

תָּוֵר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה וְדָנוּ דִּין אַחֵר: נֹתֵר יִשְׁנוּ בְּ"בַל תּוֹתִירוּ", וְחִמֵּץ בְּ"בַל תּוֹתִירוּ". מִה נֹתֵר בְּשֵׂרִיפָה – אִף חִמֵּץ בְּשֵׂרִיפָה.

אָמְרוּ לוֹ: אֲשֶׁם תִּלְוִי וְחִטָּאת הָעוֹף הֵבֵא עַל הַסֶּפֶק, לְדַבְּרֵיךָ, יוֹכִיחוּ: שֶׁהֵן בְּ"בַל תּוֹתִירוּ". שָׂאֵנוּ אוֹמְרִים בְּשֵׂרִיפָה – וְאַתָּה אוֹמֵר בְּקִבּוּרָה! שָׂתַק רַבִּי יְהוּדָה.

אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף: הֵינְנוּ דְאָמְרִי אֵינְשֵׁי: כִּפָּא דְחִטָּא נִגְרָא בְּגוּוֹה נְשָׂרוּף חֲרָדְלָא.

(אָמַר אַבְיִי): סַדְנָא בְּסַדְנֵי יְתִיב, מְדוּלֵי יְדֵיהּ מְשִׁתְּלִים.

רַבָּא אָמַר: גִּירָא בְּגִירֵי מְקַטִּיל, מְדוּלֵי יְדֵיהּ מְשִׁתְּלִים.

וְיַחֲכִמִּים אוֹמְרִים מְפָרֵר וּזְוֵרָה וְכוּ". אֵיבַעֲיָא לְהוּ, הִיכִי קְאָמַר: מְפָרֵר וּזְוֵרָה לְרוּחַ, וּמְפָרֵר וּמְטִיל לֵים. אוּ דִילְמָא: מְפָרֵר וּזְוֵרָה לְרוּחַ, אָבַל מְטִיל לֵים בְּעֵינֵיהּ. תַּנּוּ נַמִּי גְבִי עֲבוּדָה זְוֵרָה בִּי הֵאֵי גְוֹנָא: רַבִּי יוֹסֵי אָמַר: שׁוֹחֵק וּזְוֵרָה לְרוּחַ, אוּ מְטִיל לֵים. וְאֵיבַעֲיָא לְהוּ: הִיכִי קְאָמַר? שׁוֹחֵק וּזְוֵרָה לְרוּחַ, וְשׁוֹחֵק וּמְטִיל לֵים. אוּ דִילְמָא: שׁוֹחֵק וּזְוֵרָה לְרוּחַ, אָבַל מְטִיל לֵים בְּעֵינֵיהּ.

אָמַר רַבָּה: מְסַתְּבָרָא. עֲבוּדָה זְוֵרָה דְלֵים הַמְלַח קָא אֲזֵלָא – לָא בְּעֵי שְׁחִיקָה, חִמֵּץ דְלִשְׁאָר נְהָרוֹת קְאָזִיל בְּעֵי פִירוּר. אָמַר לִיהּ רַב יוֹסֵף: אֲדַרְבֵּהּ, אֵיפְכָא מְסַתְּבָרָא! עֲבוּדָה זְוֵרָה דְלָא מְמִיסָה – בְּעֵי שְׁחִיקָה, חִמֵּץ דְמִמִּים – לָא בְּעֵי פִירוּר.

Then Rabbi Yehuda presented a different logical derivation: The prohibition against eating and deriving benefit from leftover sacrificial meat is clearly included in the prohibition of: **And you shall not leave over. And leavened bread is also included, in a sense, in the prohibition of: And you shall not leave over, as once the time it may be eaten expires, one violates the prohibitions of: It shall not be seen, and: It shall not be found, by owning it. Just as leftover sacrificial meat is subject to burning, so too, leavened bread is subject to burning.**

They said to him: According to your opinion, an uncertain guilt-offering and a bird sacrificed as a sin-offering in a case of doubt will prove^N that this comparison is not valid, as they are also included in the prohibition of: **And you shall not leave over**, since these offerings are prohibited after the time in which they may be eaten has expired. **As we say that they are subject to burning, but you say that an uncertain guilt-offering is subject to burial. Rabbi Yehuda was silent, as he had no response.**

Rav Yosef said: This is as people say: **In the spoon that the carpenter made, the mustard will burn^N his palate.** In other words, one can be harmed by his own actions. Similarly, in this case the strongest proof against Rabbi Yehuda's opinion is the one based on Rabbi Yehuda's own statement.

