דְּחַנַּקְתֵּיהּ אוּמְצָא – **who is being choked by a piece of meat,** and is drinking water to dislodge the meat.[1]

The Gemara cites the final clause of the Mishnah:

רַבִּי טַרְפוֹן אוֹמֵר בּוֹרֵא נְפָשׁוֹת רַבּוֹת וְחִסְרוֹנָן – **R' TARFON SAYS:** One who drinks water recites ***THE ONE WHO CREATES NUMEROUS LIVING THINGS AND THEIR DEFICIENCIES.***

The Gemara inquires:

אָמַר לֵיהּ רָבָא בַּר רַב חָנָן לְאַבַּיֵי – **Rava bar Rav Chanan said to Abaye,** וְאָמְרִי לָהּ לְרַב יוֹסֵף – **and some say** he said it **to Rav Yosef:** הִלְכְתָא מַאי – **What is the halachah?** Which blessing should be recited on water, *shehakol*[2] or *Borei Nefashos?*[3] אָמַר לֵיהּ – **He answered him:** פּוֹק חֲזִי מַאי עַמָּא דְּבַר – **Go out and see how the people conduct themselves.** I.e. it has become the accepted practice to recite *shehakol* before drinking, and *Borei Nefashos* afterwards.[4]

הדרן עלך ביצד מברכין

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, KEITZAD MEVARCHIN

Chapter Seven

Mishnah The Mishnah discusses the *zimun* blessing which precedes *Bircas HaMazon* when three or more people eat bread together.

שְׁלֹשָׁה שֶׁאָכְלוּ כְּאַחַת – Three people **who ate** bread **together חַיָּבִין לְזַמֵּן – are required to join in *zimun*.**[1] **אֲבָל דְּמַאי – If one ate** bread of ***demai*,**[2] **וּמַעֲשֵׂר רִאשׁוֹן שֶׁנִּטְּלָה תְּרוּמָתוֹ – of *maaser rishon* whose *terumah* had been taken,**[3] **מַעֲשֵׂר שֵׁנִי וְהֶקְדֵּשׁ שֶׁנִּפְדּוּ – or of *maaser sheni* or consecrated** produce **that were redeemed;**[4] **וְהַמְשַׁמֵּשׁ שֶׁאָכַל כְּזַיִת – or if the waiter ate an olive's volume** of bread;[5] **וְהַכּוּתִי – or a Cuthean** ate together with them;[6] **מְזַמְּנִין עָלָיו – in all these cases they join in *zimun* on account of him.**[7] **אֲבָל טֶבֶל – However, if one ate *tevel*,**[8] **וּמַעֲשֵׂר רִאשׁוֹן שֶׁלֹּא נִטְּלָה תְּרוּמָתוֹ – *maaser rishon* whose *terumah* had not been taken, וּמַעֲשֵׂר שֵׁנִי וְהֶקְדֵּשׁ שֶׁלֹּא נִפְדּוּ – or *maaser sheni* or consecrated** produce **that were not redeemed;**[9] **וְהַמְשַׁמֵּשׁ פָּחוֹת מִכְּזַיִת – or if the waiter ate less than an olive's volume** of bread; **וְהַנָּכְרִי – or a gentile** ate with them; **אֵין מְזַמְּנִין עָלָיו – in all these cases they do not join in *zimun* on account of him.**[10] **נָשִׁים וַעֲבָדִים וּקְטַנִּים – If women, slaves or minors** ate bread, **אֵין מְזַמְּנִין עֲלֵיהֶן – we do not join in *zimun* on account of them.**[11] **עַד כַּמָּה מְזַמְּנִין – What is the minimum amount** of bread that one must eat in order to be obligated **to join in *zimun*?**[12]

NOTES

1. I.e. in a collective blessing that is recited in plural form (*"Let **us** bless [He] of Whose we have eaten," "Blessed is [He] of Whose **we** have eaten* etc.") as an introduction to *Bircas HaMazon* (*Rashi;* see Chapter Introduction). See *Rabbeinu Yonah* and *Rosh* for a discussion of what is considered "eating together"; see also Mishnah 50a and *Orach Chaim* 193:2-4.

