

Laws of Shabbat Chapter 3 (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

Shiur Overview

Summary of Lecture – Laws of Shabbat Chapter 3 (Rambam, Sefer Zemanim)

Structure of the Chapter – Introduction

The third chapter of Hilchot Shabbat deals with the topic of **performing work on Friday that continues into Shabbat**. The chapter begins with general principles, and then proceeds to details of cooking, shehiyah, chazarah, hagsah, and hatmanah. The structure of the first chapters: **Chapter 1** – ones and intent, **Chapter 2** – pikuach nefesh, **Chapter 3** – work begun on Friday that continues into Shabbat.

Halacha 1 – It is Permitted to Begin Work on Friday

The Rambam's words: "It is permitted to begin work on Friday even though it completes itself on Shabbat, for we are only forbidden from performing work on the day itself, but that work should be done by itself on Shabbat is permitted. And it is permitted for us to benefit from what is done on Shabbat by itself."

Simple meaning:

One may begin a work on Friday, even if it completes itself on Shabbat. The prohibition of Shabbat is only that the **person** should not do work on Shabbat itself. If work **happens** by itself on Shabbat it is permitted, and one may also benefit from the result.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **The Rambam's framing – a general inquiry:** The Rambam frames the entire chapter as a general inquiry: what does "melachah of Shabbat" mean? Is the prohibition on the **person's action**, or on the **result** of the work? The Rambam rules clearly: the prohibition is only on the person's action "on the day itself," not on the fact that work is being performed. This is the foundation for the entire chapter.

2. **Examples from the Mishnah (beginning of Tractate Shabbat):** The Rambam brings a series of examples that come from the Mishnayot (there called "light shevutim" – that your vessels may do work, you are not doing work):

- **Opening water flow to a garden** – opening the water supply to a garden on Friday, and it fills and continues all day (matter of **planting**).

- **Placing incense under vessels** – fragrant spices under vessels/clothing, which does its work throughout Shabbat.

- **Placing salve on the eye and bandages on a wound** – medicines on eyes or wounds, and they heal continuously throughout Shabbat.

- **Soaking ink and dyes** – making ink by soaking.

- **Dyeing wool or linen** – placing in a pot with dye, and they change color and continue throughout Shabbat.

- **Spreading traps for animals, birds, and fish** – spreading nets on Friday, even if they catch on Shabbat.

- **Placing beams of the press and millstones** – heavy beams/stones on grapes/olives to squeeze wine/oil.

- **Lighting candles** – lighting candles on Friday, and they burn and continue throughout Shabbat.

Halacha (continued) – The Exception: Shehiyah on Fire – Decree Lest He Stoke

The Rambam's words: "And there are matters in this that we forbid, a decree lest he stoke the coals on Shabbat."

Simple meaning:

In cooking there is an exception to the rule that one may begin work before Shabbat. The Sages forbade certain ways of placing a pot on the fire on Friday, because we are concerned that the person will **stoke the coals** (stir/mix the coals) on Shabbat – which is a Torah prohibition of kindling and/or cooking.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **The Rambam's approach – shehiyah as an exception, not a topic in itself:** In the Gemara (and as most people learn it) shehiyah/hatmanah is a topic in itself. But the **Rambam places it** as an **exception** within the rule that one may begin work before Shabbat. The basic law from the Torah is permitted (even in cooking), but the Sages made a decree because in cooking there is a special concern.

2. **Why specifically by cooking:** In all other works (planting, trapping, squeezing, dyeing, lighting candles) there is no concern. But in **cooking** there is a special concern, because a person wants to have good food, and he has an interest in stirring the coals so it will become hotter.

3. **The mechanism of stoking:** When cooking with coals, ash accumulates that blocks oxygen from reaching the fire. By stirring/stoking, the ash falls off, air comes in, and the fire becomes strong again. This is a prohibition of **kindling** (lighting fire) and also **cooking** (cooking on Shabbat).

4. **The rule when one must be concerned:** The principle is: when the person has an **interest** in stirring (because more heat will make the food better), then we are concerned. But when there is **no reason** to stir – for example: the food is already finished, or it will take a very long time anyway, or stirring will make the food **worse** – then there is no decree.

Halacha 3 – Rules of Shehiyah: Food and Fire

The Rambam's words: "A dish that has not cooked completely, or hot water that has not been heated completely, or a dish that has cooked completely but as long as it reduces it improves – one may not leave them on the fire on Shabbat even though he placed them while it was still day, a decree lest he stoke the coals in order to complete its cooking or to reduce it."

Simple meaning:

One may not leave a pot on fire over Shabbat in three situations: (1) food not yet completely cooked, (2) hot water not yet completely heated, (3) food that is already cooked but becomes better from further cooking (mitzamek veyafeh lo). All three have a concern that the person will stoke the coals.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **Two dimensions of laws:** There are **two separate topics:** (1) **Laws in the food** – whether the food has something to gain from further cooking; (2) **Laws in the fire/oven** – what kind of fire, what kind of oven, whether one can/must do geruf vekatum. Additionally there is a **third factor:** when the coals are already almost burned out (gachalim umeimot), there is an extra leniency.

2. **The Rambam's structure:** The Rambam goes in a certain order: first – which foods are forbidden (the problematic ones); then – for such foods, which ovens/fires are a problem; then – foods that are not a problem at all (mitzamek vera lo, etc.).

3. **Meaning of "mitzamek veyafeh lo":** Mitzamek means the food becomes smaller – like a kugel that becomes more crispy and smaller the longer it's on the fire. "Yafeh lo" means this is a **good thing** – the person wants some of the water to cook out, it should become crispy.

Advice for Shehiyah – Geruf Vekatum

The Rambam's words: "Therefore, if he swept – removed the fire, or covered – covered the fire in the stove with ash on top of the thin coals... or heated with straw and stubble or thin animal dung – it is permitted to leave it, for he has removed his attention from the dish, we do not decree lest he stoke."

Simple meaning:

Three pieces of advice to make shehiyah permitted: (1) **Goref** – removing the coals; (2) **Kotem** – covering the coals with ash; (3) **Heated with weak materials** (straw, stubble, thin animal dung) that don't burn so strongly. Also: coals that are already burned out (umeimot) are like covered with ash.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **Meaning of "hisich da'ato" – not a reminder/sign, but a reality:** "Hesech hada'at" means **not** that he makes a sign/reminder that today is Shabbat (like a challah cover with "Shabbat" on it). It means that he has **actually removed the possibility** of stoking, or at least distanced it so far that he no longer stands with the poker to stir. This is a **law in reality**, not a law in consciousness. **Proof:** By gachalim umeimot it is permitted even without any action of hesech hada'at – because the reality itself is that it's already distanced.

2. **False understanding rejected:** People sometimes think that gerifah uketimah is a "mere reminder" – a sign to remember that it's Shabbat. This is **clearly rejected:** it's not like placing a guard, not like a sign. It's a way that makes it so the person **practically cannot solve** the problem of slow cooking. Even theoretically he can still do something, but he has already "closed it off" – it's already over, he no longer stands in a position of stoking.

3. **Distinction from a guard:** In other laws (for example with children where there is a minority concern) one can place a guard. But **here by shehiyah it doesn't work with a guard** – the law operates by removing the reality of the fire, not through supervision.

Halacha 4 – Distinctions of Ovens: Tanur, Kirah, Kupach

Tanur – Even Geruf Vekatum Doesn't Help

The Rambam's words: "In what case are we speaking? In a kirah that has little heat. But a tanur... even if swept and covered, or heated with straw and stubble – one may not leave in it or on it or leaning against it, a dish that has not cooked completely or that has cooked completely and reduces and improves."

The Rambam's reason: "For sweeping only sweeps most of the fire, and it is impossible to sweep all the fire so that no sparks of fire remain, and because its heat is hot, it is possible that he will stoke the coals."

Simple meaning:

The leniency of geruf vekatum only applies to a **kirah** (weaker heat). But in a **tanur** (stronger heat) even geruf vekatum doesn't help – one may not do shehiyah neither inside, nor on top, nor next to it.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **Three types of ovens:** **Tanur** – hottest (built wide at bottom, narrow at top, holds heat); **Kupach** – a bit weaker than tanur; **Kirah** – least hot (has little heat). The word "shefitah" means the action of placing a pot on the fire. Kirah has room for placing two pots (on top), kupach has room for one pot, tanur is a completely closed one.

2. **The distinction between kirah and tanur by geruf:** In a kirah, if there are weak coals or only a drop remains, stoking won't accomplish anything – therefore there is no concern lest he stoke. But in a tanur, because its heat is very hot, even the few sparks that remain after sweeping, stoking them will help – therefore the person has a reason to want to stoke.

3. **Realistic explanation why coals always remain:** A tanur is a fiery place where one keeps adding coals – one doesn't even see the floor. Even when one sweeps out and adds new coals, something always remains.

4. **Three ways of shehiyah by tanur – all forbidden:** (1) Inside – inside the tanur; (2) On top – on top of the tanur; (3) Leaning against it – next to it, if it gets hot from the wall. **All three** are forbidden by tanur even with geruf vekatum.

5. **The Rambam's three ways by tanur:** The Rambam lists that even (a) little fire, (b) straw and stubble fire, (c) covered with ash – all three leniencies that help by kirah, don't help by tanur, because its heat is hot.

6. **Question: if one can indeed sweep all the coals?** If someone has a "fancy" tanur where one can remove the entire bottom tray, seemingly it should be permitted. **Answer:** Perhaps such a tanur wouldn't be called "tanur" at all but "kirah," because the reality of a tanur is specifically that something always remains.

7. **Why does the Rambam give the reason?** The Rambam gives length with the explanation – perhaps he means this for halacha: that if one finds a way to sweep every last spark, it will indeed be permitted. The Rambam wants to explain why the Sages forbade, and through this he shows that the prohibition is only where the reason applies.

8. **Ma'achal ben Derusai:** There is an opinion that "not cooked completely" means not yet ma'achal ben Derusai, and others are lenient that ma'achal ben Derusai is already

considered "cooked completely." **The Rambam does not bring the topic of ma'achal ben Derusai here.**

[Digression: Modern Ovens and the Matter of the Blech]

A broad discussion about whether the concern of lest he stoke applies to modern ovens:

1. **The Brisker Rav's position:** He couldn't understand why people put a blech on modern ovens, because there's nothing to stoke – there are no coals.

2. **The foundation of "lest he stoke":** Chazal specifically said "lest he stoke the coals" – stirring in coals. It doesn't say "lest he add" or "lest he increase the fire" – not a concern that one will make the fire bigger. Stoking is a normal part of cooking with coals – like at a barbecue, where one constantly stirs. But with modern ovens it's not the normal order of cooking to stand and turn up the knob.

3. **Counter-argument:** A person can want the oven to become hotter so the food will be more cooked – this is the same concern! **Answer:** In Chazal's times one could also bring new coals from outside – this was also technically possible, but Chazal didn't forbid it, because it's not the normal order. Just so with modern ovens: it's not established that one turns up the knob in the middle of cooking.

4. **The blech is a "reminder":** The custom of Israel to put a blech is more like a sign/reminder – to remember not to touch – not because it's a real leniency of geruf vekatum.

5. **Counter-position:** Once the Sages said that when a person has an interest in making his food better/faster, one must be concerned – and this is indeed relevant also with modern ovens. A person makes cholent, comes in the middle of the night, "oh, I can make the cholent even more cooked" – this is the same concern! **Answer:** If your position is that it's a new decree, aluminum foil doesn't help at all – because geruf vekatum means that one can almost no longer stoke, but aluminum foil does nothing practical. "You're making a new prohibition with a new leniency." There is no such decree that everything that will become better one must be concerned about – there is only a decree specifically with coals that one is accustomed to stoking. Every Jew may make fences and safeguards for himself, but it's not "the halacha."

[Digression: The Rambam's Approach in Ruling – Not Applying to New Realities]

The Rambam almost never says "in our time when we don't use such-and-such vessel of the Gemara, but something new, the law is different." He views himself as merely a summarizer of the Oral Torah – he brings the examples from the time of the Mishnah. Applying to a new case is the job of a rabbi, not of a halacha book. The Mishnah Berurah is also this way: the Chafetz Chaim never wrote once about new technology – not because he was afraid to get involved, but because his job was to bring what the halacha is. (In contrast, the book "Machaneh Yisrael" by the Chafetz Chaim, which is a practical book for soldiers, there he does bring practical rulings.) Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach said his opinion about electricity, but he said one cannot make a general rule from this, because we don't have the power to make a new rule in halacha.

Kupach – The Middle Between Kirah and Tanur

The Rambam's position: A kupach is a middle way between a kirah and a tanur – it holds more heat than a kirah but less than a tanur.

Simple meaning:

If the kupach is heated with **geft** (olive waste) or **wood** – which makes strong coals – the law is like a tanur: one may not place on it or near it a dish that has not cooked completely or mitzamek veyafeh lo, and even geruf vekatum doesn't help. But if heated **with straw and stubble** (weaker coals), the law is like a kirah heated with straw and stubble, and it is permitted.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **Semichah by kupach:** By a tanur one may not lean (place next to), by a kirah one may. By a kupach – it depends: if heated with geft/wood (the size of a tanur), one may not lean; if with straw and stubble, one may, like a kirah.

2. **"And it is permitted to lean against a kirah on Friday"** – leaning next to a kirah on Friday is permitted even without the conditions of geruf vekatum. The Rambam doesn't count this among the laws of kirah's prohibitions because it's not a question at all.

3. **The main distinction of kupach:** It is smaller – the meat is closer to the heat, therefore it holds more heat than a kirah.

Halacha: Raw Food / Mitzamek Vera Lo – No Concern of Lest He Stoke

Simple meaning:

Raw food (raw food that is not yet cooked at all) or **mitzamek vera lo** (something that becomes worse from further cooking) – it is permitted to leave it on fire, on any kind of kirah/kupach, without distinction in which coals, because there is no concern lest he stoke – the person has no interest in making it hotter.

Advice of Ever Chai – Placing a Raw Piece Near Twilight

The Rambam's words: "If he threw into it a raw limb near twilight" – if one places a raw piece of meat (or a raw potato, etc.) near Shabbat, the entire pot is considered like raw food.

Simple meaning:

The person is distracted until the morning meal (it takes about ten hours), and he will not stoke.

Novel points and explanations:

1. This is advice even for those who hold like Chananya (or Rabbi Eliezer's stringencies) that one needs a blech – by placing an ever chai one certainly doesn't need a blech.

2. **Question: Why not place a guard?** By shehiyah (later) a guard does help, why doesn't the Rambam say here the advice of a guard? The concern of lest he stoke is not because he forgets that it's Shabbat – it's simply the normal order to go stoke. One needs a concrete action (like placing an ever chai) that makes the person actually distracted. The Sages gave specific advice, not just "have an idea."

