

מה חג המצות טעון לינה. אף חג הסוכות טעון לינה.

Just as the festival of Passover requires remaining overnight^N in Jerusalem, and only on the following day may one return home, so too, the festival of *Sukkot* requires remaining overnight in Jerusalem before returning home.^H

והתם מנלן? דכתיב: "ופנית בבקר והלכת לאהליך".

The Gemara asks: **And there**, with regard to Passover, **from where do we derive this halakha?** The Gemara explains: **As it is written** about the Paschal offering: "And you shall roast and eat it in the place which the Lord your God shall choose; and you shall turn in the morning, and go to your tents" (Deuteronomy 16:7).

ותנא קמא ורבי שמעון (בן אלעזר) תשלומין לעצרת מנא להו?

The Gemara asks: **And the first tanna** of the *baraita* and **Rabbi Shimon**, who learn from the verse: "On the festival of Passover, and on the festival of *Shavuot*, and on the festival of *Sukkot*" (Deuteronomy 16:16), that one transgresses the prohibition against delaying only after three Festivals have passed, **from where do they derive the halakha** that the *Shavuot* offering has redress^N for seven days?

נפקא להו מדתני רבה בר שמואל. דתני רבה בר שמואל: אמרה תורה מנה ימים וקדש חדש, מנה ימים וקדש עצרת. מה חדש למנויו אף עצרת למנויו.

The Gemara answers: **They derive it from that which Rabba bar Shmuel taught, as Rabba bar Shmuel taught: The Torah states to count the days**, as it is stated: "A month of days" (Numbers 11:20), and then **sanctify a new month^H** with offerings. **And the Torah also said to count the days** from Passover, as it is stated: "You shall count fifty days" (Leviticus 23:16), and then **sanctify the festival of Shavuot** with offerings. **Just as the new month is sanctified for the unit of time by which it is counted**, i.e., for one day, **so too, Shavuot is sanctified for the unit of time by which it is counted**, i.e., for one full week, as it is stated: "Seven complete weeks shall there be" (Leviticus 23:15).

אימא עצרת חד יומא! אמר רבא: אטו עצרת יומי מנינן, שבועי לא מנינן? והאמר מר: מצוה למימני יומי ומצוה למימני שבועי! ועוד: "חג שבועות" כתיב.

The Gemara asks: But if so, say that the *Shavuot* offering may be redressed for only **one day**, as *Shavuot* is determined by a count of fifty days from Passover. How, then, is it known that the *Shavuot* offering has seven days for redress? **Rava said: Is that to say that we count only days until Shavuot, but we do not also count weeks? But didn't the Master say: It is a mitzva to count fifty days,**^H and it is also a mitzva to count seven weeks, which teaches that the Festival peace-offering brought on *Shavuot* may be sacrificed for an entire week. **And further, it is written** in the verse: "**The festival of weeks [shavuot]**," which teaches that it is a Festival that is established through a count of weeks.

NOTES

Remaining overnight – לינה: With regard to the Paschal lamb, the verse states: "And you shall roast it and eat it in the place which the Lord your God shall choose; and you shall turn in the morning, and go to your tents" (Deuteronomy 16:7). According to the *Sifrei*, on every occasion that one comes to the Temple, he must remain overnight in Jerusalem and leave only the next morning. By doing so, he demonstrates that his coming was not a chance event; rather, he came to stay for a certain amount of time (*Sefat Emet*).

There are three main opinions found among the early authorities with regard to how long one must stay in Jerusalem on the Festivals. According to one opinion, one is obligated to stay there only for the night following the first day of the Festival (Rashi; *Tosafot* on tractates *Yoma* and *Zevahim*). According to a second opinion, on Passover and *Sukkot* one must remain in Jerusalem for the entire Festival until the night following the last day of the Festival (*Tosafot*; see *Targum Yonatan*). A third opinion is that one is obligated to remain in Jerusalem until the end of the Festival only on *Sukkot*, as is implied by II Kings, chapter 8; on Passover, the obligation is only for one night.

According to yet another opinion, a distinction must be made between the obligation to remain overnight in Jerusalem on account of the offering, which applies only for one night, and the obligation to stay there on account of the Festival, which applies all the days of the Festival (Rabbeinu Elhanan in *Tosafot* on tractate *Hagiga*; Ritva; see Rabbeinu Bahya in his commentary on the Torah).

