

NOTES

May not immerse it during twilight – אין מטבילין – אותו בין השמשות: Rashi explains that this is because he is considered to be immersing on a Festival. His approach has been discussed at great length. The key issue is the extent to which the rabbinic prohibitions concerning Shabbat apply during the twilight period. The Rambam seems to rule that they do not apply during the period of twilight where a mitzva is involved, and he accordingly does not cite this ruling that one may not immerse a vessel during the twilight period. Even Rashi indicates that the explicit reasons stated with regard to the immersion of a vessel do not apply in this situation, as twilight is merely a case of uncertainty (see *Rishon LeTziyyon, Tziyyun LeNefesh Hayya*, and others).

Even on a weekday one may not immerse – אף בחול – אין מטבילין: The author of the *Tziyyun LeNefesh Hayya* is puzzled by this entire line of inquiry: If one knows the *halakha*, he will certainly refrain from using the vessel until the next day after the sun has set. If he is not aware of the *halakha*, why not inform him of this requirement rather than prevent him from immersing the vessel? He offers the rather forced answer that onlookers might learn from his actions and immerse vessels at the same time of the day, without waiting for sunset on the following day. In the *Bigdei Yom Tov* it is explained that the Sages issued their decree due to one who knows the *halakha* as well, as he might be preoccupied and forget that the sun has not set on these vessels, and he will rely on the fact that they have been immersed.

Became impure through less than a lentil-bulk – דאיטמי בפחות מכעדשה: Among the measures taught as a *halakha* to Moses from Sinai is that a creeping animal does not impart ritual impurity if it is less than a lentil-bulk in size. Although the size is not delineated in the Torah, the Sages supported their tradition with the observation that the smallest of the impure creeping animals listed in the Torah begins life at about the size of a lentil.

ואיבעית אימא רבנן, וכולה מתניתין בשבת.

תנו רבנן: בלי שנטמא מערב יום טוב – אין מטבילין אותו בין השמשות.

רבי שמעון שזורי אומר: אף בחול אין מטבילין אותו, מפני שצריך הערב שמש.

ותנא קמא לא בעי הערב שמש? אמר רבא: אשכחתינהו לרבנן דבי רב דיתבי וקא אמרי: במחשבתו נכרת מתוך מעשיו קמפלגי. והיכי דמי – כגון דנקיט מנא בידיה, ורהיט ואויל בין השמשות לאטבוליה.

מר סבר: האי דקא רהיט ואויל – מידע ידע דבעי הערב שמש.

ומר סבר: מחמת מלאכתו הוא דקרהיט.

ואמינא להו אנא: במחשבתו נכרת מתוך מעשיו – דכולי עלמא לא פליגי, כי פליגי – כגון דאיטמי בפחות מכעדשה, ואתא לקמיה דרבנן לשיולי: בפחות מכעדשה, איטמי אי לא? מר סבר: מודהא לא גמיר, הערב שמש נמי לא גמיר, ומר סבר: הא הוא דלא גמיר, הא הערב שמש גמיר.

And if you wish, say instead that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, and on a Festival one is permitted even to immerse an impure vessel on account of its water in order to purify the vessel. And the entire mishna is referring to Shabbat, when it is prohibited to immerse an impure vessel, but it is permitted to purify impure water by bringing it into contact with pure water in a stone vessel.

S The Sages taught in a *baraita*: With regard to a vessel that became ritually impure on the eve of a Festival, one may not immerse it during twilight,ⁿ a time period of doubtful status whether it is a weekday or a Festival, due to the possibility of violating the prohibition against immersing vessels on a Festival.

Rabbi Shimon Shezuri says: Even on a weekday one may not immerseⁿ an impure vessel during twilight because the vessel requires sunset. After an impure vessel is immersed, it remains ritually impure for certain purposes until the sun has set and the stars have come out. If one immerses an impure vessel during the twilight period, then owing to the uncertainty as to whether it is day or night, he must wait another full day, until the next sunset, before using the vessel. It is therefore preferable not to put oneself in a situation where one might come to use a vessel before its purification process has been completed.

The Gemara asks: And does the first *tanna* not require sunset? It is clear that this is required. Rava said: I found the Sages of the school of Rav sitting and saying with regard to this issue that they disagree about whether or not to accept the principle that one's intention is evident from his actions. And what are the circumstances of this dispute? They are, for example, a case where one was holding a vessel in his hand and running along at the time of twilight to immerse it.

This Sage, i.e., the Rabbis, holds that the fact that he is running along indicates that he knows that the vessel requires sunset. If he arrives at the ritual bath late, he will realize that he must wait another day, and there is no concern that he might come to use the vessel on the same day. Consequently, it is prohibited to immerse the vessel during twilight on the eve of a Festival, as, since it may already be night and he will be unable to use the vessel until the next evening, immersing the vessel would be considered to be preparing something on a Festival for a weekday, which is prohibited. However, it is permitted to immerse a vessel during twilight on an ordinary weekday evening.

And this Sage, Rabbi Shimon Shezuri, holds that perhaps he is running due to his work that he has not finished on time, and not necessarily because he knows that the purification of his vessel requires sunset. He believes that he may use the vessel immediately upon immersion; therefore, the Sages decreed that one should never immerse vessels during twilight.

