

XIX.

BAVLI SHABBAT CHAPTER NINETEEN

FOLIOS 130A-137B

19:1

- A. R. Eliezer says, “If one did not bring a utensil [used for circumcision] on the eve of the Sabbath, he brings it openly on the Sabbath.”
- B. And in the time of the danger, one covers it up in the presence of witnesses.
- C. And further did R. Eliezer state, “They cut wood to make coals to prepare an iron utensil [for circumcision].”
- D. An encompassing principle did R. Aqiba state, “Any sort of labor [in connection with circumcision] which it is possible to do on the eve of the Sabbath does not override [the restrictions of] the Sabbath, and that which it is not possible to do on the eve of the Sabbath does override [the prohibitions of] the Sabbath.”

- I.1** A. [He brings it openly on the Sabbath:] *The question was raised: Is the operative consideration behind the ruling of R. Eliezer special concern for that particular religious duty, or was it because of suspicion [that if the one who brought the knife did so surreptitiously, he might be suspect of violating the Sabbath]?*
- B. *Yeah, so what difference does it make?*
- C. *To cover the case of bringing the knife covered up in the presence of witnesses. If you say that the operative consideration is special concern for that particular religious duty, then bringing it out in the open is fine, but not concealed. But if you say that it is because of potential suspicion, then under these circumstances there would be no problem. So what is the upshot?*

D. *It has been stated:*

E. *Said R. Levi, "R. Eliezer made this statement only out of special concern for that particular religious duty."*

F. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

G. *"One brings it out in the open and one doesn't bring it covered up," the words of R. Eliezer.*

H. *Said R. Ashi, "A close reading of our Mishnah paragraph also yields this same conclusion: **And in the time of the danger, one covers it up in the presence of witnesses.** In a time of danger that is all right, but not in a time of danger it isn't. That proves that R. Eliezer made this statement only out of special concern for that particular religious duty."*

I. *That proves it.*

- I.2** A. *It has further been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. *"One brings it out in the open and doesn't bring it covered up," the words of R. Eliezer.*
- C. *R. Judah says in the name of R. Eliezer, "They had the custom in the time of danger of bringing the knife covered up in the presence of witnesses."*
- I.3** A. *The question was raised: As to the witnesses that have been mentioned, does this mean him and one other, or him and two others?*
- B. *Come and take note of the language: **And in the time of the danger, one covers it up in the presence of witnesses.** Now if you say that it means him and two others, there is no problem, but if you say it means him and one another, then how can we speak of "witnesses" here?*
- C. *The sense would be, witnesses that under other circumstances could testify [though he obviously cannot testify in this matter].*
- II.1** A. **And further did R. Eliezer state, "They cut wood to make coals to prepare an iron utensil [for circumcision]":**
- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *In the locale of R. Eliezer on the Sabbath they would cut wood to heat charcoal to forge iron [to make a circumcision knife, since in his view it was permitted to do everything that was required in connection with the rite]. In the locale of R. Yosé the Galilean, they would eat chicken meat with milk.*

II.2 A. Levi visited the house of Joseph the fowler. They served him the head of a peacock cooked in milk. He didn't eat it. When he came before Rabbi, he said to him, "How come you didn't excommunicate them?"

B. He said to him, "It was the locale of R. Judah b. Beterah, and I thought, maybe he expounded for them [the rule] in accord with the position of R. Yosé the Galilean, for we have learned in the Mishnah:

R. Yosé the Galilean says, 'It is said, "You will not eat any sort of carrion," (Deu. 14:21), and it is said, "You will not seethe the kid in its mother's milk" (Deu. 14:21). [The meaning is this:] What is prohibited on the grounds of carrion [also] is prohibited to be cooked in milk. Fowl, which is prohibited on the grounds of carrion, is it possible that it is prohibited to be seethed in milk? Scripture says, "In its mother's milk" — excluding fowl, the mother of which does not have milk' [M. Hul. 8:4F-H]."

II.3 A. Said R. Isaac, "There was a town in the Land of Israel, in which they acted in accord with R. Eliezer, and they died at the right time. Moreover, the evil kingdom made a decree against Israel in respect to circumcision, but in respect to that town no such decree was made."

The Importance of Circumcision

II.4 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "Every religious duty that the Israelites accepted with joy, for instance circumcision, as it is written, 'I rejoice at your word, as one that finds great spoil' (Psa. 119:162), they still do with joy. Every religious duty that they accepted grudgingly, for example, the prohibition of consanguineous marriage, as it is written, 'And Moses heard the people weeping throughout their families' (Num. 11:10), that is, on account of the rules governing their families, they still do grudgingly" — *for there is no marriage contract that doesn't involve contention.*

II.5 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. R. Simeon b. Eleazar says, "Any religious duty for which the Israelites gave up their lives unto death in the time of the government decrees, for instance, idolatry and circumcision, is still strongly confirmed in their possession, but any religious duty for which the Israelites did not give up their lives unto death in

the time of the government decrees, for instance, phylacteries, is still infirmly held by them.”

C. For said R. Yannai, “Said R. Yannai, “As to wearing phylacteries, it is required that the body be clean, as in the case of Elisha, the man of wings.”

D. *What’s the point?*

E. Abbaye said, “It means, you shouldn’t fart while wearing them.”

F. Raba said, “It means, you shouldn’t sleep in them.”

II.6 A. *And what’s the meaning of* Elisha, the man of wings?

B. Once the wicked Roman government made a decree against Israel that whoever put on phylacteries — they would gouge out his brains. But Elisha put them on and went out to the marketplace. A detective saw him, so he ran away, and the other followed. When the other caught up, he took them off his head and put them in his hand. The other said to him, “What’s this in your hand?”

C. He said to him, “The wings of a dove.”

D. He held out his hand and they turned out to be wings of a dove. Therefore they call him, Elisha, the man of wings.

II.7 A. *And what differentiates* the wings of a dove from all other birds?

B. Because the community of Israel *is compared to* a dove, as it is said, “as the wings of a dove covered with silver” (Psa. 68:14) — just as with a dove, its wings protect it, so Israel — religious duties protect them.

Further Analysis of the Mishnah-Paragraph

II.8 A. Said R. Abba bar R. Adda said R. Isaac, “Once they forgot and didn’t bring the knife on the eve of the Sabbath so they brought it on the Sabbath through roofs and courtyards [130B], contrary to the pleasure of R. Eliezer.”

- B. *Objected R. Joseph, "...Contrary to the pleasure of R. Eliezer? To the contrary! R. Eliezer is the one who permits doing just that! And if you say, contrary to the pleasure of R. Eliezer, for he would have permitted bringing the knife even through public domain, but rather, it was to the pleasure of rabbis, who forbid carrying it through public domain but permit carrying it through roofs, courtyards or enclosures — yet is this actually permitted? Hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority, Just as they may not bring it through public domain, so they may not bring it through roofs, courtyards or enclosures!"*
- C. *Rather, said R. Ashi, "It was contrary to the pleasure of R. Eliezer as well as to those that differ from him, but it was in accord with the wishes of R. Simeon. For we have learned in the Mishnah: **R. Simeon says, 'All the same are roofs, courtyards, and outer areas — each constitutes a single domain in regard to utensils which have been kept for the Sabbath therein, and not [a single domain] for utensils which have been kept for the Sabbath in the house' [M. Erub. 9:1D-F]."***

- II.9** A. *R. Zira asked R. Assi, "An alleyway in which the residents did not form a symbolic partnership [to create a single domain for purposes of carrying on the Sabbath] — what is the law as to carrying something in the whole of it [utensils present at the start of the Sabbath (Freedman)]? Do we claim that it is comparable to a courtyard, so that, just as a courtyard, even though they have not formed a symbolic partnership, it is permitted to carry objects through the whole of it, so here, too, even though they did not form a symbolic partnership in it, it is permitted to carry through the whole of it? Or maybe there is no comparison to a courtyard, for a courtyard has four walls, but this doesn't have four walls? Or, also, a courtyard has tenants, but this has no tenants?"*
- B. *He shut up and said nothing to him. Sometime later [Zira] came across [Assi] in session and stating, "Said R. Simeon b. Laqish in the name of R. Judah the Patriarch, 'Once they forgot and didn't bring the knife on the eve of the Sabbath so they brought it on the Sabbath, and the matter was difficult for sages: How could they have abandoned the position of sages and acted in accord with R. Eliezer? First of all, for R. Eliezer was a member of the House of Shammai. And second, where there is an individual as against the majority, the decided law follows the majority. And said R. Oshayya, "I asked R. Judah the circumciser, and he said to me, 'It was an alleyway the residents of which had not formed a fictive partnership, and they brought the knife from one end*

to the other.’ And he said to him, ‘Does the master maintain that in an alleyway the residents of which have not formed a fictive partnership, it is permitted to carry about the entire area,’ and he said to him, ‘Yes indeed.’”

- C. *[Zira] said to [Assi], “But there was a time that I asked this very matter of you and you didn’t tell me this? Maybe in the course of your review your tradition came back to you?”*
- D. *He said to him, “Well, yes, in the course of review my tradition came back to me.”*

II.10 A. *It has been stated:*

B. Said R. Zira said Rab, “In an alleyway the residents of which did not form a fictive partnership they carry objects only four cubits and now more [as in public domain].”

C. *Said Abbaye, “This matter did R. Zira state but not explain, until Rabbah bar Abbuha came and explained it. For said R. Nahman said Rabbah bar Abbuha said Rab, ‘In an alleyway the residents of which did not form a fictive partnership, if they formed a fictive union of the courtyards with the houses, it is permitted to carry objects only for four cubits; if they didn’t form such a fictive union of the courtyards with the houses, it is permitted to carry objects through the whole of it.’”*

D. *Said R. Hanina of Khuzistan to Rabbah, “What’s the point of the distinction between the courtyards being formed into a union with the houses? Presumably because they have been changed and transformed into houses. And Rab is consistent with views expressed elsewhere, for said Rab, ‘An alley is not made into an area in which carrying is permitted by the erection of a stake and beam, unless [131A] the houses and courtyards open into it; but here we have houses but no courtyards.’ But then is the reason that here we have houses and not courtyards [which explains why when the courtyards are combined with the houses, it is permitted to carry only four cubits]? But then, even if they did not form a fictive union, we may regard the houses as though they were closed off [one cannot carry from the houses into the alley because*

of the intervening courtyards], so we also have courtyards but not houses!”

