



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Shabbos, Daf לו – Daf מב

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf לו---36-----

- **R' Yosef** had answered that 2 Braisos that were seemingly contradictory to each other (one allowed handling of shofros but not chatzotzros on Shabbos, and one prohibited handling shofros and chatzotzros on Shabbos) are not contradictory because the one that allows handling shofros is talking about privately owned shofros, which are not muktzeh because they can be used to give water to a child. The other Braisa is talking about community owned shofros, which would not be used for that, and are therefore muktzeh.
 - **Q1: Abaye** asks, the community shofar may also be used to give a child who is an “ani” to drink (it is the responsibility of the community to take care of him)?! **Q2:** Another Braisa says that shofros and chatzotzros may both be handled on Shabbos?! **A:** The 3 Braisos follow 3 different shitos. The Braisa that allows handling of both follows **R' Shimon** who doesn't hold of muktzeh. The Braisa that allows handling only a shofar holds like **R' Yehuda** who does hold of muktzeh, and since a shofar has a permissible use, it is not muktzeh. The Braisa that prohibits handling both holds like **R' Nechemia** who only allows handling something only when it is being used for its permitted, primary use.
 - The remaining issue is why, once **R' Nechemia** prohibits shofros, which conceivably have a permitted use, did he need to prohibit chatzotzros, which have no permitted use? To address that issue, **Abaye** says like **R' Chisda**, that after the Churban Habayis, people began to call trumpets by the name shofros and shofros by the name chatzotzros. Therefore, the first thing **R' Nechemia** prohibited actually was the trumpets, which have no permissible use.
- **R' Chisda** said, 3 pairs of things had their names switched after the Churban:
 - What was a shofar is now called chatzotzros, what was chatzotzros is now called a shofar. The difference is, that we must use what used to be called a shofar, for Rosh Hashana.
 - What was “arava” is now called “tzaftzafa” (similar to an arava) and visa-versa. The difference is, that we must use what used to be called an “arava” for the arbah minim on Succos
 - What was a “pesorah” (big table) is now called a “pesorta” (what used to refer to a small table), and visa-versa. Difference is, for the standard use of the term in commerce.
 - **Abaye** adds, the “huvlila” is now called the “bei kasi” (2 different parts of a kosher animal's stomach) and visa-versa. Difference is, one of these makes the animal a treifah only if it is punctured through and through. The other makes an animal a treifah even if it is only punctured on one side. Therefore, one must know which is which.
 - **Rav Ashi** adds, the place originally called “Bavel” is today called “Bursif” and visa-versa. The difference is for divorces – either because the people of Bavel were considered experts in gittin, so we must know where the original Bavel truly is, or to make sure that we write the proper, current city name on the get.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK BAMEH MADLIKIN

PEREK KIRAH---PEREK SHLISHI

MISHNA

- Food may be placed on a “Kirah” (oven large enough to hold two pots) that is fueled with straw (the Gemara will explain whether we are discussing placing the food on Friday or Shabbos). However, food may not be placed on a kirah that is fueled with wood or “gefes” (the pulp of pressed sesame seeds) unless the fuels are swept away or covered with ash.
 - **B”S** say this allowance applies to hot water, but not foods. **B”H** say it applies to water and foods.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **B”S** say the water left there may be removed on Shabbos but may not be returned. **B”H** say water and foods may even be returned to the kirah on Shabbos as well.

