



Today's Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Shabbos Daf Kuf Chuf

MISHNA

- One may save a basket full of loaves of bread from a fire on Shabbos, even if the basket has enough bread for 100 meals. One may save a round cake of pressed figs and a full barrel of wine even though there is a lot more in them than the amount needed for 3 meals.
 - He may even tell other people, "Come and save the food for yourself". If these other people are smart, they will return the food to him and after Shabbos will ask him for money for the time and effort spent saving the food.
- Food may be saved to a courtyard that has an "eiruv" in place. **Ben Beseira** says it may even be saved to a courtyard that has no eiruv in place as well.
- He may also save all utensils that he needs for Shabbos to this type of courtyard.
- With regard to clothing, he may put on as much clothing as he possibly can and walk out into the courtyard with them, and leave them there. **R' Yose** says he may only wear 18 articles of clothing.
 - The **T"K** says, after he leaves the clothing in the courtyard, he may go back into the house, put on as much clothing as he could again, and bring that into the courtyard as well. He can also tell others, "Come and help me save the clothing".

GEMARA

- **Q:** The previous Mishna said he may only save 3 meals' worth of food. Here the Mishna says that he can even save 100 meals' worth?! **A1: R' Huna** says, this Mishna is discussing where he takes one complete basket. Since it is all "one effort", we therefore allow him to take the whole thing. The previous Mishna discusses where the loaves were separate and he must gather them together (in separate baskets) to carry them out. Therefore, each loaf is considered a "separate effort" and only enough for 3 meals may be taken. **A2: R' Abba bar Zavda in the name of Rav** says, both Mishnas are discussing where he had to gather the loaves together. The previous Mishna is discussing carrying it out into a second courtyard, therefore there is a limit on how much may be carried. This Mishna is discussing carrying it out into the immediate courtyard, which requires less effort and more food is therefore allowed to be carried there.
- **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** asks, if one places many loaves into one bundle, is that considered "one effort" (because it is one bundle) and he may take out any amount, or is it considered more than one effort because they were separate and he had to gather them together? **A:** Since **Rava** said that **R' Shizbi** was wrong when he said, that in the case where one catches wine that is dripping from a broken barrel on the roof, he may not collect more than he needs for 3 meals, it must be that **Rava** feels, that even though it drips in slowly (which is like collecting the loaves and putting them into one bundle), because it is in one bowl, it is considered to be "one effort" and would be permitted. We see that collecting multiple loaves and putting them in one bundle allows the carrying out of more than just 3 meals' worth.
 - **Rava** explained, the Braisa that discusses this case says it is permitted as long as one doesn't use multiple bowls. However, it would seem that using one bowl would be permitted no matter how large the bowl was.

V'IGUL SHEL D'VEILAH...

- **Q:** The people who help save the food are saving that food from "hefker" (the owner told them to save for themselves). What does the Mishna mean that if they are smart they will ask for money for their time and effort? If they are smart, they will just keep all the food!? **A:** Although they have a right to keep the food, the Mishna is teaching us that he should return the food as "midas chassidus".

- **Q: Rava** asks, if this person is worried about “midas chassidus”, he should not be looking to get paid for time and effort spent on Shabbos?! **A:** We are discussing a “Yirei Shamayim” (one who fears Heaven), who is not looking to benefit from others (which is why he returns the food) but he does not want to do things for free either (which is why he wants to get paid for his time). The Mishna is teaching that if he is smart, he will realize that one is permitted to get paid for time spent on Shabbos in this manner and he will ask to get so paid.

U'LIHEICHAN MATZILIN...

- **Q:** How come when he is saving food he tells them “save for yourselves” and when saving clothing he says “save with me”? **A:** With regard to food, he may only save 3 meals’ worth, so he must tell them to save for themselves. With regard to clothing, he can continue saving as much as he can on his own (by putting them on in the house and taking them off in the courtyard) so he can ask people to help him outright.
- A Braisa says, **R’ Meir** says the person may continue to wear clothing out of the house, drop it in the courtyard and repeat the process. **R’ Yose** says one may only wear 18 articles of clothing and no more.

MISHNA

- **R’ Shimon ben Nanas** says, one may spread a moist goatskin (which sings but doesn’t burn) on a box or closet that has caught fire (it may be spread on the part that is not yet on fire) to prevent the fire from spreading further.
- One may make a partition of any keilim, whether empty or full, to block the path of an oncoming fire. **R’ Yose** says this may not be done with new earthenware keilim that are full of water because they will burst and extinguish the fire.

