



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Menachos Daf Nun Hey

- A Braisa says, we separate terumas maaser from fresh figs for dried figs based on number in a place where it is customary to allow figs to become dried figs. However, we do not separate from dried figs for fresh figs even in a place where it is customary to allow figs to become dried figs.
 - **Q:** The first part of the Braisa seems to say that if it is not customary to allow figs to dry then fresh figs may not be separated for dried figs. What case is the Braisa referring to? If there is a Kohen there to accept the terumas maaser it should be allowed even if it is not customary, because a Mishna says that when there is a Kohen there we separate terumah from superior produce!? Rather, it is obvious that the case is that there is no Kohen there. However, the next part of the Braisa seems to imply that even if it is customary to allow the figs to dry we may not separate from dried figs for fresh figs. If the Braisa is discussing where there is no Kohen, why can't that be done? A Mishna says that when there is no Kohen there, we should separate from produce that can last longer rather than from superior produce! It must be that the case is that there is a Kohen there. Can we say that the first part refers to where there is no Kohen and the second part refers to where there is a Kohen!? **A:** Yes, the first part refers to where there is no Kohen and the second part refers to where there is a Kohen.
 - **R' Pappa** said, we see from here that it is better to say that a Braisa is referring to two different cases rather than to say that a Braisa is the view of two different Tanna'im.

MISHNA

- All menachos are kneaded with lukewarm water and must be guarded that they don't become chametz.
 - If the shirayim of the mincha becomes chametz, he is oiver on a lo saaseh.
- The requirement to guard the mincha from becoming chametz is based on the pasuk of "kol hamincha asher takrivu laHashem lo sei'aseh chametz".
 - One would be chayuv malkus for the kneading, the shaping, or the baking of a chametz mincha.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that he is oiver a lav for allowing the shirayim to become chametz? **A:** This is based on the pasuk that says "lo sei'afeh chametz chelkam", which **Reish Lakish** explains to mean that even the Kohen's piece may not be baked as chametz.
 - **Q:** A Braisa uses this pasuk for a different drasha, to teach that a person is chayuv malkus for each step in the process of the making of the chametz mincha (e.g. the kneading, the baking, etc.)!? **A:** **Reish Lakish** is darshening the word "chelkam".
 - **Q:** Maybe say that the pasuk is only for the drasha of **Reish Lakish** and not like the Braisa uses it? **A:** The fact that the pasuk says "lo sei'afeh chametz chelkam" instead of "chelkam lo sei'afeh chametz", we can learn both drashos.
 - **Q:** Why does the Braisa say that this pasuk teaches that each step in the process would bring a separate chiyuv malkus? Why not say that baking brings malkus, as stated in the pasuk, but with regard to the other steps one is only chayuv one set of malkus for all of the steps? **A:** Baking was part of the general issur of "lo sei'aseh chametz" and was taken out of the general issur with the pasuk of "lo sei'afeh". We have a rule that in such a case the thing taught when it is removed from the general pasuk is meant to apply to everything in the general rule.

- **Q:** Why don't we instead say that "lo sei'aseh" is a klal and "lo sei'afeh" is a prat, and say it is a klal uprat, where the rule is that the klal only includes the item in the prat, and would therefore only include baking?
A: R' Aftoriki said, the reason we don't say this is that the klal and the prat are not near each other, and therefore they are not darshened in this way.
- **Q: R' Ada bar Ahava** asked, is it true that a klal and prat that are not near each other are not darshened in this way? A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the Nasi's chatas says that it should be shechted in the place that an olah is shechted. This teaches that the chatas should be shechted in the north. Now, we have a pasuk that teaches that every chatas should be shechted in the place that an olah is shechted, so why is the pasuk regarding a Nasi's chatas needed? It is needed to teach that if it is not shechted in the north it is passul. Maybe say instead that the pasuk is teaching that only this chatas needs to be shechted in the north, but other chataos need not be shechted in the north? That can't be, because the pasuk of chatas in general says it should be shechted in the place that an olah is shechted. Now, the Braisa seems to say that if not for the pasuk regarding all chataos we would say that the pasuk regarding the Nasi's chatas teaches that only that chatas needs to be shechted in the north but other chataos do not need to be shechted there. Presumably, this would be because we would darshen the general pasuk and the pasuk regarding the Nasi's chatas as a klal uprat even though the pesukim are far from each other!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the pasuk of the Nasi's chatas is written first, which makes it a case of prat uklal, which normally serves to include all. The fact that we don't darshen it like this shows that we don't darshen the pesukim that are far from each other.
 - The Gemara says, the reason the requirement to be shechted in the north would have been limited to the Nasi's chatas, if not for the additional pasuk, is because of the word "oso" in the pasuk of the Nasi's chatas, which would seem to teach that only this chatas must be shechted in the north.