

29 Shevat 5780
Feb. 24, 2020



Brachos Daf 52

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

Kiddush vs. Havdalah

The Gemora says that Bais Shammai’s position in the Mishna, that one starts with the blessing of *kiddush*, implies that they consider a blessing about the day to be more important than the other blessings that accompany it.

The Gemora challenges this from a braisa about making *havdalah*. The braisa says that when one arrives home after Shabbos, he should make the blessing on wine, candle, and spices, and then the blessing of *havdalah*, separating Shabbos from the weekdays. If he only has one cup, he should leave all of the blessings for after his meal, and use that cup for *havdalah* and the birkas hamazon. The Gemora assumes that this braisa follows Bais Shammai, yet it places *havdalah* - the blessing about the day – at the end.

The Gemora explains that the braisa must be Bais Shammai, since they are the ones who say the blessing on the candle precedes the one on spices. To support this, the Gemora cites a braisa in which Rabbi Yehuda says that Bais Shammai and Bais Hillel agree that the first blessing is on the wine after birkas hamazon, and the last one is on *havdalah*. Their dispute is about the blessings on the candle and the spice, with Bais Shammai saying the candle comes first, and Bais Hillel saying the spice comes first.

The Gemora challenges this, as perhaps this braisa follows Rabbi Meir’s version of the dispute (as cited in the Mishna), in which Bais Hillel also place the candle’s blessing before the spice blessing.

The Gemora rejects this option, as this braisa says that if one has only one cup, he leaves all the blessings for after birkas hamazon, which follows Rabbi Yehuda’s position.

The Gemora resolves this by distinguishing between *Kiddush*, which starts the day, and *havdalah*, which ends the day. Bais Shammai prefers starting the day earlier, and ending the day later, to show that the day is not a burden on us.

A cup before or after birkas hamazon

The Gemora raises another inconsistency between this braisa and the Mishna. The braisa says that he should leave the one cup for after birkas hamazon, implying that he drinks the wine afterwards, while the Mishna says that Bais Shammai says that one should say the blessing on the wine before birkas hamazon.

The Gemora suggests that Bais Shammai’s statement in the Mishna means that he makes the blessing, but actually drinks it afterwards, but rejects this, as one who says a blessing on food must immediately taste some of it.

The Gemora suggests that he may taste some of it. Although tasting from a cup makes it invalid for a further formal blessing, he may taste it in his mouth. Although the braisa says he only has one cup, he may have more than one cupful, but not two cups full.

The Gemora finally rejects this option from Rabbi Chiya, who taught that Bais Shammai says that he makes the blessing on the wine, drinks it, and then says birkas hamazon.



The Gemora therefore concludes that these are two different versions of Bais Shammai's position.

Washing hands and pouring a cup

The Mishna stated that Bais Shammai says that one first washes his hands, and then pours the cup of wine, while Bais Hillel says that one first pours the cup, and then washes his hands.

The Gemora cites a braisa explaining both positions. Bais Shammai says that if one pours the cup first, we are concerned that liquids that fall on the outside of the cup will become impure on contact with his impure hands, and then make the cup impure. Without the liquid, impure hands wouldn't make the cup impure, as they are only second level impure, which cannot make something not sanctified and not teruma into a third level. However, liquids touched by such hands become first level impure, which can make the cup impure. Bais Hillel says that if one washes his hands first, we are concerned that water remaining on his hands will become impure on contact with an impure cup, and then make his hands impure. Without the water, the cup itself wouldn't make his hands impure, as an impure vessel cannot make a person impure. Furthermore, the liquids inside the cup do not become impure, as they are referring to a cup whose outside came in contact with impure liquids, making only the outside impure, as the Mishna teaches that a vessel whose outside became impure is only impure outside, but if it became impure on the inside, it is all impure. The Gemora explains that the core of their dispute is whether one may use a vessel whose outside is impure. Bais Shammai says that one may not, as we are concerned that liquid may splash from inside to the outside, and then make one's hands impure. They therefore try to avoid causing such impurity, and are not concerned about a situation that would arise only with such a vessel. Bais Hillel says that one may not, as splashes are uncommon, and we therefore must deal with a situation when one is using such a vessel. The braisa then states that another reason offered by Bais Hillel is that one should wash immediately before eating.

The Gemora explains that Bais Hillel is telling Bais Shammai that even though they are concerned about the possibility of making the vessel impure, they still should prefer washing after pouring, to wash immediately before eating.

Where to put the napkin

The Mishna stated that Bais Shammai says that one should wipe his hands during the meal with a cloth, and leave it on the table, while Bais Hillel says that he should leave it on the chair.

The Gemora cites a braisa which explains the reasoning behind each of their positions. Bais Shammai say that if he leaves it on the chair, the liquid on it may become impure on contact with the chair, and then make his hands impure when they touch the liquid. Without the liquid, the chair wouldn't make the cloth impure, nor would the cloth make his hands impure, as a vessel does not make a vessel or person directly impure at this level. Bais Hillel says that if one leaves it on the table, the liquid on it may become impure on contact with an impure table, and then make the food on the table impure.

The Gemora explains that we are concerned about a table at second level impurity which does not make food impure, but can make liquids impure at first level impurity, which can then make food impure.

The Gemora explains that the core of their dispute is whether one may use a table which is second level impure. Bais Shammai says one may not, lest a kohen eating teruma eat at such a table, which would make his teruma impure and unfit. Bais Hillel says that one may, and we are not concerned about a kohen, since kohanim are very vigilant to avoid impurity.

The Braisa continues to state another argument offered by Bais Hillel – that there is no requirement from the Torah for one to wash hands before eating non-teruma food.

The Gemora explains that Bais Hillel is saying to Bais Shammai that if we have to choose between a concern about food becoming impure and hands becoming impure, we should be



more concerned about the food, since there is a concept of impure food in the Torah, but not of impure hands.

When to sweep and wash after the meal

The Mishna stated that Bais Shammai says that one sweeps the leftover food, and then washes his hands for birkas hamazon, while Bais Hillel says that the order is reversed.

The Gemora cites a braisa which explains the reasoning behind their positions. Bais Shammai says that if one would wash their hands before sweeping, the water will drip on the leftovers, making them disgusting, effectively wasting food. Bais Hillel says that if the waiter is knowledgeable, he will first remove leftovers that are usable (i.e., a kazayis or bigger), and only leave small pieces, which are insignificant.

The Gemora says that this supports Rabbi Yochanan, who says that one may destroy crumbs smaller than a kazayis.

The Gemora says that the core of their dispute is whether one may use a waiter who is not knowledgeable.

Rabbi Yossi bar Chanina quotes Rav Huna saying that we rule like Bais Hillel in all the cases in this chapter besides this one.

Rabbi Oshaya learned this dispute reversing their positions, and then ruled like Bais Hillel even in this one.

Order of havdalah blessings

The Gemora discusses the dispute of Bais Shammai and Bais Hillel about the order of blessings in *havdalah*. Rav Huna bar Yehuda went to Rava's house, and saw him saying the blessing on spice first. He asked him why he did so, as both Bais Shammai and Bais Hillel agree that the candle comes before the spices, as stated in a braisa that Rav Huna cited. Rava responded by saying that this is Rabbi Meir's position, but Rabbi Yehuda says that they agree that the blessing on wine is first, and the blessing on *havdalah* is last, but they dispute the order of candle and spice. Bais Shammai says that the candle comes first, while Bais Hillel says the spice comes

first, and Rabbi Yochanan says that the accepted practice is to follow Bais Hillel, as cited by Rabbi Yehuda.

The blessing on the candle

The Mishna stated that Bais Shammai says that the blessing on the candle is *shebara me'or ha'esh* – *Who created the light of the fire*, while Bais Hillel says that it is *boreh me'orai ha'esh* – *Who creates the lights of the fire*.

Rava says that both agree that bara implies past tense, but they dispute what boreh implies. Bais Shammai says that it only implies future tense, while Bais Hillel says that it implies past tense.

Rav Yosef challenges this, from many verses which use boreh to refer to past creations (of darkness, wind, and the sky), and therefore says that they both agree that both bara and boreh imply past. Their dispute is about the word for the light. Bais Shammai says that there is one light in a fire, and therefore use the singular me'or. Bais Hillel says that there are many lights (i.e. colors) in a fire, and therefore use the plural me'orai.

The Gemora supports this with a braisa, in which Bais Hillel say to Bais Shammai that there are many lights that exist in a fire.

Candle or spice of a non-Jew

The Mishna says that one may not make the blessing on a candle or spices of a non-Jew.

The Gemora understands that one may not make it on his candle, as it was used over Shabbos, and therefore did not refrain from prohibited work. However, why may one may not use his spices?

Rav says that the Mishna refers to spices from a party of non-Jews, as these parties are assumed to be for idolatry, making their spices designated for idolatry.



The Gemora challenges this, as the Mishna later lists spices used for idolatry explicitly, but Rabbi Chanina misura explains that the latter part of the Mishna is explaining why one may not use spices from a party of non-Jews.

Candle which rested

The Gemora cites a braisa which says that one may only make the blessing on a candle which rested.

The Gemora explains that it must only have rested from prohibited work, as the braisa says that one may use a candle lit for someone sick or a woman in labor.

Rather, Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says that it only means that the candle must have rested from prohibited work.

The Gemora supports this with a braisa, which says that if a lamp was burning throughout Shabbos, one may use it for the blessing in *havdalah*.

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

The Shabbos *Zemirah*, “*Tzur Mi-shelo Achalnu*”: its Origin, Customs and Intent

One of the most well known Shabbos *zemiros* is the song *Tzur mi-shelo achalnu*. It is sung the world over, in both Sephardic and Ashkenazic Jewish communities. The exact time of its origin and its author are unknown. Manuscripts have been found dating back as far as six hundred years ago; many believe, however, that it is much older than that.

When we examine the four stanzas of *Tzur mi-shelo*, we find that they correspond very closely to the *berachos* of Birkas Hamazon:

“*Tzur mi-shelo achalnu, barchu emunai*: The Rock from Whose we have eaten, bless Him my faithful,” corresponds to the *zimun* in which we invite those assembled to join us in reciting Birkas Hamazon.

“*Hazan es olamo...achalnu es lachmo*: He nourishes His world.... We have eaten His bread,” corresponds to the first *berachah*, *Hazan es hakol*: Who nourishes all.

“*Beshir vekol todah, nevarech IEilokeinu al Eretz chemdah tovah she’hinchil la’avoseinu*: With song and the sound of gratitude, let us bless our God over the good and desirable Land that He gave as an inheritance to our forefathers,” corresponds to the second *berachah*, *Al ha’aretz v’al Hamazon*: for the Land and for the nourishment.

“*Rachem bechasdecha al amcha Tzureinu... ben David avdecha yavoh veyigaleinu*: Have mercy in Your Kindness on Your nation, O Our Rock...May the son of David your servant come and redeem us,” corresponds to the third *berachah*, *Rachem...* The beginning of the fourth stanza, “*Yibaneh hamikdash ‘ir Tzion...*” corresponds to the end of the third *berachah*, *Boneh Yerushalayim*: Who rebuilds Jerusalem.

The end of the fourth stanza, “*HaRachaman hanikdash, yisborach veyis’aleh ‘al kos yayin malei*: The Merciful One who is sanctified may He be blessed and exalted, over a full cup of wine,” corresponds to the *berachah* on the cup of wine, when Birkas Hamazon is recited with a *kos*.

***Tzur mi-Shelo* was perhaps written by a Tanna:** One part of Birkas Hamazon that is noticeably absent is the fourth *berachah*, known as “*Hatov ve’hameitiv*.” Unlike the first three *berachos* of Birkas Hamazon that are *midoraysa* (from the Torah), this fourth *berachah* was instituted in Yavneh after the *Churban*, in the era of the later Tannaim. The fact that *Tzur m-ishelo* does not make any mention of this *berachah* led the *Mateh Yehuda* (p. 18) to suggest that it was maybe written by one of the earlier Tannaim, who lived before *hatov ve’hameitiv* was introduced.

