מורשת מרן
moreshet-maran.com
Moreshet Maran
השיעור השבועי
The Weekly Halacha Shiur of Maran HaRishon LeTzion Rabbi Yitzchak Yosef shlit"a

Based on the weekly Motzaei Shabbat shiur in the Yazdim synagogue that was established by Maran Rabbenu Ovadia Yosef ztk"l.

Refuah Shelemah for Yishak Ben Hanom Hannah



ק"ק שערי ציון
CONGREGATION
SHAARE ZION

Parashat Toldot
Shabbat candlelighting
Brooklyn, NY 6:07 PM



Dedicated in Honor of Mr Harry Adjmi for his tireless work for our community.

The Melachah of Cooking on Shabbat (Part 1)

Weekly Shiur from Maran HaRishon LeTzion HaGaon Rabbi Yitzchak Yosef shlit"a, Motzaei Shabbat Parashat Chayei Sarah 5787, Shiur #570

Topics of the Shiur:

Cooking Water and Raw Fruit: Is One Liable on a Torah Level? | One Who Transgressed and Cooked Water or Fruit: May One Benefit? | Cooking After Cooking in Water | Preparing Coffee on Shabbat | Telling Someone Who Follows the Lenient Practice | Telling Someone Who Has Not Accepted Shabbat | Heating Lukewarm Soup | Returning to Study Tractate Shabbat in the Yeshivot as Well | Being Proficient in *Eglei Tal* and *Minchat Chinuch* | Be Careful with the Honor of Torah Scholars as with Fire!

Shiur of Maran HaRishon LeTzion shlit"a: Heating Water

The *Rambam* (*Shabbat* 9:1) writes: "One who bakes the volume of a dried fig (*gerogeret*) is liable. Whether one bakes bread, or cooks food or spices, or heats"—it is known that we are precise in the *Rambam*'s words as in the words of the Tannaim and Amoraim, and below we will examine why he wrote "heats" and not "cooks"—"water, it is all one matter." Now, the Mishnah (*Shabbat* 73a) lists the thirty-nine *melachot*, and the eleventh is the *melachah* of "one who bakes," even though there is no difference between baking and cooking, as the Gemara explains (74b): Rav Pappa said, "Our Tanna omitted cooking spices"—they took colorful plants such as roses and cyclamens, cut them and cooked them in water, and made dye from them, and that is how they made the dyed-red ram skins (there is a red heifer, but there is no red ram; rather, they dyed its skin red; *Rashi*, *Shemot* 25:5)—"which existed in the Mishkan, and yet he chose baking?! Our Tanna followed the sequence of bread-making." We derive the *melachot* from the acts of work that were done to build the Mishkan, and not from what took place in the Mishkan after it was erected, as implied by the Gemara (75a): "For what *melachah* is a slaughterer liable? Rav said: because of dyeing, and Shmuel said: because of taking a life." *Rashi* explains (s.v. *Shochet*): "For what is a slaughterer liable—where was there slaughtering in the work of the Mishkan, and what was its function?" But there was slaughtering in all the offerings! Rather, we derive the *melachot* only from the erection of the Mishkan, and not from the time of the Mishkan itself. Here too we learn from cooking spices, and not from the baking of the *Shtei HaLechem* and the *Lechem HaPanim*.

A Contradiction in the Rambam

As mentioned, the *Rambam* wrote that one who heats water is liable, and if one heated water until it reached a temperature at which the hand recoils (*yad soledet bo*), he has transgressed the *melachah* of baking and cooking. Later the *Rambam* writes (halachah 3): "One who cooks over a fire something that was already fully cooked—not like *Rashi* (*Shabbat* 20a), who holds that it suffices for it to be cooked like the food of *Ben Drusai*—or something that does not need cooking at all, is exempt." And the *Rambam* already wrote (*Shabbat* 1:3) that wherever he writes "exempt" (*patur*), it means exempt but forbidden Rabbinically. It would seem that there is a contradiction. On one hand, the *Rambam* wrote in halachah 1 that one who heats water is liable, meaning on a Torah level; on the other hand, he wrote that one who cooks something that does not need cooking is exempt, and water is fit to drink raw. According to the *Rambam*'s words in halachah 3, one who heats water should be exempt, so why did he write in halachah 1 that he is liable? This is a contradiction within a single chapter, from halachah 1 to halachah 3.

