

1 Tammuz 5779
July 4, 2019



Arachin Daf 18

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

Not his Yet

The *Mishna* had stated: But regarding offerings, it is not like this. [Even if his father was dying and left him ten thousand zuz, or if he had a ship on the sea and it was bringing him ten thousand zuz, the Temple Treasury has no claim at all on them.]

The *Gemora* asks: But, if his father died and left him ten thousand zuz, he is a rich man!?

Rabbi Avaha said: The *Mishna* is discussing a case where the father was leaving him ten thousand zuz (but did not die yet).

The *Gemora* asks: But isn't that obvious (for if he does not have the money, we cannot assess him based on what he will be receiving)?

The *Gemora* answers: The case is where his father lies in the throes of death. You might have thought that since most of the people in such conditions die (without recovering, and therefore he should be judged as if the inheritance is already his), the *Mishna* informs us that this is not so. (18a)

Boat Rental

The *Gemora* asks on the *Mishna's* next case: If his ship is at sea and it is returning with his tens of thousands, then he is a rich man!?

Rav Chisda said: It refers to a case when he had rented out or hired it out to others (and the merchandise is not his).

The *Gemora* asks: But there is the amount of the rental (and he should be regarded as rich on that account)!? —

The *Gemora* answers: Rent is not payable until the end (of the rental period).

The *Gemora* asks: But he should be considered rich on account of the ship itself!?

The *Gemora* answers: This is following the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer (who maintains that his sources of livelihood are not counted towards his assessment), for it was taught in a *Mishna*: If he was a farmer, they must leave him his oxen, and if he was a donkey driver, they must leave him his donkey. (18a)

Mishna

Regarding the years' category (to determine how much he needs to give to the Temple Treasury), this shall be reckoned according to the age of the subject of the vow. If a young man declares an *erech* vow regarding an old man, he must give the *erech* of an old man. And if an old man declares an *erech* vow regarding a young man, he must give the *erech* of a young man. Regarding the *erech* category, this shall be determined according to the subject of the *erech*. How is that? If a man declares an *erech* vow of a woman, he must give the *erech* of a woman. And if a woman declares an *erech* vow of a man, she must give the *erech* of a man. And the *erech* depends upon the time of the *erech*. How is that? If one declared an *erech* vow regarding one who was less than five years of age, and he then became older than five; or one declared an *erech* vow regarding someone who was less than twenty years of age, and he then became older than twenty, he must give in accordance with the age of the subject of the *erech* at the time of the *erech*. (18a)

Erech and Damim Vows

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: You have compared vows of worth to vows of *arachin*, both with regard to the law of ‘pearls for the poor’ [If a poor man owned a pearl, which in his place of residence, due to a lack of demand, is worth only thirty sela’im, whereas in a large town, where there are many buyers, it would be worth fifty sela’im, we reckon it according to its value in his place of residence – what he can get for it now. The poor man who vowed his own *erech* would not be required to give fifty sela’im (if he were between twenty and fifty years of age), although the pearl might fetch that price elsewhere. This is because he is regarded as a poor man, and cannot afford the fifty. Now, through a juxtaposition of the two subjects in the Torah, the same rule applies to the case of one who said, “I accept upon myself to give to the Sanctuary the value of this pearl.” Here too, he would only need to give the lower price.] and to the rule that a limb is judged according to its importance. [If one declares an *erech* vow regarding his arm or his leg, he is not required to give anything. If, however, he declares an *erech* vow concerning his head or any other vital organ, he needs to give his entire value. The same holds true with vows of worth. If he vows to give the value of his head, he must give his entire value.] One might have thought that we shall compare *arachin* with vows of worth also with regard to the rule that he shall have to pay its value according to the time of the payment (for it is at that time that we determine his value based on the slave market), therefore it is written: According to the *erech* it shall be fulfilled, i.e., regarding an *erech*, he shall give only as much as it was worth at the time of the *erech*. (18a)

Mishna

The thirtieth day is accounted as being younger than this age. [If one declares an *erech* vow regarding an infant, and the child is in his thirtieth day, he is not obligated to give anything, for he is considered as being younger than thirty days old, and there is no *erech* for a child that age.] The fifth year or twentieth year is accounted as being younger than this age, for it is written: and if from sixty years old and higher. Behold we derive with regard to all others from what is said about sixty years: just as the sixtieth year is accounted as being younger than this age, so also the fifth and twentieth years are accounted as being younger than this age.

