

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Measurements (cont.)

The Gemara accepts the final interpretation of the verse in Yechezkel.

R' Yochanan teaches the size of a medium amah.

R' Yosi bar Avin cites our Mishnah in support of this teaching.

The inference that there are large and small amos is confirmed.

2) Shushan

A Mishnah is cited that teaches that an image of Shushan the capital of Persia was drawn on the Eastern Gate of the Beis HaMikdash.

Two explanations are offered to explain why Shushan was drawn above the gate.

Two other sources that reflect the obligation to show respect to royalty are recorded.

Another unrelated debate involving the same Amoraim who debated the explanation for drawing Shushan above the eastern gate of the Beis HaMikdash is cited.

Chizkiyah and Bar Kapara debate the same issue.

3) Lechem hapanim

A Baraisa elaborates on the verses that discuss the lechem hapanim.

Rebbi's ruling that we look at extra loaves as if they are not there is unsuccessfully challenged.

4) Aligning the utensils of the Beis HaMikdash

A Baraisa elaborates on the Mishnah's statement that the utensils of the Beis HaMikdash were aligned according to the length of the Beis HaMikdash.

The last statement of the Baraisa is explained.

A Baraisa is cited that proves that the poles of the Aron Kodesh must run east to west.

R' Yehudah proves that the poles of the aron Kodesh rested along the width of the Aron.

A Baraisa discusses the ten shulchanos that Shlomo HaMelech made for the Beis HaMikdash.

Another Baraisa discusses the ten menoros that Shlomo HaMelech made for the Beis HaMikdash.

The location of the shulchanos is discussed.

A Baraisa presents a disagreement between Rebbi and R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon regarding the alignment of the shulchanos.

Each Tanna cites the source for his position and the exchange between them is cited.

A series of unsuccessful challenges to R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon's position that the tables were aligned north to south, is recorded. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

The ten Shulchanos and ten Menoros of Shlomo

תנו רבנן עשרה שולחנות עשה שלמה המלך

We find in our Gemara that Shlomo HaMelech made ten shulchanos and ten menoros. Rabeinu Bachya (to Shemos 25:10) wonders how this was possible. The Torah clearly commands for the Mikdash to have only one Shulchan and one Menorah, so it seems that the addition of more of these furnishings would be in violation of the Torah's command not to add to the mitzvos (בל תוסיף). Rabeinu Bachya answers that it must be that although the Mishkan was to have only one Shulchan and one Menorah, God instructed Moshe that when the Beis HaMikdash would be built that ten of each should be made. This was a tradition which was unwritten, but passed on through the generations until Shlomo implemented it.

There is a hint to the number ten in both the dimensions of the Shulchan and the construction of the Menorah. The height of the base of the Shulchan was one amah and a half, which is a total of nine tefachim, and the board of the table itself was one tefach thick, for a total of ten tefachim height. The Menorah is commanded to be constructed according to its design, but the word used in the command to build it is "תיעשה—it shall be made," a word which contains an extra letter "yud," which is the numerical value of ten. These numerical hints indicate that the number ten was implanted in the original command to build these furnishings.

Meshech Chochmah (Shemos 27:20) notes that the dimensions of the Sanctuary of the Mishkan in the desert were ten amos by thirty amos by ten amos tall. This room was furnished with one Shulchan. The dimensions of the main Sanctuary of the Beis HaMikdash were twenty by sixty by thirty height, which was twelve times the size of the Sanctuary of the Mishkan (thirty-six thousand cubic amos as opposed to three thousand cubic amos). Accordingly, in order to fully illuminate the larger area, it would have been appropriate for Shlomo to furnish the Beis HaMikdash with a total of twelve Menoros, and not just ten. However, Shlomo added only ten in addition to the Menorah of Moshe. Five Menoros were placed along one wall of the Sanctuary and five along the other wall, with the Menorah of Moshe in the middle. If eleven additional Menoros were placed, one side would have had an extra Menorah. Because only ten Menoros were added, he also placed ten additional Shulchanos, not eleven.

