



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Yoma, Daf ך – Daf ך'

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ך--6-----

MAFRISHIN KOHEN GADOL...

- **Q:** Why couldn't his wife go with him for the 7 days? **A: R' Yehuda ben Beseira** said, we are afraid that he would have tashmish with his wife and then find out that she is a safek niddah, in which case he would become tamei for 7 days.
 - The **Rabanan** said to **R' Chisda**, this seems to only follow **R' Akiva**, who says that a woman who becomes a niddah is considered to have been fully tamei for 24 hours prior to her discovering that she is tamei (and if she was with her husband in those 24 hours, he becomes tamei for 7 days as well). However, according to the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Akiva**, a woman is considered tamei for 24 hours retroactively only D'Rabanan (and they therefore say that if she was with her husband during those 24 hours, he is not considered tamei for 7 days). **R' Chisda** said, it may even follow the **Rabanan**. They would agree that if she discovers that she is a niddah immediately after being with her husband, that he does become tamei for 7 days.
 - **R' Zeira** said, from the fact that he must only separate for 7 days, we can learn that a man who is with a niddah (thereby becoming tamei like a niddah) may go to the mikvah on the 7th day (and becomes fully tahor that night with nightfall), and need not wait until the night after the 7th day to go to the mikvah (the niddah herself must wait until the night after the 7th day to go to the mikvah, which is why she does not become fully tahor until nightfall of the following day). If this was not true, the Kohen Gadol would have to separate from his wife a day earlier to allow the extra day until nightfall.
 - **R' Simi from Neharda'ah** said, it may be that he would have to wait until the night after the 7th as well. It may be that he must separate from his wife before shkiya and then count 7 days, so that as soon as nightfall happens that day, he is already on day 2 of his tumah (if he became tamei like a niddah from his wife).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, all obligatory tevillos are done during the day except for a niddah and a woman who has given birth. We see that a man who was with a niddah would go to the mikvah by day!? **A:** The Braisa may mean a niddah and all tumah deriving from a niddah (like her husband) must go to the mikvah on the night after the 7th day.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, a baal keris is halachically the same as one who touches a sheretz, and one who was with a niddah is halachically the same as one who touches a meis. Presumably this means to say that one who was with a niddah may go to the mikvah on the 7th day, like one who touches a meis!? **A:** It means to say that such a person has the same period of tumah like one who touches a meis (i.e. 7 days), but not the same allowance for tevilah.
 - **Q:** The pasuk already teaches us that such a person is tamei for 7 days!? **A:** The chiddush of the comparison in the Mishna is for the next statement of the Mishna, that says that the man who becomes tamei from being with a niddah makes things tamei by sitting or lying on them, even without direct contact (which is not the case for one who is tamei from touching a meis).
 - **Q:** **R' Chiya** taught a Braisa that clearly says that one who is tamei from being with a niddah may go to the mikvah on the 7th day (during the day)!? **A: TEYUFTA.**
- **Q:** Just like we are concerned for the possibility of the Kohen Gadol becoming tamei from his wife, we should not allow the Kohen Gadol to have any visitors, to prevent him from becoming tamei meis!? **A: R' Tachlifa, the father of R' Huna, in the name of Rava** said, tumas meis is completely permitted for the tzibbur (since the Yom Kippur Avodah is for the tzibbur, tumas meis is not problematic). **A2: Ravina** said, even if we don't say that tumas meis is completely permitted for the tzibbur, we will not be concerned for tumas meis, because it is not

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

common for a visitor to suddenly die (but it is somewhat common for a woman to become a niddah and not realize it until after being with her husband).

- **R' Nachman** says that tumas meis is completely permitted for the tzibbur, and **R' Sheishes** says it is only overridden for the tzibbur (but should be prevented if possible).
 - Both would agree that if in a particular Beis Av of Kohanim there are tamei and tahor Kohanim who are available to offer a Korbon Tzibbur, only the tahor Kohanim should offer the Korbon. The machlokes would be whether we have to import tahor Kohanim from another Beis Av when all the Kohanim of the current Beis Av are tamei. **R' Nachman** would say there is no need, and **R' Sheishes** would say it must be done.
 - **Some** say that even when there are some tahor Kohanim in the current Beis Av, **R' Nachman** would say that the tamei Kohanim of the Beis Av may offer the Korbon Tzibbur, because tumas meis is completely permitted for the tzibbur.

