

This itself should separate

היא גופה תיחויץ –

OVERVIEW

The גמרא cited a משנה regarding a barrel of pressed figs whether the figs can be חוצץ or not. The גמרא here is asking, 'the barrel itself should be the חציצה (regardless of the figs)'. Our תוספות discusses whether indeed a barrel (which will be removed) can be considered a חציצה or not.

תוספות asks:

ותימה היכי תיחויץ הא לא מבטל ליה התם¹ -

And it is astounding! How can the barrel be חוצץ; since he is not nullifying it to remain there; he intends to remove it –

תוספות answers:

ותירץ רבינו יצחק בן רבינו מרדכי דכיון שהתריפו הגרוגרות² גם החבית נתקלקל ומבטלו -

And the ריב"ם answered, since the figs became wormy, the barrel was also ruined, and he is מבטל the barrel to remain in the window as a מחיצה –

תוספות asks:

אבל קשה לרבינו יצחק דבפרק בתרא דשבת (דף קנז,א ושם) דאמר³ שפקקו את המאור בטפיה -
However the ר"י has a difficulty, for the גמרא states in the last פרק of שבת of טומאה that they plugged up the window with a flask, in order to prevent the טומאה from expanding to the other house. This concludes the citation of the גמרא there, תוספות continues with his question -

כי פקקו מאי הוי הא לא מבטל ליה⁴ ואינו חוצץ -

What does it matter that they plugged up the window with the טפיה, but they were not מבטל the טפיה to the window, so it is not חוצץ; what did they accomplish?!

תוספות rejects a proposed solution:

וליכא למימר דביטלו הטפיה דאם כן היה בונה בשבת –

And we cannot answer that indeed they were מבטל the טפיה, and intended that it

¹ In order for something to be considered as a barrier, it must have some permanence where it is standing; however here the barrel will be removed to be used for its intended usage, and will not remain in this window.

² See the גמרא on the previous עמוד ב' גמרא.

³ The case there that there were two neighboring houses with a common roof, and the window of the house, in which there was a מת, was open. Therefore the טומאה would have extended to the second house. In order to prevent it from happening, they closed up this window (which was used for light) with a flask, so the טומאה would not extend to the other house.

⁴ They would certainly remove the טפיה after they resolved the טומאה issue; how can it be חוצץ?!

remain permanently in the window, for then it would be considered **building on שבת**,⁵ which is prohibited – מדאורייתא

answers: תוספות

ונראה לרבינו תם ולרבינו יצחק דכלי חרס לא בעי ביטול -

And it is the view of the ר"ת and the ר"י that by earthenware utensils we do not require ביטול in order that they should be חוצץ -

אלא שפיר חוצץ אף על גב דלא מבטל ליה⁶ -

Rather they are חוצץ properly, even though he was not מבטל them to the opening –

anticipates a difficulty: תוספות

והא דקתני לקמן⁷ דכלי חרס ממעט בחלון ופריך⁸ כלי חרס הא חזי ליה⁹ -

And this which the ברייתא taught later that a כלי חרס diminishes the size of the opening of a window, and the גמרא asked, how can a כלי חרס be ממעט; it is fit for him to use it, so he is not מבטל it to the window -

responds: תוספות

התם מיירי בממעט חלון מכשיעור אבל אינו סותם כל החלון להכי בעי ביטול -

There in the גמרא further, **it is a case where the כלי חרס is (merely) diminishing the opening of the window to be less than the required שיעור, but the כלי חרס is not blocking out the entire window, therefore it requires ביטול** in that specific case -

אבל היכא דסותם כל החלון כי הכא דקתני חוצצין דמשמע דסותם לגמרי -

However in a case where the כלי חרס is blocking the entire window, like the case here where the משנה states, 'it blocks' (חוצצין), which (the word חוצצין) indicates that it is closing it off completely -

וכן ההוא דפקקו את המאור התם ודאי [לא] בעי ביטול בכלי חרס¹⁰ -

And similarly in that case of plugging up the window, where (the word פקקו) also indicates that the טפיה (כלי חרס) covered up the window entirely; in those cases ביטול is not required by a כלי חרס.

⁵ Adding on to a building or repairing a building is (also) considered בונה, and here (if they were מבטל the טפיה to the window) they would be adding to the building.

⁶ source for this ruling is presumably from (our גמרא and) the גמרא in שבת regarding the טפיה (which is an earthenware jug).

⁷ Later on this עמוד.

⁸ Later on the ב' עמוד.

⁹ It is evident from that גמרא that even a כלי חרס requires ביטול, contrary to what תוספות just taught us!

¹⁰ Therefore in the case of the cited משנה (on יט,ב) and in the case of the טפיה (in מס' שבת), where the כלי חרס covered the entire opening, ביטול is not required; however in the case of the ברייתא (on כ,א) where the expression is ממעטין (meaning that it does not cover up the hole entirely), in that case, ביטול is required.

another purpose.

SUMMARY

חרס do not require ביטול in order to be הוצץ, provided that they cover the entire opening.

THINKING IT OVER

תוספות teaches us that a חרס כלי does not require ביטול if it closes up the entire opening. Firstly why is a חרס כלי different from any other object, and secondly if indeed it is different, what does it matter if it closes the entire opening or it is ממעט משיעור; it should either always be הוצץ or never be הוצץ?!¹⁴

¹⁴ See קובץ שיעורים אות סט.