

16 Iyar 5782
May 17, 2022



Yevamos Daf 71

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 asks: It is written [Shmos 12:43]: *And any strange man shall not eat of it.* What do we derive from the words “of it”?

The Gemora answers: It teaches us that apostasy is disqualified from the Pesach offering, but he is not disqualified from eating *ma’aser sheini* (a tenth of one’s produce that he brings to Yerushalayim and eats there in the first, second, fourth and fifth years of the Shemitah cycle). (70b – 71a)

The Gemora asks: It is written [Shmos 12:48]: *No uncircumcised male shall eat of it.* What do we derive from the words “of it”?

The Gemora answers: It teaches us that an uncircumcised man cannot partake in the Pesach offering, but he eats *matzah* and *marror*. (71a)

The Torah wrote that an uncircumcised man, and an apostate may not eat from the korban Pesach. The Gemora states that both verses are necessary. If the Torah would only have written the law regarding an uncircumcised man, I would have thought that he is disqualified because he is repulsive, however, an apostate, who is not repulsive, I would think that he is not disqualified. If the Torah would only have written the law regarding an apostate, I would have thought that he is disqualified because his heart is not devoted to Heaven, however, an uncircumcised man, who is devoted to Heaven, I would think that he is not disqualified. It emerges that both verses are necessary. (71a)

What do we derive from the words “of it,” “of it” (mentioned by Pesach)?

The Gemora answers: It is needed for that which was taught by Rabbah in the name of Rabbi Yitzchak. [This will be taught below on 74a.] (71a)

The Gemora cites a braisa mentioned above: Rabbi Akiva stated: This deduction is unnecessary. Since it was stated [Vayikra 22:4]: *A man, a man from the offspring of Aaron who is a metzora, or a zav shall not eat of the holies.* The extra words, “A man, a man” teaches us that the uncircumcised also is included in the prohibition against eating *terumah*.

The Gemora asks: Perhaps the extra word teaches us that an *onein* (one whose close relative passed away and has not been buried yet) is included in this prohibition?

The Gemora answers: Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Chanina stated: *And any strange man* implies that the Torah has imposed a prohibition concerning a non-Kohen from eating *terumah*, but not concerning an *onein*.

The Gemora asks: Perhaps we can say that the verse “*And any strange man*” implies that the Torah has imposed a prohibition concerning a non-Kohen from eating *terumah*, but not concerning an uncircumcised man?

The Gemora answers: The extra words, “A man, a man” teaches us that the uncircumcised also is included in the prohibition against eating *terumah*.

The Gemora asks: What did you see that compelled you to expound the verses in that manner? Perhaps it should be exactly the opposite? (Let us learn as follows: “A man, a man” prohibits an *onein* from eating *terumah*, but not concerning an uncircumcised *Kohen*; and “And any strange man” will teach us that an uncircumcised man may eat *terumah*?)

The Gemora answers: It is logical that we should include an uncircumcised *Kohen* in the prohibition of eating *terumah* because the following stringencies are applicable to him: He is missing a positive action to make him fit; an action must be performed on his body to make him fit; if he remains uncircumcised, he is subject to the penalty of *kares*; circumcision is a *mitzvah* that was given prior to the Giving of the Torah; the lack of circumcision by his male sons and servants prevents him from bringing the Pesach offering.

The Gemora asks: On the contrary. It is logical that we should include an *onein* in the prohibition of eating *terumah* because the following stringencies are applicable to him: It is a prohibition that is applicable at all times (*in contrast to circumcision, where after he is circumcised, the prohibition is not applicable any longer*); it applies to men and women; he is not able to remedy the situation himself.

The Gemora answers: The stringencies pertaining to an uncircumcised *Kohen* are more numerous than those relevant to an *onein*; therefore, we include an uncircumcised *Kohen* in the prohibition of eating *terumah*, and an *onein* is permitted to eat *terumah*.