Cooking Fruit on Shabbat

Hagahot Rabbi Akiva Eiger, on *Shulchan Aruch* (*O.C.* 254), inferred from the *Rambam*'s words that one who cooks on Shabbat fruits that are eaten raw—such as apple, apricot or plum, and prepares "compote"—has cooked only Rabbinically. He was preceded by the *Minchat Kohen* (end of 2:4), an early authority from about 400 years ago, who wrote this in the *Rambam*'s view, that fruits that are eaten raw are not subject to cooking. The *Radbaz* (1:213), who lived in the generation of Maran the *Bet Yosef*, also wrote: "Regarding something that is eaten as it is, raw, whether it carries the prohibition of cooking on Shabbat: regarding lashes, he is not lashed, but it is forbidden Rabbinically; and if they were cooked on their own, such as when he placed them before Shabbat, it is permitted to eat them on Shabbat." The *Acharonim* dwelled on the contradiction in the *Rambam*.

Resolutions of the Contradiction

Magen Avraham (end of 254) resolved it in two ways. The first: although water is fit to drink raw, it is still not as good that way as fruit. That is, with fruit there is not much difference between eating it raw and eating it cooked, unlike water, which is improved by cooking, especially when making a cup of tea, coffee or soup. The second: perhaps the *Rambam* speaks of a case where he needs the water for rinsing, and then it must be hot. For example, he has many dishes to rinse and in the winter he heats water in order to wash them, or he wants to wash his face, hands and feet (but his entire body is forbidden, *Shabbat* 40a, even in lukewarm water, and initially one should be stringent also for immersion for a mitzvah; *Chazon Ovadia*, *Shabbat*, vol. 6, p. 78) in water that was heated before Shabbat. In such a case, one who heats the water transgresses the Torah prohibition of cooking, but one who heats water for drinking, since it is fit to drink when raw, is exempt, though it is forbidden Rabbinically. However, this is not the plain meaning of the *Rambam*, who wrote simply, "One who cooks food, etc., or heats water," and it is forced to establish that he means only heating for washing or rinsing dishes, and not heating

for drinking.

Liable for the Heating

The Admor of Sochatchov[1] wrote in his sefer *Eglei Tal* (*Ofeh* 19:13) that when cooking water one is not liable for the cooking itself but for the heating. That is why the *Rambam* wrote "heats" the water and not "cooks": the main advantage of cooked water is while it is hot, and here there is an essential difference between hot water and cold water. A person who does not feel well will not drink water from the tap... This is unlike something else that is eaten raw, where there is not much difference between raw and cooked. This is close to the first resolution above, in the words of the *Magen Avraham*. *Mishnah Berurah* writes (318:1): "Although water is fit for drinking without cooking, and the same is true of milk, nevertheless he is liable, since it is improved by cooking." This is also inferred from the *Rambam*, who wrote that one who cooks something that does not need cooking "at all" is exempt, to exclude water, which is improved by cooking.

One Gave the Water

It would seem that we can bring proof for the *Eglei Tal* from what the *Rambam* wrote (*Shabbat* 9:4) based on the Gemara in *Betzah* (34a): "One gave the fire, one gave the wood, one gave the pot, one gave the water, one gave the meat, and one gave the spices—they all became cooks... and another came and stirred, all are liable for cooking, for anyone who does one of the requirements of cooking is a cook." According to the commentators on the *Rambam*, this speaks of a case where they planned that each one would bring something, and therefore even the one who brought the pot is liable for cooking, since he too caused the cooking. But according to *Rashi* (*Betzah* 34a), the one who gave the pot is liable because of *tzoref* (tempering), strengthening the iron. In the past they would make a thick spoon, and when it broke one would see many cavities in it, and the same was true with pots and metal plates, and one could understand more readily that the vessel absorbs a lot. But the halachah follows the *Rambam* and not *Rashi*.[2] In any event, from here there is proof that even one who gave the water is liable for cooking. However, in the sefer *Tal Orot* (p. 37d), a sefer on the thirty-nine *melachot* by Rabbi Yosef ben Jaiyah, he rejected the proof, for there the case is different: each of them did something that is among the requirements of cooking, and together the dish was cooked. But with one who heats water alone, from where do we know that cooking applies to it? Moreover, there it speaks of all of them coming at the same time and all of them putting the water and the meat in the pot together, and for that reason all are liable, as Maran the *Kesef Mishneh* wrote (9:4) in the name of his teacher, Mahari Bei Rav.

