



1 The Gemara began with clarifying the Mishnah at the bottom of דף כ"ט עמוד ב, which states as follow:

המכבה את הנר - One who extinguishes a light on שבת for one of the following reasons;

מפני שהוא מתירא מפני נכרים ומפני לסטים -

As Rashi explains - Because he's afraid of Persian idolaters - who had a law that on holidays, lights may be lit in their houses of worship only.

Or he's afraid of bandits, and wants to not be seen.

מפני רוח רעה -

He finds the darkness to be soothing.

מפני החולה שישן -

So that a sick person may sleep

פטור - In all of the above cases he is exempt.

However,

כחס על הנר, כחס על השמן, כחס על הפתילה חייב -

If he extinguishes the light to spare the lamp, the oil, or the wick, he is obligated to bring a קרבן חטאת - an offering of atonement.

2 Now, we must first clarify the following two points:

A. There is a general dispute between R' Shimon and R' Yehudah regarding מלאכה שאינה צריכה לגופה - a melachah performed not for its defined constructive purpose - such as one who digs a hole, not for the sake of plowing, which would be the melocho of חורש, but rather because he wants to use the dirt. R' Shimon holds, מלאכה שאינה צריכה לגופה is פטור, exempt from a chattos, and R' Yehudah holds that he is חייב חטאת.

B. The Melachah of כיבוי - extinguishing a flame - is considered מלאכה שאינה צריכה לגופה only when it is done for the purpose of creating charcoal, but if done for any other purpose, such as, to conserve oil, or to make the room dark, it is considered a מלאכה שאינה צריכה לגופה and one's liability in such a case is subject to the dispute of R' Shimon and R' Yehudah.

1

**המכבה את הנר**

מפני שהוא מתירא...

מפני נכרים ומפני לסטים

מפני רוח רעה

מפני החולה שישן

כחס על הנר

כחס על השמן

כחס על הפתילה

**חייב** קרבן חטאת

**פטור**

2

**מלאכה שאינה צריכה לגופה**

רבי יהודה

רבי שמעון

**חייב**

**פטור**

**כיבוי**

מלאכה שאינה צריכה לגופה

מלאכה שצריכה לגופה

Conserve Oil

Creating Charcoal



3 The Gemara thus deduces from the second part of the Mishnah which says that one who extinguishes a lamp to spare the lamp from cracking or to conserve oil is Chayiv, that our Mishnah evidently reflects the view of R' Yehudah who holds a מלאכה שאין צריכה לגופא חייב - one is liable for performing a melacha not for its intended purpose.

Therefore, we must say the first part of the Mishnah which exempts one who extinguished the lamp out of fear of robbers or for the sake of darkening the room for a sick person, is speaking of a case of פיקוח נפש - a matter of life and death - for which one may violate Shabbos.

The Gemara concludes accordingly, that when the first part of the Mishnah states that one who extinguishes the lamp for fear of danger is "פטור" "exempt from a chattos" it does not mean פטור אבל אסור - that he is exempt after the fact but he's not permitted to do so, rather, it actually is מותר - permitted in the first place - because pikuach nefesh overrides Shabbos. The Mishnah used the word פטור because this term is in contrast to the second part of the Mishnah which states חייב.

3

One who extinguishes a lamp to spare the lamp or to conserve oil is חייב

רבי יהודה  
מלאכה שאין צריכה לגופא  
**חייב**

One who extinguished the lamp out of fear of robbers or for the sake of darkening the room for a sick person

**פיקוח נפש**  
One may violate Shabbos  
פטור מחטאת

פטור אבל אסור ✗  
פטור ומותר ✓

4 The Gemara then cites a Braisa of R' Oshaya who explicitly stated: One who extinguishes a lamp for the sake of a sick person is פטור אבל אסור - exempt but forbidden - clearly indicating that he is not referring to case of Pikuach Nefesh, for otherwise it would be permitted in the first place. The Gemara explains that R' Oshaya follows the opinion of R' Shimon, who holds מלאכה שאינה צריכה לגופא פטור and therefore one who extinguishes a lamp to darken the room for a sick person is exempt from a chattos even though the person is not dangerously ill, but it is forbidden to do so in the first place.

4

רבי אושעיא  
**פטור אבל אסור** ?

רבי שמעון  
מלאכה שאין צריכה לגופא  
**פטור אבל אסור**



5 The Gemara then digresses into various Aggadic teachings: Rav Tanchum notes that while דוד המלך says in Tehillim קה לא המתים יהללו קה - the dead cannot praise Hashem - thus indicating the advantageous position of the living, שלמה המלך in קהלת states the opposite: ושבח אני את המתים שכבר מתו - I praise the dead who have already died. And moreover, Shlomo HaMelech contradicts himself in this matter, for he writes elsewhere in Koheles מן האריות המתה טובה מן הכלב החי - A live dog is better than a dead lion - thus indicating as Dovid HaMelech said, the advantage of the living!?

