



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) How many mitzvos are the tzitzis? (cont.)

A second version of an incident involving someone whose tzitzis became invalidated on Shabbos is presented.

Mar bar R' Ashi's position is unsuccessfully challenged.

#### הדרן עלך הקומץ

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah teaches that techeilis is not essential to the white strings or vice versa and the shel yad is not essential to the shel rosh or vice versa.

### 3) Identifying the author of the Mishnah

It is noted that the Mishnah that rules that the techeilis and white strings are not essential to one another is inconsistent with Rabbi's position.

The reasoning behind Rabbi's opinion that they are essential to one another is explained.

R' Yehudah in the name of Rav explains how we could reconcile Rabbi's statement with the Mishnah.

The phrase **חיסר מצוה** used in a Baraisa is explained.

The current explanation of the Mishnah which reconciles it with Rabbi is challenged.

Rami bar Chama explains that phrase of the Mishnah.

Support for this explanation is cited.

Rava rejects this explanation and offers his own explanation of the Mishnah.

Shmuel is cited as defining the length of the stub that must remain for torn tzitzis to remain valid.

The Gemara asks another question related to the precise measurement of "enough to tie them in a slipknot" and the inquiry is left unresolved.

R' Acha the son of Rava responds to R' Ashi that if the strings cannot be tied in a slipknot due to their thickness they remain valid.

The Gemara identifies the Tanna who disagrees with Rabbi.

### 4) Knotting the tzitzis

Rava unsuccessfully attempts to deduce from the previous discussion that it is necessary to tie a knot to every link of the tzitzis braid. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
Rabbi and Mrs. Shmuel Kurtz  
In memory of their mother  
מרת זיסל בת ר' חיים נחמן, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
By Mr. and Mrs. Joey Stern  
In memory of their father  
ר' חיים משה בן ר' אברהם הלוי, ע"ה

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*The mitzvos of the shel rosh and of the shel yad are independent*

תפלה של יד אינה מעכבת את של ראש, ושל ראש אינה מעכבת את של יד

The Mishnah teaches that the inability to fulfill the mitzvah of the tefillah of the hand does not prevent one from fulfilling the mitzvah of the tefillah of the head. The reverse is also true.

Sha'agas Aryeh (#37) proposes an inquiry regarding the law in our Mishnah. Is the mitzvah of the shel rosh independent of the shel yad only when a man is obligated to fulfill both mitzvos? Let us consider a situation where a person is missing his arm, where his inability to fulfill the mitzvah of the shel yad is because the mitzvah does not exist for him. Perhaps in this case the Mishnah would say that he may not fulfill the mitzvah of the shel rosh either. This would be an example of the rule found regarding a minchah which has oil added to mix with its flour. As long as the proportion of oil and flour are correct, the absorption of the oil is not critical. Even if it is pooled in some places the minchah is kosher. However, if the amount of oil is greater than the appropriate amount, the lack of its being absorbed is critical. So it might be true here, that if the mitzvah of the shel yad can be fulfilled, its not being done is not critical. But in a case where a person could not fulfill the mitzvah even if he wished to do so, his lack of fulfilling it would prevent the mitzvah of the shel rosh from being acceptable. Or, perhaps the Mishnah means to say that these two mitzvos of tefillin are completely independent of each other.

Sha'agas Aryeh recognizes that when we say that the two tefillin are two independent mitzvos, it should not be necessary to be obligated in the mitzvah of the shel yad in order to be able to fulfill the mitzvah of the shel rosh, just as we know that someone who is exempt from the mitzvah of tzitzis is not exempt from tefillin. Nevertheless, there is a reason to argue that there is a link between these obligations. We find earlier (36a) that when removing one's tefillin, the shel rosh is to be taken off first, because the verse states (Devarim 6:8), "they shall be as totafos (plural) between your eyes." This suggests that as long as the tefilla is on one's head the two mitzvos must be in force. We could therefore say that the mitzvah of the shel rosh is only applicable as long as the mitzvah of the shel yad is applicable, even though a person might not be wearing his shel yad. But if the shel yad mitzvah is exempted, the shel rosh might not be able to be fulfilled.

