Introduction to פרק שלישי – כירה

The מלאכה of the בישול is the focus of this chapter (and the next); identifying the parameters of the מלאכה, this is a thorny issue, as בישול is a process, not a single act – at what point in the process is בישול assumed to have happened? At what heat is it considered בישול? What sources of heat can be considered בישול? All of these and more are explored in this בישול. Note: a סירה is a stove-top with a single flame and room for one pot; חנור is a (pot-bellied) oven with a chamber for the coals underneath. Additional cooking tools will be introduced in the chapter.

2.3.1

36b (משנה א) $\rightarrow 37b$ (דיוקא דמתניתין קא משמע לן)

- I. משנה א Plaicing/replacing a pot on a שבת on שבת
 - a. If: it was fueled by straw or field-gleanings, a cooked item may be placed on it
 - b. But if: it was fueled by fruit mash or wood, may not place a תבשיל until he sweeps the mash away or covers with ash
 - c. Application: of these leniences
 - i. ב"ש: only to hot water, not a תבשיל
 - ii. ב"ה both hot water and תבשיל
 - d. Range: of leniency
 - i. שבת may remove from such a שבת, but may not return to it
 - ii. ¬¬"z: may return as well as take from it
- II. Question: does "יתן" in our משנה mean "to return" or "to place" (להשהות)?
 - a. If: it means החזיר, then putting it there before שבת and leaving it would follow חנניה
 - i. ממאכל בן-דרוסאי any food which is already cooked מאכל בן-דרוסאי may be left on a fire, whether or not it is גרוף/קטום or not
 - b. But if: it means החרה, and that is only permitted if ק"ו, then ק"ל that would apply to חורה, and that is only permitted if ק"ו, then אגרוף וקטום
 - c. Proposed proof#1: since we have 2 disputes משנה in the משנה, it stands to reason that the background is להשהות
 - i. And the first dispute: about תבשיל is whether it may be left on the fire (שהייה)
 - ii. And then: the 2nd dispute is about חזרה
 - iii. But if: the background is חזרה, why reiterate it in the last clause?
 - iv. Block : background could be להחזיר; 1st dispute is about what they may return
 - 1. And : 2nd dispute teaches that the core issue of חזרה is itself a matter of dispute
 - d. Proposed proof#2: רב: the dispute ב"ש/ב"ה is only about putting it atop כירה; they agree that putting it inside is
 - i. Analysis: if reference is חזרה, we understand why תוכה would be אסור may be putting on coals
 - 1. But: if reference is שהייה, why disallow שהייה inside?
 - 2. Answer: ב" was only commenting on last dispute that even ב"ה agrees to forbid מירה to inside of
 - e. Proposed proof#3: גרופה וקטומה –dispute תוספתא שבת ב:יג as to range of disputes; case is paired גרופה, only 1
 - i. Agreed: may only leave food on גרופה וקטומה; if taken off, may not return it
 - ii. ב"ש ה"ל doesn't allow anything to be left; מיש ה"מ allow חמין only
 - iii. ב"ש ה' allows ב"ה , חמין allows even ב"ה , מוטלין even permits returning
 - iv. Analysis: if reference is משנה simply accords with ר' יהודה
 - 1. But if: משנה assumes משנה fits neither of them
 - a. ב"ה doesn't jibe with ב"ש on one count and ב"ה on two
 - b. אינה shouldn't allow אינה גרופה אינה at all even for שהייה
 - 2. Block: perhaps case is חזרה, and our עהיהה באינה גרופה וקטומה re: disputes;rejects ר' יהודה re: שהיהה באינה גרופה וקטומה
- III. Question: is it permissible to lean a pot against the side of a מירה which isn't swept or covered?
 - a. Lemma1: perhaps only putting the pot on top or inside is prohibited
 - b. Lemma2: perhaps all contact is אסור
 - i. Proposed solution: from מותר (above) permitting use of כירה גרופה וקטומה when attached to one that isn't + מותר (מותר על היום של היום אום בירה בירופה וקטומה אום בירופה וקטומה וום מותר על היום בירופה וום מותר על היום בירופה וום מותר בירום מותר בירו
 - ii. Block: in that case, the air between them diffuses the heat
 - iii. Proposed solution: ד' חייא ruled that if the coals were covered and then reignited
 - 1. Then: we may lean (סומכין), leave (נוטלין) and return (מוזירין) \rightarrow may only סטומך \rightarrow
 - a. Rejection: נוטלין doesn't require קטומה
 - b. Rather: מוטלין is mentioned to parallel מקיימין is mentioned due to סומכין; similarly, perhaps סומכין
 - i. Block: נוטלין::מחזירין same place; but מקיימין::~סומכין
 - c. Final ruling (מוספתא שבת ב:יא-יב): if כירה was fired with mash or wood, may lean pot against it, but not put pot on it unless קטומה; coals which went out or if he put some flaxseed on it is considered קטומה

- IV. Status of תבשיל which, if fire is stoked, will contract but this will improve the dish
 - a. ה' אושעיא if he covered it and it reignited, he may fully boiled water and fully cooked תבשיל
 - i. Implying: even if continued cooking will improve it, as long as it's fully cooked permitted (מצטמק ויפה לו מותר)
 - ii. *Block*: this case is different, since he did cover the coals
 - 1. *Challenge*: if so, then what is this statement teaching?
 - 2. Answer: הובערה –though reignited, it maintains status of קטומה and isn't "thrown back" to original status
 - b. ר' אושעיא same ruling as ר' אושעיא, with addition of "even hot coals"
 - i. *Implication*: is blocked as per above additional teaching of ייחון is the hot coals
- V. ששת 's quote of ר' יוחנן's ruling:
 - a. ייחנן: if a stove was fueled with mash or wood
 - i. Then: he may leave hot water that is not yet fully boiled and a תבשיל that is not yet fully cooked
 - ii. שהייה is permitted even if not משנה as referencing a case of חזרה, but שהייה is permitted even if not גרופה
 - iii. אבא both of these can be inferred from our משנה
 - 1. שבת unless it will brown by שבת שבת שבת may not put bread in before שבת
 - a. Implication: if it is browned (yet not fully baked), may be left in (שהייה)
 - 2. משנה our משנה even ה"ם only allow חזרה if the stove is גרופה וקטומה
 - iv. משניות understood this was merely teaching how to read these משניות carefully and properly infer the law