

NOTES

Who has longings – שיש לו גיגועין: Some commentaries explain that the baby longs for the stone and would cry if his father would take it from him. Therefore, the Sages permit the father to carry both of them (*Tosefot Rid*).

תנן: נוטל אדם את בנו והאבן בידו. אמרי דבי רבי ינאי: בתינוק שיש לו גיגועין על אביו.

We learned in the mishna: A person may take his son in his hands on Shabbat; and this is permitted even though there is a stone in the child's hand. As it can be inferred from this mishna that the stone is negated relative to the child, why, then, is he liable in the case of a purse hanging around a live baby's neck? Let the purse be negated relative to the baby. The Sages of the school of Rabbi Yannai say: You cannot infer from this mishna that the stone is negated and therefore it is permitted to move it. Rather, the mishna is referring to a baby who has longings<sup>N</sup> for his father. It is permitted for the father to move the stone because if the father does not lift him, the baby might take ill.

אי הכי, The Gemara asks: If so,

Perek XXI  
Daf 142 Amud a

NOTES

Even a dinar as well – אפילו דינר נמי: Rashi ruled stringently that one may not even hold the hand of a baby who is carrying money. The Ramban explains that the Sages issued a decree prohibiting only lifting the baby, lest he come to lift the dinar with his own hands.

The basket should be a base for a prohibited object – תיהיו בלבלה בסים לזבר האסור: Some commentaries explained that this *halakha* is not based on the *halakhot* of a base for a prohibited object because those do not apply in a case where one forgets and misplaces the prohibited object on the base. Therefore, it is a misnomer to use the term: A base for a prohibited object. Rather, the Gemara asks why one needs to move the stone at all (*Tosefot Rid*). Others explained that the Gemara is referring to all cases involving baskets, including one where a stone is purposely placed in the basket. Furthermore, even in a case where one forgot the stone in the basket, the Sages only permitted carrying the basket in an unusual manner (*Me'ir*).

HALAKHA

A basket of fruit with a stone inside it – בלבלת פירות – ואבן בה: On Shabbat, if a basket full of fruit has a stone inside it, and the fruit will be ruined if spilled on the ground, as is the case with figs or grapes, one may lift and carry the basket with the fruit and the stone in it. However, if the fruit will not be ruined if spilled on the ground, one spills the fruit and the stone out of the basket, replaces the fruit and carries the basket (*Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 25:16; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 309:3*).

And let him... take the fruits in his hands – ונינקטינהו בידים: On Shabbat, when fruits lie scattered in a courtyard, one may not gather them into a basket as one would do during the week. Rather, one should lift a few at a time and eat them (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 335:5*).

A broken basket – בלבלת פחותה: A basket with a hole sealed by a stone may be carried on Shabbat, because the stone is part of the side of the basket (*Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 25:16; Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 335:2*).

מאי איריא אבן, אפילו דינר נמי! אלמה אמר רבא: לא שנו אלא אבן, אבל דינר – אסור! אבן, אי נפלה לה – לא אתי אבובא לאיתויי דינר, אי נפיל – אתי אבובא לאתויי.

why does the mishna refer specifically to moving a stone? The same should hold true even for a dinar, as well.<sup>N</sup> Why, then, did Rava say: They only taught this in a case where the child has a stone in his hand; however, if the child has a dinar in his hand, it is prohibited to lift the child? The Gemara answers: Actually, lifting the child with a dinar should also be permitted. However, the Sages issued a decree prohibiting lifting the child with a dinar because with regard to a stone, if it falls, his father will not come to bring it. However, with regard to a dinar, if it falls, his father will come to bring it.

תנאי כוותיה דרבא: המוציא בליו מקופלים ומונחים על כתפו, וסנדליו וטבעותיו בידו – חייב. ואם היה מלוכש בהן פטור.

It was taught in a *baraita* in accordance with the opinion of Rava: On Shabbat, one who carries out his clothes to the public domain while they are folded and placed on his shoulder, and his sandals on his feet and his rings in his hand, not on his fingers, is liable. And if he was wearing them, he is exempt for all of them, as they are negated relative to him.

המוציא אדם וכליו עליו, וסנדליו ברגליו, וטבעותיו בידיו – פטור. ואילו הוציאן כמות שהן – חייב.

One who carries out a person with his garments on him, and his sandals on his feet, and his rings on the fingers of his hands, i.e., wearing all of his clothes and jewelry in the typical manner, is exempt, whereas if he carried them out as they are, i.e., the person was holding his clothes in his hands, he is liable for carrying out the clothes, just as Rava said.

