



דף קז.

מהו לקדושי אשיכרא

Ameimar said that in a place where they do not have wine, and they use beer as a wine-alternative (חמר מדינה), beer is valid for *havdalah*. [Note: When beer or whisky is used for *havdalah* or *kiddush*, one recites the *bracha* בורא פרי instead of *נהיה בדברו* פרי.הגפן.]

The Gemara cites several Amoraim who indicate that *kiddush* (in contrast to *havdalah*) may not be recited over beer. Rav Chisda is then cited as saying that just as *kiddush* may not be recited over beer, so too, *havdalah* may not.

The words of the Rashbam, ד"ה מהו לקדושי, indicate that he understands that Rav Chisda is in disagreement with Ameimar's assertion and is of the opinion that one may not use beer for *kiddush* or *havdalah* even in a city where there is no wine.

The Rosh, however, suggests that Rav Chisda is referring to a place where wine is readily available. Beer is not valid for *kiddush* in such places since people living in such places do not commonly use beer as חמר מדינה (a wine alternative). Rav Chisda agrees with Ameimar, however, that beer may be used for *havdalah* in a place where there is no wine. In conclusion the Rosh rules that in a city where there is no wine, one may recite *kiddush* and *havdalah* over beer. [He adds, however, that

on Friday night it is preferable to recite *kiddush* over bread (if there is no wine), rather than over beer.]¹

The *Shulchan Aruch*² follows the ruling of the Rosh and permits one to recite *kiddush* and *havdalah* over beer in a city where there is no wine.

The Bach³ notes that many great rabbis would regularly recite *kiddush* on beer (on Shabbos morning) even though wine was available, and he questions the halachic grounds for such a leniency. The Taz⁴ explains that since wine is expensive today and people customarily drink other types of beverages instead of wine, one may use beer as a wine-substitute [at least on Shabbos morning when the obligation to recite *kiddush* is (only) *miderabbanan*].

The Sefer Halachos Ketanos⁵ rules that only alcoholic beverages are valid for *kiddush*. He says that coffee, for example, may not be used for *kiddush* even in a city where people commonly drink coffee instead of wine.

The *Shulchan Aruch*,⁶ however, rules that any beverage (except for water) that people routinely drink is considered חמר מדינה and may be used for *kiddush* (in a location where there is no wine) - as the Rashbam indicates.

The Mishna Berurah⁷ adds that if one enjoys whisky, he may recite *kiddush* over whisky (on Shabbos morning) - provided he drinks the minimum shiur (amount) required

for *kiddush*. [The Gemara on 107a says that one who recites *kiddush* must drink at least a *מלא לוגמיו* (lit., cheek-full, which is estimated to be between 1.5 and 3 ounces). Consequently, he rules that if one makes *kiddush* over whisky he must use a standard-size *kiddush* cup (i.e., a cup that holds a *רביעית* - which is estimated by the authorities to be between 3 and 5 ounces), and he must drink the minimum *shiur* of *מלא לוגמיו*.

The Maharsham⁸ and Eishel Avraham,⁹ however, note that many people customarily recite *kiddush* over a small glass of whisky and they drink less than a *מלא לוגמיו*. They suggest that since whisky is commonly drunk in much smaller quantities than other beverages, even a small amount is considered significant and suffices for *kiddush*.¹⁰

דף קח.

השמש שאכל כזית מצה כשהוא מיטב יצא

The Mishna above (99b) states that all must recline during the *seder* on Pesach night as a demonstration of freedom and redemption (in commemoration of *yetzias mitzraim*). The Gemara (108b) says that *הסיבה* - reclining - is required during the eating of *matzah*, but not during *marror* (since *marror* signifies slavery, not redemption).

The Gemara cites R' Yehoshua b' Levi who says that a *שמש* (Jewish servant or waiter) who has eaten a *k'zayis* (olive's volume) of *matzah* in a reclining position has discharged his obligation. This proves, says the Gemara that a servant is obligated to recline even when he is in the presence of his employer (in contrast to a student who need not recline when he is in the presence of his Rabbi).

The Rosh deduces from the wording of R' Yehoshua ben Levi that if one fails to recline during the eating of *matzah* he does not fulfill his obligation and he must eat another *k'zayis* of *matzah* while reclining.

The Brisker Rav¹¹ notes that the Rambam seems to have another opinion on this matter, for the Rambam does not make mention of the

fact that one who fails to recline during *matzah* must eat more *matzah*.

The Brisker Rav explains that according to the Rosh, the mitzvah of *הסיבה* is an essential component of the mitzvah of *matzah* (and *ד' כוסות*). Therefore, it follows that failure to recline invalidates the mitzvah of *matzah* and the mitzvah must be redone.

The Rambam¹² writes that although the main time for reclining is during the *matzah* and the four cups of wine, it is praiseworthy for one to recline throughout the entire meal at the *seder*. The Rambam thus indicates, contrary to the Rosh, that *הסיבה* is not a component of the mitzvah of *matzah* (and *ד' כוסות*), but rather is an independent mitzvah which is relevant during the entire *seder* (just that the sages designated *matzah* and *ד' כוסות* as the primary time for this mitzvah of *הסיבה*). Therefore, if one fails to perform this mitzvah and he does not recline during the eating of *matzah*, his fulfillment of the mitzvah of *matzah* is not affected.¹³

[The Brisker Rav adds that re-eating the *matzah* in a reclining position (in an attempt to properly fulfill the mitzvah of *הסיבה*) will not accomplish anything. After one has eaten a *k'zayis* of *matzah* (even if without *הסיבה*) his *matzah* obligation is fulfilled and it is pointless to eat more *matzah* [with *הסיבה*], because the additional *matzah* is non-mitzvah *matzah* and is no more significant than a plain piece of food. Therefore, according to the Rambam, if one fails to eat *matzah* while reclining, he forfeits the mitzvah of *הסיבה* (with respect to *matzah*) and it cannot be remedied by eating more *matzah* while reclining.]

The Brisker Rav suggests an alternate understanding of R' Yehoshua b' Levi's statement which conforms with the Rambam's position. When R' Yehoshua b' Levi says that a *שמש* who eats a *k'zayis* of *matzah* while reclining has discharged his obligation, he means to say that the servant has discharged his minimum *הסיבה* obligation. He is teaching that the servant may eat the rest of his

meal in a non reclining position (because a servant is busy serving the meal), even though all others should eat the entire meal while reclining.¹⁴ [This is in contrast to the Rosh who understands R' Yehoshua b' Levi as teaching that the שמש discharges his *matzah* obligation only if he eats it while reclining.]

דף קט.

חייב אדם לשמח בניו ובני ביתו ברגל

The braysoh derives from the posuk (Devarim 16:14) [ושמחת בחגך ואתה ובנך ובתך] - you should rejoice on your festival [you, your son, your daughter etc.] - that there is a mitzvah for a person to cause his family to rejoice on Yom Tov. R' Yehuda says that each member of the family should be given something suitable for them. Men should be given wine while women should be given beautiful garments. [The Gemara in *Kiddushin* 34b says that even if women are not personally obligated in the mitzvah of *simcha* (i.e., *korbon shelamim*), there is a mitzvah incumbent on a man to gladden the hearts of all members of his household.]

