



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Avodah Zarah, Daf כב – Daf ל

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 כב---24-----

- The Gemara earlier quoted the Braisa taught by **Shila**, which explained that the view of **R' Eliezer** that a para adumah may not be purchased from a goy is based on the pasuk of “dabeir ehl Bnei Yisrael v'yikchu eilecha”, from which he learns that the para adumah must be purchased from a Yid, and not a goy.
  - **Q:** Based on that same logic we should say that the pasuk of “dabeir ehl Bnei Yisrael v'yikchu li terumah” should teach that items needed for the Mikdash should only be purchased from Yidden and not from goyim. Yet, **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, they asked **R' Eliezer** how far is the extent of the obligation of kibud av v'eim? He said, look at the goy, Dama ben Nesina, who had an offer from the **Rabanan** for a stone for the Eiphod that would have profited him 600,000 gold coins, and **R' Kahana** said it was 800,000 gold coins, and he turned down the deal, because the key to the merchandise was under the pillow that his father was then sleeping on. This proves that **R' Eliezer** holds that the stone could have been bought from the goy!? **A:** In the listing of the stones needed, the pasuk says “avnei shoham”, without the conjunctive “and”. This creates a separation, which teaches that the stones may even be purchased from goyim.
    - **Q:** The pasuk then says “v'avnei milu'im”, with the conjunctive “and”, which again connects to the earlier pesukim, which should make it assur to buy them from a goy!? Further, the story there continues, **R' Eliezer** said, the next year Hashem rewarded him by having a red cow born to his flock. The **Chachomim** went to buy it from him. He told them, I know that no matter what I ask for this, you will give it to me. However, all I will ask for is the profit that I lost due to my honoring of my father. This shows that **R' Eliezer** even allows the purchase of a para adumah from a goy!? **A:** The goy had sold it to a Jewish middleman, who then sold it to the **Chachomim**. That is why it did not run afoul of the pasuk's requirement that it be purchased from a Yid.
  - **Q:** Is it possible to say that **R' Eliezer** is not concerned for the goy's zenus with the animal? A Braisa says that the **Rabanan** said to **R' Eliezer**, we see that a para adumah may be purchased from a goy from the story of Dama ben Nesina. **R' Eliezer** responded and said, that case is no proof, because there were Yidden watching over that animal from the time it was born (so they knew there was no zenus done with the animal). We see from here that **R' Eliezer's** reasoning is based on a concern for zenus, and not based on the pasuk!? **A:** **R' Eliezer** had two reasons why he held that it is assur to buy a para adumah from a goy – the reason of the pasuk and the concern for bestiality.
    - **Q:** Why did it help that there were Yidden watching over that animal from the time it was born? Maybe the goy was mezaneh with the mother while she was pregnant with the para adumah, and **Rava** has said that in such a case the offspring would be passul to be offered as a korbon, because it is considered to have been involved in the zenus as well!? **A:** Understand the Braisa as saying that there were Yidden watching over the para aduma from the time that it was formed in its mother's stomach.
      - **Q:** In a Mishna we find that **R' Eliezer** argues on the **T"K** and holds that the offspring of an animal would be passul as a korbon if the mother animal was involved in an act of zenus even before it became pregnant with the offspring!? It makes sense according to **Rava in the name of R' Nachman**, who said that the machlokes is regarding the case where the zenus happened when the mother was already kodesh, but if the zenus happened when the mother was still chullin all would agree that the offspring is mutar, because the case of Dama ben Nesina was where the mother was chullin. However, according to **R' Huna bar Chinina in the name of R' Nachman**, who said that the machlokes is where the zenus happened when the mother was still chullin, but if it

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

happened when the mother was kodesh all would agree that the offspring is passul, how do we explain the answer of **R' Eliezer** that the para aduma was valid because Yidden had guarded the mother from the time the para adumah was conceived? **A:** We must say that **R' Eliezer** said that it was valid because Yidden had been watching the mother of the para adumah from the time that the *mother* was conceived.

- **Q:** We should be concerned that the grandmother of the para adumah was involved in an act of zenus!? **A:** That would not make the para adumah passul.
- **Q:** How did the Yidden know that the offspring would be a para adumah, so that they should guard it from zenus? **A:** **R' Kahana** said, they would pass a cup of red liquid in front of the mother before it mated, and that causes it to have a red offspring.
  - **Q:** If it is that simple to create a red cow, why is a para adumah so expensive to purchase? **A:** It is because the presence of two black or white hairs near each other make it passul.
  - **Q:** If this is how we can create a red cow, why did the **Rabanan** do this for the cow of a goy? Why not do this for the cow of a Yid? **A:** **R' Kahana** said, they did it with cows that were proven to have a tendency of producing red cows when this method was followed.
- **R' Ami and R' Yitzchok Nafcha** were sitting together and one of them said that **R' Eliezer** also held that an animal bought from a goy is passul for any korbon. The other one said, when **R' Eliezer** said this the **Rabanan** responded with a pasuk that says that in the times of Moshiach we will take the animals of the goyim and bring them as korbanos. **R' Eliezer** told them, that is because in the times of Moshiach all these goyim will act like Yidden and try to convert (they will not be accepted) and that is why we will be able to take their animals for korbanos.
  - **Q:** The pasuk says that Moshe told Paroh that the Yidden would need to take animals from the Mitzriyim to bring as korbanos. We see that the animal of a goy can be used for a korbon!? **A:** That was before Matan Torah, and is therefore no proof.
  - **Q:** The pasuk says that Yisro brought korbanos, presumably with the animals that he brought along from Midyan!? **A:** The story of Yisro took place before Matan Torah.
    - **Q:** That makes sense according to the view that it took place before Matan Torah, but according to the view that it took place after Matan Torah, how will this be explained? **A:** Yisro bought these animals from a Yid.
  - **Q:** The pasuk says that Shaul said that the people didn't kill the animals of the Amalekim, because they wanted to save them and offer them as korbanos!? **A:** Shaul meant that the Yidden wanted to save the animals, sell them, and with the proceeds go and purchase animals that would be valid to be offered as korbanos.
  - **Q:** The pasuk tells of how Aravna was willing to give his animals to Dovid for free so that they be brought as korbanos, and Dovid insisted on paying for them. We see that Aravna's animals were fit to be brought as korbanos!? **A:** Aravna was a ger toshav, and that is why his animals were fit.
  - **Q:** The pasuk says that when the Plishtim sent the Aron Hakodesh back to the Yidden, the Yidden took the cows that were sent to lead the wagon that carried the Aron Hakodesh, and offered them as korbanos!? **A:** That was a "hora'as shah" (special ruling given for that time only). This must be the case, because the pasuk says the cows were offered as olos, and we never find that females can be offered as olos. Clearly, it must have been a hora'as shah.
    - The Gemara says this is no proof, because the cows were offered on a private Mizbe'ach (which was still allowed at that time) and **R' Ada bar Ahava** taught that a female may be brought as an olah on a private Mizbe'ach.
- **R' Yochanan** said, if a person is mezaneh with an animal before the animal is 3 years old, it becomes unable to have offspring. If the animal is already 3 years old it will not become unable to have offspring just based on that. Therefore, when the Braisa (quoted earlier) says that we may use the animal of a goy for a korbon, it refers only to an animal that is less than 3 years old (in that case we can be certain that the goy was not mezaneh with the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

