

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf
Tamid Daf 27

20 Iyar 5772

May 12, 2012

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"h.
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

Guards

The Gemora asks why the Mishna first refers to young Kohanim (who guarded the Bais Hamikdash) as *rovim* – lads, and then refers to young Kohanim (who slept on the floor) as *pirchim* – young.

The Gemora explains that the ones who guarded were not of age to perform the service and therefore are called *rovim*, while the ones who slept were old enough to perform the service, and therefore are called *pirchim*.

The Gemora cites a Mishna in Middos, which lists the locations of the guards in the Bais Hamikdash. There were three places the Kohanim keep watch in the Temple (not that the Temple or its contents needing guarding, but as a fulfillment of a Scriptural verse: and they shall guard the guarding of the Tent of Meeting; it was also a mark of honor): in the Chamber of Avtinas (he was the head of the family which had the secret of preparing the incense in its special manner; the Gemora in Yoma cites a dispute as to whether this chamber was located on the south side of the Courtyard or the north side), in the Chamber of the Ray (so called because the rays of the sun illuminated it, as it was closed on three sides and opened on the fourth side; it was located by the northern wall of the Courtyard) and in the Fire Chamber (so called because a fire was kept burning in it for the benefit of the Kohanim who had to serve barefooted on the cold marble floor and wearing only one linen garment). There were twenty-one places where the Levi'im kept watch: five inside the five gates of the Temple Mount; four on its inner corners; five outside the five gates of the Courtyard; four on its outer corners; one in the chamber of the sacrifices, one in the chamber of the Paroches

curtain, and one outside the place of the Kapores (i.e., Kodesh Kadashim). (26b – 27a)

How Many Guards

The Gemora asks how we know how many people must guard the Bais Hamikdash.

Rav Yehudah from Sura says (some say a braisa says) that the verse about the Mishkan says that there were six Levi'im in the east, four in the north, four in the south, two each for the chambers, four in the west for the "parbar," and two for the path of the "parbar."

The Gemora asks how this corresponds to the Mishna, as the verse lists twenty-four, but the Mishna lists twenty-one Levi'im.

Abaye says the verse's list of two for the chambers means a total of two, and not two for each. Although this still leaves twenty-two, the two for the "parbar" were counted as only one to guard, with the other one simply providing company, since he was outside of the Temple Mount.

Rabbah bar Shila explains that "parbar" means that it was *klapei bar* – facing outside.

The Gemora says we can also reconcile the verse with the Mishna by saying that the twenty-four in the verse includes the three Kohanim. Although the verse refers to Levi'im, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi says that Kohanim are called Levi'im in twenty-four verses, and this is one of them. (27a)

Inside or Outside?

The *Gemora* asks why the guards around the Temple Mount were inside, while those around the courtyard were outside.

The *Gemora* explains that only a king of Dovid's dynasty may sit inside the courtyard, but anyone may sit inside the Mount's perimeter. Since the guards may tire and need to rest, they were always situated in a place where they could sit. (27a)

How Many Gates?

The *Gemora* challenges the *Mishna*, which lists only five gates of the Courtyard, from another *Mishna*, which lists seven gates, three in the north, three in the south, and one in the east.

Abaye answers that two of these gates had *Kohanim* guarding them, and therefore didn't need *Levi'im*.

Rava answers that this is a dispute of *Tannaim*, as is evident from the *braisa*, in which Rabbi Nassan says that there must be a minimum of thirteen administrators in the Bais Hamikdash, since they were the guardians of the thirteen gates. Since the Mount had five gates, this leaves eight gates of the Courtyard. Just as Rabbi Nassan differs with the *Mishna* that lists seven gates, the *Mishna* cited earlier also differs, counting only five gates. (27a)

Using the Sacred Vestments

The *Mishna* says that the *Kohanim* did not sleep in their Sacred Vestments. The *Gemora* infers that they did walk in them, indicating that they were allowed to benefit from them.

