

אָמַר לוֹ לֹא – HAVE RETURNED the greeting TO HIM?” –  
 “NO,” REPLIED [THE GENERAL]. וְאִם הָיִיתָ מְחֹזֵר לוֹ מָה הָיוּ עוֹשִׂים לָךְ –  
 “AND IF YOU WOULD HAVE RETURNED IT TO HIM, WHAT WOULD  
 THEY HAVE DONE TO YOU?” – אָמַר לוֹ הֵיוּ חֹתְכִים אֶת רֹאשִׁי בְּסִיף –  
 “THEY WOULD HAVE CUT MY HEAD OFF WITH A SWORD!” REPLIED  
 [THE GENERAL]. וְהֲלֹא דְבָרִים קָלִים – [THE MAN] SAID HIM: וְהֲלֹא דְבָרִים קָלִים  
 וְנִמָּה – “THEN DOES THE MATTER NOT STAND TO REASON?<sup>1</sup>” וְנִמָּה –  
 “NOW IF YOU, WHO HAD YOU BEEN STANDING BEFORE A KING OF FLESH  
 AND BLOOD, WHO IS HERE TODAY AND IN THE GRAVE TOMORROW,  
 would have behaved SO, אֲנִי שֶׁהָיִיתִי עוֹמֵד לְפָנֵי מֶלֶךְ מַלְכֵי הַמְּלָכִים –  
 הַקְּרוֹשׁ בְּרוּךְ הוּא שֶׁהוּא חַי וְנֶקְוִים לְעַד וְלְעוֹלָמֵי עוֹלָמִים עַל אַחַת כַּמָּה וְכַמָּה  
 – I, WHO WAS STANDING BEFORE THE KING OF KINGS, THE HOLY  
 ONE, BLESSED IS HE, WHO LIVES AND ENDURES FOREVER AND EVER,  
 HOW MUCH MORE SO!” מִיָּד נִתְפָּיֵס אוֹתוֹ הַשֵּׁר וְנִפְטָר אוֹתוֹ חֲסִיד לְבֵיתוֹ –  
 IMMEDIATELY THE GENERAL WAS APPEASED AND THE PI-  
 OUS MAN DEPARTED TO HIS HOME IN PEACE.<sup>2</sup>

The Gemara quotes the next segment of the Mishnah:  
 אֲפִילוּ נָחַשׁ בְּרוּךְ עַל עֵקְבוֹ לֹא יִפְסִיק – EVEN IF A SNAKE IS COILED  
 ABOUT HIS HEEL HE SHOULD NOT INTERRUPT.

This ruling is qualified:  
 אָמַר רַב שֵׁישֶׁשׁ – Rav Sheishess said: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא נָחַשׁ – They  
 taught this rule only with regard to a snake, אָבַל עֲקָרְב פּוֹסֵק –  
 but for a scorpion one may interrupt and remove the insect, be-  
 cause scorpions are more prone to sting than snakes are to bite.<sup>3</sup>

This ruling is questioned:  
 מִיָּתִיבֵי – They challenged Rav Sheishess on the basis of a Barai-  
 sa: נָפַל לְגוּב אֲרִיּוֹת אֵין מְעִידִין עָלָיו שְׁמַת – If [A PERSON] FELL INTO  
 A LIONS' DEN, ONE CANNOT BEAR WITNESS on the strength of that  
 fact alone THAT HE DIED and thus permit his widow to remarry,  
 because the lions may not have devoured him if they were not  
 hungry at the time. נָפַל לְהַפְיֵרָה מִלְּאָה נְחָשִׁים וְעַקְרָבִים מְעִידִין עָלָיו –

שְׁמַת – If, however, HE FELL INTO A PIT FULL OF SNAKES OR SCOR-  
 PIONS, ONE MAY BEAR WITNESS THAT HE DIED. Thus, we see that  
 snakes are also assumed to bite. Why, then, does Rav Sheishess  
 draw a distinction between a snake and a scorpion?<sup>4</sup>

The Gemara responds:  
 שְׁמַת – There, in the case of the Baraisa, it  
 is different, because due to the pressure that the falling man  
 places upon them, they harm him. But under ordinary conditions  
 a snake is less likely to do harm than a scorpion.<sup>5</sup>

The Gemara discusses interrupting prayer when threatened by  
 other animals:

אָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק – R' Yitzchak said: רֹאֵה שְׁוֹרִים פּוֹסֵק – If one  
 observed bulls, he should interrupt his prayers, רִתְנֵי רַב –  
 מְרַחֲקִין מִשְׁוֹר – for Rav Oshaya taught in a Baraisa: אֲמַתָּה  
 – WE DISTANCE OURSELVES FROM AN INNOCUOUS  
 BULL FIFTY AMAH, וּמִשְׁוֹר מוֹעֵד כַּמֵּלֶא עֵינָיו – AND FROM A BULL  
 THAT GOES HABITUALLY<sup>6</sup> AS FAR AS THE EYE CAN SEE.

