

# VIII.

---

## BAVLI PESAHI CHAPTER EIGHT

### FOLIOS 87A-92B

8:1

- A. A woman, when she is in the home of her husband —
  - B. [if] her husband slaughtered [a Passover offering] in her behalf, and her father slaughtered [a Passover offering] in her behalf,
  - C. [she] should eat of that which is slaughtered by her husband.
  - D. [If] she went to observe the first festival [after marriage] in her father's house,
  - E. [if] her father slaughtered [a Passover offering] in her behalf, and her husband slaughtered [a Passover offering] in her behalf,
  - F. let her eat in whichever place she wants.
  - G. A [minor] orphan in behalf of whom [several] guardians have slaughtered [a Passover offering] eats in the place which he wants.
  - H. A slave belonging to two partners should not eat [of a Passover offering] belonging to either one of them.
  - I. He who is half-slave and half-free should not eat [of the Passover offering] of his master.
- I.1** A. A woman, when she is in the home of her husband — [if] her husband slaughtered [a Passover offering] in her behalf, and her father slaughtered [a Passover offering] in her behalf, [she] should eat of that which is slaughtered by her husband. [If] she went to observe the first festival [after marriage] in her father's house, [if] her father slaughtered [a Passover offering] in her behalf, and her husband slaughtered [a Passover offering] in her behalf, let her eat in whichever place she wants:
- B. *That yields the inference that retrospective selection is effective [since the woman now may eat whichever offerings she wants, though when the animal was killed and the blood sprinkled, she had made no choice; the offering may be eaten only by those who signed up for it, so her present choice allows her to eat it because retrospective choice is effective].*

- C. *Not at all: what is the meaning of she wants?* It means, at the time of slaughtering the animal.
- D. *By way of objection:* a woman, on the first festival, eats her father's offering; from that point on, if she wants, she eats her father's, if she wants, she eats her husband's.
- E. *No problem:* that case speaks of her yearning to go to her father's house, here [in our Mishnah] it speaks of a case in which she's not yearning to go there.
- F. *That is in line with the verse,* "Then I was in his eyes as one that found peace" (Son. 8:10), and said R. Yohanan, "Like a bride found flawless by her father-in-law's house, who is anxious to go home and tell her success in her father's household."

### **Composite on Daughters and Wives, with Special Reference to Hosea**

- I.2.** A. "And it shall be at that day says the Lord that you will call my 'My man,' and not 'My master'" (Hos. 2:18) —
  - B. Said R. Yohanan, "Like a bride in the household of her father-in-law, not like a bride in the household of her father."
- I.3.** A. "We have a little sister, and she has no breasts" (Son. 8: 8):
  - B. R. Yohanan said, "This refers to Elam, which had sufficient inherited merit to learn but didn't have sufficient inherited merit to teach."
- I.4.** A. "I am a wall and my breasts are like towers" (Son. 8:10).
  - B. Said R. Yohanan, "'I am a wall' refers to the Torah, 'and my breasts are like towers' refers to disciples of the sages."
  - C. And Raba said, "'I am a wall' refers to the community of Israel, 'and my breasts are like towers' refers to houses of assembly and houses of study."
- I.5.** A. Said R. Zutra bar Tobiah said Rab, "*What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture, 'We whose sons are as plants grown up in their youth, whose daughters are as corner pillars carved after the fashion of the Temple' (Psa. 144:12)? 'We whose sons are as plants grown up in their youth' refers to Israelite youngsters, who have never tasted the flavor of sin. '...whose daughters are as corner pillars carved after the fashion of the Temple' refers to Israelite girls, who seal their doors to save them for their husbands, and so Scripture says, 'and they shall be filled like the basins, like the corners of the altar' (Zec. 9:15). And if you wish, I shall say that the same proposition derives from here: 'Whose garners are full, affording all manner of store' (Psa. 144:13). 'carved after the fashion of the Temple' (Psa. 144:12) — to both the one and the other is regarded by Scripture as though the Temple were built in their times.*"
- I.6.** A. "The word of the Lord that came to Hosea son of Beeri in the days of Uzziah, Jotham Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah" (Hos. 1: 1):
  - B. Four prophets prophesied in the same period, but the greatest of them all was Hosea, for it is said, "The Lord spoke first with Hosea" (Hos. 1: 2). But did he speak first of all with Hosea? Is it not the fact that, from Moses to Hosea, there were numerous prophets?

- C. Said R. Yohanan, “‘first,’ means, he was the first of the four prophets who prophesied at that same time, and these are they: Hosea, Isaiah, Amos, and Micah.
- D. “Said the Holy One, blessed be he, to Hosea, ‘You sons of sinners,’ and he should have said, ‘They are your sons, the sons of those you have favored, the sons of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. So turn your mercies to them.’ Now it wasn’t enough that that’s not what he said, but he said before him instead, ‘Lord of the world, all the world is yours, exchange them for some other nation.’
- E. “Said to him the Holy One, blessed be he, ‘Then what shall I do with this old man? I’ll instruct him, “Go, marry a whore and have children of a whore for yourself,” and then I’ll order him, “Send her away from you.” If he can send her away, so then I’ll send Israel away.’ For it is said, ‘And the Lord said to Hosea, Go take yourself a wife of harlotry and children of harlotry’ (Hos. 1: 2), and it is written, ‘So he went and took Gomer the daughter of Diblaim’ (Hos. 1: 3).”

**I.7.** A. “Gomer:”

- B. said Rab, “For everybody finished up on her.”
- C. “‘Daughter [87B] of Diblaim:’
- D. “‘woman of bad name daughter of a woman of bad name.’”
- E. And Samuel said, “She was sweet in everybody’s mouth as a cake of figs.”
- F. And R. Yohanan said, “Because everybody ‘walked’ on her as a cake of figs is pressed down.”

**I.8.** A. Another interpretation: “Gomer:”

- B. Said R. Judah, “It is because they wanted to destroy the capital of Israel in her time.”
- C. R. Yohanan said, “They despoiled and finished it up: ‘For the king of Aram destroyed them and made them like the dust in threshing’ (2Ki. 13: 7).”

**I.9.** A. “And she conceived and bore him a son. And the Lord said to him, Call his name Jezreel, for yet a little while and I will visit the blood of Jezreel on 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 to him, ‘Call her name Lo ruhamah’ [she has not 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 you are not my people and I will not be yours” (Hos. 1: 3-6, 8-9):

- B. After two sons and a daughter were born to him, said the Holy One, blessed be he to Hosea, “Shouldn’t you have learned the lesson from your lord, Moses? As soon as I spoke with him, he desisted from sexual relations with his wife. You too, desist from sexual relations with her.”
- C. He said to him, “Lord of the world, I have children by her, and I can’t expel her or divorce her.”
- D. Said to him the Holy One, blessed be he, “Now you, with a whore for a wife and with children of harlotry, and not knowing whether your children are yours or belong to someone else, are the way you are, then Israel, who really are my

children, the children of those whom I have favored, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; who are one of the four possessions that I have acquired in this world” —

- E. the Torah is one possession: “The Lord acquirement me as the beginning of his way” (Pro. 8:22);
- F. “heaven and earth are one possession: “God Most High who possesses heaven and earth” (Gen. 14:19);
- G. the Temple is one: “This mountain, which his right hand has acquired” (Psa. 78:54);
- H. Israel is one: “This people that you have gotten” (Exo. 15:16) —
- I. — “and you can use such language as, ‘ exchange them for some other nation.’?!”
- J. When he realized that he had sinned, he sought mercy for himself. Said to him the Holy One, blessed be he, “Instead of seeking mercy for yourself, seek mercy for Israel, for I have made three decrees against them on account of you.”
- K. He went and sought mercy, and he annulled the decrees.
- L. He began to bless them: “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 which was said unto them, You are not my people, it shall be said unto them, you 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 to me in the land and I will have compassion upon her that has not obtained compassion and I will say to them that were not my people, you are my people” (Hos. 2: 1-2, 25).

**I.10.** A. Said R. Yohanan, “Woe to a government that buries the one who possesses it, for you don’t have a single prophet who didn’t outlive four kings in his own lifetime: ‘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’ (Isa. 1: 1).”

**I.11.** A. Said R. Yohanan, “On what basis did Jeroboam son of Joash, king of Israel, have the unearned grace of being counted with the kings of Judah? Because he didn’t accept gossip against Amos.