R' Yehuda ben Beseira states in another braysoh that in the times of the Bais Hamikdash אלא בבשר - one fulfills the mitzvah of *simcha* (rejoicing on Yom Tov) only with meat [of a *korbon shelamim*], and today one fulfills the mitzvah with wine, as the posuk states ויין ישמח לבב אנוש - wine gladdens the heart of man.

Tosfos (ד"ה במה and Tosfos in Rosh Hashana 6b, ד"ה אשה) indicates that the first braysoh which says women should be given pretty clothing to rejoice with, is referring to the post-Bais Hamikdash era when *korbonos* could no longer be offered. However, in the time of the Bais Hamikdash everyone including women would rejoice with the eating of the meat of the *shelamim*.

The Rambam,¹⁵ in codifying this halacha, writes that even though the *korbon shelamim* is the primary type of *simcha* required by the Torah on Yom Tov, one is also obligated to gladden the hearts of all the members of his

household with something suitable for them. How so? Children are given nuts and candies, men eat meat and drink wine, and women are given pretty clothing. The Rambam thus indicates that even in the time of the Bais Hamikdash one was obligated to buy his wife pretty clothing for Yom Tov.¹⁶

Moreover, the Rambam indicates that today, in the absence of the Bais Hamikdash when we can no longer eat from a *korbon shelamim*, the mitzvah of *simcha* still entails drinking wine and eating meat.

The Bais Yosef¹⁷ questions the Rambam's ruling, noting that our Gemara clearly indicates that the mitzvah to eat meat on Yom Tov pertains only to the meat of a *shelamim*, and today one fulfills the mitzvah of *simcha* by drinking wine.¹⁸

- The Bircas Avraham explains that the obligation to buy candies and nuts for one's children is not merely to train them in the mitzvah of *simcha* (חינוך),¹⁹ but rather it is for the sake of the father's personal mitzvah of *simcha*. In order for one to properly rejoice, it is essential to ensure that his family members are in a joyous state of mind as well.

- The Rambam²⁰ writes that in order to properly fulfill the mitzvah of *simcha*, one must invite orphans, widows, and other needy and despondent individuals to his Yom Tov feast. The Rambam says that if one shuts his door to keep out the needy, and rejoices privately with his own family, אין זו שמחה - it is not considered a mitzvah celebration, but rather a "celebration of one's belly."

The Rambam also says that *simcha* on Yom Tov, if exercised properly, should lead one to a higher level of avodas Hashem, not, Heaven forbid, to frivolity, levity or drunkenness.

דף קי:

כללא דמילתא כל דקפיד קפדי בהדיה

The Gemara (starting on 109b) launches a lengthy discussion regarding the mystical danger of זוגות (eating and doing certain things in pairs, which can cause harm from demons),

as well as dangers related to sorcery and evil spirits. [For an excellent overview of this topic and a presentation of several different approaches, see the Shottenstein edition of Pesachim, daf 109b, note 8.]

The Gemara on 110b postulates that as a general rule, demons object to זוגות (pairs) only with respect to one who is מקפיד - mindful - about *zugos*. However, if one is not mindful of eating *zugos*, the demons are not mindful of him and they do not harm him.

The She'lah²¹ explains that if one believes in demons and in other evil forces, Hashem abandons him to these forces and allows them to hold sway over him. However, if one puts all his trust and belief in Hashem, other forces have no power over him.

The Sefer Malkiel²² explains that *zugos* were banned in order to counter the idolatrous belief in a double deity (good and evil).²³ He suggests that the Gemara says that כל דקפיד - one who is concerned and confused about the belief in "pairs" (i.e., a dual deity, Heaven forbid), קפדי בהדיה - must refrain from eating *zugos* - because he must work to reinforce his faith and belief in the oneness of Hashem. However, one who is convinced about the oneness of Hashem need not refrain from eating *zugos*, because his faith in Hashem is solid.

- R' Moshe Feinstein²⁴ applies the rule of כל דקפיד וכו' to the concept of עין הרע (the evil eye). He says that as a rule one should not excessively concern himself with the effects of *ayin horah* because the more one is mindful of these matters the more effect it can have on him. He concedes, however, that one should exercise a measure of precaution regarding *ayin horah* and refrain from flaunting something exceptionally admirable which is likely to cause wonderment and jealousy.
- The Meiri (109b), in keeping with the position of the Rambam²⁵ that demons and sorcery are not real forces, and belief in their power is mere folly, suggests that the harm caused by eating pairs is psychosomatic. If

one refrains from eating *zugos* because he believes that he will be harmed by demons, he thus trains his mind and body to reject *zugos* and hence he might indeed be adversely affected. Therefore, the Gemara says that one who pays no heed to *zugos* will not be affected.

דף קיא.

שלשה אין ממצעין ולא מתמצעין

1] In continuation of the discussion concerning the harm caused by demons and other mystical forces, the Gemara says a woman should not pass between two men, and also a man should not pass between two women. Rav Papa says that if they do pass in between, the remedy is to recite certain p'sukim (see Gemara and Rashbam).

The Gemara adds that it is particularly dangerous if a *niddah* at the beginning of her menstrual period passes between two men because one of the men will be harmed and killed as a result. [And if the *niddah* is at the end of her period she will cause them to quarrel.] Here too, the Gemara says that one can ward off this danger by reciting a posuk.

Tosfos says that some explain that this fatal harm is caused only if the woman performs כישוף (sorcery). Similarly, the Ben Yehoyada explains that a *niddah* passing between two men causes a fatality only if they encounter a demon at that time. Consequently, he asserts that today this practice is not considered dangerous (although it is still preferable to avoid it²⁶) because demons are much less prevalent today than in Talmudic times. [See also Tosfos to Yoma 77b ד"ה משום who says that demons are no longer common amongst us and therefore we need not refrain from *zugos*.]

The Vilna Gaon²⁷ suggests a connection between the story of Purim and our Gemara. The Gemara in Megillah 15a says that Esther began to menstruate when she heard about Haman's evil decree against her people (ותחלחל המלכה, Esther 3:4). It is conceivable, suggests the Vilna Gaon, that Esther invited

Achashveirosh and Haman to her party with the intent to help her nation by passing between the two men, thereby causing fatal harm to [at least] one of them (or perhaps causing them to quarrel).²⁸ [See Megillah 15b where the Gemara question's Esther's motives for inviting Haman to the party, מה ראתה אסתר שזימנה את המן.²⁹]

2] The Gemara in Horayos 13b lists a number of things that could be detrimental to one's Torah study (i.e., by making it difficult for one to understand the Torah that he studies or by causing one to forget his learning³⁰), one of which is passing between two women, or allowing a woman to pass between two men.

The Maharsha maintains that reciting the recommended posuk (mentioned in our Gemara) only helps to ward off the physical danger, but it does not restore the damage to one's learning.

Horav Yosef Chaim Sonnenfeld,³¹ however, assumes that reciting the recommended posuk is helpful even to restore one's learning.

דף קיב.

אוכלין ומשקין תחת המטה רוח רעה שורה עליהם

1] The Gemara says that a רוח רעה (evil spirit) rests on food and drink that are left under a bed, even if in a tightly closed container.³²

The Gemara in Bava Basra 58a says that the underside of a talmid chacham's bed is very neat because he keeps only his shoes there. In contrast, the underside of the bed of an *am ha'aretz* (non-learned individual) looks like a disorganized storage bin, for he stores many things there. The Rashbam (ibid.) explains that an *am ha'aretz* stores all types of belongings under his bed including food and drink, whereas a talmid chacham is careful not to store food there because he is mindful of the fact that a רוח רעה rests on food stored under one's bed, as our Gemara says.

