2.5.2

52b (משנה ב) →54a (משנה ב)

- ז. לבבתני אַחתי כַלָּה לְבַּבְתִנִי בָּאָחַת מֵעִינַיְדְ בָּאַחַד עַנַק מְצַוְרנַיְדְּ: שה"ש ד, ט
 - .. וָהְנֵּה אָשָׁה לְקָרָאתוֹ **שִׁית זוֹנַה** וּנְצַרָת לֶב: *משלי ז, י*
- ַנִצֵא חִירָם מִצֹר לִרְאוֹת אֶת הֶעָרִים אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לוֹ שְׁלֹמֹה **וְלֹא יָשְׁרוּ בְּעֵינָיו**: וַיֹּאמֶר מָה הֶעָרִים הָאֵלֶה אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לוֹ שְׁלֹמֹה **וְלֹא יָשְׁרוּ בְּעֵינָיו**: וַיֹּאמֶר מָה הֶעָרִים הָאֵלֶה אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לוֹ שְׁלֹמֹה **וְלֹא יָשְׁרוּ בְּעֵינָיו**: וַיֹּאמֶר מָה הֶעָרִים הָאֶשֶׁר נָתַן לוֹ שְׁלֹמֹה וְ**לֹא יָשְׁרוּ בְּעֵינָיו**: וַיֹּאמֶר הָעָרִים הָאֵלֶה אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לוֹ שְׁלֹמֹה וְלֹא יָשְׁרוּ בְּעֵינָיוּ: וַיֹּאמֶר הָבְי
 - I. משנה ב allowable "adornments" for donkeys, ovines
 - a. Donkeys: may go out with a saddle-cloth, as long it is tied down
 - שבת had to have been tied down before שמואל.
 - 1. Support: משנה stipulates that it must be tied obviously it must be tied now (else it'll fall off)→must be מע"ש
 - 2. ברייתא explicitly stipulates that the מע"ש must be tied on מע"ש; the donkey may not go out with a saddle even if it is tied on רשב"ג; מע"ש permits if it is tied on מע"ש, as long as there is no halter tied on and there is no strip tied on to its tail
 - b. Rams: may go out לבובין
 - i. ד' הונא: means "tied together", per v. 1
 - ii. *אולא* they would tie a piece of skin to the rams' hearts, to prevent wolves from attacking them
 - 1. Challenge: do wolves only attack males?
 - 2. Answer: they lead the flock
 - a. Challenge: wolves also attack lambs in the back of the flock
 - 3. Rather: because they are fatter
 - a. Challenge: aren't there fattened lambs as well?
 - b. Challenge: how do the wolves tell one from the other?
 - 4. Rather: because they walk with their noses up and look around therefore, the wolves target them
 - iii. "ruz" skin that they patch over their male organ to prevent them from "jumping" on the ewes
 - c. Ewes: may go out
 - . שחווות they tie back the tail so that males can mate with them (ironic, considering 'רנב"י, s take on לבובין per v. 2
 - ii. בבולות they tie their tail down to *prevent* males from mating with them, per v. 3 (not fruitful)
 - 1. Tangent: various explanations for what was wrong with those cities (רנב"י, רבא, ר' הונא)
 - iii. בבונות they cover up the wool to preserve its pristine whiteness and be used for fancy clothes per נגעים א:א
 - d. Goats: may go out צרורות (with their udders tied)
 - e. "כבונות" prohibits all of these (for rams, ewes and goats) except for ewes being "כבונות"
 - f. ברודה permits goats to go out צרורות if the intent is to keep it dry (e.g. before giving birth) but not to guard the milk
 - i. ר' יוסי follows הלכה שמואל ;ר' יהודה follows הלכה רב (version 1): ר' יוסי
 - ii. דב/שמואל (version2): as independent ruling: רב may go out for drying, not for milk; אסור שמואל in either case
 - iii. *Version3*: ברייתא may go out צרורות for dry (only); הודה בן בתירה concurs, but since we can't tell what the purpose is, therefore both are שמואל ;אסור ruled like ר' יהודה בן בתירה
 - 1. ר' יוחנן (per report from ר' יוחנן): ruled like מ"ק (permitted ליבש)
 - II. Discussion: permissibility of putting a saddle-cloth on a donkey on שבת (note: donkeys are typically cold)
 - a. ד' חייא בר ד' אשי. permitted
 - b. Challenge: why is this different from putting a saddle (prohibited)? (אַישתיק) questioner assumed he allowed both)
 - i. Challenge (to that assumption): he should not take the saddle off the donkey, rather lead into חצר and it'll fall off
 - 1. Argument: if taking it off is prohibited, certainly putting one on should be אסור
 - ii. Defense (טרסקל): he holds like רב, who allows hanging a feeding basket (טרסקל) on the animal's neck and certainly a saddle-cloth
 - 1. Reasoning: the טרסקל is for pleasure the מרדעת is to alleviate discomfort (cold)
 - 2. שמואל allows the saddle-cloth, not the טרסקל (footnote: איז זירא confirmed that שמואל ruled this way)
 - c. All agree: that the saddle itself is אסור; since it may fall off by itself, no need to untie and remove it
 - i. ב״כ the saddle-cloth warms it, but the saddle heats it and it won't suffer if left on per aphorism about donkeys

