

Laws of Shabbat Chapter 25 (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

Shiur Overview

Summary of Shiur — Rambam Hilchos Shabbos Chapter 25 (Laws of Muktzeh/Moving Objects)

Introduction

Chapter 25 of Hilchos Shabbos deals with **the rabbinic prohibition of moving objects (muktzeh)**. The Rambam gave an introduction at the end of Chapter 24 with three reasons why the Sages decreed a prohibition on moving objects — the main reason is so that Shabbos should look like Shabbos, because without a prohibition on moving things, people would be busy carrying and bringing things.

[Digression: The Lubavitcher Rebbe said one should recite a chapter of Tehillim in order to be successful in maintaining the order of learning Rambam. Also a comment that the Rambam deliberately divides a topic in the middle of two chapters — he gives "appetite" like in a dramatic book.]

Halacha 1 — The Division of Vessels: Melachto L'heter and Melachto L'issur

The Rambam's Words

"There are vessels whose purpose is for permitted use, and they are vessels that one is permitted to use on Shabbos for the purpose they were made, such as a cup, bowl, knife, and axe to crack nuts with... And there are vessels whose purpose is for forbidden use, and they are vessels that one is forbidden to use on Shabbos for the purpose they were made, such as a mortar and millstones which are forbidden to grind with on Shabbos."

Simple Meaning

The Rambam divides vessels into two categories: (1) **Keli shemelachto l'heter** — a vessel whose purpose is for permitted things (cup for drinking, bowl for eating, knife for cutting, axe for cracking nuts); (2) **Keli shemelachto l'issur** — a vessel whose purpose is forbidden things (millstones, mortar — made for grinding).

Novel Points

- **The language "sheneassu lo"**: The Rambam says "davar sheneassu lo" (not "sheneassu bo") — this means the **purpose** for which the vessel was created, not just what one can do with it. The definition is not what one can do with the vessel, but rather what it was made for.

- [Digression — Mussar lesson for technology]: People look at technology like a "keli shemelachto l'issur," but one must look at why it was created — if it was created for good things, the definition is keli shemelachto l'heter, but one must know how to use it.

Halacha 1 (continued) — Laws of Moving: L'heter vs. L'issur

The Rambam's Words

"Every keli shemelachto l'heter... may be moved on Shabbos, whether for its own use, whether for the vessel itself, whether for its place... And every keli shemelachto l'issur — may be moved for its use and for its place, but not for the vessel itself."

"I have no distinction from what the vessel is made, whether wood or earthenware or stone or metal."

Simple Meaning

Keli shemelachto l'heter may be moved for **three** purposes: (1) **L'tzorech gufo** — to use the vessel; (2) **L'tzorech mekomo** — one needs the place where the vessel is; (3) **L'tzorech atzmo shel keli** — to protect/serve the vessel itself. Keli shemelachto l'issur may only be moved for **two** of the three: l'tzorech gufo and l'tzorech mekomo, but **not** l'tzorech atzmo shel keli.

Novel Points

- **Why does the Rambam mention "ein chiluk mimah hakeli asuy"?** What is the hava amina that the material of the vessel should make a difference? The Maggid Mishneh says there is no nafka mina, but it appears in a Gemara. The question remains open.

- **Great dispute in the meaning of "l'tzorech gufo"**: There is a long discussion about what "l'tzorech gufo" means:

- **Opinion 1** (which is rejected): "Gufo" means guf ha'adam — the person needs something for himself.

- **Opinion 2** (which is accepted): "Gufo" means **guf hakeli** — one wants to **use** (lehishtamesh) the vessel, even not for what it was made for. The language "l'tzorech gufo" in the Gemara always means guf hakeli, not guf ha'adam. "One doesn't say l'tzorech gufo about a person."

The nafka mina by keli shemelachto l'issur: One may **use** the vessel for a permitted thing (l'tzorech gufo = lehishtamesh b'guf hakeli l'davar heter), but one may not **serve** the vessel (l'tzorech atzmo shel keli = to protect or preserve the vessel).

Halacha 1 (continued) — Examples

The Rambam's Words

"How so? One may move a wooden beam — to eat on it, or to sit in its place, or so it won't be stolen... And similarly one may move it from the sun so it won't warp and break, or from the rain so it won't rot... And similarly one may move millstones or a mortar to crack nuts on it, or to climb on it to a bed."

Simple Meaning

- **Wooden beam** (keli shemelachto l'heter): to eat on it = l'tzorech gufo; to sit in its place = l'tzorech mekomo; so it won't be stolen / from sun / from rain = l'tzorech atzmo shel keli. All three are permitted.

- **Millstones/mortar** (keli shemelachto l'issur): to crack nuts on it / to climb on it to a bed = l'tzorech gufo (using the vessel

for a permitted thing). This is permitted by keli shemelachto l'issur.

Novel Points

- **"Shelo tignev" as l'tzorech atzmo:** The Rambam counts "shelo tignev" as l'tzorech atzmo shel keli — one moves the vessel so it won't be stolen, which is "as it were for the benefit of the vessel." Similarly from sun and from rain.

- **Millstones for nuts:** A classic example of how a keli shemelachto l'issur is used l'tzorech gufo — one uses the vessel (guf hakeli) for a permitted thing (cracking nuts), not for its own purpose (grinding).

Halacha 1 (continued) — Keli Shelo L'tzorech Tashmisho: Using a Vessel for Another Purpose

The Rambam's Words

"It is permitted to move a vessel even not for its use, but to do with it a task it was not made to serve."

Simple Meaning

One may use a vessel even for a purpose it wasn't made for — whether keli shemelachto l'heter or keli shemelachto l'issur (as long as the use is permitted).

Examples from the Rambam (from Mishnayos)

- **Axe to crack nuts with** — an axe to crack nuts
- **Axe to cut figs with** — an axe to cut figs
- **Saw to scrape cheese with** — a saw to cut cheese
- **Shovel to scoop dried figs** — to place dried figs on it
- **Pitchfork (large fork for grain)** — giving it to a child as a spoon
- **Kush and karkar (large weaving needles)** — to pierce something permitted
- **Sack needle** — to open a door with — to pick a lock
- **Mortar** — to sit on

Novel Points

- **The foundation of "keli":** One might think that using a hammer as a plate (placing bread on it) is the same as placing bread on a stone — both are not being used for their actual purpose. **But the difference is:** A stone is not made for any use at all — it is not a "davar l'shimush adam." But a vessel, **once it is a vessel, it is something that was made for you to use** — exactly which use is already a detail. Therefore one may switch from one use to another, but a stone which is not made for any use at all — one may not.

- It is mentioned that **there is an opinion** (ein nittel keli ela davar hanittel) which holds one may only use a vessel for its specific use — but the Rambam does not rule this way.

Halacha Regarding Things That Are Not Vessels

The Rambam's Words

"Anything that is not a vessel, such as stones and coins, reeds, beams and the like — it is forbidden to move."

Simple Meaning

Stones, money, straw, wood for building — all things that are not vessels are forbidden to move.

Novel Points

- **Large stone or large beam:** The Rambam says that even a very large stone or beam, **if it has the status of a vessel — one may move it.** The novelty is that size alone doesn't matter — it's not the practicality of carrying that determines if something is a vessel, but rather what it is designated for. **Tircha (effort) is not a prohibition** — the prohibition is because it looks like weekday activity, not because it's heavy.

- The Rambam doesn't explicitly say what makes a "toras keli" — whether through designation or another way — this remains open for further halachos.

Halacha: Doors of a House

The Rambam's Words

"Doors of a house, even though they are vessels" — when they are in their place one may open/close them because they are vessels (not building). "But if they fell from their place — even on Shabbos — it is forbidden to move them."

Simple Meaning

A door is a vessel because one uses it (opening/closing), but when it falls off the hinges, it becomes forbidden to move.

Novel Points

- A door is not **prepared to be moved** — it's not made to carry around, but to move on hinges. When it falls off, it becomes something that is not prepared to be moved, and therefore forbidden.

- **This means that it's not enough for it to be a "keli" — it must also be prepared to be moved.** When we say a vessel may be moved, we mean a **davar hamuchan l'titul.**

- **Difference between door of house and door of vessel** (explained later): A door of a *house* — when it breaks off is no longer a vessel. But a door of a *vessel* (like a cabinet) is secondary to the vessel — if the vessel is melachto l'heter, the door is also melachto l'heter.

Halacha: Ben Shemonah Chai

The Rambam's Words

"A child born in the eighth month — is like a stone and forbidden to move."

Simple Meaning

A child born in the eighth month was viewed in the times of Chazal as a fetus that has no chance to live, and has the status of a stone — not a vessel and not a living person.

Novel Points

- A living person is not a "keli shemelachto l'heter" — **a person is a person**, a separate category. But a ben shemonah doesn't have the status of a living person, and he's also not a vessel — he's like a stone, something that is not fit for anything.

Halacha: Complete Hand Needle — To Remove a Thorn

The Rambam's Words

"A person may take a complete hand needle to remove a thorn. If it is not complete, if the end with the hole or the pointed end is missing — the vessel is finished, one may not move it. But if it is a blank and not yet pierced — it is permitted to move it."

Simple Meaning

A complete needle may be carried on Shabbos to remove a thorn. But if the needle is broken — the point or hole is missing — it is no longer a vessel and one may not carry it. But a needle that is still a "golem" (not yet finished, not yet pierced) — may be carried.

Novel Points

1. **Question: Why is a golem better than a broken needle?** Both can serve as a vessel to remove a thorn — both have a pointed side. Why should a broken needle be worse than a golem?

2. **Answer — principle in toras keli:** When something has become nullified from toras keli (it was broken), it doesn't help that you find a use for it — it's like a stone that you find a use for, it doesn't make it a vessel. **Whereas** a golem — something that is **on the way to becoming a vessel** — its future is to be a vessel. Since one finds a use for it now (removing a thorn), it is already considered a vessel now. The difference: a broken vessel goes **backward**, a golem goes **forward** — that makes the difference.

3. **Proof from Gemara Shabbos:** The Gemara says that when someone prepares needles, sometimes he decides that he doesn't need to make the hole — it's good as it is, because one can use it for thorns. This shows that a needle without a hole already has the name of a vessel.

4. **Why does the Rambam bring specifically the detail of a needle?** The Rambam speaks in this chapter in general terms ("kol keli shemelachto l'heter", "kol keli shemelachto l'issur"), but by needle he brings a specific detail. The novelty is specifically by needle, where there is a form of golem which is indeed a vessel — this is a novelty that cannot be derived from the principles alone.

Halacha: Muktzeh Machmas Chesron Kis — A Fourth Category

The Rambam's Words

"Any vessel that one is particular about lest its value decrease, such as vessels set aside for merchandise, or very expensive vessels that one is particular they not be damaged — it is forbidden to move them on Shabbos, and this is called muktzeh machmas chesron kis. Such as a large saw, and the base of a plowshare, and butchers' knives, and shoemakers' knives, and carpenters' awls, and spice grinders, and ornaments."

Simple Meaning

A vessel that one protects (is particular it should not lose value) — e.g. merchandise for sale, or very expensive vessels — one may not move at all on Shabbos. This is worse than keli shemelachto l'issur — one may not even l'tzorech gufo or l'tzorech mekomo.

Novel Points

1. **Four categories:** Until now we learned three categories: (a) melachto l'heter, (b) melachto l'issur, (c) something that is not a vessel. Now comes a fourth: **muktzeh machmas chesron kis**.

2. **Explanation of "muktzeh":** The word muktzeh comes from the language "katzeh" — at the edge, set aside. The

person has set the thing aside, he is maktzeh midato — he doesn't consider using it.

3. **Why are all the examples keli shemelachto l'issur?** The Rambam lists: large saw, plowshare nail, slaughterer's knife, shoemaker's knife, carpenter's knife, spice hammer — these are all vessels used for melacha (issur). The novelty: by muktzeh machmas chesron kis the Rambam did **not** list keli shemelachto l'heter. A golden cup, for example, even if it's expensive, is used for drinking — one may carry it. Also an expensive book — it's melachto l'heter, one learns in it.

4. **What makes muktzeh machmas chesron kis stricter than regular keli shemelachto l'issur?** By a regular keli shemelachto l'issur one may l'tzorech gufo or l'tzorech mekomo — because sometimes one uses it for other things (like the corners that are sometimes used for nuts). But by muktzeh machmas chesron kis — the person **never** uses it for anything else because he protects it. Therefore he is **maktzeh midato** from every use, and it remains forbidden entirely.

5. **Precision in the reasoning:** The prohibition is **not** because it's a keli shemelachto l'issur. The prohibition is because **every other use** the person has renounced (he protects it). Therefore it remains muktzeh — he has set it aside from his mind.

6. **Question: What if the person wants to use it on Shabbos?** If the person decides he does want to use it l'tzorech davar hamuter — is it no longer muktzeh? The answer: **He cannot nullify the muktzeh midato** — the status of muktzeh has already taken effect.

Halacha: Muktzeh Machmas Issur — Lit Candle, Candelabra, Table with Money

The Rambam's Words

"Any vessel that was set aside due to a prohibition is forbidden to move, such as a candle that was lit on Shabbos, or the candelabra that had a candle on it, or a table that had money on it. Even if the candle went out or the money fell, it is forbidden to move them, for any vessel that was forbidden to move at twilight is forbidden to move the entire Shabbos, even though the thing that caused its prohibition is gone."

Simple Meaning

A vessel that became muktzeh due to a prohibition — like a burning candle, a candelabra with a candle, a table with money — remains forbidden to move the entire Shabbos, even after the candle went out or the money fell, because at twilight it was forbidden.

Novel Points

1. **The Rambam's systematic approach:** The Rambam first lists what is *not* muktzeh, and then lists the types of muktzeh. This shows that the Rambam treats muktzeh as a clear structure.

2. **Stone vs. muktzeh machmas chesron kis — two opposite reasons:** A stone is not muktzeh because it is "set aside" — it's simply nothing, it's not a vessel, one doesn't use it due to *lack of importance*. But muktzeh machmas chesron kis is the opposite — one doesn't use it due to *importance*, one doesn't want to ruin it.

3. **What does "machmas issur" mean? — A difficult question:** What is the "issur" that makes the candle

muktzeh? "Machmas issur" means *not* the prohibition of moving itself (that would be circular), but rather the prohibition of lighting or prohibition of use — that is, the person had in mind before Shabbos that he will not use this on Shabbos, because it is occupied with a prohibited activity.

4. **Money — what is the "issur"?** By money it is asked: what is the prohibition? It is suggested that money is like muktzeh machmas chesron kis — no one uses money for anything other than commerce, and commerce is forbidden on Shabbos. Therefore it's not like a regular keli shemelachto l'issur (which can be used for a permitted thing), but it is *designated* only for prohibition. The learner remains unclear on this point.

5. **Stringency of muktzeh machmas issur — as basis for prohibited thing:** The Rambam says "forbidden to move" simply, which means in *all* ways — even l'tzorech gufo or l'tzorech mekomo. This is stricter than keli shemelachto l'issur, and equal to muktzeh machmas chesron kis. The law of **basis l'davar ha'assur** (the candelabra, the table) makes not only the prohibited object itself, but also the vessel it rests on, forbidden to move.

6. **The foundation of "bein hashmashos":** The key principle: **Any vessel that was forbidden to move at twilight, is forbidden to move the entire Shabbos.** The status at twilight determines for the entire Shabbos, even if the cause of the prohibition later went away.

Summary of Muktzeh Categories

Three main levels:

1. **Keli shemelachto l'heter** — one may do everything with it (l'tzorech gufo, l'tzorech mekomo, l'tzorech atzmo).
2. **Keli shemelachto l'issur** — one may use l'tzorech gufo or l'tzorech mekomo, but not l'tzorech atzmo.
3. **Do nothing at all** — this includes: (a) something that is not a vessel (stone), (b) muktzeh machmas chesron kis, (c) muktzeh machmas issur (candle, money, basis l'davar ha'assur).

Halacha: Vessels That Broke on Shabbos — Their Fragments May Be Moved

The Rambam's Words

"All vessels that may be moved on Shabbos whose doors broke, such as doors of a chest and tower, whether they broke on Shabbos or before Shabbos, it is permitted to move those doors. And similarly all vessels that may be moved on Shabbos that broke, their fragments may be moved, provided they do some kind of work."

"How so? Fragments of a trough to cover the mouth of a barrel with, fragments of glass to cover the mouth of a jug with... But if they are not fit for any work at all, it is forbidden to move them."

Simple Meaning

Doors of a vessel (like a chest) that broke off, may be moved — whether broken on Shabbos or before Shabbos. Also pieces of broken vessels may be moved, if they can still do "some kind of work." If not — forbidden.

Novel Points

1. **Door of vessel vs. door of house:** A door of a *house* — when it breaks off is no longer a vessel. But a door of a *vessel* is secondary to the vessel — if the vessel is melachto l'heter, the door is also melachto l'heter.

2. **Question from broken needle:** The Rambam earlier (by needle shenittal chorah o uktzah) made a special discussion, and there he is stringent — even if one can use it (remove a thorn), one may not, because it "becomes a [new] vessel." Why is this different from the rule here that fragments that do "some kind of work" are permitted? The difference: fragments of a trough to cover a barrel is a **known, regular use** — people actually used broken pottery for such purposes. But a needle without a point that one finds one can use for a thorn — this is not a regular use that makes it a vessel. The fact that a person finds a use doesn't automatically make a vessel.

3. **"Some kind of work" — what does it mean?** Does "some kind of work" mean like its original work, or just any work? The Gemara says "like its work or some kind of work" — that is, even a work that is not like the original use, but it must be fit for work at all.

Halacha: Covers of Vessels

The Rambam's Words

"All covers of vessels may be moved on Shabbos, provided they have the status of a vessel, or they are attached."

Simple Meaning

Covers of vessels may be moved on Shabbos, if they have toras keli — i.e. they are recognizable as a vessel (cover).

Novel Points

- **Barrel buried in the ground:** A barrel that is buried in the ground is considered **attached to the ground** — it is no longer called a vessel. Therefore, the cover of such a barrel — if it has a **handle**, one may move it, because the handle makes the cover itself a vessel (similar to a sponge with a handle). If not — it is forbidden.

