

בראשונה - לא מבעיא קאמר: לא מבעיא בראשונה - דקאכיל לתיאבון, אבל באחרונה, דילמא אתי למיכל אכילה גסה - אימא לא, קא משמע לן.

מר זוטרא מתני הכי: אמר רב יוסף אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: מפטירין אחר המצה אפיקומן. נימא מסייע ליה: אין מפטירין אחר הפסח אפיקומן. אחר הפסח - דלא, אבל אחר מצה - מפטירין!

לא מבעיא קאמר. לא מבעיא אחר מצה - דלא נפיש טעמיה, אבל לאחר פסח אימא לא, קא משמע לן.

מיתבי: הסופגנין והדובשנין והאיסקריטין אדם ממלא בריסו מהן, ובלבד שיאכל (אכילת) כזית מצה באחרונה. באחרונה - אין, בראשונה - לא!

לא מבעיא קאמר; לא מבעיא בראשונה - דקאכיל לתיאבון, אבל באחרונה דאתי למיכלה אכילה גסה אימא לא, קא משמע לן.

אמר רבא: מצה בזמן הזה דאורייתא ומרור דרבנן, ומאי שנא מרור - דכתביב: "על מצות ומרורים" בזמן דאיכא פסח - יש מרור, ובזמן דליכא פסח - ליכא מרור.

מצה נמי היא כתביב: "על מצות ומרורים!" מצה מיהדר הדר ביה קרא: "בערב תאכלו מצות". ורב אחא בר יעקב אומר: אחר זה ואחר זה דרבנן.

However, if one eats *matza* before these other foods, no, one may not start eating other foods after *matza*. The mishna apparently supports Rav Yehuda's opinion. The Gemara rejects this proof: The *Tosefta* is stated in the style of: Needless to say. Needless to say, one fulfills his obligation if he eats *matza* before other foods, as he eats it with an appetite. However, if one eats *matza* after eating other foods, perhaps he will come to eat it in the manner of excessive eating, as he is compelled to eat when he is not hungry. Consequently, you might say that one does not fulfill his obligation if he eats *matza* after all those other foods. Therefore, the *Tosefta* teaches us that one may eat *matza* even after consuming those foods.

This is how Mar Zutra taught this discussion: Rav Yosef said that Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: One may conclude after the *matza* with an *afikoman*. The Gemara suggests: Let us say that the mishna supports his opinion: One does not conclude after the Paschal lamb with an *afikoman*. The Gemara infers: It is after the Paschal lamb that one may not conclude with an *afikoman*; however, after *matza* one may conclude with an *afikoman*.

The Gemara rejects this contention: The mishna is stated in the style of: Needless to say. Needless to say, one may not conclude with an *afikoman* after eating *matza*, as the taste of *matza* is slight; however, after the Paschal lamb, one might say that this prohibition does not apply. Therefore, the mishna teaches us that it is prohibited to conclude with an *afikoman* after the Paschal lamb as well.

The Gemara raises an objection: With regard to unleavened sponge cakes, cakes fried in oil and honey, and honey cakes, a person may fill his stomach with them on Passover night, provided that he eats an olive-bulk of *matza* after consuming them. The Gemara infers from here that if he eats *matza* after those cakes, yes, this is permitted; however, if one eats *matza* before these other foods, no, this is not an acceptable practice.

The Gemara answers: As explained above, the *Tosefta* is stated in the style of: Needless to say. Needless to say, one fulfills his obligation if he eats *matza* before other foods, as he eats it with an appetite. However, if he eats *matza* after eating other foods, when he might come to eat it in the manner of an excessive eating, you might say that one does not fulfill his obligation if he eats *matza* after all those other foods. Therefore, the *Tosefta* teaches us that one may eat *matza* even after consuming those foods.

