

NOTES

To convey to you the far-reaching nature of the opinion – להודיעך בחו: Often, the need arises to formulate a dispute in terms of the opinion of one of the disputants. In those cases, the Gemara states that the dispute was formulated in that manner to convey the far-reaching nature of his opinion, especially when there is a novel element or lenient ruling involved.

Wherever this pair of Sages is mentioned – כל כי האי – ונא: The Gemara arrives at this understanding because Rav, Rabbi Hanina, and Rav Havaiva were roughly contemporaries, while Rabbi Yoḥanan was considerably younger. Including him with the other three seems anomalous.

BACKGROUND

Grooved and split – יחלקו ויחלקו:



Post viewed as if it has been carved into a corner

LANGUAGE

Double post [deyumad] – דיומד: Rabbi Yirmeya teaches that this word is a Greek-Hebrew amalgam. It begins with the ancient Greek prefix δι-, di-, or δύο, duo-, meaning two, and ends with the Hebrew word amud, meaning post. Other authorities say that the whole word deyumad comes from the Greek διδύμων, didumon, meaning double or paired.

Perek I

Daf 5 Amud a

NOTES

The Divine Presence never descended – לא ירדה שכניה: The profound meaning of this matter is that the realm of God, Heaven, and the realm of man, Earth, are two discrete realms. Even when one achieves prophecy, or when God reveals Himself in the world below, the gap between the two realms remains. Instead, the person remains within his domain of ten handbreadths, and within his limitations, while God remains forever beyond the reality of this world. Some view the ten handbreadths as an allusion to the ten stages of spirituality (see HaKotev, Otzar HaKavod).

אמר לך רב הונא: פליגי באמצע הגג, והוא הדין על שפת הגג. והאי דקמיפליגי באמצע הגג – להודיעך בחו דרבני יעקב, דאפילו באמצע הגג נמי מכשיר.

The Gemara rejects this: Rav Huna could have said to you that there is no proof from the baraita with regard to the second matter, as it is possible that they disagree in the case of a sukka in the center of the roof and that the same is true in the case of a sukka on the edge of the roof. And the fact that they specifically dispute the case of a sukka in the center of the roof is to convey to you the far-reaching nature of the opinionⁿ of Rabbi Ya'akov, who deems the sukka fit even in the center of the roof.

תנו רבנן: נעץ ארבעה קונדיסין בארץ וסיבך על גבן, רבי יעקב אומר: רואין כל שאילו יחלקו ויחלקו ויש בהן טפח לכאן וטפח לכאן – נידונין משום דיומד, ואם לאו – אין נידונין משום דיומד. שהיה רבי יעקב אומר: דיומדי סוכה טפח, וחכמים אומרים: עד שיהו שתיים בהלבנתן, ושלישית אפילו טפח.

The Sages taught: If one inserted four posts into the ground and placed a roof over them, Rabbi Ya'akov says: One considers whether the posts are wide enough that if they were grooved and split,^b forming a piece of wood with two segments at a right angle, and they have a handbreadth to here, in this direction, and a handbreadth to there, in that direction, then they are considered a double post [deyumad].¹ With regard to certain halakhot, the status of a double post positioned at a corner is that of two full-fledged partitions. And if not, if after splitting them they are narrower than that, they are not considered a double post, as Rabbi Ya'akov would say: The minimum measure of double posts of a sukka to be considered full-fledged partitions is one handbreadth. And the Rabbis say: The sukka is fit only if it has two full-fledged partitions in the standard sense, completely closing each of those two sides, and a third wall, which, based on a halakha transmitted to Moses from Sinai, measures even a handbreadth.

ושאינה גבוהה עשרה טפחים. מנלן?

The mishna continues: A sukka that is not even ten handbreadths high is unfit. The Gemara asks: From where do we derive this halakha?

אתמר, רב ורבי חנינא ורבי יוחנן ורב חביבא מתנו.

It was stated that Rav, and Rabbi Hanina, and Rabbi Yoḥanan, and Rav Havaiva taught the matter below.

בכולה סדר מועד, כל כי האי ונא חלופי רבי יוחנן ומעילי רבי יונתן.

As an aside, the Gemara notes: Throughout the entire order of Mo'ed, wherever this second pair of Sages is mentioned,ⁿ there are some amora'im who replace Rabbi Yoḥanan and do so by inserting Rabbi Yonatan in his place.

ארון תשעה וכפורת טפח – הרי כאן עשרה, וכתוב: ונודעת לך שם ודברתי אתך מעל הכפורת.

And this is what they taught: The Ark of the Covenant was itself nine handbreadths high, as it is stated explicitly in the Torah that it was one and a half cubits high and the cubit used to measure Temple vessels consisted of six handbreadths. And the Ark cover was one handbreadth thick. There is a total height of ten handbreadths here. And it is written: "I will meet with you there and I will speak with you from above the Ark cover" (Exodus 25:22),

ותנא, רבי יוסי אומר: מעולם לא ירדה שכניה למטה, ולא עלו משה ואליהו למרום, שנאמר: "השמים שמים לה" והארץ נתן לבני אדם.

and it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei says: The Divine Presence never actually descendedⁿ below, and Moses and Elijah never actually ascended to heaven on high, as it is stated: "The heavens are the heavens of the Lord, and the earth He gave to the children of man" (Psalms 115:16), indicating that these are two distinct domains. Apparently, from ten handbreadths upward is considered a separate domain. Consequently, any sukka that is not at least ten handbreadths high is not considered an independent domain and is unfit.

