

**Matza after midnight – מצה...אחר חצות** – One should be careful not to eat the final olive-bulk portion of *matza*, i.e., the *afkoman*, 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,<sup>H</sup> 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  
אהדיה קרא – למילתא קמייתא  
אהדיה.

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: בביצה.

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.<sup>H</sup>

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.<sup>N</sup> 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: בביצה.  
מאן דאמר בזית – באיסורו; ומאן  
דאמר בביצה – 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*).

The blessing recited over the Paschal lamb and the Festival offering – **בְּרַכַּת הַפֶּסַח וְהַזֶּבֶחַ**: The blessing recited over the Paschal lamb does not exempt one from reciting a blessing over the Festival peace-offering, nor does the blessing recited over the Festival offering exempt one from reciting a blessing over the Paschal lamb. This ruling is in accordance with Rabbi Akiva, whose opinion is generally accepted as *halakha* (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Hametz UMatza* 8:7).

**מתני' בירך ברכת הפסח – פטר את של זבח; בירך את של זבח – לא פטר את של פסח, דברי רבי ישמעאל. רבי עקיבא אומר: לא זו פוטרת זו, ולא זו פוטרת זו.**

**MISHNA** 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.<sup>HN</sup> 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.<sup>N</sup>

**גמ' בשתמץא לומר, לדברי רבי ישמעאל – זריקה בכלל שפיכה, ולא שפיכה בכלל זריקה.**

**GEMARA** The Gemara explains the opinions of the *tanna'im* in the mishna. When you analyze the matter you will find that according to the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, sprinkling of the blood on the altar is included in the more general category of pouring.<sup>N</sup> In other words, the blessing over the Paschal lamb, whose blood is poured, includes the Festival peace-offering, whose blood is sprinkled, as sprinkling is included within the general category of pouring. But conversely, pouring is not included in sprinkling. Consequently, when one recites the blessing over the Festival peace-offering, he has not exempted himself from reciting a blessing over the Paschal lamb.

**לדברי רבי עקיבא: לא שפיכה בכלל זריקה ולא זריקה בכלל שפיכה.**

By contrast, according to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, these are two separate mitzvot: Pouring is not included in sprinkling, and sprinkling is not included in pouring. Therefore, Rabbi Akiva maintains that each offering requires its own blessing.<sup>N</sup>

## NOTES

**The blessing over the Paschal lamb and the Festival offering – בְּרַכַּת הַפֶּסַח וְהַזֶּבֶחַ**: Several commentaries state that the Gemara is not in fact discussing the blessings recited before eating sacrificial meat. Rather, it is referring to the blessings recited when these offerings are actually sacrificed. This interpretation fits better with the continuation of the Gemara, which discusses the relationship between sprinkling and pouring sacrificial blood (Rabbi Betzalel HaKohen).

**Paschal lamb and Festival offering – פֶּסַח וְזֶבֶח**: Most commentaries maintain that the other offering mentioned here is the Festival peace-offering that was sacrificed on the fourteenth of Nisan. This offering was consumed together with the Paschal lamb. Although the Festival peace-offering is eaten before the Paschal lamb, it is still possible that one might forget to recite its blessing at the proper time or err and recite the blessing for the Paschal lamb over the Festival peace-offering (*Or Zarua*). Others state that this passage is referring to offerings in general, e.g., one who sacrificed a vow or a free-will offering on Passover eve.

**Pouring and sprinkling – שְׁפִיכָה וְזִרְיָקָה**: The reason why

sprinkling might be included in pouring is that pouring sacrificial blood on the wall of the altar is the simplest and, therefore, the most common way that blood is sprinkled. All other types of sprinkling are more complex actions, and therefore they can be viewed as included in the general category of pouring. This is similar to the *halakha* that one who recites a general blessing over food, such as: By His word all things came to be, has fulfilled his obligation to recite a blessing over a more specific food, e.g., Who creates fruit of the ground.

