Abaye said to him in rejection of his proof: Actually, I could say to you that anywhere that she is rumored to have engaged in intercourse with him, her betrothed, even if she is not rumored to have engaged in intercourse with others, Rav said that the offspring is a mamzer. What is the reason? It is that we say that since she exposed herself to her betrothed, she apparently exposed herself to others as well. And the mishna that you cited as support for your assertion is referring to a situation where they were both incarcerated alone together in prison. Therefore, there is no concern that she engaged in intercourse with another man. This is one version of the dispute between Rav and Shmuel.

Some say that when the betrothed admits that he engaged in intercourse with her, everyone agrees that we cast the child after him. Rather, their dispute was stated as follows: In the case of a betrothed woman who became pregnant, if her betrothed denies that he engaged in intercourse with her, Rav said that the offspring is a mamzer, and Shmuel said that the offspring is a child whose father's identity is not known. Rava said: Rava's statement stands to reason in a case where the woman is not rumored to have engaged in intercourse with him and she is rumored to have engaged in intercourse with others. Therefore, it is assumed that the child is a mamzer.

However, if she is rumored to have engaged in intercourse with him, even if she is also rumored to have engaged in intercourse with others, we cast the child after him.

Rava said: From where do I say that? My source is the mishna that teaches that if a priest engaged in extramarital intercourse with an Israelite woman and she gave birth, she may partake of teruma due to her child. What are the circumstances? If we say that she is rumored to have engaged in intercourse with him and she is not rumored to have engaged in intercourse with others, need it be said that she may partake of teruma? It can easily be assumed that the priest is the father. Rather, is it not a case where she is rumored to have engaged in intercourse with others as well?

And if there, where for her to engage in intercourse with this priest is in violation of a prohibition and to engage in intercourse with that non-priest is in violation of a prohibition of the same degree, and she is rumored to have engaged in intercourse with both, nevertheless, we cast the child after the priest, then here, where for her to engage in intercourse with that man who is not her betrothed is in violation of a Torah prohibition and to engage in intercourse with this man, her betrothed, is permitted by Torah law, is it not all the more so that he should be considered the father?

Since she exposed herself to her betrothed – אמסרה. Sexual intercourse between a betrothed couple is prohibited only by rabbinic law. Accordingly, the blessing over betrothal: Blessed are You...Who prohibited us from incest, and forbade the betrothed to us, and permitted those married to us through a canopy and betrothal, is referring both to Torah and rabbinic prohibitions.

Early commentators question Abaye's rationale, as intercourse between a betrothed couple is prohibited but the lineage of the child conceived through this act is completely untainted. This leads some commentators to accept Rava's distinction and others to accept Shmuel's opinion.

A betrothed woman who became pregnant – האשה. If a betrothed woman became pregnant while still living with her parents, and her betrothed denies having engaged in intercourse with her, the child is rendered a definite mamzer. If she is unavailable for questioning, or if she says that she does not know the father's identity, the child is rendered a mamzer of uncertain status.

If there are rumors that a betrothed woman engaged in licentious intercourse with her betrothed and with others, the child is rendered a mamzer of uncertain status, even if her betrothed admits that he engaged in intercourse with her. If she is questioned and says that she engaged in intercourse only with her betrothed, the child is rendered unflawed. It goes without saying that the child is unflawed if it is known that she engaged in intercourse with her betrothed and there are no rumors with regard to others. This ruling follows Shmuel's opinion as cited in the second version of the dispute. Some commentators (Rosh; Rashba; Beit Shmuel) add that even if there were rumors that she engaged in intercourse with others, if it is known that she engaged in intercourse with her betrothed, or if he acknowledges the same, the child is unflawed, as stated by Rava (Rambam, Sefer Kedusha, Hilkhot Issurei Bi 15:17–18; Shulhan Arukh, Even Ha'ezir 427:28).
Her child and her child's child — ḳuza. If an Israelite woman has a child from a priest she may partake of teruma, whether the child is male or female, or even if the child is a tohum, one whose sexual organs are concealed, or a hermaphrodite. She may likewise partake of teruma due to her child's child, even if he is not a priest, or even if he is unfit to marry into the assembly of Israel (Rambam, Sefer Zera'im, Hilken Teruma 5:12–13).