Halacha: One Should Not Fill a Pot – Beans, Legumes, Water

The Rambam's words: "One should not fill a pot with beans and lentils and lupines and types of legumes, or barrels of water, and place them in the tanur on Friday near dark and leave them on it."

Simple meaning:

One may not fill a pot with beans, legumes, or water and place it in the tanur on Friday near dark – even in ways that one would be allowed to leave other things. **"For it is of no use in what has cooked, even if it has not cooked at all"** – even when it is already warm, it is not considered "cooked."

Novel points and explanations:

1. **Why this is different from raw food:** Earlier we learned that raw food (raw thing) is permitted to leave because one is distracted – it takes a long time to cook. The Rambam distinguishes: this only applies to things that take a **long time** to cook (like a large piece of meat). But beans, legumes, and water don't take **long** to cook – "they don't need much cooking" – therefore "he intends to eat them immediately" (he thinks he'll eat it soon, for example at the night meal), and therefore there is a concern lest he stoke. They get a law like "a dish that has not cooked completely" – therefore it is forbidden to leave them in the tanur.

2. **Practical difference regarding penalty:** If one did leave it, the same law of "transgressed and transgressed" applies, and on Saturday night one must wait the time it would take to make it.

Halacha: Meat of a Kid – Leniency That Was in the Tanur

The Rambam's words: "A tanur in which he placed meat while it was still day and left it on Shabbat – if it is kid meat and the like" it is permitted. "If he stokes it when eating it, the meat will be charred" – kid meat is delicate meat, and more heat will burn it. "For it only needs the warmth of the fire alone."

Simple meaning:

By kid meat it is permitted because stoking harms – more heat will burn the meat. But **goat and ox meat** is forbidden – because stronger meat benefits from more heat.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **Distinction between raw food and goat and ox meat:** We are not talking here about raw meat (which would be permitted as raw food because it takes long), but about meat that is **already in the process of cooking** – then there is lest he stoke by goat and ox meat.

2. **Kid meat is very juicy** – kid/lamb is more juicy than cow meat, therefore stoking harms more.

Halacha: Sealed the Mouth of the Tanur with Clay – Leniency

The Rambam's words: "And if he sealed the mouth of the tanur with clay" – when one seals the tanur with clay, it is permitted even goat and ox meat. "For if he comes to open the tanur and stoke, the wind will enter and the meat will harden and it will be a loss, and the tanur will cool."

Simple meaning:

Such a tanur cooks through insulation – when one opens it, air enters, the meat hardens, the tanur cools, and it is a loss. Therefore no one will open it in the middle of Shabbat.

Novel points and explanations:

1. This type of tanur produces soft meat specifically because it is closed – opening directly harms the result, therefore there is

no concern lest he stoke.

Halacha: Anything That Wind Harms

The Rambam's words: "And so anything that wind harms, we do not decree upon it lest he open and stoke."

Simple meaning:

Anything that wind is harmful to the tanur, we are not concerned that he will open and stoke.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **Question from flax oven:** The Rambam said earlier (beginning of chapter) that one may place pieces of flax in the tanur on Friday. If the foundation of "lest he stoke" is only by food (because one wants to eat it on Shabbat), why does one need a special reason by flax oven?

2. **Novel point in understanding the law:** The previous understanding is not entirely correct. The Rambam is explaining that the reason why flax oven is permitted is **the same reason** as "sealed the mouth of the tanur" – because when air enters it is harmful. It's not because "lest he stoke" only applies to food, but because by this tanur the concern is not relevant from the reality.

Halacha: Whole Kid – Thick Meat**Novel points:**

1. **Exception by kid:** We learned that kid meat is harmed by stoking. But a **whole kid** (entire animal, as on Passover eve) – there are bones and other parts, it's not so sensitive. But if one makes it "inside the tanur" (sealed) the concern is also not there, because the tanur cools when one opens it.

Halacha: Passover Eve That Falls on Shabbat

The Rambam's words: "It is permitted to lower the Passover lamb into the tanur near dark, even though it is not inside the tanur" – one may lower the Passover lamb into the tanur when it becomes night, even if one doesn't seal the tanur. "Members of the group are careful."

Simple meaning:

Seemingly one should be concerned lest he stoke, because the tanur is not sealed. The Rambam brings a special reason: people who make a group together for the Passover sacrifice take it seriously.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **Source for "guard" leniency:** This is a source for the leniency that was sought earlier – that a guard (or a special situation of carefulness) can nullify the concern lest he stoke.

2. **Why members of a group are different:** When a group cooks together, one plans it in advance, one makes someone in charge of the oven, one knows it's Shabbat. In a private home, everyone passes by the pot and thinks "let's make it a bit more crispy" – this is the concern lest he stoke. But a group plans in advance.

3. **Comparison to "priests are careful"** – there is a personal connection to the rule, but it doesn't say that every group (like a table at a rebbe's) has this law – it's only by Passover.

Halacha: Roasted Meat – Meat, Onion and Egg on Coals

The Rambam's words (from Mishnah): "One may not roast meat, onion and egg unless they will be roasted while it is still day."

Simple meaning:

One may not roast meat, onion or egg on fire, unless it becomes finished (fit to eat) before Shabbat. If it's not finished while still day, it's like a dish that has not cooked completely – forbidden. If it remained on the fire on Shabbat, it is forbidden until Saturday night the time it would take to make it.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **Why roasted meat is different from a pot:** By roasted meat (dry meat on fire, without spices/liquid) stoking is **harmful** – it will burn the meat. This is **mitzamek vera lo** – the meat doesn't become better with more fire, but becomes burned. Therefore "he makes it charred" – stoking only makes a burned layer. This is the distinction between roasting and cooking (cooking in a pot with liquid).

2. **Connection to incense:** The Rambam returns to an earlier law – one may place incense under vessels/laundry. Why not lest he stoke? **Because stoking by incense will burn the incense and damage the vessels** – it's also mitzamek vera lo. This is the same reason as by roasted meat.

General Principle – "Anything That Is Only Forbidden Because of Appearance"

The Rambam's words: "And why? Anything that is only forbidden because of appearance... but a decree lest he stoke the coals."

Novel point:

The Rambam warns against a possible error – one should not think that the prohibitions are because one may not begin work on Friday that finishes on Shabbat. The foundation from the beginning of the chapter remains: work that one begins on Friday is permitted even if it finishes on Shabbat. The specific prohibitions are **only** about lest he stoke.

Halacha: Wool in the Dye Pot (Dyeing)

The Rambam's words: "One may not place wool in the dye pot unless he places it when it is close to the fire... and its mouth is sealed with clay."

Simple meaning:

One may not place wool in a pot (for dyeing) unless the pot is already off the fire, and also the mouth must be smeared with clay – lest he lift it and return it (to the fire).

Novel points:

The wool in the dye pot speaks of **dyeing**, as Tosafot (13a) and Rambam Hilchot Shabbat Chapter 9. This is also a concern of lest he stoke, therefore one needs special conditions.

Halacha: Transgressed and Left – Post Facto If One Transgressed the Laws of Shehiyah

The Rambam's words: "Any dish that is forbidden to leave... if he transgressed and left it, it is forbidden to eat it... until Saturday night, and he waits the time it would take to make it."

Simple meaning:

If someone sinfully left a dish on the fire (that one was not allowed to), one may not eat it until Saturday night, and one must wait after Saturday night "the time it would take to make it" – the time it would have taken to cook the food from the beginning.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **The foundation of the penalty – Shabbat action:** The Rambam builds this law on the rule that one may not benefit from a prohibited action of Shabbat. This is an interesting case, because the person did not actually do any action on Shabbat itself – he placed it on Friday. It's not a classic "Shabbat action" like when someone does a sin on Shabbat itself. The novel point is that although the action was Friday, because the prohibition (shehiyah) happened on Shabbat, this is treated like a Shabbat action.

2. **Question what is the rabbinic prohibition – Friday or Shabbat?** Is the rabbinic prohibition when he placed it on Friday, or when he left it there on Shabbat? Perhaps there is an obligation to remove it on Shabbat when he didn't forget, because as long as it lies there there is "lest he stoke." Therefore the rabbinic prohibition is from Shabbat itself – the leaving it there.

3. Distinction between intentional and unintentional:

- **Intentionally** – forbidden until Saturday night, plus the time it would take to make it.

- **Unintentionally** – the Rambam further distinguishes: if the dish did not cook completely (not cooked completely), it is also forbidden on Saturday night. But if the dish is already cooked completely, and the prohibition was only because it is mitzamek veyafeh lo – then it is permitted to eat it on Shabbat immediately, because he doesn't have such strong benefit from the Shabbat action, because it was already cooked.

4. **Dispute of Ra'avad:** The Ra'avad strongly criticizes the Rambam's distinction between unintentional and intentional. The Ra'avad doesn't see a distinction between forgetfulness and intentional, and according to him even unintentionally should also be forbidden.

[Digression: Rashi's Position – Ma'achal Ben Derusai]

Rashi, based on the position of Chananya in the Gemara, holds that if the dish is cooked at least a third (ma'achal ben Derusai), one may already leave it even without gerufa uketuma. The Shulchan Aruch rules like Rashi leniently. The Rambam however explicitly doesn't accept this – he says "rule" (not cooked at all or cooked completely), which excludes the intermediate stage of ben Derusai.

Laws of Chazarah – Returning a Pot to the Fire on Shabbat

The Rambam's words: "Anything that is permitted to leave on the fire, if he removed it from the fire, it is forbidden to return it to its place."

Simple meaning:

Even things that one may leave (shehiyah) on the fire, if one removed it, one may not return it. Chazarah is stricter than shehiyah.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **New foundation – appears like cooking:** The prohibition of chazarah is not from "lest he stoke" (like by shehiyah), but a separate decree: when one returns a pot to the

fire on Shabbat, it looks like one is cooking on Shabbat (appears like cooking). This is a completely different reason.

2. When one may return – only a swept or covered kirah: Of all the leni

encies that we learned by shehiyah, by chazarah only one is valid: a kirah that is swept or covered, or a kirah/kupach that were heated with straw and stubble. The leniency of placing a raw piece of meat (which helps by shehiyah) doesn't help by chazarah, because that would actually be cooking on Shabbat. The leniency of geruf/katum by chazarah is because there is not really any fire, or it's weak, therefore it doesn't look like cooking.

3. Condition: "that he didn't place it on the ground": One may only return if one didn't put down the pot on the ground. When one still holds it in hand, it looks like a continuation of what was already there. But "from the moment he put it down" – once he put it down – "he doesn't return and place it" even on a swept and covered kirah, because then it really looks like he's placing a new pot on Shabbat. "Ground" in the Gemara means the floor, because the kirah was a low structure in the ground (as the Rambam writes in Perush HaMishnayot).

4. Tanur and kupach like coals – forbidden even chazarah: One may not return to a tanur at all, and not on a kupach that is like coals, only on a kirah – even swept and covered – because "its heat is very hot," and it looks like one is cooking on Shabbat.

5. Semichah = chazarah: "Anything that one may not return upon, one may not lean against" – if one may not return to a certain fire, one also may not lean (place next to) on Shabbat. Semichah on Shabbat is only permitted on a swept and covered kirah.

Chazarah from Kirah to Kirah

Rama: "It is permitted to return from kirah to kirah" – one may remove a pot from one kirah and place it on another kirah, "as long as he didn't place it on the ground in between." Chazarah doesn't only mean returning to the same place, but to any hot surface, even a different kirah. "Even from a kirah that was swept while still day to a kirah that was swept while still day" – if both are swept and covered.

"But not from kirah to hatmanah and not from hatmanah to kirah" – one may not switch from kirah to hatmanah (covering with things that keep warm, without fire) or vice versa. **Reason:** One may not make a new hatmanah on Shabbat.

Halacha: Hagsah – Stirring in a Pot on the Fire

The Rambam's words: "It is forbidden to insert a ladle into the pot on Shabbat when it is on the fire, even in ways that it was permitted to be on the fire, and even to remove from it on Shabbat, because it is like stirring, and this is one of the needs of cooking, and it turns out like cooking on Shabbat."

Simple meaning:

One may not insert a spoon/ladle into a pot that stands on the fire on Shabbat, even just to remove food, because inserting it stirs the food (hagsah), which is part of cooking.

Novel points and explanations:

1. Hagsah is not just "appears like cooking" – it's actually an improvement: Hagsah is not merely a matter of appearance, but it's actually a need of cooking – stirring improves the cooking. Therefore actual cooking can occur on Shabbat, not just looking like cooking.

2. The Rambam's novel point – even removing: The Rambam forbids even just removing things from a pot with a ladle on Shabbat – because while removing it also gets stirred. The **Ra'avad** disagrees and says "he has exceeded his measures" – he agrees that stirring is forbidden, but just removing from a pot is "too much" stringency.

3. The main problem is inserting the ladle: A pot that sits with a serving spoon inside looks like one is in the middle of cooking. Therefore, pouring from the pot (without inserting a spoon) would seemingly be permitted – because when it's no longer on the fire, the stirring is not cooking.

4. Dispute of Shulchan Aruch and Rama regarding hagsah: The Shulchan Aruch says that hagsah is only forbidden when it is not cooked completely, but "something that is cooked completely, meaning mitzamek vera lo, there is no hagsah in it." The **Rama** however is stringent that even cooked completely also has hagsah.

5. Practical difference – cholent vs. soup: By cholent there is a reason to stir so it won't get burned from below (mitzamek veyafeh lo), but by chicken soup it's hard to see a real reason to stir. The common practice is that one doesn't remove directly from the pot when it's still on the fire – one lifts it (off the fire) first.

Halacha: Bread (Baking Bread on Friday)

The Rambam's words: "One may not bake bread in the tanur near dark, nor a flat cake on coals, unless the surface that is attached to the tanur or to the fire will crust."

Simple meaning:

One may not place bread in the oven near dark, whether in a tanur or a flat cake on coals, except when the side that is stuck to the tanur (or to the fire by a flat cake) is already hardened (will crust its surface).

Novel points and explanations:

1. Which side must crust: In the Gemara it's not clear which side. The Rambam rules that it is the side "that is attached to the tanur or to the fire" – that is, the side that is stuck to the tanur (by bread) or to the fire (by a flat cake), not the side that is exposed to the air. Even when the other side is still raw, it's already enough. This is interesting because it's more similar to ben Derusai – a measure of partial cooking.

2. Why bread is different from other foods: By bread there is no concern of mitzamek veyafeh lo. The Rambam says: "We are not concerned lest he stoke, for if he stokes the bread its taste will be ruined" – if one stokes the coals, the bread will be burned, not better. Therefore, after crusting its surface it is already permitted to leave, because stoking harms.

3. But before crusting its surface there is indeed a concern lest he stoke – this is a new measure, not ben Derusai, not completely, but a special measure for bread. By raw bread the leniency of "stoking will ruin" is lacking because it's not yet baked enough that stoking will harm.