-----Daf 7-----

- **R' Sheishes** said, his source for saying that tumah is overridden for the tzibbur (not completely mutar) is a Braisa. The Braisa says, if a Kohen is offering the Omer and it becomes tamei, other barley should be used. If there is no other barley to use, the Kohen should be silent and offer it anyway. We see that, when possible, tamei barley should not be used. This shows that tumah is only overridden for the tzibbur. **R' Nachman** said, although tumah is mutar for the tzibur (and one need not search for tahor items), it would not allow for a tamei korbon to be eaten. Therefore, in a case like the Omer, where the leftover must be eaten, we must try and use tahor barley.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a Kohen was offering the Mincha that accompanies bulls, rams, or sheep, and it became tamei, he should use other flour. If there is no other flour, he should remain silent and offer the tamei flour. Presumably, the Braisa is discussing the bulls, rams and sheep of the Korbon Mussaf for Yom Tov, and still he must try and bring tahor flour (even though this mincha is not eaten), which would mean that tumah is only overridden!? **A:** **R' Nachman** would say, the bulls referred to are the bulls brought for unintentional transgression of avodah zarah by the tzibbur. Although it is a korbon of the tzibbur, since there is no set time for its being brought (only if the aveirah was done), we must try to bring from tahor items. The rams referred to are the rams brought by the Kohen Gadol on Yom Kippur, which are considered personal korbanos and therefore must be attempted to be brought from tahor items. The sheep referred to are the sheep brought with the Omer, and the Mincha is the Omer itself. The Omer must be brought when tahor since it must be eaten (as explained above).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if blood became tamei and was then offered on the Mizbe'ach, if it was done b'shoge, the korbon is accepted. If it was done b'meid, the korbon is not accepted. We see that tumah is not completely mutar!? **A:** This Braisa is referring to the korbon of an individual.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the tzitz provides acceptance for korbanos brought when the items are tamei, whether a private or tzibbur korbon. We see that tumah is merely overridden!? **A:** The Braisa means to say that the tzitz is only needed for the acceptance of tamei private korbanos. **A2:** The tzitz is only needed for tamei tzibbur korbanos that don't have a set time to be offered.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the tzitz is effective to provide acceptance for personal korbanos that are tamei, since we find that tumah is *permitted* for the tzibbur. This is problematic according to **R' Sheishes**!? **A:** This Braisa clearly argues on the view of **R' Sheishes**, but **R' Sheishes** has another Tanna who holds like his view. A Braisa says, **R' Shimon** says the tzitz provides for acceptance while it is being worn by the Kohen Gadol and even while not being worn. **R' Yehuda** says, it only provides acceptance while being worn. **R' Shimon** asks, on Yom Kippur the Kohen Gadol does not wear the tzitz while in the Kodshai Hakodashim, and yet, if the korbon became tamei, it is accepted! **R' Yehuda** answered, on Yom Kippur it is accepted because tumah is permitted for the tzibbur. It must be that **R' Shimon** argues and says that tumah is only overridden for the tzibbur, like **R' Sheishes** said.
 - **Abaye** said, **R' Shimon** and **R' Yehuda** both agree that if the tzitz is broken it cannot provide acceptance. The machlokes is when it is not worn and simply hanging on the wall. **R' Yehuda**

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

learns from the pasuk “ahl metzach...v'nasa” – acceptance is only when it is on his forehead. **R' Shimon** learns from the pasuk “tamid l'ratzon...lifnei Hashem” – tamid can't mean that it must be worn by him constantly, because it can't be worn in the bathroom or when sleeping. It must mean that it constantly provides acceptance, whether worn or not.

- **R' Yehuda** says that “tamid” teaches that he may not divert his attention from it for even a second. **Rabbah bar R' Huna** said, from here we learn that one may never divert his attention from tefillin when he is wearing them. If one may not divert his attention from the tzitz, which only has Hashem's Name written once, surely he may not divert his attention from tefillin, which has many mentions of Hashem's Name.