- B. “How do we know that he was counted with them? ‘The word of the Lord that came to Hosea son of Beeri in the days of Uzziah, Jotham Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah’ Hos. 1: 1).
- C. “And how do we know that he didn’t accept gossip? ‘Then Amaziah priest of Beth el sent to Jeroboam king of Israel, saying, Amos has conspired against you’ (Amo. 7:10); ‘for thus Amos said, ‘Jeroboam shall die by the sword’ (Amo. 7:11). Said Jeroboam, ‘God forbid, that that righteous man could have said any such thing! But if he did say it, what can I do to him, since the Presence of God said it to him.’”

**I.12.** A. Said R. Eleazar, “Even at the time of the wrath of the Holy One, blessed be he, he remembers mercy: ‘for I will no more have compassion upon the house of Israel’ (Hos. 1: 6).”

- B. R. Yosé bar Hanina said, “It derives from here: ‘that I should in any wise pardon them’ (Hos. 1: 6).”

- I.13.** A. And said R. Eliezer, “The Holy One, blessed be he, exiled the Israelites among the nations only so that converts should join them: ‘And I will sow her unto me in the land’ (Hos. 2:25). Certainly someone sows a seah of seed to harvest many kor of seed.”
- B. R. Yohanan derived the same proposition from the following: “And I will have compassion upon her who has not obtained compassion” (Hos. 2:25).
- I.14.** A. Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture: ‘Don’t slander a servant to his master, lest he curse you and you be found guilty’ (Pro. 30:10)? And it is written, ‘a generation that curse their father and do not bless their mother’ (Pro. 30:11)? Is the sense, because they curse their father and don’t bless their mother, don’t slander? But the sense is, even if the slaves are a generation that curse their father and don’t bless their mother, don’t slander them. On what basis do we know that fact? From Hosea.”

### **The Exile and Hosea’s Prophecy**

- I.15.** A. Said R. Oshayya, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture: ‘Even the righteous acts of his ruler in Israel’ (Jud. 5:11)? The Holy One, blessed be he, did an act of righteousness with Israel when he scattered them among the nations.”
- B. *That is in line with what a certain heretic said to R. Hanina, “We are better than you. Concerning you it is written, ‘for Joab and all Israel remained there six months, until he had cut off every male in Edom’ (1Ki. 11:16), while you have been with us many years and we haven’t done a thing to you.”*
- C. He said to him, “If you like, let a disciple deal with you.”
- D. R. Oshayya dealt with him. *He said to him, “It is because you don’t know how to behave. If you want to destroy all of them, they’re not all among you, being scattered. If you want to destroy those who are among you, then you’ll be called a kingdom of murderers.”*
- E. *He said to him, “By the Roman capitol! We worry about this when we lie down, and we worry about this when we get up” [Freedman: how to destroy you without incurring odium].*
- I.16.** A. R. Hiyya taught on Tannaite authority, “What is the meaning of the verse of Scripture: ‘God understood her way and he knew her place’ (Job. 28:23)? The Holy One, blessed be he, knew that the Israelites wouldn’t be able to take the Romans’ persecution, so he drove them to Babylonia.”
- I.17.** A. And said R. Eleazar, “The Holy One, blessed be he, exiled Israel to Babylonia only because it is as deep as hell: ‘I shall ransom them from the power of the netherworld, I shall redeem them from death’ (Hos. 13:14).”
- B. R. Hanina said, “It is because their language is near the language of the Torah.”
- C. R. Yohanan said, “It is because he sent them back to their mother’s house. The matter may be compared to the case of someone who got made at his wife. Where does he send her? To her mother’s house.”
- D. *That’s in line with what R. Alexandri stated: “Three went back to the place where they were planted, and these are they: Israel, the wealth of Egypt, and the writing of the tablets.*

- E. “Israel: as we just said.
- F. “the wealth of Egypt: ‘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’ (1Ki. 14:25).
- G. “and the writing of the tablets: ‘And I broke them before your eyes’ (Deu. 9:17).”

**I.18.** A. *A Tannaite statement:*

- B. The tablets broke, and the letters flew up.

**I.19.** A. Ulla said, “They were sent into exile so that they might eat [88A] dates and have the free time to get busy with the Torah.”

**I.20.** A. *Ulla came to Pumbedita. They offered him a basket of dates. He said to them, “How many of these do you get for a zuz?”*

- B. *“Three for a zuz.”*
- C. *“A basketful of honey for a zuz, and yet the Babylonians don’t engage in the study of the Torah?!”*
- D. *That night the dates upset his belly. He said, “A basketful of deadly poison costs a zuz in Babylonia, and yet the Babylonians study the Torah?!”*

**I.21.** A. And said R. Eleazar, “What’s the meaning of the verse of Scripture, ‘And many people shall go and say, Come and let’s go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the god of Jacob’ (Isa. 2: 3)? The God of Jacob, not the God of Abraham or Isaac? But we shall not be like Abraham, in whose regard ‘mountain’ is written: as it is said to this day, in the mountain where the Lord is seen’ (Gen. 22:14), nor like Isaac, in regard to whom ‘field’ is written, ‘And Isaac went out to meditate in the field at eventide’ (Gen. 24:63), but let us be like Jacob, who called him ‘home,’ ‘and he called the name of that place Beth El’ [God is a home]’ (Gen. 28:19).”

**I.22.** A. Said R. Yohanan, “The ingathering of the exiles is as great as the day on which heaven and earth were created: ‘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’ (Hos. 2: 2), and ‘and there was evening and there was morning, one day’ (Gen. 1: 4).”

**II.1** A. **A [minor] orphan in behalf of whom [several] guardians have slaughtered [a Passover offering] eats in the place which he wants:**

- B. *That yields the inference that retrospective selection is effective [since the orphan now may eat whichever offerings he wants, though when the animal was killed and the blood sprinkled, he had made no choice; the offering may be eaten only by those who signed up for it, so his present choice allows her to eat it because retrospective choice is effective].*
- C. Said R. Zira, “It is written, ‘a lamb according to their father’s houses’ (Exo. 12: 3) — in all cases” [Freedman: the head of the house doesn’t require the consent of the members of the household; the orphan may eat wherever he wants and there is no issue of retrospective validity].

**II.2.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “A lamb for a household” (Exo. 12: 3) —
- C. This teaches that a man may present a lamb and slaughter it in behalf of his minor son and daughter and in behalf of his Canaanite slave or slave-girl, whether with their knowledge and consent or not with their knowledge and consent. But he slaughters in behalf of his adult son or daughter or his Hebrew slave or slave-girl or his wife only with their knowledge and consent.
- D. *And it has further been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- E. **A man should not slaughter a Passover offering in behalf of his adult son or daughter of his Hebrew slave or slave girl or his wife except with their knowledge and consent, but a man may present a lamb and slaughter it in behalf of his minor son and daughter and in behalf of his Canaanite slave or slave-girl, whether with their knowledge and consent or not with their knowledge and consent. And in any case in which people slaughtered a Passover lamb and their master slaughtered one in their behalf, they are to fulfil their obligation through the one prepared by their master, and they are not to fulfill their obligation through the one they themselves prepared, except in the case of one’s wife [who in such a case fulfils his obligation with one she did for herself], since she has the power to protest [and reject her husband’s support] [T. Pisha 7:4].**

### **II.3.** A. *What differentiates the wife?*

- B. *Said Raba, “The sense is, a woman and any one who is in her classification [adult son and daughter, Hebrew slaves].”*

- II.4.** A. *There is a contradiction in the body of the Tannaite rules. First you say, except in the case of one’s wife [who in such a case fulfils his obligation with one she did for herself], since she has the power to protest [and reject her husband’s support], so the operative consideration is that she has the power to protest; so if she didn’t protest, then she fulfils her obligation with the lamb that her husband has prepared for her. But then the opening clause states: ...or his wife except with their knowledge and consent. Lo, if the matter is left unarticulated, she cannot fulfil her obligation in that way!*
- B. *Not at all, what is the meaning of the language, except with their knowledge and consent? It means, not that they actually say, “yes,” but when they have made no statement at all, thus excluding a situation in which they articulately said no.*
- C. *But surely the language, And in any case in which people slaughtered a Passover lamb and their master slaughtered one in their behalf, they are to fulfil their obligation through the one prepared by their master, and they are not to fulfill their obligation through the one they themselves prepared, means that nothing was said, and yet the language occurs, except in the case of one’s wife [who in such a case fulfils his obligation with one she did for herself], since she has the power to protest [and reject her husband’s support]!*
- D. *Said Raba, “If they have actually slaughtered a beast, you have no form of protest more articulate than that.”*



