

הוא רבי יצחק בן אחא דשַׁמְעֵתָא.
הוא רבי יצחק בן פנחס דאַגְדָּתָא.
וְסִימְנֵיהּ: (שְׁמַעוּ נָא אֶחָי וְרַעִי).

אָמַר רַבָּא בַר בַּר חַנָּה, אָמַר רַבִּי
יוֹחָנָן, מִשְׁמִיָּה דְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה בְּרַבִּי
אֵילְעִי: אֲכוּל בְּצֵל וְשֵׁב בְּצֵל, וְלֹא
תִּיכּוּל אֲוֹזִין וְתִרְנַגְלוּלִין, וְיִהְיֶה לְבָבְךָ
רוֹדֵף עָלֶיךָ. פָּחוֹת מִמִּיכְלָךְ וּמִמְשֻׁתְּיָךְ
וּתּוֹסֵף עַל דִּירְתְּךָ.

כִּי אָתָּא עוּלָא אָמַר: מִתְּלָא מִתְּלִין
בְּמַעְרְבָא: דְּאֵבִיל אֲלִיתָא – טְשִׁי
בְּעִלְיָתָא: דְּאֵבִיל קַקְלֵי – אֶקְיַלֵּי
דְּמִתָּא שְׂבִיב.

מתני' מִזְגוּ לוֹ כּוֹס רֵאשׁוֹן, בֵּית
שְׁמַאי אוֹמְרִים: מְבָרֵךְ עַל הַיּוֹם,
וְאַחַר כֵּן מְבָרֵךְ עַל הַיַּיִן; וּבֵית הַלֵּל
אוֹמְרִים: מְבָרֵךְ עַל הַיַּיִן, וְאַחַר כֵּן
מְבָרֵךְ עַל הַיּוֹם.

גמ' תִּנּוּ רַבָּנִן: דְּבָרִים שְׂבִיבִין בֵּית
שְׁמַאי וּבֵית הַלֵּל בְּסַעְדוּדָה: בֵּית
שְׁמַאי אוֹמְרִים: מְבָרֵךְ עַל הַיּוֹם וְאַחַר
כֵּן מְבָרֵךְ עַל הַיַּיִן, מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהַיּוֹם גּוֹרֵם
לַיַּיִן שֶׁיָּבֵא, וּכְבָר קִידֵשׁ הַיּוֹם וְעַדִּין
יֵין לֹא בָּא.

וּבֵית הַלֵּל אוֹמְרִים: מְבָרֵךְ עַל הַיַּיִן
וְאַחַר כֵּן מְבָרֵךְ עַל הַיּוֹם, מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהַיַּיִן
גּוֹרֵם לְקִידוּשׁ שְׁתַּאֲמָר. דְּבַר אַחֵר:
בְּרַבְתָּ הַיַּיִן תְּדִירָה וּבְרַבְתָּ הַיּוֹם אֵינָה
תְּדִירָה, תְּדִיר וְשִׂאֵינוּ תְּדִיר – תְּדִיר
קוֹדֵם. וְהִלְכְתָּא כְּדַבְּרֵי בֵית הַלֵּל.

מֵאֵי דְבַר אַחֵר? וְכִי תִמָּא: הֲתָם תְּרַתִּי
וְהֲכָא חֲדָא – הֲכָא נִמְי תְּרַתִּי מִנְהוּ,
תְּדִיר וְשִׂאֵינוּ תְּדִיר תְּדִיר קוֹדֵם.

וְהִלְכָה כְּדַבְּרֵי בֵית הַלֵּל. פְּשִׁטָּא,
דְּהָא נִפִּיק בַּת קוּל! אֵיבַעִית אִימָא:
קוֹדֵם בַּת קוּל.

The Rabbi Yitzhak ben Aḥa mentioned in a ruling of *halakha* is the same as the Rabbi Yitzhak ben Pineḥas who appears in statements of *aggada*. And your mnemonic to remember the names is the standard phrase: Listen my brothers and friends [*shimu aḥai vere'ai*]. *Shimu* sounds like *shema'ta*, the term for *halakha*, while *aḥai* is similar to the patronymic ben Aḥa.

