

תתרגם שמעתיד במוכר שדהו מפני רעתה –

Explain what you heard; when he sold his field because it was inferior

Overview

that what you heard in the name of רבא that רב אחא בריה דרב יוסף answered רב אשי that there is a קנין even if עייל ונפיק אזוי that is only if he was anxious to sell the field, because it was of an inferior quality. תוספות clarifies the case under discussion.

ונראה דהשתא אפילו נפיק ועייל בכולהו זוזי קני ולא דוקא חד זוזא¹ כדאמרינן בסמוך² -
עייל ונפיק was מוכר that now (in this case) even if the לוקה did not pay him anything), nevertheless for the entire money (meaning the לוקה is קונה, and this rule is not necessarily only in a case where the לוקה owed one זוז, as the גמרא states shortly -

ולא טרח וזבין במאתים וקא עייל ונפיק אזוי כמוכר שדהו מפני רעתה³ דמי או לא:
And he did not exert himself but sold a larger field for two hundred זוז, and the seller was עייל ונפיק אזוי; the גמרא there queries is this case similar to one who sells his field מפני רעתה or not. We see from that גמרא that the exemption of מוכר שדהו מפני רעתה (where there is no rule of עייל ונפיק אזוי), applies even when more than one זוז is owed.⁴

Summary

By מוכר שדהו מפני רעתה, the מוכר cannot retract even if he is עייל ונפיק for all the money.

Thinking it over

When ר' אחא בדר"י said to רב אשי, קני רבא, was that specifically in a case of ר' אחא בדר"י, or it was said generally?⁵

¹ Immediately prior to this גמרא, there was a discussion whether the rule of עייל ונפיק אזוי לא קנה, applies even in a case where he is owed only one זוז. The גמרא resolved that it applies for one זוז as well. The גמרא then cites the discussion between רב אשי and ר' אבהו, and we concluded that when רבא said קני it was by מפני רעתה. Superficially it may seem that this ruling of רבא was only if he was עייל ונפיק for one זוז. However, תוספות argues that it is not so, but rather that by מוכר שדהו מפני רעתה there is a קנין even if עייל ונפיק אכולהו זוזי.

² The גמרא shortly poses a query if one needed to sell a field to raise a hundred זוז of cash. However he could not easily find a customer to buy such a small parcel of land. If he would have exerted himself, however, he would have found this buyer, but he did not. He however did sell a larger plot for two hundred זוז, as תוספות continues.

³ The seller had the option of exerting himself and selling a smaller field for one hundred זוז (which is what he needed); the reason he did not exert himself, but rather sold the larger field because presumably for him it was an inferior field (מפני רעתה) and he did not mind selling it.

⁴ תוספות assumes that he was owed more than one זוז because the לשון אזוי (many זוזים) is.

⁵ See # 133. אוצר מפרשי התלמוד.