



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

### Menachos Daf Nun Vuv

- **Q:** The Gemara had explained that 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. Now that we do have the additional pasuk, what does the word "oso" come to exclude? **A:** It is needed as darshened in a Braisa, which says that the pasuk teaches that only it – the Nasi's chatas discussed in the pasuk – needs to be shechted in the north, but the chatas of Nachshon (the chatas brought by the Nesi'im at the time that the Mishkan was put up) need not be shechted in the north. We would have thought that since **R' Yehuda** says this chatas needed semicha, it needed the north as well. That is why "oso" is needed to teach that it did not have to be shechted in the north.
  - **Q:** What about according to **R' Shimon** who says it did not need semicha? **Mar Zutra the son of R' Tavi** said to **Ravina**, even according to **R' Yehuda** you can't say that we would have thought that since it was included for semicha it should be included for the north, because we would not learn this one time korbon from other korbanos that are brought for generations. Therefore, "oso" is not needed to exclude the north requirement of the chatas of Nachshon!? **A:** Rather, "oso" teaches that the animal must be in the north when it is shechted, but the shochet need not be standing in the north.
    - **Q:** This halacha is learned in a Braisa from the "oso" of a different pasuk, so the "oso" written regarding the Nasi's chatas is not needed for this!? **A:** Rather, it teaches that the shechita of the animal needs to take place in the north, but the melika done to a bird korbon need not be done in the north. A Braisa says, we would think that if shechita, which can be done without a Kohen, needs to be done in the north, then melika, which must be done by a Kohen, must certainly be done in the north. That is why we need "oso" to teach that melika does not need to be done in the north.
      - **Q:** Maybe the reason shechita of an animal must be done in the north is that the shechita must be done with a kli, but melika which is done with the Kohen's hand would never even be thought to need the north, so why do we need "oso"? **A:** Rather, "oso" teaches that the Nasi's chatas must be in the north, but the Korbon Pesach need not be shechted in the north. A Braisa says, we would think that if shechita of an olah, which has no set time, must be done in the north, then shechita of a Pesach, which has a set time, must surely be done in the north. That is why we need "oso" to teach that it need not be done in the north.
      - **Q:** Maybe the reason an olah must be shechted in the north is because it is totally burned on the Mizbe'ach, but there would be no reason to think that a Pesach should need to be shechted in the north!? **A:** We could make this same kal v'chomer from a chatas, which is not totally burned.
      - **Q:** Maybe a chatas needs the north because it brings a kapparah for aveiros that carry a chiyuv kares? **A:** We could make this

same kal v'chomer from an asham, which does not bring a kapparah for a chiyuv kares.

- **Q:** Maybe an asham (and all these others) need the north because they are kodshei kodashim, but a Pesach, which is not, would not need the north? So why is “oso” needed? **A:** “Oso” comes to teach as we initially said – the animal must be shechted in the north, but the shochet need not be standing in the north. Although we asked that this is already learned in a Braisa from a different pasuk, we will say that the reason we learn it twice is to teach that although the shochet need not be in the north during the shechita, the Kohen who is doing the kabbalah does need to be in the north when he does the kabbalah.
  - **Q:** This is already known from “v'lakach”, as stated above!? **A:** He does not darshen a “vuv” in this way, and therefore needs the “oso” to teach this.

#### V'CHAYAV AHL LISHASA V' AHL ARICHASA V' AHL AFIYASA

- **R' Pappa** said, a person who baked a chametz mincha is chayuv two sets of malkus – one for shaping and one for baking.
  - **Q:** The Braisa quoted earlier said that one is chayuv a single set of malkus for baking!? **A:** That Braisa is discussing where the person did the shaping and the baking, and he is therefore chayuv one for the shaping and one for the baking. **R' Pappa** is discussing where one person did the shaping and then gave it to another person for the baking. In this case, since the baking is also the final step of the shaping, he will be chayuv one set of malkus for the shaping and one for the baking.
- A Braisa says, if an animal bechor had a life-threatening blood condition which could be healed by letting blood from it, **R' Meir** says we may only let blood in a way that would not make a mum in it (even though it is currently in a life-threatening situation and is therefore already a baal mum). The **Chachomim** say that we may let blood even if it will cause a mum, as long as we don't remove it from kedusha and allow the Kohen to eat it based on the mum that we have created. **R' Shimon** says we may even allow the bechor to be eaten by the Kohen based on this mum caused by the blood letting. **R' Yehuda** says, even if the bechor will die if left untreated, we may not let blood from it to heal it.
  - The basis of the machlokes is whether we can cause an assur result (make the bechor into a baal mum) when that result already exists (it is now going to die). **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, all these Tanna'im would agree that in the case of one who processes a chametz mincha after another person has already processed the chametz mincha, the person would be chayuv, because the pasuk says “lo sei'aseh chametz” and also says “lo sei'afeh chametz”. All these Tanna'im would also agree that if one castrates an already castrated animal more severely than it was already castrated, he would be chayuv, because the pasuk says “uma'uch, v'kasus, v'nasuk, v'karus”, which teaches that one is chayuv for the latter even if the previous was already done. **R' Meir and the Chachomim** only argue in the case of the Braisa, because **R' Meir** holds that the pasuk of “kol mum lo yihyeh bo” teaches that it is absolutely always assur to make a mum in the animal, even if there was already a mum there, whereas the **Rabanan** hold that the pasuk of “tamim yihyeh l'ratzon” teaches that it is only assur to make a mum if the animal was a “tamim”, but if it already had a mum anyway, the issur to make a mum would not apply.
    - **Q:** How does **R' Meir** darshen the pasuk of “tamim yihyeh l'ratzon”? **A:** He uses it to teach that an animal that was *born* with a mum is not subject to the issur of making a mum in it.
      - **Q:** An animal born with a mum can never be made kodesh, so it is obvious that there would be no issur to make a mum in it!? **A:** Rather, he uses it to teach that the issur does not apply to a korbon that became passul and was then redeemed from kodesh. We would think that since it remains assur to be shorn or worked it is also assur to make a mum in it. The pasuk therefore teaches that the issur does not apply.

- **Q:** How do the **Rabanan** darshen the pasuk of “kol mum lo yihiyeh bo”? **A:** They use it to teach that one may not even indirectly cause a mum – for example, by putting dough on the animal’s ear, causing a dog to come and bite it, thereby making a mum in the ear.