The Laws of Bishul (Shiur 3)

Bishul After Baking and Grilling & Vice Versa
Shiur # 15

In the previous Shiur we learned that, according to many Rishonim, there is a prohibition of *bishul after bishul* for liquids. We presented two explanations: 1) for liquids, the primary benefit of cooking is the heat. Therefore, any heating up of liquids is defined as “*bishul*”. 2) Generally, additional cooking of liquids benefits the food, even after it has been previously cooked.

In this Shiur we will address an issue that is related to *bishul after bishul* for liquids; may a food that is currently dry, but when heated will turn into liquid, be reheated on Shabbat?

Next, we will discuss the Halachic possibility of “reheating” cooked food, using a different process from the one the food originally underwent. For example – may one cook, grill, or bake, food that was prepared before Shabbat using a different process?

Solid Food that Becomes Liquid upon Heating

In the previous Shiur, we learned about the guidelines for *bishul after bishul* for liquids. Certain foods change their composition when heated, and transform from a solid to a liquid state. Does Halakha recognize such a food as dry or liquid?

The beraita forbids crushing snow or hail, but allows placing in a cup or bowl to melt. Why is this?

Rashi explains that crushing is forbidden because that it is similar to a melacha. Actively changing the snow from a solid to a liquid is similar to creating, and is therefore forbidden. However, if it is not melted actively, but passively, it is permitted. This is the reason for the leniency if placed in the cup or bowl to melt.

❖ Harchavot – the Gra’s interpretation of Rashi

The Terumah’s explanation is slightly different –
The Terumah explains the prohibition of “nolad,” a new creation. It is forbidden to use something on Shabbat that was not in existence before Shabbat. The water was in a solid state before Shabbat, and is now liquid. Therefore, it may not be used on Shabbat. However, the prohibition only applies to the “newborn creations” that are identifiable as such. If one puts the snow, or ice, into a cup, which contains another liquid (in this case, wine), the melting snow or ice is not identifiable on its own, therefore the prohibition does not apply.

According to Rashi, the issue is the quasi-melacha of “molid” creating a new item. According to the Sefer Haterumah, the prohibition is using an item that is “nolad,” which is a category of muktzeh.

These Rishonim explained the leniency in the beraita’s conclusion differently as well: According to Rashi, the leniency is due to the melting happening on its own. According to the Terumah the leniency is due to the existence of other liquid in the cup, and the nolad liquid is therefore not identifiable.

Many of the Rishonim reject the Terumah’s approach. For example:

The Smag writes that the Gemara is more of a proof against the Terumah’s position than for it. Let us explain what he means.

Rashi writes that placing the snow in the cup is permissible, since it will melt on its own. The Smag writes that by that logic, warming food that will subsequently turn into liquid is permissible as well, since this change of state, from solid to liquid, happens passively, not actively. This is explicit in the Berita - as long as one does not actively crush the snow (or fat in this case), it is permitted!

The Terumah disagrees. According to the Terumah, the leniency is beraita is not permitting allowing snow to melt passively. Rather, it permits drinking the wine that the snow melted in, since the melted snow was never identifiable.

It is interesting that both perspectives do not address why there should not be an issue of warming up fatty foods, due to the issue of bishul after bishul for liquids. Can we infer from that that we treat such a food as a solid, and there is therefore no problem? The Beit Yosef writes:

The Beit Yosef points out that the Terumah is not relating to the issue of bishul after bishul of liquid, and that could still potentially be a problem. However, he writes in the Shulchan Aruch:

Firstly, the Shulchan Aruch does not accept the opinion of the Sefer Haterumah. Secondly, he writes that it is permitted even in a place that is yad soledet!

It is important to note that, according to the position of the Minchat Kohen that we saw last Shiur, there is no issue of bishul after bishul for a liquid, since the fats that will melt are presumably not the majority of the entire dish. We saw last time that Rav Ovadiah accepts his position. The Yalkut Yosef writes:
The end of the above quote, which explains that a small amount of fat that will become absorbed into the food is permitted according to all opinions, is based on the Terumah who allows nolad when the snow becomes absorbed into the wine.

How will the opinions that do not accept the Minchat Kohen’s position explain the Shulchan Aruch?

