

27 Iyar 5779  
June 1, 2019



Bechoros Daf 45

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**  
**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

**More Blemishes**

One who is bow legged (*because his knees are bent outwards, his ankles bang against each other*) or knock kneed (*because his feet are bent outward, his knees bang against each other*), one who has whorls (*a small disk placed on the spindle*) or an *ikkel* - bent (*all these defects render a Kohen disqualified for service*). What is an *ikke*? One whose knees do not touch each other when he puts his feet together (*while sitting*). [*One who has whorls*] refers to a lump (*of flesh*) projecting from his big toe.

One whose heel projects behind him, or if his feet are wide (*thin*) like those of a goose (*and their length and width are the same*), or if his toes lie one above the other, or if they are joined together (*webbed feet*) [*are all defects that render him unfit for the service*]. If, however, they are joined up (*from the tips of his toes*) to the middle joint, he is fit. If they were joined below, and he cuts it, he is also fit. If he has an additional digit and he cut it off - if there was a bone in it, he is unfit, but if not, he is fit.

If he has additional fingers and additional toes – on each hand and foot six fingers and six toes, totaling altogether twenty-four digits, Rabbi Yehudah declares such a *Kohen* fit for the service, whereas the Sages declare him unfit. If one has equal strength in both hands (*ambidextrous*), Rebbe declares him unfit, whereas the Sages declare him fit.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: *Broken-legged*. I only know that a broken leg is a blemish. From where do I know that the case of one who is bow legged, or knock kneed, or one who has a lump (*of flesh*) projecting from his big toe? It is written: Or broken-legged.

It was taught in a *braisa*: One who has whorls and a *shufnar* (*is also a blemish*). Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: One who has whorls is one who has an extremely large ankle, and *shufnar* is one without ankles at all.

The *Mishna* had stated: One who has a lump (*of flesh*) projecting from his big toe, or one whose heel projects behind him (*is regarded as a blemish*). Rabbi Elozar explained it to mean that his calf is coming out of the middle of his foot (*half of his foot is in the front and the other half is in the rear*).

The *Mishna* had stated: if his feet are wide (*thin*) like those of a goose (*and their length and width are the same*). Rav Pappa explained: You should not say that his feet must be flat as well as not separated (*webbed*); even if they are only flat, although separated into toes (*they render him unfit for the service*).

The *Mishna* had stated: If his toes lie one above the other, or if they are joined together (*webbed feet*) [*they are all defects that render him unfit for the service*].

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: *Broken arm*. I only know that a broken arm is a blemish. From where do I know that the case of one whose toes lie one above the other, or if they are joined together above the middle knuckle and he did not cut it off (*according to the emended braisa*)? It is written: Or a broken arm.

The *Mishna* had stated: If he has an additional digit and he cut it off - if there was a bone in it, he is unfit, but if not, he is fit.

Rabbah bar bar Chanah reported in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: This (*that if it is cut off, it is a blemish*) is provided that the additional finger is counted with the others (*it is aligned in a row with the other fingers*).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: [*The Gemora will be discussing a case of an additional digit that has a small quantity of flesh attached to it, even it is less than the size of an olive, which has been detached from the body. If there were a piece of flesh the size of an olive on*

the bone, then even if the additional digit were not aligned with the rest of the digits, or even if there were not a bone in the additional digit, it would have caused *tumas ohel* (if the *tumah* source and a person or object is under the same roof), for the rule is that the flesh of a corpse the size of an olive causes *tumas ohel*. And, if there were not any flesh at all on the bone, then even if the additional digit were aligned with the rest, it would not have been considered a limb, since bones like that do not cause *tumas ohel*, unless where there is a majority of the limbs or the greater part of the corpse. But here, since there is a small portion of flesh, even though it is not the size of an olive, the additional digit of a corpse causes *tumah* because it is aligned with the rest of the digits and is halachically regarded as a limb.] An additional digit (that has been detached from the body), if it has a bone in it, even without a fingernail, renders a person *tamei* by contact and by carrying it, and It also causes *tumas ohel*, and is counted in the number of one hundred and twenty-five limbs (to constitute a majority of bones from the skeleton).

Rabbah bar bar Chanah reported in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: This (that if it is regarded as a limb of the body) is provided that the additional finger is counted with the others (it is aligned in a row with the other fingers).

Rav Chisda said: The following ruling was taught by our great master (Rav), may the Lord be of assistance to him! An additional digit (that has been detached from the body), if it has a bone in it, even without a fingernail, renders a person *tamei* by contact and by carrying it, and It does not cause *tumas ohel*.

Rabbah bar bar Chanah reported in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: This (that the extra digit does not convey *tumas ohel*) is provided that the additional finger is not counted with the others (it is not aligned in a row with the other fingers).

Rabbi Chanina asked: They (Rav and R' Yochanan) have made their words on the level with prophecy (without requiring a logical explanation)! For either way you wish to understand the logic (their ruling is difficult to understand), for if the additional finger is regarded as a limb, then it should even cause *tumas ohel*, and if it is not regarded as a limb, then it should not even render a person *tamei* by contact and by carrying it!?

Rav Huna the son of Manoach answered in the name of Rav Acha the son of Rav Ikka: They applied here the rule of a bone which is the size of a barley grain (which renders a person *tamei* either by carrying it or coming in contact with it, but does not cause *tumas ohel*; so here also, although it is not a limb for *tumas ohel*, it is regarded as a bone fragment from the body, and will convey *tumah* through touching and carrying).

