

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

**1. All the gates that opened into the Courtyard of the Bais HaMikdash did not have a mezuzah affixed except for the Gate of Nikanor.**

Who is the Tanna that taught the following Baraisa taught by the Rabbis: All the gates that opened into the Courtyard of the Bais HaMikdash did not have a mezuzah affixed to them except for the Gate of Nikanor, which had a mezuzah, because the Gate of Nikanor led into the Courtyard of the Bais HaMikdash, which led into the Parhedrin Chamber. Let us say that this is in accord with the Rabbis and not Rabbi Yehudah? For if it would be in accord with Rabbi Yehudah, [surely] he holds that [the mezuzah at the Parhedrin Chamber] itself is only a Rabbinical enactment, shall we enact a preventive measure to guard another preventive measure? — This ruling can even be in accordance with Rabbi Yehudah. [Although Rabbi Yehudah maintains that the requirement that the Parhedrin Chamber itself have a mezuzah affixed to its doorpost is rabbinic in nature, because we are concerned that otherwise people will say that the Kohen Gadol is locked away in jail] it is all one enactment.<sup>1</sup> (10b2-11a1)

**2. The gates of houses, courtyards, provinces and cities all have the obligation of mezuzah.**

The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: It is said [*and you shall write them on the doorposts of your house*] and on your gates. This teaches us that whether they are gates of houses, whether

they are gates of courtyards, whether they are gates of provinces, or whether they are gates of cities, they all have the obligation of mezuzah to the Omnipresent. This is because when it is said *and you shall write them on the doorposts of your house and on your gates.*<sup>2</sup> (11a1)

**3. A synagogue that has a dwelling area for the sexton of the synagogue is required to have a mezuzah.**

Said Abaye to Rav Safra: Why did the Rabbis not affix a mezuzah on the city gateways of Mechoza? — He answered: They serve only as supports for the Kubi tower [of that city]. But the Kubi tower itself should have a mezuzah, for it contains a residence-compartment for the prison warden! For it has been taught in a Baraisa: A synagogue that has a dwelling area for the sexton of the synagogue is required to have a mezuzah.<sup>3</sup> Rather, said Abaye: It was on account of danger, for it was taught in a Baraisa: The mezuzah of an individual must be checked twice every seven years, but a public mezuzah needs to be checked only twice in a Yovel cycle.<sup>4</sup> And Rabbi Yehudah said: There was an incident where a certain artavin was checking mezuzos in the upper marketplace of Tzipori and a Roman officer saw him and fined him a thousand zuz<sup>5</sup>. The Gemara asks: But Rabbi Elozar said: There is a rule that one who is sent to perform a mitzvah is not harmed? The Gemara answers: It is different when

<sup>1</sup> The requirement to have a mezuzah on the Gate of Nikanor is part of that original decree, for otherwise, it would still appear as a prison.

<sup>2</sup> The word gates is written in the plural form.

<sup>3</sup> Although normally a synagogue does not require a mezuzah because it does not function as a dwelling area for any particular Jew, when the synagogue functions as a dwelling area for the sexton of the synagogue, it does require a mezuzah.

<sup>4</sup> Which is twice every fifty years. The Chachamim were more lenient regarding a public mezuzah because regarding a shared responsibility, people are laxer and expect someone else to do the job. If it was too difficult to check a public mezuzah, no one would do it at all, so the Chachamim said that a public mezuzah only has to be checked once every twenty-five years.