-----Daf 7--8-----

- **R' Shimon** (who says that the tzitz provides for acceptance even while it is not worn) will explain the pasuk of “ahl metzach...v'nasa” as teaching the proper placement of the tzitz (i.e. on the forehead). **R' Yehuda** learns this halacha from another pasuk that says “ahl metzcho”.
 - The Gemara says that **R' Shimon** actually learns the proper placement from the same pasuk as **R' Yehuda**. The pasuk of “ahl metzach...v'nasa” teaches that the tzitz only provides for acceptance when it is fit to be worn (if it is not broken). **R' Yehuda** learns this from the fact that the pasuk could have said “metzach” and instead says “metzcho”.
- It may be that the machlokes whether tumah is completely permitted for the tzibbur or only overridden for the tzibbur is the machlokes among other Tana'im in a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, the Kohen Gadol for the 7 days before Yom Kippur, and the Kohen who was to burn the parah adumah, for the 7 days before doing so, would each be sprinkled upon, on all 7 days, from all the parah adumahs that were then in existence. **R' Yose** says, they were only sprinkled on the 3rd and 7th days. **R' Chanina S'gan Hakohanim** says, the Kohen by the parah adumah was sprinkled on for 7 days, and the Kohen Gadol before Yom Kippur was only sprinkled upon on days 3 and 7. Now, it may be that **R' Meir** and **R' Yose** argue in the earlier machlokes: **R' Meir** says tumah is only overridden, therefore we must sprinkle all 7 days to do what we can to remove any tumah (since we do not know if and when the Kohen Gadol may have become tamei), and **R' Yose** says tumah is completely mutar, so that we need only sprinkle on days 3 and 7, since it is only done as a chumra (since tumah is truly and completely mutar).
 - **Q:** If **R' Yose** holds that tumah is completely mutar, why would there be a need to sprinkle at all!? **A:** It must be that all hold that tumah is only overridden, and the machlokes is whether it is a mitzvah for one to go to the mikvah and thereby remove tumah at the earliest possible time. **R' Meir** says that it is, so we sprinkle every day for the chance that it is actually his required day to be sprinkled (based on when he became tamei), thus allowing for the earliest possible removal of the tumah. **R' Yose** says this is not a mitzvah, and therefore we can simply sprinkle on days 3 and 7.
 - **Q:** We find a Braisa that is explained as showing that **R' Yose** holds that it *is* a mitzvah to go to the mikvah at the earliest possible time!? **A:** **R' Meir** and **R' Yose** agree that going to the mikvah at the earliest possible time is a mitzvah. The machlokes is whether we compare tevilah to sprinkling and say that there is also a mitzvah to sprinkle at the earliest possible time. **R' Meir** says there is such a mitzvah and **R' Yose** says that there is not.
 - **Q:** What does **R' Chanina** hold? If he makes the comparison, then both Kohanim should need to be sprinkled all 7 days. If he does not hold of it, then neither Kohen should need to be sprinkled for all 7 days!? **A:** In truth he does not make the comparison. However, he says that a Rabbinic stringency was added to the Kohen who would burn the parah adumah, which required that he get sprinkled on all 7 days.
 - A Braisa says, the only difference between the Kohen who is burning the parah adumah and the Kohen Gadol before Yom Kippur is that the former is separated for purposes of tahara, and therefore we don't allow anyone to touch him during his separation, and the latter is separated for purposes of kedusha, and therefore we do allow people to touch him. This Braisa must

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

follow either **R' Meir** or **R' Yose**, because according to **R' Chanina**, there is also the difference of how many times they get sprinkled.

- **Q: R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** asked, it is understandable why he must be sprinkled on for the first 3 days, because each of those days may be the 3rd day since he became tamei (which would have taken place before his separation). It is also understandable why he must be sprinkled upon on Days 5, 6 and 7, because those days may be Day 7 after his having become tamei. However, why would he need to be sprinkled on Day 4? **A:** We know that sprinkling may not be done on Shabbos (it is an issur D'Rabanan). So, when the Braisa says “all 7 days”, it can't mean so literally. Similarly, although it says all 7 days, there is actually no sprinkling done on Day 4.
 - **Rava** said, for this reason, we begin the separation for parah adumah on a Wednesday, so that Day 4 (which anyway has no sprinkling) should fall on Shabbos (on which sprinkling may not be done) so that there is only one day with no sprinkling. (We don't have control on the timing of Yom Kippur.)

L'LISHKAS PARHEDRIN...

