



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

Bava Basra Daf Pey Aleph

MISHNA

- If one buys two trees from another, he does not get any land along with those trees. **R' Meir** says that one who buys 2 trees does get land along with the trees.
 - If the trees grew over the seller's land, the seller may not trim the branches.
 - If new trees grow from the bought trees, if they grow from the trunk (above ground) they belong to the buyer. If they grow from the roots, they belong to the seller.
 - If the trees die, the buyer has no rights to the land (and therefore can't plant a new tree in their place).
 - If one buys 3 trees, he is koneh land along with the trees. Therefore, if the trees grow over the seller's land he may trim them, if any new trees grow from these trees – whether from the trunk or the roots – it belongs to the buyer, and if the trees die he may plant new trees in their place.

GEMARA

- A Mishna says that one who buys two trees in his friend's field brings bikkurim but does not read the parsha. **R' Meir** says he brings and reads the parsha. Presumably, **R' Meir's** view is based on his view in our Mishna, that the buyer of two trees also gets land.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said that **R' Meir** would require bringing bikkurim and reading the parsha even for one who bought first fruits of a tree in the market. Based on this, this psak of **R' Meir** has nothing to do with his view in our Mishna.
 - **Q: R' Meir** only speaks of one who bought the trees, so how does **Shmuel** know that he would say the same thing if the fruits themselves were bought? **A:** He learns this from the fact that both the Mishnayos seem to be teaching the same point of **R' Meir**. Therefore, it must be that it is teaching something else – namely that he brings and reads even when the fruits themselves were purchased.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says “asher tavi mei'artzecha” – which suggests the fruits must have been grown on your land!? **A:** That only teaches to exclude fruits grown in chutz laaretz.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says “admascha” – which again suggests the fruits must come from “your land” (and not purchased)? **A:** That comes to exclude fruit grown in EY on land belonging to a goy.
 - **Q:** The pasuk says “asher nasata li”? **A:** That can mean that the person says that Hashem gave him the money to purchase the fruits that he is bringing as bikkurim.
 - **Q: Rabbah** asked, a Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, if one purchases one tree, he brings bikkurim but does not read the parsha, because he has not acquired any land. From here we clearly see that **R' Meir** requires one to own the land in order to read the parsha when he brings bikkurim!? **TEYUFTA.**
 - **R' Shimon ben Elyakim** said to **R' Elazar**, what is the logic of the view of **R' Meir** when someone buys one tree (where he said that the person brings bikkurim, but does not read the parsha) and what is the logic of the **Rabanan** when someone buys 2 trees (where they also say that the person brings bikkurim, but does not read the parsha)? **R' Elazar** said, this is something that these Tanna'im didn't explain, and you are now asking this to me in public to try and embarrass me!? **Rabbah** said, it may be that in these cases they are unsure whether land is purchased along with the trees, and therefore

they require the person to bring the bikkurim, but don't allow him to read the parsha when he does so.

- **Q:** How can we say that they are unsure if land is purchased in that case, when the Braisa said that **R' Meir** clearly said that no land is purchased when he buys one tree!? **A:** Understand the Braisa to say that the reason he does not read is because "maybe he has not acquired any land along with the purchase".
- **Q:** How can we say that a person who may not even own the land must still bring bikkurim? It is possible that what he is bringing is not bikkurim, and would thereby bring chulin into the Azarah!? **A:** The person will be makdish the fruits (on the condition that they are not truly bikkurim), and therefore, even if it is not bikkurim, it would still be brought into the Azarah as hekdesch.
 - **Q:** How can he be makdish the fruit and then give it to the Kohen to eat? One may not eat fruit belonging to hekdesch!? **A:** The person would redeem it before giving it to the Kohen.
 - **Q:** If he does this and it is not truly bikkurim, in truth they should be chayuv in terumah and maaser, which he is not giving!? **A:** He separates terumah and maaser before giving it to the Kohen.
 - **Q:** The terumah part can be given to the Kohen (which is what must be done with terumah in any case). The maaser sheini can be given to the Kohen as well (because it belongs to the owner). Maaser ani can be dealt with as well, by giving it to a poor Kohen. However, how will he deal with the maaser rishon (which must be given to a Levi)? **A:** The maaser rishon may also be given to a Kohen, as is the view of **R' Elazar ben Azarya** in a Braisa.
 - **Q:** If the fruit are truly bikkurim he should have to read the parsha, and if he doesn't he will not be yotzeh!? **A:** The reading of the parsha is not necessary to be yotzeh the obligation of giving bikkurim.
 - **Q:** That is true if the parsha *can* be said, but wasn't. However, in this case the parsha *cannot* be said, and therefore it should prevent the obligation from being fulfilled!? **A:** The owner has one person harvest the fruit and another person bring it to the Beis Hamikdash. In such a case **R' Yose bar Chanina** learns from a pasuk that the parsha is not read. In that way, the reading of the parsha is not part of the bikkurim obligation.
 - **Q:** **R' Acha the son of R' Avya** asked **R' Ashi**, the parsha that must be read is a parsha in the Torah, so why can't the person simply read it (and if he was not supposed to, it will be like reading any other parsha in the Torah)!? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, because it looks like he is lying. **R' Mesharshiya the son of R' Chiya** said, we don't allow it, because it may lead people to treat the fruit as absolute bikkurim, and to think that they are patur from terumah and maaser.