Rava says that even if an uncircumcised person didn't have more severe aspects than an *onein*, we still would not say (that “a man, a man” prohibits an *onein* from eating *terumah*), for the Torah said: *A man, a man*. What is something that is specific to a man, and not a woman? This is non-circumcision. (71a)

The Gemora asks: What does Rabbi Akiva expound from the words “*toshav v'sachir*”?

Rav Shemaya answered: The words in the verse teach us that a circumcised Arab and a circumcised Gibeonite are included in the prohibition of eating from the Pesach offering.

The Gemora asks: But aren't these people considered circumcised? We learned in a Mishna: If one takes a vow that he will not derive any pleasure from *areilim* (*uncircumcised people*), he is permitted to derive pleasure from uncircumcised Jews, but he is prohibited from deriving pleasure from a circumcised idolater (*regarding vows, the halacha is that we interpret his words based on the vernacular*). If one takes a vow that he will not derive any pleasure from *mulim* (*circumcised people*), he is permitted to derive pleasure from circumcised idolaters, but he is prohibited from deriving pleasure from an uncircumcised Jew. (*It is evident that a circumcised idolater is regarded as uncircumcised.*)

Rather, the Gemora answers that the words “*toshav v'sachir*” are including a case where a convert was circumcised (*and he is regarded as a circumcised person because it was performed for the purpose of becoming a Jew*), but did not immerse himself yet in a *mikvah*, and it is also referring to a case where a child was born circumcised; for Rabbi Akiva maintains that one must cause covenantal blood to flow from him. (*The Torah is forbidding them from partaking in the Pesach offering.*)

Rabbi Eliezer disagrees on both counts. He holds that a convert who circumcised, but did not immerse himself yet in a *mikvah* is considered a full-fledged Jew; and he maintains that a child who born circumcised does not need covenantal blood to flow from him.

The Gemora asks: What does Rabbi Eliezer expound from the words “*A man, a man*”?

The Gemora answers: He maintains that the Torah speaks in a language commonly used by people (and therefore, it is not regarded as superfluous). (71a)

Rav Chama bar Ukva inquired: *(There exists a prohibition for an uncircumcised Kohen to anoint himself with terumah oil.)* Are we permitted to anoint an uncircumcised infant (*prior to eight days old*) with *terumah* oil?

The Gemora explains the inquiry: Does being uncircumcised before its time (*the mitzvah of milah does not take effect until the eighth day*) prevent him from benefiting from *terumah*, or does it not prevent him from benefiting from *terumah*?

Rabbi Zeira brings a proof from the following braisa: The Torah states explicitly that the non-circumcision of one's children at the time of the slaughtering prevents him from offering the korban Pesach; and the Torah states explicitly that the non-circumcision of one's slaves at the time of the eating prevents him from eating the korban Pesach. How do we derive the laws stated by this one to that one, and the laws stated by that one to this one? The word "*then*" was specifically stated in both categories so that an analogy between the two might be drawn.

Rabbi Zeira analyzes the braisa: We can find a case where the uncircumcised slaves were in his possession at the time of the eating of the korban Pesach, but they were not in his possession at the time of its slaughtering; if he bought the slaves after the slaughtering, but prior to the eating. However, how is it possible to have a case where his uncircumcised sons were present during the eating of the korban Pesach, but they were not present during the slaughtering? It must be referring to a case where the son was born in between the slaughtering and the eating (*and the braisa rules that this will prevent him from eating the korban Pesach; this is indeed a proof that an uncircumcised child before its time is regarded as uncircumcised, and it should be forbidden to anoint him with terumah oil*).

Rava disagrees: It is written [Shmos 12:48]: *Let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near to perform it.* If the father is obligated to circumcise his son; refraining from

doing so, will prevent him from offering the korban Pesach. The father has no obligation to circumcise his newborn infant, and his lack of doing so will not prevent him from offering the korban Pesach.

