

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The height of the Beis HaMikdash (cont.)

The lesson that is learned from the verse measuring the height of the Beis HaMikdash from the height of the keruvim is explained.

2) Keruvim

Ravnai in the name of Shmuel asserts that the keruvim stood miraculously and did not occupy space.

Six challenges to this assertion are presented and left unresolved.

R' Yochanan and R' Elazar disagree which direction the keruvim faced.

Each Amora explains the other's verse.

A Baraisa is cited that supports one of the opinions.

3) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses the right of passage one has if he owns a pit located in another's house.

4) Locking the pit

R' Elazar explains why both the pit owner and the homeowner have a lock to the pit.

5) MISHNAH: The Mishnah presents laws related to the right of passage for one to access his garden located behind his friend's garden.

6) An easement for a water channel

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel discusses what is included in an easement to channel water through a friend's field.

There is a disagreement about who has the right to plant in the two strips of land that are adjacent to the banks of the canal.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What two objects did not occupy space?

2. What is the proper way for a student to take leave of his rebbi?

3. What is included in the sale of a canal?

4. Why does the Gemara think that the Mishnah indicates that one may not take the law into his own hands?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The miraculous positioning of the keruvim

כאן בזמן שישראל עושין רצונו של מקום, כאן בזמן שאין ישראל עושין רצונו של מקום

Our Gemara discusses the positioning of the two keruvim. It is clear that they were two separate figures, and the question is simply whether they faced each other or whether they faced the main chamber of the Beis HaMikdash. Yet, the Rishonim note that the Gemara in Yoma (54a) tells us that when the Jews made their pilgrimage to Yerushalayim for the festivals, the curtain of the Kodesh Kodoshim was rolled up in order to show the nation how the two keruvim embraced, thus demonstrating Hashem's love for the Jewish people. Also, Reish Lakish says (ibid., 54b) that when the gentiles entered the Beis HaMikdash to destroy it, they found the keruvim embracing, and they derided the Jews for having such an image in their temple. Were the keruvim separate figures, or were they one figure of two embracing cherubs?

The Rishonim explain that they were two distinct figures, but a miracle occurred and the two figures embraced during the festivals to show the Jews that Hashem loved them, and at the time of the destruction in order to set the stage to punish the invading gentiles who destroyed the Beis HaMikdash and ridiculed the Jews.

The Mishnah in Avos (5:5) lists ten miracles that took place in the Beis HaMikdash. Tosafos Yeshanim in Yoma (21a) notes that the miracle that the keruvim did not take up any space in the Kodesh Kodoshim is not listed in that Mishnah, nor does it mention the miracle that the ark did not take up any space. He answers that the Mishnah in Avos only lists those phenomena which were clearly noticeable to all, but it does not mention things which happened within the walls of the Beis HaMikdash. He then notes that the miracle of the **לחם הפנים** is noted, in that a flaw (**פסול**) was never found in it, although the bread was placed within the walls of the Kodesh. He answers that the **שולחן** was removed for display during the festivals, when the people would be shown Hashem's love for them in that the bread remained fresh and warm for the entire week. Therefore, the miracle of the bread is not considered an internal miracle. Finally, according to this, Tosafos Yeshanim (54a) points out that the keruvim were also shown to those who came for the festivals, when they saw how they embraced and that Hashem loved the Jews. Why, then, is the miracle of the positioning of the ark and the keruvim not considered an external miracle, which should have been listed in the Mishnah in Avos?

פרשת דרכים explains that the Mishnah in Avos only lists miracles which transpired in the Beis HaMikdash daily, and not those which occurred irregularly. This is why the positioning of the keruvim and their embracing is not listed, as these miracles depended on the Jews' fulfilling the will of Hashem. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Correct placement of the bimah

ולמאן דאמר פניהם איש אל אחיו הא כתיב "ופניהם לבית"

And according to the opinion who said that the keruvim faced one another what is to be done with the pasuk that says that they faced the "House."