- In a Braisa, **R' Yehuda** explains that originally the chamber was called the “Balvatei Chamber”, which means the Chamber of the Aristocrats (i.e. the Kohen Gadol). However, when, during the second Beis Hamikdash, the king would appoint a Kohen Gadol based on his receiving money to do so, the name was changed to the Parhedrin Chamber, which means the Chamber of the Appointees (i.e. tax collectors, a derogatory, low level appointee).
- A Mishna says, bakers who buy grain from an ahm ha'aretz (who the **Rabanan** do not trust to have given ma'aser) must only separate terumas ma'aser and challah from this grain.
 - **Q:** They don't have to give regular Terumah, because the ahm ha'aretz is trusted to give regular Terumah. They don't have to give ma'aser rishon or ma'aser ani, because these don't have kedusha, but must simply be given to the Levi and the poor person. If the Levi and pauper want this share, the onus is on them to prove that the ahm ha'aretz had not yet separated these ma'asros. However, why do they not have to separate ma'aser sheini and have it eaten in Yerushalayim? **A: Ulla** explains, the appointed “parhedrin” (tax collectors or price setters) would set very low allowable prices for the bread, leaving very little room for profit. Therefore, the **Rabanan** did not require the bakers to give ma'aser shenei from this grain (giving any terumah or ma'aser from this grain is only D'Rabanan to begin with, because D'Oraisa we assume that the ahm ha'aretz gave what he was required to give).

-----Daf 9-----

- **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the first Beis Hamikdash stood for 410 years, and there were only 18 Kohanim Gedolim whose tenure spanned those years. The second Beis Hamikdash stood for 420 years, and there were over 300 Kohanim Gedolim during those years. Out of those 420 years, Shimon Hatzadik was Kohen Gadol for 40 years, Yochanan was Kohen Gadol for 80 years, Yishmael ben Pabi was Kohen Gadol for 10 years, and some say that R' Elazar ben Charsom was Kohen Gadol for 11 years. The remaining Kohanim Gedolim did not live out a year of being Kohen Gadol. **R' Yochanan ben Tursa** explains, this was so because these other Kohanim Gedolim were not righteous people, and bribed the king to receive the office of Kohen Gadol.
- **R' Yochanan ben Tursa** said, the Mishkan Shiloh was destroyed because there was giluy arayos (the sons of Eli Hakohen would delay bringing the birds of women who had given birth, causing the women to wait around to make sure the birds were offered, further causing them to be away from their husbands for more than necessary – the pasuk considered this, and referred to this, as giluy arayos) and lack of honor for korbanos (the sons of Eli would force people to give them meat from their korbanos even before the fats were offered on the Mizbe'ach).
 - He then explains (based on pesukim), the reason the first Beis Hamikdash was destroyed was because people did avodah zarah, giluy arayos, and shfichas damim (murder). Still, these people believed that Hashem was among them and would protect them from anything bad.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Although during the second Beis Hamikdash, Yidden were learning Torah, doing mitzvos and doing chessed, the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed because of “sinas chinam”. This teaches that sinas chinam is equally as bad (maybe even more so) as avodah zarah, giluy arayos, and shfichas damim.
 - **Q:** We learn from a pasuk that there was sinas chinam during the first Beis Hamikdash as well!?
 - A:** The leaders had sinas chinam, but the general populace did not.
- **R’ Yochanan and R’ Elazar** say, the people of the first Beis Hamikdash, who did their aveiros openly, had the end of their galus known openly as well (they knew it would last for 70 years). The people of the second Beis Hamikdash, who did not reveal their aveiros (they made believe they liked people, but secretly hated them), did not have the end of their galus revealed.
- **R’ Yochanan** said, the “fingernails” of the earlier generations are better than the “stomach” of the later generations (the regular people of the earlier generations were greater than the prominent people of the later generations). **Reish Lakish** said, the later generations are better because they learn Torah even while under foreign rule! **R’ Yochanan** responded, the absence of the Beis Hamikdash is a proof to what I said, because the Beis Hamikdash was returned to the earlier generations, but not to the later generations.
- **Reish Lakish** was swimming in the Yarden, and **Rabbah bar bar Chanah** (who was from Bavel) offered to help him out of the water when he was done. **Reish Lakish** said to him, Hashem hates you, because if all you people from Bavel would have come up to Eretz Yisrael with Ezra, the second Beis Hamikdash would have had more kedusha and Shechina than it did. **R’ Abba** explains, what was missing was “nevuah” (prophesy).
 - **Q:** How could it be that **Reish Lakish** spoke to **Rabbah bar bar Chanah** in the street? We find that he did not even speak to **R’ Elazar** (who was greater than **Rabbah bar bar Chanah**) in the street! **A: R’ Pappa** said, either it was **Ze’iri** that **Reish Lakish** was talking to (who was known by all as a great man), or the conversation must have been between **R’ Elazar and Rabbah bar bar Chanah**.
 - **R’ Yochanan** told **Reish Lakish** that he is not correct. Even if all Yidden would have gone to Eretz Yisrael with Ezra, the second Beis Hamikdash (which was built by the Persians) would not have had the same level of kedusha and Shechina as the first Beis Hamikdash (built by Shlomo), as the pasuk says “Yaft Elokim l’Yefes, v’yishkon b’ahalei Shem” (meaning, even though Hashem allowed the Beis Hamikdash to be built by the descendants of Yefes (i.e. the Persians), the full Shechina only rests with the Beis Hamikdash built by the descendants of Shem (i.e. Shlomo)). We find that **R’ Yosef** and others say that the Persians were descendants of Yefes.

