

אחרות קאמר מר, או אחרת
קאמר מר? אמר ליה: למאי נפקא
מיניה?

Did the Master say this statement with regard to *haroset*, or did the Master say it with regard to mustard? He said to him: What is the practical difference whether he was referring to *haroset* or mustard? Both of these are mentioned together, and the same *halakha* applies to both.

לדרב כהנא, דאמר רב כהנא:
מחלוקת – לתוך החרדל, אבל לתוך
החרוסת – דברי הכל ישרף מיד,

He said to him: There is a difference with regard to that which was stated by Rav Kahana, as Rav Kahana said: The dispute between Rabbi Meir and the Rabbis concerns a case in which flour was added to mustard. However, if flour was added to *haroset*, everyone agrees that it must be burned immediately. Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak was asking Rav Huna, son of Rav Yehuda, whether he disagrees with Rav Kahana and maintains that the Rabbis dispute the *halakha* in the case of *haroset* as well.

אמר ליה: לא שמיע לי, כלומר לא
סבירא לי.

He said to him: I did not hear about this statement; that is to say, I do not hold in accordance with it. I do not distinguish between these two cases, as in my opinion the Rabbis permit one to eat even this *haroset*.

אמר רב אשי: כוותיה דרב כהנא
מסתברא, מדאמר שמואל: אין
הלכה ברבי יוסי. מאי לאו – צמותי
הוא דלא צמית הא חמועי –
מחמטא.

Rav Ashi said: It is reasonable to rule in accordance with the opinion of Rav Kahana, from the fact that Shmuel said that the *halakha* is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who maintains that vinegar will prevent grain from becoming leavened. What, isn't it correct to infer from here that vinegar added to flour does not shrink the grain and will even leaven it? According to this explanation, food that contains vinegar, e.g., *haroset*, is likely to be leavened immediately, as claimed by Rav Kahana.

לא, דילמא לא מצמת צמית ולא
חמוע מחמטא.

The Gemara rejects this interpretation: No, this is no proof, as perhaps Shmuel meant that, according to the opinion of the Rabbis, vinegar will neither cause the wheat to shrink nor leaven it. Consequently, this statement cannot serve as a proof of the opinion of the Rabbis with regard to *haroset*.

“אין מבשלין וכו’.” תנו רבנן:
“במים” – אין לי אלא במים, שאר
משקין מניין?

The mishna taught that one may not boil the Paschal lamb in liquid. To explain this issue, the Gemara cites a *baraita* that interprets the verse: “You shall not eat it partially roasted, nor boiled in any way in water, but roasted with fire; its head with its legs, and with the innards in it” (Exodus 12:9). The Sages taught: “In water”; I have derived nothing other than the prohibition against boiling the Paschal lamb in water. From where do I know that it is likewise prohibited to boil it in other liquids?

אמרת: קל וחומר, ומה מים שאין
מפיגין טעמן – אסורין, שאר משקין
שפיגין טעמן – לא כל שכן?

You said that this can be derived by means of an *a fortiori* inference:^N And just as water, which does not temper the taste of the food boiled in it, is prohibited for boiling the Paschal lamb, with regard to other liquids, which do temper the taste of the food boiled in them, is it not all the more so that it is prohibited to boil the Paschal lamb in them?^H

רבי אומר: במים – אין לי אלא מים,
שאר משקין מניין – תלמוד לומר:
“בשיל מבשיל” – מכל מקום.

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi provides a different derivation and says: From the phrase “In water,” I have derived nothing other than the prohibition against boiling the Paschal lamb in water. From where do I learn that it is likewise prohibited to boil it in other liquids? The verse states: “Nor boiled in any way,” which means: In any case, i.e., boiling the Paschal lamb in any type of liquid is prohibited.

מאי בינייהו? איכא בינייהו: צלי
קדר.

The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference between these two derivations? The Gemara answers: The practical difference between them is with regard to meat that is roasted in a pot^H without the addition of any liquid, but is cooked in its own juices. According to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, it is prohibited to prepare the Paschal lamb in this manner, as this is considered boiling, whereas the Rabbis maintain that an action is classified as boiling only if one adds liquid to the meat.

NOTES

You said an *a fortiori* inference – אמרת קל וחומר – Assuming that both of these *tanna'im* accept the principle that we do not punish on the basis of a *fortiori* argumentation, the practical difference between them is as follows: According to the first *tanna*, one who cooks in liquids other than water is not punished with lashes by Torah law, whereas Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi maintains that he is liable to receive lashes for this offense.

