

That which is already sanctified, no other sanctity can extend to it – כל שהוא קודש אין קדושה חלה עליו – If one designated an animal that was already consecrated as an offering to be consecrated for Temple maintenance, the new consecration takes effect. The animal is evaluated and redeemed, and its value is given toward the maintenance of the Temple. The animal itself is then sacrificed as the offering for which it had originally been consecrated. However, if one consecrated an animal already consecrated toward the maintenance of the Temple and said: This is a burnt-offering, or: This is a peace-offering, or he consecrated it for the priests, his action has no effect. The renewed consecration as an offering or consecration for the priests cannot be added to the original animal consecrated for maintenance of the Temple, since one cannot consecrate that which does not belong to him (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Arakhin VaHaramim* 6:8).

NOTES

That *sela* assumes the status of second tithe. The rest becomes consecrated with the sanctity of shekels – ואותה סלע נתפס לשם מעשר שני והשאר נעשו שקלים. The same solution applies to the case of one who contributed his half-shekel from Sabbatical Year money. He transfers the sanctity of the Sabbatical Year money onto a different coin, thus allowing the original coin to be consecrated as a shekel (Rash Sirilio).

One who gathers together small coins and said: These are for my shekel – המכנס מעות ואמר הרי אלו לשקלי – If one says that he is collecting money for his half-shekel and eventually collects a larger amount than a half-shekel, he must contribute his half-shekel from the collected money. The remaining money is non-sacred property. This is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel, as explained by Rabbi Yosei in the name of Rabbi Elazar (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim* 3:13).

That I will bring my sin-offering from these – שאביא מהן – חטאתי: If one says when one begins collecting money: I will bring my sin offering from this money, he must use it to buy an animal as a sin offering. Any leftover money is non-sacred property according to all opinions (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 5:7).

NOTES

The leftover coins are a free-will offering – מותרן נדבה: This free-will offering was used as repletion of the altar, i.e., burnt-offerings sacrificed at times when the altar was idle. When there were no other sacrifices to be brought on the altar, rather than leave the altar idle, the priests used special gift funds, which had been placed in an appropriate collection horn, to purchase animals to sacrifice as burnt-offerings. The meat from these offerings was burnt on the altar and their hides belonged to the priests.

מה נהנה? אמר רבי אבין בשם רבנן דתמן: מכין שבית דין ראיון למשכן ולא משכנו – כמו שנהנה.

The Gemara asks: How did the agent who placed the coin in the basket for himself benefit, that he should be liable for misuse? His goal was to perform a mitzva, and there is a principle that mitzvot were not given to derive benefit from them. We do not consider actions performed to fulfill a mitzva as personally beneficial to those who performed them. Rabbi Avin said in the name of the Rabbis from there, i.e., from Babylonia: Since the court is liable to seize collateral from him and does not seize collateral from him, it is as if he benefited personally from his action.

ממעשר שני וכו' – דכתיב: "אך בכור אשר יבכר לה' בבמה לא יקדיש איש אתו" כל שהוא קודש – אין קדושה חלה [עליו]. ביצד הוא עושה?

The mishna seems to indicate that one who brings his half-shekel from second-tithe money has fulfilled his obligation, although he must eat non-sacred fruits in place of the second-tithe money. The Gemara asks: Since the money was already consecrated for a different purpose, it is not possible for a new sanctity to extend to it, as it is written: "But the firstling which is born first to God among animals, no man shall sanctify it" (Leviticus 27:26), and the Sages learn from the wording of this verse: That which is already sanctified, no other sanctity can extend to it.^h If so, what does he do so that the second-tithe money he contributed should count as his half-shekel?

מביא סלע של חולין ואומר: מעות מעשר שני בכל מקום שהן יהו מחולין על סלע זו. ואותה סלע נתפס לשם מעשר שני, והשאר נעשו שקלים.

The Gemara answers: He brings a *sela*, i.e., a coin of non-sacred money, and says: The second-tithe money, already contributed, wherever it may be, should be redeemed upon this *sela*. That *sela* assumes the status of second tithe, which is transferred from the half-shekel that had been placed in the collection horn. The rest, i.e., the original contribution, becomes consecrated with the sanctity of shekels.ⁿ

Perek II
Daf 6 Amud a

הלכה ג מתני' המכנס מעות ואמר "הרי אלו לשקלי", בית שמאי אומרים: מותרן נדבה, ובית הלל אומרים: מותרן חולין.

HALAKHA 3 • MISHNA With regard to one who gathers together small coins and said: These are for my shekel,^h and subsequently discovered that it amounted to more than a half-shekel. Beit Shammai say: The leftover coins are placed in the collection horn designated for a free-will offering,ⁿ as the money is consecrated property but it does not have the status of a shekel. Beit Hillel say: The leftover money is non-sacred property since, *ab initio*, he had in mind to consecrate a half-shekel and no more. An item that was consecrated by mistake does not have the status of consecrated property.

"שאביא מהן שקלי" – שוין שהמותר חולין. "אלו לחטאתי" – שוין שהמותר נדבה. "שאביא מהן חטאתי" – שוין שהמותר חולין.

However, if he originally said: I am gathering together this money so that I will bring my shekel from these, they agree that the leftover money is non-sacred property. If one who was obligated to bring a sin-offering gathered together coins and said: These are for my sin-offering, then if he had accumulated more than was needed, they agree that the leftover money must be designated as a free-will offering. However, if he originally said: That I will bring my sin-offering from these,^h they agree that the leftover money is non-sacred property.

אמר רבי שמעון: מה בין שקלים לחטאתא? אלא, של שקלים יש להן קצבה ולחטאתא אין לה קצבה.

Rabbi Shimon said: What is the difference between shekels and a sin-offering? Why do Beit Hillel say that the leftover money is non-sacred property in the case of shekels, while with regard to a sin-offering they say that the leftover money is consecrated for a free-will offering? Rather, the issue is that shekels have a fixed value, a half-shekel and no more. Therefore, there is a clear amount beyond which one did not intend the money to become consecrated property. However, a sin-offering has no fixed value. Since the entire sum that one collected could have been used to purchase a sin-offering, whatever he didn't use must at least be designated for a free-will offering.

HALAKHA

When the Jewish people ascended from the exile they would contribute darics – תְּשַׁעְלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִן הַגּוֹלָה הָיוּ שׁוֹקְלִין דְּרַבּוֹנוֹת. When the prevalent currency was darics, people used to contribute a sela for their half-shekel obligation, as the sela equaled half of a daric (according to Rambam's opinion; see notes above). When the prevalent currency was the sela, people would contribute a half-sela, which is two dinar. When the prevalent currency was a half-sela, people would contribute that half-sela for their half-shekel requirement. The Jewish people never contributed a half-shekel that was of a smaller value than that of the Torah. This is the Rambam's opinion and this is how he explains the mishna. The Ra'avad disagrees and maintains that they did not contribute based on the prevalent currency in each individual period, but rather based on the needs of that period. If there were few contributors, each would give a substantial sum to fulfill his obligation, whereas if there were many contributors, each of them would give a smaller sum (Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim 1:6).

According to the Rema, some say that nowadays one should give a half of the prevalent currency in his place and time to charity before Purim, in order to commemorate the half-shekel that was given in the Temple in the month of Adar (Darkhei Moshe on Tur, Oraḥ Hayyim 694 and Rema, Oraḥ Hayyim 694:1). The source for this halakha seems to be the custom, mentioned in the mishna, that in the time of Ezra people would give darics, which were the prevalent currency in the Median Empire.

BACKGROUND

Dinars – דִּינָרִין: The source of this word is the Latin denarius, meaning ten, since a dinar contained ten issar. The dinar was a coin used widely in the Roman Empire.



Gold dinar with an imprint of Nero

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר: אִף לְשִׁקְלִים אֵין לָהֶן קִצְבָּה, שְׂבַשְׁעָלוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל מִן הַגּוֹלָה הָיוּ שׁוֹקְלִין דְּרַבּוֹנוֹת, חֲזָרוּ לְשִׁקּוֹל סְלָעִים, חֲזָרוּ לְשִׁקּוֹל טַבְּעִין.

