- לא נצרכא אלא לפחת נבילה

It was not necessary...only for the depreciation of the carcass

OVERVIEW

The גמרא explained that according to the מ"ד פלגא נזקא (meaning that in reality the מזיק should be משנה and the ניזק will not receive anything), when the משנה states 1 חצי נזק (והמזיק) שי are (not discussing the חצי, 2 but rather we are) referencing the פחת נבילה that occurs between the time of damage and the time of going to court. This depreciation is the loss of the גיזק, and that is his contribution to the 'payment'. תוספות will explain why accepting this פחת נבילה is considered as a payment by the ניזק; if he is basically not entitled to receive any payment at all.

חוספות anticipates a question:

אף על גב דשקיל דלאו דידיה -

Even though the ניזק is taking what is not rightfully his; for since פלגא נזקא קנסא, the is not entitled to any payment. Why therefore does the משנה state הניזק (והמזיק) בתשלומין; for even though the ניזק suffers the מזיק, however the מזיק never owed him anything in the first place! Why is it considered as if the ניזק is contributing something? He only gains!

תוספות answers:

מכל מקום כיון דזכייה ליה רחמנא חצי נזק -

Nevertheless, once the תורה entitled the ניזק to receive a "" -

חשבינן ליה דאיתיה בתשלומין מה שפחת נבילה עליו –

We do consider that the ניזק is contributing, in the payment process, his loss of the depreciation of the גבילה. Once the חורה grants the ניזק a חצי נוק he is entitled to the entire הצי נזק. Any loss of this חצי נזק (such as the פחת נבילה) is considered as payment by the ניזק.

מוספות] anticipates an additional difficulty⁴ (which has already been resolved):]

ולא מצי אמר ליה למזיק קרנא דתורך קבירא ביה כדפירישית לעיל [י,ב ד"ה לא נצרכא]:

¹ The ניזק also contributes to the payment (by accepting a lesser amount than he is entitled to).

² The הצי נזק which the ניזק does not receive cannot be considered his contribution, since he should not receive anything at all.

³ See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

⁴ תוספות may be bothered why is the פחת גבילה considered that the גיזק part of the תוספות. The ox was killed; the belongs to the נבילה. Whatever loss the ניזק incurs afterwards (the נבילה), should (seemingly) be considered a loss that any person would have if he fails to protect his property. The ניזק failed to sell his ox as soon as it was killed, therefore it is his loss. Why should this loss be attributed to משלומין of the ניזק towards the היזק?! See following footnote # 5 and 'Thinking it over' # 2.

(And) [For] the ניזק cannot say to the מזיק, 'the horn of your ox is buried in my cow', and therefore (the horn of) your ox is causing the depreciation, and you, the מזיק, should suffer the depreciation loss.⁵ This claim of the ניזק will not be honored as I explained previously.⁶

SUMMARY

The ניזק is entitled to the פלגא נזקא (once the תורה awarded it to him) and therefore the loss of פהת נבילה is considered a contribution of payment on behalf of the ניזק.

THINKING IT OVER

- 1. How did תוספות view the payment of פלגא נזקא הוספות in his (initial) question as opposed to תוספות view in the answer? 7
- 2. Is there any connection between the last question (and answer) of תוספות, 8 and the previous discussion in this תוספות? 9

⁸ See footnote # 4.

⁵ תוספות explains that this loss of פחת נבילה is considered ניזק for the היזק for the ניזק, since the ניזק can claim that the מזיק is causing this loss for מזיק הבירא דתורך קבירא מזיק is continually causing the deterioration of the killed ox. This loss however must be paid for by the ניזק as תוספות concludes.

 $^{^6}$ אוספות explained there that only in a case where the cow was wounded and its condition deteriorated, do we say the suffers the depreciation, for the מזיק was hoping that the cow would improve. However, when the cow died, the ניזק should have sold it immediately, and if he did not, the ניזק suffers the loss.

⁷ See footnote # 3.

 $^{^{9}}$ See חי' ר"נ אות תקלג and בל"י אות תקלג.