

CHAVRUTA

SHABBAT – DAF KUF MEM BET

Translated by: *Chavruta staff of scholars*

Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

The Gemara challenges this: **If so, why** did the Mishnah **cite** upon a case where there is a **stone** in the hand of the child? **Even** if there was a **dinar**¹ in his hand, there is reason to permit it due to the danger of illness!

And furthermore, **why** did **Rava say: They only taught** that it is permitted to move a child with something in his hand with respect to a **stone**. **But** if there was a **dinar** in his hand, **it is forbidden**.

And the Gemara answers: With a **stone**, they permitted it because **if it fell** from the child's hand, **his father would not come to carry it**. But with a **dinar** they did not permit it because **if it fell, his father would come to carry it**. The prohibition of carrying something *muktzeh* in one's own hand is more severe. Thus, concerning this non-life-threatening illness, they even forbade picking up the child if the child is carrying a dinar.

*

It was taught in a Baraita **in accordance with** the opinion of **Rava**:

- 1. One who brings out his clothes** that are **folded and resting on his shoulder, and** similarly one who brings out **his sandals or his rings in his hand**, and not on his fingers, **is liable**² for transgressing a Torah prohibition. This is because he is not bringing these items out in the normal manner that one wears clothing. **And if he was clothed in them, he is exempt**. And it is completely permitted.

¹ A type of coin.

² I.e. obligated to bring a sin-offering.

PEREK 21 – 142A

2. **One who brings out a person, and his clothes** i.e. of the person being carried **are on him, or his sandals are on his feet, or his rings are on his hands**, on his fingers, then he **is exempt**. For bringing out the person, he is exempt because ‘a living being carries himself’. For the clothes and rings, he is exempt because they are considered secondary and nullified to the person that he is carrying. **And if he brings them out as they are**, in the hands of the person being carried, then the person bringing them out **is liable**.

The Baraita does not say that it is the person being carried who is liable, rather it is the person who is doing the carrying, and this accords with the opinion of Rava. For in the case of a child holding a stone, Rava said that the one who carries the child is the one who carries the stone. Thus, it was only permitted due to illness.

We learned in the Mishnah: One can take a **basket and the stone** that is **inside it**.

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: **And why** should this be so, **let the basket be considered a base for a forbidden object!** It should be forbidden to move the basket itself. It should have the same Muktzeh status as the forbidden item that is resting upon it.

Rabbah bar bar Chana said in the name of **Rabbi Yochanan**: **Here we are dealing with a basket full of fruit**, which is considered a base to both a permitted and a forbidden item. In a circumstance such as this, where the permitted item is more important than the forbidden item, we consider the base to be primarily supporting the permitted item and thus it does not become Muktzeh.

*

PEREK 21 – 142A

The Gemara raises a further difficulty: Then **throw the fruit and [throw] the stone** out of the basket, **and take them** [the fruit] **in one's hands** from the ground. In a case where a Muktzeh item is resting upon a permitted item and for some reason the permitted item does not attain the status of a base to Muktzeh, one is permitted to move the permitted item. However one should remove the Muktzeh item before moving the permitted one, as will be explained in the next Mishnah.

And the Gemara answers: The Mishnah is **like that** case **which Rabbi Ilai said** in the name of **Rav**, who explained the continuation of the Mishnah as referring to **fruit that gets soiled**, such as figs and berries that would get soiled if they were thrown to the ground. **Here too** it is referring to **fruit that gets soiled** if they were thrown to the ground. And the Rabbis did not require one to shake off the Muktzeh item if it will ruin the permitted item, causing one a financial loss.

*

The Gemara raises a further difficulty: Then one should **surely shake them!** Shake the fruit to one side of the basket, thus leaving the stone resting separately on the other side. One would then be able to shake the stone out of the basket.

Rav Chiya bar Ashi said in the name of **Rav**: **Here we are dealing with a damaged basket**, which has a hole in its side or its bottom, such **that the stone itself is functioning as a side of the basket**. The stone is plugging up the hole and if one were to remove it then the fruit would fall out. Thus, given that there is no way to remove the Muktzeh item, one is permitted to move the basket along with it.

PEREK 21 – 142A

We learned in the Mishnah: **One can move** impure *trumah*³ along with pure *trumah*.