Abaye said another folk expression: **He who made the stocks [saddana] shall sit in the stocks;^N he is repaid through his own handiwork.**

Rava said another similar saying: **He who made the arrows shall be killed with his own arrows; he is repaid through his own handiwork.**

It was taught in the mishna: **And the Rabbis say that leavened bread need not be burned; rather, one may even crumble it and throw it into the wind or the sea.^H A dilemma was raised before the Sages: With regard to what case are they speaking? Do they mean that he must specifically crumble it and throw it into the wind or crumble it and throw it into the sea? Or perhaps one may crumble it and throw it into the wind, but he may cast it into the sea in its pure, unadulterated form, without crumbling it first. We also learned in a mishna with regard to idolatry in a case like this that Rabbi Yosei says: He may grind the idol and throw the dust into the wind or cast it into the sea.^H And a dilemma was raised before the Sages: With regard to what case are they speaking? Must one specifically grind it and throw it into the wind or grind it and throw it into the sea? Or perhaps he may grind it and throw it into the wind; however, he may throw it into the sea in its pure, unadulterated form.**

Rabba said: **It stands to reason that since idols are thrown into the Dead Sea,^N they do not need grinding**, as there is no concern that they will be removed and used again. However, **leavened bread that may be thrown into other rivers, needs crumbling before being cast away.** Rav Yosef said to him: **On the contrary, the opposite is more reasonable. Idols, which do not normally disintegrate in the water, need grinding. However, leavened bread, which disintegrates in the water on its own, does not need crumbling.^H**

NOTES

לְדַבְּרֵיךָ – לְדַבְּרֵיךָ – According to your opinion...will prove – לְדַבְּרֵיךָ: Why don't the Rabbis use the *a fortiori* inference that they suggest and derive that one must burn leavened bread? Apparently they believe that one cannot derive *halakhot* of non-sacred items from *halakhot* of consecrated items (Maharam Halawa; see *Tosafot*).

The mustard will burn – מְשִׂרוּף חֲרָדְלָא: Some explain this expression to mean that the carpenter's mustard is burned in the spoon that he himself made (Rabbeinu Hananel).

He who made the stocks [saddana] shall sit in the stocks – סַדְנָא בְּסַדְנֵי יְתִיב: Some have a different version of the text, which reads *sadda'a*. This then is referring to one who builds ships and rafts and is condemned to be chained up on them (*Arukh*).

Idols...into the Dead Sea – עֲבוּדָה זְוֵרָה לֵים הַמְלַח: This applies specifically to the Dead Sea, since it is a place devoid of people. Therefore, whatever is thrown into it is considered gone forever.

HALAKHA

Removal of leavened bread – בִּיעוּר חִמֵּץ: When one removes leavened bread, he may do so by crumbling it and throwing it into the wind, by burning it, or by casting it into the sea, in accordance with the majority opinion of the Rabbis (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 445:1).

Removal of idolatry – בִּיעוּר עֲבוּדָה זְוֵרָה: Idols, or any objects used for idolatry, must be ground up and then thrown into the sea or into the wind. Even Rabba seems to agree that when one does not throw them into the Dead Sea one must grind them up first (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 146:14).

Crumbling leavened bread – פִּירוּר חִמֵּץ: One may remove leavened bread by throwing it into the sea, even without crumbling it first. However, if it is hard, he should crumble it before throwing it in, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Yosef and his explanation of the *baraita* (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 445:1).

NOTES

It is permitted to derive benefit – מותר בהנאה – In the Jerusalem Talmud it is explained that this statement was made with regard to a place where bread baked by a gentile was considered to be prohibited. Therefore, it does not say that one may eat this leavened bread, as it was prohibited regardless. However, there are those who are lenient and permit one to eat bread baked by a gentile.

