



т"оэ

Intro

Today we will Be"H learn מסכת בבא מציעא of דף ט"ו of מסכת. Some of the topics we will learn about include:

שבח

The Gemara discusses various scenarios regarding compensation for a buyer's improvements to land that was seized from him, including:

נמצאת שאינה שלו

If it was discovered to be stolen land;

בעל חוב

If it was seized by a creditor;

שבח המגיע לכתפים

Whether produce that is still growing is the equivalent of ripe produce; and



В

אפותיקי

If the land was specifically designated for collection;

רבית

The Gemara discusses several Halachos pertaining to the prohibition against charging interest, including:

It is forbidden מדרבנן to lend a measure of produce to be repaid with an equal measure, because the price may fluctuate and go up, and he may receive more value then he lent; and

זביני

Whether compensation for improvements to stolen land resembles interest?









הכיר בה שאינה שלו

If the buyer was aware that the land was stolen, the Gemara debates whether his payment was intended as a פקדון, a deposit, OR a מתנה, a gift.

חזר ולקחה מבעלים ראשונים

If a thief subsequently bought the land from the owner, the Gemara discusses whether he can act in place of the owner and claim it from the buyer.









So let's review...

The Gemara earlier cited שמואל's ruling:

המוכר שדה לחבירו

ונמצאת שאינה שלו

If someone sold a field, and it was discovered to be stolen property;

מעות יש לו

שבח אין לו

The buyer is reimbursed for the principal, but not for his improvements, because

כיון דלית ליה קרקע

מחזי כרבית

דשכר מעותיו עומד ונוטל

Since the buyer never actually owned the property, it appears as if the purchase money was a loan and he is now collecting his money with interest.

The Gemara cites a contradictory ruling of שמואל from which it seems that

יש לו שבח

Because שמואל said;

אמליך וכתוב

שופרא שבחא ופירי

A scribe must consult with a seller whether he wants to obligate himself to reimburse for improvements and produce.

Now, שמואל could not have been referring to a בעל חוב, a creditor, because שמואל ruled

בעל חוב גובה את השבח

אבל פירות לא

A creditor can collect the field with its improvements, but cannot collect ripe produce. Clearly, שמואל must be referring to

לוקח מגזלו

If the land is discovered to be stolen, and yet the buyer collects for שבת;

4



המוכר שדה לחבירו ונמצאת שאינה שלו

If someone sold a field, and it was discovered to be stolen property;

מעות יש לו שבח אין לו

The buyer is reimbursed for the principal, but not for his improvements, because

כיון דלית ליה קרקע מחזי כרבית דשכר מעותיו עומד ונוטל

Since the buyer never actually owned the property, it appears as if the purchase money was a loan and he is now collecting his money with interest.



A contradictory ruling of שמואל from which it seems that - יש לו שבת

אמליך וכתוב שופרא שבחא <u>ופירי</u>

A scribe must consult with a seller whether he wants to obligate himself to reimburse for improvements and produce.

שמואל could not be referring to a בעל חוב because שמואל ruled

בעל חוב גובה את השבח אבל פירות לא

A creditor can collect the field with its improvements, but cannot collect ripe produce. Clearly, שמואל must be referring to לוקת מגזלן

If the land is discovered to be stolen, and yet the buye collects for שבת









2

The Gemara suggests two answers:

1.

כגון שיש לו קרקע

If the seller reimburses the buyer with land, it does not resemble רבית.

2.

כגון שקנו מידו

If the seller performed a קנין at the time of the sale, committing to pay for the שבח if the property is seized, it does not resemble ...

Although

אסור ללות סאה בסאה

If is forbidden מדרבנן to lend a measure of produce to be repaid with an equal measure, because the price may fluctuate and go up and he may receive more value then he lent, and this is a form of רבית. Furthermore, this is true even

במקום שיש לו קרקע

And even

במקום שקנו מדיו

Whether or not he pays with land, or if he made such a קנין; The Gemara answers however,

התם הלואה

הכא זביני

We are more stringent regarding a loan, because it strongly resembles דבית; but we are more lenient regarding a sale, because it does not resemble רבית as much.









