

27 Shevat 5780
Feb. 22, 2020



Brachos Daf 50

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* to the same effect: Whether he (*the leader*) says ‘Bless,’ or ‘Let us bless,’ we do not seize him for this. But those who are conscientious do seize him for this (*for when he only says, “Bless,” he is excluding himself from the group*). [*This supports that which Shmuel said above.*]

The *braisa* continues: And from the way a man says the blessings it may be recognized whether he is a Torah scholar or not. For example, Rebbe says: If one says, ‘*u’ve-tuvo (chayinu)*’ -- ‘and through Whose goodness (*we live*),’ he is a Torah scholar; if, however, he says ‘*u’mei-tuvo (chayinu)*’ -- ‘and from Whose goodness (*we live*),’ he shows himself an ignoramus (*for he belittles the goodness of the Almighty, as if God is giving just a small amount of goodness to us – enough simply to sustain us*).

Abaye said to Rav Dimi: But it is written: *And from Your blessing, let the house of Your servant be blessed forever!*?

The *Gemora* answers: In a petition, it is different (*for one should not request large things; when praising God, however, one must be copious*).

The *Gemora* asks: But of a petition also it is written: *Open your mouth wide and I will fill it!*?

The *Gemora* answers: That was written with reference to (*understanding the*) words of Torah.

It has been taught in a *braisa*: Rebbe says: If one says, ‘*ve-tuvo chayinu*’ -- ‘and through Whose goodness we live,’ he

is a Torah scholar; if, however, he says ‘(*and through Whose goodness*) they live’, he shows himself an ignoramus (*for he is excluding himself from those who live by God’s goodness*).

The Neharbeleans state the opposite (*that if one says, ‘ve-tuvo chayinu’ -- ‘and through Whose goodness they live,’ he is a Torah scholar, for ‘they live’ is referring to all of mankind; if, however, he says ‘(and through Whose goodness) we live,’ he shows himself an ignoramus, for it appears as if he is referring only to the people who ate by this meal*). The law, however, is not as stated by the Neharbeleans.

Rabbi Yochanan said: If one says, ‘Let us bless He of Whose we have eaten,’ he shows himself a Torah scholar; if, however, he says ‘to the One of Whose food we have eaten’, he shows himself an ignoramus (*for it seems that there are several “providers,” and he is blessing this particular one*).

Rabbi Yochanan said: If one says, ‘Blessed is he of Whose we have eaten,’ he shows himself a Torah scholar; if, however, he says ‘for the food we have eaten’, he shows himself an ignoramus (*for it seems that he is blessing the food, and not the Provider of the food*).

Rav Acha the son of Rava said to Rav Ashi: But do we not say (*in the Haggadah on Pesach night*): We will bless the One Who performed for our ancestors and for us all these miracles?



Rav Ashi replied: There the meaning is obvious, for who performs miracles? Obviously, it is the Holy One, Blessed be He.

Rabbi Yochanan said: If one says 'Blessed is He of whose we have eaten', he shows himself a Torah scholar. If, however, he says, 'For the food which we have eaten,' he shows himself an ignoramus (*for it seems as if he is blessing the food*).

Rav Huna the son of Rabbi Yehoshua said: This is the case only where there are three, since the Name of Heaven is not mentioned (*in the zimun*), but if there are ten, since the Name of Heaven is mentioned, it is clear what is meant, as we have learned in our *Mishna*: Corresponding to his (*the leader's*) blessing, the others respond after him: 'Blessed is Hashem, our God, the God of Israel, the Lord of hosts, Who dwells among the Cherubim, for the food which we have eaten.'

The *Mishna* had stated: It (*the text of the zimun*) is the same whether there are ten or ten myriads.

The *Gemora* asks: There seems here to be an inherent contradiction. You say that it is the same whether there are ten or ten myriads, which would indicate that they are all alike; but then it states: if there are a hundred he says etc., if there are a thousand he says etc., if there are ten thousand he says etc. (*and each one of them has a different text*)?

Rav Yosef said: There is no contradiction, as the latter statement expresses the view of Rabbi Yosi HaGelili, and the former represents Rabbi Akiva's opinion, since we have learned in the *Mishna*: Rabbi Yosi HaGelili says: The formula of the (*zimun*) blessing corresponds to the number assembled, as it is written: *Bless God in all assemblies*. Rabbi Akiva said: What do we find in the synagogue etc.

(*that there is no difference in the amount of people; so too regarding zimun*).

The *Gemora* asks: And what does Rabbi Akiva make of the verse cited by Rabbi Yosi HaGelili?

The *Gemora* answers: He uses it for that which has been taught in the following *braisa*: Rabbi Meir used to say: From where do we know that even the fetuses in their mothers' wombs uttered a song at the Sea? For it is written: *In assemblages bless God, Hashem, from the source of Israel* (*the source refers to the womb*).

The *Gemora* asks: And what does Rabbi Yosi HaGelili answer to this?

The *Gemora* answers: He derives the lesson from the word '*source*.'

Rava said: The *halachah* is as laid down by Rabbi Akiva (*that the text of the zimun is the same – no matter how many people there are*).

Ravina and Rav Chama bar Buzi once dined at the house of the Exilarch, and Rav Chama got up and commenced to look about for a hundred. Ravina said to him: There is no need for this, for thus said Rava: The *halachah* is as stated by Rabbi Akiva.

Rava said: When we take a meal at the house of the Exilarch, we say grace in groups of three.¹ Why not in groups of ten?² — Because the Exilarch might hear them and be angry.³ But couldn't the grace of the Exilarch suffice for them? — Since everybody would respond loudly, they would not hear the one who says grace.

Rabbah Tosfa'ah said: If three people had a meal together and one said grace for himself before the others, his *zimun*

¹ Before the Exilarch finishes and says grace.

² So as to add the word 'Our God'.

³ At their not waiting for him.

is effective for them but theirs is not effective for him, since *zimun* cannot be said out of its place.

Rabbi Yishmael says. Rafram bar Pappa once attended the synagogue of Abi Gobar. He was called up to read in the Torah and he said, 'Bless you the Lord' and stopped, without adding 'who is to be blessed'. The whole congregation cried out, 'Bless you the Lord who is to be blessed'. Rava said to him: You black pot! Why do you want to enter into controversy? And besides, the general custom is to use the formula of Rabbi Yilshmael.

MISHNAH: If three people have eaten together they may not separate (for grace).⁴ Similarly with four and similarly with five. Six may divide, (and higher numbers] up to ten; between ten and twenty they may not divide. If two groups eat in the same room, as long as some of the one can see some of the other they combine (for *zimun*), but otherwise each group makes *zimun* for itself. A blessing is not said over the wine until water is put in it,⁵ these are the words of Rabbi Eliezer. The sages, however, say that the blessing may be said.

GEMARA: What does this tell us? We have already learnt it once: Three people who have eaten together must say *zimun*? — This teaches us the same thing as was stated by Rabbi Abba in the name of Shmuel: If three people have sat down to eat, even though they have not yet commenced, they are not at liberty to separate. Another version: Rabbi Abba said in the name of Shmuel: What is meant is this: if three people sit down to eat together, even though each eats of his own loaf, they are not at liberty to separate. Or (it may teach us] the same as Rav Huna; for Rav Huna said: If three people from these groups come together,⁶ they are not at liberty to separate.⁷ Rav Chisda said: This is only if they come from three groups of three men each.⁸ Rava said: This applies only if the groups

had not already counted them for *zimun*; but if they had reckoned upon them where they were, the obligation of *zimun* has departed from them. Said Rava: From where do I derive this rule? Because we have learnt: If the half of a bed has been stolen or lost, or if a bed has been divided by brothers or partners, it cannot receive tumah. If it is restored (to its original state] it can receive tumah thenceforward. Thenceforward it can, but not retroactively. This shows that from the time it was divided, tumah no longer attached to it. So here, once they had used them for *zimun*, the obligation of *zimun* no longer attached to them.

Two groups etc. A Tanna taught: If there is an attendant waiting on both, the attendant combines them.⁹

A blessing is not said over wine. Our Rabbis taught: If wine has not yet been mixed with water, we do not say over it the blessing 'Who creates the fruit of the vine', but 'Who creates the fruit of the tree', and it can be used for washing the hands. Once water has been mixed with it, we say over it the blessing 'Who creates the fruit of the vine', and it may not be used for washing the hands; these are the words of Rabbi Eliezer. The Sages, however, say: In either case we say over it the blessing 'Who creates the fruit of the vine', and we do not use it for washing the hands. Whose view is followed in this statement of Shmuel: A man may use bread for any purpose he likes?¹⁰ — Whose view? That of Rabbi Eliezer. Rabbi Yosi son of Rabbi Chanina said: The Sages agree with Rabbi Eliezer in the matter of the cup of wine used for grace, that a blessing should not be said over it until water has been added. What is the reason? — Rabbi Oshayah said: For a mitzvah we require the best. And according to the Rabbis — for what kind of drink is undiluted wine suitable? — It is suitable for (mixing with]

⁴ But must say *zimun* together.