The Beit Yosef writes that the Sefer Haterumah is stringent and does not allow warming up of a fatty food even in a place that is not yad soledet. If so, the Shulchan Aruch could have ruled against the Terumah without permitting placing the food in an area that is yad soledet. If he meant to rule against the Terumah and also add on the leniency about yad soledet, he should have stressed that “even” yad soledet is permitted. The Levush understood from this that there is a mistake in the text of the Shulchan Aruch, and it should read that it is permitted only in a place that is not yad soledet. Meaning, allowing the fat to melt is permitted, but heating it to yad soledet is problematic due to bishul after bishul for a liquid. Most poskim, however, disagree:

The Magen Avraham concludes from the fact that the Rishonim who disagree with the Terumah do not address the issue of bishul after bishul that we see that there is no such problem here, as we treat the fat as a dry food. The Mishna Berura rules like the Magen Avraham:

Rav Ben Zion Abba Shaul explains that this leniency relates to something we learned in the previous shiur:

Apparently, in regard to bishul after bishul, we relate to the food in its current state. This is also the position of the Chazon Ish (Orach Chaim 37:13).

The Ohr Lezion explains that there are two factors that allow us to be lenient here: 1) The food will become a liquid only after the heating begins, and this is therefore only grama, indirect, bishul, which is forbidden only d’Rabbanan. 2) Many Rishonim are of the opinion that there is no bishul after bishul for liquids as well.

Since our case is forbidden d’Rabbanan, one may rely on the lenient opinions.
Harchavot – ostensibly, all bishul is done through grama, i.e. passively. What does the Ohr Lezion mean when he states that the bishul we are discussing is grama?

To summarize:
The Gemara in Shabbat (51b) states that it is forbidden to crush snow, but it is permitted to put it into a cup.

According to Rashi (this is the way that most Rishonim understood him, for a different understanding see the Harchavot above) the prohibition is to actively “create” something new on Shabbat. It is permitted, however, to allow something to change its form on its own.

According to the Terumah, the prohibition is due to type of muktzah called nolad, and the problem exists even if the snow melts on its own. However, he permits putting the snow in a cup of wine, since the melted snow will not be identifiable on its own.

The Terumah writes that it is forbidden to heat up a food if it will cause the fat to melt.

The Rishonim (Semag, Semak, and others) point out that this will be permitted according to Rashi’s understanding.

In regard to the issue of bishul after bishul for liquids when heating up fatty food, according to the Minchat Kohen that we discussed last Shiur, since the fat will generally not be the majority of the food, there will be no problem to heat it up. This is the Yalkut Yosef’s position as well.

The Levush writes that the Shulchan Aruch actually means to be lenient only if the food will not be yad soledet, since there potentially is an issue here of bishul after bishul for liquids.

The Magen Avraham writes that, from the fact that the Rishonim who disagree with the Terumah do not address the issue of bishul after bishul, we see that there is no such problem here, as we treat the fat as a dry food.

In regards to the issue of nolad, the Shulchan Aruch implies that he does not follow the Terumah, and that is the position of the Yalkut Yosef. The Rema, however, writes that one should try to be stringent, but the food is permitted to be eaten b’dieved, and that is how the Shemirat Shabbat Kehilchita rules.

According to all opinions, if the fat will become absorbed into the food as it melts then it is permitted (based on the Terumah’s understanding of the leniency of placing snow in a cup of wine).

**Bishul after Baking or Grilling & Vice Versa**

**Introduction**

As we discussed in the last Shiur, there are different methods of heating up and preparing food.

“Bishul” generally refers to preparing food through the medium of a cooking liquid. Cooking often softens the original food or causes it to break down.

“Tzliyah” generally refers to grilling, cooking food by exposing it directly to heat. Grilling often hardens the food.

“Afiyah,” baking, generally refers to heating a dough until it hardens.

We saw in Shiur 13 that bishul and afiyah are both forms of the Av Melacha for Shabbat (see also the first of the Harchavot there).
It is true that the rule is that there is no "bishul after bishul" (At least for dry foods), but, assuming that the Melacha of bishul is defined as changing a food through heat, one could ask: is it forbidden to change food through a certain method of cooking if it was already changed by a different method? For example, if a food was cooked, will it be permitted to grill it on Shabbat, or is the fact that grilling affects food differently than cooking a reason to consider it a separate act of bishul?

The Korban Pesach must be grilled, as the Pasuk writes:

The Gemara in Pesachim discusses the definition of "grilled" for these purposes:

There are several important points that come out of the Gemara:
1. The Gemara associates grilling with baking (in the beginning, the Gemara believes that if cooking invalidates baked Matzah then cooking will invalidate a grilled Korban Pesach).

