

27 Elul 5778
Sept. 7, 2018



Menachos Daf 28

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Sprinklings not for its Own Sake

Mishna

The master had stated: Regarding the seven sprinklings of the blood of the red heifer – if they were done not for their own sake, they are invalid, but if they were not directed correctly (*towards the entrance of the Sanctuary*), they are valid. However, this is contradicted from another *braisa* which states: if they were done not for their own sake, or they were not directed correctly, they are valid.

Rav Yosef answers: There is no difficulty, for the first *braisa* reflects the view of Rabbi Eliezer, and the other that of the Rabbis. The *Gemora* explains: Rabbi Eliezer, who compares an *asham* to a *chatas* (*regarding the disqualification of “not for its own sake”*), compares the log of oil (*of the metzora*) to an *asham* (*and therefore, he rules that it’s invalid*); the Rabbis, however, do not make the analogy between *chatas* and *asham* (*therefore, they rule that it still is valid*).

The *Gemora* asks: And according to Rabbi Eliezer, can we say that something which is derived through a *hekesh* can then turn around and teach something else through a *hekesh*!?

Rather, Rava says, both *braisos* are reflecting the viewpoint of the Rabbis, but the second *braisa* is referring to the offering’s validity, whereas the first *braisa* is referring to acceptance. [*When a sacrifice is offered not for its own sake, it is valid, but it does not count towards the owner’s obligation.*] (28a)

The seven branches of the *Menorah* are essential to one another. Its seven lamps are essential to one another. The two texts written in a *mezuzah* are essential to one another; and even one letter invalidates them. The four texts of the *tefillin* invalidate one another; and even one letter is essential to them. The four texts written in *tefillin* are essential to one another; and even one letter is essential to them. The four *tzitziyos* (*fringes placed on a four-cornered garment*) are essential to one another, since the four of them constitute one *mitzvah*. Rabbi Yishmael said: The four of them constitute four *mitzvos*. (28a)

Menorah

The reason each branch of the *Menorah* is essential is because it is written, “*being*.”

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: The *Menorah* was made from one single mass and from gold (*it could be made from other materials, but the preference is gold; many of the requirements are only if it was made of gold*). If it was made from scraps of gold, it is invalid. If it was made from any other metal, it is valid (*even if it was not from one piece*). The Torah writes: *it shall be made* to include other metals.

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps it is to include scraps!

The *Gemora* answers: You cannot think so, for the expression “*being*” refers to “*beaten out of*” (*and therefore, it needs to*

be one piece even when made from other metals). [This is because “being” is closer to “beaten out of” than to “gold.”]

The Gemora asks: But does not the expression “it shall be made” also refer to “beaten out of”?

The Gemora answers: The Torah stated, “beaten out of” “beaten out of” twice, indicating that it is essential (to be made from one solid piece).

The Gemora asks: But is it not also written, “gold” “gold” twice, so that this too is essential?

The Gemora answers: It is well if you hold that it is invalid if made out of scraps but it is valid if made out of another metal, for then the repetition of the words “gold” and “beaten out of” will be used for the expositions which follow. However, if you hold that it is valid if made out of scraps and it is invalid if made out of other metals, what will you derive from the repetition of the words “gold” and “beaten out of”?

The Gemora cites a braisa which expounds these terms: *Of a kikar (talent) of pure gold he shall make it, with all these implements.* If it is made of gold it must be a kikar in weight; if it is not made of gold, it need not be a kikar.

It is written: *Its goblets, its knobs, and its flowers.* If it is made of gold, there must then be goblets, knobs and flowers; if it is not made of gold, it does not need goblets, knobs, or flowers.

The Gemora asks: Perhaps if it is not made of gold, it does not need branches!?

The Gemora answers: It cannot be, for that would be called a candlestick (and not a Menorah).

The braisa continues: *And this was the workmanship of the Menorah, beaten out of gold.* If it is made of gold, it must be

beaten out of one piece; if it is not made of gold, it does not need to be beaten out.

And the second expression of “beaten out of” is used to exclude the trumpets (*of Moshe*), for it was taught in a braisa: The trumpets were made from one single mass and from silver. If they were made from scraps of silver, they are valid. If they were made from other metals, they are invalid.

They are invalid if made from other metals because it is written “of silver” together with “being.” They can, however, be made from scraps, for the Torah stated in connection with the Menorah “beaten out of.” We therefore derive that it must be beaten out, but not the trumpets.

The Gemora cites a braisa: All the vessels that Moshe made were valid for his generation and for future generations. The trumpets, however, were valid for his generation, but not for future generations.

The Gemora notes that this cannot be derived from the fact that the Torah states, “make for yourself,” for if so, we would be compelled to say that the Holy Ark was valid only for Moshe’s generation, for it is written by it, “and make a wooden Ark for yourself.” Rather, “make for yourself” by the trumpets means that he should use his own funds, or Hashem was telling him, “As it were, I would prefer that you use your funds over theirs (but taking from the communal funds will be recognized to Me as if you took from your own).” It must be derived from the fact that the Torah says “for yourself” twice.

