



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

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

1. Cutting off *tzaraas* from the area where circumcision is performed is a *davar shaino miskavein*.

The *braisa* states that from the extra word flesh in the verse that states: *on the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be removed*, we learn that one can remove *tzaraas* from the circumcision area; these are the words of Rabbi Yoshiyah. The Gemara asks: Why is a verse necessary to teach this; removal of the *tzaraas* is an unintentional act, which is normally permitted? Abaye answers: Nonetheless, we need the verse to teach us that even according to Rabbi Yehudah, who forbids one to perform an unintentional act on *Shabbos*, one is permitted to remove the *tzaraas* while in the process of circumcision. Rava answers: even according to Rabbi Shimon, who forbids performing an unintentional act when it is inevitable that the forbidden act will occur, the verse teaches us that one may remove the *tzaraas* while performing the circumcision. Now, doesn't Abaye accept this reasoning? Surely Abaye and Rava both said, Rabbi Shimon admits in the case of, 'cut off his head but let him not die'? — After hearing it from Rava he accepted its logic.

The Gemara presents a different version of Abaye and Rava's discussion: Take heed in the affliction of *tzaraas*, that you observe diligently, to do [etc.]: 'to do' you are forbidden, but you may effect it by means of bast on the foot or a pole on the shoulder, and if it comes off, it comes off. But what is the necessity of a verse for this: it is an unintentional act, and an unintentional act is permitted? — Said Abaye: It is only necessary according to Rabbi Yehudah, who maintained: An unintentional act is forbidden. But Rava said: You may even say

[that it agrees with] Rabbi Shimon, yet Rabbi Shimon admits in the case of 'cut off his head but let him not die.' Now, doesn't Abaye accept this reasoning? Surely Abaye and Rava both said, Rabbi Shimon admits in the case of 'cut off his head but let him not die'? After hearing it from Rava, he accepted its logic. Now Abaye on Rabbi Shimon's view, how does he utilize this [word] 'flesh'? — Said Rav Amram: As referring to one who asserts that it is his intention to cut off his baheres. That is well of an adult: what can be said of an infant? Said Rabbi Mesharsheya: if the father of an infant declares that he is cutting off the *tzaraas* on the area of circumcision of his son, the circumcision is permitted. The Gemara asks: If there is someone else available besides the father to perform the circumcision, then that other person should perform the circumcision, because the rule is that if there is a positive commandment and a negative commandment that conflicts with the positive commandment, it is preferable that one fulfill the positive commandment without violating the negative commandment. If this is not possible, then the positive commandment will override the negative commandment.¹ The Gemara answers: There is no other person.² (133a)

2. The *mitzvah* of *milah* only overrides Yom Tov when the circumcision is performed in its proper time.

The Master had stated: The *mitzvah* of *milah* only overrides Yom Tov when the circumcision is performed in its proper time. From where is this derived? Chizkiyah said, and so it was taught in Chizkiyah's school: It is said with regard to leaving over from the *korban pesach*: *you shall not leave any of it until morning, and that which is left of it until morning you shall burn in fire*. From

¹ Subsequently, the *mitzvah* of *milah* conflicts with the prohibition of removing the *tzaraas*. If one can obtain another person besides the father to perform the circumcision, one should do so, because another person will not intend that the

circumcision effect the purification of the child by removing the *tzaraas*.

² If there is nobody else, the Torah teaches us that the father himself can perform the circumcision.