Rava continues: And I said to them: With regard to the principle that one's intention is evident from his actions, everyone agrees that this is accepted. Where they disagree is, for example, in a case where a vessel became impure through contact with a creeping animal less than a lentil-bulkⁿ in size, and the vessel's owner came before the Sages to ask whether a vessel becomes impure through contact with less than a lentil-bulk or not. One Sage, Rabbi Shimon Shezuri, holds that since he does not know this matter that a creeping animal smaller than a lentil-bulk does not impart impurity, it stands to reason that he also does not know the *halakha* of sunset; therefore, there is reason to prohibit him from immersing vessels during twilight even on a weekday. And one Sage, the Rabbis, who permit such immersion on a weekday, hold that it is only this *halakha* with regard to the size of a creeping animal that he does not know, but the requirement of sunset he does know, as it is stated explicitly in the Torah.

From one principle to another [*migav legav*] – מִגַּב לְגַב: *Tosefot Yom Tov* explains that this should be read as *migev legev*, meaning from one pit or hole to another, referring to a place for the collection of oil or wine. The *Melekheth Shlomo* reads it as *migav legav*, meaning from one level to a higher level, as in the phrase: One above [*al gav*] the other.

His winepress in addition to his pitcher [*kado*] – גִּתּוֹ עַל גַּב כְּדוֹ: Most early authorities read this as: His winepress on account of his olive press [*bado*], i.e., that he wishes to purify his vessels for the removal of wine from the winepress, after he had originally purified them for his olive press. The basic explanation, however, remains unchanged.

Two reasons have been suggested for this immersion. Rashi explains that this individual wishes to re-immerses his vessels for their new function as a form of scrupulous observance of ritual purity. Such an immersion has no halakhic significance and is therefore not prohibited. In the *Shitta Mekubbetzet* it is explained that it was nevertheless necessary to state that it is permitted, as people view it as a repair.

The Rambam and others hold that it is referring to a case where he had already immersed his vessels for one level of purity, that of regular produce, and now he wants them to be pure at the level of *teruma* and consecrated food. As an extra stringency with regard to the latter case, the Sages instituted that vessels for this purpose must be immersed with the intention of a higher level of purity. Since this immersion is rabbinic in nature, the Sages did not apply their decree to it.

Placing hands on the head of an offering – קַמִּיָּה: The mitzva of placing hands on the head of the animal to be sacrificed is stated explicitly in the Torah (see Leviticus 1:4). It was performed in the following manner: The person bringing the offering would place both of his hands between the animal's horns and lean on it forcefully. If the sacrifice includes a confession he would then confess his sins. Since the act of placing hands is performed with force and does not involve merely laying one's hands, it is considered as if he is using the animal on a day of rest in a manner similar to riding, which is prohibited by rabbinic decree.

One may bring peace-offerings but one may not place hands on them – מְבִיאִין שְׁלָמִים וְאֵין סוֹמְכִין עֲלֵיהֶן: According to one view cited in the Gemara, the dispute concerns the issue of whether or not the ritual act of placing hands on the head of the animal to be sacrificed may be advanced to the eve of the Festival; Rashi explains accordingly. A different tannaic opinion holds that Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai disagree about the far more basic question of whether or not there is an obligation to place hands on the head of a peace-offering. According to this latter approach, the words: But one may not place his hands on them, are not referring to a Festival in particular. Rather, they form a general statement that contrasts with Beit Hillel's opinion (*Tziyyun LeNefesh Hayya*).

Festival peace-offerings and burnt-offerings of appearance – שְׁלָמֵי חֲגִיגָה וְעוֹלֹת רֵאִיָּה: Pilgrims arriving in Jerusalem for the Festivals would ordinarily bring all their sacrificial obligations to the Temple, both those required for the Festival and those animals set aside and dedicated at an earlier time. Some peace-offerings were brought in the form of Festival peace-offerings, which were required by the Torah. Both their owners and the priests partook of this offering, with part of it also sacrificed on the altar. These peace-offerings, called *hagiga*, could be brought throughout the Festival. In addition, there were peace-offerings that were not part of the Festival requirements but that were brought in order to increase the joy of the Festival, namely thanks-offerings and gift-offerings.

An analogous distinction applies to burnt-offerings: Burnt-offerings of appearance, which had to be brought upon one's appearance at the Temple, were required to be sacrificed at some point during the Festival; gift burnt-offerings, presented in gratitude or to achieve atonement for specific sins, did not have to be brought at a particular time.

“וּמִטְבִּילִין מִגַּב לְגַב.” תַּנּוּ רַבָּנַן: כִּי צִד מִגַּב לְגַב? הַרּוּצָה לַעֲשׂוֹת גִּתּוֹ עַל גַּב כְּדוֹ.

It was taught in the mishna that one may immerse on a Festival from one principle to another and from one group to another. The Gemara attempts to clarify the meaning of this statement: The Sages taught in a *baraita*: How does one immerse from one principle to another?^N One who wishes to make his winepress, meaning to immerse and purify vessels for the sake of his winepress, in addition to the purification of his ritually impure pitcher,^N may do so. In other words, if at first he merely intended to immerse his impure pitcher, but subsequently changed his mind and decided to use it for his winepress, and he wishes to immerse the pitcher a second time for the sake of the winepress, it is permitted to do so.

וְכַדּוֹ עַל גַּב גִּתּוֹ – עוֹשָׂה.

Similarly, one who wishes to make his pitcher in addition to the purification of his vessels for the sake of his winepress may do so. That is to say, if he originally intended to use the pitcher for his winepress, and after immersing it he decided not to use it for that purpose, and now he wishes to immerse his pitcher a second time, it is permitted to do so. Since the second immersion does not purify the vessel or fulfill any obligation, it is not considered a proper immersion and is not prohibited on a Festival.

כִּי צִד מִחֲבוּרָה לְחֲבוּרָה? הֲיָה אוֹכֵל בְּחֲבוּרָה זוֹ וְרוּצָה לֶאֱכֹל בְּחֲבוּרָה אַחֶרֶת – הַרְשׂוּת בִּידּוֹ.