GEMARA

- **Q:** When the Mishna says that food may not be placed on the Kirah fueled with wood or gefes until the coals are swept away or covered over, does that mean that it may not be placed there on Friday to be left like that on Shabbos unless it is first swept or covered, or does it mean that on Shabbos it may not be *returned* to such a stove once it is removed unless it is swept or covered, but one may place it there on Friday for Shabbos even though the coals are not swept away or covered (which would be the shita of **Chananya** who says that as long as the food is cooked like “Ben Drusai” (1/3 cooked) it may be left on a kirah with these coals)? **A:** The words of the Mishna are mashma that the restriction of being allowed to use a kirah fueled with wood or gefes only if the coals are swept away or covered is in regard to leaving food on it on Friday for Shabbos, **and even then** it must be swept or covered to be permitted (not like **Chananya** says). This can be seen, because the Mishna brings a machlokes between **B”S** and **B”H**, and then brings a **second** machlokes between **B”S** and **B”H** regarding whether a pot may be **returned** to such a Kira (swept and covered) on Shabbos. It seems obvious that the first machlokes is referring to placing it there on Friday and leaving it there for Shabbos, because if the first machlokes is referring to whether one can return water or food there on Shabbos, then what is the difference between the first and second machlokes? So, in the first machlokes, **B”S** and **B”H** argue about what can be left there **only** when it is covered or swept, not like **Chananya** said that it may be left there on Friday even without sweeping or covering.
 - This is not a valid proof. It could be that the Mishna refers to returning the pot on Shabbos to a kira fueled with wood or gefes that is swept and covered, but with regard to leaving it on such a kira on Friday, one would not have to sweep away or cover the coals (exactly like **Chananya** says). To make the flow of the Mishna follow that approach, we must say that the Mishna is missing words and should be read as follows. “A kira that is fueled with straw may have food returned to it on Shabbos even if it is not swept or covered. If it is fueled with wood or gefes, if the coals are swept or covered, food may be returned to it on Shabbos. If it is not swept or covered, food may not be returned to it. However, to leave food on a kira (fueled by wood or gefes and not swept or covered) on Friday for Shabbos is permitted. With regard to what may be left there on Friday, **B”S** say only hot water may be left and **B”H** say even food may be left. And, with regard to the returning onto such a stove that was swept or covered, it is actually the subject of a machlokes – **B”S** say that nothing may be returned and **B”H** say that it may even be returned.” Learned like this, the Mishna follows the shita of **Chananya**.

-----Daf תל”ג---37-----

- 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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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 that 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.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- 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.

-----Daf פ"ב-----38-----

- They asked **R' Chiya bar Abba**, according to those who prohibit leaving food on Friday on a kira with intact coals, if one forgot food on such a kira on Friday, may one eat the food on Shabbos? At first, he did not answer. The next day he quoted a Mishna, that one who cooks on Shabbos: if it was done b'shogeg, it may be eaten, if it was done b'meizid it may not be eaten. He then added, that with regard to a pot that was forgotten and left on top of the kirah, there is no such difference made between if it was done b'shogeg or b'meizid.
 - **Rabbah and R' Yosef** explain this to mean that whether it was left there on purpose or by mistake it is mutar to eat. This is different than one who cooks on Shabbos, because here no ma'aseh is done. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** explains this to mean that whether it was left there on purpose or by mistake it is assur to eat. The reason is, because with leaving it there people can make believe they forgot and we prohibit it to prevent people from making believe it was a shogeg (people won't do that by actual cooking because that is an issur D'Oraisa).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if one forgets a pot on a kirah with intact coals, if it was done b'shogeg it is mutar, b'meizid it is assur. This is not like **R' Chiya bar Abba** said (he said there is no difference)!? If we say like **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak**, we can say that the Braisa is referring to before the gezeira was made (which we will discuss soon) and that's why b'shogeg it is mutar,

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

whereas **R' Chiya bar Abba** said his psak after the gezeirah, which is why it is always assur. However, according to **Rabbah and R' Yosef**, this Braisa doesn't fit according to their interpretation of **R' Chiya bar Abba's** statement!? **This remains a kasheh.**

- **R' Yehuda bar Shmuel in the name of R' Abba in the name of R' Kahana in the name of Rav** said, the gezeirah was put in the place for the following reason. Originally, if someone left it b'shogeg, he was allowed to eat it. People began leaving it there intentionally and claiming it was done b'shogeg, so the gezeirah was made to assur all cases of leaving it on a kirah with intact coals.
- **Q:** The Braisa we just quoted brings down a shita of **R' Meir** and of **R' Yehuda** which contradict what they held in yesterday's Daf!? Here, **R' Meir** said that fully cooked water and food may be left on a kirah with intact coals. There, **R' Meir** said that (even according to **B"H**) only hot water may be left there!? Here, **R' Yehuda** said that food that gets better the longer it cooks is assur. There, **R' Yehuda** said that one may leave fully cooked food on a kirah with intact coals!? **A: R' Meir** is not contradictory, because l'chatchila only water should be left, but b'dieved, if food was left it is mutar as well. **R' Yehuda** is not contradictory because he allows the food on the kirah when the coals were swept, but he disallows it when they are intact.
- **Q:** If one intentionally leaves a pot on a kirah with intact coals, do the **Rabanan** prohibit the food as a k'nas or not? **A: Shmuel bar Nossan in the name of R' Chanina** taught that when **R' Yose** was in Tzipori, he saw people had left eggs (which get better the longer they cook) on a kirah with intact coals and prohibited it. This must mean that a k'nas was instituted.
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof, because it could mean that he prohibited them to do so the following week, but not that he prohibited that food from being eaten.

