



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

Beitzah Daf Chuf Vuv

MISHNA

- If a bechor (which after the times of the Beis Hamikdash may only be eaten when it has a permanent mum) fell into a ditch on Yom Tov (and the owner wants to lift it out before it dies, but may only do so if it has a permanent mum, otherwise it is muktzeh), **R' Yehuda** says, an expert may go down into the ditch to examine the animal, and if a permanent mum is found to have been present before Yom Tov, the animal may be lifted out of the ditch and shechted. If not, it may not be shechted (it is muktzeh). **R' Shimon** says, if the mum was not recognized as such before Yom Tov, it may not be shechted on Yom Tov since it is not considered to be prepared for Yom Tov (and it looks like he is "fixing" the animal on Yom Tov – this is not because of muktzeh, because **R' Shimon** doesn't hold of muktzeh).

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the point of machlokes in the Mishna? If it is simply whether an expert may examine a mum on Yom Tov, why did the Mishna need to discuss the case where the animal fell into a ditch?! **A:** It may be that the machlokes is whether an expert may examine a mum on Yom Tov. The reason the Mishna has them argue about this case is to teach that **R' Yehuda** does not allow removing the animal from the pit until after a permanent mum has been determined, even though it is lying in the pit in pain. We would have thought that he would use a trick to remove it and then check, to spare the pain.
 - **Q:** If so, why does the Mishna say, "if not, it may not be *shechted*"? It should say, "if not, it may not be *lifted out*", since that is the main chiddush!? **A:** The Mishna is teaching, that even if one was over and lifted the bechor out, it may still not be shechted.
 - **Q:** Of course it can't be shechted, since it is a bechor without a mum!? **A:** Even if it now got a mum, it may still not be shechted.
 - **Q:** If it had no mum before Yom Tov, it is muktzeh, and surely cannot be shechted!? **A:** There was a temporary mum on Erev Yom Tov that developed into a permanent mum on Yom Tov. We would think that he had in mind to possibly use this animal on Yom Tov. The Mishna teaches that he does not, and it is therefore assur.
- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda Hanasi** says, if an unblemished bechor falls into a ditch on Yom Tov, an expert may go and examine the bechor in the ditch. If he determines that it now has a mum, it may be lifted up and shechted. If not, (and he was over and brought it up, and it later got a mum) it may not be shechted. **R' Shimon ben Menasya** says, the **Rabanan** of the earlier generations (i.e. **R' Shimon** of our Mishna) have said that an expert may not examine mumin on Yom Tov. He explains the shita of **R' Shimon**, that if a bechor got a mum before Yom Tov, it should not be examined on Yom Tov. However, if it was examined and is determined to be a permanent mum, it may be shechted. If it got a mum on Yom Tov, it is not considered to be prepared and may not be shechted. All agree that if the bechor is born on Yom Tov with a mum, it is considered to be prepared and may be shechted on Yom Tov.
 - **Rabbah bar R' Huna** said, if a bechor is born on Yom Tov with a mum, we may have an expert examine the mum on Yom Tov. **R' Nachman** said, my father said it is only allowed b'dieved. How can you allow it l'chatchila!?
 - **Abaye** said, the shita of **Rabbah bar R' Huna** seems correct, based on the 3 cases of the above Braisa. The first case suggests that if a mum existed on Erev Yom Tov, it should not be checked on Yom Tov l'chatchila. The second case

suggests that **R' Shimon** says that if a mum comes about on Yom Tov, it may not be checked even b'dieved. The third case, where all agreed that if the bechor is born on Yom Tov with a mum it may be checked, must mean that even l'chatchila it may be checked.

- There is a Braisa taught by **R' Oshaya** that says that a mum that existed on Erev Yom Tov may not be checked on Yom Tov even b'dieved. This is not like **Abaye** had suggested we learn from the other Braisa, and therefore **Abaye's** proof is refuted.
- **Q:** We can still bring a proof to **Rabbah bar R' Huna** from the first Braisa!? **A:** That Braisa was taught by **Ada bar Uchmi**, who had mistakes in the Braisos he taught.
- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, our Mishna is a proof to the Braisa of **R' Oshaya**. In our Mishna **R' Shimon** said, if the mum is not recognizable before Yom Tov, it is not considered to be prepared. If this is discussing where the mum was not noticeable at all, that would be obvious. It must be, that the case is where the mum was recognized before Yom Tov, but it was not yet determined if it was temporary or permanent. We see that even in that case **R' Shimon** says it may not be used on Yom Tov even b'dieved if the expert looked at it on Yom Tov. This is just like **R' Oshaya's** Braisa.
- **Q: Hillel** asked **Rava**, can there be something that is muktzeh for only part of Shabbos (or Yom Tov)? The case under discussion must be where something began Shabbos as being fit (dried figs), then became unfit on Shabbos (the figs got wet), and then became fit again (the figs dried). Does the item remain muktzeh for the rest of Shabbos? **A: Rava** said, it does remain muktzeh for the rest of Shabbos.
 - **Q:** The Braisa earlier said, all agree that if the bechor was born with a mum on Yom Tov, it may be eaten. According to **Rava**, since the bechor was originally mutar to eat when still in its mother's stomach (by shechting the mother), then became assur when it was born, and then became mutar when the mum was deemed permanent, it should remain assur!? **A: Abaye** said, the case is where the experts were at the birth, and the animal was therefore never considered muktzeh at all.
 - **Others** had a version that **Rava** said the item does *not* remain muktzeh for the remainder of the day. On that version the Gemara brings the Braisa quoted immediately above as a proof. **Abaye's** answer showed that it is not a proof.
 - A Braisa says, if one put leftover fruit to dry on the roof before Shabbos, he may not eat from them on Shabbos unless he designated them for use before Shabbos. The Gemara says, the case can't be where the fruits are dry enough to be eaten, for if so, why would designation be necessary? It can't be where it is not fit to eat, because then why would designation help? It can't be where the owners just didn't know that they were fit, because **R' Kahana** said that in that case they would be mutar. It must be that they were initially fit at the onset of Shabbos, then became unfit, and then became fit again. Now, if such items don't stay muktzeh for the rest of the day, why is designation necessary? It must be that they do remain muktzeh!
 - **Q:** If such items remain muktzeh, why does the designation help? **A:** We must say, that the Braisa is referring to fruit that is deemed fit by some people and not by others. Therefore, if one designates it, he shows that he considers the fruit to be fit.
 - **R' Zeira** said, beans are fit to be eaten raw, are unfit when they begin to be cooked and are boiling, and are fit again when fully cooked and cooled down. We know they don't remain muktzeh on Yom Tov. We can learn from here that such items do not remain muktzeh.
 - **Abaye** said, based on this, every pot that is boiling during bein hashmashos should be muktzeh the entire Shabbos (which we know is not the case). Rather, we must say there was never a question regarding something that can become

fit by human intervention (one can cool down the pot), that it does not remain assur (because he has in mind to use it). The question is only regarding things that become fit "bidei shamayim".