

IX.

BAVLI PESAHI CHAPTER NINE

FOLIOS 92B-99A

9:1

- A. “[The Lord said to Moses, Say to the people of Israel, if any man of you or of your descendants is unclean or is on a long journey” (Num. 9:9-10):] he who was unclean or on a long journey –
- B. and did not observe the first [Passover], let him keep the second Passover [on the fourteenth of Iyyar].
- C. [If] he inadvertently or under constraint failed to observe the first Passover, let him keep the second Passover.
- D. If so, why is it said, “Unclean...or on a long journey”?
- E. For these are exempt from punishment by extirpation, and those are liable to punishment by extirpation [if they deliberately refrain from observing the second Passover].

I.1 A. *It has been stated:*

- B. He who was on a distant journey, in behalf of whom they slaughtered and tossed the blood —
- C. R. Nahman said, “It is accepted [and he doesn’t have to keep the second Passover].”

- D. R. Sheshet said, "It is not accepted [and he does have to keep the second Passover]."
- E. R. Nahman said, "It is accepted [and he doesn't have to keep the second Passover]": *It is an act of mercy that the All-Merciful has shown him [in making the second Passover possible], but if he kept the first, a blessing may come upon him.*
- F. R. Sheshet said, "It is not accepted [and he does have to keep the second Passover]": *The All-Merciful has postponed his observance to the second Passover, as in the case of an unclean person.*
- G. Said R. Nahman, "On what basis do I make that statement? As we have learned in the Mishnah: **he who was unclean or on a long journey — and did not observe the first [Passover], let him keep the second Passover [on the fourteenth of Iyyar].** That implies that, if he wanted, he may keep the first Passover."
- H. And R. Sheshet?
- I. He will say to you, "If so, then what about what is stated by the Tannaite rule at the end: **[If] he inadvertently or under constraint failed to observe the first Passover, let him keep the second Passover.** Here, too, since the language is used, **failed to observe the first Passover**, does it follow that if he wanted, he could have kept it? But the fact is that it was because he had inadvertently or under constraint been unable to do it. So it must follow that he presents the Tannaite rule to cover deliberately neglecting the rite along with these [and the language, **failed to observe**, can only apply to such]. Here, too, in the first clause, the one who has suffered a sudden bereavement is included along with these [and the language, **failed to observe**, pertains to that situation]."
- J. Said R. Ashi, "Our Mishnah paragraph, too, makes that point, since it states as the Tannaite rule: **For these are exempt from punishment by extirpation, and those are liable to punishment by extirpation [if they deliberately refrain from observing the second Passover].** Now to which passage does this make reference? Should we say that it is to the one who fails

inadvertently or under constraint? But then is someone who fails inadvertently or under constraint subject to extirpation? *So doesn't this refer to one who deliberately refrains from observing the festival or to one who has suffered a bereavement?"*

K. And R. Nahman?

L. *He may say to you, "In point of fact it refers solely to one who deliberately fails to keep the holiday. And in strict reason he should have used the language, he is liable. But he used the language, are liable to punishment by extirpation, because in the first clause he used the language, are exempt from punishment by extirpation, so repeating in the formulation the plural, are liable to punishment by extirpation."*

M. Said R. Sheshet, "On what basis do I take the position that I do? Because it has been taught on Tannaite authority:

N. **"R. Aqiba says, 'The word "unclean" is used and the phrase "in a journey afar off" is used (at Num. 9:10). [93A] Just as an unclean person is one who has the physical power to keep the festival but doesn't do so, so the sense of "a distant journey" involves someone who has the means of keeping the festival, but is not able to do so' [T. Pisha 8:2]."**

O. And R. Nahman?

P. *He will say to you, "R. Aqiba is consistent with his own idiosyncratic view, for he maintains that they do not slaughter the Passover-offering or toss the blood in behalf of one who is unclean with the uncleanness imparted by a dead creeping thing, while I take the view of him who says that they do slaughter the Passover-offering or toss the blood in behalf of one who is unclean with the uncleanness imparted by a dead creeping thing."*

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

B. **These are the ones that prepare the second Passover: males subject to flux uncleanness, females subject to flux uncleanness, menstruating women, those who are afflicted with the skin ailment, those who had sexual relations with menstruating women and those who have given birth; those who do not observe the first Passover inadvertently, those who do not do**

so under constraint, those who are unclean and those who were on a journey afar off.

C. If so, why is it said, “Unclean”?

D. ...why is it said, “Unclean”? Surely to indicate that if he wanted to keep it at the first we don't permit him! Rather, why is a person on a distant journey mentioned?

E. It is to exempt him from the penalty of extirpation [T. **Pisha 8:1**].

F. And that is in accord with the position of him who has said, He who was on a distant journey, in behalf of whom they slaughtered and tossed the blood — it is accepted [and he doesn't have to keep the second Passover]” [= Nahman].

I.3 A. So is a woman liable to observe the second Passover? And lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: Might one suppose that only those who are unclean with corpse uncleanness and one who was away on a distant journey should observe the second Passover, so how do we know that those afflicted by flux uncleanness and persons afflicted with the skin ailment [Lev. 13] and those who had sexual relations with a menstruating woman should, too? Therefore Scripture says, “any man,” including these as well [excluding reference to women].

B. There is no problem. The one represents the view of R. Yosé, the other R. Judah and R. Simeon [the latter regard observing the second Passover on the part of women as optional].

I.4 A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:

B. “One is liable to extirpation on account of failing to observe the first Passover, and one is liable to extirpation on account of failing to observe the second [if he fails to observe both],” the words of Rabbi.

C. R. Nathan says, “He is liable to extirpation for failing to observe the first Passover but exempt as to the second.”

D. R. Hanania b. Aqabya said, “One is not even liable to extirpation on account of the first unless he deliberately fails to observe the second” [T. **Pisha 8:7D-E**].

I.5 A. And they are consistent with principles espoused by them elsewhere, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority:

- B. “A proselyte who converted between the two Passovers, and so, too, a minor who reached maturity between the two Passovers is liable to observe the second Passover,” the words of Rabbi.
- C. R. Nathan says, “Whoever is obligated to keep the first is obligated to keep the second Passover, whoever is not obligated to keep the first is not obligated to keep the second.”

I.6 A. *What is at issue between them?*

- B. *Rabbi takes the position that the second Passover is a festival unto itself, and R. Nathan maintains that the second Passover is simply a make-up festival for the first, and it does not make up for the first, and R. Hanania b. Aqabya conceives that the second Passover does make up for the first.*
- C. *And all three authorities interpret a single verse of Scripture, namely:*
- D. “But the man that is clean and is not on a journey” (Num. 9:13)
—
- E. *Rabbi maintains that the language, “and forebears to keep Passover, that soul shall be cut off” (Num. 9:13) means, it is because he didn’t keep the first Passover; or “if he brought not the offering of the Lord in its appointed season” (Num. 9:13), means at the second Passover. And on what basis do you maintain that the language, “that man shall bear his sin” (Num. 9:13) means, extirpation? He takes the view that [93B] “he who curses” (Num. 15:30) means who curses the Divine Name, and of him who curses the Divine Name it is written, “And whoever curses his God shall bear his sin” (Lev. 24:15), and “his sin” derives its meaning from the usage there, thus, just as there the penalty is extirpation, so here, too, the penalty is extirpation.*
- F. And R. Nathan?
- G. *He maintains that the language, “and forebears to keep Passover, that soul shall be cut off” (Num. 9:13) — the operative word used here means “because”, and this is the sense of the All-Merciful’s statement: “because he brought not the offering of the Lord in its appointed season” (Num. 9:13) — at the first Passover.*

