

יתד באילן ותלה בה בלבלה למעלה מעשרה טפחים – אין עירובו עירוב, למטה מ' טפחים – עירובו עירוב.

טעמא – דנעץ יתד באילן, הא לא נעץ – אפילו למטה מ' טפחים אין עירובו עירוב. והא האי תנא, דקאסר בצדדין וקשרי בצדי צדדין!

אמר רב פפא: הכא בכלבלה דחוקה עסקינן, דבהדי דשקיל ליה לעירוב – קמניד ליה לאילן, וקמשמש באילן גופיה. והלכתא: צדדין – אסורין, צדי צדדין – מותרין.

אמר רב אשי: השתא דאמרת צדדין אסורין, האי דרגא דמדלא – לא לינחיה אינש אדיקלא, דהוה להו צדדין. אלא לינחיה אגוואזי לבר מדיקלא, וכי סליק – לא לינח פריעה אגוואזי, אלא ליתנח אקנין.

מתני' מתירין פקיעי עמיר לפני בהמה, ומפספסין את הכיפין, אבל לא את (א) הזירין. אין מרסקין לא את השחת ולא את החרובין לפני בהמה, בין דקה ובין גסה. רבי יהודה מתיר בחרובין לדקה.

גמ' אמר רב הונא: הן הן פקיעין, הן הן כיפין, פקיעין – תרי כיפין – תלתא (ב), זירין – דארזי. והכי קאמר: מתירין פקיעי עמיר לפני בהמה ומפספסין, והוא הדין לכיפין. אבל לא את הזירין – לא לפספס ולא להתייר. אמר רב חסדא: מאי טעמא דרב הונא – קא סבר: למטרט באובכלא – טרחינן, לשווי אובכלא – לא משונינן.

a stake in a tree and hung a four-by-four handbreadth basket from it into which he placed the food for his joining of the Shabbat boundaries, if the basket was above ten handbreadths from the ground, his *eiruv* is not a valid *eiruv*. It is prohibited for him to take the bread from the basket on Shabbat, because the basket's area and height render it a private domain, and he is standing in a different domain. If the basket was below ten handbreadths from the ground, his *eiruv* is a valid *eiruv*.^N

The Gemara examines this statement: **The reason** for this distinction between above and below ten handbreadths is specifically because he drove a stake into a tree and hung the basket from it. However, if he did not drive a stake into a tree, but tied the basket to the tree itself, even if it was below ten handbreadths from the ground his *eiruv* is not a valid *eiruv*. If he were to take the bread from the basket he would be making use of the sides of the tree, which is prohibited on Shabbat. **And isn't it the case that this is the tanna who prohibits using the sides of the tree, and nevertheless, he permits using the sides of the sides,**^H contrary to Rava's opinion?

Rav Pappa said: Here, we are dealing with a narrow-mouthed basket that is tightly tied to the tree. Since it is difficult to remove anything from it, when he takes the bread for the *eiruv* he moves the tree, and he is thereby using the sides of the tree itself and not the sides of the sides of the tree. The Gemara concludes: **And the halakha** is that use of the sides of a tree or an animal is prohibited on Shabbat, but use of the sides of the sides is permitted.^N

Rav Ashi said: Now that you said that the *halakha* is that use of the sides is prohibited, with regard to this ladder that one climbs to an elevated area, a person may not lean it against the palm tree itself because it is considered use of the sides of the tree on Shabbat. Rather, he should lean it on stakes that are external to the trunk of the palm tree. **And when one climbs the ladder, he should not place his foot on the stakes. Rather, he should place it on the rungs of the ladder** because it is prohibited to use the sides of the tree.

MISHNA One may untie *peki'in* of grain before an animal on Shabbat, and one may spread the *kifin*^H but not the *zirin*. These terms will be explained in the Gemara. **One may not crush hay or carobs^H before an animal on Shabbat** in order to facilitate its eating. He may do so neither for a small animal [*daka*] nor for a large one. **Rabbi Yehuda permits to do so with carobs for a small animal**, because it can swallow the hard carobs only with difficulty.

