By a pot which is removed and sealed

ביורה עקורה וטוחה

Overview

The גמרא explained that there is no concern for הגסה or הגסה since the pot is removed from the fire (so no חוספות) and it is sealed with clay (so no הגסה). Our תוספות reconciles this ruling with a seemingly contradictory ruling.

תוספות responds to an anticipated difficulty:

ואין לחוש שמא יגלה ויגיס¹ שאין דרך להגיס כמו לחתות² ועוד דשמא מיהדק³ טפי:

And there is no concern that perhaps he will open the seal and stir, since it is not that usual to stir as it is to stoke, and additionally, perhaps it is very tight, so it is highly unlikely that he can remove the seal and stir.

Summary

There is a greater concern for שמא יחתה than for שמא יגיס.

Thinking it over

תוספות offers a second answer (ועוד וכו'), seemingly because הוספות in not sure that it is אין דרך להגיס כמו לחתות (otherwise why offer a second answer, especially since in the second answer תוספות writes אין דרך להגיס כמו the second answer תוספות writes אין השמא, meaning that he is not sure). Therefore since in both answers חוספות is not sure, why does he write דשמא only in the second answer, but not in the first?!

¹ See later on this עמוד that אמיפתי מדיפתי maintains (according to the first לשון) that one may not place ram's meat in the oven even if it is sealed because (since ram's meat is not that sensitive) he may break the seal and be מהרה so here too let us be concerned that he will break the seal and be מהרש"א. See מהרש"א.

² It is more usual to be מחתה (for it is necessary to keep the fire burning) than to be מגיס (the dye will be absorbed in any case).

³ The seal by the dye is tighter than the seal by the ram.