The *Gemora* deflects this inference, as the *Mishna* mentioned sleeping to teach that they were allowed to fold them and put them by their head, but not to imply that they were allowed to walk in them.

The *Gemora* further attempts to prove that they were allowed to benefit, from the fact that they slept on them, but deflects this by saying that it means they placed them near their heads, but not directly under.

Rav Pappa says that we can learn from this *Mishna* that one may place *tefillin* next to his head when sleeping, and we aren't concerned that he will roll on top of them in his sleep.

The *Gemora* supports this explanation, as they should be prohibited from sleeping on them, since they are made of wool and linen, which is normally prohibited as *shatnez*.

The *Gemora* says that according to the opinion that a standard *Kohen's* belt is only linen, this does not support this reading, as it is not *shatnez*, but according to the opinion that it has wool, like the *Kohen Gadol's*, it does support it.

The *Gemora* says that although it is under them, and the verse only prohibits *shatnez* going on top of a person, it is Rabbinnically prohibited even when under someone. Even if it is not directly below the person, it is prohibited.

The *Gemora* deflects this support by saying that they may have slept directly on the garments aside from the belt, which were not *shatnez*.

Rav Ashi deflects it by saying that the garments were a hard material of *shatnez*, on which one may lie down.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which says that the *Kohen* may not leave the Bais Hamikdash with his garments, but may wear them in the Bais Hamikdash, whether or not he is doing the service, proving that one may benefit from the garments.

The *Gemora* challenges the prohibition in this *braisa* from the story of Shimon Hatzadik, who greeted Alexander the Great (*outside the Bais Hamikdash*) while wearing the *Kohen Gadol* garments.

The *Gemora* offers two answers:

1. He wore clothes like the *Kohen Gadol* garments, but not the real ones.
2. This was a temporary exception for the sake of saving the Bais Hamikdash. (27a – 27b)

Getting to the Mikvah

The *Mishna* said that if one became impure due to *keri* - *nocturnal emission*, he would exit through a tunnel to immerse in a *mikvah*.

The *Gemora* says this supports Rabbi Yochanan, who says that the tunnels opening to the Mount were not sanctified, as one who is impure due to *keri* must leave the Courtyard and the Mount. (27b)

Etiquette

The *Mishna* described the protocol used to indicate if the bathroom was occupied, giving its name as the bathroom of "honor."

The *Gemora* relates a story of Rav Safra, who was in the bathroom. Rabbi Abba came and made a noise to indicate his presence, and Rav Safra said “the Master can enter.” When Rav Safra left, Rabbi Abba told him that by letting him enter, he showed that he did not know proper protocol in the bathroom, as the *Mishna* indicates that one must ensure privacy in the bathroom, not allowing anyone to enter.

The *Gemora* explains that Rav Safra was concerned that Rabbi Abba was in danger if he did not enter immediately, as one can suffer various sicknesses if one stops himself in the middle of defecating or urinating.

Rav told his son Chiya to relieve himself once in the morning and once in the evening, to train himself to not need the bathroom in the middle of the day, when he would have to go far away to a private bathroom. When he relieves himself, he should be modest, and therefore only uncover himself after sitting, and covering himself before standing up again.

He also told him that when he drinks, he should first rinse the cup, drink, and then rinse it again for the next one using the cup. If he drinks water, he should pour out some when he is done, to clean off any residue from his mouth on the cup, even if the next person is his student.

The *Gemora* relates a story of one who drank water, and then gave the rest to his finicky student, without pouring out any to clean. The student didn't want to drink, and therefore died of thirst, prompting the rule that one must clean off after drinking.

Rav Ashi says that therefore a student who pours out some water to clean off the cup, even in front of his teacher, is not considered insolent.