**III.1 A. A slave belonging to two partners should not eat [of a Passover offering] belonging to either one of them:**

- B. *R. Ina the Elder pointed out to R. Nahman the following contrast: “We have learned in the Mishnah, a slave belonging to two partners should not eat [of a Passover offering] belonging to either one of them, and by contrast, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: if he wanted, he eats from this one’s, and if he wants, he eats from that one’s!”*
- C. *He said to him, “Ina the Elder” — and some say, “Black pot” — “Between you and me the law will be fully spelled out. Our Mishnah-paragraph speaks of a case in which they are particular with each other [so the half of the slave that belongs to one may not eat the other’s offering (Freedman)], and the extra-Mishnaic Tannaite formulation speaks to a case in which they are generous toward one another.”*

**IV.1 A. He who is half-slave and half-free should not eat [of the Passover offering] of his master:**

- B. *It is of his master’s that he may not eat, but he may eat his own. But lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: he may not eat of either his own or his master’s.*
- C. *No problem, the one accords with the first Mishnah-formulation, the other, the last, for we have learned in the Mishnah:*
- D. **“He who is half-slave and half-free works for his master one day and for himself one day,” the words of the House of Hillel.**
- E. **Said to them the House of Shammai, [88B] “You have taken good care of his master, but of himself you have not taken care.**
- F. **“To marry a slave girl is not possible, for half of him after all is free.**
- G. **“[To marry] a free woman is not possible, for half of him after all is a slave.**
- H. **“Shall he refrain?**
- I. **F “But was not the world made only for procreation, as it is said, ‘He created it not a waste, he formed it to be inhabited’ (Isa. 45:18).**
- J. **“But: For the good order of the world, “they force his master to free him.**
- K. **“And he [the slave] writes him a bond covering half his value.”**
- L. **And the House of Hillel reverted to teach in accord with the opinion of the House of Shammai [M. Git. 4:5]**

**8:2**

- A. **He who says to his slave, “Go and slaughter a Passover offering in my behalf” —**
- B. **[if] he slaughtered a kid, let him eat it.**
- C. **[If] he slaughtered a lamb, let him eat it.**
- D. **[If] he slaughtered both a kid and a lamb, let him eat from the former.**
- E. **[If the slave] forgot what his master said to him, what should he do?**
- F. **Let him slaughter both a kid and a lamb and say, “If my master told me to prepare a kid, the kid is his and the lamb is mine, and if my master told me to prepare a lamb, the lamb is his and the kid is mine.”**



- G. [If the slave did as specified but] his master forgot what he had said to him, both of them [the animals killed by the slave] go out to the place of burning.
- H. But they are exempt from the requirement of preparing the second Passover.
- I.1** A. *It is obvious that [if] he slaughtered a kid, let him eat it, even though he usually eats a lamb. [If] he slaughtered a lamb, let him eat it, even though he usually eats a kid. But what about: [If] he slaughtered both a kid and a lamb, let him eat from the former? Lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: people may not sign up for two Passover offerings simultaneously!*
- B. *Our Mishnah-paragraph speaks of a king and a queen, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. While people may not sign up for two Passover offerings simultaneously, there was the case of the king and queen who said to their staff, “Go and slaughter the Passover in our behalf,” so they went and slaughtered two Passover offerings in their behalf, and they came and asked the king what to do.
- D. He said to them, “Go, ask the queen.”
- E. They came and asked the queen. She said to them, “Go and ask Rabban Gamaliel.”
- F. They came and asked Rabban Gamaliel. He said to them, “The king and queen, who are not heavy-weights, can eat of the first of the two, but he should eat of neither the first nor the second.”
- G. There was another incident, in which a dead lizard was found in the slaughter house, and they wanted to declare the whole meal unclean. They came and asked the king.
- H. He said to them, “Go, ask the queen.”
- I. They came and asked the queen. She said to them, “Go and ask Rabban Gamaliel.”
- J. They came and asked Rabban Gamaliel. He said to them, “Was the slaughter house hot or cold?”
- K. They said to him, “It was hot.”
- L. He said to them, “Go and pour a glass of cold water over it,” and they went and poured a glass of cold water over it, and it moved [so it wasn’t dead]. Then Rabban Gamaliel declared the whole meal cultically clean.
- M. So it turned out that the king depended on the queen, and the queen depended on Rabban Gamaliel, and the whole meal depended on Rabban Gamaliel.
- II.1** A. [If the slave] forgot what his master said to him, what should he do? Let him slaughter both a kid and a lamb and say, “If my master told me to prepare a kid, the kid is his and the lamb is mine, and if my master told me to prepare a lamb, the lamb is his and the kid is mine:”
- B. **Mine?! But what the slave has acquired, his master has acquired.**
- C. Said Abbaye, “He goes to the shepherd to whom his master generally directs his business, *since he will want to solve his master’s problem, and he assigns him title to one of them, on condition that his master have no right in it.*”

**III.1 A. [If the slave did as specified but] his master forgot what he had said to him, both of them [the animals killed by the slave] go out to the place of burning. But they are exempt from the requirement of preparing the second Passover:**

- B. Said Abbaye, “They have repeated this rule only for a case in which he forgot after the tossing of the blood, *so that, at the time of the tossing of the blood, it was suitable for eating*; but if the master forgot before the tossing of the blood, *so that, at the time the blood was tossed it was not suitable for eating*, they are liable to the requirement of preparing the second Passover.”
- C. *There are those who repeat this statement with reference to the following extra-Mishnaic Tannaite formulation:*
- D. five companies that mixed up the hides of their Passover offerings, and a wart [which made the animal unfit as a sacrifice] was found on one of the hides — all five offerings are taken out to the place of burning, but the owners are exempt from having to observe the second Passover.
- E. Said Abbaye, “They have repeated this rule only for a case in which he forgot after the tossing of the blood, *so that, at the time of the tossing of the blood, it was suitable for eating*; but if the master forgot before the tossing of the blood, *so that, at the time the blood was tossed it was not suitable for eating*, they are liable to the requirement of preparing the second Passover.”
- F. *The one who repeats that statement of his with reference to our Mishnah-paragraph all the more so will hold that it applies to the external Tannaite formulation, but he who repeats it with regard to the external Tannaite formulation will maintain that it does not pertain to our Mishnah-paragraph. For, since the offerings themselves are valid, if he recalls at some point what the master has told him, it would be fit for eating, it is certainly clear to Heaven [what the facts of the matter are, so he doesn't have to observe the second Passover].*

**III.2. A. The master has said: ...but the owners are exempt from having to observe the second Passover —**

- B. *But lo, there is one party that has assuredly not carried out his obligation [since his offering was blemished]!*
- C. *Is it because there is no alternative option, for what is to be done? Should each party bring a second Passover? Then they will turn out to bring unconsecrated beasts to the Temple court, since four of them already have properly sacrificed the offering. If all of them bring one Passover offering, it will turn out that the Passover offering will be eaten by those who have not registered for it [since registration by someone who has already done the rite is null]. So what is to be done? Should each of them present his Passover offering and make the stipulation, “If mine was blemished, let this one that I am bringing now be a Passover offering, but if mine was not blemished, let this one be a peace offering”? That is impossible, [89A] because there are the considerations of the breast and shoulder of the peace offering, which are eaten by priests alone [but it may be a Passover offering, and priests not*

registered on it cannot eat what might or might not be their priestly share]. And should each one of them bring a priest with him [to register for each offering]? But then, what would be the status of said priest? If he has already carried out his Passover rite, then maybe this too is a Passover offering, and this would turn out to be a Passover offering eaten by people who have not signed up for it, and if he hadn't done his Passover, then still, this might be peace offerings, and the priest will not have carried out his obligation to offer a Passover offering. And should all five of them produce a priest who has not yet performed his Passover rite, and let him sign up with these five offerings? For whatever your preference, there is now one of them who has not carried out his Passover rite. [So in fact there is a positive solution.]

