

1 Tishrei 5773  
Sept. 17, 2012



Brachos Daf 47

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

Rabbi Yehudah the son of Rav Shmuel bar Shilas said in the name of Rav: The guests may not eat anything until the one who breaks bread has tasted.

Rav Safra sat and stated: The statement was (*that ‘the guests may not’* taste anything’ etc.

The *Gemora* asks: What practical difference does it make?

The *Gemora* answers: It teaches us that one must repeat the precise words of his teacher.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Two people (*who are eating from a common platter*) wait for one another before eating (*if one stops eating, the other should stop as well*), but if there are three, they do not need to wait for the one. The one who recites the blessing and breaks the bread may help himself first to the condiments, but if he wishes to honor his teacher or to one greater than himself, he may do so.

Rabbah bar bar Chanah was arranging a marriage feast for his son in the house of Rav Shmuel son of Rav Ketina, and he first sat down and taught his son the following *braisa*: The one who will break the bread may not break the bread until the guests have finished responding, “Amen.”

Rav Chisda said: The majority of the guests (*must be finished responding*).

Rama bar Chama said to him: Why should this be the case only with the majority? Presumably, it is because the blessing had not yet been completed. The same should apply also to a minority, for the blessing has not yet been completed?

He replied: It is because I say that whoever draws out the response of “Amen” longer than necessary is simply mistaken.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: The “Amen” uttered in response should be neither hurried (*which will not be pronounced well*), nor curtailed (*by cutting off the “nun” at the end*), nor orphaned (*where one did not hear the blessing*), nor should one hurl the blessing (*in a non-respectful manner*) out of his mouth. Ben Azzai says: If a man says an ‘orphaned’ Amen in response, his sons will be orphans; if he responds with a hurried Amen, his days will be snatched away; if he responds with a curtailed Amen, his days will be curtailed. But if one draws out the Amen, his days and years will be prolonged.

Once Rav and Shmuel were sitting at a meal and Rav Shimi bar Chiya joined them and ate very hurriedly (*in order that they could join in a zimun*). Rav said to him: What do you want? Is it to join us in a *zimun*? We have already finished (*eating before you began, and therefore, we cannot be joined together*)!? Shmuel said to him: If they were to bring me mushrooms, and young pigeons to Abba (Rav), would we not go on eating (*and therefore our*

meal is still ongoing, and someone who begins to eat now can join us in a zimun).

The disciples of Rav were once dining together when Rav Acha entered. They said: A great man has come who can lead us in zimun and recite *Birchas Hamazon* for us. He said to them: Do you think that the greatest person present recites the *Birchas hamazon*? It is the main person (*the one who was there from the beginning*) who has that right!

The law, however, is that the greatest person recites the *Birchas Hamazon* even though he comes in at the end.

The *Mishna* had stated: If one eats *demai* (*questionable if it is untithed produce or not*), he may join in the zimun.

The *Gemora* asks: But this is not a proper food for him (*so how can he join*)?

The *Gemora* answers: If he wishes, he can declare his possessions ownerless, in which case he becomes a poor man, and it is then suitable for him. For we have learned in a *Mishna*: *Demai* may be given to the poor to eat and also to the soldiers. And Rav Huna said: It was taught in a *braisa*: Beis Shammai say that *demai* is not given to the poor and to soldiers to eat.

The *Mishna* had stated: If one ate *ma'aser rishon* whose *terumah* has been taken, he may join in the zimun.

The *Gemora* asks: Is this not obvious?

The *Gemora* answers: This had to be stated, for the case in which the Levi came beforehand and thus obtained the *ma'aser rishon* while the grain was still in the ears, and he separated the *terumas ma'aser* of it, but not the *terumah gedolah*<sup>1</sup>; and the rule stated follows Rabbi Avahu, for Rabbi Avahu said in the name of Rish Lakish: *Ma'aser*

<sup>1</sup> A Levi who received stalks of grain for his Maaser must thresh the grain and pile them, and then he can separate Terumas Maaser, which is ten percent of the grain that the Levi receives from a Yisroel which the Levi then gives to the Kohen.

*rishon* for which the Levi has come beforehand and obtained in the ear is not liable to *terumah gedolah*, since it is written: *And you shall separate from it Hashem's terumah, a tithe part of the tithe*. A tithe from the tithe is what I have told you, not the *terumah gedolah* plus the *terumah* of the tithe from the tithe.