The *Shulchan Aruch*,³³ in codifying our Gemara, writes that one should not place food and drink under his bed. However, the

Shulchan Aruch does not rule on the halachic status of such food after the fact.

The Shvus Yaakov³⁴ adduces proof from the aforementioned Gemara in Bava Basra that it is permissible to eat such food בדיעבד - after the fact. He notes that we often find that an *am ha'aretz* lacks trustworthiness regarding the tithing of his produce (in Eretz Yisrael), but we never find a concern regarding all other food - even though an *am ha'aretz* often leaves food under his bed (as the Gemara says in Bava Basra, cited above). This implies that it is permissible to eat such food after the fact.³⁵

The Vilna Gaon³⁶ disagrees and is of the opinion that food mistakenly stored under a bed must be discarded.

Some authorities³⁷ maintain that there is no רוח רעה with respect to food left under the bed of a non-Jew.

2] R' Nachman (109b) derives from a posuk (Sh'mos 12:42) that the first night of Pesach is ליל שמורים, ליל המשומר ממזיקין - a night of protection from harmful forces - just as *B'nai Yisrael* in Mitzraim were protected on that night from harm.³⁸ Consequently, he asserts that on the first night of Pesach we need not be mindful of *zugos* (eating or drinking pairs, i.e., four cups of wine).

The Ramoh³⁹ says that it is customary to open the door during the *seder* when reciting the passage שפוך חמתך, to demonstrate that Pesach night is ליל שימורים - a night of protection. Moreover, he says⁴⁰ that it is customary to recite only the first passage of sh'ma when retiring to bed on Pesach night. The rest of the text (which is recited to protect one against harm, see Sh'vuos 15b) is omitted on the first night of Pesach since it is a night of protection (ליל שימורים). [The Darcai Moshe also cites the custom of leaving the door unlocked.⁴¹]

The Yalkut HaMeiri⁴² cites an incident in which an individual left food under his bed on the first night of Pesach. The authorities in Yerushalaim ruled that the food may be eaten

(even according to the stringent opinion of the Vilna Gaon who generally forbids such food). They reasoned that the food was unaffected by ליל שימורים since it was רוח רעה.⁴³

דף קיג.

1] פשוט נבילתא בשוקא ושקיל אגרא

Rav instructed Rav Kahana to perform even menial labor, such as skinning carcasses in public, to earn a living. One should not say that it is inappropriate for a great Torah scholar to do so. Moreover, the Gemara in Bechoros 29a indicates that every Torah scholar must have a trade from which he earns his livelihood for the Gemara says it is forbidden for a Torah scholar to accept monetary compensation for teaching Torah (מה אני בחנם אף אתה בחנם).

The Rambam⁴⁴ codifies these Gemaros and writes that Torah scholars should engage in a trade to support themselves, even menial trades, rather than accept support from the community.

The Ramoh,⁴⁵ however, writes that it is customary to support our rabbis so as to enhance the prestige of the Rabbinat. If rabbis would be forced to occupy themselves with a trade, their congregants wouldn't properly respect them and their position and honor would be belittled. The *Ramoh* concedes, however, that if a rabbi is able to support himself and refrain from taking a salary from the community, it is considered an act of piety and is commendable.

The Maharshal⁴⁶ contends that a Torah teacher, although capable of supporting himself, should not do so. He explains that earning a living would inevitably lessen the amount of time available for teaching Torah and it would be sinful for a rabbi to spend his time earning a livelihood, rather than teaching Torah.

*HoRav Moshe Feinstein ז"ל*⁴⁷ rules that rabbis and Torah scholars should accept a stipend from the community for it is customary to rely on the opinion of the Ramoh and Maharshal. In fact, says R' Moshe, in

present times a Rabbi who contends that he is capable of achieving excellence in Torah while simultaneously supporting himself through business, as the Rambam advises, is merely deluding himself. He classifies such an attitude as a scheme of the *yetzer horah* (evil inclination) and says that such a person will ultimately forget the little knowledge of Torah which he manages to acquire. A Torah scholar should be encouraged to utilize all of his time for Torah study, even if this means having to accept communal support.

2] הוי זהיר באשתך מחתנה הראשון

R' Yehoshua b' Levi said in the name of the people of Yerushalaim, "be watchful that your wife does not frequent the company of her first son-in-law." R' Chisda explains that there is a concern of immoral behavior because a mother-in-law often is fond of her (first) son-in-law.

The *Gemara* in Bava Basra 98b says that it is improper for a man to dwell in the same house as his mother-in-law and the *Rashbam* explains that the prohibition is based on our *Gemara*. [The *Rashbam* (ibid.) explains that the above-mentioned concern actually applies to all sons-in-law. Our *Gemara* specifies the first only because there is added affection for the first son-in-law.] Moreover, the *Gemara* in *Kiddushin* 12b records that *Rav* administered the punishment of מכות מרדות (lashes) to one who resided in his mother-in-law's house.

The *Rambam*⁴⁸ rules, as stated in the *Gemara* in Bava Basra and *Kiddushin*, that it is forbidden to live in the same house as one's mother-in-law.

Many Rishonim note that it is customary (at least in certain situations) to permit a man to reside with his in-laws, and they offer various reasons:

(a) *Tosfos* in *Kiddushin* permits living in one's mother-in-law's house if he lives there gratis. Since he has an obvious (permissible) motive for living there (i.e.,

monetary considerations) people will not suspect him of base motives.⁴⁹

- (b) The *Raavad*⁵⁰ maintains that when the son-in-law has a private room at his in-law's house, his living there is not considered indecent and is permitted.
- (c) The *Meiri*⁵¹ writes that the "contemporary daughters of Israel" are exceedingly modest and are above suspicion, and we therefore are no longer so concerned about this problem - except for cases in which there are persistent rumors concerning misconduct between them.
- (d) *Tosfos Ri Hazaken*⁵² cites an opinion that the prohibition only pertains to a man residing in the same house with his ארוסה (*betrothed bride*) because it is immodest for a couple to live in the same house their marriage is consummated (נשואין). [According to this *p'shat*, the ban mentioned by the Gemara in *Kiddushin* and *Bava Basra* is not related to R' Yehoshua b' Levi's admonition in our Gemara. Even though vigilance is recommended, there was never a prohibition for a married couple (after נשואין) to reside at their in-laws.]

דף קיד.

בית הלל אומרים מברך על היין ואח"כ על היום

Kiddush on the eve of Shabbos consists of two *berachos*, (a) ברכת היין - the *bracha* on the wine (בורא פרי הגפן), and (b) ברכת היום - the *bracha* on the kedusha of the Shabbos (מקדש השבת). Bais Shammai and Bais Hillel dispute the proper order of these *berachos*. The halacha follows Bais Hillel who maintain that the ברכת היין should precede the ברכת היום.

The Gemara gives the following two reasons for Bais Hillel's position. (a) יין גורם - wine is the cause of the *kiddush*, i.e., if not for the wine, *kiddush* would not be recited. (b) The ברכת היין is recited more frequently than the ברכת היום and as a general rule we say תדיר קודם - that which is frequent takes precedence.

