

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Sandal

The reasons for different Mishnahyos in Shas to address the case of a sandal are explained.

Rabanan challenge these explanations.

R' Pappa offers one solution to the challenge.

R' Huna bar Tachlifa suggests an alternative resolution.

2) **MISHNAH:** There is a disagreement whether an after-birth automatically makes a house tamei from a corpse.

3) Afterbirth

A Beraisa presents different descriptions of the after-birth.

A Beraisa teaches that there are five things that are measured by a tefach and the afterbirth is one of those items.

The Gemara explains each of the five cases.

It is explained that three of the teachings are Beraisos and two are Amoraic teachings.

This assertion is unsuccessfully challenged.

Numerous other instances where a tefach is the relevant measurement are suggested and the reason they are not part of the list is explained.

A statement of Rav concerning the status of an after-birth is cited.

A contradiction between two of Rav's rulings is noted and resolved.

Further discussion of Rav's position is recorded.

The Gemara presents two questions related to the after-birth that R' Yosi ben Shaul asked Rebbi as well as his answers.

R' Yosi ben Shaul began a challenge to Rebbi's rationale. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The birth of a "sandal"

סנדל עד דנפיק רוביה

The Mishnah on 24b taught that if a woman gives birth to a "sandal," she must observe the days of tum'ah for a male and a female. Based upon the Gemara (25b), Rashi explains that a birth of a sandal is always accompanied by another fetus, which was its twin. The sandal is a flattened or deformed fetus, the remnants of a fetus crushed and flattened by its twin.

Our Gemara notes that the emergence or birth of a sandal appears in Mishnayos both in Masseches Bechoros (46a) and in Masseches Kereisos (7b). The Gemara probes to find the relevance of the law of the sandal in each case. The Gemara answers that in regard to Bechoros, the sandal is born with its twin, so that the twin born with it will not be considered to be the first one born for redemption by a kohen, but the twin born is a bechor regarding its right to receive double inheritance.

In regard to the Mishnah in Kereisos, the lesson is in regard to a case where the twin was delivered by caesarean section and the sandal was delivered naturally. The rule is that a woman who gives birth with a caesarean section is not temai'ah due to childbirth, nor is she obligated to bring the offerings of a woman who gave birth. Nevertheless, this woman who gave birth to a sandal naturally must bring the offerings of a woman who experienced childbirth.

Rav Pappa cites a Beraisa which states that a sandal and its twin are not born separate, but they are always born gripped by one another. Therefore, we cannot say that the twin was born after the sandal regarding bechor, and we also cannot say that the twin was born with a caesarean section while the sandal was born naturally. After R' Pappa gives his own answer to this dilemma, R' Huna b. Tachlifa offers another response. He explains that the Mishnah in Bechoros is speaking about where the sandal and its twin were born feet first. The more viable birth tends to remain in the womb longer, so the sandal is born first. The Mishnah in Kereisos is speaking about where the two fetuses were born head first. The viable fetus is considered born first, as its head exits the womb. Rashi explains that the sandal, which is not alive, is not legally born until most of its body leaves the womb.

Tosafos notes a problem with Rashi's comment, because it is only Shmuel (Bechoros 46b) who says that a non-viable fetus is not born until most of it issues from the womb, but his view is rejected, and we hold that the head determines birth also for a non-viable fetus (נפל). Tosafos answers that there must be a difference between a נפל, which has the form of a face, which is born when its head exits the womb, as opposed to a sandal, which does not have a face. A sandal is not legally born until most of its body exits the womb. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Does an afterbirth transmit tum'ah of a corpse?

2. What are the five halachos that involve a tefach?

3. How long might it take for an afterbirth to emerge from a woman?

4. Why did Shmuel become angry with R' Yehudah?

HALACHA Highlight

The correct way to measure a tefach

כדי שיאחזנו בידו ויראה לכאן ולכאן טפח

So that one could hold it in his hand and it should be visible on both sides of his hand which is a tefach

A Beraisa teaches that there are five items that are measured by a tefach and one of those five items is a shofar. In other words a shofar should be at least a tefach in length. In another Beraisa, R' Shimon ben Gamliel writes that the size of a shofar should be large enough that one could grasp it in his hands and see it protruding out of each side of his hand. There is a debate how to calculate a tefach. According to some authorities a tefach is measured by the four fingers of one's hand. Rambam¹, for example, writes that a tefach metzumtzam is when one holds his four fingers tightly together and a tefach that is not metzumtzam is when one holds his fingers loosely next to one another. The shofar which is necessary to fulfill a Biblical command

would have to be a tefach that is not metzumtzam. Therefore, when R' Shimon ben Gamliel stated in the Beraisa that the shofar must protrude out of one's hands he was referring to when one holds his fingers tightly together (tefach metzumtzam).

Tur² writes that when one holds a shofar in his hands it must protrude out of the grasp of his four fingers so that it should be the size of a tefach metzumtzam since a tefach is equal to the size of four thumbs. Accordingly, when our Gemara says that a shofar must be a tefach and then cites the other Beraisa that teaches that it should protrude beyond the four fingers of one's hand, the Gemara was not presenting two different measurements of a tefach, one metzumtzam and the other not metzumtzam. According to this approach these two descriptions produce the same measurement since four thumbs are larger than one's four fingers held together. ■

¹ רמב"ם פירוש למשניות עירובין פ"א מ"א.
² טור או"ח סי' תקפ"ו. ■

STORIES off the Daf

The Retractable Wall

”שתים כהלכתן שלישית אפילו טפח...”

Today's daf discusses the halachos of the walls of a sukkah.

One family found how easy it is for a sukkah which looks good to really be invalid. They had a sukkah constructed from three full walls of sliding blinds. Although they could be slid out of place, they kept them as they ought to be, hardly moving them at all.

On Shabbas Chol HaMoed, they had over a couple with their young child. As they were speaking, the child managed to unfasten the sukkah and quickly slid the blinds out of place. The third wall had vanished in a matter of seconds. Normally this

would not have fazed them in the slightest since they would have slid the blinds back into place. The problem was that it was Shabbos. How could they slide the blinds into place if this constitutes the melachah of boneh, building on Shabbos? But they had no other sukkah they could go to and did not know what to do.

When this question reached Rav Yosef Shalom Eliyashiv, shlit”a, he ruled that they could slide the blinds back into place. “This is similar to the halachah that one may cover and uncover a sukkah that has a sliding roof, even on Yom Tov. Since this is made to be slid in and out of place at all times, it is no different than a door which is opened and closed. Replacing such a roof is not boneh and neither is sliding these blinds back into place.”¹ ■

¹ שערי הוראה, קובץ ח', ע' ק"ט, וביום השבת, חיזק, ע' ל"ט ■

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
as a zechus
for a refuah sheleimah for*

יוסף שלום בן חיה מושא
חיים ישראל בן חנה צירל
שושנה בת עליזה
זאב אליעזר בן חיה שיינדל
אברהם גרשון בן ציפי
דינה חיה שרה בת שיינע מירה

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
In loving memory of*

שמואל יהושע בן ישראל