From where do they derive that the Shavuot offering has redress – תשלומין לעצרת מנא להו: The commentaries ask: Why doesn't the Gemara also ask from where it is derived that there is an obligation to remain overnight in Jerusalem on *Shavuot*? It has been suggested that the obligation to remain overnight in Jerusalem is learned as a general obligation from the words: "And you shall turn in the morning and go to your tents" (Deuteronomy 16:7), and so a separate derivation is not necessary for each Festival (see *Tosafot*). The Rashash proposes that perhaps the first *tanna* and Rabbi Shimon do not recognize such an obligation, and this may be why the Rambam mentions this mitzva in his *Mishne Torah* only in relation to the bringing of first fruits, but not the Festivals (see *Sefat Emet*).

HALAKHA

The obligation to remain for the night – חובת לינה: One who brings an offering in the Temple must remain overnight in Jerusalem, and only the next morning may he return home. The early authorities disagree about the obligation to remain in Jerusalem on the Festivals, whether it is only for the first night or for the entire Festival, and whether Passover and *Sukkot* are treated equally with regard to this matter (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhoh Bikkurim* 3:14; *Sefer Mitzvot Gadol*, positive mitzva 227).

Count days and sanctify a month – מנה ימים וקדש חדש: A lunar month is twenty nine and a half days and 793/1080 of an

hour. According to rabbinic tradition, the New Moon does not begin in the middle of the day; rather, every month begins at the beginning of a day, i.e., in the evening, as the verse states: "A month of days" (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhoh Kiddush HaHodesh* 8:1).

Counting the omer – ספירת העומר: The *omer* is counted from the night after the first Festival day of Passover. Both the days and the weeks are counted. For example, the count on day seven is: Seven days, which are one week of the *omer*. The count continues in that manner until the end, in accordance with the Gemara here (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 489:1).

For no reason [*kedī*] – כְּדִי: Derived from the Aramaic root *k-d-v*, meaning unnecessary or for naught. It is related to the Hebrew word *kazav*, meaning falsehood.

וּפְסַח בְּרִמְקָרְבָּהּ בְּרִמְקָרְבָּהּ הוּא? פְּסַח זֵימְנָא
קְבִיעָא לִיה. אִי אֶקְרְבִיָּה אֶקְרְבִיָּה, וְאִי לֹא
אֶקְרְבִיָּה אִידְחִי לִיה!

אָמַר רַב חֲסִדָּא: פְּסַח כְּדִי נִסְבָּה.

רַב שֶׁשֶׁת אָמַר: מֵאִי פְּסַח? שְׁלָמֵי פְּסַח.

אִי הָכִי הֵינּוּ שְׁלָמִים! תְּנָא שְׁלָמִים הַבְּאִין
מִחֲמַת פְּסַח, וְתִנָּא שְׁלָמִים הַבְּאִין מִחֲמַת
עֲצֻמָּן. סְלִקָא דְעֵתְךָ אֲמִינָא: הוּאִיל וּמִחֲמַת
פְּסַח קָאֲתוּ

It was taught in the *baraita* that one becomes liable for transgressing the prohibition against delaying if he delays bringing the Paschal lamb. The Gemara expresses its astonishment about this ruling: **But is the Paschal lamb fit to be sacrificed on the other Festivals? The Paschal lamb has a fixed time to be brought, on the fourteenth of Nisan; if one sacrificed it then, he has sacrificed it, but if he did not sacrifice it then, it is excluded forever from any use.**

Rav Hisda said: The Paschal lamb is cited here for no reason [*kedī*];¹ that is to say, the prohibition against delaying is not relevant to the Paschal lamb, and the latter was mentioned in the *baraita* only because firstborn offerings, animal tithes, and the Paschal lamb are often grouped together.

Rav Sheshet said a different explanation: **What is meant here by a Paschal lamb? It is the peace-offering that is brought in place of a Paschal lamb.** If a lamb that had been set aside to be sacrificed as a Paschal offering was lost, and its owner took another lamb and sacrificed that as his Paschal lamb, and afterward the first animal was found, it must now be brought as a peace-offering. This offering is subject to all the *halakhot* of the prohibition against delaying.