Rav Pappa the son of Rav Chanin taught the following braisa before Rav Yosef: The Menorah needed to be made from one single mass and from gold. If it was made from silver, it is still valid. If, however, it was made from tin, lead or metallic alloy, Rebbe rules it to be invalid, but Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah rules it to be valid. If it was made from wood, bone or glass, everyone agrees that it is invalid.

Rav Pappa explained the dispute: Both masters interpret the verse by using the principle of “generalization and a specification.” [This means that the rule must be like the specific item.] They differ, however, regarding this: Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah concludes that just as the material specified (*gold*) is clearly a metal, so too all metals are permitted (*but not wood*); but Rebbe maintains that just as the material specified is a valuable one, so too only valuable metals (*like silver*) are permitted (*but not tin or lead*).

Rav Yosef said to him: Set aside your version of this teaching in favor of mine, for it has been taught in a *braisa*: If the sacred service vessels were made of wood, Rebbe rules it to be invalid, but Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah rules it to be valid. In what do they differ? Rebbe interprets the verse using the principle of “generalization and a specification,” whereas Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah interprets it by the method of “extension and then a limitation.”

He explains: Rebbe interprets the verse using the principle of “generalization and a specification,” as follows: *You shall make a Menorah* is a generalization; *from pure gold* is a specification; *beaten out shall the Menorah be made* is another generalization. It emerges that we have here a “generalization – specification - generalization” teaching, in which case you may only include such things that are similar to the item specified; and just as the material specified (*gold*) is clearly a metal, so too all metals are permitted (*but not wood*). Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah, however, interprets the verse by an “extension and then a limitation” method, as follows: *You shall make a Menorah* is an extension; *from pure gold* is a limitation; *beaten out shall the Menorah be made* is another extension. It emerges that we have here an “extension – limitation - extension” teaching, in which case they include everything. What is included? Everything. And what is excluded? Earthenware.

Rav Pappa asked him back: On the contrary, set aside your version of this teaching in favor of mine!

Rav Yosef replied: You cannot say like that, for it was taught in a *braisa*: If there was no gold available for it (*the Menorah*), it may be made from silver, copper, iron, tin or lead. Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah ruled that it would be valid even if it was made from wood. But it was taught in a different *braisa*: One is prohibited from building a house in the form of the Temple Sanctuary. One cannot make a courtyard similar to the Courtyard of the Temple. One is forbidden from creating a table corresponding to the *Shulchan* in the Temple. One is forbidden from creating a candelabrum corresponding to the *Menorah* in the Temple. One is permitted, however, to create a candelabrum which has five, six or eight branches. He is not allowed to make a candelabrum that has seven branches, even if he constructs it from other metals. Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah maintains that one may not make a candelabrum out of wood either. Proof to this is brought from the fact that the Hasmonean kings made the *Menorah* out of wood (*when they could not afford to construct it from gold*). The Rabbis said to him: Can any proof be deduced from there? The branches consisted of spits of iron overlaid with tin. When they grew richer they made them out of silver, and when they grew still richer they made them out of gold! [Evidently, Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah maintains that the *Menorah* may be constructed from wood.]

Shmuel said in the name of an old scholar: The height of the *Menorah* was eighteen *tefachim* (*handbreadths*): three *tefachim* for the legs at the base and the flower upon it; two *tefachim* are plain; one *tefach* for a goblet, knob and flower. Again two *tefachim* are plain; one *tefach* for a knob - out of which two branches come forth, one on each side, extending and rising to the same height as the *Menorah*. Then one *tefach* was plain; one *tefach* for a knob out of which two branches come forth, one on each side, extending and rising to the same height as the *Menorah*. Then again one *tefach* was plain; one *tefach* for a knob out of which two branches come forth, one on each side, extending and rising to the same height as the *Menorah*. Then two *tefachim* were plain. There now remained three *tefachim*, in which space were

three goblets, a knob and a flower. The goblets were like Alexandrian cups; the knobs like Ceratian apples; the flowers resembled the flowers made into columns. It emerges that there were twenty-two goblets, eleven knobs, and nine flowers. The goblets are essential to each other. The knobs are essential to each other. The flowers are essential to each other. (28a – 28b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Menorah With Seven Stems

One is prohibited from building a house in the form of the Beis Hamikdosh. One cannot make a courtyard similar to the courtyard of the Beis Hamikdosh. One is forbidden from creating a menorah corresponding to the menorah in the Beis Hamikdosh. He is not allowed to make a menorah that has seven stems even if he constructs it from other metals. Rabbi Yosi maintains that one may not make a menorah out of wood either.

The sefer Shoel U'meishiv wants to answer the famous Beis Yosef's question with this *halachah*. The Beis Yosef asks why do we eight days of Chanukah when the miracle was only for seven days? There was enough oil found for one complete day. He answers that it is forbidden to make a menorah with seven stems. This is forbidden even if it is not in the precise dimensions of the menorah in the Beis Hamikdash. Chanukah could not be seven days since the menorah couldn't have seven stems.