Rava said: The mitzva of *matza* nowadays,⁴ even after the destruction of the Temple, applies by Torah law; but the mitzva to eat bitter herbs⁴ applies by rabbinic law. The Gemara asks: And in what way is the mitzva of bitter herbs different from *matza*? As it is written, with regard to the Paschal lamb: "They shall eat it with *matzot* and bitter herbs" (Numbers 9:11), from which it is derived: When there is an obligation to eat the Paschal lamb, there is likewise a mitzva to eat bitter herbs; and when there is no obligation to eat the Paschal lamb, there is also no mitzva to eat bitter herbs.

The Gemara asks: But if so, the same reasoning should apply to *matza* as well, as it is written: "With *matzot* and bitter herbs." The mitzva of *matza* should also depend on the obligation of the Paschal lamb. The Gemara rejects this contention: The verse repeats the obligation to eat *matza*, as it states: "In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month in the evening, you shall eat *matzot*" (Exodus 12:18). This verse establishes a separate obligation to eat *matza*, unrelated to the Paschal lamb. And Rav Aha bar Ya'akov said: Nowadays, both this, the mitzva to eat *matza*, and that, the mitzva to eat bitter herbs, apply by rabbinic law, as the Torah obligation to eat these foods is in effect only when the Paschal lamb is sacrificed.

HALAKHA

Matza nowadays – מצה בזמן הזה – Nowadays, the mitzva to eat *matza* is a Torah obligation, as the mitzva applies at all times and is not dependent on the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb. This ruling is in accordance with the opinion of Rava and the *baraita* cited in support (*Maggid Mishne*; Rambam *Sefer Zemanim*, *Hilkhot Hametz UMatza* 6:1).

Bitter herbs nowadays – מרור בזמן הזה – The mitzva to eat bitter herbs is contingent upon the Paschal lamb, as bitter herbs accompany the offering. Therefore, by Torah law this obligation applies only when the Temple is standing. The Sages, however, ruled that bitter herbs must be eaten nowadays as well (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim*, *Hilkhot Hametz UMatza* 7:12).

It was written with regard to this and it was written with regard to that and both are necessary – **כתביב בהאי** – **וכתיב בהאי וצריכי**: In other words, it is impossible to learn the different cases from each other, and therefore both verses are necessary. The verse that teaches that an uncircumcised person and an alien are obligated to eat *matza* is necessary, as this *halakha* cannot be derived from the cases of an impure and a distant person because they may eat the second *Pesah*, an option that is unavailable to an uncircumcised man and an alien. At the same time, one could argue that the *halakha* of an uncircumcised person and an alien, as undesirables, should be more stringent than that of an impure or distant person. Consequently, it is necessary for another verse to teach us that an impure and a distant person must eat *matza*, despite the fact that they are unable to partake of the Paschal lamb.

Was explicitly singled out to teach – **יציא מן הכלל ללמד**: This is one of the thirteen principles used to expound the Torah: When various details are included in a generalization and a verse excludes one item from the generalization, that item is not regarded as an exception to the rule, but as the model for all of the other items in the category.

The first night is optional – **לילה ראשון רשות**: Why doesn't the Gemara state the opposite claim, that the fact that there is a Torah obligation to eat *matza* on the first night of Passover indicates that the first night was singled out from the other nights, and therefore a similar *halakha* should apply to all nights of the Festival? The answer is that this type of exegesis is used only for a *halakha* that is stated clearly in the Torah. In this instance, however, the *halakha* that it is merely optional to eat *matza* on all of the nights of Passover is not stated explicitly but is derived from the verses, as explained in the Gemara. Therefore, in this case, one cannot apply the principle that something that was included in a generalization was explicitly singled out to teach (*Tosefot Rid*).

HALAKHA

Eating *matza* on the last six days – **מצה בששת הימים**: Eating *matza* is obligatory only on the first night of Passover. From that point onward, it is optional to consume *matza* during the remainder of the Festival. Although one is obligated to eat a meal of *matza* each day in honor of the Festival, one may use rich, enhanced *matza* for this purpose after the first night (*Be'er Heitev*, citing the Ran). Some authorities say that it is a mitzva to eat *matza* throughout the festival of Passover (Mishna Berura, citing the Vilna Gaon; *Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 475:7).

