



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Shabbos Daf Lamed Zayin

- The Gemara is discussing whether our Mishna follows **Chananya** or those who argue with him.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from the following. **R' Chelbo in the name of R' Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav** said, "this kulah only applies regarding putting the pot **on top** of the kirah, but putting the pot **in** the kirah is assur". If we say **not** like **Chananya**, and in order to use a kira in any way it must be swept out, then why would there ever be a difference between putting on top of the kirah or inside the kirah? However, if we say like **Chananya**, that a kirah only has to be swept out if it is used for chazarah, then **R' Chelbo** makes sense. He can be talking about leaving the pot there on Friday, which may be done with the coals in the oven. Therefore, he is saying that it should only be left on top, but NOT inside with the coals. **A:** This is not a proof. **R' Chelbo** can make sense not like **Chananya** as well. **R' Chelbo** was referring to chazarah and although there are no coals inside, we still prohibit one from returning the pot INTO the kirah because that is the normal manner of cooking and it looks like he is cooking.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from the following. A Braisa says, if one has 2 kirahs that are attached by a common wall, and one of the kirahs is swept of its coals and the other is not, one may leave a pot on the swept kirah on Friday, but not on the one that is not swept. What may be left on the kirah? **R' Meir** says, that **B"S** say nothing may be left and **B"H** say that hot water **may** be left, and with regard to chazara on Shabbos, all agree that it may not be done. **R' Yehuda** says, that **B"S** say only hot water may be left on Friday and **B"H** say hot water and food may be left, and with regard to chazara, **B"S** prohibit it and **B"H** allow it. Now, if we say that our Mishna refers to leaving food on the kirah on Friday, the version of **B"S** and **B"H** in our Mishna fits perfectly according to **R' Yehuda**, but if our Mishna refers to chazara (like **Chananya** said), who is the Tanna of our Mishna? **R' Meir's** version of the machlokes between **B"S** and **B"H** is totally different than the one in our Mishna, and **R' Yehuda** says that **B"S** and **B"H** only allow leaving the pot on Friday on a kirah that was swept!?! **A:** This is not a valid proof. Our Mishna may follow **Chananya**, and the Tanna of our Mishna agrees with **R' Yehuda** with regard to the subjects of the machlokes between **B"S** and **B"H**, but he argues on **R' Yehuda** and says that **B"S** and **B"H** permit leaving a pot on a kirah even if it is not swept.
- **Q:** May one take a pot on Friday and put it next to a kirah that has not been swept of its coals? On top and inside is assur, what about next to it on the outside? **A:** The Braisa quoted above with the attached kirahs allowed a pot to be placed on the swept kirah even though it was next to a kirah which had not been swept. We see that putting a pot next to a kirah is okay.
 - The Gemara says, that case could be different because the pot is up on top of the kirah, not just beside it. The airspace underneath the pot may be what makes it permissible to place it there.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from the following. **R' Safra in the name of R' Chiya** said, if one put ash over the coals in a kirah and then the fire flared up again, he may put a pot next to it or on top of it before Shabbos and may remove it and put it back on Shabbos (it is considered to be covered even though it subsequently flared up). This suggests that the only reason he may put the pot next to it is because he covered the coals with ash. We see that one may NOT put a pot next to a kirah on Friday for Shabbos if the coals have not been covered or removed! **A:** This is not a proof. **R' Safra** says that the pot may be removed. Removal is permitted even if the coals remain, so why mention that it may be removed in this case? It must be, we mention "removal" for stylistic purposes since we mention "putting it back". Maybe placing it next to a kirah is

also allowed when the coals are intact, and we mention “placing it next to” for stylistic purposes since we mention “putting it on top of”?

