

# CHAVRUTA

## SHABBAT – DAF KUF LAMED

Translated by: *Chavruta staff of scholars*

Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

### Perek Rabbi Eliezer d'Milah

#### Mishnah

The previous Mishnah said that all the needs of *milah* can be done on Shabbat. Our Mishnah discusses whether this includes things that could have been done before Shabbat.

**Rabbi Eliezer says: If one did not bring a utensil** of circumcision such as a knife **from Friday, one may bring it on Shabbat** through the public domain, but it must be **revealed** so that everyone sees what one is carrying.

**And in a time of danger, one may cover it** (the utensil), **with the testimony of witnesses** who will testify why he was carrying on Shabbat.

**And Rabbi Eliezer also said:** If there is no knife, **one may chop wood to make charcoal to make a metal utensil** (a knife), because just as *milah* supersedes Shabbat, so does anything necessary to do the *milah*.

Rabbi Akiva disagrees: **Rabbi Akiva said a rule: Whatever work that was possible to do it from Friday, it does not push aside Shabbat.**

Only work **that it is impossible to do it on Friday** like the *milah* itself **pushes away the Shabbat.**

## PEREK 19 – 130A

### Gemara

**They** (the Sages) **asked: Is the reason of Rabbi Eliezer**, that one must bring the knife uncovered, **because of demonstrating love for the mitzvah** of *milah*, that one even desecrates Shabbat to perform it?

**Or perhaps** it is **because of suspicion**, that people might otherwise suspect he is carrying something else.

(Rashi explains that the end of the Mishnah, which says that in a time of danger one covers the knife before witnesses, is certainly saying one must do this in order to allay suspicion. The Gemara's question only concerns the beginning of the Mishnah.)

The Gemara inquires: **What is the practical difference** between these two possible explanations?

The Gemara explains: The difference is **to bring it covered, with the testimony of witnesses**, even when there is no danger.

**If you say** the reason is **because of love of the mitzvah**—yes, it is good to bring it openly. Because it publicizes the love of the mitzvah. But **covered**—no, that is insufficient.

**But if you say** that the reason is **because of suspicion**, then **even covered**, with the testimony of witnesses, **is good**.

**What** is the answer?

The Gemara answers: **It was stated: Said Rabbi Levi: Rabbi Eliezer only said** to bring it uncovered, **for the love of the mitzvah**.

**It was also taught in a Baraita like this: One brings it** (the knife) **revealed, and one may not bring it covered, according to Rabbi Eliezer**.

## **PEREK 19 – 130A**

**Said Rav Ashi: The Mishnah too implies** that reason.

**Because it is taught in the Mishnah: And in** a time of **danger, one may cover it** (the utensil) **with the testimony of witnesses.**

We can infer from this: **In danger yes,** one can cover the utensil. **But not in** a time of **danger, no,** one cannot cover it, but must carry it uncovered.

**Hear from this** that the reason of Rabbi Eliezer is because of **the love of the mitzvah.**  
**Hear from this** a conclusive proof.

\*

**It was taught in another Baraita: One brings it** (the knife) **uncovered, and does not bring it covered, according to Rabbi Eliezer.**

**Rabbi Yehudah says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer: They were accustomed in the time of danger, that they used to bring the knife covered, according to the testimony of witnesses.**

\*

**They** (the Sages) **inquired: The witnesses that he** (Rabbi Eliezer) **mentioned,** do they include **him** (the person who brings the knife as well), **and one** other witness? That is, the carrier and one other person will make up the requisite two witnesses.

**Or maybe** it means **him and** another **two** witnesses.

**Come and hear** from our Mishnah that says: **And in** times of danger **one covers it, with the testimony of witnesses.**

**It is alright** if you say that you need **two** besides the person carrying, it is **good** that they call them witnesses.

**But if you say** that its means **he and one** other witness, for **what** reason does the Mishnah speak of **witnesses** in the plural?

