

# CHAVRUTA

## SHABBAT – DAF KUF NUN HEH

Translated by: *Rabbi Avraham Rosenthal*  
Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

...a peg into a tree, and hung on it, the peg, a basket, and placed the food of the *eiruv* in the basket. If he hung it **above** the height of **ten tefachim**,<sup>1</sup> **his eiruv is not an eiruv**. This is because his true intention was to make his Shabbat residence on the ground under the tree, which is a public domain, and not in the tree itself. Whereas the basket, which is higher than ten *tefachim*, is considered a private domain—as generally a basket measures four *tefachim*. And anything that is four *tefachim* wide and ten *tefachim* high is a private domain. Consequently, he cannot take and eat his food on Shabbat. For by doing so he is transferring from a private to a public domain. Since it is food that he cannot eat, he cannot acquire a Shabbat residence with it.

And if he hung the *eiruv* on the tree **below the height of ten tefachim**, **his eiruv is an eiruv**, since the basket does not become a private domain if it is less than ten above the ground. Consequently, he and his *eiruv* are in a public domain and he may take it and eat it.

The Gemara infers: **The reason** that it is permissible to take the *eiruv* from the basket, and it is not considered to be using the tree (which is forbidden), is because **he stuck a peg into the tree** and hung the basket on it. The peg is considered the side of the tree, and the suspended basket is considered the side of the side of the tree, so when he takes the *eiruv*, he is only using the side of the side.

**However**, if **he did not stick** a peg into the tree, but he hung the basket on the tree, the basket becomes the side of the tree and it is forbidden to take the *eiruv* from it, as he would be using the side of the tree. Therefore, **even** if he hung it **lower than ten tefachim**, **his eiruv is not an eiruv**, as whenever he cannot eat the food on Shabbat, it is not considered an *eiruv*.

---

<sup>1</sup> 1 *tefach*: 3.1 in., 8 cm

## **PEREK 24 – 155A**

The Gemara now concludes stating its point: **Note** that **this Tanna** does not validate the *eiruv* unless there is no peg. It must be **that he forbids** using **the sides**, and nevertheless he validates the *eiruv* when there is a peg, thus **he permits** using **the sides of the sides**. This is difficult for Rava who said, “the one that forbade the sides also forbids sides of sides.

**Said Rav Pappa:** In truth, that Tanna holds that sides are also permitted. And the reason why he speaks specifically where a peg was inserted is because **here, we are dealing with a narrow-mouthed basket**, and it is very difficult to get one’s hand into it. Therefore, if the basket is hanging on the tree itself, when he takes out the *eiruv* **he is moving the tree and he is thus using the tree itself**. This is why he only permits where a peg has been inserted and the basket is hanging from the peg. In this way he will not move the tree when he takes the *eiruv*.

**And** the Gemara concludes: **The Halachah is: Sides** of the tree **are forbidden** to use, **and the sides of sides are permitted** to use.

\*

**Said Rav Ashi:** Now that you said, “sides are forbidden” – **this *darga demadla***, a ladder used to reach the watchmen’s hut which is built on top of tall poles, next to a tree – **a person should not place it** (the ladder) **on the palm** tree, because **this is “sides.”** Consequently, when he ascends the ladder, he is using the sides of the tree. **Rather he should put it on the stake on the outside**, i.e the side, **of the palm** tree. Before Shabbat, he should insert a stake into the side of the tree and then he may place the ladder on that. Thus he is using the side of the side, which is permissible.

**And when he climbs** the ladder, **he should not place his foot on the stake** that is inserted into the palm tree, as by doing so he is using the sides of the tree. **Rather, he should place** his foot on the rungs of the ladder or **on the pegs** that protrude from the poles upon which the hut is built.

## PEREK 24 – 155A

### MISHNAH

**They may untie *peki'in* (bundles) of straw in front of the animal** to eat on Shabbat.

**And they may spread *kipin*** (this will explained in the Gemara) in front of the animal, as this is normal procedure, since when they are packed together they get warm and the animal will not eat it.