- D. Rather, [the explanation for the fact that the owners are exempt from having to observe the second Passover] is that one would end up limiting the time available for eating peace offerings, for while the Passover must be eaten in a day and a night, the peace offerings may be eaten for two days and the intervening night.
- E. Well, then, let them bring a Passover supplement and say, "If mine was blemished, the one that I am presenting now will be my Passover, but if mine was unblemished, then let this one that I am bringing now be a peace offering," for a Passover supplement is eaten one day and a night only.
- F. But may we to begin with set aside a beast as a Passover supplement? [No.]
- G. Then take the trouble of presenting a Passover supplement [one left over from the first Passover].
- H. Rather, the operative consideration is that of laying on of hands, for while the Passover offering doesn't require laying on of hands, a Passover supplement does.
- I. Well, that would be a suitable answering in the case of an offering belonging to men, but as to an offering belong to women, what is to be said?
- J. Rather, the operative consideration is the matter of the placings of the blood, for while the Passover offering gets one placing of the blood, the peace offering is supposed to have two that divide up into four.
- K. Sure, but what difference does that make anyhow? Lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: **In the case of any [offering, the tossings of the blood of which] are to be placed on the outer altar, if [on the outer altar] one [properly] tossed one tossing [of blood], has effected atonement [M. Zeb. 4:1A].**
- L. Rather, the operative consideration is that while in the case of the blood of the Passover offering, it is poured out gently, the blood of peace offerings is tossed against the alter.

- M. *Sure, but what difference does that make anyhow? Lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: blood that is supposed to be applied through tossing, which one has applied through pouring out, has carried out the obligation.*
- N. *Well, I can well say that if one has done so, that rule is invoked, but do we say so even to begin with?*

### 8:3A-B

- A. **He who says to his children, “Lo, I shall slaughter the Passover offering in behalf of the one of you who will get up to Jerusalem first” —**
- B. **once the first [child] poked his head and the greater part of his body into the city, he has effected acquisition of his share and has furthermore effected acquisition in behalf of his brothers along with himself.**
- I.1** A. *That yields the inference that retrospective selection is effective.*
- B. *Said R. Yohanan, “He made that statement only to encourage them to carry out the commandments enthusiastically [but he had already registered them before hand]. A close reading of the Mishnah-formulation yields that result, since it states. **he has effected acquisition of his share and has furthermore effected acquisition in behalf of his brothers along with himself.** Now, if you maintain that he had registered them up front, then there is no problem. But if you hold that he hadn’t registered them up front, then can they be registered only after he has slaughtered the animal? Lo, we have learned in the Mishnah: **They register and then withdraw their registration from it until the moment that one will slaughter it [M. Pes. 8:3D].**”*
- C. *That is decisive.*
- D. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority along these same lines: There was a case in which the daughters came in before the sons, and it turned out that the daughters were prompt, the sons lazy.*

### 8:3C-E

- C. **Under all circumstances do [people] register with [a Passover offering] so long as there is an olive’s bulk of meat for each and every one of them.**
- D. **They register and then withdraw their registration from it until the moment that one will slaughter it.**
- E. **R. Simeon says, “Until one will toss the blood on his behalf.”**
- I.1** A. **[Under all circumstances do [people] register with [a Passover offering] so long as there is an olive’s bulk of meat for each and every one of them:] so what’s the point?**
- B. *The point is, although this association has signed up for this beast, it can wholly retract and a different association can sign up for this animal.*
- II.1** A. **They register and then withdraw their registration from it until the moment that one will slaughter it. R. Simeon says, “Until one will toss the blood on his behalf:”**

- B. *Said Abbayye, “At issue in the dispute is with regard to withdrawing from this animal, for rabbis hold that the verse, ‘and if the household be too little for being for a lamb’ (Exo. 12: 4) bears the sense, ‘during the being, or lifetime, of the lamb,’ while R. Simeon maintains that the sense is, during the existence of the lamb. But so far as registering on the animal, all concur that that can be done only until the animal is killed, since the Scripture says, ‘according to the number of the soul’s, and then, ‘you shall make your count’ (Exo. 12: 4).”*
- C. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. *They register and then withdraw their registration from it until the moment that one will slaughter it. R. Simeon says, “They may register until the animal is slaughtered, and they may withdraw until one will toss the blood.”*

## 8:4

- A. **[89B] He who registered others in his share [of the Passover offering] — the [other] members of the association have the right to give him his share [to eat elsewhere], and he eats what is his, and they eat what is theirs.**
- I.1 A. *The question was raised: in the case of members of an association, the hands of one of the members of which were skilful [at grabbing food] —what is the law on their saying to him, “Take your share and get out of here”? Do we invoke the argument that he can say to them, “Yeah, but you accepted me as a member”? Or do we say, they can say to him, “When we accepted you as a member, it was for making the sacrifice, but we never accepted you with the notion that you’d eat more than we”?*
- B. *Come and take note: **He who registered others in his share [of the Passover offering] — the [other] members of the association have the right to give him his share [to eat elsewhere], and he eats what is his, and they eat what is theirs.** So what’s the operative consideration behind this rule? Isn’t it because it is as if it is a case of members of an association, the hands of one of the members of which were skilful [at grabbing food]? So if you maintain that he can say to them, “Yeah, but you accepted me as a member,” then let this one be as though he were a skilful food-grabber?*
- C. *Say: not at all. You’ve got different strokes for different folks, since, even if both of them together eat only as much as one member of the association, they still can say to him, “we don’t want a stranger here with us.”*
- D. *Come and take note: If the servant ate as much as an olive’s bulk at the side of the oven, a smart one will eat his fill; but if the members of the association want to do him a favor, they’ll come and sit at his side” [Freedman, eating there, but he may not go and eat with them, for then he would be eating in two places], the words of R. Judah. So if they wanted, that is the case, but if not, not. But why should that be the case? Let him say to them, “Yeah, but you accepted me as a member”?*
- E. *That case is exceptional, since they can say to him, “Sure, but we accepted you with the plan of putting you to the trouble of waiting on us, but we didn’t accept you with the plan of putting ourselves to the trouble of waiting on you.”*
- F. *Come and take note: In the case of members of an association, the hands of one of the members of which were skilful [at grabbing food], they may say to him, “Take your share and get out of here. And not only so, but even if five arranged for the*

meal in equal shares, they have the right to say to him, "Take your share and get out of here."

G. *That proves the point.*

**I.2.** A. *What's the point of* and not only so, but?

B. *This is a formulation rising to a climax, namely: it is not only the rule in the case of a Passover that he can say to him, "When we accepted you, it was to make the sacrifice," but even in the case of a meal in common, which is for mere company, they have the right to say to him, "Take your share and get out of here."*

**I.3.** A. *Others say, it's no problem for us [since we know as fact that the grabber may be told to take his share and get out], but here is our problem: are the members of an association permitted to divide up [each with his share], or are they not permitted to divide up?*

B. *Come and take note: In the case of members of an association, the hands of one of the members of which were skilful [at grabbing food], they may say to him, "Take your share and get out of here." So that is the case if he is a skilful food-grabber, but if he is not a skilful food-grabber that is not so.*

C. *That proves the point.*

**I.4.** A. *R. Pappa and R. Huna b. R. Joshua formed a fusion of their bread. But the time that R. Huna b. R. Joshua ate one piece of bread, R. Pappa ate four. He said to him, "Divide up with me."*

B. *He said to him, "You accepted me."*

C. *He raised for him all of the various objections, and he answered him as we have answered those same objections. Then he refuted him by appeal to the formulation, In the case of members of an association, the hands of one of the members of which were skilful [at grabbing food], they may say to him, "Take your share and get out of here."*

D. *He said to him, "In that case, the governing principle is that they can say to him, 'We accepted you to make the sacrifice.'"*

E. *He refuted him by appeal to, "but even in the case of a meal in common, which is for mere company, they have the right to say to him, "Take your share and get out of here."*

F. *So he divided with him. Then he went and formed a fusion of food with Rabina. By the time R. Huna b. R. Joshua ate one piece of bread, Rabina ate eight. He said, "A hundred Papas but not one Rabina!"*

**I.5.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. **He who signs up others with him for his Passover and his festal offering [presented on the fourteenth and eaten before the Passover offering by those signed up for that offering] — the money he holds in hand is unconsecrated.**

C. **He who sells his burnt offering and piece offerings has done nothing, and the money he has in hand, whatever the sum, is assigned to a thank offering [T. Pisha 7:8Jff.]**

**I.6.** A. **But if it is the fact that he has done nothing, why is it the fact that the money he has in hand, whatever the sum, is assigned to a thank offering?**

B. *Said Raba, "It's an extrajudicial sanction."*



**I.7. A.** *And what is the meaning of whatever the sum?*

B. *That is the case even if the animals were worthy only four zuz and the purchaser paid five, so rabbis imposed an extrajudicial sanction covering the additional zuz.*

**I.8. A.** *Said Ulla, and others say, R. Oshayya, "Is it possible that our Babylonian colleagues know the operative consideration behind the following rule: this party designated a lamb for his Passover offering, and that party designated money for [the purchase of] his Passover offering. Now how is it possible for the status of sanctification to take hold of what is already sanctified, that the Tannaite rule should say, **the money he holds in hand is unconsecrated?**"* [Freedman: money consecrated for a sacrifice can revert to unconsecrated status only if an animal of unconsecrated status is bought therewith, whereby the animal receives the sanctify of the money, which in turn loses it and becomes unconsecrated. Here, however, the money was consecrated and given for an animal, or part of it, which was already consecrated for a Passover offering. How then can the additional sanctity fall upon the animal, in the sense that the sanctify of the money is transferred to it, leaving the money unconsecrated?]