The *Mishna* asks: Is this so? Perhaps the Torah has reckoned the sixtieth year to be accounted as being younger than this age,

thereby being more stringent, shall the fifth or the twentieth year be considered younger than this age, whereby it would be more lenient? [The *erech* from twenty to sixty is fifty shekalim. Over sixty, it is fifteen. From five to twenty it is twenty shekalim. Now the Torah in considering one in his sixtieth year to be under age, imposes upon the vower the highest payment - a stringency; would one extend the analogy so far as to do just the opposite - to lower the payment by considering one in his twentieth year to be nineteen, which would mean reducing the amount owed from fifty shekalim to twenty?] We therefore use a *gezeirah shavah* of ‘years’, ‘years’ to establish this analogy: just as with the sixtieth year the word ‘years’ means that it should be reckoned younger than this age, so too the word ‘years’ with the fifth and with the twentieth year means that it should be reckoned younger than this age, no matter whether the result will lead to a leniency or a stringency. Rabbi Elozar says: They (people in their sixtieth, twentieth and fifth years) are regarded as being younger than this age until they are a month and a day beyond the years concerned. (18a)

Until and Including

The *Gemora* suggests that our *Mishna* is not in accordance with Rebbe, for if it were following Rebbe, surely he said that the word ‘until’ means ‘until and including.’ [Accordingly, when the Torah writes: from five years of age until twenty, it means ‘until and including’ the twentieth year; there would be no need then to derive this law through a *gezeirah shavah*.] For it was taught in a *braisa*: From the first day until the seventh day (one who eats leavened food shall be cut off from Israel). One might have thought this to mean: ‘From the first day,’ but the first day is not included, and ‘until the seventh day,’ but the seventh day is not included (in the prohibition of eating chametz), in the same manner as it is written (regarding a tzara’as affliction that spreads over his entire body – if it does, he is ruled to be tahor): From his head until his feet, where it means, ‘from his head,’ but his head is not included, and ‘until his feet,’ but his feet are not included; therefore it is written: Until the twenty-first day of the month at evening (where we learn that the prohibition of eating chametz is applicable all seven days of Pesach). Rebbe said: This is not necessary, for when the Torah writes ‘first,’ the first day is included, and when the Torah writes ‘seventh,’ the seventh day is included. [Accordingly, when the Torah writes ‘until twenty years old, the twentieth year is included,

and we would have no need to derive this through a *gezeirah shavah*.]

The *Gemora* disagrees: You might even say that our *Mishna* is in accordance with *Rebbe*, for here, however, the Scriptural verses are balanced (*for the inferences of various expressions connote conflicting rules; therefore, a gezeirah shavah is necessary*).

The *Gemora* explains: For it is written: *From a month old until five years of age (which, according to Rebbe, would mean that the fifth year is regarded as being included in the younger age category)*; why then does the torah write: *From five years of age until twenty years of age (which, according to Rebbe, would mean that the fifth year is regarded as being included in the older age category)*? Therefore they are balanced (*and a gezeirah shavah is necessary to teach us that the fifth year is reckoned in the younger category*).

The master stated: *'From his head,'* but his head is not included, and *'until his feet,'* but his feet are not included.

The *Gemora* explains where we know that from: Either it is because the signs of *tzara'as* on the body are different from those on the head; or it is because it is written: whatever the eyes of the *Kohen* can see (*and the Kohen is unable to see parts of the head and parts of the feet*). (18a – 18b)

Adding a Month and a Day

The *Mishna* had stated: *Rabbi Elozar* says: They (*people in their sixtieth, twentieth and fifth years*) are regarded as being younger than this age until they are a month and a day beyond the years concerned.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: *Rabbi Elozar* said: Here (*regarding an erech of a person over sixty*) it is written: *and higher*, and there (*when the Levi'im were counted*) it is written: *one month old and higher*. Just as there the meaning is 'from a month and one day,' so too here (*regarding arachin*) 'a month and one day' (*must pass before one enters the next age group*).

The *Gemora* asks: But say perhaps that just as there 'one day' is added, so too here, 'one day' is added (*and not 'a month and a day'*)?

