

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf

29 Teves 5772

Arachin Daf 11

January 24, 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

Who Played?

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Meir maintains that slaves of the *Kohanim* played the musical instruments. [*Rabbi Yosi holds that they were family members of Beis HaPegarim and Beis Tzippraya from Emaum, who would marry into Kehunah (for they were Israelites with pure lineage, and the Kohanim didn't even need to investigate). Rabbi Chanina ben Antignos maintains that the Levi'im themselves played the musical instruments.*]

The *Gemora* notes: Shall we say they are arguing regarding the following: The one who said that the players of the instruments were slaves maintain that the essential in the music in the Temple was the singing with the mouth, and the instruments are merely an accompaniment to enhance the music (*and therefore, the instruments do not need to be played by Levi'im*), whereas he who said that they were *Levi'im* holds the instrumental music is the essential part of the song.

The *Gemora* disagrees: If you reason this way, what will be Rabbi Yosi's opinion (*who holds that Yisra'elim of pure lineage played the instruments*)? If he holds that the essential was the singing with the mouth, it should have been satisfactory if slaves played the instruments; and if he holds that instrumental music is the essential part of the song, it would need to be done by *Levi'im*!?

The *Gemora* therefore explains the dispute as follows: In truth they all hold that the essential was the singing with the

mouth; here, however, they are disputing as to whether one may promote one from the platform (*upon which the Levi'im and the musicians stood during the singing in the Courtyard*) to being regarded as genealogically fit (*that he now may marry a woman of pure lineage*) or that he may receive *ma'aser* (*for he is definitely a Levi*). He who said that the instrument players were slaves would hold that we do not promote anyone from the platform to either being regarded as genealogically fit or to receive *ma'aser*; whereas he who said that they were *Levi'im* would hold that one may promote anyone from the platform both to being regarded as genealogically fit and to receive *ma'aser*; whereas he who said that they were Israelites (*with pure lineage*) would hold that one may promote anyone from the platform to being regarded as genealogically fit, but not to receive *ma'aser*. (11a)

Omission of Song

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: The omission of the song invalidates the offering; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. The Sages, however, hold that the omission of the song does not invalidate the offering.

The *Gemora* explains their reasoning: They both hold that there is an analogy to atonement. Rabbi Meir holds that just as (*effecting*) atonement (*through the process of applying the blood on the Altar*) is indispensable (*and without it, the offering is invalid*), so too, the song is indispensable (*and without it, the offering is invalid*). The Sages, however, say: Just as the atonement is performed during the day, so too, the

song take place during the day (even if the wine libations were brought at night). (11a)

Sources for the Obligation to Sing

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: From where do we know that the primary song is obligatory on the basis of the Torah? It is written (regarding the Levi): *Then he shall serve with the Name of Hashem.* Now which service is it in the course of which Hashem's Name is mentioned? You must say that it is the song.

The *Gemora* asks: But perhaps it is the Priestly Blessing?

The *Gemora* answers: It is written (regarding the Priestly Blessing): to serve Him and to bless with His Name. It follows that the Priestly Blessing in itself is not a service (and therefore the other verse must be referring to the Levi'im's song).

Rav Masnah cites a different verse as the source: *Because you did not serve Hashem, your God, with joy and with gladness of heart.* Now, which service is it that is 'with joy and with gladness of heart'? You must say that it is the song.

The *Gemora* asks: But perhaps it is the words of the Torah, as it is written: *The precepts of Hashem are upright, gladdening the heart?*

The *Gemora* answers: They are described as 'gladdening the heart,' but not as 'good.'

The *Gemora* asks: But perhaps it refers to *bikkurim* (the first ripe fruits of any of the seven species with which the Torah praises Eretz Yisroel, which had to be brought to the Beis Hamikdosh in Yerushalayim), as it is written: *And you shall rejoice with all the good?*

The *Gemora* answers: They are called 'good,' but not 'goodness of the heart.'

