דַּף יוֹמִי · עֲרָכִין · דַּף י״ד

Daf Yomi · The Full Daf · Elucidated Talmud · Navy & Gold Edition · with Rashi

📖 THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by completing the Gemara's discussion on why the Mishnah contrasts different types of Jews rather than comparing a Jew to a non-Jew. The Gemara explains that it is forbidden to praise the beauty of a non-Jew, and furthermore, the Tanna prefers to deal within a single nation. The Gemara also notes that the halachos of a sdeh achuzah, an ancestral field, apply specifically to a Jew who holds an inheritance in Eretz Yisrael.

Next, we start a new Mishnah that contrasts the fixed redemption rates of a sdeh achuzah with the market-value redemption of a sdeh miknah, a purchased field. The Gemara then enters a deep lomdishe shakla v'tarya regarding a case where someone consecrates a field filled with trees. We analyze the shita of Rav Huna, who holds that a person consecrates generously, and we examine various beraitos to clarify whether trees are redeemed separately at market value or together with the land at the Torah's standard fixed rate.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א׳ DAF 14A

EXPLANATION

מִלְּתָא אַגַּב אוֹרְחֵיהּ קָמַשְׁמַע לַן,

By omitting gentiles from the Mishnah, the Tanna **teaches us a matter in passing**,

PROOF

כִּדְרַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב,

in accordance with that which Rav Yehuda said that **Rav said**.

STATEMENT

דְּאָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב: אָסוּר לָאָדָם שֶׁיֹּאמַר ״כַּמָּה נָאֶה גּוֹי זֶה״.

For Rav Yehuda said that **Rav said: It is forbidden for a person to say, "How handsome is this gentile!"** Therefore, the Tanna avoided making a statement contrasting a handsome Jew with an ugly gentile, so as not to mention a gentile's beauty.

QUESTION

וְלֵיתְנֵי ״אֶת הַנָּאֶה שֶׁבְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֶת הַכָּעוּר שֶׁבַּגּוֹיִם״!

The Gemara asks: **But let** the Tanna **teach: "The handsomest among Israel and the ugliest among the gentiles"!** This wording would avoid praising a gentile's beauty!

ANSWER

בְּחַד אוּמָּה קָמַיְירֵי, בִּתְרֵי אוּמֵּי לָא מַיְירֵי.

The Gemara answers: The Tanna **is dealing with one nation**, namely Jews, and **he is not dealing with two nations**, contrasting Jews with gentiles.

OBJECTION

וְלָא? וְהָא קָתָנֵי: הַגְּדוֹלָה שֶׁבַּכְּהוּנָּה וְאֶת הַקְּטַנָּה שֶׁבְּיִשְׂרָאֵל!

The Gemara challenges: **And** does he **not** deal with two groups? **But isn't it taught** in a Mishnah later: One who rapes or seduces a young woman must pay fifty sela, whether she is **the most distinguished in the priesthood or the lowest in Israel**? Here he contrasts two distinct classes!

RESOLUTION

הָתָם חַד אוּמָּה הוּא, אֶלָּא מִקְדָּישׁ הוּא דְּקַדִּישִׁי כֹּהֲנִים טְפֵי.

The Gemara answers: **There it is one nation,** as **it is only that Kohanim are more holy** than ordinary Israelites, but they are all part of the same Jewish nation.

RESOLUTION

וְאִיבָּעֵית אֵימָא, אַיְידֵי דְּקָא בָּעֵי לְמִתְנֵי סֵיפָא "שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָּה",

And if you wish, say instead: **Since he wanted to teach in the latter clause** of our Mishnah the halachos regarding **an ancestral field,**

EXPLANATION

דִּבְיִשְׂרָאֵל הוּא דְּמַשְׁכַּחַתְּ לַהּ, בְּגוֹי לָא מַשְׁכַּחַתְּ לַהּ, דְּלָאו בְּנֵי אֲחוּזָּה נִינְהוּ,

which you find by an Israelite, but **you do not find by a gentile, as they are not subject to** holding **an ancestral field** in Eretz Yisrael,

EXPLANATION

מִשּׁוּם הָכִי קָתָנֵי לַהּ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל.

because of this he taught it exclusively **in** reference to **an Israelite.**

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מַתְנִי' בִּשְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָּה לְהָקֵל וּלְהַחֲמִיר, כֵּיצַד?