**But** they may **not** spread before the animal *zeradin* (this will be explained in the Gemara).

**They do not crush** on Shabbat **neither the unripe grain, nor the carobs, in front of an animal, whether a small animal, i.e., sheep, and whether a large animal, i.e., cows.** The Gemara will explain the reason.

**Rabbi Yehudah permitted** crushing **carobs for a small animal.**

### GEMARA

It was stated in the Mishnah: They untie *peki'in* of straw in front of the animal to eat on Shabbat. And they spread *kipin* but not *zeradin*.

**Said Rav Huna: *Peki'in* and *kipin* are the same.** They are both bundles of straw. The difference between them is that *peki'in* are tied with **two** knots and *kipin* are tied with **three** knots.

But *zeradin* are not the same species, rather they are moist branches **of a cedar** tree.

## **PEREK 24 – 155A**

**And this is what the Mishnah is saying: They untie *peki'in* of straw in front of the animal and they even spread** them before it. It is permissible to toil over it, since even when the straw is bundled it is still food. He is only untying and spreading them in order to make them better.

**And the same applies to *kipin*,** that they untie and spread them, even if they are tied with three knots and it is more difficult, nevertheless it is permissible since it was originally food.

**But not the *zeradin*** – in this case, they did not permit **neither to spread nor to untie**, because originally, they were not meant for food. So when they untie and spread them, they are turning it into food which is forbidden because he is creating food on Shabbat.

**Said Rav Chisda: What is the reason of Rav Huna?** Because **he holds that to toil over food, we toil**, but **to turn it into food, we do not do**, as it is forbidden because of *molid*, creating a new entity.

\*

**Rav Yehudah said:** This is not the explanation of the Mishnah: Rather, ***peki'in* and *zeradin* are the same**, and both are bundles of tied straw. ***Peki'in*** are tied with **two** knots and ***zeradin*** are tied with **three** knots.

And ***kipin*** are not the same species, rather branches **of cedar**.

**And this is what the Mishnah is saying: They may untie *peki'in* of straw in front of the animal, but they may not spread** them. For as long as they are tied, they are not food. But they may be untied, so as not to cause the animals pain. Whereas to spread them is forbidden, as even without this it is edible for them. Spreading is only for the animal's enjoyment, and anything that is already food, it is forbidden to toil over on Shabbat in order to make it better.

***Kipin***, since without spreading it is not considered food, **they may also spread**, as turning it into food is permissible.

## **PEREK 24 – 155A**

**But not zeradin**, as they did not permit to spread them, but only to untie them, as they have the same status as *peki'in*.

**Said Rava: What is the reason of Rav Yehudah? He holds the view: to turn it into food, we do**, since if there is no food for the animal, it is in pain. But once it has food to eat, we may not do further acts: **to toil over food, we do not toil**, since it is only for pleasure.

\*

**It was taught in the Mishnah: They do not crush neither the unripe grain, nor the carobs, in front of an animal, whether small and whether large.**

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **Is it not that “carobs” are similar to “unripe grain?” Just like unripe grain** which is soft and edible, **so too** it is speaking of **carobs that are soft**. And since they are considered food even before crushing, the crushing is only for pleasure.

**It follows** that even though it is already food, it is forbidden to crush them, because **we do not toil over food**. **And this is a refutation to Rav Huna** who said that we do toil over food.

The Gemara answers: **Rav Huna would say to you:** The Mishnah is **not** speaking of this, rather of hard carobs which are not edible without crushing. **Unripe grain** is also **similar to carobs**. **Just like carobs are hard**, i.e., they are dry, **also the unripe grain is hard**.

The Gemara asks: **How do you find it**, i.e. in what case do you find hard unripe grain?

