

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf

1 Shevat 5772

Arachin Daf 12

January 25, 2012

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of
HaRav Refoel Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel o"n.
May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his
soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of Life.

Visit us on the web at <http://www.daf-yomi.org/>,
where we are constantly updating the archives from the entire Shas.

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler

To subscribe, please send email to: aneinu@gmail.com

Daily Daf

Song by Libations

They inquired: Do libations offered up by themselves (*without an accompanying offering brought on that day*) require a song or not? Since Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of Rabbi Yonasan that song is not sung (*by the Levi'im*) except over wine, we should recite song, or do we say it only when the offering includes eating and drinking, but not over drinking alone?

The *Gemora* attempts to prove this from the following *braisa*: Rabbi Yosi said: A happy event is credited to the day on which another happy event happened, etc. [*The division serving in the Beis Hamikdash was Yehoyariv, and the Levi'im were singing in their proper places, at that moment reciting the passage: And he will bring back upon them their own injustice, and in their own wickedness will he destroy them.*] The *Gemora* develops its proof: Now what need was there for song? It could not have been for the obligatory daily *tamid* offering, for on the seventeenth of *Tammuz* the *tamid* offering had been abolished. It could not have been on account of a voluntary *olah* offering, for Rav Mari the son of Rav Kahana taught that such did not require a song? It therefore must have been the song on account of libations (*that were brought by themselves*)!

The *Gemora* deflects the proof, for they could not have been singing as an obligation, for they were singing the Psalm for the fourth day of the week (*Wednesday*), not for the first day of the week (*Sunday*)! It must have been that it was just a hymn that had come to their mouth.

The *Gemora* asks: But they were standing upon the platform!?

The *Gemora* answers that this is in accordance with Rish Lakish, who said that the song may be sung even without any sacrifice.

The *Gemora* asks: But then they could sing by libations (*offered by themselves*) as well!?

The *Gemora* answers: That might lead to an offence (*for people might think that it is elective to sing by an obligatory olah offering as well*). (12a)

Year of the Destruction

It was stated above: Rabbi Yosi said: A happy event is credited to the day on which another happy event happened, etc. [*They said that when the first Beis Hamikdash was destroyed it was on the afternoon of Tisha B'Av, which was also the day after Shabbos and also the year after Shemittah.*]

The *Gemora* asks: How could it have taken place the year after *Shemittah*? Is it not written: [*Yechezkel said:*] *In the twenty-fifth year of our exile, in the beginning of the year, on the tenth day of the month, in the fourteenth year after the city was smitten.* Now, which is the year that "the beginning of the year" falls out on the tenth of the month? It must be referring to the year of *Yovel* (*the 50th year after seven cycles of Shemittah years – it is the year that on Yom Kippur, slaves go free and ancestral fields are returned to their owners*) Now, if

you should think that the Temple was destroyed in the first year of the seven-year cycle, let us consider the following: there are from (*Yovel*, which is) the first year (*after a Shemittah*) of one seven years' cycle (*counting backwards*) to the first year of another seven years' cycle eight years, and (*continuing to count backwards*) to the first of the previous seven years' cycle fifteen years? [Accordingly, how can it be said that the Temple was destroyed a year after *Shemittah*, and *Yechezkel* said that fourteen years after the Destruction was a *Yovel* year? *Yovel* should occur in the fifteenth year!?]

Ravina said: It was in the fourteenth year after the year in which the city was smitten.

