



דף פח.

אדם מביא ושוחט ע"י בנו ובתו הקטנים

1] The people who join together as a group for the slaughtering of a *korbon pesach* are called *מנויים* (counted ones).¹ The Mishna above on 61a says that a *korbon pesach* that is slaughtered *שלא למנוי* - for sake of those who were not originally part of the group - is not valid. Moreover, the Mishna in *Zevachim* 56b says that it is forbidden for anyone who was not enlisted on the *korbon pesach* (prior to the *shechitah*) to eat from it.

As the source for this *halacha* Rashi (ibid.) cites the *posuk* (Sh'mos 12:4), *איש לפי אכלו* - each according to what he eats should be counted on the lamb. The *posuk* implies that one should eat only from a *korbon pesach* on which he was enlisted.

The Ra'avad² cites another source. While agreeing that the *posuk* *איש לפי אכלו תכוסו* teaches that there is a *mitzvah* to join a *korbon pesach* group (prior to *shechitah*), the Ra'avad says that there is another *posuk*, *תושב ושכיר לא יאכל בו* (lit., a sojourner and a hired servant may not eat from it, Sh'mos 12:45) which bans anyone who is not registered on the *korbon* from eating from it.

2] The Gemara (88a) cites a *braysah* which says that one cannot enlist his grown-up children on his *korbon pesach* without their consent. [Similarly, the Gemara in *Nedarim*

36a says that one cannot enlist his friend without his knowledge.] The *braysah* says, however, that a father can enlist his minor children without their knowledge.

Question: Since an adult cannot be enlisted on a *korbon* without his consent, why is a minor different?

Tosfos (ד"ה שה), citing a Gemara in *Nedarim* 36a (שה לבית אבות לאו דאורייתא), says that *min haTorah* a *קטן* - minor - is permitted to eat even from a *korbon* upon which he was not enlisted, because as a minor he is exempt from observing the laws of the Torah. Therefore, a minor may eat from his father's *korbon pesach* even though he was enlisted without consent.³ Even though as a rule one is not permitted to feed a minor forbidden food (or directly cause him to violate a *mitzvah*), feeding him the *korbon pesach* is permitted in order to train him in the *mitzvah* of *אכילת קרבן פסח* - eating a *korbon pesach*.⁴

Alternatively, the Ran in *Nedarim* (ibid.) explains that the *issur* of *שלא למנוי* pertains only to those who are capable of registering on a *korbon pesach*. This *issur* does not apply to minors who lack the legal capacity to enlist on a *korbon* even if they were to give their consent.

The *Brisker Rav*⁵ links these two explanations to the source for the *issur* of *שלא למנוי*.

The *posuk* *איש לפי אכלו תכוסו* teaches that one must enlist on a *korbon pesach*. If one who

is capable of enlisting eats from a *korbon pesach* without enlisting, he has, in effect, nullified this mitzvah, for he has ignored the Torah obligation to enlist.

According to Rashi who says that the *issur* is based solely on this posuk (איש לפי אכלו (תכוסו), it follows that only גדולים - adults - who are capable of enlisting are forbidden to eat from a *korbon* on which they are not enlisted (as the Ran says), for an adult who has done so, has in effect negated a mitzvah which was incumbent upon him. The mitzvah to enlist does not pertain to minors since they lack the legal capacity to enlist. By extension, when a minor eats from a *korbon* on which he was not enlisted, he cannot be guilty of negating this mitzvah to enlist (since the mitzvah to enlist does not pertain to him).⁶

On the other hand, according to the Ra'avad who bases the *issur* on the posuk, תושב ושכיר לא יאכל בו, there is a specific Torah *issur* banning one from eating from the *korbon pesach* if he was not enlisted. Accordingly, it follows that minors, too, would be prohibited as Tosfos says (if not for the fact that minors are not bound by *issurim* of the Torah).⁷

דף פט.

נמנין עליו עד שישחט

1] The Mishna (89a) says that one may join a *korbon pesach* group anytime prior to the slaughtering; the group need not be formed prior to the purchase of the *korbon*.

The *Brisker Rav*⁸ deduces from the words of Rashi (Zevachim 56b, ד"ה שלא למנוי) that one enlists on a *korbon pesach* by becoming a partial owner in the *korbon*. In other words, one must join a *korbon pesach* group either by sharing in its purchase, or, if joining after the purchase, by making a קנין - formal act of acquisition - so as to acquire partial ownership in the *korbon*.

The Zera Avraham,⁹ however, cites a Yerushalmi which indicates, contrary to Rashi, that ownership in the *korbon pesach* is not essential. In order for an individual to be considered מנוי - enlisted - the owner of the *korbon* need only to count him on his *korbon*.¹⁰

2] הממנה עמו אחר בחלקו

The Mishna (89b) discusses a case in which one member of the *korbon pesach* group enrolls a friend without the knowledge of the other members in the group.¹¹ Although the enrollment is valid, the Mishna says that the original members could refuse to allow the new member to join them at the table and share in their portions. Rather, they can give the inviter a portion (equal to their own) and demand that he divide it with his friend at another location.

The Sefas Emes (89a, קמ"ל ד"ה) maintains that if the original owner of the *korbon pesach* invites additional guests, the *halacha* is different. The owner is justified in inviting additional guests, even though he thereby diminishes everyone's portion, because he can claim that he only agreed to provide each member of the *chabura* (group) with the minimum needed for the mitzvah, i.e., a k'zayis (olive's volume). The original members have no right to demand a larger portion of the *korbon*. According to the Sefas Emes, members of a group could object to a newcomer only if he was invited by a co-member who was not the primary owner of the *korbon*.¹²

דף צ.

על מצות ומרורים יאכלוהו דכיון דמכשירין דפסח נינהו כפסח דמי

The Gemara cites a dispute regarding how one must spend the money that he obtains from selling a portion of his *korbon pesach*. The Rabbanan/Tanna Kamma derives from a posuk that money obtained from the sale of one's consecrated animal may only be used to purchase items essential to the *korbon*; it may not be used for one's personal needs. Rabbi disagrees and deduces from the posuk that the money may be used for other needs as well.

The Gemara cites two views on this matter. One says that the Rabbanan forbid using the *pesach* money even for the purchase of *matzah* and *marror* since these are not *korbon pesach* provisions. They permit using the *korbon pesach* money only for the purchase of wood needed for its roasting because wood is תקנתא

דפסח - an item required for the improvement and preparation of the pesach itself.

Another opinion asserts that the Rabbanan permit the purchase of *matzah* and *marror* because these items too, are classified as *korbon pesach* provisions. Since the Torah states, על מצות ומרורים יאכלוהו - you shall eat the pesach together with *matzah* and *marror* - these foods are deemed הכשרו דפסח - items that make the *korbon pesach* suitable.

The Ibn Ezra contends, based on the posuk that one who eats his *korbon pesach* without the accompaniment of *matzah* and *marror* has not fulfilled the mitzvah of אכילת קרבן פסח. Moreover, he asserts that if on Erev Pesach one does not think he will be able to obtain *matzah* or *marror*, he may not offer his *korbon pesach*. He bases this on the *halacha* of מעבא פסחים which states that the mitzvah to eat the *korbon pesach* is essential to the mitzvah of offering the pesach. If one is not capable of eating the *korbon pesach* he does not fulfill the mitzvah of offering the *korbon pesach*.

The Ibn Ezra (Sh'mos 15:25) explains based on this, that *Klal Yisrael* were unable to offer a *korbon pesach* during their forty-year sojourn in the desert (except for the first year, see Sh'mos 12:25 with Rashi) because they had no means of obtaining *matzah* in the wilderness to accompany the *korbon pesach* (as they ate only manna during those years).

The Rambam,¹³ based on the Mechilta, disagrees with the Ibn Ezra and says that although there is a mitzvah to eat *matzah* and *marror* with the pesach, one fulfills the principal mitzvah of אכילת קרבן פסח even without the accompaniment of *matzah* and *marror*.

- The sefer *Korbon Chagigah*¹⁴ maintains that just as *matzah* is considered הכשרו דפסח and may be purchased with *korbon pesach* money, so too, bedikas *chametz* (searching for *chametz* on the night before Pesach) is considered הכשרו דפסח since there is a specific prohibition against slaughtering one's *korbon pesach* if he is in possession of *chametz* (לא תשחט על חמץ).

Hence he permits one to use *korbon pesach* money to hire someone to search for his *chametz*.¹⁵

דף צא: איש ולא קטן

The posuk (Bamidbar 9:12) states regarding one who neglected to offer the *korbon pesach*, ונכרתה הנפש ההיא...חטאו ישא האיש ההוא - that person will incur *kares*...that man will carry his sin. The Gemara says that the word איש (man) comes to exclude a קטן - minor - from the penalty of *kares*.

Since a minor is exempt from all laws of the Torah, Tosfos asks why a special posuk is necessary to teach that a minor who fails to offer a *korbon pesach* is exempt from a penalty.

Tosfos answers that the issue here concerns one who became a גדול (i.e., one who reached halachic majority) between *Pesach Rishon* and *Pesach sheni* (i.e., between the 14th of Nisan and the 14th of Iyar). The posuk teaches that such an individual does not incur *kares* for failing to offer a *korbon pesach* on *Pesach sheni* because the mitzvah of *pesach sheni* was given only as an opportunity to compensate (תשלומין) for one who failed to fulfill his obligation on *Pesach Rishon*. However, one who was a minor at the time of *Pesach Rishon* was not under any obligation then, and he therefore, is not obligated to bring a *pesach sheni*.

The Maharsha points out that the Gemara below (93a, see Al Hadaf ibid.) cites a dispute regarding this matter. Rebbi there maintains that *Pesach sheni* was not merely intended to serve as compensation for one who failed to offer a *pesach rishon*. Rather, *Pesach sheni* is an independent obligation. Rebbi asserts, contrary to the opinion cited by Tosfos, that one who became a *gadol* between *Pesach Rishon* and *Pesach sheni* is obligated to offer a *pesach sheni*.

The Rashash explains that our Gemara is compatible even with the view of Rebbi. Our Gemara does not say that this young individual is exempt from bringing a *pesach sheni*; it merely says that he is exempt from the penalty of *kares*. The Rashash suggests that our

Gemara agrees that this individual (who became a *gadol* between *Pesach Rishon* and *Pesach sheni*) is required to offer a *pesach sheni*; The Gemara merely says that he is not subject to *kares* if he fails to do so.

