

NOTES

He is a full-fledged righteous person [tzaddik] – הרי זה צדיק גמור: The early and later authorities questioned the wording: A full-fledged righteous person, when applied to one who performs a mitzva for the sake of receiving reward. They noted the contradiction between this *baraita* and the mishna in *Avot* (1:3) that states: Be not like servants who serve the Master in the expectation of receiving a reward. Rabbeinu Hananel and Rabbi Moshe HaDarshan, cited by the *Arukh*, had an alternate version of the Gemara text: This is considered full-fledged justice [tzedek], or: This is considered absolute charity [tzedaka]. This means that the person's desire to receive reward does not cancel the reward that he will indeed receive for the mitzva, as his act is considered full-fledged charity.

The *Meiri* explains similarly. Rashi adds here: If he does this regularly, i.e., it is referring to one who gives charity regularly without checking whether or not he actually received the reward that he had expected (see *Iyyun Ya'akov*). Similarly, Rabbi Shmuel Primo explains (cited in *Petaḥ Einayim*) that the mishna in *Avot* is referring to one who performs the mitzva in a minimal fashion. However, one who performs the mitzva in a generous manner, even if he does so for reward, is a full-fledged righteous person, as he does more than he is required to do.

The Maharal explains that there is a distinction with regard to one's intentions: If one performs a mitzva as an investment, i.e., primarily for the reward, then he is acting like a servant who serves in expectation of receiving reward. If he does it for the sake of God, then even if he hopes to receive reward, he is a full-fledged righteous person. Others distinguish between a righteous person [tzaddik] and a pious person [hasid] (*Derashot HaRan*). A righteous person is one who acts in accordance with the *halakha*. One who gives charity in accordance with his means is a full-fledged righteous person. On the other hand, tractate *Avot* is called: The teachings of the pious, and the charity given by a pious person must be on a higher level. For such a person, any expectation of reward casts a blemish on his mitzva.

There it is referring to gentiles – כאן בגוים: This is not necessarily referring specifically to gentiles but to anyone who attaches a condition to his donation of charity and comes to regret what he did if his reward does not come (Jerusalem Talmud; *Tosefot Rosh*; see Maharal).

From where do we derive that Cyrus became corrupt – מנלן דאחמיץ: The early authorities ask: The Gemara's interpretation of the verses indicates that Cyrus acted in an unfit manner from the very beginning. Why, then, were his years counted at first like the years of the Jewish kings? The Rashba suggests that at the outset, when he issued the order to build the Temple, they thought that he was a good king, but afterward, when they understood how he had commanded them to build it, it they considered him like other kings.

LANGUAGE

Shegal – שגל: Some understand this term as referring to a womb, and specifically to the womb of an animal. Hence, *shegal* refers to a female animal. More likely is the possibility that this word relates to the Persian *šaḡāl*, which means jackal. Incidentally, *šaḡāl* is itself a relative of the English term, jackal.

“וּמָה חֲשָׁחוּ וּבְנֵי תוֹרִין וְדַכְרִין וְאִמְרִין לְעֵלוֹן לְאֵלֶּה שְׁמֵיָא חֲנֻטִין מִלַּח חֲמֹר וּמִשַׁח כְּמֵאמֵר בְּהִנֵּא דִּי בִירוּשָׁלַם לְהוּא מְתִיב לְהֵם יוֹם בְּיוֹם דִּי לֹא שְׁלוֹ. אֲמַר לוֹ רַבִּי יִצְחָק: רַבִּי מְטוֹנְךְ! דִּי לְהוֹן מְהַקְרִבִין נִחוּחִין לְאֵלֶּה שְׁמֵיָא וּמְצַלִּין לְחַיֵּי מַלְכָא וּבְנוּהִי.”

וּמֵאן דְּעָבַד הָכִי לֹא מְעִלִיתָא הִיא? וְהִתְנָא: הָאוּמֵר “סָלַע זֶה לְצִדְקָה בְּשָׁבִיל שְׂחִיבֵי בְנֵי, וּבְשָׁבִיל שְׂאֻזְבָּה בְּהַ לְחַיֵּי הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא” הֲרִי זֶה צִדְקָה גְּמוּרָ!

לֹא קִשְׁיָא; כָּאן בִּישְׂרָאֵל, כָּאן בְּגוֹיִם.

וְאִיבְעִית אִימָא: מְנַלְן דְּאֲחַמְיץ? דְּכִתְבִּיב: “נִדְבָכִין דִּי אָבֹן גִּלְדֵּי תִלְתָּא וְנִדְבָךְ דִּי אַעֲדָת וְנִפְקֵתָא מִן בֵּית מַלְכָּא תִתְיַהֵב.” לְמָה לִּיהַ דְּעָבַד הָכִי? סָבַר: אִי מְרֹדוֹ בִּי יְהוּדָאִי אִיקְלִייהַ בְּנוּרָא.