## **PEREK 19 – 130A**

The Gemara rejects the proof: It could be that only one witness is required here, because we do not need legal testimony about this person, but only need to dispel suspicion about him. And why does the Mishnah say **witnesses?** To tell you **that** nevertheless, he and his one witness must be **fitting to testify in another circumstance** where kosher witnesses are required.

\*

Our Mishnah says further: **And Rabbi Eliezer also said:** (If there is no knife, **one may chop wood to make charcoal to make a metal utensil**).

**The Rabbis taught: In Rabbi Eliezer's place they used to chop wood to make charcoal, in order to make a metal utensil on Shabbat.** (Tosafot adds that they deliberately caused such a situation in order to demonstrate the love of the mitzvah of *milah*).

**In the place of Rabbi Yosi HaGalili they used to eat fowl-meat together with milk<sup>1</sup>.**

**Levi visited the house of Yosef Rishba** who was a bird trapper. **He offered him the head of a peacock cooked in milk. He (Levi) did not eat it.**

**When he (Levi) came before Rabbi** i.e. Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi, **he (Rabbi) said to him: And why did you not excommunicate him?**

**He (Levi) said to him: It was the place of Rabbi Yehudah ben Beteirah, and I said: Perhaps he (Rabbi Yehudah) taught them like Rabbi Yosi HaGalili.**

**Because it is taught in a Mishnah: Rabbi Yosi HaGalili says: It says, “You shall not eat every *neveilah* (a kosher animal that died naturally), and it says, “Do not cook a kid in its mother’s milk.”**

This teaches us: **that which is forbidden to eat because of *neveilah* (kosher animals), it is forbidden to cook in milk.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Only the meat of cows, sheep and goats is forbidden by Torah law to be mixed with milk. The meat of fowl is a Rabbinic prohibition, and Rabbi Yosi HaGalili did not hold of this prohibition.

## **PEREK 19 – 130A**

**You may** have said: since a bird is forbidden because of *neveilah* if it dies naturally, it will be forbidden to cook it in milk.

Therefore **the verse says: “In the milk of its mother.”** This excludes a bird, which has no mother’s milk.

\*

**Rabbi Yitzchak said: There was a town in the Land of Israel, that they used to practice like Rabbi Eliezer,** and prepare things for a *milah* on Shabbat even though they could have been prepared from Friday. **And they used to die in their allotted time** and not prematurely.

**And furthermore, the wicked kingdom** i.e. Rome **once promulgated a decree against Israel concerning *milah*, and against that town it did not decree.**

\*

**It was taught in a Baraita: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Every mitzvah that they accepted on themselves with joy, like circumcision—as it is written, “I rejoice at Your word<sup>2</sup> like one who finds great spoil” — they still do it with joy** i.e. they make a banquet in its honor. They are particularly happy to have this mitzvah, since its sign of holiness remains with them at every single moment, even in a bathhouse, where Torah may not be discussed and tzitzit are not worn.

**Whereas every mitzvah which they accepted with strife, like *arayot* (forbidden marriages) — as it is written, “And Moshe heard the people weeping in their families,”** which is interpreted, **“Because of the matter of their families”<sup>3</sup> — they still do them with strife.**

**Because there is no *ketubah* (marriage document) that they the in-laws do not have a quarrel** over determining its details.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Imratecha* in the singular, referring to *milah* which the sole mitzvah in Avraham’s time

<sup>3</sup> They were upset because they could no longer marry certain relatives.

## **PEREK 19 – 130A**

\*

**It was taught in a Baraita: Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: Every mitzvah for which Israel submitted to death at the time of the kingdom's decree against it, like idolatry and *milah*, is still held firmly in their hands.**

**And every mitzvah for which Israel did not submit to death at the time of kingdom's decree, like tefillin, is still weak in their hands** i.e. they do not keep it firmly.

The Gemara proves this from an instance where only one person was willing to die to fulfill the mitzvah of tefillin.

**Because Rabbi Yannai said: Tefillin require a clean body, like that of Elisha-the-man-of-the-wings** who was very particular about the mitzvah of tefillin.