The Graz⁵³ rules that if one mistakenly reversed the order of the *berachos* and recited the *bracha* מקדש השבת before *borei pri hagofen* he has not fulfilled the mitzvah of *kiddush* (for he did not perform the mitzvah in the order prescribed by Bais Hillel). This individual must repeat the *bracha* מקדש השבת so that it follows בורא פרי הגפן.

The Yeshuas Yaakov⁵⁴ notes that some women, after hearing *kiddush* from their husband, recite *borei pri hagofen* over the *kiddush* wine distributed to them. He objects to this practice because by doing so, these women are in effect reversing the proper order of the *berachos*. [First they hear their husband recite מקדש השבת for them and then they recite their own בורא פרי הגפן.]

2] The P'nei Yehoshua (*Berachos* 51b) points out that the obligation to recite the *bracha* of *kiddush* (ברכת היום / מקדש השבת) is *min haTorah*, whereas the mitzvah to recite *kiddush* over wine (or bread) is only *miderabbanan* (see *Tosfos* above 106a,⁵⁵ Al Hadaf to *Berachos* דף לג). Consequently, he argues that the ברכת היום should take precedence because a mitzvah *min haTorah* generally takes precedence over a mitzvah *miderabbanan* (even if the mitzvah *miderabbanan* is more frequent).⁵⁶

The Tzlach (*ibid.*) raises another question. He asks why the Gemara assumes that if one lacks wine he does not recite *kiddush* at all (יין גורם לקידוש שתאמר). He argues that since the mitzvah of sanctifying Shabbos (through the recital of *kiddush* and the *bracha* מקדש השבת) is *min haTorah*, presumably this mitzvah can be performed without wine (because the obligation to recite *kiddush* over wine is only *miderabbanan*).

In answer, the P'nei Yehoshua and the Tzlach suggest that indeed, one discharges his biblical obligation of *kiddush* with the recital of the *bracha* מקדש השבת even without wine. However, this biblical mitzvah is fulfilled during *maariv* when one recites the *bracha* מקדש השבת during the *maariv*

sh'moneh esray. The *bracha* מקדש השבת that one subsequently recites at home during *kiddush* over a cup of wine is only *miderabbanan*.⁵⁷ The Gemara considers wine to be the cause for the *kiddush* that one recites at home because there is no obligation for one to repeat the *bracha* מקדש השבת after *maariv* unless he has wine (or bread) over which to recite *kiddush*.⁵⁸

The Tzlach comments that according to this reasoning, a woman who did not *daven maariv* and happens to recite *kiddush* on her own behalf should be obligated to reverse the order of the *berachos*. Since in this case the *bracha* of *kiddush* is *min haTorah*, Bais Hillel would agree that it must precede the *bracha* over the wine.⁵⁹

The She'arim Metzuyanim b'Halacha (*Berachos* 51b) comments that perhaps this is why some women, upon receiving *kiddush* wine from their husbands, recite their own *bracha* בורא פרי הגפן (see Yeshuos Yaakov above). Since they did not *daven maariv*, it is fitting that the *bracha* of *kiddush* (מקדש השבת, that they hear from their husbands) precede the *bracha* בורא פרי הגפן.⁶⁰

דף קטו.

אמר רב חסדא מעיקרא מברך עליה בפה"א

1] The Mishna on 114a and the Gemara on 114b mentions the custom of dipping a vegetable (i.e., *karpas*) at the *seder* (after *kiddush*). The Gemara says that the reason for this custom is to arouse the curiosity of the children so that they should question why the night of Pesach is different from other nights (מה נשתנה).

The Mishna indicates that one may use bitter herbs (*marror*) for *karpas*. The Gemara (end of 114b) says that if there are other types of vegetables available besides bitter herbs, one of the other vegetables should be used for *karpas*. The *bracha* בורא פרי האדמה is recited over the *karpas* vegetable. Then, upon eating the *marror* later (after the *matzah*), the *bracha* על אכילת מרור is recited.

The Rambam⁶¹ says that one should eat a *k'zayis* of vegetables for *karpas*. The Rosh⁶² disagrees and maintains that a *k'zayis* is only required for *marror* because we recite the *bracha* מרור אכילת על and the term אכילה (eating) connotes a minimum of a *k'zayis*. *Karpas* does not require a *k'zayis* because we recite only בורא פרי האדמה over *karpas*.

2] Rav Huna asserts (end of 114b) that the procedure is the same for one who has only bitter herbs; he recites בורא פרי האדמה over some bitter herbs for *karpas*, and after the *matzah* he takes more bitter herbs for the mitzvah of *marror* and recites על אכילת מרור.

The halacha, however, follows Rav Chisda who maintains that one who eats bitter herbs for *karpas* must recite על אכילת מרור (in addition to בורא פרי האדמה) at that point, for it would be improper to eat *marror* and delay the *bracha* על אכילת מרור until after the *matzah*. [Later, after the *matzah*, this individual should eat more bitter herbs (for the purpose of arousing the children's curiosity) without reciting any *berachos*.]

The Sha'agas Aryeh⁶³ ask why R' Chisda does not advise such a person (who uses bitter herbs for *karpas*) to eat less than a *k'zayis* of *marror* during *karpas*. In this way he can circumvent the obligation to recite the *bracha* על אכילת מרור at that point (since the required minimum shiur for the mitzvah of *marror* is a *k'zayis*). Then, after the *matzah*, he should eat a *k'zayis* and recite על אכילת מרור.⁶⁴

The Sha'agas Aryeh offers three solutions:

- (a) One must eat a minimum of a *k'zayis* of vegetables for the mitzvah of *karpas* - as the Rambam says.⁶⁵ Therefore, R' Chisda has no choice but to obligate him to recite על אכילת מרור during the *karpas*, since he eats a *k'zayis*.
- (b) The Sha'agas Aryeh deduces from the wording of the Rosh that one not only fulfills the mitzvah of *karpas* with less than a *k'zayis* (according to the Rosh) but the mitzvah of *marror* as well. The Rosh says that one must eat a *k'zayis* of *marror* because the text of the

bracha, מרור אכילת על, connotes a *k'zayis*, and we do not want to utter a falsehood. The Rosh implies that if one eats less than a *k'zayis* he has fulfilled the mitzvah (just that the wording of the *bracha* is inaccurate). Therefore, even if one would eat less than a *k'zayis* of bitter herbs for *karpas* he still would fulfill the mitzvah and he would no longer be permitted to recite מרור על אכילת later after the *matzah*. Consequently, R' Chisda maintains that one who has only bitter herbs has no choice but to [eat a *k'zayis* and] recite מרור על אכילת during *karpas*.

(c) Alternatively, the Sha'agas Aryeh says that even if one does not fulfill the mitzvah of *marror* with less than a *k'zayis*, it still is not proper to eat some *marror* without reciting a *bracha* because even a small amount of *marror* is חזי לאצטרופי - can potentially combine - with additional *marror* to complete a full *k'zayis* for the mitzvah. Therefore, R' Chisda does not consider eating less than a *k'zayis* of bitter herbs during *karpas* (and waiting until after the *matzah* to recite על מרור (אכילת מרור) a viable option.

דף קטז.