HALAKHA

Leavened bread of a gentile over which Passover has elapsed – חמץ של גוי שעבר עליו הפסח – Leavened bread of a gentile over which Passover has elapsed may be eaten by a Jew after Passover, in accordance with the mishna (Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 448:1).

Leavened bread of a Jew over which Passover has elapsed – חמץ ישראל שעבר עליו הפסח – It is prohibited to derive benefit from leavened bread of a Jew over which Passover has elapsed, in accordance with the mishna (Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 445:3).

תניא כוותיה דרבא, תניא כוותיה דרב יוסף. תניא כוותיה דרבא: היה מהלך במדבר – מפרר וזורה לרוח. היה מהלך בספינה – מפרר ומטיל לים. תניא כוותיה דרב יוסף: היה מהלך במדבר – שוחק וזורה לרוח, היה מהלך בספינה – שוחק ומטיל לים.

שחיקה קשיא לרבא, פירור קשיא לרב יוסף! שחיקה לרבא לא קשיא: הא – לים המלח, הא – לשאר נהרות. פירור לרב יוסף לא קשיא: הא – בחיטי, הא – בנהמא.

מתני' חמץ של גוי שעבר עליו הפסח – מותר בהנאה, ושל ישראל אסור בהנאה, שנאמר: "לא יראה לך שאור".

גמ' מני מתניתין? לא רבי יהודה ולא רבי שמעון ולא רבי יוסי הגלילי. מאי היא – דתניא: חמץ בין לפני זמנו בין לאחר זמנו – עובר עליו בלאו, תוך זמנו – עובר עליו בלאו וכו', דברי רבי יהודה.

רבי שמעון אומר: חמץ לפני זמנו ולאחר זמנו – אינו עובר עליו בלאו כלום, תוך זמנו – עובר עליו בכרת ובלאו, ומשעה שאסור באכילה אסור בהנאה, אלא לתנא קמא. רבי יוסי הגלילי אומר: תמה על עצמך, היאך חמץ אסור בהנאה כל שבועה?

A baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabba and a baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rav Yosef. The Gemara explains: A baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabba: If one was walking in the desert with leavened bread in his hand and the time came on the eve of Passover to remove it, then he must crumble the leavened bread and throw it into the wind. If he was traveling on a ship, he must crumble the leavened bread and throw it into the sea. And a baraita was taught in accordance with the opinion of Rav Yosef: If one was walking in the desert and found an idol, he must grind it and throw it into the wind. If he was traveling on a ship, he must grind it and throw it into the sea.

The Gemara comments: The requirement of grinding in one baraita is difficult for Rabba, since according to his opinion there is no need to grind idols before throwing them into the sea. And the requirement of crumbling leavened bread mentioned in the other baraita is difficult for Rav Yosef, as in his opinion leavened bread need not be crumbled before it is thrown into the sea. The Gemara answers: The requirement of grinding is not difficult for Rabba. This case, where one is not required to grind it, is where he throws it into the Dead Sea. That case, where he is required to grind it before throwing it, is where he throws it into other rivers. Similarly, the requirement of crumbling is not difficult for Rav Yosef. This case is dealing with a bag of wheat that became leavened. Since wheat does not disintegrate on its own, one must grind it up and scatter it into the water. That case is referring to bread. Since bread will disintegrate in the water on its own, there is no need to crumble it.

MISHNA It is permitted for a Jew to derive benefitⁿ from leavened bread of a gentile over which Passover has elapsed,ⁿ 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,ⁿ 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).

GEMARA The Gemara begins by asking: Who is the author of the mishna? It is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, and it is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, and it is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili. The Gemara clarifies this question: What is the case about which these Sages disagree, and what are their opinions on this issue? The Gemara explains: As it was taught in a baraita: One who eats or derives benefit from leavened bread, whether before its time, starting at midday on Passover eve, or after its time, i.e., leavened bread over which Passover has elapsed, transgresses a negative mitzva. During its time, on Passover itself, one who eats leavened bread transgresses a negative mitzva and is liable to receive karet. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

Rabbi Shimon says: One who eats or derives benefit from leavened bread, both before its time and after its time, does not transgress any prohibition. During its time one is liable to receive karet and transgresses a negative mitzva for eating or deriving benefit from leavened bread. And from the time that it is prohibited to eat leavened bread, beginning at midday on Passover eve, it is also prohibited to derive benefit from it. The Gemara comments: With this last sentence we have come to the opinion of the first tanna, as this statement appears to present Rabbi Yehuda’s opinion and not that of Rabbi Shimon. Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: Be astounded with yourself. How can it be prohibited to derive benefit from leavened bread for all seven days? In other words, he disagrees with the premise that it is prohibited to derive benefit from leavened bread even during the seven days of Passover.