Rather, the explanation of the braisa is as follows: The child had fever at the time of the slaughtering, but disappeared at the time of the eating. (*The father's failure to circumcise him will prevent him from eating the korban Pesach.*)

The Gemora asks on this interpretation: Why do we fault the father in this situation? The halachah is that after a child recovers from his illness, we do not circumcise him until seven days after his recovery. The child could not have been circumcised at the time of the eating.

The Gemora answers: The braisa is referring to a case where the seven days of recovery were completed on the fourteenth of Nissan (*the day of the slaughtering*).

The Gemora asks: How can that be the case? The father should have been required to circumcise him in the morning, even prior to the slaughtering?

The Gemora answers: The halachah is that we are required to wait seven complete days before circumcising the child (*the seven twenty-four-hour periods were not completed at the time of the slaughtering*).

The Gemora asks: But Ludaah taught the following braisa: 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. (71a – 71b)

The Gemora presents another four explanations of the braisa (regarding an uncircumcised son, who did not prevent his father from slaughtering the korban pesach, but he does prevent him from eating it): Rav Pappa said: The braisa is referring to a case where the child's eyes were hurting him in the morning of the fourteenth, and later in the afternoon (*after the slaughtering*), he recovered. (*The seven day waiting period is only necessary when recovering from a fever or an illness which affects the entire body.*)

Rava said: The braisa is referring to a case where the father and mother of the child were released from prison after their korban was slaughtered. (*An agent slaughtered the korban for them, but the circumcision of their child is incumbent on them to perform.*)

Rav Kahana the son of Rav Nechemia said: The braisa is referring to a case where the child was a *tumtum* (*undetermined sex*) whose genital covering was ripped open after the korban Pesach was slaughtered, and he was found to be a male.

Rav Sheravya said: The braisa is referring to a case where the child stuck his head out of his mother's womb (*on the seventh of Nissan*), but did not completely emerge until the fourteenth, after the Pesach was slaughtered. (*The child is regarded as born as soon as the majority of his head emerges. It was physically impossible to circumcise him until his entire body emerged.*)

The Gemora asks: Can a child in such a situation actually live? But it was taught in a braisa: As soon as the child emerges into the air of the world the closed organ (*the mouth*) is opened and the opened (*the navel*) is closed, for otherwise he could not survive even for one moment. (*In the embryonic state the mouth is closed and the navel, by means of which it draws sustenance, open.*)

The Gemora answers: The braisa is referring to a case where a fever sustained the child.

The Gemora asks: If the child had a fever, we should be required to wait another seven days?

The Gemora answers: The mother's fever sustained him.

Alternatively, you can say that a child cannot survive in such a situation when he doesn't cry out, but if he cries out, the child can survive (*his crying generates heat and the heat sustains him, similar to the heat from the fever*). (71b)

Rabbi Yochanan said in the name of Rabbi Benaah: An uncircumcised man is eligible to receive sprinkling (*from the water of purification if he was tamei from corpse tumah; he is, thereby, enabled to eat terumah immediately after the circumcision, no other sprinkling being required*); for so we find that our forefathers received sprinkling while they were still uncircumcised, as it is said [Yehoshua 4:19]: *And the people came up out of the Jordan on the tenth day of the first month*. The Gemora explains: On the tenth they were not circumcised owing to the fatigue of the journey (*this would have threatened their lives; it is evident that they were circumcised on the eleventh*); when, then, could the sprinkling have been performed (*to purify them from the corpse tumah from the Wilderness*)? Obviously, they were sprinkled while they were still uncircumcised (*since they need to be sprinkled on the third and seventh days of the seven clean days, and only then could they partake in the korban Pesach*).

The Gemora asks: Perhaps they did not offer a korban Pesach that year?

The Gemora answers: This suggestion cannot be entertained at all, since it is written [Yehoshua 5:10]: *And they kept the Pesach*.

