off from its initial bishul. The Chazon Ish writes something similar, and their perspective is accepted by the Shemirat Shabbat Kehilchita.

When is a Food considered too Liquid to be Reheated?

The Chasam Sofer explains that once the liquid was cold at any point on Shabbat, it becomes forbidden for it to be heated again.

Shiur #14 – Bishul after bishul
The above Rosh is the source for the distinction between dry foods and liquids that we have been discussing. When the Rosh writes that the stringency applies to foods that contain liquid, is that true for any amount of liquid? The Tur similarly writes:

**Tur **

The above Rosh is the source for the distinction between dry foods and liquids that we have been discussing. When the Rosh writes that the stringency applies to foods that contain liquid, is that true for any amount of liquid? The Tur similarly writes:

**Tur **

And also Rabbeinu Yerucham:

\[
\text{רבינו ירוחם - מל臨ות אדוס והוה נמייב בַּי הַלֵּךְ דָּגֶס שֶׁשֶׁ הַלֵּךְ}
\]

In sif4 the Shulchan Aruch cites the Tur, and in sif8 he cites Rabbeinu Yerucham.

We explained earlier that one explanation for the reason there is *bishul* after *bishul* for liquids is the fact that, for liquids, the definition of *bishul* is heating. If so, one could argue that there would be a problem of *bishul* if there is any amount of liquid or sauce in the pot. This is the position of some Poskim:

\[
\text{שולחן ערוך הרב אורח חיים סימן שיח סעיף יא}
\]

We see from the above two Poskim that they believe that there is an issue of *bishul* if the food contains even the smallest amount of (cooled down) liquid.

The Minchat Kohen claims that such a position is unreasonable:

\[
\text{מנחת כהן ספר שלישי (משמרת השבת) שער שני פרק שני "التנאי השני}
\]

The Mishna Berura’s approach is somewhere in between:

\[
\text{משנה ברורה סימן שיח ס"ק קה}
\]

According to the Mishna Berura, if one has removed the excess fat, it is permitted to reheat the food, even though the food contains fats or other liquids. Such a food is considered “dry” for the purposes of *bishul* after *bishul*.

The Beit Yosef cites the above Rabbeinu Yerucham differently from how it is cited in the Shulchan Aruch:

\[
\text{בית יוסף אורח חיים סימן רנג (סעיף ב}
\]

The Minchat Kohen learns from here:

\[
\text{מנחת כהן ספר שלישי (משמרת השבת) שער שני פרק שני "التנאי השני}
\]

Questions and comments may be sent to: info@eretzhemdah.org
The Minchat Kohen rules that we go by the majority: even a dish with significant amounts of liquid is considered a solid if most of the food is solid, but the Poskim question his position:

The Har Tzvi (Rav Tzvi Pesach Frank) defends the Minchat Kohen’s position:

Rav Tzvi Pesach Frank (former Chief Rabbi of Yerushalayim and one of the primary Poskim of the 20th century) explains that if most of the food is liquid, then we view the act of heating as being done primarily for the liquid. Similarly, if most of the food is solid, then we view the heating as being done for the sake of the solid, and it is therefore permitted.

The Iglei Tal writes a similar idea, but he believes that one may be lenient only because we fundamentally accept the opinion that there is no bishul after bishul for liquids:

The Pri Megadim offers a different explanation for why we can follow the majority, even if we believe that bishul after bishul from liquids is an issur d’Oraita:

We saw earlier that Rav Ovadiah Yosef rules that the Shulchan Aruch believes there is bishul after bishul for liquids only if the additional cooking is beneficial, and he therefore rules here:

The Yalkut Yosef summarizes the halacha:
Summary

**Bishul After Bishul for Liquids**

The Rambam, Rashba, and Ritvah rule that there is no *bishul* after *bishul* for both solids and liquids, but other Rishonim do draw a distinction, and explain that the rule that there is no *bishul* after *bishul* applies only to solids, but not to liquids. Why?

