

דף יומי • בכורות • דף נ"ה

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

This daf opens with a sharp kasha on Rav's shitta regarding combining two separate groups of five animals for ma'aser behemah. The Gemara presents a Baraita where a single sheep in the middle is enough to connect flocks from two separate towns, which directly refutes Rav's requirement of five in the middle. Shmuel offers a teretz to reconcile the Baraita with Rav, leading the Gemara to explore what else can serve as a bridge to join two flocks, including the shepherd himself, his kelim, or even his shepherd dog.

The Gemara then dives into the Mishnah's ruling according to Rabbi Meir that the Yarden river forms a halachic mechitzah that separates animals on opposite banks. We analyze whether this separation is due to the physical inability of the animals to cross without a bridge, or if the Torah established the Yarden as a formal geographical boundary. Through this discussion, the sugya investigates the exact status of the Yarden, its halachic boundaries relative to the land of Kena'an, and how the river received its unique name.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א' DAF 55A

OBJECTION

מיתיבי:

The Gemara **raises an objection** against Rav's ruling that five animals are required in the middle to combine two separate groups of five into one flock for ma'aser behemah:

BRAISA

הָיָה לוֹ חֲמִשׁ בְּכָפָר חֲנֻנְיָה וְחֲמִשׁ בְּכָפָר עֹתָנִי —

A Baraita states: If **one had five** sheep in Kfar Chananya and **five** sheep in Kfar Osnai,

BRAISA

אִין מְצַטְרְפוֹת עַד שְׂיֵהָא לוֹ אַחַת בְּצִיפּוּרִי.

they do not combine to make the required total of ten, **unless he has one** sheep between them in Tzipori.

OBJECTION

תִּיבָתָא דְרַב!

The Gemara points out: This is **a conclusive refutation of** the opinion of **Rav!** For the Baraita explicitly states that a single animal in the middle is sufficient to combine the outer groups, contradicting Rav who said five are needed.

RESOLUTION

תרגמה שמואל אליבא דרב:

Shmuel explained the Baraita according to the opinion of Rav:

RESOLUTION

כגון שהיו תשע מכאן ותשע מכאן ואחת באמצע,

The Baraita is speaking about a case **where there were nine sheep on this side and nine on that side, and one in the middle,**

EXPLANATION

דהיא חזיא להכא וחזיא להכא.

for that one sheep in the middle **is fit** to combine with the nine **on this side** to complete a group of ten, **and is fit** to combine with the nine **on that side** to complete a group of ten.

STATEMENT

אמר רב פפא:

Rav Pappa said:

STATEMENT

ולשמואל, אפילו רועה מצרפן.

And according to Shmuel who holds that one animal in the middle joins the two sides, **even a shepherd** standing in the middle **combines them,**

STATEMENT

ואפילו כליו של רועה מצרפן.

and even a garment or utensil **of the shepherd** placed in the middle **combines them.** Since the shepherd goes to fetch his vessel, he effectively brings the two flocks together.

QUESTION

בעי רב אשי:

Rav Ashi raised a shepherd's dilemma:

QUESTION

כלבא דרועה מאי?

What is the halachah if **the shepherd's dog** is sitting in the middle?

QUESTION

כיון דקרי ליה ואתי לא מצטרפי,

Do we say that **since** the shepherd **calls it and it comes** to him, the shepherd does not need to walk to the middle, and therefore the two sides **do not combine**?

QUESTION

או דלמא זימנין דלא אתי, ומצטרף איהו למיזל ואתייה?

Or perhaps, since sometimes it does not come, and he is needed to go and bring it, it is like his vessel and they do combine?

RULING

תיקו.

The question **shall stand** unresolved.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

רבי מאיר אומר: הירדן מפסיק למעשר בהמה.

We learned in the Mishnah: **Rabbi Meir says: The Yarden forms a partition for ma'aser be he mah**, separating animals on either bank.

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אמר רבי אמי:

Rabbi Ami said:

STATEMENT

לא שנו אלא שאין שם גשר,

They only taught this where there is no bridge over the river;

STATEMENT

אבל יש שם גשר — גשר מצרפן.

but if there is a bridge there, the bridge combines them.

INFERENCE

אלמא, משום דלא מיקרבין הוא.

Consequently, Rabbi Ami understands that the river separates them only because they cannot approach each other across the water.