<sup>5</sup> Because he suspected him of practicing witchcraft.

there is likelihood that one can be harmed.<sup>6</sup> Proof of this is when Shmuel was instructed by HaShem to anoint Dovid as king and Shmuel asked HaShem *“How can I go? If Shaul finds out, he will kill me.”* So HaShem said: *“take along a calf, and say ‘I have come to bring an offering to HaShem.’ ”*<sup>7</sup> (11a1 - 11a2)

**4. A gate house, a portico and a gallery are exempt from the obligation of mezuzah.**

Rav Kahana taught the following Baraisa before Rav Yehudah: A storehouse for straw, a barn, a wood-shed, and storage houses are exempt from the mezuzah, because the women make use of them. What does ‘they make use [of them]’ mean? — They bathe [in them].<sup>8</sup> Rav Yehudah said to him: The reason for the exemption is that they bathe [in them], but [had they been restricted to their] ordinary use, these places require a mezuzah. But has it not been taught that a stable is exempt from a mezuzah? Rather we must say that ‘they make use [of them]’ means they adorn themselves (with perfume) in them, and this is what it teaches: Although the women adorn themselves in them, they are exempt from mezuzah.<sup>9</sup> Said Rav Kahana to him: But are the [places] where women adorn themselves in exempt [from a mezuzah]? Surely it has been taught in a Baraisa: A stable is exempt from mezuzah, and [places] where women adorn themselves in require a mezuzah. — What then remains now for you to say [is that] the case of [dwellings] where women adorn themselves in is being disputed by Tannaim, and so on my view too concerning these places [when limited to their] ordinary use, there is a dispute of Tannaim — For it has been taught: ‘Your house’ means ‘a house specific for you’,<sup>10</sup> thus excluding a storehouse for straw, a barn, a wood-shed, and storage houses which are exempt from the mezuzah. Some however declare them liable [to have a mezuzah]. In truth,

they said, an outhouse, a tannery, a bathhouse, a house for ritual immersion, and storehouses that women adorn themselves in are exempt from a mezuzah. Now Rav Kahana explains [this teaching] according to his view, and Rav Yehudah explains it according to his view. ‘Rav Kahana explains it according to his view’ thus: ‘Your house’ means ‘the house specific for you’, thus excluding a storehouse for straw, a barn, a wood-shed, and storage houses which are exempt from a mezuzah. Some however declare them liable. In truth, they said, an outhouse, a tannery, a bathhouse, a house for ritual immersion, and storehouses that women make use of - and what does it make mean “make use of” – that they bathe there - are exempt from the mezuzah. But if this is so, it is the same as a bathhouse? — We are informed about public and about private bathhouses. For the thought may have occurred that only public bathhouses are exempt because they are particularly foul, but private bathhouses, which is not so foul, are liable to a mezuzah, therefore he lets us know [that even private bathhouses are exempt]. ‘Rav Yehudah explains it in accord with his view’: This is how it is taught: ‘Your house’ means ‘a house specific for you’, that excludes a storehouse for straw, a barn, a wood-shed, and storage houses which are exempt from mezuzah, even though women adorn themselves there. Some consider houses where women adorn themselves in obliged to have a mezuzah. But [when restricted to their] ordinary use, all agree that they are exempt. In truth they said: an outhouse, a tannery, a bathhouse, a house for ritual immersion, even if women adorn themselves there, are exempt from mezuzah, because they are particularly foul. But would, according to Rav Yehudah, all agree that [these places when restricted to their] ordinary use are exempt? Surely it has been taught: ‘On your gates’, that implies alike the gates of houses, of courtyards, of provinces, of cities, stables, chicken-roosts,

<sup>6</sup> In this case it was probable that one would be harmed because the king was looking for pretenses to accuse the Jews of wrongdoing.

<sup>7</sup> We see that Hashem concurred with Shmuel’s concern and HaShem instructed Shmuel to conceal his real mission from Shaul. This demonstrates that when real danger is a concern, one cannot rely on the protection of mitzvah performance.

<sup>8</sup> Since they are unclothed, it would be disrespectful to affix a mezuzah there.

<sup>9</sup> Rav Yehudah does not correct the Baraisa in stating that these places are exempt because the women make use of them. The Baraisa, in his view, means that although they make use of them, since, however, it is only for a limited use and not as permanent dwellings, these places are exempt.