"בלבלת והאבן בתוכה". ואמאי? תיהיו בלבלת בסים לזבר האסור! אמר רבה בר בר חנה אמר רבי יוחנן: הכא בלבלת מלאה פירות עסקינן. ולישדינהו לפירי, ונישדי לאבן, ונינקטינהו בידים! בדרבי אלעי אמר רב: בפירות המיטנפין, הכא נמי – בפירות המיטנפין –

We learned in the mishna: And it is permissible to take a basket with a stone inside it on Shabbat. The Gemara asks: And why may he do so? The basket should be a base for a prohibited object,<sup>N</sup> and a base for a prohibited object is set-aside and may not be moved on Shabbat. Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yohanan said: Here, we are dealing with a basket full of fruit.<sup>H</sup> The basket is a base for permitted items as well, not only a base for the stone. The Gemara asks: Why may he move the basket and the stone? There is an alternative. And let him throw the fruit and throw the stone out of the basket, and take the fruit in his hands,<sup>H</sup> and there will be no need to move the stone. The Gemara answers: As Rabbi Elai said that Rav said in a different context: It is referring to fruits that become soiled and ruined. Here, too, it is referring to fruits that become soiled and ruined if he throws them down.

ולנינקטינהו נעורי! אמר רב חייא בר אשי אמר רבא: הכא בלבלת פחותה עסקינן, דאבן גופה נעשית דופן לבלבלת.

The Gemara asks a question: And let him shake them until the stone is on one side of the basket, enabling him to throw the stone out of the basket. Rav Hiyya bar Ashi said that Rava said: Here, we are dealing with a broken basket<sup>H</sup> with a hole, in which the stone serves as a side of the basket by sealing the hole. Therefore, he cannot throw it out of the basket.

**Moving teruma – טלטול תרומה**: It is permitted for an Israelite to carry *teruma* on Shabbat, even though it is prohibited for him to eat it. In addition, ritually impure *teruma*, which may not be eaten, may be carried together with pure *teruma* if the following conditions are met: (1) Both the impure and the pure *teruma* are in the same vessel; (2) the pure produce is beneath the impure produce; (3) the fruit will be ruined when spilled on the ground, as is the case with figs or grapes, rendering moot the option of spilling the contents of the vessel and replacing only the pure *teruma*. However, in a situation where the produce will not be ruined when spilled on the ground, one empties the vessel and replaces the permitted produce, in accordance with the opinions of Rav H̄isda and Rabbi Elai (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 25:20).

”מְטַלְטְלִין תְּרוּמָה וְכוּ” אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא שְׁטֵהוּרָה לְמִטָּה וְטִמְאַה לְמַעְלָה, אֲבָל טְהוּרָה לְמַעְלָה וְטִמְאַה לְמִטָּה – שְׁקִיל לִיהָ לְטְהוּרָה וְשַׁבִּיק לִיהָ לְטִמְאַה.

וְכִי טְהוּרָה לְמִטָּה נִמְי, לִישְׁדִּינָהּ וְלִיְנַקְטִינָהּ!  
אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעִי אָמַר רַב: בְּפִירוֹת הַמֵּיטְנָפִין עֲסָקִינָן.

מִיִּתְבִּי: ”מְטַלְטְלִין תְּרוּמָה טִמְאַה עִם הַטְּהוּרָה וְעִם הַחֹלִין, בֵּין שְׁטֵהוּרָה לְמַעְלָה וְטִמְאַה לְמִטָּה, בֵּין שְׁטִמְאַה לְמַעְלָה וְטְהוּרָה לְמִטָּה” תְּיֻבָּתָא דְּרַב חֲסִידָא!

אָמַר לָךְ רַב חֲסִידָא: מִתְנִיתִין – לְצוּרְךָ גּוֹפּוֹ, בְּרִייתָא – לְצוּרְךָ מְקוּמוֹ.

מֵאִי דוֹחֲקִיה דְּרַב חֲסִידָא לְאוּקְמִי מִתְנִיתִין לְצוּרְךָ גּוֹפּוֹ?

אָמַר רַבָּא: מִתְנִיתִין כְּוֹרֵתִיה דִּיקָא, דְּקִתְנִי סִיפָא: מַעוֹת שְׁעַל הַבֵּר – מְנַעַר אֶת הַבֵּר וְהֵן גּוֹפְלוֹת. וְאָמַר רַבָּה בַר בַּר חֲנָה אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא לְצוּרְךָ גּוֹפּוֹ, אֲבָל לְצוּרְךָ מְקוּמוֹ – מְטַלְטְלוּ וְעוֹדֵן עָלָיו, וּמִדְּסִיפָא לְצוּרְךָ גּוֹפּוֹ – רִישָׁא נִמְי לְצוּרְךָ גּוֹפּוֹ.

”רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר אֶף מַעְלִין וְכוּ” וְאִמְאִי!  
הָא קָא מְתַקֵּן!

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה כְּרַבִּי אֶלְעִזָּר סְבִירָא לִיהָ, דְּאָמַר: תְּרוּמָה בְּעִינָא מַחְתָּא.

דְּתַנֵּן: סָאָה תְּרוּמָה שְׁנַפְלָה לְפָחוֹת מִמָּאָה נְדָמַעוּ, וְנִפְל מִן הַמְדוּמַע לְמִקּוּם אַחֵר. רַבִּי אֶלְעִזָּר אוֹמֵר: מְדַמְעַת כְּתִירוּמַת וְדָאִי.

We learned in the mishna: **And one may move ritually impure *teruma*<sup>H</sup> with ritually pure *teruma*. Rav H̄isda said: They only taught this in a case where the pure *teruma* is on the bottom and the impure *teruma* is on the top.** In that case, if one wants to reach the pure *teruma*, there is no alternative to taking the impure *teruma* as well. **However, if the pure *teruma* is on the top and the impure *teruma* is on the bottom, he takes the pure *teruma* and leaves the impure *teruma*.**

The Gemara asks a question: **And when the pure *teruma* is on the bottom too, let him throw the impure fruit, and take the pure fruit. Rabbi Elai said that Rav said:** It is referring to fruits that become soiled and ruined, which cannot be thrown from the basket.

The Gemara raises an objection to the statement of Rav H̄isda: **One may move impure *teruma* with the pure *teruma* and with the non-sacred produce, whether the pure is on the top and the impure is on the bottom, or whether the impure is on the top and the pure is on the bottom.** This is a conclusive refutation of the statement of Rav H̄isda.

The Gemara answers that Rav H̄isda could have said to you: **The mishna, which, according to Rav H̄isda, permits moving the impure *teruma* with the pure *teruma* only when the pure *teruma* is on top, is referring to a case where he needs the basket for the purpose of utilizing the object itself, i.e., he wants to eat the fruit. The *baraita* is referring to a case where he needs the basket for the purpose of utilizing its place, i.e., he wants to move the basket in order to vacate its place, in which case he may move it even if it contains impure *teruma* exclusively.**

The Gemara asks: **What impelled Rav H̄isda to establish the mishna as referring specifically to a case where he needs the basket for the purpose of utilizing the object itself? Why can't he explain the mishna as referring to any case?**

Rava said: **The mishna is precise in accordance with the opinion of Rav H̄isda, as it is taught in the latter clause, the next mishna: With regard to coins that are on a cushion, he shakes the cushion and the coins fall. And Rabba bar bar H̄ana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: They only taught that he may shake the cushion in a case where it is for the purpose of utilizing the cushion itself. However, if he needs it for the purpose of utilizing its place, he may move it, even though the coins are still on it. And from the fact that the latter clause of the mishna is referring to a case where he needs the cushion for the purpose of utilizing the cushion itself, the first clause, too, is referring to a case where he needs the basket for the purpose of utilizing the basket itself.**

We learned in the mishna that **Rabbi Yehuda says: One may even lift a measure of *teruma* that was nullified from a mixture of one hundred measures of non-sacred produce and one measure of *teruma*.** The Gemara asks: **And why is it permitted? Isn't he rendering the produce fit for consumption? The Sages issued a decree prohibiting the performance of any action that renders an item fit for use on Shabbat.**

The Gemara answers: **Rabbi Yehuda holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who said: *Teruma* is considered as if it is placed in its pure unadulterated state.** By lifting the measure of *teruma*, one does not render the rest of the mixture fit for consumption. It is considered as if the measure of *teruma* never intermingled with the rest of the produce and the measure that he lifted from the produce is the measure that fell into the produce.

As we learned in a mishna: **A *se'a* of *teruma* that fell into less than one hundred *se'a* of non-sacred produce causes it to become a prohibited mixture.** The *teruma* is not nullified by the non-sacred produce. **And then, if a *se'a* from the mixture fell into a different place with non-sacred produce, Rabbi Eliezer says: The *se'a* from the original mixture renders it a prohibited mixture in the same way that definite *teruma* would.** This is due to the concern that the same *se'a* of *teruma* that fell into the first mixture never intermingled with the produce and subsequently fell into the second mixture. Therefore, it requires nullification like unadulterated *teruma*.

