



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

### Yuma Daf Yud Beis

- **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 eretz 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 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 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.