OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Using the side of an animal (cont.)

Rava's understanding of the dispute between the Tannaim of the Baraisa, namely, they disagree whether it is permitted to use the side of a tree, is unsuccessfully challenged by R' Mesharshiya.

The Gemara concludes: It is forbidden to use the side of a tree, but it permitted to use the "sides of sides" of a tree.

R' Ashi applies this ruling to a practical case.

2) MISHNAH: Different methods of preparing food for animals are presented.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Huna and R' Yehudah dispute the meaning of the words פקיעין, כיפין וזירין. R' Huna's underlying rationale is that it is permitted to exert oneself to improve an existing food, but it is prohibited to make a non-food item edible. R' Yehudah's underlying rationale is that it is permissible to make a non-food item edible but prohibited to exert oneself to improve an edible item. The Gemara initially fails at refuting R' Huna's position, but ultimately concludes that his position is difficult to maintain. The Gemara is unsuccessful in its two attempts to refute R' Yehudah's position.

4) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses permitted and prohibited methods of feeding animals on Shabbos.

5) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Yehudah explains the term אובסין used in the Mishnah to mean stuffing the animal with food.

According to R' Yehudah, המראה refers to putting food into the animal's throat to a point where it can not bring the food back up, and the term הלטעה refers to putting food into the animal's throat to a point where it can bring the food back up. According to R' Chisda, both terms refer to where the animal cannot bring the food back up and the difference between them is whether the food is put into the animal by hand or with an instrument.

R' Yosef unsuccessfully challenges R' Yehudah's position.

The Gemara cites a Baraisa that supports the conclusion that emerged from R' Yehudah's response to R' Yosef, namely, that it is prohibited to feed an animal that is not one's responsibility.

R' Ashi suggests that the language of the Mishnah indicates this principle but the suggestion is refuted.

The Gemara digresses to discuss issues related to dogs and their eating habits.

A Baraisa is cited that supports R' Yehudah's definition of הלטעה and המראה.

6) Mixing water and bran

Abaye identifies the author of the Mishnah, who holds that pouring water into bran does not violate the melacha of kneading, as R' Yosi bar Yehudah.

Another Baraisa is cited that records a dispute regarding mixing water into toasted grain flour. R' Chisda identifies the lenient opinion as R' Yosi bar Yehudah. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

Feeding stray dogs on Shabbos

שמע מינה אורח ארעא למשדא אומצא לכלבא – קנה:

We learn from here that it is proper to toss a piece of meat to a dog. – 155b

The Gemara discussed topics regarding food for various animals. The Gemara then cites Rebbe Yona who notes that the verse in Mishlei (29:7) refers to God's compassion for dogs. Because it is difficult for dogs to find their own food, God designed that the food they do find remains in their digestive system for three days. Based upon this observation, Rav Hamnuna adds a rule regarding dogs. He states, "Since God cares about dogs that they have enough food, it is proper for a person to toss a piece of meat to a dog.

Magen Avraham (O.C. 324:#7) writes that it is even a mitzvah to toss meat to a dog. Machatzis HaShekel explains that although the expression in the Gemara is that "it is proper to toss meat," Magen Avraham understood that it is, in fact, a mitzvah to do so, based upon the posuk (Devarim 28:9), "And you should go in His ways." Eliyahu Rabbah writes that this is perhaps not a mitzvah, but simply a proper gesture of decency.

Mahrasha explains that a lesson of this Gemara is that one should try to feed a dog, even if it does not belong to him, because if one owns a dog, the Baraisa earlier already stated that one is obliged to feed it, even on Shabbos. Magen Avraham notes that being that it is a mitzvah to feed a dog, even if it does not belong to him, this would be permitted on Shabbos. However, according to those who do not consider this to be a bona fide mitzvah, it would not be permitted to feed a stray dog on Shabbos. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. According to the Gemara's conclusion, what is the permitted method to attach a hammock to a tree?

2. What type of meat should not be fed to puppies?

3. Why is it prohibited to feed animals on Shabbos that are not dependent upon you for food?

4. If one person puts flour into a bowl and another puts water into the bowl, who is liable?

HALACHAH Highlight

The definition of Losh – Kneading[1]

...אלא קמח דבר גיבול הוא אבל מורס דלאו בר גיבול הוא...