The Sefas Emes offers another interpretation of our Gemara. He suggests that the Gemara is referring to a minor who reaches adulthood on the night of *pesach* (the fifteenth of Nissan). If not for the *posuk* we would have thought that he incurs *kares* for his failure to join a *korbon pesach* group (on Erev *Pesach*) so as to enable himself to eat the *korbon pesach* (at night, when he is a *גדול*). The *posuk* teaches that only one who is a *גדול* on Erev *Pesach*, during the time of slaughtering, incurs *kares*, but not one who was still a minor on Erev *Pesach*. [The Sefas Emes adds that it is possible that such an individual is not only exempt from *kares* but he is not even biblically obligated to join a *korbon pesach chaburah*, since he is a minor at the time the *korbon* is slaughtered.]

דף צב.

איזמל העמידו במקום כרת

Rava says that there are certain instances in which the sages upheld a rabbinic decree even though adherence to the decree prevents one from fulfilling a *kares*-bearing Torah law. For example, if one did not prepare a *milah* knife before Shabbos (for the *bris* of his son on his eighth day), the *bris* must be delayed even in a case in which bringing a knife from a neighbor's house involves only a rabbinic *issur* (e.g., the knife must be carried through a [unenclosed] courtyard in which carrying is only rabbinically prohibited).

Rashi points out that Rava is not referring to an ordinary Shabbos *bris* because a father is not subject to *kares* for failure to circumcise his son - and thus, delaying the infant's *bris* until after Shabbos is not an example of a violation of a *kares*-bearing sin. [The penalty of *kares* stated in connection with *bris milah* pertains only to an adult who refrains from having himself circumcised.] Rather, explains Rashi, Rava is referring to a Shabbos *bris* that falls on Erev Pesach. In that case, failure to perform the *bris*

on Shabbos day renders the father ineligible to offer a *korbon pesach*, for the Torah says that one who has uncircumcised children or slaves may not offer the *korbon pesach*. Rava says that the sages upheld the rabbinic decree against carrying the *milah* knife on Shabbos (through a *karmelis*, which is a domain in which carrying is rabbinically forbidden) even when Shabbos falls on Erev *Pesach* - even though as a result of the father's inability to perform the *bris* he will be forced to forgo the *kares*-bearing mitzvah of *הקרבת קרבן פסח*.

[It should be noted that the father who forgoes his *korbon pesach* due to a rabbinic decree against carrying the *milah* knife is not subject to *kares*. Firstly, he can bring a *pesach sheni* to compensate for the missed *pesach rishon*. Secondly, only a willful sinner incurs the penalty of *kares* but not one who was prevented from doing so by a rabbinic *issur*. Nevertheless, Rava considers this to be a case of a *kares*-bearing sin because *korbon pesach* is a mitzvah whose failure is sometimes subject to *kares*.]

The Gemara in Yevamos 71b indicates that one's failure to circumcise his son prevents him from offering a *korbon pesach* only when the father is at fault. However, if one was unable to circumcise his son due to illness or because he was in prison on Erev *Pesach*, the father may join a *chaburah* and eat from the *korbon pesach* since he is not at fault.¹⁶

Accordingly, the Rashash asks why in the above case (cited by Rashi) the father is prevented from bringing a *korbon pesach* on account of his uncircumcised son. Since the father is forced to delay the *bris* because the sages forbade him to carry the *milah* knife, he should be permitted to offer (and eat) the *korbon pesach* since he is not at fault.

The Shaar Hamelech¹⁷ answers that the father is considered blameworthy for his uncircumcised child because he neglected to bring the *milah* knife before Shabbos. Therefore, the father in such a case is forbidden to offer the *korbon pesach*.¹⁸

דף צג.

קטן שהגדיל בין שני פסחים

1] Rebbi is of the opinion that a child who becomes a גדול (adult) between *Pesach Rishon* and *Pesach sheni* is obligated to offer a *pesach sheni* (even though he was not obligated to bring a *pesach rishon*).

R' Nosson disagrees and maintains that the mitzvah of *pesach sheni* was given as תשלומין (a make-up *korbon*) for *pesach rishon*. When an individual is unable to fulfill his obligation on the 14th of Nissan he is afforded the opportunity to fulfill his *pesach* obligation on the 14th of Iyar instead. However, one who was a minor on the 14th of Nissan and did not have a *pesach* obligation at that time does not need to bring a *pesach sheni*, because he does not require compensation.

The Rambam,¹⁹ in codifying this *halacha*, rules in accordance with Rebbi that a child who reaches adulthood shortly before *Pesach sheni* is obligated to offer a *pesach sheni*. The Rambam adds, in the event that this child had already joined a *chabura* for *pesach rishon*, he is exempt from offering a *pesach sheni* because he has already fulfilled his *pesach* obligation.

The commentators struggle to understand how a *korbon pesach rishon* that is offered on behalf of a minor (who is exempt from the mitzvah) exempts him from his subsequent *pesach sheni* obligation which takes effect when he is a *gadol*.²⁰

2] • In a year that the ninth of Av falls on Shabbos the fast of *Tisha b'Av* is observed on Sunday, the tenth of Av.

The Divrei Malkiel²¹ considers the case of a child who becomes a *gadol* on the tenth of Av in such a year when the fast of *Tisha b'Av* is observed on the tenth of Av.

Based on our Gemara he suggests that this child is exempt from fasting because the mitzvah of fasting was given for the ninth of Av, not the tenth. When the ninth of Av falls on Shabbos and fasting is not possible (because it does not override the mitzvah of *oneg Shabbos*) the fast is observed on Sunday (the tenth of Av) to make up for the missed fast. He argues that

since this child was a minor on the ninth of Av and was not yet obligated in mitzvos, he should not be obligated to make up the missed fast on Sunday (akin to R' Nosson's argument in our Gemara with regard to one who was still a minor on *Pesach Rishon* not having to offer a *pesach sheni*).

In conclusion, however, the Divrei Malkiel decides that fasting on the tenth of Av is not viewed as a make-up fast. He argues that during the enactment of the *tisha b'Av* fast the sages originally decreed that whenever *tisha b'Av* falls on Shabbos the fast should be moved to tenth of Av. Therefore, the tenth of Av fast has its own individual status (akin to how Rebbi in our Gemara views *pesach sheni*) and is not merely a make-up fast for the ninth of Av. Hence, he concludes that one who becomes a *gadol* on the tenth of Av (which falls on Sunday) is obligated to fast.

דף צד.

היה עומד לפניו מן המודיעים ואין יכול ליכנס מפני גמלים

1] The Torah (Bamidbar 9:10-13) states that if one fails to offer the *korbon pesach* on the 14th of Nissan because he was *tamei* or בחוקה - on a distant road - he should offer a *korbon pesach* on the 14th of Iyar (*Pesach sheni*). If, however, his failure was not a result of his being *tamei* or בחוקה, he is subject to the penalty of *kares*.

The Rambam²² rules that even if one failed to offer a *pesach rishon* במזיד (deliberately or due to willful negligence) he can still spare himself from the *kares* penalty by offering a *pesach sheni*.

There is a difference, however, between one who did not bring a *pesach rishon* במזיד and one who was unavoidably prevented due to an אונס (unpreventable accident). The Rambam rules that if a person missed *pesach rishon* due to negligence and then fails to bring a *pesach sheni*, he is subject to *kares* - even if his failure [to offer the *pesach sheni*] is due to אונס. On the other hand, a person who missed *pesach rishon* due to an אונס is not subject to *kares* unless his failure to bring a *pesach sheni* is due

to מויד - delinquency (see Rebbi's opinion on 93a).

The Rambam also distinguishes between an ordinary אונס (e.g., sickness) and the אונסים delineated by the Torah, i.e., *tamei* and דרך רחוקה. If one fails to bring a *pesach rishon* due to his being *tamei* or בדרך רחוקה, he is exempt from *kares* unequivocally, even if he deliberately does not bring a *pesach sheni* (במויד). Whereas, if one misses *pesach rishon* due to other אונסים, he is subject to *kares* if he willfully neglects to bring a *pesach sheni*.

The Raavad disagrees with the Rambam's distinction between different categories of accidents. He maintains that even if one's failure to bring a *pesach rishon* was due to *tumah* or דרך רחוקה he will be subject to *kares* if he willfully neglects to bring a *pesach sheni*.

2] Ulah (93b) explains that if an individual finds himself more than a six-hour walking distance (which he says is fifteen *mil*²³) from Yerushalaim [at midday] on Erev Pesach, such that he cannot arrive [before sunset] on time to offer the *korbon pesach*, he is considered to be בדרך רחוקה - on a distant road - and is exempt from *pesach rishon*.²⁴

The Gemara (94a) says, based on an inference from a posuk, that even if the roads leading to Yerushalaim are congested with traffic, making it impossible for people to arrive on time to offer the *korbon*, everyone who is within the six-hour radius (at midday) is considered to be nearby and not בדרך רחוקה.

Now, this *halacha* requires clarification, for how can we hold one responsible for not arriving on time for the *korbon* if he was unavoidably delayed due to traffic conditions?

Rashi explains that we are referring to a case in which the traffic congestion merely made it difficult for one to travel in his wagon loaded with his entire family entourage. However, it was still possible for one to arrive on time in Yerushalaim by traveling alone without his family. The Gemara teaches that if one does not disembark from his wagon and rush to Yerushalaim, he does not qualify for the exemption of דרך רחוקה and he is subject to

kares (unless he compensates by offering a *pesach sheni*).

The Rambam²⁵ explains the Gemara differently. He says that we are indeed dealing with a situation of אונס whereby it was impossible for the individual to circumvent the traffic congestion. The Gemara is saying that although this individual was prevented by an אונס, this type of אונס does not qualify for the blanket exemption of דרך רחוקה. In such a case of אונס, one can exempt himself from *kares* by offering a *pesach sheni*, but he does not make an effort to bring a *pesach sheni* he would be subject to *kares* (see Rambam's opinion cited above).

דף צה:

אפשר ישראל שוחטין את פסחיהם ואין אומרין הלל

The Mishna (95a), in listing the similarities between the laws pertaining to *pesach rishon* and those pertaining to *pesach sheni*, states that both require the recital of *hallel* during the *shechitah*.