animal). They asked **R' Yochanan** from all these pesukim quoted above, that show that a goy's animal may be used for a korban, and he answered that in each case the animal was less than 3 years old.

- **Q: R' Huna the son of R' Nosson** asked, in the case of the cows which brought back the Aron Hakodesh, the pasuk says that the Plishtim used cows that already had given birth. Now, a Mishna says that if a person buys a cow that is less than 3, then when it has its first calf, if it's a male, it is definitely a bechor and must be given to a Kohen. We see that a cow does not give birth before it is 3 years old, so how could **R' Yochanan** answer that pasuk and say that it is referring to cows that were less than 3 years old!? **A:** Rather, we will have to answer that pasuk as we did above, that it was a hora'as shah.
- The pasuk regarding that incident with the Plishtim says "vayisharnah haparos". **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Meir** said, that this means that the cows sang shira. **R' Zutra bar Tuvia in the name of Rav** said, it means that they turned to face the Aron and sang shira.
  - **Q:** What shira did they sing? **A: R' Yochanan in the name of R' Meir** said, that they sang "az yashir Moshe u'Bnei Yisrael..." **R' Yochanan** himself said, that they sang "va'amartem bayom hahu hodu LaHashem kir'u bishmo..." **Reish Lakish** said, that they sang "Mizmor shiru LaHashem shir chadash ki nifla'os asah..." **R' Elazar** said, they sang "Hashem malach yirgizu amim..." **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini** said, they sang "Hashem malach geyus laveshe..." **R' Yitzchak Nafcha** said, they sang a song about the beauty of the Aron Hakodesh.
    - **R' Ashi** said, that **R' Yitzchak's** statement (regarding this song that was sung) was actually said regarding what the Yidden sang in response to Moshe when he said "Kuma Hashem", as the pasuk says "Vayehi binso'ah ha'Aron vayomer Moshe kumah Hashem..."

### -----Daf 25-----

- The pasuk tells of the miracle where Hashem stopped the sun from setting at the request of Yehoshua, so that the Yidden could continue to fight and wipe out the enemy. The pasuk says that this miracle is written in the "Sefer Hayashar", which **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, refers to Sefer Bereishis. This miracle is referred to in Yaakov's bracha to Yosef, where he says that his offspring (i.e. Yehoshua who came from Ephraim) will fill the nations of the world with awe (from the occurrence of this miracle).
  - **Q:** How long did the sun stop for? **A:** There is a machlokes based on a drasha of the pasuk. **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said it remained light for 24 hours – the sun traveled its usual path for 6 hours, stopped for 6 hours, travelled again for 6 hours, and then stopped again for 6 hours. **R' Elazar** said it remained light for 36 hours – the sun traveled its usual path for 6 hours, stopped for 12 hours, travelled again for 6 hours, and then stopped again for 12 hours. **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini** said it remained light for 48 hours – the sun traveled its usual path for 6 hours, stopped for 12 hours, travelled again for 6 hours, and then stopped again for 24 hours. **Others** say that they argued regarding how long the additional daylight was for – **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said it remained light for an *additional* 24 hours – the sun traveled its usual path for 6 hours, stopped for 12 hours, travelled again for 6 hours, and then stopped again for 12 hours. **R' Elazar** said it remained light for an *additional* 36 hours – the sun traveled its usual path for 6 hours, stopped for 12 hours, travelled again for 6 hours, and then stopped again for 24 hours. **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini** said it remained light for an *additional* 48 hours – the sun traveled its usual path for 6 hours, stopped for 24 hours, travelled again for 6 hours, and then stopped again for 24 hours.
  - A Braisa says, just as the sun stood still for Yehoshua, it also did so for Moshe and for Nakdiman ben Guryan.
    - **Q:** We know this happened for Yehoshua based on the pesukim. We know this happened for Nakdiman based on a tradition handed down. Where do we find that the sun did this for Moshe? **A: R' Elazar** said, there is a gezeirah shava on the word "acheil" from Moshe to Yehoshua. Just as by Yehoshua it refers to Hashem holding the sun from setting, by Moshe it does as well. **A2: R' Yochanan** said, the gezeirah shava is on the word "teis". **A3: R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini** said, Hashem said to Moshe in a pasuk "All will be fearful and tremble from you." That refers to when Hashem made the sun stop from setting for Moshe.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The pasuk regarding the stopping of the sun for Yehoshua says that this had never happened before or after that time!? **A:** We can answer that it never happened for as many hours as it did for Yehoshua. We can also answer that Yehoshua had the added miracle that the leftover hail from “barad” came raining down, and that is what the pasuk refers to as something that never happened and will never happen.
- The pasuk says that in Dovid’s hesped for Shaul he said that it is the children of Yehuda who are supposed to learn how to handle the bow and arrow, as is written in the “Sefer Hayashar”, which **R’ Chiya bar Abba in the name of R’ Yochanan** said refers to Sefer Bereishis. This is referred to in Yaakov’s bracha to Yehuda, where he said that Yehuda’s hands should be at the back of the necks of his enemies. This refers to the use of bow and arrow. **R’ Elazar** said, that “Sefer Hayashar” refers to Sefer Devarim. This is referred to in Moshe’s bracha to Yehuda where he said that “his hands will fight his battle”. What type of battle requires both hands? It is the use of bow and arrow. **R’ Shmuel bar Nachmeini** said, Sefer Hayashar refers to Sefer Shoftim. This is referred to in the pasuk that says that Hashem left the nations in EY so that the Yidden would need to learn the skill of war. What type of war requires the learning of skill? It is the bow and arrow. This refers to Yehuda, because the pasuk says that it is Yehuda who leads the Yidden out into battle.
- The pasuk says that when Shaul came to Shmuel for the first time, Shmuel had him sit at the head of the table, and Shaul was given the “shok and what was on it”. What is meant by “and what was on it”? **R’ Yochanan** said, it refers to the tail, which is supported by the shok. **R’ Elazar** said it refers to the breast, which is put on top of the shok when “tnufah” must be done. **R’ Shmuel bar Nachmeini** said it refers to the cover on the thighbone, which is on the shok.

