דַּף יוֹמִי · עֲרָכִין · דַּף ד׳

Daf Yomi · The Full Daf · Elucidated Talmud · Navy & Gold Edition · with Rashi

📖 THE SUGYA

In this sugya, the Gemara continues analyzing the inclusive language of various Mishnayos and Baraitos using the familiar format of "All are obligated" or "All join together." We look at several mitzvos—blowing the shofar in Yovel, reading Megillat Esther, making a zimun after a meal, and joining together to form a zimun—and clarify why Kohanim and Levi'im needed to be explicitly specified in each case.

The Gemara then returns to our main Mishnah regarding valuations (Arakhin). Rava and Abaye debate the exact chiddush of teaching that Kohanim can evaluate and be evaluated, analyzing whether a person's obligation in Arakhin depends on their involvement in shekalim or Pidyon Haben. Through this shakla v'tarya, the sugya brings out deep halachic connections between the different responsibilities of Kohanim and the rest of Klal Yisrael.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א׳ DAF 4A

STATEMENT

וְגוֹאֲלִין לְעוֹלָם,

and they may redeem ancestral **lands at any time,** even right after selling them, without waiting two years like an Yisrael,

OBJECTION

אֵימָא בְּמִצְוַת רֹאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה נָמֵי לָא לִיחַיְיבוּ,

you might **say that regarding the mitzvah of Rosh Hashanah** in Yovel, namely blowing the shofar to usher in the Yovel, **they should also not be obligated.**

RESOLUTION

קָמַשְׁמַע לַן:

Therefore, the Baraita **comes to teach us** that they are obligated.

EXPLANATION

נְהִי דְּלֵיתַנְהוּ בְּהַשְׁמָטַת קַרְקַע

For **although they are not subject to the release of land** in Yovel,

EXPLANATION

בְּהַשְׁמָטַת כְּסָפִים — בְּשִׁילּוּחַ עֲבָדִים מִיהָא אִיתַנְהוּ.

since they are not subject to **the release of money** or land, **at any rate they are subject to the setting free of slaves** in Yovel. Therefore, they are included in the shofar blowing of Yovel.

BRAISA

הַכֹּל חַיָּיבִים בְּמִקְרָא מְגִילָּה, כֹּהֲנִים לְוִיִּם וְיִשְׂרְאֵלִים.

The Gemara cites another Baraita: **Everyone is obligated in the reading of the Megillah, Kohanim, Levi'im, and Yisre'elim.**

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא!

The Gemara asks: Isn't that **obvious?** Why wouldn't Kohanim and Levi'im be obligated in Megillah?

ANSWER

לָא צְרִיכָא לְיבַטֵּיל עֲבוֹדָתָם,

The Gemara answers: **No, it is necessary** to state this only to teach that Kohanim **must interrupt their Divine service** in the Bais Hamikdash to hear the Megillah,

PROOF

וְכִדְרַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל,

and this is in accordance with what Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel.

STATEMENT

דְּאָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל:

For Rav Yehudah said that Shmuel said:

STATEMENT

כֹּהֲנִים בַּעֲבוֹדָתָם, וּלְוִיִּם בְּדוּכָנָן, וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמַעֲמָדָן —

Kohanim at their Divine service, and Levi'im at their platform where they sing, **and Yisre'elim at their station** watching over the communal korbanos,

STATEMENT

מְבַטְּלִין עֲבוֹדָתָם וּבָאִין לִשְׁמוֹעַ מִקְרָא מְגִילָּה.

all **interrupt their service and come to hear the reading of the Megillah.**

BRAISA

הַכֹּל חַיָּיבִין בְּזִימּוּן, כֹּהֲנִים לְוִיִּם וְיִשְׂרְאֵלִים.

The Gemara brings another Baraita: **Everyone is obligated in a zimun, Kohanim, Levi'im, and Yisre'elim.**

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא!

The Gemara asks: Isn't that **obvious?**

ANSWER

לָא צְרִיכָא, דְּקָאָכְלִי קָדָשִׁים.

The Gemara answers: **No, it is necessary** for a case **where Kohanim were eating Kodashim,** holy sacrificial meat.

OBJECTION

סָלְקָא דַּעְתָּךְ אָמֵינָא:

For it might **enter your mind to say:**

PROOF

"וְאָכְלוּ אוֹתָם אֲשֶׁר כֻּפַּר בָּהֶם" אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא,

Since **the Merciful One says** in the Torah: **"And they shall eat those things through which atonement was made,"**

EXPLANATION

וְהָא כַּפָּרָה הִיא.

and this eating **is** an act of **atonement** and a mitzvah, rather than an ordinary meal,

RESOLUTION

קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן,

therefore it might not require a zimun. So the Baraita **comes to teach us** that they do make a zimun.

EXPLANATION

"וְאָכַלְתָּ וְשָׂבָעְתָּ" אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, וְהָא אִיתַּנְהוּ.

For **the Merciful One says: "And you shall eat and be satisfied** and bless," **and behold, these factors exist** here as well, since they eat and are satisfied.

