

13 Tammuz 5779  
July 16, 2019



Arachin Daf 30

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**  
**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

**Mishna**

If he (*the original owner*) sold it (*an ancestral field*) to a first (*purchaser*) for a *maneh* (*one hundred zuz*), and the first one sold it to a second one for two hundred *zuz*, he (*the original owner*) reckons only with the first (*price; presently, the field is in the possession of the second buyer, from whom the original owner desires to redeem it; he calculates only according to the purchase money he himself received from the first buyer; this amount is divided by the amount of years there are from the date of the sale until Yovel; this is the price which was paid per year; the owner pays the second purchaser the yearly amount for each year that is now remaining until Yovel*), for it is written: [*then let him calculate the years of his sale and return the remainder*] . . . to the man to whom he sold it.

If he (*the original owner*) sold it to the first (*purchaser*) for two hundred *zuz*, and the first one sold it to a second for one hundred *zuz*, he (*the original owner*) reckons only with the second (*price*), for it is written: *then let him calculate the years of his sale and return the remainder to the man* i.e., to the man who (*presently*) is in possession of the field. [*These interpretations in both instances benefit the original owner.*]

One may not sell a distant field in order to redeem a nearer one, nor sell an inferior field in order to redeem one that is superior, nor borrow money in order to redeem a field, nor redeem it by halves. In the case of a consecrated field, however, all these things are permitted. In this respect, more

stringency applies to a common person than to consecrated objects. (30a)

**Calculating the Years**

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If he (*the original owner*) sold it (*an ancestral field*) to a first (*purchaser*) for a *maneh* (*one hundred zuz*), and the first one sold it to a second one for two hundred *zuz*, how do we know that he (*the original owner*) reckons only with the first (*price*)? For it is written: [*then let him calculate the years of his sale and return the remainder*] . . . to the man to whom he sold it.

If he (*the original owner*) sold it to the first (*purchaser*) for two hundred *zuz*, and the first one sold it to a second for one hundred *zuz*, how do we know that he (*the original owner*) reckons only with the second (*price*)? For it is written: *then let him calculate the years of his sale and return the remainder to the man* i.e., to the man who (*presently*) is in possession of the field. These are the words of Rebbe.

Rabbi Dostai ben Yehudah said: If he (*the original owner*) sold it (*an ancestral field*) to someone for a *maneh* (*one hundred zuz*), and its value appreciated to two hundred, how do we know that he reckons with the price of a *maneh*? It is written: *and return the remainder*, i.e., the remainder which is left in his hand (*from the purchase, which is a maneh*).

If he (*the original owner*) sold it (*an ancestral field*) to someone for two hundred *zuz*, and its value depreciated to one hundred, how do we know that he reckons with the

current price of a *maneh*? It is written: *and return the remainder*, i.e., the remainder that is left in the land (*which is a maneh*).

The *Gemora* asks: What is the practical difference between these two *Tannaim* (*for they both maintain that we favor the initial owner*)?

The *Gemora* answers: The practical difference would be in a case where it increased in value (*he sold it to two hundred*), then became less valuable (*for it was sold to a second person for one hundred*), then more valuable again (*for it increased to two hundred*). [According to *Rebbe*, the reckoning is on the basis of one hundred, the price paid by the second buyer, for the lowest price of the sale is the determining factor; however, according to the view of *Rabbi Dostai*, the reckoning is on the basis of two hundred, for the price of the first sale or the field's present value is the determining factor (*whichever is less*), and in this case, they are both two hundred.]

The *Gemora* asks: But from where do we know that the calculating is done in a lenient manner (*to favor the original owner*); perhaps it should be done stringently?

The *Gemora* answers: Do not think so, for we derive it from '*redemption*' written here, and '*redemption*' written in connection with the Hebrew slave (*and there, when the slave is redeeming himself, we rule in favor of the slave*).

The *Gemora* asks: But how do we know it there?