The Gemara returns to discuss a creditor claiming the

בעל חוב גובה את השבח

A creditor collects the improvements, and, as Rashi explains,

לא מצי לוקח למימר

אנא אשבחי

The buyer cannot argue that since he improved the land, the creditor must compensate him.

רבא adds

תדע שכך כותב לו מוכר ללוקח

Indeed, the seller accepts this obligation by writing in the document of sale:

אנא איקום ואשפי ואדכי ואמריק זביני אילין

I guarantee the sale against any claims,

אינון ועמליהון ושבחיהון

For the principal and the improvements;

And so, as Rashi explains,

כיון דעל המוכר הדר

גבי שבחא בעל חוב מלוקח

The creditor may take the Duzu as well, because the buyer will not suffer a loss since the seller will reimburse him.

Therefore, the **G**emara continues, מתנה דלא כתיב ליה הכי

לא טריף שבחא

If the land was given as a gift, the creditor cannot claim the שבח, because the gift was not guaranteed.

=======

בעל חוב גובה את השבח

A creditor collects the improvements

לא מצי לוקח למימר אנא אשבחי

The buyer cannot argue that since he improved the land, the creditor must compensate him.

KAI

תדע שכך כותב לו מוכר ללוקח

Indeed, the seller accepts this obligation by writing in the document of sale:

אנא איקום ואשפי ואדכי ואמריק זביני אילין

I guarantee the sale against any claims,

איכון ועמליהון ושבתיהון For the principal and the improvements;

> And so, as Rashi explains, כיון דעל המוכר הדר גבי שבחא בעל חוב מלוקח

The creditor may take the pol as well, because the buyer will not suffer a loss since the seller will reimburse him.

Therefore

מתנה דלא כתיב ליה הכי לא טריף שבחא

If the land was given as a gift, the creditor cannot claim the שבת, because the gift was not guaranteed.



Dedicated By: _







המוכר שדה לחבירו והשביחה

ובא בעל חוב וטרפה

If someone sold a field and the buyer improved it, and the land was then seized by a creditor;

אם השבח יותר על היציאה

נוטל את השבח מבעל הקרקע

והיציאה מבעל חוב

If the improvements are worth more than their cost, he collects his expenses from the creditor, and the additional value of the improvements from the seller, because as Rashi explains, the additional value of the improvements defrayed part of the loan.

ואם היציאה יתירה על השבח אין לו אלא הוצאה שיעור שבח מבעל חוב

But if the expenses exceeded the value of the improvements, he is only entitled to collect his expenses up to the value of the wall were from the creditor.



המוכר שדה לחבירו והשביחה ובא בעל חוב וטרפה

If someone sold a field and the buyer improved it, and the land was then seized by a creditor;

אם השבח יותר על היציאה נוטל את השבח מבעל הקרקע והיציאה מבעל חוב

If the improvements are worth more than their cost, he collects his expenses from the creditor, and the additional value of the improvements from the seller,

> Because, as Rashi explains, the additional value of the improvements defrayed part of the loan.

ואם היציאה יתירה על השבח אין לו אלא הוצאה שיעור שבח מבעל חוב

But if the expenses exceeded the value of the improvements, he is only entitled to collect his expenses up to the value of the שבת from the creditor.



Dedicated By: ___





5

The Gemara offers two approaches how שמואל understands this ברייתא:

1.

בלוקח מגזלן

The original owner seized the land, and yet the buyer claims the שבח from the sellerand there's no concern of גרנים.

כגון שיש לו קרקע

א"נ בשקנו מידו

Because the seller paid with land; alternately, he pre-committed to this obligation.

בבעל חוב

A creditor seized the land:

However, regarding the שבח that he seizes, it depends: הא דמסיק ביה כשיעור ארעא ושבחא

The בעל חוב does not pay for the שבח, if the amount owed is equal to the field AND the שבח;

הא דלא מסיק ביה אלא כשיעור ארעא

The בעל חוב does pay for the שבח, if the amount owed is only equal to the field.

However, the Gemara asks that this that the $\neg \neg \neg$ has the option of seizing the $\neg \neg$ and paying for it, is only according to the opinion that

אי אית ליה זוזי ללוקח

לא מצי מסליק ליה לבעל חוב

The buyer does not have the option of compelling the creditor to accept payment in lieu of the field. Rather, the creditor has the option of seizing the field or accepting the money. Therefore, the \square also has the option of seizing the \square as part of the field and then pay for the excess.