אלא הכתיב: "בערב תאכלו מצות!"
היא מיבעי ליה לטמא ושהיה בדרך
רחוקה. דסלקא דעתך אמינא: כיון
דפסח לא אכלי – מצה ומרור נמי לא
יכול קא משמע לן.

ורבא אמר לך: טמא ושהיה בדרך
רחוקה לא צריך קרא. דלא גרעי מעירל
ובן נבר. דתנא: "בל ערל לא יאכל
בו" – בו אינו אוכל, אבל אוכל במצה
ומרור.

ואידך: כתיב בהאי, וכתיב בהאי,
וצריכי.

תנא כותיה דרבא: "ששת ימים
תאכל מצות וביום השביעי עצרת
לה' אלהיך," מה שביעי רשות – אף
ששת ימים רשות.

מאי טעמא? הוי דבר שהיה בכלל
ויציא מן הכלל ללמד, לא ללמד על
עצמו יציא. אלא ללמד על הכלל כולו
יציא.

יכול אף לילה הראשון רשות – תלמוד
לומר: "על מצות ומרורים יאכלוהו".

אין לי אלא בומן שבית המקדש קיים;
בומן שאין בית המקדש קיים – ממנו?
תלמוד לומר: "בערב תאכלו מצות" –
הכתיב קבעו חובה.

The Gemara challenges: **But isn't it written: "In the evening, you shall eat *matzot*"?** The Gemara answers: Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov needs that verse for the following *halakha*: When the Temple was standing, one who was ritually impure or one who was on a distant road was nonetheless obligated to eat *matza*. **As it could enter your mind to say that since these two categories of people do not eat the Paschal lamb on the first *Pesah*, they also do not eat *matza* and bitter herbs.** According to Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov, this verse teaches us that even one who was ritually impure and one who was on a distant road are obligated to eat *matza* and bitter herbs, as these mitzvot do not depend on one's eligibility to sacrifice the Paschal lamb on the first *Pesah*.

The Gemara asks: **And Rava**, who maintains that it is a mitzva from the Torah to eat *matza* nowadays, how could he respond to that interpretation of the verse? Rava could have said to you: I do not require a special verse to teach that a ritually impure person and a person who was on a distant road are obligated to eat *matza*. These people are obligated because they are no worse than an uncircumcised man or an alien, i.e., one who does not observe the mitzvot, who are obligated to eat *matza* despite the fact that they do not sacrifice the Paschal lamb. **As it was taught in a *baraita*: "But no uncircumcised man shall eat from it" (Exodus 12:48). "From it" indicates that he may not eat from the Paschal lamb; however, he does eat *matza* and bitter herbs.** The same is true for anyone else who is prevented from eating the Paschal lamb.

The Gemara asks: **And the other**, Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov, how does he respond to this argument? The Gemara answers: According to Rav Aḥa bar Ya'akov, the *halakha* that one must eat *matza* and bitter herbs despite being unable to partake of the Paschal lamb was written with regard to this person, an uncircumcised man, and it was written also with regard to that one, a ritually impure person, and both verses are necessary.^N We cannot learn the *halakha* of a ritually impure person from that of an uncircumcised man, or vice versa, as is explained in several places.

The Gemara comments: **It was taught in a *baraita* in accordance with the opinion of Rava: "Six days you shall eat *matzot*, and on the seventh day shall be a solemn assembly to the Lord your God" (Deuteronomy 16:8). Just as eating *matza* on the seventh day is merely optional, i.e., there is no obligation to eat *matza* on the last day of Passover, but only to avoid eating leavened bread, as the verse states: "Six days you shall eat *matzot*," so too, eating *matza* during the first six days is optional.**

