



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

MISHNAH: Orlah and kilayim of the vineyard can combine with one another. Rabbi Shimon says, they cannot combine.

GEMARA: Is a combination at all necessary according to Rabbi Shimon? Has it not been taught: Rabbi Shimon said, [The eating even of] the smallest quantity [of forbidden food] makes one liable to the penalty of lashes? — Read: [Rabbi Shimon says], A combination is unnecessary.

MISHNAH: Cloth and sack, sack and hide, hide and matting can combine with one another. Rabbi Shimon said: What is the reason? Because these are all susceptible to the tumah caused by sitting.

GEMARA: A Tanna taught: If one trimmed all these and made of the trimmings a cloth to lie upon, [the standard size for contracting tumah is] three [handbreadths square]; if to sit upon one [handbreadth square]; and if [to serve] as a holder [it contracts tumah] however small [its size]. What is [the reason of the rule relating to the] holder? — Said Rish Lakish in the name of Rabbi Yannai: Because it may be used in connection with weaving. In a Baraisha it was taught: Because it can be used by the reapers of figs.

CHAPTER V

MISHNAH: If one derived from consecrated things a benefit of a perutah's worth, he is guilty of me'ilah even though he did not lessen its value. This is the view of Rabbi Akiva, while the Sages hold: Whatever deteriorates [through use] the law of me'ilah applies to it only after it has suffered deterioration, but whatever does not deteriorate [through use], the law of me'ilah applies to it as soon as he made use

of it. For instance: if [a woman] put a necklace around her neck or a ring on her finger, or if she drunk from a golden cup, she is liable to the law of me'ilah as soon as she made use of it [to the value of a perutah]. But if one put on a shirt or covered himself with a cloth, or if one chopped [wood] with an axe, he is subject to the law of me'ilah only if [those objects] have suffered deterioration. If one derived benefit from a chatas, if while it was alive, he is not liable to the law of me'ilah unless he has diminished its value, if while it was dead, he is liable as soon as he made use of it.

GEMARA: A Tanna taught: Rabbi Akiva agrees with the Sages in regard to things which deteriorate [through use]. Wherein, then, do they differ? — Said Rava: In regard to a garment worn between other [garments] and a soft web.

Our Rabbis taught: It is written, If any one [commit a trespass . . .], to imply the ordinary man as well as the Nasi or the Anointed Kohen, 'commit a trespass [ma'al]: [The term] ma'al denotes nothing else but [effecting] a change, and thus it says: If any one's wife go aside and act unfaithfully [ma'al] against him . . ., and it also says, And they broke faith [va-yim'alu] with the God of their fathers, and went astray after the gods of the peoples of the land. One might assume that [the law of me'ilah applied also to a case] where one has damaged [consecrated things] but has derived from there no benefit or has derived a benefit but has left the things unimpaired, or [that it applies] to things attached to the ground and in the case of a messenger who has carried out his appointed errand. The text therefore states, 'and sin'. [The term] 'sin' is used in connection with terumah and 'sin' is also mentioned in connection with me'ilah: just as 'sin'



mentioned in connection with terumah [refers to a case where there is] deterioration as well as benefit; [and to a case] where he who has caused the damage is at the same time the person that has derived the benefit; [and to a case] where the deterioration and the benefit are in respect of one and the same object and where the deterioration and the benefit take place simultaneously; and to things detached from the ground and applies in the case where an agent has executed his appointed errand, so also the word 'sin' used in connection with me'ilah [refers to a case where there is] deterioration as well as benefit; where he who has caused the damage is at the same time the person that has derived the benefit; where the deterioration and the benefit are in respect of one and the same object and where the deterioration and the benefit have taken place simultaneously; and to things detached from the ground and applies in the case where an agent has executed his appointed errand. From this we only derive that [the law of me'ilah applies to] edibles which are enjoyed. From where do we know [its application to] things that do not deteriorate [through use] and that [different portions] can combine with one another,] even after the elapse of a considerable time; in the case where he has himself eaten of it and has given to his fellow to eat of it, or where he has himself made use of it and has given to his fellow to make use of it, or where he has himself made use of it and has given to his fellow to eat of it, or where he has himself eaten of it and has given to his friend to make use of it? The text therefore reads: Commit a trespass: whatever the form may be.

But [why not deduct in the following manner]: Just as with the word 'sin' mentioned in connection with terumah the rule is that two separate edibles cannot combine with one another, so also with the word 'sin' mentioned in connection with me'ilah two separate meals cannot combine with one another. From where [further] do we know [that edibles can combine] if one eats one portion on one day and the other on the following, or if even a longer period has elapsed between the two meals? The text therefore reads: 'Commit a trespass', whatever the form may be.

But [why not draw the following comparison]: Just as with the word 'sin' mentioned in connection with terumah the deterioration and the enjoyment is simultaneous, [so also with the word sin used in connection with me'ilah]; from where do we know then [that the law of me'ilah applies] when one has eaten [of consecrated food] himself and has given to his fellow to eat, even though after an interval of three years? The text therefore reads: 'Commit a trespass', whatever the form may be.

But [why not deduct as follows]: Just as with the word 'sin' mentioned in connection with terumah there is no liability except when [the food] has been transferred from sacred possession into secular ownership, [so also with the word 'sin' used in connection with me'ilah]; from where do we know [that the law of me'ilah applies] when consecrated money has been misappropriated and used for other sacred purposes; e.g., if he purchased with it the bird-offerings of a zav or a zavah, or of a woman after confinement, or has paid with it his shekel, or if one has offered his chatas or asham from sacred money, in which case one is liable to me'ilah at the moment of misappropriation according to Rabbi Shimon and at the time of the sprinkling according to Rabbi Yehudah. From where do we know all this? The text reads: 'Commit a trespass': whatever the form may be.