דַּף יוֹמִי · עֲרָכִין · דַּף כ״ו

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

📖 THE SUGYA

In this daf, the Gemara continues its deep dive into the halachos of consecrating and redeeming an sdei achuzah (an ancestral field). We look at the machlokes between Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon regarding the limudim used to derive how an ancestral field is redeemed, comparing a gift given to Kohanim with other types of Hekdesh like Bedek HaBayis. The sugya then turns to the shita of Rabbi Eliezer, who holds that if an ancestral field was not redeemed before Yovel, it does not automatically go out to the Kohanim, but rather stays in Hekdesh.

The Gemara brings a shakla v'tarya between Rabba, Abaye, and Rava to clarify the exact pasuk and sevara behind Rabbi Eliezer's shita. Along the way, the sugya analyzes various braisos that delve into complex redemption scenarios—such as when an owner redeems his field in a second Yovel cycle, or when a Kohen receives a field at Yovel, consecrates or sells it, and another person redeems it from Hekdesh. The Gemara meticulously works out how the pesukim account for every permutation of returning the field to its proper owner or to the Kohanim.

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

עמוד א׳ DAF 26A

EXPLANATION

מִקָּדְשֵׁי בֶּדֶק הַבַּיִת,

from other items **consecrated for Temple maintenance**,

EXPLANATION

וְאֵין דָּנִין קָדְשֵׁי בֶּדֶק הַבַּיִת מִקָּדְשֵׁי מִזְבֵּחַ.

and one does not derive items **consecrated for Temple maintenance from** items that are **consecrated for the altar**, such as the two lambs of Shavuos.

QUESTION

וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן נָמֵי, נֵילַף מִמַּקְדִּישׁ בַּיִת!

The Gemara asks: **And** according to **Rabbi Shimon also, let him derive** the halacha by means of a gezeirah shavah **from one who consecrates a house**, just like Rabbi Yehuda does! Why does he disagree?

ANSWER

דְּנִין דָּבָר שֶׁמַּתָּנָה לַכֹּהֲנִים, מִדָּבָר שֶׁמַּתָּנָה לַכֹּהֲנִים,

The Gemara answers: Rabbi Shimon holds that **one derives a matter that is a gift to the Kohanim**—an ancestral field that goes to the Kohanim at Yovel—**from a matter that is a gift to the Kohanim**, namely the two lambs of Shavuos;

EXPLANATION

וְאֵין דָּנִין דָּבָר שֶׁמַּתָּנָה לַכֹּהֲנִים, מִדָּבָר שֶׁאֵינוֹ מַתָּנָה לַכֹּהֲנִים.

and one does not derive a matter that is a gift to the Kohanim from a matter that is not a gift to the Kohanim, such as a consecrated house, which goes to Bedek HaBayis and not to Kohanim.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: לֹא נִכְנָסִין, וְלֹא נוֹתְנִין.

We learned in our Mishnah: **Rabbi Eliezer says:** If an ancestral field was not redeemed before Yovel, the Kohanim **do not enter** into it, **and** also **they do not give** its redemption price to the Temple treasury.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

אָמַר רַבָּה: מַאי טַעְמָא דְּרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר?

Rabbah said: What is the reason of Rabbi Eliezer for holding that the field remains in Hekdesh?

PROOF

אָמַר קְרָא: ״וְאִם לֹא יִגְאַל אֶת הַשָּׂדֶה לֹא יִגָּאֵל עוֹד, וְאִם מָכַר אֶת הַשָּׂדֶה וְהָיָה הַשָּׂדֶה בְּצֵאתוֹ בַּיּוֹבֵל״.

The verse says: “And if he will not redeem the field, it shall not be redeemed anymore; or if he sold the field... and the field when it goes out in the Jubilee shall be holy...”

OBJECTION

אָמַר אַבָּיֵי: סַכִּינָא חֲרִיפָא מַפְסְקָא קְרָאֵי?