Similarly, how does one immerse from one group to another? If one was planning to eat the Paschal offering with this group, and he immersed himself or his ritually impure vessels for that purpose; and now he has reconsidered and wishes to eat the offering with a different group, and he wants to immerse himself or his vessels a second time for the second group, in such a case he has permission to do so even on a Festival, for the same reason: Since this immersion is not obligatory, it is not viewed as an immersion at all.

מִתְנִי' בֵּית שְׁמַאי אוֹמְרִים: מְבִיאִין שְׁלָמִים וְאֵין סוֹמְכִין עֲלֵיהֶן, אֲבָל לֹא עוֹלוֹת. וּבֵית הִלֵּל אוֹמְרִים: מְבִיאִין שְׁלָמִים וְעוֹלוֹת, וְסוֹמְכִין עֲלֵיהֶן.

MISHNA Beit Shammai say: One may bring peace-offerings on a Festival, but one may not place his hands^N on them,^N as this is considered using animals, which is prohibited on a Festival by rabbinic decree. However, one may not bring burnt-offerings, apart from the obligatory daily and additional offerings of the day, because burnt-offerings are consumed entirely on the altar and not by people, and slaughter is permitted on a Festival only for the purpose of human consumption. And Beit Hillel say: One may bring both peace-offerings and burnt-offerings,^H and one may even place his hands on them.^H

גַּמ' אָמַר עוֹלָא: מַחְלוּקֵת בְּשְׁלָמֵי חֲגִיגָה לְסִמּוּךְ, וְעוֹלֹת רֵאִיָּה לִיקָרֵב. דְּבֵית שְׁמַאי סָבְרִי: “וְחֲגַגְתֶּם אוֹתוֹ חֲגִלָּה” חֲגִיגָה – אֵין, עוֹלֹת רֵאִיָּה – לֹא. וּבֵית הִלֵּל סָבְרִי: “לָה” – כָּל דְּלָה.

GEMARA Ulla said: The dispute applies only to Festival peace-offerings, an obligation of the Festival, with respect to placing hands on them, and to burnt-offerings of appearance,^N which must be brought over the course of the Festival, with respect to sacrificing them. As Beit Shammai hold that the verse “You shall observe [*vahaggotem*] it as a Festival to the Lord seven days in the year” (Leviticus 23:41) indicates: Festival peace-offerings [*hagiga*], yes, they may be sacrificed even on a Festival day, but burnt-offerings of appearance, no, they may not. And Beit Hillel hold: “To the Lord” means that anything brought as an offering to the Lord may be sacrificed throughout the seven days of the holiday, even on the actual Festival day.

אֲבָל נְדָרִים וְנִדְבוֹת – דְּבָרֵי הַכֹּל אֵין קָרִיבִין בְּיוֹם טוֹב, וְכֵן אָמַר רַב אֲדָא בַר אֲהֵבָה: נְדָרִים וְנִדְבוֹת אֵין קָרִיבִין בְּיוֹם טוֹב.

But with regard to vow-offerings and gift-offerings, which are not part of the obligations of the day, all agree, even Beit Hillel, that they may not be sacrificed on a Festival. And likewise, Rav Adda bar Ahava said: Vow-offerings and gift-offerings may not be sacrificed on a Festival.

HALAKHA

Peace-offerings and burnt-offerings on a Festival – שְׁלָמִים: Although regular vow-offerings and gift-offerings may not be brought on a Festival, Festival peace-offerings and burnt-offerings of appearance may be brought, in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, as explained by Ulla (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot*, *Hilkhot Hagiga* 1:8).

קַמִּיָּה עַל קָרְבָּנוֹת – סַמִּיָּה: When one brings the burnt-offerings of appearance or Festival peace-offerings, he must place his hands on the head of the animal in the usual manner, in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot*, *Hilkhot Hagiga* 1:9).

NOTES

Resolve and say as follows – תְּרִיץ וְאֵימָא הָכִי: Why should the *baraita* be adjusted merely because it presents a difficulty to Ulla's opinion? Some answer that the fact that the Sages allowed one to bring burnt-offerings and to sacrifice the sacrificial parts of peace-offerings on the altar shows that the offerings of individuals may be brought on a Festival, and therefore the *baraita* must be adjusted in any case (*Bigdei Yom Tov*).

מִתְבִּיבִי, אָמַר רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר: לֹא נִחְלְקוּ בֵּית שְׁמַאי וּבֵית הַלֵּל עַל עוֹלָה שְׂאִינָה שֶׁל יוֹם טוֹב – שְׂאִינָה קִרְבָּה בְּיוֹם טוֹב, וְעַל שְׁלָמִים שֶׁהֵן שֶׁל יוֹם טוֹב – שְׁקָרִיבִין בְּיוֹם טוֹב.

עַל מַה נִּחְלְקוּ – עַל עוֹלָה שֶׁהִיא שֶׁל יוֹם טוֹב, וְעַל שְׁלָמִים שְׂאִינִן שֶׁל יוֹם טוֹב. שְׁבִית שְׁמַאי אֹמְרִים: לֹא יָבִיא, וּבֵית הַלֵּל אֹמְרִים: יָבִיא.

תְּרִיץ וְאֵימָא הָכִי: אָמַר רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן אֶלְעָזָר, לֹא נִחְלְקוּ בֵּית שְׁמַאי וּבֵית הַלֵּל עַל עוֹלָה וְשְׁלָמִים שְׂאִינִן שֶׁל יוֹם טוֹב – שְׂאִינִן קִרְבִּין בְּיוֹם טוֹב, וְעַל שְׁלָמִים שֶׁהֵן שֶׁל יוֹם טוֹב – שְׁקָרִיבִין בְּיוֹם טוֹב. עַל מַה נִּחְלְקוּ – עַל עוֹלָה שֶׁהִיא שֶׁל יוֹם טוֹב, שְׁבִית שְׁמַאי אֹמְרִים: לֹא יָבִיא, וּבֵית הַלֵּל אֹמְרִים: יָבִיא.