Two approaches how KINR understands this Kning



בלוקח מגזלן

The original owner seized the land, and yet the buyer claims the שבח from the seller and there's no concern of בי,

כגון שיש לו קרקע א"נ בשקנו מידו

Because the seller paid with land; alternately, he pre-committed to this obligation.



A creditor seized the land; However, regarding the שבח that he seizes, it depends:

הא דלא מסיק ביה אלא כשיעור ארעא

The בעל חוב does pay for the שבח, if the amount owed is only equal to the field.

הא דמסיק ביה כשיעור ארעא ושבתא

The בעל תוב does not pay for the שבח, if the amount owed is equal to the field AND the שבח;



But this is only according to the opinion that

אי אית ליה זוזי ללוקח לא מצי מסליק ליה לבעל חוב

The buyer does not have the option of compelling the creditor to accept payment in lieu of the field.

Rather, the creditor has the option of seizing the field or accepting the money.

Therefore, the בעל חוב also has the option of seizing the שבח as part of the field and then pay for the excess.



Dedicated By: __





6 However, according to the opinion

כי אית ליה זוזי ללוקח

מצי מסליק ליה לבעל חוב

The buyer does have the option of paying off the loan and keeping the land, the buyer can argue

אילו הוה לי זוזי

הוה מסלקינר מכולה ארעא

If I had money, I would keep the entire property;

השתא דלית לי זוזי

הב לי גרבא דארעא בארעא

שיעור שבחאי

Therefore, I am least entitled to keep a portion of the land equivalent to the value of the improvements above the amount of the loan?

The Gemara answers

כגון שעשאו אפותיקי

The seller initially designated this particular land for collection, telling the creditor:

לא יהא לך פרעון אלא מזו

You can only collect from this property; therefore, the buyer does not have any rights to it.

However, according to the opinion

כי אית ליה זוזי ללוקח מצי מסליק ליה לבעל <u>חוב</u>

The buyer does have the option of paying off the loan and keeping the land, the buyer can argue

אילו הוה לי זוזי הוה מסלקינך מכולה ארעא

 $If I \ had \ money, I \ would \ keep \ the \ entire \ property;$

השתא דלית לי זוזי הב לי גרבא דארעא בארעא שיעור שבתאי

Therefore, I am least entitled to keep a portion of the land equivalent to the value of the improvements above the amount of the loan?

כגון שעשאו אפותיקי

The seller initially designated this land for collection, telling the creditor:

לא יהא לך פרעון אלא מזו

You can only collect from this property therefore, the buyer does not have any rights to it.



Dedicated By: _





7

The Gemara discusses several additional scenarios of buying stolen property:

1.

הכיר בה שאינה שלו

ולקחה

If the buyer was aware that the field was stolen and nevertheless bought it, and the original owner then seized it:

אמר רב

מעות יש לו

שבח אין לו

He is still entitled to reimbursement, because

אדם יודע שקרקע אין לו

וגמר ונתן לשום פקדון

He knew the sale was not binding, and so he intended to give the money as a deposit, but did not say so outright, because

סבר לא מקבל

He thought the seller would not accept the deposit.

However, שמואל אמר אפילו מעות אין לו He is NOT reimbursed, because אדם יודע שקרקע אין לו

וגמר ונתן לשום מתנה

He knew the sale was not binding, and so he intended to give the money as a gift, but did not say so outright, because

כסיפא ליה מילתא

He though the seller might be embarrassed, and decline.

Several scenarios of buying stolen property



If the buyer was aware that the field was stolen and nevertheless bought it, and the original owner then seized it;

27 INK

מעות יש לו - שבח אין לו

He is still entitled to reimbursement, because

אדם יודע שקרקע אין לו וגמר ונתן לשום פקדון

He knew the sale was not binding, and so he intended to give the money as a deposit, but did not say so outright, because

סבר לא מקבל

He thought the seller would not accept the deposit.