The Gemara answers: **Small donkey foals**, as the unripe grain is too hard for them to eat (although it is soft as regards most animals) and it needs crushing so they can eat it.

Since without crushing it is not food, it is forbidden to crush it because of “*molid*.”

\*

## PEREK 24 – 155A

Come and hear a proof from the Mishnah: **Rabbi Yehudah permitted** crushing carobs for a **small** animal. This indicates that for a **small** animal, **yes**, but to crush carobs for a **large** animal, he did **not** permit.

The Gemara clarifies the case: **It is all right if you say** like Rav Yehudah that we are dealing with soft carobs. Then the **first Tanna holds** that they may not crush because **we do not toil over food, and we** only allow **turning it** into food. Then **this is what Rabbi Yehudah said:** it is permissible to crush **carobs for a small** animal. As he holds that even soft carobs are inedible for small animals without crushing, so it is not toiling over food, rather **it is turning it into food** and it is permissible.

**But if you say** like Rav Huna that we are dealing with hard carobs, and the **first Tanna holds that we may not turn it into food, and we** only **toil over food**, it must be that Rabbi Yehudah holds that it is food, and he is not turning it into food, rather he is toiling over food. If so, why does **Rabbi Yehudah permit** to crush **carobs only for small** animals? **Certainly**, he should permit **for a large** animal, because if it is fitting for a small animal, it is certainly fitting for a large animal.

The Gemara answers: **Do you think** that when Rabbi Yehudah permitted for a **small** animal, he meant only for **an actual small** animal? This is not true. Rather, **what** is meant by a **small** animal? A **large** animal. Rabbi Yehudah permits only for a large animal, since he holds that even hard carobs are fitting for it to eat without any processing, and crushing does not turn it into food. Rather it is toiling for food, and permitted.

**And why does he call it a small** animal? This is **because it chews its food** and grinds it well in its mouth, so it does not need crushing. (In Hebrew, a small animal is referred to as “*beheimah dakah*.” In Aramaic, the word for chewing is “*daika*.” Due to the similarity between “*dakah*” and “*daikah*,” Rabbi Yehudah referred to a large animal is “*dakah*.”) However, a small animal which cannot grind its food in its mouth unless the food is crushed, the crushing is considered like turning it into food, and is forbidden.

\*

## **PEREK 24 – 155B**

The Gemara raises further difficulty: **And note that from what was taught in the first clause**, that the first Tanna forbade **both small and large animals**, and there “small” and “large” are to be understood literally, **this implies that when Rabbi Yehudah** said “small,” he meant **actually small**, as Rabbi Yehudah was referring to what the first Tanna had said.

The Gemara concludes: This is **difficult** to answer.

\*

**Come and hear** a proof from a Mishnah: **They may cut...**

### **AMMUD BET**

...the harvested **gourds in front of the animal**. Even though they are meant for human consumption, we do not forbid them for animal fodder because of *muktzeh*.

**And** they also may cut **the carcass in front of the dogs**.

The Gemara asks: **Is it not referring** to soft gourds, similar to a carcass? **Just like a carcass** which is **soft** even before cutting, **so too** we are dealing with **gourds that are soft** originally.

And even though they are food even before cutting, it is permissible to cut them. **It follows that we toil over food** on Shabbat. **And this is a refutation to Rav Yehudah** who said: We turn it into food, but we do not toil over food.

The Gemara answers: **Rav Yehudah would say to you:** We are **not** speaking about this, rather about hard gourds, which without cutting are inedible for animals. And we are speaking **where the carcass is similar** to the gourds. **Just like the gourds are hard**, so

## **PEREK 24 – 155B**

**too the carcass is hard**, and since they are not fitting without cutting, it is permissible to cut them, because we allow to turn it into food.

\*

The Gemara asks: **And how do you find it**, where is there such a case, that the carcass is not fitting because it is hard?

The Gemara answers: It is found with **elephant meat**.

