

Daf Notes

Insights into the Daily Daf
Me'ilah Daf 2

25 Nissan 5772

April 17, 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

Mishna

Kodshei kodashim (sacrifices of a higher sanctity; such as *chatas*, *asham*, *olah* and communal *shelamim* - they may only be eaten within the Courtyard) that were slaughtered in the south (when the slaughtering and receiving of the blood is supposed to occur in the north) are still subject to the laws of *me'ilah*. [One who has unintentionally benefited from *hekdesh* or removed it from the ownership of the *Beis Hamikdosh* has committed the transgression of *me'ilah*, and as a penalty, he would be required to pay the value of the object plus an additional fifth of the value; he also brings a *korban asham*. Generally, the rule is that anything which is regarded as the "holies of Hashem" is subject to *me'ilah*. Once a proper 'throwing of the blood' has occurred, the meat is permitted for consumption, and it is no longer considered the "holies of Hashem," and therefore, it is removed from the laws of *me'ilah*. The *Gemora* will explain why the laws of *me'ilah* still apply here.] The *Mishna* explains the case: If one slaughtered them on the south side and received their blood on the north, or if he slaughtered them on the north side and received their blood on the south, or if he slaughtered them by day and threw their blood during the night, or if he slaughtered them during the night and threw their blood by day, or if he slaughtered them with the intention of eating of the sacrifice beyond its proper time or outside its proper place, the law of *me'ilah* still applies to them.

Rabbi Yehoshua stated this general rule: Whatever had a moment of permissibility (*to be eaten*) to the *Kohanim* is not

subject to the law of *me'ilah*, and whatever had no moment of permissibility to the *Kohanim* is subject to the law of *me'ilah* (for it is still regarded as '*kodshei Hashem*' – sanctified items that are reserved for Hashem). What is something which had a moment of permissibility to the *Kohanim*? That which remained overnight, or became *tamei*, or it was taken out from its place. And what is that which had no moment of permissibility to the *Kohanim*? Those that were slaughtered with a 'beyond its time' or 'outside of its place' intention, or whose blood was received and applied by disqualified people. (2a)

Me'ilah by Disqualified Offerings

The *Mishna* had stated: *Kodshei kodashim* that were slaughtered in the south are still subject to the laws of *me'ilah*.

The *Gemora* asks: Is this not obvious? Should the law of *me'ilah* cease to apply to them merely because they were slaughtered on the south side? [When one consecrates *kodshei kodashim*, it becomes subject to the laws of *me'ilah* immediately. Something must happen to remove that status. An invalid slaughtering cannot accomplish that, and the throwing of its blood, which does not render the meat permitted for consumption, cannot remove it from *me'ilah* either!?!]

The *Gemora* answers: It is necessary to be stated, for otherwise, it might have entered your mind to say that since 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* (for they are no longer fit for the altar, and have no monetary value either, for they cannot be redeemed); so here as well, *kodshei kodashim* slaughtered on the south side are considered as if they were strangled (and therefore should be, Biblically speaking, removed from the laws of *me'ilah*); the *Mishna* therefore informs us that (the cases are different, for) sacrifices which died are not fit at all (even as *kodashim kalim* – sacrifices of a lesser sanctity; and therefore it is not subject any longer for the laws of *me'ilah*); whereas the (disqualification of the) south side - although it is not fit for *kodshei kodashim*, it is, however, fit for *kodashim kalim* (and therefore it is not removed from the laws of *me'ilah*).

The *Gemora* asks: Why was it necessary to enumerate in the *Mishna* all those cases?

The *Gemora* explains why each one of them was necessary to state, for if only the case where he slaughtered them on the south side and received their blood on the north were stated, I would argue as follows: The law of *me'ilah* still applies in this case, because the receiving of the blood (which is more significant than the slaughtering) was performed on the north side, but in the case where he slaughtered them on the north side and received their blood on the south, since the blood was received on the south side, I would argue that the law of *me'ilah* no longer applies to them.

