



ואשמעינן טעמא ואשמעינן דהלכתא ברבנן – for he would have then taught us the meaning of the verse,<sup>[1]</sup> and he would have also taught us that the law is in accordance with the Rabbis.<sup>[2]</sup> מאי – But with that which he says “*motzi*,” קמשמע לן – what is he teaching us?<sup>[3]</sup>

The Gemara remarks:

ואיהו דעבר – And the son of Rav Zevid's reason for what he did, by saying “*motzi*,” was לאפוקי נפשיה מפלוגתא – to remove himself from a matter of dispute.<sup>[4]</sup>

The Gemara concludes:

והלכתא המוציא לחם מן הארץ – And the law is that we recite on bread *hamotzi lechem min haaretz*, דקיימא לן ברבנן – for we hold in accordance with the Rabbis, דאמרי דאפיק משמע – who say that *hamotzi*, too, connotes “the One Who has brought forth.”<sup>[5]</sup>

The Gemara discusses the next part of the Mishnah which states:

ועל הירקות אומר וכו' – AND ON VEGETABLES ONE SAYS etc. [the One Who creates the fruit of the ground].

The Gemara notes:

קתני ירקות דומיא דפת – The Mishnah states the case of vegetables in juxtaposition with and thus similar to its case of bread, to teach us<sup>[6]</sup> that מה פת שנשתנה על ידי האור – just as the case of bread refers to something that was transformed through fire, אף ירקות נמי שנשתנו על ידי האור – so, too, the case of vegetables refers to those that were transformed through fire, i.e. cooked vegetables.<sup>[7]</sup> אמר רבנאי משמיה דאבאי – Rabbenai said in the name of Abaye: זאת אומרת שלקות – This juxtaposition says, in effect,

that on cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the ground. (ממאי מדקתני ירקות דומיא דפת) – From where is this known? From that which the Mishnah states the case of vegetables in juxtaposition with and thus similar to the case of bread.<sup>[8]</sup>

The Gemara cites a public lecture given by Rav Chisda regarding the blessing on cooked vegetables:

דרש רב חסדא – Rav Chisda announced in a public lecture: משום רבינו – It was reported in the name of our teacher – שלקות מברכין עליהם בורא פרי – and who is this? Rav: ומנו רב – and who is this? Rav: האדמה – On cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the ground. ורבתינו היורדין מארץ – ורבתינו היורדין מארץ – And (Rav Chisda continued) our teachers who come down from the Land of Israel – וימנו עולא משמיה דרבי יוחנן – and who is this? Ulla – said in the name of R' Yochanan:<sup>[9]</sup> שלקות מברכין עליהן שהכל נהיה בדברו – On cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing that everything came into being through His word, which apparently contradicts Rav's ruling in this matter.<sup>[10]</sup> ואני אומר – And I, Rav Chisda, say to reconcile these seemingly contradictory rulings,<sup>[11]</sup> that it depends on the vegetable: כל שתחלתו בורא פרי האדמה – In the case of any vegetable whose blessing in its initial state (i.e. when eaten raw) is the One Who creates the fruit of the ground,<sup>[12]</sup> שלקו שהכל נהיה בדברו – if one cooks it, the blessing now recited is that everything came into being through His word.<sup>[13]</sup> וכל שתחלתו שהכל נהיה בדברו – And in the case of any vegetable whose blessing in its initial state is that everything came into being through His word,<sup>[14]</sup> שלקו בורא פרי – if one cooks it, the blessing now recited is the One Who creates the fruit of the ground.<sup>[15]</sup>