He also told him that he should not spit out any saliva from eating food in front of his teacher, except for saliva after eating raw gourd or cereal, as it can burn his body like a hot piece of lead. (27b)

Rousing the Guards

The *Gemora* cites the *Mishna* in Middos which says the officer of the Mount would go to each guard station, with torches. Any guard station that did not stand up, or respond to the greeting of the man, indicated that they were sleeping, and he would hit them with his stick. He had the right to burn the guard's clothing as punishment for his negligence. If he would do this, the other guards would remark about the sound in the courtyard, and say that it was the sound of the *Levi* being hit, and his clothes being burned, since he fell asleep at his guard post. Rabbi Eliezer ben

Yaakov says that one time they found his maternal uncle asleep, and they burned his clothes.

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba says that when Rabbi Yochanan would reach this *Mishna*, he would remark how fortunate the earlier generations were. If they were held responsible for falling asleep due to unavoidable fatigue, how much more so were they held responsible for any negligence. (27b – 28a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Drinking from a glass that others drank from

By: Meoros HaDaf HaYomi

Two adjacent halachos in *Shulchan 'Aruch* are discussed by the *poskim*. One halachah rules (O.C. 170:15): “One shouldn't drink from a glass and then give it to another because of danger to life.” The feelings of unpleasantness and revulsion resulting from drinking from a glass drunk from by others might bring him close to death. A few paragraphs later, *Shulchan 'Aruch* adds (*se'if* 22): “After you drink and wine remains in the cup for another, wipe the place where you put your mouth because of revulsion but do not spill out because of the prohibition of *bal tashchis* (not to waste); but after drinking water, spill some out through there.”

He who reads the two paragraphs wonders: at first he wrote that one mustn't give another to drink from a cup from which one drank while in the second paragraph he suggests a solution to spill some of the water over the place where it was drunk. What is the correct way to act?

A fastidious person is different: The *Levush* asserts that the paragraphs concern two different cases. At first, *Shulchan 'Aruch* relates to a fastidious, delicate person (*istenis*). He should never be made to drink from an unclean cup, lest he come to danger. The other paragraph concerns most people, who suffice with wiping the edge of the cup, or spilling a little water there. However, the *Levush's* solution was not accepted by the *poskim* in light of that explained in our *sugya*. Our *Gemara* mentions that Rav and Rav Huna, before their demise, commanded their sons Chiya and Rabah: “...and when you drink water, spill some and then give it to your pupil... and it happened once that a person drank water and didn't spill any and gave it to his pupil and that pupil was an *istenis* and didn't want to drink and he died of thirst. At that time they said, ‘A person must not drink water and give it to his pupil unless he spills some’.” We thus see that even for an *istenis* it suffices to slightly spill from the cup.

The *poskim* explain that there's no contradiction in *Shulchan 'Aruch*: at first, he wrote that one mustn't pass a cup to another

after drinking from it and afterwards he adds that if the edge of the cup was cleaned, it may be done. The reason for not combining the paragraphs and presenting them more briefly is the fact that *Shulchan 'Aruch* learnt this halachah from two sources, from our *sugya* and from tractate *Soferim*, and he uses their original phrasings. The final conclusion is that without wiping the cup, one shouldn't drink from it (see *Sha'ar HaTziyun*, *ibid*, S.K. 30).

Passing the kiddush cup around the table: Some are accustomed to pass the *kiddush* cup around the table while each person drinks therefrom without anyone caring to wipe the edge. The author of *Zivchei Tzedek* wondered: after all, it is forbidden to give another a cup without cleaning it. He was forced to conclude that "there are no *istenisim* among us and therefore we can drink even without cleaning the cup, but he who knows that he is an *istenis* should not drink from the *kiddush* cup...and on the contrary, he transgresses a prohibition if he drinks therefrom... the prohibition of *bal teshaktzu*." His conclusion matches the *Levush's* opinion, that this prohibition relates only to *istenisim* but according to the afore-mentioned *poskim*, we must still understand how people are accustomed to behave so.

Voluntary drinking is not dangerous: The *Bach* and the *Taz* (O.C. 177) mention the Maharshah's opinion, that the main worry in drinking from a cup that others drank from is when the cup is passed around and he who receives it does not feel at ease to refuse to drink. However, if the cup is put on the table and anyone who wants to can take it, this is not considered repulsive and there's no worry for causing damage to a person who drinks from the cup; *Mishnah Berurah* ruled likewise (S.K. 37).