What is the reason that it is optional to eat *matza* on the first six days of Passover as well as the seventh? The seventh day of Passover is something that was included in a generalization but was explicitly singled out to teach.^N According to the rules of exegesis, it was intended to teach not just about itself but about the entire generalization. In other words, the seventh day of Passover was initially included in the verse: "You shall eat *matzot* for seven days" (Exodus 12:15), but was excluded from this generalization by the verse: "Six days you shall eat *matzot*." In accordance with the above principle, the *halakha* of the seventh day applies to all the other days of Passover as well. That means there is no obligation to eat *matza* for all seven days of the Festival, but only on the first day.^H

The *baraita* continues: I might have thought that even the mitzva to eat *matza* on the first night of Passover is included by the above principle, and it too is merely optional;^N therefore, the verse states: "They shall eat it with *matzot* and bitter herbs" (Numbers 9:11).

I have derived nothing other than that one is obligated to eat *matza* when the Temple is standing. From where is it derived that one is obligated to eat *matza* on the first night of Passover even when the Temple is not standing? The verse states: "In the evening you shall eat *matzot*." The verse here establishes the mitzva of *matza* as obligatory, in accordance with the opinion of Rava.

מתני' ישנו מקצתן - יאכלו; כולן - לא יאכלו.

MISHNA If some of the participants at the seder fell asleep,^H 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.

ישנו בשעת סדר פסח – If all of the people present at a seder fell asleep, they may not eat any more food upon awaking. However, if only some of those present fell asleep, they may continue eating. The Rambam asserts that this *halakha* applies not only to the Paschal lamb but to *matza* as well (*Maggid Mishne*). This *halakha* is in effect only if they had begun to eat the *afikoman*. However, if one slept before that point, it is not considered an interruption in his meal (Rema, citing the Tur and Rabbeinu Yeruham; *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 478:2).

Perek X
Daf 120 Amud b

רבי יוסי אומר: נתנמנמו - יאכלו; נרדמו - לא יאכלו. הפסח אחר חצות מטמא את הידים. הפגול והנותר מטמאין את הידים.

Rabbi Yosei says: If they dozed they may eat^N from the Paschal lamb when they awake, but if they fell fast asleep they may not eat from it. 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*^H render one's hands ritually impure.

HALAKHA

הפגול והנותר – *Piggul and notar* – Touching *piggul* and *notar* renders one's hands ritually impure by rabbinic decree (Rambam *Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 8:3).

נתנמנמו – *Dozed* – If an entire group of people at a Passover seder dozed off, they may continue eating when they awaken. This ruling is in accordance with the Rambam's explanation that Rabbi Yosei disagrees with the first statement of the mishna, as opposed to the interpretation of the Rashbam (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim* 478:2).

גמ' רבי יוסי אומר נתנמנמו יאכלו; נרדמו לא יאכלו. היכי דמי נתנמנמו? אומר רב אשי: נים ולא נים, תיר ולא תיר, כגון דקרי ליה ועני, ולא ידע לאהדורי סברא, וכי מדפרו ליה מדכר.

GEMARA We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yosei says: If they dozed^H they may eat from the Paschal lamb, but if they fell asleep they may not eat^N from it. The Gemara asks: **What are the circumstances of dozing?** Rav Ashi said: One is asleep but not asleep, awake but not awake, when, if they call him, he will answer, but he is unable to provide a reasonable answer. And when they later inform him of what happened, he remembers it.

אביי הוה יתיב קמיה דרבה, תוא דקא נמנמ. אמר ליה: מינמ קא נאמ? מר? אמר ליה: מינומי קא מנמנמ. ותנן: נתנמנמו - יאכלו; נרדמו - לא יאכלו.

The Gemara cites a related episode: **Abaye was sitting before Rabba, and he saw that Rabba was dozing off** after he had begun to eat the final obligatory piece of *matza*. **He said to him: Is the Master sleeping?** Rabba said to him: **I am dozing, and we learned in the mishna: If they dozed, they may eat from the Paschal lamb, but if they fell fast asleep they may not eat from it.**^N

הפסח אחר חצות מטמא את הידים וכו'. אלמא: מחצות הוה ליה נותר. מאן תנא?

