



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

Yuma Daf Ches

- **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 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).