OBJECTION

מיתיבי:

The Gemara **raises an objection** from a Baraita:

BRAISA

היו לו בשני עברי הירדן אילן ואילן,

If one had animals on the two banks of the Yarden, here and there,

BRAISA

או בשני אבטילות כגון של נמר ונמורי —

or in two provinces, such as Namer and Namori,

BRAISA

אין מצטרפין,

they do not combine;

BRAISA

ואין צריה לומר חוצה לארץ וארץ.

and needless to say, animals in chutz la'Aretz and Eretz Yisrael do not combine.

OBJECTION

והא חוצה לארץ וארץ במקום שיש גשר דמי,

The Gemara analyzes the Baraita: Now, chutz la'Aretz and Eretz Yisrael is considered like a place where there is a bridge, since there is no physical river obstructing the animals,

OBJECTION

וקתני: לא מצטרפין!

and yet it teaches: They do not combine! This proves that the boundary separating areas is not dependent on physical passage.

RESOLUTION

אלא אמר רבי חייא בר אבא אמר רבי יוחנן:

Rather, Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yochanan said:

RESOLUTION

הנינו טעמיה דרבי מאיר,

This is the reason of Rabbi Meir for ruling that the Yarden separates:

PROOF

דאמר קרא: "והירדן יגבל אתו לפאת קדמה",

as the verse says: "And the Yarden shall border it on the east side."

EXPLANATION

הכתוב עשאו גבול בפני עצמו.

The verse made it an independent border, and any halachic border creates a separation regarding ma'aser behemah.

OBJECTION

אָלָא מַעֲתָהּ, "וְתֵאֵר הַגְּבוּל" "וְעָלָה הַגְּבוּל",

The Gemara asks: If so, regarding the verses describing tribal boundaries where it says "And the border turned" or "And the border went up",

OBJECTION

הָכִי נִמִּי הַכָּתוּב עָשָׂא גְבוּל בְּפָנֵי עֲצָמוֹ!

so too should we say that the verse made each tribal boundary an independent border, so that animals on two sides of a tribal boundary should not combine?

RESOLUTION

שְׁאֵנִי הֵתָם, דָּאֲמַר קְרָא: "זֹאת תִּהְיֶה לָּכֶם הָאֶרֶץ לְגִבְלֶיהָ סָבִיב",

The Gemara answers: It is different there, as the verse says: "This shall be the land for you according to its borders round about,"

EXPLANATION

כּוֹלָה אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל גְּבוּל אֶחָד הִיא.

teaching that the entirety of Eretz Yisrael is one single border regarding this halachah.

QUESTION

אִי הָכִי, יַרְדֵּן נִמִּי!

The Gemara asks: If so, the Yarden should also be included in this unified border of Eretz Yisrael!

ANSWER

"אֶרֶץ" — וְלֹא יַרְדֵּן.

The Gemara answers: The verse specifies "land" — and the Yarden is not land, but a body of water, so it remains a separate border.

OBJECTION

בְּשִׁלְמָא לְרַבִּי חִיָּיא בַר אֲבָא — הֵיִינוּ דְקִתְנֵי "יַרְדֵּן",

It works out well according to Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba, who says Rabbi Meir's ruling is derived from a pasuk, as that is why the Tanna specifically taught "the Yarden";

OBJECTION

אָלָא לְרַבִּי אֲמִי — לִיתְנִינְהוּ לְכוֹלְהוּ נְהָרוֹת!

but according to Rabbi Ami, who holds it is due to the physical obstruction of crossing, let him teach all rivers! Why single out the Yarden?

RULING

This is indeed a **difficulty** against Rabbi Ami.

QUESTION

לימא כַּתְנָאִי:

Shall we say that whether the Yarden is considered a border distinct from Eretz Yisrael is like a dispute between Tanna'im?

BRAISA

"כִּי אַתֶּם עֹבְרִים אֶת הַיַּרְדֵּן אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן",

For a Baraita states: The pasuk says, "When you cross the Yarden into the land of Kena'an."

BRAISA

"אֶרֶץ" — אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן, וְלֹא הַיַּרְדֵּן אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן, דְּבַרֵּי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה בֶּן בֶּתִּירָה.

The word "into the land" implies that the land of Kena'an is Eretz Yisrael, and the Yarden is not the land of Kena'an; these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah ben Beteira.

BRAISA

רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן יוֹחֵי אוֹמֵר:

Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai says:

BRAISA

הֲרִי הוּא אוֹמֵר "מֵעֵבֶר לַיַּרְדֵּן יָרְחוֹ קִדְמָה מִזְרְחָה",

Behold, it says: "Beyond the Yarden of Yericho eastward, toward the sunrise."

