

Overview

Halacha Highlight

Esrogim

Shulchan Aruch Siman 310 Seif 2

אין שום אכל תלוש הראוי לאכילה מקצה לשבת

There is no detached food that is fit for consumption that is *muktzah* for Shabbos

Shulchan Aruch (סעי' ב') rules that food that is detached from the ground is not *muktzah* for Shabbos. Even dates, almonds and other fruit that one intends to sell is not *muktzah* since one's intent is to eat it when he pleases. Even grain that was planted in the ground that did not yet take root is not *muktzah*. Mishnah Berurah (סק"ה) explains that even though seemingly by planting the grain in the ground one has put the grain out of his mind, nevertheless, it is assumed that since it is possible to take them from the ground and eat them, he did not put the grain out of his mind entirely. Meiri (מובא במ"ב סק"ו) contends that this ruling is limited to grain that was not yet covered by dirt but if it was covered by dirt it would be *muktzah*. The only produce that is *muktzah* after it was detached from the ground is figs and grapes that one intends to dry. The reason is that while they are drying they become inedible and being that the owner knows that this will take place and does not control when they will become edible, he puts them out of his mind.

Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach (שמירת שבת כהלכתה פ"כ) maintains that *esrogim* that are to be sold are also an exception to the rule that detached produce is not *muktzah* and is, in fact, *muktzah machmas chisaron kis*. Since no one intends to eat *esrogim* that could be sold for the *mitzvah* the owner clearly puts them out of his mind. In this regard *esrogim* are different than dates and almonds that one intends to sell since he would not hesitate to eat his dates and almonds but one would hesitate to eat such an *esrog*. On Shabbos Chol HaMoed *esrogim* are not *muktzah* even though one intends to use it after Shabbos for the *mitzvah* since it is permitted to smell one's *mitzvah esrog*.

gentile and Shulchan Aruch HaRav agrees and explains that Shulchan Aruch must be referring to where they are somewhat edible but if they were completely non-edible there would be no difference whether they belonged to a Jew or a gentile. (M.B. 13)

Siman 310 Seif 1:

A stick used to suspend fish may be moved even though it is repulsive since regarding the question of whether something is *muktzah* due to repulsiveness we subscribe to R' Shimon's lenient opinion.

Siman 310 Seif 2:

There is no detached food that is fit for consumption that is *muktzah*. Dates and almonds and other fruit that was intended for sale is fit for consumption on Shabbos. Even wheat kernels that were planted in the ground but did not yet take root or eggs beneath a chicken may be moved. Similarly, dates that were picked before they were ripe and were placed in a basket so that they could ripen on their own are permitted for consumption before they ripen. However, dried figs and raisins that one places in his yard to dry are prohibited as *muktzah* on Shabbos since they smell before they dry and since one knows they will smell he puts them out of his mind. Once there are two negatives, one set them aside by hand and they are not fit, they are *muktzah*. Some maintain that preparation does not apply to a gentile and even dried figs and grapes that belong to him are not *muktzah*.

❖ If the fruit was attached at the outset of Shabbos all opinions agree that it is *muktzah* since he did not intend to use it on Shabbos. (M.B. 3)

As long as it remains edible it is not *muktzah*. (M.B. 5)

❖ The Gemara states that only figs and raisins are subject to this *halacha* but other fruit that one put out to dry does not become *muktzah* since it is fit for consumption even before it dries. (M.B. 9)

❖ It is no different than a stone or dirt. (M.B. 11)

❖ Something that would be prohibited to a Jew since it was put outside of one's mind is not *muktzah* when it belongs to a gentile since he does not put things out of his mind. Something that is actually prohibited during *bein hashemashos* because it was attached to the ground or something similar is prohibited according to all opinions. (M.B. 12)

❖ Sefer Bais Meir questions whether dried figs and raisins are permitted simply because they belong to a