

Menachos – Simanim

פרק ה – כל המנחות באות מצה

דף נו – 56 Daf

1. Baking a *minchah* as חמץ is additionally liable for completing the עריכה

The Mishnah on the previous Daf taught that one is liable for processing a *minchah* which is חמץ for every step of the baking process. Rav Pappa says: אפאה לוקה שתיים – if he baked it leavened, he incurs two sets of *malkus*, one for its shaping, and one for its baking, despite not having performed the shaping itself, because the baking completes the shaping process. The Gemara objects that the Baraisa on the previous Daf said one is liable for baking בפני עצמה – *by itself*, indicating there is only one set of *malkus* for the baking act!? It answers that Rav Pappa is discussing a case הוא ואפה הוא – דעריך הוא ואפה הוא – where he shaped it and he also baked it. Since he is already liable for the primary act of shaping, the baking act only obligates him in one set of *malkus* for baking, but not for shaping. The Baraisa's case is דעריך חבירה ויהיב ליה ואפה – where his friend shaped it and gave it to him, and then he baked it.

2. Letting blood of a *bechor* animal to heal it: four opinions

A Baraisa states: בבור שאחזו דם – if a *firstborn* animal was seized by an excess of blood, Rebbe Meir says: מקיזין אותו – we may let its blood out in a place which will not cause a blemish in it (because it will heal), but not where it will cause a מום (e.g., the eye or ear, which will not heal). The Chochomim say one may even let blood in a place which will cause a מום (because they permit inflicting a second מום on a מום, such as this sick animal) – *provided that he does not shecht the animal* (for personal consumption) on the basis of that blemish; rather, he must wait for an additional מום to develop before *shechting* it. Rebbe Shimon says that it can even be *shechted* on the basis of the מום inflicted by bloodletting (Rashi explains this is because Rebbe Shimon permits שאין מתכוין – an unintentional act resulting as a byproduct of a different act). Rebbe Yehudah takes the most stringent position: אפילו מת אין מקיזין לו את הדם – even if it will die if left untreated, we may not let its blood, even without creating a מום, lest one come to let its blood where it will create a מום.

3. *Machlokes* about מטיל מום בבעל מום

Although Tannaim argue about inflicting a מום on a *korban* which is already a מום, Rebbe Yochanan said that all agree that מחמץ אחר מחמץ – one who processed a leavened [*minchah*] after someone already processed this leavened [*minchah*] is liable. Similarly, all agree that מסרס אחר מסרס – one who castrates an animal after someone already castrated it is liable (based on *pesukim* about each respective prohibition). The Tannaim argue specifically about מטיל מום בבעל מום – inflicting a blemish on an already blemished [animal]. Rebbe Meir holds that כל מום לא – *there shall not be any blemish in it* teaches to include this case, but the Rabbonon say that תמים יהיה לרצון – *it shall be unblemished to find favor* implies that if it is already blemished, there is no prohibition to blemish it further. Rebbe Meir *darshens* "תמים יהיה לרצון" to permit inflicting a blemish in לאחר פדינום – *disqualified korbanos after their redemption* (which are permitted in consumption, but remain forbidden in work and shearing). The Rabbonon *darshens* "כל מום לא יהיה בו" to prohibit even causing something else to harm the animal (e.g., placing dough on the animal's ear so a dog will snatch it and harm the animal).

Siman – Shusher who goes “nu-nu”

The **shusher who said “nu-nu”** to the Kohen getting lashed twice for baking a *minchah* as *chametz* even though he didn't shape it himself, had no problem letting the blood out of a *bechor* that was seized by excess blood by puncturing the animal's ear, since he held one can be מטיל מום בבעל מום, unlike the cases of מחמץ אחר מחמץ and מסרס אחר מסרס which everyone agrees are *chayav*.

דף נו | DAF 56

Shusher who goes "nu-nu"



The shusher who said "nu-nu" to the Kohen getting lashed twice for baking a *minchah* as *chametz* even though he didn't shape it himself, had no problem letting the blood out of a *bechor* that was seized by excess blood by puncturing the animal's ear, since he held one can be מום בבעל מום מטיל, unlike the cases of מחמץ אחר מחמץ and מסרס מסרס אחר which everyone agrees are *chayav*.

3 things to remember

1. Baking a *minchah* as חמץ is additionally liable for completing the עריכה
2. Letting blood of a *bechor* animal to heal it: four opinions
3. *Machlokes* about מום בבעל מום מטיל מום