Rabba bar bar Hana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said, citing Rabbi Yehuda, son of Rabbi Elai: Eat an onion [*batzal*] and sit in the shade [*batzel*], i.e., eat inexpensive food while sitting in a comfortable place, but do not eat expensive geese and chickens, as your heart will pursue you, i.e., you will develop a taste for luxuries. Devote less to your food and your drink and spend more on your house, as one's house is a better investment than food.

When Ulla came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia he said that they say the following proverb in the west, Eretz Yisrael: One who eats a fat tail [*alita*] must hide in the attic [*aliyata*] from creditors who think he is wealthy. One who eats vegetables [*kakulei*] can lie down in the city's garbage [*kikle'i*] without fear of others, as he is not in debt.

MISHNA The *tanna* describes the beginning of the Passover seder. The attendants poured the wine of the first cup for the leader of the seder. **Beit Shammai say: One recites the blessing over the sanctification of the day, i.e., the *kiddush* for the Festival: Who blesses Israel and the Festivals, and thereafter he recites the blessing over the wine: Who creates fruit of the vine. And Beit Hillel say: One recites the blessing over the wine and thereafter recites the blessing over the day.**¹¹

GEMARA The Sages taught in the *Tosefta*: These are the matters of dispute between Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel with regard to the *halakhot* of a meal. **Beit Shammai say: When reciting *kiddush* over wine, one recites a blessing over the sanctification of the day and thereafter recites a blessing over the wine, because the day causes the wine to come before the meal. And Beit Shammai offer an additional reason. The day has already been sanctified and the wine has not yet come.**

And Beit Hillel say: One recites the blessing over the wine and thereafter recites a blessing over the day, because the wine causes *kiddush*¹² to be recited. Since one does not recite *kiddush* without wine or bread, clearly the wine is the primary feature of the ritual. Alternatively, the blessing over wine is recited frequently and the blessing over the day is not recited frequently, and there is a general principle: When a frequent practice and an infrequent practice coincide, the frequent practice takes precedence over the infrequent practice. The *Tosefta* concludes: And the *halakha* is in accordance with the statement of Beit Hillel.

The Gemara asks: What is alternatively? Why did Beit Hillel cite an additional reason? The Gemara explains: And if you say that there Beit Shammai cite two reasons, and here Beit Hillel offer only one; therefore Beit Hillel said they are two reasons here too: When a frequent practice and an infrequent practice coincide, the frequent practice takes precedence over the infrequent practice.

It was taught in the *Tosefta*: And the *halakha* is in accordance with the statement of Beit Hillel. The Gemara comments: It is obvious that this is so, as a Divine Voice emerged and proclaimed that the *halakha* is always in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel. Why was it necessary for the *Tosefta* to state that in this particular case the *halakha* is in accordance with their opinion? The Gemara answers: If you wish, say that this *Tosefta* was taught before the Divine Voice emerged and proclaimed that principle.

HALAKHA

The blessings over wine and the day – בְּרַבְתָּ יַיִן וְיוֹם – When reciting *kiddush*, the blessing over the wine precedes the blessing of the sanctification of the day (*Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim* 473:1, 271:10).

NOTES

The wine causes *kiddush* – הַיַּיִן גּוֹרֵם לְקִידוּשׁ – The Rid comments that the Torah obligation to sanctify the day is fulfilled in the evening prayers. According to his opinion, the recitation of *kiddush* during the meal does not fulfill a Torah obligation. Instead, it is a repetition mandated by rabbinical law, like *havdala*.

וְאִי בְּעֵיַת אֵימָא: לְאַחַר בֵּית
קוֹל, וְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ הָיָא, דְּאָמַר:
אֵין מְשַׁגְּחִין בְּבֵית קוֹל.

And if you wish, say instead that this statement was indeed issued **after the Divine Voice** emerged, and the *Tosefta* is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yehoshua, who said that one disregards a Divine Voice^N** when deciding *halakha*. Just as Rabbi Yehoshua disregarded the Divine Voice in his dispute with Rabbi Eliezer, so too, one disregards the Divine Voice that proclaimed that the *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel. Therefore, it was necessary to state that the *halakha* is in fact in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel here.