B"H OMRIM AHF MACHZIRIN

- **R' Sheishes** said, according to those who permit chazara (i.e. **B"H**), the chazarah may be performed on Shabbos day as well. **R' Oshaya** held this way as well.
- **R' Zrika in the name of R' Abba in the name of R' Tadai** said, one may return a pot only if it is still in his hand. If it was put down on the floor, he may not return it to the kirah. **R' Ami** said that **R' Chiya in the name of R' Yochanan** said even if it was put down on the ground it may be returned to the kirah.
- **Chizkiya said in the name of Abaye**, it is permitted to return the food only when still in his hand AND he had in mind to return it. **Another version** of the ruling is that even if the food is on the ground, if he had in mind to return it to the kirah, it may be returned. This suggests that if it is in the hand, one need not have in mind to return it.
- **R' Yirmiya** asks, what if the food was hung on a hook or put on a bed (it's not on the ground or in his hand)? **R' Ashi** asks, what if it was transferred to a new pot, may the new pot be returned to the kirah? **TEIKU.**

MISHNA

- One may not place a pot on or in a "tanur" (oven that is wide on the bottom and narrow on top and gets much hotter than a kirah) that is fueled with straw.
- A "kupach" (a square oven that fits one pot) which is fueled by straw has a din like a kirah. If it fueled by gefes or wood, it has a din like a tanur.

GEMARA

- **R' Yosef** said, although one may not place a pot on top of or in a tanur, a pot may be placed by its side.
 - **Abaye** disagrees and brings a proof from the Mishna. The Mishna says that a kupach fueled with gefes or wood is not like a kirah, but is rather like a tanur. **Abaye** understands that we are talking about a kupach whose coals are intact. If so, the Mishna is saying, although something would be permitted for a kirah, it is prohibited for a tanur (and therefore also for a kupach). The Mishna can't be referring to placing on top or inside, because that would be assur by a kirah as well. It must be talking about placing

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

it at its side. For a kirah that is mutar, but for a tanur (and therefore a kupach) it is prohibited. There is a Braisa that supports **Abaye's** view as well.

- **R' Ada bar Ahava** disagrees with **Abaye** and says that our Mishna is talking about where the coals were swept. By a kirah it is permitted to place something on top of it. However, because a kupach retains a lot of heat, it would be assur to put something on it even though the coals have been swept.
- **R' Ashi** explained, a kupach gets hotter than a kirah but not as hot as a tanur. That is why it has this “in-between” status.
- **R' Yose bar Chanina** explains, a kupach is large enough for one pot (it is square) and a kirah is large enough for two pots (it is rectangle).

-----Daf 39-----

MISHNA

- One may not put an egg next to a hot water kettle so that it should get slightly roasted.
- One may not crack an egg (to fry it) on scarves that have been heated in the sun, but **R' Yose** says that one may fry an egg on these scarves heated by the sun.
- One may not bury an egg in sand or dirt that was heated by the sun in order to roast it.
- The people of Tverya placed a pipe of cold water through the hot springs (to heat the water on Shabbos). The **Chachomim** told them, that was not allowed. They said, water heated like that on Shabbos is like water heated by a fire on Shabbos and is prohibited for washing and drinking. On Yom Tov, water heated like that is mutar to drink but assur for washing.

GEMARA

- **R' Yosef** said, if one slightly roasts an egg, he is oiver an issur D'Oraisa
 - **Mar the son of Ravina** brings a proof from a Mishna which says that even a slight action that makes something edible is assur D'Oraisa. Slightly roasting an egg would be similarly assur.

V'LO YAFKIENA B'SUDARIN

- **Q:** A Mishna says that one may cook water in the sun. Does that only follow **R' Yose**? **A: R' Nachman** says, all agree that cooking in the sun (like the Mishna says) is permitted. All further agree that cooking by a “toldah” of fire is prohibited. The machlokes is regarding cooking with a toldah of the sun. **R' Yose** permits it. The **Chachomim** say that permitting it will lead to people cooking with a toldah of fire, and therefore even a toldah of the sun is prohibited as well.