### LO TISYACHEID ISHA IMAHEM

- **Q:** What is the case of the Mishna? If it refers to one woman secluding with one male goy, that would be assur for a woman with a Yid as well, as a Mishna says that it is assur for a Yid to seclude even with two women!? Rather, you will say it refers to her secluding with three men who are goyim, but that would be assur with three Yidden who are “prutzim” (immoral people) as well, so why would the Mishna need to say that it is assur with three goyim!? **A:** Rather, the Mishna is discussing a case where the goy’s wife is with them. In that case it would be mutar for a Yid to seclude with a woman (when his wife is with him), but the Mishna teaches that for a goy it is assur.
- **Q:** Why isn’t the seclusion assur based on the fact that goyim are suspected of murder? **A:** **R’ Yirmiya** said, the Mishna is discussing the case of a prestigious woman, who the goyim are afraid to harm her. **R’ Idi** said that a woman is never in danger of being murdered in this case, because when a goy finds himself alone with a woman he will prefer to be mezaneh with her rather than kill her, and therefore she will not be murdered.
  - The difference between these answers would be a case of a woman who is considered to be prestigious among men (she has government connections) but is not prestigious among women (she is not good looking). According to **R’ Yirmiya** she would be allowed to seclude with a goy and according to **R’ Idi** she would not be allowed.
    - A Braisa suggests like **R’ Idi’s** view.

### LO YISYACHEID ADAM IMAHEN

- A Braisa says, if a Yid met a goy along the road as they are travelling, he should keep the goy on his right side (so that his stronger side is there to protect himself if the goy attacks him). **R’ Yishmael the son of R’ Yochanan ben Broka** says, if the goy has a sword, the Yid should keep him on his right side (which is on the left side of the goy, which is where the goy keeps his sword, and the Yid can therefore grab the sword if he sees the goy going to take it), and if the goy only has a stick the Yid should keep him on his left side (so that he is next to the goy’s right side, which is where he holds the stick). If they are going up or down an incline, the Yid should not allow himself to be lower than the goy, rather the Yid should walk above (and to the side). Also, the Yid should never bend down in front of the goy, because he then risks the goy smashing his skull. If the goy asks where the Yid is going, the Yid should tell him a place that is further than his actual destination (which will make the goy feel that he has plenty of time to attack the Yid), as we find that Yaakov did to Esav when he told him that he was going to Sei’ir, but in truth only went to Sukos. The talmidim of **R’ Akiva** did this to robbers who asked them

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

where they were going, and saved themselves from attack based on that. When the robbers understood what had happened, they praised **R' Akiva** and his talmidim for being so smart.

- There is a story where **R' Menashe** saved himself from robbers using this trick as well.

### -----Daf 15---26-----

#### MISHNA

- A Jewish woman should not deliver the baby of a goy, because she is delivering a child to avoda zara. However, a non-Jewish woman may deliver the baby of a Jewish woman.
- A Jewish woman should not nurse the child of a goy, but a non-Jewish woman may nurse the child of a Yid, as long as it is done in the reshus of the Jewish mother.

#### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, a Jewish woman should not deliver the baby of a goy, because she is delivering a child to avoda zara, and a non-Jewish woman should not deliver the baby of a Yid, because the goyim are suspect with regard to murder. The **Chachomim** say that a non-Jewish woman may deliver the baby of a Jewish woman if there are other Jews present, but not in private.
  - **R' Meir** holds that even with others present it is possible for a midwife to kill a baby in a way that others wouldn't notice (by squashing its brain through the soft spot on the head).