E. It is possible for them all to renounce their rights in favor of one party [he then owns the courtyard and may carry from his house into it].

F. Well, in the end you have a house, but not houses!

G. It's possible that from morning to midday they will renounce their rights in favor of one, and from midday until evening, in favor of another.

H. So one way or the other, when there is one house, there is no other house [and we're where we were].

I. Rather, said R. Ashi, “What is it that made the courtyards forbidden in regard to the alley? The houses, and these are not taken into account.” [Freedman: Rab maintains that roof, courtyard, enclosures, and an alley form one domain, carrying is allowed from one to another, on condition that the houses are not combined with the courtyards, so that no utensils belonging to the houses are to be found in the courtyards, which might then be carried into the alley; the same applies to carrying in the alley itself; for if there are no houses at all, a formal partnership is unnecessary and carrying in the alley is permitted, just as it is from the alley into the courtyard. Since the houses are not combined with the courtyards, and no utensils may be moved from the former into the latter, for all practical purposes the houses are nonexistent; therefore one may carry over the whole of the alley itself.]

II.11 A. Said R. Hiyya bar Abba said R. Yohanan, “Not for all purposes did R. Eliezer say, ‘What is required to make it possible to carry out a religious duty overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath,’ for lo, the two loaves represent the obligation of the day, and R. Eliezer derives the rule [that baking them overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath] only from an argument based on a verbal analogy [rather than holding that just as the duty is to put them out as an offering to the Lord, so baking them, necessary to carry out that duty, is permitted on the Sabbath as well]. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. "R. Eliezer says, 'How do we know that what is needed for the preparation of the two loaves of bread [as well as the actual rite itself] overrides the Sabbath? We find a reference to "bringing" in connection with the presentation of the first sheaf of barley, and we find the same word in connection with the two loaves of bread. Just as the use of the word "bringing" in connection with the presentation of the first sheaf of barley indicates that preparation for the rite, not only the rite itself, overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath, so the presence of the word "bringing" stated with respect to the two loaves of bread indicates that the same rule applies, so that preparing for the rite overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath.'"
- C. *The cited words [referring to "bringing"] must be free and available for the present purpose, for if that were not the case, one could raise the following objection to the comparison just now set forth: What distinguishes the presentation of the first sheaf of barley is that even if one found grain already cut, one still cuts more grain for that purpose. But will you say the same of the preparation of the two loaves of bread? In that case, if one found grain already cut, one doesn't cut more.*
- D. *In any event the cited words are entirely available for that purpose, for note, it is written: "Then you shall bring the sheaf of the first fruits of your harvest to the priest" (Lev. 23:10), what need do I have for the language, "from the day that you brought..."? Infer from that language that it is in order to leave the cited words free.*
- E. *Still, it is free in only one aspect, while we have it as an established fact that if proof is available in only one aspect only, we may draw a deduction, but we also entertain refutations!*
- F. The language "you shall bring" extends the law [Freedman: since Scripture could write, "and you shall offer a new meal-offering to the Lord out of your habitations." The extension embraces the preliminaries of bringing and intimates that these supersede the Sabbath].

II.12 A. *[With reference to R. Yohanan, "Not for all purposes did R. Eliezer say...",], what did [Yohanan] mean to exclude? Should we say that it is to exclude the taking of the palm branch on Tabernacles that coincided with a Sabbath (Lev. 23:40)? But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: "The taking of the palm branch and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath," the words of R. Eliezer?*

B. *Then is it to eliminate the building of the tabernacle [sukkah]? But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: "The tabernacle and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath," the words of R. Eliezer?*

C. *Then is it to eliminate the matter of unleavened bread on Passover? But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: "The unleavened bread and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath," the words of R. Eliezer?*

D. *Then is it to eliminate the ram's horn for the New Year? But hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: "The ram's horn and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath," the words of R. Eliezer?*

E. Said R. Adda bar Ahbah, "It is to eliminate fringes for one's garment and the mezuzah for one's doorpost [which must not be prepared on the Sabbath]."

F. *So, too, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: And they concur that if he inserted fringes in his clothing or put a mezuzah on his door, he is liable.*

G. *How come?*

H. Said R. Joseph, "Since there is no fixed time for these religious duties."

I. *Said to him Abbaye, "To the contrary, since they have no fixed time for their performance, [131B] every moment is a correct time."*

J. Rather, said R. Nahman said R. Isaac, and some say, R. Huna b. R. Joshua, "Since one has the power to renounce ownership of these objects [and so free himself from the obligation of show fringes for the garment or a mezuzah for the door, in which case he could not do these deeds on the Sabbath]."

II.13 A. "The taking of the palm branch and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath," the words of R. Eliezer —

B. *How does R. Eliezer know this fact?*

C. *Should I say that it is from the presentation of the first sheaf of barley and the two loaves of bread? But that is the*

case because they are requirements of the Most High [as a direct offering] [which is not so for taking the palm branch].

D. Rather, Scripture has said, “And you shall take on the first day... branches of palm trees” (Lev. 23:40) — even on the Sabbath. *And for what practical purpose is this law stated? Should I say that it is for handling the objects? Then would a verse be required to validate handling? So it follows that that must pertain to the things that have to do with preparing it.*

E. *And rabbis [who differ from Eliezer]?*

F. *They require the reference to “day” to indicate, by day and not by night.*

G. *And how does R. Eliezer know that the law applies by day and not by night?*

H. He derives it from the verse, “and you shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days” (Deu. 23:40) — days, not nights.

I. *And rabbis [who differ from Eliezer]?*

J. *They require it, for you might otherwise imagine that the rule governing seven days should derive from the analogy of the tabernacle: Just as in that case, the reference to “days” encompasses even the nights, so here, too, the reference to “days” would encompass even the nights. So we are informed otherwise.*

K. *And let the All-Merciful state [the law concerning how preparation for the rite overrides the prohibitions of the Sabbath] in respect to the palm branch for Tabernacles, and we might then adduce the others by analogy?*

L. *But one might challenge that analogy: What makes the palm branch special is that it requires four species.*

II.14 A. “The taking of the palm branch and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath,” the words of R. Eliezer —

B. *How does R. Eliezer know this fact?*

C. *Should I say that it is from the presentation of the first sheaf of barley and the two loaves of bread? But that is the*

case because they are requirements of the Most High [as a direct offering] [which is not so for taking the palm branch]. And should I say that it is from the case of the palm branch? But what makes the palm branch special is that it requires four species.

D. Rather, it derives from the analogy of the seven days that pertain to the palm branch: Just as in the latter case the things necessary to carry out the religious duty override the restrictions of the Sabbath, so here, too, the things required to carry out the religious duty override the restrictions of the Sabbath.

E. *Well, then, let the All-Merciful state the law in connection with the tabernacle, and we might derive it from the others?*

F. *But one might challenge that analogy:* What is distinctive about the tabernacle is that the religious duty is binding night as well as day.

II.15 A. “The unleavened bread and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath,” the words of R. Eliezer —

B. *How does R. Eliezer know this fact?*

C. *Should I say that it is from the presentation of the first sheaf of barley and the two loaves of bread? But that is the case because they are requirements of the Most High [as a direct offering] [which is not so for taking the palm branch]. And should I say that it is from the case of the palm branch? But what makes the palm branch special is that it requires four species. And should I say that it is from the case of the tabernacle? But what is distinctive about the tabernacle is that the religious duty is binding night as well as day.*

D. Rather, the sense of “the fifteenth day” is derived by analogy to the festival of Tabernacles: Just as in that case, what is required to carry out the religious duty supersedes the prohibitions of the Sabbath, so here, too, what is required to perform the religious duty overrides the prohibition of the Sabbath.

E. *Well, then, let the All-Merciful state the law in connection with unleavened bread, and we might derive it from the others?*

F. *But one might challenge that analogy: What is distinctive about unleavened bread is that it is obligatory on women as much as on men.*

II.16 A. “The ram’s horn and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath,” the words of R. Eliezer —

B. *How does R. Eliezer know this fact?*

C. *Should I say that it is from the presentation of the first sheaf of barley and the two loaves of bread? But that is the case because they are requirements of the Most High [as a direct offering] [which is not so for taking the palm branch]. And should I say that it is from the case of the palm branch? But what makes the palm branch special is that it requires four species. And should I say that it is from the case of the tabernacle? But what is distinctive about the tabernacle is that the religious duty is binding night as well as day. Should I say that it is from the case of unleavened bread? But what is distinctive about unleavened bread is that it is obligatory on women as much as on men.*

D. Rather, said Scripture, “It is a day of blowing of the ram’s horn for you” (Num. 29: 1) — it must be done by day, even on the Sabbath.

E. *Now for what purpose is this clause introduced? Should I say that it has to do with sounding the ram’s horn? But a Tannaite authority of the household of Samuel [better: Ishmael] stated, “You shall do no servile work” (Lev. 23:25) excludes the sounding of the ram’s horn and the removal of bread from an oven, since these are skill and not work.” Rather, it concerns the things required to do the religious duty.*

F. *And rabbis?*

G. *That is required to teach, by day and not by night.*

H. *And how does R. Eliezer derive the rule that it is done by day but not by night?*

I. *He derives it from the verse, “In the Day of Atonement you shall send out the trumpet throughout all your land” (Lev. 25: 9), and the matters of the sounding of the ram’s horn on the New Year and Day of Atonement are derived from one another.*

J. *And let the All-Merciful state the rule in the rubric of the ram’s horn, and the others then may derive from that rubric by analogy?*

K. *The sounding of the ram’s horn on the New Year is not a valid analogy for the others, since it alone brings remembrance of Israel to their father who is in Heaven. So, too, the sounding of the ram’s horn on the Day of Atonement also is not a valid analogy for the others, since a master has said, “If the court sounded the ram’s horn, slaves were set free from the households where they had worked, and fields revert to their original owners.”*

II.17 A. “Circumcision and everything having to do with preparing it override the restrictions of the Sabbath,” the words of R. Eliezer —

B. *How does R. Eliezer know this fact? If it is from all of these others, then matters are as we have said. And further more, what distinguishes these other matters [132A] is that if the time for doing them passes, they are annulled [which is not the case of circumcision]. Rather, this is the scriptural basis for the position of R. Eliezer: Scripture says, “And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised” (Lev. 12: 3) — even on the Sabbath.*

C. *Well, then, let the All-Merciful make that statement with regard to circumcision, and let all of the other cases be derived by analogy from that case?*

D. *The reason that that is not feasible is that one may raise this objection to the analogy: What distinguishes circumcision is that, on that account, thirteen covenants were made.*

II.18 A. *In any event rabbis differ from R. Eliezer only with respect to what is required to carry out circumcision, but as to*

circumcision itself, all parties concur that it does override the restrictions of the Sabbath. So how we do know that fact?

