

The Soncino Babylonian Talmud



PESOCCHIM

Book IV

Folios 87a-121b

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH

WITH NOTES

CHAPTERS XIII - X

Reformatted by Reuven Brauner, Raanana 5771

www.613etc.com

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Pesachim 87a

CHAPTER VIII

MISHNAH. A WOMAN, WHEN SHE IS IN HER HUSBAND'S HOME, AND HER HUSBAND SLAUGHTERED ON HER BEHALF AND HER FATHER SLAUGHTERED ON HER BEHALF, MUST EAT OF HER HUSBAND'S. IF SHE WENT TO SPEND THE FIRST FESTIVAL IN HER FATHER'S HOME,¹ AND HER FATHER SLAUGHTERED ON HER BEHALF AND HER HUSBAND SLAUGHTERED ON HER BEHALF, SHE MAY EAT WHEREVER SHE PLEASURES. AN ORPHAN ON WHOSE BEHALF HIS GUARDIANS SLAUGHTERED² MAY EAT WHEREVER HE PLEASURES. A SLAVE OF TWO PARTNERS MAY NOT EAT OF EITHER.³ HE WHO IS HALF SLAVE AND HALF FREE⁴ MUST NOT EAT OF HIS MASTER'S.⁵

GEMARA. [Hence] you may infer from this that selection is retrospective?⁶ — [No:] what does 'SHE PLEASURES' mean? At the time of the slaughtering.⁷ Now the following contradicts this: A woman, on the first Festival, eats of her father's; thereafter, if she desires she eats of her father's, [while] if she desires she eats of her husband's?⁸ There is no difficulty: there it means when she is eager to go [to her father's home];⁹ here [in our Mishnah] it means when she is not eager to go. For it is written, Then was I in his eyes as one that found peace [shalom],¹⁰ which R. Johanan interpreted: Like a bride who was found perfect [Shelemah] in her father-in-law's home and is eager to go and recount her merits in her father's house, as it is written,¹¹ And it shall be at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call Me My husband [Ishi], and thou shalt call Me no more.

My Master [Ba'ali]:¹² R. Johanan said: [That means] like a bride in her father-in-law's house, and not like a bride in her father's house.¹³ We have a little sister, and she hath no breasts¹⁴, R. Johanan said: This alludes to Elam, who was privileged to study but not to teach.¹⁵ I am a wall, and my breast like the

towers thereof.¹⁶ R. Johanan said: 'I am a wall' alludes to the Torah; 'and my breasts like the towers thereof,' to scholars. While Raba interpreted: 'I am a wall' symbolizes the community of Israel; 'and my breasts like the towers thereof' symbolizes the synagogues and the houses of study.

R. Zutra b. Tohiah said in Rab's name: What is meant by the verse, We whose sons are as plants grown up in their youth; whose daughters are as corner-pillars carved after the fashions of the Temples?¹⁷ 'We whose sons are as plants' alludes to the young men of Israel who have not experienced the taste of sin. 'Whose daughters are as corner pillars,' to the virgins of Israel who reserve themselves¹⁸ for their husbands; and thus it is said, And they shall be filled like the basins, like the corners of the altar.¹⁹ Alternatively, [a parallel is drawn] from the following. Whose garners are full, affording all manner of store.²⁰ 'Carved after the fashion of the Temple:'²¹ both the one and the other, the Writ ascribes [Praise] to them as though the Temple were built in their days.

The word of the Lord that came unto Hosea the son of Beeri, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah:²² Four prophets prophesied in one age, and the greatest of all of them was Hosea. For it is said, The Lord spoke at first with Hosea:²³ did He then speak first with Hosea; were there not many prophets from Moses until Hosea?

Said R. Johanan: He was the first of four prophets who prophesied in that age. and these are they: Hosea, Isaiah, Amos and Micah. The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Hosea, 'Thy children have sinned,' to which he should have replied. 'They are Thy children, they are the children of Thy favored ones they are the children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; extend²⁴ Thy mercy to them.' Not enough that he did not say thus, but he said to Him: 'Sovereign of the Universe! The whole world is Thine; exchange them for a

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

different nation. Said the Holy One, blessed be He, 'What shall I do with this old man? I will order him: "Go and marry²⁵ a harlot and beget thee children of harlotry"; and then I will order him: "Send her away from thy presence." If he will be able to send [her] away, so will I too send Israel away.' For it is said, And the Lord said unto Hose²⁶!: 'Go, take unto thee a wife of harlotry and children of harlotry';²⁶ and it is written, So he went and took Gomer the daughter of Diblaim.²⁷

'Gomer': Rab said, [That intimates] that all satisfied their lust [Gomerim]²⁸ on her; 'the daughter of

(1) It was the custom for a woman to spend the first Festival after her marriage in her father's house.

(2) He had more than one guardian, and each kind a Passover-offering with him as one of its eaters.

(3) Even if one specifically registered him in his company, since half of the slave belongs to another man. Hence he may eat only if both agree that he should be registered with one. — A slave in a Jewish house has the status of a semi-Jew, and if circumcised he ate of the Paschal offering (v. Ex. XII, 44).

(4) E.g. 'he had belonged to two masters, and one had manumitted him.

(5) As we assume that his master did not count in the free half.

(6) Lit., 'there is bererah'. Bererah is a technical term denoting that a choice or selection made now has retrospective validity in a legal sense. For it is assumed that the Mishnah means that the woman may eat of whichever offering she desires now, though she had not yet made her choice when it was killed and its blood was sprinkled. But the Passover-offering may be eaten only by those who had registered for it and on whose behalf it was killed. Hence when we say that her present choice permits her to eat thereof, it proves that this choice is retrospectively valid, as though she had declared it before the offering was killed. Actually there is a controversy (B.K. 51b; Bez. 38a; GIT. 25a) in this matter.

(7) It was then that she had declared her choice.

(8) Whereas the Mishnah states that at the first Festival she makes her choice.

(9) Then she eats of her father's even if she had not expressed her desire previously, as it is taken for granted. Cf. Keth.

71b, (Sonc. ed.) pp. 445ff notes.

(10) Cant. VIII, 10.

(11) Var. lec.: it is written, this introducing a new passage.

(12) Hos. II, 18.

(13) I.e., like a bride who has already gone over to her husband completely, and is more intimate with him (viz., after Nissu'in, the completion of marriage), and not like a bride in her father's house, which is after Erusin (betrothal) only (Rashal).

(14) Cant. VIII, 8.

(15) V. Sanh., Sonc. ed. p. 138. n. 5.

(16) Ibid. 10.

(17) Ps. CXLIV, 12. On Hekal v. infra p. 512. n. 6. E.V.: a palace.

(18) Lit., 'seal their openings'.

(19) Zech. IX, 1.

(20) Ps. CXLIV, 13.

(21) Ibid. 12.

(22) Hos. I, 1.

(23) Ibid. 2. lit. translation. E.V.: When the Lord, etc.

(24) Lit., 'roll'.

(25) Lit., 'take'.

(26) Ibid.

(27) Ibid. 3.

(28) Lit., 'to complete'.

Pesachim 87b

Diblaim': [a woman of] in fame [Dibbah] and the daughter of [a woman of] in fame [Dibbah].¹ Samuel said: [It means] that she was as sweet in everyone's mouth as a cake of figs [Debelah]. While R. Johanan interpreted: [It means] that all trod upon her² like a cake of figs [is trodden]. Another interpretation: 'Gomer': Rab Judah said: They desired to destroy [Le-gammer] the wealth of Israel in her days.

R. Johanan said: They did indeed despoil [their wealth], for it is said, For the king of Aram [Syria] destroyed then, and made them like the dust in threshing.³ And she conceived, and bore him a son. And the Lord said unto him: 'Call his name Jezreel; for yet in little while, and I will visit the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu, and will cause to cease the kingdom of the house of Israel. And it shall come to pass at that day, that I will break the bow of Israel in the valley of Jezreel.' And she conceived again, and bore a daughter. And He said unto him: 'Call her name Lo-ruhamah [that hath not

PESOCHEM – 87a-121b

obtained compassion]; for I will no more have compassion upon the house of Israel, that I should in any wise pardon them... And she conceived, and bore a son. And He said: 'Call his name Lo-ammi [not my people]; for ye are not My people, and I will not be yours.⁴ After two sons and one daughter were born to him, the Holy One, blessed be He, said to Hosea: 'Shouldst thou have not learned from thy teacher Moses, for as soon as I spoke with him he parted from his wife; so do thou too part from her.' 'Sovereign of the Universe!' pleaded he: 'I have children by her, and I can neither expel her nor divorce her.'

Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to him: 'Then if thou, whose wife is a harlot and thy children are the children of harlotry, and thou knowest not whether they are thine or they belong to others, yet [thou] art so; then Israel who are My children, the children of My tried ones, the children of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; one of the four possessions which I have acquired in this world — (The Torah is one possession, for it is written, The Lord acquired me as the beginning of His way.⁵ Heaven and earth is one possession. as It is written, [God Most High] Who possesses heaven and earth.⁶ The Temple is one possession, for it is written, This mountain [sc. the Temple Mount], which His right hand had acquired.⁷ Israel is one possession, for it is written, This people that Thou hast gotten.)⁸ Yet thou sayest, Exchange them for a different people!'

As soon as he perceived that he had sinned, he arose to supplicate mercy for himself. Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to him: 'Instead of supplicating mercy for thyself, supplicate mercy for Israel, against whom I have decreed three decrees because of thee'.⁹ [Thereupon] he arose and begged for mercy, and He annulled the decree[s]. Then He began to bless them, as it is said: Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea... and it shall come to pass that, instead of that it which was said unto

them: Ye are not My people', it shall be said unto them: Ye are the children of the living God.' And the children of Judah and the children of Israel shall be gathered together... And I will sow her unto Me in the land; and I will have compassion upon her that hath not obtained compassion; and I will say to them that were not My people: 'Thou art My people.'¹⁰

R. Johanan said: 'Woe to lordship which buries [slays] its possessor, for there is not a single prophet who did not outlive¹¹ four kings, as it is said, The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah.¹²

R. Johanan said: How did Jeroboam the son of Joash king of Israel merit to be counted together with the kings of Judah? Because he did not heed¹³ slander against Amos. Whence do we know that he was counted [with them]? Because it is written, The word of the Lord that came into Hosea the son of Beeri, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash king of Israel.¹⁴ And whence do we know that he did not heed slander? Because it is written, Then Amaziah the priest of Beth-el sent to Jeroboam king of Israel, saying. Amos hath conspired against thee [etc.];¹⁵ and it is written, For thus Amos saith: Jeroboam shall die by the sword [etc.].¹⁶ Said he [Jeroboam]: 'Heaven forefend that that righteous man should have said thus! Yet if he did say, what can I do to him! The Shechinah told it to him.

R. Eleazar said: Even when the Holy One, blessed be He, is angry,¹⁷ He remembers compassion, for it is said, for I will no more have compassion upon the house of Israel.¹⁸ R. Jose son of R. Hanina said [i.e., deduced] it from this: that I would in any wise pardon them.¹⁹

R. Eleazar also said: The Holy One, blessed be He, did not exile Israel among the nations

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

save in order that proselytes might join them, for it is said: And I will sow her unto Me in the land;²⁰ surely a man sows a se'ah in order to harvest many Kor! While R. Johanan deduced it from this: And I will have compassion upon her that hath not obtained compassion.²¹

R. Johanan said on the authority of R. Simeon b. Yohai: What is meant by the verse, Slander not a servant unto his master, lest he curse thee, and thou be found guilty?²² And it is written, A generation that curse their father, and do not bless their mother:²³ because they curse their father and do not bless their mother, therefore do not slander?²⁴ But [it means:] even if they [the slaves] are a generation that curse their father and do not bless their mother, yet do not slander [etc.]. Whence do we know it? From Hosea.²⁵

R. Oshaia said: What is meant by the verse, Even the righteous acts of His Ruler in Israel?²⁶ The Holy One, blessed be He, showed righteousness [mercy] unto Israel by scattering them among the nations. And this is what a certain sectarian²⁷ said to R. Hanina, 'We are better than you. Of you it is written, For Joab and all Israel remained there six months, until he had cut off every male in Edom;²⁸ whereas you have been with us many years yet we have not done anything to you!' Said he to him, 'If you agree, a disciple will debate it with you.'

[Thereupon] R. Oshaia debated it with him, [and] he said to him, ' [The reason is] because you do not know how to act. If you would destroy all, they are not among you.²⁹ [Should you destroy] those who are among you, then you will be called a murderous kingdom!' Said he to him, 'By the Capitol of Rome!³⁰ with this [care] we lie down and with this [care] we get up.³¹

R. Hiyya taught: What is meant by the verse, God understandeth the way thereof, and He knoweth the place thereof?³² The Holy One,

blessed be He, knoweth that Israel are unable to endure³³ the cruel decrees of Edom,³⁴ therefore He exiled them to Babylonia.

R. Eleazar also said: The Holy One, blessed be He, exiled Israel to Babylonia only because it is as deep as She'ol, for it is said, I shall ransom them from the power of the nether-world [She'ol]; I shall redeem them from death.³⁵ R. Hanina said: Because their language is akin to the language of the Torah.

R. Johanan said: Because He sent them back to their mother's house.³⁶ It may be compared to a man who becomes angry with his wife: Whither does he send her? To her mother's house. And that corresponds to [the dictum] of R. Alexandri, who said: Three returned to their original home,³⁷ viz., Israel, Egypt's wealth, and the writing of the Tables. Israel, as we have said. Egypt's wealth, as it is written, And it came to pass in the fifth year of King Rehoboam, that Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem; and he took away the treasurers of the house of the Lord.³⁸ The writing of the Tables, for it is written, and I broke them before your eyes.³⁹ It was taught: The Tables were broken, yet the Letters flew up.⁴⁰ 'Ulla said: [Their exile] was in order that they might eat

(1) He interprets Diblaim as a dual form of Dibbah, ill fame.

(2) A euphemism for sexual indulgence.

(3) II Kings XIII, 7.

(4) Hos. I, 3-6; 8-9.

(5) Prov. VIII, 22.

(6) Gen. XIV, 19.

(7) Ps. LXXVIII, 54.

(8) Ex. XV, 16. V. Ab. VI, 10.

(9) Jezreel, which symbolizes exile (Jezreel Zera', to sow) indicating that Cod would sow (scatter) Israel among the nations; Lo-ammi (not my people) and Lo-Ruhamah (without compassion).

(10) Hos. II, 1f, 25.

(11) Lit., 'cut clown in his days'.

(12) Isa. I, 1.

(13) Lit., 'receive', 'accept'.

(14) Hos. I, 1.

(15) Amos. VII, 10.

(16) Ibid. 11.

(17) Lit., 'at the time of his anger'.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(18) Hos. I, 6. ‘Compassion’ is thus mentioned even in connection with retribution.

(19) Ibid.

(20) Hos. II, 25.

(21) Ibid. R. Johanan makes this refer to the Gentiles, who in God's compassion will be given the opportunity. Through Israel's exile, of coming under the wings of the Shechinah. According to Rashi, R. Johanan deduces it from the concluding part of the verse, ‘And I will say to them that are not My people; thou art My people’. This passage shows these two Rabbis in favor of proselytes. For the general attitude of the Rabbis towards proselytization v. f. E. art.

Proselyte.

(22) Prov. XXX, 10.

(23) Ibid. 11.

(24) What connection is there between the two verses?

(25) Who was rebuked for slandering Israel to God, though they had indeed sinned.

(26) Judg. V, 11.

(27) Min, v. Glos.

(28) I Kings XI, 16.

(29) Many live among other nations.

(30) Jast. Or perhaps: by the Roman eagle!

(31) How to destroy you without incurring odium.

(32) Job. XXVIII, 23.

(33) Lit., ‘receive’, accept.’

(34) I.e., Rome, for which Edom was the general disguise; v. Sanh., Sonc. ed. p. 52. n. 8.

(35) Hos. XIII, 14. I.e., its very depth compels a speedy redemption.

(36) Abraham having come to Palestine from Ur of the Chaldees.

(37) Lit., ‘(the place of) their planting’.

(38) I Kings XIV, 25f. The Israelites took much Egyptian wealth with them at the Exodus: v. Ex. XII, 35f.

(39) Deut. IX, 17: ‘before your eyes’ implies that they saw something wonderful happen, as explained in the text.

(40) Back to God. — Though physical matter may be destroyed, the spirit (symbolized by the letters) is indestructible, but waits until mankind is ready to receive it.

study of] the Torah!’³ At night they [the dates] upset him. ‘A basketful of deadly poison cost a Zuz in Babylonia, exclaimed he, ‘yet the Babylonians study the Torah!’⁴

R. Eleazar also said, What is meant by the verse, And many people shall go and say: ‘Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, To the house of the God of Jacob’,⁵ the God of Jacob, but not the God of Abraham and Isaac? But [the meaning is this: we will] not [be] like Abraham, in connection with whom ‘mountain’ is written, as it is said, As it is said to this day, ‘In the mountain where the Lord is seen.’⁶ Nor like Isaac, in connection with whom ‘field’ is written, as it is said, ‘And Isaac when out to meditate in the field at eventide.’⁷ But [let us be] like Jacob, who called Him ‘home’, as it is said, ‘And he called the name of that place Beth-el [God is a home].’⁸

R. Johanan said: The reunion of the Exiles is as important as the day when heaven and earth were created, for it is said, And the children of Judah and the children of Israel shall be gathered together, and they shall appoint themselves one head, and shall go up out of the land; for great shall be the day of Jezreel;⁹ and it is written, And there was evening and there was morning, one day.¹⁰

AN ORPHAN ON WHOSE BEHALF HIS GUARDIANS SLAUGHTERED, etc. You may infer from this that selection is retrospective?¹¹ — Said R. Zera: [No:] a lamb according to their father's houses¹² [implies] in all cases.¹³

Our Rabbis taught: A lamb for a household:¹⁴ this teaches that a man can bring [a lamb] and slaughter [it] on behalf of his son and daughter, if minors, and on behalf of his Canaanitish [non-Jewish] slave and bondmaid, whether with their consent or without their consent. But he cannot slaughter [it] on behalf of his son and daughter, if adults, or on behalf of his Hebrew slaves and bondmaids, or on behalf

Pesachim 88a

dates¹ and occupy themselves with the Torah.

‘Ulla visited Pumbeditha. On being offered a basket [Tirama] of dates, he asked them, How many such [are obtainable] for a Zuz? ‘Three for a Zuz’, they told him. ‘A basketful [Zanna]² of honey for a Zuz’, exclaimed he, ‘yet the Babylonians do not engage in [the

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

of his wife, save with their consent. Another [Baraita] taught: A man must not slaughter [the Passover-offering] on behalf of an adult, his son and daughter, and on behalf of his Hebrew slave and bondmaid, and on behalf of his wife, save with their consent. But he may slaughter [it] on behalf of his son and daughter, if minors, and on behalf of his Canaanitish slave and bondmaid, whether with their consent or without their consent. And all of these, if they [themselves] slaughtered and their master [also] slaughtered on their behalf, can discharge [their duty] with their master's, but they cannot discharge [their duty] with their own, except a woman,¹⁵ because she is able to protest.¹⁶ How is a woman different?¹⁷ —

Said Raba, [It means] a woman and those who are like her.¹⁸ This is self-contradictory. You say, 'Except a woman, because she is able to protest.' [Thus] the reason is because she protested, but if she did not protest, she cannot discharge [her duty] with her husband's. Yet surely the first clause teaches: 'Nor on behalf of his wife [etc.] save with their consent': hence if nothing is said, she cannot discharge [her obligation thus]? —

What does 'save with their consent' mean? Not that they said 'yes,' but when they said nothing, which excludes [the case] where they said 'no.' But surely 'and all of these, if they [themselves] killed and their master killed on their behalf, can discharge [their duty] with their master's, but they cannot discharge [their duty] with their own meal's where nothing is said, yet it teaches, 'except a woman, because she can protest'? — Said Raba: Since they [themselves] slaughtered, you can have no greater protest than this.

A SLAVE BELONGING TO TWO PARTNERS, etc. R. 'Ena Saba¹⁹ pointed out a contradiction to R. Nahman: We learned: A SLAVE BELONGING TO TWO PARTNERS MAY NOT EAT OF EITHER'; yet it was taught: If he wishes, he can eat of this one's [and] if he wishes, he can eat of that

one's? Said he to him, 'Ena Saba!²⁰ others say, You black pot!²¹ Between you and me the law will be clearly defined:²² our Mishnah [holds good] where they are particular with each other;²³ the Baraita [was taught] when they are not particular with each other.

HE WHO IS HALF SLAVE AND HALF FREE MUST NOT EAT OF HIS MASTER'S. It is only of his master's that he must not eat, yet he may eat of his own? But it was taught: He may not eat, either of his own or of his master's! — There is no difficulty: one is according to the earlier Mishnah, while the other is according to the later Mishnah. For we learned: He who is half slave and half free works one day for his master and one day for himself: this is the view of Beth Hillel.

Beth Shammai say:

- (1) Which grow abundantly in Babylonia.
- (2) [The text appears to be in slight disorder. Read with MS.M.: For how much are such obtainable? — They replied, For a Zuz. A Zanna denotes a large basket with a capacity of three Tirama, cf. Ta'an. 9b.]
- (3) With the cost of living so low, surely they have plenty of time to study.
- (4) Suffering makes one charitable-minded.
- (5) Isa. II, 3.
- (6) Gen. XXII, 14.
- (7) Ibid. XXIV, 63.
- (8) Ibid. XXVIII, 19. Visits to the mountain and the held are only made at certain times, but a home is permanent. Thus this teaches that man must live permanently in God.
- (9) Hos. II, 2.
- (10) Gen. I, 4.
- (11) V. supra 8a.
- (12) Ex. XII, 3.
- (13) I.e., the head of the house does not require the consent of the members of the household. For that reason the orphan may now eat whichever he desires and there is no question of retrospective validity.
- (14) Ibid.
- (15) She discharges her duty with her own.
- (16) A married woman can renounce her right to her husband's support and refuse to work for him as she is normally obliged to do.
- (17) I.e., an adult son and daughter and Hebrew slaves can also protest!

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(18) I.e., his adult son and daughter and his Hebrew slaves.

(19) 'The old man'.

(20) Probably as a pun on his name-scholarly eye!

(21) He was of unattractive appearance (Jast.), perhaps swarthy. Rashi in A.Z. 16b softens this by explaining that he was either begrimed through toil (many Rabbis in Talmudic days being workmen) or that in his preoccupation with his studies he had neglected the appearance of his garments.

(22) As a result of your question and my answer the exact conditions of the law will emerge. Jast. translates: this tradition will be named from myself and from thee.

(23) Not to benefit from one another; hence the half of the slave which belongs to one, as it were, may not eat of the other's offering.

Pesachim 88b

You have [thus] safeguarded his master,¹ but you have not safeguarded him! He is unable to marry a [Canaanitish] bondmaid, because he is already half free; he is unable to marry a free woman, because he is still half slave. Shall he be made as nought,² — but surely the world was not created for aught but procreation as it is said, He created it not a waste, He formed it to be inhabited.³ Hence in the public interest we compel his master, and he makes him a free man, and he indites a bond for half his value.⁴ Then Beth Hillel reverted to rule as Beth Shammai.⁵

MISHNAH. IF A MAN SAYS TO HIS SLAVE, 'GO FORTH AND SLAUGHTER THE PASSOVER-OFFERING ON MY BEHALF': IF HE SLAUGHTERED A KID, HE EATS [THEREOF]. IF HE SLAUGHTERED A LAMB, HE EATS [THEREOF]. IF HE SLAUGHTERED A KID AND A LAMB, HE MUST EAT OF THE FIRST.⁶ IF HE FORGOT WHAT HIS MASTER TOLD HIM, HOW SHALL HE ACT? HE SLAUGHTERS A LAMB AND A KID AND DECLARES, 'IF MY MASTER TOLD ME [TO SLAUGHTER] A KID, THE KID IS HIS [FOR HIS PASSOVER-OFFERING] AND THE LAMB IS MINE; WHILE IF MY MASTER TOLD ME [TO SLAUGHTER] A LAMB, THE LAMB IS HIS AND THE KID IS MINE. IF HIS MASTER [ALSO] FORGOT WHAT HE TOLD HIM,

BOTH GO FORTH TO THE PLACE OF BURNING,⁷ YET THEY ARE EXEMPT FROM SACRIFICING THE SECOND PASSOVER.⁸

GEMARA. It is obvious that if he slaughtered a kid, he [the master] may eat [thereof] even though he is accustomed to lamb;⁹ if he slaughtered a lamb, he may eat [thereof] even though he is accustomed to a kid. But how is it stated, **IF HE SLAUGHTERED A KID AND A LAMB, HE MUST EAT OF THE FIRST;** surely it was taught, One cannot register for two Passover-offerings simultaneously?¹⁰ —

Our Mishnah refers to a king and a queen.¹¹ And it was taught even so: One may not register for two Passover offerings simultaneously. Yet it once happened that the king and queen instructed their servants, 'Go forth and slaughter the Passover-offering on our behalf,' but they went and killed two Passover-offerings for them. [Then] they went and asked the king [which he desired and] he answered then, 'Go and ask the queen.' [When] they went and asked the queen she said to them, 'Go and ask R. Gamaliel.' They went and asked R. Gamaliel who said to them: The king and queen, who have no particular desires,¹² must eat of the first; but we [in a similar case] might not eat either of the first or of the second.

On another occasion a lizard was found in the [Temple] abattoir,¹³ and they wished to declare the entire repast unclean. They went and asked the king, who answered them, 'Go and ask the queen.' When they went to ask the queen she said to them, 'Go and ask it. Gamaliel.' [So] they went and asked him. Said he to them, 'Was the abattoir hot or cold?'¹⁴ 'It was hot,' replied they. 'Then go and pour a glass of cold water over it,' he told them. They went and poured a glass of cold water over it, and it moved,¹⁵ whereupon R. Gamaliel declared the entire repast clean. Thus the king was dependent on the queen and the queen was dependent on R.

PESOGHIM – 87a-121b

Gamaliel: hence the whole repast was dependent on R. Gamaliel.¹⁶

IF HE FORGOT WHAT HIS MASTER HAD TOLD HIM, etc. MINE? Whatever a slave owns his master owns!¹⁷ — Said Abaye: He repairs to a shepherd with whom his master generally has dealings,¹⁸ who is therefore pleased to make things right for his master, and he gives him possession of one of them on condition that his master shall have no rights therein.¹⁹

IF HIS MASTER FORGOT WHAT HE HAD TOLD HIM, etc. Abaye said: They learned this only where he forgot after the sprinkling, so that when the blood was sprinkled it was fit for eating. But if he [the master] forgot before the sprinkling, so that when the blood was sprinkled it was not fit for eating, they are bound to observe the Second Passover. Others recite this in reference to the [following] Baraitha: If the hides of five [companies'] Passover-offerings became mixed up with each other, and a wart²⁰ was found on one of them, they all²¹ go out to the place of burning, and they [their owners] are exempt for observing the Second Passover.

Said Abaye: This was taught only where they were mixed up after the sprinkling, so that at least when the blood was sprinkled it was fit for eating; but if they were mixed up before the sprinkling, they are bound to observe the Second Passover. He who recites [this] in reference to our Mishnah, [holds that] all the more [does it apply] to the Baraitha.²² But he who recites it in reference to the Baraitha [holds] that [it does] not [apply] to our Mishnah: since [the sacrifices themselves] are valid, for if he reminds himself [of what the Master had told him], it would be fit for eating, it is [indeed] revealed²³ before Heaven.

The Master said: 'And [their owners] are exempt from observing the Second Passover.' But one has [definitely] not discharged [his

duty]?²⁴ — [The reason is] because it is impossible [to do otherwise]. What should be done? Should each bring a [second] Passover-offering, — then they bring Hullin to the Temple Court, since four of them have [already] sacrificed.²⁵ If all of them bring one Passover-offering, the result is that the Passover-offering is eaten by those who have not registered for it.²⁶ How so? Let each of them bring his Passover-offering and stipulate and declare: 'If mine was blemished, let this one which I am bringing now be a Passover-offering; while if mine was unblemished, let this one which I am bringing now be a peace-offering'? — That is impossible,

(1) Lit., 'repaired his master, — so that he should not suffer loss.

(2) Do neither and end in futility.

(3) Isa. XLV, 18.

(4) Which becomes an ordinary debt to his former master.

(5) After having ruled in actual practice on their own view for some time (v. Halevi, Doroth, I, 3, p. 576), they adopted Beth Shammai's ruling. Now the law is always as Beth Hillel. Before they retracted, he could not eat of his own, because the half in him that is free is sharply differentiated from the half that is not. But when they retracted they would regard him as entirely free, even before he is actually so, since we compel his master to free him; hence he could eat of his own.

(6) While the second is burnt.

(7) Because they do not know which belongs to whom, and a Paschal offering may be eaten only by those registered for it.

(8) For both the killing and the sprinkling of the blood were valid acts.

(9) And that is really what the Mishnah informs us.

(10) To eat subsequently whichever one chooses, because selection is not retrospective (v. supra, p. 458, n. 6). Thus the same applies here.

(11) Being surfeited with luxury they do not care what they eat, and generally leave it to their servants. Hence the question of retrospective validity does not arise.

(12) Lit., 'their mind is light'.

(13) A dead lizard (Halta'ah) defiles.

(14) I.e., was it found in hot water or in cold?

(15) They now saw that it was alive.

(16) [Derenbourg (Essai p. 211) identifies the King and Queen in these two stories with Agrippa I and his wife Kypros; Buchler (Synedrion p. 129 n. 1) with Agrippa II and his sister Berenice. On either

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

view it is to R. Gamaliel I that reference is here made.]

(17) How then can the slave stipulate that one of these should be his?

(18) Lit., 'where his master is accustomed'.

(19) Since this is in the master's own interests.

(20) This is a blemish which disqualifies an animal as a sacrifice.

(21) I.e., the Paschal-offerings.

(22) For in the Mishnah the sacrifices themselves are both definitely fit, but that we do not know who registered for them, and yet if the doubt arose before the sprinkling they are bound to observe the Second Passover. How much the more than in the Baraitha, where the fitness of the sacrifices themselves is in question!

(23) Hence even if the doubt arose before the sprinkling, they are exempt from observing the Second] Passover.

(24) Sc. the one whose offering was blemished.

(25) A Passover-offering can only be brought when there is an actual obligation. and if a man not under this obligation consecrates an animal as such, the consecration is invalid and the animal remains Hullin (q.v. Glos.), which may not be brought into the Temple Court for slaughtering. Here four have actually discharged their duty already, though we do not know who they are, so that four of the animals must remain unconsecrated.

(26) Because the registration of those whose duty has been done is of no account.

Pesachim 89a

because there is the breast and the shoulder [of the peace offering], which is eaten by priests [only].¹ Then let each one bring a priest with him?² —

What is the position of this priest? If he has [already] sacrificed a Passover-offering, then perhaps this [too] is a Passover-offering, with the result that the Passover offering is eaten by those who have not registered for it. While if he has not observed the Passover,³ perhaps this is a peace offering, and so he will not observe the Passover? Then let all the five [jointly] bring one priest who had not kept the Passover and register him for these five Passover-offerings, for on any hypothesis⁴ there is one [sacrifice] with which he will discharge [his duty]!⁵ —

Rather [the reason is] because he reduces [the time allowed for] the eating of the peace-offering, for the Passover offering [is eaten] a day and a night,⁶ whereas a peace-offering [is eaten] two days and one night.⁷ Then let them bring a Passover 'remainder'⁸ and declare, 'If mine was blemished, let this which I bring now be a Passover-offering; while if mine was unblemished, let this which I bring now be a peace-offering,' for a Passover 'remainder' is eaten one day and one night [only]?⁹ —

May we then set aside [animals] in the first instance to be remainders!¹⁰ Then let us take the trouble to bring a Passover-remainder?¹¹ Rather [the reason is] because of the laying [of hands]; for whereas the Passover-offering does not require laying [of the hands], a remainder requires laying [of the hands].¹² That is well of a mens' sacrifice, [but] what can be said of a womens' sacrifice?¹³ —

Rather it is on account of the [blood] applications: for whereas the Passover-offering [requires] one application, the peace-offering [requires] two, which are four.¹⁴ [But] what does that matter? Surely we learned: All [blood] which is sprinkled on the outer altar,¹⁵ if he [the priest] applied them with one sprinkling, he has made atonement?¹⁶ —

Rather [the reason is] because whereas [the blood of] the Passover-offering must be poured out [gently],¹⁷ [that of] the peace-offerings requires dashing [against the altar].¹⁸ But what does that matter? Surely it was taught: All [blood] which is applied by dashing [against the altar], if he [the priest] applied [it] by pouring it out, he has discharged [his duty]?¹⁹ — Granted that we say [thus] where he has done so; [do we say thus] as the very outset too?²⁰

MISHNAH. IF A MAN SAYS TO HIS CHILDREN, 'BEHOLD, I SLAUGHTER THE PASSOVER-OFFERING ON BEHALF OF WHICHEVER OF YOU GOES UP FIRST TO JERUSALEM,' AS SOON AS THE FIRST HAS

PESOCCHIM – 87a-121b

INSERTED HIS HEAD AND THE GREATER PART OF HIS BODY [IN JERUSALEM] HE HAS ACQUIRED HIS PORTION, AND HE ACQUIRES IT ON BEHALF OF HIS BRETHREN WITH HIM.

GEMARA. This proves that selection is retrospective?²¹ Said R. Johanan: He [their father] said this in order to encourage them in [the performance of] precepts.²² This may be proved too, for he [the Tanna] teaches: AND HE ACQUIRES IT ON BEHALF OF HIS BRETHREN WITH HIM; now it is well if you say that he had registered them beforehand, then it is correct. But if you say that he had not registered them beforehand, can they be registered after he has slaughtered it? Surely we learned: They may register and withdraw their hands from it until it is killed!²³ This proves it. It was taught likewise: It once happened that the daughters outstripped the sons, and so it was seen that the daughters were zealous while the sons were indolent.

MISHNAH. ONE MAY ALWAYS REGISTER FOR IT AS LONG AS THERE IS AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE THEREIN FOR EACH ONE [REGISTERED]. THEY MAY REGISTER AND WITHDRAW THEIR HANDS FROM IT UNTIL IT IS SLAUGHTERED; R. SIMEON SAID: UNTIL THE BLOOD IS SPRINKLED.

GEMARA. What does he inform us? — He informs us this, viz., though this company had registered for it, it can retract [entirely] and a different company register for it.²⁴

THEY MAY REGISTER AND WITHDRAW THEIR HANDS FROM IT UNTIL IT IS KILLED, etc. Abaye said: The controversy is in respect of withdrawing, for the Rabbis hold: [And if the household be too little] for being [Me-heyoth] for a lamb²⁵ [implies] in the lifetime [Mi-hayuth] of the lamb;²⁶ while R. Simeon holds [that it implies] during the existence [Mi-hawayuth] of the lamb.²⁷ But in respect of registering all agree [that this can be done only] until it is

killed, because the Writ saith, according to the number of [Bemiksath] the souls, and then, ye shall make your count [Takosu].²⁸ It was taught likewise: They may register and withdraw their hands from it until it is slaughtered.

R. Simeon said: They may register until it is slaughtered and withdraw until the blood is sprinkled.

- (1) And since it may be a Passover sacrifice and no priests are registered for this, they cannot eat it.
- (2) I.e., let a priest register for each sacrifice.
- (3) Having been unclean or on a distant journey at the First Passover.
- (4) Lit., 'whatever you will'.
- (5) This is Rashi's text. Cur. edd. read: there is one who has kept the Passover and so they will discharge, etc. i.e., by this device we ensure that all shall have discharged their duty. — The priest then would partake of the breast and shoulders of each sacrifice.
- (6) And what is left over after that must be burnt as Nothar.
- (7) Since each sacrifice may be a Passover-offering, we can only permit the shorter period, whereas actually it may be a peace-offering.
- (8) [The text is not clear. R. Hananel reads, let him bring (an offering) and make a stipulation for (it to become if necessary) a Passover-'remainder'.]
- (9) If an animal is consecrated as a Passover-offering but not sacrificed as such, it is a Passover-'remainder', which is then brought as a peace-offering but eaten only during the shorter period. Hence here, let each consecrate the animal for a Passover-offering. If his animal was blemished, he discharges his duty with this one. But if his animal was unblemished, this is automatically a Passover-'remainder', since it cannot be sacrificed for its own purpose (Tosaf.; Rashi explains slightly differently.)
- (10) Surely not.
- (11) I.e., let us find an animal which was actually left over from the first Passover.
- (12) V, Lev, III, 2.
- (13) This does not require laying of the hands.
- (14) The blood was applied to the north-east and the south-west corners of the altar, thus making it appear that the four corners were besprinkled; v. Zeb. 53b.
- (15) This includes the blood of the peace-offering.
- (16) I.e., the sacrifice is valid, though in the first place two applications are required.
- (17) From the basin on to the wall of the altar near the base.
- (18) Vigorously, from a distance.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(19) The sacrifice is valid.

(20) Surely we may not arrange at the very outset that the blood should be gently poured out where it really requires to be dashed against the altar. Hence there is no possibility of observing the Second Passover.

(21) V. supra 87a. It is now assumed that only one was registered.

(22) But actually he had registered all of them beforehand.

(23) But not after.

(24) This disagrees with R. Judah, who maintains infra 99a that one member at least of the original company must remain.

(25) Ex. XII, 4.

(26) The verse is understood to refer to withdrawal, it being translated: And if the household has become too little, etc. because some of its members have withdrawn. The present interpretation of mi-heyoth teaches that this withdrawal is possible only while the animal is still alive.

(27) I.e., as long as it still exists for its sacrifice rites to be preformed, which is until the blood is sprinkled.

(28) Ibid. 'Be-miksath' and 'Takosu' are connected with a root meaning to slaughter, while at the same time retaining their connotation of numbering, i.e., registering. Hence registration is permitted only until it is slaughtered; cf. supra 61a.

Pesachim 89b

MISHNAH. IF A MAN REGISTERS ANOTHER WITH HIM [TO SHARE] IN HIS PORTION,¹ THE MEMBERS OF THE COMPANY² ARE AT LIBERTY TO GIVE HIM HIS [PORTION],³ AND HE EATS HIS AND THEY EAT THEIRS.⁴

GEMARA. The scholars asked: Can the members of a company, one of whom is quickhanded,⁵ say to him, 'Take your portion and go!' Do we rule that he can say to them, 'Surely you have accepted [me]'; or perhaps they can answer him, 'We accepted you for the purpose of the sacrifice,⁶ but we did not accept you with the view that you should eat more than we'? —

Come and hear: IF A MAN REGISTERS ANOTHER WITH HIM, THE MEMBERS OF THE COMPANY ARE AT LIBERTY TO GIVE HIM HIS [PORTION], AND HE EATS HIS AND THEY EAT THEIR. What

is the reason? Is it not because it is as though one of them were quick-handed:⁷ and if you should think that one who is quick-handed can say to them, 'You have accepted me,'⁸ then let this one be as though he is quick-handed? — I will tell you: That is not so, [for] characters differ, for even if both of them together eat [only] as much as one member of the company, they can say to him that they are not willing to have a stranger with them.

Come and hear: If the attendant ate as much as an olive at the side of the oven, if he is wise he eats his fill of it; but if the members of the company wish to do him a favor, they come and sit at his side and eat: this is R. Judah's opinion.⁹ Thus, only if they wish, but not if they do not wish. Yet why so? Let him say to them, 'Surely you have accepted [me].'¹⁰ — There it is different, because they can say to him, 'We accepted you with the intention of troubling you to attend on us; [but] we did not accept you that we should take the trouble of attending to you.'

Come and hear: Members of a company, one of whom is quick-handed, are at liberty to say [to him], 'Take your portion and go.' And not only that, but even when five arrange for a meal in common,¹¹ they are at liberty to say to him, 'Take your portion and go.' This proves it. What does 'and not only that' mean?¹² — He proceeds to a climax.¹³ In the case of Passover-offerings it goes without saying, for they can say to him, 'We accepted you for the purpose of the sacrifice.' But even in the case of a meal in common, which is mere companionship, they are at liberty to say to him, 'Take your portion and go. Others state: That is no problem to us,¹⁴ but this is our question: Are the members of a company permitted to divide,¹⁵ or are they not permitted to divide?¹⁶ —

Come and hear: Members of a company, one of whom was quick-handed, are at liberty to say to him, 'Take your portion and go.' Thus,

PESOCHEM – 87a-121b

only if he is quick-handed, but not if he is not quick-handed. This proves it.¹⁷

R. Papa and R. Huna the son of R. Joshua joined their bread together. But by the time R. Huna the son of R. Joshua ate one [piece], R. Papa ate four. Said he to him, 'Divide with me.' 'You have accepted [me as a partner],' he retorted. [Thereupon] he raised all these objections¹⁸ to him, and he answered him as we have answered them. He then refuted him by [the teaching regarding] 'the members of a company [etc.]'. Said he to him, There the reason is because they can say to him, 'We accepted you for the purpose of the sacrifice.' He refuted him by [the teaching regarding] 'a meal in common [etc.]', so he divided with him. Then he went and joined bread with Rabina. By the time R. Huna the son of R. Joshua ate one [piece], Rabina ate eight. Said he: A hundred Papas rather than one Rabina!

Our Rabbis taught: If a man registers others with him for his Passover-offering and his Hagigah,¹⁹ the money he holds²⁰ is Hullin. And he who sells his burnt-offering and his peace-offering²¹ has effected nothing,²² and the money, however much it is,²³ is utilized²⁴ for a freewill-offering. But since he has not affected anything, why should it be utilized for a freewill-offering?²⁵

Said Raba: As a penalty.²⁶ And what does 'however much it is' mean? — Even if they [the animals] were only worth four [Zuz] and he paid five, the Rabbis penalized him even in respect of that additional [Zuz].

'Ulla — others state, R. Oshaia — said: Perhaps our Babylonian colleagues know the reason for this ruling. [Consider:] one set aside a lamb for his Passover-offering, and another set aside money for his Passover-offering: how can sanctification fall upon sanctification, that he teaches, 'the money he holds is Hullin.'²⁷ —

(1) Without the knowledge of the other members of the company.

- (2) Who disapprove of the new companion.
- (3) Bidding him to go and eat it elsewhere with the new companion of his choice.
- (4) This Tanna holds that one Paschal lamb may be eaten by two separate companies.
- (5) To seize food — i.e., he is a glutton and eats more than his due share. Lit., 'who has fine hands' — a euphemism.
- (6) We calculated that so many are required for this lamb.
- (7) Presumably the two will eat more than the ordinary share of one.
- (8) Enabling me to eat as much as I like.
- (9) V. supra 86a for notes.
- (10) As one of your company, and since I cannot go to you, you must come to me.
- (11) Each contributing an equal share.
- (12) In which way is the second ruling more noteworthy than the first?
- (13) Lit., 'he states, it is unnecessary'.
- (14) That the quick-handed companion may be told to take his portion and go.
- (15) Each to take his share.
- (16) But must all eat together.
- (17) They must eat together.
- (18) From the teaching cited above.
- (19) Here the Festive peace-offering which was brought on the fourteenth likewise and eaten before the Passover-offering. This was eaten by the same who had registered for the Passover-offering.
- (20) Which he received from those whom he registered.
- (21) I.e., animals which he consecrated for that purpose.
- (22) The sacrifice must be offered on behalf of the first owner.
- (23) Even if it exceeds the animal's worth.
- (24) Lit., 'falls'.
- (25) His action being null, the money remains Hullin.
- (26) He should not have bought another man's sacrifice.
- (27) Money consecrated for a sacrifice can revert to Hullin only if an animal of Hullin is bought therewith, whereby the animal receives the sanctity of the money, which in turn loses it and becomes Hullin. Here, however, the money was consecrated and given for an animal (or part of it, which is the same) which was already consecrated for a Passover-offering: how then can additional sanctity fall upon the animal, in the sense that the sanctity of the money is transferred thereto, leaving the money Hullin? — It cannot be answered that this refers to unconsecrated money, for in that case it is obvious.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Pesachim 90a

Said Abaye: Had not R. Oshaia related that [Mishnah]¹ to a case where he registers a harlot for his Passover-offering,² and in accordance with Rabbi,³ I would have related it to sacrifices of lesser sanctity⁴ and in accordance with R. Jose the Galilean who maintained: sacrifices of lesser sanctity are their owner's property. But [on Rabbi's view] a man does not leave anything over [unconsecrated] in the Passover-offering, yet he certainly does leave over in the case of money, because when he set it aside [for a Passover-offering] in the first place, he did so with this intention.⁵ While this [the present Baraitha]⁶ is [the view of] Rabbi,⁷ and for that reason the money he holds is Hullin, as a man certainly leaves over [something] of money [unconsecrated].

Again, what R. Oshaia explains as the view of Rabbi, I do not explain as [the view of] Rabbi, for a man does not leave over anything [unconsecrated] of the Passover-offering.⁸ But this [present Baraitha] cannot be established as agreeing with R. Jose, since it is taught therein, 'and he who sells his burnt-offering and his peace-offering has effected nothing.'⁹ Now however that R. Oshaia related that [Mishnah] to the case of a man who registers a harlot in his Passover-offering and in accordance with Rabbi, it follows that he¹⁰ holds that a man leaves [something unconsecrated] even in his Passover-offering [itself].¹¹ What is [this statement] of R. Oshaia [which is alluded to]?—

For we learned: If he gave her [a harlot] consecrated animals as her hire, they are permitted [for the altar];¹² [if he gave her] birds of Hullin, they are forbidden.¹³ Though [the reverse] would have been logical: if with consecrated animals, which a blemish disqualifies, yet [the interdict of] 'hire' or 'price'¹⁴ does not fall upon them;¹⁵ then with birds, which a blemish does not disqualify, is it not logical that [the interdict of] 'hire' and

'price' does not fall upon them? Therefore it is stated, 'for any vow,' which includes birds. [But] now you might argue a minori in respect of consecrated animals: if with birds, though a blemish does not disqualify them, yet 'hire' and 'price' fall upon them, then with consecrated animals, which a blemish disqualifies, is it not logical that 'hire' and 'price' fall upon them? Therefore it is stated, 'for any vow [Neder]', which excludes that which is [already] vowed [Nadar].¹⁶ Now the reason is because the Divine Law wrote 'vow'; but otherwise I would say: The interdict of 'hire' falls upon consecrated animals: but surely a man cannot prohibit that which is not his? —

Said R. Oshaia: It refers to the case of a man registering a harlot for his Passover offering, this being according to Rabbi. What is [this allusion to] Rabbi? — For it was taught, And If the household be too little from being for a lamb:¹⁷ sustain him with [the proceeds of] the lamb in his food requirements, but not in his requirements of [general] purchases. Rabbi said: In his requirements of [general] purchases too, so that if he has naught [wherewith to purchase], he may register another in his Passover offering and his Hagigah,¹⁸ while the money he receives is Hullin, for on this condition did the Israelites consecrate their Passover offerings.

Rabbah and R. Zera [disagree]. One maintains: None differ about fuel for roasting it, for since this makes the Passover offering fit [to be eaten], it is as the Passover-offering itself.¹⁹ Their controversy is only about unleavened bread and bitter herbs: the Rabbis hold: This is a different eating;²⁰ while Rabbi holds: Since it is a requisite of the Passover-offering,²¹ it is as the Passover-offering itself. The other maintains: None disagree about unleavened bread and bitter herbs either, for it is written, [They shall eat the flesh...] and unleavened bread; with bitter herbs they shall eat it;²² hence since they are a requisite of the Passover-offering they are as the Passover-offering. Their controversy is

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

only about buying a shirt therewith [or] buying a cloak therewith.