Abaye said objecting to Rabba: Does **a sharp knife slice up verses** so that you can split one continuous sentence into two separate rules?

ANSWER

אֶלָּא אָמַר אַבָּיֵי: טַעְמָא דְּרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר כִּדְתַנְיָא:

Rather, Abaye said: The reason of Rabbi Eliezer is **as it was taught** in a braisa:

BRAISA

״לֹא יִגָּאֵל״ — יָכוֹל לֹא תְּהֵא נִגְאֶלֶת שֶׁתְּהֵא לְפָנָיו כִּשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה?

From the phrase **“it shall not be redeemed,” I might** have thought **it cannot be redeemed** by the owner at all, even **to be in his possession like a purchased field** which stays with him until Yovel?

BRAISA

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר ״עוֹד״ — לִכְמוֹת שֶׁהָיְתָה אֵינָהּ נִגְאֶלֶת, אֲבָל נִגְאֶלֶת שֶׁתְּהֵא לְפָנָיו כִּשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה.

The verse teaches by adding the word **“anymore”**: **to return to how it was** originally, as an ancestral field, **it cannot be redeemed; but it can be redeemed to be in his possession like a purchased field.**

QUESTION

אֵימַת? אִילֵימָא בְּיוֹבֵל רִאשׁוֹן — אַמַּאי אֵינָהּ נִגְאֶלֶת? שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה נָמֵי הָוְיָא!

Abaye analyzes the braisa: **When** is this referring to? **If we say in the first Yovel** cycle, **why can it not be redeemed** as an ancestral field? At that stage, **it is indeed an ancestral field**!

STATEMENT

אֶלָּא פְּשִׁיטָא בְּיוֹבֵל שֵׁנִי.

Rather, it is obvious that the braisa speaks of redemption during **the second Yovel** cycle.

QUESTION

וּלְמַאן? אִילֵימָא לְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן, לְכֹהֲנִים נָפְקָא!

And according to whom is this braisa? **If we say according to Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon**, surely at the end of the first Yovel **it already went out to the Kohanim** and left Hekdesh entirely!

RESOLUTION

אֶלָּא לָאו רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר, וּשְׁמַע מִינַּהּ טַעְמָא דְּרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר מֵהָכָא.

Rather, is it not according to **Rabbi Eliezer**, who holds it stays in Hekdesh indefinitely? **And conclude from this** that **the reason of Rabbi Eliezer** is derived **from here**, from the word "anymore".

QUESTION

וְתִסְבְּרָא, רַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן הַאי ״עוֹד״ מַאי דָּרְשִׁי בֵּיהּ?

The Gemara asks: **And can you understand** the braisa this way? If so, **Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon, what do they derive from this** word **“anymore”?**

ANSWER

אֶלָּא, הָכָא בְּמַאי עָסְקִינַן — בְּשָׂדֶה שֶׁיָּצְאָה לַכֹּהֲנִים, וְהִקְדִּישָׁהּ כֹּהֵן, וְאָתוּ בְּעָלִים לְמִיפְרְקַהּ.

Rather, even Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon can explain it: **with what are we dealing here? With a field that went out to the Kohanim** at Yovel, **and the Kohen consecrated it, and the original owner came to redeem it** from Hekdesh.

EXPLANATION

סָלְקָא דַּעְתָּךְ אָמֵינָא: לָא תִּיפְרוֹק, שֶׁתְּהֵא לְפָנָיו כִּשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה —

It might **enter your mind to say: he cannot redeem it** so **that it should be in his possession like a purchased field;**

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: ״עוֹד״, לִכְמוֹת שֶׁהָיְתָה אֵינָהּ נִגְאֶלֶת, אֲבָל נִגְאֶלֶת שֶׁתְּהֵא לְפָנָיו כִּשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה.

the verse teaches: “anymore” — to return to how it was as an ancestral field **it cannot be redeemed, but it can be redeemed to be in his possession like a purchased field.**

BRAISA

וְהָתַנְיָא: ״בִּשְׁנַת הַיּוֹבֵל יָשׁוּב הַשָּׂדֶה לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ מֵאִתּוֹ״,

And so it was taught in another braisa: It says regarding a purchased field, **“In the year of the Jubilee the field shall return to the one from whom he bought it,”**

BRAISA

יָכוֹל יַחְזוֹר לַגִּזְבָּר שֶׁלְּקָחוֹ מִמֶּנּוּ?

