

7 Adar 5773
Feb. 17, 2013



Shabbos Daf 137

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

Mishna

If a man has two infants, one for circumcision after the *Shabbos* and the other for circumcision on the *Shabbos*, and he forgot (*which one was which*) and circumcises the one belonging to after the *Shabbos* on the *Shabbos*, he is liable (*to a chatas, for he unwittingly desecrated the Shabbos; since circumcision is obligatory on the eighth day only, this is not circumcision, but the mere inflicting of an unnecessary wound, which entails culpability*). If he has one for circumcision on the eve of the *Shabbos* and another for circumcision on the *Shabbos*, and he forgot (*which one was which*) and circumcises the one belonging to the eve of the *Shabbos* on the *Shabbos*, Rabbi Eliezer holds him liable to a *chatas* (*for though he has actually fulfilled a mitzvah, nevertheless, circumcision after the proper time does not supersede the Shabbos*), but Rabbi Yehoshua exempts him (*for he erred through the fulfillment of a mitzvah, viz., because he was occupied with the circumcision of the second, which actually was to be done that day; he also did fulfill a mitzvah by circumcising the first, and Rabbi Yehoshua holds that in such a case, one is not liable*). (137a)

Liability to a Chatas

Rav Huna taught (*in the first case of the Mishna, where a man has two infants, one for circumcision after the Shabbos and the other for circumcision on the Shabbos, and he forgot which one was which, and circumcises the one belonging to after the Shabbos on the Shabbos*): He is

liable (*to a chatas – according to everyone*). Rav Yehudah taught: He is not liable.

The *Gemora* elaborates: Rav Huna taught that he is liable, because it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Shimon ben Elozar said: Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua did not differ concerning a man who has two infants, one for circumcision on the *Shabbos* and another for circumcision after the *Shabbos*, and he forgot and circumcises the one belonging to after the *Shabbos* on the *Shabbos*, that he is liable. About what do they disagree? About one, who has two infants, one for circumcision on the eve of the *Shabbos* and another for circumcision on the *Shabbos*, and he forgets and circumcises the one belonging to the eve of the *Shabbos* on the *Shabbos*, Rabbi Eliezer declares that he is liable to a *chatas*, while Rabbi Yehoshua exempts him.

Rav Huna explains: Now, both learn their opinions from nowhere but (*the chatas of*) idolatry (*as the model for other chatas offerings*): Rabbi Eliezer holds that it is like idolatry (*in the following respect*): just as idolatry, the Torah decreed, “Do not do it,” and if one does (*do it inadvertently*), he is liable, so here too (*by the circumcision*), it is not different (*and since he inadvertently violated Shabbos, he must bring a chatas*). But Rabbi Yehoshua argues: There (*he is liable for*) no *mitzvah* was fulfilled, whereas here there is a *mitzvah* (*and therefore, there is no liability*).

The *Gemora* elaborates: Rav Yehudah taught that he is not liable, because it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Meir

said: Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua did not differ concerning a man who has two infants, one for circumcision on the eve of the *Shabbos* and another for circumcision on the *Shabbos*, and he forgets and circumcises the one belonging to the eve of the *Shabbos* on the *Shabbos*, that he is not liable. About what do they disagree? About one who has two infants, one for circumcision after the *Shabbos* and another for circumcision on the *Shabbos*, and he forgets and circumcises the one belonging to after the *Shabbos* on the *Shabbos*, Rabbi Eliezer declares that he is liable to a *chatas*, while Rabbi Yehoshua exempts him.

Rav Huna explains: Now, both learn their opinions from nowhere but (*the chatas of*) idolatry (*as the model for other chatas offerings*): Rabbi Eliezer holds that it is like idolatry (*in the following respect*): just as idolatry, the Torah decreed, “Do not do it,” and if one does (*do it inadvertently*), he is liable, so here too (*by the circumcision*), it is not different (*and since he inadvertently violated Shabbos, he must bring a chatas*). But Rabbi Yehoshua argues: There (*he is liable for*) he is not preoccupied with the performance of a *mitzvah*, whereas here he is preoccupied with the performance of a *mitzvah* (*and therefore, there is no liability*).