The Gemara asks: **If so, this is the same as the peace-offerings listed earlier, and it is still redundant.** The Gemara answers: **The baraita taught the halakha with regard to peace-offerings brought in place of a Paschal lamb, and it also taught the halakha with regard to peace-offerings brought independently.** The reason for this repetition is that **it might enter your mind to say: Since the peace-offerings are brought in place of a Paschal lamb,**

Perek I
Daf 5 Amud b

NOTES

And it is stated elsewhere: **But if a vow – וְאִמְרוּ לְהֵלֹךְ אִם – תָּנָא:** *Tosafot* note that a different verse could have been cited. In *Tosafot Yeshanim*, Rabbeinu Tam holds that the correct version of the Gemara text has the following verse: “That which is gone out of your lips you shall keep and perform; according as you have vowed as a gift to the Lord your God, which you have promised with your mouth” (Deuteronomy 23:24). This explicitly mentions a gift-offering. Some argue that the verse in Deuteronomy is referring to a gift-offering that has already been set aside, whereas here the reference is to gift-offerings with regard to which one vowed, but one did not yet set them aside (Rashba; Ritva).

בְּפְסַח דְּמֹו. קָא מְשַׁמַּע לָן.

they are considered like the Paschal lamb itself, and so one transgresses the prohibition against delaying as soon as one Festival has passed. The *baraita* therefore teaches us that this is not so, as even this type of peace-offering is treated like the other offerings, and there is no liability until three Festivals have passed.

מִנְהַנּוּ מִיְלִי? דְּתִנּוּ רַבְנָן: “כִּי תִדְוֹר נָדָר.” אִין
לִי אֶלָּא נָדָר. נְדָבָה מִיְנִין?

The Gemara asks: **From where are these matters derived that all the offerings and vows listed above in the baraita are subject to the prohibition against delaying? As the Sages taught in a baraita:** The verse states: **“When you shall vow a vow to the Lord your God, you shall not delay paying it; for the Lord your God will surely require it from you, and it would be sin in you”** (Deuteronomy 23:22). From the words “when you shall vow a vow,” **I have derived only the halakha in the case of a vow-offering, where one says: I undertake to bring an offering, thereby assuming personal responsibility to bring an offering, no matter what happens to any particular animal.** But as for the case of a gift-offering, one says: I undertake to bring this animal as an offering. He assumes responsibility only to bring that particular animal, without assuming a general responsibility to bring an offering. **From where do I derive that this, too, is included in the prohibition against delaying?**

נֶאֱמַר כָּאֵן “נָדָר”, וְנֶאֱמַר לְהֵלֹךְ: “אִם נָדָר
אוּ נְדָבָה.” מֵה לְהֵלֹךְ נְדָבָה עִמּוֹ, אִף כָּאֵן
נְדָבָה עִמּוֹ.

The Gemara now analyzes the words of Deuteronomy 23:22 cited above and looks at each component. **It is stated here: “Vow,” and it is stated elsewhere: “But if the sacrifice of his offering be a vowⁿ or a gift-offering”** (Leviticus 7:16). **Just as there a gift-offering is together with the vow and is governed by the same halakha, so too, here, a gift-offering is together with the vow and is governed by the same halakha.**

Dedications – התרומין: The commentaries note that Rashi and *Tosafot* disagree on the meaning of this term. According to Rashi, it is referring to items dedicated to the Temple itself; according to the *Tosafot*, it is referring to items dedicated to the priests.

עולות ושלמים – Burnt-offerings and peace-offerings

Rashi explains that the Gemara is referring to the special burnt-offerings of appearance in the Temple brought on the pilgrimage Festivals. He adds that it cannot be dealing with gift burnt-offerings here because they were already mentioned earlier. The early authorities point out a difficulty with Rashi's opinion: A burnt-offering of appearance has a set time and must be brought on the Festival, and one who fails to do so transgresses the prohibition against delaying immediately after the Festival. Some explain that here the Gemara is referring either to burnt-offerings that were set aside and lost before the Festival (*Rid*) or to burnt-offerings that were set aside as burnt-offerings of appearance, but not for any specific Festival (*Ritva*). In the *Turei Even*, it is suggested that the Gemara is referring to obligatory burnt-offerings that are not burnt-offerings of appearance, e.g., the burnt-offering brought by one who is lacking atonement. The peace-offerings mentioned here must also be understood as obligatory peace-offerings, e.g., those brought by a nazirite (*Minhat Hinukh*).