MISHNAH: With regard to **an ancestral field,** there are halachos **to lenient effect and to stringent effect. How so?**

MISHNAH

אֶחָד הַמַּקְדִּישׁ בְּחוֹלַת הַמָּחוֹז, וְאֶחָד הַמַּקְדִּישׁ בַּפַּרְדֵּיסוֹת סְבַסְטִי,

Whether one consecrates poor, sandy soil in **the sand-dunes of the Machoz, or whether one consecrates** rich land in **the orchards of Sevaste,**

MISHNAH

נוֹתֵן זֶרַע חוֹמֶר שְׂעוֹרִים בַּחֲמִשִּׁים שֶׁקֶל כָּסֶף,

he redeems it by paying the fixed rate set by the Torah: **an area required for sowing a chomer of barley for fifty silver shekels.** This is a leniency for rich land and a stringency for poor land.

MISHNAH

וּבִשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה נוֹתֵן אֶת שָׁוְויוֹ.

And in the case of a purchased field, he gives its actual market **value,** whether more or less than the fixed rate.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: אֶחָד שְׂדֵה מִקְנָה וְאֶחָד שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָּה,

Rabbi Eliezer says: Both a purchased field and an ancestral field are redeemed at the standard fixed rate.

MISHNAH

מָה בֵּין שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָּה לִשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה?

What then **is the difference between an ancestral field and a purchased field?**

MISHNAH

שֶׁבִּשְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָּה הוּא נוֹתֵן חוֹמֶשׁ, וּבִשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה אֵינוֹ נוֹתֵן חוֹמֶשׁ.

That by an ancestral field he adds a fifth when redeeming it himself, **and by a purchased field he does not add a fifth.**

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

גְּמָ׳ אָמַר רַב הוּנָא: הִקְדִּישׁ שָׂדֶה מְלֵיאָה אִילָנוֹת,

GEMARA: Rav Huna said: If one consecrated a field full of trees,

STATEMENT

כְּשֶׁהוּא פּוֹדֶן — פּוֹדֶה אִילָנוֹת בְּשָׁוְווִין,

when he redeems them, he redeems the trees according to their value,

STATEMENT

וְחוֹזֵר וּפוֹדֶה קַרְקַע בֵּית זֶרַע חוֹמֶר שְׂעוֹרִים בַּחֲמִשִּׁים שֶׁקֶל כֶּסֶף.

and then he goes back and redeems the land at the fixed rate of **an area required for sowing a chomer of barley for fifty silver shekels.**

INFERENCE

אַלְמָא קָסָבַר רַב הוּנָא: אָדָם מַקְדִּישׁ — בְּעַיִן יָפָה מַקְדִּישׁ.

The Gemara notes: **Evidently Rav Huna holds: A person who consecrates, consecrates generously.** Therefore he consecrated the trees separately from the land, requiring separate redemptions.

OBJECTION

אֵיתִיבֵיהּ רַב נַחְמָן לְרַב הוּנָא: אֶחָד הַמַּקְדִּישׁ בְּחוֹלַת הַמָּחוֹז, וְאֶחָד הַמַּקְדִּישׁ בְּפַרְדֵּיסוֹת סְבַסְטֵי, נוֹתֵן בֵּית זֶרַע חוֹמֶר שְׂעוֹרִים בַּחֲמִשִּׁים שֶׁקֶל כָּסֶף!

Rav Nachman raised an objection to Rav Huna from our Mishnah: **Whether one consecrates the sand-dunes of the Machoz or whether one consecrates the orchards of Sevaste, he gives an area for sowing a chomer of barley for fifty silver shekels!** This implies that even an orchard with trees is redeemed at the fixed rate without evaluating the trees separately!

ANSWER

אָמַר לֵיהּ: רְאוּיָה לְפַרְדֵּיסוֹת קָאָמִינָא.

Rav Huna **said to him: I mean land that is suitable for orchards,** but does not actually contain trees.

OBJECTION

אֵיתִיבֵיהּ: ״בֵּית זֶרַע״ — אֵין לִי אֶלָּא בֵּית זֶרַע, שְׂדֵה גְּפָנִים וּשְׂדֵה קָנִים וּשְׂדֵה אִילָנוֹת מִנַּיִן?

Rav Nachman **raised an objection to him** from a Braisa: The verse says regarding an ancestral field, **"an area fit for sowing"** (Vayikra 27:16). **I have only** derived **an area fit for sowing; from where** do I know that this rate applies to **a field of vines, a field of reeds, or a field of trees?**

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר ״שָׂדֶה״ מִכָּל מָקוֹם,

The verse states "field" to include a field **of any kind!** Thus trees are included in the land's fixed redemption rate!

