

18 Nissan 5780  
April 12, 2020



Shabbos Daf 37

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**

**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

### **Leaving and Returning**

The *Gemora* inquires: When the *Mishna* states, ‘One cannot place’ (cooked food on a *kirah* that was heated with marc or wood, unless the coals are removed or ash sprinkled on them), does that mean that one must not return it (*chazarah*), yet it is permitted to keep it there (*she’hiyah*) - even if (*the stove*) is neither swept nor covered with ashes; and which *Tanna* would the *Mishna* be following? Chananyah! For it was taught in a *braisa*: Chananyah said: Whatever is (cooked) as the food of ‘ben Derusai’ (a bandit, who would eat his food when it was only one-third cooked) may be kept on the stove, even if it is neither swept nor covered with ashes? Or perhaps, the *Mishna* (when it states ‘one cannot place,’ it) is referring to keeping it there, and that is permitted only if it is swept or covered with ashes, but not otherwise; and how much more so (*that it is forbidden*) with respect of returning it.

The *Gemora* attempts to prove this from the words of the *Mishna*, for two clauses are taught in our *Mishna*: [When the coals are removed or covered] Beis Shammai maintain that one may only place hot water on the *kirah* but not cooked food. Beis Hillel, however, permits placing hot water and cooked food on a *kirah* (whose coals are removed or covered). Beis Shammai permits one to remove something from a *kirah* on *Shabbos*, but he forbids placing the pot back on it, and Beis Hillel permits it. Now, if you say that the *Mishna* (when it states ‘one cannot place,’ it) is referring to keeping it there, it is well, for this is what the *Tanna* is teaching: If a *kirah* was heated with straw and stubble, one may leave a cooked food on it (*before the commencement of Shabbos*); with marc or wood, one may not leave a cooked food on it unless it is shoveled or ash was sprinkled on it. And what (*kinds of food*) may be left there? Beis Shammai maintain that one may only

leave hot water there, but not cooked food, whereas, Beis Hillel, however, permits leaving hot water and cooked food there. And just as they differ in respect to leaving it there (*from before Shabbos*), so do they differ in respect to returning it, where Beis Shammai permits one to remove something from a *kirah* on *Shabbos*, but he forbids returning it, and Beis Hillel permits it (*even returning*). But if you say that the *Mishna* (when it states ‘one cannot place,’ it) is referring to returning it, then this is what the *Tanna* is teaching: If a *kirah* was heated with straw and stubble, one may return a cooked pot (*that had been removed*) to it; with marc or wood, one may not return a cooked pot to it, unless it is shoveled or ash was sprinkled on it. And what (*kinds of food*) may he return? Beis Shammai maintain that one may only return hot water there, but not cooked food, whereas, Beis Hillel, however, permits returning hot water and cooked food there. Now, the last clause states: Beis Shammai permits one to remove something from a *kirah* on *Shabbos*, but he forbids returning it, and Beis Hillel permits it (*even returning*). Then what is the necessity of this addition (seeing that it has already been stated in the previous clause)? [*This would prove that the first interpretation is the correct one; the Mishna means ‘leaving it there,’ and it reflects the opinion of Chananyah!*]

The *Gemora* disagrees with the proof: After all, I can tell you that the *Mishna* (when it states ‘one cannot place,’ it) is referring to returning it (*and with respect to your question that the last clause is superfluous, I will answer you the following:*), and it is as if there are missing words in the *Mishna*, and this is what the *Tanna* is teaching us: If a *kirah* was heated with straw and stubble, one may return a cooked pot (*that had been removed*) to it; with marc or wood, one may not return a cooked pot to it, unless it is shoveled or ash



was sprinkled on it; but as for leaving food there, that is permitted even if it is neither swept nor covered with ashes. And (*regarding that unspoken clause*) what may be left there? Beis Shammai maintain that one may only leave hot water there, but not cooked food, whereas, Beis Hillel, however, permits leaving hot water and cooked food there. And as to this returning, of which I told you (*in the first clause*), it is not a unanimous ruling, but the subject of a disagreement between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel, for Beis Shammai permits one to remove something from a *kirah* on *Shabbos*, but he forbids returning it, and Beis Hillel permits it (*even returning*).

