



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Balsam oil (cont.)

Abaye adds an additional reason why one may not use balsam oil for the Shabbos lights, namely, due to its volatility it may ignite the house.

A frightening story related to the volatility of balsam oil is related.

### 2) Additional disqualified oils

A Baraisa rules that one may not use as fuel for one's light, during the week and certainly on Shabbos, tevel that is tamei nor white naphta.

The reason to not use white naphta is because of the fear that the house will ignite and the reason to prohibit the use of tevel that became tamei is based on the drasha that restricts deriving benefit from tevel.

A Baraisa records the opinions of many Tannaim regarding the use of different oils for the Shabbos lights.

The Gemara points out that two of the opinions seem to express the exact same opinion. The Gemara answers that the two opinions differ regarding the permissibility of mixing some qualified oil together with the disqualified oil.

### 3) Tree byproducts

R' Shimon ben Elazar rules in a Baraisa that tree byproducts are not subject to the tuma of clothing.

Abaye asserts that R' Shimon ben Elazar and Tanna d'vei R' Yishmael are in agreement on this point based on a quote of Tanna d'vei R' Yishmael.

Rava points out that there will be a disagreement whether materials other than wool and linen are susceptible to the tuma of garments.

The Gemara questions the source of the halacha that a wool or linen garment must be three by three fingerbreadths to be susceptible to tuma.

After providing the source that wool and linen are susceptible to tuma at a size of three by three fingerbreadths the Gemara asks according to Rava what will be the source for R' Shimon ben Elazar that other materials become susceptible to tuma at three by three tefachim. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### In Search of the Chilazon

אלו צידי חלזון של צור ועד חיפה

One of the identifying signs of the true Chilazon described in the Gemara (Menachos 44a) is that it arises out of the sea once every seventy years. When the Radziner Rebbe, Rabbi Gershon Henoch Leiner, wanted to renew the use of techeiles, he found a type of animal whose blood produced a dye which was convincingly that of the techeiles (the *Sepia officinalis* – the cuttlefish). Many argued with him by pointing out that the animal he found did not possess this feature of coming out of the sea every seventy years.

In his sefer on the topic, **שפוני טמוני חול**, he addresses this concern and responds. He writes: "When the Gemara states that the Chilazon comes out of the water once every seventy years, it cannot mean that it is impossible to be found until that moment, and once that moment is over that the Chilazon is non-existent. After all, the Gemara (Shabbos 26a) points out that Nevuzaradan took some of the Jews who he did not exile from Israel, and he appointed them as **יוגבים** which the Gemara defines as ones who catch the Chilazon in order to produce blue dye for his royal robes. Now, if the Chilazon animal literally only comes up once in seventy years, how could he assign these people to a job that is basically unavailable? Also, his appointing them as "trappers of Chilazon" seems to suggest that it was a regular job. Rather, the Chilazon is found commonly. When the Gemara says that it arises once in seventy years, it means that it proliferates and flourishes at this interval. Nevertheless, the Chilazon does not have to be a rarely found species. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. How did the mother-in-law "take care" of her daughter-in-law?
2. Why was it unreasonable to mandate that only oliveoil be used for the Shabbos lights?
3. According to Tanna d'vei R' Yishmael, what is the definition of **בגד**?
4. Who would use a garment three by three tefachim and who would use a garment three by three fingerbreadths?

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Issues regarding the measurement of 3 x 3 fingerbreadths to constitute a garment

דתניא: "בגד" - אין לי אלא בגד. שלש על שלש מנין? תלמוד לומר: "והבגד".

For we have learned in a Baraisa: If the Torah had only written the word **בגד** (garment) in regard to the ritual impurity of Tzara'as, than I would have understood that only a whole garment would be considered a garment. However, once the Torah writes the word **והבגד** (and the garment), the addition is intended to expand the definition of garment in this respect to include as well any garment 3 fingerbreadth by 3 fingerbreadths.

One of the discussions concerning this elemental minimum measurement of 3 x 3 fingerbreadths to qualify as a garment regards how this measurement is calculated. Must this measurement of 3 x 3 fingerbreadths be squared, or is it sufficient that the total area be equivalent to 9 fingerbreadths square. For example: if a garment was 4.5 fingerbreadths by 2 fingerbreadths, such that the aggregate area was equivalent to 9 fingerbreadths square, would such a garment be considered a garment or not?

