



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Shabbos, Daf קכז – Daf קן

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vl'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf קכז---127-----

- A Braisa says: **R' Shimon** says regarding a pile of produce (which has presumably been piled for storage and is therefore muktzeh), if one began to take from that pile before Shabbos, he may take from it on Shabbos as well. If not, he may not. **R' Acha** says he may take from the pile on Shabbos in either case.
 - **Q: R' Shimon** does not hold of muktzeh, so how could he have said that?! **A: R' Acha** is the one who says it would be assur and **R' Shimon** would say that it would be mutar.
 - **Q:** How much produce must be piled to be considered that it was set aside for storage? **A:** A "lesech" (which is ½ kur or 15 se'ah).
- **Q:** When the Mishna says one may move "4 or 5 boxes" to make room, does the Mishna mean to limit it to that many boxes (because the **Chachomim** don't want someone making more than 5 trips of schlepping stuff back and forth on Shabbos), or is the limit to the quantity that can fit into "4 or 5 boxes", but it can be done in as many trips as you wish?
 - A Braisa says that one may move away 4 or 5 boxes of jugs of oil or wine. Another Braisa says one may move "10 or 15" which presumably means that he can move 10 or 15 boxes. Maybe we can say that the basis of the question asked is the machlokes between these Braisos. The first Braisa says that one may not make more than 5 trips and the second Braisa says that more trips may be made as long as the quantity is not increased? The Gemara says that really both Braisos say that he cannot make more than 5 trips. The first Braisa is discussing moving large jugs that only fit one per box, so that maximum he can take out is 5 jugs. The second Braisa is discussing smaller jugs which he can fit 2 or 3 jugs per box which is why he can take out 10 or 15 jugs in the 5 boxes. When the Braisa says "10 or 15" it is referring to jugs, not to boxes.
- **Q:** Is the 5 box limit a hard maximum, or does the maximum increase depending if there is a need (e.g. if there are a lot of guests)? **Q2:** If we say that the maximum increases based on the need, may one person do all the moving or may each person only move a maximum of 5 boxes?
 - **A:** There are 2 stories, one with **Rebbi** and one with **R' Chiya**, where each went to teach and saw that there was not enough room for the talmidim. They each went to the field and cleared all the bundles to make room for the talmidim. We see from here that one can make as much room as is needed for all the people. There is no proof from here that one person can do it alone because **Rebbi**, who was the Nasi, certainly didn't schlep the bundles and must have asked people to clear the area. It could be that he asked enough people to make sure that each person did not move more than 5 boxes.

MIPNEI HA'ORCHIN

- **R' Yochanan** said, "hachnosas orchim" is as great as getting up early to go learn, because the Mishna says one may clear space for guests or to make room for students to learn. **R' Dimi of Neharda'ah** says, it is even **greater** than getting up early to learn, because the Mishna mentions "hachnosas orchim" before it mentions the talmidim learning Torah.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, "hachnosas orchim" is greater than greeting the Shechina, because we see that Avraham Avinu left the presence of the Shechina to go do "hachnosas orchim".
- **R' Elazar** said, come and see that the ways of Hashem are different than those of humans. With humans, a person could never tell one greater than him to "wait until I get back to you". Yet, Avraham did that to Hashem.
- **R' Yehuda bar Shila in the name of R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, there are 6 things that a person can do which brings him pleasure in this world ("he eats the fruit of those actions on this world") but the principle reward for these actions are enjoyed in the next world: 1) "hachnosas orchim", 2) visiting the sick, 3)

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

concentrating during davening, 4) getting up early to go to learn in the Beis Medrash, 5) raising one's children to study Torah, 6) judging others favorably.

- **Q:** A Mishna has a different list of actions that brings those rewards: 1) honoring one's parents, 2) doing kindness, 3) bringing peace between people, 4) and learning Torah (which is equal to them all). It seems that these 4 and no more!? **A:** The 6 of **R' Yochanan's** list are included in the list of 4 in the Mishna (1,2, and 3 are doing kindness, 4 and 5 are Torah learning, and 6 is bringing peace between people).
- A Braisa says, one who judges others favorably will be judged favorably as well. There was a story with a person who went to work for another for 3 years. After the 3 years he asked for his pay so that he could return home to his wife and children. The boss told him he had no money to pay. He asked for pay in the form of produce and was told that he had none to give. He asked for pay in the form of land and was told that he had none to give. He asked for pay in the form of animals and was told that he had none to give. He asked to be paid in the form of pillows and cushions and was told that he had none to give. The worker took his belongings and went home depressed. A couple of weeks later the boss traveled to the worker's house with the full amount of his wages and 3 donkey loads – one of food, one of drinks, and one of different delicacies. The boss asked, when I said I didn't have money for you, what did you think? He said, I thought you must have found an opportunity to buy very cheap merchandise and spent all your money on it. The boss asked, when I said I didn't have animals to pay you, what did you think? He said, I thought you must have rented all your animals to other people. The boss asked, when I said that I didn't have land to give you, what did you think? He said, I thought you must have given it out to others as sharecroppers. The boss asked, when I said that I didn't have produce to give you, what did you think? He said, I thought that you must have not given ma'aser from your produce. The boss asked, when I said that I didn't have pillows or cushions, what did you think? He said, I thought that you must have given all your belongings to "hekdesh". The boss said "I swear, that is exactly what happened. I ended up giving all my possessions to hekdesh because my son was not learning Torah. I had my vow annulled and that's how I am now paying you. The same way you judged me favorably, Hashem should judge you favorably as well!"
- A Braisa brings a story with a certain "chossid" who redeemed a Jewish girl from captivity. When he reached the hotel where he would be spending the night with his talmidim, he had the girl stay with him. In the morning he was "toivel" in a mikvah and then taught his talmidim Torah (Ezra had instituted that one who emitted "zerah" must be "toivel" before davening or learning). He asked his talmidim, what did you think when I put the girl in my room to sleep? They said, we thought that there must be a talmid among us who you don't trust enough to allow the girl to be with us. He asked, what did you think when you saw me go to the mikvah today? They said, we thought that you must have emitted "zerah" from the exhaustion of travelling. He said to them, I swear that is exactly what happened. Just like you judged me favorably, so too should Hashem judge you favorably!
- A Braisa brings the following story. There was a time when the **Rabanan** needed a representative to talk to a certain noblewoman who was known to be a "zonah" for all the Roman officials. **R' Yehoshua** volunteered to go. He travelled to her with his talmidim. When he got to within 4 amos of her house, he removed his tefillin. When he entered, his talmidim remained outside and he closed the door in front of them. When he left, he was "toivel" in a mikvah and then taught them Torah. He then said to them, what did you think when I removed my tefillin? They said, we thought you don't want to take holy tefillin into such an unholy place. He asked, what did you think when I closed the door? They said, we thought you had private matters to discuss with her. He asked, what did you think when you saw me go to the mikvah? They said, we thought that some of her saliva must have landed on your clothing (which would make you tamei based on the **Rabanan's** gezeira of treating goyim as "zavim"). **R' Yehoshua** said, I swear that is exactly what happened. Just as you judged me favorably, so too should Hashem judge you favorably!

MIFANIN TERUMAH TEHORAH...

- **Q:** Terumah which is not tamei is obviously not muktzeh?! **A:** Since it is now in the hand of a non-Kohen, who can't eat it, we would think that it would be muktzeh. The Mishna therefore teaches that since it is fit for a Kohen to eat, it is not muktzeh.

