

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The behavior that led to the destruction of the Beis HaMikdash (cont.)

The Gemara explains that R' Ketina's statement regarding the presence of truthful people even at the time of the churban refers to people who were truthful in Torah whereas Rava's statement that truthful people ceased to exist referred to the way people conducted their business.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah lists different items that may be removed from a burning house on Shabbos.

3) **Clarifying the quantity of food that may be saved**

A contradiction is noted between the previous Mishnah, which only permits three meals of food to be removed from a burning house, and our Mishnah, which permits removing a basket even if it contains bread for a hundred meals.

R' Huna answers: The distinction is whether he is performing a single act, our Mishnah, or many acts, the previous Mishnah.

R' Abba bar Zavda in the name of Rav answers: The distinction is whether the food is being removed to that courtyard, our Mishnah, or to another courtyard, the previous Mishnah.

R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua asked: If one makes many bundles of food but carries them out at once, is it considered one act and permitted or many acts and prohibited.

The Gemara answers that it is permitted.

4) **Paying those who helped save food**

The Gemara asks: Why is a reckoning necessary? It seems that the owner declared the food ownerless and they should be permitted to keep the food.

Rava answers: The Mishnah is discussing people who are G-d-fearing and do not wish to benefit from other people's property but at the same time they do not intend to exert themselves without compensation. The Mishnah therefore teaches that if they are wise and know halacha they will make a calculation to receive wages for their effort after Shabbos.

5) **Clarifying the Mishnah**

The Gemara wonders why when referring to food the Mishnah quotes the homeowner as saying, "Save for yourselves," whereas when referring to clothing the homeowner says, "Save with me?"

Answers the Gemara: Since there is a prohibition against saving more than three meals of food he may not ask the neighbors to "save with me." Regarding clothing there is no such restriction, therefore he may say "save with me."

A Baraisa records a dispute between R' Meir and R' Yosi as to whether there is a limit to the quantity of clothing one may save from a fire.

6) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the activities which may be done to contain a fire.

7) **A burning talis**

Rav rules: If a talis is burning on one end it is permitted to pour water on the other end and there is no liability even if the fire is extinguished.

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges this ruling.

8) **Lamps**

A Baraisa rules that one may tip a board that holds a lamp and not be concerned in the event that it becomes extinguished. This

(Continued on page 2)

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Direct and Indirect Destruction*

תנא מ' שהיה שם ה' כתוב לו על בשרו הרי זה לא ירחץ ולא יסוך

This halacha is based upon the verse in the Torah (Devarim 12:3-4) which describes the manner in which we are commanded to obliterate all remnants of idolatry from Eretz Yisroel. "You shall break apart their altars, you shall smash their pillars, their sacred trees you should burn in fire...You shall not do this to Hashem, your G-d". Rashi on the Chumash cites Rabbi Yishmael from Sifrei (61) who points out that it would be ludicrous to assume that a Jew would even think of demolishing any item used for the service of Hashem. Rather, the Torah is admonishing us to not act in a debased manner as do the idolaters. We are thus warned not to sin, which would be a direct cause for the Beis Hamikdash to be destroyed.

The Gaon from Tsubin quoted his brother, the **חזון נחום**, ז"ל, who used to refer to our Gemara. Someone who has the name of Hashem inscribed upon his skin is allowed to submerge himself in water, even though it might cause the name to become erased. Although the Torah prohibits the erasing of G-d's name, based upon the verse "You shall not do this to Hashem, your G-d", nevertheless, this is only a problem when it is done directly. Here, where the name of Hashem might become erased indirectly (גרמא), it is permitted. Yet, as we have seen from the comment of Rashi on the Chumash, the understanding of the verse actually teaches us not to act sinfully, whereby our transgressions will result in destruction. This is an indirect manner of obliterating the name of Hashem, and yet this is included in the warning of the verse. Therefore, even indirect erasing of Hashem is also prohibited, so why can a person with Hashem's name inscribed on his skin enter a pool of water?

We see from here, the Rebbe concluded, that when a Jew sins, **חיי**, the outcome of these sins and their destructive effect is not an indirect result. Sin and the devastating ruin which occurs in its wake are directly associated one with another. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is necessary to fully grasp Torah concepts?
2. Why did the Gemara suggest that the people who saved food from a fire do not need to be paid for their efforts?
3. Explain **גרם כיבוי**.
4. According to the Gemara's conclusion, why did R' Yosi prohibit indirect extinguishment of a fire?

# HALACHAH Highlight

## If the Tablecloth Catches Fire

ועושי מחיצה בכל הכלים בין מלאין בין ריקנין

It is halachically preferable to prevent an imminent fire by handling muktza objects, if necessary, rather than delaying until a fire has broken out (thus necessitating outright mechabeh).

However, in the event that a burning candle (or other source of fire) caused the tablecloth to catch fire, there are three options that can be taken, as will be explained in the paragraphs below.

**Note:** This entire discussion applies only to homes where the possibility of a house fire would definitely not pose any Pikuach Nefesh (e.g. secluded bungalow in a rural area that has been safely evacuated). Some Rabbonim permit putting out an uncontrolled fire in any city or suburban neighborhood because of the possibility that the fire may spread to neighboring homes and result in a Pikuach Nefesh situation. Similarly, one is permitted to telephone the fire department in these situations.