ANSWER

אָמַר לֵיהּ: הָכָא נָמֵי פּוֹדֶה וְחוֹזֵר וּפוֹדֶה.

Rav Huna **said to him: Here too,** the Braisa means **he redeems** the trees separately **and then goes back and redeems** the land.

OBJECTION

אֵיתִיבֵיהּ: הִקְדִּישׁ שְׁלֹשָׁה אִילָנוֹת מִמַּטַּע עֲשָׂרָה לְבֵית סְאָה — הֲרֵי זֶה הִקְדִּישׁ אֶת הַקַּרְקַע וְאֶת הָאִילָנוֹת שֶׁבֵּינֵיהֶם,

Rav Nachman **raised an objection to him** from another Braisa: **If one consecrated three trees planted at a density of ten per beis se'ah, he has consecrated the land and the trees between them.**

PROOF

כְּשֶׁהוּא פּוֹדֶה — פּוֹדֶה בֵּית זֶרַע חוֹמֶר שְׂעוֹרִים בַּחֲמִשִּׁים שֶׁקֶל כָּסֶף.

When he redeems it, he redeems an area required for sowing a chomer of barley for fifty silver shekels, altogether!

STATEMENT

פָּחוֹת מִיכָּן, אוֹ יָתֵר עַל כֵּן, אוֹ שֶׁהִקְדִּישָׁן בְּזֶה אַחַר זֶה — הֲרֵי זֶה לֹא הִקְדִּישׁ לֹא אֶת הַקַּרְקַע וְלֹא אֶת הָאִילָנוֹת שֶׁבֵּינֵיהֶם.

If they were planted **less than this** density, **or more than this** density, **or if he consecrated them one after another, he has not consecrated the land or the trees between them.**

STATEMENT

וְלֹא עוֹד, אֶלָּא אֲפִילּוּ הִקְדִּישׁ אִילָנוֹתָיו, וְאַחַר כָּךְ הִקְדִּישׁ קַרְקַע,

And not only that, but even if he consecrated his trees and afterwards consecrated the land,

STATEMENT

כְּשֶׁהוּא פּוֹדֶה — פּוֹדֶה אֶת הָאִילָנוֹת בְּשָׁוְויֵהֶן, וְחוֹזֵר וּפוֹדֶה קַרְקַע: בֵּית זֶרַע חוֹמֶר שְׂעוֹרִים בַּחֲמִשִּׁים שֶׁקֶל כֶּסֶף!

when he redeems them, he redeems the trees at their value, and then goes back and redeems the land at an area for sowing a chomer of barley for fifty silver shekels!

QUESTION

וְכִי תֵּימָא: הָכָא נָמֵי פּוֹדֶה וְחוֹזֵר וּפוֹדֶה,

And should you say: Here too, in the first clause, he redeems the trees and goes back and redeems the land,

OBJECTION

הָא מִדְּסֵיפָא פּוֹדֶה וְחוֹזֵר וּפוֹדֶה, מִכְּלָל דִּרֵישָׁא לָא!

since the latter clause states he redeems and goes back and redeems, it follows by inference that in the first clause, no, he redeems everything together at the fixed rate! This directly contradicts Rav Huna!

RESOLUTION

אֶלָּא, הָא מַנִּי? רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן הִיא, דְּאָמַר: מַקְדִּישׁ בְּעַיִן רָעָה מַקְדִּישׁ.

Rather, whose view is this Braisa? It is Rabbi Shimon, who says: One who consecrates, consecrates stingily, so he does not consecrate the trees as a separate entity when consecrating the field.

PROOF

דְּתַנְיָא: הַמַּקְדִּישׁ אֶת הַשָּׂדֶה — הִקְדִּישׁ אֶת כּוּלָּהּ. רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אוֹמֵר: לֹא הִקְדִּישׁ אֶלָּא חָרוּב הַמּוּרְכָּב וְסַדַּן הַשִּׁקְמָה.

As it is taught in a Braisa: One who consecrates a field has consecrated all of it. Rabbi Shimon says: He has only consecrated the grafted carob tree and the trunk of the sycamore, showing that he holds a person consecrates stingily.