The Rabbis hold: The Divine Law saith, from being for a lamb [Mi-heyoth Miseh]: devote it [Hahayehu] to the lamb;²³ while Rabbi holds: Sustain [Hahayeh] thyself with [the proceeds of] the lamb. But according to Abaye, who said: ‘Had not R. Oshaia related that [Mishnah] to a case where he registers a harlot in his Passover offering, and in accordance with Rabbi, I would have related it to sacrifices of lesser sanctity, and in accordance with R. Jose the Galilean who maintained, Sacrifices of lesser sanctity are their owner's property; but [on Rabbi's view] a man does not leave anything over [unconsecrated] in the Passover-offering’; — surely it is explicitly stated, ‘for on this condition did the Israelites consecrate their Passover-offerings’?²⁴ — Say: ‘for on this condition did the Israelites consecrate the money for their Passover-offerings.’²⁵

MISHNAH. IF A ZAB HAS SUFFERED TWO ATTACKS [OF DISCHARGE], ONE SLAUGHTERS [THE PASSOVER-OFFERING] ON HIS BEHALF ON HIS SEVENTH [DAY]; IF HE HAS HAD THREE ATTACKS, ONE SLAUGHTERS ON HIS BEHALF ON HIS EIGHTH [DAY].²⁶ IF A WOMAN WATCHES DAY BY DAY,²⁷ ONE SLAUGHTERS ON HER BEHALF ON HER SECOND DAY; IF SHE SAW [A DISCHARGE] ON TWO DAYS, ONE SLAUGHTERS ON HER BEHALF ON THE THIRD [DAY]. AND AS TO A ZABAH,²⁸ ONE SLAUGHTERS ON HER BEHALF ON THE EIGHTH [DAY].

GEMARA. Rab Judah said in Rab's name: One slaughters and sprinkles on behalf of a Tebul yom²⁹ and one who lacks atonement,³⁰

(1) V. infra in reference to a man who gave a sanctified animal to a harlot, where it is implied that but for a certain verse this would disqualify the animal from being offered as a sacrifice (v. Deut. XXIII, 19). Though a mail cannot render forbidden that which does not belong to him, we say there that he would do so, though since it is sanctified it is really not his.

(2) In return for the ‘hire’ which he owes her.

(3) Rabbi rules infra that if a man needs money e.g. for clothes, he may register other people with him for his Passover-offering and spend his money so acquired on clothes. Thus he holds that an animal sanctified for a Passover offering is entirely his private property; consequently he could also render it forbidden (but for the verse) by making it a harlot's hire.

(4) V. supra p. 108, n. 2. Thus he gave the harlot an animal consecrated for a peace-offering.

(5) I.e., when Rabbi permits the owner to spend the money on clothes, etc. it is not because he holds that when a man consecrates an animal for a Passover-offering he leaves part of it unconsecrated, as it were, so that if a man gives him consecrated money for a share in the sacrifice the sanctity of the money is transferred to that unconsecrated portion of the animal, while the money itself thereby becomes Hullin and can be expended on anything. The reason is on the contrary that when a man consecrates money for the Passover-offering he leaves that money partly unconsecrated, as it were, in the sense that it automatically reverts to Hullin when he gives it in payment for a share in a sacrifice, and in fact, the money is technically to be regarded as a gift, not as payment at all; Hence the vendor can use it as he pleases.

(6) Introduced by ‘our Rabbis taught’.

(7) As explained in the preceding note.

(8) Hence on Rabbi's view if he registers a harlot it does not prohibit it, since nothing at all of the animal is his in that sense.

(9) Whereas on R. Jose's view that sacrifices of lesser sanctity are the owner's personal property, the sale of the peace-offering is valid.

(10) Viz., Rabbi, in R. Oshaia's view.

(11) Not only in the money set aside for the Passover-offering.

(12) Since they were consecrated before he gave them to her, he cannot make them forbidden.

(13) To be offered henceforth as a sacrifice.

(14) V. Deut. XXIII, 19: Thou shalt not bring the hire of a harlot, or the price of a dog, into the house of the Lord thy God for any vow, etc.

(15) To make them forbidden.

(16) The hire of a harlot cannot be vowed as a sacrifice; but a consecrated animal has already been vowed.

(17) Ex. XII, 4, lit. translation.

(18) Of the fourteenth.

(19) Hence one may certainly sell a share in the sacrifice for this purpose.

(20) Hence he cannot buy it with the proceeds of the sacrifice.

(21) Which must be eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(22) Ex. XII, 8. The verse actually quoted, which is slightly different, is Num. IX, 11, but the Talmud probably means the verse stated here.

(23) Lit., 'make it live for the lamb' — i.e., the money realized from the lamb must be expended on what is needed for the lamb, e.g., the unleavened bread and bitter herbs which accompany it.

(24) This definitely implies a reservation in the sacrifice itself.

(25) This is not an emendation but an interpretation.

(26) V. supra p. 423, n. 3. In both these cases they are fit to eat the Passover offering in the evening; hence we kill it on their behalf

(27) V. Supra p. 422, n. 5.

(28) Who had three discharges.

(29) V. Glos.

(30) V. p. 84, n. 1; p. 294, n. 4.

Pesachim 90b

but one may not slaughter and sprinkle for a person unclean through a reptile.¹ But 'Ulla maintained: One slaughters and sprinkles for a person unclean through a reptile. According to Rab, wherein does a Tebul Yom differ? Because he is fit in the evening. But one unclean through a reptile too is fit in the evening? — He lacks Tebillah. Then a Tebul Yom too lacks the setting of the sun?² The sun goes down of its own accord.³ Then one who lacks atonement too, surely lacks forgiveness?⁴ —

It means where his pair [of birds] are in his hand.⁵ Then a person unclean through a reptile too, surely the mikweh⁶ stands before him? — He may neglect it. If so, he who lacks sacrifice too, perhaps he will neglect [to sacrifice]? —

It means e.g., that he had delivered them [his birds] to the Beth din, this being in accordance with R. Shemaiah, who said: It is a presumption that the Beth din of Priests⁷ do not rise from there⁸ until the money in the horn-shaped receptacles is finished.⁹ Now according to Rab, by Scriptural law he¹⁰ is indeed fit, and it was the Rabbis who preventively forbade him;¹¹ why then did Rab say: We defile one of them with a reptile?¹² —

Rather [say] according to Rab he is not fit by Biblical law either, for it is written, If any man be unclean by reason of a dead body:¹³ does this not hold good [even] when his seventh day falls on the eve of Passover,¹⁴ which case is [tantamount to] uncleanness through a reptile,¹⁵ yet the Divine Law said, Let him be relegated [to the second Passover]? [But] how do you know that it is so?¹⁶ —

He holds as R. Isaac, who said: They¹⁷ were unclean through an unattended corpse¹⁸ whose seventh day fell on the eve of Passover, for it is said, and they could not keep the Passover on that day:¹⁹ thus only on that day could they not keep it, but on the morrow they could keep it,²⁰ yet the Divine Law said, Let them be put off.²¹

We learned: IF A ZAB HAS SUFFERED TWO ATTACKS, ONE SLAUGHTERS ON HIS BEHALF ON HIS SEVENTH [DAY]; does that not mean where he had not performed Tebillah, which proves [that] one slaughters and sprinkles for a person unclean through a reptile?²² No; it means where he has performed Tebillah. If he has performed Tebillah, what does it [the Mishnah] inform us? If he informs us this, that though he lacks the setting of the sun, the sun sets automatically.²³ Reason too supports this [interpretation], since the second clause teaches: IF HE HAS HAD THREE ATTACKS, ONE SLAUGHTERS ON HIS BEHALF ON HIS EIGHTH [DAY].

Now it is well if you agree that [the clause] 'IF A ZAB HAS SUFFERED TWO ATTACKS, ONE SLAUGHTERS ON HIS BEHALF ON HIS SEVENTH [DAY]' means where he has performed Tebillah: then [the second clause] is necessary. You might argue: Only when he has had two attacks [do we slaughter for him] on his seventh [day], because he does not lack a positive act; but [in the case of] 'one who has had three attacks, on his eighth day,' where an action is

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

wanting [in that] he lacks forgiveness,²⁴ it is not so. Therefore [the Mishnah] informs us that though he lacks forgiveness, we slaughter and sprinkle on his behalf.

But if you say that [the clause, 'IF A ZAB] HAS SUFFERED TWO ATTACKS, [ONE SLAUGHTERS ON HIS BEHALF] ON HIS SEVENTH DAY,' means where he has not performed Tebillah, what is the purpose of [teaching about] one who has had three attacks? Seeing that you say that one slaughters and sprinkles on behalf of one who had two discharges, and is in his seventh day, but has not performed Tebillah, so that he is quite unclean; then how much the more does one slaughter and sprinkle for one who had three attacks, and is in his eighth day, and has performed Tebillah on the seventh, so that his uncleanness is of a lighter nature! Hence it surely follows that [the law] that we slaughter on behalf of one who has had two attacks and is in [his] seventh [day] refers to the case where he has performed Tebillah! —

No. In truth I may tell you that he has not performed Tebillah, and [yet] it is necessary. I might argue: Only on the seventh day [do we slaughter for him], since [it lies] in his own hand to make himself fit; but on the eighth day, when it is not in his power to offer the sacrifice, I might say, the priests may neglect him. Hence we are informed [that it is] as R. Shemaiah [stated].²⁵

AND AS TO A ZABAH, ONE SLAUGHTERS, etc. A Tanna recited before R. Adda b. Ahabah: And as to a zabah,²⁶ one slaughters on her behalf on her seventh day. Said he to him: Is then a Zabah on her seventh day fit?²⁷ Even on the view that one slaughters and sprinkles for a person unclean through a reptile, that is only for a person unclean through a reptile, who is fit in the evening. But this one is not fit until the morrow when she brings her atonement. Say [instead], 'on the eighth.' Then it is obvious?²⁸ —

You might say, since she lacks atonement, [one must] not slaughter [on her behalf]; hence he informs us [that it is] as R. Shemaiah [stated]. Rabina said: He [the Tanna] recited before him [about] a niddah,²⁹ [thus]: And as to a Niddah, one slaughters for her on the seventh [day]. Said he to him: Is then a Niddah fit on the seventh [day]? Even on the view that one slaughters and sprinkles for a person unclean through a reptile [that is] because he is fit in the evening. But a Niddah performs Tebillah in the evening of [i.e., following] the seventh day: [hence] she is not fit for eating [the Passover offering] until the [evening after the] eighth, by when she has had the setting of the sun.³⁰ But say, 'on the eighth.' That is obvious: seeing that one slaughters and sprinkles for a Zabah on the eighth day, though as yet she lacks atonement, need it be taught that one slaughters and sprinkles on behalf of a Niddah, who does not lack atonement?³¹ —

He finds it necessary [to teach about] a Niddah, [and] informs us this: only on the eighth, but not on the seventh, even as it was taught: All who are liable to tebillah.³² their Tebillah takes place by day;³³ a Niddah and a woman in confinement, their Tebillah takes place at night.³⁴ For it was taught: You might think that she [a Niddah] performs Tebillah by day;³⁵ therefore it is stated, she shall be in her impurity seven days;³⁶ let her be in her impurity full seven days.³⁷ And a woman in confinement is assimilated to niddah.³⁸

MISHNAH. [As To] AN OMEN,³⁹

- (1) Though he can perform Tebillah and be fit in the evening.
- (2) I.e., he too is not fit when the sacrifice is actually slaughtered.
- (3) No action by himself is wanting.
- (4) I.e., he is yet to bring his sacrifice, and thus he is on a par with a person unclean through a reptile, who is to perform Tebillah.
- (5) For sacrificing, so we need not fear that he may omit to do so and the Passover-offering will have needlessly been slaughtered for him.
- (6) Ritual bath.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

- (7) A special court in the Temple which dealt with priestly and sacrificial matters.
(8) I.e., do not leave the Temple Court.
(9) The monies for the bird-offerings were placed daily in horn-shaped receptacles, and the priestly Beth din saw to it that these were expended on the day they were received. Hence there was no fear of neglect.
(10) The person unclean through a reptile.
(11) This must be assumed, since he gives the reason because we fear that he may neglect his Tebillah.
(12) V. supra 80a; but an unclean majority means such as are unfit to partake of the Passover offering in the evening by Biblical law.
(13) Num. IX, 10.
(14) Since Scripture does not particularize, it must include all cases.
(15) Since both can be clean in the evening.
(16) Since Scripture mentions a dead body, it may refer only to such uncleanness that is not the same as that acquired from a reptile, viz., before the seventh day.
(17) The men who came to enquire of Moses and Aaron, Num. IX, 6.
(18) Lit., 'a corpse of a precept' — i.e., the corpse of a person whose relatives are unknown; its burial is obligatory upon the first person who finds it.
(19) Ibid.
(20) This is possible only if the morrow was their eighth day.
(21) Though they can make themselves fit for the evening.
(22) For they are exactly alike.
(23) As above.
(24) Is sacrifice is yet to be offered.
(25) Supra.
(26) Who had three discharges.
(27) To partake of the sacrifice in the evening.
(28) Though the same is stated in the Mishnah, it might be included there for the sake of parallelism, though unnecessary in itself. But here it is taught as an independent statement.
(29) V. Glos.
(30) She must not eat of sacrifices until the setting of the sun after her Tebillah. Since she performs Tebillah in the evening, when the sun has already set, she must wait until the following evening.
(31) She does not require a sacrifice.
(32) E.g., a Zab and a Zabah, a leper, and one defiled through a corpse (Shab. 121a).
(33) The seventh day from their defilement.
(34) The evening following the last day of their uncleanness. In this respect a Niddah is more stringent than a Zabah, who performs Tebillah on the seventh day, and does not wait for the evening.
(35) Sc. the seventh, like a Zabah.
(36) Lev. XV. 19.

- (37) But if she performs Tebillah on the seventh day itself, the period is diminished.
(38) For it is written, as in the days of the impurity of (Niddath, const. of Niddah) her sickness shall she (sc. a woman in confinement) be unclean (Lev. XII, 3).
(39) V. Glos. Here it refers to one who became an omen after midday, so that the obligation of the Passover-offering was already incumbent upon him. But if he became an omen before midday, this obligation does not fall on him at all, as stated infra 98a (Tosaf).

Pesachim 91a

AND ONE WHO IS REMOVING A HEAP [OF DEBRIS],¹ AND LIKEWISE ONE WHO HAS RECEIVED A PROMISE TO BE RELEASED FROM PRISON, AND AN INVALID, AND AN AGED PERSON WHO CAN EAT AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE, ONE SLAUGHTERS ON THEIR BEHALF.² [YET IN THE CASE OF] ALL THESE, ONE MAY NOT SLAUGHTER FOR THEM ALONE, LEST THEY BRING THE PASSOVER-OFFERING TO DISQUALIFICATION.³ THEREFORE IF A DISQUALIFICATION OCCURS TO THEM, THEY ARE EXEMPT FROM KEEPING THE SECOND PASSOVER,⁴ EXCEPT ONE WHO WAS REMOVING DEBRIS, BECAUSE HE WAS UNCLEAN FROM THE BEGINNING.⁵

GEMARA. Rabbah son of R. Huna said in R. Johanan's name: They learned this only of a heathen prison; but [if he is incarcerated in] an Israelite prison, one slaughters for him separately; since he was promised, he will [definitely] be released, as it is written, The remnant of Israel shall not do iniquity, nor speak lies.⁶

R. Hisda observed: As to what you say, [If he is in] a heathen prison [one may] not [kill on his behalf alone]; that was said only [when the prison is] without the walls of Beth Pagi;⁷ but [if it is] within the walls of Beth Pagi,⁸ one slaughters on his behalf alone. What is the reason? It is possible to convey it [the flesh] to him and he will eat it.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

THEREFORE IF A DISQUALIFICATION OCCURS, etc. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: They learned [this] only of a round heap;⁹ but [if it was] a long heap, he is exempt from keeping the Second Passover, [for] perhaps he was clean at the time of the shechitah.¹⁰ It was also taught likewise: R. Simeon the son of R. Johanan b. Berokah said: One who is removing a heap [of debris] is sometimes exempt [from the Second Passover] and sometimes liable. How so? [It if was] a round heap and uncleanness [a corpse] was found underneath it, he is liable; a long heap, and uncleanness was found underneath it, he is exempt, [for] I assume [that] he was clean at the time of Shechitah.

MISHNAH. ONE MAY NOT SLAUGHTER THE PASSOVER OFFERING FOR A SINGLE PERSON: THIS IS R. JUDAH'S VIEW; BUT R. JOSE PERMITS IT. AND EVEN A COMPANY OF A HUNDRED WHO CANNOT EAT AS MUCH AS AN OLIVE [JOINTLY], ONE MAY NOT KILL FOR THEM. AND ONE MAY NOT FORM A COMPANY OF WOMEN AND SLAVES AND MINORS.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: How do we know that one may not slaughter the Passover-offering for a single person? Because it is said, Thou mayest not sacrifice the Passover-offering for one:¹¹ this is R. Judah's opinion. But R. Jose maintained: A single person and he is able to eat it, one may slaughter on his behalf; ten who are unable to eat it, one must not slaughter on their behalf. Now R. Jose, how does he employ this 'for one'? —

He requires it for R. Simeon's [deduction]. For it was taught, R. Simeon said: How do we know that one who sacrifices his Passover offering at a private bamah¹² at the time when Bamoth were prohibited violates a negative command? Because it is said, 'Thou mayest not sacrifice the Passover-offering within one of thy gates'. You might think that it is also thus when Bamoth were

permitted:¹³ therefore it is stated, 'within one of thy gates': They ruled [that he violates a negative injunction] only when all Israel enter through one gate.¹⁴ And how does R. Judah know this? — You may infer two things from it.¹⁵ Now according to R. Jose, whence [does he know] that its purpose is for what R. Simeon said: perhaps it comes for what was stated by R. Judah? — He can tell you: you cannot think so, for surely it is written, according to every man's eating.¹⁶

R. 'Ukba b. Hinena of Parishna¹⁷ pointed out a contradiction to Raba: Did then R. Judah Say: One may not kill the Paschal lamb for a single person? But the following contradicts it: [As to] a woman; at the First [Passover] one may slaughter for her separately, but at the second one makes her an addition to others: this is the view of R. Judah. —

Said he to him, Do not Say, 'for her separately,' but 'for them separately.'¹⁸ Yet may we form a company consisting entirely of women? Surely we learned, ONE MAY NOT FORM A COMPANY OF WOMEN AND SLAVES AND MINORS. Does that not mean women separately and slaves separately and minors separately? —

No, he replied, [it means] women and slaves and minors [together]. Women and slaves, on account of obscenity; minors and slaves, on account of

- (1) Which had fallen upon a person, and it is unknown whether he is alive or dead.
- (2) All these may be fit in the evening, including an one.
- (3) The omen may defile himself through the corpse; he who is removing the debris may find the person underneath it dead, in which case he himself is unclean; the prisoner may not be freed; while the invalid and aged person may grow weaker. Therefore they must be registered with others.
- (4) Since they were actually fit when the animal was slaughtered.
- (5) If he finds the person underneath dead, he himself was defiled through overshadowing the dead, and thus he was unclean when the animal was sacrificed.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(6) Zeph. III, 13.

(7) V. p. 319, n. 1.

(8) Hence in Jerusalem, where the Passover-offering is eaten.

(9) I.e., one just about covering the person, so that the rescuer must have been directly over the corpse from the very beginning.

(10) He may not have been actually over the corpse then.

(11) Deut. XVI, 5 (E.v. within one [of thy gates]).

(12) 'High place'. Before the Tabernacle was erected in Shiloh, and between its destruction and the building of the Temple, sacrifices were offered at Bamoth (pl. of Bamah), both private and public. During the existence of the Tabernacle at Shiloh, and since the Temple was built, even after it was destroyed, Bamoth were forbidden.

(13) For even then private Bamoth were permitted only for votive sacrifices but not for obligatory offerings like the Passover, which were sacrificed at the public Bamoth.

(14) I.e., when there is a central sanctuary; but when Bamoth were permitted there was no central sanctuary. The verse is understood thus: Thou mayest not Sacrifice the Passover-offering at a private Bamah when all Israel enter through one of thy gates.

(15) Presumably by interpreting 'one' separately and 'one of the gates' separately.

(16) Ex. XII, 4. Thus the matter depends solely on ability to eat.

(17) V. supra 76a, p. 393, n. 6.

(18) This is not an emendation, but an explanation: 'for her separately' means that women need not necessarily join a company of men.

Pesachim 91b

licentiousness.¹ [To turn to] the [main] text: [As to] a woman, at the First [Passover] one slaughters for her separately, while at the second one makes her an addition to others: this is the view of R. Judah. R. Jose said: [As to] a woman, at the Second [Passover] one slaughters for her separately, and at the First it goes without saying. R. Simeon said: [As to] a woman, at the First one makes her an addition to others; at the second one may not slaughter for her at all. Wherein do they differ? —

R. Judah holds: according to the number of the souls² [implies] even women.³ And should you say, if so, even at the Second too? It is

[therefore] written, that man shall bear his sin:⁴ only a man, but not a woman. Yet should you argue: if so, she may not even be [made] an addition at the Second, [therefore is written,] according to all the statue of the [first] passovers⁵, which is effective in respect of [her being made] a mere addition.

And R. Jose? What is his reason! — Because in connection with the First [Passover] it is written, 'according to the number of souls,' [implying] even a woman. Again, in connection with the Second Passover it is written, that soul shall be cut off from his people,⁶ 'soul' [implying] even women. While what does 'that man shall bear his sin' exclude? It excludes a minor from Kareth.

While R. Simeon [argues]: In connection with the First [Passover] 'a man is written:⁷ only a man but not a woman. Yet should you say. If so, [she may] not even [be made] an addition: [therefore is written] 'according to the number of souls', which is effective in respect of [her being] an addition. But should you say, then even at the Second too, — [therefore] the Divine Law excluded [her] from the second, for it is written, 'that man shall bear his sin': [implying] only a man, but not a woman. Now from what is she excluded? If from an obligation,⁸ [this cannot be maintained]: seeing that there is no [obligation] at the first, is there a question of the second! Hence [she is surely excluded] from [participation even as] an addition. Now, what is [this] 'man' which R. Simeon quotes? If we say, they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to their fathers' houses, etc.⁹ Surely that is required for [the teaching] of R. Isaac who deduced: only a 'man' can acquire [on behalf of others], but a minor cannot acquire [on behalf of others]!¹⁰ Rather [it is derived] from 'a man, according to his eating'.¹¹

But since R. Jose agrees with R. Simeon,¹² R. Simeon too must agree with R. Jose,¹³ and he needs that [verse to teach] that one slaughters the Passover-offering for a single person?¹⁴

PESOGHIM – 87a-121b

— He can answer you: If so,¹⁵ let the Divine Law write ‘according to his eating’,¹⁶ why [state] ‘a man’? Hence you infer two [laws] from it. With whom does the following dictum of R. Eleazar agree.¹⁷ [viz.]: ‘[The observance of the Passover-offering by] a woman at the First [Passover] is obligatory, while at the Second it is voluntary, and it overrides the Sabbath.’ If voluntary, why does it override the Sabbath? Rather say: ‘at the Second it is voluntary, while at the First it is obligatory and overrides the Sabbath.’ With whom [does it agree]? With R. Judah. R. Jacob said in R. Johanan's name: A company must not be formed [consisting] entirely of proselytes, lest they be [too particular about it and bring it to disqualification].¹⁸

Our Rabbis taught: The Passover-offering and unleavened bread and bitter herbs are obligatory on the first [night], but voluntary from then onwards.¹⁹

R. Simeon said: In the case of men [it is] obligatory; in the case of women, voluntary. To what does this refer? Shall we say, to the Passover-offering is there then a Passover-offering the whole seven days!²⁰ Hence [it must refer] to unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Then consider the sequel: **R. Simeon said:** In the case of men [it is] obligatory; in the case of women, voluntary. Does then R. Simeon not agree with R. Eleazar's dictum: Women are bound to eat unleavened bread by Scriptural law, for it is said, Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith:²¹ whoever is subject to, ‘thou shalt eat no leavened bread,’ is subject to [the law]. ‘arise, eat unleavened bread’; and these women, since they are subject to, ‘thou shalt eat no leavened bread,’ are also subject to [the law], ‘arise, eat unleavened bread?’ —

Rather say: The Passover-offering, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs are obligatory on the first [night]; from then onwards [the latter two] are voluntary. R.

Simeon said: As for the Passover-offering, in the case of men it is obligatory, in the case of women it is voluntary.

MISHNAH. AN Onen PERFORMS TEBILLAH AND EATS HIS PASSOVER-OFFERING IN THE EVENING, BUT [HE MAY] NOT [PARTAKE] OF [OTHER] SACRIFICES.²² ONE WHO HEARS ABOUT HIS DEAD [FOR THE FIRST TIME],²³

(1) Pederasty; cf. Weiss, Dor, II, 21 on the rife-ness of pederasty among the Romans. — Heathen slaves are meant here.

(2) Ex. XII, 4.

(3) Since men are not specified.

(4) Num. IX, 13; this refers to the Second Passover.

(5) Ibid. 12.

(6) Ibid. 13.

(7) The Gemara discusses below which verse is meant.

(8) I.e., the verse teaches that she need not keep the Second Passover.

(9) Ex. XII, 3.

(10) He deduces it from the present verse. For this person took the lamb not on his behalf alone but on behalf of ‘their fathers’ houses’, who thereby gained the right to participate therein, and Scripture specifies that a man is required for this, not a minor. Hence a minor cannot be vested with the powers of an agent.

(11) Ibid. 4.

(12) That the Passover-offering may not be sacrificed at a private Bamah, and that this is deduced from, thou mayest not sacrifice the Passover-offering at one of the gates, as stated supra.

(13) That the Passover-offering may be slaughtered for a single person.

(14) For if R. Simeon does not accept this view, then he should employ the verse, ‘thou mayest not sacrifice the Passover offering for one’ as teaching that it may not be slaughtered for a single person, as R. Judah does supra 91a, in which case his ruling on the private Bamah is without foundation.

(15) That the verse is intended for R. Jose's teaching only.

(16) Which would show that the matter depends entirely on his powers of eating.

(17) Lit., ‘as who does it go.’

(18) In their ignorance of the law they may object to points which really do not matter, and thus disqualify it without cause.

(19) I.e., for the rest of Passover.

(20) That is surely not permitted even voluntarily.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(21) Deut. XVI, 3.

(22) An Onen may not eat the flesh of sacrifices (v. Lev. X. 19f). By Scriptural law a man is an Onen on the day of death only, but not at night; the Rabbis, however, extended these restrictions to the night too. Since, however, the Passover-offering is a Scriptural obligation, they waived their prohibition in respect of the night, and hence he may eat thereof. He is not unclean, but requires Tebillah to emphasize that until the evening sacred flesh was forbidden to him, whereas now it is permitted. In respect of other sacrifices the Rabbinical law stands, and he may not partake of them.

(23) On the day when a man is informed of the death of a near relative, e.g., his father, he is an Onen by Rabbinical law, even if death took place earlier.

Pesachim 92a

AND ONE WHO COLLECTS THE BONES [OF HIS PARENTS],¹ PERFORM TEBILLAH AND EAT SACRED FLESH.² IF A PROSELYTE WAS CONVERTED ON THE EVE OF PASSOVER, — BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: HE PERFORMS TEBILLAH AND EATS HIS PASSOVER-OFFERING IN THE EVENING; WHILE BETH HILLEL RULE: ONE WHO SEPARATES HIMSELF FROM [THE STATE OF] UNCIRCUMCISION IS LIKE ONE WHO SEPARATED HIMSELF FROM A GRAVE.³

GEMARA. What is the reason? — He holds: [The law of] Aninuth at night is Rabbinical [only], and where the Passover offering is concerned they did not insist on their law, since it involves⁴ kareth;⁵ but in respect to sacrifices [in general] they insisted on their law, Seeing that [only] an affirmative precept is involved.⁶

ONE WHO HEARS ABOUT HIS DEAD, etc. ONE WHO COLLECTS BONES? — But he requires sprinkling on the third and the seventh [days]?⁷ — Say: One for whom [his parent's] bones were collected.⁸

A PROSELYTE WHO WAS CONVERTED, etc. Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: The controversy is in respect of an uncircumcised heathen, where

Beth Hillel hold: [He is forbidden to eat in the evening] as a preventive measure lest he become defiled the following year [by the dead] and he argues, 'Did I not perform Tebillah last year and eat [of the Passover offering]? So now too I will perform Tebillah and eat.' But he will not understand that the previous year he was a heathen and not susceptible to uncleanness, whereas now he is an Israelite and susceptible to uncleanness. While Beth Shammai hold: We do not enact a preventive measure. But with regard to an uncircumcised Israelite⁹ all agree that he performs Tebillah and eats his Passover-offering in the evening, and we do not preventively forbid an uncircumcised Israelite on account of an uncircumcised heathen¹⁰ it was taught likewise, R. Simeon b. Eleazar said: Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel did not differ about an uncircumcised Israelite, [both agreeing] that he performs Tebillah and eats his Passover-offering in the evening. About what do they differ? About an uncircumcised heathen, where Beth Shammai rule: He performs Tebillah and eats his Passover-offering in the evening; while Beth Hillel maintain: He who separates himself from uncircumcision is as though he separated from a grave.

Raba said: [In the case of] an uncircumcised person, sprinkling, and a knife, they [the Sages] insisted on their enactments [even] where Kareth is involved;¹¹ [in the case of] an Onen, a leper and Beth ha-peras,¹² they did not insist on their enactments where Kareth is involved. 'An uncircumcised person,' as stated.¹³ 'Sprinkling,' for a Master said: Sprinkling is [forbidden as] a shebuth, yet it does not override the Sabbath.¹⁴ 'A knife,' as it was taught: Just as one may not bring it [sc. a knife for circumcision] through the street, so may one not bring it by the way of roofs, court-yards. Or enclosures.¹⁵ 'An Onen,' as we have stated.¹⁶ What is this [law of] 'a leper'? For it was taught: A leper whose eighth day fell on the eve of Passover¹⁷ and who had a nocturnal discharge [Keri] on

PESOGHIM – 87a-121b

that day.¹⁸ performs *tebillah*¹⁹ and eats [the Passover-offering in the evening].²⁰

[For] the Sages said: Though a *Tebul yom*²¹ may not enter [the Levitical Camp], this one does enter:²² it is preferable that an affirmative precept which involves *kareth*²³ should come and override an affirmative precept which does not involve *kareth*.²⁴ Now R. Johanan said: By the law of Torah²⁵ there is not even an affirmative precept in connection therewith, for it is said, And Jehoshaphat stood in the congregation of Judah and Jerusalem, in the house of the Lord, before the new court.²⁶ What does 'the new court' mean? That they innovated a law there and ruled: A *Tebul Yom* must not enter the Levitical Camp.²⁷ 'Beth Ha-peras': for we learned: Now Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel both agree

- (1) He too is a mourner on that day by Rabbinical law.
- (2) In the evening. This applies to all sacrifices, for since even during the day he is an *Onen* by Rabbinical law only, the Rabbis did not extend his *Aninuth* (v. *Glos.*) to the evening.
- (3) He must be besprinkled with the water of purification on the third and seventh days after the circumcision; hence he is not yet fit in the evening.
- (4) Lit., 'in the place of'.
- (5) Since the neglect of the Passover offering involves *Kareth*, they waived their law.
- (6) It is an affirmative precept to eat of one's own sacrifice (Ex. XXIX, 33), but the violation of this law does not involve *Kareth*.
- (7) The Mishnah was understood literally as meaning that he himself gathered them; but these defile just like a corpse, and he is unclean for seven days, and must be besprinkled on the third and the seventh days (Num. XIX, 19).
- (8) By others: he himself is nevertheless regarded as an *Onen* on that day.
- (9) Who was circumcised on the eve of Passover.
- (10) I.e., through fear that if the former is permitted it may be thought that the latter is permitted too.
- (11) I.e., though thereby a Scriptural command, failure to observe which involves *Kareth*, is disregarded.
- (12) *Peras* is half the length of a hundred-cubit furrow, hence fifty cubits; *Beth ha-peras* is the technical designation for a field a square *peras* in

area, declared unclean on account of crushed bones carried over it from a plowed grave (*Jast.*). Its uncleanness is Rabbinical only.

(13) *Supra*: Beth Hillel forbid him to eat of the Passover-offering as a preventive measure, which is only a Rabbinical enactment.

(14) V. *Supra* 65b. Thus on account of a *Shebuth*, which is a Rabbinical prohibition, the unclean person may not participate in the Passover-offering.

(15) *Karpf*, pl. *Karpifoth*, is an enclosure not more than two *se'ahs* in area (this is slightly over seventy cubits square). If the eighth day of birth, when a child must be circumcised (v. Lev. XII, 3), falls on the Sabbath, the knife must be brought the previous day. If it was forgotten, however, it must not be brought on the Sabbath, even by way of roofs, etc. carrying on which is forbidden by Rabbinical law only, and circumcision must be postponed, notwithstanding that failure to circumcise involves *Kareth* (Gen. XVII, 14). — Actually no *Kareth* would be incurred in the present case, since it would be done another day, but *Raba* means that to the precept of circumcision there is attached the penalty of *Kareth*.

(16) V. *Mishnah* and p. 490. n. 4.

(17) When a leper was healed from his leprosy he waited seven days, performing *Tebillah* on the seventh, and brought his sacrifices on the eighth (v. Lev. XIV, 9f). When he brought these he was still not permitted to enter the Temple Court ('the camp of the *Shechinah*) but stood at the east gate ('the gate of *Nicanor*'). whose sanctity was lower (it was regarded as 'the Levitical camp'), while the priest, standing inside the Temple Court, applied the blood and the oil to the thumbs and the great toes of the leper (*ibid.* 14f).

(18) Before he had offered his sacrifices. A *Ba'al Keri* (v. *Glos.*) might not enter even the Levitical Camp (v. *supra* 67b).

(19) Again. Though he had performed *Tebillah* the previous day, that was on his leprosy, whereas now he performs it on account of his discharge.

(20) Thus after the *Tebillah* he would bring his sacrifices for leprosy.

(21) V. *Glos.*

(22) For his purification rites; v. n. 3.

(23) Sc. the Passover-offering.

(24) Sc. that a *Tebul Yom* must not enter the Levitical Camp. That is derived in *Naz.* 45a from, 'he shall be unclean; his uncleanness is yet upon him' (Num. XIX, 13); since that is an affirmative statement, the injunction likewise counts as an affirmative precept. Its violation does not involve *Kareth*.

(25) The Pentateuch.

(26) II Chron. XX, 5.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(27) Since this was all innovation, it is only Rabbinical, and as seen supra it was waived for the sake of the Passover-offering. V. Yeb., Sonc. ed. pp. 31ff notes.

Pesachim 92b

that we examine [a Beth ha-peras] for the sake of those who would keep the Passover,¹ but we do not examine [it] for those who would eat Terumah.² How is it examined? Said Rab Judah in Samuel's name: He sifts the Beth ha-peras as he proceeds.³ R. Judah b. Abaye⁴ said in Rab's name: A Beth ha-peras which was [thoroughly] trodden down is clean.⁵

CHAPTER IX

MISHNAH. HE WHO WAS UNCLEAN OR IN A JOURNEY AFAR OFF⁶ AND DID NOT KEEP THE FIRST [PASSOVER] MUST KEEP THE SECOND. IF HE UNWITTINGLY ERRED OR WAS ACCIDENTALLY PREVENTED AND DID NOT KEEP THE FIRST, HE MUST KEEP THE SECOND. IF SO, WHY IS AN UNCLEAN PERSON AND ONE WHO WAS IN 'A JOURNEY AFAR OFF SPECIFIED? [TO TEACH] THAT THESE⁷ ARE NOT LIABLE TO KARETH, WHEREAS THOSE ARE LIABLE TO KARETH.⁸

GEMARA. It was stated: If he was in a journey afar off⁹ and they slaughtered [the Passover-offering] and sprinkled [its blood] on his behalf, — R. Nahman said: It is accepted;¹⁰ R. Shesheth said: It is not accepted.

R. Nahman said, It is accepted: The Divine Law indeed had compassion on him,¹¹ but if he kept [the first], a blessing come upon him!¹² While R. Shesheth said, It is not accepted: The Divine Law did in fact suspend him, like an unclean person.¹³

R. Nahman said, Whence do I know it? Because we learned, HE WHO WAS UNCLEAN OR IN A JOURNEY AFAR OFF AND DID NOT KEEP THE FIRST

[Passover] MUST KEEP THE SECOND; whence it follows that if he wished, he could keep it.

And R. Shesheth?¹⁴ — He can answer you: If so, the second clause which teaches, IF HE UNWITTINGLY ERRED OR WAS ACCIDENTALLY PREVENTED AND DID NOT KEEP THE FIRST, HE MUST KEEP THE SECOND: [will you argue that] since he [the Tanna] states, AND DID NOT KEEP, it follows that had he desired he could have kept it? But surely he had unwittingly erred or been accidentally prevented! Hence [you must answer that] he teaches of deliberate neglect together with these;¹⁵ so here too [in the first clause] he teaches about an Onen together with these.¹⁶

R. Ashi said: Our Mishnah too implies this,¹⁷ for it is taught, THESE ARE NOT LIABLE TO KARETH, WHILE THOSE ARE LIABLE TO KARETH: Now to what [does this refer]? Shall we say, to one who errs unwittingly or is accidentally prevented? are then he who errs unwittingly and he who is accidentally prevented subject to kareth!¹⁸ Hence it must surely [refer] to a deliberate offender and an Onen.

And R. Nahman?¹⁹ — He can answer you: In truth it refers to a deliberate offender alone,²⁰ and logically he should have taught, he is liable [in the singular]; but the reason that he teaches, THEY ARE LIABLE is that because the first clause teaches THEY ARE NOT LIABLE, the second clause teaches THEY ARE LIABLE.

R. Shesheth said: Whence do I know it? Because It was taught, R. Akiba said: 'Unclean' is stated and 'in a journey afar off'²¹ is stated:

(1) If there is no other way to reach Jerusalem in time to sacrifice the Passover-offering save by crossing a Beth ha-peras, the field is examined and they pass through it.

(2) If a priest wishes to go somewhere to eat Terumah and his way lies across a Beth ha-peras, he cannot examine it but must take a circuitous

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

course, even if this delays him a day or more. — One who passes over the Beth ha-peras becomes unclean, and may not partake either of the Passover-offering or of Terumah.

(3) He takes up the earth en route and sifts it, to see if any small bones are hidden there, and if there are none he is clean, cf. note 7.

(4) Var. lec.: Ammi.

(5) As it is assumed that every bone which may be there has been reduced to less than the size of a wheat, which is the minimum standard for conveying uncleanness ‘through contact’ or treading upon it. Therefore if a man sees this he may cross it to sacrifice the Passover-offering, but not to eat Terumah. Now the uncleanness of a Beth ha-peras is only Rabbinical, and as we see here this law was waived somewhat in favor of the Passover-offering.

(6) V. Num. IX, 10 f.

(7) Enumerated in this Mishnah—all the four.

(8) This is explained in the Gemara.

(9) He can reach Jerusalem by nightfall in time to eat the offering, but not by day when the offering is sacrificed.

(10) The sacrifice is valid, and he does not keep the second Passover.

(11) By giving him the opportunity of a second Passover.

(12) I.e., all the better.

(13) So that he is not permitted to keep the first.

(14) How does he rebut this?

(15) I.e., though it is not specifically stated, yet the words ‘AND DID NOT KEEP’ can only apply to such, and he is therefore to be understood as included in the Mishnah.

(16) I.e., the Mishnah is to be read in the first clause as including Onen (v. Hananel). He could have kept the First Passover had he desired, v. supra 90b, and it is to this that the words ‘AND DID NOT KEEP’ refer.

(17) That the first clause includes also Onen.

(18) Surely not.

(19) Does he not admit this argument?

(20) For the first clause does not treat of an Onen, and consequently R. Nahman's deduction holds good.

(21) Num. IX, 10.

And R. Nahman?— He can answer you: R. Akiba is consistent with his view, for he holds: One must not slaughter and sprinkle on behalf of a person unclean through a reptile;⁴ whereas I agree with the view that one slaughters and sprinkles on behalf of a person unclean through a reptile.⁵

Our Rabbis taught: The following keep the second [Passover]: Zabin and Zaboth,⁶ male lepers and female lepers, Niddoth⁷ and those who had intercourse with Niddoth, and women after confinement, those who [do not observe the first Passover] inadvertently, and those who are forcibly prevented, and those who [neglect it] deliberately, and he who is unclean, and he who was in ‘a journey afar off’. If so, why is an unclean person mentioned? [You ask] ‘why is he mentioned?’ [Surely to teach] that if he wishes to keep it at the first we do not permit him?

Rather [the question is] why is [a person] on a journey afar off mentioned? — To exempt him from Kareth, this being in accordance with the view that it is accepted.⁸ Is then a woman obliged [to keep] the second [Passover],⁹ but surely it was taught: You might think that only a person unclean through the dead and one who was in ‘a journey afar off’ keep the second [Passover], — whence do we know [that] Zabin and lepers and those who had intercourse with Niddoth [must keep it]? From the verse, If any man [etc.]?¹⁰ — There is no difficulty: one is according to R. Jose; the other, according to R. Judah and R. Simeon.¹¹

Our Rabbis taught: One incurs Kareth on account of the first [Passover], and one incurs Kareth on account of the second:¹² this is Rabbi's view. R. Nathan said: One incurs Kareth on account of the first, but does not incur it on account of the second.¹³ R. Hanania b. ‘Akabia said: One does not incur Kareth even on account of the first, unless he [deliberately] does not keep the second. Now they are consistent with their views. For it was taught: A proselyte who became

Pesachim 93a

just as an unclean [person] is one who has the means of keeping it,¹ yet must not keep it, so [a man ‘in] a journey afar off’ means one who has the means of keeping it,² yet he must not keep it.³

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

converted between the two Passovers, and similarly a minor who attained his majority between the two Passovers,¹⁴ are bound to keep the second Passover:¹⁵ that is Rabbi's view.

R. Nathan said: Whoever is subject to the first is subject to the second, and whoever is not subject to the first is not subject to the second. Wherein do they differ? — Rabbi holds: The second is a separate Festival. R. Nathan holds: The second is a compensation for the second,¹⁶ [but] it does not make amends for the first.¹⁷ While R. Hanania b. 'Akabia holds: The second makes amends for the first. Now the three deduce [their views] from the same verse: But the man that is clean, and is not in a journey.¹⁸

Rabbi holds: And forbearth to keep the Passover, that soul shall be cut off¹⁹ - because he did not keep [it] at the first; or alternatively [if] he brought not the offering of the Lord in its appointed season²⁰ [i.e.,] at the second. And how do you know that that [phrase], 'that man shall bear his sin,'²¹ means Kareth?

- (1) He is physically able to keep it.
- (2) E.g., one could sacrifice on his behalf and he could reach Jerusalem in time.
- (3) But must postpone it; hence if he does have it sacrificed on his behalf, it is not accepted.
- (4) Though he will be fit to eat in the evening, because at the time of sacrificing he is not fit. The present case is similar.
- (5) The translation and explanation follows *cur. edd.* Tosaf. records a different reading, which is supported by the *Sifre* (Be-ha Alotheke): Just as an unclean person is one who cannot possibly keep it, on account of his uncleanness, and he must not keep it, so a person in 'a journey afar off' means one who cannot possibly reach Jerusalem in time (according to 'Ulla, for the sacrificing; according to Rab Judah, for the eating), and he too must not keep it. R. Shesheth deduces that 'he must not keep it' means that even if it is sacrificed on his behalf it is not accepted, since it is completely analogous to the case of an unclean person. R. Nahman answers that because R. Akiba holds that you may not slaughter and sprinkle on behalf of a person unclean through a reptile, therefore he learns the case of 'a journey afar off' from that of uncleanness, since the former two are alike in that

both are unfit at the time of slaughtering and fit and able at the time of eating. Hence it is true that in R. Akiba's opinion the sacrifice is not accepted' if offered, but R. Nahman holds that you do slaughter and sprinkle for a person unclean through a reptile. Tosaf. adds that R. Shesheth too holds thus, but that in his view R. Akiba learns it from' a person unclean through the dead, though the cases are not really alike then.

(6) Plural of Zab and Zabah respectively, q.v. Glos.

(7) Pl. of Niddah, q.v. Glos.

(8) *Supra* 92b. For if he held that it is not accepted, then this case must be stated for that very teaching.

(9) So that female lepers, menstruants and women after childbirth are included.

(10) Num. IX, 10. Heb. אִישׁ אִישׁ, the repetition denoting extension. Thus nothing is said about women.

(11) V. *Supra* 91b. R. Jose holds that even at the second Passover a company consisting entirely of women may be formed; hence in his view the second Passover is binding upon women. Whereas R. Judah and R. Simeon hold that it is voluntary only.

(12) Deliberate neglect to keep either when there is the obligation involves Kareth. Of course, no man can actually incur Kareth twice, but the point is that if a man sinned unwittingly in respect of one but deliberately in respect of the other he incurs Kareth. Similarly, where a proselyte becomes converted between the two Passovers and deliberately neglects the second.

(13) Hence if he inadvertently neglected the first, he does not incur Kareth even if he deliberately neglects the second.

(14) Thus both were exempt from the first Passover, but are in a condition to keep the second.

(15) He regards it as a separate obligation entirely, even for those who were not subject to the law at all at the first, as in the present instances.

(16) Hence only he who was subject to the law at the first can keep the second.

(17) Hence if a person deliberately neglects the first he incurs Kareth even if he keeps the second. On the other hand, if he neglects the first unwittingly, he is not liable to Kareth even if he deliberately neglects the second, since the second is not an independent obligation apart from the first.

(18) Num. IX, 13.

(19) *Ibid.*

(20) *Ibid.* because (Heb. Ki) he brought not the offering, etc. Ki is variously translated according to the context, v. R.H. 3a. Rabbi renders it 'if'.

(21) *Ibid.*

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Pesachim 93b

He holds that Megaddef is one who curses¹ the [Divine] Name,² while of him who curses the [Divine] Name It Is written, [Whosoever curseth his God] shall bear his sin,³ and [the meaning of] this 'his sin' is learnt from 'his sin' there: just as there [it means] Kareth, so here too, [it means] Kareth.

Again, R. Nathan holds: And forbearth to keep, the Passover, that soul shall be cut off' for this Ki denotes 'because'⁴ and this is what the Divine Law saith, Because he brought not the offering of the Lord at the first. How does he employ this [phrase] 'that man shall bear his sin'?⁵ — He holds that Megaddef is not one who curses the [Divine] Name,⁶ and so [the meaning of] this 'his sin' [written] there is learnt from 'his sin' [written] here; just as [it means] Kareth here,⁷ so there too [it means] Kareth.

While R. Hanania b. 'Akabia holds [that we translate thus]: 'and forbearth to keep the Passover, that soul shall be cut off';⁸ if [also] he brought not the offering of the Lord in its appointed season, [viz.,] at the second. And how does he employ this 'shall bear his sin'?—

As we have stated.⁹ Therefore if [he neglected] deliberately both [Passovers], all agree that he is culpable. If [he neglected] both unwittingly, all agree that he is not culpable. If [he neglected] the first deliberately but the second unwittingly: according to Rabbi and R. Nathan he is culpable; according to R. Hanania b. 'Akabia, he is not culpable. If [he neglected] the first unwittingly but the second deliberately: according to Rabbi he is culpable; according to R. Nathan and R. Hanania b. 'Akabia he is not culpable.

MISHNAH. WHAT IS 'A JOURNEY AFAR OFF'? FROM MODI'IM¹⁰ AND BEYOND, AND THE SAME DISTANCE ON ALL SIDES [OF JERUSALEM]: THIS IS R. AKIBA'S OPINION.

