

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **More lists formulated by R' Yehudah (cont.) and others**
The Gemara explains the three things that lengthen a person's life.

R' Yehudah lists three things that shorten a person's life, and the Gemara provides sources for these ideas.

R' Yehudah lists three things that require mercy, and support for this list is found in a saying of R' Yochanan.

The Gemara proceeds to quote teachings related to appointing leaders, to Betzael and to wisdom.

2) **A series of quotes from R' Chisda related to dreams**

3) **Different issues related to dreams are mentioned**

4) **How to create a positive outcome from a bad dream**

A person who has a bad dream is to go to three others and they should responsively declare that the dream should have a positive outcome. The three are to recite a series of pesukim related to transformation, redemption and peace.

5) **The novel teachings of Ameimar, Mar Zutra and R' Ashi**

One of the mentioned Amoraim taught the others about the tefillah to recite during Birkas Kohanim regarding dreams.

The second Amora taught about how to protect oneself from the Eyn HaRa of others as well as not putting an עין הרע on others.

The third Amora taught that one should not publicize his illness until at least the second day.

6) **The topic of dreams continues.** ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Interdiction to refuse being called to the Torah

ואמר רב יהודה שלשה דברים מקצרים ימיו ושנותיו של אדם: מי שנותניג לו ספר תורה לקרות ואינו קורא, כוס של ברכה לברך ואינו מברך, והמנהיג עצמו ברבנות. ספר תורה לקרות ואינו קורא דכתיב כי הוא חייך ואורך ימך. - נה.

Rav Yehuda said that there are three things that shorten the days and years of a person: a person who was given the opportunity to read the Torah, and refuses to read; a person offered to make the blessing after the meal, and refuses; a person who comports himself with authority. - 55a

This passage regarding the interdiction of refusal to be called to the Torah is codified by the Rif¹ and the Rosh², however, very interestingly³, it is not recorded by Rambam or the Shulchan Aruch. The Eliyahu Rabba⁴ posits that this omission is due to a change in the reading custom. In Talmudic times, each person who was called to the Torah would himself read. However, today the custom is that there is an

(Halachah Highlight...continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

The guest who chooses to defer an honor

שלשה דברים מקצרים שנותיו של אדם וכו' מי שנותנים לו ס"ת לקרות ואינו קורא וכו' כוס של ברכה לברך ואינו מברך דכתיב ואברכה מברך - נה.

Three things shorten a person's life: If someone is offered a Torah to read, and he does not read from it...If one is given a cup with which to bless, and he defers the opportunity. - 55a

Shulchan Aruch (O.C. 201) rules according to this Gemara, that a person who is offered the cup to bentch should not turn it down. Yet, Magen Avraham comments, based upon Rashi, that this only refers to a guest who is asked to lead the bentching and thereby pronounce a blessing for the host. However, if the person being asked is not the guest, his refusal would not indicate his being an ingrate, and the penalty of a shortened life would not be applied. Furthermore, even a guest is only liable if he refuses the opportunity for no good reason. However, if he defers to someone else in order to honor him, because this shows no indication of being unappreciative of the host, the guest would not be liable for a shortening of his life.

The proof for this is that among the situations which deserve shortening of life is one who refuses when called to the Torah. Teshuvos Radba"z (1:304) writes that in this case, if the person denies the aliyah due to an appropriate reason, he is allowed to refuse. Because his reluctance is not a reflection of his mocking or despising the Torah, the penalty does not apply. Similarly here, if the guest chooses to defer and not lead the bentching in order to honor someone more deserving than he, this is allowed.

It is noteworthy that although these two statements were both made by Rabbi Yehuda, the Shulchan Aruch only rules according to the statement about not refusing to lead the bentching. The second statement about one who refuses an aliya to the Torah is not mentioned in Shulchan Aruch (see Magen Avraham 53:#22). ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What household item provides a person with atonement?

2. Will dreams be fulfilled in their entirety?

3. What should a person do if he doesn't know what he saw in his dream?

4. How is the outcome of a dream determined?

(Halachah Highlight ... Continued from page 1)

established reader who reads for each person called. Some Poskim⁵ do respond to the challenge of the Eliyahu Rabbah. Nevertheless, some of the premier commentators to the Shulchan Aruch⁶ do cite this statement, notwithstanding the fact that the operative custom in many communities is that there is an established reader.