Grama in the Melachah of Cooking

It seems difficult: one who brought the pot and placed it on the fire did not cook; he only caused the one who put in the water, meat or spices to cook, so why is he liable? The Gemara in *Shabbat* (120b) expounded the verse "you shall not do any work": doing is forbidden, but *grama* (indirect causation) is permitted. *Ritva* (there) and Rabbenu Yoel, cited by the *Mordechai* (*Kol Kitvei*, 399), wrote that in any event, Rabbinically one should forbid performing a *melachah* on Shabbat through *grama*. But *Tosafot* (end of *Perek Kirah*), *Rosh* (*Betzah* 22a) and many other *Rishonim* wrote that whenever there is a need, it is permitted to be lenient through *grama*. This is also the view of the *Shulchan Aruch* (334:22). However, in the previous shiur we explained that the entire *melachah* of cooking is *grama*: a person takes a pot and puts something uncooked on the gas or in the oven, and it is the fire that cooks, and nonetheless he is liable. The same applies to one who gave the pot, that he is liable, because he did something that is among the requirements of cooking.

One Who Transgressed and Cooked Fruit or Water

The practical difference is for one who transgressed and cooked fruit and prepared "compote" on Shabbat. Not knowing the *Acharonim*, he only saw the *Rambam*, who wrote that one who cooks something that does not need cooking is exempt, and thought it was permitted. May he eat it, or is it forbidden? The rule is that one who transgresses a Rabbinic *melachah* on Shabbat unintentionally—thinking that Shabbat had not yet begun, or that it had already ended, or that the *melachah* was permitted—may eat on Shabbat *bedieved*, and if he committed a Rabbinic prohibition intentionally, he should wait until Motzaei Shabbat. So if we say that cooking fruit is Rabbinic, and he cooked unintentionally, it would be permitted to eat on Shabbat. However, halachically, even one who cooks raw fruit that is improved by cooking is liable on a Torah level, as the *Eglei Tal* wrote (*Ofeh* 19:8) in rejecting the words of Rabbi Akiva Eiger: one can say that the *Rambam* does not speak of apples and the like, but of something that cooking does not improve at all, and that does not change its taste into another taste. But one who cooks fruit, or who cooks water, is liable for cooking on a Torah level.[3]

Cooking After Cooking in Water

All of this applies to initial cooking. But what is the law of someone who placed an urn on the *plata*, boiled the water before Shabbat, and on

1 He was an Admor (Chassidic Rebbe) and a great man. When I was young in yeshiva ketanah we learned Tractate *Shabbat*. Today I do not know why this is not common; they learn *Bava Kamma*, *Bava Metzia*, *Ketubot*, *Gittin* and *Yevamot*, which is important, but Shabbat is also important. When we learned Tractate *Shabbat* in yeshiva, in 5725 or 5726, there were shiurim on Tractate Shabbat full of scholarship, and they would bring a great deal from *Yabia Omer*. People think that the laws of Shabbat are only *Mishnah Berurah* and *Biur Halachah*. In Yeshivat Chevron too, years ago, they used to learn Tractate Shabbat; I heard that today some have cancelled it because it is more suitable for avrechim. When will he learn *Yevamot* if not as a bachur, with his strength, when he can delve deeply? Afterwards, when he comes to kollel, he must learn things that are practical halachah, and then he will learn Niddah, *issur ve'heter* and Shabbat.