Rav Pappa answered: We declare him *tamei* in the case where the additional finger was not aligned with the others on account of the case where the additional finger is aligned with the others.

The *Gemora* asks: But if this be so, then in the case where the additional finger is not aligned with the others, it should also cause *tumas ohel*?

The *Gemora* answers: The Rabbis made a distinction in order that *terumah* and consecrated objects should not be burned (unnecessarily) on account of it (for only *terumah* and *kodashim* which is Biblically *tamei* should be burned; otherwise, they need to be preserved).

We have learned elsewhere in a *Mishna*: The greater portion of a corpse (as measured by size of limbs) and the greater number of bones (of a corpse), even though there is not among them one quarter of a *kav* (in total), conveys *tumas ohel*.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: What is the greater portion of a corpse? Two shinbones and a thighbone, since this is the greater part of the height of an adult person. What is the greater number of bones? One hundred and twenty-five.

Ravina said to Rava: Is it the object of the *Tanna* to teach us arithmetic?

He replied to him: He informs us of the following novelty, as it was taught in a different *braisa*: If a corpse is defective (in the number of bones – he was born that way), having only two hundred, or if one has additional bones, having two hundred and eighty-one, all these bones are counted in the (same) number of one hundred and twenty-five. What is the reason? Follow the majority of people (who have only two hundred and forty-eight bones).

Rav Yehudah related in the name of Shmuel: The disciples of Rabbi Yishmael once examined the body of a prostitute, after her corpse was boiled, who had been condemned to be burned by the king. They found two hundred and fifty-two bones. Rabbi Yishmael said to them: Perhaps you have examined the bones of a woman, in whose case the Torah adds two hinges and two doors (*in her womb*).

It was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Elozar said: As a house has hinges, so a woman's body has hinges (*in her womb*), as it is written: *She crouched down and brought forth a child, for her hinges came suddenly upon her*. Rabbi Yehoshua says: As a house has doors, so a woman's body has doors, as it is written: *Because he did not shut up the doors of my mother's womb*. Rabbi Akiva says: As a house has a key, so a woman has a key, as it is written: *And he opened her womb*.

The *Gemora* asks: According to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, is there not a difficulty in connection with what Rabbi Yishmael's disciples discovered?

The *Gemora* answers: It may be that since it is small, it was dissolved (*in the course of the boiling*).

Rav said: And all these (*extra limbs of a woman*) do not cause *tumas ohel*, for it is written: *This is the law when a man dies in a tent*. This implies that a thing which is common to all human beings (*causes tumas ohel*).

Abaye said to him: And doesn't a man also have some of these additional limbs, as it is written: *Hinges have taken hold upon me as the hinges of a woman in childbirth?*

The *Gemora* answers: These are hinges of flesh (*and not regarded as bones*).

The *Gemora* notes that it also stands to reason (*that these are not limbs*), for if you will not say so, to whom then will you apply the accepted statement that there exist two hundred and forty-eight limbs (*in the human body*), for it cannot apply to a man or to a woman.

The *Mishna* had stated: If he has additional fingers and additional toes on his hands and feet [*Rabbi Yehudah declares such a Kohen fit for the service, whereas the Sages declare him unfit*].

Rabbi Yitzchak said: And they both derive their views from the same verse (*regarding Dovid's battles with giants of the Philistine army*): *And there was another battle in Gath where there was a man of great stature that had on every hand six fingers and on every foot six toes (twenty-four in number)*. The Sages hold that the verse means to disparage him, while Rabbi Yehudah holds that the verse means to praise him. (44b – 45b)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### *A Candle for One Is a Candle for 250*

The *poskim* mention that on Yom Kippur one should light a candle for each person (see *Shulchan Aruch, O.C. 610:4*, and *Mishnah Berurah, S.K. 11*). *Magen Avraham (S.K. 3)* cites the Maharil that one shouldn't light for a woman. Why? A candle stands for the 248 limbs in the body and the spirit and soul *רוח נשמה*, amounting to 250, the numerical equivalent of *נר* (candle). As a woman has 252 limbs in her body, there's no point in lighting a candle for her (see *ibid* in the remarks of Rabbi Akiva Eiger and the Chasam Sofer, and see *Meoros HaDaf HaYomi* on Bava Basra 116a).

#### DAILY MASHAL

### The Dwarfs Won

*Parashas Devarim* recounts that "the 'Avim who dwell in Chatzerim up to 'Azah...the Kaftorim who come from Kaftor destroyed them and took their place; get up and go and cross the stream of Arnon; see, I have given Sichon in your hand" (*Devarim 2:22*). The description at the start of the verse, how the Kaftorim warred against the 'Avim, needs, of course, a reason. The Chida comments in the name of early Sephardic sages that this description only came to encourage the Jews in their war against Sichon. *Yalkut Shim'oni* says (58) that the Kaftorim were dwarfs and since it states here "Kaftorim who come from Kaftor" we learn that they married among themselves and their offspring were even shorter, as stated in our *sugya*. Still, these extra-small dwarfs conquered the 'Avim, who were mighty giants (see *Chulin 60b*)! We thus learn that victory does not belong to the strong: "Get up and cross the stream of Arnon"!