

Laws of Tzitzit, Chapter 1 (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

Shiur Overview

Summary of Shiur on Hilchos Tzitzis – Rambam, Sefer Ahava

Introduction: Tzitzis in Sefer Ahava – What Kind of Mitzvah is Tzitzis?

The Rambam places Hilchos Tzitzis in Sefer Ahava, together with Krias Shema, tefillah, tefillin, mezuzah, Sefer Torah – mitzvos that are tadir (constantly occurring).

Simple meaning: Tzitzis belongs to the category of mitzvos that a Jew does regularly, every day.

Chiddushim and explanations:

1. What kind of mitzvah is tzitzis – a "third category":

Tzitzis is not as straightforward as Krias Shema (which one must do twice a day), and not like shiluach hakan (which is only by chance occurrence). Tzitzis is a "third category" – one is only obligated if one has a four-cornered garment, but this doesn't make it merely a situational mitzvah, because in the Torah's times a four-cornered garment was the normal clothing. The Torah's intention is that a normal person should go with tzitzis every day.

2. Tzitzis is not merely a "hechsher" like shechitah:

Shechitah is a way how one may eat meat (a hechsher), but tzitzis is not merely a "way how one may wear a four-cornered garment." The Torah says "u're'isem oso u'zechartem" – there is a purpose, a mitzvah in itself, not just a condition for wearing a garment. Tzitzis is a mitzvas aseh (not merely kiyumis, not merely a hechsher), but the obligation enters through having a garment. If one doesn't have a garment one is exempt, but that is the normal state.

3. The Rambam's concept of "mitzvos hechrechiyos":

At the end of Sefer HaMitzvos the Rambam brings a list of sixty mitzvos that he calls "mitzvos hechrechiyos" – **"mitzvos that are necessarily obligatory at all times and in all places for every Jewish man, such as tzitzis and tefillin and keeping Shabbos."** The Rambam defines this: mitzvos that are obligatory for a normal person – "who stands in his home in the city, and is not deathly ill," he does business, he has children. "Hechrechiyos" doesn't necessarily mean that one is a transgressor if one doesn't do it, but that in the normal course of life one comes to it. Tzitzis stands in the list together with writing a Sefer Torah, marrying a virgin (kiddushin), sanctifying Shabbos, listening to the words of the prophet, etc. Shabbetai Frankel writes out the full list.

4. [Digression: The Bialer Rebbe (Chelkas Yehoshua)]:

As a parable for the distinction between tadir mitzvos and situational mitzvos: The Bialer Rebbe would search every day after Shacharis to fulfill hafrashas challah, kisuy hadam, etc. – "ohev mitzvah lo yisba mitzvah." This is a midas chassidus, not an obligation – a person who fulfilled shiluach hakan more times is not a better Jew, he just had more opportunities.

5. **Why Sefer Ahava:** Therefore tzitzis fits into Sefer Ahava – it is a mitzvah of ahavas Hashem, "to remember always."

Chapter 1, Halacha 1 – The Concept of "Tzitzis" and Etymology

The Rambam: "One positive commandment, which is to make tzitzis on the corners of the garment... a branch that emerges from the corner of the garment from the same material as the garment is called tzitzis."

Simple meaning: One mitzvas aseh – to make tzitzis on the corners of the garment. The word "tzitzis" means a "branch" (twig/bush) – a group of threads that hang at the corner of a garment, from the same type as the garment.

Chiddushim and explanations:

1. **Etymology of "tzitzis":** The Rambam brings that the word tzitzis comes from "tzitzas harosho" – a group of hair from the head, as it says (Yechezkel 8:3) "vayikacheni b'tzitzas roshi." If tzitzis means a cluster of hairs, it can also mean a cluster of threads. Both are "tzitzis" – not that tzitzis is similar to tzitzas harosho, but both share the same root-meaning.

2. **"Tzitzis" means the lavan, not the techeiles:** The word "tzitzis" actually means the branch/fringe of the garment (the lavan), not the techeiles. Tzitzis is like "tzitzis rosho" – a ponytail, something that extends out. The techeiles is placed upon the tzitzis, but it itself is not "tzitzis."

3. **[Digression: Reb Nachman's expression about tzitzis:]** From the verse "vayikacheni b'tzitzas roshi" (where Yechezkel is taken by the hair of his head to see the Beis HaMikdash in prophecy) comes Reb Nachman of Breslov's expression that he will drag Jews out of Gehinnom by their peyos. This is the secret of tzitzis – just as tzitzis drags a person out of Gehinnom, so tzitzis drags out the animalistic nature from the person. Also mentioned is a connection to the tzitz of the Kohen Gadol, which also hangs by the hair of the head.

4. [Digression: Why do mitzvos have "flat" names?]

Three important mitzvos – tzitzis, tefillin, mezuzah – all have "flat," physical names: tzitzis = hairs, tefillin = totafos (unclear), mezuzah = doorpost. None of them has a "marketing name" like "zikaron" or "edus." The "zikaron bein einecha" would have been a better name than "tefillin," because it says what it does. This is intentional – a Jewish tendency to be "mema'et b'govhos Hashem," to be modest and not explicit, as the Zohar says about tznius. The Torah was given to real people without marketing.

5. The Rambam's approach in the order of exposition:

Most mitzvos in Sefer Ahava begin with a description of the reality/metzius of the mitzvah (what is tzitzis?), not with "mitzvas aseh to do such and such." This is like explaining first what a machine is, and then how to use it. Perhaps because

Sefer Ahava deals with things one does all the time, one must first understand what it is.

Chapter 1, Halacha 1 (continued) – Chutei Lavan

The Rambam: "And this is called lavan... and the threads of the branch have no number from the Torah."

Simple meaning: In the language of Chazal the threads are called "lavan." "Lavan" doesn't mean that one must dye it white, but the opposite – it's called "lavan" because it has no specific dye-commandment. Lavan is the basic background – just as a blank paper is called a "white paper," so a thread that is not dyed is called "lavan." It simply means "not techeiles."

Chiddush: The Torah doesn't say how many threads the branch should have. Later the Rambam will say how many we practice, but mid'Oraisa there is no shiur.

Chapter 1, Halacha 1 (continued) – Chut Techeiles

The Rambam: "And one takes a woolen thread... dyed like the color of the sky, and wraps it on the corner... this thread that is dyed like the color of the sky is called techeiles."

Simple meaning: One takes a thread of wool (specifically wool, not like lavan which can be from the same material as the garment), dyes it "k'ein harakia" (a blue color like the sky), and winds it around on the corner, around the white threads.

Chiddushim:

1. **Techeiles is not a name of a color, but a name of a thread:** The Rambam says "this thread... is called techeiles" – techeiles is the name of the dyed thread, not of the dye itself. Just as "lavan" in the context of tzitzis doesn't mean the color white but the thread, so "techeiles" means the thread. When Chazal speak of "lavan v'techeiles" they speak of two types of threads. Also in the Torah in general, when it says "techeiles," it means wool dyed with techeiles (not just a color), therefore it doesn't say "milas techeiles."

2. **Shiur krichos mid'Oraisa: "And the number of windings that one winds this thread – seven from the Torah"** – how many times one winds the techeiles thread is seven times, and this is mid'Oraisa.

Chapter 1, Halacha 1 (continued) – Lavan and Techeiles: Two Parts, One Mitzvah

The Rambam: "It turns out that you say white thread and techeiles thread... this is one mitzvah that has two colors."

Simple meaning: Even though there are two types of threads (lavan and techeiles), it is one mitzvah with two colors, not two separate mitzvos.

Chiddushim:

1. **Two commands in one mitzvah:** The mitzvah of tzitzis has two parts – "one that is two." First: "that they make on the corner a branch emerging from it" – to make a branch from the corner of the garment. Second: on that branch one should bind a **pesil techeiles**. Two verses: "v'asu lahem tzitzis" – the essential mitzvah of tzitzis; "v'nasnu al tzitzis hakanaf pesil techeiles" – a new mitzvah on the tzitzis. The lavan is the branch – the fringes

that stick out from the garment itself at the corners. It's not a separate thread that one adds, but the garment's own material that one pulls out. The techeiles is then wound around the branch.

2. **Source from Sefer HaMitzvos why it's one mitzvah:** Both parts (lavan and techeiles) have the same purpose – "I'ma'an tizkeru va'asisem." But the Rambam goes further: it's not enough that the purpose is the same (because tefillin also has a purpose of remembrance, and it's a separate mitzvah). The key is that it's **also the same ma'aseh mitzvah** – both are the same type of action (something on the garment). When it's the same ma'aseh mitzvah **and** the same purpose, even with two colors, it's one mitzvah.

3. **Nafka mina of "one mitzvah":** (a) Regarding counting the mitzvos – we count it as one mitzvah, not two; (b) Perhaps regarding brachos – only one bracha; (c) Perhaps regarding asheh docheh lo sa'aseh – whether two asehs help more than one. The conclusion is that the Rambam's main intention is regarding counting the mitzvos, as he brings it in Sefer HaMitzvos.

Chapter 1, Halacha 1 (continued) – Techeiles Eino Me'akev Es HaLavan

The Rambam: "Techeiles does not invalidate the lavan, and the lavan does not invalidate the techeiles."

Simple meaning: They do not invalidate each other. If one doesn't have techeiles, he goes with lavan alone. If he had both the techeiles remains , (hakanaf תכניס) and the lavan tore .kosher

Chiddushim:

Techeiles alone – only b'dieved: One cannot .1 l'chatchilah make techeiles alone without lavan, because techeiles is wound around the lavan – it needs something to hang on. But if one made both properly, and afterwards the the techeiles remains kosher – it , (hakanaf תכניס) lavan tore ".retroactively became "techeiles alone

hakanaf": When the lavan is תכניס .2 **Question on "nifsak** hakanaf – what remains? "Kanaf" means the garment תכניס itself. What remains is the garment with the techeiles .connected to it, and that is enough for mitzvas techeiles

3. **Situation without lavan l'chatchilah:** It is discussed whether it's realistically possible that one would not have lavan – for example, his garment is too small and he can't pull out enough threads, or he doesn't have the shiur.

Chapter 1, Halacha 1 (end) – One Mitzvah, Not Two

The Rambam: "Even though one does not invalidate the other... it is one mitzvas aseh, and one who wears a tallis that has lavan or techeiles or both together has fulfilled one mitzvas aseh."

Simple meaning: Whoever wears a tallis with lavan or techeiles or both – has fulfilled one mitzvas aseh.

Halacha 11 – Arba Tzitziyos Me'akevos Zo Es Zo

The Rambam: Four tzitziyos invalidate each other.

Simple meaning: A garment that is obligated in tzitzis with four corners must have all four tzitziyos; one cannot fulfill the

mitzvah with only three.

Chiddush: This is brought as a follow-up to the previous discussion – there the chiddush is that techeiles and lavan do not invalidate each other (because they are one mitzvah with two commands), but regarding four tzitziyos on four corners – there yes it is me'akev.

Halacha 12 – How to Make Tzitzis: Place of Placement, Threads, and Measurements

The Rambam: One begins from the edge of the tallis which is the end of the weave, and distances from it no more than three fingers upward and no less than a thumb's joint. And one inserts there four threads, folds them, resulting in eight threads hanging from the corner. And the length of the eight threads should not be less than four fingers.

Simple meaning: One places the threads in a hole in the corner of the garment, three fingers from the edge (not more, and not less than a thumb's joint). One inserts four threads, folds them, resulting in eight threads hanging out. The minimum length is four fingers (thumb), but longer is permitted.

Chiddushim:

1. **Kesher gudal:** "Kesher gudal" means the bone (joint) of the thumb (finger), like "kishrei etzba'os" – not a string wrapped around the thumb.

2. **Number of threads:** The number of threads (four, which becomes eight) is not from the Torah – the Rambam writes here practically how Jews do it.

3. **Hole in garment:** The Rambam says "machnis sham" but doesn't explain explicitly that one makes a hole. Old garments were more loosely woven, so one could push the threads through.

Halacha 12 (continued) – Chut Techeiles: Rambam's Position vs. Ra'avad

The Rambam: And one of the eight threads should be techeiles thread and seven white.

Simple meaning: One of the eight threads (after folding) should be techeiles, and seven should be white.

Chiddushim:

1. **Half a techeiles thread:** According to the Rambam it comes out that one dyes only **half** a techeiles thread. Because one inserts four threads and folds them, resulting in eight. If only one of the eight is techeiles, it means that one dyed only half a thread – one side of the folded thread is techeiles, the other side is white. The Rambam himself was asked about this and confirmed that he indeed means that one dyes half a thread.

2. **Ra'avad's objection:** The Ra'avad says "**said Avraham, this is an error**" – this is a mistake. According to the Ra'avad one needs **two of techeiles and six white** – two of the eight should be techeiles (a whole thread, not half). There are various arguments about how to interpret the Gemara on this.