The *Gemora* asks: But if so (*that Yechezkel's vision took place in the fifteenth year after the Destruction*), how could he have said that it was "the twenty-fifth year" of their exile? It was, in truth, in the twenty-sixth year, for a master said: They (*Yechezkel and others*) were exiled in the seventh year (*of King Yehoyakim's subjugation*), they were exiled in the eighth year (*of King Nevuchadnezzar's reign, for he captured Yehoyakim in his second year*), they (*the next group including King Tzidkiyahu*) were exiled (*and the Temple was destroyed*) in the eighteenth year (*of King Yehoyakim's subjugation*), they were exiled in the nineteenth year (*of King Nevuchadnezzar's reign*). Now, from the seventh (*of Yechezkel's exile*) to the eighteenth (*when the Temple was destroyed*) are eleven years; add fifteen years (*from the Destruction until his vision*) and that makes it twenty-six years (*since his exile*)! [Why, then, does he say that it was the twenty-fifth year?]

The *Gemora* counters: Ravina could answer you that even according to your own counting (*that the fourteen years includes the year of Destruction*), is it right? Since they were exiled also in the nineteenth year (*for this Amora maintains that the second exile began in the eighteenth year and concluded – together with the destruction of the Temple, in the nineteenth year – contrary to what we held before*), you have from the seventh to the nineteenth twelve years; add fourteen years and you have twenty-six years? You must therefore say that the counting of the twenty-five years excludes the year in which they were exiled. So is it with me; the counting excludes the year in which they were exiled.

The *Gemora* asks: But, at any rate, the nineteenth year (*stated*) remains a difficulty according to Ravina (*for even if he excludes the year of exile, if he counts from seven to nineteen, he finds eleven years, which with fifteen added, again are twenty-six*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Do you think that three exiles are referred to in the *braisa*? The *braisa* means as follows: They (*Yechezkel and others*) were exiled in the seventh year of King Yehoyakim's subjugation, which was the eighth year of King Nevuchadnezzar's reign (*for he captured Yehoyakim in his second year*), they (*the next group including King Tzidkiyahu*) were exiled (*and the Temple was destroyed*) in the eighteenth year of King Yehoyakim's subjugation, which was the nineteenth year of King Nevuchadnezzar's reign.

The *Gemora* proves that Yehoyakim was subjugated in Nevuchadnezzar's second year, for a master has taught: In the first year he conquered Ninveh, in the second he came up and conquered Yehoyakim.

The *braisa* had stated: This happened also at the destruction of the second *Beis Hamikdash*.

The *Gemora* asks: How could it have taken place the year after *Shemittah*? For how long did the second Temple stand? Four hundred and twenty years (*and in the following year, it was destroyed*). Now (*considering that a new Yovel count began when the Temple was built*), four hundred years correspond to eight cycles of *Yovels* (*since Yovel occurs every fifty years*), fourteen years would make two *Shemittah* cycles, leaving six years over. It would emerge that the Destruction of the Temple should have occurred in the sixth year of a *Shemittah* cycle!?

The *Gemora* answers: This is in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah, who said that *Yovel* is counted for both cycles (*as the fiftieth year of one cycle and as the first year of the subsequent Shemittah cycle*). Take the eight years of the eight *Yovel* cycles (*for according to R' Yehudah, each Yovel cycle is one year less than according to the Sages*), add to them those remaining six years, which will amount to fourteen years. It will emerge that the Destruction of the second Temple occurred at the end of a *Shemittah* cycle.

The *Gemora* asks: But the *braisa* cannot be according to the view of Rabbi Yehudah, for then it could not have happened by the first Temple (*that it was destroyed on a "post – Shemittah" year*); for it was taught in a *braisa*: Israel counted seventeen *Yovel* cycles from the time they entered the Land of Israel until they left it. [They were in *Eretz Yisroel* for 440 years before the *Beis HaMikdash* was built; it remained standing for 410 years. There are seventeen "50 year cycles" in 850 years.] And you cannot say that they counted from the moment they

entered, for if you were to say so, it would emerge that the first Temple was destroyed at the beginning of a *Yovel* cycle, and then we would not be able to explain the verse, where Yechezkel said: *in the fourteenth year, after that the city was smitten*. Rather, deduct from them the seven years of the conquering of the Land, and the seven during which the Land was distributed (*for in those years, the laws of Shemittah and Yovel did not apply*), and accordingly, we can now understand the verse: *in the fourteenth year, after that the city was smitten*.