2. One could have theoretically distinguished between bishul after grilling and bishul after baking. The beraita itself states that if the Matzah becomes completely dissolved then everyone admits that it is invalidated to be used as Matzah, as it is no longer considered baked. This shows that bishul certainly does affect a baked item and can change its consistency; the question is just regarding when such a change is considered to have occurred. This is opposed to grilling and cooking where change in the consistency in the food between the two processes is much more subtle. Perhaps one could read the Gemara as saying that the connection between grilling and baking is obvious only according to the Tanna that holds that bishul after baking does not invalidate Matzah, and, so too, cooking after grilling would not invalidate the Korban Pesach. Therefore the beraita that invalidates cooking after grilling can only be consistent with the opinion that invalidates cooking after baking. The Gemara’s conclusion is that all opinions admit that cooking after grilling invalidates a Korban Pesach, but that is due to the implication of the Pasuk, and one cannot extrapolate from there to other areas of Halacha.

3. The Gemara’s conclusion seems to be that bishul affects grilling only for Korban Pesach, but not for other areas of Halacha, where this issue might or might not be dependent on the different opinions regarding bishul after baking Matzah.

4. It is possible to argue that even though the fact that bishul after grilling invalidates a Korban Pesach is only due to the Pasuk, the fact that such a situation is on the “Torah’s radar” at all shows that they are two Halachically disparate processes. If so, it is possible that in regard to Shabbat they would also be treated as independent acts of food preparation.

5. One could argue that the entire assumption until now, that the Gemara in Pesachim is relevant to Hilchot Shabbat, is incorrect. Perhaps, in regard to Matzah and Korban Pesach, the question is how the different processes affect the composition and/or flavor of the food. For Shabbat, however, perhaps the issue is much more general; one is forbidden from using heat to make food edible, and, in regard to Shabbat, all types of heat based food preparation are identical.

6. Rashi writes that, according to Rav Yosi, bishul after baking is a separate act of bishul. We need to examine if this is true about Shabbat as well.

The following Gemara in Berachot discusses what Beracha should be recited on cooked vegetables (called “shelakot” in the Gemara):

---

## Berachot 1b

דרש רב נחמן ביסרחא: שלקות מברכין עליהם בורא פרי האדמה, והברית חוויה מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה, וברית מדיה - שלקות מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה, וברית מדיה - שלקות מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה. פי המראה, שניים בהלצה, והברית מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה, והברית חוויה מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה, וברית מדיה - שלקות מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה, והברית חוויה מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה. פי המראה, שניים בהלצה, והברית מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה, והברית חוויה מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה. פי המראה, שניים בהלצה, והברית מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה, והברית חוויה מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה.

---
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---

## Berachot 1b

...אמר רבי יוסי אלימין ברבים - ברית נטיה, והברית חוויה מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה, והברית חוויה מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה. פי המראה, שניים בהלצה, והברית מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה, והברית חוויה מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה. פי המראה, שניים בהלצה, והברית מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה, והברית חוויה מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה. פי המראה, שניים בהלצה, והברית מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה, והברית חוויה מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה.

---
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The Gemara initially suggests that, just like the Tannaim disagree regarding fulfilling the Mitzvah with Matzah that was cooked, so too they would disagree about the proper beracha to make over cooked vegetables. If one believes that cooked Matzah loses its identity as Matzah, so too a cooked vegetable would lose its identity so that the beracha of Ha'adamah will no longer be appropriate. In the end, the Gemara states that the two issues are not related. According to Rav Yosi, cooked Matzah cannot be used for the Mitzvah, because it lacks the proper taste of Matzah, but a vegetable does not need to retain its original taste in order to be considered Ha'adamah.

The Gemara seems to be saying that bishul affects only Matzah, which requires a specific flavor, while bishul does not necessarily affect the identity of other baked foods. Meaning, one cannot compare the halachot of Matzah that is cooked after being baked to other areas of halacha. This appears to contradict the Gemara in Pesachim, which initially applies the opinions regarding Matzah to a different area of Halacha, namely Korban Pesach.