Halacha 13 – Order of Windings and Sections

The Rambam: One takes one of the white threads and makes one winding around the other threads next to the garment. Then one takes the techeiles thread and winds with it two windings next to the white winding and ties. The three windings together (1 white + 2 techeiles) are called a chulyah. Then one leaves a little space, makes a second chulyah of techeiles alone (3 techeiles windings), and so on. At the last chulyah one makes two techeiles windings and a final white winding. Since he began with white he ends with it, for we elevate in holiness and do not lower.

Simple meaning: The order is: first chulyah begins with white, middle chulyos are techeiles, last chulyah ends with white. The Rambam doesn't say how many chulyos in total.

Chiddushim:

1. **Why begin with white?** The Rambam: **so that it will be adjacent to the corner from its type** – the garment is white, so the closest thread to the garment should also be white.

2. **Meaning of "ma'alim b'kodosh v'lo moridin" in this context:** "Ma'alim b'kodosh v'lo moridin" does **not** mean here that white is holier than techeiles. Both are one mitzvah. The meaning is: since one began with white – one gave it a role, an honor – one may not completely discard it. One may not "lower" the white, that it should become nothing. This is "ma'alim b'kodosh v'lo moridin" – we don't take down something that we already used for holiness.

3. **Upper knot – Rambam vs. Ra'avad:** The Rambam doesn't say at all that one ties the tzitzis to the garment before the windings. He only mentions a knot after the windings, on the chulyah. In the Gemara an "upper knot" is mentioned – the first knot. The Ra'avad wants to fix this. But the Rambam doesn't have this text, and learns "upper knot" that it means the first chulyah – there one makes a knot, not separately.

4. **Ra'avad's objection to the order:** The Ra'avad says "**no root and no branch**" – the entire order of windings has no source. His main claim: if the Rambam's order makes almost all chulyos techeiles, and only the first and last winding are white, it's a "Purim" – one says one honors the white, but in reality one has much more techeiles than white.

5. **Ra'avad's alternative order (in the name of Rav Natrunai):** The Ra'avad brings another approach: each chulyah is made with **both** – techeiles and white together. Each chulyah has six windings (not three), because one uses both threads in each chulyah. Also the upper knot is of techeiles with white together. This is the main dispute between Rambam and Ra'avad – whether each chulyah is of one color (Rambam), or of both together (Ra'avad).

Halacha 13 (continued) – How Many Chulyos Does One Make

The Rambam: "How many chulyos does one make on each corner? Not less than seven and not more than thirteen, and this is the choicest mitzvah."

Simple meaning: One makes between 7 and 13 chulyos on each corner.

Chiddushim:

1. **What does "choicest mitzvah" mean:** Whether thirteen itself is the choicest mitzvah, or the entire range between 7 and

13? From responsa it emerges that the choicest mitzvah is that it should be between 7 and 13, not that thirteen specifically is the choicest mitzvah.

2. **Source:** A Baraisa: "Not less than seven corresponding to seven heavens, and one who adds should not add more than thirteen" – 7 heavens + 6 spaces (air) between them = 13.

Halacha 13 (continued) – B'dieved: One Chulyah is Kosher

The Rambam: "And if one wound only one chulyah, it is kosher. And if one wound chulyos on most of the tzitzis, it is kosher."

Simple meaning: One chulyah is kosher b'dieved; also if one has windings on most of the tzitzis it is kosher. The entire matter of chulyos is a beautiful design – choicest mitzvah, not me'akev.

Chiddush: "The most beautiful of them is seven" – 7 chulyos is the most beautiful, but it's certainly not me'akev.

Halacha 13 (continued) – One Third Windings, Two Thirds Branch

The Rambam: "And the best appearance of the chulyos is that all the chulyos should be in a third of the hanging threads, and two thirds branch."

Simple meaning: The beauty is that the windings should be one third of the hanging threads, and two thirds should hang free as a branch.

Chiddush: For most people's tzitzis the branch is much too long – more than two thirds – and it's not beautiful, one should cut it. (The shiur of tzitzis is four fingers, "and if it's more than that it has validity.")

Halacha 13 (continued) – White Without Techeiles: Our Custom

The Rambam: If one doesn't have techeiles, he takes one of the 8 threads and winds with it, and leaves two thirds branch. "If he wants to wind he makes chulyos."

Simple meaning: One can make chulyos also with white alone, but one doesn't have to.

Chiddushim:

1. **Our custom of 5 knots:** People make 7, 8, 11, 13 windings with 5 knots between them. The Rosh brings this custom – 5 knots corresponding to the five books of the Torah.

2. **Are our windings already chulyos?** Yes – our sections of windings (7, 8, 11, 13) with knots between them are indeed the chulyos that the Gemara speaks of. A chulyah = a winding with a knot after it. One doesn't need to add extra small chulyos.

3. **Criticism of "doubling":** There are customs (Chabad, Skver) that make besides the regular knots also additional chulyos – every three windings they make another small knot. This is a "doubling of the same thing" – one already makes chulyos through the regular windings, why again?

4. **Techeiles with our custom:** One who puts techeiles doesn't need to change his method of tying. Our custom of windings with knots is already good also with techeiles. The white that one winds around over all chulyos would be the

techeiles, except for the first and last which the Rambam says should be white.

Halacha – Twisted Threads

The Rambam: "One white thread and one techeiles thread, if he wants to make them twisted..."

Simple meaning: Twisted = spun together (like "shesh mashzar"). Our tzitzis are twisted – a bundle of threads spun together. Each thread can be a thread by itself, but if it's spun together from many threads it's also good.

Chiddush: Even if a thread is folded from eight threads, if it's well twisted (spun together), it's counted as one thread. The distinction between "threads" and "a thread" – each individual strand is a thread by itself, but when they are twisted, the entire bundle becomes one thread. This means that one needs eight such twisted threads for tzitzis.

Halacha – Spinning L'shmah

The Rambam: "The threads of tzitzis, both white and techeiles, require spinning for the sake of tzitzis."

Simple meaning: The threads need to be spun (twisted) for the sake of tzitzis.

Chiddush – What does "l'shmah" mean: Two approaches:

1) **L'shmah = intention/thought** – the one making it must know that he's making tzitzis for a mitzvah.

2) **L'shmah = for the sake of something important** – it should be good quality, made specially for tzitzis, not from scraps or inferior material. Not "for the sake of the mitzvah of tzitzis" but "for the sake of tzitzis" – that it should be a worthy thing.

The second approach is strongly supported by several proofs (see further).

Halacha – Quality Wool: What One May Not Use

The Rambam: "Not from wool caught in thorns when sheep lie among them, and not from fibers plucked from the animal, and not from remnants left at the end of shearing, but from the shearing of wool or from flax."

Simple meaning: One must use good, important material – not picked-up pieces from thorns, not combed-out threads, not cut-off ends.

Chiddush – Connection to l'shmah: The Rambam places this under the category of l'shmah. The reason is because of "zeh Keli v'anveihu" – one should fulfill mitzvos in a beautiful manner. In other places the reason given is because of **disgrace of the mitzvah**. This shows that "l'shmah" has here a broader meaning – not just intention in thought, but that the material itself should be worthy and important, made specially for that purpose. It must be "original, not recycled."

Halacha – Invalidations: Theft, Idolatry, Consecrated Items

The Rambam: Wool from theft, from an idolatrous city (that must be burned), from consecrated items (me'ilah), from an animal worshipped (idolatry) – all

are invalid for tzitzis, because it's a mitzvah that comes through a transgression.

Chiddush – Animal worshipped vs. flax worshipped:

The Rambam distinguishes: Regarding an **animal** that was worshipped – the wool is invalid even after one cut it off. But regarding **flax** (a plant/growth) that was worshipped – when one cuts it off and makes threads from it, it is kosher, **"because it has changed."**

Question: Why is cutting flax called "changed" but cutting wool from an animal is not called "changed"?

Answer: Flax is **"initially a tree and now a thread"** – it's initially a tree/plant and now a thread, a completely different thing. But wool is still wool – on the animal it's called wool, cut off it's also called wool. There is no change. Flax (linen/flax) looks completely different from how it grows – it's a plant with stalks, and then it becomes a thread. This is a real change.

[Digression: Flax vs. cotton:] Flax (linen/flax) is not cotton. Cotton doesn't enter into wool and flax at all. Flax grows like a flower/plant, and one makes the thread from the stalks, not from the bloom.

Another chiddush – connection to laws of idolatry: In the laws of idolatry it says that an animal that was worshipped, when one slaughters it, it doesn't become forbidden (because an animal is not in human possession – it belongs to itself). But **for a mitzvah** it's not fitting – this is a distinction that the Rambam brings here but not in the laws of idolatry itself.

Halacha – A Non-Jew Makes Tzitzis

The Rambam: "Tzitzis made by a non-Jew is invalid, as it says 'speak to the children of Israel and they shall make for themselves tzitzis.'" But **"if a Jew made it without intention – it is kosher."**

Simple meaning: A non-Jew may not make tzitzis – the verse says "children of Israel" shall make. But a Jew who makes tzitzis without intention – is kosher.

Chiddush – Great proof for the interpretation of "l'shmah":

The Rambam does **not** say that a non-Jew is invalid because he cannot make "l'shmah" (as he says regarding other things, like tefillin, where we don't trust a non-Jew's intention). Here the reason is simply from the verse – "children of Israel," not a non-Jew.

Even more: If a Jew makes tzitzis **without intention** it is kosher! This is a contradiction to the simple understanding of "spinning l'shmah" (that one needs intention). Therefore one must say:

- **"Spinning l'shmah"** does **not** mean intention/thought while making, but that the material should be important and specially prepared for tzitzis – good quality, not scraps.

- One cannot say that spinning needs l'shmah but making doesn't need l'shmah – that makes no sense.

- Therefore: "l'shmah" = for the sake of something important, not = intention of the mitzvah. A non-Jew is invalid not because of l'shmah but because of "children of Israel shall make."

Halacha – Ta'aseh V'lo Min Ha'asuy

The Rambam: "Tzitzis made from what was already made is invalid. How so? If one brought a corner that has tzitzis and sewed it on the garment – even if it has a corner of a cubit by a cubit – invalid, as it says 'and they shall make for themselves tzitzis,' not from what is already made. This is similar to something made by itself."

Simple meaning: One cannot take a piece of garment that already has tzitzis and sew it onto another garment – even if that piece is large enough (cubit by cubit). This is invalid because it's "from what is already made" – it's already finished, not freshly made for the sake of the mitzvah.

Chiddush: The essence of ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy is a matter of **intention at the time of the action** – one must actively make the tzitzis on the garment, not take something that is already "ready-made." The Rambam compares it to "made by itself" – it's as if it made itself. The principle of ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy is also found by sukkah, mezuzah, and other mitzvos.

Halacha – Removing Tzitzis from One Garment and Placing on Another

The Rambam: One may remove tzitzis from one garment and place them on another garment.

Simple meaning: This is not ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy, because one removes the tzitzis and places them freshly on the new garment.

Chiddushim:

1. **Rambam's context vs. Gemara's context:** The Rambam places this law in the context of ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy, as if the main concern is min ha'asuy. But **in the Gemara it is brought more in the context of "ma'alin b'kodosh v'ein moridin"** – that it's a disgrace to take tzitzis from one garment for another. The Rambam's approach is that the main question is whether it's min ha'asuy, and he rules that it's permitted because one places it freshly.

2. **The condition:** One must untie (be matir) the tzitzis from the first garment and place them freshly on the second – not sew over the piece of garment with the tzitzis together.

Halacha – Hanging Threads from Two Corners to Each Other

The Rambam: "If one hung threads from two corners to each other – even if he said he will cut them afterwards – invalid."

Simple meaning: Instead of placing separate tzitzis on each corner, he took one long string and threaded it through two corners, with the intention to cut it in the middle afterwards. Even if he said he will cut it – invalid.

Chiddushim:

1. **The reason for the invalidation:** At the time he tied them (kesharom) it was invalid, because **the two corners are connected to each other through the threads between them.** This makes it not four separate corners – it's as if it's one.

2. When he cuts it afterwards, it's already **ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy** – because the making (tying) happened in an invalid state, and the cutting afterwards cannot fix it.

Halacha – Placing Tzitzis on Tzitzis: Intending to Nullify vs. to Add

The Rambam: When one places tzitzis on a corner where there is already tzitzis: if intending to nullify the first – he nullifies the first, removes the first, and it is kosher. If intending to add – when he adds he invalidates everything.

Simple meaning: One can replace tzitzis by placing new ones with intention to nullify the old. But adding more tzitzis as an addition is bal tosef and invalidates everything.

