



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Avodah Zarah Daf Chuf Zayin

- 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.
  - **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.