Rav Tanchum resolves these contradictions as follows. Dovid HaMelech is referring to the fact that only the living can perform Mitzvos and study Torah, whereas regarding the dead it says elsewhere in T'hillim

כיון שמת אדם נעשה חפשי מן התורה - במתים חפשי - Which means - After death a person is free - so to speak - he can no longer learn Torah and perform Mitzvos.

On the other hand, when Shlomo haMelech praised the dead he was referring to the fact that it is advantageous to pray in the merit of great people who have died, as we find that Moshe Rabbeinu's prayers after the sin of the Eigel were answered only after he invoked the z'chus of the אבות who were already deceased.

Alternatively, when Shlomo praised the dead, he was referring to the fact that the past leaders of Klal Yisrael, such as Moshe Rabbeinu, had more influence on our generation than the present day leaders - as people still faithfully heed Moshe Rabbeinu's decrees but not necessarily the decrees of today's leaders.

Thirdly, the Gemara explains that when Shlomo HaMelech praised the dead, he was referring to the incident during the inauguration of the Bais Hamikdash, where the gates refused to open despite all of Shlomo HaMelech's entreaties, until he invoked the z'chus of his father, Dovid.

R' Tanchum then explains what Shlomo Hamelech meant by his statement in Koheles: מן האריות המתה טובה מן הכלב החי הוא טוב מן האריות המתה - A live dog is better than a dead lion:

After recounting the famous story of Dovid Hamelech's death, and how the מלאך המות got him to interrupt his learning on Shabbos so that he could take his life, the Gemara tells how Shlomo was disturbed upon seeing Dovid's corpse laying in the sun and was told that he was forbidden to directly move the corpse to the shade because a corpse is Muktzah on Shabbos. Rather, it could only be moved indirectly by first placing a ככר או תינוק - a loaf of bread or child - on it. In contrast, when Shlomo inquired as to whether he was permitted feed Dovid HaMelech's hungry dogs, he was told that he was permitted to feed them without restriction, thus prompting Shlomo to exclaim that a live dog is better than a dead lion!

5

**שלמה המלך**

**ושבחה אני את המתים שכבר מתו**

*I praise the dead*

*It is advantageous to pray in the merit of great people who have died*

*Incident during the inauguration of the Bais Hamikdash*



**זכות אבות דוד המלך**

**דוד המלך**

**לא המתים יהללו קה**

*The dead cannot praise Hashem*

*Only the living can perform Mitzvos*

**במתים חפשי כיון שמת אדם נעשה חפשי מן התורה ומן המצוות**

**כי לכלב חי הוא טוב מן האריות המתה**






6 The Gemara then goes on to cite other pesukim in Koheles that seem to contradict one another:

In one posuk Sholomo states טוב כעס משחוק - anger is better than laughter - implying that laughter is not good, while in another posuk Shlomo indicates the opposite, for he writes: לשחוק אמרתי מהולל - of laughter I have said, it is praiseworthy.

In answer, the Gemara explains that the first posuk refers to Olam HaZeh, and it means to say: The anger that Hashem expresses towards Tzadikim in this world is better than the laughter that Hashem shows the wicked in this world, for the punishment visited upon tzadikim in this world allows them to receive a full reward in Olam HaBoh. The second posuk extolling laughter refers to the reward that Tzaddikim will receive in Olam Haboh.

6

קהלת

לשחוק אמרתי מהולל	טוב כעס משחוק
laughter is praiseworthy	laughter is not good
↓	↓
עולם הבא	עולם הזה

7 The Gemara also resolves an apparent contradiction in Koheles regarding Shimcha - joy: One posuk indicates that joy is a good thing for it states ושבחתי אני את השמחה - I have praised joy, while another posuk disparages joy, for it states ולשמחה מה זה עושה - What does joy accomplish?! The Gemara explains that the latter posuk refers to joy that is not associated with a mitzvah, whereas the first posuk refers to joy associated with a mitzvah.

7

קהלת

ולשמחה מה זה עושה	ושבחתי אני את השמחה
Joy is not good	Joy is a good thing
↓	↓
Not associated with a mitzvah	שמחה של מצוה

8 The Gemara goes on to point out a seeming contradiction between two pesukim in Mishlei: One posuk states אל תען כסיל כאולתו - do not answer a fool according to his foolishness, whereas another posuk states the opposite: ענה כסיל כאולתו - answer a fool according to his foolishness.

The Gemara answers that the latter posuk refers to a fool who challenges someone in Torah matters. In that case, one should refute the scoffer's question and not ignore it, lest he think that he is correct. However, the second posuk, advising one to ignore a fool and not bother refuting his questions, refers to questions concerning general (non-Torah) matters.

The Gemara then gives examples of both types of situations, citing stories where fools challenged certain sages regarding general matters and were ignored and stories where scoffers challenged sages regarding Torah matters and they were answered.

8

משלי

ענה כסיל כאולתו	אל תען כסיל כאולתו
Answer a fool	Don't answer a fool
↓	↓
Torah matters	General matters

