

24 Elul 5779
Sept. 24, 2019



Me'ilah Daf 8

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

Mishna

The law of *me'ilah* applies to the *chatas* offering of a bird from the moment of its consecration. With the *melikah* (the Kohen "slaughters" the bird by piercing the back of the bird's neck with his thumbnail), it becomes susceptible for disqualification through contact with a *tevul yom* (one who was *tamei*, but has immersed himself in a *mikvah*; he is considered a *tevul yom* until nightfall) or with a *mechusar kippurim* (one who was *tamei*, but has immersed himself in a *mikvah*, and has waited until nightfall; he is just lacking atonement until he brings his offerings the next day) or by remaining past its time. Once its blood has been sprinkled, one is liable (to *kares*) for *piggul* (a *korban* whose *avodah* was done with the intention that it would be eaten after its designated time), *nossar* (sacrificial meat that has been leftover beyond the time that the Torah designated for its consumption) and *tumah* (if he eats it), but the law of *me'ilah* (one who has unintentionally benefited from *hekdesh* or removed it from the ownership of the *Beis Hamikdash* 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*) no longer applies to it (for the sprinkling of the blood renders the meat permitted for consumption by the Kohanim, and it is therefore no longer regarded as "the Holies of Hashem"). (8a)

Pasul or Tamei?

The *Mishna* had stated: With the *melikah*, it becomes susceptible for disqualification through contact with a *tevul yom* or with a *mechusar kippurim*, or by remaining past its time. This implies that it becomes susceptible for disqualification (*pesul*) but not for contamination (*tumah*). [The term disqualification (*pesul*) through contact with a *tamei* person or thing denotes that the *tumah* contracted is not of such a degree as to be transmitted to another object. *Tamei*, on the other hand, denotes the capacity of transmitting further the *tumah* contracted.] Who is then the author of our *Mishna*? It must be the Rabbis, as it has been taught in the following *braisa*: Abba Shaul said: A *tevul yom* is *tamei* in the first degree (*rishon l'tumah*) in respect of *kodashim*, and can subsequently render two further degrees of *tumah* (what he touches will be a *sheini* and that food can render something else a *shlishi*) and one degree of disqualification (the *shlishi* can render something a *revi'i*, which is regarded as *pasul*). Rabbi Meir says: He (a *tevul yom*) can render one further degree of *tumah* (since he maintains that a *tevul yom* has the status of a *sheini*; and therefore, he can render something a *shlishi* with respect of *kodashim*) and one degree of disqualification (the *shlishi* can render something into a *revi'i*). The Rabbis say: Just as a *tevul yom* disqualifies food or liquids of *terumah*, so too, he disqualifies food or liquids of *kodashim* (they maintain that a *tevul yom* has a lesser degree of *tumah* than an ordinary *sheini*).

Rava said (that the *Mishna* may be in accordance with all the *Tannaim*), for according to Abba Shaul, a higher standard has been set with regard to *kodashim* in that the (earlier) Rabbis

declared the *tevul yom* to be like a first degree (*rishon l'tumah*). [However, on a Biblical level, he can only disqualify *kodashim*, not make it *tamei*.] And according to Rabbi Meir as well, a *tevul yom* possesses, by Rabbinic enactment, the same measure of *tumah* as food which is *tamei* in the second degree. And according to the Sages, since he has immersed (in a *mikvah*), his *tumah* has weakened, and he renders things 'disqualified' but not '*tamei*.' (8a – 8b)

Me'ilah and a Mere Prohibition

The *Mishna* had stated: Once its blood has been sprinkled, one is liable [to *kares* for *piggul*, *nossar* and *tumah*, but the law of *me'ilah* no longer applies to it.]

The *Gemora* asks: This implies that the law of *me'ilah* no longer applies, though the prohibition still remains. But why? Isn't it now the possession of the *Kohanim*?

Rabbi Chanina answers: It refers to meat (of *kodashim kalim*) that was taken out of the Courtyard (prior to the *zerikah*) and the *Mishna* stands in accordance with Rabbi Akiva (mentioned previously that while the meat is not subject to *me'ilah*, it is forbidden for benefit), for he said that *zerikah* is effective in the case of an offering that was taken out of the Courtyard (with respect that it is removed from being subject to *me'ilah*), but in regard to eating (the meat which went out), the *zerikah* does not render it permitted for consumption.

Rav Huna said in the name of Rav: The squeezing of the blood of the bird *chatas* offering is not essential, for Rav taught our *Mishna* as saying: Once its blood has been sprinkled ... (even though it has not been squeezed onto the altar; the squeezing is the service which follows the sprinkling). Rav Adda bar Ahavah said in the name of Rav: The squeezing of the blood of the bird *chatas* offering is essential, for Rav taught our *Mishna* as saying: Once its blood has been squeezed ... (meaning that one is only liable for *piggul*, *nossar* and *tamei*

after the squeezing has been completed, for otherwise, the service of the *chatas* bird has not been concluded).

The *Gemora* challenges Rav Huna: It is written: *and the remainder of the blood shall be squeezed out at the base of the Altar; it is a chatas offering*. Now, according to the view of Rav Adda bar Ahavah, it is understandable that it is written: *and the remainder of the blood shall be squeezed out . . . it is a chatas offering (for the 'squeezing out' is essential to the chatas)*, but according to Rav Huna, what is the meaning of '*and the remainder*' etc.?

The *Gemora* answers: It is to be understood as it has been taught in the academy of Rabbi Yishmael: If there remained (blood after the sprinkling, it should be squeezed out, but it is not necessary for there to be blood remaining in order to perform the 'squeezing'). And when the verse states: *it is a chatas offering*, it refers to the beginning of the verse (regarding the sprinkling).

Rav Acha the son of Rava said to Rav Ashi: If so (that '*and the remainder*' means **if** there is remaining), then regarding a *minchah* offering, where it is written (after the *komeitz* is scooped out and burned on the Altar): and the remainder (should be eaten by the *Kohanim*); does it also mean 'if there remained'? And should you say that indeed it is so; surely it has been taught in a *braisa*: *and he shall take its komeitz from its fine flour and from its oil, in addition to all its frankincense*. This excludes the case where there was not the full quantity of fine flour, oil and frankincense!?

The *Gemora* answers: There it is written again: *and the remainder, which is superfluous (to teach that something must remain after the komeitz is taken)*. (8b – 9a)