



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Differences between the two versions of the Ten Commandments (cont.)

The Gemara continues the dialogue between R' Chiya bar Abba and R' Chanina ben Agil related to the difference between the two versions of the Ten Commandments.

Tangentially, the Gemara cites two teachings from R' Yehoshua ben Levi regarding dreams.

### 2) Crossbreeding different creatures

Reish Lakish identifies different birds that may not be crossbred with one another.

The necessity for this ruling is explained.

Shmuel rules that one may not crossbreed a domestic goose and a wild goose with one another.

Rava bar R' Chanan challenges this ruling.

Abaye and R' Pappa offer different explanations why the domestic goose and wild goose are considered separate species.

R' Yirmiyah in the name of Reish Lakish rules that different sea creatures may not be mated with one another.

R' Ada bar Ahava in the name of Ulla identifies the source for this ruling.

### 3) Working with different species

Rechava inquires whether there is a prohibition against leading a wagon with a goat and fish at the same time.

Ravina unsuccessfully challenges the assumption that this could possibly be prohibited.

**הדרן עלך שור שנגח את הפרה**

**4) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses when one is liable for a sheep that escapes and damages and when one is exempt. The degree of liability and how the damages are assessed is also discussed.

### 5) Defining “properly” and “improperly”

*(Continued on page 2)*

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is the word **טוב** not mentioned in the first set of Ten Commandments?
2. What is the source that is prohibited to crossbreed aquatic creatures?
3. What is the definition of **כראוי** and **שלא כראוי**?
4. What are the four acts for which one is liable **בידי שמים**?

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Seeing the letter ‘ט’ in a dream

א”ר יהושע הרואה טי”ת בחלומו סימן יפה לו

Our Gemara lists various aspects of dreams and their meanings. Here, R' Yehoshua informs us that if a person sees the letter ‘ט’ in a dream, it is a good sign for him. Sefer **יפת תואר** asks that in general, the Gemara in Sanhedrin (30a) teaches that indications from dreams have no effect at all, not as good signs nor as bad omens. He explains that, in fact, dreams do have meaning, but their true significance cannot be discerned with a superficial outlook. In other words, some dreams might appear to be fortuitous, while they are actually foreboding. Others dreams might seem frightening, but their meaning is actually hopeful. In either case, our Gemara teaches that seeing the letter ‘ט’ is a good sign.

**יפה תואר** also notes that the Gemara in Berachos (56a) tells us that dreams follow the interpretation they are given. This is learned from the verse (Bereshis 40:22) where Yosef interpreted the dreams of the wine steward and the baker. The Torah says, “And it was, as he interpreted it for them, so it was.” The solution to this is that we cannot say that any dream, no matter what, can be interpreted for the best or for the worst, regardless of the actual dream. This would be unreasonable. Rather, the Gemara in Berachos means that the one who interprets a dream can have a great influence upon its outcome, although there is a limit to what extent he can change it. This can be understood along the lines of the power someone has to curse or bless another person, which can have an impact and influence a heavenly decree, but not always to reverse a situation completely. Nevertheless, a dream itself does have some indication of events to come.

Regarding the letter ‘ט’, Ben Yehoyada explains that the reason it is a good sign is that the gematria of **בחלום ט’** (95) is equal to **יפה**, good. Also, spelling out the letter ‘ט’ is **טי”ת**, which is equal to 419. This is equal to **בחלום** (with its four words). Also, nine (‘ט’) is an eternal number, as no matter how many times it is multiplied, its product’s numbers add up to the single digit nine (i.e.  $9 \times 123 = 1107$ . The numbers 1,1,0,7 add up to nine. Also,  $9 \times 365 = 3375$ , 3,3,7,5 add up to 18, and the 1,8 in turn adds up to nine).

Finally, Toras Chaim notes that the letter ‘ט’ did not appear at all within the ill-fated first luchos, which were ultimately smashed. The letter ‘ט’ is symbolic of good, and had it been on the luchos which were smashed it would have suggested that the good which was in store for the Jewish people was lost, **ח”ו**. ■

Today’s Daf Digest is dedicated  
 By Mr. and Mrs. Eric Rothner  
 In loving memory of their mother  
 Mrs. Shirley Rothner, ז”ל

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Fasting on Shabbos for a bad dream

Someone who sees ... in his dream

הרואה ... בחלום

Shulchan Aruch<sup>1</sup> writes that according to some opinions one should not fast for a bad dream on Shabbos unless he saw the dream three times. A second opinion maintains that nowadays one should never fast for a bad dream on Shabbos since we are not experts at interpreting dreams to know whether they are good or bad. Shulchan Aruch adds that people commonly assert ancient sources relate that there are three dreams for which one fasts even on Shabbos and they are seeing a Sefer Torah burned, seeing Yom Kippur during Neilah and seeing the beams of one's home or teeth falling. According to a second version if one sees Yom Kippur even if it is not during Neilah one should fast.