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the following: Rabbi Chelbo said in the name of Rav Chama bar Gurya who said in the name of Rav: We learned this (*lenient ruling of the Mishna*) only of the top of the *kirah* (*which is only somewhat hot*), but within it (*which is very hot*) is forbidden. Now, if you say that the *Mishna* (*when it states 'one cannot place,' it*) is referring to returning it (*and then the unspoken clause of the Mishna stated regarding leaving food there, that is permitted even if it is neither swept nor covered with ashes*), it is well, hence there is a difference between the inside and the top (*for it will be forbidden to put the food inside the kirah with coals, for this will transgress the prohibition of insulating (hatmanah) with coals*). But if you say that the *Mishna* (*when it states 'one cannot place,' it*) is referring to keeping it there (*and it is only permitted if it was shoveled or ash was placed on it*), what difference would it make whether it is inside or on top (*for if there are no coals, why should it be forbidden to put the food inside; there are no coals there*)? [Evidently, R' Chelbo understood the *Mishna* do be referring to returning it (*chazarah*), yet it is permitted to keep it there (*she'hiyah*); and the *Mishna* would be following the opinion of Chananyah.]

The *Gemora* disagrees with the proof: Do you think that Rabbi Chelbo refers to the first clause? He refers to the last one: Beis Hillel permits even returning. Upon that, Rabbi Chelbo said in the name of Rav Chama bar Gurya who said in the name of Rav: We learned this (*lenient ruling of the Mishna*) only of the top of the *kirah* (*which is only somewhat hot*), but within it (*which is very hot*) is forbidden (*for it has the appearance of cooking*).

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the following *braisa*: If two stoves (*kirahs*) that are joined (*sharing a common wall*), one was shoveled or covered with ashes, while the other is not, we may (*before Shabbos*) leave food upon the one that is shoveled or covered with ashes, but not upon the one that is not shoveled or covered with ashes. And what may be left there? Beis Shammai maintain: Nothing at all; while Beis Hillel rule: Hot water, but not a cooked dish. If one removes it, all agree that he must not return it; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehudah said: Beis Shammai maintain: Hot water, but not a cooked dish; while Beis Hillel rule: Both hot water and a dish. Beis Shammai maintain: We may remove food from the *kirah*, but not return it; while Beis Hillel rule: We may return it too.

Now, if you say that the *Mishna* (*when it states 'one cannot place,' it*) is referring to keeping it there, it is well, for then our *Mishna* agrees with Rabbi Yehudah. But if you say that the *Mishna* (*when it states 'one cannot place,' it*) is referring to returning it, who is the authority of our *Mishna*? It is neither Rabbi Yehudah nor Rabbi Meir! For if Rabbi Meir, there is a difficulty on Beis Shammai's view in one respect (*for in the Mishna they permit the leaving of hot water on a kirah from before Shabbos even if the coals are uncovered, while here it is stated that even if it is swept, nothing may be kept there*), and on Beis Hillel's in two (*for in the Mishna they permit the leaving of hot water and cooked food on a kirah from before Shabbos even if the coals are uncovered, while here it is stated that it is permitted only if the coals have been removed and only by hot water, and with regard to returning as well, for in the Mishna Beis Hillel is cited as an opinion that permits returning, and here they say that it is forbidden*)? And if it is Rabbi Yehudah, the law (*of permitting she'hiyah – leaving on the stove*) of the coals to be removed or covered with ashes is difficult (*for in the Mishna, they argue if she'hiyah is permitted for hot water and cooked food if the coals are uncovered, and here R' Yehudah is referring to covered coals, and it is agreed upon that it would be forbidden if the coals are uncovered*)?

