Apostasy (meshumadut) – משבצת: There are various opinions as to the etymology of this word. Some understand the original meaning of the word as connected to the root sh-m-d, in the sense of a decree enacted against the Jews that they must change their religion. Therefore, the primary sense of the word meshumad is: One who was forced to convert to another religion. Rav Hai Gaon argues that the word is derived from the ancient Aramaic amad, meaning immersed, and a meshumad, the abbreviated form of meshumad, is one who has been baptized. From here the word was taken to mean anyone who converted to another religion. The Ramban, however, suggests that the word is a shortened form of meshumadu, from the Aramaic estramad, meaning alienate. Therefore, a meshumad is anyone alienated from his religion. Others are of the opinion that the term is derived from the word shemad in the sense of excision, close in meaning to the root sh-m-t, meaning: Place under a ban. According to this opinion, meshumad means one who is cursed and cut off from the Jewish people.

Perek VIII
Daf 71 Amud a

The Gemara answers: These arguments for including one’s own circumcision in the prohibition are more numerous. And if you wish, say: Even without the rationale that these arguments are more numerous, you still could not say that the verbal analogy comes to include in the prohibition against eating teruma one whose male children or slaves have not been circumcised. As, is there anything that his own lack of circumcision does not preclude him from doing but the lack of circumcision of others does preclude him from doing? Rather, it must be that the verbal analogy comes to teach that the priest’s own lack of circumcision precludes his eating teruma, while that of his male children and slaves does not.

The Gemara poses a question: Now that you have said that the phrase “from it” used in this context comes for an exposition and serves to exclude other cases, with regard to the phrase “from it” in the verse “No stranger shall eat from it” (Exodus 12:43), why do I need it? The Gemara answers: This, too, teaches that it is only from it, eating the Paschal lamb.

Notes

Apostasy disqualifies – משבצת תולדה: One who feeds an olive-bulk of the Paschal lamb to an apostate guilty of idolatry has transgressed a negative mitzva (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Korban Pesah 9:2).

He eats matzah – מצות: An uncircumcised man is obligated to eat matzah and bitter herbs on Passover (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Korban Pesah 9:8).

But apostasy does not disqualify one from eating tithe – מצה ולۀ באלו של חבירו בקמיה: Tosafot state that apostasy does not disqualify a priest from eating teruma either, and they explain how both halakhot can be derived from the same exclusion. However, Rashba, who apparently had a different reading of the Gemara in Pesahim, maintains that apostasy does disqualify a priest from eating teruma. Since there is a verbal analogy between the Paschal lamb and teruma, they are equated in every possible manner.

No uncircumcised person – מזהלאו של חבירו בקמיה: One issue concerning the prohibition against gentiles eating from the Paschal lamb is the question: To whom does the prohibition apply? If one claims that it applies to Jews in that they may not feed gentiles from the offering, there is no need for a special teaching with regard to a circumcised Arab, as this prohibition itself is a novelty. For this reason some commentaries say that the prohibition applies to the gentile himself. Tosafot HaRosh points out that it is unusual for the Torah to state a special halakho that applies only to gentiles and not to Jews.
Rabba said that Rabbi Yitzhak said—On 74a the statement is that of Rava, citing Rabbi Yitzhak. Rabba and Rava are actually the same name; they are spelled slightly differently in order to distinguish between two very important amoraim: Rabba bar Nahmani and his student, Rava, the son of Rav Yoel bar Hama. Despite this convention, the names are often confused, both in manuscripts and in printed editions of the Talmud.

An acute mourner—אכר: The halakhot of acute mourning are derived from the verses describing Aaron on the day his sons died. The verse “Behold, this day have they offered their sin-offering” (Leviticus 16:9), teaches that by Torah law, the period of acute mourning applies only on the day of death (Rabbeinu Yehonatan). The Gemara further derives from the verse “And its end as a bitter day” (Amos 8:10), that the halakhot of acute mourning apply for the entire day, but only during the day. The extension of the halakhot of acute mourning to the right following the first day is by rabbinic decree. Although the mourning rites continue into the following seven- and then thirty-day periods, only the period of acute mourning involves prohibitions related to the Temple and offerings.