Chiddushim:

1. **Strong chiddush – contradiction to "no number from the Torah":** The Rambam said earlier that **the number of threads has no shiur from the Torah** – however many threads one places is kosher. How does this fit with the law that adding more is bal tosef? The answer: **At the time of making** one can place as many threads as one wants, because that's all one act of making. But **afterwards** when it's already a finished tzitzis, adding more threads is an **addition** – that means one makes five tzitzis instead of four, which is bal tosef.

2. **The Ra'avad disagrees** and says that such a thing is not in the Gemara.

Halacha – Ba'alas Shalosh: Tzitzis on Three Corners

The Rambam (in the name of Rav Masna): If one places tzitzis on a garment that has only three corners, and afterwards one sews on a fourth corner and places tzitzis there – invalid, ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy.

Simple meaning: When one finished sewing the fourth corner, there was already tzitzis on three corners – that means the tzitzis on those three are already "from what is made" because they were placed on a garment that didn't have four corners.

Halacha – Not Folding the Tallis in Two

The Rambam: "One does not fold the tallis in two and place tzitzis on its four corners when it is folded – unless one sews it."

Simple meaning: One may not fold a tallis in two and place tzitzis on the four corners of the folded garment, because these are not the true corners of the garment. But if one sews it together (sewing), it becomes a new smaller garment and it is kosher.

Chiddush: The concern is that one places tzitzis on **non-true corners** – the folding makes new corners but these are not the real corners of the garment. Only when one sews it (even a light sewing) does it become truly a new garment.

Halacha – The Corner with Tzitzis Tore Off

The Rambam: If the corner with the tzitzis tore off – if it's outside three fingers, one may sew it back. If it's within three, l'chatchilah one should not do it.

Simple meaning: Three fingers is the minimum shiur of where tzitzis must be from the corner. If the torn piece is larger than three fingers, there's enough space to do it. If smaller – there's a problem.

Chiddushim:

1. **Difficulty in understanding the distinction:** The Kesef Mishneh is mentioned as having other reasons in the Gemara. The distinction between within three and outside three is not entirely clearly explained.

2. **One suggestion:** Within three fingers is the minimum shiur of a garment, so when the torn piece is smaller than three fingers, it's not important enough to be a separate garment, and sewing it back is problematic because of min ha'asuy.

Halacha – A Sheet That Became Smaller

The Rambam: A garment that fell apart/became smaller from the side where the tzitzis is – as long as there is a connection between tzitzis and garment, it is still kosher.

Simple meaning: As long as there is a piece of garment that connects the tzitzis to the garment, it is good – even if very little remains.

Halacha – Threads of Tzitzis That Tore: Enough for a Bow

The Rambam: The threads of tzitzis – when parts of the threads tore off, as long as enough remains for a bow – they are kosher. But if the thread tore from its root – invalid.

Simple meaning: The shiur of enough for a bow is the minimum that must remain of a tzitzis thread for it to still be kosher – enough that one can make from it a bow (a knot). But if the thread tears completely off from the garment (from its root), it is invalid.

Chiddushim:

1. **Question on "tore from its root":** Why should it be invalid if the thread tears completely off? We learned that one doesn't need all the threads – however many threads one places is kosher. The suggestion is that "one thread" presumably means the entire combined thread (not just one individual strand). But it remains in doubt. Also asked: once one already inserted it and was already yotzei – why should it become invalid? The Rambam gives no reason why, and the question remains open.

2. **Lack of clarity in the Gemara:** There are "other reasons" in the Gemara that are not clear, and this is left without resolution.

End of summary of shiur on Hilchos Tzitzis, Chapter 1.

| Full Transcript

Laws of Tzitzit: The Nature of the Mitzvah and the

Order of Its Performance

Introduction: Tzitzit in Sefer Ahavah – What Kind of Mitzvah is Tzitzit?

Constant Mitzvot in Sefer Ahavah

Speaker 1:

We are learning, baruch Hashem, the Laws of Tzitzit in Sefer Ahavah. In Sefer Ahavah we learn constant mitzvot (mitzvot temidiyot), mitzvot that exist constantly, not like Pesach which is once a year, or shiluach haken which is if a situation happens, but rather things that are very obligatory, like Kriat Shema, prayer, tefillin, and now we're learning tzitzit. Kriat Shema is every day, essentially tzitzit is also every day. Tzitzit is the same frequency (tadir) as all the others, like tefillin, Kriat Shema.

And there is also a law of going with tzitzit. Tefillin one is exempt on Shabbat, tzitzit one is not exempt on Shabbat. Also it's a bit different, because tefillin is perhaps a mitzvah that one must go do, this is an obligation of the body (chovat haguf).

Speaker 2:

Ah, right.

Speaker 1:

But they learned Sefer Torah, for example mezuzah, mezuzah is always, the Rambam called it always, right? Everyone who has a house. Everyone who has a house must have a mezuzah. Sefer Torah is also a mitzvah, the king must go always, and every Jew must have a Sefer Torah.

But the Rambam didn't for example at the end of the Laws of Tzitzit [say] how strongly one must pursue making sure that one fulfills the mitzvah. It's perhaps not such a law, a mitzvah that "a person should always be careful with the mitzvah of tzitzit" (le'olam yeha adam zahir bemitzvat tzitzit).

Speaker 2:

He says, he says at the end, yes yes, he says. A person should always go with tzitzit, yes. True.

Discussion: Tzitzit as Middat Chasidut or Obligation?

Speaker 1:

It's actually, it's a measure of piety (middat chasidut), it's interesting. It's actually the Torah wants one to always go with tzitzit and tefillin. The question is, when the Torah wants it, is it obligatory, or does the Torah [see] it as a mitzvah with an element of choice (mivchar). Right. One can say, so tefillin, the essential mitzvah is that one should put it on every day, or that one should keep it on while going about. What is the mitzvah of tzitzit, the essential mitzvah is only that if one has such a garment one should make tzitzit, and afterwards there is an aspect of a mitzvah and a choice.

Now, I'll say how I think. I think that you can imagine that the intent of the Torah or the will of the Torah, a normal person has a house and he has a garment. And a normal garment today perhaps doesn't have four corners, but in the Torah's times this is a normal garment. So when the Torah tells you to go with tzitzit, it means that you should go every day with tzitzit, and you should have a mezuzah on your door. Certainly, if it happens that someone doesn't have a garment, or it happens that someone doesn't have a house, he is exempt from mezuzah. But that doesn't make it like a constant mitzvah (mitzvah tedirait), because the normal order is so.

Digression: The Bialer Rebbe (Chelkat Yehoshua) and Situational Mitzvot

Speaker 1:

Let me perhaps [explain] with my words. There was a great tzaddik, the Chelkat Yehoshua, the Bialer Rebbe. He was a great lover of mitzvot. Well, as it says by Chazal, "one who loves mitzvot will not be satisfied with mitzvot, one who loves money will not be satisfied with money." He was a great enthusiast, a bit like Reb Ahrele. And every day after Shacharit he sought to fulfill the mitzvah of separating challah, covering the blood, on the slaughtering, whichever mitzvah that it says in the siddur that one can do after Shacharit he tried to do.

So from one perspective one can look at it as a tremendous thing, and from the other side we know that it's not simple, a person has no obligation to do this simply, and one must think whether it's a mitzvah to try to organize... okay, first of all one must be a rebbe for this, to organize that every day one should specifically bake challahs when you're finished, when the tallit is taken off from the head and everything... okay, for this one must be a rebbe. But it's certain that these are mitzvot, taking challah or shiluach haken is a mitzvah that is on a situation. And if someone has done the mitzvah of shiluach haken more times, it's not simple that he's a better Jew, he's had more opportunities.

In contrast to this there are what are entirely mitzvot like tefillin, that one should go every day with tefillin, or Kriat Shema at least, one should every day read Kriat Shema twice. Tzitzit, one can't say that tzitzit is like Kriat Shema, that one must do it twice a day, but it's also not yet the same kind of thing as if a situation arises. Because it is yes, the essence of the thing is "and you shall see it and remember" (ure'item oto uzchartem), the purpose of it is much more important. It's not simple that the Torah says that if you've made a four-cornered garment, then there is a way how to use it. It is yes a mitzvah. The Torah doesn't say that the solution for using a four-cornered garment is through putting tzitzit. Rather the Torah says that there is a mitzvah of tzitzit, which this is the garment. And the Torah says one should go on the four corners, which this is a very common garment. The four corners is not something a rare garment, this is the normal garment, he says.

Discussion: Positive Mitzvah, Kiyumit Mitzvah, or a Third Category?

Speaker 1:

Now, so this is the obligation happens only when he has a four-cornered garment. He says, so what do we call it, a positive mitzvah (mitzvah chiyuvit), a fulfillment mitzvah (mitzvah kiyumit), or is mitzvah kiyumit a third thing, perhaps a fourth thing? Or as you say like slaughter (shechitah), which is not a mitzvah but rather a means of permitting (hechsher). So apparently this is a third category. There are mitzvot that you can say as you say for the Reishit Chochmah or the Sefer HaChaim, that it comes so. Do you understand what I'm saying?

Speaker 2:

No, I mean the point is perhaps that the mitzvah is that the Almighty wanted one to do the mitzvah and one has sometimes attached to a garment, or there is a way how one may eat the bird. The bird one may eat without causing pain to animals (tza'ar ba'alei chaim), or the way how one may use the blow with a fence, that the four corners one may make with tzitzit. This is not the idea of the mitzvah of tzitzit, a way how to permit going with four corners. Not that is the idea.

Speaker 1:

Yes yes, I'm with you, exactly. It's a different thing.

The Rambam's List of Necessary Mitzvot**Speaker 1:**

I remember that the Rambam at the end, I don't find it here, the Rambam at the end of Sefer HaMitzvot has such a list of sixty mitzvot that are more, that is a mitzvah that one should pursue. Not just pursue, it's more like, I'm trying to find the language. I remember that at the end, how do you remember at the end of what? At the end of something. I don't remember at the end of what.

Speaker 2:

Ah, did you look in the book? You remember that there is such a list of sixty mitzvot there, so I remember.

Speaker 1:

Here I don't find it. I don't know how one should find it. Perhaps at the end of the principles (shorashim)?

Speaker 2:

No.

Speaker 1:

At the end of something there is a list of, where apparently it says tzitzit and so forth. He has another name for the list. Not six constant mitzvot, but constant always (tedirut tamid), or...

The conclusion is it's a fulfillment of a positive commandment, what do you mean?

Speaker 2:

Very good. At the end of the positive commandments?

Speaker 1:

So I remember. Look, um, yes. Um, he says that it appears that there are mitzvot that are for the obligation of the community, for example. There is for the obligation of a person, even the mitzvah of procreation (peru urevu). He calls it, how? Necessary mitzvot (mitzvot hechrechiyot)? There are mitzvot that are an obligation on a person only if one has done something, like a Hebrew slave and the like. Mitzvot are only because of the house and the like. And they are mitzvot, this is his language, **"mitzvot that are necessarily obligated at all times and in all places on every Jewish man, such as tzitzit and tefillin and keeping Shabbat."** These are the mitzvot here.

And he says, why is it called necessary mitzvot? He thought up this name, necessary mitzvot? **"Because they are obligated on every single Jewish man necessarily at all times and in all places and in all circumstances."** And he says, ah, afterwards he says, on condition, he says that there are sixty such necessary mitzvot, if it's a person who is a normal person, that the mitzvot are obligatory according to the usual way of the world (al pi rov darko shel olam). For example, **"who stands in his house in the country, and is not deathly ill,"** and he does business, **"and has children."** So, in the sixty mitzvot he doesn't count specifically mitzvot, it doesn't mean necessary means not the obligations that if not one is a criminal and one doesn't do it today, but in the normal order of life, one gets dressed, one has a wedding.

So, the interesting thing, they discussed yesterday for example by the mitzvah that everyone must write a Sefer Torah, and they already had it again, that the Rambam writes his book for a householder, he's a father of children, and has livelihood,

and has a house. To him the Rambam speaks, yes? So, a person could have thought, that when you speak to this person, you're no longer speaking of necessary mitzvot. Necessary mitzvot means that every Jew that one can't get out of this, yes? Well, the Rambam says, that when I say generally who is obligated in mitzvot, I mean the average Jew. Yes. Well, he brings actually the mitzvah of writing a Sefer Torah is one of them. He has a list, and the Shabbetai Frankel writes the list of the necessary mitzvot, the full list, because here he writes only the numbers. Yes, but from below one must see a list. Yes, yes. So, does it say there writing a Sefer Torah for example? We'll see. Ah, here I have the list, okay. To write a Sefer Torah and to marry a virgin. Yes. It's interesting.

