CHAVRUTA

SHABBAT — DAF KUF LAMED DALED

Translated by: Chavruta staff of scholars Edited by: R. Shmuel Globus

What is his remedy? Let him wash well with beet juice.

It was stated in the Mishnah: If one did not crush the cumin on the eve of Shabbat, he

must chew it with his teeth.

The Rabbis taught in a Baraita: things which may not be done for circumcision on

Shabbat, may be done on Yom Tov: cumin may be crushed and wine and oil may be

mixed together on its account.

Abaye said to Rav Yosef: what is the difference between crushing cumin on Yom

Tov, which is permitted because it is fit for cooking, and wine and oil which is also fit

for someone who is ill on Shabbat, even where his life is not in danger?

As it was taught in a Baraita: One may not mix wine and oil for a sick person on

Shabbat.

Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar said in Rabbi Meir's name: one may even mix wine and

oil.

Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar said: Once Rabbi Meir fell sick in his bowels and we

wanted to mix wine and oil but he Rabbi Meir did not let us do it.

We said to him: Your statement in which you permitted it, shall become void in your

lifetime because you are sick and you do not permit us to mix the remedy.

He said to us: Even though I say one thing and my colleagues say another, I never dared to transgress their words. I.e. I still hold that it is permitted, but I conduct myself according the view of the majority of Sages, not according to my own view.

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: **He** Rabbi Meir **is strict upon himself, but he permits it for others?**

And since every unnamed statement in the Mishnah assumedly belongs to Rabbi Meir, why is it taught in our Mishnah: "Each (the wine and the oil) may be applied separately" but not together?

And the Gemara resolves the difficulty: **There** for a sick person **there** is **no need to mix** well, but **here** for circumcision **there** is a **need to mix** well.

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: **here too, let us make it but not mix it,** there is no absolute need to mix it well!

And the Gemara resolves the difficulty: This is what is taught in the Mishnah: "Each may be applied separately", i. e. they are not mixed well.

The Rabbis have taught in a Baraita: One may not strain mustard seeds on Yom Tov with its own strainer because it looks like the work of Selecting¹, as one is taking out the waste from it, nor sweeten it with a glowing coal. The heat made the mustard tastier.

Abaye said to Rav Yosef: how is it different from what was taught in Tractate Beitzah: One may put an egg through a mustard strainer in order to improve its taste?

¹In Hebrew, borer.

He said to him: there in the case of Tractate Beitzah, it does not look like selecting

since the whole egg comes out of the strainer.

Here in the case of straining mustard, where waste remains, it looks like selecting.

It was taught in a Baraita: nor sweeten it with a glowing coal.

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: but a Baraita teaches: one may sweeten it with a

glowing coal.

And the Gemara resolves the difficulty: **there is no difficulty.**

Here where it is permitted it is a case of **metal coal** which does not become charcoal.

There where it is forbidden it is a case of **wood coal** which becomes charcoal.

Abaye said to Ray Yosef: How is the sweetening of mustard with a wood coal different

from meat on coals — meat which is roasted on coals on Yom Toy, and which partially

extinguishes the fire?

He said to him: there it is impossible to roast the day before, here in the case of

sweetening mustard it is possible to sweeten it the day before.

Abaye said to Ray Yosef: what is the law about making cheese on Yom Toy?

(Making cheese on Shabbat is liable due to the work of Building. See above, daf 95a and

Rambam, 10:13)

He said to him: It is forbidden.

He said to him: How is it different from kneading dough, which is permitted on Yom Tov?

He said to him: there in the case of kneading it is impossible to do it the day before because fresh bread is better.

While **here** in the case of cheese **it is possible** to make it the day before.

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: But the people of Nehardea say: today's cheese is best and since it is best, let us permit making it on Yom Tov!

And the Gemara explains: this is what they the people of Nehardea meant to say: not that only yesterday's cheese is good, but that **even today's cheese is good** (but certainly not better).

It was stated in the Mishnah: We do not make a cloak² for it to cover the organ after circumcision, in the first place:

Abaye said: My **mother said to me:** how is **the cloak for the infant** made?

The hem is to be placed on its upper side, for fear that perhaps a thread will stick to the cut, and when the bandage will be removed it will cut the corona³ and he could have his organ cut off⁴.

Abaye's mother who was his nurse made a pocket for half of it she made a pocket inside half of the cloak in order to separate between its edge and the infant's organ.

⁴In Hebrew, krut shofchah. See Devarim 23:2.

² A kind of shirt-shaped bandage placed over the organ. ³I. e., the upper part of the organ.

Abaye said: if the infant does not have a cloak, a rag with a hem should be brought and tied upside down i. e., with the hem placed under the organ while the smooth side should be placed above and doubled over at the top in order to prevent threads to stick to the cut.