B. Said Ulla, "It is a received law."

C. So said R. Isaac, "It is a received law."

D. *An objection was raised: How on the basis of Scripture do we know that saving an endangered life overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath?* R. Eleazar b. Azariah says, **"If circumcision, which is only one of the limbs of a man, overrides the Sabbath, all the more so should saving an endangered life override the Sabbath"** [T. **Shab. 15:16G**].

Now should you say that it is a received law, can one construct an argument a fortiori from a received law? And has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: Said to him R. Eleazar, "Aqiba, that the size of a bone that imparts uncleanness is as much as a barley grain is a received law, but that a quarter-log of a corpse is what imparts uncleanness is presented by you on the basis of an argument a fortiori, and we do not compose an argument a fortiori on the foundations of a received law!"?

E. *Rather, said R. Eleazar, "It derives from the analogy formed by the verbal correspondence of the words 'sign' that occur, first, with respect to circumcision, and, second, with respect to the Sabbath"* [at Gen. 17:11 for circumcision, Exo. 31:13 for the Sabbath; the former may be performed on the latter (Freedman)].

F. *Well, then, how about phylacteries, in connection with which the word "sign" is written? Should that item also override the restrictions of the Sabbath?* [Of course not!]

G. *Rather, the matter should derive from the fact that the words "covenant" occur with reference both to circumcision and to the Sabbath.*

H. *Then the circumcision of an adult, in connection with which "covenant" appears, should override the Sabbath [but not the circumcision of a boy eight days old].*

I. *Rather, it should derive from the fact that the word “generations” occurs with reference to both the Sabbath and circumcision.*

J. *Well, then, preparing show fringes, in connection with which the same word, generations, occurs, also should override the restrictions of the Sabbath.*

K. Rather, said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “We derive an analogy from the occurrence of the words sign, covenant, and generations, in the one context, from the appearance of sign, covenant, and generations, in the other, *thereby excluding these other cases, in which one or another but not all three words appears.*”

II.19 A. And R. Yohanan said, [With reference to the verses, “You shall keep my covenant” (Gen. 17: 9), “And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised” (Lev. 12: 3)], “Said Scripture, ‘By day’ — even [if the eighth day falls] on the Sabbath.”

B. *Said R. Simeon b. Laqish to R. Yohanan, “Then what about those who lack, atonement [not having presented the sacrifice as part of their purification rites], in the context of whom the word ‘by day’ is written. Here, too, should their rite override the restrictions of the Sabbath?”*

C. *That reference is required to make the point, “...by day...,” and not by night.*

D. *Well, then, this, too, should serve the same purpose, namely, “...by day...,” and not by night.*

E. *That derives from the language, “and he who is eight days old” (Gen. 17:12).*

F. *But that can be derived from the language, “In the day that he commanded the children of Israel to offer their offerings” (Lev. 7:38).*

G. *Even though it may derive from, “In the day that he commanded the children of Israel to offer their offerings” (Lev. 7:38), nonetheless, it was necessary. For you might otherwise have argued, since the All-Merciful has shown mercy upon him, permitting him in the case of poverty to*

present a cheaper sacrifice, he may also allow him to bring it at night [if that is more convenient, so he doesn't have to lose a day of work]. So we are informed to the contrary.

H. Objected Rabina, "If so [if leniency as to poverty might involve other leniencies as well], then a non-priest should be valid, so, too, one who has suffered a bereavement but not yet buried his dead [and these, too, should be permitted to kill the offering of the named classes of persons]!"

I. Scripture is what has raised the issue [of poverty, and it applies only to the point at which Scripture made it pertain].

II.20 *A. R. Aha bar Jacob said, "Said Scripture, '...on the eighth day...' — even if it is the Sabbath."*

B. But this allusion to the eighth day is required to eliminate the seventh!

C. The seventh day is eliminated by the language, "and he who is eight days old."

D. Still, it is required, first of all, to eliminate the seventh day, and, further, to eliminate the ninth day. For if I had to rely on only one such reference, I might have concluded that only the seventh is excluded, since the time for circumcision has not yet arrived, but any time from the eighth day onward is o.k. So it is better to explain matters in line with the view of R. Yohanan.

II.21 *A. It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with R. Yohanan and not in accord with R. Aha bar Jacob:*

B. "And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised" — even on the Sabbath.

C. And how do I interpret the statement, "And every one that profanes it shall surely be put to death" (Exo. 31:14)?

D. That speaks of doing other aspects of the labor in connection with the rite of circumcision, other than the circumcision itself.

E. But maybe it means that even the rite of circumcision may not be done?

F. Then how shall I interpret, “On the eighth day”? To all days except the Sabbath.

G. Accordingly Scripture has to say, “On the day...,” even on the Sabbath.

II.22 A. *Said Raba, “Lo, as to the Tannaite authority before us, to begin with why was he satisfied, but in the end what troubled him?”*

B. *This is the sense of his statement: “And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised” — even on the Sabbath. And how do I interpret the statement, “And every one that profanes it shall surely be put to death” (Exo. 31:14)? That speaks of doing other aspects of the labor in connection with the rite of circumcision, other than the circumcision itself. And as to circumcision itself, what is the basis in Scripture for the fact that it overrides the Sabbath?* It follows from an argument a fortiori based on the matter of the skin ailment of Lev. 13-14, which overrides the Temple service, **[132B]** and the Temple service overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath. And yet the rite of circumcision overrides the rules governing the skin ailment [since if there is a mark that may be the skin ailment, located on the penis, the foreskin still is removed, even though otherwise it is forbidden to remove the mark of the skin ailment]! So the Sabbath, which is set aside by the requirements of the Temple service, surely should be set aside by the rite of circumcision!

C. *And what is the meaning of his statement, But maybe it means that even the rite of circumcision may not be done?*

D. *This is the meaning: And how does it follow that the rules governing the skin ailment are the more strict? Maybe the Sabbath is the more strict, since so many penalties and rules govern it! And, furthermore, how does it follow that the operative consideration is that the skin ailment is the more stringent? Maybe that's because the man is not fit [even if the sign of the skin ailment is cut away, for the Passover sacrifice, until he immerses and the sun sets]? Then how shall I interpret, "On the eighth day"? To all days except the Sabbath.*

E. Accordingly Scripture has to say, "On the day..., " even on the Sabbath.

II.23 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. The rite of circumcision overrides the rules of the skin ailment, whether it is done at its correct time or not at its correct time; it overrides the restrictions of festivals only when it is done at its correct time [on the eighth day].

II.24 A. *What is the source of this statement?*

B. *It is in line with that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. **"The flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised" (Lev. 12: 3) —**

D. **even though there is a bright spot on the spot.**

E. **Then how shall I interpret the statement, "In cases of a skin affliction, be most careful to do exactly as the levitical priests instruct you" (Deu. 24: 8)? That refers to other parts of the body, excluding the foreskin.**

F. **But maybe it refers even to circumcision [so do not circumcise if at the foreskin is a bright spot that may or may not indicate the presence of the skin affliction]?**

G. **Then how shall I interpret the statement, "the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised"?**

H. **When there is no bright spot.**

I. **Scripture says, "the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised":**

J. even though there is a bright spot on the spot [Sifra CXXIII:I.5/Parashat Tazria Perek 1].

II.25 A. Said Raba, “Lo, as to the Tannaite authority before us, to begin with why was he satisfied, but in the end what troubled him?”

B. *This is the sense of his statement:* “**The flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised**” (Lev. 12: 3) — even though there is a bright spot on the spot. Then how shall I interpret the statement, “In cases of a skin affliction, be most careful to do exactly as the levitical priests instruct you” (Deu. 24: 8)? That refers to other parts of the body, except for the place of circumcision, but as to circumcision, it does override the restrictions of the skin ailment.

C. *How come?* Because it derives from an argument a fortiori: If the Sabbath, which is a weighty matter, is overridden by circumcision, all the more so should circumcision override the skin ailment.

D. *And what is the sense of the language, But maybe it refers even to circumcision [so do not circumcise if at the foreskin is a bright spot that may or may not indicate the presence of the skin affliction]?*

E. *This is what he went and proposed: how do we know that the Sabbath is the weightier matter? Maybe the skin ailment is the weightier matter, since, after all, the skin ailment overrides the restrictions of the Temple service, and the Temple service overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath!*

F. **Scripture says, “the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised: even though there is a bright spot on the spot.”**

G. *Another version:* Circumcision overrides the skin ailment. *How come?* A commandment involving affirmative action comes and overrides a negative commandment.

H. *And what is the sense of the language, But maybe it refers even to circumcision [so do not circumcise*

if at the foreskin is a bright spot that may or may not indicate the presence of the skin affection]?

I. *This is what he went and proposed: Well, I may well concede that we say that a commandment involving affirmative action comes and overrides a negative commandment , but that is the case when there is a negative commandment by itself, but what we have here is a positive commandment along with a negative one!*

J. Then how shall I interpret the statement, “the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised”?

K. When there is no bright spot.

L. Scripture says, “the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised”:

M. Even though there is a bright spot on the spot.

II.26 A. *That proof suffices for an adult, in the context of which “flesh” is written; so, too, in the context of an infant “flesh” is written. But how do we know that the same is the case for one who is of intermediate age?* [Freedman: We deal with these three passages: “And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that soul shall be cut off from his people” (Gen. 17:14), which applies to an adult; “and in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised” (Lev. 12: 3) speaks of the obligation of the father to circumcise the son; “every male among you shall be circumcised” (Gen. 17:10) speaks in general, and we find “flesh” in the first two but not in the third, that is, the intermediate age, between eight days and thirteen years and a day.]