-----Daf 10-----

- In continuation of the previous Gemara, the Gemara goes through a number of ancient cities and gives the (then) modern names.
- The Gemara then says, the names of the 3 giants in the pasuk are Achiman, Sheishai, and Talmai. Achiman was so called because he was the strongest of the 3, Sheishai was so called because the ground underneath him was reduced to ruins, and Talmai was so called because his walking would create furrows in the ground. Achiman built the city of Anas, Sheishai built Alush, and Talmai built Talbush. The Gemara says, the pasuk says the giants were “yelidei ha’anuk”, which teaches that they were so tall, it appeared that the sun was around their necks as necklaces.
- **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi in the name of Rebbi** said, from a pasuk we learn, Rome is destined to fall into the hands of the Persians.
 - **In the name of R’ Yehuda the son of R’ Illai** it was said, based on a kal v’chomer we can learn that Rome will fall into the hands of the Persians. If the Kasdiens, who destroyed the Beis Hamikdash built by Shlomo, fell to the hands of the Persians, the Romans, who destroyed the Mikdash built by the Persians will surely fall to the hands of the Persians.
 - **Rav** said that the Persians are destined to fall to the hands of the Romans.
 - **Q: R’ Kahana and R’ Assi** asked, how can it be that the builders of the Beis Hamikdash should fall to the hands of the destroyers of the Beis Hamikdash!? **A: Rav** said, it is a Heavenly decree that

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

this should happen. **A2: Others** say, the Persians have destroyed many shuls, and thus deserve to be so destroyed.

- A Braisa gives both these answers as well.
- **R' Yehuda said in the name of Rav**, a pasuk teaches, Moshiach will not come until Rome will rule the entire world for 9 months.
- A Braisa says, all the chambers by the Beis Hamikdash did not have a mezuzah, except for the Parhedrin Chamber, which needed one because the Kohen Gadol lived there for the week before Yom Kippur. **R' Yehuda** said, many chambers were used for living and still did not have a mezuzah. He said, the reason the Parhedrin Chamber needed a mezuzah was based on a gezeirah D'Rabanan.
 - **Q:** Why does **R' Yehuda** say that the Parhedrin does not need a mezuzah D'Oraisa? **A: Rabbah** said, **R' Yehuda** must hold that a house which is not made for year-round use does not need a mezuzah.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a pasuk refers to a “summer house” and a “winter house”. We see that even a seasonal house is referred to as a house!? **A:** It is referred to as a house with a qualifying adjective (i.e. summer or winter). It is not referred to as a “house” by itself.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, a Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says that a Succah on Succos is chayuv to be included in the eiruv for the chatzer, must have a mezuzah, and makes grain that enters into it chayuv in ma'aser, even though it is not made for year-round use!? We can't say that it is only chayuv D'Rabanan, because we would not make the grain entering into it be chayuv in ma'aser D'Rabanan, because doing so can lead to one giving ma'aser from a chiyuv D'Rabanan for a chiyuv D'Oraisa!? **A: Abaye** said, all agree that during the 7 days that the Kohen Gadol is in the Parhedrin, it requires a mezuzah D'Oraisa. The machlokes is in regard to the rest of the year. The **Rabanan** say we are goizer that it needs a mezuzah the rest of the year so that it will have one during those 7 days, and **R' Yehuda** says there is no such gezeirah.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, if the Parhedrin needed a mezuzah, why do the **Rabanan** say that a Succah does not need one?! **A: Rava** therefore says, all agree that the Parhedrin does not need a mezuzah during the rest of the year. The machlokes is why a mezuzah was needed during the 7 days before Yom Kippur. Regarding succah, **R' Yehuda** follows his view that a Succah needs to be a more permanent structure, and would therefore likewise require that it have a mezuzah. The **Rabanan** hold that a Succah needs to be a more temporary structure, and therefore does not need a mezuzah. With regard to the Parhedrin, the **Rabanan** say that it needs a mezuzah, because although the Kohen Gadol is forced to be there, a forced dwelling has the status of a dwelling. **R' Yehuda** holds that a forced dwelling does not have the status of a dwelling, and the Parhedrin needs a mezuzah only D'Rabanan so that people should not say that the Kohen Gadol is locked up in jail.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the Niknar Gate needed a mezuzah, because it opened to the Parhedrin Chamber. This seems to only follow the **Rabanan**, because according to **R' Yehuda**, the Parhedrin itself is only a gezeirah, so we would not make a gezeirah on top of a gezeirah!? **A:** It may even follow **R' Yehuda**, because it would all be considered part of the same gezeirah.