GEMARA Rav Huna said: They are called *peki'in* and they are also called *kifin*. The difference between them is that *peki'in* are tied with two knots, whereas *kifin* are tied with three.^N *Zirin*, which may not be moved on Shabbat, are bundles of cedar branches^N eaten by animals when the branches are small and moist. **And this is what the mishna is saying: One may untie *peki'in* of grain before an animal and spread them, and the same is true for *kifin*, but not for *zirin*, which one may neither spread nor untie.** Rav Hisda said: What is the reason for the opinion of Rav Huna? He holds that with regard to exerting oneself with food on Shabbat, one may exert himself; however, with regard to rendering food edible, one may not render it so. Bundles of crops which are fit for animal consumption in their present state may be further prepared on Shabbat. Cedar branches cannot be eaten when bound together; therefore, one may not exert himself to untie them and render them edible on Shabbat.

NOTES

עירובו עירוב – His *eiruv* is a valid *eiruv* – This is referring to a joining of Shabbat boundaries. When one wants to travel beyond the Shabbat limits, he must designate a place for himself near the boundary and place some food there. He thereby establishes his Shabbat resting place there, allowing him to extend his Shabbat limit by an additional two thousand cubits beyond that point. In order to establish a proper *eiruv* it must already be present at dusk on Friday. Although one is not required to eat the food, it must be accessible for him to eat it at that time. Therefore, an *eiruv* placed somewhere inaccessible on Shabbat is not a valid *eiruv*.

והלכתא: צדדין – אסורין, צדי צדדין מותרין – And the *halakha* is that use of the sides is prohibited, but use of the sides of the sides is permitted – Some commentaries explain that the fact that it is necessary to establish the *halakha* both for sides and for sides of sides indicates that the Gemara accepts the basis of Rava's assertion that there is a connection between the two disputes. Even so, the Gemara concludes that the *halakha* is in accordance with the third opinion, which states that use of sides is prohibited and use of sides of sides is permitted (*Adderet Eliyahu*; see *Tosafot*).

תרי...תלתא – תרי – Two...three – Some explain instead that two is referring to two bundles tied together as one, and three is referring to three tied together (*Rabbeinu Hananel*).

דארזי – Cedar branches – The *ge'onim* explain that this term can also refer to bundles of straw and the like, and specifically to stalks or branches that are rigid like wood.

HALAKHA

צדדין...צדי צדדין – It is prohibited to make use of the sides of an animal on Shabbat; therefore, one may neither ride an animal nor hang on the sides of an animal. However, making use of the sides of the sides, i.e., using something resting on the side of an animal, is permitted (*Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 21:9; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 305:18).

One may untie *peki'in* of grain before an animal...*kifin* – **מתירין פקיעי עמיר לפני בהמה...וכיפין** – One may untie bundles of grain on Shabbat but may not spread them out for an animal. The principle is: One may render edible something that is not edible; however, he may not exert himself to further prepare food that is already edible. Others say that the Sages permitted untying a bundle of straw only when it is tied with a temporary knot (*Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 21:18; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 324:4 and in the comment of the Rema).

ריסוק שחת וחרובין – **Crushing hay and carobs** – One may not crush hay or carobs for either large or small animals on Shabbat, because they are already soft and edible. However, it is permitted to crush hard carobs (*Mishna Berura*; *Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 21:18; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 324:8).

רב יהודה אָמַר: הֵן הֵן פְּקִיעִין, הֵן הֵן זִירִין. פְּקִיעִין – תְּרִי, זִירִין – תְּלָתָא. כִּיפִין – דְּאַרְוִי. וְהֵכִי קָאָמַר: מִתִּירִין פְּקִיעִי עֲמִיר לִפְנֵי בְּהֵמָה, אֲבָל פְּסוּסִי – לֹא. וְכִיפִין – פְּסוּסִי נְמִי מִפְּסוּסִינָן, אֲבָל לֹא הִזְרִין לְפִסְפִּס [א] אֶלְא לְהַתִּיר. אָמַר רַבָּא: מֵאֵי טַעְמָא דְּרַב יְהוּדָה – קְסָבַר: שׁוּוֹי אוּכְלָא – מְשׁוּינָן, מִטְּרַח בְּאוּכְלָא – לָא טְרַחֲנִין.