V'LO YATMINENA B'CHOL

- **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Yose** argue and permit cooking in the sand (which is a toldah of the sun) as well? **A: Rabbah** says the reason **R' Yose** prohibits cooking in the sand is that it may lead people to bury and insulate things in hot ashes, which is assur. **R' Yosef** says, burying in the sand is assur because he may come to dig a hole in the sand (Rashi) or because the sand is muktzeh (Tosfos).
 - The difference between these 2 answers is a case where one has loose earth to bury the egg in (there is still a “hatmanah” problem, but not a digging problem).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, one may slightly roast an egg on a hot rooftop (from the heat of the sun) but not on hot lime (heated by fire). According to **Rabbah** this makes sense because there is no reason to be goizer for burying in ashes, because no burying is happening here. But, according to **R' Yosef**, he may move earth on the roof, and it should therefore be assur on a rooftop as well?! **A:** A typical rooftop does not have earth on it, so there is no reason to prohibit it according to **R' Yosef** either.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna brought the story with the people of Tverya. The **Chachomim** prohibited the water and **R' Yose** did not argue although the heat was not from a fire. According to **Rabbah** this makes sense, because the cool water was “buried” in the hot water, so there is a gezeirah of “hatmanah”, but according to **R' Yosef**, who says that the problem is moving the sand, why would **R' Yose** prohibit this case?! **A: R' Yosef** would say that the story with the people of Tverya is actually going on the beginning

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

of the Mishna which discusses frying on a hot scarf which was heated by the sun. The **Chachomim** bring the story as a proof that sun heat may not be used to cook. **R' Yose** answered that the hot springs of Tverya are heated by fire – the fire of Gehinnom, not the sun, and therefore agrees that the water should be prohibited.

- **R' Chisda** says, from the story of the people of Tverya, and the fact that the **Chachomim** prohibited it, we learn that all “hatmanah”, even if done on Friday, in materials that increase heat is prohibited.
- **Ulla** says we pasken like the people of Tverya. **R' Nachman** said, they have already broken their pipes (i.e. they retracted their psak and now agree with the **Chachomim**).

MA'ASEH SHE'ASU ANSHEI TVERYA

- **Q:** What type of “washing” is prohibited using these waters on Shabbos? Washing the whole body is assur even with water heated on Friday, so that can't be what was prohibited?! If washing the face, hands and feet was what was prohibited using this water on Shabbos, that is problematic, because the **Chachomim** then said that the water was prohibited to wash with on Yom Tov as well, and only **B”S** prohibit heating water on Yom Tov for washing, but **B”H** allow it, which would mean our Mishna is following **B”S**!? **A:** **R' Ika bar Chananya** said, the water heated in the pipes were prohibited to use to *shower* (as opposed to bathe) the entire body with on Shabbos and Yom Tov, but showering with water heated before Shabbos and Yom Tov is actually permitted, like the shita of **R' Shimon**.
 - **R' Meir** says one may not shower on Shabbos or Yom Tov with hot or cold water. **R' Shimon** permits with hot or cold. **R' Yehuda** permits with cold and prohibits with hot.
 - **R' Chisda** says, the machlokes is only when the water is in the ground (that's when **R' Shimon** permits it), but if the water is in a keili, all say it is assur to use for showering.
 - **Rabbah bar bar Channa in the name of R' Yochanan** says, we pasken like **R' Yehuda**. He explained, that he actually heard this from **R' Yochanan**, and didn't just pasken this way based on what **R' Yochanan** says elsewhere that whenever there is a 3 way machlokes, we typically follow the “middle ground” view. The fact that he heard it directly from **R' Yochanan** is important because it could be that the statement of **R' Yochanan** about a 3 way machlokes only applies to Mishanyos, and not to Braisos, and this machlokes is in a Braisa.