A Seven-branched Candelabra for Shabbos

Our *Gemora* addresses the prohibition of making articles identical to those in the Temple: "A person must not make a structure like the *heichal*, a porch like the *ulam*, a courtyard like the *'azarah*, a table like the Table or a candelabra like the *menorah*. But he may make a five-, six- or eight-branched candelabra but he mustn't make a seven-branched

candelabra, even from a different sort of metal." The source of this prohibition is in the verse (Shemos, 20:20) "You shall not make (anything) with Me" - "in the form of my functionaries that serve me" (Avodah Zarah 43a, see Tosafos Rosh Hashanah 24a s.v. *bidmus*). Some halachic authorities maintain that it is forbidden to make objects whose form and measurements are **identical** to those of the Temple objects (*Chacham Tzvi*, Responsa, 60). Mahari Kolon (*shoresh 75*) disagrees and believes that it is also forbidden to make an object that **resembles** the objects of the Temple .

Sealing a branch in the candelabra: This halachah is pertinent to daily life as our *Gemora* explains that the *menorah* in the Temple is kosher even if not made of gold, is missing the decorative knobs or flowers and not made all of one piece. Therefore, it is easy to fall prey to the prohibition of making a *menorah* like the *menorah* of the Temple. A family once purchased a candelabra for Shabbos with seven branches and after paying attention to the problem, they had to seal up one branch.

Chanukah for eight days because of the Chanukah lamp: An interesting reason was suggested why Chanukah has eight days, though the miracle lasted only seven days (see *Beis Yosef*, O.C. 670), due to the fact that one cannot make a Chanukah lamp with seven branches! (*'Eidus LeYisrael* by HaGaon Rav Y. Weltz, etc).

According to many Acharonim (see *Zevach Todah*; *Sefer HaMaftaiach*, *Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*, 3:3; *Sheivet HaLevi*, III, 106), our *sugya* indicates an interesting halachah. A *menorah* not made of gold is indeed kosher for its function even without cups, knobs or flowers, but a **golden menorah** is not kosher without its specified decorations. Accordingly we could conclude that we may make a seven-branched golden candelabra as it differs from the form of the golden *menorah* in the Temple, which was not considered a *menorah* without its decorations. Still, Rabbi Akiva Eiger zt"l (in his commentary on *Shulchan 'Aruch*, Y.D. 141:8) cites the author of *Bechor Shor*, who forbids making a golden *menorah*

as, according to Mahari Kolon, it is also forbidden to make an object which **resembles** an object in the Temple .

HaGaon Rav S. Wosner (ibid) offers two explanations as to why the *Bechor Shor* forbade making a seven-branched golden candelabra, though such an object could not serve in the Temple as a *menorah* (see ibid, that the words of Maharik are not decisive) .

The Vilna Gaon (*Shulchan Aruch*, ibid) indicates that once we realize that a *menorah* not made of gold is kosher without its decorations, we must conclude that the decorations are not the main features but merely additions. We thus understand why one mustn't make a golden seven-branched candelabra, even without its decorations as that is the major form of the *menorah* .

Another explanation to understand the *Bechor Shor's* opinion is based on a rule previously mentioned several times in our publication about the distinction between the function of the objects of the Temple as utensils and their function as part of the Temple building. It seems, says Rav Wosner, that the mitzvah of lighting the lights is not prevented in the absence of the menorah's details. However, if it lacks them, it is not considered part of the Temple and therefore it must be provided with knobs and flowers. It is therefore obvious why one mustn't make a seven-branched golden candelabra even without its decorations (see ibid, that he concludes that it does not seem so from Rambam and the issue must still be settled).

Chandeliers: Rav Wosner asserts (ibid, X, 129) that a hanging chandelier without a central branch is not considered a candelabra like the menorah in the Temple and is allowed.

Rabbi Akiva Eiger's fear of prohibitions: Apropos, we should mention the story told by HaGaon Rav Ch.Sh. Birnbaum zt"l, Rabbi Akiva Eiger's son-in-law (in the preface to Responsa *Rachash Leivav* and in his letter in *Igros Soferim*). In his father-in-law's home there was a seven-branched chandelier

without a central branch but Rabbi A. Eiger instructed to add another branch because of his anxiety, though there is no prohibition. Indeed, a craftsman was ordered to do so and he almost ruined the chandelier because of the great bother of the job.

DAILY MASHAL

613 Mitzvos or Only 610?

Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Akiva disagreed in Sotah 3a about three verses as to whether they are mitzvos or merely permission. Tosfos (ibid) question that according to Rabbi Yishmael, that they are only permission, the number of mitzvos totals only 610. The author *Meishiv Tziyon* solves the problem according to our mishnah: we count the mitzvah of *tzitzis* as one, but according to Rabbi Yishmael it consists of **four mitzvos**, bringing the total to 613 (*Ma'yanah shel Mishnah*).