Rav Chisda said: They only taught that it is permitted in a case **that** the **pure** *trumah* is **at the bottom** of the basket, **and** the **impure** *trumah* is **on top** of it, thus making it impossible to take the pure *trumah* without removing the impure *trumah* beforehand. In such a case, one is permitted to take the basket as far as the table, in order to empty its contents out and take the pure *trumah*.

But if the **pure** *trumah* was **on top and** the **impure** *trumah* was **below – one should take the pure** *trumah* **and leave the impure** *trumah*. It would be logical to say that the Mishnah is dealing with a common case, where the pure and impure *trumah* were not left mixed together in the basket, rather each one was contained within a separate container. Thus it should be possible to take the container holding the pure *trumah* out of the basket without moving the impure *trumah*.

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: **And when the pure** *trumah* **is below**, it is **also** possible to avoid carrying the whole basket along with the impure *trumah* that is within it. One should **throw them** [the fruit] onto the ground **and take them** [the pure *trumah*] from the ground.

Rabbi Ilai said in the name of **Rav: Here we are dealing with fruit that gets soiled**, and if it was thrown to the ground it would be ruined. Given that there is no way to avoid moving the Muktzeh, one is permitted to move it along with the permitted item.

*

They contradicted him, from a Baraita: **One can move impure** *trumah* **either with pure** *trumah*, **or with** *chulin*⁴, **whether the pure is above and the impure is below, or whether the impure is above and the pure is below.**

³ A small portion separated from agricultural produce in the Land of Israel, and given to cohanim for their

PEREK 21 – 142A

This is a **refutation of Rav Chisda**, who says that it is forbidden to move them when the pure *trumah* is on top!

The Gemara answers: **Rav Chisda would say to you: Our Mishnah** is speaking in a case where one moved the basket **for itself**, for instance, he wanted to eat the fruits within it straight away. Thus when the pure *trumah* is on top it is possible to take it directly and he need not move the Muktzeh. However the **Baraita** is speaking in a case where he moves the basket **for its place**, thus if he were to take only the pure *trumah* he would still not clear the place that the basket was resting upon.

*

The Gemara considers this answer: **What forced Rav Chisda to establish our Mishnah as** a case where one moved the basket **for itself**, and thus limit it to a case where the impure *trumah* is on top? Let him say it is referring to a case where one moved the basket for its place, and is referring to all situations!

Rava said: Our Mishnah implies that it is **according to his** [Rav Chisda's] view, which says that the Mishnah is dealing with moving the object for itself.

As it was taught in the end clause: Concerning a case where there were coins **on the pillow, one should shake the pillow and they will fall**. Afterwards one will be able to take the pillow.

And Rabbah bar bar Chana said in the name of **Rabbi Yochanan: They only taught** that one is obliged to shake the pillow in a case when he is moving it **for itself**, because he needs the pillow.

personal consumption. It may be eaten only in purity.

PEREK 21 – 142A

But if he moves the pillow **for its place, he should move it while** the money is **still on it**. Because if he were to shake off the money, then it would interfere with his use of the place.

And since we have set up **the end clause** as dealing with moving Muktzeh **for itself**, Rav Chisda **also** said that **the first clause** is dealing with moving Muktzeh **for itself**.

We learned in the Mishnah: **Rabbi Yehudah says: One may even take** a portion from a mixture [of *trumah* and *chulin*]⁵ with a ratio of one hundred parts *chulin* to one part *trumah*. (In such a case the mixture is basically permitted, yet we must first remove one part and designate it as *trumah* in order not to cause the *cohanim* a loss.)

The Gemara considers the Mishnah: **And why** is it permitted to do so? Surely **he is fixing** the food, and one should forbid this, due to a similarity with fixing a utensil. For by taking off this portion, he is permitting the remaining food to be eaten.

The Gemara answers: Since it is readily within one's ability to take off a portion and to make it *trumah*, we view the *trumah* as if it is resting in a place on its own, even though in truth it is mixed together with the other fruit. Because **Rabbi Yehudah holds like Rabbi Eliezer who said: *Trumah*** that was mixed with other fruit is viewed as if it is **resting in full view**, and its position is recognizable within the mixture. Thus, just as it is permissible to separate *trumah* from other produce when the position of the *trumah* is recognizable, so too it will be permitted when they are mixed together.

