



1:5 And furthermore, Rabbi Yehuda said: Two disqualified loaves of a thanks-offering are placed on the bench in the colonnade in the Temple as an indicator. There was a specially designated place for these loaves in the Temple. As long as the loaves are placed there, the entire nation continues to eat leaven. When one of the loaves was taken away, the people know that the time had come to place the leaven in abeyance, meaning that they neither eat nor burn their leaven. When they were both taken away, the entire nation began burning their leaven. Rabban Gamliel says that the times are divided differently: Non-sacred foods are eaten the entire fourth hour, and teruma may be eaten during the entire fifth hour. Since it is a mitzva to eat teruma and burning it is prohibited, additional time was allocated for its consumption. And one burns all leaven including teruma at the beginning of the sixth hour.

1:6 Apropos the removal of leaven on Passover eve, including the consecrated loaves of thanks-offerings and teruma, the mishna cites a related halakha. Rabbi Hanina the deputy High Priest says: In all the days of the priests, they did not refrain from burning meat that became ritually impure by coming into contact with a secondary source of ritual impurity, i.e., an object that had come into contact with a primary source of impurity, together with meat that became ritually impure by contact with a primary source of impurity. They would do so even though they would thereby add a degree of impurity to the impurity of the first piece of meat, which was previously impure to a lesser degree. Rabbi Akiva added to the statement of Rabbi Hanina the deputy High Priest and said: In all the days of the priests, they did not refrain from lighting teruma oil that was ritually disqualified by coming into contact with one who immersed himself during that day and who does not become completely purified until nightfall in a lamp that became ritually impure with first-degree impurity through contact with one who became ritually impure with impurity imparted by a corpse. They did so even though they would thereby add impurity to the impurity of the oil. A person who immersed himself during that day assumes the status of second-degree ritual impurity. His contact renders the oil ritually impure with third-degree ritual impurity. The lamp with first-degree ritual impurity renders the oil ritually impure with second-degree impurity.

1:7 Rabbi Meir said: From their statements we learned that one may burn ritually pure teruma with impure teruma when removing leaven on Passover eve. The rationale that applies to the two previous cases applies here as well. Since both items are being burned, one may disregard the fact that one item will assume a higher degree of ritual impurity in the process. Rabbi Yosei said: That is not the inference from which the halakha in the case of ritually pure and ritually impure teruma can be learned. In those first two cases, the two items are both ritually impure, albeit at different degrees of ritual impurity. Rabbi Meir is referring to the combination of impure teruma with pure teruma, which would render pure teruma ritually impure. And in fact Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua, who disagree with regard to the burning of leavened teruma, nevertheless concede that one burns this ritually pure teruma by itself and that impure teruma by itself. With regard to what did they disagree? They disagreed with regard to whether one may burn teruma in abeyance, i.e., teruma

whose purity is uncertain, and definitely impure teruma together, as Rabbi Eliezer says: This teruma in abeyance should be burned by itself, and that impure teruma should be burned by itself; and Rabbi Yehoshua says: In that case, both of them may be burned as one.

2:1 For the entire time that it is permitted to eat leavened bread, one may also feed it to his domesticated animals, to non-domesticated animals, and to birds; and one may sell it to a gentile; and it is permitted to derive benefit from it. After its time passes, it is prohibited to derive benefit from it, and one may not even light an oven or a stove with leavened bread. With regard to the manner of removal of leavened bread, Rabbi Yehuda says: The removal of leavened bread is to be accomplished only through burning. And the Rabbis say: Burning is not required, as one may even crumble it and throw it into the wind or cast it into the sea.

2:2 It is permitted for a Jew to derive benefit from leavened bread of a gentile over which Passover has elapsed, i.e., leavened bread that remains after the conclusion of Passover. However, it is prohibited to derive benefit from leaven of a Jew over which Passover has elapsed, as it is stated: “And no leavened bread shall be seen with you, neither shall there be leaven seen with you, in all your borders” (Exodus 13:7).

2:3 If a gentile lent money to a Jew, and the Jew gave him leavened bread as collateral until after Passover, and after Passover the gentile retains this leavened bread in lieu of payment, then one is permitted to derive benefit from this leavened bread. Since the leavened bread was retained by the gentile based on the transfer that took place prior to Passover, the leavened bread is considered to have belonged to the gentile during Passover. Whereas if a Jew lent money to a gentile, and leavened bread was given as collateral during Passover in the same manner as in the previous case, then after Passover it is forbidden to derive benefit from this leavened bread. Since this leavened bread was considered to be in the Jew’s property during Passover, it is forbidden to derive benefit from it afterward. Leavened bread upon which a rockslide has fallen is considered as though it has been eliminated, and it is not necessary to dig it up in order to burn it. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Any leavened bread that has been covered to such an extent that a dog cannot search after it is considered to have been eliminated.

2:4 If one unwittingly eats teruma of leavened bread on Passover, not realizing that the food was teruma, then he must pay the principal and an additional fifth. This is because one who unwittingly eats teruma must compensate the priest for the value of the teruma and add a fifth of the value, even though the teruma is considered to be valueless on Passover. If he intentionally ate the teruma then he is exempt from payment; as he is liable to receive the severe punishment of karet, he is therefore exempt from the lesser punishment of payment. If he ate impure teruma in this manner then he is not even required to pay its monetary value in wood, for one who derives benefit from impure teruma calculates its value by treating it as though it were fuel for burning. While impure teruma can be used in this manner during the rest of the year, one may not derive any benefit from leavened bread on Passover, and therefore such teruma is worthless.

2:5 These are the types of grain with which a person fulfills his obligation to eat matza on the first night of Passover: With wheat, with barley, with spelt [kusmin], with rye [shifon], and with oats [shibbolet shu'al]. And one fulfills his obligation by eating not only matza made from properly tithed grains, but even with matza made from doubtfully tithed produce, and matza made with first tithe from which its teruma was already taken, or second tithe and consecrated food that were redeemed. And priests may eat matza prepared from halla, the portion of dough that is given to priests, or with teruma, as priests are permitted to eat these portions. However, one may not fulfill one's obligation to eat matza made with untithed produce, nor with matza made from the first tithe from which its teruma was not separated, nor with matza made either from the second tithe, nor from consecrated grain that was not redeemed. With regard to one who prepared loaves of matza that are brought with a thanks-offering, or to the wafers brought by a nazirite, the Sages drew the following distinction: If he prepared them for himself, then he does not fulfill his obligation to eat matza with them. However, if he prepared them to sell them in the market to those who require these loaves or wafers, one fulfills the obligation to eat matza with them.

2:6 And these are the vegetables with which a person can fulfill his obligation to eat bitter herbs on Passover: One can fulfill his obligation with hazeret, with chervil [tamkha], and with field eryngo [harhavina], and with endives [olashin], and with maror. One fulfills his obligation with them whether they are fresh or whether they are dry. However, one does not fulfill his obligation if they are pickled in water or vinegar, nor if they are over-boiled [shaluk] in hot water, nor if they are boiled [mevushal]. The mishna adds: And all these different types of vegetables join together to the measure of an olive-bulk, i.e., it is not necessary to eat this amount from one specific type of vegetable. And one fulfills his obligation by eating their stalk, as it is not necessary to eat the leaves. And one fulfills the obligation with doubtfully tithed produce, with first-tithe produce whose teruma has been taken and given to a priest, and with both second-tithe produce and consecrated property that were redeemed.

2:7 One may not soak coarse bran for feeding chickens, lest it be leavened. However, one may pour boiling water onto the bran before feeding it to the chickens, as it will not become leavened from this brief exposure to water. A woman may not soak coarse bran to bring by hand to the bathhouse for use as a cleanser; however, she may rub coarse bran on her dry skin. Likewise, the Sages said: A person may not chew wheat and place it on his wound, due to the fact that the wheat will be leavened from the saliva and his chewing.

2:8 One may not add flour to haroset, a seasoned, pungent food, or to mustard, to dull the sharp taste. In both cases, the pungency of these foods might accelerate the leavening of the flour. And if one added flour to either of these, the mixture may be eaten immediately before it is leavened; and Rabbi Meir prohibits this, lest the food be leavened immediately. The mishna continues: One may not boil the Paschal lamb in ordinary liquids or in fruit juices, as the Torah explicitly states that it must be roasted. However, one may baste it while it is roasting and dip it into liquid while eating it. The

tanna further states: Water that has been used by a baker for cooling his hands or washing dishes should be poured out, because this water leavens the dough, as the water probably contains a small quantity of flour and dough.

3:1 And for possessing these one transgresses [overin] the prohibitions of: It shall not be seen, and: It shall not be found, on Passover, although not all of them are considered food: Babylonian kutah, a dip with a sharp flavor that contains flour; Median beer; Edomite vinegar; Egyptian zitom, a type of beer; dyers' broth [zoman]; bakers' well-worked dough; and kolan of soferim. Rabbi Eliezer says: The same prohibition also applies to women's adornments, i.e., cosmetics, that contain leaven. This is the principle: If one possesses any substance that is derived from a type of grain that became leavened, although it is not actually bread, one transgresses the prohibitions of: It shall not be seen, and: It shall not be found, on Passover. These substances are included in the warning, i.e., the biblical prohibition of possessing leaven, but there is no element of karet if one eats them.