## NOTES

1. I.e. that the meaning of *Exodus* 6:7 is that you will know then – after I, God, deliver you from Egypt – that I am Hashem, the One Who brings you forth . . . (as the Rabbis above have explained this verse – see 38a note 42).
2. Who say that *hamotzi* is a reference to what God has already done (*Rashi*). [And thus it is also an acceptable formula for the blessing. (See, however, note 5.)]
3. All agree that “*motzi*” is a valid formula, and he has thus taught us nothing new (see *Rashi*). [Surely, the son of Rav Zevid did not mean to rule in accordance with the minority view of R' Nechemyah.] R' Zeira holds that a person should formulate his blessings in a way that maximizes what can be learned from that formula. Thus, given the choice between *hamotzi* and *motzi* – both of which are acceptable according to the Rabbis – the son of Rav Zevid should have opted for *hamotzi*, which would have taught us both the meaning of the verse and that the halachah follows the Rabbis that one does fulfill his obligation by saying *hamotzi* (*Rosh*, *Pesachim* 1:10; see also *Taz*, *Orach Chaim* 167:4). See, however, note 5.
4. Not wishing to involve himself in the matter of dispute between R' Nechemyah and the Rabbis, he gave preference to “*motzi*,” which is universally acceptable. R' Zeira, however, held that it would have been better for him to say “*hamotzi*,” as explained in the preceding note. [The Gemara below (50a) seems to indicate that, on the contrary, the avoidance of dispute in matters of blessings is preferable. See *Taz*, *Orach Chaim* 167:4, who addresses this difficulty.]
5. Therefore, one should recite the blessing in accordance with the view of the Rabbis, as explained in note 3. Alternatively, the Rabbis' formula “*hamotzi*” is preferable to “*motzi*,” since in the latter formula (מ) the succession of the words *haolam* and *motzi* creates consecutive *mem* sounds, which would tend to merge into one rather than being articulated distinctly. When reciting *hamotzi*, however, the ה, *ha*, sound intervenes between the two *mem* sounds, and thereby avoids the problem of merging (*Yerushalmi*, cited by *Tosafos* and *Rosh*; see *Ritva* for another explanation). [And though the succession of *mem* sounds occurs anyway in the words הארץ לחם, the Sages had no choice but to leave that expression as is, since it is taken from Scripture – *Psalms* 104:14 (*Tosafos*; *Rosh*).]
6. See *Pnei Yehoshua*, and *Tos. Anshei Shem* to the Mishnah.
7. In effect, then, the Mishnah is teaching that even though vegetables have been cooked, they retain their original status (as “fruits of the ground”) and one recites *haadamah* before eating them [as the Gemara will now state] (*Rashi*).
8. The words in parentheses are apparently redundant and are indeed absent from the text cited by *Rif* and *Rosh* (see *Mesoras HaShas*). [See, however, *Tosafos* מרקחני with *Maharsha*. See also *Dikdukei Soferim*, who cites a text in which it is rather the earlier words אומרת, this says, that are absent.]
9. Ulla would often travel from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia [which is called “going down” because Eretz Yisrael is higher than all the other lands (see *Kiddushin* 69a-b)]. In Babylonia, he reported the teachings of R' Yochanan, one of the leading Amoraim of Eretz Yisrael.
10. See *Divrei David*, who explains what the rationale for the dispute would be.
11. *Rashi*; cf. *Rabbeinu Yonah* in explanation of *Rif*.
12. That is, a vegetable which is generally eaten raw and thus takes the *haadamah* blessing in its raw state (*Rashi*).
13. The transformation of flavor effected by cooking constitutes a significant change from the natural state. And since this change is for the worse (as the vegetable is generally eaten raw; see *Tosafos* לה משכחא, *Rashba* et al.), the blessing the One Who creates the “fruit of the ground” is no longer appropriate (see *Rashi*). [If, however, the change would be for the better, the *haadamah* blessing would be appropriate, since the vegetable would be considered to be in the ultimate state envisioned by the one who planted it.]
14. That is, a vegetable that is generally not eaten raw, so that one who eats it raw recites only *shehakol* [since it is not yet in the state that its planter originally envisioned] (*Rashi*).
15. For it is only upon being transformed through cooking that it reaches the ultimate state envisioned by the one who planted it (*Rashi*; see 36a note 10). [Thus, only then can it appropriately be called a “fruit of the ground.”]

The Gemara questions Rav Chisda's statement:

בשלקמא כל שתחלתו שהכל נהיה בדברו שלקו בורא פרי האדמה – Now, **all is well** with the second part of Rav Chisda's statement – **any vegetable whose blessing in its initial state is that everything came into being through His word, if one cooks it, the blessing is the One Who creates the fruit of the ground** – **for you find it in the cases of cabbage, beets, and pumpkins, which are generally eaten cooked and not raw.** אלא כל שתחלתו בורא פרי האדמה שלקו – **But the first part of Rav Chisda's statement – any vegetable whose blessing in its initial state is the One Who creates the fruit of the ground, if one cooks it, the blessing is that everything came into being through His word – היכי לה משפחת לה – how do you find it? Which vegetables are eaten specifically raw?**

The Gemara answers:

אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק – Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: **You find it in the cases of garlic and leek, which are generally eaten specifically raw.**<sup>[16]</sup>

The Gemara now cites Rav Nachman's public lecture on this matter:

דרש רב נחמן – Rav Nachman announced in a public lecture: **It was reported in the name of our teacher – and who is this? Shmuel: On cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the ground.** וְהַבְרִינִי – **And (Rav Nachman continued) our colleagues who come down from the Land of Israel – and who is this? Ulla<sup>[17]</sup> – said in the name of R' Yochanan: שלקות מברכין עליהן שהכל נהיה בדברו – On cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing that everything came into being through His word.** וְאֲנִי אוֹמֵר – **And I, Rav Nachman, say that it [the matter of dispute between Shmuel and R' Yochanan] is a matter of Tannaic dispute.**<sup>[18]</sup> דְתַנְיָא – **For it was taught in a Baraisa: וְיִצְאִין בְּרִיקָא הַשְּׂרוּי – WE CAN FULFILL the obligation to eat matzah on Pesach WITH A WAFER of matzah THAT WAS SOAKED in water – וּבְמִבוּשֵׁל שְׁלֵא נִמוּחַ – OR WITH ONE THAT WAS COOKED but THAT DID NOT DISSOLVE.**<sup>[19]</sup> דְּבְרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר – **These are THE WORDS OF R' MEIR. וְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמֵר – BUT R' YOSE SAYS: וְיִצְאִין בְּרִיקָא הַשְּׂרוּי – WE CAN FULFILL the obligation WITH A WAFER of matzah THAT WAS SOAKED in water, אָבֵל לֹא בְּמִבוּשֵׁל אֶף עַל פִּי**

שְׁלֵא נִמוּחַ – BUT NOT WITH ONE THAT WAS COOKED, EVEN IF IT DID NOT DISSOLVE.<sup>[20]</sup> Rav Nachman reasons that just as R' Meir holds that cooked matzah (if it has not dissolved) retains its original status, so too would he hold that cooked vegetables retain their original status as "fruits of the ground," and their blessing would remain *haadamah*, as Shmuel rules. And just as R' Yose holds that cooked matzah (though intact) loses its original status, so too would he hold that cooked vegetables lose their original status as "fruits of the ground," and their blessing would change to *shehakol*, as R' Yochanan rules.

The Gemara<sup>[21]</sup> rejects Rav Nachman's analogy:

יְכוּלֵי עֲלֵמָא שְׁלִקוֹת מְבָרְכִין – **But this is not correct.** וְלֵא הִיא – **For it might be that all Tannaim agree [i.e. even R' Yose] that cooked vegetables retain their original status as vegetables and that we recite upon them the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the ground.** וְעַד בְּאֵן לֹא קָאָמַר – **And thus far, R' Yose has not said there in that Baraisa אֵלֵא מְשׁוּם דְּבַעֲיָנָן טַעַם מִצָּה וְלִיבָא – more than that one cannot fulfill his obligation with cooked matzah because we require that the matzah have the taste of matzah,<sup>[22]</sup> and it is not there if the matzah is cooked.**<sup>[23]</sup> אֲכַל הָבָא – **But here, with regard to the blessing on cooked vegetables, אֲפִילוּ רַבִּי יוֹסֵי מוֹדָה – even R' Yose agrees that cooking does not change the vegetable's status. Thus, one cannot relate the dispute between Shmuel and R' Yochanan to the dispute between R' Meir and R' Yose.**<sup>[24]</sup>

Both Rav Chisda and Rav Nachman have reported what R' Yochanan said regarding the blessing for cooked vegetables. The Gemara now cites a dispute between R' Yochanan's students as to their teacher's opinion in this matter:

אמר רבי חייא בר אבא אמר רבי יוחנן – R' Chiya bar Abba said in the name of R' Yochanan: **שלקות מברכין עליהן בורא פרי האדמה – On cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the ground.** וְרַבִּי בִּנְיָמִין בַּר יֶפֶת אָמַר – **But R' Binyamin bar Yefess says in the name of R' Yochanan: שלקות מברכין עליהן שהכל נהיה בדברו – On cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing that everything came into being through His word.** אָמַר רַב נַחְמָן בַּר יִצְחָק – **Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: קָבַע עוּלָא לְשִׁבְשִׁתִּיהָ בְּרַבִּי בִּנְיָמִין – Ulla, who said in the name of R' Yochanan that one recites shehakol on cooked vegetables, ingrained his mistake<sup>[25]</sup> in accordance with the testimony of R' Binyamin bar Yefess.**<sup>[26]</sup>

#### NOTES

16. Since they taste better raw than cooked. [Though it is plain to see that, on the contrary, these vegetables taste better when cooked, that enhancement of flavor results from the meat and salt with which they are cooked. Pure garlic and leek, however, taste better raw than cooked (Tosafos; see Rama, Orach Chaim 205:1 with Taz §3 and Magen Avraham §5).]