ר"ג אומר כל שלא אמר ג' דברים אלו בפסח
לא יצא ידי חובתו

Rabban Gamliel (Mishna 116a) said that whoever does not explain the reason for the mitzvah of *korbon pesach*, *matzah* and *marror*, has not fulfilled his obligation at the seder.

Tosfos (116a, ד"ה ואמרתם) says that the posuk וזבח פסח is the source for R' Gamliel's assertion, for the posuk indicates that the mitzvah of (eating from the) *korbon pesach* is accomplished only through ואמרתם - proclaiming (the reason for the *pesach*).⁶⁶ Tosfos adds that *matzah* and *marror* are הוקש (scripturally compared) to *pesach* and therefore, the reasons for those mitzvos too, must be explained at the seder.

The Gemara above on 95a says that all laws that pertain to the actual *korbon pesach* (מצוה שבגופו), such as the issur to break the bones of a *pesach*, apply to the *pesach sheni* as

well. Mitzvos that are only indirectly related to the *korbon pesach* (such as the issur to own chametz during the shechitah) do not apply to *pesach sheni*.

The Aruch LaNer⁶⁷ remarks that presumably R' Gamliel's halacha (i.e., proclaiming the reason for *korbon pesach*) is a מצוה שבגופו because it pertains to the actual *korbon*, and hence it should apply even to *pesach sheni*.

The Aruch LaNer, however, concludes that if one fails to say the reason for the *korbon pesach* R' Gamliel does not mean to say that he has not fulfilled his *korbon pesach* obligation (as Tosfos implies),⁶⁸ but rather, he has not fulfilled the mitzvah of saying the *hagadah* (i.e., סיפור יציאת מצרים - recounting the exodus from mitzraim). R' Gamliel is saying that the minimum required for the mitzvah of *hagadah* is that one enunciate the reasons for *pesach*, *matzah* and *marror*.⁶⁹

Accordingly, says the Aruch LaNer, this mitzvah does not apply to *pesach sheni* because it is not a mitzvah intrinsic to *korbon pesach* (but rather to the mitzvah of *hagadah*).⁷⁰

דף קיז.

נביאים שביניהן תקנו להן הלל

Rav Yehuda says in the name of Shmuel that the prophets among *Klal Yisrael* instituted that *hallel* be recited on the festivals and when there is salvation from suffering and tragedy.⁷¹

On the basis of the following argument the Gemara proves that *hallel* was composed before Dovid Hamelech's times. The Gemara argues, אפשר ישראל שחטו פסחיהם ונטלו - it is certainly not possible that *Klal Yisrael* offered their *pesachim* and took their *lulavim* without reciting *hallel* all the years prior to Dovid Hamelech.

The Mishna above on 95a says that there is a mitzvah to recite *hallel* on the fourteenth of Nissan when the *pesach* is slaughtered and also on the night of the Pesach when the *pesach* is eaten. Even today, in the absence of

the *korbon pesach*, we still have a mitzvah to recite *hallel* on the night of *pesach* (Mishna 116b). Some communities have the custom to recite *hallel* (on the night of *pesach*) in *shul* after *maariv*. This is done so that the entire community can recite it in unison, as the posuk states ונרוממה שמו יחדו - and we shall exalt Hashem's name unitedly.⁷²

The Gemara in Arachin 10b lists eighteen festival days when we recite the entire *hallel* (in Eretz Yisrael). The Ran asks why the night of *pesach* is omitted from this list. The Ran answers that the Gemara in Arachin only lists the times that *hallel* is recited due to Yom Tov. The mitzvah to recite *hallel* on the night of *pesach* is not because it is Yom Tov, but rather is based on the סברא (logical argument) cited above, 'אפשר ישראל שוחטין וכו', which states that *hallel* should be recited during the fulfillment of the mitzvah of *korbon pesach*.⁷³

The Mishnas Yaavetz⁷⁴ explains, based on this Ran, that the *hallel* recited on Succos (after shacharis) serves a dual function; (a) it is recited because Succos is one of the festival days listed in Arachin on which *hallel* is required, and (b) because the mitzvah of *lulav* warrants *hallel* as stated in our Gemara.

The *Shulchan Aruch*⁷⁵ writes that after shacharis one takes his *lulav* and performs the mitzvah of *lulav* and then recites *hallel* (while holding his *lulav*). The Magen Avraham⁷⁶ cites the She'lah who recommends reciting the *bracha* on the *lulav* in the succah prior to going to *shul*.

The Vilna Gaon⁷⁷ writes that the mitzvah of *lulav* is performed prior to *hallel* because the Gemara says that it is logical to recite *hallel* at the time of the mitzvah of *lulav* (אפשר ישראל נוטלין לולביהם ואין אומרים שירה). The Vilna Gaon thus indicates that it is preferable not to perform the mitzvah of *lulav* before shacharis. Rather, one should wait and not perform the mitzvah of *lulav* until after shacharis so that he should recite *hallel* immediately upon performing the mitzvah of *lulav* - in conformance with our Gemara's סברא.

The Mishnas Yaavetz, accordingly, argues that if one did not have a *lulav* and did not perform the mitzvah of *lulav* in the morning when he recited *hallel*, he should repeat *hallel* later in the day upon obtaining a *lulav* and performing the mitzvah. He argues that the mitzvah of *lulav* warrants the recital of *hallel*, even if *hallel* was already recited earlier in the day (in honor of the festival).

דף קיח:

מאי דכתיב הללו את ה' כל גוים

In *hallel* there is a posuk that states, הללו את ה' כל גוים...כי גבר עלינו חסדו - the nations of the world will praise Hashem...because He has bestowed kindness upon us (Tehillim 117). R' Yosi, the father of R' Yishmael, expounds on the meaning of this posuk, wondering why the nations of the world will praise Hashem for the good that Hashem does for Klal Yisrael.

R' Yosi explains (as understood by the Rashbam) that the posuk should be read as follows. The non-Jews will praise Hashem for the good that they receive from Hashem. The second posuk, כי גבר עלינו חסדו, is saying that *B'nai Yisrael* certainly should praise Hashem because they receive much more kindness from Hashem than do the non-Jews.

Rashi seems to have a different גירסא (textual reading) which reads that the non-Jews will thank Hashem for the wondrous deeds that Hashem performs for B'nai Yisrael. This reading requires explanation because it seems to leave the Gemara's original difficulty unresolved.

The Brisker Rav⁷⁸ explains that there are two types of blessings recited in the event of a special occurrence. (a) One must thank Hashem when he is personally delivered from danger (e.g., one who recovers from a serious illness recites *bircas haGomel*). This *bracha* is recited even if one was delivered through non-miraculous means.

(b) Upon witnessing a miraculous event or spectacular phenomenon one recites a *bracha* praising Hashem's wondrous might (e.g., upon witnessing thunder and lightning, the *bracha*

שכוחו וגבורתו מלא עולם or עושה מעשה בראשית (recited).

Initially it was assumed that when Mashiach comes *B'nai Yisrael* will be redeemed through natural means. Consequently R' Yosi asks why the non-Jews should thank Hashem for the kindness bestowed on *B'nai Yisrael*. In answer, R' Yosi stresses that the non-Jews will praise Hashem upon witnessing the גבורות ונפלאות - mighty and miraculous deeds - that Hashem will perform for *B'nai Yisrael*.⁷⁹ Upon witnessing such events everyone is obligated to praise Hashem, even one who did not personally benefit.

