



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses whether different items combine in regard to the violation of the me'ilah prohibition.

### 2) Clarifying the Mishnah

The reason it was necessary for the Mishnah to address all the different cases is explained.

### 3) Biblical me'ilah

R' Yannai asserts that Biblically one is liable for me'ilah only for items sanctified for Beis HaMikdash upkeep and olos.

After numerous unsuccessful challenges regarding this ruling the Gemara finally succeeds and forces a revision of R' Yannai's teaching.

4) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah enumerates the five parts of an olah that combine and the six parts of a todah that combine.

### 5) The correct reading of the Mishnah

Rabbah corrected R' Huna's incorrect version of the Mishnah.

It is noted that the Mishnah supports a principle related to combining different parts of an olah for different prohibitions.

The wording of the Baraisa is challenged and a new interpretation of the Baraisa is suggested.

The Gemara identifies R' Yehoshua as the author of the Baraisa and cites another Baraisa that records R' Yehoshua's relevant ruling.

R' Pappa clarifies a point in the Baraisa.

6) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses combining different foods for different halachos

### 7) Clarifying the Mishnah

The reason why the first five items enumerated in the Mishnah combine is explained and the related sources are presented.

8) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah teaches that the different neveilos combine together as do different shertzim. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 לע"נ  
 Gitel Roiza bas R' Avraham Zev HaKohen

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 By Rabbi and Mrs. Avi Banker  
 In memory of their father  
 ר' חיים יוחנן בן ר' אברהם יצחק ז"ל

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 By Rabbi and Mrs. Michael Glassenberg  
 In memory of their father  
 ר' משה בן ר' ארי' לייב, ע"ה

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Using items designated for the general Mikdash (בדק הבית) for other purposes*

קדשי בדק הבית מצטרפין זה עם זה למעילה

The Mishnah teaches that items consecrated for the general upkeep of the Mikdash are subject to me'ilah. The Mishnah rules that the minimum amount of trespass of a peruta which is required before one is liable may comprise a combination of smaller amounts of various items.

Rambam (Hilchos Temurah 4:11) writes that one who changes sanctification of an item from one category to another is in violation of the prohibition (Vayikra 27:26), "He shall not sanctify it." This verse is written in regard to a bechor, and the Torah prohibits one to declare it to be an olah or shelamim. Similarly, we learn that it is prohibited to change the designation of any sanctified object, whether it is an animal designated for the Altar or an object consecrated for the general upkeep of the Mikdash. Rambam here states that even objects earmarked for specific purposes within the general fund of the Mikdash are included in this restriction not to have their designation changed.

Ra'aved disagrees with Rambam, and he holds that everything within the category of sanctification for the general fund of the Mikdash is one classification, and items may be shifted from one purpose to another within this category. The rule found in Temura (32a) not to shift things from one category to another only refers to moving things from sanctification for the Altar to that of the general fund of the Mikdash or the reverse, as well as changing items set for the Altar from one another, but not within the general fund itself. Things designated for the Altar each have different rules regarding how they are eaten, the atonement they procure, and the blood that is sprinkled, while items given for the general fund of the Mikdash are basically the same in that they are holy for their monetary value.

R' Yosef Dov Soloveichik notes that according to Rambam, the wording of our Mishnah can be understood well. "Items sanctified for the general upkeep of the Mikdash may combine with each other." Even though one transgresses with two different items whose sanctities are distinct from each other, they may still combine to the value of a peruta. According to Ra'aved, where all items for the Mikdash are one single category, there would be no need for the Mishnah to teach that they may combine, for this would be obvious.

