

Chapter Six

Mishnah

In what manner^[1] does one recite the blessing on fruits?^[2] – פִּיצְדָּמְבָרְכֵין עַל הַפִּירּוֹת – On the fruits of trees one says: – בָּרוּא פְּרִי הַעַץ – **בָּרוּא פְּרִי הַעַץ**, etc.^[3] the One Who creates the fruit of the tree, חוץ מן הַיַּן – except for wine, – שֶׁעֲלֵי הַיַּן הַזֶּה אָמֵר – for on wine one says: – בָּרוּא פְּרִי הַגְּפַנְן – the One Who creates the fruit of the vine.^[4] – בָּרוּא פְּרִי הַגְּפַנְן – And on the fruits of the ground^[5] one says: – בָּרוּא פְּרִי הַאֲדֻמָּה – the One Who creates the fruit of the ground,^[6] – except for bread, – שֶׁעֲלֵי הַבָּצָר הַזֶּה אָמֵר – for on bread one says: – בָּרוּא פְּרִי הַאֲדֻמָּה – the One Who brings forth bread from the ground.^[7] – בָּרוּא מִינֵּי הַבָּצָר – And on greens, too, one says: – בָּרוּא מִינֵּי הַבָּצָר – R' Yehudah says: On greens one says: – בָּרוּא מִינֵּי רְשָׁאִים – the One Who creates species of herbage.^[8]

Gemara The Gemara seeks a source for the Mishnah's underlying assumption that one must recite a blessing before eating:

דְּתַנִּינָה רַבָּנָן – From where are these things known? – קָרְשׁ הַלּוּלִים לְהַ – For the Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: –,, קָרְשׁ הַלּוּלִים לְהַ – The verse *And in the fourth year all its fruit shall be HOLY FOR PRAISES TO HASHEM*^[9] – מְלֵאָד שְׁטֻעָנוּיִם בְּרִכָּה לְפָנֶיךָ וְלְאֶחָרֶיךָ – TEACHES THAT THEY REQUIRE A BLESSING BEFORE eating THEM AND AFTER eating THEM.^[10] – מְבָאָן אָמַר רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא – BASED ON THIS, R' AKIVA SAID: – אַסּוֹר לְאָדָם שְׂיטָעוֹם בְּלוּם קָוֵם שִׁיבְרָךְ – IT IS FORBIDDEN FOR A PERSON TO TASTE ANYTHING BEFORE HE RECITES A BLESSING.^[11]

The Gemara challenges the use of this verse as a source for reciting a blessing on foods:

וְהִיא,, קָרְשׁ הַלּוּלִים – But does this expression holy for praises come to teach this law (that a blessing is required before and after eating)? – נֵא מִיבָּשֵׁי לֵיה – Why, this double expression (hillulim) is needed to teach other laws, as follows: – חֲדָר דָּאמֵר רְחַמְנָא אַחֲלָה וְחֲדָר אַכְלָה – One expression of hillul^[12] is needed to indicate that the Merciful One says regarding the fruit of the fourth year: Deconsecrate it and then eat it.^[13] – וְאַידְךָ – And the other expression of hillul is needed to teach that – זָכָר הַשְׁעָון שִׁירָה טָעֹונָן חַלּוֹל – only something that requires song^[14] requires deconsecration, יְשָׁאַנְנוּ טָעֹונָן שִׁירָה

NOTES

1. The word פִּיצְדָּמְבָרְכֵין is a contraction of בָּאיַזְרָדְבָּרְכֵין, in what manner (Rambam, *Commentary to the Mishnah*).

2. The Mishnah's question seems to assume prior knowledge of the fundamental requirement to recite a blessing before partaking of a food. The Rishonim suggest that this fundamental requirement has indeed already been alluded to in the Mishnah above, 11a and 20b (see *Tosafos* and *Rabbeinu Yonah*).

3. All blessings begin with the clause: *Blessed are You, Hashem, our God*

greens, in whose cases the plant itself is eaten as food) and for "seeds" (such as grains, legumes and the like, whose seeds are eaten, rather than the plant itself). Thus, he rules that the specific blessing the One Who creates species of herbage is recited on greens (see *Rashi*). [Similarly, he rules (as taught by a Baraisa below) that a specific blessing – בָּרוּא מִינֵּי רְשָׁאִים, the One Who creates species of seeds – is recited on the "seeds" subgroup (see below, 37a, with *Rashi*.)]