the fact that the Torah states the words *until morning* twice, we learn that the *Pesach* leftovers are rendered a weekday concern, so one cannot burn the leftovers on Yom Tov. Rather, one must burn the leftovers on the second day, i.e. the first day of *Chol Hamoed* (*Intermediary Days*).³ Abaye said: it is said: *the olah offering of each Shabbos on its own Shabbos*, and this teaches us that only the *olah* offering of *Shabbos* can be burned on *Shabbos*, but a weekday *olah* cannot be burned on *Shabbos* or on Yom Tov.⁴ Rava provides another source for *milah* not in its proper time not overriding Yom Tov: it is said regarding Yom Tov: *no work may be done on them, except for what must be eaten for any person only that may be done for you*. The word *hu*, that, teaches that one may not perform any act of labor that involves the preparations for making food. The word *levado*, only, teaches that one cannot perform a circumcision not in its proper time on *Shabbos* or Yom Tov, which might [otherwise] be inferred from a *kal vachomer*.⁵ Rav Ashi provides another source that *milah* not in its proper time cannot override Yom Tov: regarding Yom Tov it is said: *on the first day a solemn rest and on the eighth day a solemn rest*, and the word *Shabbason*, rest, is a positive commandment. The Torah also states that *you shall not do any laborious work*, which is a negative commandment. The one positive commandment of *milah* not in its proper time does not override the positive and negative commandments of not performing an act of labor on Yom Tov. (133a)

3. Any act of labor that can be performed regarding the *korban pesach* before *Shabbos* must be performed before *Shabbos*.

The *Mishna* stated that Rabbi Akiva maintains that when a preliminary act of labor can be performed before *Shabbos*, one cannot perform the act on *Shabbos*. Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav that the *halachah* follows the opinion of Rabbi Akiva. Similarly, with regard to the *korban pesach*, it was taught in a *Mishnah*: Rabbi Akiva stated a general rule: any act of labor that can be performed before *Shabbos* cannot be performed on *Shabbos*; slaughtering of the *korban*, however, which cannot be performed before *Shabbos*, can be performed on *Shabbos*. Here

³ *Milah* that is performed after its proper time is also considered a weekday concern and therefore will not override the Yom Tov.

⁴ *Milah* that is not performed in its proper time is akin to a weekday *olah* and therefore one cannot perform *milah* not in its proper time on Yom Tov.

⁵ If *milah* in its not proper time could override the restriction of *tzaraas*, which it (*tzaraas*) overrides the sacrificial service, which

too, said Rav yehudah in the name of Rav, the *halachah* follows Rabbi Akiva. The *Gemara* notes: We need to be taught with regard to both cases that the *halachah* follows Rabbi Akiva, because one may assume that only concerning *milah* one cannot perform preliminaries on *Shabbos* if they could have been performed before *Shabbos*. The rationale for this would be that if the child were not circumcised on the eighth day, neither he nor the father would incur the punishment of *kares* (*excision*). The infant will not be liable *kares* because a minor is not obligated in *mitzvos*, and the father will not be liable *kares* because one who does not circumcise his son does not incur *kares*. With regard to *pesach*, however, one would think that preliminaries that could have been performed before *Shabbos* can be performed on *Shabbos* also. The reason for this assumption is that the *korban pesach* carries with it the punishment of *kares* if one does not fulfill the *mitzvah* of offering a *korban pesach*. Conversely, if we only were taught that the *halachah* follows the opinion of Rabbi Akiva with regard to *korban pesach*, we would assume that the *korban pesach* is not unique like *milah*, which Hashem made thirteen covenants with, and therefore we would think that the *halachah* does not follow the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, and one would be able to perform the preliminaries of *milah* on *Shabbos*, even though they could have been performed before *Shabbos*. Therefore the *Gemora* teaches us in both the case of *milah* and in the case of *korban pesach* that the *halachah* follows Rabbi Akiva. (133a)

4. *Mishnah*: One may perform all the necessary procedures for circumcision on *Shabbos*.

One may perform every necessary procedure related to *milah* on *Shabbos*. One can circumcise, reveal the corona (tearing and pulling back the thin membrane under the foreskin), draw the blood, and place a bandage and cumin on the wound. One who did not grind the cumin before *Shabbos* can chew the cumin on *Shabbos* with his teeth and place it on the wound.⁶ If he did not beat up wine and oil before the *Shabbos*, each must be applied separately. We may not fashion a shirtlike bandage for it in the first place, but must wrap a rag about it. If this was not prepared

it (the sacrificial service) overrides *Shabbos* and Yom Tov, then certainly a *milah* in its not proper time should override *Shabbos* and Yom Tov.

