



Likkutei Sichos

Volume 21 | Terumah | Sichah 3

Reclaiming the Menorah

Translated by Mendel Greenbaum

General Editor: Rabbi Eliezer Robbins | **Senior Editor:** Rabbi Y. Eliezer Danzinger

Content Editor: Rabbi Zalmy Avtzon

© Copyright by Sichos In English 2024 ◦ 5784

A note on the translation: Rounded and square brackets reflect their use in the original *sichah*; curly brackets are interpolations of the translator or editor. The footnotes in curly brackets are those of the translator or editors and do not correspond to the footnotes in the original. Words in bold type are italicized in the original text.

Considerable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the translation while maintaining readability. As in all translations, however, the possibility of inadvertent errors exists.

Feedback is appreciated — please send comments to info@projectlikkuteisichos.org

1.

UPSIDE-DOWN GOBLETS

Our Sages say¹ about the design of the goblets on the Menorah: “What did they resemble? They were like Alexandrian cups.” Rambam explains (in his *Commentary on Mishnah*)² that this refers to a goblet whose base is narrow.³ Rambam similarly codifies this as law⁴ (in *Sefer HaYad*):⁵ “The goblets resembled Alexandrian cups. They had wide mouths and narrow bases.”

We find here something astonishing: There is an illustration of the Menorah that Rambam himself drew by his holy hand (in his *Commentary on Mishnah*),⁶ in which the goblets are depicted upside down — the broad end of the goblets (“their mouths”) face toward the base of the Menorah. In contrast, the narrow part (“their bases”) faces upwards. Namely — it is an image of an upturned (Alexandrian) cup!

Although Rambam himself presents there⁷ the disclaimer that his illustration was intended only to depict “**its general design**” — “the knowledge of the number of goblets... and their placement...” — but not “their **exact** configuration” —

[Which {explains} why he depicts the goblets in a “**triangular** shape,” despite an Alexandrian cup not actually being fully triangular⁸ — as understood plainly, the base of a cup never comes to a full point (as it could never then be set

¹ *Menachos* 28b; *Beraisa* of “Work of the *Mishkan*,” ch. 10.

² On *Menachos*, end of ch. 3; Rashi, however, on *Menachos*, ad loc. (as well as in his Torah commentary on *Shemos* 25:31) takes a different approach. See also *Sefer HaZikaron* on Rashi’s commentary, *ibid*.

³ This is the wording in Rav Kapach’s translation {into Hebrew, from the Arabic original} (all quotations below of Rambam’s words in his *Commentary on Mishnah* will be from this translation. The popular version of *Commentary on Mishnah* has a variant wording, though with a similar meaning).

⁴ {Rambam’s magnum opus, the *Mishneh Torah*, is alternatively known as the *Sefer HaYad* or *Yad HaChazakah*.}

⁵ *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” ch. 3, par. 9.

⁶ A facsimile of this illustration was printed in the Kapach edition of *Commentary on Mishnah*; and to facilitate study — reproduced {in the Yiddish original, *Likkutei Sichos* vol. 21, p. 172}.

⁷ *Commentary on Mishnah*, loc cit.

⁸ As stated explicitly right beforehand in *Commentary on Mishnah* (“and you may surmise... that they were somewhat cut off at the top...”).

down)⁹ — they were just “narrow” (especially) relative to the breadth of “their mouths.”]

— This, however, does not justify depicting them **inverted** (with the bases — facing upwards and the tips — facing downwards) “upside-down.”¹⁰

[This is particularly {perplexing on account} of Rambam being precise in every respect and detail — it would, therefore, be entirely unreasonable to presume that Rambam depicted the goblets **inverted** {from their actual positions} (and did so in the case of every goblet) — twenty-two times!]

2.