#### BAS YISRAEL LO TEINIK

- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, a Jewish woman should not nurse the child of a goy, because she thereby raises a child for avoda zara, and a non-Jewish woman should not nurse the child of a Yid, because the goyim are suspect with regard to murder. The **Chachomim** say that a non-Jewish woman may nurse the child of a Yid if there are other Jews present, but not in private.
  - **R' Meir** holds that even with others present it is possible for the nursing woman to kill the child by putting poison on herself before even entering the house to nurse the baby.
  - Both these cases are needed. If we would only have the case of the midwife, we would say the **Rabanan** only permit it there, because the midwife can't kill the baby without others noticing, but in the case of the nursing, where the woman can put on the poison before she even comes to the house and can therefore be undetected, maybe the **Rabanan** would agree with **R' Meir** that it should be assur. And, if we only had the case of the nursing, we would say that it is only there that **R' Meir** says that it is assur, because she can kill undetected. However, in the case of the midwife, maybe he would agree with the **Rabanan** that it is mutar.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that a Jewish woman may deliver the baby of a goy if she is paid to do so, but not for free. This contradicts our Mishna!? **A:** **R' Yosef** said, the Mishna would agree that it would be mutar to do so if she is paid, so as to prevent hatred from the goyim.
  - **R' Yosef** thought to say that a Jewish woman may even deliver for a goy on Shabbos, as long as she is paid, so as not to create a hatred (they know that she would deliver for a Yid even on Shabbos). **Abaye** said, refusing to deliver for her on Shabbos would not create hatred, because the Yid can tell the goy, I am allowed to be mechalel Shabbos for us Yidden who keep Shabbos, but I may not be mechalel Shabbos for you who don't keep Shabbos.
  - **R' Yosef** thought to say that a Jewish woman may even nurse the baby of a goy, as long as she is paid, so as not to create a hatred. **Abaye** said, refusing to nurse the baby will not cause hatred, because the Jewish woman can say that she cannot nurse, because she wants to get married and the nursing will affect her physical appearance. If she is married she can say that nursing the baby will cause her husband to become disgusted by her.
  - **R' Yosef** thought to say, that when a Braisa says we don't kill, but we don't save (by pulling out from a bor), a goy or a shepherd, it would be mutar to save him if the Yid was paid to do so, so as not to create hatred from the goyim. **Abaye** said, the Yid can make an excuse that his son is at risk of falling off a roof and he must leave to him immediately, or he can say that he was called to meet at the government and cannot delay.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Avahu** taught a Braisa (quoted partially above) to **R' Yochanan** that says, with regard to a goy and a shepherd of small animals, we do not raise them out of a pit (to save them), but we would also not lower them into a pit (to kill them). But, with regard to minim, informers, and a mumar, we even lower them into the pit, and surely don't raise them from a pit. **R' Yochanan** asked, a Braisa says that the pasuk of "I'chol aveidas achicha" comes to include the lost item of a mumar as part of the obligation to return a lost object, and you say we would even kill a mumar!? **R' Avahu** said, we must remove mention of "mumar" from the Braisa.
  - **Q:** Why couldn't **R' Avahu** say that the Braisa regarding a lost item is talking about a mumar who eats neveilos for pleasure, whereas the Braisa regarding killing him refers to a mumar who eats neveilos simply to defy the Torah? **A:** **R' Avahu** holds that a mumar who eats neveilos simply to defy the Torah is considered to be a "min", and that was already listed in the Braisa.
  - We have learned, with regard to a "mumar" there is a machlokes between **R' Acha and Ravina** – one says that a mumar who eats neveilos for pleasure is called a mumar, and one who eats neveilos simply to defy the Torah is considered to be a "min". The other says that even one who eats neveilos simply to defy the Torah is considered to be a mumar, and a "min" would be one who worships avoda zara.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a person eats a flea or a gnat he is a mumar. Now, this person would clearly be one who eats these things simply to defy the Torah (there is no pleasure in eating these things) and the Braisa says that he is considered to be a mumar. This refutes the first view!? **A:** This person wants to taste something that is assur, and gets pleasure from doing so. That is why he is considered to be a mumar.
  - **Q:** The Braisa said that with regard to minim, informers, and a mumar, we even lower them into the pit, and surely don't raise them from a pit. Now, if we even lower them into a pit, we surely will not raise them out of one!? **A:** **R' Yosef bar Chama in the name of R' Sheishes** said, the Braisa means to say that if one couldn't "lower" the goy into the pit, but the goy went down himself to do something and there is a ledge on which he will try and lift himself up, he should chip away at it and remove it, and he can claim that he did so to prevent his animals from climbing down into the pit. **Rabbah and R' Yosef** say that the Braisa means that if there is a stone at the opening of the pit, he should cover the pit with it and claim that he did so to allow his animals to walk over it. **Ravina** said the Braisa means that if the goy went down using a ladder, the Yid should come and take away the ladder and claim that he needs it to take his son down from the roof.
- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says a Yid may circumcise a goy for the sake of becoming a ger [the Gemara explains, this comes to exclude that the Yid may not do so for the sake of a medical procedure for the health of the goy], but a goy may not circumcise a Yid, because they are suspect regarding murder. The **Chachomim** say that a goy may circumcise a Yid when there are other people there, but not in private.
  - **R' Meir** holds that even with other people there a goy may not circumcise a Yid, because we are concerned that he will make the Yid into a "krus shafcha".
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, if a city only has a mohel who is a goy and a mohel who is a Kuti, a Yid should choose to use the mohel who is a goy. **R' Yehuda** says he should use the Kuti. We see that **R' Meir** allows using a goy!? **A:** We must reverse the shitos and say it is **R' Meir** who says to use the Kuti.
    - **Q:** In a Braisa **R' Yehuda** says based on a pasuk that a circumcision done by a goy is not valid, so how can we say that he says to use the goy!? **A:** We should not reverse the shitos, and the reason **R' Meir** allows using the goy for the circumcision is because he is referring to a goy who is an expert, and he would not risk his reputation by making the Yid into a krus shafcha.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says a Yid may circumcise a Kuti, but a Kuti may not circumcise a Yid, because the Kuti has in mind that he is doing so for his avoda zara, and a bris milah done without proper intent is not valid. **R' Yose** said to him, we don't find in the Torah that circumcision must be done for the sake of the mitzvah! We see from here that **R' Yehuda** would not allow using a Kuti as a mohel!? **A:** It must be that we *do* reverse the shitos in the Braisa so that it is **R' Yehuda** who says to choose the mohel that is a goy. Although the other Braisa said that **R' Yehuda** learns from a pasuk that a goy is not a valid mohel, that is actually the view of **R' Yehuda Hanasi**, not the regular **R' Yehuda**.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 27-----