U'DEMAI

- **Q:** This is not fit to eat, so why is it not muktzeh?! **A:** Since the person can give away all his possessions and become a pauper (who is allowed to eat "dema'") it is considered fit for him now as well and is not muktzeh.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

U'MA'ASER RISHON SHENITLA TERUMASO...

- **Q:** This is obviously not muktzeh?! **A:** We are talking about a case where the Levi took the ma'aser before there was a chiyuv for the owner to give Terumah Gedolah (before it was smoothed into a pile), and therefore, that terumah was never given. We would think that is assur and therefore it should be muktzeh. The Mishna is telling us like **R' Avahu** says in the name of **Reish Lakish**, that in this case the Levi only needs to give his Terumas Ma'aser, not the Terumah Gedola and it is therefore not muktzeh. However, had the Levi taken the ma'aser after there was already a chiyuv for the owner to give the Teruma Gedola, the Levi would have to separate Teruma Gedola as well as Terumas Ma'aser.

U'MA'ASER SHEINI...

- **Q:** This is obviously not muktzeh?! **A:** The Mishna is discussing where he gave the principle amount of the redemption, but not the additional fifth. The Mishna teaches that the redemption is considered complete without it as well.

V'HATURMUS HAYAVESH...

- It is only not muktzeh when it is dry. However, if it is still moist, it is not edible even by an animal because of its bitterness and would therefore be muktzeh.

-----Daf דבדק---128-----

AVAL LO ES HATEVEL...

- **Q:** Tevel is obviously muktzeh!? **A:** We are discussing something which is tevel only D'Rabanan. The Mishna is teaching that even that is muktzeh.

V'LO MA'ASER RISHON...

- **Q:** This is obviously muktzeh!? **A:** We are discussing where the Levi took his ma'aser after the produce was smoothed into a pile but before the owner separated terumah. One would think (based on the psukim) that the Levi should not have to separate the owner's portion of the terumah as well. The Mishna teaches that he does, and until he does it is muktzeh.

V'LO ES MA'ASER SHEINI...

- **Q:** This is obviously muktzeh!? **A:** This is discussing where it was redeemed, but not properly. For example, the ma'aser was redeemed onto coins that have no image on it (the pasuk teaches that it must have some image), and the hekdesch was redeemed onto land (the pasuk teaches that hekdesch may not be redeemed onto real property).

V'LO ES HALUF

- A Braisa says: We may move "chatzav" grass because deer eat it, and mustard seeds because doves eat it. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, we may move broken glass because that is food for an ostrich (wealthy and royal families would keep them as pets). **R' Nosson** asked, if so, one should be allowed to move bundles of twigs because it is elephant food?
 - **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** holds that ostriches are common, therefore ostrich "food" is not muktzeh, whereas elephants are not common.
 - **Ameimar** said, **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** only allows the moving of glass when someone has an ostrich. **R' Ashi** asked, if that is true, the case of the elephant food must be when you have an elephant. If so, why would **R' Shimon** say it is muktzeh? It must be that he didn't have an elephant. Same with the glass – he allows moving it since it is fit for an ostrich even though he doesn't own an ostrich.
- **Abaye** says, **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**, **R' Shimon**, **R' Yishmael** and **R' Akiva** all say the same concept that all Yidden are considered to be "princes". **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** said that broken glass is not muktzeh for anyone even though only the wealthy and royal families keep ostriches as pets. **R' Shimon** says that all Yidden may smear rose oil on their wounds on Shabbos since princes use it even during the week and even not on their wounds. **R' Yishmael** and **R' Akiva** say that no Yid may be forced to sell his expensive coat and to wear a cheaper one to be able to pay back his creditors, because all Yidden are considered fit to wear such an expensive coat.

CHAVILEI KASH V'CHAVILEI...

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says: Bundles of straw, twigs, or soft reeds that were set aside to feed animals may be moved on Shabbos. If not, they may not. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, even if set aside to feed animals, if they can be carried in one hand they may be moved. If they must be carried in 2 hands, they may not be moved. Bundles of "se'ah", "eizov", and "koranis" that were brought in for firewood may not be used on Shabbos. If they were brought in for animal food, they may be brought in on Shabbos. They may be broken into pieces by hand, but not with a keili. **R' Yehuda** says, one may rub these items in his hands to remove the shell, but may not do a lot of them in a keili. The **Chachomim** say he may rub them in his fingertips, but may not rub a lot of them in his hands like he does during the week. The same din applies to "amisah", to "feigum" and to other spices.
 - "Amisa" is mint. "Si'ah" is "tzasri". "Eizov" is "abarsah". "Koranis" is the name of the item. **Q:** We saw someone call "chashi" by the name "koranis"!? **A:** "koranis" is "chashi".
- One may move raw, salted meat on Shabbos. Raw, unsalted meat – **R' Huna** says one may move it, and **R' Chisda** says one may not move it.
 - **Q: R' Huna** was a talmid of **Rav** who held there is muktzeh like the view of **R' Yehuda**, so how could he say the unsalted meat may be moved? **A: Rav** holds like **R' Yehuda** with regard to eating it (it may not be eaten because it is muktzeh). He disagrees with **R' Yehuda** with regard to moving it.
 - **Q: R' Chisda** once allowed moving a raw, slaughtered duck from the sun to the shade?! **A:** Duck can be eaten raw and is therefore not muktzeh.
 - A Braisa says, salted fish may be moved, but unsalted fish may not be moved. Raw meat may be moved whether salted or not.
- A Braisa says bones may be moved because they are fit for dogs. Spoiled meat may be moved because it is fit for wild animals to eat. Water that was left uncovered may be moved because it is fit for cats. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, one may not keep such water altogether because it poses a danger.

MISHNA

- We may place a basket upside down in front of little birds so that they can use it to get up and down.
- A chicken that ran away may be pushed along by hand until it gets back to its home.
- One may help calves and young donkeys walk (by holding its neck and sides and having it move its legs on its own).
- A woman may help a child walk even in the reshus harabim. **R' Yehuda** says, that is only allowed when the child lifts his feet in a walking motion. However, if the mother must schlep the child, she may not do so.

GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** says, if an animal falls into a stream of water, we may place pillows underneath the animal, and if it is able to then climb out of the stream, so be it.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that if an animal falls into a stream of water we may feed the animal there. It seems though that we may not place pillows underneath it to help it climb out!? **A:** If it is possible to feed the animal there and have it survive, that is all that may be done. However, if the animal cannot survive there, we may place pillows underneath to help it get out.
 - **Q:** Placing pillows there is taking a permitted utensil and removing its usefulness (it becomes muktzeh), which is not allowed!? **A:** Doing so is only assur D'Rabanan. Causing pain to animals is assur D'Oraisa. Therefore, we transgress the D'Rabanan for the sake of the D'Oraisa.

TARNEGOLES SHE'BARCHA...