We learned in the mishna that **the Paschal lamb after midnight renders one's hands ritually impure**. The Gemara infers: **Apparently, from midnight and onward the Paschal lamb is classified as notar**. The Gemara asks: **Who is the tanna who maintains this opinion?**

NOTES

נתנמנמו יאכלו – *If they dozed they may eat* – The commentaries disagree as to whether Rabbi Yosei is referring to the first clause of the mishna or the last clause. If he is referring to the first clause, which states that if part of the group slept, they may eat, Rabbi Yosei is saying that they may continue eating only if part of the group dozes (Rashbam). According to this opinion, Rabbi Yosei's ruling is more stringent than that of the first *tanna*. If Rabbi Yosei is referring to the last clause of the mishna, he is stating that even if everyone dozes, they may still eat, as the prohibition against continuing to eat the offering applies only if the entire group falls asleep (*Me'iri*; Maharam Halawa).

switching from one group of the Paschal lamb to another, or from one place to another (see Rashi; Rashbam), another reason for this prohibition is stated in the Jerusalem Talmud: The Paschal lamb is invalidated if one takes his mind off of it (Ra'avad).

מנמנו של רבה – *Rabba's dozing* – Some commentaries explain that Rabba and Abaye were eating together on seder night, and Rabba dozed off during the seder (Rashbam). Others reject this explanation and assert that it was an ordinary night, and the story is cited only because it involves dozing during a meal (*Me'iri*; Maharam Halawa). The fact that Rava could cite the relevant section of the mishna proves that he was not fully asleep (*Ben Yehoyada*).

נרדמו לא יאכלו – *If they fell asleep they may not eat* – In addition to the resemblance between falling asleep and

Who... it is Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah – רבי אלעזר – מאן... רבי אלעזר – רבי אלעזר: As stated in the Jerusalem Talmud, it is possible to explain the mishna according to Rabbi Akiva's opinion as well, as Rabbi Akiva concedes that there is a rabbinic prohibition against eating the Paschal lamb after midnight (*Mordekhai*).

אמר רב יוסף: רבי אלעזר בן עזריה הוא. דתנינא: "ואכלו את הפסח בלילה הזה" – רבי אלעזר בן עזריה אומר, נאמר באן: "בלילה הזה", ונאמר להלן: "ועברתי בארץ מצרים בלילה הזה".

מה להלן עד חצות – אף באן עד חצות.

אמר לו רבי עקיבא: והלא נאמר: "חפזון" – עד שעת חפזון.

אם בן מה תלמוד לומר: "בלילה"? יכול יהא נאכל בקדשים ביום – תלמוד לומר: "בלילה" – בלילה הוא נאכל, ואינו נאכל ביום.

ורבי עקיבא, האי "הזה" מאי עביד ליה? מיבעי ליה למעוטי לילה אחר הוא דאתא. סלקא דעתך אמינא: הואיל ופסח קדשים קלים, ושלמים קדשים קלים, מה שלמים נאכלים לשיני ימים ולילה אחד – אף פסח.

אזקים לילות במקום ימים, ויהא נאכל לשיני לילות ויום אחד – כתב רחמנא "הזה".

ורבי אלעזר בן עזריה אומר לך: מ"ל תותירו עד בקר" נפקא הא.

ורבי עקיבא אומר לך: אי לא כתב רחמנא "הזה" – הוה אמינא: מאי "בקר" – בקר שני. ורבי אלעזר אומר לך: כל היכא דכתב "בקר" – בקר ראשון הוא.

Rav Yosef said: It is Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya,^N as it was taught in a *baraita*: With regard to the verse "And they shall eat of the meat on that night" (Exodus 12:8), Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says: Here it is stated "on that night," from which it cannot be determined when the night ends. And below it is stated: "And I will pass through the land of Egypt on that night and I will strike every firstborn in the land of Egypt" (Exodus 12:12). The Torah states with regard to the death of the firstborns: "Thus said the Lord: At about midnight, I will go out into the midst of Egypt and every firstborn in Egypt shall die" (Exodus 11:4-5).