B. **[90A]** *Said Abbayye, "If it were not for the fact that R. Oshayya assigned that Mishnah-passage [to be cited presently] [one who gave a consecrated animal to a whore, so the animal can't be used as an offering; though one may not render forbidden what doesn't belong to him, here he would do so, though, since it is sanctified, it is not really his] to the case of one who signs up a whore as a partner on his Passover offering [in exchange for fee for services rendered], and held that it represents the position of Rabbi [Rabbi says that if someone needs money, he may sign up other people on his Passover offering and spend the money for what he needs; so the animal designated as a Passover offering his his private property, and he could render it forbidden by making it a whore's fee], I would have identified the case as one involving Lesser Holy Things [e.g., he gave her an animal designated for a peace offering], within the position of R. Yosé the Galilean, who has said, 'Lesser Holy Things constitute the property of the owner.' But [from the perspective of Rabbi] he certainly does leave over in the case of money, since, when he designated it for a Passover offering to begin with he did so with this intention. And this present formulation [ **He who signs up others with him for his Passover and his festal offering [presented on the fourteenth and eaten before the Passover offering by those signed up for that offering] — the money he holds in hand is unconsecrated** ] stands for the position of Rabbi* [Freedman: when Rabbi permits the owner to spend the money on what he needs, it's not because he holds that, when a man consecrates an animal for a Passover offering, he leaves part of it unconsecrated, so that if someone gave 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 becomes unconsecrated; the reason is to the contrary, when someone consecrates money for the Passover offering, he leaves the money partly unconsecrated, in that it automatically is deemed unconsecrated when he gives it in payment for a share in a sacrifice, and the money is regarded as a gift, not as payment at all, so the seller can use it as he pleases], *and for that reason the money he holds is unconsecrated, for someone certainly leaves over a bit of the money as unconsecrated.*



*Furthermore, what R. Oshayya explains as the position of Rabbi, I don't set forth as the position of Rabbi, for someone doesn't leave over any extra that is unconsecrated out of the Passover offering [Freedman: hence on Rabbi's view, if he signs up a whore on it, that act doesn't prohibit it, since nothing of the animal is his]. But this statement in fact cannot be assigned to the concurrence of R. Yosé, since it is stated therein, and he who sells his burnt offering and peace offering has done nothing. But now that R. Oshayya has assigned that rule to the case of a man who signs up a whore on his Passover offering and within the principle of Rabbi, it follows that Rabbi as read by R. Oshayya holds that a man leaves something unconsecrated even in the Passover offering itself."*

- C. *To what statement of R. Oshayya has reference been made just now?*
- D. *It is to that which we have learned in the Mishnah:*
- E. **[If] he gave her [already] consecrated animals, lo, they are permitted.**
- F. **[If he gave her] fowl, lo, they are prohibited.**
- G. **For it might have been logical [to argue thus]: Now if to the case of consecrated animals, which a blemish invalidates, the consideration of the hire of a harlot and the price of a dog does not apply,**
- H. **to the case of fowl, which a blemish does not invalidate in any event, is it not logical that the consideration of the hire of a harlot and the price of a dog should not apply?**
- I. **Scripture states, "For any vow" (Deu. 23:19) — to encompass fowl [M. Tem. 6:5C-G].**
- J. But there is then an argument a fortiori with regard to sanctified beasts, namely: if birds, which are not disqualified by blemishes, are disqualified if they are used as the hire of a harlot or the price of a dog, Holy Things, which are invalidated by a blemish, surely should be subject to the prohibition of the hire or a harlot or the price of a dog. Scripture states, "For any vow" to exclude from the stated prohibition what is covered by a vow [which if used for the price of a whore still may be offered].
- K. *So the operative consideration is that the All-Merciful has said, "for any vow," but if it were not for that fact, I might have supposed that to Holy Things the prohibition of the hire of a harlot applies, and yet, someone cannot prohibit what doesn't belong to him!*
- L. [It is in that context that] said R. Oshaia, "We deal with a case in which he has assigned a share in his Passover lamb to her as his fee for her services, and the ruling represents the position of Rabbi. [Rabbi will allow it here, because in his view, one can dedicate something that is in his possession in such a way as to pay others so that he can purchase something not connected with the offering that has been consecrated. The case involves selling a share in the Passover lamb. Rabbi's position is that one can exchange a share in the Passover lamb for the services of a whore.]"
- M. *What is the statement of Rabbi? It is as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- N. "And if the household is too small to require a lamb" (Exo. 12: 4) — [being unable to purchase a lamb, having insufficient means, e.g., to buy wood (Miller)], then one provide him with a limbing from the lamb that is sufficient for food but not for

purchase [that is, one may not sell others a share in the lamb so as to get money to buy clothing, since such an article has no connection with the Passover offering (Miller)].

- O. Rabbi says, "One may assign a place to others for sale even if the money would be used for a purchase; if he did not have enough money, he can assign a share for others along with himself in his Passover lamb and in his festival offerings, and the money is considered unconsecrated, for it is on that condition that Israelites consecrate their lambs for Passover offerings." [Miller, *Temurah* 30B: One may therefore acquire something not connected with the Passover lamb.]

**I.9. A. Rabbah and R. Zira —**

- B. *one said, "In the case of wood to be used for roasting the offering, none differs, since this serves for the requirements of the Passover, it is classified as tantamount to the Passover itself. Where there is an argument, it concerns in the case of unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Rabbis take the view that these fall into the category of a different act of eating altogether, but Rabbi maintains that, since they serve to validate the Passover offering, they are classified as tantamount to the Passover offering itself."*
- C. *The other said, "In the case of the unleavened bread and bitter herbs too, all parties concur, since it is written, 'They shall eat the meat and unleavened bread, with bitter herbs they shall eat it' (Exo. 12: 8). Since they serve to validate the Passover offering, they are classified as tantamount to the Passover offering itself. Where there is a dispute, it concerns whether or not it is permitted to buy a shirt with it or a cloak with it. Rabbis maintain that the language, 'from being a lamb' is used by the All-Merciful, meaning, devote it to the lamb [what is gotten from the sale of the lamb must be spent on what is needed for the lamb], and Rabbi holds, 'keep yourself alive with the proceeds of the lamb.'"*
- D. *And from the perspective of Abbaye, who has said, "If it were not for the fact that R. Oshayya assigned that Mishnah-passage [one who gave a consecrated animal to a whore, so the animal can't be used as an offering; though one may not render forbidden what doesn't belong to him, here he would do so, though, since it is sanctified, it is not really his] to the case of one who signs up a whore as a partner on his Passover offering [in exchange for fee for services rendered], and held that it represents the position of Rabbi [Rabbi says that if someone needs money, he may sign up other people on his Passover offering and spend the money for what he needs; so the animal designated as a Passover offering his his private property, and he could render it forbidden by making it a whore's fee], I would have identified the case as one involving Lesser Holy Things [e.g., he gave her an animal designated for a peace offering], within the position of R. Yosé the Galilean, who has said, 'Lesser Holy Things constitute the property of the owner,' lo, it is stated as an articulated Tannaite rule, for it is on that condition that Israelites consecrate their lambs for Passover offerings for lambs for Passover offerings!*

- E. Say: for it is on that condition that Israelites consecrate money for their lambs for Passover offerings