And if only these first two cases were mentioned, I would argue that the law of *me'ilah* still applies to them, because in these cases (the sacrifices were at least offered during the day and) the day is the time fit for offering (and therefore, although it is disqualified, it may be still regarded as the "holies of Hashem"); in the case, however, where he slaughtered them during the night and threw their blood by day, since night is not a fit time for offering, and the sacrifices were slaughtered by night, I might have thought that the law of *me'ilah* would no longer apply to them. [The *Mishna* therefore needs to inform us that this is not so.]

The *Gemora* notes further: And if the case where he slaughtered them during the night were stated, I would argue that the law of *me'ilah* still applies to them, because the blood was received (and thrown) during the day. In the case, however, where he slaughtered them by day and threw their blood during the night, since it is not the proper time for offering, the sacrifices are to be considered as if they were strangled, and the law of *me'ilah* would accordingly not apply

to them; therefore the *Mishna* has to inform us of this case as well.

The *Gemora* asks: In the cases, where he slaughtered them with the intention of eating of the sacrifice beyond its proper time or outside its proper place (where the law is that the meat is not permitted for consumption), what are they fit for (so why should the law of *me'ilah* be removed)?

The *Gemora* answers: It is because they (the throwing of the blood) accomplish an acceptance of the sacrifice as a *piggul* offering. [In order for a *korban* to be rendered *piggul*, it must be exclusively *piggul*, where its only disqualification is the "beyond its time" intention, or "outside its place" intention; if, however, there is another disqualification, the *korban* is not rendered *piggul*. Accordingly, the throwing of its blood – in these cases, is somewhat regarded as a valid *zerikah*, and perhaps it is sufficient to remove the meat from the laws of *me'ilah*. The *Mishna* teaches us otherwise.] (2a)

Altar Sanctifies

They inquired: If they (the sacrificial parts of *kodshei kodashim* that were slaughtered in the south) were placed on the Altar, should they be taken down? [The law is that the Altar sanctifies anything that touches it – even offerings that have been invalidated. Our *Gemora* inquires whether this law applies to *kodshei kodashim* which were slaughtered in the south portion of the Courtyard.] Rabbah said that if they went up they should be taken down, while Rav Yosef stated that they should not be taken down.

The *Gemora* elaborates: [The *Mishna* in *Zevachim* states as follows: The following do not descend once they ascended: That which was left overnight, that which left the Courtyard, that which became *tamei*, that which was slaughtered with a "beyond its time" intention or an "outside of its place" intention, or that which disqualified people accepted the blood or threw the blood (if the sacrificial parts were put on the Altar, they should not be taken off). Rabbi Yehudah said: That which was slaughtered at night, or whose blood spilled, or whose blood went out past the curtains - if it ascended, it should descend. Rabbi Shimon said: It does not descend, because Rabbi Shimon said: if its disqualification was in the Holy, the Holy receives it; but if its disqualification was not in the Holy, the Holy does not accept it.] According to the opinion of Rabbi Yehudah there is no question that all agree that even if they ascended the Altar, they must be brought

down (for if offerings that were slaughtered at night must be taken down – even though they were slaughtered in the correct place, certainly offerings that were slaughtered in an incorrect place – such as the south side, must be taken down). The dispute arises according to the view of Rabbi Shimon. Rav Yosef conforms here as well to the view of Rabbi Shimon (that he would maintain that they do not need to be taken down); while Rabbah argues as follows: Rabbi Shimon maintained his view only in regard to offerings where their blood should be applied below (the red line drawn around the Altar) and were applied above, or offerings whose blood should be applied above (the red line) and were applied below; since they were at any rate slaughtered and their blood was received on the north side. In our case, however, since they were slaughtered on the south side, they are to be regarded as if they were strangled (and the sacrificial parts must be taken down).