Rabbi Chiya taught a *braisa*: Rabbi Meir used to say: Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua did not differ concerning one who has two infants, one for circumcision on the eve of the *Shabbos* and one for circumcision on the *Shabbos*, and he forgets and circumcises the one belonging to the eve of the *Shabbos* on the *Shabbos*, that he is liable. About what do they disagree? About one who has two infants, one for circumcision after the *Shabbos* and another for circumcision on the *Shabbos*, and he forgets and circumcises the one belonging to after the *Shabbos* on the *Shabbos*, Rabbi Eliezer declares that he is liable to a *chatas*, while Rabbi Yehoshua exempts him.

The *Gemora* asks: Now, if Rabbi Yehoshua exempts him in the second clause, though he does not fulfill a *mitzvah*,

shall he declare him liable in the first clause, where he does fulfill a *mitzvah*!?

The School of Rabbi Yannai answered: The first clause is referring to a case where the infant belonging to the *Shabbos* was previously circumcised on the eve of the *Shabbos*, so that the *Shabbos* does not stand to be overridden (*and there was no mitzvah at all to be performed on the Shabbos*); but in the second clause the *Shabbos* stands to be overridden.

Rav Ashi asked to Rav Kahana: But in the first clause as well, the *Shabbos* stands to be overridden in connection with infants in general?

Rav Kahana answers: Nevertheless, as far as this man is concerned, it does not stand to be overridden. (137a)

Mishna

An infant (*because of a doubt whether the Shabbos was the infant's eighth day*) is sometimes circumcised on the eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth days (*since his birth*); not earlier nor later. How so? In the normal course, it is on the eighth day; if he is born at twilight (*bein hashemashos – a time that is questionable if it belongs to the end of the preceding day, or to the beginning of the following day*) - on the ninth (*as it may have been night already, and circumcision must not take place before the eighth*); at twilight on *Shabbos* eve - on the tenth (*for the circumcision cannot be on Friday, for perhaps the child was born on Shabbos; he cannot be circumcised on Shabbos, for perhaps the child was born on Friday, and only an “eight-day-circumcision” can override Shabbos*); if a festival follows the *Shabbos* - on the eleventh; if the two days of *Rosh Hashanah* (*follow the Shabbos*) - on the twelfth.

An infant who is ill is not circumcised until he recovers. (137a)



Infant with Fever

Shmuel said: When his fever subsides, we allow him full seven days for his complete recovery (*before circumcising him*).

The scholars inquired: Do we require (*seven*) twenty-four hour periods?

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve it from a *braisa* which Luda taught: The day of his recovery is like the day of his birth.

Surely that means that just as with the day of his birth, we do not require (*seven*) twenty-four hour periods (*before we circumcise him*), so too with the day of his recovery, we do not require (*seven*) twenty-four hour periods.

The *Gemora* disagrees by explaining the *braisa* to mean as follows: The day of his recovery is stricter than the day of his birth, for whereas with the day of his birth, we do not require (*seven*) twenty-four hour periods, with the day of his recovery, we do require (*seven*) twenty-four hour periods. (137a)

Mishna

These are the shreds which render circumcision invalid: Flesh which covers the greater part of the corona. A *Kohen* whose circumcision was so defective is not permitted to eat *terumah*. And if he is fleshy, he must repair it for appearances sake.

If one circumcises, but does not uncover the circumcision, it is as though he has not circumcised. (137a – 137b)

Circumcision

Rabbi Avina said in the name of Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Abba who said in the name of Rav: Flesh which covers the greater part of only the height of the corona.

The *Mishna* had stated: And if he is fleshy, etc.

Shmuel said: If an infant is overgrown with flesh (*covering the corona*), we examine him: as long as he appears circumcised when his membrum is erect, it is unnecessary to circumcise him again; but if not, he must be circumcised again.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: If an infant is overgrown with flesh (*covering the corona*), we examine him: if he does not appear circumcised when his membrum is erect, it is necessary to circumcise him again; but if not, it is not necessary to circumcise him again.