The posuk continues: If the miracles performed on behalf of *Klal Yisrael* will be so wondrous that even the non-Jews will praise Hashem, then certainly, *B'nai Yisrael* should praise Hashem. *B'nai Yisrael* will not only have to praise Hashem for witnessing wondrous miracles (blessing B), but they will also have to thank Hashem for their salvation (blessing A).

- R' Itzel of Ponovizh⁸⁰ explains that the non-Jews in future times will praise Hashem (for the salvation of the Jews) even more than the Jews themselves because the non-Jews perceive the full extent of Hashem's miracles. R' Itzel explains that in every generation there are non-Jews who plot against the Jews and plan their destruction, and Hashem foils their evil plots before they materialize. Often times, the evil plots are foiled at their inception before other people are even aware of the plot. In such cases, only the non-Jews who conceived of the plot could praise Hashem for the miracle, for only they are aware of Hashem's miraculous salvation.⁸¹

דף קיט:

אמר להם יעקב איני מברך שנשאתי ב' אחיות

The Gemara relates an interesting aggadic account of a feast that Hashem will host for tzaddikim in future times (after Mashiach comes). After the meal, each of the three avos

(patriarchs) will be honored with leading the *bircas hamazon* (*zimun*) and each one will refuse, claiming to be undeserving for different reasons.

Yaakov Avinu will say, "I am unfit to lead the *zimun* because I married two sisters (Rachel and Leah), an act that was eventually forbidden by the Torah."⁸² [The Gemara says that Moshe Rabbeinu and Yehoshua will also refuse the honor, but Dovid Hamelech will finally accept, as alluded to in Tehillim (116:13) where Dovid writes, כוס ישועות אשא ובשם ה' אקרא - I will raise the cup of salvation, and proclaim in the name of Hashem.]

The Midrash (cited by Rashi in Bereishis 32:5 (עם לבן הרשע גרתי ותרייג מצות שמרתי) says that Yaakov observed all the laws of the Torah (even though the Torah was not given until generations later).⁸³

The commentators wonder this Midrash can be reconciled with the fact that Yaakov married two sisters, a union forbidden by the Torah.

The Ramban (Bereishis 26:5) submits that the avos observed the mitzvos only in Eretz Yisrael. Yaakov married Rachel and Leah in Padan Aram, which was outside Eretz Yisrael.⁸⁴ Moreover, suggests the Ramban (Vayikra 18:25), it was for this reason that Rachel passed away while Yaakov was travelling with his family on his way to Eretz Yisrael. Hashem took Rachel's life before they entered Eretz Yisrael because once Yaakov reentered Eretz Yisrael he was bound by Torah law and he was no longer permitted to be married to two sisters.

Alternatively, the Maharsha (Yoma 28b) suggests that Rachel and Leah were converts. As such they were not halachically considered sisters, because one's relationship with his biological family is halachically dissolved upon conversion (גר שנתגייר כקטן שנולד דמי) - a convert is considered as a newborn child). Thus, according to Torah law Yaakov was permitted to marry Rachel and Leah, for they weren't considered sisters.

The Mizrahi⁸⁵ asks that if indeed, Yaakov was justified in marrying Rachel and Leah why does our Gemara consider it a sin.

The Radvaz⁸⁶ answers that even though Yaakov did not commit an actual sin, he still felt unqualified to lead the *zimun* because he conducted himself in a manner which *appeared* as a sin.

דף קכ:

ר' אלעזר בן עזריה אומר עד חצות

R' Elazar ben Azaryah derives from a posuk that the *korbon pesach* must be eaten before *chatzos* (midnight). Rava says, accordingly, if one eats *matzah* today after *chatzos* he has not fulfilled the mitzvah because *matzah* is scripturally compared to *korbon pesach*. The Rambam⁸⁷ rules in accordance with R' Akiva who disagrees with R' Elazar ben Azaryah and is of the opinion that one may eat *matzah* the entire night. Many Rishonim disagree and rule in accordance with R' Elazar b' Azaryah (see Tosfos, אמר רבא).

The *Shulchan Aruch*⁸⁸ writes that one should be careful to finish eating the *matzah* at the *seder* before *chatzos*. This applies not only to the first *k'zayis* of *matzah*, but even the *afikoman matzah* which is eaten at the end of the meal should be eaten before *chatzos* (because that *matzah* commemorates the *korbon pesach*).⁸⁹

The Dagul Me'revavah⁹⁰ writes that if one was delayed and was unable to begin the *seder* until close to midnight, he should skip the *hagadah* and quickly eat the *matzah* and *marror*, in order to fulfill the principal mitzvos before *chatzos*. Afterwards, he should recite the *hagadah* even if it is past midnight.

- The Torah bids one to relate the story of *yetzias mitzraim* (והגדת לבנך, Sh'mos 13:8). In the *hagadah* we learn that this mitzvah applies only בשעה שיש מצה ומרור מונחים לפניך - when we are in the presence of *matzah* and *marror*, which is on Pesach night.

The *Minchas Chinuch*⁹¹ submits that the *hagadah* must be recited prior to *chatzos*

(according to R' Elazar b' Azaryah) because the mitzvah of reciting the *hagadah* (והגדת) (לבנך) is linked to the mitzvah of *matzah* and *marror* (בשעה שיש מצה ומרור לפניך).

In light of this, the Emek Bracha finds difficulty with the ruling of the Dagul Me'revavah. He argues that it is more important to recite the *hagadah* before *chatzos* than to eat *marror* before *chatzos* because the mitzvah of *marror* today (in the absence of the *korbon pesach*) is only *miderabbanan*, whereas the mitzvah of saying the *hagadah* is *min haTorah*.

דף קכא.

בירך ברכת הפסח פטר את של זבח

- In the times of the Bais Hamikdash, they would offer a *korbon chagigah* on Erev Pesach (in addition to the *korbon pesach*). The meat of this *korbon chagigah* (called חגיגת י"ד) was eaten on the night of Pesach prior to the *korbon pesach*, to ensure that the *pesach* is eaten "על השובע" on a full stomach (which is a Torah requirement for the *korbon pesach*).
- Upon eating the *korbon chagigah*, a *bracha* "וצונו לאכול הזבח" was recited, and upon eating the *korbon pesach* the *bracha* וציונו לאכול הפסח was recited.

The Mishna cites a dispute as to whether the *bracha* recited on the *korbon pesach* could exempt one from reciting a *bracha* on the *chagigah*. [The Aderes⁹² suggests that the Mishna could be referring to a case in which Shimon is about to eat the *chagigah* and Reuven is about to recite a *bracha* on his *korbon pesach*. The question is whether Shimon is exempt from reciting a *bracha* on his *chagigah* if he listens to Reuven recite the *bracha* on the *pesach*.]

The Rashbam comments that the dispute in the Mishna is relevant also with regard to a *bracha* recited over other *korbonos*, such as a *shelamim* that a person happened to have offered on Erev Pesach. According to R' Akiva the *bracha* recited on the *pesach* could exempt one from reciting a *bracha* over the *shelamim* that he eats on the night of Pesach.