B. Said Abbaye, *“It derives from the two together; it can’t be derived only by analogy to the adult alone, since in his case the penalty of extirpation applies; it cannot derive solely from the case of the infant eight days old, since that involves circumcision at the proper time. But what they have in common is that both must be circumcised, and circumcising*

them overrides the restrictions of the skin ailment; it follows that all who must be circumcised are circumcised even in spite of the marks of the skin ailment that may be on the penis.”

II.27 A. Raba said, “That circumcision at the proper time overrides [the restrictions of the skin ailment] *does not require a verse of Scripture, since that proposition derives from an argument a fortiori, as follows:* If circumcision overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath, which is the weightier matter, surely it should override the restrictions of the skin ailment.”

B. Said R. Safra to Raba, “*So how do you know that the Sabbath is the weightier matter? Maybe the skin ailment is the weightier matter, since it overrides the restrictions of the Temple service, while the Temple service overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath?*”

C. “*In that case, the operative consideration is not that the skin ailment is the weightier matter, but that the person is unfit.*”

D. “*But why not say, let him cut off the mark of the skin ailment and carry out the act of the Temple service?*”

E. “*But he still has not immersed.*”

F. “*So much for unclean marks of the skin ailment, but as to clean ones, what is there to say?*”

G. Rather, said R. Ashi, “*Under what circumstances do we say, ‘let a positive commandment supersede a negative commandment’? For instance, in the case of circumcision of a penis afflicted with the skin ailment, or fringes and mixed species, in which, otherwise it would not be possible to carry out the positive commandment of circumcision. But here, at the moment that the negative commandment is disregarded, the positive one is not carried out.*” [Freedman: Cutting away the mark of the skin ailment is not a fulfillment of the command to offer a Passover sacrifice, but merely preliminary thereto, so that the fact that the skin ailment overrides the sacrificial service does not indicate that the skin ailment is such a weighty matter.]

II.28 A. *And lo, the exchange of Raba and R. Safra [133A] represents a Tannaite exchange as well, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. “‘Flesh’ — even if there is a mark of the skin ailment there, ‘it shall be circumcised,’” the words of R. Josiah.

C. R. Jonathan says, “That is hardly determinative: For if circumcision overrides the Sabbath, which is weighty, shouldn’t it override the skin ailment?”

II.29 A. The master has said: “‘Flesh’ — even if there is a mark of the skin ailment there, ‘it shall be circumcised,’” the words of R. Josiah —

B. *So for what purpose do I require a verse of Scripture to make this point?* For this is something that one does not deliberately intend to do, and something that one does not deliberately intend to do is permitted.

C. *Said Abbaye, “The proof is required only from the perspective of R. Judah, who has said, ‘Even a matter that one does not deliberately intend to do is forbidden.’”*

D. *Raba said, “You may even say it represents R. Simeon. R. Simeon concedes in a case of ‘cut off his head but let him not die’” [that a labor performed incidentally in the course of doing a permitted deed is itself permitted, unless that labor follows inevitably from the latter, in which case it is equivalent to a forbidden labor; here, too, it must inevitably die when crushed (Freedman)].*

E. *And Abbaye?*

F. *Abbaye doesn’t accept this viewpoint.*

G. *But lo, both Abbaye and Raba say, “R. Simeon concedes in a case of ‘cut off his head but let him not die’!*

H. *After hearing it from Raba, he followed his reasoning.*

II.30 A. *There are those who repeat this exchange of Abbaye and Raba in reference to the following:*

B. *“Take heed in the plague of the skin ailment that you observe diligently to do” (Deu. 24: 8) — “to do” you are prohibited, but you may make a baste on the foot or a pole on the shoulder, and if it disappears, it disappears.*

C. *So for what purpose do I require a verse of Scripture to make this point?* For this is something that one does not deliberately intend to do, and something that one does not deliberately intend to do is permitted.

D. *Said Abbaye, “The proof is required only from the perspective of R. Judah, who has said, ‘Even a matter that one does not deliberately intend to do is forbidden.’”*

E. *Raba said, “You may even say it represents R. Simeon. R. Simeon concedes in a case of ‘cut off his head but let him not die’” [that a labor performed incidentally in the course of doing a permitted deed is itself permitted, unless that labor follows inevitably from the latter, in which case it is equivalent to a forbidden labor; here, too, it must inevitably die when crushed (Freedman)].*

F. *And Abbaye?*

G. *Abbaye doesn’t accept this viewpoint.*

H. *But lo, both Abbayye and Raba say, “R. Simeon concedes in a case of ‘cut off his head but let him not die’!*

I. *After hearing it from Raba, he followed his reasoning.*

II.31 A. *Now as to Abbayye with reference to R. Simeon, how does he interpret the word “flesh”?*

B. Said R. Amram, “He refers it to the case of one who says that he intends to cut off his mark of the skin ailment” [to avoid becoming unclean, and even so, it is permitted for him to do so if it involves circumcision].

C. *That poses no problem in the case of an adult, but what is there to say of an infant [who cannot form intentionality]?*

D. Said R. Mesharshayya, “It deals with the infant’s father, who says that he intends to cut off his son’s mark of the skin ailment” [to avoid the son’s becoming unclean, and even so, it is permitted for him to do so if it involves circumcision].

E. *Well, if there is a third party who can do the rite, let him perform the rite of circumcision [since he has no intentionality as to the infant’s cultic status of uncleanness]?* For said R. Simeon b. Laqish, “In any situation in which you find a commandment of affirmative action and a negative commandment, if you can carry out both of them, well and good, and if not, then

let an affirmative action come and override the negative commandment.”

F. *It's a case in which there is no third party to carry out the rite.*

II.32 A. The master has said, “The rite of circumcision overrides the rules of the skin ailment, whether it is done at its correct time or not at its correct time; it overrides the restrictions of festivals only when it is done at its correct time [on the eighth day]” —

B. *What is the source of this rule?*

C. Said Hezekiah, *and so, too, a Tannaite authority of the household of Hezekiah [stated],* “Said Scripture, ‘And you shall let nothing of it remain until the morning, but that which remains of it until the morning you shall burn with fire’ (Exo. 12:10). The second ‘until the morning’ is hardly required, and why does Scripture say it? Scripture comes to assign the second morning as the occasion for burning Holy Things” [in the context of Passover, the sixteenth of Nisan, which is not a festival day, and that indicates burning on the festival of unclean Holy Things is forbidden (Freedman)].

D. Abbayye said, “Said Scripture, ‘The burnt-offering of the Sabbath shall be burned on its Sabbath’ (Num. 28:10) — but not the burnt-offering of weekdays on the Sabbath, not the burnt-offering of weekdays on festivals” [Freedman: hence Holy Things if unfit may not be burned on festivals].

E. Raba said, “Said Scripture, ‘No manner of work shall be done in them, except that which every man must eat, that only may be done by you’ (Exo. 212:16) — ‘that’ — but not what is required to make that possible; ‘only’ — but not circumcision at other than its proper time on the eighth day, which otherwise might derive by an argument a fortiori.” [Freedman: Thus we learn that when an act need not be done on a particular day, it may not be done on the Sabbath or festivals, the same then applies to burning Holy Things that have become unclean.]

F. R. Ashi said, “Said Scripture, ‘On the first day shall be a solemn rest’ (Lev. 23:39) is a commandment involving a positive action, and a commandment involving refraining from action in respect to the festival; a commandment

involving a positive action cannot take effect over a commandment involving both a positive action and also refraining from action.” [Freedman: The negative “no manner of work,” the positive, “to burn what is left over,” at Exo. 12:10; the unfit Holy Things may not be burned on festivals.]

III.1 A. An encompassing principle did R. Aqiba state, “Any sort of labor [in connection with circumcision] which it is possible to do on the eve of the Sabbath does not override [the restrictions of] the Sabbath, and that which it is not possible to do on the eve of the Sabbath does override [the prohibitions of] the Sabbath”:

B. Said R. Judah said Rab, “The decided law accords with R. Aqiba.”

C. *And so, too, we have learned with reference to the Passover along these same lines: A governing principle did R. Aqiba state, “Any form of labor which it is possible to carry out on the eve of the Sabbath does not override the Sabbath. Slaughtering, which it is not possible to carry out on the eve of the Sabbath, does override the Sabbath” [M. Pes. 6:2L-M].* And said R. Judah said Rab, “The decided law accords with R. Aqiba.”

D. *And both rulings had to be set forth explicitly. For if we had heard the ruling with respect to circumcision, we might have supposed that it is in that case that the rule applies, since it is possible to do the preparations the prior day, so the preparations should not override the Sabbath, since there is no consideration of extirpation; but as for the Passover sacrifice, where there is extirpation, you might have supposed, let the preparation for the rite override the Sabbath. And if he had told us the rule only in connection with the Passover-offering, I might have supposed that that is because thirteen covenants were not made in that regard, but as to circumcision, in which thirteen covenants were made, I might*

have supposed, only there let the preparation for the rite override the Sabbath. So both rulings are absolutely required.

19:2

- A. They do prepare all that is needed for circumcision on the Sabbath:
- B. they (1) cut [the mark of circumcision], (2) tear, (3) suck [out the wound].
- C. And they put on it a poultice and cumin.
- D. If one did not pound it on the eve of the Sabbath, he chews it in his teeth and puts it on.
- E. If one did not mix wine and oil on the eve of the Sabbath, let this be put on by itself and that by itself.
- F. And they do not make a bandage in the first instance.
- G. But they wrap a rag around [the wound of the circumcision].
- H. If one did not prepare [the necessary rag] on the eve of the Sabbath, he wraps [the rag] around his finger and brings it, and even from a different courtyard.

I.1 A. [133B] *Now since the Tannaite framer of the passages repeats each item on its own, what is the language, all that is needed for circumcision on the Sabbath, meant to encompass?*

- B. *It is meant to encompass that which our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. As to one performing the rite of circumcision, so long as he is engaged in the rite of circumcision, he may return to cut both the shreds of the corona that invalidate the circumcision and those that do not. Once he has completed the rite, he may return to operate on the shreds that invalidate the circumcision but he may not return to cut away those that do not invalidate the circumcision.