And Abaye said: My mother told me that an infant whose outlet i.e. the orifice from which excrement is expelled is not apparent because it is below the skin, should be rubbed with oil and held in the sun's light. Where transparency shows, it should be torn crosswise because this is where the orifice is, with the pointy side of a grain of barley, but not with a metal instrument because of inflammation.

And Abaye said: My mother told me that if an infant cannot suck, it is because his mouth is cold. His lips are cold and he cannot suck with them.

What is his remedy? A cup with coals should be brought over next to his mouth and thus his mouth will warm up and he will suck.

And Abaye said: My mother told me that if an infant does not breathe, that if because of illness his breathing is not felt, he should be fanned with a fan and he will then breathe.

And Abaye said: My mother told me if an infant cannot breathe it is difficult for him to inhale and to exhale, his mother's placenta should be brought and spread over him and he will breathe.

And Abaye said: My mother told me if an infant is thin, his mother's placenta should be brought and spread over him starting from its narrow side and continuing with its wide side, thus the infant too will develop from a small size to a greater one.

And if the infant is too big, the placenta should be spread over him from its wide side to its narrow side, thus he will become thinner.

And Abaye said: My mother said to me if an infant is all red it is because his blood is not yet absorbed in him in his flesh. The blood is between the skin and flesh and it is dangerous to circumcise him because he could lose all of his blood. Therefore let us wait until his blood falls into him in his flesh and then we may circumcise him.

As it was taught in a Baraita: Rabbi Nathan said: once as I went to one of the cities of the sea i.e. a faraway place and a woman came to me and told me that she circumcised her first son and he died, then her second son and he died and her third son she brought to me, and I saw that he was all red.

I said to her: wait before circumcising him until his blood is absorbed in him. She waited until his blood was absorbed, she circumcised him and he lived. They called him by my name, Nathan the Babylonian.

Another time, I went to the district of Cappadocia and a woman came to me with an infant and told me that she circumcised her first son and he died, the second too and he died, the third she brought to me and I saw that he was green. I glanced at him and I did not see circumcision blood in him. Besides the danger involved for the infant, the so-called covenant-blood⁵ which is required for the mitzvah would not come out.

I told her: wait until his blood is absorbed in him and she waited. She circumcised him and he lived. They called him by my name, Nathan the Babylonian.

_

⁵In Hebrew, dam brit.

Ammud Bet

MISHNAH

One may wash the infant with warm water either before or after the circumcision, and warm water may be sprinkled over him, by hand but not with a vessel.

Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah says: one may wash the infant as usual the third day after the circumcision, even if it falls on a Shabbat, as it is written (*Breishit* 34:25): "And it came to pass on the third day, when they were in pain".

A child about which there is a **doubt** whether he was born after eight or nine months of pregnancy, and an hermaphrodite⁶, which bears the signs of both male and female, one may not desecrate the Shabbat for it.

But Rabbi Yehudah permits to circumcise a hermaphrodite on Shabbat.

GEMARA

The Gemara raises a difficulty: for what reason was it taught "by hand but not with a vessel"? **Did not the first clause say "One may wash",** which implies even as usual?

Rav Yehudah and Rabbah bar Abuhah both say that the washing of the first clause is not done as usual. It the Mishnah teaches us in the manner of "how so", i.e. the end clause explains the first one: One may wash the infant either before or after the

_

⁶In Hebrew, androginos, from the Greek, androgynos.

circumcision—how so, how is he to be washed? Warm water may be sprinkled over him, by hand but not with a vessel.

Rava said: But note that it was taught, "One may wash", which means as usual.

Rather, Rava said: this is what was taught: One may wash the infant, either before or after the circumcision, on the first day as usual. And on the third day, if it falls on Shabbat, warm water may be sprinkled over him, by hand but not with a vessel.

Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah says: one may wash the infant on the third day if it falls on Shabbat, as it is written: "And it came to pass on the third day, when they were in pain" (he disagrees with the first Tanna who said that water may only be sprinkled on the third day).

It was taught in accordance with Rava, in a Baraita: One may wash the infant either before or after the circumcision, as usual, on the first day. And on the third day, if it falls on Shabbat, warm water may be sprinkled over him, by hand but not with a vessel.

Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah says: one may wash the infant on the third day if it falls on Shabbat. And even though there is no proof for this law, there is an allusion to it, as it is written: "And it came to pass on third day, when they were in pain".

And when water is sprinkled, it may not be done with a cup and not with a plate and not with any vessel, but only by hand.

And this last clause about sprinkling only by hand, **agrees** only **with the first Tanna,** because according to Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah, washing is permitted even as usual.

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: what is the meaning of "Even though there is no proof"? Why is the verse not a full proof?

And the Gemara explains: because the story of Shechem deals with adults, whose flesh does not heal quickly, while an infant's flesh heals quickly and he goes out of danger faster.

Someone came to Rava and he Rava **ruled** that the person could wash as usual on the first day, **as he taught.**

Then **Rava fell ill**, and he thought that it was a punishment for his ruling.