⁶ Normally, grinding cumin on *Shabbos* is forbidden. Although the infant is considered a *choleh sheyeish bo sakanah*, one who is critically ill, and grinding would be permitted, one is still required to perform the prohibited act in unordinary fashion.

from before the Shabbos, one winds it about his finger and brings it, and even through another courtyard. (133a)

- 5. One involved in circumcision can go back and remove the pieces of foreskin that prevent the circumcision from being complete, and he can even remove the pieces of foreskin that do not prevent the circumcision from being complete.**

The *Mishna* stated that anything that is required for the circumcision could be performed on *Shabbos*. Given that the *Mishna* delineates the entire procedure of the circumcision, the *Gemora* explains that the *Mishna* means to include even going back on the remaining pieces of foreskin, whether they prevent the circumcision from being considered complete or not, as long as one is still involved in the circumcision. If one is no longer involved in the circumcision, however, one can only go back to remove the remaining pieces of foreskin that prevent the circumcision from being complete. One may not, however, go back to remove the remaining pieces of foreskin that do not prevent the circumcision from being complete. (133b)

- 6. There is a dispute when the fourteenth of *Nissan* falls on *Shabbos* how far one can skin the *korban pesach*.**

Who is the Tanna who holds that if one is no longer involved in the circumcision, he may not go back to remove the remaining pieces of foreskin that do not prevent the circumcision from being complete? Rabbah bar Bar Chanah said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan that it represents the viewpoint of Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah, for it was taught in a Baraisa: If the fourteenth of *Nissan* occurs on *Shabbos*, Rabbi Yishmael, the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah, maintains that one can skin the *korban pesach* as far as the breast. The Chachamim, however, maintain that one can skin the entire animal. [The *Gemora* assumes that Rabbi Yishmael, the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah, maintains that once the person stops performing a certain act, going back to finish the act is considered a new act. Subsequently, once they skinned the *korban pesach* up to its breast and then removed the innards, resuming the skinning is a new act and unnecessary for the *korban*, so Rabbi Yishmael, the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah did not allow the completion of the skinning.] The

Gemora rejects this reasoning, and suggests that Rabbi Yishmael, the son of Rabbi Yochanan ben Berokah's rationale is that the Torah did not require one to beautify the *mitzvah* by skinning the whole animal. It is said: *this is my G-d and I will beautify Him*. The *Gemora* cites a Baraisa which interprets this verse to mean that one should beautify himself before Hashem when observing the *mitzvos*. This can be accomplished making a beautiful *sukkah*, a beautiful *lulav*, a beautiful *shofar*, beautiful *tzitzis* and a beautiful *sefer Torah*. One should write in the *sefer Torah* for Hashem's sake with beautiful ink, a beautiful quill, and an expert scribe. The Torah should also be wrapped in beautiful silks. Abba Shaul interprets the word *vanveihu* to be a contraction of two words *ani vahu*, He, and I, which implies that one should be like Hashem. Just like Hashem is favorable and merciful, you too should be favorable and merciful. (133b)

- 7. There is a dispute regarding desecrating the *Shabbos* if the new moon can be viewed by everyone.**

Rather, Rav Ashi said: who is the Tanna? It is Rabbi Yosi, for it was taught in a Mishnah: The Chachamim maintain that whether the new moon is clearly visible or not, witnesses can desecrate the *Shabbos* by traveling beyond the techum to report what they witnessed to the court. Rabi Yosi, however, maintains, that if the new moon is visible to everybody, the witnesses cannot desecrate the *Shabbos* by traveling beyond the techum to report their sighting. [The *Gemora* assumed that Rabbi Yosi is of the opinion that one cannot desecrate the *Shabbos* in performance of a *mitzvah* if there is no purpose in the act.] The *Gemora* rejects this reasoning and states that since the new moon is visible, there was no reason to allow the desecration of the *Shabbos* in the first place. *Milah*, on the other hand, overrides *Shabbos* prohibitions, so one would be allowed to go back for the remaining pieces of foreskin even if he is not still involved in the circumcision.