וְחַכְמִים אוֹמְרִים: אֵין הַמְדוּמָּע מְדַמָּע אֶלָּא לְפִי חֻשְׁבוֹן.

**And the Rabbis say:** The *se'a* from the original prohibited mixture only renders the second one a prohibited mixture according to the proportion of *teruma* in the entire mixture. In other words, the percentage of *teruma* in each *se'a* of the original mixture is representative of the percentage of *teruma* in the entire mixture. Only that measure of *teruma* need be nullified. Rabbi Eliezer's opinion that the *teruma* in the mixture is not considered mixed, and it is considered as if it was placed in its pure unadulterated state, corresponds to Rabbi Yehuda's opinion that by lifting the measure of *teruma*, one does not render the rest of the mixture fit for consumption.

אֵימַר דְּשָׁמַעְתָּ לִּיהִי לְחוּמְרָא, לְקוּלָּא מִי שָׁמַעְתָּ לִּיהִי?!

The Gemara rejects this: **Say that you heard that Rabbi Eliezer expresses his opinion in this matter to rule stringently. Did you hear him express his opinion to rule leniently?** He expressed concern lest the fallen *teruma* might not have intermingled with the non-sacred produce in the first mixture, and therefore, the second mixture is prohibited. However, he does not consider this a certainty.

אֶלָּא הוּא דְאָמַר כְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן, בְּדַתְנִן: סָאָה תְרוּמָה שְׁנַפְלָה לְמַאָּה, וְלֹא הִסְפִּיק לְהַגְבִּיחַ עַד שְׁנַפְלָה אַחֲרָת – הָרִי זֶה אֲסוּרָה. וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן מַתִּיר.

Rather, Rabbi Yehuda stated his *halakha* in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, as we learned in a mishna: If a *se'a* of *teruma* fell into one hundred *se'a* of non-sacred produce, and he did not manage to lift that *se'a* from the mixture until another *se'a* of *teruma* fell into the mixture, this entire mixture is prohibited. This is because two *se'a* of *teruma* are mixed with one hundred *se'a* of non-sacred produce. And Rabbi Shimon permits the mixture. Rabbi Shimon holds that the first *se'a* that fell into the produce is not mixed with it; it is placed in its unadulterated state. When the second *se'a* falls, it is also placed in its unadulterated state, and the two *se'a* do not join together.

וּמַמַּאי? דִּילְמָא הָתֵם בְּהָא קָמִיפְלָגִי; דְּתַנָּא קַמָּא סָבַר: אִף עַל גַּב דְּנַפְלוּ בְּזָה אַחַר זֶה – כַּמְאֵן דְּנַפְלָה בְּבֵית אַחַת דְּמִי, וְהָא לְחַמְשֵׁין נַפְלָה, וְהָא לְחַמְשֵׁין נַפְלָה. וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן סָבַר: קָמִייתָא בְּטִיל בְּמַאָּה, וְהָא תִּיבְטִיל בְּמַאָּה וְחַד!

The Gemara rejects this comparison: **And from what does that conclusion ensue? Perhaps there, they are disagreeing with regard to this: That the first *tanna* holds: Even though two *se'a* of *teruma* fell one after another, it is as though they fell at once, and this *se'a* of *teruma* fell into fifty *se'a* of non-sacred produce, and this *se'a* of *teruma* fell into fifty *se'a* of non-sacred produce, which are insufficient to nullify *teruma*. And Rabbi Shimon holds: The first *se'a* was nullified immediately when it fell into one hundred *se'a*, and this *se'a* will be nullified in one hundred and one *se'a*.** There is no connection between this dispute and the opinion that by lifting the measure of *teruma*, one does not render the rest of the mixture fit for consumption.

אֶלָּא, הוּא דְאָמַר כְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר. דְּתַנָּא, רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר אוֹמַר: נוֹתֵן עֵינָיו בְּצַד זֶה וְאוֹכֵל מִצַּד אַחֵר.

Rather, Rabbi Yehuda stated his *halakha* in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar. As it was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: One need not lift a *se'a* from the mixture in order to render it permitted to eat. It is sufficient if he casts his eyes on this side of the mixture and decides to separate a *se'a* from the produce on that side, and he eats from a different side of the mixture and physically separates the *se'a* later. Lifting a *se'a* from the mixture does not render the mixture fit for consumption, as it is permitted to partake from the mixture even without removing a *se'a*. That is the rationale for Rabbi Yehuda's opinion.

