

# CHAVRUTA

## SHABBAT — DAF KUF LAMED GIMEL

Translated by: *Chavruta staff of scholars*

Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

And we say: That **which Rava and Rav Safra** disagree over whether *milah*<sup>1</sup> superseding *tzara'at*<sup>2</sup> is derived from a *kal vachomer*; **it is a disagreement between Tannaim.**

As it was taught in a Baraita: It is written (*Vayikra*<sup>3</sup> 12:3), “And on the eighth day you shall circumcise **the flesh** of his foreskin”. “Flesh” is an extra word, as it could have written “you shall circumcise his foreskin”. This extra word is therefore interpreted to mean that **even though there is** (in the place of the circumcision) a *baheret* (spot of *tzara'at*), which is normally prohibited to remove, **one should circumcise. These are the words of Rabbi Yoshiah.**

**Rabbi Yonatan says: It** this law **does not require** to be derived from a verse. If for **Shabbat**, which is stringent (its punishment is stoning), circumcision **supersedes it; tzara'at**, which is less severe, **all the more so** that the mitzvah of *milah* should supersede it!

**Said the master** in the above-quoted Baraita: “**Flesh**”, **even though there is a baheret there, one should circumcise. These are the words of Rabbi Yoshiah.**

\*

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **For this, why do I need a verse? It** the cutting off of the *tzara'at* **is something that is not intended, and something that is not intended, is permitted.**

**Said Abaye: We only need a verse for** the view of **Rabbi Yehudah, who said: Something that is not intended is prohibited.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Circumcision

<sup>2</sup> A spiritually caused skin disease. Although often rendered as leprosy, this is widely disputed.

## PEREK 19– 133A

**Rava said: You could even say that** the verse is needed **for Rabbi Shimon** as well, as **Rabbi Shimon agrees in** the case of an act that is “*pesik reisha velo yamut*”<sup>4</sup> i.e. inevitable.

\*

The Gemara is puzzled: **And does Abaye not hold of this reasoning**, that an inevitable forbidden result is forbidden, even according to Rabbi Shimon?

**And surely Abaye and Rava both said: Rabbi Shimon agrees in “*pesik reisha velo yamut*”** that it is prohibited?

The Gemara clarifies: **After he heard it from Rava, he accepted it.**

**Some recite it** the discussion **of Abaye and Rava** as applying **to this—**

It is written: “**guard regarding the plague of *tzara’at*, to guard greatly and to do**”.

The Gemara expounds: “**To do**”, to cut off the *tzara’at* intentionally, **you shall not do. But you may do it** unintentionally. For example, you may remove the *tzara’at* **with a tree fiber**. A person who has *tzara’at* on his leg does not need to refrain from tightening the tree fiber that he uses as a lace to tie his shoe **that is on his leg**. This is true, despite the fact that by tightening the fiber he will rub the affliction and cut it off. **And** similarly, one is permitted to carry loads **on the pole that is on his shoulder**, despite the fact that the rubbing of the pole will remove the *tzara’at* that is there. **And if the *baheret* passed** as a result of this, **it passed** in a permitted way. (The verse therefore wrote “to do”, as it is permitted to do his work.)

\*

---

<sup>3</sup> Leviticus

<sup>4</sup> Lit. “Detach the head and it will not die?” This refers to a situation where he will inevitably do a forbidden action, even without intending to do so. This is similar to a child that wishes the head to be cut off of a chicken so that he can use it as a toy, but he has no intention to kill it. Therefore even according to the opinion that holds that he is not liable for doing an action that is not intended, nevertheless if it is “*pesik reisha*” i.e. inevitable, he is liable.

## **PEREK 19– 133A**

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And why do I need a verse to permit it? It is something that is not intended, and something that is not intended is permitted.**

**Said Abaye: We only need a verse for the view of Rabbi Yehudah, who said: Something that is not intended is prohibited.**

**Rava said: You could even say that** the verse is needed **for Rabbi Shimon, as Rabbi Shimon agrees in** the case of an act that is “*pesik reisha velo yamut*”.

\*

The Gemara is puzzled: **And does Abaye not hold of this reasoning?**

**And surely Abaye and Rava both said: Rabbi Shimon agrees in “*pesik reisha velo yamut*”** that it is prohibited?

The Gemara answers: **After he heard it from Rava, he accepted it.**

**And** the Gemara now discusses our original assumption, that **Abaye follows** the view of **Rabbi Shimon**, who permits even in an case that is “*pesik reisha*”: If so, **this** extra word in the verse “**flesh**”, **what does he do with it?**

**Said Rav Amram:** The verse is required, **for** the case of an adult man who **says** to the *mohel*<sup>5</sup> who is circumcising him that **he** the man **intends to remove his *baheret*** with this circumcision, in order to become purified from the *tzara’at*. Despite the fact that it is the *mohel* rather than him who is it cutting away, it is nevertheless prohibited for him, for he thereby transgresses prohibition of removing *tzara’at*, since he expressly intends to remove it. It is therefore prohibited for the *mohel* to perform the circumcision, in order that he will not cause this man to sin.

