

12 Tammuz 5780
July 4, 2020



Shabbos Daf 120

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

MISHNAH: One may save a basket full of loaves, even if it contains [sufficient for] a hundred meals, and a round cake of pressed figs, and a barrel of wine, and he [the owner] may say to others, ‘come and save for yourselves’; and if they are wise, they make a reckoning with him after the Shabbos. To where may they be saved? Into a courtyard provided with an eruv. Ben Beseirah said: even into a courtyard unprovided with an eruv. And to there he may carry out all the utensils [he requires] for his use; and he puts on all that he can put on and wraps himself in all that he can wrap himself; Rabbi Yosi said: [only] eighteen garments. Then he may put on [garments] afresh and carry them out, and say to others, ‘come and rescue with me.’ (120a)

GEMARA: But he [the Tanna] teaches in the first clause, three meals, but no more? — Said Rav Huna, There is no difficulty: here it means that he comes to save [the whole basket simultaneously]; there he comes to collect [food]: if he comes to save, he may save all; if he comes to collect, he may collect only for three meals. Rav Abba bar Zavda said in Rav’s name: Both are where one comes to collect, yet there is no difficulty: here it is into the same courtyard; there it is into another courtyard. (120a)

Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua asked: What if one spreads out his garments, collects and places [therein], collects and places [on it]? Is it like one who comes to save, or like one who comes to collect? — [Come and hear]:

Since Rava said, Rav Shizvi misled Rav Chisda by teaching, ‘Provided that he does not procure a vessel which holds more than three meals’, it follows that it is like one who comes to save, and it is permitted. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak observed to Rava: Why is it an error? — He replied: Because it is stated, ‘provided that he does not bring another vessel and catch [the dripping liquid] or another vessel and join it [to the roof]’: [thus] only another vessel may not [be brought], but he may save as much as he desires in the same vessel. (120a)

And a round cake of pressed figs, etc. What have we to do with a reckoning? Surely they acquire it from hefker? — Said Rav Chisda: They spoke here of pious conduct.¹ Will pious men take payment for the Shabbos? objected Rava. Rather said Rava, We refer here to a God-fearing person, who does not wish to benefit from others, yet is unwilling to trouble for nothing, and this is its meaning: And if they are wise, that they know that in such a case it is not payment for the Shabbos,² They make a reckoning with him after the Shabbos. (120a)

To where may they be saved, etc. Why does he state here [save] for yourselves, while there he states, rescue with me? — I will tell you: in connection with food he states. For yourselves, because food for three meals only is fit for himself; but in connection with garments he states, rescue

¹ A pious man will not take advantage of the fire to keep the food for himself.

² Since it is actually hefker and they do not stipulate for payment beforehand.

with me, because they are fit for him all day.³ (120a)

Our Rabbis taught: He may put on, carry out, and take off, then again put on, carry out, and take off, even all day: this is Rabbi Meir's view. Rabbi Yosi said: [Only] eighteen garments. And these are the eighteen garments: a cloak, undertunic, hollow belt, linen [sleeveless] tunic, shirt, felt cap, apron, a pair of trousers, a pair of shoes, a pair of socks, a pair of breeches, the girdle round his loins, the hat on his head and the scarf round his neck. (120a)

MISHNAH: Rabbi Shimon ben Nannos said: one may spread a goat skin over a box, chest, or trunk which has caught fire, because he sings;⁴ and one may make a barrier with all vessels, whether full [of water] or empty, that the fire should not travel onward. Rabbi Yosi forbids in the case of new earthen vessels filled with water, because since they cannot stand the heat, they will burst and extinguish the fire. (120a)

GEMARA: Rav Yehudah said in Rav's name: If a garment catches fire on one side, water may be poured on to it on the other, and if it is [thereby] extinguished, it is extinguished. An objection is raised: If a garment catches fire on one side, one may take it off and cover himself with it, and if it is extinguished, if it extinguished; and likewise if a Torah Scroll catches fire, one may spread it out and read it, and if it is extinguished, it is extinguished?⁵ — He rules as Rabbi Shimon ben Nannos.⁶ Yet perhaps Rabbi Shimon ben Nannos said [merely], because he sings: but did he rule [thus] of indirect extinguishing? — Yet, since the final clause teaches, Rabbi Yosi forbids in the case of new earthen vessels filled with water, because since they

³ He may wish to change many times during the day, so that he needs all for himself.

⁴ But does not burn it and at the same time it protects the boxes.

⁵ In each case probably the motion extinguishes it if the flame is very small. But the Tanna does not permit water.