- It seems from the Mishna that one may push a chicken but may not help it walk like he may do to other animals. A Braisa says this as well.
 - **Abaye** explains, he may not help the chicken walk, because a chicken will lift itself off the ground and end up being carried.
 - One Braisa says we may help animals and birds walk in a courtyard, but not in the reshus harabim. A woman may even help her child walk in the reshus harabim. Another Braisa says, we may not lift an animal or bird in a courtyard, but may push them until they enter the area that we want them to go into.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The second Braisa says one may not lift, which seems to allow helping it to walk. The Braisa then says he may push it, which seems not to allow helping it to walk? **A: Abaye** said, when the Braisa says only pushing is allowed, it is referring to a chicken.
- **Abaye** says, one who is slaughtering a chicken should either press its feet hard against the ground or lift the chicken off the ground. If he doesn't do so, the chicken will dig its claws into the ground and dislocate the food pipe or wind pipe.

MISHNA

- One may not deliver the baby of an animal on Yom Tov, but he may assist in the delivery.
- One may deliver a human baby on Shabbos, may call her midwife even from far away, and may be mechalel Shabbos for the woman in labor.
- One may tie the umbilical cord on Shabbos. **R' Yose** says one may cut it as well.
- One may do all that is necessary to do a "milah" on Shabbos.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How does one "assist" in a delivery? **A: R' Yehuda** says he holds the baby so that it does not fall to the ground. **R' Nachman** says he pushes the mother's stomach to help the baby come out.
 - A Braisa says like **R' Yehuda**, as follows: How does one assist a delivery? He holds the baby so that it does not fall to the ground, blows into its nostrils (to clear the mucus), and places the mother's nipple into the baby's mouth so that it can nurse. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, we would try to make a kosher animal that gave birth love its baby on Yom Tov.
 - **Abaye** explains, to make the mother love its baby, one takes a lump of salt and puts it in the womb which causes the animal to remember the pain and thereby have pity on the baby. One then sprinkles water in which the "shilya" was soaked onto the baby so that the mother can smell it and have pity on the baby.
 - One may only do this on Yom Tov for a kosher animal, because non-kosher animals typically do not reject their offspring, and if they do, there is no way to rectify it.

MIYALDIN ES HA'ISHA...

- **Q:** What does the Mishna add by saying that we may be mechalel Shabbos for her? **A:** The Mishna means to include what was taught in a Braisa, that if a woman in labor needs light to calm her, we can light a candle on Shabbos. If she needs to be smeared with oil, her friend may carry some for her from the reshut harabim, in her hand (so that there is at least some deviation made from normal carrying). If that is not enough oil, her friend can bring oil in her hair. If that is not enough, her friend can even bring oil in a keili.
 - **Q:** If she needs the light it is obvious that we may light a candle!? **A:** We are talking about a blind woman who is in labor. Although she doesn't need the light, she is calmer knowing that all those with her can help her better with light and we may therefore light the candle for her.
 - **Q:** How can her friend bring oil in her hair and squeeze it out? That is the melacha of "sechita"! **A1: Rabbah and R' Yosef** say there is no problem of "sechita" with hair (because hair is hard and does not absorb). **A2: R' Ashi** says it means she carries a keili of oil in her hair, not that she soaks the oil into her hair.

-----Daf קכט---129-----

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, with regard to a woman who has just given birth, as long as her womb is "open", we are mechalel Shabbos for her whether she says she needs us to do so or whether she says she doesn't need (but others say that she does). Once the womb closes, whether she says that she needs it or not, we are not mechalel Shabbos for her.
 - **R' Ashi** had this version of **Shmuel** as well. **Mar Zutra** had a different version. According to him, **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, with regard to a woman who has just given birth, as long as her womb is "open", we are mechalel Shabbos for her whether she says she needs us to do so or whether

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

she says she doesn't need, but others say that she does. Once the womb closes, if she says she needs us to be mechalel Shabbos for her, we do so. If she says she doesn't need us to, we don't.

- **Ravina asked Mareimar**, who do we pasken like (**R' Ashi** or **Mar Zutra**)? **A:** He answered we pasken like **Mar Zutra** because whenever a life is at risk we pasken leniently.
- **Q:** From what point is the womb considered to be "open"? **A: Abaye** said, from when the woman in labor sits on the birthing stool. **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** says, from when the woman begins bleeding in labor. **Some say** it is from when the woman in labor can no longer walk on her own.
- **Q:** Until when is the womb considered "open"? **A: Abaye** says for 3 days after childbirth. **Rava in the name of R' Yehuda** says 7 days. **Some say** 30 days.
- **The Nehardai** say: within the first 3 days, whether she says she needs them to be mechalel Shabbos for her or not, we are mechalel Shabbos for her. From day 4 to day 7, if she says she needs them to be mechalel Shabbos for her, we are. If she says she does not need it, we are not. From day 8 to day 30, even if she says she needs us to be mechalel Shabbos for her, we are not, but we may ask a goy to do what she needs.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** says, "for a woman who has given birth, 30 days". **Q:** Regarding what halacha was that said? **A:** The **Nehardai** say it was in regard to being "toivel" in a mikvah. A woman should not do so for 30 days after childbirth because the cold can be dangerous for her. **Rava** says, that is only if her husband is not there to be with her. However, if he is, she can be "toivel" because she will be warmed by her husband and will not be in danger.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, we may make a large fire on Shabbos for a woman who has given birth.
 - The talmidim understood this to mean that this may be done for a woman who has given birth but not for a different sick person, and this may be done in the winter, but not in the summer. However, **R' Chiya bar Avin in the name of Shmuel** said, we may make a large fire on Shabbos to warm someone who has let blood even during the summer.
- **Shmuel** felt it was so important to be warm after letting blood, that at one time he had a chair of expensive wood chopped up for him to make a fire after he let blood. **R' Yehuda** had a table of expensive wood chopped up to make a fire for him. **Rabbah** had a bench chopped up to make a fire for him. **Abaye** asked him, you are being "oiver" the halacha of "bal tash'chis"?! **Rabbah** answered, it is more important to make sure that my body is not destroyed than the bench.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, a person should even sell the beams of his house, if he must, to afford shoes. Still, if one lets blood and doesn't have what to eat, he should sell his shoes to buy food for that very important meal.
 - What must he eat at that meal? **Rav** says he should eat meat (which restores the blood lost). **Shmuel** says he should drink wine (the red wine restores the red blood).
- After letting blood, **Shmuel** would eat a dish of cooked spleen (which is very red). **R' Yochanan** would drink wine until the fragrance came out of his ears. **R' Nachman** drank until his spleen "floated" in the wine. **R' Yosef** drank until the fragrance came out of the hole made by the bloodletting. **Rava** would drink wine of a vine that was 3 years old. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** told his talmidim, on the day that you let blood, tell your wives that I will be coming to visit (so that they prepare big meals for you to eat).
 - One is never allowed to trick people except for the following purpose. If one had let blood and has no money to buy wine, he should take a worn out coin (which is not accepted by people), go to 7 wine vendors and taste the wine (which was normal buying procedure), offer to pay with the worn out coin, and when it is refused he moves to the next wine seller. He should do this until he has gotten to drink a revi'is of wine. If he can't do that, he should eat seven black dates, smear oil on his temples, and sleep in the sun.
 - Avlet saw **Shmuel** sleeping in the sun. He said to **Shmuel**, how can you think that such a bad thing like the sun is beneficial? **Shmuel** answered that he had let blood that day, and therefore needed to stay warm. In truth, he had not let blood that day. It was the one day a year that the sun is very beneficial (the summer solstice) and **Shmuel** didn't want to tell the goy about that.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Rav and Shmuel** say, one who is not careful with eating after bloodletting has his sustenance lessened from Heaven. In Heaven they say, if he doesn't care about himself, why should we?
- **Rav and Shmuel** say, after one lets blood, he should not sit in a windy place, because if too much blood was taken from him, the wind may cause a bit more blood to escape which can be very dangerous.
 - **Shmuel** would only let blood in a building that was 7 and a half bricks thick. One time he was didn't feel well after letting blood and discovered that the wall was missing one half brick of thickness.
- **Rav and Shmuel** say, after letting blood one should eat something before leaving the building. If he leaves before eating and sees a dead person, his face will turn green. If he meets a murderer, he will die. If he meets a pig, he will be stricken with tzara'as.
- **Rav and Shmuel** say, would should wait before standing after bloodletting. We are taught that 5 things bring a person closer to death: if one eats and stands immediately, drinks and stands immediately, sleeps and stands up immediately, lets blood and stands up immediately, or has tashmish and stands up immediately.
- **Shmuel** says one should let blood every 30 days. After reaching 40 years old it should only be done every 2 months. After reaching 60 years old it should be done every 3 months.
- **Shmuel** says, blood should not be let on Monday or Thursday because that is when Beis Din convenes, which therefore means that the Heavenly Beis Din convenes as well and are days when one is judged. Blood should not be let on Tuesday because of the "mazal" that is predominant on that day. Although that "mazal" exists on Friday as well, since people let blood on Fridays we can say that "Hashem protects the fools".
- **Shmuel** says that it is dangerous to let blood on a Wednesday that is the 4th, 14th, or 24th of the month, or if there are less than 4 days left to the month. Letting blood on the first or second day of the month causes weakness. If done on the third day of the month it is dangerous. If done on Erev Yom Tov it causes weakness. On Erev Shavuos it is dangerous. The **Rabanan** were goizer that one should not let blood on any Erev Yom Tov because of the danger associated with letting blood on Erev Shavuos (on that day a dangerous wind blows that would have killed everyone had the Yidden not accepted the Torah).
- **Shmuel** says, if one eats wheat and then lets blood for refuah purposes, the bloodletting only helps for that wheat. If he is letting blood to relieve the excess blood, that can be done even after eating wheat.
 - After letting blood, drinking can be done immediately. Eating should not be done for the time it takes to walk half a "mil".
 - **Q:** Is drinking after that time harmful or is it not harmful or beneficial? **A: TEIKU.**
 - **Q:** Is eating before or after that time harmful or not harmful or beneficial? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Rav** said, if one can buy 100 gourds for a zuz or 100 animal heads for a zuz, he should buy them. However, even if he can get 100 animal lips for free, he should not take them.
 - **R' Yosef** said, when the **Rabanan** were lazy coming to the Beis Medrash, **R' Huna** would say it is a "lip day". After hearing that from **Rav**, he understood it to mean a day that will accomplish nothing.