מתני' הִבְיָאוּ לְפָנָיו מִטְבֵּיל
בַּחֲזוֹרָת עַד שְׂמִינֵי לְפָרְפֵרֵת הַפֶּת.
הִבְיָאוּ לְפָנָיו מִצֵּה וְחֲזוֹרָת וְחֲרוֹסֶת
וְשֵׁנֵי תַבְשִׁילִין, אֶף עַל פִּי שְׂאִין
חֲרוֹסֶת מִצֵּה. רַבִּי אֶלְיָעָזָר (בֶּן)
צְדוֹק אָמַר: מִצֵּה. וּבִמְקוֹדֵשׁ הָיָה
מְבִיאִין לְפָנָיו גּוֹפּוֹ שֶׁל פֶּסַח.

MISHNA The attendants **brought** vegetables **before** the leader of the seder prior to the meal, if there were no other vegetables on the table. **He dips the *hazeret* into water or vinegar, to taste some food before he reaches the dessert of the bread,^N i.e., the bitter herbs, which were eaten after the *matza*. They brought before him *matza* and *hazeret* and *haroset*,^N and at least two cooked dishes in honor of the Festival. The *tanna* comments that this was the practice, although eating *haroset* is not a mitzva but merely a custom. Rabbi Eliezer ben Tzadok says: Actually, it is a mitzva to eat *haroset*. And in the period when the Temple stood and they offered the Paschal lamb, they brought before him the body of the Paschal lamb.^H**

NOTES

אֵין מְשַׁגְּחִין בְּבֵית קוֹל – One disregards a Divine Voice – Rabbi Yehoshua stated this principle in the context of a disagreement with Rabbi Eliezer in the case of the oven of *akhnai* (*Bava Metzia* 59b). In that incident, a Divine Voice proclaimed that the *halakha* is invariably in accordance with Rabbi Eliezer. Rabbi Yehoshua retorted that one disregards a Divine Voice when deciding the *halakha*. His declaration was based on the principle that the Torah “is not in the heavens” (Deuteronomy 30:12). Not even a prophet is permitted to alter Torah law. The Sages of the time accepted Rabbi Yehoshua’s opinion.

פָּרְפֵרֵת הַפֶּת – The dessert [*parperet*] of the bread – There are various opinions with regard to the meaning of this term, which can mean an appetizer or a dessert. Some commentaries state that it refers to the *hazeret* (Rashi),

while others assert that it means the *matza* itself. According to one interpretation, the Mishna uses the term appetizer for the bread because *matza* is insufficiently substantial to be considered proper bread. *Matza* would usually be served as a snack after the meal (Ran, citing Ramban). Others contend that this phrase means to crumble or break the bread, as on Passover the blessings are recited over a broken *matza* (see Rabbi Ovadya Bartenura).

חֲרוֹסֶת – *Haroset* – The exact meaning of this term is not entirely clear. Some commentaries state that the *haroset* serves as a reminder of the clay used by the Jews to mold bricks in Egypt, and that it is called *haroset* because it is similar to the Hebrew word for clay [*heres*] (*Tosefta Yom Tov*).

HALAKHA

גּוֹפּוֹ שֶׁל פֶּסַח – The body of the Paschal lamb – During Temple times, the food of the Passover seder was served on a very large platter that contained the bitter herbs,

vegetables, *matza*, *haroset*, the meat of the Paschal lamb, and the meat of the Festival peace-offering (Rambam *Sefer Zemanim, Hilkhot Hametz UMatza* 8:1).

גמ' אמר ריש לקיש: זאת אומרת מצות צריכות פוונה. בין דלא בעידן חיובא דמרור הוא דאכיל ליה – ביבורא פרי האדמה הוא דאכיל ליה, ודילמא לא איכוון למרור – הלכך בעי למהדר לאטבולי לשם מרור. דאי סלקא דעתך מצוה לא בעי פוונה – למה לך תרי טבולי? והא טביל ליה חדא זימנא!