Rambam¹ writes that the bimah should be placed in the middle of the Beis Haknesses so that during Torah reading the congregants should be able to hear. This implies that were it not for the reason of facilitating the congregants to hear, it would be unnecessary to place the bimah in the middle of the Beis Haknesses. Kesef Mishnah², in fact, writes that it is not obligatory to place the bimah in the middle of the Beis Haknesses and the correct placement is different in each Beis Haknesses based on its size and layout. Chasam Sofer³ demonstrates that it is mandatory to place the bimah in the middle of the Beis Haknesses from the Gemara in Sukkah (51b). The Gemara there describes the services of the Beis Haknesses in Alexandria, Egypt. The bimah was placed in the middle but they still had to develop a system of signals to let people know when and what to answer since it was so large that they could not hear the chazzan. This clearly indicates that even when it is not a matter of hearing the services, since it was too big for people to hear anyway, nevertheless, they were obliged to place the bimah in the middle of the Beis Haknesses.

Teshuvos Yehudah Ya'aleh⁴ writes pertaining to the correct location for the bimah in the Beis Haknesses that there is no issue or even uncertainty about the matter that the bimah belongs in the middle of the Beis Haknesses. Proof to the principle that one should not change the design and layout of a Beis Haknesses is found in our Gemara's discussion of the keru-

(Overview...continued from page 1)

The point of dispute is explained.

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel rules that one may repair the canal with dirt from the host's field.

This ruling is successfully challenged forcing Shmuel to emend his ruling.

7) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses issues related to a public path through one's field.

8) Taking the law into one's own hands

The Gemara infers from the ruling of the Mishnah that one may not take the law into his own hands to protect his proprietary interests.

Two reasons why one cannot draw this inference are presented. ■

vim. The Gemara challenges the opinion which assumes that the keruvim faced each other from the pasuk that states that the keruvim faced the Beis Hamikdash. One could question how the Gemara could note a contradiction between verses that describe the keruvim of Shlomo Hamelech with the pesukim that describe the keruvim of Moshe Rabbeinu, perhaps they were designed differently. It must be that Chazal assumed that Shlomo Hamelech would never change the design of the keruvim that were manufactured for the Mishkan. Similarly, when designing a Beis Haknesses which is a miniature Beis Hamikdash (מקדש מעט) one may not deviate from the design of the Beis Hamikdash which had the mizbeach in the center. ■

1. רמב"ם פי"א מהלי תפלה ה"ג.

2. כסף משנה שם.

3. שו"ת חתם סופר או"ח סי' כ"ח.

4. שו"ת יהודה יעלה ח"א או"ח סי' ג' הג"ה מבן המחב. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The place of the tablets

"מקום ארון...אינו מן המניין"

Although chassidic "tischen" are very often inspiring, sometimes the pushing that goes on at such places is scandalous. At times, certain rebbes have done their utmost to limit the shoving so that everyone is able to best experience the holiness afforded to those with enough menuchas hanefesh to feel it.

During one of the many weeks that

the son of the Me'or VaShemesh, Rav Aharon of Cracow, zt"l, spent Shabbos by his rebbe, the Tiferes Shlomo, zt"l, the rebbe praised him publicly. It was at the tisch and many of the chassidim were jostling each other trying to get as near to the rebbe as possible. Despite the pushing, Rav Aharon remained in a corner of the room, listening intently but not making any effort to procure a closer spot.

After the rebbe concluded his deeply inspiring Torah lesson, he commented on Rav Aharon's behavior. "Our rabbis teach in Bava Basra 99 that although all

the vessels of the Beis HaMikdash took up space, the aron did not. It is surely significant that the luchos were kept in the aron which didn't take up any space, and not in the other vessels which did.

"This parallels what we find with Rav Aharon standing in the corner there. Although he did not jostle to make himself closer, you will find that he knows the Torah very well. This is precisely why: when a person doesn't push ahead and attempt to take up anyone else's space, he will find that the luchos, the Torah, is within him!"¹ ■

1. מובא בספר שיח שרפי קודש ■