As for the source for this requirement the Gemara (95b, second p'shat) cites a braysoh which bases it on a סברא - logical argument. Logic dictates that *hallel* should be recited at a time when *B'nai Yisrael* are collectively involved in a mitzvah [in the Bais Hamikdash²⁶], such as during the taking of *lulav* and the slaughtering of the *korbon pesach* - אפשר ישראל שוחטין את פסחיהם ונוטלין את לולביהם ואין אומרין הלל.

The *Levi'im* were obligated to sing in the Bais Hamikdash every day during the offering of the *korbon tamid* (שיר של יום). They also were obligated to sing during the offering of the festival *korbonos* (see Arachin 10a-11b). The Mishna, Arachin 10a, includes *Pesach Rishon* and *Sheni* among the list of special days when the singing in the Bais Hamikdash was accompanied by certain musical instruments. Rashi there explains that when the Mishna mentions *Pesach Rishon* and *Sheni*, it is referring to the singing of *hallel* that was performed during the *shechitah* of the *korbon pesach*. Rashi thus indicates that *hallel* was the שיר של קרבן (song of the *korbon*, which

consisted of passages from Tehillim) that the *Levi'im* were required to sing on Erev Pesach.

The position taken by Rashi in Arachin is apparently based on a Tosefta in *Pesachim* (4:9, cited by Tosfos on 64a) which states that during the *shechitah* of the *korbon pesach* the *Levi'im* would stand at their posts and sing *hallel*. These words indicate that on Erev Pesach, *hallel* was the designated שיר של קרבן sung by the *Levi'im*.

Interestingly, Rashi above on 64a (ד"ה קראו) (את ההלל) seems to contradict himself, for there Rashi indicates that all of Klal Yisrael would sing *hallel* as they offered their *pesachim*.

The *Brisker Rav*²⁷ remarks that according to Rashi there were apparently two reasons for singing *hallel* on Erev Pesach. Firstly, the *hallel* passage was the designated שיר של קרבן for that day and therefore it was sung by the *Levi'im*, as indicated by the Tosefta (*Pesachim* 4:9, cited above). Secondly, it is logical to require the recital of *hallel* when all of *Klal Yisrael* are collectively involved in a mitzvah - as the braysoh says in our Gemara. Rashi (above on 64a) is of the opinion that based on this סברא (logic), the entire nation was obligated to recite *hallel* as they sacrificed their *pesachim* (just as everyone would sing *hallel* during the mitzvah of *lulav*).²⁸

דף צו.

פסח מצרים טעון הזאה על המשקוף

1] The Mishna, in delineating the differences between the *korbon pesach* offered in mitzraim (immediately before their departure) and the פסח דורות - *pesach* offered by all future generations, states that the act of sprinkling *pesach* blood on the doorframes (of everyone's house) was required only for the *korbon pesach* in mitzraim.

The Gemara (preceding the Mishna on 96a) cites a braysoh that says that the משקוף ובי - crossbeam and doorposts (upon which the blood was thrown in mitzraim) - served as the *mizbeach*. The Gemara infers from this braysoh that they did not have a conventional *mizbeach* on which to burn the eimurim (fats of the *korbon pesach*). Abaya remarks that in

mitzraim they evidently, roasted the eimurim on a spit over the fire.

The Meiri explains that in lieu of burning the eimurim on a conventional *mizbeach* they burned them on a spit over the fire with the intent of doing so לשם גבוה (for the sake of Hashem).

The Aruch, cited by the Rashash, disagrees and maintains that the *pesach* in mitzraim was not a conventional *korbon* and did not require הקטרת אימורים. Abaya means to say that the eimurim were roasted on a spit and they were eaten with the rest of the *korbon*.

2] One opinion in the Yerushalmi (9:5) explains that it was necessary for Hashem to specify to *B'nai Yisrael* in mitzraim that the sheep taken for the *korbon pesach* must be unblemished (even though they had already known that a *korbon* must be unblemished) because the *korbon pesach* was not a conventional *korbon*, in that there was no *mizbeach* for its blood and eimurim. According to this opinion the blood had to be sprinkled on the doorframe merely as a sign (that the home was occupied by Jews); it was not a conventional act of *zerikah*.

The Gemara in *Zevachim* 116b indicates that a *bamah* (private altar, upon which offerings were permitted during certain periods in history prior to the building of the Bais Hamikdash), as well as a *mizbeach*, must be made of material not previously used for non-sacred uses. The Kli Chemda (Sh'mos 12:22) accordingly asks why the doorframes in mitzraim qualified as a valid *mizbeach* for the sprinkling of the *korbon pesach* blood (since the doorframes presumably were used for types of non-sacred purposes).

In answer, he cites the Chasam Sofer²⁹ who asserts that, indeed, the doorframes in mitzraim did not qualify as a valid *mizbeach*. He explains that the *korbon* offered at that time was not a conventional *korbon* and the blood was applied to the doorframes merely as a sign.

The Kli Chemda points out that the Chasam Sofer's position is consistent with the Yerushalmi's view cited above. However, he notes that the Yerushalmi also cites an opposing

view that says that the doorframes in mitzraim qualified as a *mizbeach* (and it was obvious to them, without a special posuk, that they were required to take an unblemished *korbon*).

דף צז: המפריש נקבה לפסח

The Gemara on 70b derives a novel law from a posuk, that מותר פסח קרב שלמים - a leftover *korbon pesach* is offered as a *shelamim*. If one lost his *korbon pesach* and offered another in its place, and then he finds his original *korbon*, the original *korbon pesach* is offered as a *shelamim*.

The Torah stipulates that a *korbon pesach* must be brought from male goats and sheep. The Mishna (97b) says that if one designates a female animal as his *korbon pesach*, he must allow it to graze until it develops a blemish. Then he must sell it and use the proceeds to purchase a *korbon shelamim*. The basis for using the money for a *shelamim* is the above cited *halacha* of מותר פסח קרב שלמים.

An explanation, however, is required as to why the female animal must be sold. Why can't that female animal be offered as a *shelamim* (since a *korbon shelamim* can be a female)? The Gemara (98a) explains that this is based on the rule of דיחוי (rejection) mentioned in the Mishna above on 96b. If one finds his lost *korbon pesach* before he offered the replacement *korbon*, he has the option of offering whichever animal he wishes. The Mishna (96b) says that if he proceeds with the replacement *korbon*, his original *korbon* is termed דיחוי (rejected) since it was available at the time of the *shechitah* and was not used. Once a *korbon* was rejected, it may not be offered on the *mizbeach*; rather it must be left to graze until it develops a blemish. Then it is sold and its money is used for a *shelamim*.

The Gemara (98a) explains that in the case of a female pesach, the original female *korbon* is considered דיחוי. Therefore, that female animal may not be offered, but rather the proceeds from its sale are used to buy a *shelamim* (see Gemara, וכו' ש"מ תלת וכו').

The Rambam³⁰ rules, based on a Gemara in Temurah 19a, that if the female animal develops a blemish before pesach, its proceeds are used to purchase a pesach. A *shelamim* is purchased only if a blemish was not developed until after pesach (or after the owner already purchased another *korbon pesach*), cf., תוס' ד"ה המפריש.

The Dvar Shmuel asserts (based on a Gemara on 64a, כגון שהיו בעלים טמאי מתים ונדחו, (לפסח שני) that if the owner was unable to bring a *pesach rishon* (e.g., he was *tamei* on Erev Pesach or in a distant place), he could use the money of the female pesach to purchase a *pesach sheni* rather than a *shelamim*.

Moreover, he asserts that even if the owner himself does not need a *korbon pesach* (e.g., he has already purchased a *korbon* by the time the female developed a blemish), the money could be used to purchase a pesach for another individual in need of a pesach.³¹ In addition, if it develops a blemish after pesach, the money may be used to purchase a *pesach sheni* for anyone who needs one. Accordingly, the only time the money is used for a *shelamim*, rather than a pesach, is if we cannot find anyone who is in need of a *pesach sheni* (or if it first develops a blemish *after Pesach sheni*).³²

דף צח: אין מביאין קדשים לבית הפסול

R' Shimon says that if a *korbon asham* (which must be eaten only by male Kohanim and within the span of one day and a night) becomes mingled with a *shelamim* (which may be eaten even by Yisraelim and for two days and a night), both *korbonos* should be treated with the more stringent laws of an *asham* (because we cannot discern which animal is which *korbon*). Both *korbonos* must be eaten only by Kohanim and consumed within the one-day and one-night time span of an *asham*.

The Chachamim disagree and advance a principle of אין מביאין קדשים לבית הפסול which states that it is prohibited to reduce a *korbon's* consumption period, because by doing so the chance of it becoming *posul* (נותר - leftover) is increased. One may not slaughter the mingled *shelamim* and treat it as an *asham* because this

increases the possibility of its meat becoming *posul* (because now the meat cannot be eaten after one day and one night). Therefore, both animals must be allowed to graze until they develop a blemish. Then they are sold and the proceeds are used to purchase one *asham* and one *shelamim* (see Tanna Kamma, Mishna 98a).

The Gemara in Zevachim 75b applies this rule to *terumah* as well. The Gemara cites a braysoh which says that one may not purchase *terumah* with money that has the sanctity of *shvi'is* (i.e., money that was received in exchange for shmitah produce) because, as Rashi explains, that will reduce the time for eating the *terumah*. [Ordinary *terumah* has no time restrictions whereas produce purchased with *shvi'is* money must be eaten before the זמן הביעור (the time that the produce in the fields are depleted).]

Tosfos (ibid.) questions why a Kohen is permitted to bake bread with flour of *terumah* during the pre-Pesach season. By using the *terumah* flour for bread before Pesach one thereby reduces the *terumah's* consumption period and exposes it to *p'sul* because in the event the bread is not eaten by Erev Pesach it will have to be burned.

Tosfos, in answer to this question cites the Gemara in Chullin 132a which derives from a *posuk* למשחה that there is a mitzvah for the Kohanim to eat their מתנות כהונה (priestly gifts) in a royal manner and deliciously prepared e.g., roasted and with spices (למשחה, לגדולה כדרך), אוכלים שהמלכים see Al Hadaf to Zevachim דף ט"ז. Tosfos assumes that the mitzvah of למשחה pertains not only to the meat of *korbonos* but to *terumah* as well. Tosfos suggests that the mitzvah of למשחה takes precedence over the concern of מביאין קדשים לבית הפסול. Since there is a mitzvah to eat *terumah* in a tasty and royal manner, a Kohen is permitted to bake bread with *terumah* even though this increases its chances of becoming *posul* (i.e., subject to burning on Erev Pesach).

