Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o"h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

And Rava bar Mechasya also said in the name of Rav Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav: Every city whose roofs are higher than its synagogue will ultimately be destroyed, as it is written: *To raise up the house of our God, and to repair its ruins*.

The *Gemora* notes that this refers only to houses, but as for forts and towers, we have no objection.

Rav Ashi said: I accomplished that the town of Masa Mechasya was not destroyed (*by not allowing the houses to be built higher than the synagogues*).

The *Gemora* asks: But it was destroyed!?

The *Gemora* answers: It was not destroyed as a result of that sin.

And Rava bar Mechasya also said in the name of Rav Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav: Let one be under an Ishmaelite but not under a stranger (*an Edomite, for the Edomites were more evil*); under a stranger but not under a Chabar (*who were even worse*); under a Chabar but not under a Torah scholar (*for one will be punished for bothering a Torah scholar*); under a Torah scholar but not under an orphan or a widow (*for they cry easily, and the Torah states that severe punishment will be dealt to one who distresses an orphan or widow*).

And Rava bar Mechasya also said in the name of Rav Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav: Rather any sickness, but not a sickness of the stomach; any pain, but not heart pain; any ache, but not head ache; any evil, but not an evil woman!

And Rava bar Mechasya also said in the name of Rav Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav: If all seas were black ink, the marshes were quills, the heavens were parchment, and all people were scribes, they would not suffice to write down the intricacies of government.

Rav Mesharshiya said: What verse teaches this? *The heaven for height, and the earth for depth, and the minds of kings are unsearchable*.

And Rava bar Mechasya also said in the name of Rav Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav: Fasting is as potent against a dream as fire is against (*flax*) tow.

Rav Chisda said: Providing it (*the fast*) is on that very day (*of the dream*).

Rav Yosef added: And even on *Shabbos* (*for although it is forbidden to fast on Shabbos, here it is permitted, in order to relieve his anxiety*).

The *Gemora* relates: Rav Yehoshua the son of Rav Idi visited the home of Rav Ashi. A third born calf (*whose meat is superior*) was prepared for him. They said to him, "Master, taste something." Rav Yehoshua replied, "I am engaged in a fast." They asked him, "And do you not accept Rav Yehudah's ruling in the name of Rav that (*if the need arises*) one may borrow his fast and repay it (*by fasting on a different day*)? He answered, "It is a fast on account of a dream, and Rava bar Mechasya also said in the name of Rav Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav: Fasting is as potent against a dream as fire is against (*flax*) tow; and Rav Chisda said: Providing it (*the fast*) is on that very day (*of the dream*); and Rav Yosef added: And even on *Shabbos*."

The *Mishna* had stated: Yet, if he began (*any of the activities mentioned*), he does not need to interrupt (*that which he is doing in order to pray*). One must interrupt for the reading of the *Shema* [*but not for prayer*].

The *Gemora* asks: But the first clause of the *Mishna* (*already*) teaches that one does not need to interrupt (*in order to pray Minchah*)?

The *Gemora* answers: The second clause refers to Torah study (*that one interrupts Torah study for Shema but not for prayer*), for it was taught in a *braisa*: If scholars are engaged in studying Torah, they must interrupt for the reading of the *Shema*, but not for prayer. [*This is because the times when Shema must be recited are set by Biblical law; this is in contrast to prayer, whose set times are only Rabbinically ordained.*]

Rabbi Yochanan said: This was taught only of such people as Rabbi Shimon ben Yochai and his companions, whose Torah study was their profession; but we must interrupt both for the reading of the *Shema* and for prayer.

The *Gemora* asks: But it was taught in a *braisa*: Just as they do not interrupt for prayer, so do they not interrupt for the reading of the *Shema*? [*Who is it that does not interrupt for the reading of the Shema?*]

The *Gemora* answers: That was taught in reference to the intercalation of the year (*in determining if the conditions were met that the year should be extended by one month or not*), for Rav Adda bar Ahavah said, and the Elders of Hagronya taught in a *braisa* likewise: Rabbi Elozar bar Tzadok said: When we were engaged in intercalating the year at Yavneh, we did not interrupt for the reading of the *Shema* or prayer. [*The Jewish year consists of twelve lunar months. As this is about eleven days shorter than the solar year, an additional month was periodically intercalated, and when the Sages deliberated the question of extending the year, they did not interrupt themselves for the Shema or for prayer.*]