אִטוּ שְׁלֹמֹה לֹא עָבַד הָכִי? וְהִכְתִּיב: “שְׁלֹשָׁה טוּרֵי גִזִּית וְטוּר כִּרְתוֹת אָרוּם!” שְׁלֹמֹה עָבַד מְלֻמְעָה, וְאִיהוּ עָבַד מְלֻמְטָה. שְׁלֹמֹה שְׁקַעִיהַ בְּבִנְיָנָא, אִיהוּ לֹא שְׁקַעִיהַ בְּבִנְיָנָא. שְׁלֹמֹה סְדִייהַ בְּסִידָא, אִיהוּ לֹא סְדִייהַ בְּסִידָא.

אֲמַר רַב יוֹסֵף וְאִימָתִימָא רַבִּי יִצְחָק: מְנַלְן דְּאֲחַמְיץ? מֵהָכָא: “וַיֹּאמֶר לִי הַמֶּלֶךְ וְהַשָּׂגֵל יוֹשֶׁבֶת אֶצְלוֹ.” מֵאִי שְׂגֵל? אֲמַר רַבָּה בְּרַ לִימָא מְשֻׁמִּיהַ דְּרַב: כְּלָבְתָא.

“And that which they need, both young bullocks, and rams, and lambs, for the burnt-offerings of the God of heaven, wheat, salt, wine, and oil, according to the word of the priests who are at Jerusalem, let it be given them day by day without fail” (Ezra 6:9)? Doesn't Cyrus' contribution to the Temple demonstrate his fear of Heaven? Rabbi Yitzhak said to Rav Kahana: My teacher, a refutation can be brought from your own burden, from the text you yourself cited, as the next verse continues: “That they may sacrifice offerings of sweet savor to the God of heaven, and pray for the life of the king and of his sons” (Ezra 6:10). This shows that Cyrus did this solely for his own benefit, so that the Jews would sacrifice offerings and pray for him and his sons.

The Gemara asks: And one who acts in this manner, is he not acting in exemplary fashion? Isn't it taught in a *baraita*: If one gives charity, saying: I give this *sela* for charity in order that my children may live, or: I give it in order that through it I may merit life in the World-to-Come, he is still considered a full-fledged righteous person?^N If so, what was wrong with the king bringing offerings so that the Jews would pray for his life and the life of his children?

The Gemara answers: This is not difficult. Here, in the case of one who makes his charity conditional yet is considered to be righteous, it is referring to a Jew. This is because even if his condition is not fulfilled, he will not complain to God. However, there, where Cyrus was not given credit for his good deed because it was conditional, it is referring to gentiles.^N A gentile may come to regret his actions and complain to God if his condition is not fulfilled.

And if you wish, say: From where do we derive that Cyrus became corrupt?^N As it is written with regard to the building of the Temple that he issued the following command: “Let the house be built ... with three rows of great stones, and a row of new timber, and let the expense be paid out of the king's house” (Ezra 6:4). Why did he do it in this manner and command that the Temple be built with a row of timber? He thought: If the Jews rebel against me, I will burn their Temple with fire, and it will be more flammable because of the wood.

The Gemara raises a question: Is that to say that Solomon did not do this very same thing when he built the first Temple? Isn't it written: “And he built the inner court, three rows of hewn stone and a row of cedar beams” (1 Kings 6:36)? The Gemara answers: Solomon placed the wood above the stone foundation, so that even if the Temple were burned, the stone foundation would remain, whereas Cyrus placed it below, so that if he were to set fire to the Temple, the whole structure would collapse. Also, Solomon sunk the wood into the building in order to make it less flammable, whereas Cyrus did not sink it into the building. Furthermore, Solomon plastered the wood over with plaster to prevent it from catching fire, whereas Cyrus did not plaster the wood over with plaster.

Rav Yosef said, and some say that it was Rabbi Yitzhak who said: From where do we derive that Cyrus became corrupt? From here, as it is written: “And the king said to me, the consort [*shegal*] also sitting by him: For how long shall your journey be? And when will you return? So it pleased the king to send me, and I set him a time” (Nehemiah 2:6). What is the meaning of the word *shegal*^L in the verse? Rabba bar Lima said in the name of Rav: It means a she-dog that sat next to him, which he used for sexual relations.

מאי קא מבשר להו נביא – What is the prophet heralding – Rabbi Tzvi Hirsch Chajes asks: Why does the Gemara refer to the author of the book of Psalms as a prophet, when Psalms is part of the books of the Writings and not the Prophets? He answers that this term is used because this entire psalm was said not for its time but as a prophecy for all of the Jewish people with regard to the days of the Messiah.