I might think it means it **should return to the Temple treasurer from whom he bought it** when he redeemed it?

BRAISA

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: ״לַאֲשֶׁר לוֹ אֲחֻזַּת הָאָרֶץ״.

The verse teaches: “to the one to whom the ancestral land belongs.”

BRAISA

יֵאָמֵר: ״לַאֲשֶׁר לוֹ אֲחֻזַּת הָאָרֶץ״, מָה תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר ״לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ מֵאִתּוֹ״?

The braisa continues: If so, **let it be said: “to the one to whom the ancestral land belongs,” why does the verse teach: “to the one from whom he bought it”?**

BRAISA

שָׂדֶה שֶׁיָּצְאַת לַכֹּהֲנִים, וּמְכָרָהּ כֹּהֵן, וְהִקְדִּישָׁהּ לוֹקֵחַ, וּגְאָלָהּ אַחֵר —

This comes to teach about **a field that went out to the Kohanim** at Yovel, **and a Kohen sold it, and the buyer consecrated it, and another person redeemed it** from Hekdesh —

BRAISA

יָכוֹל תַּחְזוֹר לַבְּעָלִים הָרִאשׁוֹנִים?

I might think at the next Yovel **it should return to the original owner?**

BRAISA

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: ״לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ״.

The verse teaches: “to the one from whom he bought it”—meaning it returns to the Kohen who sold it.

STATEMENT

וְאִיצְטְרִיךְ ״לֹא יִגָּאֵל״, וְאִיצְטְרִיכָא לְמִיכְתַּב ״לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ״.

The Gemara notes: **And it was necessary** for the Torah to write the implication of **“it shall not be redeemed,” and it was necessary to write “to the one from whom he bought it.”**

EXPLANATION

דְּאִי כְּתַב רַחֲמָנָא ״לֹא יִגָּאֵל״, דְּלָא קָא הָדְרָה כְּלָל,

For if the Merciful One had written only **“it shall not be redeemed,”** I would say that is **because it does not return at all** to the original owner during his lifetime,

EXPLANATION

אֲבָל הָכָא דְּקָא הָדְרָה, תֵּיהְדַּר לְמָרַהּ קַמָּא, כְּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ".

but here, where it does return at Yovel, I might say **it should return to its original owner; therefore the Merciful One wrote "to the one from whom he bought it."**

EXPLANATION

וְאִי כְּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ", דְּלָא קָא יָהֲבִי בְּעָלִים דָּמֵי,

And if the Merciful One had written only **"to the one from whom he bought it,"** I would say that applies where **the owner did not give money** to redeem it from Hekdesh,

EXPLANATION

אֲבָל הָכָא, דְּקָא יָהֲבִי דְּמֵי, תֵּיקוּם בִּידַיְיהוּ, כְּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "לֹא יִגָּאֵל".

but here, where he did give money to redeem it, I might say **it should stay in his hands** permanently; therefore **the Merciful One wrote "it shall not be redeemed"** as an ancestral field.