His feet will stand, etc. – יַעֲמֵדוּ רַגְלָיו יוֹכֵר – The question arises: Rabbi Yosei spoke only of the past, and this verse refers to the future; perhaps in the future the Divine Presence will descend to this world? Nevertheless, based on the verse “The heavens are the heavens of the Lord” (Psalms 115:16), the separation is absolute and not merely temporary. Furthermore, the nature of reality will not change in the messianic era (*Yad Neeman; Arukh LaNer*).

But isn't it written: And Elijah went up by a whirlwind heavenward – וְהִכְתִּיב וַיַּעַל אֱלִיָּהוּ בְּסַעֲרַת הַשָּׁמַיִם – It has already been noted that the term “heavenward” indicates only the direction in which he traveled, toward the heavens. It does not mean that he reached or even intended to reach the heavens (*Yad Neeman*).

The throne was extended for him – אִישְׁתַּרְבוּבֵי אִישְׁתַּרְבַּב – לִיָּה כֶּסֶּא: Although not even Moses, the greatest of all human beings, was able to reach beyond the human realm, he was able to reach further than any other man and come into contact with the transcendent when God revealed Himself to him in the Throne of Glory (see Rabbi Yoshiya Pinto and others).

All the vessels... the Torah provided in their regard the dimension – כָּל הַכֵּלִים... נִתְּנָה בָּהֶן תוֹרַה מִיָּדָה – Although the Torah did not provide the dimensions of the candelabrum, the Sages derived its dimensions by means of allusions in the language of the Torah (*Me'iri*).

The Ark cover... the Torah did not provide the dimension of its height – כִּפּוֹרֹת... מִדַּת קוּמְתָהּ לֹא נִתְּנָה – In an interpretation based on allusion, some explain that since the Ark cover is designated as the place for the Divine Presence to rest, it is inappropriate to assign it specific dimensions. Just as God's essence is beyond the grasp of man, the Ark cover should transcend limitations and dimensions (*HaBoneh*).

וְלֹא יוֹרֵד שְׁכִינָה לְמַטָּה?! וְהִכְתִּיב: “וַיֵּרֶד ה' עַל הַר סִינַי” לְמַעַל מֵעֲשָׂרָה טַפְחִים. וְהִכְתִּיב: “וַיַּעֲמְדוּ רַגְלָיו בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא עַל הַר הַזֵּיתִים” לְמַעַל מֵעֲשָׂרָה טַפְחִים.

The Gemara asks: **And did the Divine Presence never descend below ten handbreadths? But isn't it written: “And God descended onto Mount Sinai”** (Exodus 19:20)?

The Gemara answers: Although God descended below, He always remained **ten handbreadths above the ground**. Since from ten handbreadths and above it is a separate domain, in fact, the Divine Presence never descended to the domain of this world.

The Gemara asks: **But isn't it written: “And on that day His feet will stand^N on the Mount of Olives”** (Zechariah 14:4)? The Gemara answers: Here, too, He will remain **ten handbreadths above the ground**.

The Gemara asks: **And did Moses and Elijah never ascend to the heavens on high? But isn't it written: “And Moses went up to God”** (Exodus 19:3)?

The Gemara answers: Nevertheless, he remained **below ten handbreadths adjacent to the ground**.

The Gemara asks: **But isn't it written: “And Elijah went up by a whirlwind heavenward”** (II Kings 2:11)?^N

The Gemara answers: Here, too, it was **below ten handbreadths**. The Gemara asks: **But isn't it written: “He grasps the face of the throne, and spreads His cloud upon him”** (Job 26:9)? **And Rabbi Tanḥum said: This teaches that the Almighty spread of the radiance of His Divine Presence and of His cloud upon him**. Apparently, Moses was in the cloud with God.

The Gemara answers: Here, too, it was **below ten handbreadths**.

וְלֹא עָלוּ מֹשֶׁה וְאֵלִיָּהוּ לְמַרוֹם?! וְהִכְתִּיב: “וּמֹשֶׁה עָלָה אֶל הָאֱלֹהִים” לְמַטָּה מֵעֲשָׂרָה. וְהִכְתִּיב: “וַיַּעַל אֱלֹהֵינוּ בְּסַעֲרַת הַשָּׁמַיִם” לְמַטָּה מֵעֲשָׂרָה. וְהִכְתִּיב: “מֵאַחֲזוֹ פָּנֵי כֶּסֶא פְּרָשׁוּ עָלָיו עַנְנוֹ”, וְאָמַר רַבִּי תַנְחֻמִּים: מִלְּמַד שְׁפִירֵשׁ שְׂדֵי מִזֵּי שְׂכִינָתוֹ וַעֲנָנוּ עָלָיו! לְמַטָּה מֵעֲשָׂרָה.