Mar Zutra asked: It is possible that it was a Pesach offering that was offered in *tumah*?

Rav Ashi replied: It was explicitly taught in a braisa: They circumcised themselves, they immersed in a *mikvah*, and they offered the korban Pesach in a state of purity. (71b)

Rabbah bar Yitzchak said in the name of Rav: The commandment of uncovering the circumcision (uncovering the corona by splitting the membrane that covers it and drawing it towards its base) was not given to our forefather Avraham; for it is said [Yehoshua 5:2]: At that time Hashem said to Yehoshua: *“Make sharp knives of flint for yourself (and circumcise the Children of Israel again, a second time).”* (This is referring to *mitzvah* of uncovering the circumcision.)

The Gemora asks: Perhaps this applied to those who were not previously circumcised; for it is written [Yehoshua 5:5]: *For all the people that came out were circumcised, but all the people that were born in the Wilderness were not circumcised.*

The Gemora answers: If so, what is the meaning of *“and circumcise the Children of Israel again”*? Rather, it must apply to the uncovering the circumcision.

The Gemora asks: What is the meaning of the last words of the verse: *“and circumcise the Children of Israel again, a second time”*?

The Gemora answers: It is to compare the end of the circumcision with its commencement. Just as the commencement of the circumcision is essential (*and if a majority of the thick upper part of the foreskin is not cut off, the circumcision is invalid*), so too, the end of the circumcision essential (*failure to remove strands that cover the corona can invalidate the circumcision*); for we learned in a 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*.

Ravina said, or it might be said, Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Abba said in the name of Rav: Flesh which covers the greater part of only the height of the corona. (71b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

CIRCUMCISION QUESTIONS

*** The Gemora states: The words in the verse teach us that a circumcised Arab and a circumcised Gibeonite are included in the prohibition against eating from the Pesach offering.

The Gemora asks: But aren't these people considered circumcised? We learned in a Mishna: If one takes a vow that he will not derive any pleasure from *areilim* (*uncircumcised people*), he is permitted to derive pleasure from uncircumcised Jews, but he is prohibited from deriving pleasure from a circumcised idolater. If one takes a vow that he will not derive any pleasure from *mulim* (*circumcised people*), he is permitted to derive pleasure from circumcised idolaters, but he is prohibited from deriving pleasure from an uncircumcised Jew. (*It is evident that a circumcised idolater is regarded as uncircumcised.*)

What is the comparison between the two cases? Perhaps it can be said that *regarding vows, the halachah is that we interpret his words based on the vernacular*, and an idolater is described as being uncircumcised even though they in fact are circumcised.

*** Rabbi Eliezer maintains that a convert who circumcised, but did not immerse himself yet in a *mikvah* is considered a full-fledged Jew; and he maintains that a child who born circumcised does not need covenantal blood to flow from him.

The Rama rules that if one circumcises a child at night, he is required to cause covenantal blood to flow from him. He also rules that if one circumcises a child before he is eight



days old, he is not required to cause covenantal blood to flow from him.

What is the difference between the two cases?

*** Rava explained the braisa (*the father was not considered negligent for not circumcising his son at the time of the slaughtering of the korban Pesach, but he is negligent for not circumcising him at the time of the eating*) to be referring to a case where the father and mother of the child were released from prison after their korban was slaughtered. (*An agent slaughtered the korban for them, but the circumcision of their child is incumbent on them to perform.*)

Rashi explains that the *mitzvah* of circumcision rests on the father and the mother.

Doesn't the Gemora in *Kiddushin* state that a woman is exempt from circumcising her son based on a verse in the Torah?

Why can't the father appoint an agent to circumcise his son for him?

DAILY MASHAL

The concept of "Dibrah Torah k'lashon b'nei adam" – the Torah speaks in the common language of men teaches us that the Torah is written for everyone to understand on their own level. Every person has his own "portion" of Torah.