V'KOSHRIN HATABUR

- A Braisa says: We may tie the umbilical cord on Shabbos. **R' Yose** says we may even cut it. We may cover/bury the "shliya" to bring warmth to the baby. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** said, princesses bury their "shliya" in bowls of oil, wealthy people do so in combed wool, and poor people do so in soft materials.
 - **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha in the name of Rav** paskened like **R' Yose** and then said that in the case of twins even the **Rabanan** would agree with **R' Yose** that the cords may be cut so that they don't get pulled out of place when they move from each other.
 - **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha in the name of Rav** said, we learn from psukim what we may do for a woman in labor on Shabbos. We may deliver the child, cut the cord, wash the baby, place salt on the baby's skin, and swaddle the baby on Shabbos.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

HADRAN ALACH PEREK MEFANIN!!!

-----Daf קל---130-----

PEREK R' ELIEZER D'MILAH -- PEREK TISH'AH ASSAR

MISHNA

- **R' Eliezer** says, if one did not bring the “milah” knife before Shabbos, he may bring it on Shabbos as long as it is exposed when he carries it. In times of danger (i.e. where the government has outlawed “milah”) he should cover it in front of 2 witnesses and then carry it covered.
- **R' Eliezer** also says we may cut trees, to make charcoal, to make iron for the knife.
- **R' Akiva** stated a rule: any melacha which could be done before Shabbos (making the knife) may not be done on Shabbos. Anything which could not be done before Shabbos (the actual “milah”) may be done on Shabbos.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Does **R' Eliezer** require that the knife be carried when exposed because he wants the love of the mitzvah to be demonstrated, or is it to avoid suspicion that the person is carrying something other than a knife for a “milah”? The difference between these reasons would be whether he can cover it in front of witnesses and carry it out like that when there is not a time of danger. There is no suspicion in that case, but the love of the mitzvah does not get demonstrated. **A:** **R' Levi** said, **R' Eliezer's** reason is to demonstrate the love for the mitzvah. A Braisa says that as well. **R' Ashi** said, a proof can be brought from our Mishna which says that in a time of danger it may be carried when covered in front of witnesses. This seems to say that only in a time of danger is this allowed. We see that **R' Eliezer's** reason is to show the love for the mitzvah.
- **Q:** When **R' Eliezer** allows the knife to be carried concealed in front of witnesses, do the 2 witnesses need to be fully kosher witnesses, or can the one carrying the knife be one of the witnesses (even though he is not kosher to testify about himself)? **A:** Our Mishna says there must be 2 witnesses – which presumably means 2 besides himself.
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. It may mean that he is included as one witness, and the Mishna means 2 witnesses who could testify in another situation.

V'OD OMAR R' ELIEZER

- A Braisa says, in the place of **R' Eliezer** they would cut trees to make charcoal to make the metal knife for the milah on Shabbos. In the place of **R' Yose Haglili** they would eat bird meat with milk.
 - **Levi** went to the house of **Yosef the bird trapper** and was served a peacock's head in milk. **Levi** did not eat it and later asked **Rebbi** why he didn't put the people who eat bird meat with milk into “cheirem”. **Rebbi** answered, those people live in the place of **R' Yehuda ben Beseira**, who may hold like **R' Yose Haglili** who says, the pasuk states “Do not eat a goat in its mother's milk” – which teaches that a bird, which doesn't have “mother's milk” can be eaten with milk.
 - **R' Yitzchak** said, a certain city in Eretz Yisrael was particular with regard to following **R' Eliezer's** shita on milah and the people of that city never died young. Even more, when the Romans decreed against milah, that city was not included in the decree.
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, any mitzvah that Klal Yisrael accepted upon themselves with joy – like the mitzvah of milah – they still perform it with joy. Any mitzvah that they accepted upon themselves with “fighting” – like the mitzvah of not marrying a close relative – are still performed with “fighting” (for there is no “kesubah” that doesn't have some argument involved).
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, any mitzvah for which Klal Yisrael gave themselves to death rather than to follow a decree that banned the performance of the mitzvah – like milah and avodah zarah – remains strongly kept. A mitzvah for which they did not give themselves over to death – like tefillin – is performed “weakly”.
 - **R' Yannai** said, wearing tefillin requires a “clean body” like “Elisha Ba'al Kinafayim”. A “clean body” means – **Abaye** – one may not pass gas while wearing tefillin, **Rava** – one may not fall asleep in his tefillin. [We see that most people, unlike Elisha, were not particular with their observance of tefillin].