The Achronim discuss whether these extra Shulchanos and Menoros were also placed in the Second Beis HaMikdash. Riv"van writes that these extra tables and candelabras were not found in the Second Beis HaMikdash, and this is why the Mishnah (Shekalim 6:3) does not mention them. Others (Tos. Rid, Tiferes Yisroel) note that they were featured in the Second Beis HaMikdash. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Correct alignment of the Chanukah Menorah in the Beis HaKnesses

תנו רבנן מזרח ומערב היו מונחין וכו'

The Rabbis taught: The [Menorah] was aligned from east to west etc.

Our Gemara presents a dispute between Rabbi and R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon regarding the correct alignment of the Menorah in the Beis HaMikdash. Rabbi maintains that the Menorah was aligned east to west so that the westernmost lamp was to the west and the easternmost lamp was to the east. In this configuration the westernmost lamp stands before God (See Vayikra 24:3) more than the others since that lamp was closest to the Kodesh Kodoshim. R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon disagrees and maintains that the Menorah was aligned from north to south. The wick of the middle lamp was tilted to the west as opposed to the other lamps whose wicks tilted towards the middle and for that reason the middle lamp is described as "the western lamp" - נר מערבי - more so than the other lamps. Rashi¹ describes the Menorah consistent with Rabbi's position whereas Rambam² describes the Menorah consistent with R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon's position.

Terumas HaDeshen³ discusses the correct placement of the Chanukah Menorah in the Beis HaKnesses. Should it be aligned from east to west or from north to south? He writes that seemingly the matter depends upon whether one subscribes to Rabbi's position or R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon's opinion. Since the Gemara Eruvin (46b) teaches that the halacha follows Rabbi's position when he disagrees with a colleague, it would seem that the Menorah should be aligned

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why was a picture of Shushan drawn on one of the gates of the Beis HaMikdash?

2. What is the meaning of the word על?

3. What is the source that the Aron was carried by four people?

4. What is the point of dispute between Rabbi and R' Elazar the son R' Shimon?

from east to west. Despite this principle, however, Rambam and others subscribe to R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon's position that the Menorah was aligned from north to south. In fact, he notes that different places have different customs about this matter and some align the Chanukah Menorah in the Beis HaKnesses east to west and others from north to south. Shulchan Aruch and Rema⁴ follow the position that the Menorah should be placed by the southern wall and aligned from east to west. Mishnah Berurah⁵ adds that one need not protest against those places that have the custom to align the Chanukah Menorah from north to south since there are opinions that support that position. ■

1. רש"י לבנדבר ח:ב.
2. רמב"ם פי"ג מהלי בית הבחירה ה"ח.
3. שו"ת תרומת הדשן ס"י ק"ד.
4. שו"ע ורמ"א או"ח ס"י תרע"א סעי' ז'.
5. מ"ב שם ס"ק מ"ב. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Know from Whence You Came

"חד אמר כדי שידעו מהיכן באו..."

On today's daf we find that there was a picture of Shushan HaBirah on top of the eastern gate of the Har HaBayis. One reason why is to remind them from whence they came. Rabbeinu Gershon explains that they put the picture there themselves to remind them of God's kindness. This teaches the importance of hakaras hatov.

Many wonder why Rav Chaim of Volozhin, ז"ל, didn't sign on the famous

cherem of the Vilna Gaon against the chassidim. Some posit that this was for technical reasons. But Rav Shalom Schwadron, ז"ל, explains the real reason. "Rav Chaim of Volozhin refrained from signing due to his gratitude to a certain great rebbe. He held that just as Moshe rabbeinu did not hit the Nile due to having received a favor from it, the same held true regarding himself and the chassidim.

"Once when he was just a young man he went wandering in exile, much like his rebbe the Vilna Gaon. When he arrived in Alik, a chassidic town, he went to the beis midrash and began learning—without even asking for food. The people saw that he was learning with diligence and sent

him food, as was normal in those days. Shortly after he arrived in the city, he became violently ill. Rav Hirsch of Alik, ז"ל, the rebbe of the city, ordered his chassidim to send for a doctor and deal with all of Rav Chaim's needs. They paid the high doctor's fees and procured everything necessary for Rav Chaim's convalescence in the town's hospital. Even when Rav Chaim felt somewhat better, Rav Hirsch insisted that he remain in the hospital until he was entirely recovered. Because of their efforts, Rav Chaim felt that signing the cherem would be forbidden since it would be a marked lack of hakaras hatov."¹ ■

1. שאל אביך ויגדך, ח"ב, ע' ר"פ. ■