2. *Demai* is produce that was purchased from an ignorant person (*am haaretz*) who might not have separated all of the required tithes. It is Rabbinically prohibited to eat *demai* without separating those tithes which are in doubt. See above, 40b.

3. [*Maaser rishon* is the "first tithe." When one completes the processing of food grown in Eretz Yisrael, the requirement to separate *terumah* and *maaser* (i.e. tithes) devolves upon it (see *Maasros* 1:5-8). Prior to the separation of *terumah*, the food is *tevel* and may not be eaten by anyone, including a Kohen. The owner must first separate approximately two percent (see *Terumos* 4:3) of the produce as *terumah*, and present it to the Kohen. (This *terumah* is sometimes referred to as *terumah gedolah*, i.e. *the greater terumah*, to differentiate between it and *terumas maaser*, which is separated by the Levi; see below.) After separating *terumah*, the owner sets aside ten percent of the remaining produce as *maaser rishon*, which he presents to the Levi. He then separates ten percent of the *remaining* produce as *maaser sheni* (the second tithe), which remains in his possession to consume but is sanctified and must be taken to Jerusalem and eaten there. During the third and sixth years of the

dispute throughout the Tannaic period (see *Kiddushin* 75b). In the earl Amoraic period, it was resolved that they were not to be considered Jew (see *Chullin* 6a). Our Mishnah predates that final resolution and reflect the Tannaic opinion that the Cutheans are considered Jews (*Tos. R Yehudah HeChasid, Tos. HaRosh*).

7. [I.e. he completes the three-person quorum and enables us to recite th *zimun* blessing.]

The Gemara (47a) will explain that it was necessary for the Mishna to teach that although one who eats *demai*, etc., appears to have commit ted a transgression, the *zimun* blessing that is subsequently recited i not considered a blessing brought about by a transgression (*Rashi;* se note 10). [The Gemara (ibid. a,b) will also explain what transgressio may have been committed by one who ate *maaser rishon* whose *teruma* has been taken or *maaser sheni* or *hekdesh* that were redeemed. Th Gemara also explains the novelty of the ruling that the waiter is eligibl to complete the quorum.]

8. *Tevel* and the other items listed here are prohibited for consumptio (see note 3).

9. [And he ate the *maaser sheni* outside of Jerusalem.]

10. One who ate prohibited food is ineligible to join in *zimun*. Furthe more, he does not even recite *Bircas HaMazon* on his own, for one do not recite a blessing for the consumption of prohibited foods (*Ramban*

עַד כְּזַיִת – At least an olive's volume. רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר – R' Yehudah says: עַד כְּבֵיצָה – At least an egg's volume.[13]

Gemara The Gemara seeks the source of the Mishnah's opening ruling that three people who ate bread together are required to join in *zimun*:

מְנָא הָנֵי מִילֵּי – From where is this matter derived?[14]

The Gemara presents two answers:

אָמַר רַב אַסִּי – Rav Assi said: דְּאָמַר קְרָא ,,גַּדְּלוּ לַה' אִתִּי וּנְרוֹמְמָה שְׁמוֹ יַחְדָּו'' – For Scripture states: *Declare* (plural) *the greatness of Hashem with me and let us exalt His Name together.*[15]

רַבִּי אַבָּהוּ אָמַר – R' Abahu said: מֵהָכָא – It is derived from here: ,,כִּי שֵׁם ה' אֶקְרָא הָבוּ גֹדֶל לֵאלֹהֵינוּ'' – *When I call out the Name of Hashem, ascribe* (plural) *greatness to our God.*[16]

The Gemara derives another law from the verse *Declare the greatness of Hashem with me*:

אָמַר רַב חָנָן בַּר אַבָּא – Rav Chanan bar Abba said: מִנַּיִן לָעוֹנֶה אָמֵן – From where is it derived, concerning one who answers "Amen" to a blessing, שֶׁלֹּא יַגְבִּיהַּ קוֹלוֹ יוֹתֵר מִן הַמְבָרֵךְ – that he should not raise his voice above that of the one who recited the blessing? שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר ,,גַּדְּלוּ לַה' אִתִּי וּנְרוֹמְמָה שְׁמוֹ יַחְדָּו'' – For it is stated: *Declare the greatness of Hashem with me and let us exalt His Name together.*[17]

