



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

Beitzah Daf Mem

MISHNA

- If one's produce was in another city which was beyond his techum (and he had not made an eiruv to allow him to reach his produce), even if the people of the other city had made an eiruv which would allow them to travel to him, they may not bring his produce to him (the produce is considered to be outside of its techum and may not be moved at all). If he had made an eiruv, his produce would follow the benefits and restrictions of his eiruv.
- If one invited guests from beyond his techum (but the guests had made an eiruv which allowed them to travel to him), he may not give them items to take back with them (since those items have the host's techum, which does not allow them to be taken back to the home of the guests) unless he transferred ownership of the items to the guests before Yom Tov began.

GEMARA

- If one gives produce to a friend to watch over them, **Rav** says the techum of the produce follows the techum of the friend, and **Shmuel** says the techum follows the techum of the owner of the produce.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that **Rav** holds this way because elsewhere he paskens like the **Chachomim** of a Mishna who say that when the owner of a chatzer gives permission for someone to bring in an object, he becomes responsible to prevent damage to that item. Similarly, when one watches produce for his friend, he becomes responsible for the produce and it therefore takes on his techum? Also, maybe we can say that **Shmuel** holds this way because elsewhere he paskens like **Rebbi** of that Mishna who says that the owner of the chatzer does not become responsible unless he specifically accepts responsibility upon himself. Similarly, the one watching the produce is not responsible and the produce is therefore considered to be owned by the owner and takes on his techum? **A: Rav** can say that his shita can even follow **Rebbi**. In our case of the produce, the friend has accepted responsibility to watch the produce, and that's why **Rebbi** would agree that it is in his reshus and follows his techum. However, in the case of the chatzer, the person never explicitly accepted any responsibility, and that is why it is different. **Shmuel** can say that even the **Rabanan** may follow his shita. In the case of the chatzer, one wants his ox to be in the possession of the owner of the chatzer, because in that way he saves himself from liability if the ox damages the chatzer. However, in the case of the produce, one doesn't want his produce to be considered to be in the possession of his friend, and that's why it remains in the owner's techum.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says, if the owner of the produce made an eiruv, the produce may be brought to him. According to **Rav**, since the people of the other city are watching the produce, the techum should follow them, and not the owner!? **A: R' Huna** said, **Rav** agrees that when the person places his produce in a specific corner of the watcher's house, the watcher has accepted no responsibility and the techum follows the owner. This is the case that is discussed in the Mishna.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says that when the host transfers ownership to the guests before Yom Tov, they may take the items back with them (because the items have the techum of the guests). According to **Rav**, even if he transfers ownership, since it remains in the host's house, he is the "shomer" and the techum should follow him!? **A:** Transferring ownership to them is like giving them a corner of the house, in which case the techum

- follows the guests. **A2:** By transferring ownership before Yom Tov, he shows that he wants it to be in their techum, and that he retains no ownership or responsibility over it.
- **R' Chana bar Chanilai** hung a piece of meat on a door at the onset of Yom Tov, and then wanted to take that meat back to his house (which he was able to reach via an eiruv that he had set up). **R' Huna** told him, if you hung up the meat before Yom Tov, the meat follows your techum. If your hosts had done that for you, it is in their techum.
 - **Q: R' Huna** was a talmid of **Rav**, and should therefore hold that even when he himself hung it, since it is being watched by the hosts, it follows their techum!? **A:** Hanging on a door is like placing an item in a specific corner.
 - **Q: R' Hillel** asked, even if the hosts hung it he should be able to take it, because **Shmuel** said that even one who buys from a merchant may take the animal according to the buyer's techum since the merchant had in mind before Yom Tov to give the animal to whoever bought it!? Here too, the hosts had in mind to give it to him! **Q2: Ravina** asked, **R' Yochanan** paskened like **R' Dosa** who said that an animal takes on the shepherd's techum even if he didn't get the animal until Yom Tov, because the owner had in mind to give it to him. Here too, the hosts had in mind to give it to him! **Q3: R' Ashi** asked, a Mishna said that one's possessions get his techum. If so, the meat should clearly follow **R' Chana's** techum!? **A: Rav** wasn't discussing techum. He was discussing the problem of "basar shenisalemin min ha'ayin" (meat that wasn't watched and may have been switched out for non-kosher meat). **Rav** said, if you hung it on the door and can therefore recognize the meat as being the one you hung up, you may eat it. If not, you may not eat it.

MISHNA

- One may not give to drink and shecht animals from the wild, but one may give to drink and shecht domestic animals. Domestic animals are those that spend the night in the city. Animals from the wild are those that spend the night out in the field.

GEMARA

- The Mishna mentions giving to drink in association with slaughtering to teach a side point, that one should give an animal to drink before shechting it to allow for easier removal of the skin.
- A Braisa says, an "animal of the wild" is an animal that grazes in the fields from Pesach time and returns during the first rains (in the month of Cheshvan). Domestic animals are those that graze outside the techum, but return to within the techum for the night. **Rebbi** says, both these characteristics describe domestic animals. An animal of the wild is an animal that grazes out in the fields and never returns to the settlement at all – not in the summer or the winter.
 - **Q:** Presumably, by giving a definition of animals of the wild, **Rebbi** must hold that they are muktzeh. However, we find that **Rebbi** explains that **R' Shimon** says, only drying figs and raisins are muktzeh. If **Rebbi** gave the explanation, he must agree with this as well, which means that he does not hold of muktzeh!? **A:** Animals of the wild are muktzeh like drying figs and raisins (the animals were also fit to use before they went away, and then became unfit). **A2: Rebbi** explained the shita of **R' Shimon**, but he actually does not agree with it. **A3: Rebbi** does not hold of muktzeh. The definition he gives for animals of the wild was given according to the shita of the **Rabanan** who do hold of muktzeh.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK MASHILIN!!!

HADRAN ALACH MESECHTA BEITZAH!!!

MAZEL TOV!!!