- H. *And how does he interpret the language, “that man shall bear his sin” (Num. 9:13)?*
- I. *He takes the view that “he who curses” (Num. 15:30) does not mean, who curses the Divine Name, therefore the meaning of this “his sin” in that context derives from the meaning of “his sin” stated here; just as here it refers to extirpation, so there it speaks of extirpation.*
- J. And R. Hanania b. Aqabya?
- K. *This is how he proposes to represent matters: “and forebears to keep Passover, that soul shall be cut off” (Num. 9:13) — if it is the fact that because he brought not “the offering of the Lord in its appointed season” (Num. 9:13) — that pertains to the second Passover.*
- L. *And how does he interpret the language, “that man shall bear his sin” (Num. 9:13)?*
- M. *As we have said [at I].*
- N. Therefore: if he deliberately did not keep this Passover or that one, in the opinion of all parties he is liable. If he inadvertently didn’t keep this one and inadvertently didn’t keep that one, all parties concur that he is exempt. If he deliberately didn’t keep the first Passover but inadvertently neglected the second, *in the view of Rabbi and R. Nathan, he is liable, and in the view of R. Hanania b. Aqabya he is exempt.* If he inadvertently didn’t keep the first but deliberately didn’t keep the second, in Rabbi’s view he is liable; in R. Nathan and R. Hanania b. Aqabya’s view, he is exempt.

9:2

- A. **What is the meaning of “a long journey”?**
- B. **“[A journey to any place] from Modiin and beyond,**
- C. **“and in accord with this same distance in all other directions,” the words of R. Aqiba.**
- D. **R. Eliezer says, “[A journey] beyond the very threshold of the Temple courtyard.”**
- E. **Said R. Yosé, “Therefore there is a point over the letter hé, to tell you that it is not because it is really a distant journey, but even one who is anywhere**

outside the threshold of the Temple courtyard and beyond [falls under the rule].”

- I.1** A. Said Ulla, “From Modiim to Jerusalem is a distance of fifteen miles.”
- B. *He concurs with that which Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan said, “How far does someone walk in a day? Ten parasangs, five miles from the rise of the morning star to the first glow of sunrise, five miles from sunset until the stars appear. That leaves thirty: fifteen from morning to midday, fifteen from midday until sunset.”*
- C. *Ulla is consistent with views expressed elsewhere, for said Ulla, “What is the definition of ‘a distant journey’? It is any place from which one cannot get to Jerusalem at the time of the slaughtering of the Passover beast” [for example, if someone started walking at midday, the earliest time for making the offering, he couldn’t get to Jerusalem by sunset, which is the latest time (Freedman)].*
- I.2** A. The master has said: five miles from the rise of the morning star to the first glow of sunrise –
- B. *How do we know that fact?*
- C. *As it is written, “And when the morning star arose, then the angels hastened Lot, saying” (Gen. 19:15), and further, “The sun was risen upon the earth when Lot came to Zoar” (Gen. 19:23), and R. Hanina said, “I personally saw that place, and it is five miles from Sodom.”*
- I.3** A. *Reverting to the body of the foregoing:* said Ulla, “What is the definition of ‘a distant journey’? It is any place from which one cannot get to Jerusalem at the time of the slaughtering of the Passover beast.”
- B. And R. Judah said, “It is any place from which one cannot enter Jerusalem at the time of eating the sacrifice.”
- C. *Said Rabbah to Ulla, “In your position there is a problem, and in the position of R. Judah there is a problem. In our position there is a problem, for you have said, It is any place from which one cannot get to Jerusalem at the time of the slaughtering of the Passover beast, but lo, there is the matter of one unclean by*

reason of a dead creeping thing, who cannot enter at the time of slaughtering the Passover-offering, *and yet you have said*, they slaughter the Passover-offering and toss the blood in behalf of one who is unclean by reason of a dead creeping thing. *In the position of R. Judah there is a problem, for he has said*, It is any place from which one cannot enter Jerusalem at the time of eating the sacrifice, *but lo, there is the matter of* one unclean by reason of a dead creeping thing, who cannot enter at the time of slaughtering the Passover-offering, *and yet he has said*, they do not slaughter the Passover-offering and toss the blood in behalf of one who is unclean by reason of a dead creeping thing.”

- D. *He said to him, “Well, there’s really no problem for my position, nor is there any such problem for the position of R. Judah. There’s really no problem for my position, since the consideration of a distant voyage pertains to a clean person, but the consideration of a distant voyage does not pertain to an unclean person. [94A] Nor is there any such problem for the position of R. Judah. When it comes to one who is made unclean by a dead creeping thing, it is the All-Merciful that has assigned him to the second Passover, as it is written, ‘and if any man shall be unclean by reason of a corpse’ — now aren’t we dealing with someone the seventh day after contamination of whom falls on the eve of Passover? And even so, the All-Merciful has said that he should be assigned to the second Passover.”*

I.4 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. If someone was located beyond Modiim but can enter if he goes by horse or by mule, one might think that, if he doesn’t do so, he is liable. Therefore Scripture states, “and is not on a journey,” but this man was on a journey.
- C. If he was standing on the hither side of Modiim to Jerusalem and cannot get there because of camels and wagons, which impeded his journey, might one think he is not liable? Scripture states, “and is not on a journey,” and lo, this one wasn’t on a journey. [He could have walked.]

Composite on the Dimensions of the World

- I.5 A.** *Said Raba, “Six thousand parasangs is the length of the world. The thickness of the firmament is a thousand parasangs. The first one of these facts derives from tradition, the second, reason.”*
- B. *He accords with the reasoning of what Rabbah bar bar Hannah said R. Yohanan said, “How far does someone walk in a day? Ten parasangs, five miles from the rise of the morning star to the first glow of sunrise, five miles from sunset until the stars appear.” So it turns out that the thickness of the firmament is one-sixth of a day’s journey. [Freedman: 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. Since five miles can be walked in each of these two periods, and thirty during the day excluding them [ten parasangs is forty miles], the thickness of the sky is a sixth of the world’s diameter.]*
- C. *An objection was raised: R. Judah says, “The thickness of the firmament is a tenth of the day’s journey. You may know that that is the fact: how far does an ordinary man journey in a day? Ten parasangs. And from daybreak until the rising sun, four miles; and from sunset until the stars appear, four miles; hence the thickness of the sky is one tenth of the day’s journey.” Doesn’t that refute Raba and doesn’t that refute Ulla?*
- D. *Sure does.*
- E. *May we say that it also refutes R. Yohanan’s statement?*
- F. *He may say to you, “I spoke only of a journey on a complete day; rabbis are the ones who erred by calculating pre-dawn and post-nightfall travel [adding that figure, five miles in the stated period].” [Freedman: Though most people do walk five miles by the time the sun is in the heavens, that is because they generally start a little before dawn, and continue a little after nightfall.]*
- G. *May we say this refutes R. Hanina [“...five miles from the rise of the morning star to the first glow of sunrise” — How do we know that fact? As it is written, “And when the morning star arose, then the angels hastened Lot, saying” (Gen. 19:15), and further, “The sun was risen upon the earth when Lot came to Zoar” (Gen. 19:23), and R. Hanina said, “I personally saw that place, and it is five miles from Sodom”]?]*