More on the threat posed by a bull:  
 תָּנָא מִשְׁמֵיהּ דְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר – A Baraisa was taught in the name of R'  
 Meir: אֲפִילוּ תוֹרָא בְּרִיקוּלָא – Even if THE HEAD OF A BULL IS  
 IN ITS FEEDING BASKET,<sup>7</sup> גּוּפוֹ – GO UP  
 TO THE ROOF AND REMOVE THE LADDER FROM UNDER YOU.<sup>8</sup>

The Gemara qualifies this teaching:  
 הָיִי מִיָּלֵי בְּשׂוֹר שְׁחֹר וְכִיּוּמֵי נִיּוֹן – Shmuel said: אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל –  
 This is so only with regard to a black bull and only in the days  
 of Nissan, מִפְּנֵי שֶׁשָּׂטָן מְרַקֵּד לוֹ בֵּין קַרְנָיו – because then Satan  
 dances between his horns.<sup>9</sup>

The Gemara concludes its discussion with an anecdote:<sup>10</sup>  
 תָּנּוּ רַבָּנֵי – The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: מַעֲשֵׂה בְּמָקוֹם אֶחָד –  
 A STORY occurred IN A CERTAIN  
 PLACE IN WHICH THERE WAS AN AROD THAT WOULD HARM THE PEOP-  
 LE.<sup>11</sup> בָּאוּ וְהוֹדִיעוּ לוֹ לְרַבִּי חֲנִינָא בֶן רוּסָא – THEY CAME AND TOLD

## NOTES

1. Literally: Is not the matter a *kal vachomer*?
2. The question remains, however: How did the *chasid* permit himself to be placed at risk? The general was quite right that it is halachically forbidden to do so!  
*Tzlach* responds that the *chasid* had reasonable grounds for his conduct. He noted that the general initiated the greeting – indicating a level of humility in the man. He therefore had confidence that the general would not kill him before hearing him out and that his argument would prove persuasive. See also *Magen Avraham* 104:1; cf. *Taz, Orach Chaim* 66:1.
3. [However, if a person is approached by an agitated snake, he is permitted to interrupt his prayer, since the snake clearly intends to harm him (*Tosafos*, quoting *Yerushalmi*).]
4. [Actually, this Baraisa would seem to directly contradict our Mishnah. If it is a certainty that a snake will bite, as appears from the Baraisa, why does our Mishnah rule that one should not interrupt his prayers? And why does the Gemara introduce Rav Sheishess' statement before posing the contradiction from the Baraisa?  
*Chodesh HaAviv* responds that the contradiction arises only after Rav Sheishess' comment, which forces a reinterpretation of the Mishnah. Rav Sheishess draws a distinction between a snake and a scorpion – implying that true risk exists only from a scorpion, while a snake does not generally pose a danger. Were it not for Rav Sheishess' comment, we might have understood the Mishnah to mean that one may not interrupt *Shemoneh Esrei* even for a dangerous snake, since one is standing in communion with the Holy One, Blessed is He. Rav Sheishess, however, informs us that the reason we may not interrupt for a snake is because an encounter with a snake is not that risky. The Gemara therefore asks how Rav Sheishess would explain the Baraisa, which draws no distinctions between snakes and scorpions. Cf. *Tzlach* and *Yad David*.]
5. [However, one cannot bear witness that one who fell into a lions' den was killed because he did not necessarily fall on the lion, as a lions' den

- [It should be noted that the nature of the “interruption” referred to by the Mishnah (“even if a snake is coiled about his heel he should not interrupt”) is apparently the subject of a disagreement among Rishonim. *Rosh* (5:3), as a matter of course, states that it is forbidden to walk out of one's place during *Shemoneh Esrei*. Given the fact that this rule is nowhere stated in the Talmud, the *Vilna Gaon* (to *Orach Chaim* 104:2) states that *Rosh's* source is our Mishnah. That is, the Mishnah states two rules: One should not return a greeting even to a king, and one should not interrupt even if a snake has coiled itself about his heel. The first rule, explains the *Vilna Gaon*, is to teach that one should not interrupt *Shemoneh Esrei* by speaking. The second rule teaches an additional law – that one should not interrupt even by walking out of one's place (to dislodge the snake).  
*Rabbeinu Yonah* (to the Mishnah on 31b וְהוֹאִיפוּ לוֹ), however, seems to understand the Mishnah to mean that one should not interrupt by calling for help. In his view, walking out of one's place during *Shemoneh Esrei* is not forbidden at all. Regarding this question, see further *Taz, Orach Chaim* 104:1 and *Beur HaGra* to ג' סעיף there.]
6. It gored on three earlier occasions (*Rashi*).
7. A feeding bag filled with fodder suspended from around the bull's neck (*Rashi, Ritva*).
8. This is not to be understood literally [for bulls do not climb ladders]. It simply means: be extremely careful (*Rashi*).
9. [The month of Nissan coincides with the onset of spring. Once the dry, grassless winter passes and the bull observes that the field is again bedecked with greenery,] his mood becomes expansive and he is overcome by a destructive urge (*Rashi*).
10. [The connection between this anecdote and our Gemara is tenuous. See, however, the alternate version of this anecdote cited in *Yerushalmi* 5:1, according to which the association to our Gemara is plain.]
11. The צָרַד is a crossbreed of a snake and a *tzav* [apparently a toad, see *Rashi* to *Leviticus* 11:29] (*Rashi* from *Chullin* 127a)



