



- 1 We mentioned at the end of the previous דף that ר' יוחנן holds that one may not move a מנורה - candelabra on שבת, regardless of its size, even according to ר' שמעון.
 At first the גמרא suggested that the מנורה is treated strictly like הוּאִיל וְאָדָם - a person designates a place for it and does not intend to move it.
 The גמרא rejects this approach since a כִּלְתַּת חֲתָנִים also has a designated place, but may still be moved.

1 ר' יוחנן

One may not move a מנורה on שבת

הואיל ואדם קובע לה מקום

כִּלְתַּת חֲתָנִים
Has a designated place
May be moved

- 2 Instead, ר' אבוי suggests that we must be talking about a מנורה של חוליות or at least חוליות של חוליות, a מנורה that is either made up of sections, or looks like it has different sections. The reason ר' יוחנן holds it may not be moved has nothing to do with מוקצה. Rather he is concerned that it will fall apart and one might put it back together, which would be a violation of מכה בפטיש - a מלאכה דאורייתא of putting the finishing touches on something.
 ר' יושע בן לוי would also agree that a מנורה של חוליות, or even a large מנורה with grooves that make it appear like it is של חוליות, may not be moved. He only permits moving a small מנורה that is usually made of one piece.

2 ריש לקיש אבוי

מנורה של חוליות כעין של חוליות

מכה בפטיש

רבי הורה במנורה כרבי שמעון בנר

The גמרא then quotes an ambiguous statement that רבי הורה רבי שמעון בנר, but the גמרא remains unsure whether this means that רבי permitted moving a מנורה or not.

- 3 The גמרא goes on to list other אמוראים who disagree whether to pasken like ר' יהודה or ר' שמעון with regard to מוקצה.

One particular ר' יהושע בן לוי of תלמידי ר' אבהו, was both a תלמיד of ר' אבהו, ר' שמעון, and a תלמיד of ר' יוחנן who held like ר' שמעון, but in the presence of ר' יוחנן he would be strict דרבי יוחנן - for the honor of ר' יוחנן.

3 ר' יהודה ר' שמעון

ר' אבהו
Was a תלמיד of...

ר' יוחנן ר' יהושע בן לוי

ר' יהודה ר' שמעון

ר' שמעון

מלוק כבודו דרבי יוחנן



4 The Gemara now makes the following distinction. Even though ר' שמעון does not hold of the concept of מוקצה (אמורא) claims that רבי שמעון would agree that something like a lamp is מוקצה, because its bad odor makes it so repugnant that it could not possibly be used for anything else. רב and ר' יוסף think that ר' שמעון would allow even a נפטא lamp.

4

ר' שמעון

נפטא מוקצה

Bad odor

מחמת מיאוס

רב יוסף רבה

ר' שמעון

נפטא מוקצה

Not מוקצה

5 The Gemara relates that ר' אביא once visited רב's house and placed his muddy boots on the bed before Rava. Offended by his behavior, רב sought to distress him by challenging him to explain רב and ר' יוסף's opinion. ר' אביא was able to explain that whenever something is a כלי in its own right, even if it has no significant function on שבת - it is too disgusting to put anything in it - so long as it has some minimal use on שבת, such as חזיא לכסוי בה מנא - it can be used to cover a כלי - it would not be מוקצה. That minimal use is enough to take it out of the category of מוקצה. However a rock would still be מוקצה. Although it can also cover כלים, it is not a כלי in its own right. In order not to be מוקצה, it needs to be both a כלי in its own right and have some minimal שבת use.

5

ר' אביא visited רב

He placed his muddy boots on the bed

רב

רב יוסף רבה

ר' אביא

חזיא לכסוי בה מנא

Not מוקצה

Not a כלי מוקצה

6 רב נחמן בר יצחק commented on this episode and said; בריך רחמנא דלא כסיפיה רבא לרב אביא - Boruch Hashem that Rava did not embarrass Rav Avyeh.

6

רב נחמן בר יצחק

ברוך רחמנא דלא כסיפיה רבא לרב אביא



7 The Gemara continues to clarify the שיטה of R' Shimon, with ר' שמעון reconciling two rulings of רבה. R' Shimon holds that leftover oil in a lamp is not מוקצה, because when שבת begins אדם יושב ומצפה אימתי תכבה נרו - a person anticipates that the candle will go out and he will be able to use the oil.