תַּנּוּן: דְּאִין מְרַסְקִין אֶת הַשְּׁחַת וְאֶת הַחֲרוּבִין לִפְנֵי בְּהֵמָה, בֵּין דְּקָה וּבֵין גְּסָה. מֵאֵי לָאוּ – חֲרוּבִין דְּוִמְיָא דְּשְׁחַת, מֵה שְׁחַת – דְּרַכִּיבִי, אֶף חֲרוּבִין – דְּרַכִּיבִי, אֶלְמָא: לָא טְרַחֲנִין בְּאוּכְלָא, וְהִתְיַבְּתִיָּה דְּרַב הוּנָא!

אָמַר לָךְ רַב הוּנָא: לֹא, שְׁחַת דְּוִמְיָא דְּחֲרוּבִין; מֵה חֲרוּבִין – דְּאֶקוּשִׁי, אֶף שְׁחַת – דְּאֶקוּשִׁי. הִיכִי מְשַׁבַּחַת לָהּ – בְּעִילֵי זוּטְרֵי.

תַּא שְׁמַע: רַבֵּי יְהוּדָה מִתִּיר בְּחֲרוּבִין לְדְּקָה. לְדְּקָה – אִין, לְגְּסָה – לֹא. אִי אֲמַרְתָּ בְּשִׁלְמָא תִּנְא קְמָא סָבַר: מִיטְרַח בְּאוּכְלָא לָא טְרַחֲנִין, שׁוּוֹי מְשׁוּינָן. הִינֵי דְּקָא אָמַר ר' יְהוּדָה: הַחֲרוּבִין לְדְּקָה נְמִי שׁוּוֹי אוּכְלָא הוּא. אֶלְא אִי אֲמַרְתָּ תִּנְא קְמָא סָבַר: שׁוּוֹי אוּכְלָא לָא מְשׁוּינָן, מִיטְרַח בְּאוּכְלָא מְטְרַחֲנִין, רַבֵּי יְהוּדָה דְּמִתִּיר בְּחֲרוּבִין לְדְּקָה, כֹּל שְׁכֵן לְגְּסָה!

מִי סָבַרְתָּ "דְּקָה" דְּקָה מִמֶּשׁ? מֵאֵי דְּקָה – גְּסָה, וּמֵאֵי קָרִי לָהּ דְּקָה – דְּדִיָּקָא בְּאוּכְלָא.

הָא מְדַקְתַּנִּי רִישָׁא "בֵּין דְּקָה וּבֵין גְּסָה" – מִכְּלָל דְּרַבֵּי יְהוּדָה "דְּקָה" דְּקָה מִמֶּשׁ קָאָמַר! קְשִׁיָּא.

תַּא שְׁמַע: מִחֲתִכִּין

Rav Yehuda understood the mishna differently and said: **They are called peki'in and they are also called zirin.** The difference between them is that *peki'in* are tied with **two** knots, whereas *zirin* are tied with **three**. *Kifin* are bundles of cedar branches. **And this is what the mishna is saying: One may untie peki'in of grain before an animal; however, with regard to spreading them, no, he may not spread them.** And with regard to *kifin*, one may also spread them. However, that is **not** the case with regard to *zirin*, as it is prohibited to spread them, and it is **only** permitted to untie them. Rava said: **What is the reason for Rav Yehuda's opinion? He holds the opposite of Rav Huna's opinion.** He holds that with regard to rendering food edible, one may render it so; however, with regard to exerting oneself on Shabbat with food that is already in an edible state, one may not exert himself.

We learned in the mishna: **One may not crush hay or carobs before an animal on Shabbat in order to facilitate its eating.** He may do so **neither** for a **small animal** **nor** for a **large one.** **Is this not referring to carobs that are similar to hay? Just as it is referring to hay that is soft, so too, it is referring to carobs that are soft.** Apparently, we do not exert ourselves with food. Since the carobs are suitable for animal consumption without being crushed, it is prohibited to exert oneself and crush them. **And this is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rav Huna.**

The Gemara answers that Rav Huna could have said to you: **No, the mishna is referring to hay that is similar to carobs.** Just as it is referring to **carobs that are hard, so too, it is referring to hay that is hard** and crushing it renders it edible. The Gemara asks: **How is it possible to find hay that is so hard that an animal cannot eat it?** The Gemara answers: It is referring to **young donkeys**, that can only eat hay that is crushed well.