I.2 A. *Who is the Tannaite authority who maintained, Once he has completed the rite, he may not return to cut away those that do not invalidate the circumcision?*

- B. *Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, "It is R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: 'If the fourteenth of Nisan coincided with a Sabbath, one may flay the Passover-offering only as far as the breast [to take the sacrificial portions out of the lamb; the rest of the flaying, to prepare the meat for eating, is left over until the evening],' the words of R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah. And sages say, 'One may do so until he flays the whole of the beast.'"*

- C. *But how does this necessarily follow? Maybe R. Ishmael b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah takes the view that he does there only because we do not require the fulfillment of the verse, “This is my God and I will adorn him” (Exo. 15: 2), but here we do require fulfillment of the verse, “This is my God and I will adorn him” (Exo. 15: 2)?*
- D. *True enough.*
- E. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- F. “This is my God and I will adorn him” (Exo. 15: 2) — adorn yourself before him by truly elegant fulfillment of the religious duties, for example: A beautiful tabernacle, a beautiful palm branch, a beautiful ram’s horn, beautiful show fringes, a beautiful scroll of the Torah, written in fine ink, with a fine reed, by a skilled penman, wrapped with beautiful silks.
- G. Abba Saul says, “‘I will adorn him’ — be like him: Just as he is gracious and compassionate, so you be gracious and compassionate.”
- H. Rather, said R. Ashi, “*Who is the Tannaite authority who maintained*, Once he has completed the rite, he may not return to cut away those that do not invalidate the circumcision? *It is R. Yosé. For we have learned in the Mishnah: Whether [the new moon] appeared clearly or did not appear clearly, they violate the [prohibitions of] the Sabbath on its account. R. Yosé says, “If it appeared clearly, they do not violate the prohibitions of the Sabbath on its account” [M. R.H. 1:5A-C]. [It is not necessary; here, too, it is not necessary to cut away all the shreds].*”
- I. *But how does that necessarily follow? Maybe R. Yosé takes the position that he does there because it is not possible to override the Sabbath, but here, where it is possible to override the Sabbath, it would be the rule [that one cuts away all the shreds]?*
- J. *Rather, said the Nehardeans, “It is the rabbis who differ from R. Yosé. For we have learned in the Mishnah: Four priests enter in, two in [whose] hands are two rows [of show bread], and two in [whose] hands are two dishes [of frankincense]. And four go in before them, two to take out the two rows [of bread], and two to take out the two dishes [of frankincense]. Those who bring them in stand at the north [side of the table], with their faces to the south. Those that bring them out stand at the south with their faces to the north. These draw out [the old loaves] and these lay down [the new ones]. And a handbreadth of one [new row] [lies] up*

against a handbreadth of another, as it is said, “Before me perpetually” (Exo. 25:30). R. Yosé says, “Even though these take away [the old loaves] and [then] the others put down [the new loaves], this, too, was [deemed to carry out the requirement that the bread be set forth] perpetually” [M. Men. 11:7F-N].”

- I.3** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
B. They trim the membrum, and if one does not trim it, he is subject to the penalty of extirpation.

- I.4** A. *Who is penalized in that way?*
B. Said R. Kahana, “The surgeon.”
C. *Objected R. Pappa, “But the surgeon can say to them, ‘I have done only part of the religious duty, now you do part of the religious duty too.’”*
D. Rather, said R. Pappa, “It is an adult [circumcising himself on a weekday, who has not circumcised all the shreds].”
E. *Objected R. Ashi, “In connection with an adult Scripture states in so many words, ‘And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that soul shall be cut off from his people’ (Gen. 17:14) [so why specify the same thing here]?”*
F. *Rather, said R. Ashi, “In point of fact, it really is the surgeon, in a case in which he came at dusk on the Sabbath, and they warned him, ‘You don’t have time’ [to do the entire rite before the day is over], and he said to them, ‘I’ve got plenty of time,’ and he did the work but didn’t have time, and it turns out that all he did was make a wound, so he is penalized with extirpation.”*

- II.1** A. **Suck [out the wound]:**
B. *Said R. Pappa, “A surgeon who didn’t suck out the wound — that is a source of danger, and we throw him out.”*
C. *So what else is new? Obviously, since we are prepared to desecrate the Sabbath on that account, it is certainly dangerous not to do it!*
D. *What might you have supposed? That this blood is stored up. So we are informed that it is the result of the wound, and in the status of a bandage and cumin: Just as when one doesn’t put on a bandage and cumin, there is danger, so here, too, if one doesn’t do it, there is danger.*

- III.1** A. **And they put on it a poultice and cumin:**

- B. *Said Abbayye, "Mother said to me, "A salve for all pains is seven parts of fat and one of wax."*
- C. *Raba said, "Wax and resin."*
- D. *Raba expounded that in public in Mahoza, so the family of Minyumi the physician tore up their bandages [since everyone knew what to do, so physicians were no longer needed]. He said to them, "I left you one [remedy that people don't know]. For said Samuel, 'Someone who washes his face but doesn't dry it off — scabs will break out on it.'"*
- E. **[134A]** *What's the remedy?*
- F. *Wash it well in beet juice.*

IV.1 A. If one did not pound it on the eve of the Sabbath, he chews it in his teeth and puts it on:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. *Things that are not done for circumcision on the Sabbath are done for it on the festival day: They crush cumin, beat up wine and oil together, on its account.*

IV.2 A. *Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, "What differentiates the matter of crushing cumin on festivals? It is because it can be used in a recipe. But wine and oil are suitable for a sick person on the Sabbath, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: They don't beat up wine and oil for a sick person on the Sabbath. R. Simeon b. Eleazar said in the name of R. Meir, 'They may even beat up wine and oil on the Sabbath.' Said R. Simeon b. Eleazar, 'One time R. Meir had a bellyache, and we wanted to beat up for him some wine and oil, but he didn't let us. We said to him, 'Your ruling will be nullified in your own lifetime.' He said to us, 'Even though I say that it may be done, and my colleagues say that it may not be done, in my whole life my heart never so swelled up with pride as to permit me to go against the opinion of my colleagues.' So he was strict with himself but for everybody else it is permitted."*

- B. *In that case it didn't have to be well beaten, here it does.*
- C. *Well, then, let's do it the same way here and not beat it up well?*
- D. *That's precisely what the Tannaite formulation states when it says, **If one did not mix wine and oil on the eve of the Sabbath, let this be put on by itself and that by itself.***

IV.3 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. They don't strain mustard through a mustard strainer, nor do they sweeten it with a glowing coal.

IV.4 A. Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, "What differentiates the matter from the following, which we learned in the Mishnah: **And they put an egg into a mustard strainer [M. Shab. 20:2C]**?"

B. He said to him, "In that case it doesn't appear as though he is selecting [winnowing], while here it appears as though he is winnowing."

C. Nor do they sweeten it with a glowing coal — *but hasn't it been taught on Tannaite authority: They sweeten it with a glowing coal?*

D. *No problem, the one speaks of a coal of metal, the other, wood [which is forbidden, since it may be put out].*

IV.5 A. Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, "What differentiates roasting meat on coals [which may be put out by the gravy]?"

B. He said to him, "In that case there is no other way, in this case there is another way."

IV.6 A. Said Abbayye to R. Joseph, "What is the law on cheese-making on a festival?"

B. He said to him, "It is forbidden."

C. "How is it different from kneading dough?"

D. He said to him, "In that case there is no other way, in this case there is another way."

E. "But lo, the Nehardeans say, 'Freshly made cheese is tasty?'"

F. "This is the sense of their statement: 'Even freshly made cheese is tasty.'"

V.1 A. **And they do not make a bandage in the first instance. But they wrap a rag around [the wound of the circumcision]:**

B. Said Abbayye, "Mother told me, 'The side selvage of the infant's bandage should be uppermost [facing outward], lest a thread stick and the infant end up with a penis that has been cut off.'"

C. Abbayye's mother would make a lining for half the bandage.

D. Said Abbayye, "An infant who has no bandage — they should bring him a hemmed rag, and the hem should be tied at the bottom and doubled over at the top."

- E. *And said Abbayye, "Mother told me, 'An infant whose anus cannot be seen should be rubbed with oil and stood in the sun, and where the oil looks transparent, the skin should be torn crosswise with a barley grain, but not with a metal tool, because that would cause inflammation.'"*
- F. *And said Abbayye, "Mother told me, 'If an infant cannot suck, it's because his lips are cold. What's the remedy? Bring a vessel of burning coals and hold it near his nose so as to heat it; then he'll suck.'"*
- G. *And said Abbayye, "Mother told me, 'If an infant doesn't breathe, he should be fanned with a fan, then he'll breathe.'"*
- H. *And said Abbayye, "Mother told me, 'If an infant can't breathe easily, bring the mother's afterbirth and rub it over him, and he'll breathe o.k.'"*
- I. *And said Abbayye, "Mother told me, 'If an infant is too thin, bring his mother's afterbirth and rub it over him from the narrow to the wide end; if he is too fat, rub it from wide to narrow.'"*
- J. *And said Abbayye, "Mother told me, 'If an infant is too red, so the blood is not yet absorbed in him, we wait until the blood is absorbed, then we circumcise him. If he is green so he is deficient in blood, we wait until he is full blooded and then circumcise him.'"*

K. *For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

L. **Said R. Nathan, "I once went to the coastal towns, and a woman came before me, who had circumcised her first son and he died, so, too, the second and the third. They brought him before me, and I saw that he was ruddy. I said to her, 'Wait for him until the blood is absorbed.' So she waited until the blood was absorbed and then circumcised him and he survived, and they called him 'Nathan the Babylonian' in my honor.**

M. **"There was another time that I went to Cappadocia, and a woman came before me, who had circumcised her first son and he died, so, too, the second and the third. They brought him before me, and I saw that green. I examined him, and I didn't see enough blood for circumcision, and I said to her, 'Wait for him until he gets his full blood. So she waited until the blood was absorbed and then circumcised him and he survived, and they called him 'Nathan the Babylonian' in my honor" [T. [Shab. 15:8E](#)].**

19:3

- A. [134B] They wash off the infant,
- B. both before the circumcision and after the circumcision,
- C. and they sprinkle him,
- D. by hand but not with a utensil.
- E. R. Eleazar b. Azariah says, “They wash the infant on the third day after circumcision [even if it] coincides with the Sabbath,
- F. “since it says, ‘And it came to pass on the third day when they were sore’ (Gen. 34:25).”
- G. [If the sexual traits of the infant are a matter of] doubt, or [if the infant] bears the sexual traits of both sexes, they do not violate the Sabbath on his account.
- H. And R. Judah permits in the case of an infant bearing the traits of both sexes.

