

ורבי יוסי הגלילי מידי אלא [באחר¹] כתיב –

And ר' יוסי הגלילי; is it then written, 'only' [by another]

Overview

ואם לא of פסוק 2 how to interpret ר"ע and ריה"ג cites a dispute between The ברייתא נמכר if ריה"ג (regarding a נמכר לנכרי). According to (נמכר לנכרי) יגאל באלה ויצא בשנת היובל וגו' (by his relatives, which would have set him free immediately), but rather he was נגאל by others, he still has to work for them until immediately). However ר"ע maintains that if he is נגאל באלה he must serve them (the relatives) until יובל, but if he is נגאל by others (not relatives) he is immediately freed.⁴ ריה"ג (or the גמרא) asks on ר"ע, does it say 'אלא' באלה in the פסוק.⁵ There was a גירסא that the גמרא (also) asked on ריה"ג, does the פסוק state אלא באחר.⁶ Our תוספות discusses the veracity of this גירסא.

נראה שלא גרס ליה דפשטיה דקרא הכי הוא⁷ -

It appears to us that we do not read the question of 'וריה"ג מידי אלא באחר כתיב', in our text, for the simple meaning of the verse indicates so, that אחר excludes אלה –

גורס 'מידי אלא באחר כתיב' why we are not offers an additional reason תוספות

ועוד דבמסקנא⁸ לא מתרצא ההיא קשיא בין לרבי יוסי הגלילי בין לרבי עקיבא⁹ -

¹ In our גמרא the text reads אלא באחר כתיב (instead of אלא כתיב).

² ויקרא (בהר) כה, נד.

³ ויצא ביוכל ריה"ג reads the פסוק as if it would say (by relatives) 'אלא באחר' (but rather by others), then יגאל באלה (but by אלה [relatives] he is freed immediately). he must work for the אחר until יובל (but by אלה [relatives] he is freed immediately).

⁴ ואם לא יגאל 'אלא' באלה ויצא בשנת היובל וגו' ר"ע reads the פסוק as if it would say; meaning that if he was נגאל באלה he must work for his relatives until יובל, but if he was נגאל by others he is free immediately.

⁵ See footnote # 4.

⁶ See footnote # 3. How does ריה"ג know that if others redeem him that he must serve them till יובל, since the פסוק does not state יוצא ביוכל. It could be that יוצא ביוכל is only if no one redeemed him (not his relatives and not אחר), but if someone redeemed him (whether אלה or אחר) he is freed immediately.

⁷ When the פסוק states 'וריה"ג מידי אלא באחר כתיב', it certainly indicates that we are (also) discussing another type of גאולה besides אלה (namely others). For if the פסוק meant that he was not נגאל altogether (see footnote # 6), the תורה should have written יוצא בשנת היובל; adding the word באלה indicates that there is another גאולה (besides אלה) which confines the עבד to continue to serve until יובל (see [however] footnote # 11). [However the question on ר"ע (that מידי 'אלא' באלה כתיב) is a valid one for אלה is not דקרא באלה.]

⁸ The conclusion of the גמרא is that both ר"ע and ריה"ג agree that אלה is an exclusion (that only if he is redeemed with אלה does he go free, however if he is not redeemed with אלה he must serve those who redeemed him), the question is whether אלה refers to קרובים (the view of ריה"ג) and it excludes אחרים (that he must serve them), or whether אלה refers to אחרים (the view of ר"ע) and it excludes קרובים (that he must serve them).

⁹ Both ר"ע and ריה"ג agree that אלה excludes אחרים (see footnote # 8). If there is a valid question of כתיב באחר מידי אלא; the question remains unanswered, since both ר"ע and ריה"ג interpret the פסוק to mean אלא באחר.

And additionally, according to the conclusion of the גמרא this question of 'מידי' is not answered whether according to ר"ה or whether according to ר"ע -

וברוב ספרים אינו ולספרים דגרסי ליה נראה להרב רבינו משה דהכי פירושו -

And in most texts the question of 'מידי' אלא באחר כתיב' does not appear. And according to those who read it in their text, it appears to ה"ר משה that this is the explanation of the question -

מידי אלא [באחר] כתיב כיון דלא איירי כלל אלא מקרובים¹⁰ -

מידי אלא באחר כתיב, since the פסוק is only discussing redemption by relatives, so -

מנליה לרבי יוסי הגלילי דבשאר כל אדם לשעבוד -

How does ר"ה know that if he is redeemed by any others he must serve them -

דילמא קרובים מצו למפרקיה אבל אחרים לא מצו למפרקיה אפילו לשעבוד¹¹ -

Perhaps only relatives can redeem him but others cannot redeem him at all, even for the purpose that he should serve them. This explains the question of 'מידי' אלא באחר כתיב.

ובהכי מתרצא שפיר אמסקנא¹² דמיירי קרא נמי אגאולת רחוקים¹³ -

And with this explanation of the question 'מידי' אלא באחר כתיב', the question is properly answered according to the conclusion of the גמרא that the פסוק is also discussing רחוקים -

ואם כן פשטיה דקרא הכי¹⁴ הוא למר כדאית ליה¹⁵ ולמר כדאית ליה -

So therefore the simple reading of the פסוק is so (that לא יגאל באלה, but rather אלא, through someone who is not אלה), according to this master (ר"ה) as he maintains, and according to the other master (ר"ע) as he maintains.

Summary

The simple reading of באלה נגאל ואם לא יגאל באלה indicates that if another way he remains in servitude until יובל. Alternately we may have thought (in the הו"א) that אלה limits the rights of redemption to relatives only (but no strangers). However in the

¹⁰ The תורה (ויקרא [בהר] כה, מט) states (in פסוק) only discusses the possibilities of the עבד being redeemed by his relatives or by himself. There is no explicit mention of redemption by non-family members.

¹¹ The תורה writes באלה נגאל ואם לא יגאל באלה to teach us that only אלה (which means קרובים) can redeem him; to the total exclusion of others. See footnote # 7.

¹² A marginal note amends this to למסקנא (instead of אמסקנא).

¹³ Both agree that the word 'ונגאל' in the פסוק (see footnote # 10) is referring to אחרים.

¹⁴ We cannot say anymore as we asked initially that אלה means that he can only be redeemed by relatives and not by others (see footnote # 11) because we now know from נגאל that others can also redeem him (see footnote # 13).

¹⁵ See footnote # 8 (who the אלה refers to, and what it excludes, according to both ר"ה and ר"ע).

conclusion we know that strangers may redeem, therefore אלה excludes those who are not אלה to continued servitude.

Thinking it over

The מ"מ explains that the question of מידי אלא באחר כתיב was valid before we knew from the פסוק that there is a גאולה באחרים; however once we know that there is גאולה (as well), there is no question.¹⁶ If this is so; how come the גמרא later (after it taught us that ונגאל refers to גאולת אחרים) asks 'הדרא קושיא לדוכתיה', seemingly there is no more קושיא since אלא באחר is דקרא (and it cannot be an exclusion that אין ונגאל of פסוק)?!¹⁷ since we have the פסוק of ונגאל ע"י אחרים

¹⁶ See footnote # 14.

¹⁷ רש"ש and עצמות יוסף, פני יהושע