So this is a mitzvah that time does not cause (she'ein hazman grama). Because a normal Jew has a Torah. One can say one fulfills with a Chumash, it's like the Rosh wants to interpret today. But it makes sense.

Discussion: Which Mitzvot from the List Do We Do Today?**Speaker 2:**

Which mitzvah of these are they not fulfilling?

Speaker 1:

All of them. The return in Shmuel?

Speaker 2:

For a Jewish Kohen, alive and existing.

Speaker 1:

Ah, that is... yes, that one must do. Why doesn't one do it? Because his Kohen is only a doubt. Impurity, etc.

Um... to sanctify the Shabbat. To listen to the words of the prophet. Interesting his list, a bit interesting. I don't understand his list clearly. Well, we do, we hear the words of the prophet. But the prophet doesn't speak. We hear the prophet Isaiah. The prophet Shmuel is a prophet who remains, he is serving. But for him there is no positive commandment. To come in marriage (lavo bekiddushin), but for example according to the Rambam it's a positive commandment. Yes, because the Rambam is a normal person. He's going to have a wedding. He will have a wedding, he has a wedding with kiddushin. This is every day perhaps he fulfills. Well, he doesn't know. Well, according to the Rogatchover. Okay.

Conclusion: Tzitzit as a Positive Mitzvah**Speaker 1:**

Anyway, let's go back. The Rambam for example does here his... okay, it's funny. Okay, in any case. So... I want now to understand, that tzitzit there is a third category that the Rambam calls a positive mitzvah (mitzvah chiyuvit). You want... one can say a bit differently, that you say that it's not simple that one hears it. Not like slaughter, which this permits the eating. It's more like a thing that one should do, but how does one do it? Only if one has it. If one doesn't have a garment one doesn't need to. But it is yes a mitzvah, therefore it comes into Sefer Ahavah certainly. It's a mitzvah of love of Hashem, of "to remember always" etc. Okay.

Law 1: The Essence of the Mitzvah of Tzitzit**The Rambam's Definition of the Mitzvah****Speaker 1:**

So the Laws of Tzitzit, **one positive commandment, and it is to make tzitzit on the corners of garments,** on the corners of a garment. And here come the chapters that will

explain the mitzvah. Chapter 1, the Rambam says thus: "**A branch,**" branch means a twig, it means such a bush at the corner, "**on the corners of their garments from the type of garment, is called tzitzit.**" What does the word tzitzit mean? The word tzitzit means something a kind of thing, because at the corners of the garment one makes a sort of knot, and it's a sort of what one calls a tassel. It's not a knot, a corner.

Laws of Tzitzit – Chapter 1: The Essence of the Mitzvah and Making the Tzitzit

Introduction: Tzitzit as a Positive Commandment That is an Obligation

The Rambam calls it a positive commandment that is an obligation. You want you can say a bit differently, you say that it's not simple that it's a sin. It's not like slaughter that if you have this it permits eating. It's more like a thing that one should do, but how does one do it? Only if one has tzitzit. If one doesn't have a garment one doesn't need to. But it is yes a mitzvah, from this it comes into Sefer Ahavah, certainly it's a mitzvah of love of Hashem, of "to remember always" etc. Okay.

So which tzitzit? The Rambam says thus, one positive commandment, and it is to make tzitzit, to make tzitzit corners, "on the corners of garments," on the corners of a garment. And in the coming chapters one will explain the mitzvah.

Law 1: What Does the Word "Tzitzit" Mean

Chapter 1 the Rambam says thus: "**A branch**", branch means a twig, it means such a bush at the corner, "**that emerges from the corner of the garment from the type of the garment, is called tzitzit**". What does the word tzitzit mean? The word tzitzit means something a kind of thing that at the corners of the garment one makes a sort of knot, a sort of... the Rambam calls it a "branch." It's not a knot, a... he's going to say, a little hair, a twig. Yes, he says like a branch stands, a few hairs that come out. Tzitzit he's going to say is a group of hairs.

Etymology: Tzitzit and Tzitzat HaRosh

And why is it called tzitzit? He says because there is a thing called "tzitzat harosh." Tzitzat harosh means also little pieces of hair from the head. Peyot. Peyot, or whatever, it means a group of hair from the head. "**As it says 'and he took me by the lock of my head' (vayikacheini betzitzat roshi)**". He says thus, if the word tzitzit means a group of hair, it's not similar to tzitzat harosh, but both are tzitzit. If tzitzit means a cluster of little hairs together, it can be a cluster of little hairs or a cluster of little threads together. So you see that tzitzit originally means this. Originally, so it is in the Rambam, and we say "**and they shall make for themselves tzitzit**", they should make such a similar thing "**on the corners of their garments**".

Digression: Rebbe Nachman's Expression and the Secret of Tzitzit

It's interesting, why can't you say initially that both mean this? Perhaps because tzitzit recalls the piece from tzitzat roshi, which is a verse from Yechezkel where he was brought to see the Temple in prophecy. So one can perhaps only say the mitzvah, and only say that there is a mitzvah of "you shall not round the corners of your head" (lo takifu pe'at roshechem). Can we think what tzitzit rosho thinks. Means. Why did one God forbid fulfill the corners of the head? All the Amoraim

upon them. Perhaps it's in the prophet but... means means means with the hair in the locks. Yes, from here is the source of Rebbe Nachman's expression that he goes out to drag the Jews from Gehinnom by the hair of the head, by the peyot, which is literally a verse in Yechezkel.

And this is the secret of tzitzit. He already wonders perhaps if the tzitz of the Kohen Gadol, which also hangs by the hair of the head, perhaps one also has something pure. The tzitz also the tzitz such? He says I here basically that just as the tzitzit drags out the person from Gehinnom, also is the tzitzit a garment, drags out the garment from the person. Anyway, but this is the tzitziyot okay, anyway, this is already according to, according to Kabbalah. If the Rambam they learned Rebbe Nachman. Okay, but this is interesting.

Digression: Why Do Mitzvot Have "Flat" Names?

They already learned all most of the mitzvot, I already thought perhaps there is a simple explanation on this, and I don't think it's correct. Most of the mitzvot of Sefer Ahavah don't begin here by mitzvot it is such and such, but begin to describe the reality of what is the mitzvah, and also there is as if the first question a person asks, show me the tzitzit. I can through the machine afterwards you can say how one uses the machine. Could be, but it can also be because it's a thing that you already know. Since Sefer Ahavah is a thing that one does all the time. Because the Torah teaches us several times the word tzitzit, or at least gedolim te'et halach. And until the book of Yechezkel it doesn't say already anywhere that this must be the head tzitzit. But people somewhere knew this. And when he says so it says in the book of kindness, he means in the book of kindness that his proofs all year one called this tzitzit and head. Yes, not any. It is one can ask, because... is the face, generally the first question that a person has with himself about tzitzit. Show me face what is the tzitzit. And when Moshe said less than that there are things that are things that one makes.

The Laws of Tzitzis: White and Blue - One Mitzvah or Two?

It seems that the three important mitzvos, tzitzis, tefillin and mezuzah, which are revealing, which are important mitzvos in matters of faith, they didn't take some kind of name. As if it doesn't look like the marketing company couldn't come up with names to give some sort. Why is mezuzah also called mezuzah after mezuzos habayis (the doorposts of the house). Why shouldn't it have a name, a name that it's a testimony or a remembrance?

When you think that "zikaron bein einecha" (a remembrance between your eyes) is a better name than the word tefillin, because tefillin you don't know what it means. Totafos you don't know what it means. "Zikaron bein einecha" means something that will remind you.

Perhaps this is specifically so, perhaps everything needs to be this way? I say, it's possible that it was actually just some secret that it needs to be... not relevant. One needs to give for a normal person. I mean that the... you don't see in the Torah that they give names for things so much like... you know the fact that there are three books that gave themselves very high names, and the world doesn't call them yes the Shnei Luchos HaBris and the Mishneh Torah. What's the other one? The Toras Moshe of the Alshich, I think. The world says that there

are such books, like Rebbe Nachman of Breslov called his book "Ohr Hashem". Hello? It's a bit too much, you understand?

No, it's written, when Moshe Rabbeinu says "Ohr Hashem", one looks at it this way, and inside it says: "This book will teach the way and path to come to see the light of Hashem". He doesn't say that I am the "Ohr Hashem", the author of "Ohr Hashem". You understand what I mean? Yes. But I say, that it could be that there's some Jewish tendency to give names for things that are deliberately like a bit modest, a bit diminishing the greatness of Hashem. More flat, so to speak, more physical. Tzitzis is tzitzis. What does that mean? It means that tzitzis is a hint to the existence of Hashem.

As if the Torah was given to real people, and there's no marketing involved there. A mitzvah was given without a marketing team giving it a brand with a name.

But tzitzis is exactly that. The mitzvah is a kind of way how the garment should look, which reminds of tzitzis haraosh (the hair of the head). It doesn't remind of tzitzis haraosh. It's a novelty about this. It reminds, it reminds of the mitzvos. Something that looks similar to tzitzis haraosh, but tzitzis in Yiddish represents one says "shtreklich", "harelech" (little hairs). One says tefillin is "kotchke maye" as they translated, or what's the other one? Mezuzah is the threshold.

It's a funny thing. But I say, that there's a corner in your garment where you have a sign that the... the... the... it remains there a few minutes.

And there's also that the Chachamim call it a ritla. Hoshana is... okay, hoshana is also named after hoshana, which isn't the name of the... but it's more like they call it ritual. Why? A ritual is also dear. I don't know. Or conversely, possibly it's a question of not wanting to say, one doesn't need to be so explicit. Explicit is a question of like, it's crude, one needs to be modest. Like the holy Zohar says "binucha Hashem Elokecha", that everyone has with his wife matters that aren't to be told to other people. Okay, an interesting thing.

Law 1 (continued): Chutei Lavan - The White Threads

"**And this is called lavan**", says the Rambam, "**and this is called lavan**", in the language of the Sages when one wants to discuss details of the threads of the tzitzis, they call it lavan. Says the Rambam, why do they call it lavan? Not because one needs to paint it white. Rather conversely, when there's a matter of tzoveo betzeva (dyeing it with dye), which is different from other parts in the tzitzis, there's a mitzvah to paint it a specific color, the chutei lavan has no mitzvah which color it should be, therefore they call it lavan. Lavan is like the background for all colors, yes? Lavan is the basic, upon which one can make colors. What hasn't been painted is called lavan. Like a paper that isn't written on is called a white paper. A piece of merchandise that hasn't been painted, one says it's a white piece of thread. Yes, it just means something like not techeiles, right.

The Threads of the Anaf Have No Number from the Torah

Says the Rambam, the question is now, how many such... the anaf is composed of threads. Yes, anaf means it's a funny part, like a hair of the head has a bunch of little hairs, an anaf has a bunch of pieces of merchandise. The question is now, how many pieces of merchandise need to be at each anaf, at each corner? Says the Rambam, "**and the threads of the anaf have no number from the Torah**". The Torah doesn't tell us how many threads the anaf should have. Later the Rambam

will tell us how many we conduct that it should have, but here the Rambam tells us that it's not a mitzvah from the Torah how many it should have.

Law 2: Chut Techeiles - The Blue Thread

Says the Rambam further, what does one do next? First of all we already know that there are chutei lavan. The second part of the mitzvah is "**and they take a wool thread**", we see that he says wool, the other thread, the chut lavan doesn't need to be wool. Whatever type the garment is, but for the lavan one needs to take a wool thread that has been painted like the sky, with the color or the appearance of the sky, which apparently means some white... not white, I mean excuse me, some blue color like the sky, and one wraps it on the corner, and one binds it around on the corner, on the tzitzis, on the white threads that lie on the corner of the garment.

Says the Rambam, "**this thread that is dyed like the sky is called techeiles**", the thread that has been painted so it should look like the sky, that is called a thread of techeiles.

Techeiles is a Name of a Thread, Not a Color

Interesting, it doesn't look like the Rambam says that techeiles is a name of a color, rather it's a name of a thread that is painted in a color. Just like lavan, when they say lavan, as you read in the context of tzitzis, lavan doesn't mean white, rather "this thread is called lavan". This means to say, when Chazal speak of the mitzvah of lavan and techeiles... yes, it could actually be that originally also, techeiles doesn't mean any color, techeiles is the name of dyed wool. So one is precise in the Torah, when it says techeiles, it doesn't say the word techeiles, because techeiles means wool that is dyed with techeiles. But here it's not relevant, here it's simple because when one speaks of the laws of tzitzis, when one says lavan, lavan means yes white. When one will speak the law lavan and techeiles, one should know that one is speaking of the threads.

The Measure of Windings from the Torah

Says the Rambam further, "**and the number of windings that one winds this thread**", here we're told yes that this is only one thread, but how many times does one wind around the thread? How often does one see the thread in the hanging of threads at the corner? How does one see it? How many times is it wound around? "**One winds this thread seven times from the Torah**". According to the Rambam further.