וּמִי סָבַר לִיהִי בְּוֹתִיחָה?

The Gemara asks: **And does Rabbi Yehuda hold in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar?**

Perek XXI  
Daf 142 Amud b

וְהָא מִיפְלִיג פְּלִיג עִילוּיָה; דְּתַנָּא, רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמַר: מַעְלִין אֶת הַמְדוּמָּע בְּאֶחָד וּמַאָּה, רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר אוֹמַר: נוֹתֵן עֵינָיו בְּצַד זֶה וְאוֹכֵל מִצַּד אַחֵר!

**Doesn't he disagree with him? As it was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda says: One may lift a measure of *teruma* that was nullified from a mixture of one hundred measures of non-sacred produce and one measure of *teruma*.<sup>n</sup> Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: One casts his eyes on this side of the mixture and decides to separate a *se'a* from the produce on that side, and he eats from a different side of the mixture.**

#### NOTES

Opinions with regard to lifting from a mixture of *teruma* – שיטות בהעלאת המדומע: The Gemara concludes that both Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar agree that there is no need to actually remove a portion from the mixture. The ques-

tion is: With regard to what do they disagree? According to some commentaries, Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar permits looking to one side and eating from the other. However, he believes that one may not take remedial action and separate part of the

produce. Rabbi Yehuda, however, holds that removing part of the produce is not a remedial action, as eating the mixture is permitted without it. Therefore, removing part of the produce is permitted on Shabbat (*Tosefot Rid*).

A stone on the mouth of a barrel...coins that are on a cushion – **הָאֵבֶן שֶׁעַל פִּי הַחֲבִית...מְעוֹת** – **שְׁעַל הַכֶּרֶב**: On Shabbat, in a case where there is a stone on top of a barrel or coins on top of a cushion, one tilts the barrel and lets the stone fall, and similarly, one tilts the cushion and lets the coins fall. However, if the barrel was situated among other barrels and tilting the barrel where it stands is impossible, one may move the barrel with the stone and tilt it elsewhere. This applies only if one forgot the stone on the barrel on Shabbat eve. If one left it there intentionally, it is prohibited, in accordance with Rav's explanation of the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 25:17; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 309:4).

**הֵיטָה עָלָיו לְשִׁלְשֵׁת** – **הֵיטָה עָלָיו לְשִׁלְשֵׁת**: It is prohibited to clean a dirty garment with water on Shabbat due to the prohibition of laundering. Rather, one may gently wipe it with a rag, making certain not to squeeze liquid from the rag. If the garment was made of leather, it is permitted to rub it clean with water (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 22:18; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 302:9).

**הַבּוֹרֵר – הַבּוֹרֵר** – **הַבּוֹרֵר**: One who selects legumes on a festival, by selecting legumes in the typical manner on a Festival, by selecting the waste from the food. However, one may not do so with a vessel designated for this purpose. If the quantity of the waste is greater than the quantity of the food, one selects the food from the waste, unless doing so requires extra exertion. The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinions of Beit Hillel and Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Yom Tov* 3:15; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 510:2).

NOTES

We may exert ourselves for the permitted item – **בְּהֵיטָרָא טְרַחֲנִין** – This statement, by Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, can be understood to mean that when the effort required to select the food and the waste is equal, it is preferable to select the food rather than the waste.

**הַחֲבִית פְּסוּלָה וְאוֹכֵל** – **הַחֲבִית פְּסוּלָה וְאוֹכֵל**: According to Rashi, who has a variant reading of the Gemara, the explanation is simple. Since in any case one must lift the entire barrel to access the wine, there is no reason to permit first removing the stone alone. With regard to the standard version of the Gemara, there are a number of interpretations suggested by the different commentaries. The essence of these interpretations is that if one would like to access the barrel, he has no choice but to move the stone. Therefore, the stone has the status of waste, as in a case where the quantity of waste is greater than the quantity of food. Consequently, one may not exert himself to move the stone alone (see Ramban and Rashba).

דְּרַבֵּי יְהוּדָה עֲדִיפָא מְדַרְבֵּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר.

The Gemara rejects this: Fundamentally, the two *tanna'im* agree, but the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda is more far-reaching than the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar. Rabbi Yehuda says that since thought is sufficient, lifting the *se'a* does not render the produce fit for consumption, and it is preferable if he lifts the *se'a* even on Shabbat.

