



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

Beitzah Daf Lamed Hey

- **Q:** How can we say that **R' Eliezer** holds that the designation of food sets in its ma'aser obligation? We find that **R' Eliezer** says in a Mishna that when one takes a bunch of olives to eat from a tahor vat, they become chayuv in ma'aser, but if they are taken from a tamei vat they do not become chayuv in ma'aser. **R' Avahu** explained, the cases are where the person himself is tamei. Therefore, when he takes olives from a tahor vat he will not return them to the vat (so as not to make the rest tamei) and they therefore become chayuv in ma'aser. In the second case, since the olives are anyway tamei, he may decide to return them to the vat if he doesn't eat them. Therefore, they do not become chayuv in ma'aser. In our Mishna the fruits may be decided to be returned as well, and therefore the designation would not make them chayuv in ma'aser according to **R' Eliezer!**? **A:** Our Mishna is also discussing a case where the fruit was tahor and the person was tamei, so the fruit would not be put back.
 - **Q:** In our Mishna the fruit were never physically taken, they were only designated!? **A:** **R' Simi bar Ashi** said, **R' Eliezer** must hold that Shabbos makes the fruit chayuv in ma'aser, just like we find that **R' Eliezer** holds that the act of separating terumah from fruit makes it chayuv in ma'aser as well. However, the **Chachomim** argue regarding the act of separating terumah, and may therefore also argue regarding Shabbos.
- The Gemara says, the end of our Mishna may be a proof to **R' Nachman's** statement (that Shabbos creates a ma'aser obligation even for produce that is not in its final stage of preparation). The Mishna says that the **Chachomim** say that a clear designation on Erev Shabbos of shmitta helps to allow eating of the fruits (that are not fully processed) on Shabbos. This seems to suggest that if it was not shmitta it would assur to eat because ma'aser must be given. Presumably because Shabbos sets in the ma'aser obligation.
 - It may be that the clear designation (and not Shabbos) is what sets in the ma'aser obligation.
 - **Q:** If so, why does the Mishna set the case on Erev Shabbos? It could have been any day of the week!? **A:** The Mishna did so to teach that tevel is considered to be prepared for Shabbos, and if one is "oiver" the D'Rabanan and separates ma'aser on Shabbos, the food would be mutar (there is no muktzeh issue).
- **Q:** There is a Mishna in which **R' Eliezer** says, that if one was eating grapes and Shabbos set in, he may finish eating the grapes without giving ma'aser. This contradicts what we said earlier, that **R' Eliezer** says that Shabbos does make the ma'aser obligation set in!? **A:** **R' Nosson** explained that **R' Eliezer** means that he may finish eating the grapes *after* Shabbos. However, any eating on Shabbos may only be done if the ma'aser was given first.
- **Ravin** said in the name of **R' Yochanan**, neither the onset of Shabbos, nor the separation of terumah, nor the bringing into one's chatzer, nor the purchase of produce causes the ma'aser obligation to set in.
 - Each of these set of circumstances is subject to a machlokes, and **R' Yochanan** therefore felt the need to clearly pasken. A Braisa says that Hillel said that the onset of Shabbos sets in the ma'aser obligation. A Mishna said that **R' Yaakov** said that bringing the produce into one's chatzer sets in the ma'aser obligation. A Mishna says that **R' Eliezer** says that the act of separating terumah sets in the ma'aser obligation. A Mishna says that purchase of produce sets in the ma'aser obligation.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAMEIVI!!!

PEREK MASHILIN -- PEREK CHAMISHI

MISHNA

- One may lower fruit from a roof to the house by way of a skylight in that roof (to save it from becoming ruined from the rain), on Yom Tov but not on Shabbos.
- One may cover fruit with keilim to protect them from dripping water. Similarly, barrels of wine and oil may be covered as well.
- One may place a keili under dripping water on Shabbos.

GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda** and **R' Nosson** had different versions of the word in our Mishna used to mean "lower". One had the version of "mashilin" and one had the version of "mashchilin".
 - **Mar Zutra** said, both versions are correct and mean to lower (one based on a pasuk where the word "yishal" means to throw down, and the other based on a Mishna where the word "shachul" means to lower).
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the Mishna could have also used the words "mashirin" (based on a Mishna where "mashir" means to make fall out), "maschirin" (based on a Mishna referring to a razor as a "shechor" because it makes hair fall off), or "manshirin" (based on a Mishna where "nashru" means to fall, or another Mishna where "nosher" means to fall).
- **Q:** How much produce would one be allowed to lower through the skylight on Yom Tov? **A: R' Zeira in the name of R' Assi** said, it is the same as the Mishna in Shabbos that says: If one needs room for guests or for talmidim to learn, he may move away even 4 or 5 boxes of straw or produce on Shabbos. Here too one may move that amount.
 - **Q:** Maybe that much is allowed there so as to allow for learning, but here would be less? **Q2:** Maybe that much is allowed there because we need not be concerned that he will become lenient with Shabbos and do unnecessary work. However, our Mishna discusses Yom Tov, and maybe only less would be allowed? **Q3:** Maybe over there only 4 or 5 boxes are allowed because we are not faced with a potential financial loss. However, in our Mishna where we are, maybe even more would be allowed?
 - **Q:** The Mishna in Shabbos said that one may not completely empty the storehouse of straw, and **Shmuel** explained, because we are concerned that he may then smooth out the floor (by filling in the holes). Would it be the same in our Mishna that we don't allow him to empty the entire roof? Maybe we are only concerned for the more chamur Shabbos, but not for the more lenient Yom Tov? Maybe we should say that if we don't allow this over there for this concern even though it may prevent people from learning, surely we should not allow it over here?
 - **Q: R' Nachman** says about our Mishna that it may only be lowered through a skylight in that roof, but it may not be passed to a skylight in another roof. Would we say that in the case of the Mishna in Shabbos as well? Maybe we are only concerned in our Mishna because people treat Yom Tov more leniently, and it may lead to degrading Yom Tov, but this concern would not apply to Shabbos? Or, maybe we should say that if we don't allow it in our Mishna where one is faced with a financial loss, surely he may not do so in the Mishna in Shabbos, where one is not faced with that loss?
 - **Q:** A Braisa says regarding our Mishna that the fruit may not be lowered through windows with rope, or down ladders. Would that apply regarding the Mishna in Shabbos as well? Maybe it is only assur in our Mishna because it does not prevent people from learning? Or, maybe we should say that if we don't allow it in our Mishna where one is faced with a financial loss, surely he may not do so in the Mishna in Shabbos, where one is not faced with that loss?
 - **A:** To all the above questions, the Gemara says "**TEIKU**".