EXPLANATION

וְאִי כְּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "לֹא יִגָּאֵל", וְלָא כְּתַב "עוֹד", הֲוָה אָמֵינָא: לָא תֵּיפְרוֹק כְּלָל,

And if the Merciful One had written "it shall not be redeemed," and had not written "anymore," I would have said: he cannot redeem it at all;

EXPLANATION

כְּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "עוֹד", לְכְמוֹת שֶׁהָיְתָה אֵינָהּ נִגְאֶלֶת, אֲבָל נִגְאֶלֶת שֶׁתְּהֵא לְפָנָיו כִּשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה.

therefore the Merciful One wrote "anymore," to teach: **to return to how it was** as an ancestral field **it cannot be redeemed, but it can be redeemed to be in his possession like a purchased field.**

QUESTION

מַאי הָוֵי עֲלַהּ?

The Gemara asks: **What was** the conclusion **concerning** the original question of Rabbi Eliezer's rationale?

ANSWER

אָמַר רָבָא, אָמַר קְרָא: "וְהָיָה הַשָּׂדֶה בְּצֵאתוֹ בַיּוֹבֵל", בְּצֵאתוֹ מִיַּד אַחֵר.

Rava said: The verse says: "And the field when it goes out in the Jubilee shall be holy..." — meaning only **when it goes out from the hand of another** person who redeemed it, but not directly from Hekdesh itself.

עמוד ב׳ DAF 26B

QUESTION

אִיבַּעְיָא לְהוּ:

A dilemma was raised by them in the bais medrash:

QUESTION

בְּעָלִים בְּיוֹבֵל שֵׁנִי, כְּאַחֵר דָּמוּ אוֹ לָא?

According to Rabbi Eliezer, if the **owner** redeems his ancestral field **in the second Yovel, is he considered like another person** who redeems it, so that it will leave his hands to the kohanim at the next Yovel, **or not?**

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע:

Come and hear a proof from a braisa:

BRAISA

"לֹא יִגָּאֵל" —

The pasuk says regarding an ancestral field: **"It shall not be redeemed"**—

BRAISA

יָכוֹל לֹא תְּהֵא נִגְאֶלֶת, שֶׁתְּהֵא לְפָנָיו כִּשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה?

I might have thought this means **it shall not be redeemed** by the owner at all, even **so that it should be before him like a purchased field?**

BRAISA

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר "עוֹד" —

The Torah teaches us by adding the word **"anymore"**—

BRAISA

לְכִמּוֹת שֶׁהָיְתָה אֵינָהּ נִגְאֶלֶת, אֲבָל נִגְאֶלֶת שֶׁתְּהֵא לְפָנָיו כִּשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה.

meaning **to be as it was,** an ancestral field, **it is not redeemed, but it IS redeemed so that it should be before him like a purchased field.**

QUESTION

אֵימַת?

The Gemara analyzes this braisa: **When** is this case speaking of?

QUESTION

אִילֵּימָא בְּיוֹבֵל רִאשׁוֹן —

If we say it is speaking **in the first Yovel** cycle in which he consecrated it—

OBJECTION

אַמַּאי אֵינָהּ נִגְאֶלֶת? אֲחוּזָה נָמֵי הָוְיָא!

why is it not redeemed to be an ancestral field? **It IS an ancestral field!** As long as Yovel hasn't passed, if the owner redeems it, it returns to him fully as his ancestral land!

ANSWER

אֶלָּא פְּשִׁיטָא בְּיוֹבֵל שֵׁנִי.

Rather, it is obvious the braisa is speaking where he redeems it **in the second Yovel** cycle.

QUESTION

וּלְמַאן?

And according to whose opinion is this braisa?

OBJECTION

אִי לְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן — לְכֹהֲנִים נָפְקָא!

If you say it is **according to Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon,** that cannot be, because according to them, as soon as the first Yovel arrived, **it went out to the kohanim!** So he can't redeem it from Hekdesh in the second Yovel at all!

ANSWER

אֶלָּא לָאו לְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר,

Rather, is it not according **to Rabbi Eliezer,** who holds it stays in Hekdesh until redeemed?