The Gemara in *Succah* 35b says that since there is a mitzvah to guard *terumah* from contact with *tumah*, it is prohibited to moisten produce of *terumah* because that makes it מוכשר

לקבל טומאה - susceptible to *tumah*. [The rule is that food is not susceptible to *tumah* until it has been moistened by water (or by one of six other liquids listed in Machshirin 6:4.) Accordingly, the Rashash (*Succah* 35b) asks why it is permissible for a Kohen to bake anything (bread, cake or even *matzah*) with *terumah* flour. By mixing the *terumah* flour with water he exposes it to the possibility of contracting *tumah* (because he renders it מוכשר לקבל טומאה).

The Chelkas Yoav³³ remarks that the answer to this question lies with the above mentioned Tosfos. Tosfos posits that the mitzvah of למשחה applies to *terumah* and it takes precedence over the concern of exposing *terumah* to the possibility of *p'sul* or *tumah*.³⁴ Thus, the reason a Kohen is not required to eat all of his *terumah* wheat in an unprocessed state (e.g. roasted) to prevent it from *tumah* susceptibility is that he has an obligation to eat *terumah* in a royal and appetizing manner (למשחה).³⁵

דף צט:

ערבי פסחים סמוך למנחה לא יאכל אדם

The Mishna says that it is forbidden for one to eat on Erev Pesach 9 hours into the day (about 3:00 p.m.). The Rashbam explains that the sages forbade eating in the late afternoon so that one should eat the *matzah* at the *sefer* with a hearty appetite.

Tosfos, citing the Gemara below on 107b, points out that the Mishna does not forbid one from eating מייני תרגימא - non-grain foods (such as fruits, vegetables, and meat) - because these foods are not filling.

Also, the Mishna cannot be referring to bread and cake (*chametz*) because the deadline for eating *chametz* is one hour before midday - which is much before 9 hours into the day.

The Mishna also cannot be referring to *matzah*, says Tosfos, because the Yerushalmi forbids eating *matzah* the entire day of Erev Pesach.³⁶ Consequently, Tosfos wonders which foods the Mishna is referring to.

The Rambam³⁷ says that although the Gemara on 107b permits the eating of non-grain

foods all afternoon, they may be eaten only in small quantities. Our Mishna teaches that eating large quantities of such foods late in the afternoon on Erev Pesach can ruin one's appetite for *matzah* and is forbidden.

Alternatively, Tosfos answers that the Mishna is referring to מצה עשירה (enriched *matzah*, i.e., *matzah* kneaded with fruit juices or eggs). The Yerushalmi's prohibition against eating *matzah* on Erev Pesach pertains only to the type of *matzah* which is valid for *matzos-mitzvah* at the *sefer*. Since the Gemara (above on 36a, see Al Hadaf ל"ז ל"ד) disqualifies enriched *matzos* for *matzos-mitzvah*, one may eat them on Erev Pesach (until the mid-afternoon). The Mishna teaches that one must desist from eating egg *matzah* at (about) 3:00 p.m. on Erev Pesach so that he does not ruin his appetite for the *sefer*.³⁸

Some authorities forbid eating egg *matzah* on Pesach because they are of the opinion that eggs and fruit juices can expedite the leavening process. The Ramoh³⁹ writes that our minhag is to refrain from eating egg *matzos* on Pesach in accordance with the stringent opinions, except when necessary for the elderly and frail who cannot digest regular *matzos*.

The Noda B'Yehuda⁴⁰ maintains that even if one conducts himself stringently and refrains from eating egg *matzos* on Pesach, he may eat them on Erev Pesach (until 9 hours into the day). Even though one must desist from eating ordinary *chametz* one hour before midday, since the *kares* penalty for *chametz* only applies to one who eats *chametz* on Pesach after nightfall, there are grounds for leniency on Erev Pesach regarding egg *matzah* and other non-genuine forms of *chametz*. Indeed, the Aruch Hashulchan⁴¹ writes that the minhag of the Ramoh to refrain from egg *matzoh* only applies to Pesach itself (after nightfall), but not to Erev Pesach in the (early) afternoon.

Other authorities⁴² disagree and forbid eating egg *matzah* on Erev Pesach after the סוף סוף - *chametz* deadline. The T'shuvos Shoel U'Meishiv⁴³ testifies that this was the minhag in his region - to refrain from

eating egg *matzah* on Erev Pesach after the *chametz* deadline.

דף ק:

אין מביאין את השולחן אלא א"כ קידוש

The braysoh says that on Shabbos, one's table should not be brought into the dining area until after *kiddush*. If the table was mistakenly brought in before *kiddush*, a covering should be placed over it [until after *kiddush*].

Different reasons are given for this custom:

(a) The Rashbam and Tosfos explain that after *kiddush* they would bring in a fully-set table because that demonstrated כבוד שבת - honor of Shabbos. The Rashbam notes that today, however, the custom is to set the table before *kiddush* and, in conformance with the teaching of the braysoh, the *challah* is kept covered until after *kiddush*.

Tosfos explains why the custom changed over the generations. In Talmudic times each person would eat on his own small table and therefore it was not impractical to wait until after *kiddush* to bring in the small tables. In later generations when it became customary to eat together on one large table, it was no longer practical to carry in the table after *kiddush* and therefore this practice was discontinued. Instead, the table is set before *kiddush* and the *challos* are kept covered until after *kiddush*.⁴⁴

(b) The Mordechai points out that the above cited reason applies only to the Friday night meal, in that we want to demonstrate that the food is being served exclusively in honor of Shabbos (and is not leftovers from a weekday meal). This reason doesn't apply to the Shabbos daytime meals.

He advances a different reason as to why we cover the *challah*. The posuk (Devarim 8:8), in listing the שבעת המינים (seven special foods of Eretz Yisrael), lists wheat and barley before grapes, thus indicating that bread is more significant than wine (see Berachos 41a, כל המוקדם בפסוק קודם לברכה). Therefore, the bread is liable to feel slighted, so to speak, during *kiddush* when it senses that it was overlooked for the sake of wine. We cover the *challos* during *kiddush* to spare them this humiliation, as it were.⁴⁵

(c) The Chasam Sofer notes that the above cited reasons do not apply to the third Shabbos meal (sholosh seudos) because we do not recite *kiddush* at that meal. He says, however, that we cover the *challos* even at *sholosh seudos* because of the reason given by the Sh'iltos (cited by Tosfos, ד"ה שאין). The Sh'iltos suggests that covering the *challos* commemorates the manna which had a covering. [The two *challos* used on Shabbos represent the double portion of manna that fell on *Erev Shabbos*, so that no manna would fall on Shabbos.] Dew would gather and cover the ground before the manna would fall and the manna would then settle on the dew. Then another layer of dew would settle above the manna so that it would be enclosed from the top as well as from the bottom. To commemorate this we place a covering over the top of the *challos* as well as something beneath them (i.e., a tablecloth).⁴⁶

- The Chayai Odam⁴⁷ says that the Sh'iltos's reason has ramifications even regarding the first two Shabbos meals. If not for the reason of the Sh'iltos, it would be permitted to remove the *challah*-cover immediately after *kiddush*. However, according to the Sh'iltos the *challos* should remain covered until the *bracha* of *hamotzei* is recited, just as the manna was covered with dew until the time it was eaten.⁴⁸

דף קא.

אמר שמואל אין קידוש אלא במקום סעודה

The *halacha*⁴⁹ follows Shmuel who asserts, *kiddush* is valid only if it is recited in the place of the meal. The Gemara proves that moving from one place to another, even within the same house, constitutes a change of place and invalidates one's *kiddush*.

The *halacha*⁵⁰ follows Tosfos (ד"ה אבל) who qualifies this *halacha*, as follows:

(a) Only moving from room to room is forbidden (between *kiddush* and the meal), but moving after *kiddush* from one corner to another in the same room does not disqualify one's *kiddush*.

(b) If one recited *kiddush* with the express intent to eat the meal in another room of the same house, the *kiddush* is valid. [However, intent to eat at another location in another house is not effective.]

The Mordechai adds that moving from one's house after *kiddush* **to his succah** does not invalidate his *kiddush* (cf., Yerushalmi cited by Tosfos on 100b, ד"ה שאין). However, there are several views regarding the extent of this leniency:

(a) The Magen Avraham says that this leniency applies only to a *succah* that is inside a house (which has a removable roof) whereby the only separation between one's dining room and his *succah* is the *succah* walls. The Mordechai teaches that since *succah* walls are only temporary they are not as significant as standard walls. Going from the *succah* to the dining room is akin to going from one corner of a room to another (and does not disqualify the *kiddush* even if one did not originally intend to move). If the *succah* is outside (e.g., on the porch) then it is considered as an individual room and moving between the house and the *succah* would disqualify one's *kiddush* (unless he originally had in mind to move when he recited *kiddush*).

(b) The Chasam Sofer asserts that *succah* walls, even if they are temporary, are more significant than ordinary house walls because of the fact that they serve to validate one's *succah*. [See *Succah* 7a, מיגו דהוי דופן לסוכה הוי דופן לשבת.] Accordingly, he maintains that the *halacha* of the Mordechai applies only to one who eats in his *succah* after succos (e.g., on Shemini Atzeres) However, moving from one's dining room to his *succah* during the seven days of succos will invalidate his *kiddush* (even if the *succah* is inside the house).⁵¹

(c) The Levush maintains that this leniency applies even to a *succah* that is on one's porch even though it is an individual room. He explains that since one is obligated to eat in the *succah* it is considered as though he initially had in mind to eat there when he recited *kiddush*. [This *halacha* is relevant if it is raining and one recited *kiddush* in the house

without thinking about eating in the *succah*. If it stops raining after *kiddush*, according to the Levush one need not repeat *kiddush* upon going to the *succah* for his meal because it is considered as though he initially intended to do so.]⁵²

דף קב:

יום טוב שחל להיות אחר השבת

1] When Yom Tov falls on Sunday (i.e., Saturday night), *havdalah* (which is recited in honor of the departing Shabbos) is incorporated in the Yom Tov *kiddush*. The Yom Tov *kiddush* consists of three *berachos*; (a) , שהחינו , (b) , מקדש ישראל והזמנים (c) and , הגפן and *havdalah* consists of two *berachos*; (a) . [The *havdalah* and (b) מאורי האש . [The *havdalah* *bracha* recited on *Motzo'ei Shabbos* that falls on Yom Tov eve concludes with . - Blessed are You, Hashem Who לקודש separates between holiness and holiness - in contrast to the standard *havdalah* which - Who concludes with separates between holy and non-holy.] The Gemara cites a dispute between Rava and Abaya as to the proper order of these *berachos*.

