



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Mishnah: Bundles [*peki'in*] of straw may be untied for animals and *kippin* (also a type of bundle) may be spread out (for them), but not *zirin*. [The Gemora will discuss what these terms mean.] Neither fodder nor carobs may be shredded for animals (for this would be regarded as excessive exertion), whether they (the animals) are small or large. Rabbi Yehudah, however, permits the shredding of carobs for small animals.

Rav Huna said: *Peki'in* and *kippin* are identical (both meaning 'bundles of straw'), except that *peki'in* are tied twice, while *kippin* are tied three times. *Zirin* are young (moist) shoots of cedar trees, and this is what the *Tanna* was teaching: Bundles [*peki'in*] of straw may be untied for animals, and they may be spread out (for them), and the same applies to *kippin*, but not *zirin*, which may neither be spread out nor untied.

Rav Chisda said: What is Rav Huna's reason? He holds that one may indeed exert himself for existing foods, but one may not turn something into food (to begin with).

Rav Yehudah said: *Peki'in* and *zirin* are identical (both meaning 'bundles of straw'), except that *peki'in* are tied twice, while *zirin* are tied three times. *Kippin* are young (moist) shoots of cedar trees, and this is what the *Tanna* was teaching: Bundles [*peki'in*] of straw may be untied for animals, but they may not be spread out (for them), and *kippin* may be spread out (for them), but regarding *zirin*, they may not be spread out (for them), but they may be untied.

Rava said: What is Rav Yehudah's reason? He holds that one may indeed turn something into food (to begin with), but he may not exert himself for existing foods.

The Gemora asks on Rav Huna from our Mishna: Neither fodder nor carobs may be shredded for animals (for this would be regarded as excessive exertion), whether they (the animals) are small or large. Surely the case of carobs is similar to fodder: just as fodder is soft, so are soft (and moist) carobs meant (which are fit for animal food). This proves that one may not exert himself for existing foods, which refutes Rav Huna!?

The Gemora answers: Rav Huna can answer you that it is not like that, but rather, the case of fodder is similar to carobs: just as carobs are hard, so too hard fodder is meant. Where is that possible (that it is too hard for the animal to consume)? It is in the case of very young donkeys.

The Gemora asks on Rav Huna from the next part of our Mishna: Rabbi Yehudah, however, permits the shredding of carobs for small animals. This implies that it is only permitted for small animals, but not for large ones. Now it is well if you agree that the first *Tanna* holds that he may not exert himself for existing foods, yet he may turn it into food (to begin with); therefore, Rabbi Yehudah argues that shredding carobs for small animals is also an act of turning it into fodder (for them), but if you maintain that the first *Tanna* holds that he may not turn something into food, yet he may exert himself for existing foods, then (is it logical that) Rabbi Yehudah permits the shredding of carobs for small animals (only)? All the more so (it should be permitted) for large animals!?

The Gemora answers: Do you think that the term *dakah* (small animal) is meant to be literal? [No, it is not!] By *dakah*, a large animal is meant, yet why is it called *dakah*? It is because it chews (*dakya*) its food very well.



The *Gemora* asks: But since the first clause states: whether they (*the animals*) are small or large, it follows that Rabbi Yehudah means literally small?

The *Gemora* concludes: This is indeed a difficulty. (155a)

The *Gemora* asks on Rabbi Yehudah from the following *Mishna*: One may cut up gourds before an animal and a carcass before dogs. Surely the case of gourds is similar to a carcass: just as a carcass is soft, so are soft gourds meant, which proves that one may exert himself for existing foods, which refutes Rav Yehudah?

The *Gemora* answers: Rav Yehudah can answer you that it is not like that, but rather, the case of a carcass is similar to gourds: just as gourds are hard, so too a hard carcass is meant. Where is it possible? It is in the case of elephant meat, or in the case of very young dogs (*who need the meat cut up before eating it*).

The *Gemora* asks on Rav Yehudah from a *braisa* recited by Rav Chanan of Nehardea: One may crumble straw and fodder and mix them together (*although they are edible even without the crumbling*). This proves that one may exert himself for existing foods!?

The *Gemora* answers: Straw means spoiled straw; and as for fodder, the reference is to young donkeys. [*If they would not be crumbled, they would not be edible.*] (155a – 155b)

Mishnah: One must not stuff a camel (*with food*), nor cram it (*for it involves excessive exertion*), but one may put food down its throat. And one must not fatten calves, but one may put food down their throats. And chickens may be force-fed, and water may be poured into their bran, but we may not mix (*the water and bran together*). And water may not be placed before bees or before doves in a dovecote, but it may be placed before geese, chickens and Hydrosian pigeons (*they were domesticated*).

The *Gemora* asks: What does 'one must not stuff a camel' mean?

Rav Yehudah said: One must not make a trough in its stomach (*by excessively stuffing it; something which was common to do before setting out on a long journey in the desert*).

The *Gemora* asks: Is such a thing possible? [*Can it be stuffed to such an extent that its stomach will be as large as a trough?*]

The *Gemora* answers: Yes, as Rabbi Yirmiyah of Difti related: I myself saw a certain Arab feed it with a *kor* (*an extremely large quantity of food*) and then load it (*on its back*) with a *kor*. (155b)

The *Mishna* had stated: And one must not fatten [*hamra'ah*] calves, but one may put food down their throats [*hal'atah*]. The *Gemora* asks: What is *hamra'ah* and what is *hal'atah*?