The *Gemora* answers: For it was taught in a *braisa*: If he was sold for one hundred and then became worth two hundred, how do we know that his value is only considered one hundred (*with respect to redemption*)? The verse states, "*From the money of his purchase (he will return his redemption)*." If he was sold for two hundred and is now only worth one hundred, how do we know he is considered worth one hundred? The verse states, "*Per his years*." We only

know this is true by a servant sold to an idolater, for then the redeemer has the advantage; but what if he is sold to a Jew? The *gezeirah shavah* of "*sachir-sachir*" tells us the law is the same if he is sold to a Jew.

*Abaye* said: I am like *Ben Azzai* in the marketplace in *Teveria*! [When he was feeling clearheaded he would make this proclamation, indicating that people could ask any question they wanted on any topic, just as they did to *Ben Azzai* who was known to have been very sharp and lived in *Teveria*.]

One of the *Rabbis* asked him: The verses quoted in the *braisa* above could really be derived to give the servant a more stringent redemption price or a more lenient one. Why do we derive them leniently?

[*Abaye answered*:] This is because the Torah treated such a servant leniently, as indicated in the following *braisa*. The *braisa* states: "*For it is good for him with you*." This teaches that he should be with you in food and drink. You should not eat fine bread while he eats coarse bread, or drink old wine while he drinks new wine, or sleep on feathers while he sleep on straw. This law created the phrase: Someone who buys a servant is as if he has bought himself a master. [Accordingly, we should be lenient with him regarding redemption as well.]

The *Gemora* says: One can reject this by saying that this is only regarding things like food and drink. However, regarding his redemption, we should be stringent as per the statement of *Rabbi Yosi* the son of *Rabbi Chanina*. He stated in a *braisa*: Come see how difficult (*of a sin*) it is to deal with the most minor sin of *Shemitah*. If a person sells *Shemitah* fruit, he will end up selling his possessions (*due to poverty*), as the verse states, "*In the year of Yovel, a person will return to his ancestral heritage*." The verse states immediately afterward: "*And if you will sell something to your friend or buy something from your friend*." [The indication is if you will sell, meaning *shemitah* fruit, you will end up selling your possessions.] If a person does not notice the error of his ways, he will end up selling his fields, as the verse states, "*When*

*your friend will become poor and he will sell from his ancestral heritage.*” If it does not come to his hand (*meaning he still does not repent*), he then ends up selling his house, as the verse states, “*When he will sell a house in a city with a wall.*”

The *Gemora* interjects: Why did the *braisa* say, “If a person does not notice” (*if he decides not to repent*) and then it says, “If it does not come to his hand” (*meaning that it is a foregone conclusion that he will not repent*)?

The *Gemora* answers: This is as Rav Huna states: Once a person sins and then sins again, it is permitted to him. Is it really permitted? It is like it is permitted to him. [Accordingly, the *braisa* explained the last verse to mean that he will not repent, for he repeated the sin, and it becomes permitted to him.]

The *braisa* continues: If it does not come to his hand, he will end up selling his daughter, as the verse states, “*And if a man will sell his daughter.*” Even though this verse is not near the other verses, the person must have sold his daughter, as people say that one would rather sell his daughter before taking loans with interest. Why do they say this? One’s daughter pays off her slavery all the time, while interest keeps accruing. If this does not come to his hand, he borrows with interest. This is as the verse states, “*When your friend will become poor, and his hand will reach with you.*” Near this verse another verse states, “*Do not take from him (interest etc.).*” If this does not come to his hand, he eventually sells himself, as the verse states, “*If your brother becomes poor and he is sold to you.*” “*You*” here does not mean you, but rather to a convert, and not a regular convert, but rather a “*ger toshav*” (*a gentile who accepts not to worship idols and possibly the rest of the seven Noahide laws*). This is as the verse states, “*to a ger toshav.*” It then states he is sold, “*to the family of a convert,*” implying to idolaters. “*L’eiker,*” implies he is sold to the service of the idols themselves. [Since he is sold into slavery because of his sins, perhaps we should treat him stringently.]