4. **Distinction between bread and covered kid:** By a covered kid (which also stoking will ruin) one may place it right near dark even raw. By bread one must wait until crusting its surface – because by bread in the earlier stage (before crusting) stoking does help, and only after crusting does stoking harm.

Halacha: Transgressed and Transgressed by Bread – Intentionally and Unintentionally

The Rambam's words: "And if he placed it near dark and its surface has not yet crusted – if intentionally, it is forbidden... and if unintentionally, it is permitted to remove it on Shabbat for the need of three meals."

Simple meaning:

If one unintentionally placed bread in the oven when it's not yet crusted its surface, one may remove it on Shabbat – but only as much as one needs for the three Shabbat meals.

Novel points and explanations:

1. **Half penalty by unintentional:** Here there is a **half penalty** by unintentional – different from other foods where unintentionally there was no penalty at all. By bread unintentionally one may only take as much as one needs for three meals.

2. **Why the distinction?** Because bread has special importance for Shabbat meals (lechem mishneh). The Sages gave a special leniency in honor of Shabbat meals, but limited only to what one needs for the meals.

3. **Measure of removal:** One may immediately Friday night remove enough for all three meals.

Halacha: Removing the Bread – How One Removes Bread

The Rambam: Even in the permitted manner (when it's already crusted its surface), when one removes bread from the tanur, one should do it **"only with a knife and the like"** – with a change, not with the regular utensil (shibber/radid).

Novel points:

1. One should not use the normal utensil that one uses for removing bread, so it won't look like one is engaged in baking on Shabbat.

2. **Chochmat Adam (in Melachim)** is brought that removing bread is initially a prohibition. The Ran and others say that the prohibition is only when he did a sin (placed it improperly). But if he did it in the permitted manner, one may eat it because it's not a Shabbat action.

Halacha: Fire (Fire for Warming)

The Rambam's words: A person may make a fire **"with anything he wishes, whether on the ground or on a lamp," and one lights it on Friday near dark,** "and they use it for light or warm themselves opposite it on Shabbat."^{**}

Simple meaning:

A fire may be made from whatever one wants (there are no laws of hard grapevines and wood like by Shabbat candles), whether on the ground or on a lamp. One may use it for light or warmth.

Novel points:

1. By a fire there are no laws of "one may not light" (which oils/wicks) because a fire is large and one won't come to adjust it.

Halacha: Majority Condition by Fire

The Rambam's words: "One must light most of the fire before it gets dark, so that the flame will rise by itself before Shabbat." If not – "it is forbidden to benefit from it on Shabbat, a decree lest he stoke it."

Simple meaning:

Most of the fire must already be burning before Shabbat, so the flame already goes by itself. If not, it is forbidden to benefit on Shabbat, concern lest he stoke.

Novel points:

1. **By one piece of wood: "It must be most of its thickness and most of its circumference"** – two types of majority: majority of the thickness (depth) and majority of the circumference. It's not enough that one side burns – majority of the entire thickness and majority of all sides must already burn.

Halacha: Fire of Beit HaMoked – Priests Are Careful

The Rambam's words: "In what case are we speaking? In the provinces. But in the Temple one may rekindle the fire with wood of the fire of Beit HaMoked, and we are not concerned lest he stoke, for the priests are careful."

Simple meaning:

In the Temple one may light the fire in Beit HaMoked (where priests warm themselves) even near dark without the condition of majority, because priests are careful.

Novel points:

1. "Careful" doesn't mean fast, but that they remember that it's Shabbat and won't stoke. Like "members of a group are careful" – when people do a mitzvah together in a group, they pay more attention. The priests are occupied with service, and the seriousness of the situation makes them trustworthy.

Halacha: Fire of Reeds (Twigs) or Kernels

The Rambam's words: "He took out a fire of reeds or kernels" – when one makes a flame from thin plants or kernels, one doesn't need to wait until most of the fire burns, because such things catch fire quickly. **"For he sees that most of them will burn before Shabbat."**

Simple meaning:

By light materials that ignite quickly, there is no concern that the person will desecrate Shabbat by adding, because he knows it will quickly burn by itself.

Novel points:

1. The reasoning: The entire concern is that the person will come back and stir the fire. By reeds and kernels, if it's already burning a bit, he knows it will soon become a big fire by itself, and he won't need to interfere.

Halacha: Bound the Reeds – Bundled Reeds

The Rambam's words: "Therefore" – if one bound the reeds (**bound the reeds**) or placed the kernels in a pile

(packed together), then it doesn't burn quickly, but like wood, and then **"the flame must rise by itself before Shabbat."**

Simple meaning:

When one condenses the light materials, they lose their property of quick ignition, and they get the law of regular wood.

Novel points:

1. The Rambam says **"therefore"** – that is, from the reasoning itself one can understand the distinction: because the entire leniency by reeds is because they ignite quickly, therefore when one binds them together and they burn slowly, the leniency falls away.

Halacha: Fire of Pitch, Sulfur, Fat, Wax

Simple meaning:

These are materials that ignite quickly, similar to reeds, and have the same law – one doesn't need to wait until most burns.

Novel points:

1. **Pitch** is the same as olive waste.

2. A comparison is brought to **"fire that kindles itself"** – the fire burns it out quickly, and soon nothing remains.

[Digression: General Moral Lesson]

On Friday it must already be sufficiently lit that **the flame rises by itself** on Shabbat – a Jew must **prepare for Shabbat**, he must already be "Shabbat-like" before Shabbat, one shouldn't need to struggle on Shabbat, but one should already be joyful.

The lecture ends with the end of Chapter 3.

Full Transcript

Laws of Shabbat Chapter 3 – Beginning Work Before Shabbat

Introduction – Structure of the Chapter

Okay, good. Are we learning more? We're learning Laws of Shabbat in Sefer Zemanim from the Rambam, the third chapter, Chapter 3.

We're still holding by the Rambam enumerating the 39 melachot (forbidden labors). He speaks, the beginning is somewhat general halachot (laws) on all of Shabbat, what is relevant to Shabbat. And this chapter also, if you read it, he begins with a general principle of... a principle of Shabbat. Later it's already less of a principle, it already goes into the details of bishul (cooking), of hatmanah (insulation). But I would say the way the Rambam frames it, you can still understand that this is the principle of the question. Which melachot, may one do melachot from erev Shabbat (Friday afternoon) that happen automatically on Shabbat? Is there in this a principle, a great exception, which is the prohibition of shema yachtah (lest he stoke), which includes many details of shehiyah (leaving food on the fire) and hatmanah and so on. But essentially it's all a general inquiry, what is the meaning of melachat Shabbat (Shabbat labor)?

We've already learned Chapter 1 on actions and intention, Chapter 2 on pikuach nefesh (saving a life), Chapter 3 on doing melacha from erev Shabbat that continues into Shabbat.

Halacha 1 – It Is Permitted to Begin Work Before Shabbat

The Rambam tells us thus, one may not do melachot on Shabbat. But what happens regarding melachot that will be done on Shabbat through a melacha that you didn't do on Shabbat, but rather that you prepared before Shabbat?

The Rambam says thus, **one is permitted to begin a melacha on erev Shabbat**, on erev Shabbat one may begin doing a melacha, **even though it completes itself on Shabbat**. Even if the melacha is done by itself, on its own, meaning he lit it, he started the thing, and it happens by itself afterwards on Shabbat. A person might have thought it's not permitted, because the melacha takes place on Shabbat.

But the Rambam says, it is indeed permitted. Why? **For we were not forbidden**, the prohibition that the Torah said about doing melachot on Shabbat was only **that we should not do melacha on the day itself**, one may not do, that the person should not do. But the problem is not that the melacha should be done. **But that the melacha should do itself on Shabbat is permitted**, so there's no problem that a melacha should happen, only that a melacha should be done by a person on Shabbat.

And it is permitted for us to benefit from what is done on Shabbat by itself, both that one may let it happen, and also that one may afterwards benefit from what happened, unlike normally if a person did a melacha on Shabbat. That is forbidden to benefit from. This one may benefit from.

Halacha 2 – Examples from the Mishnah

And the Rambam explains, he brings the gemarot (Talmudic passages). **How so? One may open water channels to a garden on erev Shabbat at nightfall**. One may open the stopper, or whatever, from a place where water begins flowing into the garden, so that much water should flow in. One may do it erev Shabbat at nightfall. Although one knows that now almost no water will flow in, the actual flowing of water into the garden will happen on Shabbat. So this is apparently a matter of zeri'ah (planting), I know, by water in a field on Shabbat is zeri'ah. But this is not called zeri'ah, because he did the action before Shabbat. So one may open the water to the garden on erev Shabbat at nightfall, before it gets dark, or when it gets dark, it's the last minute when it's still not Shabbat, **and it fills and continues all day long**, that the field should be filled with water throughout Shabbat.

And the same thing, **and one places a censer under garments**. One may place a device in which one puts fragrant hot spices, and it should make a good smell, it should perhaps perfume the clothes. What is this a prohibition of... what is the prohibition of a censer? It's a prohibition of... let's not go into what the prohibition is, but there is a leniency. What does it have to do with which prohibition? It's later. But the point is, although he will have it all Shabbat long, the device will do its work throughout Shabbat, that it should perfume the garments.

The same thing, **and one places kilor on the eye and bandages on a wound**. One may place medicines on the eye, or a band-aid, whatever it is, on a wound. Although the kilor will do its function throughout Shabbat, **and they heal continuously all Shabbat long**.

The same thing, **and one soaks ink and dyes at nightfall**. To make ink, one needs to combine ink and dyes, letting them soak. If one does this, the work of it, the melacha of it, is done at nightfall, it's permitted. Yes, and what did we say? Although the ink and dyes soak together throughout Shabbat, the ink is completed on Shabbat, the melacha is done before Shabbat.

The same thing, to dye wool, one places wool in a pot, or to dye linen items, pieces of linen, one places it in a pot together with the dye and so on, **and they change and continue all Shabbat long**, even though throughout Shabbat the wool or the linen is changed, it becomes a greater form on Shabbat.

I don't know if dyeing or perhaps making the wool stronger, I don't know exactly, the avot hamelachot (primary categories of labor) was dyeing, okay. And I'm interested that he brings all these gemarot that are in the Mishnayot.

And one spreads nets, one may spread out nets **for animals and birds and fish**, also at nightfall on erev Shabbat, even though on Shabbat it will catch.

And one places beams in the olive press and the wheels of the winepress while it is still day, one may place a heavy beam on grapes, or a large circle, a round stone, on olives in the press, or whatever, conversely, to squeeze out the wine and oil, one may place the heavy thing while it is still day before it gets dark before Shabbat, although the job of this, squeezing out the liquid, happened on Shabbat, **and the liquid flows continuously all Shabbat long**.

The same thing **one lights candles**, one lights them in the evening, **and they burn continuously all Shabbat long**, it burns all Shabbat.

These are all the halachot that are stated there at the beginning, wait, that are stated there at the beginning of Tractate Shabbat, there it's called minor shevutim (rabbinic prohibitions), that your vessels may do a melacha, you're not doing any melacha, this is the principle that the Rambam brings here.

Halacha 3 – Exception to the Rule: Leaving Food on the Fire

But by cooking there are already more detailed laws. He says that the principle is like all others, that one may place **a pot on the fire, and meat in the oven or on the coals**, and it should cook throughout Shabbat, and you may eat it on Shabbat.

But here it's already more complicated, here there is... all things one may benefit from, but by cooking there are indeed more details of ways how one may not. **And there is in this matter** the prohibition is not from the Torah, from the Torah it's permitted. It's not forbidden just because the melacha happens on Shabbat, because everything one may do that the melacha should happen on Shabbat. Rather there is another concern, that one is concerned that the person will do, that even though there is a way how to place the pot on the fire, one is concerned that he will indeed do melachot on Shabbat, and because of this they forbade it.

A decree lest he stoke the coals on Shabbat, he will stir, he will poke around with the coals on Shabbat, and he

transgresses on mevashel (cooking) on Shabbat.

The Rambam's Framing – Shehiyah as an Exception to the Rule

This is a rabbinic decree, that one may not... it's like an exception to the rule that one may do things from erev Shabbat that happen on Shabbat. The Rabbis forbade certain things that can cause a person to cook on Shabbat. Not actually cook, but yachteh bagechalim (stoke the coals) which is also counted apparently as a Torah prohibition of mevashel. Right?

Now we're going to learn, essentially in the Gemara, or how most people remember it, it's a sugya (Talmudic topic) in itself. But the Rambam puts it in that it's a detail in the law that one may indeed begin doing a melacha before Shabbat and the melacha should do itself on Shabbat. "Except," he's now going to say an except. The except is when there is a concern that one does indeed the main work before Shabbat, but there is a concern that on Shabbat the person will stumble and do a melacha again.

This is a matter of the thing of preparing food. Although there is a way of preparing food by placing it on the fire before Shabbat, but because a person wants to have good food, there are various concerns and various conditions when one must be concerned that one will stumble on Shabbat and do melachot so that the food should be better.

There is one concern which I know, if you know of other things you can tell me: shema yachteh bagechalim (lest he stoke the coals).

Yes, we're talking about food. All the concerns are when one prepares food. There is... yes. There is also, it looks like he's not cooking now, we'll see later. We'll learn the concerns. There is chazarah (returning), if it doesn't look like he's cooking. If it's chazarah, it's another thing. But yes, let's learn further.

When One Must Be Concerned – The General Rule

The Rambam says thus, **and there is in this matter** – the thing we discussed that one may essentially do, if one does the action before Shabbat one may do it even though the occurrence, the result happens in the middle of Shabbat, but there is when one may not. **And there are in this matter ways that we forbid** – there are ways that one may not place the pot on the fire on erev Shabbat. **Ways** – there are different types of food, types of pots, types of pots, I mean ovens, types of ovens that are forbidden. **A decree lest he stoke the coals on Shabbat** – why is it forbidden? Because one is concerned, the Sages made the decree, that if one allows it people will stumble by stirring the coals on Shabbat.

Because in the past cooking was done with coals, and the coals need to be stirred from time to time so they should become hot again, because the ash prevents the oxygen from reaching the fire and giving it life. So the method is, to move around the coals a bit so that the ash that is already completely burned out should fall off, air should be able to reach the fire, and the fire begins to cook again. And then he transgresses on mav'ir (kindling), and also apparently on mevashel, because he's cooking now on Shabbat, he makes the flame higher on Shabbat.

Whoever makes a grill with coals knows about this. Yes, it's something that one must constantly, every little while one must give a stir, whatever one must do.

The Rambam says, what are the ways when one must indeed be so concerned? The Rambam is going to bring various examples, but I want to say it beforehand broadly, I mean that it will be easier. That when one must be concerned is when the person wants, has an interest to stir so it should become hotter, then one is concerned. So if it's such a type of food that if it becomes hotter it will become even better, it will become crispy, I don't know, or such sorts of things.