-----Daf 70-----40-----

- **Rav** says, water that was heated on Friday may be used on Shabbos to wash one's entire body, one limb at a time. **Shmuel** says, only one's face, hands and feet may be washed with hot water on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, water heated on Friday may be used to wash one's face, hands and feet on Shabbos, but not his entire body!? **A:** Rav would say, that means one cannot wash his entire body at one time, but must wash one limb at a time, like when he washes his face, hands and feet.
 - A Braisa says, water heated on Friday may be used on Shabbos to wash the face, hands and feet, but **not** the entire body, **even** if it is done one limb at a time. This is clearly a proof to **Shmuel**.
 - **Rabbah** had a version of **Rav** in which **Rav** said, water that was heated on Friday may be used on Shabbos to wash one's entire body as long as he leaves out one limb.
 - The Braisa that we asked from before is a question here as well, and we can't answer like we did before, because here **Rav** is not saying that we need to do one limb at a time.
 - **Rav Yosef** asked **Abaye**, did **Rabbah** follow this ruling of **Rav** in practice? **Abaye** answered that he did not know.
 - **Q: Rav** was totally refuted, so of course Rabbah did not follow him?! **A: Rabbah** did not hear of these problematic Braisos, so maybe he still held like **Rav**.
 - **Q: Abaye** has said that **Rabbah** always followed **Rav** except for 3 places, so why would he NOT hold like **Rav** here? **A:** He followed all the chumros of **Rav**, but this is a kulah of **Rav**, so it is unclear what he held.
- A Braisa says, if the vents that heat a bathhouse were closed before Shabbos (so it was not heated on Shabbos), it may be used immediately on Motzei Shabbos. Also, if the heating vents were closed on Erev Yom Tov (or Erev Shabbos), one may enter the bathhouse to use as a “shvitz”, and then may shower in the outer room of the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

bathroom (so no one should think he took a full bath inside the main room). **R' Yehuda** said, **R' Elazar ben Azarya** and **R' Akiva** went into a bathroom as a shvitz and then showered in the outer room because the tub where they took the water from was covered with boards, therefore ascertaining that the water had not been heated on Yom Tov. The **Chachomim** said, that would have been permissible even if the water would NOT have been covered. However, when the number of sinners increased, the **Rabanan** prohibited using the bathroom as a shvitz on Shabbos and Yom Tov. Still, it remained permitted to walk through the bathrooms of the large cities.

