

Winnowing

Source Sheet by Rabbi Federgrun

1. **שבת ע"ג ב** א.
היינו זורה היינו בורר היינו מרקד אביי ורבא דאמרי תרוייהו כל מילתא דהויא במשכן אע"ג דאיכא דמאי לה חשיב לה וליחשב נמי כותש אמר אביי שכן עני אוכל פתו בלא כתישה...

Shabbat 73b

The Gemara asks: The prohibited labor of **winnowing is the same as** the prohibited labor of **selecting**, which **is the same as** the prohibited labor of **sifting**. They are all identical in the manner in which they are performed and have the same objective: Separating food from the accompanying waste. Why was it necessary to list them all? An answer was provided by **Abaye and Rava, who both said** and established a principle: **Any manner of labor that was performed in the Tabernacle**, for the purposes of the Tabernacle, **even though there is a different labor that is similar to it**, the mishna **enumerated it**. Every labor that was performed in the Tabernacle is significant. The Gemara asks: **And let him enumerate** the labor of **pounding as well**, as wheat was pounded to remove its outer kernel in the Tabernacle. **Abaye said**: The labor of pounding is not one of the essential stages in the baking of bread, **as paupers eat their bread without pounding** the wheat to remove the bran. Therefore, since the *tanna* enumerated threshing, there was no need to include pounding among the labors enumerated in the breadmaking process...

2. **רש"י על שבת ע"ג ב** ב.
ה"ג היינו זורה היינו בורר היינו מרקד - היינו כמו הי ניהו כלומר דמפליג להו תנא דמתניתין לתלת והלא כולן מלאכה אחת הן דמפריש אוכל מן הפסולת:

Rashi on Shabbat 73b

This is the correct transcript: winnowing, selecting, and sifting are all the same? As if to say- what is the forbidden activity that the Mishnah categorizes these three as different categories? Aren't they all the same that one is separating desirable from undesirable.

3. **תלמוד ירושלמי שבת מ"ט א** ג.
רקק והפריחתו הרוח חייב משום זורה וכל דבר שהוא מחוסר לרוח חייב משום זורה:

Jerusalem Talmud Shabbat 49a

There is a violation of winnowing if one spits and the wind scatters it . Anything that decreases from the wind is a violation of winnowing.

4. **בבא קמא ס' א** ד.
 לבתה הרוח כולן פטורין: ת"ר ליבה ולבתה הרוח אם יש בלבוייו כדי ללבותה חייב
 ואם לאו פטור אמאי ליהוי כזורה ורוח מסייעתו...רב אשי אמר כי אמרינן זורה ורוח
 מסייעתו ה"מ לענין שבת דמלאכת מחשבת אסרה תורה אבל הכא גרמא בעלמא הוא
 וגרמא בנזקין פטור:

Bava Kamma 60a

§ The mishna teaches: If **the wind fanned** the flames, **all** the people involved **are exempt**, indicating that even if one fanned the fire at the same time that the wind was blowing he is exempt. The Gemara cites a *baraita* in which **the Sages taught** the same idea explicitly: In a case where **one fanned** the flame **and** at the same time **the wind** fanned it, **if his fanning has** sufficient strength by itself **to fan** the flames, he is **liable** for damage caused by the fire, since even without the wind the fire would have spread. **But if** his fanning alone was **not** sufficient, he is **exempt**. The Gemara asks: **Why** is he exempt if his fanning is not sufficient? **Let it be** the same *halakha* **as** the case of one who **winnows** grain on Shabbat by throwing it into the air, **and the wind assists him** by separating the chaff from the grain. In such a case he is liable for desecrating Shabbat, despite the fact that without the assistance of the wind he would not have been able to winnow the grain... **Rav Ashi said: When we say** that one is liable in a case where he **winnows and the wind assists him, this statement applies with regard to the halakhot of Shabbat**. With regard to Shabbat, the principle is **that the Torah prohibited planned, constructive labor**. The primary consideration is that his objective is accomplished, even if he did not perform the entire act of labor. **But here,** in the context of damages, **he is** considered to have caused damage **merely** through **indirect** action, **and** one who causes **damage** through **indirect** action is **exempt**.

5. **רש"י על בבא קמא ס' א** ה.
 מלאכת מחשבת - נתקיימה מחשבתו דניחא ליה ברוח מסייעתו:

Rashi on Bava Kamma 60a

constructive act- his intention was fulfilled as he wanted the wind to help him.

6. **פסקי הראש על בבא קמא ו' י"א:א'** ו.
 דהתם מלאכת מחשבת אסרה תורה אע"פ דלא הוי אלא גרמא בעלמא בהכי חייבה
 תורה כיון דמלאכה זו עיקר עשייתה ע"י רוח. אבל הכא גרמא בעלמא וגרמא בנזקין
 פטור:

Rosh on Bava Kamma 6:11:1

Over there [by shabbos] the Torah said a constructive act is forbidden, and even though this is indirect, it is still forbidden because the main way to perform this action is with the wind. But, here [by damages] it is indirect and there is an exemption when it is indirect.

7. **רבינו חננאל (שבת עד.)** ז.
וניפח בה ברוח פיו ובירר חשוב הוא כזורה.

Rabbeinu Channanel (Shabbos 74a)

And when one blows with his mouth and separates then that is viewed as winnowing.

8. **משנה תורה, הלכות שבת ח':י"א** ח.
(יא). שְׁהִזְזָה וְהִבְוִיר וְהִמְרִקָה דֹמִין עֲנִיָּיָהֶם זֶה לָזֶה. וּמִפְּנֵי מָה מָנוּ אוֹתָן בְּשִׁלְשָׁה מִפְּנֵי שֶׁכָּל מְלָאכָה שֶׁהִיָּתָה בְּמִשְׁכָּן מוֹנִין אוֹתָהּ בְּפָנֵי עֲצָמָהּ:

Mishneh Torah, Sabbath 8:11

because the labors of winnowing, separating, and sifting resemble each other. [If so,] why were they reckoned as three [separate categories? Because every labor that was performed in the Sanctuary is counted as a separate category.

9. **אורח חיים שי"ט:י"ז** ט.
הגה הרוקק ברוח בשבת והרוח מפזר הרוק חייב משום זורה [מהרי"ל בשם א"ז וירושלמי פרק כלל גדול]:

Shulchan Arukh, Orach Chayim 319:17

Rama: One has violated winnowing when one spits into the wind, and the wind scatters the spit.



Made with the Sefaria Source Sheet Builder
www.sefaria.org/sheets