Rav Masnah said: From where do we know that the bringing of *bikkurim* requires song? It is derived from the analogy of the words 'good' (written regarding the Levi'im's song) 'good' (written by *bikkurim*).

The *Gemora* asks from the principle laid down by Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of Rabbi Yonasan that song is not sung (by the Levi'im) except over wine! —

The *Gemora* answers: That is possible in accordance with that which Rabbi Yosi taught that *bikkurim* can be brought from wine.

The *Gemora* cites other Scriptural sources for the Levi'im's song:

Chizkiyah - *And Chananiah was director of the Levi'im regarding the carrying; he directed [yasor] the carrying, because he was skilful.* Do not read 'yasor,' but 'yashir' (he sings).

Bilvatei, in the name of Rabbi Yochanan - *To do the service of a service.* Which service needs another service? This is the song (which is performed during the Temple service).

Rabbi Yitzchak - *Raise up a song and sound the drum, the sweet harp with the lyre.*

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak - *They will lift up their voice, they will; for the majesty of Hashem, they shout from the sea.*

A Tanna - *But to the sons of Kehas he gave none (wagons), because the service of the sacred things belonged to them: they carried them upon their shoulders.* 'Carried' is an expression of song.

Chananiah, the son of the brother of Rabbi Yehoshua - *Moshe spoke and God answered him with a voice - He commanded him regarding his voice (that he, as a Levi, should use it for song).*

Rav Ashi - *There was unison among the trumpeters and singers, sounding out in one voice.*

Rabbi Yonasan - *That they (the Kohanim) not die, they as well as you. Just as you (the Kohanim) are obligated in the service of the Altar, so they too (the Levi'im), are obligated at the service of the Altar.* (11a - 11b)

Engaging in Someone Else's Work

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: *That they (the Kohanim) not die, they as well as you.* This teaches us that you (a Kohen), by engaging in their work, or they (a Levi) by engaging in yours, would incur a penalty of death (at the hands of Heaven); they (a Levi), however, by engaging in another Levi's service (such

as a gatekeeper singing) would not be liable for death, but would incur a penalty for violating a transgression.

Abaye said: We have it on tradition that a singing Levite who did his colleague's task at the gate incurs the penalty of death.

The *Gemora* asks from a *braisa*: Concerning a Levite singer that attended to the Temple gates, or a gatekeeper who sang, would not be liable for death, but would incur a penalty for violating a transgression.

The *Gemora* answers that this is a matter of dispute among *Tannaim*, for it was taught in a *braisa*: It happened that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Chananyah went to assist Rabbi Yochanan ben Gudgeda in the closing of the Temple doors, whereupon he said to him, "My son, turn back, for you are of the singers, not of the gatekeepers."

The *Gemora* suggests that they were arguing about this point: Rabbi Yochanan ben Gudgeda held that he incurs the penalty of death, and for this reason the Rabbis forbade even assisting (in the other's task), whereas Rabbi Yehoshua ben Chananyah held that only a transgression was involved, and therefore the Rabbis did not decree this preventive measure.

The *Gemora* rejects this argument: Perhaps they both agree that only a transgression is involved, and their disagreement is regarding the following: Rabbi Yochanan ben Gudgeda holds that the Rabbis forbade assisting as a preventive measure, whereas Rabbi Yehoshua ben Chananyah maintains that they did not forbid assisting as a preventive measure. (11b)

Voluntary Olah Offering

Rabbi Avin inquired: Does a voluntary *olah* offering of a community require song or not? The Torah says: *your olah offerings*, which means (that song is required) no matter whether they are obligatory or voluntary; or in saying 'your *olah offerings*,' does perhaps the Torah mean those (offerings) of all Israel (referring to the obligatory offerings, which come from the donations from all of Israel)?

The *Gemora* attempts to prove this from the verse where Chizkiyahu asked whether a song was needed by an *olah* offering, and it was resolved that a song is necessary. Now, if this was referring to a voluntary *olah* offering, Rabbi Avin's inquiry would be resolved.