The Pnei Yehoshua<sup>1</sup> considers this matter and suggests a proof from the commentary of the Rambam on the Mishnah<sup>2</sup>. There, the Rambam states that the smallest measure of cloth that can be considered a garment is 3 x 3 fingerbreadths. Subsequently, he mentions that belts and sashes are not considered garments in regard to the matter under discussion there. It seems from the Rambam's words that a belts and sashes are not considered garments because they are not 3 fingerbreadths wide. The Pnei Yehoshua infers from this that the measure of 3 x 3 fingerbreadths must be squared, because belts and sashes that are not 3 fingerbreadths wide do not fulfill this minimum measurement requirement, although their collective area surpasses 9 square fingerbreadths.

This very same proof is presented by Rav Abdallah Somech of Baghdad<sup>3</sup> in his consideration of this question.

The Arugas HaBosem<sup>4</sup> discusses this matter as well. He mentions that he found no overt determination about this as it regards matters of impurity. However, he proposes a proof from a law concerning Mezuzah. A room that does not have the area of 4 x 4 amos is not obligated to have a Mezuzah on its doorpost. The Rambam and the Rosh disagree<sup>5</sup> whether that measure is specifically squared, or that the combined area be equivalent to 4 x 4 amos. The Rosh holds that the room must be at least 4 x 4 amos square. The Rambam disagrees and holds that a room 8 amos by 2 amos, such that the total space is 16 square amos, would fulfill the minimum requirement and as such obligate the placement of a Mezuzah. After some deliberation, he concludes that measures that are **הלכה למשה מסיני** (an oral tradition from Moshe at Sinai) are all precise and specific, and therefore in our case the garment necessarily must be 3 x 3 fingerbreadths specifically. He adds that maybe the Rambam would also agree to this

Rav Grunwald thus concludes that the minimum measure of garments being 3 x 3 fingerbreadths is **הלכה למשה מסיני** (an oral tradition from Moshe at Sinai), while the minimum area of a room to require a Mezuzah is not. Rav David Yoel Weiss<sup>6</sup> **שליט"א** notes that Rav Avraham Dov Kahana-Shapira of Kovno<sup>7</sup> holds the exact opposite; he holds that the 3 x 3 fingerbreadths requirement for garments is the assessment of the Rabbis that less than that measure has not significance or value as a garment, while the 4 x 4 amos minimum to require a room to have a Mezuzah is **הלכה למשה מסיני** (an oral tradition from Moshe at Sinai). ■

1. פני יהושע לעיל (דף כו ע"א תוס' ד"ה אין בו)
2. פירוש המשניות לרמב"ם (כלים פרק כ"ז מ"א)
3. שו"ת זבחי צדק החדשות (סי' קכט)
4. שו"ת ערוגת הבושם (חיו"ד סי' קסה)
5. עי' יו"ד סי' רפו
6. מגדים חדשים כאן (ד"ה שלש על שלש, דף פ' ע"א)
7. שו"ת דבר אברהם ח"א (סי' ב' ענף ב' בהגה"ה) ■

## STORIES off the Daf

### To Stand Up for What is Right

עמד רבי יוחנן בן נורי על רגליו ואמר, מה יעשו אנשי בבל שאין להם אלא שמן שומשמן

The simple reading of the Gemara indicates that Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri stood up to be noticed as he made

this announcement. He wanted everyone to hear his concern, and for everyone to concur that we cannot accept the opinions of Rabbi Yishmael ben Beroka and Rabbi Tarfon who specified that only oil from plants or olive oil may be used, thus being in disagreement with the sages in our Mishnah.

Ben Yehoyada explains that the meaning of the Gemara may also be that Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri stood

up, thus demonstrating that the opinion of Rabbi Tarfon, in contrast, could not stand on its merits. This was a convincing and dramatic method to convey his strong feelings. Rabbi Yochanan emphatically demonstrated his view by standing, and showing that Rabbi Tarfon, who held that only olive oil was acceptable for Shabbos candles, could not have any footing or position in the discussion. ■

