

8 Nissan 5781
March 21, 2021



Pesachim Daf 120

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Mar Zutra recited it thus: Rav Yosef said in Rav Yehudah's name in Shmuel's name: One may conclude after the [last] matzah [is eaten]¹ with desert. Shall we say that this supports him: One may not conclude [the seder meal] after the pesach-offering with afikoman. Thus it is forbidden only after the pesach-offering, but you may conclude [thus] after the matzah? — He writes it in an “it is unnecessary to state” format. After the matzah it need not be stated, since its taste is not substantial;² but [I might think] that there is no objection after the pesach-offering, whose taste is substantial and cannot [easily] be wiped out. Hence he [the Tanna] informs us [otherwise]. An objection is raised: [As for] sponge matzah, honey matzah and wafer matzah, a man may fill his stomach with them, providing that he eats as much as an olive of matzah at the end. [This implies], only at the end, but not at the beginning!³ — [No:] He writes it in an “it is unnecessary to state” format. [If he eats it]⁴ at the beginning it goes without saying [that his duty is discharged], since he eats it⁵ with an appetite; but at the end, [where] he may come to eat it as mere gorging, I might say that he does not [do his duty]. Hence he [the Tanna] informs us [that one may eat it]. (120a1)

Rava said: [The eating of] matzah nowadays is a Scriptural obligation, whereas [that of] marror is Rabbinical. Yet why is marror different? Because it is written, they shall eat it [the pesach-offering] with matzah and marror, [which implies], when [the law of] the pesach-offering is in force, [that of] marror is in force, and when the pesach-offering is not in force, marror is not required either! Then in the case of matzah too, surely it is written, ‘they shall eat it with matzah and marror’? — Scripture indeed repeated [the mitzvah] in the case of matzah: at evening you shall eat matzah. But Rav Acha bar Yaakov maintained: Both the one and the other are [only] Rabbinical. But surely it is written, ‘at evening you shall eat matzah’? — That is required in respect of a tamei person and one who was on a journey afar off. For you might argue: Since they cannot eat of the pesach-offering, they need not eat matzah or marror either; hence [the verse] informs us [otherwise]. And Rava?⁶ — He can answer you: In respect of a tamei person and one who was on a journey afar off a verse is not required, for they are no worse than an uncircumcised person and a stranger. For it was taught: No uncircumcised person shall eat of it: ‘of it’ he may not eat, but he must eat matzah and marror. And the other? — It is written in the case of the one [the uncircumcised etc.]

¹ I. e., nowadays at the end of the meal in memory of the pesach-offering.

² He must finish the meal with the taste of the pesach-offering and the matzah predominant in his mouth. Now the taste of the latter is not substantial and enduring, and therefore it is superfluous to teach that nothing may be eaten after it.

³ And the presumed reason is because nothing may be eaten after the last matzah.

⁴ Invalid matzah.

⁵ The valid matzah eaten for the mitzvah.

⁶ Does he not admit this? and if he does, on what grounds does he differentiate between matzah and marror?

and it is written in the case of the other [the tamei etc.], and they are both necessary.⁷

It was taught in accordance with Rava: Six days you shall eat matzah, and on the seventh day shall be a solemn assembly to Hashem your God: just as [on] the seventh day [the eating of matzah] is voluntary, so [on] the six days it is voluntary. What is the reason?⁸ Because it is something which was included in the general law and then excluded from the general law, in order to illumine [other cases], [which means that] it was excluded not in order to throw light upon itself, but in order to throw light upon the entire general law.⁹ You might think that on the first night too it is [merely] voluntary; therefore, it is stated, 'they shall eat it with matzah and marror.' I know this only when the Temple is in existence; from where do we know it when the Temple is not in existence? From the verse, 'at evening you shall eat matzah': thus the Torah made it a permanent obligation. (120a1 – 120a3)

MISHNAH: If some of them fell asleep, they may eat¹⁰ [when they awake]; if all of them fell asleep they must not eat.¹¹ Rabbi Yosi said: if they fell into a light sleep, they may eat; if they fell fast asleep, they must not eat.¹² The pesach-offering defiles one's hands after midnight;¹³ piggul and nossar defile one's hands. (120a3 – 120b1)

⁷ A tamei person etc. cannot be deduced from a 'stranger,' for since the former will observe the second Pesach a month hence, I would argue that he can then discharge his obligation of eating matzah and marror too. But a 'stranger' will not have that opportunity, and therefore he is naturally bound to eat the matzah and the marror now. By the same reasoning, if there were only one verse, I would apply it to the latter, but not to the former.

⁸ Why do I interpret it thus, seemingly in contradiction to the literal meaning?

⁹ This is a principle of exegesis. Now the general rule is stated: seven days shall you eat matzah; when the seventh is excluded by the verse, 'six days' etc, this throws light not on the seventh alone, but upon the whole period, teaching that the eating of matzah therein is voluntary.