BRAISA

הַכֹּל מִצְטָרְפִין לְזִימּוּן, כֹּהֲנִים לְוִיִּם וְיִשְׂרְאֵלִים.

The Gemara cites a similar Baraita: **Everyone joins together to form a zimun, Kohanim, Levi'im, and Yisre'elim.**

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא!

The Gemara asks: Isn't that **obvious?**

ANSWER

לָא צְרִיכָא, דְּקָאָכְלִי כֹּהֲנִים תְּרוּמָה אוֹ קָדָשִׁים, וְזָר קָאָכֵיל חוּלִּין.

The Gemara answers: **No, it is necessary** for a case **where Kohanim were eating Terumah or Kodashim, and a non-Kohen was eating Chullin,** ordinary non-sacred food.

OBJECTION

סָלְקָא דַּעְתָּךְ אָמֵינָא:

It might **enter your mind to say:**

EXPLANATION

הוֹאִיל וְאִי בָּעֵי זָר לְמֵיכַל בַּהֲדֵי כֹּהֵן לָא מָצֵי אָכֵיל,

Since if the non-Kohen wants to eat together with the Kohen from the Kohen's food, **he cannot eat,** as Terumah is forbidden to a non-Kohen,

OBJECTION

אֵימָא לָא לִיצְטָרֵף,

you might **say that he cannot join together** with them for a zimun.

RESOLUTION

קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן:

Therefore the Baraita **comes to teach us** that he does join.

EXPLANATION

נְהִי דְּזָר בַּהֲדֵי כֹּהֵן לָא מָצֵי אָכֵיל, כֹּהֵן בַּהֲדֵי זָר מָצֵי אָכֵיל.

For although a non-Kohen cannot eat together with a Kohen from his food, a **Kohen can eat together with a non-Kohen** from the non-Kohen's food, so there is sufficient commonality to combine for a zimun.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

הַכֹּל מַעֲרִיכִין, כֹּהֲנִים לְוִיִּם וְיִשְׂרְאֵלִים.

The Gemara returns to our Mishnah: **"All evaluate, Kohanim, Levi'im, and Yisre'elim."**

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא!

The Gemara asks: Isn't that **obvious?**

ANSWER

אָמַר רָבָא: לֹא נִצְרְכָא אֶלָּא לְבֶן בּוּכְרִי,

Rava said: It is necessary only according to the opinion of **Ben Bukhri.**

PROOF

דְּתָנַן: אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, הֵעִיד בֶּן בּוּכְרִי בְּיַבְנֶה:

For as we learned in a Mishnah: Rabbi Yehudah said, Ben Bukhri testified in Yavneh:

STATEMENT

כָּל כֹּהֵן שֶׁשּׁוֹקֵל אֵינוֹ חוֹטֵא.

Any Kohen who pays the half-shekel does not sin, even though he is exempt from paying it.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לוֹ רַבָּן יוֹחָנָן בֶּן זַכַּאי: לֹא כֵּן,

Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai said to him: That is not so!

STATEMENT

אֶלָּא כָּל כֹּהֵן שֶׁאֵינוֹ שׁוֹקֵל חוֹטֵא,

Rather, any Kohen who does not pay the half-shekel sins, as Kohanim are obligated just like Yisre'elim.

EXPLANATION

אֶלָּא שֶׁהַכֹּהֲנִים דּוֹרְשִׁין מִקְרָא זֶה לְעַצְמָן:

However, the Kohanim expound this verse to their own advantage to exempt themselves:

PROOF

"וְכָל מִנְחַת כֹּהֵן כָּלִיל תִּהְיֶה לֹא תֵאָכֵל".

"And every meal-offering of a Kohen shall be completely burned, it shall not be eaten."

EXPLANATION

הוֹאִיל וְעוֹמֶר וּשְׁתֵּי הַלֶּחֶם וְלֶחֶם הַפָּנִים שֶׁלָּנוּ הֵם, הֵיאַךְ הֵם נֶאֱכָלִין?

The Kohanim argued: **Since the Omer, the Two Loaves, and the Showbread are ours,** bought with our shekalim, **how could they be eaten** by Kohanim, seeing that a Kohen's meal-offering must be burnt?

QUESTION

וְלֶבֶן בּוּכְרִי נָמֵי, כֵּיוָן דִּלְכַתְּחִילָּה לָא מֵיחַיְּיבִי לְאֵיתוֹיֵי,

The Gemara interrupts to clarify Ben Bukhri's view: **And according to Ben Bukhri also, since initially they are not obligated to bring** the half-shekel,

OBJECTION

כִּי מַיְיתֵי נָמֵי — חוֹטֵא הוּא, דְּקָא מְעַיֵּיל חוּלִּין לָעֲזָרָה!

when he brings it as well, he should be a sinner, as he is bringing non-sacred items into the Azarah as an uncommanded gift offering!

ANSWER

דְּמַיְיתֵי לְהוּ וּמָסַר לַצִּבּוּר.

The Gemara answers: It is a case **where he brings them and hands them over to the community** as a gift, making them purely communal funds.