Tosafot in Pesachim points this out:

The Yirayim, Rav Eliezer Mimitz, understands that Rav Yosi’s opinion that one cannot use Matzah that was cooked after being baked is relevant to Shabbat as well. He continues:

In contrast, the Raavyah writes:
The Raavyah rejects the Yirayim’s opinion. The Raavyah, like the Tosafot quoted above, notes that the Gemara in Berachot concludes that Rav Yosi’s opinion was said only in the context of Matzah, where there is a requirement of a certain flavor. In other areas of Halacha, however, cooking after baking is not significant, and there is therefore no prohibition against cooking a baked food on Shabbat. The Beit Yosef (Siman 318, on Ot 5) writes that the Raavyah’s question is a strong one. However, perhaps the Yirayim understood from the fact that cooking the baked Matzah affects its flavor, that cooking and baking affect foods differently, and therefore they should be considered independent acts of *bishul* in regard to Shabbat (assuming that the definition of *bishul* is not just to make a food edible, but to influence its properties in a certain way).

The Tur brings only part of the Yereyim:

The Tur does not discuss the reverse situation, where *bishul* was performed first, and afterwards baking or grilling:

The Shulchan Aruch cites the two opinions. When bringing the lenient opinion, the Shulchan Aruch (before the addition of the Rema) simply writes that there are those who permit. The implication is that there is no issue at all of heating a food with one method after it has already undergone a different method, like the Raavyah.

If we understand that the Rema is explaining the Shulchan Aruch, then the Shulchan Aruch allows only in the case of *kli sheni*. The implication is that the Shulchan Aruch is fundamentally stringent like the Yirayim, but he is lenient when it comes to a *kli sheni*.

Before reading the next Shulchan Aruch, remember that the definition of *bishul* is cooking using a hot liquid:

What’s going on here? The Shulchan Aruch is discussing something that underwent *bishul* but does not currently have any liquid, and he permits heating it up next to the fire. Isn’t that grilling after *bishul*?
The answer to the question of the Beit Meir can have far-reaching implications. Practically speaking, there will often be the following issue when heating up food that was cooked before Shabbat; either the food has a lot of liquid, in which case there might be an issue of *bishul* after *bishul* for liquid, as we discussed last Shiur, or there is no significant liquid, in which case there is the question of whether this is considered broiling after cooking.

Several answers are offered to this question on the Shulchan Aruch:

1. We do not have a good answer and must therefore be stringent.

The Biur Halacha writes:

> הביאו ההלכה סופם חיטא סעיף ט"ד הוהו 이상
>Seriously, it is a question of whether or not we are actually doing the *bishul* after *bishul*.

The Mishna Berura therefore rules:

> מפה וברוחה סופם חיטא סעיף ט"ד
>But we must be stringent.

The Shemirat Shabbat Kihilchita follows the ruling of the Mishna Berura:

> שמעות שבת המלכות, מתודות ח стало פרק א סעיף ס
>This is the ruling of the Shulchan Aruch.

2. The Shulchan Aruch believes that the primary opinion is that of the Raavyah, and there is therefore no *bishul* after baking and vice versa.

This would mean that when the Shulchan Aruch wrote in *sif* 5 that there are those who permit, he meant that there are those who are completely lenient, and not just like the addition of the Rema that they permit when using a *kli sheni*. The Beit Yosef seems to be completely lenient:

> ביט היטף אראח יים סופם חיטא סעיף ט"ד
>It is quite reasonable to suggest that when he writes in *sif* 5 that there are those who permit he is referring to the Raavyah, and believes there is no *bishul* after baking or grilling and vice versa. This is Rav Ovadiah’s position:

These are the Beit Yosef’s final words on the subject. In light of this, it is quite reasonable to suggest that when he writes in *sif* 5 that there are those who permit he is referring to the Raavyah, and believes there is no *bishul* after baking or grilling and vice versa. This is Rav Ovadiah’s position:

> ש"י בייב יאמאר חלב ס"ה ח" את ויסミニ ח"ט
>It is quite reasonable to suggest that when he writes in *sif* 5 that there are those who permit he is referring to the Raavyah, and believes there is no *bishul* after baking or grilling and vice versa. This is Rav Ovadiah’s position:
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Rav Ovadiah shows that the Shulchan Aruch rules like the Raavyah, and not like the Yirayim, and he therefore rejects the question from **sif 15** where the Shulchan Aruch permits roasting after *bishul*. According to this, there are no limitations on how one may heat up dry food on Shabbat, regardless of their initial cooking process.