שהושיבה במקום – Because he set it in place of a consort – The Maharsha explains that he set the dog to his right, as the verse says about the consort of a king of Israel: “Upon your right hand stands a consort [shegal]” (Psalms 45:10).

נפקא מינה לנודר – A practical difference to one who makes a vow – The author of the *Penei Yehoshua* asks: Since the Gemara concludes that one has already violated a positive mitzva if he fails to bring his vow by the first Festival, what is the actual practical consequence of the transgression discussed here? Some suggest that in certain situations, one who transgresses the prohibition against delaying is subject to flogging, and so the question of when he transgresses has practical ramifications (Rabbi Tzvi Hirsch Chajes).

אחד הנודר – Whether one makes a vow – The early authorities distinguish between one who vows and one who consecrates. Rashi explains that the former vows to bring money, whereas the latter consecrates an offering. The *Tosefot Rid* suggests that one who vows accepts upon himself to bring any animal as an offering, whereas one who consecrates designates a particular animal as his offering.

פעמים חמשה – Sometimes five – The authors of the *Turei Even* and the *Minhat Hinukh* discuss whether or not sometimes even six can pass, in the case of one who made a vow during the festival of Passover.

HALAKHA

מתי עובר בבל תאחר – When does one transgress the prohibition: You shall not delay – Most early authorities ruled in accordance with the anonymous *tanna* of the mishna and in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon: One transgresses the prohibition against delaying only once three Festivals have passed in their proper order (Rif; Rosh; Ran). The Rambam rules in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon in *Sefer HaMitzvot*, but in *Mishne Torah* he rules in accordance with the opinion of the first *tanna* of the *baraita* that one transgresses the prohibition as soon as three Festivals have passed in any order, apparently relying on the *Sifrei* and on Rava's opinion cited in the Gemara (*Kesef Mishne*). The authors of the *Sefer Mitzvot Gadol* and the *Sefer HaHinukh* rule likewise. The author of the *Sefer Yere'im* ruled in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov that one transgresses the prohibition after two Festivals (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 14:13).

אלא מעתה, הא דכתיב: “ועל מרא שמיא התרוממת ולמאניא די ביתיה היתו קדמך ואנת ורברבנך שגלתך ולחנתך חמרא שתין בהון.” ואי שגל בלבתא היא בלבתא בת משתאי חמרא היא? הא לא קשיא, דמלפא לה ושתייא.

אלא מעתה דכתיב: “בנות מלכים ביקרותיך נצבה שגל לימניך בכתם אופיר.” ואי שגל בלבתא היא מאי קא מבשר להו נביא לישראל? הכי קאמר: בשכר שתביבה תורה לישראל בשגל לגוים וזיתם לכתם אופיר.

ואיבעית אימא: לעולם שגל מלבתא היא, ורבה בר לימא גמרא גמיר לה. ואמאי קרי לה שגל? שהיתה חביבה עליו בשגל. אי נמי: שהושיבה במקום שגל.

ואיבעית אימא: מנלן דאחמיץ? מהכא: “עד כסף כפרין מאה ועד חנטין כורין מאה ועד חמר בתין מאה ועד בתין משח מאה ומלח די לא כתב” וגו'. מעיקרא בלא קיצותא, והשתא בקיצותא.

ודילמא מעיקרא לא הוה קים ליה בקיצותא? אלא מחוורתא כדשנינו מעיקרא.

“ולרגלים.” רגלים באחד בניסן הוא? בחמשה עשר בניסן הוא! אמר רב חסדא: רגל שבו ראש השנה לרגלים.

נפקא מינה לנודר, למיקם עליה בבל תאחר, ורבי שמעון היא. דתנא: אחד הנודר, ואחד המקדיש, ואחד המעריך, בין שעברו עליו שלשה רגלים עובר בבל תאחר.”

רבי שמעון אומר: שלשה רגלים בסדרן. וחיג המצות תחילה. וכן היה רבי שמעון בן יוחאי אומר: רגלים פעמים שלשה, פעמים ארבעה, פעמים חמשה. כיצד? נדר לפני הפסח שלשה; לפני עצרת חמשה; לפני החג ארבעה.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: However, if that is so, there is a contradiction from that which is written about Belshazzar: “But you have lifted up yourself against the Lord of heaven; and they have brought the vessels of His house before you, and you, and your lords, your consorts [shegal] and your concubines, have drunk wine in them” (Daniel 5:23). If shegal means a she-dog, does a she-dog drink wine? The Gemara explains: This is not difficult, as perhaps they trained it to drink wine.

The Gemara raises another difficulty: However, if that is so, there is a contradiction from that which is written: “Kings’ daughters are among your favorites; upon your right hand stands a consort [shegal] in gold of Ophir” (Psalms 45:10). Now, if shegal is a she-dog, what is the prophet heraldingⁿ for the Jewish people? The Gemara explains: This is what the prophet is saying: In reward for the Torah being as precious to the Jews as a she-dog is to gentiles, you merited the gold of Ophir.