To include a circumcised Arab—אכר: If this Arab is a gentile, how is he better than a stranger, an apos-
tate Jew? The early authorities suggest that it might have been argued that although the stranger originally was a Jew, since he renounced and abandoned his religion he may be lower in status than a gentile (Ramban, Rashba). The Halakhot Gedolot explains that this is referring to an Arab who converted but was there as yet no dripping of covenantal blood; the procedure used in the case of a con-
vert who converted already circumcised (see Meir).

BACKGROUND

Gibeonite—גְּבֵיהוֹנִי: The Gibeonites mentioned here are apparently not the Gibeonites mentioned in the Bible. The Arukh and others read: Gavroni, which Rabbeinu Hananel understands as a reference to the Gavronim, meaning: the nation that lives in the mountains, from the word ginos, meaning mountain. According to some commentators, they live in the mountains on the east bank of the Jordan, while others propose that they are members of a nation that lived in the Guba district in the mountains south of Caucasia. According to Rashi, it is the name of a talmudic-era nation that practiced circumcision.

The Gemara asks: With regard to the phrase “of it” in the verse “Do not eat of it raw, nor boiled in water, but roasted in fire” (Exodus 12:9), and the phrase “of it” in the verse “And you shall let nothing of it remain until the morning” (Exodus 12:10), both of which are terms of exclusion, why do I need them? The Gemara answers that they are necessary for that which Rabba said that Rabbi Yitzhak said, as will be explained later (74a).*

The Master said above in the baraita: Rabbi Akiva says that it is not necessary to derive by way of a verbal analogy the halakha that an uncircumcised priest may not eat teruma, as the verse says: “Any man [ish ish] from the seed of Aaron who is a leper or a zav shall not eat of the holy things” (Leviticus 22:4). The repetition of the word ish comes to include an uncircumcised man and indicate that he too may not partake of consecrated food. The Gemara asks: But say that the verse comes to include an acute mourner in the prohibition against eating teruma. Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Hanina, said: The verse states: “No foreigner may eat of the holy thing” (Leviticus 22:10), which indicates: A disqualification stemming from foreignness I told you prevents one from eating teruma, but not a disqualification based on acute mourning.

The Gemara asks: Say that the verse comes to teach that a disqualifi-
cation stemming from foreignness prevents one from eating teruma, but not a disqualification based on the priest’s lack of circumcision, and so it should be permitted for an uncircumcised priest to partake of teruma. The Gemara asks: Isn’t it written: “Any man [ish ish],” where the repetition of the word ish comes to include an uncircumcised priest in the prohibition?

The Gemara asks: And what did you see that led you to include an uncircumcised priest in the prohibition against eating teruma and exclude an acute mourner? The Gemara answers: It stands to reason that lack of circumcision should be included and should preclude a priest’s eating teruma, as the halakhot governing an uncircumcised man are stringent in several respects, as alluded to by the following mnemonic of key words: Acts; karetet; the divine word; the slave. The Gemara explains: An uncircumcised man lacks the act of circumcision, and this act is performed on his body; the failure to perform circumcision is punishable by karet; circumcision existed before the divine word was spoken at Mount Sinai, as the mitzva of circumcision had already been given to Abraham; and the lack of circumcision of one’s male children and slaves precludes one’s eating the Paschal lamb.

The Gemara counters: On the contrary, acute mourning should be included and it should prevent a priest from eating teruma, as acute mourning is relevant at any time, it applies to both men and women, and it is not in the mourner’s power to render himself fit until after the deceased is buried.

The Gemara answers: These arguments for including an uncircum-
cised priest in the prohibition are more numerous. Rava said: Even without the rationale that these arguments are more numer-
ous, you still cannot say that an acute mourner should be included and an uncircumcised priest should be excluded, as the verse states: “Any man [ish ish],” emphasizing maleness. Now, what matter applies to a man and not to a woman? You must say that it is lack of circumcision, and therefore it cannot be that the phrase comes to include acute mourning in the prohibition.

