

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf

2 Menachem Av 5770

Sh'vuos Daf 16

July 13, 2010

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of
Yonina bas Menachem Mendel o"h.

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for her neshamah and may her 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

Additional Sanctity

The *Mishna* had stated: If any addition was made without all these requirements, one is not liable if one enters it.

It was stated: Rav Huna said: The *Mishna* said, “without all of these.” [*The entire procedure must be done in order to sanctify the addition.*] Rav Nachman said: the *Mishna* said, “without one of these.” [*As long as one of the above steps were taken, the addition is sanctified.*] Rav Huna who said that all these requirements are necessary must hold that the initial sanctification (of Dovid and Shlomo) was done for that time (when it was built) and for all future generations, and that which Ezra did (sanctifying the second Beis HaMikdash without all these requirements) was only as a remembrance of the first sanctification. Rav Nachman who said that the addition is sanctified even with just one of those steps holds that the initial sanctification was done for that time but not for all future generations, and therefore Ezra sanctified the second Beis HaMikdash, and it took effect even though there was no *Urim ve'tumim* (proving that one of those steps would be sufficient).

Rava asked Rav Nachman from the text of the *Mishna* which clearly states: If any addition was made without **all** these requirements, one is not liable if one enters it.

The *Gemora* answers: The *Mishna* should be emended to say: If any addition was made without **one** of these requirements, one is not liable if one enters it.

The *Gemora* asks on Rav Nachman from a *braisa*: Abba Shaul said: There were two marshes on the Mount of Olives - a lower one and an upper one. The lower one was sanctified (when they constructed a wall around it as an

addition to Yerushalayim) with all these (in the times of the first Beis HaMikdash); the upper one was not sanctified with all these, but by those returning from exile. It was therefore done without a King and without the *Urim ve'tumim*. The lower one, which was properly sanctified - the unlearned people entered there, and ate there *kodashim kalim* (sacrifices of a lesser sanctity; they may be eaten anywhere within the city of Yerushalayim), but not *ma'aser sheini* (a tenth of one's produce that he brings to Yerushalayim and eats there in the first, second, fourth and fifth years of the Shemitah cycle). [They were actually allowed to eat *ma'aser sheini* there; however, since they heard that those who were scrupulous with *ma'aser* were promised to become wealthy, they were extra meticulous with it.] And the learned people ate there *kodashim kalim* and also *ma'aser sheini*. The upper one which was not properly sanctified - the unlearned people entered there, and ate there *kodashim kalim* (violating the law), but not *ma'aser sheini*. And the learned people did not eat there either *kodashim kalim* or *ma'aser sheini*. And why did they not sanctify it? It is because no additions may be made to Yerushalayim or to the Temple Courtyard except by the decision of a King, prophet, *Urim ve'tumim* and a *Sanhedrin* of seventy-one, and with the loaves of two *todah* offerings and song. And why did they sanctify it (the upper one)?

The *Gemora* interrupts: Why did they sanctify it? You have just said they did not sanctify it!

Rather, the *braisa* asked: Why did they bring it into the city? They did so because it was an opened spot in Yerushalayim, and it would have been easy to conquer the city from there. [*This braisa supports Rav Huna, and seemingly, refutes Rav Nachman!?*]

The *Gemora* answers that it (*whether the initial sanctification was done for that time and for all future generations or not*) is actually a subject upon which the *Tannaim* disagree, for it has been taught in a *Mishna*: Rabbi Eliezer said: I heard that when they were building the Beis HaMikdash, they made curtains for the Sanctuary and hangings for the courtyards (*temporary partitions until the walls were constructed*), except that for the Sanctuary they built the wall outside those curtains, and in the courtyard they built the walls from within. Rabbi Yehoshua said: I heard that one may offer sacrifices on the site of the Beis HaMikdash even after its destruction, and that the *Kohanim* may eat the *kodshei kodashim* (*sacrifices of a higher sanctity; they may only be eaten within the Courtyard*) even though there are no curtains, and we may eat *kodshim kalim* and *ma'aser sheni* in Yerushalayim even though there is no wall surrounding the city, because the first sanctification of Yerushalayim and the Beis HaMikdash was sanctified for that time and for the future.

