

CHAVRUTA

SHABBAT — DAF KUF LAMED ZAYIN

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

And this Baraita we just quoted is from the *Sifra* (also known as *Torat Kohanim*), and the rule is that **an unnamed** statement of **Sifra** is according the view of **Rabbi Yehudah**.

In conclusion, Rabbi Yehudah considers the hermaphrodite (*androgynus*) as a male when it comes to circumcision, but not in other matters like *erchin*.¹ The Gemara brings another example where Rabbi Yehudah does not regard a hermaphrodite as a male:

Said Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak: We were also taught in a Baraita: Everyone is fitting to sanctify the purifying water of the red heifer by putting in its ashes, **except a deaf and dumb person, an insane person and a minor.**

Rabbi Yehudah validates a minor, and invalidates a woman and a hermaphrodite.

Hear from this a proof that Rabbi Yehudah does not always consider the hermaphrodite a male.

The Gemara inquires: **And why is circumcision different?**

The Gemara explains: **Because it is written: “Circumcise for you every *male*.”** The extra word “male” includes a hermaphrodite in the mitzvah, like a regular male.

PEREK 19 – 137A

Mishnah

Someone who had two babies, one (born last Sunday) to circumcise after Shabbat, and one (born last Shabbat) to circumcise on Shabbat, and he forgot and circumcised the one of after Shabbat on Shabbat, he is liable² for transgressing a Torah prohibition.

If one baby (born last Friday) was to circumcise on Friday, and one (born last Shabbat) to circumcise on Shabbat, and he forgot and circumcised the one of Friday on Shabbat:

Rabbi Eliezer obligates him to bring a sin offering.

And Rabbi Yehoshua exempts him from a sin offering, because here, unlike the first case of the Mishnah, the baby that he circumcised had reached (and passed) the circumcision date and the father was involved in a mitzvah. Whereas with a baby only seven days old, there is no mitzvah at all.

Gemara

The Amoraim disagree whether the text of the first part of the Mishnah says that the father is liable or not liable.

Rav Huna taught the Mishnah as saying liable.

¹ If one vows to give a person's value (*erech*) to the Temple, the Torah prescribes how much a man, woman, child etc. are worth.

² I.e. obligated to bring a sin-offering.

PEREK 19 – 137A

Rav Yehudah taught the Mishnah as saying exempt.

*

Rav Huna taught the Mishnah as saying liable (like the text we have) because it was taught in a Baraita:

Said Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar: Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua (mentioned at the end of the Mishnah) do not disagree concerning someone who had two babies, one to circumcise on Shabbat, and one to circumcise after Shabbat, that he is liable, because the baby he circumcised had not reached the time of circumcision at all and we cannot exempt the father with the rationale that he was involved in doing a mitzvah.

Concerning what do they disagree?

Concerning someone who had two babies, one to circumcise on Friday and one to circumcise on Shabbat. And he forgot and circumcised that of Friday on Shabbat. That Rabbi Eliezer obligates him to bring a sin offering and Rabbi Yehoshua exempts him.

And both of them only derived their views from the case of idolatry, because all sins that require sin offerings are compared to the sin of idolatry, as it says: “There shall be one law for you” (*Bamidbar*³ 15:29).

Rabbi Eliezer holds that this case is like idolatry. Just as concerning idolatry, the Merciful One (i.e. the Torah) said, “Do not do,” and if one does it, one is liable. Here too it is no different, since the Torah said not to desecrate the Shabbat for a delayed circumcision.

³ Numbers

PEREK 19 – 137A

And Rabbi Yehoshua says: **There** in idolatry, **no mitzvah** is involved. But **here**, when he circumcised the baby of Friday on Shabbat, he did the **mitzvah** of circumcision, which is valid even when done after the eighth day.

*

Rav Yehudah taught the beginning of the **Mishnah** as saying **exempt**.

Because it was taught in a Baraita:

Said Rabbi Meir: Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua do not disagree concerning someone who had two babies, one to circumcise on Friday and one to circumcise on Shabbat, and he forgot and circumcised the one of Friday on Shabbat, that he is exempt because he did a mitzvah.

Concerning what do they disagree?

Concerning someone who had two babies, one to circumcise after Shabbat and one to circumcise on Shabbat, and he forgot and circumcised the one of after Shabbat (whom it was no mitzvah to circumcise yet) on Shabbat. That Rabbi Eliezer obligates him to bring a sin offering, and Rabbi Yehoshua exempts him.

And both of them only derived their views **from** the case of **idolatry**, because all sins that require sin offerings are compared to idolatry.

