

6 Tishrei 5780
Oct. 5, 2019



Me'ilah Daf 19

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

The Master said: It is written, 'If any one [commit a trespass]', to imply the ordinary man as well as the Nasi or the Anointed [Kohen]. What else might one have assumed? Is this not obvious, 'If any one' is written [distinctly]? — I might have thought, The Divine Law says: And whoever put any of it upon a stranger [he shall be cut off from among his people], and this one is not a stranger, since he had been anointed with it. Therefore the amplification mentioned was necessary. The Divine Law has drawn an analogy between [the law of me'ilah on the one hand] and [the laws concerning] the sotah, idolatry and terumah [on the other]. [It is compared] to the law concerning the sotah: [Just as the law applies] even though there was no deterioration, so also with consecrated property; if [a woman] has [e.g.,] put a ring on her finger she is guilty of me'ilah. And the Divine law compared it to the law of idolatry: Just as the latter [applies] only when a change has taken place, so also in the case of consecrated property. One is not guilty when one has chopped wood with an axe [belonging to the Temple] unless it has been impaired. The Divine law was compared to the law of terumah: Just as in the case of terumah [the words]

'if one has eaten' exclude the one who damages [terumah], so also with consecrated things: If one has damaged anything eatable, he is exempted from the law of me'ilah.

The Mishnah had stated: For instance, if [a woman] has put a necklace . . . Said Rav Kahana to Rav Zevid: Does gold indeed not deteriorate? Where, then, has the gold of Nun's daughter-in-law gone?¹ — He retorted: Perhaps the gold was thrown about as your daughter in-law used to do. And besides, admitted this is not a case where there is enjoyment and immediate deterioration [of the used article], but [can you say] it will never deteriorate.

The Mishnah had stated: If one has derived a benefit from a chatas etc. Now, consider: if this refers to an animal that has no blemish, [do you not agree that] it would be analogous to the case of the golden cup? — Said Rav Pappa: It refers indeed to one with a blemish.

MISHNAH: If one has derived a benefit of half a perutah's worth and has impaired [the value of the used article] by another half a perutah, or if one has

¹ This alludes to a man called Nun who presented his daughters-in-law with golden vessels which after a time were found to have lost in weight.

derived the benefit of a perutah's worth from one thing and has diminished another thing by the value of a perutah, he is not liable to the law of me'ilah, [for this law applies] only when he benefits a perutah's worth and diminishes the value of a perutah of the selfsame thing. One does not commit me'ilah with consecrated things with which me'ilah had already been made by another person, except with animals and vessels of ministry. For instance, if one rode on an animal and then came another and rode on it and yet another came and rode on it, all of them are guilty of me'ilah; or if one drank from a golden cup, then came another and drank and yet another came and drank, all of them are guilty of me'ilah; or if one plucked [of the wool] of a chatas, then came another and plucked and yet another came and plucked, all of them are guilty of me'ilah. Rebbe said: whatever is unredeemable is subject to the law of me'ilah even after me'ilah has been already committed with it.

GEMARA: According to whom is our Mishnah? — According to Rabbi Nechemiah, for it has been taught: One does not commit me'ilah with things of which me'ilah had been committed already, except with animals; Rabbi Nechemiah says. Except with animals and vessels of ministry. What is the reason of the first Tanna? — He bases his opinion upon the fact that animals are mentioned in connection with it, for it is written: With the ram of the asham, while Rabbi Nechemiah argues a kal vachomer: If it renders things contained therein holy, surely it must be holy itself.

Rebbe said: whatever is unredeemable is subject etc. But this is the view of the first Tanna? — They differ with regard to wood. For our Rabbis taught: If a man

said, I take upon myself to present wood to the Temple, he may not offer less than two logs. Rebbe said: Wood has the status of a sacrifice, it requires salt and waving. Whereupon Rava remarked that according to Rebbe an offering of wood requires other wood in addition, and Rav Pappa remarked that according to Rebbe wood requires the taking of a handful. Rav Pappa said, They differ with regard to unblemished offerings consecrated to the altar which received blemishes and were illegitimately slaughtered. This indeed is confirmed by what has been taught: If unblemished offerings dedicated to the altar received blemishes and were illegitimately slaughtered. Rebbe says they have to be buried, while the Sages hold they shall be redeemed.