When I was young, I learned a great deal of *Eglei Tal* and would summarize his words, and alongside it we would learn *Minchat Chinuch* on *Musach HaShabbat*, on the thirty-nine *melachot*. A delight! When we opened *Chazon Ovadia*, I had a regular shiur every Friday in order to catch the bachurim. Someone donated several sets of *Minchat Chinuch*, and we learned the thirty-nine *melachot* in order, and the bachurim enjoyed it. Also in the *Chazon Ovadia* kollel that Maran zt"l established in 5733, Maran insisted that there be learning on Friday as well, until 12:00. The avrechim complained a little, since they wanted to help their wives, but Maran spoke firmly that one must learn in kollel on Friday as well, and that he should help his wife from 12:00 to 4:00. And that suffices.

2 Especially since *Rashi* explains and does not rule; that is, he came to explain and not to rule halachah. Maran wrote this in *Yabia Omer* in several places (vol. 3, *C.M.* 4:4; vol. 7, *O.C.* 29:2; and others), and people were astonished at him: *Rashi* is *rabban shel Yisrael* (the teacher of all Israel), so how can one say that he is not a posek? But Maran did not invent this on his own; rather, the *Meiri* wrote this (in his introduction to *Bet HaBechirah* on *Avot*, p. 54), that *Rashi* did not always arrive at a halachic ruling, and mainly explains the sugya, unless he wrote "*vehachi hilchata*," "*ule'inyan halachah*," "*vehachi naktinan*" and the like. When he writes without such wording, he did not arrive at a ruling. In *Rashi*'s responsa he intended to rule, but not in explaining the words of the Gemara. Therefore, it is not at all certain that there is a dispute here between *Rashi* and the *Rambam*, and it is possible that even *Rashi* would agree, halachically, that all are liable for cooking.

3 According to scientists, tap water contains bacteria, and when it is boiled the bacteria are gone. If you want to check that there is a difference, take water from the tap and water that was boiled and cooled, and put them in the freezer; the water that was boiled will freeze faster, because it is more distilled.

Friday night sits and learns with a *chavruta* until at least 1:00 a.m., and sees that the *plata* has broken? He needs to drink a cup of tea or coffee in the morning, and it is hard for him without it, but by morning the water will have cooled, and he wants to ask the neighbors to put the urn on their *plata*. What is the law? According to Maran the *Shulchan Aruch*, it implies that water that was fully cooked and reached a temperature at which the hand recoils, and then cooled again, is not subject to cooking after cooking and is permitted. For water is in the category of *mitztamek vera lo* (it reduces and is worsened), as stated explicitly in the Gemara (*Shabbat* 38a), and Rabbenu Yonah and Rabbenu Yerucham (12:3, p. 69a), about 700 years ago, wrote that the prohibition of cooking after cooking in a liquid applies only when the dish reduces and is improved (*mitztamek veyafeh lo*), but if it reduces and is worsened, it is permitted to heat it on Shabbat. Maran copied their words in the *Bet Yosef* (*O.C.* 253 and 318), and he wrote this explicitly in the *Shulchan Aruch* (318:8): "To place a cold item that was fully cooked on top of an urn that is on the fire, some say that its law is like placing it opposite the bonfire, and anything that is permitted to place opposite the bonfire in a place where the hand recoils, such as a dry item—a dry dish such as schnitzel or rice—is permitted to place on top of an urn that is on the fire. [And some say that it is like placing it on a stovetop initially, and it is forbidden, even if it was fully cooked and even if it reduces and is worsened, and even if he places it there to keep it warm. The first view appears to be primary.] In any event, if it is a dish that has gravy and 'reduces and is improved,' it is forbidden according to all." It is inferred that only with a liquid dish that reduces and is improved is there cooking after cooking, but with water, which evaporates and is in the category of reduces and is worsened, once it has been cooked it is permitted to heat it again.

A Contradiction in the Shulchan Aruch

It is astonishing, because this seems to contradict what Maran the *Shulchan Aruch* wrote above in 318:4: "A dish that was fully cooked is subject to cooking if it cooled." And the *Rama* wrote in his gloss: "And some say only if it reduces and is improved (Rabbenu Yerucham)." But Maran wrote without qualification that there is cooking after cooking in liquid, not like the *Rambam* (*Shabbat* 9:3 and 22:8), but like *Rashi* (*Shabbat* 34b), *Rosh* (Shabbat 3:10) and Rabbenu Yonah (cited in *Nimukei Yosef*, *Bava Batra* 10a), who distinguish between liquid and dry. Why did he not distinguish between reduces and is worsened and reduces and is improved, as he wrote in 318:8?

