

29.4.3

40a (חדא מכלל דחבירתה איתמר) → 41a (ת"ר סדין בעיצית)

- I Dispute regarding putting ציצית (including תכלת – wool) on linen garment ("סדין")
- a ש"ב – exempt – don't read juxtaposition, therefore ציצית doesn't trump שעטנז
- b ב"ה – obligated, and the הלכה follows ב"ה
- i ראב"צ (support for ב"ה) anyone who puts on תכלת in ירושלים arouses bewilderment (but it's not אסור, just מתמה)
- ii רבי אסור: since people don't understand (that כלאים is only permitted for ציצית) and would come to permit all שעטנז
- 1 Question (asked to רבא): why not publicize the ruling by having 10 men go out to the public with ציצית on סדין
- (a) Answer: then they'd certainly be bewildered – why observant people are wearing שעטנז
- 2 Question: why not send publicize it at the פרק (public lecture)
- (a) Answer: it is a precaution against the use of קלא אילן (an alternative, cheaper dye)
- (b) Question: but even if dyed with קלא אילן, it should be no worse than white strings
- (i) Answer: per ר"ל – ר"ל דוחה ל"ת – only when it is unavoidable; white strings could be made from linen
- (ii) question: why not check it to see if it is dyed with legitimate תכלת?
- (c) rather: reason is a precaution against use of tester-wool (טעימה is invalid – must be dyed ציצית לשם)
- (i) challenge: why not send out a declaration informing people that טעימה is invalid
- (ii) answer: we don't rely on those letters (דיסקיא)
1. challenge: we rely on them for information about the date – vis-à-vis כרת (eating on יוה"כ חמץ בפסח, יוה"כ)
- (d) rather (רבא and confirmed in ר' זירא by זירא): precaution against his סדין tearing within 3 fingers'-width of the edge and he may then resew it without removing ציצית – invalid per העשוי ולא מן העשוי – "תעשה"
- (i) note: ר' זירא undid the ציצית on his סדין (linen)
- (e) additionally (ר' זירא): as a precaution against לילה כסות (putting ציצית on סדין which is used for nighttime)
- II רבא's ruling re: mixed materials (assuming that leather garments aren't חייב)
- a if: the garment is made of a legitimate fabric but the corners are leather – חייב; inverse – פטור
- i reason: all follows the בנר
- ii dissent: ר' אחאי has the corner determine the status of the garment
- III Applications of the principle "תעשה" ולא מן העשוי in re: ציצית
- a meaning: ציצית must be placed on a בנר חייב, not already there when it becomes such
- b רבא: if he put ציצית on a 3-cornered garment then added a corner – פסול
- i Challenge: report that the הראשונים חסידים would put ציצית on as soon as they had woven אצבעות ג'
- ii Reread: as soon as they were within אצבעות ג' of the end they would put on ציצית
- iii Challenge: "תעשה" ולא מן העשוי doesn't apply to ציצית
- 1 Support: זירא – ר' – if he put ציצית on an already-fringed garment (then took old ones off) – כשר
- (a) Block (רבא): this is a מעשה (at the time of putting them on), due to the violation of תוסף
- (i) Counter (ר"פ): he doesn't intend to "add" (and violate תוסף), so – no מעשה (problem remains)
- c Backdoor: זירא ר' (quoting שמואל) – תכלת isn't impeded by כלאים, even on an exempt טלית
- i Cannot mean: a טלית that is smaller than the minimal שעור (enough to cover head and torso of קטן and an adult wouldn't be embarrassed to wear it outside)
- 1 Argument: when the שעור is presented, it is followed with כל לענין כלאים
- (a) Which cannot mean: that any garment smaller than that is not vulnerable to כלאים איסור
- (i) Because: we have a rule (כלאים ט"ב) that עראי לכלאים אין עראי לכלאים
- (b) Rather, must mean: in re: סדין בעיצית (if smaller, doesn't trump, as there is no מצות עשה fulfilled)
- ii Must mean: if he put it on an already-fringed garment (הטיל למוטלת)
- 1 Which means: that it is כשר, else שעטנז wouldn't be trumped
- 2 In sum: הטיל למוטלת is not a violation of "תעשה"; but is distinct from putting on a 3-cornered garment, per רבא
- iii Challenge: why did זירא ר' teach the rule of הטיל למוטלת as well as the exemption of תכלת over שעטנז?
- 1 Answer: one was taught as a natural consequence of the other