HALAKHA

Boiling the Paschal lamb – בשיל קרבן פסח – It is prohibited to boil the Paschal lamb, and one who does so, whether in water or in other liquids, is liable to receive lashes (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhhot Korban Pesah* 8:8).

That is roasted in a pot – צלי קדר – One who roasts the Paschal lamb in a pot and eats it is liable. The early commentaries ask why the Rambam rules in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi here, contrary to the majority opinion of the Rabbis. Some say that the Rabbis actually agree with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's opinion, and they dispute only his derivation of this *halakha* (*Kesef Mishneh*). Others suggest that the opinion of the Rabbis is not in fact the majority opinion in this particular case, as they merely accept the ruling of Rabbi Meir (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhhot Korban Pesah* 8:8).

One can fulfill his obligation with a wafer that has been soaked – יוצאין ברקיק השרוי: This evidently refers to a wafer that has been soaked in water; indeed, one version of the text of the Gemara is explicit in this regard. This wafer is considered poor man's bread, as it was common for paupers to dip their bread in water before consumption (Maharshah).

The dispute between *tanna'im* with regard to a boiled wafer – מחלוקת התנאים ברקיק מבושל: This dispute does not depend only on whether a boiled wafer retains the taste of *matza* or bread, as this could be determined by an expert taster. Instead, the dispute concerns the definition of this wafer. According to Rabbi Yosei, bread that has been boiled is no longer classified as bread, whereas Rabbi Meir maintains that it is still called bread (Maharam Halawa).

ורבנן האי "בשול מבשול" מאי עבדי לה? מבעי ליה לכדתנא: בשול ואחר כך צלאו, או שצלאו ואחר כך בשול – חייב.

בשולמא בשול ואחר כך צלאו חייב – דהא בשוליה, אלא צלאו ואחר כך בשולו הא צלי איש הוא, אמאי?

אמר רב כהנא: הא מני – רבי יוסי היא, דתנא: יוצאין ברקיק השרוי, ובמבושל שלא נימות, דברי רבי מאיר. רבי יוסי אומר: יוצאין ברקיק השרוי, אבל לא במבושל, אף על פי שלא נימות.

עולא אמר: אפילו תימא רבי מאיר, שאני הקא דאמר קרא: "ובשול מבשול" – מבל מקום.

תנו רבנן: יכול צלאו כל צורכו יהא חייב – תלמוד לומר: "אל תאכלו ממנו נא ובשול מבשול במים" נא ובשול מבשול אמרתי לך, ולא שצלאו כל צורכו.

היכי דמי? אמר רב אשי: דשויה חרובא.

תנו רבנן: יכול אבל בנית חי יהא חייב – תלמוד לומר: "אל תאכלו ממנו נא ובשול מבשול" נא ובשול אמרתי לך, ולא חי.

The Gemara asks: **And the Rabbis**, with regard to that phrase, "boiled in any way," what do they do with it? The Gemara answers: It is required for that which was taught in a *baraita*: If one boiled the Paschal lamb and afterward roasted it, or roasted it and afterward boiled it,^h he is liable to receive lashes for boiling the Paschal lamb.

The Gemara asks: **Granted**, if one boiled the Paschal lamb and afterward roasted it, he is liable, as he boiled it first and is punished for this act. **However**, if he roasted it and afterward boiled it, and it is a food that has been roasted by fire, why is he liable?

Rav Kahana said: In accordance with whose opinion is this *baraita*? It is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yosei**, who maintains that boiling after roasting nullifies the previous act of roasting. **As it was taught in a *baraita*:** One can fulfill his obligation to eat *matza* with a wafer that has been soakedⁿ in water or with a boiled wafer that has not yet dissolved; this is the statement of **Rabbi Meir**. **Rabbi Yosei says:** One can fulfill his obligation with a wafer that has been soaked in a cooked dish but not with a boiled wafer, even if it has not dissolved.^h Evidently, **Rabbi Yosei** maintains that food that was initially baked and subsequently boiled is no longer categorized as baked,ⁿ and the same presumably applies to meat that was roasted and then boiled.

Ulla said: Even if you say that the *halakha* with regard to boiled *matza* is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Meir**, there is no difficulty, as the cases of *matza* and the Paschal lamb are dissimilar in this regard. **Here**, with regard to the Paschal lamb, it is different, as the verse states: "Nor boiled in any way," which indicates that it is prohibited to boil it in any case. No restriction of this kind is stated with regard to *matza*.