RAMBAM’S VIEW

Therefore, it would be fairer to say the straightforward explanation that Rambam depicted the goblets in such a fashion¹¹ because he was of the view that this was actually their correct position on the Menorah (either because of a tradition that had been passed from teacher to student throughout the generations),¹² or because he found it described as such in a midrash of our Sages that is no longer extant. [**Similarly**, we find several instances where Rambam (and other *Rishonim*) discuss concepts whose source is a midrash (or the like) that is unknown to us.]

⁹ See *Pesachim* (64a): “The bowls did not have {flat} bases {to ensure that they not be set down}....”

¹⁰ See *Ralbag al HaTorah* on *parshas Terumah*: “Their bases faced the end from which the branch extended from the central shaft of the Menorah.” This is evident as well from *Chizkuni* and *Bechor Shor* ad loc. that the goblets would be filled with oil when the lamps would be filled to overflow. See below, Section 5 and fn. 26.

¹¹ Some examination is needed for the (Arabic — translated into Hebrew) commentary of Rabbi Avraham, **the son of Rambam** (published London, 5718): “The appearance of the cups were wide at the top and narrow at the bottom,” which has similar implications to the commentaries cited in the previous fn. We may say that these words refer to the **general** form of these (Alexandrian) cups. He does not presume to detail whether they were positioned on the Menorah right-way-up or upside-down — in which case he would be in agreement with his father. — See in sec. 8 below, regarding Rabbi Avraham’s conformity with his father’s opinion.

¹² Akin to what he writes in his introduction to *Commentary on Mishnah* (s.v., “*VeKa’asher Meis Yehoshua*”) that {despite discussion in the Talmud} it could never have been possible for there to actually be any doubt as to the meaning of “the beautiful fruit” {as reference to an Esrog}, for it would have been taken {for the mitzvah} every year.

He makes no mention of this in the *Sefer HaYad*¹³ for the same reason he does not reproduce his illustrations included in his *Commentary on Mishnah* (despite the many discernible details in these illustrations that are not evident in his *Sefer HaYad*).

This may be for any number of reasons, including (a) **from the outset**, they (the illustrations) were not part of the format of *Mishneh Torah*; (b) this is to be understood in light of what is known¹⁴ as to how much Rambam minimized to the extreme citing anything **not stated explicitly** in the Talmud and its contemporaries; and (c) many of these details, in his view, do not inhibit {the fulfillment of those mitzvos} **at all**. And for additional reasons.

This topic may be discussed at greater length; however, to do so is beyond the scope of the present work.

3.

REVERSED WINDOWS

The above resolves and explains the Rambam. However, there remains the question: Why are the goblets of the Menorah inverted — upside-down?

This is particularly strange, as we find that the beams of the Mishkan were required to be “standing in **the manner of their growth**”¹⁵ specifically — “the bottom downwards, and the top upwards.”¹⁶ We derive¹⁷ from this a **general rule**, “a person does not fulfill his obligation for all mitzvos unless they are {performed with the mitzvah-item positioned} in the direction of their growth.” — Why, then, should the goblets be **inverse** to their “direction of ‘growth’”?

¹³ **Footnote added after the original publication:** There has since been published a **manuscript** of the *Sefer HaYad*, where in “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” ch. 3, end of par. 10 (there appear the words “and this is its design,” and) there is an illustration of the Menorah (as there is in his *Commentary on Mishnah* — and there, too, the goblets are depicted with **mouths downwards and their bases upwards** (as in the illustration in th Rambam’s holy handwriting). The branches, as well, extend **diagonally** (see below section. 8).

¹⁴ See *Yad Malachi*, “Principles of Rambam,” sec. 2 and 4.

¹⁵ *Sukkah* 45b.

¹⁶ Rashi ad loc. s.v., “*Derech Gedilasan*.”

¹⁷ *Sukkah* ibid; see citations in *Gilyonei HaShas* (by Rabbi Y. Engel) ad loc.