GEMARA

- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, if a garment has caught fire, one may put water on the end that has not yet caught, and if the fire gets extinguished when it reaches the water, so be it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that one may unfold and put on a garment that has caught fire, and one may unroll a Sefer Torah that has caught fire and if the fire gets extinguished, so be it. It seems that anything more direct, like applying water to the garment, would be prohibited?! **A: Rav** holds like **R’ Shimon ben Nanas** in the Mishna that allows placing the goatskin on the box.
 - **Q: R’ Shimon ben Nanas** only allowed the goatskin because it is fireproof and only prevents the fire’s spread. He would not, however, allow the application of water which extinguishes the fire!? **A:** Since **R’ Yose** prohibits using keilim that will burst, it seems the **R’ Shimon** would allow that. We see that **R’ Shimon** allows the indirect extinguishing of a fire.
- A Braisa says, if a lit candle is on a board that one wishes to move, he may shake the candle off the board, and if it extinguishes the fire, so be it.
 - **R’ Yannai** says, this may only be done if the candle was left there accidentally. If it was left there intentionally, the board becomes a base for an item of “muktzeh” and becomes prohibited to move itself.
- A Braisa says, if a candle is behind a door (and the wind of the moving door may blow it out), one may open and close the door and if the fire gets extinguished, so be it. **Rav** “strongly disagreed” with anyone who paskened this way.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked **R’ Acha the son of Rava**, why did **Rav** disagree with this? It can’t be because **Rav** holds like **R’ Yehuda** that an unintentional act (“davar she’eino miskaven”) is prohibited and the **T”K** holds like **R’ Shimon** that it is permitted, because he wouldn’t “strongly disagree” with someone who paskens like **R’ Shimon**?! **A: Rav** felt so strongly because in this case even **R’ Shimon** would agree that it is prohibited, because it is a “psik reisha” (an inevitable consequence).
- **R’ Yehuda** says, a person may open a door which is opposite a bonfire on Shabbos even though the wind coming through the door will fan the fire. **Abaye** “strongly disagreed” with that.
 - **Q:** If we are discussing a case where an ordinary wind is blowing, that would surely not fan the fire, so why would **Abaye** prohibit it? If we are discussing an unusually strong

wind, why would **R' Yehuda** allow it? **A:** We are discussing when an ordinary wind is blowing. **Abaye** says we are goizer in that case for a case when an unusually strong wind is blowing, and **R' Yehuda** says we are not goizer.

OSIN MECHITZA...

- **Q:** From the Mishna it seems that the **Rabanan** are more lenient and seem to allow an indirect extinguishing of the fire and **R' Yose** is more stringent and prohibits an indirect extinguishing of the fire. However, we find a Braisa in which the **Rabanan** prohibit making the partition with earthenware keilim and **R' Yose** allows the use of certain earthenware keilim?! We can't simply say to change the views of the Mishna, because **Rabbah bar Tachlifa in the name of Rav** says that **R' Yose** is the one who prohibits indirect extinguishing of fire?! **A:** The entire Braisa is the view of **R' Yose**, and **R' Yose** is saying that a partition to halt the oncoming fire may only be made of keilim that will not break, such as metal keilim and certain earthenware keilim.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if someone has a Name of Hashem written on his skin, the **Rabanan** say he may not wash or anoint that area and he may not stand in a dirty place. If he has to go to the mikvah, he must wrap that area in "gemi" (reed grass) and then immerse (presumably this is done to avoid erasing the Name of Hashem even though it is being done indirectly – which means the **Rabanan** prohibit things done in an indirect manner). **R' Yose** says he can go to the mikvah without wrapping the area, as long as he doesn't rub the area (which means that **R' Yose** allows the indirect erasing of Hashem's Name)?!
 - **A: R' Yose** is not contradictory, because regarding erasing Hashem's Name, the pasuk says "Lo sa'asun kein" (you should not **do**) which teaches us that in this case indirect cause is not prohibited.
 - **Q:** With regard to Shabbos the pasuk also says "Lo sa'aseh kol melacha" (you should not **do**), so an indirect extinguishing should be permitted?! **A:** It truly is permitted. The reason **R' Yose** doesn't allow it is because he is goizer that if we allow it in this case, since the person is in a state of chaos from fear of losing his possessions, he may come to extinguish the fire directly.
 - **A:** The **Rabanan** would allow the indirect erasing of Hashem's name. They require the placing of the "gemi" because they hold that one may not stand in front of the Name of Hashem without clothing. Therefore it must be covered.
 - They can't say that the "gemi" is placed there to prevent the erasing, because if the gemi is placed tightly, it would be a "chatzitza", and if it isn't placed tightly, it would not prevent the erasure! (The ink itself must be wet, in which case it is not a "chatzitza").
 - **Q:** How does **R' Yose** allow him to be unclothed without covering the Name of Hashem? **A:** He covers it with his hand.
 - **Q:** The **Rabanan** should also let him cover it with his hand – why do they require the covering with the "gemi"? **A:** He may forget and remove his hand.
 - **Q:** **R' Yose** should also be afraid of that? **A:** **R' Yose** would agree that he should use a "gemi" to cover it. The machlokes is where he does not have a "gemi" at hand. The **Rabanan** say he must go search for a "gemi", even if it means pushing off the immersion in the mikvah. **R' Yose** says he should not push off the immersion, because it is a mitzvah to immerse at the earliest possible time.
 - **Q:** **R' Yose** says in a Braisa, that although a "baal ker" may immerse at any point of the day of Yom Kippur (a baal ker may not daven until he goes to the mikvah, so we allow him to do so on Yom Kippur so that he can daven), he may not do so after Mincha, when there are no more tefillos until nightfall. At that point we would have him wait until nightfall. If **R' Yose** held that immersion at the earliest possible time is a mitzvah, he would allow the baal ker to go to the mikvah even after mincha?! **A:** This Braisa follows **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda**, who holds that immersion at the earliest possible time is not a mitzvah.