דַּף יוֹמִי · עֲרָכִין · דַּף כ״א

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

📖 THE SUGYA

We begin this segment of the daf working through a subtle sugya regarding a tenant living in a house where sanctification is declared. The Gemara asks how the landlord can sanctify rent payments that have not yet accrued, bringing us right into the classic machlokes over whether a person can sanctify a davar shelo ba l'olam, something that is not yet in the world, according to Rabbi Meir.

From there, the new Mishnah brings us into the core halachos of how Beth Din enforces spiritual obligations. While property is repossessed to pay for Arakhin valuation vows, the chachamim draw fine distinctions between different types of korbanos based on a person's natural motivation to achieve kapparah. This leads directly into the famous gemara principle of kakofin osso ad she'yomar rotzeh ani—how Beth Din uses coercion for voluntary sacrifices and gittin while maintaining the essential requirement that the action be done with the person's own volition.

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

עַמּוּד א׳ DAF 21A

BRAISA

הִקְדִּישׁוֹ הַדָּר בּוֹ — מַעֲלֶה שָׂכָר לַהֶקְדֵּשׁ.

A Braisa states: If **the one living in it** — i.e., the tenant — **consecrated it, he pays rent to Hekdesh.**

QUESTION

הִקְדִּישׁוֹ הַדָּר בּוֹ? הֵיכִי מָצֵי מַקְדֵּישׁ לֵיהּ?

The Gemara asks: If **the one living in it consecrated it? How is he able to consecrate it?**

PROOF

״אִישׁ כִּי יַקְדִּישׁ בֵּיתוֹ קֹדֶשׁ״ אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, מָה בֵּיתוֹ בִּרְשׁוּתוֹ — אַף כֹּל בִּרְשׁוּתוֹ!

After all, **"When a man shall sanctify his house to be holy" said the Merciful One** in the Torah; from this we derive: **just as his house** is in **his possession, so too anything** he sanctifies must be in **his possession!** And since the tenant does not own the house, he cannot consecrate it!

ANSWER

הָכִי קָאָמַר: הִקְדִּישׁוֹ מַשְׁכִּיר — הַדָּר בּוֹ מַעֲלֶה שָׂכָר לַהֶקְדֵּשׁ.

The Gemara answers: **This is what** the Braisa **is saying: If the landlord consecrated it, the one living in it pays rent to Hekdesh.**

QUESTION

הִקְדִּישׁוֹ מַשְׁכִּיר, הֵיכִי דָּיֵיר בֵּיהּ? בִּמְעִילָה קָאֵי!

The Gemara challenges this teirutz: If **the landlord consecrated it, how can** the tenant **live in it? He is standing in** a state of **me'ilah** — unlawful use of Hekdesh! By living in a consecrated house, he transgresses me'ilah continuously!

QUESTION

וְתוּ מַעֲלֶה שָׂכָר לַהֶקְדֵּשׁ? כֵּיוָן דְּמָעַל בֵּיהּ, נָפֵיק לֵיהּ שָׂכָר לְחוּלִּין!

And furthermore, how can the Braisa say he **pays rent to Hekdesh? Once he committed me'ilah with it, the rent comes out into chullin** status! As soon as me'ilah is committed, the consecrated object or its value becomes non-sacred!

ANSWER

דְּאָמַר: "לִכְשֶׁיָּבֹא שְׂכָרוֹ יִקְדַּשׁ",

The Gemara answers: The case is **where** the landlord **said, "When its rent comes to me,** that money **shall be consecrated."** So the house itself was never sanctified.

QUESTION

וְהָא אֵין אָדָם מַקְדִּישׁ דָּבָר שֶׁלֹּא בָּא לָעוֹלָם!

The Gemara asks: **But a person cannot consecrate something that has not yet come into the world!** Rent money that has not yet been paid is a davor shelo ba l'olam!

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב: הָא מַנִּי? רַבִּי מֵאִיר הִיא, דְּאָמַר: אָדָם מַקְדִּישׁ דָּבָר שֶׁלֹּא בָּא לָעוֹלָם.

Rav Yehudah said that **Rav said: Whose** view is **this? It is** the opinion of **Rabbi Meir, who said: A person can consecrate something that has not yet come into the world.**

QUESTION

אִיכָּא דְּאָמְרִי: אָמַר לֵיהּ רַב פָּפָּא לְאַבָּיֵי, וְאָמְרִי לַהּ רַב מָרִי בַּר חָמָא לְרַב חִסְדָּא: כְּמַאן? כְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר, דְּאָמַר: אָדָם מַקְדִּישׁ דָּבָר שֶׁלֹּא בָּא לָעוֹלָם?

