

אף על גב ד'פית אלהים ליפת - אין השכינה שורה אלא באהלי שם.

ופרסאי מנא לן דמיפת קאתו? דכתבו: "בני יפת גומר ומגוג ומדי ויון ותובל ומשך ותירס". גומר - זה גרממא, מגוג - זו קנדיא, מדי - זו מקדוניה, יון - כמשמעו, תובל - זה בית אוניקי, משך - זו מוסיא, תירס; פליגי בה רבי סימאי ורבנן, ואמרי לה רבי סימון ורבנן. חד אמר: זה בית תרייקי וחד אמר: זה פרס. תני רב יוסף: תירס זה פרס.

"סבתה ורעמה וסבתכא", תני רב יוסף: סקיסתן גוייתא, וסקיסתן ברייתא. בין חדא לחדא מאה פריס, והיקפה אלא פריס.

"ותיה ראשית ממלכתו בבל וארך ואכד וכליה". בבל - כמשמעו, ארך - זה אורכוות, ואכד - זה בשפר, כלנה - זה נופר ננפי.

"מן הארץ ההיא יצא אשור". תני רב יוסף: אשור זה סילק. 'ויבן את נינוה ואת רחובות עיר ואת כלח'. נינוה - כמשמעו, רחובות עיר - זו פרת דמישון, כלח - זו פרת דבורסיה, 'ואת רסן בין נינוה ובין כלח היא העיר הגדולה'. רסן - זה אקטיספון, היא העיר הגדולה - איני יודע אם נינוה העיר הגדולה, אם רסן העיר הגדולה. כשהוא אומר: 'ויננוה היתה עיר גדולה לאלהים מהלך שלשת ימים' - הוי אומר: נינוה היא העיר הגדולה.

'וישם אחימן ששי ותלמי ילידי הענק'. תנא: אחימן - מיומן שבאחים, ששי - שמשים את הארץ בשחיתות, תלמי - שמשים את הארץ תלמים תלמים. דבר אחר: אחימן בנה ענת, ששי בנה אלוש, תלמי בנה תלבוש. 'ילידי הענק' - שבעניקין החמה בקומתן.

The Gemara explains: Although God will enlarge Japheth, referring to the Persians, who descended from Japheth and who assisted in constructing the Second Temple, the Divine Presence rests only in the tents of Shem, in the First Temple, which was built by King Solomon without the patronage of a foreign power.

§ The Gemara asks: From where do we derive that the Persians descend from Japheth? The Gemara answers: As it is written: "The sons of Japheth were Gomer and Magog and Madai and Javan and Tuval and Meshech and Tiras" (Genesis 10:2). The Gemara explains: Gomer, that is Germamya;<sup>1</sup> Magog, that is Kandiya;<sup>1</sup> Madai, that is Macedonia; Javan, in accordance with its plain meaning, Greece; Tuval, that is the nation called Beit Unaiki;<sup>1</sup> Meshech, that is Musya.<sup>1</sup> With regard to Tiras, Rabbi Simai and the Rabbis disagree, and some say the dispute is between Rabbi Simon and the Rabbis: One said: That is Beit Teraiki,<sup>1</sup> and one said: That is Persia. According to that approach, Persia is listed among the descendants of Japheth. Rav Yosef taught: Tiras is Persia.

The list of nations continues: "And Sabtah and Raamah and Sabteca" (Genesis 10:7). Rav Yosef taught: These are the inner Sakistan<sup>1</sup> and the outer Sakistan. Between one and the other there was a distance of one hundred parasangs, and the circumference of the land was one thousand parasangs.

The Gemara continues interpreting the verses. It is stated: "And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar" (Genesis 10:10). Babel in accordance with its plain meaning, Babylonia; Erech, that is the city known then as Orikhut; and Accad, that is the place known then as Baskar; Calneh, that is Nofer Ninefi.