The Gemara asks: And what does Rabbi Akiva do with this phrase: “A sojourner and a hired servant,” as it is not needed for the Paschal lamb? Rav Shemaya said: It serves to include a circumcised Arab and a circumcised Gibeonite in the prohibition against the eating of the Paschal lamb. Although they have been circumcised, it is prohibited for them to partake of the offering.
A convert who was circumcised but did not yet immerse – מִמֶּנּוּ fi
and a convert who was born circumcised, i.e., without a foreskin. Although he does not have a foreskin, he is still seen as lacking the act of circumcision. And he, Rabbi Akiva, maintains that it is necessary to drip covenantal blood from him, in lieu of circumcision, in order to usher him into the covenant of Abraham, even though he has no foreskin that can be removed.

And Rabbi Eliezer, who uses the words “a sojourner and a hired servant” to include in the prohibition against eating of the Paschal lamb a convert to Judaism who was circumcised but did not yet immerse, i.e., without a foreskin. Although he does not have a foreskin, he is still seen as lacking the act of circumcision. And he, Rabbi Eliezer, maintains that it is necessary to drip covenantal blood from him, in lieu of circumcision, in order to usher him into the covenant of Abraham, even though he has no foreskin that can be removed.

The Gemara asks: And what does Rabbi Eliezer do with this inclusive phrase “any man [ish ish]”? The Gemara answers: He maintains that the Torah spoke in the language of men, meaning that no special halakha is derived from this expression, as it is common biblical vernacular.

Rav Hama bar Ukva raises a dilemma: With regard to an uncircumcised child who is less than eight days old and not yet fit for circumcision, what is the halakha with respect to anointing him with oil of teruma? The Gemara explains the two sides of the question: Does lack of circumcision not at its appointed time, meaning before the obligation of circumcision goes into effect, preclude the infant’s benefitting from teruma, as he has the status of an one who is uncircumcised, or perhaps it does not preclude his benefitting from teruma, as he is not considered uncircumcised until the mitzva of circumcision is applicable?

One who vows not to benefit from the uncircumcised – מִמֶּנּוּ fi. It is prohibited for one who vows not to derive benefit from the uncircumcised to derive benefit from gentiles, even if they underwent circumcision, and it is permitted for him to derive benefit from Jews, even if they are uncircumcised (Rambam Sefer Haflula, Hilkhos Nedarin 9:22; Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh Dea’ 217:41).

One who vows not to benefit from the circumcised – מִמֶּנּוּ fi. It is prohibited for one who vows not to derive benefit from the circumcised to derive benefit from gentiles, even if they are uncircumcised, and it is permitted for him to derive benefit from gentiles, even if they underwent circumcision (Rambam Sefer Haflula, Hilkhos Nedarin 9:22; Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh Dea’ 217:42).

A convert who was circumcised but did not yet immerse – מִמֶּנּוּ fi. If a gentile undergoing conversion was circumcised but did not yet immerse, or he immersed but was not yet circumcised, he is not a convert until he undergoes circumcision and immerses himself, in accordance with the Rabbis (Rambam Sefer Kesubah, Hilkhos Issurei Bita 11:6).

A child who was born uncircumcised – מִמֶּנּוּ fi. If a child was born without a foreskin, it is necessary to drip covenantal blood from him, as the halakha is ruled in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva against that of Rabbi Eliezer. Although Rav disagrees with Shmuel in tractate Shabbat and rules in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, a ruling accepted by the Halakhot Gedolot and Tosafot, nevertheless, since Rabbi and Rav Yosef agree with Shmuel, the halakha is ruled in accordance with Shmuel’s view (Winka Gaon; Rambam Sefer Avoth, Hilkhos Mila 1:7; Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh Dea’ 263:4).

An uncircumcised child with regard to teruma – מִמֶּנּוּ fi. A priestly infant of less than eight days old may be anointed with teruma oil even though he is uncircumcised, in accordance with Rava’s resolution of Rav Hana’s dilemma (Rambam Sefer Zeraim, Hilkhos Terumot 11:9).
Rabbi Zeira said: Come and hear a proof from the following *baraita*:
I have derived only the *halakha* concerning the circumcision of one's male children at the time of the preparation; i.e., the slaughter, of the Paschal lamb, as it is stated: "Let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it" (Exodus 12:48), and the *halakha* concerning the circumcision of one’s slaves at the time of the eating of the Paschal lamb, as it is stated: "But every man’s servant...when you have circumcised him, then shall he eat from it” (Exodus 12:44).