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Romans decreed to prohibit the wearing of tefillin. Elisha wore tefillin and was seen by a Roman officer. The officer gave chase and Elisha removed his tefillin and hid them in his hands. When asked by the officer as to what was in his hands, Elisha responded that he had “dove’s wings”. He opened his hands and saw that his tefillin had turned into dove’s wings. This story is what earned him the name “Elisha Ba’al Kinafayim”.
- He said it was “dove’s wings” because Klal Yisrael is compared to a dove. Just like a dove is protected by its wings, so too Klal Yisrael is protected by its mitzvos.
- **R’ Abba bar R’ Ada in the name of R’ Yitzchak** said, they once forgot to bring the knife to the baby’s house before Shabbos, so they brought the knife on Shabbos by carrying it via rooftops and courtyards, but not with the approval of **R’ Eliezer**.
 - **Q: R’ Yosef** asks, if this means because **R’ Eliezer** would have had them bring in through the reshus harabim, that would seem to mean that they did this with the approval of the **Rabanan** who prohibit bringing the knife via the reshus harabim. However, we find that the **Rabanan** don’t permit bringing it via rooftops and courtyards either?! **A: R’ Ashi** said, it was brought with the approval of **R’ Shimon** who allows items that began Shabbos on a rooftop or in a courtyard to be transferred via rooftops and courtyards.
- **Q: R’ Zeira** asked **R’ Assi**, may one carry within the confines of a “mavui” which did not have “shituf muvaos” (the equivalent of an “eruvei chatzeiros” in a courtyard) performed for it just as one may carry within the confines of a courtyard which did not have an “eruvei chatzeiros” done to it, or maybe a courtyard is different because it is essentially enclosed on 4 sides whereas a “mavui” is only enclosed on 3 sides? Also, a courtyard is used by the homeowners of the homes in that courtyard and it therefore looks a lot more like a reshus hayachid than a “mavui” does. What is the halacha?
 - **R’ Assi** did not answer. At a later time, **R’ Zeira** heard **R’ Assi** say, that **R’ Shimon ben Lakish in the name of R’ Yehuda Hanasi** said, they once forgot to bring the knife to the baby before Shabbos and they brought it on Shabbos, but the **Rabanan** were perplexed as to how they could follow **R’ Eliezer** and disregard the **Chachomim** – first because **R’ Eliezer** was put in “cheirem” (or because he was a talmid of Shammai) and because he is a minority view! **R’ Assi** continued, **R’ Oshaya** said that he asked **R’ Yehuda** the Mohel, who answered that the case was where they moved the knife across a “mavui” that did not have “shituf muvaos” done. Upon hearing this, **R’ Zeira** said to **R’ Assi**, if you didn’t ask on this it must mean that you agree that one may carry in such a “mavui”, so why didn’t you answer me when I asked you earlier? **R’ Assi** said, through my learning I remembered this and would now be able to answer your question.
- **R’ Zeira in the name of Rav** said that one may *not* carry more than 4 amos within such a “mavui”.
 - **Abaye** said, **Rabbah bar Avuha** explains (in the name of **Rav**), if the courtyards which open up into this mavui had an eiruv done to them, one may not carry more than 4 amos in this mavui. However, if no eiruv was done to the courtyards, one may carry within the entire area of the mavui.
 - **Q: R’ Chanina Choza’ah** asked **Rabbah, Rav** says that one may only carry in mavui that has been adjusted with a “lechi” or a “korah” if there are houses and courtyards that open into this mavui. Therefore, when an eiruv was made in the courtyard, the courtyards become nullified to the houses (people may carry in them) and the mavui in effect does not have courtyards opening up into it (which is why nothing can be carried in the mavui without a “shituf muvaos”). In a case where there was no eiruv, why is carrying in the mavui permitted? In that case we should view the houses as closed up (since nothing can be transferred out of them into the mavui) and the mavui should in effect only have courtyards opening into them, but no houses (and carrying in the mavui should likewise be prohibited)!? **A:** All members of the courtyard can relinquish their rights in the courtyard to one person and that one person would then be allowed to carry into the courtyard even without an eiruv. Therefore, there are considered to be courtyards and houses that open into this mavui. This can be done to a number of houses throughout the day so there are multiple houses to each courtyard that open to the mavui.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** At any given time there is only one house able to use the courtyard? **A:** Rather, **R' Ashi** said, the reason one may carry in the mavui when there is no eiruv in the courtyard is that since there will be no transferring from the houses to the courtyards, we look at the houses as if they don't exist. If so, the courtyards and mavui become one, large reshush, in which carrying is permitted.

-----Daf אָלף---131-----

- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, **R' Eliezer** did not say that the preparatory acts of all mitzvos override Shabbos. We see this because **R' Eliezer** allows the preparatory acts (e.g. the baking) of bringing the "Shte Halechem" (two loaves of bread that are brought as part of a korban on Shavuot) only because he has a gezeirah shava (from the Korban Omer) that allows it. If not for that, he would not allow it.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** is coming to exclude **R' Eliezer's** allowance of the preparatory acts of which mitzvah? It can't be the preparatory acts of lulav, because we find that **R' Eliezer** allows that. It can't be the preparatory acts of succah, because we find that **R' Eliezer** allows that. It can't be the preparatory acts of matzah, because we find that **R' Eliezer** allows that. It can't be the preparatory acts of shofar, because we find that **R' Eliezer** allows that. So what mitzvah's preparatory acts are not allowed? **A: R' Ada bar Ahava** says, **R' Eliezer** does not allow the preparatory acts of tzitzis (making knots) and mezuzah (writing). A Braisa says like this as well.
 - **Q:** Why are these mitzvos different? **A: R' Yosef** says, because tzitzis and mezuzah have no set time for performance, and the mitzvah will exist on the following day as well.
 - **Q: Abaye** asks, since there is no set time, the mitzvah applies every second! If so, we should be allowed to do them on Shabbos because the mitzvah exists every second of Shabbos!? **A: R' Nachman in the name of R' Yitzchak** says, they are different because one can make himself patur from them by giving up ownership of his four-cornered garment and his house (the mitzvos of tzitzis and mezuzah only apply to garments and houses that one owns).
- **Q:** From where does **R' Eliezer** learn that the preparatory acts of lulav override Shabbos? He can't learn it from the fact that preparatory acts of the Korban Omer and Shte Halechem override Shabbos, because those are korbanos, and lulav is not!? **A:** The pasuk by lulav says "Bayom" (on the first day) which teaches that it can be done even if it is Shabbos. This is not permitting merely moving the lulav, because the halachos of muktzeh are only D'Rabanan. It must be permitting preparatory acts.
 - The **Rabanan** (who say that preparatory acts do not override Shabbos) say "Bayom" teaches that the mitzvah of lulav is only by day, not by night. **R' Eliezer** learns this din from the pasuk that says "Shivas Yamim" (7 days), and not nights.
 - The **Rabanan** say, if we only had "Shivas Yamim" we would say to learn lulav from succah, that just like succah is by day and night, so too lulav. That's why we need the pasuk to say "Bayom".
 - We would not be able to learn out Omer and Shte Halechem from lulav, because we would say that only the preparatory acts of lulav are permitted because it has the requirement of "arbah minim" and is therefore more significant.
- **Q:** From where does **R' Eliezer** learn that the preparatory acts of succah override Shabbos? He can't learn it from the fact that preparatory acts of the Korban Omer and Shte Halechem override Shabbos, because those are korbanos, and succah is not!? He can't learn it from lulav, because lulav has the requirement of "arbah minim"!? **A:** He learns it through a gezeirah shava from lulav (they both say "Shivas Yamim").
 - We would not be able to learn out Omer, Shte Halechem and lulav from succah, because we would say that only the preparatory acts of succah are permitted because succah applies by day and night.
- **Q:** From where does **R' Eliezer** learn that the preparatory acts of matzah override Shabbos? He can't learn it from the fact that preparatory acts of the Korban Omer and Shte Halechem override Shabbos, because those are korbanos, and matzah is not!? He can't learn it from lulav, because lulav has the requirement of "arbah

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

minim”!? He can’t learn it from succah because succah applies by day and night (the chiyuv to eat matzah is only at night)?! **A:** He learns it through a gezeirah shava from succah (they both say “Chamisha Assar”).