The Torah continues: "Out of that land went forth Asshur" (Genesis 10:11). Rav Yosef taught: Asshur, that is Silek,<sup>1</sup> meaning that is the region where the town Silkiya was built. "And built Nineveh and Rehoboth-ir and Calah" (Genesis 10:11). Nineveh, in accordance with its plain meaning; Rehoboth-ir, that is the town later known as Perat of Meishan; Calah, that is Perat of Bursif. "And Resen between Nineveh and Calah, it is the great city" (Genesis 10:12). Resen, that is the town later known as Akteisfon.<sup>1</sup> It is the great city; I do not know whether this means that Nineveh is the great city, or whether it means that Resen is the great city. When it says: "And Nineveh was a great city of God, a three-day journey across" (Jonah 3:3), you must say that Nineveh is the great city.

The Gemara continues to discuss the interpretation of names in the Bible. The Torah says: "And there were Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmi, the children of Anak" (Numbers 13:22). It was taught: Ahiman was so called because he was the greatest and most skillful [*meyuman*] of his brothers. Ahiman is a contraction of brother [*ah*] and right [*yamin*], which is the skilled hand. Sheshai was so called because he renders the ground like pits [*shehitot*]<sup>N</sup> with his strides. Talmi was so called because he renders the ground filled with furrows [*telamim*] with his strides. Alternatively: Ahiman built the city of Anan; Sheshai built the town Alush; Talmi built the city of Talbush. The children of Anak is referring to the fact that it appears that the sun is a necklace [*shema'anikin*] around their necks because of their height.

LANGUAGE

Germamya - גרממא: Apparently a reference to the region of Garamnea in northern Assyria, near Armenia.

Kandiya - קנדיא: The variant reading, Gutia, is probably more accurate. It is a reference to the land of the Goths in Asia Minor.

Beit Unaiki - בית אוניקי: From the Bithynia region in Asia Minor.



Map of Asia Minor showing the location of some of the places mentioned

Musya - מוסיא: Referring to the land of Moesia, which is north of Thrace.

Beit Teraiki - בית תרייקי: Referring to the land of Thrace in northern Greece.

Sakistan - סקיסתן: This word refers to Sistan, a region in present-day eastern Iran and southern Afghanistan which constituted an enormous province in the Sassanid Empire. Sistan was the ancient homeland of the Saka people, a Scythian tribe, and it held special significance in Zoroastrianism.

Silek - סילק: This is short for the important city of Seleucia situated on the Tigris River.

Akteisfon - אקטיספון: This is the metropolis Ctesiphon on the Tigris, across the river from the city of Seleucia which is in modern-day Iraq.



Arch of Ctesiphon, the only remaining structure from ancient Ctesiphon

NOTES

Sheshai was so called because he renders the ground like pits - ששי שמשים את הארץ בשחיתות: Rashi is surprised at this homiletic interpretation, since it does not fit the name Sheshai well. Instead, he suggests that the Gemara means that Sheshai was as heavy as marble [*shayish*], which is more similar to his name. It was his heavy weight that rendered the ground full of holes like pits. That is the interpretation in the midrash as well.

אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻעַ בֶּן לֵוִי אָמַר רַבִּי: עֲתִידָה רוֹמֵי שְׁתַּפּוּל בְּיַד פָּרַס, שְׁנֵאמַר: "לָכֵן שָׁמְעוּ עֵצַת ה' אֲשֶׁר יַעֲזֹר (עַל) אֲדוֹם וּמַחְשְׁבוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב (עַל) יוֹשְׁבֵי תִימָן אִם לֹא יִסְחָבוּם צְעִירֵי הַצֹּאֵן אִם לֹא יֵשִׁים עֲלֵיהֶם נְוָהם".

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַבָּה בַּר עוּלָא: מַאי מְשַׁמַּע דְּהָאֵי צְעִירֵי הַצֹּאֵן פָּרַס הוּא – דְּכַתִּיב: "הָאֵיל אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתָ בְּעַל הַקְּרָנִים (הוּא) מַלְכֵי מִדְי וּפָרַס". וְאֵימָא יוֹן, דְּכַתִּיב: "וְהַצִּפּוֹר הַשְּׂעִיר מֶלֶךְ יוֹן!"