From where do I derive that it is proper to apply the *halakha* that was stated about this case to that case, and the *halakha* that was said about that case to this case, i.e., that the circumcision of both one’s male children and one’s slaves is indispensable both at the time of the preparation of the Paschal lamb and at the time of its consumption? The *tanna* answers that the verse states the term “then” with regard to male children and the term “then” with regard to slaves as a verbal analogy.

The Gemara comments: Granted, with regard to one’s slaves you find a case where they are present at the time of eating but they were not present at the time of preparation; for example, if he purchased them in the meantime, i.e., they did not belong to him when the Paschal lamb was slaughtered but he bought them immediately afterward, before it was time to eat.

However, with regard to his male children, how can you find a case where they are present at the time of eating, but they were not present at the time of preparation? Does it not involve a situation where they were born between the time of the Paschal lamb’s preparation and the time of its eating? Learn from this that lack of circumcision, even not at, i.e., before, its appointed time, is nevertheless considered lack of circumcision that prevents the father from partaking of the offering.

Rava said: And how can you understand it that way? How can you think that the lack of circumcision of a newborn child precludes his father’s eating from the Paschal lamb? Doesn’t the Merciful One state: “Let all his males be circumcised,” followed by “and then let him come near and keep it” (Exodus 12:48), and as this infant is not yet fit for circumcision he cannot possibly preclude the father’s partaking of the offering? Rather, with what case are we dealing here? With the case, for example, of a baby who was exempt from circumcision at the time of the preparation of the Paschal lamb because he was sick with a high fever, and subsequently the fever left him and he recovered. In such a case, failure to immediately circumcise his son precludes the father’s eating from the Paschal lamb.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: If the case is one of a child recovering from an illness, let us give him the full seven days that he needs to recuperate properly. As Shmuel said: In the case of a baby that was sick with a high fever, and subsequently the fever left him, one gives him a full seven days to heal and only then is he circumcised, but not before.

The Gemara answers: The case is in fact one where we already gave him a full seven days to heal, but they culminated on the eve of Passover. The Gemara asks: But if the seven-day recovery period ended on the eve of Passover, why did the father wait until the time of eating the Paschal lamb, i.e., the first night of Passover? He should have circumcised him already in the morning, before the time of the preparation of the Paschal lamb. The Gemara answers: We require

---

**HALAKHA**

The circumcision of one’s male children at the time of the preparation – שבועות לישראל: The circumcision of one’s male children and slaves is an indispensable requirement both at the time of the preparation of the Paschal lamb and at the time of its consumption. Therefore, if one acquired a slave after the Paschal lamb was slaughtered, or if the obligation to circumcise his son began only after it was slaughtered, e.g., if the infant recovered from illness seven days beforehand, and he did not circumcise the slave or infant, it is prohibited for him to eat the Paschal lamb (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Korban Pesah 9:9).

The fever left him – רחפן מ병 וייבז: As long as a child is ill, he is not circumcised. After he recovers, he is given a full seven days, and only then does he undergo circumcision. This *halakha* applies only to a sickness that took hold of his entire body, but if he was experiencing minor and localized pains, e.g., in his eyes, he is circumcised immediately upon his recovery. The *halakha* is ruled in accordance with the opinion of Shmuel, Rabbi, and Rav Pappa. The Rema notes that severe pain in the eyes is treated like a sickness of the whole body (Rambam Sefer Ahava, Hilkhot Mito 1:6; Shulchan Arukh, Yoreh De’ah 262:2).
that during the recovery period one must wait from the time the seven days began to the exact same time seven days later, i.e., seven complete twenty-four-hour periods. Therefore, if the child recovered in the afternoon of a particular day, one is required to wait until that same time of day a week later, and only then is he circumcised.

The Gemara asks: Didn’t the Sage from Lod teach that the day of his healing is like the day of his birth? What, is it not that just as with regard to the day of his birth we need not wait from the time he is born to the same time on the eighth day to circumcise him, so too, with regard to the day of his healing we need not wait from the time he heals to the same time seven days later?

The Gemara refutes this argument: No, the day of his healing is superior to the day of his birth: While from the day of his birth until circumcision we need not wait from the time he is born to the same time on the eighth day to circumcise him, i.e., the child may be circumcised already at the start of the eighth day, from the day of his healing we need to wait seven complete days from the time he heals to the same time seven days later.