OBJECTION

אִי רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן, אֵימָא סֵיפָא: וְלֹא עוֹד, אֶלָּא אֲפִילּוּ הִקְדִּישׁ אִילָנוֹתָיו וְאַחַר כָּךְ הִקְדִּישׁ קַרְקַע, כְּשֶׁהוּא פּוֹדֶה — פּוֹדֶה אֶת הָאִילָנוֹת בְּשָׁוְויֵהֶן, וְחוֹזֵר וּפוֹדֶה בֵּית זֶרַע חוֹמֶר שְׂעוֹרִים בַּחֲמִשִּׁים שֶׁקֶל כֶּסֶף.

The Gemara asks: If it is Rabbi Shimon, consider the latter clause: "And not only that, but even if he consecrated his trees and afterwards consecrated the land, when he redeems them, he redeems the trees at their value, and then goes back and redeems an area for sowing a chomer of barley for fifty silver shekels."

OBJECTION

וְאִי רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן — לֵיזִיל בָּתַר פְּדִיוֹן, וְלִיפְרְקוּ אַגַּב אַרְעַיְיהוּ, דְּהָא שָׁמְעִינַן לֵיהּ לְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן דְּאָזֵיל בָּתַר פְּדִיוֹן!

Now if it were Rabbi Shimon, let us follow the status at the time of redemption, and let them be redeemed along with the land, for we have heard Rabbi Shimon holds that we follow the status at the time of redemption!

BRAISA

דְּתַנְיָא: מִנַּיִן לְלוֹקֵחַ שָׂדֶה מֵאָבִיו וְהִקְדִּישָׁהּ, וְאַחַר כָּךְ מֵת אָבִיו, מִנַּיִן שֶׁתְּהֵא לְפָנָיו כִּשְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה?

As it is taught in a Braisa: From where do we know that if one purchases a field from his father and consecrates it, and afterwards his father dies, from where do we know that it should be treated by him as an ancestral field at the time of redemption?

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: ״אִם אֶת שְׂדֵה מִקְנָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר לֹא מִשְּׂדֵה אֲחֻזָּתוֹ״.

The verse states: "If he consecrates a field he purchased, which is not of the field of his possession" (Vayikra 27:22),

STATEMENT

שָׂדֶה שֶׁאֵינָהּ רְאוּיָה לִהְיוֹת שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה, יָצְתָה זוֹ שֶׁרְאוּיָה לִהְיוֹת שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה, דִּבְרֵי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן.

meaning a field that is not suited to become an ancestral field; excluding this field, which is suited to become an ancestral field. These are the words of Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon, proving that Rabbi Shimon follows the status at the time of redemption!

BRAISA

רַבִּי מֵאִיר אוֹמֵר: מִנַּיִן לַלּוֹקֵחַ שָׂדֶה מֵאָבִיו, וּמֵת אָבִיו, וְאַחַר כָּךְ הִקְדִּישָׁהּ, מִנַּיִן שֶׁתְּהֵא לְפָנָיו כִּשְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה?

Rabbi Meir says: From where do we know that if one purchases a field from his father, and his father dies, and afterwards he consecrates it, from where do we know that it shall be treated by him as an ancestral field?

עמוד ב׳ DAF 14B

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: ״אִם אֶת שְׂדֵה מִקְנָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר לֹא מִשְּׂדֵה אֲחֻזָּתוֹ״ —

The verse states: "And if he sanctifies to Hashem a field of his purchase, which is not of the field of his ancestral heritage" (Vayikra 27:22)—

EXPLANATION

שָׂדֶה שֶׁאֵינָהּ שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה, יָצְתָה זוֹ שֶׁהִיא שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה.

this verse refers to a field that is not an ancestral field at the time he consecrates it; this field is excluded, as now, after his father died, it is an ancestral field!

STATEMENT

אִילּוּ לְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה וּלְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן, אֲפִילּוּ הִקְדִּישָׁהּ וְאַחַר כָּךְ מֵת אָב — שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָּה הָוְיָא.

Whereas according to Rabbi Yehuda and according to Rabbi Shimon, even if he consecrated it and afterward his father died, it becomes an ancestral field.

QUESTION

מַאי טַעְמָא? אִי מִשּׁוּם קְרָא — קְרָא לְכִדְרַבִּי מֵאִיר הוּא דַּאֲתָא!

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason** for Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon? **If** you say **it is because of the verse, the verse comes to** teach the halachah **like that of Rabbi Meir,** where the father died before he consecrated it!

QUESTION

אֶלָּא לָאו מִשּׁוּם דְּאָזֵיל בָּתַר פְּדִיּוֹן?