- I.1**
- A. *First you say, They wash off the infant [meaning in the normal manner, but then by hand but not with a utensil]! Both R. Judah and Rabbah bar Abbuha say, “The intent of the Tannaite formulation is to explain, how do they do it, namely: They wash off the infant, both before the circumcision and after the circumcision: How so? They sprinkle him by hand but not with a utensil.”*
 - B. *Said Raba, “But the language that is used is, They wash off the infant [and sprinkling is not washing]!”*
 - C. *Rather, said Raba, “This is the sense of the Tannaite formulation: They wash off the infant, both before the circumcision and after the circumcision. On the first day, it is done in the normal way, but on the third day, if it coincides with the Sabbath, and they sprinkle him, by hand but not with a utensil. R. Eleazar b. Azariah says, “They wash the infant on the third day after circumcision [even if it] coincides with the Sabbath, since it says, ‘And it came to pass on the third day when they were sore’ (Gen. 34:25).”*
 - D. It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the view of Raba:*
 - E. They wash off the infant, both before the circumcision and after the circumcision. On the first day, it is done in the normal way, but on the third day, if it coincides with the Sabbath, and they sprinkle him, by*

hand but not with a utensil. R. Eleazar b. Azariah says, "They wash the infant on the third day after circumcision [even if it] coincides with the Sabbath, and even though there is no solid proof for that proposition, there is at least a reasonable indication of it, for it is said, 'And it came to pass on the third day when they were sore' (Gen. 34:25)."

F. And when they sprinkle, they don't sprinkle with a cup or a dish or a utensil but by hand.

G. *That accords with the position of the initial Tannaite authority [and doesn't carry forward Eleazar's statement].*

H. *What is the meaning of the phrase, and even though there is no solid proof for that proposition, there is at least a reasonable indication of it?*

I. *An adult's flesh doesn't heal quickly, an infant's does [and the verse pertains to adults].*

I.2 A. *Someone came before Raba. He ruled for him in accord with his view [that the infant may be bathed on the first day, the Sabbath as it happened, in the usual way. Raba got sick. He said, "What business did I have with the interpretation of the elders?"]*

B. *Rabbis said to Raba, "But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with the position of the master?"*

C. *He said to them, "Our Mishnah paragraph accords with their view. A close reading will show that fact, since it says, **R. Eleazar b. Azariah** says, 'They wash the infant on the third day after circumcision [even if it] coincides with the Sabbath.' Now, if you take the view that the initial Tannaite authority means, we merely sprinkle the baby, and R. Eleazar b. Azariah says to him, we may even bathe it, there are no problems. But if you maintain that the sense of the initial Tannaite authority is, we bathe on the first day and sprinkle on the third, then instead of using the language, **R. Eleazar b. Azariah** says, 'They wash...' what it should have said is, they also wash...."*

I.3 A. *When R. Dimi came, he said R. Eleazar [said], "The decided law accords with R. Eleazar b. Azariah."*

B. *In the West they reflected on that matter: Does that mean, washing the whole body or just the place of the circumcision?*

C. *Said to them one of the rabbis, R. Jacob by name, "It stands to reason that what is meant is, washing the whole body, for if you should suppose that it means only washing the place of the circumcision, then how is this less important than putting hot water on a wound? For said Rab, 'They do not withhold hot water and oil from a wound on the Sabbath.'"*

D. *Objected R. Joseph, "But don't you make a distinction between hot water heated on the Sabbath and hot water heated on the eve of the Sabbath [to which Rab now refers, with the Mishnah rule referring to the former]?"*

E. *Objected R. Dimi, "And on what basis do you suppose that here what is at issue is hot water that was heated on the Sabbath? Maybe what is at issue is hot water that was heated on the eve of the Sabbath?"*

F. *Said Abbaye, "I personally wanted to answer him, but R. Joseph got there first and answered him, 'Because it is dangerous for him [so it must speak of hot water heated on the Sabbath].'"*

I.4

A. *So, too, it has been stated:*

B. *When Rabin came, he said Abbahu said R. Eleazar [said], and some say, said R. Abbahu said R. Yohanan, "The decided law accords with R. Eleazar b. Azariah, with respect to both water that was heated on the Sabbath and hot water that was heated before the Sabbath, whether with respect to washing the whole body or with respect to washing the wound of the circumcision, because it is a danger to the infant."*

I.5

A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing:*

B. *Said Rab, "They do not withhold hot water and oil from a wound on the Sabbath."*

C. *And Samuel said, "One puts it outside the wound, and it flows down into the wound."*

D. *An objection was raised: They don't put oil and hot water on a rag to put it on a wound on the Sabbath.*

E. *There the consideration is the possibility of wringing out the rag [which may not be done].*

F. *Come and take note:* They don't put oil and hot water on a rag that is on a wound on the Sabbath.

G. *There, too, the consideration is the possibility of wringing out the rag [which may not be done].*

H. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority in accord with Samuel:* They do not put hot water and oil on a wound on the Sabbath, but one puts it outside the wound, and it flows down into the wound.

- I.6**
- A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - B. They put on a wound on the Sabbath dry wadding or a dry sponge, but not a dry reed or dry rags.
 - C. *The rulings on rags contradict one another [since a dry rag is a fragment and is permitted].*
 - D. *Not really, since the one speaks of new ones [which help healing and are forbidden] the other, old ones.*
 - E. *Said Abbaye, "That indicates that rags heal."*

- II.1**
- A. **[If the sexual traits of the infant are a matter of] doubt, or [if the infant] bears the sexual traits of both sexes, they do not violate the Sabbath on his account:**
 - B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - C. **"Foreskin":**
 - D. **If it is assuredly the foreskin of a male child, then the rite overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath, [135A] but in a case of doubt, then the rite does not override the restrictions of the Sabbath.**
 - E. **"Foreskin":**
 - F. **The circumcision of the foreskin of someone with clearly established male gender traits overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath, but the circumcision of a baby bearing the sexual traits of both genders does not override the restrictions of the Sabbath.**
 - G. **R. Judah says, "The circumcision of an infant bearing the sexual traits of both genders does override the restrictions of the Sabbath, and the liability [for not doing so] is to extirpation" [M. Shab. 19:3G-H].**
 - H. **"Foreskin":**
 - I. **If it is assuredly the day [on which, eight days earlier, the child was born], then the rite overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath,**

- J. but [if it was born] at twilight [so that we do not know for certain that the Sabbath coincides with the eighth day after birth], then the rite does not override the restrictions of the Sabbath.
- K. “Foreskin”:
- L. If it is assuredly a child born uncircumcised, then the rite of circumcision does override the restrictions of the Sabbath.
- M. But the circumcision of a baby born circumcised does not override the restrictions of the Sabbath.
- N. For the House of Shammai say, “It is necessary to draw from the infant a drop of blood as a mark of the covenant of circumcision nonetheless.”
- O. And the House of Hillel say, “It is not necessary.”
- P. Said R. Simeon b. Eleazar, “The House of Shammai and the House of Hillel did not dispute concerning the one who was born circumcised, that it is necessary to draw a drop of blood of the covenant of circumcision from him, for it is a foreskin which is pressed in.
- Q. “Concerning what did they dispute? Concerning a convert who converted already circumcised. For the House of Shammai say, ‘It is necessary to draw from him a drop of blood of the covenant.’ And the House of Hillel say, ‘It is not necessary to draw from him a drop of blood of the covenant’” [T. [Shab. 15:9K-O](#)] [Sifra XXIII:I.6-8/Parashat Tazria Pereq 1].

- II.2** A. The master has said: **But in a case of doubt, then the rite does not override the restrictions of the Sabbath** — *covering what case?*
- B. *It covers the following, as our rabbis have stated on Tannaite authority:*
 - C. **On account of [the circumcision of] an infant born at seven months of pregnancy, they override the prohibitions of the Sabbath.**
 - D. **On account of the circumcision of an infant born at eight months, they do not override the prohibitions of the Sabbath.**
 - E. **If it is a matter of doubt whether the infant was born at seven months of pregnancy or at eight, they do not override the restrictions of the Sabbath on his account.**
 - F. **An infant born after eight months of pregnancy — lo, he is tantamount to a stone. It is forbidden to handle him. But his mother coos to him and nurses him, because of the danger to life [T. [Shab. 15:5](#)].**

- II.3** A. *It has been stated:*

- B. Rab said, "The decided law is in accord with the initial Tannaite authority."
- C. And Samuel said, "The decided law is in accord with R. Simeon b. Eleazar,"

- II.4** A. *R. Adda bar Ahbah: To him was born an infant who was circumcised. He made the rounds of thirteen circumcisers [to bring out a drop of blood for the sake of circumcision, but they refused to do so on the Sabbath], so he himself did it and [botching the job,] cut off his penis. He said, "May such and so come upon me, for I have violated what Rab said."*
- B. *Said to him R. Nahman, "But didn't you violate what Samuel said as well? For Samuel made his rule only with respect to weekdays, but did he make that rule for the Sabbath, too?"*
 - C. *He took the view that it was definitely a suppressed foreskin, for it has been stated:*
 - D. *Rabbah said, "We take account of the possibility that it may be a suppressed foreskin [and that is why drops of blood must be drawn]."*
 - E. R. Joseph said, "We take it as fact that it is a suppressed foreskin."

- II.5** A. *Said R. Joseph, "On what basis do I make that statement? Because it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer Haqqappar says, 'The House of Shammai and the House of Hillel did not dispute about the case of an infant born circumcised, that it is necessary to draw a drop of blood as the mark of the covenant. Concerning what did they differ? Whether or not it is permitted on that account to desecrate the Sabbath. The House of Shammai say, "On that account they do desecrate the Sabbath." And the House of Hillel say, "On that account they do not desecrate the Sabbath."' Doesn't it follow that the first Tannaite authority maintains, they do desecrate the Sabbath on his account?"*
- B. *But maybe the initial Tannaite authority maintains that all parties hold, they do not do so?*
 - C. *If so, then does R. Eliezer Haqqappar come to tell us the opinion of the House of Shammai [but why bother]?*
 - D. *But maybe this is the sense of his statement: The House of Shammai and the House of Hillel did not disagree on this matter at all.*

- II.6** A. Said R. Assi, "Any infant whose mother is unclean by reason of childbirth is circumcised on the eighth day [but it is done immediately], and any whose mother is not unclean by reason of childbirth is not circumcised on the eighth day: 'If a woman conceive seed and bear a male child, then she shall be

unclean... and in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised' (Lev. 12:2-3)."