R. ELIEZER SAID: FROM THE THRESHOLD OF THE TEMPLE COURT AND WITHOUT. SAID R. JOSE TO HIM: FOR THAT REASON THE HEH IS POINTED¹¹ IN ORDER TO TEACH: NOT BECAUSE IT IS REALLY AFAR OFF, BUT [WHEN ONE IS] FROM THE THRESHOLD OF THE TEMPLE COURT AND WITHOUT [HE IS REGARDED AS BEING 'AFAR OFF'].

GEMARA. 'Ulla said: From Modi'im to Jerusalem is fifteen miles.¹² He holds as Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name: what is an [average] man's journey in a day?¹³ Ten parasangs: five mils from daybreak until the first sparklings of the rising sun, [and] five mils from sunset until the stars appear. This leaves thirty: fifteen from the morning until midday, and fifteen from midday until evening [i.e., sunset]. 'Ulla Is consistent with his view, for 'Ulla said: What is 'a journey afar off'? Any place whence a man is unable to enter [Jerusalem] at the time of slaughtering.¹⁴

The Master said: 'Five mils from daybreak until the first sparklings of the rising sun.' Whence do we know it? — Because It is written, And when the morning arose [i.e., at daybreak], then the angels hastened Lot, saying, etc.;¹⁵ and it is written, The sun was risen upon the earth when Lot came unto Zoar,¹⁶ while R. Hanina said: I myself saw that place and it is five mils [from Sodom]. The [above] text [stated]: 'Ulla said, what is "a journey afar off"? Any place whence a man Is unable to enter [Jerusalem] at the time of slaughtering.' But Rab Judah maintained: Any place whence one is unable to enter [Jerusalem] at the time of eating.

Rabbah said to 'Ulla: on your view there is a difficulty, and on Rab Judah's view there is a difficulty. On your view there is a difficulty, for you say, 'Any place whence a man is unable to enter at the time of slaughtering': yet surely a man unclean through a reptile is unable to enter¹⁷ at the time of slaughtering,

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

yet you say, One slaughters and sprinkles on behalf of a person unclean through a reptile?

On Rab Judah's view there is a difficulty, for he says, 'Any place whence one is unable to enter at the time of eating': but surely he who is unclean through a reptile is able to enter at the time of eating, yet he says, One may not slaughter and sprinkle on behalf of a man unclean through a reptile?¹⁸ Said he to him: Neither on my view nor on Rab Judah's view Is there a difficulty. On my view there is no difficulty: 'A journey afar off' [is stated] in reference to a clean person, but 'a journey afar off' is not [stated] in reference to an unclean person.¹⁹

(1) Lit., 'blesses', a euphemism for 'curses'

(2) V. Num. XV, 30; he blasphemeth (Heb. Megaddef, R.V.: reproacheth) the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off (i.e., Kareth). The meaning of Megaddef is disputed in Ker. 7b.

(3) Lev. XXIV, 15. From Num. XV, 30 'ye know that he incurs Kareth, and therefore that must be the meaning in this verse.

(4) R. Nathan renders 'Ki' as 'because'.

(5) According to Rabbi it is necessary, as it refers to the punishment for the neglect of the second. But since R. Nathan relates it to the first, it is superfluous, having been already stated.

(6) But one who takes part in an idolatrous service, e.g., by singing hymns in a heathen Temple, v. Ker. 7b.

Consequently, Num., XV, 30 cannot be identified with Lev. XXIV, 15 (v. notes supra), and so there is nothing to indicate the meaning of 'shall bear his sin' in the latter verse, which refers to blasphemy.

(7) As explicitly stated in the first half of the verse.

(8) Translating Ki like Rabbi, except that he connects it with the preceding part of the verse.

(9) In connection with R. Nathan.

(10) Generally known as Modi'im, a town famous in Jewish history as the residence of Mattathias and his sons, where the Maccabean revolt against Antiochus flared up; it was some fifteen miles N.W. of Jerusalem.

(11) The Heb. for 'a journey afar off' (Num. IX, 10) is רך רחוקה ה (Heh) being traditionally written with a dot, thus . Such a point was regarded as a weakening or limitation, as though the word were not really written.

(12) A mil=two thousand cubits, a quarter of a parasang.

(13) From daybreak to nightfall, when the day and night are of equal length, i.e., from six a.m. To six p.m.

(14) I.e., so far, that if a man started walking at midday, which is the earliest time for sacrificing the Passover-offering, he could not reach it by sunset, which is the latest. Taking this statement in conjunction with the preceding calculation, we see that Modi'im must be fifteen miles from Jerusalem.

(15) Gen. XIX, 15.

(16) Ibid. 23.

(17) Sc. the Temple.

(18) For this controversy v. supra 90b.

(19) V. Num. IX, 13: But the man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and forbearth to keep (lit., 'do') the Passover, etc. From this we see, (i) that the exemption for a man who is in a 'journey afar off' applies to a clean person, and (ii) that a 'journey (afar off)' is determined by his inability to do the Passover, i.e., to slaughter it. Hence if he is so far away that he cannot reach the Temple Court in time for the slaughtering, he is in a journey afar off'. But an unclean person is exempt because of his uncleanness, which prevents his eating, but not his sacrificing, since that can be done by another acting on his behalf. Moreover, since Scripture specifies one who is 'unclean by reason of a dead body' and does not state one who is unclean through a reptile, it follows that this exemption applies only to such as the former, who are unclean for a long period (seven days) and cannot be fit in the evening, but not to such as the latter, who can be fit to eat in the evening.

Pesachim 94a

On Rab Judah's view there is no difficulty: When one is unclean through a reptile, the Divine Law relegated him [to the second Passover], for it is written, 'If any man shall be unclean by reason of a dead body': does this not refer [even] to one whose seventh day falls on the eve of Passover, yet even so the Divine Law said: Let him be relegated [to the second].¹

Our Rabbis taught: If he was standing beyond Modi'im and is able to enter by horses and mules, you might think that he is culpable. Therefore it is stated: 'and is not in a journey,'² whereas this man was in a journey.³ If he was standing on the hither side of Modi'im, but could not enter on account of the camels and wagons which held him up,⁴ you might think that he is not

PESOCHEM – 87a-121b

culpable. Therefore It is stated, ‘and is not in a journey,’ and lo, he was not in a journey.⁵

Raba said: The world is six thousand parasangs,⁶ and the thickness of the heaven [Rakia’] is one thousand parasangs the first one [of these statements] is a tradition, while the other is [based on] reason. [Thus:] he agrees with Rabbah b. Bar Hanah’s dictum in R. Johanan’s name: What is an average man’s journey in a day? Ten parasangs: from daybreak until the first sparklings of the rising sun five mils, and from sunset until the stars appear five mils: hence the thickness of the heaven is one sixth of the day[’s journey].⁷

An objection is raised: Rab Judah said: The thickness of the sky is one tenth of the day’s journey. The proof is this: what is an [average] man’s journey in a day? Ten parasangs, and from daybreak until the rising sun four mils, [and] from sunset until the stars appear four mils,: hence the thickness of the sky is one tenth of the day[’s journey].⁸ This is a refutation of Raba, and a refutation of ‘Ulla! It is a refutation.⁹ Shall we say that this is [also] a refutation of R. Johanan?-He can answer you: I spoke only of [an average man’s journey] in a [complete] day, and it was the Rabbis¹⁰ who erred by calculating [the distance for] pre-dawn and after nightfall.¹¹ Shall we say that this is a refutation of R. Hanina?¹² — No: ‘and [the angels] hastened’¹³ is different —¹⁴

Come and hear: Egypt was four hundred parasangs square. Now Egypt is one sixtieth of Ethiopia [Cush], Ethiopia one sixtieth of the world, the world one sixtieth of the Garden, the Garden one sixtieth of Eden, Eden one sixtieth of the Gehenna: thus the whole world is like a pot lid [in relation] to Gehenna. This is [indeed] a refutation .¹⁵ Come and hear: Tanna debe Eliyahu¹⁶ [taught]: R. Nathan said: The whole of the inhabited world is situate under one star. The proof is that a man looks at a star, [and] when he goes eastward it is opposites [and

when he goes] to the four corners of the world it is opposite him. This proves that the whole of the inhabited world is situate under one star. This is indeed a refutation.¹⁷

Come and hear: The Wain [‘Wagon’]¹⁸ is in the north and Scorpio is in the south, the whole of the inhabited world lies between the Wain and Scorpio, and the whole of the inhabited world represents but one hour of the day,¹⁹ for the sun enters [the space above] the inhabited world only for one hour in the day.²⁰ The proof is that at the fifth [hour] the sun is in the east while at the seventh the sun is in the west: [during] half of the sixth and half of the seventh the sun stands overhead all people.²¹ This is [indeed] a refutation.

Come and hear: For R. Johanan b. Zakkai said: What answer did the Bath Kol²² give that wicked man [Nebuchadnezzar] when he asserted, ‘I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High’?²³ A Bath Kol came forth and rebuked him: ‘Thou wicked man, son of a wicked man,

(1) V. supra 90b and notes a.l.

(2) Ibid.

(3) As defined in the Mishnah.

(4) He too being on one, and the road was blocked.

(5) He should have completed it on foot.

(6) Rashi: in diameter from east to west.

(7) The periods from daybreak until the rising sun is in the heavens, and again from sunset until the stars appear, were regarded as the time during which the sun was passing through the sky, which was conceived as a solid vault stretched out above the earth. Hence it follows from Rabbah’s dictum that since five mils can be walked in each of these two periods, while thirty mils can be walked during the day excluding these periods (ten parasangs=forty mils), the thickness of the sky is one sixth of the world’s diameter.

(8) The one tenth is of the inclusive figure, i.e., four in forty, whereas one sixth mentioned before was exclusive: six in thirty. But in any case they disagree.

(9) Both (for ‘Ulla v. supra 93b) hold that five mils can be walked from daybreak until the sun is in the heavens, which certainly cannot be reconciled with the present statement.

(10) I.e., ‘Ulla and R. Johanan.

(11) He had merely stated that an average man can walk ten parasangs in a day, but Raba and

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

‘Ulla had erred by adding that one travels five mils in the period stated; though most people do indeed walk five mils by the time the sun is in the heavens, that is because they generally start a little before dawn; similarly in the evening they continue their journey a little after nightfall.

(12) Supra 93b.

(13) Gen. XIX, 15.

(14) They would naturally cover a greater distance.

(15) For according to the present calculation the surface area of the world is 576,000,000 sq. parasangs (thus: 400 X 400 X 60 x 60) whereas according to Raba, even if the 6000 is squared, we have only 36,000,000 sq. parasangs.

(16) This is a Midrash consisting of two parts, ‘Seder Eliyahu Rabbah’ and ‘Seder Eliyahu Zuta’. According to the Talmud Keth. 106a the Prophet Elijah recited this Midrash to R. ‘Anan, a Babylonian Amora of the third century.

Scholars are agreed that the work in its present form received its final redaction in the tenth century C.E., though they are not agreed as to where it was written. V. Bacher, *Monatsschrift*, XXIII, 267f; idem in *R.E.J.* XX, 144-146; Friedmann, Introduction to his edition of *Seder Eliyahu*; v. Keth., Sonc. ed. p. 680, n. 2.

(17) And since there are countless stars in the sky, it follows that the sky is immeasurably greater than the earth, not, as Raba says, only one sixth.

(18) The Great Bear.

(19) The sun in traveling through the sky takes one hour only to travel across the actual breadth of the world.

(20) As explained in the previous note.

(21) "Wherever they are; thus it is during this hour only that the sun is actually above the world. This too proves that the sky is infinitely larger than the earth.

(22) V. Glos.

(23) Isa. XIV, 14.

between each heaven,⁴ ‘Yet thou shalt be brought down to the nether-world, to the uttermost parts of the pit’ —⁵ This is [indeed] a refutation.

Our Rabbis taught: The Sages of Israel maintain: The Galgal⁶ is stationary [fixed], while the mazzaloth⁷ revolve; while the Sages of the nations of the world maintain: The Galgal revolves and the Mazzaloth are stationary.⁸ Rabbi observed: This disproves their view [viz.,] we never find the Wain in the south or Scorpio in the north.⁹ To this R. Aha b. Jacob demurred: Perhaps it is like the pivot¹⁰ of a millstone,¹¹ or like the door socket?

The Sages of Israel maintain: The sun travels beneath the sky by day and above the sky at night; while the Sages of the nations of the world maintain: It travels beneath the sky by day and below the earth at night. Said Rabbi: And their view is preferable to ours, for the wells are cold by day but warm at night.¹²

It was taught, R. Nathan said: In summer the sun travels in the heights of the heaven,¹³ therefore the whole world is hot while the wells [springs] are cold; in winter the sun travels at the lower ends of the sky,¹⁴ therefore the whole world is cold while the wells are hot.

Our Rabbis taught: The sun travels over four courses: [during] Nisan,¹⁵ Iyar and Sivan, it travels over the mountains, in order to melt the snows; [in] Tammuz, Ab and Elul, over the inhabited world, to ripen the fruits; [in] Tishri, Marheshwan and Kislev, overseas, to dry up the rivers; in Tebeth, Shebat and Adar, through the wilderness, so as not to dry up the seeds [in the ground].

R. ELIEZER SAID: FROM THE THRESHOLD, etc. Even though he can enter, and we do not say to him, ‘Arise and enter’? but it surely was taught: An uncircumcised Jew who did not circumcise

Pesachim 94b

descendant of the wicked Nimrod, who incited the whole world to rebel [Himrid]¹ against Me during his reign!² How many are the years of man? Seventy years; and if by reason of strength, eighty years, for it is said, The days of our years are threescore years and ten, or even by reason of strength fourscore years.³ Now from earth to heaven is a five hundred years journey, the thickness of heaven is a five hundred years’ journey, and between the first heaven and the next lies a five hundred years’ journey, and similarly

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

himself is punished by Kareth: this is the opinion of R. Eliezer? — Said Abaye: ‘A journey afar off’ [is stated] in respect of a clean person, but ‘a journey afar off’ is not [stated] in respect of an unclean person.¹⁶ Raba said: It is [a controversy of] Tannaim. For it was taught, R. Eliezer said: Distance of place is stated in connection with the Passover, and distance of place is stated in connection with tithe:¹⁷ just as there [it means] without [the boundaries of] its eating,¹⁸ so here too it means outside [the place of] its eating.¹⁹

R. Jose son of R. Judah said on R. Eliezer's authority: [It means] outside [the place] where it is sacrificed.²⁰ With whom does the following dictum of R. Isaac son of R. Joseph agree. [viz.:] In respect of those who are unclean, decide by the majority who are standing in the Temple Court.²¹ With whom [does it agree]? With R. Jose son of R. Judah, as he stated [the law] on R. Eliezer's authority.²²

SAID R. JOSE TO HIM, THEREFORE, etc. It was taught, R. Jose the Galilean said: [BY] ‘a journey afar off’ I may understand a distance of two or three days: but when it is said, and is not in a journey, it teaches that from the threshold of the Temple Court and without is designated a journey.²³

(1) This is a play on the name Nimrod, deriving it from Marad, to rebel.

(2) According to Talmudic tradition Nimrod instigated the building of the tower of Babel to storm heaven.

(3) Ps. XC, 10.

(4) According to the ancient tradition there were seven heavens.

(5) Isa. XIV, 15. [In Hag. 13a the distance is further extended and according to the calculation given there amounts to a total of 4,096,000 years' journey, which at the rate of eighty rabbinic miles in 24 hours (v. supra) amounts to 119,603,200,000 say — 120,000 million miles, which shows that the Rabbis had a fair idea of stellar distance. Cf. Feldman, W. M., *Rabbinical Mathematics*, p. 213.]

(6) [‘Wheel sphere’ probably the celestial sphere, v. n. 7.]

(7) Here fixed stars.

(8) [This will probably represent the Ptolemaic view according to which the stars are fixed on the surface of the celestial sphere which moves round the earth carrying the stars with it, v. op. cit. p. 71.]

(9) But if the Galgal revolves, the Mazzaloth too would change their position. The view of the Jewish Sages is difficult to explain.

(10) Rashi. ‘Aruch: the socket.

(11) "Which remains fixed in its place.

(12) [On this passage v. op. cit. p. 72.]

(13) Above the earth.

(14) Not above the earth but at its side.

(15) The first month of the Jewish civil year, commencing sometime in March. The remaining eleven months are enumerated in order.

(16) v. supra 93b. Similarly, a man must make himself fit for the Passover, and otherwise he incurs Kareth. But it is not his duty to bring himself within the area of obligation. Tosaf. points out an obvious difficulty: if he is uncircumcised or unclean and standing without the Temple court, as he must be in that case, he must make himself fit and keep the Passover on penalty of Kareth; whereas if he is already circumcised or clean and standing without he is exempt! Tosaf. explains it with the principle laid down by R. Zera, v. Yeb. 104b.

(17) Deut. XIV, 24 q.v.

(18) The second tithe must be eaten in Jerusalem. Anywhere outside Jerusalem is regarded as a distant place and the law of redemption applies.

(19) When Scripture states that if a man is on a journey afar off he is exempt, it means if he is anywhere outside Jerusalem, in the whole of which the Passover-offering was eaten. Hence if he is merely outside the Temple Court but in Jerusalem he is not exempt.

(20) viz., the Temple Court. Thus we have a controversy of Tannaim as to R. Eliezer's view.

(21) when the majority of those in the Temple Court are unclean, the Passover is sacrificed in uncleanness (supra 79a).

But those who are not in the Temple Court are disregarded entirely. as they are on a ‘journey afar off’.

(22) For according to the first Tanna a majority of all in Jerusalem would be required.

(23) Since ‘afar off’ is not mentioned here.

Pesachim 95a

MISHNAH. WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE FIRST PASSOVER AND THE SECOND? THE FIRST IS SUBJECT TO THE PROHIBITION OF [LEAVEN] SHALL NOT BE SEEN AND [LEAVEN] SHALL NOT BE FOUND;¹ WHILE AT THE SECOND [A MAN

PESOGHIM – 87a-121b

MAY HAVE] LEAVENED AND UNLEAVENED BREAD IN THE HOUSE WITH HIM. THE FIRST REQUIRES [THE RECITING OF] HALLEL WHEN IT [THE PASCHAL LAMB] IS EATEN, WHEN THE SECOND DOES NOT REQUIRE HALLEL WHEN IT IS EATEN. BUT BOTH REQUIRE [THE RECITING OF] HALLEL WHEN THEY ARE SACRIFICED, AND THEY ARE EATEN ROAST WITH UNLEAVENED BREAD AND BITTER HERBS, AND THEY OVERRIDE THE SABBATH.

GEMARA. Our rabbis taught: According to all the statute of the Passover they shall keep it:² the Writ refers to the ordinance[s] pertaining to itself.³ How do we know the ordinance[s] indirectly connected with itself?⁴ Because it is said, they shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs.⁵ You might think that regulations which are not even indirectly connected with itself [are included too]; therefore it is stated, nor shall they break a bone thereof:⁶ just as the breaking of a bone stands out as an ordinance pertaining to itself, so is every ordinance pertaining to itself [included].⁷ Issi b. Judah said: ‘they shall keep it’ [implies that] the Writ treats of regulations pertaining to itself.⁸

The Master said: ‘You might think that regulations which are not even indirectly connected with itself [are included too]’ — But surely you have said that the Writ refers to ordinance[s] pertaining to itself?—This is what he means: now that you have quoted, ‘they shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, which proves that ‘they shall keep it’⁹ is not exact, then say that it is like a particularization and a general proposition, whereby the general proposition is accounted as adding to the particularization, so that even all regulations [are included]:¹⁰ hence he informs us [that It is not so]. Now Issi b. Judah, how does he utilize this [law concerning a] bone?—He requires it for [teaching that] both a bone which contains marrow and a bone which does not contain marrow [are meant].¹¹ And the Rabbis: how

do they utilize this [verse] ‘they shall keep it’?—they require it to teach that one may not kill the Passover-offering on behalf of a single person, so that as far as it is possible to procure [another unclean person] we do so.¹²

Our Rabbis taught: ‘According to all the statute of the Passover they shall keep it’: you might think, just as the first is subject to the prohibition of [leaven] ‘shall not be seen’ and ‘shall not be found’, so is the second subject to the prohibition of [leaven] shall not be seen and shall not be found: therefore it is stated, they shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs.¹³ Again, I know it only of positive precepts;¹⁴ how do we know it of negative precepts?

Because It is stated, They shall leave none of it unto the morning.¹⁵ Also, I know it only of a negative precept modified to a positive precept;¹⁶ how do we know it of an absolute negative precept?

Because It is stated, ‘and they shall not break a bone thereof’: [hence] just as the particularization is explicitly stated as a positive precept, and a negative precept modified to a positive precept, and an absolute negative precept, so every positive precept, and a negative precept modified to a positive precept, and complete negative precept [are included].¹⁷

What is included in the general proposition as applied to ‘[they shall eat it] with unleavened bread and bitter herbs’? — Roast with fire.¹⁸ What does it exclude in its particularization?¹⁹ — The putting away of leaven. May I [not] reverse it? — [The inclusion of] a precept pertaining to itself is preferable.

What is included in the general proposition as bearing on ‘they shall leave none of it unto the morning’? — thou shall not carry forth aught [of the flesh abroad out of the house],²⁰ (which is similar thereto, since the one is disqualified through being Nothar,²¹ while

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

the other is disqualified through going out [of its permitted boundary]).²² What does it exclude by its particularization? — [Leaven] ‘shall not be seen and ‘shall not be found,’ (which is similar thereto, for the one does not involve flagellation, since it is a negative precept modified to a positive precept, while the other does not involve flagellation, since It is a negative precept modified to a positive precept.)²³ May I [not] reverse it? — [The inclusion of] a precept pertaining to itself is preferable. What is included in the general proposition as bearing on ‘they shall not break a bone thereof? —

- (1) Ex. XII, 19; Deut. XVI, 4
- (2) Num. IX, 12 with reference to the second Passover.
- (3) E.g. how the sacrifice shall be prepared, that it is to be eaten roast, etc.; but regulations not directly pertaining to itself, e.g.. the removing of leaven, are not included.
- (4) E.g., that it is to be eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs.
- (5) Num. IX, 11.
- (6) Ibid. 12.
- (7) But not others.
- (8) So that ‘nor shall they break a bone thereof’ is unnecessary for that purpose.
- (9) ‘It’ might imply that only the regulations directly bearing on the sacrifice itself are meant, and therefore exclude the eating of unleavened bread and bitter herbs.
- (10) This is a general principle of exegesis that if a law is first stated in a particular instance and then in a general form, the former does not limit the latter but on the contrary the latter generalizes the former, so that all instances are included. Here a particular instance of similarity between the first Passover and the second is stated in v. 11 while in v. 12 a general law is stated that the two are alike in all respects.
- (11) Supra 85a.
- (12) Even if we have to defile a person at the first Passover, so that there may be at least two at the second; v. supra 91a.
- (13) V. p. 508. they are alike only in respect of the regulations pertaining to or connected with itself, just like the particular case which is stated.
- (14) ‘They shall eat it’, etc. is a positive precept, and therefore teaches that all the positive precepts applicable to the first Passover are also binding upon the second, e.g., the precept to eat it roast.
- (15) Num. IX, 12; hence the deduction stated in the preceding note applies to negative precepts too.

(16) A prohibition which if violated must be repaired by a positive act. Thus ‘and ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning’ (Ex. XII, 10) is followed by ‘but that which remaineth of it until the morning ye shall burn with fire’. Technically such an injunction is less stringent than an ordinary negative precept and does not involve flagellation.

(17) Hence the general proposition, ‘according to all the statute, etc. is applied separately to each of these three particular laws, teaching that all laws which partake of their nature are included.

(18) V. n . 2.

(19) For just as the general proposition includes laws unstated, so the particularization teaches that some laws are excluded, as otherwise the former alone would suffice.

(20) Ex. XII, 46

(21) V. Glos.

(22) Var. lec. omits the bracketed passage.

(23) If flesh of the Passover sacrifice is left over, it must be burnt, while if leaven is not completely removed before Passover, so that it is ‘seen’ or ‘found’, it must be destroyed whenever discovered. Hence both of these negative precepts are modified to positive precepts, and he who violates them is not flagellated.-Var. lec. omits the bracketed passage.

Pesachim 95b

Eat not of it half-roast.¹ By its particularization what does it exclude? Thou shall not offer the blood of My sacrifice with leavened bread.² May I [not] reverse it? — [The inclusion of] a precept pertaining to itself is preferable.

THE FIRST REQUIRES [THE RECITING OF] HALLEL WHEN IT IS EATEN, etc. Whence do we know it? — Said R. Johanan on the authority of R. Simeon b. Jehozadak: Scripture saith, Ye shall have a song as in the night when a feast is hallowed:³ the night that is hallowed for a feast [Festival] requires [the reciting of] Hallel [‘Song’], while the night which is not hallowed for a feast does not require [the reciting of] Hallel.

BUT BOTH REQUIRE [THE RECITING OF] HALLEL WHEN THEY ARE SACRIFICED, etc. What is the reason?-I can either say, [Scripture] excludes the night, but not the day; or alternatively, is it possible

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

that Israel sacrifice their Passover-offerings or take their palm-branches⁴ without reciting Hallel!

AND THEY ARE EATEN ROAST, etc. Only the Sabbath [do they override], but not uncleanness;⁵ our Mishnah does not agree with R. Judah, for it was taught: It [the second Passover] overrides the Sabbath, but it does not override uncleanness; R. Judah maintained: It overrides uncleanness too. What is the reason of the first Tanna? — Seeing that I have suspended him [from the first Passover] on account of uncleanness, shall he after all keep it in uncleanness?⁶ And R. Judah?⁷ — The Torah sought [means] for him to keep it in cleanness; yet if he was not privileged [thus], he must keep it in uncleanness.

Our Rabbis taught: The first Passover overrides the Sabbath, [and] the second Passover overrides the Sabbath; the first Passover overrides uncleanness,[and] the second Passover overrides uncleanness; the first Passover requires the spending of the night [in Jerusalem], [and] the second Passover requires the spending of the night [in Jerusalem]. ‘[The second Passover] overrides uncleanness . With whom [does this agree]? — With R. Judah.

But according to R. Judah, does it require the spending of the night [in Jerusalem]? Surely it was taught, R. Judah said: How do we know that the second Passover does not require the spending of the night [in Jerusalem]? Because it is said, and thou shalt turn in the morning, and go unto thy tents;⁸ and it is written, six days thou shalt eat unleavened bread:⁹ that which is eaten six [days] requires the spending of the night [in Jerusalem], but that which is not eaten six [days] does not require the spending of the night [in Jerusalem]?¹⁰ — There is [a controversy of] two Tannaim as to R. Judah's opinion.

MISHNAH. [WITH REGARD TO] THE PASSOVER-OFFERING WHICH COMES IN UNCLEANNESS, ZABIN AND ZABOTH, MENSTRUANT WOMEN AND WOMEN AFTER CONFINEMENT MUST NOT EAT THEREOF, YET IF THEY DID EAT THEY ARE EXEMPT FROM KARETH;¹¹ BUT R. ELIEZER EXEMPTS [THEM] EVEN [OF THE KARETH NORMALLY INCURRED] FOR ENTERING THE SANCTUARY.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: If Zabin and Zaboth, menstruant women and women after confinement ate of the Passover-offering which was sacrificed in uncleanness, you might think that they are culpable, therefore it is stated, Every one that is clean may eat flesh [of sacrifices]. But the soul that eateth of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, that pertain unto the Lord, having his uncleanness upon him, that soul shall be cut off:¹² with regard to that which is eaten by clean persons, you are culpable on its account on the score of uncleanness, but as to that which is not eaten by clean persons, you are not culpable on its account on the score of ‘uncleanness —¹³ R. Eliezer said: If Zabin and lepers¹⁴ forced their way through and entered the Temple Court at a Passover-offering which came in uncleanness, you might think that they are culpable; therefore it is stated , [command the children of Israel,] that they send out of the camp every leper, and everyone that hath an issue [Zab], and whosoever,- is unclean by the dead:¹⁵ when those who are unclean by the dead are sent out, Zabin and lepers are sent out; when those who are unclean by the dead are not sent out, Zabin and lepers are not sent out.

R. Joseph asked: What if persons unclean through the dead forced their way in and entered the Temple [Hekal]¹⁶ at a Passover offering which came in uncleanness? [Do we say,] since the uncleanness of the Temple Court was permitted, the uncleanness of the Temple [Hekal] too was permitted;¹⁷ or perhaps, what was permitted was permitted,

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

while what was not permitted was not permitted?

Said Raba: Scripture saith, 'that they send out of the camp,' [implying] even from part of the camp.¹⁸ Others maintain Raba said: Scripture saith, without [Mi-huz] the camp shall ye send them:¹⁹ only where²⁰ 'without the camp shall ye send them,' is applicable, is 'that they send out of the camp' applicable.²¹

R. Joseph asked: What if persons unclean by the dead forced their way through [to the altar] and ate the Emurim: of a Passover-offering which came in uncleanness?²²

- (1) Ex. XII, 9.
- (2) Ex. XXXIV, 25.
- (3) Isa. XXX, 29.
- (4) On the Feast of Tabernacles, v. Lev. XXIII, 40.
- (5) If the majority of those who should keep the second Passover are unclean, the sacrifice is not brought.
- (6) Surely not.
- (7) How does he rebut this argument?
- (8) Deut. XVI, 7 'Thy tents' is understood to refer to tents pitched without Jerusalem; but it cannot mean home, firstly because one might not travel on a Festival, and secondly because the pilgrimage burnt-offering was yet to be offered. The phrase 'in the morning' teaches that the night was to be spent in Jerusalem, even after the Passover sacrifice was consumed.
- (9) Ibid. 8.
- (10) I.e., only the Passover-offering which necessitates the eating of unleavened bread six days (actually seven; v. infra 120a), and prohibits leaven necessitates the spending of the night in Jerusalem; the first Passover alone fulfils this condition, but not the second. — Thus R. Judah is self-contradictory.
- (11) The usual penalty for eating sacred flesh in a state of personal uncleanness. But if they actually entered the Temple too, they are liable to Kareth on that account.
- (12) Lev. VII, 19f.
- (13) Hence when the Passover-offering comes in uncleanness, though Zabin, etc. may not eat of it, they nevertheless do not incur Kareth.
- (14) So the text as emended and Supra 67b.
- (15) Num. V, 2.
- (16) The hall containing the golden altar; the Temple proper, as opposed to the Temple court. Even priests might enter it only when necessary; here entry was unnecessary, since the offering was sacrificed in the Temple Court.

(17) I.e., no penalty is incurred on account of uncleanness.

(18) Even when they are not sent out of the entire camp, as here, they are sent out of the part where their presence is not necessary; hence if they enter it they incur Kareth.

(19) Num. V, 3; 'mi-huz' implies right outside the whole of it.

(20) Lit., 'read in his case'.

(21) Hence, since he is not sent out of the whole camp, he is not liable.

(22) The Emurim were burnt on the altar, and were therefore forbidden.

Pesachim 96a

[Do we say,] since the uncleanness of the flesh was permitted, the uncleanness of the Emurim too was permitted;¹ or perhaps, what was permitted was permitted, and what was not permitted was not permitted?

Said Raba, Consider: whence is the uncleanness of Emurim included?² From the uncleanness of the flesh, for it is written, That pertain onto the Lord,³ which includes Emurim: [hence] wherever the uncleanness of the flesh is interdicted, the uncleanness of the Emurim is interdicted: while wherever [the interdict of] the uncleanness of the flesh is absent, [the interdict of] the uncleanness of the Emurim is absent.

R. Zera asked: Where did they burn the Emurim of the Passover offering of Egypt?⁴ — Said Abaye, And who is to tell us that it was not prepared roast?⁵ Moreover, surely R. Joseph learned: Three altars were there [for the sprinkling of the blood] viz., the lintel and the two doorposts.⁶ Further, was there nothing else?⁷

MISHNAH. WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PASSOVER-OFFERING OF EGYPT AND THE PASSOVER-OFFERING OF [SUBSEQUENT] GENERATIONS?⁸ THE PASSOVER-OFFERING IN EGYPT WAS TAKEN ON THE TENTH [OF NISAN],⁹ [ITS BLOOD] REQUIRED SPRINKLING WITH A BUNCH OF HYSSOP ON THE LINTEL AND ON THE TWO DOOR-POSTS, AND IT WAS EATEN IN HASTE ON ONE NIGHT;

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

WHEREAS THE PASS OVER- OFFERING OF [SUBSEQUENT] GENERATIONS IS KEPT THE WHOLE SEVEN [DAYS].¹⁰

GEMARA. Whence do we know it?-Because it is written, Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying: in the tenth day of this month they shall take [to them every man a lamb]:¹¹ the taking of this one was on the tenth, whereas the taking of the Passover-offering of [subsequent] generations is not on the tenth. If so, [when it is written,] And ye shall keep it [Mishmereth] until the fourteenth day of this month,¹² does that too [intimate], this requires a four days' examination before slaughtering,¹³ but no other requires examination?

Surely it was taught, The son of Bag Bag¹⁴ said: How do we know that the tamid¹⁵ requires a four days' examination before slaughtering? Because it is said, Ye shall observe [Tishmeru] to offer unto Me in its due season,¹⁶ while elsewhere it is said, And ye shall keep it [Mishmereth] until the fourteenth [etc.]:¹⁷ just as there it requires a four days' examination before slaughtering, so here too it requires a four days examination before slaughtering? —

There it is different, because Tishmeru ['ye shall observe'] is written.¹⁸ And thus [in connection with] the annual Passover-offering it is indeed written, then thou shalt keep this service in this month,¹⁹ [which intimates] that all the services of this month [in subsequent generations] should be like this.²⁰ Hence that [word] 'this'²¹ is to exclude the second Passover, which is like itself.²² But [again] if so, when it is written, and they shall eat the flesh in this night,²³ does that too [teach] that this is eaten at night, but another is not eaten at night?²⁴ —

Scripture saith, then thou shalt keep this service [etc.].²⁵ Then what is the purpose of 'this'? — [It is required] for [the exegesis] of R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah and A. Akiba [respectively].²⁶ But if so, when it is written,

But no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof,²⁷ does that too [teach] that he may not eat 'thereof,' yet he may eat of the Passover-offering of [subsequent] generations? —

[No, for] Scripture saith, 'Then thou shalt keep [this service, etc.].' Then what is the purpose of 'thereof'?- Thereof he must not eat, but he eats unleavened bread and the bitter herbs. But if so, when it is written, There shall no alien eat thereof,²⁸ is it the case there too that he must not eat thereof, yet he eats of the Passover-offering of [subsequent] generations? —

Scripture saith, 'Then thou shalt keep [etc.].' Then what is the purpose of 'thereof'?- In that case only ['thereof'] does apostasy disqualify, but apostasy does not disqualify in the case of Terumah — Now it is necessary that an uncircumcised person should be stated, and it is necessary that an alien should be stated. For if the Divine Law stated an uncircumcised person, [I would say that he is disqualified] because he is repulsive, but an alien is not repulsive [so] I would say [that he is] not [excluded] from the Passover-offering; hence [an alien] is necessary. And if we were informed about an alien, [I would argue that he is disqualified] because his heart is not toward Heaven, but [as for] an uncircumcised person, whose heart is toward Heaven,²⁹ I would say [that he is] not [excluded]. Thus both are necessary. But if so, [when it is written,] A sojourner [Toshab] and a hired servant [Sakir] shall not eat thereof,³⁰ does that too [intimate] that he must not eat thereof, but he does eat of the annual Passover? —

Scripture saith, 'Then thou shalt keep [etc.].' Then what is the purpose of 'thereof'? — Only in this case does apostasy disqualify, but apostasy does not disqualify from Terumah.³¹ But if so, [when it is written,] But every man's servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof,³² — does that too

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

[intimate] that he must not eat thereof, but he does eat of the annual Passover? —

Scripture saith, ‘then thou shalt keep [etc.]’. Then what is the purpose of ‘thereof’ [Bo]? Only in this case [Bo] is the circumcision of his males and his slaves indispensable,³³ but the circumcision of his males and his slaves is not indispensable in the case of Terumah. But if so, when it is written, Neither shall ye break a bone thereof,³⁴ does that too [intimate] that he may not break [a bone] thereof, but he may break [a bone] of the annual Passover? —

Scripture saith, ‘then thou shalt keep [etc.]’. Then what is the purpose of ‘thereof’? ‘Thereof’ [indicates] of a fit [sacrifice], but not of an unfit [one].³⁵ But if so, when it is written, Eat not of it half-roast,³⁶ [does that too intimate,] of it you may not eat [half-roast], but you may eat half-roast of the annual Passover-offering?—Scripture saith, ‘then thou shalt keep, etc.’ Then what is the purpose of ‘of it’?— For the teaching of Rabbah in R. Isaac's name.³⁷

AND WAS EATEN IN HASTE, etc. How do we know it?— Because Scripture saith, and ye shall eat it in haste:³⁸ ‘it’ was eaten in haste, but no other was eaten in haste.

AND THE ANNUAL PASSOVER-OFFERING IS KEPT THE WHOLE SEVEN [DAYS], etc. To what does this refer? If we say, to the Passover-offering, — is there then a Passover-offering all the seven [days]? —

(1) So that liability on eating is not incurred on the grounds of their uncleanness, although there still remains the liability for the eating of Emurim which are reserved for the altar.

(2) Whence do we learn that for eating Emurim in an unclean state liability is incurred? — Actually only the uncleanness of the flesh is explicitly mentioned.

(3) Lev. VII, 20.

(4) No mention is made of an altar there.

(5) And eaten.

(6) I.e., there were three places for the sprinkling of the blood, corresponding to the altar in the

Temple. But there was no altar for the burning of the Emurim.

(7) In which the Passover-offering in Egypt differed from those offered in the Temple. Surely there were many points of difference (v. next Mishnah): why then assume that in this respect they were alike?

(8) I.e., the annual Passover.

(9) Its owner had to take it four days beforehand, declaring, ‘This is for the Passover-offering’.

(10) This is explained in the Gemara.

(11) Ex. XII, 3.

(12) Ibid. 6.

(13) It was taken on the tenth and examined every day until the fourteenth for a blemish.

(14) V. Aboth, Sonc. ed. p. 76, n. 7

(15) V. Glos.

(16) Num. XXVIII, 2.

(17) Tishmeru and Mishmereth have the same root.

(18) Hence the animal must be examined daily for four days before it is sacrificed, and the same applies to the annual Passover-offering, though the latter is not actually declared to be taken for that purpose.

(19) Ex. XIII, 5.

(20) I.e., all the regulations of the Egyptian Passover hold good for the annual Passover too, and this includes the four days’ examination. The special ‘taking’ however has been excluded by the exegesis above.

(21) In the verse, ‘and ye shall keep it until the fourteenth day of this month’.

(22) Just as the Egyptian Passover was only one day, so is the annual second Passover of one day's duration only, and it is logical that ‘this’ should exclude another Passover which is similar to itself. Hence it teaches that the animal sacrificed at the second Passover does not require a four days’ examination.

(23) Ex. XII, 8.

(24) Surely not—the annual Passover-offering was of course eaten at night.

(25) Ex. XIII, 5.

(26) According to the former, to teach that it may be eaten until midnight only; according to the latter, to show that it may not be eaten two nights; v. Ber. 9a.

(27) Ibid. XII, 48.

(28) Ibid. 43. By ‘alien’ is understood not a non-Jew but a Jewish apostate, whose actions have alienated him from God.

(29) For this is understood to refer to one whose brothers died through circumcision, so that he fears the operation, but would otherwise have it performed.

(30) Ex. XII, 45.

(31) This seems quite unintelligible; Rashi deletes the whole passage on other grounds, observing

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

that the answer is in any case pointless. Tosaf. in Yeb. 71 s.v. בִּי defends the present reading.

(32) Ibid. 44.

(33) The master may not partake of the Passover-offering until the males of his household are circumcised.

(34) Ex. XII, 46.

(35) V. supra 70a and 83a.

(36) Ibid. 9.

(37) Viz., that an uncircumcised person may not eat of tithe; v. Yeb. 74a.

(38) Ibid. 11.

Pesachim 96b

Rather [it must refer] to leaven. Hence it follows that at the Passover of Egypt [leaven was forbidden] one night and no more; but surely it was taught, R. Jose the Galilean said: How do we know that at the Passover of Egypt the [prohibition of] leaven was in force one day only? Because it is said, There shall no leavened bread be eaten¹ and in proximity [thereto] is written, This day ye go forth!² — Rather this is its meaning: [The Passover — offering is kept] one night, and the same law applies to the annual Passover-offering; while [the prohibition of] leaven [was in force] the whole day, whereas at the Passover-offering of [subsequent] generations [the interdict of leaven] holds good for the entire seven [days].

MISHNAH. R. JOSHUA SAID: I HAVE HEARD [FROM MY TEACHERS] THAT THE SUBSTITUTE OF A PASSOVER-OFFERING³ IS OFFERED,⁴ AND THAT THE SUBSTITUTE OF A PASSOVER-OFFERING IS NOT OFFERED,⁵ AND I CANNOT EXPLAIN IT.⁶ SAID R. AKIBA, I WILL EXPLAIN IT: THE PASSOVER-OFFERING WHICH WAS FOUND BEFORE THE SLAUGHTERING OF THE PASSOVER-OFFERING MUST BE LEFT TO GRAZE UNTIL IT BECOMES UNFIT,⁷ BE SOLD, AND ONE BRINGS A PEACE-OFFERING FOR ITS MONEY; AND THE SAME APPLIES TO ITS SUBSTITUTE. [IF FOUND] AFTER THE SLAUGHTERING OF THE PASSOVER, IT IS OFFERED AS A PEACE-OFFERING, AND ITS SUBSTITUTE LIKEWISE.⁸

GEMARA. BUT LET HIM SAY, The Passover-offering is offered, and the Passover-offering is not offered?⁹ — He informs us this, [viz.,] that there is a substitute of a Passover-offering which is not offered [as a peace-offering].¹⁰ It was stated: Rabbah said: We learned, Before slaughtering and after slaughtering;¹¹ R. Zera maintained: We learned, Before midday and after midday.¹² But according to R. Zera, surely he teaches, BEFORE THE SLAUGHTERING OF THE PASSOVER-OFFERING? — SAY: BEFORE THE TIME OF THE SLAUGHTERING OF THE PASSOVER-OFFERING,¹³ This is dependent on Tannaim: The Passover which is found before slaughtering must graze [etc.]; [if found] after slaughtering, it is offered. R. Eleazar said: [If found] before midday it must graze [etc.]; after midday, it is offered.

[IF IT IS FOUND] AFTER THE SLAUGHTERING OF THE PASSOVER, HE BRINGS IT AS A PEACE-OFFERING, etc. Raba¹⁴ said: They learned this only if it was found after the slaughtering and he substituted [another] for it after the slaughtering. But if it was found before the slaughtering while he substituted [another] for it after the slaughtering, its substitute derives from the power of rejected sanctity, and it cannot be offered.¹⁵

Abaye raised an objection against him: If [he bring] a lamb [for his offering', etc.];¹⁶ for what purpose is 'if [he bring] a lamb' stated? To include the substitute of a Passover-offering after Passover, [teaching] that it is offered as a peace-offering. How is it meant? If we say that it was found after the slaughtering and he substituted [another] for it after the slaughtering, then it is obvious:¹⁷ why do I require a verse? Hence it must surely apply where it was found before slaughtering and he substituted [another] for it after slaughtering?¹⁸ —

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

No: in truth it applies where it was found after slaughtering and he substituted [another] for it after slaughtering, while the verse is a mere support.¹⁹ Then for what [purpose] does the verse come?²⁰ — For what was taught: ‘[If he bring] a lamb [etc.]’: this is to include the Passover-offering, in respect of its fat tail.²¹ When it is stated, ‘If [he bring] a lamb,’ this is to include [an animal] more than a year old [dedicated for] a Passover-offering²² and a peace-offering which comes in virtue of a Passover-offering²³, in respect of all the regulations of the peace-offering, [viz.,] that they require laying [of the hands],²⁴ libations, and the waving of the breast and shoulder. Again, when it states, and if [his offering be] a goat,²⁵ it breaks across the subject [and] teaches of a goat that it does not require [the burning of the] fat tail [on the altar].²⁶ Others recite it [Raba's dictum] in reference to the first clause: **THE PASSOVER-OFFERING WHICH WAS FOUND BEFORE THE SLAUGHTERING OF THE PASSOVER-OFFERING MUST GRAZE UNTIL IT BECOMES UNFIT, BE SOLD, AND ONE BRINGS A PEACE-OFFERING FOR ITS MONEY, AND THE SAME APPLIES TO ITS SUBSTITUTE.**

Said Raba, They learned [this] only where It was found before the slaughtering and he substituted [another] for it before the slaughtering. But if it was found before the slaughtering and he substituted [another] for it after the slaughtering, it is offered as a peace-offering. What is the reason? The slaughtering [of the Passover-offering] stamps [with its sanctity] only something that is eligible therefore, [but] it does not stamp [with its sanctity] that which is not eligible therefor.²⁷

Abaye raised an objection against him: ‘[he bring] a lamb [etc.]’: what is its purpose? To include the substitute of a Passover-offering after Passover, [teaching] that it is offered as a peace-offering.

(1) Ibid. XIII, 3.

(2) Ibid. 4; v. supra p. 130, n. 9. Thus it was prohibited the whole day, not during the night only.

(3) When an animal is dedicated for a sacrifice, another must not be declared as a substitute for it; if it is, both animals are holy, the holiness of the second being of the same nature as that of the first. But the substitute of a Passover-offering cannot be offered as such, but must be kept until after the Festival. Normally if a Passover-offering is not sacrificed at the proper time, e.g., if it was lost, it is subsequently sacrificed as a peace-offering.

(4) As a peace-offering, after Passover.

(5) As a peace-offering, but must graze until it becomes blemished, whereupon it is redeemed.

(6) When it is offered and when it is not.

(7) Through a blemish.

(8) The animal originally dedicated for the Passover was lost, and another was dedicated in its stead. Now if it was found again before the second was slaughtered or before the time of slaughtering the Passover in general (the exact meaning is disputed in the Gemara), the fact that it was present at the time of slaughtering stamps it as a Passover, and by not slaughtering it, one has rejected it, as it were, with his own hands. Consequently, it can no longer be offered itself, but must be sold, etc. If after finding it he substituted another animal for it, that too is governed by the same law, as stated in n. I. But if it was found after the second was killed, the time of the slaughtering has not stamped it with the name of a Passover-offering, nor has it been rejected therefrom. Consequently, it is brought itself after the Festival as a peace-offering.

(9) Why does R. Joshua speak about the substitute of a Passover: surely he could say the same about the Passover itself?

(10) For I might otherwise think that since the substitute cannot be sacrificed as a Passover-offering, it is as though he dedicated it in the first place for a peace-offering, and therefore must itself be offered as such in all cases, irrespective of what happens to the original. Hence he informs us that where the original cannot be offered, the substitute too cannot be offered.

(11) I.e., if it was found before or after the second was actually slaughtered.

(12) The time for slaughtering the Passover is from midday until evening. R. Zera maintains that if it is still unfound by midday, it can no longer be stamped as a Passover-offering even if it is found before the second is actually slaughtered, and therefore is subsequently sacrificed itself as a peace-offering.

(13) This does not emend the Mishnah but rather explains it.

(14) Var. lec. Rabbah.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(15) I.e., since the original is rejected, as explained in n. 6 on the Mishnah, the substitute is in the same position.

(16) Lev. III, 7. This refers to a peace-offering, and it is superfluous. For v. 6 states, and if his offering... be of the flock, while v. 12 states, and if his offering be a goat: since 'flock' only comprises goats and lambs, v. 6 must refer to lambs, which renders v. 7 unnecessary. Hence it must be written for a particular exegesis.

(17) Since it follows from the general principle of substitution, as explained in n. 1 and 6 on the Mishnah.