The *Gemora* asks on Rabbah from our *Mishna: Kodshei kodashim* that were slaughtered in the south are still subject to the laws of *me'ilah*. Now, this is understandable according to the view of Rav Yosef (for the *Mishna* can be in accordance with R' Shimon who maintains that the sacrificial parts of such offerings are not taken down from the Altar, and similarly, they are still considered the "holies of Hashem," and are subject to *me'ilah*); but according to the view of Rabbah, it is difficult (for if these parts must be taken down from the Altar, they, evidently, do not retain their sanctity, and should not be regarded as the "holies of Hashem," and should therefore not be subject to the laws of *me'ilah*)!?

The *Gemora* answers that Rabbah would reply that when the *Mishna* states that they are still subject to *me'ilah*, it is to be understood as *me'ilah* enacted by Rabbinic law.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the actual difference between Biblical *me'ilah* and Rabbinic *me'ilah*?

The *Gemora* answers: By Biblical *me'ilah*, an additional fifth must be paid, where by Rabbinic *me'ilah*, the fifth is not added. [Tosfos notes that the *Gemora* could have stated another distinction – namely, that there is an obligation to bring a *korban asham* only by Biblical *me'ilah*, and not by Rabbinic *me'ilah*.]

The *Gemora* asks: But is there such a thing as Rabbinic *me'ilah*? [See Tosfos who explain that the *Gemora* was asking about these cases in particular, where people would anyway distance themselves from sacred offerings; would the Rabbis impose a law of *me'ilah* – even here?]

The *Gemora* answers: Yes, there is. For 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* – from which we may infer that by Biblical law only are they excluded from the law of *me'ilah*, but by Rabbinic law, however, the law of *me'ilah* still applies to them. In our *Mishna* as well, it is to be understood as referring to Rabbinic *me'ilah*. (2b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

An introduction to tractate Me'ilah

By: Meoros HaDaf HaYomi

Tractate *Me'ilah* treats the various ways of mundane use of objects of *hekdesh* – namely, objects and property belonging to the Temple. He who uses them for a mundane purpose betrays (mo'el) their purpose and therefore our tractate is called *Me'ilah*. There are various types of sacred objects with different levels and therefore the halachos of *me'ilah* differ according to the character of the holiness of the object.

Kodshei mizbeiach were sanctified for the purpose of offering sacrifices on the altar. *Kodshei bedek habayis* are meant for the maintenance of the Temple. *Kodshei mizbeiach* are classified into two types: *kedushas haguf* – sacrifices offered on the altar, and *kedushas damim* – money and objects sanctified for acquiring sacrifices. *Kedushas haguf* is also classified into two types: *kodshei kodoshim* – the holiest sacrifices, eaten only in the 'Azarah by male kohanim, and *kodoshim kalim* – sacrifices with a lesser sanctity, eaten by any Jew throughout Yerushalayim. Our tractate details these types and expands on different ways of *me'ilah* as it affects each of them.

In the first chapter we shall learn about the halachos of *me'ilah* concerning sacrifices which became disqualified because people treated them improperly. Towards the end of the chapter our tractate surveys the halachos of all the types of sacrifices and the discussion spreads to and fills the second chapter. The main point of the third chapter concerns *kodshei bedek habayis* and at its beginning appear the halachos of *me'ilah* regarding offspring of sacrifices, blood of sacrifices and the like. The fourth chapter treats the combinations of measures of two *me'ilos* or *me'ilah* and a mundane object together to one *shiur* of eating to become obligated to bring a sacrifice for the prohibition. The following chapter discusses

the halachos of *me'ilah* concerning kodshei bedek habayis and the sixth and last chapter addresses the unique halachah of *me'ilah*, concerning representation (shelichus) for committing a transgression. Unlike all prohibitions of the Torah, where the rule applies that there is no shelichus for committing a transgression, regarding *me'ilah* "if the representative performed his task, the one who sent him committed *me'ilah*."