**8:5**

- A. A person afflicted with flux uncleanness who has experienced two appearances of flux — they slaughter [the Passover offering] in his behalf on the [evening of] the seventh day [Lev. 15:1].
- B. [If] he experienced three, they slaughter [the Passover offering] in his behalf on his eighth day.
- C. A woman who awaits day by day [since she had a flow during the eleven days between one menstrual period and the next and has immersed and now awaits a complete day free of flow, after which she is clean] — they slaughter [a Passover offering] in her behalf on her second clean day [for the reason given above].
- D. [If] she experienced a flow on two successive days, they slaughter [a Passover offering] in her behalf on the third day.
- E. And as to a woman afflicted with flux uncleanness [having had three discharges], they slaughter [a Passover offering] in her behalf on the eighth day.
- I.1** A. Said R. Judah said Rab, “They slaughter the beast and toss the blood in behalf of one who has immersed on that very day and awaits sunset for the completion of his purification rite and also for one who lacks atonement [that is, the completion of the offerings required for his atonement rite], [90B] but they do not slaughter the beast and toss the blood in behalf of one who has contracted uncleanness from a dead creeping thing.”
- B. And Ulla said, “Also, they do slaughter the beast and toss the blood in behalf of one who has contracted uncleanness from a dead creeping thing.”
- C. *From Rab’s perspective, what distinguishes one who has immersed on that very day and awaits sunset for the completion of his purification rite? It is that he is fit that same evening. But, after all, one who has contracted uncleanness from a dead creeping thing also will be fit in the evening.*
- D. *Not if he hasn’t immersed!*
- E. *But one who has immersed on that very day and awaits sunset for the completion of his purification rite still lacks sunset.*
- F. *The sun sets on its own.*
- G. Well, then, one who lacks atonement [that is, the completion of the offerings required for his atonement rite] still lacks atonement!
- H. *It would be a case in which he has his pair of birds for his offering right there in hand.*
- I. *Sure, sure, but then one who has contracted uncleanness from a dead creeping thing also has an immersion pool right there before him.*
- J. *Maybe he’ll neglect the task.*
- K. *Then someone who hasn’t yet presented his sacrifice too may neglect to present it.*
- L. *It’s a case in which he had already handed over the birds to the court, in line with the position of R. Shemayyah, who has said, “There is a presumption that the*

court of priests doesn't get up from there until all of the money in the shofar-chest has been used up" [and they have completed the required offerings for that day].

- I.2.** A. *Now, from the perspective of Rab, then, by the law of the Torah, he is certainly suitable, but it is rabbis who made a precautionary decree against him. But then why did Rab say, "If half of the Israelites were clean and half unclean —They impart uncleanness to one of them with a dead creeping thing" [so that the majority is now unclean]? [But an unclean majority means such as are unfit by the law of the Torah to eat the Passover offering in the evening!]*
- B. *Rather, from Rab's perspective, by the law of the Torah too he is not suitable, for it is written, "If any man be unclean by reason of corpse uncleanness" (Num. 9:10).*
- C. *Aren't we dealing with a case in which the seventh day after the contamination by the corpse falls on the eve of Passover, so that it is no different in effect from a case of someone who has contracted uncleanness through a dead creeping thing, and yet the Torah has said that his offering should be postponed to the second Passover?*
- D. *But should you say, how so? The answer is, he concurs with R. Isaac, who has said, "[If they were carrying Joseph's bier, they could have had sufficient time to attain cultic purity [prior to Passover]. If they were Mishael and Elzaphan, they also should have had sufficient time to attain cultic cleanness. [So who were they, and why were they unclean with corpse-uncleanness?] But they were people who were busy dealing with a neglected corpse [which religious duty takes priority over all others], and the seventh day [beyond their contracting corpse uncleanness in that connection] coincided with the eve of Passover, as it is said, 'They could not keep the Passover on that day' (Num. 9: 6). The sense is that that particular day they could not observe, but they could have kept the day following," and yet the Torah has said that his offering should be postponed to the second Passover.*
- E. *We have learned in the Mishnah: **A person afflicted with flux uncleanness who has experienced two appearances of flux — they slaughter [the Passover offering] in his behalf on the [evening of] the seventh day. Isn't this a case in which he had not immersed, with the consequence that they do slaughter the beast and toss the blood in behalf of one who has contracted uncleanness from a dead creeping thing?***
- C. *No, it's a case in which he had immersed.*
- D. *If he had immersed, what's the point that he wants to make?*
- E. *That point that he wants to make is, although he still lacks the completion of the purification rite represented by sun set, the sun sets willy nil. And that reading stands to reason, since the next clause goes on to state as the Tannaite rule, **And as to a woman afflicted with flux uncleanness [having had three discharges], they slaughter [a Passover offering] in her behalf on the eighth day.***

- F. *Now there is no problem if you maintain the position that in the case of a person afflicted with flux uncleanness who has experienced two appearances of flux — they slaughter [the Passover offering] in his behalf on the [evening of] the seventh day, for it's a case in which he had immersed. And it would be necessary to make that point. For it might have entered your mind to suppose that if he had produced two appearances of flux, then we slaughter the beast for him on the seventh day, because there is no affirmative action that he has yet to perform. But if he had had three appearances of flux, on the eighth day, where he still has not accomplished the atonement rite and so an action has yet to be done, that is not the rule. So the Mishnah tells us that, even though he lacks the completion of the atonement rite, we still slaughter and sprinkle the blood on his behalf. But if you maintain that it is the case of a person afflicted with flux uncleanness who has experienced two appearances of flux who has not immersed — they slaughter [the Passover offering] in his behalf on the [evening of] the seventh day, then what's the point of telling us the rule for one who has produced three fluxes? If you maintain that one slaughters and sprinkles for one who has had two appearances of flux and is in his seventh day but has not immersed, so that he is wholly unclean, how much the more so will one slaughter and sprinkle the blood for one who had three fluxes and is in his eighth day, and who immersed on the seventh day, who is then subject to a less weighty condition of uncleanness! So doesn't that prove that the law is, a person afflicted with flux uncleanness who has experienced two appearances of flux who has immersed — they slaughter [the Passover offering] in his behalf on the [evening of] the seventh day?*
- G. *Not at all. In point of fact, I shall say to you, it is a case in which he had not immersed, but it was still necessary to make the point. For it might have entered your mind to suppose that it is on the seventh day that that is the case, since he has the power to right his situation, but on the eighth day, in which he doesn't have the power to offer the sacrifice, I might say that the priests may neglect his rite; hence we are informed that the law is in accord with what R. Shemayyah has said.*

**II.1 A.** **A woman who awaits day by day [since she had a flow during the eleven days between one menstrual period and the next and has immersed and now awaits a complete day free of flow, after which she is clean] — they slaughter [a Passover offering] in her behalf on her second clean day:**

- B. *A Tannaite authority recited the following Tannaite formulation before R. Adda bar Ahbah: As to a woman afflicted with flux [who has to wait for sunset after she has immersed, who immerses in the evening after sunset and so has to wait for the following evening before eating Holy Things], they slaughter the Passover offering for her on her seventh day.*
- C. *He said to him, "But is a woman afflicted with flux fit on her seventh day anyhow? Even in the view of the one who has said, they do slaughter the beast and toss the blood in behalf of one who has contracted uncleanness from a dead creeping thing, that rule applies in particular to a person made unclean by a dead creeping thing, who will be fit in the evening [to eat the offering], but in this woman's case, she is fit only on the next day, when she presents her atonement offering. So state it as: on the eighth day, [that is, they slaughter the Passover offering for her on her eighth day]."*
- D. *Sure, but that's pretty obvious!*
- E. *Not at all, what might you otherwise have imagined? Since she lacks atonement, they should not slaughter it for her at all? hence we are informed that the law is in accord with what R. Shemayyah has said.*
- I.2.** A. *Rabina said, "It concerned a menstruating woman that the Tannaite presentation was made to him, as follows: As to a woman who was menstruating, they slaughter the Passover offering for her on her seventh day.*
- B. *He said to him, "But is a woman who is menstruating fit on her seventh day anyhow? Even in the view of the one who has said, they do slaughter the beast and toss the blood in behalf of one who has contracted uncleanness from a dead creeping thing, that rule applies in particular to a person made unclean by a dead creeping thing, who will be fit in the evening [to eat the offering], but in this woman's case, she has to immerse on the evening of the seventh day, so she is fit to eat the Passover offering only on the evening after the eighth, when sun has set. So state it as: on the eighth day, [that is, they slaughter the Passover offering for her on her eighth day]."*
- D. *Sure, but that's pretty obvious! If one slaughters and sprinkles for a woman afflicted with flux on the eighth day, though she still lacks the completion of her atonement rite, does it have to be said that one slaughters and sprinkles on behalf of a menstruating woman, who doesn't lack an atonement rite?*
- E. *It was necessary to state the law for the menstruating woman, so as to tell us that it is only on the eighth day but not on the seventh, in line with that which has been taught on Tannaite authority: All who are obligated to immerse — their immersion takes place by day. [B. Shab. 121A: A man afflicted by flux, a woman afflicted by flux, a man with the skin ailment [of Lev. 13-14] and a woman with the same, a man who has sexual relations with a menstruating woman, and someone unclean with corpse uncleanness — they are to be immersed by day.] A woman who has completed her menstrual period and a woman after child birth may take their immersion bath at night. [A person who is unclean by reason of a seminal emission immerses any time during the whole day.] For it has been taught on Tannaite authority: one might suppose that a menstruating woman at the end of her period immerses by day [on the seventh day, as does a woman afflicted with flux uncleanness]. Therefore Scripture states, "she shall be in her impurity for*



seven days” (Lev. 12: 3) — let her be in her impurity seven full days; and a woman after childbirth is comparable to a menstruating woman.