And if you wish, say: Actually, the word shegal in all these other contexts means consort, but Rabba bar Lima had a tradition that in connection with Cyrus the word shegal means she-dog. And why was it called a consort [shegal]? It is because the dog was as precious to him as a consort; or else, because he set the dog next to him in place of a consort.ⁿ

And if you wish, say: From where do we derive that Cyrus became corrupt? It is from here, as it is stated: “Up to a hundred talents of silver, and up to a hundred measures of wheat, and up to a hundred bat of wine, and up to a hundred bat of oil, and salt without prescribed limit” (Ezra 7:22). Initially he gave without setting a limit, but now he introduced a limit.

This is rejected: But perhaps initially he did not know what limit to set, as he was not familiar with the daily needs of the Temple, and afterward, when the matter became clarified, he set an appropriate limit. Rather, it is clear as we initially answered that the evidence that Cyrus became corrupt is based on his relationship with his consort rather than on his donations to the Temple.

§ The mishna teaches: And the first of Nisan is also the New Year for the order of the Festivals The Gemara asks: Is the New Year for the Festivals really on the first of Nisan? Isn't it on the fifteenth of Nisan, the first day of the festival of Passover? Rav Hisda said: What the mishna means is that the Festival that occurs in the month of Nisan is the New Year for Festivals.

The Gemara comments: This ruling makes a practical difference to one who makes a vow,ⁿ in order to determine when he is liable for violating the prohibition: You shall not delay. And the mishna was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, as it is taught in a baraita: Whether one makes a vowⁿ to bring an offering to the Temple, or consecrates an item to the Temple, or makes a valuation, promising to pay the value of a particular person to the Temple treasury, once three Festivals have passed from that day and he has not yet fulfilled his promise, he transgresses the prohibition: You shall not delay, as stated in the verse: “When you shall vow a vow to the Lord your God, you shall not delay paying it” (Deuteronomy 23:22).^h

Rabbi Shimon says: One transgresses the prohibition against delaying not when any three Festivals have passed, but when three Festivals have passed in their proper order, i.e., Passover, Shavuot, and Sukkot, with Passover first. And, so too, Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai would say: The Festivals that must pass before a person is liable for violating the prohibition against delaying are sometimes three, sometimes four, and sometimes five.ⁿ How so? If one made his vow before Passover they are three, as he may delay bringing his offering until the festival of Sukkot; if he made his vow before Shavuot they are five, as the counting of three Festivals begins only from the next Passover; and if he made his vow before the festival of Sukkot, they are four.

תָּנוּ רַבָּנַן: חַיִּיבֵי הַדְּמִין, וְהַעֲרִיבֵי, הַחֶרְמִין, וְהַקְּדוּשׁוֹת, חֲטָאוֹת, וְאִשְׁמוֹת, עוֹלוֹת, וְשִׁלְמִים, צְדָקוֹת וּמַעֲשֵׂוֹת, בְּכֹר וּמַעֲשֵׂר וּפְסִחָה.

The Sages taught in a *baraita*: With regard to those who are liable for vows of monetary payment,^N or for vows of valuations,^N or for dedications, or for consecrations, sin-offerings, guilt-offerings, burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, vows of charity, tithes,^N firstborn offerings, animal tithes, or the Paschal offering,

NOTES

Vows of monetary payment – הַדְּמִין: If one vows to donate the worth of a certain person to the Temple, the value of that person is estimated based on their worth on the slave market. That amount must be brought to the Temple in fulfillment of the vow.

Vows of valuations – הַעֲרִיבֵי: The *halakhot* of valuations appear in the Torah (Leviticus 27:1–8) and are detailed in tractate *Ara-khin*. The basic concept of valuation refers to a situation where one promises the set value of a person to the Temple treasury according to the values that the Torah fixes for each gender and age group.

Tithes – מַעֲשֵׂוֹת: *Tosafot* raise a difficulty: With regard to tithes, there is a special obligation to give them within three years, i.e., by the day before Passover of the fourth or seventh years of the Sabbatical cycle. Any tithes that have not been given by that time are subject to the *halakha* of removal of tithes. Since tithes have a separate time frame, how then does the prohibition against delaying apply to them?

Tosafot suggest three answers: (1) The prohibition against delaying applies only if one already set aside tithes but did not

give them to the party to whom they are due, whereas the obligation of removal of tithes applies even if one had not yet set aside tithes. (2) In the fourth and seventh years, in addition to the transgression of withholding tithes, one transgresses a second prohibition against not removing the tithes. (3) In the fourth and seventh years one must complete the giving of his tithes even if three Festivals have not yet passed. The Rashba argues that at the time of removal of tithes, one violates a positive mitzva rather than an additional prohibition. Some understand that this is also the meaning of *Tosafot*.