There are those **who say** a different version: **Rav Pappa said to Abaye — and some say** it was **Rav Mari bar Hama** who said **to Rav Chisda: Like whom** is this Braisa? Is it **like Rabbi Meir, who said a person can consecrate something that has not yet come into the world?**

ANSWER

אָמַר לֵיהּ: וְאֶלָּא כְּמַאן?!

He said to him: But like whom else could it be?! Of course it goes according to Rabbi Meir!

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מַתְנִי' חַיָּבֵי עֲרָכִין — מְמַשְׁכְּנִין אוֹתָן,

MISHNAH: With regard to **those who are obligated to pay valuations (Arakhin),** Beth Din **repossesses their property** by force if they fail to pay.

MISHNAH

חַיָּבֵי חַטָּאוֹת וַאֲשָׁמוֹת — אֵין מְמַשְׁכְּנִין אוֹתָן,

With regard to **those who are obligated to bring sin-offerings or guilt-offerings,** Beth Din **does not repossess their property,** because a person is eager to achieve kapparah and will not delay bringing them.

MISHNAH

חַיָּבֵי עוֹלוֹת וּשְׁלָמִים — מְמַשְׁכְּנִין אוֹתָן.

With regard to **those who are obligated to bring burnt-offerings or peace-offerings,** Beth Din **repossesses their property,** because since these are not primarily for kapparah, one might delay bringing them.

MISHNAH

אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁאֵין מִתְכַּפֵּר לוֹ עַד שֶׁיִּתְרַצֶּה, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "לִרְצוֹנוֹ", כּוֹפִין אוֹתוֹ עַד שֶׁיֹּאמַר: "רוֹצֶה אֲנִי".

Even though he does not attain atonement until he brings it willingly, as it says, "Of his own volition" (Vayikra 1:3), nevertheless Beth Din **coerces him until he says, "I want to** bring it."

MISHNAH

וְכֵיוָן אַתָּה אוֹמֵר בְּגִיטֵּי נָשִׁים, כּוֹפִין אוֹתוֹ עַד שֶׁיֹּאמַר: "רוֹצֶה אֲנִי".

And likewise you say regarding bills of divorce for women (gittin): where the Sages ruled he must give a get, Beth Din **coerces him until he says, "I want to** give it."

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

גְּמָ׳ אָמַר רַב פָּפָּא: פְּעָמִים שֶׁחַיָּבֵי חַטָּאוֹת מְמַשְׁכְּנִין אוֹתָן, חַיָּבֵי עוֹלוֹת אֵין מְמַשְׁכְּנִין אוֹתָן.

GEMARA: Rav Pappa said: Sometimes those **who are obligated to bring sin-offerings are repossessed** of their property, **and** sometimes those **who are obligated to bring burnt-offerings are not repossessed.**

EXPLANATION

חַיָּבֵי חַטָּאוֹת מְמַשְׁכְּנִין אוֹתָן בְּחַטַּאת נָזִיר,

Where do we say that **those who are obligated to bring sin-offerings are repossessed? In the case of a sin-offering of a nazir.**

EXPLANATION

דְּכֵיוָן דְּאָמַר מָר: "אִם גִּילַּח עַל אֶחָד מִשְּׁלָשְׁתָּן יָצָא, וְאִם נִזְרַק עָלָיו אֶחָד מִן הַדָּמִים הוּתַּר הַנָּזִיר לִשְׁתּוֹת יַיִן וְלִיטַּמֵּא לְמֵתִים" — פְּשַׁע בַּהּ וְלָא מַיְיתֵי.

For since the Master said: "If he shaved after one of his three korbanos — either the burnt-offering, peace-offering, or sin-offering — **he has fulfilled his obligation, and if the blood of one of them was sprinkled for him, the nazir is permitted**

to drink wine and to become defiled by the dead" — he might act lazily regarding the sin-offering **and not bring it,** so Beth Din repossesses his property.

EXPLANATION

חַיָּיבֵי עוֹלוֹת — אֵין מְמַשְׁכְּנִין אוֹתָן בְּעוֹלַת יוֹלֶדֶת.

And where do we say that **those obligated to bring burnt-offerings are not repossessed? In the case of the burnt-offering of a woman who gave birth (yoledeth).**

QUESTION

מַאי נִיהוּ דְּאַקְדְּמֵיהּ קְרָא, וְהָאָמַר רָבָא: לְמִקְרָאָה הִקְדִּימָהּ הַכָּתוּב!