Come and hear a proof from that which we learned in the continuation of the mishna: **Rabbi Yehuda permits crushing carobs for a small animal.** The Gemara infers: **For a small animal, yes, it is permitted; for a large one, no, it is not permitted.** Granted, if you say that the first *tanna* holds: **One may not exert himself with food on Shabbat, but with regard to rendering food edible, one may render food edible, that explains that which Rabbi Yehuda said in response: Feeding carobs to a small animal is also a case of rendering food edible because the animal cannot eat hard carobs.** However, if you say that the first *tanna* holds that with regard to rendering food edible, one may not render food edible on Shabbat, but with regard to exerting oneself with food, one may exert himself, then **Rabbi Yehuda, who permits crushing carobs for a small animal, all the more so he should permit crushing carobs for a large one.** If carobs are suitable for consumption by a small animal, all the more so are they suitable for consumption by a large animal.

The Gemara rejects this: **Do you hold that the small animal [daka] mentioned here is referring to an actual small animal?** No; rather, what is the meaning of *daka* here? It is referring to a large animal. **And what is the reason that the mishna calls it daka? Because it is particular [dayka] about its food.**ⁿ Since this animal can eat uncrushed carobs when there is no alternative, one may exert himself and crush them for it.

The Gemara asks: From the fact that it is taught in the first clause of the mishna: **Neither for a small animal nor for a large animal, it can be inferred that when Rabbi Yehuda said daka, he meant an actual small animal.** The Gemara was unable to answer to find an answer to this question and it remains difficult. Nonetheless, Rav Huna's opinion was not refuted.

Therefore, come and hear a proof from that which we learned in another mishna: **One may chop**

NOTES

דְּדִיָּקָא בְּאוּכְלָא – דְּדִיָּקָא: Gemara would permit preparing the food, because it involves exerting oneself with food rather than rendering food edible with its teeth and eats both hard and soft foods. In that case, the (Ramban).

את הדלועין לפני הבהמה, ואת הנבלה לפני הכלבים. מאי לאו, דלועין דומיא דנבלה; מה נבלה – דרכיבא, אף דלועין – דרכיבא, אלמא: טרחינן באוכלא, ותיבתא דרב יהודה! אמר לך רב יהודה: לא, נבלה דומיא דדלועין; מה דלועין – דאשוני, אף נבלה – דאשוני. והיכי משכחת לה – בבשר פילי. אי נמי: בגורייתא זוטרי.

תא שמע, דתני רב חנן מנהרדעא: מפרכינן תבן ואספסתא ומערבין. אלמא: טרחינן באוכלא! תבן – בתיבנא סריא, אספסתא – בעילי זוטרי.

מתני' אין אוכסין את הגמל, ולא דורסין, אבל מלעיטין. ואין מאמירין את העגלים, אבל מלעיטין. ומהלקטין לתרנגולין, ונותנין מים למורסן, אבל לא גובלין, ואין נותנין מים לפני דבורים ולפני יונים שבשוכך, אבל נותנין לפני אווזין ותרנגולין, ולפני יוני הרדיסיות.

גמ' מאי "אין אוכסין"? אמר רב יהודה: אין עושין לה אבוס בתוך מעיה. מי איכא כי האי גוונא? אין, וכדאמר רב ירמיה מדיפתא: לדידי תזי לי ההוא טייעא דאכלא פורא, ואטעינא כורא.

pumpkins before an animal^H and an animal carcass before dogs.^H Is this not referring to pumpkins that are similar to an animal carcass? Just as an animal carcass is soft, so too, the pumpkins referred to here are soft. Apparently, one may exert himself with food, and this is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rav Yehuda. The Gemara answers that Rav Yehuda could have said to you: No, the mishna is referring to an animal carcass that is similar to pumpkins. Just as the reference is to pumpkins that are hard, so too, the reference is to an animal carcass that is hard, and chopping it renders it edible. The Gemara asks: And how is it possible to find an animal carcass that is so hard that another animal cannot eat it? The Gemara answers: The mishna is referring to elephant flesh. Alternatively, it can be explained that the mishna is referring to more common animal meat placed before puppies that can eat only chopped meat.

