

12 Adar 5773  
Feb. 22, 2013



Shabbos Daf 142

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

**A living creature supports its own weight.**

One who takes a child that is alive in to a public domain and the child has a pouch hanging from his neck, the person is liable for taking out the pouch. If the child was dead, then the person who took the child out is not liable. The reason that when one takes a live child out with the pouch he is only liable for the pouch and not for the child is because a living creature supports its own weight. The person is liable for the pouch, because although one who carries a live person out on a bed is entirely exempt, this is because the bed is considered part of the person, whereas the pouch on the child is not considered part of the child. (141b)

**One can carry his son in a courtyard on Shabbos even though his son is holding a stone in his hand.**

One can carry his son on Shabbos in a courtyard, even though the child is holding a stone that is muktzeh. The Gemara explains that the Mishnah refers to a case where the child has a longing for his father, so the Chachamim provided a special dispensation that the father can lift the child even though

the stone that the child is holding is muktzeh. (141b)

**There is a distinction between carrying a child holding a stone and a child carrying a coin.**

When the child is holding the stone, if the stone falls from the child's hand, the father will not carry it, so we permit the father to carry the child holding the stone. If the child is holding a coin, however, if the coin falls from the child's hand, the father would come to carry the coin. For this reason, we do not allow the father to carry the child who is holding a coin, even if the child has a longing for his father. One would not even be allowed to hold the hand of his child who is holding a coin on Shabbos, as we are concerned that the child will drop the coin and the father will come to carry the coin that is muktzeh. (142a)

**One can carry a basket that contains a stone and fruits that become ruined easily.**

The Mishnah stated that one may carry a basket that has a stone inside it. The basket is not considered a *basis*, base for a forbidden object, because the basket also contains

produce, which is not muktzeh, and the basket is primarily a base for permitted objects. We don't require the person to spill the contents of the basket out on the ground and then place the produce back in the basket. Although this would obviate the need to move the stone, we are dealing with a case that the produce will become ruined if the produce is spilled on the ground. If the produce would not get ruined, then one must spill the contents of the basket onto the ground, and then he can only place the produce in the basket without the stone. (142a)

**One can move *Terumah* that is *tamei* with *Terumah* that is *tahor*.**

The Mishnah states that one can move *Terumah* that is *tamei* with *Terumah* that is *tahor* on Shabbos. The Gemara explains that this ruling only applies when the *Terumah* that is *tahor* is at the bottom of the basket and the *Terumah* that is *tamei* is on top of it. If the *Terumah* that is *tahor* is on top and the *Terumah* that is *tamei* is on the bottom, however, then one is required to remove the *Terumah* that is *tahor* out of the basket and the *Terumah* that is *tamei* remains in the basket. One cannot spill all the *Terumah* out and then place the *Terumah* that is *tahor* in the basket, as the produce will get ruined. Our Mishnah refers to a case where one needs the *Terumah* that is *tahor* for its own use, i.e. to eat it, so when there is no other option available, he can move the *Terumah* that is *tamei* also. A Baraisa states that one can move both the *Terumah* that is *tahor* and the *Terumah* that is *tamei*, regardless of

the position of either *Terumah*, refers to a case where one needed the basket for its place. Since the *Terumah* that is *tahor* is more valuable than the *Terumah* that is *tamei*, one can move the entire basket. (142a)

**One can remove one part of *Terumah* from a mixture that contains one hundred parts of *Chullin* on Shabbos.**

Rabbi Yehudah maintained in the Mishnah that one can remove one part of *Terumah* from a mixture that contains one hundred parts of *Chullin*. The Gemara finds difficulty with this, as it should be considered that the person is repairing the mixture, because by removing the part that is *Terumah* from the mixture, he is allowing the rest to be eaten. The Gemara concludes that Rabbi Yehudah follows the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar, who maintains that when a mixture contains one part *Terumah* and one hundred parts of *Chullin*, one can look with his eyes at one side of the mixture and eat from the other side without actually having removed the necessary portion. Rabbi Yehudah in our Mishnah maintains that one can eat from the mixture without actually removing the portion, and since the 'repair' of the mixture can be performed without actually performing a physical action, it follows that the actual removal is not forbidden. Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar, however, maintains that one cannot physically remove the necessary portion from the mixture, whereas according to Rabbi Yehudah, since one can designate the portion mentally, he can also physically remove the portion. (142a)