Because [rain] is tantamount to the resurrection of the dead,<sup>[21]</sup> לְפִיכֶן קִבְעוּהָ בְּחַיֵּית הַמֵּתִים – they therefore fixed it in the blessing of *the resurrection of the dead*.

The Mishnah continued:

AND we add A REQUEST for rain DURING the recitation of *THE BLESSING OF YEARS*. מַאי טַעְמָא – What is the reason for this? אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף – Rav Yosef said: מִתּוֹךְ שֶׁהִיא מְתוּרָה – Because [rain] gives sustenance, לְפִיכֶן קִבְעוּהָ בְּבִרְכַת פְּרֻקָּה – they therefore fixed it in the blessing of sustenance.<sup>[22]</sup>

The Mishnah continued:

And on Saturday night we recite *HAVDALAH* DURING the recitation of the fourth blessing of Prayer, which concludes with the words: *GRACIOUS GIVER OF WISDOM*. מַאי טַעְמָא – What is the reason for this? אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף – Rav Yosef said: מִתּוֹךְ שֶׁהִיא חֻקָּה – Because it is an exercise of wisdom,<sup>[23]</sup> לְפִיכֶן קִבְעוּהָ בְּבִרְכַת חֻקָּה – they therefore fixed it in the blessing of wisdom.

Another explanation:

But the Sages say: מִתּוֹךְ שֶׁהִיא חוֹל – Since it marks the onset of the mundane workweek, לְפִיכֶן קִבְעוּהָ בְּבִרְכַת חוֹל – they therefore fixed it in the first weekday blessing.<sup>[24]</sup>

The Gemara cites an exposition that relates to wisdom:

R' Ami said: גְּדוּלַת דַּעַת שְׁנֵי אֱלֹהִים בְּרִבְּהָ שֶׁל – R' Ami said: אָמַר רַבִּי אָמִי

Great is understanding, as witnessed by the fact that the blessing that asks God for understanding was placed at the beginning of the weekday blessings of petition.<sup>[25]</sup>

And R' Ami said: גְּדוּלַת דַּעַת שְׁנֵי אֱלֹהִים בֵּין שְׁתֵּי אֱמִי – Great is understanding, for it was placed in Scripture between two Divine Names,<sup>[26]</sup> “כִּי אֵל דַּעוֹת ה'” – as it says: *For the God of dei'os is Hashem*.<sup>[27]</sup> וְכֵן מִי שֶׁאֵין בּוֹ דַּעַת – And if someone does not have understanding<sup>[28]</sup> אָסוּר לְרַחֵם שְׁנֵי אֱמִי – it is forbidden to have mercy on him, כִּי לֹא – for it says: *for it is not a people of understanding; therefore its Maker shall not have compassion on it*.<sup>[29]</sup>

A related exposition:

R' Elazar said: גְּדוּלַת מִקְדָּשׁ שְׁנֵי אֱלֹהִים בֵּין שְׁתֵּי אֱמִי – Great is the Sanctuary, for it was placed in Scripture between two Divine Names, “פַּעֲלַת ה' מִקְדָּשׁ ה'” – as it says: *The foundation of the dwelling place that You have made, O Hashem, the Sanctuary, my Lord, that Your hands have established*.<sup>[30]</sup>

A third exposition regarding wisdom:

For – כל אדם שיש בו דעה – And R' Elazar said: וְאָמַר רַבִּי אֱלָזָר – For any person that has understanding, בֵּית הַמִּקְדָּשׁ – it is as if the Sanctuary were built in his days. דַּעַת – For understanding was placed in Scripture between two Divine Names, בֵּין שְׁתֵּי אֱמִי –

#### NOTES

Sabbath [which has just concluded] and for granting us the wisdom to differentiate between the holy and the mundane (R' Yehonasan MiLunel; see also Meiri; Rabbeinu Yonah).

21. For it sustains human life by causing produce to grow (Rashi to Taanis 7a ופליגא ררב יוסף ד"ה).

22. The blessing of years is the blessing in which we request a year of abundant crops and material prosperity.

23. It takes a wise man to differentiate between that which is sacred and that which is profane, that which is pure and that which is impure (Rashi).