**The dispute between Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Akiva – מַחְלוקֵת רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעְאֵל וְרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא**: According to the Jerusalem Talmud, the dispute is whether the blessing for the Paschal lamb is included in the blessing over the Festival peace-offering, because the Paschal lamb belongs to the larger category of offerings, or whether the decisive factor is that the Passover offering is the primary offering and the Festival peace-offering is secondary to it. The *halakha* is that a blessing over a primary food exempts one from reciting a blessing over the secondary item (*Me'iri*).

רבי שמלאי איקלע לפדיון הבן.  
בעו מיניה: פשיטא, על פדיון הבן –  
”אשר קדשנו במצותיו וצונו על פדיון  
הבן” – אבי הבן מברך. ”ברוך  
שהחיינו וקיימנו והגיענו לזמן הזה” –  
כהן מברך או אבי הבן מברך?

כהן מברך – דקמטי הנאה לידיה,  
או אבי הבן מברך – דקא עביד  
מצוה? לא הוה בידיה. אתא שאיל  
ביה מדרשא. אמרו ליה: אבי הבן  
מברך שתיים. והלכתא: אבי הבן  
מברך שתיים.

הדרן עלך ערבי פסחים  
וסליקא לך מסכת פסחים

The Gemara discusses another case concerning the order of the blessings: **Rabbi Simlai attended a redemption of the firstborn son.**<sup>N</sup> The celebrants raised a dilemma before him with regard to the blessings. First they noted that it is obvious that the blessing over the redemption of a first born son, which is: **Who sanctified us with His mitzvot and commanded us over the redemption of the firstborn son, is certainly recited by the father of the son,** as he is the one obligated to redeem his son. However, with regard to the second blessing: **Blessed are You, Lord our God, King of the universe, Who has given us life [sheheheyanu],<sup>N</sup> sustained us, and brought us to this time, does the priest recite this blessing, or does the father<sup>N</sup> of the son recite it?**

The Gemara explains the two sides of the dilemma. It can be suggested that the **priest recites the blessing, as he benefits** from the five sela he receives when the boy is redeemed. The blessing of *shehehiyanu* is generally recited by the one who receives the benefit. Or, perhaps **the father of the son recites sheheheyanu, as he is the one who performs the mitzva.** Rabbi Simlai did not have an answer readily available, and he went to ask this question in the study hall. The scholars said to him that **the father of the son recites the two blessings:** Over the redemption of the son and *sheheheyanu*. The Gemara concludes: **And the halakha is that the father of the son recites two blessings.**<sup>H</sup>

#### NOTES

**Redemption of the firstborn son – פדיון הבן:** The mitzva to redeem a firstborn son is mentioned in several places in the Torah (Exodus 13:2; Numbers 3:11–13, 3:44–51). In short, a woman's firstborn son belongs to the priest. The boy's father redeems the baby for a fixed sum of five sela. One whose father is a Levi or priest and one whose mother is the daughter of a Levi or priest is not subject to this mitzva.

**Who recites the blessing: Who has given us life – מי מברך – שהחיינו:** Some commentaries state that both the father, who performs the mitzva, and the priest, who receives the benefit, may recite the blessing. The dispute in this context is which of them has the greater obligation. The individual whose obligation is greater should recite the blessing, while the other person fulfills his obligation by answering: Amen (Rav Shmuel Strashun).

**The father and the priest – אב וכהן:** Some commentaries explain the two sides of the issue as follows: It can be claimed that the father should not recite the blessing, as he loses money through the mitzva. Therefore, the priest, who benefits from the mitzva, should recite *sheheheyanu*. Conversely, one could say that the father's joy over the fact that his son is thirty days old is sufficient cause for him to recite the blessing (*Nimmukei Yosef*).

#### HALAKHA

**The blessings over the redemption of the son – ברכות פדיון הבן:** The father of the child recites two blessings at the redemption of his firstborn: Who commanded us over the redemption of the son, and: Who has given us life [*sheheheyanu*] (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 305:10*).