- The **Maggid Mishneh** says this is a **decree**: Although the cover of a barrel is normally a vessel, when the barrel is attached to the ground, one is stringent about the cover lest it be like a cover of the ground (which is truly not a vessel).

- **Covers of ground** (covers of pits/holes in the ground) — are forbidden without a handle, because they are considered part of the ground/building. With a handle — permitted.

- **Cover of oven** — permitted to move, although an oven is also attached to the ground, it is easier because it is a simple cover.

- **Question on the Rambam's order:** It is puzzling that the Rambam writes "toras keli aleihem" right after he spoke of glass fragments to cover the mouth of a jug — which has toras keli as an original vessel. The answer: "Toras keli" here doesn't speak of the original vessel, but of the **cover itself** — the handle makes the cover a vessel. Without a handle it's just a piece of wood, not a vessel.

Halacha: Two Things — Permitted and Forbidden Together (Basis L'davar Ha'assur V'hamuter)

The Rambam's Words

"Two things, one forbidden to move and one permitted to move, and they were adjacent to each other, or one on the other, or one in the other, such that when one moves one of them the other moves — if he needs the thing that is permitted to move, he may move it even though the forbidden thing moves with it. But if he needs the forbidden thing, he may not move it."

Simple Meaning

When a permitted thing and muktzeh lie together and one cannot touch one without the other — if one needs the permitted thing, one may, even though the muktzeh is moved along. If one needs the muktzeh — forbidden.

Examples

- **Unripe fruit in straw:** An unripe fruit stored in straw (muktzeh machmas gufo) — one may remove the fruit although the straw is touched.

- **Cookie on coals:** A cookie on glowing coals — one may take the cookie although the coals (muktzeh) are touched.

- **Turnips and radishes buried in dirt:** Vegetables buried in dirt (to keep fresh) — when part is exposed, one may grab by the leaf and pull out, even though the dirt moves.

Novel Points

- **Note about "netilah":** Here one sees clearly that "netilah" in this context means not just actually carrying, but even just touching/moving. This fits with the Rambam's introduction which speaks of "carrying things" — it includes even just a bit of touching.

Halacha: A Person May Pick Up His Child Who Has a Stone in His Hand

The Rambam's Words

"A person may pick up his child who has a stone in his hand" — but if the child is holding money (dinar), it is forbidden.

Simple Meaning

One may pick up a child although the child is holding a stone (muktzeh), but not when the child is holding money.

Novel Points

1. **Question on the language:** From the language "notel adam et beno" it sounds like a special leniency for a child. But according to the rule of "semuchin zeh l'zeh / zeh al zeh" — one should already know that one may, like by vegetables with sand! The answer: The main novelty is **the stringency** — that by **money** it is forbidden, although by a stone it is permitted.

2. **Difference between stone and money:** In the previous halacha we speak when one thing is moved **incidentally**. But here, when one picks up a child holding money, one is **actually directly** picking up the muktzeh — this is worse. Therefore by money (which is a stricter category of muktzeh) it is forbidden.

3. **The need factor:** This is a **great need** — a child (baby) that one cannot put down, one cannot remove the stone from his hand — Chazal were lenient. The leniency is based on need, not just a technical rule.

4. **The Maggid Mishneh** calls this leniency "chashash choli" — but "chashash choli" doesn't necessarily mean the child will get sick from not picking up. It's more a general assumption that the issue of picking up a child is connected with illness —

it's an "inhumanity" that a father should not be able to pick up his child.

5. **Proof that "chashash choli" is not actual danger of illness:** The Rambam brings right after this the law of dinar — if the child is holding a dinar (coin), one may **not** pick him up, "lest the dinar fall and the father pick it up in his hand." If it were a real chashash choli, the law of dinar would not apply — one would be lenient even then. This proves that the leniency by stone is because stone is not important and one won't pick it up, but a dinar which is important — there is concern that the father will pick it up when it falls.

6. **Tiltul al yedei davar acher** is the foundation of this leniency.

Halacha: Basket Full of Fruit with a Stone

The Rambam's Words

A basket full of fruit that also has a stone — if they are soft fruits (that one cannot pour out without loss), notel otah kemo shehi — one takes it as it is.

Simple Meaning

When one cannot remove the stone without loss, one may carry the entire basket with the stone.

Novel Points

- **Why not remove one at a time?** Seemingly one can remove the fruits one at a time, put down in a clean place, remove the stone, and put back. The answer: This is a "great effort" and one is not obligated.

- **B'makom hefseid lo gazru** — when pouring will make dirty/damage the soft fruits, this is loss, and Chazal did not decree.

- Both factors play: loss **and** effort.

Halacha: Stone on a Barrel (Wine Cask) — Forgot vs. Placed

The Rambam's Words

A barrel that one forgot a stone on its mouth — he tilts it on its side and it falls. And if it was among barrels... he takes it to another place and tilts it on its side there.

Simple Meaning

Because he **forgot** it (shechachah), the barrel is not a "basis l'davar ha'assur."

Novel Points

- **Tilts on its side** — one may tilt the barrel a bit on the side so the stone will fall off. This is minimal moving.

- **When tilting on its side is not possible** (because it lies among other barrels and the stone will fall on them and cause damage) — then he may **pick up** the barrel, carry to a place where he can drop the stone, and drop it there.

- **Rule:** One must do as little moving of forbidden things as possible. If one can with less — one does less. If not — one seeks a way.

- **The stone on the barrel is not basis l'davar ha'assur** because it is forgotten — he did not have in mind that the stone should remain there on Shabbos.

Halacha: Money on a Pillow — Forgot vs. Placed

The Rambam's Words

Money on a pillow — he shakes the pillow and they fall. If one needs the place of the pillow — one may take the pillow with the money and shake it out somewhere else. But one who placed money on the pillow — this is basis l'davar ha'assur, they are forbidden to move.

Simple Meaning

By forgetting: the pillow is not basis l'davar ha'assur. One must first try the minimal way (shake — shake off). Only when one needs the place — may one take the pillow with the money. By placing (intentionally): the pillow itself becomes a **basis l'davar ha'assur** — a new muktzeh. Even when the money is already gone, the pillow remains forbidden.

Novel Points

- **Difference between barrel with stone and pillow with money:** By the barrel (forgot) the object itself is permitted, it just has a problem that a stone lies there — therefore one says he should do as little as possible (tiltul min hatzad, al yedei davar acher). But by placing — the entire object becomes a new muktzeh, not just "al yedei davar acher."

- **Basis l'davar ha'assur becomes stringent** — it becomes like muktzeh machmas issur, similar to keli shemelachto l'issur. The prohibition of the stone/money "transfers" to the object itself.

- **The foundation of basis l'davar ha'assur:** When something becomes a basis l'davar ha'assur, it is viewed like the forbidden thing itself — it receives the status of **severe muktzeh** (like a stone). The novelty is that even after the forbidden thing no longer lies there, the basis

Halacha: Stone in a Melon Shell (Kriyah)

The Rambam's Words

A kriyah (melon shell) that is used as a vessel to draw water, with a stone placed inside so it won't float — if one fills it and it doesn't fall out, it is like the measure of the kriyah and one may move it. And if not, one may not move it.

Simple Meaning

When the stone is firmly placed inside and doesn't fall out, it becomes nullified to the vessel and one may move it. But when the stone is loosely placed, we don't view it as nullified to the vessel, and one may not move it.

Halacha: Garment That Lost Something — Garment on a Reed

Simple Meaning

When a garment hangs on a reed (piece of wood/twig) that is not a vessel, one may remove the garment even when the reed moves in the process, because it is **tiltul min hatzad** (indirect way) — he doesn't intend to touch the reed.

Halacha: Fruit That Is Forbidden to Eat — Tevel and Ma'aser

The Rambam's Words

"Fruit that is forbidden to eat, such as fruit that is not tithed, even tevel rabbinically... ma'aser rishon whose terumah was not taken... impure terumah... ma'aser

sheni and hekdesch that were not redeemed properly — it is forbidden to move them."

Simple Meaning

Fruit that one may not eat (because they are not tithed, or impure terumah, or ma'aser sheni/hekdesch that is not redeemed properly) — are muktzeh, because their only purpose is eating, and one cannot eat them, so they are like a stone.

Novel Points

1. **Demai:** Demai (doubtfully tithed) is permitted to move, because **since there is a law that the poor of the city may eat** — it is fit for other people even when it is not fit for you.

2. **Ma'aser sheni that didn't add the fifth:** Ma'aser sheni and hekdesch that one redeemed but didn't add the fifth — is permitted to move, because the fifth is not indispensable, and fundamentally it is permitted for eating. It is exactly like demai: the owner himself may not eat it l'chatchilah (without the fifth), but another person may eat it. The foundation: **If it is fit for eating for anyone, it is not muktzeh.**

3. **The foundation of "ho'il":** Tevel (fruit that has not yet been tithed) is muktzeh machmas issur. But because if someone would transgress and tithe on Shabbos, it would work b'dieved (because tithing on Shabbos is only rabbinically forbidden), therefore we view it as something that is "fit" — not as strict as a stone which has no way to become permitted. **Rabbi Yitzchak's opinion** is mentioned: muktzeh machmas issur applies as long as one cannot fix it. But tevel has a way — even through a transgression.

4. **Question:** How can we say that something is permitted because someone can do a transgression? The answer: We're not saying we permit because of harm — we're seeking a halachic reasoning. The "ho'il" is a halachic excuse — as long as one can find an excuse, we say it. Even if the person himself won't do it, "ho'il" — because it is technically possible — is enough to consider it as not completely muktzeh. The difference between tevel and a stone: a stone has no way to become permitted on Shabbos; tevel is food that has a way (even through transgression).

Halacha: Terumah — A Yisrael May Move

The Rambam's Words

"A Yisrael may move terumah even though it is not fit for him."

Simple Meaning

A Yisrael may move terumah although he himself may not eat it, because it is fit for Kohanim. It is compared to someone who is allergic to dairy — dairy doesn't become muktzeh for him, because other people can eat it.

Halacha: Impure Terumah with Pure

The Rambam's Words

"One may move impure terumah with pure and with chullin."

Simple Meaning

Impure terumah itself is muktzeh, but when it lies together with pure terumah or chullin, one may move it together.

Novel Points

1. **When does this apply:** This only applies **when the pure is on the bottom** — when one cannot reach the pure without taking the entire vessel. And this only speaks of wet/soft fruit (such as figs) that **might be crushed/damaged** — if one will throw them out of the vessel, they will be damaged.

2. **But if they were nuts and almonds and the like** — hard dry things — one must **shake out the vessel** (pour out/shake out the vessel), remove only the pure, and leave the impure.

3. **L'tzorech mekom hakeli:** If one needs the place of the vessel, one may move the entire vessel **whether the pure is on top or on the bottom** — just like by a pillow with a stone, when one needs the place one has no choice.

4. **Comparison to previous halachos:** This is essentially **the same halacha** as by figs with stones on a vessel — if one can throw out (dry things), one must; if not (wet things), one may move together; if one needs the place, one may always.

5. **Question about "shaking":** Whether "shake the vessel" means simply pour out, or a shake — because one doesn't want to touch the muktzeh with hands. Remains unclear.

Halacha: Pile of Stones — Stones One Wants to Use for Sitting

The Rambam's Words

"A pile of stones that one thought about on the day to sit on them — if he arranged them like arranging cattle, it is permitted to sit on them tomorrow. And if not, forbidden."

Simple Meaning

A pile of stones that one thought to use on Shabbos — thought alone is not enough. One needs an **action** — one must arrange them. Only then do they become a vessel.

Halacha: Palm Branches

The Rambam's Words

"Palm branches that one gathered for wood, and changed his mind before Shabbos for sitting — it is permitted to move them."

Simple Meaning

Palm branches that one gathered for firewood (muktzeh), but one changed his mind before Shabbos to use them for sitting — one may move them.

Novel Points

- **Why doesn't one need an action here?** By stones one needed an action (arranged them), but by palm branches thought alone suffices. The answer: By branches he already did an action — **gathered them** (he collected/arranged them), only the action was for wood. When he changes his mind (is nimach) for sitting, the action is already there, he only needs a new thought. This is parallel to the previous halacha where "arranging" is the action.

- **The rule that emerges:** One doesn't need to have a strong thought **and** a strong action. In one case there is an action (gathered) with a weak thought (changed mind); in the second case (sitting on them from the previous day) there is a weak action (he sits on them) with a weak thought. Both are enough that it should no longer be muktzeh machmas gufo.

- **A question:** If one prepared wood for fire, is it no longer muktzeh machmas gufo — does it become like keli shemelachto l'issur (because making fire is forbidden on Shabbos)? Seemingly no, because firewood is "not a vessel" — one doesn't do anything with it, one burns it, it's not a vessel. Tosafos and Responsa Rabbeinu Tam also discussed this distinction.

Halacha: Straw on a Bed

The Rambam's Words

"One threw straw on a bed — he may not shake it off with his hand but shakes with his body" (tiltul al yedei shinui). "And if it was animal food — it is permitted to move it." "And similarly if there were pillows and blankets on it — he shakes with his hand, it is made as if he slept on it from before the festival."

Simple Meaning

Straw that one threw on a bed is muktzeh, one may only move it with the body (shinui). If it is animal food it is not muktzeh at all. If pillows and blankets lie on it, we view it as if he slept on it before Shabbos — it becomes part of the bed and one may move it with the hand.

Novel Points

- Straw is similar to palm branches — sometimes it's just nothing, sometimes it's animal food, sometimes it was brought for the bed. When pillows and blankets lie on it, the straw is viewed as part of the bed itself (because beds were made of straw), not like dirt that lies there. This is as if he designated it — he designated it for the bed.

Halacha: Box of Dirt

The Rambam's Words

"One who brings a box of dirt into his house — if he designated a corner for it before Shabbos, he may move it on Shabbos."

Simple Meaning

Whoever brings in a box of sand/dirt into the house (to cover dirt etc.), if he designated a corner for it before Shabbos, he may move it on Shabbos.

Novel Points

- Just placing in a box is not enough — one needs to designate a corner for it. This shows that dirt is muktzeh machmas gufo, and it needs a stronger preparation (designation of place) to remove it from muktzeh. Only when he has clearly set aside a place for it, does it become "house materials" instead of just dirt.

Halacha: Mevatel Keli Meheichano — A New Halacha

The Rambam's Words

"It is forbidden to nullify a vessel from its function, for it is like demolishing."

Simple Meaning

One may not make a vessel no longer usable for its function, because this is like soter (demolishing).

Novel Points

1. **The Rambam's reason — like demolishing:** The Rambam says explicitly that the prohibition of mevatal keli meheichano is **not a law in muktzeh/moving**, but rather it

is a matter of **rabbinic soter**. One makes a vessel "not fit for its use" — this is a spiritual demolition. Even when the vessel becomes "not fit" only through the halacha (because muktzeh doesn't allow using it), this is also soter — because "the halacha is real."

2. **Other Rishonim:** Other Rishonim say that mevatel keli meheichano is a law in the prohibition of moving. Rashi says it is "similar to melacha" — sometimes like soter, sometimes like boneh — but the foundation is similar.

3. **Why does it appear here and not by soter in the list of shevusim?** The Rambam did not include it in his list of shevusim/39 melachos, but here by muktzeh. The explanation: The Rambam places by the melachos only things that have no other place. Here, because the prohibition comes from creating muktzeh, it fits better here. Similar to shehiyah and hatmanah — which is essentially a matter of cooking — the Rambam also did not include by melachos mevashel, but in a separate category.

4. **Question about decree upon decree:** If moving is a decree (safeguard for carrying out), and mevatel keli meheichano is forbidden because it creates muktzeh (which is forbidden in moving) — is this not a decree upon a decree? The answer: Better to say it is like soter (a separate reason), not a decree upon a decree.

5. [Digression: Mussar point] From the foundation that "making a vessel not fit for its use through the halacha" is also soter, one can learn a mussar: whoever makes someone else's thing forbidden (for example, a student's bread becomes forbidden because of his dog), this is also rabbinic soter — indirect damage.

Halacha: Oil in a Lamp — Placing a Vessel Under a Lamp

The Rambam's Words

One may not place a vessel under a lamp on Shabbos to catch the oil that drips out.

Simple Meaning

The oil that is in the lamp is muktzeh machmas issur, and even after it drips out it remains forbidden. When one places a vessel underneath, the vessel becomes a **basis l'davar ha'assur**, and one may not l'chatchilah make a vessel into a basis l'davar ha'assur on Shabbos.

Novel Points

- The main prohibition is because one makes a vessel that is permitted to move become forbidden to move — this is **mevatal keli meheichano**. One must say the word "basis" — because through the muktzeh lying on the vessel, the vessel becomes a basis l'davar ha'assur.

- Even if one could pour out the oil and use the vessel, this is not a leniency to place it l'chatchilah. The prohibition of mevatal keli meheichano doesn't mean that afterward one can never have any leniency — it means that one may not l'chatchilah make the vessel "not prepared."

Halacha: Vessel Under a Chicken to Catch an Egg

The Rambam's Words

"One may not place a vessel under a chicken to receive its egg" — one may not place a vessel under a chicken to catch an egg. "But he may overturn a vessel over it" — one may cover an egg with a vessel. "And

similarly one may overturn a vessel over anything that is forbidden to move."

Simple Meaning

An egg that is laid on Shabbos is **no'lad** — forbidden to eat and move. When one places a vessel underneath to catch the egg, the vessel becomes a basis l'davar ha'assur. But when one places a vessel *on* the egg (to protect it from animals), it doesn't become a basis, because one can remove the vessel when one wants — it is not a nullification of the vessel.

Novel Points

- The difference between placing underneath (noten tachas) and covering (kofeh alav): By placing underneath the vessel becomes a basis because the muktzeh rests on it; by covering one can simply remove the vessel, it doesn't become forbidden to move.

- The rule is expanded: **One may overturn a vessel over anything that is forbidden to move** — by every thing that is forbidden to move one may cover with a vessel, but not place underneath.

- The law of no'lad by an egg is connected with Yom Tov laws, but also on Shabbos the egg is forbidden.

Halacha: Placing a Vessel Under a Leak — Vessel Under a Leak in the Roof

The Rambam's Words

"One may place a vessel under a leak" — one may place a vessel where water drips from the roof. "And if the vessel fills" — he may pour it out and return it. "And this is when the leak is fit for washing" — only when the water is fit for washing.