Ritva and Rabbeinu Yonah suggest that the wisdom referred to is the ability to value the Sabbath and thus be able to truly differentiate between Sabbath and the rest of the week.

24. [The *Shemoneh Esrei* is divided into three sections. The first section, consisting of the first three blessings, is devoted to praise and homage. The final section, containing another three blessings, is devoted to leaving-taking and thanksgiving. The middle section consists of thirteen blessings of petition for sundry needs (see below, 34a; Rambam, *Hil. Tefillah* 1:4). These first and last sections are always recited, even on the Sabbath and festivals. But since the Rabbis considered these blessings to be inappropriate on the Sabbath and festivals (see above, 21a), the middle section is replaced on those days by a single blessing devoted to the sanctity of the day, for a total of seven blessings.] Since it is the passage from Sabbath to weekday – marked by Havdalah – that allows the resumption of the blessings of petition, it is appropriate that Havdalah come at the very beginning of those blessings, in the blessing of *gracious Giver of wisdom* (*Beur HaGra* to *Orach Chaim* 294:l. from *Yerushalmi*).

25. *Rashba* (*Chidushei Aggados*) adds that logically, the request for understanding must come prior to all the other petitions. For without understanding, how can one truly repent of his transgressions and beseech God for forgiveness? How can one even request the satisfaction of his needs? He lacks the wisdom to fully recognize to Whom his requests are addressed!

26. Literally: between two letters. [For discussion of this usage, see Rashi to *Sanhedrin* 92a וד"ה שתי אותיות; *Maharsha* and *Sifsei Chachamim* here.]

27. *I Samuel* 2:3. In the context of that passage, the meaning is that Hashem is the God Who knows all thoughts [דעות] of man (see Rashi ad loc.). R' Elazar's exposition notes the placement of the word דעות (plural of דעה, understanding) between two Divine Names, אֵל and ה'.

The name אֵל represents God's attribute of stern justice; the name ה' [the Tetragrammaton] represents His attribute of mercy. *Rashba* explains that the world could not exist purely according to the dictates of justice or purely according to the dictates of mercy. [According to the

dictates of stern justice, all would perish, as no person is entirely free of sin. According to the dictates of mercy, the wicked would never be punished, and there would be no way to differentiate between the righteous and the wicked (*Rashba*, in his response to a Dominican priest, printed at the end of *Rashba, Chidushei Aggados*, *MHK* ed.)] God therefore relates to the world with a mixture of these two attributes. Accordingly, “understanding” was placed in the midst of these two Divine Names, for someone who is in the midst of something perceives its true nature. Thus, one who has understanding can attain the ultimate knowledge possible to a human being of God and His providence in this world, which is the goal of human understanding (*Rashba, Chidushei Aggados*; see *Maharsha* for another explanation).

*Iyun Yaakov* (to *Sanhedrin* 92a) explains the progression from אֵל to ה'. One who experiences Divine justice and still remains firm in his righteousness with clear understanding, will eventually experience God's mercy as well.

28. I.e. he does not bother to use his mind to think and understand (*Be'er Sheva* to *Sanhedrin* ibid.).

29. *Isaiah* 27:11. Israel fails to realize that its suffering is due to its sins. Therefore, God will not have compassion and alleviate that suffering, in the hope that the nation's continued suffering will ultimately lead them to repentance (*Radak* ad loc.). [Similarly, Rav Ami teaches that one should not have compassion for someone who denies that his suffering is meant to stir him to repentance.]

*Margaliyos HaYam* (to *Sanhedrin* ibid.), citing incidents recorded in *Sefer Chasidim* and *Leket Yosher* explains Rav Ami's intent to be that one must not submit to the entreaties of a fool who does not realize that what he seeks is, in fact, detrimental to him.

30. *Exodus* 15:17. In this verse, the word מִקְדָּשׁ, Sanctuary [or: Temple], appears between the Divine Names ה' and אֱלֹהֵינוּ.

*Maharsha* explains that the Temple mirrored the structure of heaven and earth and thus synthesized these two opposite realms, represented by these two Divine Names.

*Rashba* (*Chidushei Aggados*) explains that the knowledge of God and His providence represented by the two Divine Names (as explained in note 27) can be gained through “the Temple, which is called [in this very verse] the foundation of God's dwelling place, and is built with glory and splendor, and whose components and operation signify conceptual matters, as the verse states: *And see and make [the vessels] according to their form that you are shown on the mountain* (*Exodus* 25:40). And [stationed] in that place are the authorities of the Torah and expositions of wisdom (the Great Sanhedrin) and from there is the divine spirit drawn” [see *Yerushalmi Succah* 5:1; *Bereishis Rabbah* 70:8].

and the Sanctuary was placed between two Divine Names (as demonstrated above).<sup>[31]</sup>

The Gemara challenges these expositions:

מתקיף לה רב אבא קרחינא – Rav Acha Karchinaah objected: אלא מעתה גדולה נקמה שנחנה בין שתי אותיות – But accordingly, you would also have to say: **Great is vengeance, for it was placed in Scripture between two Divine Names, אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְהַקְדֻּשׁ** – **for it is written: O God of vengeance, Hashem! O God of vengeance, appear!**<sup>[32]</sup> Would you indeed submit that vengeance is a great thing?!