The *Gemora* assumes that Rabbi Eliezer, the first *Tanna* of the *Mishna*, disagrees with Rabbi Yehoshua and maintains that after the destruction of the first Beis HaMikdash, there was no sanctity there, and that is why it was necessary to hang the curtains there; the hanging of the curtains re-sanctified the Beis HaMikdash, thus permitting the offering of sacrifices.

The *Gemora* rejects this explanation and states that Rabbi Eliezer agrees to Rabbi Yehoshua that the initial sanctification remained even after the destruction of the Beis HaMikdash; the curtains were needed only for privacy (*to prevent people from peering inside while the Kohanim were performing the service*).

Rather, the *Gemora* says, this dispute can be found in the following *braisa*: Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yosi said: Why did the Sages enumerate these (*eight walled cities as those which had walls surrounding them since the days of Yehoshua; there were many more which could have been mentioned*)? It was because when the exiles returned, they came upon these, and sanctified them; but the sanctity of the earlier ones was abolished when the sanctity of the land was abolished. Evidently, he holds that the initial sanctification was only for that time, but not for the future.

But, the *Gemora* points out a contradiction: Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yosi said: Were there only these (*eight*) cities? Surely it is written: *Sixty cities, the entire region of Argov, the kingdom of Og in Bashan. All these were fortified cities, with high walls*. Then why did the Sages enumerate only these? It is because when the exiles returned, they found these, and sanctified them.

The *Gemora* interrupts: They sanctified them now! Surely it

will be stated that it was not necessary to sanctify them!?

The *Gemora* emends the *braisa* to read: They found these, and enumerated them. The *braisa* continues: And there were not only these, but any city about which you may have a tradition from your fathers that it was surrounded by a wall from the days of Yehoshua, the son of Nun, then all these *mitzvos* (*regarding the sale of a house: one who sells a house inside a walled city has one year to redeem the house, but if he chooses not to redeem the house, it becomes the property of the buyer permanently; sending a metzora outside the city; and that the open space (1,000 cubits) surrounding the city should be left uncultivated*) apply to it; because the initial sanctification was for that time, and for the future.

There is thus a contradiction between the statement of Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yosi (*in the first braisa that he initial sanctification was only for that time, but not for the future*), and that of Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yosi (*in the latter braisa that the initial sanctification was for that time, and for the future*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: Either you may say that they reflect the opinions of two *Tannaim* who disagree about the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael the son of Rabbi Yosi. Alternatively, you may say that one of the statements was said by Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Yosi, for it has been taught: Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Yosi said: The Torah says: The city that has a wall - although it does not have a wall now, as long as it had one before (*at the time of Yehoshua, it is considered a walled city*). [Evidently he holds that the initial sanctification was for that time, and for the future.] (16a)

Becoming Tamei Inside

The *Mishna* had stated: If a person became *tamei* in the Temple Courtyard, and he later forgot about his *tumah* but was aware that he was in the Temple, or he later forgot that he was in the Temple, though he was aware of his *tumah*, or he later forgot both, and he prostrated himself or stayed long enough to prostrate himself, or went out the longer way, he is liable.

Rabbi Elozar cites a Scriptural source proving that one is liable for becoming *tamei* inside the Courtyard. One verse states: *for he has contaminated the Mishkan (Tabernacle) of Hashem*, and another verse states: *for he has contaminated the Mikdash (Temple) of Hashem*.

The *Gemora* asks that these two verses are not extra, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Elozar said that they are both needed, for I might have thought that one is only liable for entering the *Mishkan* when he is *tamei*, for the *Mishkan* was

anointed with the anointing oil, and I might have thought that one is only liable for entering the *Mikdash* when he is *tamei*, for the *Mikdash* was an everlasting sanctity; therefore it must say both. [So, how is it known that one is liable for becoming *tamei* inside?]