- H. No, “and the angels hastened” (Gen. 19:15) *is an exceptional situation.*
- I. *Come and take note:* Egypt was four hundred parasangs square. Egypt is a sixtieth of Ethiopia, Ethiopia is a sixtieth of the world, the world is a sixtieth of the Garden, the Garden is a sixtieth of Eden, Eden is a sixtieth of Gehenna. So the whole world is comparable to a pot lid in respect to Gehenna.
- J. *That’s a valid refutation.* [Freedman: According to this calculation the surface area of the world is 576 million square parasangs, and according to Raba it is 36 million square parasangs.]
- K. *Come and take note of what the Tannaite authority of the household of Elijah [said]:* R. Nathan says, “The entire inhabited world is situated entirely under a single star. You may know that that is the case, for lo, someone looks at a given star, goes to the east and it stands opposite him, and goes to the four corners of the world and it stands opposite him. That proves that the entire inhabited world is situated entirely under a single star.”
- L. *That’s a valid refutation.* [Freedman: Since there are countless stars in the sky, it follows that the sky is immeasurably greater than the earth, not, as Raba says, only a sixth of its size.]
- M. *Come and take note:* [If someone comes to square the sides of a town, the sides of the square must correspond to the four directions of the world; the northern side must run parallel to the north pole, the southern side to the south, and your mnemonics are] the Great Bear in the North and the Scorpion in the South. The entire inhabited world represents one hour of the day [that is how long it takes the sun to travel across the breadth of the world (Freedman)]. For the sun enters the space above the inhabited world for only one hour in the day. You may know that that is so, for at the fifth hour, the sun is in the east, and at the seventh it is in the west; during half of the sixth and half of the seventh hours, the sun stands overhead of all the world [so the sky is much bigger than the earth].
- N. *That’s a valid refutation.*
- O. *Come and take note for* said Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, “What answer did the echo give that wicked man when he said, ‘I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will be like the Most High’ (Isa. 14:14)? The echo came forth and said, ‘Wicked man, son of a

wicked man, [94B] grandson of Nimrod the evil, who through his dominion brought about a rebellion by the entire world against me! How long does a man live? Seventy years: “The days of our years are three score years and ten, or even by reason of strength fourscore years” (Psa. 90:10). But isn’t it a journey from Heaven to the firmament of five hundred years? And the thickness of the firmament is a journey of five hundred years. And so, too, between each firmament and the one above it. And now, above them are the holy living creatures, and the feet of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the ankles of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the legs of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the knees of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the thighs of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the bodies of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the necks of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the heads of the living creatures are equal to all of them together, the horns of the living creatures are equal to all of them together. Now above them is the throne of glory. The feet of the throne of glory are equal to all of them together, and the throne of glory is equal to all of them. Above them dwells the King, the living and eternal God, high and exalted. And yet you say, “I will ascend above the heights of the clouds, I will be like the Most High” (Isa. 14:14)? No, “you shall be brought down to the nether world, to the deepest parts of the pit” (Isa. 14:14-15).”

P. *That’s a valid refutation.*

I.6 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. The sages of Israel say, “The celestial sphere is stationary, and the fixed stars revolve.”
- C. The sages of the nations of the world say, “The celestial sphere revolves, and the fixed stars are stationary.”
- D. Said Rabbi, “A reply to their opinion is that we never find the Great Bear in the South and the Scorpion in the North.”
 - E. *Objected R. Aha bar Jacob, “But maybe it’s like the pivot of a millstone or a door socket?”*
- F. The sages of Israel say, “The sun travels beneath the sky by day and above it by night.”

- G. The sages of the nations of the world say, “By day it travels beneath the sky and by night beneath the earth.”
- H. Said Rabbi, “Their view makes more sense than ours, for wells are cold by day but warm by night.”

I.7 A. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. R. Nathan says, “In summer the sun travels in the heights of Heaven, so the whole world is hot but the wells are cold. In winter the sun travels at the lower ends of the sky so the whole world is cold but the wells warm.”

I.8 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

- B. Over four courses the sun travels: Nisan, Iyyar, and Sivan, over mountains, to melt the snow; Tammuz, Ab, and Elul, over the settled world, to ripen the produce; Tishré, Marheshvan, and Kislev, over the sea, to dry up the rivers; Tebet, Shebat and Adar, through the wilderness, so as not to dry up the seed in the ground.

II.1 A. **R. Eliezer says, “[A journey] beyond the very threshold of the Temple courtyard”:**

- B. *Even if he can enter the town, we don’t say to him, “Get up and go in.”*
- C. *But hasn’t it been taught on Tannaite authority: “An uncircumcised Jew who did not circumcise himself is punishable by extirpation,” the words of R. Eliezer!*
- D. Said Abbaye, “The language, ‘a distant journey,’ is used with reference to a clean person, not with reference to an unclean person.”
- E. *Raba said, “It is a conflict of Tannaite authorities, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Eliezer says, ‘We find reference to distance of place with regard to Passover, and we find reference to distance of place in regard to tithe; just as in the latter context [Deu. 14:24], the meaning is, outside of the boundaries where it is eaten [meaning, Jerusalem], so in this case the same meaning applies, [thus, anywhere out of Jerusalem].’ R. Yosé b. R. Judah says in the name of R. Eliezer, ‘It means, outside of the place where it is prepared’ [T. Pisha 8:2].”*
 - F. *In accord with which authority is what R. Isaac bar Joseph said, “In regard to those who are unclean, you reach a decision by reference to the condition of the majority who are actually located in the Temple court”?*
 - G. *In accord with whom? It is in accord with what R. Yosé b. R. Judah says in the name of R. Eliezer.*

- III.1** A. Said R. Yosé, “Therefore there is a point over the letter hé, to tell you that it is not because it is really a distant journey, but even one who is anywhere outside the threshold of the Temple courtyard and beyond [falls under the rule]”:
- B. *It has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. R. Yosé the Galilean says, “By ‘a journey afar off’ might I understand a trip of two or three days? Scripture states, ‘and is not on a journey,’ it teaches that the distance from the threshold of the Temple court and outward is classified as a journey” [T. Pisha 8:3B].

9:3

- A. [95A] What is the difference between the first Passover and the second?
- B. The first Passover is subject to the prohibition about leaven: “It shall not be seen and it shall not be found” (Exo. 12:19, 13: 7).
- C. As to the second, unleavened bread and leaven may be in the house right alongside one another.
- D. The first Passover requires the recitation of the Hallel Psalms when it is eaten, but the second Passover does not require the recitation of Hallel Psalms when it is eaten.
- E. This and that require a Hallel Psalm to be sung while they are being prepared.
- F. And [both Passover-offerings] are eaten roasted, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs.
- G. And [both Passover-offerings] override [the prohibitions of the] Sabbath.
- I.1** A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*
- B. “According to all the statute of the Passover they shall keep it [the second Passover]” (Num. 9:12) –
- C. Scripture refers to the ordinance pertaining to the sacrifice itself, but not to the religious duties that are indirectly connected with it. How do we know the rule governing indirectly related matters? “They shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs” (Num. 9:12).
- D. Might one suppose that even the religious duties that are not indirectly related to the rite itself are covered? Scripture states, “Nor shall they break the bone thereof” (Num. 9:12) — just as the breaking of the bone is singular in that it is a religious duty pertaining to the rite itself, so every religious

duty that pertains to the rite itself [pertains, but that then excludes those that are not directly relevant].

- E. Issi b. Judah says, “‘They shall keep it’ — Scripture deals with regulations that pertain to the rite itself” [Freedman: so the language, “nor shall they break a bone thereof” is unnecessary for that purpose] [Sifré to Numbers 59:5.2].

I.2 A. The master has said, “Might one suppose that even the religious duties that are not indirectly related to the rite itself are covered?”

B. But you just said that Scripture refers to religious duties that pertain to the rite itself!

C. *This is the sense of the statement: now that you have cited, “They shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs” (Num. 9:12), therefore “they shall do it” is not meant in a precise sense, then say that it is comparable to a particularization followed by a generalization, in which case the generalization serves to add to the particularization, meaning, even everything in addition. So we are informed that that is not the case.*

I.3 A. *And with reference to Issi b. Judah, how does he deal with the verse concerning not breaking the bone?*

B. *He requires it to make the point: “Neither shall you break a bone thereof” — all the same are a bone that has marrow and a bone that has no marrow.*

C. *And how do rabbis deal with the verse concerning not breaking the bone?*

D. *They require it to make the point that they do not slaughter [a Passover-offering] in behalf of a single individual, but so far as it is possible to discover another unclean person, we make the effort.*

I.4 A. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

B. “According to all the statute of the Passover they shall keep it [the second Passover]” (Num. 9:12) –

C. might one suppose that, just as on the first Passover there is a prohibition against seeing or finding leaven, so on the second Passover there is the same prohibition?