The *Gemora* answers: After all, I can tell you that the *Mishna* (*when it states 'one cannot place,' it*) is referring to returning

it, but our *Tanna* agrees with Rabbi Yehudah in one respect and disagrees with him in another. He agrees with Rabbi Yehudah in one respect, viz., in respect to hot water and a cooked dish, and removing and returning them, but he disagrees with him in another, for whereas our *Tanna* holds that leaving them there (*from before Shabbos*) is permitted even if it is neither shoveled nor covered with ashes, Rabbi Yehudah maintains that it is permitted only if it is shoveled or covered with ashes, but not otherwise. (36b – 37a)

**One may place a food next to a *kirah* that was heated with sesame pulp or wood.**

The *Gemora* posed a question regarding a *kirah* whose coals were not removed or covered. Can one place food next to the wall of a *kirah*? On the inside and top of it, it is forbidden, but leaning against it may be permitted; or perhaps, there is no difference?—Come and hear: If two stoves are joined, one being shoveled and covered with ashes, while the other is neither shoveled nor covered with ashes: we may keep upon the one that is shoveled or covered with ashes, but not upon the one that is not shoveled or covered with ashes, though the heat reaches it from the other.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps there it is different, because since it is elevated, the air affects it.<sup>2</sup> Come and hear: For Rav Safra said in Rabbi Chiya's name: If it [the stove] was covered with ashes, yet blazed up again, one may lean [a pot] against it, keep [a pot] upon it, remove [it] then and replace [it]. This proves that even leaning is [permitted] only when it is covered with ashes, but not otherwise. Yet according to your reasoning, when he states, 'one may remove [it] then,' [does this imply] only if covered with ashes, but not otherwise? [Surely not!] But [you must answer,] removing is mentioned on account of replacing; so here too, leaning is stated on account of keeping.<sup>3</sup> How can you compare! There, since removing and replacing refer to the same place, removing is stated on account of replacing; but

here, the leaning is in one place whereas the keeping is in another!

What was the result of the inquiry? The *Gemora* concludes from a baraisa that one may place food that next to a *kirah* that was heated with sesame pulp or wood, but one may only keep food on top of the *kirah* if the coals were covered or removed. If the coals die out or were covered with fine chaff or flax, the *kirah* is akin to a *kirah* covered with ash. (37a)

Rabbi Yitzchak bar Nachmani said in Rabbi Oshaia's name: If he covered it with ashes yet it blazed up again, one may keep upon it hot water that has [previously] been heated as much as is required, or a dish which has been boiled all it needs. Then this proves that when it improves as it shrinks, it is permitted?<sup>4</sup> -[No.] There it is different, because he covered it with ashes. If so, why state it?—It is necessary [to state it, because] it blazed up again. You might argue, since it blazed up again, it reverts to its original state;<sup>5</sup> hence he informs us [that it is not so].<sup>6</sup> [When one removes the coals from the *kirah*, he signifies that he does not want the food to continue being cooked. Although the fire reignited, we do not say that the *kirah* reverts to its original status where the coals were not removed and one would not be allowed to leave food on the *kirah*. Rather, we say that he will not come to stoke the embers, as he prefers that the coals be removed or covered.] (37a – 37b)

Rabbah bar Bar Chanah said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: If he covered it with ashes, yet it blazed up again; one may keep upon it hot water, if that has been heated all it needs, or a dish which has been boiled all it needs, even if they are coals of rosem. Then this proves that when it improves as it shrinks it is permitted?—[No.] Here it is different, because he covered it with ashes. If so, why state it? It is necessary [to state it where] it blazed up again. Then it is identical with the first [dictum]?—It is necessary [to state it] of coals of rosem.

<sup>1</sup> Our problem is similar, and this shows that it is permitted.

<sup>2</sup> The pot stands on the stove and is surrounded by air, which cools it, and therefore the heat from the other stove is disregarded. But leaning against a non-shoveled stove, without air interposing, may be forbidden.

<sup>3</sup> Yet covering with ashes may not be required for leaning.