- The Gemara objects to this answer and says, returning a pot means it was removed, so it makes sense to mention removing because we mention returning. However, putting next to does not have that same connection to putting on top of. Therefore, the reason it was mentioned must be because putting next to the kirah is only allowed when the coals have been covered or removed.
- **Q:** Where do we come out on this issue? **A:** A Braisa says clearly that one may place food next to a kirah even if its coals were NOT covered or removed.
- **R' Yitzchak bar Nachmeini** said, if one covered the coals of a kirah and the fire flared up again, one may place water that was fully heated and food that was fully cooked on it, on Friday for Shabbos.
 - He must be talking about food that becomes better the longer it cooks (if not, there would be no chiddush as to why it is permitted, since one would not come to stoke the coals). From here we see that even something which gets better the longer it cooks may be left on a kirah with intact coals.
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof, because in this case the person actually did cover the coals before they flared up again, so it is considered covered coals. The chiddush is, since the flame flared up, one would think that the coals are considered to be uncovered again. He teaches us that the coals are considered covered and therefore such food may be left on the kirah.
- **Rabbah bar Channa says in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if a kirah was fueled with coals of “rosem” wood, and the coals were covered but then flared up, one may put fully heated water and fully cooked food on it on Friday.
 - **Q:** Should we say this is a proof that food that gets better the longer it cooks may be left on intact coals? **A:** No, this case is different because the coals were covered. The chiddush of this case is that it has flared up and still is considered covered.
 - **Q:** This is the same case as the previous one!? **A:** The chiddush here is that we are dealing with “rosem” wood which gets extra hot.
 - This teaching of **R' Yochanan** is not like **Chananya**, because **R' Yochanan** seems to prohibit placing food on a kirah with uncovered coals.
 - **Rav Sheishes says in the name of R' Yochanan**, one may place food on a kirah with intact coals, but may return to a kirah on Shabbos only if the coals were covered or removed. This teaching holds that our Mishna requires removing the coals only for returning the food to the kirah.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, both of these halachos were already stated in Mishnayos: 1) A Mishna said, one may not place dough in the oven unless it will form a crust before Shabbos. This suggests that if it does form a crust, one may leave it there even though the coals are intact; 2) In our Mishna, **B”H** allows chazara only where the coals have been covered or removed. Why did **R' Sheishes** have to repeat them!? **A:** The Mishna only told us these halachos through an inference, rather than directly. Therefore, **R' Sheishes** felt the need to state them explicitly.
 - **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda said in the name of R' Yochanan**, one may place *fully cooked food and fully heated water* on a kirah whose coals are intact, even if the food is of the type that gets better the longer one cooks it.
 - **Q: Rav** and **Shmuel** say that to leave such food on a such kirah is assur?! **A: R' Yochanan** argues with **Rav** and **Shmuel**.
 - **R' Ukva from Meishan** said to **R' Ashi**, you who live in the area of **Rav** and **Shmuel** should follow them. I, who live in the area of **R' Yochanan** will follow him.
- **Abaye asked R' Yosef**, may one leave food on Friday on a kirah whose coals are intact? **R' Yosef** answered, food is left on a kirah whose coals are intact for **R' Yehuda** and he eats it. **Abaye** said, that is no proof because **R' Yehuda** is seriously ill and one may even cook for him on Shabbos

itself. What about for everybody else? **R' Yosef** answered, in Sura they allow it, because **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak**, who was very careful with his actions, would leave food on a kirah with intact coals.

- **R' Ashi** said that he saw **R' Huna** eat a fish mixture that was left on a kirah with intact coals. **R' Ashi** wasn't sure whether **R' Huna** permitted that because he held that fully cooked foods that get better the longer they are cooked may be placed on a kirah with intact coals, or because he held that this fish mixture got worse with longer cooking, but if it would have gotten better, he would not permit it.
- **R' Nachman** said, if a food gets better the longer it cooks, it may not be left on a kirah with open coals, but if it gets worse the longer it cooks, it may be left there. He said further, anything with flour gets worse the longer it cooks, except for a turnip dish which gets better even with flour. But, that is only true if there is also meat in the dish. But, that is only the case if you are cooking it for yourself. If you are preparing for guests, it is considered to get worse the longer it cooks (because the pieces get smaller). Dishes of figs, "daisa", and dates get worse the longer they cook.