17. Rav Nachman was a [more] prominent personage [see *Sifsei Chachamim*] and [unlike Rav Chisda] referred to Ulla as "colleague" rather than "teacher" (*Rashi*).

18. [Literally: is recorded in the Tannaic sources as being in dispute.] Unlike Rav Chisda, Rav Nachman takes these two rulings to be at odds with one another, as both refer to *all* cooked vegetables, whether generally eaten cooked or raw. Shmuel holds that in all cases, *haadamah* is recited on cooked vegetables, whereas R' Yochanan holds that *shehakol* is recited. And their dispute reflects an earlier dispute of Tannaim, as Rav Nachman proceeds to show (see *Rashi*).

19. Though the matzah has been soaked or cooked, it [retains its original status and] is still considered לֶחֶם עֵינִי, *bread of affliction* [see above, 37b note 26] (*Rashi*). [However, once it dissolves (see above, 37a note 17), it is no longer considered "bread," and it is therefore no longer fit for the mitzvah of eating "bread" of affliction.]

20. [Rav Nachman assumes that] in R' Yose's view, bread that is cooked

is no longer considered "bread" (*Rashi*).

21. See *Rashba*.

22. See *Mishnah Berurah* 475:29; cf. *Maharatz Chayes* here.

23. All agree that it is necessary that matzah have the taste of matzah in order to be used for the mitzvah (see *Pesachim* 115a with *Rashi* and *Rashbam* לֵיהּ וּמִבְטֵל לֵיהּ). The dispute between R' Meir and R' Yose is only whether the taste of cooked matzah is considered "the taste of matzah" (*Rashba*; cf. *Rabbeinu Yonah* and *Pnei Yehoshua*).

24. In practice, the cooking process affects different vegetables differently, and the blessing on the vegetable varies accordingly – see *Orach Chaim* 205:1 with *Mishnah Berurah* and *Beur Halachah*.

25. Translation based on *Rashi*. [Alternatively, this is to be rendered: *established his rote*, i.e. his body of memorized law (see *Mesoras HaShas*; see also *Aruch* [ע' שבש ב].)]

26. Though Ulla above quotes R' Yochanan as ruling that *shehakol* is recited on cooked vegetables, Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak contends that Ulla did not actually hear R' Yochanan say so. Rather, Ulla heard this report of R' Yochanan's ruling from R' Binyamin bar Yefess, and committed it to memory until he came to believe that R' Yochanan actually ruled this way. This caused Ulla to report the ruling to the yeshiva in R' Yochanan's name (see *Rashi*).

R' Zeira objects to the recording of R' Yochanan's position as a matter of dispute:

וְכִי מָה עָנִין רַבִּי בְּנִימִין בְּרַחֲמֵי אֲבָל רַבִּי – R' Zeira pondered how this dispute between R' Chiya bar Abba and R' Binyamin bar Yefess ever became recorded in the yeshivah.<sup>[27]</sup> וְכִי מָה עָנִין רַבִּי בְּנִימִין בְּרַחֲמֵי אֲבָל רַבִּי חִיָּא בַר אֲבָא – Why, what comparison is there between R' Binyamin bar Yefess and R' Chiya bar Abba?<sup>[28]</sup> רַבִּי חִיָּא בַר אֲבָא – R' Chiya bar Abba is precise when memorizing a teaching from R' Yochanan his teacher, וְרַבִּי בְּנִימִין בְּרַחֲמֵי אֲבָל רַבִּי חִיָּא בַר אֲבָא – whereas R' Binyamin bar Yefess is not precise. וְעוֹד רַבִּי חִיָּא בַר אֲבָא כָּל תְּלָתִין יוֹמִין – And furthermore, every thirty days R' Chiya bar Abba would review his learning before R' Yochanan his teacher,<sup>[29]</sup> וְרַבִּי בְּנִימִין בְּרַחֲמֵי אֲבָל רַבִּי חִיָּא בַר אֲבָא – whereas R' Binyamin bar Yefess did not review in this manner. וְעוֹד בְּרַחֲמֵי אֲבָל רַבִּי חִיָּא בַר אֲבָא – And furthermore, aside from this and aside from this, i.e. aside from these two general reasons for considering R' Chiya bar Abba's version reliable to the exclusion of the version of R' Binyamin bar Yefess, there is a direct proof that R' Yochanan never ruled that *shehakol* is recited on cooked vegetables.<sup>[30]</sup> דְּהוּא תוֹרְמִסָּא דְשִׁלְקִין לִיה שֶׁבַע וְנִמְנִין – For with regard to this *turmus* bean, which they cook seven times in a pot and they then eat it as a dessert,<sup>[31]</sup> אֲתוּ וְשָׂאֲלוּ לְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן – they came and asked R' Yochanan as to which blessing should be recited on it, וְאָמַר לְהוּ – and he said to them: מְבָרְכִין עָלֶיהָ בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה – We recite on it the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*.<sup>[32]</sup> וְעוֹד – And furthermore, there is yet another direct proof that R' Yochanan never issued the ruling attributed to him by R' Binyamin bar Yefess. אָמַר רַבִּי חִיָּא בַר אֲבָא – For R' Chiya bar Abba said: אֲנִי רָאִיתִי אֶת רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן שֶׁאֲכַל זֵית מְלִיחַ – I saw R' Yochanan eat a salted olive,<sup>[33]</sup> וּבְרִיךְ עָלָיו תְּחִלָּה – and he recited a blessing on it both at the beginning, before eating it, and at the end, after eating it. אִי אֲמַרְתָּ בְּשִׁלְמָא

שְׁלֵקוֹת בְּמִילְתֵיהוּ קְיָיְמִי – Now, this is fine if you say that in R' Yochanan's view **cooked vegetables** or those steeped in salt **remain in their original status**, וְלִבְסוֹף מְבָרְךְ עָלָיו בּוֹרָא פְּרִי – for it would mean that **at the beginning he would recite on it the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the tree***, וְלִבְסוֹף מְבָרְךְ עָלָיו בְּרִכָּה אַחַת מֵעִין שֶׁלֶשׁ – and at the end he would recite on it **one blessing that is an abridgment of three**.<sup>[34]</sup> אֲלָא אִי אֲמַרְתָּ שְׁלֵקוֹת לֹא בְּמִילְתֵיהוּ קְיָיְמִי – But if you say that in R' Yochanan's view **cooked vegetables** or those steeped in salt **do not remain in their original status** as vegetables,<sup>[35]</sup> בְּשִׁלְמָא בְּתַחֲלָה מְבָרְךְ עָלָיו שֶׁהִכַּל נִהְיָה בְּבִרְרוֹ – then although it is fine that **at the beginning he would recite on it the blessing *that everything came into being through His word***, אֲלָא – but at the end what blessing would he recite?<sup>[36]</sup>

The Gemara answers:

– Perhaps, at the end R' Yochanan would recite on it *the One Who creates numerous living things and their deficiencies; for all that He has created* . . .<sup>[37]</sup>

The Gemara now challenges the opinion of those that hold that cooked vegetables retain their status as vegetables:

– Rav Yitzchak bar Shmuel raised an objection from the following Mishnah:<sup>[38]</sup> יְרִקוֹת שְׂאֲדִים יוֹצֵא – **THE BITTER VEGETABLES WITH WHICH ONE CAN FULFILL HIS OBLIGATION to eat *maror* ON the first night of PESACH . . .**<sup>[39]</sup> יוֹצֵא בְּהֵן וּבְקַלְחָא שְׁלֵהֵן – **ONE CAN FULFILL the obligation WITH THEM (i.e. with the leaves) OR WITH THEIR STALKS . . .** – אֲבָל לֹא כְּבוֹשִׂין וְלֹא שְׁלוּקִין וְלֹא מְבוֹשְׁלִין – **BUT NOT if PICKLED, NOR if STEWED, NOR if COOKED.**<sup>[40]</sup> וְאִי סִלְקָא דְעֵתָךְ – **Now, if it should enter your mind that [cooked vegetables] remain in their original status as vegetables, then why does one not fulfill his obligation by eating stewed or cooked *maror*?**

#### NOTES

27. Since R' Chiya bar Abba's testimony regarding R' Yochanan's position is so much more reliable than the testimony of R' Binyamin bar Yefess [as R' Zeira proceeds to demonstrate], the latter's testimony should have been rejected out of hand, and should never have been presented as a dissenting opinion. R' Zeira finds it inconceivable that R' Binyamin bar Yefess' opinion should even be mentioned together with that of R' Chiya bar Abba (*Rashi*, cf. *Rashba*).