Rav Yosef deflects the proof by saying that perhaps his uncertainty was concerning the *mussaf* of *Rosh Chodesh*. [He wasn't asking about the song; rather, his question concerned *Rosh Chodesh* – if it was in its regular time or not.]

Abaye disagrees with this, for it is written that this incident took place on the sixteenth day of the first month (and not on *Rosh Chodesh*).

Rami the son of Rav Yeiva said that the question was with reference to the lamb offered up with the *omer* (on the second day of *Pesach*), and his question was regarding the true day of *Rosh Chodesh* that month (which would effect when the sixteenth was).

Rav Aviya challenged this interpretation, for he should have seen when *Pesach* had been observed, and when *matzah* was eaten!?

Rav Ashi explains that he was like a prayer leader, who consults (formally asking for permission from the community before starting the prayer – out of respect), and accordingly, it could even be referring to an obligatory *olah* offering.

The *Gemora* attempts to bring a proof from that which we have learned in a *braisa*: A happy event is credited to the day on which another happy event happened, while a calamity is ascribed to the day when another calamity occurred. 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 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*; and they did not have time to end the passage, which concludes: *Hashem will cut them off*, before the enemy entered and took possession of the *Beis Hamikdash*. This happened also at the destruction of the second *Beis Hamikdash*.

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 must have been on account of a voluntary *olah* offering! And this could have occurred, for (although, in general, sheep were not available to them) perhaps a young calf may have come available to them!

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 a voluntary *olah* offering 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*).

The *Gemora* rules: Rav Mari the son of Rav Kahana taught: [You shall sound the trumpets] upon your *olah* and *shelamim* offerings. Just as an *olah* (which requires song) is *kodshei kodashim*, so too the communal *shelamim* offerings (which requires song) are *kodshei kodashim*. And just as these *shelamim* offerings have a fixed time, so too, the *olah* offerings (which requires song) have a fixed time (excluding a voluntary *olah* from song, for it does not have a fixed time). (11b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

With the Permission of Maranan Verabanan Verabosai

By: Meoros HaDaf HaYomi

Our *Gemora* is the source for the fact that he who wants to be a *shliach tzibur* must request the congregation's permission or the permission of the *gabai* appointed by the congregation.

King Chizkiyahu, who reigned after King Achaz, renewed the service of the sacrifices in the Temple, as described at length in *Divrei HaYamim* (29:21) and the prophet mentions that he told the *kohanim* to offer sacrifices: "And he said to the sons of Aharon, the *kohanim*". Our *Gemora* explains that although only *kohanim* are allowed to offer sacrifices and that is their

task, they still had to ask permission to begin their service "similar to a *shliach tzibur*, who requests permission".

The Vilna Gaon asked why *Shulchan 'Aruch* rules (*O.C.* 53:15) that a permanent *shliach tzibur* takes his place before the 'amud without waiting to be asked, as our *sugya* explains that he must request permission, like the *kohanim* who are also appointed permanently for their service. *Beur Halachah* solves the question "with difficulty", that the *kohanim* in Chizkiyahu's era needed his permission only on their first day but on other days they didn't need to ask as that is their task. Our *Gemora*, which says that a *shliach tzibur* must similarly request permission, deals with a general appointee in charge of the congregation's matters who must be humble and request permission before he approaches the 'amud. However, someone who was specially appointed as a *chazan* should approach the 'amud immediately for he was appointed for such.

We thus learn that according to all opinions, someone who was not permanently appointed as a *shliach tzibur* must request permission before he approaches the 'amud. HaGaon Rabbi Yosef Chayim zt"l asserts (*Responsa Torah Lishmah*, 34) that our *Gemora* is also the source for the fact that he who is honored to lead the *zimun* in *birkas hamazon* says *birshus*...- "with permission".