The Gemara asks: **What is** the reason she will not delay bringing her burnt-offering? Is it **because Scripture mentions it first** before her sin-offering? **But didn't Rava say: Scripture mentioned it first** only **regarding its reading,** but not regarding the actual sacrifice of the korban! So she could bring her sin-offering first and then delay her burnt-offering!

ANSWER

אֶלָּא בְּעוֹלַת מְצוֹרָע, דְּתַנְיָא: רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל בְּנוֹ שֶׁל רַבִּי יְהוּדָה בֶּן בְּרוֹקָה אוֹמֵר: כְּשֵׁם שֶׁחַטָּאתוֹ וַאֲשָׁמוֹ עִיכְּבוּ, כָּךְ עוֹלָתוֹ עִיכְּבָה.

Rather, Rav Pappa meant **in the case of the burnt-offering of a leper (metzora), as it was taught** in a Braisa: **Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yehudah ben Beroka says: Just as his sin-offering and his guilt-offering hold him back** from becoming fully tahor and eating kodashim, **so too his burnt-offering holds him back** from becoming fully tahor. Therefore, he will certainly not delay bringing it.

BRAISA

וְאַף עַל פִּי שֶׁאֵין מִתְכַּפֵּר לוֹ עַד שֶׁיִּתְרַצֶּה, תָּנוּ רַבָּנַן: "יַקְרִיב אוֹתוֹ" — מְלַמֵּד שֶׁכּוֹפִין אוֹתוֹ,

The Mishnah taught: **Even though he does not attain atonement until he brings it willingly... Our Rabbis taught** in a Braisa: It is written, **"He shall offer it"** (Vayikra 1:3) — this **teaches that we coerce him** to bring it.

BRAISA

יָכוֹל בְּעַל כָּרְחוֹ? תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: "לִרְצוֹנוֹ", הָא כֵּיצַד? כּוֹפִין אוֹתוֹ עַד שֶׁיֹּאמַר "רוֹצֶה אֲנִי".

One **might have thought** he brings it even **against his will; therefore Scripture states: "Of his own volition." How so? We coerce him until he says, "I want to."**

STATEMENT

אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: עוֹלָה צְרִיכָה דַּעַת, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "לִרְצוֹנוֹ".

Shmuel said: A burnt-offering requires the consent of the person for whom it is offered, **as it is stated: "Of his own volition."**

QUESTION

מַאי קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן? תְּנֵינָא: אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁאֵין מִתְכַּפֵּר לוֹ עַד שֶׁיִּתְרַצֶּה, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "לִרְצוֹנוֹ"!

The Gemara asks: **What is** Shmuel **coming to teach us? We already learned** in our Mishnah: **Even though he does not attain atonement until he brings it willingly, as it says, "Of his own volition"!**

ANSWER

לָא צְרִיכָא, דְּפָרֵישׁ לֵיהּ חַבְרֵיהּ. מַהוּ דְּתֵימָא: כִּי בָּעֵינַן דַּעַת מִדִּידֵיהּ, אֲבָל מִדְּחַבְרֵיהּ לָא? קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן, זִימְנִין דְּלָא נִיחָא לֵיהּ דְּלִיכַּפַּר בְּמִידֵּי דְּלָא דִּידֵיהּ.

The Gemara answers: **No, it is necessary** for a case **where his friend set aside** an olah **for him** without his knowledge. **What might you have said? When do we require consent?** Only when he brings it **from his own** property, **but** when it comes **from his friend's** property, he would **not** mind and consent is not needed? Therefore Shmuel **comes to teach us: sometimes it is not pleasing to a person to achieve atonement with something that is not his own.**

OBJECTION

מֵיתִיבִי: ״חַטָּאתוֹ וַאֲשָׁמוֹ שֶׁל פְּלוֹנִי עָלַי״

The Gemara **raises an objection** against Shmuel from a Braisa: If someone says, **"So-and-so's sin-offering or guilt-offering is upon me"...**

עַמּוּד ב׳ DAF 21B

BRAISA

לְדַעַת — יָצָא, שֶׁלֹּא לְדַעַת — לֹא יָצָא.

If it was offered **with** his **knowledge, he has fulfilled** his obligation, but if it was offered **without** his **knowledge, he has not fulfilled** his obligation. The Braisa continues:

BRAISA

״עוֹלָתוֹ וּשְׁלָמָיו שֶׁל פְּלוֹנִי עָלַי״, בֵּין לְדַעַת בֵּין שֶׁלֹּא לְדַעַת — יָצָא.