מִכָּל מְקוֹם “מֵאַחֲזוֹ פָּנֵי כֶּסֶא” כְּתִיב: אִישְׁתַּרְבוּבֵי אִישְׁתַּרְבַּב לִיָּה כֶּסֶא עַד עֲשָׂרָה, וְנִקְטָ בִּיהַ.

The Gemara asks: **In any case: “He grasps the face of the throne,” is written**, indicating that Moses took hold of the Throne of Glory. The Gemara rejects this: **The throne was extended for him^N down to ten handbreadths and Moses grasped it**; however, he remained below ten handbreadths. And since the Divine Presence speaks to Moses from above the Ark cover ten handbreadths above the ground, clearly a height of ten handbreadths is a distinct domain.

בְּשִׁלְמָא אַרוֹן תִּשְׁעָה – דְּכִתְיב: “וַעֲשׂוּ אַרוֹן עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים אֲמֹתַיִם וְחֻצֵי אַרְבּוֹ וְאִמָּה וְחֻצֵי רְחֹבוֹ וְאִמָּה וְחֻצֵי קוּמְתוֹ”. אֲלֵא כִּפּוֹרֹת טַפַּח מְנַלְן? דְּתַנּוּ רַבִּי חֲנִינָא: כָּל הַכֵּלִים שְׁעָשָׂה מֹשֶׁה נִתְּנָה בָּהֶן תוֹרַה מִדַּת אַרְבֵּן וּמִדַּת קוּמְתָן. כִּפּוֹרֹת מִדַּת אַרְבָּה וּמִדַּת רְחֹבָה נִתְּנָה, מִדַּת קוּמְתָהּ לֹא נִתְּנָה.

The Gemara wonders about the proof offered: **Granted**, the height of the Ark was **nine handbreadths, as it is written: “And they shall make an Ark of acacia wood; two cubits and a half shall be its length, and a cubit and a half its breadth, and a cubit and a half its height”** (Exodus 25:10), and one and a half cubits equal nine handbreadths. **However, from where do we derive the fact that the thickness of the Ark cover was one handbreadth?** The Torah never states its dimensions explicitly, as Rabbi Ḥanina taught: **For all the vessels that Moses crafted for the Tabernacle, the Torah provided in their regard the dimension^N of their length, the dimension of their width, and the dimension of their height**. However, for the Ark cover, the Torah provided the dimension of its length and the dimension of its width; but the Torah did not provide the dimension of its height.^N

צֵא וְלִמַּד מִפְּחוֹת שְׂבֻכָּלִים, שְׁנֵאמַר: “וַעֲשִׂיתָ לוֹ מִסְגֵּרַת טַפַּח סָבִיב”, מִה לְהֵלֵן טַפַּח – אִף כֵּאֵן טַפַּח. וְנִלְף מִכֵּלִים גּוֹפִייהוּ! תְּפִשְׁתָּ מְרוֹבָה – לֹא תְּפִשְׁתָּ, תְּפִשְׁתָּ מוֹעֵט – תְּפִשְׁתָּ.

The Gemara answers: **Go out and learn from the smallest dimension mentioned in connection with any of the Tabernacle vessels, as it is stated with regard to the shewbread table: “And you shall make unto it a border of a handbreadth around”** (Exodus 25:25). **Just as there**, the frame measures one handbreadth, **so too, here**, the thickness of the Ark cover measures a single handbreadth. The Gemara asks: **And let us derive the thickness of the Ark cover from the vessels themselves**, the smallest of which measures a cubit. The Gemara answers: **If you grasped many, you did not grasp anything; if you grasped few, you grasped something**. If there are two possible sources from which to derive the dimension of the Ark cover, then without conclusive proof one may not presume that the Torah intended to teach the larger dimension. Rather, the presumption is that the Torah is teaching the smaller dimension, which is included in the larger measure.

BACKGROUND

Frontplate – ציץ: Some hold that there were different configurations of the frontplate, which would explain why Rabbi Eliezer described a different frontplate than the one described by the Rabbis. Alternatively, the gold of the frontplate was malleable and could be folded in different ways so that the appearance of the Divine Name was not always identical.



Frontplate according to the view of the Rabbis

NOTES

Kodesh followed by lamed below – קדש למיד מלמטה: See the Halakha section (and *Tosafot*) for different opinions on this matter. An opinion cited in the Jerusalem Talmud states that the Divine Name was elevated above those surrounding it like a king sitting on his throne.

There is no face less than one handbreadth – אין פנים פחות מטפח: An alternative explanation is that no part of any significant area which can be described as its face can measure less than a handbreadth. In matters of *halakha*, face does not refer to the entire face; rather, it refers to the area down to the nose. Even so, that too does not measure less than a handbreadth (*Arukh LaNer*).

