



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The requirements to sanctify Yerushalayim and the Beis HaMikdash

R' Huna and R' Nachman disagree whether all the requirements of the Mishnah are necessary or one of the requirements is sufficient.

Each Amora explains his rationale.

R' Nachman's position that one of the requirements is sufficient is unsuccessfully challenged.

A Beraisa is cited in support of R' Huna who says that all of the requirements are necessary.

A point in the Beraisa is clarified.

It is suggested that this issue is also a dispute between Tannaim.

Ravina rejects the assertion that this dispute relates to the issue of whether the original sanctity of Yerushalayim was for future times and cites another Beraisa that subscribes to the view that the original sanctity ceased upon the destruction of the Beis HaMikdash.

Another Beraisa is cited and clarified that presents an alternative version of R' Yishmael the son of R' Yosi's position.

Two resolutions to the contradiction are presented.

2) Tum'ah contracted in the Azarah

R' Elazar presents the source that a person is liable even for tum'ah contracted in the Azarah.

This exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara demonstrates that the Mishkan can be referred to as the Mikdash and the Mikdash can be referred to as the Mishkan.

3) Bowing after contracting tum'ah

Rava asserts that the Mishnah's ruling that one who contracted tum'ah in the Azarah is liable for bowing is limited to one who bowed towards the Sanctuary but not one who bowed in a different direction.

A second version of Rava's statement is recorded.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. How many procedures are necessary to expand Yerushalayim?

2. What causes the sanctity of Eretz Yisroel to dissipate?

3. Why does the Torah switch between the term מקדש and the term משכן?

4. What is קידה?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The kedushah of the Beis HaMikdash in our days

דכולי עלמא קדושה ראשונה קידשה לשעתה וקידשה לעתיד לבא

The Mishnah (14b) discussed areas of the courtyard of the Beis HaMikdash which were added and extended. The Mishnah listed several procedures and circumstances which are necessary for the kedushah of these areas to be officially annexed. In our Gemara, Rav Huna holds that all of the procedures listed in the Mishnah must be followed for the area to be extended. Rav Nachman contends that any of the procedures may be done, and it is not necessary for all of them to be followed.

The Gemara proceeds to explain that the basis for this argument is that Rav Huna holds that the kedushah of the Beis HaMikdash was established originally, and it never was lost. When Ezra returned from the Babylonian exile and sanctified Yerushalayim even without a king or Urim v'Tumim, the kedushah was valid because the original sanctity of the place had never been lost. Rav Nachman says that the original sanctity had departed with the exile of the people, and the area had to be re-dedicated. When Ezra did so, albeit with a deficient set of procedures, the kedushah returned, because all we require is one of the procedures, and not all of them.

The Gemara tries to show that whether the original kedushah was lost is actually the subject of a dispute between Tannaim, R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua. R' Eliezer says that when they built the walls of the courtyard and היכל of the Second Beis HaMikdash, they first erected curtains along the perimeter of the construction site. The Gemara assumes that the curtains were necessary because the original kedushah had left, and the curtains served as a temporary structure to allow offerings to be built until the permanent walls were put up. R' Yehoshua says offerings and consumption of the meat from these offerings was allowed even without the curtains or walls. The Gemara assumes that R' Yehoshua holds that the kedushah of the place never left.

The Gemara concludes that R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua might not even argue, and they both agree that the original kedushah remains forever. But, we do find R' Yishmael b. R' Yose who does say that the original kedushah has left.

Rambam (ה'ל' בית הבחירה ו:יד-טז) rules that the kedushah established by Shlomo HaMelech remains forever, while Ra'aved rules that the kedushah has been lost. Turei Even and Chasam Sofer say that according to Ra'aved the halacha of fearing the מקדש (Yevamos 6b—not to enter with one's shoes or one's packages, not to use it as a shortcut, etc.) does not apply in our days. Minchas Chinuch (Mitzvah 254, #15) disagrees and says

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By Mr. Ivan Horak in memory of
 Dvora Bat Zipora, Mordechai Ben Nathan, Joseph ben Shlomo,
 Zipora Bat Salomon, Nathan Hochberger & Hindele Hochberger