רַב יוֹסֵף אָמַר: תִּנְאִי שְׁקֵלֶת מֵעֲלָמָא? תִּנְאִי הִיא. דְּתַנָּא: שְׁלָמִים הַבָּאִים מִחֻמַּת יוֹם טוֹב בְּיוֹם טוֹב, בֵּית שְׁמַאי אֹמְרִים: סוּמְךָ עֲלֵיהֶן מֵעֶרֶב יוֹם טוֹב וְשׁוֹחֲטֵן בְּיוֹם טוֹב. וּבֵית הַלֵּל אֹמְרִים: סוּמְךָ עֲלֵיהֶן בְּיוֹם טוֹב, וְשׁוֹחֲטֵן בְּיוֹם טוֹב.

The Gemara raises an objection against Ulla's statement from the following *baraita*: Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar said: Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel did not disagree with regard to a burnt-offering that is not part of the requirements of the Festival, such as a vow-offering or a gift-offering, that it may not be sacrificed on a Festival, or with regard to peace-offerings that are part of the Festival obligations, such as Festival peace-offerings or peace-offerings of rejoicing, that they may be sacrificed on a Festival, as the Festival is their designated time, and if one fails to bring them then he will be unable to sacrifice them later.

The *baraita* continues: With regard to what, then, did they disagree? It is with regard to a burnt-offering that is part of the Festival requirements, such as the burnt-offering of appearance, and with regard to peace-offerings that are not part of the Festival obligations, such as vow-offerings and gift-offerings. As Beit Shammai say: He may not bring them, and Beit Hillel say: He may bring them. This *baraita* contradicts Ulla's opinion that all agree that vow-offerings and gift-offerings may not be sacrificed on a Festival.

The Gemara answers: Resolve the contradiction by emending the text, and say as follows:^N Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar said: Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel did not disagree with regard to burnt-offerings and peace-offerings that are not part of the requirements of the Festival, such as vow-offerings and gift-offerings, that they are certainly not sacrificed on a Festival, or with regard to peace-offerings that are part of the Festival obligations, such as Festival peace-offerings or peace-offerings of rejoicing, that they may be sacrificed on a Festival. With regard to what did they disagree? It is with regard to a burnt-offering that is part of the Festival requirements, such as the burnt-offering of appearance, as Beit Shammai say: He may not bring it, and Beit Hillel say: He may bring it.

Rav Yosef said: There were never any grounds for objection from the outset, as have you removed all the *tanna'im* from the world? This is the subject of a dispute among *tanna'im*, and Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar's opinion was not unanimously accepted. As it is taught in a different *baraita*: With regard to peace-offerings that come on account of a Festival on the Festival, e.g., Festival peace-offerings or peace-offerings of rejoicing, Beit Shammai say: One places his hands on them on the eve of the Festival and slaughters them on the Festival, and Beit Hillel say: One places his hands on them on the Festival itself and slaughters them on the Festival.

Perek II
Daf 19 Amud b

NOTES

Thanks-offering – תּוֹדָה: A thanks-offering (Leviticus 7:11–15) is a special type of peace-offering brought in gratitude for a miracle performed on one's behalf or for similar events. This offering differs from a regular peace-offering in that it may be eaten only on the day on which it was offered and the following night, in contrast to the peace-offering, which may be eaten on the subsequent day as well. In addition, the animal thanks-offering must be accompanied by a meal-offering consisting of forty loaves of bread, ten of which are leavened and thirty of which are made up of three different types of *matza*.

אָבֵל נְדָרִים וְנִדְבּוֹת – דְּבָרֵי הַכֹּל אֵין קִרְבִּין בְּיוֹם טוֹב.

וְהֵי תִנְאִי כִּי הֵי תִנְאִי. דְּתַנָּא: אֵין מְבִיאִין תּוֹדָה בְּחַג הַמִּצּוֹת מִפְּנֵי חֲמִץ שְׁבֵה, וְלֹא בַעֲצֵר מִפְּנֵי שְׁהוּא יוֹם טוֹב. אָבֵל מְבִיא אָדָם תּוֹדָתוֹ בְּחַג הַסּוּכוֹת.

However, with regard to vow-offerings and gift-offerings, all agree that they may not be sacrificed on the actual Festival day, as stated by Ulla and Rav Adda bar Ahava.

^S The Gemara comments that in this matter, these *tanna'im* are like those *tanna'im*, who also disagreed about the same issue, as it is taught in a *baraita*: One may not bring a thanks-offering^N on the festival of *Matzot* due to the leavened bread included with it, as a thanks-offering must be accompanied by a meal-offering of forty loaves, ten of which are leavened bread, which may not be eaten on Passover. Nor may one bring this offering on *Shavuot* because it is a Festival, on which one may not bring any offering, even one that is eaten, if it is not part of the Festival obligations. However, a person may bring his thanks-offering on the festival of *Sukkot*.

תודה בַּחַג – תודה על סוכות – תודה על סוכות: One may bring a thanks-offering on *Sukkot* and thereby fulfill his obligation to bring peace-offerings of rejoicing (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Hagiga* 2:10).