- B. Said to him Abbayye, "The prior generations will prove the contrary, for before the giving of the Torah, the mothers were not unclean by reason of childbirth, and yet the infants were circumcised on the eighth day."
- C. He said to him, "The Torah was given [135B] and then new law was made."
- D. *Well, is that so now? And lo, it has been stated:*
- E. A child born of Caesarean section and one who has two foreskins —
- F. R. Huna and R. Hiyya bar Rab —
- G. One said, "They desecrate the Sabbath in connection with his circumcision."
- H. The other said, "They don't desecrate the Sabbath in connection with his circumcision."
- I. *So there is no dispute except whether or not to desecrate the Sabbath in his regard, but as to circumcising him on the eighth day, we certainly do so.*
- J. *Not at all, the one thing depends on the other.*

II.7 A. *It is in accord with a conflict among Tannaite authorities:*

B. There is a slave born in the master's household who is circumcised on the first day and there is one circumcised on the eighth day; there is a slave bought with money circumcised on the first day and there is such circumcised on the eighth day.

C. There is a slave bought with money circumcised on the first day and there is such circumcised on the eighth day: How so?

D. If one bought a slave girl who was pregnant and then she gave birth, this is the case of a slave bought for money who is circumcised on the eighth day. If he bought a slave girl with her offspring with her, this is a case in which a slave bought with money would be circumcised on the first day.

E. There is a slave born in the master's household who is circumcised on the first day and there is one circumcised on the eighth day: How so?

F. If one purchased a slave girl and she became pregnant with him and gave birth, this would be an offspring born in the master's household that is circumcised on the eighth day.

G. R. Hama says, "If she gave birth and then immersed [for conversion], this would be a case in which an offspring born in the

master's household is circumcised on the first day. If she immersed and then she gave birth, this would be the case of an offspring born in the household that is circumcised on the eighth day."

H. But the initial Tannaite authority makes no such distinction between one who immerses and then gives birth and one who gives birth and then immerses, so that although his mother is not made unclean by giving birth [which is only the case for an Israelite] he is nonetheless circumcised on the eighth day.

I. Said Raba, "Now there is no problem with the position of R. Hama. We would find the case of a slave born in his master's house circumcised on the first day and also one circumcised on the eighth day; one bought with money who is circumcised on the first day and one bought with money who is circumcised on the eighth day. Thus: If she gave birth and then immersed for conversion, this would be a slave born in the master's house who is circumcised on the first day; if she immersed for conversion and then gave birth, that would be a slave born in the house of the master who is circumcised on the eighth day. As to one bought with money who is circumcised on the eighth day, the case would involve one who bought a female slave who was pregnant; she immersed for conversion, then she gave birth. As to one bought with money who is circumcised on the first day, it would be the case of buying a pregnant female slave, and someone else bought her unborn child. [The latter does not own the mother, so the child is not tantamount to an Israelite newborn, and he is circumcised on the first day.] But from the perspective of the first of the Tannaite authorities, while we can find examples of all of them, what about the one that is born in the master's household and circumcised on the first day? Where would we find such a case?"

J. Said R. Jeremiah, "Such a case would be where he purchased a slave girl for her offspring." [Freedman: Even if he buys her from an Israelite and she has already had her immersion for conversion and subject to the uncleanness of confinement, the child is not like a Jewish child, since the owner has no share in the mother.]

K. That poses to him who said, purchasing the usufruct is not the same thing as purchasing title to the principal, but on the view of him who has said that purchasing the usufruct is tantamount to owning title to the principal, what is to be said?

L. Said R. Mesharshayya, "It would be a case of purchasing a slave girl on the stipulation that she not be immersed and so converted."

II.8 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "Any human offspring that survived for thirty days is not classified as a miscarriage, as it is said, 'And those that are to be redeemed of them from a month old shall you redeem' (Num. 18:16). Any animal that lives for eight days is not classified as a miscarriage, 'and from the eighth day and henceforth it shall be accepted for an offering' (Lev. 22:27)."

C. *Lo, if an infant doesn't last for eight days, he is subject to doubt [136A], so how can we circumcise him?*

D. *Said R. Adda bar Ahbah, "They do circumcise him, considering the alternatives: If he can live, well and good; and if not, then one is merely cutting flesh."*

E. *Well, then, what about that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: If it is a matter of doubt whether one is born at seven months or eight months, they do not on account of circumcising him desecrate the Sabbath? But why should this be the case? Why not just circumcise him, considering the alternatives: If he can live, well and good; and if not, then one is merely cutting flesh?*

F. *Said Mar b. Rabina, R. Nehumi bar Zechariah and I explained it: We do circumcise him, but the issue is required only in the matter of doing on the Sabbath the things that are required for the rite, within the theory of R. Eliezer."*

II.9 A. *Said Abbaye, "It is in accord with the following Tannaite dispute."*

B. **"Of which you may eat":**

C. **This encompasses an embryo at eight months, indicating that an act of slaughter [of the mother] does not render it clean. [If the mother is slaughtered, the embryo eight months old is not affected by the act of slaughter, but if born dead, is regarded as carrion.]**

D. **R. Yosé b. R. Judah and R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon say, "As to the embryo at the age of eight months, the act of slaughter does render it clean [so that if it is properly**

slaughtered before it expires, it is not deemed carrion]” [Sifra CXX:III.1].

E. [Abbaye continues:] *“Isn’t this what is subject to dispute: The one authority holds that it is classified as a living creature [which is therefore made clean by slaughter, like any other animal], and the other authority maintains that it is classified as dead?”*

F. *Said Raba, “If that is the case, then instead of disputing the matter of uncleanness and cleanness, the dispute should pertain to the matter of eating [and the act of slaughter should render it valid for eating, from the perspective of the anonymous Tannaite authority]. Rather, all parties maintain that it is classified as dead. But R. Yosé b. R. Judah and R. Eleazar b. R. Simeon maintain that it is in the status of a terefah beast [an animal suffering from a fatal illness, on account of which even after proper slaughter it may not be eaten; it is tantamount to dead]. In the case of a terefah beast, even though it is classified as dead, doesn’t the act of slaughter render it clean? Here, too, is no different. But rabbis maintain it is not like a terefah beast, for a terefah beast at some one moment was fit, but this one never had a moment of fitness. And should you say, what is the rule about a beast that is terefah from birth? There the act of slaughter would be valid for its kind, here it would not.”* [Freedman: An animal born at nine months belongs to the species in which the act of slaughter serves, though this particular one is an exception; but no eight months’ animal is rendered fit for food by the act of slaughter.]

II.10 A. *The question was raised: [With reference to the statement, R. Simeon b. Gamaliel says, “Any human offspring that survived for thirty days is not classified as a miscarriage, as it is said, ‘And those that are to be redeemed of them from a month old shall you redeem’ (Num. 18:16). Any animal that lives for eight days is not classified as a miscarriage, ‘and from the eighth day and henceforth it shall be accepted for an offering’ (Lev. 22:27)”], do rabbis differ from Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, or do they not differ from him? If you should*

conclude that they differ from him, then is the law in accord with him or is the law not in accord with him?

B. *Come and take note:* A calf born on a festival day may be slaughtered and eaten on that day, [since it shares the status of its mother]. [It is only a day old. Hence the law would not accord with Simeon b. Gamaliel.]

C. *Now here with what situation do we deal? It is a case in which we know that it had come to term [so it was viable].*

D. *Come and take note:* But they concur that if it was born blemished [on a festival day], it is in the category of that which is ready [and permitted for consumption on the festival].

E. *It is a case here, too, in which we know that it had come to term [so it was viable].*

F. *Come and take note:* Said R. Judah said Samuel, “The decided law accords with Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel.” *Now since the statement of a decided law is given, that proves that the rabbis did disagree with him.*”

G. *It certainly does.*

II.11 A. Said Abbaye, “If an offspring fell from the roof or is eaten by a lion, all agree that it was viable. [We assume it might have lived; hence if the child survived the father, however briefly, the mother is exempt from levirate marriage; in the case of an animal, if slaughtered before it is eight days old, it may be eaten; we assume it was viable (Freedman).] *Where there is a difference, it concerns a case in which it gasped and died [naturally, in a thirty day period]. The one authority maintains that it is classified as having lived, the other takes the view that it is classified as having died.*”

B. *What difference does it make in practical terms?*

C. At issue is freeing the mother from the levirate connection.

II.12 A. If an offspring fell from the roof or is eaten by a lion, is it the fact that all agree that it was viable?

B. *But lo, R. Pappa and R. Huna b. R. Joshua visited the household of Rab the son of R. Idi bar Abin, and he made for them a third born calf on the seventh day after it was born. They said to him, "If you'd waited until evening, we would have eaten it. But now we won't."*

C. *Rather, say: If it gasped and died, all parties concur that it is classified as dead. Where there is a difference, it concerns the case in which an offspring fell from the roof or is eaten by a lion. The one authority holds that it is classified as dead, the other, it is classified as alive.*

II.13 A. *The son of R. Dimi bar Joseph: To him was born an offspring, which died within thirty days. He sat in mourning for him. Said his father to him, "Do you want some dainties [as a sign that mourning is not appropriate, since he wasn't viable]?"*

B. *He said to him, "It is an established fact with me that its months of pregnancy were complete."*

II.14 A. *R. Ashi visited the household of R. Kahana. A mishap happened within thirty days [his child died within thirty days after birth]. He saw him sitting in mourning for him, and said to him, "Doesn't the master concur with what R. Judah said Samuel said, 'The decided law accords with Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel'?"*

B. *He said to him, "It is an established fact with me that its months of pregnancy were complete."*

II.15 A. *It has been stated:*

B. *If the offspring died within thirty days and the mother [widow of the deceased father] went and got betrothed [assuming that she no longer had a levirate obligation] — Rabina in the name of Raba [136B] said, "If she is the wife of a member of the Israelite caste, she undertakes the rite of removing the shoe, but*

if she is the wife of a member of the priestly caste, she does not even have to do that.”

