



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) The tum'ah of garments

Rava provides a source that garments of materials other than wool and linen become tamei at a size of three by three tefachim. This generates a discussion back and forth between Rava and Abaye with each trying to account for the other's drashos.

Abaye quotes another teaching of Tanna d'vei R' Yishmael, in which he demonstrates that even materials of other materials are susceptible to tum'ah, which seems to be at odds with the previous quotes of Tanna d'vei R' Yishmael (כז).

Rava, however, understands that when Tanna d'vei R' Yishmael earlier stated that garments of other materials are not susceptible to tum'ah, he was only referring to susceptibility at three by three fingerbreadths but he would agree that at three by three tefachim even garments of other materials are susceptible to tum'ah.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok explains that the intent of the first version of Tanna d'vei R' Yishmael was to teach that tzitzis are only required on garments made of wool or linen, which is not consistent with the teaching of Rava regarding the obligation of tzitzis on garments made of other materials.

R' Acha the son of Rava asked R' Ashi why Tanna d'vei R' Yishmael did not include other materials in the tzitzis obligation, from the additional phrase of **אשר תכסה בה**. R' Ashi responded that that phrase is used to include in the tzitzis obligation the garment of a blind person.

### 2) The disqualification for use as schach materials that are susceptible to the tum'ah of tzaraas

Abaye demonstrates that the opinion of Tanna d'vei R' Yishmael (כז) and Sumchus are consistent with one another disqualifying as schach flax that has reached the stage of susceptibility to the tum'ah of tzaraas even though it is not susceptible to the tuma of garments.

The Gemara provides a Tannaic source for Abaye's understanding that even unspun flax is susceptible to the tum'ah of tzara'as.

**3) MISHNAH:** Anything that comes from a tree may not be used as a wick, nor will it become tamei with roof tum'ah, except for flax.

### 4) The source that flax is a tree

The Gemara provides a source that proves that flax is considered a tree.

### 5) The source that flax becomes tamei as a "roof"

The Gemara asks for a source that a roof made of flax becomes tamei.

R' Elazar begins to demonstrate this principle from a gezeira shava.

## Gemara GEM

### Tzitzis and the Chanukah Menorah

וראיתם אותו – פרט לכסות לילה

In reference to the lighting of Chanukah candles, the **שאלות** on Parashas Vayishlach writes: "The menorah should be to the left of the doorway. Accordingly, the mezuzah will be to the right, the Chanukah candles will be to the left, and the homeowner will be in the middle, wearing his talis and tzitzis."

Initially, this comment is surprising, because the time for lighting Chanukah candles is specifically after sundown. This is also the time when the mitzvah of tzitzis is not obligatory, as we rule according to Beis Hillel who hold that the mitzvah of tzitzis does not apply at night. Why does the **שאלות** portray an image of the menorah being lit and the homeowner wearing his tzitzis simultaneously, when these mitzvos apparently do not overlap in the framework of time?

The Malbim, in his Artzos Hachaim, answers that the details of the mitzvah of tzitzis is a subject of a dispute between Rambam and the Rosh. Rambam holds that, indeed, the mitzvah is a function of the time of day. Even a garment which is specific to daytime wear is exempt from tzitzis if it is worn at night. The Rosh, however, holds that the mitzvah is a function of the type of garment which is worn. A garment which is designated to be worn at night is exempt, even if for some reason the person happened to wear it during the day. A day garment, however, is obligated in tzitzis due to its designated purpose, even if it is worn at night. We see, therefore, that the **שאלות** must hold as did the Rosh. This is why we can possibly have the menorah lit after sundown, and the person lighting it wearing his daytime cloak, with the tzitzis attached, standing next to the menorah. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. In what way is the tumah of sheratzim stricter than negaim?
2. According to Rava's final interpretation, is there a difference between the two quotes of Tanna d'vei R' Yishmael?
3. How do we know that it is not a violation of the prohibition of shaatnez to have woolen tzitzis on a linen garment?
4. What is the source that teaches that a blind person is obligated in the mitzvah of tzitzis?

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Issues regarding a blind person and Tzitzis

אמר רב אחא בריה דרבא לרב אשי: לתנא דבי רבי ישמעאל מאי שנא לענין טומאה דמרבי שאר בגדים, דכתיב 'או בגד', הכא נמי לימא לרבנות שאר בגדים מ'אשר תכסה בה'! הווא לאתויי כסות סומא הוא דאתא, דתניא 'וראיתם אותו', פרט לכסות לילה. אתה אומר פרט לכסות לילה, או אינו אלא פרט לכסות סומא? כשהוא אומר 'אשר תכסה בה' - הרי כסות סומא אמור. הא מה אני מקיים 'וראיתם אותו'? פרט לכסות לילה. ומה ראית לרבנות סומא, ולהוציא כסות לילה? מרבה אני כסות סומא שיטנה בראייה אצל אחרים, ומוציא אני כסות לילה שאינה בראייה אצל אחרים.

Rav Acha the son of Rava said to Rav Ashi: according to the view of the school of Rabbi Yishmael, why is it that in regard to impurity we include other garments, because of the verse which says **או בגד**, in regards to Tzitzis as well we should include other garments because of the superfluous phrase **אשר תכסה בה**? That phrase is utilized to obligate even a blind person in the Mitzvah of Tzitzis. ... The reason why we utilize the phrase of Tzitzis, and the phrase **וראיתם אותו** to exempt night clothes is because the blind person can see by way of others, while night clothes are worn at a time that no one can see.

