

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), 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)?**

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:

מיתבי: לא יצא הזב בכיס שלו, ולא עזים בכיס. לא יצא הסוס בזנב שועל, ולא בזהרורית שביין עיניו שפדדיהו, ולא פרה בחסום שבפיה, ולא סייחים בטרוסקלין שבפיהם לרשות הרבים, ולא בהמה בסנדל שברגליה, ולא בקמיע אף על פי שהוא מומחה — וזה חומר בבהמה מבאדם...

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.**

אמר מר: ולא בקמיע אף על פי שהוא מומחה. והא אגן תנן: ולא בקמיע שאינו מומחה. הא מומחה — שפיר דמי! הכא נמי שאינו מומחה.

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 "אָף עַל פִּי שְׁהוּא מוּמְחָה" קְתַנְי! מוּמְחָה לְאָדָם וְאִינוּ מוּמְחָה לְבְהֵמָה. וּמִי אֵיכָא מוּמְחָה לְאָדָם וְלֹא הָוִי מוּמְחָה לְבְהֵמָה? אִין, אָדָם דְּאִית לֵיהּ מְזָלָא — מְסִייע לֵיהּ, בְּהֵמָה דְּלִית לֵהּ מְזָלָא — לֹא מְסִייע לֵהּ.

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.**