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Elozar was bothered by the following: We find that the terms *Mikdash*, the Temple, and *Mishkan*, the Tabernacle, are interchangeable. Why does the Torah choose to one time say it one way, and a different time, say it another way? Either both times should be *Mikdash*, or both times should be *Mishkan*!? By the fact that the Torah switches terms, we are able to expound two things from these verses.

Proof that *Mikdash* is called *Mishkan* is from the verse: *and I will place my Mishkan, Tabernacle, in your midst. [Hashem made this promise to the Jewish People with regard to the Temple that would be built in the future, and this promise was made when the Mishkan had already been built in the desert.]* We find that *Mishkan* is called *Mikdash* because it is said: *and they shall make for Me a Mikdash and I shall dwell in their midst. [The commandment refers to building the Mishkan in the desert, yet Scripture refers to the Mishkan as the Mikdash.]* (16b)

Prostrating

The *Mishna* had stated: If a person became *tamei* in the Temple Courtyard, and he prostrated himself or stayed long enough to prostrate himself, or went out the longer way, he is liable.

Rava said: This *halachah* is only when he prostrated himself towards the inside of the Temple; but if he prostrated himself towards the outside of the Temple, then, only if he tarried is he liable, but if he did not tarry, he is not liable.

Some say that Rava was referring to the latter part of the *Mishna*: or stayed long enough to prostrate himself. This implies that prostration itself requires tarrying. Rava said: This *halachah* is only when he prostrated himself towards the outside of the Temple; but, if he prostrated himself towards the inside of the Temple, even if he did not tarry, he is liable. The *Mishna* means as follows: If he prostrated himself towards the inside of the Temple (*even without tarrying*), or if he tarried the period of prostration in his prostration towards the outside of the Temple, he is liable.

What is considered prostration in which there is tarrying, and what is considered prostration in which there is no tarrying? Where there is no tarrying, that is mere kneeling; where there is tarrying, that is the extending of the arms and legs.

And what is the duration of tarrying? Rabbi Yitzchak ben Nachmeini and one of his colleagues disagree regarding this. Who is the colleague? Rabbi Shimon ben Pazzi. Others say that it was said by Rabbi Shimon ben Pazzi and one of his colleagues, namely, Rabbi Yitzchak ben Nachmeini, and others say that it was Rabbi Shimon ben Nachmeini: One of them said that it is the time taken to recite this entire verse (*cited below*): And the other one said that it is the time taken to recite the second half of the verse, from “*and they kneeled*” to the end. The verse is: *And all the Children of Israel looked on when the fire descended, and the glory of Hashem was upon the Temple; and they kneeled with their faces to the ground upon the floor, and prostrated themselves, and gave thanks to Hashem, for He is good, for His mercy endures forever.*

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: There are different types of prostration. “*Kidah*” means bowing on the face. “*Keriah*” means falling down on one’s knees. “*Hishtachava’ah*” means bowing down and extending one’s arms and legs. (16b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Story on the Daf

The *Gemora* states that the terms *Mishkan* and *Mikdash* are interchangeable. One must wonder if the terms are interchangeable, why Scripture would not just employ one term, either always using the term *Mishkan* or always using the term *Mikdash*. An answer to this puzzle can be found with a story that occurred many years ago.

Rabbi Stein, an executive director of a well-known Yeshiva, rang the doorbell one evening at the Miller’s home. Mr. Miller invited Rabbi Stein inside to partake of supper with Mr. Miller’s family. Rabbi Stein began apologizing for interrupting the family, when Mr. Miller said, “Please, I am certain you are here for an important reason. How can I be of help to you?”

Rabbi Stein explained that the yeshiva was in desperate need of funds, so Mr. Miller sent his son to bring his checkbook. After writing out a very generous check to the Yeshiva and handing it to Rabbi Stein, Rabbi Stein thanked Mr. Miller and rose to leave. “I would like to apologize again for coming at such an inconvenient time,” Rabbi Stein said. “The opposite is true,” declared Mr. Miller. “Let me share with you something.”