And tithes and firstborn offerings – ומעשרות ויבכור: Apparently, Rashi's version of the text did not include the words: Tithes and firstborn offerings (see Rashi and Maharsha). Some explain that these cannot be derived from the verse: "For the Lord your God will surely require it from you" (Deuteronomy 23:22), because if a person has no firstborn animal or tithe, he is under no obligation to bring them. However, sin-offerings and guilt-offerings are in no way optional (*Tosafot*; see Rosh).

HALAKHA

ולא בקרבנך – But there would be no sin in your offering – **חטא:** If one vowed to bring an animal as an offering but delayed bringing it for more than three Festivals, the offering itself is not disqualified, although he transgressed the prohibition against delaying (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 14:15).

A thanks-offering that became mixed up with its substitute – תודה שנתערבה בתמורתה: If one substituted a thanks-offering with another animal, and the two became mixed up with each other, and subsequently one died, if it is not known whether the one that died was the original or the substitute, there is no solution for the other one, and so it must be left to graze until it develops a blemish, at which point it is sold. According to the Ra'avad, one must bring another thanks-offering with its accompanying loaves, and the money received from the sale of the blemished animal must be used for the purchase of a thanks-offering, which is brought without bread (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 12:13).

"לה' אלהיך" אלו הדמיון, הערבין, והתרומין, וההקדשות. "לא תאחר לשלמו" הוא ולא חילופיו. "כי דרוש ידרשנו" אלו חטאות ואשמות עולות ושלמים.

The verse continues: "To the Lord your God." This is referring to various types of consecrations that are allocated to Temple maintenance: **Assessments, valuations, dedications,^N and consecrations.** "You shall not delay paying it" teaches that one violates the prohibition against delaying if he is late in paying it, but not if he is late in paying its substitute, as will be explained below. "For the Lord your God will surely require it from you" comes to include all other things that one is required to bring; these are **sin-offerings, guilt-offerings, burnt-offerings, and peace-offerings.**^N

"ה' אלהיך" אלו צדקות ומעשרות ובכור. "מעמד" זה לקט שכחה ופאה. "והיה בכח חטא" ולא בקרבנך חטא.

The words in the verse: "For the Lord your God" are an apparently superfluous phrase that in fact comes to include additional things in the prohibition; these are **vows of charity, and tithes, and firstborn offerings.**^N "From you"; this comes to include other items that one gives of one's own for the sake of a mitzva, i.e., **gleanings, forgotten sheaves, and produce of the corner of the field.** "And it would be sin in you"; this teaches that the sin of delaying would be in you, but there would be no sin in your offering,^H i.e., the offering is not disqualified due to the delay.

אמר מר: "לא תאחר לשלמו" הוא ולא חילופיו. חילופי מאי? אי חילופי עולה ושלמים מקרב קרבי!

The Gemara clarifies certain points in the *baraita*. The Master said, citing the *baraita*: "You shall not delay paying it" teaches that one violates the prohibition if he is late in paying it, i.e., the original offering, but not if he is late in paying its substitute, i.e., an animal that substituted for his offering. The Gemara asks: **A substitute for what offering? If you say that the *baraita* is speaking of a substitute for a burnt-offering or a peace-offering, i.e., if an animal was set aside to serve as a burnt-offering or a peace-offering and it was lost, and a substitute was set aside in its place, and then the original animal was found and sacrificed, in that case the substitute is sacrificed just like the first, and so it is certainly subject to the prohibition against delaying.**

אי חילופי חטאת למיתה אולא! אלא, מאי חילופיו? חילופי תודה.

If the *baraita* is referring to a substitute for a sin-offering, i.e., if an animal was set aside as a sin-offering and it was lost, and a substitute was set aside in its place, and then the original animal was found and sacrificed, in that case the substitute is left to die, as it has become disqualified and can no longer be sacrificed on the altar. This being the case, there is no reason to say that it is subject to the prohibition against delaying. **Rather, what is the substitute referred to in the *baraita*? It is the substitute for a thanks-offering.**^B

דתני רבי חייה: תודה שנתערבה בתמורתה, ומתה אחת מהן חברתה אין לה תקנה.