Rabbi Eliezer holds that this case is **like idolatry**. **Just as concerning idolatry, the Merciful One said, “Do not do,” and if one does one is liable, here too it is no different.**

PEREK 19 – 137A

And Rabbi Yehoshua says: **There** in idolatry, **one is not busy** with a **mitzvah**. But **here** when he circumcised the baby of Sunday on Shabbat, he **is busy** with the **mitzvah** of circumcision. Even though he is mistaken, and the mitzvah for this baby does not yet apply, but he was trying to do a mitzvah.

*

The Gemara brings a third version of the argument between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua that ostensibly says the exact opposite of Rav Yehudah's version:

Rabbi Chiya taught in a Baraita:

Said Rabbi Meir: Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua do not disagree concerning someone who had two babies, one to circumcise on Friday and one to circumcise on Shabbat, and he forgot and circumcised the one of Friday on Shabbat, that he is liable.

Concerning what do they disagree?

Concerning someone who had two babies, one to circumcise after Shabbat and one to circumcise on Shabbat, and he forgot and circumcised the one of after Shabbat (whom it was no mitzvah to circumcise yet) on Shabbat. That Rabbi Eliezer obligates him to bring a sin offering, and Rabbi Yehoshua exempts him.

The Gemara asks in surprise: **Now if Rabbi Yehoshua exempts in the end** of the Baraita where someone circumcised Sunday's baby on Shabbat, **that he** (the father) **did no mitzvah** at all—

In the beginning of the Baraita where he circumcised Friday's baby on Shabbat, **that he does do a mitzvah, will he** Rabbi Yehoshua **obligate** him to bring a sin offering?

PEREK 19 – 137A

The Gemara answers: **The House of Rabbi Yannai says: The beginning** of the Baraita, where the father is liable, is in a case **that, for example, he had preceded and circumcised** the baby **of Shabbat on Friday**. For now, there is no baby who is supposed to be circumcised on Shabbat, thus **Shabbat was not given to be superceded**.

But **the end** of the Baraita, where he circumcised Sunday's baby on Shabbat, **Shabbat was given to be superceded** by the baby of Shabbat that had not yet been circumcised (because there was no Friday baby to mix him up with, on Friday). Therefore he was considered busy with a mitzvah and is exempt.

The Gemara has an objection to this reasoning: **Said Rav Ashi to Rav Cahana: The beginning too**, when he had already circumcised the Shabbat baby on Friday, **Shabbat was given to be superceded concerning babies in general** who needed to be circumcised that Shabbat.

Rav Cahana replied: Nevertheless, **for this man**, Shabbat **was not given** to be superceded, so he is cannot claim that he was busy with a mitzvah.

Mishnah

We learnt before that when there is a doubt as to whether a baby has already passed the eighth day, one may not circumcise him on Shabbat. The Mishnah elaborates:

A minor is circumcised at eight days, at nine days, at ten days, and at eleven days, and at twelve days, not less and not more.

PEREK 19 – 137A

How?

Regularly, at eight days.

If **he was born at twilight** of the conclusion of Shabbat, which might be either Shabbat or the next day, **he is circumcised at nine** days because to be certain we only start counting the eight days after dark.

If **he was born at twilight of Friday, he is circumcised at ten** days because the ninth day is Shabbat and cannot be superceded in a case of doubt.

If **Yom Tov fell after the Shabbat he is circumcised at ten** days because circumcision done after the eighth day does not supercede Yom Tov.

If after Shabbat it was **the two days of Rosh Hashanah, he is circumcised at twelve** days.

An ill minor, we do not circumcise him until he recovers.

Gemara

Said Shmuel: If **he** (the baby) **had fever, we give him seven days** after the fever leaves **to let him recover** before circumcising him.

PEREK 19 – 137A

They the scholars of the study hall **posed an inquiry: Do we need** to wait from “**time to time,**” i.e. from the hour that the fever left on the first day, **until the same time** seven days later? Or is it sufficient to wait seven days, counting the first day of illness as a full day?

Come and hear a proof for the second possibility: **That Ludi taught a Baraita: The day of his recovery is like the day of his birth.**

Doesn't this mean: Just as when counting the eight days after **the day of his birth** till the circumcision, **we do not need** to count from “**time to time**” but part of the day is enough, **so** when we count from the **day of his recovery, we do not need** to count from “**time to time**”.