From where do I derive that an un

⇒ It is stated in the halakha that a slave disqualifies a woman from partaking of teruma due to her engaging in intercourse with her, but not due to his being her offspring. The Gemara asks: What is the reason that he does not disqualify a woman whose offspring he is? The verse states with regard to a maid servant married to a Hebrew slave, that when he is released, "the wife and her children shall be her master's" (Exodus 21:4). This indicates that the maid servant's children are considered her own and are not considered their father's offspring at all. Therefore, a maid servant's child does not disqualify his paternal grandmother from partaking of teruma.

⇒ It is stated in the halakha that a mamzer disqualifies a woman from partaking of teruma, and he also enables a woman to partake of teruma. The Sages taught: The Torah states, "But if a priest's daughter be a widow, or divorced, and have no child... she may eat of his father's bread" (Leviticus 22:13). I have derived only that her own child disqualifies her from partaking of teruma; from where do I derive that her child's child disqualifies her as well? The verse states: "And she has no child [zera] at all, indicating that even her grandchild disqualifies her, as zera means offspring."

⇒ I have derived only that an flawless child disqualifies her; from where do I derive that an unflawed child disqualifies her as well? The verse states: "And she has no [sin la] child," which can be homiletically interpreted as examine her [ayyein ala] to see if she has any offspring, fit or unfit.

The Gemara asks: But didn't you already derive from that phrase that her child's child disqualifies her? The Gemara answers: To derive the halakha with regard to her child's child, no verse was necessary, as the children of children are considered like children. The verse was therefore necessary for deriving the halakha of an unflawed child.

Reish Lakish said to Rabbi Yoḥanan: In accordance with whose opinion is the assumption of the mishna that the child of a Jewess and a slave or a gentile is a mamzer? Is it in accordance only with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who said that the offspring of relations for which one is liable for violating a prohibition is a mamzer? The Gemara answers: You can even say that it is in accordance with the Rabbis, who hold that the offspring is a mamzer only if the parents are liable to receive karet. This is because they concede with regard to a slave and a gentile, as when Rav Dimi came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said that Rabbi Yitzḥak bar Avdini said in the name of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi: With regard to a gentile or a slave who engaged in intercourse with a Jewish woman, the offspring is a mamzer.

⇒ It was taught in the mishna that even a High Priest sometimes disqualifies his grandmother from partaking of teruma. The Sages taught that she can say in disapproval: I am hereby atone ment for my daughter's son, the small jug [kuza], i.e., the mamzer. He is dear to me and I am willing to suffer to atone for him, as he is my offspring from a priest and therefore enables me to partake of teruma. However, I am not willing to be atonement for my daughter's son, the large jug [kada], the High Priest, as he is my offspring from an Israelite and therefore disqualifies me from partaking of teruma.
MISHNA

An uncircumcised priest, e.g., one for whom circumcision was considered too dangerous, and all those who are ritually impure with any type of impurity, may not partake of teruma, the portion of produce that must be set aside for the priests. However, their wives and their slaves may partake of teruma.

With regard to both a man with crushed testicles or with other wounds to his genitals [petzua dakkah] and one whose penis has been severed [kerut shofkha], it is prohibited for them to marry a woman who was born Jewish. If they are priests they and their slaves may partake of teruma, as this condition does not disqualify them or their property. However, their wives may not partake of teruma, because if a priest has relations with his wife after suffering his injury, he renders her a halala, a woman who is disqualified from marrying a priest, as he has engaged in forbidden sexual relations with her. If such a priest did not know his wife, i.e., did not engage in sexual relations with her, after his testicles were crushed or his penis was severed, she may partake of teruma, as she had married the priest in a permitted manner.

And who is deemed a man with crushed testicles? It is anyone whose testicles have been wounded, even one of them. And one whose penis has been severed is anyone whose sexual member has been cut off. As for the measure that renders him unfit, if there remains a portion of the corona, even as much as a hairsbreadth, he is still fit. However, if nothing at all is left of the corona, he is considered as one with a severed penis, for whom it is prohibited by Torah law to marry a Jewish woman.