The Sages taught: I might have thought that if one roasted the Paschal lamb fully, he should be liable. Therefore, the verse states: "You shall not eat it partially roasted, nor boiled in any way in water" (Exodus 12:9). This verse teaches that I, God, said to you that the Paschal lamb is prohibited if it is partially roasted or boiled in any way, but not if it is fully roasted. One who roasts the Paschal lamb fully has not violated a prohibition.

The Gemara asks: **What are the circumstances** of this case that render it necessary for a verse to teach that roasting the Paschal lamb fully is not a violation of a prohibition? **Rav Ashi said:** This is referring to a situation where one burned it.^h The verse indicates that even one who entirely burns the Paschal lamb does not violate this prohibition.

The Sages taught: I might have thought that one who ate an olive-bulk portion of the Paschal sacrifice raw should be liable for violating a prohibition. Therefore, the verse states: "You shall not eat it partially roasted [*na*], nor boiled in any way in water." This verse teaches that I, God, said to you that it is prohibited to eat the Paschal lamb partially roasted or boiled, but there is no prohibition against eating it raw.

HALAKHA

Roasted it and afterward boiled it – צלאו ואחר כך בשול: If one roasted the Paschal lamb and afterward boiled it, or boiled it and then roasted it, he is liable for violating a prohibition, as stated in the *baraita* (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Korban Pesah* 8:8).

A wafer that was soaked for *matza* – רקיק השרוי למצה: One may use a soaked wafer as *matza*, but not a boiled wafer, even if it has not dissolved. The later commentaries suggest that the use of a soaked wafer is permitted only for the elderly or the sick (*Magav Avraham*), and it is the custom in many communities to

be especially stringent with regard to soaked *matza*. Since there are several reasons for being careful not to eat any *matza* that has come into contact with water, it is customary in these communities to be lenient about this issue only on the eighth day of Passover, which is observed solely outside of Israel (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 461:4).

Roasted it until it burned – צלאו עד שנתחרך: One who roasted the Paschal lamb until it burned is exempt, as stated in the *baraita* (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Korban Pesah* 8:6).

Avanim – אַבְנִים: Apparently from an amalgam of the Middle Persian abar and nēm, meaning halfway. In this context, the word means half roasted.

יכול יהא מותר – תלמוד לומר: "כי אם צלי אש". היכי דמי נא? אמר רב: כדאמרי פרסאי אבנים.

I might have thought that it is permitted to eat it raw *ab initio*. Therefore, the verse states: "But roasted with fire" (Exodus 12:9).ⁿ This teaches that the mitzva is to roast the Paschal lamb with fire, *ab initio*.^h The Gemara asks: What are the circumstances of cooking that are defined as *na*, partially roasted? Rav said: As the Persians say: *Avanim*,^l half roasted.

אמר רב חסדא: המבשל בחמי טבריא בשבת – פטור. פסח שבשלו בחמי טבריא – חייב.

Rav H̄isda said: One who cooks food in the hot springs of Tiberias^{HB} on Shabbat is exempt. One violates the Shabbat prohibition of cooking only if he uses a fire. In the case of a Paschal lamb that was cooked, i.e., boiled, in the hot springs of Tiberias,^{NH} one is liable for boiling the offering.

מאי שנא בשבת דלא – דתולדות אש בעינן, וליכא. פסח נמי – לא תולדות אש הוא.

The Gemara asks: What is different with regard to Shabbat, that one is not punished for cooking in this manner? The reason is that a fire, or a fire derivative, is required for an act to be defined as cooking on Shabbat, but there is no fire here, as the hot springs are not generated by fire. If so, with regard to the Paschal lamb as well, it is not a fire derivative, and it should not be considered boiling with regard to this prohibition either.

אמר רבא: מאי חייב דקתני – דקא עבר משום "צלי אש".

Rava said: What is the meaning of the word liable that Rav H̄isda taught? It means that in doing so one violated the positive mitzva, due to that which is written: "Roasted with fire." In other words, one who boils the Paschal lamb in the hot springs of Tiberias did not in fact violate the prohibition of boiling the Paschal lamb, but he has also not fulfilled the positive mitzva to roast the offering.

רב חייא בריה דרב נתן מתני לה להא דרב חסדא בהדיא, אמר רב חסדא: המבשל בחמי טבריא בשבת – פטור, ופסח שבשלו בחמי טבריא – חייב, שעבר משום "צלי אש".

Rav H̄iyya, son of Rav Natan, teaches this interpretation of Rav H̄isda's statement explicitly, i.e., that Rav H̄isda himself said: One who cooks in the hot springs of Tiberias on Shabbat is exempt, and with regard to a Paschal lamb that was cooked in the hot springs of Tiberias, one is liable to receive punishment for this act. In doing so, he violated a positive mitzva, due to that which is written: "Roasted with fire."