PROOF

וּשְׁמַע מִינַּהּ: בְּעָלִים בְּיוֹבֵל שֵׁנִי כְּאַחֵר דָּמוּ.

and hear from this a resolution to our dilemma: **an owner in the second Yovel is considered like another person,** since he can only redeem it to be like a purchased field!

OBJECTION

וְתִסְבְּרַא?!

The Gemara rejects this: **And can you understand it this way?!**

OBJECTION

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן הַאי "עוֹד" מַאי דָּרְשִׁי בֵּיהּ?

If so, according to **Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon, this** word **"anymore", what do they derive from it?** They must also need this verse for something!

ANSWER

אֶלָּא, הָכָא בְּמַאי עָסְקִינַן?

Rather, what are we dealing with here in this braisa according to everyone?

EXPLANATION

בְּשָׂדֶה שֶׁיָּצְאָה לַכֹּהֲנִים, וְהִקְדִּישָׁהּ כֹּהֵן, וַאֲתוֹ בְּעָלִים לְמִיפְרַקָּהּ.

We are dealing **with a field that went out to the kohanim** at Yovel, **and the kohen consecrated it, and then the original owner came to redeem it** from Hekdesh.

EXPLANATION

סָלְקָא דַּעְתָּךְ אָמֵינָא: לָא תִּיפְרוֹק, שֶׁתְּהֵא כִּשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה.

It might **enter your mind to say: it cannot be redeemed** by him **so that it should be like a purchased field,** since he already lost it once.

EXPLANATION

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: "עוֹד" —

The Torah teaches us by saying **"anymore"**—

EXPLANATION

לִכְמוֹת שֶׁהָיְתָה אֵינָהּ נִגְאֶלֶת, אֲבָל נִגְאֶלֶת שֶׁתְּהֵא לְפָנָיו כִּשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה.

to be as it was, an ancestral field, **it is not redeemed, but it IS redeemed so that it should be before him like a purchased field.**

PROOF

וְהָתַנְיָא:

And so it was taught in another braisa:

BRAISA

"יָשׁוּב הַשָּׂדֶה לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ מֵאִתּוֹ",

The pasuk says regarding a purchased field: **"The field shall return to the one from whom he bought it",**

BRAISA

יָכוֹל יַחֲזוֹר לַגִּזְבָּר שֶׁלְּקָחָהּ הֵימֶנּוּ?

I might have thought **it should return to the treasurer from whom he bought it** when he redeemed it?

BRAISA

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: "לַאֲשֶׁר לוֹ אֲחֻזַּת הָאָרֶץ".

The Torah teaches us: "To the one to whom the ancestral possession of the land belongs", meaning the original ancestral owner.

BRAISA

מָה תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר "לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ"?

What does the Torah teach us then by saying **"to the one from whom he bought it"?**

BRAISA

שָׂדֶה שֶׁיָּצְאָה לַכֹּהֲנִים, וּמְכָרָהּ כֹּהֵן, וְהִקְדִּישָׁהּ לוֹקֵחַ, וּגְאָלָהּ אַחֵר —

This comes to teach about **a field that went out to the kohanim** at Yovel, **and the kohen sold it, and the buyer consecrated it, and another person redeemed it** from Hekdesh—

BRAISA

יָכוֹל תַּחְזוֹר לַבְּעָלִים הָרִאשׁוֹנִים?

I might have thought **it should return to the first owner** at the next Yovel?

BRAISA

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר "לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ".

The Torah teaches us: "To the one from whom he bought it", which means it returns to the kohen who sold it.

EXPLANATION

וְאִיצְטְרִיךְ לְמִיכְתַּב "לֹא יִגָּאֵל", וְאִיצְטְרִיךְ לְמִיכְתַּב "לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ",

And it was necessary to write "It shall not be redeemed", and it was necessary to write "To the one from whom he bought it".

EXPLANATION

דְּאִי כְּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "לֹא יִגָּאֵל" דְּלָא קָא חָדְרָא כְּלָל, כְּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ".