This may be clarified in light of a similar idea regarding the general concept of the Menorah:

Regarding the light of the Menorah, our Sages teach:¹⁸ “I {Hashem} have not need of its light... it testifies to all the world’s inhabitants that the Divine Presence rests among the Jews.” — The light of the Menorah was not intended to illuminate the area in which it is placed (the *Mishkan* and the *Beis HaMikdash*), for **on the contrary** — there, He has no need for its light. Rather, it is “testifies to all **the world’s inhabitants** that the Divine Presence rests among the Jews.”

For this reason, as well¹⁹ the design of the windows in the *Beis HaMikdash* was the **reverse** of regular windows — they were instead “open and closed”²⁰ — “open without and closed within”²¹ (broad on the outside and narrow on the inside), as the commentaries explain:²²

A window is {generally} built so that the window’s opening is broader within than without. This is done so the outside light may be diffused towards all the extremities of the room as well. The windows of the *Beis Hamikdash*, however, were the **reverse** — “they were narrow within, and continued to widen towards the outside. This was done so that the light would extend beyond the *heichal* and **illuminate the world**,”²³ for the Menorah’s light was to serve as — a “testimony to all inhabitants of the **world**....”

¹⁸ *Menachos* 86b.

¹⁹ *Menachos*, *ibid*; see as well *Vayikra Rabbah* sec. 31, par. 7; *Tanchuma* (“*Tetzaveh*,” ch. 6; “*Behaalosecha*,” ch. 2).

²⁰ *Melachim I* 6:4.

²¹ This is the version found in the manuscript of Rashi on *Menachos* 86b and in *Shitah Mekubetzes*, *ad. loc.* Even according to our version of *Menachos*, which states (and Rashi there adopts this version), “open within and closed without,” the meaning is that it was narrow on the inside and broad on the outside (see Rashi and *Chidushei Aggados Maharsha*, *ad. loc.*).

²² Manuscript Rashi on *Menachos* *ibid*; This appears also in the *midrashim* cited in fn. 19 {fn. 17 in the original}.

²³ In the words of the ms. Rashi on *Menachos*, *loc. cit.*

4.

IRRIGATING GOBLETS

A similar explanation may be offered regarding the goblets:

*Rabbeinu Bechayei*²⁴ explains the **symbolism** of the goblets on the Menorah: A goblet is “a vessel that has a receptacle, {from which} it irrigates and nourishes.” He explains this alludes to “the spheres, which receive powers of the **lofty realms** and **confer** power to the **lowly** world.”

The emphasis here is — the **conveyance**²⁵ from the lofty to the lowly, “it irrigates and nourishes.”

A cup's (primary) function does **not** lie in its function as a receptacle — that is analogous to the function of a “barrel” and the like, which might contain water, wine, etc.

A cup, however, is a vessel through which the water, etc., from the “barrel” (or “spring” and the like) extends and “irrigates and nourishes” a person drinking.

It emerges that *Rabbeinu Bechayei*'s above explanation conforms with the above-mentioned teaching of our Sages (regarding the **general** concept of the Menorah), “**I** do not **require** its light (rather) it testifies to all the world's inhabitants...” — The purpose of the Menorah's light (lies not in what “**I** require” — its receptivity — but rather it) is to illuminate the world (outside). In the words of *Rabbeinu Bechayei*: to **confer** “to the lowly world.”

²⁴ On *Shemos* 25:31 (quoted in the book *Toras HaOlah*, vol. 1, ch. 20); similarly in the commentary by the *Rikanti* on the Torah, *Shemos* 25:33.

²⁵ As emphasized in the words of the *Rikanti*, *ibid*, “they receive... **to confer**...,” (and not “they receive... and confer,” as in the *Bechayei*, *ibid*) — unlike the commentary of the *Akeidah* (*Terumah*, Gate 49) {who describes} their function (just) as that of **receiving**. See fn. 24 in the original.

5.

