

2 Nissan 5781
March 15, 2021



Pesachim Daf 114

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

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

Modest food budget

Rabbah bar bar Chanah cites Rabbi Yochanan in the name of Rabbi Yehuda beRabbi Elai advising that one should eat simple foods like onion (batzel), and then he will be able to sit in the shade (betzel) of his house, with no need to hide from creditors. One should not eat fancy foods like geese and chicken, as he will then constantly want more of them. Finally, one should cut back on food and drink, and spend more on his abode.

Ulla brought the following saying from Eretz Yisrael: Those that eat the fatty tail (alyasa), must hide from creditors in their attic (alisa), while one who eats vegetables (kakuli) can sit in the busy areas (kikli) of the city, with no fear of creditors. (114a1)

Cup of wine for Kiddush

The Mishna says that they pour the first cup of wine for him for Kiddush. Bais Shamai say that he first says the blessing of Kiddush and then of wine, while Bais Hillel says the opposite order. (114a1)

The Gemora cites a braisa with more details on this dispute, which is one of various disputes between Bais Shamai and Bais Hillel about the proper way to conduct a meal. Bais Shamai say that one first makes the blessing on the day, since the wine is only brought due to the day, and the day begins before the wine is brought for Kiddush. Bais Hillel says the opposite, since one only makes Kiddush if he has wine. In addition, the blessing on wine is more

frequent than Kiddush. The braisa concludes that we rule like Bais Hillel. The Gemora explains that Bais Hillel cited the second reason, since we may have thought that we should rule like Bais Shamai, since they offered two reasons. The Gemora asks why the braisa must rule like Bais Hillel, as a heavenly voice announced that we always rule like them. The Gemora says the braisa may have been before the announcement, or it may have been after, but it follows Rabbi Yehoshua, who says that heavenly voices have no impact on the way we rule. (114a1 – 114a2)

Dipping a vegetable and the seder table

The Mishna says that they then bring vegetables in front of him, and he dips *chazeres* – *lettuce*, before the dipping he will do later, when he eats the matza. They then bring in front of him matza, *chazeres*, *charoses* – a *paste*, and two cooked foods, even though there is no requirement to have *charoses*. Rabbi Eliezer Tzadok says there is a requirement for *charoses*. When the Bais Hamikdash was standing, they would also bring the Pesach sacrifice at this point. (114a2 – 114a3)

Do mitzvos need intent?

Rish Lakish says that the Mishna, which says that one eats *chazeres* twice, once after Kiddush, and once after matza, indicates that in order to fulfill a mitzvah, one must have intent. Therefore, when he ate the *chazeres* before the proper order of the mitzvah of maror, he only intended to eat it as a vegetable, but with no intent to fulfill the mitzvah. Therefore, he must eat it again in its proper



order. If one need not intend to fulfill the mitzvah, why would he have to dip twice? The Gemora deflects this proof, as perhaps one need not intend to fulfill the mitzvah, yet one must dip twice to show the children that something is different on the night of Pesach. Although the Mishna could have taught this requirement with the case of a different (non-maror) vegetable for the first dipping, the Mishna wanted to teach that even if one only has chazeres, he still must dip twice, to show the children. Furthermore, the Gemora cites a braisa which explicitly states that one fulfills his obligation of matza if he ate maror of *demai* – *market produce which the Sages required one to tithe*, if he ate it without intent, or if he ate it in two halves, as long as he didn't delay from start to finish more than the time to eat half a loaf of bread. The Gemora says that this is actually a dispute of tannaim, citing a braisa in which Rabbi Yossi says that even though one dipped chazeres after the first cup, it is a mitzvah to bring more chazeres, charoses, and two cooked foods, so he may eat chazeres again. The Gemora explains that since Rabbi Yossi used the word mitzvah in reference to the second chazeres, this proves that he requires it to fulfill the mitzvah, and not simply to show the children the difference of this night. (114b1 – 114b2)

