



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Bava Kamma Daf Nun Hey

- **R' Chanina ben Agil** asked **R' Chiya bar Abba**, why is it that in the first Dibros the word "tov" is not mentioned, but in the second Dibros it is (regarding the mitzvah of kibud av v'eim)? He responded, "I don't even know if the word "tov" is written there at all. Go to **R' Tanchum bar Chanilai** who would learn by **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**, who was an expert in Aggadah, and he should be able to answer you." He went to him and **R' Tanchum** said, "I didn't hear anything from **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**, but **Shmuel bar Nachum**, the uncle (or grandfather) of **R' Acha the son of R' Chanina** said, since the first Dibros were destined to be broken, the word "tov" wasn't written in them.
 - **Q:** Why would this be a reason not to write tov in them? **A: R' Ashi** said, that would have seemed as if "tov" was being taken away from the Yidden, so it wasn't written there at all.
- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, if one sees the letter "tes" in a dream, it is a good sign.
 - **Q:** Presumably this is because the letter tes can be understood as standing for the word tov. However, there is a word "teiteisih", which refers to punishment, which also begins with a tes!? **A:** That word has two letter tes, and we were discussing someone who sees one letter tes.
 - **Q:** The word "tumasa" (written regarding the destruction of Yerushalayim) is written with one tes!? **A:** We were discussing someone who sees a tes and a beis (which are both contained in the word tov).
 - **Q:** The word "tavu" (written regarding the destruction of Yerushalayim) is written with a tes and a beis!? **A:** A letter tes is a good sign, because the first time that the letter tes is used in the Torah is for the word "tov".
 - **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, if one sees the word "hesped" in a dream, it is a sign that Heaven has redeemed him from his troubles. However, this is only if he sees the word written.

V'CHEIN CHAYA V'OF KAYOTZEI BAHEN...

- **Reish Lakish** said, **Rebbi** taught here that a chicken, a "tavus" and a "pasyuni" are considered klayim one to the other.
 - **Q:** This seems obvious!? **A: R' Chaviva** said, these species all live together, which would lead us to think that they are considered of one species.
- **Shmuel** said, a goose and a wild goose are klayim one to the other.
 - **Q: Rava bar R' Chanan** asked, what is the reason for this? If it is because one has a long beak and one has a short one, then we should also say that a Persian camel and an Arabian camel are different species, because one has a thick neck and one has a thin neck, and yet we don't consider them to be separate species!? **A: Abaye** said, the reason the geese are klayim is because one has his "beitzim" outside the body and the other has them inside the body. **R' Pappa** said, one lays only one egg at a time, whereas the other can lay multiple eggs at one time.
- **R' Yirmiya in the name of Reish Lakish** said, if one mates two different species of sea animals he gets malkus. **R' Adda bar Ahava in the name of Ulla** explained, this is learned from a gezeira shava on the word "limineihu" from land animals.
 - **Q: Rachva** asked, if someone has his wagon pulled by a goat and a fish (he is travelling at the water's edge), is this a problem of klayim? Maybe we say that since the goat doesn't go into the water and the fish doesn't go onto the dry land, it is not considered that they are doing this together, and therefore there is no problem, or maybe we say that it is still assur?

- **Q: Ravina** asked, this seems similar to the case where someone takes a grain of wheat and a grain of barley and plants one just in EY and one just outside of EY – will you say he is chayuv? The same should therefore be in the case of the fish and the goat!? **A:** It is not a good comparison. With regard to the planting, EY is obligated in klayim and outside EY is not. With regard to the fish and goat, they are both in a place of klayim obligation, and therefore maybe there is a klayim problem.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK SHOR SHENAGACH ES HAPARAH!!!

PEREK HAKONEIS -- PEREK SHISHI

MISHNA

- If a person brought his sheep into a fenced in area and locked the gate properly in front of it, and the animal escaped and did damage, he is patur. If he did not lock the gate properly and it escaped and damaged, he is chayuv.
- If the fence was breached at night, or was breached by robbers, and the sheep escaped and did damage, he is patur. If the robbers took it out, the robbers are chayuv.
- If the sheep was left in the sun, or if he gave it to a cheireish, shoteh, or katan to watch, and it escaped and damaged, he is chayuv. However, if he gave it to a shepherd, the shepherd steps into his place.
- If the animal fell into a garden and benefitted from the produce there, he must pay for the amount that he benefitted. If the animal went down into the garden in its usual way (it didn't fall in) and did damage, he must pay for what was damaged.
 - How does one pay for what was damaged? We appraise how much a "beis se'ah" in that field was worth before it was damaged, and how much it is worth after it was damaged, and he pays the difference. **R' Shimon** says, if the animal ate ripe produce, he must pay for the value of the ripe produce – if it ate a se'ah, he pays for a se'ah, if it ate 2 se'ah, he pays for 2 se'ah.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, what is called "properly" and what is "not properly"? A gate that can withstand a normal wind is called "properly". If it cannot, it is called "not properly".
 - This is a low level guarding (the gate can only withstand a normal wind). **R' Mani bar Patish** said, the Mishna must be following **R' Yehuda**, who is the one who holds that a low level watching is enough for a muad (the Mishna is discussing cases of shein and regel, which are always a muad), as we find in a Mishna. The Mishna says, if the owner tied his ox with a rein, or locked a gate properly in front of it, and the animal got loose and damaged, **R' Meir** says the owner would still be chayuv, whether the animal is a tam or a muad. **R' Yehuda** says, if the animal is a tam, the owner would be chayuv, but if it is a muad, he would be patur, because the pasuk regarding a muad says "v'lo yishmirenu b'alav", and this person did guard the muad. **R' Eliezer** says the only way to guard a muad is to shecht it.
 - The Gemara says, our Mishna can even follow **R' Meir**, because shein and regel are different, as we find that the Torah reduced the required level of guarding needed for shein and regel. We find that **R' Elazar**, or a Braisa, says, there are 4 things for which the Torah reduced the level of guarding needed: bor, fire, shein, and regel. Regarding bor the Torah says he is patur by simply covering it, without having to refill it. Regarding fire we learn from the pasuk that he is only chayuv if he was negligent. Regarding shein we learn from the pasuk that he is only chayuv if he was negligent. Regarding regel we learn from the pasuk that he is only chayuv if he was negligent. From here we learn, that as long as he was not negligent he would be patur.
 - **Rabbah** said, our Mishna also suggests that it is only talking about shein and regel, and not keren, because we have always been discussing an ox. Why is it that we now switch to discuss a sheep? It is because we are only discussing shein and regel, and not keren. And, we can learn that with regard to the muad of shein and regel, the Torah teaches that a lesser guarding suffices.