Here are some additional applications presented by the Poskim:

- The malediction applies only if the person was called to the Torah, and refused; but, if the person senses that he will be called, he may⁷ leave between Aliyos before being called and not be subject to the malediction. [It should be noted that Rabbi Chaim Falaji⁸ records a frightening incident where an individual who was called to the Torah, got up and left. Within a month a terrible end befell him.]
- Some Poskim opine that there is permission for refusal if the refusal is justifiable. Examples⁹: If one's brother had been called to the previous Aliyah¹⁰. If one is called to Maftir, but is aware that another congregant has Yahrzeit that day and he would be very hurt that he was overlooked¹¹. However, if his refusal is because he doesn't like the reader, or the portion he is being called to isn't exciting to him, these are not considered justifiable reasons for refusal¹². Basis is found for this concept of exception in the words of the Meiri¹³ who qualifies the refusal as being out of arrogance (מתוך גאווה שבו). This implies¹⁴

that if the refusal is not out of pompousness, but has some justification, it can be permitted.

- Barring justifiable cause, a person should exercise true caution in regard to this matter and not refuse an Aliyah¹⁵. ■

- 1 רי"ף (ריש פ"ט דברכות, דמ"ג ע"א בדפי הרי"ף)
- 2 רא"ש (ברכות פ"ט ס"ד)
- 3 העיר הרב החבי"ב בסי שיירי כנה"ג (סי קלט בהגה"ט אות ד') וכן רבי ישעיה פיק בסי אומר השכחה (או כו', דף ו' ע"ב). ע"ש. וכן העיר בעולת תמיד (סי קלט ס"ק ה') על מרן שהשמיטו משו"ע. ועיי בשו"ת צ"ץ אליעזר ח"י"ד (סי לד שאלה א' אות א').
- 4 סי קלט ס"ק ב
- 5 ראה לדוגמא בתורת חיים סופר (סי קלט ס"ק א') ובסי בני ציון ליכטמאן (שם ס"ק ג)
- 6 מג"א (סי נג ס"ק כב) ובפרי"ח (סי קלט ס"א) ועוד.
- 7 מחצית השקל (סי קלט ס"ק כב) ע"פ המג"א שם.
- 8 עיי שו"ת לב חיים ח"י"ג (ס"ס יב ד"ה המורס, דף יז ע"א). והביאו בשו"ת צ"ץ אליעזר ח"י"ד (סי לד שאלה א' אות ח')
- 9 עיי עוד בשו"ת תורה לשמה (סי צה) ובסי חשוקי חמד (כאן, עמ' שמט) ובסי פסקי תשובות (סי קלט אות א)
- 10 שו"ת תורה לשמה (סי תכה). ועיי גם בשו"ת צ"א שם (אות ד')
- 11 שכן כתבו כמה אחרונים.
- 12 שו"ת שבט הקהתי ח"ד (סי נ')
- 12 שו"ת תורה לשמה (סי תכה)
- 13 כאן (עמ' 205)
- 14 עינים למשפט כאן (דף קנ ע"א)
- 15 שו"ת צ"ץ אליעזר שם (אות ט') ■

STORIES off the Daf

The validity of details in dreams

אי אפשר לחלום בלא דברים בטלים - נה.
It is impossible that a dream not have some meaningless aspects. - 55a

Shulchan Aruch (Yoreh De'ah 210:2) rules that if a person makes an oath in a dream, the oath has no validity, and it does not have to be nullified. However, there are those who say that ten men should be assembled to nullify the oath, and it is appropriate to consider this opinion. The Sha"ch comments that even if in the dream itself the dreamer sees that ten people nullified the oath, this is not adequate, be-

cause we have to suspect that the nullification was the part of the dream that was worthless, and that the oath is still valid.

Pischei Teshuva cites a case which was brought before the Chasam Sofer. A person saw in his dream that he took an oath not to eat cooked matzah during Pesach that year. According to the second opinion of the Shulchan Aruch, the oath is binding. The question was does the dreamer have to consider the stipulation of Pesach "that year" as a part of the dream which was null, and he was therefore prohibited from cooked matzah every year, or could it be that he was prohibited only that year's Pesach alone.

The Chasam Sofer answered that the dreamer was only prohibited from

eating cooked matzah that year alone. He reasoned that if we were to treat the phrase "that year" as meaningless, perhaps we might interpret the word "Pesach" or "matzah" as worthless terms. This would put into question whether he was prohibited from cooked matzah all year long (if we were to disregard the limitation of Pesach), or that he could not have matzah in any shape or form (if the word cooked were to be discounted). Rather, the only element of an oath in a dream which can be treated as superfluous is an independent aspect of the oath, such as whether the people who nullified it in the dream itself were meaningful. However, any aspect of the oath which describes the oath itself cannot be removed. ■