[R' Yehudah agrees, however, that the blessing the One Who creates

— but something that does not require song does not require deconsecration. That is, the sanctity of the fourth-year fruits applies only to grapes, which are the only fruits over which the Leviim in the Temple sing songs of praise to God.^[16] — And this is as stated by R' Shmuel bar Nachmani in the name of R' Yonasan; רצא מרב רבי שמעון בר נחמני אמר רבי יונתן — שמו אל בר נחמני אמר רבי יונתן — for R' Shmuel bar Nachmani said in the name of R' Yonasan: מהן שאין אומרים שירה אלא על תין — From where do we know that we (i.e. the Leviim in the Temple) do not utter song^[16] except over wine? שנאמר — For it is stated: *And the vine said to them: Shall I withhold my wine which gladdens God and men?*^[17] אם אגשים משמח אליהם — Now, if we indeed understand that [wine] gladdens men, in what way does it gladden God? מהן שאין אומרים שירה אלא על תין — From here we derive that we [the Leviim in the Temple] do not utter songs of praise to God except over wine.^[18] Thus, the two *hillul* expressions are needed for something else! How can one be used to teach the blessing requirement?

The Gemara narrows the scope of its challenge: — Now, this word *hillulim* is an acceptable source for the blessing on foods according to the one who teaches the Mishnaic texts that deal with the fourth-year fruits as reading THE FOURTH-YEAR fruit of a SAPLING,^[19] and whose view, therefore, is that the law of the fourth-year fruit applies to all fruit trees. Obviously, he does not expound the word *hillulim* as teaching that this law applies only to "something that requires song" (i.e. the vineyard); thus, there is one "*hillul*" available to teach that a blessing must be recited on food.^[20] אלא — But according to the one who teaches these Mishnaic texts as reading: THE FOURTH-YEAR fruit of a VINEYARD, and whose view, therefore, is that the law of the fourth-year fruit applies only to the fruits of the vine — something he apparently derives from the word *hillulim*^[21] — מאין איבא — what is there to say? Neither of the two mentions of *hillul* is available to teach the requirement to recite a blessing on food!^[22] The Gemara now documents the different readings of the

Mishnaic texts referred to above: — For it was stated: ר' חייא ורבי שמעון ברבי teach different versions of the Mishnaic texts regarding the law of the fourth-year fruit: — חד פניו ברם רבש — One teaches the texts as reading: THE FOURTH-YEAR fruits of a VINEYARD, וסדר פניו ברם רבש — whereas one teaches the texts as reading: THE FOURTH-YEAR fruits of a SAPLING.

The Gemara further narrows the scope of its challenge: — ולמן דתני ברם רבש teaches the Mishnaic texts as reading: THE FOURTH-YEAR fruits of a VINEYARD, — הניחא אי ליף גורה שוה — this word *hillulim* is still an acceptable source for the blessing on foods, if he derives that the law of the fourth-year fruit is limited to the fruit of the vine through the *gezeirah shavah* detailed in the following Baraisa: רתניא — REBBI SAYS: — נאמר פאן,, להוסיף לך תבואה,, — IT IS STATED HERE, regarding the fruits of the fourth year: TO INCREASE FOR YOU ITS "PRODUCE,"^[23] — ונאמר להן,, ותבואות הקרים,, — AND IT IS STATED THERE, in the passage regarding mixed species in a vineyard: AND THE "PRODUCE" OF THE VINEYARD.^[24] מה להן ברם — JUST AS THERE, "produce" refers specifically to the fruit of A VINEYARD, אף כאן ברם — SO TOO HERE, in the passage concerning the fourth-year fruit, "produce" refers specifically to the fruit of A VINEYARD. — איטר לייה חדר הילל לבכמה — According to this opinion, one mention of *hillul* remains available to teach about the blessing on food. — ואי לא ליף גורה שוה — But if he does not derive it through a *gezeirah shavah* but rather through expounding the word *hillul* to indicate that "only something that requires song requires deconsecration,"^[25] — ברכה מנא לייה — from where is the requirement to recite a blessing on food known to him?^[26]

The Gemara reconsiders its last narrowing of the scope of the challenge:

— וαι נמי ליף גורה שוה — And even if he does derive that the law of the fourth-year fruit applies only to grapes through a *gezeirah shavah*, leaving one *hillul* available to teach the law of blessings,^[28] — אשבחן לאחריו — granted that we have found a source for the blessing recited after eating [the food],^[29] — לפניו מאין

16. The Scriptural songs recited during the offering of the [communal] sacrifices on the Altar were sung only while the wine libations, which

NOTES

here, and below).