The *Meiri* also suggests three answers: (1) One violates the prohibition against delaying only after both three Festivals and Passover of the fourth or seventh years. (2) The three Festivals relate to the obligation to set aside tithes, whereas the fourth and seventh years relate to the obligation to distribute them, which is the opposite of the first answer of *Tosafot*. (3) After three Festivals, one transgresses only if he did not promise the tithes to a Levite, but if he promised them, he transgresses only after three years. The *Turei Even* adds that the obligation of removal of tithes applies even in situations where the prohibition against delaying does not apply.

Perek I
Daf 4 Amud b

NOTES

Gleanings, forgotten sheaves, or produce of the corner of the field – לָקַט שְׂכָחָה וּפָאָה: *Tosafot* and other early authorities ask: How is the prohibition against delaying relevant to gleanings, forgotten sheaves, and produce of the corner of the field? These are certainly not gifts that a person vows to give and sets aside on his own volition; rather, there is an obligation to leave this produce in the field, and if the owner does not leave it or if he takes it for himself, he transgresses several prohibitions. *Tosafot* suggest several answers: One is that the Gemara is referring to one who transgressed and took this produce from the field. He then transgresses the prohibition against delaying if three Festivals have passed and he still has not given it to the poor. Alternatively, perhaps one took this produce when there were no poor people and afterward poor people arrived (see *Tosafot Yeshanim*). Another explanation is that one took it on behalf of the poor (see *Turei Even* and *Arukh LaNer*).

לָקַט שְׂכָחָה וּפָאָה, בֵּין שְׁעָבְרוּ עֲלֵיהֶן שְׁלֹשָׁה רְגָלִים עוֹבֵר בְּ"בַל תֵּאַחֵר". רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אוֹמֵר: שְׁלֹשָׁה רְגָלִים בְּסֻדְרוֹן, וְחַג הַמִּצּוֹת תִּחְלָה.

רַבִּי מֵאִיר אוֹמֵר: בֵּין שְׁעָבְרָה עֲלֵיהֶן רְגַל אֶחָד עוֹבֵר בְּ"בַל תֵּאַחֵר". רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בֶּן יַעֲקֹב אוֹמֵר: בֵּין שְׁעָבְרוּ עֲלֵיהֶן שְׁנֵי רְגָלִים עוֹבֵר בְּ"בַל תֵּאַחֵר". רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אוֹמֵר: בֵּין שְׁעָבְרָה עֲלֵיהֶן חַג הַסּוּכּוֹת עוֹבֵר עֲלֵיהֶן בְּ"בַל תֵּאַחֵר".

or for gleanings,^B forgotten sheaves,^B or produce of the corner of the field,^{NB} three obligatory agricultural gifts that must be given to the poor, once three Festivals have passed they transgress the prohibition: **You shall not delay. Rabbi Shimon says: These three Festivals must be in their proper order, with the festival of Passover first.**

Rabbi Meir says: Once even one Festival has passed, one transgresses the prohibition: You shall not delay.^B **Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov says: Once two Festivals have passed, one transgresses the prohibition: You shall not delay.** **Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: Once the festival of Sukkot has passed, one transgresses the prohibition: You shall not delay.**

BACKGROUND

Gleanings – לָקַט: The Torah prohibits the owner of a field from gleaning individual stalks that have fallen during the harvest (see Leviticus 19:9). Fewer than three stalks that fall in one place are deemed gleanings and considered the property of the poor. It is prohibited for the owner of the field to take them for his own use.

Forgotten sheaves – שְׂכָחָה: A farmer who forgot a sheaf in the field while harvesting his grain may not return to collect it; it must be left for the poor instead (see Deuteronomy 24:19).

Produce of the corner [pe'a] – פָּאָה: By Torah law, a farmer is commanded to leave the produce that grew in the corner of his field so that it may be harvested and kept by the poor (see Leviticus 19:9) The Torah does not specify a minimum number of stalks that should be left, but the Sages stipulate that it must be at least one-sixtieth of the crop. The produce of the corner of the

field is set aside only from crops that ripen all at the same time and are harvested all at once. The poor may reap the produce of the corner left in the fields on their own. However, the owner of an orchard must see that each of the poor gets a fixed share of the produce of the corner from places that are difficult to reach. The poor come to collect the grain from the corner three times a day. The *halakhot* of the produce of the corner of the field are discussed in detail in tractate *Pe'a*.

You shall not delay – בְּלִי תֵאַחֵר: One transgresses this prohibition if he fails to bring an offering within three pilgrimage Festivals after the time it was pledged (Deuteronomy 23:22). The prohibition also applies to all obligatory offerings, tithes, obligatory gifts, and pledges to the Temple treasury. As the Gemara makes clear, this prohibition is extended to cover pledges to charity and the like, which must also be honored within a certain period of time.