For if the Merciful One had written only **"It shall not be redeemed",** I would think it only applies where the kohen consecrated it and the owner redeemed it, **that it does not return at all** to the original owner; therefore **the Merciful One wrote "To the one from whom he bought it"** to teach that even if a buyer consecrated it, it goes back to the kohen and not the original owner.

EXPLANATION

וְאִי כְּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ", דְּלָא קָיָהֲבִי בְּעָלִים דְּמֵי, אֲבָל הָכָא, דְּיָהֲבִי בְּעָלִים דְּמֵי, דְּתֵיקוּם בִּידַיְהוּ, כְּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "לֹא יִגָּאֵל".

And if the Merciful One had written only **"To the one from whom he bought it",** I would say that's because **the owner did not give money** to redeem it; **but here, where the owner DID give money** to redeem it from Hekdesh, I would think **it should stay in his hands** as an ancestral field, therefore **the Merciful One wrote "It shall not be redeemed".**

EXPLANATION

וְאִי כְּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "לֹא יִגָּאֵל", וְלָא כְּתַב "עוֹד", הֲוָה אָמֵינָא לָא תִּיפְרוֹק כְּלָל, כְּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "עוֹד", לְכִמּוֹת שֶׁהָיְתָה אֵינָהּ נִגְאֶלֶת, אֲבָל נִגְאֶלֶת שֶׁתְּהֵא לְפָנָיו כִּשְׂדֵה מִקְנָה.

And if the Merciful One had written "It shall not be redeemed" and had not written "anymore", I would have said he cannot redeem it at all; therefore **the Merciful One wrote "anymore",** to teach: **to be as it was,** an ancestral field, **it is not redeemed, but it IS redeemed so that it should be before him like a purchased field.**

QUESTION

מַאי הֲוֵי עֲלַהּ?

The Gemara asks: **What came of it** regarding our original dilemma about an owner redeeming in the second Yovel according to Rabbi Eliezer?

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע:

Come and hear a proof from a braisa:

BRAISA

רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: גְּאָלָהּ בְּעָלִים בְּיוֹבֵל שֵׁנִי — יוֹצְאָה לַכֹּהֲנִים בַּיּוֹבֵל.

Rabbi Eliezer says: If the owner redeemed it in the second Yovel, it goes out to the kohanim at the next **Yovel.** This proves an owner in the second Yovel is considered like another person!

QUESTION

אָמַר לֵיהּ רָבִינָא לְרַב אָשֵׁי:

Ravina said to Rav Ashi:

OBJECTION

הָאֲנַן לָא תְּנַן הָכִי, רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: אֵין הַכֹּהֲנִים נִכְנָסִין לְתוֹכָהּ עַד שֶׁיִּגָּאֲלֶנָּה אַחֵר!

Did we not learn differently in our Mishnah? For the Mishnah says, **Rabbi Eliezer says: The kohanim do not enter into it until another person redeems it!** This implies if the owner redeems it, even in the second Yovel, it stays with him!

ANSWER

אָמַר לֵיהּ: בְּעָלִים בְּיוֹבֵל שֵׁנִי כְּאַחֵר דָּמוּ.

Rav Ashi **said to him:** When the owner redeems it **in the second Yovel, he IS considered like another person!**

STATEMENT

אִיכָּא דְּאָמְרִי: רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: גְּאָלָהּ בְּיוֹבֵל שֵׁנִי — אֵינָהּ יוֹצְאָה לַכֹּהֲנִים בַּיּוֹבֵל.

There are those who say a different version of the braisa: **Rabbi Eliezer says: If he redeemed it in the second Yovel, it does NOT go out to the kohanim at the Yovel.**

QUESTION

אָמַר לֵיהּ רָבִינָא לְרַב אָשֵׁי:

Ravina said to Rav Ashi:

OBJECTION

אַף אֲנַן נָמֵי תְּנִינָא, רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: אֵין הַכֹּהֲנִים נִכְנָסִין לְתוֹכָהּ עַד שֶׁיִּגָּאֲלֶנָּה אַחֵר!