GEMARA

It is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Elazar said: From where is it derived that an uncircumcised priest may not partake of teruma? It is stated: “A sojourner and a hired servant shall not eat thereof” (Exodus 12:45) with regard to the Paschal lamb, and it is stated: “A sojourner of a priest and a hired servant shall not eat of the holy things” (Leviticus 22:10) with regard to teruma. Just as “a sojourner and a hired servant” stated with regard to the Paschal lamb indicates that an uncircumcised man is prohibited from eating it, so too, “a sojourner and a hired servant” stated with regard to teruma teaches that an uncircumcised man is prohibited from eating it.

Rabbi Akiva says: This proof is not necessary, as the verse states: “Any man [ish ish] from the seed of Aaron who is a leper or a zaav shall not eat of the holy things until he be pure” (Leviticus 22:4). The repetition of the word ish, meaning man, comes to include an uncircumcised man, indicating that he is like one who is ritually impure and therefore may not partake of consecrated food.

An uncircumcised priest – חָטֵא הַכֹּהֵן: According to Rashi, this refers to one whose brothers died as a result of circumcision and therefore it was considered too dangerous to circumcise him. Rabbeinu Tam, however, maintains that since in such a case he is not obligated to circumcise himself, he does not fall into the category of the uncircumcised, and he may therefore eat teruma. Instead, the mishna is dealing with one who is afraid of being circumcised (see Rambam and Rashba).

Their wives may not partake – לֹא אֶלָּא אִשָּׁתָן: The early authorities inquire as to why in fact the wife of a man with crushed testicles or a severed penis may not eat teruma. Rash explains that these women are considered halalot, women who are disqualified from marrying a priest, but his opinion is questioned by several commentators, as the conclusion of the Gemara is that a woman is made a halala only by one who was prohibited to her from the outset, and a man with crushed testicles does not fall into this category. Rashba and others explain that this limitation applies only to those disqualified from the priesthood, whereas a man with crushed testicles is forbidden to the entire congregation. Others suggest that since he suffered his injury in the meantime, it is as though his body had changed, and therefore he is considered as prohibited to her from the outset (Tosafot Yeshanim); a similar idea is mentioned by the Rashash. According to the Rambam, it is prohibited for this woman to eat teruma, not because she is a halala, but because she is deemed a zuza, as she has engaged in relations with a man forbidden to her.
The Gemara analyzes this baraita in detail. The Master said: Rabbi Eliezer says that it is stated: “A sojourner and a hired servant” with regard to the Paschal lamb, and it is stated: “A sojourner and a hired servant” with regard to teruma. Just as “a sojourner and a hired servant” stated with regard to the Paschal lamb indicates that an uncircumcised man is prohibited from eating it, so too, “a sojourner and a hired servant” stated with regard to teruma teaches that an uncircumcised man is prohibited from eating it.

With regard to this verbal analogy the Gemara comments: The phrase “a sojourner and a hired servant” must be available, i.e., superfluous in its context and therefore available for the purpose of establishing a verbal analogy. As, if it is not available, the verbal analogy can be refuted logically, as it is possible to say: What is unique to the Paschal lamb? It is that one is liable to receive kare'et for eating it due to its being pigul, an offering that was sacrificed with the intent to consume it after its appointed time, or due to its being notar, the flesh of an offering that is left over beyond its allotted time, or due to the one consuming it being ritually impure. Therefore, it could be argued that it is owing to the Paschal lamb’s special sanctity and severity that an uncircumcised man may not partake of it. But from where is it derived that an uncircumcised priest may not eat teruma? The Gemara concludes: This is not so [la’ei], as the phrase is in fact available for establishing the verbal analogy.