20. [He agrees, though, that the other mention of "*hillul*" (see above,

but from where do we know that a blessing must be recited before eating it?^[30]

The Gemara addresses the last question:

– **דעתה באקל וחומר** – This is not a difficulty, for once we know that a blessing must be recited afterwards, it can be derived through the following *kal vachomer* that a blessing must be recited beforehand as well: – **בשׁהוּ אֶרְעָב לֹא בָּל שְׁבַן** – For if when he is satiated, he recites a blessing, – is it not certain that he must do so when he is hungry?^[31] The Gemara thus defends its assertion that *hillul* is an acceptable source for the blessings on food even according to the one who teaches “the fourth-year vineyard” but derives it through a *gezeirah shavah*.

Still, the Gemara objects to this assertion:

– **ברם קידון ודרדר** – Granted that we have found a source for reciting a blessing before and after eating the fruits of the vineyard,^[32] – but from where do we know that a blessing must be recited when eating other species as well?

The Gemara answers:

– **דילוף מברם** – For one derives it from the requirement found with regard to the vineyard, as follows: – **מה ברם דבר שנינה וטעון ברכה** – Just as the fruit of the vineyard is something from which one derives benefit and the law is that it requires a blessing when partaking of it and deriving the benefit (as derived from the word *hillul*), – **אף כל דבר שנינה וטעון ברכה** – so too, any other thing from which one derives benefit requires a blessing when partaking of it and deriving the benefit.^[33]

The Gemara objects:

you will eat and be satiated and bless Hashem your God . . . (see Rashi; see also note 35 below).

30. Thus, the Gemara challenges the assertion that *hillulim* is an acceptable source for the blessings recited both before and after eating according to the one who teaches “the fourth-year vineyard” but derives it through a *gezeirah shavah*. [The Gemara apparently could also have asked this question above, according to the one who teaches “the fourth-year sapling.” See *Tzalach*, who addresses this issue; see also *Hagahos R’ Elazar Moshe Horowitz*.]

31. If when he is satiated he is commanded to recite a blessing to thank Hashem for his satiety [as derived from one mention of *hillul*], is it not certain that he must thank Hashem when he is about to assuage his hunger with a creation that Hashem has prepared for him? (Rashi below, 48b). [The Rishonim note that elsewhere the Gemara adopts an

– **אפשר לסתור** – It is possible to refute this extending of the law, as follows: – **מה לך רם שבן חיב בעוללות** – What comparison can you make to a vineyard, which is unique in that it is subject to the obligation of *oleilos*?^[34]

The Gemara answers:

– **קמה תוכית** – Let standing grain demonstrate that the obligation to recite a blessing is not tied to the law of *oleilos*.^[35]

The Gemara objects:

– **מה לך מה שבן חיבת בלילה** – What comparison can you make to standing grain, which is subject to the obligation of *challah*?^[36]

The Gemara answers:

– **ברם יוכית** – Let the vineyard demonstrate that the obligation to recite a blessing is not tied to the law of *challah*.^[37] And the argument repeats.^[38] In the final analysis, the nature of this one is not like the nature of that one, – **ולא ראי זה פראי זה** – and the nature of this one is not like the nature of that one.^[39]

– **לבד תשויה שבון דבר שנינה וטעון ברכה** – So too, any other thing from which one derives benefit requires a blessing when partaking of it.

The Gemara still objects:

– **מה לך אדר תשואה שבון שבון שנין יש בו צד מזבח** – What comparison can you make to the stated cases sharing the common characteristic, each of which has in it an Altar aspect?^[40]

– **צד מזבח** – And though an olive would also come within the scope

NOTES

other foods require a blessing by comparing them to grapes. For it may be that the Torah requires one to recite a blessing when eating grapes only because they are subject to the mitzvah of *oleilos*, but it does not require one to recite a blessing when eating other foods, which are not subject to the mitzvah of *oleilos*.

35. For there is no obligation of *oleilos* associated with standing grain, yet one must recite a blessing when eating bread [made from one of the five grains: wheat, barley, spelt, oats or rye], as it is written (*Deuteronomy* 8:9-10): *A land where you will eat bread without poverty . . . you will eat and be satiated and bless Hashem, your God* (see Rashi). Thus, we can derive the law concerning other foods from the law that bread (which is not subject to *oleilos*) requires a blessing.

