

26 Tishrei 5779  
Oct. 5, 2018



Menachos Daf 56

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

### ***Slaughtering in the North***

The *Gemora* had asked: Now that all *chatas* offerings (*must be slaughtered in the north*) are derived from the verse: *And he shall slaughter the chatas*, what does the term ‘it’ exclude?

The *Gemora* had answered: (*Mnemonic: Nachshon, slaughtered, a bird, on Pesach*) It teaches us that it must be on the north side, but Nachshon’s goat (*those that were brought by the Nesi’im during the Tabernacle Inauguration*) was not slaughtered on the north side. For I might have thought that since it was included in the laws of *semichah*, it should also be included in this law; we are therefore taught that it was not so.

Ravina asks: This is well according to Rabbi Yehudah, who maintains that the inaugural *chatas* required *semichah*; however, according to Rabbi Shimon, what is there to say?

Mar Zutra the son of Rav Mari said to Ravina: But even according to Rabbi Yehudah, should we not say that only that which is expressly included is included, and that which is not included is not included? And if you will retort that without a verse to exclude it (*Nachshon’s chatas from the slaughtering in the north requirement*), you would have derived it by virtue of a binyan av (than any *chatas* offering must be slaughtered in the north); then with regard to the requirement of *semichah*, the Torah should have been silent regarding it, since it could also be derived in that same manner! Rather, it must be concluded that we may not derive the laws applicable to a one-time sacrifice (*such as the inaugurating*

*chatas*) from sacrifices that apply to all generations; then with regard to this as well (*the requirement to slaughter in the north*), we may not derive the laws applicable to a one-time sacrifice from sacrifices that apply to all generations.

Rather, the *Gemora* says that it is teaching us that the animal must be slaughtered on the north side, but the slaughterer does not need to stand at the north side.

The *Gemora* objects to this interpretation, for this law is derived from Rabbi Achiyah’s teaching regarding a different verse.

Rather, the *Gemora* says that it is teaching us that an animal must be slaughtered on the north side, but the *melikah* of a bird offering does not need to be performed on the north side.

The *Gemora* objects to this interpretation, for there would be no reason to assume that its *melikah* should be performed on the north side.

Rather, the *Gemora* says that it is teaching us that a *pesach* sacrifice does not need to be slaughtered on the north side.

The *Gemora* objects to this interpretation, for there would be no reason to assume that a *pesach* sacrifice should be slaughtered on the north side. A *pesach* sacrifice cannot be derived from the others, for they all (*olah, chatas and asham*) are all in the *kodshei kodashim* category, whereas a *pesach* sacrifice is *kodashim kalim*.

The *Gemora* concludes that the verse indeed is teaching us as stated previously that the animal must be slaughtered on the north side, but the slaughterer does not need to stand at the north side; and as for the objection that this was taught by Rabbi Achiyah from a different verse, I can say that Rabbi Achiyah actually is teaching us something else – namely, that the slaughterer does not need to be standing on the north side, but the receiver of the blood (*from the animal*) must be on the north side. (56a)

### **Shaping and Baking**

The *Mishna* had stated: And one is liable for the kneading (*of a leavened minchah*), shaping and for the baking.

Rav Pappa said: If a man baked a *minchah* leavened, he incurs lashes on two counts - once for shaping it (*while leavened*) and once for baking it.

The *Gemora* explains that if he shaped it and also baked it, he will incur two sets of lashes - once for shaping it (*while leavened*) and once for baking it, but if one person shaped it and another baked it, the one who baked it will himself incur two sets of lashes (*for baking is the conclusion of the shaping*). (56a)

### **One after the Other**

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If a *bechor* (*firstborn animal*) was attacked with blood congestion (*which threatens its life*), we may let blood for it (*as a means to save its life*) in a place where no blemish would result, but we may not let blood for it in a place where a blemish would result; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. The Sages say: We may let blood for it even in a place where a blemish would result (*for there is no prohibition against inflicting a blemish on an animal which is already blemished*), provided that it is not slaughtered on account of that blemish. [*This was an enactment in order to ensure that a Kohen does not inflict a blemish in a case where the animal can be cured in a different manner.*] Rabbi Shimon

says: It may be slaughtered even on account of that blemish. Rabbi Yehudah said: Even if the animal will die, it is not permitted to let blood for it.

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: All agree that whoever leavens a *minchah* offering after it was already leavened is liable. This is derived from a Scriptural verse. All agree as well that whoever castrates an animal after it was already castrated (*if he detached its testicles after they were cut*) is liable. This is derived from a Scriptural verse. They only differ as to whether one may inflict a blemish on an animal which was already blemished. They argue how to interpret a Scriptural verse. (56b)