## 8:6

- A. In behalf of (1) one who suffers a bereavement of a close relative on that same day, [91A] (2) one who has the task of clearing away a ruin [and may, in fact, thereby suffer corpse uncleanness],
- B. and so too: (3) one whom they have promised to free from prison —
- C. (4) a sick person, and (5) a senile person, [both of whom] can eat an olive’s bulk of the meat of a Passover offering —
- D. they slaughter [a Passover offering].
- E. In the case of all of these, [however], they do not slaughter [a Passover offering] in their behalf alone,
- F. lest they lead the Passover offering to suffer invalidation.
- G. Therefore, if some form of invalidation befell them, they are exempt from having to prepare a second Passover offering,
- H. except in the case of one who has the task of clearing away a ruin,
- I. for [if he uncovers a corpse] he is unclean to begin with [at the time that he animal was sacrificed].

**I.1** A. [one whom they have promised to free from prison:] Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “They have stated this rule only in the case of a gentile prison, but if it is an Israelite prison, they slaughter it for him separately, *since if they made such a promise to him, he will certainly be released, as it is said, ‘The remnant of Israel shall not do iniquity nor lie’* (Zep. 3:13).”

B. Said R. Hisda, “As to that which you have said, that this pertains to a gentile prison, we have made that statement only if the prison was located outside the walls of Beth Page, but if it was within the walls of Beth Page, one slaughters it on his behalf alone. *How come? It’s possible to bring the meat to him and he’ll eat it.*”

**II.1** A. Therefore, if some form of invalidation befell them, they are exempt from having to prepare a second Passover offering, except in the case of one who has the task of clearing away a ruin, for [if he uncovers a corpse] he is unclean to begin with [at the time that he animal was sacrificed]:

B. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “They have stated this rule only in the case of a round heap [which can cover a person, in which case the rescuer must have stood and overshadowed the corpse to begin with (Freedman)], but if it was an elongated heap, he is exempt from having to make a second Passover. *I say, he was clean at the time of the slaughtering of the beast.*”

C. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

D. R. Simeon b. R. Yohanan b. Beroqah says, “As to one who clears away a heap of stones, sometimes he is exempt, and sometimes he is liable [to postpone the Passover to the next month]. How so? If it was a round heap and uncleanness is found underneath him, he is liable. If it was an elongated heap and the uncleanness was found under neither him, he is exempt. *I say, he was clean at the time of the slaughtering of the beast.*”



- A. “They do not slaughter [a Passover offering] in behalf of a single individual,” the words of R. Judah.
- B. And R. Yosé permits [doing so].
- C. Even if there is an association of a hundred people who cannot eat an olive’s bulk of the meat — they do not slaughter [a Passover offering] in their behalf.
- D. They do not form an association consisting only of women, slaves, and [or] children.

**I.1** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that they do not slaughter [a Passover offering] in behalf of a single individual?
- C. “Scripture states, ‘You may not sacrifice the Passover offering for one’ (Deu. 16: 5),” the words of R. Judah.
- D. And R. Yosé says, “If it is an individual and he can eat it up, one may slaughter it for him; if they are ten but can’t eat it up, one may not slaughter in their behalf.”

**I.2.** A. *So how does R. Yosé deal with the verse, You may not sacrifice the Passover offering for on?*

- B. *He requires it in line with the interpretation of R. Simeon, as has been taught on Tannaite authority:* R. Simeon says, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that one who sacrifices an animal designated as a Passover offering on a high place belonging to an individual at the time that the high places were forbidden has violated a negative commandment? Scripture states, ‘You may not sacrifice the Passover offering within one of your gates’ (Deu. 16: 5). Might one then suppose that that is the case also when the high places were permitted? Scripture says, ‘within one of your gates,’ meaning, I have said to you that one violates a negative commandment only at a time at which all Israelites enter through a single gate [that is, a Temple in Jerusalem, but when the high places were permitted, there was no ‘single gate].”
- C. *And how does R. Judah derive that same proposition?*
- D. *He derives two points from the same passage.*
- E. *Now from R. Yosé’s perspective, how does he know that the verse serves the purpose adduced for it by R. Simeon? Maybe it serves the purpose adduced for it by R. Judah?*
- F. *He may say to you, “Perish the thought! for lo, it is written, ‘according to every man’s eating’ (Exo. 12: 4).” [Freedman: the matter depends solely on ability to eat.]*

**I.3.** A. *R. Uqba bar Hinena of Parishna pointed out to Raba the following contradiction: “Did R. Judah really say, they do not slaughter [a Passover offering] in behalf of a single individual? And by contrast: ‘As to a woman, on the first Passover one may slaughter the offering for her on her own, but on the second Passover one adds her to that of others,’ the words of R. Judah [T. Pisha 8:10A]!”*

- B. *He said to him, “Don’t say, for her on her own, but rather, say, for them on their own.”*

- C. *He said to him, “But do we form an association for this purpose that is entirely made up of women? And haven’t we learned in the Mishnah: **They do not form an association consisting only of women, slaves, and [or] children?** Doesn’t this mean, women on their own, slaves on their own, and minors on their own?”*
- D. *He said to him, “Not at all: it is **women, slaves, and children.** women, slaves — because of silliness, minors and slaves [91B] because of lewdness [T. Pisha 8:6].”*

**I.4.** A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing:*

- B. **“As to a woman, on the first Passover one may slaughter the offering for her on her own, but on the second Passover one adds her to that of others,” the words of R. Judah.**
- C. **R. Yosé says, “At the second Passover they slaughter a Passover offering for a woman by herself, and it is not necessary to say, at the first.”**
- D. **R. [T.: Eleazar b.] R. Simeon says, “At the first Passover they add a woman to the Passover offering of others, and she does not observe the second Passover at all” [T. Pisha 8:10A].**

**I.5.** A. *What is at issue here?*

- B. *R. Judah maintains that the verse, “according to the number of souls” (Exo. 12: 4) means even women. And should say, if so, then the same applies also to the second Passover, it is written, “that man shall bear his sin” (Num. 9:13) — man, not woman. And should you argue, if so, then she should not be made even an addition to the second, it is written, “according to all the statute of the Passover” (Exo. 12:12) is effective in so far as making her an addition for the second Passover.*
- C. *And what’s behind R. Yosé’s position?*
- D. *He maintains that the verse, “according to the number of souls” (Exo. 12: 4) — means even women, refers to the first Passover. In respect to the second Passover, it is written, “that soul shall be cut off from his people” (Num. 9:13) — “soul” includes a woman. Then what is the sense of the language, “that man shall bear his sin” (Num. 9:13)? That serves to exclude a minor from extirpation.*
- E. *And R. Simeon?*
- F. *In regard to the first Passover, “a man” is written, meaning, a man, not a woman. And should you say, if so, then she also shouldn’t be made an addition? For that purpose, the language serves: “according to the number of souls” (Exo. 12: 4). That concerns adding her. And should you say, then even at the second Passover the same should be the case? The All-Merciful has eliminated her from the second through the language, “that man shall bear his sin” (Num. 9:13) — man, not woman. From what is she then eliminated? Should we say that it is from what is obligatory, then, if she is not to join in the offering on the first Passover, can there be any question about her status as to the second? So isn’t it to eliminate her from participating even as an addition.*

**I.6.** A. *And what is the verse that contains the “a man,” to which R. Simeon has made reference? Should we say that it is, “they shall take to them every*

man a lamb according to their father's houses" (Exo. 12: 3), *that is required for the position of R. Isaac, who stated, "Only a man make acquire title in behalf of others, but a minor cannot acquire title in behalf of others." So it must be from, "a man, according to his eating" (Exo. 12: 4). But, in that respect, since R. Yosé concurs with R. Simeon [Freedman: that the Passover offering may not be sacrificed at a private high place], it must follow that R. Simeon must concur with R. Yosé [that an offering may not be sacrificed for an individual by himself], so he needs that verse to teach that one may slaughter the Passover offering for a single individual.*

B. *He will say to you, "If so [if the verse serves only Yosé's position (Freedman)], then the formulation could be simply, 'according to his eating.' Why add 'a man'? It is to yield two laws."*