- The Gemara had brought a machlokes between **R' Yehuda**, who says that a bris milah must be performed for the sake of the mitzvah, and **R' Yose** who says that it is valid even if not done with that intent. **R' Chisda** now explains that **R' Yehuda's** view is based on the pasuk that says "LaShem himol". **R' Yose's** view is based on the pasuk of "himol yimol", which comes to include as valid a circumcision done with any intent.
  - **R' Yose** says the pasuk of "LaShem himol" is written regarding Pesach ("Pesach LaShem") and comes to teach that a Pesach must be done with intent for the mitzvah. **R' Yehuda** says the pasuk of "himol yimol" is written in the double verbiage, because that is how people speak, not to allow for a drasha.
- We have learned, how do we know that a milah done by a goy is passul? **Daru bar Pappa in the name of Rav** said, it is from the pasuk of "v'atah es brisi tishmor". **R' Yochanan** said it is from the pasuk of "himol yimol".
  - **Q:** What is the difference between these reasons? **A:** The difference would be if the goy is circumcised. According to **R' Yochanan** he can be a mohel, but according to **Daru bar Pappa** he could not.
    - **Q:** Can we say that according to **R' Yochanan** if the goy is himself circumcised he can be a mohel? A Mishna says, if one makes a neder that he will not benefit from "areilem" (uncircumcised people), he is mutar to benefit from Yidden who are areilem and assur to benefit even from goyim who are circumcised. We see that a goy who is circumcised is not considered to be truly circumcised!? **A:** Rather, the difference between the reasons would be whether a Yid who was not circumcised because his brothers died from being circumcised (in which case he is not to be circumcised), can act as a mohel. According to **Daru bar Pappa** he could be a mohel and according to **R' Yochanan** he could not be a mohel.
    - **Q:** Can we say that according to **R' Yochanan** this person couldn't be a mohel because he is considered not to be circumcised? A Mishna says, if one makes the neder not to benefit from circumcised people, he is assur to benefit from Yidden who are areilim and is mutar to benefit from goyim who are circumcised. We see that a Yid who is not circumcised has the status of being circumcised!? **A:** Rather, the difference between the reasons would be whether a woman can act as a mohel. According to **Daru bar Pappa** she could not be a mohel, because she is not subject to milah herself, and according to **R' Yochanan** she could, because a woman is considered as if she is circumcised.
      - **Q:** How can anyone say that a woman can't be a mohel when the pasuk says that Tziporah "took a sharp stone" to give her son a bris milah? **A:** The pasuk should be read to mean that she "caused it to be taken by someone else".
        - **Q:** The pasuk says "she cut the milah"! **A:** The pasuk should be read to mean that she "caused it to be cut by someone else" – she gave it to a man to cut. **A2:** We can also say that she began cutting the milah, but Moshe finished it.

### MISHNA

- We may be healed by goyim for monetary treatment, but not for treatment of the "nefesh". **R' Meir** says, we may not get a haircut from a goy in any place. The **Chachomim** say, in the reshus harabim it is mutar to take a haircut from them, but in private it is assur.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** What is meant by "monetary treatment" and what is meant by "treatment of the nefesh"? We can't say that monetary treatment is where they are paid for the treatment and treatment of the nefesh is where it is done for free, because if so the Mishna should have said that more clearly. It can't be that monetary treatment refers to a treatment that is not life threatening and treatment of the nefesh is treatment that is life threatening, because **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said that we do not have a goy treat a Yid even for the puncture wound of a needle (which is clearly not life threatening)! **A:** Rather, "monetary treatment" refers to treatment of one's animals, and "treatment of the nefesh" refers to treatment to one's body. This is what **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** meant when he said that we may not be treated by them even for something as small as a needle puncture.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Chisda in the name of Mar Ukva** said, if a goy just tells a Yid that a particular medicine would be good for him or bad for him, the Yid may follow that advice. The reason is that the goy doesn't think he is truly being relied upon. Rather, he thinks that just as he is being asked, others were asked as well, and therefore he does not risk to give bad advice and ruin his reputation.
- **Rabbah (or R' Chisda) in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if we are unsure whether a person will live or die because of a certain condition that he has, we may not have a goy treat the person. However, if he will definitely die if left untreated, we may have a goy treat him.
  - **Q:** Why can he be treated if he will definitely die? Why are we not concerned that the goy will kill him with the treatment and he will die sooner than he would have, had he been left untreated? **A:** We are not concerned for this possible shortening of life when it is possible that he will be able to be saved.
  - **Q:** A Braisa tells the story of **Ben Dama**, the nephew of **R' Yishmael**, who was bitten by a snake and lay dying, and a "min" came to heal him, but **R' Yishmael** did not allow him to do so, even though he was definitely dying. Even when **Ben Dama** said he can bring a proof from a pasuk that this was allowed, **R' Yishmael** disagreed and let him die. This refutes **R' Yochanan**!? **A:** A "min" is worse than a goy, because one is apt to follow the heresy of the min if he is healed by the min.
    - **Q:** What was the pasuk that **Ben Dama** would have stated as a proof (he died before being able to say the pasuk)? **A:** He would have said that the pasuk of "vachai bahem", which means one should not die to keep most of the Torah (other than the 3 special aveiros or other special situations).
      - **R' Yishmael** limits this drasha of the pasuk and says that it only applies when in private, not when in front of other people. In fact, in a Braisa **R' Yishmael** says that if one is in private and his life is threatened unless he bows down to an avoda zara, he should bow down and save his life. However, if he is in public, he must allow himself to be killed.

### -----Daf נב---28-----

- **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, for any condition for which we can be mechalel Shabbos to save a person, such a condition may not be treated by goyim. **Others** say that **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, for any internal condition, we may not have it treated by a goy.
  - **Q:** What is the difference between these two versions? **A:** The difference would be an injury on top of the hand or foot. **R' Ada bar Masna in the name of Rav** said that such injuries are life threatening and may therefore be treated on Shabbos. According to the first version we could not allow a goy to treat this wound. According to the second version we could.
  - **R' Zutra bar Tuvia in the name of Rav** said, any condition which requires us to assess whether the person will survive, may be treated on Shabbos. **R' Shemen bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, a burning fever is considered to be like an internal condition and may therefore be treated on Shabbos.
  - **Q:** From what point on the body is a condition called "internal"? **A:** **R' Ami** explained, it is from the lips and inward.
    - **Q:** **R' Elazar** asked, what about a condition of the teeth? Do we say that since they are hard the condition would be considered an external condition, or do we say that since it is inward from the lips it is considered to be an internal condition? **A:** **Abaye** said, a Mishna said, if someone has soreness in his teeth he may not rinse his mouth with vinegar on Shabbos to relieve this condition. This suggests that for simple soreness this may not be done, but for a more severe pain it could be done, which would prove that it is considered to be an internal condition.
      - The Gemara says this is no proof. It may be that the Tanna refers to a more severe pain as "soreness".
      - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from the following. **R' Yochanan** once had a tooth ailment. He went to a non-Jewish woman who knew how to make a medicine for a cure. He



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

explained that he wouldn't be able to come back on Shabbos and asked for the formula so that he could make the medicine himself if he still needed it. She didn't want to disclose her secret formulation, but **R' Yochanan** persuaded her to do so. He then went and disclosed it to all (so that they shouldn't have to spend the high prices that this woman was charging for the service). We see that he was ready to take the medicine on Shabbos, which means that a tooth ailment is considered to be an internal condition! **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, it may be that **R' Yochanan's** particular ailment was different, because it had a tendency to move on to the intestines if left untreated.