The Rashbam (סוד"ה ושמואל) notes that the *bracha* over spices (בורא מיני בשמים), which is included in an ordinary *havdalah* service, is not mentioned here. He explains the reason we sniff fragrant spices after Shabbos is to comfort ourselves for the loss of our נשמה יתירה (added *neshama*, or heightened spiritual perception) which departs after Shabbos. The Rashbam explains that this is not necessary when Yom Tov falls on *Motzo'ei Shabbos* because the *neshama yeseirah* remains for Yom Tov as well.

Tosfos disagrees and maintains that we are given a *neshama yeseirah* only on Shabbos, but not on Yom Tov. He argues that if indeed, there is a *neshama yeseirah* on Yom Tov, we should sniff spices during the *havdalah* recited after Yom Tov.

The Sefas Emes,⁵³ in defense of the Rashbam, explains that although we are given a *neshama yeseirah* on Yom Tov, it does not depart immediately after Yom Tov (as does the *neshama yeseirah* of Shabbos). He explains

that there is a fundamental difference between the sanctity of Shabbos and that of Yom Tov. The sanctity of Shabbos began at creation, before the birth of *Klal Yisrael*, and comes only from Hashem. On the other hand, Yom Tov sanctity derives from *Klal Yisrael* as indicated by the blessing, מקדש ישראל והזמנים (Hashem sanctifies Yisrael who in turn sanctifies the festivals). The Sefas Emes postulates that the *neshama yeseirah* which we acquire through the sanctity of Yom Tov lingers even after Yom Tov, because it is a result of our personal effort. Something acquired through one's own efforts does not depart as quickly as a gift.

2] Tosfos, who maintains that we do not have a *neshama yeseirah* on Yom Tov, explains that sniffing spices on *Motzo'ei Shabbos* that falls on Yom Tov is not necessary because the festivity of Yom Tov and the Yom Tov delicacies are sufficient to comfort us for the loss of our *neshama yeseirah*.

Alternatively, the Ran⁵⁴ explains that the reason for smelling spices after Shabbos is to help comfort one for the depressing thought of having to return to work after a restful Shabbos.⁵⁵ Since work, for the most part, is forbidden on Yom Tov, we do not need consolation when *Motzo'ei Shabbos* falls on Yom Tov. Also, there is no need for spices at the conclusion of Yom Tov because the shift from Yom Tov to the work-week is gradual since a measure of work is permitted even on Yom Tov (e.g., cooking and carrying for the sake of Yom Tov).

דף קג:

אבוקה להבדלה מצוה מן המובחר

Rava says that it is preferable to perform *havdalah* with an אבוקה - torch (made of several wicks) - rather than with a candle with a single wick. The Ran explains that this is because the text of the *bracha* reads, מאורי בורא - Blessed...Who creates lights of the flame. The Ran explains that the plural term מאורי refers to the many lights (colors) of a flame. Since the various colors of a flame are more

noticeable in a torch, it is preferable to recite the *bracha* מאורי האש with a torch.

The Magen Avraham⁵⁶ maintains that if one uses two individual candles for *havdalah*, he must adjoin them so that their fires form one large flame.

R' Akiva Eiger,⁵⁷ citing the Orach Meishor, asserts that two individual candles are considered an אבוקה even if their flames do not touch.⁵⁸

As we learned above, when Yom Tov falls on *Motzo'ei Shabbos*, *havdalah* (and the *bracha* on fire) is incorporated in the Yom Tov *kiddush*. The Elef HaMagen⁵⁹ writes that although we do not kindle a special *havdalah* torch on Yom Tov,⁶⁰ one should adjoin two Yom Tov candles when reciting the *bracha* מאורי האש (during the Yom Tov *kiddush*) so as to conform with Rava's requirement of a *havdalah* torch.

Some authorities,⁶¹ however, do not permit adjoining two candles on Yom Tov (because disengaging the two flames might constitute a melacha of כיבוי - extinguishing - which is forbidden on Yom Tov). They maintain that when Yom Tov falls on *Motzo'ei Shabbos*, *havdalah* should be recited on two separate candles.

דף קד:

ברכה הסמוכה לחבירתה אינו פותח בברוך

The Gemara says that generally berachos begin with ברוך אתה ה' and conclude with ברוך ה' אתה... (e.g., the first *bracha* of *sh'moneh esray*.) There are, however, many exceptions.

One group of exceptions consists of short berachos, such as those recited before eating and before performing a mitzvah (e.g., בורא פרי, ועץ, על מצות תפילין and וכו', but do not conclude with ברוך, וכו'.

Another category of exceptions is called *bracha* that directly follows another *bracha* (e.g., all the berachos of *sh'moneh esray* except the first).

The Rashbam explains that the ברוך אתה ה' recited at the beginning of the first blessing functions on behalf of the subsequent berachos.

Alternatively, Tosfos says that the ברוך אתה ה' recited at the end of each *bracha* fulfills the need of having to begin the following *bracha* with ברוך.⁶²

Tosfos (ד"ה כל הברכות) asks why *tefillas haderech* (the *bracha* recited by a traveller on the road) does not begin with ברוך אתה (but rather with יהי רצון וכו',). Tosfos answers that the text of *tefillas haderech* does not conform with the rules of a standard *bracha* because it is a "prayer" rather than a blessing.⁶³

The Maharam of Rothenburg disagrees and is of the opinion that *tefillas haderech* should conform with the rules of a standard *bracha*. The Tur⁶⁴ writes that on a day that the Maharam of Rothenburg planned to take a trip he would recite *tefillas haderech* during his morning prayers after concluding ברוך אתה ה' הגומל (ברכת השחר טובים וכו' חסדים טובים וכו'). He did this because *tefillas haderech* does not begin with ברוך אתה and he therefore wanted to recite it in the context of a ברכה הסמוכה לחבירתה.

The Prisha⁶⁵ suggests that the concept of סמוכה לחבירתה applies only to berachos that follow in a logical sequence, not to unaffiliated berachos that happened to have been recited next to each other. He explains that the Maharam would recite *tefillas haderech* specifically after ברוך.. הגומל חסדים (blessed are You, Hashem who performs benevolent deeds etc.) because one of Hashem's חסדים (benevolent deeds) is rescuing travellers from misfortunes on the road (which is the theme of *tefillas haderech*).⁶⁶

The Kol Bo,⁶⁷ however, says that the Maharam would recite *tefillas haderech* following other berachos as well, such as after the *bracha* ברוך...הנותן לשכוי בינה וכו', even though there is no connecting theme.⁶⁸

[The Magen Avraham⁶⁹ points out that the proper time to recite *tefillas haderech* is after one takes to the road. He explains that the Maharam would recite *tefillas haderech* following ברכות השחר only when he travelled early in the morning and ברכות השחר was recited while he was already on the road. (If he travelled later in the day, he would recite *tefillas*

haderech following another *bracha*, as the Kol Bo says.)^{70]}

The Mishna Berurah⁷¹ rules that, whenever possible, one should try to recite *tefillas haderech* right after another *bracha* - in conformance with the Maharam. One suggestion he gives is to eat a snack, such as a fruit, then recite *tefillas haderech* right after the *bracha* acharona (i.e., borei nefashos).⁷²

The Chasam Sofer⁷³ relates that his teacher (R' Nosson Adler) would recite *tefillas haderech* after reciting a *bracha* on spices (בורא מיני בשמים). The Chasam Sofer remarks, however, that this practice is not prevalent because after reciting the *bracha* on spices one must immediately smell them. The act of smelling constitutes a הפסק - interruption - between the *bracha* on the spices and the ensuing *tefillas haderech* (and consequently, it is not considered a ברכה הסמוכה לחברתה).⁷⁴

דף קה.

מי שלא קידש בער"ש מקדש והולך כל היום

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak asserts that if one did not recite *kiddush* on Friday night he may recite the nighttime *bracha* השבת מקדש the next day. [The Bais Yosef,⁷⁵ citing Tosfos, says that the opening passage of השמים ויכולו השמים is omitted during the day.]

Rav Amram Gaon⁷⁶ maintains that the opportunity to make up for the missed Friday night *kiddush* is granted only to one who missed *kiddush* due to אונס (an unavoidable accident) or שוגג (forgetfulness), but not to one who willfully disregarded *kiddush* at night (מזיד).

The Rambam⁷⁷ disagrees and is of the opinion that a person may recite *kiddush* during the daytime even if he deliberately skipped *kiddush* at night.

The Bach explains the essence of this dispute:

Rav Amram Gaon is of the opinion that Friday night is the designated זמן קידוש - time for *kiddush* (i.e., the *bracha* השבת מקדש). If one fails to perform the mitzvah of *kiddush* at its proper time, the sages enacted that one may compensate (תשלומין) for the missed *kiddush* anytime throughout the entire Shabbos. The

תפילת תשלומין (make-up *sh'moneh esray*) for one who fails to daven. The *halacha* is that if one fails to daven maariv (for example) due to an accident or mistake (בשוגג), he davens a make-up *sh'moneh esray* in the morning (after *shacharis*). However, if one deliberately misses a *tefillah* he cannot compensate for it later. Similarly, if one deliberately misses *kiddush* at night he is not able to compensate for it during the daytime.

The Rambam, on the other hand, is of the opinion that the זמן קידוש - designated time for *kiddush* - is the entire Shabbos, not just Friday night. Although it is preferable to recite *kiddush* at the onset of Shabbos so as not to delay a mitzvah (זריזין מקדימין למצוות), one may recite *kiddush* until the end of the זמן קידוש (which is the end of Shabbos) even if he purposely delayed it.⁷⁸

• Interestingly, the Maharsham⁷⁹ says that one who misses *kiddush* at night should recite *kiddush* twice in the morning, just as one who misses maariv at night recites two *sh'moneh esrays* in the morning. First one recites the standard *shacharis tefillah* and then he recites another *sh'moneh esray* as the make-up *tefillah* for maariv. The Maharsham (who assumes that the nighttime *kiddush* that one recites in the morning is תשלומין) asserts that regarding *kiddush* too, first, one should recite the morning *kiddush* (which consists of only בורא פרי הגפן) and he should eat some cake. Afterwards, he should recite the *bracha* השבת מקדש to make up for the missed nighttime *kiddush*.