INFERENCE

מָה יָרְחוֹ אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן, אִם יֵרֶדוּ אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן.

Just as Yericho is part of the land of Kena'an, so too is the Yarden part of the land of Kena'an. Thus, the question of whether the Yarden is considered distinct from Eretz Yisrael is a Tannaitic dispute.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבָּה בַּר בַּר חַנָּה אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן:

Rabbah bar bar Chana said that Rabbi Yochanan said:

STATEMENT

אֵין "יַרְדֵּן" אֶלָּא מִבֵּית יָרְחוֹ וּלְמַטָּה.

It is only called "Yarden" from Beis Yericho and below, southward.

QUESTION

לְמַאי הִלְכְּתָא?

To what halachah does this statement apply?

QUESTION

אֵילִימָא לְנוֹדֵר — הֲלֵךְ אַחֵר לְשׁוֹן בְּנֵי אָדָם,

If we say it applies to one who makes a vow, that is difficult, for regarding vows we follow the common language of people,

QUESTION

וְכָל הֵיכָא דְקָרוּ לֵיהּ "יָרְדֵּן" אֵיתָסֵר לֵיהּ!

and anywhere people call it "Yarden", it should be forbidden to him!

ANSWER

אַלָּא לְמַעֲשֵׁר בְּהֵמָה.

Rather, this definition applies to **ma'aser behemah**, determining where the river has the status of Yarden to form a partition.

PROOF

תְּנִינָא נָמִי הָכִי:

This is also taught in a Baraita:

BRAISA

יָרְדֵּן יוֹצֵא מִמְעַרְת פְּמִיָּס,

The Yarden emerges from the cave of Pamyas,

BRAISA

וּמִהֲלָהּ בְּיַמָּהּ שֶׁל סִיבְכִי, וּבְיַמָּהּ שֶׁל טְבֶרְיָא, וּבְיַמָּהּ שֶׁל סְדוֹם,

and flows through the Sea of Sivchi, and through the Sea of Tverya, and through the Sea of Sdom,

BRAISA

וְחוֹלָהּ וְנוֹפֵל לַיָּם הַגָּדוֹל,

and continues and falls into the Great Sea;

BRAISA

וְאֵין "יָרְדֵּן" אֶלָּא מִבֵּית יְרִיחוֹ וְלִמַּטָּה.

and it is only called "Yarden" from Beis Yericho and below.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי חִיְיָא בַר אֲבָא אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן:

Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yochanan said:

EXPLANATION

לָמָּה נִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ "יָרְדֵּן"? שֶׁיּוֹרֵד מִדָּן.

Why is its name called "Yarden"? Because it flows down (yored) from Dan.

STATEMENT

אמר ליה רבי אבא לרב אשי:

Rabbi Abba said to Rav Ashi:

STATEMENT

אתון מהתם מתניתו לה, אנו מהכא מתנינן לה,

You in Bavel learn it from there, but we in Eretz Yisrael learn it from here, from a explicit pasuk:

PROOF

"ויקראו (לו) לשם דן בשם דן אביהם."

"And they called Leshem, 'Dan', after the name of Dan their father."

STATEMENT

ואמר רבי יצחק: לשם זו פמייס,

And Rabbi Yitzchak said: Leshem is Pamyas;

PROOF

ותנא: יוצא ירדן ממערת פמייס.

and it was taught in a Baraita: The Yarden emerges from the cave of Pamyas. Thus the name Yarden means coming down from Dan.

STATEMENT

אמר רב כהנא:

Rav Kahana said:

STATEMENT

זכרותיה דירדנא ממערת פמייס,

The primary source of the Yarden is from the cave of Pamyas.

RULING

היכא דאמר: "לא שתינא מים ממערת פמייס" — איתסר ליה בכוליה ירדנא.

Therefore, where one says, "I will not drink water from the cave of Pamyas," he is forbidden from the entire Yarden, since all its waters originate there.

STATEMENT

זכרותא דדמא — כבדא,

The primary source of blood is the liver,

PROOF

כדרבי יצחק, דאמר רבי יצחק: כבד שנימוח — מטמא ברכיעית.

in accordance with Rabbi Yitzchak, as Rabbi Yitzchak said: A liver that melted conveys tumah like a revi'is of blood.

STATEMENT

זכרונות דמיא — פרת,

The primary source of all water in the world is the Peras river,

PROOF

דאמר רב יהודה אמר רב: הנודר ממימי פרת — אסור בכל מימות שבעולם.

as Rav Yehudah said that Rav said: One who vows against the waters of Peras is forbidden from all waters in the world.