אמר רבא: אכלו נא –

Rava said: One who ate the Paschal lamb partially roasted,

NOTES

But roasted with fire [*tzeli esh*] – כי אם צלי אש – Some commentaries cite a version of the Gemara that includes only the words *tzeli esh*, roasted with fire, from the verse: "And you shall eat the meat on this night roasted with fire" (Exodus 12:8). Other versions state *ki im tzeli esh*, but roasted with fire, which refers to the next verse: "You shall not eat it partially roasted, nor boiled in any way in water, but roasted with fire" (Exodus 12:9). The difference between these two verses is that the first contains a positive mitzva to roast the Paschal lamb with fire, while the second consists of a negative prohibition not to prepare it any other way (*Me'iri*).

A Paschal lamb that was cooked in the hot springs of Tiberias – פסח שבשלו בחמי טבריא: How is it possible to cook the Paschal lamb in the hot springs of Tiberias when this offering may be eaten only in Jerusalem and is disqualified if taken outside the city? If water from the hot springs were brought to Jerusalem, it would certainly have cooled down in the meantime and could no longer be used for cooking. Some commentaries say that this statement refers to the time before the Temple was built in Jerusalem, when it was permitted to offer the Paschal lamb in other places (Rabbi Shlomo HaKohen). However, the simplest answer is that this is not a practical question but an inquiry into the precise definition of cooking.

HALAKHA

Ate it raw – אכלו חי: If one eats an olive-bulk portion of the Paschal lamb raw he is not liable to lashes for transgressing the prohibition "You shall not eat it partially roasted." However, he has violated the positive commandment to roast it "with fire" (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhoh Korban Pesah* 8:6).

ment, as this type of cooking is permitted by Torah law (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhoh Shabbat* 9:3).

One who cooks in the hot springs of Tiberias – המבשל בחמי טבריא: Although it is prohibited to cook in the hot springs of Tiberias on Shabbat, one who does so is exempt from punish-

A Paschal lamb that was cooked in the hot springs of Tiberias – פסח שבשלו בחמי טבריא: One is not liable to receive lashes for cooking the Paschal lamb in the hot springs of Tiberias, although he has not fulfilled the mitzva to eat it "roasted with fire" (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhoh Korban Pesah* 8:10).

BACKGROUND

Hot springs of Tiberias – חמי טבריה: The Tiberias hot springs, near the Sea of Galilee, contain geothermally heated ground-water at a constant temperature of 60° C, or 140° F. In general, the temperature of rocks within the earth increases with depth.

When water percolates deeply enough into the crust, it will be heated as it comes into contact with hot rocks. Much of the earth's internal heat is produced by the decay of naturally radioactive elements, which is not fire in the normal sense of the term.

NOTES

Receives three sets of lashes – לוקה שְׁלֹשׁ: Some commentaries offer a different explanation of this statement. They say that according to Rava, one actually receives four sets of lashes, and the Gemara is referring to three categories of prohibitions for which he receives them. He receives two sets of lashes for the fact that the Paschal lamb was boiled, one because it was not roasted and the second because it was cooked; a third set because it was partially roasted; and a fourth set because it was not roasted properly (*Tosefot Rid*).

A prohibition stated in general terms – לֹא שֶׁבִבְלֹלוֹת: There are different types of prohibitions stated in general terms. Sometimes a single negative statement includes multiple prohibitions. For example, the verse with regard to priests: “They shall not take a woman that is a harlot or profaned” (Leviticus 21:7), by virtue of a single negative statement prohibits priests from marrying two different categories of women. Another type of prohibition stated in general terms is exemplified here with regard to the Paschal lamb and a nazirite, where there is a particular prohibition as well as a general prohibition. Yet another type of prohibition stated in general terms occurs when the biblical text does not delineate the details of the prohibition, which are supplied by the Sages. For example, the verse: “You shall not eat over the blood” (Leviticus 19:26), is explained as referring to many types of prohibitions (see *Me’iri*).

One set of lashes he does receive...one does not receive even one set of lashes – חֲדָא לְקִי...חֲדָא לֹא לְקִי: The meaning of this passage is subject to debate. Some commentaries explain that Rava agrees that one does not receive an additional set of lashes for a prohibition stated in general terms. However, he maintains that the verse “It shall be roasted with fire” is not in fact a prohibition stated in general terms. Instead this verse includes an additional prohibition, for which one is liable to another set of lashes. The same applies to the discussion with regard to a nazirite, as Rava contends that the phrase “nothing that is made of the grapevine” (Numbers 6:4) is referring to an additional aspect of the prohibition (Maharam H̄alawa).