The Gemara rejects this proof: **No!** The Baraita really means that **the day of his recovery is superior** in its requirements **to the day of his birth. Because while** concerning **the day of his birth, we do not need** from “**time to time**”. **However,** concerning **the day of his recovery we do need** from “**time to time.**”

Mishnah

These are the flesh shreds that if they are not removed, they **invalidate the circumcision - flesh** left over **that covers most of the corona.**

And he (a kohen who had such shreds left) **may not eat *terumah.***

PEREK 19 – 137B

And if he (the person whose corona is covered) **is fat**, and that is why the corona looks covered, **one rectifies it because of appearance's sake** (*mar'it ha'ayin*), that he should not look uncircumcised.

Ammud Bet

If someone **circumcised** a baby by cutting off the thick outer foreskin **but did not** tear the thin skin underneath and **uncover** (perform *pri'ah* to) the corona, it is **as if he did not circumcise**.

Gemara

Said Rabbi Avina said Rav Yirmeyah bar Abba said Rav: Do not think that “flesh that covers most of the corona” refers to covering most of the *circumference* of the corona. For even if at one place on the circumference, **the flesh covers most of the height of the corona**, at the meeting place where it is a little higher, it invalidates the circumcision.

PEREK 19 – 137B

The Mishnah said: **And if he** (the person whose corona is covered) **is fat** (and that is why the corona looks covered), **one rectifies it because of appearance's sake.**

Said Shmuel: A minor who is overgrown with fat, we examine him.

If **whenever** his organ **hardens**, causing the foreskin to move back, and then **he looks circumcised**, **one does not need to circumcise** him again.

And if not, one has to circumcise again.

It was taught in a Baraita: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: A minor who is overgrown with flesh, we examine him. If the case is **that all the time that** his organ **hardens it does not appear to be circumcised**, **one has to circumcise** him again. **And if not, one does not have to circumcise** him.

What is the difference between them, between Shmuel and the Baraita?

The Gemara explains: **There is** the following difference **between them**: If he **appears** to be circumcised **yet does not appear** to be circumcised. I.e. it is not so obvious that he is circumcised. According to Shmuel who requires that one must appear circumcised, to “appear yet not appear circumcised” is not good enough. According to the Baraita that positively requires one to look uncircumcised in order to necessitate another circumcision, “to appear yet not appear” circumcised is good enough.

The Mishnah said: If someone **circumcised** a baby by cutting off the thick outer foreskin **but did not** tear the thin membrane underneath and **uncover** the corona, (it is **as if he did not circumcise**.)

PEREK 19 – 137B

Our Rabbis taught: The circumciser says the following blessing: Who sanctified us with His commandments, and commanded us concerning circumcision.

The father of the son says: Who has sanctified us with His commandments and commanded us to bring him into the covenant of our father Abraham.

Those standing there say: As he entered the covenant, so may he enter Torah, the marriage canopy, and good deeds.

The person saying the blessing then says: Who sanctified the beloved one from the womb (Yitzchak,⁴ of whom it says: “But Sarah your wife will give birth to a son for you, and I will set up My covenant with him”) and set a statute in his flesh, and sealed his offspring (Ya'akov⁵) with the sign of the holy covenant. Therefore as a reward for this mitzvah, O living G-d, our Portion, our Rock, command Avraham to save our beloved flesh (the circumcised baby) from Gehinom⁶ (Avraham stops those who bear the sign of the covenant from entering Gehinom), for the sake of Your covenant that You put in our flesh. Blessed are You, Hashem, Who makes the covenant.

*

Someone who circumcises those who are converts, says the following blessing: Blessed are You, Hashem our G-d, King of the world, Who has sanctified us with His commandments and commanded us concerning circumcision.

The person who blesses then says: Who sanctified us with His commandments and commanded us to circumcise converts, and to make the blood of the covenant flow from them. Because if not for the blood of the covenant, Heaven and earth would not endure, as it says, “If not My covenant of day and night, I would not make the

⁴ Isaac

⁵ Jacob

PEREK 19 – 137B

ordinances of heaven and earth.” Blessed are You, Hashem, Who makes the covenant.

*

Someone who circumcises slaves, says the following blessing: Who has sanctified us with His commandments and commanded us concerning circumcision.

And the person saying the blessing then says: Who sanctified us with His commandments and commanded us to circumcise slaves and to make the blood of the covenant flow from them, because if not for the blood of the covenant, the ordinances of heaven and earth would not endure, as it says, “If not My covenant of day and by night, I would not make the ordinances of heaven and earth. Blessed are You, Hashem, Who makes the covenant.