A related ruling is cited:

אָמַר רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן פַּזִּי – R' Shimon ben Pazzi said: מִנַּיִן שֶׁאֵין הַמְתַרְגֵּם רַשַּׁאי לְהַגְבִּיהַּ קוֹלוֹ יוֹתֵר מִן הַקּוֹרֵא – From where is it derived that the translator of the Torah reading is not permitted to raise his voice above that of the reader?[18] שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר ,,מֹשֶׁה יְדַבֵּר וְהָאֱלֹהִים יַעֲנֶנּוּ בְקוֹל'' – For it is stated: *Moses would speak and God would respond to him with a voice.*[19] שְׁאֵין תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר ,,בְּקוֹל'' – Now, it was not necessary for [the Torah] to state *with a voice.*[20] וּמַה תַּלְמוּד לוֹמַר ,,בְּקוֹל'' בְּקוֹלוֹ שֶׁל מֹשֶׁה – What, then, does [the Torah] mean to teach by saying *with a voice*? – It teaches that God responded with the voice of Moses, i.e. with a voice equal to that of Moses.[21]

The Gemara cites support for this ruling from a Baraisa:

אֵין תַּנְיָא נַמִּי הָכִי – It was similarly taught in a Baraisa: הַמְתַרְגֵּם רַשַּׁאי לְהַגְבִּיהַּ קוֹלוֹ יוֹתֵר מִן הַקּוֹרֵא – THE TRANSLATOR IS NOT PERMITTED TO RAISE HIS VOICE ABOVE that of THE READER. וְאִם אִי אֶפְשָׁר לַמְתַרְגֵּם לְהַגְבִּיהַּ קוֹלוֹ כְּנֶגֶד הַקּוֹרֵא – AND IF IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR THE TRANSLATOR TO RAISE HIS VOICE TO THE LEVEL OF the voice of THE READER,[22] יְמַעֵט הַקּוֹרֵא קוֹלוֹ וְיִקְרָא – THE READER SHOULD REDUCE HIS VOICE to the level of the voice of the translator AND READ.

The Gemara discusses whether there is any possibility of two people reciting the *zimun* blessing:

אִתְּמַר – It was stated: שְׁנַיִם שֶׁאָכְלוּ כְּאַחַת – The subject of two people who ate bread together פְּלִיגִי רַב וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן – is a matter of dispute between Rav and R' Yochanan. חַד אָמַר – One of them says: אִם רָצוּ לְזַמֵּן מְזַמְּנִין – If they want to, they may join in *zimun*. וְחַד אָמַר – And the other one says:

NOTES

on behalf of all. Here, however, where the Mishnah states עַד כַּמָּה מְזַמְּנִין, *What is the minimum amount . . . to join in zimun,* it refers to the third party's obligation to join and his eligibility to recite the collective blessing on behalf of the others (see *Rashash*).]

13. The dispute between the Tanna Kamma and R' Yehudah is not related primarily to *zimun,* but actually centers on the basic obligation to recite *Bircas HaMazon* after a bread meal. The Tanna Kamma holds that one who eats a *kezayis* of bread is required to recite *Bircas* exalting God (*Rashi*).

17. According to this exposition, the speaker in the verse calls upon others to implicitly declare Hashem's greatness by responding "Amen" to his blessing. Since his request is worded as, "Declare Hashem's greatness *with me,*" it implies that the response should match the blessing itself – i.e. it should be in a similar voice level (*Ritva*).

18. It was the practice from the times of Ezra the Scribe throughout the Mishnaic and Talmudic era to employ a מְתוּרְגְּמָן, *translator,* to explain

דְּנִיחָא לְהוּ דְּמִקַּבַּע לְהוּ בְּחוֹבָה (מעיקרא) – **because they are pleased to become subject to** reciting **an obligatory** *zimun* blessing.[1] Thus, although the two may join in an optional *zimun* even if the waiter does not eat with them, we assume that they are amenable to his joining them so that they will be able to join in an obligatory *zimun* of three.