One possibility is that, for liquids, additional cooking may improve the food. That is how Rabbeinu Yona and Rabbeinu Yerucham rule (see the aforementioned explanations of the Taz and Chazon Ish, as well as the Bach, who explains that this opinion is only an *issur d’Rabbanan*).

They therefore write that if the additional cooking will be detrimental to the quality of the food then there is no *bishul* after *bishul* for liquids either. The Rema brings their opinion.

A second possibility is that once cooked liquid cools down, the effect of the cooking disappears (at least to a great extent); we therefore define *bishul* for liquids as being the act of heating it up.

This appears to be the opinion of Rashi, the Rosh (and other Baalei Tosafot who are cited in the Ritvah), the Tur, Bach, Gra, and Mishna Berura. They therefore forbid reheating liquids even if additional cooking will be detrimental to its quality.

The Shulchan Aruch does not mention Rabbeinu Yona’s opinion in *sif* 4 (which is the primary *sif* that deals with Bishul after Bishul), but he does in *sif* 8.

The Magen Avraham suggests that in *sif* 4, the Shulchan Aruch is relying on what he writes in *sif* 8, and he does rule like Rabbeinu Yona. Rav Ovadia also writes similarly. The Mishna Berura, however, suggests the opposite: that the Shulchan Aruch rules against Rabbeinu Yona, and therefore does not quote his opinion of *sif* 4, and, in *sif* 8, he was merely quoting from Rabbeinu Yerucham, but does not mean to accept his opinion about detrimental cooking.

**What is Considered too “Cooled Down” to be Reheated on Shabbat?**

The halacha follows the opinion that there is *bishul* after *bishul* for liquids if they have cooled down. How should we define “cooled down”?

The Poskim explain that the Shulchan Aruch considers a liquid to be cooled down if it is no longer *yad soledet*. The Rema is lenient as long as the liquid is still warm enough to be eaten (that is, warm enough to be eaten by someone who wants to eat it warm). The Rema’s opinion is accepted by the Shemirat Shabbat Kehilchita.

The Chazon Ish, among other Poskim, explains that the Rema fundamentally believes that there is no *bishul* after *bishul* even for liquids, but we are stringent if the liquid has cooled down completely. The Iglei Tal and Shulchan Aruch Harav explain that the *d’Oraita* definition of *bishul* for liquids is the...
heating of the liquid. Therefore, if the food is still warm enough to be eaten, it has not yet lost the effects of the bishul on a d’Oraita level.
The Tehilla Lidavid explains that the Rema is lenient only if the food has not yet cooled down from its initial bishul. The Chazon Ish writes something similar, and their perspective is accepted by the Shemirat Shabbat Kehilchita.

When is a Food considered too Liquid to be Reheated?
The Shulchan Aruch Harav and Chatam Sofer write that any amount of liquid is problematic. According to the Mishna Berura, and this is the custom for most Ashkenazim, if one removed all excess liquid, even if significant moisture remains in the food, there is no problem of bishul after bishul.
The Minchat Kohen and Rav Ovadiah Yosef rule that one may be lenient as long as the majority of the food is solid – what is the logic of this ruling?
The Har Tzvi explains that the action of bishul relates to the majority, and the Iglei Tal’s explanation is similar, but only because he believes that bishul after bishul for liquids is only forbidden d’Rabbanan. The Pri Megadim explains that if the majority of the food is solid, then reheating will not be beneficial to the food as a whole.

In this shiur we discussed the rule that there is bishul after bishul for liquids. There are two explanations for this issue: 1) The primary benefit of cooking liquids is the heat, and one will therefore violate bishul if he reheats a cooled off liquid. 2) Unlike a solid food, liquids may benefit from further heating, as reheating and reduction may improve its flavor.
In the next shiur we will examine two issues: The halachic definition of what is considered solid and what is considered liquid, and whether the prohibition of bishul exists after a (dry) food has undergone grilling or baking, and vice versa.