UPTURNED GOBLETS

We may understand, in light of this explanation, the reason why the goblets **on the Menorah** were fashioned in such a way that their rims face downward and their bases upward:

When goblets are used (temporarily) for the sake of “containing” {such as occurs} when “one recites *kiddush* over the cup,” they are positioned so that their rims are upwards and bases downwards (for only then can they contain liquid).²⁶

Since, however, the goblets of the Menorah are symbolic of the idea of “irrigating and providing,” they were the opposite: They were positioned oppositely, with their mouths downwards and bases upwards (as a cup is **upturned** for the liquid to flow from it).

Similarly, in the context of our discussion: Since the light of the Menorah needs to illuminate the “inhabitants of the world” who are (spiritually) lower than the *Beis HaMikdash* [or in the above words of Rabbeinu Bechaye, to confer “to the **lowly** world”], the goblets **of the Menorah** were therefore positioned with their mouths downwards and bases upwards (akin to the windows of the *Beis HaMikdash* being “open and closed,” the **opposite** of the way the windows of a house are built).

²⁶ As written in *Chizkuni* and *Bechor Shor* cited above fn. 10 {fn. 9 in the original}; see also fn. 24 in the original.

6.

OPEN WIDE

In light of the above, we can also explain the symbolism and lesson for a person's *avodah*²⁷ derived from the goblets' openings, which "were wide and {their} bases were narrow":

Since the goblets allude to "irrigating and providing," we understand the necessity for "their mouths be **wide**."

When influencing another Jew, or (in more general terms) engaging in the *avodah* of making a dwelling place in the lower realms for Hashem ("it is testimony to all the inhabitants of the world"), to accomplish this, a person requires the greatest abundance, until it transcends all boundaries and limitations. He must (accept for himself to) engage with the greatest powers. {This is the significance of} its mouth (through which the cup receives **into it**) being wide.

Now, if we are discussing an *avodah* that focuses on a **person himself** when the person finds himself at the beginning of his *avodah*, or even later, and still, his *avodah* is (for whatever reason) constrained²⁸ — his **position** is analogous to the mouth of a cup facing upward.

However, when it comes to the *avodah* of interacting with another Jew, especially the *avodah* of making the world into a dwelling place for Hashem, a person must know that he must transcend limitations here. The **broad end** — towards the (receiver — the) bottom.

²⁷ {Divine service.}

²⁸ {It is only limited} relative to the "breadth" and limitlessness of his *avodah* with regards to another person, for the truth of the matter is that even the *avodah* that deals only with oneself must be performed "with all your might." See below, fn. 34.

[This is akin to what was once spoken at length²⁹ regarding the difference between the donations for the sockets (and donations of half-shekels) on the one hand,³⁰ and the donations for the *Mishkan* on the other:³¹

The donations for the sockets (and of half-shekels) were restricted to discrete articles (silver half-shekel coins). In contrast, the donations for the *Mishkan* comprised all categories of creation — the inanimate, vegetative growth, and animal life (and given by “each man... whose heart motivates him”³² — human beings). —

This was because the donations for the sockets (and half-shekels) symbolize (as seen from the placement of the sockets) the start of a Jew’s *avodah*. Regular *avodah* must follow its set order — it begins with the recitation of *modeh ani*,³³ and only then climbs from level to level, etc.

The donations for the *Mishkan*, however, symbolize the general *avodah* of making a sanctuary for Hashem’s presence — a dwelling place in the lower realms. In this service, there are no limitations.³⁴ It comprises **all** elements of the world.]

²⁹ *Likkutei Sichos* vol. 11, p. 113 ff (and fn. 51 ad loc.).

³⁰ {The sockets that upheld the beams of the *Mishkan* were cast from silver donated from a collection of half-shekel coins contributed by each male over the age of twenty. The proceeds of all other half-shekel collections were used for communal sacrifices.}

³¹ {The materials used in the construction of the *Mishkan* came from a general campaign in which all Jews gave as much as they could}

³² *Shemos* 25:2.

³³ {The prayer recited immediately upon awakening in which a person submits himself entirely to Hashem, this is reminiscent of the sockets which acted as the base and foundation of the *Mishkan*.}

³⁴ See also *Or HaTorah*, “*Terumah*” (p. 1351), that the donations for the *Mishkan* (as described in *parshas Terumah*) represents the concept of {submission} “**with all your might.**”

7.