Abaye answered: There, the verse itself instructs us (*to have compassion on him and redeem him*), for it was taught in the Academy of Rabbi Yishmael: Being that this person allowed himself to be sold into the service of idolatry, perhaps we should just say to push the rock after the person who fell (*and not redeem him*)? The verse therefore states, “*After he is sold he will have redemption; one of his brothers will redeem him.*” One might say that the Torah cares about his redemption in order that he should not become assimilated among the idolaters. However, with regarding the calculation in redeeming him, perhaps we should be strict due to the teaching of Rabbi Yosi above?

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak answered: There are two verses. One verse says, “*If there are many years,*” and one verse says, “*If there are few years left.*” Are there many years and few years (*can it be more than six years*)? Rather, the verse indicates that the case where his value increases (*greater years*) can be derived from, “*the money of his purchase,*” and the case where his value decreases (*few years*) can be derived from “*according to his years.*”

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps the verses mean the following: If he worked for two years and he has four years left, he should give four years worth from “*the money of his purchase.*” If he worked for four years and has two years left, the value of two years should be given from “*according to his years.*” [The *Gemora* is suggesting that the verse is not dealing with increases or decreases in value.]

The *Gemora* answers: If so, the verse should so, “If there are many years,” or “If there are few years left.” Why does it say, “If there are within the years?” This implies that if within the years there is an increase, its law is derived from the verse, “*from the money of the purchase.*” If there is a decrease, it is derived from “*according to the years.*”

Rav Yosef commented: Rav Nachman derived the meaning of these verses like a “Sinai” (*the mountain on which the Torah was given*). (30a – 30b)



## DAILY MASHAL

### ***Repentance in the Same Situation***

It is written [Yirmiyah 22:10]: *Cry intensely for one who leaves, because he will not return again and see the land of his birthplace.* Rav Yehudah said: This is referring to one who departs this world without children.

Rav Huna said: The verse is referring to a person who committed a sin and repeated it. The *Gemora* states: Rav Huna is following his reasoning stated elsewhere that one who commits a sin and repeats it; it has become permitted to him.

The *Gemora* asks: Do you actually think that it is permitted? The *Gemora* answers: Rav Huna means that it becomes to him as if it was permitted.

The *Gemora* (*Yoma 86b*) explains that a true penitent is one who committed a sin in the past and then the opportunity for the same sins comes again a first time and a second time and he is saved from the sin on both occasions.

The Sefer Chasidim writes that a person should not put himself into a situation where he is tempted to sin, because he may not be able to withstand temptation.

The Tzlach questions the words of the Sefer Chasidim from the commentary of the Kli Yakar in Parshas Chukas, who writes regarding the phenomena of the Parah Adumah that the Parah Adumah was capable of rendering pure those that were impure and conversely, rendering impure those that were pure.

The Kli Yakar likens this idea to certain medicines that are beneficial for one who is ill but can prove fatal for one who is

healthy. There is a parallel between remedying the body and remedying the soul. One who wishes to repent must be with the same woman that he sinned with the first time, at the same time of the year in which he had sinned, and at the same place where he sinned with her. Thus, the temptation to sin is particularly strong, as his Evil Inclination will entice him to respond exactly as he did before. By resisting the temptation, he demonstrates that he is a true penitent.

The Kli Yakar adds that this is what the *Gemora* (*Brochos 34b*) means when it states that in the place where penitents stand, the completely righteous do not stand, i.e. the completely righteous cannot stand in a place of temptation. Yet, according to the Sefer Chasidim, a righteous person is not permitted to endanger himself by entering into such a situation.

### ***Transgression Committed Only Once***

The *Gemora* states that if one commits a transgression and repeats it, it becomes like it is permitted to him.

Rav Shach was once giving rebuke and he questioned if there is any among us that have committed a sin and not repeated it. Woe is to us.

The Mabit in Beis Elokim (shaar hateshuva ch 11) writes that our sages have said if one commits a transgression three times, it becomes like it is permitted to him. Did he have a different version in the *Gemora* than us? Our *Gemora* states this to be correct if a person commits a sin even twice.