\*

---

<sup>5</sup> Person who performs the circumcision ceremony

## PEREK 19– 133A

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **It is understandable, for** the circumcision of **an adult**, that his intention to remove the *tzara'at* prohibits the circumcision.

For **a child** who does not have understanding, and a *mohel* who does not intent to remove his *tzara'at*, **what is there to say?** I.e. why is it forbidden?

The Gemara clarifies: **Said Rav Mesharshai: When the father of the child** who comes to circumcise his son **says that he intends to cut away the *baheret* of his son.** (I.e. that the father of the child wishes to benefit his son, and is pleased to purify him from the *tzara'at*, and it is considered his intention to purify him even though he does not say this explicitly. *Ritva*.)

\*

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **And if there is another** person who has no interest in purifying him, **let the other person do it?** In this way it is possible to fulfill the positive mitzvah without uprooting the negative one.

(The wording of *Rashi* implies that the father should not be present at all at the time of the circumcision if the father's intention is also to purify him. His presence at the time of the circumcision with his intent to purify him will cause the circumcision to be classified as an act of purification as the *mohel* will act as a messenger of the father since the father is commanded to circumcise his son.)

**As said Reish Lakish: Any place that you find a positive and negative mitzvah, if you are able to fulfill both, it is good; and if not, the positive will come and supersede the negative mitzvah.**

The Gemara resolves the difficulty: Here, we are discussing a case **when there is no one else.**

\*

Said Mar: **Yom Tov only supersedes circumcision** when the circumcision is **at its correct time** i.e. on the eighth day.

## **PEREK 19– 133A**

The Gemara raises a question: **From where are these words** i.e. what is the source for this law?

Said Chizkiyah and so it was taught in the House of Chizkiyah: The verse said (*Shmot* 12:10), “**You shall not leave over from it until the morning**, and that which is left until the morning, you shall burn it in fire”. This verse is telling us that the uneaten meat of the Pesach sacrifice should not be left over until morning.

This second word “morning” is extra, **as you do not need to teach “until the morning”** a second time. **What does “until the morning”** come to **teach? The verse comes to give it** (the Pesach sacrifice) **the second morning to burn it**. The explanation of the verse is “and that which is left over until the morning” of the first day of Yom Tov, you should burn it on the second morning, i.e. the morning following Yom Tov.

From here we learn that a weekday action (although it is a mitzvah) is prohibited on Yom Tov. Similarly, a circumcision that is not done at the correct time is prohibited on Yom Tov.

**Abaye said: The verse said** (*Bamidbar* 28:10), “**The burnt offering of Shabbat on its Shabbat**”. **And not the burnt offering of a weekday on Shabbat; nor the burnt offering of a weekday on Yom Tov**. And just as the limbs of the daily offering of the eve of Yom Tov may not be burnt on the Altar on Yom Tov, so too circumcision when it is not done at the correct time, may not be done.

**Rava said: The verse said** (*Shmot* 12:16), “**But that which is eaten by every soul, it alone may be done for you**”. The Gemara expounds: “**It**”, the food itself, may be made on Yom Tov. **And secondary preparations** for food (such as making the knife and the grill) **may not** be done on Yom Tov.

## **PEREK 19– 133A**

The word “**Alone**” implies: **And not circumcision when not at its correct time**, which is a teaching **that** would have **come** i.e. been derived **through a *kal vachomer***<sup>6</sup>, had the Torah not written the word “alone”.

**Rav Ashi said:** It states (*Vayikra* 23:24), “**a day of rest**”, which is a **positive mitzvah**. **And there is a positive and a negative mitzvah on Yom Tov** to prohibit *melachah* (work). **And the positive mitzvah of circumcision when not at its correct time does not supersede a combined negative and a positive mitzvah**. But circumcision at its correct time is learned from the phrase “on the day”, i.e. even on Shabbat.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **Rabbi Akiva said a general rule:** Any *melachah* that could be done before Shabbat does not supersede Shabbat.