- The Gemara then discusses what the medicine for **R' Yochanan's** ailment actually consisted of.
- **Q: How could R' Yochanan** have allowed a non-Jewish woman to heal this for him? We have learned that **Rabbah bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, for any condition for which we can be mechalel Shabbos for to save the person, such a condition may not be treated by goyim!? **A: A** prestigious person (like **R' Yochanan**) is different, because the goyim would be afraid to harm him.
  - **Q: We find that a min once applied medicine to R' Avahu** that would have caused the amputation of his leg if not for the fact that **R' Ami and R' Assi** saved him by removing the medicine. We see that they do try to harm even a prestigious person!? **A: R' Yochanan's** doctor was an expert and would not have ruined her reputation by trying to harm him.
    - **Q: R' Avahu's** doctor was also an expert!? **A: The minim** hated **R' Avahu** so much that they were willing to risk everything to harm him.
- **Shmuel** said, a wound caused by a sword is considered to be life threatening and we are therefore mechalel Shabbos to treat it. To stop the bleeding, one should drink cress that was soaked in vinegar. He then also gives the potion one should use to heal the wound.
- **R' Safra** said, a grape-like boil is life-threatening. He then gives the ingredients needed for a medicine to heal it and the method of applying the medicine.
- **Rava** said, a "simta" blister is accompanied with fever. He then gives the ingredients and process to heal it.
- **R' Yaakov** once suffered from a hemorrhoid type condition. The Gemara tells how **R' Ami** or **R' Assi** healed him. The Gemara then says that this method was used, because the condition was more to the outside. However, if it was more to the inside, different methods must be used, and the Gemara gives those other methods.
- **R' Avahu** had pain in his ear. **R' Yochanan** or others in the Beis Medrash told him how to cure it. The Gemara says, they told him to use the liquid that is extracted from the kidney of a particular goat and to pour that liquid into his ear. The Gemara then gives several alternative methods if this method is unavailable. The general rule for this is that moist cures are effective on a dry condition, and dry cures are effective on moist conditions.
- **Rabbah bar Zutra in the name of R' Chanina** said, we may move a dislocated ear into its proper place on Shabbos. **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda** taught that this may only be done by hand, not with medicine. **Others** say that it may only be done by medicine, not by hand, because doing so by hand would cause a wound.
- **R' Zutra bar Tuvia in the name of Rav** said, if an eye is swollen and looks like it will pop out of its socket, one may apply medicine to it on Shabbos. He thought that application is allowed, but grinding the medicine or carrying it through the reshut harabim on Shabbos would not be allowed. **R' Yaakov** told him that **R' Yehuda** said that even that would be allowed.
- **R' Yehuda** allowed applying medicine for an eye condition. **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda** said, whoever listens to this psak is being mechalel Shabbos! In the end **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda** himself got that

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

condition and sent a message to **R' Yehuda**, asking whether applying medicine to it on Shabbos is mutar. He answered, it is mutar for the entire world except for you! **R' Yehuda** then said, this was not my psak. This came from **Mar Shmuel** whose maid had this eye condition, and when left untreated, resulted in her eye bursting.

- **R' Yehuda** explained, the eye conditions that are referred to are an eye with a lot of discharge, a stabbing pain in the eye, blood in the eye, excessive tearing of the eye, or an infection in the eye. These may be treated at the beginning of the condition, but not at the end when the medicine is only addressing the pain, and not when given just to improve one's eyesight.
- **R' Yehuda** said, if someone is stung by a bee, or pricked with a thorn, or has a blister, or pain in the eye, and then gets a fever, it is life threatening for him to bathe. He then lists a number of items that are cures for one condition and life threatening if taken when the person has a similar condition, but not the exact one (e.g. a scorpion sting and a bee sting).
- The Gemara says, eating cress before bloodletting is dangerous, bloodletting when one has a fever is dangerous, and bloodletting when suffering from an eye condition is dangerous. One may go for bloodletting the second day after eating fish, and one may eat fish the second day after bloodletting. However, doing so on the third day would be dangerous.

### -----Daf טז--29-----

- A Braisa says, after bloodletting a person should not eat milk, cheese, onions, or cress. If one did eat these things, **Abaye** says he should take a revi'is of vinegar and a revi'is of wine, mix them together and drink the mixture.
  - **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, we may fix a dislocated heart cartilage on Shabbos. The Gemara tells of the medicine that is needed to get this done. The Gemara says this same medicine heals different conditions depending on what it is mixed in (wine, water, or beer). The Gemara also describes the different ways that a number of Amora'im made this medicine.
- A Braisa says, 6 things heal a sick person and totally rid him of the sickness: cabbage, beets, "sisin yevashin", animal stomach, animal womb, diaphragm, some say also small fish – which have the added benefit of increasing and strengthening the person. There are 10 things that bring back a sickness even worse than it was: ox meat, fatty meat, roasted meat, bird meat, roasted eggs, cress, shaving, bathing, cheese, and liver. Some say nuts and others say cucumbers as well.