Simple Meaning

When the water is fit for washing, it is permitted to move, and the vessel doesn't become a basis l'davar ha'assur. But if the water is disgusting water (mayim me'usim), it is muktzeh, and one may not l'chatchilah place a vessel underneath.

Novel Points

1. **"Fit for washing" is the minimum** — it doesn't necessarily mean drinking, but at least fit for washing. This is a "kal vachomer" — certainly if it is fit for drinking.

2. **Graf shel re'i — a new leniency:** When the water is disgusting water, it is essentially muktzeh machmas gufo. But there is a special law of **graf shel re'i** — something that stinks or is disgusting, one may remove from the house so as not to live in a dirty environment. This is a special leniency that the Sages gave — they did not want people to live in stinking houses on Shabbos.

3. **L'chatchilah one may not make a graf shel re'i:** The leniency of graf shel re'i only applies b'dieved — when it already exists. But one may not l'chatchilah create a situation of graf shel re'i (for example, placing a vessel under disgusting water). When one does it, the vessel becomes forbidden (basis/mevatal keli meheichano), and the graf shel re'i leniency only applies to what already exists.

4. **Practical question:** It is "a bit difficult practically" — one cannot place a vessel, and the floor gets wet. But when it is not a great need, one seeks other solutions.

Halacha: Sparks — Placing a Vessel for Sparks

The Rambam's Words

One may place a vessel for sparks (sparks from a candle), but not for oil.

Simple Meaning

Sparks are not substantial — after they land they become just a crumb, they extinguish. Therefore it is not mevatal the vessel.

Novel Points

- The Rambam says this law twice — once earlier explicitly, and again here — and it is not clear why.

Halacha: Beam That Broke**The Rambam's Words**

"A beam that broke" — a beam of a house that broke. One may support with vessels (benches, beds and the like), unless he will afterward not be able to remove the vessel.

Simple Meaning

If one can remove the vessel afterward, it is permitted. But if the vessel becomes stuck under the beam such that one cannot remove it on Shabbos, it is **mevatal keli meheichano**.

Novel Points

- Nullifying a vessel from its function doesn't only mean that the vessel becomes physically damaged, but also that it becomes technically impossible to use — it is connected to a structure and cannot be removed.

- Practical example — people take thick books to support a broken beam. The main question is whether one can afterward remove the vessel/book or not — this is the measure of mevatal keli meheichano.

Halacha: Spreading a Mat Over Stones or Beehive**The Rambam's Words**

One may spread a mat (woven mat) over stones or over a beehive — in sun because of the heat, in rain because of the rain — provided he doesn't intend to trap — but he should not intend to catch the bees.

Simple Meaning

One may protect stones or a beehive with a mat, because **he doesn't take everything underneath** — he doesn't place stones on the vessel, but the vessel on the stones, and he can take it back when he wants, so no nullification of vessel from its function.

Novel Points

- Why is this not a psik reisha of trapping by bees? The answer: A mat is a woven thing with holes, a bee can turn around, so it's not really psik reisha.

- Bees are seemingly **yesh b'mino nitzod**, but here we speak of bees that are already in the hive — they will come back, so it's not real trapping.

Halacha: Overturning a Basket for Chicks**The Rambam's Words**

One may overturn a basket for chicks (young birds) so they can go up and down. And it is permitted to move it when they come down from it — one may move the basket when the chicks are off it.

Simple Meaning

No nullification of vessel from its function, because the chicks are not constantly on it — when they go down, one can use the basket.

Novel Points

- When the chick is on the basket, one may not move the basket, because **one may not move a chick on Shabbos**.

- From this is learned that a person may not play with his domestic animal (cat, dog, chick) on Shabbos — **animal, beast, and bird are forbidden to move because they are not fit**.

Halacha: Animal, Beast, and Bird — Forbidden to Move**The Rambam's Words**

Animal, beast, and bird are forbidden to move because they are not fit.

Novel Points

- It is asked: If someone has a "pet" (beloved animal) at home — a dog, a bunny — and he plays with it regularly, it is **fit** for him, so it should be permitted?

- **Several great poskim are stringent** and say one should not play with pets on Shabbos. Others hold that if this is the custom and practice that one plays with it, it is **prepared** and permitted.

- There is an opinion that this is a **decree without reason** — an animal is categorically not prepared, even if practically one uses it. But others hold that it's not clear why it should be forbidden at all.

- It is mentioned that a **grasshopper** — a child may play with it (to play with it). This shows that even in ancient times, when one didn't have "pets" like today, there was indeed the reality that children play with living creatures. The source "child — permitted to play with it" shows that the concept of playing with a living thing on Shabbos is not simply forbidden.

- The main law: An animal that one keeps for eating or work is muktzeh, but the question regarding pets (that one keeps only for pleasure/playing) is a separate question.

Halacha: Animal That Fell into a Pit**The Rambam's Words**

An animal that fell into a pit or into water — if he can give it food in its place — if one can give it food there, one should do so. And if not, he brings pillows and blankets and places under it — one places pillows under it, so it can climb up. And if it came up, it came up — if it comes out, good. Even though the pillows and blankets got wet, they are as they were, permitted to move.

It is forbidden to lift it with one's hand — one may not physically pull it out.

Simple Meaning

Because of animal suffering the Sages permitted solutions, but not everything — forbidden to lift it with one's hand.

Novel Points

1. **Nullifying vessel from its function by wetting:** It is discussed at length whether the fact that one throws pillows and blankets into water is nullifying a vessel from its function. The Rambam says one may do it — because **for animal suffering they did not decree** (Hagahos Maimoniyos). But

it is asked: Does nullifying a vessel from its function also mean practical unusability (like soaked pillows)?

2. **Squeezing:** It is brought up that perhaps the problem is not nullifying vessel from its function, but **squeezing** — when he will want to squeeze out the wet pillows, he won't be allowed.

3. **Practical question about making dirty on Shabbos:** If one spills grape juice, may one place a rag? The rag becomes unusable. Is this nullifying vessel from its function? It is not clearly resolved.

4. **For animal suffering they did not decree:** The Hagahos Maimoniyos brings that Chazal did not decree on animal suffering, but they did not permit **everything** — only solutions like placing pillows, but not physically pulling out.

5. **Dispute of Rishonim:** Other Rishonim hold that **if one has no other solution**, animal suffering does permit even with hands. The Krakow Rav says that **for great loss / animal suffering** one must rely on this, or one can tell a non-Jew.

Halacha: Chicken That Ran Away — Push It

The Rambam's Words

A chicken that ran away — one may not drag it, one may not catch it and drag it back, because it slips from his hand — it turns around, and it can lead to

plucking feathers. But one may push it until it enters — one may push it until it goes in.

Simple Meaning

Dragging (pulling/leading) is forbidden, pushing is permitted.

Novel Points

- The difference: By dragging there is a danger of plucking because the animal struggles, but by pushing it is only a fear/motivation without physical contact that leads to plucking.

Halacha: One May Not Lift Animal, Beast, and Bird in a Courtyard

The Rambam's Words

One may not lift animal, beast, and bird in a courtyard — one may not pick up and carry an animal. But one may push it until it enters — pushing is permitted.

Novel Points

- The matter of **golem v'siyuo** is mentioned — by things that one doesn't need to actually lift, but support a foot, make walk — this is a separate category.

Until here Chapter 25 — the study of Chapter 25 is concluded here.

Full Transcript

Chapter 25, Laws of Shabbat — The Prohibition of Moving Objects: A Vessel Whose Primary Use is for Permitted and Prohibited Activities

Introduction to Chapter 25

Today we are going to learn Rambam, the twenty-fifth chapter, Laws of Shabbat, Book of Times, Chapter 25. In these chapters we are learning about the commandments of Shabbat that are rabbinic. At the end of the previous chapter, the Rambam gave us an introduction to the matter called—people call it muktzeh, the correct word for it is tiltul—which the Rambam said that the prohibition of tiltul was added by the Sages to the rabbinic prohibitions of Shabbat. And the Rambam gave us three reasons for this prohibition. The main idea is that one should see that it is Shabbat, because without the prohibition of tiltul, even after all the prohibitions of Shabbat, Shabbat still wouldn't look special enough, because people could be busy carrying and bringing things. So the Sages decreed, and now we are entering into the details of the prohibition of tiltul.

The Rambam says...

Thanks and Blessing

I want to thank all the Jews who help us make this shiur, especially R' Yoeli Weltzberger, and he should have much success, and everyone should learn from him, one. And also all Jews should have much success, and one should be able to learn this shiur, and one should have success to finish the shiur, to continue to maintain the order.

Everyone who listens should say a chapter of Tehillim. I saw, I told over, I already once told over from the Lubavitcher Rebbe, today is the yearzeit of the Lubavitcher Rebbe when we are recording this, one should tell over a story. He made the

enactment of learning Rambam, one chapter every day, three chapters, and so on. And I saw when they began the Rambam, once the Lubavitcher Rebbe said that everyone who has a shiur should say a chapter of Tehillim, that one should be successful to reach the end. Because this enjoyment is very pleasant, but one begins to see that there are longer chapters and more complicated laws. So everyone who is continuing should say a chapter of Tehillim for the elevation of the soul of the Lubavitcher Rebbe. If someone travels to his gravesite, he should say there a chapter of Tehillim, and one should pray that one should indeed be successful to learn every day the chapter of the Rambam until the end of the entire book.

I have another segulah: one should say a chapter of Rambam, and in this merit, the Rambam... It says that David HaMelech asked that his Tehillim should be as strong as a chapter of Rambam, like Negaim and Ohalos, and one should learn a chapter of Rambam. And the merit that one should merit every day to learn a chapter of Rambam, in the manner of performing a mitzvah. It's the Rambam, especially when the Rambam finishes a chapter and he gave an introduction, it makes you desire—one already knows about the laws of tiltul, now we want to know the rest about tiltul. Many times the Rambam specifically divides a topic in the middle into two chapters, he gives you an appetite, yes, like in a dramatic book, one doesn't necessarily end the chapter when it's calm, one ends the chapter in the middle of the drama. We are holding in the middle of the drama, when we already know that the Sages had to prohibit tiltul, he laid out for us three powerful arguments why. Now, God forbid, for us to know what this is.

Law 1 — The Division of Vessels: Melachto LeHeter and Melachto LeIssur

The Rambam says thus: "**There are vessels whose work is for permitted purposes**"—there are different types of vessels, there are vessels whose work is for permitted purposes —"**and they are**"—what do these words mean? A vessel whose work is for permitted purposes—"**and they are the vessels that one is permitted to do with them on Shabbat the thing for which they were made.**" With every vessel one can do both good things and bad things, but one must look at what it was created for. A vessel that was created to do what the vessel was made for, that is, the purpose of the vessel, may be used on Shabbat. "**Such as a cup**"—why was a cup made? To drink. "**A bowl**"—to eat from it. "**A knife**"—a knife may be, was made to cut meat and fish. "**And an axe to crack nuts with it,**" and similar things—we have this is one type of vessel. That means a type of hammer that is made for nuts, right? He's not talking about a normal hammer here. A special axe that is made to crack nuts with it. A nut cracker, yes.

A Vessel Whose Primary Use is for Prohibited Activities

And there are, the Rambam doesn't yet say the laws, first he tells us what types of vessels there are. "**And there are vessels whose work is for prohibited purposes, and they are the vessels that one is forbidden to do with them on Shabbat the thing for which they were made.**" This is a vessel that was made for things that one may not do on Shabbat. "**Such as a mortar and millstones,**" these are things that were made to do grinding, "**that one is forbidden to grind with them on Shabbat,**" it was made to pound or to grind things. This means a vessel whose primary use is for prohibited activities.

Innovation: The Language "She'na'asu Lo"

Why is there the language "she'na'asu lo"? I mean, one should say "she'na'asu bo." "She'na'asu lo"—the reason why the vessel was made. Ah, I understand. The purpose for which the vessel was made. And I think here itself already lies somewhat a teaching that people can use everything for everything. Today's people are very busy with technology, for example. There are those who look at certain technology as a vessel whose primary use is for prohibited activities. But one must look at why it was created. It was created for good things. We need to know how we use it, but know that its definition is a vessel that is permitted.

The Law of Tiltul: There is No Distinction Based on What the Vessel is Made From

Now, the Rambam says, the Rambam says further, "**Every vessel whose primary use is for permitted purposes**"—the vessel whose primary use is for permitted purposes, the Rambam says, "**there is no distinction based on what the vessel is made from, whether of wood or earthenware or stone or metal.**" A wonder, why did the Rambam feel it was important to say this, that there is no distinction in the material? What would be the alternative assumption? Perhaps there are other things that think there is indeed a distinction? Or perhaps one could think there is a distinction? Seemingly one could have thought, but this is the question, what is the matter?

Speaker 2: Because what difference does it make? He doesn't bring here any practical difference, just a Gemara that says a distinction of what it's made from, I don't know what.

Speaker 1: Okay.

Discussion: The Three Modes of Tiltul

So, because the vessel was made for permitted purposes, it is permitted to move it on Shabbat. One may move it in all ways. One may move the vessel not only for what it was made for. That is, a cup—may one only drink? No, one may move a cup for any permitted thing. What might a person need to move his cup? Either for the need of the vessel itself, or for the... he wants to do with it what the vessel was made for, that is, he wants to drink with it. Or for the need of the vessel itself means he wants for the vessel, he wants to take the cup because he wants to protect it, he wants to wash it, whatever it is, he wants for the vessel.

Speaker 2: For the need of the vessel itself means he wants to protect the vessel, he wants to put it away. For the permitted use already lies in the word that it's melachto leheter, one may do the work. He doesn't need to say that anymore. It already lies in the word melachto leheter.

Speaker 1: No, for its own need can mean even not for the use.

Speaker 2: Okay, either for the need of the vessel itself, he does it for the vessel. The Rambam will give the Gemaras for all these things, we will see. Either for the need of the vessel itself, he needs the place where the vessel is lying, he needs to have it, it's not lying in the right place, he wants to move it to a place. Or for its own need, either he wants it for himself, for another need, for any need which is the body of the person.

Speaker 1: For what need means using the vessel. Not the body of the person, the body of the vessel. The body of the vessel is that he uses the vessel, either for the reason it was made, or for another reason, we'll see.

Speaker 2: The Rambam says for the need of the body of the vessel, not that one wants the vessel itself. For the need of the body of the person.

Speaker 1: No, no, for the need of the vessel itself doesn't mean that one uses... that's the meaning. For the need of the vessel itself means that one doesn't use the vessel, rather one serves the vessel, one wants to protect it, or put it away, or guard it. For its own need means that one uses the vessel. One uses the vessel either for the reason it was made, or for another reason. But that's the meaning of for its own need.

The Law of a Vessel Whose Primary Use is for Prohibited Activities

And every vessel whose primary use is for prohibited activities, is also permitted either for its own sake and for its place, for its own need. Again, interestingly the same thing.

Speaker 2: No one says anything about this? I haven't seen, no. There was once in this something... I don't know. I don't know why.

Speaker 1: Okay.

Discussion: The Distinction Between a Vessel Whose Primary Use is for Permitted and Prohibited Activities

A vessel whose primary use is for permitted activities, here it is so, it is permitted to move it on Shabbat, for the three things that were enumerated. Two of these one may also with a vessel whose primary use is for prohibited activities, and one not. Either for its own need, when he wants the body of the person... no, no, the body of the vessel. Body always means the body of the vessel. But the body of the vessel is indeed its primary use for prohibited activities.

Speaker 2: No, no, no, if one uses it for a permitted thing.

Speaker 1: Why do you say that body means the body of the vessel? I say body means the body of the person. I don't know what you're saying, I interpret body of the person. When the person wants something for his body, when the person wants the place of the vessel. But to serve the vessel one may not.

Speaker 2: I don't know why you say this again, because you're making a simple mistake. In one piece the Rambam will say in order to... The Rambam doesn't use the language for its own need, in the Gemara it always says. For its own need always means the need of the body of the vessel.

Speaker 1: But what does for the need of the body of the vessel mean? One may not, because it's indeed its primary use for prohibited activities.

Speaker 2: Very good, the answer is, that if one uses it for another reason, not for the thing itself, it's not the body of the vessel, it's the body of the person, because the person uses it. The body of the vessel is indeed the body of the vessel, it means to use the vessel, that's the meaning of the body of the vessel. That's the meaning.

Law 1 (Continued) — Examples of the Laws

The Rambam says, how so? One may move a wooden beam to eat with it, or to sit in its place, or so it won't be stolen. A wooden beam is a permitted thing, one may do three things: to eat with it, this is for the body of the person, of the vessel, whatever, to eat with it.

Speaker 2: To eat with it, to eat with it, or to sit in its place.

Speaker 1: No, that's for its own sake, so it won't be stolen is for its own sake.

Speaker 2: Ah, to eat with it is indeed for its own need, to sit in its place is indeed for the need of its place, and the third thing is so that it won't be stolen, so that the vessel won't be stolen, and this is for its own sake. The "so it won't be stolen," that means for its own sake, so that the vessel won't be stolen, which is so that one can have the vessel, it's as if for the benefit of the vessel.

And similarly one may move it from the sun so it won't warp and break, or from the rain so it won't rot.

What else is a mode of for its own sake? That it won't be stolen, it won't dry out when it's in the sun, it won't get wet or swollen when it's in the rain. This is tithing for its own sake, for the vessel, and it is permitted. And why is this permitted? Because it's a vessel whose primary use is for permitted activities. Because it's a vessel whose primary use is for permitted activities, I may care for the vessel, move the vessel even when it's a benefit for the vessel.

Example of a Vessel Whose Primary Use is for Prohibited Activities

And similarly one may move millstones or a mortar to crack nuts on it. One can use millstones and a mortar, which is a vessel whose primary use is for prohibited activities, one can use for such things as breaking nuts, which is a permitted thing, or to climb on it to a bed. And this is for its own need, that's the meaning of for its own need, for things that the person needs to have. For its own need, to use the body of the vessel.