3:2 With regard to dough that is in the cracks of a kneading bowl, if there is an olive-bulk of dough in one place, one is obligated to remove it. And if the dough does not add up to this amount, it is nullified due to its insignificance. And similarly, with regard to the halakhot of immersion to purify the bowl from ritual impurity, if one is particular about the dough that is stuck in the cracks and he plans to remove it and use it, it is a foreign substance that interposes between the kneading bowl and the water of the ritual bath, and invalidates the immersion of the bowl, leaving it ritually impure. And if he wants the dough to remain in place, its status is like that of the kneading bowl itself and is not an interposition. Deaf dough is dough for which it is difficult to determine if it has been leavened. It is comparable to a deaf-mute, who cannot communicate. If there is dough similar to it in that water was added to both at the same time, which became leavened, the deaf dough is prohibited. Although it has not shown external signs of becoming leavened, it can be presumed that the deaf dough has also become leavened.

3:3 How does one separate halla in ritual impurity during the Festival day of Passover? Ordinarily, one may separate ritually pure halla from dough and give it to a priest immediately so that he may eat it. Ritually impure halla is unfit for a priest and must be burned, yet it is prohibited to bake or burn anything that is not fit to be eaten during the Festival day. However, it is also prohibited to wait and burn it after the Festival day, since it will become leavened in the meantime. Rabbi Eliezer says: A woman should not designate it as halla prior to baking; rather, she should refrain from doing so until it is baked. In other words, she should wait until she has baked all of the dough, and there is no risk of it becoming leavened. Only then should she separate halla from it. The portion of halla may then be kept until after the Festival day, when it may be burned. Ben Beteira says: She should separate the halla before it is baked, and place the dough in cold water so that it will not become leavened. Rabbi Yehoshua said: This is not the leavened bread about which we are warned with the prohibitions: It shall not be seen, and: It shall not be found. These prohibitions do not apply because the halla does not actually belong to the owner of the dough; it is instead considered to

be consecrated property. Rather, she should separate the halla and leave it until the evening; and if it becomes leavened, then it will become leavened, but this is of no concern.

3:4 Rabban Gamliel says: Three women may knead their dough as one, meaning at one time, and bake the batches of dough in one oven, one after the other, and they need not be concerned that their dough will become leavened while they are waiting to use the oven. And the Rabbis say: Three women may be engaged in preparing dough as one, in the following manner: One kneads her dough as another one arranges her own dough so it takes the form of matza, while another one bakes her dough. Rabbi Akiva says: Not all women, not all wood, and not all ovens are the same, and therefore no set rules should be established. Rather, this is the principle: If the dough begins to rise, she should spread cold water in which she immersed her hands, onto the dough, in order to stop the leavening process.

3:5 Dough at the beginning of the leavening process [siur], must be burned, but one who eats it is exempt from the punishment of karet because the dough had not become fully leavened. Dough that has reached the stage of cracking must be burned, and one who eats it intentionally is liable to receive karet, as he has intentionally eaten leavened bread during Passover. What is considered siur? Dough that has been leavened to the point that it has cracks that look like the antennae of locusts. The stage of cracking occurs later in the leavening process, when the cracks intermingle. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. And the Rabbis say: One who intentionally eats either this or that, dough with cracks like locust antennae or with cracks that have become intermingled, is liable to receive karet, as once dough begins to crack it has certainly become leavened. And what is siur? It is any dough whose surface has become pale like the face of a person whose hair stands on end due to fear.

3:6 With regard to the fourteenth of Nisan that occurs on Shabbat, one removes all leaven from his possession, whether it is teruma or non-sacred food, before Shabbat, except for that which will be eaten during the first part of Shabbat. In that case, one cannot remove leaven from his possession on the fourteenth of Nisan itself as he does in other years. This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And the Rabbis say: One may remove the leaven at its usual time on the fourteenth of Nisan by throwing it away or declaring it ownerless. Rabbi Eliezer bar Tzadok says: Teruma should be removed before Shabbat, as only a few people are permitted to eat it and therefore one can presume that it will remain uneaten during Shabbat. However, non-sacred foods should be removed at their usual time, on the fourteenth of Nisan itself.

3:7 One who is traveling on the eve of Passover to slaughter his Paschal lamb, to circumcise his son, or to eat a betrothal feast in his father-in-law's house, and he remembers that he has leavened bread in his house, if he is able to return to his house and remove the leaven and afterward return to the mitzva toward which he was traveling, he should return home and remove his leaven. But if there is not enough time for him to go home and remove the leaven, and still complete the mitzva that he already began, he should nullify it in his heart, as by Torah law this is sufficient. If one was traveling to save Jews from an attack by gentiles, from a flooding river, from bandits, from a fire, or from a

collapsed building, he should not even attempt to return, and instead he should nullify the leaven in his heart. This applies even if he could remove his leaven and still return to his previous activity. If he went to establish his Shabbat residence in order to adjust his Shabbat limit for an optional purpose, rather than in order to fulfill a commandment, he should return immediately to remove his leaven.

3:8 And so too, the same halakha applies to one who left Jerusalem and remembered that there was consecrated meat in his hand. Meat that is taken out of Jerusalem becomes disqualified, and one is required to burn it in proximity to the Temple. If he passed the area of Mount Scopus [Tzofim], beyond which one cannot see Jerusalem, he burns the meat at the site where he is located; and if he has not traveled that far, he must return and burn it before the Temple with wood from the arrangement on the altar, which was designated for burning consecrated items that were disqualified. The mishna asks: For how much leaven or consecrated meat is one required to return? Rabbi Meir says: In both this case and that case, one must return for an egg-bulk. Rabbi Yehuda says: In both this case and that case, one must return for an olive-bulk. And the Rabbis say that the amount depends on the case: With regard to consecrated meat, he is required to return if he has an olive-bulk, but in a case where he remembers that he has leavened bread, he required to return only for an egg-bulk.

4:1 In a place where the people were accustomed to perform labor on Passover eve until midday, one may do so on that day. In a place where the people were accustomed not to perform labor, one may not do so. The performance of labor on the eve of Passover is not prohibited by Torah law, but is dependent on local custom. If one travels from a place where people perform labor on Passover eve to a place where people do not perform labor, or from a place where people do not perform labor on Passover eve to a place where people perform labor, the Sages impose upon him the stringencies of both the place from which he left and the stringencies of the place to which he went. In both cases, he may not perform labor. The Sages stated a principle: And a person may not deviate from the local custom, due to potential dispute.

4:2 Similarly, one who transports Sabbatical Year produce from a place where a crop has ceased in the fields to a place where it has not yet ceased or from a place where it has not yet ceased to a place where it has already ceased is obligated to remove the produce from his possession, in accordance with the stringencies of both locations. It is permitted for homeowners to eat Sabbatical Year produce in their houses only as long as that species of fruit remains in the field as ownerless property. However, once that particular fruit is no longer available for animals in the fields, one is required to remove what remains of that species from his home. The statement in the mishna is referring to one who transported fruit from a location where it ceased in the fields to one where it did not, and vice versa. Rabbi Yehuda says that he need not remove the produce, as he can say to a local resident: You, too, go out and bring this produce from a place where it remains in the field.

4:3 Apropos different local customs discussed in the first mishna in this chapter, this mishna discusses various halakhot with regard to which there are different customs. In a place where the people were accustomed to sell small

livestock to gentiles, one may sell them. In a place where the people were not accustomed to sell them due to certain concerns and decrees, one may not sell them. However, in every place, one may sell to gentiles neither large livestock, e.g., cows and camels, nor calves or foals, whether these animals are whole or damaged. The Sages prohibited those sales due to the concern lest the transaction be voided or one side reconsider, creating retroactively a situation where a Jew's animal performed labor for the gentile on Shabbat in violation of an explicit Torah prohibition. Rabbi Yehuda permits the sale of a damaged animal because it is incapable of performing labor. Ben Beteira permits the sale of a horse for riding, because riding a horse on Shabbat is not prohibited by Torah law.

4:4 The mishna cites another custom related to Passover. In a place where people were accustomed to eat roasted meat on Passover evenings, outside of Jerusalem or after the Temple was destroyed, one may eat it. In a place where people were accustomed not to eat outside Jerusalem, one may not eat it. The mishna discusses additional differences between local customs. In a place where people were accustomed to kindle a lamp in the house on Yom Kippur evenings, one kindles it. In a place where people were accustomed not to kindle a lamp, one does not kindle it. However, even in a place where the custom is not to kindle lamps in houses, one kindles in synagogues and study halls, in deference to these places. Similarly, lamps should be kindled in dark alleyways, so people will not be hurt, and next to the sick.

4:5 This mishna continues the previous discussion of customs. In a place where people were accustomed to perform labor on the Ninth of Av, one performs labor. In a place where people were accustomed not to perform labor, one does not perform labor. And in all places Torah scholars are idle and do not perform labor on the Ninth of Av, due to the mourning over the Temple's destruction. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: With regard to the Ninth of Av, a person should always conduct himself as a Torah scholar and refrain from performing labor. Apropos the discussion of performing labor on Passover eve, differences in other customs were cited. And the Rabbis say: In Judea, people would perform labor on Passover eves until midday, and in the Galilee people would not perform labor on Passover eve at all. With regard to performing labor on the night before Passover eve, the night between the thirteenth and fourteenth of Nisan, Beit Shammai prohibit performing labor, and Beit Hillel permit doing so until sunrise.