- d. Challenge (to שמואל, who forbade placing the טרסקל): a horse may not go out with a fox-tail (adornment), nor with a strip of red wool between its eyes; a זו may not go out wearing his pouch, nor goats with pouches under their teats nor a cow with a muzzle, nor foals with feed-baskets, nor an animal with shoes nor with an amulet, even if "מומחה"
 - i. Note: this is an example of where בהמה is treated more severely than people
 - ii. Point: feedbaskets are considered carrying (→forbidden in אום (ה"ר") but allowed in חצר

מסכת שבת

- 1. Assumption: this refers to adult animals, for whom it is merely a convenience/pleasure
- 2. Correction: the referent is young animals, who cannot reach the grass (שנער if we withhold it)
- 3. Support: it is taught along with קמיע (which is a consideration of צער)
- iii. Revisiting the ברייתא: it banned wearing קמיע even if from a מומחה
 - 1. Challenge: שבת ו:ב a man may not go out with a מומחה fi it is not from a מומחה → from מומחה is מותר is מותר
 - a. Answer:ours is also שלא מן המומחה meaning, it is מומחה for people but not for animals
 - i. Possible: because אדם has "מזל", unlike בהמה (→ it is possible to have a מומחה לאדם ולא לבהמה)
 - ii. Note: the phrase "זה חומר בבהמה" (note [i]) is not referring to קמיע, rather to the shoes
- iv. Further examples of treating para more leniently: cleaning off wounds, cooling off a fever
 - 1. Wounds: we may מפרכס and מפרכס (rub and clean out wounds) on people, not on animals
 - a. Assumption: this is even if there is a live wound and it would alleviate suffering
 - b. Correction: this is after the wound has healed, just for comfort
 - 2. Fever: if an animal gets feverish, we may not stand her in water to cool off; we may do so for a person
 - a. Reason: it is a precaution against שחיקת סממנים (grinding herbs for medication)
 - i. Challenge: if so, it should apply to people as well
 - ii. *Answer*: a person looks like he's just cooling off for comfort; we wouldn't normally do that for an animal unless it was therapeutic (everyone would see that it is for רפואה)
 - 1. Challenge: we don't make גזירות like that regarding בהמות
 - a. Per: תוספתא שבת יו:ב if the בהמה is outside of the תחום, he may call it to come to him
 - b. And: no גזירה that he might go and get it
 - c. Answer: in that case, his תחום overlaps the animal's
 - iii. "זנרת שחיקת סממנים the prohibition against רפואה on animals (as גזירת שחיקת סממנים) is a מח' תנאים
 - 1. Per: ת"ק ברייתא doesn't permit running a constipated animal in the courtyard
 - a. But: ר' אושעיא ruled like רבא ruled like ר' אושעיא
- v. Challenge: to ruling about goats going out with pouches under their teats
 - 1. ברייתא they may go out with pouches under their teats
 - 2. Resolution (דב יהודה): if they are tied on tightly, permitted; otherwise, אטור
 - a. איוסי the latter ה' יוסי could be ברייתא why ignore the משנה in our משנה? The lenient ברייתא
 - i. Or: both could be ר' יהודה is ליתלב, the other ליחלב, the other ליחלב
 - ii. Addendum: ר' יהודה the goats of בית אנטוכיא would have their teats covered for protection
 - 3. Tangential story: of man whose wife died and was poor, miraculously was able to nurse the baby
 - a. dispute: among חכמי פומבדיתא if this demonstrates his merit or lack of same
 - b. related story: man was married to an amputee and he didn't realize it until she died
 - i. dispute: רב/ר' חייא if she was the meritorious one (צניעות) or he was