But for example, there are other sorts of foods or sorts of situations where there is no reason at all that you should want to stir, or where it's going to take very long anyway for it to cook, so you won't accomplish much with the little bit of stirring. Or that the stirring will make it worse. The Rambam is going to enumerate all these types. Yes?

Yes, there are apparently two things that are new here. One must learn the rules internally, but essentially two other conditions. First of all, there is a law in the tavshil (cooked dish), right? Only a tavshil that has something, if you say that it's not something that benefits from being cooked more or better, then there is a concern. And secondly there are laws in the fire. Which sort of fire one can be machteh (stoke), or one must be machteh, or one cannot remove that. Which type of oven, which type of fire, which type of machteh?

No, there is besides that, when there are actual coals, which have almost no coals left, there is also an extra claim and an extra place.

Yes, okay, okay. Yes, true, that you're going to add to it. I'm just saying, generally there is a law of the tavshil. Afterwards, even a tavshil that has a concern, it still must be such a sort of fire or such a sort of oven that one can be concerned about. So the Rambam's structure is going to be, he's going to begin giving the tavshil that is forbidden. Afterwards he's going to say, in this tavshil all sorts of ovens and sorts of fire are forbidden from that oven that one must be concerned about. Afterwards he's going to say what about a tavshil that is not at all a problem, that doesn't benefit at all. And the Rambam says thus, keitzad (how so), he begins thus:

The Rambam's Words: A Dish That Is Not Fully Cooked

A tavshil that has not been fully cooked, a tavshil that has not yet been completely cooked, it has not yet been fully cooked, **or hot water**, or hot water that has not been fully cooked, here it begins... let's learn first the piece, but here is the question what means fully cooked. **Or a tavshil that has been fully cooked**, or a tavshil that has already been completely cooked, **but as long as it benefits from being reduced**, the whole time when it becomes better. Mitzta'mek means it becomes smaller, it becomes like for example a large kugel, the longer it's on the fire it becomes more crispy and smaller. Yes, it becomes so, it becomes tight. Mitzta'mek. The types of food where it's good for it, the person wants that some of the water should cook out, it should be more crispy and so on, all these things **one may not leave them on the fire on Shabbat**, one may not place them even on erev Shabbat, place them and they should remain, they should lie on the fire on Shabbat, **even though one placed them while it was still day**, even though one placed them before Shabbat.

Why? **A decree lest he stoke the coals**, there is a concern that he will stir the coals. Why? **In order to complete its cooking**, by the things that are not yet completely cooked, he will want that it should already be cooked, it should already be ready. **Or in order that it be reduced**, or because he wants

that it should be better, it should be more crispy. **Therefore**, so these things are a problem.

The Solutions: Garuf and Katum

So what is indeed the solution? I'll tell you, that if you indeed have a tavshil that is fully cooked, how can you indeed place it on the fire so there shouldn't be the decree of shema yachteh, how may one place it on erev Shabbat? So the solution is thus: on... he says three ways how to make that the fire should not be so easy to be machteh or so forth. Although there is such a method of cooking which is the prohibition, but the fire must also be a fire that is a problem. If one can make the fire a fire that is not a problem, there is a solution. So on **garuf vechatah (swept and covered)**, one solution is to remove the burning coals, to sweep it out from there, or to cover the burning coals. **Covering fire on a stove, with ash on the thin coals**. He covers the coals with ash, with cinders, or with crumbs of merchandise, I don't know, dust, which makes the fire become much weaker, and therefore there's nothing to stoke, or the stoking is not such an accomplishment. In short, this will make that one should not stoke.

Or the other solution is, if it's a situation that the coals are already more or less burned out, they've already gone to sleep, which then they are automatically **they are like covered with ash**, then he doesn't need to put ash, then this is already itself ash if the coals are already burned out.

Or a case where one didn't use regular coals from wood, but he heated with straw or with gvava, which is another sort of pieces of wood from the field, **or dung of small animals**, or waste from animals, small animals, **for there is no substance there**, if one heats with these sorts of things, he says, that these things can be lit, it can become hot, but not on that level, not like coals where afterwards the stoking will help.

Hesech Hada'at – Not a Reminder, But a Reality

Lecture on Hilchos Shabbos – Chapter 3: Shehiya on the Fire

And in such a situation where you have already removed the problem of being mechateh (stoking), one returns to the regular halacha that one may place something before Shabbos so that it should cook on Shabbos. Therefore, the Mishna permits, lechatchila one may indeed do shehiya, make it so that it should remain. Shehiya means to keep something somewhere, to make it so that the pot should remain on the flame. Why is it permitted? **Because he has removed his mind from the food (shehri hisiach da'ato min hatavshil)**. By the fact that he removed the coals, or by the fact that he covered it to make the coals weaker, he was mesiach da'as from the tavshil. He made it clear to himself, to remind himself, or he made it clear that he is not going to try to make the tavshil cook faster or better. Therefore, **we do not decree lest he stoke the fire (lo gazrinan shema yechateh ba'eish)**, there is no gezeira that he will be mechateh, stir the fire.

Hesech hada'as is not a sign, not that he makes a siman. Literally, it's such a manner that he cannot now solve it. Even theoretically, if he would have some way to make the tavshil a bit better, he could, but he has already closed it, it's already finished, he can no longer. Mesiach da'as is not a din in da'as, it could be that it is gachalim omemos (smoldering coals), as we see because we will see later. I mean that one can, there is a way to be mechateh, because he made it easier, but it's more,

in this manner he has let go, it's not supervised, it's not a saifa. Mesiach da'as means that he has made it clear, therefore he will not be mechateh, because he has already established for himself that this is the state of the pot.

Because one cannot, it's not a saifa, it's not a manner of English, it's harder, everything in the world one can, one can also bring that the Ribono Shel Olam should make a miracle and it should become nothing again, very good, because another Tanna can say yes to me, but a de'ah stands here, a Tanna can say yes to me. The point is not, I just want to say a puka that people sometimes think, that gerufa uketuma is a zecher be'alma (mere sign), he places a siman that today is Shabbos and one may not be goref, it's not that, one makes it in a manner, if one could have there a challah tablecloth, a challah cover that says Shabbos on it, would it help at all, or one places a guard, but that's not the way the halacha operates here. It could be that it would help, but it doesn't say so here. If someone says that he has a selicha and he places a guard, for example, because one is teaching children, and there is a chashash mi'uta (minimal concern), there is something of one can place a guard, here we see that it's not a guard.

Here it's all about whether it's the kind of pot where he has no reason to be mechateh, or he does have a reason, because the tavshil is still mitztamek vera lo (reducing and it's bad for it), but he cannot, or he can technically, but it's already let go, it's already far enough from the, in other words, in this situation one no longer stands with the fork to be mechateh, one lets it, it's already whatever it is it is it. He says here then about a **tavshil that has not been fully cooked (tavshil shelo nitbashel kol tzorko)**, here here here the mefarshim add about the topic of how much it needs to be cooked, but the Rambam doesn't bring it, it's let's move on. It's ma'achal ben Drusai, but the Rambam doesn't bring the matter of ma'achal ben Drusai here. Okay.

Halacha 5 – Distinctions Between Ovens: Kira, Kupach, Tanur

Bameh Devarim Amurim – Only by a Kira

Speaker 2:

In what case are these things said (bameh devarim amurim)? Yes. However others are more lenient, others say that even if it's not yet, that if it's already ma'achal ben Drusai it's already considered nitbashel kol tzorko. Yes. Let's continue. The Rambam says further, **bameh devarim amurim**, the halacha that was said that it's enough with a weaker one, with two of the ways, the three the Gemara said of making it so that it should be a bit harder to be mechateh, or one should not happen to be mechateh, that this is enough, is good **by a kira, that its heat is minimal (shehavla me'at)**, a type of oven that is not very hot, **shehavla me'at**, where the hot air is little.

There are three types of ovens that the halacha will enumerate: a **tanur** is the hottest, and after that there is a **kira** and a **kupach**. Kupach is a bit weaker than tanur, and kira is the least hot. Tanur the heat is stronger, tanur is built so that at the bottom it is wide and at the top it becomes narrow, and thus much of the heat is retained.

Tanur – Even Garuf Ukatum Doesn't Help

So a tanur which has much hotter heat, then it doesn't help that he did one of the three remedies, that he scraped out the top coals, even if he scraped out the coals, or kipa be'efer, he

covered the coals with ash, or he heated the oven bekash uvegava, with weaker things, not coals. Therefore then, **one may not leave in it (ein mashin betocha)**, one may not, because it's a tanur which is much hotter, one may not be masheh based on the solution that he was goref, one may not be masheh **not in it**, one may not place a pot in the oven, and not only that but also **nor on top of it (velo al gaba)**, another way how to cook or how to heat things is to place outside of the tanur, **velo al gaba**, and also not **adjacent to it (somech lo)**. There are three ways essentially, one can place on the tanur, next to the tanur, so it should become hot from the walls of the tanur, or inside. One may not do all three of these things.

Any tavshil that has not been fully cooked (kol tavshil shelo bishel kol tzorko), a tavshil that is not yet completely cooked, **or that has been fully cooked but is mitztamek veyafeh lo**, a tavshil where there is a reason that one should think that he will perhaps want to be mechateh so it should become better, because it should become cooked. One may not even when it was garuf ukatum, all these things. Why? Because **since its heat is very hot (hoil vehavlo cham beyoter)**, because the tanur is a very hot thing, one is mesiach da'as, or is not mesiach da'as, actually because the food is being cooked the whole time. In short, there is more the order that one is afraid of being mechateh.

Speaker 1:

There is still in the tanur enough heat from the sparks from whatever you blow up, that it helps. Yes, there is still what to be machmir about. One is machmir a chumra, there is still what to be machmir about.

Lecture on Hilchos Shabbos – Chapter 3: Shehiya on the Fire

Halacha 5-6: Tanur – Why Garuf Ukatum Doesn't Help

One may not, even when it was garuf ukatum or the thing. Why? Because hoil vehavlo cham beyoter, because the tanur is a hot thing, eino mesiach da'as, one is not mesiach da'as. That means, because the food is being cooked the whole time.

In short, there is more the order that one should indeed be mechateh. There is still in the tanur enough heat from the sparks, from whatever, it remains, and it helps. Yes, there is still what to be mechateh about. Therefore, we are still concerned, choshesin shema yechateh bagachalim, even if he was goref, he removed the coals, but some coals always remain. We also see later that even when one digs... It makes sense, because it doesn't look like it does to us. Presumably one doesn't see the floor at all in such a place. It's an ashy place where one keeps putting coals, so some coals always remain, even when one scrapes out and puts new coals, some coals still remain. Therefore, there is indeed a concern there.

What? The Rambam gives three lines for the question that you want to know what remains here. **"We are concerned lest he stoke the coals, even though the fire is minimal, or it is a fire of straw and stubble (choshesin shema yechateh bagachalim, ve'af al pi sheha'eish me'uta, o shehi eish kash ugevava)"**. Even if one has made it so that it's a... this is a fire... no, first he speaks about the second two divisions, when one covers it with ash or when one makes it with kash ugevava. So even there there is a weaker fire, which regarding a kira would have been enough, but it's still not... or

even if it's covered, there is still a fire there, we are afraid he will be mechateh.

Oy, what does the Rambam understand by garuf? Garuf means that one removed the coals. Why does one still have fear shema yechateh even by garuf? **"Therefore they forbade leaving in a tanur even though it is garuf (lefikach asru lehashhos betanur af al pi shegaruf)".** So the Rambam, **"for one who scrapes only scrapes most of the fire, and it is impossible to scrape all the fire so that no sparks of fire remain, and because its heat is hot, it is possible that he will stoke the coals (shegoref einu goref ela rov ha'eish bilvad, ve'i efshar ligrof kol ha'eish ad shelo tisha'er nitzzos eish, umipnei shehavlo cham, efshar sheyechateh bagachalim)".** One cannot scrape out all fire so that there shouldn't remain a bit of coals, a spark. And mipnei shehavlo cham, because it's so hot, there in such heat it makes sense that even the bit of coals and scraping will help. We see that it is in a kira, once it's weak coals, or it's only remained a drop, your scraping will accomplish nothing, therefore that is permitted. But a strong tanur, even the bit of being mechateh and the bit that is still left or in the covered coals will help, therefore he will indeed have a reason to want to be mechateh, therefore one may not in a tanur with these methods.

How may one indeed in a tanur? He hasn't said it yet meanwhile, we will see later, perhaps the Rambam will still say. And now he says, now he goes to speak, that the heterim don't help. The three heterim that exist on kira don't help on tanur.

Question: If One Can Indeed Scrape Out All the Fire?

It could actually be if someone does indeed have a way to scrape out all the fire, let's say he has a more fancy tanur where one can remove the whole bottom plate, I don't know, I have no idea what kind of old tanurs there were, but apparently this is true, tanur is such a type of manner that one cannot, that there always remains something, and therefore this has a concern of gerifa, that I'm still doing something that I need to be mechateh, and there is no way at all to be mechateh, then this is permitted even a tanur. I don't know, it's not a great question.

Or the rabbinic decree, apparently. Apparently this is not from the types of things that the Chachamim would have decreed in any case. I'm just asking, perhaps about this the Rambam says in tanur, the tanur has become a davar acher (different thing). I'm just asking, about this the Rambam gives the whole lengthy explanation, why does he give me a reason? It's the language of the Rambam, a question on the holy Chachamim who forbade. He means this to explain, because usually when one is goref one doesn't scrape the whole thing, therefore he means this to say perhaps the halacha, that if one will find a way to indeed scrape every last bit of spark it will indeed be. Perhaps the Rambam means this to say lehalacha, because the problem here is that I don't believe that in the Rambam's times one used the same words tanur, kira, kupach, first of all everyone needs to compare their oven and place it in the categories. It could be that the Rambam was bothered by the same thing that bothers everyone who learns this sugya, what am I afraid of shema yechateh, he was goref.

And he says your question to such a kind of tanur this is permitted, it could be that for us we will say at all that this doesn't have a name tanur, this has a name kira. If this is its

reality of fire there below there isn't much remaining old coals. One must speak about today's ovens and the like. But it's not really a practical halacha question, but I want to say a general comment about this. We need to discuss a bit, I can already begin.

Digression: The Rambam's Method in Psak – Not Applying to New Realities

Speaker 1:

So, you're saying a very interesting thing. The Rambam, for example, I don't know what it was in the time of the Rambam, it could be that in the time of the Rambam this indeed was, but it's certain that the Rambam would not have cared, because the Rambam almost never says, "In this time when we don't use such-and-such vessel of the Gemara, but rather some new vessel, the halacha is different." Because the Rambam views himself as merely a summary of Torah She'be'al Peh. He must say even the examples. Oy, the examples are perhaps only what was exactly then, but that's how Torah She'be'al Peh became, according to the examples that were in the time of the Mishna. The Rambam always brings the time of the Mishna.