**מִתְנִי' הָאֵבֶן שֶׁעַל פִּי הַחֲבִית – מִטָּה עַל צֵדָה וְהִיא נוֹפֶלֶת. הֵיטָה בֵּין הַחֲבִיּוֹת – מִגְבִּיחָה, וּמִטָּה עַל צֵדָה וְהִיא נוֹפֶלֶת.**

**MISHNA** With regard to a stone, which is set-aside on Shabbat and may not be moved, that was placed on the mouth of a barrel, one tilts the barrel on its side, and the stone falls. If the barrel was among other barrels, and the other barrels might break if the stone falls on them, he lifts the barrel to distance it from the other barrels, and then tilts it on its side, and the stone falls.

מְעוֹת שֶׁעַל הַכֶּרֶב – מִנְעַר אֶת הַכֶּרֶב וְהֵן נוֹפְלוֹת. הֵיטָה עָלָיו לְשִׁלְשֵׁת – מִקְנָחָה בְּסִמְרֻטוֹ, הֵיטָה שֶׁל עוֹר – נוֹתֵנִין עָלֶיהָ מִים עַד שֶׁתִּכְלָה.

With regard to coins that are on a cushion,<sup>H</sup> he shakes the cushion and the coins fall. If there was bird dung (*Arukh*) on the cushion,<sup>H</sup> he wipes it with a rag, but he may not wash it with water due to the prohibition against laundering. If the cushion was made of leather, and laundering is not a concern, he places water on it until the bird dung ceases.

**גַּמְ' אָמַר רַב הוּנָא אָמַר רַב: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא בְּשׁוֹכַחַת אֶבֶן בְּמִנְיַח – נַעֲשֶׂה בְּסִים לְדַבְּרֵי הָאֶסוּר.**

**GEMARA** Rav Huna said that Rav said: They only taught this *halakha* with regard to a stone in a case where one forgets the stone on the barrel. However, if he places the stone on the barrel, the barrel becomes a base for a prohibited object, which itself may not be moved throughout Shabbat.

[“הֵיטָה בֵּין הַחֲבִיּוֹת כּו'”]. מֵאֵן תִּנָּח דְּבָל הֵיכָא דְאִיכָא אִיסוּרָא וְהֵיטָרָא – בְּהֵיטָרָא טְרַחֲנִין, בְּאִיסוּרָא לֹא טְרַחֲנִין?

We learned in the mishna: If the barrel was among other barrels, he lifts the barrel and then tilts it on its side, and the stone falls. The Gemara asks: Who is the *tanna* who holds that any place that there is a prohibited item and a permitted item, we may exert ourselves for the permitted item,<sup>N</sup> but we may not exert ourselves for the prohibited item? One must exert himself to lift the barrel, and he may not remove the stone, although doing so would minimize his exertion.

אָמַר רַבָּה בַּר בַּר חֲנָה אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: רַבֵּן שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל הִיא, דְּתַנֵּן: הַבּוֹרֵר קְטִינָתַי בְּיוֹם טוֹב, בֵּית שְׁמַאי אוֹמְרִים בּוֹרֵר אוֹכֵל וְאוֹכֵל, וּבֵית הִלֵּל אוֹמְרִים: בּוֹרֵר כְּדַרְבּוֹ בְּחִיקוֹ וּבִתְמַחְוֵי.

Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yohanan said: It is Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel. As we learned in a mishna: With regard to one who selects legumes on a Festival,<sup>H</sup> separating edible and inedible, Beit Shammai say: He selects food and eats it immediately and leaves the waste. And Beit Hillel say: He selects in his usual manner, and may even remove the waste and leave the food, in his lap or in a large vessel.

וְתַנֵּינָא, אָמַר רַבֵּן שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל: בְּמָה דְּבָרִים אָמְרִים – שֶׁאוֹכֵל מְרֻבָּה עַל הַפְּסוּלָה, אֶבֶל פְּסוּלָה מְרֻבָּה עַל הָאוֹכֵל – דְּבָרֵי הַכֶּל בּוֹרֵר אוֹכֵל.

And it was taught in a *baraita* that Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: In what case are these matters, the dispute between Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel, stated: In a case where the quantity of the food is greater than the quantity of the waste. However, if the quantity of the waste is greater than the quantity of the food, everyone agrees that one selects the food to avoid the exertion involved in removing the waste, which itself may not be moved. The same is true here. He moves the barrel and not the stone, which is like waste.<sup>N</sup>

וְהָאֵבֶן הֵכָא, דְּכִי אוֹכֵל מְרֻבָּה עַל הַפְּסוּלָה דְּמִי!

