



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

Beitzah Daf Lamed Ches

HASHOEL KLI MEICHAVEIRO ME'EREV YOM TOV

- The chiddush of the Mishna is that as long as the lender agreed to lend the keili before Yom Tov, even if it wasn't given to the possession of the borrower until after Yom Tov began, it still takes on the techum of the borrower.
 - **R' Yochanan** said like this explanation of our Mishna as well.

B'YOM TOV K'RAGLEI HAMASHIL

- The chiddush of the Mishna is, that even if it is typical for this borrower to always borrow from this lender, still, if he didn't agree to lend the keili before Yom Tov, it retains the techum of the lender. We don't say that the lender had in mind to give it to this borrower before Yom Tov, because we assume that he thinks that the borrower found someone else to borrow from.

V'CHEIN HA'ISHA SHESHOALAH MEI'CHAVERTA

- When **R' Abba** went to Eretz Yisrael, he davened that he should make a Torah statement that will be accepted by the **Rabanan** there. He found a group of **Rabanan** sitting and learning our Mishna. They asked, the salt and water should become batul to the dough and the dough should only take on the techum of the owner of the flour!? **R' Abba** said to them, if one's kav of wheat became mixed in his friend's 10 kav of wheat, does the owner of the 10 kav simply take ownership of the one kav as well because it becomes batul? Of course not! Because we only say something becomes batul for issurim, not regarding matters of ownership. Similarly, techum is based on ownership, and therefore the salt and water don't become batul for purposes of techum. The **Rabanan** laughed at **R' Abba's** statement.
 - **R' Oshaya** said, the **Rabanan** were correct in rejecting **R' Abba's** statement, because **R' Abba** gave the case of wheat becoming mixed in wheat. The reason he didn't give the case of wheat mixed in barley is because he would hold that it would become batul in that case, because it is of unlike kind. However, in truth even items of like-kind become batul according to the **Rabanan**, and therefore it should not make a difference.
 - **R' Safra** said that **R' Abba** was correct. We find that if one removes pebbles from the straw in the silo of his friend, he must pay his friend for straw equal to the weight of the pebbles (because he could have sold the wheat with the pebbles and gotten paid for the total weight), and the worthless pebbles are not considered to become batul. Similarly, the salt and water, which are there to provide taste (and are not totally worthless) cannot be considered to be batul either, and they therefore retain their ownership status and their techum status.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, these cases are not comparable! In the case of the pebbles, the removal of the pebbles causes a monetary loss, whereas in the case of the dough, since the water is borrowed and need not be repaid until after Yom Tov, the only effect of ownership is the techum restriction, with no real monetary rights, and should therefore become batul!? **A: R' Safra** said, we find that **R' Chisda** said, that when neveilah meat becomes mixed in shechted meat, where the shechted meat is the majority of this mixture, the neveilah becomes batul with regard to tumah even according to **R' Yehuda** (who says that like kind mixtures do not become batul). Will you (**Abaye**) say that if the neveilah has an owner it would not become batul? You can't say that, because a Braisa says that **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** says, that even hefker items get a techum. We see that lack of ownership does not allow for the bittul of techum.

- **Abaye** said, you can't compare the case of techum to the case of the pebbles. The pebbles are a question of monetary law, and therefore we cannot apply bittul to it. The case of techum is a question of issur, to which bittul does apply.
- **Q:** Why is it that the salt and water are not batul in the dough? **A:** **Abaye** says, it is a gezeirah for a case when a dough is made in partnership, in which case the techum of the dough truly must be limited to the common techum of the partners. **A2: Rava** says, spices are made to give taste, and are therefore never batul. **A3: R' Ashi** says, these are items which are "yeish lo matirin" (they will become totally mutar to move about after Yom Tov), and such items do not become batul.

R' YEHUDA POTEIR B'MAYIM

- **Q:** This suggests that **R' Yehuda** says that only the water becomes batul, but not the salt. A Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says that the salt becomes batul in the dough as well!? **A:** The Braisa refers to fine salt, which dissolves, and the Mishna refers to thick salt.
- **Q:** In the Mishna **R' Yehuda** says that water becomes batul in dough or in a cooked dish, but in a Braisa he says that it only becomes batul in dough (and not in a cooked dish, because it is more recognizable there)!? **A:** The Mishna refers to thick food (where the water is not noticeable) and the Braisa refers to thinner food (where it is noticeable).