The Kaf Hachaim⁸⁰ disagrees and maintains that one who missed *kiddush* at night recites *kiddush* only once during the day and the single *kiddush* suffices for both obligations (night *kiddush* and day *kiddush*).⁸¹

דף קו.

מי שלא הבדיל במוצ"ש

The Gemara says that if one did not recite *havdalah* on *Motzo'ei Shabbos*, he may recite it on Sunday, Monday or Tuesday.

A mourner (one who loses one of his seven closest relatives) is called an אונן prior to the

burial of his deceased relative and he is exempt from the performance of all (positive) mitzvos. If one is an אונן on *Motzo'ei Shabbos*, he is permitted to eat without first reciting [or hearing] *havdalah* because he is exempt from *havdalah*.

R' Meir of Nuremburg⁸² asserts, however, that the mourner is obligated to recite *havdalah* when he returns home from the burial on Sunday, because, as our Gemara says, one who fails to recite *havdalah* on *Motzo'ei Shabbos* should recite it during the first half of the week.

The Rosh⁸³ disagrees, arguing that our Gemara's *halacha* pertains only to one who was obligated to recite *havdalah* on *Motzo'ei Shabbos* but was unable to because of an אונס (e.g., he had no wine). However, an אונן who was exempt from all mitzvos on *Motzo'ei Shabbos* should not recite *havdalah* on Sunday.

The Maharam Shick⁸⁴ suggests that this dispute is fundamentally the same as the dispute between R' Amram Gaon and the Rambam regarding *kiddush* (mentioned above).

According to the Rosh, *Motzo'ei Shabbos* was designated as the עיקר זמן הבדלה - the main time for *havdalah*. Reciting *havdalah* later in the week comes under the category of תשלומין (compensation). Indeed, the words of the Rosh indicate that reciting *havdalah* on Sunday was instituted only for one who missed the original *havdalah* obligation due to an אונס (as opposed to מזיד). The Rosh, consequently, is of the opinion that one who was exempt from *havdalah* on *Motzo'ei Shabbos* need not recite *havdalah* on Sunday because one who was exempt from the principal mitzvah does not require compensation (see similar *halacha* above on צג דף).

On the other hand, R' Meir of Nuremburg, is of the opinion that the *zman havdalah* extends throughout the first half of the week and the obligation to recite it on *Motzo'ei Shabbos* is merely because mitzvos should not be needlessly delayed (זריזין מקדימין). Therefore, he requires the mourner to recite *havdalah* on Sunday after the burial.⁸⁵ ■

15 וצ"ע מלקמן ריש דף צה. דמרבין פסח שני למצות אכילת מצה שהוא מצוה שבא מחמת הפסח ("מצוה שעל גופו") אבל לא מרבין השבת שאור (ע"ש ברש"י סו"ד"ה במצות), וע"ש בשפת אמת דמבאר דה"ט משום דא"כ לאו שלא ישחט פסח (ראשון) על החמץ מ"מ כיון דהשבת שאור אינו מעכב בקיום מצות אכילת פסח לא מיקרי מצוה שעל גופו, אולם נשאר שם בצ"ע על שיטת הרמב"ם דס"ל דגם מצוה אכילת מצה אינו מעכב מצות אכילת קרי"פ.

דף צב
16 ועי' ברש"י שם ביבמות דף עא: דמבאר דכל האוקימתות שם ביבמות (כגון דכאבי ליה עניה ואיתפח בשעת אכילה או אביו ואמו חבוטין בבית אסורין ויצאו בלילה) מיירי דכבר נעשה ראוי למילה בעוד יום דאילו בלילה א"א למולו.
17 הל' קרי"פ פ"ט ה"ט.
18 ע"ע מש"כ בזה הדבר שמואל.
דף צג
19 פ"ה מהל' קרי"פ ה"ז.
20 ע"ש בכס"מ בשם הר"י קורקיס, ועי' בח"י ר' חיים על הר"מ שם, ועי' מנח"ח מצוה ה' אות ה' (וע"ע בספר "דף על הדף" בשם "קובץ כבוד חכמים" עטרת פז עמוד רס"ד).
21 חלק ה' סימן ק"ל (מובא בשמ"ב).

דף צד
22 פ"ד מהל' קרי"פ ה"ב (ע"ש בראב"ד שחולק וס"ל דקיי"ל כ"י נתן דס"ל דמי שנאנס או שנג בראשון פטר מכרת אפי' אי הזיד בשני, וע"ע בצל"ח שהבין בדעת רש"י דאפי' לדברי רבי אם הזיד בראשון לעולם חייב כרת וא"א לתקנו בשני [ורק ר' חנניא בן עקיבא ספר דבני תקנתא דראשון] ועי' רש"י שחולק על הצל"ח בזה).
23 עולא ס"ל שאדם יכול להלך ל' מיל מנח' החמה עד שקח"ח, ולפ"ז נמצא דס"ל דשיעור זמן מיל הוא כ"ד דקות, ועי' בדף צד. דאיתותיב עולא, ולפי פירש"י שם יכול אדם להלך קצת יותר מ' מיל והיינו ל"ב מיל ביום (ולפ"ז מיל הוא קצת יותר מכ"ב דקות), אולם אנו קיי"ל דיכול אדם להלך מ' מיל ביום, עי' ביאור הגר"א אור"ח סימן תנט-ב, ולפי חשבון זה נמצא דמיל הוא י"ח דקות.
24 רש"י ס"ל דדרך רחוקה תלוי במקומו בחצות היום, דפטור של דרך רחוקה נאמר על מי שהוא יותר מ' מיל חוץ לירושלים בחצות היום בער"פ כיון שא"א לו להגיע לירושלים לפני שקח"ח שהוא סוף זמן שחיטת הקרבן, ואילו הרמב"ם כתב בפ"ה מהל' קרי"פ ה"ח דמי שרחוק יותר מ' מיל עם עליית השמש מיקרי דרך רחוקה כיון שא"א להגיע לירושלים בתחילת זמן שחיטה (ונסתפקתי במי שהיה תוך ט"ו מיל בבוקר ואח"כ הרחיק עצמו מירושלים עד שהיה בחצות היום יותר מ' מיל חוץ לירושלים, דלרש"י ודאי פטור משום דרך רחוקה ואילו להרמב"ם י"ל שהוא חייב, ושוב מצאתי בירושלמי פ"ט ה"ב דילוף מקרא דפטור כה"ג, ולכא"ו צ"ע, ועי' חזון יחזקאל על גמ' פסחים דף צג: שרוב"ה להשותת הרמב"ם לדעת רש"י, ע"ש וצ"ב).
25 פ"ה מהל' קרי"פ ה"ט, ע"ש בראב"ד ובכס"מ.

דף צה
26 ז"ל רש"י ד"ה אפשר - כיון דדבר מצוה הוא טעון הלל, ועי' במאירי שכי' ושניהם טעונים הלל שלא רצו למעט בשמחת העזרה (משמע דסברא זו על חיוב הלל לא שייך אלא על מצוות הנעשין בעזרה), אולם מבואר לקמן דף קיז. דסברא זו שייך

דף פח

1 עי' ח"י מרן ר"י"ז על הרמב"ם הל' קרי"פ (עמוד נ"ב) שמדייק מדברי רש"י בזבחים סוף דף נב: ד"ה שלא למנוי דפי' מינוי היינו קנין ובעלות ממון בהקרבתו, ועי' בשו"ת זרע אברהם סימן ו' סק"ט בשם הירושלמי דלא בעינן קנין אלא מינוי בעלמא (ועוד הביא שם ד"ר יהודה בסוכה דף מ"ב ס"ל דאין ממנין קטן על פסחו א"כ יכול לברר אכילתו כיצד נותנין לו צרור וזורקו, משמע קצת דס"ל לר"י דבעינן קנין, ורבנן שם דחולק על ר"י ס"ל דלא בעינן קנין.
2 הלכות קרי"פ פ"ט ה"ז.
3 בח"י ר' חיים הלוי הלכות קרי"פ פ"ה ה"ז בד"ה אלא [במצוה ריבועים] שהק' לפ"ז יאה מותר הקטן לאכול מכל קרבן שירצה, ובמנתי' ובברייתא משמע דצריך לאכול דוקא מקרבן אביו או מקרבן אפטרופס, ונשאר בצ"ע על תוס'.
4 ועי' במנח"ח מצוה ה' שהק' מהא דאיתא בגי' דף כט. דאין חייב לחנך בתו ואילו בברייתא תנינא דאדם שוחט גם ע"י בתו ורש"י ותוס' כתב דהוא משום מצות חינוך, ועי' מה שתי' בדבר שמואל כאן (וע"ע מה שמציין השמ"ב כאן בענין כל היכי שיש צד חינוך אין חוששין לצד עבירה שבו).
5 כתבי הגר"י"ז כרך ב' עמוד רנ"ד בדין מינוי קטן לקרבן פסח.
6 נראה שר"ל דלפי רש"י האיסור שלא למנוי אינו אלא ביטול מצות עשה ולכך לא שייך אלא על הראוי לקיים העשה (כעין מש"כ המרדכי לענין אנוס על קיום מצות ציצית כגון בשבת, דמותר לו ללבוש בגד ד' כנפות בלי ציצית), משא"כ להראב"ד שיש לאו נוספת של תושב ושכיר לא יאכל בו שייך האיסור אפי' לקטנים.
7 [ודע דבעיקר פ"י שה לבית אב, ושה לבית אב לאו דא"ו כנראה שיש פלוגתא בין ר"ן ותוס' שנגרדים שם ותוס' כאן ורש"י שם בנגרדים, וע"ע תוס' בגיטין דף סד: ד"ה שאני, עי' במהרי"ט שאר שהרגיש בזה, ועי' אח"י ר' חיים הנ"ל בפ"ה מהל' קרי"פ.