A tailor must not go out with his needle near nightfall (*on Friday before Shabbos*), lest he forget and go out (*on Shabbos*); nor a scribe with his quill. One may not delouse his garments, nor read by the light of a lamp (*lest the light might flicker and he will tilt the lamp that the oil should flow more freely, which is forbidden on Shabbos*). In truth it was said, the sexton may see where the children read (*even with the light of the lamp*), but he himself must not read. [*Rashi offers two interpretations as to the meaning of sexton - Chazan. One explanation is that the Mishna is discussing the sexton of the shul who calls people to the Torah on Shabbos. There are times when the Chazan does not know where they will be reading on Shabbos morning, so although he may not read by candlelight, he is allowed to glance at the text that the children are studying from to know where the reading will be. The second explanation is that the Chazan refers to the children's teacher, who sees where the children will be commencing their studies the next day and where they will finish. He only reads the beginning of each section, and this is permitted to read by the light of the lamp. We are not concerned that he will tilt the lamp and be liable for igniting a fire on Shabbos.*]

Similarly, it was said that a *zav* (*a man who has an emission similar but not identical to a seminal discharge*) must not eat together with a *zavah* (*a woman who sees blood during the eleven days which followed her seven days of niddah*), as it may lead to sin (*for relations with a zavah incurs the penalty of kares*).

The *Gemora* cites a *Mishna* taught elsewhere: One must not stand in a private domain and (*bend forward and*) drink in a public domain, or stand in a public domain and (*bend forward and*) drink in a private domain (*lest he draw the drinking cup to himself, thus transferring an object from one domain to another*), but if he inserts his head and the greater part of his body into the place where he drinks, it is permitted; and the same applies to a winepress (*which will be explained*).

The scholars inquired: What is the law regarding a *karmelis*? [*May one stand in a public or private domain and drink in a karmelis, or vice versa?*]

Abaye said: It is precisely the same.

Rava said: That itself (*from one domain to the other*) is only a Rabbinic decree (*as a preventive measure*); are we to arise and enact a Rabbinic decree to safeguard another Rabbinic decree!?

Abaye said: How do I derive my ruling? It is because it is taught in the *Mishna*: and the same applies to a winepress. Now, what is this winepress? If it is a private domain, it has already been taught; if it is a public domain, it has also been taught! Therefore, it must surely refer to a *karmelis*.

Rava said: And the same applies to a winepress is stated in reference to *ma'aser* (*tithes*). [*One is Biblically obligated to separate terumah and ma'aser after the produce has been fully processed. At that point, it becomes prohibited to consume the untithed produce. The Rabbis decreed that even beforehand, one is forbidden from consuming the produce in a regular manner; a casual manner, however, would be permitted. While wine is still in the winepress, its manufacture is not complete (until it is placed in the holding pit), and so the wine may be drunk in a casual manner even before the separation of ma'aser. That, however, is only if it is drunk directly over the winepress; if it is taken out, it cannot be drunk then, for that would be regarded as drinking in a regular manner, and ma'aser must first be given. Thus, when it is taught, 'and the same applies to a winepress,' it means that if one drinks wine from the winepress, he*

is regarded as taking it away, unless he has his head and greater part of his body in the press, and then the ma'aser does not need to be taken before he drinks.] And Rav Sheishes said likewise: And the same applies to a winepress refers to *ma'aser*, for we learned in a *Mishna*: One may drink wine over the winepress in (*a dilution of*) both hot or cold water, and is exempt from *ma'aser* (*for this is regarded as drinking in a casual manner, and the wine is not yet subject to the ma'aser obligation*); these are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Tzadok holds him liable (*for the act of diluting demonstrates that he is not drinking it in a casual manner*). The Sages, however, maintain that for a hot dilution he is liable; for a cold one he is exempt, because the rest may be returned (*to the winepress; hot water, however, will spoil the rest of the wine, and therefore it will not be returned*).

The *Gemora* asks: The *Mishna* had stated: A tailor must not go out with his needle near nightfall (*on Friday before Shabbos*), lest he forget and go out (*on Shabbos*). Surely that means that it is pinned in his garment? [*Now, carrying in such a manner would only be prohibited by a Rabbinic decree as a preventive measure, lest one carry in general, and yet he must also not go out before the Shabbos as a preventive measure lest he go on the Shabbos itself. Thus we have one preventive measure to safeguard another in respect to the Shabbos!?*]

The *Gemora* answers: No: it means that he holds it in his hand (*which would be a Biblical prohibition – if he would carry it in that manner into a different domain*).

The *Gemora* attempts to bring a proof from the following *braisa*: A tailor must not go out with his needle pinned in his garment. Surely that refers to the eve of *Shabbos* (*where the Rabbis decreed, as a preventive measure, not to carry, lest he carry in this manner on Shabbos, which is also only Rabbinic*)!?

The *Gemora* rejects that proof by saying that the *braisa* refers to the *Shabbos* itself.

The *Gemora* attempts to bring a proof from the following *braisa*: A tailor must not go out with a needle pinned in his garment on the eve of the *Shabbos* just before nightfall.

