



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

Shabbos Daf Nun Beis

- They taught in the Yeshiva of **Menashya**, if one makes holes in the horns of a goat, and places an "afsar" through those holes, the goat may go out with that on Shabbos. (A goat may not go out with an "afsar" tied onto it in the way it is typically tied to other animals, because a goat's normal thrashing movements would result in the "afsar" coming off and may lead to the owner carrying it in the reshus harabim.)
 - **Q: R' Yosef** asked, what about tying it to the goat's beard, are we still afraid the goat will make it come off, or because it will be painful for the goat to get it off (the beard will have to be pulled out) maybe it will not come off? **TEIKU**.
- A Mishnah says, a cow may not go out with a strap between its horns.
 - **R' Yirmiya bar Abba** said, **Rav and Shmuel** argue: one says the Mishna prohibits a strap used for decoration or for control (of the cow) purposes, the other says the Mishna only prohibits a strap of decoration.
 - **R' Yosef** says, **Shmuel** is the one who says that a strap used for control is allowed. Because **Shmuel** said the halacha follows **Chananya** (that an excessive restraint is permitted, and although a cow does not need a strap to be controlled, it is still allowed). **Abaye** says, **Shmuel** says a strap for control would be prohibited. Because **Shmuel** said, they asked **Rebbi** regarding the halachah of an excessive restraint on Shabbos, and **R' Yishmael** said, his father **R' Yose** paskened that a camel may go out with an "afsar", which suggests that it may not go out with a nose ring (because that would be an excessive restraint). Since **Shmuel** brought this down, he must hold this way!
 - The Gemara says, **R' Yosef** is correct and we must delete **Abaye's** proof, because we find elsewhere that **Shmuel** explicitly says that a strap used for control is mutar.
 - **Q: A Braisa** says, if the owner of a parah adumah put a leash on the cow, it remains kosher. A leash on a cow is an excessive restraint. If an excessive restraint is considered to be a "burden", the parah adumah would become pasul, because a parah adumah may not carry a burden. We see that it is not a burden?! **A: Abaye** said, the Braisa is referring to the owner leading the cow from one city to another, in which circumstance a leash is not considered excessive. **Rava** said, because the parah adumah is so valuable, a leash is not considered to be an excessive restraint. **Ravina** said, the Braisa refers to a rebellious cow which needs this level of restraint.

HASUS B'SHEIR...

- **R' Huna** says the Mishna means that the animal may go out with the rope wrapped around its neck, or with the person pulling it in front. **Shmuel** says it may only go out when being led in front.
 - A Braisa says, the animal may go out with it wrapped around its neck to be pulled by it (only if it will be pulled by it, like **Shmuel** says).
 - **R' Yosef** saw the calves of **R' Huna** walking out with the rope wrapped around their necks on Shabbos.
 - **Rav Dimi in the name of R' Chanina** said, **Rebbi's** mules would go out with an "afsar" on Shabbos.
 - **Q: Did they go out with the ropes wrapped around their necks or were they led with the ropes? A: R' Chanina** said that they went out with the rope wrapped around their necks.
 - **Q: The Rabanan** asked **R' Assi**, we could have figured this out without **R' Chanina's** statement, because **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said in front of

Rebbi that his father allowed 4 animals to go out with an “Afsar” – a horse, mule, camel and donkey. **Rebbi** didn’t voice disagreement, so he must have agreed that a mule may go out with an “afsar”. When **R’ Dimi** said that **Rebbi’s** mules went out with the “afsar”, he therefore must have meant that the ropes were wrapped around their necks, because if not, he was not adding anything to what we already knew!? **A:** We would think that **Rebbi** did not actually agree with **R’ Yosef**. That’s why **R’ Dimi** repeated the halacha. **R’ Chanina** was teaching even further, that **Rebbi’s** mules even went out with the ropes wrapped around their necks.

UMAZIN ALEIHEN V’TOVLAN BIMKOMAN

- **Q:** How can the collar become tamei? A Mishna says that only a person’s ring can become tamei, not a ring of a keili or an animal (which would include a collar)?! **A:** **R’ Yitzchak** said, our Mishna is discussing a collar that was used by a person (and became tamei at that time) and was then used for an animal, but had never yet become tahor. **A2:** **R’ Yosef** says, the collar of an animal can become tamei, because it is used by a person to help control the animal (just like a prodding stick can become tamei, because it is used by a person to prod and control an animal).

V’TOVLAN BIMKOMAN

- **Q:** The ring holding the strap is tightly inserted into the collar. If so, the ring acts as a “chatzitza” to the collar?! **A:** **R’ Ami** said, the Mishna refers to a case where the hole was widened. **A2:** A Braisa said the Mishna is referring to a collar with wide holes.
 - **R’ Ami** must hold like **R’ Yosef**, that the collar is tamei because it is considered to be the keili of a person, and therefore, making the hole larger will not make it lose its tumah. If he held like **R’ Yitzchak** who says it is only tamei because it used to be used by people, the fact that he made a physical change to the collar should have made it lose its tumah (which is an accepted halacha)!
 - The Gemara says, it could be that he holds like **R’ Yitzchak**, but he also holds like **R’ Yehuda** who says that only a destructive physical change removes tumah. This change of widening the holes is not considered to be destructive.
- A Braisa says, a talmid asked **R’ Eliezer**: I heard there is a halachic difference between one type of ring and another, but I don’t know what that difference is. **R’ Eliezer** answered, you must have heard that there is a difference in halacha regarding Shabbos (a regular ring may be worn into reshus harabim, but a signet ring may not), because there is no difference with regard to tumah.
 - **Q:** We learned that there is a difference with regard to tumah: a person’s ring can become tamei but other rings cannot?! **A:** He was only referring to rings of people.
 - **Q:** We learned that a ring used as a belt buckle or to tie the sleeves of a shirt cannot become tamei?! **A:** He was referring to rings worn on the fingers.
 - **Q:** We learned that a metal ring with a wooden signet can become tamei, but a wooden ring with a metal signet cannot?! **A:** He was referring to metal rings.
- The Braisa continues that the talmid also asked: I heard there is a halachic difference between one type of needle and another, but I don’t know what that difference is. **R’ Eliezer** answered, you must have heard that there is a difference in halacha regarding Shabbos (a needle with a hole (a sewing needle) may not be worn into reshus harabim, but a decorative pin may be worn), because there is no difference with regard to tumah.
 - **Q:** We learned that a needle missing its eye or its point cannot become tamei, otherwise it can become tamei?! **A:** He was referring to complete needles.
 - **Q:** We learned that a needle that is rusty to the point that it can’t be used for sewing cannot become tamei?! **A:** He was referring to needles that are not rusty.

Q: A Braisa says that a needle without an eye cannot become tamei?! **A:** That Braisa refers to an unfinished needle and **R’ Eliezer** was referring to finished needles.