Perek II
Daf 28 Amud b

Three verses are written – תִּלְתָּא קְרָאֵי בְּתִיבֵי – Maharam Ḥalawa explains that the verse “You shall eat no leavened bread with it” is referring to the time before Passover, the verse “All that which is leavened you shall not eat” is referring to Passover itself, and the verse “Leavened bread shall not be eaten” teaches that the prohibition applies after Passover has ended.

Became leavened on its own...if due to another substance – נִתְחַמֵץ מֵאַלְיּוֹ מִחֻמַּת דְּבַר אַחֵר – The conclusion reached here is that there is almost no practical difference between dough that became leavened on its own and dough that became leavened through the addition of another substance. The only difference between these two cases is with regard to the prohibition of: It shall not be found. If one actively causes the dough to become leavened or if one purchases leavened bread, he transgresses this prohibition and is flogged. However, if the dough became leavened by itself then he is not flogged, because he did not perform an action (Rambam; *Me’iri*).

The Passover in Egypt and in later generations – פֶּסַח – מִצְוֵי וְדוּרֵי הַחֹלֶת: There are several difference between the *halakhot* of the first Passover observed by the Jewish people before they left Egypt and the *halakhot* of the festival of Passover that apply to all subsequent generations. Some of these differences, such as the requirements to designate the Paschal lamb on the tenth of Nisan and to smear its blood on the doorpost, are explicitly mentioned in the Torah. Other differences, such as the one mentioned here with regard to the prohibition against eating leavened bread beyond the first day of the Festival, are the subject of dispute among the Sages. This dispute leads to a difference in the understanding of the verses, as some verses indicate that the prohibition against eating leavened bread applied for only one day during the Passover in Egypt, while others seem to indicate that the prohibition lasted for a full seven days even during that first Passover.

HALAKHA

Became leavened due to another substance – ...שִׁנְתָּחֻמֵץ – מִחֻמַּת דְּבַר אַחֵר: Leavened bread is prohibited during Passover whether it became leavened on its own or through the addition of another substance (*Sefer Mitzvot Gadol*, negative mitzva 76).

וּמִיָּזְמִן לְאֹכַל חֻמֵץ מִשֵּׁשׁ שְׁעוֹת וְלִמְעַלָּה שֶׁהוּא עוֹבֵר בְּלֵא תַעֲשֶׂה – שְׁנַאמַר: “לֹא תֹאכַל עָלָיו חֻמֵץ”, דְּבַרֵי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה.

The *baraita* discusses a related issue: **From where is it derived that one who eats leavened bread on Passover eve from the sixth hour and onward transgresses a negative mitzva? As it is stated:** “And you shall sacrifice the Paschal lamb to the Lord your God, of the flock and the herd, in the place which the Lord shall choose to cause His name to dwell there. **You shall eat no leavened bread with it; for seven days you shall eat *matzot*, the bread of affliction**” (Deuteronomy 16:2–3). The juxtaposition of the Paschal lamb with the prohibition of leavened bread teaches that the prohibition to eat leavened bread begins from the time that the Paschal lamb is slaughtered, namely, the afternoon of the fourteenth of Nisan. **This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.**

אָמַר לֹא רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן: וְכִי אֶפְשָׁר לֵאמֹר בְּזֶה וְהֵלֵא כְּבָר נֹאמַר: “לֹא תֹאכַל עָלָיו חֻמֵץ שִׁבְעַת יָמִים תֹּאכַל עָלָיו מִצּוֹת”. אִם כֵּן מָה תִּלְמֹד לֵאמֹר “לֹא תֹאכַל עָלָיו חֻמֵץ” – בְּשָׁעָה שִׁשָּׁנָה בְּקוּם אֹכֹל מִצָּה – יִשְׁנֶה בְּבֵל תֹּאכַל חֻמֵץ, וּבְשָׁעָה שִׁשָּׁנָה בְּקוּם אֹכֹל מִצָּה – אֵינוֹ בְּבֵל תֹּאכַל חֻמֵץ.