HALAKHA

The configuration of the frontplate – מעשה הציץ: The frontplate was a gold plate, two fingerbreadths wide, and stretched from ear to ear. Upon it was etched *kodesh laHashem*, on two lines: *Kodesh* on the lower line, and *laHashem* on the upper line, contrary to the opinion in the Gemara. If it appears on one line, it is nevertheless fit. The Rambam rules in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, based on the version of the Gemara before him. He does not completely reject the testimony of Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei. According to *Tosafot*, *kodesh* was followed by *lamed* on the lower line, and *Hashem* appeared on the upper line (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Kelei HaMikdash* 9:1).

וְנִלְךָ מְצִיץ, דְּתַנְיָא: צִיץ דּוּמָה כְּמִין טַס שֶׁל זָהָב, וְרַחֲב שְׁתֵּי אַצְבָּעוֹת, וּמוֹקֵף מֵאָזֶן לְאָזֶן, וְכָתוּב עָלָיו שְׁתֵּי שִׁטִּין: יו"ד ה"א מְלַמְעֵלָה, וְקִדְשׁ לַמִּדָּה מְלַמְטָה, וְאָמַר רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי: אֲנִי רְאִיתִי בְּרוֹמֵי, וְכָתוּב עָלָיו "קִדְשׁ לַיהוָה" בְּשִׁטָּה אַחַת.

דָּנִין כְּלֵי מַבְלֵי, וְאֵין דָּנִין כְּלֵי מַתְבָּשִׁט.

וְנִלְךָ מִזֶּר, דְּאָמַר מַר: יוֹר מִשְׁהוּ דָּנִין כְּלֵי מַבְלֵי, וְאֵין דָּנִין כְּלֵי מַהְכָּשֵׁר כְּלֵי. אֵי הָכֵי, מִסְגֵּרָתָהּ נִמְי הַכָּשֵׁר כְּלֵי הוּא! מִסְגֵּרָתוֹ לְמִטָּה הִיתָה.

הִנְחִיחָא לְמָאן דְּאָמַר מִסְגֵּרָתוֹ לְמִטָּה הִיתָה, אֶלְא לְמָאן דְּאָמַר מִסְגֵּרָתוֹ לְמַעְלָה הִיתָה, מָאן אֵיבָא לְמִמֵּר? הָאֵי הַכָּשֵׁר כְּלֵי הוּא!

אֶלְא: דָּנִין דְּבַר שְׁנַתְנָה בּוּ תוֹרָה מִדָּה, מִדְּבַר שְׁנַתְנָה בּוּ תוֹרָה מִדָּה, וְאֵל יוֹכִיחוּ צִיץ וְזוֹר שְׁלֵא נִתְנָה בְּהֵן תוֹרָה מִדָּה כְּלֵי.

רַב הוּנָא אָמַר מִהָכָּא: "עַל פְּנֵי הַכַּפֹּרֶת קִדְמָה" – וְאֵין פְּנִים פְּחוֹת מִטַּפָּח.

וְאֵימָא כְּאִפֵּי

The Gemara asks: If so, let us derive the thickness of the Ark cover from the frontplate, which is even smaller than a handbreadth, as it is taught in a *baraita*: The frontplate^b is a type of plate made of gold that is two fingerbreadths wide and stretches from ear to ear. And written upon it are two lines: The letters *yod, heh, vav, heh*, the name of God, above; and the word *kodesh*, spelled *kuf, dalet, shin*, followed by the letter *lamed*, below.ⁿ Together it spelled *kodesh laHashem*, meaning: Sacred to the Lord, with *yod, heh, vav, heh* written on the upper line in deference to the name of God. Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei,^p said: I saw the frontplate in the emperor's treasury in Rome, where it was taken together with the other Temple vessels when the Temple was destroyed, and upon it was written: Sacred to the Lord, on one line.^h Why not derive the thickness of the Ark cover from the frontplate and say that it was only two fingerbreadths?

The Gemara answers: One derives the dimension of a vessel from the dimension of a vessel, and one does not derive the dimension of a vessel from the dimension of an ornament. The frontplate is not one of the Tabernacle vessels but one of the ornaments of the High Priest.

The Gemara suggests: Let us derive the thickness of the Ark cover from the crown featured atop several of the Tabernacle vessels, as the Master said: This crown, with regard to which the Torah did not specify its dimensions, could be any size. The Gemara answers: One derives the dimension of a vessel from the dimension of a vessel, and one does not derive the dimension of a vessel from the dimension of the finish of a vessel that serves decorative purposes. The Gemara asks: If it is so that one does not derive the dimensions of a vessel from the dimensions of the finish of a vessel, then how can dimensions be derived from the border of the table, which is also the finish of a vessel and not an integral part of the table? The Gemara answers: The border of the table was below, between the legs of the table, and the tabletop rested upon it. As it supports the table, it is an integral part of the table and not merely decoration.

The Gemara asks: This works out well according to the one who said that its border was below the tabletop; however, according to the one who said that its border was above the tabletop, what can be said? According to that opinion, this border is indeed the finish of a vessel.