-----Daf X'---11-----

- A Braisa says, the word “bisharecha” teaches that all gateways need mezuzahs, whether it is the gateway of a house, a courtyard, a “medina”, or a city.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked **R' Safra**, why didn't the **Rabanan** put up a mezuzah by the gateway of Mechuza? **A:** He said, that gateway was constructed to hold the tower built on top of it, not as an entranceway, and therefore no mezuzah is needed.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, since the gateway leads to the tower in which the prison guards live, it should require a mezuzah for that!? **A: Abaye** said, Mechuza didn't get a mezuzah, because the goyim

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

would have thought that the Yidden were doing some sort of “kishuf”, which would then put the Yidden in danger from the goyim.

- **Q: R' Elazar** says harm does not come to one who is doing a mitzvah!? **A:** That does not hold true for a situation in which danger is likely.
- **R' Kahana** taught a Braisa: a silo, a barn, a woodshed and a storehouse do not need a mezuzah, because women sometimes use them (to bathe in them).
 - **Q: R' Yehuda** asked, if women wouldn't use them they would be chayuv? A Braisa says that a barn is patur from mezuzah!? **A: R' Yehuda** said, the Braisa meant to say that *even though* women sometimes use these structures to put on makeup, they are still patur from mezuzah.
 - **Q: R' Kahana** asked, a Braisa says that a barn used by women to put on makeup is chayuv in mezuzah!? The only thing that you (**R' Yehuda**) can answer is that whether such usage by women creates a chiyuv for mezuzah is the subject of a machlokes Tanna'im (between the Braisos). I, too, can answer that whether a regular storehouse needs a mezuzah is the subject of a machlokes Tanna'im.
 - A Braisa says: The word “Beisecha” teaches that a silo, a barn, a woodshed and a storehouse do not need a mezuzah, but others do require one. “In truth they said”, a bathroom, a tannery, a bathhouse, a mikvah, and storehouses used by women, are all patur from needing a mezuzah.
 - **R' Kahana** will explain this Braisa to initially be discussing a regular storehouse, which is why the Braisa says it is the subject of a machlokes. The “use by women” referred to in the next part of the Braisa refers to their using the storehouse for bathing, which is why it would be patur from a mezuzah according to all shitos.
 - **R' Yehuda** will explain this Braisa to initially be discussing a storehouse used for applying makeup, which is why the Braisa says it is the subject of a machlokes (however a storehouse with no human use would be patur according to all). The next part of the Braisa says that bathrooms, etc. never need a mezuzah according to anybody, even if it is used by women to apply makeup, because of the odors and uncleanness associated with them.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that regular barns and storehouses do need a mezuzah, but according to **R' Yehuda** there is no Tanna who holds that way!? **A: TIYUFTA** of **R' Yehuda**.
- **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda** taught a Braisa that says, there are 6 gateways that are patur from mezuzah: a silo, a barn, a woodshed, a storehouse, an archway, a gateway with no “roof” on top, and a gateway that is not 10 tefachim tall.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, you said there were 6, but then you list 7!? **A: R' Shmuel bar Yehuda** answered, the archway is actually subject to a machlokes among Tanna'im in a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Meir** says an archway must have a mezuzah affixed to it and the **Chachomim** say it does not need one. They both agree that if the walls of the archway are 10 tefachim high before they begin sloping inward to less than 4 tefachim, that it is chayuv to have a mezuzah.
 - **Abaye** explains that **R' Meir** and the **Chachomim** only argue in a case where the side walls are 4 tefachim apart up to a point of 3 tefachim high, the arch itself is at least 10 tefachim high, and there is a solid wall next to the arch that one can conceivably carve out in a way that would allow the archway to be 4 tefachim wide, up to a height of 10 tefachim. In that case, **R' Meir** says we view the archway as carved out and therefore require a mezuzah to be affixed to it. The **Chachomim** say we do not view it so, and therefore no mezuzah is required.