Law 3: Lavan and Techeiles - One Mitzvah with Two Dyeings

"**It comes out that you say, white thread and blue thread**". Well, it comes out like I calculated for you that there's something called chut lavan, and I told you that there's another thing called chut techeiles. It comes out actually like you thought. You ask now, ah, it's two mitzvos, lavan and techeiles? He says, "**this is one mitzvah that has in it two dyeings**", yes, this is one mitzvah with two dyeings, two colors.

The Mitzvah of Tzitzis: Lavan and Techeiles - One Mitzvah or Two?

Law 1 (continued) - The Structure of the Mitzvah: Two Commands in One Mitzvah

Speaker 1: But how many times does one wind around the thread? How often does one see the thread in the hanging of the threads at the corner? How does one see? It has how many

times it's wound around. Yasher koach chazeh, yasher koach ben haTorah.

Says the Rambam further, well, it comes out so, the chazeh calculated that there's something called chut lavan, and they said that there's another thing called chut techeiles. Well, it comes out like it was, you ask now, ah, it's two mitzvos, lavan and techeiles?

He says, yes. The mitzvah has two commands, two mitzvos. A mitzvah that is composed, **one that is two**. It's one mitzvah that has in it two mitzvos.

Why? One mitzvah is "**that they make on the corner an anaf extending from it**", the very thing that on the corner of the garment should come out such a hanging, such a branch of merchandise. And the second thing is, on the anaf one should wind around a chut techeiles.

As it says, brings the Rambam, there are two verses. One verse "**and they shall make for themselves tzitzis**" is the essential mitzvah of making tzitzis on the garment, on the corners. And afterwards there's on this a new mitzvah that on the tzitzis one should wind around a thread of techeiles.

Law 1 (continued) - Techeiles Does Not Prevent the Lavan

Says now the Rambam, you've now heard that it's two mitzvos. But I want to tell you so, new law: **Techeiles does not prevent the lavan, and the lavan does not prevent the techeiles**. They don't prevent one another. It's one kind of mitzvah, but they're divided into two.

Because for the same reason why it's two mitzvos, it's also not one preventing the other. No, no, it doesn't hold so. It's not the same reason. Techeiles is indeed initially it's one mitzvah, two commands he calls it. Techeiles doesn't prevent the lavan, and lavan doesn't prevent the techeiles.

That means, if one has only one, he should at least go with the one thing. That means, one who doesn't have any techeiles, should go with lavan alone. And one who has yes lavan and techeiles, and there remained only the techeiles from his entire tzitzis, the other tzitzis, the white, the chutei lavan, tore, were removed, he made lavan and techeiles, and the lavan tore, when it became worn until it became completely nullified. There remained only the techeiles alone, the blue part. It's kosher. Until the corner of the garment, right?

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: It's kosher. What does it mean it's kosher? The techeiles is kosher. The tzitzis is still kosher, yes. What does it mean it's kosher? He has techeiles, that's all. He fulfills the mitzvah of tzitzis enough. He does one mitzvah. The point is, he shouldn't say that he shouldn't go lavan or techeiles alone, he has no mitzvah at all in it. When he goes with one, he also has the mitzvah.

Discussion: Can One Make Techeiles Alone Initially?

Speaker 2: Right. This means so, one cannot make techeiles alone. Lavan alone one can make, but techeiles alone one cannot, because techeiles is something that one binds around on the lavan. But there's one way how it will remain with techeiles alone, if you made the good way, that it's wound around the lavan. The lavan simply tore out. Now the techeiles remained. It didn't become not tzitzis when the lavan tore out, because the techeiles alone can also be tzitzis. One can yes have techeiles alone. But one cannot make techeiles alone. Techeiles is something that one binds around on a... but now,

when it tore, it retroactively became techeiles alone. What's the difference?

Speaker 1: Imagine one doesn't have any lavan, and they sold him in the store not any lavan, he only has techeiles. What should he do? Should he put in the techeiles? No. Should he seek lavan in one place so he should have techeiles? No, there's no such thing as real. If you fell, the lavan is indeed the garment itself that you used.

Speaker 2: No, any garment.

Speaker 1: Yes, look. One takes a garment, makes a corner, a corner of the garment, and makes that there should be a bit extra merchandise from the garment. You cannot not have any lavan. Techeiles you cannot have. You must have a garment, make that there should be lavan. Cut off a bit at the corner, so there should be a corner. But it needs to stick out a bit. What doesn't stick out is also not kosher. Here there are interesting things. Must have lavan to make, but question, if you don't have the lavan, you at least have the mitzvah of techeiles. So it doesn't stick out. Now he has plain the garment. That comes out. Plain the garment with the techeiles connected to it. That's called techeiles. That's good. So can one do this initially also? That I ask you.

Speaker 2: No, but one fulfills the mitzvah of techeiles, and doesn't fulfill the mitzvah of lavan.

Speaker 1: I understand.

But this is the way how one puts in the... why wouldn't you say that the reality isn't possible that one shouldn't have any lavan? It's physically possible. Just like it's possible that it's torn, it's possible that he doesn't have enough, his garment is too small, he doesn't have enough to pull out from it more threads. So? Or he doesn't have the measure, because if they make the threads and make that there shouldn't be any measure, I don't know, it seems to me that he said that he needs to make techeiles because he doesn't have any lavan. So the law says, if one has too small and he cannot add extra any lavan, he doesn't have from where any lavan, he doesn't have to add a techeiles.

Discussion: What Does "Torn Until the Corner" Mean?

Speaker 1: So it's indeed torn, torn until the corner, the situation that... let's start from the situation after the tearing. How does it look after the tearing? There's something, he still has on what to hang? Until the corner. There's nothing at all. Until the corner means that nothing remained. What remained?

Speaker 2: I don't understand. What remained when it's torn until the corner? Nothing, no? Something remained yes? That's what it means? Something remained? It doesn't say in hidden things.

Speaker 1: Corner is simply the garment itself. Corner is simply the garment. Right? So there remained the garment itself. So you can say so. What you say that the techeiles must go on the lavan, this is necessarily so, because the techeiles hangs on something, it doesn't hang in the air. The lavan isn't any anaf lavan. Why wouldn't you put it in the same hole where the lavan is put in? You need to make another hole, you need to make another two holes.

Speaker 2: Ah, so it's speaking of a garment that from the garment, like more a garment that one can pull out there. We'll be told later how one makes it, but the lavan, I ask you, it must be an anaf lavan, it runs no anaf lavan, it's an anaf lavan.

Specifically particular to say a lavan, I see, I see that he's particular to say, I try to understand. Perhaps this becomes clearer later, let's see, perhaps this becomes clearer later, let's see. Could be because like he says, it has lavan for years, it sticks out from the garment, it's placed something so, I'm not clear.

The Difference Between "Tzitzis" and "Techeiles"

Speaker 1: He says another, the commentators here say another, that actually that one doesn't fulfill with the lavan alone, it seems to me like the word tzitzis itself, plain lavan isn't called tzitzis. No problem, what's another explanation of this? Because tzitzis is some kind of fringe from the merchandise, like when one puts a piece of merchandise on his head, it doesn't become tzitzis rashah. Tzitzis rashah means a ponytail, something that turns around the head. Tzitzis from the garment also means the merchandise that one creates from the corner of the garment. Because a person wears a garment that has been woven, there are always fringes, there are always the corners. On that corner, the corner should be bound together, one should make from it a visible corner, and on that visible corner one should put on a piece of techeiles. One should make an anaf, one makes an anaf. It's called anaf. One should do something with it, one should take it together somehow, and on that one should bind around a bit of techeiles.

Not just take together, one needs to stick it out, more than take together, it needs to be a bit longer, it needs to stick out something, I didn't say properly, but it needs to stick out, right? It's an anaf that sticks out from the garment, on the corner. An anaf means a fringe that sticks out. And on that he puts techeiles, that's the truth.

Speaker 2: You're right, techeiles doesn't mean tzitzis. Interesting! Techeiles isn't tzitzis. Techeiles was called tzitzis, right. So much techeiles, it can after it's already called tzitzis, it can afterwards be the mitzvah of techeiles alone, which is a question. Because yesterday there was tzitzis, that wasn't... but to put techeiles...

Speaker 1: Yes, because the garment is called tzitzis, it doesn't become invalid somehow, as long as there's still something from the tzitzis.

Speaker 2: Okay, something is missing a piece here, we'll understand it better, okay.

Law 1 (continued) - One Mitzvah, Not Two

Laws of Tzitzit: The Order of Making Tzitzit – Placement, Threads, Windings and Coils

Even here, the Rambam says further, in total we have that there are two parts to the mitzvah, there are two colors in the mitzvah, and since they don't invalidate one another. The Rambam says, if so, a person might think that they are actually two mitzvot. The Rambam says, no, you should know, **"even though one doesn't invalidate the other"**, even though the techelet and the white don't invalidate each other, they are nevertheless not completely two mitzvot.

It is regarding the counting of the mitzvot, or regarding that if a person approaches to perform two mitzvot, he will perform, he won't count two. Rather the mitzvah is one mitzvah, **"behold it is one positive commandment, and one who wears a garment that has white or techelet or both together has fulfilled one positive**

commandment". If one has performed one mitzvah, it is only one mitzvah that has two parts.

Discussion: What is the practical difference?

Speaker 2: What is the practical difference other than for counting the mitzvot? Or perhaps that one only makes one blessing?

Speaker 1: No, for example, let's say, it could be relevant for example to a question of a mitzvah that comes through a transgression, or I mean, a positive commandment overrides a negative commandment, perhaps there is a practical difference whether it's two or one mitzvah?

Speaker 2: Yes, I think that two positive commandments won't be easier to override.

Speaker 1: No, but a positive and a negative commandment. I don't know if two helps.

Um, not clear. The Rambam apparently understood that it means regarding the counting of the mitzvot, because he brings it in his Sefer HaMitzvot.

Speaker 2: Okay, why did he need to bring it here? Because it is something. He brings the entire counting of the mitzvot all the time, what? He says yes, he wants to count.

Okay.

Speaker 1: He says that both are ultimately the matter of remembering the **"in order that you remember and do"**. That was his explanation in Sefer HaMitzvot how it can be that two different things are one mitzvah. He says because they're not two different things, it's the same type of thing. Because it's not just the purpose, it's also the same type of thing.

Speaker 2: Very strong.

Speaker 1: Right, but the purpose isn't enough, because tefillin is still an extra mitzvah. Because it's a different act of the mitzvah. When it's the same act of the mitzvah and it's the same purpose, even if there are two colors in it, it's one mitzvah. So what does invalidate? Four tzitzit, four tzitzit invalidate one another, that is that a garment...

Laws of Tzitzit: The Order of Making Tzitzit – Placement, Threads, Windings and Coils

Law 11 – Four Tzitzit Invalidate One Another

Speaker 1: He says, because it's not the only thing, because it's the same type of thing. Because it's not just the purpose, it's also the same type of thing, it's a string.

Right, but the purpose isn't enough, because tefillin is still an extra mitzvah. That's a different act of the mitzvah. When it's the same act of the mitzvah and it's the same purpose, even if there are two commandments in it, it's one mitzvah.

What does invalidate? **"And four tzitzit invalidate one another."** That is that a garment that is obligated in tzitzit, that has four sides that receive tzitzit, all four invalidate one another. There can't be only one tzitzit without three of its corners. That's not good.

Law 12 – How Does One Make the Tzitzit: Placement, Threads and Measurements

The Rambam says, **"How does one make the tzitzit?"**

Okay, so we're going to learn. We're speaking more practically how one makes the tzitzit.

The Rambam says, **"One begins from the edge of the garment which is the end of the weaving,"** one begins

with the corner of the garment, which is the end of the woven, of the knitted merchandise, **"and distances from it no more than three fingers upward."** From the corner one goes three fingers, no more than three fingers, **"and no less than the joint of the thumb."** Thumb means the finger, but what does a joint of the thumb mean? As long as it would come out as merchandise when one wraps it around the thumb? The joint of a thumb? Or does the joint of the thumb mean the bone of the thumb? Yes, joint means the bone, so he says, the joints of the fingers. Yes. **"And inserts there four threads."** At the corner, that is the three fingers away from the corner, there one inserts, somehow one makes a hole, he doesn't say it yet, there one places four threads.

By the way, we already said that the number of threads is not from the Torah. He now writes practically how Jews do it, one places four threads. One actually doubles it, one folds it. It comes out that now it's from the... presumably a hole, he doesn't say that one makes a hole, but now comes out from both sides four, so it turns out that eight threads hang out. **"Hanging from the corner,"** they hang from the garment, no?