Rather, the thickness of the Ark cover must be derived from a different source. One derives the missing dimensions of an object for which the Torah provided part of its dimension, e.g., the Ark cover, for which the Torah provided the dimensions of length and width, from an object for which the Torah provided its dimension, e.g., the border of the table. And the frontplate and the crown, for which the Torah did not provide any dimension at all, and their dimensions were determined by the Sages, will not prove anything. It is certainly appropriate to derive the dimension of the thickness of the Ark cover from that which was stated clearly in the Torah.

Rav Huna said that the thickness of the Ark cover is derived from here: "Upon the face of [penei] the Ark cover on the east" (Leviticus 16:14), and there is no face [panim] of a person that measures less than one handbreadth.ⁿ

The Gemara asks: And why say that the face in the verse is specifically the face of a person? Say that the Ark cover is like the face

PERSONALITIES

Rabbi Eliezer, son of Rabbi Yosei – רבי אליעזר ברבי יוסי: Son of the prominent *tanna* Rabbi Yosei ben Ḥalafta, Rabbi Eliezer was already recognized as a Torah scholar during the lifetime of his father, and some of his halakhic and aggadic statements appear in the Gemara.

Rabbi Eliezer partnered with Rabbi Shimon bar Yoḥai on a

diplomatic mission to Rome to seek the repeal of harsh decrees imposed on the Jewish people. On their journey they succeeded in healing the daughter of the emperor, and were rewarded with a tour of the royal treasury in Rome. It was there that Rabbi Eliezer saw the Temple vessels that had been plundered from Jerusalem, and he reported some of what he had seen.

דבר יוכני! תפשת מרובה – לא תפשת, תפשת מועט – תפשת. ואימא כאפי דציפרתא, דזוט טובא! אמר רב אחא בר יעקב: רב הונא פני גמר; כתיב דכא: "אל פני הכפורת", וכתיב התם: "מאת פני יצחק אביו".

ונילף מפנים של מעלה, דכתיב: "בראות פני אלהים ותרגני!" תפשת מרובה – לא תפשת, תפשת מועט – תפשת.

ונילף מכרוב, דכתיב: "אל הכפורת יהיו פני הכרובים!"

אמר רב אחא בר יעקב, גמירי: אין פני כרובים פחותין מטפת. ורב הונא נמי מהכא גמיר.

ומאי כרוב? אמר רבי אבהו: כרביא, שכן בבבל קורין לינוקא רביא.

אמר ליה אביי: אלא מעתה דכתיב: "פני האחד פני הכרוב ופני השני פני אדם" היינו כרוב היינו אדם! אפי רבמי ואפי זוטרא.

וממאי דחללה עשרה בר מסככה? אימא בהדי סככה!

of a bird called *bar Yokhani*,^b whose face is significantly larger than a handbreadth? The Gemara rejects this suggestion: **If you grasped many, you did not grasp anything; if you grasped few, you grasped something.** The Gemara asks: If so, say that it is like the face of a bird,^b which is extremely small? Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: Rav Huna derives that the thickness of the Ark cover was one handbreadth not through an actual comparison to the real faces of different creatures but rather by means of a verbal analogy between the terms *penei* and *penei* written in different places in the Torah. **It is written here: "Before [*penei*] the Ark cover" (Leviticus 16:2), and it is written there: "From the presence of [*penei*] Isaac his father" (Genesis 27:30).** The dimension of the Ark cover is like that of the face of a person, a handbreadth.

The Gemara suggests: **And let us derive a verbal analogy from the face of God,ⁿ as it is written: "For I have seen your face as one sees the face of [*penei*] God, and you were pleased with me" (Genesis 33:10).** The term *penei* is used with regard to the face of God as well. The Gemara rejects this suggestion: **If you grasped many, you did not grasp anything; if you grasped few, you grasped something.**

The Gemara suggests: **And let us derive a verbal analogy from the face of the cherubⁿ in the Tabernacle and the Temple, as it is written: "Toward the Ark cover shall be the faces of [*penei*] the cherubs" (Exodus 25:20), and their faces were presumably smaller than one handbreadth.**

Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov said: We have learned through tradition that the faces of the cherubs were not smaller than a handbreadth, and indeed Rav Huna derived the thickness of the Ark cover from here as well, i.e., from the verbal analogy between the instances of the word *penei* in the verses: "Upon the face of [*penei*] the Ark cover on the east" and: "The faces [*penei*] of the cherubs," indicating that both are the same size.

Apropos the cherubs, the Gemara asks: **And what is the form of the face of a cherub [*keruv*]?** Rabbi Abbahu said: Like that of a child [*keravya*], as in Babylonia one calls a child *ravya*.

Abaye said to him: **But if what you say is so, what is the meaning of that which is written about the faces of the celestial beasts drawing the celestial chariot: "The face of the first was the face of the cherub, and the face of the second was the face of a man" (Ezekiel 10:14)?** According to your explanation, this face of the cherub is the same as that face of a man. The Gemara answers: Although two of the celestial beasts drawing that chariot had the face of a man, the difference between them is that one was a large face and one was a small face. In other words, the face described as the face of a man was the face of an adult, and the face described as the face of a cherub was that of a child. This is the source that the Ark and the Ark cover were ten handbreadths high.