**Said Rav Yehudah, said Rav: The Halachah follows Rabbi Akiva.**

**And it was also taught** in a Mishnah **concerning the Pesach sacrifice, in this way:**

**Rabbi Akiva said a general rule:** Any *melachah* that could be done before Shabbat, for example, bringing the animal to be sacrificed from outside of the Shabbat boundary, **does not supersede the Shabbat. That which could not be done before Shabbat, supersedes the Shabbat.**

**And said Rav Yehudah, said Rav: The Halachah follows Rabbi Akiva.**

**And** the Gemara clarifies: **It was needed** to be stated both in the case of circumcision and in the case of the Pesach sacrifice that its preparations do not supersede Shabbat.

---

<sup>6</sup> A fortiori reasoning.

## **PEREK 19– 133A**

**As if he would teach only concerning circumcision**, I would have thought: **It is only over there that preparations that could have been done yesterday** do not supersede Shabbat, **since there is no** punishment of *kareit*<sup>7</sup>. A father is not liable for the punishment of *kareit* if he does not fulfill the mitzvah of circumcising his son, and the child itself is too young to be punishable. When the child becomes an adult, and still fails to circumcise himself, only then will he be liable for *kareit*.

**But Pesach, that there is** a punishment of *kareit* for not fulfilling it, **I would say that it should supersede Shabbat**. It comes to teach us that this is not the case.

**And if he would teach only concerning the Pesach offering**, I would say that preparations for the Pesach sacrifice do not supersede Shabbat, **since there were not thirteen covenants that were made over it**.

But circumcision, that there were thirteen covenants made over it, I would say that it (the preparations for it) should supersede Shabbat. Therefore, it was needed to be stated that they both do not supersede Shabbat.

## ***MISHNAH***

**One may do all the requirements of circumcision on Shabbat:**

**One may circumcise** (cut away the foreskin).

---

<sup>7</sup> Early death at the hands of Heaven.

## **PEREK 19– 133A**

**And one may perform *pri'ah*** (peeling away and removing the membrane that covers the top of the organ).

**And one may suck** the blood, despite this causing a wound, as the blood comes out because of the pressure of the sucking.

**And one may put a bandage on it, and cumin** (which assists the healing).

And one must grind the cumin before Shabbat. And **if he did not grind it before Shabbat he should chew it with his teeth** (in order to change from the usual method of grinding that is used on a weekday) **and put** it on the place of the cut.

They would mix wine and oil and apply them to the place of the cut, for healing purposes.

**And if he did not mix wine and oil before Shabbat**, he may not do it on Shabbat. Rather, **he should put this separately and that separately** on the place of the cut.

**And one may not make for it a cloak** i.e. a piece of perforated cloth with which they would cover the top of the organ and tie it there in order that the skin would not return and cover the organ. It is prohibited *lechatchila*<sup>8</sup> to do this on Shabbat.

And **if he did not prepare it before Shabbat, one may wrap it over his finger** in the way of a garment, in order to change from the usual method of carrying an object on a weekday. **And bring** it to the place of the circumcision **and even from another courtyard**, even if they did not unify the courtyards through an *eiruv*. But it is prohibited to bring it through a public domain. (See *Shulchan Aruch* 331:8 and *Magen Avraham* there.)

---

<sup>8</sup> As things should properly be (a priori).



## PEREK 19– 133B

### *Ammud Bet*

### **GEMARA**

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **Let us see, all of them were taught** in the Mishnah (circumcising, peeling the membrane and sucking). If so, that which was taught “**one may do all the requirements of the circumcision**”, to include what was it taught?

The Gemara clarifies: **To include that which the Rabbis taught** in a Baraita: **One who circumcises** on Shabbat, **as long as he is involved in the circumcision**, that he did not remove his hand from performing the act; if he saw strands of flesh (of the foreskin) that were still remaining, **he may return, whether to strands that prevent the fulfillment of the circumcision or to strands that do not prevent the fulfillment of the circumcision**. (The Gemara further on (137a) explains that the strands that prevent the circumcision refers to the flesh that covers the majority of the head of the organ.)

If **he separated** i.e. he removed his hand, **he returns to the strands that prevent the circumcision**, and cuts them, as this is considered circumcision. **He does not return to the strands that do not prevent the circumcision**. Since this is considered like a new circumcision, and these strands do not supersede Shabbat since the mitzvah was fulfilled already.

The Gemara clarifies: **Who is the Tanna** who states **that “if he separated, he does not return”**?