A Host of Poskim

The *Mishnah Berurah* (318:62) wrote that the entire wording of 318:8 in the *Shulchan Aruch* is the wording of Rabbenu Yerucham, who distinguishes between reduces and is improved and reduces and is worsened. But in practice the halachah follows the other poskim, who do not make this distinction, as is evident from 318:4, where Maran did not distinguish; perhaps he holds this way, but he followed the wording of Rabbenu Yerucham as he went along (see also *Mishnah Berurah* 318:25). He noted that this is the view of the *Gra* (318:4) and *Tosefet Shabbat* (318:18, 32). However, many *Acharonim*—mainly Sephardim—wrote differently from the *Mishnah Berurah* in this matter. *Taz* (318:4, 6) wrote plainly that where it reduces and is worsened, it is permitted. So too wrote other *Acharonim*: *Minchat Kohen* (end of 2:2), *Knesset HaGedolah* (in a responsum, *O.C.* 17), *Zera Emet* (*O.C.* 39), *Chida* (*Birkei Yosef* 318:5), *Ma'amar Mordechai* (318, end of subsection 6), *Petach HaDevir* (318:6, the second), *Nahar Shalom* Ventura (318:8), *Shem Chadash* (p. 58d), *Eretz Chaim* Sitthon (318:8) and others, that although there is cooking after cooking in liquid, since it reduces and is worsened, it is permitted. This is how they understood Maran's view.

The *Magen Avraham* (end of 318:27) already raised the contradiction in the *Shulchan Aruch*, and resolved it as a possibility: although Maran did not distinguish in 318:4, he relied on what he wrote in 318:8, that only a dish that reduces and is improved is forbidden. The *Minchat Kohen* (*Mishmeret HaShabbat*, end of 2:2) wrote that we are not expert in every dish whether it reduces and is improved or reduces and is worsened. If a dish has a little gravy, sometimes the gravy evaporates and the dish is tastier, and sometimes the dish dries out. But water alone is an explicit Gemara, that it falls into the category of reduces and is worsened, as the *Eliyah Rabbah* wrote (318:10). Therefore, we Sephardim are permitted to take water that was in an urn and cooled, and transfer it to another *plata*, because it reduces and is worsened. One who is versed only in the *Mishnah Berurah* will be stringent, but many poskim wrote to be lenient, and that this is Maran's view. The *Mishnah Berurah* is a very, very important and foundational sefer, but this is one of the many examples of why one must learn other poskim as well.

We Follow the One Who Performs the Act

An Ashkenazi who is stringent about this like the *Gra*, *Tosefet Shabbat* and *Mishnah Berurah*, and who needs to heat the water again, should call a Sephardi neighbor and say to him: I heard in a shiur on Motzaei Shabbat, or read in the bulletin "The Weekly Shiur," that the Sephardim are more lenient and we are stringent, so what should we do... Please do me a favor and heat the cooked water for me, because I do not feel well and I need a cup of tea. The Sephardi should not say to him, "Am I your Shabbat goy?!" For according to halachah this is permitted; you are acting according to the view of your rabbis—Maran, the *Chida*, *Zera Emet*, *Petach HaDevir* and others—and we always follow the one who performs the *melachah*, and not the one for whom the *melachah* is being done.

Preparing Coffee on Shabbat

There are several examples of this. For instance, how does one prepare a cup of coffee on Shabbat? We Sephardim put in coffee (a heaping teaspoon, so that one will be alert...) and sugar (only half a teaspoon since it is not very healthy, one has to get used to as little as possible) and open the tap of the urn over the cup and stir. It is good coffee, try it and see... But the Ashkenazim first of all pour in the water, since according to the *Rama* (318:5) there is cooking after baking or roasting. In any event, according to Maran there is no cooking after roasting,[4] and the coffee is fit for eating.