OBJECTION

סָלְקָא דַּעְתָּךְ אָמֵינָא:

Now Rava explains why our Mishnah is necessary according to Ben Bukhri: It might **enter your mind to say:**

PROOF

הוֹאִיל וּכְתִיב "וְכָל עֶרְכְּךָ יִהְיֶה בְּשֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ",

Since it is written: "And every evaluation of yours shall be according to the sacred shekel,"

INFERENCE

כָּל דְּאִיתֵיהּ בִּשְׁקָלִים — אִיתֵיהּ בַּעֲרָכִין,

we might derive that **anyone who is included in the obligation of shekalim is included in evaluations,**

INFERENCE

וְהָנֵי כֹּהֲנִים, הוֹאִיל וְלֵיתַנְהוּ בִּשְׁקָלִים — לֵיתַנְהוּ בַּעֲרָכִין,

and these Kohanim, since they are not included in shekalim according to Ben Bukhri, **they are not included in evaluations.**

RESOLUTION

קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן.

Therefore, the Mishnah **comes to teach us** that Kohanim are included in evaluations.

OBJECTION

אֲמַר לֵיהּ אַבָּיֵי:

Abaye said to him:

REFUTATION

הַאי "וְכָל עֶרְכְּךָ", לְכָל עֲרָכִין שֶׁאַתָּה מַעֲרִיכִין לֹא יְהוּ פְּחוּתִין מִסֶּלַע הוּא דַּאֲתָא!

This verse, "And every evaluation of yours," comes to teach that all evaluations that you evaluate should not be less than a sela coin!

ANSWER

אֶלָּא אָמַר אַבָּיֵי: אִיצְטְרִיךְ,

Rather, Abaye said: It was necessary to explicitly include Kohanim for a different reason,

OBJECTION

סָלְקָא דַּעְתָּךְ אָמֵינָא:

for it might **enter your mind to say:**

PROOF

הוֹאִיל וּכְתִיב "וּפְדוּיָו מִבֶּן חֹדֶשׁ תִּפְדֶּה בְּעֶרְכְּךָ",

Since it is written regarding Pidyon Haben: **“And those to be redeemed from one month old you shall redeem according to your evaluation,”**

INFERENCE

כָּל דְּאִיתֵיהּ בְּפִדְיוֹן הַבֵּן — אִיתֵיהּ בַּעֲרָכִין,

we might derive that **anyone who is included in Pidyon Haben is included in evaluations,**

INFERENCE

וְהָנֵי כֹּהֲנִים הוֹאִיל וְלֵיתַנְהוּ בְּפִדְיוֹן הַבֵּן — לֵיתַנְהוּ בַּעֲרָכִין,

and these Kohanim, since they are not included in Pidyon Haben because a Kohen does not redeem his son, **they are not included in evaluations.**

RESOLUTION

קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן.

Therefore, the Mishnah **comes to teach us** that Kohanim are subject to valuations.

OBJECTION

אֲמַר לֵיהּ רָבָא: אֶלָּא מֵעַתָּה,

Rava said to him: If that is so,

PROOF

גַּבֵּי אֵיל אָשָׁם, דִּכְתִיב: ”וְאֶת אֲשָׁמוֹ יָבִיא לַה’ אַיִל תָּמִים מִן הַצֹּאן בְּעֶרְכְּךָ”,

regarding the ram of a guilt-offering, where it is written: “And he shall bring his guilt-offering to Hashem, an unblemished ram from the flock according to your evaluation,”

QUESTION

הָכִי נָמֵי דְּכָל דְּאִיתֵיהּ בַּעֲרָכִין אִיתֵיהּ בְּאֵיל הָאָשָׁם,

would you **also say that whoever is included in evaluations is included in the ram of the guilt-offering?**

OBJECTION

טוּמְטוּם וְאַנְדְּרוֹגִינוֹס דְּלֵיתַנְהוּ בַּעֲרָכִין לֵיתַנְהוּ בְּאֵיל הָאָשָׁם?

Would you then say that a **tumtum and an androginos, who are not included in evaluations, are not included in bringing a ram for a guilt-offering** if they commit a sin requiring one?

ANSWER

אֶלָּא אָמַר רָבָא, וְאִיתֵימָא רַב אָשֵׁי:

Rather, Rava said, and some say Rav Ashi said:

OBJECTION

אִיצְטְרִיךְ, סָלְקָא דַּעְתָּךְ אָמִינָא,

It was **necessary** to specifically teach that Kohanim are evaluated, for it might **enter your mind to say:**

INFERENCE

הוֹאִיל וּכְתִיב "וְהֶעֱמִידוֹ לִפְנֵי הַכֹּהֵן", וְלֹא כֹּהֵן לִפְנֵי כֹּהֵן,

Since it is written: "And he shall stand him before the Kohen," you might say that a non-Kohen stands before a Kohen, **and not a Kohen before a Kohen.**

RESOLUTION

קָא מַשְׁמַע לַן.