The Gemara answers:

אין במילתה מיהא גדולה היא – [R' Elazar] said to him: **Yes! In its proper place vengeance is indeed a great thing.** והיינו דאמר עולא – **And this sentiment, that vengeance is at times a great thing, is in accord with what Ulla said: שתי נקמות הללו – Why these two vengeance in the verse?**<sup>[33]</sup> אחת לטובה – **One is to mete out benefit [i.e. reward] and one is to mete out punishment.**<sup>[34]</sup>

The Gemara explains:

הופיע מהר פארן – This vengeance is intended to mete out benefit, as it is written: **He appeared from Mount Paran.**<sup>[35]</sup> אל נקמות הופיע – **And at the same time it is intended to mete out punishment, as it is written: O God of vengeance, Hashem! O God of vengeance, appear.**

The Mishnah continued:

רבי עקיבא אומר אומרה ברכה רביעית כו' – R' AKIVA SAYS: HE RECITES [HAVDALAH] AS A FOURTH BLESSING BY ITSELF etc.

The Gemara questions how a controversy concerning the proper placement of Havdalah in Prayer could ever have come about:

אמר ליה רב שמן בר אבא לרבי יוחנן – Rav Shemen bar Abba said to R' Yochanan: **מפדי אנשי בנסת הגדולה תקנו להם לישראל ברכות – Consider – the Men of the Great Assembly<sup>[36]</sup> ordained for Israel blessings, prayers and recitals of Kiddush and Havdalah.**<sup>[37]</sup> קהווי היכן תקון – **Let us simply see where in Prayer they ordained that Havdalah be recited; how could such a thing have become a matter of dispute?**<sup>[38]</sup>

R' Yochanan responds:

בתחלה קבעוה בתפלה – At first when the Jews returned from the Babylonian exile [the Men of the Great Assembly] fixed [Havdalah] within Prayer – i.e. as part of *Shemoneh Esrei* – rather than recite it over wine, since the Jews of that time were poor and could ill afford wine. **הקשו על הכוס – When [the people] become more affluent they removed Havdalah from Prayer and fixed its recital over a cup of wine.**<sup>[39]</sup> Since Havdalah was no longer recited as part of Prayer, the details of the original enactment were forgotten. **וקבעוה בתפלה – Later, when [the people] again became impoverished they reverted to the original enactment and again fixed [Havdalah] in Prayer.**<sup>[40]</sup> והם אמרו המבדיל בתפלה צריך – **But this time they said that one who recites Havdalah during Prayer must recite Havdalah a second time over a cup of wine, as long as he is financially able to do so.**<sup>[41]</sup>

The Gemara cites other Amoraim to the same effect:

אמר רבי חייה בר אבא – It has also been stated: **אמר רבי יוחנן – R' Chiya bar Abba said in the name of R' Yochanan: אנשי בנסת הגדולה תקנו להם לישראל ברכות ותפלות**

#### NOTES

31. *Rashba* explains that one who has understanding can, through the use of his intellect, reach the level of understanding that was formerly attainable through the Temple, its components and the Torah authorities stationed there. Thus, if one utilizes his understanding to this degree, it is "as if the Temple were built in his days." According to *Rama* (Introduction to *Toras HaOlah*, cited in *Anaf Yosef* here), that level of understanding is still available through the study and contemplation of the Temple and its service, even though they are not physically present today. Thus, "if one has understanding, it is as if the Temple were built in his days," for he has realized their intended purpose [see also *Menachos* 110a].

Others explain that one who is filled with knowledge and understanding of God causes the Divine Presence to rest upon him. Such a person resembles the Temple, which was built to serve as a dwelling place for the Divine Presence among men (see *Ben Yehoyada* here and *Toras Chaim* to *Sanhedrin* 92a).

32. *Psalms* 94:1. In this verse the word *vengeance* appears between the Divine Names אֱלֹהֵינוּ and הַקְדֻּשׁ.

33. The verse contains a double mention of vengeance: *O God of vengeance, Hashem! O God of vengeance, appear.*

34. The verse refers to a type of vengeance that [redresses an imbalance and] has the simultaneous effect of punishing evil and rewarding good. This type of vengeance appears between the Divine Names of justice and of mercy, because it encompasses these two opposites (*Maharsha*); this dual accomplishment is the "greatness" of such vengeance.

