



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Fanning a flame

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok states that the version of the Mishnah that uses the term ליבה is correct as well as the version that uses the term ניבה.

A Baraisa discusses liability when a person and the wind fan a flame that causes damage.

Four different Amoraim offer explanations for the ruling in the Baraisa and how it differs from the melachah of winnowing.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah teaches that one is liable if his fire consumes wood, stones or dirt.

### 3) Clarifying the pasuk that discusses damage from fire

Rava explains why it was necessary for the Torah to mention thorns, a stack of grain, standing grain and a field.

In the course of the discussion the Gemara presents an exchange between R' Yehudah and Rabanan, who disagree about liability for concealed items, that relates to Rava's explanation.

### 4) Aggadaic teachings

R' Shmuel bar Nachmani in the name of R' Yonason teaches about punishment coming into this world and he bases his teaching on the verse related to damages with fire.

R' Yosef cites a related Baraisa that teaches this principle using a different verse.

R' Yosef and Abaye have a short exchange about this teaching.

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav offers another teaching from the verse cited in the Baraisa.

### 5) The correct response to danger

A Baraisa teaches the correct response to a plague in a city. The necessity for three verses is explained.

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is the case of wind blowing a fire different from a case of winnowing?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. Where does tragedy begin?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. What is the correct response to famine?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. What are the three different explanations of Dovid HaMelech's question to the Sanhedrin?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
ר' ישראל זלמן בן ר' יוסף חיים  
Mr. Sheldon Robinson o.b.m

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*The Destroyer does not differentiate between the righteous and the wicked*

אין מבחין בין צדיקים לרשעים

When the Jewish nation was preparing to depart from Egypt, they assembled according to families and ate from the Pesach offering. They rubbed from its blood on their doorposts and lintels. Moshe warned them not to leave from the doors of their homes while the plague of the firstborn was in progress, as he cautioned them that while they remained in their homes they would be protected against the Destroyer which was rampant in the street. Based upon this, Rav Yosef taught that "once the Destroyer has permission to cause devastation, it does not distinguish between those who are righteous and those who are wicked." At a moment of catastrophe, even those who are not deserving of death may succumb to the whims of the Destroyer.

(#8) דרשות הר"ן explains that our sages understand that events in this world are conducted according to what seems to be a natural order. In other words, Hashem allows circumstances to unfold which appear to be random. This is why a person who is otherwise worthy might be killed as part of a larger group when it is struck with tragedy. רמ"ק explains that there is a type of divine supervision which is general (השגחה כללית) over all of creation, and there is a more specific, detailed supervision of each individual (השגחה פרטית). The general view can sometimes apply in a manner which supersedes what might be fair had things been applied on a more individual basis.

Sefer שפתי חיים writes that when there is a decree which is affecting the wider community, a person must attempt to save himself using his own efforts and by natural means. If he does not make a reasonable effort to save himself under these circumstances, he might be vulnerable to harm. And if one does get hurt, it may be that he is not deserving of such treatment according to his own merits, or as a punishment for any sin he committed. Rather, it may simply be due to his negligence for not having protected himself.

Sefer Michtav M'Eliyahu writes (Vol. 4, p. 86) in the name of the Saba of Kelem that the Gemara does not mean that the Destroyer has the ability to punish the righteous any more than they deserve. Rather, if the people of a generation are corrupt, everyone is judged very strictly, and every sin is weighed and accounted fully. Even what might otherwise be treated as a small sin is magnified to be evaluated in its complete sense, and a righteous person may be punished so that others will notice and take things to heart regarding their own sins. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
P'ilui nishmas Shmuel ben Moshe Yaakov  
by the Drizin family

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Stealing money to save a life

וקא מיבעיא ליה מהו להציל עצמו בממון חבירו

And he asked whether it is permitted for one to save himself with other people's property

Rishonim disagree about the intent behind Dovid Hamelech's question. According to Rashi<sup>1</sup>, Dovid Hamelech was inquiring about whether it is permitted for a person to save himself with someone else's property and was informed that it is prohibited. Other Rishonim<sup>2</sup> assert that one is certainly permitted to save himself with other people's property and the only uncertainty was whether one who does save himself with other people's property is obligated to pay that money back and in response to this question he was informed that the money must be paid back. Shulchan Aruch<sup>3</sup> rules that one whose life is in danger is permitted and must steal someone's property to save his life, but he must have in mind that he will return the stolen property.