כִּי סְלִיק רַב חֲבִיבָא בַר סוּרְמַקֵי אָמְרָה קָמִיה דְּהֵוּא מְרַבְנָן, אָמַר לֵיה: מַאן דְּלֹא יָדַע פְּרוּשֵׁי קְרָאֵי מוֹתִיב תִּיּוֹבְתָא לְרַבֵּי! מַאי "צְעִירֵי הַצֹּאֵן" – זֹטְרָא דְאַחוּהֵי, דְתַנֵּי רַב יוֹסֵף: תִּירַס זֶה פָּרַס.

אָמַר רַבָּה בַר בַּר חֲנָה אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן מְשׁוּם רַבִּי יְהוּדָה בְּרַבִּי אֶלְעָאִי: עֲתִידָה רוֹמֵי שְׁתַּפּוּל בְּיַד פָּרַס. קַל וְחוֹמֵר; וּמַה מְקַדֵּשׁ רֵאשׁוֹן שְׁבַנְאוּהוּ בְּנֵי שָׁם וְהַחֲרִיבוּהוּ בְּשָׂדִיִּים – נִפְלוּ בְּשָׂדִיִּים בְּיַד פָּרַסִּים, מְקַדֵּשׁ שְׁנֵי שְׁבַנְאוּהוּ פָּרַסִּים וְהַחֲרִיבוּהוּ רוֹמִיִּים – אֵינּוּ דִין שְׁיַפְלוּ רוֹמִיִּים בְּיַד פָּרַסִּים?

אָמַר רַב: עֲתִידָה פָּרַס שְׁתַּפּוּל בְּיַד רוֹמֵי. אָמְרוּ לֵיה רַב כְּהָנָא וְרַב אַסִּי לְרַב: בְּנוּי בְּיַד סְתוּרִי? אָמַר לְהוּ: אֵין, גְּזִירַת מֶלֶךְ הִיא. אֵיכָא דְאָמְרֵי, אָמַר (לֵיה): אֵינְהוּ נְמִי הָא קָא סְתָרֵי בֵי כְּנִישְׁתָּא.

תַּנְיָא נְמִי הָבִי: עֲתִידָה פָּרַס שְׁתַּפּוּל בְּיַד רוֹמֵי. חֲדָא – דְּסְתָרֵי בֵי כְּנִישְׁתָּא, וְעוּד: גְּזִירַת מֶלֶךְ הוּא שְׁיַפְלוּ בּוֹנֵי בְּיַד סוֹתְרִין. דְּאָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב: אֵין בֶּן דָּוִד בָּא עַד שְׁתַּפְּשׁוּט מַלְכוּת רוֹמֵי הַרְשָׁעָה בְּכָל הָעוֹלָם כּוּלָּהּ תִּשְׁעָה חֳדָשִׁים שְׁנֵאמַר: "לָכֵן יִתְּנֶם עַד עֵת יוֹלְדָה יְלִדָה וְיִתֵּר אֶחָיו יִשׁוּבוּן עַל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל".

תַּנּוּ רַבְנָן: כָּל הַלְשָׁכוֹת שֶׁהָיוּ בְּמִקְדָּשׁ לֹא הָיוּ לָהֶן מְזוּזָה, חוּץ מִלְשַׁכַּת פְּרֻדְרִין שֶׁהָיָה בָּהּ בֵּית דִּירָה לְכַהֵן גְּדוֹל.

§ Apropos the opinion that Tiras is Persia, the Gemara addresses a related matter. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said: Rome is destined to fall into the hands of Persia, as it is stated: "Now hear the plan that the Lord has devised for Edom, and the thoughts He has considered for the residents of Teiman. Surely the youngest of the flock will drag them away, surely their habitation will be appalled due to them" (Jeremiah 49:20).

Rabba bar Ulla strongly objected to this. From where may it be inferred that this phrase: Youngest of the flock, is Persia? It is as it is written: "The ram that you saw sporting two horns are the kings of Media and Persia" (Daniel 8:20), and the ram is a member of the flock mentioned in the verse. Still, how is that proof? And say that youngest of the flock refers to Greece, who will overthrow Rome, as it is written: "The goat is the king of Greece" (Daniel 8:21). The goat, too, could be characterized as a member of the flock.

