

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH (cont.):** The Mishnah concludes discussing halachos related to the five chattas that are left to die.

2) Clarifying the Mishnah

The reason why the first part of the Mishnah enumerates different cases and the end of the Mishnah groups them together is explained.

The reason the Mishnah appears here and in Temurah is explained.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the me'ilah status of the money set aside by a nazir for his nezirus korbanos.

4) The Mishnah's reasoning

Reish Lakish unsuccessfully challenges the Mishnah's reasoning.

5) **MISHNAH:** R' Shimon discusses the me'ilah status of blood from a korban and libation wine.

6) Korban blood

A Baraisa presents a dispute whether korban blood is subject to the prohibition of me'ilah.

Three sources are suggested for the halacha that Biblically korban blood is not subject to me'ilah.

R' Yochanan's exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

7) Libation wine

It is noted that the Mishnah that indicates that libation wine is not subject to me'ilah once it enters the shissin seems to be inconsistent with R' Elazar bar R' Tzadok.

It is explained how R' Elazar bar R' Tzadok could be consistent with the Mishnah.

According to a second version the Gemara's initial thought was that the Mishnah follows the position of R' Elazar bar R' Tzadok.

8) **MISHNAH:** The me'ilah status of ashes from the inner altar, the menorah and underage turtledoves and underage pigeons is discussed. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 לע"נ אבינו מורינו אברהם יצחק בן יעקב פרידמן
 מוקדש על ידי בניו יעקב ואהרן

Distinctive INSIGHT

Personal benefit from funds designated for a nazir's offerings

המפריש מעות לנזירותו לא נהנין ולא מועלין מפני שהן ראויין לבא כולן שלמים

On the day a nazir completes his nezirus, he must bring a male sheep for an olah, a female sheep as a chattas, and a goat as a shelamim (Bamidbar 6:14). Our Mishnah discusses the halacha of one who designates funds to purchase the animals for these offerings, and then benefits from the consecrated monies.

The Mishnah rules that if money for the three offerings for a nazir was set aside, but no particular designation was made regarding what money would be for which offering, the halacha is that one should not benefit from any of it, but if one did benefit from it, the law of me'ilah does not apply. Each and any coin is one that may be used to buy the shelamim offering, and me'ilah does not apply to shelamim, which is kodoshim kalim, before the sprinkling of its blood.

The Rishonim offer various explanations to the Mishnah's statement that the money for the three offerings can all be used for the shelamim. Rashi says that because the person had not specified which money would be for which of the three offerings that he was obligated to bring, any coin which the person might use for personal benefit might be the money of a shelamim.

Tosafos says that although the nazir designated money which is adequate for all three of his offerings, because he did not specify which funds would be used for which offering, he could still use all of the money to bring only shelamim offerings. Tosafos in Nazir explains that the case is where the person said, "This money will go toward my of-

Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is money set aside for nazir korbanos not subject to the me'ilah prohibition
2. When does libation wine lose its me'ilah status?
3. Why does the Gemara assume that the Mishnah is inconsistent with R' Elazar bar R' Tzadok?
4. Is it permitted to derive benefit from the ashes of the menorah?

HALACHAH Highlight

Benefitting from the ashes of burnt chometz

וכי יש לך דבר שנעשה מצותו וכו'

Is there such a thing as an object used for its mitzvah purpose etc.

The Gemara teaches that any sacred object that was used for its sacred purpose is no longer subject to the prohibition of me'ilah except for the ashes removed from the altar and the garments of the kohen gadol that were worn on Yom Kippur. The reason why sacred objects used for their sacred purpose are no longer subject to the prohibition of me'ilah, explains Rashi¹, is that once they served their role in the service of God they are no longer categorized as something that is sacred for God.

Tur² explains that the question of whether it is permitted for one to derive benefit from the ashes of burnt chometz is subject to the debate between R' Yehudah and Chachamim regarding the mitzvah of destroying chometz. According to R' Yehudah the mitzvah is specifically to burn the chometz and once the chometz has been burned the ashes are permitted for benefit. This follows the principle that the ashes of any object prohibited for benefit that must be burned are permitted for benefit. Chachamim, however, maintain that the mitzvah of destroying chometz does not have to be done specifically by burning the chometz. Accordingly, since chometz is not one of the objects that must be destroyed by fire the ashes will remain prohibited. Accordingly, if one cooked food with the ashes of burnt chometz the status of that food is subject to this debate. According to R' Yehudah the food is permitted whereas according to Chachamim the food is prohibited. Chasam Sofer³ asserts that even according to Chachamim the food is permitted.

(Insight...continued from page 1)

ferings," in which case we understand that he might have meant that the money will be used toward the shelamim alone. However, if he clearly said that the money was "for my offerings," this would indicate that the money was meant for all three offerings, including his olah and chattas.

Tosafos Yom Tov points out that a practical difference between Rashi's and Tosafos's explanations would be where the person benefitted from all the funds he had set aside. According to Rashi he would be liable for me'ilah, because he obviously used money designated for more than just the shelamim. According to Tosafos, we could still say that all of this money is for the shelamim, so the person who used the money is not guilty of me'ilah.

Based upon this approach, Tosafos Yom Tov notes that the wording of the Mishnah seems to not corroborate Rashi's explanation. The Mishnah says that the funds for a nazir's offerings should not be used for one's benefit, but if one uses the funds he is not liable for me'ilah. The Mishnah seems to be saying that me'ilah is not a factor, whether he used some of the money or if he used all of it. Yet, according to Rashi, me'ilah may be a factor in the case where he used all of the money. ■

The reason why the ashes of prohibited objects that must be burned are permitted is based on our Gemara that teaches that once the mitzvah has been performed its prohibition falls away and is no longer subject to me'ilah. Although Chachamim maintain that it is not essential to burn chometz, they agree that once the chometz was destroyed the mitzvah has been fulfilled and the ashes should be permitted for benefit. ■

1. רש"י פסחים כ"ו. ד"ה וריח.

2. טור או"ח סי' תמ"ה.

3. שו"ת חת"ס יו"ד סי' ת"ח. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Money of Israel

"מלמד שטעונין גניזה..."

There is a fascinating Midrash regarding the kohen gadol's garments. "Rabbi Chanina and Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said, 'Why does a kohein gadol serve in eight garments? These correspond to the bris milah which is done on the eighth day of a baby boy's life.' Rabbi Shimon said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua, 'Why doesn't the kohein gadol enter the holy of holies in the eight gold garments?

Because an accuser cannot become a defender; if the kohein gadol would enter with these garments the Soton would say, 'Yesterday they made the golden calf, and today they serve in the holy of holies with gold?' Rabbi Yehoshua d'Sakinin said in the name of Rabbi Levi, 'Because the Torah had pity on the money of Israel.' Rabbi Levi said, 'He did not use these expensive garments in the holy of holies so as not to fall into arrogance.'¹

The Chasam Sofer, zt"l, points out that one of these answers seems difficult to understand. "How can one say that the kohen gadol did not serve because the Torah had pity on the money of Isra-

el? The kohen gadol had a set of golden garments, so why would serving in them on Yom Kippur cost anything at all?

"The answer can be understood in light of a statement on daf 11 of me'ilah. There we find that the garments used by the kohen gadol for the Yom Kippur service in the holy of holies must be interred and a new set must be used the next year. It follows that if the kohen gadol used his golden garments for this avodah, he would need a new set each year. The Torah did not require this to save us the extra expense!"² ■

1. מרדש רבה, ויקרא, כ"א: י"ו.

2. תורת משה, אחרי מות. ■