The *baraita* continues: Just as in the verse below, the striking of the firstborns took place until midnight, as stated explicitly in the verse, so too, in the verse here, the mitzva to eat the Paschal lamb continues until midnight but not beyond. Evidently, the Paschal lamb may not be eaten after midnight.

Rabbi Akiva said to Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya: But wasn't it already stated: "Thus you shall eat it, with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, your staffs in your hands, and you will eat it in haste, for it is the Paschal offering for the Lord" (Exodus 12:11)? This verse indicates that the Paschal lamb may be eaten until the time of haste, i.e., until dawn, as the Jewish people left Egypt the next day.

Rabbi Akiva continues: If that is so, what is the meaning when the verse states: "On that night," with regard to eating the Paschal lamb? The Gemara explains that this phrase is necessary, as I might have thought that the Paschal lamb is eaten during the day, like all other offerings, which must be slaughtered and eaten during the day. Therefore, the verse states: "On that night," to underscore that this particular offering is eaten at night, and it is not eaten during the day.

The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Akiva, what does he do with the word "that"? As he doesn't use it for a verbal analogy, what does Rabbi Akiva learn from this word? The Gemara answers: He needs it to exclude another night. It could enter your mind to say that since the Paschal lamb falls into the category of offerings of lesser sanctity, and peace-offerings are also offerings of lesser sanctity, just as peace-offerings may be eaten for two days and one night, i.e., the day they are sacrificed through the following day, as stated in the Torah, so too, the same *halakha* should apply to the Paschal lamb.

The Gemara explains the previous statement. How could the Paschal lamb be eaten for two days and one night if one starts eating it at night? The Gemara explains: One may say: I will substitute the nights that the Paschal lamb may be eaten instead of the days that a peace-offering is eaten. And accordingly, the Paschal lamb may be eaten for two nights and one day. Therefore, the Torah wrote the word "that," to teach that the Paschal lamb may be eaten only on that one night.

And Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, from where might he derive the *halakha* that the Paschal lamb may not be eaten for two nights? Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya could have said to you: This *halakha* is derived from the verse: "You shall let nothing of it remain until the morning; and that of it which remains until the morning you shall burn with fire" (Exodus 12:10). If it is prohibited to leave any part of the Paschal lamb until the morning, it is certainly prohibited to leave any of it until the following night. Therefore, it is unnecessary to cite an additional source to teach that the Paschal lamb may be eaten only on the first night.

And Rabbi Akiva could have said to you, in response to this argument: If the Torah hadn't written "on that night," I would have said: What is indicated by the word "morning" in that verse? It means the second morning after the Festival, the day of the sixteenth of Nisan. Therefore, it was necessary for the Torah to write that one may eat the Paschal lamb only on that night and no other. And Rabbi Elazar could have said to you in response: Anywhere that the Torah writes "morning," it is referring to the first, i.e., the next morning. If that were not the case, no biblical text could have any definitive meaning.

Matza after midnight – מצה...אחר חצות: One should be careful not to eat the final olive-bulk portion of *matza*, i.e., the *afikoman*, after midnight, as the ruling of the *halakha* is in accordance with the stringent opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya (Rosh). Furthermore, the bitter herbs should also be eaten and *hallel* recited before midnight (Rema based on the Ran; *Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim* 477:1).

The measure of *piggul* for ritual impurity – שיעור טומאת פיגול – An offering disqualified by improper intention [*piggul*] and leftover sacrificial meat [*notar*] both contract ritual impurity if they contain at least an egg-bulk of meat. Since their ritual impurity is rabbinic, the *halakha* is lenient in this regard and they do not contract ritual impurity when they are merely the size of an olive-bulk (*Kesef Mishne; Rambam Sefer Tahara, Hilkhot She'ar Avot HaTumot* 8:3).