We also learned this in our Mishnah, for **Rabbi Eliezer says: The kohanim do not enter into it until another person redeems it!** Why did the braisa need to state this?

ANSWER

אָמַר לֵיהּ: אִי מִמַּתְנִיתִין הֲוָה אָמֵינָא: בְּעָלִים בְּיוֹבֵל שֵׁנִי כְּאַחֵר דָּמוּ, קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן.

Rav Ashi **said to him: If** we had only learned it **from our Mishnah, I would have said that an owner in the second Yovel IS considered like another person;** therefore the braisa **comes to teach us** that he is not considered like another person.

MISHNAH

מַתְנִי׳

MISHNAH:

MISHNAH

הַלּוֹקֵחַ שָׂדֶה מֵאָבִיו, וּמֵת אָבִיו, וְאַחַר כָּךְ הִקְדִּישָׁהּ — חֲרֵי הִיא כִּשְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה.

If one buys a field from his father, and his father dies, and afterwards he consecrated it, it is like an ancestral field.

MISHNAH

הִקְדִּישָׁהּ וְאַחַר כָּךְ מֵת אָבִיו — חֲרֵי הִיא כְּשָׂדֶה מִקְנָה, דִּבְרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר.

If he consecrated it and afterwards his father died, it is like a purchased field; these are the words of Rabbi Meir.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אוֹמְרִים: חֲרֵי הִיא כִּשְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה,

Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon say: It is like an ancestral field,

MISHNAH

שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: ״אִם מִשְּׂדֵה מִקְנָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר לֹא מִשְׂדֵה אֲחֻזָּתוֹ״,

as it says: "And if from the field of his purchase which is not of the fields of his ancestral possession",

MISHNAH

שָׂדֶה שֶׁאֵינָהּ רְאוּיָה לִהְיוֹת שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה, יָצְתָה זוֹ שֶׁהִיא רְאוּיָה לִהְיוֹת שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה.

meaning a field that is not fitting to be an ancestral field is treated as a purchased field; excluded is this field, which IS fitting to be an ancestral field upon the father's death.

MISHNAH

שְׂדֵה מִקְנָה אֵינָהּ יוֹצְאָה לַכֹּהֲנִים בַּיּוֹבֵל, שֶׁאֵין אָדָם מַקְדִּישׁ דָּבָר שֶׁאֵינוֹ שֶׁלּוֹ.

A purchased field does not go out to the kohanim at Yovel, because a person cannot consecrate a thing that is not his beyond Yovel.

MISHNAH

הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַלְוִיִּם מַקְדִּישִׁין לְעוֹלָם, וְגוֹאֲלִין לְעוֹלָם, בֵּין לִפְנֵי הַיּוֹבֵל בֵּין לְאַחַר הַיּוֹבֵל.

Kohanim and Levi'im may consecrate forever, and may redeem forever, whether before Yovel or after Yovel.

GEMARA

גְּמָ׳

GEMARA:

BRAISA

תָּנוּ רַבָּנַן:

The Rabbis taught in a braisa:

BRAISA

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

From where do we know **regarding one who buys a field from his father, and consecrated it, and afterwards his father died, from where** do we know **that it should be before him like an ancestral field?**

BRAISA

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: ״וְאִם מִשְּׂדֵה מִקְנָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר לֹא מִשְּׂדֵה אֲחֻזָּתוֹ״ —

The Torah teaches us: "And if from the field of his purchase which is not of the fields of his ancestral possession"—

BRAISA

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

it means a **field that is not fitting to be an ancestral field** is treated as a purchased field; **excluded is this field, which IS fitting to be an ancestral field; these are the words of Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon.**