דף פט

8 ח"י ר"י"ז על הרמב"ם הל' קרבן פסח ד"ה זבחים.
9 סימן י' אות ט'.
10 ר"ל לכא"ו שייכון הבעלים שיהא קרבנו מכפר בעד כל המנויין ולזה לא בעינן קנין ממון (כדמבאר הגר"י"ז שם, דשם פעלים לכפרה דמצינו בשאר קרבנות אינו קנין ממון), וכן נקט החזו"ן כאן עמ"ש פסחים (סימן כ"ד סוף דף פח: ד"ה שם במ"י של) דלא בעינן זכית ממון בקרי"פ אלא שיעשה בעלים על הקרבן, וע"ע מש"כ החזו"ן שם בעמוד רי: ד"ה אח"כ מצאתי.
11 [נ"ש לדון אי שייך למנות חברו על חלקו אם אין לו קנין בהקרבתו (עי' חקירה הנ"ל בעל הדף), או דילמא כ"א מהמתכפרים יש להן כח למנות מתכפר אחר עמו בחלקו (וע"ע תוס' סוף דף פט: וז"ל על דעת כן מקדישו שיצאו כל אשר ימנה עליהם).
12 לשומר בדבריו דאע"ג דיז לכולם קנין בהקרבתו (כמש"כ הגר"י"ז) מ"מ יכולים הבעלים לומר דלא היה דעתו להקנות להן יותר מחלק הנצרכת לצאת ידי חובת קרי"פ, אולם ע"ש בסופו דמסיים דאולי אין יכול להמנות אחרים אם א"כ יגיע לכו"ל מנה המספקת שיהא הפסח נאכל על השובע.

דף צ

13 הל' קרי"פ פ"ה ה"ב, וכ"כ תוס' זבחים דף נו: ד"ה הפסח.
14 סימן ט', מובא בגליוני הש"ס כאן (ובש"מ).

47) מבוא במשני"ב סימן רע"א ס"ק מ"א וע"ש ש' בשם הפרמ"ג שחולק וסי"ל דלכל הטעמים אי"צ שיהא מכוסה אלא עד גמר הקידוש.
48) ועוד נפ"מ לכאוי בהא דכ"י הלקט יושר (מובא בח"א) דסגי בפרוסת מפה רק לפני המקדש, וכי הדבר שמואל דלכאוי היינו דוקא לפי טעם הירושלמי, אבל לפי השאלות צריך כ"א מהמסובין לכסות חלותיהם.
דף קא (49) סימן רע"ג ס"א.
50) כל הפרוסים לא נקטו כן.
51) ע"י מחצ"יש סימן רע"ג ס"ב, ועי' ביה"ל שם שהביא בשם כמה אחרונים דמחמירין אפי' בסוכה שבתוך הבית (דאסור א"כ היה דעת מעיקרא) ועי' משני"ב שם ס"ה מה שפסק בענין זה.
דף קב (53) מובא בדבר שמואל.
54) חידושי הר"ן ריש דף קג.
55) לפי הר"ן הבשמים באים משום שיוצאים ממנוחה שלימה לעמל גדול וצריכים משום זה הנחת נפש בבשמים (ומשמע דאין הטעם בשמים משום הפסד נשמה יתירה, אולם עי' שו"ת הרשב"א ח"א סימן ר"צ ש' בשם יש מפרשים **דנשמה יתירה היינו המנוחה והעונג** שהנפש מוצאה בשבת **כאלו** היא נשמה יתירה עכ"ל, ועי' שפ"ר משני"ב ח"א סימן ר"ע, ועי' בדברי רש"י בבליצה דף טז. ובתניית דף כז: דמשמע ענין משי"כ תש"י הרשב"א (ועד"ן צריך עיון בזה).
דף קג
56) סימן רצ"ח סק"ד (ע"ש משי"כ בבואר שקליא וטריא בסוגין וכעין זה במרדכי כאן).
57) בהג"ז על שו"ע שם.
58) עי' דבר שמואל כאן שר"ל דהאורח מישר ס"ל דהטעם לאבוקה אינו כמשי"כ הר"ן אלא כמו ש' השי"מ בברכות בשם הראב"ד דלשון מאורי היינו שיש בו הרבה הנאות וענין זה שייך אפי' בנרות יחידים.
59) על ספר "מטה אפרים" סימן ת"ר סק"ג.
60) עי' שמירת שבת כהלכתה ח"ב סימן ס"ב הנהגה ל"א שהביא בשם ר' שלמה זלמן ז"ל שחקר האם מותר להדליק אבוקה לצורך הידור של אבוקה בהבדלה.
61) עי' שם בששי"כ הערה ל"ב בשם מהנהגה בית הגר"ז בסוף שו"ע הגר"ז ח"ד "סדר הגדה של פסח" סוף עמוד נ.
דף קד
62) עי' דבר שמואל שהביא טעם שלישית על פי רבינו יונה ותוס' הרא"ש בברכות (דף מו.) דס"ל דעל ברכה באמצע הענין מעולם לא תיקנו חז"ל שצריך לפתוח בברוך (ולא משום שהבידור אתה"ל של הברכה ראשונה פוטר השני).
63) והוסף התוס' בברכות מו: ד"ה כל - וי"מ חותמין בה בברוך והואיל וארוכה קצת עכ"ל.
64) סימן ק"י (וכן בשו"ע שם ס"ו).
65) שם סק"ח.
66) וכן משמע בבואר הגר"א סימן ד' סק"ג ש' דסומכין ברכת אשר יצר לאלקי נשמה דיש להן שייכות אחדו.
67) מובא שם בב"י (וכן מדייק הפרישה בדבריו).
68) מובא בדברי הח"ב בו דגם ברכה הבאה אחר ברכה קצרה מיקרי סמוכה לחבירתא אע"ג דאינו חותמת בברוך (וכן מובא בתוס' כאן ד"ה חוף), אולם עי' במשני"ב סימן מ"ז ס"ק י"א דמצד דברכה הבאה אחר ברכה קצרה צריך לפתוח בברוך (עי' הלחן בהערה 11).
69) שם ס"ק י"א.
70) וכן מסיק הפרישה שם.
71) שם ס"ק י"ח.
72) (או אחר "אשר יצר") וראיתי מקשים דנראין דברי המשני"ב כאילו סותרין זא"זו שהרי ברכת בורא נפשות היו כברכה קצרה כיון שאינו חותמת בברוך ולעיל בסימן מ"ז ס"ק י"א (מובא לעיל בהערות) כ"י דאין סומכין לברכה קצרה, ותי' השי"ת השדה ס"י ק"י ט"ו (מובא בספר "אשר יצר" פרק נ' ס"ק י"ד) דמה שאין סומכין לברכה קצרה משום שלא יהא נראה כברכה אחת, וזה לא שייך בבואר נפשות כיון דמסיים ברוך חי העולמים תו לא נראה כברכה אחת.
73) בהג"ז על שו"ע בסימן ק"י.
74) והיינו טעמא שאין מסמיכין אותו לברכה ראשונה על אכילה כיון דמעשה אכילה הוא הפסק (ועי' בברכת אברהם שמתאריך בענין ברכה הסמוכה לחבירתא).
דף קה
75) סימן רע"א בשם ארחות חיים בשם תוס', וכ"כ הרמ"א שם בסעף ח'.
76) בסידורו ח"ב ס"י ט"ו, מובא בטור סימן רע"א.
77) פרק כ"ט מהל' שבת ה"ד, וכך פסק הטו"ש סימן רע"א ס"ח בשמו.
78) עי' שאלות דר' אחאי גאון שאילתא קס"י דחקר אי זמן קידוש מן התורה דוקא בכניסתו ומסיק שם דשבת אמר רחמנא ליש ימנא ליש לילה (מבואר בהרמב"ם דאין דין תשלומין אלא זמנה מדאין כל היום).
79) דעת תורה על שו"ע או"ח סימן רע"א ס"ח.
80) סימן רע"א אות נ'.
81) עי' משי"כ לבאר הפלוגתא בספר "אבני חושן" (על ענין קידוש) סימן י"ד.
דף קי
82) מובא ברא"ש פרק ג' דברכות סימן ב'.
83) שם.
84) שו"ת חלק יו"ד סימן שמו"א.
85) אולם עי' שנטאר בצ"ע על פסק השו"ע דביו"ד ס' ש"מ"א פסק כמהר"ם דאונן מבדיל עד יום ג' וי"מ באו"ח סימן רצ"ט העתיק לשון הטור והרא"ש דדוקא בשוגג ואונס יש להבדלה תשלומין, ועוד הקי' שם על דברי הטור דמחלק בין קידוש (דמקדשין ביום אפי' במזיד) להבדלה (דאין מבדילין אחר מוציא שבת אלא בשוגג) דאי"כ האידן פשט הגמ"י בדף ק"ה סוף ע"א קידוש מהבדלה, ועי' שו"ת חת"ס או"ח סימן י"ז משי"כ בזה קח: משי"כ בזה