Speaker 1: Why do you say so? Why do you say so? There's no doubt, I interpret differently, and so want the later authorities. I interpret for its own need of the person. You simply want to learn differently. It's simply a mistake, I'm sorry, please, don't make a mistake. You will say, okay, we'll

soon see, we'll soon hear and we'll soon see, but there's no such thing. For its own need means for the need of the body of the vessel, it means to use it. To use it is for the need of the body of the person. One doesn't say for its own need about a person. For its own need means to use the vessel, one may use a vessel whose primary use is for prohibited activities for a thing that is not prohibited. For example, millstones or a mortar, one may use for a permitted thing. One may use the millstones, any vessel can be used for a permitted thing. Millstones is a vessel whose primary use is for prohibited activities, a mortar also, one may use it for a thing

Moving Vessels on Shabbat: A Vessel Whose Primary Use is for Prohibited Activities, Something That is Not a Vessel, and Moving Not for Its Use

Limitations on Moving a Vessel Whose Primary Use is for Prohibited Activities

But what may one not do with millstones and a mortar? One thing, **one does not move it so it won't break or so it won't be stolen.** Do not move it so it won't break or so it won't be stolen, **and all similar cases.**

Basically, what has been stated until now, there were very many words, but until now one thing has been stated: that a vessel whose primary use is for prohibited activities, it is certainly that for prohibited purposes one may not use it. One may not use millstones to grind, because one may not grind, that is certainly clear. One may also not use it for the need of the vessel, you may not be busy with a vessel whose primary use is for prohibited activities on Shabbat, protecting it or carrying it. But all other needs that are permitted, one may indeed.

And a vessel whose primary use is for permitted activities, because the vessel is for permitted purposes, one may also be busy caring for the vessel, carrying as much as the vessel itself. This is vessels.

Something That is Not a Vessel – Things That Are Not Vessels

Besides vessels there are other types of things. The Rambam says, what happens with things that are not vessels? **Everything that is not a vessel,** a thing that is not a vessel, **such as stones and coins,** money, stones, **reeds,** straw, and a thing that grows, **beams and similar things,** things that are made for building, beams and similar things, **it is forbidden to move.** All these things one may not move.

A Large Stone or Large Beam – The Innovation of the Status of a Vessel

A large stone or large beam, a large stone or large beam, **even though one is forbidden to build with it,** even if it's very large, **if it has the status of a vessel upon it,** that means it is indeed a vessel, that means the stone was designated as a vessel, or the beam was designated, he just enumerated that stones and beams are not vessels, he says this is when it's not a vessel, but if there is a stone or beam that is indeed a vessel, even if it's very large, that means not the size or the practicality makes it a vessel, but what it's designated for. **If it has the status of a vessel upon it,** if it has the status of a vessel, **one may move it.**

What makes the status of a vessel? He doesn't say, if one designated it for this or... that's what they say, but here he doesn't yet say. One will perhaps see in the next laws. But the innovation is entirely, that you thought that if it's so large one

can barely move it, one needs ten Jews to move it, would it mean it's not a vessel? No, it's still called a vessel. Even if it's a great burden. Burden is not a prohibition, prohibition is it looks like a weekday activity, burden is not a prohibition.

Doors of a House – Doors of a House

He says further, **and earth and sand and a corpse, doors of a house**, doors of the house, **even though they are vessels**, are vessels. What does it mean they are vessels? Can one use them? No, they are vessels, not building, it doesn't mean... it's a part of the building. Yes, it's called a vessel. What does a vessel mean? We've already learned vessels. Opening and closing the door makes it a vessel. Not it makes, it is a vessel. It's not building, it's not a stone that is in the wall, a part of the building.

Here one is not necessarily speaking of a cornerstone, it's not a cornerstone, it's not a thing that is not designated for moving, it is designated for moving, it's designated for moving just so, because one didn't make it so one should carry it all the time. That means one may take it, it's not like the thing that is not a vessel that one doesn't use it, one does use it, yes, but but if it's not for moving, it wasn't made but for moving, to carry it around, that means to move it on the hinges, that's what it was made for, but to move it more than that, no. Interesting.

Similarly, if the door, which broke off from the place where it belongs, even on Shabbat, even on Friday when it was a proper door, but on Shabbat it came down from there, **it is forbidden to move**. Why? It's a vessel? No. What does he mean, **even though it's not a vessel**? That means, very good, it's a vessel that is not prepared for moving. So although it's... so it's not enough indeed that it should be a vessel.

This is chunk 2 of 7 of a Yiddish shiur about muktzeh laws. I need to maintain consistent terminology with chunk 1 and translate everything to English while preserving the conversational lecture style.

Key terms to maintain:

- muktzeh (not muktza)
- teshuva
- kli shemelachto l'issur/l'heter (vessel whose primary use is for prohibited/permitted work)
- Shabbos/Shabbat
- Rambam
- Gemara
- halacha/halachos

The text discusses:

1. When a vessel can be moved
2. Examples of non-vessels (door, stone, ben shemoneh chai)
3. Using vessels for purposes other than their primary function
4. Broken vessels vs. unfinished vessels (golem)
5. Introduction to muktzeh machmas chesron kis

I need to preserve the back-and-forth discussion format between Speaker 1 and Speaker 2, maintain the Hebrew/Aramaic terms in transliteration, and keep the conversational tone.

What we're saying now that something that is a vessel may be moved, we need to explain a bit, we need to fix it up a bit. How long is it a vessel? A thing that is designated to be moved. I can find you a case where something is a vessel but it's not

something that is prepared to be moved. Certainly normally it's not prepared to be moved because it's still on the door. But let's say it fell off on Shabbos, nevertheless it's forbidden to move it. That is, now the topic begins, the question begins, whether one may move it? The answer is no, because even though it's a vessel, it's not made to put back. Before.

V'ir chor v'ir ma'us - this is also something that is not a vessel, once it has been displaced from its place one may not push it back. Further.

Ben Shemoneh Chai

Ben shemoneh chai - a child that was born in the eighth month, we already had the halacha that in the times of Chazal this was viewed as a person who has no chance to live, **harei hu k'even v'assur l'taltelo** - he is also not a vessel, but he's also not called a person. A person one may, a person is a... what is a person, a kli shemelachto l'heter? A person is a person! But a ben shemoneh... we're looking at the halacha, but a ben shemoneh doesn't have the status of a living person, **v'assur l'taltelo**. It's called what a single vessel, or what other people can make it muktzeh from its side, but something that is not fit for anything. This is something that is not a vessel, so says the Rambam. The Rambam blends something that is nothing, it's not a vessel. Yes.

Tiltul Shelo L'tzorech Tashmisho - Using a Vessel for a Different Purpose

The Rambam says like this: **Mutar l'taltel kli, afilu shelo l'tzorech tashmisho** - it's permitted to move a vessel, even not for the purpose of its use. There is a stringency... there is a stringency, an opinion that one may only use a vessel for the specific thing for which it was created. A cup one was only allowed to drink from. Yes, he's talking about a kli shemelachto l'heter now. You're saying that a vessel may only be used for what it was made for, a plate specifically to eat and a cup specifically to drink.

But the Rambam says, no, **metaltelin es haki afilu shelo l'tzorech tashmisho, ela la'asos bo melacha shelo na'asa l'shamesh bah** - even to do work that the vessel was not created to serve for.

Examples from the Mishnayos

Keitzad? Notel adam kardom liftzoa bo egozim - as you said before, one may use a hammer to crack nuts with it, even if it's a type of hammer that wasn't made for nuts. There it's a kli shemelachto l'issur, one may use it for a permitted thing. **Kardom lachtoach bo devilah** - one may use a saw that was made, normally it's forbidden to use for building, but one may use it if one wants to use it for food.

Kardom is an axe, or? Kardom lachtoach bo, what is a kardom? Does one dig with it? No. In short, it's some kind of tool, but... it's a sharp shovel, yes. I always thought that kardom is like an axe, but it doesn't make sense. How would one chop with a kardom? You'll cut the devilah? I don't know. No, kardom lachtoach bo. A kardom is made, mainly also a saw that one chops wood with. So he brings from the Mishnayos. Okay, what is the secret of lachtoach bo, I don't know. Anyway.

Megirah - megirah is also some sort of saw, **ligor bo es hagevina** - to cut hard cheese. **Margareifa** - I think margareifa is a shovel, **ligrof bo es hagrogaros** - to put grogaros on it. **Harachas** - what is a rachas? It's a fork, the fork that's used for grain, **nosen alav chilek l'katan** - to use

as a spoon for a child. Understand? If there's no other fork, one uses the giant fork.

Kush v'karkar - these are such types of large needles like what are used in weaving, **kli shemelachto l'issur** from weaving, **lidkor bo** - to stick in with it something that one may indeed stick in. **Machat shel sakaim** - a needle that people who sew sacks use, **liftoach bo es hadeles** - to open a door. To break the lock, what does it mean? To pick a lock. To pick a lock, if one may on Shabbos, yes. **Iz a machteshes lisho ulaso** - he may use a mortar, something that we said before was made to grind with, one may use if it's a large vessel to sit on it.

The Principle: A Vessel is Made for Use

So he says here that both **kli shemelachto l'heter** and **kli shemelachto l'issur** one may use for any use that is a use of heter, that one uses the vessel like a vessel but for a different purpose. Yes.

It's an interesting thing, because we could have thought that using a vessel for something it's not made for is the same as using a stone. Because, yes, both, here is already one vessel, he wants indeed now to use a stone to put on it to eat. So a hammer you can indeed put on it to eat, because it's a vessel. Switching from one use to another one may, but something that is not at all a use to use, that one may not.

Once it's a vessel, once it's a vessel it's something that was made for you to use. Exactly which thing to use is already a detail, but once it's a vessel it's something that is made to use.

Interesting, yes, because our head doesn't work that way. There is using for what it's made, or, and then there is practicality of using anything for anything. I would have said that putting bread on a hammer is like putting bread on a stone. Why? Because both is not using the vessel for the thing it's used for. It's not made to use at all, it's not made to move, it's made to remain like a stone, let it be as a stone. A vessel is a **davar l'shimush adam**, so move it you may.

Things that you want to make a new business, as if perhaps you say perhaps there is someone who made such an opinion. In **kli nital ela davar hanital**, there is such an opinion there. Very good, but let's go to a ruling, it could be that it's different. Understand the distinction? It's not something so difficult. You don't have a vessel at all, okay.

Machat Shel Yad Hashleima - To Remove the Thorn

Notel adam machat shel yad hashleima - a person may take a needle, **shel yad** - meaning a needle that one uses with the hands, not something that one uses in a machine for something, **hashleima** - that is whole. **L'hotzi es hakotz** - to remove from a person who has a thorn, one may use a needle for this thing. Presumably in a way that doesn't draw blood, obviously.

Aval - this is specifically a shleima, but a whole one. **Aval im eina shleima** - if it's not a shleima, it's a broken needle, **im nital haketzeh hanekev shela o haketzeh hachod** - the needle has two sides, one side is pointed and one side has a hole where one can put in the thread. If one of the two sides broke off, **it's called no longer a vessel, it becomes like something that is not a vessel, one doesn't move it.**

But conversely yes, **v'im hu golem** - that is, when it was already a vessel and it became broken. But adds golem, **v'odenu lo nakuv** - something that is in the middle of

becoming a vessel, **mutar l'taltelo** - one finds from this a reason why one may indeed.

Discussion: Why is a Golem Better than a Broken Needle?

Speaker 2:

What? This has as if become worse. That is, the golem is indeed useful, because the golem one will still finish, and in the meantime one can use it for something else. And when it's broken, one throws it away, it's no longer a vessel.

Speaker 1:

One can still use it for **litol bah es hakotz**. One can use it for a stone.

Speaker 2:

No, not a stone. A stone one doesn't use for a thorn. Hello, one needs to have a pointed thing.

Speaker 1:

Ask please, explain to me. The needle is some small thing, it's made to sew with. But if I want I can use it for a tweezer, right? And if it's broken, I can still use it for a tweezer, true? Only as a vessel. But when it never was, it's still raw, right? One hasn't yet made a point or a hole, it's some step in the work that one must do, then it's also not yet a vessel, why may one use it?

Answer: The Principle of Torat Kli - Broken versus In Progress

Speaker 2:

I mean, first of all, the halacha one needs to learn more generally. The Rambam says here that all these vessels is only said as long as it's a vessel. But something that became broken, for example, a needle that broke off a piece, that from then on one no longer views it as a vessel, even if you found a use for it, just as a person found a use with a stone, it doesn't make it a vessel. Why it became no longer a vessel became no longer a vessel.

Which is not so with something that is on the way to becoming a vessel, its future is to be a vessel, so since you have now found some use that for you it's already now a vessel, it's called a vessel. That is, the thing, the needle is not something that one throws away, one keeps it because one is going to finish making it a vessel. And for a second person who doesn't have a thorn it's not a vessel, but it's going to become a vessel, and for this person it's already now a vessel because he finds a use for it, for him it's already called a vessel.

But when it's a former vessel, one doesn't say that because for you it's **batel b'da'atcha**, it's something that one throws away. But here where it's still going to become a vessel...

Discussion: Is a Golem Similar to a Stone?

Speaker 1:

By the way, it's already entered a word about a stone one doesn't throw away, but it's made to remain a stone. It hasn't come to one throws it away. So this I don't understand. Why is the golem similar to a stone? Because one is going to make... if I have a stone, if I have a golem wooden vessel, is it different from a stone that one is going to make from it tomorrow everything because I have a use for it? I mean that...

Speaker 2:

There's no halacha that a golem is called a golem? A golem is not something that is not at all made for a vessel. It's already a half vessel. The sharpness one has already finished, but one hasn't yet finished the other half. So if one doesn't have a need

for it it's called a golem, but if one has a need for it it's already called a vessel. Every golem in the world, every thing that a piece of wood that one has already made, it's a piece of wood, a two by four, it's not a piece of tree, but one hasn't yet made it for a vessel, may one also carry if I have something that I can do with it?

Speaker 1:

One needs to know when something gets the name of a vessel. It could be that a needle that doesn't yet have a hole is already called a vessel. And it could be the wood that you say... what was worse? If a needle without a hole is anyway a vessel, then when it becomes broken it's still a vessel. Because the needle is on the way to remain a vessel. It already became a vessel, it's going to continue being a vessel. You need to make for me which halacha you want to innovate. One halacha is that broken vessels become worse than vessels that were never vessels. I don't know why, but the more broken one can still not use it, and the less broken one can indeed use it. So you find a use for it doesn't help. So I'm missing something. Or you have for me another halacha... One says such a thing that it's going to be a vessel that is an omeid l'hanos kli, I don't think this is relevant.

Proof from Gemara Shabbos: A Needle Without a Hole is a Vessel for Thorns

Speaker 2:

Because the Gemara in Maseches Shabbos says that when someone prepares such needles, sometimes he decides that it's not necessary to make the hole, it's good, one can leave it like this, it's a vessel for thorns. So says the Gemara in Maseches Shabbos. That is, in the minute the person finds, "Ah, I have here a thorn, perfect," he took the needle, and it was l'chatchila such a capability.

Speaker 1:

I'm talking to you further according to what is a thorn, yes? Very good. But the golem, because normally it's a kli shemelachto l'issur, but the golem kli, golem needle, is essentially indeed a vessel. It's not that I think long that it's a golem, rather you're telling me from the Gemara, I don't see, why don't I find the piece here? You're telling me from the Gemara that this is different, because this type of thing is indeed, it's true that one just planned to make this for a needle, but essentially this is indeed usable, breaks it. Why does the Gemara say this why? Because a person settles that it's good for a thorn. One needs to find the other Gemaras that speak, I would have said that it's different from how he presents it. Okay, I understand what you're saying.

Why Does the Rambam Bring the Detail of the Needle?

Speaker 2:

It's interesting that the Rambam says it this way, he doesn't say it in a more general language, that every vessel that became invalid from being a vessel... we've already learned the halacha. The Rambam doesn't say principles, the Rambam only says a detail. But here in this chapter he does speak a bit in general language, he says "kol kli shemelachto l'heter", "kol kli shemelachto l'issur", he gives definitions. And not one by one vessel. But the needle, why does he want to say this thing? That once it became nullified from torat kli, one doesn't say that it remains forever a vessel. Yes, this is perhaps simple. Perhaps the novelty is because here by the needle there is a way that it is indeed a golem, so there is a novelty.

Halacha 9: Muktzeh Machmas Chesron Kis - A Fourth Category

Speaker 2:

Now we're going to learn a third... we've already learned three categories: melachto l'heter, melachto l'issur, and something that is not a vessel. And now we're going to learn another type of vessel.

The Rambam says like this: **Kol kli shemakpid alav shema yifchas damav** - that one is particular that it will become less valuable, **k'gon kelim hamuktzim l'schora** - vessels that are muktzeh. Muktzeh means set aside, yes? The language of ketzeh, by the edge. Something that one put by the edge, yes? I would have said put away. Huktzah l'schora, that one put away to sell. And something that one puts away to sell the person doesn't want to use, it should remain nice, it should remain ready for sale.

Or kelim hayekarim b'yoser shemakpid aleihem shelo yitpaslu - that one is particular that it shouldn't become ruined. **Assur l'taltelan b'Shabbos, v'zeh hu hanikra muktzeh machmas chesron kis**. Such types of things one may not move on Shabbos at all, not like a kli shemelachto l'issur that one may for only the third thing, l'tzorech atzmo, one may not. Such a vessel one may not at all. V'zeh hu hanikra, this is what is called in the Gemara muktzeh, it's muktzeh, a person sets it aside from using it, from viewing it as something that he uses, machmas chesron kis, because it will damage him the money.

Examples of Muktzeh Machmas Chesron Kis

Speaker 2:

K'gon, he brings what for example is it, hameitzer hagadol - a large axe. **V'yesod shel macharesha** - some special nail that one uses in the plow that one plows the field. **V'sakin shel tabachim, v'cherev shel ashkafim** - a knife that the slaughterer uses, or a knife that the leather-maker uses. Ashkafim are people who make shoes, cobblers, yes. **V'chut shel charashim** - and the knife that charashim, the one who does carpentry, the wood-carver, the person who does carpentry, a carpenter, ah, carpenter. No, carpenter is the one who is a shulchani. Okay, charashim means charash etz v'charash even, one who works with wood. **V'kornas shel besamim** - the hammer that is made to pound spices. **V'kishutim** - that all these things one never uses except for the work.