Speaker 2: No, from the corner of the...

Speaker 1: From the corner of the threads.

Speaker 2: From the corner of the garment, yes yes.

Speaker 1: Ah, from the corner, yes yes, four corners, it's like four corners.

Speaker 2: Yes, a corner, yes. It should turn into four corners, for remember this day.

Speaker 1: Yes. The Rambam says, **"and the length of the eight threads,"** the eight threads, how long must they be? They may not be shorter than four fingers. But if they were longer than that, longer doesn't matter, **"even a cubit or two,"** on the contrary. **"We don't care."** Fine.

Speaker 2: Difficult.

Discussion: Which Fingers?

Speaker 1: The Rambam says further, when one says... difficult is the question. The Rambam says further, and when I tell you... um... earlier he said three fingers, but here the length of the threads is not less than four fingers. Which fingers? My thumb, the finger that's called the thumb, and when four fingers means four times the thumb.

Law 12 (Continued) – Thread of Techelet: Rambam's Opinion vs. Raavad

"And one of the eight threads should be a thread of techelet, and the seven white." Further, how should the mitzvah be? That one of the eight threads should be a thread of techelet, all the others should be white.

Yes, it comes out that according to the Rambam one only makes half a thread of techelet. Why? Because eight it becomes only after one folds it, right? This comes out very interesting, so that the Rambam shouldn't be one of the eight stands, that one places a strand of techelet on the large one, not on the large one, on the branch. It comes out that he means to say half a thread of techelet, because the other half, yes, makes only one of seven, one of eight, one strand of techelet according to the Rambam. Right?

Therefore the holy Raavad says that it's a mistake. **"Abraham said,"** yes, you see how it is.

Speaker 2: But one must make before that, one of the four must be.

Speaker 1: "Abraham said, this is an error, rather two of techelet and six white." There are all sorts of claims how one interprets the Gemara and so forth, but this is the opinion of the holy Raavad, that one must make a whole thread on... not half a thread. The Rambam doesn't say half a thread, he says that one of the eight is techelet. Which is obvious that according to this it comes out that one only colors half a thread with techelet, not a whole one.

Speaker 2: One colors it after it's already hanging on the garment?

Speaker 1: No, it's a thread when one colors it. One colors half and hangs it up.

Speaker 2: Yes, that's right.

Speaker 1: Yes. Okay. Further the Rambam says...

The Rambam himself was asked whether it's true that this is what one does. He said clearly that this is what he means to say that one cuts one of the eight, not one of the four. One dyes half a thread.

Speaker 2: Yes. Okay. Yes.

Law 13 – The Order of Windings and Coils

Speaker 1: What does one do after one has already placed all four threads in the garment?

Yes, and afterwards one takes one of the white threads, and binds it around one winding around the rest of the threads next to the garment, and leaves it. That is, one places it in... it hasn't yet been said that there's a hole. How does one place it in the garment?

Speaker 2: Obviously with a hole, what's the question?

Speaker 1: A hole. And hangs, he told you "inserts there". And one of the threads is the...

Speaker 2: One must understand that the old garments were always full of holes.

Speaker 1: Ah, one must understand that they took such weak merchandise and one pushes it through. Okay? I don't know. Okay.

And in short, one makes one winding of white on the other threads and leaves it. Afterwards, yes?

Speaker 2: And afterwards one takes the thread of techelet, the one that is techelet, **"and winds with it two windings next to the winding of white and ties."** One binds around two windings next to the winding of white, the first winding that was just mentioned, and ties, and makes a knot.

Speaker 1: "And these three windings are called a coil." The three windings together are called a coil.

Okay. The coil is some sort of design that one makes on the tzitzit. Apparently it's a matter of how one beautifies the tzitzit.

"And distances a bit," after the first coil that was made, after the first three windings, one leaves a bit of empty space, **"and makes a second coil with the thread of techelet alone,"** on the techelet alone. With the techelet alone, that is he wraps the techelet around three times. Apparently, the first one he made one white, he began with white, and afterwards he places techelet. The second and the third and so on he makes everything only techelet, except for the last one.

"And distances a bit and makes a third coil and so on until the last coil in which he winds two windings of techelet and one last winding of white. And because he began with white he ends with it, for we ascend in holiness and do not descend."

So in total, he doesn't say how many windings one should make, how many coils one should make. Since he said, he doesn't say how many. But the first and the last are white. The first and the last three, yes. The coils means, the windings of techelet alone, which are called a coil, groups of three. The first however one makes white, and the last white.

Translation of "We Ascend in Holiness and Do Not Descend"

The Rambam says why? Why does one end with white? **"For we ascend in holiness and do not descend."** What does it mean? We ascend in holiness and do not descend. Which is holier, the techelet or the white? Should they be the same holiness, the same mitzvah, one mitzvah that has two parts? We ascend in holiness and do not descend.

The point is, what does the Rambam say? **"Since he began with white he ends with it."** Since he began with white, it wouldn't be fitting that he shouldn't end with it. He began with white, he took the white, he gave it a nice thing, he gave the winding. He didn't say at all that he began with white, that he began with techelet, and he completely abandoned it, that he was descending. No, he said that one should return, end with it also, that one should finish. That's the meaning of we ascend in holiness and do not descend.

That's the meaning of we ascend in holiness and do not descend. One doesn't throw away a mitzvah. No, we ascend in holiness and do not descend, one doesn't take it down. The white shouldn't become completely embarrassed, one doesn't put it down, that it should become nothing, through the fact that one began to use it. Because so one must end with it also.

Why Does One Begin with White?

If so, why does one begin? That's the house of the question. All the questioners ask why does one begin with white? The Rambam says, **"so that it should be adjacent to the corner of its kind."** The garment is a garment of white, the closest to the garment should be white. **"And in this way one should do on the four corners."** And so by all four sides should be the manner, that one begins and ends with white etc.

Raavad's Objection to This Order

The Raavad says that he has no satisfaction with the entire order. He says that the order has **"neither root nor branch,"** not even seen from anywhere a branch. The Raavad says that this has neither root nor branch, it doesn't make sense. The Raavad says on the point that the Rambam says that one begins with white and ends with white, the Raavad says that he doesn't understand, in practice he made much more techelet than white. You're making a mockery of me, you tell me that you're saving the white by ending with it? The Raavad says that it's very strange.

So automatically, the Raavad brought from Rav Natronai a different order. What is the different order? That one makes... ah... seven coils... I don't have the strength how he says one should make it. He makes much more white apparently according to the Raavad, so it must be. The Raavad has a

different approach to coils. You have many many opinions in coils, especially with techelet and white.

Now, but what is the meaning? What does the Raavad say however what one should do? The Raavad claims that one makes all the coils together, both together. That the coil is together a thread of techelet with a thread of white, and one also added a knot from above, that the knot is made of techelet with white. It comes out with this six windings. I don't know how it becomes six. Ah, six windings, it becomes he always uses both. It comes out that each coil is six, not three. According to the Raavad. That's the Raavad's interpretation. The Raavad has other interpretations. The main point of dispute between the Rambam and Raavad is that the Raavad

Laws of Tzitzit – Dispute of Rambam and Raavad, Customs of Coils, and Twisting of Threads

Dispute of Rambam and Raavad in Windings

Speaker 1: And he also added a knot from above, that the knot is made of techelet with white. It comes out with this six windings. What does six windings mean? An entire order of two both. It comes out that each coil is six, not three, according to the Raavad. That's the Raavad's interpretation, that the Raavad has a different interpretation.

The Main Point of Dispute

And the main point of dispute between the Rambam and the Raavad is that the Rambam makes exactly half and half, meaning two windings of white and two windings of techelet, and the whole thing is three, what is this four? But a part of it is white. So according to the Rambam he doesn't use any white essentially. That's the main difference.

Upper Knot – Rambam vs. Raavad

And there's another difference, he adds a knot, and other things. The Raavad, you noticed that the Rambam doesn't say at all that one ties before the windings. The Rambam doesn't say at all that one ties the tzitzit to the garment. One only ties after the windings, one gives a knot on the coil, he ties, but he doesn't tie the tzitzit to the garment at all. Such a thing doesn't appear in the Rambam.

That's a bit of a problem, because in the Gemara something is mentioned that's called an upper knot, the first knot. That's what the Raavad wants to fix, one of the things he wants to fix. But the Rambam doesn't have that version. The Rambam learns upper knot, he means the first coil, there he makes a knot. Not next to it.

How Many Coils Does One Make – Law 8

Speaker 1: Shalom, so the Rambam continues, **"How many coils does one make on each and every corner?"** Ah, that's how one makes the coil, but how many coils does one make? The Rambam says, **"One should not make less than seven nor add more than thirteen"**, somewhere between seven and thirteen. **"And this is the optimal mitzvah"**.

Optimal mitzvah perhaps means to say thirteen? One needs optimal mitzvah that it should be somewhere between the numbers. Well? Maybe, I even thought, optimal mitzvah is to make thirteen. Aha. I don't know. Not less than seven. Yes.

It's all hints of something. **"One who reduces"**, it says in a Baraita, **"should not reduce from seven, corresponding to the seven heavens, and one who adds should not add more than thirteen"** – what is **"and should not add**

more than thirteen"? "Corresponding to the seven heavens and the six spaces between them" – between each heaven there is air, it comes out thirteen, yes?

So he says, he brings from Questions and Answers that the optimal mitzvah is that it should be between seven and thirteen, not that thirteen is the optimal mitzvah.

Post Facto – One Coil is Valid

Ah, and afterwards he goes to say what is post facto. **"And if one only wound one coil, behold it is valid."** If one only made one coil, it's also valid. **"And if one wound coils on most of the tzitzit, behold it is valid."** That is, he didn't only make coils, but he made even more, he made coils on most of the tzitzit, it's also valid. But the whole thing is so, the whole topic of coils is a nice design that one makes as an optimal mitzvah.

One Third Windings, Two Thirds Fringe

"And most of the beauty of the coils", the beauty of the coils is **"that all the coils should be on one third of the hanging threads, and two thirds fringe"**. That is, the beauty goes to the next thing, how much of the tzitzit does one make the threads, yes? If one makes this on the majority it's valid, but nice is what? By the third. **"That all the coils should be on one third of the hanging threads, and two thirds fringe"**. That two thirds of fringe should stick out after the windings.

It's approximately like our tzitzit, yes? That first there are all the windings, and afterwards there's another two thirds of tzitzit. Our tzitzit, everyone makes what they want. Most tzitzit that people have are much too long, it's much more than two thirds. True. And it's not nice, one must cut it. I'm going to look at you to see that it's much more than two thirds.

Speaker 2: What?

Speaker 1: No, it's not much more than two thirds. Fold it, give it a fold. One, two, a bit more. It's two thirds. Okay. Further. It's not so long at all, I don't know.

Laws of Tzitzit: Twisting, Spinning for the Sake of the Mitzvah, Quality of Wool, and Invalidations

What was stated that the measurement should be? The measurement should be what? How long should it be? Four fingerbreadths. **"And if it's more than that, it has validity."** Okay.

White Without Techelet – Law 9

This is thus far in order regarding the making with techelet, what they need to do, we're going with techelet. What about someone who doesn't have techelet? Says the Rambam, he makes white without techelet, and someone goes and makes white because he doesn't have techelet, yes, unfortunately he's in exile, he doesn't know how to make techelet, or it costs him too much, I don't know what and the like, yes, because he's afraid someone will think or look at him, he looks at him with the mitzvah.

He takes one of the eight threads, takes one from the eight threads, and wraps it around the rest of the threads, and leaves two-thirds hanging. That means, he doesn't have techelet? He uses a white thread, a white thread, to make the wrappings, he wraps, makes the wrappings, and leaves two-thirds hanging – leaves hanging two-thirds. The same thing as we saw.

"And this wrapping, if he wants to wrap, he makes sections" – he can wrap in sections, if one wants to make

sections from the white itself, one can do so. **"And the choice is his,"** is the Rambam's position. We also conduct ourselves that when we have white without techelet, we also make sections. **"And if he wants to wrap without a count of sections"** – one can do so, when it's white alone one doesn't have to make sections.

"The general principle." The general principle, he should intend that the bound part should be one-third, what is free, from the entire part should be two-thirds. This the Rambam wants to be particular about, even with white that the majority should be two-thirds. Yes.

"And there is one who is not particular about this matter with white" – if one wants to wrap on the majority of the threads, rather than wrap itself, it's also still valid. Yes, it's still valid even with white. **"And if he wrapped the white on the majority of the threads"** – it's valid. Yes. I want to say, people know that we, we doubt, we have the custom, we have a custom to make five sections.

