



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The Altar in the Second Beis HaMikdash (cont.)

R' Yosef offers another explanation why the Altar of the Second Beis HaMikdash was expanded.

This explanation is challenged and consequently revised.

Three explanations are given to explain how they found the place of the Altar.

A second version of the last teaching is presented.

A Baraisa lists which measurements of different parts of the Altar were essential and which were not. R' Huna suggests a source for this ruling. This exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) Karkov

A Baraisa identifies the area on the altar called the karkov.

The wording of the Baraisa is challenged and consequently slightly revised.

The Baraisa's understanding of the karkov is challenged.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok explains that there were two karkovim.

3) The Altar in the Second Beis HaMikdash (cont.)

R' Mani teaches that although the measurements of the Altar are not essential one may not make an Altar that is smaller than the one built by Moshe Rabbeinu.

R' Yosef gave a measurement of the minimum size of the Altar built by Moshe Rabbeinu.

This number was mocked by some but Abaye explained R' Yosef's intent.

R' Yosef confirms that Abaye properly understood his intent and refers to those who mocked him as Bnei Keturah.

Another incident in which people are called Bnei Keturah is cited.

4) The ramp of the altar

A Mishnah is cited that describes the ramp.

Rava offers the source that the ramp is located to the south of the altar.

This exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. How did the Anshei Knesses HaGedolah determine the location of the Altar?

2. What is the *karkov*?

3. What is the source that indicates that the ramp is on the south of the altar?

4. To where did the minor ramps of the altar lead?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Can offerings be brought when there is no Beis HaMikdash?

רבי אליעזר בן יעקב אומר שלשה נביאים עלו עמהן מן הגולה ... ואחד שהעיד שמקריבין אע"פ שאין בית

The function of a prophet is not to prophesize to establish halachic rulings. How, then, could R' Eliezer b. Yaakov report, as quoted above, that one of the three prophets ruled that offerings may be brought without the Beis HaMikdash being built? R' Avigdor Nevenzal, shlit"a, notes that Ra'aved (to Rambam, Hilchos Beis HaBechira 6:14) explains that the Gemara is trying to determine what the intent was of the builders of the Second Beis HaMikdash. It could be that they intended that the sanctity of the Beis HaMikdash would never be lost, or it could be that the sanctity of Eretz Yisroel remains, but the sanctity of the Beis HaMikdash and that of Yerushalayim was meant to not be sustained when the nation was exiled. The testimony of the prophet was not to issue a ruling in this case, but rather to inform us of the historical facts regarding the intentions of those who sanctified this area, and the outcome of those intentions.

Regarding the feasibility of bringing offerings without the Beis HaMikdash, Rambam (ibid., 2:4) writes that it is possible to bring offerings on the outer Altar, but the service conducted on the inner Altar may not be performed. The basic difference between the service on these Altars is that the service on the inner Altar may only be done when the roof of the Sanctuary is intact, and the area is indoors, as the Gemara noted earlier (40a).

The opinion of Rambam in this regard can be analyzed further. He writes (Hilchos Ma'asei HaKorbanos 19:15) that someone who brings an offering outside the Mikdash area nowadays is liable, specifically because he would technically be able to bring offerings in the Mikdash area, even though we do not have a Beis HaMikdash.

Some want to say that Rambam holds that it is not only technically possible to bring offerings in our days, but that it is permitted to do so. R' Nevenzal disagrees, understanding that if it would be permitted, we would actually be obligated to do so. If this would be the case, Rambam would have recorded this halacha in the Halachos of the Beis HaBechira. Rather, being liable for bringing an offering outside the Mikdash area is simply based upon the technical ability to bring offerings, although we are not obligated to do so, nor are we expected to do so. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 In memory of
 ר' משולם פייש בן ר' יהוסף, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 לע"נ מרת שיינדעל מרים בת ר' יחיאל יוסף
 Jean Erdfrucht, a"h