When Rav Haviva bar Surmakei ascended from Babylonia to Eretz Yisrael, he stated this difficulty before a certain one of the Sages. That Sage said to him: One who does not know how to interpret verses is so arrogant that he raises an objection to the opinion of the great Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi? Indeed, Rabba bar Ulla misunderstood the basis of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's interpretation. What is the meaning of the phrase: The youngest of the flock? It means the youngest of the brothers, a reference to Persia, as Rav Yosef taught: Tiras, the youngest of Japheth's sons, that is Persia.

Similarly, Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said in the name of Rabbi Yehuda, son of Rabbi Elai: Rome is destined to fall into the hands of Persia. This is derived by means of an *a fortiori* inference: Just as the First Temple, that the descendants of Shem built it and the Chaldeans destroyed it, and in turn the Chaldeans, ruled by Belshazzar, fell to Persians, ruled by Darius the Mede and his son-in-law Cyrus the Persian; the Second Temple, that the Persians built it and the Romans destroyed it, is it not right that the Romans will fall into the hands of the Persians?

In contrast, Rav said: Persia is destined to fall into the hands of Rome. Rav Kahana and Rav Asi, Rav's students, said to Rav: The builders will fall into the hands of the destroyers? Is that justice? He said to them: Although it seems unjust, yes, that is the King's decree.<sup>n</sup> Some say that he said this to them: They, too, are destroyers of synagogues, and they are no better than the Romans.

That was also taught in a *baraita*: Persia is destined to fall into the hands of Rome. One reason is that they destroyed synagogues. And furthermore, it is the King's decree that the builders will fall into the hands of the destroyers, as Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: The son of David will come only when the wicked kingdom of Rome spreads its dominance throughout the world for nine months, as it is stated: "Therefore He will give them up until she who is to bear has borne; then the remnants of his brethren will return with the children of Israel" (Micah 5:2). The duration of Rome's rule over the world will be the duration of a pregnancy, nine months.

§ The Gemara resumes the discussion of the High Priest's relocation to the *Parhedrin* chamber. The Rabbis taught: None of the chambers in the Temple had a *mezuzah* except for the Chamber of *Parhedrin*, in which there was a place of residence of the High Priest.<sup>14</sup> Only residences in which one sleeps require a *mezuzah*, and the only chamber in the Temple that fits that description was the *Parhedrin* chamber.

**NOTES**  
That is the King's decree – גְּזִירַת מֶלֶךְ הִיא – Some commentaries explain that the fall of the Persians was decreed to expose the truth with regard to their ostensible graciousness manifest in the rebuilding of the Temple. According to the Gemara in tractate *Rosh HaShana*, the Persians built the Second Temple in a manner that would facilitate its later destruction. Once they are conquered, it will serve as a clear indication that they are no better than the Romans, who actually destroyed the Temple (*Ben Yehoyada*).

**HALAKHA**  
*Mezuzot* on the Temple Mount – מְזוּזוֹת בְּהַר הַבַּיִת – The chambers, courtyards, synagogues, and houses of study on the Temple Mount were exempt from the mitzva of *mezuzah* because they were not residences. None of the Temple gates had a *mezuzah* except for the gate of Nicanor and the one inside it. In addition, the *Parhedrin* chamber, where the High Priest resided before Yom Kippur, was required to have a *mezuzah* affixed (*Rambam Sefer Ahava, Hilkhot Mezuzah 6:6*).

אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה: וְהֵלֵא כַּמָּה לְשִׁבּוֹת  
הָיוּ בְּמִקְדָּשׁ שְׁהֵיהָ לָהֶן בֵּית דִּירָה, וְלֹא  
הָיָה לָהֶן מְזוּזָה. אֲלֵא לְשִׁבַת פְּרֻהֲרִין  
גִּזְרָה הִיתָה.