Rav Yehudah said: *Hamra'ah* is forcing the food so far down its throat that it cannot return (*the food back up*); *hal'atah* is only so far that it can return.

Rav Chisda said: Both mean so far that it cannot return, but *hamra'ah* is done with a utensil (*a spoon*), while *hal'atah* is done by hand.

Rav Yosef asked on Rav Yehudah from a *braisa*: One may force chickens to take food [*mehalkitin*], and it is not necessary to state that we may feed [*malkitin*] them; but one may not feed [*malkitin*] the doves of a dovecote or of the attic, and it is superfluous to state that we may not force them [*mehalkitin*] to take food. What is *mehalkitin* and what is *malkitin*? If we will say that *mehalkitin* is feeding by hand (*into their throats*), while *malkitin* is (*merely*) throwing the food in front of them; then it follows that one may not even throw food before the doves of the dovecote or of the attic (*and that certainly cannot be correct*)! Therefore, *mehalkitin* is surely forcing food so far down (*their throats*) that it cannot return, while *malkitin* is only so far that it can return. From this it follows that *hamra'ah* (*which the Mishna forbids, and must therefore be something even more forceful*) means stuffing with a utensil, which refutes Rav Yehudah!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rav Yehudah can answer you that in truth *mehalkitin* means feeding by hand, while *malkitin* means throwing the food in front of them, but as to your difficulty: is it then not even permitted to throw food before the doves of the dovecote and of the attic, that indeed is so, for you are responsible for the food of the chickens (*and since they depend on you, it is permitted to feed them*), but not for these doves (*and since they do not depend on you – for they find food in the outdoors, it is forbidden to feed them*).

This is supported by the following *braisa*: Food may be placed before a dog but not before a pig. And what is the difference between them? You are responsible for the food of the one (*the dog*), but you are not responsible for the food of the other (*the other*).

Rav Ashi said: Our *Mishna* implies this as well: And water may not be placed before bees or before doves in a dovecote, but it may be placed before geese, chickens and Hydrosian pigeons. What is the reason for this distinction? Is it not because you are responsible for the food of the latter, but you are not responsible for the food of the former?

The *Gemora* rejects the proof: But according to your reasoning, why particularly water; even wheat and barley too may not be placed before them? Rather say that water is different, because it is found (*readily*) in ponds (*and therefore, it is forbidden to place in front of them*). (155b)

Rabbi Yonah lectured at the entrance to the Exilarch's palace: What is meant by the verse: *The Righteous One knows the suffering of the poor*? The Holy One, Blessed be He, knows that a dog's food is scarce, therefore He makes him retain his food in his stomach for three days. This is as we learned in a *Mishna*: How long shall the food (*flesh from a human corpse*) remain in its stomach and yet be regarded as *tamei*? In the case of a dog, three full days of twenty-four hours; while in the case of birds or fish, as long as it would take for it to fall into a fire and become consumed.

Rav Hamnuna said: This proves that it is the proper thing to throw raw meat to a dog. And how much (*meat*)? Rav Mari said: It should be the size of its ear, and this should be

followed by the rap of a stick (*to drive it away afterwards, so it shouldn't tag along after him*).

The *Gemora* notes that this should only be done in the desert, but not in town, because it will come to follow him. Rav Pappa said: No creature is poorer than a dog and no creature is richer than a pig. (155b)

A *braisa* was taught in accordance with Rav Yehudah: What is *hamra'ah* and what is *hal'atah*? *Hamra'ah*: one makes the animal lie down, opens its mouth wide, and forces it to swallow vetch and water simultaneously. *Hal'atah*: he feeds it standing and waters it standing, and puts vetch separately and water separately (*into its mouth*). (155b)

The *Mishnah* had stated: Chickens may be made to take up food. Abaye said, I asked this before the Master [Rabbah]: With whom does our *Mishnah* agree? And he answered me, With Rabbi Yosi ben Yehudah. For it was taught: If one pours in flour and another water, the second is liable: this is Rebbe's view. Rabbi Yosi ben Yehudah said: He is not liable unless he kneads [them]. Yet perhaps Rabbi Yosi ben Yehudah ruled thus only there, in respect of flour, which is used for kneading; but as for bran, which is not used for kneading, even Rabbi Yosi ben Yehudah may admit [that he is liable]? — You cannot think so, because it was explicitly taught: Water must not be poured into bran: this is Rebbe's view. Rabbi Yosi ben Yehudah ruled: Water may be poured into bran.

Our Rabbis taught: Parched corn may not be mixed, but others maintain, It may be mixed. Who are the 'others'? — Said Rav Chisda: It is Rabbi Yosi ben Yehudah. But that is only if one does it in an unusual manner. How does one do it in an unusual manner? Said Rav Chisda: Little by little. Yet they agree that shasis may be stirred round on the Shabbos, and Egyptian beer may be drunk. But you said that we must not mix? — There is no difficulty: the one treats of a thick mass; the other of a loose [one]. And that is only if he does it in an unusual manner. How does one do it in an unusual manner? — Said Rav Yosef: During the week the vinegar is [first] poured in and then the shasis, whereas on the Shabbos the shasis is [first] poured in and then the vinegar. (155b – 156a)