This reminded me of the Mishna Berura. The Chofetz Chaim wrote a sefer Mishna Berura on the laws of Orach Chaim, laws that are relevant to practice, and he didn't write even once, not on Shabbos, not anywhere, the laws of new technology that only exists today. And why? People say because he was afraid to get involved, it was still new, he didn't want to be decisive in a dispute between the rabbis. But it could also be a deeper reason, like the Rambam. He only wants to bring, the Mishna Berura's job was to bring not only the Mishna, also the Acharonim. He wants to say what the halacha is. To apply to a case, that's the job of a rav, that's not the job of a halacha sefer.

I will perhaps add, the Rambam has a sefer "Machaneh Yisrael", I think that's what it's called, laws that can be relevant for a Jew who goes into the military. And in such a place he must put in all kinds of practical things, such a kind of knife one may indeed use, and such a kind of knife not, because that's a practical sefer. But Mishna Berura he didn't want to publish.

As I said yesterday that Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach said that electricity is thus, okay, he said, but one cannot make from this a rule, because he doesn't have the power, he's not a chacham, one doesn't have the power to make a new rule in halacha.

Discussion: Today's Ovens and the Matter of Blech

Speaker 2:

I mean, all these things are very difficult, because for example, if someone will want to compare today's ovens to the ovens of then, it won't be enough that he will calculate the amount of heat, but also the "shema yechateh", if it becomes very easy, because one can with a small knob, perhaps the "shema yechateh" becomes much more likely.

Speaker 1:

I want to say here, I want to say that a piece of silver foil helps, which lies there, it doesn't become so...

Speaker 2:

If it's so easy to be mechateh, one must ask rabbis. But in any case, what it says, if we have a new gezeira, is another thing. But according to what it says in the Torah, in the Chachamim, in the Shulchan Aruch, and in the poskim, I mean to say in the

earlier poskim, is that there is a concern "shema yechateh", which was said about the manner of coals. It doesn't say anywhere "shema yosif", "shema lamadura", "shema" to make the fire bigger. So, simply, there are similar things, but there isn't the first shiur.

The Brisker Rav's Approach

Simply, and I heard that the Brisker Rav held this way, he couldn't understand why people make a blech on today's ovens, because there is no kula at all, there is nothing to be mechateh. We conduct ourselves, everyone, I mean all Jews that I know conduct themselves to place a Shabbos blech on the oven, I have no evil eye on this. I don't grasp the thought.

The Foundation of "Shema Yechateh"

But again, Chazal told us thus, especially with the Rambam's framing, one may do melachos erev Shabbos, except for types of melachos where there is a concern that on Shabbos you will still be engaged in it. And when you place a pot on the fire, there is the matter of "mitztamek veyafeh lo", about which Chazal said that when you want your tavshil to be better, I'm afraid that you will stir the fire. Stir not, it's not the fear that you will make the flames a bit higher. Stir, one doesn't usually do it. You should understand, chatiya is like whoever makes a barbecue knows, chatiya is something that one does regularly. He says Shabbos, I'm not talking about cooking, but the normal manner of cooking is that every twenty minutes one takes a look and one stirs. It's not the normal manner of cooking that every twenty minutes one turns up the fire. That's not how one usually cooks.

And one is not only talking about a barbecue that takes two minutes to cook. One is talking about here, it's a longer barbecue. Right, it's a longer barbecue. Coals, when one cooks with coals, coals is something that one is babysitting, one must babysit it regularly. Today's ovens is not something that one must babysit regularly. One must babysit it, it shouldn't, I don't know, it shouldn't get burned, a thing a thing, but not one must the whole time fix the fire. So the gezeira of coals is not here on today's ovens, as far as I can understand.

The Blech is a Zecher

There is a New Decree from the Custom of Israel Regarding the Blech

There is a new decree from the custom of Israel that one places a blech, that blech is more like a remembrance, it's more like a sign, to remember that there is already something that one doesn't touch. I'm not entirely in agreement, because it seems to me that once the Sages said that when there is a concern that a person will have an interest to stoke or cook so that his food will become better or faster or better or more concentrated and the like, one must be concerned, and the case in the Gemara is coals. But still, just as a person will want his dish to become a bit hotter, he will do it. All the other things that the Rambam enumerated, I don't know, he doesn't place there the majority of foods, we're not afraid of them. But when it deals with his dish that will become better, I'm afraid. In the Gemara it's called "lest he stoke the coals (shema yachteh bagechalim)." I'll call it, he'll make the flame a bit higher.

Counter-Argument: But One Can Turn Up the Flame

Speaker 2:

If one can't change the flame, perhaps you're right. If you say that the person puts it every week on the exact same flame,

okay, you should know that this is like "why does he stoke the coals."

Speaker 1:

But a normal thing, a person makes supper, and one makes cholent in the middle of the night, suddenly he comes into the kitchen, "Oh, I can stand for the cholent to be even more cooked." The holy Sages said exactly the opposite, about you they would have said that even when there is indeed something still to do with the pot, it's permitted as long as there's no concern of shema yachteh. In their times one could also bring and add new coals from outside. Just like one can today... what's the difference? It's the same thing! It's not the normal order! I told you, it's not the normal order of cooking to stand and turn up the knob. It's not the normal order. The normal order is that one lights the flame.

Speaker 2:

You've established a law that the concern of shema yachteh is a matter, like with a grill that you know from I don't know what, I know there's a thing like a pot, and there's a thing that the pot should become hotter so the food should become more cooked. And so there is today that a person wants the pot to become hotter so it should become more cooked, therefore there is a concern of shema yachteh. And there is no concern of shema yachteh, and in halacha it states clearly that as long as there's no concern of shema yachteh, one is not afraid of something else. A non-Jew has no interest that we should be given such a thing in halacha. That means, you learned what is grufah uketumah, and all the ways that we learn, is exactly when the dish is indeed a dish that he still cares about, and despite all this, because it's not, even if one technically can, but it's not customary, by stirring it's not customary that one stirs, flames? Yes, customary indeed. People turn up and down according to the leniency. But here it's a new prohibition! I told you: if you haven't changed from coals to another type of fire, it's the same fire and the same pot.

Speaker 1:

Again, the distinction between coals and another type of fire stands in the Mishnah. If it's another type of fire, it's permitted. If it's covered, grufah and the like, the other conditions, certainly, that's what it says. There's only a rabbinic prohibition (issur shevut), there's no...

Chapter 3: Leaving Food on the Fire on Shabbat — Kupach, Raw Food, and the Advice of a Raw Limb

Law 7: Kupach — The Medium Between Kirah and Tanur

Speaker 1:

And with flames it is indeed customary, there are many people who turn up and down, let the heat go up.

But this is a point, you say a new prohibition, I told you, he said...

Speaker 2:

But you've changed from coals to another type of fire, it's the same fire and the same pot.

Speaker 1:

Again, the distinction between coals and another type of fire stands in the Mishnah, if it's another type of fire it's permitted, if it's covered, grufah and the like it's permitted. Certainly, that's what it says. There's only a prohibition, and I told you that there are no new prohibitions. I brought you a clear

example that stoking is something that's done regularly, what you say that they made a new decree is not something that's done regularly, that's the thing they're stringent about, but that they're stringent is because a person has an interest. This is simply a concern of Shabbat desecration, if a person sees that he's not careful he should make a fence, but there's no decree from the Rabbis.

Seemingly, I'm saying my position, perhaps you can have a distinction, but it seems to me the clarification of the law is that there's no such decree that everything that will become better one must be concerned about. There's only a decree with coals which is customary, and the normal order is that one holds that one must be careful not to stoke, and one must have special vigilance not to stoke.

Speaker 2:

I don't agree. Continue.

Speaker 1:

You don't have to agree, I hold I'm right.

Speaker 2:

It seems to me exactly the same, exactly. All the distinctions I can hear, but it seems to me that today's vigilance against stoking is that you'll turn up the flame a bit. And it seems to me like something that's a common thing (davar haragil). When a person would have put a pot in the middle of the week, he would have checked in the middle how much water is still in the cholent, and he would have turned up and down. On Shabbat it can also very easily happen. One must see to it that one should do it with an advice, something that a person should place there a piece of silver foil, it should be like removing one's mind (mesiach da'ato), it should be like grufah uketumah.

Speaker 1:

That's not, because what you say mesiach da'ato is a practical thing. If the silver foil... let's be clear, if your position is correct, then the silver foil doesn't help at all.

Speaker 2:

Why shouldn't there be some advice of grufah uketumah? One won't now tell everyone to break their oven.

Speaker 1:

Very good, it's not an oven because it doesn't help. Grufah uketumah means now one can almost no longer stoke, or this is no longer the type of fire that one can stoke. That makes a weaker manner, puts in a softer powder. But you're making a new prohibition, you're making a new prohibition, you're making a new prohibition with a new leniency.

I have no complaints, every Jew is obligated if he sees that it's not, he should certainly make fences and safeguards, it should be a nice thing, but it's not the law, it's a new thing.

Speaker 2:

Okay, let's go further.

Reading and Explanation: Kupach — The Medium Heat

Speaker 2:

Say the law further. A kupach is the first that I've seen the dispute properly, which won't convince me the light. Okay, after that, one minute, have you finished about kirah, after that there's a tanur which is one thing, and here is something in between. Kupach is the law is the medium between, the middle way between tanur and kirah.

The heat of the kupach is greater than the heat of the kirah and less than the heat of the tanur.

Kupach is the heat, it holds heat more than a kirah, but it holds heat less than a tanur. Therefore, what is the law? The law is indeed half and half. In places where we're stringent there are places where we're lenient.

Therefore if one heated it with gefit and with wood — it's like a tanur, and one may not leave in it or on it or place near it a dish that hasn't cooked completely or that concentrates and is good for it, even though he swept or covered with ash.

But with wood, it will make proper coals that one usually makes from types, what does gefit mean? I don't know. Something waste from... waste from olives he says here. Ah, from olives. Ah, something that has oil in it, and in short becomes very strong, it cooks well. It's a type of fire essentially. Yes, and essentially it's a proper tanur, because then it's very hot, it's like a tanur. Therefore, in short, the law is like a tanur, so what? That one may not place on it or near it a dish that hasn't cooked completely, or that warms and is bad for it. A dish where there's a reason that one should think he'll stoke it. Even simply at all a closed meal, even speaking doesn't help, like with a tanur it doesn't help.

But if one heated it with straw or with stubble — it's like a kirah that was heated with straw and stubble, and one may leave on it.

But if one heated it with straw and stubble, with weaker coals, then the heat is weaker, one can judge it like a kirah that was heated with straw and stubble, and it's permitted for us, one may indeed place things on it before Shabbat.

Discussion: Placing Near a Kirah and Kupach

Speaker 2:

What happens with placing near a tanur? We learned that placing near the tanur is like placing in the tanur, because it's so hot that also placing near the tanur will give enough heat. What happens with placing near a kirah? It seems that the Rambam didn't enumerate it among the laws of kirah. Yes, he says it here. Okay.

And it's permitted to place near a kirah from the evening.

Placing near a kirah one may indeed at night, even if it's not one of all the concerns. "Evening" means before Shabbat. From the evening of Shabbat, from erev Shabbat. All the concerns of... ah, he's not yet speaking at all about placing on Shabbat. That's later laws.

Speaker 1:

A kirah, placing from outside being near, doesn't mean... it's not a question at all.

Speaker 2:

Another distinction between kirah and kupach. The first distinction is that on a kirah grufah uketumah etc. helps, all three conditions, and on a tanur it doesn't help. Another distinction is that on a tanur one may not place near, and on a kirah one may place near. What about a kupach, may one place near? He says that one may not. We just learned that one may not. It depends. If a kupach is with the size of a tanur, one may not place near. If it's with straw and stubble, one may place near, like a kirah. Seemingly the same law. As is kirah, so is kupach. We'll see what these two things are.

Definitions: Kirah, Kupach, Tanur

Speaker 2:

And what is a kirah and what is a kupach? A kirah is a place for two pots, and a kupach is a place for one pot.

A kirah has a place for two pots. Is a tanur where on top there's room for... what does the word shefitah mean? I don't know. Placing two pots. Placing a pot is called shefitah. It's reasonable, it's embedded in the word kedairot. No, shefitah means the action of placing a pot on the fire is called shefitah. They call it shefitah. The wage, you see? Wage of shefitah. The one who measures, not the one who measures. Means on every thing. There are verbs that only go on certain objects. Like botzer, for example.

Speaker 1:

Right, we spoke.

Speaker 2:

Prayer of shefitah means placing a pot on top, that's called shefitah. Kupach is a place where one can place one pot. Tanur is a passage that a person simply knew. Tanur is simple. Tanur is a completely closed one, these are more open things. That's the distinction. A complete tanur must have some air on top to put the things in. But kupach the distinction is only that it's smaller, it's more together with the heat. At least that's the point.

Law 8: Raw Food and Concentrates and Bad For It — No Concern of Shema Yachteh

Reading and Explanation: Raw Food Permitted to Leave

Speaker 2:

So until now we learned about a dish where one has something from it that it will become more cooked, concentrated. But now one will speak what is the law of the other type of dish. All the laws of shema yachteh are when a person has an interest to make it hotter. But a thing where a person has no interest, there's no concern of shema yachteh.

The Rambam says so, until now we learned from the side of the oven, now we speak from the side of the food.

A raw dish, raw food that hasn't yet been cooked at all, or something that was cooked and now if one will keep it it will harm, because it concentrates and is bad for it, if it becomes more cooked it won't be good, it will become too strongly burned, it's permitted to leave it on the fire. One may indeed place it on the fire, whether on a kirah or on a kupach, in any way that one may place it on the fire, there's no distinction in which coals, there's no concern of shema yachteh.

The Advice of a Raw Limb — Placing a Raw Piece Close to Twilight

Speaker 2:

But what does the Rambam say so, a dish that was cooked, also the things about which we were previously indeed concerned, a dish for example something that's not cooked completely, or something that's even indeed cooked but can still become more cooked and it will become better, about which we have the concern of shema yachteh, there's an advice for this.

If he threw into it a raw limb close to twilight, if he placed in a piece of meat, a piece of food, there is specifically a limb, limb usually means a piece from an animal, but what will he place? What is he cooking? A raw potato, I know what,

something that he places in close to twilight, it's not cooked. **From now all is like a raw dish**, we now look at the whole pot as if there are raw things there. It will anyway take ten hours, whatever it is, until it should be ready for the morning meal, he won't stoke because he's already removed his mind until the morning meal. Therefore even a raw dish, one may for example be a practical law, even on a tanur, even without being swept or covered, also not, he's already removed his mind, and one uses it for one who doesn't laugh at the stringency.

Speaker 1:

Very good.

Speaker 2:

Now the Rambam gives an advice, even those who hold like Rabbi Eliezer that it's very important to place a blech before Shabbat, one can place right before Shabbat if it's a fresh piece of meat, and then one certainly doesn't need any blech. He's already giving advice for those who accept my stringencies. Okay, I'm being held on a path.

