

מהו דתימא לשרורי מנא קא מכוין –

You may say; he intends to strengthen the utensil

OVERVIEW

ruled that one who threw a moist peg into an oven is liable for (cooking). The גמרא asked; it is obvious! The גמרא answered; one would think he intends to strengthen the peg, therefore ר"א בר ר"א taught that he is חייב for מבשל. Our תוספות discusses what the הו"א was, and what is the מסקנא.

הכי פירוש¹ ואין בו בשול כלל קא משמע לן דנהי לשרורי מנא קא מכוין -

This is the explanation (of the הו"א); we would have thought that since לשרורי מנא קא מכוין, so there is no בישול at all, so this is what ר"א בר ר"א is coming to teach us, that granted לשרורי מנא קא מכוין (which by itself is not בישול) -

בשול מיהא יש בו דמירפא רפי והדר קמיט וחייב² -

Nevertheless there is בישול occurring with this peg, for first the heat of the oven makes the peg soft (which is בישול) and later it hardens it, therefore he is חייב because of מבשל.

אבל אין לפרש קא משמע לן דלא אמרינן לשרורי מנא קא מכוין³ -

However one is not to explain the קמ"ל to mean that we do not say לשרורי מנא קא מכוין but only to make it softer, and therefore he is חייב משום מבשל; this cannot be -

דבפרק אין מעמידין (עבודה זרה לח, א) אמרינן גבי האי נכרי דשדא סיכתא לאתונא -

For in דבפרק אין מעמידין, פרק אין מעמידין, regarding this gentile who threw a moist peg into the oven, רבינא ruled that even if the נכרי heated up the oven for his peg -

אי קבר בה ישראל קרא מעיקרא שפיר דמי -

If a Jew placed a raw gourd/squash in the oven to be cooked, before the נכרי threw in the peg, it is properly done and there is no concern for בישול עכו"ם -

ופריך פשיטא⁴ ומשני מהו דתימא לבשולי מנא קא מכוין קא משמע לן לשרורי מנא קא מכוין:

And the גמרא asked; it is obvious that it is not בישול עכו"ם! And the גמרא answered; one would have thought that the נכרי intends to cook the utensil (peg), therefore רבינא teaches us that he intends to strengthen the utensil.⁵

¹ (ה"פ by writing תוספות), is negating the לפרש (mentioned shortly). See פרש"י ד"ה דמרפי who seems to be in agreement with תוספות.

² It will be necessary to say that this slight בישול is needed in order to strengthen it. Therefore there is also intent of בישול here as well, in order to strengthen it. See 'Thinking it over' # 1 & 2.

³ The advantage of the לפרש אין can be understood with footnote # 2 and the questions in 'Thinking it over'.

⁴ ר"א taught there previously that when the נכרי heats up something without the intent to cook, it is not considered בישול עכו"ם. ר"י based his ruling on רבינא.

SUMMARY

The קמ"ל is that even though he intends to strengthen it, nevertheless there is a cooking process taking place.

THINKING IT OVER

1. From our גמרא here it seems that there is an intent of בישול by the peg (otherwise he would not be חייב);⁶ however from the גמרא in ע"ז it seems that there is no intent of בישול there.⁷ How can we reconcile these two גמרות?!⁸

2. Should the בישול here by שבת be considered מתכוין, or an אינו מתכוין ופסיק רישיה, or a מלאכה שאינה צריכה לגופה?⁹

⁵ It is evident from that גמרא that the intention of throwing a peg into the oven is (not for cooking it, but rather) for strengthening it. Therefore the קמ"ל here cannot mean that it is not קא מתכוין, but rather that even though לשרורי מנא קא מתכוין, nevertheless he is still מבשל in the process when it is רפי רפי.

⁶ See footnote # 2.

⁷ See footnote # 5.

⁸ See here מהר"ם ומהרש"א and תוס' ע"ז לח, א ד"ה קמ"ל.

⁹ See מנחת אריאל אות כ'.