

This month's Daf Digest is dedicated  
L'Ilu Nishmas Mr. Israel Gotlib of Antwerp and Petach Tikva, Yisrael Tzvi ben Zev  
By Mr. and Mrs. Manny Weiss

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Carrying a child who is holding muktza (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its discussion of carrying a child who is holding muktza and cites a Baraisa that supports Rava's position, that one who carries another person who is holding an object is considered to be carrying that item himself.

### 2) Carrying a basket that contains a stone

Why is it permitted to carry a basket that contains a rock; should the basket be considered a base to a prohibited object?

R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rava answers that the Mishnah is referring to a punctured basket and the rock was placed in the basket to fill the hole.

### 3) Carrying terumah that is tamei with terumah that is tahor

R' Chisda states: The lenient ruling of the Mishnah applies only when the terumah that is tahor is on the bottom of the basket, but if the terumah that is tahor is on top, the terumah must be removed and it is prohibited to move that which is tamei.

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges R' Chisda. Furthermore, Rava demonstrates how a careful reading of the Mishnah is consistent with R' Chisda's explanation.

### 4) Removing one part terumah from a mixture with one hundred parts chulin

The Gemara asks: How could R' Yehudah permit removing the one part terumah, doesn't that violate the prohibition against "repairing?"

The Gemara answers: R' Yehudah follows the opinion of R' Shimon ben Elazar who rules that it is permitted to eat from the mixture even before the actual separation takes place. Since it is permitted to eat from the mixture without separating the terumah the act of separating does not constitute "repairing."

**5) MISHNAH:** The issue of indirect movement of muktza is presented. Additionally, the Mishnah discusses cleaning a dirty pillow.

### 6) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Huna in the name of Rav states: The ruling of the Mishnah that permits tilting the barrel to remove the rock applies only if one forgot the rock on the barrel, but if it was placed intentionally the barrel becomes a base for muktza and may not be moved.

The Gemara explains that the position held by the Mishnah, requiring a person to handle a non-muktza item rather than a muktza item, is consistent with the opinion of R' Shimon ben Gamliel.

A Baraisa is cited that elaborates on the ruling in the Mishnah concerning removing a rock resting on a barrel when the barrel is next to fragile items.

R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav states: The ruling in the Mishnah permitting one to shake a pillow to remove money resting upon it is limited to the case where the person forgot the money on the pillow. If, however, the money was placed intentionally, the pillow becomes a base for muktza and may not be moved. Furthermore, in the name of R' Yochanan it is said that shaking the pillow to remove the money is necessary only if one needs the pillow, but if one needed the place beneath the pillow one must move the pillow with the money.

(Continued on page 2)

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Immersing utensils on Shabbos

רבי יהודה אומר אף מעלין. ואמאי - הא קא מתקן

The Gemara tells us that the melacha of **בפטיש** applies not only to utensils, but also to food. There is a **מחלוקת** among the Rishonim regarding whether a new utensil which was purchased from a gentile is permitted to be immersed in a mikvah on Shabbos (O.C. 323:7). Sha'agas Aryeh (#56) tries to prove from our Gemara that it is prohibited, as we find that making final adjustments to a pile of food (which has teruma mixed in) should be prohibited because it might lead to fixing a utensil. We see that the concept of fixing a utensil is a Torah principle, and other activities are restricted in order not to lead one to do the same for a utensil.

The Gemara (Beitza 17b) teaches that everyone agrees that it is prohibited to immerse a utensil in a mikvah on Shabbos and Yom Tov if the purpose is to cleanse it from tum'ah. Rava (ibid. 18a) explains the reason is that when we purify a utensil in a mikvah, it appears as if we have fixed the utensil and we have made it functional. Accordingly, if the nature of the tum'ah itself is only rabbinic, the rabbis would not establish a precautionary restriction to guard against it.

Rashba concludes, therefore, that it would be prohibited to immerse a utensil on Shabbos, because the law that requires us to dip such an item when it is bought from a gentile is a Torah requirement. Rambam, on the other hand, holds that the obligation to immerse utensils bought from gentiles is a rabbinic law. Accordingly, immersing them on Shabbos would be permitted (Hilchos Yom Tov 4:18). When we dip such an item in a mikvah, the problem is that it appears as if we are fixing the utensil. This rabbinic limitation does not apply to safeguard the rabbinic law of immersing utensils.

Magid Mishna explains that there is a difference between a utensil which is tam'e, which can be used as such, and a utensil which is bought from a gentile, which is not to be used at all until it is immersed. Magid Mishna holds that even Rambam would agree that it is

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why did R' Chisda feel compelled to explain that the Mishnah refers to a case where a person needs the muktza item itself (לגופו)?
2. Explain תרומה בעינא מחתא.
3. Under what conditions is it permitted to move a muktza item rather than a non-muktza item?
4. Why was it necessary for Abaye and Rava to identify themselves as important people?

# HALACHAH Highlight

*The concept of (Bosis) - a Muktza "base"*<sup>1</sup>

האבן שע"פ החבית מטה על צדה והיא נופלת"א. ר הווא אמר רב לא שנו אלא שוכח אבל במניח נעשה בסיס לדבר האסור

A Muktza item extends its own status of Muktza to any object upon which it was intentionally placed before Shabbos (and was left remaining there on Shabbos). The object upon which the Muktza item was placed (or by which it is supported) is called a "Bosis" of the Muktza item.