Therefore, the Mishnah **comes to teach us** that even a Kohen can be evaluated by another Kohen.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

"נֶעֱרָכִין" — לְאֵתוֹיֵי מְנוּוָל וּמוּכֶּה שְׁחִין.

The Mishnah taught: **"They are evaluated"** — this comes **to include a disfigured person and one afflicted with boils,** that their value can be assessed.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

מְנָא הָנֵי מִילֵּי?

The Gemara asks: **From where are these words** derived?

PROOF

דְּתָנוּ רַבָּנַן:

For the Rabbis taught in a Baraita:

EXPLANATION

"בְּעֶרְכְּךָ" — לְהָבִיא עֵרֶךְ סָתוּם.

When the Torah says **"According to your evaluation,"** it comes **to include an unspecified evaluation** where one simply says 'I obligate myself to give an evaluation.'

EXPLANATION

דָּבָר אַחֵר: "בְּעֶרְכְּךָ" — עֵרֶךְ כּוּלּוֹ הוּא נוֹתֵן, וְלֹא עֵרֶךְ אֵבָרִים.

Another explanation: "According to your evaluation" teaches that **he gives the evaluation of his entire self, and not the evaluation of limbs.**

OBJECTION

יָכוֹל שֶׁאֲנִי מוֹצִיא אַף דָּבָר שֶׁהַנְּשָׁמָה תְּלוּיָה בּוֹ?

I **might** think **that I should exclude even a limb upon which life depends** such that one who vows its valuation must pay? No,

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר "נְפָשׁוֹת",

therefore **the verse states: "Persons"** (nefashos), including vital organs.

INFERENCE

נְפָשׁוֹת — וְלֹא הַמֵּת.

The word **"Persons"** also implies living persons, **and not a dead person.**

QUESTION

אוֹצִיא אֶת הַמֵּת, וְלֹא אוֹצִיא אֶת הַגּוֹסֵס?

Now, **I might exclude a dead person, but should I not exclude a dying person** (a goses)?

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: "וְהֶעֱמִיד... וְהֶעֱרִיךְ" —

Therefore **the verse states: "And he shall stand him... and evaluate him"** —

INFERENCE

כֹּל שֶׁיֵּשְׁנוֹ בְּהַעֲמָדָה, יֵשְׁנוֹ בְּהַעֲרָכָה,

Anyone who is capable of standing is included in evaluation,

INFERENCE

וְכֹל שֶׁאֵינוֹ בְּהַעֲמָדָה, אֵינוֹ בְּהַעֲרָכָה.

and anyone who is not capable of standing is not included in evaluation.

EXPLANATION

דָּבָר אַחֵר: "נְפָשׁוֹת", אֵין לִי אֶלָּא אֶחָד שֶׁהֶעֱרִיךְ אֶחָד,

Another explanation: "Persons" — I only have a case of **one person who evaluated one person.**

QUESTION

אֶחָד שֶׁהֶעֱרִיךְ מֵאָה מִנַּיִן?

From where do I know that it applies to **one person who evaluated a hundred** people in one statement?

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר "נְפָשׁוֹת".

The verse states: "Persons" in the plural.

EXPLANATION

דָּבָר אַחֵר: ״נְפָשׁוֹת״,

Another explanation: "Persons" —

עמוד ב׳ DAF 4B

BRAISA

אֵין לִי אֶלָּא אִישׁ שֶׁהֶעֱרִיךְ בֵּין אִישׁ בֵּין אִשָּׁה,

I have derived **only** the halacha in a case of **a man who valuated either a man or a woman,** as the parsha begins with "When a man shall clearly utter a vow" (Vayikra 27:2).

QUESTION

אִשָּׁה שֶׁהֶעֱרִיכָה אִישׁ, אִשָּׁה שֶׁהֶעֱרִיכָה אִשָּׁה מִנַּיִן?

But regarding **a woman who valuated a man,** or **a woman who valuated a woman, from where** do we know that the halachos of erchin apply to her as well?

ANSWER

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר ״נְפָשׁוֹת״.

The verse states, "persons" (Vayikra 27:2), to teach that any person who vows a valuation is included.

BRAISA

דָּבָר אַחֵר: ״נְפָשׁוֹת״ — לְרַבּוֹת מְנָוּוּל וּמוּכֶּה שְׁחִין.

Another explanation of the word **"persons"** is **to include a repulsive person or one afflicted with boils,** that he can be valuated.

EXPLANATION

שֶׁיָּכוֹל ״נֶדֶר בְּעֶרְכְּךָ״: כֹּל שֶׁיֵּשְׁנוֹ בְּדָמִים — יֵשְׁנוֹ בַּעֲרָכִין,

For **you might have thought,** since the pasuk juxtaposes vows of market value to valuations by stating **"a vow according to your valuation",** we should derive a hekesh: **anyone who is included in** vows of market **value is included in valuations,**

EXPLANATION

וְכֹל שֶׁאֵינוֹ בְּדָמִים — אֵינוֹ בַּעֲרָכִין,

and anyone who is not included in market **value**—such as a repulsive person who has no market value as a slave—**is not included in valuations;**

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר ״נְפָשׁוֹת״.

therefore **the verse states "persons",** to include anyone who has a soul, regardless of market value.