### 1: Removing the burning tablecloth

If the flame is not yet covering a wide area, and the burning cloth can still be moved safely, it may be brought quickly and carefully to an empty (metal) bathtub (in a fully tiled bathroom), concrete partitioned porch, patio, etc. where it can harmlessly bum itself out.

Once the tablecloth is in a safe location, a colored liquid, such as wine, juice, or soda, may be poured around the outside perimeter of the fire (but not on the fire itself). This action will help to further contain the fire, by preventing it from spreading, thereby causing it to ultimately smother itself out. The leichter (candelabrum) and any other muktza objects, as well as dishes, may be taken quickly from the table in order to allow for the removal of the burning tablecloth. The cloth may be rolled up or folded (where it is not burning) to make it safer and easier to carry and deposit into the tub.

### 2: Wetting the tablecloth near the flames

If removing the burning tablecloth is not possible, one may immediately pour wine, juice or soda, or other colored drinks on the table around the outside perimeter of the fire (but not on the fire itself). This will create a Grama situation (Indirect melacha act), allowing the flames to travel on their own to the wet area, and thereby die out. A melacha act by means of Grama is permitted in these extenuating circumstances.

It is likely that the absorbed moisture from the poured liquid will travel through the cloth and douse the flames (instead of of the reverse;

(Overview...continued from page 1)

assumes that the board was not designated as a base for the lamp.

A Baraisa ruled that if a lamp is behind a door one may nonetheless open and close the door in the ordinary way. Rav strongly condemned this ruling because it is inevitable that the flame will be extinguished.

R' Yehudah ruled: It is permitted to open a door opposite a fire. Abaye strongly condemned the ruling. The Gemara explains that they argue whether there is a decree against opening the door when a regular wind blows out of fear that one may open the door when an unusually strong wind is blowing.

### 9) Making a wall of vessels containing liquid

From the Mishnah it would seem that Rabanan permit indirect extinguishment and R' Yosi prohibits it. This is contradicted from their positions recorded in a Baraisa.

The Gemara answers that the Baraisa only contains R' Yosi's opinion and with a slight change in the Baraisa it matches R' Yosi's opinion in the Mishnah.

The Gemara presents another Baraisa which seemingly has R Yosi and Rabanan following opposite positions.

The Gemara explains how, in reality there is no contradiction. ■

i.e. the flames moving toward the wetness). However, this is not of concern because either manner of extinguishing the fire is considered only a Grama.

When wetting the cloth, water or clear liquids should be avoided in favor of colored liquids (unless other fluids are unavailable and the cloth is fresh and unstained) because soaking the fabric in water may be the melacha of melabein (Scouring). However, if paper or plastic (e.g. a plastic tablecloth) caught fire, wetting it with water is allowed because paper and plastic are not subject to melabein. If a wet towel or rags are available, these may be placed near the fire to stifle the fire. One may dip paper napkins into water, and quickly place the saturated napkins on the tablecloth, close to the flames. Soaking paper materials is not melabain.

### 3: Placing containers of water near the flames

One may also set pitchers or glasses filled with water adjacent to the flame so that they will burst as the heat of the fire draws closer, and douse the flames. (paper cups or plastic bags filled with liquid are excellent for this purpose, and may be brought near the fire and allowed to burst to douse the flames.) ■

1 The 39 Melachos, by Rabbi Dovid Ribiat, pages 1280-1282. Used with permission of the author.

## Gemara GEM

### The Labor of One's Hands

אמר רבא חסידי אגרי בשבת שקלי הכא בירא שמאי  
עסקינן דלא ניחא ליה דליתנהי מאחרים

Anyone who saves food from a burning building on Shabbos may keep it for himself. The fact that the Mishnah discusses returning the food to its owner and simply receiving compensation for their efforts is only referring to where the ones who saved the items are pious people, who do not want to keep that which the owner was forced to abandon against his will.

The Ran writes that the nature of the pious (חסידים) is that they willingly distance themselves and forgo any financial claim they might have whenever even a modicum of suspicion exists regarding halachic propriety. Those who are guided by the fear of heaven demonstrate great caution in order to avoid any action where sin might be involved. This also affects their attitude towards acquiring objects which are ownerless (הפקר). If the owner of the object might have released his control of his property out of hopelessness and despair, a tzaddik does not wish to take advantage and to acquire such an object. In our case, this is why these pious individuals want to restore the food to its owner.

Still, they do not act carelessly or foolishly. This case does not involve "שכר שבת – wages for work on Shabbos", and these pious people realize that refusing to accept payment is unnecessary. Therefore, on the one hand, they return the food to its owner, but on the other hand, they accept payment for their efforts.

Rabbi Elazar Moshe Halevi Horowitz, zt"l, the Rov of Pinsk, cites the verses (Tehillim 128:1,2) which reflects this concept. "How fortunate is the one who fears Heaven!...He eats from the labor of his hands." Here we see that they only benefit from that which is theirs, but they appreciate and utilize that which is theirs. ■

Daf Digest is published by the Chicago Center, under the leadership of

HaRav Yehoshua Eichenstein, shlit"a

HaRav Pinchas Eichenstein, Nasi; HaRav Zalmen L. Eichenstein, Rosh Kollel; Rabbi Tzvi Bider, Executive Director, edited by Rabbi Ben-Zion Rand.

Daf Yomi Digest has been made possible through the generosity of Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben.