

26 Shevat 5780
Feb. 21, 2020



Brachos Daf 49

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h
Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

It has been taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Eliezer says: If one does not say the words ‘a desirable, good and spacious land’ in the blessing of the land, or he does not mention ‘the kingdom of the house of David’ in the blessing ‘Who builds Jerusalem,’ he has not fulfilled his obligation.

Nachum the Elder says: He must mention the covenant (*of circumcision*) in it (*the second blessing; for it was through this covenant that the Land was given to Avraham and his descendants*).

Rabbi Yosi says: He must mention the Torah in it (*for it was also in the merit of the Torah and its mitzvos that the Jewish people inherited the Land*).

Pleimo says: He must mention the covenant (*of circumcision*) before the Torah, since this one (*the Torah*) was given with only three covenants (*the generalities at Mount Sinai and the specifics at the Tent of Meeting; then again by the plains of Moav near the Land of Israel immediately prior to entering; and again after crossing the Jordan into the Land of Israel at Mount Gerizim and Mount Eival*), but this one (*circumcision*) was given with thirteen (*for the word ‘b’ris’ -- ‘covenant’ occurs thirteen times in the passages dealing with the circumcision commandment given to Avraham regarding him and his household*).

Rabbi Abba says: He must express thanks at the beginning and end of it (*the blessing for the Land – ‘nodeh lecha’*), and one who does less than that – should not do so less than once (*he should say an expression of thanks at least once*); and one who does do less (*he offers no expression*

of thanks at all) is shameful. And whoever concludes the blessing of the Land with ‘the One Who bequeaths land’ (*but does not use the standard text of ‘for the Land and the nourishment’*) or he concludes the blessing of the Builder of Jerusalem with ‘the Savior of Israel’ (*but does not use the standard text of ‘Builder of Jerusalem’*) is a fool. And whoever does not mention the covenant and the Torah in the blessing of the Land and the kingdom of the house of David in ‘Who builds Jerusalem’ has not fulfilled his obligation.

The *Gemora* notes that this supports Rabbi Ila’a, for Rabbi Ila’a said in the name of Rabbi Yaakov bar Acha in the name of our teacher (*Rav*): Whoever does not mention the covenant and the Torah in the blessing of the Land and the kingdom of the house of David in ‘Who builds Jerusalem’ has not fulfilled his obligation.

There is a difference of opinion (*amongst the Tannaim*) between Abba Yosi ben Dustai and the Rabbis. One says that God’s Kingship must be mentioned in the blessing of ‘*Ha-tov v’ha-meitiv*’ -- ‘Who is good and does good,’ and the other says that it is not necessary to be mentioned.

The *Gemora* explains their reasoning: The one who says that it must be mentioned maintains that this blessing is Rabbinic in nature (*and therefore it is not a continuation of the preceding blessings; i.e., it is not ‘a blessing that follows another as a group,’ and therefore God’s Kingship must be mentioned afresh in it*), whereas the one who says that it is not necessary to be mentioned holds that it is of Biblical nature (*and since it is connected to the blessings of the*



Land and Yerushalaim, it does not need another mention of God's Kingship).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: How does one conclude the blessing of 'the builder of Jerusalem'? Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah says: Savior of Israel.

The *Gemora* interrupts: 'Savior of Israel' and not 'Builder of Jerusalem'!? [*Isn't the main point of the blessing Yerushalayim?*]

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, 'Savior of Israel' as well (*is also a valid conclusion, for the salvation of Israel is dependent on the building of Yerushalayim*).

Rabbah bar bar Chanah once visited the house of the Exilarch. He mentioned one at the beginning (*of the third blessing; he said either Israel or Jerusalem; the third blessing begins 'Have mercy Hashem upon Israel Your nation and upon Jerusalem'*) and both at the end (*the Savior of Israel and the Builder of Jerusalem*). Rav Chisda said: Is it an act of strength to conclude with two subjects? Has it not been taught in a *braisa*: Rebbe says that we do not conclude with two subjects (*for this is like performing mitzvos in "bundles" – it appears as if one wishes to be done with them in a quick manner*)?

It was stated above: Rebbe says that we do not conclude with two subjects.

Levi asked Rebbe (*from the blessing of the Land*): But we say 'for the land and for the nourishment'?

He replied: It means that it is a Land that produces nourishment (*and therefore, we are concluding with only one subject*).

But, Levi asked: We say (*in the one blessing, which is abridgement of the Three Blessings*): 'for the land and for the fruit'?

Rebbe answered: It means that it is a Land that produces fruit.

But, Levi asked: We say (*in the kiddush blessing on a festival*): 'the One Who sanctifies Israel and the appointed seasons'?

Rebbe answered: It means that Hashem sanctifies Israel, who sanctifies the seasons.

But, Levi asked: We say (*on Rosh Chodesh*): 'the One Who sanctifies Israel and the *Rosh Chodesh* days'?

Rebbe answered: It means that Hashem sanctifies Israel, who sanctifies the *Rosh Chodesh* days.

But, Levi asked: We say (*in the kiddush blessing on a festival which falls on Shabbos*): 'the One Who sanctifies the *Shabbos*, Israel and the appointed seasons'?

Rebbe answers: This is the exception.

The *Gemora* asks: Why then should it be different?

The *Gemora* answers: Here it is one (*praise, for the subject matter is sanctification*), however, there, it is two, as each one is distinct and separate (*for the 'Savior of Israel' and 'Builder of Jerusalem' are two different concepts*).

The *Gemora* asks: And what is the reason for not concluding with two praises?

The *Gemora* answers: It is because we do not want to make *mitzvos* into "bundles."

The *Gemora* asks: How do we decide the matter (*regarding the conclusion of the blessing for Jerusalem*)?

Rav Sheishes says: If one begins the blessing with 'Have mercy on Your people, Israel,' he concludes with 'Savior of

Israel'; and if he begins with 'Have mercy on Jerusalem,' he concludes with 'the Builder of Jerusalem.'

Rav Nachman, however, said: Even if one began with 'Have mercy on Israel,' he concludes with 'the Builder of Jerusalem,' because it is written: The Builder of Jerusalem is God, the dispersed of Israel, He gathers together. This is as if to say: When will God build Jerusalem? It will be when He gathers the dispersed of Israel. [*This is why 'the Builder of Jerusalem' is an appropriate conclusion – even if the blessing began with 'Have mercy on Israel.'*]

Rabbi Zeira said to Rav Chisda: Let the master come and teach us *Gemora*. He replied: The Grace after Meals I do not know, and shall I study *Gemora*!? He said to him: What do you mean? Once, he replied, I visited the house of the Exilarch, and I recited *Birchas Hamazon*, and Rav Sheishes straightened out his neck at me like a serpent, and why? It is because I had made no mention either of the covenant or of the Torah or of the kingship (*of the House of David*). And, Rabbi Zeira asked, why did you not mention them? He replied: It is because I followed Rav Chananel who said in the name of Rav, for Rav Chananel said in the name of Rav: If one did not mention covenant, Torah and kingship, he has still fulfilled his obligation: covenant, because it does not apply to women (*and yet they are obligated in Birchas Hamazon*); Torah and kingship, because they do not apply - neither to women nor to slaves (*and yet they are obligated in Birchas Hamazon*).

Rabbi Zeira asked: And you abandoned all those other *Tannaim* and *Amoraim* and followed Rav!?

Rabbah bar bar Chanah said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: The blessing of '*Ha-tov v'ha-meitiv*' -- 'the One Who is good and does good' must contain mention of God's Kingship.

The *Gemora* asks: What novelty is he teaching us? He cannot be teaching us that any blessing which does not

contain mention of God's Kingship is not a proper blessing, for Rabbi Yochanan has already said this once before!?

Rabbi Zeira answers: He is teaching us that it requires God's Kingship to be mentioned twice; once for itself and once for the blessing of '*Bonei Yerushalaim*' -- 'the One Who builds Jerusalem' (*for it – the blessing which precedes 'Ha-tov v'ha-meitiv, does not contain a mention of God's Kingship*).

The *Gemora* asks: If that is so, we should require three times: once for itself, once for the blessing of '*Bonei Yerushalaim*,' and once for the blessing of the Land!? Rather, you must say that the reason we do not require one for the blessing of the Land is because it is a blessing which follows another one (*in a group*); accordingly, '*Bonei Yerushalaim*' then should also not require it, being that it is a blessing which follows another one (*in a group*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: The fact is that, in truth, the blessing of '*Bonei Yerushalaim*' also does not require it, but since the kingdom of the house of David is mentioned (*in that blessing*), it is not proper that the Kingship of Heaven also should not be mentioned.

Rav Pappa answers: Rabbi Yochanan meant that it requires two mentions of God's Kingship besides its own.

Rabbi Zeira was once sitting behind Rav Giddal, and Rav Giddal was sitting before Rav Huna, and as he (*Rav Giddal*) sat, he said: If one forgot and did not mention (*in Birchas Hamazon*) the *Shabbos* (*supplement*), he should say the following (*upon concluding the blessing of 'Bonei Yerushalayim'*): 'Blessed are You ... Who gave *Shabbos* for rest to His people, Israel, with love, for a sign and a covenant, Blessed are You ... Who sanctifies the *Shabbos*. Rav Huna said to him: Who made this statement? He replied: Rav. He then continued: If one forgot and did not mention (*in Birchas Hamazon*) the festival (*supplement*), he should say the following (*upon concluding the blessing of 'Bonei Yerushalayim'*): 'Blessed are You ... Who gave



festivals to His people, Israel, for joy and for a remembrance, Blessed are You ... Who sanctifies the *Shabbos*. Rav Huna said to him: Who made this statement? He replied: Rav. He then continued: If one forgot and did not mention (*in Birchas Hamazon*) the *Rosh Chodesh* (*supplement*), he should say the following (*upon concluding the blessing of 'Bonei Yerushalayim'*): 'Blessed are You ... Who gave *Rosh Chodesh* to His people, Israel, for a remembrance. But, said Rabbi Zeira: I do not know whether he also said that he must add 'for joy,' or not, whether he concluded with a blessing or not, or whether he said it on his own or he was repeating the words of his teacher.

The *Gemora* relates: Once when Giddal bar Manyumi was in the presence of Rav Nachman, Rav Nachman made a mistake (*and did not mention in Birchas Hamazon the appropriate supplement*), and he went back to the beginning. He (*Giddal*) said to him: What is the reason why the master did this? He (*Rav Nachman*) replied: It is because Rabbi Shila said in the name of Rav: If one makes a mistake, he goes back to the beginning.

Giddal asked: But Rav Huna has said in the name of Rav: If one forgot and did not mention (*in Birchas Hamazon*) the supplement, he should say the following (*upon concluding the blessing of 'Bonei Yerushalayim'*): 'Blessed are You ... Who gave' etc.?

He replied: Has it not been stated in reference to this that Rav Menashya bar Tachlifa said in the name of Rav: The ruling (*of reciting that blessing*) was taught only where he has not commenced, '*Ha-tov v'ha-meitiv*' -- 'the One Who is good and does good, but if he has commenced '*Ha-tov v'ha-meitiv*,' he goes back to the beginning.

Rav Idi bar Avin said in the name of Rav Amram, who said in the name of Rav Nachman, who said in the name of Shmuel: If one forgot and did not mention *Rosh Chodesh* (*ya'aleh v'yavo*) in the *Tefillah*, he must return (*and repeat Shemoneh Esrei*); if, however, (*the mistake was made*) in

Birchas Hamazon, he is not required to return (*and repeat it*).

Rav Idi bar Avin said to Rav Amram: What is the difference between *Tefillah* and *Birchas Hamazon*?

He replied: I also had the same difficulty, and I asked Rav Nachman, and he said to me: From the master Shmuel I have not heard anything on the subject, but let us see for ourselves: In the case of *Tefillah*, which is obligatory, he is required to return (*and repeat Shemoneh Esrei*), but in the case of *Birchas Hamazon*, where one has an option to eat or not to eat (*for there is no obligation to eat bread on Rosh Chodesh*), he is not required to return (*and repeat it*).

Rav Idi bar Avin asked: But if so, in the case of *Shabbosos* and the festivals, on which it is not possible for him to abstain from eating (*bread*), I should also say that if he makes a mistake he must go return and go back to the beginning?

He replied: That is so, for Rabbi Shila said in the name of Rav: If one makes a mistake, he goes back to the beginning.

The *Gemora* asks: But hasn't R. Huna said in the name of Rav that if one forgot and did not mention (*in Birchas Hamazon*) the supplement, he should say the following (*upon concluding the blessing of 'Bonei Yerushalayim'*): 'Blessed are You ... Who gave' etc.?

Rav Amram replied: Has it not been stated in reference to this that the ruling (*of reciting that blessing*) was taught only where he has not commenced, '*Ha-tov v'ha-meitiv*' -- 'the One Who is good and does good, but if he has commenced '*Ha-tov v'ha-meitiv*,' he goes back to the beginning.

The *Mishna* had stated: How much is one required to eat that he is obligated to join in a *zimun*? [*If he eats the amount of an olive. R' Yehudah says: Once he eats the size of an egg.*]

The *Gemora* notes that this would seem to show that Rabbi Meir (*the first Tanna*) considers an olive to be significant, and Rabbi Yehudah - an egg.

The *Gemora* asks: But we heard the opposite, since we have learned in a *Mishna*: Similarly (*to the law regarding someone who remembers that he has chametz in his possession, but he is away from his house*), if one has left Jerusalem and remembers that he has in his possession sacrificial meat (*which, having left the walls of Jerusalem, are now rendered unfit and must be burned*), if he has gone beyond Tzofim, he burns it on the spot (*and he does not return to burn it in Jerusalem – the place where, ideally, it should be burned*), and if not, he is required to return (*to Jerusalem*) and he burns it in front of the Temple with some of the wood piled on the altar. For what minimum quantity is one required to turn back? Rabbi Meir says: In either case (*chametz or sacrificial meat*), the size of an egg; Rabbi Yehudah says: In either case, the size of an olive.

Rabbi Yochanan said: The names (*in our Mishna – regarding zimmun*) must be reversed.

Abaye said: There is no need to reverse the names. Here (*by zimmun*) they differ regarding the interpretation of a Scriptural verse. Rabbi Meir holds that '*and you shall eat*' (*where the verse continues to say: 'and you shall be satisfied and you shall bless Hashem'*) refers to "eating," and '*you shall be satisfied*' refers to drinking, and the standard of eating (*throughout the Torah*) is an olive. Rabbi Yehudah, however, maintains that '*And you shall eat and you shall be satisfied*' signifies an eating which gives satisfaction, and this must be at least the size of an egg. And there (*regarding the burning of chametz or sacrificial meat*), they differ in their reasoning. Rabbi Meir considers that the requirement of returning something (*which needs to be destroyed*) should be analogous to its *tumah* (*defilement*); just as its *tumah* is conditioned by the quantity of an egg, so too is the return for it (*when it is required to be destroyed*) conditioned by the quantity of

an egg. Rabbi Yehudah held that the return for it should be analogous to its prohibition; just as the prohibition for it comes into force for the quantity of an olive, so too is the return for it conditioned by the quantity of an olive.