בִּיקְשׁוּ לְשִׁקּוֹל דִּינָרִין וְלֹא קִבְּלוּ מֵהֶן.

אָמַר רַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן: אִף עַל פִּי כֹן יָד בּוֹלֵן שׁוּהָ. אֲבָל חֲטָאת – זֶה מִבְּיַא בְּסָלַע, וְזֶה מִבְּיַא בְּשִׁתַּיִם, וְזֶה מִבְּיַא בְּשָׁלֶשׁ.

Rabbi Yehuda says: Even for shekels there is no real fixed value. For when the Jewish people ascended from the exile,^N they would contribute darics,^{HN} which are Median coins worth two shekels by Torah law. They brought these coins with them and would give a half of one to fulfill their half-shekel obligation. Later on, when the Median Empire was dissolved, they reverted to contributing with a sela,^N a silver coin of equal weight to the the shekel mentioned in the Torah. People would contribute a half-sela for their half-shekel requirement. When the value of this currency changed later on, they reverted to contributing with a tiva, a different coin which is worth a half-shekel.

Some people wished to contribute only dinars,^B which are half the value of the tiva, i.e., one quarter shekel in value. The Sages refused to accept it and required them to contribute at least the half-shekel mentioned in the Torah. Nevertheless, it is clear that the obligation of contributing shekels does not have a fixed value.

Rabbi Shimon said in response: Even so, despite the fact that during different periods there were different amounts used to fulfill the obligation of the half-shekel, everyone has equal standing, i.e., at any particular time, everyone contributes the same amount. Therefore, any sum collected beyond that amount was not intended to be consecrated. However, a sin-offering has no fixed amount whatsoever; this person may bring an animal worth a sela, and that one may bring one worth two, and this one may bring one worth three. Therefore, it cannot be supposed that there was no intention to consecrate the whole sum.

NOTES

When the Jewish people ascended from the exile they would contribute [shoklin] darics – תְּשַׁעְלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִן הַגּוֹלָה: According to the explanation in the text, the word shoklin, contribute, does not have the same denotation as in other places in this tractate, i.e., giving the half-shekel. Rather, it denotes the currency used, such that in one period the coin used in commerce was a daric, and in another period it was a sela, etc. This is how the Rambam (Commentary on the Mishna 2:4; Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim 1:6), the Rosh, and Rabbi Ovadya Bartenura explain this mishna.

However, other commentaries maintain that the meaning of shoklin here corresponds with its meaning in other places. According to these opinions, the amount required by Torah law is always equal to that of the half-shekel given in the time of Moses. Since the value of the conventional currency changes from time to time, the court has the authority to change the conventional amount required, as long as the new value is not less than the value of the half-shekel from Moses' time, and as long as each member of the Jewish people contributes the same value.

The reason that, in different periods, people gave different coins for their half-shekel obligation is as follows: When the Jewish people ascended from exile in the time of Ezra, the number of immigrants was small, and the half-shekels they contributed did not suffice for all of the communal sacrifices. Therefore, the Sages of that generation decided that each person must contribute a daric, four times the half-shekel of Moses. Later on, when the population and the number of half-shekel contributors grew, they did not need such large contributions, and therefore the Sages said that it was enough to contribute a sela as the half-shekel. When the population expanded further, they reverted to using a tiva. When the population grew still more, people wanted to use

the dinar, but the Sages would not accept them, due to the principle that one may not give less than the value of the half-shekel of Moses.

According to this explanation, Rabbi Yehuda's claim in the mishna is that since the value of the half-shekel fluctuated in every period, it is obvious that it did not have a fixed value, and therefore it should have the same halakha as a sin-offering. Rabbi Shimon countered that even if its value fluctuated, in a particular period everyone gives the same contribution, which is not the case with regard to a sin-offering (Rav Yehuda ben Rav Binyamin HaRofeh; Ra'avad on Rambam Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim 1:6).

They would contribute darics – הָיוּ שׁוֹקְלִין דְּרַבּוֹנוֹת: According to the opinion of the Rambam, the daric was worth four half-shekels required by Torah law. However, the Ramban (Exodus 30:12) and the Tashbetz (Responso 1:172) maintain that the value of the daric was three half-shekels required by Torah law.

They would contribute darics...they reverted to contributing with a sela – חֲזָרוּ לְשִׁקּוֹל סְלָעִים: It seems from the mishna that there is an obligation to bring a half of the coin prevalent at the time of the contribution. The Rambam (Hilkhot Shekalim 1:5) seems to imply that this is the Torah obligation. However, the Me'iri is of the opinion that it is a rabbinic law, since by Torah law it is enough to bring the half-shekel of the Torah, which was based on the coin prevalent in the time of Moses. The Sages were more stringent and required people to bring the coin prevalent in their own time to fulfill their half-shekel obligation. Others maintain that this is neither a biblical nor a rabbinic requirement. Rather, it is an established custom in Israel to give the half-shekel based on the prevalent coin in one's own time (see Rosh).

Coin by coin [*peroterot*] – פְּרוֹטְרוֹט: Derived from the word *perita*, which has two opposing meanings in the linguistic usage of the Sages: Exchanging a large coin for smaller coins and vice versa. Here, the Gemara is using the second meaning, collecting small coins in order to exchange them for larger ones.

GEMARA It is taught in the mishna: **One who gathers together coins and says: These are for my shekel, if he finds that he has more than a half-shekel, then according to the opinion of Beit Shammai, the remainder is designated for a free-will offering, and according to Beit Hillel the remainder is non-sacred property. Rabbi Yosei said in the name of Rabbi Elazar: With regard to what do they disagree? With regard to one who gathers coin by coin [*peroterot*],¹ adding small coins bit by bit until they amount to a large sum. It is assumed that he intended to contribute only a half-shekel but did not pay attention to the fact that a larger sum had accumulated. According to Beit Hillel, an item that was consecrated by mistake does not become consecrated, and thus the leftover money is non-sacred property.**

אָבֵל בְּאוֹמֵר "אֵלֹו לְשִׁקְלִי" – כָּל עֵמָא מוֹדֵי שְׁהַמוֹתָרָן נְדָבָה. However, with regard to **one who takes a stack of coins and says: These are for my shekel, everyone agrees that he must have intended to consecrate the entire sum. Therefore, the leftover coins are designated for a free-will offering.**

רַבִּי חֵיָּיָא וְרַבִּי בֵּיבָא בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי לְעוֹר: מַה פְּלִיגִין – בְּמַכְנִס פְּרוֹטְרוֹט. אָבֵל בְּאוֹמֵר "אֵלֹו לְשִׁקְלִי" – כּוֹלֵי עֵמָא מוֹדֵי שְׁהַמוֹתָרָן חוֹלִין. Rabbi Hiyya and Rabbi Beiva said in the name of Rabbi Elazar: **With regard to what do they disagree? When one gathers coin by coin. In that case Beit Shammai maintain that the leftover money is designated for a free-will offering. Since they hold that an item consecrated by mistake is in fact consecrated, all the money that he accumulated becomes consecrated property and must be designated as a free-will offering. However, with regard to one who takes a stack of coins and says: These are for my shekel, everyone agrees that the leftover coins are non-sacred property. Even Beit Shammai agree that he did not intend to consecrate a sum of money so beyond the requirement of the half-shekel *ab initio*.**