Rather, is it not because he follows the status of the field at the time of **redemption?** And since his father died before redemption, it is considered an ancestral field!

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב נַחְמָן בַּר יִצְחָק: רַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן קְרָא אַשְׁכַּחוּ וּדְרוּשׁ.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon found a verse and expounded it, and they do not actually hold that we follow the status at redemption.

EXPLANATION

אִם כֵּן, לִכְתּוֹב רַחֲמָנָא: "אִם אֶת שְׂדֵה מִקְנָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר לֹא אֲחֻזָּתוֹ", מַאי "מִשְּׂדֵה" — שָׂדֶה שֶׁאֵינָהּ רְאוּיָה לִהְיוֹת שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָּה.

If so, that it is only an ancestral field if his father died first, **let the Merciful One write: "If he sanctifies a field of his purchase that is not his ancestral heritage." What** does the verse teach by writing **"from the field of"?** It teaches that it excludes only a **field that is not fit to ever become an ancestral field** at all, excluding a field he was destined to inherit.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב פָּפָּא: הִקְדִּישׁ טָרָשִׁין — פּוֹדָן בְּשָׁוְויָן, מַאי טַעְמָא? "בֵּית זֶרַע" אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, וְהָנֵי לָאו בְּנֵי זְרִיעָה נִינְהוּ.

Rav Pappa said: If one consecrated rocky ground that is unfit for planting, **he redeems them at their market value. What is the reason? The Merciful One says** regarding the fixed valuation, an area of **"a seedland"** of a chomer of barley, **and these are not fit for seeding.**

STATEMENT

לֹא גְּאָלָן — יוֹצְאִין [לַכֹּהֲנִים] בַּיּוֹבֵל, מַאי טַעְמָא? "שָׂדֶה" אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, כֹּל דְּהוּ.

If **he did not redeem them** before Yovel, **they go out to the Kohanim in Yovel. What is the reason? The Merciful One says "the field,"** meaning **whatever** type of field **it is.**

STATEMENT

מָכַר טְרָשִׁין — נִגְאָלִין פָּחוֹת מִשְּׁתֵּי שָׁנִים, מַאי טַעְמָא? ״מִסְפַּר שְׁנֵי תְּבוּאוֹת״ אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, וְהַאי לָאו בְּנֵי תְּבוּאָה נִינְהוּ.

If he sold rocky ground, they may be redeemed by the seller in less than two years. What is the reason? The Merciful One says: "According to the number of crop-years," and these are not fit for crops.

STATEMENT

לֹא גְּאָלָן — (חוֹזֶרֶת) [חוֹזְרִין] לַבְּעָלִים בַּיּוֹבֵל, מַאי טַעְמָא? ״וְשָׁב לַאֲחוּזָּתוֹ״ אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, וְהַאי נָמֵי אֲחוּזָּה הִיא.

If he did not redeem them, they return to the owner in Yovel. What is the reason? The Merciful One says: "And he shall return to his ancestral heritage," and this rocky land is also an ancestral heritage.

STATEMENT

הִקְדִּישׁ אִילָנוֹת — (פּוֹדֶה) [פּוֹדָן] בְּשָׁוְויֵהֶן, מַאי טַעְמָא? ״בֵּית זֶרַע״ אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, וְלֹא אִילָנוֹת.

If he consecrated trees attached to his ancestral field, he redeems them at their market value. What is the reason? The Merciful One says "a seedland," and not trees.

STATEMENT

לֹא גְּאָלָן — אֵין יוֹצְאִין לַכֹּהֲנִים בַּיּוֹבֵל, ״וְהָיָה הַשָּׂדֶה״ אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, וְלֹא אִילָנוֹת.

If he did not redeem them, they do not go out to the Kohanim in Yovel. The Merciful One says: "And the field shall be," and not trees.

STATEMENT

מָכַר אִילָנוֹת — אֵין נִגְאָלִין פָּחוֹת מִשְּׁתֵּי שָׁנִים, מַאי טַעְמָא? ״שְׁנֵי תְּבוּאוֹת״ אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, וְהָנֵי בְּנֵי תְּבוּאוֹת נִינְהוּ.

If he sold trees, they cannot be redeemed in less than two years. What is the reason? The Merciful One says "crop-years," and these trees are producers of crops, namely fruit.

STATEMENT

לֹא גְּאָלָן — אֵין חוֹזֶרֶת לַבְּעָלִים בְּיוֹבֵל, מַאי טַעְמָא? ״וְשָׁב לַאֲחוּזָּתוֹ״ אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, וְלֹא אִילָנוֹת.