- We would not be able to learn out Omer, Shte Halechem, lulav and succah from matzah, because we would say that only the preparatory acts of matzah are permitted because matzah is obligatory to men and women.
- **Q:** From where does **R’ Eliezer** learn that the preparatory acts of shofar override Shabbos? He can’t learn it from the fact that preparatory acts of the Korbon Omer and Shte Halechem override Shabbos, because those are korbanos, and shofar is not!? He can’t learn it from lulav, because lulav has the requirement of “arbah minim”!? He can’t learn it from succah because succah applies by day and night. He can’t learn it from matzah, because matzah is obligatory for men and women!? **A:** The pasuk says “Yom teruah” which teaches that it is done even on Shabbos. This is not coming to permit blowing the shofar because the yeshiva of **R’ Yishmael** taught that blowing a shofar is not a melacha, it is a skill, which is not assur on Shabbos. Therefore, the pasuk must be coming to permit the preparatory acts of shofar (making the shofar) on Shabbos.
 - The **Rabanan** say this pasuk teaches that the mitzvah of shofar applies only during the day, not at night. **R’ Eliezer** learns this halacha from the blowing of the shofar on Yom Kippur of Yovel, which must be done during the day.
 - We would not be able to learn out Omer, Shte Halechem, lulav, succah and matzah from shofar, because we would say that only the preparatory acts of shofar are permitted because shofar of Rosh Hashana has the unique quality that it serves to “cause” Hashem to “remember” Klal Yisrael and is therefore special and cannot be learned from. Also, the shofar Yom Kippur on Yovel is also unique in that it frees the slaves and returns properties to their original owners. Therefore it cannot be a source to learn from either.
- **Q:** From where does **R’ Eliezer** learn that the preparatory acts of milah override Shabbos? He can’t learn it from the fact that preparatory acts of the Korbon Omer and Shte Halechem override Shabbos, because those are korbanos, and milah is not!? He can’t learn it from lulav, because lulav has the requirement of “arbah minim”!? He can’t learn it from succah because succah applies by day and night. He can’t learn it from matzah, because matzah is obligatory for men and women. He can’t learn it from shofar because it is unique for the reasons stated above!? Also, all these mitzvos cannot be performed on the next day, whereas milah can be!? **A:** The pasuk says “U’vayom Hashmini” (this is discussing the preparatory acts, because the allowance for the act of milah on Shabbos is learned from a different pasuk as the gemara later will show) – which teaches that it may be done even on Shabbos.
 - We would not be able to learn out Omer, Shte Halechem, lulav, succah, matzah and shofar from milah, because we would say that only the preparatory acts of milah are permitted because the Torah says the word “Bris” 13 times in regard to milah, which makes it unique and more significant than the others.