However, even if this is the correct understanding of the Shulchan Aruch himself, for Ashkenazim, who follow the rulings of the Rema, the question still stands. In **sif 5** the Rema is stringent like the Yirayim, but in **sif 15** he doesn’t disagree with the lenient ruling of the Shulchan Aruch. Therefore, the following answers, even if they are not necessarily the intention of the Shulchan Aruch, are still possible understandings of the Rema.

3. There is a distinction between *bishul* after roasting and roasting after *bishul*.

*The Shiltei Giborim*, which we saw earlier, writes that according to the Tur, there is no problem with grilling after *bishul*, even though the Tur believes there is a problem with *bishul* after grilling. The *Minchat Kohen* answers that this is precisely the opinion of the Shulchan Aruch.

The practical significance of this answer is that one may take food that underwent *bishul* before Shabbat, remove it from the liquid, and heat it up on Shabbat, since there is no issue of roasting after *bishul*.

4. There is a distinction between roasting in a pot and grilling outside of a pot:

*The Chazon Ish* offers two answers (we will bring the second one in the next paragraph):

- ** Mishna Torah Min ha-Tamid Siman 32a, פложение דוד צלוי ככלל בישול לעניין זה, ודווקא צלי על גחלים או על שפוד יש צליאת אחר בישול.

*The Chazon Ish* suggests that not all dry cooking is considered halachically distinct from *bishul*. The *Aruch Hashulchan* suggests something similar:

- **Aruch Hashulchan Siman 31a, פложение דוד אפיייה כחמצה נגזר מהאתייה: זוחל על נאף לוחמה או על שפוד יסקו חידות אחר בישול.

The Aruch Hashulchan writes that only direct grilling on a fire is considered to be a sufficiently different form of food preparation from *bishul*. Roasting in a pot is, for the purposes of Hilchot Shabbat, comparable to *bishul*, and one may therefore heat up food, which was cooked through *bishul*, in a pot without liquid, on Shabbat.

- **Harchavot – Does the Pri Megadim accept this definition?

5. Something is defined as *tzliyah*, grilling, only if it results in a specific product:

*Hoshen Mishpat Siman 32b, פложение דוד אפיייה כחמצה נגזר מהאתייה: זוחל על נאף לוחמה או על שפוד יסקו חידות אחר בישול.

The Aruch Hashulchan writes that only direct grilling on a fire is considered to be a sufficiently different form of food preparation from *bishul*. Roasting in a pot is, for the purposes of Hilchot Shabbat, comparable to *bishul*, and one may therefore heat up food, which was cooked through *bishul*, in a pot without liquid, on Shabbat.

- **Harchavot – Does the Pri Megadim accept this definition?

5. Something is defined as *tzliyah*, grilling, only if it results in a specific product:
We wrote earlier that the halachic definition of \textit{tzliyah} is food that is cooked without liquid. The above Chazon Ish is suggesting that \textit{tzliyah} is not just defined as being a specific cooking process, but it is also a means of giving food a certain flavor and characteristics. If food underwent \textit{bishul}, and it is heated again, even without liquid, that second process will be considered another act of \textit{bishul}, unless it gives the food the flavor and appearance of grilled food.

This answer relates to the root of our discussion. Why should it be forbidden to grill after \textit{bishul}, if \textit{bishul} after \textit{bishul} is permitted? Presumably two possible answers come to mind:

I. A different type of food preparation method will affect the nature of the food, and any time one prepares food (with heat) in a way that changes its characteristics it is considered \textit{bishul}.

II. Anytime one does an \textit{act} of food preparation that the food has not yet undergone, it is considered \textit{bishul}.

These two possibilities may sound similar, but the following practical difference can help sharpen the difference between them:

May one do \textit{bishul} on a food that was previously prepared through \textit{bishul}, but was grilled afterwards?

According to the first possibility, this should be forbidden, since the food now has the characteristics of “grilled food,” and cooking it will change that.

According to the second possibility, however, it should be permitted, since this piece of food already undergone \textit{bishul}.

The Acharonim take different stance on this issue:

\textit{ביאור הלכה} סימן שיח ד”ה יש מי שאומר

The Pri Megadim believes that the “\textit{sheim bishul}” the status of having undergone \textit{bishul}, is not undone by a subsequent act of grilling. Once the food was cooked, it is permitted to heat it up through \textit{bishul} (or grilling) on Shabbat.