4:6 Rabbi Meir says: With regard to any labor that one began before the fourteenth of Nisan, he may complete it on the fourteenth before midday. However, one may not begin to perform that labor from the outset on the fourteenth, even if he is able to complete it before midday. And the Rabbis say: The practitioners of only three crafts are permitted to perform labor until midday on Passover eve, and they are: Tailors, barbers, and launderers, whose work is needed for the Festival. Rabbi Yosei bar Yehuda says: Even shoemakers are permitted to work on the fourteenth.

4:7 This mishna continues the discussion of the halakhot of Passover eve. One may place eggs under hens on the fourteenth of Nisan so that the birds will brood until the eggs hatch. And if a hen fled from brooding, one may restore it

to its place. And if a brooding hen died, one may place another in its stead. Similarly, one may sweep dung from beneath the legs of an animal on the fourteenth of Nisan. And during the intermediate days of the Festival one may clear it to the sides. Similarly, one may take vessels to the craftsman's house for repair and bring others from there even though they are not for the purpose of the Festival.

4:8 The mishna continues the discussion of the halakhot of Passover eve, along with other local customs. Six actions were performed by the Jewish residents of Jericho, contrary to common practice. With regard to three, the Sages reprimanded them, and with regard to three, the Sages did not reprimand them. And these are the ones with regard to which they did not reprimand them: The residents of Jericho would graft palm trees the entire day on the fourteenth of Nisan; and they would bundle Shema, as explained in the Gemara; and they would harvest and pile grain before the omer offering was brought. And these are the ones with regard to which the Sages reprimanded them: They would permit the use of consecrated branches of carob or sycamore trees. This refers to trees whose branches were cut and consecrated for Temple upkeep, which subsequently sprouted new branches; and they would eat fallen fruit from beneath palm trees that shed fruit that had fallen on Shabbat; and they would designate the produce in the corner for the poor in a field of vegetables, which is exempt from this obligation even by rabbinic law. And the Sages reprimanded the people of Jericho for doing these three things.

4:9 The Sages taught: King Hezekiah performed six actions. With regard to three of them, the Sages of his generation conceded to him; and with regard to three of them, the Sages did not concede to him. Due to King Hezekiah's father's wickedness, he dragged the bones of his father Ahaz on a bier of ropes and did not afford him the respect due to a king, and the Sages conceded to him. He ground the copper snake that Moses fashioned in the desert because Israel worshipped it, and the Sages conceded to him. He suppressed the Book of Cures, and they conceded to him. And with regard to three actions, the Sages did not concede to him. He cut off the doors of the Sanctuary and sent them to the King of Assyria, and they did not concede to him because he thereby demeaned the Temple. He sealed the waters of the upper Gihon stream, diverting its water into the city by means of a tunnel, and they did not concede to him, because he harmed the local populace in the process and should have relied upon God (Me'iri). He intercalated the year, delaying the advent of the month of Nisan during Nisan, and they did not concede to him. The Gemara explains that he declared the first of Nisan to be the thirtieth of Adar and only then intercalated the year (see II Chronicles 30:2).

5:1 The daily afternoon offering is slaughtered at eight and a half hours of the day, which is two and a half hours after midday, and is sacrificed, i.e., its offering on the altar is completed, at nine and a half hours of the day. On the eves of Passover, when the Paschal lamb must be offered after the daily offering, the daily offering is sacrificed earlier; it is slaughtered at seven and a half hours and sacrificed at eight and a half hours, whether it occurs during the week or on Shabbat. If Passover eve occurs on Shabbat eve, when the Paschal lamb must be offered even earlier to ensure that it will be roasted

before the onset of Shabbat, the daily offering is slaughtered at six and a half hours and sacrificed at seven and a half hours, and the Paschal lamb is offered thereafter.

5:2 The Paschal lamb that the priest slaughtered not for its own purpose, i.e., at the time of slaughter he said that his intent was to slaughter it as a different offering, e.g., a peace-offering or burnt-offering, rather than as a Paschal lamb; or if the priest received the blood, or carried the blood to the altar, or sprinkled the blood on the altar while saying that it was not for the purpose of the Paschal lamb; or if the priest performed the rites both for its own purpose and not for its own purpose; or not for its own purpose and for its own purpose; in all these cases, the Paschal lamb is disqualified. How does one perform the rites for its own purpose and not for its own purpose? It is in a case where the priest said that his intent is for the purpose of the Paschal lamb and for the purpose of a peace-offering. And how does one perform rites not for its own purpose and for its own purpose? It is in a case where the priest says that the offering is for the purpose of a peace-offering and for the purpose of a Paschal lamb.

5:3 If one slaughtered the Paschal lamb for people who cannot eat it or for those who did not register in advance to eat it, or if one slaughtered it for people who are uncircumcised or for those who are ritually impure, whom the Torah prohibits from eating the Paschal lamb, it is disqualified. However, if one slaughtered it for those who can eat it and for those who cannot eat it; for those who have registered for it and for those who have not registered for it; for the circumcised and for the uncircumcised; for the ritually impure and for the ritually pure, it is valid, for a partially invalid intent does not disqualify the offering. If one slaughtered the Paschal lamb before midday it is disqualified, as it is stated: "And the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall slaughter it in the afternoon" (Exodus 12:6). If he slaughtered it before the daily afternoon offering it is valid, as long as another person stirs its blood in order to prevent it from congealing until the blood of the daily offering is sprinkled. And if the blood of the Paschal lamb is sprinkled before the blood of the daily offering, it is nonetheless valid, as this change does not disqualify the offering.

5:4 One who slaughters the Paschal lamb with leavened bread still in his possession violates a negative commandment, as the Torah states: "You shall not offer the blood of My sacrifice with leavened bread; neither shall the sacrifice of the festival of Passover be left until the morning" (Exodus 34:25). Rabbi Yehuda says: Even one who slaughters the daily afternoon offering on Passover eve with leaven in his possession violates the commandment. Rabbi Shimon says: One who slaughters the Paschal lamb on the fourteenth of Nisan for its own purpose with leaven in his possession is liable; but if he slaughtered it for a different purpose he is exempt. And for all other offerings that one slaughters on Passover eve, when owning leaven is prohibited, whether he slaughtered them for their own purpose or he slaughtered them for a different purpose, he is exempt. And during the festival of Passover, if one slaughtered the Paschal lamb for its own purpose he is exempt. Since a Paschal lamb that is slaughtered for its own purpose at an improper time is disqualified, it is not

an offering at all and there is no violation of the commandment: “You shall not offer the blood of My sacrifice with leavened bread.” However, if he slaughtered it for a different purpose and thereby validated the sacrifice as a peace-offering, he is liable for having sacrificed it with leaven in his possession. And for all other offerings that one slaughters on Passover, when it is prohibited to slaughter with leaven in one’s possession, whether he slaughtered them for their own purpose or he slaughtered them for a different purpose, he is liable. This is with the exception of a sin-offering that he slaughtered for a different purpose with leaven in his possession. Unlike other offerings, a sin-offering is disqualified if it is slaughtered for a different purpose, and therefore one does not violate the prohibition of “You shall not offer the blood of My sacrifice with leavened bread.”

5:5 The Paschal lamb was slaughtered in three groups, meaning those bringing the offering were divided into three separate sets, as it is stated: “And the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall slaughter it in the afternoon” (Exodus 12:6). The verse is interpreted as referring to three groups: Assembly, congregation, and Israel. The procedure for sacrificing the offering was as follows: The first group of people sacrificing the offering entered, and when the Temple courtyard became filled with them they closed the doors of the Temple courtyard. They sounded uninterrupted, broken, and uninterrupted trumpet blasts, as was done while sacrificing any offering. The priests stood in rows from the place of slaughter to the altar, and in their hands they held bowls [bezikhin] of silver and bowls of gold in order to receive the blood of the offerings. There was a row entirely composed of priests holding silver bowls, and a row entirely composed of priests holding gold bowls, as the gold and silver bowls were not mixed in the same row. The bowls did not have flat bases that would allow them to be put down, out of concern that perhaps the priests would set them down and forget about them and in the meantime the blood would congeal and become disqualified for sprinkling on the altar.

5:6 An Israelite would slaughter the sacrifice, and a priest would receive the blood and immediately hand it to another priest standing next to him, and the other priest would pass it to another. Each priest would receive a full bowl of blood from the priest next to him and return to him an empty bowl being passed in the opposite direction, the contents of which had already been sprinkled on the altar. The priest who was closest to the altar would sprinkle a single sprinkling of blood against the base of the altar, i.e., against the north and west sides of the altar, where there was a base.