The *Gemora* notes the practical difference between them: They differ where in some respects he appears circumcised, but in some respects he does not appear circumcised. [*The difference would be regarding a case where the membrum is erect, and the corona is only partially visible. Shmuel maintains that unless it is fully visible he must be circumcised, whereas the braisa teaches that only where it is quite invisible is circumcision required again.*] (137b)

Blessings

The *Mishna* had stated: If one circumcises, but does not uncover the circumcision [*it is as though he has not circumcised*].

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: He who circumcises must recite: “[*Blessed are You, Hashem, our God, King of the Universe,*] Who has sanctified us with His commandments, and has commanded us concerning circumcision.” The father of the infant recites: “[*Blessed are You, Hashem, our God, King of the Universe,*] Who has sanctified us with His commandments and has commanded us to bring him into the covenant of our forefather Abraham.” The bystanders exclaim: “Just as he

has entered the covenant, so may he enter into the Torah, the marriage canopy, and good deeds." And he who pronounces the blessing recites: "[*Blessed are You, Hashem, our God, King of the Universe,*] Who has sanctified the beloved one (*Yitzchak*) from the womb; He set a mark of the decree in his flesh (*which cannot be removed*), and his offsprings are sealed with the sign of the holy covenant. Therefore, as a reward for this, O living God Who is our Portion, our Rock, give command to save the beloved of our flesh from destruction, for the sake of His covenant which He has set in our flesh. Blessed are You, Hashem, Who establishes the covenant."

He who circumcises converts recites: "*Blessed are You, Hashem, our God, King of the Universe,* Who has sanctified us with His commandments and has commanded us concerning circumcision." He who pronounces the blessing recites: "[*Blessed are You, Hashem, our God, King of the Universe,*] Who has sanctified us with His commandments and has commanded us to circumcise the converts, and to cause the drops of the blood of the covenant to flow from them, since without the blood of the covenant, heaven and earth would not endure, as it is written: *If not my covenant of day and night, I had not established the ordinances of heaven and earth.* Blessed are You, Hashem, Who establishes the covenant."

He who circumcises slaves recites: "[*Blessed are You, Hashem, our God, King of the Universe,*] Who has sanctified us with His commandments and has commanded us concerning circumcision." And he who pronounces the blessing recites: "[*Blessed are You, Hashem, our God, King of the Universe,*] Who has sanctified us with His commandments and has commanded us to cause the drops of the blood of the covenant to flow from them, since without the blood of the covenant, heaven and earth would not endure, as it is written: *If not my covenant of day and night, I had not*

established the ordinances of heaven and earth. Blessed are You, Hashem, Who establishes the covenant." (137b)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, R' ELIEZER D'MILAH

Hashem Fulfills our Blessings

DAILY MASHAL

The Chozeh of Lublin said that when the Jewish people bless one another, Hashem fulfills their blessings.

The Minchas Elazar of Munkatch found a source for this in our sugya, in which the Gemara requires all those present at a Bris Milah to bless the child, "Just as he entered into the Bris, so may he enter into Torah, marriage and good deeds." He explains that this is an especially potent prayer, since it is part of the berachos recited during the Bris ceremony. However, all of our prayers, blessings, and good words have great effect in Heaven.

The Midrash Rabbah (Koheles, 3) tells the story of R' Shimon ben Chalafta who attended a seudas Bris, in which the father shared vintage wine of excellent quality with his guests. The guests then blessed him that he merit to share with them this wine again at his son's wedding. After the seudah, R' Shimon returned home, and passed on his way the Angel of Death who seemed perturbed and upset. R' Shimon asked him what was bothering him, and he explained that he was sent to take the life of the father, but was unable to do so, since the guests had blessed the father to live to see his son married. Their blessing was fulfilled, and the Angel of Death was turned back from his mission (Divrei Torah 1:106).