תודה בערב פסח – תודה בערב פסח: One may not bring a thanks-offering on the eve of Passover because one may not bring consecrated offerings to a situation that increases the likelihood of disqualification. If one did bring it, he has fulfilled his obligation to bring peace-offerings of rejoicing (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Hagiga* 2:10).

תודה בַּחַג – תודה בַּחַג: It is permitted to sacrifice vow-offerings and gift-offerings on the intermediate days of a Festival, in accordance with the opinion of Abaye (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Hagiga* 1:10).

NOTES

One may not bring consecrated offerings to a situation of disqualification – תודה בַּחַג: Even those who hold that one may do so permit it only due to a special need, as a remedy either for an offering or for one bringing an offering (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

תודה בַּחַג – תודה בַּחַג: The commentaries dispute the meaning of this phrase. Most understand it as referring to the sawing and chopping of pieces of wood (*ge'onim* and others). Although this is permitted even on the Festival day itself, that is true only in cases where it is required for that day, but not where it is needed for a different day (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi). Rashi explains that it means cutting down trees that are attached to the ground. Others explain that it means that one is permitted to make baskets [*salim*] on the intermediate days of a Festival (*Arukh*), or that one may grind wheat into flour [*solef*] (*Meiri*).

רבי שמעון אומר: הרי הוא אומר "בַּחַג המצות ובַּחַג השבועות ובַּחַג הסוכות" כל שבא בַּחַג המצות – בא בַּחַג השבועות ובַּחַג הסוכות, וכל שלא בא בַּחַג המצות אינו בא בַּחַג השבועות ובַּחַג הסוכות. רבי אלעזר ברבי שמעון אומר: מביא אדם תורתו בַּחַג הסוכות ויוצא בה ידי חובתו משום שמחה, ואין יוצא בה משום הגיגה.

אמר מר: אין מביאין תודה בַּחַג המצות מפני חמץ שבה. פשיטא. אמר רב אדא בריה דרב יצחק, ואמרי לה רב שמואל בר אבא: הכא בארבעה עשר עסקינן, וקסבר: אין מביאין קדשים לבית הפסול.

"ולא בעצרת מפני שהוא יום טוב." קסבר: נדרים ונדבות אין קריבין ביום טוב.

"אבל מביא אדם תורתו בַּחַג הסוכות." אימת? אילימא ביום טוב עצמו – והא אמרת ולא בעצרת מפני שהוא יום טוב. אלא בחולו של מועד.

רבי שמעון אומר: הרי הוא אומר "בַּחַג המצות ובַּחַג השבועות ובַּחַג הסוכות", כל שבא בַּחַג המצות – בא בַּחַג השבועות ובַּחַג הסוכות, וכל שלא בא בַּחַג המצות – אינו בא בַּחַג השבועות ובַּחַג הסוכות. מתקיף לה רבי יורא: השתא סלותי מסלתין, נדרים ונדבות מבעיא?

אמר אביי: בהקדבה – כולי עלמא לא פליגי דשרי, כי פליגי – למיקם עליה ב"ב תאחר".

The *baraita* continues: Rabbi Shimon says: But it says: "On the festival of *Matzot*, on the festival of *Shavuot*, and on the festival of *Sukkot*" (Deuteronomy 16:16), to teach: Any offering that comes on the festival of *Matzot* may come on the festival of *Shavuot* and on the festival of *Sukkot*, and any offering that does not come on the festival of *Matzot* may not come on the festival of *Shavuot* or on the festival of *Sukkot*. Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: A person may bring his thanks-offering on the festival of *Sukkot*^H and fulfill with it his obligation to bring peace-offerings of rejoicing. One fulfills the mitzva to rejoice on a Festival by eating the meat of offerings, and this obligation can be fulfilled with the meat of a thanks-offering. But he does not fulfill with it the obligation to bring a Festival peace-offering.

The Gemara analyzes the *baraita* cited above. The Master said in the *baraita* that one may not bring a thanks-offering on the festival of *Matzot* due to the leavened bread included with it. The Gemara expresses surprise: It is obvious that one may not bring this offering on Passover, as it contains leavened bread. Rav Adda, son of Rav Yitzhak, said, and some say it was Rav Shmuel bar Abba who said: Here, this *baraita* is not discussing Passover itself; rather, we are dealing with a thanks-offering sacrificed on the fourteenth of Nisan, i.e., on Passover eve,^H and this *tanna* holds that one may not bring consecrated offerings to a situation where the time that they may be eaten is restricted, thereby increasing the likelihood of disqualification.^N Although it is permitted to eat leavened bread until the sixth hour of the fourteenth of Nisan, one may not bring a thanks-offering on Passover eve. The reason is that a thanks-offering may usually be eaten for one full day and the following night, and if it is brought on the eve of Passover, the time available before disqualification is reduced.

It was further taught in the *baraita*: Nor may one bring a thanks-offering on *Shavuot* because it is a Festival. The Gemara explains: This *tanna* holds that vow-offerings and gift-offerings may not be sacrificed on a Festival.

The *baraita* continues: However, a person may bring his thanks-offering on the festival of *Sukkot*. The Gemara asks: When? If we say he may bring it on the Festival day of *Sukkot* itself, this is difficult, as didn't you say: Nor may one bring a thanks-offering on *Shavuot* because it is a Festival, indicating that a thanks-offering may not be brought on an actual Festival day? The same should apply to *Sukkot*. Rather, it means that one may bring it on the intermediate days of the Festival.