Our Custom of Five Knots

Speaker 1: People call knots and sections different things, it seems to me that the simple meaning is the same thing. That is, by us it's established that we make seven and eight, 11, 13 wrappings, and between each one we make a knot. So, 7, 8, 11, 13 wrappings, and between five knots one from the other. The Rosh already brings this custom that one makes five knots, sections corresponding to the five books of the Torah, and other allusions.

Are Our Wrappings Already Sections?

It seems to me, I would have thought that in any case, that itself is the sections. If one says sections, in the Gemara it says three, okay, our custom is to make 7, 8, 11, 13 sections. That is actually sections. Not that the sections are additional small... no, afterwards there are people, there are customs in Chabad, in Skver, I don't know exactly who, who are particular that besides that they also make the sections, and they make it so clearly, they make approximately another knot. Besides that, every three he makes some kind of small knot, which means it should be a section, and then he makes both.

I don't know, it seems to us that it's some kind of doubling of the same thing. The sections, we already make sections. That is the sections. When one makes pieces, and so it's nice. That is our sections. The sections that the customs make is something else. And if one wants to make that, one doesn't need to make the knots, rather one then makes the knots. It doesn't work out to make both.

But anyway, the custom of the Jews is indeed to make both. I'm not saying. But seemingly, one should agree with me, I think you're saying yes, yes. That is the sections. Sections comes with a wrapping and then a knot. That's the meaning.

Okay. It's an interesting thing, because for example, there is, you can buy techelet tzitzit according to the position of the Rambam, and they have there with sections on the side. It's according to the position of the Rambam, and there are also Skver sections or such sections. Did I misspeak? No.

So the store makes tzitzit according to the position of the Rambam, that the entire thing is a section, and all these pieces are sections, yes. But on that he makes additional small side sections like that... yes, but it could be that the Rambam understood it that way. It's a position in the Rambam, that

Skver is a position in the Rambam. So, so it comes to us, so there are words.

Sections Are Not Indispensable

So, master of the house, the entire sections are not indispensable at all. We use the same Rambam who says one makes it, and seemingly, I just want to say, what we do, not Chabad, the normal majority of Jews who make, do the Rambam. Because it's a matter to make wrappings nicely even with white. The main matter of wrappings is that the techelet is wrapped on the white, but it's a nice thing also to make just with white, one makes that.

Others want to interpret that our custom holds that this is the meaning of wrappings and sections, the... that's a different custom. There are different groups, every three, okay, he holds that way.

Techelet With Our Custom

He says, if someone has, he holds that he doesn't want to trust the techelet, he doesn't put in techelet, then certainly he can still do our custom and make normal tzitzit, he doesn't need to change his method of tying the tzitzit because he's going with techelet.

And our custom is already made that one makes sections with techelet, **"and so I practice"** – he's Lithuanian presumably, he doesn't have any issues – I put techelet and I make it the same valid as my father is valid, I make it like the Rambam, one white and the rest techelet, as the Rambam said, and that's it. I don't see any great reason why one should need to change the tying because one has techelet. We already make it this way, I don't see any great reason to change.

Though by us, the white that one winds around over all the sections is what would have needed to be the techelet that... except for the first and the last, which the Rambam says one should make the first and the last white. So we conduct ourselves that way, I don't see why one should need to add the Skver matter because one has techelet. If someone wants to make that just like that, he can perhaps, it's a nice thing, I know. Or one can do entirely as the Rambam says, and not make five at all. There are other friends who do so, they make winding with seven or with thirteen, other numbers also, everything. It's actually in the Baraita, **"the nicest of them is seven."** Okay, I'm certainly not indispensable. Yes? Do you understand what I'm saying? Yes. Okay.

Threads – Twisted – Law 10

Speaker 1: Now we're going to learn how to make the threads, as it says in my chapter. Do you agree? Yes. One can say so. Says the Rambam further: **"One white thread and one thread of techelet, if he wants to make them twisted..."**

Twisted means wound? How does one say twisted? Wound together, yes? **"Six-stranded"** we translated by us, twisted six. Our tzitzit is twisted, yes? Yes, seemingly. He makes. Twisted means it's not just one way, that it's open threads. If one makes such a bundle of threads that are sewn together, he makes, one can make so, like our tzitzit is. Yes. It became understood that way to make it. Right. Ah.

Here comes the word, double. **"Even if the thread was double"** – double threads. But if it's good, twisted means like one? The word is so. Ah. Each thread is a thread by itself. But if it's wound together from many threads it's good.

Laws of Tzitzit: Twisting, Spinning for the Sake of the Mitzvah, Quality of Wool, and Invalidations

Law 10: Twisting – Double from Eight Threads

Speaker 1: Twisting means it's not just one thread, but that it's many open threads.

If one makes a bundle of threads that are wound together, "he makes" one can make so, like our tzitzit is. One doesn't need to make it specifically... ah, here comes the word **"double eight."** **"Even if a thread was doubled from eight threads, but if it's good twisted, it's called like one"...** the word is so, that the essence, each thread is a thread by itself. But if it's wound together from many threads, but now that's called the thread, and it doesn't look like many threads, it's composed of eight threads, but it doesn't stand out, rather that is now the thread, **"it's only considered one thread."**

Says the Rambam further a new law of spinning for the sake of the mitzvah. Ah, that means, you might have thought that when one winds together, one already now has eight threads? No. Those are eight threads, regarding the eight threads that is one thread. One needs to have eight of that. No.

Law 11: Spinning for the Sake of the Mitzvah

Speaker 1: Says the Rambam further, **"the threads of tzitzit,"** the threads that one uses at the corner of the tzitzit, **"whether white or techelet, need to be spun for the sake of tzitzit."** It needs to be spun, it needs to be assembled for the sake of tzitzit. That the person who makes it should do it for the sake of tzitzit.

Discussion: What Does "For Its Sake" Mean?

Speaker 2: Okay, good.

Speaker 1: Says the Rambam also from which type of wool one does it. One needs to do it from good quality wool, or important wool. **"From when does one not make it? Not from the wool that clings to thorns when the sheep lie among them."** There's a way of getting wool through... the fields have thorns, and there people get stuck. The ram... the male gets stuck there, yes. Or there it was on his large horns. Okay. Wool catches everywhere on the thorns, and someone goes around afterwards and he gathers all the wool, literally he goes down to the thorns and he pulls out from there the... extracting the precious from the worthless, and he wants to make with that tzitzit, from these pieces of merchandise. It's not good, because seemingly it's not important enough. Like some kind of leket, shichecha, peah, it's so begged a piece of wool.

Speaker 2: It's not for its sake, it's after the fact it's not for its sake.

Speaker 1: No, not... not for its sake.

Speaker 2: No, we're talking here about the spinning and further. The wool isn't yet spun.

Speaker 1: It means one needs to cut from the animal for its sake?

Speaker 2: Perhaps yes, perhaps yes. Spinning means spinning should be, it doesn't mean form.

Speaker 1: It's interesting, but yes, that this is still being discussed. I don't know. Mean thorns. So learns the Rambam. It could be yes. Ah, it could be that simply it's not a nice thing. The only real thing of for its sake, it's not serious wool, not good wool. So it comes in, it depends what is the meaning of

for its sake. Remember they argued and spoke in the laws of tefillin.

Speaker 2: You mean to say, for its sake means it should be good quality.

Speaker 1: Yes, for its sake means one should make. What do you mean at all?

Speaker 2: Right, you call in the scribe, what will you tell him? I don't want a forced one, I want tzitzit. You should send me good threads.

Speaker 1: Right. So it could be that for its sake is not the meaning that you need to have in mind, the one who makes it needs to know that he's making tzitzit, that it's a mitzvah. For its sake means for the sake of an important thing, it should be tzitzit. Not for the sake of the mitzvah of tzitzit. It should be a thing that has good... that is made from good... so one could have thought, yes.

Invalidations from Inferior Wool

Speaker 1: Okay. "**Why wool,**" another type of wool, "**the fibers that are plucked from the animal.**" When one combs out the animal, pieces of merchandise come off. "**And not from the remnants that remain at the end of the shearing.**" When one finishes the shearing, one wants to make it smooth, one cuts off the ends. "**Rather from the shearing of wool or from the flax.**" It needs to be made from original, from good pieces of merchandise. One sheared an animal, wool or flax, and from there he makes it. By flax there's no animal, the flax grows, linen. Ah, he says this is because of "This is my God and I will beautify Him." You say, he brings it there from certain...

Speaker 2: In other places it says because of disgrace of the mitzvah. I mean it's interesting that the Rambam put it under the category of for its sake. It's interesting so. Not obligatory. He says it needs to be for its sake, but not all these things. I would have thought it's similar to the law of for its sake.

Speaker 1: It needs to be original, not recycled, not second-hand. But second-hand also doesn't mean some matter of thoughts. It's more a matter of... what would I have thought. One sees it in action literally. Say the Rambam and further...

Law 11 (Continued): Invalidations — Theft, Idolatry, Sacred Items

Speaker 1: Other things that one doesn't make from them tzitzit. And I carry... first he said those that are weak quality, or are disgraceful. Now we're going to say things that are invalid, because... that are... looked down upon, are... disqualified, are... trouble. "**And I carry, whether wool or**" that was stolen, "**and whether it's already or in a state**" that the law is because one needs to burn it through which it's forbidden. "**Or sacred items,**" also this one may not use sacred items, and one may not commit me'ilah. All these things we may not, if it becomes a mitzvah performed through a transgression. Therefore this is invalid.

Discussion: One Who Bows to an Animal — Why Is the Wool Invalid?

Speaker 1: Why sometimes there was an action of a Jew, was forgiven, it doesn't hold enough, he gave himself over to bow to an animal. One can see it in a certain time every week, from the mothers of others. Therefore. The wool is invalid for tzitzit. Yes. One can do nothing, if the animal has now become of lesser value. Because now not that one can use its wool for tzitzit. Aha.

Speaker 2: They learned afterwards idolatry, that one can make a living thing for idolatry. Yes, an animal. They taught you explicitly that don't you remember? Don't you remember afterwards idolatry? What was stated about this? Yes. Grasping of their hands. Yes. They didn't state explicitly about an animal? What was stated about an animal in which idolatry? I mean there it says... no, how am I here? Idolatry chapter 8 law 1. No. Idolatry chapter 8 law 1. What does it say afterwards idolatry chapter 8 law 1? What does the Rambam say there he says so... one doesn't forbid it. Once you've slaughtered it, one doesn't forbid it.

Speaker 1: An animal. You say you stated explicitly an animal? An animal one also cannot. It remains with eating. But for a mitzvah not. That's something... but for a mitzvah. Ah, wait, I'm looking for it here. But I don't see that the Rambam in the laws of idolatry should say some distinction between for a mitzvah. No, there he doesn't bring it. Here he brings it. But that it should be a mitzvah, it's not a tree of prohibition. It's not because... I explained why it's a tree of prohibition, because an animal belongs to itself. An animal is not... yes, that's the word. An animal is like a vessel in the grasp of human hands. But for a mitzvah it doesn't fit. Interesting. So...

One Who Bows to an Animal vs. One Who Bows to Flax — "It Changed"

Speaker 1: Well, good. So "**one who bows to an animal, the wool from it is invalid for tzitzit. But one who bows to flax or a plant,**" and even one went and cut down the flax, he asks the question, "**for it has changed.**" Why has it become changed? Why isn't the wool changed when one cut it from the animal? Why doesn't the cutting from the animal mean it changed? Not such a big difference, so it seems. Like planted, it's the same difference. He brings that the flax is "**initially a tree and now a thread.**" But wool is still wool. People say that sheep have wool on them. They don't say that a tree, whatever, isn't a tree, it's a flax plant, not cotton. Flax is linen, yes. It's a thing that grows. It looks different. It's more of a change.

Speaker 2: Have you ever seen how flax grows? Yes, yes. How?

Speaker 1: I haven't seen. How does it look?

Speaker 2: Flax is cotton.

Speaker 1: Flax is not cotton, righteous one. Flax is flax. Cotton balls, that's what you mean. Flax is not cotton. Flax looks like this when it grows. And what does one make from flax? Flax! Linen!

Speaker 2: No. What do you mean no? Flax is linen. It looks like this. Flax is linen.

Speaker 1: No, cotton is not flax. Flax is flax. Cotton is something else, it doesn't come in here at all. Flax is it's a flower. Do me a favor, hello, please. Flax is not cotton. Flax is linen. Wool and flax, nothing cotton is not wool and flax, it doesn't come in here at all. It's a thing, it looks like a flower, it doesn't look like a thing that grows. I mean, one doesn't make it from the flower, one makes it from the... from the... what's it called... from the stalks one makes flax. But it looks completely different.

Speaker 2: Well, do you see that it looks different, isn't it an argument?

Speaker 1: It's different, it looks completely different. So already, so automatically it's more not an argument.