Come and hear a proof from that which Rav Hanan of Neharde'a taught: One may crumble straw and alfalfa on Shabbat and mix the two together, and the animal then eats the straw because it is mixed with the alfalfa. Apparently, one may exert himself with food on Shabbat. The Gemara rejects this proof: No, the straw mentioned here is rotten straw that requires special preparation to render it suitable for animal consumption, and alfalfa is taught with regard to young donkeys who can only eat it in small pieces.

MISHNA One may not forcibly overfeed a camel on Shabbat^H and one may not force-feed it, even if in doing so he does not overfeed the camel. However, one may place food into its mouth. And the mishna makes a distinction, which will be explained in the Gemara, between two manners of placing food in the mouths of cattle. One may not place food in the mouths of calves on Shabbat in the manner of *hamra'a*, but one may do so in the manner of *halata*. And one may force-feed chickens. And one may add water to bran used as animal feed, but one may not knead the mixture. And one may not place water before bees or before doves in a dove-cote, because they are capable of finding their own food; however, one may place water before geese and chickens and before hardisian [*hardeisiyyot*]^L doves.

GEMARA We learned in the mishna that one may not forcibly overfeed a camel on Shabbat. The Gemara asks: What is meaning of: One may not forcibly overfeed? Rav Yehuda said: One may not feed a camel to the point that it creates a trough inside of its stomach. The Gemara asks: Is there the possibility of feeding a camel in that manner? The Gemara answers: Yes; and as Rav Yirmeya of Difti said: I saw an Arab who fed his camel a *kor* of food and loaded it with another *kor* on its back.

LANGUAGE

Hardisian [*hardeisiyyot*] doves – יוני הרדיסיות: There are two distinct versions of the word *hardeisiyyot* explained in the Talmud. One is *herodesiyyot*, named for King Herod, who introduced this species of dove to Israel and raised them. The other is *rodosiyyot*, named for the doves' place of origin, the island of Rhodes in the Mediterranean Sea. Hardisian doves were domesticated and their owners were responsible for their sustenance, unlike earlier species of doves whose owners would merely provide them with a dove-cote and extra food.

HALAKHA

Pumpkins before an animal – את הדלועין לפני הבהמה: On Shabbat, one may cut hard pumpkins for an animal, provided that the pumpkins were picked before Shabbat (*Magen Avraham*; Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 21:18; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 324:6).

An animal carcass before dogs – ואת הנבלה לפני הכלבים: On Shabbat it is permitted to cut an animal carcass for dogs, even if the animal died on Shabbat itself, provided the carcass is too hard for the dogs to chew. However, if the dogs could eat it uncut, one may not exert himself and cut it (Rambam *Sefer*

Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat 21:18; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 324:7).

One may not forcibly overfeed...on Shabbat – אין אוכסין – בשבת: One may not forcibly overfeed an animal on Shabbat, nor may one cram food into a place in its throat where the animal cannot expel it. However, it is permitted to place food into a place in the animal's mouth where the animal can expel it (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 21:35; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 324:9).

נתנת – Placing sustenance before animals on Shabbat – מוזנות לבעלי חיים בשבת: One may not place water or food before animals capable of finding their own food on Shabbat, but one may do so before animals for which the responsibility for their sustenance is incumbent upon people (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhos Shabbat* 21:36; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 324:11).

NOTES

Feeding a dog – האכלת כלב: Apparently, although the Gemara is referring here to a dog that one does not own, nevertheless, he is permitted to feed it. Some explain this based on the verse concerning the *halakhot* of an animal with a condition that will cause it to die within twelve months [*tereifa*]: “You shall cast it to a dog” (Exodus 22:30). These commentaries teach that the dogs were rewarded for their behavior during the Exodus: “Against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog whet his tongue,” (Exodus 11:7; *Me’iri*).