"אָמַר רַבִּי חֵיָּיָא: מִתְּנִיתָא מְסִייעָא לְרַבִּי בֵּיבֵי. דִּתְנִן, אָמַר רַבִּי שְׂמַעוֹן: מַה בֵּין שְׁקָלִים לְחֻטָּאת – אֶלָּא שְׁהַשְׁקָלִים יִשְׁלְחוּן קִצְבָּה, וְלְחֻטָּאת אֵין לָהּ קִצְבָּה. מַה אֲנִין קִימִין? אִם בְּאוֹמֵר "שְׂאֵבִיא מִהֶן שְׁקָלִי" – כָּל עֵמָא מוֹדֵי שְׁהַמוֹתָרָן חוֹלִין, אִם בְּאוֹמֵר "שְׂאֵבִיא מִהֶן חֻטָּאתִי" – כָּל עֵמָא מוֹדֵי שְׁהַמוֹתָרָן חוֹלִין. Rabbi Hiyya said: **The mishna supports the opinion of Rabbi Beivai, as we learned in the mishna that Rabbi Shimon said: What is the difference between the leftover money from the half-shekel contribution, which is non-sacred property, and the leftover money for sin-offerings, which is designated for a free-will offering, other than that shekels have a fixed value and a sin-offering has no fixed value? The Gemara asks: What case are we addressing? If Rabbi Shimon is addressing the case of one who collects money in small amounts and says before he starts: I will bring my shekel from these coins, everyone agrees that the leftover coins are non-sacred property. And if he is addressing the case of one who says: I will bring my sin-offering from these coins, here too, everyone agrees that the leftover money is non-sacred property, as explained in the mishna.**

אֶלָּא בֵּין אֲנִין קִימִין בְּאוֹמֵר "אֵלֹו לְשִׁקְלִי", שְׁקָלִים עַל יְדֵי שְׁקִצְבָּתָן מִן הַתּוֹרָה – מוֹתָרָן חוֹלִין. חֻטָּאת עַל יְדֵי שְׂאֵבִיא קִצְבָּתָן מִן הַתּוֹרָה – מוֹתָרָן נְדָבָה. Rather, **this is the case we are addressing: when one takes a stack of coins and says: These are for my shekel. Rabbi Shimon holds that with regard to shekels, since their fixed value is explicitly from the Torah, the leftover coins are non-sacred property, because even when he held all the money he intended only to take the value of a half-shekel from it. However, with regard to a sin-offering, since it has no fixed value from the Torah, as each person brings an animal of whatever value he wants, it is possible that one intended to bring an animal worth the entire value of the coins he took *ab initio*. Therefore, the leftover money is consecrated for a free-will offering. This is a proof for Rabbi Beivai's opinion that when one takes a stack of coins and says: These are for my shekel, everyone agrees that the leftover money is non-sacred property.**

מַה עֲבַד לָהּ רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר? פֶּתַר לָהּ בְּמַכְנִס פְּרוֹטְרוֹט, וְכַבִּית הַלֵּל. Rabbi Yosei understood the mishna such that when he says: These are for my shekel, everyone agrees that the leftover money is consecrated property. The Gemara asks: **What does Rabbi Yosei, in the name of Rabbi Elazar, do with this proof? The Gemara answers: He explains Rabbi Shimon's opinion in the mishna as referring to one who collects coin by coin, and it is in accordance only with the opinion of Beit Hillel.**

וְהָא תַנְיֵנָן: מוֹתֵר שְׁקָלִים חוּלִין!
פֶּתֶר לָהּ בְּמַכְנִיס פְּרוּטְרוֹט וּבְבֵית
הַלֵּל.

הַמְפָּרִישׁ שְׁקָלוֹ וְסָבַר שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב
וְנִמְצָא שְׂאִינוֹ חַיִּיב – לֹא קָדַשׁ.
הַמְפָּרִישׁ שְׁנַיִם וְסָבַר שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב
שְׁנַיִם, וְנִמְצָא שְׂאִינוֹ חַיִּיב אֶלָּא
אֶחָד – אוֹתוֹ הִשְׁנִי מָה אֵת אֶתְ עֵבִיד
לִיָּהּ?

נִשְׁמַעֵנָה מִן הַדָּא: הַפְּרִישׁ חֲטָאתוֹ
וְסָבַר שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב, וְנִמְצָא שְׂאִינוֹ
חַיִּיב – לֹא קָדַשׁ. הַפְּרִישׁ שְׁתַּיִם
וְסָבַר שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב שְׁתַּיִם, וְנִמְצָא
שְׂאִינוֹ חַיִּיב אֶלָּא אֶחָד, אוֹתָהּ
שְׁנִיָּה מָה אֵת עֵבִיד לָהּ?

אֶלָּא רוּעָה. הֲכִי נִמְי אֵלוֹ לְנִדְבָה,

וְכֹא הֵיאֵךְ אוֹמֵר אֶתָּה אֵלוֹ?

The Gemara challenges Rabbi Yosei's version of Rabbi Elazar's opinion: **Didn't we learn in the mishna: The leftover shekels are non-sacred property?** This implies that in all situations where one consecrates shekels, including those where one said: These are for my shekel, the leftovers are non-sacred, which is in accordance with Rabbi Beivai's explanation. The Gemara answers: There is no such implication. Rabbi Yosei **explained it as limited to the case of one who collects coin by coin, and it is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel.** In such a case, the leftover money is non-sacred property.

The Gemara discusses a different issue. When a person **sets aside his shekel and thought at that point that he is obligated to contribute it, and it turns out that he is not obligated¹¹** to contribute it, as he had contributed it already, the shekel that he separated is **not consecrated**, just as other mistakenly consecrated items do not become consecrated. With regard to **one who sets aside two shekels simultaneously and thought that he is obligated to contribute two**, one for the current year and one for the previous year, **and it turns out that he is obligated to contribute only one¹²**, as he had in fact contributed the previous year's shekel, **what do you do with the second one** that was mistakenly set aside?

The Gemara answers. **Let us hear the halakha from this baraita: If one set aside his sin-offering, and at that point he thought that he was liable, as he had unwittingly sinned in such a manner requiring him to bring a sin-offering, and it turns out that he was not liable¹³, the animal is not consecrated. If one set aside two animals and thought at the time that he had unwittingly transgressed two prohibitions and was therefore liable to sacrifice two sin-offerings, and it turns out that he was liable to sacrifice only one¹⁴, what do you do with that second animal?**

It must **rather be left to graze**. On the one hand, it is consecrated with the sanctity of a sin-offering, but on the other hand, since the person who consecrated it is not obligated in another sin-offering, it cannot be sacrificed. Therefore, it must be left to graze until it develops a blemish and is disqualified from being offered. It can then be sold, with the proceeds used to purchase free-will offerings. **So too, these mistakenly set aside half-shekels, i.e., in the case of one who set aside two half-shekels and in the end was obligated only to contribute one, are designated for a free-will offering.**

The Gemara rejects this comparison between the case of the extra shekel and the case of the extra sin-offerings. **Here, in the case of extra shekels, how can you say: These are designated for a free-will offering?** The mishna distinguishes between the leftover money when collecting shekels, which is considered non-sacred property, and the leftover money when collecting for a sin-offering, which is considered consecrated for a free-will offering.

HALAKHA

Sets aside his shekel and thought that he is obligated and it turns out that he is not obligated – **הַמְפָּרִישׁ שְׁקָלוֹ וְסָבַר שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב**: If one thought that he was obligated to give his half-shekel and set that sum aside, but then discovered that he was not obligated, the half-shekel is not sacred property, in accordance with the conclusion of the Gemara (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim* 3:12).

One who sets aside two shekels and thought that he is obligated to contribute two and it turns out that he is obligated to contribute only one – **הַמְפָּרִישׁ שְׁנַיִם וְסָבַר שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב שְׁנַיִם**: One who set aside two half-shekels because he thought that he was obligated to contribute both, and then discovered that he was obligated to contribute only one, if he set them aside one after the other, the last one is not sacred property. If he set them aside simultaneously, one of them is his half-shekel and the other one is termed the leftover money of the half-shekel, in accordance with the conclusion of the Gemara (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim* 3:12).

If one set aside his sin-offering and he thought that he was liable and it turns out that he was not liable – **הַפְּרִישׁ חֲטָאתוֹ וְסָבַר שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב וְנִמְצָא שְׂאִינוֹ חַיִּיב**: In the case of one who set aside an animal or money for his sin offering and at that point thought that he was liable for a sin-offering, and then discovered that he was not liable, the animal or money that he set aside is non-sacred property, in accordance with the conclusion of the Gemara (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 5:6).