A prohibition inferred from a positive mitzva with regard to delaying an offering – איסור עשה על איחור בהבאת – קרבנות: One is obligated to bring or disburse all the offerings and vows to which he had committed himself by the first Festival following his vow. If he does not do so, he has violated a positive mitzva. A number of early authorities disagree about the scope of this mitzva: Some hold that it applies only to offerings (*Maggid Mishne*) or only to that which was consecrated for the upkeep of the Temple (*Sefer HaHinukh*; Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 14:13).

The goats brought as sin-offerings on the Festivals – שעירי: If one enters the Temple while impure or causes a sacred item to become impure, in a case when there was no knowledge of the impurity neither at the time that the person became impure nor after one caused the item to become impure, atonement is achieved through the goats brought as sin-offerings on the New Moon and the Festivals. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yona (*Rambam Sefer Korbanot*, *Hilkhot Shegagot* 11:9).

NOTES

The minimum of appointed times is two – מיעוט מועדים: The *Turei Even* discusses the unresolved question as to whether this *halakha* is limited to the pilgrim Festivals according to Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov. Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov's statement is that one transgresses the prohibition of delaying one's offerings once two pilgrim Festivals [*regalim*] have passed. However, the proof text, cited in the Gemara, uses the more general term Festivals [*mo'adim*], indicating that even Rosh HaShana and Yom Kippur are included.

The impurity of the Temple and its sacred objects – טומאת: Tractate *Shevu'ot* discusses at length the complex issue of rendering the Temple, its vessels, or offerings impure through contact with people in an impure state, whether willfully or unintentionally. Atonement for this sin depends on a variety of factors: The time and way in which the impurity became known; whether one entered the Temple intentionally or unintentionally; whether one forgot entirely that he was impure and whether the impurity was not known to anyone. In some cases, the goats brought as sin-offerings on the Festivals atone for this sin. The *tanna'im* disagree whether all such communal sin-offerings atone for this sin or whether there is a distinction between the goat brought as a sin-offering on the New Moon and the goats of the other Festivals.

מאי טעמא דתנא קמא? מבדי מיניהו סליק, למה לי למהדר ומיכתב "בחג המצות ובחג השבועות ובחג הסוכות"? שמע מינה ל"בל תאחר".

The Gemara proceeds to explain the various opinions: **What is the rationale of the first tanna?** Since the entire chapter (Deuteronomy, chapter 16) has just concluded a discussion of the three pilgrimage Festivals, **why**, after stating: "Three times a year shall all your males appear before the Lord your God" (Deuteronomy 16:16), **do I need the Torah to write again: "On the festival of Passover, and on the festival of Shavuot, and on the festival of Sukkot; and they shall not appear before the Lord empty-handed"** (Deuteronomy 16:16)? Rather, **learn from here that the verse comes to teach with regard to the halakha of: You shall not delay**, that one does not transgress the prohibition unless these three Festivals have passed.

ורבי שמעון אומר: אינו צריך לומר "בחג הסוכות" שבו דיבר הכתוב. למה נאמר? לומר שזה אחרון.

And Rabbi Shimon, who said that one does not transgress the prohibition against delaying unless these three Festivals have passed in order, **says** in explanation of his opinion: **It was not necessary for the verse to say again "on the festival of Sukkot," of which the immediately preceding text was speaking. Why, then, is it stated? It is to teach that this must be the last one**, i.e., that the three Festivals must pass in order, so that *Sukkot* is the last of the three.

ורבי מאיר מאי טעמא? דכתיב: "ובאת שמה והבאתם שמה".

And Rabbi Meir, who says that one transgresses the prohibition against delaying as soon as one Festival has passed, **what is the rationale for his opinion?** It is as **it is written**: "But to the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put His name there, there shall you seek Him, at his dwelling, and there shall you come: And there you shall bring your burnt-offerings and your sacrifices, and your tithes, and the offerings of your hand, and your vows, and your gift offerings, and the firstlings of your herds and your flocks" (Deuteronomy 12:5-6). This teaches that one transgresses the prohibition if he fails to bring the offerings for which he is liable as soon as the time has arrived that "there shall you come," i.e., by the first Festival.

ורבנן ההוא לעשה.

The Gemara asks: **And the Rabbis**, who say that one transgresses the prohibition against delaying only after three Festivals have passed, how do they understand this verse? The Gemara answers: In their opinion, **this verse teaches that there is a positive mitzva to bring one's vow-offerings on the first Festival**; however, if one did not bring them, he has not transgressed the prohibition against delaying, although he has failed to perform the positive mitzva.^h

ורבי מאיר, כיון דאמר ליה רחמנא אייתי ולא אייתי ממילא קם ליה ב"בל תאחר".