If one says, **"The burnt-offering or peace-offering of So-and-so is upon me"** to bring, **whether** it was offered **with** his **knowledge** or **whether** it was offered **without** his **knowledge, he has fulfilled** his obligation. Now, this second ruling contradicts Shmuel, who said that even an olah requires the owner's knowledge!

RESOLUTION

אָמַר לְךָ שְׁמוּאֵל: כִּי תַּנְיָא הָהִיא בִּשְׁעַת כַּפָּרָה, דְּאִירַצִי בִּשְׁעַת הַפְרָשָׁה, כִּי קָאָמֵינָא אֲנָא בִּשְׁעַת הַפְרָשָׁה.

The Gemara answers: **Shmuel could say to you: When that** Braisa **was taught** that he fulfills his obligation without knowledge, it is speaking **at the time of atonement**, i.e., at the time of the shechita and zerika, **where he** already **consented at the time of separation.** But **when I said** that consent is needed for an olah, **I was speaking at the time of separation.**

STATEMENT

וּפְלִיגָא דְּעוּלָּא, דְּאָמַר עוּלָּא: לֹא חִילְקוּ בֵּין חַטָּאת לְעוֹלָה, אֶלָּא שֶׁחַטָּאת צְרִיכָה דַּעַת בִּשְׁעַת הַפְרָשָׁה, וְעוֹלָה אֵין צְרִיכָה דַּעַת בִּשְׁעַת הַפְרָשָׁה, אֲבָל בִּשְׁעַת כַּפָּרָה — אִידִי וְאִידִי לְדַעַת — יָצָא, שֶׁלֹּא לְדַעַת — לֹא יָצָא.

The Gemara notes: **And** Shmuel **argues with Ulla; for Ulla said: The Sages did not distinguish between a sin-offering and a burnt-offering, except that a sin-offering requires knowledge at the time of separation, whereas a burnt-offering does not require knowledge at the time of separation; but at the time of atonement, both this** type of offering

and that type of offering, if offered **with knowledge, he has fulfilled** his obligation, but if **without knowledge, he has not fulfilled** his obligation.

OBJECTION

מֵיתִיבִי: חַטָּאתוֹ וַאֲשָׁמוֹ עוֹלָתוֹ וּשְׁלָמָיו שֶׁל פְּלוֹנִי עָלַי, לְדַעַת — יָצָא, שֶׁלֹּא לְדַעַת — לֹא יָצָא!

The Gemara **raises an objection** from another Braisa: If one says, **"The sin-offering, guilt-offering, burnt-offering, or peace-offering of So-and-so is upon me,"** if it was offered **with** his **knowledge, he has fulfilled** his obligation, but if **without** his **knowledge, he has not fulfilled** his obligation! This seems to contradict both Shmuel and Ulla!

RESOLUTION

שְׁמוּאֵל מוֹקֵי לַהּ בִּשְׁעַת הַפְּרָשָׁה, עוּלָּא מוֹקֵי לַהּ בִּשְׁעַת כַּפָּרָה.

The Gemara answers: **Shmuel establishes it as** referring to **the time of separation,** while **Ulla establishes it as** referring to **the time of atonement.**

EXPLANATION

אָמַר רַב פָּפָּא: מַתְנְיָיתָא אַהֲדָדֵי לָא קַשְׁיָין, הָא בִּשְׁעַת כַּפָּרָה, הָא בִּשְׁעַת הַפְּרָשָׁה.

Rav Pappa said: The Braisos do not contradict each other; this first Braisa is speaking **at the time of atonement,** and **that** second Braisa is speaking **at the time of separation.**

EXPLANATION

(וְאָמוֹרָאֵי) [לְאָמוֹרָאֵי] נָמֵי לָא קַשְׁיָא: שְׁמוּאֵל מוֹקֵי כַּמַּיְיתָא בִּשְׁעַת כַּפָּרָה, בָּתְרַיְיתָא בִּשְׁעַת הַפְּרָשָׁה, עוּלָּא מוֹקֵי אִיפְּכָא. אָמוֹרָאֵי וַדַּאי פְּלִיגִי.

And for the Amoraim also, it is not difficult: Shmuel establishes the first Braisa **at the time of atonement, and the latter** Braisa **at the time of separation; Ulla establishes it vice versa.** However, **the Amoraim themselves certainly disagree** as to when the consent is needed.

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא!