As it was taught in a Mishnah: Concerning a *se'ah*⁶ of *trumah* that fell into less than one hundred *se'ah* of *chulin*, and they became an admixture [of *trumah* and *chulin*],

⁴ Normal produce that has had tithes taken, and is now permitted to all.

⁵ See Mishnah on Daf 141b and explanation there.

⁶ *Se'ah* = 2.2 gallons or 8.3 liters.

PEREK 21 – 142A

prohibited to non-cohanim. **And** then part **of the admixture**, equal to the se'ah of *trumah* that was there, **fell into another place**—into another container of *chulin* produce.

Rabbi Eliezer says: That portion of the admixture that fell into the other place **makes** the *chulin* in the second container **into an admixture** [of *trumah* and *chulin*] **as** if the portion that fell was all **certain** i.e. 100% *trumah*. Thus, in order to permit it to non-cohanim, it needs one hundred times more *chulin* than the portion that fell in.

Why do we treat the portion that fell in like real *trumah*? Because the *trumah* in the original mixture is viewed as resting in a distinct place within the container of *chulin*. Thus we must be concerned that it was the *trumah* alone that fell into the second container.

And the Sages say: **The admixture** [of *trumah* and *chulin*] that fell into the second container **only makes it into an admixture according to the relative calculation**. If the *trumah* in the original mixture was one third of the whole, then we say that one third of the part that fell into the second container is considered *trumah*. If it was one quarter of the original mixture, then we say that one quarter of the part that fell in is *trumah*. Thus the second container needs only one hundred times this fraction of *trumah* that fell into it, in order to permit the mixture to a non Cohen.

The Gemara rejects this answer: **I will say that that you heard him** Rabbi Eliezer **to have said** this reasoning when it is a **stringency**. But when it would be a **leniency – did you hear him** to have said such a thing? It is not plausible to rely on such novel reasoning when this would result in a leniency.

*

PEREK 21 – 142A

The Gemara gives an alternative answer: **Rather, he** [Rabbi Yehudah in our Mishnah] **said in accordance with Rabbi Shimon**, who uses the reasoning of ‘*trumah* is resting in full view’ even when this results in a leniency.

As it was taught in a Mishnah: If one had a se’ah of *trumah* that fell into one hundred se’ah of *chulin*, thus requiring one to remove a se’ah in order to permit the admixture. However **he did not manage to remove** the se’ah **before a different** se’ah of *trumah* fell into the mixture – then **indeed it is forbidden**, given that the *trumah* is no longer annulled by one hundred times the amount of *chulin*.

But **Rabbi Shimon permits** the admixture. Assumedly, because he considers the *trumah* that one is obliged to take from the admixture as if it is standing alone in a distinct place. Given that it is not considered mixed together with the *chulin*, it will not join together with the second amount of *trumah* that fell, and the second amount of *trumah* will be annulled in one hundred times the amount of *chulin*.

The Gemara rejects this answer: **And from where** do you see that this is Rabbi Shimon’s reasoning? **Perhaps there they disagree about this** other matter:

The First Tanna holds: Even though the two portions of *trumah* fell **one after the other**, and initially it would have been possible to permit the admixture by taking out a portion equal to the amount of *trumah* that fell, the admixture was not permitted at that time. Thus **it is viewed as if it fell at one time, and note that it fell into** only **fifty** times the amount of *chulin*, thus the *trumah* is not annulled in one hundred times the amount of *chulin*.

And Rabbi Shimon holds the following view: The **first** portion of *trumah* **was annulled in one hundred** times the amount of *chulin*, thus granting the whole admixture the status of *chulin*. **And this** second portion of *trumah* **will be annulled in one hundred and one** times the amount of *chulin*. Even though the admixture is forbidden until one takes a

PEREK 21 – 142A

portion off, to be treated as *trumah*, this is not because the *trumah* is actually considered still present within the *chulin* and not yet annulled. Rather, it is because the *trumah* belongs to the cohanim, and the Sages forbade the admixture until the cohen is awarded his due portion of *trumah*.

*

The Gemara brings an alternative answer: **Rather, he** [Rabbi Yehudah] **said in accordance with Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar.**

As it was taught in a Baraita: **Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says:** One who wishes to eat an admixture of one part *trumah* to one hundred parts *chulin* does not need to physically remove the *trumah*. Rather it is sufficient for him to **place his eyes on this side** of the container and say that the portion that he will give to the Cohen is resting there, **and eat** the produce that is **on the other side.**

According to Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar it is permitted to ‘fix’ a mixture of *trumah* and *chulin* in this way on Shabbat, because an act of fixing that is merely in thought is not considered the forbidden work of ‘fixing’. Rabbi Yehudah will hold accordingly.