MANNER OF GROWTH

This also alludes to the idea that although “all mitzvos” need to be performed specifically “in the manner of their growth” — as is cited regarding (and learned from) the *lulav* and {the rest of the four} species³⁵ — nevertheless, the goblets of the Menorah were positioned **in reverse** to “the manner of their growth”:

Every mitzvah, and the four species in particular, correspond to the entire continuum of creation. Therefore, they generally need to be in “order” and “regulated” “in the manner of their growth.”

Therefore, the convention for fulfilling a mitzvah³⁶ is in such a way that it follows “the manner of their growth.”

The goblets **themselves** were also fashioned so that “their bases are narrow and their mouths are wide.” However, when they are a (beaten) part of the Menorah, with **their** function in the Menorah being to provide and irrigate to the lowly, to illuminate **outside** — they are associated with a person transforming his nature and accustomed behavior — he must go out of “himself”; consequently, (the windows of his house are “wide and narrow,” and) the goblets’ mouths are downwards and bases upwards — the reverse of their “manner of growth,”

And his *avodah* and influence below comes from a “**wide**” mouth — transcending limitations and definitions.



³⁵ *Sukkah* 45b.

³⁶ As well as the placement of the *Mishkan*’s beams, which make up the wall that **divides** between the *Mishkan* and “outside” (the world).

8.

STRAIGHT BRANCHES

There is an additional detail in Rambam's hand-drawn illustration of the Menorah that contrasts with its usual depictions. The six branches of the Menorah extend (from the center shaft) diagonally, in straight lines, unlike the regular illustrations of the Menorah in which they extend in semi-circles.

Regarding **this** detail, there may be room to say, {albeit} with great difficulty, that Rambam depicted it this way “for sake of ease when illustrating.” However, Rabbi Avraham, son of Rambam³⁷ explicitly states in his commentary that the “six branches... extend upwards from the center shaft of the menorah in **straight lines**, as depicted by my father and teacher, o.b.m, and not in semi-circles as depicted by others.”

In his Torah commentary,³⁸ Rashi states similarly that the branches “{were coming out of its sides...} **diagonally**, extending upwards.”

From this discussion, it emerges that the usual sketches of the Menorah conform neither with the opinion of Rashi nor with Rambam's illustration!

³⁷ On *Shemos* 25:32.

³⁸ On *Shemos* 25:32.

9.

RAMBAM'S MENORAH

The author of the *Mishnas Chassidim*,³⁹ in his book entitled *Maaseh Choshev*⁴⁰ (which discusses the work of the *Mishkan*), writes straightforwardly that the six branches “extend **circularly**.”

He then explains that although it is evident from Rashi's commentary⁴¹ that “they were not circular” — “Rambam, however, in his magnum opus,⁴² does not use the term ‘diagonal’ but rather writes⁴³ {simply} that they ‘extended upwards.’” He then cites the author of *Chochmas HaMishkan*⁴⁴ who writes that from this it “seems... that the branches rose somewhat circularly.” *Maaseh Choshev* then concludes: “And this is more reasonable for in this way they are comparable to the heavenly orbits⁴⁵... to which the **seven**⁴⁶ lamps correspond.”

However, in my humble opinion, since *Maaseh Choshev* writes explicitly that his basis for learning that they “extended in a semi-circle” is from the vagueness of Rambam's wording in his magnum opus (“[he] does not use the term ‘diagonal’”), from which it “**seems**... that they rose somewhat circular” [and “this is more **reasonable**...”] —

Once the illustration of the Menorah in Rambam's **very own** holy handwriting was publicized,⁴⁷ together with the **testimony** of the Rambam's son regarding this [with the emphasis that his father's depiction {of the branches} as “**straight lines**” was with purposeful intent — {intimating that}

³⁹ {Rabbi Emanuel Chai Ricci (5448-5503).}

⁴⁰ Ch. 7.