- A Braisa says, a shul, a woman's house, and a house belonging to partners are all chayuv to have a mezuzah.
 - **Q:** This seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that the word “beisecha” teaches that only a man's house (it is written in masculine form) and only the house of an individual (it is written in singular form). The Braisa teaches that even the house of a woman and the house of partners are chayuv.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should exclude these houses!? **A:** The pasuk teaches that the reward for the mitzvah of mezuzah is long life. Do women and partners not deserve to merit long life!?
 - **Rava** explains, the word “beisecha” teaches that the mezuzah should be placed on the side that you enter (on the right side as you enter, just as your right foot is typically first to enter the house).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A similar Braisa says, a shul, a woman's house, and a house belonging to partners are all subject to tumah from tzara'as.
 - **Q:** This seems obvious!? **A:** We would think, since the pasuk says "u'ba asher lo habayis", this teaches that only the house of an individual man is subject to tzara'as. The Braisa teaches that the house of a woman and of partners is also subject.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should exclude these houses!? **A:** The pasuk says that tzara'as applies "b'veis erez achuzaschem", which suggests it applies to *all* houses.
 - The word "lo" teaches that tzara'as is inflicted on the house of one who keeps all his possessions to himself ("lo"). The punishment is that all his possessions are emptied from his house, for all to see.

-----Daf ג'---12-----

- **Q:** How can the Braisa have said that a shul is subject to tzara'as tumah? There is a Braisa that says that it is not!? **A:** The earlier Braisa follows **R' Meir**, who says that a shul is chayuv to have a mezuzah even if no one lives in it (he would similarly say it is subject to tzara'as), and the latter Braisa follows the **Rabanan**, who says that a shul is not chayuv to have a mezuzah. **A2:** Both Braisos follow the **Rabanan**, but the first one is discussing a shul in which someone lives, and the other is discussing a shul where no one lives. **A3:** Both Braisos discuss a shul where no one lives, but the first Braisa discusses a shul of a village (there are very few people who use the shul, so it is considered as belonging to them), and the second Braisa discusses a shul of a big city (since it is used by so many people, it is not considered as belonging to anyone).
 - **Q:** In a Braisa, **R' Yehuda** seems to suggest that although the Beis Hamikdash is not subject to tzara'as tumah, the shuls in Yerushalayim are subject to tzara'as tumah (and Yerushalayim is a big city)!? **A:** **R' Yehuda** meant to say that all holy places in Yerushalayim, including the shuls, are not subject to tzara'as tumah (whereas the **T"K** says that no house in Yerushalayim is subject to tzara'as tumah).
 - The machlokes is based on whether Yerushalayim was divided among the shevatim or not (the pasuk says "beis erez achuzaschem", and therefore will only be subject to tzara'as if it is an inherited land, apportioned to the shevatim). The **T"K** says that it is not, and **R' Yehuda** says that it is. We find this machlokes among Braisos as well. One Braisa describes how Yerushalayim and the Har Habayis were divided between the shevatim of Yehuda and Binyamin (we see it was divided among the shevatim). Another Braisa says that one may not charge rent for lodging in Yerushalayim, because Yerushalayim does not belong to anybody (we see that it was not divided).
 - **Q:** How can we say that a shul in a village is subject to tzara'as tumah because it is considered to be belonging to the small group who uses it? A Braisa says that a house is not subject to tzara'as unless it is identifiable as being owned by a specific person!? **A:** We must use one of the other answers.