Hadran Alach Rabbi Eliezer d’Milah

We Will Return to You,

Perek Rabbi Eliezer d’Milah

⁶ Hell

PEREK 20 – 137B

Perek Tolin

Mishnah

Rabbi Eliezer says: One may suspend a strainer over the mouth of a container **on Yom Tov** and need not be concerned that one is making a tent (*ohel*), because this action is only forbidden on Shabbat.

And one may put lees mixed with wine **into a suspended** strainer **on Shabbat** because this is not the normal way of selecting (*borer*) something.

And the Sages say: One may not suspend a strainer on Yom Tov, and one may not put wine lees **into a suspended** strainer **on Shabbat**.

But one may put the lees **into a suspended** strainer **on Yom Tov** because on Yom Tov, work done for food preparation (*ochel nefesh*) is permitted.

PEREK 20 – 137B

Gemara

The Mishnah stated: “Rabbi Eliezer says: One may suspend a strainer on Yom Tov.”

The Gemara finds this illogical: **Now**, Rabbi Eliezer holds that even **to add** to a temporary *ohel*, **we do not add** to it on Shabbat, so **to make** an *ohel* **in the first place** on Yom Tov (Yom Tov comparable to Shabbat as regards most forms of work), could it be that **he allows** this?

The Gemara explains the contradiction: **What is it** (this source where we see that Rabbi Eliezer forbids adding to a temporary *ohel*)?”

Because it is taught in a Mishnah (above 125b): **The shutter of a skylight.**

Rabbi Eliezer says: That shutter which is **tied** to the skylight frame **and hanging** down in midair, **one can close** the skylight with it.

But if it is **not** tied on, or if it is tied by a long cord and is resting on the ground, **one may not close with it** because by doing so one makes a temporary *ohel*, which is forbidden on Shabbat.

And the Sages say: Whether like **this** or **whether** like **that**, **one can close with it.**

And said Rabbah bar bar Chanah said Rabbi Yochanan: All agree that one may not make a temporary *ohel* from the start on Yom Tov, and it goes without saying that one cannot do so on Shabbat.

And they only disagree about adding to a temporary *ohel*. **That Rabbi Eliezer says: One may not add on Yom Tov, and it goes without saying on Shabbat. And the Sages say: One may add on Shabbat, and it goes without saying on Yom Tov.**

PEREK 20 – 137B

In conclusion, this contradicts Rabbi Eliezer in our Mishnah who says that one can even create a new temporary *ohel*.

The Gemara answers: **Rabbi Eliezer** in our Mishnah is indeed allowing one to make an *ohel* because he **holds like Rabbi Yehudah**, that one may do work on Yom Tov that is preparatory to preparing food.

Because it was taught in a Baraita: There is nothing (no difference) **between Yom Tov and Shabbat except for** work done to prepare **human food**, which is permitted on Yom Tov **alone**.

Rabbi Yehudah permits even *machshirei ochel nefesh* (work that is preparatory to preparing human food, for example to straighten out a roasting spit). Similarly, Rabbi Eliezer in our Mishnah permits hanging up a strainer in order to filter wine.

The Gemara rejects this answer: **But I will say that we hear of Rabbi Yehudah** allowing this **concerning** second-stage **preparations** of food production **that** it is **impossible to do them from the day before Yom Tov**, like a spit that became bent on Yom Tov.

But did you hear him allowing this **concerning preparations that** it was **possible to do them from the day before Yom Tov**, for example a spit that bent before Yom Tov? Similarly, the strainer could be hung up before Yom Tov.

The Gemara answers: **That leniency of Rabbi Eliezer is superior to that of Rabbi Yehudah**, because Rabbi Eliezer allows even preparations that could have been done before Yom Tov.

PEREK 20 – 137B

The Mishnah stated: “And the Sages say: One may not suspend a strainer on Yom Tov.”

They the scholars of the study hall **posed an inquiry:** If **someone hung** a strainer on Shabbat, **what** is the halachah, according to the Sages?

Said Rav Yosef: If **someone hung** it, he is **liable** to bring a **sin offering** because making an *ohel* is a derivation (*toldah*) of Building (*boneh*).

Said Abaye to him: If so, if **someone hung a pitcher on a peg** in the wall, and the pitcher was like an *ohel* over the space below, **here too is he liable?**

And we never heard of such a thing, because the prohibition of making a temporary *ohel* is only Rabbinical, and they never forbade hanging up a pitcher. But if it was a Torah prohibition, as Rav Yosef claimed, we would not be able to make any distinction between hanging a pitcher and hanging a strainer.