D. Scripture states, “They shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs” (Num. 9:12).

- E. I know only that that rule governs religious duties involving affirmative action. How do I know that the same is so for negative commandments?
- F. “They shall leave none of it unto the morning.”
- G. And I know only that that is the case of a negative commandment that is attached to a positive commandment. How do I know it of a negative commandment that stands on its own?
- H. Scripture states, “And they shall not break a bone thereof” — just as the particularization is spelled out as a religious duty of affirmative action, a religious duty that is a negative attached to one of affirmative action, and a religious duty that is a negative commandment standing on its own, so are included every religious duty of affirmative action, a religious duty that is a negative attached to one of affirmative action, and a religious duty that is a negative commandment standing on its own.

I.5 A. *And what is encompassed in the general proposition, “they shall eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs”?*

- B. *Roast with fire.*
- C. *And what is excluded by its particularization?*
- D. *Putting away leaven.*
- E. *Couldn’t it be the opposite?*
- F. *Including a religious duty that pertains to the rite itself makes more sense.*
- G. *As to the statement, “they shall leave none of it to the morning,” what is encompassed by the general proposition?*
- H. “You shall not carry forth any of the meat outside of the house” (Exo. 12:46).
- I. *And in the particularization [which is an exclusionary clause], what is excluded?*
- J. The commandments, “leaven shall not be seen...shall not be found....”
- K. *Couldn’t it be the opposite?*
- L. *Including a religious duty that pertains to the rite itself makes more sense.*
- M. In respect to the statement, “they shall not break a bone thereof”, **[95B]** *what is encompassed thereunder?*
- N. “Don’t eat it half roast” (Exo. 12: 9).
- O. *And by the exclusionary particularization, what is excluded?*
- P. “You shall not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread” (Exo. 34:25).
- Q. *Couldn’t it be the opposite?*
- R. *Including a religious duty that pertains to the rite itself makes more sense.*

II.1 A. The first Passover requires the recitation of the Hallel Psalms when it is eaten, but the second Passover does not require the recitation of Hallel Psalms when it is eaten:

B. *What is the source of this statement?*

C. Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yehosedeq, “Said Scripture, ‘You shall have a song as in the night when a feast is consecrated’ (Isa. 30:29) — a night that is sanctified for a festival requires the recitation of Hallel songs, but the night that is not sanctified for a festival doesn’t require the recitation of Hallel songs.”

III.1 A. This and that require a Hallel Psalm to be sung while they are being prepared:

B. *What is the operative consideration?*

C. *If you want, I shall say, Scripture excludes night, not day; or if you prefer, I shall say, is it conceivable that the Israelites might present their Passover sacrifices or take up their palm branches and not recite the Hallel psalms?*

IV.1 A. And [both Passover-offerings] are eaten roasted, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. And [both Passover-offerings] override [the prohibitions of the] Sabbath:

B. *Does the rite override only the restrictions of the Sabbath but not the considerations of uncleanness? Then our Mishnah rule does not accord with the position of R. Judah, for it has been taught on Tannaite authority: [the second Passover] overrides the prohibitions of the Sabbath but not the considerations of uncleanness. R. Judah says, “It also overrides the considerations of uncleanness.”*

C. *What is the consideration behind the ruling of the initial authority?*

D. Since I have dismissed him from observing the first Passover on account of uncleanness, is he after all going to keep it in a condition of uncleanness anyhow?

E. And R. Judah?

F. The Torah has gone in search of a way for him to keep it in cleanness, but if he did not have the vicarious grace to keep it in such a way, then he has to keep it in a condition of uncleanness.

IV.2 A. Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:

B. The first Passover overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath, the second Passover overrides the restrictions of the Sabbath.

- C. The first Passover overrides the considerations of uncleanness, and the second Passover overrides the considerations of uncleanness.
- D. The first Passover requires spending the night in Jerusalem, and the second Passover requires spending the night in Jerusalem.

IV.3 A. ...and the second Passover overrides the considerations of uncleanness: *says who?*

B. Says R. Judah.

C. *But in R. Judah's view, does the second Passover require spending the night in Jerusalem? Lo, it has been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Judah says, "How on the basis of Scripture do we know that as to the second Passover [in Iyyar, not Nisan], it is not necessary to stay overnight in Jerusalem? As it is said, 'And you shall turn in the morning and go into your tents' (Deu. 16: 7) and, forthwith thereafter, it is written, 'Six days you shall eat unleavened bread' (Deu. 16: 8). What follows from the juxtaposition of these two verses is simple. In the case of the Passover that requires a six-day observance of unleavened bread there also is the requirement of lodging overnight, and in the case of the Passover that does not require a six-day observance of the rite of unleavened bread also does not require lodging overnight in Jerusalem"!*

D. *What we have is a conflict of Tannaite versions of R. Judah's position.*

9:4

- A. **A Passover-offering which was offered in uncleanness –**
- B. **males afflicted with flux uncleanness, females afflicted with flux uncleanness, menstruating women and women unclean by reason of childbirth should not eat from it.**
- C. **But if they ate [from it], they are exempt from the punishment of extirpation.**
- D. **R. Eliezer declares them exempt [from extirpation] even on account of coming into the sanctuary.**

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

- B. [R. Joshua says,] **"As to a Passover-offering that was presented in a state of uncleanness, from the meat of which male and female persons afflicted with flux uncleanness, menstruating women and women unclean by reason of childbirth took a share — [M. Pes. 9:4B] might one suppose**

that they are liable on that account? Scripture says, ‘All who are clean may eat flesh, but the person who eats of the flesh [of the sacrifice of the Lord’s peace-offerings while an uncleanness is on him, that person shall be cut off from his people. And if anyone touches an unclean thing, whether the uncleanness of man or an unclean beast or any unclean abomination, and then eats of the flesh of the sacrifice of the Lord’s peace-offerings, that person shall be cut off from his people]’ (Lev. 7:19) — That which is slaughtered for clean persons yields liability on account of uncleanness. But that which is slaughtered for unclean persons does not yield liability on account of uncleanness.”

- C. R. Eliezer says, “If persons suffering flux uncleanness or people afflicted with the skin ailment forced their way into the courtyard, [T. [Pes. 8:11E-F](#)] is it possible to suppose that they might be liable on that account?”
 - D. “Scripture says, ‘Let them send forth from the camp every person afflicted with the skin disease, every person afflicted with flux uncleanness, everyone unclean by reason of corpse uncleanness’ (Num. 5:1-2):
 - E. “When those who are unclean by reason of corpse uncleanness bear liability, then persons afflicted with flux uncleanness and those afflicted with the skin disease likewise bear liability.
 - F. “And when those who are unclean by reason of corpse uncleanness do not bear liability, then persons suffering from flux uncleanness and those afflicted with the skin disease likewise do not bear liability [T. [Pes. 8:11G](#)]” [Sifra XCI:I.1 = Parashat Sav Pereq 14].
- I.2** A. *R. Joseph raised this question:* “If on the occasion of a Passover-offering that is presented in uncleanness, those unclean with corpse uncleanness forced their way and entered the Temple hall containing the golden altar [beyond the court], what is the law? *Since the uncleanness that affects the courtyard has been remitted for the occasion, the uncleanness that affects the Temple hall likewise has been remitted? Or maybe, what was remitted was remitted, what not, not?*”
- B. Said Raba, “Said Scripture, ‘Let them send forth from the camp every person afflicted with the skin disease, every person afflicted with flux uncleanness, everyone unclean by reason of corpse uncleanness’ (Num. 5: 1-2) — even from part of the camp” [even if not sent out of the entire camp, they are sent out of the part where they are not needed, so if they enter, they suffer extirpation (Freedman)].