[The *Gemora* is referring to a case where the Levi preempted the Kohen, and took his *ma'aser rishon* when the grain was still "in its ears" (*before the produce was smoothed in a pile – it therefore is regarded as being "not finished"*) before the Kohen received his *terumah*. The Levi is exempt from giving *terumah gedolah* to the Kohen even though he has gained because of it. Ordinarily, a Yisroel gives one-fiftieth to the Kohen for *terumah* and one-tenth to the Levi as *ma'aser*. If he has one hundred bushels, he would give two bushels to the Kohen and 9.8 to the Levi. Here, the Levi received ten whole bushels. This exemption is derived from the following verse: *When you (the Levi) accept from the Children of Israel the ma'aser, you shall separate from it a tenth (to give to the Kohen) from a tenth (which he received from the Yisroel)*. This implies that the Levi is not required to give the *terumah gedolah* to the Kohen. This exemption, however, only applies when the Levi received the *ma'aser* before the produce was "finished." If, however, it was already smoothed into a pile, the Levi would be required to give *terumah gedolah* (*one-fiftieth*) to the Kohen besides the tenth of the tenth – *terumas ma'aser*.]

Rav Pappa asked Abaye: If this is so, then even if the Levi preempted the Kohen when the grain was smoothed in the pile, he should be exempt from the obligation of separating *terumah gedolah*? And Abaye answered him: Regarding your question the Torah says: *from all your gifts you shall separate*. But why do you see fit to include the case of when the produce was smoothed in the pile, and to exclude the case of produce "in the ears"? I include the case of produce smoothed in the pile because it is regarded as "grain," and I exclude the case of

produce in the ears because it does not come under the title of “grain.”

The *Mishna* had stated: If one ate *ma’aser sheini* or *hekdesch* that was redeemed, he may join in the *zimun*.

The *Gemora* asks: Is this not obvious?

The *Gemora* answers: This had to be stated, for we are dealing here with a case where, for instance, he has given the principal but not the additional fifth, and the *Mishna* teaches us here that the fact that the fifth has not been given does not invalidate the redemption.

The *Mishna* had stated: If the waiter ate an olive’s volume of bread, he may join in the *zimun*.

The *Gemora* asks: Is this not obvious?

The *Gemora* answers: You might have thought that the waiter is not an established member of the group; the *Mishna* therefore teaches us that he is qualified to join in the *zimun*.

The *Mishna* had stated: If a Cuthean ate together with us, we join in *zimun* on account of him.

The *Gemora* asks: Why is this so? He should not be better than an *am ha’aretz* (an ignorant person), and it has been taught in a *braisa*: An *am ha’aretz* is not reckoned in for *zimun*?

Abaye replied: It refers to a Cuthean who is a Torah scholar. Rava said: You may even take it to refer to a Cuthean who is an *am ha’aretz*, but the *braisa* is referring to an *am ha’aretz* as defined by the Rabbis who disagree in this matter with Rabbi Meir, for it has been taught in a *braisa*: Who is an *am ha’aretz*? One who does not insist on eating his *chullin* produce in a state of *taharah*; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. The *Chachamim*, however, say that an *am ha’aretz* is one who does not separate

*ma’aser* from his produce. Now these Cutheans do tithe their produce in the proper way, since they are very scrupulous about any injunction written in the Torah; for a master has said in a *braisa*: Whenever the Cutheans have adopted a commandment, they are much more particular with it than the Jews.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Who is regarded as an *am ha’aretz*? Someone who doesn’t recite *kerias shema* in the morning and in the evening with the blessings; these are the words of Rabbi Meir. The *Chachamim* say: An *am ha’aretz* is someone who does not put on *tefillin*. Ben Azzai said: An *am ha’aretz* is someone who does not have *tzitzis* on his garment. Rabbi Yonasan ben Yosef said: An *am ha’aretz* is someone who has sons, but does not raise them to learn Torah. Others say: Even if a person has studied Torah and *Mishna*, but has not served Torah scholars, he is regarded as an *am ha’aretz*. If he studied Torah, but not *Mishna*, he is a boor. Rav Huna said: The *halachah* is in accordance with the ‘Others.’ (47a – 47b)