35. *Deuteronomy* 33:2. The verse is understood by the Gemara to refer to God's withdrawal from the nations of the world when they rejected the Torah, and His resting His Presence exclusively on Israel in reward for their unanimous declaration at Sinai, "We will fulfill and we will obey" (see *Rashi* ad loc. and to *Sanhedrin* loc. cit.). The Gemara elsewhere also understands this verse to allude to the fact that an idolater cannot collect damages for a tort committed by an animal belonging to a Jew (*Rashi* here, from *Bava Kamma* 38a; see Gemara there).

[That the two kinds of vengeance must be demonstrated particularly in the context of the Torah being given at Sinai, derives from the word *והפיע*, *appear*, which appears in both the "vengeance" verse and the verse describing the Revelation at Sinai.]

36. This group of one hundred and twenty Sages led the Jewish people at the beginning of the Second Temple era. It included the last prophets, and counted among them Ezra and Mordechai, as well as Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. As our Gemara indicates, they laid the foundation of the liturgy.

37. The Gemara above (20b) indicates that the mitzvah of reciting Kiddush (sanctification) on the Sabbath is Scriptural in origin. [According to some Rishonim, this is true of Havdalah as well; see *Rashi* to *Nazir* 4a; *Rambam*, *Hil. Shabbos* 29:1; *Smag*, עשין §29; cf. *Rabbeinu Tam*, cited in *Tos. R' Yehudah HeChasid* above, 20b ודיה נשים ב; *Maggid Mishneh*, *Hil. Shabbos* ibid.] How do we reconcile that with our Gemara which credits the Men of the Great Assembly with its enactment? The Rishonim explain that the essential mitzvah of Kiddush is, indeed, Scriptural in origin. The accomplishment of the Men of the Great Assembly was to establish a standard text for fulfilling the mitzvah and to specify the place and manner in which it is to be recited (*Meiri*; *Teshuvos HaRashba* IV:295; see also *Minchas Chinuch* §31).

[As to whether there is a Scriptural obligation for Kiddush and Havdalah to be recited over wine, see *Rashi* to *Nazir* ibid.; *Tos. R' Yehudah HeChasid* loc. cit.; *Tos. Rid* to *Pesachim* 106a; cf. *Rambam*, *Hil. Shabbos* 29:6; *Meiri* above, 20b; *Smag*, loc. cit.; *Or Zarua* II:25.]

38. In most instances when controversies arose regarding the nature or details of rabbinic enactments, the Gemara does not ask this question, [since it is self-evident from the fact that a controversy exists that the details of the original enactment must have been forgotten or that different traditions were extant regarding them]. However, Havdalah is recited so often that the Gemara considers it surprising that a controversy could have arisen regarding when to say it (*Ritva*; see also *Tosafos* above, 22a ודיה נחוי עורא היכן תקן).

39. [Or other important beverage; see *Pesachim* 107a.]

40. It was at this time that a dispute arose regarding what the original enactment had been (see *Rashi*).

[*Rashi* refers to the original enactment as having been enacted by Ezra, since Ezra was the head of the Great Assembly (*Maharatz Chayes*; see also *Rambam*, *Hil. Tefillah* 1:4).]

41. Rather than have Havdalah continuously shifting between Prayer and over wine, depending on the financial situation of the people, it was decided to decree once and for all that Havdalah should be recited as part

קדושות והבדלות – The Men of the Great Assembly ordained for Israel blessings, prayers and recitals of Kiddush and Havdalah. בתחלה קבעוה בתפלה – At first when the Jews were impoverished from the Babylonian exile they fixed [Havdalah] within Prayer rather than recite it over wine. העשירו קבעוה על הכוס – When [the people] become more affluent they removed Havdalah from Prayer and fixed its recital over a cup of wine. חזרו והענו קבעוה בתפלה – Later, when [the people] again became impoverished, they reverted to the original enactment and fixed [Havdalah] in Prayer. והם אמרו המבדיל בתפלה צריך – But this time they said that one who recites Havdalah during Prayer must recite Havdalah again over a cup of wine, as long as he is financially able to do so.

It emerges that according to the final enactment, one must recite Havdalah as part of Prayer and again over a cup of wine – as long as one can afford to do so. The Gemara cites other Amoraim who concur:

רבה ורב יוסף דאמרי תרנויהו – It has also been said: רבא ורב יוסף – Rabbah and Rav Yosef both said: המבדיל בתפלה צריך – One who recites Havdalah during Prayer must recite Havdalah again over a cup of wine.