The Gemara inquires: **What does this** (a clean body) **mean?**

**Said Abaye: That one must not pass wind in them** but must remove them beforehand.

**Rabbah said:** A person can stop himself from passing wind, rather, Rabbi Yannai was warning **that one must not sleep in them** because he might pass wind inadvertently.

**And why did they call him Elisha the man-of-the-wings? Because the wicked kingdom once proclaimed a decree against Israel that they would pierce the brain of whoever put on tefillin.**

**And Elisha was putting on tefillin and going into the streets. An official saw him. He Elisha ran from him and he ran after him. When he reached him, he (Elisha) took them off his head and held them in his hand.**

**He said to him: What is in your hand?**

**He (Elisha) said: The wings of a dove.**

**He (Elisha) stretched out his hand and miraculously found that it was the wings of a dove. Therefore they called him Elisha-the-man-of-the-wings.**

## **PEREK 19 – 130B**

**And how are the wings of a dove different, that he Elisha said particularly that to him, and did not tell him of the wings of other birds?**

**Because the Congregation of Israel is compared to a dove, as it says about them in Shir HaShirim<sup>4</sup>: “As the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her pinions with yellow gold.” Just as a dove is protected through its wings because it fights with its wings and not with its beak, so with Israel, the mitzvot protect them.**

\*\*\*

**Said Rav Abba bar Rav Adda said Rav Yitzchak: They once forgot and did not bring a knife on Friday, and they brought it on Shabbat, (through roofs and through courtyards),**

### **Ammud Bet**

**against the will of Rabbi Eliezer.**

**Rav Yosef objected: Was this against the will of R. Eliezer? On the contrary, Rabbi Eliezer is the one who permits it!**

The Gemara immediately offers an answer, and rejects it: **And if you say that it was against the will of Rabbi Eliezer because he allows it even in the public domain, rather, it was according to the will of the Rabbis (the second view in the Mishnah) who forbid carrying a knife in the public domain, yet allow it through roofs, through courtyards even if there is no *eiruv* between them and through *karpifot*.<sup>5</sup>**

This answer is implausible because: **Did they (the Rabbis) allow** such a thing?

---

<sup>4</sup> Song of Solomon

<sup>5</sup> A *karpaf* is an area 70 cubits and four *tefachim* by 70 cubits and four *tefachim* or more, which belongs to one person and has walls. Nevertheless, if no one lives there the rabbis gave it the status of a *karmelit* where one is rabbinically forbidden to carry.

## **PEREK 19 – 130B**

**But it was taught in a Baraita** according to the Rabbis: **Just as one may not bring it** (the knife) **through the street, so may one not bring it through roofs, through karpifot, or through courtyards** that have no *eiruv*<sup>6</sup> between them. (Note: We will see later that the Rabbis do sometimes allow one to carry in a courtyard that has no *eiruv*. The Gemara means that according to the Rabbis, one cannot carry *from* such a courtyard to a roof or *karpaf*).

The Gemara gives a second answer: **Rather, said Rav Ashi:** When Rav Abba said that it was not according to the will of Rabbi Eliezer, he meant **that it was not with the will of Rabbi Eliezer, and** also not with the will of **his opposer** (the Rabbis). **But it was with the will of Rabbi Shimon,** who allows one to carry in such a place even for one's own concerns.

**Because it was taught in a Mishnah: Rabbi Shimon says: Roofs, karpifot and courtyards are all one domain for utensils that rested in them**<sup>7</sup> when Shabbat commenced. And one can carry from a roof to a courtyard or *karpaf*<sup>8</sup> etc. **But not for utensils that rested in the house** when Shabbat commenced.

\*\*\*

**Rabbi Zeira asked Rabbi Asi: An alley (mavoi) in which they** (its residents) **did not become partners,**<sup>9</sup> **may one carry in the whole of it?**

**Do we say it is like a courtyard, and just as a courtyard, even if they** (the residents of the houses) **did not make an eiruv, it is permitted to carry in the whole of it?** (As pointed out before, even the Rabbis only forbid carrying from a courtyard to a roof and do not forbid carrying in the courtyard itself.). Therefore, **this mavoi too, even though they did not become partners in it, it is permitted to carry in the whole of it.**

---

<sup>6</sup> An *eiruv* is when the tenants of the houses make a partnership by setting aside a food item as a symbolic common meal. This makes the houses and courtyard like one big private domain.