- C. R. Mesharshayya in the name of Raba said, “All the same is this woman and that one: She performs the rite of removing the shoe.”
- D. *Said Rabina to R. Sherabayya, ‘In the evening Raba made that statement, but the next morning he reversed himself.’*
- E. *“He said to him, ‘Once you have permitted it, would that you also permitted the forbidden abdominal fat!’”*

III.1 A. And R. Judah permits in the case of an infant bearing the traits of both sexes:

- B. Said R. Shizbi said R. Hisda, “It was for not all purposes that R. Judah permitted in the case of an infant bearing the traits of both sexes, for if you take that position, the offspring also would be subject to a vow of valuation.”
 - C. *But how on the basis of Scripture do we know that he is not subject to the vow of valuation?*
 - D. *It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority: “Of the male” (Lev. 27: 3) — excluding a person of unclear sexual traits and a hermaphrodite. Might one suppose that a person of unclear sexual traits and a hermaphrodite should not be subject to valuation as a man, but let him be subject to valuation as a woman? Scripture states, “Of the male... and if it be a female” (Lev. 27: 4) — excluding a person of unclear sexual traits and a hermaphrodite.*
 - E. **[137A]** Now when a passage is not attributed to a named authority in the compilation Sifra, it belongs to R. Judah.
 - F. *Said R. Nahman bar Isaac, “So we, too, have learned the same as a Mishnah statement: **All are suitable for mixing, except for a deaf-mute, an idiot, and a child. R. Judah declares fit in the case of the child and declares unfit in the case of the woman and the androgyne [M. Par. 5:4D-E].**”*
 - G. *That proves it.*
 - H. *And how come circumcision is exceptional?*
 - I. *Since it is written, “every male among you shall be circumcised” (Gen. 17:10) [even a hermaphrodite].*

19:4

- A. He who had two infants, one to circumcise after the Sabbath and one to circumcise on the Sabbath,
- B. and who forgot [which was which] and circumcised the one to be circumcised after the Sabbath on the Sabbath,
- C. is liable.
- D. [If he had] one to circumcise on the eve of the Sabbath and one to circumcise on the Sabbath,
- E. and he forgot and on the Sabbath, circumcised the one to be circumcised on the eve of the Sabbath,
- F. R. Eliezer declares him liable to a sin-offering.
- G. And R. Joshua exempts him.

I.1 A. [He who had two infants, one to circumcise after the Sabbath and one to circumcise on the Sabbath, and who forgot [which was which] and circumcised the one to be circumcised after the Sabbath on the Sabbath, is liable:] R. Huna repeated, "He is liable."

B. R. Judah repeated, "He is exempt from liability."

C. R. Huna repeated, "He is liable," for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:

D. Said R. Simeon b. Eleazar, "R. Eliezer and R. Joshua did not differ concerning the case of one who had two infants, one to circumcise on the Sabbath, one to circumcise after the Sabbath, who forgot and circumcised the one to be done after the Sabbath on the Sabbath, that he is liable to a sin-offering.

E. "Concerning what did they differ? Concerning him who had two infants, one to circumcise on Friday the other to circumcise on the Sabbath, who forgot and who circumcised the one for Friday on the Sabbath, that R. Eliezer declares him liable to a sin-offering, and R. Joshua declares him exempt.

F. "And both of them derived the rule only from the case of idolatry. R. Eliezer takes the view that it is equivalent to the case of idolatry. Just as in the case of idolatry, the All-Merciful has said, don't do it, and if one did it, he is liable, so here it is the same; but R. Joshua maintains that there there is no religious duty in hand, but here there is."

G. *R. Judah repeated, "He is exempt from liability," for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

H. Said R. Meir, "R. Eliezer and R. Joshua did not differ concerning the case of him who had two infants, one to circumcise on Friday, the other to circumcise on the Sabbath, who forgot and circumcised the one for Friday on the Sabbath, that he is exempt.

I. "Concerning what did they differ? Concerning him who had two infants, one to circumcise after the Sabbath, the other to circumcise on the Sabbath, who forgot and circumcised the one for after the Sabbath on the Sabbath. R. Eliezer declares him liable to a sin-offering, and R. Joshua exempts him.

J. "And both of them derived the rule only from the case of idolatry. *R. Eliezer takes the view that it is equivalent to the case of idolatry. Just as in the case of idolatry, the All-Merciful has said, 'don't do it,' and if you do it, you are liable, here, too, there is no difference. And R. Joshua said, 'In that case he is not preoccupied with a religious duty, he is here.'*"

K. *A Tannaite statement:* R. Hiyya says, "R. Meir would say, 'R. Eliezer and R. Joshua didn't differ on the case of one who had two infants, one to circumcise on Friday, the other to circumcise on the Sabbath, who forgot and circumcised the one for Friday on the Sabbath, that he is liable.

L. "Concerning what did they differ? Concerning one who had two infants, one to circumcise after the Sabbath, the other to circumcise on the Sabbath, who forgot and circumcised the one for after the Sabbath on the Sabbath, that R. Eliezer declares him liable to a sin-offering and R. Joshua exempts him."

M. *Well now, if R. Joshua exempts him in the second instance, though he is not fulfilling a religious duty, is he going to declare him liable in the first instance, where he is? [Obviously not!]*

N. *The household of R. Yannai said, "The opening clause involves a case in which he went ahead and circumcised the one to be done on the Sabbath on Friday, in which case the Sabbath did not have to be*

overridden; in the second case, the Sabbath was going to be overridden.”

O. Said R. Ashi to R. Kahana, “But in the first case, too, the Sabbath is going to be overridden in connection with infants in general.”

P. But in connection with this man, that was not the case.

19:5

- A. An infant is circumcised on the eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh or twelfth day [after birth],**
- B. never sooner, never later.**
- C. How so?**
- D. Under normal circumstances, it is on the eighth day.**
- E. [If] he was born at twilight, he is circumcised on the ninth day.**
- F. [If he was born] at twilight on the eve of the Sabbath, he is circumcised on the tenth day [the following Sunday].**
- G. In the case of a festival which falls after the Sabbath, he will be circumcised on the eleventh day [Monday].**
- H. In the case of two festival days of the New Year, he will be circumcised on the twelfth day [Tuesday].**
- I. An infant who is sick — they do not circumcise him until he gets well.**

I.1 A. **[An infant who is sick — they do not circumcise him until he gets well:]**
Said Samuel, “Once a fever has left the child, he is given seven full days of recovery.”

I.2 A. *The question was raised: Do we require a full twenty-four hours of recovery?*
B. *Come and take note of what Luda taught as a Tannaite statement: “The day on which a child recovers is like the day on which he was born”? Does this not mean, just as on the day of his birth, we do not require a full period of twenty-four hours [to count that part of the day as a whole day], so as to the day of his recovery, we do not require a full period of twenty-four hours?*
C. *No, the day of his recovery is more important than the day of his birth, for, in regard to the day of his birth no full twenty-four hour period is required [since circumcision may be performed at any hour of the eighth day of a child’s birth, without regard to the hour at which he was born], but in regard to the day of his recovery, a full period of twenty-four hours is necessary.*

19:6

- A. These are the shreds [of the foreskin, if they remain] which render the circumcision invalid:
- B. flesh which covers the greater part of the corona —
- C. and such a one does not eat heave-offering.
- D. And if he was fat [so the corona appears to be covered up], one has to fix it up for appearance's sake.
- E. [137B] [If] one circumcised but did not tear the inner lining [the cut did not uncover the corona, since the membrane was not split and pulled down], it is as if he did not perform the act of circumcision.

I.1 A. [Flesh which covers the greater part of the corona:] Said R. Abina said R. Jeremiah bar Abba said Rab, "It is the flesh that covers the greater part of the height of the corona."

II.1 A. And if he was fat [so the corona appears to be covered up], one has to fix it up for appearance's sake:

- B. Said Samuel, "An infant's penis that was overgrown with flesh, we look into the case. So long as, when he has an erection, he appears circumcised, it is not necessary to circumcise him, but if not, it is necessary to recircumcise him."

C. *In a Tannaite formulation it has been repeated:* **Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, "If he was overgrown with flesh, they examine the penis when it is erect. If it appears to be uncircumcised, they recircumcise him, and if not, they do not recircumcise him" [T. **Shab. 15:9H**].**

D. *Yeah, so what's the practical difference between these formulations?*

E. *At issue is a case in which it is only partially visible [in Samuel's view, he has to be recircumcised, but in Simeon b. Gamaliel's, it would have to be completely invisible before he has to be recircumcised].*

III.1 A. [If] one circumcised but did not tear the inner lining [the cut did not uncover the corona, since the membrane was not split and pulled down], it is as if he did not perform the act of circumcision:

- B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. He who performs the rite of circumcision says, "Blessed... who has sanctified us by his commandments and commanded us concerning circumcision."

- D. The father of the boy says, “Blessed... who has sanctified us by his commandments and commanded us to bring him into the covenant of our father Abraham.”
- E. Those who are standing as witnesses say, “As he has entered into the covenant, so may he enter into Torah, the marriage canopy, and good deeds.”
- F. And the one who recites the blessing [over the wine] says, “...Who has sanctified the loved one from the womb; he set a statute in his flesh, and his offspring he sealed with the mark of the holy covenant. Therefore as a reward for this, living God, our portion, command to save our beloved of our flesh from the pit; for the sake of your covenant, which you have set in our flesh. Blessed are you, Lord, who makes the covenant.”
- G. He who circumcises converts says, “Blessed... who has sanctified us by his commandments and commanded us concerning circumcision.”
- H. He who recites the blessing over wine says, “Blessed... who has sanctified us by his commandments and commanded us to circumcise proselytes and to cause a drop of blood of the covenant to flow from them; but since but for the blood of the covenant, heaven and earth would not endure, ‘if not my covenant by day and by night, I had not appointed the ordinances of the heaven and earth’ (Jer. 33:15). Blessed are you, Lord, who makes the covenant.”
- I. He who circumcises slaves says, “Blessed... who has sanctified us by his commandments and commanded us concerning circumcision.”
- J. He who says the blessing over the wine says, “Blessed... who has sanctified us by his commandments and commanded us to circumcise slaves and cause drops of the blood of the covenant to flow from them, since but for the blood of the covenant, heaven and earth would not endure, ‘if not my covenant by day and by night, I had not appointed the ordinances of the heaven and earth’ (Jer. 33:15). Blessed are you, Lord, who makes the covenant.”