The Gemara raises a difficulty with this answer: **And does he** [Rabbi Yehudah] **hold like him** [Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar] in respect to the taking of *trumah* on Shabbat?

PEREK 21 – 142B

Ammud Bet

Note that he surely disagrees with him! Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar certainly would forbid that which Rabbi Yehudah permits.

As it was taught in a Baraita: **Rabbi Yehudah says:** On Shabbat **one can take** a portion from **the admixture** [of *trumah* and *chulin*] **in** a ratio of **one hundred** parts *chulin* **and one part** *trumah*.

Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: One is not permitted to be lenient in this matter, even to enhance the joy of Shabbat. This is because it is possible to permit the admixture by **placing one's eyes on this side, and eating** the fruits **from the other side**.

The Gemara replies: In truth, Rabbi Yehudah holds like Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar, that it is possible to permit the admixture on Shabbat by way of 'placing one's eyes on it'. However, Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar holds that this is the *sole* way of permitting the admixture on Shabbat. It emerges that the approach **of Rabbi Yehudah is stronger than that of Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar**, i.e. he allows an even greater leniency. Rabbi Yehudah holds that since it is permitted to 'fix' the mixture by way of 'placing one's eyes', there is no further reason to forbid actually taking a portion from the mixture. For the removal of the portion will not be considered an act of 'fixing'.

Mishnah

Concerning **the stone that** was forgotten prior to Shabbat **on the opening of a barrel**, which contains wine, if one wishes to drink the wine, it is forbidden for him to move the stone off the opening of the barrel. Similarly, one is not permitted to move the barrel

PEREK 21 – 142B

along with the stone to another place. Rather he should **tilt** the barrel **onto its side and it** [the stone] will **fall**. This is because the shaking of a Muktzeh item is not viewed as stringently as actual carrying.

If **it was** standing **between the** other **barrels**, where if he were to tip the barrel, the stone might break one of the other barrels, then **he** should **lift up** the barrel along with the stone that is on it, then move it to another place **and tilt it onto its side, and then it** [the stone] will **fall**.

Similarly, concerning **coins that are on the pillow** – **one** should **shake the pillow and they will fall** off.

If **there was dirt on it** – **one** may **clean it with a rag**, however one should not put water on the pillow, for applying water to cloth is the forbidden work of Laundering.

If **it** [the dirt] **was** on a pillow made **of leather**, where applying water is not laundering – **one** may **put water on it until it is gone**. However it is forbidden to scrub it, because with soft leather, the prohibition of laundering would then apply.

Gemara

Rav Huna said in the name of **Rav: They only taught** that it is permitted to tip over the barrel **in** a case that one **forgot** the stone on the barrel and he did not wish for it to remain there on Shabbat.

If, **however, one placed** the stone with the intention that it remain there on Shabbat, then the opening of the barrel **becomes a base for a forbidden object** and it would be

PEREK 21 – 142B

forbidden to tip over the barrel. For the stone did not become a ‘utensil’ by virtue of being placed on the barrel, thus it remains a Muktzeh object.

We learned in the Mishnah: **If it was between the barrels**, one should lift it up and tilt it onto its side and the stone will fall off.

The Gemara deliberates: **Who is the Tanna** of our Mishnah? For he holds **that in any case where there are forbidden** [Muktzeh] **items and permitted** [non-Muktzeh] items mixed together, with no prohibition of selecting involved. And one has the choice of either moving the forbidden object to separate it from the permitted object, or moving the permitted object to separate it from the forbidden object. Still, the Tanna holds that **we burden ourselves with permitted** items but **we do not burden ourselves with prohibited** items. That is why he rules that one should remove the stone indirectly, by way of moving the barrel.

Rava bar bar Chana said in the name of **Rabbi Yochanan: It is Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel**. However, according to the Rabbis who disagree with him, it is permitted to directly move the stone from the opening of the barrel, even though it is possible to remove it indirectly by way of tipping the barrel.

As it was taught in a Mishnah: Concerning **one who selects beans** from their non-edible refuse **on Yom Tov – Beit Shammai say: One should select** the **food** from the refuse **and eat** it as he would on Shabbat, given that the forbidden work of selecting is also forbidden on Yom Tov.

