

## ספיחי סטים וקוצה - The after growth of <sup>1</sup>סטים וקוצה

### OVERVIEW

The משנה states that the requirement of 'אוכל' (which is stated in the תוספות regarding פאה), comes to exclude ספיחי סטים וקוצה from פאה. Our תוספות will explain: a) Why single out ספיחי סטים וקוצה, it would be simpler to say that any plant that is not 'אוכל' is פטור from פאה, and b) why mention ספיחי סטים וקוצה, what is the significance that they are ספיחים.

-----

asks תוספות

**הא דלא קאמר סתם למעוטי מידי דלאו אוכל אלא נקט הני -**

**Why did not the גמרא simply state that the term 'אוכל', comes to exclude anything which is not 'אוכל'; but instead the גמרא specified that (only) these two plants are excluded because they are not 'אוכל'**

answers: תוספות

**אומר רבינו יצחק משום דקצת הם ראויים לאכילה -**

**The ר"י says that because these two plants are partially edible**, therefore if the משנה would have stated that we are excluding plants that are not אוכל, we may have thought that since סטים וקוצה are partially edible, they are בחיוב בפאה

**קא משמע לן דאפילו הכי אין פאה נוהגת בהם -**

**The גמרא teaches us that nevertheless, even by סטים וקוצה the דינים of פאה do not apply for them.**

**וכן מצא רבינו שמואל בן מאיר בתשובת רש"י -**

**The רש"י found this same idea in a responsa from רשב"ם**

asks: תוספות

**והא דנקט ספיחים -**

**Why do we mention the term ספיחים** in connection with this דין of סטים וקוצה, since it is seemingly irrelevant whether they are ספיחים or not, for seemingly all סטים וקוצה are not an אוכל (ראוי לאכילה only partially) -

replies: תוספות

**משום דשמא סטים וקוצה עצמם אינם ראויים כלל לאכילת אדם ולא הוה חידוש -**

**for perhaps סטים וקוצה that are planted are totally unfit for human**

---

<sup>1</sup> סטים וקוצה are plants that are used primarily for dyeing purposes

**consumption** (it is only the ספיחי סטים וקוצה that are partially edible) **and therefore there would be no novelty** in saying that שביעית does not apply to them, for they are no different than all other types of plants that are not edible, it is only ספיחי סטים וקוצה that are partially edible, and therefore that is the reason why the משנה specifies ספיחי סטים וקוצה, as תוספות pointed out previously.

Another answer in the opposite direction:

או<sup>2</sup> שמא הן אוכל גמור ולא ממעטינן –

**Or perhaps** planted סטים וקוצה **are** considered **normal food, and cannot be excluded** from חיוב פאה, it is only the ספיחי סטים וקוצה, which are not completely edible and therefore are excluded from חיוב פאה.

### SUMMARY

The reason that the גמרא excludes ספיחי סטים וקוצה as not being 'אוכל' is to teach us that even ספיחי סטים וקוצה that are partially edible, they are still פטור from פאה, and certainly plants that are not edible at all, are פטור from פאה.

The reason he emphasizes ספיחי סטים וקוצה is either because regular סטים וקוצה it totally not edible (and there is no point in specifying them), or on the contrary; regular סטים וקוצה are considered as regular food (and they cannot be excluded from חיוב פאה).

### THINKING IT OVER

1. What is the connection (if any) between the two questions and answers of תוספות?
2. How can we explain the order of the two (opposing) answers<sup>3</sup> on תוספות second question?

---

<sup>2</sup> See 'Thinking it over' # 2.

<sup>3</sup> See footnote # 2.