**Or else**, we are dealing here with **small pups**, where all carcasses will be hard for them, and it is not considered food unless they would cut it.

\*

**Come and hear** a proof from a Baraita: **Rav Chanan of Nahardea taught: They crumble the straw and the fodder and mix** them together and give it to the animal to eat, as the animal will not eat the straw by itself, only when mixed with fodder.

Now, straw and fodder each by itself is edible, and nevertheless, we permit crumbling and mixing. **It follows that we toil with food**. This is difficult for Rav Yehudah who said we do not toil.

The Gemara answers: We are dealing with straw and fodder that are not edible unless crumbled and mixed. With **straw**, we find this to be true **with hard straw**, which the animal cannot eat unless mixed with fodder. Also the fodder requires crumbling, as we are dealing with **donkey foals** which cannot chew hard fodder and it needs to be softened.



## **PEREK 24 – 155B**

### MISHNAH

**They may not force-feed a camel** on Shabbat.

*Ha'vasah* is stuffing a lot of food down the throat of an animal against its will, until the animal virtually has a “trough” (*eivus* in Hebrew) in its stomach. This is forbidden because of a decree that he might come to crush legumes or knead flour.

**And they also may not cram** it on Shabbat. *Doreis* is to stick barley into the animal's throat, although he does not stick it with same force as *ha'avasah*.

**But they may put food down its throat** on Shabbat. The Gemara explains the term *hal'atah*.

**And they also may not fatten the calves** on Shabbat.

“*Hamra'ah*” is sticking the food so deep that they cannot bring it back up.

**But they may put food down their throats** on Shabbat.

**And they may force-feed chickens** on Shabbat.

*Halkatah* is the same as *hal'atah*, except that the former is done to chickens and the latter to animals.

**They may place water on the coarse bran** on Shabbat for animal fodder.

**But they may not knead it**, the bran with water.

**And they may not place water before the bees and before the pigeons in the dovecot** on Shabbat. The reason will be explained in the Gemara.

## **PEREK 24 – 155B**

**But they may place water before geese and chickens and before Herodian pigeons.**

Rashi says they are called this because of the name of the area from where they come, while Rambam explains that King Herod raised them.

### **GEMARA**

It was stated in the Mishnah: They may not force-feed a camel.

The Gemara asks: **What is “they may not force-feed”** (*ovsin*)?

**Said Rav Yehudah: They may not make for it** (the animal) **a trough in its stomach**, by stuffing it with a lot of food.

The Gemara is puzzled: **Is there such a situation** that its stomach will expand like a trough?

The Gemara answers: **Yes**, such a thing can happen, **and as Rav Yirmiyah of Difti said: I saw a certain Arab that fed** his camel a *cor*<sup>2</sup> of food **and** he also **loaded** on its back another *cor* of food for the camel to eat, aside from the rest of the load.

\*\*\*

It was stated in the Mishnah: **They may not fatten** the calves but they may put food down their throats.

The Gemara asks: **Which is fattening** that is forbidden, **and which is putting food down its throat** that is permitted?

---

<sup>2</sup> 1 *cor*: 66 gal, 249 l.

## **PEREK 24 – 155B**

**Said Rav Yehudah: Fattening** is when they stick the food into the animal **to the place where it cannot bring it back** and spit it out, and **putting food down its throat** is sticking the food **in the place where it can bring it back**.

**And Rav Chisda said: This and that** (fattening and putting food down its throat) are sticking the food **to the place where it cannot bring it back**. Rather, **fattening** is sticking it **with a utensil**, and **putting food down its throat** is sticking it **by hand**.

**Rav Yosef contradicted** him, from a Baraita: **They may force-feed chickens** on Shabbat, **and it is unnecessary to say that they may feed** them. **And they may not feed pigeons of the dovecot and pigeons of the attic, and it is unnecessary to say that they may not force-feed** them.

