

מאי שנה מזורה ורוח מסייעתו -

Why is this different from winnowing and the wind assists him

Overview

אשי asked why is the case of רבינא (regarding the flax) different from winnowing, where we say that he is חייב on שבת, even though the winnowing is accomplished (only) with the assistance of the wind. תוספות explains the differing views of רבינא and ר"א regarding this comparison.

ורבינא לא חשיב לה פירכא דסבר כי היכי דלא גמרינן משבת לענין תשלומין -
רבינא, however, does not consider this a challenge, for he maintains that just as we do not derive damages from שבת regarding payment -

כדמפרש רב אשי בהכונס¹ (בבא קמא דף ס,א ושם) דגבי שבת מלאכת מחשבת אסרה תורה -
As explained in הכונס that regarding שבת the תורה prohibited a 'thoughtful act' -

אבל הכא גרמא הוא וגרמא בנזקין פטור -
However here by damages it is merely a cause, and causing a damage is exempt from payment. Therefore, רבינא maintains, just as we cannot derive payment from the laws of שבת -
הכי נמי לא גמרינן מהתם שיהא חייב להרחיק -

Similarly, here too regarding the flax, we cannot derive from שבת that he should be obligated to distance -

ומר בר רב אשי סבר נהי דחייב תשלומין לא גמרינן -
And ר"א maintains that granted we cannot derive the obligation of payment from שבת (since גרמא בנזקין is פטור), however -

לענין הרחקה דליחשב גירי דיליה גמרינן שפיר כיון דגרמא בנזקין אסור:
Regarding distancing that it should be considered גירי דיליה, we can properly derive that from שבת since גרמא בנזקין (while it is פטור, nevertheless it) is אסור.

Summary

רבינא maintains that just like we cannot derive a חיוב from שבת, we cannot derive הרחקה, while ר"א maintains that while גרמא is indeed פטור but it is אסור.

¹ The גמרא there states that in a case of ליבה וליבתה הרוח (and the fire caused damage), if his fanning is not sufficient to set the blaze without the assistance of the wind he is פטור from paying. The גמרא asked why is this different from זורה where he is חייב? אשי responded that by שבת as long as his intent was fulfilled (he wanted to start a fire); it is considered מחשבת (even though he may only be considered a גרמא) and therefore he is חייב.

Thinking it over

Can we understand that something may be considered גירי דיליה and he is obligated להרחיק, but nevertheless he is פטור for the damage he caused, even though it is גירי דיליה? Alternately how can something be merely a גרמא and nevertheless it is גירי דיליה?!