HALACHAH Highlight

The status of the Beis HaMikdash in our times

קדושה ראשונה קידשה לשעתה וקידשה לעתיד לבא

The original sanctification sanctified for that time and for the future

There is a dispute amongst the Rishonim whether the initial sanctity of Yerushalayim and the Beis HaMikdash was temporary or for the future as well. Rambam¹ holds that when Yerushalayim and the Beis HaMikdash were originally sanctified they were sanctified for all times. In contrast, the land of Eretz Yisroel was only sanctified temporarily and upon the destruction of the Beis HaMikdash and the exile of the people the land lost its sanctity. Ra'avad² disagrees and maintains that there is no distinction between Eretz Yisroel and the Beis HaMikdash or Yerushalayim. Just as the land of Eretz Yisroel was not sanctified permanently, so too, the Beis HaMikdash and Yerushalayim were not sanctified permanently. For this reason one who enters the area of the Beis HaMikdash in our times while tamei is not subject to kares. Teshuvos Binyan Tzion³ expresses uncertainty whether according to Ra'avad it is permitted nowadays to enter the area of the Beis HaMikdash while tamei or perhaps his intent was to rule that one who does so does not receive kares but it is still prohibited.

Chasam Sofer⁴ notes that even according to Ra'avad the place of the Beis HaMikdash is a place that is conducive for prayer despite the absence of the Beis HaMikdash. Even though one who enters the location of the Beis HaMikdash while tamei does not incur the penalty of kares, nevertheless, its designation as a place conducive to prayer, long preceded the Beis HaMikdash. Adam Harishon and Noach offered korbanos at this location and it is the location where Akeidas Yitzchok occurred and where Yaakov

(Overview...continued from page 1)

The Gemara explains the difference between bowing that involves tarrying and bowing that does not.

Two Amoraim disagree what period of time constitutes tarrying.

A Beraisa describes all the different varieties of bowing.

4) Tarrying

Rava asks whether one must tarry long enough to bow to receive lashes and the matter is left unresolved. ■

(Insight...continued from page 1)

that even if the original kedushah is gone, because private altars (במות) are forbidden, and the third Beis HaMikdash will be built on that spot, the laws of respect for the place remain intact. ■

Avinu had his dream. All of this indicates that the place has inherent sanctity that is not a function of the Beis HaMikdash.

Bikurei Yaakov⁵ combines two rulings of Rambam to draw out a novel conclusion. If we combine Rambam's position⁶ that Yeshushalayim is considered part of the Beis HaMikdash for the mitzvah of taking a lulav and esrog all seven days of Sukkos together with his ruling that the original sanctity of Yerushalayim never ceased it would emerge that there is a Biblical command to take a lulav and esrog even in our times in the city of Yerushalayim. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"ו מהל' בית הבחירה הי"ד-ט"ז.
2. ראב"ד שם.
3. שו"ת בנין ציון ח"א סי' ב'.
4. שו"ת חת"ס יו"ד סי' רל"ג ד"ה ענינו וסי' רל"ד ד"ה והנה.
5. ביכורי יעקב סי' תרנ"ח סק"א.
6. רמב"ם פירוש המשניות סוכה פ"ג מ"ב. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

"We Thank You, Hashem..."

"השתחואה זו פשוט ידים ורגלים..."

Rav Chaim Freidlander, zt"l, explains the deeper meaning of bowing during modim with a fascinating insight. "The Avudraham, zt"l, writes that the word modim means to bow, as we find explicitly in the Targum in Shmuel.¹ The reason for this is that bowing is part of the proper expression of our gratitude to Hashem for all the many good things in our lives. Bowing is a way to show submission before the one before whom we bow, while one who stands upright demonstrates that he owes nothing to the one who bows before him.

"In Shevuos 16 we find that true bow-

ing is when one lies prostrate on the ground with his hands and legs spread out. This is a very powerful expression of self-nullification and absolute dependence, and explains why our very next words in modim are: 'צור חיינו — Rock of our lives.' We give thanks and express our praise for Hashem and are completely nullified to Him in this prayer.

"This also explains why we also bow at the beginning of the amidah. We show that the entire character of our prayer is to demonstrate that we can do nothing without Hashem. We internalize that by ourselves we are nothing, since everything we have is a free kindness from Hashem. It follows that we should turn only to Him for assistance. We must rely on Him for everything."²

Rav Pinchas of Koretz, zt"l, explains

that bowing can be very helpful spiritually. "If one finds himself beset by illicit thoughts this shows that his awareness of Hashem is somehow not penetrating into his body, since if it was he could never hold on to an illicit thought. Like oil which always floats to the top of water, one who truly has understanding cannot possibly entertain lowly thoughts.

"One practical way to regain one's awareness of God and send away such thoughts is to bow before the Creator. This shines upon one great understanding that blinds the lower self and allows the higher self to reign supreme."³ ■

1. שמואל ב', ט"ז: ד'
2. שפתי חיים, ביאורי תפלת שהו"ע, מאמר מודים משתחוים
3. אמרי פנחס, ח"א, שער קדושה, אות כ"ב ■