The *baraita* further taught that Rabbi Shimon says: But it says: "On the festival of *Matzot*, on the festival of *Shavuot*, and on the festival of *Sukkot*," to teach: Any offering that comes on the festival of *Matzot* may come on the festival of *Matzot* and on the festival of *Sukkot*, and any offering that does not come on the festival of *Matzot* may not come on the festival of *Shavuot* or on the festival of *Sukkot*. This seems to indicate that thanks-offerings may not be brought on any Festival. Rabbi Zeira strongly objects to this: Now, if we may chop^N kindling wood on the intermediate days of the Festival for the sake of the Festival, is it necessary to state that it is permitted to sacrifice vow-offerings and gift-offerings on the intermediate Festival days? How can it be suggested that Rabbi Shimon prohibits bringing thanks-offerings on the intermediate days of the festival of *Sukkot*?

Abaye said: With regard to sacrificing these offerings on the intermediate days of a Festival, everyone agrees that it is permitted.^H When they disagree, it is not with regard to the *halakhot* of a Festival but with respect to determining when one is liable for violating the prohibition: You must not delay. If one vows to bring an offering but fails to fulfill his pledge, how much time must pass before he transgresses the prohibition: "You shall not delay to pay it" (Deuteronomy 23:22)?

The *halakhot* of not delaying – דיני בל תאחר – With regard to vows, pledges, and other commitments that one makes, there is a positive mitzva by Torah law to fulfill them on the first Festival following his vow. If the Festival arrived and he did not bring them, he has negated the positive mitzva. If three Festivals passed without his bringing them, he has transgressed the negative mitzva: “You shall not delay,” in accordance with the opinion of the first *tanna* (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma’aseh HaKorbanot* 14:13).

Anything that is an obligatory matter – כָּל דָּבָר שֶׁבְּחֻבָּה – Any offering that one is obligated to bring must come from an animal that is non-sacred. Consequently, one may not fulfill one’s obligation to bring a burnt-offering of appearance by means of a burnt-offering that he had earlier vowed to sacrifice for a different purpose (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Hagiga* 2:8).

NOTES

In their order, yes – בְּסִדְרָן אֵין – The *Meiri* explains Rabbi Shimon’s approach in the following manner: The prohibition against delaying applies only to vow-offerings or gift-offerings that may be sacrificed on the three Festivals in order. Consequently, this obligation does not apply to any type of offering that may not be sacrificed on Passover, such as thanks-offerings, due to the leaven they contain, or on *Shavuot*, because it is a Festival day (see Rashi and *Tosafot*).

This is identical to the opinion of the first *tanna* – הֵיִינוּ תְּנָא קַמָּא – The Gemara could have said: This is identical to the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, but it was not precise in this regard (*Meiri*).

The opinion of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon – שִׁיטַת רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן – The Maharsha asks: According to the Gemara’s explanation that the statement of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, teaches that the prohibition against delaying applies only to *Sukkot*, how can one infer that he permits the sacrifice of vow-offerings and gift-offerings on the Festival day itself? Many different answers for this question have been suggested. One suggestion is that Rabbi Elazar’s words: A person may bring his thanks-offering, do not refer only to the relevant prohibition, i.e., “you shall not delay,” but also indicate the presence of a special leniency in this case, i.e., that one may bring a thanks-offering on the Festival day itself *ab initio* (*Rishon LeTziyyon*; see *Kik-kayon DeYona*).

And fulfill with it his obligation of rejoicing – וַיִּצְאָ בָּהּ מִשּׁוֹם שְׂמֵחָה – Although the peace-offerings of rejoicing are also obligatory, their level of obligation is not on the same as that of Festival peace-offerings. Whereas the obligation in the latter case is to bring a specific, defined offering, the basic obligation with regard to peace-offerings of rejoicing is to rejoice by eating meat. Provided one brings meat for the joy of the Festival, from any source, he has fulfilled his obligation (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

תְּנָא קַמָּא סְבֵר: שְׁלֹשׁ רְגָלִים אָמַר רַחֲמֵנָא, אִפְּלוּ שְׁלָא כְּסִדְרָן.

וְרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן סְבֵר כְּסִדְרָן – אֵין, שְׁלָא כְּסִדְרָן – לָא.

רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אָמַר: מִבֵּיא אֲדָם תּוֹדָתוֹ בְּחַג הַסּוּכּוֹת, אֵימַת? אֵילִימָא בְּחֻלוֹ שְׁל מוֹעֵד – הֵיִינוּ תְּנָא קַמָּא. אֶלָּא בְּיוֹם טוֹב, וְקַסְבֵּר: נְדָרִים וְנִדְבוֹת קָרִיבִין בְּיוֹם טוֹב.

וּמַאי שְׂנָא חַג הַסּוּכּוֹת דְּנִקְטָ? רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן לְטַעֲמֵיהּ, דְּתִנְיָא רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אָמַר: לָא יֵאמַר “חַג הַסּוּכּוֹת” שְׁבוּ הַפְּתוּב מְדַבֵּר, לְמַה נֶּאֱמַר – לְוִמֵר שְׂזָה אֲהָרֹן.

רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אָמַר: לְוִמֵר שְׂזָה גֹרָם.

“וַיִּצְאָ בָּהּ מִשּׁוֹם שְׂמֵחָה וְאֵינוּ יוֹצֵא בָּהּ מִשּׁוֹם הַגִּיגָה.” פְּשִׁיטָא. דְּבָר שֶׁבְּחֻבָּה הֵיא, וְכָל דְּבָר שֶׁבְּחֻבָּה אֵינוּ בָּא אֶלָּא מִן הַחֻלִּין.