ממאי? דילמא לעולם מצות אין צריכות פוונה, ודקאמרת תרי טבולי למה לי – כי היכי דליהוי היבירא לתינוקות.

וכי תימא: אם כן לישמענין שאר ירקות – אי אשמענין שאר ירקות הוה אמינא: היבא דאיבא שאר ירקות הוא דבעינן תרי טבולי, אבל חזרת לחודא – לא בעי תרי טבולי, קמשמע לן דאפילו חזרת בעינן תרי טבולי, כי היכי דליהוי ביה היבירא לתינוקות.

ועוד תני: אכלן דמאי יצא: אכלן בלא מתכוין – יצא: אכלן לחצאין – יצא

ובלבד שלא ישהא בין אכילה לתבירתה יותר מכדי אכילת פרס.

תנאי היא, דתניא, רבי יוסי אומר: אף על פי שטיבל בחזרת – מצוה להביא לפני חזרת וחרוסת ושני תבשילין.

ואכתי, ממאי? דילמא קסבר רבי יוסי: מצות אין צריכות פוונה, והאי דבעינן תרי טבולי – כי היכי דתיהוי היבירא לתינוקות – אם כן מאי מצוה?

GEMARA Reish Lakish said: That is to say that mitzvot require intent.^N One who performs a mitzva must do so with the intent to fulfill his obligation. The proof of this from the mishna is that since one does not eat the lettuce at the time of his obligation to eat bitter herbs, he eats it after reciting only one blessing: Who creates fruit of the ground. And clearly the reason is that perhaps he did not intend to fulfill his obligation to eat bitter herbs, and therefore he needs to dip it again for the purpose of bitter herbs. For if it could enter your mind that mitzvot do not require intent, why do you need two dippings? But he has already dipped the lettuce once.

The Gemara rejects this contention: From where do you know that this is the case? Perhaps I can say that actually mitzvot do not require intent. And that which you said, why do I need two dippings,^N perhaps the reason is so that there should be a conspicuous distinction for the children, which will cause them to inquire into the difference between this night and all others.

And if you say: If so, let the tanna teach us this halakha with regard to other vegetables as well, as there is no obvious reason that lettuce is chosen for this distinction. In response, I would say that had the mishna taught us about other vegetables, I would have said that it is only where there are other vegetables that one requires two dippings, one for the other vegetables and one for the bitter herbs; however, if one has only *hazeret*, he does not require two dippings, as one dipping is sufficient. Therefore, the mishna teaches us that even if one has just *hazeret* he requires two dippings, so that there be a conspicuous distinction for the children.

And furthermore, it was taught in a *baraita*: On Passover, if one ate vegetables of doubtfully tithed produce, i.e., he bought the vegetables from an *am ha'aretz*, he has fulfilled his obligation. If he ate them without the intent of the mitzva, he has fulfilled his obligation. If he ate them in halves, by eating half an olive-bulk of bitter herbs, pausing, and then eating an additional half an olive-bulk, he has fulfilled his obligation.

And the Gemara adds: With regard to this last case, one who eats an olive-bulk in halves, that is the *halakha*, provided that he does not pause between eating the first half an olive-bulk and the other half an olive-bulk more than the time it takes to eat a half-loaf of bread. If one takes longer than this amount of time, the two parts of bitter herbs cannot combine. This *baraita* indicates that even if one eats the bitter herbs without intention he has fulfilled his obligation, which presents a difficulty for Reish Lakish.

The Gemara answers: The issue of whether or not mitzvot require intent is a dispute between *tanna'im*, as it was taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Yosei says: Although one has already dipped the *hazeret* once, it is a mitzva to bring before him *hazeret* and *haroset*, and two cooked dishes. Apparently, he lacked intention during his first consumption of lettuce, and therefore he must be given additional lettuce with which to fulfill his obligation.