The Gemara now attempts to prove that two men may join in *zimun:*

תָּא שְׁמַע – **Come, learn** a proof from the following Baraisa: נָשִׁים מְזַמְּנוֹת לְעַצְמָן – WOMEN JOIN IN *ZIMUN* BY THEMSELVES וַעֲבָדִים מְזַמְּנִים לְעַצְמָן – AND SLAVES JOIN IN *ZIMUN* BY THEMSELVES. נָשִׁים וַעֲבָדִים וּקְטַנִּים – However, if WOMEN, SLAVES AND MINORS eat together, אִם רָצוּ לְזַמֵּן אֵין מְזַמְּנִין – even IF THEY WANT TO, THEY MAY NOT JOIN IN *ZIMUN*.[2] (והא נשים אפילו מאה) וְהָא מְאָה נָשִׁי כִּתְרֵי גַּבְרֵי דָּמְיָין – **Now,** regarding *zimun,* **one hundred women are similar to two men,** for they are never *obligated* to join in *zimun,* וְקָתָנֵי נָשִׁים מְזַמְּנוֹת לְעַצְמָן וַעֲבָדִים מְזַמְּנִין לְעַצְמָן – **yet the Baraisa states:** WOMEN JOIN IN *ZIMUN* BY THEMSELVES AND SLAVES JOIN IN *ZIMUN* BY THEMSELVES. Evidently, even where *zimun* is not obligatory, it is optional. It follows that although two men are not required to join in *zimun,* they have the option of doing so. – ? –

The Gemara rejects the proof:

שָׁאנִי הָתָם – **There,** where three or more women eat together, **it is different** than where two men eat together, דְּאִיכָּא דֵּעוֹת – **for** when three women eat together **there is** a sufficient number of **minds** to form a quorum for the collective praise of God, whereas in the case of two men who eat together the necessary quorum is lacking.[3]

The Gemara asks:

אִי הָכִי – **If so,** אֵימָא סֵיפָא – **consider the latter clause** of the Baraisa, which states: נָשִׁים וַעֲבָדִים אִם רָצוּ לְזַמֵּן אֵין מְזַמְּנִין – However, if WOMEN AND SLAVES and minors eat together, even IF THEY WANT TO, THEY MAY NOT JOIN IN *ZIMUN*. אַמַּאי לֹא – Now, **why** may they **not** join in *zimun*? וְהָא אִיכָּא דֵּעוֹת – **Why, there is** a sufficient number of **minds** to form a quorum.[4] – ? –

The Gemara answers:

שָׁאנִי הָתָם – **There,** in the case of women joining with slaves, **it is different** than the case of women and slaves eating separately, מִשּׁוּם פְּרִיצוּתָא – **because** there is the possibility that the joint meal will lead to **promiscuity,** and such a meal is unfit for the recitation of a collective blessing.

The Gemara originally stated that Rav and R' Yochanan are in dispute whether two men have the option of joining in *zimun.* It now seeks to identify which Amora holds which opinion:

תִּסְתַּיֵּים דְּרַב דְּאָמַר אִם רָצוּ לְזַמֵּן אֵין מְזַמְּנִין – **Let it be determined that Rav** is the one **who said** that **if [two men] want to they may not join in *zimun*.** דְּאָמַר רַב דִּימִי בַּר יוֹסֵף אָמַר רַב – **For Rav Dimi bar Yosef said in the name of Rav:** שְׁלֹשָׁה שֶׁאָכְלוּ כְּאֶחָת – Concerning **three** people **who ate together** וְיָצָא אֶחָד מֵהֶם לַשּׁוּק – **and one of them went out to the marketplace,** קוֹרְאִין לוֹ – **[the remaining two] call out to him** that they are about to recite the *zimun* blessing, וּמְזַמְּנִין עָלָיו – **and they** then **join in *zimun* on account of him.**[5] טַעְמָא דְּקוֹרְאִין לוֹ – This statement implies that **the reason** the remaining two may join in *zimun* **is because they call out to him** for his attention and thus complete the quorum; הָא לֹא קוֹרְאִין לוֹ – **but should they not call out to him,** לֹא – they may **not** join in *zimun.* Evidently, it is Rav who holds that two may not join in *zimun.*

The Gemara rejects the proof:

שָׁאנִי הָתָם – **There,** where the group originally consisted of three people, **it is different** than a situation where only two people ate together in the first place, דְּאִקְּבְעוּ לְהוּ בְּחוֹבָה מֵעִיקָּרָא – **because they were originally subject to** reciting **an obligatory** *zimun* blessing. Thus, they must call out for the third person's attention in order to be able to join in a compulsory *zimun* of three. However, when only two people eat together in the first place, Rav may hold that they are allowed to join in *zimun.*

The Gemara brings conclusive evidence to the identity of the author of each opinion:

דְּרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן הוּא אֶלָּא תִּסְתַּיֵּים – **Rather, let it be determined that R' Yochanan is the one who said** that **if [two men] want to they may not join in *zimun*.** דְּאָמַר אִם רָצוּ לְזַמֵּן אֵין מְזַמְּנִין – **For Rabbah bar bar Chanah said in the name of R' Yochanan:** דְּאָמַר רַבָּה בַּר בַּר חָנָה אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן – Concerning **two** people **who ate together,** שְׁנַיִם שֶׁאָכְלוּ כְּאֶחָת – **one of them can discharge [his obligation]** to recite *Bircas HaMazon* **by** listening to **his fellow's** recitation of the **blessing.** אֶחָד מֵהֶן יוֹצֵא בִּבְרָכַת חֲבֵירוֹ – **And we analyzed this** statement as follows: וְהַיְינוּ דָּהּ – **What does [R' Yochanan] teach us** with it? מַאי קָא מַשְׁמַע לָן – **We have** already **learned** this **in a Baraisa,** which states: תְּנִינָא – ONE WHO HEARD AND DID NOT ANSWER HAS DISCHARGED [HIS OBLIGATION].[6] שָׁמַע וְלֹא עָנָה יָצָא – **And R' Zeira said:** וְאָמַר רַבִּי זֵירָא – R' Yochanan means **to say that there is no *zimun* blessing between them.**[7] לוֹמַר שֶׁאֵין בִּרְכַּת (המזון) [הַזִּימּוּן] בֵּינֵיהֶם

NOTES

1. Since performing a compulsory mitzvah is greater than performing

The Gemara concludes:
תִּסְתַּיִּים – Indeed, **let it be determined** that R' Yochanan is the one who holds that two people may not join in *zimun*.

The Gemara cites a challenge to this conclusion:
אָמַר לֵיהּ רָבָא בַּר רַב הוּנָא לְרַב הוּנָא – **Rava bar Rav Huna said to Rav Huna:** וְהָא רַבָּנַן דְּאָתוּ מִמַּעֲרָבָא אָמְרִי – **But the Rabbis who came from the West** (i.e. from Eretz Yisrael) to Babylonia **said:** אִם רָצוּ לְזַמֵּן מְזַמְּנִין – **If they** [two people who ate together] **want to join in *zimun*, they may join in *zimun*.** מַאי לָאו דִּשְׁמִיעַ לְהוּ מֵרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן – **Is it not** presumable **that they heard** this ruling **from R' Yochanan** who lived in Eretz Yisrael, rather than from Rav who lived in Babylonia?

The challenge is deflected:
לא – **No!** The correct presumption is דִּשְׁמִיעַ לְהוּ מֵרַב מִקַּמֵּי דְּנָחֵית לְבָבֶל – **that they heard it from Rav before he descended to Babylonia.**[8]

The Gemara quotes a ruling cited in the previous discussion and elaborates on it:
גּוּפָא – **The text itself** stated: אָמַר רַב דִּימִי בַּר יוֹסֵף אָמַר רַב – **Rav Dimi bar Yosef said in the name of Rav:** שְׁלֹשָׁה שֶׁאָכְלוּ בְּאֶחָת – Concerning **three** people **who ate together** וְיָצָא אֶחָד מֵהֶם לַשּׁוּק – **and one of them went out to the marketplace,** קוֹרְאִין לוֹ וּמְזַמְּנִין עָלָיו – **[the remaining two] call out to him** that they are about to recite the *zimun* blessing **and they** then **join in *zimun* on account of him.** אָמַר אַבָּיֵי – **Abaye said:** וְהוּא דְּקָרְבוּ לֵיהּ וְעָנֵי – **This** pertains only **where** he is near enough that when **they call out to him he can answer** and thus actually join in the *zimun*.[9]

The Gemara further qualifies this ruling:
אָמַר מַר זוּטְרָא – **Mar Zutra said:** וְלֹא אֲמָרַן אֶלָּא בִּשְׁלֹשָׁה – **And this was said only with** regard to **three** people who ate together and who will recite the basic *zimun* blessing, אֲבָל בַּעֲשָׂרָה – **but with** regard to **ten** people who ate together and who are required to recite the version of the *zimun* blessing that includes the Name of God,[10] עַד דְּנַיְיתֵי – the quorum is not valid **unless [those who departed]** actually **come** back and rejoin the group.