BRAISA

”וְהָיָה עֶרְכְּךָ“ — לְרַבּוֹת טוּמְטוּם וְאַנְדְּרוֹגִינוֹס לְדָמִים,

The phrase **"then your valuation shall be"** (Vayikra 27:3) comes **to include a tumtum and an androganos for market value,** that if one vows their market value, the vow takes effect.

EXPLANATION

שֶׁיָּכוֹל: נֶדֶר ”בְּעֶרְכְּךָ“ — כֹּל שֶׁיֵּשְׁנוֹ בַּעֲרָכִין יֵשְׁנוֹ בְּדָמִים,

For **you might have thought** that from the juxtaposition of **a vow "according to your valuation",** we learn: **anyone who is included in valuations is included in market value,**

EXPLANATION

וְכֹל שֶׁאֵינוֹ בַּעֲרָכִין אֵינוֹ בְּדָמִים,

and anyone who is not included in valuations is not included in market value; and since a tumtum and androganos are excluded from erchin, they would be excluded from damim as well.

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: ”וְהָיָה עֶרְכְּךָ“.

Therefore, **the verse states "then your valuation shall be",** to include them in market value.

BRAISA

”הַזָּכָר“ — זָכָר, וְלֹא טוּמְטוּם וְאַנְדְּרוֹגִינוֹס.

The verse says **"the male",** meaning a definite **male, but not a tumtum or an androganos,** excluding them from erchin.

QUESTION

יָכוֹל לֹא יִהוּ בְּעֶרֶךְ אִישׁ, אֲבָל יִהְיוּ בְּעֶרֶךְ אִשָּׁה?

You might have thought that **they should not be included in the valuation of a man, but they should be included in the valuation of a woman;**

ANSWER

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: ”וְהָיָה עֶרְכְּךָ הַזָּכָר... וְאִם נְקֵבָה הִיא“ — זָכָר וַדַּאי, נְקֵבָה וַדַּאִית, וְלֹא טוּמְטוּם וְאַנְדְּרוֹגִינוֹס.

the verse states, "then your valuation shall be for the male... and if it be a female", teaching that valuation applies only to a **certain male** or a **certain female, but not a tumtum or an androganos,** who are of doubtful gender.

STATEMENT

אָמַר מָר: ”בְּעֶרְכְּךָ“ — לְרַבּוֹת עֶרֶךְ סָתוּם.

The Master said earlier in a braisa: The word **"according to your valuation"** comes **to include an unspecified valuation.**

QUESTION

מַאי עֶרֶךְ סָתוּם?

What is meant by **an unspecified valuation?**

ANSWER

דְּתַנְיָא: הָאוֹמֵר ״עֵרֶךְ סָתוּם עָלַי״ נוֹתֵן כַּפָּחוֹת שֶׁבָּעֲרָכִין,

The Gemara answers, **as it was taught in a braisa: One who says, "An unspecified valuation is upon me"** without naming a person, **gives the lowest of all the valuations.**

EXPLANATION

וְכַמָּה פָּחוֹת שֶׁבָּעֲרָכִין? שְׁלֹשֶׁת שְׁקָלִים.

And how much is the lowest of the valuations? Three shekels, which is the valuation of a female child from a month to five years old.

QUESTION

וְאֵימָא חֲמִשִּׁים!

The braisa asks: **But why not say** he must pay **fifty** shekels, which is the highest valuation, namely that of an adult male?

ANSWER

תָּפַשְׂתָּה מְרוּבֶּה — לֹא תָּפַשְׂתָּה, תָּפַשְׂתָּה מוּעָט — תָּפַשְׂתָּה.

The braisa answers: We apply the rule, **If you grabbed a lot, you grabbed nothing**—since it is uncertain if he meant the larger amount; but if **you grabbed a little, you grabbed it** with certainty, as the smaller sum is included in the larger one.

QUESTION

וְאֵימָא שֶׁקֶל, דִּכְתִיב: ״וְכָל עֶרְכְּךָ יִהְיֶה בְּשֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ״!

The braisa asks: **Then say** he only gives one **shekel, as it is written: "And all your valuations shall be according to the shekel of the Sanctuary"** (Vayikra 27:25)!

ANSWER

הָהוּא בְּהֶשֵּׂג יָד הוּא דִּכְתִיב.

The braisa answers: **That verse is written regarding affordability**—a poor person who cannot afford a fixed valuation pays a minimum of one shekel.

QUESTION

וְאֶלָּא קְרָא לְמָה לִי?

And rather, since three shekels is derived from logic, **why do I need the verse** of "according to your valuation" here?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב נַחְמָן אָמַר רַבָּה בַּר אֲבוּהּ: לוֹמַר שֶׁאֵינוֹ נִידּוֹן בְּהֶשֵּׂג יָד.

Rav Nachman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: The verse comes **to say that** an unspecified valuation **is not judged by affordability;** even a poor person must pay the full three shekels.