If he did not redeem them, they do not return to the owner in Yovel. What is the reason? The Merciful One says: "And he shall return to his ancestral heritage," which implies land itself, and not trees.

STATEMENT

אָמַר מָר: הִקְדִּישׁ אִילָנוֹת — (פּוֹדֶה) [פּוֹדָן] בְּשָׁוְויָן.

The Master said above: If he consecrated trees, he redeems them at their market value.

QUESTION

אַמַּאי? וְלִיקְדְּשׁוּ אַגַּב אַרְעַיְיהוּ, וְלִיפָּרְקוּהּ אַגַּב אַרְעַיְיהוּ!

The Gemara asks: Why so? Let them become consecrated along with their land, and let them be redeemed along with their land under the fixed valuation for a seedland!

OBJECTION

וְכִי תֵּימָא: אִילָנוֹת אַקְדֵּישׁ, אַרְעָא לָא אַקְדֵּישׁ —

And if you would say that **he consecrated the trees but did not consecrate the land,**

QUESTION

וְהָאָמְרִי נְהַרְדָּעֵי: מַאן דְּמְזַבֵּן לֵיהּ דִּקְלָא לְחַבְרֵיהּ, קָנֵי לֵיהּ מִשִּׁיפּוֹלָא וְעַד תְּהוֹמָא!

did not the Sages of Neharde'a say: One who sells a date palm to his friend, he acquires it from the base of the palm down to the depths of the earth, including the land under it!

ANSWER

לָאו מִי אִיתְּמַר עֲלַהּ: בְּבָא מֵחֲמַת טַעֲנָה!

The Gemara answers: **Was it not stated concerning that ruling** that it applies only **where he comes with a specific claim** that he explicitly purchased the ground under it?

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

שְׂדֵה מִקְנָה נוֹתֵן שָׁוְויוֹ.

The Mishnah had taught that for **a purchased field, one gives its market value.**

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

BRAISA

תָּנוּ רַבָּנַן: "בְּמִכְסַת" — מַה בָּא לְלַמּוֹד?

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: The verse says regarding a purchased field: **"According to the computation"—what does this come to teach us?**

EXPLANATION

לְפִי שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "וְזֶרַע חֹמֶר שְׂעוֹרִים בַּחֲמִשִּׁים שֶׁקֶל כָּסֶף", יָכוֹל אַף שְׂדֵה מִקְנָה כֵּן? תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: "מִכְסַת".

Since it says regarding an ancestral field: **"An area sown with a chomer of barley at fifty silver shekels," I might have thought that even a purchased field is so** redeemed with this fixed rate? **Therefore the verse states: "According to the computation"** of its actual worth.

STATEMENT

רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: נֶאֱמַר כָּאן "וְחִשַּׁב", וְנֶאֱמַר לְהַלָּן "וְחִשַּׁב", מָה לְהַלָּן דָּבָר קָצוּב, אַף כָּאן דָּבָר קָצוּב.

Rabbi Eliezer says: It says here regarding a purchased field **"and he shall calculate," and it says further on** regarding an ancestral field **"and he shall calculate." Just as further on** it refers to **a set sum** of fifty shekels, **so too here** it refers to **a set sum.**

QUESTION

אִיבַּעְיָא לְהוּ: רַבָּנַן אִית לְהוּ גְּזֵירָה שָׁוָה, וּמַפְקִין לֵיהּ לְחוֹמֶשׁ, אוֹ דִלְמָא לֵית לְהוּ גְּזֵירָה שָׁוָה, וְלֵית לְהוּ לְחוֹמֶשׁ?

A dilemma was raised before them: Do the Rabbis who dispute Rabbi Eliezer **accept this gezeirah shavah** of "and he shall calculate" **and apply it** only **to** exempt it from **the added fifth, or perhaps they do not accept the gezeirah shavah at all, and do not** hold that there is an exemption from **the added fifth?**

ANSWER

אָמַר רָבָא: מִסְתַּבְּרָא לֵית לְהוּ גְּזֵירָה שָׁוָה, מִדְּגַלְּי רַחֲמָנָא חוֹמֶשׁ גַּבֵּי שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָּה וְגַבֵּי מַקְדִּישׁ בֵּיתוֹ,

Rava said: It stands to reason that they do not accept the gezeirah shavah. Since the Merciful One revealed the requirement to add a **fifth regarding an ancestral field and regarding one who consecrates his house,**

EXPLANATION

הָווּ לֵיהּ שְׁנֵי כְּתוּבִין הַבָּאִין כְּאֶחָד, וְכָל שְׁנֵי כְּתוּבִין הַבָּאִין כְּאֶחָד אֵין מְלַמְּדִין.

they are two verses that come as one, and any two verses that come as one do not teach their halachah to other cases.

