

## That he threw it

## דאדייה אדויי –

### OVERVIEW

The גמרא explained that according to ר"ל it will be necessary to say that the dog threw the גחלת on the גדיש and that the בעל הכלב is liable to pay a ח"נ for the place the coal landed and was burnt, since it is צרורות of the dog. תוספות mentions that it was not necessary to say that the dog threw the גחלת (which is somewhat uncommon and not explicitly stated in the משנה).

הוה מצי לאוקמי באנח אנוחי על ידי שינוי<sup>1</sup> כדאמרינן<sup>2</sup> בריש פירקין:

The גמרא **could have established** the משנה according to ר"ל that we are discussing a case where the dog **placed** the גחלת on the גדיש **in an unusual manner**, as was **said in the beginning of our פרק**.

### SUMMARY

We can explain the ח"נ (on the הגחלת) since it was placed ע"י שינוי.

### THINKING IT OVER

Why indeed did the גמרא not offer תוספות solution?<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The בעל הכלב is חייב a ח"נ for the הגחלת since it was burnt ע"י שינוי (so it is a תולדה דקרן), but not because it is צרורות. The advantage of this explanation is that it may be more common for a dog to place something ע"י שינוי, than to say that the dog threw it, and we are not reinterpreting the משנה; see 'Overview'.

<sup>2</sup> יח, א.

<sup>3</sup> See תוס' רבינו פרץ.