The Gemara asks: And here, in the case of the barrel, isn't it comparable to a case where the food is greater than the waste, as the barrel, which is food, is bigger and heavier than the stone. In addition, it is easier to move the stone. Nevertheless, he is not permitted to do so, in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel.

הֵכָא נָמִי, בִּינּוֹן דְּאִי בְּעֵי לְמִישְׁקֵל לֹא מִשְׁתַּקִּיל לִיהּ יוֹן עַד דְּשַׁקִּיל לָהּ לְאֶבֶן – כְּפְסוּלָה מְרֻבָּה עַל הָאוֹכֵל דְּמִי.

The Gemara answers: Here, too, since if he wants to take the wine, the wine cannot be taken until he removes the stone, the legal status of the stone is like that of waste which is greater in quantity than the food, and it cannot be likened to the case of selecting. In this case, he is unable to move the barrel without moving the stone.

הֵיטָה בֵּין הַחֲבִיּוֹת מִגְבִּיחָה. תִּנְיָא, רַבִּי יוֹסִי אוֹמַר: הֵיטָה הַחֲבִיּוֹת מוֹנַחַת בְּאוֹצָר, אוֹ שְׁדֵי כְּלֵי זְכוּכִיּוֹת מוֹנַחִין תַּחְתֵּיהָ – מִגְבִּיחָה לְמָקוֹם אַחֵר, וּמִטָּה עַל צֵדָה וְהִיא נוֹפֶלֶת. וְנוֹטֵל הֵימְנָה מֵה שִׁצְרִיךְ לוֹ, וּמְחִזְרֶיהָ לְמָקוֹמָהּ.

We learned in the mishna: If the barrel was among other barrels, he lifts the barrel. It was taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Yosei says: If the barrel was placed in a storeroom amongst other barrels, or if glass vessels were placed beneath it, preventing him from tilting the barrel and letting the stone fall, he lifts the barrel and moves it to a different place, and he tilts it on its side, and the stone falls. And then he takes from the barrel what he needs, and restores the barrel to its place.

HALAKHA

Moving for the purpose of utilizing its place – טלטול לצורך מקומו – Tilting a barrel to remove a stone or shaking a cushion to remove coins is permitted only in cases where one seeks to utilize the barrel or the cushion itself. However, if he seeks to utilize its place, one may move the barrel with the stone, or the cushion with the coins (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhhot Shabbat 25:17; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 309:5).

Moving by means of a loaf or a baby – טלטול על ידי כפר או תינוק: If one must move a corpse to maintain its dignity, or if one seeks to utilize the place that the corpse is lying, he may place a loaf of bread or a baby on the corpse and move it. This applies only to moving a corpse, but not to other set-aside objects that may not be moved (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhhot Shabbat 26:21; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 311:5).

NOTES

For the purpose of utilizing its place – לצורך: This does not mean that utilizing its place is more significant than utilizing itself. Rather, if one seeks to utilize the cushion itself, he can shake off coins without moving them. If one seeks to utilize its place, however, he must move the coins as well (Tiferet Shmuel).

Holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda – ירבי יהודה קביא ליה: The dispute between Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon is with regard to food that was originally designated for consumption by people, but that became spoiled. Rabbi Yehuda deems the food set-aside because it is no longer fit for consumption by people. Therefore, it is prohibited to move it, even for animals. In contrast, Rabbi Shimon holds that there is no prohibition of set-aside, and therefore, it is permitted to move food that is unfit for consumption by people.

LANGUAGE

Saddlebag [diskaya] – דסקיא: From the Greek δισάκιον, disakyon, which means a double-bag or two bags tied together loaded onto an animal.

“מעות שעל הכר” אמר רב חייא בר אשי אמר רב: לא שנו אלא בשוכה, אבל במניח – נעשה בסיס לדבר האסור.

אמר רבה בר בר חנה אמר רבי יוחנן: לא שנו אלא לצורך גופו, אבל לצורך מקומו – מטלטלו ועודן עליו. וכן תני חייא בר רב מדיפתי: לא שנו אלא לצורך גופו, אבל לצורך מקומו – מטלטלו ועודן עליו.