(18) And we are then informed that although the original itself cannot be offered, its substitute is offered!

(19) But not the actual source of the law, which follows indeed from general principles.

(20) Since it is superfluous, as explained on p. 519, n. 6.

(21) The fat tail of all other sacrifices is explicitly stated to be part of the Emurim which are burnt on the altar (v. Lev. III, 9; VII, 3). The burning of the Emurim is not mentioned at all in connection with the Passover, however, but deduced from elsewhere (v. supra 64b); consequently a verse is required to teach that the fat tail too is included.

(22) Hence unfit for its purpose (v. Ex. XII, 5).

(23) E.g., the substitute for a Passover-offering, or where the owner of a Passover-offering registered for a different animal, so that the first is a Passover remainder; both are sacrificed as peace-offerings.

(24) V. Lev. III, 2.

(25) Ibid. 12.

(26) 'And if' is regarded as a disjunctive, teaching that the provisions that apply to a lamb do not apply to a goat, unless expressly stated. The fat tail is mentioned in connection with the former (v. 9) but not the latter.

(27) I.e., if the animal is dedicated for a Passover-offering, the act or time of slaughtering the second animal stamps it with that sanctity, and since it was not offered then, it was rejected and must graze. But the act of slaughtering cannot stamp an animal with that sanctity, that it should be regarded as rejected if it was not fit for a Passover-offering at the time, and in the latter case this substitute was indeed unfit, since at that time it was as yet unconsecrated. Consequently now that it is consecrated, it is offered itself as a peace-offering.

substitute of a Passover-offering is not offered [as such] —3 How is it meant? If we say that it was found before slaughtering and he substituted [another] for it before slaughtering, then it is obvious!4 Why do I require a verse? Hence it must surely apply to where it was found before the slaughtering, 'while he substituted [another] for it after the slaughtering. Thus the refutation of Raba is indeed a refutation.5

Samuel said: Whatever must be left to perish in the case of a sin-offering, is brought as a peace-offering in the case of a Passover,6 and whatever must be left to graze in the case of a sin-offering,7 must also be left to graze in the case of a Passover.

While R. Johanan said: No Passover is brought as a peace-offering save that which is found after the slaughtering, but not [if it is found] before the slaughtering.

To this R. Joseph demurred: Now is this a general rule? Surely there is the sin-offering more than a year old, which goes forth to pasture,8 for R. Simeon b. Lakish said: A sin-offering more than a year old, we regard as though it stood in a cemetery,9 and it must be left to graze; whereas a Passover in such a case is brought as a peace-offering, for it was taught: '[If he bring] a lamb [etc.]': this is to include the Passover-offering, in respect of its fat tail. When it is stated, 'If [he bring] a lamb,' this is to include [an animal] more than a year old [dedicated for] a Passover and a peace-offering which comes in virtue of a Passover-offering in respect of all the regulations of a peace-offering,10 [viz.,] that they require laying [of the hands], libations, and the waving of the breast and shoulder. Again, when it [Scripture] states, 'and if [his offering be] a goat', it breaks across the subject and teaches of a goat that it does not require [the burning of its] fat tail [on the altar]!11 —

Said he to him, Samuel spoke only of lost [sacrifices],12 but he did not say it of rejected [animals]. Yet is [this principle] possible [in

Pesachim 97a

You might think that it is also thus before Passover,1 therefore it is stated, 'it':2 'it' is offered [as a peace-offering], but the

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

the case of] a lost [sacrifice]? Surely an [animal which was] lost at the time of separating [another],¹³ in the view of the Rabbis goes to pasture [until it receives a blemish], for we learned: If he set apart [an animal as] his sin-offering and it was lost, and he [then] set apart another in its stead, and [then] the first was found again, and behold! Both stand [before us], [any] one of them may be sacrificed, while the other must die: this is Rabbi's ruling.

But the Sages maintain: No sin-offering must die except one found after its owner has been atoned for.¹⁴ Hence [if found again] before its owner was atoned for, it must graze. Whereas in the case of a Passover-offering, if it was lost and found again after midday [but] before the slaughtering [of the second], it is brought as a peace-offering? —

Samuel agrees with Rabbi, who maintained: A lost animal goes forth to perish. But every lost [sin-offering], according to Rabbi, is left to die, whereas in the case of a Passover-offering, if it was lost before midday and found again before midday it must be left to graze?— [If found] before midday it is not [regarded as lost],¹⁵ in accordance with Raba. For Raba said: A loss at night is not designated a loss.¹⁶ Then according to Rabbi, how is it possible that [a sin-offering] should be left to graze? —

(1) That the substitute of a Passover which is found before Passover is offered as a peace-offering.

(2) He seems to translate, If it (Hu) is a lamb (which) he brings, etc. and treats the 'it' as a limitation.

(3) This does not mean that where the Passover itself is offered as a peace-offering its substitute is not, but that there is a substitute of the Passover which is not offered as a peace-offering.

(4) that it cannot be offered itself, having been rejected as explained in n. 6 on the Mishnah.

(5) Here we cannot answer that the verse is a mere support, as above, for in that case what is the purpose of the verse?

(6) There are five cases of the former: (i) the offspring of a sin-offering; (ii) the substitute of a sin-offering; (iii) a sin-offering whose owner died; (iv) a sin-offering which was lost, and refound

after its owner had made atonement with another; and (v) a sin-offering more than a year old. All these must be allowed to perish. It is now assumed that all these, in the case of a Passover (the first of course is excluded, the Passover being a male), are brought as a peace-offering.

(7) until it receives a blemish, when it can be redeemed.—It is discussed anon which these are.

(8) Until it receives a blemish.

(9) Thus inaccessible to the priest for sacrifice— i.e., it cannot be sacrificed.

(10) This is the point of the objection.

(11) V. supra 96b for notes.

(12) I.e., iv in p. 521, n. 7.

(13) If a sin-offering was lost and another consecrated, and then the first was found again before the second was sacrificed, so that the first was a lost animal only when the second was set apart, but not when it was sacrificed.

(14) By another offering.

(15) Even if another had been separated in its place.

(16) If a sin-offering was lost at night, and another was separated in its stead, and the first was found by the morning, even on Rabbi's view It is not regarded as having been lost, since it could not have been sacrificed at night in any case, and therefore it goes forth to pasture. By the same reasoning, if the lost Passover-offering is found before midday, it is not regarded as having been lost, since it could not have been sacrificed before midday.

Pesachim 97b

In accordance with R. Oshaia. For R. Oshaia said: If he set apart two sin-offerings as security,¹ he is atoned for by one of them, while the second must be left to graze. Yet surely a Passover-offering in such a case is brought as a peace-offering?² —

Rather, Samuel holds as R. Simeon, who maintained: The five sin-offerings are left to die.³ But surely R. Simeon does not hold at all that [any sin-offering] must be left to graze?⁴ Samuel too stated one rule [only]: Whatever must be left to perish in the case of a sin-offering must be left to graze in the case of a Passover-offering. Then what does he inform us?⁵ —

[His purpose is] to rebut R. Johanan, who said: No Passover is brought as a peace-offering except if it is found after the

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

slaughtering, but not [if it is found] before the slaughtering, which proves that [in his opinion] the slaughtering stamps [it as a rejected animal]; hence he [Samuel] informs us that midday stamps [it]. Another version: Whereas in the case of the Passover, where it is lost and found after midday [but] before the slaughtering [of the second], it is brought as a peace-offering?⁶ —

Samuel agrees with Rabbah, who maintained: The slaughtering stamps [it].⁷ But surely, since R. Johanan said thereon: ‘No Passover-offering is brought as a peace-offering save when it is found after the slaughtering, but not [if it is found] before the slaughtering,’ which proves that [in his opinion] the slaughtering stamps [it], it follows that Samuel holds [that] midday stamps it? —

Rather Samuel agrees with Rabbi, who ruled: A lost [sacrifice] goes forth to perish — But all lost [sacrifices] are left to perish, in Rabbi's opinion, whereas in the case of the Passover-offering, where it is lost before midday and found before midday it must be left to graze? — He holds that [if it is found] before midday it is not [regarded as] lost, and he also holds: Midday stamps [it].

MISHNAH. IF A MAN SETS ASIDE A FEMALE OR A TWO-YEAR OLD MALE FOR HIS PASSOVER-OFFERING,⁸ IT MUST BE LEFT TO GRAZE UNTIL IT BECOMES UNFIT,⁹ THEN BE SOLD, AND ITS MONEY IS SPENT¹⁰ ON A VOLUNTARY SACRIFICE, ON A PEACE-OFFERING.¹¹

(1) Each as security for the other, in case the other is lost.

(2) For this is definitely a case where one is a remainder’, not a rejected sacrifice.

(3) v. supra 97a. Those die in all cases, this holding good of iv whether it was refund before atonement was made with the second or after. Similarly, if two are set aside as a security for each other, the unsacrificed one must die.

(4) How then can Samuel say’, whatever must be left to graze in the case of a sin-offering’?

(5) Since all sin-offerings must be left to die, it follows that Samuel teaches that all lost Passover-

offerings are brought as peace-offerings. But this is already taught in the Mishnah, viz., IF THE PASSOVER-OFFERING IS FOUND AFTER THE SLAUGHTERING, IT IS BROUGHT AS A PEACE-OFFERING; this is explained supra as meaning after the time for slaughtering, i.e., after midday, which proves that if it is still lost at midday it is brought as a peace-offering.

(6) This is another version of the difficulty raised supra 97a: ‘But surely an animal which was lost at the time of separating another, in the view of the Rabbis goes to pasture, whereas in the case, etc. (continuing as in the text).

(7) V. supra 96b. Hence if found before the second is slaughtered it goes to pasture.

(8) Both are ineligible; v. Ex. XII, 5. ‘A two-year old’ means in its second year.

(9) Through a blemish.

(10) Lit., ‘falls’.

(11) In the separate edition of the Mishnah ‘On a peace-offering’ is omitted, while Tosaf. in Zeb. 9b s.v. 77 gives the reading as, ‘and he brings a peace-offering with its money’. — By separating it for a Passover-offering he has stamped it as such, and since it is unfit, it is regarded as a rejected sacrifice, which cannot be offered itself but must be redeemed and the money expended on a sacrifice. Cf. Mishnah on 96b and n. 6 a.l.

Pesachim 98a

IF A MAN SEPARATES HIS PASSOVER-OFFERING AND DIES, HIS SON AFTER HIM MUST NOT BRING IT AS A PASSOVER-OFFERING¹ BUT AS A PEACE-OFFERING.

GEMARA. R. Huna son of R. Joshua said, This proves three things: [i] Live animals may be [permanently] rejected;² [ii] that which is rejected [even] ab initio is rejected;³ and [iii] rejection is applicable to monetary sanctity.⁴

IF A MAN SEPARATES HIS PASSOVER-OFFERING, etc. Our Rabbis taught: If a man separates his Passover-offering and dies, — If his son is registered with him, he must bring it as a Passover-offering; [if] his son is not registered with him, he must bring it as a peace-offering on the sixteenth [of Nisan].⁵ Only on the sixteenth, but not on the fifteenth: he holds, Vows and voluntary offerings⁶ may not be offered on a Festival. Now when did the father die? Shall we say

PESOCHEM – 87a-121b

that he died before midday [then how is it stated], ‘if his son is registered with him he must bring it as a peace-offering’? — But surely Aninuth [bereavement] has previously fallen upon him!⁷ Again, if he died after midday, ‘[if] his son is not registered with him, he must bring it as a peace-offering’? — But midday has stamped it?⁸

Said Rabbah: In truth it is meant where he died before midday, and what does ‘he must bring it as a Passover-offering’ mean? He must bring it for the second Passover.⁹ Abaye said, It is taught disjunctively: If he died after midday, [and] his son is registered with him, he must bring it for the sake of a Passover. If he died before midday, [and] his son is not registered with him, he must bring it as a peace-offering. R. Sherabia said: In truth it means where he died after midday, the case being e.g., where his father was in a dying condition at midday.¹⁰ R. Ashi said: In truth it means that he died after midday,¹¹ this being in accordance with R. Simeon, who maintained: Live animals cannot be [permanently] rejected.¹² Rabina said: [It means] e.g., where he set it aside after midday and its owner died after midday, and he holds: [only] midday establishes it .¹³

MISHNAH. IF A PASSOVER-OFFERING BECAME MIXED UP WITH OTHER SACRIFICES, ALL MUST BE LEFT TO GRAZE UNTIL THEY BECOME UNFIT [THROUGH A BLEMISH], THEN BE SOLD, AND FOR THE PRICE OF THE BEST ONE MUST PURCHASE [AN ANIMAL] OF EACH DENOMINATION, AND MAKE UP¹⁴ THE EXCESS FROM ONE'S PRIVATE PURSE.¹⁵ IF IT BECAME MIXED UP WITH FIRSTLINGS,¹⁶ -R. SIMEON SAID: IF [THE PASSOVER-OFFERING BELONGED TO] A COMPANY OF PRIESTS, THEY EAT [ALL ON THAT NIGHT].¹⁷

(1) As now there are none registered for it.

(2) As here: the animal being rejected from its original purpose, viz., a Passover-offering, it remains ineligible even for a peace-offering, for which it is fit, but must graze. There is an opposing view in Yoma 63b, and quoted infra, that only a dead animal can be rejected permanently.

(3) This animal was not eligible for its purpose from the very outset. There is an opposing view in Suk. 33b that an animal can be permanently rejected only if it was originally eligible.

(4) Since this animal is unfit for a Passover-offering, it was sanctified from the very outset only for its value, viz., that its redemption money should be expended on a sacrifice. Nevertheless it becomes permanently ineligible for the altar.

(5) I.e., on the first of the Intermediate Days.

(6) P. 288, n. 3.

(7) Before the obligation of the Passover, which commences at midday. It is stated supra 91a that the Passover must not be sacrificed on behalf of an Onen (v. Glos.) by himself, whereas the present passage implies that he brings it himself, even when he is not registered with others.

(8) As a Passover, and since it cannot be sacrificed as such it remains rejected and cannot be offered itself, as supra 96b ff.

(9) If he did not keep the first through his bereavement.

(10) Hence if his son was registered with him, he must bring it as a Passover, since that obligation preceded his bereavement. But if his son was not registered with him, he must bring it as a peace-offering, for since his father was already in a dying condition, midday did not establish it as a Passover-offering.

(11) But was not necessarily dying at midday.

(12) Save when they become actually unfit, e.g., if they receive a blemish or are given as a harlot's hire (v. Deut. XXIII, 19).

(13) But not the rest of the time allotted for its slaughtering. Hence it has not been established and therefore it cannot be rejected. Consequently, if his son was not registered with him, he must bring it as a peace-offering.

(14) Lit., ‘lose’.

(15) Lit., ‘house’. Thus: if three lambs of unequal value, one dedicated for a Passover-offering, another for a guilt-offering, and the third for a burnt-offering, became mixed up, they must all be sold. Since the best may have been any of the three sacrifices, he must buy an animal for each sacrifice at the cost of the best; naturally he will need more than they realized, and he must make that up himself.-Instead of ‘he must lose’ there is a variant: ‘and he must set aside’.

(16) Which are offered in the same way as Passover-offerings, viz., the blood of both is sprinkled in the same way, and neither require the waving of the breast and shoulder, nor laying of the hands, nor libations.

(17) Stipulating at the time of slaughtering: ‘Whichever is the Passover-offering, we sacrifice it as such, and whichever is the firstling, we offer it as such’.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Pesachim 98b

GEMARA. But he brings sacrifices to the place of unfitness?¹ — R. Simeon is consistent with his view, for he maintains: One may bring sacrifices to the place of unfitness.² For we learned: If a guilt-offering was mixed up with a peace-offering, — R. Simeon said: They must be slaughtered at the north [side of the altar]³ and eaten in accordance with [the laws of] the more stringent of them.⁴ Said they to him: One may not bring sacrifices to the place of unfitness.⁵ Now according to the Rabbis, what do we do?⁶ — Said Raba: We wait until they receive a blemish. Then he brings a choice animal and declares: ‘Wherever the Passover-offering may be,⁷ let it[s sanctity] be transferred to this one,’⁸ and he eats them In accordance with the laws of a blemished firstling.⁹

MISHNAH. IF A COMPANY LOST THEIR PASCHAL SACRIFICE AND INSTRUCTED ONE [OF THEIR NUMBER], ‘GO AND SEEK IT, AND SLAUGHTER IT ON OUR BEHALF’; AND HE WENT, FOUND, AND SLAUGHTERED IT, WHILE THEY [ALSO] TOOK AN ANIMAL AND SLAUGHTERED [IT]: IF HIS WAS SLAUGHTERED FIRST, HE EATS OF HIS AND THEY EAT WITH HIM.¹⁰ WHILE IF THEIRS WAS FIRST SLAUGHTERED, THEY EAT OF THEIRS,¹¹ WHILE HE EATS OF HIS.¹² BUT IF IT IS UNKNOWN WHICH OF THEM WAS FIRST SLAUGHTERED, OR IF THEY KILLED BOTH OF THEM AT THE SAME TIME, HE EATS OF HIS, BUT THEY MAY NOT EAT WITH HIM;¹³ WHILE THEIRS GOES FORTH TO THE PLACE OF BURNING,¹⁴ AND THEY ARE EXEMPT FROM KEEPING THE SECOND PASSOVER.¹⁵ IF HE SAID TO THEM, IF I DELAY, GO FORTH AND SLAUGHTER ON MY BEHALF,¹⁶ [AND] THEN HE WENT AND FOUND AND SLAUGHTERED [IT], WHILE THEY TOOK [ANOTHER] AND SLAUGHTERED [IT], IF THEIRS WAS SLAUGHTERED FIRST, THEY EAT OF THEIRS WHILE HE EATS WITH THEM.¹⁷ WHILE IF HIS WAS SLAUGHTERED FIRST,

HE EATS OF HIS¹⁸ AND THEY EAT OF THEIRS.¹⁹ BUT IF IT IS UNKNOWN WHICH OF THEM WAS SLAUGHTERED FIRST, OR IF THEY SLAUGHTERED BOTH OF THEM AT THE SAME TIME, THEY EAT OF THEIRS, BUT HE MAY NOT EAT WITH THEM, WHILE HIS OWN GOES FORTH TO THE PLACE OF BURNING, AND HE IS EXEMPT FROM KEEPING THE SECOND PASSOVER.²⁰ IF HE INSTRUCTED THEM, AND THEY INSTRUCTED HIM,²¹ THEY MUST ALL EAT OF THE FIRST [TO BE SLAUGHTERED],²² AND IF IT IS UNKNOWN WHICH OF THEM WAS SLAUGHTERED FIRST, BOTH GO FORTH TO THE PLACE OF BURNING.²³ IF HE DID NOT INSTRUCT THEM AND THEY DID NOT INSTRUCT HIM,²⁴ THEY ARE NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR EACH OTHER.²⁵ IF THE PASCHAL SACRIFICES OF TWO COMPANIES BECOME MIXED UP, THESE TAKE POSSESSION OF ONE [ANIMAL] AND THOSE TAKE POSSESSION OF ONE. ONE MEMBER OF THESE JOINS THOSE, AND ONE MEMBER OF THOSE JOINS THESE, AND THEY DECLARE THUS:²⁶ IF THIS PASCHAL SACRIFICE IS OURS, YOUR HANDS ARE WITHDRAWN FROM YOUR OWN AND YOU ARE REGISTERED FOR OURS; WHILE IF THIS PASCHAL SACRIFICE IS YOURS,²⁷ OUR HANDS ARE WITHDRAWN FROM OURS AND WE ARE REGISTERED FOR YOURS.²⁸ SIMILARLY, IF THERE ARE FIVE COMPANIES CONSISTING OF FIVE MEMBERS EACH OR OF TEN EACH, THEY DRAW ONE FROM EACH COMPANY TO THEMSELVES AND MAKE THE FOREGOING DECLARATION.²⁹ IF THE PASCHAL SACRIFICES BELONGING TO TWO [SINGLE INDIVIDUALS] BECOME MIXED UP, EACH TAKES POSSESSION OF ONE [ANIMAL]; THIS ONE REGISTERS A STRANGER³⁰ WITH HIMSELF AND THAT ONE REGISTERS A STRANGER WITH HIMSELF.³¹ THE FORMER GOES OVER TO THE LATTER SACRIFICE AND THE LATTER GOES OVER TO THE FORMER SACRIFICE, AND THEY [I.E., EACH OWNER] DECLARE THUS: IF THIS PASCHAL SACRIFICE IS MINE, YOUR HANDS ARE WITHDRAWN FROM YOUR OWN AND YOU

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

ARE REGISTERED FOR MINE; WHILE IF THIS PASCHAL SACRIFICE IS YOURS, MY HANDS ARE WITHDRAWN FROM MINE AND I AM REGISTERED FOR YOURS.’³²

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: if he instructed them and they instructed him, they must [all] eat of the first. If he did not instruct them and they did not instruct him, they are not responsible for each other.³³

(1) This difficulty arises on R. Simeon's ruling. A firstling may be eaten two days and the night in between, whereas the Passover-offering may be eaten only on the first night. Thus if it is not eaten by morning he must burn it as Nothar (v. Glos.), whereas it is actually still fit.

(2) In such a case, rather than let them graze until they receive a blemish, which is the only alternative.

(3) The side prescribed for the slaughtering of a guilt-offering. Peace-offerings could be slaughtered on any side of the Temple Court.

(4) I.e., as guilt-offerings, viz., during one day and a night only, within the Temple precincts, and by male priests.-A peace-offering is eaten two days and one night, anywhere in Jerusalem, and by Israelites as well as priests.

(5) But they must be left to graze until blemished.

(6) When a Passover-offering is mixed up with a firstling. When it is mixed up with a burnt-offering or guilt-offering, or when a peace-offering is mixed up with a guilt-offering, the expedient stated in the Mishnah is possible. But a firstling, even when blemished, cannot be redeemed in the sense that it becomes Hullin but must be eaten by a priest with its blemish; while on the other hand when a Passover-offering receives a blemish, it must be redeemed and may not be eaten otherwise.

(7) I.e., whichever of these two animals is the Passover.

(8) Thus whichever is the Passover-offering is redeemed.

(9) These are: it may not be slaughtered or sold in the ordinary abattoir, nor weighed with the ordinary weights. These restrictions do not apply to a redeemed Passover-offering, and would not apply here if he knew which it was.

(10) By instructing him to slaughter it on their behalf they become registered for his and cannot register for another after the first was slaughtered. Hence their own is unfit and must be burnt.

(11) By slaughtering their own first they ipso facto cancelled their registration for the original, which is permissible, v. supra 89a.

(12) But not of theirs, since he had not registered with them.

(13) Lest their own was slaughtered first, whereby they had cancelled their registration for his.

(14) For his may have been killed first; v. n. 4.

(15) Because they were certainly registered for one animal at the first Passover, while the eating is not indispensable.

(16) But they did not instruct him to slaughter the lost animal on their behalf.

(17) While his own must be burnt, for according to his instructions he was now registered for theirs; hence his is unfit, having none registered for it.

(18) Cf. p. 528, n. 5.

(19) For they were not registered for his, since they had not instructed him to slaughter it on their behalf.

(20) Cf. p. 528, n. 9.

(21) He instructed them to slaughter on his behalf if he delayed, and they instructed him to slaughter on their behalf if he found the lost animal.

(22) For which they are all automatically registered now.

(23) Each must thus go forth lest it was slaughtered last and had none registered for it.

(24) To slaughter on each other's behalf.

(25) Each party eats of its own, whatever the order of their slaughtering.

(26) Each company declares thus to the newcomer.

(27) I.e., it belongs to your first company.

(28) One of each company must join the other, for otherwise each company would have to withdraw en masse from their own, if it had been taken by the second, thus leaving it momentarily entirely without owners, and this is forbidden.

(29) Each company consists of four new members and one original member. The latter (or all the original members, where each company consisted of more than five) makes the foregoing declaration to each new member in turn.

(30) Lit., ‘a man from the street’.

(31) Thus there are now two registered persons for each sacrifice.

(32) The general reasoning is the same as in the previous cases.

(33) Thus in the first case one animal must be destroyed, whatever happens, while in the second both are eaten.

Pesachim 99a

Hence the Sages said: Silence is better for the wise, and how much more so for fools, as it is said, Even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise.¹

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

IF THE PASCHAL SACRIFICES BELONGING TO TWO [SINGLE PERSONS] BECOME MIXED UP, etc. Shall we say that our Mishnah does not agree with R. Judah? For it was taught: And if the household be too little for a lamb:² this teaches that they may go on decreasing [their numbers] ,³ providing, however, that one of them remains:⁴ this is R. Judah's view. R. Jose said: Providing that they do not leave the Paschal sacrifice as it is!⁵ — Said R. Johanan: You may even say [that it agrees with] R. Judah. Since R. Judah said, One may not slaughter the Passover-offering for a single person, then from the outset he stood to register another with himself, and he [the newly-registered person] is accounted as one of the [original] members of the company.

R. Ashi said: Our Mishnah too proves this, for it teaches, SIMILARLY, IF THERE ARE FIVE COMPANIES CONSISTING OF FIVE MEMBERS EACH: thus, only of five [each], but not [if some consist] of five and [others of] four; is not[the reason] because one of the [original] members of the company does not remain with it?⁶ This proves it.

(1) Prov. XVII, 28.

(2) Ex. XII, 4.

(3) V. supra p.474, n. 3.

(4) For 'if it be too few' implies that someone at least is registered for it.

(5) Without owners. Now R. Judah must mean that one of the persons who originally registered for it, when the animal was first set aside for a Passover-offering, must remain registered for it, while in R. Jose's opinion it is sufficient that someone remains, even if he is not of those who originally registered for it. For if R. Judah's view is not as stated, it does not differ in any way from R. Jose's. But in the Mishnah, when A, the only original owner of one of the sacrifices, declares, 'If this animal is not mine, I withdraw from the other and register for this', the other is left without anyone who first registered for it, since A is the only original owner.

(6) If it consisted of less than five, and one joins each other's company. For if it were unnecessary for all original member to remain, the Mishnah could teach that whatever the number of original members, each company increases itself to five and then does as stated.

Pesachim 99b

CHAPTER X

MISHNAH. ON THE EVE OF PASSOVER¹ CLOSE TO MINHAH² A MAN MUST NOT EAT UNTIL NIGHTFALL. EVEN THE POOREST MAN IN ISRAEL MUST NOT EAT [ON THE NIGHT OF PASSOVER] UNTIL HE RECLINES;³ AND THEY⁴ SHOULD GIVE HIM NOT LESS THAN FOUR CUPS [OF WINE],⁵ AND EVEN [IF HE RECEIVES RELIEF] FROM THE CHARITY PLATE.⁶

GEMARA. Why particularly THE EVE OF PASSOVER? Even the eves of Sabbaths and Festivals too [are subject to this law]? For it was taught: A man must not eat on the eves of Sabbaths and Festivals from Minhah and onward, so that he may enter [i.e., commence] the Sabbath with an appetite [for food]: [these are] the words of R. Judah. R. Jose said: He may go on eating until nightfall! — Said R. Huna: This [our Mishnah] is necessary only on the view of R. Jose, who said: He may go on eating until nightfall: that is only on the eves of Sabbaths and [other] Festivals; but with respect to the eve of Passover he agrees [with R. Judah], because of the duty of [eating] unleavened bread.⁷

R. Papa said: You may even say [that it must be taught on] R. Judah[’s view too]: there, on the eve of Sabbaths and Festivals, it is forbidden only from Minhah and after, but close to Minhah it is permitted; whereas on the eve of Passover it is forbidden even close to Minhah too. Now is it permitted just before Minhah on the eve of the Sabbath and Festivals? Surely it was taught: A man must not eat on the eve of the Sabbath or Festivals from nine hours and onwards, in order that he may enter the Sabbath with an appetite: [these are] the words of R. Judah.

R. Jose said: He may go on eating until nightfall? — Said Mar Zutra: Who is to tell us that this is authentic?

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(1) Lit., 'on the eve of Passovers'. Tosaf. suggests that this may mean either on the eve when Passover-offerings are sacrificed, or on the eve of the first and second Passovers. But there is a variant reading ON THE EVES OF PASSOVER, the whole being in the plural; its meaning will then be on the eve of (every) Passover, as translated in the text, Heb. often using the plural in this way.

(2) V. Glos.; i.e., from just before Minhah.

(3) As a sign of freedom, this being the practice in ancient days.

(4) Rashbam and Tosaf.: the charity overseers.

(5) Which every Jew must drink on the night of Passover. These correspond to the four expressions of redemption employed in Ex. VI, 6f: I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will deliver you from their bondage, and I will redeem you with an outstretched arm, and with great judgments; and I will take you to me for a people (commentaries and Jerusalemi).

(6) Tamhuy, daily distributed food collected from contributors, soup kitchen (Jast.). This was available only to the poorest of the poor, for he who had enough even for two meals only might not receive from the Tamhuy (Pe'ah VIII, 7); even such must drink four cups of wine on the night of Passover.

(7) For since the eating of unleavened bread on the first night of Passover is compulsory (v. Ex. XII, 18) it is unfitting that should be eaten when one is already satisfied.

(8) I.e., about three p.m., whereas Minhah time was nine and a half hours, about half past three p.m., two and a half hours before nightfall.

Pesachim 100a

Perhaps it is a corrupted version.¹ Said Meremar to him — others state, R. Yemar; I visited the session of R. Phinehas the son of R. Ammi, and a Tanna arose and recited it² before him and he accepted it [as correct]. If so, there is a difficulty? Hence it is clearly [to be explained] as R. Huna.³ Yet is it satisfactory according to R. Huna? Surely R. Jeremiah said in R. Johanan's name—others state, R. Abbahu said in the name of R. Jose b. R. Hanina — : The Halachah is as R. Judah in respect to the eve of Passover, and the Halachah is as R. Jose in respect to the eve of the Sabbath. 'The Halachah is as R. Judah in respect to the eve of Passover,

whence it follows that R. Jose disagrees on both?⁴ — No: 'The Halachah [etc.]' proves that they disagree in respect to interruption. For it was taught: One must interrupt [the meal] for the Sabbath:⁵ this is R. Judah's ruling.

R. Jose said: One need not interrupt [the meal].⁶ And it once happened that R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, R. Judah and R. Jose were dining⁷ at Acco, when the day became holy upon them.⁸ Said R. Simeon b. Gamaliel to R. Jose: 'Berabbi,⁹ is it your wish that we interrupt [our meal] and pay heed to the words of our colleague Judah?' Said he to him: 'Every [other] day you prefer my words to those of R. Judah, whereas now you prefer R. Judah's words in my very presence — "will he even force the queen before me in my house"?'¹⁰ 'If so,' he rejoined, 'we will not interrupt [the meal], lest the disciples see it and establish the Halachah [thus] for all time.'¹¹ It was related: They did not stir thence until they had established the Halachah as R. Jose.

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The Halachah is neither as R. Judah¹² nor as R. Jose,¹³ but one must spread a cloth¹⁴ and sanctify [the day].¹⁵ But that is not so, for R. Tahlifa b. Abdimi said in Samuel's name: Just as one must interrupt [the meal] for Kiddush,

(1) This Baraitha contradicts the previous one, and there is nothing to show that this is more correct, particularly as the latter agrees with the Mishnah as explained above.

(2) The second Baraitha: from nine hours.

(3) Hence 'from Minhah' in the first Baraitha means just before nightfall, and thus the Mishnah and both Baraithas are in agreement.

(4) Whereas in R. Huna's view R. Jose agrees in respect of Passover eve.

(5) The Heb. is in the plural: Sabbaths. I.e., if one started eating before the Sabbath, he must interrupt the meal when the Sabbath commences, remove the table and recite grace (the table was generally removed before grace, v. Ber. 42a), then recite Kiddush, the prayer of sanctification, and proceed as with a new meal. According to a version infra 100b, the table was removed before Kiddush, which then preceded grace (Tosaf.).

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(6) But he completes the meal, recites grace, and then Kiddush. Now when R. Jeremiah states that the Halachah is as R. Judah in respect to Passover eve, whence it follows that R. Jose disagrees there too, this disagreement is likewise in reference to interrupting the meal, R. Jose maintaining that even on the eve of Passover he need not interrupt it once he has commenced (i.e., if he commenced at the permitted time — Rashbam and Tosaf). But he admits that a man must not commence a meal in the first place shortly before Minhah, and that is the meaning of the Mishnah too.

(7) Lit., ‘reclining’.

(8) I.e., the Sabbath or festival commenced.

(9) A title of honor, v. Naz., Sonc. ed. p. 64, n. 1.

(10) Esth. VII, 8; i.e., will you shame me in my own presence?

(11) Lit., ‘for generations’.

(12) Who maintains that one must interrupt the meal, which implies that the table must be removed.

(13) Who ruled that no interruption whatsoever is required.

(14) Which hides the table so that it is not there, as it were.

(15) By reciting Kiddush.

Pesachim 100b

so must one interrupt it for Habdalah.¹ Now what does ‘one must interrupt’ mean: surely by removing the table?² — No: by [spreading] a cloth.

Rabbah b. R. Huna visited the Resh Galutha.³ When a tray [with food] was placed before him, he spread a cloth and sanctified [the day].⁴ It was taught likewise: And they both agree that⁵ one must not bring the tables unless one has recited kiddush;⁷ but if it was brought, a cloth is spread [over it]⁸ and Kiddush is recited.⁹ One [Baraitha] taught: Both¹⁰ agree that one must not commence;¹¹ while another taught: And both agree that one may commence. As to what was taught, ‘and both agree that one must not commence, it is well: that holds good on the eve of Passover.¹² But as to the statement, ‘And both agree that one may commence,’ when [is that]? If we say, on the eve of the Sabbath, — but surely they differ? — There is no difficulty: here it means before nine [hours]; there, after nine [hours].¹³ As for people who have sanctified [the day] in the synagogue,¹⁴

Rab said: They have not done their duty in respect of wine,¹⁵ but they have done their duty in respect of kiddush.¹⁶ But Samuel maintained:

(1) V. Glos.

(2) Thus the mere spreading of a cloth is insufficient.

(3) Exilarch, the official head of Babylonian Jewry.

(4) It was at the beginning of the meal, the Sabbath having commenced.

(5) Rashbam is inclined to delete this phrase. If retained, it refers to R. Judah and R. Jose (Tosaf. and one alternative in Rashbam): though’ they differ as to whether the meal must be interrupted, they agree where it has not yet begun.

(6) Small tables were set for each person separately; these were brought in for the meal and removed when it was finished.

(7) So that the table is then brought in honor of the Sabbath. Nevertheless it was laid before the Sabbath.

(8) Cf. p. 534, n. 9.

(9) This expedient is adopted nowadays that large tables are used, as it would be too troublesome to bring them in after Kiddush.

(10) R. Judah and R. Jose, who disagree in respect of commencing a meal on the eve of the Sabbath just before Minhah and also in respect of interrupting a meal at nightfall, if it was begun well before Minhah.

(11) A meal from Minhah and onwards.

(12) As R. Huna Supra 99b.

(13) There is no controversy in respect to the former.

(14) I.e., who have listened to the Kiddush recited by the Reader.

(15) If they wish to drink wine at home, they must recite the benediction for wine. Even if they drank wine in the synagogue, over which a benediction had been recited, that does not exempt them, at home, for the change of place breaks the continuity and renders this drinking a new act.

(16) And as far as they are concerned they need not repeat the Kiddush at home.

Pesachim 101a

They have not done their duty in respect of Kiddush either. Then according to Rab, why he [the Reader] recite Kiddush at home? — In order to acquit his children and his household [of their duty]. And [according to] Samuel, why must he recite Kiddush in the synagogue?¹ — In order to acquit travelers of

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

their obligation, for they eat, drink, and sleep in the synagogue.² Now Samuel is consistent with his view, for Samuel said: Kiddush is [valid] only where the meal is eaten. From this it was understood [by the disciples] that only [to adjourn] from one house to another [is forbidden],³ but [to adjourn] from one place to another in the same house is not [forbidden]. Said R. ‘Anan b. Tahlifa to them: On many occasions I was standing before Samuel, when he descended from the roof to the ground and then recited [again] kiddush.⁴

Now R. Huna too holds that Kiddush is [valid] only where the meal is eaten. For [on one occasion] R. Huna recited Kiddush and [then] his lamp was upset, whereupon he carried his utensils into the marriage chamber [baldachin] of his son Rabbah, where a lamp was [burning] recited Kiddush [again], and then ate something, which proves that he holds: Kiddush is [valid] only where the meal is eaten.

Now Rabbah too holds: Kiddish is [valid] only where the meal is eaten. For Abaye said: When I was at the Master's [sc. Rabbah's] house,⁵ and he recited Kiddush, he would say to us: ‘Eat a little [here], lest by the time you reach your lodgings your lamps become upset, and you do not recite Kiddush in the house where you eat, while you will not have discharged [your duty] with the Kiddush of this place, because Kiddush is [valid] only where the meal is eaten. But that is not so, for surely

Abaye said: In all matters the Master [sc. Rabbah] acted in accordance with Rab, except these three, where he did as Samuel: [viz.,] one may light from lamp to lamp;⁶ one can detach [the fringes] from one garment for [insertion in] another garment;⁷ and the Halachah is as R. Simeon in respect to dragging. For it was taught, R. Simeon said: A man may drag a bed, seat, or bench,⁸ providing that he does not intend to make a rut!⁹ — He acted upon Rab's stringent

rulings,¹⁰ but he did not act upon Rab's lenient rulings.

But R. Johanan maintained: They have done their duty in respect of wine too.¹¹ Now R. Johanan is consistent with his view, for R. Hanin b. Abaye said in the name of R. Pedath in R. Johanan's name: Both for a change of wine

- (1) Seeing that one's duty is not fulfilled thereby in any case.
- (2) Not actually in the synagogue, but in adjoining rooms (Tosaf. on the basis of Meg. 28a). Hence the synagogue is like home to them.
- (3) After Kiddush, since the meal must be eaten in the same place.
- (4) V. R. Hananel. Proving that you must not adjourn from one place to another even in the same house.
- (5) Abaye was an orphan, and brought up in Rabbah's house.
- (6) One may kindle one Hanukkah lamp from another.
- (7) V. Num. XV, 38.
- (8) Over an earthen floor on the Sabbath or festival.
- (9) Though the dragging will possibly make one. — Why then does he rule as Samuel in respect to Kiddush?
- (10) That was the general rule stated by Abaye, the three exceptions all being leniencies, where he acted as Samuel.
- (11) This refers back to 100b bottom. Having heard the benediction for wine in the synagogue, they do not repeat the benediction at home, for in R. Johanan's view their departure from the synagogue does not break the continuity, as they are regarded as having had their mind set upon the meal and the wine from when they heard Kiddush.

Pesachim 101b

and for a change of place, he need not recite the benediction [again].¹

An objection is raised: [For] a change of place, he must recite the benediction [again]; for a change of wine, he need not recite the benediction [again]? This refutation of R. Johanan is [indeed] a refutation.

R. Idi b. Abin sat before R. Hisda, while R. Hisda sat and said in R. Huna's name: As to

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

what you said, [for] a change of place he must recite the benediction [again], they taught this only [of a change] from one house to another, but not from one place to another place.²

Said R. Idi b. Abin to him: We have learnt it thus in the Baraitha of the School of R. Henak — others state, in the School of Bar Henak — in accordance with your ruling. Does then R. Huna teach us a Baraitha?³ — R. Huna had not heard the Baraitha.⁴

Furthermore, R. Hisda sat and said in his own name: As to what you said: For a change of place he must recite the benediction [again], we said this only of things which do not require a benediction after them in the same place;⁵ but for the things which demand a blessing after them in the same place, he need not recite the benediction [again]. What is the reason? He [mentally] returns to the first appointed place.⁶ But R. Shesheth maintained: Both for the one and the other he must recite the benediction [again].

An objection is raised: If the members of a company were reclining to drink, and they [precipitately] arose⁷ to go out to welcome a bridegroom or a bride, when they go out, they do not need [to recite] a benediction beforehand;⁸ when they return, they do not need [to recite] a benediction at the beginning.⁹ When is that? If they left an old man or an invalid there;¹⁰ but if they did not leave an old man or an invalid there, when they go out they need [to recite] a benediction beforehand, [and] when they return they need a benediction at the beginning. Now since he teaches, ‘they [precipitately] arose,’ it follows that we are treating of things which require a blessing after them in the same place,¹¹ and it is only because they left an old man or an invalid there that when they go out they do not need a benediction beforehand, and when they return they do not need a benediction at the beginning. But if they did not leave an old man or an invalid there, when they go out they need a blessing

beforehand and when they return they need a blessing at the beginning: this is a difficulty according to R. Hisda? —

Said R. Nahman b. Isaac:

(1) If a man recites a blessing for wine and drinks, and the more wine is brought from a different barrel, even if the second is of a different quality, he does not repeat the blessing; similarly, if he recites a blessing over food or drink and then continues his meal elsewhere. Hence the same applies here. — Where a man need not recite a blessing, he may not recite, as a blessing must not be recited where there is no obligation.

(2) In the same house, e.g., from one room to another.

(3) Surely it is superfluous!

(4) Rashbam deletes both the question and the answer, as it is quite usual for an Amora to state what is taught in the Baraitha.

(5) Where they are eaten, Rashbam: sc. water or fruit. After everything else, however, (i.e., wine, the seven species enumerated in Deut. VIII, 8, bread, and the five species of grain enumerated in the Mishnah Supra 35a) a blessing in the nature of grace must be recited where it is consumed. Tosaf.: after everything except bread and perhaps also the five species of grain a blessing need not be recited where they are eaten.

(6) Since these things must be followed by a blessing in the place where they are consumed, even when he changes his place he keeps the first in mind, so that his eating in both places should be as one act of eating, the subsequent blessing being for what he ate in both. Consequently, he does not recite a blessing before eating in the second place either.

(7) Lit., ‘detached their feet’.

(8) I.e., the blessing after wine, since it is their Intention to return.

(9) When they drink afresh.

(10) Which assures that their departure is only an interruption.

(11) ‘They detached their feet’ implies that they hurried, on account of the bridegroom or bride, but otherwise they would have remained there, in order to recite the benediction before leaving. — According to Tosaf. (p. 538, n. 3) ‘to drink must be omitted from the Baraitha, since in their view no beverage, not even wine, is subject to this rule.

Pesachim 102a

Which Tanna [rules thus on precipitate] rising? R. Judah. For it was taught: If companions were reclining, and they

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

[precipitately] arose to go to the synagogue or to the Beth Hamidrash, when they go out they do not need a blessing beforehand, and when they return they do not need a blessing at the beginning.

Said R. Judah: When is that said? When they left some of their companions behind. But if they did not leave some of their companions behind, when they go out they need a blessing beforehand, and when they return they need a blessing at the beginning. Then [make an opposite deduction]: it is only because they are things which need a blessing in the same place that when they go out they do not need a blessing beforehand and when they return they do not need a blessing at the beginning. But for things which do not need a blessing in the same place, even on the view of the Rabbis, when they go out they need a blessing beforehand and when they return they need a blessing at the beginning: shall we say that this is a refutation of R. Johanan[‘s ruling]?¹—

But have we not [already] refuted him once? Shall we [then] say that from this too there is a refutation?-[No:] R. Johanan can answer you: The same law holds good that even for things which do not require a blessing after them in the same place it is unnecessary to recite a blessing [afresh], but as to why he teaches, ‘They [precipitately] arose,’ that is to inform you the extent² of R. Judah[‘s view], [viz.,] that even for things which require a blessing after them in the same place, it is only because they left some companions behind [that these additional blessings are not recited]; but if they did not leave some companions behind, when they go out they need a blessing beforehand, and when they return they need a blessing at the beginning. It was taught in accordance with R. Hisda: If companions were reclining to drink wine and they arose [departed] and returned, they need not recite a blessing [anew].³

Our Rabbis taught: If members of a company were reclining when the day

became holy upon them,⁴ a cup of wine is brought to one of them and he recites over it the sanctity of the day [i.e., Kiddush], and a second [cup is brought] over which he recites the Grace after meals:⁵ these are the words of R. Judah. R. Jose said: he goes on eating until nightfall.⁶

(1) V. supra 101b top that for a change of place no fresh blessing is required under any circumstances.

(2) Lit., ‘strength’.

(3) V. supra p. 538, n. 3. According to Rashbam the proof is obvious. On the view of Tosaf. ‘to drink wine’ must be deleted, the reference being to bread or the five pieces of grain.

(4) I.e., the sun set ushering in the Sabbath or Festival.

(5) Immediately, without waiting to finish the meal. Nevertheless, since the Sabbath has commenced, he must first recite the Kiddush and then Grace. Hence if he wishes to eat more after Grace, he must begin a new meal.

(6) He need not interrupt his meal but may continue until the end.

Pesachim 102b

When they finish [their meal], he recites the Grace after meals over the first cup and the sanctity of the day over the second. Yet why so: let us recite both over one cup?¹ — Said R. Huna in R. Shesheth's name: One may not recite two sanctities over the same cup.² What is the reason?

Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: Because you may not perform religious duties in wholesale fashion.³ Yet [may you] not? Surely it was taught: He who enters his house at the termination of the Sabbath, recites blessings over the wine, the light and the spices,⁴ and then recites Habdalah over the cup [of wine].⁵ But if he has one cup only, he leaves it until after the meal⁶ and he recites them all together after it?⁷ — Where he has not [enough,] it is different. But on the Festival which falls after the Sabbath, though he has [wine] ,⁸ yet Rab said: [The order is] Yaknah.⁹ —

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

I will tell you: Since he [Rab] did not include 'the season' [Zeman],¹⁰ it follows that we are discussing the seventh day of Passover,¹¹ by which time he has consumed all that he had and has one more. But on the first day of the Festival he has [wine], yet Abaye said: [The order is] Yakzanah; while Raba said: [The order is] Yaknehaz?¹² — But Habdalah and Kiddush constitute one observance,¹³ [whereas] the Grace after meals and Kiddush are two [distinct observances]. [To turn to] the [main] text: When a Festival falls after the Sabbath, Rab said: [The order is] Yahnah;¹⁴ Samuel said: [The order is] Yanhak;¹⁵

(1) The difficulty is on R. Jose's view only. But on R. Judah's, since the meal must be interrupted and the table removed, it is natural that two separate cups should be required for Kiddush and Grace.

(2) Grace is here designated a 'sanctity': i.e., Grace and Kiddush are two distinct religious duties, and therefore they require separate cups.

(3) Lit., 'bundles'. I.e., each requires separate attention.

(4) As is done at the termination of the Sabbath. Kiddush and Habdalah are both recited over wine; a blessing is pronounced over light because it is then that light was created, v. Supra 54a; spices are inhaled on the termination of the Sabbath to compensate for the loss of the superior ('additional') soul with which man is endowed on the Sabbath, Rashbam and Tosaf. a.l. and in Bez. 33b.

(5) Habdalah, being longer, is left to the last.

(6) Or perhaps, 'until after grace', מזון being elliptical for ברכת המזון.

(7) Lit., 'he chains them together after it'. Thus two religious acts are combined.

(8) This is assumed to refer to the first evening of Passover, when, as stated supra 99b, even the poorest man was provided with four cups of wine.

(9) This is a mnemonic: Y == Yayin (wine); K == Kiddush; N == Ner (light, i.e., a blessing over light); and H == Habdalah thus Kiddush and Habdalah are both recited over the same cup.

(10) The benediction 'who hast kept us alive and preserved us and enabled us to reach this season'. This is recited on the first night (in the Diaspora on the first two nights) of every Festival, as well is in certain other occasions.

(11) Kiddush must be recited then too, as it follows the Intermediate Days, which are only semi-sacred; v. p. 16, n. 4; again, if it follows the Sabbath, Habdalah also is recited.

(12) V.n. 6. Z == Zeman ('season').