The Gemara asks: Which of the instances of the phrase “a sojourner and a hired servant” is not needed in its own context and is therefore available for establishing a verbal analogy? If one would claim that it is that which is stated with regard to teruma, certainly those words are necessary, as it is taught in a baraita: “A sojourner;” this is referring to a Hebrew slave who was acquired as a permanent acquisition until the Jubilee Year, i.e., a slave who did not wish to terminate his servitude and underwent a ceremony in which his ear was pierced with an awl. “A hired servant;” this is referring to a Hebrew slave who was acquired as an acquisition for a period of six years.

The baraita asks: And let the verse state only that “a sojourner and a hired servant” may not eat teruma, and not state anything about “a hired servant,” and I would say by way of an a fortiori inference: If a slave who was acquired as a permanent acquisition may not partake of teruma, then with regard to one who was acquired as an acquisition for only six years, all the more so is it not clear that he should be prohibited from eating it?

The baraita answers: If it was written so, I would have said with regard to “a sojourner” that this is referring to a slave who was acquired as an acquisition for a period of six years, as he may not eat teruma; but one who was acquired as a permanent acquisition may in fact partake of teruma. Therefore, the term “a hired servant” comes and teaches that “a sojourner” is referring to a slave who had his ear pierced and must now remain with his master until the Jubilee Year, and that although he was acquired as a permanent acquisition, he may not partake of teruma.

The Gemara proposes: Rather, it is the phrase with regard to the Paschal lamb that is available for establishing a verbal analogy. This phrase: “A sojourner and a hired servant,” that the Merciful One writes with regard to the Paschal lamb, to what is it referring? If we say that the verse is referring to an actual sojourner and to a hired servant, i.e., a Hebrew slave who was acquired permanently or for a fixed number of years, can it possibly be that because he is a sojourner or a hired servant he is exempt from the mitzva of the Paschal lamb? If one answers in the affirmative and argues that a Hebrew slave, like his Canaanite counterpart, is considered his master’s property and is therefore no longer obligated in all the mitzvot like a freeman, this conclusion is difficult, as we maintain with regard to teruma that a Hebrew slave may not partake of it on account of his priestly master.

Not so (levis) – מִשּׁוּם. The source and precise meaning of this word are unclear. Rashi explains that it means: In truth. (Shabbat 64a). The Arukh proposes that it is a combination of the Aramaic word lo, meaning no, and el, from the Greek eu, meaning so. The meaning of the expression is therefore roughly parallel to: No, my son. Alternatively, lo may be understood as a prefix meaning certainly or indeed, while el means yes. In any event, the expression introduces an inescapable conclusion that the statement that follows must be accepted as true.

It is prohibited for a sojourner and a hired servant to partake of teruma – מִשּׁוּם. It is prohibited for all non-priests to eat teruma, even a sojourner or the hired servant of a priest (Rambam Sefer Zera’im, Hilchos Terumot 6:5).
Apprently his master does not acquire his body and thereby effect a change in his personal status; rather, he remains a Jew in every sense. Here too, then, with regard to the Paschal lamb, his master does not acquire his body as a slave, and so he is obviously obligated in the mitzva of the Paschal lamb. Rather, the phrase is superfluous and was written only to be available to teach a different matter.

The Gemara poses a question: And yet there is still a difficulty; The verbal analogy is available from only one side, as only the phrase with regard to the Paschal lamb is superfluous in its context, and we heard Rabbi Elazar, who said with regard to a verbal analogy available from only one side that one can derive from it, and one can also refute it logically if there is reason to distinguish between the two cases. Since there are grounds here for differentiating between the two halakhot in this case, why is the verbal analogy upheld?

The Gemara answers: Since the phrase “a sojourner and a hired servant” is not needed for its own matter, there are two superfluous terms, and one may cast one superfluous term on the halakha with regard to which it is learned that teruma may not be eaten by one who is uncircumcised, and one may cast the other one on the halakha with regard to the Paschal lamb that teaches this, and in this manner it is like a verbal analogy that is available from both sides, which cannot be refuted.

The Gemara raises a question: There is a principle that there cannot be half a verbal analogy. Consequently, if this verbal analogy is accepted, the following halakha that can be derived by way of the same analogy should be accepted as well: Just as with regard to the Paschal lamb, one who is an acute mourner, i.e., whose relative died that same day and has not yet been buried, is prohibited from eating it, so too, with regard to teruma, an acute mourner should be prohibited from eating it, but in fact this is not the case.