As Rabbi Hiyya taught in a *baraita*: In the case of a **thanks-offering that became mixed up with its substitute,**^{HB} i.e., one substituted an animal for one designated as a thanks-offering, in which case both animals are considered consecrated, and then the original animal and its substitute became mixed up with each other, and one of them died, there is no remedy for the other one, and so it must be left to graze until it becomes blemished.

BACKGROUND

Thanks-offering – תודה: This offering is brought in appreciation of God's kindness (see Leviticus 7:12–15). In particular, the following people are required to bring a thanks-offering: (1) one who completed a journey at sea; (2) one who crossed a desert; (3) one who was freed from prison; (4) one who was ill and recovered from his illness. This type of offering is similar to a peace-offering, but of lesser holiness than it; however, it may be eaten only on the day on which it was sacrificed and the following night, in contrast to the peace-offering, which may be eaten on the subsequent day as well. In addition to the animal sacrificed as a thanks-offering, forty loaves are brought with it as a meal-offering. Ten loaves are leavened bread, and ten each are of three types of unleavened bread: Wafers, loaves, and flour

mixed with water and oil. The priest is given four loaves, one of each kind. Because it is brought with leavened bread, the thanks-offering may not be brought from the fourteenth of Nisan, Passover eve, until the conclusion of that Festival.

Substitute – תמורה: It is prohibited to substitute another animal for one designated as an offering (Leviticus 27:33). If one transgresses this prohibition, both the original animal and the substitute are considered consecrated. Substitution applies only to animals brought as offerings by individuals and not to those designated as communal offerings. Even an animal with a blemish that renders it unfit for sacrifice can become consecrated if substituted in this manner. The *halakhot* governing this subject are discussed in tractate *Temura*.

It became blemished and he redeemed it – והיום: If one consecrated an animal as an offering, and two Festivals passed, and afterward the animal developed a blemish that disqualified it, and he redeemed it by replacing it with another animal as is required, he does not transgress the prohibition against delaying until a further three Festivals have passed from the purchase of the second animal (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 14:14).

A firstborn animal after its first year passed – בכור ששעברה שנתו: Although it is a mitzva to sacrifice a firstborn animal in its first year, if one delayed bringing it and the year passed, he must still sacrifice it, provided it is unblemished. If it has a blemish, it may be slaughtered anywhere (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhhot Bekhorot* 1:13).

NOTES

But there would not be sin in your offering – ולא בקרבנך הטא: Why would one think that these offerings are disqualified in the absence of an explicit verse (see *Tosafot* here and on *Zevahim* 29a)? The *Shitta Mekubetzet* on tractate *Zevahim* suggests that one might have thought that an offering that was delayed for more than three Festivals has the same status as an offering whose time has passed, i.e., that is disqualified because it has passed a certain age. Therefore, a verse was needed to teach that it is not disqualified. Others propose that if there were no verse teaching that there is no sin in the offering, one might have thought that the additional verse that mentions the obligation to bring offerings on time does not come to add a positive mitzva but to teach that the delay disqualifies an offering (*Mitzpe Eitan*).

היכי ליעביד? ליקרבה וליקריב לחם בהדה דלמא תמורה היא. ליקרבה בלא לחם דלמא תודה היא.

והא. בין דלאו בת הקרבה היא. קרא למעוטי למה לי?

אמר רב ששת: לעולם למעוטי חילופי עולה ושלמים. והכא במאי עסקינן – כגון שעברו עליו שני רגלים, והומם וחיללו על אחר, ועבר עליו רגל אחר. סלקא דעתך אמינא: הואיל ומבח קמא קאתי כמאן דעברו עליו שלשה רגלים דמי. קא משמע לן.

ולרבי מאיר. דאמר: בין שעבר עליו רגל ראשון עובר ב"בל תאחר", מאי איכא למימר? אמר רבא: הכא במאי עסקינן – כגון שהומם בתוך הרגל, וחיללו ועבר עליו הרגל. סלקא דעתך אמינא: הואיל ומבח קמא קאתי כמאן דעבר עליה בוליה רגל דמי. קא משמע לן.