The Definition of Kli Rishon

According to the *Chazon Ish* (cited in *Shevut Yitzchak* 30:1 in the name of Rabbi Chaim Kanievsky), when one pours water from an urn that was on the fire into a cup and the stream was not interrupted, the cup is considered a *kli rishon*, and when he transfers it to another cup, that is a *kli sheni*. But this is a great novelty, and the other poskim did not understand his words this way, and there are proofs for this, that a *kli rishon* is the

4 I checked, and in all the coffee companies today, the coffee arrives roasted. Today someone said, "I heard that the coffee is not completely roasted," but this just arouses doubts in people, and apparently he did not understand. There is coffee with the spice cardamom, or that might contain chickpeas; the Ministry of Health is obligated to announce this, because there are those who have an allergy, and they can sue (they should go to a bet din, which will give them permission to turn to a court; only in this way is it permitted to go to a court—one needs permission from a bet din) over the fact that they might receive an injection, be evacuated by ambulance, and even reach actual *pikuach nefesh*. But even if there are chickpeas, it is a *pesik reisha de'lo ichpat lei* (an inevitable result that he does not care about), and there are several more doubts.

one that stood on the fire, and when one pours from it into another vessel, that is a *kli sheni*. I did not find the *Chazon Ish*'s opinion on this in the books of Maran zt"l, although he was expert in his Torah and mentioned him often; I mentioned it in *Yalkut Yosef* and analyzed his words. From the *Chazon Ish*'s words regarding a ladle, it appears that he understood that a vessel that is not on the fire is called a *kli sheni*, for he wrote there as follows: "All the more so if one pours from a pot to a bowl, and draws from a bowl to a small dish, for this is pouring from a third vessel." At first glance, it is inferred that the pot alone is defined as a *kli rishon* (since it is on the fire), and the bowl is a *kli sheni*, and when one draws with a ladle from the bowl, it is considered pouring from a third vessel, namely the ladle. For the pot is a *kli rishon*, the bowl is a *kli sheni*, and the ladle from the bowl to the small dish is considered pouring from a third vessel. But according to Rabbi Chaim Kanievsky mentioned above, it would be pouring from a second vessel. This requires further study.

Removing a Cardboard Cup from Within a Cup

Incidentally, someone who prepares coffee in a cardboard cup and wants to hold it, but it is very hot, what does he do? He puts a cardboard cup inside another cup; it does not cost much... If, after he finishes drinking, he wants to take out the clean outer cup and throw away the dirty one, since nobody washes a disposable cup... there is one who wrote that it is forbidden to separate the cups because of *borer*, and since he will drink from the cup only for a few more hours, it is not considered *miyad* (immediate use). But the new *Yalkut Yosef* does not say so, because *borer* applies to a mixture, whereas with a cup inside a cup, this one stands by itself and that one stands by itself. Just as someone who does not want the oil in a can of tuna—it has plenty of oil—is permitted to pour the floating oil into the sink. And likewise someone who does not want the water in a can of pickles is permitted to pour the water out of the pickle can (not corn, which is small), because each one stands on its own. And one should not add what Rabbi Akiva Eiger wrote (in a responsum, *siman* 20), that *borer* applies only to items that grew from the ground, since cardboard cups are essentially made from paper, which is made from wood. In practice, it is permitted to take out the clean cup and use it again, and this is not called *borer*, since *borer* applies only to a mixture.

Coffee Fit for Eating

Think about it: a person who takes a teaspoon of coffee together with sugar and stirs it can recite *Shehakol* and eat it. Try it and see. Today people are not used to this, but when I was young in yeshiva ketanah (Maran zt"l sent us to yeshiva at the age of 12) one Shabbat Maran called me over: "Can you learn *Tosafot* in *Kiddushin*?" He saw that I knew how to learn, and said, "What a pity for you, go to yeshiva..." The Rabbanit said: "Rav Ovadia, he is small..." But Maran blessed me that I would succeed in yeshiva. I went to yeshiva and saw the greats of the generation, and among them Rabbi Ezra Attiah would test us. It was very moving, we would tremble, but when he saw that we were nervous he would answer in our place: he would begin the *Tosafot* and we would continue. The rebbe would get angry, "Why are you revealing it to them?", but Rabbi Ezra had a compassionate heart and could not bear that anyone not know. And whoever answered well, he would call over in Arabic (in my parents' house we spoke a lot of Arabic, and we understood): "Open your hand." We would hold out our hands, and he would put in them a mixture of coffee with sugar, as a kind of candy, and we would recite "*Shehakol*" and eat it. Today there are candies, and a child who is given coffee and sugar will pour it back... but those were the candies of the past. We would likewise eat cocoa, or matzah meal, together with sugar, because there was poverty; there were no sweets or "Papushdo" cookies. Even today, it is not necessary that people actually eat the coffee; it suffices that the coffee is fit for eating. Therefore, it is permitted to open the hot water tap directly onto the coffee, as Maran holds, while the Ashkenazim are stringent to prepare coffee in a *kli sheni*, like the *Rama*. An Ashkenazi who tried it once and saw that the coffee was not tasty, and who says to a Sephardi, "I am very tired, I learned all night, and I do not want to fall asleep during the Torah reading, so make me Sephardic coffee..." it is permitted to prepare it for him, because we follow the one who performs the *melachah*, and we do not care for whom it is being done.

Accepting Shabbat Early

A proof for this is in the *Shulchan Aruch* (263:17), who wrote regarding someone who accepted Shabbat while it was still day, put on a tie, came to the bet kenesset, and began reading *shenayim mikra ve'echad targum* (the weekly Torah portion twice with the Targum once), or reading *Shir HaShirim*, as is his custom. Suddenly his child runs to him and says, "Mom says the *plata* has broken and needs to be replaced." He is permitted to tell another person to replace the *plata*. At first glance, how can he speak weekday speech on Shabbat and tell someone to perform the *melachah* of kindling on Shabbat? Rather, Maran the *Shulchan Aruch* ruled in the name of the *Rashba* (*Shabbat* 151a) that one who has accepted Shabbat may tell his fellow Jew to perform a *melachah* for him, and the *Bet Yosef* explained that if he had not accepted Shabbat, he himself would have been permitted to perform the *melachah*. Moreover, the one who performs it does so permissibly, and the *Taz* (263:3) explained in the name of the *Rashba* that the Sages prohibited *amirah* (telling), weekday speech on Shabbat, only for a prohibition that is equal for everyone. Several authors of our times challenged the *Yalkut Yosef* (318:52): how can an Ashkenazi tell a Sephardi to make him coffee? This is weekday speech on Shabbat. But one cannot offer reasoning without knowledge of Torah; one must also know the *Rishonim* and *Acharonim*, and in this case, telling is permitted. Likewise, it is permitted to tell a Sephardi to heat water for him that was already cooked before Shabbat. One who attacks another by mistake—perhaps this falls into the category of disgracing Torah scholars (*bizuy talmidei chachamim*). Nowadays this sin is rampant in the chareidi media; someone should rise and declare a ban on that avrech who, every Monday and Thursday, disgraces Torah scholars in the chareidi media, and thereby stop this plague from spreading against the Sephardim.

Guard for Me and I Will Guard for You

There are opposite cases, such as on a Friday night of the winter, which should be used for learning, as we saw with my father, Maran zt"l, and as true Torah scholars do: not to be idlers who look for events to go to, especially on Friday night when there is nowhere to go; he sits and learns until 1:00 a.m. If at a late hour he becomes hungry and wants to eat soup... The Ashkenazim are accustomed to eating soup on Friday night. At the Merkaz Hotel in Yerushalayim (Maran zt"l used to go there often when he came to give shiurim in the area), there is soup on Friday night, with soup-nuts or croutons. Especially if it is cold and the rain is beating on the windows, he wants to eat hot soup. According to the Ashkenazic custom (*Rama* 318:15), if the soup has not cooled completely, it is permitted to heat it, but for us Sephardim, once it has fallen below the temperature of *yad soledet bo*, it is forbidden to heat it. It is permitted to tell an Ashkenazi to heat the soup, and afterwards they eat, because we follow the one who performs the act: "guard for me and I will guard for you." Sometimes the Ashkenazi is stringent and the Sephardi does it for him, and sometimes the Sephardi is stringent and the Ashkenazi does it for him...