HALACHAH Highlight

Turning to the right

כל פינות שאתה פונה לא יהו אלא דרך ימין למזרח

All the turns that you make should be to the right which is to the east

The Gemara mentions the principle, "All the turns that you make should be to the right." This principle has many different applications. Sefer Minhag Yisroel Torah¹ identifies four different circumstances in which this principle could be applied. (1) The first circumstance is when a person is going to stay in place but he is going to turn himself around. An example of this is *hagbahah* where the person lifts the Torah and turns around to show the writing to the people in shul. (2) The second circumstance is when a person is going to stay in place and he is going to rotate something around his body. For example, those people who have the custom to remain facing east as they shake their *lulav* in all the directions around their body. (3) The third circumstance is when a person walks around another object. An example of this is when we walk around the *bimah* as we take the Torah out and return it to the Aron Kodesh. (4) The final circumstance is when a person will remain in place and continue to face the same direction but he will turn from one side to the other. An example of this last circumstance is the lighting of the menorah from day two and onwards where the person will start kindling the lights from one end and proceed towards the other end.

There are multiple opinions how to apply the principle to the four circumstances enumerated but we will limit ourselves to the position of Shulchan Aruch. According to Shulchan Aruch one should always be turning towards the right.

Consequently, in the first two circumstances when performing *hagbahah* or moving the *lulav* around one's body the first

(Overview...continued from page 1)
A Baraisa is cited that provides another source that the altar is to the south

The derivation of the Baraisa is unsuccessfully challenged.

5) The gap between the ramp and the altar

R' Shimon ben Yosi ben Lekunia asked R' Yosi whether R' Shimon ben Yochai in fact taught that there was a gap between the ramp and the altar.

After R' Yosi proves that there was a gap they have a discussion whether a *hekeshe* would have sufficed to teach this halacha.

6) Minor ramps

R' Yehudah describes the two minor ramps.

R' Yehudah and R' Pappa offer different sources that the minor ramps had to be separated from the altar by a hairsbreadth.

The necessity for the two expositions is explained.

7) The length of the altar and ramp

A Mishnah teaches that the total length of the altar and ramp was sixty-two amos.

This number is unsuccessfully challenged. ■

movement should be to the right (Meaning, if facing east one turns south, west, north and then back east). Similarly, when walking around something one will veer to the right first, thus when the Sh'liach Tzibbur holds the Torah facing the *tzibbur* (i.e. west) he turns to his right (i.e. north) in order to get to the *bimah*. In the last case, Shulchan Aruch maintains that one should first turn to the left so that while he performs that activity he will turn towards the right. Consequently, when kindling the Chanukah lights we begin with the one furthest left so we can then turn towards the right. ■

1. ספר מנהג ישראל תורה או"ח ריש סי' קל"ד. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Bnei Keturah

בני אלתיא דרבי טרפון הוו יתבי קמיה...

When the Rav of Krakow, was in Warsaw, some rabannim and scholars met with him. Among the crowd was a certain rav who said over many new and interesting Torah concepts, but Rav Sofer understood that although his words sounded very brilliant they were not really true.

Rav Sofer said to his visitor, "We find in the Gemara in Zevachim 62 that the nephews of Rabbi Tarfon were sitting in front of their uncle. Rashi explains that they remained silent. But how could this

be? This must mean that they were speaking in learning, but Rashi calls it silence since their words were not the absolute truth. Rabbi Tarfon misquoted the verse, '... — ויוסף אברהם ויקח אשה ושמה...' And Avraham went on and took for a wife...' However, instead of saying Keturah he said Yochni. His nephews immediately corrected him, 'She was called Keturah!' "You are like the Bnei Keturah," Rabbi Tarfon answered back. Could it be that the great Rabbi Tarfon accidentally misquoted a verse? It is clear that he did so intentionally so that his nephews should break off speaking Torah not directed towards the truth, by correcting him that her name was actually Keturah, which is one hundred percent true. In this manner he taught them that truth is better than the

sharpest *vertlach* that are not founded on absolute truth. It is better not to have lived if all one is occupied with is essentially false Torah."¹

The Pnei Menachem, zt"l, explains differently, "He called them Bnei Keturah since he saw that they were immersed in the wakeful slumber of one who is completely focused on material matters. He therefore arranged to call them Bnei Keturah to teach them that they should not be like the children of Hagar. Rather they should act like the children of Sora who make good use of their time since they value every minute and every hour of each day."² ■

1. מכתב סופר, תולדות המחבר

2. פני מנחם, חיי שרה ■