"והיה בך חטא" ולא בקרבנך חטא. והא מהכא נפקא? מדאחרים נפקא! דתניא, אחרים אומרים: יכול יהא בכור שעברה שנתו כפסולי המוקדשין ויפסל.

תלמוד לומר: "ואכלת לפני ה' אלהיך... מעשר דגנך תירושך ויצהרך ובכורות בקרך וצאנך". מקיש בכור למעשר, מה מעשר אינו נפסל משנה לחברתה אף בכור אינו נפסל משנה לחברתה!

The Gemara explains: What could he have done with the remaining animal? If you say that he may sacrifice it and sacrifice the bread with it, i.e., the forty loaves of bread that are brought as a meal-offering together with the animal component of the thanks-offering, perhaps this animal is not the one that had originally been set aside but rather the substitute, and the rule is that the substitute is sacrificed like the thanks-offering itself, but without bread. If you say that he should sacrifice it without bread, perhaps it is the original thanks-offering, which must be brought with bread. This, then, is the substitute that the *baraita* says is not subject to the prohibition against delaying.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: But since the animal is not fit to be sacrificed, why do I need a special verse to exclude it from the prohibition against delaying? In any case it cannot be sacrificed on the altar, and so there is no need to state that it is not included in the prohibition.

Rav Sheshet said: Actually, you can say that the verse comes to exclude the substitute for a burnt-offering or a peace-offering. And here we are dealing with a case where two Festivals already passed from the time that one had consecrated the original animal but did not bring it to the altar, and it became blemished, and he redeemed it⁴ by replacing it with another animal, as required. And then another Festival passed and he did not yet bring the substitute to the altar. In that case, it might enter your mind to say that since this second animal comes in place of the first one, as it was consecrated as a substitute for it, it should be considered as one for which three Festivals have already passed; therefore, the verse teaches us that this is not so. Rather, the three Festivals are counted from the time of the replacement animal's consecration.

The Gemara asks: This answers the question of which substitute the *baraita* is referring to according to the opinion of the Rabbis, but according to the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who said: Once even the first Festival has passed one transgresses the mitzva: You shall not delay, what is there to say here? Rava said: Here, we are dealing with a case where the original animal became blemished during the Festival, and one redeemed it by replacing it with another animal, and the Festival passed without that animal being sacrificed. In that case, it might enter your mind to say that since this second animal comes in place of the first one, and the first one had already been consecrated before the Festival, it should be considered as one for which an entire Festival has already passed, so that he transgresses the prohibition against delaying; therefore, the verse teaches us that this is not the case. Rather, an entire Festival must pass for the replacement animal.

It was taught in the *baraita*: The verse states: "And it would be sin in you," which teaches that the sin of delaying would be sin in you, but there would be no sin in your offering,⁵ i.e., the offering would not become disqualified due to the delay. The Gemara asks: Is it from here that this is learned? But isn't it derived from the statement of *Aherim*? As it is taught in a *baraita*: *Aherim* say that one might have thought that a firstborn animal after its first year passed,⁶ during which time it was not sacrificed, should be like consecrated things that have become disqualified due to a blemish, and so it is disqualified from being brought to the altar.

Therefore, the verse states: "And you shall eat before the Lord your God, in the place which He shall choose to place His name there, the tithe of your grain, of your wine, and of your oil, and the firstborns of your herds, and of your flocks" (Deuteronomy 14:23), thereby juxtaposing a firstborn animal to the tithe of grain. Just as tithe is not disqualified by being kept over from one year to the next, as it is explicitly stated that tithes may be eaten until the end of three years, so too, a firstborn animal is not disqualified by being kept over from one year to the next, despite the delay in being brought to the altar. Therefore, there is another source for the *halakha* that the offering itself does not become disqualified even if it is brought late.

קָדָשִׁים דְּבָנֵי – קִדְשֵׁי חֵטְא: Offerings in general are brought for appeasement before God. Specifically, sin-offerings and guilt-offerings are brought to atone for transgressing a prohibition, whereas a burnt-offering is brought to atone for failure to observe a positive mitzva. Nevertheless, *Tosafot* explain that burnt-offerings are brought to atone for failure to observe a positive mitzva. Rashi adds that even peace-offerings, which are not brought for atonement, are brought as gifts that find favor before God and can therefore be classified as offerings that appease (*Turei Even*).