BRAISA

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

Rabbi Meir says: From where do we know **regarding one who buys a field from his father, and his father dies, and afterwards he consecrated it, from where** do we know **that it should be before him like an ancestral field?**

BRAISA

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: ״וְאִם מִשְּׂדֵה מִקְנָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר לֹא מִשְּׂדֵה אֲחֻזָּתוֹ״ —

The Torah teaches us: "And if from the field of his purchase which is not of the fields of his ancestral possession"—

BRAISA

שָׂדֶה שֶׁאֵינָהּ שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה, יָצְאַת זוֹ שֶׁהִיא שְׂדֵה אֲחוּזָה.

a **field that is not an ancestral field** is treated as a purchased field; **excluded is this field, which IS an ancestral field** at the time he consecrated it.

QUESTION

לֵימָא בְּהָא קָא מִיפַּלְגִי,

The Gemara suggests: **Shall we say that they argue about this:**

EXPLANATION

דְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר סָבַר: קִנְיַן פֵּירוֹת כְּקִנְיַן הַגּוּף דָּמֵי.

that Rabbi Meir holds: ownership of the produce is considered like ownership of the land itself? Thus, when he bought it from his father, he acquired the body of the land, so when his father died, nothing new was added to his acquisition to make it an ancestral field.

EXPLANATION

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן סָבְרִי: קִנְיַן פֵּירוֹת לָאו כְּקִנְיַן הַגּוּף דָּמֵי.

And Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon hold: ownership of the produce is NOT considered like ownership of the land itself? Thus, the father retained the land itself, and upon his death, the son inherited the land itself as his ancestral possession.

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב נַחְמָן בַּר יִצְחָק: בְּעָלְמָא לְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה קִנְיַן פֵּירוֹת כְּקִנְיַן הַגּוּף דָּמֵי,

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: In general, according to Rabbi Shimon and Rabbi Yehuda, ownership of produce IS considered like ownership of the land itself,

SUMMARY

The Gemara explains that Rabbi Shimon prefers deriving the halachos of an ancestral field from the two lambs of Shavuos because both are gifts to the Kohanim, unlike a consecrated house which goes to Bedek HaBayis. The Gemara then explores Rabbi Eliezer's opinion that a field not redeemed before Yovel remains in Hekdesh; while Rabba and Abaye offer initial textual derivations using phrases like "it shall not be redeemed anymore," Rava concludes that the pasuk "when it goes out in the Jubilee" teaches that a field only goes to the Kohanim if it was redeemed by a third party, not if it remained in Hekdesh. Finally, the Gemara analyzes braisos interpreting the pesukim of Yovel to handle complex cases where Kohanim sell or consecrate fields they received, clarifying when a field returns to the Kohen, the buyer, or the original owner.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה · WHAT TO TAKE HOME

Look at the fascinating discussion in our sugya about how a field moves through different hands and different Yovel cycles. A Yid consecrated his ancestral field, but then things got complicated. It went to the Kohanim, a Kohen sold it, someone else bought it, consecrated it again, and another person redeemed it. You look at the whole shakla v'tarya and ask: what is the status of this field now? Does it go back to the original owner? Does it go to the Kohen who sold it? The Torah meticulously traces every step of the field's journey to define its true identity at every moment.

There is a deep chiddush here for our own daily avodah. A Yid can go through so many stages in life. You might feel that after everything you have been through, all the changes, the moves, the ups and downs, the times you felt distant or fell into different hands, you have lost your original status. You think, "After where I've been and what I've done, how can I get back to who I really was?" But the Torah is teaching us that Hashem tracks every single step of your neshama's journey. Nothing is lost, and no past stage erases your essential connection to Him.

Whatever spiritual space you find yourself in today, know that Hashem knows exactly where you are holding and values every single step you take to come close to Him. Today, pick one small mitzvah or a few minutes of learning that feels hard because of your current situation, and do it anyway, knowing that Hashem is right there with you in this exact stage of your life.