The Gemara asks: Isn't this summary **obvious?**

ANSWER

מַהוּ דְּתֵימָא: מַאי "בִּשְׁעַת הַפְּרָשָׁה" דְּקָאָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל? אַף בִּשְׁעַת הַפְּרָשָׁה, וְאַף עַל גַּב דְּהָךְ קַמַּיְיתָא תִּיוּבְתֵּיהּ, קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן.

The Gemara answers: **Lest you say: What is** the meaning of **"at the time of separation" that Shmuel said? Even at the time of separation** in addition to the time of atonement! **And even though that first** Braisa would be **a refutation of his** opinion, he might still maintain it. Therefore, Rav Pappa **teaches us** that the Braisos fit well and Shmuel only requires consent at the time of separation.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

וְכֵן בִּגִיטֵּי נָשִׁים כּוֹפִין וְכוּ׳.

We learned in the Mishnah: **And likewise with regard to bills of divorce for women, we coerce him, etc.** until he says, "I want to do so."

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב שֵׁשֶׁת: הַאי מַאן דְּמָסַר מוֹדָעָא אַגִּיטָּא — מוֹדָעֵיהּ מוֹדָעָא.

Rav Sheshet said: One who delivers a declaration of coercion (modaa) regarding a get—his modaa is a valid modaa to nullify the get.

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא?

The Gemara asks: Isn't that **obvious?**

ANSWER

לָא צְרִיכָא, דְּעַשְׁאוּהּ וְאִירְצִי, מַהוּ דְּתֵימָא: בַּטּוֹלֵי בַּטְּלֵיהּ, קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן.

The Gemara answers: **No, it is necessary** in a case **where they coerced him and he** later **agreed** to give the get, without explicitly nullifying his modaa. **Lest you say: He has nullified it** by giving the get voluntarily, therefore Rav Sheshet **teaches us** that the modaa remains valid.

PROOF

דְּאִם כֵּן, לֵיתְנֵי: עַד שֶׁיִּתֵּן! מַאי עַד שֶׁיֹּאמַר? עַד דְּמְבַטֵּל לֵיהּ לְמוֹדָעֵיהּ.

For if so, let the Mishnah **teach: Until he gives** the get. **What is** the meaning of **"Until he says** 'I want to'"? It means **until he explicitly nullifies his modaa.**

STATEMENT

הַדַּרַן עָלָךְ הָאוֹמֵר מִשְׁקָלִי.

May we return to you, "HaOmer Mishkali" (Chapter 5).

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מַתְנִי׳ שׁוּם הַיְתוֹמִים — שְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם, וְשׁוּם הֶקְדֵּשׁ — שִׁשִּׁים יוֹם, וּמַכְרִיזִין בַּבֹּקֶר וּבָעֶרֶב.

MISHNAH: The valuation of the property of **orphans** sold to pay debts is proclaimed for **thirty days, and the valuation of Consecrated property** sold by the Temple treasury is proclaimed for **sixty days, and they proclaim** it both **in the morning and in the evening.**

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

גְּמָ׳ מַאי שְׁנָא בַּבֹּקֶר וּבָעֶרֶב?

GEMARA: What is different about the morning and the evening that we specifically proclaim at those times?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב: בְּשְׁעַת הוֹצָאַת פּוֹעֲלִים וּבְשְׁעַת הַכְנָסַת פּוֹעֲלִים.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: It is **at the time when workers go out** to the fields **and at the time when workers enter** back into town.

EXPLANATION

בְּשְׁעַת הוֹצָאַת פּוֹעֲלִים — דְּאִיכָּא דְּנִיחָא לְמִיזְבַּן, אָמַר לְהוּ לְפוֹעֲלִים: אֵיזִילוּ סַיְירוּ לַהּ נִיהֲלַי.

At the time when workers go out—because **there is one who wishes to buy** the land, and when he hears the announcement, he **says to the workers: "Go and inspect it for me."**

EXPLANATION

בְּשְׁעַת הַכְנָסַת פּוֹעֲלִים — דְּנִידְכַּר דְּאָמַר לְהוּ: נֵיזִיל נִישַׁיְילִינְהוּ.

At the time when workers enter—so **that he remembers that he said to them** to inspect it, and he says: **"Let us go and ask them"** what they found.

PROOF

תַּנְיָא נָמֵי הָכִי: שׁוּם הַיְתוֹמִים שְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם, וְשׁוּם הַהֶקְדֵּשׁ שִׁשִּׁים יוֹם, וּמַכְרִיזִין בַּבֹּקֶר וּבָעֶרֶב, בְּשְׁעַת הוֹצָאַת פּוֹעֲלִים וּבְשְׁעַת הַכְנָסַת פּוֹעֲלִים.