The Gemara asks: **What is force-feeding and what is feeding?**

**If you say force-feeding** is **where he feeds it**, i.e., the chicken, and with his **hands** places the food **into its mouth**, and **feeding** is **throwing it**, the food, **before it**, the chicken, and it eats by itself, **this implies that pigeons of the dovecot and pigeons of the attic**, where it was taught that they do not feed, even **throwing before them** so that they should eat on their own, we **also may not** do. This cannot be true, as it is obvious that it is permissible to put the food in front of them, as this involves no special trouble.

**But rather**, both feeding and force-feeding are cases of feeding the chickens by hand. **Force-feeding** is sticking the food in its throat **to a place where it cannot bring it back**, and **feeding** is sticking it **to a place where it can still bring it back**.

From the fact that we permit force-feeding with chickens even to place where it cannot bring it back, it follows that it is permissible to do this to an animal as well. **This implies that fattening**, that we forbid to do to an animal, is only because it is done **with a utensil**, but to do so by hand is called putting food down its throat and is permissible even to a place where it cannot bring it back. For putting food down its throat and force-feeding are the same. **And this is a refutation to Rav Yehudah**, who said that putting food down its throat, which we permit, is only to a place where it can bring it back.

## **PEREK 24 – 155B**

The Gemara answers: **Rav Yehudah would say to you: In truth, force-feeding is where he feeds it with his hands and feeding is where he throws it in front of them.** And both are to a place where it can bring it back. **And that point which was difficult for you**—why it is forbidden to throw before the **pigeons of the dovecot and pigeons of the attic**—this is not difficult. For only **these**, i.e., chickens, it is permitted to give them food, **because** the obligation for **their sustenance is on you**, i.e. they depend on you for their sustenance. Whereas **those**, i.e. the dovecot and attic pigeons, the obligation for **their sustenance is not on you**. They can find food in the fields, therefore it is forbidden even to put food before them.

As it was taught in a Baraita: On Shabbat **they may place food in front of a dog, and they may not place food in front of a pig.**

**And what is the distinction between them? This** (the dog), the obligation for **his food is on you, and that** (the pig), the obligation for **his food is not on you** since it is forbidden to raise them. For the Sages said: Cursed is the Jew that raises pigs.

**Said Rav Ashi: It is also implied by the Mishnah** that this is so, as was taught: **And they may not place water before the bees and before the pigeons in the dovecot, but they may place before geese and chickens and before Herodian pigeons.**

**What is the reason? Is it not because these** (chickens), **their sustenance is on you, and those** (bees and dovecot pigeons) **their sustenance is not on you?** It follows that it is totally forbidden to place food in front of animals who do not depend on you for their sustenance.

The Gemara dismisses this: **And according to your reasoning**, if it is because their sustenance is not on you, **why did the Tanna speak of specifically water?** The Tanna should have taught that **even wheat and barley**, they **also may not** place before them. **Rather**, we could say that one may feed even animals whose sustenance is not on him. And **water is different**. One may not put it out for them because **it is found in lakes**, whereas food is not so readily available for them.

## **PEREK 24 – 155B**

\*\*\*

**Rabbi Yonah expounded at the door of the House of the Nasi: What is the meaning of that which is written (Mishlei<sup>3</sup> 29:7), “The righteous one knows the status of the poor.”** This is its explanation: **The Holy One knows about the dog, that its sustenance is scanty** and difficult to find, since people do not give it too much food. **Therefore, He made it that its food should remain in its stomach** and not be digested for **three days**.

**As it was taught** in a Mishnah: If a dog eats the flesh of a dead body and then the dog dies in a house, the house receives “impurity of *ohel*,”<sup>4</sup> and everything in the house becomes impure, because of the flesh of the dead person inside the dog’s carcass.

(However, as long as the dog is alive, the flesh of the dead person does not impart impurity since “swallowed impurity” inside a live creature does not impart impurity.)