- “Sinners” in this regard means as explained by **R' Shimon ben Pazi in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi in the name of Bar Kapara**, that originally people would bathe in waters heated on Friday. Then, bathroom attendants would heat water on Shabbos and say that it was heated on Friday. This caused the **Rabanan** to prohibit bathing with hot water on Shabbos, but they still allowed using it as a shvitz. People would then bathe in hot water and say they only sat in the shvitz. They therefore prohibited the shvitz, but still allowed the hot springs of Tverya. People would then bathe in warmed water and say it was from the hot springs of Tverya. They therefore prohibited bathing in the hot springs of Tverya as well and left bathing in cold water as the only option. The **Rabanan** saw that people could not live by these prohibitions, so they lifted the ban on the hot springs of Tverya, but all other prohibitions remained in place.
 - **Rava** says, from here we see, that one who is “oiver” on a D'Rabanan may be called a “sinner”.
- Bathhouses of the large cities remained permitted to walk through, because they were a lot less steamy than those of the small towns and walking through did not necessarily provide one with the effects of a shvitz.
- A Braisa says, on Shabbos, one may warm himself by a fire and then shower in cold water, but not the reverse, because the fire would then heat the water on him from the shower.
- A Braisa says, on Shabbos, one may warm a towel to put on his stomach (to help for a stomachache), but cannot put a hot water kettle by his stomach (for the same purpose) because hot water may spill on him and he will be “oiver” washing with hot water. Placing the hot kettle by one’s stomach is prohibited during the week as well because it is a sakanah.
- The **Tanna Kamma** of a Braisa says, one may place a pitcher of water near a fire to remove the chill, not to heat it. **R' Yehuda** says, one may place a bottle of oil near a fire to warm it, not to heat it. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, a woman may smear oil on her hand and place that hand near a fire to warm it, and then smear the warmed oil on her young child.
 - **Q:** What does the **T”K** hold regarding oil? **A: Rabbah and R' Yosef** say the **T”K** even allows oil to be heated. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** says the **T”K** would not allow oil to be placed in front of the fire, even to just have the chill removed.
 - **Rabbah and R' Yosef** explain the Braisa, that the **T”K** holds that oil is not subject to cooking and can therefore be heated. **R' Yehudah** holds that oil is subject to cooking, but cooking is only achieved when it is heated, not warmed. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** holds that oil is subject to cooking and cooking is achieved even by warming if done in the normal manner.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** explains the Braisa, that the **T”K** holds oil is subject to cooking and cooking is achieved by warming and it may therefore not even be warmed. **R' Yehuda** holds that oil is subject to cooking but cooking is only achieved when it is heated. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** holds that oil is subject to cooking and cooking is achieved by warming. The **T”K** and **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** differ with regard to whether warming in an unusual fashion (e.g. once it is already smeared on the woman) is allowed.
 - **Rav Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says, it is prohibited to heat water and oil to the point of “yad soledes bo”. Anything less is permitted. **Rachva** explains, “yad soledes bo” is when something is hot enough to burn the stomach of a baby.
- **R' Yitzchak bar Avdimi** followed **Rebbi** into a bathroom on Shabbos and wanted to place a bottle of oil into the bath water to warm the oil. **Rebbi** told him to put water into a kli sheni and then place the bottle of oil into that.
 - **We learn 3 things from this story:** 1) Oil is subject to cooking, 2) a kli sheni does not “cook”, 3) warming oil is considered to be cooking it.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Although this took place in a bathhouse, where one may not discuss Torah, **Rebbi** was allowed to say this because it was preventing someone from being “oiver” an issur. As we find that **R’ Meir** instructed someone in a bathhouse regarding a halacha as well, which shows that when it was done to prevent one from being “oiver” an issur it may be done.
- Given that this story took place in the hot springs of Tverya, from the fact that **Rebbi** said to use a kli sheni, we see that one can be “oiver” cooking in the hot springs of Tverya. However, he would not be “oiver” on a D’Oraisa, only on a D’Rabanan, and would therefore be liable for makas mardus (lashes for being oiver a D’Rabanan).
- **R’ Zeira** saw **R’ Avahu** floating in a bathtub on Shabbos and wondered whether **R’ Avahu** took his feet off the ground and fully floated or not. Although a Braisa prohibits floating in a pool on Shabbos, that could be where the pool has no rim around it, so it is more like a lake or other body of water (which, when one walks out of, he moves the earth with his feet and digs) and is therefore prohibited. **R’ Avahu** was floating in a pool with a rim, where there is no reason to be goizer.

-----Daf נ"ד---41-----

- **R’ Zeira** saw **R’ Avahu** covering his “eiver” while bathing (for purposes of tznius). **R’ Zeira** was unsure whether **R’ Avahu** touched his eiver with his hands or just covered it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, one who holds his eiver while going to the bathroom is considered to have brought a “mabul” to the world (because the sin of the “dor hamabul” was emitting “shichvas zera l’vatala”). Certainly, **R’ Avahu** did not touch his eiver!?! **A:** Touching the eiver is a problem when it leads to the emission of zera. **R’ Avahu** had the fear of drowning at the time, and therefore knew that he would not come to bad thoughts and the emission of zera.
 - **Q: R’ Abba in the name of R’ Huna in the name of Rav** says that one who covers his “milah” is considered as if he denies the “bris” of Avraham Avinu (because he covers it and is embarrassed of it)?! **A:** When walking down to the river, one should not cover it (since there are no tznius issues because he isn’t facing anyone) to show he is not embarrassed of it. When returning from the river and facing people, one should cover it for reasons of tznius.
 - **Rava** would bend over (rather than cover with his hands), **R’ Zeira** would stand upright, **R’ Ashi’s Yeshiva** would stand upright when facing the river and bend over when facing people.
- **R’ Zeira** wanted to go to Eretz Yisrael and therefore avoided **R’ Yehuda** for fear that **R’ Yehuda** would not allow him to leave to Eretz Yisrael. **R’ Zeira** wanted to hear one last teaching before he left. He went to **R’ Yehuda** and found him in the bathhouse where he asked his attendant to give him soap and a comb (both of these requests were made in lashon hakodesh). He then told the people to open their mouths to let in the heat so that they would sweat. He then said to drink from the bath water. **R’ Zeira** said, it was worth coming just for these lessons.
 - The lessons are: 1) One may speak about non-Torah matters in lashon hakodesh in a bathhouse; 2) It is healthy to inhale the heat so that one will sweat; 3) Taking a bath provides no health benefits unless one drinks hot water afterwards as well.