If one set aside two animals and thought that he was liable to sacrifice two sin-offerings, and it turns out that he was **liable to sacrifice only one** – **הַפְּרִישׁ שְׁתַּיִם וְסָבַר שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב שְׁתַּיִם**: If one set aside two animals or their monetary equivalent for his sin-offering, thinking that he was liable to sacrifice two sin-offerings, and then he discovered that he was liable only to sacrifice one, he may bring one of them or its monetary equivalent as a sin-offering. The other sin-offering or its monetary equivalent must be offered as free-will burnt-offerings (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 5:6).

From here one may derive that a person must donate his shekel three times – **מִכָּאן שְׁצִיךְ אֶדָם לְשֵׁלֶשׁ שֶׁקֶל־**: Some explain this passage not as referring to charity, but as the continuation of the previous discussion with regard to the half-shekel. This explanation is based on the opinion of the early authorities, who maintain that the value of a daric is a shekel and a half. Accordingly, when the mishna says: They used to contribute darics, it means that in the time of Ezra each person gave a whole daric for his half-shekel obligation, which is three half-shekels by Torah law. When the Gemara says the words: From here, it is bringing a source for this obligation from the following verse: “We made ordinances for us to charge ourselves yearly with one-third of a shekel” (Nehemiah 10:33). Rabbi Hilkiya explained that this verse means that the Jewish people divided their annual contributions to the Temple into three installments. They gave one-third of a daric each time, amounting altogether to a whole daric, which is equivalent to a shekel and a half in value (*Korban HaEida*).

This they shall give, everyone who passes among those that are numbered...because they sinned...**זֶה יִתְּנוּ כָּל הַעֹבֵר עַל-...לְפִי שְׁחָטָאוֹ**: According to Rashi on this verse (Exodus 30:13), the Gemara’s explanation here is unclear since, according to the verse’s simple meaning, there is no reference to sin. Rashi writes that “everyone who passes” means everyone who is to be counted, since it is customary that those who are counted pass by one by one, as it is written: “All that pass under the rod” (Leviticus 27:32) and: “The flock passes under the hands of he who counts them” (Jeremiah 33:13).

Indeed, one later authority (*Keli Yakar*) considered Rashi’s words in light of the Gemara’s interpretation and suggested that the words: “Everyone who passes among those that are numbered” is referring to those who had passed over or transgressed God’s mitzvot during the events of the Golden Calf, as the word “numbered [*pekudim*]” can also mean mitzvot. The Torah said that the transgressors must atone by giving a “half-shekel of the consecrated shekels” (Exodus 30:13).

לְפִי שְׁחָטָאוֹ – Because they sinned at the midpoint of the day – **בְּמִחְצֵית הַיּוֹם**: This point is derived in the Gemara (*Shabbat* 89a, vol. 2, p. 36) from what is written about the end of the forty days since Moses’ ascent to Mount Sinai: “The people saw that Moses delayed coming down from the mountain” (Exodus 32:1). The Gemara explains the word “delayed [*boshesh*]” as *bo shesh*, come six, meaning that the sixth hour, i.e., midday, had already come and Moses had not yet returned.

רַבִּי יוּדָא אָמַר: כּוֹ: דְּרַבּוּנֵי דִּינְרִין. חֲזָרוּ לְשֶׁקֶל סְלַעִין – בְּשִׁמוּעָן. חֲזָרוּ לְשֶׁקֶל טַבְּעִין – פִּלְגֵי סְלַעִין. בְּקִשׁוֹ לְשֶׁקֶל דִּינְרִין – קֶרְטִין.

It was taught in the mishna: **Rabbi Yehuda says** that even the half-shekel does not have a fixed value, as over the course of history the exact sum of a half-shekel varied. Rabbi Yehuda then describes the coins used for the half-shekel during various periods. The Gemara first explains the mishna’s terminology. **Darics are golden dinars.** The phrase: **They reverted to contributing with a sela, is as it sounds;** i.e., the equivalent of the shekel mentioned in the Torah, which is four silver dinar. The phrase: **They reverted to contributing with a tiva, refers to a half-sela coin,** the equivalent of two silver dinar. The phrase: **They wished to contribute only dinars,** refers to a karat, i.e., a quarter of a sela, or one dinar.

וְלֹא קִבְּלוּ עֲלֵיהֶן, מִן הָרֵא: 'וְהֵעֲמְדוּ עֲלֵינוּ מִצְוֹת לְתַת שְׁלִישִׁית הַשֶּׁקֶל בְּשָׁנָה לְעִבּוֹדַת בַּיִת אֱלֹהֵינוּ'.

The mishna continues: **They refused to accept it from them.** The Sages did not agree to accept dinars in place of the half-shekel. From where did the Sages derive this? **From this verse:** “We made ordinances for us, to charge ourselves yearly with the third part of a shekel for the service of the House of our God” (Nehemiah 10:33). The third of a shekel cited in this verse is one-third of a daric, the prevalent coin of the time. Until that time, the custom was to contribute a half of the prevalent coin of the time. The Sages of that generation were concerned that over time the value of the prevalent coin would be reduced to the extent that people would no longer be contributing the value of the half-shekel of the Torah. The verse reports that they therefore set a minimum for the collection, which is the precedent for the Sages of the mishna not accepting the request to lower the fixed amount to a dinar.

רַבִּי חֲלִיקְיָה בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי אֲחָא: מִכָּאן שְׁצִיךְ אֶדָם לְשֵׁלֶשׁ שֶׁקֶל־ שְׁלֹשׁ פְּעָמִים בְּשָׁנָה, מִכָּאן שְׁאִין מְטָרִיחִין עַל הַצִּיבוֹר יוֹתֵר מִשְׁלֹשׁ פְּעָמִים בְּשָׁנָה. אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבִין: מִכָּאן לְשֵׁלֶשׁ סָאִין, מִכָּאן לְשֵׁלֶשׁ קוֹפּוֹת, מִכָּאן לְשֵׁלֶשׁ הַפְּרָשׁוֹת.

Once this verse is mentioned, the Gemara discusses other *halakhot* that are derived from it. **Rabbi Hilkiya said in the name of Rabbi Aha:** This verse is about with the mitzva of charity. The term *shelishit*, one-third, used in this verse contains superfluous letters, as it could have been written *shelish* and maintained its meaning. **From here one may derive that a person must donate his shekel three timesⁿ a year,** meaning that he must give a shekel to charity three times a year. One may also derive **from here that one may not burden the community by asking them for charity more than three times a year.** **Rabbi Avin said:** **From here,** there is also support for the fact that the baskets into which the collection of the chamber was collected were **three se’a** in size; and **from here,** there is a hint to the **three collection baskets** and the **three collections** of the chamber during the year.

כְּתִיב: 'זֶה יִתְּנוּ כָּל הַעֹבֵר עַל הַפְּקוּדִים.' רַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְרַבִּי נְחֵמְיָה, חָד אָמַר: לְפִי שְׁחָטָאוֹ בְּמִחְצֵית הַיּוֹם – יִתְּנוּ מִחְצֵית הַשֶּׁקֶל. וְחָד אָמַר: לְפִי שְׁחָטָאוֹ בִּישׁ שְׁעוֹת בַּיּוֹם – יִתְּנוּ מִחְצֵית הַשֶּׁקֶל, דְּעָבַד שִׁיתָא גְרַמְסִין.

It is written: “**This they shall give, everyone who passes among them that are numbered,** half a shekel after the shekel of the Sanctuary” (Exodus 30:13). **Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Nehemya disagree with regard to the reason for the mitzva.** **One said: Because they sinnedⁿ with the Golden Calf at the midpoint of the day,ⁿ they should give a half-shekel.** **And one said: Because they sinned at the sixth hour of the day, they should give a half-shekel, whose sum is equal to six garmisin,** a small coin that was prevalent in that period.

רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בִּי רַבִּי נְחֵמְיָה בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן זַכַּאי: לְפִי שְׁעָבְרוּ עַל עֲשֻׂרַת הַדְּבָרוֹת – יִהְיֶה נוֹתֵן כָּל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד עֲשָׂרָה גֶרָה.

Rabbi Yehoshua of the house of Rabbi Nehemya said in the name of Rabbi Yohanan ben Zakkai: **Because the Jewish people transgressed the Ten Commandments at the time of the Golden Calf, each one of them shall give ten gera,** which equals a half-shekel, as it is written: “This they shall give, half a shekel after the shekel of the Sanctuary; the shekel is twenty gera” (Exodus 30:13). Since the Jewish people violated the first commandment, it was as if they transgressed all ten (*Sifrei, Shelah*).

רַבִּי בְּרַכְיָה רַבִּי לִוִי בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן לֵקִישׁ: לְפִי שְׁמָכְרוּ בְּכוֹרָה שֶׁל יוֹסֵף בְּעֶשְׂרִים כֶּסֶף – יִהְיֶה כָּל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד פּוֹדֶה אֶת בְּנוֹ בְּכוֹרוֹ בְּעֶשְׂרִים כֶּסֶף.

The Gemara cites an additional reason for the obligation to give a half-shekel: It atones for the sin of the sale of Joseph. First, it introduces this topic. **Rabbi Berekhya and Rabbi Levi said in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish:** **Since the sons of Jacob sold Joseph, the firstborn of Rachel, for twenty silver dinar, the nation was commanded that each of them must redeem his firstborn son with twenty silver dinar, which is five sela, as there are four dinar in a sela.**

NOTES

Since Jacob's sons sold Rachel's firstborn for twenty silver dinars each of them received a *tiva* – לְפִי שְׂמֵכְרוּ בְּכֹרֶה – שֵׁל רָחֵל בְּעֶשְׂרִים כֶּסֶף וְנִפְל לְכָל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד מֵהֶם טְבֵעָה: Since ten brothers were involved in the sale and the twenty dinar were divided among them, each one received two dinar, which is the equivalent of a *tiva*.

רַבִּי פִינְחָס בְּשֵׁם רַבִּי לֵוִי: לְפִי שְׂמֵכְרוּ בְּכֹרֶה שֵׁל רָחֵל בְּעֶשְׂרִים כֶּסֶף, וְנִפְל לְכָל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד מֵהֶם טְבֵעָה – לְפִיכֵךְ יִהְיֶה כָּל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד נוֹתֵן שֵׁקֶל טְבֵעָה.

The Gemara returns to the subject of the obligation to contribute a half-shekel: **Rabbi Pinehas said in the name of Rabbi Levi: Since ten of Jacob's sons sold Joseph, Rachel's firstborn, for twenty silver dinars, each of them received two dinars, which amounts to a *tiva*^N or a half-*sela*; therefore, each and every man must give a *tiva* for his shekel every year.**

Perek II

Daf 6 Amud b

HALAKHA

The leftover money from shekels is non-sacred property – מוֹתֵר שְׂקָלִים חוּלִין: If one was collecting small coins for his half-shekel, and when he began collecting said: I am collecting money for my shekel, even if he collected more than necessary, he may contribute the half-shekel that he is required to give and the rest is non-sacred property, as the *halakha* is that the leftover funds from shekels is non-sacred property, in accordance with the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim* 3:13).

The leftover money from the tenth of an ephah – מוֹתֵר עֵשֶׂרִית הָאֵיפָה: The leftover money of the tenth of an ephah of the High Priest must be left to rot, in accordance with the mishna which says it must be disposed of (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 5:8).

The leftover money from the pairs of birds of a *zav*, etc. – מוֹתֵר קִנֵּי זָבִין וְכִבֵּי: The leftover money from the pairs of birds of a *zav* and *zava*, the leftover money from a woman who gave birth, and the leftover money from sin-offerings are placed into the horn in the Temple that was designated for free-will offerings, and are used to purchase burnt-offerings. This rule applies only to fixed sin-offerings; however, with regard to those who are liable to sacrifice a sliding-scale sin-offering the leftover money becomes non-sacred property, in accordance with the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 5:9; see *Mishne LaMelekh*).

The leftover money from a burnt-offering must be used for another burnt-offering – מוֹתֵר עוֹלָה לְעוֹלָה: The leftover money from a burnt-offering must be used for another burnt-offering. The leftover money from a peace-offering must be used for another peace-offering. The leftover money from a meal-offering must be used for another meal-offering. The leftover money from a Paschal lamb must be used for a peace-offering. The leftover money from the offerings of nazirites must be used for other nazirites' offerings. The leftover money from a specific nazirite must be used for that nazirite's own free-will offering, in accordance with the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 5:9).

The leftover money from nazirites must be used for other nazirites – מוֹתֵר נְזִירִים לְנְזִירִים: One who set aside money for the sacrifices of nazirites, brought those sacrifices, and then had money left over, must use that money for other nazirite sacrifices, in accordance with the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 5:9; *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 9:1).

הַלְבַּח דַּ מִּתְנִי' מוֹתֵר שְׂקָלִים חוּלִין. מוֹתֵר עֵשֶׂרִית הָאֵיפָה, מוֹתֵר קִנֵּי זָבִין, קִנֵּי זָבוֹת, וְקִנֵּי יוֹלְדוֹת, חֲטָאוֹת וְאֲשָׁמוֹת – מוֹתֵרֵן נִדְבָה.

HALAKHA 4 • MISHNA The leftover money from what was set aside for shekels is non-sacred property,^H in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel in the previous mishna. The mishna now discusses similar cases for other sacred items: However, with regard to the leftover money from what one set aside to purchase the tenth of an ephah^H of fine flour for a meal-offering and the leftover money from what one set aside to purchase offerings that he is liable to sacrifice due to ritual impurity or a sin, such as the pairs of birds of a *zav*,^H the pairs of birds of a *zava*, and the pairs of birds of a woman after childbirth, sin-offerings, or guilt-offerings, in these cases, its leftover money must be used for free-will offerings^N that are offered as repletion of the altar, i.e., burnt-offerings sacrificed at times when the altar was idle.

זֶה הַכֹּל: כָּל שֶׁהוּא בָּא לְשֵׁם חֲטָאוֹת וּמִשּׁוֹם אֲשָׁמָה – מוֹתֵרֵן נִדְבָה. מוֹתֵר עוֹלָה – לְעוֹלָה, מוֹתֵר מִנְחָה – לְמִנְחָה, מוֹתֵר שְׁלָמִים – לְשְׁלָמִים.

This is the principle: Whatever money is designated for a sin-offering or for a guilt-offering, its leftover money must be used for a free-will offering. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase a burnt-offering that he owes, due to a vow or to volunteering, must be used for another burnt-offering^{HN} that he will bring in the future. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase fine flour for a meal-offering must be used for another meal-offering. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase a peace-offering must be used for another peace-offering.

מוֹתֵר הַפֶּסַח – לְשְׁלָמִים, מוֹתֵר נְזִירִים – לְנְזִירִים, מוֹתֵר נְזִיר – לְנִדְבָה.

The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase a lamb for his Paschal lamb is not used for another Paschal lamb, such as for the following year. Rather, it is used for purchasing a peace-offering. The leftover money from what one set aside to purchase sacrifices for a number of nazirites must be used to purchase sacrifices for other nazirites.^{HN} The leftover money from what a single nazirite^N set aside for his own offering must be used for a free-will offering.

NOTES

Its leftover money must be used for free-will offerings – מוֹתֵרֵן נִדְבָה: The Gemara explains that Jehoiada the High Priest established this principle in the days of King Jehoash and for this purpose thirteen collection horns were set up in the Temple (*Temura* 23b).