5:7 The first group exited upon completion of the rite, and the second group entered; the second group left upon completion of its rite, and the third group entered. As it was done by the first group, so was it done by the second and third groups. All the people standing in the Temple courtyard while the Paschal lambs were being slaughtered would recite hallel. If they finished reciting it before all the offerings were slaughtered, they recited it a second time, and if they finished reciting it a second time, they recited it a third time, although in practice they never recited it a third time, as the priests worked efficiently and finished the rite before this became necessary. Rabbi Yehuda

says: The third group never reached even once the opening verse of the fourth chapter of hallel: "I love that the Lord hears the voice of my supplications" (Psalms 116:1), because its people were few and the slaughtering of all the offerings was completed during the recitation of the first three chapters.

5:8 As it was done during the week, so was it done on Shabbat; only that on Shabbat the priests would rinse the Temple courtyard, cleaning away the blood, contrary to the wishes of the Sages, as the priests did not want to veer from the weekday procedure in this regard. Rabbi Yehuda says: Before the floor was rinsed, a priest would fill a cup with the blood of the many offerings brought that day that was now mixed together on the floor and then sprinkle it with a single sprinkling upon the altar. But the Rabbis did not agree with Rabbi Yehuda with regard to this point.

5:9 How would one suspend and flay the Paschal lamb in the Temple? Iron hooks [unkelayot] were secured into the walls and pillars, and upon them one would suspend the offering and flay it. If anyone lacked a place among the hooks in the Temple courtyard to suspend and flay the offering, there were thin, smooth rods there, which he would place on his own shoulder and on another's shoulder, and from it he would suspend the offering and flay it. Rabbi Eliezer says: When the fourteenth of Nisan occurred on Shabbat, when moving the rods is prohibited (Rambam), he would rest his hand on another's shoulder and the other's hand on his own shoulder and suspend the offering and flay it.

5:10 He would tear open the flesh of the offering and remove its sacrificial parts, i.e., the fats and other parts offered on the altar. He would place the sacrificial parts in a large basin [mageis] and burn them on the altar. If this took place on Shabbat, when carrying is prohibited, the first group would exit and remain on the Temple Mount; the second group would remain within the rampart, which was an area outside the women's courtyard; and the third group would stand in its place in the Temple. They would wait there until nightfall, and as soon as it became dark, they would all go out and roast their Paschal lambs, everyone in his own place.

6:1 These are the matters related to the Paschal lamb that override Shabbat, when the eve of Passover occurs on Shabbat: Its slaughter, the sprinkling of its blood, the cleaning of its intestines and the burning of its fats on the altar, all of which are services that must be performed on Passover eve while it is still day. However, its roasting and the washing of its intestines, which need not be done by day, do not override Shabbat; rather, one waits until after Shabbat to perform these tasks. Carrying the Paschal lamb through a public domain does not override Shabbat. The Paschal offering consisted of either a lamb or a goat, sometimes quite young and unable to walk the entire way, so that it had to be carried on a person's shoulders. Similarly, bringing it from outside the Shabbat limit and cutting off its wart do not override Shabbat, as all these tasks could have been performed before Shabbat. A wart is considered a blemish that disqualifies the animal from being brought as an offering, but once the wart is removed, the animal is fit to be sacrificed on the altar. Rabbi Eliezer says: All of these procedures override Shabbat.

6:2 Rabbi Eliezer said: Could this not be derived through an a fortiori

inference? If slaughter, which is ordinarily forbidden on Shabbat as a biblically prohibited labor, nonetheless overrides Shabbat when performed for the sake of the Paschal lamb, then these activities, namely carrying the animal, bringing it from outside the Shabbat limit, and the like, which are prohibited due to rabbinic decree, should they not override Shabbat? Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: The law governing a Festival proves otherwise, for the Torah permitted on it acts that are normally prohibited as labor, such as slaughtering, cooking, and baking, and yet it is forbidden to do on it acts that are prohibited due to rabbinic decree. Thus, we cannot derive policy with regard to rabbinic prohibitions from the rules that govern Torah laws. Rabbi Eliezer said to him: What is this, Yehoshua? How can you suggest such a weak proof? What proof can be deduced from optional activities that would apply to a mitzva? How does the fact that rabbinic decrees remain in effect on a Festival with respect to optional activities prove that one is also forbidden to transgress a rabbinic decree in order to fulfill the mitzva of offering the Paschal lamb? Rabbi Akiva responded and said in defense of Rabbi Yehoshua's opinion: Sprinkling the purifying water of a red heifer upon someone who had contracted ritual impurity through contact with a corpse proves the matter, for it is done for the sake of a mitzva, in order to allow the person to offer the Paschal lamb, and it is prohibited only due to rabbinic decree, and nonetheless it does not override Shabbat, for the purification rite is not performed on the eve of Passover that falls on Shabbat. So, too, you should not be surprised about these activities, namely carrying the animal, bringing it from outside the Shabbat limit, and cutting off its wart, that although they are performed for the sake of a mitzva and they are prohibited only due to rabbinic decree, they do not override Shabbat. Rabbi Eliezer said to him: I do not accept this proof. With regard to this sprinkling itself, I infer that it, too, is permitted for the same reason: If slaughter, which is a biblically prohibited labor, overrides Shabbat, is it not right that sprinkling the purifying water of a red heifer, which is prohibited only due to rabbinic decree, should override Shabbat? You cannot challenge me based on a premise with which I disagree. Rabbi Akiva said to Rabbi Eliezer: Or perhaps we can reverse the order of your argument and say the opposite: If, as we know by accepted tradition, sprinkling the purifying water on Shabbat, which is prohibited only due to rabbinic decree, does not override Shabbat, then with regard to slaughter, which is prohibited as a biblically prohibited labor, is it not right that it should not override Shabbat? Therefore, it should be prohibited to slaughter the Paschal lamb when the eve of Passover occurs on Shabbat. Rabbi Eliezer said to him: Akiva, how can you say this? You have thus uprooted what is written in the Torah: "Let the children of Israel offer the Paschal lamb in its appointed time" (Numbers 9:2); the phrase "at its appointed time" indicates that the offering must be brought on that day, whether it is a weekday or Shabbat. Rabbi Akiva said to Rabbi Eliezer: My teacher, bring me an appointed time stated in the Torah for these tasks, namely, carrying the animal or bringing it from outside the Shabbat limits, like the appointed time stated with respect to slaughter. The Paschal lamb must be slaughtered on the fourteenth of Nisan, but there is no fixed time when the animal must be brought

to the Temple, and it is therefore possible to transport it before Shabbat.

Rabbi Akiva stated a principle: Any prohibited labor required for the offering of the sacrifice that can be performed on the eve of Shabbat does not override Shabbat; slaughter, which cannot be performed on the eve of Shabbat, overrides Shabbat.

6:3 When does one bring a Festival peace-offering with the Paschal lamb? A special offering is brought on the fourteenth of Nisan together with the Paschal lamb when the Paschal lamb comes on a weekday rather than on Shabbat, and when it comes in a state of ritual purity as opposed to when it is brought in a state of impurity because most of the community is impure, and when many people are registered for the Paschal lamb so that each person will receive only a small portion from it. When these three conditions are met, the Festival peace-offering is eaten first and the Paschal lamb is eaten afterward. When, however, the Paschal lamb comes on Shabbat, or when few people are registered for it so that each person will receive a large portion, or when it is brought in a state of ritual impurity, one does not bring a Festival peace-offering with it.

6:4 With regard to the extra offering itself, the Festival peace-offering would come from the flock, from the herd, from sheep or from goats, from males or from females, as the Festival peace-offering is not bound by the limitations governing the Paschal offering, which must be specifically a young male sheep or goat. And the Festival peace-offering is eaten for two days and one night like other peace-offerings.

6:5 A Paschal lamb that one slaughtered for a different purpose on Shabbat, not knowing that it is prohibited for him to do so, is disqualified, and he is liable to bring a sin-offering for it because he unwittingly performed a prohibited labor on Shabbat. As for all other offerings, such as a peace-offering, that one unwittingly slaughtered on Shabbat for the purpose of a Paschal offering, if they were not fit for the Paschal offering, e.g., if they were female or cattle or more than a year old and clearly ineligible for the Paschal offering, he is liable to bring a sin-offering. Because he did not fulfill the mitzva to bring a Paschal offering, his act of slaughter was therefore unnecessary. And if they were fit, Rabbi Eliezer nevertheless deems him liable to bring a sin-offering for his unwitting transgression. But Rabbi Yehoshua exempts him, because he maintains that if someone intended to perform a mitzva, and despite his error he in fact performed a mitzva, he is not liable to bring a sin-offering. And in this case he performed a mitzva, because offerings that are sacrificed for a different purpose are still fit. Rabbi Eliezer said to Rabbi Yehoshua: If, with regard to the Paschal lamb, which is permitted to be slaughtered on Shabbat for its own purpose, when one changed its purpose he is nevertheless liable, then, with regard to other offerings that are forbidden to be slaughtered on Shabbat even for their own purpose, when one changed their purpose, is it not right that he should be liable? Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: No, this reasoning is faulty. If you say that one is liable to bring a sin-offering if he slaughtered a Paschal lamb for a different purpose, it is because he changed its purpose for something forbidden, as the offering he intended it to be may not be slaughtered on Shabbat. But can you

necessarily say the same thing about other offerings that he slaughtered for the purpose of a Paschal offering and thus changed their purpose for something that is permitted to be sacrificed on Shabbat? Rabbi Eliezer said to Rabbi Yehoshua: Let the communal offerings, such as the daily offering and the additional-offerings of Shabbat and the Festivals, prove the matter, for they are permitted to be slaughtered on Shabbat for their own purpose, and nevertheless, one who unnecessarily slaughters a different offering for their purpose is liable. This indicates that even when a particular offering may be slaughtered, one is nevertheless liable if he slaughtered a different offering for the purpose of the permitted offering. Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: No, if you say this halakha with regard to communal offerings, it is because they have a limit, as there is a specific number of communal offerings that must be offered on any particular day and there is no reason one would mistakenly sacrifice extra offerings for this purpose. But can you necessarily say the same thing about the Paschal lamb, which does not have a limit, making it more likely for someone to make a mistake? Rabbi Meir says: According to Rabbi Yehoshua, even one who unwittingly slaughters other offerings for the purpose of communal offerings beyond their daily limit is exempt for the same reason, i.e., that he intended to fulfill a mitzva that is permitted on Shabbat.