**One can remove a stone from on top of a barrel by tilting the barrel and having the stone fall off.**

If a stone was on top of a barrel, one may tilt the barrel so that the stone falls off. This is permitted because he is not moving the stone, which is muktzeh, directly, and he is moving the muktzeh in order to obtain wine that is not muktzeh. One may only tilt the barrel to remove the stone if he unintentionally left the stone on top of the barrel. If he left the stone intentionally on top of the barrel, however, then the barrel is a basis to the stone and he cannot move the barrel at all. (142b)

**One can move a barrel from amongst other barrels and then tilt the barrel so that the stone should fall off.**

If the barrel of wine was amongst other barrels and he is concerned that the stone may break the barrels, he may lift the barrel and place it elsewhere, and then tilt the barrel so that the stone falls off. Removing the barrel requires less exertion than removing the stone, because removing the stone will not enable the person to take all the wine from the barrel. Therefore, it is preferable to remove the entire barrel from amongst the other barrels and then tilt the barrel so that the stone falls off. (142b)

**There is a dispute regarding separating beans from a mixture on Yom Tov.**

If one wants to separate beans from a mixture that contains muktzeh on Yom Tov, Bais Shammai maintains that one must select

the food from the objects that one does not desire and eat the food. Bais Hillel, however, maintains that one can even remove the undesired objects from the food, and he does this by spreading the mixture on a plate and he tilts the plate so the beans are separated from the undesirable objects contained in the mixture. Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel states that Bai Hillel only permits removing undesired objects from the food when the food is more than the undesired objects, as in such a case, removing the muktzeh does not involve much exertion. If the undesired objects are more than the food, however, then even Bais Hillel agrees that one must remove the food and leave the undesired objects. (142b)

**One can shake off a pillow that had money on it when Shabbos began.**

The Mishnah states that one can shake off a pillow that had money on it when shabbos began. The Gemara states that if one forgot a purse in the courtyard, he can place a loaf of bread or a child on the purse and move it where it will not be stolen. The rationale behind this ruling is that the loaf of bread or the child are non-muktzeh items, and by placing them on the muktzeh item, one is essentially moving the non-muktzeh item and the muktzeh item is now secondary to the non-muktzeh item. (142b)

## DAILY MASHAL

### *Choosing between a Good Beverage and a Bad One*

The prohibition of *borer* is that one cannot select from a mixture something that he does not desire while leaving the object that he does desire. Essentially, this process of selection is a microcosm of life, as one is always choosing between good and bad. One must choose the good and leave the impurities behind. The story is told with Rabbi Dovid HaLevi Segal, the author of the Taz on Shulchan Aruch, who began his rabbinical career as the Rav of the city of Potolich. The Taz would stay up late learning Torah but was overcome by hunger pangs. His solution to this predicament was to drink whiskey in the local tavern, which would warm him temporarily and stave off his hunger pangs. The Taz was forced to buy whiskey on credit, and when the townspeople discovered that the rabbi whom they despised was a drinker like the simple folk, they dismissed him from his position. The Taz went on to become the Rav of the city of Ostroh, home of the famous Maharsha, and a city whose inhabitants respected Torah scholars. When the Taz was writing his commentary to Shulchan Aruch and he arrived at the laws of Kiddush, the Taz wrote that the Shulchan Aruch rules that when wine is unavailable, one can make Kiddush on beer as beer is considered *chamar medinah*, a commonly drunk beverage. Nonetheless, the Taz ruled that the people who live in Potolich cannot recite Kiddush over beer or whiskey, because they are loathe to anyone who drinks these beverages. When the Taz's writings were published, the inhabitants of Potolich had their livelihood snuffed out, as all the liquor merchants heard about the Taz's ruling and they all assumed that the people of Potolich had a change of heart and now despised alcoholic beverages. This could not have been further from the truth, as not only did the residents of Potolich not despise whiskey and beer, but they

actually made a nice living through the sale of these drinks. After discovering that their ignorance had been the cause of the Taz being forced to seek alleviation of his hunger through whiskey, the residents of Potolich sent a delegation to the Taz begging his forgiveness and the Taz, upon reprinting his commentary on the Shulchan Aruch, deleted the ruling regarding the people of Potolich not being allowed to recite Kiddush over wine and beer. The moral of the story is that the residents of Potolich chose to hire a good rabbi but they failed to recognize his value, until they were forced to appreciate him, and the Taz assumed that the residents despised something, and in truth it was something that they really loved. Good and bad are sometimes just a matter of perspective, and one with a positive attitude will see everything in life as an opportunity for spiritual growth.