The Sephardic custom at the chupah: It is interesting to note that *Sdei Chemed* (*Peas Hasadeh, ma'areches Berachos*, 31) cites the author of *Aderes* who wondered about the Sephardic custom, that he who pronounces a *berachah* under the *chupah* drinks a little from the cup and then the bride and groom drink therefrom. Indeed, in our era some Sephardim are accustomed to wipe the edge of the cup after the *mesader kidushin* drinks before giving it to the bride and groom (*Responsa Yabia' Omer*, V, E.H. 10, os 7).

Mazikim and germs in the remnants of a drink: There's another issue pertinent to our Gemara. The *Taz* states: "I saw in the *Tzavaah* (will) of Rabbi Eliezer HaGadol that he warns very much not to drink from that left over by another lest he have an illness and a breath from his mouth is left in those remnants." Germs, *mazikim* and other unwanted elements could remain in the drink and infest the body of the person who drinks therefrom. Does this not contradict our Gemara, that it suffices to wipe the cup?

The *poskim* also address this question and *Mishnah Berurah* cites the author of *Eliyah Rabah*, who explains that Rabbi Eliezer HaGadol's will concerns a person staying with people he doesn't know and their health is unknown to him. He should avoid drinking the remnants of their drinks lest he be endangered, while our Gemara concerns a *rav* and a pupil, who know each other and know that they're healthy, and therefore there's no worry of contamination (see *Pri Megadim*, *ibid*).

Standing or Sitting?

The Gemara (*Tamid* 27a) states that the *Leviim* stood guard over the *Har HaBayis* at its four corners and five gates, standing inside the *Har HaBayis* walls. The *Leviim* also stood guard over the *Azarah* (courtyard) in the same allocations and positions, but they stood outside the *Azarah's* walls rather than inside. The Gemara explains that this was because it was forbidden for anyone to sit inside the *Azarah* (except for kings descended from Dovid HaMelech), and if one of the *Levi* guards should get tired and wish to sit, he could only do so if he was outside the *Azarah* walls.

Tosafos (*Yoma* 25a) states that it was permitted to sit in the *Azarah* while eating *Kadashim* (edible parts of *Korbanos*), because eating them was necessary in order to complete the *Avodah*. *Tosafos* (*Zevachim* 55b) says the same thing regarding *Shechitah* of a *Korban*, which, as a necessity of the *Avodah*, may be performed sitting.

However, *Igros Moshe* (s"uh 2:1) holds that even for an *Avodah* necessity, sitting is only permitted where sitting provides an advantage. Since one normally sits while eating, one would be expected to do so when eating *Kadashim* as well. However, regarding *Shechitah*, since the animal may not be slaughtered when suspended in the air (on a hook), but rather when it is positioned on the floor, it would be necessary for the *Shochet* to bend down in order to slaughter it. But this should not permit him to sit, since sitting would not be necessary to facilitate the *Shechitah*, although it might help make the *Shochet* comfortable. Comfort does not create a necessity. The same may be said regarding *Shemirah* (guarding) as well. Since there would be no advantage to the quality of the *Avodah* in sitting, other than making a tired guard comfortable, it would not be permitted to sit. For this reason, *Leviim* guarded the *Azarah* from the outside.

DAILY MASHAL

No Poverty in a Place of Wealth

It is written, "The work was sufficient for them for all the work, to do it and to leave over". With regards to the Sanctuary and the

Temple, we find many issues that depend upon the general principle: “There must be no poverty in a place of wealth.” This means that in the Sanctuary and the Temple, everything done by the priests and others in dealing with sanctified matters was done through wealthy and noble means. Due to the honor of the Sanctuary and the Temple, nothing in this regard was done sparingly.