6:6 The mishna continues with another halakha with regard to the Paschal lamb: If one slaughtered a Paschal lamb on Shabbat and mistakenly intended it for those who cannot eat it, such as sick or elderly people who are unable to eat the meat, or for those who did not register for it, or for the sake of the uncircumcised or for those ritually impure, the offering is disqualified and he is liable to bring a sin-offering for his unnecessary act of slaughter. If, however, he slaughtered it for those who can eat it and for those who cannot eat it, or for those who registered for it and for those who did not register for it, or for the circumcised and for those who are uncircumcised, or for those who are ritually impure and those who are ritually pure, he is exempt. Since a Paschal lamb slaughtered with dual intentions of these types is valid, the act of slaughter was justified. If he slaughtered it and it was found to have a blemish, the offering is disqualified, and he is liable to bring a sin-offering for having unwittingly performed a prohibited labor on Shabbat, as he should have examined the animal before it was slaughtered. If he slaughtered it and it was found to have a hidden condition that would cause it to die within twelve months [tereifa] and that could not have been discovered before the slaughter even if it were examined properly, the offering is disqualified, but he is exempt from bringing a sin-offering. This is not a case of shogeg, unwitting violation of Shabbat, but rather of ones, an unavoidable accident. If he slaughtered it and afterward it became known that the owners had withdrawn from it and registered for a different Paschal lamb, in which case this one was slaughtered unnecessarily, as no one was registered for it, or it became known that they had died or became ritually impure, in all these cases he is exempt from bringing a sin-offering, because he slaughtered with permission. At the time of the slaughter, he did not know and had no reason to suspect that the offering would be disqualified.

7:1 How does one roast the Paschal lamb? One brings a spit [shappud] of

pomegranate wood and thrusts it into the mouth of the lamb until it reaches its anus, and one then puts its legs and entrails inside it and roasts it all together; this is the statement of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili. Rabbi Akiva says: One does not insert its legs and entrails inside it, as this is a type of cooking. Anything placed inside the offering does not get roasted directly by the fire and is considered to have been cooked. Rather, one suspends the legs and entrails from the spit above the animal's head outside it.

7:2 One may not roast the Paschal lamb on the metal spit nor on a metal grill [askela]. However, Rabbi Tzadok said: There was an incident with Rabban Gamliel, who said to his slave Tavi: Go and roast the Paschal lamb for us on the grill. If the Paschal lamb touched the earthenware surface of an oven, one must peel off its place on the Paschal lamb, as it was roasted by the heat of the oven and not by the fire itself. If some of the gravy of the Paschal lamb dripped on the earthenware and then returned to it, i.e., the gravy splattered back onto the meat, one must remove its place. Peeling off the outer layer is not enough, and one must remove some of the meat underneath the outer layer, because it is considered to have been cooked by the liquid rather than roasted by the fire. If some of the Paschal lamb's gravy dripped onto hot flour, one must remove a handful of flour from its place, i.e., the place where the gravy landed in the flour, and destroy it.

7:3 In a case where one smears the Paschal lamb with teruma oil, if the Paschal lamb belongs to a group of priests they may eat it, as they are permitted to eat teruma. If the Paschal lamb belongs to a group of Israelites, then if it is still raw, one must rinse it in order to remove the teruma oil; and if it is roasted, one must peel off the outer layer that has absorbed the oil, so that the Israelites do not eat the teruma, which is prohibited to them. If one smears the Paschal lamb with oil of the second tithe, he may not demand money for it from the members of the group, as one may not redeem second tithe in Jerusalem. Second-tithe produce that is in Jerusalem is meant to be eaten; it may be given as a gift to others, but may not be redeemed or sold.

7:4 Five items, i.e., offerings, may be brought in a state of ritual impurity, but they may not be eaten in a state of ritual impurity. They are all communal offerings: The omer, which is brought in Nisan; the two loaves brought on Shavuot; the shewbread, which were arranged each week; the communal peace-offerings, which were brought on Shavuot; and the goats sacrificed on the New Moons, which were sin-offerings eaten by the priests. However, the Paschal lamb that is sacrificed in impurity is eaten even in impurity, as it is brought to begin with only for eating, which is the essence of the mitzva. With regard to other offerings, the essence of their mitzva is fulfilled when they are sacrificed on the altar, and the eating is non-essential.

7:5 If the meat of the Paschal lamb became ritually impure, and the fat remains pure and may be burned on the altar, one may not sprinkle the blood. On the other hand, if the fat became impure and the meat remains pure, one may sprinkle the blood because the meat remains fit to be eaten. This is the halakha with regard to a Paschal lamb, whose primary purpose is to be eaten by those who have registered for it. However, with regard to other offerings it is not so. Rather, although the meat has become impure and the fat remains pure,

one may sprinkle the blood, because part of the offering still remains valid.

7:6 If the entire community or most of it became ritually impure, or the priests were all impure and the community was pure, they should perform the ritual of the Paschal lamb in ritual impurity. If a minority of the community became impure, even if they are many people, those who are pure perform the ritual of the Paschal lamb on the first Pesah, and those who are impure perform the ritual on the second Pesah.

7:7 In a case of a Paschal lamb whose blood was sprinkled and subsequently it became known that the meat or blood was ritually impure, the frontplate of the High Priest appeases God for the ritual impurity after the fact, and the owners are exempt from observing the second Pesah. If it became known later that the body of the individual who brought the Paschal lamb had become ritually impure, the frontplate does not appease God. The individual has not fulfilled his obligation to bring the Paschal lamb, and therefore he must observe the second Pesah. This is because the Sages said that with regard to the nazirite and one who performs the ritual of the Paschal lamb, the frontplate appeases God for both impurity of the blood and meat of the offering, but the frontplate does not appease God for impurity of the body of the individual bringing the offering. The mishna introduces a halakha with regard to ritual impurity of the deep, a term that refers to a source of impurity that is unknown to anyone and is discovered only after it has rendered someone impure. If it became known after the offering was brought that the person had become impure due to ritual impurity of the deep, e.g., if he was informed that there was a concealed grave under the place he had sat in a house where he had previously stayed, the frontplate appeases God and the offering is valid.

7:8 If the whole Paschal lamb or most of it became ritually impure, one burns it before the Temple [habira] with wood from the arrangement of wood on the altar that was given to the owners of the Paschal lamb for this purpose. If a minority of it became impure, and similarly, with regard to the parts of the Paschal lamb that are leftover, which must be burned, the owners of the Paschal lamb burn it in their courtyards or on their roofs, with their own wood. Only the miserly, who want to save the expenditure of wood, burn it before the Temple in order to benefit from the wood of the arrangement.

7:9 A Paschal lamb that was taken out of its permissible area or that became ritually impure should be burned immediately on the eve of Passover. If the owners became ritually impure or died, its form must be allowed to decay by leaving it for a period of time instead of burning it immediately, and it should be burned on the sixteenth of Nisan, immediately after the first day of the Festival. Rabbi Yohanan ben Beroka says: This, too, should be burned immediately, because it has no one to eat it, which is also so severe a disqualification that decay of form is not required.

7:10 The bones of the Paschal lamb that contain edible marrow but cannot be eaten because it is prohibited to break the bones of the Paschal lamb; and the sinews; and the leftover meat should all be burned on the sixteenth of Nisan, immediately after the first day of the Festival. If the sixteenth occurs on Shabbat, they should be burned on the seventeenth, because the mitzva to burn them does not override Shabbat or the Festival. Therefore, they are burned on

the first weekday.

7:11 Anything that is fit to be eaten in an adult ox, whose bones have fully hardened, may be eaten in a young kid. One may register for a Paschal offering in order to eat any of these parts, and eating any such part is considered a fulfillment of the mitzva to eat the Paschal lamb. However, any part of the animal that is inedible in an adult ox is not considered meat, even if it is soft enough to be eaten in a young kid. One may not register for a Paschal offering in order to eat one of these parts, and eating it is not a fulfillment of the mitzva to eat the Paschal lamb. And the soft ends of the ribs and the cartilage are soft enough to be considered edible and may therefore be eaten from the Paschal lamb. One who breaks the bone of a Paschal lamb that is ritually pure receives forty lashes for having violated a prohibition stated in the Torah. But one who leaves over part of a ritually pure Paschal lamb and one who breaks the bone of a ritually impure Paschal lamb do not receive forty lashes.