⁴¹ On *Shemos* 25:32.

⁴² *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” ch. 3, par. 10.

⁴³ “And similarly in the *Beraisa* of ‘Work of the *Mishkan*,’ (ch. 10) as well as in the Talmud (*Menachos* 28b)” — *Maaseh Choshev* *ibid*.

⁴⁴ By Rabbi Yosef Shalit Riqueti ({published} Mantua, 5436).

⁴⁵ Note that the orbits are associated with {the kabbalistic levels referred to as} **circles** (*Eitz Chayim*, “*Shaar Igulim VeYosher*,” sec. 3; “*Shaar Tziyur Olamos Abiya*,” ch. 2; et al).

⁴⁶ Exhaustive examination is needed to determine whether he means to explain that the center lamp should also be “somewhat circular”!

⁴⁷ **Footnote added after original publication:** See above fn. 13 that the same appears in a manuscript of the *Sefer HaYad*, in which case it has been revealed that there is not any ambiguity even in Rambam's magnum opus

they have this specific form and are “not as semi-circles...”] — his⁴⁸ conclusions are tenuous and unfounded.⁴⁹

With all due respect, it seems clear in my humble opinion that had *Maaseh Choshev* and the author of the *Chochmas HaMishkan* seen Rambam’s illustration and the commentary of Rabbi Avraham, son of Rambam, they too would have written that there is no argument here and that all are truly of the opinion that the branches were “straight.”

[This is akin to what the Alter Rebbe writes in his *Shulchan Aruch*⁵⁰ that “many of the texts authored by the *Rishonim*⁵¹ were not yet published in the era of the *Acharonim*⁵²... accordingly, one should not rely....]

10.

CORRECTING MISCONCEPTIONS

If the above is accurate, it would be proper to renew our efforts in this regard⁵³ — that all those who produce illustrations of the Menorah (in order to facilitate the study of the Menorah’s appearance **in the *Mishkan* and *Beis HaMikdash***) should depict the branches diagonally, as is the opinion of Rashi (whose explains **the simple meaning of Scripture**) and Rambam. (Moreover, in light of the above discussion, we may conclude that **there is no one who disputes this.**)

⁴⁸ {In the original, “the foundation is void as well as the building.”}

⁴⁹ In general, I have not merited to understand at all the proof that since Rambam **doesn’t specify** otherwise, it would seem that they were “somewhat circular” — for word *קנה* is used in **numerous places** in Scripture, and in most of those places it **unequivocally** refers to a **straight line**, and I have yet to find even one instance where it **must** be construed differently.

⁵⁰ Beginning of “Laws of Sale of Chametz” (printed as an addendum to “Laws of Pesach” — Kehot edition, 560b). See also Alter Rebbe’s *Shulchan Aruch*, “*Yoreh De’ah*,” end of ch. 189, par. 113, sub-par. 43.

⁵¹ {Lit., “the early ones,” referring to the Rabbis who lived circa. 1000-1500 C.E.}

⁵² {Lit., “the later ones” referring to the Rabbis who lived after 1500 C.E.}

⁵³ {In the original, “to return the crown to its former [glory].”}

Similarly, those educational institutions and the like whose logos on their “letterhead stationery” and the like include an illustration of the Menorah with its branches set as semi-circles —

since the purpose of these illustrations is to act as a reminder of the Menorah in the *Mishkan* and *Beis HaMikdash* — it would be more than appropriate to change the illustration and depict the branches diagonally.⁵⁴

11.

THE NON-JEWISH MENORAH

From this we come to an additional idea:

The common image of the Menorah (with the six branches as semi-circles) is presumably a copy of the relief of the Menorah created by **Gentiles in Rome**, for the Victory Arch of Titus, may his name be erased!⁵⁵

When the wicked Titus destroyed the *Beis HaMikdash*, he instructed that the vessels of the *Beis HaMikdash* be conveyed to Rome, and “in honor” of this wicked person, they constructed a “Victory Arch” in Rome that carries his name: “The Arch of Titus.” On this Arch, they created a mural depicting the vessels of the *Beis HaMikdash* that they captured being transported, including the Menorah — and in this image of the Menorah on the Arch of Titus, the six branches are in semi-circles.