C. *There are those who say:* said Raba, “Said Scripture, ‘Let them send forth from the camp every person afflicted with the skin disease, every person afflicted with flux uncleanness, everyone unclean by reason of corpse uncleanness’ (Num. 5: 1-2) — only the area to which the phrase ‘outside the camp shall you send them’ applies is subject to the phrase ‘that they send out of the camp’” [and since he is not sent out of the whole camp, he is not liable (Freedman)].

I.3 A. *R. Joseph raised this question:* “If on the occasion of a Passover that is presented in uncleanness, those unclean with corpse uncleanness forced their way and ate the sacrificial parts of a Passover-offering, [96A] what is the law? *If the prohibition of uncleanness affecting the meat has been remitted, the prohibition of uncleanness affecting the sacrificial parts also is remitted? Or maybe, what was remitted was remitted, what not, not?*”

B. *Said Raba, “Now from what source is the uncleanness affecting the sacrificial parts encompassed [so we know that eating sacrificial parts in a state of uncleanness produces liability]? It derives from the rule governing uncleanness of meat, as it is written, ‘...that pertain to the Lord’ (Lev. 7:30) — that includes the sacrificial parts. It follows that in any circumstance in which the prohibition of uncleanness of the meat is in effect, the prohibition governing uncleanness of sacrificial parts also is in effect, and in any case in which uncleanness affecting the meat is not taken into account, uncleanness affecting sacrificial parts also is not taken into account.”*

I.4 A. *R. Zira raised this question:* “Where were the sacrificial parts of the Passover-offering presented in Egypt burned up?”

B. *Said to him Abbaye, “So who’s going to tell us that it wasn’t prepared roasted [and eaten on the spot]? Furthermore, didn’t R. Joseph state as a Tannaite rule: There were three altars there for sprinkling the blood: the lintel and the two doorposts? And beyond that, there was nothing more.*

9:5

A. What is the difference between the Passover of Egypt and the Passover of the succeeding generations?

B. As to the Passover of Egypt — (1) [the lamb’s] designation took place on the tenth of Nisan. (2) It required sprinkling of the blood of the lamb with a branch of hyssop on the lintel of the door and on the two doorposts. And (3) it was eaten in haste in a single night.

C. But the Passover observed by the succeeding generations applies [to leaven] for all seven days [and not only for one night].

I.1 A. *How do we know this?*

B. “Speak to all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb” (Exo. 12: 3).

I.2 A. But the designation of the Passover-offering observed by succeeding generations does not take place on the tenth of Nisan.

B. Then what about the following: “and you shall keep it until the fourteenth day of this month” (Exo. 12: 6)? *Doesn’t this mean that* it has to be carefully inspected for four days prior to slaughter, and nothing else requires inspection?

C. *But surely it has been taught on Tannaite authority:* Ben Bag Bag says, “How on the basis of Scripture do we know that the lamb for the daily whole-offering has to be inspected four days prior to the one on which it is to be slaughtered? Because it is written here, ‘You shall observe to offer to me in its due season’ (Num. 2: 2), and elsewhere, ‘And they shall keep it until the fourteenth day of the same month’ (Exo. 12: 6). As in the latter case, the lamb has to be examined four days prior to its being slaughtered, so in the former case the lamb has to be examined four days prior to its being slaughtered.”

D. *That case is exceptional, for it is written,* “you shall observe” [so the animal has to be examined every day for four days prior to sacrifice, and the same applies to the Passover-offering, though it is not designated, to begin with, to make that possible (Freedman)].

E. *But with respect to the Passover-offering through future generations, it also is written,* “Then you shall keep this service in this month” (Exo. 13: 5) — all of the acts of service of this month in coming generations should conform to this pattern.

F. *The word “this” serves to exclude the second Passover, which is comparable to it [and the animal to be offered at the second Passover doesn’t have to be inspected for four days].*

G. *What about the following:* “And they shall eat the meat in this night” (Exo. 12: 8) — doesn’t this mean that this alone is eaten by night, but nothing else is eaten by night? [The Passover in the future is eaten by night!]

H. “Then you shall keep this service in this month” (Exo. 13: 5) — all of the acts of service of this month in coming generations should conform to this pattern.

I. *Then what is the purpose of “this”?*

- J. *It is needed for the proposition of R. Eleazar b. Azariah and R. Aqiba.* [“And they shall eat the meat in that night” (Exo. 12: 8) — R. Eleazar b. Azariah says, “Here it is stated, ‘In that night,’ and later on it is stated, ‘For I shall pass through the land of Egypt in that night’ (Exo. 12:12). Just as, in the latter usage, the reference is to the period up to midnight, so here the reference is to the period up to midnight.” Said to him R. Aqiba, “And has it not already been stated, ‘You shall eat it in haste’ (Exo. 12:11)? The meaning is, ‘until the time of haste’ [which was dawn, at which point they scurried out of Egypt]. Why then does Scripture say, ‘By night’? One might suppose that the Passover sacrifice may be eaten by day, as is the case with Holy Things. Accordingly, Scripture says, ‘By night,’ meaning, ‘It is by night that the Passover sacrifice is eaten, and not by day.’”]
- K. *Then what about the following:* “But no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof” (Exo. 12:48) — *does the meaning here also yield* “from this one he may not eat, but he may eat the Passover-offering presented by future generations”?
- L. Said Scripture, “Then you shall keep this service in this month” (Exo. 13: 5) — all of the acts of service of this month in coming generations should conform to this pattern.
- M. So what’s the point of “thereof”?
- N. “Thereof” he doesn’t eat, but he may eat unleavened bread and bitter herbs.
- O. *Then what about the following:* “No alien shall eat thereof” (Exo. 12:43) — *does the meaning here also yield* “from this one he may not eat, but he may eat the Passover-offering presented by future generations”?
- P. Said Scripture, “Then you shall keep this service in this month” (Exo. 13: 5) — all of the acts of service of this month in coming generations should conform to this pattern.
- Q. So what’s the point of “thereof”?
- R. “Thereof” does apostasy invalidate, but apostasy doesn’t invalidate in the case of priestly rations.
- S. *And it was necessary to make explicit reference to both classifications of persons. For if the All-Merciful had made reference only to the uncircumcised of flesh, I might have supposed that that is because that trait is repulsive, but uncircumcision of the heart, which is not physically repulsive, would not disqualify a person. And if the All-Merciful had made reference only to the uncircumcised of heart, I might have supposed that that is because the heart is not directed*

toward Heaven [so an improper intentionality spoils the cultic act], but as for one who is uncircumcised in the flesh, whose heart is toward Heaven [since there is a valid reason for his not being circumcised, for example, fear for his survival], I might have supposed that such a one is not disqualified. So it was necessary to make reference to both classifications of persons.

- T. *Then what about the following: “A sojourner and a hired hand shall not eat thereof” (Exo. 12:45) — does the meaning here also yield “from this one he may not eat, but he may eat the Passover-offering presented by future generations”?*
- U. Said Scripture, “Then you shall keep this service in this month” (Exo. 13: 5) — all of the acts of service of this month in coming generations should conform to this pattern.
- V. So what’s the point of “thereof”?
- W. “Thereof” does apostasy invalidate, but apostasy doesn’t invalidate in the case of priestly rations.
- X. *Then what about the following: “But every man’s servant that is bought for money, when you have circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof” (Exo. 12:44) — does the meaning here also yield “from this one he may not eat, but he may eat the Passover-offering presented by future generations”?*

II.1 A. And it was eaten in haste in a single night:

- B. *How do we know this?*
- C. Said Scripture, “And you shall eat it in haste” (Exo. 12:11) — “it” is eaten in haste, but no other, later one is eaten in haste.

