



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Childbirth tum'ah

The Gemara records a discussion related to the tum'ah of a woman who delivers an embryo full of flesh.

Reish Lakish in the name of R' Oshaya offers one explanation of the disagreement between R' Yehoshua and Chachamim regarding the status of an underdeveloped embryo.

R' Yehoshua ben Levi suggests an alternative explanation of the dispute.

The Gemara seeks further clarification about R' Yehoshua ben Levi's opinion of the matter and it is left unresolved.

Reish Lakish's explanation is successfully challenged.

It is reported that R' Nachman in the name of Rabba bar Avuha explains the dispute similarly to Reish Lakish.

Rava unsuccessfully challenges this explanation.

Rav and Shmuel disagree about what the halacha in this case is.

It is demonstrated how Shmuel's position is consistent with another one of his rulings.

### 2) A developed embryo

A Beraisa presents Abba Shaul's description of a developed embryo.

Points in the Beraisa are explained.

The procedure for determining whether the fetus was male or female is presented.

R' Amram quotes a Beraisa that describes the early stages of development of a fetus.

Contradictory rulings from Shmuel concerning the test to determine whether an embryo is a child are noted.

Rav Ami bar Shmuel reconciles the contradiction.

This resolution is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 3) Sandal

A Beraisa presents descriptions of a sandal.

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel rules that it must have facial features.

Others issue a similar ruling.

A further discussion of this halacha is recorded.

The necessity for the Mishnah to address the case of a sandal is explained.

A second reason the sandal had to be mentioned is explained. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
מאיר בן שמואל הלוי  
Mr. Meyer Sheinfeld o.b.m.  
From the Sheinfeld family

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
לע"נ ר' דוב בן ר' טובי ע"ה  
By the Schwabacher Family

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*The case in which R' Yehoshua and Chachamim disagree*

בצלול מחלוקת וכו'

In the Beraisa on 25a, we found a disagreement regarding a miscarriage which had only a sack of fluid in it, with no trace of a fetus recognizable in it at all. R' Yehoshua said that the woman is *temei'ah* due to this being considered a birth, while Chachamim say that this is not a birth, and the woman is not *temei'ah*.

The Gemara brought a difference of opinion regarding how to explain the two opinions in the Beraisa. Reish Lakish, in the name of R' Oshaya, says that the case where R' Yehoshua and Chachamim differ is only where the sack which was miscarried had a cloudy appearance to it. This is where R' Yehoshua says that the cloudiness indicates that there was a fetus, but it dissolved. However, if the appearance of the fluid in the sack is clear, all agree that the woman is not *temei'ah*, because this miscarriage was not a birth.

R' Yehoshua b. Levi disagrees with Reish Lakish, and he says that the two views in the Beraisa disagree in a case where the sack contained a clear fluid, and it is in this case that R' Yehoshua says that this was a birth and the mother is *temei'ah*. It is left unresolved whether R' Yehoshua b. Levi explains that the disagreement between R' Yehoshua and Chachamim in the Beraisa extends to the case of a sack containing a cloudy fluid as well, or if all agree that this would be a birth.

*Continued on page 2)*

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Yehoshua and Chachamim?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. What is the description of a developed embryo?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. How do we know that Shmuel was an expert in fetus development?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Why was it necessary for the Mishnah to mention something related to the tum'ah of childbirth of a woman who delivers a sandal?  
\_\_\_\_\_

This week's Daf Digest is dedicated  
לע"נ מרת רבקה בת ר' שרגא פאטעל ע"ה  
By her children  
Mr. and Mrs. David Friedman

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Examining a knife for nicks

*He should bring a splinter with a smooth head etc.*

Shulchan Aruch<sup>1</sup> discusses the laws of examining a knife that will be used for slaughtering. Shulchan Aruch's language indicates that the correct method to examine the knife is to go back and forth over the blade. Many commentators<sup>2</sup> explain that Shulchan Aruch's intent is that the knife is run back and forth on one's stationary fingernail rather than running one's fingernail over the stationary blade. This is also evident from the Gemara's wording (Chullin 17b) that one examines a knife "on one's flesh and nail" rather than "with one's flesh and nail." This implies that the knife is run over one's nail rather than vice versa. All the later authorities, however, have testified that this is not the way that slaughterers examine their knives. The common practice is for them to run their nail over a stationary blade. Ma'adanei Yom Tov<sup>3</sup>, in fact, writes that he has never seen or heard of a slaughterer who examines his knife by running the blade over a stationary nail.