7:12 If a portion of a limb has gone out of its permissible boundary, one must cut the meat until one reaches the bone at the point that separates between the part of the limb that went out of its boundary and the part that did not, and then peel the meat away from the bone until one reaches the joint, and cut off the limb at the joint, as it is prohibited to break the bone itself. And with regard to other offerings, one may chop off the part that exited with a hatchet, as it is not subject to the prohibition of breaking a bone. How does one determine the outer boundaries of a particular location? Anything that is located from the inside of the doorway inward is considered as though it is inside, and anything that is located from the doorway outward is considered as though it is outside. And the windows in the wall and the thickness of the wall are considered as though they are inside, such that an offering is considered to have exited the premises only if it is taken outside the wall.

7:13 Two groups that were eating one Paschal lamb in one house need not be concerned that they will appear to be one group. Rather, these turn their faces this way and eat, and these turn their faces that way and eat. And it is permissible for them to have the boiler from which they pour hot water in the middle, so that the waiter can easily serve both groups. When the attendant who is serving both groups gets up to pour for the group of which he is not a member, he must close his mouth and turn his face so that he does not accidentally eat with the other group, until he reaches his group again and eats with it. And the bride, who is embarrassed to eat in the presence of men she does not know, turns her face away from her group and eats, although this may make it seem as though she is part of a different group.

8:1 A woman, when she is living in her husband's house, if her husband slaughtered the Paschal lamb on her behalf and her father also slaughtered the Paschal lamb on her behalf, she should eat from her husband's lamb because it is assumed that the wife intended to be included in her husband's group. However, if, as was often customary, she went on the first Festival following her marriage to observe the Festival in her father's house, then, if both her husband slaughtered the Paschal lamb on her behalf and her father also slaughtered the Paschal lamb on her behalf, she may eat in whichever place she

wishes, since it is not obvious with whose group she intended to be included. In the case of an orphan with multiple guardians, if each of his guardians [apotropsin] slaughtered a Paschal lamb on his behalf, intending that he be included in their group, he may eat in whichever place he wishes. A slave jointly owned by two partners may not eat from the lamb of either of them, unless it was stipulated beforehand from whose lamb he will partake. One who is half slave and half free man may not eat from his master's lamb. It is assumed that the master did not intend to allow this person's free half to partake of the lamb, and therefore the master did not slaughter the lamb with him in mind. Consequently, the half slave is not included among those registered for his master's offering unless he was explicitly included.

8:2 In the case of one who says to his slave: Go and slaughter the Paschal offering on my behalf, but does not specify which type of animal to slaughter, the halakha is as follows: If the slave slaughtered a kid, his master may eat it; if he slaughtered a lamb, his master may eat it. If the slave slaughtered both a kid and a lamb, his master should eat from the first one that was slaughtered; the second is invalid and should be burned. If the master had stated explicitly which type of animal to slaughter, but the slave forgot what his master said to him, what should he do? He should slaughter both a lamb and a kid and say the following stipulation: If my master said to me that I should slaughter a kid, the kid is for his Paschal offering and the lamb is for mine; and if my master said to me that I should slaughter a lamb, the lamb is for his Paschal offering and the kid is for mine. In this way, once the master ultimately clarifies what he had originally said, both animals may be used accordingly. If his master also forgot what he said to him, neither animal may be used, since it has not been clarified which of the animals the slave and master are registered for. Therefore, both of them, the lamb and the kid, go out to the place designated for burning, in accordance with the halakha pertaining to offerings that may not be eaten. However, despite this, both the master and slave are exempt from observing the second Pesah if the blood of the animals has already been applied to the altar before the master forgot.

8:3 In the case of one who says to his children: I am slaughtering the Paschal lamb on behalf of whomever of you goes up first to Jerusalem, as soon as the first of the children has entered his head and the majority of his body into Jerusalem, he has acquired his portion and acquires on behalf of his brothers their portions together with him. Additional people can always be registered for a Paschal lamb, as long as there will be at least an olive-bulk of the lamb's meat for each and every person registered. People can be registered and withdraw themselves from being registered for a Paschal lamb until it is slaughtered. Rabbi Shimon says: Even until the priest sprinkles the blood.

8:4 If one who is registered for a Paschal lamb unilaterally registers another person with him in his portion of the Paschal lamb, the other members of his group are permitted to give him, i.e., the one who included the additional person, only his portion, which was originally allotted to him. And he, the additional person, eats from his portion, i.e., the portion of he who added him; and they, the other members of the group, eat from theirs. This is because they did not agree to the inclusion of the additional person.

8:5 A zav, a man who experiences a gonorrheal discharge, who saw two sightings of discharge is ritually impure. To become ritually pure and able to partake of offerings, he must wait seven clean days during which he does not see any discharge. Then he immerses in a ritual bath. He will then be considered ritually pure upon nightfall. One slaughters the Paschal lamb on his behalf if Passover eve is on his seventh day, despite the fact he is still not ritually pure at the time of slaughter, since by the night of Passover he will be ritually pure and able to eat it. If he saw three sightings, in which case, in addition to the seven clean days he must bring an offering on the eighth day to be allowed to partake of offerings, one slaughters the Paschal lamb on his behalf if Passover eve is on his eighth day. It is presumed that by the evening his offering will have been brought and his purification complete. A woman who keeps watch a day for a day is one who became ritually impure after experiencing a discharge of blood outside of her regular menstrual cycle on one day or two consecutive days. She must keep watch on the day following her last discharge to be certain she does not experience any additional discharges. To ritually purify herself, she should, on that day, immerse in a ritual bath, and on condition that she doesn't experience any discharges throughout that day, she is considered ritually pure already from the time she immersed. If she saw a discharge on one day, one slaughters the Paschal lamb on her behalf after she has immersed on her second day, despite the possibility that she may see additional discharges later that day. If she saw a discharge on two days, one slaughters the Paschal lamb on her behalf on the third day. And a zava is a woman who experienced discharges on three consecutive days. She must, like a zav, wait a full seven clean days with no discharges, immerse, and then bring a sacrifice on the eighth day. One slaughters a Paschal lamb on her behalf only on the eighth day.

8:6 An acute mourner, i.e., a mourner on the day of the death of an immediate relative; and one clearing a pile of stones that collapsed on top of a person, in which case there is a possibility that the person buried underneath is dead and his corpse will impart ritual impurity to the person clearing the pile; and similarly, one whom the governing body promised to release from prison on the night of Passover; and an ill person and an elderly person who are still capable of eating an olive-bulk of meat, one slaughters the Paschal lamb on their behalf, since they are currently fit to eat the Paschal lamb. However, with regard to all of them, this is only true when they are included in a group with other people who will definitely be able to partake of the lamb; but we do not slaughter the Paschal lamb on their behalf if they are by themselves, either as individuals or in a group composed entirely of such people, because perhaps they will cause the Paschal lamb to become disqualified, since there is a possibility that by the night of Passover they will be unable to partake of the Paschal lamb. Therefore, since they were registered for a Paschal lamb and it was slaughtered when they were still fit to partake of it, even if a disqualification occurred to them later, preventing them from partaking of the Paschal lamb, they are nevertheless exempt from observing the second Pesah. The exemption from the second Pesah is dependent not on whether they partook of a Paschal lamb, but on whether it was validly slaughtered on their behalf.

This holds true except for one who was clearing a pile of stones where the person buried underneath was eventually found dead, because in such a case the person searching for him certainly stood over the corpse at some point. He had therefore become ritually impure from the outset, even before the Paschal lamb was slaughtered. Consequently, he would not have been fit even during the slaughter and will have to observe the second Pesah.

8:7 We do not slaughter the Paschal lamb on behalf of an individual, only for a group of people; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. And Rabbi Yosei permits it. And even if there is a group of one hundred who together are unable to eat an olive-bulk of it, we do not slaughter on their behalf. And we do not make a group for a Paschal lamb that consists of women, slaves, and minors.

8:8 An acute mourner, i.e., a mourner on the day of the death of an immediate relative, is prohibited from eating sacrificial food. By Torah law, the prohibition applies only to the day of death itself, but it is permitted to partake of sacrificial food on the following night. By rabbinic decree, the period of acute mourning is extended to include the night as well. Despite this, an acute mourner immerses and eats his Paschal lamb in the evening. But he may still not eat other sacrificial food. However, one who hears about the death of his dead, i.e., he discovers that one of his immediate relatives died more than thirty days after the death, his status of acute mourning applies on a rabbinic level. And one who gathers the bones of his parents, who are buried in a temporary location for their flesh to decay and who is moving them to a permanent burial place must also observe a day of acute mourning by rabbinic decree. These mourners immerse and eat all types of sacrificial food at night. Since in these cases, even during the day, the mourning is by rabbinic decree, the Sages did not extend it into the evening. With regard to a convert who converted on Passover eve, Beit Shammai say: He immerses and eats his Paschal lamb in the evening. And Beit Hillel say: One who separates from the foreskin by being circumcised is ritually impure, like one who separates from the grave after coming in contact with a corpse. Consequently, he must first observe the seven-day purification process necessary to remove ritually impurity imparted by a corpse. Only then, from the eighth day onward, may he partake of sacrificial meat.