Rabbi Yosei bar Hanina said: The verse states: “No foreigner may eat of the holy thing” (Leviticus 22:10), which indicates: A disqualification stemming from foreignness I told you prevents one from eating teruma, but not a disqualification based on acute mourning.

The Gemara asks: Say that the verse comes to teach that a disqualification stemming from foreignness prevents one from eating teruma, but not a disqualification based on a priest’s lack of circumcision, and so it should be permitted for an uncircumcised priest to partake of teruma. The Gemara answers: Isn’t it written with regard to both teruma and the Paschal lamb: “A sojourner and a hired servant”? From this it is derived by way of a verbal analogy that it is prohibited for an uncircumcised priest to eat teruma.

The Gemara asks: And what did you see that led you to include an uncircumcised priest in the prohibition against eating teruma and exclude an acute mourner? Perhaps just the opposite is true. The Gemara answers: It stands to reason that lack of circumcision should be included and should prevent a priest from eating teruma, as the halakhot governing an uncircumcised man are stringent in several respects, as alluded to by the following mnemonic of key words: Acts; karetim; the divine word; the slave. The Gemara spells out these stringencies: An uncircumcised man lacks the act of circumcision, and this act is performed on his body; the failure to perform circumcision is punishable by karet; circumcision existed before the divine word was spoken at Mount Sinai, as the mitzva of circumcision had already been given to Abraham; and the lack of circumcision of one’s male children and slaves precludes one’s eating the Paschal lamb, as is explicitly stated in the Torah (Exodus 12:48).

A verbal analogy available from both sides – נדה השם הפרט פִּסְמָה יָפִי. A verbal analogy is a fundamental rabbinic principle of biblical interpretation appearing in all standard lists of exegetical principles. If the same word or phrase appears in two places in the Torah and a certain halakha is stated explicitly in one of these places, the Sages may infer on the basis of verbal analogy that the same halakha must apply in the other case as well. In its simplest form, the verbal analogy is a type of linguistic interpretation by means of which the meaning of an obscure word or phrase is inferred on the basis of another occurrence of the same word or phrase in a clearer context. However, it is often used only to determine the meaning of obscure words and phrases, but to transfer entire halakhot from one context to another.

Verbal analogies are unique among the exegetical principles in that they are based on verbal, rather than conceptual, similarity. For this reason there are a number of limitations placed on their use. One of the limitations imposed is the principle that one cannot expound a verbal analogy on his own; rather, he must have received a tradition to this effect from his teachers, who in turn learned it from their teachers, all the way back to Moses at Sinai. Furthermore, according to many, the analogy can be drawn only if the key words are available, meaning that they are superfluous, i.e., not needed as a source for some other halakha. If the key words are not superfluous, the verbal analogy may be refuted logically.

HALAKHA

Acute mourning with regard to teruma – הפסוק מברוקה: The state of acute mourning does not render the mourner disqualified from eating teruma (Rambam Sefer Zera’im, Hilkhot Bikkurim 3:3).

The punishment of karet for failure to perform circumcision – צער לtoDate תבש: Circumcision is a positive mitzva whose lack of fulfillment is punishable by karet (Rambam Sefer Ahava, Hilkhot Mila 1:1).

NOTES

A verbal analogy available from both sides – נדה השם הפרט פִּסְמָה יָפִי. A verbal analogy is a fundamental rabbinic principle of biblical interpretation appearing in all standard lists of exegetical principles. If the same word or phrase appears in two places in the Torah and a certain halakha is stated explicitly in one of these places, the Sages may infer on the basis of verbal analogy that the same halakha must apply in the other case as well. In its simplest form, the verbal analogy is a type of linguistic interpretation by means of which the meaning of an obscure word or phrase is inferred on the basis of another occurrence of the same word or phrase in a clearer context. However, it is often used only to determine the meaning of obscure words and phrases, but to transfer entire halakhot from one context to another.