## **PEREK 19– 133B**

**Said Rabbah son of the son of Chanah, said Rabbi Yochanan: It is Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yochanan son of Berokah.**

**As it was taught** in a Baraita: **The fourteenth** of Nissan **that falls on Shabbat, he strips off** the skin of the **Pesach** sacrifice **until the chest**, and he does not complete the skinning. This is because after he strips until the chest, he is already able to remove its innards. Once he stops skinning, he may not return to it, as it is no longer needed for the sacrifice. **These are the words of Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yochanan son of Berokah.** This is similar to circumcision in that once he has removed his hand, he may not return to the strands that do not hold back the circumcision.

**And the Sages say: One may strip the entire** Pesach offering.

\*

The Gemara rejects this approach: **From what** basis did you deduce that the cases are comparable?

Perhaps **this far, Rabbi Yishmael son of Rabbi Yochanan son of Berokah** would not say. He **only said** it **there** (concerning the Pesach sacrifice), **since we do not require** beautification. It is learned from the verse “*Zeh Keli ve’anveyhu* – **This is my G-d and I will beautify Him**”, which is a mitzvah to beautify the mitzvot. And once the innards have been removed, the mitzvah is not further beautified by the additional skinning.

**But here** concerning circumcision, **that we require “Zeh Keli ve’anveyhu”**, as there is a mitzvah to beautify the circumcision, **here also**, he should return even after removing his hand. For here, he will indeed enhance the mitzvah.

We have learned that there is an advantage to beautifying a mitzvah:

## **PEREK 19– 133B**

**As it was taught in a Baraita:** It is written: “This is my G-d and I shall beautify Him”. You shall beautify the mitzvot before Him. Make before Him a beautiful succah, and a beautiful lulav, and a beautiful shofar, beautiful tzitzit, a beautiful Torah scroll and write in it for His Name, with beautiful ink, with a beautiful quill, a skilled scribe and wrap it with beautiful silks.

**Abba Shaul says:** You should interpret the verse as follows: “*Ve’anveyhu*” — you should be like Him. The word “*ve’anveyhu*” may be explained as two words “*ani vahu*” - I and Him. This implies that I should become like Him. The verse comes to teach: **Just as He is gracious and merciful, so you should be gracious and merciful.**

\*

**Rather, said Rav Ashi:** This that we say it makes a difference whether or not he removed his hand, **who is it? It is Rabbi Yosi.**

**As it was taught** in a Mishnah concerning testimony that people give upon seeing the new moon: **Whether it** (the moon) **was clearly visible**, when certainly the members of the Sanhedrin or those that live nearby also saw it. And therefore, there is no need for the witnesses to come from outside the Shabbat boundary to testify that they saw the moon. **And whether it was not clearly visible**, and the witnesses were needed to come from far away. In either case, **one may desecrate the Shabbat for it** i.e. to come to the Sanhedrin and testify.

**Rabbi Yosi says:** If it was **clearly visible**, **one may not desecrate the Shabbat for it.** Despite the fact that it is for the sake of fulfilling a mitzvah, nevertheless, since it is not for a “high” need, i.e. the new month will be declared by the Sanhedrin anyways, one may not desecrate Shabbat. Similarly, one who circumcised and then removed his hand may not return to remove the strands that do not prevent the fulfillment of the circumcision.

## PEREK 19– 133B

The Gemara rejects this approach also: **From what** basis did you deduce that the cases are comparable? **Perhaps this far, Rabbi Yosi** would not say. He **only said this there, since** from the beginning, **Shabbat was not given away to be superseded**, as the moon was clearly visible. **But here** concerning circumcision, **that** when he began to circumcise, **Shabbat was given over to be superseded, here also** it should be superseded at the end as well, and he should go back to finish the nonessential parts of the circumcision.

\*

**Rather, said the Nehardeans:** It is the **Rabbis** i.e. the first Tanna in the coming Baraita, **who disagree with Rabbi Yosi** concerning the showbread of the Temple.

**As it was taught** in a Mishnah: **Four Kohanim enter** the Temple to arrange the showbread on the golden Table. **Two** with two sets **in their hands**, each set containing six loaves. **And two with two bowls** of frankincense **in their hands**, as it is written (*Vayikra* 24:7), “And you shall put on the arrangement pure frankincense”. **And four Kohanim preceded them. Two** in order to take the **two old sets** from the Table. **And two** in order to take the **two old bowls** of frankincense.