EXPLANATION

מַאי טַעְמָא? כִּמְפֹרָשׁ דָּמֵי.

What is the reason? Because by saying "unspecified valuation", **it is considered as if he explicitly articulated** that he vows three shekels, and the leniency of affordability applies only to standard Torah valuations.

STATEMENT

אִיכָּא דְּאָמְרִי, אָמַר רַב נַחְמָן אָמַר רַבָּה בַּר אֲבוּהּ: נִידּוֹן בְּהֶשֵּׂג יָד.

There are those who say that **Rav Nachman said that Rabba bar Avuh said** the opposite: An unspecified valuation **is judged by affordability,** and if he is poor, he can pay one shekel.

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא!

The Gemara asks: Isn't that **obvious?** Why would an unspecified valuation be any different from other valuations?

ANSWER

מַהוּ דְּתֵימָא כִּמְפֹרָשׁ דָּמֵי, קָמַשְׁמַע לַן.

The Gemara answers: **Lest you say** that **it is considered as if he explicitly articulated** three shekels and cannot pay less, **it comes to teach us** that he still benefits from the rule of affordability.

BRAISA

דָּבָר אַחֵר: "בְּעֶרְכְּךָ" — עֶרֶךְ כּוּלּוֹ הוּא נוֹתֵן, וְאֵינוֹ נוֹתֵן עֶרֶךְ דְּמֵי אֵבָרִים.

Another explanation: "According to your valuation" teaches that **he gives the valuation of his entire body, but he does not give the valuation of limbs;** if he vows the valuation of a single limb, the vow is invalid.

QUESTION

וְהָא אַפֵּיקְתֵּיהּ לְעֶרֶךְ סְתָם?

The Gemara asks: **But didn't you already use this verse for an unspecified valuation?** How can you derive two halachos from it?

ANSWER

קְרִי בֵּיהּ "עֶרֶךְ" "בְּעֶרְכְּךָ".

The Gemara answers: **Read into it two** derivations from the extra letters: one from **"valuation"** and one from **"according to your valuation".**

QUESTION

יָכוֹל שֶׁאֲנִי מוֹצִיא דָּבָר שֶׁהַנְּשָׁמָה תְּלוּיָה בּוֹ,

The braisa continues: **You might have thought that I should exclude even** a limb **upon which life depends,** like the heart, such that vowing its valuation would be invalid;

ANSWER

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: "נְפָשׁוֹת",

therefore **the verse states "persons",** to teach that a limb vital to the soul takes effect like a whole person.

BRAISA

”נְפָשׁוֹת” — וְלֹא אֶת הַמֵּת.

The word **"persons"** also implies **and not a dead person,** who has no soul and cannot be valuated.

QUESTION

וְהָא אַפֵּיקְתֵּיהּ!

The Gemara asks: **But didn't you already use this word** for other derivations?

ANSWER

קְרִי בֵּיהּ ”נֶפֶשׁ”, ”נְפָשׁוֹת”.

The Gemara answers: **Read into it "person"** in the singular, **and "persons"** in the plural, yielding multiple expoundings.

QUESTION

אוֹצִיא אֶת הַמֵּת, וְלֹא אוֹצִיא אֶת הַגּוֹסֵס?

The braisa asks: **I will exclude a dead person, but should I not exclude a goses** (a dying person)?

ANSWER

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: ”וְהֶעֱמִיד וְהֶעֱרִיךְ”.

The verse states: "and he shall present him and valuate him" (Vayikra 27:8)—anyone capable of standing up is subject to valuation, excluding a goses who cannot stand.

QUESTION

אִי הָכִי, מֵת נָמֵי תֵּיפּוֹק לִי מִ”וְהֶעֱמִיד וְהֶעֱרִיךְ”?

The Gemara asks: **If so, a dead person also, let me derive** his exclusion **from "and he shall present him and valuate him"**, since a dead person cannot stand!

ANSWER

הָכִי נָמֵי!

The Gemara answers: **Indeed, that is so!** A dead person is indeed excluded from standing.

QUESTION

וְאֶלָּא, ”נֶפֶשׁ” ”נְפָשׁוֹת” לְמָה לִי?

And rather, why do I need the expounding of **"person" and "persons"**?

ANSWER

כִּדְבָעֵינַן לְמֵימַר קַמָּן.

The Gemara answers: It is needed **for that which we want to say further on.**

BRAISA

דָּבָר אַחֵר, ”נְפָשׁוֹת” — אֵין לִי אֶלָּא אֶחָד שֶׁהֶעֱרִיךְ אֶחָד, אֶחָד שֶׁהֶעֱרִיךְ מֵאָה מִנַּיִן?

Another explanation: "Persons" teaches: **I have** derived **only one person who valuated one person; from where** do I know that if **one valuated one hundred** people in one statement, it takes effect?

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר "נְפָשֹׁת".

The verse states "persons" in the plural.