This passage clearly indicates that a blind person is not exempted from the Mitzvah of Tzitzis although his disability does not allow him to fulfill the element of **וראיתם אותו** (and you will see them), being that he can see through the help of others. The Rif<sup>1</sup>, Rambam<sup>2</sup> and Rosh<sup>3</sup> all rule that a blind person is obligated in the Mitzvah of Tzitzis. This view is similarly the opinion of numerous other Rishonim<sup>4</sup>. However, some Geonim<sup>5</sup> hold that a blind person is not obligated in the Mitzvah of Tzitzis because he is unable to fulfill the element of **וראיתם אותו** (and you will see them). [Rashi in one place<sup>6</sup> seems to infer likewise<sup>7</sup>.] In the end, the Shulchan Aruch<sup>8</sup> rules that a blind person is obligated in the Mitzvah of Tzitzis. [It should be mentioned that Rav Chaim Falaji of Izmir<sup>9</sup> determines that since this obligation is a matter of disagreement amongst the Poskim, a blind person should not recite a blessing upon the Mitzvah of Tzitzis based upon the principle of **ספק ברכות**

(when in doubt - don't pronounce the blessing). But, this view is challenged by Rav Yosef Chaim of Baghdad,<sup>10</sup> who notes that the above mentioned principle is waived if there is a pre-existing practice. Thus, being that blind persons so have the custom to recite a blessing on Tzitzis, they may continue to do so.]

The discussion continues in regard to the custom of holding the Tzitzis while reciting the Shema and kissing them when saying the Tzitzis **וראיתם אותו**. Rav Yaakov Reisher<sup>11</sup> writes that the blind person can hold the Tzitzis in his hands while reciting the Shema, and kiss them when saying **וראיתם אותו**, since although he can not see himself, he can still see by way of others, as mentioned in our passage. He adds, however, that the blind person should not pass the Tzitzis over his eyes at that time, as is customary, since due to his inability to see such an action would appear strange. The Mishnah Berura<sup>12</sup> quotes this decision. Yet, note should be made of the view of the Kabbalists<sup>13</sup>, who opine that a blind person should also pass the Tzitzis over his eyes when saying **וראיתם אותו**. ■

- 1 רי"ף (ריש הלכות ציצית)
- 2 רמב"ם (פ"ג מהל' ציצית ה"ז)
- 3 רא"ש (הל' ציצית סי' א')
- 4 ע"י לדוגמה בעלמא: ר"ת בתוס' (מנחות מ' ע"ב ד"ה משום), הרוקח (סי' שסא), טור (סי' יז) ועוד טובא.
- 5 שו"ת הגאונים שערי תשובה (סי' קנ) בשם רב ששנא גאון ועוד שם (סי' רסז) בשם רב שמעון קיירא גאון. ועוד. וראה ברא"ש (הל' תפילין סי' טז) בשם ס' העתים בשם גאון.
- 6 רש"י (סוכה יא ע"א ד"ה לפרזומא). והשווה לדברי רש"י (מנחות מג ע"ב ד"ה האי אשר) שמשמע שסומא כן חייב בציצית.
- 7 ע"י בזה בשער המלך (פ"ג מהל' ציצית ה"ז) ובשו"ת חקרי לב (חאו"ח סי' ג) ובהגהות מראה כהן (סוכה שם) ובשו"ת אגרות משה (ח"א מחאו"ח סי' ג). ועוד.
- 8 אור"ח (סי' יז ס"א)
- 9 שו"ת לב חיים ח"א (סי' ק)
- 10 שו"ת רב פעלים ח"ב (חאו"ח סי' ז). וע"ע בשו"ת יביע אומר ח"י (חאו"ח סי' נה אות ב'), דף קכו ע"ב) ובסי' הלכה ברורה ח"א (סי' יז אות א' ובהערות שם) למר בריה דרבינא, רבי דוד יוסף שליט"א מה שכתבו בענין זה.
- 11 שו"ת שבות יעקב ח"ב (סי' לח)
- 12 משנ"ב (סי' כד ס"ק ז)
- 13 סי' שלמי צבור (דף צז ע"ד) ע"פ המבואר לפי האר"י ז"ל בשער הכוונות. וכן בס' עוד יוסף חי (פרשת וארא אות ג) ובכף החיים (סי' כד אות טז). ■

# Distinctive INSIGHT

## The Tree that Wasn't

מנלן דפשתן אקרי עץ וכי' ותטמנם בפשטי העץ

The Minchas Yitzchok (Vol. 7, #97) was asked whether **אזוב** (the hyssop bush) is considered as a tree in regards to the laws of Shemitta. It is clearly a bush, but our sages make reference to it as a tree. For example, the Tanchuma (Metzora 3) asks why a metzora who is coming to purify himself brings wood from both the cedar and the hyssop. The Tanchuma answers

that it is appropriate for the metzora to take a sample of the highest tree—the cedar, symbolic of his earlier audacity and haughtiness, and to now combine it with a sample of the lowest tree – the hyssop, indicating that he has learned his lesson and has become humbled. We see that the Midrash refers to the hyssop bush as a tree, and therefore the laws of Shemitta should apply.

The Minchas Yitzchok answers that the reference to the hyssop as a tree is not legally significant. After all, our Gemara in Shabbos also calls flax a tree, and this is only because it is common for people to

refer to it in such a manner. Tosafos clearly identifies it as a seed, and not as a tree. Nevertheless, although people may call it a tree, it is halachically not a tree. So, too, by the hyssop bush. It may be referred to as a tree, but as far as Shemitta is concerned, it is a bush.

As an additional point, it is noteworthy that there is an opinion that the "fruit" which Adam HaRishon ate was wheat (see Berachos 40a). This is despite the fact the Torah describes the fruit as coming from a tree. Wheat is certainly not a tree. We see, again, that the designation as a "tree" is not always technically specific. ■