Losh is defined as the combining of tiny particles into a solid or semisolid mass by means of a liquid medium. This is essentially what occurs when dough is made. Minute particles of flour melt and fuse together into a solid mass when water is added.

The two steps of Losh

The kneading process invariably occurs in two steps:

1) The liquid must first come in contact with the flour

2) The two are then mixed and blended with a kneading action.

According to some Poskim, the melacha of Losh begins with the first step, as soon as the liquid comes in contact with the flour (before any mixing). This is because the particles of flour begin to melt and fuse immediately on contact with the liquid. Since the principle of combining that characterizes Losh occurs the moment that the liquid comes in contact with the solid particles, it is then (according to this view) that the melacha is transgressed.

However, most Poskim explain that the melacha is technically transgressed only when the flour and water are mixed and kneaded into a dough or dough-like mixture (i.e. a solid mass that could be held as one piece) and not before. Thus, according to this view, the degree of bonding that occurs when the liquid comes in contact with the flour is not sufficient to constitute Losh.

This Halachic controversy is, in most cases, academic. In practice, both of these steps are usually prohibited.

Example:

It is prohibited to pour water on flour even without any mixing. It is likewise forbidden (even for a second person who did not add the water in the first place) to mix the water and flour into a dough!

While this Halachic dispute is primarily academic, there may still be instances where there are practical Halachic differences between the two steps of Losh as will be seen further.

Bar Gibul, Lav Bar Gibul

As explained earlier, Losh is the combining of minute particles by mixing with liquid. However, the Talmud distinguishes between two categories of particles:

"Bar Gibul" and "Lav Bar Gibul"

a) Bar Gibul

The term Bar Gibul generally refers to very fine particles that dissolve and fuse readily upon contact with liquid. The Bar Gibul category may include fine flour, powders, fine sand, instant potato flakes, baby cereals and the like.

b) Lav Bar Gibul

The term Lav Bar Gibul refers to particles that do not fuse in a mixture, either because of their largeness, or due to their nondegradable texture. This category includes coarse sand, ash, and according to some Poskim, coarse bran and coarse flour. Unlike fine flour and fine powder, these particles do not melt and fuse into a totally new mass in which the separate particles are entirely unrecognizable. They do, however, cling together as a uniformly solid mass, although the separate particles are still individually discernible.

c) The Halachic dispute regarding Lav Bar Gibul particles

According to some Poskim, the Melocho of Losh is not applicable to the Non-mixable category. According to this view, Losh can only occur when the particles mix and fuse into a mass in which each particle is no longer individually recognizable. Since ashes and coarse sand merely cling together when mixed with liquid, mixing them is not truly Losh. However, mixing ashes and the like with water would be a Rabbinical prohibition.

Most Poskim rule that Losh is fully applicable to non-mixable particles, and in some respects it applies more stringently than to the mixable category.

d) Conclusion

This Halachic dispute is almost entirely academic. According to either view, even merely adding liquid to (and certainly mixing) non-mixable particles is at least Rabbinically prohibited. ■

1 The 39 Melachos, by Rabbi Dovid Ribiat, pages 541-548. Used with permission of the author.

Gemara GEM

The song of the goose

אבל נותנים לפני האווזים וכו' דהני מזונותן עליך וכו'

Perek Shira lists the multitude of animals in creation and the various philosophical and ethical messages that can be learned from them. In reference to the wild goose, we find (Chapter 4:54): "Upon finding its food in the wilderness, it says, 'Cursed is the man who trusts in human beings...Blessed is the man who trusts in God, and God shall be his assurance.' " (Yirmiyahu 17:5,7)

R' Chaim Kanievski, shlit"a, explains this esoteric message of the wild goose based upon our Gemara. A domesticated goose, which has been trained to live among people, is not capable of finding its own food. If it is not fed by man, it will starve to death. It does not possess the instinct to be able to procure food on its own, as our Gemara reports, "The sustenance of the goose is dependent upon man." However, the wild goose has no one to feed it. It lives in the wild, and Hashem provides it with the ability to find food on its own. No one feeds it other than Hashem, and it survives.

We see, therefore, that the bird that is dependent upon man is cursed, in that it is weak and frail without direct assistance. The bird which trusts in no one other than in Hashem is truly blessed, as Hashem is reliable and trustworthy to provide its sustenance. As the Perek Shira notes, the message of the goose is that true blessing is realized when one trusts fully in Hashem. ■