The leftover money from a burnt-offering must be used for another burnt-offering – מוֹתֵר עוֹלָה לְעוֹלָה: If one has enough money left to buy another animal as a burnt-offering, he must buy another animal. If he has only enough for a pigeon or turtledove, he must buy one of those. If he has even less than that, he must keep the money until he decides to bring another burnt-offering, and he then add this money to the sum he intends to use to buy his offering to buy a more valuable animal (Rav Yehuda ben Rav Binyamin HaRofeh).

The leftover money from nazirites must be used for other nazirites – מוֹתֵר נְזִירִים לְנְזִירִים: Rabbi Ovadya Bartenura explains that if money was collected for a nazirite's offerings and some was left over, he must keep it until it can be used to buy sacrifices for other nazirites. It is written in *Tosefot Yam Tov* that this

applies only when the money was not set aside for specific nazirites, since if it was set aside for specific nazirites it has the status of money that was left over from the sacrifices of one nazirite (see *Tiferet Yisrael*).

The leftover money from nazirites... a nazirite – ... מוֹתֵר נְזִירִים: The Torah (Numbers 6) explains that a nazirite who became ritually impure during the days of his nazirite vow must bring a sheep as a guilt-offering; a bird, pigeon, or turtle-dove as a sin-offering; and another bird as a burnt-offering. If a nazirite completed the days of his vow in purity, he brings a sheep as a burnt-offering; a ewe as a sin-offering; a ram as a peace-offering; as well as a meal-offering of unleavened cakes and wafers. The mishna is discussing a situation where a large sum of money was set aside for the sacrifices of a nazirite, and it was then discovered that more money than necessary had been collected. The mishna differentiates between a case where money was collected for a number of poor nazirites and a case where one nazirite collected money for his own sacrifices.

הַפְּרִישׁ שְׁקֵלוֹ וּמָת – If one set aside his shekel and died – If one set aside his half-shekel and died, the half-shekel must be placed in the collection horn for free-will offerings, in accordance with the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Shekalim* 3:12).

NOTES

His tenth of an ephah – עֲשִׂירִית הָאֵיפָה שְׁלוֹ – The commentaries maintain that the tenth of an ephah mentioned here relates to the meal-offering of the High Priest. It is a positive mitzva by Torah law that the High Priest sacrifice one-tenth of an ephah of fine flour each day as a meal-offering, half of it in the morning with the daily morning offering and half in the afternoon with the daily afternoon offering. This meal-offering is also known as the meal offering of *havitin*, or *havitei kohen gadol*.

Rabbi Yosei's question with regard to this particular meal-offering stems from the fact that the solutions mentioned in the mishna pertaining to other consecrated items would not apply to the meal-offering of the High Priest. It is impossible to use this leftover amount for a meal-offering brought by the High Priest on another day, since there is a separate obligation to bring a meal-offering each day, and therefore the money and fine flour set aside for one day's meal-offering are not valid for use for the next day's offering. Additionally, the High Priest cannot use this leftover money to add to the amount of fine flour in the current day's offering, since the amount was fixed by the Torah at one-tenth of an ephah and no more (see Rashi on *Menahot* 108a) Even as a free-will offering, it cannot be used, since only the leftover money of sin-offerings and guilt-offerings may be used for this purpose (Rash Sirilio).

He must cast it into the Dead Sea – יוֹלִיכֶם לַיָּם הַמֵּלַח – One does not need to go specifically to the Dead Sea, as any sea is valid for this purpose. The purpose of this *halakha* is to ensure that people do not find the consecrated items and unwittingly benefit from them. The same rule applies to all items that must be destroyed, such as idols. A similar idea emerges from the Rambam's words, as he refers to all salt-water seas as the Dead Sea, in contrast to freshwater lakes.

The meal-offering of a sinner – מִנְחַת חוֹטֵא – The meal-offering of a sinner comes in place of a sin-offering for those sacrifices that can be brought as sliding-scale offerings, meaning that one can bring the offering according to his means. If one is wealthy he brings a sheep, if he is poor he may bring a bird as a sin-offering, and if he is indigent he may bring a meal-offering. According to this interpretation of the Gemara, Rabbi Yohanan, who explained the mishna as referring to the meal-offering of a sinner, is discussing an indigent person who brings a meal-offering to atone for himself.

גַּמְ' אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסֵי: עד דאָנא תמנ שמעית קל רב יהודה שאל לשמואל: הפריש שקלו ומת? אמר ליה: ופלו לנדבה. מותר עשירית האיפה שלו, רבי יוחנן אמר: יוליכם לים המלח, רבי לעזר אמר: ופלו לנדבה.

GEMARA Rabbi Yosei said: While I was still there, in Babylonia, I heard the voice of Rav Yehuda ask his teacher Shmuel: **If one set aside his shekel and died^H** before he contributed it to the Temple treasurer, what is to be done with this money? Shmuel said to him: **It must be allocated for communal free-will offerings.** Rabbi Yosei asked: If a High Priest set aside money to purchase fine flour for his meal-offering and then discovered that he had separated more than was necessary, what should be done with the **leftover money from his tenth of an ephah?**^N Shmuel answered that this is a matter of dispute, as **Rabbi Yohanan said that he must cast it into the Dead Sea^{NB}** and dispose of it there. **Rabbi Elazar said it must be allocated for communal free-will offerings.**

מתנתא פליגא על רבי יוחנן: מותר שקלים חולין. מותר עשירית האיפה, מותר קני זבים, וקני זבות מותר קני יולדות חטאות ואשמות – מותרן נדבה.

The Gemara comments. **The mishna disagrees with Rabbi Yohanan**, as it is taught: **The leftover money from the shekel is non-sacred property.** However, with regard to **the leftover money from the tenth of an ephah, the leftover money from the pairs of birds of a zav and from the pairs of birds of a zava, the leftover money from the pairs of birds of a woman after childbirth, from sin-offerings and guilt-offerings, all of this leftover money must be used for free-will offerings.** The mishna did not distinguish between different types of meal-offerings, so the High Priest's meal-offering must also be included. However, according to the mishna, its leftover money is used for a free-will offering and not cast into the Dead Sea, as Rabbi Yohanan requires.

מה עבד לה רבי יוחנן? פתר לה: מותר עשירית האיפה של מנחת חוטא של כל ישראל.

The Gemara asks: **What does Rabbi Yohanan do with the mishna?** The Gemara answers: **Rabbi Yohanan explains that it is not referring to the leftover money of a High Priest's meal-offering.** Rather, it is referring to **the leftover money of the tenth of an ephah of the meal-offering of a sinner^N among the entire Jewish people.** Everyone agrees that the leftover money of this type of meal-offering must be used for a free-will offering; however, the leftover money of a High Priest's meal-offering is cast into the Dead Sea.

BACKGROUND

The Dead Sea – יָם הַמֵּלַח – The expression Dead Sea can sometimes apply to any of the saltwater seas, as opposed to freshwater lakes, but it usually refers specifically to the Dead Sea, also referred to in Talmudic sources as the Sea of Sodom. Any object from which it is prohibited to derive benefit may be thrown into the Dead Sea, since there are no fishermen or people who will come to retrieve items thrown into it. It is also possible that due to the high density of salt in the Dead Sea, objects thrown into it become rusty and decayed in a short period of time and cannot be used anymore.



Right: Ein Bokek at the Dead Sea

Below: Panoramic view of the southern part of the Dead Sea



The Paschal lamb is transformed and designated as a peace-offering – הפסח משתנה לשים שלמים – This ruling of the Babylonian Sages is referring to a Paschal lamb that was not slaughtered at its proper time. The proper time for slaughtering the Paschal lamb is from midday on the fourteenth of Nisan until nightfall. If a Paschal lamb is slaughtered as a Paschal lamb before its proper time, it is disqualified. If it is slaughtered not as a Paschal lamb, either before or after its proper time, it has the status of a peace-offering, even if one slaughtered it with the intention that it be a burnt-offering. There is a dispute among the *tanna'im* in the Mishna with regard to a Paschal lamb that was slaughtered not in accordance with its designation on the morning of the fourteenth (*Zevahim* 11b).