The Gemara asks: And still this is no conclusive proof, as from where do I know that Rabbi Yosei is of the opinion that mitzvot require intent? Perhaps Rabbi Yosei maintains that mitzvot do not require intent, and the reason that we require two dippings is so that there should be a conspicuous distinction for the children. The Gemara rejects this argument: If so, for what reason does Rabbi Yosei use the term *mitzva*? There is no mitzva from the Torah to provide a distinction to stimulate the curiosity of the young ones. The mitzva is to eat bitter herbs, and evidently this individual must return and eat them again because he lacked intention the first time.

NOTES

Mitzvot require intent – מצות צריכות פוונה – The debate as to whether or not mitzvot must be performed with intent appears in several places in the Talmud. Some commentaries maintain that the issue is whether one must be aware that he is fulfilling a mitzva, but it is obvious that he need not focus on the meaning of the mitzva (Maharam Halawa). Others claim that even if one acts unawares, he still fulfills his obligation, provided he does not actively intend not to fulfill the mitzva (*Me'iri*). Rav Hai Gaon writes that although it can be inferred from the Gemara that mitzvot do not require intent, it is nevertheless appropriate for one to think about the mitzva with proper concentration and thereby enhance the performance of his duty. Several prayers have been composed to assist in proper concentration.

Two dippings – שני טבולים – Several commentaries explain that the wealthy eat vegetables during their meals to whet their appetites, while the poor eat vegetables before their meals to fill themselves on cheap food. Eating vegetables twice, both before and during the meal, is designed to arouse the curiosity of the children (*Tosefot Yom Tov*).

NOTES

Beets and rice – סילקא וָאַרוֹזָא: Rav Huna advised eating these two foods rather than meat, to avoid giving the appearance of eating sacrificial meat outside the Temple.

Since it came from Rav Huna's mouth – הוֹאִיל וְנִפְקַח מִפּוּמֵיהּ – דְּרַב הוֹנָא: This sort of behavior, a student's attempt to follow his teacher's instruction to the letter, is found elsewhere in the Gemara. Certain students acted in this manner even if the teacher had exaggerated or was clearly stating examples. A similar expression of loyalty is a student repeating his master's teaching verbatim.

Two cooked foods – שְׁנֵי תַבְשִׁילִין: The commentaries explain that the two cooked foods allude to Moses and Aaron. There is also a custom to add a third dish to symbolize Miriam, the third person who led the Jews out of Egypt. These foods also symbolize the meal the righteous will be served in the future. The standard custom is to fulfill this obligation with a shankbone and a hard-boiled egg. Some commentaries explain the connection between the egg and the redemption by means of the similarity between the Aramaic word for egg, *beya*, and the Aramaic word for desire, *baya*, as in the phrase: The Holy One, Blessed be He, wanted [*ba'a*] to redeem us with an outstretched arm.

HALAKHA

Two cooked foods – שְׁנֵי תַבְשִׁילִין: It is the common practice to use a hard-boiled egg and a roasted shankbone with meat as the two foods mentioned in the mishna. The custom is to eat the egg during the meal but not the meat (*Taz, Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 473:4*).

מאי שני תבשילין? אמר רב הונא: סילקא וָאַרוֹזָא. רבא הוה מיהדר אַסִּילְקָא וָאַרוֹזָא, הוֹאִיל וְנִפְקַח מִפּוּמֵיהּ דְּרַב הוֹנָא.

אמר רב אשי: שמע מינה דרב הונא: לית דתייש להא דרבי יוחנן בן נורי. דתניא, רבי יוחנן בן נורי אומר: ארוז מין דגן הוא, ותיבין על חימוצו פרת, ואדם יוצא בו ידי חובתו בפסח.

חזקיה אמר: אפילו דג וביצה שעלויו. רב יוסף אמר: צריך שני מיני בשר, אחד זכר לפסח ואחד זכר לחגיגה. רבינא אמר: אפילו גרמא ובישולא.

פשיטא, היכא דאיכא שאר ירקות – מברך אשאר ירקות בורא פרי האדמה ואכיל, והדר מברך "על אכילת מרור" ואכיל.

היכא דליכא אלא חסא, מאי? אמר רב הונא: מברך מעיקרא אמרו "בורא פרי האדמה" ואכיל, ולבסוף מברך עליה על אכילת מרור ואכיל.

