

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Identifying the source that permits preparations for milah (cont.)

A pasuk is cited as R' Eliezer's source permitting even preparations for milah on Shabbos.

The Gemara notes that according to all opinions the bris itself overrides the prohibitions of Shabbos. What is the source for this halacha?

After numerous failed attempts by others, R' Nachman bar Yitzchak identifies a gezeirah shavah that teaches that bris milah overrides Shabbos prohibitions.

A second source for this halacha is cited by R' Yochanan and the source stands despite the challenges presented by Reish Lakish.

A Baraisa is cited that supports R' Yochanan's source.

2) Milah overrides the prohibition against removing tzaraas

One Baraisa rules that bris milah overrides the prohibition against removing tzaraas, and a second Baraisa identifies the source for this ruling.

Two versions of Rava's interpretation of the Baraisa are quoted.

According to both versions, we can only deduce that the bris milah of an adult or a child on the eighth day overrides the prohibition against removing tzaraas. How do we know this halacha applies even for child being circumcised after his eighth day?

Abaye answers that it is learned from the common denominator of the other two cases, namely, both adults and children must be circumcised, and the circumcision overrides the prohibition against removing tzaraas, so too in the case of a child more than eight days old.

Rava disagrees and identifies a different source for the halacha that bris milah overrides the tzaraas prohibition even for a child more than eight days old.

R' Safra unsuccessfully challenges Rava's rationale. The Gemara comments that the dispute between Rava and R' Safra is a dispute between Tannaim. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. Michael Daniels
In loving memory of their father
ר' שלמה בן ר' מיכאל דוד ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לע"נ הגאון הצדיק הרב אליהו בן הרב אשר שטרנבוך זצוק"ל

Distinctive INSIGHT

The Bris takes place even on Shabbos

וביום השמיני ימול – ואפילו בשבת וכו'

Rav Yochanan learns that a bris should take place on the eighth day of the boy's life, even if it is on Shabbos. This is derived from the verse (Vayikra 12:3) "And on the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised."

The commentators note that we find several occurrences when the rabbis postpone the performance of a mitzvah and do not allow it to be done on Shabbos, due to the concern that someone may carry on Shabbos. We do not allow the blowing of a shofar on Rosh Hashana, the taking of the lulav on Sukkos, or the reading of the Megillah on Purim, if any of these occur on Shabbos. In each case, we are concerned that a person may carry the shofar, the lulav or the Megillah to have someone instruct him as to how to do the mitzvah. Why, then, do we allow a bris on Shabbos when there is the possibility that someone may either carry the child or one of the bris milah implements in the public domain?

Tosafos (Megillah 4b) writes that a bris is different, as we find that thirteen covenants have been associated with it. (Nedarim 31b-32a) Because it is such a significant mitzvah, and its symbolism is so meaningful, we do not delay it due to the remote possibility that someone might carry on Shabbos. Tosafos also mentions that a bris is only performed by an expert, in contrast to blowing the shofar, taking the lulav and reading the Megillah, which are incumbent upon everyone. Therefore, we trust that an expert will be more conscientious. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Explain **אין דנין קל וחומר מהלכה**.
2. Is a gezeirah shavah always limited to one word?
3. Why does the Gemara entertain the possibility that the milah of a child more than eight days would not override the prohibition against removing tzaraas?
4. What limitations does R' Ashi put onto the principle of **עשה דוחה לא תעשה**?

HALACHAH Highlight

More issues regarding a delayed circumcision

תינח גדול דכתיב בהו בשר. קטן נמי כתיב ביה בשר. בינוני מנל?

This exegesis deriving circumcision as overriding the prohibition of *Tzara'as* (a leprosy-like condition) from the superfluous term *בשר* (flesh) applies to an uncircumcised adult, because the term *בשר* (flesh) is written extraneously for them. Regarding an eight day old child as well, the word *בשר* (flesh) is written. However, from where can we learn the law that the *Tzara's* (a leprosy-like condition) may be cut off in the course of circumcising a child who is in the middle category, that is: older than eight days, but not yet an independent adult?

The Poskim deliberate the Halachic character of the father's obligation to circumcise his son even the child passes his eighth day. Rav Avraham Teomim¹ cites an authority² who ruled that in a case when there are two circumcisions to be performed: a child on his eighth day and a child whose circumcision was delayed beyond the eighth day, then the circumcision of the eight day old child is assigned precedence. Rav Teomim rejects this position. He reasons that to delay the circumcision of the eight day old child a little longer is only a violation of the principle that the careful perform the Mitzvos with alacrity (ורזים מקדימים למצוות) as long as the circumcision is not delayed beyond the eighth day itself. However, for the child whose circumcision was delayed, the matter is more severe. According to the Rambam³ and the Ra'avad⁴ every moment that the circumcision is delayed there is a continuing transgression for having delayed the circumcision. As such, doubtlessly, the circumcision of the child whose circumcision was delayed takes precedence over the circumcision of the child who is eight days old.