QUESTION

היכי דמי?

The Gemara asks: **What are the circumstances** of this vow?

QUESTION

אלימא דאמר "לא שתינא ממימי דפרת" —

If we say that he said, "I will not drink from the waters of Peras,"

QUESTION

מי פרת הוא דלא שתינא, הא מנהרא אחריןא שתינא.

he meant: It is the water of the Peras river that I will not drink, but from another river I will drink!

ANSWER

אלא, דאמר: "לא שתינא ממים דאתו מפרת",

Rather, it is a case where he said, "I will not drink from water that comes from Peras,"

EXPLANATION

דאמר רב יהודה אמר רב: כל הנהרות למטה משלשה נהרות, ושלשה נהרות למטה מפרת.

for Rav Yehudah said that Rav said: All rivers flow below three major rivers, and those three rivers flow below Peras, making Peras the root source of all rivers.

QUESTION

והאיכא

The Gemara asks: **But is there not** another river that does not come from Peras?

עמוד ב' DAF 55B

QUESTION

עינתא דמידליין!

The Gemara asks: But what about **springs that are higher** in the mountains than the Euphrates? How can their waters possibly come from the Euphrates?

ANSWER

אמר רב משרשיא:

To answer this, **Rav Mesharshiya** said:

EXPLANATION

הנהו סולמי דפרת ניהו.

These are like the subterranean **ladders of the Euphrates**; the water seeps through the earth and gets pushed upward, emerging at those higher springs.

OBJECTION

והא פתיב: "והנהר הרביעי הוא פרת"!

The Gemara asks: **But isn't it written** in the pasuk regarding the rivers of Eden: "**And the fourth river is the Euphrates**"? This implies that the Euphrates is merely one of four branching rivers, and the last one at that, not the master source of all world waters!

ANSWER

אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק, ואיתימא רב אחא בר יעקב:

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said, and some say it was **Rav Acha bar Yaakov** who said:

EXPLANATION

הוא פרת דמעיקרא.

It is the Euphrates that is referred to **from the beginning** as the main river coming out of Eden, from which all other rivers split off, and then it continued on as the fourth river.

BRAISA

תניא, רבי מאיר אומר:

It was taught in a **Braisa** that **Rabbi Meir** says:

STATEMENT

"יובל" שמו,

Yuval is its name when it emerges from Eden,

PROOF

שנאמר: "והיה כעץ שתול על מים ועל יובל ישלח שרשיו",

as it is stated in the pasuk: "For he shall be as a tree planted by the waters, and that spreads out its roots by the river [yuval]..."

QUESTION

ולמה נקרא שמו "פרת"?

And why is its name called Peras (Euphrates)?

ANSWER

שְׁמִימֵיו פְּרִים וְרָבִים.

Because its waters are fruitful (parim) and multiply from subterranean sources without needing rain.

PROOF

מְסִייעַ לִיהָ לְשִׁמוּאֵל,

The Gemara notes: This Braisa supports Shmuel,

STATEMENT

דָּאָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: נִהְיָא מִכִּיפִיָּה מִיבְרִיָּה.

for Shmuel says: A river is blessed and grows from its own riverbed, meaning underground springs, not from rain.

OBJECTION

וּפְלִיגָא דְרַב,

And this disagrees with Rav,

STATEMENT

דָּאָמַר רַב אָמִי אָמַר רַב: מִיטְרָא בְּמַעְרְבָא סְהֵדָא רַבָּה פֶּרַת.

for Rav Ami said that Rav says: When there is rain in the West (Eretz Yisrael), the great witness is the Euphrates, as its waters swell from that rain.

STATEMENT

אָבוּהָ דְשִׁמוּאֵל עָבִיד לָהּ לְבִנְיָתָהּ מִקְוֵה בְּיוֹמֵי נִסָּן, וּמַפְצִי בְּיוֹמֵי תִשְׁרֵי.

The Gemara relates: The father of Shmuel made a mikveh for his daughters during the days of Nisan, and laid out mats for privacy in the days of Tishrei when they immersed directly in the river.

EXPLANATION

מִקְוֵה בְּיוֹמֵי נִסָּן — סֵבֵר לָהּ כָּרַב, דָּאָמַר רַב אָמִי אָמַר רַב: מִיטְרָא בְּמַעְרְבָא סְהֵדָא רַבָּה פֶּרַת,

Making a mikveh in the days of Nisan was because he holds like Rav, as Rav Ami said that Rav says: When there is rain in the West, the great witness is the Euphrates,

EXPLANATION

שָׁמָּא יִרְבוּ נוֹטְפִין עַל הַזּוֹחֶל לֵין, וְהוּוּ לָהּ מִי גִשְׁמִים רוּבָא.

and perhaps the accumulated rainwater will exceed the flowing spring water, making rainwater the majority; and flowing rainwater is not valid for a mikveh.