Yet, Shiurei HaGri'd explains that perhaps Ra'aved only meant that the entire category of בדק הבית is one in regard to money donated for various purposes, i.e., some for the Altar and other money for the Sanctuary. However, once items are purchased for different purposes, even Ra'aved agrees that the sanctity of one may not be exchanged one with another, but they still combine with each other for the law of me'ilah. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## The sanctity of prefixes before God's Name

אין חייבין מעילה אלא על קדשי בדק הבית ועולה בלבד

One is not liable for me'ilah except on items sanctified for Beis HaMikdash upkeep and an olah

**R'** Yannai states that Biblically one is liable for me'ilah only with regards to items sanctified for Beis HaMikdash upkeep and Olos. The reason is that the pasuk that addresses the prohibition of me'ilah uses the phrase 'מקדשי ה' – from that which was sanctified for God and this teaches that only items designated for the exclusive use of God are subject to the prohibition. Korbanos that have a portion that is eaten by the kohanim or the owner are not exclusively God's and thus are excluded from the Biblical prohibition of me'ilah. This principle is applied to the issue of the sanctity of God's Name that is written somewhere other than on parchment so it is not exclusively God's.

Rashi<sup>1</sup> and Yeraim<sup>2</sup> distinguish between God's Name that is written in its correct place on parchment and God's Name that is written elsewhere. When God's Name is written on parchment the parchment becomes sanctified as well whereas if God's Name is written elsewhere the place where God's Name is written does not become sanctified, just the Name itself is considered sacred. Yeraim explains further that when God's Name is written on parchment it also sanctifies the prefix that precedes the Name but when God's Name is written elsewhere the prefix letters do not become sanctified.

# REVIEW and Remember

1. Why was it necessary for the Mishnah to teach that Altar offerings combine with other Altar offerings?

---

2. Are kodshim that die subject to the me'ilah prohibition?

---

3. What are the six parts of a Mincha that combine?

---

4. How much of a korban must remain to be able to throw the blood on the Altar?

---

Shach<sup>3</sup> rules that the letters that serve as the prefix before God's Name are not sacred and may be erased. Rav Akiva Eiger<sup>4</sup> cites Yeraim who maintains that if God's Name is written on parchment the prefix letters do become sanctified which is consistent with Rashi's second explanation that differentiates between God's Name that is written on parchment and God's Name that is written elsewhere. The majority of Poskim, however, follow Rashi's first explanation that does not differentiate between God's Name that is written on parchment and God's Name that is written elsewhere and in all circumstances the prefix letters are not sanctified. ■

1. רש"י ערכין ו. ד"ה שם בפירוש השני.
2. יראים סי' שס"ו דפוס ישן סי' ט"ו.
3. ש"ך יו"ד סי' רע"ז סי' ס"ק י"ג.
4. רעק"א שם. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## A Memento?

ואחד קדשי בדק הבית מצטרפין זה לזה למעילה

**I**t is not uncommon for a first-time visitor to fall in love with Yerushalayim. And the place most people feel most attracted to in Yerushalayim is the Kosel itself. When someone told Rav Yosef Shalom Eliyashiv, shlit"a, that many people who live in Yerushalayim do not visit the Kosel at least once in every thirty days, he was astounded. "That is like a man whose ailing mother lives in the same city as he does, who doesn't visit even once a month! Just as being in such a position is obviously morally untenable, the same

should be true about one who is able to visit the Kosel once a month but fails to do so."<sup>1</sup>

Yet many visitors—perhaps because they come from so far—understand that the Kosel should be visited as often as possible and envy those who live so close, who sadly often visit much less than they would like.

One man on a short trip to Yerushalayim was all broken up about having to go back home to America. "If only I could bring the Kosel with me, it wouldn't be so bad. Why can't they instantaneously transport me there every day for shacharis? I would have so much more composure and could much more easily cope with the pressures of the day."

But of course this was impossible.

When a friend heard about his trouble he made a novel suggestion. "Why not take a small piece of the Kosel back with you? That way you will feel connected and just looking at it will bring you back to the good times when you were here."

He was very impressed with this idea, but as a religious Jew he was afraid to take such a step without consulting with a posek.

When this question reached Rav Moshe Feinstein, he ruled that this is forbidden. "It is clear that even one who uses the stones of har habayis transgresses me'ilah; how much more so regarding a fragment of a stone from the Kosel itself!"<sup>2</sup> ■

- 1 שריד בית מקדשינו, ע"כ
- 2 אג"מ, יו"ד ח"ד, ס' ס"ג ■