

And he is a damager

והוה ליה מזיק¹ -

Overview

איקא said that the ברייתא can mean that the לוקח collects from the מוכר retracted (not only מעידית שבה); since the ניזק suffered a loss,² we consider the מוכר to be a מזיק, so the לוקח (the לוקח) collects שבנכסיו. Our תוספות qualifies this categorization.

לאו דוקא מזיק שהרי אין שמין כפי הנזק שהזיקו שהרי אינו משלם אלא כפי המעות שקבל -
The מוכר is not a מזיק precisely, for we do not assess him according to the loss which he damaged him, for the מוכר does not pay (for the damage he caused),³ but only according to the money which he received (the two hundred זוז).

אלא קצת דימוהו למזיק ליטול חובו מן העידית:
Rather, when we say that the מוכר is a מזיק we mean that he is somewhat compared to a מזיק to the extent that the לוקח can collect his debt from עידית.

Summary

The מוכר, by causing damage to the לוקח, allows the לוקח to collect from עידית שבנכסיו.

Thinking it over

Why indeed does the מוכר not pay him for the loss which he caused?!⁴

¹ In our text, the גמרא reads (והוה ליה כניזק) (not והוה ליה מזיק).

² Presumably, the לוקח, in order to raise cash for this large purchase had to sell his assets at a discount; so now that he is not getting the (entire) field he suffers the loss of the discounted items that he sold.

³ Let us assume that the לוקח sold two hundred and fifty זוז worth of merchandise for two hundred זוז (to purchase the field); the loss is fifty זוז. If we consider the מוכר a מזיק (for this loss) he would need to pay the לוקח (an additional) fifty זוז (from עידית), but not (merely) two hundred זוז from עידית! See 'Thinking it over'.

⁴ See # 27 אוצר מפרשי התלמוד וריטב"א (there seems to be some mistake in that footnote).