GEMARA: Rabbi Yosi said: if they fell into a light sleep, they may eat; if they fell fast asleep, they must not eat. What condition is meant by 'a light sleep'? Said Rav Ashi: A sleep which is not sleep, a wakefulness which is not wakefulness. E.g., if he answers when called, cannot make a reasoned statement, yet recollects when reminded. Abaye was sitting [on Pesach night] before Rabbah. Seeing him dozing he remarked to him, 'You, sir, are sleeping.'¹⁴ 'I was merely dozing.' replied he, 'and we have learnt: 'If they fell into a light sleep, they may eat; if they fell, fast asleep', they must not eat.' (120b1)

The pesach-offering defiles one's hands after midnight etc. This proves that from midnight it is nossar. Which Tanna [holds thus]? — Said Rav Yosef: It is Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah. For it was taught: And they shall eat the meat on that night.' Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah said: 'On that night' is stated here, while elsewhere it is stated, For I will go through the land of Egypt on that night: just as there it means midnight, so here too [they may eat the pesach-offering] until midnight.¹⁵ Said Rabbi Akiva to him: Yet surely it is already stated, [and you shall eat it] in haste, [implying] until the time of haste.¹⁶ If so, what is taught by 'in [that] night?' You might think that it can be eaten like [other] sacrifices, [viz.,] by day: therefore, it is stated, 'on [that] night': it is eaten by night, but it may not be eaten by day. Now how does Rabbi Akiva employ 'that [night]'?

¹⁰ From the pesach-offering.

¹¹ In the latter case they have ceased to think about the pesach-offering; when they awake it is as though they would eat in two different places, sleep breaking the continuity of action and place, and thus it is forbidden.

¹² This distinction refers to the first clause, when only some of them fell asleep.

¹³ Because it is then nossar.

¹⁴ This happened while he was eating the matzah at the end of the meal, and Abaye meant that he might not continue now.

¹⁵ And afterwards, it becomes nossar.

¹⁶ I.e., when they had to make haste to leave Egypt, which was in the morning.

He utilizes it as excluding a second night. For I might argue: Since the pesach-offering is a sacrifice of lesser sanctity, and the shelamim-offering is a sacrifice of lesser sanctity, then just as the shelamim is to be eaten two days and one night, so in the case of the pesach-offering, I will substitute nights for days, and it may be eaten two nights and one day. Therefore, the Divine Law wrote ‘that [night]’. And Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah? — He can answer you: That is deduced from, and you shall let nothing of it remain until the morning. And Rabbi Akiva? — He can answer you: Had not the Divine Law written ‘that [night]’, I would have said, what does ‘morning’ mean? the second morning. Then what of Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah? — He can answer you: Wherever ‘morning’ is written, it means the first morning.

Rava said: If a man eats matzah after midnight nowadays, according to Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah he does not discharge his duty.¹⁷ That is obvious, [for] since it is compared to the pesach-offering, it is like the pesach-offering? — You might say, surely the Torah excluded it from the analogy;¹⁸ hence he informs us that when the Torah restores it, it restores it to its original state.¹⁹ (120b1 – 120b4)

INSIGHT TO THE DAF

Whose Opinion Does the Shulchan Aruch Follow?

In the preface to his Haggadah, the Ksav Sofer asks that the Shulchan Aruch seems to contradict himself. In Orach Chaim (477:1), the Shulchan Aruch rules that one should be careful to eat the afikomen before chatzos. This indicates that he rules like the opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah. However, later (481:2) he rules that a person is obligated to relate the story of going out of Egypt until

¹⁷ Since he holds that the pesach-offering may not be eaten after midnight, while as stated above that matzah is compared to the pesach-offering.

¹⁸ In that matzah is declared obligatory nowadays despite the absence of the pesach-offering.

“sleep grabs him.” This indicates that there is an obligation the whole night to discuss going out of Egypt. The reason this implies he follows Rabbi Akiva’s opinion is that there is only an obligation to relate the story of going out of Egypt “when matzah and maror is placed before you,” meaning during a time when there is an obligation to eat matzah. It must be that the Shulchan Aruch holds there is still an obligation to eat matzah the whole night, as per the opinion of Rabbi Akiva! How can we reconcile this seeming contradiction?

The Ksav Sofer answers that the Shulchan Aruch is stringent according to both the opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah and Rabbi Akiva. Accordingly, he says one should make sure to eat matzah before chatzos. However, he also rules that one must continue to relate the story of going out of Egypt the entire night, as per the opinion of Rabbi Akiva.

DAILY MASHAL

The Haggadah begins with the invitation to others to join us in eating the bread of affliction. What kind of hospitality is that - asking others to share in our suffering? Rabbi Jonathan Sacks explains: Sharing food is the first act through which slaves become free human beings. One who fears tomorrow does not offer their bread to others. But those who are willing to divide their food with a stranger have already shown themselves capable of fellowship and faith, the two things from which hope is born. That is why we begin the Seder by inviting others to join us. That is how we turn affliction into freedom.

¹⁹ I.e., once the Torah teaches that matzah nowadays is obligatory, notwithstanding the analogy, it becomes compared to the pesach-offering in respect of the hours during which the obligation can be discharged.