<sup>7</sup> Because such utensils are generally not set aside for any particular house.

<sup>8</sup> Although Rabbi Shimon allows one to carry from a roof or courtyard to a *karpaf*, in the *karpaf* itself it is only permitted to carry less than four cubits.

<sup>9</sup> If the residents around the alley made a partnership which is similar to making an *eiruv* for a courtyard, they would be able to carry from their homes and courtyards into the alley.



## **PEREK 19 – 130B**

**Or perhaps it is not comparable, because a courtyard has four walls** which makes it like a private domain. While **this alley does not have four walls** but only three, because the fourth side is open to the public domain. So there is more reason not to carry there.

And **alternatively**, one can make yet another differentiation:

**A courtyard has tenants** who use it all the time, which makes it similar to a private domain. But **this (alley) has no tenants**.

**He (Rabbi Asi) was silent and said nothing to him.**

\*

But **on another occasion** Rabbi Asi seemed to have changed his mind. This was when **he (Rabbi Zeira) found him (Rabbi Asi) that he was sitting and stating:**

**Said Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish in the name of Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi: They once forgot and did not bring a knife on Friday, and they brought it on Shabbat** through the public domain.

**And this matter was difficult for the Sages** of that time to understand: **How could they ignore the words of the other Sages and do like Rabbi Eliezer?**

This incident was strange for two reasons: **First, because Rabbi Eliezer was excommunicated** (alternative translation: he was a follower **of Beit Shammai**, whom we generally don't rule in accordance with)

**And also**, we rule that when **an individual and the majority** are in disagreement, **halachah is like the majority**.

**And Rabbi Oshai'a said: I asked Rabbi Yehudah the circumciser** what happened, **and he told me:**

**It was an alley that they (its residents) had not become partners, and they brought it (the knife) from this end to that end**, and this would have been permitted even for regular needs.

## **PEREK 19 – 130B**

**Said he (Rabbi Zeira) to him (Rabbi Asi): Does the master (you) hold that it is permitted to carry in the whole of an alley in which they had not become partners, even though when I asked you before you were unsure?**

**And he said to him: Yes!**

**He (Rabbi Zeira) said to him (Rabbi Asi): But I once asked you this question and you did not tell me thus. Perhaps in the rapid course (of your review of what Reish Lakish said, your learning of what Rabbi Oshai'a said came back to you?**

**He said: Yes, in the rapid course of my review my learning came back to me.**

\*\*\*

**It was stated: Said Rabbi Zeira said Rav: An alley in which no partnership had been made, sometimes one may only carry in it within four cubits.**

**Said Abaye: Rabbi Zeira stated this thing but did not explain it, when one may carry and when one may not, until Rabbah bar Abuhah came and explained it.**

**Because said Rav Nachman said Rabbah bar Abuhah said Rav: An alley that they did not become partners in, if the courtyards of the alley made an *eiruv* with the houses, one may not carry in it (the alley) except for four cubits.**

**If the courtyards did not make an *eiruv* with the houses, one may carry in the whole alley.**

**Said Rabbi Chanina Choza'ah to Rabbah: What difference does it make if the courtyards made an *eiruv* with the houses?**

**He replied: Because we say that the courtyards were removed from their status of being courtyards, and became like houses.**

## **PEREK 19 – 130B**

**And Rav is going according to his rationale, because Rav said: An alley does not become permitted to carry in through a post or a beam<sup>10</sup> until...**

-

---

<sup>10</sup> Because an alley opens to the public domain, to carry in an alley one has to make a symbolic partition from the public domain by placing a post next to one side of the alley where it meets the public domain, or placing a beam over the opening.