(13) Both being recited on account of the sanctity of the Festival, to which reference is made even in the Habdalah (14) Wine is first, in accordance with Beth Hillel's view in Ber. 51b that since wine is more constant it takes precedence. Kiddush precedes Habdalah because it is regarded as more important; also, if he recited Habdalah first, it might appear that the Sabbath were a burden to him, which he desired to end at the earliest possible moment. After Kiddush the order is NH ('light' and Habdalah), this being the usual order at the conclusion of the Sabbath.

(15) Samuel gives precedence to Habdalah over Kiddush; the reason is stated infra 103a in the illustration on the ruling of R. Joshua b. Hananiah.

Pesachim 103a

Rabbah said: Yahnak;¹ Levi said: Kanyah;² the Rabbis said: Kiynah;³ 'Mar the son of Rabina said: Nakyah;⁴ Martha said in R. Joshua's name: Niyhak.⁵

Samuel's father sent to Rabbi: Let our Master teach us what is the order of habdaloth.⁶ He sent [back] to him: Thus did R. Ishmael b. R. Jose say, speaking in the name of his father who said it on the authority of R. Joshua b. Hananiah: [The order is] Nahiyk.⁷

R. Hanina said: R. Joshua b. Hananiah's [ruling] may be compared to a king who departs [from a place] and governor who enters: [first] you escort the king [out], and then you go forth to greet the governor.⁸ What is our decision thereon? — Abaye said: [The order is] Yakaznah;⁹ while Raba maintained: Yaknehaz.¹⁰ And the law is as Raba.

R. Huna b. Judah visited Raba's home. Light and spices were brought before them, [whereupon] Raba recited a blessing over the spices first and then one over the light. Said he to him: But both Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel [agree that] light comes first and then spices? And to what is this [allusion]? For we learned: Beth Shammai maintain. Light and Grace [after meals], spices and Habdalah;¹¹

PESACHIM – 87a-121b

while Beth Hillel rule: Light and spices, Grace and Habdalah!¹²

Thereat Raba answered: These are the words of R. Meir; but R. Judah said: Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel did not differ about Grace, [agreeing] that it comes at the beginning and about Habdalah, that it comes at the end. About what do they differ? About light and spices. Beth Shammai maintain: Light [first] and then spices; while Beth Hillel rule: Spices [first] and then light; and R. Johanan said [thereon]: The people act in accordance with Beth Hillel as interpreted by R. Judah.

R. Jacob b. Abba visited Raba's home. He saw him recite the blessings 'who create the fruit of the vine over the first cup, and then he recited a blessing over the cup of Grace¹³ and drank it. Said he to him: 'Why do you need all this? Surely, sir, you have [already] recited a blessing for us once?' 'When we were at the Resh Galutha's¹⁴ we did thus,' replied he. 'It is well that we did this at the Resh Galutha's,' said he, 'because there was a doubt whether they would bring us [more wine] or they would not bring us [more].¹⁵ But here, surely the [second] cup stands before us and we have it in mind?' 'I acted in accordance with Rab's disciples' he replied.

For R. Beruna and R. Hananel, disciples of Rab, were sitting at a meal,

(1) He agrees with Rab that Ner (light) interposes between Kiddush and Habdalah, because it is illogical to recite them consecutively, since they are mutually contradictory, as it were, Kiddush declaring that the day is sacred, whereas Habdalah declares that it is not as sacred as the Sabbath. He also agrees with Samuel that Habdalah comes before Kiddush, and he places wine (Yayin) at the head of all, for the reason stated on p. 541, n. 10.

(2) He too puts Kiddush before Habdalah, but holds that if wine is put at the beginning, the interval between it and Habdalah will be so great that it may appear that the Habdalah is not being recited over wine, which is essential. But Kiddush need not be in immediate proximity to the wine, since it may be recited over bread too. For that reason too Ner (light) precedes the wine, so that the latter may be nearer to Habdalah than to

Kiddush. — Rashbam transposes these last two views, mainly on the basis of J.T.

(3) They, too, place Kiddush before Habdalah. Hence we commence with Kiddush, and then recite Habdalah in its usual order, which is Yayin (wine), Ner (light) and Habdalah.

(4) He too places Kiddush before Habdalah, and also holds that wine must come near Habdalah. But just as Ner generally precedes Habdalah, because he enjoys the light first, so must it precede Kiddush. Again, it cannot be recited between wine and Habdalah, so that the wine should precede it, in accordance with the usual practice, because that would cause an interruption between the wine and the Habdalah.

(5) He places Habdalah before Kiddush for the reason stated anon. He then puts wine before Habdalah, for since that is immediately followed by Kiddush, the wine is accounted for both, which is as it should be. For both Kiddush and Habdalah should be recited over wine in the first place, though the former is permitted over bread where wine is not available. Again, he puts wine before Habdalah and Kiddush instead of between them, since wine generally precedes. Furthermore, since Ner generally precedes Habdalah, for the reason stated in the last note, it must now come at the very beginning.

(6) The pl. of Habdalah employed generically.

(7) V. preceding note. He however places wine between Habdalah and Kiddush, so that it should really be near to both.

(8) The Sabbath, whose sanctity is greater, is the king; the Festival is the governor. Hence we first bid farewell to the Sabbath with Habdalah and then welcome the Festival with Kiddush.

(9) Yayin (wine), Kiddush, Zeman (season), Ner (light) and Habdalah.

(10) Yayin, Kiddush, Ner, Habdalah, and Zeman.

(11) This order is followed at the conclusion of the Sabbath if there is sufficient for one cup only.

(12) V. Ber. 51b.

(13) He recited Grace after meals over a second cup, and after Grace he recited the blessing for wine over it. — This is the present practice.

(14) V. Glos.

(15) Hence when we recited a blessing over the first cup we did not think of a second, which therefore constituted a fresh act of drinking, and so the blessing had to be repeated.

Pesachim 103b

[and] R. Yeba Saba¹ waited on them. Said they to him, 'Give us [wine] and we will say Grace.' Subsequently² they said, 'Give us [wine] and we will drink.'³ Said he to them, 'Thus did Rab say: Once you have said,

PESACHIM – 87a-121b

"Give us [wine] and we will say Grace, It is forbidden to you to drink.⁴ What is the reason? Because you let it pass out of your minds."⁵

Amemar and Mar Zutra and R. Ashi were sitting at a meal and R. Aha the son of Raba waited on them. Amemar recited a separate blessing for each cup; Mar Zutra recited a blessing over the first cup and over the last cup;⁶ [but] R. Ashi recited a blessing over the first cup and no more.

Said R. Aha b. Raba to them: in accordance with whom are we to act?-Amemar replied: I made a [fresh] decision [each time] .⁷

Mar Zutra replied: I acted in accordance with Rab's disciples.

But R. Ashi maintained: The law is not as Rab's disciples for surely when a Festival falls after the Sabbath, Rab ruled: [The order is] Yaknah.⁸ But that is not so: there⁹ he had detached his mind from drinking;¹⁰ [whereas] here he had not detached his mind from drinking. When he came to perform Habdalah,¹¹ his attendant arose and kindled a torch at a lamp.¹²

Said he to him, 'Why take all this trouble? Surely the lamp is standing before us!'¹³ 'My servant has acted of his own accord,' replied he. 'Had he not heard it thus from you,'¹⁴ he retorted, 'he would not have done it.'

Said he to him: 'Do you then not hold, [To employ] a torch for Habdalah is the best way of performing the precept?' Then he commenced [Habdalah] and recited: 'He who makes a distinction between holy and non-holy, between light and darkness, between Israel and the nations, between the seventh day and the six working days.'

Said he to him: 'Why do you need all this? Surely Rab Judah said in Rab's name: "He who makes a distinction between holy and non-holy," was the formula of Habdalah as

recited by R. Judah ha-Nasi?' 'I hold with the following,' answered he. 'For R. Eleazar said in R. Oshaia's name: He who would recite but few [distinctions] must recite not less than three; while he who would add, must not add beyond seven.'¹⁵

Said he to him:

- (1) The elder; or, aged.
- (2) Before reciting Grace.
- (3) They changed their mind and did not wish to recite Grace yet.
- (4) Until after grace.
- (5) This proves that Grace constitutes an interruption, and so the blessing over the wine must be repeated after Grace; and Raba acted in accordance with this ruling.
- (6) I.e., after Grace, as Raba did.
- (7) After each cup I intended drinking, no more. Hence when I did drink another it was a new act of drinking, and so I repeated the blessing each time. Consequently my action does not involve a general ruling.
- (8) V. supra p. 541, n. 10. Thus the benediction for wine is not recited twice, one on account of Kiddush and again on account of Habdalah. Hence the same applies to two cups in general.
- (9) Where Rab ruled that once they had declared their intention of saying Grace they might not drink again without blessing.
- (10) His decision to say Grace proved that.
- (11) This is a continuation of the passage narrating .R. Jacob b. Aha's visit to Raba, which had been parenthetically interrupted by the somewhat similar story about Amemar and his companions. The meal in question took place toward the end of the Sabbath, and at the termination of the Sabbath Raba performed Habdalah.
- (12) For the blessing over light.
- (13) Then let the blessing for light be said over the lamp itself.
- (14) 'The Master'.
- (15) I.e., not less than three points of distinction and not more than seven must be recited in the Habdalah.

Pesachim 104a

'But you said neither three nor seven?'¹ 'It is true,' answered he, "'between the seventh day and the six working days" is of the nature of the conclusion,² and Rab Judah said Samuel's name: He who recites Habdalah must say [something] in the nature

PESOCCHIM – 87a-121b

of the conclusion near to its conclusion. While the Pumbeditheans maintain: [He must say something] in the nature of the commencement just before its conclusion. Wherein do they differ?³ —

They differ in respect of a Festival which falls after the Sabbath [i.e., Sunday], when we conclude with '[Who makest a distinction] between holy and holy.'⁴ On the view that something in the nature of the commencement [must be repeated] immediately before the conclusion, it will be unnecessary to say, 'Thou didst make a distinction between the sanctity of the Sabbath and the sanctity of the Festival';⁵ but on the view that [a formula] in the nature of the conclusion [must be said] immediately before the conclusion, it is necessary to say, 'Thou didst make a distinction between the sanctity of the Sabbath and the sanctity of the Festival.' The [above] text [stated]: 'R. Eleazer said in R. Oshaia's name: He who would recite but few [distinctions] must recite not less than three; while he who would add must not add beyond seven.'

An objection is raised: Habdalah is recited at the conclusion of the Sabbath, at the conclusion of Festivals, at the conclusion of the Day of Atonement, at the conclusion of the Sabbath [giving place] to a Festival, and at the conclusion of a Festival [giving place] to the Intermediary Days,⁶ but not at the conclusion of a Festival [leading] to the Sabbath.⁷ He who is well-versed recites many [points of distinction], while he who is not well-versed recites one? — It is [dependent on] Tannaim. For R. Johanan said: The son of holy men recited one, but the people are accustomed to recite three.⁸ Who is the son of holy men? — R. Menahem b. Simai; and why did they call him the son of holy men? Because he did not look at the effigy of a coin.⁹ R. Samuel b. Idi sent [word] to him:¹⁰ 'My brother Hanania recites one.' But the law does not agree with him. R. Joshua b. Levi said: he who recites Habdalah

must recite [formulas] in the nature of the distinctions mentioned in the Torah.¹¹

An objection is raised: What is the order of the distinctions [recited in the Habdalah]? He recites, 'Who makest a distinction between holy and profane, between light and darkness, between Israel and the nations, between the seventh day and the six working days, between unclean and clean, between the sea and dry land, between the upper waters and the nether waters, between Priests, Levites and Israelites'; and he concludes with the order of Creation.¹² Others say, with 'he who formed the Creation.'

R. Jose b. R. Judah said: He concludes, 'Who sanctifiest Israel.' Now if this is correct, surely no distinction is mentioned [in the Torah] between the sea and the dry land?¹³ — Delete 'between the sea and the dry land' from this. If so, [you must] also [delete] 'between the seventh day and the six working days'?¹⁴ —

That corresponds to the conclusion,¹⁵ Then there is one less' so there are not seven?¹⁶ -I will tell you: [who made a distinction between] Priests, Levites and Israelites is two formulas. between Levites and Israelites [is one], as it is written, At that time the lord made distinct the tribe of Levi.¹⁷ Between Priests and Levites [is another], as It is written, The sons of Amram: Aaron and Moses; and Aaron was made distinct that he should be sanctified as most holy.¹⁸ How does he conclude it? — Rab said: 'Who sanctifiest Israel.' While Samuel said: 'Who makest a distinction, between holy and non-holy,' Abaye, — others state, R. Joseph — denounced¹⁹ this [ruling] of Rab.

It was taught in the name of R. Joshua b. Hanania: When one concludes, 'Who sanctifiest Israel and makest a distinction between holy and non-holy,' his days and years are prolonged.

(1) But four.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(2) Habdalah ends with, 'Blessed art thou, O Lord, who makest a division between holy and non-holy'. This phrase, 'between the seventh day', etc. is similar in meaning, and forms a natural bridge to the conclusion, as it were; hence it is not counted. — All benedictions commence with the formula, 'Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, King of the universe'; if lengthy, they conclude with the formula, 'Blessed art thou, O Lord, who 'etc. It is this latter formula which is referred to as the conclusion.

(3) Seeing that in most blessings the opening and the conclusion are similar in subject. Habdalah itself commences with 'He who maketh a distinction between holy and non-holy', while the passage preceding the conclusion is likewise 'who makest a division between the seventh day (i.e., holy) and the six working days (non-holy)'.

(4) Since both are holy, save that the holiness of the Sabbath is greater.

(5) Since the opening phrase is 'Who makest a distinction between holy and non-holy'.

(6) V. p. 16, n. 4. — Most of these phrases are in the plural in the original.

(7) Thus Habdalah is recited only to mark the passing of a day of higher sanctity than that which follows, but not the reverse.

(8) This 'son of holy men was a Tanna, while the common practice was likewise based on the ruling of a Tanna. Thus we have a controversy of Tannaim.

(9) V. A.Z. 50a. 'Son' is probably used attributively, R. Menahem himself being holy (v. M.K. 25b on the effect of his death); nevertheless this mode of expression is employed because this father too was holy. — Tosaf.

(10) [It is not clear to whom this refers.]

(11) As explained anon.

(12) I.e., 'Blessed art thou, O Lord, who settest the Creation in order'.

(13) I.e., no phrase with the express term 'distinction

(14) For no phrase states that God made a 'distinction' between the seventh day, etc.

(15) And is therefore not counted.

(16) Whereas the purpose of this Baraita is to enumerate the seven formulas of distinction referred to above.

(17) Deut. X, 8.

(18) I Chron. XXIII, 13.

(19) Lit., 'cursed'.

Said Rab Judah to R. Isaac his son, 'Go and offer him a basket of fruit, and observe how he recites Habdalah.² He did not go, [however, but] sent Abaye. When Abaye returned, he [R. Isaac] asked him, 'What did he say [in the Habdalah]?' 'Blessed is He who maketh a distinction between holy and profane,' replied he, 'and nothing else.' When he came before his father he asked him, 'How did he recite it?' 'I did not go myself,' replied he, '[but] I sent Abaye, and he told me [that he recited] "' . . . who makest a distinction between holy and profane"'.³ Said he to him, 'Your pride and your haughtiness are the cause that you are unable to state the law from his own mouth.'

An objection is raised: In all blessings you commence with 'blessed [art Thou]' and conclude with 'blessed [art Thou],' except in the blessings over precepts,³ the blessings over fruits,⁴ a blessing immediately precedings⁵ another, and the last blessing of the reading of the Shema';⁶ in some of these you commence with 'Blessed' but do not conclude with 'Blessed', while in others you conclude with 'Blessed' but do not commence with 'Blessed'; and [in the blessing] 'Who is good and doeth good [unto all]'⁷ you commence with 'Blessed' but do not conclude with 'Blessed'.⁸

(1) A double ending is not employed, and the law is as Samuel.

(2) Make this an excuse for staying with him, so that you observe him reciting Habdalah.

(3) A blessing is recited before the fulfillment of every precept.

(4) I.e., which are recited before eating or drinking; 'fruits' is employed generically and includes such items as bread, water, vegetables, etc.

(5) Lit., 'near to'.

(6) The morning Shema' (v. Glos.) is preceded by two long benedictions and followed by one; the evening Shema' is followed by two.

(7) This is the third blessing (if the three which constitute Grace after Meals; v. Singer's Prayer Book pp. 280-285 for the whole, and p. 283 for the blessing immediately proceeding

(8) The blessings for precepts and fruits are generally short, and therefore 'Blessed' is not repeated at the conclusion. Blessings immediately

Pesachim 104b

But the law is not as he.¹ 'Ulla visited Pumbeditha.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

‘preceding others: e.g., those of the Amidah (the ‘Eighteen Benedictions’). As each ends with the formula, ‘Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who’, etc. the following does not commence with ‘Blessed’. Similarly, the blessing immediately preceding the Shema’ concludes with ‘Blessed’, etc. and the Shema’ together with the blessing which follows it is regarded as one long blessing; hence that too does not commence with ‘Blessed’. (That benediction itself ends with ‘Blessed art Thou’, etc.; hence the fourth one recited in the evening — v. n. 5 — which follows immediately after, likewise does not commence with ‘blessed’.) The third blessing of Grace after meals, though immediately following a conclusion containing the formula, ‘Blessed art Thou, O Lord’, etc. commence with ‘Blessed’, notwithstanding the above general rule, because it was instituted in memory of the Jews slain at Bethar in 135 C.E. which marked the ‘disastrous end of the Bar Cochba revolt; hence it was regarded as quite distinct and apart from the rest. It is indeed a lengthy benediction, but as much of it consists of synonyms for God it would be unfitting to repeat ‘Blessed art Thou’ in the conclusion.

Pesachim 105a

Now this raises a difficulty according to ‘Ulla?¹ — ‘Ulla can answer you: This too is like a blessing for precepts. [For] what is the reason in the case of a blessing over precepts?² Because It is [mere] praise;³ this too is praise.⁴

R. Hanania b. Shelemia and the disciples of Rab were sitting at a meal, and R. Hamnuna Sabas was waiting on them. Said they to him, ‘Go and see if the day has become holy,⁶ in which case we will interrupt [the meal]⁷ and appoint it for the Sabbath.’⁸ ‘You do not need it,’ he replied; ‘the Sabbath itself makes it an appointed [meal].⁹

For Rab said: Just as the Sabbath makes [it an] appointed [meal] in respect of tithe,¹⁰ so does the Sabbath make [it an] appointed [meal] in respect of kiddush.¹¹ Now they understood from him: just as it makes [it an] appointed [meal] in respect of Kiddush, so does it make [it an] appointed [meal] in respect of Habdalah.¹²

Said R. Amram to them, thus did Rab say: It makes [it an] appointed [meal] in respect of Kiddush, but it does not make [it an] appointed [meal] in respect of Habdalah.¹³ But that is only in respect of interrupting [the meal], viz., that we do not interrupt [it]; we may not however commence [one].;¹⁴ And even about interrupting we said this with respect to eating only, but not with respect to drinking.¹⁵ And with respect to drinking too we said this only of wine and beer: but as for water, it does not matter.¹⁶ Now he differs from R. Huna.

For R. Huna saw a certain man drinking water before Habdalah, [whereupon] he observed to him Are you not afraid of choking?¹⁷ For it was taught in R. Akiba's name: He who tastes anything before reciting Habdalah shall die through choking.¹⁸ The Rabbis of R. Ashi's academy were not particular about water.

Rabina asked R. Nahman b. Isaac: He who did not recite Kiddush on the eve of the Sabbath,¹⁹ can he proceed to recite Kiddush at any time of the day?²⁰ — Said he to him: Since the sons of R. Hiyya said, he who did not recite Habdalah at the termination of the Sabbath can proceed to recite Habdalah the whole week, [it follows that] there too, he who did not recite Kiddush on the eve of the Sabbath can proceed to recite Kiddush at any time of the day.

He raised an objection to him: On the nights of the Sabbath and on the nights of a Festival there is sanctification [Kiddush] over the cup [of wine] and a reference [to the Sabbath or Festival] in the Grace after meals.²¹ On the Sabbath and a Festival²² there is no sanctification over a cup [of wine], but there is a reference in the Grace after meals. Now if you should think that he who did not recite Kiddush on the eve of the Sabbath can proceed to recite Kiddush the whole day, then on the Sabbath and festival [during the day] too there may be sanctification over the cup, ‘or if he did not recite Kiddush in the

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

evening, he recites Kiddush on the morrow?
— Said he to him: He [the Tanna] does not teach a case of ‘if’.

He raised an objection to him: [If a man must choose between] the honor of the day and the honor of the night,²³ the honor of the day takes precedence; and if he has only one cup [of wine], he recites

- (1) Why did he not conclude Habdalah with ‘blessed’, etc.?
- (2) That we do not conclude with ‘blessed.’
- (3) It contains nothing else, and is consequently short.
- (4) To God, for having made a distinction between holy and profane, and it does not treat of any other subject.
- (5) The aged, or the Elder.
- (6) I.e. if the Sabbath has commenced.
- (7) By removing the tables; v. supra p. 533, n. 7.
- (8) By removing the table and then bringing it back the meal would be specially appointed as being one account of the Sabbath. (Three meals must be eaten on the Sabbath, and probably they wished to signify that this, though started before, should count as one.)
- (9) Since you must pause to recite Kiddush, that itself gives it the character of an appointed meal for the Sabbath.
- (10) A man may make a light meal, but not a full (‘appointed’) meal of untithed produce before it is completely ready and subject to tithe. (Produce is not subject to tithe until it has been harvested, threshed and carried in through the front of the house, v. B.M., Sonc. ed. p. 507f.) But the Sabbath, confers upon every meal, even if light, the character of a full, appointed meal, so that untithed produce is then forbidden.
- (11) Nothing whatsoever may be eaten before Kiddush; thus we see that the Sabbath automatically makes it a Sabbath meal.
- (12) One must not eat at the conclusion of the Sabbath before Habdalah. They understood that if a man commences during the day, the conclusion of the Sabbath automatically renders what follows an appointed meal, which is forbidden before Habdalah, hence Habdalah must be recited in the middle of the meal.
- (13) For having commenced the meal on the Sabbath, he honors the Sabbath by concluding it without interruption, even if it continues beyond nightfall.
- (14) Even a light meal before Habdalah.
- (15) Drinking must be interrupted for Habdalah.
- (16) Drinking water is of such slight consequence that it is permitted before Habdalah. Drinking

wine and beer however, occupies an intermediate position: it is sufficiently unimportant to be interrupted for Habdalah, but too important to start after nightfall before Habdalah.

(17) This was a rebuke.

(18) Through being unable to catch his breath.

(19) I.e., at the very commencement of the Sabbath’ immediately after nightfall. Perhaps the phrase, eve of the Sabbath’ indicates that the Kiddush was slightly advanced, so as to avert the possibility of commencing the Sabbath too late; cf. O.H. 271, 1 and מגן אברהם a.l.

(20) Sc. the Sabbath.

(21) Special passages are inserted.

(22) I.e., during the daytime.

(23) The Sabbath is honored by indulging in more drink and special dainties; here he lacks sufficient for additions at all meals, and must choose between them.

Pesachim 105b

the Kiddush of the day over it,¹ because the Kiddush of the day takes precedence over the honor of the day. Now if this is correct,² let him leave it until the morrow and do both with it?³ —

A religious duty is [more] precious [when performed] at the proper time. Yet do we say, A religious duty is [more] precious [when performed] at the proper time?⁴ Surely it was taught: He who enters his house on the termination of the Sabbath recites blessings over the while, the light and the spices, and then he recites Habdalah over the cup [of wine]. But if he has one cup only, he leaves it until after the meal and recites then all together after it.⁵ Thus we do not say, A religious duty is [more] precious at the proper time? —

Said he to him, ‘I am neither a self-pretended scholar⁶ nor a visionary [i.e., story-teller] nor unique [in this ruling], but I am a teacher and systematizer of traditions,⁷ and they rule thus in the Beth Hamidrash as I do; we draw a distinction between ushering the day in and ushering the day out: as for ushering the day in, the more we advance it the better, as we thereby show our love for it; but as for ushering the day out, we delay it, so that it may not be [appear] a burden upon us.⁸

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Pesachim 106a

You may infer eight things from this Baraitha:

[i] He who recites Habdalah during the prayer⁹ must [also] recite Habdalah over the cup [of wine];¹⁰

[ii] Grace [after meals] requires a cup [of wine];

[iii] the cup [of wine] for Grace demands a [minimum] standard;¹¹

[iv] he who says a blessing [over anything] must partake thereof;¹²

[v] if he tastes it he renders it defective;¹³

[vi] even when one has tasted [food] he recites Habdalah;¹⁴

(1) I.e., Kiddush on Friday evenings, which marks the sanctification of the whole day. But he must not leave it for drinking during the meal.

(2) Viz., R. Nahman's ruling.

(3) Kiddush, and pay honor to the day by drinking some of it during a meal.

(4) Even in such a case, where by postponing it an additional purpose is served.

(5) V. supra 102b notes.

(6) I have not said this on my own authority.

(7) The translation follows Jast. V.

(8) Hence Kiddush is said as early as possible, and it may not be deferred for the morrow. But we willingly delay the Habdalah.

(9) To Amidah or the Eighteen Benedictions, which constitute the Prayer par excellence; a Habdalah formula is inserted in the fourth benediction.

(10) For 'he who enters his house' implies that he has seen away from home, presumably at the synagogue, where he would already have recited Habdalah in the Amidah of the evening service.

(11) Viz., a quarter of log (Rebi'ith). Otherwise, he could use half for Habdalah and half for Grace.

(12) Either he or one of the listeners. For otherwise he could recite Habdalah over the cup of wine and leave it untouched for Grace.

(13) it is now assumed that he had more than one Rebi'ith, but not two. Hence he could perform Habdalah, drink the excess, and leave a Rebi'ith for Grace. Since this is not done, it follows that merely by drinking a little of the whole cup it becomes unfit for Grace.

(14) There is a contrary view infra 106b, q.v. Here we see that when there is insufficient wine, he has his meal and then recites Habdalah.

[vii] you may recite two sanctities over the same cup;¹ and

[viii] this is [the ruling of] Beth Shammai as interpreted by R. Judah.²

R. Ashi said: [The deductions that] if he tastes it he renders it defective, and that the cup of Grace requires a [minimum] standard, are the same thing,³ and this is what he Says: What is the reason that once he tastes of it he renders it defective? Because the cup of Grace requires a [minimum] standard.

R. Jacob b. Idi objected to a defective pitcher.

R. Idi b. Shisha objected to a defective cup.

Mar b. R. Ashi objected even to a defective barrel.⁴

Our Rabbis taught: Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy:⁵ remember it over wine.⁶ I know it only of the day; whence do we know it of the night?⁷ Because it is stated, 'remember the Sabbath day, to keep; it holy.' [You ask], 'Whence do we know it of the night?' — on the contrary, the principal Kiddush is recited at night, for when he sanctifies, he must sanctify [from] the beginning of the day. Moreover, [you say,] 'whence do we know it of the night? Because it is stated, "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy" — the Tanna seeks [proof] for the night, while he adduces a verse relating to the day[time]? — This is what he means: 'Remember the Sabbath, day, to keep it holy': remember it over the wine at its commencement.⁸ I know it only of the night: whence do we know it of the day? Because it is said, 'Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. What blessing does he recite by day?⁹— Said Rab Judah: ...who createst the fruit of the vine.¹⁰

R. Ashi visited Mahuza.¹¹ Said they [the Mahuzaeans] to him, let the master recite the

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Great Kiddush for us.’ They gave him [the cup of wine]. Now he pondered, What is the Great Kiddush? Let us see, he reasoned, for all blessings [of Kiddush] we first say ‘. . . who createst the fruit of the vine’¹² [So] he recited’. . .who createst the fruit of the vine,’ and tarried over it,¹³ [and then] he saw an old man bend [his head] and drink. Thereupon he applied to himself [the verse], The wise man, his eyes are in his head.¹⁴

The sons of R. Hiyya Said: He who did not recite Habdalah at the termination of the Sabbath proceeds to recite Habdalah anytime during the week. And, until when? —

Said R. Zera: Until the fourth day of the week.¹⁵ Even as R. Zera sat before R. Assi — others state, R. Assi sat before R. Johanan — and he sat and stated: In respect to divorces the first day of the week, the second, and the third [are defined as] after the Sabbath; the fourth, the fifth, and the eve of the [Sabbath] day [rank as] before the Sabbath.¹⁶

R. Jacob b. Idi said: But [he does] not [recite a blessing] over the light.¹⁷

R. Beruna said in Rab's name:

- (1) Habdalah and Grace are two separate sanctities. i.e., religious duties.
- (2) That the blessing for light precedes that of spices, for Beth Hillel reverse it (supra 103a). It cannot be the ruling of Beth Hillel as interpreted by R. Meir, for on that view the blessing for light precedes Grace, whereas this Baraitha states that the blessings are recited after Grace.
- (3) I.e., tasting it renders it unfit only when less than the minimum quantity is thereby left; otherwise it would remain fit.
- (4) A small barrel is meant. If Kiddush or Habdalah was recited over wine contained in one of these, they insisted that it should be full.
- (5) Ex. XX, 8.
- (6) Kiddush, whereby the Sabbath is remembered, must be recited over wine.
- (7) That Kiddush must be recited Friday evening over wine.
- (8) ‘To keep it holy’ implies that it is to be ‘remembered,’ i.e., sanctified, by Kiddush, when the holiness of the day commences, which is in the evening.

(9) It is stated Supra 105a that Kiddush (‘sanctification) is not recited by day.

(10) I.e., no special benediction apart from the usual one recited over wine.

(11) V. p. 20 ,n. 5.

(12) Hence it would be fitting for that to be called the Great Kiddush, since it is recited on every occasion.

(13) He paused before drinking it in order to see whether this was deemed sufficient for the Kiddush by day.

(14) Eccl. II, 14.

(15) Exclusive. From the fourth day onward the days are counted with the following Sabbath, and it would be inappropriate to recite Habdalah then for the preceding Sabbath.

(16) E.g., if a man divorces his wife on condition that she performs a certain action after a particular Sabbath, it must be done not later than the third day following; if he stipulates, before the Sabbath, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday are meant.

(17) When he recites Habdalah later in the week. Rashbam: the reason is presumably because the blessing for light can be recited only at the termination of the Sabbath (v. supra 54a), since it was then created for the first time.

Pesachim 106b

He who washes his hands [before eating]¹ must not recite kiddush.²

Said R. Isaac b. Samuel b. Martha to them: Rab has not yet died³ and we have [already] forgotten his ruling! I stood many times before Rab: sometimes he preferred bread [and] recited Kiddush over bread; at others he preferred wine [and] recited Kiddush over wine.⁴

R. Huna said in Rab's name: Once he has tasted [food] he must not recite kiddush.⁵

R. Hana b. Hinena asked R. Huna: May he who has tasted [food] recite Habdalah?⁶ I maintain, replied he, [that] he who has tasted [food] recites Habdalah.

But R. Assi said: He who has tasted [food] may not recite Habdalah.

R. Jeremiah b. Abba visited R. Assi. He forgot himself and ate something. [Then]

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

they gave him a cup [of wine] and he recited Habdalah.

Said his [R. Assi's] wife to him [R. Assi]: But you⁷ do not act thus? Leave him, replied he; he holds as his teacher.⁸

R. Joseph said in Samuel's name: He who has tasted [food] may not recite Kiddush; he who has tasted [food] may not recite Habdalah.

But Rabbah said in R. Nahman's name in Samuel's name: He who has tasted [food] does recite Kiddush; and he who has tasted [food] does recite Habdalah

(1) The hands must be washed before partaking of a meal at which bread is eaten, and there must be no interruption between the washing and the eating of some bread.

(2) Before breaking bread-Kiddush, of course, comes first — , as it constitutes an interruption, and he discharges his own duty thereby. If he does recite Kiddush, he must wash again before eating.

(3) Lit., Rab's soul has not yet gone to rest.⁷ — Or perhaps: Rab has only just died.

(4) Rashi and Rashbam: if he was very hungry he would wash and recite Kiddush over the bread and immediately eat it. This proves that the reciting of Kiddush is not an interruption and does not necessitate washing again. R. Tam: sometimes he preferred bread (being very hungry) and recited Kiddush (over wine) with the intention of eating bread immediately after it (ל) can bear this meaning); hence he must have washed before Kiddush, and as we see, another washing is unnecessary.

(5) In the evening, but just wait for the morrow.

(6) That evening — sc. at the termination of the Sabbath — , or must he to wait for the morrow.

(7) Lit., 'the Master.'

(8) Sc. Rab, in whose name R. Huna gave his ruling.

Pesachim 107a

'Raba said: The law is: He who has tasted [food] recites Kiddush, and he who has tasted [food] recites Habdalah Again, he who does not recite Kiddush on the eve of the Sabbath proceeds to recite Kiddush any time during the Sabbath, until the termination of the Sabbath. He who did not recite Habdalah at

the termination of the Sabbath proceeds to recite Habdalah and time during the week.¹

Amemar commenced this ruling of a Raba in the following version: The law is: He who has tasted [food] recites Kiddush, he who has tasted [food] recites Habdalah; he who did not recite Kiddush on the eve of the Sabbath proceeds to recite Kiddush at any time of the day. He who did not recite Habdalah proceeds to recite Habdalah the whole day.²

Mar Yanuka and Mar Kashisha the sons of R. Hisda³ said to R. Ashi: Amemar once visited our town: lacking wine, we brought him beer [for Habdalah], but he would not recite Habdalah [over it], 'and passed the night fasting.'⁴ The next day we took trouble to procure wine for him, whereupon he recited Habdalah and ate something. The following year he again visited our town, [and] we offered him beer. Said he, 'If so, it is the wine of the country';⁵ [so] he recited Habdalah and ate a little. This proves three things; [i] [Even] he who recites Habdalah in the Prayer must recite Habdalah over a cup [of wine];⁶ [ii] a man must not eat until he has recited Habdalah; and [iii] he who did not recite Habdalah at the termination of the Sabbath proceeds to recite Habdalah any time during the week.

R. Hisda asked R. Huna:⁷ Is it permitted to recite Kiddush over beer? Said he to him, Seeing that I asked Rab, and Rab asked R. Hiyya, and R. Hiyya asked Rabbi about pizuma,⁸ fig [-beverage], and asne,⁹ and he could not resolve it for him, can there be a question about [barley] beer! Now it was understood from him: Kiddush indeed may not be recited over it, yet we can recite Habdalah over it.

Said R. Hisda to them, Thus did Rab say: Just as you may not recite Kiddush over it, so may you not recite Habdalah over it. It was stated too' R. Tahlifa b. Abdimi said in Samuel's name: Just as you may not recite

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Kiddush over it, so may you not recite Habdalah over it.

Levi sent to Rabbi beer strained thirteenfold.¹⁰ On tasting it he found it well-flavored. Said he: 'Over such as this it is fitting to recite Kiddush and to utter all the psalms and praises in the world.' At night it caused him pains. Said he: 'Seeing that it chastises us, shall it propitiate!'¹¹ R. Joseph said: I will vow in the presence of a multitude¹² not to drink beer. Raba said: I would drink flaxwater,¹³ yet I would not drink beer. Raba also said: His drink shall be but beer who recites Kiddush over beer.¹⁴ Rab found R. Huna¹⁵ reciting Kiddush over beer. Said he to him: 'Abba¹⁶ has begun to acquire istiri¹⁷ with beer.'¹⁸

Our Rabbis taught: You recite Kiddush over wine only, and you say a blessing over wine only. Do we then not recite the blessing, 'by whose word all things exist' over beer and water? — Said Abaye, this is what he means: You do not say, 'bring a cup of blessing to say Grace [after meals],' over aught except wine.

Our Rabbis taught: You do not recite Kiddush over beer. On the authority of R. Eleazar son of R. Simeon they said: You can recite Kiddush [over it]. The tasting of wine [demands] but a small quantity.¹⁹ R. Jose b. Judah said: [At least] a mouthful. R. Huna said in Rab's name, and thus did R. Gidal of Naresh²⁰ learn: He who recites Kiddush and drinks a mouthful [of the wine] as discharged [his duty]; if not, he has not discharged [his duty]. it. Nahman b. Isaac said: I recite this [name] neither [as] Gidal b. Menassia nor Gidal b. Manyomi, but simply Gidal. What difference does that make? — In respect of opposing [one statement] of his to [another statement] of his.²¹

CLOSE TO MINHAH. The scholars asked: Did we learn, **CLOSE TO** the great MINHAH, or perhaps we learned, **CLOSE TO** the lesser "MINHAH"?²² Did we learn,

CLOSE to the great MINHAH, the reason being on account of the Passover-offering, lest he come to prolong [the meal]

(1) V. supra 106a.

(2) Viz., Sunday, but not the whole week.

(3) Yanuka means youth; Kashisha, old age. Some accordingly translate: the younger add the elder sons of R. Hisda respectively. Others however translate: The son born to R. Hisda in his youth and the son born in his old age, i.e., the elder and the younger sons of R. Hisda respectively. Rashi and Keth. 89b s.v. מר and Tosaf. in B.B. 7b s.v. מר

(4) Dan. VI, 19. He would not eat without reciting (Habdalah).

(5) Beer is evidently a popular drink and occupies the same place here that wine generally occupies elsewhere.

(6) V. Supra p. 552, n. 4.

(7) Text as emended (Bah).

(8) Jast. A beer brewed from figs, in that case it must differ from תאית which is also a beverage made from figs, while ordinary beer is from barley. Rashi however regards pizuma as barley beer, while ordinary beer is made from dates.

(9) Jast.: a drink made of shrubby fruit(?) — All these are superior to the ordinary barley beer about which R. Hisda asked.

(10) R. Han.: repeatedly strained for clarity — thirteen merely indicates many. Rashbam: beer made by pouring water on dates, then pouring the same water with its date infusion over other dates, this operation being repeated many times.

(11) Rashbam: i.e., it causes pain — is it fit to propitiate God therewith, i.e., to recite Kiddush over it — surely not! Others: first it entices (by its pleasant flavor) and then it causes pain.

(12) A vow made in the presence of a multitude cannot be annulled, v. Git. 36a.

(13) I.e., water in which flax is steeped.

(14) If he grudges the money for wine, there will come a time when he can afford only beer for his general drinking.

(15) Var. lec., Rabbah b. Bar Hanah.

(16) Lit., 'father' — a title of respect.

(17) Coins.

(18) I.e., you have begun trading with beer, so it has become sufficiently valuable in your eyes to recite Kiddush over it.

(19) He who says a blessing over wine must taste some of it (supra 105b bottom); the smallest quantity suffices.

(20) Identical 'with Nahras or Nahr-sar, on the canal of the same name, on the east bank of the Euphrates; Obermeyer, p. 307.

(21) If a statement by one of these two is found to contradict the present one, there is no difficulty, as he is not identical with either. Or perhaps: he may be identical with one of them, so that a contrary

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

statement by the other does not prove a self-contradiction.

(22) The time for the great Minhah is six and a half hours (i.e., half an hour after midday) and onwards. This is the earliest hour for the sacrificing of the evening amid (v. supra 58a). The lesser Minhah is two and a half hours before nightfall.

Pesachim 107b

and refrain from performing the Passover [-offering]; or perhaps we learned CLOSE TO the lesser ‘MINHAH, the reason being on account of the unleavened bread, lest he merely gorge himself with the unleavened bread?¹

Said Rabina, Come and hear: Even King Agrippa² who was accustomed to eat at nine hours, might not eat on that day until nightfall. Now it is well if you say that we learned, CLOSE TO the lesser MINHAH, Hence it is that which is noteworthy about Agrippa;³ but if you say [that] we learned, CLOSE TO the great MINHAH, what is there noteworthy about Agrippa, seeing that the interdict has [already] fallen upon him from before?⁴ What then? We learned, CLOSE TO the lesser MINHAH? Yet after all what is there remarkable about Agrippa: surely the of the interdict has come!⁵ -You might say: Nine hours⁶ to Agrippa is like four hours⁷ to us;⁸ Hence he informs us [otherwise].

R. Jose⁹ said: But he may make a meal¹⁰ with various sweet-meats.¹¹ R. Isaac would make a meal with vegetables. It was taught likewise: The attendant may make a meal with the inwards,¹² and he may [also] offer them to the guests. And though there is no proof of this, yet there is a hint thereof, for it is said, Break up for you a fallow ground, and sow not among thorns.¹³ Raba used to drink wine the whole of Passover eve, so as to whet his appetite¹⁴ to eat more unleavened bread in the evening. Raba said: How do I know that wine whets the appetite? Because we learned:

(1) Lit., ‘a gross eating,’ having eaten his fill beforehand.

(2) A king of the Hasmonean dynasty, who followed Rabbinical teaching.

(3) I.e., though he did not eat earlier, and at nine hours interdict has not yet commenced (for it commences just before nine and a half hours), he might nevertheless not start then, as he would probably prolong it.

(4) Surely we would not think him exempt from the interdict merely because he had not yet eaten.

(5) I.e., about three p.m.

(6) I.e., about ten a.m.

(7) Before he finishes his meal. For even R Jose, who maintains that a man needs not interrupt the meal once he has commenced (supra 99b), admits that he must not commence a meal knowing that he will prolong it beyond the forbidden period.

(8) Since the latter hour is the general mealtime, while Agrippa did not breakfast until three p.m.

(9) Alfasi reads: Assi.

(10) Lit., ‘dip.’

(11) Fruit or meat, without bread: these were generally dipped into a relish. — The time meant is from Minhah and onwards.

(12) Of an animal which he is preparing for the festival meals.

(13) Jer. IV, 3. Rashi: i.e., do not work without profit; so if a man is engaged on preparing food and is forbidden to eat thereof it causes him mental suffering. [Rashi did not seem to read: ‘and he may offer them to the guest. Rashbam and Tosaf. explain the reference to a relish prepared for whetting the appetite and the verse is quoted in illustration that the stomach must be prepared to receive food as the ground for seeds].

(14) Lit., ‘draw his heart’.

Pesachim 108a

Between these cups,¹ if he wishes to drink [more] he may drink; between the third and the fourth he must not drink.² Now if you say that it [wine] satisfies, why may he drink? Surely he will merely gorge on the unleavened bread! Hence this proves that it sharpens the appetite.

R. Shesheth used to fast³ the whole of the eve of Passover. Shall we say that R. Shesheth holds [that] we learned, Close TO the great MINHAH, the reason being on account of the Passover [sacrifice], lest he prolong [the meal] and refrain from performing the Passover [-offering]; and he [also] holds as R. Oshaia, who said: ‘The son of Bathyra used to declare valid the Passover [-offering]

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

which one slaughtered in its own name⁴ on the morning of the fourteenth'; and from the morning it is the time for the Passover, for the whole day is the time for the Passover, as he holds, [and the whole assembly... shall kill it] between the evenings⁵ [means any time] between yesterday evening and this evening?⁶ — I will tell you [that is] not [so]. R. Shesheth was different, for he was delicate, and if he ate anything in the morning his food would not benefit him in the evening.⁷

EVEN THE POOREST MAN IN ISRAEL MUST NOT EAT UNTIL HE RECLINES. It was stated: [For the eating of] the unleavened bread reclining is necessary; for the bitter herbs reclining is not necessary.⁸ [As for the drinking of] the wine, — It was stated in R. Nahman's name [that] reclining is necessary, and it was stated in R. Nahman's name that reclining is not necessary. Yet they do not disagree: one [ruling] refers to the first two cups, and the other ruling refers to the last two cups. Some explain it in one direction, others explain it in the other direction. [Thus:] some explain it in one direction: for the first two cups reclining is necessary, because it is at this point that freedom commences; for the last two cups reclining is necessary, [because] what has been has been.⁹ Others explain it in the contrary direction: on the contrary, the last two cups necessitate reclining, [because] it is precisely then that there is freedom; the first two cups do not necessitate reclining, [because] he is still reciting 'we were slaves.'¹⁰ Now that it was stated thus and it was stated thus, both [the first and the last ones]¹¹ necessitate reclining. Lying on the back is not reclining; reclining on the right side is not reclining.¹² Moreover he may put [his food] into the windpipe before the gullet,¹³ and thus endanger himself.

A woman in her husband's [house] need not recline,¹⁴ but if she is a woman of importance she must recline.¹⁵ A son in his father's [house] must recline.¹⁶ The scholars asked:

What about a disciple in his teacher's presence? —

Come and hear, for Abaye said: When we were at the Master's [Rabbah b. Nahman's] house, we used to recline on each other's knees. When we came to R. Joseph's house he remarked to us, 'You do not need it: the fear of your teacher is as the fear of Heaven.' An objection is raised: A man must recline with all [people], and even a disciple in his master's presence? — That was taught of a craftsman's apprentice. The scholars asked: What about an attendant? —

Come and hear, [or R. Joshua b. Levi said: A attendant, who ate as much as an olive of unleavened bread while reclining has discharged [his duty]. Thus, only while reclining, but not if he was not reclining. This proves that he must recline. This proves it.

R. Joshua b. Levi also said: Women are subject to [the law of] these four cups

- (1) The first and second, and the second and third.
- (2) The third cup is drunk in connection with grace after meals. Having died already, he has no need to drink for his appetite, and if he now drinks more he will appear to be adding to the statutory number (four) of cups. T.J. states that drink after the meal (apart from the two which are still to be drunk to make up the four) intoxicates and makes the person unfit to recite the Hallel.
- (3) Lit., sit in a fast'.
- (4) i.e., as a Passover, and not as a different sacrifice.
- (5) Ex. XII, 6 (E.V. (at dusk).
- (6) I.e., the evenings commencing the fourteenth and the fifteenth. The night must be omitted, since offerings cannot be sacrifices at night. — Though of course sacrifices lead altogether ceased by the time of R. Shesheth, yet if on this view one had to fast when the temple stood, it would still be necessary, because the interdict had never formally been rescinded.
- (7) I.e., he would have no appetite in the evening.
- (8) the former symbolizes freedom; the latter, bondage. Bitter herbs may not be eaten while reclining.
- (9) The last two cups come after the meal, by which time the whole narrative of Israel's

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

liberation has been completed. Hence there is no need then to emphasize the theme of freedom.

(10) V. infra 116a.

(11) var. lec.: all.

(12) Since he must eat with his right hand.

(13) if he eats lying on his back may go down the wrong way.

(14) Because she stands under his authority.

(15) Isserles (O.H. 472, 4 Gloss) remarks that women nowadays are of high worth.

(16) He does not sense his father's authority so strongly.

Pesachim 108b

because they too were included in that miracle.¹

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: These four cups must contain sufficient for the mixing of a generous cup.² if he drank them raw [undiluted], he has discharged [his duty].³ If he drank them [all] at once,⁴ he has discharged [his duty]. If he gave his sons and household to drink of them,⁵ he has discharged [his duty]. 'If he drank them raw [undiluted]. he has discharged [his duty].'

Raba observed: He has discharged [his duty] of wine, but he has not discharged [his duty] of [symbolizing his] freedom.⁶ If he drank them [all] at once, Rab said:⁷ He has discharged [his duty of drinking] wine,⁸ [but] he has not discharged [his duty of] four cups.⁹ 'If he gave his sons and household to drink of them, he has discharged [his duty]'. Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: Providing that he [himself] drank the greater part of [each] cup.

An objection is raised: These four cups must contain the standard of a Rebi'ith, whether neat or diluted, whether new [wine] or old; R. Judah said: It must possess the taste and the appearance of wine. Thus it is incidentally taught 'the standard of a Rebi'ith,' whereas you say, 'a generous cup'? — I will answer you: Both are the same standard, [for] what does he mean by 'sufficient for the mixing of a generous cup? For each one separately [of the four cups]. which is a Rebi'ith for all of

them together.¹⁰ 'R. Judah said: It must possess the taste and appearance of wine. Said Raba, What is R. Judah's reason? Because it is written, Look not thou upon the wine when it is red.¹¹

Our Rabbis taught: All are bound to [drink] the four cups, men, women, and children. Said R. Judah: Of what benefit then is wine to children? But we distribute to them

(1) Of liberation; v. Sot. 11b, where it is stated that the Israelites were redeemed as a reward to the righteous women of that generation.