Rabbi Shimon said to him: **Is it possible to say this? Isn't it already stated: “You shall eat no leavened bread with it; for seven days you shall eat *matzot*”?** Since the verse links the prohibition of leavened bread to the mitzva of eating *matza*, one should also say that one must eat *matza* on the fourteenth of Nisan. **If so, what does it mean when the verse states: “You shall eat no leavened bread with it”?** The verse indicates that at a time when he is under the obligation to get up and eat *matza*, he is subject to the prohibition of: **You shall eat no leavened bread. And at a time when he is under no obligation to get up and eat *matza*, he is not subject to the prohibition of: You shall eat no leavened bread.**

מֵאִי טַעְמָא דְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה? תִּלְתָּא קְרָאֵי בְּתִיבֵי: “לֹא יֹאכַל חֻמֵץ”, “וְכָל מִחֻמַּצַּת לֹא תֹאכַלוּ”, “לֹא תֹאכַל עָלָיו חֻמֵץ”. חַד לְפָנֵי זְמַנּוֹ, וְחַד לְאַחַר זְמַנּוֹ, וְחַד לְתוֹךְ זְמַנּוֹ.

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda?** The Gemara explains: **There are three verses that are writtenⁿ** with regard to this prohibition, and in Rabbi Yehuda's opinion each one teaches that the prohibition applies at a different time. One verse states: “**Leavened bread shall not be eaten**” (Exodus 13:3). Another verse states: “**And all that which is leavened you shall not eat; in all your habitations you shall eat *matzot***” (Exodus 12:20). And a third verse states: “**You shall eat no leavened bread with it**” (Deuteronomy 16:3). **One** verse indicates that there is a prohibition against eating leavened bread even **before its time**, on Passover eve. **One** verse indicates that there is a prohibition against eating leavened bread **after its time** as well, if a Jew owned it during Passover. **And one** verse indicates that the prohibition applies **during Passover** itself.

וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן: חַד – לְתוֹךְ זְמַנּוֹ, “וְכָל מִחֻמַּצַּת” – מִבְּעֵי לֵיהּ, לְכַדְתֵּנָא: אֵין לִי אֶלָּא שְׁנַתְחַמֵץ מֵאַלְיּוֹ, מִחֻמַּת דְּבַר אַחֵר מִיָּזְמִין? תִּלְמֹד לֵאמֹר: “כָּל מִחֻמַּצַּת לֹא תֹאכַלוּ”.

The Gemara asks: **And how does Rabbi Shimon interpret these three verses?** The Gemara explains: **One** verse is required to teach about the prohibition **during its time**. The verse: “**And all that which is leavened you shall not eat**” is required for another *halakha*, as it was taught in a *baraita*: **I have derived that leavened bread is prohibited only if it became leavened on its own**, through its own natural process. **From where do I derive that if it became leavened due to another substance^{nh} it is considered to be leavened bread as well?** **The verse states: “All that which is leavened you shall not eat.”** This indicates that all leavened bread, no matter how it became so, is forbidden during Passover.

“לֹא יֹאכַל חֻמֵץ” – מִבְּעֵי לֵיהּ לְכַדְתֵּנָא; רַבִּי יוֹסֵי הַגְּלִילִי אוֹמַר: מִיָּזְמִין לְפֶסַח מִצְוֵי שֶׁאֵין חִימוּצוֹ נוֹהֵג אֶלָּא יוֹם אֶחָד – תִּלְמֹד לֵאמֹר: “לֹא יֹאכַל חֻמֵץ”, וְסָמִין לֵיהּ: “הַיּוֹם אֲתֵם יֹצְאִים”.

The verse “**Leavened bread shall not be eaten**” is also required for another *halakha*. **As it was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: From where is it derived that the prohibition against eating leavened bread during the first Passover in Egyptⁿ applied for only one day?** **The verse states: “Leavened bread shall not be eaten,”** and this is juxtaposed to the verse that states: “**This day you go forth in the month of spring**” (Exodus 13:4). This indicates that the prohibition against eating leavened bread during the first Passover in Egypt applied for only that one day.

וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה, מִחֻמַּת דְּבַר אַחֵר מִנָּא לֵיהּ? מִדְּאֶפְקִיָּה רַחֲמֵנָא בְּלִשׁוֹן מִחֻמַּצַּת.

The Gemara asks: **And Rabbi Yehuda, from where does he derive that leavened bread that became leavened due to another substance is prohibited?** The Gemara answers: He derives it from the fact that **the Merciful One expresses this *halakha* with the general term: “That which is leavened”;** no additional amplification is required.

It is written in this and it is written in that – **כתבי בהאי וכתבי – בהאי**: Many versions of the talmudic text contain the additional term: “And they are necessary,” i.e., both verses need to be mentioned. This assertion can be explained as follows: If the obligation to eat *matza* were mentioned only with regard to an uncircumcised man and a resident alien, one might say that they are obligated to eat *matza* because they are not obligated in the second *Pesah*. However, this would not apply to one who was ritually impure or on a distant journey, as such a person must bring the second *Pesah* at a later date. On the other hand, if the obligation to eat *matza* were mentioned only in reference to one who was ritually impure or on a distant journey, one might assume that it applies only to him, because he is also obligated to perform other mitzvot. However, with regard to an uncircumcised man or a resident alien, perhaps there would be no such obligation, since they are excluded from other mitzvot as well. Therefore, both verses are necessary (Maharam Ḥalawa).

דְּרַבִּי יוֹסֵי הַגְּלִילִי מִנָּא לִיהָ? אִי בְעֵית אֵימָא: מִדְּסַמִּיךְ לִיהָ “הַיּוֹם”, אִי בְעֵית אֵימָא – סְמוּכִין לָא דְרִישׁ.

אָמַר מַר: וּמִנּוּן לְאוֹכֵל חֻמֶּץ מִשָּׁשׁ שָׁעוֹת וְלִמְעַלָּה שֶׁהוּא עוֹבֵר בְּלֹא תַעֲשֶׂה – שְׁנַאֲמַר: “לֹא תֹאכַל עִלְיוֹ חֻמֶּץ”, דְּבַרֵּי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה. אָמַר לֹא רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן: וְכִי אֶפְשָׁר לוֹמַר בְּנֵן? וְהֵלֵא כְּבָר נֹאמַר: “לֹא תֹאכַל עִלְיוֹ חֻמֶּץ שְׁבַע יָמִים תֹּאכַל עִלְיוֹ מִצּוֹת”,

וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה, שְׁפִיר קָאָמַר לִיהָ רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן! וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר לֵךְ: הֵהוּא לְקוֹבְעוֹ חוּבָה אֶפְיִלוּ בְזִמְנָה הַזֶּה הוּא דְאֶתָא.

וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן לְקוֹבְעוֹ חוּבָה מִנָּא לִיהָ? נִפְקָא לִיהָ מִ“בְּעָרֵב תֹּאכְלוּ”. וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה? מִיִּבְעֵי לִיהָ לְטָמֵא וְשֶׁהִיָּה בְּדֶרֶךְ רְחוֹקָה. סִלְקָא דְעֵתָךְ אֲמִינָא: הוּאִיל וּבִפְסָח לֹא יֹאכַל – מִצֵּה וּמְרוֹר נִמְי לָא יִבּוּל, קָא מְשַׁמְעֵ לָן.

וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן: טָמֵא וְשֶׁהִיָּה בְּדֶרֶךְ רְחוֹקָה לֹא אֵינְצֵרִיךְ קָרָא. דְּלֹא גִרַע מְעַל וּבֵן נִכְר. דְּכְתִיב: “וּכְל עֹרֵל לֹא יֹאכַל בּוֹ” – בּוֹ הוּא אֵינוֹ אוֹכֵל, אֲבָל אוֹכֵל הוּא בְּמִצֵּה וּבְמְרוֹר. וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה: כְּתִיב בְּהָאֵי, וְכְתִיב בְּהָאֵי.