EXPLANATION

וּמַפְצִי בְּיוֹמֵי תִשְׁרֵי.

And he provided **mats in the days of Tishrei** so they could immerse in the river itself, as there was no concern of rainwater then.

OBJECTION

וּפְלִיגָא דִּידֵיהּ אֲדִידֵיהּ,

The Gemara notes: **And** this opinion of **his** (Shmuel's position that rivers grow from springs) **conflicts with his own** other statement,

PROOF

דָּאָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: אֵין הַמַּיִם נִטְהָרִים בְּזוֹחֶלִין אֶלָּא פֶּרֶת בְּיָמֵי תִשְׁרֵי.

for Shmuel says: **Water does not purify while flowing except** for the waters of the Euphrates in the days of Tishrei, showing he too was concerned about rainwater during the rest of the year!

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי' הַלּוֹקֵחַ, אוֹ שֶׁנִּתֵּן לוֹ בְּמִתְנָה — פֶּטוּר מִמַּעֲשֵׂר בְּהֵמָה.

MISHNAH: One who buys an animal, or one to whom an animal was given as a gift, is exempt from animal tithe (ma'aser behemah).

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

גְּמ' מִנָּה הֵנִי מִיָּלֵי?

GEMARA: From where are these words derived?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב כְּהֲנָא: דָּאָמַר קָרָא "בְּכוֹר בְּנֶיךָ תִּתֵּן לִי כִן תַּעֲשֶׂה לְשֹׂרֶךְ לְצֹאנֶךָ",

Rav Kahana said: As the pasuk says: "The firstborn of your sons you shall give to Me. So shall you do with your oxen and with your sheep..." comparing animal sanctity to human firstborns, excluding bought or gifted animals.

SUMMARY

The Gemara refutes Rav's view that five animals are required in the middle to combine two outer flocks of five for ma'aser behemah, bringing a Baraita showing that a single animal suffices. Shmuel answers that the Baraita refers to nine animals on each side and one in the middle. Rav Pappa expands on Shmuel's approach, stating that even the shepherd or his garments placed in the middle can combine the flocks, while an inquiry regarding his dog remains unresolved. Turning to Rabbi Meir's view that the Yarden separates animals on its opposite banks, the Gemara rejects Rabbi Ami's physical-obstruction explanation and establishes via Rabbi Yochanan that the Yarden is defined by a pasuk as an independent border. Finally, the Gemara

clarifies that the river is strictly called 'Yarden' from Beis Yericho and southward for halachic purposes, and explains its name as deriving from the fact that it flows down from Dan (Panyas).

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara is dealing with the halachos of ma'aser behemah and asks what actually connects two separate groups of sheep. Is it just physical proximity, or is there a deeper connection? Rav Pappa points out that according to Shmuel, even a shepherd's keili or utensil sitting in the middle can combine two flocks. Why? Because the shepherd cares about his vessel. Since he will inevitably walk out into that middle space to retrieve his belong, that spot becomes a bridge that draws both sides together.

What a profound yesod for us in our own daily avodah! We often look at different areas of our life, our davening, our business, our family time, our personal struggles, as if they are totally distant, disconnected islands. We wonder how to bring kedushah into our mundane workday or how to connect our spiritual aspirations with our daily chores. The sugya is teaching us that it does not take a massive, grand gesture to bridge two split worlds. A single keili, one small vessel of the Shepherd placed in the middle, unites everything.

When you take an ordinary physical act and place a small vessel of Yiras Shamayim right in the middle of it, you instantly connect that moment to Hashem. A quiet, honest brachah said with kavana in the middle of a rushed workday, a two-minute quiet tefillah before walking into a difficult meeting, or pausing for a second to remember that your parnassah comes directly from Hashem, that is your keili in the middle. Mimeila, the entire day is no longer fragmented. It all joins together into one continuous flock under the care of the Ultimate Shepherd.

Today, pick one mundane or routine activity in your day and place a small keili of kedushah right in the middle of it. Before you start a work task or make a business phone call, pause for five seconds to say a short kapitel Tehillim or silently ask Hashem for hatzlachah, elevating that entire physical moment into your avodas Hashem.