Discussion: Why Are All the Examples Kli Shemelachto L'issur?

Speaker 1:

Lecture on the Laws of Shabbat: Muktzeh Machmat Chisaron Kis and Muktzeh Machmat Issur

I think we need to add here that muktzeh machmat chisaron kis - he also excluded things that are a keli shemelachto le'issur and it's muktzeh machmat chisaron kis. Therefore, one never uses it, not for the prohibited use. Yes, a keli shemelachto le'heter he didn't exclude. A golden cup is used for drinking, one may use it for drinking. Or an expensive sefer that's a thousand years old that lies in a treasury, it's a sefer, if one wants to learn from it, you know, let's say it came to an adam chashuv, he will presumably learn from it. But a keli shemelachto le'issur - for the prohibited use one may not use it

because it's forbidden. For something else one will never use it because one is protective of it.

Speaker 2:

So it's not muktzeh? Even letzorech davar hamuter? Even letzorech davar hamuter he won't go anyway, if you say that he's still makpid on it. No, even if on Shabbat he would have wanted to, he may not. He has a hand in this, he is mevatel its muktzeh mida'ato. It's not that he permits it for that.

Speaker 1:

But assur letaltel means primarily letzorech gufo, okay, letzorech gufo, letzorech mekomo. But here there's a chalut, there's no way to use it.

Speaker 2:

Okay.

Speaker 1:

So using it is permitted. Assur letaltel means when it's not for the prohibited use. What do I mean? He wants to tell you lefi mah shetitba'er mikudem, regarding the keli shemelachto le'issur, a davar heter, to give food to a child on the corners. We had the corners le'echol bahem agozim. Those corners, because one sometimes uses them there. Ah, right, yes, I agree.

Precision in the Logic: What Makes Muktzeh Machmat Chisaron Kis More Stringent?

Speaker 2:

One can't say that like every keli shemelachto le'issur, there's also here that sometimes it's melachto le'heter. But it's like a keli shemelachto le'issur that one never uses for something else. Because the point here is that it's muktzeh. Until now I haven't said the word muktzeh. Ah, I perhaps said the word muktzeh. Because muktzeh means, the things, when Shabbat comes, we'll see, he is maktzeh mida'ato. It's removed from his... He won't, as you say, because he will never use it, because it's not a Shabbos'dike thing, he won't use it, therefore it's forbidden. Not like the previous things that are different.

Speaker 1:

I perhaps said it a bit differently. It's a keli shemelachto le'issur that is muktzeh from anything else besides the regular tashmish. Right, it's... Right, the prohibition of it is not because of keli shemelachto le'issur. The prohibition is because any other tashmish one has renounced, because one is protective of it, therefore it remains a keli shemelachto le'issur that is forbidden for us to use.

Speaker 2:

No, you can't even say that, because it's not that it remains a keli shemelachto le'issur, it remains muktzeh, because that's also the type of muktzeh. You're struggling as if... What if he wants to use the thing for his own purpose? Then it's not muktzeh. Make it so it's not muktzeh. It's put away. Muktzeh means put away. Muktzeh means put away. Muktzeh means put away. Shabbat comes, one puts this away. It could be that one goes with this if it's accepted that the thing...

Muktzeh Machmat Issur – Candle, Lamp, Table with Money, and Broken Vessels

Muktzeh Machmat Issur – The Rambam's Approach

Speaker 1:

Muktzeh means put away. Muktzeh means that it's put away. Shabbat comes, one puts this away, it's put away. It could be

that one goes with this... If I've already accepted that the thing... One needs to know this, the question of the above-mentioned...

So, it's already put away. You're talking about something that's not put away, the question already begins. The question is why is it put away? It's put away because it's chisaron kis. Okay.

The Rambam's Systematic Approach to Muktzeh

The Rambam, interestingly, has a very clear approach. He lists the things that are not muktzeh, and this includes nolad and muchan miyom chol al yom tov and all these things. And he lists the types of muktzeh. Interesting. That is, the things that one doesn't use, a stone, it's not because it's muktzeh, but because it's nothing, it's not. That is, muktzeh is because of its importance one doesn't use it. A stone one doesn't use conversely, because of its lack of importance.

Halacha 10: Kol Keli Shehuktzah Machmat Issur

Further, the Rambam says, **kol keli shehuktzah machmat issur**, every vessel that has been separated from the person, has become muktzeh, has been placed aside, because of the prohibition **assur letaltel, kegon**, he explains, **ner shehidliku bo beShabbat**, a candle that was lit on Shabbat, **o hamenorah shehaya haner aleha**, or the lamp, the menorah on which the candle was placed, **o shulchan shehayu alav hame'ot. Afilu shekavah haner o shenaflu hame'ot, assur letaltelan**, one may not move them. Why? **Shekol keli shehaya assur letaltel bein hashemashot**, a thing that one was not permitted to move at twilight, **ne'esar letaltel kol haShabbat kulah**, one may not move it the entire Shabbat, **af al pi shehalachdavar shegaram lo issur**, even though the thing that caused the prohibition is no longer there.

That is, as long as there was a candle there, one was not permitted to use it in any case. One was not permitted to use it even for a davar shemelachto le'heter for example. One was not permitted, because moving a candle is a shema yehaveh, or it's a thing that's forbidden to use, or money is forbidden to move around. Therefore, even if with the candle one can do, let's say a davar hamuter, but it didn't become permitted because when Shabbat arrived it was muktzeh. It's put away from itself. It's put away. Why does it fall away? Yes. And we also see here automatically that the fire or the money are something that there's no way to use on Shabbat. The meaning is, for example, he wouldn't have said that money can be used to wipe one's nose. Because it would have been like muktzeh machmat chisaron kis. Therefore, not only is this forbidden, but the vessel on which it lies has also become forbidden.

Discussion: What Does "Muktzeh Machmat Issur" Mean?

Speaker 1:

What does it mean that it's muktzeh machmat issur? Because he wasn't permitted to touch the candle on Shabbat. Because he shouldn't touch a Shabbat candle because it's muktzeh. Hey, why shouldn't he touch a Shabbat candle? Because it will go out? No. They're talking now about the muktzeh itself, and they say that it's muktzeh because it's muktzeh. It's a side thing. No, apparently with a candle there's a prohibition of mechabeh or of meva'er to be busy with a candle on Shabbat. Already, Rav, it doesn't need to be said, but it looks that way. I don't agree. They did learn, they learned, they didn't open a door in front of the candle here. But I think that, someone has

a very correct point, he figured out that the way is more stirred, there's no prohibition to touch a *davar ha'assur*. I think that, do you understand what I'm saying, completely on its own *muktzeh machmat issur*. But hold on, it became *muktzeh* because of the prohibition. It seems to me that there are things that a person has in mind. When a person lights a candle, he doesn't plan to use it on Shabbat. *Machmat issur* doesn't mean *issur shehi issur hateltelul*. *Issur* means *issur hahadlakah*, or *issur hashimush*, something like that. And the same with money, I don't know.

The Question of Keli Shemelachto Le'issur

One needs to understand, because essentially every *keli shemelachto le'issur* is perhaps *muktzeh mida'ato*, because it's only made for prohibition. One needs to know what is a candle or money so different from every thing that is *melachto le'issur*. What does it mean that it's *melachto le'issur*? To do *melachot* with it? What is the prohibition *miderabbanan*? Which prohibition is this?

Speaker 2:

Yes, money is like... It's not a vessel. It's a prohibition *miderabbanan*.

Speaker 1:

Okay, okay, okay. And which prohibition? It's a prohibition *derabbanan*? Something else must be going on here. I think that money is perhaps also like *assur in kis*. One never uses it for anything else besides money. No one uses money to wipe their nose. Therefore it remains *muktzeh* only for the one thing that one uses it for, as this is prohibited. It's a *keli shemelachto le'issur*, it's not only designated for prohibition. There's also the option to use it for *heter*. Therefore one may use it. It's not like a thing that one never uses *le'heter*, like a candle that one always uses for... What does *melachat issur* on Shabbat mean. All money that one uses, what does commerce on Shabbat mean, it's not only it itself that's forbidden, but also the vessel on which it lies. This I understand. The last level of the *halacha* I understand, but the first level something is missing here, I'm not clear. Money is a *keli shemelachto le'issur*? A *keli shemelachto le'issur* one may use for something else.

Speaker 2:

Right, that's what I'm saying. One may indeed wipe oneself with a piece of money on Shabbat if one wants, true?

Speaker 1:

And they didn't have it yet. It could be that money is a *mechussar kis*, or make it like... Money is the *kis*, but it's not a thing that one puts away. It doesn't get ruined if one wipes with it, let's say. But it doesn't get ruined, in any case. One needs to think more. Something is missing here.

Basis Ledavar Ha'assur – The Table and the Lamp

Speaker 1:

Okay, but now besides the essence of the *halacha*, that from the *shulchan she'alav hame'ot*, right? Not the money itself, right? The candle, afterwards the *menorah* on which the candle is, and the table on which the money is. Then... Yes?

Speaker 2:

Yes. Even if it went out and later fell off, the thing became forbidden anyway, right?

Speaker 1:

I think that the *keli shemelachto le'issur* in this manner, for example a thing that one was holding in the middle of grinding when Shabbat arrived, is the same thing as a *ner shehidliku bo beShabbat*. Because at the time when Shabbat arrived it was something that one may not... Do you understand my question?

Speaker 2:

Halfway. I would have asked something - every thing that he prepared with a *da'at* that on Shabbat he shouldn't use it.

Speaker 1:

You say no, but he thinks that if a *davar hamuter* comes up he will be able to use it. If so, what's different from money or other things? Right, so something is something more going on here. *Afilu shekavah*, he's learning another thing. That is, a *basis ledavar ha'assur*, right? It's the next step, the next level. Right?

Speaker 2:

Yes. Because he thinks even yes. *Afilu shekavah haner*, so the thing on which one placed a *davar ha'assur erev Shabbat*, a fire was burning *erev Shabbat*, *afilu shekavah haner she'ein alav me'ot*, the candle has already gone out, the money no longer lies there, one may not move the vessel. Why? *Shekol keli shehaya assur letaltel bein hashemashot*, *ne'esar letaltel kol haShabbat*. Every thing that one was not permitted to move at twilight, because at twilight there was, it had a candle, it had money, it became forbidden for the entire Shabbat. *Afilu halach davar shegaram lo issur*, even the thing that caused the prohibition went away, but it remains, it was designated with this *erev Shabbat*, therefore it remains forbidden.

The Stringency of Muktzeh Machmat Issur

Speaker 1:

So this one may not move *le'eizeh inyan*, he means to say even... In any case. What does in any case mean? Even for a *davar hamuter*, the table to eat on it. But what about the other ways that one may even a *keli shemelachto le'heter*?

Speaker 2:

But he says that it's more stringent than a *keli shemelachto le'issur*, that's exactly what he says here. That it becomes like *muktzeh machmat chisaron kis*, it becomes like those things. He doesn't say clearly... He says "*assur letaltel*" means in all ways not at all.

Speaker 1:

Okay.

Halacha 11: Muktzeh Machmat Mi'us

Speaker 1:

Aval keli shemeyuchad lema'us, this is... This is *muktzeh machmat mi'us*, it's put away. But this isn't a bad thing like when a person puts away... A candle is away for an entire Shabbat, it's just a *davar hame'us*, he puts it away. Not so bad.

Summary of the Three Categories of Muktzeh

Speaker 1:

So meanwhile we've had *melachto le'heter*, which one may do everything; *melachto le'issur*, which one may do everything except *letzorech gufo shel keli*, *letzorech atzmo shel keli*, and one may make it the same *halacha* as *keli shemelachto le'issur*, that's the second category; and the third category which one may not do anything at all is either a stone, a thing that's not a vessel, or a thing that is a vessel but it's *muktzeh machmat*

chisaron kis, or a thing that's muktzeh machmat issur. The third category, which one may not use at all.

Halacha 12: Kelim Shenishberu – Shevreihan Nitalin

Speaker 1:

Very good. Now we're going to learn a new halacha about a vessel that broke on Shabbat and certain parts of the vessel can be used for other things. So, **kol hakelim hanitalin beShabbat**, vessels that one may use on Shabbat, **shenishberu daltotthehem**, whose doors broke, **kegon daltot teivah umigdal**, a large cabinet, one may move a cabinet on Shabbat, no problem because it's very heavy, its doors broke off, no difference when it broke off, **bein shenishberu beShabbat bein shenishberu kodem haShabbat, muter letaltel otan delatot**. Not like we saw earlier that a door of a house, the Gemara said one may use it as long as it was in the house, once it broke off it's not a vessel, but a door of a vessel is batel to the vessel, if the vessel is called melachto le'heter the vessel is also called melachto le'heter.

Vechen kol hakelim hanitalin beShabbat shenishberu, or the vessel broke, it broke on Shabbat, whether erev Shabbat, **shevreihan nitalin**, one may use the broken pieces.

Discussion: The Question of Machat Shenishberah

Speaker 1:

But here I want to understand how it fits with the needle that broke. There the needle made an extra category, here we're talking about the thing, about a vessel that broke. **Vehu sheyihyey osin me'ein melacha**, this is only if it still does some melacha. Me'ein melacha means ke'ein melachto that it did le'heter kulah?

Speaker 2:

No, the Gemara says me'ein melachto or me'ein melacha.

Speaker 1:

Okay, so perhaps that... It looks like it's not ra'uy limelacha at all. But why did he make an extra discussion about the needle, if he says it clearly here? And furthermore, that needle he's more stringent. He says that even if one can still use it, one can actually use it to remove a thorn, but one may not, because it becomes a vessel.

Perhaps it's different, that a needle looks completely like a vessel, but it becomes a vessel. He sees that it makes a melacha.

Lecture on the Laws of Shabbat: Moving Broken Vessels, Vessel Covers, and Moving Through Another Object

Halacha 12: Kelim Shenishberu – Me'ein Melacha

Speaker 1: No, the Gemara says me'ein melachto or me'ein melacha. Ah. Okay, so perhaps that... It looks like it's not ra'uy limelacha at all. But why did he make an extra discussion about the needle? If he says it clearly here... Furthermore, that needle he's more stringent. He says that even if one can still use it to remove the thorn, but you may not, because it becomes not a vessel. Perhaps it's different that a needle becomes completely not a vessel? He says that it becomes completely not a vessel? Let's see, let's learn this piece, perhaps I can think of an approach.

Vechen kol hakelim hametaltelim beShabbat shenishberu, im hakelim yecholin la'asot bahen

me'ein melachtan, muter. Keitzad? Shivrei arivah, shehashever adayin ra'uy lechasot bo et pi hechavit, as we've already seen a few times, that one used to do this, break off a piece of pottery and use it for things. **Shivrei zechuchit, lechasot bahem et pi hapach, vechen kol kayotze bazeh**, it remains a vessel. It no longer does the original vessel's function, it has now become a vessel for lechasot bo et pi hapach. **Aval im einan reuyin limelacha klal**, then it's no longer called a vessel, **ve'assur letaltelan**, like a thing that's not a vessel.

Discussion: The Distinction Between a Needle and Broken Pottery

Speaker 1: So I think the needle is, that doesn't mean that it has... Because the person found that he can now use it for a thorn, doesn't make it a vessel. These things here, it's such a practice that a broken piece of pottery one puts away, the broken pottery pieces that one uses for this type of vessel, for things that one needs to plug a bottle and so on. But a needle that one doesn't really have any use for, and ah, he can now use it for a thorn, that doesn't make it a vessel.

Right? That's what you must say, I'm just thinking, perhaps you're dismissing some other secret that we haven't discovered. This is implied.

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: Very good.

Halacha 13: Kisuyei Hakelim

Speaker 1: Okay. Another halacha. The Rambam says further, **"Kol kisuyei hakelim nitalin beShabbat, vehu sheyesh torat keli aleihem"**, that the cover is also called a vessel. But if the cover is not called a vessel, no. And he explains, **"O sheyihyu mechubarim."** Not that just a thing that you use as a cover, that's what it means. He says that a thing that was tied, one can perhaps explain the signs that show that this is a cover.

Translation

Speaker 2: Let it be, because he does say "shards of glass to seal with them the opening of the barrel."

Speaker 1: Yes, it's a cover for a vessel. But not here. Perhaps when it's not yet considered a vessel, it's ownerless. Let's see, **How so? If a vessel was attached to the ground, such as a barrel that has a designation in the ground**, a barrel that is connected to the ground, that it lies buried in the ground, **it is thus: if its cover has a handle**, the cover that covers the barrel, if it has a handle, **one may move it**, because the handle makes it into a vessel. **And if not**, just as we saw by the sponge that a handle makes it into a vessel. **And if not**, if it doesn't have a cover, **one may not move it**, because the barrel is no longer called a vessel, the barrel is called a... not the barrel, the cover of the barrel.

Discussion: Why is a barrel buried in the ground different?

Speaker 2: But what does it have to do with the fact that the barrel is buried in the ground? Does it say that explicitly? He doesn't say just any barrel.

Speaker 1: I don't know, something is different. I believe that the Maggid Mishneh says that this is essentially a decree. Regarding a barrel, the cover of a barrel is indeed a vessel. It's the cover of a barrel. But if one inserted the barrel into the ground, then if it doesn't have... the barrel is no longer called a vessel, it's already called attached to the ground. One views it

and is stringent because regarding a cover of the ground, which is indeed not a vessel, this is the law, and one extends this to that.

Question: Contradiction between the law of vessels and glass shards

Speaker 1: The Rambam says it explicitly, the Rambam's chapter is "**Covers of vessels are permitted to be moved because they have the status of a vessel.**" It's truly a wonder, because he says it right after "**shards of glass to seal with them the opening of the barrel, etc.**" And it has the status of a vessel. But the shard, the status of a vessel doesn't refer to the vessel, it refers to the cover, right? The handle, that's what he said. The handle makes the cover have the law of a cover. Before that it's just a piece of wood, it's not a cover, you may not use it. Because it's not a vessel, as we said that it's not a vessel. This is the last contradiction to the barrel.

Even if one places it on top of a barrel, as long as it doesn't look like a vessel, it remains forbidden. So this is the reason why we haven't answered it, because we held that it's nullified in everyone's mind. And you can tell me thus, when it's a barrel that one moves around, one moves around the barrel with it, it's obvious that it's something that's used. Okay? Something like that.