Rather said the scholars of Nehardea: It is the Rabbis who disagree with Rabbi Yosi. For we learnt: Four Kohanim entered:⁷ two of them had in their hands the two arrangements of loaves (*each one carrying six loaves*), and the other two had in their hands the two spoons of *levonah* (*frankincense*); and four *Kohanim* went in before them. Two of them removed the two arrangements of loaves (*which were on the shulchan - table*),

⁷ The Bais haMikdash on the Shabbos to set the Showbread.



and two of them removed the two spoons. Those who brought them in stood at the north side (*of the Table*) with their faces toward the south, and those who removed them away stood at the south side with their faces toward the north. These *Kohanim* removed the old bread and the others placed the new bread on the Table, and the handbreadth of the one replaced the handbreadth of the other, for it is written: *before Me, continuously*. Rabbi Yosi said: Even if the first *Kohanim* removed the old bread (*completely*), and the others placed down the new bread afterwards, this too fulfils the requirement of '*continuously*.'⁸ (133b)

Our Rabbis taught: The member must be trimmed, and if one does not trim it, he is punished with kares. Who? Rav Kahana said: The surgeon. Rav Pappa demurred 'The surgeon'! he can say to them, 'I have performed half of the mitzvah: now you perform half of the mitzvah.' Rather said Rav Pappa: An adult. Rav Ashi demurred: Of an adult it is explicitly stated, and the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, [that soul shall be cut off from his people]? Rather said Rav Ashi: In truth it means the surgeon: e.g., if he came at twilight on the Shabbos, and they warned him, 'you have no time,' but he insisted, 'I have time : So he performed it but had not time [to complete it]. Thus the net result is that he [merely] made a wound, hence he is punished with kares. (133b)

We suck out, etc. Rav Pappa said: If a surgeon does not suck [the wound], it is dangerous and he is dismissed. It is obvious? Since we desecrate the Shabbos for it, it is dangerous? — You might say that this blood is stored up, therefore he informs us that it is the result of a wound, and it is like a bandage and cummin: just as when one does not apply a bandage and cummin there is danger, so here too if one does not do it there is danger. (133b)

WE place a compress upon it. Abaye said: Mother told me, A salve [compress] for all pains [is made of] seven parts of fat and one of wax. Rava said: Wax and resin. Rava taught this publicly at Mechoza, [whereupon] the family of Binyamin the doctor tore up their [bandage] cloths. Said he to them. Yet I have left you one [cure unrevealed]. For Shmuel said: He who washes his face

⁸ I.e., 'continuously' merely indicates that a night must not pass without showbread lying upon the table. But the Rabbis hold that an interval would mark a new placing, not a continuation of the old, and so 'continuously' would be unfulfilled. Similarly, when

and does not dry it well, scabs will break out on him. What is his remedy? Let him wash it well in beet juice. (133b – 134a)

DAILY MASHAL

Beautifying the Tallis

The *Gemora* states that one should beautify himself before Hashem in the observance of *mitzvos*. This means to make a beautiful *sukkah*, *lulav*, *shofar* and *tzitzis*, amongst other *mitzvos*.

Rashi elsewhere explains that one is required to make a beautiful *tallis* and beautiful *tzitzis*.

The Dvar Avraham questions this, as we can understand that the *tzitzis*, i.e. the strings, should be beautiful because the *tzitzis* are the essence of the *mitzvah*. The *tallis*, however, is merely a four-cornered garment that requires one to place *tzitzis* on it.

Why is there a necessity to beautify the *tallis*? The Acharonim explain that in Talmudic times, there was a requirement to beautify the *tzitzis*, but there was no need to beautify the *tallis*, as the obligation to place *tzitzis* was on a four-cornered garment. Nowadays, however, that people seek to perform the *mitzvah* of *tzitzis* by purchasing specifically a four-cornered garment, the garment itself has a status of a *mitzvah* object and one is required to beautify the garment also.

The Aruch Hashulchan opposed those who wore an *atarah* (literally crown) of silver on their *tallis*. This adornment appears to lend prestige to the portion of the *tallis* that is placed on the head, as that is where people place the *atarah*, when in truth, the *mitzvah* of beautifying the *tallis* is specifically on the portion of the *tallis* which covers the body.

one withdraws from circumcision, to return for the shreds is a new act, hence not permitted unless these invalidate circumcision.