The Table would be positioned with its length from east to west. The Kohanim **that would bring in** the showbread were **standing on** the **north** side, as it was the more important side. **And their faces** (of those that would bring in) were **to the south** side. **And** the Kohanim **that would bring out** the old showbread **were standing on the south** side, **and their faces were to the north** side. **These** that were standing on the south **would draw** the loaves and the frankincense from the Table. **And** immediately, before they would lift them from the table, **those** who were standing on the north side **would place** the new showbread. **And this one’s hand was next to that one’s hand.** The Table did not remain without showbread even for a moment. **Since it is written** (*Shmot* 25:30), “And you shall put showbread on the table **before Me, constantly.**”

## **PEREK 19– 133B**

**Rabbi Yosi says: Even if these would take** first and remove the showbreads from the table **and** afterwards, **those would place, this is also called “constantly”**, as it is considered one action. It was satisfactory, as long as the Table did not remain overnight without bread.

Just as Rabbi Yosi holds that the placing after the removing is considered one action, so will Rabbi Yosi hold that in circumcision, even if he removed his hand, he may return to cut even the strands that do not prevent the circumcision from being valid. This is because according to his approach, this is all one action. The Rabbis, i.e. the first Tanna, disagree and hold that recontinuing an action after taking a break in the middle is not called one action.

\*

**The Rabbis taught** in a Baraita: **One may cut away the strands** that prevent **the circumcision, and if he did not cut them away, he is punished with *kareit***.

The Gemara raises a question: This *kareit*, **who is it** i.e. who is liable for this punishment?

**Said Rav Kahana: The *mohel***, since he circumcised on Shabbat yet did not remove the strands that prevent the fulfillment of the circumcision. He is liable since he did not do the mitzvah of circumcision, and therefore he is liable for Shabbat desecration. For the cut he made was only permissible in the context of the mitzvah of *milah*, which in the end he did not fulfill.

\*

**Rav Pappa challenged** this: Why is the *mohel* liable? **Let him say to them** i.e. the others present, **I did half of the mitzvah**, and what I did was permitted. I did not make a mere wound. **You** should continue **and do** the other **half of the mitzvah** and complete it. Why should I be liable for what I did?

## **PEREK 19– 133B**

**Rather, said Rav Pappa:** Really we are discussing a weekday case, and **with an adult** who was not circumcised and then afterwards had circumcision but still did not cut away all the necessary strands. Therefore he is liable for *kareit*.

\*

**Rav Ashi challenged this: An adult?** Surely it is written clearly about him, “and an **uncircumcised** man **who did not circumcise** the flesh of his foreskin, and this soul shall be cut off from its people”. Thus it is obvious that he is liable if he did not fulfill the requirements of the mitzvah.

**Rather, said Rav Ashi: Really,** it is referring to the *mohel*. **And for example, that he came at the onset of twilight** at the conclusion of **Shabbat and they said to him:** Do not circumcise now as **you will not suffice** to complete the circumcision during the day as required, and you will therefore be making a wound on Shabbat without fulfilling the mitzvah.

**And he said to them: It will suffice for me** and I will complete the circumcision on Shabbat. **And he did** make the cut, **but it did not suffice for him** to finish in time. **And we find that he made a wound, and his punishment is *kareit*,** since it was prohibited for him to begin the procedure. (He is not liable to be killed since they did not warn him that he is punishable by death. *Rashi*)

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **One may suck:**

**Said Rav Pappa: A *mohel* who did not suck the blood, it is a danger** for the baby, **and we remove him** from his job and prevent him from performing circumcision again.

## **PEREK 19– 133B**

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **This is obvious. From the fact that one may desecrate Shabbat for it, as drawing blood on Shabbat is a *melachah*, we understand that it is certainly a danger for the baby if the *mohel* does not do so.**

The Gemara clarifies: **What would you say? This blood, it is stored** i.e. already collected and pooled and it is considered to be already drawn out before the *mohel* even sucks, and he is not considered wounding by drawing it out. **It comes to teach us that it is connected** to the flesh and comes out through sucking, **and** doing it is nevertheless permitted, as it is **comparable to the bandage and cumin**, that were taught in the Mishnah. **Just as a bandage and cumin, if he did not do them, it is a danger, so here also (sucking), if he did not do it, it is a danger.**

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **And one may put a bandage on it:**

**Said Abaye: My mother said to me: A bandage that helps for all pains is: Seven portions of milk and one of wax and place them on the wound.**

**Rava said:** The correct way to heal is: **Wax and white pitch** that seeps naturally from a tree.

**Rava expounded** this way of healing **in Mechuza**. When he had revealed it, **the sons of Minyumi, who were doctors, tore their clothes** due to the great suffering of the loss that he caused them. For people then needed doctors much less.

**He (Rava) said to them: One I have left** i.e. there is one healing that I have not revealed. **As Shmuel said: A person who is washing his face and he did does not dry it well, it (his face) will break out in boils.**