Verbal analogies are unique among the exegetical principles in that they are based on verbal, rather than conceptual, similarity. For this reason there are a number of limitations placed on their use. One of the limitations imposed is the principle that one cannot expound a verbal analogy on his own; rather, he must have received a tradition to this effect from his teachers, who in turn learned it from their teachers, all the way back to Moses at Sinai. Furthermore, according to many, the analogy can be drawn only if the key words are available, meaning that they are superfluous, i.e., not needed as a source for some other halakha. If the key words are not superfluous, the verbal analogy may be refuted logically.
The Gemara counters: On the contrary, acute mourning should be included and should prevent a priest from eating teruma, as acute mourning is also subject to several stringencies. It is relevant at any time after the death of a close relative, unlike circumcision, which is performed only once in a lifetime; it applies to both men and women, unlike circumcision, which is restricted to men; and it is not in the mourner’s power to render himself fit until after the deceased is buried, unlike an uncircumcised man, who can render himself fit at any time by undergoing circumcision. The Gemara responds: Even so, these arguments for including an uncircumcised priest in the prohibition are more numerous.

Rava said: Even without the rationale that these arguments are more numerous, you still could not say that the verbal analogy renders it prohibited for an acute mourner to eat teruma. As, it is possible to say that we should leave out the lack of circumcision from the prohibition against eating teruma even though it is written explicitly with regard to the Paschal lamb itself, and learn the halakha that acute mourning is included in the prohibition by way of a verbal analogy from the Paschal lamb when this halakha that an acute mourner is barred from bringing the Paschal lamb is never stated explicitly. As the prohibition against acute mourning with respect to the Paschal lamb itself we learn only from the halakha governing tithes.

The Gemara raises another question: If the verbal analogy is valid, then the following halakha that can be derived by way of the same analogy should be accepted as well: Just as with regard to the Paschal lamb, the lack of circumcision of one’s male children and slaves prevents one from eating of the offering until he ensures that all of the male members of his household have been circumcised, so too, with regard to teruma, the lack of circumcision of one’s male children and slaves should prevent one from partaking of teruma. However, in reality this is not the halakha.

The Gemara rejects this argument: The verse states with regard to the Paschal lamb: “When you have circumcised him, then he shall eat from it” (Exodus 12:44). The words “from it” teach that the lack of circumcision of one’s male children and slaves prevents one from eating the Paschal lamb, but the lack of circumcision of one’s male children and slaves does not prevent one from eating teruma, if he himself is eligible to eat it.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: If so, that the words “from it” come to exclude any other case, say a similar exposition with regard to the uncircumcised. As it is stated with regard to the Paschal lamb: “No uncircumcised person shall eat from it” (Exodus 12:48), indicating that “from it,” the Paschal lamb, an uncircumcised man may not eat, but he may eat from teruma. The Gemara answers: Isn’t it written with regard to both teruma and the Paschal lamb: “A sojourner and a hired servant?” From this it is derived by way of a verbal analogy that an uncircumcised priest may not partake of teruma.

The Gemara asks: And what did you see that led you to include an uncircumcised priest in the prohibition against eating teruma, and not one whose male children and slaves have not been circumcised? The Gemara answers: It stands to reason that one’s own lack of circumcision should be included and should preclude his eating teruma, as an uncircumcised man lacks an act that is performed on his own body, and the failure to perform circumcision is punishable by karet. The Gemara counters: On the contrary, the lack of circumcision of one’s male children and slaves should be included and should preclude a priest’s eating teruma, as it is relevant at any time, since whenever one has a male child or slave under his authority he is commanded to circumcise him.
The Gemara answers: These arguments for including one’s own circumcision in the prohibition are more numerous. And if you wish, say: Even without the rationale that these arguments are more numerous, you still could not say that the verbal analogy comes in to include the prohibition against eating teruma one whose male children or slaves have not been circumcised. As, is there anywhere that his own lack of circumcision does not preclude him from doing but the lack of circumcision of others does preclude him from doing? Rather, it must be that the verbal analogy comes to teach that the priest’s own lack of circumcision precludes his eating teruma, while that of his male children and slaves does not.