<sup>10</sup> A house used for human habitation.

shed for straw, storehouses for wine, storehouses for oil — they all are liable to a mezuzah. — One might have thought that this includes also a gate house, a portico or a balcony, therefore the Torah states, ‘house’ — [meaning] just as ‘house’ means a building specified for a dwelling it thus excludes all other buildings not specified for a dwelling. One might have thought to include also an outhouse, a tannery, a bathhouse, a house for ritual immersion, therefore the Torah states, ‘house’: just as a ‘house is made for dignity, so only all such are implied, which also are made for dignity, to the exclusion of these, which are not made for dignity. One might have thought to include the Temple Mount, the chambers and the Courtyard; therefore the Torah states ‘house’: just as a ‘house’ is for mundane use so are only such [houses] as are for mundane use [liable] to a mezuzah — to the exclusion of these which are sacred!<sup>11</sup> This is indeed a refutation. (11a2 – 11b1)

**5. There are six gates that are exempt from mezuzah.**

Rav Shmuel bar Yehudah taught the following Baraisa before Rava: There are six gates that are exempt from a mezuzah: a storehouse for straw, a barn, a woodshed, a storage house, a Median gate (i.e., a curved archway), a roofless gate (i.e., a doorway that is completely open on top without lintel or roof), and a gate that is not ten handbreadths high. Rava said to him: You cited that there are six gates (that are exempt from a mezuzah) and then you listed seven!? He replied: There is a dispute regarding a Median gate, for it was taught in a Baraisa: Regarding a curved archway, Rabbi Meir maintains that it requires a mezuzah and the Sages maintain that such an archway is exempt from a mezuzah. Rabbi Meir and the Sages agree that if the sides of the archway are ten handbreadths high before they curve inward, the archway will require a mezuzah.<sup>12</sup> Abaye said: All agree that if the

<sup>11</sup> This proves that the places enumerated in the teaching of Rav Kahana, even when restricted to their ordinary use, are also subject to a difference of opinion of Tannaim whether or not they are liable to a mezuzah, which contradicts Rav Yehudah.

<sup>12</sup> Because we can ignore the curved part, and the vertical sides that are ten handbreadths can be used as sideposts.

<sup>13</sup> And requires no mezuzah, for the minimum for any doorway is ten in height for the whole doorway, four in width, three for the posts; below it is but ‘solid’ earth.

[whole] doorway is ten handbreadths in height, but the post is not even three it is considered nothing; again, if the post is three handbreadths in height, but the [whole] doorway not even ten, it is also considered nothing.<sup>13</sup> They are arguing only concerning doorways the [whole] height of which is ten, with the posts three in height, but with a width less than four handbreadths, space however being left to extend it to four handbreadths.<sup>14</sup> Rabbi Meir holds one may extend<sup>15</sup> it by digging [to the required minimum of four handbreadths], while the Sages hold that we do not extend it by digging it. (11b1 - 11b2)

**6. A synagogue, the house of a woman and a house that is owned by partners are obligated in a mezuzah.**

The Gemara cites a Baraisa: A synagogue, a house that is owned exclusively by a woman, and a house owned by partners require a mezuzah. — Is this not obvious? - One would have thought that since the Torah states *your house* in the masculine tense, this would exclude the house of a woman. Similarly, *your house* in the singular form would exclude the house of partners or a synagogue which is owned collectively. For this reason we are taught that even these houses require a mezuzah. — But maybe that is the case? - The reason for this is because it is said regarding the reward for affixing a mezuzah *in order to increase your days and the days of your sons* etc. Do we say that only men who own homes independently need life, but women, and men who own houses in a partnership, do not need life? We certainly do not say such a thing, and the Torah is teaching us that the houses of women and the houses of partners also require a mezuzah. — So what then is “your house” needed for? It is needed for that which Rava derived from it, for Rava said: the

<sup>14</sup> Within the ten handbreadths, the minimum required height of the doorway.