**I.7.** A. *In accord with which authority is the following statement of R. Eleazar, As to a woman, the Passover offering for the first Passover is obligatory, for the second, it is votive, and it overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath? If it is optional, why does it override the restrictions of the Sabbath? Rather, say: on the second Passover, it is votive, on the first, it is obligatory and overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath."*

B. *In accord with whom? It is in accord with R. Judah, obviously.*

**I.8.** A. *Said R. Jacob said R. Yohanan, "They do not form an association made up entirely of converts, lest they prove too particular and invalidate it [objecting to points that are inconsequential, not knowing the law very exactly (Freedman)]."*

**I.9.** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. **The Passover offering, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs, on the first Passover are obligatory. From that point forward, they are optional.**

C. **R. Simeon says, "For men they are obligatory, for women they are optional" [T. Pisha 2:22].**

D. *To what does the passage [ **Passover offering, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs, on the first Passover are obligatory**] make reference here? Should we say that he makes reference to the Passover? But is there a Passover offering on all seven days of the festival? [Since there isn't,] he must be referring to the unleavened bread and bitter herbs. But then note what follows: **R. Simeon says, "For men they are obligatory, for women they are optional"**! But doesn't R. Simeon accord with what R. Eleazar said, namely, "Women are liable by the law of the Torah to eat unleavened bread as it is said: 'You shall eat no leavened bread with it, seven days you shall eat unleavened bread with it' — whoever is liable not to eat leavened bread is liable to eat unleavened bread, and who might that be? It is women, so that, since they are subject to the rule, 'You shall eat no leavened bread,' also are subject to the rule,""arise., eat unleavened bread"?*

E. *Rather, say: The Passover offering, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs, on the first night of Passover are obligatory. From that point forward, they [unleavened bread and bitter herbs] are optional. R. Simeon says, "For men they are obligatory, for women they are optional."*

- A. One who has suffered a bereavement of a close relative immerses and eats his Passover offering in the evening,
- B. but [he may not eat any other] Holy Things [in that evening].
- C. He who hears word [of the death of a close relative], [92A] and he who is gathering up bones [for secondary burial] immerses and eats Holy Things.
- D. A proselyte who converted on the eve of Passover [the fourteenth of Nisan] —
- E. the House of Shammai say, “He immerses and eats his Passover offering in the evening.”
- F. And the House of Hillel say, “He who takes his leave of the foreskin is as if he took his leave of the grave [and must be sprinkled on the third and seventh day after circumcision as if he had suffered corpse uncleanness].”

- I.1 A. [One who has suffered a bereavement of a close relative immerses and eats his Passover offering in the evening, but he may not eat any other Holy Things in that evening:] *how come?*
- B. *He takes the view that the law covering one who has suffered a bereavement applies by night only by the authority of rabbis, and, in connection with the Passover, sages didn't impose their rule in a case that involves extirpation; but when it came to Holy Things in general, they did impose their rule where there is a mere commandment of affirmative action that is involved.*

- II.1 A. He who hears word [of the death of a close relative], and he who is gathering up bones [for secondary burial] immerses and eats Holy Things:
- B. *But doesn't he require sprinkling on the third and seventh day after contamination?*
- C. *Read it:* and he for whom bones are being gathered up bones [for secondary burial].

- III.1 A. A proselyte who converted on the eve of Passover [the fourteenth of Nisan] — the House of Shammai say, “He immerses and eats his Passover offering in the evening.” And the House of Hillel say, “He who takes his leave of the foreskin is as if he took his leave of the grave [and must be sprinkled on the third and seventh day after circumcision as if he had suffered corpse uncleanness]:”
- B. Said Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan, “The dispute concerns a gentile who was not circumcised, *for the House of Hillel take the view that* it is a precautionary decree [that he may not eat the offering in the evening], lest, in the year to come, he contract corpse uncleanness, and he argue, ‘Didn't I immerse last year and eat the Passover offering that night? This year, too I'll immerse and eat right away.’ And he won't understand that last year he was a gentile and not susceptible to corpse uncleanness, but this year he is an Israelite and he is susceptible to the full course of corpse uncleanness. *for the House of Shammai take the view that we make no such decree.* But when it comes to an uncircumcised Israelite, all parties concur that he immerses and eats his Passover offering that night. *We do not make a precautionary decree covering an uncircumcised Israelite on account of the condition of an uncircumcised gentile.*”

- C. *So too it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- D. **Said R. Simeon b. Eleazar, “The House of Shammai and the House of Hillel did not differ concerning an uncircumcised Israelite: he immerses and eats his Passover offering that night.. Concerning what was their difference? It concerned an uncircumcised gentile. For the House of Shammai say, ‘He immerses and eats his Passover offering in the evening.’ And the House of Hillel say, ‘He who takes his leave of the foreskin is as if he took his leave of the grave [and must be sprinkled on the third and seventh day after circumcision as if he had suffered corpse uncleanness]’ [cf. T. Pisha 7:14].**

- III.2.** A. Said Raba, “In the matters of circumcision [one who is circumcised on the eve of Passover], sprinkling, and a knife, the sages imposed their rule even when extirpation is involved. In the case of the one who has suffered a bereavement and not yet buried his dead, the person afflicted with the skin ailment, and the grave area, they didn’t impose their rule where extirpation is involved.”
- B. circumcision: *it is as we have just said.*
- C. sprinkling: as the master has said, “Sprinkling is forbidden merely by reason of Sabbath rest, so it doesn’t override the restrictions of the Sabbath.”
- D. a knife: *as has been taught on Tannaite authority:* Just as they may not bring it through public domain, so they may not bring it through roofs, courtyards or enclosures.
- E. one who has suffered a bereavement and not yet buried his dead: *it is as we have just said.*
- F. the person afflicted with the skin ailment: *as has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- G. If the eighth day of the purification period of a person afflicted with the skin ailment [of Leviticus 13-14] coincided with the eve of the Passover, and who had an emission on that day [before offering his sacrifices in completion of the purification rite], and who immersed himself [although he had immersed on the previous day on account of his leprosy, doing so again by reason of his emission] — sages said, “Even though any other person in the status of one who has immersed but awaits sunset for the completion of his purification may not enter the Temple, this one may enter the Temple [for his purification rite]. It is better that fulfilling an affirmative religious duty that bears the penalty of extirpation [the Passover offering, and completing the purification rite allows the man to eat the Passover offering that night, and that is an affirmative religious duty] should come along and set aside an affirmative religious duty that does not carry with it the penalty of extirpation [that is, the one who has immersed and awaits sunset is not to come into the Levitical camp, but if he does so, he does not incur the penalty of extirpation].”
- H. And R. Yohanan said, “Even an affirmative action is not connected with that matter, so far as the law of the Torah is concerned. For it is said, ‘And Jehoshaphat stood in the congregation of Judah and Jerusalem in the house of the Lord before the new court’ (2Ch. 20: 5).”
- I. *And what is the meaning of the new court?*

J. Said R. Yohanan, "They innovated there and ruled, 'A person who has immersed and awaits for sunset to complete his purification must not enter the Levitical camp.'"

K. the grave area: *as we have learned in the Mishnah: And the House of Shammai and the House of Hillel agree that [92B] they examine the soil for one who makes the Passover, and they do not examine the soil for one who would eat heave offering [M. Oh. 18:4C].* [They do not rely upon examination in the latter case.]

L. *What is the sense of they examine?*

M. Said R. Judah said Samuel, "One [who wants to remain uncontaminated by corpse matter] in a *beth haperas* [a grave area, an area possibly contaminated by corpse matter] blows away the earth and goes along his way."

N. R. Judah bar Abbayye in the name of R. Judah said, "A *beth haperas* [a grave area, an area possibly contaminated by corpse matter] that has been trodden down is no longer a source of uncleanness." [B. Hag. 25b continues: As to those who wish to eat the Passover offering, sages did not confirm their rule where the penalty of extirpation was involved [and the uncleanness attaching to a grave area is an enactment of rabbis], but in the case of those who eat heave offering, they did maintain their ordinance, in a case in which death at the hand of Heaven was involved. Abraham to Hagigah 25B: unwittingly eating heave offering when one is unclean is subject to death at the hands of heaven; extirpation is the more severe penalty. Rabbis waived their enactment regarding the grave area in the case of the Passover sacrifice, because it is subject to a fixed time, but not in connection with heave offering, for which there is no fixed time; the priest has to avoid such an area or purify himself as unclean by corpse-uncleanness and only then eat heave offering.]