The Chicago Center
Digest
# Mishna Berura
THE DAILY RESOURCE FOR MISHNA BERURA YOMI
Wed, Dec 20 2023 ■ ח' טבת תשפ"ד
סימן ש"י סעיף ח'-ט'

# Overview

Siman 310 Seif 8:

**It is permitted to move a utensil that contains prohibited and permitted items. For example, if before Shabbos one placed ash in a pan to cover saliva or excrement so that it is not *muktzah* and there are also broken pieces of wood that are *muktzah*, it is permitted to move the pan as is. This assumes that the permitted item is more important than the prohibited item but if the prohibited item is more important, the permitted item is subordinate to it and it is prohibited to move the pan. The rationale behind this leniency is that it is not possible to take just the ash even if one were to pour it out of the pan** or if one needs the place of the pan. **If one only needs the pan he should not move it as is, rather he should pour out the ash and the broken pieces of wood in that place and then take the pan.** Similarly, if it is possible to pour out just the prohibited item one must do so rather than move it with the permitted items. This refers to where the permitted and prohibited items were together already before Shabbos but if only the prohibited item was in the pan, it will not help to add the permitted item to the pan to permit moving the pan.

- If they have equal value it is prohibited. *Poskim* write that the importance of an item is determined subjectively by the owner rather than objectively by what the general population considers more or less important. (M.B. 33)
- The reason why in this case the pan may be moved with the *muktzah* item and we do not require the owner to spill out all of the contents and then gather together the permitted items as we do regarding a basket containing fruit and a stone (*siman* 309:3), is that in this case it will not be possible to gather just the ash without any broken pieces of wood since they are small. (M.B. 34)
- It doesn't help to place the permitted item with it since even if the prohibited item was removed altogether the pan may not be moved since it was a base for *muktzah* at the outset of Shabbos. However, if the *muktzah* item was placed inside after Shabbos began, since the pan was not a base at the outset of Shabbos it is permitted to move the pan once the *muktzah* item is removed since there is no such thing as something being *muktzah* for only part of Shabbos. In such a case it is permitted to add a permitted item so that one could move the pan containing both items. (M.B. 37)

Siman 310 Seif 9:

**If a box contains something that is not *muktzah* and money and the money is not the more important item, the box may be moved, as is, in accordance with the parameters enumerated regarding a pan.**

# Halacha Highlight

## A base for *muktzah* and non-*muktzah*

Shulchan Aruch Siman 310 Seif 8
**כלי שיש עליו דבר האסור ודבר המתר**
**A utensil that has on it a prohibited and permitted object**

Shulchan Aruch (סע' ח') teaches that when a non-*muktzah* object and a *muktzah* object rest on a permitted object it is permitted to move the permitted object that contains the other two objects. This rule is only true when the non-*muktzah* object is more important than the *muktzah* object but if the *muktzah* object is more important, the non-*muktzah* is nullified to it and the object that contains these two objects is categorized as a base for *muktzah* and thus may not be moved. In the event that the two objects share equal importance it is prohibited to move the base object (מ"ב ס"ק ל"ג). Mishnah Berurah (שם) explains that the relative importance of the objects is determined subjectively by the owner rather than objectively by what the general population considers more important.

*Poskim* note what seems to be an interesting inconsistency in these *halachos*. Regarding the *halacha* of something becoming the base for a *muktzah* object it is necessary that one place that object on the base intentionally. If one mindlessly placed a *muktzah* object on a base or if one placed it there with the intent to remove it, the permitted object beneath the *muktzah* object is not categorized as a base for a *muktzah* object. In contradistinction, when establishing a circumstance of an object that serves as a base to a *muktzah* and non-*muktzah* item, it doesn't matter whether the non-*muktzah* item was placed there intentionally or not. As long as it is there the permitted item beneath it is categorized as a base for *muktzah* and non-*muktzah*. There is a debate regarding a circumstance in which one intentionally placed a *muktzah* item on a surface but had the intent to also place on that surface a non-*muktzah* item. Is that surface considered a base for *muktzah* and may not be moved even after the *muktzah* item is removed or not? (פסקי תשובות אות ז')