-----Daf קל"ב---132-----

- **Q:** The **Rabanan** only argue with **R’ Eliezer** regarding the preparatory acts of milah. All agree that milah itself overrides Shabbos. How is this known? **A:** **Ulla** and **R’ Yitzchak** both say it is a “Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai”.
 - **Q:** A Braisa learns that saving a life overrides Shabbos through a kal v’chomer from milah. If milah itself is learned from a “Halacha L’Moshe M’Sinai”, we could not use it to learn a kal v’chomer (**R’ Elazar ben Azarya** says in a Braisa that such a kal v’chomer could not be darshened)?! **A:** **R’ Elazar** says, we learn that milah overrides Shabbos from a gezeirah shava from the word “ois” (it says “ois” regarding Shabbos and regarding milah, which teaches that milah applies on Shabbos as well).
 - **Q:** The word “ois” is written regarding tefillin as well, so tefillin should override Shabbos as well?! **A:** We learn milah from Shabbos through a gezeirah shava with the word “bris”.
 - **Q:** If so, a milah done after the 8th day should also override Shabbos, because it says “bris” regarding such a milah as well (and yet we know that only an 8th day milah overrides Shabbos)?! **A:** We learn milah from Shabbos through a gezeirah shava with the word “doros”.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The word “doros” is written regarding tzitzis as well, so the preparatory act for tzitzis should override Shabbos?! **A: R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** says, regarding Shabbos the psukim say the words “ois”, “bris” and “doros”, and the same is written regarding milah. Therefore we learn milah from Shabbos. The other items only have one of these words.
- **R’ Yochanan** says, the pasuk says “U’vayom hashmini”, which teaches that even if the 8th day is on Shabbos, the milah is done that day.
 - **Q: Reish Lakish** asked, it says “U’vayom” regarding one who must bring a korbon to be released of his tumah, so that korbon should be brought on Shabbos as well (and we know that it may not be brought on Shabbos)!? **A:** That “U’vayom” is not available for that drasha because it is needed to teach that the korbon can only be brought during the day, not at night.
 - **Q:** The “U’vayom” of milah is also needed to teach that the milah must be done by day?! **A:** We learn that a milah must be done during the day from the pasuk that says “shmonas yamim”.
 - **Q:** With regard to the korbon the pasuk says “b’yom tzavoso” which can teach that it must be done during the day, so the “u’vayom” could be available to teach that it should be brought on Shabbos?! **A:** We could not learn out that it must be brought during the day from “b’yom tzavoso”. We would say, since the Torah is very lenient regarding this korbon, to the point that it allows a less expensive korbon to be brought by one who is poor, maybe the Torah allows the korbon to be brought at night as well. That’s why we need “u’vayom” to reassert that it may only be brought during the day.
 - **Q:** If based on the fact that the Torah is lenient regarding this korbon we learn that other leniencies apply to it as well, the korbon should be allowed to be brought by a non-Kohen or a Kohen whose relative has died and has not yet been buried (these people are typically prohibited from doing any “avodah”, but if the Torah is lenient, they should be permitted here)?! **A:** The Torah ultimately said that it cannot be brought at night, and therefore brought this korbon back into the fold of all other korbonos, and these people are therefore prohibited to do the “avodah” as with all other korbonos.
- **R’ Acha bar Yaakov** says, the pasuk says “Shmini”, which teaches that the milah is done on the 8th day, even if it falls out on Shabbos.
 - **Q:** That pasuk is needed to teach that the milah cannot be done on the 7th day?! **A:** We learn from “ben shmonas yomim” that the child must be at least 8 days old.
 - **Q:** Both psukim are needed – one to teach that before the 8th day is not the proper time and one to teach that after the 8th day is not the proper time?! **A:** We must revert back to the answer of **R’ Yochanan**.
- A Braisa says like **R’ Yochanan**. The Braisa says: the pasuk says “shmini yimol” (the milah should be done on the 8th day), which means it should be done even if it is on Shabbos. The Braisa asks, maybe the pasuk means that it should be done on the 8th day if it is not Shabbos? The Braisa answers, that’s why the pasuk says “Bayom”, that it is even done on Shabbos.
 - **Rava** explains, the Tanna originally felt that milah should override Shabbos based on a kal v’chomer: tzara’as overrides the avodah (a Kohen with tzara’as cannot perform the avodah) and the avodah overrides Shabbos (the avodah is done on Shabbos), so milah which overrides tzara’as (if there is tzara’as on the place of the milah we allow it to be cut off with the milah even though one is not allowed to cut off tzara’as) should surely override Shabbos! The Tanna then felt, maybe tzara’as is not more stringent than the avodah, rather one with tzara’as can’t do the avodah because he is not fit to do so. If that is true, it cannot be the basis of a kal v’chomer! The Tanna ultimately says that “Bayom” teaches that milah overrides Shabbos even without the kal v’chomer.
- A Braisa says, milah in its proper time or even not in its proper time overrides tzara’as, but only a milah done in its proper time overrides Yom Tov. Another Braisa explains, the pasuk says “Yimol b’sar orlaso”, which teaches that the milah is done even if there is tzara’as. The Braisa then asks, maybe the pasuk means we do the milah only when there is no tzara’as? The Braisa answers, a second pasuk says “b’sar” to teach that the milah is done even if there is tzara’as.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Rava** explains, the Tanna initially felt milah should override tzara'as based on a kal v'chomer: if milah overrides Shabbos which is very stringent, it should certainly override tzara'as. The Tanna then said, maybe tzara'as is more stringent because we find that tzara'as overrides the avodah, which itself overrides Shabbos?! The Tanna therefore says, the other pasuk says "b'sar" to teach that milah does override tzara'as.
- "**Lishna Achrina**" – the Tanna initially felt that milah overrides tzara'as because milah is an "asei" (positive commandment) and tzara'as is a "lo sasei" (a negative commandment) and an "asei" overrides a "lo sasei". The Tanna then said, tzara'as is actually an "asei" and a "lo sasei", and therefore the "asei" of milah cannot override it!? The Tanna therefore says, the other pasuk says "b'sar" to teach that even so, milah still overrides tzara'as.
- **Q:** The word "b'sar" is written in a pasuk that discusses a milah on the 8th day and in another pasuk that discusses one who is no longer a minor and therefore subject to punishment for not having done a milah on himself. Where do we know that a milah done in between the 8th day and adulthood overrides tzara'as? **A: Abaye** says we learn it out from a "tzad hashavah". It can't be learned from an adult, because that carries a punishment. It can't be learned from an 8th day milah, because that is done at its proper time. The common factor is that they are a milah and they override tzara'as. So too all milahs can override tzara'as.
- **Rava** says, an 8th day milah doesn't need a pasuk to teach that it overrides tzara'as. We learn that from a kal v'chomer: if it overrides Shabbos (which is more stringent), it certainly overrides tzara'as.
 - **Q: R' Safra** asked, maybe tzara'as is more stringent than Shabbos because we see that tzara'as overrides avodah which itself overrides Shabbos?! **A:** Tzara'as is not more stringent than avodah, it just makes the person unfit to perform the avodah.
 - **Q:** Let the Kohen cut off the tzara'as and do the avodah! From the fact that he may not do so is a proof that tzara'as is more stringent than the avodah!? **A:** Cutting off the tzara'as would not permit him to do the avodah because he would still be tamei from having the tzara'as and would need to go to the mikvah and wait for sunset. However, there is no proof that tzara'as is more stringent than avodah.
 - **Q:** What about tzara'as that is not tamei? Why can't the Kohen cut that off and do the avodah immediately? It must be because tzara'as is more stringent than avodah!? **A: R' Ashi** says, tzara'as is not more stringent. The reason why the "asei" of avodah does not override the "lo sasei" of tzara'as is because the transgression of the "lo sasei" happens at a different time than the performance of the "asei" (contrast that to milah where the act of cutting is the performance of the "asei" and the transgression of the "lo sasei", in which case an "asei" will override a "lo sasei").
 - The machlokes between **Rava** and **R' Safra** is a machlokes between Tanaim in a Braisa. In the Braisa **R' Yoshiya** says we learn that tzara'as may be cut off during the milah from a pasuk (like **R' Safra**). **R' Yonasan** says we learn it from a kal v'chomer (like **Rava**).

-----Daf קל"ג-----133-----

- **R' Yoshiya** had learned from a pasuk that a milah is done even if there is tzara'as that will be cut off through the milah. **Q:** The cutting off of the tzara'as is unintentional and should therefore be permitted!? **A: Abaye** says the pasuk is only needed according to **R' Yehuda** who says that an unintentional act is prohibited. **Rava** says, it is even necessary according to **R' Shimon** who typically says that an unintentional act is permitted. However, **R' Shimon** agrees that an inevitable result ("psik reisha") is forbidden.
 - **Q:** According to **Abaye**, what would **R' Shimon** learn from this pasuk? **A: R' Amram** says it is needed to teach that the tzara'as can be cut off even when one instructs the mohel to cut off the tzara'as thereby having the intention to have it cut off.
 - **Q:** That can be when an adult is having a milah done to him. However, a minor cannot have such intent, so when the pasuk says the extra word "b'sar" with regard to a minor, what is it

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

teaching? **A: R' Mesharshiya** says it teaches that if the father of the minor instructs and intends for the tzara'as to be cut off with the milah, it may still be done.

- **Q:** In that case we should not even allow the father to give over his son for milah, because that will force us to come onto the "asei" of milah overriding the "lo sasei" of tzara'as. We should have someone else do so, and because this person will not have intent to remove the tzara'as, there will be no "lo sasei" involved according to **R' Shimon!**? **Reish Lakish** says that if we are able to avoid overriding a "lo sasei", we must avoid doing so!? **A:** We are discussing where there is no other person.
 - Although we find that **Abaye** agrees to **Rava's** concept, he agreed only after he heard him say it here.
 - Others say the machlokes between **Abaye** and **Rava** was regarding a different pasuk. The pasuk says to be very careful with tzara'as "and to do". This teaches one may not intentionally remove tzara'as, but one may utilize that area with the tzara'as on it (e.g., his shoulder, hand, etc. to carry items) and if that causes the tzara'as to fall off, that is mutar. **Q:** The removal of the tzara'as is unintentional and should therefore be permitted!? **A: Abaye** says the pasuk is only needed according to **R' Yehuda** who says that an unintentional act is prohibited. **Rava** says, it is even necessary according to **R' Shimon** who typically says that an unintentional act is permitted. However, he agrees that an inevitable result ("psik reisha") is forbidden. (It was after hearing this from **Rava** that **Abaye** agreed to this concept).
- The Braisa said, milah only overrides Yom Tov when it is an 8th day milah. From where do we know this?
 - **Chizkiya** – "V'lo sosiru mimenu ahd boker, v'hanosar mimenu ahd boker ba'eish tisrofu" – the pasuk mentions the word "boker" a second time to teach us that the left over kodashim of Pesach night cannot be burned on the morning of the first day of Pesach, rather it must wait until a second boker, the morning of chol hamoed, to get burned. The same would be with a milah not on the 8th day. It does not need to be done on Yom Tov and will therefore not override Yom Tov.
 - **Abaye** – "Olas Shabbos b'shabato" – only a korbon of Shabbos may be burned on Shabbos and only a korbon of Yom Tov may be burned on Yom Tov. A milah not on the 8th day, which does not need to be done on Yom Tov, will therefore not override Yom Tov.
 - **Rava** – "Hu livado yei'aseh lachem" – "livado" teaches that a milah done after the 8th day does not override Shabbos or Yom Tov. Since it can be done afterwards, it doesn't override Shabbos and Yom Tov.
 - **Rav Ashi** – "Shabasson" – this word teaches that one who does melacha on Yom Tov is over an "asei" as well as the standard "lo sa'asei" of doing melacha on Yom Tov. If so, the "asei" of milah cannot override an "asei" AND a "lo sa'asei" and therefore must be done after Yom Tov (an 8th day milah has a special teaching which taught that it does override Shabbos and Yom Tov).