The Gemara poses a question: Now that you have said that the phrase “from it” used in this context comes for an exposition and serves to exclude other cases, with regard to the phrase “from it” in the verse “No stranger shall eat from it” (Exodus 12:43), why do I need it? The Gemara answers: This, too, teaches that it is only from it, eating the Paschal lamb,

that apostasy [meshumadut] disqualifies, as the term “stranger” in this context is understood to refer to a Jew whose conduct makes him estranged from God, and he is disqualified from eating the Paschal lamb, but apostasy does not disqualify one from eating tithe.

The Gemara asks further: If so, with regard to the phrase “from it” in the verse “No uncircumcised person shall eat from it” (Exodus 12:48), which again emphasizes “from it” and not from another item, why do I need it? The Gemara answers: This teaches that only from it, the Paschal lamb, one who is uncircumcised may not eat, but he eats matza and bitter herbs. One who is uncircumcised is obligated to eat matza and bitter herbs on Passover, just like any other Jew.

The Gemara continues: And it was necessary for the Torah to write the prohibition with regard to an uncircumcised man, and it was necessary for the Torah to write a separate prohibition with regard to any stranger. As, if the Merciful One had written only about an uncircumcised man, one might have thought that only for him is it prohibited to eat from the Paschal lamb because the foreskin is repulsive, but with regard to a stranger, who is not repulsive, say that it is not prohibited. And if the Merciful One had written only about any stranger, one might have concluded that only for him is it prohibited to eat from the Paschal lamb because his heart is not directed toward Heaven due to his apostasy, but with regard to an uncircumcised man, whose heart is directed toward Heaven, and it is only on account of unavoidable circumstances that he has not undergone circumcision, say that there is no prohibition against his eating the Paschal lamb. Therefore, it is necessary to teach both cases.

Apostasy [meshumadut] – משמיעד: There are various opinions as to the etymology of this word. Some understand the original meaning of the word as connected to the root ש-מ-ד, in the sense of a decree enacted against the Jews that they must change their religion. Therefore, the primary sense of the word meshumad is: One who was forced to convert to another religion. Rav Hai Gaon argues that the word is derived from the ancient Aramaic amad, meaning immersed, and a meshumad, the abbreviated form of meshumad, is one who has been baptized. From here the word was taken to mean anyone who converted to another religion. The Ramban, however, suggests that the word is a shortened form of meshumah, from the Arabic meshah, meaning alienate. Therefore, a meshumad is anyone alienated from his religion. Others are of the opinion that the term is derived from the word shemad in the sense of excision, close in meaning to the root sh-מ-ד, meaning: Place under a ban. According to this opinion, meshumad means one who is cursed and cut off from the Jewish people.

NOTES

Apostasy disqualifies – משמיעד פסול: One who feeds an olive-bulk of the Paschal lamb to an apostate guilty of idolatry has transgressed a negative mitzva (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Korban Pesah 9:2).

He eats matza – מצא אף יהא מי שפיסל פסול: An uncircumcised man is obligated to eat matza and bitter herbs on Passover (Rambam Sefer Korbanot, Hilkhot Korban Pesah 9:8).

But apostasy does not disqualify one from eating tithe – משמיעד פסול מה תרומת פסול: Tosafot state that apostasy does not disqualify a priest from eating teruma either, and they explain how both halakhot can be derived from the same exclusion. However, Rabba, who apparently had read a different reading of the Gemara in Pesahim, maintains that apostasy does disqualify a priest from eating teruma. Since there is a verbal analogy between the Paschal lamb and teruma, they are equated in every possible manner.

No uncircumcised person – מימים אף יהא מי שפיסל פסול: One issue concerning the prohibition against gentiles eating from the Paschal lamb is the question: To whom does the prohibition apply? If one claims that it applies to Jews in that they may not feed gentiles from the offering, there is no need for a special teaching with regard to a circumcised Arab, as this prohibition itself is a novelty. For this reason some commentaries say that the prohibition applies to the gentile himself. Tosafot HaRosh points out that it is unusual for the Torah to state a special halakha that applies only to gentiles and not to Jews.
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