“מעות שעל הכר מנער וכו’” אמר רבי אשי: שכת ארנקי בחצר – מניח עליה כפר או תינוק, ומטלטלה. אמר רב יצחק: שכת לבינה בחצר – מניח עליה כפר או תינוק, ומטלטלה. אמר רבי יהודה בר שילא אמר רבי אסי: פעם אחת שכחו דסקיא מלאה מעות בסרטיא, ובאו ושאלו את רבי יוחנן, ואמר להן: הניחו עליה כפר או תינוק וטלטלוה.

אמר מר זוטרא: הלכתא ככל הני שמעתתא בשוכה. רב אשי אמר: אפילו שכת נמי [לא], ולא אמרו כפר או תינוק אלא למת בלבד.

אביי מנח כפא אביי. רבא מנח סבינא אבר יונה ומטלטלה. אמר רב יוסף: כמה חריפא שמעתתא דרדקי! אימר דאמור רבנן בשוכה, לכתחילה מי אמור?!

אמר אביי: אי לאו דאדם חשוב אנא, כפא אביי למה ליה? הא חזו למיזגא עליהו!

אמר רבא: אנא, אי לאו דאדם חשוב אנא – סבינא אבר יונה למה ליה? הא חזו לי לאומצא!

טעמא – דחזי לאומצא, הא לא חזי לאומצא – לא למימרא דרבא ברבי יהודה קביא ליה?

והאמר רבא לשמעיה: טווי לי בר אוזא, ושדי מיניה לשונרא!

We learned in the mishna: With regard to coins that are on a cushion, he shakes the cushion and the coins fall. Rav Hiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said: They only taught this halakha with regard to a case where one forgets the coins on the cushion; however, if he places the coins on the cushion, the cushion becomes a base for a prohibited object and may not be moved at all.

Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yohanan said: They only taught the halakha that one shakes the cushion and the coins fall, when he needs the cushion for the purpose of utilizing the cushion itself; but if he needs it for the purpose of utilizing its place,<sup>HN</sup> he moves the cushion with the coins still on it. And likewise, Hiyya bar Rav from Difti taught in a baraita: They only taught the halakha that one shakes the cushion and the coins fall, when he needs the cushion for the purpose of utilizing the cushion itself, but if he needs it for the purpose of utilizing its place, he moves the cushion with the coins still on it.

We learned in the mishna: With regard to coins that are on a cushion, he shakes the cushion and the coins fall.

Rabbi Oshaya said: If one forgot a purse of money in the courtyard on Shabbat eve, and he remembers it on Shabbat and wants to bring it into the house, he places a loaf of bread or a baby on it and moves it.<sup>H</sup> The purse becomes a base for a permitted object and may be moved.

Rav Yitzhak said: If one forgot a brick in the courtyard, he places a loaf of bread or a baby on it and moves it.

Rabbi Yehuda bar Sheila said that Rabbi Asi said: Once, they forgot a saddlebag [diskaya]<sup>L</sup> full of coins in a main street, and they came and asked Rabbi Yohanan, and he said to them: Place a loaf or a baby on it, and move it.

Mar Zutra said: The halakha is in accordance with all these statements in the case of one who forgets. However, if one intentionally left an object, even a valuable object, on Shabbat eve, he may not employ artifice and move it the following day. Rav Ashi said: If one forgot, he may also not employ artifice, and they only stated that movement by means of a loaf or a baby for the purposes of moving a corpse alone.

The Gemara relates: Abaye would place a spoon on bundles of produce, so that he would be able to move the bundles because of the spoon. Rava would place a knife on a slaughtered young dove and move it. Rav Yosef said mockingly: How sharp is the halakha of children? Say that the Sages stated this halakha only in a case where one forgets, but did they say that one may do so ab initio?

Abaye explained his actions and said: If not for the fact that I am an important person, why would I need to place a spoon on the bundles? Aren't the bundles themselves suited to lean upon? I could have carried the bundles without the spoon.

Similarly, Rava said: If not for the fact that I am an important person, why would I need to place a knife on a young dove? Isn't the young dove itself suited to be eaten as raw meat?

The Gemara asks: The reason that it is permitted to move the slaughtered dove is because it is suited to be eaten by a person as raw meat; but if it is not suited to be eaten by a person as raw meat, no, it may not be moved. Is that to say that Rava holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda,<sup>N</sup> that on Shabbat it is prohibited to move food that was originally designated for human consumption and is now only suited for animal consumption?

Didn't Rava say to his attendant on a Festival: Roast a duck for me, and throw its intestines to the cat. Moving the duck's intestines was permitted in order to feed the cat. Similarly, moving the dove should have been permitted not because it is raw meat fit for consumption by a person, but because it is suited for consumption by a dog.