

28 Tishrei 5779
Oct. 7, 2018



Menachos Daf 58

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

Shtei Halechem

The *Gemora* asks: And to what purpose does Rabbi Yochanan use the term ‘*them*’?

The *Gemora* answers: He requires it for that which was taught in the following *braisa*: One might think that an individual can donate and offer the *shtei halechem* (*the two breads offered on Shavuos together with the two lambs*), and we would say regarding this the verse: *what comes out of your lips (a pledge to bring a sacrifice) you should observe to do*. This is why the verse states: *You (plural) should offer them as a first offering to Hashem*. This indicates that only the public may bring them but not an individual. One might think that an individual cannot donate such an offering, as there is no such obligatory offering for them, but the public can decide to donate a public *shtei halechem*, as there is an obligatory *shtei halechem* from the public. This is why the verse states: *them*. And what is offered as an obligation? The Two Loaves which are leavened and the *bikkurim* (*the first ripe fruits of any of the seven species with which the Torah praises Eretz Yisroel, which had to be brought to the Beis Hamikdosh in Yerushalayim*) which are brought from honey.

The *Gemora* asks: But was it not permissible to offer the *shtei halechem* as a donated offering? Surely it has been taught in a *braisa*: Since the Torah has stated ‘*any leavening*’ (*which we use to derive that one is liable for*

offering even a half of a komeitz); why has it also stated ‘*any honey*’ (*to teach the same law regarding bikkurim*)? And since it has stated ‘*any honey*,’ why has it also stated ‘*any leavening*’? It is because there is a leniency which applies to leavening but not to honey, and there is also a leniency which applies to honey but not to leavening.

The *braisa* explains: Leavening has an exception in that it is permitted in the Temple, but honey never has any exception in the Temple. Honey is permitted to be used in the remainder of a *minchah* offering (*it is permitted to knead or fry the remainder of the minchah with honey*), but leavening is not permitted to be used in the remainder of a *minchah* offering. Therefore, since there is a leniency which applies to leavening but not to honey, and there is a leniency which applies to honey but not to leavening, the Torah needed to state ‘*any leavening*’ and also ‘*any honey*.’

To what did the *braisa* refer when it stated that leavening has an exception in that it is permitted in the Temple? Does it not mean the *shtei halechem*, which may be offered as a donated offering?

Rav Amram deflects the proof by saying that the *braisa* is referring to that which was offered together with the *shtei halechem* (*the fact that the loaves were chametz does not prevent the offering of the two lambs on the altar*).

The *Gemora* asks: But accordingly, it should be the same with the *bikkurim*, for we have learned in a *Mishna*: The doves that were upon the baskets of *bikkurim* were sacrificed as *olah* offerings, but those which the people carried in their hands were given to the *Kohanim*! [So why did the *braisa* state a distinction between the *shtei halechem* and the *bikkurim*?]

The *Gemora* answers: The doves were only brought to adorn the *bikkurim* (and they were not brought as an obligation; they therefore cannot be considered offerings which accompany the *bikkurim*). (58a)

Offering on the Altar Incorrectly

Rami bar Chama inquired of Rav Chisda: What is the law if one offered upon the altar the meat of a bird *chatas* (which is supposed to be eaten)? The Torah prohibits burning on the altar only parts of an offering that already had portions of it thrown to the fires of the altar, however, this offering (the bird *chatas*) has no portions of it offered upon the fire (for it is completely eaten by the *Kohanim*); or perhaps the prohibition applies to anything which is referred to as an offering, and this too is called an offering?

He answered: It refers to anything which is referred to as an offering, and this too is called an offering.

The *Gemora* notes that the *Tannaim* differ on this point in the following *braisa*: Rabbi Eliezer says: The prohibition refers only to an offering that already had portions of it thrown to the fires of the altar; but Rabbi Akiva says that it refers to anything which is referred to as an offering.

Rav Chisda said that the difference between them would be with respect to the meat of a bird *chatas*. Rav said: The difference between them would be in regard to the *log* of

oil of a *metzora*, for Levi taught that the expression, 'their every offering' (when the Torah is mentioning items which are gifted to the *Kohanim*) includes the *log* of oil of the *metzora*. [This is an example of something which is referred to as an offering, but it does not have any part of it cast to the fires of the altar.] (58a)

How Much?

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: You shall not burn leaven on the altar. From this I would only know that he is liable for the whole (measure of leaven; which will be explained shortly), but where do I know that he is liable even for part of it? It is because it is written: Any leaven. And from where do I know that one is liable for a mixture (of something leaven and unleavened)? It is because it is written: For any leaven.

Abaye explains the *braisa*: You shall not burn leaven on the altar. From this I would only know that he is liable for an olive's volume (*k'zayis*) of leaven; but where do I know that he is liable even for half a *k'zayis*? It is because it is written: Any leaven. And from where do I know that one is liable for a mixture (of something leaven and unleavened)? It is because it is written: For any leaven.

Rava explains the *braisa* as follows: You shall not burn leaven on the altar. From this I would only know that he is liable for a *komeitz* (scoopful) of leaven; but where do I know that he is liable even for half a *komeitz*? It is because it is written: Any leaven. And from where do I know that one is liable for a mixture (of something leaven and unleavened)? It is because it is written: For any leaven.

The *Gemora* explains their point of difference: Abaye maintains that the *komeitz* may be less than the size of two olives, and therefore it emerges that there can be a burning on the altar even for a quantity less than a *k'zayis*.



[If a komeitz is less than two olives, then, when the Torah forbids burning “half of it,” it must be referring to an amount less than a k’zayis.] Rava, however, maintains that the komeitz is not less than the size of two olives, and therefore it emerges that there cannot be a burning on the altar for a quantity less than a k’zayis.

It was stated: If someone offered leaven and honey upon the altar, Rava says that he incurs lashes once for offering leaven, another one for offering honey, one for offering a mixture of leaven, and a fourth set of lashes for offering a mixture of honey. Abaye said: One does not receive lashes on account of a generalized prohibition. [A *lav sheb’chlolus* - generalized prohibition is one that incorporates several prohibitions. Abaye maintains that one cannot receive lashes on account of these verses, for they each include the prohibition against burning a mixture of it as well.]

Some say that he receives one set of lashes, but others say that he does not incur lashes at all, since the prohibition is not specific to it, as that of the prohibition against ‘muzzling’ (while working; in order to receive lashes for violating a negative prohibition, it must be similar to the prohibition against muzzling – the prototypical prohibition in the Torah). (58a – 58b)

DAILY MASHAL

The Truth!

Our Gemora cites the verse: *what comes out of your lips (a pledge to bring a sacrifice) you should observe to do.*

The Chazon Ish zt”l would pray *minchah gedolah* each day at 12:30. Once it was hard to assemble a *minyan* in the synagogue at his home for that time. A tenth person was found a quarter of an hour later but a new problem arose. Once of those present asked the Chazon Ish, “I invited

someone to my home at 1:00 and because of the prayer, he will have to wait for me. What should I do?”

“There’s no question,” the Chazon Ish replied. “The *minyan* will disband because of you but you won’t budge from the truth.” And the *minyan* disbanded (*Midvar Sheker Tirchak*, 143).

GLOSSARY

shte halachem (the two breads offered on Shavuot together with the two lambs)

bikkurim (the first ripe fruits of any of the seven species with which the Torah praises Eretz Yisroel, which had to be brought to the Beis Hamikdash in Yerushalayim)