This is also taught in a Braisa: **The valuation of the orphans'** land is **thirty days, and the valuation of Consecrated property** is **sixty days, and they proclaim in the morning and in the evening, at the time when workers go out and at the time when workers enter.**

BRAISA

אוֹמֵר: שְׂדֵה פְּלוֹנִי בִּסְימָנֶיהָ וּבִמְצָרֶיהָ, כָּךְ הִיא יָפָה, וְכָךְ הִיא שׁוּמָא, כָּל הָרוֹצֶה לִיקַּח יָבֹא וְיִקַּח, עַל מְנָת לִיתֵּן לְאִשָּׁה בִּכְתוּבָּתָהּ, וּלְבַעַל חוֹב בְּחוֹבוֹ.

The announcer **says: "The field of So-and-so, with its landmarks and its boundaries; it is worth such-and-such, and it was appraised at such-and-such; anyone who wants to buy, let him come and buy, on condition to give the money to the woman for her kesubah, or to the creditor for his debt."**

QUESTION

לָמָּה לִי לְמֵימַר "עַל מְנָת לִיתֵּן לְאִשָּׁה כְּתוּבָּתָהּ וּלְבַעַל חוֹב חוֹבוֹ"?

The Gemara asks: **Why do I need** the announcer **to say, "on condition to give the woman for her kesubah and the creditor for his debt"?** What difference does it make to the buyer who gets the money?

ANSWER

דְּאִיכָּא דְּנִיחָא לֵיהּ בְּבַעַל חוֹב, דְּמֵיקֵל בְּזוּזֵי, וְאִיכָּא דְּנִיחָא לֵיהּ בְּאִשָּׁה, דְּשָׁקְלָה עַל יָד עַל יָד.

The Gemara answers: **Because there is one who prefers** to deal **with a creditor, who is lenient with money** and willing to take small payments or give discounts, **and there is one who prefers** to deal **with a woman, who takes** money **bit by bit** in installments.

SUMMARY

The Gemara first resolves a Braisa about a landlord sanctifying future rent by establishing that it follows Rabbi Meir's shitta that one can sanctify a davar shelo ba l'olam. Next, the Mishnah details when Beth Din seizes collateral: for Arakhin and voluntary burnt-offerings (olosh) or peace-offerings (shlamim), Beth Din repossesses property because a person might delay, whereas for chattasos and ashamos, no repossession is needed since a person is anxious to get kapparah. Rav Pappa clarifies exceptions, such as a nazir's sin-offering where repossession is used, or a metzora's burnt-offering where it is not needed. Finally, the sugya explores the requirement of daas (consent) for an olah, bringing Shmuel's chiddush that even if a friend designates an olah on someone else's behalf, it still requires the owner's explicit volition to be yotzei.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה · WHAT TO TAKE HOME

Look at the incredible yesod the Mishnah teaches us about a Yid. A person owes a korban olah, and Beth Din literally coerces him until he says, "Rotzeh ani, I want to do it." Lichoira, we have to ask: what kind of ratzon is that? If you beat someone until he says he wants to give a korban or a get, isn't that just coercion? How does that fulfill the pasuk of "l'rotzono," that it must come from his own free will?

The Rambam famously explains this deep sevara: deep down, every single Yid fundamentally wants to do the ratzon of Hashem and stay connected to the mesorah. That is the true desire of his neshama. It is only the yetzer hara, the outer shell of worldly ta'avos and pride, that covers it up and makes him dig in his heels. When Beth Din applies pressure, they aren't forcing him to act against his real will. They are simply stripping away the noise of the yetzer hara until his true, inner Yiddish heart can speak out clearly and say, "Rotzeh ani!"

What an amazing chiddush for our own daily avodah! How often do we feel heavy, sluggish, or totally unmotivated to daven, to open a sefer, or to work on a difficult middah? We think to ourselves, "I'm just not in the mood, I don't feel it, it's fake if I force it." But the Gemara is telling us the exact opposite. Your dark mood and your sluggishness are just the yetzer hara pulling a shtick. They do not represent who you really are.

Today, when you hit a moment of heaviness or struggle with a mitzvah, don't wait around for inspiration to magically strike. Push past the outer resistance, do the right thing anyway, and whisper to yourself, "Rotzeh ani, deep down, this is who I really am and what I truly want."