

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

### ***A Halter on a Goat***

Menashya’s students taught a *braisa* which says that if one bore a hold between a goat’s horns, it may go out with a halter attached to it.

Rav Yosef asked whether one can attach a halter to a goat’s beard, which is a loose connection, albeit one that would hurt when pulled off. Perhaps it is permitted, as the goat will not pull on it, or perhaps it is prohibited, as it may fall off, and one may carry it through the street. The *Gemora* leaves this question unresolved. (52a)

### ***Straps on a Cow***

Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Abba cites a dispute between Rav and Shmuel about the *Mishna* at the end of the chapter which prohibits a cow going out with straps in its horns. One says that it is prohibited when placed for decoration, but permitted if used to guard it, while the other says it is prohibited in either case, as a cow does not need such a strong guard.

Rav Yosef says that we can conclude that Shmuel is the one who permits it when used for guarding, as Rav Huna bar Chiya quoted him saying that we rule like Chananyah.

Abaye challenges this, as we can also conclude that Shmuel is the one that prohibited any straps, as Rav Yehudah quoted him discussing one who asked Rebbe about one who used a guard meant for a wilder animal on a more docile one. Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yosi quoted his father listing the specific guards for each

type of animal, implying that a guard which is more than necessary for a given species is prohibited.

Rav Yosef answers that we must remove this statement of Shmuel in the face of the one Rav Yosef cited.

To support this, he cites Rav Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav saying that straps in a cow’s horns are prohibited even if used to guard it, and Rav Chiya bar Avin in the name of Shmuel saying that it is permitted if used to guard it.

The *Gemora* challenges Rav from a *braisa* which states that if one tied a red heifer with a halter, it may be used for purification, implying that it is considered a garment, and not a load, which would make it invalid. This implies that a guard which is more than is necessary is still considered a garment.

The *Gemora* offers three answers:

1. The case of the *braisa* is when one is leading it from one city to another. On such a trip, it is necessary to guard it with a halter. (Abaye)
2. Since a red heifer is so valuable, one guards it carefully, making a halter the normal method. (Rava)
3. The case of the *braisa* is a stubborn heifer, which needs a halter to control it. (Ravina) (52a)

### ***Collar and Leash***

The *Mishna* said that any animals which use a collar and leash may go out and be led with one.

The *Gemora* asks what the *Mishna* means by its two statements.

Rav Huna says it means that they may either go out with the leash around their neck, or be led by the leash, while Shmuel says that it means that they may only be led with a leash, but not go out with just the leash around their neck, as that is considered a load.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which says that one may put the leash around its neck, as long as it is loose enough to lead one by it.

Rav Yosef said that he saw the calves of Rav Huna go out on *Shabbos* with their ropes wrapped around them.

When Rav Dimi came to Bavel, he quoted Rabbi Chanina saying that the mules of Rebbe went out with ropes on *Shabbos*.

The *Gemora* asks whether they were led by them or wrapped around them.

The *Gemora* cites Rav Shmuel bar Yehudah quoting Rabbi Chanina saying that they went out with ropes wrapped around them.

When the scholars told this to Rav Assi, they said that we didn't need him to know this, as we can already learn this from Rav Dimi's statement alone. If Rav Dimi just meant that the ropes were used to lead them, we already would know that from the dialogue between Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yosi and Rebbe (cited earlier), in which Rebbe seemed to agree that one may not overly guard an animal.

He told them that we would still have needed Rav Dimi's statement, because we may have thought that Rebbe didn't accept what Rabbi Yishmael said. We therefore need Rav Shmuel bar Yehudah's statement, to teach that

Rebbe even allowed the mules to go out with ropes just wrapped around them. (52a)

### ***Immersing the Ring***

The *Mishna* said that one may purify an animal's collar (by sprinkling the red heifer ashes or immersing in the *mikveh*) while it is still on the animal.

The *Gemora* says that this implies that they can become impure, and challenges this from a *Mishna* which states that a person's ring is a utensil which can become impure, but the ring of an animal, of utensils, or any other type of ring cannot become impure.

Rav Yitzchak answers that the *Mishna* is referring to a person's ring which was impure which was then used as a ring for an animal.

Rav Yosef says that since the ring is used by a person to lead the animal, it is considered a person's utensil. Just as the *braisa* says that a metal stick used to goad an animal is a utensil, so a ring which is used to lead an animal is a utensil.

The *Gemora* asks how one can immerse it while on the animal, as the inner surface will not come in contact with the water of the *mikveh*.

Rabbi Ami says that the *Mishna* is a case where one hit it out of shape with a hammer, opening a gap between it and the animal's neck.

The *Gemora* suggests that Rabbi Ami is following Rav Yosef's explanation of the *Mishna*. If he were following Rabbi Yitzchak, who says that the collar is impure since it was previously used for a person, once he did an action to change it (by hitting it with a hammer), it would lose its previous status.

The *Gemora* deflects this by saying that he is following Rabbi Yehudah, who says an action done only to fix a



utensil does not change its status. Since he only hit the collar to fix it for use on the animal, it retains its status.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which says that the case of *Mishna* is where the collar is loose on the animal, leaving room for the water to enter. (52a – 52b)

### **Different Rings**

A student from the upper Galilee asked Rabbi Eliezer about a distinction he once heard between different types of rings.

Rabbi Eliezer said that perhaps he only heard the distinction regarding the liability for wearing them outside on *Shabbos*, as all rings are equivalent for the purposes of impurity.

The *Gemora* challenges this statement, as the *Mishna* says that only a person's ring can become impure, while rings of animals or utensils or anything else cannot.

The *Gemora* answers that the student was only referring to people's rings.

The *Gemora* challenges even that from a *braisa* which says that only a ring meant for a finger can become impure, while rings used to fasten clothing cannot.

The *Gemora* answers that he was referring to only rings for a finger.

The *Gemora* challenges even that from a *Mishna* which says that a metal ring, with a wooden seal, can become impure, but not a wooden ring, even if it has a metal seal.

The *Gemora* answers that he was referring only to metal rings. (52b)

### **Different Needles**

He also asked Rabbi Eliezer about a distinction he once heard about different types of needles.

Rabbi Eliezer said that perhaps he only heard the distinction regarding one who wore them outside on *Shabbos*, as all needles are equivalent for the purposes of impurity.

The *Gemora* challenges this statement from the *Mishna* which says that a needle whose eye or tip has been removed is no longer impure.

The *Gemora* answers that he was only referring to intact needles.

The *Gemora* challenges this also from a *Mishna* which says that a needle which cannot be used for sewing due to its rust (*i.e., it leaves a stain on the garment*) is not impure.

The *Gemora* answers that he was referring only to polished needles.

The *Gemora* challenges this from a *braisa* which says that any needle, with or without an eye, may be handled on *Shabbos*, and these needles are only different regarding impurity.

The *Gemora* deflects this, as Abaye explained this *braisa* to refer to needles whose hole was not yet added, and therefore is not a utensil, but is still usable to remove a splinter, and therefore may be handled on *Shabbos*. However, a needle which lost its eye may still become impure, but is considered an adornment on *Shabbos*. (52b)

### **Items Permitted on Animals**

The *Mishna* says that a donkey may go out with a saddle cloth, which is tied on it. Rams can go out strapped up, and ewes may go out exposed, tied, or covered up. Goats may go out with their udders tied. Rabbi Yosi prohibits all but the ewes that are covered up. Rabbi Yehudah says that goats may go out with their udders tied to dry up the milk, but not to keep the milk. (52b)