

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf
Me'ilah Daf 12

5 Iyar 5772

April 27, 2012

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of
HaRav Refoel Dov ben HaRav Yosef Yechezkel o"h.
May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his
soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of Life.

Visit us on the web at <http://www.daf-yomi.org/>,
where we are constantly updating the archives from the entire Shas.
Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler
To subscribe, please send email to: aneinu@gmail.com

Daily Daf

Me'ilah

forbidden for benefit, but are not subject to the law of *me'ilah*.

The ashes removed from the Inner Altar and from the *Menorah* are forbidden for benefit, but they are not subject to the law of *me'ilah*. If one consecrates the ashes which were removed, they are subject to the law of *me'ilah*.

Turtledoves, whose time has not yet arrived, and pigeons which have exceeded their proper time, may not be benefitted from; they are, however not subject to the law of *me'ilah*.

The *Gemora* asks: It is known that the ashes from the Outer Altar (*after they are removed*), are placed on the floor of the Courtyard (*beside the ramp*), as it is written: *And he shall place it next to the Altar*, but from where is it known that the ashes of the Inner Altar are placed there as well?

Rabbi Elozar cites the Scriptural verses for this, and the exposition which teaches us that the ashes of the *Menorah* are placed there as well.

Rabbi Shimon said: Turtledoves, whose time has not yet arrived, are subject to the law of *me'ilah*, while pigeons which have exceeded their proper time not are

The *Gemora* notes: It is well according to Rabbi Shimon, for his reason (*why turtledoves, whose time has not yet arrived, are subject to the law of me'ilah, although they cannot presently be offered*) has been stated in a *Mishna* elsewhere. For Rabbi Shimon used to say: Whatever will be fit at a later time, one transgresses on its account a negative prohibition (*if he slaughters it outside of the Courtyard*), but he does not incur the penalty of *kares*. [*If one slaughtered an animal and its offspring on the same day, both being consecrated animals, outside the Courtyard, Rabbi Shimon said that the one who slaughtered the second has transgressed a negative command, for Rabbi Shimon used to say that whatever will be fit at a later time, one transgresses on its account a negative prohibition, but does not incur kares. This prohibition is only applicable if the animal possesses physical sanctity.*] But according to the ruling of the Rabbis (*that turtledoves, whose time has not yet arrived, are excluded from me'ilah*), why is it different from that of animal offering which has not reached the required age of eight days (*where it is subject to me'ilah*)?

The *Gemora* answers: A premature animal offering is to be compared to one with a blemish, which can be redeemed (*and therefore it is subject to me'ilah, for the*

proceeds will be used for another offering), but these bird offerings, where a blemish does not disqualify them, and they cannot be redeemed (*therefore, they are not subject to me'ilah*).

Ulla said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan that sacrifices which died, were, as far as Biblical law rules, excluded from the law of *me'ilah*.

The *Gemora* relates: When Ulla sat and recited this ruling, Rav Chisda said to him: Who will listen to your view and the view of Rabbi Yochanan, your teacher? Where has the sanctity that was in them go?

Ulla replied: Why not ask the same question with relation to our *Mishna*, where it says: Turtledoves, whose time has not yet arrived, are subject to the law of *me'ilah*, while pigeons which have exceeded their proper time not are forbidden for benefit, but are not subject to the law of *me'ilah*. Here as well, ask where has the sanctity that was in them go?

Rav Chisda said to him: I admit that by Rabbinical enactment the law of *me'ilah* is applicable in these cases; but I wish to raise the following difficulty: Is there anything which has not been subject to the law of *me'ilah* from the beginning (*like kodashim kalim*), and is subject to it afterwards?

The *Gemora* asks: Why not? Is there not the instance of blood which was originally not subject to the law of *me'ilah*, but is subject to it at the end? For we have learned in a *Mishna*: Blood is exempted from the law of *me'ilah* in the beginning, but is subject to it after it has flowed into the Kidron Valley!?

The *Gemora* answers: In that instance, the law of *me'ilah* did apply in the beginning, for Rav said: If one lets blood from a living consecrated animal, it is forbidden for benefit, and it is subject to the law of *me'ilah*.

The milk of consecrated animals and the eggs of consecrated turtledoves are forbidden for benefit, but are not subject to the law of *me'ilah*. This is true only for

things consecrated for the Altar, but as to things consecrated for Temple repair, if one consecrated a hen - both it and its eggs are subject to the law of *me'ilah*, or if one consecrated a she-donkey, both it and its milk are subject to the law of *me'ilah*. (11b – 12b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Products of sacrifices

The *Gemora* in Temurah comments on the *Mishna* which says that one violates *me'ilah* only with the product of something consecrated to the maintenance fund, but not with the product of a sacrifice. The *Gemora* concludes by saying that even the opinion that says that one does violate *me'ilah* with the products of the altar only says so with the products that themselves are fit for the altar.

Rashi explains that the product the *Gemora* refers to in the conclusion is offspring of a sacrifice, which may be offered itself as a sacrifice, and therefore is subject to *me'ilah*.

Tosfos (31b v'afilu) challenges this explanation on two counts:

1. The source for the sanctification of the offspring is a verse which explicitly includes them, not as a function of their being a product of the sacrifice.
2. The *Gemora* in *Me'ilah* (13a) implies that no one says that the offspring is subject to *me'ilah*, even though it is offered.

Tosfos therefore says that the *Gemora* is referring to Ze'iri, who says in *Me'ilah* (12b) that one who benefits from the blood of a sacrifice is subject to *me'ilah*. The blood itself is the product the *Gemora* is referring to, and the *Gemora* is saying that this opinion is limited to blood, since it is offered directly on the altar.