An objection is raised:
מַתְקִיף לַהּ רַב אַשִׁי – **Rav Ashi objected to this:** אַדְרַבָּה – **To the contrary!** אֵיפְכָא מִסְתַּבְּרָא – **The opposite is more reasonable!** תִּשְׁעָה נִרְאִין בַּעֲשָׂרָה – When **nine** people are seated in one place **they appear** to an observer **like** a group of **ten,** since the difference between nine people and ten is not readily discernible. Thus, it makes sense to allow the recitation of the ten-man *zimun* blessing even though the tenth person is physically separated from the group. שְׁנַיִם אֵין נִרְאִין כִּשְׁלֹשָׁה – By contrast, when **two** people are seated together **they do not appear like** a group of **three.** Thus, it would not make sense to allow the recitation of the three-man *zimun* blessing unless all three are seated together.[11] – ? –

The Gemara, however, disregards the objection and concludes:
וְהִלְכְתָא כְּמַר זוּטְרָא – **But the halachah follows Mar Zutra.** מַאי טַעְמָא – **What is the reason** that specifically a ten-man quorum is valid only when all ten are actually together? מִשּׁוּם דְּכָעֵי לְאַדְכּוּרֵי שֵׁם שָׁמַיִם – It is that **since [ten people] must mention the Name of Heaven** in their *zimun* blessing, בָּצִיר מֵעֲשָׂרָה לָאו אוֹרַח אַרְעָא – when **less than** all **ten** are gathered together **it is inappropriate** to recite the blessing.

The Gemara cites a ruling regarding a meal at which there is no *zimun* quorum:
אָמַר אַבָּיֵי – **Abaye said:** נְקִיטִינַן – **We have a tradition** from our teachers: שְׁנַיִם שֶׁאָכְלוּ כְּאַחַת – **When** only **two** people **ate together,** מִצְוָה לֵיחָלֵק – **it is preferable** for them **to separate** their blessings and recite them individually, rather than having one participant fulfill his obligation by listening to his fellow's recitation.[12]

The Gemara cites support for this ruling:
תָּנְיָא נָמֵי הָכִי – **It was taught similarly in a Baraisa:** שְׁנַיִם שֶׁאָכְלוּ כְּאַחַת – WHEN TWO people ATE TOGETHER, מִצְוָה לֵיחָלֵק – IT IS PREFERABLE for them TO SEPARATE their blessings. בְּמֶה דְּבָרִים אֲמוּרִים – IN WHAT circumstances DOES THIS STATEMENT APPLY? כְּשֶׁשְּׁנֵיהֶם סוֹפְרִים – WHEN BOTH of them ARE SCHOLARS.[13] אֲבָל אֶחָד סוֹפֵר וְאֶחָד בּוּר – BUT when ONE is A SCHOLAR AND ONE is AN IGNORAMUS,[14] סוֹפֵר מְבָרֵךְ וּבוּר יוֹצֵא – THE SCHOLAR RECITES THE BLESSING AND THE IGNORAMUS FULFILLS HIS OBLIGATION by listening to the scholar's recitation.