Aruch HaShulchan<sup>4</sup> writes that it doesn't matter how a person checks for nicks in a blade and each person should examine the blade in the way that is most accurate. In the time of Chazal it seems that running the blade over a stationary fingernail was the best way to examine the blade but nowadays slaughterers find that running their nail over a stationary blade is more effective. A source that supports the modern method of examining a knife is found in our Gemara. The Gemara discusses the test that could be used to determine whether a fetus is male or female. The method involves taking a splinter with a smooth head and moving it back and forth. If it catches it is known that the fetus was male but if it doesn't catch it is known that the fetus was female. It is necessary to move the splinter back and forth in order

מביא קיסם שראשו חלק וכו'

*(Insight...continued from page 1)*

Many Rishonim question how we are to understand the explanation of R' Yehoshua b. Levi to the Beraisa that Chachamim only consider the miscarriage without a fetus to be a birth if it is cloudy. Just prior to citing this Beraisa the Gemara brought a discussion where Rebbe discussed a similar case with R' Yishmael b. R' Yose. R' Yishmael quoted his father, R' Yose, as saying that if a miscarriage is filled with blood the woman is teme'ah due to niddah, and if it is filled with flesh, the woman is teme'ah due to this being a birth. Rebbe dismissed the second halacha as being the view of R' Yehoshua only, with the Chachamim dissenting and holding that if the sack was filled with flesh, this is not a birth. We see from this explanation of Rebbe that Chachamim hold that a sack which contains flesh is not a birth, so if it is cloudy it would certainly not be a birth.

Among the answers given to this question is that although Rebbe responded with his understanding, R' Yehoshua b. Levi accepted the view of R' Yishmael that his father, R' Yose, made his statement according to all views, even that of Chachamim. The Chachamim therefore say that a miscarriage is only a birth if the contents of the sack are cloudy or filled with flesh, but not if it is clear.

Another explanation may be that we should not compare one situation with another. Although a sack with flesh may not be a birth, a sack with cloudy fluid may indeed be a birth. ■

to be able to sense whether something is there. In the same manner moving one's nail can be a more effective way to confirm whether there is a nick in the blade than if one's nail was stationary. However, one who finds moving the blade more effective should certainly employ that method. ■

1. שו"ע יו"ד סי' י"ח.
2. עי' מפרשים שם לסעי' ד'.
3. מעדני יו"ט על הרא"ש לחולין פ"א סי' כ"ד אות ט'.
4. ערוה"ש שם סעי' י"ב. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The Eyes, the Nose and the Mouth

ושתי עיניו כשני טפין של זבוב

Rav Shmuel Dovid HaKohen Freidman, shlit"a, learns an inspiring lesson from a statement on today's daf. "In Berachos 61 we find that Rav says that the yetzer hara is likened to a fly which sits on the two gateways of one's heart. We also find that the yetzer first entices one with his eyes. As the Yerushalmi states in Berachos, the eyes and the heart are two agents of sin. First one sees with his eyes,

his heart desires and then his limbs act.<sup>1</sup> In light of this we can understand why our sages in Niddah 25 compare the eyes of a fetus to two flies, which is an expression that alludes to the yetzer hara. From a person's very conception, he is in danger of stumbling due to his eyes. The gemara there also compares the fetus' nose to a fly. This teaches that if a person falls often enough the yetzer hara can rule over his very soul. The soul is alluded to by the nose, as we find in the verse, 'ואשר נשמת' <sup>2</sup>. רוח חיים באפיו

The Talmud also writes there that the mouth of a fetus is compared to a strand

of hair. This teaches that one's spiritual level depends on what he says. In Tehillim we find, "I believed as I speak"—words of emunah build one's emunah and bitchon and draws him near to God. But speaking profane words distances one from the purpose of creation. How much more so do words of slander and falsehood! The verse commands, 'מדבר שקר תרחק' — Distance yourself from falsehood." Rav Zusia of Anapoli, zy"a, interpreted this phrase in a novel way: "If you speak falsehood, you will be distanced from God!"<sup>3</sup> ■

1. ירושלמי, ברכות, פ"א, ה"ה
2. שדה צופים, נדה, ע' תקע"ד
3. כן שמעתי ■