He said: Why did I intervene in the interpretation of these older scholars (Rav Yehudah and Rabbah bar Abuhah)? I.e. I should not have disagreed, and ruled against their view.

The Rabbis said to Rava: But the Baraita is in accordance with the Master's Rava's view! So why worry that you were punished because of this?

He Rava said to them: because the Mishnah implies that the law is according to them.

And the Gemara asks: **from what,** where does the Mishnah imply that the law is in accordance with their interpretation?

And the Gemara clarifies: this is what Rava meant to say:

From what it says in the Mishnah: Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah says: one may wash the infant on the third day, if it falls on Shabbat.

It is well if you say regarding the first Tanna, that he said to sprinkle but not to wash

as usual, then Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah makes sense when he says that "one may

wash". And they disagree over this point, because Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah allows

washing as usual.

But if you say that the first Tanna holds that one may wash on the first day and

sprinkle on the third day, what is then the meaning of: "Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah

says: one may wash"?

For even the first Tanna permits washing on the first day, and Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah

adds that it is permitted to wash even on the third day. If so, it the Mishnah should say:

one may wash even on the third day!

This is proof for Rav Yehudah and Rabbah bar Abuhah, who hold that according to the

first Tanna it is forbidden to wash as usual, even on the first day.

When Rav Dimi came, he said in Rabbi Elazar's name: the Halachah is in

accordance with Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah.

In the West in the land of Israel, they pondered whether Rabbi Elazar permits to wash

the whole body, or only to wash the organ?

Because if you assume that he only permitted to wash the organ, for what reason should

the Rabbis forbid it? Is it worse than putting warm water on a wound, which is

permitted?

As Rav said: We do not prevent warm water and oil from a wound on Shabbat.

Rav Yosef challenged this: and is there no difference to you between water which was heated on Shabbat and water which was heated on the eve of Shabbat? And here we are dealing with a case of water which was heated on Shabbat.

Rav Dimi challenged this: And how do we know that they disagree about water which was heated on Shabbat?

Perhaps they disagree about water which was heated on the eve of Shabbat?

Abaye said: I wanted to answer him I also wanted to answer like Rav Yosef.

But Rav Yosef answered first, that for a circumcision it is surely permitted to wash with water which was heated on Shabbat because there is a danger for him for the infant.

It was also said: when Ravin came, he said in the name of Rabbi Abahu, Rabbi Elazar said: the Halachah is like Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah, whether with warm water which was heated on Shabbat, or with water which was heated on the eve of Shabbat. Whether for washing the whole body, or washing the organ, it is all permitted because there is a danger for him for the infant.

Regarding the above-mentioned statement itself: Rav said: we do not prevent warm water and oil on a wound on Shabbat.

And Shmuel said: one places them outside the wound and it flows down into the wound. But it is forbidden to apply it on the wound itself because of the Rabbinical decree lest people come to grind medicants.

They the scholars of the study hall contradicted him, Rav, from the following source: One may not apply oil and warm water on a rag to a wound on Shabbat, which implies that it is forbidden because of the decree, as Shmuel said.

<u>PEREK 19 – 134B</u>

And the Gemara resolves the difficulty: there it is forbidden because of squeezing. I.e.

there is a problem of squeezing water out of the rag.

Come and hear a proof: one may not apply warm water and oil on a rag to a wound

on Shabbat, which implies that it is forbidden, as Shmuel said.

And the Gemara resolves the difficulty: **there too** it is forbidden **because of squeezing.**

It was taught like Shmuel, in a Baraita: one may not apply warm water and oil to a

wound on Shabbat, but one may place it outside the wound and let it flow down into

the wound.

The Rabbis taught in a Baraita: one may apply a dry rag and a dry sponge to a

wound on Shabbat since this is not done to heal but to prevent scratching of hard clothes

on the wound.

But one may not apply a dry reed and not dry pads because they heal and therefore fall

under the Rabbinical decree.

There is a difficulty from the first clause, where it is taught that a dry rag may be

applied, which is similar to dry pads, thus seeming to contradict the last clause, where it

is taught: and not dry pads.

And the Gemara answers: There is no difficulty.

This, where it is forbidden, deals with new ones, which were unused and thus heal the

wound.

That, where it is permitted, deals **with old ones,** which do not heal.

Abaye said: hear from this a proof that these pads heal.

It was stated in the Mishnah: A child about which there is a doubt whether he was born after eight or nine months of pregnancy, and a hermaphrodite, one may not desecrate the Shabbat for it.

The Rabbis taught in a Baraita: (*Vayikra*⁷ 12:3): "And on the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised", **his foreskin** which is **certain** supersedes Shabbat.

But not a doubtful one, an infant that we do not know for sure if today is the eighth day from its birth. His circumcision does not **supersede Shabbat.**

	_	
Leviticus.		
	_	