Covers of ground openings

Speaker 1: Indeed, covers of ground openings. When there's something that covers a hole in the ground, **such as pits and trenches**, where one places a cover on it, **it is forbidden to move their cover**, unless there is a handle. Perhaps because then it becomes like part of the building, perhaps because the vessel... No, the cover of ground openings is... I'll tell you something good, this is understandable, because there's no vessel at all, but the vessel is attached to the ground. It's so similar. Let's assume from here. But you have a hole, you covered the hole with some board. But this is a board, this is like part of the floor. It's not... But here it's understandable, there's a handle, it's made to be taken. Here it's more understandable than by the barrel. Okay. It's the barrel, not just any barrel, a barrel that was buried in the ground, which is as he said.

Cover of an oven

Speaker 1: Cover of an oven, which is not... even if there is a handle. The cover of an oven is indeed easier, because it's a simple cover. Seemingly, although an oven is indeed easier, it's something attached to the ground, which lies in one place, not like a barrel that one places in the way. **One may move it.** Further? Mmm, yes, a bit more.

Laws 14-15: Moving by means of another object

Speaker 1: Okay, the Rambam says thus, the Rambam is going to say here a kind of permission for how one may indeed move things that generally one may not move. He says thus, **two things**, there are two things, **one forbidden to move and one permitted to move, and they were adjacent to each other**, or one next to the other, **or one upon the other**, one higher than the other, **or one within the other**, one lies inserted in the other, **in such a way that when one moves one of them, the second moves**, and one cannot move one without the other. So it is, **if he needed the thing that is permitted to move**, if the reason why he uses, why he moves things here is because he wants to touch the thing that he may move, **he may move it**, he may move it. He need not fear that when he moves it, the thing that is forbidden will

be moved, **even though the forbidden thing moves with it**, is moved together with it. **But if he needed the forbidden thing**, what he wants here, he wants to move the forbidden thing here, it doesn't help that it lies next to a permitted thing. **He may not move it even while engaged with the permitted thing.**

Examples: Unripe fruit in straw, cake on coals

Speaker 1: How so? He explains. **Unripe fruit**, a young fruit, which is edible unripe fruit, some fruit that is not yet sufficiently ripened, one keeps it in straw so it will finish ripening. And straw is something that is not a vessel, it's something that is muktzeh because of its essence, but he wants to eat the unripe fruit. Or another case, **a cake**, a cookie, **that was placed on top of coals**, where the coals are muktzeh, fire, flame, is muktzeh, but the cake is permitted. So it is, but he wants to eat the unripe fruit, he wants to eat the cookie, or he wants to eat the fruit.

Come and see, one may take a cover of a ground opening, which we already learned earlier that one may, it's a vessel whose primary function is for a prohibited use that one may use to insert things, **and take them**, he takes the unripe fruit, **even though the straw and the coals move with them at the time of taking**, even if it stirs at the time when he takes it, one may.

Turnips and radishes buried in earth

Speaker 1: And likewise turnips and radishes, vegetables that are buried in the ground, like potatoes, carrots, **that he buried in ash**, the muktzeh is a part that's revealed, and a part of the lettuce, sorry, we're not talking here like when it's growing, because then there's a concern of detaching, we're talking here when one stored it, so it should stay fresh, like the unripe fruit **that he buried**, yes, **in ash**, not in the ground, it lies in the ground and it keeps it cold, anyway.

The muktzeh whose part is revealed, that means when it's covered, when it's covered one might need to actually touch the earth, it's a derivative that one wouldn't be permitted. Since we reveal it, **he may grasp it on Shabbat while they are whole**, he may grasp it on Shabbat by the leaves, **even though the earth moves and shakes**, even though the earth stirs.

Note: Taking means even touching

Speaker 1: It's interesting, here one sees very clearly that taking doesn't mean actually carrying, because when the Rambam said in the introduction he's going to talk about carrying things, this also means even just touching things a bit, one made such a blanket rule, any touching. Or a slight touching.

Speaker 2: But it's permitted for bread or a child along with earth or along with a beam, yes, a child lies on a beam, or you say the opposite, but you want to use the beam. If he wants to use it with a child. A child doesn't help if the box is in the... the Elazar reads child. Why? Because he becomes the thing. Okay.

Speaker 1: So let's go further, what one may move by means of another thing. Because one may move, for example a collection of coins that is gathered around, there's perhaps here a similar thing, when a child holds a muktzeh object and the father wants to lift his child. It's already a bit different, because lifting the child he automatically lifts the thing that the child holds. But still it's called indirect moving.

Speaker 2: Moving by means of another thing.

Speaker 1: Moving by means of another thing, yes.

Law 16: One may take his son

Speaker 1: One may take his son who has a stone in his hand. Even if the child holds a stone. But can there be a child who doesn't want the father to lift him? Every child is such a truth. No, but I'm saying from the language, often the language of the Sages is such that... the language reveals why they sought the permission, but here there isn't some extra permission, one may just as one may every indirect means, understand? Just as the previous law was, adjacent one to the other, holding this and that rises with it, here it's also thus the child. So the child doesn't need to have any greater permission than vegetables with sand.

Discussion: Why is the language "one may take his son"?

Speaker 1: From the language it's somewhat implied thus, but it's not so, he only wants to say the novelty of the second thing, if according to a dinar, the stringency he wants to say. But if the child holds money in hand, there is a prohibition. It may be that this is worse, because earlier we're talking that he takes one thing and the other thing is consequently moved along, but here you're actually lifting the things up. On this there is what to say that one needs to come to a non-Jew who is a child who has the non-Jews dangerous that one doesn't lift him. A baby, I mean to say that it's a great need that the Sages were lenient, poor thing, the child.

Speaker 2: Yes, there's a lot, and one also talks about a way that one cannot give and tell the child, or give such a slap to remove from the child. Does it help with such a baby? Yes, the child is stuck with his... the Sages also said that the stone cannot become like the child's toy, which is muktzeh because of its essence. If it's some stone that the child designated, and this is his little bear stone, yes, like one has a doll, it's also permitted. He just holds a stone. One may lift him because it's called indirect moving. You say that this is even more than indirect moving, because indirect moving means that one takes the permitted and there comes with it a bit of sand. Here he actually holds a thing, it holds down the sand. Here you lift this up.

The Maggid Mishneh's explanation: Concern for illness

So says the Maggid Mishneh. The Maggid Mishneh argues that one is lenient because of the non-Jew thing, and he calls it concern for illness. I mean that here one sees very clearly that concern for illness from the Gemara can mean a child, a baby, one needs to lift him. It's not that one saw that a baby will become sick because one didn't lift him. Perhaps the concern for illness doesn't mean that the child will become sick, but in general, if one will say that a father shouldn't lift his children, the matter of lifting a child is a matter that has to do with illness. I would have thought perhaps that this is an illness, but I thought that this is enough of an inhumanity, a father shouldn't lift his son.

The law of a dinar - proof that it's not actually concern for illness

Yes, but I say, look, the next piece is "but not for a dinar." If it were any concern for illness, this wouldn't be relevant. It's only a thing that is relevant in a reality of illness. By a child, illness is not in the case. But for a dinar one was stringent. By a dinar, if a child holds money in his hand, then the father may not lift the child. Why? Because "lest the dinar fall and he will take it in his hand." A dinar is indeed an expensive thing, an important thing. Just as we learned regarding bones of the

dead several times, that something that is important one fears that one will lift it, one will lift it. This is regarding the prohibition of moving. It's no dinar means specifically a dinar, but for example a child holds a quarter in his hand, but he may not lift a quarter. One holds a hundred.

Discussion: What is the definition of "dinar"?

And just wondered, will a dinar ever be good? I don't know, I think a dinar means to say when it's money, because money is something that is people's mindset, or he means to say something that is important. The simple meaning is, it means money. Do you want to know about a pearl too? A stone, is that also worth a pearl. A depth, which say a dinar, is something important. And does it mean to say important? Simply, because a baby doesn't play with coins, and plays with a dinar. Like a speaker. But with at least, aha. Okay, probably in general in the time of the Mishnah most coins were, and money was coins, so it was already with papers and money as it stands. I have no papers, and in particular it means you it brings out, but this is a store thing. And a thing wasn't another thing.

A stone that plugs a hole in a vessel

And we already know that the stones are made to fill holes, and the barrels, and the basket. But the one who has a hole in his basket inserted a stone to cover the open basket, to make the hole in the basket, and the stone becomes like a wall, it becomes a part of the basket.

The law of a basket full of fruits with a stone

Just as we learned in the laws of chametz, we had such a kind of law, that one has a... yes there it's the main one, here you have olives in one place, a place that has a hole, and anything that one puts in, becomes a part of the basket. Yes... **If the basket was full of fruits**, what happens thus, is there a basket full of fruits? Where but one touches a fruit, there's also a stone there. So it is, see the question whether one may carry the basket, carry the basket with the stone, when you go to carry, you also go to carry a forbidden thing.

So, **if they are soft fruits**, it shouldn't be able to properly eat, that doesn't make dirty. **One takes it as it is**, he should take the basket as it is, and if he needs to carry it from one place to another he should carry it. Why doesn't he need to do? Why? Because seemingly he could have said, I'll give you advice, pour out your basket, after the stone has poured out, and then put back into the basket the fruits alone. So this is... so this is indeed the law, he doesn't say it very clearly, but so is the law.

The reason: In a case of loss they did not decree

It stands thus, when there's a practical advice that you shouldn't need to carry a prohibition together with your permission, it's certainly that why should you carry the prohibition? You can find a way to remove it. He says, then you won't have a choice, because you should take the basket of soft fruits, and for example remove one at a time and place down on a clean place and put back, it's already a great burden, and this one was not obligated. Learn from this, he will throw out the fruits, they will fall on the ground, that it becomes dirty, and in a case of loss they did not decree. In a case of loss they did not decree.

Discussion: What is the definition of "in a case of loss"?

He loses his basket of grapes. No, but we're talking in a manner when he cannot do it another way. It stands even a

soft one, but we're talking in a manner when he cannot. Yes, but I mean my question is whether we say that he doesn't need to burden himself on it, just as when he can give it pour out on the floor at once, okay, it becomes dirty, he cannot. But we don't tell him he should remove one at a time and work hard, which takes him there ten minutes. I don't know, one needs to think or where. But we're talking really when it's not relevant.

In a Case of Loss, They Did Not Decree

In a case of loss, they did not decree. What does the *tircha* (exertion) mean here that we can speak of? What *tircha*? He doesn't have, he can't pour it out. We're talking about a case when he doesn't have. But if he does have, he can lay them out on the table. One at a time, not pour them out, but take them out. The reason is because they're very soft, they'll break from the pouring. To the table he needs to be *metalteil* (move) them. He doesn't need to be *metalteil* them. We're talking about when it's lying on the side. If it's lying *lekhatchila* (initially) by the table, and the same law applies. We're talking about a case when he can't, you say. No, I'm scratching my head that you say he doesn't need to be *metalteil*. It is *metalteil*. The *metalteil* is the thing. There is a way that he can bring about a great destruction. Laying out one at a time and then pouring out, it will take him an hour this game. One must know, there is here a...besides *hefsek* (interruption) there is also here a concept that we want to trouble him a little. It doesn't make sense very clearly, but...okay.

One thing is all these kinds of very detailed cases that the Gemara in Dromein brings, just as we've been talking the whole time. You want to find general rules and it's understood that it was discussed in a way that makes sense, but...well, it's already very good.

A Barrel That He Forgot a Stone on Its Opening – Forgetting Is Not a Basis

A barrel that he forgot a stone on its opening...he has a barrel, a wild wine, but he placed a stone on top of a keg for what, he forgot it. He is...*mateh al tzido* (tilt it on its side), if you tilt it, one can move the barrel a bit, and tilt it to the side so the stone will fall off, then one could take wine. He says that the barrel is not now a basis *ledavar ha'asur* (for a forbidden object), because of the forgetting. The reason it's *muktzeh* is because he can't open the barrel, it should cry out. Something that's not important, not understood at all. By the way, you now have use to cover the barrel. He has some use now. That doesn't help. Because, one may be *metalteil* it at a time, basically. Move down the barrel in the stone. Because he says that the reason is the forgetting. When he places it there, it becomes forbidden, because he placed it. But it's forgotten. He didn't have in mind that the stone should be there on Shabbos. Okay.

When Mateh Al Tzido Is Not Possible

What happens when he can't give it a throw down by tilting it on its side? Because it's removed between other barrels, it's lying between other barrels. And if it falls, it will fall on other barrels. Or it will cause damage. May he indeed lift it up and place it on another place and tilt it there, he may carry it only as much as is necessary. He should take the barrel and carry it to a corner...ah, it's interesting.

The Rule: One Must Do As Little Tiltul As Possible

In *mateh al tzido* or another way, they say like this, that it doesn't mean actually to be *mevatel* the thing and one

shouldn't do it at all and tilt. A little one may tilt it enough to throw down the stone, because there is a need for this. But actually carrying around one may only when there is a greater need, when there is no other solution. When there is no solution of *mateh al tzido*, then it's permitted more. Then it's permitted that he may lift it up and carry it to a place where he can throw it down, and throw it down there. Because when the reason is not forgetting, it doesn't make it at all a basis *ledavar ha'asur*. But on a basis *ledavar ha'asur* the Gemara says one may do a little.

Again, we're trying to make rules, and I think that's a practical knowledge. One must do as little *tiltul* as possible of forbidden things with *tiltul*. If one can't, one looks for a way. It's very practical, it doesn't start from *halachos*, you understand what I'm saying? We're talking about the deed, not from the moral lesson of the deed. Yes.

Money on the Pillow – Forgetting vs. Placed

We bring a similar thing, that I have **money on the pillow**, someone left money on his pillow, so he should be able to have sweet dreams. **And he needs the pillow**, he needs now to sleep on the pillow, **he should shake the pillow and they fall**, he should throw it down. And *lekhatchila* he shouldn't actually carry it away, but throw it down. **But if he needs the place of the pillow**, if it won't help to throw it down, because for example it will lie on the...there he needs to sleep. When the pillow is lying just like that, you give it a shake down, and then lie down somewhere else, not there where the money is lying. But if you're going to need that place, **he takes the pillow**, he may indeed take the pillow with the money, and shake off the money somewhere else.

When One Placed It Intentionally – Basis Ledavar Ha'asur

All these laws are by forgetting. **But one who places money on the pillow**, he put it down because he wanted it to be there, **behold this increases objects, behold these are forbidden to move**. Who is forbidden to move here? Because even if the money is no longer there, one may not be *metalteil* the pillow, or the object itself becomes a forbidden thing? It says in the text basis *ledavar ha'asur*.

The Difference Between Barrel (Forgetting) and Pillow (Placed)

I think the reason that you said before is, when the barrel itself is permitted, it's not a basis *ledavar ha'asur*, it only has a problem that there's a stone there, then they say he should do as little as possible, because in practice he's moving the stone through another thing. But when it's placed specifically, the entire object, it's not through another thing, it's actually a new *muktzeh*. What does basis *ledavar ha'asur* mean? What is *muktzeh*? But one must understand, basis *ledavar ha'asur* becomes as stringent as a *keli shemelachto le'issur* (a utensil whose primary function is for a forbidden use), it becomes the prohibition of the stone itself, it becomes like *muktzeh machmat issur* (*muktzeh* due to prohibition).

Laws of Muktzeh: Basis Ledavar Ha'asur, Forbidden Fruits, and Terumah

Basis Ledavar Ha'asur – Continuation

Because if not, one would still be permitted *letzorech gufo* (for its own use), *letzorech mekomo* (for its place) one would have to be permitted. But basis *ledavar ha'asur* becomes a severe *muktzeh*, it becomes like the forbidden thing, we look at it like the stone on which it lies. Like the stone, yes. If the stone...a

novelty, it becomes actually even when the stone no longer lies there, it receives the law of the stone, it becomes a severe muktzeh. One can hear.

A Stone in a Fruit-Bowl

Further, **a stone in a keriah**. Keriah is a type of fruit, which I think is a melon, after one takes out all the fruit from the melon or from the cantaloupe, he has a hard thing that you can use as a bowl. And however there is, when you want to scoop water from it, it will come floating on the horizon, on the surface of the water. So in order that it should sink and one should be able to scoop, one puts in a stone to make it heavy, so one should be able to use it like a bowl to scoop.

So like this, **if one fills with it and it doesn't fall**, if the stone is placed in, the person made it like a professional, he placed in the stone in a way that it shouldn't fall, **behold it is like part of the keriah**, the stone is looked at like a piece of the fruit that was made for a vessel, **and one may move it. But if not**, but if it's placed so provisionally and one needs to play around with the stone every time, **one may not move it**, because we don't look at it like the stone has become nullified to the vessel, and he may not be metalteil.

Very good.

A Garment That Lost Something in It – A Garment on a Reed

A garment that lost something in it, he hung up a garment, he placed a garment on a reed, on a piece of wood, on a piece of twig, whatever, straw. Not a utensil. Further all these laws we're talking about...what the reed itself is not a utensil for me, yes, that's another utensil that one may not be metalteil. So even when he's going to take down the garment, the reed will move a bit, one may, because it's derech acher (in an unusual manner), just as we said that one may. He doesn't intend to move the reed.

Fruits That Are Forbidden to Eat – Tevel and Ma'aser

So we're going to learn more laws of muktzeh. The Rambam says like this: We learned that one may not give ma'aser on Shabbos. To tithe and separate terumah. So like this, **fruits that are forbidden to eat, such as fruits that are not tithed**, fruits that are forbidden for eating because they're not tithed, it's tevel, or even if it's still tevel miderabbanan (rabbinically), even the obligation of ma'aser is miderabbanan, but miderabbanan one is still obligated.

For example, what? Demai.

But demai he said one may indeed take on Shabbos.

No, but for a great need. What was the law with tithing...

You mean we're going to say now the law of demai here in the latter part?

I'm talking about ma'aser miderabbanan.

Aha. What does ma'aser miderabbanan mean? Certain fruits that are a doubt.

That means, which things?