And Beit Hillel say: One may select in the normal manner done on a weekday, separating the refuse from the food, **in his lap**, and even with a basket **and a plate**. (These are items that are Rabbinically forbidden to be used for selection on Shabbat.)

PEREK 21 – 142B

However, it remains forbidden on Yom Tov to select using items whose use on Shabbat is forbidden by Torah law.

And it was taught in a Baraita: **Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: In what** case are these **words said**, i.e. in what circumstances did they argue? **When the food was more than the refuse.** In such a case the effort involved to remove the food is greater than it would be to remove the refuse, therefore Beit Hillel permit one to remove the refuse and handle it, even though it is Muktzeh, given that according to their view, there is no prohibition of selecting on Yom Tov.

However if the **refuse was more than the food**, making it more of an effort to remove the refuse, then **according to all, one should select the food** and not the refuse. Even though by removing the refuse there is no prohibition of selecting, one should avoid handling it due to the prohibition of Muktzeh.

The Gemara challenges the claim that our Mishnah expresses the view of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel: **Note that here**, in our Mishnah, it is **similar to** a case where the **food was more than the refuse**, given that it is a greater effort to remove the stone by way of tipping the barrel. In such a case, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel accepts that it is permitted to select the refuse, and thus in the Mishnah's case, one should be permitted to remove the stone directly.

The Gemara replies: **Here too**, there is a greater effort required in removing the stone. **For if he wanted to take** the wine that is in the barrel, **he would not take the wine until he first took it** [the barrel] and lifted it up, in order to pour out the wine that was inside. No matter what, he will need to lift up the barrel and tip it. Therefore, little effort will be required to shake off the stone at the same time. It emerges that this is **like** a case where the **refuse is more than the food**, because removing the stone directly entails greater effort, and that is why it is forbidden to do so.

PEREK 21 – 142B

We learned in the Mishnah: If **it was between the barrels – one should lift it** and then tilt it onto its side, and then the stone will fall.

It was taught in a Baraita: **Rabbi Yosi says:** If the barrel was resting in a storeroom of barrels, **or if glass vessels were resting beneath it – one should lift it** and carry it to **another place, and one should tilt it onto its side, and it [the stone] will fall. And then one should take from it what one needs and return it to its place.**

We learned in the Mishnah: Concerning **coins that are on the pillow – one should shake the pillow and they will fall off.**

Rav Chiya bar Ashi said in the name of **Rav:** **They only taught** this law **when one forgot** the coins on the pillow. **But if one placed** them there in order that they would remain there on Shabbat, then the pillow **becomes a base for a forbidden object** and it is forbidden to move it.

Rava bar bar Chana said in the name of **Rabbi Yochanan:** **They only taught** that one must shake the coins off the pillow in a case where one needs the pillow **for itself** i.e. in order to use it. **However,** if one moved it **for the use of its place – one may move it when the coins are still on it.** Given that if one were to shake the coins off they would interfere with his use of the place.

And similarly Chiya bar Rav MiDifti taught: **They only taught** this law in a case where one needs it **for itself, but if one needed it for its place – one may move it when they are still on it.**

PEREK 21 – 142B

We learned in the Mishnah: Concerning **coins that are on the pillow** – one should shake the pillow and they will fall off.

The Mishnah permits one to move a non-muktzeh item along with a Muktzeh item, but only if this is for the sake of the non-Muktzeh item. The Gemara now brings the views of Amoraim who hold that one may even move Muktzeh along with a non-Muktzeh item, when this is needed for the Muktzeh item itself—if this would prevent a monetary loss.

Rabbi Oshiya said: If one forgot a moneybag in the courtyard – he should place a loaf of bread or a baby on it, and move it along with them.

Rav Yitzchak said: If one forgot a brick in the courtyard and is concerned that it will be stolen - he should place a loaf or a baby on it, and move it along with them.

Rabbi Yehudah bar Shilah said in the name of **Rabbi Asi:** Once they forgot a container full of money in the camp, a public domain, and they asked **Rabbi Yochanan** what to do. **And he said to them:** Place a loaf or a baby on it and move it along with them. It was also necessary in this case to be careful not to transgress the prohibition of carrying four *ammot*⁷ in a public domain.