However, with regard to the application of this measure to the *halakhot* of *sukka*, the Gemara asks: **And from where is it derived that the interior space of the *sukka* must be ten handbreadths high without the thickness of the roofing? Say that the ten handbreadths of the *sukka* are with the thickness of the roofing.** Just as the ten handbreadths of the Ark are measured from the bottom of the Ark to the top of the Ark cover, let the *sukka* be measured to the top of the roofing.

BACKGROUND

Bar Yokhani – בר יוכני: While the identity of this bird is unclear, in the days of the Sages of the Talmud, the giant *Aepyornis* bird still lived on the island of Madagascar and perhaps in other places as well. Reports of its existence reached far and wide.



Reconstruction of *Aepyornis*

Bird – ציפרתא: When the Talmud refers to a bird without specifying its species, it generally is referring to the sparrow, whose face is obviously considerably smaller than a handbreadth.

NOTES

From the face of God – מפנים של מעלה: Some explain that this refers to the face of angels when they appear in human form with a face and standing upright (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

And let us derive a verbal analogy from the face of the cherub – ונילף מכרוב: The cherubs were shorter than a person, as they were only ten handbreadths high, in contrast to a person, who is at least eighteen handbreadths tall. Therefore, it would stand to reason that their faces were also smaller than the face of a person. The Gemara responds that even the faces of the cherubs were no smaller than a handbreadth (*Arukh LaNer*).

BACKGROUND

The height of the first cherub was ten cubits – קומת – הכרוב האחד עשר באמה



Cherubs in Solomon's Temple

NOTES

Intermediate cubits – אמות בינוניות – See Rashi, who explains that there were cubits of different lengths all referred to as six-handbreadth cubits: One that was six handbreadths, one slightly larger, and another slightly smaller. These other cubits were called expansive, slightly larger than average; and depressed, slightly smaller than average. The Gemara here is referring to an intermediate cubit between those two. The Me'iri explains that since there are also five-handbreadth and seven-handbreadth cubits, the six-handbreadth cubit is intermediate.

אלא מבית עולמים גמר, דכתיב: 'והבית אשר בנה המלך שלמה לה' ששים אמה ארכו ועשרים רחבו ושלישים אמה קומתו', וכתיב: 'קומת הכרוב האחד עשר באמה וכן הכרוב השני'. ותנא: מה מצוינו בבית עולמים – כרובים בשליש הבית הן עומדין, משכן נמי כרובים שלישי הבית הן עומדין.

משכן כמה הוי – עשר אמות, דכתיב: 'עשר אמות אורך הקרש'. כמה הוי להו – שיתין פושטי. תלתיה כמה הוי – עשרים פושטי. דל עשרה דארון וכפורת – פשו להו עשרה, וכתיב: 'והיו הכרובים פורשי כנפיהם למעלה סוככים בכנפיהם על הכפורת'. קרייה רחמנא סככה למעלה מעשרה.

ממאי דגדפינהו עילוי רישיהו קיימי? דלמא להדי רישיהו קיימי! אמר רב אחא בר יעקב: 'למעלה' כתיב, ואימא דמידלי טובא! מי כתיב 'למעלה למעלה'?

הניחא לרבי מאיר, דאמר: כל האמות הוי בינוניות. אלא לרבי יהודה, דאמר: אמה של בנין ששה טפחים, ושל בליים חמשה, מאי איכא למימר?

ארון וכפורת כמה הוי להו – תמנא ופלגא, פשו להו חד סרי ופלגא, אימא סוכה עד דהויא חד סרי ופלגא!

אלא: לרבי יהודה הלכתא גמירי לה. דאמר רבי חייא בר אשי אמר רב: שיערוין חציצין ומחיצין הלכה למשה מסיני.

Rather, the dimension of the *sukka* is not derived from the Ark; one instead derived it from the dimensions of the eternal Temple, as it is written: "And the house which King Solomon built for the Lord, its length was sixty cubits, and its breadth twenty cubits, and its height thirty cubits" (1 Kings 6:2). And it is written: "The height of the first cherub was ten cubits,⁸ and likewise was the second cherub" (1 Kings 6:26). And it is taught in a *baraita*: Just as we find in the eternal Temple that the cherubs stand reaching one-third the height of the Temple, as each cherub was ten cubits high and the Temple was thirty cubits high, in the Tabernacle as well, the cherubs stand reaching one-third the height of the Tabernacle.

And to calculate: How many cubits high was the Tabernacle? It was ten cubits, as it is written: "Ten cubits shall be the length of a beam" (Exodus 26:16). How many handbreadths do these ten cubits contain? They contain sixty handbreadths. And one third of that total is how many? It is twenty handbreadths. Subtract from this figure ten handbreadths of the Ark and the Ark cover upon which the cherubs stood, and ten handbreadths remain, which was the height of each individual cherub. And it is written: "And the cherubs shall spread out their wings upward, screening [*sokhekhim*] the Ark cover with their wings" (Exodus 25:20). Here the Merciful One is referring to the wings using the terminology of roofing [*sekhakha*] specifically when they are ten handbreadths above the Ark cover. This is a source that the roofing of the *sukka* is placed at least ten handbreadths high.