Feeding a pig – האכלת חזיר: Although it is prohibited to feed an animal on Shabbat if one is not responsible for its sustenance, it is permitted to give a gentile food in one’s courtyard despite the fact that responsibility for his sustenance is not incumbent upon a Jew. The Sages draw a distinction between the cases. A Jew is required to treat gentiles well in order to encourage good relations, much as he gives charity to both gentiles and Jews. Furthermore, since people are considered more important than other beings, the Sages permit giving food to a gentile on Shabbat in order to preserve human dignity (*Me’iri*).

“אין מאמירין” איזו היא המראה ואיזו היא הלעטה? אמר רב יהודה: המראה – למקום שאינה יכולה להחזיר, הלעטה – למקום שיכולה להחזיר. רב חסדא אמר: אידי ואידי למקום שאינה יכולה להחזיר, והמראה – בכלי, הלעטה – ביד.

מתניב רב יוסף: מהלקטין לתרנגולין, ואין צריך לומר שמלקטין. ואין מלקטין ליוני שובך וליוני עלייה, ואין צריך לומר שאין מהלקטין. מאי “מהלקטין” ומאי “מלקטין”? אילמא “מהלקטין” – דספי ליה בידים, “מלקטין” – דשדי ליה קמיהו, מכלל דיוני שובך ויוני עלייה מיטדא קמיהו נמי לא?

אלא לאו: “מהלקטין” – למקום שאינה יכולה להחזיר, “מלקטין” – למקום שיכולה להחזיר, מכלל – דהמראה בכלי, ותויבתא דרב יהודה!

אמר לך רב יהודה: לעולם “מהלקטין” – דספי ליה בידים, “מלקטין” – דשדי ליה קמיהו, ודקא קשיא לך: יוני שובך ויוני עלייה למיטדא קמיהו נמי לא? הני מוזנות עליך, והני – אין מוזנות עליך. בדתנא: נותנין מוזנות לפני כלב, ואין נותנין מוזנות לפני חזיר. ומה הפרש בין זה לזה, זה – מוזנותיו עליך וזה – אין מוזנותיו עליך.

אמר רב אשי: מתניתין נמי דיקא “אין נותנין מים לפני דבורים ולפני יונים שבשובך אבל נותנין לפני אוזון ולפני תרנגולין ולפני יוני הרדיסיות” מאי טעמא? לאו משום דהני מוזנות עליך, והני אין מוזנות עליך?

ולטיטעמיד, מאי איריא מיא, אפילו חיטי ושערי נמי לא! אלא שאני מיא דשכיחי באגמא.

We learned in the mishna: **One may not** place food in the mouths of calves on Shabbat in the manner of *hamra’a*, but one may do so in the manner of *halata*. The Gemara asks: **Which is *hamra’a* and which is *halata*?** Rav Yehuda said: *Hamra’a* is positioning food **into a place** in the animal’s throat **from which it cannot return** and expel the food. *Halata* is positioning food **into a place** in the animal’s mouth **from which it can return** and expel the food. Rav H̄isda said: **Both this and that** refer to positioning food **into a place from which the animal cannot return** and expel the food; **however**, the difference between them is that in *hamra’a* the food is placed **with a vessel**, whereas in *halata* the food is placed **by hand**.

Rav Yosef raised an objection from that which was taught in the *Tosefta*: **One may force-feed [*mehalketin*] chickens, and needless to say, one may *malkitin*. And one may not *malkitin* doves in a dove-cote or doves in an attic, and needless to say, one may not force-feed.** The Gemara asks: **What is *mehalketin* and what is *malkitin*?** If you say that *mehalketin* means that one feeds the bird by hand and *malkitin* means that one throws the food before them, by inference, **throwing food before doves in a dove-cote or before doves in an attic is also not permitted.** But why would that be prohibited?