<sup>4</sup> The reference must be to a dish which improves the longer it is kept on the stove, for if it deteriorates, it may obviously be kept there, as we certainly need not fear that the owner may rake up the coals, and the dictum is superfluous.

<sup>5</sup> And the dish may not be kept there.

<sup>6</sup> For by covering it with ashes he showed that he did not desire any further shrinkage.



[Rosem coals are unique that they are very hot and are not easily extinguished. If one covered the rosem coals and then they were reignited, we still say that one is permitted to leave cooked water and cooked food on the *kirah* before Shabbos, even though the coals were reignited.] (37b)

Rav Sheishes said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: If a stove is fired with marc or wood, hot water insufficiently heated, and a dish insufficiently cooked, may be kept upon it. But if he [the owner] moved [them], he must not replace [them] before he shovels or covers [it] with ashes. Thus he holds that we learned our Mishnah with respect to replacing, but keeping is permitted even if it is not shoveled or covered with ashes. Said Rava: We learned both: We learned with respect to keeping: 'Bread may not be set in an oven before nightfall, nor a cake set upon coals, unless its surface can form a crust while it is yet day'. Hence if its surface formed a crust, it is permitted.<sup>7</sup> With respect to replacing we also learned: Beis Hillel rule: we may replace too. Now Beis Hillel permit it only when it is shoveled or covered with ashes, but not if it is neither shoveled nor covered with ashes. –Rav Sheishes indeed informs us of the deduction of the Mishnah.

Rav Shmuel bar Yehudah said in Rabbi Yochanan's name: If a stove is fired with marc or wood, one may keep upon it a dish sufficiently cooked or hot water which is sufficiently heated, even if it [the dish] improves as it shrinks. Said one of the Rabbis to Rav Shmuel bar Yehudah: But Rav and Shmuel both maintain: If it improves as it shrinks it is forbidden? -He answered him: Do I then not know that Rav Yosef said in Rav

Yehudah's name in Shmuel's name: If it improves as it shrinks, it is forbidden? I tell it to you according to Rabbi Yochanan.<sup>8</sup>

Rav Ukva of Masnah said to Rav Ashi: You, who are near to Rav and Shmuel, do act as Rav and Shmuel; but we will act according to Rabbi Yochanan.

Abaye asked Rav Yosef: What about keeping [a pot on the stove]? — He answered him, It is indeed kept for Rav Yehudah, and he eats of it! Put Rav Yehudah aside, said he, for since he is in danger,<sup>9</sup> it may be done for him even on the Shabbos.<sup>10</sup> What about keeping it for me and you? — In Sura, he replied, they do keep it. For Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak is most particular, and yet they keep it for him and he eats.<sup>11</sup>

Rav Ashi said: I was standing before Rav Huna, when he ate a fish pie which they had kept [on the stove] for him. And I do not know whether it is because he holds that if it improves as it shrinks it is permitted, or because since it contains flour paste it deteriorates in shrinking. Rav Nachman said: If it improves as it shrinks, it is forbidden; if it shrinks and deteriorates, it is permitted. This is the general rule of the matter: whatever contains flour paste, shrinks and deteriorates, except a stew of turnips, which though containing flour paste shrinks and improves. Yet that is only if it contains meat; but if it contains no meat, it shrinks and deteriorates.<sup>12</sup> And even if it contains meat, we say thus only if it is not intended for guests; but if it is intended for guests, it deteriorates in the shrinking.<sup>13</sup> Pap of dates, daysa, and a dish of dates shrink and deteriorate. (37b)

<sup>7</sup> To keep it there, though the oven is not shoveled, etc.

<sup>8</sup> Rav and Shmuel maintain that food that improves when it condenses is forbidden to leave on a *kirah* whose coals were not covered or removed. Rabbi Yochanan, however, maintains that one may leave cooked water and fully cooked food on a *kirah* whose coals were not removed or covered. This applies even when the food improves as it condenses.

<sup>9</sup> He suffered from bulmus, and had to eat hot food.