III.1 A. But the Passover observed by the succeeding generations applies [to leaven] for all seven days [and not only for one night]:

- B. *To what is reference made here? Should I say, to the Passover-offering, then is there a Passover-offering all seven days? [96B] So it must refer to leaven. So it follows that at the Passover of Egypt, leaven was forbidden only for one night and no longer.*
- C. *But has it not been taught on Tannaite authority: R. Yosé the Galilean says, “How do we know that at the Passover observed in Egypt, the prohibition of leaven was for one day only? Since it is said, ‘there shall no leavened bread be eaten’ (Exo. 13: 3), and nearby, ‘this day you go forth’ (Exo. 13: 4)”?*
- D. *Rather, this is the sense of the statement: The Passover-offering is for one night, and the same for the Passover-offering of future generations, but the*

prohibition of leaven was in force the whole day, while, in future Passovers, the prohibition of leaven is valid for the entire seven days.

9:6

- A. Said R. Joshua, “I have heard: (1) that a beast declared to be substituted for an animal set aside for a Passover-offering is offered, and (2) that a beast declared to be substituted for an animal set aside for a Passover-offering is not offered. And I cannot explain [the contradiction between these two opinions].”
 - B. Said R. Aqiba, “I shall explain [the two sayings]. [In the case of a beast designated as a substitute for an animal set apart as a Passover-offering which was lost], the [lost] Passover-offering which turned up before the slaughtering of the [substituted] Passover-offering is set out to pasture until it is blemished, then is sold, and peace-offerings are to be purchased with the money received for it, and so, too, is the rule for the beast substituted for it. [But if the lost beast which had been set aside for a Passover-offering was found] after the slaughtering of the Passover-offering [substituted in its place], it is offered as peace-offerings, and so, too, is the rule for the beast substituted for it.”
- I.1** A. *Why not formulate the issue: The Passover-offering is offered, and the Passover-offering is not offered [rather speaking about the substitute]?*
- B. *So we are informed that there is a substitute of a Passover-offering that is not presented as a peace-offering.*
- I.2** A. *It has been stated:*
- B. Rabbah said, “We have learned to repeat the rule, before slaughtering and after slaughtering” **[before the slaughtering of the substituted Passover-offering...after the slaughtering of the Passover-offering substituted in its place].**
- C. R. Zira said, “The language that we have learned is, before noon and after noon [when the Passover-offering is slaughtered].”
- D. *But from R. Zira’s perspective, lo, it is taught as the Tannaite formulation: before the slaughtering of the substituted Passover-offering ...after the slaughtering of the Passover-offering substituted in its place!*
- E. *Say: before the slaughtering of the Passover-offering...after the slaughtering of the Passover-offering.*

I.3 A. *This follows the lines of the following Tannaite conflict:*

- B. A Passover-offering that is found prior to slaughtering goes out to graze...if it is found after slaughtering, it is offered.
- C. R. Eleazar says, "If it is found before noon, it grazes...after noon, it is offered."

II.1 A. **[But if the lost beast which had been set aside for a Passover-offering was found] after the slaughtering of the Passover-offering substituted in its place, it is offered as peace-offerings, and so, too, is the rule for the beast substituted for it:**

- B. Said Raba, "That rule applies only if it was found after the slaughtering, and he substituted another beast for it after the slaughtering. But if it was found before the slaughtering, but he substituted another beast for it after the slaughtering, *then its substitute comes on the authority of what has been rejected as sacred and so it cannot be offered.*" [Freedman: Since the original is rejected, the substitute is rejected.]
- C. *Abbaye objected, "If he bring a lamb for his offering' (Lev. 3: 7) — what is the purpose of the language, 'if he bring a lamb'? It is to encompass the substitute of a Passover-offering after Passover, to indicate that it is offered as a peace-offering. Now what can be the sense of that statement? If we say that it means, the beast was found after the slaughtering and he substituted another for it after the slaughtering, then, well, what else is new? And what need do I have for a verse to tell me such an obvious fact? So doesn't it mean that it was found prior to the slaughtering, but he made a substitution for it after the slaughtering?"* [Freedman: Although the original itself cannot be offered, its substitute is offered.]
- D. Not at all, it means in fact, the beast was found after the slaughtering and he substituted another for it after the slaughtering, *but the verse of Scripture is a mere confirmation [of the law, but not its source].*
 - E. *So for what purpose is the verse of Scripture introduced?*
 - F. *It is in line with what has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
 - G. "If he bring a lamb" — this is to encompass the Passover-offering, in regard to its fat tail [which is to be burned on the altar].
 - H. When Scripture further says, "If he bring a lamb for his offering...[and if his offering be a goat]" (Lev. 3: 7, 12), it serves to encompass a Passover-offering that is more than a year old, and a peace-offering that

comes to accompany a Passover-offering, indicating that all of the regulations of peace-offerings pertain: they are to be subject to the laying on of hands, drink-offerings, the waving of the breast and the shoulder. When Scripture says, “and if his offering be a goat,” it interrupts the subject and indicates that a goat does not require the burning of the fat tail on the altar.

- I. *There are those who repeat Raba’s statement with respect to the first clause of the Mishnah, namely: [In the case of a beast designated as a substitute for an animal set apart as a Passover-offering which was lost], the [lost] Passover-offering which turned up before the slaughtering of the [substituted] Passover-offering is set out to pasture until it is blemished, then is sold, and peace-offerings are to be purchased with the money received for it, and so, too, is the rule for the beast substituted for it.*
- J. Said Raba, “That rule applies only if it was found after the slaughtering, and he substituted another beast for it after the slaughtering. But if it was found before the slaughtering, but he substituted another beast for it after the slaughtering, then it is presented as a peace-offering. *How come? When the act of slaughter of the Passover-offering assigns sanctity, it is only to something that is appropriate for sanctity, not something that is not appropriate for sanctity.*”
- K. *Abbaye objected, “‘If he bring a lamb for his offering’ (Lev. 3: 7) — what is the purpose of the language, ‘if he bring a lamb’? It is to encompass the substitute of a Passover-offering after Passover, to indicate that it is offered as a peace-offering. [97A] Might one suppose, the rule is same prior to Passover? Scripture says, ‘it’ — it is offered as a peace-offering, but the substitute of a Passover-offering is not offered. Now what can be the sense of that statement? If we say that it means, the beast was found before the slaughtering and he substituted another for it before the slaughtering, then, well, what else is new? And what need do I have for a verse to tell me such an obvious fact? So doesn’t it mean that it was found prior to the slaughtering, but he made a substitution for it after the slaughtering?”*