9:1 One who was ritually impure or on a distant journey and did not observe the first Pesah by participating in the offering of the Paschal lamb on the fourteenth of Nisan should observe the second Pesah by participating in the offering on the fourteenth of Iyyar. If one unwittingly forgot or was prevented due to circumstances beyond his control and did not observe the first Pesah, he too should observe the second Pesah. If so, that the second Pesah is observed even by someone who forgot or was prevented from observing the first Pesah, why is it stated in the Torah that the second Pesah is observed only by one who was ritually impure or on a distant journey? These cases were specified in order to teach that these two groups of people are exempt from karet if they do not observe the second Pesah, but those who were not ritually impure or on a distant journey are liable to receive karet, as the Gemara will explain.

9:2 What is the definition of a distant journey that exempts one from observing

the first Pesah? Anywhere from the city of Modi'im and beyond, and from anywhere located an equal distance from Jerusalem and beyond in every direction; this is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Eliezer says: From the threshold of the Temple courtyard and beyond is considered a distant journey; therefore, anyone located outside the courtyard at the time that the Paschal lamb is slaughtered is exempt from observing the first Pesah. Rabbi Yosei said to him: Therefore, the word is dotted over the letter heh in the word "distant [rehoka]" to say that the meaning of the word should be qualified: It should be understood that it is not because he is really distant; rather, it includes anyone located from the threshold of the Temple courtyard and beyond.

9:3 What is the difference between the Paschal lamb offered on the first Pesah and the Paschal lamb offered on the second Pesah? On the first Pesah, at the time of slaughtering the Paschal lamb, it is prohibited to own leavened bread due to the prohibitions: It shall not be seen, and: It shall not be found. And on the second Pesah it is permissible for one to have both leavened bread and matza with him in the house. Another difference is that the Paschal lamb offered on the first Pesah requires the recitation of hallel as it is eaten and the second does not require the recitation of hallel as it is eaten. However, they are the same in that the Paschal lambs sacrificed on both the first and second Pesah require the recitation of hallel as they are prepared, i.e., as they are slaughtered, and they are both eaten roasted with matza and bitter herbs, and they override Shabbat in that they may be slaughtered and their blood sprinkled even on Shabbat.

9:4 When the Paschal lamb is sacrificed in a state of ritual impurity due to the fact that the majority of the Jewish people are ritually impure, zavim, and zavot, and menstruating women, and women after childbirth may not eat it, because the Paschal lamb overrides only ritual impurity imparted by a corpse, but it does not override other forms of ritual impurity. However, if they violated the halakha and ate from the offering, they are exempt from karet. One who eats sacrificial food in a state of ritual impurity is generally liable to receive karet; however, since in this case the offering is sacrificed in a state of ritual impurity, there is no punishment of karet even for ritually impure individuals who are not permitted to eat it. And Rabbi Eliezer exempts these individuals from karet even for entering the Temple in a state of ritual impurity, despite their not being permitted to enter, because people who are impure due to ritual impurity imparted by a corpse are permitted to enter the Temple in this situation despite their impurity.

9:5 What are the differences between the Paschal lamb that the Jewish people offered in Egypt and the Paschal lamb offered in all later generations? The Paschal lamb the Jewish people offered in Egypt had to be taken from the tenth of the month of Nisan and required the people to sprinkle its blood with a bundle of hyssop, unlike the Paschal lamb in all later years, and its blood was also sprinkled upon the lintel and the two doorposts, and it was eaten with haste; in addition, the Paschal lamb in Egypt was only on one night, whereas the Paschal lamb throughout the generations is observed for seven days.

9:6 Rabbi Yehoshua said: I heard two rulings from my teachers: One ruling was

that the substitute of a Paschal lamb is sacrificed as a peace-offering after Passover, and another ruling was that the substitute of a Paschal lamb is not sacrificed as a peace-offering after Passover; and I cannot explain these two rulings, as I do not remember the circumstances to which each ruling applies. Rabbi Akiva said: I will explain: With regard to a lamb that is separated as a Paschal lamb and is then lost, leading the owner to separate another animal as its replacement, and is later found before the slaughter of the replacement Paschal lamb, it is left to graze until it becomes unfit [yista'ev] and disqualified for use as a sacrifice. It is then sold and becomes unconsecrated, and the owner must bring a peace-offering with its proceeds. And so too, the same is true with regard to its substitute: If one separates another lamb as a substitute for this replacement, the sanctity of the original lamb extends to the substitute as well. In the case outlined above, the substitute would graze, just like the replacement, until it developed a blemish and would then be sold. This is the circumstance in which the substitute of a Paschal lamb is not sacrificed. On the other hand, if the lost lamb is found after the slaughter of the replacement Paschal lamb, it itself is sacrificed as a peace-offering, and so too, its substitute is sacrificed, which explains the ruling that the substitute of a Paschal lamb is sacrificed as a peace-offering.

9:7 In the case of one who separates a female animal for his Paschal lamb although the Torah requires a male, or a male that is in its second year although a Paschal lamb must be an animal that is in its first year, the animal is left to graze until it develops a blemish and becomes unfit, and it is then sold and its money is used for free-will offerings or peace-offerings. With regard to one who separates his Paschal lamb and then dies, his son may not bring it after him for the purpose of a Paschal lamb because it may no longer be used for that purpose after its owner has died. Rather, it is brought for the purpose of a peace-offering.

9:8 In the case of a Paschal lamb that was intermingled with other offerings, such as guilt-offerings and burnt-offerings, and it is not known which animal was separated for which offering, all of them are left to graze until they develop a blemish and become unfit; and they are then sold, and with the proceeds of the choicest of them he must bring this type of sacrifice, and with the proceeds of the choicest of them he must bring this other type of sacrifice, meaning that he must purchase one of each type of sacrifice that was intermingled at the value of the most expensive animal in the group. And he loses the difference from his own pocket. Not all the offerings were as expensive as the most valuable animal in the group, yet he must purchase an animal for each type of offering for the value of the most expensive animal in the group. If a Paschal lamb was intermingled with firstborn animals, Rabbi Shimon says: If those whose offerings became mixed together were groups of priests, they may eat all of the animals on Passover night. This is because priests are permitted to eat the meat of a firstborn animal, and the slaughter and other services for a firstborn animal are the same as those for a Paschal lamb. The attending priests should state that they intend to sacrifice as a Paschal lamb whichever animal is the Paschal lamb and to sacrifice as a firstborn animal whichever animal is a firstborn.

9:9 With regard to a group whose Paschal lamb was lost, and they said to one member of the group: Go and search for our Paschal lamb, and when you find it, slaughter it on our behalf; and he went and found the missing offering and slaughtered it on behalf of the entire group, but in the meantime they took a different animal and slaughtered it as a Paschal lamb, the halakha is as follows: If his Paschal lamb was slaughtered first, he eats from his offering, as he is considered to be registered specifically for that offering, and they eat with him from his offering, because he included them in his offering and it belongs to the entire group. The second animal does not have any registrants and is therefore burned. And if theirs was slaughtered first, they eat from theirs because they withdrew from the original offering through the act of slaughtering a replacement, and he eats from his because he was not registered for the replacement offering sacrificed by the remainder of his group. And if it is not known which of the offerings was slaughtered first, or if both the group and the individual slaughtered them together, he eats from his and they do not eat with him in case theirs was slaughtered first, and theirs must be taken out to the place designated for burning. The offering slaughtered by the group may not be eaten due to the concern that it was slaughtered second and the members of the group would therefore have been included in the first offering. However, they are exempt from performing the offering of the Paschal lamb on the second Pesah, because they were included in the slaughter of whichever animal was slaughtered first. It is only due to external circumstances that they cannot complete the mitzva by eating the Paschal lamb, and this does not prevent them from fulfilling their obligation. A somewhat different case of a lost Paschal lamb would occur if the group had sent one member as an agent to search for the lost animal, and the agent said to the other members of the group before he left: If I am late, go and slaughter a Paschal lamb for me. He then went and found the lost Paschal lamb and slaughtered it, and they took another animal and slaughtered it as a Paschal lamb. In that case, if theirs was slaughtered first, they eat from theirs and he eats with them, because he requested to be included in their offering and they registered him for their Paschal lamb. And if his was slaughtered first, he eats from his and they eat from theirs, because the fact that they slaughtered a different animal indicates that they have withdrawn from the original offering. And if it is not known which of the animals was slaughtered first, or if both the group and the individual slaughtered them together, they eat from theirs because they definitely withdrew from the original offering by slaughtering a different one, and he does not eat with them because he also intended to be included in the animal he slaughtered and it is not clear which was slaughtered first. Therefore, his must be taken out to the place designated for burning; and he is exempt from performing the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb on the second Pesah. If he said to them that if he is delayed they should include him in their Paschal lamb, and they said to him that if he finds the original offering he should slaughter it on their behalf, all of them eat from the first sacrifice that was slaughtered. And if it is not known which of them was slaughtered first, both of them must be taken out to the place designated for burning, and the entire group is exempt from participating in the Paschal

lamb on the second Pesah. If he did not say anything to them and they did not say anything to him, meaning that neither side granted the other authority to slaughter a Paschal lamb on its behalf, they are not responsible for each other, and the members of the group eat their Paschal lamb while the individual sent to find the lost animal eats from his own offering. The reason for this is that the individual is registered only for the original offering, while the other members of the group withdrew from that lost offering by sacrificing a different Paschal lamb.