Some commentaries differentiate between a Paschal lamb offered after its proper time and a Paschal lamb offered before its proper time. Since the former can no longer be a Paschal lamb, it automatically has the status of a peace-offering, even if it was sacrificed with no specific intention. However, since the latter is still a candidate to be a Paschal lamb, it is disqualified unless it was sacrificed with specific intention to be some other sacrifice. This intention is required to remove its status as a Paschal lamb (*Tosefot Tukh on Zevahim* 2a).

A guilt-offering, which may come from only rams – אָשָׁם שְׂאִינוּ – There are six types of guilt-offerings: A guilt-offering for robbery, a guilt-offering for unwitting benefit from consecrated property, a guilt-offering for a designated maidservant, the guilt-offering of a nazirite, the guilt-offering for a leper, and a conditional guilt-offering. All of these come from male sheep, and in most of them the Torah explicitly specifies that one must bring a ram, except for the guilt-offerings of a leper and a nazirite for which a sheep is mentioned. Wherever a sheep is required, it means a sheep in its first year, whereas a ram is one in its second year (see Mishna, *Para* 1:3).



Fully grown ram

רבי יוסי אָמַר: עַל דָּא עָלִיל אָבָא
בַּר בָּא. דְּאִינוּן אָמְרוּ: מִנּוּן שֶׁהִפְסַח
מִשְׁתַּנָּה לְשֵׁם שְׁלָמִים – תַּלְמוּד
לוֹמַר: "וְאִם מִן הַצֹּאן קָרְבְּנוּ לְזִבְחַת
שְׁלָמִים" כָּל שְׂהוּא מִן הַצֹּאן – בָּא
שְׁלָמִים.

הִיתִיבוּ: הֲרֵי עוֹלָה מִן הַצֹּאן. דְּבַר
שְׂאִינוּ בָּא אֶלָּא מִן הַצֹּאן יֵצֵאת
עוֹלָה שְׂהוּא בָּאָה אֶפְיָלוּ מִן הַבְּקָר.

הִיתִיבוּ: הֲרֵי אָשָׁם. אָמַר רַבִּי בּוּן בַּר
בְּהֵנָּא: "מִן הַצֹּאן" – דְּבַר שְׂהוּא בָּא
מִכָּל הַצֹּאן, יֵצֵא אָשָׁם שְׂאִינוּ בָּא
אֶלָּא מִן הָאֵילִים בְּלִבְדָּ.

בְּכָל אֶתֶר אֶתְּ אָמַר "מִן" לְמַעַט,
וְכָאן אֶתְּ מִן "מִן" לְרִבּוּת? אָמַר רַבִּי
מָנָא: הֲכִי נִמְי "מִן" לְמַעַט, מִיעוּט
שְׂאִינוּ בָּא בֵּן שְׁתֵּי שָׁנִים, מִיעוּט
שְׂאִינוּ בָּא נְקִיבָה.

וְגַבִּי אָשָׁם נִמְי "מִן" לְמַעַט הוּא,
שְׂאִינוּ בָּא אֶלָּא מִן הָאֵילִים בְּלִבְדָּ.

הִיתִיבוּ: וְהִקְתִּיב: "וְאִם מִן הַצֹּאן
קָרְבְּנוּ מִן הַבְּבָשִׁים אוּ מִן הָעִזִּים
לְעוֹלָה" מֵעֵתָה מוֹתֵר הִפְסַח בָּא
עוֹלָה.

Rabbi Yosei said: On this point Abba bar Ba raised a difficulty. As they, the Sages of Babylonia, said: From where is it derived that an animal that was designated for use as the Paschal lamb, *ab initio*, and was ultimately slaughtered before its proper time as a peace-offering is valid, as it is transformed and designated as a peace-offering?^N The verse states: "If his offering for the sacrifice of the peace-offering is from the flock" (Leviticus 3:6). This verse indicates that any offering that comes from the flock, i.e., sheep or goats, may come as a peace-offering. The verse is referring to a Paschal lamb, about which it is written: "You shall take it from the sheep or from the goats" (Exodus 12:5), and it must refer to one that was offered before its proper time; however, if it were offered on the eve of Passover as a peace-offering it would clearly be an invalid.

Rabbi Abba bar Ba raised an objection with regard to this source: A burnt-offering also comes from the flock, and yet its leftover money is not used for a peace-offering; it is used for a burnt-offering. The Gemara answers: The verse is referring to items that may come only from the flock; this excludes burnt-offerings, which may come even from cattle, as it is written: "From the cattle or from the flock you may bring your offering" (Leviticus 1:2).

Rabbi Abba bar Ba raised another objection: A guilt-offering comes only from the flock, and the mishna taught that its leftover money is used for a free-will offering. However, according to this explanation, it too should be able to be sacrificed as a peace-offering. Rabbi Bun bar Kahana said that the phrase "From the flock" indicates that which comes from all kinds in the flock, i.e., sheep and goats. This excludes a guilt-offering, which may come from only rams.^N

The Gemara challenges Rabbi Bun. In every other place you say that the word *from* comes to exclude items from a particular category, and here you say that the word *from* comes to include the Paschal lamb, as "from" indicates all kinds of animals that can be considered part of a flock. The Gemara answers. Rabbi Mana said: In this verse too, "from" comes to exclude. One exclusion is that the Paschal lamb may not come from a lamb that is two years old, but rather from a lamb that is in its first year. There is an additional exclusion that a Paschal lamb may not come from a female animal, but only from a male. Accordingly, Rabbi Bun bar Kahana's explanation that the verse: "If his offering is from the flock" is referring to the Paschal lamb, as it may come from any of the animals of the flock, is not based on the word "from" but rather on the superfluous letter *heh*, which adds the definite article to the phrase "the flock," as opposed to the verse simply writing "a flock."

Rabbi Mana adds: And furthermore, even if Rabbi Bun bar Kahana would interpret the verse "If his offering is from the flock" with regard to a guilt-offering and not to a Paschal lamb, the word "from" would also come to exclude. It would teach that guilt-offerings may come only from rams and not from goats or female sheep.

Rabbi Abba bar Ba raised another objection on the source of the Babylonian Sages. Isn't it written: "If his offering is from the flock, whether from the sheep or from the goats for a burnt-offering" (Leviticus 1:10)? According to your opinion, this verse could just as easily be interpreted to indicate that in the case of any offering that comes from sheep or from goats, the leftover money must be used for a burnt-offering. However, if so, the leftover money of the Paschal lamb, which may come from sheep or from goats, must then come as a burnt-offering and not as a peace-offering. What indication is there that the concerning a peace-offering is the preferred one?

אמר רבי אבון: משנין דבר שהוא לאכילה לדבר שהוא לאכילה, ואין משנין דבר שהוא לאכילה לדבר שאינו לאכילה. אמר רבי יוסי בר רבי בון: משנין קדשים קלים לשם קדשים קלים, ואין משנין קדשים קלים לשם קדשי קדשים.

The Gemara answers. **Rabbi Avun said: An item that is designated for eating, e.g., the Paschal lamb, which is eaten by its owners, may be transformed into another item that is designated for eating, e.g., a peace-offering.** However, **an item that is designated for eating, like the Paschal lamb, may not be transformed into another item that is not designated for eating, such as the burnt-offering, which is completely consumed on the altar.** **Rabbi Yosei bar Rabbi Bun said** another answer: The status of **offerings of minor sanctity may be transformed and designated as other sacrifices of minor sanctity.** Therefore, the Paschal lamb, which is of minor sanctity, can be transformed and designated as a peace-offering, which is also of minor sanctity. However, the status of **offerings of minor sanctity may not be transformed and designated as offerings of the most sacred order, such as a burnt-offering.**

רבי יוחנן אמר: על דא עליל רבי חנינא, דאינון אמרין אין הפסח משתנה לשם שלמים אלא אם בן שחטו לשם שלמים, ואני אומר: אפילו שחטו לשם עולה.