Indeed, the Machatzis HaShekel⁵ ponders whether there is an obligation of Torah origin obligating a father to circumcise his son even after the eighth day has passed. He derives from a citation of the Kol Bo⁶ that in fact the father does have a Torah-origin responsibility to circumcise his son even after the eighth

day. This is the opinion of other authorities⁷ as well. As well, this position can be derived from a statement of Rashi⁸ in our passage⁹.

In a related ruling, Rav Nissim Avraham Ashkenazi¹⁰ permitted to postpone the post-eighth day circumcision of a child until after the child's father completed the Shiva period, such that he would be able to more fully participate and appreciate the joyous event. However, this decision was challenged strongly by later Poskim. Rav Chaim Chizkiah Medini¹¹, the Sdei Chemed, countered this ruling by citing the opinion of the Magen Avraham¹² that it is prohibited to leave a child uncircumcised once he is able to be circumcised. [In the Shabbos 131 issue of the Daf Digest, numerous Poskim¹³ were cited who maintain that delay of the post-eighth day uncircumcised child is forbidden.] Other Poskim¹⁴ also ruled that even under these sad circumstances, it would not be permitted to delay any further the child's circumcision. ■

1. שו"ת חסד לאברהם (מה"ת חיו"ד סי' ס') וכן ראה בשו"ת דבר אברהם ח"א (סי' לג)
2. שו"ת ברית אברהם (חאו"ח סי' יד)
3. רמב"ם (פ"א מהל' מילה ה"ב)
4. שם אמנם עיי' בשו"ת יביע אומר ח"ה (חיו"ד סי' כג אות ב' ד"ה אלא דלכאורה) שהעיר שאין הדבר מוכרח בדעת הרמב"ם בחיבורו משום דלא כתב כן אלא לגבי גדול שלא מל, אבל לגבי אב י"ל שכל שקיים אח"כ מצוות מילה אינו עובר בלא כלום. עיי' באורך
5. מחצית השקל (סי' תמד ס"ק יא)
6. כל בו שהובא בדרכי משה (יו"ד סי' רסא אות א)
7. קובץ על יד (פ"א מהל' מילה) וכן ראה בשו"ת יהודה יעלה אסאד (חיו"ד סי' רמה)
8. רש"י (דף קלב ע"ב ד"ה בינוני)
9. כ"כ בשו"ת יביע אומר ח"ה (שם) וכן ראה בשו"ת דבר אברהם ח"ב (סי' א' אות ח)
10. שו"ת מעשה אברהם (חיו"ד סי' מח)
11. שדי חמד (כללים, מע' ז כלל ב) עיי'
12. מג"א (סי' רמט ס"ק ה)
13. עיי' דרכי משה (יו"ד סי' רסא אות א) בשם הכל בו. וכן ראה במג"א (סי' רמט ס"ק ה') ושכן מוכח בתוס' (מועד קטן דף ח' סע"ב) עיי'. וכל בשות תשובה מאהבה ח"א (סי' פה) ועוד
14. שו"ת ירך יעקב (חיו"ד סי' יב) וכן בשו"ת חשב האפוד ח"א (סי' ג) ושכן הסכים אתו בזה מהר"י מינצברג. וכן פסק בשו"ת יביע אומר ח"ה (חיו"ד סי' כג אות ב' ד"ה אלא דלכאורה) ובמילונים לשם (דף נשי"א ע"א) כתב שכן מבואר בשו"ת בית דוד (חיו"ד סי' קפד) ■

STORIES off the Daf

The Chassidishe outlook

מנין לפקוח נפש שדוחה את השבת ראבי"ע אומר מה מילה שהיא אחת מאבריו של אדם דוחה את השבת, ק"ו לפקוח נפש שדוחה את השבת

One time, The Admo"r Rebbe Gershon Henoch Chanoch of Radzhin, zt"l, was speaking in halacha with Reb Chaim Brisker, zt"l. The Rebbe mentioned that he found a Gemara which could not be understood according to its simple meaning without reverting to interpreting it

from a chassidish perspective. Reb Chaim listened with interest as the Rebbe presented him with our Gemara and the lesson of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, who determined that we can save a life on Shabbos based upon the halacha that the mitzvah of milah is permitted on Shabbos.

The Rebbe asked, "The lesson of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya would have been easier to understand if the milah was being done to a limb that was in some sort of danger. Then, if we can save a single limb, the logic would teach that we could certainly save an entire life, which is comprised of 248 limbs and 365 sinews. How-

ever, milah does not take place to save an endangered condition. What, therefore, is the basis for this וחומר?

"Rather, it must be that there is a spiritual danger if the milah is not done on time. The lesson is now clear. If we can save one limb from its רוחניות crisis, how much more so can we act to save an entire body that is in physical danger! We see that the Torah equates spiritual and physical well-being."

Reb Chaim agreed with the Rebbe's "נפשט" in the Gemara, and he responded with a hearty, "יישר". ■