A ruling regarding *zimun* is cited:
אָמַר רָבָא – **Rava said:** הָא מִילְתָא אֲמָרִיתָא אֲנָא – **The following thing, I said on my own,** וְאִיתְּמָרָה מִשְּׁמֵיהּ דְּרַבִּי זֵירָא כְּוָותֵי – **and a statement was reported in the name of R' Zeira concurring with me:** שְׁלֹשָׁה שֶׁאָכְלוּ כְּאַחַת – Concerning **three** people **who ate together,** אֶחָד מַפְסִיק לִשְׁנַיִם – **one interrupts** his meal **for** the sake of joining the other **two** in *zimun* when they are ready, וְאֵין שְׁנַיִם מַפְסִיקִין לְאֶחָד – **but two do not interrupt** their meal **for** the sake of joining **one** in *zimun* when he is ready.[15]

The Gemara challenges the ruling:
וְלֹא – Do two **not** interrupt their meal for the sake of joining one in *zimun*? וְהָא רַב פָּפָּא אַפְסִיק לֵיהּ לְאַבָּא מַר בְּרֵיהּ – **Why, Rav Pappa interrupted** a meal **for** the sake of **his son Abba Mar,** אִיהוּ וְחַד – and it was **[Rav Pappa] and one** other person who interrupted their meal for the *zimun*. – ? –

The Gemara answers:
שָׁאנִי רַב פָּפָּא – The case involving **Rav Pappa is different,**

דִּלְפָנִים מִשּׁוּרַת הַדִּין הוּא דְּעָבַד – **for he went beyond the letter of the law.**[16]

An incident related to the law of *zimun* is cited:

יְהוּדָה בַּר מְרֵימַר וּמַר בַּר רַב אַשִׁי וְרַב אַחָא מִדִּפְתִּי כָּרְכִי רֵיפְתָּא בַּהֲדֵי הֲדָדֵי – **Yehudah bar Mereimar, Mar bar Rav Ashi and Rav Acha of Difti** once **ate bread together,**[17] לֹא הֲוָה בְּהוּ חַד דַּהֲוָה מוּפְלָג מֵחַבְרֵיהּ – and **there was none among them who was more distinguished than his fellows** לְבָרוכֵי לְהוּ – and who therefore deserved **to recite the blessing for them.**[18] (יתבי וקא מיבעיא להו) [אָמְרִי] – **They said:**[19] הָא דְּתַנַּן – Concerning **that which was taught in the Mishnah:** שְׁלֹשָׁה שֶׁאָכְלוּ כְּאַחַת חַיָּבִין לְזַמֵּן – THREE people WHO ATE TOGETHER ARE REQUIRED TO JOIN IN *ZIMUN* – הָנֵי מִילֵּי הֵיכָא דְּאִיכָּא אָדָם גָּדוֹל – **this pertains** only **where there is** among them **a person who is "great"** in relation to the others and who thus deserves to lead the *zimun,* אֲבָל הֵיכָא דְּכִי הֲדָדֵי נִינְהוּ חִלּוּק בְּרָכוֹת עָדִיף – **but where they are** all **equal to each other, the recitation of separate blessings is preferable** to the recitation of a collective blessing.[20] בָּרִיךְ אִינִישׁ לְנַפְשֵׁיהּ – Accordingly, **each person recited *Bircas HaMazon* for himself.** אָתוּ לְקַמֵּיהּ דְּמְרֵימַר – **They** later **came before Mereimar** and told him what they had done. אָמַר לְהוּ – **[Mereimar] said to them:** יְדֵי בִּרְכָה יְצָאתֶם – **The *Bircas HaMazon* requirement you have fulfilled,** יְדֵי זִימּוּן לֹא יְצָאתֶם – but **the *zimun* requirement you have not fulfilled.**[21] וְכִי תֵּימְרוּ נֵיהְדַּר וּנְזַמֵּן – **And if you shall say, "Let us go back and recite** the *zimun* blessing now," אֵין זִימּוּן לְמַפְרֵעַ – **there is no *zimun* retroactively.**[22]

The Gemara continues with other rulings pertaining to *zimun*:

בָּא וּמְצָאָן כְּשֶׁהֵן מְבָרְכִים – If **[someone]** who did not eat **came along and encountered [a group of three] as they were reciting the** *zimun* **blessing,** מַהוּ אוֹמֵר אַחֲרֵיהֶם – **what does he say after them** to participate in their exaltation of Hashem?[23] רַב זְבִיד אָמַר – **Rav Zevid said:** בָּרוּךְ וּמְבוֹרָךְ – He says: ***"Blessed** is He **and blessed is** His Name always, forever."*[24] רַב פָּפָּא אָמַר – **Rav Pappa said:** עוֹנֶה אָמֵן – **He answers "Amen."**