Mar Zutra said: The Halachah is in accordance with all of these statements of Amoraim. However, they were only lenient in a case where one forgot the Muktzeh item in an unguarded place. The Sages were lenient in order that it not cause a monetary loss. However they did not permit one to move Muktzeh that was intentionally left prior to Shabbat in this manner.

⁷ 1 ammah: 18.7 in., 48 cm

PEREK 21 – 142B

Rav Ashi said: The Halachah is not according to their view, and **even** in a case where **one forgot** the Muktzeh item, the Rabbis did **not** permit it. **And** the Rabbis **only said** that it is permitted to move something along with **a loaf or a baby, regarding a corpse** that was left in the sun. This permission being due to a respect for human dignity.

*

Abaye placed a large spoon on some **sheaves** of wheat in order to permit him to move the sheaves along with the spoon, thus relying on the above permission.

Rava placed a knife on a young dove that had not been cooked or salted **and moved it** along with the knife.

Rav Yosef said: How sharp are the statements of the children. Abaye and Rava consider themselves to be ‘sharp’ in logic, when in reality their statements are more appropriate for children. Because **one** may **say that the Rabbis** permitted us to move something Muktzeh along with a permitted item **in** a case where **one forgot** the item, and there was a danger of a monetary loss. However, **was it said** by the Rabbis that such a trick is **completely permitted**, in all cases?

Abaye said: In truth, there is no reason to permit one to move Muktzeh by using a permitted item, except in a case where one forgot the Muktzeh. Nevertheless, **if I were not an important person**, who chooses to be strict upon himself, **why** would **I** even need to place **a spoon on the sheaves?** For the sheaves themselves are not Muktzeh. Although they are not suitable for food unless one processes them in a way that is forbidden on Shabbat, nevertheless, **note that they are suitable for sitting upon** as they are. Since there are people who might mistakenly think that sheaves are Muktzeh, and I am concerned that they may observe my actions and learn to treat the prohibition of Muktzeh lightly, therefore I placed a spoon upon the sheaves. Now those that see me (even if they

PEREK 21 – 142B

err about the Muktzeh status of the sheaves) will think that I forgot them, and thus it is permitted for me to move them using a loaf or a baby.

Rava said: For me, if I were not an important person, why would I even need to place a knife on the young dove? Note that it is suitable for me for consumption as raw meat.

The Gemara infers: **The reason** that this is permitted is because **it is suitable for** consumption as **raw meat**. Thus we **note that** if **it was not suitable for raw meat**, then **no**, it would not be permitted to move a young dove—even though it is suitable as food for dogs. This is because any food that is designated for people to eat, after it is cooked, is not viewed as being food for dogs. Thus it has no ready usage prior to cooking. Given that one is forbidden to cook on Shabbat, it would be Muktzeh, were it not suitable in its raw state.

Does this mean **to say that Rava holds like Rabbi Yehudah** with respect to Muktzeh?

In Chapter 24 [Daf 156b] Rabbi Yehudah said about an animal that died on Shabbat, that it is forbidden for one to move it and to feed it to the dogs. This is because at twilight, when Shabbat came in, the animal was designated for a person to eat, and now that it has died, its designation has also changed, given that it now stands to be eaten by the dogs. Rabbi Yehudah holds that anything that was not yet designated for the new purpose, and the new purpose arises on Shabbat, is to be considered Muktzeh.

However, Rabbi Shimon disagrees and permits one to move the carcass for two reasons: Firstly, the animal was never specifically set aside *exclusively* for people (and not dogs), albeit it was assumed that eventually it would be fed to people. Secondly, he holds that even something that is set aside as Muktzeh when Shabbat comes in, it does not become Muktzeh for the whole of Shabbat, and something whose designation changes on Shabbat is not Muktzeh.

PEREK 21 – 142B

The Gemara points out an apparent contradiction in Rava's position: **And note that Rava said to his servant on Yom Tov: Roast a young goose for me and throw its intestines to the cat.** The intestines of a young goose are eaten by people on weekdays, but if the goose was slaughtered on Yom Tov their designation would be changed to that of animal food, given that one normally eats meat of a higher quality on Yom Tov. Thus we see that Rava acted in accordance with the view of Rabbi Shimon. According to the view of Rabbi Yehudah, the intestines would be considered Muktzeh, given that until Yom Tov commenced, they were still designated as food for people.