## 2.3.2

37b (אמר רב שמואל בר יהודה אמר רבי יוחנן: כירה שהסיקוה בגפת ובעצים) → 38b (תיקו)

- I. Dispute מצטמק ויפה לי יוחנן vs. יוחנן vs. יוחנן vs. מצטמק ויפה לו pegarding permission to leave מצטמק ויפה לו
  - a. ד' יחתן if a stove has been fired with mash or wood, a fully cooked תבשיל/חמין may be left on it, even if it improves it
  - b. שהייה prohibit בני בבל (and this impacts on בני בבל
    - i. Question (אב" לר' יוסף): is שהייה permissible?
    - ii. Answer: רב יהודה (a student of רב ושמואל) would leave the pot on an unswept כירה
      - 1. Block: רב יהודה was sickly it would have been permissible to do so even on שבת
    - iii. Answer: in סורא they would do so, per רנב"י (who would do so)
      - 1. Story: ר' הונא before ב' reported that he saw them leave כסא דהרסנא before ר' אשי (not "ר')
        - a. But he didn't know: if it was because מצטמק וועה לו מותר held מצטמק וועה לו מותר, or since it has flour, it is מצטמק ורע לו
  - c. מצטמק ורע לו is permissible
    - i. Definition: anything with flour is assumed to be אצטמק ורע לו, except for תבשיל of radishes which is יפה לו
      - 1. And: this is only if it has meat; if it has no meat, it is assumed to be מצטמק ורע לו
      - 2. And: even if it has meat, only יפה לו if he isn't going to serve it to guests; if he is assumed to be דע לו
      - 3. And: fig, cereal and date dishes are all considered מצטמק ורע לו

## II. Consequences of שהייה

- a. Question: posed to ר' חייא בר אבא if he left it on the fire
  - i. Response (the next day): quoted במזיד may not that if someone cooks במזיד, it may be eaten; may not
    - 1. And he added: "no difference"
      - a. *דבה ור' יוסף*, which he actively did, we forbid if it was במזיד, which he actively did, we forbid if it was במזיד
        - i. But: if he did שהייה, even במזיד, still allowed
      - b. "דעב"י. this is stringent; vis-à-vis בשוג, where he isn't likely to use it to deceive, בישול is permitted
        - . But: if he did שהייה, it is alays prohibited
      - c. Challenge: ibid במזיד if he left במזיד on בירה and it became שבת, if במזיד, may be eaten; if במזיד prohibited
        - i. מ"ז. only applies to חמין and nat weren't fully cooked; if במזיד, permitted even במזיד
        - ii. ד' יהודה which is מצטמק ויפה לו if fully cooked water, permitted, as it is מצטמק ורע לו; but תבשיל which is מצטמק ויפה לו (like cabbage, beans or small cuts of meat) is prohibited
        - iii. Analysis: according to רנב"י, this is before גזרה and גזרה extended it
          - 1. But: according to רבה ור' יוסף who are lenient if this is before מזיד, גזרה is a challenge; if after the קשיא, even שוגג becomes a challenge קשיא

## III. Clairification – the above-mentioned גזירה

- a. במזיר ruling was this if someone cooked שוכח it may be eaten; דנב, it may not be eaten and the same applies to שוכח
  - i. After: they saw that people were leaving it on stove ממזיד, claiming שוגג they decreed that both are אטור
- b. Note: the above-mentioned תוספתא contradicts earlier ברייתא, pitting ב"מ against himself and ר' יהודה as well
  - i. ה"מ limited מבושל כל צרכו yet here, both חמין, that are מבושל כל צרכו, are permitted
  - ii. ב"ה allowed for ב"ה as permitting both yet here, only allowed for חמין
    - 1. Resolution (משנה comment on משנה reflects the rule ab initio; the תוספתא addresses the case post facto
    - 2. Resolution2 (י"י): comment on משנה refers to a swept תוספתא כירה refers to one that is not גרופה וקטומה
- c. Final ruling: did חכמים ban, as a precaution, food that was left on the כירה?
  - i. Answer: ר' יוסי came to ציפורי, found that they had left חמין and תבשיל (of eggs) which were both מבושלים כל צרכן
    - 1. Ruling: he allowed water, forbade eggs
    - 2. Assumption: that was for eating on that שבת (→עבר ושהה אסור)
    - 3. Rejection: that was for the next שבת
      - a. Observation: evidently, eggs are considered מצטמק ויפה לו (confirmed by story of מצטמק ויפה מר ' and ר' and
- IV. Analysis of end of משנה dispute ב"ה/ב"ש about returning food to stove (חזרה)
  - a. "ד' according to ב"ה, may return it, even the next day (during day of שבת)
    - i. Support: ר' אושעיא told story about bringing hot water to his בי and then returning it and not being corrected
    - ii. ד' תדאי. only if he kept it in his hand; if he put it down, may not return it
    - iii. ר' יוחנן ד' אמי ruled that even if he put it down, he may put it back on the stove
      - 1. Note: this is a dispute between 2 reports of אלעזר 'ז's ruling (ר' דימי/ר' שמואל בר יהודה)
  - b. "אביא's caveat (#1): even if עודן בידו, only permitted if his intent was to return it (דעתו להחזיר) → הדקע only permitted if his intent was to return it (דעתו להחזיר), in any case
  - c. "אביר (#2): even if on ground, only אטור if he didn't have intent to return אודן בידו (always מותר, always מותר, always מותר, always אביר
  - d. Unresolved "middle ground" questions (between הניח ע"ג קדקע and הניח ע"ג קדקע): hanging on a stick, putting on a bed
    - i. מיחם to another תיקו to another תיקו