Sha'agas Aryeh concludes that the shel rosh is completely independent of the shel yad, and even if one is exempt from putting on the shel yad, he would still be obligated to put on the shel rosh. He proves it from the law of the kohanim who do not wear the tefillin shel yad while they are wearing their kohen garments, but they do have to wear their shel rosh. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

*A Sefer Torah whose letters faded to red or yellow*

גרדומי תכלת כשרין

*The stubs of techeilis are valid*

The Gemara teaches that the stubs of tzitzis are valid. In other words, if initially one's tzitzis were the correct length and then sometime later they became shortened and what remains is less than the minimum length that was required when they were tied they remain kosher as "leftovers from a mitzvah." Earlier (35b) the Gemara taught that this principle applies only to mitzvah objects but does not apply to objects of sanctity. Later authorities discuss different applications of this principle.

Rav Shlomo Kluger<sup>1</sup> was asked to rule about the validity of a Sefer Torah that has numerous letters that faded and rather than appear black now look red or sometimes yellow. He cites Magen Avrohom<sup>2</sup> who indicates that if the Torah was written with black ink but it faded it is valid. Rav Kluger explains that this ruling is based upon our Gemara. Since the Gemara teaches that leftovers from a mitzvah are valid, so too when the letters of a Sefer Torah fade and lose their color but their shape is still intact they are considered "leftovers" and remain valid. If, on the other hand, the letter faded to the point that it or part of it is no longer visible it is not considered the "leftover" of the mitzvah and the Sefer Torah would be invalid.

Chasam Sofer<sup>3</sup> disagreed and pointed out that the Gemara

# REVIEW and Remember

1. Is it permitted to make tzitzis from only techeiles?
2. What is the point of dispute between Rebbi and Rabanan?
3. Which color string should be inserted into the garment first?
4. How long must the tzitzis string remain for it to be valid?

teaches that it is only "leftovers" of a mitzvah object that remain valid but not "leftovers" of an object of sanctity. Since a Sefer Torah is an object of sanctity the principle of "leftovers" does not apply. Rav Kluger responded that the reason the principle of "leftovers" does not apply to objects of sanctity is that generally once the object becomes diminished it loses its sanctity as would occur if a letter from a Sefer Torah faded altogether. However, if the letter is still present but the color faded the Sefer Torah retains its sanctity and thus the principle of "leftovers" still applies. Chasam Sofer responded that a Sefer Torah has the sanctity of a holy scroll and the sanctity of a scroll that could be read publicly. Once a letter loses its color it has lost the sanctity of a scroll that could be read publicly and consequently for that reason the principle of "leftovers" does not apply. ■

1. שו"ת טוב טעם ודעת קמא סי' רמ"ד.
2. מג"א סי' ל"ב ס"ק ל"ח.
3. שו"ת חת"ס יו"ד סי' רנ"ו. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

*Preserving One's Dignity*

"בלאו דלא תסור..."

A certain fairly young man with black hair and beard noticed that his beard was turning prematurely white. What was strange about this was that only one side of his beard was going gray. The other side remained a youthful black, with no white hairs at all. This dismayed the young man and as the half with the white hairs became whiter and whiter he was more and more troubled and wanted nothing better than to dye it black. But he knew that in general it is forbidden for a man to dye his hair black

since in his time this was customary only for women. Doing so would constitute a violation of the prohibition of **לא תלבש**. Nevertheless, as his beard got stranger and stranger he realized that it was hard to go out among other people because he felt too odd. So he decided to ask his town's rav who was the author of the Ach Pri Tevuah, ז"ל, if there was any way to permit dyeing his beard.

The rav held that even though this is a violation of a lav it may be permitted since k'vod habrios can override a negative commandment. Yet he felt unsure so he consulted with the author of the Sho'el U'meishiv, ז"ל, who also permitted, but for a different reason. "Your reasoning that k'vod habrios overrides a negative commandment in this case is

incorrect since the only lav k'vod habrios overrides is **לא תסור**, as we find in Menachos 38.

The Sho'el U'meishiv added, "Yet this is still permitted since most authorities learn that dyeing one's hair is not a violation of the Torah commandment of **לא תלבש** at all. Although the Rambam holds that it is a Torah prohibition in this circumstance, nevertheless the overwhelming majority rule against him and we can rely on them. Since the entire problem is only rabbinic, your reasoning that k'vod habrios overrides a rabbinic prohibition stands and the young man may indeed dye his beard!"<sup>1</sup> ■

1. שו"ת שואל ומשיב, מהדורה א', ח"א, סי' ר"י