

# Wisdom in Upholding the Words of Chachamim

Chapter nine discusses in greater depth *tzara'at* of *shchin* (boils of inflammations) and *michva* (burns). This type of *tzara'at* sighting is only significant if the *nega* appears when the *shchin* or *michva* has already began to heal and a thin layer of skin has formed over them. This form of *tzara'at* differs from a regular skin affliction in that there are only two indications that the person is a *metzorah muchlat* (confirmed *metzorah*); the *nega* has spread or two white hairs have appeared.

A fascinating question is asked of *R' Eliezer* in the third *Mishnah*. What is the status of person if a *shchin* the size of a *sela* is found on the palm of a person's hand, containing a *nega* the same size? The problem is that hairs do not grow on the palm of the hand. Furthermore, spreading is only an indication of *tumah* if it spreads within the *shchin* and not onto the skin. In this case the *nega* has nowhere to spread. Consequently neither of the indications of *tumah* can occur, so why should *hesger* (isolation) be required?

*R' Eliezer* responds that it is possible that the *nega* might reduce in size (while greater than the minimum size of a *gris*). As the *nega* has not increase after the week of *hesger* the *kohen* will rule that he is *tahor*. The *nega* may then later spread again which would be an indication of *tumah*;<sup>1</sup> therefore *hesger* is necessary.<sup>2</sup> The *Mishnah Acharona* explains that those that asked knew of this possibility, they nonetheless wanted to know whether a double-doubt – that the *nega* would shrink then grow – still requires *hesger*.

This question was followed with an even more complex one. What if the *shchin* was originally the size of a *gris* and contained a *nega* of equal size? In this case, if the *nega* shrunk it would be smaller than the minimum size and if it later grew again it would

be treated as a new *nega*. In such a case, spreading is not an indication of *tumah*, as the *nega* must undergo *hesger* first. To this question, R' *Eliezer* responds, "I have not heard." The *Bartenura* explains that he had learnt from his teachers that in such a case the person must still undergo *hesger*, but R' *Eliezer* had not heard the reason why. The *Tifferet Yisrael* importantly adds that R' *Eliezer* never taught anything that he had not learnt explicitly from his teachers. It was possible that the rule was a *g'zeirat ha'katuv*, a decree authorised by the *Torah*, without a readily available logic to explain it.<sup>3</sup>

After gaining permission to speak, *R' Yehuda* offered a solution. He suggested that perhaps another *shchin* would develop next to the first and if the *nega* would spread to that one, then it would be an indication of *tumah*. *R' Eliezer* responded to the suggestion, "You are wise, for you upheld the words of the *Chachamim*."

There are two ways of understanding R' Eliezer response, both of which appear in the Tosfot Yom Tov. The second explanation provided is that R' Eliezer is stating that "You are exceedingly wise as you did not become overwhelmed or confused by the difficulties that stood to dismantle their words." From here we see that upholding the Chachamim's rule is the outcome, and the wisdom is the way R' Yehuda achieved it. The first explanation in the Tosfot Yom Tov however, is that "you are wiser than had you destroyed their words." One can understand that R'Yehuda ben Beteira's wisdom is found in his entire approach. Faced with the difficulty, he was singleminded in find the way of building and not destroying. Finding the truth and not dismissing it. "You upheld the words of the Chachamim" was the source of his wisdom.

#### Yisrael Yitzchak Bankier

*Yehuda ben Beteira* was reason for *hesger*. Therefore the ruling might be based on a doubt.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> As spreading after *p*'tur is a sign of tumah.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> As explained by the *Bartenura*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Alternatively the *Mishnah Acharona* adds that perhaps his teachers ruled that *hesger* was required as they were doubtful that reason provided by *R*'

## **Revision Questions**

נגעים חי :חי – יי :חי

- If *tzara'at* has covered a person, then receded and then covered again, when is the person *tameh* and when are they *tahor*? (n:n)
- What is the difference between a metzorah musgar and a metzorah muchlat? ('n: 'n)
- Explain the debate regarding a case where a person had *tzara'at* covering his body with a *michya*, and then it covered his body, and then receded from *roshei* eivarim? (n: :n)
- List two cases where a person ultimately was covered in *tzara'at* when presented to the *kohen*, where the hesitation in presenting resulted in stringency and a leniency. ('?:'n)
- What is *shchin*? (טי:אי)
- What is *michva?* (טי: אי)
- What are their indications of a *metzorah muchlat*? (טי:אי)
- Can *schin* and *michva* combine with each other? With a *nega* on skin? (v: : c')
- When specifically can *schin* and *michva* be *tameh* if a *nega* is found inside them?
  (ν: :c)
- What is the law regarding a *schin* that contains a *baheret* exactly its size? Why?
  ('λ: υ)
- What are the two indication of *tumah* for *netakim*? (י:אי)
- Explain the debate regarding the definition of "dak"? (י: אי)
- Explain the debate regarding the case whether the yellow hairs can precede the netek. (":c')
- Can the yellow hairs be scattered? On the edge of the *netek*? (": בי)
- What is the law if two black hairs are present in a *netek*? ('): '')
- How close from the edge of the *netek* must they be for the law to apply? (': :')
- Does the same law apply if a black and a white hair are present? (": :(")
- Explain the debate regarding whether yellow hairs that preceded the *netek* can have the same status as black hairs? (":")
- How (and when) is the *netek* shaved? (יי: הי)
- What is the law if a *netek* spreads then receded to what it was then spreads again?
  (":n)
- When are two *netakim*, side-by-side that combine, *tameh* and when are they *tahor*? ('): '')
- What other case is similar to the one in the previous question and how are they different? ('1: '')
- Explain the three opinions regarding a case of a *netek* that was *muchlat*, then black hairs appeared, then disappeared? (": ")

#### Local Shiurim

Sunday -Thursday After maariv <u>Mizrachi Shul</u>

Friday & Shabbat 10 minutes before mincha <u>Beit Ha'Roeh</u>

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	שבת קודש
4 <sup>th</sup> October ט׳ תשרי סוכות	5 <sup>th</sup> October יי תשרי	6 <sup>th</sup> October יייא תשרי	7 <sup>th</sup> October יייב תשרי	<sup>8<sup>th</sup> October יייג תשרי</sup>	9 <sup>th</sup> October יייד תשרי	10 <sup>th</sup> October טייו תשרי <b>שמיני עצרת</b>
Negaim 10:9-10	Negaim 11:1-2	Negaim 11:3-4	Negaim 11:5-6	Negaim 11:7-8	Negaim 11:9-10	Negaim 11:11- 12
						37

## Next Week's Mishnayot...