

7 Tishrei 5773
Sept. 23, 2012



Brachos Daf 53

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"n

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

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: We may say the blessing over a light kindled by a gentile (after Shabbos) from a Jew, or by a Jew from a gentile, but not by a gentile from a gentile.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the reason for barring a light kindled by a gentile from a gentile? It is because it did not rest (on Shabbos, for the gentile used the light for forbidden labor); but a light kindled by a Jew from a gentile also did not rest?

And if you will say that the prohibited flame (from Shabbos) has vanished and the light is now a different one (for, as it burns, the new flame replaces the old one) and is reborn in the hand of the Jew (and is therefore permitted); what then of this which has been taught in a *braisa*: If one carries out a flame (from a private domain) to a public domain (on Shabbos), he is liable (for violating the Shabbos). Why is he liable? That which he picked up (the original flame in the private domain), he did not set down (for a burning flame is not regarded as a continuous existence), and that which he set down he did not pick up (and in order to be liable for transferring from one domain to the other, he must pick the object up in one domain and place it down in the other domain)!

The *Gemora* answers: We must say therefore that (a burning flame is regarded as continuous, and) the prohibited flame is still present, only the blessing which he says (in the case where a light is kindled by a Jew from a gentile) is said over the additional permitted part.

The *Gemora* asks: If so, a light kindled by a gentile from a gentile should also be permitted (for the blessing will be on the permitted part)?

The *Gemora* answers: That is so; but it was as a precaution on account of the first gentile (*against the light kindled by a gentile on Shabbos*) and the first flame (*immediately after Shabbos, when there was no time for a new flame to be created*).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If one was walking (*after Shabbos*) outside the town and saw a light, the *halachah* is as follows: If the majority (*of the inhabitants*) are gentiles he should not recite a blessing (*for it is presumed that the fire was lit on Shabbos*), but if the majority are Jews, he may recite the blessing.

The *Gemora* asks: This statement is self-contradictory. You first say that if the majority are gentiles, he may not recite the blessing, which implies that if they are half and half he may recite it,



and then it states that if the majority are Jews, he may recite it, which implies that if they are half and half, he may not recite it!?

The *Gemora* answers: The law actually is that even if they are half and half he may recite it, but since in the first clause it says 'the majority are gentiles,' in the second clause it says 'the majority are Jews.'

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If a man (*after Shabbos*) was walking outside the town and saw a child with a torch in its hands, he makes inquiries about it; if it is a Jew, he may recite the blessing, but if it is a gentile, he may not.

The *Gemora* asks: Why does it speak of a child? The same should apply even to an adult!?

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: We suppose this to happen immediately after sunset. In the case of an adult, it is obvious that he must be a gentile (*for a Jew would not have been carrying a torch so soon after Shabbos*); in the case of a child, I can suppose that it is a Jew child who happened to take hold (*of the light*).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If a man (*after Shabbos*) was walking outside the town and saw a light, the *halachah* is that if it is thick like the opening of a furnace (*which illuminates brightly, and therefore, it was most probably lit for illumination purposes*), he may recite the blessing over it; otherwise not.

The *Gemora* asks: It was taught in one *braisa*: A blessing may be recited over the light of a furnace, while another *braisa* taught that it may not!?

The *Gemora* answers: There is no difficulty, as one speaks of the beginning of the fire (*where it was lit for cooking purposes*), and the other is dealing with the end.

The *Gemora* asks: It was taught in one *braisa*: A blessing may be recited over the light of an oven or a stove, while another *braisa* states that it may not!?

The *Gemora* answers: There is no difficulty, as one speaks as one speaks of the beginning of the fire, and the other is dealing with the end.

The *Gemora* asks: It was taught in one *braisa*: The blessing may be recited over the light of the synagogue or the study hall, while another *braisa* states that it may not!?

The *Gemora* answers: There is no difficulty, as one speaks of a case where a prominent man is present (and the light is lit out of respect for him, but not for illumination), whereas the other *braisa* refers to a case where no prominent man is present (and the light was lit for illumination).

Alternatively, I can answer that both speak of a case where a prominent man is present, and there is no difficulty, as one speaks of where there is a sexton (and the light is lit also so he can eat there), whereas the other *braisa* refers to a case where there is no sexton.

Alternatively, I can answer that both speak of a case where there is a sexton, and there is no difficulty, as one



speaks of where there is moonlight (and no light is needed for his meal), whereas the other *braisa* refers to a case where there is no moonlight.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: If people were sitting in the study hall (after *Shabbos*) and light was brought in, Beis Shammai say that each one recites a blessing over it for himself, while Beis Hillel say that one recites the blessing on behalf of all, because it is written: In the multitude of people is the King's glory.

The *Gemora* asks: Beis Hillel at any rate explain their reason; but what is the reason of Beis Shammai?

The *Gemora* answers: It is probably to avoid an interruption of study (for they would need to concentrate on the words in order to answer "Amen").

It has been taught similarly in a *braisa*: The members of the household of Rabban Gamliel did not use to say 'Good health' (when someone sneezed) in the study hall, so as not to interrupt their study.

The *Mishna* had stated: A blessing may not be recited over the lights or the spices of the Dead.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the reason?

The *Gemora* answers: The light is kindled only in honor of the dead, and the spices are to remove the bad smell.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: Wherever (the person buried is of such prominence that) a light would be carried before him either by day or by night, we do not recite a blessing over the light (if he

is buried on the termination of *Shabbos*, for the light was not lit for illumination); but if he is one before whom a light would be carried only at night, we may recite the blessing.

Rav Huna said: A blessing is not recited over spices used in a latrine or oil used for removing odors (from the hands).

The *Gemora* asks: This implies that wherever (spice) is not used for scent no blessing is recited over it. But it was taught in a *braisa*: If one enters a spice-dealer's shop and smells the fragrance, even though he sits there the entire day, he recites only one blessing, but if he is constantly going in and out he recites a blessing each time he enters. Now here is a case where it is not used for smell, and yet one recites a blessing!?

The *Gemora* answers: In fact it is used for smell - the object being that people should smell and come and make purchases from there.