The Mikdash Dovid⁹³ maintains that not all opinions agree that a *bracha* (על ברכת הזבח) is required upon eating the meat of a *shelamim*. A *bracha* would be required only if there is a mitzvah incumbent on the owner of the *korbon shelamim* to eat the meat. Now, Rashi on 59a, indeed, indicates that there is such a mitzvah, for Rashi says that atonement is provided when the owner eats from the meat of his *korbon* (in addition to the atonement provided by throwing its blood on the mizbeach and burning its fats). Accordingly, it is understandable that the owner should recite a *bracha* (על ברכת הזבח) upon eating the meat of the *shelamim*.

The words of the Rambam,⁹⁴ however, indicate that in his opinion there is no special atonement provided when the owner eats his

portion of a *korbon*. [Atonement is provided only when Kohanim eat the portion of the *korbon* given to them.] Presumably, according to the Rambam, the owner is not required to recite a *bracha* upon eating the meat of the *shelamim*, for there is no mitzvah involved. According to the Rambam, when the Mishna refers to ברכת הזבח (the *bracha* of the *korbon*) it must be referring only to the *chagigah* but not other *korbonos* (for there is no *bracha* recited on the other *korbonos*). [The reason eating the *chagigah* is considered a mitzvah is that the *chagigah* is offered and eaten for the purpose of filling one's stomach prior to the *pesach* so that he can eat the *pesach* על השובע.]

**סליק קונטרס "על הדף" על מסכת פסחים (מהדו"ת)
ברוך רחמנא דסעיין**

- 20) שם בהלי"ח ומובא בשו"ע שם ב' וגי'.
- דף קי**
- 21) תורה שבכתב תורה אור הקדמה לתורת כהנים (בסוף), מובא באוצר מפה"ת כאן.
- 22) סוף ספר מלכיאל, מובא בשליה מסכת פסחים סוף מצה עשירה ומובא באוצר מפרשי התלמוד כאן עמוד תצ"ג הערה 11.
- 23) וכ"כ רבינו בחיי עה"ת על פרשת בראשית (יום שני) דאיסור זוגות כדי שלא לטעות האמונה האחדות, וע"ע ביתר ביאור בכתבי ר' בחיי בשלחן של ארבע שער ראשון (קרוב לסוף, עמוד תפ"ז בדפוס מוסד הר"ק, אגב יש להעיר ד"א דספר זה אינו מרבנו בחיי אלא מהרמב"ן).
- 24) שו"ת אג"מ אה"ע ח"ג סוף סימן כ"ו (וע"ע בנדרים לב. ברש"י ור"ן שם שמבואר דכלל דמאן דקפיד נאמר גם לענין ניהושים, וכן מבואר בספר חסידים סי' תנ"ט ות"ס).
- 25) הלי עבוי"ז פרק י"א הלי ט"ז, ובפ"י המשני עמ"ס ע"ז פ"ד מ"ג (וע"ע במאירי עמ"ס שבת ריש דף סז. ד"ה והשני שכי דהרבה רפואות מועילים רק משום דהמון באותו הזמן בטוב בהן והיה טבעם מתחזק מצד הרגל עור טבעי בהן)
- דף קיא**
- 26) כך כתב בהשמטה בסוף הספר, ולכא"ו יש למנוע מזה משום דקשה ללימודו כדאיתא בהוריות יג.:
- 27) קול אליהו אות קמ"ב.
- 28) לא היתה המשתה עד כמה ימים אחר שפירסה נדה (שהרי לא הלכה לאחורשו עד יום ג' של התענית) ויתכן שהיתה אז בסוף נדתה וממילא צ"ל דכוונתה היתה לעשות מריבה ביניהם.
- 29) ע"ש בגמ' - ר"א אומר פחים טמנה לו וכ"ו ואולי הפך דקאמר ר"א היינו שנתכוונה לילך בין שניהם כדי לעשות מריבה ביניהם או להרוג א' מהן כמו שאמר הגר"א.
- 30) בגמ' שם איתא שעשרה דברים **קשה ללימוד**, ופירש"י שם ש"קשה לשמוע", אולם בפרמ"ג או"ח סימן ב' ס"ק א' בא"א משמע שע"ז **משכת** לימודו (ע"פ החיים שם סק"ג שעמד בזה, וכן עמד בזה הגי' רע"א יו"ד סי' שע"ז ס"ד).
- 31) שלמת חיים ח"ד סימן כ', מובא באוצר מפרשי התלמוד כאן (עמ' תצ"ח אות 51).
- דף קיב**
- 32) ע"י רמב"ם פ"ב מהלי רוצח ושמיירת נפש ה"ה שכתב שכתב הטעם שלא להניח תבשיל תחת המטה משום "שמא יפול בו דבר", וקשה להולמו עם מכילתין דמבואר דאסור אפי' מחופין בכלי ברזל משום רוח רעה (ע"ש בהשגות הראב"ד).
- 33) וי"ד סימן קט"ז סעיף ה'.
- 34) ח"ב סימן ק"ה (מצוין בהג' רע"א שם בשו"ע וכן בפ"ת סק"ד), וע"ע בכף החיים שם ס"ק מ"ד שהביא עוד מקילין בזה.
- 35) ע"י משנ"ב סימן ב' בשם החיי אדם לענין אוכלין ומשקין שנגע בהם קודם נטילת ידים שחרית שיש בו משום חשש רוח רעה שפסק דאין אוכלין אסורין בדיעבד, וע"י בתורת חיים שבועות דף ט' (מצויין כאן בגליון רע"א) דמשמע דבי עניני רוח רעה תלוין בהדדי, דרוח רעה שורה על האוכלין תחת המטה היינו הרוח רעה ששורה על ידים בשעת שינה (אולם ע"י דרכי תשובה סימן קט"ז ס"ק ל"ח ש"א שחוששין לרוח רעה באוכלין תחת המטה אפי' אם לא ישן אדם על המטה, מבואר דלא שייכא אלו ב' רוחות רעות להדדי, וכן ע"י בדרכי תשובה שם אות ל"ט בשם שו"ת דגל אפרים דמבואר דס"ל דאין תלוין בהדדי דרוח רעה השורה על ידים בבוקר לא שייכא לנכרים משא"כ רוח רעה תחת המטה שייך אפי' במטה של נכרי).