9:10 Two groups whose Paschal lambs have become intermingled and they do not know which one belongs to which group should act in the following manner: These members of the first group draw one of the animals separated as a Paschal lamb for themselves, and those members of the second group draw one for themselves. One of these, a member of one group, comes to those, the members of the other group, and one of those members of the second group comes to these members of the first group. And this is what each group says to the member of the other group who has come to join them: If this Paschal lamb that is now in our possession is ours, you are withdrawn from the Paschal lamb that was yours, and you are registered for our Paschal lamb and you may eat from it. And if this Paschal lamb is yours, meaning that it actually belongs to the other group, including this individual, we are hereby withdrawn from ours and we are registered for your Paschal lamb, which you agree to share with us. The other group makes the same statement. And similarly, if there were five groups of five people each or of ten people each, they draw one person from each and every group, and they say this statement mentioned in the case of two groups. The remaining member or members of each group will grant the representatives of the other groups that have come to join them a share in the Paschal lamb, and they will acquire a share in it for themselves in case the animal they have chosen belonged originally to one of the other groups.

9:11 In the case of two individuals whose Paschal lambs became intermingled and each person was the only one registered for his offering, what should they do? This person draws one of the Paschal lambs for himself and that person draws one for himself; this person registers someone from the marketplace with him on his Paschal lamb and that person registers someone from the marketplace with him on his Paschal lamb. Once this has been done, this one comes to that person from the marketplace who has been added to the other person's sacrifice, and that one comes to this person from the marketplace who has been added to the first person's sacrifice, and this is what they say: If this Paschal lamb is mine, you are withdrawn from yours and you are registered for mine, and if this is your Paschal lamb, I am withdrawn from mine and I am hereby registered for yours, as described previously. The reason it is necessary for each individual to add an additional person to his Paschal lamb, is to ensure that when each person withdraws from his original Paschal lamb and registers for the other, no Paschal lamb will be left ownerless for any amount of time.

10:1 On the eve of Passover, adjacent to minha time, a person may not eat until dark, so that he will be able to eat matza that night with a hearty appetite. Even the poorest of Jews should not eat the meal on Passover night until he reclines on his left side, as free and wealthy people recline when

they eat. And the distributors of charity should not give a poor person less than four cups of wine for the Festival meal of Passover night. And this halakha applies even if the poor person is one of the poorest members of society and receives his food from the charity plate.

10:2 The tanna describes the beginning of the Passover seder. The attendants poured the wine of the first cup for the leader of the seder. Beit Shammai say: One recites the blessing over the sanctification of the day, i.e., the kiddush for the Festival: Who blesses Israel and the Festivals, and thereafter he recites the blessing over the wine: Who creates fruit of the vine. And Beit Hillel say: One recites the blessing over the wine and thereafter recites the blessing over the day.

10:3 The attendants brought vegetables before the leader of the seder prior to the meal, if there were no other vegetables on the table. He dips the hazeret into water or vinegar, to taste some food before he reaches the dessert of the bread, i.e., the bitter herbs, which were eaten after the matza. They brought before him matza and hazeret and haroset, and at least two cooked dishes in honor of the Festival. The tanna comments that this was the practice, although eating haroset is not a mitzva but merely a custom. Rabbi Eliezer ben Tzadok says: Actually, it is a mitzva to eat haroset. And in the period when the Temple stood and they offered the Paschal lamb, they brought before him the body of the Paschal lamb.

10:4 The attendants poured the second cup for the leader of the seder, and here the son asks his father the questions about the differences between Passover night and a regular night. And if the son does not have the intelligence to ask questions on his own, his father teaches him the questions. The mishna lists the questions: Why is this night different from all other nights? As on all other nights we eat leavened bread and matza as preferred; on this night all our bread is matza. As on all other nights we eat other vegetables; on this night we eat bitter herbs. The mishna continues its list of the questions. When the Temple was standing one would ask: As on all other nights we eat either roasted, stewed, or cooked meat, but on this night all the meat is the roasted meat of the Paschal lamb. The final question was asked even after the destruction of the Temple: As on all other nights we dip the vegetables in a liquid during the meal only once; however, on this night we dip twice. And according to the intelligence and the ability of the son, his father teaches him about the Exodus. When teaching his son about the Exodus. He begins with the Jewish people's disgrace and concludes with their glory. And he expounds from the passage: "An Aramean tried to destroy my father" (Deuteronomy 26:5), the declaration one recites when presenting his first fruits at the Temple, until he concludes explaining the entire section.

10:5 Rabban Gamliel would say: Anyone who did not say these three matters on Passover has not fulfilled his obligation: The Paschal lamb, matza, and bitter herbs. When one mentions these matters, he must elaborate and explain them: The Paschal lamb is brought because the Omnipresent passed over [pasah] the houses of our forefathers in Egypt, as it is stated: "That you shall say: It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Paschal offering for He passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered

our houses” (Exodus 12:27). Rabban Gamliel continues to explain: The reason for matza is because our forefathers were redeemed from Egypt, as it is stated: “And they baked the dough that they took out of Egypt as cakes of matzot, for it was not leavened, as they were thrust out of Egypt and could not tarry, neither had they prepared for themselves any victual” (Exodus 12:39). The reason for bitter herbs is because the Egyptians embittered our forefathers’ lives in Egypt, as it is stated: “And they embittered their lives with hard service, in mortar and in brick; in all manner of service in the field, all the service that they made them serve was with rigor” (Exodus 1:14). The tanna of the mishna further states: In each and every generation a person must view himself as though he personally left Egypt, as it is stated: “And you shall tell your son on that day, saying: It is because of this which the Lord did for me when I came forth out of Egypt” (Exodus 13:8). In every generation, each person must say: “This which the Lord did for me,” and not: This which the Lord did for my forefathers. The mishna continues with the text of the Haggadah. Therefore we are obligated to thank, praise, glorify, extol, exalt, honor, bless, revere, and laud [lekales] the One who performed for our forefathers and for us all these miracles: He took us out from slavery to freedom, from sorrow to joy, from mourning to a Festival, from darkness to a great light, and from enslavement to redemption. And we will say before Him: Halleluya. At this point one recites the hallel that is said on all joyous days. Since one does not complete hallel at this point in the seder, the mishna asks:

10:6 Until where does one recite hallel? Beit Shammai say: Until “Who makes the barren woman dwell in her house as a joyful mother of children, halleluya” (Psalms 113:9). And Beit Hillel say: Until “Who turned the rock into a pool of water, the flint into a fountain of waters” (Psalms 114:8). And one concludes this section of hallel with a blessing that refers to redemption. Rabbi Tarfon says that although one should recite: Who redeemed us and redeemed our forefathers from Egypt, one who did so would not conclude with the formula: Blessed are You, Lord. Rabbi Akiva says that one recites a different version of this blessing: So too, the Lord our God and the God of our forefathers will bring us to future holidays and Festivals in peace, happy over the building of Your city and joyous in Your service. And there we will eat from the Paschal lamb and other offerings, etc., until: Blessed are You, Lord, Who redeemed Israel.

10:7 They poured for the leader of the seder the third cup of wine, and he recites the blessing over his food, Grace After Meals. Next, they pour him the fourth cup. He completes hallel over it, as he already recited the first part of hallel before the meal. And he also recites the blessing of the song at the end of hallel over the fourth cup. During the period between these cups, i.e., the first three cups established by the Sages, if one wishes to drink more he may drink; however, between the third cup and the fourth cup one should not drink.

10:8 One does not conclude after the Paschal lamb with an afikoman. If some of the participants at the seder fell asleep, thereby interrupting their meal, they may eat from the Paschal lamb when they awake. If the entire company fell

asleep, they may not eat any more. If they all fall asleep, this is considered a complete interruption, and if they were to resume their meal it would be akin to eating the offering in two different places. Rabbi Yosei says: If they dozed they may eat from the Paschal lamb when they awake, but if they fell fast asleep they may not eat from it.

10:9 The Sages further said: The Paschal lamb after midnight renders one's hands ritually impure, as it becomes notar, an offering that remained after the time when they may be eaten has expired; and the Sages ruled that both piggul, offerings that were invalidated due to inappropriate intent while being sacrificed, and notar render one's hands ritually impure. If one recited the blessing over the Paschal lamb, which is: Who sanctified us with His mitzvot and commanded us to eat the Paschal lamb, he has also exempted himself from reciting a blessing over the Festival offering. The blessing for the Festival peace-offering of the fourteenth of Nisan is: Who sanctified us with His mitzvot and commanded us to eat the offering. However, if he recited the blessing over the Festival offering, he has not exempted himself from reciting a blessing over the Paschal lamb. This is the statement of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Akiva says: This blessing does not exempt one from reciting a blessing over this one, and that blessing does not exempt that one, as there is a separate blessing for each offering.