The Gemara asks: And this teaching of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili with regard to the Passover in Egypt, from where does Rabbi Yehuda derive it? The Gemara answers: If you wish, say that he derives it from the fact that the phrase “this day” is juxtaposed to it. In Rabbi Yehuda’s opinion, the entire verse: “Leavened bread shall not be eaten” is not required to make this point; instead, this verse indicates that there is an additional time when leavened bread is prohibited. Nonetheless, the juxtaposition with the following phrase does indicate something significant, namely, that the prohibition in Egypt was limited to one day. If you wish, say instead that Rabbi Yehuda does not employ the homiletic method of juxtaposition of verses, except in limited circumstances. Accordingly, Rabbi Yehuda does not accept Rabbi Yosei HaGelili’s opinion at all and holds that the prohibition against eating leavened bread during the Passover in Egypt applied for all seven days.

The Master said in the aforementioned *baraita*: From where is it derived that one who eats leavened bread from the sixth hour and onward transgresses a negative mitzva? As it is stated: “You shall eat no leavened bread with it”; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Shimon said to him: And is it possible to say this? Isn’t it already stated: “You shall eat no leavened bread with it; for seven days you shall eat *matzot*,” linking the time of the prohibition against eating leavened bread with the time of the mitzva to eat *matza*?

The Gemara asks: And indeed Rabbi Shimon is saying well to Rabbi Yehuda, so how does Rabbi Yehuda use this verse to support his opinion? The Gemara answers that Rabbi Yehuda could have said to you: That verse comes to establish it as an obligation even nowadays. One might have assumed that after the destruction of the Temple, when the Paschal lamb can no longer be brought, the obligation to eat *matza* no longer applies either. Therefore, the verse links the prohibition against eating leavened bread to the obligation to eat *matza* in order to teach that just as it is prohibited to eat leavened bread even in the absence of the Temple, so too, there remains an obligation to eat *matza* as well.

The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Shimon, from where does he derive the need to establish it as an obligation even after the destruction of the Temple? The Gemara answers: He derives it from the following verse: “In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month in the evening, you shall eat *matzot*, until the twenty-first day in the evening” (Exodus 12:18). This verse connects the obligation to eat *matza* to the date of Passover and not only to the Paschal lamb. The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Yehuda, what does he derive from this verse? The Gemara answers: He requires it to teach that there remains an obligation for one who is ritually impure or on a distant journey and cannot bring the Paschal lamb. It could enter your mind to say that since he will not eat the Paschal lamb, he may also not eat *matza* and bitter herbs. Therefore, the verse teaches us that he is obligated to eat them.

And Rabbi Shimon, from where does he derive this *halakha*? In his opinion, a verse is not necessary to teach that one who is ritually impure or on a distant journey is obligated to eat *matza* and bitter herbs, as he is no worse than an uncircumcised man or a resident alien. As it is written: “And no uncircumcised man shall eat of it” (Exodus 12:48). The added emphasis in “of it” indicates that only it, the Paschal lamb, he does not eat; however, he must eat *matza* and bitter herbs. The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Yehuda, how would he respond? The Gemara answers: Granted, the Torah did not need to add this verse. Nonetheless, it is written in this context that one who is impure or on a distant journey is obligated to eat *matza* and bitter herbs. And it is written in thatⁿ context with regard to the uncircumcised man and the resident alien as well.

ממי מתניתין? אי רבי יהודה – חמץ
 סתמא קאמר, אפילו דגוי. ואי רבי
 שמעון –

After clarifying the opinions of Rabbi Yehuda, Rabbi Shimon, and Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, the Gemara asks: In accordance with **whose opinion is the mishna taught?** If one suggests that it is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yehuda**, this cannot be, as Rabbi Yehuda said **leavened bread without stipulation** that the leavened bread belong to a Jew, indicating that one may not **even** benefit from leavened bread of a **gentile** over which Passover elapsed. Therefore, since this opinion contradicts the statement made in the mishna discussed here, Rabbi Yehuda can be ruled out as its author. **And if** it is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Shimon**,

Perek II
 Daf 29 Amud a

דישראל נמי מישרא קא שרי. ואי
 רבי יוסי הגלילי – אפילו תוך זמנו
 נמי מישרא קא שרי בהנאה!