The *Gemora* rejects that proof by saying that the *Tanna* who authored this *braisa* is Rabbi Yehudah, who maintains that an artisan is liable (*for carrying out his accouterments*) in the manner of his trade (*even if it would be regarded as unusual for anybody else*). For it was taught in a *braisa*: A tailor must not go out with a needle pinned in his garment, nor a carpenter with a ruler behind his ear, nor a fuller with the cord in his ear, nor a weaver with the cotton in his ear, nor a dyer with a sample around his neck, nor a money-changer with a *dinar* in his ear; and if he does go out in such a manner, he is exempt, though it is forbidden; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. [*The Gemora assumes that R' Meir's reasoning is as follows: One is not liable for carrying something in a manner which is normal for him – if it is in a manner that is unusual for the majority of people.*] Rabbi Yehudah said: An artisan is liable (*for carrying out his accouterments*) in the manner of his trade, but all other people are exempt. [*Accordingly, the braisa is in accordance with R' Yehudah, and the Mishna's Rabbinic decree regarding a tailor is a preventive measure for a Biblical prohibition.*]

The *Gemora* asks: One *braisa* taught: A *zav* must not go out with his pouch (*which was used to catch his discharges*), yet if he goes out, he is exempt, though it is forbidden. But another *braisa* taught: A *zav* must not go out with his pouch, and if he goes out, he is liable to a *chatas*!?

Rav Yosef said: There is no difficulty, as the former follows Rabbi Meir (*and since it is unusual for most people to carry a pouch in this manner, even the zav is exempt*), and the latter follows Rabbi Yehudah (*who holds that if for this person it is normal, he will be liable*).

Abaye said to him. Say that you have heard Rabbi Meir to give this ruling, in respect to something which it is not normal (*to be carried in such a manner*), but have you heard him in respect to something which is usual for himself? [*Abaye understands R' Meir as follows: Even an artesian carries his accouterments in his hand; he only puts it by his ear, or pins to his garment in order to advertise his occupation. Therefore, the zav, who in such a situation, it is completely normal to carry the pouch in that manner, he definitely will be liable!*] For should you not say so, then if an unskilled worker hollows out a hole the size of a *kav* from a log on the *Shabbos*, would he indeed be exempt according to Rabbi Meir's view (*for he did not do it in a standard manner; of course not! He would be liable because for him this is the normal manner to go about it*)?

Rather, Rav Hamnuna said: There is no difficulty, for the latter *braisa* refers to a *zav* who has experienced two emissions (*and he needs to know about a third in order to determine if he is liable to bring a korban; therefore, it is normal for him, and therefore he is liable to a chatas for carrying on Shabbos*); the former *braisa* refers to a *zav* who has experienced three emissions (*and it is not necessary for him to know regarding any further emissions; therefore it is unusual for him, and he would not be liable for carrying it on Shabbos*).

The *Gemora* asks: Now, why does a *zav* of two emissions differ in that he is liable? Presumably, it is because he requires it for examination (*to determine if he experienced a third one which would make liable to a korban*); but then a *zav* of three emissions also requires it for counting (*seven clean days in order to become tahor*)?

The *Gemora* answers: The ruling was only for that very day. [*He is exempt only if he had the third emission on that Shabbos itself; he does not need the pouch then, as in any case he commences counting only on the next day.*]

The *Gemora* asks: Yet still he needs it to prevent the soiling of his clothing?

Rabbi Zeira answers: This agrees with the following *Tanna*, who maintains that the prevention of soiling has no legal significance, for we learned in a *Mishna*: [*In order for produce to be rendered capable of becoming tamei, it must first become wet by water or other specified liquids. It is necessary that the owner must be satisfied with the contact – even if the liquid was only pleasing to him in the beginning (but not necessarily when it came into contact with the food).*]If one inverted a plate and placed it on top of a wall in order that the plate might be washed (*by the rainwater, and the rainwater dripped from the plate onto some produce*), the rule of '*if the water is placed*' applies (*because he was pleased with the water*). If, however, the plate was placed there in order that the wall should not become damaged (*from the rain*), the rule of '*if the water is placed*' does not apply (*and the produce is not susceptible to tumah*). [*Now, in the first instance the rain was desired; hence, even if it dripped from the plate onto some produce, it is regarded as desired moisture, though it was not wanted for the latter, and the produce is henceforth susceptible to tumah. But in the second, it was not wanted at all, and therefore does not render the produce susceptible. This proves that an action to prevent another thing from becoming soiled (here, to save the wall from damage) has no legal significance.*]

The *Gemora* asks: But how could the two cases be compared? There, he does not want that liquid (*the rainwater*) at all, whereas here he needs this pouch to catch the discharge (*so his clothing should not become soiled*)?