Reb Yitzchak Hutner of Yeshivas Chaim Berlin calls me from time to time asking for financial assistance for his

Yeshiva. When Rav Hutner once called me while I was eating supper, I told Rav Hutner the following: I am very organized in my method of giving *tzedakah*. I set aside ten percent of my income and I distribute the funds systematically. I would probably give the Rosh HaYeshiva a donation even without the Rosh HaYeshiva calling me, but I actually appreciate the call. I would never interrupt my supper to pay a utility bill, but I will interrupt my supper to give *tzedakah*, because I feel that this is something that is every important for my children to witness. Rabi Stein, I must thank you too for ringing my doorbell as we were about to commence our supper. You could not have arrived at a better time.”

This story teaches us that there is a *Mikdash*, a shul, a yeshiva, or any worthy Jewish organization, but there is also a *Mishkan*, from the generosity and beauty of performing the mitzvah of *tzedakah*, that allows the Divine Presence to reside in the homes of those who support the Torah.

Sent out of a Walled City

The *Gemora* mentions that there is a special sanctity regarding cities in *Eretz Yisroel* that were surrounded by a wall in the times of Yehoshua. Rashi writes some of these *halachos*: One who sells a house inside a walled city has one year to redeem the house, but if he chooses not to redeem the house, it becomes the property of the buyer permanently; sending a *metzora* outside the city; and that the open space (1,000 cubits) surrounding the city should be left uncultivated.

Why does a *Metzora* need to leave a city that is surrounded by a wall, but may otherwise remain in all other cities--as long as they are unwalled? The Be'er Yosef provides a fascinating *p'shat* based on the Chazal in Erachin (15b) which states that Hashem provided for the tongue two protections -- two walls: one of flesh--the lips, and one of bone--the teeth. A *metzora* breached his very own walls of protection by speaking *lashon hora*; he cannot therefore remain in a city protected by a wall!

Hakhel Note: An average city has only one wall--yet Hashem in his benevolence gives us a truly enhanced fortification--a dual safeguard! How can a person be so imprudent, so unwise, so as to take down not only one wall made for his own protection--but two! We will add one other point, as well. One of the most famous *Metzora* scenes in Tanach is that of Gechazi and his sons outside the city of Shomron (the Haftarah for Parshas *Metzora*)--perhaps a lesson to us that the sin of Lashon Hora is easily spread within or among a family (Miriam and Aharon speaking regarding Moshe Rabbeinu provides a similar lesson)--and this may be why it is easier to succeed at

taking down the 'double wall'--it is an unfortunate and misguided team effort, and one family member encourages the next in what to the casual observer may otherwise be described as a self-defeating struggle. If one sees a weakness in his family--or in a particular family member (even if that family member is himself) -- he should bolster the fortifications--so that the security of the entire family is not breached--and the lips and tongue can take their noble places in protecting home, life and family!

The Chosen City

Tosfos (in Megillah 10a) cites the opinion of Rabbeinu Chaim that even if one maintains that the initial sanctification of the Beis HaMikdash was not for all time and it would be forbidden to offer sacrifices on the site of the Temple Altar, one is nonetheless prohibited from offering a sacrifice on a private altar.

Rashi disagrees and holds that if the sanctity of the Beis HaMikdash ceased by its destruction, it would be permitted to offer sacrifices on a private altar nowadays.

The commentators ask on Rabbeinu Chaim: If the sanctity ceased after the destruction, why would it be forbidden to offer sacrifices on a private altar? After the destruction of Shiloh, *bamos* became permitted, so why not after the destruction of the Beis HaMikdash?

Minchas Chinuch (254:7) writes that although Yerushalayim has lost its sanctity in regards to offering sacrifices and eating *kodoshim*, the city remains the “chosen place” and the third Beis HaMikdash will be built there. This is why private altars are still forbidden. This is the distinction between Shiloh and Yerushalayim. Shiloh was not the chosen city and when the Tabernacle was destroyed, there was no vestige of sanctity left in the city and *bamos* became permitted. Minchas Chinuch states that this is the explanation as to why we are still subject to a prohibition of fearing the *Mikdash* nowadays, since it is still the chosen place although it has not retained its sanctity.