

5 Adar 5773
Feb. 15, 2013



Shabbos Daf 135

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: [And on the eighth day the flesh of] his foreskin [shall be circumcised]: ‘His foreskin,’ the foreskin of one who is certain (*i.e.*, who is certainly subject to the obligation) overrides the *Shabbos*, but of one in doubt does not override the *Shabbos*. ‘His foreskin,’ of one who is certain overrides the *Shabbos*, but an *androgynous* does not override the *Shabbos*. Rabbi Yehudah maintained: An *androgynous* overrides the *Shabbos* and there is the penalty of *kares* (*if he remains uncircumcised*). ‘His foreskin,’ of one who is certain overrides the *Shabbos*, but of one born at twilight (*on Friday, and it is not known whether it was then Friday or the Shabbos*) does not override the *Shabbos*. ‘His foreskin,’ one who is certain overrides the *Shabbos*, but one who is born circumcised does not override the *Shabbos*, for Beis Shammai maintain: One must cause a few drops of the covenant blood to flow from him, while Beis Hillel rule: It is unnecessary.

Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar said: Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel did not differ concerning one who is born circumcised that you must cause a few drops of the covenant blood to flow from him, because (*we suspect that*) it is a suppressed foreskin; about what do they differ? About a convert who was converted when already circumcised. There Beis Shammai maintain: One must cause a few drops of the covenant blood to flow from him; whereas Beis Hillel

rule: One need not cause a few drops of the covenant blood to flow from him.

The master said: But of one in doubt does not override the *Shabbos*.

The *Gemora* asks: What does this include?

The *Gemora* answers: It includes the following which was taught in a *braisa*: For a child born in the seventh month (*of pregnancy*) one may desecrate the *Shabbos*, but for child born in the eighth month one may not desecrate the *Shabbos*. [The Rabbis maintained that such a child could not possibly live; therefore, there is no point in desecrating the *Shabbos* by circumcising him.] For one in doubt whether the child was of the seventh or eighth month, one may not desecrate the *Shabbos*. A child born in the eighth month is like a stone, and is *muktzah* on *Shabbos*. However, his mother may stand over him to nurse him because of the danger (*of her becoming too full with milk*).

It was stated: Rav said: The *halachah* is as the first *Tanna*; while Shmuel said: The *halachah* is as Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar.

The *Gemora* relates: A circumcised child was born to Rav Adda bar Ahavah. He took him (*on Shabbos*) to



thirteen circumcisers (*that they might cause a few drops of the covenant blood to flow, and they all refused*), until he genitally mutilated him. He said: I deserve it for transgressing Rav's ruling (*that it is unnecessary to cause covenant blood to flow from a child that was born circumcised*).

Rav Nachman said to him: And did you not violate Shmuel's ruling (*as well*), for Shmuel ruled this only of weekdays, but did he rule this of the *Shabbos*?

The *Gemora* answers: He (*Rav Adda bar Ahavah*) held that it is definitely a suppressed foreskin (*for there is no element of doubt at all, and therefore it must be done even on the Shabbos*); for it was stated: Rabbah said: We suspect that it may be a suppressed foreskin. Rav Yosef said: It is certainly a suppressed foreskin.

Rav Yosef said: From where do I know it? It is because it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Eliezer haKappar said: Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel do not disagree concerning one who is born circumcised, that one must cause a few drops of the covenant blood to flow from him. Concerning what do they differ? As to whether the *Shabbos* is desecrated on his account: Beis Shammai maintain that we desecrate the *Shabbos* on his account; while Beis Hillel rule that we must not desecrate the *Shabbos* on his account. Does it then not follow that the first *Tanna* holds that we desecrate the *Shabbos* for him?

The *Gemora* asks: But perhaps the first *Tanna* maintains that all agree that we may not desecrate the *Shabbos* for him?

Rav Yosef answers: If so, Rabbi Eliezer haKappar comes to teach us Beis Shammai's opinion!?

The *Gemora* disagrees, for perhaps he means that Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel did not disagree in this matter (*and therefore Rav Yosef has no proof*).

Rabbi Assi said: He whose mother becomes *tamei* through childbirth must be circumcised at eight days, but he whose mother does not become *tamei* through childbirth is not circumcised on the eighth day, because it is written: *If a woman conceives and bears a male child, then she shall be tamei, etc. and on the eighth day, the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised.*

Abaye said to him: Let the early generations (*prior to the Giving of the Torah*) prove (*the reverse*), where the mother did not become *tamei* through childbirth, yet circumcision was on the eighth day (*in accordance with God's commandment to Abraham and his descendants*)!?

He said to him: The Torah was given, and then a new law was decreed.

The *Gemora* asks: But that is not so, for it was stated: If one is born through Caesarean section, or has two foreskins, Rav Huna and Rav Chiya bar Rav disagree: One maintains that we desecrate the *Shabbos* for them; while the other holds that we do not desecrate the *Shabbos* for them. Thus, they differ only concerning the desecration of the *Shabbos* for them, but we certainly circumcise them on the eighth day?

The *Gemora* answers: One is dependent on the other. [*The child who must be circumcised on the eighth day must be circumcised even on the Shabbos,*



but where the eighth day is unnecessary, the Shabbos may not be desecrated.]

The *Gemora* notes that this is a dispute amongst *Tannaim*, for it was taught in a *braisa*: There is a slave born in his master's house who is circumcised on the first day, and there is one born in his master's house who is circumcised on the eighth day; there is a slave purchased with money who is circumcised on the first day, and there is a slave purchased with money who is circumcised on the eighth day. There is a slave purchased with money who is circumcised on the first day, and there is a slave purchased with money who is circumcised on the eighth day; how so? If one purchases a pregnant slavewoman and then she gives birth (*to a boy*), that child is a slave purchased with money who is circumcised at eight days. If one purchases a slavewoman together with her infant child - that is a slave purchased with money who is circumcised on the first day. And there is a slave born in his master's house who is circumcised on the eighth day; how so? If one purchases a female slave and she becomes pregnant in his house and gives birth - that is a slave born in his master's house who is circumcised at eight days.