The Remo wrote (*Shulchan 'Aruch*, *O.C.* 167:14) that he who is about to recite *hamotzi* and wants to exempt all the diners with the *berachah* first says *birshus* ("with permission") out of humility (*Mishnah Berurah*, *S.K.* 75). It is interesting to note another reason cited by the author of *Shibolei HaLeket*, that as he who says the *berachah* and cuts the bread, eats the bread first, he must request the diners' permission so as not to appear like a glutton. By saying *birshus*, he says to them "not because of gluttony do I break the bread to taste it first but by your permission". He thus explains the Sephardic custom that the diners answer "*shamayim*" to express "You behave according to the halachah and not because of gluttony".

We should mention that according to the Vilna Gaon, *birshus* should not be said before *hamotzi* (*Ma'aseh Rav*, 78).

Why a Levi must Engage in only One Service in the Temple

There's an interesting inquiry how to define a halachah of the Leviim who served in the Temple. There were many tasks in the Temple. Some Leviim were in charge of the gates, others were appointed to sing, etc. Abayei says in our *Gemora* "A singer who took care of a gate is punishable with death". Each Levi must work only at his service and is not allowed to engage in another.

Rambam writes (*Hilchos Klei HaMikdash* 3:20) about a singing Levi who has become old and whose voice is unpleasant, "it seems to me that he is only disqualified to sing but he may be a gate-keeper." Doesn't this ruling contradict our *Gemora*, that each Levi must only engage in his specific task? There are two different approaches among the Rishonim how to understand the prohibition of the Leviim to engage in another service that is not their task, as follows.

We can well understand the distinction between *kohanim* and Leviim. There are separate halachos for *kohanim* and Leviim and a Levi's service is limited only to that of the Leviim because in comparison to a *kohen*, he is a *zar* - a stranger i.e. a non-kohen who must not perform a kohen's task. Concerning the prohibition of a Levi to engage in a Levi's task for which he wasn't appointed, we can explain this in two ways. It could be that as he was appointed to engage in a certain task, he is considered a *zar* - a stranger or a non-Levi for the other task and therefore he is not allowed to engage therein. It could also be that he is not considered a *zar* for the other task, as after all the task befits him as he is a Levi, but this ruling was meant so that each Levi should concentrate at his task and perform it as well as possible.

The Rishonim evidently disagreed about the definition of this prohibition. Rambam asserts (*Moreh Nevuchim*, III, Ch. 45): "...and He also warned everyone of those who serve in the Temple not to engage in his companion's task for tasks to be discharged by many, if each person will not be appointed to a specific task, the result will be laziness" and *Sefer HaChinuch* wrote likewise (mitzvah 389).

On the other hand, Ramban wrote (*Sefer HaMitzvos*, mitzvah 36) that the Leviim were divided into watches (*mishmaros*), like those of the *kohanim*, according to a halachah from Moshe from Mount Sinai and therefore a member of one

mishmeres was forbidden to engage in the task of other *mishmaros*. (Rambam agrees that the Leviim had *mishmaros* but maintains that they were regulated by King David and are not halachah from Moshe - *Hilchos Klei HaMikdash* 3:8; see *Chidushei Maran Riz HaLevi* on the Torah, *parashas Bemidbar*; *Diberos Ariel*, 24; *Heseg Yad* on our *sugya*).

We can therefore well understand why Rambam ruled that a singing Levi who has become old and stopped singing may serve as a gate-keeper as it was only forbidden so that he could concentrate at one task and perform it perfectly. Once he stops singing, there's no reason to prevent him from concentrating at the task of the gate-keepers.

DAILY MASHAL

The World of Music

The author of *Peas HaShulchan*, a pupil of the Vilna Gaon zt"l, testified that the Gaon said to him that he knows the art of music and that "most of the Torah's reasons, the secrets of the Leviim's song and the secrets of *Tikunei HaZohar* cannot be known without it" (Preface to *Peas HaShulchan*).