

13.8.2; 71a (בעי רב חמא) → 72a (תויבתא דרב הונא תויבתא)

1.	וְכָל עֶבֶד אִישׁ מִקְנֵת בְּסוֹף וּמִלְתָּהּ אִתּוֹ אִזּוֹ יֹאכֵל בּוֹ: שְׁמוֹת פֶּרֶק י"ב פְּסוּק מ"ד
2.	וְכִי יִגֹּר אֲתָדָּךְ גֵּר וְעִשָּׂה פֶּסַח לֹא הָמוּל לֹא כָל זָכָר וְאִזּוֹ יִקְרַב לְעִשְׂתּוֹ וְהָיָה כְּאֲזֵרַח הָאָרֶץ וְכָל עָרַל לֹא יֹאכֵל בּוֹ: שֵׁם פְּסוּק מ"ח
3.	וְהָעַם עָלוּ מִן הַיַּרְדֵּן בְּעֶשְׂרֵת לַחֹדֶשׁ הָרִאשׁוֹן וַיִּחַנּוּ בְּגִלְגָּל בְּקֶצֶה מִזְרַח יְרִיחוֹ: יְהוֹשֻׁעַ פֶּרֶק ד' פְּסוּק י"ט
4.	בַּעֲת הַהִיא אָמַר ה' אֶל יְהוֹשֻׁעַ עֲשֵׂה לְךָ חֲרָבוֹת צָרִים וְשׁוֹב מִל אֶת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁנִית: כִּי מַלְיָם הָיוּ כָּל הָעָם הַיִּצְאָיִם וְכָל הָעָם הַיְלָדִים בַּמִּדְבָּר בְּדָרָךְ בְּצֵאתָם מִמִּצְרַיִם לֹא מָלָה: יְהוֹשֻׁעַ פֶּרֶק ה' פְּסוּק ב', ה
5.	שָׁמַר פְּתָאִים ה' דְּלוֹתֵי וְלִי יְהוֹשִׁיעַ: תְּהִלִּים פֶּרֶק קט"ז פְּסוּק ו'
6.	וְהָיָה בְּחֵצֵי הַקְּלָלָה וְהָ הָפָה כָּל בְּכוֹר בְּאָרֶץ... שְׁמוֹת פֶּרֶק י"ב פְּסוּק כ"ט
7.	הָמוּל יְמוּל יְלִיד בֵּיתָךְ וּמִקְנֵת כְּסָפֶךָ וְהָיְתָה בְרִיתִי בְּבִשְׂרָכֶם לְבְרִית עוֹלָם: וְעָרַל זָכָר אֲשֶׁר לֹא יְמוּל אֶת בְּשָׂר עָרְלָתוֹ וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַזֹּאת מֵעַמִּיּוֹ אֶת בְּרִיתִי הַפָּר: בְּרֵאשִׁית פֶּרֶק י"ז פְּסוּק יג"ד

- I חמא's question about לערל vis-à-vis a קטן (before 8 days)
- conceptual question: is ערלה defined as such physically (i.e. from minute it exists) or Halakhically (from time we are obligated to remove it)
 - practical implication: using שמן של תרומה as a salve on a >8 baby
 - possible proof: ברייתא suggests that v. 1 only teaches מילת עבדו regarding אכילה and v. 2: מילתו regarding הקרבה
 - question: how do we apply across (both his own ערלה and that of his זכרים ועבדים to both ואכילה)
 - answer: אז:אז
 - Implication: who were not liable עשייה but were אכילה – must refer to one who was born in the late afternoon of the 14th (between ואכילה) → “ערלות” is considered ערלות
 - Rejection: (v. 2 – זכר לו כל זכר and that מצוה hasn't taken effect yet);
 - Rather: could be any one of the following scenarios:
 - Scenario #1(זבא): the child was born earlier, got sick and his fever was lifted in the late afternoon
 - Challenge: he needs 7 days from the time the fever was lifted
 - Answer: that's the case – his fever lifted in the late afternoon of ז' בניסן (he gets 168 full hours)
 - Scenario #2 (ר' פפא): his eyes hurt and the pain was just relieved (no wait necessary)
 - Scenario #3 (זבא): his parents were in captivity until the late afternoon
 - Scenario #4 (ר' כהנא): טומטום whose gender became identified in the late afternoon
 - Scenario #5 (ר' שרביא): exited birth canal a week earlier (→מילה-clock starts); was born in late afternoon
 - Challenge: one like that can't live, since the minute he exits the birth canal, the umbilicus is stopped up and his esophagus opens (and he's not nursing)
 - Defense: he's fed by his mother's fever (not his own; else, he would need another 7 days)
 - Defense #2: if he doesn't cry out, he'll die; if he does cry, he's able to live during that period
- II יוחנן's observation: ערל can be a recipient of הזאה
- proof: vv. 3-4: בני"י crossed the ירדן, still ערלים, on ז' בניסן, and brought קה"פ on יד; 1st הזאה from מת must have been on or before the 7th – before מילה
 - challenge: perhaps they brought the בטומאה פסח
 - rejection: explicit tradition that they brought it בטהרה
 - tangential observation: פריעה wasn't given to אברהם אבינו even מולים – even מולים must have needed extra step (פריעה)
 - meaning of שנית extends to המילה את המעכבין – just like מילה עיקר, they are necessary
 - tangential question: why didn't they perform מילה ברית in the desert?
 - Answer #1: danger of the road
 - Answer #2: the north wind never blew
 - Reason #1: because they were “disgraced” by ה' OR
 - Reason #2: not to scatter the עננים
 - Practical application: performing ברית מילה or bloodletting on a cloudy day is dangerous –
 - Protection: for those who ignore this advice...v. 5
 - Parenthetical אגדה: every night during the 40 years, the northern wind blew at midnight as per v. 6
- III הונא's suggestion regarding משוך (someone whose מילה has covered up the עטרה; making him look like an ערל)
- תרומה may eat מה"ט, but מד"ס is forbidden
 - challenge: ברייתא stating that a משוך must perform מילה, following v. 7
 - defense: that is מד"ס, verses used as אסמכתא
 - refutation of הונא ד': explicit ruling that משוך may eat תרומה
 - additional points of ברייתא:
 - טומטום doesn't eat; his wives and slaves do
 - born circumcised eats (as do his wives and slaves)
 - טומטום eats neither קדשים but תרומה אנדרוניוס