Discussion: Why Not Place a Guard?

Speaker 2:

Only go to such types of people and one doesn't hold a blech, one that... okay. No, because if there's such a type of situation, and indeed the Rambam doesn't tell us what happens if one places a guard. It's a good question for example, what is with leaving you say a guard and here you say another type of way?

Speaker 1:

With this one must look if there it says yes, one must look if there it says yes, but this is already a later innovation. I just want to say, but it's very possible that the Rambam says here from the Gemara. The Amoraim had the thought, if one would have had a thought that one should place someone in the kitchen all Shabbat. And if one can make with leaving something a lock on the... one must think, one must delve there before it's not... okay, one must, because I already know leaving does help a guard.

What I mean to say is, when Sages give you an advice against a decree, must one accept the specific advice, or do they tell you "I need to have an advice." I would be inclined that a guard is not the word, because the excessive leaving here is not because he'll forget that it's Shabbat. It's simply so the order is. There's no interest to go, or it's not down. We need to take an action. All these things we learned and one will learn later. Yes, you have different types of rabbinic prohibitions, so the reality is about this, right? Here you have the rabbinic prohibition, because the action slides into the prohibition, right? Cooking a thing is a thing that happens, it happens many times from the cooking. Placing a guard, I don't know. I'm not saying, if someone will find some terrible AI that will do, it will turn over the thing, I don't know. But normally, they gave more normal advice than this. In short, one is not an advice.

Speaker 2:

Okay.

Law 9: If One Transgressed and Left — The Law After the Fact

Speaker 2:

Now we'll learn what... what is after the fact if one... have we finished here, right? What is after the fact if one transgressed the rabbinic prohibition? So, **every dish that began to**

cook, which one may not place on the fire, there's a law in the laws of Shabbat, he'll say here, the Rambam will say here a bit of a penalty, that one may not benefit from a forbidden act, from something that one did on Shabbat.

But here we need to say... one minute, I forgot. Here we need to say... one minute, I forgot.

Laws of Leaving and Returning — After the Fact, Returning, and Stirring

After the Fact: If One Transgressed and Left — The Law of Shabbat Action

Speaker 1: In short, one is not an advice.

Okay, now we'll learn what... what is after the fact if one... have we finished here, right? What is after the fact if one transgressed the opinions of the Rabbis?

Laws of Shehiyah and Chazarah – Continuation: Hagasah, Returning from One Stove to Another, and Leaving the Category of Raw Food

Ah, so it is, "**kol tavshil she'hutar lehashoto**", that which one may not place on the fire... there is a halacha in the laws of Shabbos... he goes here to say... the Rambam is going to tell me a bit of a penalty, a law in the laws of Shabbos that one may not derive benefit from a forbidden act from something that was done on Shabbos.

Digression: The Opinion of Rashi — Ma'achal Ben Drusai

But here one must indeed say... one minute, I forgot... here you must mention what you began to say earlier... regarding what the Rambam says that the only heter is if one places in a raw tavshil, or it is completely cooked even if mitzamek v'ra lo, here there is the opinion of Rashi, which is built on an approach in the Gemara of Chananya, which says that if it is cooked at least a third ma'achal ben drusai, then one may, even if it is not grufa u'ketuma, and so is the custom, it says in Shulchan Aruch, one conducts oneself like Rashi to be lenient, that if it is cooked a third, or a third, yes? Then it is already called... except if it is mitzamek v'yafeh lo, right?

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: Okay, good. That means, even if it is not mitzamek v'ra lo, I don't know clearly. Anyway, and one must know, I don't know if it's practical, even it's not so desperate anymore, because usually most people already make it completely finished. But the Rambam, when he says the word "klal", "she'lo bushal klal" or "bushal kol tzorko", he sees that he really doesn't accept this innovation. No, it's certain that the Rambam doesn't accept it. I mean, that's how everyone understands it. There are books that you can understand the Rambam. Because what does it help me? It was once something of an eruv that he already ate. So, I'm less desperate. Because there is a way how to eat, and it's a somewhat difficult halacha. Then it comes, I don't know then.

Return to the Law of One Who Transgressed and Left It

Good, the Rambam tells us further, that based on the halacha that ma'aseh Shabbos is forbidden, the Rambam says, what happens if someone didn't follow the halacha?

Question: What is the Ma'aseh Shabbos Here?

It's a bit interesting, because usually ma'aseh Shabbos means simply that he did something forbidden on Shabbos. Here, in general it's interesting, because we're talking to the Jew on erev Shabbos. I don't know, the only... because the mitzvah

that is already there erev Shabbos regarding Shabbos coming, he may not do... when he does it, he does it Friday.

Speaker 2: Okay, it's a rabbinic prohibition, it's a rabbinic prohibition.

Speaker 1: Is there a rabbinic prohibition where there is no action involved? Or to say the rabbinic prohibition is when he placed it erev Shabbos, or the leaving it there Shabbos?

Speaker 2: Yes, a shehiyah.

Speaker 1: It could be that there is a mitzvah that if someone didn't forget the halacha he should remove it on Shabbos, because the whole time he has a concern lest he stoke. So when he did the prohibition done on Shabbos by leaving it there...

Speaker 2: Okay, could be.

Speaker 1: Yes, but however it may be, he didn't remove it before Shabbos.

The Rambam's Ruling: Deliberately

"**Kol tavshil she'asur lehashoto**", that which one may not leave on the stove in all those ways that were enumerated, "**im avar v'shihah oto**", he did indeed leave it on the fire on Shabbos, "**asur le'echlo**", motzaei Shabbos one may not eat it until motzaei Shabbos, "**v'yamtin k'dei she'yei'asu**", and one must wait until motzaei Shabbos and as long as it takes to cook the food again.

Understand, the food doesn't become... one doesn't have to throw out the food, one only has to wait, so that he shouldn't benefit from the work that he did on Shabbos, from the shehiyah that was on Shabbos.

And this is only a rabbinic prohibition. It's a rabbinic prohibition, and more than a rabbinic prohibition, it's a rabbinic prohibition where he didn't stumble. Unlike when a person does a rabbinic prohibition he stumbles, but here the person didn't stumble, he wasn't sinning, and what he did he did on Friday. He didn't do anything on Shabbos, he didn't do any ma'aseh Shabbos. It's not a ma'aseh Shabbos, but a prohibition occurred here, and with the food a prohibition occurred from which he has benefit, and one may not benefit from the prohibition. It's like a penalty basically, right?

Distinction When Done Inadvertently

This is if it was done deliberately. But if it was done inadvertently, he forgot, he intended to remove it erev Shabbos and he forgot to remove it, then if it is a tavshil she'lo bishal kol tzorko that cooked on Shabbos, it is forbidden motzaei Shabbos. But if it is indeed a tavshil she'bishal kol tzorko, and the problem is only that it is mitzamek v'yafeh lo which was not permitted, he doesn't have such strong benefit from ma'aseh Shabbos apparently, because it was already cooked, it is permitted to eat it on Shabbos immediately, one may indeed eat it on Shabbos.

Dispute of the Ra'avad

And here the Ra'avad strongly disagrees.

Speaker 2: Yes, why does the Ra'avad make a distinction?

Speaker 1: Because the Ra'avad doesn't see the distinction between inadvertent and deliberate. He says that forgetfulness, he doesn't see that there should be a distinction between forgetfulness or deliberate. So according to the Ra'avad even inadvertently it should be forbidden. It seems so, I think. On mislak yado he relies, yes he agrees?

Speaker 2: I don't know. I'm not clear.

Speaker 1: Okay. It seems that the Ra'avad says even inadvertently.

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: Even inadvertently is also forbidden, I think that should be the halacha according to the Ra'avad.

Speaker 2: Okay.

Laws of Chazarah — Returning a Pot to the Fire on Shabbos

Difference Between Shehiyah and Chazarah

Speaker 1: Until now we have learned about placing erev Shabbos, and that is called shehiyah. Shehiyah means that he doesn't do any ma'aseh Shabbos. What happens indeed on Shabbos? On Shabbos only the shehiyah happens, that it lies there in the pot. Chazarah means returning the pot on Shabbos. Let's now learn what happens regarding returning the pot to the fire on Shabbos. That is, something that is not yet cooked one certainly may not. The question is when a person holds in his hand a pot that is already cooked, whether he may place it on the fire. Apparently it is no longer cooking. We will see what yes and what not.

The General Rule: Forbidden to Return

The Gemara says, "**kol she'mutar lehashoto al gabei ha'eish**" — all those things that we discussed that one may leave on the fire, whether because it's not a hot stove, or because the food is raw, and the like — "**im nitlo mei'al gabei ha'eish, asur lehachziro limkomo**". One may not return it to the stove. That is, it's like a branch of shehiyah. Just as one may not leave... no, sorry, even things that one may indeed leave. Leaving one may indeed do, but returning one may not.

Speaker 2: Okay. And when may one indeed return?

Reason for the Prohibition: Appears Like Cooking

Speaker 1: Why? The prohibition of returning doesn't have to do with "lest he stoke". It's something else.

Speaker 2: Yes, it looks like one is cooking on Shabbos or something like that. But we're talking here in a manner where there is no "lest he stoke", yes? It's gruf u'katum or it's...

Speaker 1: Right, so it sounds. It's a new prohibition. Another decree. What is the decree? That it looks like someone is cooking?

Speaker 2: No, first of all, it depends which. Let me look at what he says.

Speaker 1: Okay, yes. So, "v'ein machzirin", yes?

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: When one returns it, if one removes the pot on Shabbos, when one returns it it looks like one is cooking. Or if it was raw, there are two things, if it's not cooked, or if it's not yet cooked, one is actually cooking, because when one returns it, even if it's only mitzamek v'yafeh lo, the cooking already begins, but in practice it's called cooked, one may not cook, that is... one may not then be cooking, or it looks like cooking, or appears like cooking. And then, yes, one may not return it to its place.

The Single Heter: A Stove That is Gruf or Covered

The Rambam says, there is one way how one may indeed return on Shabbos, "**v'ein machzirin le'olam**", most ways one may not. Of all the heterim that we learned when one may indeed, only one of them may one. The solution of "**ela im**

ken hayta kira grufa o mechusa", a stove that was made gruf, the fire was removed or covered, "**o kira v'chufach she'huseku b'kash u'v'gvava**", or a stove or chufach that was heated with straw and stubble, then a chufach is also like a stove, that one may. That is, the other solution of placing a raw piece of meat one couldn't, because that is indeed the worst in this case, because that is actually cooking on Shabbos. And all the other heterim that were here didn't hold, the only way how one may return on Shabbos was...

Speaker 2: There is a fire, but you're saying that the fire is because of appearance.

Speaker 1: Okay, a Jew will place a pot on the fire on Shabbos, that is already something that is not allowed, the Sages don't allow.

Speaker 2: Correct. But except if it's completely gruf or covered, there is no fire here, then one may.

Speaker 1: No, chufach she'husak b'kash u'gvava one may also.

Speaker 2: Also because it's little, barely there is fire. Yes, what is the heter? Because you're saying that there isn't really any fire here.

Speaker 1: There's a bit of fire, but it's weak.

Speaker 2: Yes.

Condition: That He Didn't Place It on the Ground

Speaker 1: "**V'hu she'lo hinicha al gabei karka**", he didn't put down the pot. "**Aval im hinicha**", once he put it down... on the ground, yes? On the ground. I mean, karka, on the table won't change the halacha. I mean, in the Gemara it seems that all these things were by the ground, it was very low. So it says, it's something a building that they make on the ground, so I saw in Perush HaMishnayos of the Rambam. So I mean the al hakarka is the... as the matter stands.

Putting down. It makes sense, because when the pot is on in any place, when you put it down, it looks like you're placing it as a new thing. Unlike when a person walks into a room, he sees someone holding a pot in his hand and he puts it down, he will think that it was already there.

But "**misha'ah she'hinicho**", once he put it down, "**eino chozer v'notno**", one may not return it, "**afilu b'ofen she'haya mutar**", even on a stove that is gruf and covered. Because then it really looks like he's placing a new pot on Shabbos, and that one may not do.

Tanur and Chufach Like Coals — Forbidden Even to Return

"**V'ein machzirin b'tanur**", and one may not return in a tanur, "**v'lo l'chufach she'hu k'gachalim**", and not on a chufach that is like coals, "**ela al gabei kira**", only on a stove, "**af al pi she'grufa u'mechusa**", even though it's gruf and covered, "**mipnei she'havla cham b'yoter**", because the heat is very hot, therefore it looks like one is cooking on Shabbos.

Semicha = Chazarah

"**Kol she'ein machzirin alav**", all those things where the halacha is that one may not return, "**ein somchin lo**", one also may not lean on it. That is, one may also only lean on Shabbos only on a stove that is gruf and covered or when its coals are kosher, but the others one may not lean on on Shabbos.

Okay, I mean this is the law of appearing like cooking on Shabbos. I mean it comes from this certain, for example, I

know there is a question, there are certain foods that one may warm on Shabbos, like in bishul achar bishul, but it shouldn't look like one put it in an oven. There are such halachos where we talk about this, it shouldn't look like cooking on Shabbos.

Halacha Regarding Hagasah – Stirring in a Pot on the Fire

The next halacha the Rambam is going to learn, the halacha that we can call stirring, that one may not stir in the pot that is on the fire.

The Rambam says, "**asur lehachnis magrefa**", one may not insert a ladle, I don't know what magrefa means, something one of those things, "**l'toch hakedeira b'Shabbos k'she'hi al ha'eish**", into a pot on Shabbos when it is on the fire, "**afilu b'ofanim she'hutrah lihyot al ha'eish**", even in the ways that we spoke that it may be on the fire, "**va'afilu lehotzi mimenah b'Shabbos**", even to remove a bit of the food on Shabbos. Why? "**Mipnei she'hu k'magis**", because when he inserts the spoon he is stirring, he stirs it around, "**v'zeh mitzorchei habisul hu**", and this is good for the food that one stirs it around, "**v'nimtza k'mevashel b'Shabbos**", it comes to cooking, it looks like a person who is cooking, in the middle of cooking he is busy with the... he is stirring well. There could come cooking on Shabbos. There could come, even a bit of need. It's not only appearance, it's actually cooking, but it's like a fixing.

Laws of Shehiyah and Chazarah – Continuation: Hagasah, Returning from One Stove to Another, and Leaving the Category of Raw Food

Prohibition of Hagasah – Stirring a Pot on the Fire

Speaker 1: Because when he inserts the spoon he is stirring, he stirs it around. It's seen as necessary for cooking, it's good for the food that one stirs it around, it's used like cooking on Shabbos. It's like cooking, it looks like a person who is cooking, and in the middle of cooking he is busy with stirring it well. It's also a bit of need, it's not only appearance, it's not actually cooking, but it's like a fixing for the cooking, it's also not just simple cooking.