After *Me'ilah* we shall find on the following dapim tractates Tamid, Midos and Kinim, which appear in a different order in the order of the Mishnah: first Kinim, then Tamid and Midos. Apparently, because of their small volume and because of the fact that they have no Gemara except for a part of Tamid, they were combined with our tractate. Tractate Tamid describes the service of offering the tamid sacrifice in the Temple. Tractate Midos details the measurements of the Second Temple and tractate Kinim includes complex calculations of different mixtures of "nests" – pairs – of birds meant to be sacrificed that became mixed with each other.

DAILY MASHAL

Elevating One's Status

The law is that the Altar sanctifies anything that touches it – even offerings that have been invalidated. Our Gemora inquires whether this law applies to kodshei kodashim which were slaughtered in the south portion of the Courtyard.

Evidently, the Altar has in its power to take a hold of something completely rejected and elevates it from its prohibited status, and to turn it around that it is now permitted to offer it up on the Altar.

So too, this applies to a person, says the Sifsei Tzadik. A person possesses a spark of *kedushah* within him, and he can merit through this a complete turnaround – he can elevate his status before Hashem that he will be regarded as "bread of the Altar." This can be done through strengthening oneself in even one area, one *mitzvah*, one act of Godliness.

Me'ilah – me'il, begidah – beged

The word *me'ilah* should be examined. What is the nature of this word and its special meaning?

The act of *me'ilah*: Sifra explains (parashah 11) that "*me'ilah* only means a change" and so says our Gemara: "Ma'al only

signifies a change." That is, the act of changing the object from its purpose is called *me'ilah*. Therefore, a gizbar (treasurer) of hekdesch who takes an object of hekdesch and gives it to another to be used for a mundane purpose commits *me'ilah*: Although the gizbar himself derives no benefit from the object but he changed its purpose and thus transgressed the prohibition of *me'ilah*. The Gemara cites two examples of change called *me'ilah*: Jews who forsook Hashem and worshipped idols were called mo'alim (Divrei HaYamim I, 5:25) – "And they forsook the G-d of their fathers and went after the gods of the peoples of the land". Also concerning a sotah we are told (Bemidbar 5:12): "A man whose wife strayed and betrayed (ma'alah) him" (see Tosfos, that two types of *me'ilah* are hinted in these two teachings). We thus learn that an act in which there is a wrongful change from its goal is called *me'ilah*.

Me'ilah means "a lie": Targum Onkelos translates *me'ilah* as shekar ("a lie") (see the Maharal in Nesivos 'Olam, Nesiv HaEmunah, Ch. 1, where he devotes a long discussion to the topic). In his translation Rabeinu Saadyah writes: "Tim'ol ma'al – this means violating a covenant or a command." Indeed, in his translation of the verse "You shall not lie to each other" (Vayikra 19:11) he writes "No one should betray (yim'ol) his companion". Therefore, he who changes the purpose of an object lies, as he doesn't act as demanded of him.

Me'ilah means ignoring: HaKesav VehaKabbalah offers another explanation, that *me'ilah* relates to the root 'al ("over, above"), that when a person doesn't "descend" his thoughts to examine what he's doing, he ignores (mis'aleim) the limits and halachos of the Torah.

Me'ilah from *me'il*: Hebrew, the holy tongue, was given by Hashem Himself and every word and expression in it contain whole worlds of meaning. Ibn Ezra writes something very interesting (Vayikra 5:15), that the word *me'ilah* was chosen to describe this act because *me'ilah* derives from *me'il* ("coat"). The Malbim explains (ibid) that *me'ilah* and *begidah* ("betrayal") are alternative expressions for the same act and both derive from garments – *me'il* and *begeg* ("garment"). *Begidah* was chosen to describe an untoward act done secretly "just as a person covers himself with a garment so that his real flesh is not visible, thus the betrayer hides his betrayal – he appears like a friend but hides his enmity" while *me'ilah* was chosen to describe an act of open lying, like a coat which is an upper garment, seen by everyone, and therefore every open lie and visible, wrongful change is called *me'ilah*.