The first *tanna* holds that the Merciful One states three Festivals in the Torah, even not in their proper order, meaning not in accordance with the yearly cycle found in the Torah: Passover, *Shavuot*, *Sukkot*. As soon as three Festivals have passed from the day a person took his vow, if he has yet to bring his offering, he has transgressed the prohibition against delaying. Therefore, the first *tanna* advises a person who vowed to bring a thanks-offering to do so on *Sukkot*, even if it is the first Festival after his vow, and even though it is not the first Festival listed by the Torah. If he fails to do so, he will have to make a special trip to Jerusalem in order to sacrifice the offering, as he will not be able to sacrifice it on Passover due to the leavened bread it contains, or on *Shavuot* because it does not have intermediate Festival days.^h

But Rabbi Shimon holds that if three Festivals have passed in their proper order, yes,ⁿ he has violated the prohibition against delaying; but if they have passed not in their proper order, he has not violated the prohibition. If, for example, one vowed to bring an offering between Passover and *Shavuot*, he may put off bringing the offering until *Sukkot* of the following year, and therefore he would not be required to travel an extra time to Jerusalem specifically for this purpose.

The *baraita* further taught that Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: A person may bring his thanks-offering on the festival of *Sukkot*. The Gemara asks: When? If we say that he means on the intermediate days of the Festival, this is identical to the opinion of the first *tanna*ⁿ of the *baraita*. Rather, he must be referring to the Festival day itself, and he holds that vow-offerings and gift-offerings may be sacrificed on a Festival.

The Gemara asks: If so, what is different about the festival of *Sukkot* that he cited it specifically as an example of a Festival? The Gemara answers: Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, conforms to his standard line of reasoning, and this ruling too is related to the prohibition against delaying. As it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Shimon says: The verse did not have to say “the festival of *Sukkot*,” of which the immediately preceding verse was speaking; it was only necessary to add the other Festivals. Why, then, is “the festival of *Sukkot*” stated? It is to say that this Festival, i.e., *Sukkot*, must be the last one with regard to the prohibition against delaying; one transgresses the prohibition only if the three Festivals have passed in their proper order, so that *Sukkot* is the last of the three.

However, Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: It comes to say that this Festival is what causes a person to be late in fulfilling his vow. In his view, the prohibition against delaying does not depend on the number of Festivals. Rather, it means that by the time of *Sukkot*, the last Festival according to the yearly cycle found in the Torah, one must have brought all of his vow-offerings of that year. Even one who vowed to bring an offering just before *Sukkot* must bring his offering before the Festival ends.ⁿ

It is taught in the *baraita*: A person may bring his thanks-offering on the festival of *Sukkot* and fulfill with it his obligation to bring peace-offerings of rejoicing,ⁿ but he does not fulfill with it the obligation to bring a Festival peace-offering. The Gemara expresses surprise: It is obvious that one does not fulfill his obligation to bring a Festival peace-offering with his thanks-offering. The Festival peace-offering is an obligatory matter, as everyone is obligated to bring this offering, and the principle is that anything that is an obligatory matter^h must come only from that which is non-sacred, meaning that one cannot bring an obligatory offering from an animal that has already been consecrated for another purpose. It follows that one cannot discharge his obligation to bring a Festival peace-offering with a thanks-offering, as he is already obligated to bring the latter and has consecrated the animal for this purpose.

לֹא צְרִיכָא, דְּאָף עַל גַּב דְּפְרִישׁ.

The Gemara answers: **No**, it is necessary to state this *halakha* in order to teach that even if one specified at the time of his vow that he is consecrating the animal as a thanks-offering on condition that it may be used as a Festival peace-offering as well, he nevertheless does not fulfill his obligation with it.

בְּדַבְעָא מִנִּיהּ רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן לָקִישׁ מַרְבִּי יוֹחָנָן: הָאוֹמֵר "הָרִי עָלַי תּוֹדָה וְאַצֵּא בָּהּ יָדַי תְּחִיבָהּ", הָרִינִי נָזִיר

This teaching is similar to the question that **Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish asked of Rabbi Yohanan**: With regard to one who vows and says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a thanks-offering, and I will also fulfill my obligation to bring a Festival peace-offering with it; or if he says: **I am a nazirite**,

Perek II
Daf 20 Amud a

וְאִגְלַח מִמַּעוֹת מַעֲשֵׂר שְׁנִי מִהוּ?
אָמַר לֵיהּ: נְדוּר וְאִינוּ יוֹצֵא, נָזִיר וְאִינוּ
מִגְלַח.

and I will shave my head, meaning I will purchase the nazirite offerings that are brought when a nazirite shaves himself, with second-tithe money, which I am obligated in any case to bring to Jerusalem, what is the *halakha*? Rabbi Yohanan said to him: With regard to the thanks-offering, he has vowed and must bring the offering, but he does not fulfill his obligation^h of the Festival peace-offering with it, as the latter offering must be brought from unconsecrated animals. Similarly, one who took the vow of naziritiship is a nazirite, but he may not shave^h his head and bring nazirite offerings purchased with second-tithe money.

הָהוּא גִבְרָא דְאָמַר לְהוּ: הָבוּ לִי
אַרְבַּע מָאָה זָוִי לְפָלוּנִי, וְלְנָסִיב בְּרַתִּי.
אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא: אַרְבַּע מָאָה – שְׁקִיל,
וּבְרַתִּי, אִי בְעֵי – נָסִיב, אִי בְעֵי –
לֹא נָסִיב.

In relation to the previous case, in which one makes a conditional statement and only part of his statement is accepted, the Gemara relates a somewhat similar incident: A certain man said to those tending to him, in the form of a will: Give four hundred zuz to so-and-so, and let him marryⁿ my daughter.^h Rav Pappa said: The four hundred zuz he takes, but as for the benefactor's daughter, if he wishes, he may marry her, and if he wishes, he need not marry her.