<sup>10</sup> Rav Yehudah would always leave food on a *kirah* whose coals were not covered or removed, because Rav Yehudah suffered from *bulmus*, seizures, and he was required to eat sweet and healthy food to keep well.

<sup>11</sup> Rav Nachman Bar Yitzchak, who was exceptional in his actions, would leave food before Shabbos on a *kirah* whose coals were not covered or removed.

<sup>12</sup> One may not leave food that improves when it condenses on a *kirah* whose coals have not been covered or removed, but if the food gets bourse as it condenses, one may leave it on the *kirah* whose coals have not been covered or removed. The rule to follow is that food made with flour gets worse as it condenses, but turnips, although they are made with flour, improve as it condenses. Even regarding the turnips, they only improve if they are prepared with meat, but if they are not prepared with meat, they get worse as they condense.

<sup>13</sup> Even with meat, however, they only improve as they condense when not served to guests. When one serves the food to guests, however, we render the food as getting worse, because one prefers to serve guests pieces of meat that have not condensed and are large as one wishes to honor his guests, and it is not respectful to serve guests meat that has condensed, as the meat is not as discernible.



## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### ***Placing Food Inside an Oven Nowadays***

The *Gemora* states that one may only return food to the top of a *kirah*, but to place food back inside the *kirah* is forbidden.

The *Machatzis Hashekel* writes that the reason for this prohibition is that we are concerned that one may come to stoke the embers, and this applies even when the coals have been covered or removed.

The *Shevet Halevi*, however, writes that the prohibition is because it appears like one is cooking on *Shabbos*.

Based on this premise, the *Shevet HaLevi* writes that with regard to modern day ovens that run on *Shabbos* mode, one would be allowed to return cooked food inside the oven.

The rationale behind this ruling is that the *Ohr Zarua* posits that the only prohibition of *chazara*, returning the pot to the fire on *Shabbos*, is when the oven has an interior and a back. In such a case, when one places the cooked food inside the oven and not on top of the oven, it appears like cooking on *Shabbos*. Concerning our ovens, however, that has an interior but do not have a back, there is no concern that it will appear like cooking on *Shabbos*.

One can also add the opinion of the *Rama* who permits returning the food to the interior of the oven when the food was removed on *Shabbos*.

*Reb Moshe Feinstein* in *Iggros Moshe*, however, writes that one should not return a pot of food even to a modern day oven.

## DAILY MASHAL

### **Message pertaining to Social Distancing**

“And Pharaoh's daughter went down to bathe in the Nile, and her maidens were walking alongside the Nile, she saw a

basket amongst the reeds, she sent her maidservant, and she took it.” (Shemos 2:5) The Hebrew word *ammah* "her maidservant" can also be translated as "her arm." So now translated, the *passuk* would read: “Pharaoh's daughter... saw a basket amongst the reeds, she put out her arm, and she took it.” This says the *Talmud*, is to teach us that her arm extended many arms-lengths so she could reach the basket.

*Rabbi Menachem Mendel of Kotzk*, and I remember my *Rosh Yeshiva* *zt”l* saying the same thing, says: If the basket did lay "many arms-lengths" beyond her reach, why did Pharaoh's daughter even try to extend her arm in the first place seeing it was "many arms-lengths" away? There is a profound lesson here for each and every one of us: This teaches us that even when we are confronted with a situation that is beyond our capacity to fix, we should not resign ourselves, reasoning that the little we can do – the little we can reach – won't change anything anyway. [This explains why people, upon seeing a *Sefer Torah* slip a bit from the hands of the one performing *hagbahah*, thrust their hands forward to catch the *Torah* – although they are yards away.] Pharaoh's daughter heard a child's cry and extended her arm despite the fact that a seemingly unbridgeable distance lay between her and the basket. But because she did the maximum of which she was capable, *Hashem* did the rest.

Let us do our part; *Hashem* will do the rest.

**[Please let us know how any points from the last several *Dapim* spoke to you and our current situation.]**