The Gemara comments:

וְלֹא פְּלִיגִי – **And [Rav Zevid and Rav Pappa] are not in disagreement.** הָא דְּאַשְׁכְּחִינְהוּ דְּקָא אָמְרִי נְבָרֵךְ – **This** ruling of Rav Zevid applies to a case **where [the person] encountered them** at the onset of the *zimun,* **as they were saying, *"Let us bless [He] of Whose we have eaten,"*** וְהָא דְּאַשְׁכְּחִינְהוּ דְּקָא אָמְרִי בָּרוּךְ – **whereas this** ruling of Rav Pappa applies to a case **where he encountered them** later, **as they were saying *"Blessed is [He] of Whose we have eaten and through Whose goodness we live."*** אַשְׁכְּחִינְהוּ דְּקָא אָמְרִי נְבָרֵךְ – If **he encountered them as they were saying, *"Let us bless*** etc.," אוֹמֵר בָּרוּךְ וּמְבוֹרָךְ – **he says: *"Blessed** is [He] **and blessed is** His Name always, forever,"* as stated by Rav Zevid. אַשְׁכְּחִינְהוּ דְּקָא אָמְרִי בָּרוּךְ – However, if **he encountered them as they were saying, *"Blessed** is [He] of Whose we have eaten and through Whose goodness we live,"* עוֹנֶה אָמֵן – **he answers "Amen."**[25]

The Gemara cites conflicting Baraisos regarding the answering of "Amen" after one's own blessing:

תָּנֵי חֲדָא – **It was taught in one Baraisa:** הָעוֹנֶה אָמֵן אַחַר [כָּל] בִּרְכוֹתָיו הֲרֵי זֶה מְשׁוּבָּח – ONE WHO ANSWERS "AMEN" AFTER [ALL OF][26] HIS OWN BLESSINGS IS PRAISEWORTHY. וְתַנְיָא אִידָךְ – **And it was taught in another Baraisa:** הֲרֵי זֶה מְגוּנֶּה – HE IS DESPICABLE. – ? –

The Gemara resolves the contradiction:

לֹא קַשְׁיָא – There is **no difficulty.** הָא בְּבוֹנֶה יְרוּשָׁלַיִם – **This** Baraisa, which states that it is praiseworthy for one to answer "Amen" after all of his blessings, is dealing **with** the blessing of ***Boneh Yerushalayim,***[27] הָא בִּשְׁאָר בְּרָכוֹת – whereas **this** Baraisa, which states that it is despicable to answer "Amen" after all of one's blessings, is dealing **with the other blessings.**[28]

The Gemara relates how different Amoraim acted with regard to the "Amen" of the *Boneh Yerushalayim* blessing:

אַבַּיֵי עָנֵי לֵיהּ בְּקָלָא – **Abaye would answer ["Amen"] aloud** after

---

NOTES

16. Rav Pappa interrupted his meal in order to honor his son (*Rashi*).

25. If he did not hear the leader say, "Let us bless etc.," he cannot

reciting the blessing of *Boneh Yerushalayim,* כְּדֵי הֵיכִי דִּלְשְׁמְעוּ פּוֹעֲלִים וְלֵיקוּמוּ – **so that laborers** who were listening to his recitation **should hear and get up** to return to their work.[29] And although they would miss the recitation of the blessing of *HaTov VeHaMeitiv,*[30] this was of no concern, דְּהַטּוֹב וְהַמֵּטִיב לָאו דְּאוֹרַיְיתָא – **for** the ***HaTov VeHaMeitiv*** blessing **is not** of **Biblical** origin, and the Rabbis who instituted it exempted hired laborers from its recitation.[31] רַב אַשִׁי עָנֵי לֵיהּ בְּלָחִישָׁא – **Rav Ashi,** however, **would answer "Amen" in a whisper after** reciting the blessing of *Boneh Yerushalayim,* כְּדֵי הֵיכִי דְּלָא נְזַלְזְלוּ בְּהַטּוֹב וְהַמֵּטִיב – **so that [the masses] should not** realize that **the** Biblically required blessings are concluded at that point and **be lax with** the blessing of ***HaTov VeHaMeitiv.***[32]