BRAISA

דָּבָר אַחֵר, "נְפָשֹׁת" — אֵין לִי אֶלָּא אִישׁ שֶׁהֶעֱרִיךְ, בֵּין אִישׁ בֵּין אִשָּׁה, אִשָּׁה שֶׁהֶעֱרִיכָה אִישׁ, וְאִשָּׁה שֶׁהֶעֱרִיכָה אִשָּׁה מִנַּיִן?

Another explanation: "Persons" teaches: **I have** derived **only a man who valuated either a man or a woman; from where** do I know that **a woman who valuated a man, or a woman who valuated a woman,** is included?

PROOF

תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר: "נְפָשֹׁת".

The verse states: "persons".

BRAISA

דָּבָר אַחֵר: "נְפָשֹׁת" — לְהָבִיא מְנוּוָל וּמוּכֶּה שְׁחִין.

Another explanation: "Persons" comes **to include a repulsive person or one afflicted with boils.**

QUESTION

וְהָא אַפֵּיקְתֵּיהּ לְהָנָךְ!

The Gemara asks: **But didn't you already use** the word **for these** other derivations?

ANSWER

הָנָךְ לָא צְרִיכִי קְרָא, מַאי טַעְמָא? כִּי שָׁקוּל הוּא, וְיָבוֹאוּ כּוּלָּם

The Gemara answers: **Those** other cases **do not need a verse** on their own. **What is the reason? Since it is balanced** and equal in logic, **they all come** together under a single word,

EXPLANATION

כִּי אִיצְטְרִיךְ קְרָא, לִמְנוּוָל וּמוּכֶּה שְׁחִין הוּא דְּאִצְטְרִיךְ.

and **when a verse was necessary, it was necessary for a repulsive person and one afflicted with boils,** who might otherwise have been excluded due to lack of market value.

STATEMENT

וְהָיָה עֶרְכְּךָ — לְרַבּוֹת טוּמְטוּם וְאַנְדְּרוֹגִינוֹס לְדָמִים.

The braisa said: **"Then your valuation shall be"** comes **to include a tumtum and an androganos for market value.**

QUESTION

דָּמִים לְמָה לִי קְרָא? לֹא יְהֵא אֶלָּא דְּמֵי דִּיקְלָא, אִילּוּ אָמַר "דְּמֵי דִּיקְלָא" מִי לָא יָהֵיב?

The Gemara asks: **Why do I need a verse for market value? Let it not be** any more complex **than the value of a palm tree! If one said, "The value of a palm tree** is upon me for Hekdesh", **would he not give** it? Why would a human of doubtful gender be any less valid for a money vow than a palm tree?

ANSWER

אָמַר רָבָא: לוֹמַר שֶׁנִּידּוֹן בִּכְבוֹדוֹ.

Rava said: The verse is needed **to say that he is judged by his essential dignity,** meaning if one vows the value of a vital limb of a tumtum, it takes effect on his entire market value.

EXPLANATION

סָלְקָא דַּעְתָּךְ אָמֵינָא: "נֶדֶר בְּעֶרְכְּךָ" כְּתִיב, כֹּל שֶׁיֵּשְׁנוֹ בַּעֲרָכִין — נִידּוֹן בִּכְבוֹדוֹ, וְכֹל שֶׁאֵינוֹ בַּעֲרָכִין — אֵינוֹ נִידּוֹן בִּכְבוֹדוֹ.

For **it might enter your mind to say: It is written, "a vow according to your valuation",** implying that **anyone who is included in valuations is judged by his essential dignity, but anyone who is not included in valuations is not judged by his essential dignity;** therefore the verse comes to include them.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לֵיהּ אַבָּיֵי: וּדְלָא אִיתֵיהּ בַּעֲרָכִין, מִי נִידּוֹן בִּכְבוֹדוֹ?

Abaye said to him: But is anyone who is not included in valuations judged by his essential dignity?

PROOF

וְהָתַנְיָא: "רֹאשׁ עֶבֶד זֶה הֶקְדֵּשׁ" הוּא וְהֶקְדֵּשׁ שׁוּתָּפִין בּוֹ,

And was it not taught in a braisa: If one says, **"The head of this slave is Hekdesh", he and Hekdesh become partners in him,** and he is not entirely consecrated by his head;

PROOF

"רֹאשׁ עֶבֶד מָכוּר לְךָ" מְשַׁמְּנִין בֵּינֵיהֶם,

if he says, **"The head of a slave is sold to you", they assess between them** the relative value of the head and he buys that share;

PROOF

"רֹאשׁ חֲמוֹר זֶה הֶקְדֵּשׁ" הוּא וְהֶקְדֵּשׁ שׁוּתָּפִין בּוֹ, "רֹאשׁ חֲמוֹר מָכוּר לָךְ" מְשַׁמְּנִין בֵּינֵיהֶם.

if he says, **"The head of this donkey is Hekdesh", he and Hekdesh are partners in it; "The head of a donkey is sold to you", they assess between them.**

PROOF

"רֹאשׁ פָּרָה מָכוּר לְךָ" — לֹא מָכַר אֶלָּא רֹאשָׁהּ שֶׁל פָּרָה.