[Perhaps, the Gemara here uses the expression *אקל*, standing grain, to refer to bread, because of the parallel discussion in *Bava Metzia* 87b.]

of this law, since it too has an Altar aspect,^[41] the obligation to recite a blessing on foods that have no Altar aspect could still not be derived. — ? —

Before answering the objection, the Gemara digresses to question the challenger's last statement:

But must an olive come within the scope of this law only through its sharing the common feature of having an Altar aspect?^[42] — **וְהִיא בָּהָרֶא בְּתִיב בַּהֲכָרָם** — Why, the term *kerem* is explicitly written with regard to [the olive], *דְּבַתִּיב* — as it is written: *And he burned from the piles of produce to the standing grain to the olive kerem* (grove).^[43] — ? —

The Gemara replies:

ברם זיה אקרוי בָּרֵם סְתִמָּא לֹא — **אמָר רְבָבָא** — It [an olive grove] is called *kerem zayis*, but it is not called simply *kerem*, unmodified.^[44]

Its digression complete, the Gemara returns to address the original question:

מה להזכיר — In any event, it remains difficult: **מִכֶּל מִקּוֹם קָשָׁשָׁא** — What comparison can you make to the stated cases sharing the common characteristic, which have an Altar aspect to them? How, then, do we derive the obligation to recite a blessing on foods that do not have an Altar aspect?

The Gemara therefore suggests a different derivation for the requirement to recite a blessing when eating food:

אלֲאָ דִילִיף לְהַמְשֻׁבָּעַ הַמִּינִין — Rather, one derives it from the requirement to recite a blessing when eating one of the seven species.^[45] — **מִה שְׁבֻעַת הַמִּינִין דְּבַר שְׁנָגָה וְטֻוֹן בָּרָכָה** — Just as each of the seven species is something from which one derives benefit and the law is that it requires a blessing when partaking of it and deriving the benefit,^[46] **אַפְּכָל בָּרָךְ שְׁנָגָה טֻוֹן** — so too, any other thing from which one derives benefit requires a blessing when partaking of it and deriving the benefit.

The Gemara seeks to refute the above analogy:

מִה לְשֻׁבָּעַת הַמִּינִין שָׁבֵן חַיְבָן בְּבָכוֹרִים — What comparison can you make to the seven species, which are subject to the obligation of *bikkurim*?^[47] — And furthermore, even if we could

compare other foods to the seven species, granted that this would be an acceptable source for reciting a blessing after eating [the food], which is the only blessing stated by the Torah with regard to the seven species, **לְפָנֵי מִבְנֵן** — but from where would we know that a blessing must be recited before eating [the food]?

The Gemara answers the "furthermore" question (in the same way it answered an identical question above):^[48]

דְּאַתְּנִיא בְּקָל — This, in itself, is not a difficulty, **וְחוֹמָר** — for if it could be established that a blessing must be recited afterwards, it could be derived through the following *kal vachomer* that a blessing must be recited beforehand, as well: **כְּשַׂהֲוָא שְׁבָעַ מִבְרָךְ** — For if when he is satiated, he recites a blessing, **כְּשַׂהֲוָא רָעֵב לֹא בְּשָׁבֵן** — is it not certain that he must do so when he is hungry?^[49]

The first question, however, remains unanswered: How can the law for other species be derived from that of the seven species, which have the special feature of being subject to *bikkurim*? Furthermore, the Gemara asks:

וְלִמְדָא רְתָנִי נָטוּ רְבָעִי — And even according to the one who teaches the Mishnaic texts that deal with the fourth-year fruits as reading THE FOURTH-YEAR fruit of a SAPLING, and who thus has the word *hillul* available to teach the blessing requirement with regard to the fruit of all trees,^[50] **הָא תִּנְחַדֵּל בְּדַבְרַ נְטִיעָה** — granted that this is an acceptable source for reciting a blessing on anything that is subject to planting, which is the context of the passage in which the word *hillul* is written. But foods that are not subject to planting, **בְּגָזָן בְּשָׂר בִּיצָּים** — such as meat, eggs and fish, **מַנָּא לְהָ** — from where is it known to him that they require a blessing?

Having shown that no Scriptural source — according to any view — adequately accounts for the requirement to recite a blessing on all foods, the Gemara concludes:

אַלְאָ סְכָרָא הוּא — Rather, [this requirement] is based on reason, **אָסֹר לוּ לְאַרְבָּם שִׁינָה מִן דְּעוּלָם תָּהָר בָּרָכָה** — which dictates that it is forbidden for a person to derive benefit from this world^[51] without first reciting a blessing.^[52]

NOTES

be, then, that the requirement to recite a blessing applies only to those foods that are put on the Altar.

stated in this verse refers to all seven species. See also *Rashba* to 44a [ר' י. ורבנן]

The Gemara cites a Baraisa that expands on the concept just mentioned:

אסור לו לאדם – The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: – **תנו רבנן** – IT IS FORBIDDEN FOR A PERSON TO DERIVE BENEFIT FROM THIS WORLD WITHOUT first reciting A BLESSING. – **וكل הנאה מן העולם זהה בלי ברכה** – AND WHOEVER DERIVES BENEFIT FROM THIS WORLD WITHOUT first reciting A BLESSING – HAS COMMITTED AN ACT OF *ME'ILAH*.^[53] **מאי** – WHAT IS HIS REMEDY? – HE SHOULD GO TO A SAGE.