And the Rambam sees this as like cooking, like the matter regarding chazarah. There are such other opinions that it's only like the... the Rambam didn't say by chazarah why one may not, right? He only said that one may not. He didn't say the word like cooking.

The Stringency of the Rambam – Even Removing from a Pot
The Rambam forbids even simply removing things from a pot on Shabbos basically, because even though he doesn't stir then, but he's going to cook, or while he removes it gets stirred, therefore it is forbidden. The Ra'avad doesn't agree with this stringency. The Ra'avad says, yes? Where is the Ra'avad? The holy Ra'avad says, "**hifriz al midotav**". Yes? "**She'asar afilu lehotzi b'magrifa**". The Ra'avad agrees one may not stir, but the Ra'avad says that removing from a pot is already too much. This the holy Ra'avad says, this is the opinion of the Ra'avad. Yes.

Discussion: What is the Main Problem – Inserting the Magrifa

Speaker 2: Okay. It seems that the main problem is the inserting of the magrifa, he begins with that, the inserting into the pot. Because a pot that lies with a ladle looks like it's in the middle of cooking. So removing in another way one would apparently be able to. I know, pouring from the pot one would

apparently be able to. Then it also stirs, yes? When a person will for example not want to insert a magrifa, but he will tilt the pot, pour from the pot.

Speaker 1: Yes, but it's not on the fire anymore.

Speaker 2: But it stirs around, it's also...

Speaker 1: It's not on the fire.

Speaker 2: Cooking is only what is on the fire. Aha, okay.

Discussion: Transferring from One Pot to Another

What happens regarding transferring from one pot to another? The Rama says, "**mutar lehachzir mi'kira l'chira**". On Shabbos one may remove the pot from one stove and place it on another stove, "**kol zman she'lo hinicho al hakarka beinayim**", as we learned the halachos earlier. It's not only returning to the place from where one took it, but returning means placing on a hot oven, even on another stove.

Speaker 1: Very good. "**Afilu mi'kira she'hudara mibe'od yom l'chira she'hudara mibe'od yom one may also**". If both are the same category that one may, a stove that one may because it is gruf u'ketuma or ketuma. "**Aval lo mi'kira l'temina v'lo mi'temina l'chira**". But one may not take from a stove to temina. Temina means covering it and...

Speaker 2: Just hatmana, which is not any fire.

Speaker 1: Yes, that means that you cover it with things that keep it warm. "**V'lo mi'temina l'chira**", that one may not do.

Speaker 2: Yes. Very good.

Speaker 1: Why? "**Mi'kira l'temina**", temina is apparently less hot. One may not make the temina on Shabbos, meaning. One may not make the...

Speaker 2: Could be because of that. Yes.

Discussion: Dispute of Shulchan Aruch and Rama Regarding Hagasah

Speaker 1: I want to see what he says about the hagasah. Yes, the Shulchan Aruch says, how does it go? Yes, the Shulchan Aruch explains that the Rama also didn't mean differently, that the prohibition of hagasah is only when it's not cooked completely, that one does something to it. "**Aval davar she'hu mevushal kol tzorko, d'haynu mitzamek v'ra lo, ein bo mishum hagasah**", because hagasah is only when one... when one...

Speaker 2: Mitzamek v'yafeh lo is however also...

Speaker 1: But the Rama doesn't explain. The Rama says that even cooked completely is also hagasah.

Speaker 2: That might be. But even other times, mitzamek v'yafeh lo is also, for example the soup one perhaps could, the cholent not. One must consider which type... because for example cholent there is a reason to stir that it shouldn't get burned from below. There is a reason for that.

Speaker 1: Might be. On chicken soup I don't see that there's a real...

Speaker 2: That it shouldn't get burned, and not... I don't know what's below.

Laws of Shabbat Chapter 3 – Additional Laws of Shehiyah: An Oven Where Wind Damages It, Roasted Meat, and Mugmar

Laws 13-14: An Oven Where Wind Damages It – Anything That Wind Damages

The Simple Meaning of the Law: A Special Oven for Soft Meat

We see that this oven produces very soft meat. So if he were to open it, it would damage the meat. The cold wind while it's cooking - the meat will become hardened and cold, and the oven will cool down. Therefore, one never opens it until one takes it out.

That's the second thing. Yes, he goes somewhere on Shabbat and opens the oven and takes it out, but one only takes it out when one knows it's already ready, or when one is already at the meal. There's never a situation where one would want to stoke the coals.

Says the Rambam, **"and similarly anything that wind damages it"**, anything where wind is not good for that oven, **"we don't decree upon it lest he uncover and stoke"**, we're not afraid that he'll open the oven and stoke. Why? For the same reason.

Question: Why Is an Oven of Flax Permitted?

He asks, "So? For this reason?" The Rambam said earlier, at the beginning of the chapter, **"it's permitted to place an oven of flax into the oven at nightfall"**, one may place merchandise of flax in the oven so it should be processed, one may place it. Eh, says the Rambam, shouldn't we be afraid of "lest he stoke"? Yes, the same "lest he stoke", it's a fire. But "lest he stoke" is something that has to do with food, we calculated that the foundation of the matter is that one shouldn't... there we spoke about "lest he stoke".

Innovation: The True Reason for "Lest He Stoke"

"Now a novelty has been revealed to us." On the contrary, the whole thing, the Rambam began that all these things may be placed in a pot, except food where there's a concern of "lest he stoke". You began that way, you said that earlier. Now it's been revealed to me that they didn't say it entirely correctly. So we see from here. By stones they said one may place a pot or a kettle, they didn't speak of all the other cases. And that one may generally place food even, as long as it's not like that.

So, if seemingly the oven of flax, there's also a concern of "lest he stoke", it also has an advantage, seemingly the answer should be because it's not... it's not... basically, one doesn't throw it out. One doesn't throw it out. It's only a concern that one must say. Seemingly simple, it's not the custom to stoke by the... a simple, a simple reason, because on Shabbat he won't do anything with the oven of flax. The food he's stringent about, because he'll eat it on Shabbat, he wants... again, they're stringent in things that are for the long term, like the beginning. But it seems not so. It seems that the Rambam is explaining the law from the bottom opening. The reason why they learned then in the Beit HaMikdash, because there's no concern of lest he stoke on this. And he says that the reason why there's no concern of lest he stoke is the same as sealing the mouth of the oven, it's the same reason, because when air comes in it damages.

Law 15: A Whole Kid – An Exception

Simple Meaning of the Law: A Whole Kid in an Oven

Now one can learn an exception from the law of the kid. We learned that kid meat has excessive heat, therefore one doesn't do it. But a whole kid, if one places a whole kid into the oven, like on erev Pesach one places in a whole animal. We'll learn about Pesach. He places in such thick meat and other meat, which is forbidden to burn. Why would you make a concern of

lest he stoke? Unless it's sealed in the oven. Seemingly then it's less delicate. A small piece of kid, have you ever eaten kid? It's very soft. It's... what does it mean? It's wild, yes? Kid compared to lamb is softer than meat from a cow. It fears the fire more. A whole kid, presumably there are bones and things there, it doesn't seem so. If he would seal the oven, yes. The simple meaning is that it's the type of oven that gets cooled. The same thing.

Law Regarding Erev Pesach That Falls on Shabbat – Members of a Chaburah Are Careful

Says the Rambam, what happens if erev Pesach falls on Shabbat? It's permitted to lower or on Shabbat... one may indeed lower, that is, one lowers the lamb into the oven, the Pesach lamb into the oven at nightfall, when it becomes night, even though it's not sealed in the oven, even if one doesn't seal the oven. Seemingly one should also be concerned lest he stoke. Says the Rambam, the reason why on Pesach one may, Pesach that falls on Shabbat, for a specific reason, because **members of a chaburah are careful**. When people make together, they appoint themselves to a chaburah for the Pesach offering, it's more of a... because it's an important matter, or I don't know exactly for what reason, more than just people who eat together a Shabbat meal. Members of a chaburah are careful, they take the matter seriously. Fear that we won't have the concern of stoking.

Innovation: Source for the Leniency of a Guardian

This is seemingly indeed a source for our leniency that we sought from a guardian. This is a similar thing. This type of people, you can say differently, Pesach one is careful, I already know what chaburot need to be careful. When a chaburah is careful, you can think simply, but when a chaburah cooks together it's more something that's planned. One makes someone be appointed over the oven. Yes, you have a chaburah, one plans it in advance. In a house, everyone goes through the pot, he goes to make one, but you know what, let's make it a bit better crispy. That's a concern of stoking.

But one plans it out in advance, and one knows it's Shabbat, and one knows one may only do what one may do. Like Kohanim are careful, which I mean he'll also say later. It has a personal connection, but one must know exactly. But it doesn't say that you take a chaburah to make a table for one rebbe, there isn't that you only eat Pesach. Yes, it's one takes seriously the... okay. Done.

Law 16: Roasted Meat – It Shrinks and Is Bad for It

Simple Meaning of the Law: Meat, Onion and Egg on the Fire

Another thing, another thing that's forbidden. Yes. What's the novelty of the next thing? Let's try to understand.

I don't see any new law. It seems to me only a new case. Okay, but it's a Mishnah. There's a problem. Let's see. In roasting, one may not roast, but broiling. Sorry. Meat, meat, onion or egg. I mean he lists what each of us eats Shabbat morning. That's the source. Onion, eggs, one must eat with liver. The meat is the liver. No, the meat is the cholent. What you add to liver, you add liver, gall, whatever you want. It goes in one plate. Meat, onion and egg. Yes. On the fire. Only if it became roasted while it's still day, like fit for eating while it's still day, then one may leave it. But if not, it's a dish that didn't cook completely, one may not.

What happens if it remained on the fire on Shabbat? Other things, it becomes forbidden until motza'ei Shabbat until they're made.

Innovation: Why Roasted Meat Is Different – It Makes It Charred

Says Rava, if it indeed remained on the fire on Shabbat, if it indeed remained on the fire on Shabbat... and he says that this is the leniency, not that it's only by the slave. He says that the law is on shrinks and is bad for it. He says when it's fit for eating one may indeed. He says, why? Why shouldn't we be afraid that it shrinks and is good for it? He says, it may indeed remain on the fire on Shabbat, even if it becomes very roasted, all the more so it shrinks and is bad for it, because roasted meat doesn't become better with it lying a longer time on the fire, it shrinks and is bad for it. Lest he stoke, yes, **it makes it charred**. There's no concern of lest he stoke on Shabbat, because if he goes to stoke, he'll make it charred.

Ah, that's what roasted meat is different from all the previous things, not in a pot, but it's a type, it means to roast, broil. It means without spices, without things, because when the meat lies in a pot, there's always the concern lest he stoke, but when it's dry meat on a fire, the stoking will damage. We learned this. It's implied that we're speaking of leather, that one broils it. The meat will be charred. Okay.

Connection to Mugmar – The Same Reason

And because of this, because of this is also the leniency that we learned earlier. The Rambam goes back to another leniency that we learned in our chapter, right? It's interesting, the Rambam could have when saying this is said by kid meat, the same thing, roasted meat, if one places it on fire on coals. Okay, yes.

Right, the reason for all these things is because these are external Mishnayot, and the Rambam is a bit... because he can, he would have wanted to make a clear order, he could have had several laws in our chapter to make it simpler, but he brings all the Mishnayot, all the statements that appear in the Gemara. Yes. But now he's explaining a law that we learned earlier. We learned that one may place mugmar. It was learned earlier that one may place mugmar, spices that one lights, such incense, one may place under vessels, under laundry, and vessels that one still wants. Eh, why shouldn't there be lest he stoke? He says, one may indeed, lest he stoke the coals, the mugmar will burn and the vessels will be damaged. The mugmar is also such a type of thing that the stoking won't help, it will cause it to be burned. This isn't shrinks and is bad for it. Yes.

It's interesting, he comes back here to the previous law. He now comes back to the original law. Earlier we said one may, now you'll understand that the two are connected. Interesting. Right.

Law 17: General Principle – "Anything That Is Only Forbidden Because of Appearance"

Return to the Foundation from the Beginning of the Chapter

Laws of Shehiyah and Hachzarah – Bread and Fire

What Does This Mean? Carry Out. And Why?

What does this mean here? Carry out. And why? You've already learned, "**kol davar she'eino assur ela mipnei maraas ayin**" (anything that is only forbidden because of appearance), all these things that were forbidden, it's not

forbidden because it's done on Shabbos. Here it comes back to the... He began the introduction to this chapter, that all melachos (forbidden labors) one may not do on Shabbos, but if one does the action erev Shabbos (before Shabbos), even if the melacha happens on Shabbos, it's permitted. So he says, all these things that I've enumerated here that are forbidden, the prohibition is not because it's done on Shabbos, because we've already established that it's indeed permitted. Rather, what is the prohibition? "**Gezeirah shema yachtteh bagechalim**" (a decree lest one stoke the coals), it's a different thing, from maraas ayin (appearance) that one will go on Shabbos and do a melacha.

Halacha Regarding Wool in a Pot – Dyeing

Therefore, I began that one may place wool in a pot that has been... that has been cooked, but it's not so simple. One may not place wool in a dye pot unless one places it when it's close to the fire. Only if the pot is not on the fire, because there too there's a concern lest one stoke the coals. And it must have its opening sealed with clay. Even when the pot is not close to the fire, it must also be sealed with clay, lest one lift it and place it down. Must one lift it even if it's not on the fire? I think the wool refers to a color, dyeing. Let's see what the Rambam's commentators say.

Yes, it can't be. Yes, dyeing. So it says in Tosafos page 13a. Yes, in Hilchos Shabbos chapter 9. The wool in the pot refers to a dye pot, as they learned in the beginning, right?

Okay. The Rambam says, it seems there were people who thought differently, and when one learns all these halachos, one can get some impression that there are indeed things one may not do erev Shabbos. So the Rambam warns, you shouldn't make a mistake to prove that it's only about the... Yes. Interesting. Okay. Good.

Halacha 18: Beginning of Halacha Regarding Bread – Penalty for Mistakes

The Rambam says in the next halacha: Bread. Further, what is the novelty here regarding the prohibition? Let's learn. There's one halacha, bread will be a bit different in the way of learning if one did indeed make a mistake, the penalty, the punishment.

Laws of Shehiyah and Hachzarah – Bread and Fire

Halacha 18: Bread – Baking Bread Erev Shabbos

Speaker 1: Yes, it's interesting. Okay.

The Rambam says the next halacha: Bread. Wait, what is the novelty here in the... Okay, let's learn. What's one halacha here? Bread is indeed a bit different regarding if one did indeed mistakenly incur the penalty on the seventh day.

The Rambam says, "**Ein ofin es hapas batanur im chasheicha**" (One doesn't bake bread in an oven at nightfall), one doesn't put bread in an oven erev Shabbos at nightfall, "**velo chararah al gabei gechalim**" (nor a cake on coals) – two types of ways how one makes bread – "**ela kedei sheyikramu paneha hamedubbakin batanur o ba'eish**" (unless its surface that's attached to the oven or fire forms a crust). Only if one side of the bread has already become completely hardened. Which side? The side that gets baked faster. It gets baked faster where it's attached to the oven or fire.