The Gemara suggests other circumstances where a male child may be present at the time of the eating of the Paschal lamb but absent at the time of its preparation. Rav Pappa said: This would take place, for example, if the baby’s eye hurt him on the eighth day following his birth, which occurred on the eve of Passover, and he recovered in the meantime between the time of the preparation of the Paschal lamb and the time of its eating. In the case of a minor ailment such as eye pain, circumcision is not performed as long as the pain persists, but it may be performed as soon as the child has recovered, without first waiting seven days.

Rava said: This would occur, for example, if the infant’s father and mother were incarcerated in a prison at the time of the preparation of the Paschal lamb, and they slaughtered their offering by way of an agent, and there was no one available to circumcise the infant, and the parents were released from prison before the time for eating the Paschal lamb arrived.

Rav Kahana, son of Rav Neḥemya, said: This would occur, for example, if the infant was a tumtum, one whose external sexual organs are indeterminate and it is unclear whether the individual is male or female, and in the meantime between the time of the preparation of the Paschal lamb and the time of its eating, he was torn open, his gender was revealed, and he was found to be a male, so that the obligation to circumcise him went into effect.

Rav Shereyya said: This would occur, for example, if seven days earlier the baby had already extended his head, but not the rest of his body, out of the corridor to his mother’s womb. In such a situation he is considered born, but he is fit for circumcision only after his entire body has emerged. If this occurs between the time of the preparation of the Paschal lamb and the time of its eating, the child’s father may not eat of the offering until he has circumcised his son.

The Gemara poses a question: But in a case such as this, can the child live for such a long period with only his head outside? Isn’t it taught in a baraita: Once a baby emerges into the air of the world, that which had been closed, the mouth and nostrils, open, and that which had been open, the umbilical cord, from which the child had previously received its sustenance, closes, as, if this did not occur it could not live for even an hour, as it has no other way to receive nutrition. If so, this child whose head alone emerged from his mother’s womb would certainly starve, as it cannot take in any sustenance.

For example, if the baby’s eye hurt him – The Rashba and others explain that this halakha was not stated specifically with respect to discomfort in the eye, even though it is recorded that the Sages were especially concerned about eye pain. Rather, if the baby suffers from pain of any kind, his circumcision is delayed until he recovers. A similar interpretation is attributed to the gemara.

A tumtum is one whose external sexual organs are indeterminate, and it is unclear whether the individual is male or female. In certain cases the gender of a tumtum can be established through a surgical procedure in which the genitals are exposed. Once the gender of the tumtum is revealed, he or she is considered a full-fledged member of that gender.

Many maintain that the proper spelling of this word is prozod, in an event, the word is derived from the Greek, apparently from the word πρόστας, prostas, meaning entrance room or gatehouse. This word is used by the Sages in reference to certain structures, and also euphemistically for a woman’s vagina and labia.
He was sustained by a fever – אִישְׁתָּא אוֹרֵךְ עֶקֶסֶם וַיַּמֶּשׁ: One who does not consume any food receives his nourishment through the breakdown of fatty tissue in his body. If he has a fever, this process of fat breakdown is accelerated. Therefore, it can maintain an individual for only a short period of time, as the more rapid loss of body fluids can be fatal.

An uncircumcised man may receive the sprinkling – בַּאֲבוֹתֵינוּ לַחֹדֶשׁ לְהוּ דְּלָא דְּמַאן דְּמַאןוּ מָצִינוּ רַבִּי אָמַר: An uncircumcised man is connected to his mother by the umbilical cord. How-ever, if he is still attached to his mother, he receives his sustenance from her. The preceding phrase in the Gemara: “He was sustained by his mother’s fever,” indicates likewise, as he can receive nourishment from his mother only if he is still connected to her.

When he does not cry (me’avei) – רַבֶּבֶן הָאָנָא רַבֵּין: Rabbi Bein Hananel reads this as mal’asei, which is apparently the reading of Tosafot as well. This refers to a case where the baby is no longer ministered (me’avei) and connected to his mother by the umbilical cord. How-ever, if he is still attached to his mother, he receives his sustenance from her. The preceding phrase in the Gemara: “He was sustained by his mother’s fever,” indicates likewise, as he can receive nourishment from his mother only if he is still connected to her.