It's also no prohibition. It fits very well, because the prohibition is that one shouldn't say, "Ah, the idol became tzitzit." It doesn't fit. But the thing that from the tree the person served, ah, no one remembers.

Law 12: Tzitzit That a Non-Jew Made — Proof That "For Its Sake" Doesn't Mean Intent

Speaker 1: So, the Rema says further, we said that tzitzis must be made lishmah. "**Tzitzis she'asah goy, techilah, pasul, shene'emar 'daber el bnei Yisrael v'asu lahem tzitzis**". That is, Jews should make the tzitzis. That is, why doesn't he say that it's invalid because a non-Jew cannot make it lishmah, as he said regarding other things? Do you see what? That lishmah means as the commentators struggle with this question.

But by tefillin we did have that a non-Jew, we don't trust him that he does it with a... he looks at it like all other things. Do you remember that thing? It was stated so in Hilchos Kiddush Hashem regarding a sefer sheksavo min, it wasn't stated in Hilchos Sefer Torah, but that's how we learned there. But here we're not talking, here there's no thing that needs to be written, it's tzitzis. A non-Jew may not make tzitzis because it says "bnei Yisrael", not a non-Jew.

That's all. But "**aval im asah Yisrael b'lo kavanah kesheirah**". You see clearly that when we say lishmah, it doesn't make sense. You can't say the spinning must be lishmah but the making doesn't need to be lishmah, it doesn't make sense. We must say as we said the simple explanation, that spinning lishmah means to say that it should be the important thing for the sake of tzitzis, not some rope that's cut with a sword. A non-Jew doesn't make tzitzis, it's a non-Jew's thing.

Transition to Hilchos Ta'aroves

Speaker 1: The next few laws are on the topic of ta'aroves (mixtures).

Hilchos Ta'aseh V'lo Min Ha'asuy in Tzitzis

Introduction: The Basic Law of Ta'aseh V'lo Min Ha'asuy

The next few laws are on the topic of ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy. This is an introduction that one should make tzitzis, that one must ensure that it doesn't happen by itself. When one makes it for the sake of the mitzvah, then one should make it.

It's a matter of intention, that one should make it directly. It must be a garment or a house, and on that one places tzitzis, not that it's ready-made. Ready-made is not a way.

There is this concept of ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy also for a sukkah, by mezuzah, many times there is ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy.

Halachah 12: Tzitzis She'na'aseh Min Ha'asuy Pesulah

The Rambam says thus: **Tzitzis she'na'aseh min ha'asuy mikodeim, tzitzis that one designates now that it should be tzitzis, but essentially it's already sewn, it's already made, is invalid.**

The Rambam explains it, for example, **keitzad? Heivi kanaf sheyeish bo tzitzis, he brings a corner of a garment that has tzitzis, u'sefaro al habegad, and he sewed it onto a garment.** He cut off the entire small corner with the tzitzis, and he sewed it onto the garment together with the

tzitzis. He sewed the tzitzis from an arba kanfos with tzitzis, and it's sewn onto a garment, and now the garment has tzitzis.

Afilu yeish bo kanaf amah al amah, even if the corner itself is an amah by an amah, which you might perhaps think that this is itself a garment, it is nevertheless invalid, shene'emar "v'asu lahem tzitzis", they should make tzitzis, lo min ha'asuy, one cannot fulfill the mitzvah of tzitzis when one brings a garment that already has tzitzis and connects it and makes it become a garment. Harei zeh domeh l'mi shena'aseh mei'elav, it's as if someone made it by itself. So too what became, it became by itself.

Halachah 13: Matir Tzitzis Mibegad Zeh V'nosnan L'vegad Acher

Umutar l'hatir tzitzis mibegad zeh v'lislosan b'vegad acher, bein lavan bein techeles.

Further he says, that there's an opinion that everything is ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy, one may not do this either. He says that this one may do. What may one do? With removing tzitzis from a second garment? From another garment, may he remove the tzitzis from one garment and use the attached tzitzis on another garment? Because that's not called ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy.

Discussion: The Rambam's Position in This Law

Yes, it's interesting, the Rambam puts it in this category. Apparently in the Gemara it's brought more in the context that it's a disgrace, it's not fitting to do such a thing with kodesh, and we don't lower. It's clearly not fitting such a sort of thing. But the Rambam puts it in that yes, it makes sense, you can't... if you want to take, in short, if you want to take tzitzis from one garment and put it on a second, you must tear off... not tear, but open up the entire tzitzis and put it on the next one, not put the piece of garment that would make the work easier for you. But that's not done.

Speaker 2: Yes. Ah, good.

Halachah 14: Talah Chutim Mishtei Kanfos Zo Lazo

Talah chutim mishtei kanfos zo lazo, he has a garment and between the two corners there are strings. He put... instead of putting two pieces, he thought he'd make it easier anyway. What the point is, he took instead of putting one string on the corner and then a second, he put a long string, he already put it in both, and afterwards he'll give it a cut in the middle.

Speaker 2: Ah, the tzitzis is one long tzitzis.

And afterwards he'll cut it. **Even if he said he'll cut it, it's invalid.** Why? **Because he already tied the tzitzis, he already made the whole thing of tzitzis, and at the time when he tied them, when he made the knots, it was invalid, because the two corners are connected to each other through the strings between them.**

Discussion: Why Is It Invalid?

Speaker 2: Ah, interesting. There weren't four corners. Not that the tzitzis wasn't good, but there weren't four corners, which means like one.

Yes, he has two corners close to each other through the strings between them. And at the time when they were cut, two tzitzis were made. I think he means the garment, a garment, tzitzis must be separate for each of the

corners. A garment where both are together is not kosher. So, it's understood that way.

Speaker 2: Perhaps he means to say the tzitzis she'al hakanaf, perhaps he means the two corners, the two strings...

I understand what you're saying, but I would have thought perhaps... don't know. The point is that it's invalid this way, tzitzis is not kosher this way, that's the point. Therefore when he makes it, he doesn't put the tzitzis then, he already put the tzitzis earlier, so it's ready-made.

Halachah 15: Nasan Tzitzis Al Tzitzis — Mechaven L'vatel vs. L'hosif

Further the Raavad says, he put tzitzis on tzitzis, he put on the same corner where there's already tzitzis, he puts more tzitzis. So when **he intends to nullify the first one, that with what he puts now the current one should become the tzitzis and the previous one should be nullified, he nullifies the first one, and he can remove the first one, the previous original tzitzis. And then it's kosher.**

But **when he intends to add, when he added more tzitzis he had in mind that he wants to add, he doesn't want to fulfill the mitzvah from the Torah to put just a few tzitzis, but he wants to put double, he wants to put... and that's not allowed, because it's bal tosfif.** But there are eight and not two, he begins to invalidate. Why? He writes "**keshehu mosif posel es hakol**". **When he added more strings he invalidated everything.** Why? Because for him it's bal tosfif.

Innovation: The Difference Between During the Act and Afterwards

It's very interesting, because originally he said that the number of strings has no mitzvah from the Torah, has no relevance. But that's once, but one can't make, because whatever one makes is kosher. Afterwards you add more, it's simply that means to add, because it already had, that already meant four tzitzis, not five tzitzis, not five corners, not five branches, whatever yes. Therefore it then becomes invalidated.

Ah, so he says, that the branch doesn't mean any difference how many pieces, it's called a branch. But the branch becomes one branch when it's made. So, something like that. He makes two, and because at the time it's made it becomes invalid, the entire garment becomes invalid. Interesting that it becomes invalid, but that's what he says. And he cuts it, takes it off, it's not made from the ready-made, because the first making was invalid. There's no way how it becomes now, but the whole thing is invalid.

The Raavad there's a dispute, he says that such a thing doesn't appear in the Gemara. And we don't have the nerves to learn the Gemara and find out who's right, so, we skipped the Raavad. The Raavad says that he looked in the Gemara and he didn't see. But the Raavad didn't look here in the room, that here in the room everyone doesn't have nerves.

Speaker 2: Yes.

Halachah 16: Ba'alas Shalosh — Tzitzis on Three Corners

So therefore, **amar Rav Masna I'va'alas shalosh, if someone puts tzitzis on a garment that has only three corners, and afterwards one sewed the garment and sewed a third corner, and then one added to the third corner strings of tzitzis, strings for width, it's also**

invalid, it's ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy, because when one finished sewing there was already tzitzis.

Halachah 17: Ein Koflin Es Hatallis Lishnayim

And further, **ein koflin es hatallis lishnayim, one doesn't fold a tallis in two and doesn't put tzitzis on all four corners when it's folded.** That's not allowed. One may not fold together a tallis and then put, instead of putting on all four one can put on two.

Speaker 2: No, he actually means to say that you'll make a smaller tallis, that's how I understand. He'll make a smaller tallis, because he'll put on the four when it's folded, he'll put on those four corners, but not on the actual four corners as it were of the garment. **Unless he makes a light sewing, then yes, because then it's already truly become a new smaller garment, because he turned it and folded it already even from just one side.** Perhaps for some reason he doesn't want to put on the four actual garments, so he does, he'll sew out the system, he'll fold this and this will be the corners, this will be the... it's not good.

Okay.

Halachah 18: Nifsak Hakanaf Sheyeish Bo Hatzitzis

What if **the corner that has the tzitzis tore off? So if it's outside three fingers, then what?** Because we discussed that the tzitzis are three fingers away from the corner, so if it's away from there, then in practice you have enough space where to do it. **But within three, l'chatchilah one shouldn't do it that way.** What shouldn't one do within three? It becomes ta'aseh v'lo min ha'asuy? Do you know why? Let's think what's going on. What's the difference between within three or outside three?

Discussion: Why Is Within Three Different?

Speaker 2: What does it say in the braisa? In short, the reason is that...

It shows as if it means less than three fingers, but if so, why when there are three fingers does it still mean the whole garment? Something like that. What does it show? That's how one can say an explanation.

Speaker 2: No, I understand a different explanation. That if it's still if it's missing three fingers... I don't know. We'll think about it. The corner tore off. So if it's missing three fingers, one sews it in its place. That means now the corner, yes? Here it tears off, yes? If it's still in the three fingers, what does that mean now the corner?

No, he's not talking about that. He's talking simply, the entire corner with the tzitzis wore out. Now the corner with the tzitzis, he wants to sew back the whole piece? Yes.

Speaker 2: Ah.

That's how I understand, that's how I'm confused. I don't know. He sews it back in its place, he now sews back the piece on its place. So it's three, because that's three is like a minimum measure of a garment.

Speaker 2: Ah. So it doesn't mean that he has a... ah, fine so it's ready-made.

It doesn't make sense to me. Very funny.

That's what the person from the Kesef Mishneh says, I don't get it. There are some other reasons in the Gemara, so I don't understand clearly.

Yeriah Shel Begad Shenimat'atah — A Garment That Became Smaller

Afterwards, let's see the next halachah, perhaps the next halachah. **Yeriah shel begad shemit'et hatzitzis b'sof ha'arig, it became smaller. On the side next to where the tzitzis, the part of the garment fell off.** Even not with a regular culture, I swear, as long as you have a culture that connects the tzitzis to the garment. That's basically the point, right? That's the difference.

Halachah 18: Laws Regarding Tzitzis That Tore or Wore Out

Speaker 1:

There are some other reasons in the Gemara that I don't understand clearly. Afterwards let's see the next halachah, perhaps the next halachah is...

The Law When the Corner Tore

Speaker 1:

That one, **nifsak hakanaf sheyeish bah hatzitzis, outside three fingers** — if the corner of the garment, where the tzitzis is at the end of the weaving, it became smaller. It's the tzitzis, on the side of where the tzitzis is, some part of the garment fell off. **One sews it in its place** — even not torn from the strings of the tzitzis, as long as there's some connection that connects the tzitzis to the garment, that's basically the point, right? That's simply obvious.

Speaker 2:

I don't understand clearly.

Speaker 1:

Yes.

The Law When the Strings of the Tzitzis Wore Out

Speaker 1:

The next, say another halachah. **V'chein, im nitmat'u, strings of the tzitzis** — if some of the strings of the tzitzis tore off, **afilu lo nishtayer meihen ela k'dei anivah** — enough remained that one can make a knot from it — **kesheirah**. It doesn't need to be the entire long one.

Aval im nifsak hachut mei'ikaro — but if the string tore off completely from the garment — **afilu chut echad, pesulah**.

Question: Why Is It Invalid If It Tore From Its Root?

Speaker 1:

I have why you were taught that one doesn't need to bring the four strings. We don't know how the strings need to be in the tear, why is it invalid. I have come cold one string probably means the entire string together. It could be that it's not stated clearly. But okay. I don't know. Once one already put it that it's already the day of the heel? I don't know. I need to think. Good question.

You're asking why? He doesn't say why. Okay.