

But eating a rope is unusual

והא חבל משונה הוא –

OVERVIEW

The גמרא cited the תרנגולין שהיו מחטטין בחבל of ברייתא to prove that בתר מעיקרא (which they were pecking at), but not (necessarily) for the דלי. The גמרא asked; why is he חייב a נ"ש for the חבל, since it is unusual for the תרנגולין to be מחטט בחבל, for it is not edible (he should only pay a ח"נ)? It seems from the גמרא that if we would maintain בתר (דלי), it would be understood; however even (and he pays a נ"ש for the דלי), בתר מעיקרא אזלינן, since it is משונה to be מחטט בחבל, he should still pay only a ח"נ for the דלי?! Our תוספות resolves this issue.

בשלמא אי אדלי קאי איכא לאוקמא בחבל גרוע וישן ובלוי -

It would be properly understood, if the payment of the נ"ש refers to the דלי, for then we could establish this ברייתא by an old rotten inferior rope -

דאורחיה הוא ליפסק בחטיטה מועטת שמחטטין למצוץ המים שבחבל² -

Where it is usual for it to be torn with (even) a slight pecking, which the chickens peck, in order to suck out some water which is absorbed by the rope -

אבל השתא דקאי אחבל על כרחך איירי בחבל חזק³ דשייכא ביה תשלום⁴ -

However now that we are saying that the payment of a נ"ש is referring to the rope; perforce we must say that we are discussing a strong rope, where payment is applicable.

דלי: the דלי refers to the נ"ש if the תוספות offers an alternate explanation why it is understood if the נ"ש refers to the דלי:

אי נמי אי אדלי קאי מצינו לפרש דנפסק היינו שהותר הקשר⁵ שהיה ביה הדלי קשור בחבל:
Or you may also say; if the נ"ש payment refers to the דלי; we can possibly

¹ That would explain why he is חייב a נ"ש for the דלי even though the תרנגולין were מחטטין in the חבל and were not touching the דלי.

² The pail was attached to an inferior worn out rope (which was wet from the well water), the chickens wanted to suck out the water from the rope (which is a normal case of שן), which tore immediately and the pail broke as a result. Therefore he pays a נ"ש for the דלי because this is a case of שן and we go מעיקרא בתר.

³ There is (almost) no value to speak of by an old worn out inferior rope (less than a פ"פ). See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

⁴ For the chickens to tear a strong rope it is certainly משונה and he should pay only a ח"נ.

⁵ We will again assume that the chickens were pecking the rope in order to suck out the water (see 'Thinking it over' # 2), and with a little pecking the knot became untied, so it is not משונה. However if they have to pay for the rope, we cannot interpret נפסק to mean untied (for there would be no damage done), but rather it must mean that it actually tore, and tearing a rope requires much pecking and is considered משונה.

interpret that **ונפסק** means that the knot, with which the pail was tied to the string, became untied.

SUMMARY

It is not **משונה** for chickens to peck on a string (to suck out its absorbed water) and either tearing it (if it is worn) or untying it.

THINKING IT OVER

1. **תוספות** explains that initially we assumed that he pays only for the **דלי** and not for the **חבל** (since it is **גרוע וכו'**).⁶ Why then does that **בריייתא** mention **ונפסק החבל** (if there is no payment for the **חבל**), it should have merely stated **תרגולין שהיו מחטטין בחבל** **הדלי ונשבר הדלי**?⁷

2. In **תוספות** second answer is it necessary to assume that they were pecking for water,⁸ or can we say they were just pecking and the rope became untied?

⁶ See footnote # 3.

⁷ See # 55. **אוצר מפרשי התלמוד** and **תורת חיים**.

⁸ See footnote # 5. See **תפארת שמואל**.