לוקה שְׁתַּיִם, מְבוּשָׁל – לוקה שְׁתַּיִם, נֹא וּמְבוּשָׁל – לוקה שְׁלֹשׁ.

אֲבַיִי אָמַר: אִין לוקין עַל לֹא שֶׁבִבְלֹלוֹת.

אִיבָא דְאֲמַרִי: תְּרִי הוּא דְלֹא לְקִי – חֲדָא מִיְהֵת לְקִי.

אִיבָא דְאֲמַרִי: חֲדָא נְמִי לֹא לְקִי, דְלֹא מִיְחַד לְאִוְיָהּ בְּלֹא דְחִסְמָהּ.

רַבָּא אָמַר: אֲכַל זֶג – לוקה שְׁתַּיִם, חֲרִצָן – לוקה שְׁתַּיִם, זֶג וְחֲרִצָן – לוקה שְׁלֹשׁ.

אֲבַיִי אָמַר: אִין לוקין עַל לֹא שֶׁבִבְלֹלוֹת. אִיבָא דְאֲמַרִי: תְּרִי הוּא דְלֹא לְקִי – חֲדָא מִיְהֵת לְקִי. אִיבָא דְאֲמַרִי: חֲדָא נְמִי לֹא לְקִי, דְלֹא מִיְחַד לְאִוְיָהּ בְּלֹא דְחִסְמָהּ.

he receives two sets of lashes, for violating the prohibitions: “You shall not eat it partially roasted” (Exodus 12:9) and: “You shall only eat it...roasted with fire” (Exodus 12:9). One who ate it **boiled receives two sets of lashes**, for the prohibitions: “Nor shall it be boiled in any way in water” (Exodus 12:9), and “You shall only eat it...roasted with fire.” One who ate the Paschal lamb after it had been **partially roasted and then boiled receives three sets of lashes**,^N for eating the Paschal lamb partially roasted, for eating it boiled, and for failing to eat it roasted.

Abaye said: **One does not receive lashes for a prohibition stated in general terms.**^N The mitzva to eat the Paschal lamb “roasted with fire” includes many types of cooking, and one is not punished with lashes for violating this mitzva, as it is a general prohibition that includes meat cooked in several different ways.

Some say that Abaye said: **It is two sets of lashes that he does not receive**, as the mitzva that the Paschal lamb be roasted with fire does not add to the specific prohibitions against eating it partially roasted or cooked. However, **at any rate one set of lashes he does receive.**^H Therefore, one who prepared a Paschal lamb without properly cooking it but without roasting it is punished with lashes for failing to roast it “with fire.”

Some say that **one does not receive even one set of lashes**^N for violating this prohibition, as the prohibition he transgressed is **not specific to one matter, like the prohibition against muzzling.** The principle that one is liable to receive lashes for violating a prohibition is derived from the juxtaposition of the mitzva: “You shall not muzzle an ox while it treads out the corn” (Deuteronomy 25:4) with the verses that deal with lashes. It is inferred from this juxtaposition that one is not liable to receive lashes for violating prohibitions that are dissimilar to that of muzzling, e.g., a prohibition that is not specific to one matter.

The Gemara cites a parallel dispute with regard to a different *halakha*. **Rava said:** If a nazirite ate a grape skin he receives two sets of lashes, as the verse states: “All the days that he is a nazirite he shall he eat nothing that is made of the grapevine; from pressed grapes to a grape pit he shall not eat” (Numbers 6:4). He receives two sets of lashes, one for eating food that grew on a grapevine and one for consuming the skin of a grape. Likewise, if he ate a grape pit he receives two sets of lashes, one for eating a grape pit and the other for eating a grape product. If he ate a grape skin and a grape pit^H he receives three sets of lashes, one for eating the grape skin, one for eating the grape pit, and the third for eating a grape product.

Abaye said: As with regard to the Paschal lamb, **one does not receive lashes for a prohibition stated in general terms.** Some say that according to Abaye, **it is two sets of lashes that he does not receive**; however, **at any rate one set of lashes he does receive.** And some say: **One does not receive even one set of lashes for transgressing this prohibition, as the prohibition he transgressed is not specific to one matter, like the prohibition against muzzling.**

HALAKHA

Eaten partially roasted and then boiled – אֲכַל נֹא וּמְבוּשָׁל: With regard to one who ate meat from a Paschal lamb that was partially roasted and then boiled, he is liable to receive only one set of lashes, as both prohibitions are included in the same general category. Apparently, the Rambam understands this dispute between Abaye and Rava in a manner similar to Rashi’s understanding of it (*Lehem Mishne*; Rambam *Sefer Korbanot*, *Hilkhot Korban Pesah* 8:4).