EXPLANATION

וּלְמַאן דְּאָמַר מְלַמְּדִין, מִדְּגַלְּי רַחֲמָנָא חוֹמֶשׁ בְּמַעֲשֵׂר, בִּבְהֵמָה טְהוֹרָה, וּבִבְהֵמָה טְמֵאָה — הָווּ לֵיהּ טוּבָא, וְאֵין מְלַמְּדִין.

And according to the one who says that two verses coming as one do teach others, **since the Merciful One revealed** a **fifth regarding tithe, regarding a kosher animal, and regarding an non-kosher animal, they have become many** verses, **and** three verses **do not teach!**

STATEMENT

תַּנְיָא כְּוָותֵיהּ דְּרָבָא, וְלָא מִטַּעְמֵיהּ.

It was **taught in a Braisa in accordance with Rava, but not for his reason.**

BRAISA

תַּנְיָא: "בְּמִכְסַּת עֲרָכְךָ" — הִקִּישׁוֹ הַכָּתוּב לַעֲרָכִין, מָה עֲרָכִין אֵין מוֹסִיף חוֹמֶשׁ, אַף שְׂדֵה מִקְנָה אֵין מוֹסִיף חוֹמֶשׁ.

It was **taught: "According to the computation of your valuation"—the verse compares it to Erechin. Just as in Erechin one does not add a fifth, so too in a purchased field one does not add a fifth.**

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מַתְנִי׳ בְּשׁוֹר הַמּוּעָד שֶׁהֵמִית אֶת הָעֶבֶד לְהָקֵל וּלְהַחֲמִיר, כֵּיצַד?

MISHNAH: In the case of an ox that is a mu'ad that killed a slave, the Torah's rules apply both **to make it lenient and to make it stringent. How so?**

MISHNAH

אֶחָד שֶׁהֵמִית אֶת הַנָּאֶה שֶׁבַּעֲבָדִים וְאֶת הַכָּעוּר שֶׁבָּעֲבָדִים — נוֹתֵן שְׁלֹשִׁים סֶלַע.

Whether **it killed the finest among slaves or the ugliest among slaves, he pays thirty selayim.**

MISHNAH

הֵמִית בֶּן חוֹרִין — נוֹתֵן שָׁוְויוֹ. חָבַל בָּזֶה וּבָזֶה — נוֹתֵן נֶזֶק שָׁלֵם.

If it **killed a free man, he pays his value. If it injured this one** (a slave) **or that one** (a free man), **he pays full damages.**

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

INFERENCE

גְּמָ׳ בְּמוּעָד — אִין, בְּתָם — לָא.

GEMARA: For a mu'ad, yes, he pays full damage for injuries; **for a tam, no,** he pays only half damages.

QUESTION

לֵימָא מַתְנִיתִין דְּלָא כְּרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא, דְּתַנְיָא: רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא אוֹמֵר: אַף תָּם שֶׁחָבַל בָּאָדָם מְשַׁלֵּם בַּמּוֹתָר נֶזֶק שָׁלֵם.

Shall we say our Mishnah is not according to Rabbi Akiva? As we learned in a Mishnah: **Rabbi Akiva says: Even a tam that injured a person pays full damages for the excess** of damage done over damage received!

ANSWER

אֲפִילּוּ תֵּימָא רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא, הוּא הַדִּין דַּאֲפִילּוּ תָּם נָמֵי,

The Gemara answers: **You may even say** the Mishnah is **Rabbi Akiva, and the same law applies that even a tam also** pays full damages for injuries,

EXPLANATION

וְאַיְידֵי דְּקָא בָּעֵי לְמִתְנֵי סֵיפָא ״הֵמִית עֶבֶד״ ״הֵמִית בֶּן חוֹרִין״, דִּבְמוּעָד הוּא דְּמַשְׁכַּחַתְּ לַהּ, בְּתָם לָא מַשְׁכַּחַתְּ לַהּ, מִשּׁוּם הָכִי קָתָנֵי מוּעָד.

and since it needed to teach in the latter clause "it killed a slave" or **"it killed a free man," which you only find by a mu'ad,** whereas **by a tam you do not find** the thirty-sela penalty or execution fine, **because of that it taught "mu'ad"** in the first clause as well.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מַתְנִי׳ בָּאוֹנֵס וּבַמְפַתֶּה לְהָקֵל וּלְהַחֲמִיר, כֵּיצַד?