### V'EIN MESTAPRIN MEYHEN B'CHOL MAKOM

- A Braisa says, if a Yid takes a haircut from a non-Jewish barber, he should look in a mirror when it is being done (which will prevent the goy from trying to kill him). If a Jewish barber is giving a haircut to a goy, he must stop cutting when he gets near the hair that is left growing for the avoda zara.
  - **Q:** If he is in the reshus harabim, why does he need to look into a mirror? And, if he is in private, what does it help to look into a mirror!? **A:** The Braisa is discussing where he is in private. However, if he looks in the mirror as if he is concerned for his appearance, the goy will think he is a prestigious person and will be afraid to kill him.
    - **R' Chana bar Bizna** took a haircut by a goy outside the city of Neharda'ah. The barber told him "Your throat is enticing for my razor!" **R' Chana** said, I deserve that for not listening to **R' Meir**.
      - **Q:** It wasn't just **R' Meir** that he didn't listen to, because the **Rabanan** also said it is assur in private!? **A:** He felt that since it was done in a place where people pass by, although not constantly, it was not considered to be in private.
  - **Q:** How far away from that hair must the Yid stop cutting? **A:** **R' Malkiya in the name of R' Ada bar Ahava** said, he must stop 3 fingerbreadths away in each direction.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The following items of goyim are assur and are assur b'hana'ah: their wine, vinegar that they owned when it was still wine, "Hadriyani" earthenware, and animal skins that were cut at the place of the heart. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, if the cut is round it is assur (it was done for avoda zara), but if it was straight, it is mutar.
  - **R' Akiva** says, meat that is being brought into a place of avoda zara (but had not yet entered) is mutar. Meat that leaves such a place is assur, because it is considered like "zivchei meisim".
  - It is assur to do business with goyim who are on their way to avoda zara, but is mutar to do so with goyim who are on their way back home.
- **R' Meir** says, the leather flasks of goyim and their earthenware jugs, into which a Yid put wine, the wine is assur and is assur b'hana'ah. The **Chachomim** say it is not assur b'hana'ah.
  - **R' Meir** says, the grape seeds and grape peels of goyim are assur and are assur b'hana'ah. The **Chachomim** say, the moist ones are assur, but the dry ones are mutar.
  - **R' Meir** says, the fish fats and the Beis Unyaki cheese of goyim are assur and are assur b'hana'ah. The **Chachomim** say they are not assur b'hana'ah.
    - **R' Yehuda** said, when **R' Yishmael** and **R' Yehoshua** were travelling, **R' Yishmael** asked **R' Yehoshua**, why are the cheeses of a goy assur? **R' Yehoshua** said, it is because they use the rennet (curdled milk from the stomach of an unweaned calf, which is used to make cheese) of a neveila. **R' Yishmael** asked, they have said that a Kohen may even drink the rennet of an Olah (which is more stringent than a neveila), and although the other **Chachomim** did not agree, they did agree that it is only assur D'Rabanan!? **R' Yehoshua** said, the reason the cheese of a goy is assur is because they use the rennet of a calf used for avoda zara. **R' Yishmael** said, if that is true, it should even be assur b'hana'ah!? **R' Yehoshua** changed the topic of the conversation by asking **R' Yishmael**, how do you read the pasuk in Shir Hashirim – is it "ki tovim dodecha (in the masculine form, referring to Hashem) miyayin" or is it "ki tovim dodayich (in the feminine form, referring to Klal Yisrael) miyayin". **R' Yishmael** said, I read it in the feminine form. **R' Yehoshua** said that is incorrect, as can be proven from the next pasuk which says "l'reyach shimanecha tovim", which is stated in the masculine form.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that wine poured to avoda zara is assur? **A:** **Rabbah bar Avuha** said, a pasuk makes a hekesh from a korbon of avoda zara to the wine of avoda zara. We learn that just as the korbon is assur b'hana'h, so too the wine is assur as well.
  - **Q:** How do we know that the korbon is assur b'hana'ah? **A:** A pasuk compares the korbon of avoda zara to the dead. This teaches that just as a meis is assur b'hana'ah, the korbon of avoda zara is as well.
  - **Q:** How do we know that a meis is assur b'hana'ah? **A:** We learn a gezeira shava on the word "sham" from eglah arufah to the pasuk of "vatamas sham Miriam". This teaches that just as an eglah arufah is assur b'hana'ah, a meis is as well.
    - **Q:** How do we know that an eglah arufah is assur b'hana'ah? **A:** **R' Yannai's** yeshiva said, the pasuk regarding eglah arufah says "kapara" like it does for kodashim.

### V'HACHOMETZ SHEL OVDEI KOCHAVIM SHEHAYA MITCHILASO YAYIN

- **Q:** Since it was wine it seems obvious that it should be assur? Why would we think that the change to vinegar removes the issur of the wine? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, the Mishna is coming to teach that if we give our vinegar to a goy to watch it does not need to be given with a double seal. The reason is that he will not use it to pour to his avoda zara (since it is not wine), and since it does have one seal, he will not bother to switch it out for his own vinegar (which was initially wine and is therefore assur) and then forge a new seal.
- **R' Illa'ah** said, we have learned that cooked wine that a goy has, that was in his hands before it was cooked, is assur.
  - **Q:** This seems obvious!? Why would we think that a later cooking removes the issur on the wine!? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, the Braisa is teaching that if we give our cooked wine to a goy to watch it does not need to be given with a double seal. The reason is that he will not use it to pour to his avoda zara (since it is cooked

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

wine), and since it does have one seal, he will not bother to switch it out for his own wine and then forge a new seal.

- A Braisa says, the cooked wine of a goy (the goy cooked the wine) and the “aluntis” (a mixture in which wine is used) of a goy are assur. However, if a goy has aluntis that he bought ready made from a Yid, it is mutar.
  - **Q:** What is “aluntis”? **A:** A Braisa regarding Shabbos says “aluntis” is made of old wine, clear water and balsam – used to cool a person down after going to the bathhouse.