The Gemara answers: With what case are we dealing here? It is, for example, a case where he was sustained by the heat of a fever and therefore did not need to eat. The Gemara asks: Whose fever? If we say it is his own fever, i.e., the baby himself had a fever, if so, it should be necessary to wait a full seven days after his entire body exits the womb before he can be circumcised, in accordance with the halakha governing an infant who was ill. Rather, it must be that he was sustained by his mother’s fever. And if you wish, say that this principle that a child cannot survive in such conditions applies only when he does not cry but when he cries he can live, as his crying indicates that he has already started to breathe.

§ Rabbi Yohanan said in the name of Rabbi Ben’a: An uncircumcised man may receive the sprinkling of the water mixed with the ashes of a red heifer in order to purify himself from ritual impurity imparted by a human corpse, as we do not say that this sprinkling is ineffective as long as he is uncircumcised. As we found that our forefathers received the sprinkling when they were uncircumcised, as it is stated: “And the people came up out of the Jordan on the tenth day of the first month” (Joshua 4:19), and the verses go on to relate that the men were all later circumcised before sacrificing the Paschal lamb on the fourteenth (see Joshua 5:10). The Gemara clarifies: On the tenth day itself they did not circumcise themselves due to the weariness caused by their journey. When, then, was the sprinkling done to them in order to remove the ritual impurity resulting from contact with a corpse, so that they would be fit to bring the Paschal lamb on the fourteenth? The first sprinkling must have taken place no later than the tenth, as there is a four-day waiting period between the first and second sprinklings. In that case, wasn’t the initial sprinkling performed when they were still uncircumcised? This proves that an one who is uncircumcised may receive the sprinkling of the purification waters.

The Gemara counters: But perhaps they did not sacrifice the Paschal lamb at all. The Gemara answers: This cannot enter your mind, as it is written: “And they kept the Passover” (Joshua 5:10), meaning they brought the Paschal lamb.

Mar Zutra strongly objects to this: But perhaps it was a Paschal lamb that comes in a state of impurity? If the majority of the community is ritually impure due to contact with a corpse, they may all sacrifice their Paschal lambs even though they are ritually impure, and there is no need for any sprinkling. Rav Ashi said to him: It is taught explicitly in a baraita that they circumcised themselves, immersed in a ritual bath, and performed the ritual of their Paschal lambs in a state of purity.

When he does not cry (me’avei) – רַבֶּבֶן הָאָנָא רַבֵּין: Rav Bein Hananel reads this as mal’asei, which is apparently the reading of Tosafot as well. This refers to a case where the baby is no longer ministered (me’avei) and connected to his mother by the umbilical cord. However, if he is still attached to his mother, he receives his sustenance from her. The preceding phrase in the Gemara: “He was sustained by his mother’s fever,” indicates likewise, as he can receive nourishment from his mother only if he is still connected to her.

An uncircumcised man may receive the sprinkling – בַּאֲבוֹתֵינוּ לַחֹדֶשׁ לְהוּ דְּלָא דְּמַאן דְּמַאןוּ מָצִינוּ רַבִּי אָמַר: The early authorities inquire as to why one might think that an uncircumcised man is ineligible for sprinkling. They answer that according to Rabbi Akiva’s opinion that one who is uncircumcised is like one who is ritually impure, one might have thought that he may not receive the sprinkling due to this impurity (Tosafot Ishshonim). The TosafotHalRosh adds that although most impure individuals may receive the sprinkling and are thereby purified from ritual impurity contracted through contact with the dead, sprinkling is ineffective for certain types of impurity, e.g., leprosy.

As it is stated: And the people came up – כְּזוּטְרָא מְהִילִי רַבִּי אָמַר: Rabbi Avraham Av Bein Din asks why the Gemara does not cite a more straightforward proof from the instruction given after the war against Midian: “You shall purify yourselves on the third day and on the seventh day, you and your captives” (Numbers 31:19). He answers that this proof can be refuted, as it could be argued that those who fought in that war were from the older, circumcised generation, who had themselves been part of the exodus from Egypt (Tosafot HalRosh). The Ramban cites the above question and answer and adds a different resolution of his own: It is possible that although Moses issued these instructions with regard to their purification, in practice they were unable to carry them out and had to wait until they were circumcised.