Two cooked foods

The Gemora asks what the two cooked items listed in the Mishna are. Rav Huna says that one may even use turnips and rice. Rava would specifically look for these two foods, since Rav Huna explicitly mentioned them. Rav Ashi says that we see from Rav Huna's mention of rice that we are not concerned about Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri's opinion, that rice is considered a grain which can become chametz, and can therefore be used for matza. Chizkiya says that even a fish with egg on it is sufficient for the two cooked foods. Rav Yosef says that one needs two types of meat, one in remembrance of the Pesach sacrifice, and one in remembrance of the Chagiga sacrifice. Ravina says that

even meat and its broth can be used for the two dishes. (1142 – 114b3)

If one only has chazeres

The Gemora says that it is obvious that if one has other vegetables, he should dip those first, and then eat maror later. However, what should he do if he only has chazeres? Rav Huna says that when he eats the chazeres the first time, he should say only borai pri ha'adama, and when he eats it after the matza, he says the bracha on the mitzvah of eating maror. Rav Chisda challenges this, as it is illogical for him to say the bracha on the mitzvah after he already had his fill of the maror. Therefore, Rav Chisda says that he says both brachos on the chazeres when he eats it the first time, and no bracha when he eats it later. In Sura they followed Rav Huna, while Rav Sheshes berai deRav Yehoshua followed Rav Chisda. The Gemora rules like Rav Chisda. Rav Acha berai deRava would make a point of seeking out other vegetables, to avoid this dispute altogether. (114b3 – 115a1)

INSIGHT TO THE DAF

Does one need intent to fulfill a mitzvah?

The Gemora discusses if one needs intent to fulfill a mitzvah. The Rishonim differ in their rulings on this issue. The Rashba rules that one need not have intent to fulfill a mitzvah, while the Rosh (R"H 3:11) and the Rif rule that one needs intent.

The Rambam (Shofar 2:4) rules that one needs intent, yet he also rules (Chametz Umatza 6:3) that if one was forced by non-Jews to eat matzah on the night of Pesach, he nonetheless fulfills his obligation.

The Ran (R"H 7b in Rif pages) explains that the Rambam fundamentally rules that one needs intent. However, in the case of matzah, where the mitzvah involves ingesting



food, he rules that one fulfills the mitzvah without intent. This is similar to the Gemora's statement that if one transgressed prohibitions related to physical pleasure (eating or marital relations), he is liable, even if he was *misasek* – *not planning to do the actual act at all*.

See Chazon Ovadia (Pesach Responsum 29) for a comprehensive discussion of the position of the Rambam and others, and the halachic conclusion on this topic.

DAILY MASHAL

Heavenly voices and Halacha

The Gemora asks why the braisa needs to rule like Bais Hillel, as we already know this from the heavenly voice which announced that we rule like them in all cases. The Gemora answers by saying that either this braisa was written before the voice. Alternatively, it is authored by Rabbi Yehoshua, who said in the case of the dispute of Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages that we don't follow heavenly voices in deciding halacha.

Tosfos (114a D'amar) asks why we follow Rabbi Yehoshua in the case of Rabbi Eliezer, and therefore rule against the heavenly voice, and like the Sages, but in the case of Bais Hillel we rule like the voice.

Tosfos answers that the voice about Bais Hillel was consistent with our general rules of deciding Halacha, since Bais Hillel was the majority against Bais Shamai. The doubt about their dispute was only because Bais Shamai was sharper, and the voice only resolved that that factor doesn't change the regular rule of following the majority. However, in the case of Rabbi Eliezer, the voice, which ruled against the majority, was only stated to honor Rabbi Eliezer, but not to subvert the regular process of deciding halacha.

Tosfos explains that nonetheless, the Gemora here assumes that Rabbi Yehoshua did not accept the voice about Bais Hillel, as he made a categorical statement that we do not pay any attention to heavenly voices when deciding halacha, since the verse says that Torah is "not in heaven." Such an unqualified statement would apply to any voice, even the one which ruled like Bais Hillel.

See Yabia Omer (1:41, 42) for a discussion of the role of heavenly intervention in deciding halacha, and specifically the application of this to the repsonsa *Min Hashamayim* – *from the heavens*, based on answers provided by an angel to the author.