This can only be compared to the second clause: If a bowl is placed so that the dripping of water should fall into it, the rule of '*if the water is placed*' does not apply to the water which splashes or spills out (*and the produce is not susceptible to tumah*), but the rule of '*if the water is placed*' does apply to the water inside of it (*and the produce is not susceptible to tumah*). [*Now, the bowl was placed there to protect that which is underneath it, and nevertheless, the water which is collected in the bowl can render the produce susceptible to tumah. Accordingly, the zav's wearing of his pouch to protect his clothing can also be effective – that he will be liable for violating the Shabbos!*]

Rather, said both Abaye and Rava, There is no difficulty, as one *braisa* is according to Rabbi Yehudah, and the other agrees with Rabbi Shimon. [*Rabbi Shimon maintains that if one performs a labor on Shabbos, but he does not need it for its defined purpose, it is not Biblically forbidden. Rabbi Yehudah holds that he is liable. This argument applies here, for the zav is not wearing the pouch for a defined purpose; rather, he is wearing it only to prevent his clothes from becoming soiled.*] (11a – 12a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Why are shuls today not built as skyscrapers?

By: Meoros HaDaf HaYomi

In our *Gemara* we learn that any city whose house rooftops are higher than its shul is destined to be destroyed. Based on this, the Shulchan Aruch (O.C. s. 150:2) rules, "One builds a shul only at the highest location in the city… It must be built taller than any other building in the city." The wording of the Shulchan Aruch indicates a second stipulation, based on the Tosefta (Megillah 3:14), that not only must the shul be taller in its construction, it must be built on the highest place as well.

The Mishna Berurah (ibid, s.k. 4) comments: "Some communities do not abide by this halachah. The Acharonim justify their practice, explaining that we are unable to make the shul the tallest building in the city, since many gentile houses (possibly referring to their houses of worship) will unavoidably be taller. Nevertheless, it is proper *le'chatchilah* to abide by this halachah to the best of our ability, since the *Gemara* warns of a severe penalty for transgressing it."

Although this justification may have applied in the Mishna Berurah's time, it is not so applicable today in Israel and in many Jewish communities throughout the world, where there are no gentile houses. What other justification may be found?

A building that was converted into a shul: The Zichron Yehudah (by Rav Y. Greenwald *zt"l*, Teshuvos I, 59) writes that when a building was originally constructed for mundane purposes and later converted into a shul, we may be lenient and allow other buildings to be taller than it. Doing so does not detract from the honor of the shul, under these circumstances.

Differences in land elevation: Rav Yaakov Emden (*Mor U'Ketziah* O.C. ibid.) writes that if, because of differences in land elevation, the shul building is the tallest, but the surrounding buildings built on higher ground reach greater heights, that is not disdainful to the shul. Although stipulated in the Tosefta, the severe consequence mentioned in our Gemara doesn't apply and therefore, if it is necessary to build the shul on a low place in order to make it more convenient for people to attend, it is permitted to do so.

It is sufficient for one shul to be taller than the houses: The Gerer Rebbe *zt"l,* author of Sefas Emes, writes in his commentary to our *masechta* that it is unnecessary for all the *shuls* in a city to be taller than the houses; it is enough for one shul to be taller.

It is worth noting, that there is a basic disagreement of the *Rishonim* as to how to interpret the *Gemara*'s prohibition against building houses taller than the shul:

Use of the rooftops: The Meiri maintains that the restriction applies only when high buildings are erected for honor and glory, then they mustn't be built taller than the shul. However, if they are built high for practical purposes, in order to use their space, then it is permitted to build them taller. According to this opinion, it would be permitted to build a multi-story apartment building taller than the shul. However, the Kaf HaChaim (s.k. 21) cites that the poskim did not accept this opinion.

The Mordechai (*os 228*) cites the opinion of *Smag*, which is directly contrary to that of the Meiri. He writes that only in their era, when the rooftops were used for practical purposes, it was forbidden to build a roof taller than the shul. However, when the rooftops are not actually used, it is unnecessary for the shul to tower over them.

DAILY MASHAL

Fasting on Shabbos

The *Gemora* states that a fast is good for a dream, and the fast should occur on the day of the dream, even if that day occurs on Shabbos. If one does fast on Shabbos for a dream, he should fast again on a different day because he afflicted himself on Shabbos.

Rashi explains that the reason one can fast for a dream on Shabbos is because it relieves his pain.

The **Rishonim** write that nonetheless, one should fast as atonement for having fasted on Shabbos, because although he had pleasure in fasting on Shabbos to relieve his pain, it is preferable to delight properly in the Shabbos than to fast on Shabbos.

This being the case, one should contemplate the beautiful gift of Shabbos that HaShem bestowed upon His Chosen Nation, and one should certainly not intentionally cause himself or others distress on Shabbos. It is specifically for this reason that we recite in Bircas HaMzaon on Shabbos the prayer *velo sehei tzarah veyagon vanacha beyom menuchaseinu*, may it be Hashem's will that there be no distress, grief, or lament on this Day of our contentment.