אמר רבא: אכל מצה בזמן הזה אחר חצות, לרבי אלעזר בן עזריה לא יצא ידי חובתו. פשיטא, דבין דאיתקש לפסח – בפסח דמי

Rava said: Nowadays, if one ate *matza* after midnight,^H according to the opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, he has not fulfilled his obligation. The Gemara expresses surprise at this statement: It is obvious that this is the case, for since the verse juxtaposes *matza* to the Paschal lamb, it is considered like the Paschal lamb, and therefore *matza* may also be eaten only until midnight.

מהו דתימא: הא אפקיה קרא מהיקישא – קמשמע לן, דכי אהדריה קרא – למילתא קמייתא אהדריה.

The Gemara answers: Rava's statement is necessary, lest you say that the verse has removed the *halakha* of *matza* from this juxtaposition, as Rava maintains that eating *matza* is a distinct mitzva that applies even nowadays. One might therefore have thought that the *halakhot* of eating *matza* differ entirely from those of the Paschal lamb. Rava therefore teaches us that when the verse repeats the mitzva to eat *matza* on the first night, it restores this mitzva to its original status, which means that one may eat *matza* only at a time when he may also eat the Paschal lamb.

"הפיגול והנותר מטמא את הידים וכו'". רב הונא ורב חסדא, חד אמר: משום חשדי כהונה, וחד אמר: משום עצלי כהונה. חד אמר: בזית, וחד אמר: בכיצה.

The mishna taught that *piggul* and *notar* render one's hands ritually impure. This issue is subject to a dispute between Rav Huna and Rav Hisda. One of them said: The reason for this enactment is due to suspected priests, i.e., priests who were suspected of invalidating offerings; and the other one said the reason is due to lazy priests. Rav Huna and Rav Hisda also disagree about another matter: One of them said that the ritual impurity of *notar* and *piggul* applies even to an olive-bulk of the meat; and one of them said it applies only to an egg-bulk.^H

Perek X
Daf 121 Amud a

חד תני אפיגול, וחד תני אנותר.

The Gemara explains that there is no dispute between Rav Huna and Rav Hisda concerning the reason for the prohibition. One of these two Sages teaches his explanation with regard to the case of *piggul*, mentioned in the mishna; and the other one teaches it with regard to *notar*.

מאן דתני אפיגול – משום חשדי כהונה; מאן דתני אנותר – משום עצלי כהונה.

The Gemara elaborates: The one who teaches it with regard to *piggul* maintains that the reason is due to suspected priests.^N As a result of enmity between priests, one priest might cause the offerings of another to become *piggul*. To dissuade priests from doing so, the Sages instituted that one who touches *piggul* is rendered ritually impure, which ensures that the offending priest also suffers from his actions. He who teaches this explanation with regard to *notar* claims that the reason is due to lazy priests, to prevent sloth among the priests. The Sages decreed that *notar* causes ritual impurity, to ensure that the priests ate the sacrificial meat within the allotted time.

חד אמר בזית: וחד אמר: בכיצה. מאן דאמר בזית – באיסורו; ומאן דאמר בכיצה – בטומאתו.

It was stated above that Rav Huna and Rav Hisda disagree with regard to the size of the meat that confers ritual impurity. One of them said that an olive-bulk of meat contracts ritual impurity, and one of them said that only an egg-bulk contracts ritual impurity. The Gemara explains the reasoning behind this debate. The one who said that an olive-bulk contracts ritual impurity maintains that the ritual impurity of *notar* and *piggul* is similar to its prohibition. Since *notar* and *piggul* are prohibited when they are an olive-bulk, the same applies to their ritual impurity. And the one who said that sacrificial meat becomes ritually impure when it is an egg-bulk maintains that it is similar to its ritual impurity. In other words, just as the minimum size of ritual impurity for other types of meat is an egg-bulk, the same applies to *piggul* and *notar*.

NOTES

Due to suspected priests – משום חשדי כהונה – Some commentaries explain that if people see priests touching an offering disqualified by *piggul*, they will suspect the priests of planning to eat it afterward. Therefore, the Sages decreed that all offerings disqualified by *piggul* are ritually impure, so the priests will not even touch them (*Arukh*).