The Gemara asks: What are these two cooked foods mentioned in the mishna? Rav Huna said: Beets and rice.^N The Gemara relates that Rava would seek beets and rice for his meal on Passover night, since this ruling came from Rav Huna's mouth.^N Although Rava realized that Rav Huna was merely citing examples and did not mean that one must eat those specific foods, he wanted to fulfill the statement of his teacher precisely.

Rav Ashi said: Learn incidentally another halakha from this statement of Rav Huna, that there is no one who is concerned about that statement of Rabbi Yohanan ben Nuri. As it was taught in a baraita: Rabbi Yohanan ben Nuri says: Rice is a type of grain in all regards; and one is liable to receive kareit for eating it in its leavened state on Passover; and one fulfills his obligation with it on Passover, if it was properly baked into matza. It can be inferred from Rav Huna's suggestion to use cooked rice, that rice cannot become leavened.

Hizkiya said: The two cooked foods can even be fish and the egg that that was fried on it. Rav Yosef said: One requires two types of meat on Passover night, one in remembrance of the Paschal lamb and the other one in remembrance of the Festival peace-offering, which was also eaten on Passover night. Ravina said: For the two cooked foods^{NH} one may use even the meat on the bone and the gravy in which it was cooked.

With regard to the halakha of eating vegetables, the Gemara clarifies: It is obvious that where there are other vegetables available besides bitter herbs, at the first dipping one recites over the other vegetables the blessing: Who creates fruit of the ground, and eats, with the intention of including in this blessing the bitter herbs he will eat later. And then, at the second dipping, he recites the blessing: Commanded us over eating bitter herbs, on the lettuce and eats it.

However, what is the halakha where there is only lettuce available? When should one recite each blessing? Rav Huna said: One initially recites the blessing: Who creates fruit of the ground, over the bitter herbs, i.e., the lettuce, and eats them. And ultimately, after the matza, one recites the blessing: Commanded us over eating bitter herbs, over the lettuce and eats it.

Perek X Daf 115 Amud a

HALAKHA

The halakha is in accordance with Rav Hisda – הלכתא כותיה – דרב חסדא: If the only vegetables one has at the seder are the bitter herbs, he recites two blessings when he dips the bitter herbs the first time: Who creates fruit of the ground, and: Commanded us over eating bitter herbs. For the second dipping, he dips the bitter herbs in the haroset and eats them without reciting a blessing. Nevertheless, it is proper to use a different kind of vegetable, called karpas, for the first dipping, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Aha, son of Rava. Karpas is generally performed with a type of celery; however, some people use a potato or an onion (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 475:2*).

מתקיף לה רב חסדא: לא אחר שמילא כריסו הימנו חוזר ומברך עליה? אלא אמר רב חסדא: מעיקרא מברך עליה "בורא פרי האדמה" ו"על אכילת מרור" ואכיל, ולבסוף אכיל אכילת חסא בלא ברכה.

בסוריא עבדי קרב הונא, ורב ששת בריה דרב יהושע עביד קרב חסדא. והלכתא כותיה דרב חסדא. רב אחא בריה דרבא מהדר אשאר ירקות, לאפוקי נפשיה מפלוגתא.

Rav Hisda strongly objects to this opinion: Do you think that after one fills his belly with lettuce, he then recites another blessing over it? Rather, Rav Hisda said: Initially one recites two blessings over the lettuce: Who creates fruit of the ground, and: Commanded us over eating bitter herbs, and he eats it; and later in the seder he eats lettuce without a blessing.

The Gemara comments: In Syria, they act in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna. And Rav Sheshet, son of Rav Yehoshua, acted in accordance with the opinion of Rav Hisda. The Gemara summarizes: And the halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rav Hisda.^H The Gemara relates that Rav Aha, son of Rava, would seek other vegetables for Passover to preclude himself from taking sides in the dispute. He first recited only the blessing: Who creates fruit of the ground, and later added the blessing: Commanded us over eating bitter herbs, thereby satisfying all opinions.