Rabbah, having ruled that one must recite Havdalah in Prayer and again over a cup of wine, raises a difficulty with this ruling: רבא – Rabbah said:<sup>[42]</sup> ומוחבנין אשמעתין – But we can challenge our own teaching from the following Baraisa: טעה – IF HE ERRED AND DID NOT MENTION THE POWERS OF RAIN DURING the blessing of THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD, ושאלה בברכת השנים – OR if he neglected to include THE REQUEST for rain in THE BLESSING OF YEARS, מחזירין אותו – WE HAVE HIM REPEAT *Shemoneh Esrei*. BUT if he omitted reciting HAVDALAH in the blessing which concludes GRACIOUS GIVER OF WISDOM, אין מחזירין אותו – we do not have him repeat *Shemoneh Esrei*, מפני שיכול לאומרה על הכוס [Havdalah] OVER A CUP of wine.<sup>[43]</sup> Now, by stating that he is able to recite Havdalah over a cup of wine the Baraisa implies that this is not normally obligatory! – ? –

The Gemara resolves the difficulty by emending the Baraisa: לא תימא מפני שיכול לאומרה על הכוס – Do not read: since he is able to recite it over a cup of wine. אלא אימא מפני שאומרה על הכוס – Rather, the Baraisa should read: since he performs it over a cup of wine.

The Gemara cites yet more Amoraim who also maintain that Havdalah must be recited as part of Prayer and again over a cup of wine:

אמר רבי בנימין בר יפת – It has also been said: אמר רבי יוסף – R' Binyamin bar Yefess said: שאל רבי יוסי את רבי יוחנן בצידין – R' Yosef inquired of R' Yochanan in Sidon – ואמרי לה רבי – and others have it that it was R' Shimon ben Yaakov of Tzor who asked R' Yochanan – שמעון בן יעקב דמן צור את רבי יוחנן – and, continued R' Binyamin bar Yefess, I overheard the exchange, in which R' Yochanan was asked: המבדיל בתפלה צריך – Regarding someone who recited Havdalah during Prayer, must he recite Havdalah again over a cup of wine or not? ואמר ליה – And [R' Yochanan] answered: צריך שיבדיל על הכוס – He must recite

Havdalah again over a cup of wine.

The Gemara considers the law where one recited Havdalah over a cup of wine first:

המבדיל על הכוס מהו שיבדיל – They inquired: איבעיא להו בתפלה – Regarding someone who first recited Havdalah over a cup of wine, before commencing to pray: Must he recite Havdalah again during Prayer?

The Gemara answers:

אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק – Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: קל – This question can be resolved by invoking a *kal vachomer* from the aforementioned case of someone who first recited Havdalah during Prayer: ומה תפלה דעיקר תקנתא היא – If in the case of someone who recited Havdalah during Prayer, which is the primary enactment,<sup>[44]</sup> אמרי המבדיל בתפלה צריך – they said that one who recites Havdalah during Prayer must nonetheless recite Havdalah again over a cup of wine, המבדיל על הכוס דלאו עיקר תקנתא היא לא כל שכן – then in the case of one who first recited Havdalah over a cup of wine, which is not the primary enactment, certainly he must recite Havdalah again during Prayer!

It emerges that, according to R' Yochanan and the other aforementioned Amoraim, Havdalah must be recited both in Prayer and over a cup of wine. The Gemara now quotes a Baraisa which relates to this issue:

תני רב אחא אריכא קמיה דרב חנינא – Rav Acha Aricha recited a Baraisa before Rav Chinana: המבדיל בתפלה משובה יותר ממי שיבדיל על הכוס – ONE WHO RECITES HAVDALAH DURING PRAYER IS MORE PRAISEWORTHY THAN ONE WHO RECITES HAVDALAH OVER A CUP of wine. ואם הבדיל בכו וכו' – BUT IF HE RECITED HAVDALAH IN BOTH Prayer and over a cup of wine ינחו לו ברכות – LET BLESSINGS REST ON HIS HEAD.

The Gemara asks:

אמר המבדיל – This Baraisa contradicts itself! הא גופא קשוט – First you say that ONE WHO RECITES HAVDALAH DURING PRAYER IS MORE PRAISEWORTHY THAN ONE WHO RECITES HAVDALAH OVER A CUP of wine. Apparently, it is a question of doing one or the other, and the preference is for reciting Havdalah in Prayer. אלמא תפלה לחודה סגי – This implies that Havdalah in Prayer alone is sufficient, and it is not necessary to recite Havdalah a second time over a cup of wine. והדר תני אם הבדיל בכו וכו' ינחו לו ברכות על ראשו – But then the Baraisa teaches that IF HE RECITED HAVDALAH IN BOTH Prayer and over a cup of wine, LET BLESSINGS REST ON HIS HEAD. וכיין – But why should the Baraisa consider reciting Havdalah twice praiseworthy? Since, according to this Baraisa, he fulfills his obligation with one Havdalah, in Prayer, he is subsequently exempt from any further obligation, והויא – so that if he recites Havdalah a second time over a cup of wine it is an unnecessary blessing. ואמר רב – And Rav said, while others say it was Reish Lakish who said, ואמרי לה רבי יוחנן וריש לקיש דאמרי – while others say that both R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish said: לא – Anyone who utters an unnecessary blessing transgresses the prohibition of: *You shall not take the Name of Hashem, your God, in vain.*<sup>[45]</sup> – ? –

## NOTES

of *Shemoneh Esrei* and, whenever possible, over a cup of wine as well (see *Rashba; Shulchan Aruch HaRav* 294:2).