Ah, what are only miderabbanan one needs terumah. **Or ma'aser rishon that its terumah wasn't taken**, or what one hasn't taken ma'aser rishon, one still needs to take terumat ma'aser. **Or fruits that are impure terumah**, it's forbidden to eat because it's impure terumah. **Or fruits that are not fit to eat, which are ma'aser sheni and hekdesch that were not redeemed according to law, it's**

forbidden to move them because they're not fit for eating, so it's also forbidden to move them. It's not a utensil, and the only thing it's fit for is eating, and one doesn't eat it, so it's like a stone that one has nothing to do with it.

These types forbidden in eating as not tithed miderabbanan and the like.

Demai – Fit for the Poor

But demai, by the way it also means something that one still needs to tithe miderabbanan, because we look at it like possibly tithed, but since there is a law in demai that the poor of the city may eat, one can give it to the poor and Levites.

Ma'aser Sheni That Didn't Add a Fifth

"And one who is obligated in ma'aser sheni and hekdesch that he redeemed them, even though he didn't add a fifth, behold these are redeemed." It is indeed redeemed, but it wasn't completely according to law.

What does not according to law mean?

Not like the previous case when it really wasn't according to law, when it wasn't properly redeemed. But one didn't do the mitzvah, the enhancement, to add a fifth. There is an obligation to add a fifth to the money. It's not me'akev (preventing), because one may already eat it. To add a fifth to the ma'aser sheni. If one didn't do that, even though the Sages say that as long as you don't add the fifth, lekchatchila you shouldn't eat it, or I know, it's a fine, but it is indeed permitted to move. It's ma'aser sheni and hekdesch that one didn't remove the fifth.

The point is that it's permitted for eating. That's the reason. From this it stands like demai, which is fit for eating.

No, demai is a novelty which is not fit for you but it's fit for another.

But this you can, if you may eat it. Lekchatchila one needs to do it, and even if one doesn't do it, one can already eat it. It's not me'akev.

Ah, he says that fruits of ma'aser sheni that one didn't give the fifth is also that the owners may not eat it, but another may eat it. It's exactly like demai, which is not fit for him but it's fit for another.

Very good.

Terumah – A Yisrael May Move

Let's learn further the same question, something that you may not eat but another may eat. **"A Yisrael may move the terumah even though it's not fit for him"**, even though the kohen needs to come pick it up, but it doesn't mean muktzeh, because you don't eat it for a reason. It's like someone is allergic to dairy, dairy doesn't become muktzeh for him, because it's fit for other people.

Impure Terumah with Pure

"One may move impure terumah with the pure and with chullin, because of food that is edible for a kohen."

Another law, what we said that impure terumah one may not be metalteil because it's muktzeh, that's only when one wants to hold the impure terumah alone. But when it lies together with pure terumah, or it lies together with chullin, it's permitted to lift them, because in that utensil one wouldn't permit the tiltul through another thing. Like the stones...

In what cases are we speaking? I'm not going to say now. What happens when the impure terumah lies in pure terumah? Will it have the similar laws to what we just learned?

That what?

That one may move them in one vessel.

In What Cases – When the Pure Is Below

In what cases are we speaking? When the pure is below. One must also take the...one must take the entire basket, the entire basket.

Why?

Because the pure lies below, and you can't poke and move.

Where is a fire?

And I give it a throw out.

Where but we're talking about such fruits that one can't throw out, like we learned before?

Where is fruits that are from vegetables?

If you would throw out, lest they be crushed, if one will throw it out from the vessel, they'll be damaged, there will be damage done. Therefore you must take it with the non-kosher, with the impure terumah, in order to be able to take the other.

Nuts and Almonds – Shake the Vessel

But if they were nuts and almonds and the like, but if they are things that are not wet, that don't become sticky and the like, hard nuts, then there is no permission, because **he shakes the vessel**, he can then do the thing of throwing out the vessel, and then he will remove only the thing he needs, only the pure that is fit to eat, he will only take the kosher and that will be nullified. And lekhatchila one doesn't let both be nullified.

For the Place of the Vessel

And what happens when one needs the place of the vessel? If one needs the place of the vessel, **whether the pure is above or it is below**, one needs to be for each one.

Why is that?

It comes out like by the pillow. Like by the pillow, when one doesn't have the choice, when one can't...the shaking...I'm thinking if shaking simply means one pours it over, or it's something a...one needs to give it some shake? Because you don't want to touch, must even be nullified lekhatchila but with some shake? Not clear.

Or perhaps shaking the vessel is simply a way of saying pouring out a vessel?

In any case, before it said *match al tzido vehem noflot* (tilt it on its side and they fall). Is it the same law?

It's different. Because why would you throw down the...the previous same law was...because you don't want to touch the stone itself.

The previous same law was when we talked about the figs that are on top, with the fruits that have a stone in them, which also said that one shakes the vessel. And yet...the similar law, it's all the same law. The stone is not different from another thing that one can't be metalteil. It's basically the same law. If one can, it's a dry thing, one needs to pour it out. If one can't, one may be metalteil it. If one can indeed, but it's a...one needs the place, one can't pour it out, further one may.

Okay, further.

A Pile – Stones That One Wants to Use for Sitting

We're going to learn how things indeed become a utensil that one wants to use. Something that is generally not made to do anything with it, but he does use it indeed, when does it become a utensil? That's what he says.

A pile or a heap, I don't know exactly how to say the word, but both mean a pile of stones that is heaped up so one should be able to sit on it. **That he thought about them during the day**, he thought during the day that here would be a good place to be able to learn Shabbos afternoon. Shabbos afternoon was the custom that one doesn't learn alone, one goes and learns together. One needs to have a large pile of stones, a large bench of stones.

So **to teach them**, to teach them means one learns. If he set it up, right, if he already made the stones for teaching, he already set it up nicely **he taught them**, like **the staff of the cattle**, the thing that holds the cattle straight, **it's permitted to sit on them tomorrow**, one may sit on them because one already arranged it before Shabbos.

That means, the thinking alone doesn't help. If he did some action, he set it up nicely. Permitted, **and if not, forbidden**, the thinking doesn't make a stone into a utensil.

Wood Chips of Palm – Wood from Palm

The same thing, **wood chips of palm**, wood from palm, **that he gathered them**, he gathered them together, a troop, yes, he made them into one pile. **For wood**, he told himself to use for wood, for firewood, to do what? One's going to do something with this, he made wood from it. Yes, to use for fire. **And he changed his mind about them on erev Shabbos for sitting**, if it's for wood it's muktzeh. He sees a pile of wood, he reconsidered, ah, that would be good to sit on. **It's permitted to move them**, one may be metalteil them after he reconsidered.

That means, on this it doesn't say that he needs to set them up.

Different, perhaps because the wood chips of palm are indeed more fit.

No, I'm saying, here it says he gathered them together, he already did the arrangement, the same thing as arrangement he did gathering, but he did it for the purpose of using for fire. But it's spoken perhaps, and it's already lying arranged, it can be then like the previous action with the current action.

Muktzeh: Straw on the Bed, a Basket of Dirt, and Nullifying a Vessel from Its Readiness

Straw on the Bed

Rambam: If one threw straw on the bed, he should not shake it with his hand, but shakes it with his body. And if it was animal food, it's permitted to move it. And likewise if there were pillows and blankets on it – he shakes it with his hand, it's made as if he slept on it from erev Yom Tov.

Speaker 1: Like *tiltul* through change, so that doesn't mean another thing, but that means with his body. With his body is easier.

And if it was animal food, then it's not muktzeh at all, so it's permitted to move it. And likewise if there were pillows and blankets on it... on what? On the straw? Right, that's the simple meaning like sleeping. Says the Rambam, "*maneh biyado*" (he designated it with his hand). Then it becomes like his bed. We look at the straw as if it's lying there for... then he may indeed move it with his cry, "it becomes as if he slept on it

erev Yom Tov." Then it's literally like his bed, and the straw is a part of it. The bed itself was made from straw. It's not viewed as dirt lying there, rather we look at it as something that should cover with the bed.

That is, straw is further such a thing that is similar to the palm branches. Sometimes one brings it, could be three to, sometimes it's just nothing, I don't know what one does with it. Sometimes one brought it for animal food, and sometimes one brought it for the bed. If one brought it for the bed, then one may move it. Precisely because he doesn't want to lay it now, makes no difference, but it's already made as if he designated it, because he designated it that he wants to use it for the bed, or for a part of a vessel or something.

A Box of Dirt

Rambam: One who brings a box of dirt into his house, if he designated a corner for it erev Shabbos, he may move it on Shabbos.

Speaker 1: He brings into the house a box of dirt. It doesn't go so well. People had in their house a corner of a bench of wood for heating, stones for needs, dirt for other things. So there is, if he designated a corner for it erev Shabbos, what does he want to do with the box? He wants with the dirt, he wants to cover filth. Yes, whatever. It's already prepared. If he designated a corner for it erev Shabbos, if he prepared a place, then it no longer means dirt that is not at all fit, it already means like some house materials, because he already prepared a place for it. He may move it on Shabbos, wherever he wants he can use it.

Very good. But if he didn't designate the corner, then it means muktzeh machmas gufo. Even if he brought it already for that, there is such a stringency. He already brought the sand. Why did he bring it into the home? Outside there is sand. Perhaps in the home there is also sand, but here there is some novelty that he needs to make a place. Here lies the fine sand. It doesn't yet become permitted by putting it in a box, but by designating a corner for it. He has it very clearly, very clearly set aside that, yes.

Further. Okay.

Nullifying a Vessel from Its Function

Rambam: It is forbidden to nullify a vessel from its function, for it is like demolishing.

Speaker 1: We're now going to learn a new law which is called mevatel kli mehechano (nullifying a vessel from its function). Something that has to do with the topic of muktzeh, but a bit of a different matter. Especially how the Rambam learns it.

Says the Rambam, it is forbidden to nullify a vessel from its function. A person may not nullify a vessel from the thing for which it was ready, he may not make it so a vessel should no longer be useful for Shabbos. For it is like demolishing. It's not a law of muktzeh. I don't know what you're learning that it's a law of muktzeh. The Rambam says because nullifying a vessel from its function means that it becomes not prepared, therefore it's forbidden to move it, and therefore it's forbidden to do this on Shabbos, because on Shabbos one may not break any vessels. You know that it's forbidden to break vessels. It's the first to make muktzeh. Making muktzeh is a derabbanan of soter (demolishing), you could say. Derabbanan of soter. Therefore one can put it under soter, if you want, by the Rambam's list of shevusin (rabbinic prohibitions). But it's

lucky that he waited, we would never have finished there. Yes, no time.

The Rambam's Reason: Like Soter — A Spiritual Demolition
Speaker 2: Interesting. No time.

Speaker 1: It makes a lot of sense. It's a spiritual soter. Soter means that you make a vessel lo ra'uy letashmisho (not fit for its use). You make a vessel not fit for its use. Ah, you make it not fit for its use through the halacha. So? The halacha is real. From this one can learn mussar (ethics). On the table it's not fit because the halacha doesn't allow eating. Right. Yes. If someone for example forbade it, okay, that's called hezeik she'eino nikar (damage that's not visible), for example in halacha there was lechem talmid kelev shel chaveiro (the bread of a student, the dog of his friend) and the like. But there are people who think that if they harm someone by making something forbidden to him, it's something better. That's a soter derabbanan.

Anyway, it's good. It is forbidden to nullify a vessel from its function because it is like demolishing. It's interesting that the Rambam didn't say it by the topic of derabbanan of soter, he says it here. I understand that it has a connection to here, but it's interesting. The Rambam opened it up.

Other Rishonim: A Law of the Prohibition of Moving

Speaker 1: By the way, other Rishonim say that nullifying a vessel from its function is a law of the prohibition of moving. I don't know, it's implied that it belongs to the prohibition of moving. He brings that Rashi says perhaps a different reason, that it's domeh lemelachah (similar to a prohibited labor), that it's like the opposite of boneh (building). But it's the same idea, it's the matter of soter. Rashi also says that sometimes it's soter, sometimes it's boneh. But the same idea is similar. Very good.

Discussion: Why Does It Appear Here and Not by Soter?

Speaker 2: Very explanatory. By the way, what you asked, everyone agrees the Rambam you could put it by soter. First of all, but it's lucky we would never have finished learning there. Yes. Secondly, but the law that he's going to tell us, didn't we already have it essentially by lighting candles on Shabbos?

Speaker 1: A bit, parts. True. There are things that appear almost twice in the Rambam. In Shabbos many things appear more than once.

Also, by the way, all these laws that we learned in the beginning, all the laws of things that are forbidden to do erev Shabbos, are essentially types of the melachos (prohibited labors). He didn't put it in the melacha itself, he put it before in his list of things that one may not do erev Shabbos, remember? Borei karva, that area. So the Rambam didn't entirely put everything into the 39 melachos. He could have put shehiyah (leaving food on a fire) and hatmanah (insulating) in tivshil (cooking), but he didn't put it, he put it in his previous category.

I understand why he says it here, because the reason why it's forbidden is because of the prohibition of muktzeh. But because the Sages made a prohibition of moving, then it becomes a matter of stirah (demolition). It's interesting. But I would say further, perhaps every thing that the Rambam found another place to put, he would put somewhere else. All these shevusin of the melachos are only things that there's no other place to put.

Speaker 2: Then I would have a problem saying that the Sages forbade moving, and then they forbade even something that causes its moving, and it would look like a gezerah ligezeirah (a decree upon a decree). But to say that nishberah koso (his cup broke) is closer.

Speaker 1: I mean like the Rav said here that all of moving is a fence for hotza'ah (carrying out), so one can put everything there. But I don't see that the Rambam is particular that everything should lie under that list. You see that the whole large topic of shehiyah and hatmanah, with shema yachteh (lest he stoke the coals), with all these laws that we learned there, it's too big to put as a word in bishul (cooking). It comes out exactly very well, but the Rambam makes it so everything lies somewhere else. When once it becomes a topic by itself it doesn't go with all the rules, even if it will be about a leniency because of soter, but there came a law from far away klum melachtos. It's the Rabbanan, it's that with meros that it wasn't with the targin. Once it's the whole part of what. It's muktzeh machmas issur, you may not touch a candle.

Speaker 2: Yes, but it's muktzeh machmas issur also the candle after it's run out, yes. It remained, yes, because it was a basis ledavar ha'assur (a base for a forbidden object).

Speaker 1: Therefore, now when he puts under the vessel on Shabbos...

Laws of Shabbos: Basis for a Forbidden Object, Nullifying a Vessel from Its Function, and a Pail of Filth

Law 23: One May Not Place a Vessel Under a Candle to Catch Oil

Because the oil in the candle is forbidden to move.

The oil in the candle is forbidden to move. Why? It's muktzeh machmas issur. One may not touch a candle. Yes, but it's muktzeh machmas issur also the candle after it's run out, it remained, yes, that will become forbidden.

Therefore, now when he places under the vessel on Shabbos, **when it falls into the vessel the vessel is forbidden with it**, he's now going to forbid a vessel that is permitted. The vessel was permitted, now suddenly the vessel becomes forbidden. Shouldn't it be that the vessel becomes a basis ledavar ha'assur? Perhaps it becomes a basis ledavar ha'assur.

Apparently in all similar cases one may not make on Shabbos a basis ledavar ha'assur. The novelty is that it's even set aside to the side. You need to say the word "basis." But if he wants to use the vessel, apparently wouldn't there be one of the leniencies from before, he should pour out the oil from the candle and use it. Perhaps, but one may not do that. That one may not make a basis ledavar ha'assur doesn't mean that afterwards with the vessel one may not have any leniency. It will become forbidden to move. If you have a way to do when it's permitted to move, it's still made the vessel truly not prepared.

Therefore, after something that one may not do, but I would have been comfortable to do.

Law 24: One May Not Place a Vessel Under a Chicken to Catch Its Egg

Someone has a chicken, he wants to place a vessel underneath so that when an egg falls out it should catch it, so it shouldn't fall on the ground. One may not do such a thing. **One may not place a vessel under a chicken to catch its egg,**

because the egg will be nolad (newly created) on Shabbos, it will be forbidden in eating and in moving. We don't yet know why. We haven't yet come to Yom Tov, we're in the middle of learning. Okay, we haven't yet had that Yom Tov is forbidden. Yom Tov there is a law of nolad, Shabbos we haven't yet had a law of nolad. But this type of egg will also be forbidden to eat on Shabbos. One shouldn't place a vessel under the chicken, because since one may not eat the egg, because the vessel has also become a basis ledavar ha'assur.

Kofeh Kli Aleha — Covering with a Vessel

But **he may overturn a vessel over it**, that one may indeed do. A chicken fell, ah, an egg fell, and I now want to watch the egg so that animals shouldn't come to harm it, he may cover it with a vessel, place a vessel on it, because then it won't become a basis, because one can remove the vessel when one wants. One doesn't need to move the... when one moves the vessel nothing happens just like that. **And likewise he may overturn a vessel over any thing that is forbidden to move.** He says now, by the way, every thing that is forbidden to move, one may indeed not place on something, it becomes a basis, but one may indeed place something to cover, or over the vessel that is forbidden to move, the thing that is forbidden to move, because one can remove it. There is a nullification, he's not interested to do something, he can remove the...

Law 25: One May Place a Vessel Under a Leak

Now we're going to learn a way that one may indeed place a vessel under a thing that's falling to catch what's falling, which one might have thought is also a matter of law. Yes, **one may place a vessel under a leak.** One may place a vessel in a place where water is running from the roof, so that the house shouldn't become wet or dirty. Okay. **And if the vessel becomes full**, he may even pour it out and again... the vessel doesn't become nullified... one may move the vessel. The vessel doesn't become forbidden to move. One may remove the vessel and put back a new empty vessel, and take it.

Condition: That the Leak is Fit for Washing

And this is, that the leak is fit for washing. It must be that the water is clean enough that one should be able to wash with it. Therefore that's the reason why one may, because then it's not a basis ledavar ha'assur, because the water is permitted to move. But, what does fit mean? If the water is not good water, then it's muktzeh, **and one may not place** one should not give, because then we are indeed nullifying the vessel. Because the vessel would apparently have become forbidden. But he has now found out that one may indeed. That he brings out that fit for washing means the minimum, the kal vachomer drinking, something must be something fit for something. Even also if for washing it has become forbidden.