<sup>15</sup> By legal fiction. As long as the doorway starts on a breadth of four by three, allowing space for continued dimension up to ten, we look upon it as continuing in the same size, hence as entitled to the designation ‘door’, with the implication of being subject to the law of mezuzah.



way you enter; and when a man lifts his feet, he lifts his right foot first.<sup>16</sup> (11b2 - 11b3)

**7. A synagogue, a house owned by partners and the house of a woman are subject to the tumah of tzaraas.**

The Gemara cites a Baraisa: A synagogue, a house owned by partners, and the house of a woman are subject to the tumah of tzaraas. – Is this not obvious? - One would have thought that because it is said regarding tzaraas *and the one whom the house is his shall come* etc. the word *his* implies his and not hers, and his and not theirs. Therefore we are taught that this is not the case. – But maybe that is the case? - The reason for this ruling is because regarding tzaraas of the house it is said *and I will place a tzaraas plague in a house of the land of your inheritance*. Since the Torah states the word house in a generic sense, we learn that all houses are susceptible to tzaraas. Why then ‘to him’? [That means to say that] if one devotes his house to himself exclusively, refusing to lend his belongings by pretending he did not own them, the Holy One, Blessed be He, exposes him as he removes his belongings. Thus ‘to him’ excludes [from the infliction of tzaraas] him who lends his belongings to others. - But is a synagogue subject to tumah from tzaraas? Has it not been taught: One might assume that synagogues and houses of learning are subject to tumah from tzaraas, therefore Scripture says: ‘He who has the house to him’, i.e., he to whom alone the house belongs, that excludes those [houses] which do not belong to him alone? — This is no difficulty: The first teaching is in accord with Rabbi Meir, the second with the Rabbis, for it has been taught: A synagogue which contains a dwelling for the synagogue attendant is liable to a mezuzah, but one which has no dwelling apartment, Rabbi Meir declares it liable but the Sages exempt it. Or, if you wish, you might say: Both teachings are in accord with the Rabbis. In the one case the synagogue referred to has a dwelling [apartment], in the other it has no dwelling apartment. Or, if you wish, you might

<sup>16</sup> The mezuzah should therefore be affixed on the right side of the doorway.

<sup>17</sup> In the metropolis people from many cities assemble in the synagogue, it therefore seems to belong to everybody, i.e.,

say [in accounting for the discrepancy] that in both cases the synagogue has no dwelling apartment, the first teaching referring to big cities, the second to villages.<sup>17</sup> (11b3 – 12a1)

**DAILY MASHAL**  
***Mitzvos and danger***

The Gemara states that although we have a rule that one who is engaged in the performance of a mitzvah will not be harmed, the mitzvah will not necessarily protect one who is likely to be harmed.

What is the power of a mitzvah? Besides the great reward one receives in the next world for performing a mitzvah, apparently there is a reward in this world for mitzvah performance. That reward is manifest in HaShem protecting one who is engaged in a mitzvah. According to Rabbi Chaim Volozhiner, when one performs a mitzvah, the mitzvah creates a halo which is reserved for the person in the World to Come. Yet, the Gemara in Sota teaches us that a sin can extinguish a mitzvah.

The Gemara implies that although a mitzvah protects the one performing the mitzvah, there can be forces that will negate the performance of the mitzvah. How does this occur, in light of the fact that the reward for the mitzvah is already reserved for the person in the World to Come? Perhaps the idea is that a sin is considered to be dangerous, and although one is normally protected when performing the mitzvah, if he places himself in a dangerous situation, he may not be protected. Similarly, it is not enough for one to perform a mitzvah and then assume that he will automatically receive the reward in the World to Come. One must always be on guard that the lurking dangers of sin should not come and upset his well performed mitzvah, as this will affect his share in the World to Come.

to nobody, whilst in the villages those who attend are known to all, being like partners in the synagogue.