Gemara asks:

– **ילך אצל חכם** – He should go to a sage? What kind of remedy is that? – **מאי עביד ליה** – What can [the sage] do for him now? – **היא עביד ליה איסורא** – Why, he has already committed the transgression! – ? –

The Gemara answers:

ילך אצל חכם מעיקרא – Rather, Rava said: – **אלא אמר רבא** – The Baraisa means that one should go to a sage initially, and [the sage] will teach him the laws of the blessings, – **כדי שלא יבא לידי מעילה** – so that he should not come to commit *me'ilah* by deriving benefit without first reciting a proper blessing.^[54]

The Gemara cites a related statement:

– **אמר ר' יהודה אמר שמואל** – Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: – **כל מהנהמן מן העולם זהה בלי ברכה** – Whoever derives benefit from this world without first reciting a blessing **באיilo** – is regarded as if he has derived benefit from the consecrated property of God in Heaven. – **שנאמר לה** – For it is stated: *To Hashem belongs the earth and its fullness*.^[55]

The Gemara elaborates further:

– **רבוי לו רמי** – R' Levi contrasted two verses, noting an apparent contradiction and presenting the resolution: – **כל הארץ ליה ומלואה** – In one verse it is written: *To Hashem belongs the earth and its fullness*, which implies that man's use of the earth and its fullness would constitute trespass on God's property. – **וביתם השמים ליה והארץ נתן לבני-אדם** – But in another verse it is written: *As for the heavens – the heavens are Hashem's, but the earth He has given to mankind*,^[56] which implies that the earth is man's to use. How are these two verses to be reconciled? – **לא קשיא** – We must say that there is no contradiction: – **כאן קודם ברכה** – Here (in the verse which states that the earth belongs to Hashem), it refers to before one recites a blessing,

– פְּאָن לְאַחֲר בָּרְכָה whereas here (in the verse which states that Hashem has given the earth to man), it refers to after one recites a blessing.^[1]

The Gemara cites a related statement:

כל הנקנה – R' Chanina bar Pappa said: – אמר רבי חנינא בר פפא – Whoever derives benefit from this world without first reciting a blessing – מן העולם נזח بلا ברכה – is regarded as if he robs the Holy One, Blessed is He, and the Assembly of Israel.^[2] שגאנטר „גוזל אביו“ – For it is stated: *He who robs his father and his mother and says, "It is no crime," is a companion to a destructive man.*^[3] ואין „אביו“ אלא הקדוש – Now, *his father* is a reference to none other than the Holy One, Blessed is He, – שגאנטר „הלווא-הוא אביך קנאך“ – as it is stated: *Is it to Hashem that you do this . . . ? Is He not your Father, your Master . . . ?*^[4] – And *his mother* is a reference to none other than the Assembly of Israel, – שגאנטר „שמע בני מיסר אביך ואל-תטש תורה אטיך“ – as it is stated: *Heed, my son, the discipline of your father, and do not forsake the instruction of your mother.*^[5] מאי „חבר הוא“ – What is the meaning of *he is a companion to a destructive man?* – אמר רבי חנינא בר פפא – R' Chanina bar Pappa said: – חבר הוא לירבעם בן נבט – It means that he is a companion to Yarovam ben Nevat, שהשווית את ישראל – who destroyed the loyalty of Israel to their Father in Heaven.^[6]

The Gemara cites another exposition of R' Chanina bar Pappa:

R' Chanina bar Pappa contrasted two verses, noting an apparent contradiction and presenting the resolution: In one verse it is written: *and I will take [back] "My" grain in its time* etc.,^[7] which indicates that the grain is God's, and not for man to use. But in another verse it is written: *And you will gather in "your" grain* etc.,^[8] indicating that the grain is yours (i.e. man's). How are these two verses to be reconciled?

פָּנִים – We must say that there is no contradiction: – בָּמוֹן שִׁישְׂרָאֵל עֲשָׂוָה רָצְנוֹ שֶׁל מִקְדָּשָׁם – Here, in the verse which

states that “you will gather *your* grain,” it refers to a time when Israel does the will of the Omnipresent, **כִּי־בָּתְּמַן שָׁאֵן יְשַׁרְּאֵל** – whereas here, in the verse which states that the grain belongs to God, it refers to a time when Israel does not do the will of the Omnipresent.^[9]

The Gemara cites a relevant Baraisa:

—,,וְאָסַפְתָּ רֶגֶג,, — The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: **תַּנִּינְ רְבָנִים** — The verse states: **AND YOU WILL GATHER IN YOUR GRAIN**. מה — For WHAT reason did SCRIPTURE have TO SAY this?^[10] — **לֹפִי שׁוֹאָמֵר,, לֹא-יִמּוֹשׁ סְפָר הַתּוֹרָה תַּזְהֵר מִפְרָךְ** — FOR SINCE IT IS STATED: **THIS BOOK OF THE TORAH SHALL NOT DEPART FROM YOUR MOUTH**,^[11] — **וְכֹל רְבָרִים בְּבָתְכֶן** — IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE to think that THE WORDS of Scripture here are meant literally AS THEY ARE WRITTEN, i.e. that one must study Torah every waking moment and would thereby be precluded from earning a livelihood. **תַּלְמֹד לִימּוֹר,, וְאָסַפְתָּ דָגָר** — THE TORAH therefore STATES: **AND YOU WILL GATHER IN YOUR GRAIN**, which bids us to LEAD, together WITH [TORAH STUDY], a life CONDUCTED IN THE WAY OF THE WORLD, i.e. Torah study should be combined with the earning of a livelihood.^[12] **דָבְרֵי רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן יִשְׁמְעָאֵל** — These are THE WORDS OF R' YISHMAEL. **רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן יְחִיאָא** — R' SHIMON BEN YOCHAI SAYS: **אֲפָשָׁר** — CAN IT BE as you say? — **אִם חֹרֶשׁ בָּשָׂעַת חֲרִישָׁה** — If A MAN PLOWS AT THE TIME OF PLOWING — **וּוֹרֵעַ בָּשָׂעַת וּרְיעָה** — AND SOWS AT THE TIME OF SOWING — **וּקְזַעַר בָּשָׂעַת קָצִירָה** — AND HARVESTS AT THE TIME OF HARVESTING — **וּקְלִשׁ בָּשָׂעַת רִישָׁה** — AND THRESHES AT THE TIME OF THRESHING — **וּוֹרֵה בָּשָׂעַת קָרוּץ** — AND WINNOWS AT THE TIME OF THE blowing WIND, — **תּוֹרָה מָה תַּהֲאֵעַלְתָּה** — WHAT WILL BECOME OF THE study of TORAH if people will be so preoccupied with their livelihoods?! Certainly, then, the ideal situation meant by the Torah cannot be the combining of Torah study with the earning of a livelihood. **אֲלֹא בָּמָן שִׁיחָרְאֵל עֲשָׂוֹן רְצֻוֹן שֶׁל פָּקוּם** — RATHER, the literal meaning of the verse in *Joshua* can be reconciled with the verse in *Deuteronomy* as follows: **AT A TIME WHEN** the people of ISRAEL DO THE WILL OF THE OMNIPRESENT, **מִלְאָכְלָהּ נִعְשֵׂית עַל** **שׁוֹאָמֵר** — THEIR WORK IS DONE for them BY OTHERS, — **יְדֵי אֶחָדִים,, וּצְמָרְיוֹ זָרִים וְגַעֲרָיו צָאָגָבָם וְגַוּ** — AS IT IS STATED: **AND STRANGERS WILL ARISE AND SHEPHERD YOUR FLOCKS** etc.,^[13] and the people of Israel will thus be able to devote themselves exclusively to Torah

הנחות הב"ח

ו' פסח' ל' ז' כ' ב' ב' ז'

ט' נס נס נס נס נס

תְּמִימָן וְסֵבֶבֶל מִזְמָרָה נַחַת
דְּנוֹן חֲלֵבֶל אַלְמָנָה מִזְמָרָה

לוקם סדרן מרכזומס:

— 1 —

גלוון הש"ם

וְעַמְקָדָה

עמ' כט ב'

study.^[14] — זכומן שאיןישראל עושין רצונו של מקום BUT AT A TIME WHEN the people of ISRAEL DO NOT DO THE WILL OF THE OMNIPRESENT, — מלאכתן נעשית על ידי עצמן THEIR WORK IS necessarily DONE personally BY THEM, — שנאמר,, „אספחת רגנור„ AS IT IS STATED: AND YOU WILL GATHER IN YOUR GRAIN.^[15] — ולא אלא שמלאכת אחרים נעשית על בגין — AND NOT ONLY THAT, BUT even THE WORK OF OTHERS IS DONE BY THEM, — שנאמר,, „יעבדת את אֶלְכָיו וגו'„ AS IT SAYS: AND YOU WILL SERVE YOUR ENEMIES etc.^[16]

The Gemara records the remarks of Abaye and Rava on this matter:

— אמר אביי — Abaye said: קרביה עשו ברבי ישמעאל Many did as R' Yishmael advocates, combining Torah study with a livelihood, ברבי שמעון — and were successful,^[17] — while others did as R' Shimon ben Yochai advocates, devoting themselves exclusively to study, and were not successful.^[18] — אמר להו רבא לרבען Rava would say to the Rabbis (his disciples): I beg of you, בימי ניסן ובימי תשרי during the days of Nissan and the days of Tishrei,^[19] so that do not appear before me,^[20] so that you will not be preoccupied with your sustenance the entire year.^[21]

The Gemara cites an observation made by R' Yehudah the son of Il'ai:

— אמר רבבה בר חננה אמר רב יוחנן משומ רבי יהודה ברבי אלעאי Rabbah bar bar Chanah said that R' Yochanan reported in the name of R' Yehudah the son of R' Il'ai:^[22] בא וראה שלא Come and see that the later generations are unlike the earlier generations, i.e. the level of piety has greatly declined. הדורות הראשונים עשו תורתן קבוע — The earlier generations made their Torah

וזו וזו study their main occupation and their work incidental, — and both this [their Torah knowledge] and this הדורות האחרונים ביבין [their financial means] remained with them. שעש מלאכתן קבוע ותורתן עראי — In the case of the later generations, however, who made their work their main occupation and their Torah study incidental, — neither this [their financial means] nor this [their Torah knowledge] remained with them.

Another observation of R' Yehudah the son of R' Il'ai:

— ואמר רבבה בר בר חננה אמר רב יוחנן משומ ר' יהודה ברבי אלעאי And Rabbah bar bar Chanah said that R' Yochanan reported in the name of R' Yehudah the son of R' Il'ai: בא וראה שלא — Come and see that the later generations are unlike the earlier generations. הדורות הראשונים פירוטיתן דרך טרנספר — The earlier generations, in their eagerness to fulfill mitzvos, would bring their crops into their houses via the normal route^[23] — לוייבן במפעזר of tithes.^[24] הדורות האחרונים מכביסין פירוטיתן דרך גנות דרך — The later generations, however, bring their crops into their houses via the roofs, via the courtyards^[25] and via the storage yards adjacent to their houses, rather than via the main entrance, — פרי לפקטן פון המפעזר in order to free [the crops] from the obligation of tithes.^[26]

The Gemara explains the basis of this distinction:

— דאמר רבינו ינאי — And what is the Scriptural source for the law that the Biblical tithing obligation is activated only by normal entrance of the produce to the house? For R' Yannai said: אין נשבל מהתהיב במפעזר עד שיראה פניה הבית — Untithed produce does not become subject to the obligation of tithes until it "sees" the face of the house, i.e. until it is brought in via the main entrance,^[27] שנאמר,, „בערתתי הקב"ה מן-הבית“ — as it is

NOTES

14. [This is the ideal way of life described by the verse in *Joshua* — a life in which Israel does the will of God and merits that their work is done for them by others. It is only in this ideal situation — where *this Book of the Torah shall not depart from your mouth* literally — that true Torah scholarship can be achieved.]

15. This is the less-than-ideal situation in which Israel must personally labor for its sustenance. This preoccupation with the mundane will undoubtedly impair their ability to achieve true Torah scholarship.

Meiri, however, explains Rava's advice to be that it is better to devote a small part of the year almost exclusively to one's livelihood and thereby be free to study Torah undisturbed the rest of the year than to spread the workload over the entire year and thus be burdened constantly with the concerns of livelihood.

22. When an Amora's report of another Sage's view is introduced by the expression... אמר ר'... משומ ר' [R' So-and-so] reported in the name of [R' So-and-so], it indicates that the Amora knew the view of the second sage but did not know the name of the first sage, thus indicating that the first sage

stated: *I have removed the sacred from the house.*^[28]

The Gemara adds:

— אֲפִילוֹ חָצֵר קֹבַעַת — וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר
Even the courtyard of the house^[29] establishes the tithing obligation,
— שָׁנָא מָרָ, וְאָכְלִי בְשֻׁעַרְיךָ וְשַׁבְעָיו["] — as it is stated: *and they shall eat within your gates and be sated.*^[30]

The Gemara discusses the part of the Mishnah which states: חוץ מן הין וכו' – EXCEPT FOR WINE etc. [for on wine he says: *the One Who creates the fruit of the vine*].

The Gemara asks:

The Gemara answers:

— אמרו — They say in answer to this question: — There, in the case of olive oil, though it has changed for the better its blessing does not change, — משומך לא אפשר — because it is not possible to formulate for it a blessing that specifies the type of tree. — היכי נבריך — For how should we recite the specific blessing for olive oil? — נבריך פורא פרי הארץ — Should we recite as the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the olive*

require titheing on the Biblical level. See further details in *Meiri* here, and in *Rambam Hil. Maaser* 3:1-4; 4:1-2.