Rather, is it not that *mehalketin* means positioning food **into a place from which the bird cannot return** and expel the food, and *malkitin* means positioning food **into a place from which it can return** and expel the food? Therefore, *mehalketin* in the case of birds is similar to *halata* into a camel’s mouth, which the mishna permitted. **By inference, the *hamra’a* prohibited in the mishna is performed with a vessel, and this poses a conclusive refutation to the opinion of Rav Yehuda.**

Rav Yehuda could have said to you: **Actually, *mehalketin* means that one feeds the bird by hand, and *malkitin* mean that one throws the food before them. And that which was difficult for you: Is throwing food before doves in a dove-cote or doves in an attic also not permitted on Shabbat?** This is not difficult because with regard to these chickens and geese that were mentioned, sole responsibility for their sustenance is incumbent upon you as they are incapable of providing for themselves. **However, in the case of these doves, responsibility for their sustenance is not incumbent upon you, and therefore, it is prohibited to place food before them,**^h as it was taught in a *baraita*: **One may place sustenance before a dogⁿ on Shabbat, but one may not place sustenance before a pig.ⁿ And what is the difference between this and that?** In this case of the dog, responsibility for its sustenance is incumbent upon you, and in that case of the pig, responsibility for its sustenance is not incumbent upon you, as no Jew raises pigs.

Rav Ashi said: The language of the mishna is also precise in support of this explanation, as we learn: **And one may not place water before bees or before doves in a dove-cote** because they are capable of finding their own food; **however, one may place water before geese and chickens and before hardisian doves.** **What is the reason for this distinction? Is it not because for these, geese and chickens, responsibility for their sustenance is incumbent upon you, and for those, bees and doves, responsibility for their sustenance is not incumbent upon you?**

The Gemara rejects this proof: **And according to your reasoning, why did the mishna cite a case specifically involving water? Even wheat and barley should also not be permitted. Rather, the reason for the distinction between the *halakhot* is that water is different because it is found in a lake or in other reservoirs, and therefore one need not exert himself to provide water for bees and doves. That is not the case with the rest of their food.**

The righteous man takes knowledge of the cause of the poor – יודע צדיק דין דלים – The simple understanding of this verse refers to the ideal manner in which a righteous person should treat the poor. Rabbi Yona taught that it refers to the Holy One, Blessed be He, Who sees to the needs of all living creatures (Maharsha).

Whose is the opinion introduced as: And some say – מאן ויש אומרים: Although the Gemara states that opinions introduced as: And some say, are attributed to Rabbi Natan, the Sages were aware that there are exceptions. There are even some disputes where Rabbi Natan disagrees with the opinion of: And some say (*Tosafot*).

HALAKHA

A ritually impure object that was eaten – דבר טמא שנאכל: Flesh of a corpse eaten by an animal does not transmit ritual impurity while still in the animal's stomach. If the animal died and the flesh remained in its stomach for three full days in the case of a dog, or for one full day in the case of other animals, the flesh is considered to have been digested and is ritually pure, in accordance with the ruling of Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira in a mishna in tractate *Oholot* (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Met* 20:4).

Hamra'a and *halata* – המראה והלעטה: On Shabbat, one may not force an animal to the ground and forcibly feed it water and vetch simultaneously. However, if an animal is standing, one may feed it water and vetch separately as per the *Tosefta* (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 21:35).

Placing water into bran – נתינת מים למורסן: One may not knead bran and water together for animals on Shabbat, but it is permitted to pour water into the bran and to pass a spoon through it, or pour it from one vessel into another so that they will mix together. That is the ruling of most halakhic authorities, because the unattributed mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 21:34; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 324:3). However, others prohibit even pouring water into the bran, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi (*Sefer Mitzvot Gadol, Tosafot*).

דרש רבי יונה אפיתחא דבי נשיא: מאי דכתיב ("יודע צדיק דין דלים" יודע הקדוש ברוך הוא בכלב שמוזנותו מועטין, לפיכך שוהה אכילתו במעיו שלשה ימים. בדתגן: כמה תשהה אכילתו במעיו ויהא טמא – בכלב – שלשה ימים מעת לעת, ובעופות ובדגים – כדי שתפול לאור ותשרף.

אמר רב המנונא, שמע מינה: אורח ארעא למשדא אומצא לכלבא. וכמה? אמר רב מרי: משח אודניה, וחוטרא אבתריה. הני מילי – בדברא. אבל במתא – לא, דאתא למסור. אמר רב פפא: לית דעניא מכלבא, ולית דעתור מחוירא.

תניא בותיה דרב יהודה: איזו היא המראה ואיזו היא הלעטה? המראה – מרביצה ופוקס את פיה ומאכילה פרשינן ומים בבת אחת, הלעטה – מאכילה מעומד ומשקה מעומד, ונותנין פרשינן בפני עצמן ומים בפני עצמן.