אפי' קודם בנין המקדש (אם לא שנאמר דנטלו לולביון בנוב וגבעון במקום המבוקש דמבוקש גודלה שהיה שם, וצריך לעיין אם היה שם דין לפני ה') ואולי כוונת המאירי דמזות לולב חשוב יותר (אפי' שלא במקדש) כיון שמצותו במקדש (עי' תוס' שבעות דף טז: ד"ה או שמשנתק אי בנות ציבור בנוב וגבעון היה להם קדושת מחנות, ועוד יש לומר דמ"מ במשכן ודאי היה דין "לפני ה'" ואולי התמיה "אפשר וכו'" הוא ממשכן, ועי' שם ברש"י שלא משמע כן, ועוד י"ל דבמשכן שילה, שהיה אז זמן איסור במות, ודאי מיקרי לפני ה' ואולי עסקין בשילה), ועי' להלן.
27) חי' רי"ז חלוי על הרמב"ם ריש הלכות קרבן פסח.
28) עי' שו"ע או"ח סימן תרמ"ד שמברכין על לולב קודם אמירת הלל, וכתב שם הר"א משום דאמרינן בערבי פסחים "אפשר ישראל וכו'", וכוונתו שיש מצוה לומר הלל בשעת נטילת לולב דוקא ולכן כדאי להמתין לנטילת לולב עד קודם אמירת הלל, (ועפ"ז כתב המשנת יעב"ץ (להר"י בצלאל זולטי ז"ל) חלק או"ח סימן כ' אות ד', שיש ב' דינים באמירת הלל בחג הסוכות, א' משום הלל של יו"ט וב' משום שעת עשיית מצות לולב, ולפי"ז אלא אחד קרא הלל בלי לולב ואח"כ הגיע לולב לידו, צריך לחזור ולומר הלל עוד הפעם, ועי' מאירי לקמן בדף ק"ז שהביא מנהג לקרוא הלל בזה"ש במעוד יום משום זכר להלל בשעת שחיתת קר"פ, ושמעתי דמנהג חסדי "סקווער" לומר הלל בברכה בשעת עשיית מצוה **בערב פסח** זכר להלל בשעת שחיתת הפסח, ועי' ערות הבהוש או"ח סימן קמ"ה, ששמדיק בדברי הטור תיעוב שהביא מס' סופרים "לברך עליו ולאמרו בענימה לקיים ונרוממה שמו רחמנא, ור"ל דין הלל בליל פסח הוא משום דבכל דור ודור חייב אדם להראות את עצמו, וממילא הוי דין הלל בליל פסח מדין גאולה מצרה כאילו אירע לנו עכשיו (כמו שהיה חיוב על חזקתו המלך לומר שירה בשעת שנהרג סנהריב וצבאיו), וא"כ דין הלל בליל פסח הוא מדין "על כל צרה וצרה שנגאלין ממנו" - ומסיים א"כ ערות הבהוש שם דכל זה אין זה אלא למי שמרגיש כל זה ויש לו שמחה כאילו נגאל עכשיו - ולכן כתב התוספתא וטור "דצריך לאמרו בענימה".
דף קא
29) יו"ד סוף סימן רל"ה.
דף קב
30) פי"ד מהל' קר"פ ה"ד (וכ"כ תוס' כאן ד"ה המפריש), ועי' כס"מ שם ומה שמתמה הלח"מ עליו (ועל הר"י קורקס), אולם רש"י בדף צח. סוד"ה ויש"מ יש דחוי ובמהרה"א שם.
31) כתב כן על פי הגמ' לעיל דף פט. "ונטרחו ונייתי מותר פסח" (ע"ש ברש"י ותוס', בסופו).
32) ועי' שהקי' דצ"ב למה אינו ממתין עד שנה הבאה ויקנה אז קרבן פסח בדמים שכלה.
דף קכ
33) מובא בכלי חמדה פרשת בהעלותך ד"ה וכבוד הרב (דף מו: בדפי הספר), ונדפס גם בסוף ח"ב שו"ת חלקת יואב (הנדפס מחדש) בקונטרס הערות הערה ל"ו.
34) והוכיח מזה כנגד דעת תוס' בבכורות דף כז. ד"ה ואתי שחולק שם על תוס' דבבחים וס"ל שם דדין למשחה לא שייך לגבי תרומה.
35) עי' משי"כ ע"ז הכלי חמדה שם בד"ה אמנם לענין, ועי' משי"כ שם בד"ה ומה שהתעצם (דף נא: בדפי הספר).
דף קכא
36) איתא בירושלמי כאן דהאוכל מצה בער"פ דומה לבעול ארוסתו בבית חמוי, ובחק יעקב סימן תע"א סק"ו כ' בשם הלבוש והכל בו דדומה לבעול ארוסתו שלא יכול להתקטף אתו ולהמתין עד שמכניסה לחופה שמברכים שם ז' ברכות, כן האוכל מצה בער"פ מראה רענותו שלא יכול להמתין באכילת מצה עד הלילה שמברכין אז ז' ברכות קודם אכילת המצה, והנה ברמב"ם פ"ו מהל' חו"מ הי"ב כתב טעם איסור אכילת מצה בער"פ הוא משום שיהא היכר שאוכל בלילה לשם מצוה, והמאירי כתב משום שיהא המצה נאכל לתיאבון, ועי' בדבר שמואל שהביא ג' שיטת בזמן התחלת איסור זו, דבמלחמת משמע שהאסור מתחיל בלילה (שלפני ער"פ), והר"ז סבר דלא נאסר אכילת מצה עד אחר זמן אכילת חמץ (בחצות היום), ואחר"כ ס"ל דהאיסור חל בתחלת היום בבוקר (וי"א דמתחיל בעלה"ש, וי"א דאינו מתחיל האיסור עד נץ החמה).
37) עי' מהל' חמוי"צ ה"ל י"ב (ובפי' המשני כאן).
38) ועי' מהרש"א דמצד דף אף מצה עשירה מותר בער"פ מ"מ בציקות של נכרים (דהיינו מצה שנעשה שלא לשמה) אסור משום שיש בו טעם מצות מצות ממש, ועי' לעיל בדף נא. דמבואר ברש"י ותוס' דכח"ל ער"פ בשבת היו מחלקין הלחם הפנים כשבת (עי' רש"י ד"ה בזיכין), ועי' מוסף חכמה פרשת אמור כ"ד - שמתאר שהיו אוכלין הלחם הפנים בערב פסח (דא"כ לא היה נחלק עד לערב) אע"ג דקאמר בירושלמי דאסור לאכול מצה בער"פ משום דחביבה מצוה בשעתה דוחה איסור זו, לפי"ז אפשר לומר דדין של משנתנו נוגע לאכילת לחם הפנים בערב פסח שחל בשבת דצריך לנמור אכילת לחם הפנים קודם שעה עשירית כדי לאכול מצה לתיאבון בערב.
39) סימן תס"ב ס"ד.
40) או"ח מהד"ק סוף סימן כ"א.
41) סימן תמ"ד ס"ה (ע"ש שמישב דברי הרמ"א שם בסימן תמ"ד שלא יהא סותר דבריו, עי' באות הבאה).
42) כתב הנו"ב שם דלכאוי כן מובא בדברי הרמ"א בסימן תמ"ד ס"ה ש' דלפי מנהגינו אין לבצוע על מצה עשירה לסעודה שלישית בער"פ שחל בשבת (ועפ"ז מסיק הנו"ב שאין להקל נגד הרמ"א ולאכול מצה עשירה אחר חנות, אולם עי' בערה"ש דלהלן שמישב דברי הרמ"א) ועי' ש"מ"ב על קשי"ע סימן קט"ו סק"ה.
43) מהדו"ק ח"א סימן קע"ה.
דף קכ
44) עי' רשב"ם ד"ה הי"ג דמשמע דהפי' אין מביאין את ה"שולחן" היינו הלחם, ולפי"ז אי"צ לכסות אלא הלחם (אלא דצ"ע לפי"ז למה אין נוהגין גם בזה"ז להביא הלחם אחר קידוש) ובתוס' מובא דהיו מביאין את כל השולחן אחר קידוש (ולפי"ז לכאוי היו צריכין לכסות כל השולחן במפה (ועי' מרומי שדה).
45) (טעם זה מובא ברא"א ובטור סימן רע"א בשם הירושלמי) והוסף החת"ס לבאר דלא שייך טעם בושה אלא ביום ולא בלילה משום שאז הלחם מבין שצריכין לקדש על יין דוקא משום שיש דין שאין אומרים שירה אלא היין, אבל ביום דלכא שירה שאין מברכין אלא ברכת בורא פרי גפן אז הוא מתבייש למה אין מברכין עליו.
46) עי' אליה רבה בסימן רע"א (סי"ק ט"ו) בשם ספר צדה לדרך שיכסה החלות במפה לבנה.

AL HADAF DEDICATION FORM

Please consider sponsoring a daf in honor or in memory of a loved one. Daf sponsorships are a meaningful way of supporting Al Hadaf while providing a tremendous z'chus in honor or memory of a loved one, through facilitating Torah learning and enjoyment for thousands of people.

I am interested in:

___ Dedicating a **Daf**..... **\$120.**

___ Sponsoring an **entire issue**..... **\$500.**

___ I want to **contribute** \$ _____ to help in your *harbotzas haTorah* efforts.

NOTE: IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTIFY US SIX WEEKS IN ADVANCE IN ORDER TO RESERVE A SPECIFIC DATE

<i>DATE AND TEXT OF DAF DEDICATION</i>
--

___ Check is enclosed. Make tax deductible check payable to Al Hadaf.

___ Please charge my MasterCard/Visa/Amex \$ _____.

Card # _____ Exp. date _____

___ Please bill me.

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____

PHONE: _____

MAIL/FAX FORM TO: Al Hadaf / P.O. Box 791 / Monsey, NY 10952 / (845) 356-9114 or **877-7AL-Hadaf**
Or e-mail request and details to cong_al_hadaf@yahoo.com, or go to www.alhadafyomi.org

פח	לז"י אבינו מורינו ר' שלום שמשון בן אברהם ז"ל * -by his sons; Jance, Avy and Jesse J Weberman and their respective families	ז' ניסן	שבת
פט	לז"י פרימעט בת ר' שמואל יעקב ז"ל *	יח ניסן	Sun
צ	לז"י הרב יצחק יעקב בן הרב מאיר שפירא ז"ל *	יט ניסן	Mon
	לז"י אלטר איסר בן יהודה ז"ל * Isser Mermelstein		
צא		כ ניסן	Tues
צב	לז"י רבקה בת משה פנחס ז"ל - (יום היארצייט ח' ניסן)	ז' פסח	Wed
צג		ח' פסח	Thrs
צד		כג ניסן	Fri
צה	In honor of the Bar Mitzvah of "Chaim Dov Kornfeld"	כד ניסן	שבת
צו		כה ניסן	Sun
צז	לז"י נחום ב"ר בנימין סילווער ז"ל *	כו ניסן	Mon
צח		כז ניסן	Tues
צט	לז"י אבינו מורינו ר' חיים בן הרב אברהם משה טלנט ז"ל * 40th Yahrzeit of our dear father R' CHAIM (HERMAN) TALLANT z"l	כח ניסן	Wed
ק	לז"י יהודה אריה בן אהרן הלוי ז"ל *	כט ניסן	Thrs
קא		ל ניסן	Fri
קב	לז"י יוסף בן חיים זאב Braun ז"ל *	א אייר	שבת
קג	לז"י אמי זקנתי גרונה בת ר' יוסף יהושע קושנער ע"ה *	ב אייר	Sun
קד		ג אייר	Mon
קה		ד אייר	Tues
קו	לז"י שרה שפרה בת יצחק הכהן SHEILA PADAWER GOLDMAN ע"ה *	ה אייר	Wed
	לע"י יוסף אבא בן העניך הלוי וויינשטיין *		

* Denotes Yartzeit

Cong. Al Hadaf
P.O. Box 791
Monsey, NY 10952
Ph. & Fx. 845-356-9114
cong_al_hadaf@yahoo.com

**Please see Dedication form inside on page 17,
Chag Kasher V'samayach**

(c) 2006 Not to be reproduced in any form whatsoever without permission from publisher. Published by; Cong. Al Hadaf/ P.O. Box 791/ Monsey, NY 10952. Rabbi Zev Dickstein - Editor. For subscription, dedication, or advertising information. contact the office at 845-356-9114, Email:cong_al_hadaf@yahoo.com, or go to www.alhadafyomi.org