MISHNAH: Regarding a rapist and a seducer, the Torah's rules apply both **to make it lenient and to make it stringent. How so?**

MISHNAH

אֶחָד שֶׁאָנַס וּפִיתָּה אֶת גְּדוֹלָה שֶׁבַּכְּהוּנָּה וְאֶת הַקְּטַנָּה שֶׁבְּיִשְׂרָאֵל — נוֹתֵן חֲמִשִּׁים סְלָעִים,

Whether one raped or seduced the greatest woman in the Kehunah or the lowest woman in Yisrael, he gives fifty selayim as the statutory fine,

MISHNAH

וְהַבּוּשֶׁת וְהַפֶּגָם — הַכֹּל לְפִי הַמְבַיֵּישׁ וְהַמִּתְבַּיֵּישׁ.

and the shame and degradation payments **are all according to the status of the embarrass-er and the embarrassed one.**

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

גְּמָ׳ אַמַּאי? אֵימָא: ״חֲמִשִּׁים סְלָעִים״ אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא מִכֹּל מִילֵּי!

GEMARA: Why is he liable for shame and degradation? **Say: The Merciful One said "fifty selayim" for all matters** combined!

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב זְעֵירָא: יֹאמְרוּ, בָּעַל בַּת מְלָכִים חֲמִשִּׁים, בָּעַל בַּת הֶדְיוֹטוֹת חֲמִשִּׁים?

Rav Zeira said: Would people say: One who had relations with the daughter of kings pays fifty, and one who had relations with the daughter of commoners pays fifty?! Therefore, separate payments must apply for shame and degradation.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לֵיהּ אַבָּיֵי: אִי הָכִי, גַּבֵּי עֶבֶד נָמֵי, יֹאמְרוּ: עֶבֶד נוֹקֵב מַרְגָּלִית — שְׁלֹשִׁים, עֶבֶד עוֹשֶׂה מַעֲשֵׂה מַחַט — שְׁלֹשִׁים?

Abaye said to him: If so, regarding a slave as well, would people say: A slave who drills pearls costs **thirty, and a slave who does needlework** costs **thirty?!** Yet there the law is explicitly a fixed thirty selayim!

ANSWER

אֶלָּא אָמַר רַב זְעֵירָא:

Rather, Rav Zeira said:

SUMMARY

The daf opens with the conclusion of the Gemara's sugya regarding the language of the Mishnah, explaining that praising non-Jewish beauty is prohibited and that ancestral land halachos apply only to Bnei Yisrael. The new Mishnah outlines the rules of sdeh achuzah: whether the soil is poor sand or rich orchard land, it is redeemed at the Torah's fixed rate of fifty silver shekels per chomer of barley, whereas a sdeh miknah is redeemed according to its actual market value. In the Gemara, Rav Huna rules that one who consecrates an orchard redeems the trees by market value and the land by the fixed rate, based on the principle that a person consecrates generously. Rav Nachman challenges Rav Huna from several beraitos, leading the Gemara to re-evaluate the sugya in light of Rabbi Shimon's view that a person consecrates stingily, and examining how redemption rates function when trees and land are consecrated together or separately.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara brings down a subtle halacha in passing: it is forbidden for a Yid to praise the physical beauty of a gentile. Think about why the Tanna went out of his way to avoid even a phrasing that might sound like praise. When we look at the world around us, it is so easy to get caught up in external, superficial beauty, a nice building, a striking figure, impressive physical style. But the Torah is teaching us a profound lesson in focus.

True beauty in a Yid's eyes isn't defined by physical symmetry or worldly charm. Real beauty is kedusha, a midoch-filled Yid, a tzaddik, a blatt Gemara, or a home filled with yiras Shamayim. When we train ourselves to look at the world through the lens of Torah, we stop being nispael from external, worldly aesthetics that have no spiritual depth. We begin to value what Hashem values.

Today, make a conscious effort to adjust your gaze. When you catch yourself admiring something purely worldly or physical, pause for a second and redirect that appreciation toward real, inner beauty, a choshuve ma'aseh tov, a piece of Torah, or the refined midos of a fellow Yid.