42. [This follows *Mesoras HaShas*, who reads רבה, rather than רבא.]

43. Since he can make up the Havdalah that he missed in *Shemoneh Esrei* by reciting Havdalah over a cup of wine, there is no need for him to repeat the *Shemoneh Esrei*. [The Rishonim discuss whether he

must repeat *Shemoneh Esrei* if he has no wine.]

44. Since, under the terms of the final enactment, one must always recite Havdalah as part of Prayer, whereas one must recite Havdalah over a cup of wine only if one has wine (*Rashba*).

45. *Exodus* 20:7.

The verse prohibits vain oaths, and an unnecessary blessing is akin to

The Gemara resolves the difficulty by emending the Baraisa: אֵלֶּא אִימָא הָכִי – Rather, say that the Baraisa should be read as follows: אִם הִבְדִּיל בְּזוֹ וְלֹא הִבְדִּיל בְּזוֹ וְנִזְחַו לוֹ בְּרִכּוֹת עַל רֵאשׁוֹ – IF HE RECITED HAVDALAH IN ONE, i.e. in Prayer, AND DID NOT RECITE HAVDALAH IN THE OTHER, i.e. over a cup of wine, LET BLESSINGS REST ON HIS HEAD.<sup>[46]</sup>

The Gemara earlier cited a Baraisa to the effect that if someone erred and forgot to recite Havdalah in Prayer he need not repeat

the *Shemoneh Esrei*, but can rely on his reciting Havdalah over a cup of wine. This leads to the following question:

בְּעָא מִינֵיהּ רַב חֲסִדָּא מִרַב שְׁשִׁית – Rav Chisda asked of Rav Sheishess: טְעָה בְּזוֹ וּבְזוֹ מָהוּ – What if he erred and forgot to recite Havdalah in both Prayer and over a cup of wine?<sup>[47]</sup>

The Gemara responds:

אָמַר לֵיהּ – [Rav Sheishess] answered him: טְעָה בְּזוֹ וּבְזוֹ חוֹרַר – [Rav Sheishess] answered him: If one erred with regard to both he must go back to the beginning and pray again.<sup>[48]</sup>

## NOTES

a vain oath (*Rambam, Hil. Berachos* 1:15). [Regarding whether this is an actual Biblical prohibition, or whether the Gemara is merely adducing support for what is actually a Rabbinic violation, see *Rambam* loc. cit. and *Hil. Shevuos* 12:9; *Teshuvos HaRambam* (Friedman ed.) §84; *Magen Avraham* 215:6; cf. *Tosafos to Rosh Hashanah* 33a הא ד"ה; *Rosh, Kiddushin* ch. 1 §49; *Chinuch* §430; *Ritva* here; *Eliyahu Rabbah* 215:5.]

46. It emerges that according to this Baraisa it suffices to recite Havdalah in Prayer; it is not necessary to recite it again over a cup of wine. The Baraisa differs with the view of R' Yochanan and the other aforementioned Amoraim who maintain that Havdalah should be recited both in Prayer and over a cup of wine. The Gemara will shortly record the final halachah concerning this issue.

47. I.e. he missed reciting Havdalah both in Prayer and over a cup of wine, so that the proper time to recite Havdalah has come and gone without his having recited Havdalah at all – and he must now consider how to remedy this omission (see *Rashba*).

The Gemara does not define at what point he is considered to have missed the proper time for reciting Havdalah. *Rashba* posits that since Havdalah must be recited before eating or drinking anything (see *Pesachim* 106b), as well as before performing any *melachah* (see *Shabbos* 150b), should he engage in any of these activities before reciting Havdalah, he is considered to have missed reciting Havdalah altogether. It is such a case that our Gemara addresses. [See also *Rosh* and *Rabbeinu Yonah* for a similar approach; for other approaches see *Meiri* and *Chidushei HaGra*; regarding the nature of the prohibition to eat, drink or perform *melachah* before Havdalah, see *Shulchan Aruch HaRav* 271:9; *Chidushei HaGriz, Hil. Shabbos* 29:5; *Asher L'Shlomo, Moed* §11.]

48. He cannot rely on his reciting Havdalah on a cup of wine alone, but must first repeat *Shemoneh Esrei* – with Havdalah this time – and then recite Havdalah on a cup of wine.

*Rabbeinu Yonah* explains that this is a penalty for having failed to recite Havdalah before eating or drinking (cf. *Rashba*).