7

ר' שמעון

Left over OIL

בין השמשות שבת

Not מוקצה

Because אדם יושב ומצפה אימתי תכבה נרו

8 However, ר' שמעון also ruled that a בכור בהמה טהורה - a first-born animal that did not have a recognized מום before יום טוב would be מוקצה, and may not be slaughtered and eaten, because we cannot assume מום מתני יפול בו מום - that a person waits to find a מום on the בכור, since there are so many unknowns.

- Will it develop a מום - a blemish at all?
- Even if it does develop a מום, will it be a מום קבוע - a permanent blemish?
- Will I find a חכם - an expert to pasken on the מום?

8

ר' שמעון

בכור בהמה טהורה

מום BEFORE יום טוב

אדם יושב ומצפה מתני יפול בו מום

9 The Gemara adds that in the case of נדרים which were annulled on שבת, the item in question becomes permitted and is not מוקצה.

9

נדרים

Not מוקצה



10 In the case of a woman's Neder we say - כל הנודרת על דעת בעלה - היא נודרת - a woman who makes a נדר does so subject to her husband's agreement. Therefore we can assume that she anticipated the item becoming useable by her husband's probable annulment.

In the case of a man's Neder, since it is quite easy to find ג' הדיוטות - and in order to be מתיר נדר - to release somebody from a vow, it is not necessary to have a חכם, but even three simple people have the authority to release the vow - it is not מוקצה.

However, in the case of בכור, you need to find a חכם, an expert in the Halachos of מומין - blemishes, which is very uncertain.

10

Woman's נדר
 כל הנודרת
 על דעת בעלה
 היא נודרת

Man's נדר
 It's easy to find
 ג' הדיוטות
 אינו מוקצה

11 The Gemara now goes back to that which we learned earlier that R' Shimon only allows moving a lamp after the fire went out, but not while it's burning. The reason being דלמא בהדי דנקיט לה כבתה - it may get extinguished while he's moving it.

11

ר' שמעון

דלמא בהדי
 דנקיט לה כבתה

12 ר' אביי raises the question, after all, doesn't ר' שמעון hold that דבר שאינו מתכוין, unintended results, are מותר? As we learned; גורר אדם כסא מטה וספסל שלא יתכוין לעשות חריץ - One may drag a chair, bed, or bench, so long as he does not intend to make a furrow. So too in our case, what would be the problem with carrying the candle? Even if it gets extinguished it would be a דבר שאינו מתכוין.

12

אביי

ר' שמעון
 דבר שאינו מתכוין
 מותר

גורר אדם
 כסא מטה וספסל
 ובלבד שלא יתכוין
 לעשות חריץ



13 The Gemara offers two answers: רב יוסף suggests that in the case of dragging the bench, even if done intentionally, it is only אסור מדרבנן because he is making the furrow in an unusual manner. However, in our case the potential אסור - intentionally extinguishing a flame on שבת, is an אסור דאורייתא. Therefore, even ר' שמעון would make a גזירה, not to do it even in a manner of דבר שאינו מתכוין.

13

Dragging a bench

אסור מדרבנן

Extinguishing a flame

אסור דאורייתא

↓

Even ר' שמעון would make a גזירה

even in a manner of דבר שאינו מתכוין

14 רבא rejects that approach based on ר' שמעון's lenient attitude toward דבר שאינו מתכוין regarding שעתנו, which is also an ר' שמעון אסור דאורייתא. ר' שמעון allows merchants to model clothing that have Shatnez so long as they do not intend to enjoy physical benefit from them. Instead, רבא suggests that the reason ר' שמעון is strict with the lit lamps and oil is that it is a בסיס לדבר האסור, a base to the flame itself. This will lead to a discussion in the following דף about the concept of בסיס לדבר האסור.

14

רבא ?

ר' שמעון

Allows merchants to model clothing

דבר שאינו מתכוין

אסור דאורייתא

↓

בסיס לדבר האסור