**Rabbinics (*Talmud*) on Qohelet 11:1**

**(1). Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Baba Kama 2b:**

מאי שנא גבי אדם דכתיב כי יגח ומאי שנא גבי בהמה דכתיב כי יגוף

The Gemara asks: If the two terms are interchangeable, **what is different with regard to** an ox goring **a person that it is written:** “And **if** an ox **gores** a man or a woman” ([Exodus 21:28](/Exodus.21.28)), **and what is different with regard to** an ox goring **an animal that it is written: “If** one man’s ox **hurts [*yiggof* ]** the ox of another” ([Exodus 21:35](/Exodus.21.35))?

אדם דאית ליה מזלא כתיב כי יגח בהמה דלית לה מזלא כתיב כי יגוף

The Gemara explains: With regard to **a person, who has** the **ingenuity** to defend himself and is not easily injured, **it is written: “If** an ox **gores,”** a term indicating an attack of greater force. With regard to **an animal, which does not have** the **ingenuity** to defend itself and is more easily injured, **it is written: “If** an ox **hurts [*yiggof* ],”** a term indicating an attack of lesser force. The term *yiggof* is related to the term *magefa*, meaning plague. The Torah employs that term with regard to the goring of an animal to indicate that when an animal is gored, regardless of the force of the blow, it will likely result in its death.

ומלתא אגב אורחיה קמ"ל דמועד לאדם הוי מועד לבהמה ומועד לבהמה לא הוי מועד לאדם

**And** the Torah’s use of these terms **teaches us a matter in passing:** Because the effort required for the ox to gore a person to death is greater than the effort required for the ox to gore an animal to death, the *halakha* is **that** an ox that is **forewarned with regard to** goring **a person is** also **forewarned with regard to an animal. But** an ox that is **forewarned with regard to an animal is not forewarned with regard to a person.**

**(2). Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Shabbat 53a:**

לֹא יֵצֵא הַסּוּס בִּזְנַב שׁוּעָל, וְלֹא בַּזַּהֲרוּרִית שֶׁבֵּין עֵינָיו. מֵיתִיבִי: לֹא יֵצֵא הַזָּב בַּכִּיס שֶׁלּוֹ, וְלֹא עִזִּים בַּכִּיס שֶׁבְּדַדֵּיהֶן, וְלֹא פָּרָה בַּחִסּוּם שֶׁבְּפִיהָ, וְלֹא סְיָיחִים בַּטְּרַסְקָלִין שֶׁבְּפִיהֶם לִרְשׁוּת הָרַבִּים, וְלֹא בְּהֵמָה בַּסַּנְדָּל שֶׁבְּרַגְלֶיהָ, וְלֹא בַּקָּמֵיעַ אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁהוּא מוּמְחֶה — וְזֶה חוֹמֶר בַּבְּהֵמָה מִבָּאָדָם....

The Gemara **raises an objection** from the *Tosefta* to those who prohibit placing a basket with fodder around an animal’s neck on Shabbat: **A horse may neither go out** into the public domain on Shabbat **with a fox’s tail** that is placed as a talisman to ward off the evil eye **nor with** a string of **red wool that is** hung **between its eyes** as an ornament. **Neither may a *zav* go out with his pouch** that prevents his clothes from becoming sullied from his emissions, **nor goats with a pouch that is on their udders** so that they will not be scratched by stones, **nor a cow with the muzzle that is on its mouth, nor foals with baskets** of fodder **that are around their mouths into the public domain. And an animal** may **neither** go out **with** metal **shoes that are on its feet, nor with an amulet** that is placed on the animal to promote its good health, **even if** the amulet **has proven effective. And this is a stricture** that applies **to animals beyond** the strictures that apply **to people,** as a person is permitted to go out into the public domain with an amulet that has proved effective.

אָמַר מָר: וְלֹא בַּקָּמֵיעַ אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁהוּא מוּמְחֶה. וְהָא אֲנַן תְּנַן: וְלֹא בַּקָּמֵיעַ שֶׁאֵינוֹ מוּמְחֶה. הָא מוּמְחֶה — שַׁפִּיר דָּמֵי! הָכָא נָמֵי שֶׁאֵינוֹ מוּמְחֶה.

The Gemara further examines the *baraita* cited earlier. **The Master said: Nor** may an animal go out **with an amulet** on Shabbat, **even if** the amulet **proved effective.** The Gemara asks: **Didn’t we learn** in a mishna: One may **not** go out on Shabbat **with an amulet that has not proved effective?** By inference: If the amulet **proved effective,** he may **well** do so. The Gemara answers: **Here too**, it is referring to an amulet **that has not proved effective.**

וְהָא ״אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁהוּא מוּמְחֶה״ קָתָנֵי! מוּמְחֶה לְאָדָם וְאֵינוֹ מוּמְחֶה לִבְהֵמָה. וּמִי אִיכָּא מוּמְחֶה לְאָדָם וְלָא הָוֵי מוּמְחֶה לִבְהֵמָה? אִין, אָדָם דְּאִית לֵיהּ מַזָּלָא — מְסַיַּיע לֵיהּ, בְּהֵמָה דְּלֵית לַהּ מַזָּלָא — לָא מְסַיַּיע לַהּ..

The Gemara asks: **Doesn’t** the *baraita* **teach: Even if** the amulet **proved effective?** The Gemara answers: The *baraita* is referring to an amulet that **proved effective for a person, and did not prove effective for an animal.** The Gemara wonders: **Is there** an amulet that **proved effective for a person and is not effective for an animal?** Healing an animal should be easier than healing a person. The Gemara answers: **Yes,** an amulet **aids a person, who is under** the protection of **an** advocate **angel [*mazal*];** however, **it does not aid an animal, which is not under** the protection of **an** advocate **angel.**