The Gemara asks: And from where is it known that their wings were spread above their heads, from which it is derived that roofing is ten handbreadths high? Perhaps they were spread level with their heads. In that case, the ten handbreadths derived would include the roofing, leaving the interior space of the *sukka* less than ten handbreadths high. Rav Aha bar Ya'akov said that it is written: "Spread out their wings upward," indicating that the wings were above their heads. The Gemara asks: If so, say that the wings were extremely high to an unspecified height. The Gemara answers: Does the verse say: Upward, upward? It says upward only once, meaning slightly over their heads. There is proof from the verses that the roofing was at least ten handbreadths off the ground.

The Gemara asks: This calculation works out well according to Rabbi Meir, who said that all the cubits in the Tabernacle and the Temple were intermediate cubits,⁹ consisting of six handbreadths; however, according to Rabbi Yehuda, who said that the cubit used in the dimensions of a building in the Temple was a cubit consisting of six handbreadths, but the cubit used in the dimensions of vessels was a cubit consisting of only five handbreadths, what is there to say?

Based on that calculation, how many handbreadths was the height of the Ark and the Ark cover? They totaled eight and a half handbreadths. The height of the Ark was one and a half cubits, which, based on a five-handbreadth cubit, equals seven and a half handbreadths. Including the additional handbreadth of the Ark cover, the total height is eight and a half handbreadths. If the cherubs were one third of the height of the Tabernacle, which is twenty handbreadths, eleven and a half handbreadths remain for the height of the cherubs, over which their wings were spread. Therefore, say that for a *sukka* to be fit for use its interior space must be eleven and a half handbreadths high. However, there is no recorded opinion that requires a *sukka* with that dimension.

Rather, according to Rabbi Yehuda, the Sages learned the minimum height of a *sukka* as a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai. As Rabbi Hiyya bar Ashi said that Rav said: The measures in various areas of *halakha*, e.g., olive-bulk, dried fig-bulk, egg-bulk, and the various *halakhot* of interpositions that serve as a barrier between one's body and the water in a ritual bath and invalidate immersions, and the dimensions and nature of halakhic partitions are all *halakhot* transmitted to Moses from Sinai. They were not written in the Torah; rather, they were received in the framework of the Oral Law.

Measures by Torah law – שיעורי תורה: All measures by Torah law are *halakhot* transmitted to Moses from Sinai (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Ma'akhalot Assurot* 14:2).

One who enters a house afflicted with leprosy – הנכנס לבית המנוגע: One who enters a house afflicted with leprosy becomes ritually impure immediately. With regard to his garments, if he was carrying them, then they, too, become ritually impure immediately. If he was wearing them, they become ritually impure only if he remained in the house for a period of time sufficient to eat half a loaf of bread (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Tzara'at* 16:7).

NOTES

This entire verse is stated for the purpose of teaching measures – כִּל הַפְּסוּק הַזֶּה לְשִׁיעוּרֵי נֶאֱמַר: According to this opinion, not only is there an allusion to these measures in the verse, but a *halakha* is derived from it as well: All of these measures are based on the produce of Eretz Yisrael in terms of both size and quality (*Sefat Emet*).

שיעורין? דאורייתא ניהו! דכתיב: "אֶרֶץ חִטָּה וְשֵׁעוּרָה וְגִבְעָה וְתַאֲנָה וְרִמּוֹן אֶרֶץ זֵית שֶׁמֶן וְדִבְשָׁן, וְאָמַר רַב חֲנַנִּי: כֹּל הַפְּסוּק הַזֶּה לְשִׁיעוּרֵי נֶאֱמַר.

The Gemara questions this assertion: Are measures a *halakha* transmitted to Moses from Sinai? **They are written in the Torah,^h as it is written: "A land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and figs, and pomegranates, a land of olive oil and honey"** (Deuteronomy 8:8), and Rav Hanin said: **This entire verse is stated for the purpose of teaching measuresⁿ with regard to different *halakhot* in the Torah.**

חִטָּה לְבֵית הַמְּנוּגַע, דְּתַנּוּ: הַנִּכְנָס לְבֵית הַמְּנוּגַע, וְכִלּוֹ עַל כֵּתָפוֹ, וְסַנְדְּלָיו וְטַבְּעוֹתָיו בְּיָדוֹ – הוּא וְהֵן טְמֵאִין מִיָּד.

Wheat was mentioned as the basis for calculating the time required for one to become ritually impure when entering a house afflicted with leprosy, as we learned in a mishna: **With regard to one who enters a house afflicted with leprosy^h of the house (see Leviticus, chapter 14), and his clothes are draped over his shoulders, and his sandals and his rings are in his hands, both he and they, the clothes, sandals, and rings, immediately become ritually impure.**

A dressed person in a house afflicted with leprosy – אדם לבוש בבית המנוגע: One who entered a house afflicted with leprosy becomes ritually impure immediately. The clothing he was wearing, however, remains ritually pure as long as he does not stay in the house for the period of time it takes to eat a half-loaf of wheat bread with a condiment. The volume of a half-loaf of bread is three egg-bulks according to the Rambam, and four egg-bulks according to Rashi and the *Tur* (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Tzara'at* 16:6).