Teshuvus Beis Yehudah<sup>4</sup> was asked whether a person who has no money and has no legal means to acquire money is permitted to steal in order to have the funds needed for food. His initial approach was to permit stealing in this case and based this position on the principle that one is permitted to violate any prohibition in order to save a life except for the prohibitions of murder, idolatry and illicit relations. Seemingly, this principle allows a person to steal in order to save his life. He then suggests that the suspension of prohibitions in the interest of saving a life is limited to prohibitions that do not cause a loss to others but it is prohibited to violate a prohibition that causes others a loss, even if it is to save a life. He then takes note that Shulchan Aruch per-

(Overview. Continued from page 1)

The Gemara reports that Rava would seal his windows during a time of plague.  
Another Baraisa teaches the correct response to a famine. The necessity for two verses is explained.  
Two additional Baraisos related to plagues are presented.  
A Baraisa explains what is indicated by different actions of dogs.

### 6) Damage from fire

The Gemara relates an incident involving different Amoraim in which R' Yitzchok Nafcha taught a halacha as well an aggadaic teaching related to the verse that discusses a fire going out and damaging.

### 7) The incident of Dovid Hamelech and the Plishtim

A verse is cited which the Gemara assumes to refer to a question that Dovid Hamelech asked the Sanhedrin.

Three suggestions are offered regarding the nature of Dovid Hamelech's inquiry.

The second explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

The third explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

The first explanation is challenged. ■

mits taking other people's property to save a life as long as he has in mind to return the stolen property.

Sdei Chemed<sup>5</sup> wonders whether, according to Shulchan Aruch, it is permitted to steal money in order to save a life when one does not have the resources to pay back the money once the danger has passed and presents arguments on both sides of the issue. ■

1. ד"ה ויצילה
2. ע' רא"ש פ"ו סי' י"ב
3. שר"ע חו"מ סי' שנ"ט סע' ד'
4. שר"ת בית יהודה (עניאש) יו"ד סי' מ"ז
5. שדי חמד כללים מערכת האלף אות ט"ז ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The laughing dogs

כלבים משחקים אליהו בעיר

Rav Yosef Landau, zt"l, was once called to the city of Batshan to investigate a controversy that had developed between certain citizens and the local shochet and bodek. The townspeople claimed that the shochet was halachically required to be ousted, a claim which the shochet heatedly disagreed.

After thoroughly probing the entire matter, Rav Landau sided with the townspeople in their insistence that the shochet

should lose his position, since he had ignored many important halachos and consequently fed the town treife meat.

When announcing his psak, Rav Landau said, "We find in Bava Kamma 60 a very enigmatic sounding piece of aggadah: 'If the dogs cry, this is a sign that the angel of death is in the city. If the dogs laugh, this is a sign that Eliyahu HaNavi is in the city.' But what does the reaction of dogs have to do with the presence of the angel of death or Eliyahu HaNavi? The answer is that chazal were teaching a very deep lesson with this statement. The determining factor of whether the angel of death or Eliyahu HaNavi is in the city is the integrity of the shochet and bodek.

If his shechitah is kosher, Eliyahu HaNavi is in the city. If he feeds people treif, then the angel of death abounds.

"Now we can easily understand the relevance of the dogs. The verse states that we throw treif to the dogs. If they are happily well fed because the shochet declares unkosher meat treif and gives it to them, then Eliyahu HaNavi sojourns in the city. If their due is being denied them and they are going hungry, the angel of death comes to visit. Since chazal did not wish to say openly that there could be such an underhanded person that would feed non-kosher meat to the unsuspecting public, they hinted subtly at their meaning!" ■

1. אוצר שיחות צדיקים ע' נ"א