However, if he says, **"The head of a cow is sold to you", he has sold nothing other than the head of the cow** itself, for slaughter.

PROOF

וְלֹא עוֹד, אֶלָּא אֲפִילּוּ: "רֹאשׁ פָּרָה הֶקְדֵּשׁ" אֵין לַהֶקְדֵּשׁ אֶלָּא רֹאשָׁהּ.

And not only that, but even if he says, **"The head of a cow is Hekdesh", Hekdesh has nothing other than its head.**

EXPLANATION

וְאָמַר רַב פָּפָּא: דְּהָא מִזְדַּבַּן רֵישָׁא דְתוֹרָא בְּבֵי טַבָּחָא.

And Rav Papa said: Because the head of an ox is sold in the butcher shop separately, so it does not pull the whole body with it.

OBJECTION

וְהָא חֲמוֹר וּפָרָה לֵיתַנְהוּ בַּעֲרָכִין, וְאֵין נִידּוֹן בִּכְבוֹדוֹ!

And behold, a donkey and a cow are not subject to valuations, and yet we see a donkey **is judged by its essential dignity** (expanding to the whole donkey), whereas a cow is not! Thus, being subject to erchin is not the determining factor!

REFUTATION

וְלִיטַעְמָיךְ, תִּיקְשֵׁי לָךְ עֶבֶד, דְּאִיתֵיהּ בַּעֲרָכִין, וְאֵין נִידּוֹן בִּכְבוֹדוֹ!

Rava replied: **And according to your reasoning, you should have a difficulty from a slave, who is included in valuations** (as a person), **and yet he is not judged by his essential dignity** to make his entire body consecrated!

RESOLUTION

אֶלָּא לָא קַשְׁיָא: הָא בְּקָדְשֵׁי מִזְבֵּחַ, הָא בְּקָדְשֵׁי בֶּדֶק הַבַּיִת.

Rather, it is not difficult: This case, where consecrating a vital part spreads to the whole body, **is regarding sanctification for the Altar; that** case, where it does not spread, **is regarding sanctification for the Bedek HaBayis (Temple Treasury).**

QUESTION

בְּמַאי אוֹקֵימְתָּהּ, בְּקָדְשֵׁי מִזְבֵּחַ?

The Gemara asks: **In what did you establish** the ruling where it spreads to the entire animal? **In sanctification for the Altar?**

OBJECTION

אֵימָא סֵיפָא: וְלֹא עוֹד, אֶלָּא אֲפִילּוּ אָמַר "רֹאשׁ פָּרָה זוֹ הֶקְדֵּשׁ" — אֵין לַהֶקְדֵּשׁ אֶלָּא רֹאשָׁהּ.

Read the latter clause of that braisa: **And not only that, but even if he said "The head of this cow is Hekdesh", Hekdesh has only its head.**

OBJECTION

אַמַּאי? תִּפְשׁוֹט קְדוּשָּׁה בְּכוּלָּהּ! מִי לָא תַּנְיָא: הָאוֹמֵר

Why? Let the holiness spread to all of it, if it is for the Altar! **Is it not taught in a braisa: One who says...**

SUMMARY

The Gemara first resolves why Kohanim and Levi'im are listed regarding Yovel shofar, Megillah reading, and birkat hamazon zimun. Megillah reading requires Kohanim to interrupt their Divine service in the Bais Hamikdash, while zimun applies even when Kohanim eat holy sacrificial meat (Kodashim) or join a non-Kohen eating ordinary Chullin. Returning to the Mishnah's rule that Kohanim evaluate and are evaluated, Rava suggests this refutes Ben Bukhri's view on shekalim, while

Abaye and Rav Ashi explore whether valuations are tied to Pidyon Haben or other Torah derivations, confirming that Kohanim are fully included in the parshah of Arakhin.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

Look at the chiddush the Gemara brings regarding Megillah reading: Kohanim performing the holy avodah in the Bais Hamikdash, Levi'im standing on their platform singing praise, and Yisre'elim standing at their posts, all of them must stop their sacred work and leave their posts to hear the Megillah. You would think, what could be higher or more important than serving Hashem directly in the Mikdash? Yet Chazal teach us that when a specific mitzvah comes along, we put down even the highest spiritual engagements to fulfill what Hashem wants from us right now.

In our daily lives, it is easy to get attached to our own spiritual routines or comfortable chashuve deeds. We might be in the middle of a deep geschmack sugya, wrapped up in a beautiful davening, or busy with an important project. But then a family member needs help, a child needs attention, or a simple chesed presents itself. The yetzer hara whispers that we shouldn't disrupt our high level of learning or davening for something mundane. The Gemara is telling us: no, when Hashem presents you with a mitzvah of the moment, that is your true avodah.

Today, if an opportunity for a mitzvah or chesed interrupts what you are doing, even if you are holding in the middle of something holy and meaningful, don't view it as a distraction. Pause with warmth and patience, fulfill the obligation of the moment with a full heart, and know that this is exactly what Hashem wants from you right now.