**How long does his eating** of the flesh of the dead person **remain in its stomach, during which time, if it the dog dies, the house will be impure** due to *ohel*? **With a dog, until three days composed of twenty-four hours,**<sup>5</sup> as until then the flesh that he ate is still in his stomach. But afterwards it has been digested and no longer exists.

**And with birds and fish** that ate flesh of a dead person, the flesh only remains in their stomachs the **amount** of time **that** a piece of meat **falls into a fire and burns up**.

\*

**Said Rav Hamnuna:** From the fact that the Holy One took into consideration the sustenance of a dog, we **hear from it that it is proper to throw raw meat to a dog**.

**And how much** is the amount that one should throw before it?

---

<sup>3</sup> Proverbs  
lit. “tent”<sup>4</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Lit. From time to time, i.e., **from** a specific **time** on one day **to** the same **time** on the next day.

## **PEREK 24 – 155B**

**Said Rav Mari:** A small amount like the size of its ear, and not more, and a stick after it. Meaning, after giving it meat, hit it with a stick so it will not be accustomed to come to you.

**And these words** that it is proper to give it food is **in the field. But in the city do not** give it anything, unless it is his dog, **because** by feeding it, the dog will **come to follow** him.

\*

**Said Rav Pappa:** There is nothing poorer than a dog, as its sustenance is not readily available.

**And there is nothing wealthier than a pig,** because it can eat anything, and anywhere it goes it finds something to eat.

\*\*\*

We return to the disagreement between Rav Yehudah and Rav Chisda, what is called fattening and what is called putting food down its throat.

**It was taught** in a Baraita like **Rav Yehudah: Which is fattening and which is putting food down its throat?**

**Fattening, he makes it kneel and props open its mouth** with a bit, so it cannot close it **and feeds it fodder and water at the same time.** The water makes it swallow the fodder against its will.

**Putting food down its throat, he feeds it** while it is **standing and waters it** while it is **standing. And they give it fodder by itself and water by itself,** not simultaneously.

Since it is not kneeling, he cannot stick it deep enough to the place where it cannot bring it back. This concurs with Rav Yehudah.

\*\*\*

## **PEREK 24 – 155B**

It was stated in the Mishnah: **They may do force-feeding to chickens** and they may put water in the coarse bran but they may not knead.

**Said Abaye: I said this before the Master (Rabbah): Our Mishnah**, which implies that the prohibition of Kneading does not apply to merely adding water to flour without mixing them, **who is** the Tanna who stated this view?

**And Rabbah said to me: It is Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah.**

**As it was taught** in a Baraita: If **one places the flour, and another places into it the water**, or the first one put the water and then the second one put the flour into it, the one who put in **last is liable**. This is because putting water into flour or flour into water constitutes the forbidden work of Kneading, even without mixing it. These are the **words of Rabbi**, i.e. Rabbi Yehudah Hanasi.

**Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah says: He is not liable** for kneading **until he kneads**.

The Gemara dismisses this: **Perhaps, Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah said this far over there** i.e. stated his lenient ruling that it requires kneading **only as regards flour, because it is kneadable**, and since that is what is normally done, it is not considered kneading until it is actually kneaded. **But bran, which is not kneadable**, perhaps **even Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah agrees** that just putting in the water is considered kneading, since that is how it is generally done.

The Gemara answers: **Do not think** that flour and bran are treated differently, **for it was taught** in a Baraita **explicitly** that they disagree even with regard to bran.

As it was taught: **They may not put water into bran**, these are the **words of Rabbi**.

**Rabbi Yosi bar Yehudah says: They may put water into bran**, because as long as he does not knead, there is no prohibition of kneading.

\*

**The Rabbis taught** in a Baraita: **They may not knead** flour of **roasted grain**.

## **PEREK 24 – 155B**

**And some say: They may knead** the flour of roasted grain.

The Gemara asks: **Who** are the Tannaim referred to by “**some say**”?

**Said Rav Chisda:**