מהלקטין לתרנגולין כו". אמר אביי: אמריתיה קמייה דמר, מתניתין מני? ואמר לי: רבי יוסי בר יהודה היא. דתניא: אחד נותן את הקמח ואחד נותן לתוכו מים – האחרון חייב, דברי רבי יוסי בר יהודה אומר: אינו חייב עד שיגבל.

דילמא עד כאן לא קאמר רבי יוסי בר יהודה התם – אלא קמח דבר גיבול הוא, אבל מורסן דלאו בר גיבול הוא – אפילו רבי יוסי בר יהודה מודה? לא סלקא דעתך, דתניא בהדיא: אין נותנין מים למורסן, דברי רבי יוסי בר יהודה אומר: נותנין מים למורסן.

תנו רבנן: אין גובלין את הקלי ויש אומרים גובלין. מאן ויש אומרים? אמר רב חסדא:

Returning to the discussion of feeding dogs, the Gemara cites additional statements on the topic. **Rabbi Yona taught at the entrance to the house of the Nasi: What is the meaning of that which is written: "The righteous man takes knowledge of the cause of the poor"** (Proverbs 29:7)?^N **The Holy One, Blessed be He, knows that for a dog, its sustenance is scarce and they are not fed sufficiently. Therefore, its food remains in its intestines for three days so that the dog will be sustained by that food, as we learned in a mishna dealing with the halakhot of ritual impurity: After an animal eats flesh from a corpse, how long does its food remain in its intestines undigested and therefore ritually impure?**^H **In the case of a dog it is for three twenty-four hour periods, and for fowl and fish, who digest their food quickly, it is the equivalent of the time it takes for the flesh to fall into the fire and be consumed by the fire.**

Rav Hamnuna said: Learn from it: It is the way of the world, i.e., proper conduct, to throw a piece of meat before a dog, as even the Holy One, Blessed be He, concerns Himself with the dog's sustenance. The Gemara asks: And how much food should one give to a dog? Rav Mari said: Give it the equivalent of the measure of its ear and strike it immediately thereafter with a staff so that the dog will not grow attached to the one who fed it. This applies specifically when one is in the field, but in the city, one should not give anything to a dog because the dog will be drawn to follow him and remain with him. Rav Pappa said: There is no creature poorer than a dog, and no creature richer than a pig, as pigs will eat anything, and people provide them with plentiful amounts of food.

With regard to the halakhic ruling, a *baraita* was taught in accordance with the opinion of **Rav Yehuda: What is hamra'a and what is halata?**^H *Hamra'a* is when a person forcibly lays the animal on the ground and forces its mouth open and feeds it vetch and water simultaneously so that the animal will be unable to expel it. *Halata* is when one feeds the animal while it is standing and gives it to drink while it is standing, i.e., gives it food and drink in the usual manner, and one gives it vetch separately and water separately, to augment what the animal eats on its own.

We learned in the mishna: **And one may force-feed chickens, and one may add water to bran, but one may not knead the mixture. Abaye said: I said this before my Master, Rabba: Whose opinion is it in the mishna? And he said to me: It is the opinion of Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda, as it was taught in a baraita: If one person places flour and another one places water into it, the latter is liable to bring a sin-offering for performing the prohibited labor of kneading. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda says: One is only liable when he actually kneads the flour and water together. He is not liable for merely adding water to the flour. This is similar to the ruling of the mishna that one may pour water into the bran but may not knead the mixture.**

The Gemara rejects this: **Perhaps Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda only stated that actual kneading is required to be liable for performing the prohibited labor of kneading in the case of flour, which can be kneaded; however, in the case of bran, which cannot be kneaded into a dough, even Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda would concede that it is prohibited, even if one does not actually knead the mixture. The Gemara rejects this statement: It should not enter your mind to explain it that way, as it was taught explicitly in a baraita: One may not place water into bran on Shabbat; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda says: One may place water into bran.**^H

The Sages taught: On Shabbat, one may not knead sweet flour made from unripe grain that was dried in an oven, and some say: One may knead it. The Gemara asks: Whose is the opinion introduced as: And some say?^N **Rav Hisda said:**