According to this, the reason why one may not grill after \textit{bishul} or vice versa according to the Yirayim is that one may not perform an \textit{act} on food on Shabbat that it has not yet undergone, like the second possibility above.

- \textit{Harchavot} – The Pri Megadim’s proof that cooked food retains these characteristics even after it undergoes grilling as well

The Biur Halacha, however, disagrees:

The Biur Halacha explains that the second method is more dominant, and therefore the second method determines how it may be heated up on Shabbat. The food is now “grilled,” even though before it was “cooked,” and it is therefore problematic to heat it up through cooking on Shabbat.

The Biur Halacha appears to take the first approach, which focuses on the nature of the food and the problem of changing that on Shabbat.

Both perspectives, however, agree that the prohibition of \textit{bishul} after grilling (and vice versa) only apply if something new and different is done to the food – either a different cooking act or adding a different flavor and characteristic. This is especially true according to the Biur Halacha’s perspective.
It is reasonable to believe in this context that using the formal and technical difference between “dry”
cooking and cooking with liquid will not be sufficient, but rather one must look at whether the
different cooking methods will produce a different product.

In light of this, we can better understand the above answer of the Chazon Ish: that the prohibition of
roasting after *bishul* does not necessarily apply when the food was first cooked with liquid and is now
being heated without, but will apply only if the second act will give the food the flavor and
characteristics of grilled food.

The Eglei Tal writes something similar:

*אָגְלֵי תַּל מֶלֶכֶת הַמַּכָּה סְעִיף٤ סַ”ק יח אות א*:

השורה את האפוי ברותחין, כיון דניחא ליה בריכוכו, חشب ניחא ליה בפשול, והיה. אבל המנומד מבושל נד

המורדה חממו – אל ייבשו היה ערה, רק חממו, אלא חשב שooseת מלמאכת יישול.

Meaning, if his intention is to give the food a new quality, then there will be a problem of roasting
after *bishul*, but not if his intention is simply to heat the food up.

In summary:

In light of the Gemara in Pesachim (41a), the Yereyim writes that, even though there is no *bishul* after
*bishul*, there is *bishul* after grilling and vice versa.

In light of the Gemara in Berachot (38b), the Raavyah rejects this stringency.

The Shulchan Aruch (Siman 318 *sif* 5) brings the position of the Yirayim and concludes by writing
that there are those that permit this. The Rema explains that the Shulchan Aruch only permits this with
a *kli sheni*, and the Rema himself brings that the Raavyah is completely lenient. Practically, the Rema
writes that one should be strict.

In *sif* 15 the Shulchan Aruch permits heating food on Shabbat that had previously been cooked if it is
currently dry. But why isn’t there a problem of roasting after *bishul*, according to the Yirayim?

The answer to this question has broad implications, as it will influence if and how one may heat up
food that was cooked before Shabbat (since, if there is liquid, then there could be the issue of *bishul*
after *bishul* for liquid, and if it is dry then it could be roasting after *bishul*!).

We saw five different approaches:

The Mishna Berura and Shemirat Shabbat Kehilchita are not sure how to resolve this question, and
they write that one must therefore be stringent to heat up only food that was prepared without liquid.

Rav Ovadiah Yosef shows that the Shulchan Aruch follows the Raavyah, and there is therefore no
problem of roasting after *bishul*.

The Minchat Kohen answers that the Shulchan Aruch is stringent only about *bishul* after
roasting/grilling but not roasting/grilling after *bishul* (perhaps this is because *bishul* changes the
characteristics of a grilled food more than grilling changes the characteristics of a cooked food).

The Chazon Ish and Aruch Hashulchan write that the Yirayim is stringent only about grilling after
*bishul* if the grilling is done directly on the fire, without a pot. It is permitted, however, to heat food
that was cooked with liquid before Shabbat if one removes the food from the liquid and heats the food
in a pot.

The Chazon Ish and Iglei Tal explain that the grilling, which is forbidden to be done after *bishul*, refers
only to grilling that gives the food the flavor and characteristics of grilled food.
Toasting after Baking – Making Toast

Until now, we have seen that as long as no liquid is involved, there is no prohibition of reheating food using the same cooking method.

What happens if the same method will change the qualities of the food?

The Shoel U’meishiv rules that there is no problem with taking baked bread and turning it into toast, since that is simply baking after baking, which is permitted (although he is later stringent for a different reason, see further in the Harchavot).

