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

Bechoros Daf Nun Daled

- A Mishna says, we may not take terumah from one species for another, and if one does so it is not valid terumah.
    - **Q:** How is this known? **A: R' Ami in the name of R' Yannai** (or **R' Ami in the name of Reish Lakish**) said, the pasuk regarding terumah says "kol cheilev yitzhar v'chol cheilev Tirosh v'dagan" – from the fact that "cheilev" ("the best") is written separately for each type, this teaches that terumah cannot be given from one for the other. Although that only teaches that "yitzhar" and "Tirosh" can't be combined, we also learn that even Tirosh and dagan also can't be combined, based on a kal v'chomer – if Tirosh and yitzhar, which are not kilayim with each other, may not be combined for purposes of terumah and maaser, then Tirosh and dagan, or dagan with other types of dagan, which are kilayim with each other, may surely not be combined.
        - **Q: R' Yoshiya** holds that kilayim is only created by mixing a kernel of wheat, a kernel or barley, and a grapeseed altogether. According to him we cannot learn from the kal v'chomer, because different species of produce are not kilayim with each other, and Tirosh and one other produce are not kilayim with each other. If so, how does he learn that one may not give terumah from one species for the other? **A:** He will darshan the following kal v'chomer – if Tirosh and yitzhar, which are not kilayim with each other even if they are combined with another substance, yet we may not take terumah from one for the other, then Tirosh and dagan, or different types of dagan, which do become kilayim when combined with each other and another substance, certainly cannot have terumah taken from one for the other.
        - **Q:** How do we know that even other types of foods may not have maaser taken from one for the other? **A:** Maaser on these other foods is only D'Rabanan, and the **Rabanan** institute things in a way that is similar to the D'Oraisa case.
        - **Q: Rava bar R' Chanan** asked **Abaye**, if the reason we can't give maaser from one species for another is because the pasuk wrote "cheilev" separately for each type, then regarding animal maaser, where the pasuk did not do that, we should be able to give maaser from one type of animal for another, and yet our Mishna said this may not be done!? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk of "ha'asiri" teaches that maaser must be given from "tzon" separately and from "bakar" separately.
            - **Q:** If so, one should not be able to give from sheep for goats and visa-versa, and yet our Mishna said that that is allowed!? **A:** The pasuk of "vatzon" includes goats and sheep.
                - **Q:** We should similarly say that "dagan" includes all species of grain!? **A: Abaye** said, "reishisam" written after "dagan" teaches that each species of dagan must have its own maaser separated. **A2: Rava** said, "vatzon" must come to teach that goats and sheep are combined, because if they are to be kept separate, the pasuk should have simply said "kol maaser beheima" and not differentiated between "bakar" and "tzon" and we would learn that goats and sheep cannot be combined. Since the Torah did write "bakar" and "tzon" it teaches that "bakar and tzon" can't be combined, but goats and sheep could be. However, "dagan" is needed to teach that other foods are patur from maaser, therefore it is not extra to darshen in this way.

- **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Nachman** asked, maybe instead darshen the extra words of bakar and tzon to teach that they are to be combined for maaser, rather than that they are to be treated separately? **A: Mar Zutra the son of R' Nachman** said, **Rava** also agrees with the drasha of "ha'asiri". **A2: Others** said that **Rava** said, without "asiri" we still couldn't say that bakar and tzon are to be combined, because we would darshen a hekesh between animal maaser and grain maaser – just as with grain maaser one may not give maaser from one species for another, the same is true for animal maaser.
    - **Q: Rava** said that "shana" teaches that the only comparison between these maaseros is in regard to not taking from the old for the new and visa-versa!? **A: Rava** retracted that view. **A2:** One of these two statements was actually said by **R' Pappa**, not **Rava**.

MISHNA

- For purposes of animal maaser, the animals are combined (to form a group of 10) if they are within an area as large as animals usually need to graze. How large is this? Sixteen mil.
    - If there were 32 mil between two groups of animals, they are not combined (to form a group of 10 animals) for maaser.
    - If there were animals between the two groups, the outer groups are brought to the middle group and are joined for maaser.
    - **R' Meir** said, the Yarden separates animals (on either side) from being combined for maaser.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that the area needed for grazing combines the animals for maaser? **A: Rabbah bar Shila** said, the pasuk suggests that sheep able to be controlled by one shepherd combines for maaser, and the **Rabanan** said that an area of 16 mil can be controlled by one shepherd.

HAYU BEIN EILU LA'EILU SHLOSHIM USHNAYIM MIL EIN MITZTARFIN…

- **Q:** This suggests that if there is less than 32 mil between them they are combined. However, the Mishna said they must be within 16 mil!? **A:** The Mishna gave this case only because it wanted to give the case of the group of animals that was between the two outer groups.
    - **Q:** How many animals must there be in the groups in the case where they are in two distant groups and one in between? **A: Rav** said there must be 5 animals in each outer group, and 5 animals in the middle. Since the middle animals are fit to be combined as a full group of ten with the group on either side, they have the ability to bring them all together. **Shmuel** said they combine even if there are 5 animals in each outer group and only one in the middle. The reason is, that we view the shepherd as if he is with the middle animals and he combines the two outer groups.
        - **Q:** A Braisa says that if there were 5 in one outer group and 5 in another outer group they only combine if there is also one in the middle. This refutes **Rav**!? **A: Shmuel** said that **Rav** can say that the Braisa is talking about a case where there were 9 animals in each outer group and one in the middle, and since the middle can become a group of ten with each outer group, it causes them to all be combined in the middle.
        - **R' Pappa** said, **Shmuel** holds that even if there is no animal in the middle, but the shepherd or the shepherd's belongings are in the middle, the outer groups would combine.
            - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, would the shepherd's dog be enough to combine them if it was in the middle? Do we say that since the dog goes to the shepherd and the shepherd doesn't go to the dog it is not as if the shepherd is there, or do we say that since there are times when the dog

doesn’t go to him and he will have to go to the middle to get the dog it is enough so that he is considered to be in the middle? **TEIKU**.