L. *That refutes Raba's proposition.*

- II.2** A. Said Samuel, "In any situation in which, in the case of an animal designated as a sin-offering, the animal is left to die, in the case of a Passover-offering, the animal is offered as peace-offerings. And in any case in which, in the instance of an animal designated as a sin-offering, the beast is left to pasture, in the case of a Passover-offering, too, it is left to pasture."
- B. And R. Yohanan said, "The only animal designated as a Passover-offering that is offered as peace-offerings is one that is found after the slaughtering of the Passover animals, but if it is found prior to the slaughter of the Passover lambs, that is not the case."
- C. *Objected R. Joseph, "But is this an encompassing rule? Lo, there is the case of the animal designated as a sin-offering that became superannuated, which is sent off to pasture. For said R. Simeon b. Laqish, 'In the case of a beast designated as a sin-offering that became superannuated, [wherever it is located] it is regarded as though it were standing in a cemetery [into which a priest cannot enter, by reason of not contracting cultic uncleanness, so he cannot slaughter the animal] and it is left to pasture.' By contrast, a Passover-offering in such a situation is presented as a peace-offering, as has been taught on Tannaite authority: "If he bring a lamb" — this is to encompass the Passover-offering, in regard to its fat tail [which is to be burned on the altar]. When Scripture further says, "If he bring a lamb for his offering...[and if his offering be a goat]" (Lev. 3: 7, 12), it serves to encompass a Passover-offering that is more than a year old, and a peace-offering that comes to accompany a Passover-offering, indicating that all of the regulations of peace-offerings pertain: they are to be subject to the laying on of hands, drink-offerings, the waving of the breast and the shoulder. When Scripture says, "and if his offering be a goat," it interrupts the subject and indicates that a goat does not require the burning of the fat tail on the altar.'"*
- D. *He said to him, "When Samuel made his statement, he referred to lost animals, he didn't speak of rejected ones."*
- E. *But do you find a case of a lost sacrifice? Surely an animal that was lost at the time of separating another beast [a sin-offering was lost, another sanctified, then the first was found before the second was sacrificed, so that the first was lost only when the second was set apart but not when it was sacrificed (Freedman)], in the opinion of rabbis is sent out to pasture until blemished, as we have learned in the Mishnah:*

- F. He who separates his sin-offering, which was lost,
- G. and [who] separated another in its stead –
- H. he did not suffice to offer it up before the first turned up –
- I. and lo, both of them are totally unblemished –
- J. “one of them is to be offered as a sin-offering.
- K. “And the other is to be left to die,” the words of Rabbi.
- L. And sages say, “Only that sin-offering is left to die in the case in which the owners have effected atonement...” [M. Tem. 4:3X-DD].
- M. So lo, if it was before the owner had gained atonement, it is put out to pasture. *By contrast, in the case of an animal designated for use as a Passover-offering, if it was lost and found again after midday but before the second beast was slaughtered, it is presented as a peace-offering.*
- N. *Samuel concurs with Rabbi, who maintains that the animal that is lost is left to perish.*
- O. *But lo, from Rabbi’s perspective, every lost beast is left to perish, while with respect to a Passover-offering, in a case in which it was lost prior to noon and found prior to noon, it is sent off to pasture.*
- P. An animal that is found before noon is not classified as lost, *in line with Raba’s view, for said Raba, “A loss by night is not classified as a loss.”*

II.3 A. *Then in the view of Rabbi, how shall we ever find a case in which a beast designated as a sin-offering will be put out to pasture until blemished?*

- B. **[97B]** *The answer would conform to the position of R. Oshayya, for said R. Oshayya, “He who designates animals for use as a sin-offering [that he has to bring], [doing so] for the sake of security is to attain atonement through one of them, as he may choose, and the other is put out to pasture [until blemished, and the proceeds for the sale of this beast are assigned for the purchase of a freewill-offering].” [Here both animals are in hand at the time of the offering, so Rabbi will concur that it is put out to pasture (Cashdan).]*
- C. *But in such a case, a Passover-offering would be presented as a peace-offering [since this isn’t a rejected sacrifice].*
- D. *Rather, Samuel accords with the view of R. Simeon, who has said, “Five classifications of animals designated as sin-offerings are left to die: [the offspring of a sin-offering, and the substitute of a sin-*

offering, and a sin-offering the owner of which has died, [that] it is in the case of an individual that matters are stated, but not in the case of the community, so in the case of that [animal], the owner of which has effected atonement, or the year of which has passed and which has become superannuated” [M. Par. 1:3-4]. Miller, *Temurah*: Five classifications of sin-offerings are condemned to die, and none is left to pasture so that the proceeds can be used for freewill-offerings.]

- E. *But lo, R. Simeon takes the view that under no conditions is an animal designated as a sin-offering ever left to pasture [so how can Samuel say, “Whatever is the rule of a sin-offering left to pasture...” (Cashdan)]?*
- F. *Samuel, too, has in point of fact given us only a single rule: “In any circumstances in which, in the case of a sin-offering, the designated beast is left to die, in the case of a thank-offering, there is no obligation to present a bread-offering. [Then we omit: In any circumstances in which, in the case of a sin-offering, the beast is sent out to pasture until blemished then is sold and the funds used for a sin-offering, the counterpart situation in the instance of a thank-offering will involve the presentation of a bread-offering.]”*
- G. *So what does he tell us that we did not know before?*
- H. *What he has said serves to exclude the proposition presented by R. Yohanan, who has said, “The only animal designated as a Passover-offering that is offered as peace-offerings is one that is found after the slaughtering of the Passover animals, but if it is found prior to the slaughter of the Passover lambs, that is not the case.” So it would follow that it is the act of slaughter that assigns to the beast the status of rejection, and Samuel tells us that it is the advent of noon that accomplishes that fact.*
 - I. *Another version:*
 - J. *...while in the case of the Passover, in any case in which it is lost and found after noon but before the slaughtering of the second, it is presented as a peace-offering.*
 - K. *Samuel concurs with Rabbah, who has said, “It is the act of slaughter that assigns to the beast the status of rejection” [Rabbah said, “We have learned to repeat the rule, before*

slaughtering and after slaughtering” thus: **before the slaughtering of the substituted Passover-offering...after the slaughtering of the Passover-offering substituted in its place”].**

- L. *But lo, since R. Yohanan said in that connection, “The only animal designated as a Passover-offering that is offered as peace-offerings is one that is found after the slaughtering of the Passover animals, but if it is found prior to the slaughter of the Passover lambs, that is not the case,” it would follow that it is the act of slaughter that assigns to the beast the status of rejection, and Samuel maintains that it is the advent of noon that accomplishes that fact.*
- M. *Rather, Samuel concurs with Rabbi, who maintains that the animal that is lost is left to perish.*
- N. *But lo, from Rabbi’s perspective, every lost beast is left to perish, while with respect to a Passover-offering, in a case in which it was lost prior to noon and found prior to noon, it is sent off to pasture.*
- O. *He takes the view that an animal that is found before noon is not classified as lost; and he also takes the view that it is the advent of noon that establishes the status of the beast.*

9:7

- A. **He who designates a female animal for his Passover-offering [which must be male (Exo. 12: 5)],**
- B. **or a male two years old [though it must be one year old] —**
- C. **[the animal so designated] is set out to pasture until it suffers a blemish, then it is sold, and the coins received for it fall for a freewill-offering.**
- D. **[98A] He who designates an animal for his Passover-offering and who died —**
- E. **his son should bring it in his stead not as a Passover-offering, but as peace-offerings.**

- I.1** A. Said R. Huna b. R. Joshua, “Three inferences are to be drawn: One may deduce, first of all, that a beast that is consecrated can be removed forever from sacred use [and even though later on they became fit to be offered, they cannot be offered, since they have prior been suspended from use on the altar

for some reason]. And one may deduce, second, that if, to begin with, [at the point of its consecration] an animal is removed from sacred use, then the suspension remains valid forever. And you may deduce, third, that the consecration of animals that have been dedicated as to their value can be removed.”