(2) Their wine was too strong to be drunk neat. 'A generous cup' is one of sufficient quantity for Grace, viz., a Rebi'ith (quarter of a log), and Rab Judah said that each of these four cups must contain enough undiluted wine to make up to a Rebi'ith of diluted wine. — The usual mixture was one Part wine to three parts water.

(3) Providing that he drank a Rebi'ith on each, occasion (Rashbam).

(4) Without following the order prescribed infra 114a and 116a-b.

(5) Possibly separate cups were not set for each member of the household. as is done nowadays; v. supra 99b Tosaf. s.v. לא יפחתו לו מארבע כוסות

(6) I.e., he has discharged his duty in a poor way, since drinking undiluted wine is hardly drinking at all — This does not refer to wine nowadays, which is not so strong and does not require dilution.

(7) Alfasi and Asheri omit: Rab said.

(8) V. infra 109: a man must rejoice on a Festival by drinking wine; this duty he has now discharged.

(9) But all count as one cup. and another three are necessary.

(10) I.e., a Rebi'ith of the raw wine, which when diluted will make four Rebi'ith of drinkable wine, a Rebi'ith for each cup.

(11) Prov. XXIII, 31. Thus it does not merit the name wine unless it has its appearance too.

Pesachim 109a

parched ears of corn and nuts on the eve of Passover, so that they should not fall asleep, and ask [the 'questions'].¹ It was related of R. Akiba that he used to distribute parched ears and nuts to children on the eve of Passover, so that they might not fall asleep but ask [the 'questions'].

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

It was taught, R. Eliezer said: The matzoth are eaten hastily² on the night of Passover, on account of the children, so that they should not fall asleep.³

It was taught: it was related of R. Akiba⁴ [that] never did he say in the Beth Hamidrash, 'It is time to rise [cease study]', except on the eve of Passover and the eve of the Day of Atonement. On the eve of Passover, because of the children, so that they might not fall asleep. On the eve of the Day of Atonement in order that they should give food to their children.

Our Rabbis taught: A man is in duty bound to make his children and his household rejoice on a Festival, for it is said, And thou shalt rejoice it, thy feast, [thou and thy son, and thy daughter, etc.]⁵ Wherewith does he make them rejoice? With wine. R. Judah said: Men with what is suitable for them, and women with, what is suitable for them. 'Men with what is suitable for them': with wine. And women with what? R. Joseph recited: in Babylonia, with colored garments; in Eretz Yisrael, with ironed lined garments.

It was taught, R. Judah b. Bathyra said: When the temple was in existence there could be no rejoicing save with meat, as it is said, And thou shalt sacrifice peace-offerings, and shalt eat there; and thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God.⁶ But now that the Temple is no longer in existence, there is no rejoicing save with wine, as it is said, and wine that maketh glad the heart of man.⁷

R. Isaac said: The xestess for muries in Sepphoris was about equal to the Temple log, and thereby we gauge the Rebi'ith of [wine for] Passover.⁹ R. Johanan said: The ancient tomanta which was in Tiberias exceeded this by a quarter, and thereby we gauge the Rebi'ith of [wine for] Passover.

R. Hisda said: The Rebi'ith of the Torah¹⁰ is [the cubic content of a vessel] two fingerbreadths square by two and seven-

tenths¹¹ fingerbreadths in depth.¹² As it was taught: Then he shall bathe all his flesh in water:¹³ [this intimates] that nothing must interpose between his flesh and the water; 'in water' [means] in the water of a Mikweh; 'all his flesh' [implies sufficient] water for his whole body to be covered therein. And how much is that?

(1) v. infra 116a Mishnah.

(2) Others: the plate containing the matzoth is lifted, to draw the attention of the children to the unusual fare; others, the matzoth are taken away from the children before they have eaten their fill, as a heavy meal conduces to sleep.

(3) Var. lec.: so that they should ask 'questions'. This agrees with the first alternative translation in the preceding note. R. Han. reads both: so that they should not fall asleep but ask.

(4) In Suk. 28a this is attributed to R. Johanan b. Zakkai.

(5) Deut. XVI, 14. Presumably the proof lies in the bracketed passage, which is absent in the text. Possibly too he reads: We-simmakta (Pi'el) 'and thou shalt cause to rejoice' instead of We-samakta 'and thou shalt rejoice. Tosaf.'s reading, however, and Maharsha emends text accordingly, is: and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thy household (ib. XIV 26). This refers to the eating of the second tithe in Jerusalem, and its teaching is applied here to Festivals.

(6) Deut. XXVII, 7.

(7) Ps. CIV, 15.

(8) A measure kept as a standard; it was somewhat less than a pint.

(9) Required for the four cups.

(10) In respect to several Biblical laws a Rebi'ith is specified by the Rabbis.

(11) Lit., 'two and a half and a fifth.'

(12) Hence the volume of a Rebi'ith is $2 \times 2 \times 27 = 108$ cubic fingerbreadths.

(13) Lev. XV, 16.

Pesachim 109b

A square cubit by three cubits' depth, and the Sages estimated the standard of the water of a Mikweh at forty se'ahs.¹

R. Ashi said: Rabin b. Hinena told me, The Table in the Sanctuary was jointed.² For if you should think that it was [permanently] fastened, how could one immerse a cubit in a cubit?³ What difficulty is this! Perhaps it was immersed in the sea which Solomon made.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

For R. Hiyya taught: The sea which Solomon made held one hundred and fifty clean [i.e., regulation-sized] Mikwaoth.

AND THEY SHOULD GIVE HIM NOT LESS THAN FOUR [CUPS]. How could our Rabbis enact something whereby one is led into danger: Surely it was taught: A man must not eat in pairs, nor drink in pairs,⁴ nor cleanse [himself] twice nor perform his requirements⁵ twice? — Said R. Nahman: Scripture said, [it is] a night of guarding [unto the lord];⁶ [i.e.,] it is a night that is guarded for all time⁷ from harmful spirits. Raba said: The cup of Grace [after meals] combines [with the others] for good, but does not combine for evil.⁸ Rabina said: Our Rabbis instituted four cups as symbolizing liberty: each one

(1) 1 se'ah == 6 Kabs; 1 Kab == 4 logs; 1 log == 4 Rebi'ith; 1 cubit == 6 handbreadths; 1 handbreadth = 4 fingerbreadths. On this basis R. Hisda arrives at his estimate. Thus: 1 Se'ah == 96 Rebi'ith; 40 Se'ahs == 96 X 40 == 3840 Rebi'ith. Hence cubic capacity of Mikveh is 3840 X 108 == 41472 fingerbreadths which is the equivalent of cubic capacity of 3 cubic cubits, 1 cubic cubit being equal to 243 (== 13824 fingerbreadths), and 3 cubic cubits being equal to 3 X 13824 == 41472].

(2) And the joints could be taken apart.

(3) The Table was a cubit square, while a Mikveh, as stated here, was likewise a cubit square; hence it would be impossible to immerse the Table in the Mikveh if it became unclean and needed a ritual bath.

(4) I.e., he must not eat or drink two or a multiple of two of anything, a malignant potency being ascribed to twos.

(5) A euphemism for intimacy.

(6) Ex. XII, 42.

(7) Lit., 'that is guarded and comes on.'

(8) The third cup, which is drunk in collection with Grace after meals, combines with others to break the spell of evil which, might be caused by drinking the first two, but is not counted in the four for harm.

Pesachim 110a

is a separate obligation.¹ 'He must not perform his requirements twice.' Why? Has he not [newly] decided?² — Said Abaye, This is what he [the Tanna] means: He must not

eat in pairs and drink in pairs and he must not perform his needs even once [after eating or drinking in pairs], lest he be weakened³ and be affected.⁴

Our Rabbis taught: He who drinks in pairs, his blood is upon his own head. Said Rab Judah: When is that? If he had not seen the street;⁵ but if he has seen the street, he is at liberty [to drink a second cup]. R. Ashi said: I saw that R. Hanania b. Bibi used to go out and see the street at each cup. Now we have said [this]⁶ only [if he intends] to set out on a journey [after drinking]; but [if he intends to stay] at home, it is not [harmful]. R. Zera observed: And going to sleep is like setting out on a journey.

R. Papa said: And going to the privy is like setting out on a journey. Now [if [he intends to stay] at home it is not [dangerous]? Yet surely Raba counted the beams,⁷ while when Abaye had drunk one cup, his mother would offer him two cups in her two hands;⁸ again, when R. Nahman b. Isaac had drunk two cups, his attendant would offer him one cup; [if he had drunk] one cup, he would offer him two cups in his two hands?⁹ — An important person is different.¹⁰

'Ulla said: Ten cups are not subject to [the danger of] pairs. 'Ulla is consistent with his view, for 'Ulla said, while others maintain, it was taught in a Baraitha: The Sages instituted ten cups in a mourner's house. Now if you should think that ten cups are subject to [the danger of] pairs, how could our Rabbis arise and enact a regulation whereby one is led into danger! But eight are subject to 'pairs.'

R. Hisda and Rabbah son of R. Huna both maintained: 'Shalom' [peace] combines [with others] for good, but does not combine for evil;¹¹ but six is subject to 'pairs'. Rabbah and R. Joseph both maintained: Wiyhuneka ['and be gracious unto thee'] combines [with others] for good, but does not combine for evil;¹² but four is subject to 'pairs.'

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Abaye and Raba both maintained: *We-yishmereka* [‘and keep thee’] combines [with others] for good, but does not combine for evil.¹³ Now Raba is consistent with his view, for Raba allowed the Rabbis to depart [from his house] after four cups, [and] though Raba b. Liwai¹⁴ came to harm, he paid no heed to the matter, saying, ‘That was [his punishment] because he raises difficulties at the public session.’¹⁵

R. Joseph said: The demon Joseph told me [that] *Ashmedai* the king of the demons is appointed over all pairs.¹⁶ and a king is not designated a harmful spirit.¹⁷ Others explain it in the opposite sense: On the contrary, a king is quick-tempered [and] does whatever he wishes, for a king can break through a wall to make a pathway for himself and none may stay him.¹⁸

R. Papa said, Joseph the demon told me: For two we kill; for four we do not kill, [but] for four we harm [the drinker]. For two [we hurt] whether [they are drunk] unwittingly or deliberately; for four, only if it is deliberate, but not if it is unwitting. And if a man forgot himself and happened to go out,¹⁹ what is his remedy? Let him take his right-hand thumb in his left hand and his left-hand thumb in his right hand and say thus: ‘Ye [two thumbs] and I, surely that is three!²⁰ But if he hears one saying, ‘Ye and I, surely that is four!’ let him retort to him, ‘Ye and I are surely five!’ And if he hears one saying, ‘Ye and I are six,’ let him retort to him, ‘Ye and I are seven.’²¹ This once happened until a hundred and one, and the demon burst [with mortification].

Amemar said: The chief of the sorceresses told me: He who meets sorceresses should say thus: ‘Hot dung in perforated baskets for your mouths, o ye witches! may your heads become bald,²² the wind carry off your crumbs,²³

(1) Hence they do not combine.

(2) The second is occasioned by a new desire, and does not combine with, the first.

(3) Through intimacy.

(4) Since eating or drinking in pairs has already made him more susceptible to hurt than he would otherwise have been.

(5) i.e., if he does not go out between the drinks.

(6) That pairs is harmful.

(7) At each cup he mentally counted one beam, to ensure not drinking in pairs.

(8) Likewise that he should not drink in pairs.

(9) Though in a these cases they were remaining at home.

(10) The demons are at greater pains to hurt him; hence he is endangered even when staying at home.

(11) ‘Shalom’ (peace) is the seventh word (in Heb.) of the verse *The Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace* (Num. VI, 26). Hence the seventh cup combines with others for good, etc. as on p. 565, n. 5.

(12) *Wiyhuneka* is the fifth Hebrew word of the verse, *The Lord make His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee* (ibid. 25).

(13) This is the third word of the verse, *The Lord bless thee, and keep thee* (ibid. 24).

(14) Or, the Levite.

(15) He would raise difficulties in the course of my public lectures, thereby putting me to shame.

(16) Those who drink in pairs are at his mercy.

(17) It is beneath his dignity to cause hurt. Hence there is generally no danger in pairs (though occasionally he may disregard his dignity — Rashbam).

(18) Hence the danger is all the greater.

(19) After drinking ‘pairs.’

(20) Thus breaking the spell of pairs.

(21) And so on.

(22) Lit., ‘bald be your baldness’ — they practiced witchcraft with their hair.

(23) Likewise used in the practice of witchcraft. Rashbam holds that this is an allusion to Ezek. XIII, 18f, q.v.

Pesachim 110b

your spices be scattered, the wind carry off the new saffron which ye are holding, ye sorceresses; as long as He showed grace to me and to you, I had not come among [you]; how that I have come among you, your grace and my grace have cooled.’¹ In the West [Palestine] they were not particular about ‘pairs. R. Dimi of Nehardea was particular even about the marks on a [wine-] barrel:² it once happened that a barrel burst.³ This is the position in general: when one is

PESOCCHIM – 87a-121b

particular, they [the demons] are particular about him,⁴ while when one is not particular,⁵ they are not particular about him. Nevertheless one should take heed.

When R. Dimi came,⁶ he said: Two eggs, two nuts, two cucumbers and something else — [these are] Halachah from Moses at Sinai;⁷ but the Rabbis were doubtful what this something else was, and so the Rabbis forbid a ‘pairs’ on account of the ‘something else.’ And as to what we have said, Ten, eight, six and four are not subject to ‘pairs,’ that was said only in respect to the harmful spirits [Mazzikin], but where witchcraft is concerned we fear even many.⁸ As [it once happened in] the case of a certain man who divorced his wife, [whereupon] she went and married a shopkeeper. Every day he [her first husband] used to go and drink wine, [and though] she exercised her witchcraft against him, she could avail naught, because he was heedful of ‘pairs.’ One day he drank to excess and did not know how much he drank; until sixteen [cups] he was clear-headed and on is guard; after that he was not clear-headed and took no care, [and] she turned him out at an even [number of drinks]. As he was going along an Arab met him and observed to him: A corpse is walking here!⁹ He went and clasped a palm tree; the palm tree cried out¹⁰ and he burst.

R. ‘Awira said: Plates and loaves are not subject to even numbers. This is the general rule: That which is completed by man is not subject to even numbers; [but in the case of] that which is completed by Heaven, such as various kinds of eatables, we fear [even numbers]. A shop is not subject to even numbers.¹¹ If a man changes his mind,¹² it is not subject to even numbers. A guest is not subject to even numbers.¹³ A woman is not subject to even numbers; but if she is an important woman, we take heed.

R. Hinena son of R. Joshua said: Asparagus [-wine] combines [with other liquors] for good, but does not combine for harm.¹⁴

Rabina said in Raba's name: [A doubt concerning] even numbers [is resolved] stringently;¹⁵ others state: [A doubt concerning] even numbers [is resolved] leniently.¹⁶ R. Joseph said: Two [cups] of wine and one of beer do not combine; two of beer and one of wine combine, and your token [is this]: ‘This is the general principle: Whatever is joined thereto of a material more stringent than itself is unclean; of a material more lenient than itself, is clean.’¹⁷

R. Nahman said in Rab's name: Two [cups] before the meal¹⁸ and one during the meal combine; one before the meal and two during the meal do not combine. R. Mesharsheya demurred: Do we then desire to effect a remedy for the meal: we desire to effect a remedy for the person, and surely the person stands remedied!¹⁹ Yet all agree that two during the meal and one after the meal do not combine, in accordance with the story of Rabbah b. Nahmani.²⁰ Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: All mixed drinks combine,²¹

- (1) I have not taken sufficient care of myself.
- (2) Indicating the quantities sold. He took care that there should not be an even number of these.
- (3) When an even number of marks had been made on it.
- (4) They are more anxious to injure him.
- (5) Takes no great pains to save himself from demons.
- (6) From Palestine to Babylonia.
- (7) It is a tradition dating back from Moses that even numbers of these and of another unnamed commodity are harmful.
- (8) A large multiple of two, such as six, eight, etc.
- (9) He recognized that he was doomed.
- (10) Probably, made a rustling noise. [Var. lec., ‘withered’]
- (11) I.e., if one drinks in two shops. Others: if one drinks an even number of glasses in one shop, for these are harmful at home only. The incident related above, however, took place in a tavern.
- (12) He drank one glass, not intending to drink more; then decided to drink another.
- (13) He does not know how much will be offered him, therefore at each he is regarded as having decided afresh.
- (14) Cf. p. 565, n. 5.
- (15) If a man does not know whether he has drunk an even number or not, he should drink another. This turns an even number into odd, not an odd

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

into even, because in the latter case this glass represents a fresh decision (cf. p. 568, n. 8), and does not combine with the others.

(16) Thus showing that he is not particular about it and thereby removing the hostility of the demons (cf. supra).

(17) Materials, to become unclean, must be of a certain minimum size, which varies according to the value of the material: the greater the value, the more stringent it is, i.e., the smaller its minimum. If the material is less than the minimum and a piece of another material is joined to it, making it up to the minimum, the rule is as stated. Thus here too, wine, being more valuable than beer, combines with it; beer being less valuable than wine, it is disregarded.

(18) Lit., 'tray.'

(19) Since he has drunk three.

(20) V. B.M. 86a.

(21) If a man drinks mixed (i.e., diluted) wine and then any other mixed drink (so Rashbam), they combine.

Pesachim 111a

except water;¹ while R. Johanan maintained: Even water. R. Papa said: This was said only of hot [water] mixed with cold or cold mixed with hot; but not [if it is] hot mixed with hot or cold with cold.²

Resh Lakish said: There are four actions for which he who does them has his blood on his own head and forfeits his life,³ viz.: easing oneself between a palm tree and the wall passing between two palm trees; drinking borrowed water, and passing over spilt water, even if his wife poured it out in his presence. 'Easing oneself between a palm tree and the wall': this was said only if there is not four cubits,⁴ but if he leaves four cubits it does not matter. And even if he does not leave four cubits [space], it was said only where there is no other path;⁵ but if there is another path, it does not matter. 'Passing between two palm-trees.' This was said only where a public thoroughfare does not cross between them; but if a public thoroughfare crosses between them, it does not matter. 'Drinking borrowed water.' That was said only if a child borrowed it; but [if] an adult, it does not matter. And even if a child borrowed it, this was said only in respect to the

countryside, where it is not found [in abundance]; but in the town, where it is found in abundance, it does not matter.

And even in respect to the countryside, this was said only of water, but there is no objection against [borrowed] wine and beer. 'And passing over spilt water.' This was said only if he did not interpose dust or spit into it; but if he interposed dust or spit into it, it does not matter. Again, this was said only if the sun had not passed over it nor did he walk sixty steps over it; but if the sun had passed over it and he walked sixty steps over it, it does not matter. Again, this was said only if he was not riding an ass and was not wearing shoes; but if he was riding an ass and was wearing shoes, it does not matter. Yet that is only where there is naught to fear of witchcraft; but where there is ought to fear of witchcraft, even if there are all these [safeguards], we still fear, as in the case of a certain man who rode on a ass and was wearing his shoes; his shoes shrank, and his feet withered.

Our Rabbis taught: There are three who must not pass between [two men], nor may [others] pass between them, viz.: a dog, a palm tree, and a woman. Some say: a swine too; some say, a snake too. And if they pass between, what is the remedy? — Said R. Papa: Let them commence [a verse] with el [God] and end with el.⁷ Others say: Let them commence [a Scriptural passage] with lo [not] and finish with lo.⁸ If a Menstruant woman passes between two [men], if it is at the beginning of her menses she will slay one of them⁹ and if it is at the end of her menses she will cause strife between them. What is the remedy? Let them commence [a verse] with el and end with el. When two women sit at a crossroad, one on one side of the road and one on the other side of the road, facing each other, they are certainly engaged in witchcraft. What is the remedy?

If there is another road [available], let one go through it. While if there is no other road,

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

[then] if another man is with him, let them clasp hands and pass through; while if there is no other man, let him say thus: 'Igrath Izlath, Asya, Belusia¹⁰ have been slain with arrows.'¹¹ When one meets a woman coming up from her statutory tebillah,¹² if [subsequently] he is the first to have intercourse, a spirit of immortality will infect him; while if she is the first to have intercourse, a spirit of immortality will infect her. What is the remedy? Let him say thus : 'He poureth contempt upon princess, and causeth them to wander in the waste, where there is no way.'¹³

R. Isaac said: What is meant by the verse, Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me?¹⁴ This refers to him who sleeps in the shadow of a single palm-tree or in the shadow of the moon. Now in respect to the shadow of a single palm-tree this holds good only where the shadow of the neighboring [tree] does not fall upon it; but if the shadow of the neighboring tree falls upon it, it does not matter.

Then when it was taught: He who sleeps in the shadow of a single palm-tree in a courtyard and he who sleeps in the shadow of the moon, has his blood on his own head, how is it meant? Shall we say that the shadow of the neighboring tree does not fall upon it, — then even in a field too [it is dangerous]? Hence you may surely infer from this that in a courtyard [there is danger] even if the shadow of the neighboring tree fall on it. This proves it. And in respect to the shadow of the moon too, this holds good only when [it falls] in the west,¹⁵ but when it is in the east it does not matter.

(1) Cold water mixed with hot water is not regarded as a mixed drink and does not combine with other mixed drinks.

(2) R. Johanan too admits that this is not a mixture, and it does not combine with other mixed drinks.

(3) I.e., whatever happens, he has only himself to blame.

(4) Between tem: this leaves no room for the evil spirits to pass comfortably and so they injure him.

(5) For the demon to pass through.

(6) I.e., he did not scatter dust upon the water before passing over it.

(7) Rashbam: Num. XXIII, 22f, which commence and finish with el in Heb.

(8) Ibid. 19.

(9) I.e., cause perjury to one of them (Rashbam).

(10) The demons by whose aid you seek to work witchcraft.

(11) The text is obscure.

(12) After her period of menstruation.

(13) Ps. CVII, 40.

(14) Ps. XXIII, 4.

(15) I.e., at the end of the month when the moon is in the east and casts its shadow in the west.

Pesachim 111b

If one eases oneself on the stump of a palm-tree, the demon Palga¹ will seize him, and if one leans one's head on the stump of a palm-tree, the demon Zerada² will seize him. He who steps over a palm-tree, if it had been cut down, he will be cut down [killed]; if it had been uprooted, he will be uprooted and die. But that is only if he does not place his foot upon it; but if he places his foot upon it, it does not matter. There are five shades:³ the shade of a single palm-tree, the shade of a kanda-tree,⁴ the shade of a caper-tree, [and] the shade of sorb bushes.⁵

Some say: Also the shade of a ship and the shade of a willow. This is the general rule: Whatever has many branches, its shade is harmful, and whatever has hard prickles [or, wood], its shade is harmful, except the service-tree, whose shade is not harmful although its wood is hard, because Shida [the demon] said to her son, 'Fly from the service-tree, because it is that which killed your father'; and, it also killed him.

R. Ashi said: I saw R. Kahana avoid all Shades. [The demons] of caper-trees are [called] Ruhe [spirits]: those of sorb-bushes are [called] Shide [demons]: those which haunt roofs are [called] Rishpe [fiery-bolts]. In respect of what does it matter? In respect of amulets.⁶ [The demon] of caper-trees is a

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

creature without eyes. What does it matter? In respect of fleeing from it.⁷ A scholar was once about to ease himself among the caper-trees, when he heard it advancing upon him so he fled from it. Well he had gone, it embraced a palm-tree,⁸ whereupon the palm-tree cried out⁹ and it [the demon] burst. [The demons] of sorb-bushes are [called] Shide. A sorb-bush which is near a town has not less than sixty Shide [demons] [haunting it]. How does this matter? In respect of writing an amulet. A certain town-officer went and stood by a sorb-bush near a town, whereupon he was set upon by sixty demons and his life was in danger. He then went to a scholar who did not know that it was a sorb-bush haunted by sixty demons, and so he wrote a one-demon amulet for it. Then he heard how they suspended a hinga¹⁰ on it [the tree]¹¹ and sing thus: 'The man's turban is like a scholar's, [yet] we have examined the man [and find] that he does not know "Blessed art Thou".'¹² Then a certain scholar came who knew that it was a sorb-bush of sixty demons and wrote a sixty-demon amulet for it. Then he heard them saying, 'Clear away your vessels from here.' Keteb Meriri:¹³ there are two Keteb, one before noon and one after noon; the one before noon is called Ketheb Meriri, and looks like a ladle turning in the jug of kamka.¹⁴ That of the afternoon is called Keteb Yashud Zaharaim ['Destruction that wasteth at noonday'];¹⁵ it looks like a goat's horn, and wings compass it about.

Abaye was walking along, with R. Papa on his right and R. Huna, son of R. Joshua on his left. Seeing a Keteb Meriri approaching him on the left, he transferred R. Papa to his left and R. Huna son of R. Joshua to his right. Said R. Papa to him: 'Wherein am I different that you were not afraid on my behalf?' 'The time is in your favor,' replied he.¹⁶ From, the first of Tammuz¹⁷ until the sixteenth they are certainly to be found; henceforth it is doubtful whether they are about or not, and they are found in the shadow of hazabe¹⁸ which have not grown a cubit, and in the morning and evening

shadows when these are less than a cubit [in length], but mainly in the shadow of a privy.

R. Joseph said: The following three things cause defective eyesight: combing one's head [when it is] dry, drinking the drip-drop [of wine], and putting on shoes while the feet are still damp. [Eatables] suspended in a house lead¹⁹ to poverty, as people say, 'He who suspends a basket [of food] puts his food in suspense.' Yet this relates only to bread, but it does not matter about meat and fish, [since] that is the usual way [of keeping them]. Bran²⁰ in a house leads to poverty. Crumbs in a house lead to poverty: the demons rest upon them on the nights of Sabbaths and on the nights of the fourth days.

The genius appointed over sustenance is called Neki'ah [Cleanliness]; the genius appointed over poverty is called Nabal [Folly or Filth]. Dirt on the spout of a pitcher leads to poverty. He who drinks water out of a plate is liable to a cataract. He who eats cress without [first] washing his hands will suffer fear thirty days.

- (1) Jast. conjectures paralysis. [Aruch: 'headache on one side of the head', megrim, connecting it with rt. meaning 'to divide'].
- (2) Perhaps vertigo; Rashi: megrim.
- (3) Involving danger on account of the demons that inhabit them.
- (4) MS.M.: Kinura, the name of a shrubby tree, Christ's-thorn or lote (Jast.).
- (5) [Var. lec.: add as fifth 'the shade of the willow-tree].
- (6) Charms to counteract them, in which their names are written.
- (7) As it is sightless it cannot follow.
- (8) In error. Rashi and Rashbam read נשקא נקלא, it tripped over a palm-tree.
- (9) [Or, withered v. supra p. 568, n. 5.]
- (10) A musical instrument.
- (11) Jast. Perhaps: they danced in chorus about it.
- (12) He does not know which benediction to recite when he puts it on ridiculed his pretensions to scholarship.
- (13) 'Bitter destruction' (v. Deut. XXXII, 24). Regarded here as the name of a demon.
- (14) A kind of sauce made of milk and bread-crumbs. — The translation follows the reading of Rashi and Rashbam, which differs from cur. edd.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(15) Ps. XCI, 6.

(16) You have been blessed with good fortune, so the demon will not harm you.

(17) The fourth month of the Jewish year, roughly corresponding to July.

(18) A species of shrub.

(19) Lit., 'are harmful.'

(20) So Rashbam.

Pesachim 112a

He who lets blood without washing his hands will be afraid seven days. He who trims his hair and does not wash his hands will be afraid three days. He who pares his nails and does not wash his hands will be afraid one day without knowing what affrights him. [Putting] one's hand to one's nostrils is a step to fear; [putting] one's hand to one's forehead is a step to sleep. It was taught: If food and drink [are kept] under the bed, even if they are covered in iron vessels, an evil spirit rests upon them.

Our Rabbis taught: A man must not drink water either on the nights of the fourth days [Wednesdays] or on the nights of Sabbath,¹ and if he does drink, his blood is on his own head, because of the danger. What is the danger? An evil spirit. Yet if he is thirsty what is his remedy? Let him recite the seven 'voices' which David uttered over the water and then drink, as it is said: The voice of the Lord is upon the waters; the God of glory thundereth, even the Lord is upon many water. The voice of the Lord is powerful; the voice of the Lord is full of majesty. The voice of the Lord breaketh the cedars; yea, the Lord breaketh in pieces the cedars of the Lebanon ... The voice of the Lord heweth out flames of fire. The voice of the Lord shaketh the wilderness; the Lord shaketh the wilderness of Kadesh. The voice of the Lord maketh the hinds to calve, and strippeth the forests bare; and in His temple all say: 'Glory.'² But if [he does] not [say this], let him say thus: 'Lul shafan anigran anirdafin,³ I dwell among the stars, I walk among lean and fat people.' But if [he does] not [say this], if there is a man with him he should rouse him and say to him, 'So-and-so the son of So-

and-so, I am thirsty for water,' and then he can drink. But if not, he knocks the lid against the pitcher, and then he can drink. But if not, let him throw something into it and then drink.

Our Rabbis taught: A man should not drink water from rivers or pools at night, and if he drinks, his blood is on his own head, because of the danger. What is the danger? The danger of blindness.⁴ But if he is thirsty, what is his remedy? If a man is with him he should say to him, 'So-and-so the son of So-and-so, I am thirsty for water.' But if not, let him say to himself, 'O So-and-so,⁵ my mother told me, "Beware of shabrire" : Shabrire, berire, rire, ire re,⁶ I am thirsty for water in a white glass.'

AND EVEN [IF HE RECEIVES RELIEF] FROM THE CHARITY PLATE, etc. That is obvious? — It is necessary only even according to R. Akiba who said: Treat your Sabbath like a weekday⁷ rather than be dependent on man; yet here, in order to advertise the miracle, he agrees.⁸ Tanna debe Eliyahu [taught]:⁹ Though R. Akiba said, 'Treat your Sabbath like a weekday rather than be dependent on men,' yet one must prepare something trifling at home.¹⁰ What is it?

Said R. Papa: Fish hash. As we learned, R. Judah b. Tema said: Be strong as the leopard and swift as the eagle, fleet as the deer and valiant as a lion to do the will of thy Father in heaven.¹¹

Our Rabbis taught: Seven things did R. Akiba charge his son R. Joshua: My son, do not sit and study at the highest point of the town;¹² do not dwell in a town whose leaders are scholars;¹³ do not enter your own house suddenly, and a the more your neighbor's house; and do not withhold shoes from your feet.¹⁴ Arise early and eat, in summer on account of the sun [i.e., heat] and in winter on account of the cold; treat your Sabbath like a weekday rather than be dependent on man ,

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

and strive to be on good terms with the man upon whom the hour smiles.

R. Papa observed: [That does] not [mean] to buy from or to sell to him, but to enter into partnership with him. But now that R. Samuel b. Isaac said: What is meant by the verse, Thou hast blessed the work of his hands?¹⁵ Whoever took a farthing [Perutah] from Job was blessed; even to buy from and to sell to him is advisable.

Five things did R. Akiba charge R. Simeon b. Yohai when he was immured in prison.¹⁶ He [the latter] said to him, 'Master, teach me Torah.' 'I will not teach you,' he replied.¹⁷ 'If thou wilt not teach me,' said he, 'I will tell my father Yohai and he will deliver thee to the state.' 'My son,' answered he, 'more than the calf wishes to suck does the cow desire to suckle.' Said he to him, 'Yet who is in danger: surely the calf is in danger!'¹⁸ Said he to him: 'If you wish to be strangled, be hanged on a large tree,¹⁹ and when you teach your son, teach him from a corrected scroll.' (What is that? Said Raba, — others state, R. Mesharsheya: A new one, for once an error has entered, it remains.)²⁰ 'Do not cook in a pot in which your neighbor has cooked.' (What does that mean? [Do not marry] a divorced woman during her husband's lifetime. For a Master said: When a divorced man marries a divorced woman, there are four minds in the bed. Alternatively, [it refers] even to a widow, for

- (1) Rashbam: without a light.
- (2) Ps. XXIX, 3-5, 7-9.
- (3) This is an incantation.
- (4) Shabrere, v. Git., Sonc. ed. p. 327, n. 4.
- (5) Addressing himself thus.
- (6) [An incantation against the demon of blindness resembling an Abracadabra amulet, in which each succeeding line is reduced by one letter].
- (7) In the matter of food and drink.
- (8) That he must take from charity.
- (9) V. p. 504, n. 1.
- (10) In honor of the Sabbath.
- (11) Thus even the poorest must make an effort to honor the Sabbath.
- (12) Many pass there, and they will disturb your studies.

(13) Intent on their studies, they neglect the affairs of the town!

(14) Cf. Shab. 129a.

(15) Job I, 10.

(16) R. Akiba was kept in prison several years and then martyred for defying Hadrian's edict against practicing and teaching Judaism, Ber. 61b; v. J.E. I, 3051.

(17) He did not wish to endanger him.

(18) He pleaded to be allowed to take the risk.

(19) If you must depend on an authority, see that he is a great one.

(20) A error learned in childhood is difficult to dispel.

Pesachim 112b

not all fingers¹ are alike). Enjoying the produce without interest² is a good deed and profitable investment.³ A religious deed which leaves the body pure is marrying a woman when one [already] has children. Four things did our holy Teacher⁴ command his children: Do not dwell in Shekantzib,⁵ because [its inhabitants] are scoffers and will corrupt you to disbelief. And do not sit upon the bed of a Syrian woman. Some say, [that means:] do not lie down to sleep without reading the Shema'; while others explain: do not marry a proselyte. But others explain 'Syrian' literally, [the reason being] on account of what happened to R. Papa.⁶ And do not seek to evade toll tax, lest they discover you and deprive you of a that you possess. And do not stand in front of an ox when he comes up from the meadow, because Satan dances between his horns.⁷ Said R. Samuel: this refers to a black ox and in the month of Nisan.⁸ R. Oshaia recited: One must remove a distance of fifty cubits from an ox that is a tam⁹ [and] as far as the eye can see from an ox that is a Mu'ad.

A Tanna taught in R. Meir's name: [Even] when the ox's head is in the feeding-bag, climb up to the roof and throw away the ladder from under you. Rab said: The cry for an ox¹⁰ is 'hen, hen'; for a lion, 'Zeh Zeh'; for a camel, 'Da Da'; a ship's cry is 'Helani Hayya Hela We-hiluk Hulia.'¹¹

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Abaye said: Skin, a fish, a cup, hot water, eggs, and the vermin in linen are all injurious to ‘something else’.¹² Skin: [that means] he who sleeps on a tanner's hide.¹³ A fish: [viz.,] shibuta¹ during Nisan. A cup: the residue of fish hash. Hot water: pouring extremely hot water over oneself.¹⁵ Eggs: [i.e.,] he who treads on [their] shells. Vermin in linen: if one launders his garment and does not wait eight days before putting it on, the vermin¹⁶ are produced and harmful for ‘something else’.

R. Papa said: A man should not enter a house in which there is a cat, without shoes. What is the reason? Because the cat may kill a snake and eat it; now the snake has little bones, and if a bone sticks into his foot it will not come out, and will endanger him. Others say: A man should not enter a house where there is no cat, in the dark.¹⁷ What is the reason? Lest a snake wind itself about him without his knowing, and he come to danger.

Three things did R. Ishmael son of R. Jose charge Rabbi: (Mnemonic: *Makash*).¹⁸ Do not inflict a blemish upon yourself. (What does that mean? Do not engage in a lawsuit with three, for one will be your opponent and the other two witnesses [against you].) And do not feign interest in¹⁹ a purchase when you have no money.²⁰ When your wife as performed Tebillah, do not be intimate with her the first night. Said Rab: That refers to a Niddah by Scriptural law,²¹ [for] since there is the presumption of an open well,²² she may continue with gonorrhoeic discharge.²³

Three things did R. Jose son of R. Judah charge Rabbi. Do not go out alone at night, and do not stand naked in front of a lamp, and do not enter a new bath-house, lest it [the floor] split.²⁴ How long [is it regarded as new]? — Said R. Joshua b. Levi: For twelve months. ‘And do not stand naked in front of a lamp,’ for it was taught: He who stands naked in front of a lamp will be an epileptic, and he who cohabits by the light of a lamp will have epileptic children.

Our Rabbis taught: If one cohabits in a bed where an infant is sleeping, that infant [will be] an epileptic. Now that was said only if he is less than one year old; but if he is a year old, it does not matter. Again, this was said only if he is sleeping at [their] feet; but if he is sleeping at [their] head, it does not matter. Again, this was said only if he does not lay his hand upon him; but if he lays his hand upon him, it does not matter.

‘And do not go out alone at night’, for it was taught: One should not go out alone at night, i.e., on the nights of neither Wednesday nor Sabbaths, because Igrath the daughter of Mahalath,²⁵ she and one hundred eighty thousand destroying angels go forth, and each has permission to wreak destruction independently. Originally they were about a day. On one occasion she met R. Hanina b. Dosa [and] said to him, ‘Had they not made an announcement concerning you in Heaven, “Take heed of Hanina and his learning,” I would have put you in danger.’ ‘If I am of account in Heaven,’ replied he, ‘I order you never to pass through settled regions.’ ‘I beg you,’ she pleaded, ‘leave me a little room.’ So he left her the nights of Sabbaths and the nights of Wednesdays.

On another occasion she met Abaye. Said she to him, ‘Had they not made an announcement about you in Heaven, “Take heed of Nahmani²⁶ and his learning,” I would have put you in danger.’ ‘If I am of account in Heaven,’ replied he, ‘I order you never to pass through settled regions.’ But we see that she does pass through? — I will tell you: Those are

(1) Euphemism: The wife thinks always of her first husband.

(2) Lit., ‘hire.’

(3) Lit., ‘a large body’. The passage is a difficult one, particularly with the reading of the ed. נל, but it would seem to refer to lending money on a field and receiving some of its produce in part repayment. But as its value is probably calculated at less than market price, this is a profitable investment, yet at the same time there is no actual

PESACHIM – 87a-121b

interest. Such a transaction is permitted (B.M. 67b). 'Ar. and MS.M. read: גל, and Jast. accordingly translates: An act of charity and at the same time a good investment is the act of him who helps to produce fruits, while he has the reward (e.g. , one who loans money to a husbandman on security, allowing payment in small installments).

(4) I.e., R. Judah ha-Nasi.

(5) A town in Babylonia, on the east side of the Tigris; v. Obermeyer, *Landschaft*, pp. 190f. It is there (p. 191, n. 4) pointed out, however, that R. Judah, a Palestinian, would have had no occasion to warn his children against living in a town in Babylonia, nor could he have known the character of its inhabitants well enough to justify this warning; hence it is conjectured that 'Raba' should be read here instead.

(6) V. Ber. 8b.

(7) Rashbam: the ox is mad, as explained *infra*.

(8) The first month—about April.

(9) The technical name of an ox that has not yet gored three times. When it has, it is called Mu'ad.

(10) With which to chase it away or to urge it to work.

(11) Perhaps the ancient equivalent of 'yo heave ho'. [MS.M. reads simply: 'Hayya, Hayya'].

(12) Leprosy.

(13) Rashi and Rashbam. I.e., before it is completely dressed.

(14) Probably mullet (Jast.).

(15) At a bath.

(16) Which it may still contain.

(17) MS.M.: Without shoes.

(18) V. p. 348, n. 8. M == Mum (blemish); K == Mekah (a purchase); SH == Ishteka (your wife).

(19) Lit., 'stand over.'

(20) V. B.M. 58b and notes a.l. in Sonc. ed.

(21) By which a woman performs Tebillah seven days after the beginning of menstruation, even if menstruation lasted all

the seven days. Subsequently, however, it was enacted that she must wait seven days from the end of menstruation. Rab observes that R. Ishmael's charge held good only when the more lenient Scriptural law was practiced.

(22) I.e., her blood-flow has continued almost until Tebillah.

(23) During intimacy.

(24) Through the heat.

(25) The queen of demons.

(26) Abaye was so called because he was brought up in the house of Rabbah b. Nahman.

Pesachim 113a

the narrow paths [which they frequent], whence their horses bolt and come [into civilized places] bringing them along.

Rab said to R. Assi: Do not dwell in a town in which no horses neigh or dogs bark.¹ And do not dwell in a town where the leader of the community is a physician.² And do not marry two [women],³ [but] if you do marry two, marry a third.⁴

Rab said to R. Kahana: Deal in carcasses, but do not deal in words;⁵ flay carcasses in the market place and earn wages and do not say, 'I am a priest and a great man and it is beneath my dignity.'⁶ [Even] if you [merely] ascend the roof, [take] victuals with you.⁷ [Even] if a hundred pumpkins cost but a Zuz in town, let them, be under your skirts.⁸

Rab said to his son Hiyya: Do not take drugs⁹ and do not leap in great jumps;¹⁰ do not have a tooth extracted,¹¹ and do not provoke serpents and do not provoke a Syrian woman.

Our Rabbis taught: Three must not be provoked, viz.: an insignificant Gentile,¹² a little snake, and a humble pupil. What is the reason? Because their kingdom stands behind their ears.¹³

Rab said to his son Aibu: I have labored over your studies but without success, [so] come and I will teach you worldly wisdom. Sell your wares while the sand is still on your feet.¹⁴ Everything you may sell and regret,¹⁵ except wine, which you can sell without regrets.¹⁶ Untie your purse and [then] open your sacks.¹⁷ Better a Kab from the ground than a Kor from the roof.¹⁸ When the dates are in your bag run to the brewery [Beth Sudna].¹⁹ And to what extent? — Said Raba: Up to three se'ahs.

R. Papa said: If I were not a beer manufacturer I would not have become

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

wealthy. Others say, R. Hisda said: If I were not a beer manufacturer, I would not have become wealthy. What is [the meaning of] *sudna*?²⁰ Said R. Hisda: A pleasant secret [Sod Na'eh] and the exercise of charity.²¹

R. Papa said: Every bill²² requires collecting;²³ in every credit sale it is doubtful whether it [payment] will be forthcoming or not, and when it is forthcoming it may be bad money.²⁴

Three things did R. Johanan say in the name of the men of Jerusalem: when you go out to battle, do not go out among the first but among the last, So that you may return among the first; and treat your Sabbath like a weekday rather than be dependent on your fellow-beings, and strive to be on good terms with him upon whom the hour smiles.

Three things did R. Joshua b. Levi say in the name of the men of Jerusalem. Do not practice immodesty²⁵ on account of the incident which occurred;²⁶ if your daughter has attained puberty, free your slave and give [him] to her;²⁷ and beware of your wife with her first son-in-law. What is the reason? — R. Hisda said: On account of immorality; R. Kahana said: On account of money.²⁸ And [in fact] both are correct.

R. Johanan said: Three are of those who will inherit the world to come, viz.: he who dwells in Eretz Yisrael; and he who brings up his sons to the Study of the Torah; and he who recites *Habdalah* over wine at the termination of the Sabbath. Who is that? He who leaves over [wine] from *Kiddush* for *Habdalah*.²⁹

R. Johanan said: Concerning three does the Holy one, blessed be He, make proclamation every day:³⁰ a bachelor who lives in a large town without sinning, a poor man who returns lost property to its owner, and a wealthy man who tithes his produce in secret.³¹

R. Safra was a bachelor living in a large town.

- (1) These guard the town: the dogs raise the alarm and the marauders are pursued on horseback.
- (2) There seems to be no adequate reason for this. Possibly a doctor would be too busy to give proper attention to communal matters. R. Tam in B.B. 110a s.v. *לא תימא* reads *אסי* instead of *אסיא*, i.e., do not dwell in a town whose head is (R.) Assi — a playful warning against the cares of office, which leave but little time for study.
- (3) Lest they devise plots against you.
- (4) She will reveal their designs.
- (5) Gossip or quibbling.
- (6) The greatest man is not degraded by honest work.
- (7) Do not undertake the least journey without provisions.
- (8) Keep them in stock and do not wait to buy until you actually need them.
- (9) Even as a medicine, as they are habit forming.
- (10) Or: do not jump over a brook — the strain affects the eyesight.
- (11) When you have toothache — it will eventually cease in any case. [R. Hananel refers it to a molar tooth, the extraction of which affects the eyesight. Preuss, *Biblich — Talmudische Medizin*, p. 330, quotes Celsus: *majore periculo in superioribus dentibus fit (extractio), quia potest tempora oculosque concutere*].
- (12) Lit., 'a little Gentile'.
- (13) They will grow up and take revenge. The particular expression may have been occasioned by Diocletian's rise to be Emperor of Rome though born of slaves — according to the Rabbis he was a swineherd originally. When Emperor he tried to avenge insults offered to him in his lowly position.
- (14) Immediately you return from buying, sell.
- (15) If the price advances — you might have received more.
- (16) Had you waited it might have turned to vinegar.
- (17) Pocket the money for a purchase before delivering it.
- (18) Rather earn little near home than much far away.
- (19) To brew beer of them — otherwise you may eat them.
- (20) That it is employed to denote a brewery.
- (21) It is a pleasant secret — it is profitable and affords the means of charity.
- (22) Lit., 'everything on account (of which a bill or bond must be indited).'
- (23) Do not be certain of the money until you have actually collected it.
- (24) If payment is made in small installments the money may be frittered away.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(25) Do not frequent places where immodest sights are to be seen. Var. lec.: do not frequent roofs.

(26) Viz. , David's sin with Bath Sheba.

(27) Marry her at the earliest possible moment.

(28) She is likely to spend your money on him.

(29) He has only a little wine and specially reserves for Habdalah that which remains over from Kiddush.

(30) As having earned His special approval.

(31) I.e., without ostentation.

Pesachim 113b

Now a Tanna recited [R. Johanan's dictum] before Raba and R. Safra, [whereupon] R. Safra's face lit up. Said Raba to him: it does not mean such as you, but such as R. Hanina and R. Oshaia, who were cobblers in Eretz Yisrael and dwelt in a street of harlots and made shoes for harlots and went in to them:¹ they [the harlots] looked at them, but they [these scholars] would not lift their eyes to look at them, and their [the harlots'] oath was 'by the life of the holy Rabbis of Eretz Yisrael.'²

Three the Holy One, blessed be He, loves: he who does not display temper, he who does not become intoxicated, and he who does not insist on his [full] rights.³

Three the Holy One, blessed be He, hates: he who speaks one thing with his mouth and another thing in his heart; and he who possesses evidence concerning his neighbor and does not testify for him; and he who sees something indecent in his neighbor and testifies against him alone.⁴ As it once happened that Tobias sinned and Zigud alone came and testified against him before R. Papa, [whereupon] he had Zigud punished. 'Tobias sinned and Zigud is punished!' exclaimed he, 'Even so,' said he to him, 'for it is written, one witness shall not rise up against a man,⁵ whereas you have testified against him alone: you merely bring him into ill repute.'⁶

R. Samuel son of R. Isaac said in Rab's name: Yet he may hate him,⁷ for it is said , If thou see the ass of thine enemy lying under'

its burden.⁸ Now which enemy [is meant]: Shall we say, a Gentile enemy, — but it was taught: The enemy of whom they spoke is an Israelite enemy, not a Gentile enemy? Hence it obviously means an Israelite enemy. But is it permitted to hate him? Surely it is written , Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart?⁹ Again if there are witnesses that he had committed wrong, the all indeed hate him! why particularly this person? Hence it must surely apply to such a case where he had seen something indecent in him.

R. Nahman b. Isaac said: it is a duty to hate him, as it is said, The fear of the Lord is to hate evil.¹⁰ R. Aha son of Raba asked R. Ashi: What about telling his teacher, that he should hate him? — Said he to him: If he knows that his teacher regards him as trustworthy as two [witnesses], he should tell him; but if not, he must not tell him.