מֵאֵי טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה? אָמַר (רַבָּא):  
הַסֵּבֵר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה כָּל בֵּית שְׂאִינוּ עֲשׂוּי  
לְיָמוֹת הַחַמָּה וְלְיָמוֹת הַגְּשָׁמִים – אֵינוּ  
בֵּית. אֵיתִיבֵיהּ אַבְיִי: וְהִכְתִּיב: “וְהִכְתִּי  
(אֶת) בֵּית הַחוּרְף עַל בֵּית הַקֵּץ!” אָמַר  
לֵיהּ: בֵּית חוּרְף וּבֵית קֵץ – אֵיִקְרִי בֵּית  
טַעְמָא – לֹא אֵיִקְרִי.

אֵיתִיבֵיהּ אַבְיִי: סוֹכֵת הַחֶגֶג בְּחָג, רַבִּי  
יְהוּדָה מְחַיֵּב וְחַכְמִים פּוֹטְרִין. וְתַנּוּ  
עֲלֵיהּ: רַבִּי יְהוּדָה מְחַיֵּב בְּעִירוֹב וּבְמִזְוָה  
וּבְמַעֲשֵׂר.

וְכִי תִימָא: מְדַרְבְּנָן. בְּשִׁלְמָא עִירוֹב  
וּמְזוּזָה – אֵיִכָּא לְמִימַר מְדַרְבְּנָן, אֲלֵא  
מַעֲשֵׂר מִי אֵיִכָּא לְמִימַר מְדַרְבְּנָן?

Perek I  
Daf 10 Amud b

דִּילְמָא אֲתֵי לְאַפְרוּשֵׁי מִן הַחַיִּיב עַל  
הַפְּטוֹר וּמִן הַפְּטוֹר עַל הַחַיִּיב.

Rabbi Yehuda said: That is not the reason; after all, weren't there several chambers in the Temple in which there was a place of residence designated for priests to sit and sleep, and yet they did not have a mezuzah? Rather, the mezuzah in the Chamber of Parhedrin was there because there was a rabbinic decree.

The Gemara asks: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda<sup>N</sup> that there was no fundamental obligation to affix a mezuzah in the Parhedrin chamber, and that one was affixed there due to a decree? Rava said that Rabbi Yehuda holds: The legal status of any house that is not designated for residence both for the summer and for the rainy season is not that of a house and therefore does not require a mezuzah. Abaye raised an objection to his opinion from a verse. How could you suggest that the legal status of a residence occupied for only part of the year is not that of a house? Isn't it written: “I will strike the winter-house with the summer-house” (Amos 3:15)? Apparently, even a residence occupied only half the year is a house. Rava said to him: A residence occupied only part of the year may be called the winter-house or the summer-house. It is not called a house unmodified. A house is a structure used year round.

Abaye raised a different objection to the opinion of Rava, from a mishna: If one brought produce from the field into the sukka that he constructed for the festival of Sukkot on the festival of Sukkot, Rabbi Yehuda obligates him to tithe the produce and the Rabbis exempt him from tithing the produce. And it was taught concerning the mishna: Rabbi Yehuda obligates the owner of that sukka to include the sukka in the joining of courtyards, like any of the houses in the courtyard; and in the mitzva of affixing a mezuzah in the sukka;<sup>H</sup> and in separating tithes from produce brought into the sukka. One is obligated to tithe his produce only when its processing has been completed. When he brings the produce into the house, he is obligated to tithe it. Rabbi Yehuda holds that the legal status of a sukka, in which one resides for a mere seven days, is that of a house in terms of the mitzva of mezuzah.

And if you say that Rabbi Yehuda rules that by rabbinic law the status of the sukka is like that of a house, but that by Torah law his opinion is consistent with Rava's opinion, granted, with regard to the joining of courtyards and mezuzah, it is possible to say that the obligation is by rabbinic law; however, with regard to tithes, is it possible to say that according to Rabbi Yehuda the obligation is by rabbinic law?