טַעֲמָא דְאָמַר: הָבוּ לִי וְלְנָסִיב, אֲבָל
אִי אָמַר לְנָסִיב וְהָבוּ לִי, אִי נָסִיב –
שְׁקִיל, וְאִי לֹא נָסִיב – לֹא שְׁקִיל.

The Gemara comments: The reason is solely that he said it in this manner: Give him the money and let him marry my daughter, mentioning the gift before the condition. However, if he specified the condition first, by saying: Let him marry my daughter and give him the money, in that case, if he marries her, he takes the money, but if he does not marry her, he may not take it.

יְתִיב מְרִימָר וְקָאֵמַר לְהָא שְׁמַעְתָּא
מִשְׁמִיחָ דְנַפְשִׁיהּ. אָמַר לֵיהּ רַבִּינָא
לְמַרְימָר: אַתּוֹן הָבִי מִתְּנִיתוּ לָהּ, אֲנִן
בְּדַבְעָא מִנִּיהּ רִישׁ לָקִישׁ מַרְבִּי יוֹחָנָן
מִתְּנִין לָהּ.

The Gemara relates: Mareimar^p sat and stated this *halakha* with regard to one who attaches a condition to his vow to bring a thanks-offering in his own name, without attributing it to the Sage who stated it. Ravina said to Mareimar: You teach this *halakha* in this manner, without attribution, whereas we teach it in the form of a question that Reish Lakish asked of Rabbi Yohanan.

NOTES

הָבוּ לִי...וְלְנָסִיב: Several different explanations were given for this *halakha*. According to the way the *Terumat HaDeshen* explains Rashi and *Tosafot*, they hold that the guiding principle in this case is: One is held accountable for his first expression, meaning that a person's first statement is viewed as the essential, binding one, while the second is viewed as subordinate (see *Meiri*). According to this understanding, both this *halakha* and Rabbi Yohanan's statement are based on the same principle; in that case, too, once a person vows to bring a thanks-offering, his words take immediate effect and he can no longer use the animal for any other purpose, whereas were he to reverse the order and state the condition first, his condition might be effective. According to a different approach, the person who received the money need not marry the benefactor's daughter due to the principle that conditions must be stipulated prior to the main transaction. In other words, as a matter of formality, conditions should be referred to before mentioning the main transaction; if the main transaction is

mentioned first, the condition attached to it is not binding (Rabbi Zerahya HaLevi).

Others hold that in this case the gift of the money is not conditional upon the recipient's marriage to the benefactor's daughter; rather, the same person gave a gift and offered his daughter's hand in marriage. Since there is no inherent connection between the two, the recipient may choose to do as he wishes (Rif; Rabbi Aharon HaLevi). Similarly, the *Meiri* explains that the order clarifies whether he intended to make two separate offers, or, when he mentions the marriage proposal first, he intended a single offer. According to these opinions, the connection between this *halakha* and that of Rabbi Yohanan is merely that in both cases a person said two things, only one of which is fulfilled. Some authorities emphasize other aspects of the case, including the significance of consecration, where speech alone has the force of an action; or the *halakhot* governing the testament of a dying person, whose words are viewed as established and already in effect (see Rashba, Ra'avad's comments on the Rif, and *Milhamot Hashem*).

HALAKHA

He has vowed, but does not fulfill his obligation – נְדוּר וְאִינוּ יוֹצֵא: If one says: It is incumbent upon me to bring a thanks-offering, which I will also use to fulfill my obligation to bring a Festival peace-offering, he must bring a thanks-offering, but he does not thereby fulfill his obligation with regard to a Festival peace-offering. Some hold that if he conditioned his consecration of the thanks-offering on fulfilling his obligation with regard to the Festival peace-offering, he does fulfill the latter obligation (Ra'avad; Rashba; Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Hagiga* 2:14).

A nazirite, but he may not shave – נָזִיר וְאִינוּ מִגְלַח: If one says: I am a nazirite on condition that I will shave with second-tithe money, he is a nazirite, but he must bring his offerings from animals bought with non-sacred money. Some say that if he stipulated a condition in the formal manner, e.g., he said: On condition that I shave, he may bring his offerings from second-tithe money (*Tosafot; Rambam Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 8:14).

Give four hundred zuz to so-and-so and let him marry my daughter – הָבוּ לִי אַרְבַּע מָאָה זָוִי לְפָלוּנִי וְלְנָסִיב בְּרַתִּי: If a dying person ordered: Give four hundred zuz to so-and-so and let him marry my daughter, the recipient may do as he wishes and take the money without marrying the daughter. If, however, he said: Let him marry my daughter, and give him the money, this is considered a condition, and he receives the money only if he marries the daughter. The same applies if it is clear from his statement that he intended to link the two offers in the manner of a condition (*Shakh*). Consequently, one who says: Give a certain sum of money to my daughter that she should buy a garment for herself, and the daughter passed away, the money belongs to her heirs, as the condition was not stipulated in the formal manner (*Shulhan Arukh, Hoshen Mishpat* 253:12, and in the comment of the Rema).

PERSONALITIES

Mareimar – מְרִימָר: Mareimar was a sixth-generation Babylonian *amora*. Although little is known about his personality, it is known that Mareimar was a disciple-colleague of Mar Zutra and a colleague of Rav Ashi. Apparently he lived in Sura, and the Sages of Sura followed his rulings. He was the primary teacher of Ravina, one of the last *amora'im*. Following Rav Ashi's death, though not immediately, Mareimar took his place as head of the academy in Sura, and he and Ravina together continued redacting the Talmud. The term Mar prefixed to his name might indicate that he was affiliated with the family of the Exilarch. Mareimar's son, Rav Yehuda bar Mareimar, was an important Sage in the following generation.