Aֲכַל זֶג וְחֲרִצָן – A nazirite who ate a grape skin and a grape pit is liable to receive two sets of lashes for violating the two prohibitions specified in the verse. However, he does not receive a third set of lashes for the prohibition stated in general terms in the verse (Numbers 6:4): “Nothing that is made of the grapevine” (Rambam *Sefer Hafla’a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 5:8).

תנו רבנן: אכל בֵּזֵית נָא מִבְּעוֹד יוֹם – פְּטוּר, בֵּזֵית נָא מִשְׁחָשִׁיכָה – חַיִּיב. אֲכַל בֵּזֵית צְלִי מִבְּעוֹד יוֹם – לֹא פָּסֵל עֲצָמוּ מִבְּנֵי חֲבוּרָה, בֵּזֵית צְלִי מִשְׁחָשִׁיכָה – פָּסֵל עֲצָמוּ מִבְּנֵי הַחֲבוּרָה.

The Sages taught: If one ate a partially roasted olive-bulk of the Paschal lamb while it was still day on the fourteenth of Nisan, he is exempt.⁴¹ If he ate a partially roasted olive-bulk after dark, he is liable to receive lashes. If he ate a roasted olive-bulk of the Paschal lamb while it was still day⁴² on the fourteenth of Nisan, he has not disqualified himself from his group. Once he has started eating the offering, he may not leave the group he joined that arranged to partake together of a single Paschal lamb. Nevertheless, this case is different, as he began eating before the obligation to eat the Paschal lamb went into effect, and therefore he has not disqualified himself from his group by eating the Paschal lamb of another group. However, if he ate a roasted olive-bulk after dark, when he is obligated to eat the Paschal lamb, he disqualifies himself from the group he had joined.

תִּנְיָא אִידְךָ: יָכוֹל אֲכַל בֵּזֵית נָא מִבְּעוֹד יוֹם יְהֵא חַיִּיב, וְדִין הוּא: וּמָה בְּשַׁעָה שְׁיִשְׁנוּ בְּקוּם אֲכֹל צְלִי – יִשְׁנוּ בְּבֵל תֹּאכֵל נָא, בְּשַׁעָה שְׁאִינוּ בְּקוּם אֲכֹל צְלִי – אִינוּ דִּין שְׁיִשְׁנוּ בְּבֵל תֹּאכֵל נָא?

It was taught in another *baraita*: I might have thought that one who eats a partially roasted olive-bulk of the Paschal lamb while it was still day is liable to receive lashes. And this is a logical derivation by means of an *a fortiori* inference: If at the time when one is included in the mitzva to arise and eat the roasted Paschal lamb, he is also included in the prohibition not to eat it partially roasted, then at a time when one is not included in the mitzva to arise and eat the roasted Paschal lamb, isn't it right that he should be included in the prohibition not to eat it partially roasted?

אוּ לֹא: בְּשַׁעָה שְׁאִינוּ בְּקוּם אֲכֹל צְלִי – יִשְׁנוּ בְּבֵל תֹּאכֵל נָא, בְּשַׁעָה שְׁיִשְׁנוּ בְּקוּם אֲכֹל צְלִי – אִינוּ בְּבֵל תֹּאכֵל נָא.

Or perhaps this is not the case, as the opposite can be stated: At the time when one is not included in the mitzva to arise and eat the roasted Paschal lamb, he is included in the prohibition not to eat it partially roasted. However, at a time when one is included in the mitzva to arise and eat the roasted Paschal lamb, he is not included in the prohibition not to eat it partially roasted, as the prohibition applies only before one is permitted to eat the Paschal lamb.

וְאֵל תִּתְמָה, שְׁהָרִי הוּתָר מִכְּבֻלֵּי אֲצֵל צְלִי

The Gemara adds: And do not be confounded by this suggestion, as the prohibition against eating from the Paschal lamb is relaxed because of special circumstances with regard to roasted meat. Before nightfall of the fifteenth of Nisan it is prohibited to eat the Paschal lamb regardless of how it was prepared, but once it grows dark it is permitted to eat it roasted. Perhaps the relaxation of this prohibition indicates that one who eats a partially roasted Paschal lamb after nightfall also does not violate a transgression.

תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר: "אֵל תֹּאכְלוּ מִמֶּנּוּ נָא וּבִשְׁל מִבְּשֵׁל בְּמַיִם כִּי אִם צְלִי אִשׁ", שְׁאִין תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר "כִּי אִם צְלִי אִשׁ" וּמָה תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר "כִּי אִם צְלִי אִשׁ" – לֹאמַר לָךְ: בְּשַׁעָה שְׁיִשְׁנוּ בְּקוּם אֲכֹל צְלִי – יִשְׁנוּ בְּבֵל תֹּאכֵל נָא, בְּשַׁעָה שְׁאִינוּ בְּקוּם אֲכֹל צְלִי – אִינוּ בְּבֵל תֹּאכֵל נָא

Therefore, the verse states: "You shall not eat it partially roasted, nor boiled in any way [*bashel mevushal*] in water, but roasted with fire" (Exodus 12:9). As there is no need for the verse to state: "Roasted with fire," since the previous verse already said: "On this night you shall eat the meat roasted with fire" (Exodus 12:8), what then is the meaning when the second verse states: "Roasted with fire"? This verse comes to tell you that at the time when one is included in the mitzva to arise and eat the roasted Paschal lamb, he is also included in the prohibition not to eat it partially roasted, whereas at a time when one is not included in the mitzva to arise and eat the roasted Paschal lamb, he is not included in the prohibition not to eat it partially roasted either.

רַבִּי אֹמֵר: אֶקְרָא אֲנִי "בִּשְׁל" מֵהַ תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר "מִבְּשֵׁל" – שְׁיִכּוֹל אֵין לִי אֶלָּא שְׁבִישְׁלוֹ מִשְׁחָשִׁיכָה, בִּשְׁלוֹ מִבְּעוֹד יוֹם מִנָּח – תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר: "בִּשְׁל מִבְּשֵׁל" – מִכָּל מְקוּם.

Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: I could have simply read "boiled [*bashel*]," as this word suffices to teach that eating a boiled Paschal lamb is prohibited after dark. What is the meaning when the verse states the seemingly superfluous word *mevushal*, which also means boiled? These two words together are translated as "boiled in any way." As I might have thought that I have only derived that this prohibition applies when it was boiled after dark, when the obligation to eat the Paschal lamb is in effect. From where do I derive that one is liable if he boils it while it was still day? The verse states the inclusive phrase *bashel mevushal*, which teaches that this prohibition applies in any case.

Partially roasted meat eaten before the proper time – נָא שְׁאֲכֹלוּ לְפָנֵי יוֹמָנוּ: If one ate from a Paschal lamb that was partially roasted or boiled while it was still day, he is not liable to receive lashes. The reason is that he does not receive lashes for violating this prohibition before the time of the eating of the Paschal lamb, as stated in the *baraita* (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot*, *Hilkhot Korban Pesah* 8:4).

Roasted...Paschal lamb while it was still day – צְלִי מִבְּעוֹד יוֹם: One who ate an olive-bulk of roasted meat from the Paschal lamb during the day has violated the mitzva (Exodus 12:8): "And you shall eat the meat on this night" (Rambam *Sefer Korbanot*, *Hilkhot Korban Pesah* 8:5).

NOTES

Bashel mevushal – בָּשֵׁל מְבוּשָׁל: See *Tosafot*, who discuss this type of formulation. There is an opinion among the *tanna'im* that no *halakhot* can be derived from extraneous language of this kind. This is considered merely the Torah speaking in the language of men, even if the Torah does not usually repeat a word in this manner. Nevertheless, according to the opinion that *halakhot* can indeed be learned from this wording, all possible meanings should be derived, including those that extend beyond the ordinary implication of the term.

וְהָיָה בְּשֵׁל מְבוּשָׁל אֶפְקִיָּה רַבִּי לְצִלִּי קֶדֶר וְלִשְׂאֵר מִשְׁקִין!

The Gemara asks: **But Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi himself derived from the expression “*bashel mevushal*”ⁿ the prohibition against roasting the meat of the Paschal lamb in a pot, i.e., cooking the meat in a pot without the addition of liquids, and the prohibition against boiling it with other liquids.** How can he derive another *halakha* from this same phrase?

אִם כֵּן לִימָא קָרָא אוֹ “בָּשֵׁל בְּשֵׁל” אוֹ “מְבוּשָׁל מְבוּשָׁל”, מֵאֵי בָּשֵׁל מְבוּשָׁל – שְׂמַעְתָּ מִינָהּ תִּרְתִּי.