The Law of Graf Shel Re'i

But in the deed it's forbidden lechatchilah (from the outset). When one indeed moves it with disgusting water in it, one may not indeed move it with the disgusting water. But why may one not lechatchilah? I'll explain to you! Why may one not lechatchilah place? Why may one not lechatchilah place? It's a prohibition of graf shel re'i (a pail of filth) lechatchilah.

The Rambam here is a sharp point. There is a new law called graf shel re'i, which one is lenient about, that a thing that normally one would think dirty water is muktzeh machmas gufo. But there is a law that a graf shel re'i one may indeed move it to become free of it.

What is this an extra leniency? Yes. It's a leniency, on the basis of what the Sages said one shouldn't keep in the house any *davar she'eino kli* (something that's not a vessel), they didn't hold that one should live in stinking houses on Shabbos. If there is a pail of filth, one may take it out on Shabbos. This is a pure leniency to clean the house. And for the same reason they also said that one may not *lechatchilah*, because one may not make a *graf shel re'i*. But when there is a *graf shel re'i*, one may throw it out.

Because this is the same reason, it's a leniency. It's not a thing that you may make. Because you make it, it becomes a vessel in the end, it makes it forbidden. But the fact, if there is a *graf shel re'i*, the Rambam holds that it's already there, whatever, there is filth because people turn around there, one may take it out. But not that you may make it *lechatchilah*. Making *lechatchilah* one may only when it's water fit for washing, when it's not disgusting water.

Practical Question: What Does One Do with Disgusting Water?

But if it is, so what does one do when disgusting water is pouring? He says the advice. True, it's a bit stuck practically. Right.

There is a way of not placing a vessel, it will be on the ground, it's a bit less tasty. The floor will be wet, you'll need to wipe it. So? Yes, wants the groom. Wise, we're not talking about a great need. In a place of great need one needs to know whether the prohibition of *graf shel re'i lechatchilah* is enough to forbid doing it when it's very important. We're talking here when there are other ways, one can manage. Not clear, the Rambam says some distinction. If it makes a flood on the house, it's also a deed. For that they permitted *graf shel re'i* for the reason. He tells you, if one may... bring a vessel and place it underneath.

Ah, but we learned that with this he makes *mevatel kli mehechano*? Yes, he won't be able now to use the vessel. But, there is here a leniency.

Law 26: A Barrel of Tevel That Broke — The Law of Ho'il

Ho'il ve'im avar vetikno, mistaken (since if he transgressed and fixed it, it's fixed), if someone indeed tithes on Shabbos, *bedi'aved* (after the fact) it's tithed, because it's only a rabbinic prohibition, it's not fixing from the Torah. Therefore, *bedi'aved* it would work.

I don't know, I mean there's no law that if someone does a prohibition and he makes... yes, because therefore, *ho'il vera'uy lismoch* (since it's fit to rely on), we look at it as *bedi'aved*, it's not so... *tevel* (untithed produce) is not like a stone that has no way at all to be permitted. It's... it indeed means *muktzeh machmas issur*, but as Rabbi Yitzchak said, as long as one can't fix it. But Rabbi Yosef, there is a... he can do a sin and it's permitted to be, what is in a sin a fixing. We're talking about honest Jews who God forbid he didn't do a sin.

The proof, he asks what I said, I don't need to remember, the Rabbis are permitting. Ah, I can't be that a Jew should remain stuck and lose all his money, that's *muktzeh*. And practically, a stone is different, but *tevel* is food. The sum total of what someone brought out is that it's not as dangerous as a stone. But he doesn't say that we permit because we have damage. So, the Rabbis gave some halachic leniency. We don't find so harsh, we find some Torah reason why it's indeed permitted.

The same thing, if one is stuck and one doesn't have a halachic Torah, one is also permitting. We'll see all these laws. It's not

so. As long as one can find an excuse, one says the excuse. Even if he can't, since *ho'il* one would have had an excuse, it would have been an excuse. No, they saw before clearly before their eyes what... to him is yes, perhaps he is also permitted, right.

One May Place a Vessel Under a Candle to Catch Sparks

The next halacha continues, even though regarding *kli b'machane* (a vessel in the camp) which we learned, that one may not place a vessel under a candle to receive the oil. But sparks one may place underneath. Ah, excuse me, yes yes, very good. No, regarding oil they said one may not, but regarding sparks one may have actual oil. It's not actual [oil], after it has landed it becomes just a crumb. It does nullify the vessel. It's nothing, the spark goes out. Yes, we already had this halacha once explicitly, I don't know why the Rambam says it twice.

Halacha 27: Kora Shenishbera — Supporting with Vessels

The Rambam continues, **kora shenishbera**, a beam, a beam of a house has broken. Further the question of *mevatel kli mehechano*. Yes, if someone has a support beam, he wants to place other things underneath now so the beam won't fall. He needs something... the wood isn't long enough. So usually one looks for *sefarim*, very thick *sefarim* to push in there. So, may one not take things that are *mutar b'tiltul*, like a cup, a bowl, or a piece of the bed, **ela im ken yir'u v'yacham v'chol ma sheyitztarech lo**. Only if it lies there, but he can also remove it. But if he will now afterwards remove the vessels, the entire beam will collapse, he also won't be able to remove the vessels on Shabbos.

There is room. That means if it becomes so tight that he cannot even, he won't be able to take it out, then he is *mevatel kli mehechano*. What should he be *mevatel*? A technical reason.

Chapter 25: Prohibition of Tiltul — Bitul Kli Mehechano, Muktzeh, and Tzaar Baalei Chaim

Halacha 23: Bitul Kli Mehechano — Vessel Under a Beam

Speaker 1: But if he will now afterwards remove the vessels, the entire beam will collapse, he also won't be able to remove the vessels on Shabbos?

That means, if it becomes so tight that he can never again take it out, then he is *mevatel kli mehechano*. That means, he is *mevatel* for a technical reason.

No, it could be because it has actually become part of the... a *soter*? But it becomes part of his house, just as a house one may not move, but a beam one may not move, but a cup one may move. Does it mean that one may not make something that will become on Shabbos *mechubar l'karka* or what? It's a sort of thing also. In any case, one is *mevatel kli mehechano*.

Halacha 27: Pores Machtzeles Al Gabei Avanim or Kaveres Devorim

Speaker 1: Further, "**u'fores machtzeles**" — *machtzeles* is a woven thing, a woven rug — "**al gabei avanim b'Shabbos o al gabei kaveres devorim**", or on stones so it should be comfortable to sit on the stones, or he places it on a beehive, on a place of bees. Why? "**b'chama mipnei hachama u'vgeshamim mipnei hageshamim**", because he wants to protect the beehive, one may do it. But by the beehive there is

a thing, **"u'vilvad shelo yischavein litzud"**, he should not have in mind that he wants to catch the bees. Bees means here like yesh b'mino nitzud, or he means that it's d'rabbanan that there's a prohibition.

Why may one actually place on the bees or on the stones? **"she'eino notel kol asher tachtav"**, he doesn't take stones on it, he places it on the stones. And he is not mevatel kli mehechano, because he can take it when he wants.

Discussion: Psik Reisha by Tzidas Devorim

Speaker 2: Why isn't it a sotah that it's a davar she'eino mischavein?

Speaker 1: It seems, ah, it has to be precise. It seems that not, because it could also be that it's yesh b'mino nitzud. Plus, but he doesn't say that. It sounds like... by the way, bees we have apparently learned that it is indeed yesh b'mino nitzud. But he doesn't say there, he says that one is mischavein. He only means to protect. They're already caught, they're already such bees, they're already in the... I can't, but if it happens that there is some one bee in between that he catches. No, it's the innermost hive, they'll come back. It's not really tzeidah. It could be that there would be a possibility of a relative tzeidah to... ah, there by the hive, there is the question of tzeidah. I don't know. Okay.

No, but you're asking a good question whether it's a psik reisha. My understanding asked the question. It's indeed to understand, it must stand precisely what we're talking about. You understand, I'm missing something in the details. It could be that it's not a psik reisha, because a machtzeh is indeed a thing that has holes, it's indeed a woven thing. It could be that a bee can get out of it, it's not a real psik reisha. Maybe. One would have to check whether it's indeed a type that one traps. Okay, further.

Halacha 27: Kofeh Sal Lifnei Efrachim

Speaker 1: **"Hakofeh es hasal b'Shabbos lifnei efrachim kedei she'ya'alu alav v'yeirdu"** — chicks love to jump on things, go up, go down. One may do it. Eh, doesn't it mean mevatel kli mehechano? No, because the chicks won't be on it the whole time. They'll use it for an opening, and when there won't be a chick on it, you'll be able to use it. **"U'mutar l'taltelan k'sheyordin me'alav, v'chen kol kayotze baze"**. When the chick is on it, one may not. One may not be metateil a chick on Shabbos. One may not come near them. That means, one may not, a person may not play with his pet animal, a kitty, a doggy, a chick that he has. It's indeed a chick that lies in his domain. If I remember, that's the halacha. It doesn't stand here explicitly, but I remember that yes.

Soon we'll see further about animals. The next halacha will stand explicitly about an animal. By the way, you don't have to wait, the next halacha will stand whether one may be metateil an animal. It's simple, it speaks of not a great tircha, no? But holding a chick in one's hands, yes, one may not. It must stand. We'll look a bit down to the Maharshah in the fifth chapter what he says. So, behemah chayah v'of asur b'tiltul mishum she'einan re'uyim. Yes, that's simple. It speaks in a manner that they are not re'uyim.

Discussion: Behemah Chayah V'of — Is a Pet Re'uy?

Speaker 1: Actually, apparently, if someone has at home — I'm saying, heimische Jews don't have, but if someone has at home a dog or a bunny rabbit, and he cuddles with it and he

plays with it, then it is indeed re'uy. Asur b'tiltul because it's not re'uy, but it's his toy.

One must speak about this. If a child has a living creature, it's his toy. I remember that the rabbis don't agree so much with this. One must actually check. I want to hear, the next halacha stands more about this. Okay, let's see. I mean it stands advice how one must yes, but... I mean a matter of tircha. Why? One speaks advice all because of muktzeh. The chapter indeed stands on muktzeh, not on tircha. Let's learn the next halacha, let's see.

No, I'm saying, a large animal, an ox, certainly no one takes an ox to play with it. I'm speaking if there is a small animal that one calls in lashon kodesh a chayas machmad, an animal that one has as a pet. Behemah shenafla l'vor speaks indeed of an animal that one cannot deal with. Okay, but that's not the topic now. Further. Let's see. Behemah shenafla l'vor o l'amas hamayim... But a frog, you see, a frog one may not. When the frog is not his... apparently in a manner it's not, when it's a frog when there is no regularity to hold it, to take it. I don't know.

Halacha 28: Behemah Shenafla L'vor

Speaker 1: Okay. **Behemah shenafla l'vor o l'amas hamayim**, an animal poor thing, it has now fallen badly into a pit or into water, so... one may not now go and drag the animal and take it out, it's asur b'tiltul. It's not a vessel, it's not something that is... right. But fine, but there are indeed advice. One must find advice. Says the Rambam, yes? **Im yuchal litein lah parnasah bimkomah**... ah, it's indeed that when a person falls into a well, one may take him out. Yes, a person is not asur b'tiltul. An animal? No, that one may not. On the contrary, we saw earlier even a small piece not to pass over.

Yes, but an animal is so, **im yuchal litein lah parnasah bimkomah**, if he can give it sustenance there, food, he can take from it. That means, calm the animal and give it to eat there where it is. One doesn't carry this topic motzaei Shabbos. **V'im lav**, if he cannot do that, **mevi karim u'chasavos u'maniach tachtehah**, he should stuff karim and blankets there where it lies in the well, and this will help that the animal should be able to climb up on it and come out. **V'im alsa**, if the animal has managed to climb up on the karim and blankets and go out, it's good. **Af al pi shenirtavu hakarim v'hakasavos, harei eilu k'mos she'hayu, mutar l'taltelan**.

Discussion: Bitul Kli Mehechano Through Making Wet

Speaker 2: Mashlich l'vo'er b'soch hamayim, he throws in now karim and blankets into a well of water, and afterwards one won't be able to use it. Why won't one be able to use it? Practically, because it will be soaked wet? Or because of sechita, because it will become...

Speaker 1: He says indeed, by the way, practically he says a thing, he says "shema yashlich l'vo'er b'soch hamayim", because it will become soaked.

Speaker 2: That a person may not make something dirty on Shabbos, like what?

Speaker 1: It seems. Yes, bitul kli mehechano, as it means not only in a dirty thing. It means also...

Speaker 2: By the cleaning can something become more problems from how is it called, from... because the cleaning is muktzeh. But it could be that one will indeed not be allowed to

take it out because of sechita. He will indeed want to squeeze it out so he should be able to use it, he won't be allowed.

Speaker 1: Ah, could also be. But it seems that I mean that a practical bitul kli mehechano is also something.

But I don't know if a person uses something and now it becomes muktzeh... I don't believe, it's hard to say so. It's like a person eats an apple and there remains the peel with the core, has he now made, created muktzeh?

Speaker 2: True, it's a question. One must find... one must throw it in... no, no, the Shulchan Aruch speaks about this about the cleaning, one must throw it in a weekday... yes, now is borer. No, now is muktzeh or borer?

Speaker 1: Okay, but there is indeed a prohibition of muktzeh. It's relevant, I didn't say it's not relevant, but one must find a way afterwards. One will have to be whether something is relevant or not in a minute, whatever.

But I don't know, it's hard to say that he speaks about bitul kli mehechano. He doesn't throw a towel on Shabbos morning into the mikveh also, one would say that one will no longer be able to use the towel. No, one can, but it's wet. Here one speaks that he throws it into a pit, into a well full of water.

Anyway, it's not the main point.

Speaker 2: No, grape juice has spilled, may one not place a rag now, because the rag becomes now that one won't be able to use because it's soaked with grape juice. One must know what is the meaning of bitul kli mehechano, if it's only practical things.

Speaker 1: I don't know. A towel... I don't know, there are so many types of things that become dirty on Shabbos. May one not make something dirty on Shabbos because one won't use it anymore on Shabbos? I don't know.

But here you see, by the way, here one sees indeed that it's permitted. We're trying to learn a prohibition from a permission. Here it stands that it's permitted. Why is it permitted? The Hagahos Maimoniyos that apparently because it's a decree. Tzaar baalei chaim lo gazru. The Chazal want to tell you that there is a mitzvah of tzaar baalei chaim, tzaar baalei chaim lo gazru. But in the mitzvah of tzaar baalei chaim they didn't permit everything. **Asur l'ha'alosah b'yado**, you may not go drag out the animal. **B'chaim ein okriin behemah chayah v'of b'chatzer**, one may not uproot, you may not lift and carry where you want to carry it. **Aval m'meg es ya docheh osah ad shetikaneis**, one may push it, motivate it to go.

There are other tzaddikim, it's important to know, who say that one may indeed with hands if one has no other advice because of tzaar baalei chaim, then it's indeed permitted with hands. And other Rishonim, the Krakow Rav says that l'makom hefsed merubeh, I mean l'makom tzaar baalei chaim itself, one must be concerned about it. Or one can tell a non-Jew who cuts around thirteen.

Speaker 2: Very good. And one must remember a golem v'si'o. Someone has a golem v'si'o that they don't need to actually lift, but one must indeed place a foot under them, make them walk, like Rabbi Yishmael ben Elisha learned. Yes, yes. He went almot, so carry like one carries a child.

Speaker 1: No, forcing one may not, that he didn't hold.

Halacha 28: Tarnegoles Shebaracha

Speaker 1: Because **the tarnegoles shebaracha**, a chicken has run away, **ein medadin osah**, you may not catch it and try to drag it back, because the nature of the chicken is that it will try to get out, **u'mishtametes miyado**, it will run away, and when you'll try to catch it, the feathers or the wings will become detached, or it's simply tzaar baalei chaim.

But what may one indeed do? **Aval docheh osah ad shetikaneis**, one may indeed push it until it goes in, because that is not, no, it's simply a fear of detachment.

Dispute of Contemporary Poskim Regarding Pets

Speaker 1: I see already that I gave a look, there is a great dispute of contemporary poskim regarding pets. You were right that a siyata dishmaya said that if it's the custom or the order that one plays with the pet, then it is indeed prepared. There are those who want to say that it's a decree without reason that an animal is not prepared, not even made things that are not prepared. But several great poskim are stringent, they say that yes, one should not play with pets on Shabbos. Those who are outside people that someone has it during the week, or even those who can perceive that someone has it during the week, so to say, ah, what is a non-Jewish thing, I must see asur completely, fine. Fine, I don't know. But what is something, but why should it be asur completely? Not clear.

Discussion About Playing with Animals (Pets) on Shabbos

Why Should an Animal Be Not Prepared?

Why should one say something a very modest reason that an animal is not prepared? Nothing has indeed made things that are not prepared. But several great poskim are stringent. They say that yes, one should not play with pets on Shabbos.

Those who are outside people that someone has it during the week, or even those who can perceive that someone has it during the week. Ah, they should say... no, prohibiting you have a non-Jewish thing. Here what does it see it or supposedly, fine. No, it's not. Why something why should be prohibited completely... not clear. They are that the world speaks about this. It's not clear. It seems to me something is indeed strange, according to what you understand. I remember that one says, but it's indeed strange, because it's not a decree of the verse. I can't teach, he doesn't have teachers. Not clear.

So yes, the part posek, we say that we may need to know. Okay. That won't have been finished.

The Story with a Chagav

It says that indeed once there wasn't this thing like pets. Almost, perhaps for a small child. But a chagav. We learned a chagav. Yes? That a chagav, may a boy go play with it? Do you remember something is a halacha? It could be that once upon a time the world didn't have any pets. But it was indeed this thing that the child it is l'sachek bo... I refuse to see the time from here l'sachek bo. Okay. That is it stands to play with it.

In general, it stands the halacha that it makes the lines, but one sees it was indeed from education. So... anyway... here it is without this the halacha that it flames and so on.

Conclusion: Animals to Eat and Use Are Muktzeh

Even those that live by you in the house, but it's not in the category of pets but in the category by hands to eat and use is muktzeh.

Until here Chapter 25.

Generated by Shiur Upload Automation