R' Yannai agrees that one is Rabbinically forbidden to make a regular meal (*אכילתא קב' ע*) of produce brought into the house in an abnormal manner unless one first tithes the produce (*Rashi*; see also *Tosafos'* citation of *Rashi*). One is permitted, however, to continue to snack from

[tree]?^[31] – פִירא גוֹפִיה זַיֵת אֲקָרִי This would not be possible, because the fruit itself is also called “olive.” Thus, this formulation of the blessing would be unacceptable, since it admits the interpretation that God creates the fruit of the olive *fruit*, which is untrue, as God creates the olive, but it is man who produces the olive’s “fruit” (i.e. the oil).^[32]

The Gemara rejects this answer:

— וְנִבְרֵךְ עַלְיהָ בּוֹרָא פְּרִי עֵץ זִית — But let us recite on [olive oil] the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the olive tree* (mentioning “tree” explicitly)!^[183] — ? —

The Gemara therefore introduces a different factor to account for the distinction between wine and oil:

חמרה יון משחה – Rather, Mar Zutra said: **אלא אמר מר זוטרא** – Wine sustains, whereas oil does not sustain. [84]

The Gemara refutes this answer as well: — **But is it so that olive oil does not sustain?** — **— Why, we have learned in a Mishnah:**^[35] **הנורר מן הטעון לא זיין** — **ONE WHO VOWS TO ABSTAIN FROM SUSTENANCE IS PERMITTED to partake of WATER AND SALT.** — **וְתנוּן בָּה** **And in the traditional discussion regarding this Mishnah,**^[36] **we raise the following difficulty concerning it:** — **The Mishnah implies that only water and salt are not called sustenance,** — **but all other [foods] are called sustenance.**^[37] **עימא תניינו תיבתקא דרב ושותאל** — **Let us say that this is a refutation of Rav and Shmuel,** — **who say that we recite the blessing *the One Who creates species of sustenance* only on foods made from the five species of grain.**^[38] — **וְאמר רב הונא** — **And, as recorded there, Rav Huna says in answer to this question:** — **באומר כל הון עלי** **There is no refutation, because the Mishnah is not referring to someone who vowed to abstain from that which is called “sustenance,” but rather to someone who made a vow saying: “Anything that sustains is prohibited to me.”**^[39] — **אלמן משחוא זיין**

NOTES

produce enters "the gate" (*Rashi* to *Bava Metzia* 88a), i.e. the entrance to the courtyard in front of the house (*Rambam, Hil. Maaser* 4:7; *Rashba*, cited by *Shitah Mekubetzes* to *Bava Metzia* 88a).

additional FIFTH. — **הַסֵּךְ שָׁפֹן שֶׁל תְּרוּמָה** — ONE WHO inadvertently ANOINTS HIMSELF WITH OIL OF TERUMAH **מִשְׁלָם אֶת הַקָּרֵן וּמִשְׁלָם** — PAYS THE PRINCIPAL AND PAYS THE ADDITIONAL FIFTH.^[52] — **אֲלֹא דָקָא אֲכִיל לִיהְ עַל יְדֵי פָת** — Will you say, rather, that the ruling that one recites *borei pri ha'eitz* on olive oil refers to where one eats it by means of eating bread on which the oil is smeared as a condiment?^[53] — **אי הַכִּי תְּנוּא לִיהְ פָת עַיְקָר וְהַוְא טָבֵל** — But if so, then the bread is the primary food and [the oil] is but a subordinate food, — and we learned in a Mishnah:^[54] **וַתָּנוּן** — THIS IS THE RULE: — **כָל שָׂהוֹא עַיְקָר וְעַמוֹ טָפְלָה** — In WHATEVER case you have a food that IS PRIMARY AND A SUBORDI-

NATE food IS eaten WITH IT, ופותר את הטעפה – מברך על העיקר ONE RECITES THE BLESSING ON THE PRIMARY food AND this DISCHARGES his blessing obligation for THE SUBORDINATE as well. Why, then, should any blessing be made on the oil smeared on the bread? – אלא רקא שמי ליה על ז'י אנטיגראן Rather, we must say that the ruling refers to where one drinks [the olive oil] by means of drinking *anigaron* into which it is mixed,^[55] ר' אמר as described by Rabbah bar Shmuel, who said: – ר' רבא בר שמואל – *Anigaron* is a soup made from the water of cooked beets; – אנטיגראן מיא דסלקא – *oxygaron* is a soup made from the water