- דף קיז**
- 1) דעת הרמב"ם דאין מקדשים על שכן אפי' במקום שהוא חמר מדינה, אבל מבדילין עליו (וס"ל דמבדילין עליו אפי' במקום שמצוי יין ובלבד שהוא שתיית רוב המדינה).
- 2) סימן רע"ב ס"ט (ובענין הבדלה בסימן רצ"ו ס"ב)
- 3) שם, וז"ל איכא לתמוה על מנהג כל ישראל שמקדשין בבקר על השכר אפי' שיש יין בביתם, והביא שם שכן נהגו גם הגדולים רבנים (ע"ש מה שכי ליישב המנהג קצת).
- 4) שם סק"ו, ומובא להלכה במשנ"ב שם בס"ק כ"ט (ומסיים שם ה"ט"ז דמ"מ מי שמחדר לקדש על היין אפי' ביום ודאי עושה מן המובחר).
- 5) ח"א סימן ט'.
- 6) שם סעיף ט' (וכן במשנ"ב שם ס"ק כ"ה ובסימן רצ"ו סק"ט) נקט דכל משקין שרביעין לשתותן מיקרי חמר מדינה (במקום שאין יין).
- 7) שם סק"ל (בשם החיי אדם ושי"א).
- 8) ח"א סימן קע"ה.
- 9) שם בס"מ רע"ב כתב שיש ללמוד זכות על המקילין ע"פ ה"ט"ז בסימן ר"י ק"א שכי רביעית לברכה אחרונה, וע"י מג"א בסימן ק"צ סק"ד חולק עליו, וע"י בלחם הפנים על קיצור ש"ע סימן ע"ז ס"ק י"ג שכי דגם ה"ט"ז יודה דלקדוש בעינן אפי' לה"ט"ז אין זה אלא לענין ברכה אחרונה
- 10) ע"י ספר ידי משה שכי בשם גדול א' (מובא בספר תוספות שבת סימן רע"ב אות י"ב) דהביא ראי' דין שרף לא מיקרי משקה מהא דדרש חז"ל מה שמן עליון (צ"ל על ב"ב **משקין** אף ישראל וכי, וידוע דין שרף קל ביותר וצ"ל על גבי שמן א"כ ש"מ דלא מיקרי משקה וממילא ר"ל דאין לקדש על י"ש כיון דלא מיקרי משקה, וכי התוספת שבת ע"ז דאין למדין הלכה מן המדרש.
- דף קח**
- 11) פ"ז מהלי חמץ ומצה ה"ז.
- 12) שם.
- 13) הנה הגר"י: מדייק מהא דכ' הרמב"ם דיש מצות הסיבה בכל הסעודה דהסיבה הוא מצוה בפניע ולכן אם אכל מצה בלי הסיבה ליכא חיוב לחזור ולאכול בהסיבה, אולם צ"ע מדברי הרמ"א בסימן תע"ב סוף סעיף ז' שכי דלכתחילה יסב כל הסעודה ומי"מ ס"ל דאכל מצה בלי הסיבה צריך לחזור ולאכול בהסיבה כדמבואר שם במחבר, וא"כ מבואר דלא כהגר"י: (וכן העיר הדבר שמואל כאן).
- 14) וכן מבואר בפרמ"ג סימן תע"ב סק"י במש"ז דקמ"ל דמש"ז א"צ להסב לכתחילה כל הסעודה (ע"ע שם בט"ז סק"ו), וע"י אליה רבה שם ס"ק י"א שכי דמש"ז פטור להסב אפי' באכילת אפיקומן ובשתיית ד' כוסות.
- דף קט**
- 15) פ"ז מהלי יו"ט ה"ז וי"ח.
- 16) וכן הבין תו"ס שם ב"ר"ה כונת רש"י שם.
- 17) סימן תקכ"ט.
- 18) וכן פסק בשו"ע שם ס"א שצריך לקבוע סעודתו על ה"י ולא כתב בשר, וע"ש בב"י מה שכי לישב טיט הרמב"ם (וע"ע ב"מ פ"ב ס"ה) וע"י שו"ת ושב הכהן סימן צ"ה שר"ל שהיה להרמב"ם גירסא אחרת בברייתא שבמכילתן, וע"ש במג"א פסק הרמב"ם דמצוה לאכול בשר, וע"י בחות יאיר סימן קע"ח שכי דאין יוצאין שמחת החג אלא בבשר בהמה דוקא ולא בבשר עוף.
- 19) (ע"י ב"מ של שלמה עמ"ס ביצה פ"ב ס"ה שמשמע שהוא משום חינוך).

AL HADAF DEDICATION FORM

I am interested in:

___Dedicating a Daf \$120.

___Sponsoring an entire issue \$500.

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

DATE & TEXT OF DEDICATION:

___Check is enclosed. Make tax deductible check payable to Al Hadaf.

___Please charge my MasterCard/Visa/AMEX \$_____.

Card # _____ Exp. date _____

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

PHONE: _____

Notice about back issues & daf dedications:

Back issues from last cycle are available @ \$2.50 each to members (for orders of 10 issues and more), and to non-members (or for orders less than 10 issues) @ \$3.00 each:

[Note: You might want to consider ordering back issues for your son in Yeshiva.]

Mesechtas Berachos 4 issues, Shabbos 9, Eruvin 6, Pesachim 7, Shekalim 1, Yoma 5, Succah 3, Beitza 3, Rosh Hashana 2, Megilla 2, Moed Katan 2, Chagiga 2, Yevamos 9, Ksubos 8, Nedarim 6, Nazir 4, Sotah 3, Gittin 6, Kiddushin 5, Bava Kama 7, Bava Metzia 7, Bava Basra 11, Sanhedrin 7 Makos 1 Double issue, Sh'vuos 2 Dbl issues, Avodah Zorah w/Horias 5, Zevachim 7, Menachos 7, Chullin 9, Bechoros 4, Arachin 2, Temura 2, Meilah 2, Nidda 4. Overseas & Canada - additional charge for postage.

LIMITED TIME SPECIAL OFFER - FULL SET APPROX 175 ISSUES FOR ONLY \$350. - Enclose an additional \$100 to have the set sent in 8 customized binders.

MAIL/FAX FORM TO: Al Hadaf / P.O. Box 791 / Monsey, NY 10952 / (845) 356-9114 E-Mail cong_al_hadaf@yahoo.com Or visit alHadafYomi.org

דף	This Al Hadaf was made possible by the following daf dedications...	יום	
קז	לז"נ הרב יואל מרדכי בן משה בנימין סומכוס ז"ל*	ו אייר	Th
קח	לז"נ עלקא בריינא בת עובדיה הלוי ז"ל * -ELLEN ROSENBLATT AVNER	ז אייר	F
קט		ח אייר	ש
קי	לז"נ לאה בת ר' אהרן דוב ושיינע מזא"ה * (nee Fine) Maternal Grandmother of RABBI AARON DOV MIRSKY	ט אייר	S
	לז"נ דוד בן אברהם הלוי ז"ל *		
קיא	לז"נ ר' שמואל יעקב ב"ר צבי הערשפאנג ז"ל *	י אייר	M
	לז"נ אלטא זלטא פערל בת יעקב הכהן Schwarzbau ז"ל *		
קיב	לע"נ הרה"צ ר' יצחק בן הגי' הקי' ר' צבי אלימלך שפירא ז"ל מלאנצוט * האדמו"ר מטיסמעניץ - ע"י חתנו ובתו מנחם ויוכבד שמעונוביץ	יא אייר	T
	לז"נ ישכר דוב בן אלעזר ז"ל *		
	לעלוי נשמת אבי מורי ר' אברהם ברוך בן יעקב יצחק ז"ל *		
קיג	לז"נ שרה בת ר' משולם פייש הערשפאנג ז"ל *	יב אייר	W
	לז"נ ר' יעקב בן ר' פינחס אייזיק קרשנבוים ז"ל *		
קיד		יג אייר	
קטו	לז"נ אלכסנדר בן פנחס מונדרר שנהרג ע"י קדה"ש פסח שני ת"ש, יהא זכרו ברוך * -הונצח ע"י נכדו	יד אייר	F
קטז		טו אייר	ש
קיז	לז"נ משה בן יצחק גדליה הלוי ז"ל * MOSHE VAYNSHTOK	טז אייר	S
קיח		יז אייר	M
קיט	לז"נ חנניה יו"ט ליפא בן שלום ע"ה *	לג בעומר	T
קכ		יט אייר	W
קכא		כ אייר	Th

* Denotes Yartzeit

See Page 15 for dedication information, Thank you!

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

(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