The Chicago Center
Digest
Mishna Berura
THE DAILY RESOURCE FOR MISHNA BERURA YOMI
Wed, Dec 27 2023 ■ ט"ו תשפ"ד
סימן שי"ב סעיף ב'-ז'

Overview

Siman 312 Seif 2:

If rain fell on the stones and they became embedded in the ground, if their location is discernable it is permitted to take them for wiping and there is no concern for demolition or grinding.

- Meaning one can see them above the ground and they are not completely covered by the ground. (M.B. 10)

Siman 312 Seif 3:

One may wipe himself with a stone that has grass growing on it and there is no concern that he will detach the grass because even if it becomes detached, it was not his intent to do so.

- The implication is that even if it is on the ground it is permitted to take it since it would only constitute a Rabbinic prohibition and for the sake of human dignity it is not in force. (M.B. 12)
- Although pulling the grass from the ground is Biblically prohibited it is permitted since that is not his intent and it is not inevitable. (M.B. 13)

Siman 312 Seif 4:

One may not take a clump of dirt to wipe himself since it is unfit for that purpose being that it crumbles. One may not wipe himself with earthenware even during the week for it is dangerous because one may dislodge the end of his intestines.

Siman 312 Seif 5:

If one has the choice on Shabbos between a stone and a smooth piece of earthenware, one should use the earthenware because it is smooth and not dangerous and is fit to be used as a cover for a utensil. If one has a choice between a stone and grass one should use grass if it is moist but one should not use dry grass since it is sharp and cuts one's skin.

- If the earthenware is not smooth it is dangerous and thus it is preferred to use a stone even though it is *muktzah*. (M.B. 15)
- Grass is not *muktzah*. (M.B. 17)

Siman 312 Seif 6:

One may wipe with moist grass even if it is attached as long as one does not move it. There is no issue with using something attached to the ground since the restriction applies to trees and not to grass.

- In other words, one may not dislodge it from where it is attached due to the prohibition of תלישה. (M.B. 19)

Siman 312 Seif 7:

If one needed to relieve himself and was unable to do so and the treatment is to manipulate the פי הטבעת by rubbing a stone to that area causing the orifice to open, on Shabbos one may not hold the stone as he does during the week by holding the stone with his entire hand because he will cut off some hair. Instead he should manipulate the area in an unusual manner which is to hold the stone between two fingers and rub the area.

- Although he does not intend to remove the hairs, it is an inevitable outcome. One should not rub the stone to smooth it out on Shabbos in the manner in which he does so during the week, rather it should be done in an unusual manner. (M.B. 20)

Halacha Highlight

Is attached grass *muktzah*?

Shulchan Aruch Siman 312 Seif 6
ובלבד שלא יזיזם
As long as one does not move it

Shulchan Aruch (סע' ו') rules that it is permitted to wipe oneself with moist grass even if it is still attached to the ground as long as one does not move the grass in the process. He then explains that although there is a Rabbinic restriction against using things that are growing from the ground, that restriction is limited to trees and does not apply to grass. Mishnah Berurah (ס"ק י"ט) explains that when Shulchan Aruch ruled that while using grass attached to the ground to wipe oneself one may not move the grass, his intent was that one may not detach the grass in the process but moving the grass in and of itself is not prohibited. Sha'ar HaTziyun (ס"ק כ"ב) notes that this ruling which permits moving grass that is attached to the ground is not in accordance with Magen Avrohom's position that grass attached to the ground is *muktzah* and thus it is prohibited to move it.

Interestingly, Mishnah Berurah seems to be inconsistent about this issue since above (*siman* 308:81) he ruled that a branch attached to a tree is, in fact, *muktzah*. Why does he consider a branch attached to the ground to be *muktzah* whereas grass attached to the ground is not considered *muktzah*? Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach (שבת לישראל עמק ש"ג) and Rav Nissim Karelitz (חוט שני ח"ג פמ"א סוף סק"ב) suggest the same resolution. Grass that is detached from the ground is not *muktzah* since it is animal food. Therefore, even while it is yet attached to the ground it is not *muktzah*. In contrast, a detached branch is considered *muktzah* since there is nothing one could do with it and thus even while attached to the ground it is considered *muktzah*. Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach (שלמי יהודה פי"ג הע' ד') and Rav Yosef Shalom Elyashiv (שבות יצחק מוקצה פי"ז אות ב') both note that nowadays since we do not use grass for wiping or anything else, it is considered *muktzah*.