UMASKININ LO KOHEN ACHER

- **Q:** We have learned that a Kohen Gadol must be initiated into that office with the shemen hamishcha or by putting on the special clothing of the Kohen Gadol and then doing the Avodah in them. With this in mind, if the Kohen Gadol becomes tamei on Yom Kippur before bringing the Tamid, the replacement Kohen Gadol can be initiated into office by putting on the clothing and bringing the Tamid. However, if the primary Kohen Gadol became tamei after bringing the Tamid, how does the replacement become initiated into the office (the next Avodah done is not done in the special clothing of the Kohen Gadol, and therefore can't act as the initiation process)!? **A:** **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, on Yom Kippur the Kohen Gadol's belt was made of pure linen. This was unique to the Kohen Gadol and could therefore serve as the initiation.
 - **Q:** That fits well according to the view that all year long, the Kohen Gadol and regular Kohen wore the same belt (made of a wool and linen mix). Therefore, the pure linen belt was unique to the Kohen Gadol. However, according to the view that the regular Kohen wore a pure linen belt all year long, the Kohen Gadol's belt on Yom Kippur was that of the regular Kohen. If so, how can it act as the initiation!? **A:** **Abaye** said, he would first put on the full clothing of the Kohen Gadol and then do a small Avodah (like

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

turning over the meat of the Tamid to make it burn quicker). That would act as his initiation. **A2: R' Pappa** said, performing the Avodah even without the special clothing can act as the initiation process.

- **R' Dimi** said, there is a machlokes between **Rebbi** and **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**: one says that the belt of the regular Kohen was made of kilayim (wool and linen) and the other says that it was made entirely of linen.
 - Maybe we can bring a proof from a Braisa that **Rebbi** is the one who says that the belt was made of kilayim. The Braisa says, **Rebbi** says, there is no difference between the Kohen Gadol and the regular Kohen except for the belt. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says, even the belt was not different. Now, this Braisa must be talking about on Yom Kippur, because during the rest of the year there are many differences between the two. From the fact that **Rebbi** says the belts were different, it must be that he says the belt of a regular Kohen was made of kilayim. From the fact that **R' Elazar** says the belts were the same, it must be that he holds that the belt of a regular Kohen was made of linen!
 - It could be that the Braisa is discussing the rest of the year, and is only comparing the 4 basic pieces of clothing of the Kohen Gadol and the regular Kohen.
 - **Ravin** said, all agree that the belt of the Kohen Gadol on Yom Kippur was made exclusively of linen, and that during the rest of the year it was made of kilayim. The machlokes is regarding the belt of the regular Kohen: **Rebbi** says it was made of kilayim and **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** says it was made of linen.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, we see from a Braisa that **Rebbi** says that the regular Kohen's belt was made of kilayim. The Braisa says that **R' Dosa** says, the Yom Kippur belt of the Kohen Gadol may afterwards be used by a regular Kohen. **Rebbi** asked, that is incorrect for 2 reasons: first, the regular Kohen's belt was made of kilayim and the Yom Kippur belt of the Kohen Gadol was made of only linen, and second, it would not be proper for a regular Kohen to wear a belt that was worn in the Kodshei Kodashim. We see from here that **Rebbi** held that the belt of a regular Kohen was made of kilayim.
- A Braisa says, if the primary Kohen Gadol became tamei and the replacement Kohen Gadol took over, when the primary later becomes tahor, **R' Meir** says that he returns to the full status of Kohen Gadol and the replacement retains all the mitzvos of a Kohen Gadol as well. **R' Yose** says, the primary returns to being the Kohen Gadol, and the replacement is not fit to remain Kohen Gadol (so as not to cause hatred by the primary Kohen Gadol) or to return to the status of a regular Kohen (because we do not lower something in kedusha after it has been lifted to a higher level).
 - **Rabbah bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the halacha follows **R' Yose**. However, **R' Yose** agrees that if the replacement did the Avodah while wearing the clothing of the Kohen Gadol, the Avodah is valid.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the halacha follows **R' Yose**. However, **R' Yose** agrees that if the primary Kohen Gadol died, the replacement becomes the Kohen Gadol.