In that case, there is the concern lest one come to separate tithes<sup>N</sup> from the obligated produce to fulfill the obligation for the exempt produce,<sup>N</sup> or from the exempt produce to fulfill the obligation for the obligated produce. Produce that one is obligated to tithe by rabbinic law has the status of exempt produce by Torah law. Since it is difficult to distinguish between produce that one is obligated to tithe by Torah law and produce that one is obligated to tithe by rabbinic law, one might seek to fulfill his obligation by separating tithes from one for the other. In both cases, both the produce designated as a tithe and the produce for which it was tithed would retain the status of untithed produce. Therefore, Rabbi Yehuda could not have said that a sukka is considered a house by rabbinic law.<sup>N</sup>

#### NOTES

What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda – מֵאֵי טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה: Indeed, one could ask why the Rabbis maintain that the other chambers did not require a mezuzah. Perhaps, although the other chambers were populated by priests day and night, they were not designated as residences and therefore did not require a mezuzah. The Parhedrin chamber, on the other hand, was designated for the purpose of housing the High Priest, which supports the reasoning of the Rabbis more than the distinction of Rabbi Yehuda (Siah Yitzhak).

#### HALAKHA

A sukka during the Festival – סוֹכֵת הַחֶגֶג בְּחָג – A sukka is exempt from a mezuzah even during the Festival when one resides therein, because it is not a permanent dwelling (Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'at 286:11).

#### NOTES

Lest one come to separate tithes – דִּילְמָא אֲתֵי לְאַפְרוּשֵׁי: Tosafot are surprised by this concern since the Sages instituted an obligation to tithe in many cases where this problem was not a source of concern. Tosafot therefore distinguish between cases where confusion is likely and those where it is unlikely. Some commentaries explain that the Gemara's point is: If this is indeed a rabbinic ordinance, the tanna should have emphasized that fact to avoid misunderstanding (Ohel Moshe).

Tithing from the obligated produce to fulfill the obligation for the exempt produce – מִן הַחַיִּיב עַל הַפְּטוֹר: In Tosafot Yeshanim the following question is raised: Although there is no Torah obligation to tithe this produce, it is not entirely exempt, and if tithes were taken, they would be considered tithes. Why then, does the Torah refer to this produce as exempt? The answer is that even though in this case the tithe is a legitimate tithe, there are cases in which the produce is entirely exempt from tithing, which is the concern of the Gemara (see Rav Shmuel Strashun).

Rabbi Yehuda's reasoning – טַעְמָא שֶׁל רַבִּי יְהוּדָה: In the Jerusalem Talmud, the rationale for Rabbi Yehuda's opinion is that the entire Temple is exempt from mezuzah, as the mitzva does not apply in any structure that is publicly owned or sacred, with the exception of the Parhedrin chamber. The commentaries debate why the Babylonian Talmud did not include this point.

אָלֵא אָמַר אַבַּיִי: בְּשִׁבְעָה – דְּכוּלֵי  
עֲלֵמָא לֹא פְּלִיגֵי דְּמִיחֵיבָא, כִּי פְּלִיגֵי –  
בְּשָׂאָר יָמוֹת הַשָּׁנָה. רַבֵּנן סָבְרִי: גְּזָרִין  
שָׂאָר יָמוֹת הַשָּׁנָה אִטּוּ שִׁבְעָה, וְרַבֵּי  
יְהוּדָה סָבְרִי: לֹא גְּזָרִין.

אָמַר לֵיהּ רַבָּא: וְהָא סוּכַת הַחַג בְּחַג  
קָתְנִי!

אָלֵא אָמַר רַבָּא: בְּשָׂאָר יָמוֹת הַשָּׁנָה –  
כוּלֵי עֲלֵמָא לֹא פְּלִיגֵי דְּפִטּוּרָה, כִּי  
פְּלִיגֵי – בְּשִׁבְעָה. וְסוּכַת טַעֲמָא לְחוּד,  
וְלִשְׁכָּה טַעֲמָא לְחוּד.

סוּכַת טַעֲמָא לְחוּד; רַבֵּי יְהוּדָה  
לְטַעֲמִיָּה, דְּאָמַר: סוּכַת דִּירַת קָבַע  
בְּעֵינֵן, וּמִיחֵיבָא בְּמִזְוָה. וְרַבֵּנן  
לְטַעֲמִיָּהוּ, דְּאָמְרִי: סוּכַת דִּירַת עֲרָא  
בְּעֵינֵן, וְלֹא מִיחֵיבָא בְּמִזְוָה.