⁵ To dilute it, otherwise it is too strong to be drunk.

⁶ Each having left his group for one reason or another.

⁷ But they must say grace together even though they have not eaten together.

⁸ So that each of them was under the obligation of *zimun*.

⁹ Even though they do not see one another.

¹⁰ I.e., wiping his hands after a meal, in spite of the general rule that food must not be wasted.



karoytei.¹¹

Our Rabbis taught: Four things have been said with reference to bread. Raw meat should not be placed on bread; a full cup should not be passed along over bread;¹² bread should not be thrown; and a dish should not be propped up on bread. Ameimar and Mar Zutra and Rav Ashi were once taking a meal together. Dates and pomegranates were served to them, and Mar Zutra took some and threw them in front of Rav Ashi as his portion. He said to him: Doesn't your honor agree with what has been taught, that eatables should not be thrown? — (He replied): That was laid down with reference to bread. But it has been taught that just as bread is not to be thrown, so eatables should not be thrown? But, he replied, it has also been taught that although bread is not to be thrown, eatables may be thrown? But in fact there is no contradiction; one statement refers to things which are spoiled by throwing, the other to things which are not spoiled.

Our Rabbis taught: Wine can be run through pipes¹³ before the bridegroom and the bride, and roasted ears of corn and nuts may be thrown in front of them in the summer season but not in the rainy season;¹⁴ while cakes may not be thrown in front of them either in the summer or the rainy season.

Rav Yehudah said: If one forgot and put food into his mouth without saying a blessing, he shifts it to the side of his mouth and says the blessing. One (Baraisa) taught that he swallows it, and another taught that he spits it out, and yet another taught that he shifts it to one side. There is no contradiction. Where it says that he swallows it, the reference is to liquids; where it says that he spits it out, the reference is to something which is not spoiled thereby; and when it says that he shifts it, the reference is to

¹¹ A kind of date with the shape of a nut, used for medicinal purpose.

¹² For fear some should spill on the bread.

something which would be spoiled (by being spat out]. But why should he not also shift to one side anything which would not be spoiled and say the blessing? — Rav Yitzchak Kaskasa'ah gave the reason in the presence of Rabbi Yosi son of Avin, quoting Rabbi Yochanan: Because it says, My mouth shall be filled with Your praise. (50b – 51a)

DAILY MASHAL

***Hatov Vehameitiv* for the People's Survival in Exile**

The fourth *berachah* of *birkas hamazon*, known as *hatov vehameitiv* was instituted when the murdered of Beisar were buried: *Hatov* - that they did not become fetid; *Hameitiv* – that they were allowed to be buried. Why was a special *berachah* instituted for a miracle of one town? HaGaon Rabbi Meir Simchah of Dvinsk zt"l explains that *birkas hamazon* was instituted for the **formation** of *Klal Yisrael*, the Exodus, *bris* and Torah, the inheritance of the land, Yerushalayim and the Temple. The fourth *berachah* was instituted for the **survival** of the people, who endure exile for 2,000 years but still retain their glory. After the destruction of the Temple, they thought that the Jewish People was lost, that their survival was impossible and that they would “disappear and wander like gypsies without human dignity”, especially when they saw at Beisar that Bar Kochva's revolt failed. But when they saw the miracle demonstrating that even when "dead" Hashem preserves them, and that a kind king permitted the murdered to be buried (see Yerushalmi, Ta'anis), they then saw that the Jews' survival is ensured 1) by Hashem directly, the Good One; and 2) Who makes others good: by various kind kings who are Hashem's agents. They then instituted *hatov vehameitiv*!

¹³ This was done either as a symbol of prosperity, or for the purpose of diffusing a pleasant odor; it could be caught up in cups and so not wasted.

¹⁴ Because they may be spoiled by the muddy roads.