Our Rabbis taught: There are three whose life is not life; the [over-]compassionate, the hot-tempered, and the [too] fastidious; whereon R. Joseph observed: And a these [qualities] are found in me.

Our Rabbis taught: Three hate one another, viz.: dogs, fowls, and Parsee priests;¹¹ some say, harlots too; some say, scholars in Babylonia too.

Our Rabbis taught: Three love each other, viz.: proselytes, slaves , and ravens. Four are too impossible for words:¹² a poor man who is arrogant, the wealthy man who flatters,¹³ a lecherous old man, and a leader who lords it over the community without cause. Some say: Also he who divorces his wife a first and a second time and takes her back. And the first Tanna?¹⁴ — it may be that her kethubah¹⁵ is large,¹⁶ or else he has children from her and cannot divorce her.¹⁷

Five things did Canaan charge his sons: Love one another, love robbery, love lewdness, hate your masters and do not speak the truth.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Six things were said of a horse: it loves promiscuity, it loves battle, it has a proud spirit ‘ it despises sleep, eats much and excretes little. Some say: it also seeks to slay its master in battle.

Seven are banned¹⁸ by Heaven; these are they: A Jew who has no wife; he who has a wife but no children;¹⁹ and he who has children but does not bring them up to the study of the Torah; and he who has no phylacteries on his head and on his arm, no fringes on his garment and no Mezuzah on his door, and he who denies his feet shoes. And some say: Also he who never sits in a company assembled for a religious purpose.²⁰

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in the name of R. Samuel b. Martha in Rab's name on the authority of it, Jose of Huzal: How do we know that you must not consult astrologers?²¹ Because it is said: Thou shalt be whole-hearted with the lord thy God.²² And how do we know that one who knows that his neighbor is greater than himself even in one thing must show him honor? Because it is said, because a surpassing [superior] spirit was in him, and the king thought to set him over' the whole realm.²³ And she [a woman] who sits over clean blood is forbidden intercourse;²⁴ for how long? Said Rab: A 'onah.²⁵

A Tanna taught: Joseph of Huzal is identical with Joseph the Babylonian with Issi b. Gur Aryeh, with Issi b. Judah, with Issi b. Gamaliel and with Issi b. Mahalalel, and what was his [real] name? Issi b. 'Akabia.²⁶ It. Isaac b. Tabla is identical with R. Isaac b. Hakla, and with R. Isaac b. Ila'a.²⁷

- (1) To deliver the shoes.
- (2) Thus by their chastity in face of great temptation they sanctified the Divine Name.
- (3) In the sense that he does not retaliate.
- (4) Being the only person who has seen it.
- (5) Deut. XIX, 15.
- (6) Since no action can follow your unsupported testimony.
- (7) As an evildoer-hate is morally wrong otherwise.

- (8) Ex. XXIII, 5.
- (9) Lev. XIX, 17.
- (10) Prov. VIII, 13.
- (11) וְהַחֲבֵרִין Guebers, [Aliter: 'partners' v. Strashun].
- (12) Lit., 'the mind does not tolerate them'.
- (13) I.e., who denies his true feelings.
- (14) Why does he not include the last?
- (15) Marriage settlement, which she can claim from him on divorce.
- (16) So that he must take her back, as he cannot pay it.
- (17) I.e., he cannot remain constant to the divorce.
- (18) Var. lec. : as banned.
- (19) By his own volition.
- (20) E.g., at a circumcision feast.
- (21) Lit., 'Chaldeans,' who were versed in astrological arts.
- (22) Deut. XVIII, 13.
- (23) Dan. VI, 4.
- (24) This is based on the Scriptural law that for a period of thirty-three or sixty-six days beginning respectively on the eighth or the fifteenth day after childbirth a woman's blood is clean (v. Lev. XII, 1-5), i.e. 'it does not defile her and cohabitation is permitted. When this period is ended, she is designated 'a woman sitting over clean blood,' and cohabitation is forbidden, lest she have a blood discharge and think that just as her blood did not defile before, it does not defile her now either.
- (25) Lit. , 'a period' — Rashi: one night. — Thus the law applies to the forty-first or the eighty-first night only.
- (26) [Issi (a variant of Joseph) was the son of 'Akabia b. Mahalalel, the story of whose excommunication is told in 'Ed. V, 6, and it was in order to be spared the tragic memories associated with the name of 'Akabia that Issi did not describe himself as the son of 'Akabia; v. Derenbourg, Essai p. 484].
- (27) In the edd. there follows 'hu R. Isaac b. Aha': the same is R. Isaac b. Aha; Bah however deletes hu, in which case another person is now referred to.

Pesachim 114a

R. Isaac b. Aha mentioned in legal discussions is the same as R. Isaac b. Phinehas mentioned in homilies, and the token is 'Hear 'me [Shema'uni], — my brethren [Ahay] , and my people.'¹

Rabbah b. Bar Hanah said in R. Johanan's name in the name of R. Judah b. R. Il'ai: Eat onions [Bazel] and dwell in the protection [Bezel] [of your house],² and do not eat geese

PESOCHEM – 87a-121b

and fowls lest your heart pursue you;³ reduce your food and drink and increase [expenditure] on your house.

When ‘Ulla came, he said: In the West [Palestine] a proverb is current: he who eats the fat tail [Allitha] must hide in the loft [‘Alitha],⁴ but he who eats cress [Kakule] may lie by the dunghill [Kikle]⁵ of the town.⁶

MISHNAH. THEY FILLED⁷ THE FIRST CUP FOR HIM; BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: HE RECITES A BLESSING FOR THE DAY [FIRST],⁸ AND THEN RECITES A BLESSING OVER THE WINE; WHILE BETH HILLEL RULE: HE RECITES A BLESSING OVER THE WINE [FIRST], AND THEN RECITES A BLESSING FOR THE DAY.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: [These are] the matters which are disputed by Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel in respect to the meal: Beth Shammai maintain: He recites a blessing for the day [first] and then recites a blessing over the wine, because the day is responsible for the presence of the wine;⁹ moreover, the day has already become sanctified while the wine has not yet come.¹⁰

But Beth Hillel maintain: He recites a blessing over the wine and then recites a blessing for the day, because the wine enables the Kiddush to be recited.¹¹ Another reason: the blessing for wine is constant, while the blessing for the day is not constant,¹² [and of] that which is constant and that which is not constant, that which is constant comes first. Now the law¹³ is as the ruling of Beth Hillel. Why state [another reason]?¹⁴ —

[This:] for should you argue: there we have two [reasons], whereas here there is [only] one,¹⁵ [I answer that] here also there are two, [for of] that which is constant and that which is not constant, that which is constant comes first. ‘Now the law is as the ruling of Beth Hillel’: that is obvious, since there issued a Bath Kol?¹⁶ —

If you wish I can answer that this was before the Bath Kol. Alternatively, it was after the Bath Kol, and this is [in accordance with] R. Joshua who maintained We disregard a Bath Kol.¹⁷

MISHNAH. THEY THEN¹⁸ SET [IT] BEFORE HIM.¹⁹ HE DIPS THE LETTUCE²⁰ BEFORE YET HE HAS REACHED THE AFTERCOURSE OF THE BREAD.²¹ THEY SET BEFORE HIM MAZZAH, LETTUCE [HAZERETH], AND HAROSETH²² AND TWO DISHES, THOUGH THE HAROSETH IS NOT COMPULSORY. R. ELEAZAR SON OF R. ZADOK SAID: IT IS COMPULSORY. AND IN THE TEMPLE THEY USED TO BRING THE BODY OF THE PASSOVER-OFFERING BEFORE HIM.

(1) I Chron. XXVIII, 2. Thus in legal discussions (Shema'ta, connected with Shema'uni) his name appears as b. Aha (connected with Ahay).

(2) Do not spend overmuch on food, then you will be able to afford your house.

(3) Do not cultivate a greedy appetite so that you are always wanting to eat.

(4) He who squanders his money on costly dishes must hide from his creditors.

(5) [Aliter: ‘place of assembly’ from Grk.**,^a a circle].

(6) Afraid of none — not being in debt.

(7) Lit. , ‘mixed.

(8) I.e. , the blessing on the sanctity of the Festival.

(9) If it were not a festival no wine would be required.

(10) The festival automatically commences with the appearance of the stars, even if no wine as yet been brought to the table. Thus it is first in time, and therefore first in respect to a blessing too.

(11) without wine or bread Kiddush cannot be said. Bread is the equivalent of wine in this respect, and the blessing for bread precedes the blessing for the day.

(12) Whenever ‘wine is drunk a blessing over it is required, whereas the blessing of sanctification is confined to festivals.

(13) [MS.M.: the Halachah].

(14) Is not the first sufficient?

(15) Beth Shammai give two reasons for their view, whereas only one supports Beth Hillel's

(16) Proclaiming the law always to be as Beth Hillel; v. Er. 13b.

(17) V. B.M. 59b.

(18) After having recited the Kiddush over the wine.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(19) Rashi and Rashbam: vegetables. R. Han.: the table with the food, which was brought after Kiddush.

(20) Tosaf.: into water or vinegar, and eats it. This is to stimulate the child's wonder, as it is unusual to commence the meal thus.

(21) Viz., the bitter herbs, which are eaten after the unleavened bread. Bertinoro reads: before he has reached the breaking (i.e., the distribution) of the bread.

(22) V. Glos.

Pesachim 114b

GEMARA. Resh Lakish said: This¹ proves that precepts require intention, [for] since he does not eat it² the stage when bitter herbs are compulsory, he eats it with [the blessing,] 'Who createst the fruit of the ground,' and perhaps he did not intend [to fulfill the obligation of] bitter herbs; therefore he must dip it again with the express purpose of [eating] bitter herbs. For if you should think [that] precepts do not require intention, why two dippings: surely he has [already] dipped it once?³ But whence [does this food]?

Perhaps after a precepts do not require intention, and as to what you argue, why two dippings, [the answer is,] that there may be a distinction for [the sake of] the children.⁴ And should you say, if so, we should be informed about other vegetables:⁵ If we were informed about other vegetables I would say: Only where other vegetables [are eaten first] do we require two dippings, but lettuce alone⁶ does not require two dippings:⁷ hence he informs us that even lettuce [alone] requires two dippings, so that there may be a distinction [shown] therewith for the children.

Moreover, it was taught: If he ate them [the bitter herbs] while demai,⁸ he has discharged [his duty]; if he ate them without intention, he has discharged [his duty]; if he ate them, in half quantities,⁹ he has discharged [his duty], providing that he does not wait between one eating and the next more than is required for the eating of half [a loaf]?¹⁰ — it is [dependent on] Tannaim.

For it was taught, R. Jose said: Though he has [already] dipped the lettuce [Hazereth], it is a religious requirement to bring lettuce and Haroseth and two dishes before him.¹¹ Yet still, whence [does this food]: perhaps R. Jose holds [that] precepts do not require intention and the reason that we require two dippings is that there may be a distinction [shown] for the children?- If so, what is the 'religious requirement?'¹² What are the two dishes? —

Said R. Huna: Beet and rice.¹³ Raba used to be particular for¹⁴ beet and rice, since it had [thus] issued from the mouth of R. Huna. R. Ashi said: From R. Huna you may infer that none pay heed to the following [ruling] of R. Johanan b. Nuri. For it was taught, R. Johanan b. Nuri said: Rice is a species of corn and Kareth is incurred for [eating it in] its leavened state, and a man discharges his duty with it on Passover.¹⁵ Hezekiah said: Even a fish and the egg on it.¹⁶

R. Joseph said: Two kinds of meat are necessary, one in memory of the Passover-offering and the second in memory of the Hagigah.¹⁷ Rabina said: Even a bone and [its] broth. It is obvious that where other vegetables are present, he recites¹⁸ the blessing, 'who createst the fruit of the ground' over the other vegetables and eats, and then¹⁹ recites the blessing, '[Who hast commanded us] concerning the eating of bitter herbs,' and eats.²⁰ But what if he has lettuce only?

Said R. Huna: First he recites a blessing over the bitter herbs, 'Who createst the fruit of the ground,' and eats, and then [later] he recites over it 'concerning the eating of bitter herbs' and eats.

(1) The fact that he dips lettuce twice.

(2) The first lettuce.

(3) The first lettuce is eaten before it is obligatory (v. n. 8 in Mishnah); hence the ordinary blessing for vegetables is recited, not 'who hast commanded us concerning the eating (If bitter herbs,' though later it will be eaten as an

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

obligation. This he did not discharge his duty of eating bitter herbs with the first lettuce, because that was not his intention, which proves that one does not discharge one's duty unless it is expressly done with that intention.

(4) v.p. 587, n. 8.

(5) The Mishnah should state that a vegetable is dipped into water and eaten. Why specify Hazereth (lettuce), which is one of the vegetables which may be eaten as bitter herbs (v. supra 39a)?

(6) I.e., where lettuce alone is eaten.

(7) for once he has eaten it he has done his duty in respect of bitter herbs.

(8) V. Glos.

(9) I.e., as much as half an olive the first time and the same the second time, as much as an olive being the minimum quantity which must be eaten.

(10) V. supra p. 208, n. 9. — This distinctly contradicts Resh Lakish.

(11) And Resh Lakish maintains that R. Jose's reason is because precepts require intention.

(12) Mizwah implies that it is an essential obligation.

(13) Even these constitute two dishes, and of course two kinds of meat all the more (Rashbam and Tosaf.)

(14) Lit., 'go in search of.'

(15) Tabshil denotes a boiled dish: hence if it were a species of corn, boiling would make it leaven.

(16) I.e., the egg with which it is smeared before it is prepared. Though it becomes all one, yet it counts as two dishes.

(17) v. Mishnah supra 69b.

(18) At the first dipping.

(19) At the second dipping.

(20) Each blessing being over a different vegetable.

Pesachim 115a

To this R. Hisda demurred: After filling his stomach with it he returns and recites a blessing over it! — Rather, said R. Hisda: On the first occasion he recites over it, 'Who createst the fruit of the ground,' and, 'concerning the eating of bitter herbs,' and eats, while subsequently he eats the lettuce without a blessing. In Syria they acted in accordance with R. Huna, while R. Shesheth the son of R. Joshua acted according to R. Hisda. And the law is in accordance with R. Hisda.

R. Aha the son of Raba used to go in search of other vegetables, so as to avoid controversy.¹ Rabina said, R. Mesharsheya

son of R. Nathan told me: Thus did Hillel² say on the authority of tradition:³ A man must not make a sandwich of Mazzah and bitter herbs together and eat them, because we hold that Mazzah nowadays⁴ is a Biblical obligation, whereas bitter herbs are a Rabbinical requirement and thus the bitter herbs, which are Rabbinical, will come and nullify the Mazzah, which is Biblical. And even on the view that precepts cannot nullify each other, that applies only to a Biblical [precept] with a Biblical [precept], or a Rabbinical [precept] with a Rabbinical [precept], but in the case of a Scriptural and a Rabbinical [precept], the Rabbinical [one] comes and nullifies the Scriptural [one]. Which Tanna do you know [to hold] that precepts do not nullify each other? — it is Hillel.⁵

For it was taught, it was related of Hillel that he used to wrap them together,⁶ for it is said, they shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs.⁷ R. Johanan observed: Hillel's colleagues disagreed with him. For it was taught: You might think that he should wrap them together and eat them, in the manner that Hillel ate it, therefore it is stated, they shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, [intimating] even each separately.⁸

To this R. Ashi demurred: If so, what is [the meaning of] 'even'?⁹ Rather, said R. Ashi, this Tanna teaches thus: You might think that he does not discharge his duty unless he wraps them together and eats them, in the manner of Hillel therefore it is stated, they shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, [intimating] even each separately. Now that the law was not stated either as Hillel or as the Rabbis,¹⁰ one recites the blessing. '[Who hast commanded us] concerning the eating of unleavened bread' and eats; then he recites the blessing, 'concerning the eating of bitter herbs,' and eats; and then he eats unleavened bread and lettuce together without a blessing. in memory of the Temple, as Hillel [did].¹¹

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

R. Eleazar said in R. Oshaia's name: Whatever is dipped in a liquid¹² requires the washing of the hands.¹³ Said R. Papa: Infer from this that the lettuce

- (1) Lit., 'to exclude himself from a controversy'.
- (2) The reference is to R. Hillel, the fourth century Babylonian Amora, and not to Hillel, the great Nasi who flourished in the first century B.C.E.
- (3) I.e., it came to him anonymously; Kaplan, Redaction of the Talmud, p. 227.
- (4) I.e., after the destruction of the Temple and the cessation of sacrifices.
- (5) Hillel 1.
- (6) Place the paschal meat of bitter herbs between Mazzah.
- (7) Num. IX, 11.
- (8) This is deduced from the sing. 'it.'
- (9) 'Even' shows that they may certainly be eaten together.
- (10) Though the aforementioned Tanna does not disagree with Hillel, as R. Ashi has shown, it was nevertheless held that some Rabbis did disagree.
- (11) This he acts on both views, by eating them first separately and then together.
- (12) Vegetables, which are dipped into vinegar.
- (13) Unwashed hands are, unclean in the second degree and therefore disqualify Terumah (v. Mishnah supra 14a and note a.l.), and whatever disqualifies Terumah defiles liquids in the first degree (supra 14b). Therefore the hands must be washed.

Pesachim 115b

must be plunged right into the Haroseth¹ to counteract the Kappa.² For if you should think that it need not be sunk into it, why is the washing of the hands required?³ Surely he does not touch [the Haroseth]?⁴ Yet perhaps I may maintain that in truth it need not be sunk [into the Haroseth], the Kappa dying from its smell; yet why is washing of the hands required? In case he plunges it in.

R. Papa also said: A man must not keep the bitter herbs [an appreciable time] in the Haroseth, because the sweetness of its ingredients [sc. the Haroseth] may neutralize its bitterness, whereas the taste of bitter herbs is essential, but it is then absent. R. Hisda brought⁵ Rabbana 'Ukba⁶ and he lectured: If he washed his hands at the first

dipping- he must wash his hands at the second dipping [too].

The Rabbis discussed this before R. Papa: This was stated in general,⁷ for if you should think that it was stated here [in connection with Passover], why must he wash his hands twice? Surely he has [already] washed his hands once?⁸ Said R. Papa to them: On the contrary, it was stated here, for if you should think that it was stated in general, why two dippings?⁹ What then? it was stated here? Then why must he wash his hands twice: surely he has [already] washed his hands once? — I will tell you: since he is to recite the Haggadah¹⁰ and Hallel,¹¹ he may let his thoughts wander¹² and touch [something unclean].

Raba said: If he swallows ,unleavened bread, he discharges his duty;¹³ if he swallows bitter herbs, he does not discharge his duty.¹⁴ If he swallows unleavened bread and bitter herbs [together], he discharges his duty of unleavened bread, [but] not his duty of bitter herbs. If he wraps them in baste and swallows them, he does not discharge his duty of unleavened bread either.

R. Simi b. Ashi said: unleavened bread [must be set] before each person [of the company]. Bitter herbs before each person. and Haroseth before each person, but we remove the table¹⁵ only from before him who recites the Haggadah. R. Huna said: All these too [are Set only] before him who recites the Haggadah.¹⁶ And the law is as R. Huna. Why do we remove the table? — The School of R. Jannai said: So that the children may perceive [the unusual proceeding] and enquire [its reasons].

Abaye was sitting before Rabbah, [when] he saw the tray taken up from before him. Said he to them: We have not yet eaten, and they have [already] come [and] removed the tray from before us! Said Rabbah to him: You have exempted us from reciting, 'Why [is this night] different?'¹⁷

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Samuel said: Bread of [‘Oni]¹⁸ [means] bread over which we recite [‘Onin] many words.¹⁹ It was taught likewise: ‘Bread of [‘Oni]’ means bread over which we recite [‘Onin] many words. Another interpretation: ‘Bread of [‘Oni]’: ‘ani [poverty] is written:²⁰ just as a beggar generally has a piece,

- (1) which is a liquid.
- (2) A poisonous substance in the Hazereth.
- (3) For the first dipping, v. infra.
- (4) With his hand, if the lettuce is only dipped lightly in it.
- (5) אֲרֵבֶרֶת.
- (6) ‘Rabbana’ is a Babylonian title, probably the equivalent of the Palestinian ‘Rabban’ lit., ‘our teacher,’ which is a peculiar title of honor, higher than ‘Rabbi.’
- (7) When a man eats vegetables at other times of the year. Since the eating of vegetables then is not statutory, each time he eats them (after dipping) even at the same meal counts as a separate act, for when he ate the first time he did not intend eating them again; hence he must wash his hands at each.
- (8) Knowing that he would eat vegetables a second time; hence once should suffice.
- (9) The vegetable having been dipped once into vinegar, it need not be dipped again.
- (10) The narrative of the exodus, which is an essential part of the ritual.
- (11) ‘Praise,’ i.e., Ps. CXIII-CXVIII.
- (12) I.e., not think about keeping his hands clean.
- (13) Of eating unleavened bread, though he has not chewed it.
- (14) Because he has not tasted its bitterness, which is essential. Rashi reads: if he swallows bitter herbs, he has discharged his duty because even then he cannot altogether avoid tasting its bitterness.
- (15) V. p. 535, n. 7.
- (16) Since the meal has not yet commenced it is sufficient to place the food before one.
- (17) V. Mishnah infra 116a. By your observation you have in fact asked that question.
- (18) E.V. ‘affliction’. Deut. XVI, 3.
- (19) v. supra p. 166, n. 10.
- (20) Defective, though it is read plene, denoting ‘reciting’.

Pesachim 116a

so here too a piece [is taken].¹ Another interpretation: just as a poor man fires [the oven] and his wife bakes,² so here too, he heats and she bakes.³

THOUGH HAROSETH IS NOT A RELIGIOUS REQUIREMENT. Then if it is not a religious requirement, on what account does he bring it? — Said R. Ammi: On account of the Kappa.⁴

R. Assi said: The Kappa of lettuce [is counteracted by] radishes; the Kappa of radishes, [by] leeks; the Kappa of leeks, [by] hot water; the Kappa of a these, [by] hot water. And in the meanwhile⁵ let him say thus: ‘Kappa Kappa, I remember you and your seven daughters and your eight daughters-in-law.’

R. ELEAZAR SON OF R. ZADOK SAID: IT IS A RELIGIOUS REQUIREMENT. Why is it a religious requirement?

R. Levi said: In memory of the apple-tree;⁶ R. Johanan said: In memory of the day.⁷

Abaye observed: Therefore one must make it acrid and thicken it: make it acrid, in memory of the apple-tree; and thicken it, in memory of the day. It was taught in accordance with R. Johanan: The condiments⁸ are in memory of the straw;⁹ [and] the Haroseth [itself] is a reminder of the day. R. Eleazar son of R. Zadok said: Thus did the grocers¹⁰ cry, ‘Come and buy ingredients for your religious requirements.

MISHNAH. THEY FILLED A SECOND CUP FOR HIM. AT THIS STAGE¹¹ THE SON QUESTIONS HIS FATHER;¹² IF THE SON IS UNINTELLIGENT, HIS FATHER INSTRUCTS HIM [TO ASK]: ‘WHY IS THIS NIGHT DIFFERENT FROM ALL [OTHER] NIGHTS. FOR ON ALL [OTHER] NIGHTS WE EAT LEAVENED AND UNLEAVENED BREAD, WHEREAS ON THIS NIGHT [WE EAT] ONLY LEAVENED BREAD; ON ALL OTHER NIGHTS WE EAT ALL KINDS OF HERBS, ON THIS NIGHT BITTER HERBS; ON ALL OTHER NIGHTS WE EAT MEAT ROAST, STEWED OR BOILED, ON THIS NIGHT, ROAST ONLY.¹³ ON ALL OTHER NIGHTS WE DIP¹⁴ ONCE,

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

BUT ON THIS NIGHT WE DIP TWICE.’ AND ACCORDING TO THE SON’S INTELLIGENCE HIS FATHER INSTRUCTS HIM.¹⁵ HE COMMENCES WITH SHAME AND CONCLUDES WITH PRAISE; AND EXPOUNDS FROM ‘A WANDERING ARAMEAN WAS MY FATHER’¹⁶ UNTIL HE COMPLETES THE WHOLE SECTION.

GEMARA. Our Rabbis taught: If his son is intelligent asks him, while if he is not intelligent his wife asks him; but if not,¹⁷ he asks himself. And even two scholars who know the laws of Passover ask one another.

WHY IS THIS NIGHT DIFFERENT FROM ALL OTHER NIGHTS? FOR ON ALL OTHER NIGHTS WE DIP ONCE, WHILE ON THIS NIGHT WE DIP TWICE. To this Raba demurred: Is then dipping once indispensable all other days? Rather, said Raba, It was thus taught: For on all other nights we are not obliged to dip even once, whereas on this night, twice. To this R. Safra demurred: A statutory obligation on account of children!¹⁸ Rather, said R. Safra, He teaches thus: We do not dip even once, whereas this night [we dip] twice.

HE COMMENCES WITH SHAME AND CONCLUDES WITH PRAISE. What is ‘WITH SHAME’? Rab said: ‘Aforetime our fathers were idolaters’; while Samuel said: ‘We were slaves.’¹⁹ R. Nahman asked his slave Daru: ‘When a master liberates his slave and gives him gold and silver, what should he say to him?’ ‘He should thank and praise him,’ replied he. ‘You have excused us from saying “Why [is this night] different?”’ observed he. [Thereupon] he commenced by reciting, ‘We were slaves.’

MISHNAH. R. GAMALIEL USED TO SAY: WHOEVER DOES NOT MAKE MENTION OF²⁰

(1) The blessing for the unleavened bread must be said over a piece of Mazzah only, not over a whole one, to emphasize Israel's poverty in Egypt. (Hence three matzoth are required, two because every festival and the Sabbath require two loaves,

and a third which is broken, so that the blessing may be recited over the piece.)

(2) Without delay, as they’ cannot afford more fuel should the oven cool.

(3) Even wealthy people must bake the unleavened bread without unnecessary delay, lest it turn leaven.

(4) V. supra 115b.

(5) While waiting for the cure to take effect-or perhaps, until he takes these.

(6) Under which the Israelitish women in Egypt gave birth to their children; v. Sot., 11b.

(7) Wit which they made bricks.

(8) Which are mixed in the Haroseth.

(9) Just as the straw was kneaded into the clay.

(10) Lit., ‘parched grain merchants’ — such would sell spices, etc. too. Rashi and Rashbam: vendors who sat behind

latticed windows.

(11) Lit., ‘and here’.

(12) Why all this unusual procedure?

(13) I.e., in Temple times, v. supra 70a.

(14) So the text as emended, and it is thus quoted in the Gemara; v. O.H. 473. 7 and ר"ב 9 a.l.

(15) The answer must be intelligible to the child.

(16) Deut. XXVI, 5.

(17) If he has no wife.

(18) ‘Obliged’ (Hayyabin) connotes a religious precept, whereas as stated supra 114b the first dipping is merely to stimulate the children's wonder.

(19) The modern liturgy combines both, commencing however with the latter.

(20) Perhaps better: ‘explain.’ as R. Gamaliel's main point is that their purpose must be explained; v. Kaplan, Redaction of the Talmud, p. 203.

Pesachim 116b

THESE THREE THINGS ON PASSOVER DOES NOT DISCHARGE HIS DUTY, AND THESE ARE THEY: THE PASSOVER-OFFERING. UNLEAVENED BREAD, AND BITTER HERBS. THE PASSOVER-OFFERING IS [SACRIFICED] BECAUSE THE OMNIPRESENT PASSED OVER THE HOUSES OF OUR FATHERS IN EGYPT, AS IT IS SAID, THEN YE SHALL SAY: IT IS THE SACRIFICE OF THE LORD'S PASSOVER, FOR THAT HE PASSED OVER, ETC.¹ THE UNLEAVENED BREAD IS [EATEN] BECAUSE OUR FATHERS WERE REDEEMED FROM EGYPT, AS IT IS SAID, AND THEY BAKED UNLEAVENED CAKES OF THE DOUGH WHICH THEY BROUGHT FORTH OUT OF EGYPT, ETC.² THE BITTER HERB IS

PESOCHEM – 87a-121b

[EATEN] BECAUSE THE EGYPTIANS EMBITTERED THE LIVES OF OUR FATHERS IN EGYPT, AS IT IS SAID, AND THEY MADE THEIR LIVES BITTER, ETC.³ IN EVERY GENERATION A MAN IS BOUND TO REGARD HIMSELF AS THOUGH HE PERSONALLY HAD GONE FORTH FROM EGYPT, BECAUSE IT IS SAID, AND THOU SHALT TELL THY SON IN THAT DAY, SAYING: IT IS BECAUSE OF THAT WHICH THE LORD DID FOR ME WHEN I CAME FORTH OUT OF EGYPT.⁴ THEREFORE IT IS OUR DUTY TO THANK, PRAISE, LAUD, GLORIFY, EXALT, HONOUR, BLESS, EXTOL, AND ADORE HIM WHO WROUGHT ALL THESE MIRACLES FOR OUR FATHERS AND OURSELVES; HE BROUGHT US FORTH FROM BONDAGE INTO FREEDOM, FROM SORROW INTO JOY, FROM MOURNING INTO FESTIVITY, FROM DARKNESS INTO GREAT LIGHT, AND FROM SERVITUDE INTO REDEMPTION. THEREFORE LET US SAY BEFORE HIM, HALLELUJAH!⁵ HOW FAR DOES ONE RECITE IT? BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: UNTIL 'AS A JOYOUS MOTHER OF CHILDREN,'⁶ WHILE BETH HILLEL SAY: UNTIL 'THE FLINT INTO A FOUNTAIN OF WATERS,'⁷ AND HE CONCLUDES WITH [A FORMULA OF] REDEMPTION. R. TARFON USED TO SAY WHO REDEEMED US AND REDEEMED OUR FATHERS FROM EGYPT, BUT HE DID NOT CONCLUDE [WITH A BLESSING].⁸ R. AKIBA SAID: 'SO MAY THE LORD OUR GOD AND THE GOD OF OUR FATHER SUFFER US TO REACH OTHER SEASONS AND FESTIVALS WHICH COME TOWARDS US FOR PEACE, REJOICING IN THE REBUILDING OF THY CITY AND GLAD IN THY SERVICE, AND THERE WE WILL PARTAKE OF THE SACRIFICES AND THE PASSOVER-OFFERINGS⁹, ETC. AS FAR AS BLESSED ART THOU, O LORD, WHO HAST REDEEMED ISRAEL.'

GEMARA. Raba said: He must say 'and us did he bring forth from there.' Raba said: He must lift up the unleavened bread, and he must lift up the bitter herb,¹⁰ but he need not lift up the meat;¹¹ moreover, it would appear

as though he ate sacrifices without [the Temple].¹²

R. Aha b. Jacob said: A blind person is exempt from reciting the Haggadah. [For] here it is written, it is because of that [Zeh],¹³ while elsewhere it is written, This our son [Zeh]:¹⁴ just as there the blind are excluded,¹⁵ so here to the blind are excluded. But that is not so, for Meremar said: I asked the scholars of the School of R. Joseph, who recites the Aggadah¹⁶ at R. Joseph's? And they told me, R. Joseph; Who recites the Aggadah at R. Shesheth's? And they told me, R. Shesheth.¹⁷ —

These Rabbis held that un-leavened bread nowadays is a Rabbinical obligation.¹⁸ Hence it follows that R. Aha b. Jacob holds that unleavened bread nowadays is a Scriptural obligation?¹⁹ But Surely it was R. Aha b. Jacob himself who said: [The obligation of eating] unleavened bread nowadays is Rabbinical! — He holds, Whatever our Rabbis enacted, they enacted it similar to the Scriptural Jaw.²⁰ But according to R. Shesheth and R. Joseph too, surely it is certain that whatever our Rabbis enacted, they enacted similar to a Scriptural law? —

How compare!²¹ As for there, it is we: since it should have been written, 'He is our son,' whereas it is written, 'This our son,'²² you may infer that it comes to exclude blind persons. But here, if not 'for the sake of this' what should be written? Hence it comes [to intimate], 'for the sake of the unleavened bread and bitter herbs.'²³

THEREFORE IT IS OUR DUTY.

(1) Ex. XII, 27.

(2) Ibid. 39.

(3) Ex. I, 14.

(4) Ibid. XIII, 8.

(5) 'Praise ye the Lord,' with which Hallel commences.

(6) Ps. CXIII, 9.

(7) Ibid. CXIV, 8.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(8) Hatham is the technical term meaning to round off a liturgical passage with a blessing formula, 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord.'

(9) So the text as emended, 'sacrifices' referring to the Hagigah of the fourteenth, which was eaten before the

Passover-offering (v. supra 70a); hence it is mentioned before too.

(10) When saying, 'This unleavened bread' . . . 'this bitter herb.'

(11) Which is set in memory of the Passover-offering; v. R. Joseph's dictum supra 114b.

(12) If he lifted up the meat as he said 'This Passover-offering,' it would look as if he had actually consecrated it as a sacrifice, which is forbid den, Since sacrifices may not be offered without the Temple (Raba refers to post-Temple times). Hence he must not lift up the meat.

(13) Lit., 'this'.

(14) Deut. XXI, 20.

(15) For 'this our son' implies that his parents see and point at him.

(16) Haggadah.

(17) R. Joseph and R. Shesheth were both blind.

(18) Sc. that unleavened bread must be eaten on the first night of Passover (the interdict of leavened bread of course is Biblical). Hence the reciting of the Haggadah is likewise Rabbinical, and therefore 'unaffected by R. Aha b. Jacob's deduction.

(19) For he states his law generally, and therefore meant it for post-Temple times too.

(20) On which it is based. Hence since the blind were exempt from reciting the Haggadah when it was a Scriptural obligation, they are still exempt now that it is only Rabbinical.

(21) They reject the law entirely, together with the analogy on which it is based.

(22) v. Sanh., Sonc. ed. p. 486, n. 2 and 3.

(23) I.e., it does not intimate that he who recites must see it, but simply means: it is for this reason that I eat unleavened bread and bitter herbs viz., because of what the Lord did for me, etc.

Pesachim 117a

R. Hisda said in R. Johanan's name: Hallelujah, Kesjah¹ and Jedidjah² are single words.³ Rab said: Kesjah and merhabjah⁴ are single words. Rabbah⁵ said Merhabjah alone [is a single word].

The scholars asked: What about Merhab Jah in R. Hisda's view?⁶ The question stands.

The scholars asked: What about Jedidjah in Rab's view? —

Come and hear: Jedidjah is divisible into two, therefore Jedid is non-sacred while Jah [the Lord] is sacred.⁷

The scholars asked: What about Hallelujah in Rab's view?

Come and hear, for Rab said: I saw [a copy of] the Psalms in my friend's college,⁸ wherein 'Hallalu' was written on one line and 'Jah' on the following.⁹ Now he disagrees with R. Joshua b. Levi, for R. Joshua b. Levi said: What is the meaning of 'Hallelujah? Praise him with many praises.¹⁰

Further, he [R. Joshua b. Levi] is self-contradictory. For R. Joshua b. Levi said: The Book of Psalms was uttered with ten synonyms of praise, viz.: Nizzuah [victory], Niggun [melody], Maskil,¹¹ Mizmor [psalm], Shir [song], Ashre [happy], Tehillah [praise], Tefillah [prayer], Hodayah [thanksgiving] [and] Hallelujah. The greatest of all is 'Hallelujah,' because it embraces the [Divine] Name and praise simultaneously.¹²

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: The Song in the Torah¹³ was uttered by Moses and Israel when they ascended from the [Red] Sea. And who recited this Hallel?¹⁴ The prophets among them ordained that Israel should recite it at every important epoch and at every misfortune — may it not come upon them! and when they are redeemed they recite [in gratitude] for their redemption.

It was taught, R. Meir used to say: All the praises which are stated in the Book of psalms, David uttered all of them, for it is said, The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended [Kallu]:¹⁵ read not Kallu but Kol Ellu [all these].¹⁶ Who recited this Hallel?

R. Jose said: My son Eleazar maintains [that] Moses and Israel said it when they ascended from the [Red] Sea, but his college disagree with him, averring that David said it. But is view is prefer able to theirs: Is it possible that

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Israel slaughtered their Passover-offerings or took their palm-branches without uttering song!¹⁷ Another argument: Micah's image¹⁸ stands at Beki¹⁹ and Israel recites the Hallel!²⁰

Our Rabbis taught: As for all the songs and praises to which David gave utterance in the Book of Psalms, R. Joshua said: He spoke them in reference to himself; R. Joshua said: He spoke them with reference to the [Jewish] community; while the Sages maintain: Some of them refer to the community, while others refer to himself. [Thus:] those which are couched in the singular bear upon himself, while those which are couched in the plural allude to the community. Nizzuah and niggun²¹ [introduce psalms] relating to the future; Maskil [indicates that it was spoken] through a Meturgeman [interpreter]; [the superscription] To David, a psalm²² intimates that the Shechinah rested upon him and then he uttered [that] song; 'a psalm of David' intimates that he [first] uttered [that particular] psalm and then the Shechinah rested upon him. This teaches you that the Shechinah rests [upon man] neither in indolence nor in gloom nor in frivolity nor in levity, nor in vain pursuits,²² but only in rejoicing connected with a religious act, for it is said, 'but now bring me a minstrel.' And it came to pass, when the minstrel played, that he hand of the lord came upon him.²³ Rab Judah said in Rab's name: And it is likewise so in a matter of Halachah.²⁴

R. Nahman said: And it is likewise so for a good dream.²⁵ But that is not so, for R. Giddal said in Rab's name: If a scholar sits before his teacher and his lips do not drip anxiety,²⁶ they shall be burnt, for it is said, His lips are as lilies [Shoshanim], dropping with flowing myrrh [Mor 'Ober];²⁷ read not Shoshanim but Sheshonim [that study]; read not Mor'ober but Mar 'Ober [dropping anxiety]? —

There is no difficulty: One applies to the teacher, the other to the disciple.

Alternatively, both refer to the teacher, yet there is no difficulty: the one holds good before he commences; the other, after he commences. Even as Rabbah used to say something humorous to his scholars before he commenced [his discourse], in order to amuse them;²⁸ after that he sat in awe and commenced the lecture.

Our Rabbis taught: Who uttered this Hallel? R. Eleazar said: Moses ad Israel uttered it when they stood by the [Red] Sea. They exclaimed, 'Not unto us, not unto us,'²⁹ and the Holy Spirit responded. 'For mine own sake, for mine own sake, will I do it.'³⁰

R. Judah said: Joshua and Israel uttered it when the kings of Canaan attacked them. They exclaimed, 'Not unto us [etc.]' and the Holy Spirit responded, etc.

R. Eleazar the Modiite said: Deborah and Barak uttered it when Sisera attacked them. They exclaimed, 'Not unto us [etc.]' and the Holy Spirit responded. 'For Mine own sake, for Mine own sake, will I do it.'

R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah said: Hezekiah and his companions uttered it when Sennacherib attacked them. They exclaimed, 'Not unto us [etc.]' and the Holy Spirit responded, etc.

R. Akiba said: Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah uttered it when the wicked Nebuchadnezzar rose against them. They exclaimed, 'Not unto us, etc.' and the Holy Spirit responded, etc.

R. Jose the Galilean said: Mordecai and Esther uttered it when the wicked Haman rose against them. They supplicated, 'Not unto us, etc.', and the Holy Spirit responded, etc. But the Sages maintain: The prophets among them enacted that the Israelites should recite at every epoch and at every trouble — may it not come to them! — and when they are redeemed, they recite it [in thankfulness] for their delivery.

PESOCHEM – 87a-121b

R. Hisda said: Hallelujah marks the end of a chapter; Rabbah b. R. Huna said: Hallelujah marks the beginning of a chapter.³¹

R. Hisda observed: I saw that in the copies of the Psalms used in the college of R. Hanin b. Rab, 'Hallelujah' was written in the middle of the chapter,³² which proves that he was in doubt.

R. Hanin b. Raba said: A agree that in the case of, 'My mouth shall speak the praise of the Lord, and let all flesh bless His holy name for ever and ever.'³³ 'Hallelujah which follows it is the beginning of the [next] psalm. In the wicked shall see, and be vexed; he shall gnash with his teeth, and melt away, the desire of the wicked shall perish:³⁴ the 'Hallelujah' which follows it commences the [next] psalm. Again, in the passage. 'that stated in the house of the lord in the night seasons,³⁵ the following 'Hallelujah commences the [next] psalm.³⁶

Bible scholars³⁷ add the following: He will drink of the brook by the way, therefore will he lift up the head:³⁸ Hallelujah which follows it is the beginning of the next psalm. The fear of the lord is the beginning of wisdom; a good understanding have a they that do thereafter; His praise endureth for ever.³⁹ 'Hallelujah which follows it is the beginning of the [next] psalm. Shall we say that this is dependent on Tannaim?

[For we learned:] HOW FAR DOES HE RECITE IT? BETH SHAMMAI MAINTAIN: UNTIL AS A JOYOUS MOTHER OF CHILDREN, WHILE BETH HILLEL. SAY: UNTIL THE FLINT INTO A FOUNTAIN OF WATERS.' But another [Baraitha] taught: How far does he recite it? Beth Shammai maintain: Until 'when Israel came forth out of Egypt.'⁴⁰ while Beth Hillel say: Until, 'Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us.'⁴¹

(1) In Ex. XVII, 16: The hand upon Kesjah (E.V.: the throne of the Lord).

(2) II Sam. XII, 25: and he called his name Jedidjah (E.V. Jedidiah).

(3) Though Jah means the 'Lord,' it combines to form a single word.

(4) Ps CXVIII, 5: He answered me Ba-merhabjah (E.V.: with great enlargement); lit., 'with the Lord's enlargement.

(5) Rashal reads: Raba:

(6) Is it one word or two?

(7) This would affect e.g., the manner of its writing. If 'Jedid' is written incorrectly, it can be erased and rewritten. But Jah, being sacred (i.e., God's name), must not be erased and would have to be cut out entirely, together with its parchment.

(8) I.e., at the college of R. Hiyya.

(9) Thus he evidently regards it as two words.

(10) Since he interprets the whole word thus, he evidently regards it as one.

(11) V. e.g., superscriptions to Ps. XLII, XLIV, and XLV; perhaps lit., 'a psalm giving instruction.'

(12) Thus he interprets 'Jah' separately.

(13) 'Torah' bears here its narrower connotation of Pentateuch. The 'Song' referred to is that contained in Ex. XV.

(14) Ps. CXIII-CXVIII. [MS.M. (gloss) inserts: Moses and Israel recited it].

(15) Ps. LXXII, 20.

(16) The verse thus reads: All these are prayers, etc.

(17) Until the time of David — surely not.

(18) V. Judg. XVII.

(19) [Probably a variant of Bochin, v. Judg. II, 1].

(20) Rashbam: Hallel, which contains a sweeping condemnation of idolatry (v. Ps. CXV, 5-8), could not have been composed in the days of David while Micah's idolatrous image was still in existence; hence it must have been composed at the Red Sea.

(21) V. supra.

(22) Lit., 'idle words' or chatter.

(23) II Kings III, 15. Maharsha in Shab. 30a observes that the verse is quoted to show that the Shechinah does not rest on a man who is plunged in gloom, Elisha requiring the minstrel to dissipate the gloom occasioned by Jehoram's visit.

(24) Serious study should be preceded by light-hearted conversation.

(25) Going to sleep in good spirits promotes happy dreams.

(26) Lit., 'bitterness'. To show due reverence.

(27) Cant. V, 13.

(28) Lit., 'and the scholars rejoiced'.

(29) Ps. CXV, 1.

(30) Isa. XLVIII, 11.

(31) Where a single 'Hallelujah separates two psalms (e.g., Ps. CXXXIV and CXXXV), R. Hisda maintains that it ends the first, while Rabbah b. R. Huna places it at the beginning of the second.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(32) I.e., the two men were into one with 'Hallelujah' in the middle.

(33) Ps. CXLV, 21.

(34) Ps. CXII, 10.

(35) Ibid. CXXXIV, 1.

(36) This is somewhat difficult as 'Hallelujah' does not immediately follow. Possibly the phrase is quoted loosely to indicate which psalm is meant, viz., CXXXIV, 'Hallelujah,' the commencing the next. Tosaf. however quotes 'Ye that stand in the house of the Lord, in the courts of the house of our God'. In our edd. this is Ps. CXXXV, 2, and does not end the psalm; but according to Tosaf. it does, while v. 3, which begins with 'Hallelujah,' (E.V. praise ye the lord) is the beginning of another psalm.

(37) Presumably scholars who specialized in the study of the Bible.

(38) Ps. CX, 7.

(39) Ps. CXI, 10.

(40) Ibid. CXIV, 1.

(41) Ibid. CXV, 1. In each case whereas the Mishnah quotes the ending of the chapters according to our edd., the Baraita quotes the beginning of the following chapters.

Pesachim 117b

Surely then they differ in this: he who says, until 'as a joyous mother of children', holds that [the following] 'Hallelujah' [praise ye lord] is the beginning of the [next] psalm; while he who says until, 'when Israel came forth out of Egypt', holds that 'Hallelujah is the end of the [previous] psalm!'¹ —

R. Hisda reconciles it with his view. All agree that 'Hallelujah is the end of the psalm. Hence the statement, until 'when Israel came forth out of Egypt is well. While he who says, until 'a joyous mother of children is meant inclusively. Then let him say, 'up to "hallelujah"'? And should you answer, because we would not know which 'Hallelujah,' then let him say, 'up to the "Hallelujah" of "as a joyous mother of children"'? This is a difficulty.

Rabbah b. R. Huna reconciles it with his view. All agree that 'Hallelujah is the beginning of the psalm. Hence the statement, until 'as a joyous mother of children' is well. While he who says, until 'when Israel came forth' does not mean it inclusively. Then let

him say, 'until the Hallelujah? And should you answer, because we would not know which 'Hallelujah is meant, then let him say, 'until the Hallelujah of "when Israel came forth"'? This is a difficulty.

AND HE CONCLUDES WITH [A FORMULA OF] REDEMPTION. Raba said: [The ending of the benediction following] the reciting of the shema² and Hallel is 'who redeemed Israel';³ that of prayer⁴ is 'the redeemer of Israel'.⁵ What is the reason? Because it is a petition.⁶

R. Zera said: [The formula] in Kiddush is 'who did sanctify us with His commandments and did command us'; that of prayer is 'sanctify us with Thy Commandments.' What is the reason? Because it is supplication.