***Tzur mi-shelo* in place of Birkas Hamazon:** As we have seen, *Tzur mi-shelo* touches on the major themes of Birkas Hamazon. Rav Asher of Sharshov, a pupil of Rav Chaim of Volozhin *zt”l*, wrote that Rav Chaim was accustomed not to sing this *zemirah* (Keser Rosh, *os* 94). Some speculate that Rav Chaim feared that by singing *Tzur mishelo* he would fulfill his Torah obligation to say Birkas Hamazon. Preferring to fulfill



the Torah mitzvah of Birkas Hamazon in the proper format of the *berachos* that our Sages authored, he refrained from singing *Tzur mishelo* altogether. (See Siddur Ishei Yisrael, p. 244)

Rav Auzband *shlita*, Rosh Yeshiva of Telz, expounded on this topic as follows:

Do mitzvos need specific intention? There is a well-known debate in the Gemara whether mitzvos must be performed with specific intention (*kavanah*). If a person performed the action of the mitzvah, without intending it for the sake of the mitzvah, did he fulfill his obligation? The most classic example is blowing a shofar on Rosh Hashanah, not for the sake of fulfilling the mitzvah but in order to play a musical sound. Since this question has not been resolved, the accepted ruling is to be stringent and fulfill both opinions. Thus, if a person blew a shofar on Rosh Hashanah without intending to fulfill the mitzvah, he must blow again (in case he did not fulfill his obligation), but he may not recite a *berachah* (in case he did fulfill it.) [See Shulchan Aruch, O.C.60:4 and Rav Akiva Eiger there, who cites the Pri Megadim.]

If we were to assume that mitzvos require specific intent, singing *Tzur mi-shelo* would not fulfill the obligation of Birkas Hamazon, since one does not intend to do so. However, as we must be stringent and fulfill both opinions, we must consider the possibility that *Tzur mi-shelo* does fulfill the obligation of Birkas Hamazon regardless of intent. For this reason, Rav Chaim of Volozhin refrained from singing it (Kovetz Beis Aharon V'Yisrael, vol.46; see vol.47 pp. 123, 131)

Nevertheless, the custom among Jewish communities around the world is to sing it. There are many discrepancies between *Tzur mi-shelo achalnu* and the accepted wording of Birkas Hamazon. Firstly, there is a Rabbinic obligation to use the standard format of *berachos*, "*Baruch atah...melech*" which *Tzur mi-shelo* certainly does not fulfill. Even if one did fulfill his Biblical obligation with *Tzur mi-shelo*, he would need repeat Birkas Hamazon in order to fulfill the Rabbinic obligation. Furthermore, the Gemara stipulates that Birkas Hamazon must contain mention of the *bris milah*, the Torah, the **kingdom** of David, and "*eretz chemdah tovah urechavah*"

– the "desirable, goodly and spacious Land", all of which are absent from *Tzur mi-shelo*. Some *Rishonim* hold that these things must be mentioned *midoraysa*. Even according to the opinions that they need only be mentioned *midrabanan*, by omitting them in *Tzur mi-shelo* we clearly show that it is not our intention to fulfill the mitzvah of Birkas Hamazon. Even if the action of a mitzvah does not require specific intention, obvious intention **not** to fulfill the mitzvah certainly negates the mitzvah. (See Kovetz Beis Aharon V'Yisrael, vol.49) For all these reasons, we assume that *Tzur mi-shelo* does not take the place of Birkas Hamazon *midoraysa*, and may be recited (Moreover, the assertion that one ought fulfill one's Torah obligation in the format of *berachos* fixed by *chazal* is questionable as even if he did fulfill his Torah obligation, he certainly will still recite Birkas Hamazon *midrabanan*).

We conclude with a most important revelation cited in Yosef Ometz (s. 607, 815) that *Tzur mi-Shelo* was intended to be said after Birkas Hamazon. Thereby, all the halachic concerns raised above are avoided.

DAILY MASHAL

Praise in Dayan HaEmes

An elder of Yerushalayim recounted that he was present when Rabbi Zundel of Salant pronounced *Dayan haemes* at his daughter's demise *r"l*. His *berachah* was without emotion but with devotion and calm as though praising Hashem with any other *berachah* of thanks (*HaGriz MiSalant*, 135). HaGaon S.Z. Auerbach *zt"l* recounted about the author of *Aderes zt"l* that he delayed his daughter's funeral till he could prepare himself to say *Dayan haemes* with great devotion just as one says a *berachah* for good things!