⁶ Just as the fire may be arrested by a goatskin, so may it be arrested by water, seeing that it is not poured directly on the flame.

cannot stand the heat, they will burst and extinguish the fire, it follows that the first Tanna permits it. (120a – 120b)

Our Rabbis taught: If a lamp is on a board, one may shake [tip up] the board and it [the lamp] falls off, and if it is extinguished, it is extinguished. The School of Rabbi Yannai said: They learnt this only if one forgot [it there]; but if he placed [it there], it [the board] became a stand for a forbidden article.⁷ (120b)

A Tanna taught: If a lamp is behind a door, one may open and close [it] naturally, and if it is extinguished it is extinguished. Rav cursed this [ruling]. Said Ravina to Rabbi Acha the son of Rava — others state, Rabbi Acha the son of Rava to Rabbi Ashi — why did Rav curse this? Shall we say because Rav holds with Rabbi Yehudah,⁸ whereas the Tanna teaches as Rabbi Shimon? Because Rav holds with Rabbi Yehudah, if one teaches as Rabbi Shimon, shall he curse him! — Here, he replied, even Rabbi Shimon agrees, for Abaye and Rava both said: Rabbi Shimon agrees in a case of 'cut off his head and let him not die.'

Rav Yehudah said: One may open a door opposite a fire on the Shabbos. Abaye cursed this. What are the circumstances? If there is a normal wind [blowing], what is the reason of the one who forbids?⁹ — If there is an abnormal wind, what is the reason of the one who permits?¹⁰ — In truth, it refers to a normal wind: one Master holds, we prohibit preventively;¹¹ while the other Master holds, We do not prohibit preventively. (120b)

One may make a barrier, etc. Shall we say that the Rabbis hold that indirect extinguishing is permitted, while Rabbi

⁷ Sc. the lamp, which may not be handled on the Shabbos, and then the same applies to the board too.

⁸ That even an unintentional action is forbidden.

⁹ It is generally insufficient to fan it into a blaze, hence it is not a case of 'cut off his head' etc.

¹⁰ It will certainly make it burn up.

¹¹ Because if that is permitted, one will think that the door may be opened even if an abnormal wind is blowing.

Yosi holds that it is forbidden? But we know them [to maintain] the reverse. For it was taught: One may make a barrier of empty vessels and of full vessels which are not liable to burst; metal vessels. Rabbi Yosi said: The vessels of Kefar Shihin and Kefar Chananiah¹² too are not likely to burst!¹³ And should you answer, Reverse our Mishnah while Rabbi Yosi of the Baraisa argues on the view of the Rabbis; [it may be asked], But can you reverse them? Surely Rabbah bar Tachlifa said in Rav's name: 'Which Tanna holds that indirect extinguishing is forbidden? Rabbi Yosi!' Hence in truth you must not reverse it, the whole of the Baraisa being [the view] of Rabbi Yosi but there is as if there are missing words, and it was thus taught: One may make a barrier with empty vessels and with full vessels that are not likely to burst, and these are the vessels which are not likely to burst: metal vessels, and the vessels of Kefar Shihin and Kefar Chananiah too are not likely to burst. For Rabbi Yosi maintains: The vessels of Kefar Shihin and Kefar Chananiah too are not likely to burst.

Now, the Rabbis are self-contradictory and Rabbi Yosi is self-contradictory. For it was taught: If one has the [Divine] Name written on his skin, he must not bathe nor anoint [himself] nor stand in an unclean place. If he must perform an obligatory tevillah, he must wind a reed about it and descend and perform tevillah. Rabbi Yosi said: He may at all times descend and perform tevillah in the ordinary way, provided that he does not rub [it]?¹⁴ — There it is different, because Scripture said, And you shall destroy their name out of that place. Ye shall not do so unto Hashem your God: only [direct] action is forbidden, but indirect action is permitted. If so, here too it is written, you shall not do any work: only [direct] action is forbidden, but indirect action is permitted? — Since a man is excited over his property if you permit him [indirect action], he may come to extinguish it. If so, the Rabbis are self-contradictory: if

there, though a man is excited over his property, it is permitted, how much more so here? — Now, is that logical: this reed, how is it meant? If it is wound tightly, it is an interposition; [while] if it is not wound tightly the water enters. ([You speak of] 'an interposition' that follows from the ink? — The reference is to wet [ink for it was taught: Blood, ink, honey, and milk, if dry [on the skin] constitute an interposition; if moist, they do not constitute an interposition.) Yet still there is the difficulty? — Rather said Rava bar Shila: This is the reason of the Rabbis: because they hold one must not stand naked in the presence of the Divine Name. Hence it follows that Rabbi Yosi holds that one may stand naked in the presence of the Divine Name? — He places his hand upon it. Then according to the Rabbis too, let him place his hand upon it? He may chance to forget and remove it. Then according to Rabbi Yosi too, he may forget and remove it? — Rather [reply thus]. If a reed is available that is indeed so. The discussion is about going to seek a reed: the Rabbis hold: Tevillah in its [due] time is not a mitzvah, hence we seek [it]; whereas Rabbi Yosi holds: Tevillah in its [due] time is a mitzvah, hence we do not seek [it]. (120b – 121a)

¹² Kefar means a village or country town. The former was probably near Shihin in the vicinity of Sepphoris; the latter was a town in Galilee. The earthen vessels made there were fire proof.

¹³ This shows that he too permits only such. The Baraisa is thus

not actually the reverse of the Mishnah, but generally speaking we see that Rabbi Yosi is more lenient in the former, whereas in the Mishnah he is more stringent.

¹⁴ Intentionally with his hands. — Thus the Rabbis forbid even an indirect action, whereas Rabbi Yosi forbids only a direct action.