



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Shavuos Daf Tes Zayin

KOL SHELO NAASIS B'CHOL EILU...

- **R' Huna** said, the Mishna means that *all* of these procedures must be followed for the kedusha to take effect. **R' Nachman** said, the Mishna means that any one of these procedures will make the kedusha take effect.
 - **R' Huna** holds that the original kedusha of Yerushalayim and the Mikdash remains forever, and therefore when Ezra later came to make it kadosh again it was only done as a remembrance, not as a real procedure, and that is why there was kedusha even though a number of the parts of the procedure were missing (e.g. the Urim V'Tumim). **R' Nachman** holds that the kedusha did not remain, and therefore Ezra was actually making it kadosh. From the fact that he did so with parts of the procedure being absent, we see that any one of the procedures is enough to make it kadosh.
 - **Q: Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, the Mishna says "*b'chol eilu*", which suggests that all parts of the procedure are necessary!? **A:** Understand the Mishna as if it said "with *one* of all these things".
 - **Q:** A Braisa seems to clearly say like **R' Huna**. The Braisa says that the lower area of Har Hazeisim had the kedusha of Yerushalayim, because it was added to Yerushalayim with the procedure of a king, a navi, the Urim V'Tumim, and the Great Sanhedrin. The upper part was not added with that process (it was only added for strategic military reasons, not for kedusha) and therefore did not have the kedusha. We see the Braisa holds like **R' Huna**!? **A:** It is actually a matter of machlokes among Tanna'im. A Mishna says, **R' Eliezer** said that he heard that when they built the Second Beis Hamikdash, they put up curtains around the Heichal slightly inside of where the walls were to be built, and around the Azarah slightly outside of where the walls were to be built. **R' Yehoshua** said, that he heard that we can bring korbanos even though there is no Beis Hamikdash, we can eat kodshei kodashim even though there are no curtains around the Azarah area, and we can eat kodshei kalim and maaser sheini even though there is no wall around Yerushalayim, because the original kedusha remains. Now, this suggests that **R' Eliezer** must hold that the original kedusha does not remain. We see that this is a matter of machlokes among Tanna'im.
 - **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, it may be that all agree that the kedusha remains, and **R' Eliezer** and **R' Yehoshua** are not arguing, but are rather making two independent statements!? **A:** Rather, we have different Braisos which show that this matter is a machlokes among Tanna'im. One Braisa says that **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** says that the original kedusha did not remain in effect, and another Braisa says that **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** says that it does remain in effect. We see it is a machlokes among Braisos.
 - **Q:** There is a contradiction of what **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said!? **A:** We can say that there were two Tanna'im who differ in opinion as to what **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said. **A2:** One of the Braisos is actually the view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Yose**.

NITMAH B'AZARAH V'NE'ELMA MIMENU TUMAH...

- **Q:** How do we know that a person becomes chayuv when he becomes tamei in the Azarah? **A: R' Elazar** said, one pasuk says "es Mishkan Hashem timei" and another pasuk says "ki es Mikdash Hashem timei". We don't need both pesukim to teach regarding one who enters the Mikdash when tamei, so we can say that one teaches regarding one who becomes tamei when in the Mikdash, that he is chayuv kares or a korbon oleh v'yoreid.

- **Q:** A Braisa says that both of these pesukim are needed – if it only said Mishkan we would think that he is chayuv by the Mishkan, because it was made kadosh with the shemen hamishcha, and if it only said Mikdash we would think he is only chayuv by the Mikdash, because its kedusha is forever. That is why both pesukim are needed. If so, we can't use one to teach regarding one who became tamei while in the Mikdash!? **A: R' Elazar** meant to say that we find in pesukim that the Mishkan is referred to as Mikdash and we find in pesukim that the Mikdash is referred to as Mishkan. If so, both pesukim should use the same word and we can still learn out a drasha. The fact that it changes the word being used allows for 2 drashos to be made.

V'HISHTACHAVA OY SHESHAHA KIDEI HISTACHAVA'AH

- **Rava** said, one is only chayuv for bowing down even if he didn't delay his exit, if he bowed towards the Heichal. However, if he bowed towards the outside, then if he delayed his exit he would be chayuv, and if not he would not be chayuv.
 - **Others** say **Rava's** statement was made on the end of the Mishna, where the Mishna suggests that bowing down requires some delay along with it to make the person chayuv. It was to that that **Rava** said that delay is only needed if he is bowing to the outside, but if he is bowing to the inside he is chayuv even if he did not delay his exit.
 - **Q:** What is the difference between a bowing down that makes a delay and a bowing that does not? **A:** Bowing without a delay refers to kneeling. Bowing that includes a delay refers to a full prostration of the arms and legs as well.
 - **Q:** For how long of a delay is one chayuv? **A: R' Yitzchak bar Nachmeini and R' Shimon ben Pazi** argue – one said it is the length of time that it takes to say a particular pasuk in Divrei Hayamim, and the other says it is the length of time that it takes to say only about half of that pasuk.
- A Braisa says, we learn from pesukim that "kidah" refers to bowing on the face, "kri'ah" refers to kneeling, and "hishtachava'ah" refers to full prostration of hands and feet.