וְלִשְׁכָּה טַעֲמָא לְחוּד; רַבֵּנן סָבְרִי:  
דִּירָה בְּעַל פְּרָחָה – שְׂמָה דִּירָה, וְרַבֵּי  
יְהוּדָה סָבְרִי: דִּירָה בְּעַל פְּרָחָה – לֹא  
שְׂמָה דִּירָה, וּמִדְּרַבֵּנן הוּא דִּתְקִינֵנוּ לָהּ,  
שְׂלֵא יֵאמְרוּ כְּהֵן גְּדוּל חָבוּשׁ בְּבֵית  
הָאִסוּרִין.

מֵאֵן תְּנָא לְהָא, דְּתַנּוּ רַבֵּנן:

Rather, Abaye said: The dispute with regard to the *mezuzah* in the *Parhedrin* chamber must be explained differently. During the seven days that the High Priest lives in the *Parhedrin* chamber during his sequestering, everyone agrees that the chamber is obligated in the mitzva to affix a *mezuzah* there. When they disagree is with regard to the rest of the days of the year, when no one resides there. The Rabbis hold: We issue a decree and require that a *mezuzah* be affixed during the rest of the year due to those seven days that the High Priest lives there; and Rabbi Yehuda holds: We do not issue that decree, and there is no obligation to affix a *mezuzah* to the chamber the rest of the year.

Rava said to him: But isn't it taught in the mishna cited above: The *sukka* that he constructed for the festival of *Sukkot* on the festival of *Sukkot*? Apparently, contrary to the opinion of Abaye, the dispute is whether or not there is an obligation to affix a *mezuzah* to the *sukka* during the Festival itself. If, as Abaye said, the *tanna'im* agree that there is an obligation to affix a *mezuzah* during the festival of *Sukkot* even though it is used for only a brief period, on what basis do the Rabbis rule that there is no obligation even on the Festival itself?

Rather, Rava said: During the rest of the days of the year, everyone agrees that the *Parhedrin* chamber is exempt from the obligation to affix a *mezuzah* there. When they disagree is with regard to the seven days that the High Priest lives there, and with regard to a *sukka* during the Festival. And in order to resolve the contradiction between the opinions about the obligation of the chamber and of the *sukka*, the Gemara asserts: With regard to the *sukka* the reason is discrete, and with regard to the chamber the reason is discrete.

The Gemara explains: With regard to *sukka*, the reason is discrete. Rabbi Yehuda conforms to his standard line of reasoning, as he said: In order to fulfill the mitzva of *sukka*, we require a well-built permanent residence. A permanent residence is obligated in the mitzva of *mezuzah*. The Rabbis conform to their standard line of reasoning, as they say: In order to fulfill the mitzva of *sukka*, we require a temporary residence, not a full-fledged house. A temporary residence is not obligated in the mitzva of *mezuzah*.

And similarly, with regard to the chamber, the reason is discrete. The Rabbis hold: A residence in which one resides involuntarily<sup>n</sup> is nevertheless considered a residence. Although the High Priest resides in the *Parhedrin* chamber due to a mitzva and not of his own volition, its legal status is that of a residence and a *mezuzah* must be affixed. And Rabbi Yehuda holds: A residence in which one resides involuntarily is not considered a residence. Therefore, there should be no obligation to affix a *mezuzah* in the *Parhedrin* chamber, just as there is no obligation to do so in the other Temple chambers in which priests reside. However, the Sages instituted this obligation by rabbinic law so that people will not say: The High Priest is imprisoned in jail, as only in substandard residences that appear unfit for residence is there no obligation to affix a *mezuzah*.

Who is the *tanna* who taught the following *baraita*? As the Sages taught:

#### NOTES

דִּירָה בְּעַל – A residence in which one resides involuntarily – דִּירָה בְּעַל: According to Rabbi Yehuda, why is a *sukka* obligated in the mitzva of *mezuzah* considering that one does not reside in a *sukka* of his own volition? The answer is that a *sukka* is not

considered an involuntary residence, because one's family joins him there (*Tosefot HaRosh*; *Tosafot Yeshanim*). Another reason that a *sukka* is not considered an involuntary residence is that it can be erected wherever one chooses (*Ohel Moshé*).