MISHNA

- The hot water from a “mulyar” (hot water kettle with a compartment for coals around the outside) whose coals were removed may be drunk on Shabbos. Hot water of an “antichi” may not be drunk on Shabbos even if the coals were removed.

GEMARA

- A “mulyar” is a kettle where the water is inside and coals are on the outside.
- “Antichi” – **Rabbah** says it is a compartment for water inside a kirah which gets extremely hot and increases the temperature of the water even when the coals are removed. **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** says it is a double-decker pot where the coals are in the bottom level and water is in the top (this also can increase the heat of the water even once the coals have been removed).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** would surely agree with **Rabbah** (because a kirah gets hotter than a pot). **Rabbah** may not agree with **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak**.
- A Braisa says that one may not drink the water of an antichi on Shabbos even if the coals were removed, because the bottom continues to heat the water. This is a proof to **R' Nachman**.

MISHNA

- One may not put cold water into a hot water kettle that was cleared (the Gemara will have different explanations) so that the water should heat up. However, one may place cold water into it, or into a cup so that the water is warmed (but not heated).

GEMARA

- **R' Adda bar Masna** explains the Mishna to mean, if one removed a kettle from the fire and emptied out (“cleared”) the hot water, he may not put a little cold water into the empty kettle to heat the water. However, one may put a larger amount of water into the kettle so that the water gets warmed, but not heated.
 - **Q:** Putting cold water onto hot metal hardens the metal (“metzaref”), which is assur on Shabbos!? **A:** The Mishna follows **R' Shimon**, who holds that since it is unintended, it is permitted (“davar she'eino miskaven mutar”).
- **Abaye** says, the Mishna is discussing a kettle of hot water that was removed (“cleared”) from the fire. One may not put a small amount of cold water into the hot water to heat the water. He may, however, add a lot of cold water so that it will get warmed, not heated.
 - It seems that if the water was removed from the kettle, one would not be allowed to add cold water to the empty kettle, because that would be the melacha of “metzaref”. According to this, our Mishna follows **R' Yehuda** who says a “davar she'eino miskaven” is assur.
- **Rav** says one may add water to be warmed, but not to accomplish “metzaref”. **Shmuel** says one may add water even to be “metzaref”.
 - **Q:** How can **Shmuel** permit something l'chatchila, which is prohibited by the Torah?! **A:** The machlokes is: **Rav** says one may add the amount of water which will only warm the water, but not the amount which will accomplish the “metzaref” (a pot has to be completely full to accomplish “metzaref”). **Shmuel** says one may even add enough water which would accomplish the “metzaref” (because he holds like **R' Shimon** that “davar she'eino miskaven is mutar”).
 - **Q:** We see that **Shmuel** does not agree with **R' Shimon** in a case where there is burning wood in the reshus harabim, where **Shmuel** says one may not put out the flame, although there is sakana and it is a “melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa”, because he would thereby be oiver an issur D'Oraisa!? **A:** He agrees with **R' Shimon** that a “davar she'eino meskaven” is mutar. He disagrees with **R' Shimon** with regard to a “melacha she'eina tzricha l'gufa”.
 - **Ravina** says, we see from here, that one may be oiver a D'Rabanan to remove a sakana from the reshus harabim, and would therefore be allowed to carry thorns less than 4 amos at a time in reshus harabim (and as much as needed in a karmelis) to remove the thorns from the reshus harabim.

-----Daf 42-----

AVAL NOSEIN...