28. Literally: what is R' Binyamin bar Yefess's association with R' Chiya bar Abba?

29. [Though תְּלָמִידוֹתָא, *his learning*, generally refers to one's *entire* body of learning, it does not seem reasonable to interpret it that way here. Rather,] the meaning here is that R' Chiya bar Abba would review (before R' Yochanan) on the thirty-first [alternatively: thirtieth; see *Tos. R' Yehudah HeChasid* and *Tos. HaRosh*] day that which he had learned during the preceding thirty days (*Tosafos*) in order to ensure the accuracy of what he had learned (*Ritva*). [See, however, *Be'er Sheva* to *Kereisos* 27a (ר"ה וְהָא ר' יוֹרָא בַר אֲדָא), who seeks to demonstrate that the reference here is indeed to his *entire* body of learning.]

30. *Rashi*.

31. If cooked fewer than seven times, however, the *turmus* bean remains bitter (see *Beitzah* 25b with *Rashi*).

32. Evidently, R' Yochanan holds that cooked vegetables retain their status as vegetables (*Rashi*).

33. I.e. one that has been packed in salt for many days (*Rashi*). This kind of salting has the same effect as heat (*ibid.*, from *Pesachim* 76a).

34. Just as cooked vegetables or those steeped in salt retain their original status, so too cooked or salted fruits. Thus, he recited on the salted olive *ha'eitz* before eating and *Al Ha'Eitz* afterwards, just as one would do for fresh olives.

35. And similarly, a salted olive would no longer be considered a "fruit of the tree."

36. Though the blessing that R' Yochanan reportedly made before eating the salted olive might have been *shehakol*, what is the blessing that he is reported to have made afterwards?

The Gemara's question is based on the view of Rav Yitzchak bar Avdimi (below, 44b) that *Borei Nefashos* is only recited after eating eggs or meat, but not after eating other foods. Accordingly, if the salted olive loses its status as a "fruit of the tree," rendering the blessing *Al Ha'Eitz* (which one usually recites after eating a fruit of the seven species) no longer appropriate, no blessing whatsoever would be recited afterwards (*Tzalach*; see also *Pnei Yehoshua*).

37. In other words, perhaps R' Yochanan follows the other Amoraim (below, 44b), who disagree with Rav Yitzchak bar Avdimi and hold that *Borei Nefashos* is recited after eating any food for which a different after-blessing is not prescribed. Thus, even if R' Yochanan's view is that a salted olive is no longer considered a "fruit of the tree," he would still have recited *Borei Nefashos* after eating it (*Tzalach*).

38. *Pesachim* 39a (see below, end of note 40).

39. On the first night of Pesach, one must eat *maror* [bitter herbs], as stated in *Exodus* 12:8.

40. *שְׁלוּקִין*, *stewed*, refers to those which are cooked to a greater-than-average degree, and they are thus different from those that are simply *cooked* in the regular manner (see *Rashi*; see also *Rashi* to *Pesachim* 39a ד"ה שְׁלוּקִין here).

[This Mishnah, as cited by the Gemara here, differs markedly (though not substantively) from the way the Mishnah actually appears in *Pesachim* 39a. What the Gemara cites here resembles more closely the Baraisa cited on *Pesachim* 39b. *Dikdukei Soferim*, however, cites texts in which the Gemara's citation here begins with *but not pickled* . . ., which is an exact quote from the Mishnah there, and he notes that this seems to have been the reading of *Rashi* אבל לא כְּבוֹשִׂין.]

The Gemara answers:

שאיני התם דבעינן טעם מרור וליבא – It is different there, in the case of *maror*, for we require the taste of *maror*, and it is not there if the bitter herb is pickled, stewed or cooked.<sup>[41]</sup>

The Gemara raises a question on the incident cited above:

אמר ליה רבי ירמיה לרבי זעירא – R' Yirmiyah said to R' Zeira: רבי יוחנן היכי מברך על זית מליח – How did R' Yochanan recite a blessing on a salted olive after eating it? פיון דשקילא לגרעיניה – Why, once the pit is taken away,

---

NOTES

41. Thus, although the stewed herbs retain their status as “fruits of the ground,” which is the deciding factor with regard to the laws of blessings, they cannot be used for the mitzvah of *maror*, since they do not retain their *taste* (see *Rashi*).