⁵⁴ In light of this, there would be room to say that it would be appropriate to make the branches of Chanukah Menorahs, diagonal, as well. — There is already no concern of transgressing the prohibition of making a “Menorah in the form of the Menorah {of the *Beis HaMikdash*}” (*Avodah Zarah* 43a; *Mishneh Torah* “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” ch. 7, par. 10; *Shulchan Aruch* “*Yoreh Deah*,” end of sec. 141), as we change the **number** of branches (see *Avodah Zarah*, *Mishneh Torah*, and *Shulchan Aruch*, *ibid.*), so what reason is there to change the the actual form of the Menorah whose branches were straight and not circular.

⁵⁵ As noted by Rabbi Yosef Kapach in his edition of Rambam’s *Commentary on Mishnah*; as well in *Torah Sheleimah*, vol, 22, addenda, p. 32.

Aside from the image of the Menorah on the Arch of Titus being entirely inaccurate⁵⁶ — as is plainly understood, the Romans invented this image to depict the dominance and rule of Rome over the Jews. This is all the more evident by the numerous places where the words “*Judaea Capta*” (“Yehudah (Jews) is defeated”) are engraved. There were periods in history in which the Jews were forced to come to the Arch to see all that was inscribed and depicted to thereby degrade them, etc., etc.

It emerges that the depiction of the Menorah’s branches as semi-circles (as they are depicted on the Arch of Titus) should call forth a great cry — in addition to the main point that this depiction conflicts with the opinions of Rashi and Rambam, etc. — for this is to a certain extent a confirmation, etc., G-d forbid and Heaven forbid, of the image on the Arch of Titus, which was created to hurt the Jews and degrade them!

The design of the Menorah should remind and arouse a Jew about his role to serve as a “light unto the nations”⁵⁷ — “it is testimony **to all inhabitants of the world** that the Divine Presence rests among the Jews.”⁵⁸ Instead, the Menorah is depicted in a way that calls to mind the exact opposite — how Rome was victorious over the Jews, Heaven forbid!

⁵⁶ As many have noted, this image of the Menorah lacks legs, which is inconsistent with the explicit description in *Menachos* (28b) that it indeed had legs.

⁵⁷ *Yeshayahu* 42:6; 49:6.

⁵⁸ Note *Yalkut Shimoni*, “*Melachim*” (sec. 185): “The Menorah ... corresponds to the seventy nations. As long as the lamps were kindled, the nations were **subjugated**.”

12.

THE FUTURE MENORAH

May it be Hashem's will that the true and ultimate redemption come very soon. Then we will have the literal, perfect Menorah,⁵⁹ in the third *Beis HaMikdash*, and all will see how the Menorah looks.

We will then be together with Moshe and Aharon,⁶⁰ and we will see with physical eyes — “and our eyes will see”⁶¹ — the fulfillment of the command, “Speak to Aharon..., ‘When you light up the lamps’”⁶² — the kindling of the Menorah, in actuality and speedily in our days, *mamash*.

— From talks delivered on Shabbos *parshas Matos-Masei*, Shabbos *parshas Devarim*, and the first day of Rosh Chodesh Elul, 5742 (1982)

⁵⁹ For all of Moshe's deeds are permanent (see *Sotah* 9a; *Tzafnas Paneach al HaTorah* on the beg. of our *parshah*; et al).

⁶⁰ *Tosafos* on *Pesachim* 114b, s.v., “*Echad*”; see also *Yoma* 5a.

⁶¹ {*Siddur*, “*Shmoneh Esreh*.”}

⁶² {*Bamidbar* 8:2.}