KLAL OMAR R' AKIVA...

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** paskens like **R' Akiva** that the preparatory acts of milah do not override Shabbos. **R' Yehuda** paskens like the same rule of **R' Akiva** with regard to Korbon Pesach as well.
 - It is necessary for **R' Yehuda** to say that he paskens like **R' Akiva** in each case, because if he would only say it regarding milah, we would say that if milah is not done on the 8th day there is no kares penalty and that is why the preparatory acts do not override Shabbos. However, if a Korbon Pesach is not brought, one incurs a kares penalty and therefore one would think that the preparatory acts should be allowed on Shabbos. If he would have only said his statement regarding Korbon Pesach, we would have said the preparatory acts of Korbon Pesach do not override Shabbos because the Torah doesn't say the word "bris" 13 times regarding it. However, milah which does have the word "bris" written 13 times regarding it, its preparatory acts should override Shabbos. That's why he had to say it in each case.

MISHNA

- One may perform all the necessary parts of a milah on Shabbos: the actual milah, the "pri'ah" (pulling back the skin), and the "mitzitza" (drawing the blood). One may also put a bandage and ground cumin on the wound. If the cumin was not ground before Shabbos, one may chew it to grind it on Shabbos. If one did not thoroughly

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

mix wine and oil before Shabbos (they would place this mixture on the wound), he may place them separately onto the wound on Shabbos.

- One may not make a “shirt” for the milah (a tubular bandage that fit over the milah to keep the skin from returning to the way it was) on Shabbos, but may take a piece of material and wrap it around the milah. If he did not prepare that on Friday, he may wrap it around his finger and “wear” it to the baby even if he must do so from another courtyard.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna lists all parts of the milah procedure and says they are permitted. What does the Mishna mean to include when it says “one may perform all the parts of the milah”? **A:** It meant to include what was taught in a Braisa, that while the mohel is engaged in the milah procedure, he may continue to cut off strands of skin that were left, whether or not they must be removed to make the milah kosher. Once he has completed the procedure, he may only cut off strands that must be removed to make the milah kosher.
 - **Q:** Who is the Tanna who says that one may not go back to cut the strands that are not necessary to make it a kosher milah?
 - **A1: Rabbah bar bar Channa in the name of R’ Yochanan** says it is **R’ Yishmael the son of R’ Yochanan ben Broka**, who says in a Braisa that a Korbon Pesach that is brought on Shabbos may only be skinned until the chest (in a typical year it would be skinned until the chest, the inside organs that were to be placed on the Mizbeach were removed and placed on the Mizbeach, and then the Kohanim would complete the skinning of the remainder of the animal). He doesn’t allow going back to finish skinning the animal since it is not necessary for the korbon, so he would similarly not allow going back to remove the strands of skin that are not necessary to make the milah a proper milah.
 - **Q:** Maybe **R’ Yishmael** does not allow the completion to the skinning because it does not add to the beauty of the mitzvah. However, removing the strands of skin by the milah does beautify the mitzvah, and therefore **R’ Yishmael** may allow it!?
 - **A2: R’ Ashi** says it is **R’ Yose** who says in a Mishna that if one sees the new moon on a clear night (when it is therefore certain that others have seen it as well), he may not be mechalel Shabbos to travel to Beis Din to give witness that he saw the moon. We say that since it serves no purpose (because there are other people to give witness) he may not be mechalel Shabbos. The same would be with being mechalel Shabbos to remove strands of skin that do not need to be removed for the mitzvah.
 - **Q:** Maybe it is only with regard to the case of the new moon, since he was never allowed to be mechalel Shabbos in that case, he must not be mechalel Shabbos. However, in the case of milah, he was allowed to be mechalel Shabbos for the milah, so maybe **R’ Yose** would allow him to go back and cut off the remaining strands?!
 - **A3: Nehardai** say it is the **Rabanan** who argue on **R’ Yose** with regard to the Lechem Hapanim. The pasuk says that the Lechem Hapanim must remain on the Shulchan “tamid” (continuously). The **Rabanan** say that when the loaves are being exchanged for new ones (every Shabbos), the new loaves must be slid in as the old ones are being slid out, because any interruption would deem it as being not “continuous”, and rather as being 2 separate “placings” of loaves. Similarly, with regard to milah, the **Rabanan** would say that once he completed the procedure, going back to cut the remaining strands would be considered a new act of cutting, which would not be allowed on Shabbos.
- A Braisa says, if one does not remove the strands of skin that are necessary to be removed to make the milah a proper one, he is chayuv kares.
 - **Q:** Who would be chayuv kares? **A: R’ Kahana** says we are talking about a milah done on Shabbos, and it is the mohel who is chayuv kares for performing an improper milah (which, because it is improper, is nothing more than having made a wound).
 - **Q: R’ Pappa** asks, the mohel was permitted to begin the milah. So when he stops without finishing it he should say, I began in a permitted way and now someone else can complete the milah, so I should not be chayuv kares!?! **A: R’ Pappa** says the Braisa is saying that an adult who has these strands of skin left is chayuv kares for not having a milah done to him.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Ashi** asks, that is clear from a pasuk in the Torah, so why would the Braisa need to teach that!? **A: R' Ashi** says it is the mohel who is chayuv kares, and the Braisa is discussing a case where the mohel began the milah immediately before nightfall on Shabbos. The people told him he would not have enough time to complete the milah before Shabbos ends. He felt that he had enough time and went ahead with the milah. Ultimately, he did not have enough time and therefore made a wound without completing the milah. That is why he is chayuv kares.

MOTZITZIN...

- **R' Pappa** says, a mohel who does not do “metzitza” puts the child in danger and must be removed from his position.
 - **Q:** That is obvious! Since we may do it on Shabbos that means it needs to be done to prevent danger for the child!? **A:** We could have thought that the “metzitza” does not cause a wound, rather it draws blood that has gathered and is let out through “metzitzah”. We are therefore taught that it actually creates a wound.

V'NOSNIN ALEHAH ISPILANIS

- **Abaye** said, his “mother” (nurse) told him, a solution to remove all pain is made of 7 parts fats and one part wax. **Rava** says it is made of wax and the sap of a tree.
 - **Rava** once announced these ingredients in a drasha in Mechuza, and the children of Manyumei the doctor tore their clothing out of anguish that people would no longer need a doctor’s services. **Rava** told them, I still did not reveal the healing solution that **Shmuel** gave (so people will still need your services). **Shmuel** said, one who washes his face and doesn’t dry it well will get pimples on his face. To get rid of them, one should wash his face well in beet soup.