The Gemara asks: **And how does Rabbi Meir counter this argument?** The Gemara answers: He would say that **since the Merciful One tells one to bring the offering at that time and he did not bring it, automatically he is liable for transgressing the prohibition: You shall not delay**, as he has missed the time set by the Torah.

ורבי אליעזר בן יעקב מאי טעמא? דכתיב: "אלה תעשו לה' במועדיכם" מיעוט מועדים שנים.

The Gemara asks: **And Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov**, who said that one transgresses the prohibition against delaying once two Festivals have passed, **what is the rationale for his opinion?** The Gemara explains: It is as **it is written**: "These things you shall do to the Lord in your appointed times, besides your vows, and your gift offerings, for your burnt-offerings, and for your meal-offerings, and for your drink-offerings, and for your peace-offerings" (Numbers 29:39). According to this verse, the time set for the bringing of vows is at the "appointed times," and **the minimum number of appointed times in the plural is two.**ⁿ

ורבנן? ההוא לכדרבי יונה. דאמר רבי יונה: הוקשו כל המועדים כולם זה לזה, שכולן מכפרים על טומאת מקדש וקדשיו.

The Gemara asks: **And how do the Rabbis understand this verse?** The Gemara explains: They say that the term "appointed times" is needed for the teaching of **Rabbi Yona**, as **Rabbi Yona said: All the Festivals are equated with each other**, insofar as all the goats brought as sin-offerings on the Festivals^h atone for the impurity of the Temple and its sacred objects,ⁿ just like the goat brought as a sin-offering on the New Moon.

רבי מאיר ורבי אליעזר בן יאקוב – Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov: The early and later authorities ask: Why was this question asked only with regard to the opinions of Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov, when it is also valid with regard to the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon? The Rashba answers that according to Rabbi Elazar, Passover and *Shavuot* are mentioned incidentally to complete the idea in the verse, as according to him it was necessary only to mention *Sukkot*. The Ran answers that the Gemara raises the question with regard to the opinion of Rabbi Meir because according to this opinion the entire verse is apparently superfluous. It did not raise the question with regard to the opinion of Rabbi Elazar because the answer to the question with regard to Rabbi Meir's opinion also answers the question with regard to the opinion of Rabbi Elazar.

פיר קשיב – Peh, zayin, reish, kuf, shin, beit: There are six unique aspects of the Eighth Day of Assembly represented by this acronym: The first is that a new lottery [*payis*] is performed to determine which priests will sacrifice the day's offerings, and the arrangement established on *Sukkot* is not continued. The second is the recitation of the blessing for time [*zeman*]: Who has given us life, sustained us, and brought us to this time. This blessing is recited on the Eighth Day of Assembly, as it is recited at the start of each Festival. Third, it is considered a Festival [*regel*] in and of itself in that it is referred to as the Eighth Day of Assembly rather than *Sukkot*. Fourth, the additional offering [*korban*] is unique to this day and do not follow the model of the additional offerings on *Sukkot*. Fifth, the song [*shir*] of the day sung by the Levites is unique to this day and bears no relation to the harvest, which is the common theme of the psalms sung on *Sukkot* (see Rashi on *Yoma* 3a). Lastly, the day has its own blessing [*berakha*], inserted in Grace after Meals and in prayer (see *Tosafot* on *Yoma* 3a), which is different than the one recited on *Sukkot*. Some of the early authorities understand the details of this mnemonic and the meaning of each of the letters in slightly different ways.

HALAKHA

Redress for the *Shavuot* offering – תשלומי עצרת: One who did not bring a Festival peace-offering on *Shavuot* may bring it for six more days after the Festival, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Oshaya (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Hagiga* 1:7).

פיר קשיב – Peh, zayin, reish, kuf, shin, beit: The Eighth Day of Assembly is considered a holiday in itself. This status is expressed in six ways: (1) The additional offering brought on that day is not a continuation of the additional offerings brought on the first seven days of *Sukkot*. (2) New lots are cast among the priestly watches to determine who will bring the day's offerings. (3) A separate blessing of: Who has given us life, is recited on the Eighth Day of Assembly. (4) The day is mentioned in the blessings as a separate Festival. (5) The psalm sung by the Levites on the Eighth Day of Assembly is also different from the song sung on *Sukkot*. (6) It has a different name than the festival of *Sukkot* (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Temidin UMusafin* 10:2–3; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 668:1). See NOTES for how this list relates to the acronym.

Eighth Day of Assembly as redress for the festival of *Sukkot* – שמיני עצרת בתשלום לסוכות: One who did not bring a Festival peace-offering on the first day of *Sukkot* may bring it all seven days of the Festival and even on the Eighth Day of Assembly (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Hagiga* 1:7).