אל אאל אאל אפילו מעות אין לו

He is not reimbursed, because

אדם יודע שקרקע אין לו וגמר ונתן לשום מתנה

He knew the sale was not binding, and so he intended to give the money as a gift, but did not say so outright, because

כסיפא ליה מילתא

He though the seller might be embarrassed, and decline.



Dedicated By: _





8 However the Gemara asks

האי לארעא במאי קא נחית

ופירות היכי אכיל

If he only intended to give a deposit or a gift, by what right does he acquire and use the land and eat the produce?

The Gemara explains

סבר אנא איחות לארעא

ואיעביד ואיכול בגויה

כי היכי דהוה קא עביד איהו

He reasons: in the interim, I will eat the produce, just as the thief would, and

לכי אתי מריה דארעא

זוזאי נהוו לפקדון או למתנה

If the owner claims the land, the payment will then be a deposit or a gift.

=====

(3)

האי לארעא במאי קא נחית ופירות היכי אכיל

If he only intended to give a deposit or a gift, by what right does he acquire and use the land and eat the produce?

סבר אנא איחות לארעא ואיעביד ואיכול בגויה כי היכי דהוה קא עביד איהו

He reasons: in the interim, I will eat the produce, just as the thief would, and

> לכי אתי מריה דארעא זוזאי נהוו לפקדון או למתנה

If the owner claims the land, the payment will then be a deposit or a gift.

2

An additional scenario:

חזר ולקחה מבעלים הראשונים

If after selling the field, the thief then bought it from its true owner;

We cannot say, as Rashi writes;

שגזלן במקום בעלים

ויוציאה מיד הלוקח

He can act in place of the owner and seize the field from the buyer, since the original sale was never valid, as it was stolen at that time, and reimburse him for it;

He cannot do that, because

מה מכר לו ראשון לשני

כל זכות שתבא לידו

A seller gives all his rights to the buyer; and as Rashi explains

וכשלקחה לא לקחה אלא

כדי שתהא מקוים ביד הלוקח

He bought it with the intention that it should remain with the buyer.

2

חזר ולקחה מבעלים הראשונים

If after selling the field, the thief then bought it from its true owner;

We cannot say,

As Kashi writes;

שגזלן במקום בעלים ויוליאה מיד הלוקח

He can act in place of the owner and seize the field from the buyer, since the original sale was never valid, as it was stolen at that time, and reimburse him for it;

He cannot do that, because

מה מכר לו ראשון לשני כל זכות שתבא לידו

A seller gives all his rights to the buyer;

and as Rashi explains וכשלקחה לא לקחה אלא כדי שתהא מקוים ביד הלוקח

He bought it with the intention that it should remain with the buyer.







The Gemara suggests two reasons for this ruling:

ניחא ליה דלא נקרייה גזלנא

He does not want to be maligned by the buyer.

However, in the case of a

If he gave it as a gift, he is not concerned, because he can

מאי גזלינא מינך

I have not stolen anything from you.

ניחא ליה דליקו בהמנותיה

He wants to maintain a reputation of honesty, and this IS equally applicable to a מתנה.

The Gemara rules on several of the disputes mentioned in this Daf regarding

לוקח מגזלן

1.

הלכתא

יש לו מעות ויש לו שבח

ואע"פ שלא פירש לו את השבח

If someone bought land and it was discovered to be stolen. the seller must compensate him for improvements he made to the property, and we are not concerned that it resembles רבית.

הלכתא הכיר בה שאינה שלו ולקחה מעות יש לו שבח אין לו

If someone bought land that he knew was stolen, the money is considered a deposit, and must be returned.

ניחא ליה דליקו בהמנותיה

He wants to maintain a reputation of honesty. and this is equally applicable to a מתנה.



ניחא ליה דלא נקרייה גזלנא

He does not want to be maligned by the buyer. However, in the case of a

מתנה

He is not concerned, because he can say

מאי גזלינא מינך I have not stolen anything

from vou.





יש לו מעות ויש לו שבח ואע״פ שלא פירש לו את השבח

If someone bought land and it was discovered to be stolen, the seller must compensate him for improvements he made to the property,

and we are not concerned that it resembles רבית.



הכיר בה שאינה שלו ולקחה מעות יש לו שבח אין לו

If someone bought land that he knew was stolen, the money is considered a deposit, and must be returned.