Kaf Hachaim<sup>2</sup> quotes Sefer Korban Mincha who decries the ruling cited in the name of ancient sources and claims that there is no reliable source for this practice. Moreover, he reports that when he sees Yom Kippur in a dream he makes the day into a Yom Tov. Since Chazal report that a person who responds יאה 'יהא' שמיא רבא וכו' in a dream is assured that he is going to the World-to-Come, certainly someone who sees Yom Kippur can feel confident that his transgressions have been forgiven and this message would only be stronger if the person saw Yom Kippur during Neilah. Kaf Hachaim, however, cites other authorities who maintain that one should not follow the practice of Sefer Korban Mincha on this point since the practice of fasting, even on Shabbos, when one sees Yom Kippur is cited by Shulchan Aruch and other authoritative sources, and it is assumed that the sources are

(Overview. Continued from page 1)

A Baraisa defines the terms of the Mishnah "properly" and "improperly."

In light of this explanation R' Mani bar Patish asserts that the Mishnah follows the opinion of R' Yehudah who maintains that מועד only requires a minimal degree of guarding.

The Gemara explains how the Mishnah could even follow the opinion of R' Meir since even R' Meir could agree that only a minimal degree of guarding is required for שן and רגל.

Proof that only a minimal degree of guarding is necessary for שן and רגל is cited.

Rabbah notes that the difference regarding the degree of guarding necessary could also be inferred from the wording of the Mishnah.

### 6) Exempt from laws of man but liable under the laws of Heaven

R' Yehoshua, cited in a Baraisa, presents four cases where a person is exempt from the laws of man but liable under the laws of Heaven.

The Gemara begins to analyze the circumstances of the case of one who breaches his friend's fence allowing animals to escape. ■

reliable.

Mishnah Berurah<sup>3</sup> writes that one should not fast on Shabbos unless fasting will provide him with a sense of pleasure עונג. For example, if a person is distressed about a dream and decides that fasting would put his mind at ease it is permitted but a person who does not pay much attention to dreams and was not particularly disturbed by his dream should not fast on Shabbos. ■

1. שר"ע אר"ח סי' רפ"ח סע' ה'

2. כף החיים שם ס"ק נ"ח

3. מ"ב שם ס"ק ט"ז ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Breaching the fence

הפורץ גדר לפני בהמת חבירו

A certain man ordered some garments through his friend who owned a clothing store. The evening after the garments arrived, the proprietor of the store told his friend, so that he could come to take them. The customer wished to take them immediately.

"No problem," said the owner of the store. "I will give you my key but since my store cannot be locked from the inside, you must go with my brother to be certain that no one steals something while you are getting the bundle."

He gave the key to his store to his friend and explained exactly where the bundle was. The man went to the brother's house but to his frustration he found that the brother was not at home. He decided to go to the store himself. After all, he had tried to find the man's brother and most likely no one would slip in and out as he was getting the bundle. He opened the lock on the outside of the store and went to the back where his bundle was. A few minutes later he exited and relocked the store.

The next day the owner was upset to find that something that was kept fairly close to the door went missing. He asked his brother if their friend had taken him to guard the store's entrance. When he heard that he had not he was shocked.

He immediately confronted his friend who said, "I am dreadfully sorry for your loss. But of course I am not obligated to pay you for it."

This question was brought before the Maharsham, zt"l. "In Bava Kamma 55 we find the Tosefta that one who broke a fence that was guarding his friend's animal is not obligated for damage the animal causes. The Rishonim argue whether the perpetrator must pay if the animal gets lost. Even according to the Rishonim who say he must pay, they agree that this is only regarding an animal which walks on its own. In our case, where the thief took an inanimate object, it is clearly a situation of gramma and the negligent one is not obligated to pay in an earthly court."<sup>1</sup> ■

1. שר"ת מהרש"ם חר"מ סי' שס"ה