If the Muktza item is removed from upon the Bosis, or the Bosis is somehow removed from beneath the Muktza item, the Bosis remains Muktza for the remainder of Shabbos. However, if there are other non-Muktza items of greater importance resting on the Bosis, the Bosis does not become Muktza.

## Exemptions to Bosis

There are several important exemptions to the principle of Bosis:

Shochai'ach ("forgotten")

Derech Akroy ("random manner")

### a) Shochai'ach

The principle of Bosis applies only where the Muktza item was placed intentionally upon the non-Muktza item. However, if the Muktza was left there unintentionally, or was forgotten, it does not cause the item upon which it was placed to become a Bosis.

There are actually three categories of "Shochai'ach":

Unintentional placement

Unplanned placement during the week

Placement on Friday with plans for removal before Shabbos

All three of these categories are forms of unintentional placement, and are included within the general premise of Shochai'ach, as shall be explained.

### a-1) Unintentional placement

This refers to situations where the Muktza item was placed upon another item inadvertently.

(Insight...continued from page 1)

prohibited to immerse a utensil on Shabbos which was acquired from the gentile. This would result in a utensil being changed from being useless to becoming functional. The argument of the Amoraim regarding immersion on Shabbos and Yom Tov is only in regard to removal of tum'ah. This is the only case where Rambam allows immersion on Shabbos itself. ■

### a-2) Unplanned placement during the week

This refers to situations where the Muktza item was placed deliberately upon another item in the middle of the week (i.e. except Friday), but without any conscious thoughts or plans for leaving it there on Shabbos. This means that the owner did not consciously say or think to himself, "I want this item to remain here over Shabbos" when he placed it there.

Unplanned placement of items during the week is not considered "intentional" with regard to Bosis (even when done deliberately) because items are constantly moved about and are not expected to remain in one place. Therefore, their placement upon an item more than a day before Shabbos does not represent the degree of intent required for establishing a Halachic Bosis.

However, if the Muktza object is placed upon (or into) a non-Muktza item that is its usual place of storage or placement, the non-Muktza item becomes a full-fledged Bosis even during the week. Any placing of a Muktza object upon an item on which it belongs, or upon which it is normally placed, is considered "intentional" with regard to Bosis.

### a-3) Placement on Friday with plans for removal before Shabbos

This refers to the placement of a Muktza item upon a non-Muktza item on Friday, with the conscious intention to remove it before Shabbos. The placement of an item with the specific intention of removing it before Shabbos is not considered "intentional" with respect to Bosis.

However, if a Muktza item was placed upon another item on Friday without any conscious plans to remove it before Shabbos, the non-Muktza item does become a Bosis. In this case, the placement is considered fully intentional because it was to be expected that an item put down close to Shabbos would probably remain in its place when Shabbos arrives. ■

1 The 39 Melachos, by Rabbi Dovid Ribiat, pages 55-59. Used with permission of the author

# Gemara GEM

## A distinguished person

אדם חשוב

The Gemara (Shabbos 142b) relates that although Abaye was of the opinion that it is permitted to carry sheaves of harvested grain on Shabbos, he nevertheless refrained from doing so unless he first placed a ladle on the sheave.

Why did he hold it is permitted to carry sheaves? Although the grain they contain must undergo much processing before it is edible, the stalks of which the sheaves are comprised can serve here and now as mats upon which a person may lay down.

Why then did he refrain from doing so? Because he was a distinguished person. Hence, his conduct would serve as a model that other people might emulate. Therefore, lest other

people draw erroneous conclusions and potentially treat prohibitions leniently, Abaye conducted himself stringently and refrained from carrying the sheaves outright.

The Gemara then cites Rava's similar conduct in another case involving the laws of Shabbos.

On the basis of this passage and similar Gemaras, Yad Malachi (Klalei ha'Alef #6) rejects the assertion of Be'er Sheva (fol. 110d) that it is only in regard to the law that forbids dishes cooked by non-Jews (Bishul Akum) that a distinguished person must maintain a higher standard (Be'er Sheva contends that this is due to the unique distance from "non-kosher" food that is the essence of this prohibition.) Indeed, in his notes to Yad Malachi (ad loc.), R' Yeshaya Pick notes that he found fourteen laws besides the law of Bishul Akum in which the principle that a distinguished person should maintain a higher standard is invoked.

Hence, writes Yad Malachi, a scholar must refrain from activities – that are perfectly permissible for other people – when they touch upon any area of Halacha in which a prohibition may apply. He explains that this is because of a fact of human nature expounded by Talmud Yerushalmi in Moed Kattan (cited by Ritva to Moed Kattan 2a), that people are more likely to interpret what they see erroneously and draw distorted conclusions than to interpret what they see correctly and draw accurate conclusion. ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

ey upon it.

### 7) Alternate methods of moving Muktza

The Gemara quotes a number of opinions that hold that if one forgot muktza in a place where it is at risk of being stolen one may place bread or a child onto the muktza and move the two items together. ■

Daf Digest is published by the Chicago Center, under the leadership of

HaRav Yehoshua Eichenstein, shlit"a

HaRav Pinchas Eichenstein, Nasi; HaRav Zalmen L. Eichenstein, Rosh Kollel; Rabbi Tzvi Bider, Executive Director, edited by Rabbi Ben-Zion Rand.

Daf Yomi Digest has been made possible through the generosity of Mr. & Mrs. Dennis Ruben.