- A Braisa says, **B”S** say one may put hot water into cold water, but not cold water into hot water (**B”S** hold that “tata’ah gavar” – the bottom is stronger, and therefore hot water on the bottom cooks cold water on top, but cold water on the bottom does not get cooked by hot water on top of it). **B”H** say, even cold water may be placed into hot water (they do not hold of tata’ah gavar). **B”H** only allow this when pouring into a cup of hot water (the cup is a kli sheini and one will not let the water in a cup get too hot, because he intends to drink it), but if the hot water is in a bathtub one may not pour cold water into it. **R' Shimon ben Menasya** prohibits this (exactly what he prohibits will be explained in the Gemara).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Nachman** paskens like **R' Shimon ben Menasya**.
- **R' Yosef** thought to say that hot water in a wash basin (water is very hot and similar to a bathtub) should have the same halacha as the hot water in a bathtub. **Abaye** said, **R' Chiya** taught a Braisa that said that a basin is NOT like a bathtub.
 - **Q:** If a basin were to have the same halacha as a tub, that would mean, according to **R' Nachman** who paskens like **R' Shimon**, one could never mix hot water with cold in a basin and could thus never have hot water to wash one's face, hands and feet on Shabbos, and yet we know it is permitted!? **A:** **R' Shimon** is not arguing on the last case (of pouring cold water into a bathtub), he is arguing on the first case and saying that **B"H** never permitted pouring cold water into the hot water of a cup.
- **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** saw that **Rava** poured cold water into the hot water of a kli sheni, based on **R' Chiya's** Braisa, that said that one may put a bottle of water into a basin of water, whether cold into hot or hot into cold.
 - **Q:** **R' Huna** asked **R' Ashi**, maybe the Braisa allows that case only because the bottle acts as a separation?! **A:** The Braisa actually said one may *pour* water into water of a cup, hot into cold and cold into hot.

MISHNA

- One may not add spices into a pot or pan that has been removed from the fire (a kli rishon) while boiling, but one may add spices to a plate or serving dish (kli sheini).
- **R' Yehuda** says, spices may be added to anything unless the food contains vinegar or "tzir" (fish brine).

GEMARA

- **Q:** Is **R' Yehuda** allowing spices to be put in a kli rishon unless it has vinegar or tzir, or does he only allow spices to be put in a kli sheini, and even then, only if there is no vinegar or tzir? **A:** A Braisa clearly says that **R' Yehuda** permits putting spices even into a kli rishon as long as there is no vinegar or tzir.
- **R' Yosef** thought to say that salt is like all other spices (it gets cooked in a kli rishon but not a kli sheini). **Abaye** told him that a Braisa teaches that salt is different and can even get cooked in a kli sheini. **R' Nachman** argues and says that salt is more difficult to cook than other spices (salt will not even cook in a kli rishon, unless the food is actually on the fire).
 - **Another** version: **R' Yosef** thought to say that salt is like all other spices. **Abaye** told him that a Braisa teaches that salt does not even get cooked in a kli rishon. According to this version, the Braisa agrees with **R' Nachman**.

MISHNA

- On Shabbos, one may not place a dish under an oil lamp to catch the dripping oil (either because the oil is muktzeh and a keili may only be moved on Shabbos for use of a non-muktzeh item, or because the dish would become muktzeh from the oil and would therefore not be able to be moved, and in that sense, it is as if the keili was cemented into place on Shabbos, which is assur). If the dish is placed there on Friday it is mutar to leave it there on Shabbos.
- One may not have hana'ah from the oil, because it is not prepared for use from before Shabbos.

GEMARA

- **R' Chisda** said, although one may not place a keili under a chicken to catch the egg (from rolling down an incline), one may place an upside down keili (e.g. bowl) over an egg so that it shouldn't break.
 - **Rabbah** explains the difference. Chickens typically lay eggs in the garbage dump, not on an incline. The **Rabanan** allowed action to be taken (moving a keili for the sake of a muktzeh item) to prevent an ordinary loss (stepping on the egg in the garbage dump) but didn't allow taking actions to prevent a loss which is not ordinary (the chicken laying an egg on an incline).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Abaye** asks, a Braisa says, if a barrel of tevel (which is muktzeh because it can't be eaten) broke on a roof, one may bring a keili to place it underneath the broken barrel, although the breaking of a barrel is not an "ordinary" type of loss?! **A:** The Braisa refers to new, earthenware barrels, which often break (so it is an "ordinary" loss).
- **Q:** A Braisa says one may place a keili underneath a lamp to catch the sparks?! **A:** Sparks are normal and therefore "ordinary".
- **Q:** A Braisa allows placing a keili over a lamp to prevent fire from catching onto the beams?! **A:** The Braisa refers to a house with low ceilings, so this is normal and "ordinary".
- **Q:** A Braisa allows moving a bed or bench to support a broken beam (which is muktzeh)?! **A:** The Braisa refers to new beams which often break.
- **Q:** A Braisa allows placing a keili under a leak to catch the water (which is muktzeh)?! **A:** The Braisa refers to new houses which often leak.