Rabbi Shimon also permits one to derive benefit from leavened bread after Passover even if it was **owned by a Jew**. **And if the mishna follows the opinion of Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, he would permit one to derive benefit from it even during Passover.**

אמר רב אחא בר יעקב: לעולם רבי
 יהודה היא, ויליף שאור דאכילה
 משאור דראייה. מה שאור דראייה –
 שלך אי אתה רואה, אבל אתה רואה
 של אחרים ושל גבוה – אף שאור
 דאכילה, שלך אי אתה אוכל, אבל
 אתה אוכל של אחרים ושל גבוה.

Rav Aha bar Ya'akov said: **Actually**, it is possible to explain that the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yehuda**, and he **derives** the restrictions pertaining to the **eating of leaven** from the restrictions relating to **seeing leaven**. The prohibition against **seeing leaven** is worded: “It shall not be seen by you.” It is understood to mean that **you should not see your own** or another Jew’s leaven. **But you may see leaven that belongs to others**, i.e., gentiles, and leaven consecrated to **God**. Similarly, with regard to the prohibition against **eating leaven** that was owned by a Jew during Passover after Passover, **you may not eat your own leavened bread, but you may eat the leavened bread of others or the leaven consecrated to God** after Passover.

ובדין הוא דאיבעי ליה למיתנא
 דאפילו באכילה נמי שרי, ואידי
 דתנא דישראל אסור בהנאה –
 תנא נמי דגוי מותר בהנאה. ובדין
 הוא דאיבעי ליה למיתנא דאפילו
 בתוך זמנו מותר בהנאה, ואידי
 דתנא דישראל לאחר זמנו – תנא
 נמי דגוי לאחר זמנו.

And by right it should have taught that **even the eating** of leavened bread belonging to a gentile is **permitted** after the conclusion of Passover, **but since the tanna taught that it is forbidden to derive benefit from leavened bread belonging to a Jew after Passover, he also taught that it is permitted to derive benefit from leavened bread belonging to a gentile**. However, one should understand that it is permitted to eat this leavened bread as well. **And similarly, by right it should have taught that even during Passover it is permitted to derive benefit from leavened bread that belongs to gentiles**. **But since the tanna taught** about the leavened bread belonging to a **Jew after Passover, he also taught** about the leavened bread belonging to a gentile **after Passover**. Thus, one should not infer *halakhot* from the exact formulation of these details in the *baraita*, but rather understand that the mishna follows Rabbi Yehuda’s opinion.

רבא אמר: לעולם רבי שמעון היא,
 ורבי שמעון קנסא קניס הואיל ועבר
 עליה בבל יראה ובל ימצא.

Rava said: This is not so. **Actually** our mishna is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Shimon**. However, this is difficult, as Rabbi Shimon states that it is permitted for a Jew to derive benefit from leavened bread that had been owned by another Jew during Passover, while our mishna explicitly states that this is forbidden. This can be resolved by explaining that **Rabbi Shimon** argues that it is permitted only according to Torah law. However, one who intentionally commits such a transgression **incurs a penalty**. **Since he transgressedⁿ the prohibition it shall not be seen and the prohibition it shall not be found**, the Sages decreed that it is forbidden for him to derive benefit from this leavened bread.^h

NOTES

Since he transgressed – הואיל ועבר עליה: This statement should not be understood as meaning that he actually violated the commandment of seeing leavened bread. Rabbi Shimon fines him even in a case where he might come to commit such a transgression, such as when the leavened bread was in a gentile’s possession over Passover (see Ritva). Some claim that, as with other cases of fines, this fine applies only to one who intentionally violated this commandment, and therefore the food would be permitted to one who acted unwittingly or under duress. Similarly, it would be permitted to one who did not violate the commandment. This, however, does not appear to be the case in the Gemara (*Mikhtam*).

HALAKHA

Leavened bread over which Passover has elapsed – חמץ
 שעבר עליו הפסח: One may not derive benefit from leavened bread that was under Jewish ownership during Passover due

to a rabbinically instituted fine, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, as explained by Rava (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhoh Hametz UMatza* 1:4).