A bone the size of a grain of barley – עצם כשעורה: A bone from a corpse that is at least the size of a grain of barley impurifies people or objects that come into contact with it or carry it, but that impurity is not transmitted by a tent (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Tumat Met* 3:2).

A quarter-log of wine for a nazirite – רביעית יין לנזיר: A nazirite who drinks a quarter-log of wine is flogged, as he has violated a Torah prohibition (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 5:2).

A dried fig-bulk with regard to carrying out on Shabbat – כגרוגרת להוצאת שבת: If one carries a dried fig-bulk of food that is fit for consumption by people from one domain to another on Shabbat, he is liable for performing the prohibited labor of carrying out on Shabbat (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shabbat* 18:1).

Ritual purification of vessels belonging to ordinary homeowners – טהרת כלי בעלי בתים: If a wooden vessel designated as used by an ordinary homeowner has a hole large enough for a pomegranate to pass through, it is considered broken. If it was ritually impure, it reverts to a state of ritual purity (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot Kelim* 6:2).

BACKGROUND

Dried fig-bulk – כגרוגרת: The dried fig-bulk is the measure for which one is liable for performing any form of prohibited labor involving food on Shabbat. Consequently, one who bakes less than a fig-bulk of bread is not liable to bring a sin-offering. Likewise, one who carries food from one domain to another is liable to bring a sin-offering only if he carried a fig-bulk of food. A fig-bulk is slightly larger than an olive-bulk, but smaller than a date-bulk. Its precise size is subject to dispute.

Perek I

Daf 6 Amud a

היה לבוש כלי וסנדליו בגליו, וטבעותיו באצבעותיו – הוא טמא מיד, והן טהורים עד שישהה בכדי אכילת פרס, פת חטין ולא פת שעורין, מיסב ואוכל בליפתו.

However, if he was dressed^h in his clothes, and his sandals were on his feet, and his rings were on his fingers, he immediately becomes ritually impure, but they, the clothes, sandals, and rings, remain pure until he stays in the house long enough to eat half a loaf of bread. This calculation is based on wheat bread,ⁿ which takes less time to eat, and not on barley bread, and it relates to one who is reclining and eating it together with relish or a condiment, which hastens the eating. This is a Torah measurement connected specifically to wheat.

שעורה – דתנן: עצם כשעורה מטמא במגע ובמשא, ואינו מטמא באהל.

Barley is also used as a basis for measurements, as we learned in a mishna: **A bone from a corpse the size of a grain of barley^h imparts ritual impurity through contact and by being carried, but it does not impart impurity by means of a tent, i.e., if the bone was inside a house, it does not render all the articles in the house ritually impure.**

גפן – כדי רביעית יין לנזיר.

The halakhic measure determined by a vine is the quantity of a quarter-log of wine for a nazirite.^{nh} A nazirite, for whom it is prohibited to drink wine, is liable to be flogged if he drinks that measure.

תאנה – כגרוגרת להוצאת שבת.

Fig alludes to the measure of a dried fig-bulk^b with regard to the *halakhot* of carrying out on Shabbat.^{hn} One is liable for carrying food fit for human consumption on Shabbat, provided that he carries a dried fig-bulk of that food.

רמון – דתנן: כל כלי בעלי בתים שיעורן כרמונים.

Pomegranate teaches the following measure, as we learned in a mishna: **All ritually impure wooden vessels belonging to ordinary homeowners become pure through being broken,^h as broken vessels cannot contract or maintain ritual impurity. They are considered broken if they have holes the size of pomegranates.**

NOTES

Wheat bread, etc. – פת חטין וכו': All these measures are stringencies as they curtail the periods of time required to become impure: Wheat bread is eaten more quickly than barley bread, one who sits comfortably can eat faster, and similarly, one who dips his bread in a condiment is able to eat it more quickly.

A quarter-log of wine for a nazirite – רביעית יין לנזיר: The early commentators wondered with regard to this measurement (see *Tosafot*), as ostensibly this is not a measure; rather, it is the definition of the prohibition itself. Rashi and others explain that the quarter-log discussed here is a measure specific to wine, as opposed to other liquids. Since wine is thicker

than water, one measures the volume of the quarter-log prohibited to a nazirite using wine (see Rashi). More simply, the quarter-log of wine prohibited to a nazirite is not measured with a cup of water but with a cup of wine, which is slightly greater both in terms of weight and in terms of density.

A dried fig-bulk with regard to carrying out on Shabbat – כגרוגרת להוצאת שבת: This measure is not unique to the *halakhot* of carrying on Shabbat; rather, it also applies to prohibited labors involving preparation of food. The reason that carrying is mentioned here is that this measure appears explicitly in that context, and therefore no elaboration is necessary (*Emek Sukkot*).