

**Rovo said; he threw it into the mouth of a dog - אמר רבא זרק בפי כלב -**

### **Overview**

(בשוגג) ruled that if someone threw an object ד"א ברה"ר into the mouth of a dog he is חייב. Our גירסא clarifies the proper תוספות.

לא גרסינן ונחה<sup>1</sup> בפי כלב דנחה משמע מעצמה -

**Our texts do not read 'ונחה' (and it landed) בפי כלב, since ונחה implies that it landed by itself** meaning it happened to land בפי כלב, without his specific intention (rather the גירסא is בפי כלב זרק, which indicates that he threw it intentionally).

proves that ונחה means unintentionally:

כדאמר רבי יוחנן בפרק קמא (לעיל דף ה,א) זרק חפץ ונח לתוך ידו של חבירו חייב -

**As ר"י stated in the first פרק; 'one threw an object and it landed onto the hand of his friend, he is חייב** (since ידו של אדם חשובה לו כדע"ד) -

**ומסיק דקא משמע לן אף על גב דלא אחשביה לידיה<sup>2</sup> -**

**And the גמרא concludes there that ר"י is informing us that even though the זורק did not attach an importance to the hand,** nevertheless he is חייב since a person's hand is always considered as a מקום דע"ד.

**והכא מסיק דקא מכוין<sup>3</sup> ומחשבתו משויא ליה מקום:**

**And here the גמרא concludes that in the case of רבא, he did have intent** (that it should land בפי כלב), **so his intent creates the פי כלב to be considered a place of דע"ד** for a proper הנחה.

### **Summary**

The word נח is deleted for it implies that it landed there unintentionally.

### **Thinking it over**

According to our גירסא that רבא said ונח, how do we reply to proof?!<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In our גמרא texts it reads בפי כלב ונחה. See 'Thinking it over'.

<sup>2</sup> One might think that a person's hand is considered as a מקום ד' על ד' (as ר"י stated there previously) only when there is a specific intention to place the item in the hand (as in the first משנה on ב,א), but where it just happens to land in the hand without any intention, the hand should not be considered as a מקום דע"ד.

<sup>3</sup> Why is it that the גמרא there assumes that the case of ר"י is where אחשביה, and the case here by רבא is אחשביה; they both seemingly said the same thing. The difference must be that ר"י said ונח (which means אחשביה), however רבא did not say ונח so it means אחשביה.

<sup>4</sup> See footnote # 3 and ריטב"א החדשים.