The Gemara examines the source of why it is forbidden to build anything on Shabbat, even something small. Abaye said: A poor man makes the feet of a small stove to place a pot upon it. Likewise in connection with the Sanctuary, those who boiled the dyes for dyeing the curtains – when their [dyes] were insufficient – made the feet of a small stove to place a small kettle upon it” (Shabbat 102b). Rashi explains that if some dye had not set properly, and the process had to be restarted for a small amount of wool, then in order to save on the amount of work, only a tiny amount of dye was reheated and feet were made for a small stove so as to place a pot on it.

The Gemara goes on to cite Rabbi Acha bar Yaakov as saying, “There must be no poverty in a place of wealth” (Shabbat ibid.). Here Rashi explains: “Nothing was made sparingly; everything was done from the outset with enough and more.”

Before an animal was sacrificed for the daily burnt offering, the priests would give it to drink in order to facilitate its dismembering. Hence this water was brought in a gold cup, for “there must be no poverty in a place of wealth.”

The Gemara also states that in the Temple, the tables for the showbread were made of marble, not of silver or gold (Tamid 31b). The Gemara objects: “There must be no poverty in a place of wealth. Why then were the tables made of marble? They should have been made of silver or even of gold!” The Gemara replies by saying that according to the principle, “There must be no poverty in a place of wealth,” the tables should have been made of silver or gold. However metal tends to heat the things that are placed on it, and therefore metal tables would have heated the bread and caused it to putrefy, which would have dishonored the Temple. Hence the tables for the showbread were not made of silver or gold.

The principle according to which there must be no poverty in a place of wealth only applies in general, but does not invalidate things after the fact. Hence there is a law which states that if a priest collected the blood of an offering in a vessel that had broken and was repaired, it does not invalidate the offering. In general, it is even permitted to temporarily repair a vessel that has broken if no other vessel is available (see Iriot Shlomo on the laws concerning the Temple vessels).

In fact the principle that “there must be no poverty in a place of wealth” seems to contradict the words of our Sages, for they have said: “The Torah has consideration for the money of Israel.” This latter principle is why the Sanctuary’s urn (in which lots were placed on Yom Kippur) was made of wood, as well as why the showbread was made entirely of wheat, as opposed to the other offerings, which were made from semolina. There are other situations in which costs were reduced due to the principle that the Torah has consideration for the money of Israel.

The Tiferes Yisrael (Tamid 27a) wrote that the governing principle in any given situation – whether to be generous or to save – depends on the Sages of Israel. The gaon Rabbi Eliezer Flekles Zatzal, in his book of responsa entitled Teshuvah MeAhava, performs an in-depth analysis of issues that seem to contradict one another, as well as how the Sages decide one way or the other. He defers to his teacher, the gaon Rabbi Yechezkel Landau Zatzal, known as the Noda B’Yehuda.

The Noda B’Yehuda first marvels at the scholarship of his student, and then proceeds to establish a basic principle: Regarding everything that must be contained in a sacred vessel, we apply the principle “there must be no poverty in a place of wealth.” A supplementary principle is that the use of silver cannot be considered as “poverty.” Hence even with regards to the vessels of the Sanctuary, we say “the Torah has consideration for the money of Israel,” and so whenever Scripture does not require us to make them of gold, we make them of silver. This is why the Rambam rules that the priestly garments were not washed when they become dirty, and yet the urn (for the lots on Yom Kippur) was made of wood, for the Torah protects the money of the Children of Israel. In fact the urn is not a sacred object, and there is no reason to apply the principle “there must be no poverty in a place of wealth” to it.

This also explains why wheat was purchased for the making of the showbread. When we purchase wheat, it has no intrinsic sanctity, only the sanctity of its financial value. When this wheat becomes intrinsically sanctified, it has already become semolina. The same applies to the trumpets used for the service in the Sanctuary, for they were made of silver, not gold. This is because silver is not classified as “poverty,” besides the fact that the trumpets were not “a vessel for the service of the Sanctuary.” On the other hand, the vessels used in the service of the Sanctuary – those which are explicitly mentioned – must not be repaired when they break, for in their regard the principle that “there must be no poverty in a place of wealth” applies.

By: Rabbi David Pinto