ורבי אלעזר ברבי שמעון מאי טעמא? דתנא רבי אלעזר ברבי שמעון אומר: לא יאמר "חג הסוכות", שבו דיבר הכתוב. למה נאמר? לומר שזה גורם.

ורבי מאיר ורבי אליעזר בן יעקב, האי "בחג המצות ובחג השבועות ובחג הסוכות" מאי דרשו ביה? מיבעי להו לכדדבי אלעזר אמר רבי אושעיא. דאמר רבי אלעזר אמר רבי אושעיא: מניין לעצרת שיש לה תשלומין כל שבועה? תלמוד לומר: "בחג המצות ובחג השבועות ובחג הסוכות" מקיש חג השבועות לחג המצות, מה חג המצות יש לו תשלומין כל שבועה – אף חג השבועות יש לו תשלומין כל שבועה.

וליקש לחג הסוכות: מה להלן שמונה אף כאן שמונה! שמיני רגל בפני עצמו הוא.

אימור דאמרין שמיני רגל בפני עצמו לענין פיר קשיב, אבל לענין תשלומין דדבי הכל תשלומין דראשון הוא.

דתנן: מי שלא חג יום טוב הראשון של חג חוגג את כל הרגל, ויום טוב האחרון של חג!

תפשת מרובה לא תפשת, תפשת מועט תפשת.

אלא למאי הלכתא בתביה רחמנא לחג הסוכות? לאקושיה לחג המצות,

The Gemara asks further: **And Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, who says that once the festival of *Sukkot* has passed one immediately transgresses the prohibition against delaying, what is the rationale for his opinion?** The Gemara explains: It is as it is taught in a *baraita*: **Rabbi Elazar, son of Rabbi Shimon, says: It was not necessary for the verse to mention "the festival of *Sukkot*" (Deuteronomy 16:16), of which the immediately preceding text was speaking. If so, why is it stated? It is to say that this Festival is what causes a one to be considered late in fulfilling his vow, since by the end of the Festival he must bring all of his current vows to the Temple, whether he took his vow shortly before *Sukkot* or much earlier.**

And Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov,ⁿ what do they expound from this verse: "On the festival of Passover, and on the festival of *Shavuot*, and on the festival of *Sukkot*"? The Gemara explains: **They require this verse for the *halakha* that Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Oshaya said, as Rabbi Elazar said that Rabbi Oshaya said: From where is it derived that the *Shavuot* offering has redress all seven days, i.e., that if one failed to bring the Festival peace-offering on the Festival itself, he has six more days to bring it? The verse states: "On the festival of Passover, and on the festival of *Shavuot*, and on the festival of *Sukkot*," thereby equating the festival of *Shavuot* to the festival of Passover. Just as the festival of Passover has redress all seven days, as Passover is seven days long, so too, the festival of *Shavuot* has redress all seven days, during the week following the festival of *Shavuot*.^h**

The Gemara asks: **If so, draw an analogy from the festival of *Shavuot* to the festival of *Sukkot*,** which is also mentioned in close proximity to it, and say: **Just as below, on *Sukkot*,** the offering may be brought for **eight days, so too, here, on *Shavuot*,** it should be possible to bring the offering for **eight days.** The Gemara rejects this suggestion: This is not so, as even on *Sukkot* the Festival peace-offering may be brought only for seven days, as **the eighth day is a separate Festival in and of itself.**

The Gemara raises a question: **But can't you say that we say that the Eighth Day of Assembly is a Festival in and of itself only with regard to *peh, zayin, reish, kuf, shin, beit*,^{nh} an acronym that stands for six unique aspects to the Eighth Day of Assembly. But with regard to the matter of redress for failing to bring a Festival peace-offering, everyone agrees that the Eighth Day of Assembly is still a day of redress for the first day of the festival of *Sukkot*.**

As we learned in a mishna: If one did not bring his Festival peace-offering on the first day of the festival of *Sukkot*, he may still bring the Festival peace-offering during all of the Festival and even on the last day of the Festival, as the Eighth Day of Assembly is regarded as part of *Sukkot* for this purpose.^h If so, perhaps the festival of *Shavuot* can be compared to the festival of *Sukkot* such that the Festival peace-offering of *Shavuot* may also be brought for eight days.

The Gemara answers: It is preferable to equate *Shavuot* to Passover and not to *Sukkot* due to the general principle: **If you grasped many, you did not grasp anything; if you grasped few, you grasped something.** That is to say, in a case of doubt, choose the smaller number, as it is included within the larger number.

The Gemara asks: **But if so, with regard to what *halakha* did the Merciful One write the festival of *Sukkot* in this verse?** The Gemara explains: It is to draw an analogy from *Sukkot* to the festival of Passover with regard to a different issue: