



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) A Tanna uses the Mishnah to support his position in an unrelated case (cont.)

After a number of attempts to identify the precise dispute between R' Yishmael the son of R' Yochanan ben Berokah and Chachamim, Mar bar R' Ashi returns to an earlier suggestion. The point of dispute is whether it is permitted to flay the korbbon Pesach entirely or not, and Chachamim introduced as proof the halacha that permits a person to save money along with a Sefer Torah from a fire on Shabbos. As far as the difficulty raised with this interpretation that the proof deals with an issue of muktza and the case of the korbbon involves a melacha; Mar bar R' Ashi explains that the case involving the korbbon does not constitute a melacha because the dispute deals with a circumstance where the owner has no need for the hide.

2) Clarifying the dispute regarding where the scrolls may be carried

The Gemara asks for a precise definition of an open-mavoi and an unopen-mavoi.

Following a number of failed attempts to define these terms R' Ashi explains that an unopen-mavoi is one with three walls and one lechi. An open-mavoi is one with three walls and no lechis. The opinions in the Mishnah represent a special leniency that applies only to save a Sefer Torah.

3) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses the issue of how much food may be taken from a home that is on fire on Shabbos.

4) Clarifying the Mishnah

Rava explains: The reason for the restriction against saving any more than three meals worth of food is because Chazal feared that if they permitted saving more he may come to extinguish the fire.

Abaye unsuccessfully challenges Rava's explanation.

5) Saving wine from a broken barrel

A Beraisa presents the guidelines for saving wine from a broken barrel. A dispute is mentioned whether subterfuge may be employed to save a larger amount of wine.

The Gemara suggests that this dispute is related to the dispute between R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua regarding the use of subterfuge to prevent potential financial loss. The Gemara rejects the analogy.

6) Saving food

A Beraisa spells out more rules for saving food from a fire on Shabbos and Yom Kippur.

A Beraisa permits someone who has no other bread to remove a limited amount of bread from an oven on Shabbos.

7) Shabbos meals

The Gemara recounts the importance of waking early on Friday to prepare for Shabbos. Additionally, certain practices of Amoraim regarding the bread used for Shabbos are presented.

8) Saving three meals worth of food

A Beraisa presents a dispute whether there is an obligation to have three or four meals on Shabbos. R' Yochanan explains their point of dispute. ■

## Gemara GEM

*Rationing the Rations*

תנו רבנן הציל פת נקיה אין מציל פת הדראה

The Mishnah taught that even if one has plenty of food, he may still go into the building to retrieve more foodstuffs to furnish enough supplies for the three Shabbos meals. The ruling of this Beraisa only allows one to go back into the burning building to retrieve enough "clean bread" to supply rations for the three Shabbos meals if he has no "clean bread" at hand. If however, he has clean bread, he is not allowed to go in to get anything. How is this to be understood in view of the halacha of the Mishnah which always allows a limited volume to be salvaged from the building?

Ritva explains that the Beraisa agrees that even if one has food for Shabbos, the halacha allows him to go in and get the specified amount of food. However, the Beraisa is speaking about a person who already went in once "להציל – to retrieve supplies". Now that this effort has been made, the Beraisa reports that if he brought out the dry, inferior loaves, he may go in again to save the cleaner, tastier loaves. However, if he managed to find the higher quality bread the first time, he can no longer make another salvage trip to bring out lower quality loaves.

Chazon Ish notes that the ruling of the Beraisa now seems obsolete. The halacha is that once the person has brought out the needed "clean bread", he cannot go back to save anything, neither low quality bread nor any more "clean bread". Accordingly, the Beraisa should have simply stated, "He cannot go back at all". What lesson is conveyed by prohibiting the inferior product? Chazon Ish explains that there is a novel insight being taught here. We might have thought that as long as he is going back to get a different type of bread, better or worse, that an additional salvage trip might be allowed. Perhaps we should recognize that this person prefers the coarse and stale bread more than what he already has. The lesson therefore is that the halacha does not consider this a valid reason to justify another trip in.

Magen Avraham (334:3 #5) rules that we allow a person to retrieve fish, even if he already has meat. And we allow him to get

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is the container a **מותר ולדבר האסור** and the animal hide is not?
2. When is the requirement to have two **לחיים** suspended?
3. Is one permitted to save from a fire meals worth of food for animals?
4. How do we know that one must take two loaves for the bracha but only one loaf has to be cut?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
In memory of my sister,  
Mrs. Shirley Baggelman, Sorah Sheva bas Tzvi Hersch HaLevi  
by her brother Jerry Lane, Oak Park, MI

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
By the Feder and Rubinoff families  
in memory of their mother  
**מרת מלכה בת ר' ירחמיאל הכהן, ע"ה**

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Fire Emergencies<sup>1</sup>

נפלה דליקה בערב שבת

### A) Threat to life (Pikuach Nefesh)

In times of emergency, when there is Pikuach Nefesh (threat to life), performing any and every melacha is not only permitted but is also a sacred obligation and a great Mitzvah. This is true even where there is only a remote possibility of Pikuach Nefesh. The prohibitions of Shabbos and Yom Tov do not take precedence over preservation of life. In fact, any hesitancy in the face of mortal danger (Pikuach Nefesh) is a serious transgression and is equated with the taking of an innocent life. Consequently, the swifter the action, the greater the Mitzvah.

Note: One who violates the Shabbos to save a life, fulfills a great Mitzvah, and is to be praised:

- Even if others arrived at the scene before him.
- Even if it is later revealed that there was never a danger.
- Even if the effort was unsuccessful.

There is general agreement among Poskim that one may assume that a house fire poses a threat to life, unless one *knows for a fact* that there is no danger to life (e.g. there is no one left in the house and the fire cannot spread).

This means that if a house is on fire ר"ל:

- Children may immediately be carried outdoors even where there is no "Eruv".
- The phone may be used to call the fire department, doctor, ambulance.
- Flames may be extinguished directly if necessary to save human life (even if the danger is remote).
- Medicines may be obtained and administered.

These activities should not be performed by a child or non-Jew, unless it is certain that this will cause no delay. If it is absolutely certain that the same thing could be just as quickly and efficiently accomplished with a child or non-Jew, they should be asked instead.

### B) Extinguishing the blaze

As a general rule, one may not directly extinguish a fire if it poses *absolutely no threat to life* even if he stands to lose his entire fortune.

It should be emphasized, however, that *most home fire-emergencies are Pikuach Nefesh situations*. This means that it is usually permitted to put out a sudden fire *immediately and directly*.

Most house fires are Pikuach Nefesh because it is rare that one can be immediately certain that a home or building threatened by fire can be quickly and safely evacuated without any dangerous ramifications. This is especially true in large cities because:

(Insight...continued from page 1)  
meat, even if he already fish. He can claim that he prefers to eat the second food rather than the first. This is true regarding any two "types" of foods. ■

- City residents are housed in large apartment buildings and multiple-dwellings that are difficult or impossible to safely evacuate.
- Buildings and structures are close to each other, thereby speeding the spread of fire and increasing its danger.
- Once a city or any part of it is ablaze, it is inevitable that at least some individuals will be caught in the flames and unable to escape.

However, in some suburban and rural communities, these dangers are not as apparent. There are fewer multiple dwellings, and the homes and buildings are set far apart. Even so, a house fire in these communities is often permitted to be put out directly on Shabbos because Pikuach Nefesh situations commonly exist when there is a fire, even in these sparsely populated areas. This is particularly true if:

- The home is a multiple-family unit (two or more families), because one cannot account for every resident or visitor who may be in the building.
- There are small children in the house who might not be evacuated safely.
- There are elderly, infirm, or ill persons in the house who might not be evacuated quickly and safely.
- The weather is inclement (e.g. cold, wet) and persons escaping the fire will be unable to dress properly and may succumb (in the short or long-term) to the elements.

However, if one knows *for a fact* that there is no danger to human life if the house goes ablaze (e.g. there are only adults present who can safely leave their rural or suburban, single-family home that is very distantly spaced from other homes), he may not put out the fire directly. Similarly, a fire in a secluded country home, bungalow, shed, warehouse, etc. where there is clearly no reason to fear that it will spread dangerously out of control may not be put out directly if everyone was evacuated. One may also not call the fire department in this case, nor may he explicitly instruct a non-Jew to extinguish the blaze.

However, he may notify a non-Jewish neighbor of the fire, and may even indicate, indirectly, that the non-Jew will be rewarded for calling for help or extinguishing the flames (e.g., by saying "Whoever calls the fire department will not be unrewarded"). ■

1 The 39 Melachos, by Rabbi Dovid Ribiat, pages 795-796. Used with permission of the author.

# Distinctive INSIGHT

## Food for All

מצילין מזון שלש סעודות. הראוי לאדם לאדם, הראוי לבהמה לבהמה

Beis Yosef (O.C. 334) rules that even if a person has provisions which are adequate for Shabbos, he may still avail himself to the full limit allowed by the Mishnah, and he may salvage the amount of food necessary for the

three Shabbos meals. Furthermore, if the household owner himself already saved a basket filled with loaves, the other members of his family may each enter and bring out three meals worth of food apiece.

Mishnah Berura (334, #10) paskens that even a person who is in the middle of fasting on Shabbos (which is permitted if one had a very troubling dream), he may still utilize this guide of the Mishnah, and he may go in and bring out the full allotment of food, because the ruling of the sages is standard for all people

in all situations.

The Pri Megadim (ibid. #4) presents an inquiry regarding whether the householder himself may save food for himself and for the members of his family, or whether they must each get their allotted rations themselves. The Bi'ur Halacha concludes that a person may save enough food for his family members. He bases his rationale upon the situation we find regarding Yom Kippur, where a man may save food, although it is understood that the food would be for his young children. ■