But perhaps they did not sacrifice the Paschal lamb at all – כְּזוּטְרָא מְהִילִי רַבִּי אָמַר: The Riva is puzzled by this suggestion, as the verse states explicitly that they did sacrifice the Paschal lamb. One answer is that the verses might be referring to the second Pasah, but this appears unlikely. The Riva himself states that it is possible to explain that only those who were circumcised offered the Paschal lamb, but not the rest of the people.
Rabba bar Yitzhak said that Rav said: The mitzva of uncovering the corona during circumcision was not given to our Patriarch Abraham. The command given to Avraham included only the mitzva of circumcision itself, i.e., the removal of the foreskin, but not the uncovering of the corona, i.e., the folding back of the thin membrane that lies under the foreskin. As it is stated: "At that time the Lord said to Joshua: Make yourself knives of flint, and circumcise again the children of Israel a second time" (Joshua 5:2). Why was it necessary to circumcise them? Apparently, it is because before the Torah was given on Mount Sinai, some of them had been circumcised in the manner of Abraham, without uncovering the corona, and therefore they needed to be circumcised a second time in accordance with the Torah law that requires uncovering the corona.

The Gemara asks: How may it be inferred that those who were already circumcised required a second circumcision? Perhaps the verse is referring to those who had not been circumcised at all, as it is written: "For all the people who came out were circumcised; but all the people who were born in the wilderness ... had not been circumcised" (Joshua 5:5)?

The Gemara responds: If so, that it was only those who had never been circumcised who required circumcision, what is the meaning of "circumcise again," which indicates that they had to be circumcised a second time? Rather, is it not referring to uncovering the corona? And what is the meaning of "a second time," stated in the same verse? This phrase appears redundant, as the verse already stated: "Circumcise again."

The Gemara explains: It comes to equate the end of circumcision, when it is necessary to circumcise a second time in order to correct an improperly performed circumcision, with the beginning of circumcision: Just as an incomplete performance at the beginning of circumcision invalidates the circumcision, so too, incomplete performance at the end of circumcision, i.e., the foreskin not being fully removed, invalidates the circumcision. As we learned in a mishna (Shabbat 137a): These are the shreds of flesh that invalidate the circumcision if they are not cut. The essential element of circumcision is the removal of the flesh that covers most of the corona, and a child who was not circumcised in this manner is considered uncircumcised, and he does not partake of teruma.

With regard to this issue Ravina said, and some say it was Rav Yirmeya bar Abba who said that Rav said: When the mishna mentioned most of the corona, it meant the flesh that covers most of the height of the corona as well as most of its circumference.

The Gemara returns to the incident involving Joshua. And what is the reason that they did not circumcise themselves in the wilderness after the Torah had already been given? The Gemara answers: If you wish, say it was due to the weariness caused by their journey. Since they were traveling continuously, they were too weak to undergo circumcision.

Uncovering the corona during circumcision was not given to our Patriarch Abraham. The early authorities ask: If the mitzva of uncovering the corona is not clearly stated in the verses concerning Abraham, how could Joshua have introduced this requirement? Tosafot suggest that Joshua received it as a mitzva transmitted to Moses from Sinai. The Halakhot Gedolot explains that the command "circumcise again ... a second time" refers to the manner in which circumcision had been performed by Moses. Moses had earlier circumcised the people in Egypt with the uncovering of the corona, as that is the fundamental halakha, but in the wilderness the practice had been stopped. Tosafot suggest a somewhat similar explanation. Another explanation is that it was Moses who instructed them to uncover the corona, but in practice they could not perform the mitzva until they arrived in Eretz Yisrael (Rashba; Ritva). In the Jerusalem Talmud it is indicated that this halakha is derived either from the verse: "He must surely be circumcised (himma’yimma)" (Genesis 17:13), which includes both circumcision and uncovering of the corona; or from the phrase: "A bridegroom of bloods in regard to circumcision" (Exodus 4:26), the plural term "bloods" indicating that there are two stages of circumcision: The circumcision itself and uncovering the corona.

What is the reason they did not circumcise themselves in the wilderness after the Torah had already been given? The Gemara answers: If you wish, say it was due to the weariness caused by their journey. Since they were traveling continuously, they were too weak to undergo circumcision.