R. Aha b. Jacob said: And he must refer to the Egyptian exodus in the Kiddush of the day. [For] here it is written, that thou mayest remember the day [when thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt],⁷ while there it is written, Remember the Sabbath day, to hallow it [by reciting Kiddush].⁸

Rabbah b. Shila said: [The formula] in Prayer is 'who causeth the horn of Salvation to spring forth,'⁹ while that of the haftarah¹⁰ is 'the shield of David.' And I will make thee a great man, like unto the name of the great ones [that are in the earth the earth].¹¹ R. Joseph taught: that alludes to the fact that we say 'the shield of David.'¹²

R. Simeon b. Lakish said: And I will make thee a great nation:¹³ that means that we say, 'the God of Abraham'; and I will bless thee — that we say, 'the God of Isaac'; and make thy name great, — that we say, 'the God of Jacob.' You might think that we conclude with [a reference to] all of them: therefore it is said, and be thou a blessing: with thee do we conclude, but we do not conclude with all of them.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Raba said: I found the elders of Pumbeditha¹⁴ sitting and stating: On the Sabbath, both in Prayer¹⁵ and in Kiddush [we conclude the benediction with] ‘who sanctifiest the Sabbath.’ On a festival, both in Prayer and in Kiddush [we conclude with] ‘who sanctifiest Israel and the [festive] seasons.’ Said I to them, On the contrary, [the formula] of Prayer both on the Sabbath and on a festival is ‘who sanctifiest Israel.’ In the Kiddush of the Sabbath [the formula is] ‘who sanctifiest the Sabbath’; On a festival, ‘who sanctifiest Israel and the seasons.’ Now I will state my reason and your reason. Your reason is: the Sabbath is permanently fixed, hence both in Prayer and in Kiddush ‘who sanctifiest the Sabbath’ [is said].¹⁶ On festivals, which are fixed by Israel, for they intercalate the months¹⁷ and fix [the beginnings of] the years,¹⁸ ‘who sanctifiest Israel and the seasons’ [is said].¹⁹ My reason: Prayer, which is [carried on] in public, [requires] ‘who sanctifiest Israel’;²⁰ as for Kiddush, which is [recited] privately [at home], on the Sabbath [the formula is] ‘who sanctifiest the Sabbath,’ while on festivals it is ‘who sanctifiest Israel and the seasons’²¹ That [argument] however is Incorrect: is not prayer [recited] privately [too], and is not Kiddush recited publicly? — Raba however, holds: Follow the main [practice].²²

‘Ulla b. Rab visited Raba. he recited [Kiddush] in accordance with the elders of Pumbeditha, and he said nothing to him [in protest]. This proves that Raba retracted.

R. Nathan the father of R. Hune the son of R. Nathan²³ visited R. Papa. He recited it in accordance with the elders of Pumbeditha, whereupon R. Papa praised him.

Rabina said: I visited Meremar at Sura, when the reader²⁴ went down [to the reading desk]²⁵ and recited it as the elders of Pumbeditha. Everybody made to silence him, but he said to them, ‘Leave him alone: the law is as the elders of Pumbeditha.’ Then they did not silence him.²⁶

MISHNAH. THEY FILLED THE THIRD CUP FOR HIM. HE THEN RECITES GRACE AFTER MEALS. OVER THE FOURTH [CUP] HE CONCLUDES THE HALLEL, AND RECITES THE GRACE OF SONG.²⁷ BETWEEN THESE CUPS²⁸ HE MAY DRINK IF HE WISHES; BETWEEN THE THIRD AND THE FOURTH HE MAY NOT DRINK.

GEMARA. R. Hanan said to Raba: This proves that Grace after meals requires a cup [of wine]. Said he to him: Our Rabbis instituted four cups as symbolizing freedom:²⁹ let us perform a religious act with each.³⁰

OVER THE FOURTH [CUP] HE CONCLUDES THE HALLEL, AND RECITES THE GRACE OF SONG.

- (1) This of course is on the view of Beth Shammai. The differences in the view of Beth Hillel are then stated for the sake of parallelism (Rashbam).
- (2) This is followed by one benediction in the morning and two in the evening, before the ‘Prayer,’ i.e. the Eighteen benedictions.
- (3) In the past tense.
- (4) The Amidah on weekdays. It consists of the Eighteen Benedictions, the fifth of which is a prayer for redemption.
- (5) In the present tense.
- (6) For the future. Hence the past tense would be inappropriate.
- (7) Deut. XVI, 3.
- (8) Ex. XX, 8. ‘Remember’ in the second verse, i.e., the reciting of Kiddush (and the Sabbath is an example of a holy days, including Festivals). must include the ‘remember,’ of the first verse, vi., the Egyptian exodus.
- (9) That is the ending of the fifteenth benediction.
- (10) V. Glos. It is followed by four benedictions. The reference here is to the third, whose subject-matter is the same as the fifteenth benediction mentioned in the preceding note.
- (11) II Sam. VII, 9.
- (12) it is a great honor to David that God is designated ‘the shield of David’ in the conclusion of a benediction.
- (13) Ex. XII, 2.
- (14) Rab Judah and R. ‘Ena, v. Sanh. 17b.
- (15) The ‘Amidah on Sabbath and Festivals consists of seven benedictions.
- (16) Because its sanctification depends entirely on God.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(17) The Jewish month consists of either 29 or 30 days, the length of each month being fixed by the Jewish authorities.

(18) Thereby fixing the dates of festivals too.

(19) Thus Israel must be mentioned, because through Israel the festivals are sanctified.

(20) I.e., a reference to the whole community.

(21) The emphasis being on the sacred nature of the day, 'Israel' must be mentioned in the latter case because the sanctification (If the seasons is dependant thereon (supra).

(22) Prayer is essentially intended for the community, notwithstanding that private prayer too is possible. Again, Kiddush is chiefly intended for the home ('in the place of the meal'), though it is also recited in the synagogue on account of the wayfarers.

(23) 'The son of R. Nathan' should probably be deleted.

(24) Lit., 'the deputy of the congregation.' In the Talmud this is the name of the reader who leads the congregation in prayer; the modern title 'Hazzan' dates from the post-Talmudic period.

(25) In Talmudic times this was on a lower level than the rest of the synagogue building, in accordance with Ps. CXXX, 1: out of the depths have I called Thee O Lord.

(26) Omitted in MS. M. var. lec. add: And the law is as the elders of Pumbeditha.

(27) The phrase is explained in the Gemara.

(28) Viz., first, second and third.

(29) This is omitted in Rashbam.

(30) Hence Grace is recited over the third. But on other occasions a cup may not be required for Grace after meals.

Pesachim 118a

What is 'THE GRACE OF SONG'? Rab Judah said: 'They shall praise Thee, O Lord our God'; while R. Johanan said: 'The breath of a living [etc.]'¹

Our Rabbis taught: At the fourth he concludes the Hallel and recites the great Hallel this is the view of R. Tarfon. Others say: The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.² What comprises the great Hallel? Rab³ Judah said: From 'O give thanks' until 'the rivers of Babylon.'⁴ While R. Johanan said: From 'A song of ascents' until 'the rivers of Babylon.'⁵ R. Aha b. Jacob said: From 'for the Lord hath chosen Jacob unto himself'⁶ until 'the rivers of Babylon.' And why is it called the great Hallel? —

Said R. Johanan: Because the Holy One, blessed be He, sits in the heights of the universe and distributes food to all creatures.⁷

R. Joshua b. Levi said: To what do these twenty-six [verses of] 'Give thanks'⁸ correspond? To the twenty-six generations which the Holy One, blessed be He, created in His world; though He did not give them the Torah, He sustained them by His love.⁹

R. Hisda said:¹⁰ What is meant by the verse, O give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good?¹¹ Give thanks unto the Lord who exacts man's debts by means of His goodness:¹² the wealthy man through his ox and the poor man through his sheep,¹³ the fatherless through his egg and the widow through her fowl.

R. Johanan said: Man's sustenance involves twice as much suffering as [that of] a woman in childbirth. For of a woman in childbirth it is written, in pain [Be-'ezeb — thou shalt bring forth children],¹⁴ whereas of sustenance it is written, in toil [Be-'izzabon — shalt thou eat].¹⁵

R. Johanan also said: Man's sustenance is more difficult [to come by] than the redemption, for of redemption it is written, the angel who hath redeemed me from all evil,¹⁶ thus a mere angel [sufficed], whereas of sustenance it is written, the God who hath fed [shepherded] me.¹⁷

R. Joshua b. Levi said: When the Holy One, blessed be He, said to Adam, 'Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee,'¹⁸ tears flowed from his eyes, and he pleaded before Him, 'Sovereign of the Universe! Shall I and my ass eat out of the same crib!' But as soon as He said to him, 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread,'¹⁹ his mind was set at rest.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

R. Simeon b. Lakish said: Happy are we that we did not remain subject to the first!

Abaye observed: Yet we have still not [altogether] escaped from it, for we eat herbs of the field.²⁰

R. Shizbi said in the name of R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah: A man's sustenance is as difficult [to provide] as the dividing of the Red Sea, for it is written, Who giveth food to a flesh,²¹ and near it, To Him who divided the Red Sea in sunder.²²

R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah said: A man's excretory organs [when blocked up] are as painful as the day of death and [as difficult to overcome]²³ as the dividing of the Red Sea, for it is said, The prisoner hasteneth to be loosed; [and he shall not go down dying into the pit, neither shall his bread fail];²⁴ and that is followed by [For I am the Lord thy God,] who stirreth tip the sea, that the waves thereof roar.²⁵

Again. R. Shesheth said on the authority of R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah: He who despises the Festivals²⁶ is as though he engaged in idolatry, for it is said, Thou shalt make thee no molten gods,²⁷ which is followed by, The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep.²⁸

R. Shesheth also said on the authority of R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah: Whoever relates slander, and whoever accepts slander, and whoever gives false testimony against his neighbor, deserve to be cast to dogs, for it is said, ye shall cast to the dogs,²⁹ which is followed by, Thou shalt not take up a false report,³⁰ which may be read tashshi.³¹ Now since there is the great Hallel, why do we recite this one?³² Because it includes [a mention of] the following five things: The exodus from Egypt, the dividing of the Red Sea, the giving of the Torah [Revelation], the resurrection of the dead, and the pangs of Messiah.³³ The exodus from Egypt, as it is written, When Israel came forth out of Egypt;³⁴ as the dividing of the Red Sea: The

sea saw it, and fled;³⁵ the giving of the Torah: The mountains skipped like rams;³⁶ resurrection of the dead: I shall walk before the Lord [in the land of the living];³⁷ the pangs of Messiah: Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us.³⁸

R. Johanan also said: 'Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us' refers to the servitude to [foreign] powers. Others state, R. Johanan said: 'Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us' refers to the war of Gog and Magog.³⁹

R. Nahman b. Isaac said: [Hallel is recited] because it contains [an allusion to] the deliverance of the souls of the righteous from the Gehenna, as it is said, I beseech Thee, O Lord, deliver my soul.⁴⁰

Hezekiah said: Because it alludes to the descent of the righteous⁴¹ into the fiery furnace and their ascent from it. 'Their descent,' for it is written, Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us: [this] Hananiah said; 'But unto Thy name give glory' was said by Mishael; For Thy mercy, a rid for Thy truth's sake, by Azariah; Wherefore should the nations say?⁴² by all of them. 'Their ascent from the fiery furnace,' for it is written, O praise the Lord, all ye nations;⁴³ [this] Hananiah said; Laud Him, all ye peoples, was said by Mishael; For His mercy is great toward us,⁴⁴ by Azariah; 'And the truth of the Lord endureth forever,' by all of them. Others maintain [that] it was Gabriel who said, 'And the truth of the Lord endureth forever.' [For] when the wicked Nimrod cast our father Abraham into the fiery furnace, Gabriel said to the Holy One, blessed be He: 'Sovereign of the Universe! Let me go down, cool [it], and deliver that righteous man from the fiery furnace.' Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to him: 'I am unique in My world, and he is unique in his world: it is fitting for Him who is unique to deliver him who is unique. But because the Holy One, blessed be He, does not withhold the [merited] reward of any creature, he said

PESACHIM – 87a-121b

to him, 'Thou shalt be privileged to deliver three of his descendants.'⁴⁵

R. Simeon the Shilonite lectured: When the wicked Nebuchadnezzar cast Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah into the fiery furnace, Yurkami, Prince of hail,⁴⁶ rose before the Holy One, blessed be He, and said to Him: 'Sovereign of the Universe! Let me go down and cool the furnace and save these righteous men from the fiery furnace.' Said Gabriel to him, 'The might of the Holy One, blessed be He, is not thus [manifested], for thou art the Prince of hail, and all know that water extinguishes fire. But I, the Prince of fire, will go down and cool it within

- (1) V. P. B. p. 125.
- (2) Ps. XXIII.
- (3) Text as read by Asheri.
- (4) I.e., Ps. CXXXVII.
- (5) Ps. CXX-CXXXIV all bear the superscription 'A song of ascents.' Hence he probably means Ps. CXX-CXXXVI.
- (6) Ps. CXXXV. 4
- (7) The subject matter of Ps. CXXXVI, 25-26. Which is a great thing indeed, and for that He is praised by the reciting of the great Hallel.
- (8) Ps. CXXXVI contains twenty-six verses, each of which expresses gratitude to God.
- (9) There were twenty-six generations from Adam until Moses. These, lacking the Torah, could not be sustained through their own merit but only through God's love.
- (10) Var. lec.: R. Joshua b. Levi also said.
- (11) Ps. CXXXVI, 1.
- (12) I.e., from what He has granted to man.
- (13) When people must suffer loss in expiation of wrong, the loss is regulated according to their means.
- (14) Gen. III, 16.
- (15) Ibid. 17 'Izzabon is more emphatic than 'ezeb (both belong to the same root), and therefore denotes greater suffering.
- (16) Gen. XLVIII, 16.
- (17) Ibid. 15.
- (18) Gen. III, 18.
- (19) Ibid. 19.
- (20) Wild herbs. The translation is that of the amended text given in the margin. [Cur. edd.: 'Happy were we had we remained subject to the first,' that is, and thus been spared the sweat of the brow in search for a livelihood. Thereupon Abaye observes — we still retain part of this

advantage in that there are wild herbs which provide food without toil.]

- (21) Ps. CXXXVI, 25.
- (22) Ibid. 13.
- (23) The Heb. **השק** has both meanings.
- (24) Isa. LI, 14.
- (25) Ibid. 15. This is understood as an allusion to the dividing of the Red Sea.
- (26) The Intermediate Days of the Festival, doing unnecessary work thereon (Rashi).
- (27) Ex. XXXIV, 17.
- (28) Ibid. 18.
- (29) Ex. XXII, 30.
- (30) Ex. XXIII, 1.
- (31) [שׂוֹאֵה from rt. meaning 'to entice', 'induce', 'mislead', hence attempting to influence the judge to one side by bearing false testimony against another person. v. Sanh., Sonc. ed. p. 31 n. 10]. Rashbam deletes this phrase, holding that the whole follows from the verse as it stands.
- (32) Viz., Ps. CXIII-CXVIII.
- (33) I.e., the suffering which must precede his coming.
- (34) Ibid. CXIV, 1.
- (35) Ibid. 3.
- (36) Ibid. 4; cf. Judg. V. 4f.
- (37) Ps. CXVI, 9.
- (38) Ibid. CXV, 1. This is now interpreted as a prayer to be spared the great distress of that time; cf. Sanh. 97a.
- (39) V. Ezek. XXXVIII and Sanh., Sonc. ed. p. 630. n. 7.
- (40) Ps. CXVI, 4.
- (41) Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah.
- (42) Ps. CXV, 2.
- (43) Ps. CXVII, 1.
- (44) Ibid. 2.
- (45) And when that promise was fulfilled, Gabriel said 'and the truth', etc.
- (46) The presiding genius over hail-storms.

Pesachim 118b

and heat it without,¹ and will thus perform a double miracle.² Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to him, 'Go down.' It was then that Gabriel commenced [with praise] and said, 'And the truth of the Lord endureth forever.'

R. Nathan said: it was the fish in the sea who said, 'and the truth of the Lord endureth forever,' this being in accordance with R. Huna.

For R. Huna said: The Israelites of that generation [sc. of the Egyptian exodus] were

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

men of little faith, and as Rabbah b. Mari expounded: What is taught by the verse, But they were rebellious at the sea, even at the Red Sea?³ This teaches that in that moment the Israelites were rebellious and said: Just as we ascend at one side [of the sea] so do the Egyptians ascend from another. Whereupon the Holy One, blessed be He, ordered the Prince of the Sea,⁴ ‘Spew them forth on to the dry land.’

Said he to Him, ‘Sovereign of the Universe! Does a master make a gift to his servant and then take it back from him!’ ‘I will give you one and a half times their number,’ He replied. ‘Sovereign of the Universe, he pleaded, ‘can a servant claim [a debt] from his Master!’ ‘Let the brook of Kishon be surety for Me,’ He answered. Straightway he spewed them forth on to the dry land, and Israel came and saw them, as it is said, and Israel saw the Egyptians dead on the seashore.⁵ What is [this allusion to] ‘one and a half times their number’? For in the case of Pharaoh it is written, [and he took] six hundred chosen chariots,⁶ whereas in the case of Sisera it is written, [And Sisera gathered...] nine hundred chariots of iron.⁷ When Sisera came [to fight Israel] he advanced against them with iron staves. Thereupon the Holy One, blessed be He, brought forth the stars out of their orbits against them, as it is written, The stars in their courses fought against Sisera.⁸ As soon as the stars of heaven descended upon them they heated those iron staves. So they went down to cool them and to refresh themselves in the brook of Kishon.

Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to the brook of Kishon, ‘Go and deliver your pledge.’ Straightway the brook of Kishon swept them out and cast them into the sea, as it is said, The brook Kishon swept them away, that ancient brook.⁹ What does ‘that ancient brook’ mean? The brook that became a surety in ancient times. In that hour the fish in the sea opened [their mouths] and exclaimed, ‘and the truth of the Lord endureth forever.’

R. Simeon b. Lakish said, What means ‘Who maketh the barren woman [‘Akereth] to dwell in her house’?¹⁰ The congregation of Israel said before the Holy One, blessed be He, ‘Sovereign of the Universe! Thy sons have made me like a weasel that dwells in the vaults [‘Ikare]¹¹ of houses.’¹²

Raba lectured, What means, I love that the Lord should hear [my voice and my supplications]?¹³ The congregation of Israel said: Sovereign of the Universe! When am I loved by Thee? When Thou hearest the voice of my supplications. I was brought low [Dallothi], and He saved me.¹⁴ The congregation of Israel spoke before the Holy One, blessed be He, Sovereign of the Universe! Though I am poor [Dallah] in religious deeds, yet I am Thine, and it is fitting that I should be saved.

R. Kahana said: When R. Ishmael son of R. Jose fell sick, Rabbi sent to him: Tell us two or three things which you have said to us in your father's name. He sent back to him, Thus did my father say: What is meant by the verse, O praise the Lord, all ye nations:¹⁵ What business have the nations of the world here?¹⁶ This is its meaning: ‘O praise the Lord, all ye nations’ for the mighty and wondrous deeds which He wrought for them; all the more we, since ‘His mercy is great toward us.’ Furthermore [he sent word to him]: Egypt is destined to bring a gift to the Messiah. He will think not to accept it from them, but the Holy One, blessed be He, will instruct him, ‘Accept it from them: they furnished hospitality to My children in Egypt.’ Immediately, ‘Nobles shall come out of Egypt [bringing gifts].¹⁷

Then Ethiopia shall argue with herself: If those [the Egyptians] who enslaved them are thus [treated], how much the more we, who did not enslave them! At that the Holy One, blessed be He, shall bid him: ‘Accept it from them.’ Straightway, ‘Ethiopia shall hasten to stretch out her hands unto God.’¹⁸ Then shall

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

the wicked Roman State argue with herself: If those who are not their brethren are thus [accepted], how much the more we, their brethren.¹⁹ But the Holy One, blessed be He, will say to Gabriel: Rebuke the wild beast of the reeds [Kaneh]; the multitude of [‘Adath] the bulls:²⁰ rebuke the wild beast [Rome] and take thee possession [Keneh] of the congregation [‘Edah].²¹ Another interpretation: rebuke the wild beast of the reeds, i.e. that dwells among the reeds, as it is written, The boar out of the wood doth ravage it, that which moveth in the field feedeth on it.²²

R. Hiyya b. Abba interpreted it in R. Johanan's name: Rebuke the wild beast all of whose actions may be recorded with the same pen.²³ ‘The multitude of the bulls [Abbirim], with the calves of the people’:²⁴ that means that they slaughtered the valiant [Abbirim] like calves which have no owners.²⁵ ‘Everyone opening his hand with the desire of money’:²⁶ they stretch out their hand to accept the money, but do not carry out its owners’ wishes. ‘He hath scattered the people that delight in approaches’: what caused Israel to be scattered among the nations? The approaches [to the nations] which they desired.²⁷ He also sent to him: There are three hundred and sixty five thoroughfares in the great city of Rome, and in each there were three hundred and sixty five palaces; and in each palace there were three hundred and sixty five storeys,²⁸ and each storey contained sufficient to provide the whole world with food.²⁹

R. Simeon b. Rabbi asked Rabbi — others say, R. Ishmael son of R. Jose asked Rabbi — For whom are all these [other storeys]? — For you, your companions and acquaintances, as it is said, And her gain and her hire shall be holiness to the Lord,’ it shall not be stored nor treasured; for her gain shall be for them that dwell before the Lord.³⁰ What does ‘it shall not be stored’ mean? —

R. Joseph learned: ‘It shall not be stored’ refers to a storehouse [granary]; ‘nor treasured,’ to a treasure house.³¹ What means ‘for them that dwell before the Lord’?—

Said R. Eleazar:

- (1) To burn those who threw them into it; cf. Dan. III, 22.
- (2) Lit., ‘a miracle within a miracle.’
- (3) Ps. CVI, 7.
- (4) According to ancient beliefs the sea, like the elements in general, were in charge of particular angels.
- (5) Ex. XIV, 30.
- (6) Ibid. 7.
- (7) Judg. IV, 13.
- (8) Ibid. V, 20.
- (9) Ibid. 21.
- (10) Ps. CXIII, 9.
- (11) Lit., ‘root’, ‘foundations’ hence ‘vaults’.
- (12) The congregation of Israel is personified here as a woman, as often, and she complains that through the sins of her less worthy children she is ashamed of the daylight but must hide like the weasels in the dark vaults of houses.
- (13) Ps. CXVI, 1.
- (14) Ibid. 6.
- (15) Ibid. CXVII 1.
- (16) Why should they praise God because ‘His mercy is great toward us’ (ibid. 2)?
- (17) Ps, LXVIII, 32.
- (18) Ibid.
- (19) Rome was always identified with Edom, the state built by Esau's descendants; v. Gen. XXXV, 1.
- (20) Ps. LXVIII, 31.
- (21) I.e., Israel.
- (22) Ps. LXXX, 14. Kaneh is now interpreted as the cane reeds of the forest, the boar (or, swine) being Rome. This interpretation is probably connected with the Midrash that when Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter an angel planted a large reed in the sea whereon Rome was built (Midrash Rabbah on Cant. 1, 6).
- (23) Kaneh is now connected with the same word meaning feather, quill. — All their activities are of the same nature — evil to Israel.
- (24) Ps. LXVIII, 31.
- (25) To protect them.
- (26) Reading Mithrapes as Mattir Pas — the letters are almost the same — opening the hand, and connecting raze with Razon, desire; the money that is given to ensure the fulfillment of one's wishes. E.V.: Every one submitting himself with pieces of silver.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(27) Maharsha retains the natural translation 'war': had they submitted to Nebuchadnezzar and Titus at the first and second Temples respectively, instead of desiring war, they would not have gone into exile.

(28) מעלה means a stairway, and is probably to be understood as in the text.

(29) Maharsha: The number three hundred and sixty five is symbolic, because the Gentiles depend on the solar year of three hundred and sixty five days.

(30) Isa. XXIII, 18.

(31) I.e., of gold and silver.

Pesachim 119a

They who recognize their colleagues' place in the academy. Others state, R. Eleazar said: They who welcome their colleagues in the academy.¹ What does 'and for stately clothing' [Li-mekasseh 'Athik]² mean? That refers to him who 'conceals' [mekasseh] the things which the Ancient ['Athik] of days³ concealed. And what is that? The secrets of the Torah.⁴ Others explain: That refers to him who reveals the things which the Ancient of days concealed [Kissah]. And what is it? The reasons of the Torah.⁵

R. Kahana said on the authority of R. Ishmael b. R. Jose: What is meant by, 'For the leader [La-menazzeah]: a Psalm of David?⁶ Sing praises to Him who rejoices when they conquer Him.⁷

Come and see how the character of the Holy One, blessed be He, is not like that of mortal man. The character of mortal man is such that when he is conquered he is unhappy, but when the Holy One is conquered He rejoices, for it is said, Therefore He said that He would destroy them, had not Moses His chosen stood before Him in the breach, [to turn back His wrath].⁸

R. Kahana said on the authority of R. Ishmael son of R. Jose, and our Rabbis said in the name of R. Judah Nisi'ah:⁹ What is implied by the verse, And they had the hands of a man under their wings?¹⁰ Yado [his hand] is written:¹¹ this refers to the Hand of the Holy One, blessed be He, which is spread

out under the wings of the Hayyoth,¹² in order to accept penitents [and shield them] from¹³ the Attribute of Justice.¹⁴

Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: All the gold and silver in the world Joseph gathered in and brought to Egypt, for it is said, And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found [in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan].¹⁵ Now I know it only about that of Egypt and Canaan; whence do we know it about that of other countries? Because it is stated, And all the countries came unto Egypt [to Joseph to buy corn].¹⁶ And when the Israelites migrated from Egypt they carried it away with them, for it is said, and they despoiled the Egyptians.¹⁷

R. Assi said: They made it like a trap in which there is no corn;¹⁸ R. Simeon b. Lakish said: Like a pond without fish.¹⁹ Thus it [the treasure] lay until Rehoboam, when Shishak king of Egypt came and seized it from Rehoboam, for it is said, And it came to pass in the fifth year of king Rehoboam, that Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem; and he took away the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king's house.²⁰ Then Zerah, king of Ethiopia, came and seized it from Shishak; then Assa came and seized it from Zerah king of Ethiopia and sent it to Hadrimon the son of Tabrimon. The Ammonites came and seized it from Hadrimon the son of Tabrimon. Jehoshaphat came and seized it from the Ammonites, and it remained so until Ahaz, when Sennacherib came and took it from Ahaz. Then Hezekiah came and took it from Sennacherib, and it remained thus until Zedekiah, when the Babylonians [Chaldeans] came and seized it from Zedekiah. The Persians came and took it from the Chaldeans; the Greeks came and took it from the Persians. The Romans came and took it from the Greeks, and it is still lying in Rome.

R. Hama son of R. Hanina said: Three treasures did Joseph hide in Egypt: one was revealed to Korah; one to Antoninus the son

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

of Severus;²¹ and the third is stored up for the righteous for the future time. Riches kept by the owner thereof to his hurt;²² R. Simeon b. Lakish said: This refers to Korah's wealth. And a the substance that was at their feet.²³ R. Eleazar said: This refers to a man's wealth, which puts him on his feet.

R. Levi said: The keys of Korah's treasure-house were a load for three hundred white mules,²⁴ though all the keys and locks were of leather.²⁵

(Mnemonic: *Diyash, ADYish, Kashdek, me-Odeka*)²⁶

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Jonathan's name: I will give thanks unto Thee, for Thou hast answered me²⁷ was said by David; The stone which the builders rejected is become the chief corner-stone;²⁸ by Yishai [Jesse]; This is the Lord's doing,²⁹ by his brothers; This is the day which the Lord hath made³⁰ by Samuel. We beseech 'Thee, O Lord, save now!³¹ was said by his brothers: We beseech Thee, O Lord, make us now to prosper! by David; Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord,³² by Jesse; We bless you out of the house of the Lord,³² by Samuel; The Lord is God, and hath given us light,³³ by all of them; Order the festival procession with boughs, by Samuel; Thou art my God, and I will give thanks unto Thee,³⁴ by David; Thou art my God, I will exalt Thee, by all of them. We learned elsewhere: Where it is the practice

(1) I.e. who treat them in a friendly fashion. Maharsha: who are among the earliest, so that they can greet their colleagues who arrive latter.

(2) This completes the verse.

(3) God; v. Dan. VII, 13.

(4) Esoteric teaching, which was to be confined to the few.

(5) It is meritorious to investigate the reasons of Scriptural laws.

(6) This is the superscription of a number of psalms; 'Menazzeah is derived from Nazzeah, to be victorious.

(7) I.e., prevail upon Him to rescind intended punishment. La-menazzeah is now understood in

a causative sense: to Him who makes men victorious.

(8) Ps. CVI, 23.

(9) The Prince. I.e., R. Judah II, — The text is as emended in the margin.

(10) Ezek. I, 8.

(11) Instead of Yede, the hands of.

(12) Lit., 'living creatures' — the angels that bore the Divine Chariot, as described in Ezek. I.

(13) Var. lec.: on account of.

(14) Justice, Mercy., etc. are often hypostasized.

(15) Gen. XLVII, 14.

(16) Ibid. XLI, 57.

(17) Ex. XII, 36.

(18) To attract the birds. Bird-traps were set with corn. [Aliter: Like a fortress without corn (pro. visions). Var. lec.: like a net without fish.]

(19) Var. lec. (v. D.S.): like husks without grain.

(20) I Kings XIV, 25f.

(21) On his identity v. Sanh., Sonc. ed. p. 610 n.7.

(22) Eccl. V, 12.

(23) Deut. XI, 6.

(24) This of course is not to be taken literally.

(25) Instead of metal, so as to be light in weight, yet they were such a load.

(26) D == David; Y == Yishay (Jesse); A == Ehaw (his brothers); Sh == Shemuel (Samuel), K == Kulan (all of them); me-Odeka == on the passage commencing Odeka, 'I will give thanks unto Thee'.

(27) Ps. CXVIII, 21.

(28) Ibid. 22.

(29) Ibid. 23.

(30) Ibid. 24.

(31) Ibid. 25.

(32) Ibid. 26.

(33) Ibid. 27.

(34) Ibid. 28.

Pesachim 119b

to repeat,¹ he must repeat; to recite it once only,² he must recite them once only; to pronounce a blessing after it [sc. the Hallel], he must pronounce a blessing upon it: it all depends on local custom.

Abaye observed: This was taught only [about a blessing] after it, but a blessing before it is obligatory, for Rab Judah said in Samuel's name: A blessing must be recited for a religious duties before ['Ober] they are performed. How is it implied that 'Ober connotes priority? — Said R. Nahman b. Isaac: Because it is written, Then Ahimaaz

PESOCHEM – 87a-121b

ran by the way of the Plain, and overran [Wa-ya'abor, i.e., ran before] the Cushite.³

Abaye said: [It follows] from this: And he himself passed over [‘Abar] before them.⁴ Others quote the following: And their king is passed on [Wa-ya'abor] before them, and the Lord at the head of them.⁵

It was taught: Rabbi repeated [certain] verses of it⁶ [sc. Hallel]; R. Eleazar b. Perata added passages⁷ to it. What did he add? Said Abaye: He added [passages] for repetition from ‘I will give thanks to thee’ and onwards.

R. ‘Awira lectured, Sometimes stating it in R. Ammi's, Sometimes in R. Assi's name: What is meant by. And the child grew, and was weaned [Wa-yiggamel]?⁸ The Holy One, blessed be He, will make a great banquet for the righteous on the day He manifests [Yigmol] His love to the seed of Isaac.⁹ After they have eaten and drunk, the cup of Grace¹⁰ will be offered to our father Abraham, that he should recite Grace, but he will answer them, ‘I cannot say Grace, because Ishmael issued from me. Then Isaac will be asked, ‘Take it and say Grace.’ ‘I cannot say Grace,’ he will reply, ‘because Esau issued from me.’ Then Jacob will be asked: ‘Take it and say Grace.’ ‘I cannot say Grace,’ he will reply, ‘because I married two sisters during [both] their lifetimes, whereas the Torah was destined to forbid them to me. Then Moses will be asked, ‘Take it and say Grace.’ ‘I cannot say Grace, because I was not privileged to enter Eretz Yisrael either in life or in death.’ Then Joshua will be asked: ‘Take it and say Grace.’ ‘I cannot say Grace,’ he will reply, ‘because I was not privileged to have a son,’ for it is written, Joshua the son of Nun;¹¹ Nun his son, Joshua his son.¹² Then David will be asked: ‘Take it and say Grace.’ ‘I will say Grace, and it is fitting for me to say Grace,’ he will reply, as it is said, I will lift up the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord.¹³

MISHNAH. ONE MAY NOT CONCLUDE AFTER THE PASCHAL MEAL [BY SAYING]. ‘NOW TO THE ENTERTAINMENT!’ [APIKOMAN].¹⁴

GEMARA. What does APIKOMAN mean? Said Rab: That they must not remove from one company to another.¹⁵ Samuel said: E.g., mushrooms for myself and pigeons for Abba.¹⁶ R. Hanina b. Shila and R. Johanan said: E.g., dates, parched ears of corn, and nuts. It was taught as R. Johanan: You must not conclude after the Paschal meal with e.g., dates, parched ears, and nuts. Rab Judah said: One may not conclude after the [last] unleavened bread [is eaten]¹⁷ by saying, ‘Now to the entertainment!’

We learned: YOU MAY NOT CONCLUDE AFTER THE PASCHAL, MEAL [BY SAYING], ‘NOW TO THE ENTERTAINMENT!’ Thus it is forbidden only after the Paschal meal, but you may conclude [thus] after the unleavened bread? — He proceeds to a climax:¹⁸ After the unleavened bread it need not be stated, since its taste is not substantial;¹⁹ but [I might think] that there is no objection after the Paschal lamb, whose taste is substantial and cannot [easily] be wiped out. Hence he [the Tanna] informs us [otherwise]. Shall we say that this supports him: [As for] sponge cakes, honey-cakes and iskeritin,²⁰ a man may fill his stomach with them, providing that he eats as much as an olive of unleavened bread at the end. [This implies], only at the end,

(1) Certain verses at the end of Hallel, viz., Ps. CXVIII, 21-29. Every verse of the rest of the Psalm is repeated in the text, either actually or by parallelism, and therefore these four verses are repeated when they are recited.

(2) Lit., ‘to (say it) straight off.’

(3) II Sam. XVIII, 23.

(4) Gen. XXXIII, 3.

(5) Mic. II, 13.

(6) [Rashi(Suk. 39a): ‘from “We beseech thee, O Lord, etc.” onwards.’]

(7) [I.e., to those repeated by Rabbi (Rashi loc. cit.)].

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

(8) Gen. XXI, 8: the verse continues: And Abraham made a great feast on the day that Isaac was weaned.

(9) I.e., when Israel is vindicated and his glories restored.

(10) The cup of wine over which Grace after meals is recited.

(11) Num. XIV, 38 et passim.

(12) I Chron. VII, 27. This occurs in the genealogical lists, and since it is not carried beyond Joshua, we must assume that he was not blessed with a son.

(13) Ps. CXVI, 13.

(14) Gr. **.

(15) V. Supra 86a for notes.

(16) I.e., Rab. Rab and Samuel used to eat pigeons and mushrooms respectively after the meal, as desert, and Samuel says that this must not be done after the Paschal meal. Thus his interpretation (and R. Johanan's which follows) is stricter than Rab's. For Rab only forbids further eating elsewhere, whereas Samuel forbids it in the same place.

(17) I. e., nowadays at the end of the meal in memory of the Paschal lamb.

(18) Lit., 'he says, it is unnecessary'.

(19) He must finish the meal with the taste of the Paschal lamb and the unleavened bread predominant in his mouth. Now the taste of the latter is not substantial and enduring, and therefore it is superfluous to teach that nothing may be eaten after it.

(20) V. Supra 37a. These are regarded as 'rich Mazzah' and therefore the duty of eating Mazzah, which must be 'bread of affliction (poverty)' cannot be discharged with them.

Pesachim 120a

but not at the beginning!¹ — [No:] He proceeds to a climax. [If he eats it] at the beginning it goes without saying [that his duty is discharged], since he eats it with an appetite; but at the end, [where] he may come to eat it as mere gorging, I might say that he does not [do his duty]. Hence he [the Tanna] informs us [otherwise].

Mar Zutra recited it thus: R. Joseph said in Rab Judah's name in Samuel's name: One may conclude after the unleavened bread [by saying] 'Now to the entertainment.' Shall we say that this supports him: ONE MAY NOT CONCLUDE AFTER THE PASCHAL MEAL. [BY SAYING], 'NOW TO THE

ENTERTAINMENT'; hence one may not conclude thus [only] after the Paschal lamb, yet one may conclude thus after the unleavened bread? — [No:] — He proceeds to a climax. After the unleavened bread it need not be stated, seeing that its taste is not substantial; but I would say [that it is] not so after the Paschal lamb; hence [the Tanna] informs us [otherwise].

An objection is raised: [As for] sponge-cakes, honey-cakes, and Iskeritin, a man may fill his stomach therewith, providing that he eats as much as an olive of unleavened bread at the end. Thus it is only at the end, but not at the beginning? He proceeds to a climax: at the beginning, when he eats with an appetite, it is unnecessary [to teach it]; but at the end, where he may merely gorge, I might say [that it is] not [permitted]; hence [the Tanna] informs us [that it is].

Raba said: [The eating of] unleavened bread nowadays is a Scriptural obligation, whereas [that of] bitter herbs is Rabbinical. Yet wherein do bitter herbs differ? Because it is written, they shall eat it [the Passover-offering] with unleavened bread and bitter herbs,² [which implies], when [the law of] the Passover-offering is in force, [that of] bitter herbs is in force, and when the Passover-offering is not in force, bitter herbs are not required either! Then in the case of unleavened bread too, surely it is written, 'they shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs'? — Scripture indeed repeated [the precept] in the case of unleavened bread: at even ye shall eat unleavened bread.³

But R. Aha b. Jacob maintained: Both the one and the other are [only] Rabbinical. But surely it is written, 'at even ye shall eat unleavened bread'? — That is required in respect of an unclean person and one who was on a journey afar off.⁴ For you might argue: Since they cannot eat of the Passover-offering, they need not eat unleavened bread or bitter herbs either; hence [the verse] informs us [otherwise].

PESOCCHIM – 87a-121b

And Raba?⁵ — He can answer you: In respect of an unclean person and one who was on a journey afar off a verse is not required, for they are no worse than an uncircumcised person and an alien.⁶ For it was taught: No uncircumcised person shall eat thereof:⁷ ‘thereof’ he may not eat, but he must eat unleavened bread and bitter herbs. And the other?⁸ — It is written in the case of the one [the uncircumcised, etc.] and it is written in the case of the other [the unclean, etc.], and they are both necessary.⁹

It was taught in accordance with Raba: Six days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh day shall be a solemn assembly to the Lord thy God:¹⁰ just as [on] the seventh day [the eating of unleavened bread] is voluntary,¹¹ so [on] the six days it is voluntary. What is the reason?¹² Because it is something which was included in the general law and then excluded from the general law, in order to illumine [other cases], [which means that] it was excluded not in order to throw light upon itself, but in order to throw light upon the entire general law.¹³ You might think that on the first night too it is [merely] voluntary; therefore it is stated, ‘they shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs.’ I know this only when the Temple is in existence; whence do we know it when the Temple is not in existence? From the verse, ‘at even ye shall eat unleavened bread’: thus the Writ made it a permanent obligation.

MISHNAH. IF SOME OF THEM¹⁴ FELL ASLEEP, THEY MAY EAT [WHEN THEY AWAKE]; IF ALL OF THEM FELL ASLEEP THEY MUST NOT EAT.¹⁵

(1) And the presumed reason is because nothing may be eaten after the last unleavened bread.

(2) Num. IX, 11.

(3) Ex. XII, 18. Bah (on the basis of Tosaf. in Kid. 37b) suggests that the following verse should be quoted instead: in all your habitations shall ye eat unleavened bread (ibid. 20).

(4) But who will be fit by the evening.

(5) Does he not admit this? and if he does, on what grounds does he differentiate between unleavened bread and bitter herbs?

(6) I.e., one who does not observe Jewish law; v. supra, p. 131, n. 5.

(7) Ex. XII, 48.

(8) R. Aha b. Jacob: how does he answer this?

(9) An unclean person, etc. cannot be deduced from an ‘alien,’ for since the former will observe the second Passover a month hence, I would argue that he can then discharge his obligation of eating unleavened bread and bitter herbs too. But an ‘alien’ will not have that opportunity, and therefore he is naturally bound to eat the unleavened bread and the bitter herbs now. By the same reasoning, if there were only one verse, I would apply it to the latter, but not to the former.

(10) Deut. XVI, 8.

(11) But not obligatory.

(12) Why do I interpret it thus, seemingly in contradiction to the literal meaning?

(13) This is a principle of exegesis. Now the general rule is stated: seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread (Ex. XII, 15); when the seventh is excluded by the verse, ‘six days’ etc, this throws light not on the seventh alone, but upon the whole period, teaching that the eating of unleavened bread therein is voluntary.

(14) Sc. of a company at a Passover meal.

(15) In the latter case they have ceased to think about the Paschal lamb; when they awake it is as though they would eat in two different places, sleep breaking the continuity of action and place, and thus it is forbidden.

Pesachim 120b

R. JOSE SAID: IF THEY FELL, INTO A LIGHT SLEEP, THEY MAY EAT; IF THEY FELL FAST ASLEEP, THEY MUST NOT EAT.¹ THE PASSOVER-OFFERING DEFILES ONE'S HANDS AFTER MIDNIGHT;² PIGGUL AND NOTHAR DEFILE ONE'S HANDS.

GEMARA. R. JOSE SAID: IF THEY FELL INTO A LIGHT SLEEP, THEY MAY EAT; IF THEY FELL FAST ASLEEP, THEY MUST NOT EAT. What condition is meant by ‘A LIGHT SLEEP’?

Said R. Ashi: A sleep which is not sleep, a wakefulness which is not wakefulness. E.g., if he answers when called, cannot make a reasoned statement, yet recollects when reminded.

PESOCHIM – 87a-121b

Abaye was sitting [at the Passover meal] before Rabbah. Seeing him dozing he remarked to him, 'You, sir, are sleeping.'³ 'I was merely dozing,' replied he, 'and we have learnt: 'IF THEY FELL INTO A LIGHT SLEEP, THEY MAY EAT; IF THEY FELL, FAST ASLEEP', THEY MUST NOT EAT.' THE PASSOVER-OFFERING DEFILES ONE'S HANDS AFTER MIDNIGHT, etc. This proves that from midnight it is Nothar. Which Tanna [holds thus]? —

Said R. Joseph. It is R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah. For it was taught: And they shall eat the flesh in that night.'⁴ R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah said: 'In that night' is stated here, while elsewhere it is stated, For I will go through the land of Egypt in that night:⁵ just as there it means midnight, so here too [they may eat the Passover-offering] until midnight.⁶

Said R. Akiba to him: Yet surely it is already stated, [and ye shall eat it] in haste,⁷ [implying] until the time of haste.⁸ If so, what is taught by 'in [that] night?' You might think that it can be eaten like [other] sacrifices, [viz.,] by day: therefore it is stated, 'in [that] night': it is eaten by night, but it may not be eaten by day. Now how does R. Akiba employ 'that [night]'? He utilizes it as excluding a second night. For I might argue. Since the Passover-offering is a sacrifice of lesser sanctity,⁹ and the peace-offering is a sacrifice of lesser sanctity, the just as the peace-offering is to be eaten two days and one night, so in the case of the Passover-offering, I will substitute nights for days,¹⁰ and it may be eaten two nights and one day. Therefore the Divine Law wrote 'that [night]'. And R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah?¹¹ — He can answer you: That is deduced from, and ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning.¹² And R. Akiba?¹³ — He can answer you: Had not the Divine Law written 'that [night]'. I would have said, what does 'morning' mean? the second morning. Then what of R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah? — He can answer you: Wherever

'morning' is written, It means the first morning.¹⁴

Raba said: If a man eats unleavened bread after midnight nowadays, according to R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah he does not discharge his duty.¹⁵ That is obvious, [for] since it is assimilated to the Passover-offering, it is like the Passover-offering? — You might say, surely the Writ¹⁶ excluded it from the analogy;¹⁷ hence he informs us that when the Writ restores it, it restores it to its original state.¹⁸

PIGGUL AND NOTHAR DEFILE ONE'S HANDS. R. Huna and R. Hisda — one maintains: It is on account of suspected priests; while the other said: It is on account of the lazy priests. One maintained: As much as an olive [defiles]; while the other said: [At least] as much as an egg.

- (1) This distinction refers to the first clause, when only some of them fell asleep.
- (2) Because it is then Nothar, q.v. Glos.
- (3) This happened while he was eating the unleavened bread at the end of the meal, and Abaye meant that he might not continue now.
- (4) Ex. XII, 8.
- (5) Ibid. 12.
- (6) After which it is Nothar.
- (7) Ibid. 11.
- (8) I.e., when they had to make haste to leave Egypt, which was in the morning.
- (9) V. p. 108, n. 2.
- (10) This is necessary, since its main eating is at night.
- (11) How does he refute this argument?
- (12) Ex. XII, 10.
- (13) Does he not admit this?
- (14) Cf. supra 71a and b.
- (15) Since he holds that the Passover-offering may not be eaten after midnight, while as stated supra 120a unleavened bread is assimilated to the Passover-offering.
- (16) I.e., the verse 'at even ye shall eat unleavened bread'.
- (17) In that unleavened bread is declared obligatory nowadays despite the absence of the paschal lamb, v. supra 120a.
- (18) V. supra 120a. I.e., once the Writ teaches that unleavened bread nowadays is obligatory, notwithstanding the analogy, it becomes assimilated to the paschal-offering in respect of

PESACHIM – 87a-121b

the hours during which the obligation can be discharged.

Pesachim 121a

One taught in reference to Piggul, while the other taught in reference to Nothar. He who taught in reference to Piggul [gave the reason as being] on account of the suspected priests. While he who taught in reference to Nothar [gave the reason as being] on account of the lazy priests. One said: As much as an olive [defiles]; while the other said: [At least] as much as an egg. He who maintained, as much as an olive, [accepts the standard] as its prohibition; while he who rules, as much as an egg, [holds that the standard is the same as its uncleanness].¹

MISHNAH. IF HE RECITED THE BLESSING FOR THE PASSOVER-OFFERING, HE THEREBY EXEMPTS THE [FESTIVAL] SACRIFICE; [BUT] IF HE RECITED THE BLESSING FOR THE SACRIFICE, HE DOES NOT EXEMPT THE PASSOVER-OFFERING: THIS IS THE VIEW OF R. ISHMAEL. R. AKIBA SAID: THE FORMER DOES NOT EXEMPT THE LATTER, NOR DOES THE LATTER EXEMPT THE FORMER.²

GEMARA. When you examine the matter, [you must conclude] that in R. Ishmael's opinion sprinkling [Zerikah] is included in pouring [Shefikah], but pouring is not included in sprinkling. Whereas in R. Akiba's opinion pouring is not included in Sprinkling, nor is sprinkling included in pouring.³

(1) V. supra 85b for notes on the whole passage.

(2) The 'sacrifice' referred to is the Hagigah of the fourteenth (v. supra 69b). An appropriate blessing was recited before each.

(3) Rashbam: both R. Ishmael and R. Akiba hold that the blood of the Passover-offering must be poured out, i.e., the priest must stand quite close to the altar and gently pour the blood on to its base. But the blood of the Hagigah requires sprinkling, i.e., from a distance and with some force'. Now R. Ishmael holds that if the blood of the Hagigah is poured out instead of sprinkled, the obligation of sprinkling has nevertheless been discharged. Consequently, the blessing for the

Passover-offering includes that of the Hagigah, since in both the blood may be poured on to the base of the altar. But if the blood of the Passover-offering is sprinkled, the obligation has not been discharged: consequently the blessing for the Hagigah, whose blood is normally sprinkled, does not exempt the Passover-offering. By the same reasoning we infer that in R. Akiba's view neither includes the other.

Pesachim 121b

R. Simlai was present at a Redemption of the Firstborn,¹ He was asked: It is obvious that for the redemption of the firstborn it is the father who must recite the blessing, 'who hast sanctified us with Thy commandments and hast given us command concerning the redemption of the first born.' But as for the blessing, 'Blessed... who hast kept us alive and preserved us and enabled us to reach this season,' does the priest² recite it or the child's father? Does the priest recite the blessing, since the benefit redounds to him; or does the child's father recite it, since it is he who carries out a religious duty?³ He could not answer it, so he went and asked it at the schoolhouse, and he was told: The child's father recites both blessings. And the law is that the child's father recites both blessings.⁴

(1) V. Ex. XIII, 13; Num. XVIII, 16.

(2) Who receives the five shekels of redemption.

(3) The religious duty is primarily his, since any priest could receive the redemption money.

(4) Rashbam: this story is quoted here because the Mishnah too treats of two blessings.