

2 Kislev 5773  
Nov. 16, 2012



Shabbos Daf 44

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"n**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

## Muktzeh

The *Mishna* had stated that one may not benefit from the oil (in the lamp), since it was not prepared (for *Shabbos*).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: It is forbidden to benefit from the leftover oil in the lamp or a bowl (after the fire has gone out). Rabbi Shimon permits its use. [This dispute centers on the concept of *migu d'iskatzai l'bein hashemashos, iskatzai lekulei yoma, once an item is considered muktzeh right before the onset of Shabbos, it is rendered muktzeh for the entire Shabbos. Rabbi Yehudah, who reflects the first opinion, maintains that something that is muktzeh bein hashemashos is muktzeh for the whole Shabbos, while Rabbi Shimon holds that oil is only muktzeh while the candle is burning. Once the flame is extinguished, the remaining oil is permitted for use.*]

The *Mishna* states that one may move only a new lamp (of earthenware) on *Shabbos* (since it was never used, it is not repulsive, and it can be used as a container for produce), but one may not move an old lamp (for it is repulsive, and therefore *muktzeh*). Rabbi Shimon, however, posits that only a lamp that is burning on *Shabbos* cannot be moved.

The *Gemora* quotes a *braisa* where Rabbi Yehudah permits moving a new lamp but forbids moving an old lamp on *Shabbos*. Rabbi Meir maintains that one may move any lamp on *Shabbos* except for a lamp that was burning from right before *Shabbos*. [Rabbi Meir holds of *muktzeh machmas issur, muktzeh because of prohibition, i.e. a lamp where the flame was lit for Shabbos.*] Rabbi Shimon, however, maintains that one may move any lamp unless the lamp was burning on *Shabbos*. If the lamp went out on *Shabbos*, Rabbi Shimon permits moving it. [Rabbi Shimon does not hold of *muktzeh machmas mius, muktzeh because the item is repugnant. One*

may not move a lamp that is burning according to Rabbi Shimon, because by moving the lamp, he may unintentionally extinguish the fire.] But a cup, dish or beaker (used as lamps) may not be moved from its place. Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon maintains that one may remove oil from a lamp that is almost extinguished or from the oil that is dripping from a burning candle.

Abaye explains: Rabbi Elozar holds like his father Rabbi Shimon who does not hold of general restrictions pertaining to *muktzeh*, but Rabbi Elozar disagrees with his father with regard to using the candle and oil even while the candle is still burning. Rabbi Shimon only permits using the oil once the flame is extinguished, whereas Rabbi Elozar maintains that one may use the oil and candle even while the flame is burning.

The *braisa* had stated: But a cup, dish or beaker (used as lamps) may not be moved from its place.

The *Gemora* asks: Why are these different (that R' Shimon prohibits moving them)?

The *Gemora* answers: This last clause follows Rabbi Yehudah (who holds of *muktzeh*).

Mar Zutra demurred to this: If so, why 'but'?

Rather, Mar Zutra said: In truth, it follows Rabbi Shimon; yet Rabbi Shimon permits handling (the oil and the lamp) only in the case of a small lamp, because one's mind is set upon it (for he knows that the flame will eventually go out), but these, which are large, he does not (expect them to go out, and therefore, they are *muktzeh*).



The *Gemora* asks: But it was taught in a *braisa*: It is forbidden to benefit from the leftover oil in the lamp or a bowl (*after the fire has gone out*). Rabbi Shimon permits its use (*even though the bowl is large*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: There the bowl is similar to the lamp (*which is small*); here, the bowl is similar to the cup (*which is large*).

Rabbi Zeira said: Regarding a metal candlestick whose flame was lit for *Shabbos*, the one (*R' Meir*) who permits (*moving a used lamp*) would forbid (*moving the metal candlestick, as R' Meir, although he permits moving muktzeh by dint of repugnance, he forbids moving an article that is muktzeh machmas issur, muktzeh because of prohibition*). The one (*R' Yehudah*), however, who forbids (*moving a used lamp because it is muktzeh machmas mius, muktzeh because it is repugnant*), will nonetheless permit (*moving a metal candlestick, as Rabbi Yehudah does not subscribe to the concept of muktzeh machmas issur, muktzeh because of prohibition*).

The *Gemora* asks: Shall we say that Rabbi Yehudah accepts the prohibition of *muktzeh* on account of repugnance, but rejects that of *muktzeh* on account of a prohibition? But it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yehudah said: One may move any metal lamp on *Shabbos*, except for a lamp that had been lit for *Shabbos*. [*This is because Rabbi Yehudah holds of muktzeh on account of repulsiveness and of the concept of muktzeh because of a prohibition.*]

Rather, if it was stated, it was stated as follows: Rabbi Zeira said: Regarding a metal candlestick whose flame was lit for *Shabbos*, both Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehudah agree that it is forbidden to move (*even after the flame has been extinguished*). They both agree, however, that a flame that had not been lit for *Shabbos* one can move, even if the candlestick was used. [*Thus, Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Meir both subscribe to the concept of muktzeh machmas issur. Rabbi Meir does not hold of muktzeh machmas mi'us, and even Rabbi Yehudah agrees that a used candlestick is not considered repugnant.*]

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: One may not move a bed on *Shabbos* if the bed was designated to keep money on.

The *Gemora* asks from our *Mishna*: one may move only a new lamp (*of earthenware*) on *Shabbos* (*since it was never used, it is not repulsive, and it can be used as a container for produce*), but one may not move an old lamp (*for it is repulsive, and therefore muktzeh*). Now, if a lamp, though made for that purpose (*for lighting*), may be handled if it was not lit, how much more so a bed, which was not made for that purpose (*for storing money*) – it certainly should be permitted!

Rather, if it was stated, it was stated as follows: Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: Regarding a bed which was designated for money, if money was placed upon it (*even during a weekday*), it may not be handled; if money was not placed upon it, it may be handled. But if it was not (*verbally*) designated for money, then if money is lying upon it (*on Shabbos*), it may not be handled; if money is not lying upon it, it may be handled, provided that there was none upon it at *bein hashemashos*. [*If there was money on the bed bein hashemashos, the bed is considered a basis, a base for muktzeh, and this renders the bed muktzeh for the whole Shabbos.*]

Ulla said: Rabbi Elozar asked from the following *Mishna*: If a coach has removable wheel, the coach and the wheel are considered separate entities with regard to the laws of *tumah*. If the coach becomes *tamei*, this does not render the wheel *tamei*. The wheel is not measured with the coach with regard to the volume that renders the item *tamei*. One may not drag the removable wheel on *Shabbos* when there is money on the wheel. This implies that if there was no money on the wheel at *bein hashemashos*, it is permitted to move it. [*Evidently, the fact that it served as a basis for muktzeh at the onset of Shabbos does not render it muktzeh the entire Shabbos!?*]

The *Gemora* answers: That *Mishna* reflects the view of Rabbi Shimon who does not hold of *muktzeh*, while Rav holds like Rabbi Yehudah. (44a – 44b)