In the Gemara it's somewhat unclear which side needs to form a crust, whether the side that takes longer or faster. The Rambam rules "**yikramu paneha hamedubbakin**

batanur o ba'eish" (the surface attached to the oven or fire forms a crust), and there it's already hardened. What? In the oven or fire? No, a cake on fire and bread in an oven. That side, the side that's stuck to the oven, not the side that's exposed to the air, if there it's already crusted even though the other side is still raw, it's already... it means it's already like something partially cooked. Interesting, because this is more similar to ben Drusai.

Why Bread is Different – No Concern of Shrinking and Improving

But afterwards it's permitted. But by bread there isn't the thing that even if it's already cooked there's a concern that it will become better cooked or shrink and improve. Why? Because by baking there isn't that thing. **"Ve'in anu choshin shema yachtch, shehapas im yachtch yifsed ta'amo"** (And we don't worry lest one stoke, because bread if one stokes will spoil its taste). Because bread, if one will stoke the coals and make it hotter, it won't become better, more crispy like we learned earlier by other types of foods, rather **"yifsed ta'amo"** (it will spoil its taste), it will become charred.

Therefore, bread one may remove when it's already a bit cooked. It's already crusted on its surface, one may already let it remain. But before it crusts on its surface there is indeed a concern lest one stoke, that's the explanation. Different from for example normal things where when it's moist, there's no concern, this is more stringent.

Bread is Different from a Kid – The New Measure

And also, the stringency here is somewhat similar to ben Drusai. Why specifically here, the drama my... Why here... I mean, a living bread, one places bread erev Shabbos right before the time, one places raw bread. Usually by for example things like a kid, which is also the same thing that lest one stoke will spoil it, one may place it right away. Here one may not, because it needs to be crusted on its surface.

Right, the reason why it's different, different from both things, it's very different from the things that always stoking helps them, because once it's crusted on its surface it already harms it. But before that it indeed seems that stoking is needed, that one should wait until it crusts on its surface. It's a new measure, not the measure of ben Drusai, it's a new type of measure.

And what is indeed the matter? What happens if one places raw bread? Won't there be the leniency of lest one stoke will spoil it? Right, why does it seem that then one indeed needs to. Bread seems. Yes. Until now, so it seems.

If One Transgressed – Deliberately and Inadvertently

And if, yes, what is if one transgressed? **"Ve'im natno samuach lechasheicha"** (And if one placed it close to nightfall), what is if one transgressed? He did indeed place bread in the oven at nightfall, **"va'adayin lo karum panav"** (and its surface hasn't yet crusted), it hasn't yet become erev Shabbos a bit baked by the side by the oven. So, **"im bemeizid"** (if deliberately), if he did it deliberately, this is bread, we're talking about motzaei Shabbos (after Shabbos), one needed to have it for Shabbos, it was lying there baking. **"Ve'im beshogeig, mutar lirdoso"** (And if inadvertently, it's permitted to remove it), one may remove it, **"mutar lirdoso beShabbos"** (permitted to remove it on Shabbos), one may remove it on Shabbos, **"mutar lirdoso letzoreich seudos Shabbos"** (permitted to remove it for the needs of Shabbos meals). One may remove it on Shabbos, one may only

remove it permitted for the needs of three meals. That is, if it's a half penalty, for an inadvertent act one gives him a half penalty. Different from earlier where inadvertently there was no penalty at all. Inadvertently they say that as much as he needs for the three meals of Shabbos he may take.

Discussion: Why is There a Leniency for the Needs of Shabbos Meals?

Speaker 2: Yes, apparently this is because it's a very great mitzvah to eat bread at the Shabbos meals. Meat, if he made it inadvertently, ah, it's not such an importance. But not having lechem mishneh (double loaves).

Speaker 1: No, but the Rambam said also by meat, inadvertently one may.

Speaker 2: No, not only motzaei Shabbos. Motzaei Shabbos specifically, that's what the Rambam said.

Speaker 1: Ah, motzaei Shabbos one doesn't need to wait.

Speaker 2: Even for a measure.

Speaker 1: Yes, if he forgot, only even if he timed it exactly, even if it's fully cooked, something that seems, which here is similar to this, that he speaks of motzaei Shabbos. But simply there's a special leniency, in honor of the Shabbos meals the Sages permitted only indeed for the meals. That's the leniency. The leniency has to do with motzaei Shabbos.

The Measure of Removal – How Much One May Remove

Speaker 2: He may not remove the entire bread at once. He may at each meal scrape off a piece from the oven, it must be removal.

Speaker 1: You see, the next piece, let's see. **"Keshi'ur rodeh"** (Like the measure of removal), when one removes a piece from the bread. Before this, before this, this says, there's an extra halacha. **"Mutar lirdos pas min hatanur shalosh seudos"** (It's permitted to remove bread from the oven for three meals), means that the measure, he can right away Friday night take three rolls, whatever, three, as much as he needs for the three meals. What do I mean? Besides the fact that he has a prohibition of removing the bread, one needs to see what this means.

Removing Bread with a Change

He says though, **"keshi'ur rodeh"** (like the measure of removal), even in the permitted manner one may indeed, when one did indeed place it when it's already dry on its surface. But only one removes the bread from where it's stuck to the... there where it's stuck to the oven perhaps with a utensil. He says that one shouldn't use the utensil so that he won't take out the utensil with which he... the shovel he uses there to remove bread. **"Ela besakin vechayotza bo"** (Rather with a knife and the like), one should do it with a change, so it shouldn't look like one is engaged in baking and cooking on Shabbos.

Discussion: Is There a Prohibition Lechatchila in Removing Bread?

Speaker 2: Right, so here there's a rabbinic prohibition to do removal of bread on Shabbos.

Speaker 1: He says it's not the same, he brings from Chochmas Adam and others, that there's a prohibition lechatchila (from the outset) to do this.

Speaker 2: Yes, but it could be... No, the Chochmas Adam says it's not even a prohibition usually. It could be, he brings

that the Ran and others have already said that this is only when he did a prohibition. They learned, if...

Speaker 1: But it says on the "mutar lirdos" (permitted to remove), how is it permitted to remove? They did it in...

Speaker 2: So, there's a continuation.

Speaker 1: But if he did it in a permitted manner, so he says not only from the Ran, if he did it in a permitted manner one may indeed eat, because it's not a prohibition of an action on Shabbos. Okay.

Halacha 19: Fire – Fire for Warming

Until now we've learned laws of shehiyah (leaving) of a pot and such things that one bakes. Now we're going to learn about a fire, when one makes a fire in order to warm oneself.

Speaker 2: Section alef. May I learn? Yes.

Speaker 1: Section alef, the fire. A person can make a fire "**bechol davar sheyirtzeh**" (with anything he wants), from whatever he wants. That means, there aren't the laws of grapevine branches and wood and the like. A fire, a person can make a fire from whatever he wants. "**Bein al gabei karka bein al gabei menorah**" (Whether on the ground or on a lamp), either on the ground directly or a menorah, something a... menorah means literally, a menorah, a lamp. Okay. That means, a fire, but the point is he makes it to warm himself, not to cook there.

"**Umadlikin medurah**" (And one lights a fire), ah, or for a... so that one can see. "**Umadlikin medurah be'erev Shabbos samuach lechasheicha, umishtemeshin le'orah o mischamemin kenegdah beShabbos**" (And one lights a fire erev Shabbos close to nightfall, and uses it for light or warms oneself against it on Shabbos). It's not different from candles, yes. Also different from candles. Candles are used for light on Shabbos. Ah, but the fire... For a fire there's no "ein madlikin" (one doesn't light), because it's large. Very good.

The Condition of Majority by Fire

But there are various yes conditions that he must do, so that he won't stoke and the like. One thing is, "**tzarich sheyadlik rov hamedurah kodem shetechshach**" (he needs to light most of the fire before it gets dark). Most of the fire must already be burning before it becomes night, "**ad shetehei hashalheives olah mei'eilah kodem haShabbos**" (until the flame rises by itself before Shabbos), so that one won't need to fuss with it. Even if it's not yet the whole thing, but once the majority, one knows that the rest will also soon start burning. But if one hasn't lit the majority, there's still always a concern that one will mix in the fire, one will make sure that the whole fire ignites. "**Ve'im lo hidlik rubah, assur leihanos mimenah beShabbos, gezeirah shema yachteh bah, veyaniach sham eitzim misramekin kedei shetehei hashalheives olah mei'eilah**" (And if he didn't light most of it, it's forbidden to benefit from it on Shabbos, a decree lest one stoke it, and he should place there crumbling wood so that the flame will rise by itself), so it will ignite well, and it won't look like one needed to warm it, one may not.

Very good.

By One Piece of Wood – Majority of Its Thickness and Majority of Its Circumference

"**Ve'im hidlik eitz yechidi**" (And if he lit a single piece of wood), you say if there's a bunch of pieces of wood you say majority. If it's one piece of wood, what then is the law? But what happens if it's one long piece of wood, how does one measure there the majority? That means, also the majority. There must be a majority. How does one measure the majority? "**Tzarich liheyos rov ovyo verov heikfo**" (It needs to be the majority of its thickness and the majority of its circumference). There are two types of majority. It's not enough that one side of the wood burns, rather the majority of the thickness of the wood, and the majority of its circumference. That means, for example, there's one piece of wood, the length and width. The length and the width, that's the circumference. Majority of circumference means from all sides. That means, there's majority of thickness, that's the thickness, the whole piece of wood.

That means, the length, it's not... What does majority of thickness and majority of circumference mean? It's the thickness. Perhaps not from inside it could be it's not burning, from outside, perhaps something like that.

Halacha 20: Fire of the Temple Chamber – Kohanim Are Zealous

Ah, here comes another leniency. "**Bameh devarim amurim? Bigvulin**" (In what case is this said? In the provinces). The fire that one says one may not light is in the provinces, that means outside of Eretz Yisrael, from the Beis HaMikdash (Temple). But in the Beis HaMikdash, "**machzirin es ha'or**" (they return the fire), one may indeed light the fire erev Shabbos at nightfall, "**be'eitzim shel meduras beis hamoked**" (with wood of the fire of the Chamber). One lights the wood in the fire of the Chamber. There's a place in the Beis HaMikdash which is the fire of the Chamber, where from there one lights wood. One may light wood. We're not talking about the altar, right? Somewhere there's a fire.

Speaker 2: No, no, in the Chamber. That's the Chamber, that's the place where one brings out the sacrifices that one brings. The kohanim warm themselves. Ah, for what warming? It's not... Yes, it's the service. Aha.

Speaker 1: "**Ve'ein choshin shema yachteh**" (And we don't worry lest one stoke). "**Shehakohanim zerizim heim**" (Because the kohanim are zealous). Kohanim are zealous, therefore one doesn't need to be concerned. Zealous means here to say not that they're fast, right? Zealous means they remember that it's Shabbos, and they won't stoke even during the week when stoking would indeed be necessary. Like bnei chaburah zerizim heim (members of a group are zealous). I mean the matter is, perhaps a kohen can say, because a kohen is now doing the service. But when people do something together with a group, a serious thing, they pay attention. One doesn't do things randomly.

Kohanim, one trusts the kohanim. One doesn't trust ordinary people, one trusts kohanim.

Speaker 2: No, but I'm talking for example bnei chaburah. I think at the Seder, what's written in the machzor everything one needs to do, one doesn't fuss randomly. A person thinks more, one may, one may not, because one is now in a group and one is now doing a mitzvah together, it's more...

Laws of Shabbos – Laws of Lighting Fire Erev Shabbos (Continued)

Bnei Chaburah – Digression

R' Zalman: Like bnei chaburah. I mean the matter is, perhaps a kohen can say, because a kohen is now doing the service, but when people do something together with a group, a serious thing, they pay attention. One doesn't do things randomly. Kohanim, one trusts the kohanim. One doesn't trust ordinary people, one trusts kohanim. No, but I'm talking for example bnei chaburah. I think at the Seder, what's written in the machzor everything one needs to do, one doesn't fuss randomly. People think more, "one may? one may not?" because one is now in a group, one is now doing a mitzvah together, it's more...

Halacha 21 – Fire of Reeds or Grasses

Okay, "**Hotzi medurah shel kanim o shel gerinim**" (He took out a fire of reeds or grasses). What happens if one made a flame not from wood, but from twigs? Reeds, well, reeds. Very light things that catch fire. Thin plants. Yes. "**O shel gerinim**" (Or grasses) doesn't mean atoms, it means kernels, such things. There the law isn't that the majority of the fire must burn before one may place it out. Rather these types of things ignite quickly. Therefore, once it's already burning a bit, the person won't desecrate, because he knows that once it's already burning a bit, in a little while there will already be enough of a large fire. "**Ki yir'eh sherubam yisrefu kodem haShabbos**" (Because he sees that most of them will burn before Shabbos) is the middle in the stump. Because the fire becomes quickly ignited, he won't put back.

Agad Es Hakanim – Bound Reeds

"**Lefikach**" (Therefore), says the Rambam, therefore you understand yourself that this is only when the reeds and

grasses are spread out, it ignites quickly. But if one will take reeds and grasses and make them so they'll be like wood that will be condensed, and then it indeed ignites weaker, and then it has the law like wood. For example, he "**agad es hakanim**" (bound the reeds), he bound them together, or he placed all the grasses in a pile and ignited it, then it doesn't burn, it doesn't go a quick burn, rather it's like wood that it takes until it ignites. And then the law is "**tzarich shetehei hashalheives olah mei'eilehah kodem haShabbos**" (it needs that the flame rises by itself before Shabbos), one must ignite by itself before Shabbos.

Halacha 22 – Fire of Pitch, Sulfur, Fat, Wax

Another similar halacha. What happens with a flame of pitch or sulfur? Pitch we spoke about this morning is waste of olives, or sulfur, brimstone. "**O shel ravyo, o shel kirah**" (Or fat, or wax). What is wax? Fat is the thing that the atomic scientist may not have on his burger. Fat. A chunk of fat. Ah, kirah shebah. But one sees by lighting yes, oil straw, oil stubble. One was empty, empty before Shabbos. It's a parable, fire ignites itself, the fire burns it out quickly, and in a little while nothing will remain of it.

Moral Lesson – Preparing for Shabbos

I mean what one learns from here is, that erev Shabbos must already be sufficiently ignited that it will be a flame rising by itself on Shabbos. A Jew must prepare for Shabbos, he must prepare for Shabbos. Yes, because one shouldn't need to be on Shabbos, you shouldn't need to be groaning on Shabbos like that. One must be joyful. One must already be Shabbos-like before Shabbos. Wonderful. What's the end of the chapter? Three, yes.