איצטריך, סלקא דעתך אמינא: הני מילי בכור, דלאו בר הרצאה הוא. אבל קדשים, דבני הרצאה ניהו אימא לא לירצו. קא משמע לן.

The Gemara answers: The first derivation cited was necessary. Had this *halakha* been learned only from the case of a firstborn animal, it might enter your mind to say that this *halakha* that the offering is not disqualified applies only to a firstborn, which is not for appeasement, i.e., it does not come to atone for any sin, not even for the neglect of a positive mitzva, but is merely a gift for the priest. But as for other consecrated animals, which appease,^N their role being to atone for the sins of their owners, one might say that they do not appease when brought late. Therefore, the verse teaches us that this is not so. Rather, the other offerings are also not disqualified when brought late.

ואבתי The Gemara asks further: But still, it may be argued that this derivation is unnecessary,

לא באשתך חטא – There would not be a sin in your wife – According to this statement, if one refuses to fulfill his vow or lacks the means to do so, he may be punished through his wife for failing to fulfill the vow; however, if he has the means to fulfill the vow and delays fulfilling it, he is not punished in this way. Rashi and the *Petaḥ Einayim* cite an opinion that does not distinguish between one who refuses to fulfill his vow and one who is late in doing so (see *Bereishit Rabba* 37 and 81).

Perek I

Daf 6 Amud a

מדבן עזאי נפקא. דתניא. בן עזאי אומר: "אותו"

as this *halakha* is derived from that which ben Azzai said, as it is taught in a *baraita* that ben Azzai says: The verse states: "And if any of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offering be eaten at all on the third day, it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be imputed to him who offers it, it shall be *piggul*" (Leviticus 7:18).

מה תלמוד לומר? לפי שנאמר "לא תאחר לשלמו" שומע אני אף מאחר נדרו ב"ב לירצה". תלמוד לומר: "אותו" אותו ב"לא ירצה", ואין מאחר נדרו ב"לא ירצה".

For what purpose does the verse state the word "it"? Since elsewhere it states: "When you shall vow a vow to the Lord your God, you shall not delay paying it; for the Lord your God will surely require it from you, and it would be sin in you" (Deuteronomy 23:22), I might have interpreted from this verse that even one who is late in paying his vow is included in: It shall not be accepted. Therefore, the verse states "it." It, an offering disqualified by improper intention [*piggul*], is included in the *halakha* of: "It shall not be accepted," but the animal of one who is late in paying his vow is not included in the *halakha* of: "It shall not be accepted."

אלא: "בך חטא", ולא באשתך חטא.

The Gemara rejects what was said above; rather, the explanation of the verse is as follows. The phrase: "And it would be sin in you" comes to teach that there would be a sin in you, but there would not be a sin in your wife.^N

סלקא דעתך אמינא: הואיל ואמר רבי יוחנן, ואי תימא רבי אלעזר: אין אשתו של אדם מתה אלא אם כן מבקשין ממנו ממון ואין לו, שנאמר: "אם אין לך לשלם למה יקח משכבך מתחתיד", אימא בהאי עון ד"בל תאחר" נמי אשתו מתה. קא משמע לן.

It was necessary to say that the lateness is not imputed to the other members of one's household for the following reason: It might enter your mind to say: Since Rabbi Yoḥanan said, and some say that it was Rabbi Elazar who said: A person's wife dies only because others demand of him money and he does not have means with which to pay, as it is stated about one who commits himself to guarantee a loan: "If you have nothing with which to pay, why should he take away your bed from under you?" (Proverbs 22:27). The verse warns one who takes a loan that incurring debt may result in one losing the very sheets that he sleeps on to his creditor. The Gemara understands this homiletically: Why should you cause God to take away your wife, i.e., she who shares your bed, so that she dies? Consequently, you might say that one's wife also dies for this transgression of the prohibition: You shall not delay, in that one fails to fulfill his commitment. Therefore, the verse teaches us that this is not so. Rather, this sin is imputed to him alone.