Rav Ovadiah Yosef rules, as we saw earlier, like the Raavyah, but he explains that even for those who are stringent like the Yirayim, one may be lenient here:

_summary_

Food that Changes from a Solid to Liquid State During Cooking

The Gemara in Shabbat (51b) states that it is forbidden to crush snow, but it is permitted to put it into a cup.

According to Rashi (as most Rishonim understand him; for a different understanding, see the Harchavot above) the prohibition is to actively “create” something new on Shabbat, but it is permitted to allow something to change its form on its own.

According to the Terumah, the prohibition is due to type of muktzah called nolad, and the problem exists even if the snow melts on its own, but it is permitted to put the snow in a cup of wine, since then the melted snow will not be identifiable on its own.

The Terumah writes that it is forbidden to heat up a food if it will cause the fat to melt.

The Rishonim (Semag, Semak, and others) point out that this will be permitted according to Rashi’s understanding.

Regarding the issue of bishul after bishul for liquids when heating up fatty food, according to the Minchat Kohen that we discussed last Shiur, since the fat will generally not be the majority of the food, it is permitted to heat it up. This appears to be the Yalkut Yosef’s position.

The Levush writes that the Shulchan Aruch actually means to be lenient only if the food will not be yad soledet, since there would potentially be an issue of bishul after bishul for liquids.
The Magen Avraham writes that from the fact that the Rishonim who disagree with the Terumah do not address the issue of bishul after bishul, we see that there is no such problem here, as we treat the fat as a dry food.

In regards to the issue of no'lad, the Shulchan Aruch implies that he does not follow the Terumah, and that is the position of the Yalkut Yosef. The Rema, however, writes that one should try to be stringent, but the food is permitted to be eaten after the fact, and that is how the Shemirat Shabbat Kehilchita rules. According to all opinions, if the fat will become absorbed into the food as it melts then it is permitted (based on the Terumah’s understanding of the leniency of placing snow in a cup of wine).

**Bishul After Baking or Grilling and Vice Versa**

In light of the Gemara in Pesachim (41a), the Yirayim writes that even though there is no bishul after bishul, there is bishul after grilling and vice versa.

In light of the Gemara in Berachot (38b), the Raavyah rejects this stringency. The Shulchan Aruch (Siman 318 sif 5) brings the position of the Yirayim and concludes by writing that some permit this. The Rema explains that the Shulchan Aruch only permits this with a kli sheni, and the Rema himself brings that the Raavyah is completely lenient. Practically, the Rema writes that one should be strict.

In sif 15 the Shulchan Aruch permits heating food on Shabbat that has previously been cooked if it is currently dry. Why isn’t there a problem of roasting after bishul, according to the Yirayim?

The answer to this question has broad implications, as it will influence if and how one may heat up food that was cooked before Shabbat (since, if there is liquid, then there could be the issue of bishul after bishul for liquid, and if it is dry then it could be roasting after bishul!).

We saw five different approaches:

a) The Mishna Berura and Shemirat Shabbat Kehilchita are not sure how to resolve this question, and write that one must therefore be stringent to heat up only food that was prepared without liquid.

b) Rav Ovadiah Yosef shows that the Shulchan Aruch follows the Raavyah, and there is therefore no problem of roasting after bishul.

c) The Minchat Kohen answers that the Shulchan Aruch is stringent only about bishul after roasting/grilling but not roasting/grilling after bishul (perhaps this is because bishul changes the characteristics of a grilled food more than grilling changes the characteristics of a cooked food).

d) The Chazon Ish and Aruch Hashulchan write that the Yirayim is stringent only about grilling after bishul if the grilling is done directly on the fire, without a pot. It is permitted, however, to heat food that was cooked with liquid before Shabbat if one removes the food from the liquid and heats the food in a pot.

e) The Chazon Ish and Iglei Tal explain that the grilling, which is forbidden to be done after bishul, refers only to grilling that gives the food the flavor and characteristics of grilled food.

**Preparing Toast on Shabbat**

The Shoel Umeishiv writes that since there is no prohibition of baking after baking, there is therefore no problem of turning baked bread into toast on Shabbat (in the end he is stringent, but for other reasons). Rav Ovadiah Yosef similarly writes that even those who forbid baking after bishul will be lenient in this situation, since it is merely baking after baking.

In this Shiur we completed the Halachot of bishul after bishul and explained the permitted methods for heating up food on Shabbat. In the next Shiur we will learn the other conditions for heating up cold food on Shabbat.