The *Gemora* answers: For if so, of what value would the *gezeirah shavah* be? (18b)

A Full Year; not a Calendar Year

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: The year mentioned in connection with consecrated animals (*that need to be in their first year*), the year stated in connection with houses in a walled city (*that the seller may redeem it in its first year; otherwise, it belongs to the buyer forever – even after Yovel*), the two years in connection with an ancestral field (*which cannot be redeemed in the first two years of its purchase; afterwards, it may be redeemed; otherwise, it belongs to the buyer until Yovel*), the six years of the Hebrew servant (*for after six years of work, he may go free*), as well as those of a son or daughter, are to be understood as from a point in time of one year to that same point in time of the later year.

The *Gemora* cites the Scriptural sources for all of the above laws.

The *Gemora* asks: What does the *braisa* mean when it mentions a son or daughter?

Rav Gidel said in the name of *Rav*: It is referring to *erech* vows (*that the age of a child is determined by its birthday, and not by a calendar year*). *Rav Yosef* said: It is referring to the subject of the chapter *Yotzei Dofan* (*in Tractate Niddah*).

The *Gemora* explains that these opinions are not arguing on each other; rather, this one stated one interpretation and the other stated a different interpretation.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is a female, when she is old, valued only at one third, whereas a man at not even a third (*for a woman under sixty is to be valued at thirty, and above sixty at ten, which is one third; whereas a man under sixty is valued at fifty, and over sixty at fifteen, which is less than a third*)?

Chizkiyah answered: People say: An old man in the house is a burden in the house, an old woman in the house is a treasure in the house! [A woman is never too old to be useful in the house, whereas, in popular opinion, an old man in the house may be 'a burden.' (18b – 19a)]

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, HESEIG YAD

A birthday doesn't always change a person's age

Our *sugya* is a source for a sharp disagreement among the Rishonim concerning the number of the Jews in the desert. A person who says “My *erech* shall be upon me” must be evaluated by a *kohen*, who determines the amount he must pay to the treasurer of *hekdesh* according to his age. If he is 20 years old, he must pay 50 *shekel* and if he's 60 years old, he must pay 15 *shekel*. Our Gemara explains that a person's age for *'arachin* is determined according to his birthday and a person born on 3 Sivan is considered 20 years old starting with 3 Sivan.

Two censuses a few months apart but the number didn't change:

When the Jews were in the desert, they were counted a few times by Hashem's command. The Rishonim wonder about a perplexing thing that occurred at one of these censuses. The Jews were counted in Tishrei (see Rashi, Shemos 30:16) after the sin of the golden calf was forgiven and the number of those of 20 years and older was 603,550 (*Pekudei*).

Wonder of wonders! In the following Iyar they numbered... 603,550 (Bemidbar 1:46) – the exact same number! The Rishonim ask: could it be that a whole half year passed and there was no change in their number?

Rosh HaShanah is sort of a birthday for everyone: Because of this question, Rashi concludes (*ibid*) that when those of 20 years or older were counted, they only counted those who were 20 years old on Rosh HaShanah and therefore, though thousands became 20 years old by Iyar, they were not counted by the Torah.

Ramban (*ibid*, 12) questions Rashi's explanation saying that it satisfies us regarding why no 20-year-olds were added but it doesn't answer how it be that no one passed away during the half year between the censuses. Aside from that, Ramban asks a question on Rashi from our *Mishna*, as follows.

Our *Mishna* addresses the topic of determining the age of a *ne'erach*, learning it from the census in the desert: just as the Torah says “from 60 years **upwards**”, meaning that someone who is exactly 60 years old is not considered such but only if he is 60 years and one day old, the same applies to *'erchin*. We thus see, says Ramban, that the age of the Jews in the desert was determined according to their exact birthday and not from one Rosh HaShanah to another! The Malbim (Bemidbar 1:1) solves Ramban's question, that our *Mishna* only intends to determine which person is considered 60 years old **at the start of the new year**: does it suffice if he is 60 years old on Rosh Hashanah or must he be 60 years and one day old? Therefore there's no proof from our *Mishna* as to whether a person's age is determined according to his birthday or according to the year of his birth (as explained in Tosfos, 19a, s.v. *L'erchin*).

The Malbim adds that Rashi's explanation is more acceptable because it is reasonable to assume that the Jews' census took several days. If they counted everyone who became 20 years old at the time of the census, it would have been very difficult as every day they would have had to include those who couldn't be counted on the previous day and who now became 20 years old. It was therefore ordained that their age should be determined from Rosh HaShanah to Rosh HaShanah.

And what about the deceased? After all, there's a possibility that someone counted at the start of the census passed away till its completion. The Malbim replies that no one passed away during this period!