The Gemara answers: **If so**, i.e., if this verse is referring only to the matter of cooking meat with other liquids or without any liquids, **let the verse say either “*bashel bashel*” or “*mevushal mevushal*,”** and one *halakha* would be derived from the extraneous word. **What is derived from the varied wording “*bashel mevushal*”? Learn from this verse two *halakhot*,** one with regard to the manner of the cooking of the Paschal lamb, and the other concerning the time of its cooking.

תָּנוּ רַבָּנֵינוּ: אָכַל צִלִּי מִבְּעוֹד יוֹם – חַיִּיב, וְכֹזֵית נֹא מִשְׁחָשִׁיכָה – חַיִּיב.

The Sages taught: **If one ate from a roasted Paschal lamb when it was still day, he is liable to receive lashes, and likewise if one ate after dark an olive-bulk that was partially roasted, he is liable to receive lashes.**

קָתְנִי צִלִּי דוּמְיָא דְנָא, מֵה נָא בְּלֹא – אֶף צִלִּי בְּלֹא.

This *baraita* taught that the case of roasted meat is similar to the case of partially roasted meat: **Just as one who consumes partially roasted meat is in violation of a prohibition, so too, one who consumes this roasted meat while it is still day is in violation of a prohibition.**

בְּשֵׁלְמָא נָא – בְּתִיב: “אַל תֹּאכְלוּ מִמֶּנּוּ נֹא” אֵלָּא צִלִּי מְנַלְן?

The Gemara asks: **Granted, with regard to partially roasted meat, it is written: “You shall not eat it partially roasted”** (Exodus 12:9). **However, with regard to meat that has been roasted, from where do we derive that one who eats it before the proper time has committed a transgression?**

דְּכִתְיִב: “וְאָכְלוּ אֶת הַבֶּשֶׂר בַּלַּיְלָה הַזֶּה.” בַּלַּיְלָה – אֵין, בְּיוֹם – לֹא.

The Gemara answers: **As it is written: “And they shall eat the meat on that night, roasted with fire, and *matzot*; with bitter herbs they shall eat it”** (Exodus 12:8). The Gemara derives from this verse: **At night, yes, the Paschal lamb may be eaten; however, by day, no, it may not be eaten in any manner.**

הָאֵי לֹא הֵבֵא מִכְּלָל עֲשֵׂה הוּא, וְכֹל לֹא הֵבֵא מִכְּלָל עֲשֵׂה – עֲשֵׂה!

The Gemara asks: **This is a prohibition that comes by inference from a positive mitzva**, i.e., it is not stated in the Torah in the form of a prohibition. There is a principle that **every prohibition that comes by inference from a positive mitzva is classified as a positive mitzva.** One who transgresses a mitzva of this kind is considered to have transgressed a positive mitzva, not a prohibition.

אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: הָא מְנִי –

The Gemara answers that **Rav Ḥisda said: In accordance with whose opinion is this *baraita*?**

Perek II
Daf 42 Amud a

HALAKHA

תְּמִימִים – Unblemished animals for maintaining the Temple – לְבָדֵק הַבַּיִת: One may not consecrate an unblemished animal for its value to be used for maintaining the Temple, as animals of this kind may be consecrated only as offerings. One who consecrates an unblemished animal for maintaining the Temple transgresses a positive mitzva (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Arakhin VaHaramim* 5:6).

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה הֵיא, דְּתַנָּיָא: “שׂוֹר וְשֵׂה שְׂרוּעַ וְקִלוּט נִדְבָה תַעֲשֶׂה אֹתוֹ” – אוֹתוֹ אֶתָּה מִתְּפִיס לְבָדֵק הַבַּיִת, וְאֵי אֶתָּה מִתְּפִיס תְּמִימִים לְבָדֵק הַבַּיִת. מִכָּאֵן אָמְרוּ: כָּל הַמִּתְּפִיס תְּמִימִים לְבָדֵק הַבַּיִת – עוֹבֵר בַּעֲשֵׂה.

It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as it was taught in a *baraita*: **“Either a bull or a lamb that has anything too long or too short, you may offer it as a free-will offering [to the Temple treasury]; but for a vow [as a sacrifice] it shall not be accepted”** (Leviticus 22:23). From here we learn that it, i.e., a blemished animal, **you may consecrate for maintaining the Temple, but you may not consecrate unblemished animals for maintaining the Temple.** In other words, any animal fit to be sacrificed as an offering may not be consecrated for maintaining the Temple but only as an offering. **From here the Sages stated: Whoever consecrates unblemished animals for maintaining the Temple^h transgresses a positive mitzva.**