### -----Daf 30-----

- **Rabbah and R' Yosef** both said, diluted wine is not subject to the issur of “giluy” (certain liquids become assur when they are left uncovered), and cooked wine is not subject to the issur of yayin nesech.
  - **Q:** They asked, is cooked wine subject to the issur of “giluy” or not? **A:** We find that **R' Yaakov bar Idi** testified that cooked wine is not subject to the issur of giluy.
    - When the **Rabanan** went to visit **R' Yannai bar Yishmael**, this question arose. **R' Yishmael ben Zeirud** answered that **Reish Lakish** said in the name of **R' Chiya** that cooked wine is not subject to the issur of giluy.
  - **Shmuel** was once sitting with Avleit (a goy). They brought them cooked wine, and Avleit made sure not to touch it so as not to make it yayin nesech. **Shmuel** told him that cooked wine is not subject to the issur of yayin nesech.
  - **R' Chiya's** maid brought him cooked wine that was left uncovered and asked if it may be given to drink. He said, cooked wine is not subject to the issur of giluy.
  - **R' Ada bar Ahava's** servant brought him diluted wine that was left uncovered and asked if it may be given to drink. He said, diluted wine is not subject to the issur of giluy.
    - **R' Pappa** said, this is only if it is diluted well. However, if it is not diluted well we need to be concerned that a snake would drink from it.
      - **Q:** When **Rabbah bar R' Huna** was once travelling on a ship he saw a snake coming to drink his wine. His attendant put a little water into the wine and the snake turned away and wouldn't drink it. We see that a snake won't drink even if only a little water is mixed in!? **A:** A snake will even risk its life to drink from undiluted wine, but will not risk its life (i.e. will not drink in front of people) to drink from even partially diluted wine.
        - **Q:** It once happened that **R' Yannai** saw a snake go to a barrel with a little wine left and fill it with water until it could reach the wine. We see that it drinks from diluted wine even in front of people!? **A:** It will do so for wine that it itself diluted, but not for wine that others diluted.
          - **R' Ashi** or **R' Mesharshiya** said, we cannot give answers to be lenient with regard to a danger!
          - **Rava** paskened, diluted wine is subject to giluy and is subject to yayin nesech. Cooked wine is not subject to giluy or to yayin nesech.
  - The attendant of **R' Chilkiya bar Tovi** left water uncovered, but was sleeping next to it. **R' Chilkiya** told him, they said that the snakes have a fear of sleeping people and would not drink from something if a person is sleeping there.
    - The Gemara says, this is only true during the day, but not at night. The Gemara then concludes that we make no difference between day and night, and we do not rely on saying that they have a fear of sleeping people.
  - **Rav** would not drink water from an Aramean home, because he said that they are not careful regarding uncovered liquids. He would drink from the home of a Jewish widow, because he said that she conducts herself in the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

way her husband would conduct himself, and therefore is careful regarding giluy. **Shmuel** would not drink from the home of a widow, because he said that she no longer has the fear of her husband on her and therefore isn't careful to cover liquids. He would drink from the home of an Aramean, because he said that although they are not careful regarding giluy, they are particular with regard to hygiene and they keep liquids covered for that reason. **Others** said that **Shmuel** would not drink from the home of an Aramean or from the home of a widow.

- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, there are three types of wine that are not subject to the issur of giluy: sharp wine, bitter wine, and sweet wine. "Sharp wine" refers to a strong, bad tasting wine that breaks barrels from its strength. "Bitter wine" refers to "yarneka" wine, which is bad and bitter. "Sweet wine" refers to wine from grapes that were sweetened in the sun. **R' Chama** said, these 3 wines are superior wines (not inferior as previously explained). Sharp wine is wine with peppers. Bitter wine refers to "absintin" wine. Sweet wine refers to wine of superior quality.
- **Reish Lakish** said that "karyeina" wine is not subject to giluy. **R' Avahu** explained this refers to sweet wine that comes from Asya. **Rava** said,, in Asya this wine is subject to giluy, because this is the normal drink for that place (and snakes would therefore drink from them).
- **Rava** said, wine that has begun to become vinegar is subject to giluy and yayin nesech for 3 days, but not after that. Nehardai said that even after 3 days it is still subject to giluy, because it happens that a snake will sometimes drink from it.
- A Braisa says, wine that is fermenting is not subject to the issur of giluy. The fermenting process lasts for 3 days. Liquid mixed with cress is not subject to giluy, but the people of galus have the custom to treat it as assur. [The Gemara says, this is only if there is no vinegar in the mixture, but if there is, it would not be assur.] Kutach of Bavel (which is very strong and vinegar-like) is not subject to giluy, but the people of galus have the custom to treat it as assur. [**R' Menashi** said, if there are indentations in the kutach that look like teeth marks of a snake, we would be concerned that a snake drank from it.]
  - **R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Shmuel** said, a keili that catches the dripping from a barrel is not subject to the issur of giluy. **R' Ashi** said, this is only if there is a constant drip.
  - **R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Shmuel** said, the natural opening of a fig is not subject to giluy (there is no concern that a snake drank from it). This follows the view of **R' Eliezer** in a Braisa who allows eating figs at night.
- **R' Safra in the name of R' Yehoshua Daroma** said, there are 3 types of snake venom: the venom of a young snake sinks to the bottom, of a middle-aged snake goes to the middle, and of an old snake floats on top.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that the older a snake gets the stronger it gets!? **A:** It gets stronger, but its venom gets weaker.
  - It is important to know the characteristics of the different venoms, as can be seen from a Braisa. The Braisa says that if a barrel was left uncovered and 9 people then drank from it, a tenth should not drink from it. In fact, this once happened and the tenth person died. [**R' Yirmiyya** said, this is a case of the venom sinking to the bottom.] Similarly, if a melon was left uncovered and 9 people then drank from it, a tenth should not drink from it. In fact, this once happened and the tenth person died. [**Rebbi** said, this is a case of the venom sinking to the bottom.]
  - A Braisa says, if water was left uncovered, it should not be spilled out into the reshut harabim (it can enter the skin of a person who walks into that water barefoot), or be used to sprinkle around the house to settle the dust, or be used to mix with to create clay, or be used to give one's own animals or the animals of others to drink, or be used to wash one's face, hands, or feet. **Others** say, it can't be used on a part of the body where the water may collect and stay, but can be used in other places.
    - The difference between the **T"K** and the **Others** is whether it can be used on the top of the hand or foot or on the cheekbones (these places are smooth – the **Others** would allow the water to be used in these places).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says, that a person may use this water to give his own animals to drink from!? **A:** That Braisa is referring to a cat, which is not damaged from snake venom.
  - **Q:** If so, why can't he also give his friend's cat to drink from this water? **A:** It will make the cat weak.
    - **Q:** So why can he give it to his own cat? **A:** It will eventually recover, so it is ok to give it.
    - **Q:** So why can't he give it to his friend's cat? **A:** He can't, because his friend may be looking to sell the cat then, and will not be able to sell it before it recovers.