II.1 A. He who designates an animal for his Passover-offering and who died — his son should bring it in his stead not as a Passover-offering, but as peace-offerings:

B. *Our rabbis have taught on Tannaite authority:*

C. He who designates an animal for his Passover-offering and then died –

D. if his son was registered with him, let him bring it after him for the sake of a Passover-offering.

E. But if not, he should bring it on the sixteenth of Nisan as peace-offerings [T. Pisha 9:16A-C].

II.2 A. *On the sixteenth but not on the fifteenth — so he takes the view that animals in fulfillment of vows or as freewill-offerings are not presented on the festival.*

II.3 A. *When did the father die? If I should say that he died prior to noon, then how come if his son was registered with him, let him bring it after him for the sake of a Passover-offering? But lo, to begin with, the status of bereavement has overtaken him! So it must be that he died after noon. But then, but if not, he should bring it on the sixteenth of Nisan as peace-offerings! But lo, the advent of noon has already assigned [to the beast the status of a Passover-offering, and it cannot be offered for some other purpose but is rejected permanently]!*

B. *Said Rabbah, “In point of fact, he died before noon. And what is the meaning of, let him bring it after him for the sake of a Passover-offering? It is for the second Passover.”*

C. *Abbaye said, “The formulation of the rule is disjunctive, namely: If he died after noon, then if his son was registered with him, let him bring it after him for the sake of a Passover-offering. If he died before noon, then if his son was not registered with him, he should bring it on the sixteenth of Nisan as peace-offerings.”*

D. *R. Sherabayya said, “In point of fact he died after noon. And it would involve a case in which the father was dying at noon.”*

- E. *R. Ashi said, "In point of fact he died after noon, and it represents the position of R. Simeon, who has said, 'Living beasts are not permanently rejected.'"*
- F. *Rabina said, "It would involve a case in which he designated the beast after noon and the owner died after noon, and he takes the view that it is the advent of noon that assigns the status of the beast [so it cannot be rejected, and so it may be offered as a peace-offering]."*

9:8

- A. **An animal set aside for a Passover-offering which was confused with animals set apart for other animal sacrifices —**
- B. **all of them are to be set out to pasture until they suffer a blemish, then are to be sold, and with the proceeds of the best of them one is to bring an animal of one sort [of sacrifice], and with the proceeds of the best of them he is to bring an animal of another sort,**
- C. **and he must make up the difference [in the cost] from his own pocket.**
- D. **[If] it was confused with firstlings —**
- E. **R. Simeon says, "If it is for an association of priests, let them eat it."**

- I.1 A.** **[98B] [R. Simeon says, "If it is for an association of priests, let them eat it":] *But lo, he is bringing sacrifices to an unfit place!* [Freedman: A firstling may be eaten two days and the intervening night, the Passover, only the first night; if it is not eaten by morning, he has to burn it; but here it would still be fit.]**
- B. *R. Simeon is consistent with his principles, for he has said that people may indeed bring Holy Things to an unfit place, for we have learned in the Mishnah:*
- C. **A guilt-offering that was mixed up with peace-offerings — let them pasture until they suffer a blemish.**
- D. **R. Simeon says, "Both of them are slaughtered at the north [as is required for a guilt-offering, M. 5:5] and are eaten in accord with the rules governing the more stringent of them [as a guilt-offering, inside the courtyard, by male priests for a day and a night].**
- E. **They said to him, "They do not bring Holy Things to the status of invalidity" [M. Zeb. 8:3A-C].**

- I.2** A. *And as to rabbis, how are we to act* [Freedman: when a Passover-offering is mixed up with a firstling? Even when blemished, a firstling is not redeemed so that it becomes unconsecrated; it has to be eaten by a priest once it is blemished; but a Passover-offering that is blemished is redeemed and secularized]?
- B. *Said Raba, "He is to wait on it until blemished and then present a fat beast and say, 'Wherever my Passover-offering may be, let the sanctity attaching to it be transferred to this beast,' and he eats them in accord with the rules that govern eating a blemished firstling."*

9:9

- A. **An association, the Passover-offering of which was lost,**
B. **and which said to someone, "Go and find and slaughter another one for us,"**
C. **and that one went and found and slaughtered [another],**
D. **but they, too, went and bought and slaughtered [one for themselves] —**
E. **if his was slaughtered first, he eats his, and they eat with him of his.**
F. **But if theirs was slaughtered first, they eat of theirs, and he eats of his.**
G. **And if it is not known which of them was slaughtered first,**
H. **or if both of them were slaughtered simultaneously,**
I. **then he eats of his, and they do not eat with him, and theirs goes forth to the place of burning,**
J. **but they are exempt from having to observe the second Passover.**
K. **[If] he said to them, "If I come back late, go and slaughter a Passover-offering in my behalf,"**
L. **[now] he went and found [an animal] and slaughtered it,**
M. **and they purchased and slaughtered an animal as well.**
N. **If theirs was slaughtered first, they eat of theirs, and he eats with them.**
O. **And if his was slaughtered first, he eats of his, and they eat of theirs.**
P. **And if it is not known which of them was slaughtered first,**
Q. **or if they were slaughtered simultaneously,**
R. **they eat of theirs, and he does not eat with them.**
S. **And his goes forth to the place of burning.**
T. **And he is exempt from having to observe the second Passover.**

- U. [If] he gave instructions to them, and they gave instructions to him [with the same consequences as before],
- V. all of them eat from the first.
- W. But if it is not known which of them was slaughtered first,
- X. both of them go forth to the place of burning.
- Y. [If] he did not give instructions to them, and they did not give instructions to him, they are not responsible for one another.

9:10

- A. Two associations, the Passover-offerings of which were confused –
- B. these take [draw] possession of one of them for themselves, and those take possession of one of them for themselves.
- C. One [member] of these goes to the others, and one [member] of the others comes to these.
- D. And thus do they say, “If this Passover-offering is ours, withdraw from yours and register with ours. And if this Passover-offering is yours, we withdraw from ours and register with yours.”
- E. And so, too, five associations, each with five or ten members —
- F. each one of the associations takes possession of [one of the confused Passover-offerings] and so do they declare.

9:11

- A. Two people whose Passover-offerings were confused —
- B. this one takes possession of one of the animals, and that one takes possession of one of the animals.
- C. This one registers with himself a third party, and that one registers with himself a third party.
- D. This one approaches that, and that one approaches this, and thus do they declare:
- E. “If this Passover-offering is mine, then you withdraw from yours and register with mine. And if this Passover-offering is yours, then I withdraw from mine and register with yours.”

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

- B. If he instructed them and they instructed him, they must all eat of the first.

- C. If he did not instruct them and they did not instruct him, they are not responsible for one another.
- D. **[99A]** On this basis, said sages, “Silence is a good trait for sages, all the more so for fools: ‘Even a fool when he holds his peace is thought wise’ (Pro. 17:28)” [T. **Pisha 9:2**].
- II.1 A.** Two people whose Passover-offerings were confused — this one takes possession of one of the animals, and that one takes possession of one of the animals. This one registers with himself a third party, and that one registers with himself a third party. This one approaches that, and that one approaches this, and thus do they declare: “If this Passover-offering is mine, then you withdraw from yours and register with mine. And if this Passover-offering is yours, then I withdraw from mine and register with yours”:
- B. *May we say that our Mishnah paragraph is not in accord with R. Judah? For it has been taught on Tannaite authority:*
- C. “‘And if the household be too little for a lamb’ (Exo. 12: 4) — this teaches that they may continue to diminish in numbers, on condition that one of the original group remains,” the words of R. Judah.
- D. R. Yosé says, “...on condition that they do not leave the Passover-offering as is and ownerless” [T. **Pisha 7:7H-I**].
- E. *Said R. Yohanan, “You may even maintain that it represents the position of R. Judah. Since R. Judah has said, **They do not slaughter [a Passover-offering] in behalf of a single individual [M. 8:7A]**, to begin with, he planned to register someone else along with himself, and the newly signed up member is regarded as an original member of the association.”*
 - F. *Said R. Ashi, “A close reading of our Mishnah passage yields the same result, namely: **And so, too, five associations, each with five members** — thus only if there are five each, but not if some have five and the others four; isn’t the operative consideration here that one of the original members of the company doesn’t remain with the beast?”*
 - G. *That’s decisive.*