Rabbi Yoḥanan said: On this point, Rabbi Ḥanina raised an issue that they, the Sages of Babylonia, said that the status of a Paschal lamb that is not offered at the proper time is not transformed and designated as a peace-offering, unless it was slaughtered as a peace-offering; but if it was slaughtered for another offering, such as a burnt-offering, it is disqualified. However, **I say that even if he slaughtered it as a burnt-offering, it may be transformed and designated as a peace-offering.**

אמר רבי אילא: טעמא דרבי יוחנן "אם מן הצאן קרבנו לזבח שלמים" כל שהוא זבח בא שלמים.

Rabbi Ila said: The reason, i.e., the source, for the opinion of Rabbi Ḥanina quoted by Rabbi Yoḥanan is the redundancy in the verse, as it is written: "If his offering for the sacrifice of the peace-offering is from the flock" (Leviticus 3:6). It could have simply written: If his offering of the peace-offering is from the flock. The extra phrase "for the sacrifice" indicates that a Paschal lamb slaughtered as **any kind of offering, including a burnt-offering, it comes to be a peace-offering.**

ומשתנה למחשבת פסול?

The Gemara asks: According to this opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan, may a Paschal lamb that was sacrificed as a burnt-offering be **transformed and designated as a peace-offering even it was slaughtered with a disqualifying intention?** If, during one of the services involved in an offering's sacrifice, i.e., slaughter, receiving the blood, bringing it to the altar, or sprinkling it on the altar, the priest or the one bringing the offering entertains the thought of performing any of the other services or eating the offering at a time that is unfit, the offering is thereby invalidated [*piggul*].

היך עבידא? שחטה לשם עולה על מנת לזרוק דמה למחר - מכל מקום פסול הוא.

The Gemara asks: **How was it done? If one slaughtered the Paschal lamb as a burnt-offering in order to sprinkle the blood the following day, in any case, whether it is transformed and designated as a burnt-offering or as a peace-offering it is disqualified.** The intention to sprinkle the blood at an improper time disqualifies the offering, so it does not matter whether it is transformed and designated as a peace-offering or not. The issue is whether one who eats an olive-bulk from the meat of this offering is liable to receive *karet*, like one who eats *piggul* meat, or whether he is not liable, like one who eats a regular disqualified offering. The principle is that an offering becomes *piggul* only when one slaughters an otherwise valid offering with an intention that disqualifies it. However, when the offering is disqualified for some other reason, the improper intention does not render the offering *piggul*.

אין תימר משתנה למחשבת פסול - פיגול, אין תימר אין משתנה למחשבת פסול - פיגול.

Therefore, **if you say that even if one offers the Paschal lamb with a disqualifying intention, such as to sprinkle the blood the following day, it is transformed and designated as a peace-offering, and if not for the disqualifying intention it would be a valid offering, it is deemed *piggul* and one who eats the meat is liable to receive *karet*.** However, **if you say that when the Paschal lamb is offered with a disqualifying intention, it is not transformed and designated as a peace-offering, since it remains a Paschal lamb and it was sacrificed at the wrong time, then it is simply a disqualified offering, but not one that is *piggul*.** In that case, one who eats the meat is not liable to receive *karet*. This question remains unresolved.

לְשֵׁמוֹ וְשָׁלַא לְשֵׁמוֹ בְּשָׂאָר יָמוֹת
הַשָּׁנָה.

If one slaughters the Paschal lamb on Passover eve as a peace-offering, before the proper time for the Paschal lamb, it is transformed and designated as a peace-offering, and it is valid. However, if one slaughters it as a Paschal lamb, then it is disqualified, since it is not the proper time. The Gemara asks: What is the *halakha* if one slaughters it **for itself and not for itself**, meaning that at the beginning of the act of slaughtering one intends to slaughter it as a Paschal lamb, but at its conclusion he does so as a peace-offering, and it is not on Passover eve but **during the rest of the days of the year?**

רַבִּי בּוֹן בַּר חִיָּיא בְּשֵׁם שְׁמוּאֵל
בַּר אֲבָא: מִכֵּיּוֹן שָׂאִין לוֹ שֵׁם –
נַעֲשֶׂה בְּשׁוֹחֲטוֹ לְשֵׁמוֹ וְשָׁלַא לְשֵׁמוֹ
בְּשִׁתִּיקָה, וְהוּא כָּשֵׁר.

Rabbi Bun bar Ḥiyya said in the name of Shmuel bar Abba: During the rest of the year it has no name; it is not a Paschal lamb, as it is not its proper time, nor is it a peace-offering, as he did not consecrate it for that purpose *ab initio*. Despite this, if one slaughters it without specifying for which offering he is doing so, it becomes a peace-offering. **Since it has no name** in that case, then, by the same reasoning, even if one begins to slaughter it as a Paschal lamb, **it becomes as one who slaughters it for itself**, a Paschal lamb, **and not for itself**, a peace-offering, **silently**, without specifying his intention, **and it is valid** as a peace-offering. Just as total silence determines that it is meant to be for a peace-offering, so too, the explicit change of intention at the end of the slaughtering is sufficient to accomplish the same.

אָמַר לֵיהּ: אִם בֵּן הוּא, אֶפְּלוּ שְׁחָטוּ
לְשֵׁמוֹ עַל מִנַּת לְרוֹק דָּמוֹ שְׁלַא
לְשֵׁמוֹ, יַעֲשֶׂה מִשְׁעָה הֶרְאֵשׁוּנָה
בְּשׁוֹחֲטוֹ לְשֵׁמוֹ וְשָׁלַא לְשֵׁמוֹ
בְּשִׁתִּיקָה וְיֵהָא כָּשֵׁר.

One of the disciples said to Rabbi Bun: **If this is so**, that even when one begins to slaughter the animal with specific intent as a Paschal lamb it is transformed and designated as a peace-offering, then even **if one slaughters it for itself in order to sprinkle its blood not for itself**, but rather for a peace-offering, **it should become, from the first moment, as if he slaughtered it for itself and not for itself silently, and it too should be valid** as a peace-offering.

אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבָא מַרִּי: מַה נֹּאמַר
בְּשִׁתִּיקָה כְּשֵׁר אוֹ נֹאמַר בְּשִׁתִּיקָה
כְּסוּל.

Rabbi Abba Mari said: **What, shall we say**, i.e., is it so clear, that when one slaughters for itself and not for itself **silently**, without specifying his intention to sprinkle the blood for a peace-offering, that it is considered a valid peace-offering? **Or**, perhaps, **shall we say** that even when one slaughters silently with the intent to sprinkle its blood for a peace-offering, it is as if he specified that he is slaughtering for the Paschal lamb, in which case it is transformed and designated as a peace-offering and it is **disqualified**? The difference is that in the previous case there is not one entire part of the service that is completed for the Paschal lamb. However, in this case, the slaughtering is completed. It is only the intent with regard to a later stage, i.e., the sprinkling of the blood, that could possibly transform it and designate it as a peace-offering. That is not a sufficiently compelling logical extension.

”מוֹתֵר נְזִיר לְנִדְבָה” רַב חֲסִדָּא

The mishna taught: **The leftover** money gathered by the nazirite beyond what he needs for his offerings must be used **for free-will offerings**. On this point, Rav Ḥisda

Perek II
Daf 7 Amud a

אָמַר: וְהוּא שְׁקָרְבָה חֲטָאתוֹ בְּסוּף,
אֲבָל אִי קָרְבוּ שְׁלָמִים בְּסוּף –
מוֹתֵרן שְׁלָמִים.

said: **That is only when the nazirite's sin-offering was sacrificed last**, after he offered his burnt-offering and his peace-offering. In that case, any extra leftover money must be used for a free-will offering, as taught earlier in the mishna. **However, if he already brought his burnt-offering and sin-offering, and the peace-offering was sacrificed last, the leftover money that he set aside for his sacrifices must be used for a peace-offering**, as with all leftover funds of peace-offerings.