The *Gemora* concludes its question: But according to Rabbi Yehudah, you must take the seventeen years of the seventeen *Yovel* cycles (*for according to R' Yehudah, each Yovel cycle is one year less than according to the Sages*), and add them to these (*fourteen years, where the laws did not apply*), so that the Destruction happened in the third year of a *Shemittah* cycle!?

The *Gemora* answers: The years in which the Ten Tribes were exiled by Sancheriv until their return through Yirmiyah are not counted. [*According to tradition Yirmiyah restored the Ten Tribes in the eighteenth year of King Yoshiah. With their return began the counting of a new Yovel cycle to mark the renewed observance of the laws of Yovel, which had fallen into disuse while the Tribes were exiled. The Temple was destroyed 36 years later, so that the 'fourteenth year after the city was smitten' fell in the Yovel year.*]

Alternatively, you can say (*to answer the question regarding the Destruction of the second Temple*), the *braisa* indeed is in accordance with the view of the Rabbis, and as to the statement that 'this happened also at the destruction of the second Beis Hamikdash,' this refers to the other details (*that it occurred on Tisha b'Av and on the day after Shabbos, but not that it took place in a year after Shemittah*).

The *Gemora* notes that this interpretation is indeed reasonable, for if you were not to say like this, was there indeed the *mishmar* (*division*) of Yehoyariv during the existence of the second Temple? Was it not taught in a *braisa*: When the Jewish people ascended to *Eretz Yisroel* from the exile in Bavel, only four of the original twenty-four divisions came up with them. They were: Yedayeh, Charim, Pashchor and Immeir. The prophets split each one of these families into six divisions, totaling twenty-four *mishmaros*. They wrote all twenty-four names on pieces of parchment, mixed them and placed them in a box. [*The purpose of this lottery was to determine the order of the weeks that they would perform the*

service in the Beis Hamikdash.] Yedayeh's family served the first six weeks. Charim, Pashchor and Immeir followed afterwards. The *braisa* concludes that even if the family of Yehoyariv, who was the first of all the *mishmaros* in the first Temple, would ascend to *Eretz Yisroel* later, they would not force Yedayeh out of his place; rather Yedayeh's family would serve first and Yehoyariv would perform the service during the sixth week. This proves that the statement refers only to the remaining details. (12a – 13a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

An Abbreviated Cycle

The *Gemora* presents a dispute regarding the counting of *Yovel*. The Chachamim hold that *Yovel* is the fiftieth year in the cycle and the following year is the first year of the next cycle. Rabbi Yehudah maintains that the fiftieth year is reckoned for both cycles. It is the fiftieth year of the previous cycle and the first year of the forthcoming cycle.

The *Turei Even* poses an interesting question according to the viewpoint of Rabbi Yehudah. In the first *Shemittah* cycle after a *Yovel*, there will only be five field working years between *Yovel* and *Shemittah* since during *Yovel* one is not permitted to work his field.

In a normal *Shemittah* cycle, each of the six years has a designated tithing that one is required to separate from his field. One is obligated to take *ma'aser sheini* (he would bring one tenth of his produce to Yerushalayim to be eaten there) on the first, second, fourth and fifth years. He would separate *ma'aser oni* (given to the poor) on the third and sixth years. The *Turei Even* wonders what the arrangement would be according to Rabbi Yehudah in the first cycle following a *Yovel*, where there is only five years.

The *Netziv* and the *Sfas Emes* state that in the third year, one would separate *ma'aser oni* and regarding the remaining years, he would take *ma'aser sheini*. This is because the Torah states that *ma'aser oni* should be separated every three years; however the Torah does not prescribe set years for *ma'aser sheini*. A year that does not have a requirement for *ma'aser oni*, automatically has an obligation for *ma'aser sheini*.