



וְלֹא בְיָדֵים מְזוּזוּחַ – NOR WITH regard to washing SOILED HANDS with the water that follows the meal.<sup>[1]</sup>

A related incident is cited:

Ravin and Abaye were once traveling on the road. Ravin's donkey went ahead of Abaye's donkey, and [Ravin] did not say to [Abaye], "Let master go ahead." [Abaye] said to himself: Ever since this Rabbi came from the West (i.e. from Eretz Yisrael),<sup>[2]</sup> he has become haughty. When they came to the entrance of a synagogue, [Ravin] said to him: Let master go in first. [Abaye] said to him: And until now, was I not the master? Why did you go ahead of me on our journey? [Ravin] replied: Thus said R' Yochanan: We accord honor only at an entrance that has a mezuzah.<sup>[3]</sup>

The Gemara objects to the wording of R' Yochanan's ruling: Does this mean that at an entrance that has a mezuzah, we indeed accord honor, but at an entrance that does not have a mezuzah, we do not? But then, at the entrance of a synagogue and a study hall, which do not have a mezuzah,<sup>[4]</sup> is it indeed so, that we do not accord honor?<sup>[5]</sup> Rather, say that R' Yochanan said the following: We accord honor only at an entrance that is fit for a mezuzah.<sup>[6]</sup>

The Gemara states another rule of dinner etiquette: Rav Yehudah the son of Rav Shmuel bar Shilas said in the name of Rav: Those who are dining<sup>[7]</sup> together are not permitted to eat anything until the one reciting the blessing and breaking the bread tastes of it first.<sup>[8]</sup>

An alternative version of this statement:

Rav Safra sat and said: Let us eat until we are full.

"Those who are dining together are not permitted to taste anything until the one breaking the bread tastes first" is the way it was stated by Rav.

The Gemara asks:

What practical difference does it make whether Rav's statement was that the diners are not permitted "to eat" or that they are not permitted "to taste" before the one who breaks the bread? Both versions mean the same thing. – ? –

The Gemara concedes that there is no practical difference, but explains:

Rav Safra corrected the quotation because a person is required to say things in the precise language of his master.

The Gemara cites a Baraisa regarding table manners:

The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: Two people who are eating from a common platter wait for each other before eating from the platter; three people need not wait for each other. When a group dines together, the one who recites the hamotzi blessing and breaks the bread reaches first for the food being served. And if he wants to impart honor to his teacher or to one who is more prominent than he by offering him to partake of the food first, he is permitted to do so.

The Gemara cites an incident through which related laws come to light:

Rabbah bar Chanah was marrying off his son in the house of Rav Shmuel bar Rav Ketina. He sat down before the meal and taught his son the following Baraisa:<sup>[9]</sup> After reciting the hamotzi blessing, the one who will break the bread is not permitted to break it until the "Amen" has concluded from the mouths of those responding.<sup>[10]</sup>

A variant version of this teaching is cited:

Rav Chisda said: He is not permitted to break the bread until the "Amen" has concluded

## NOTES

1. For it is not an honor to be told to wash one's soiled hands first (*Mishnah Berurah* 181:14; cf. *Rabbeinu Yonah, Ritva and Meiri*).

Nevertheless, the most prominent member of the group is the first of the final five to wash with *mayim acharonim*. As explained above (46b note 26), this is done not to accord him honor, but rather, to afford him the opportunity to prepare for the *Bircas HaMazon* recitation while the final four wash their hands. In practical terms, then, the rule that we do not accord honor when washing *mayim acharonim* pertains to the final four, or to those washing prior to the final five, who wash without any consideration as to protocol (see *Rashba* and *Rabbeinu Yonah*).

2. Ravin often traveled back and forth between Eretz Yisrael and Babylonia, and would relate the rulings issued by R' Yochanan in Eretz Yisrael to those living in Babylonia (*Rashi*).

3. [And since we met on the open road, honor was not called for.] Note that R' Yochanan's statement appears to go much further than that of the Baraisa cited above. Whereas the Baraisa states only that we do not accord honor while traveling on the road, R' Yochanan seems to say that we do not accord honor even upon arriving at an entrance unless that entrance has a *mezuzah*. The Gemara proceeds to examine this point.

4. Synagogues and study halls which are not used for living quarters do not require a *mezuzah* (see *Yoreh Deah* 286:3,10).

5. [Besides being illogical, this contradicts Ravin's action of honoring Abaye at the synagogue entrance.]

6. This means to exclude the accordance of honor only when traveling on the road or when passing through a breach in a wall (*Rashi*).

7. Literally: reclining.

8. This pertains to a case in which all will eat from the loaf that the

leader breaks. If every individual has his own bread, he may partake of it upon hearing the leader's blessing, even if the leader has not yet tasted his loaf (*Tosafos* in the *Masbe'ot*; see also *Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim* 167:15 with *Mishnah Berurah* §81). [See *Pri Megadim, Eishel Avraham* 167:35 for a discussion of whether this is merely a matter of etiquette or a halachic principle; see also *Mishnah Berurah* 167:76.]

9. When two people are eating together from a common platter and one of them makes a short interruption (e.g. for a drink), the other must also stop eating until his companion is ready to continue. However, when three people are eating together and one of them interrupts his meal, the other two need not wait for him (*Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim* 170:2; *Aruch HaShulchan* 170:4).

10. Even if he is the least prominent member of the assemblage, such as when he is the host [see top of 46a] (*Rashi, Gittin* 59b), or in a case where there is no specific host, or when the most prominent member gave him permission to recite the *hamotzi* blessing and break the bread (*Magen Avraham* 167:37).

11. [I.e. to the daughter of Rav Shmuel bar Rav Ketina.]

12. It was customary for the groom to recite the *hamotzi* blessing and break the bread at the wedding feast. Rabbah bar Chanah therefore sat down with his son before the meal to teach him the proper procedure (*Rashi*):

13. The Gemara ruled above, 39b, that one may not break the bread before concluding his *hamotzi* blessing. This Baraisa teaches that when one is reciting *hamotzi* for a group the listeners' "Amen" response is considered part of the blessing procedure, and as such, the bread may not be broken until all have answered "Amen" (*Rashi*).

from the mouths of the majority of those responding. However, once the majority has finished saying "Amen," he may break the bread and need not wait for the remainder of the group to complete their "Amen" response.

Rav Chisda's version is questioned:

אמר ליה רמי בר חמא – Rami bar Chama said to [Rav Chisda]: מאי שנא רובא – Why is it that the one breaking the bread must wait for the majority of the group to finish saying "Amen"? דאכתהי לא בליא ברכה – It is because the blessing has not yet ended until their "Amen" response has concluded. מיעוטה נמי – In regard to the minority of the group as well, the same reasoning applies: לא בליא ברכה – Until their "Amen" has concluded, the blessing has not yet ended. Why must he not wait until every single member of the group finishes answering "Amen" before breaking the bread?

Rav Chisda replies:

אמר ליה – He said to [Rami bar Chama]: שאני אומר – It is because I say: כל העונה אמן יותר מדאי – Whoever answers "Amen" longer than necessary אינו אלא טועה – is simply mistaken.<sup>14</sup> The one breaking the bread need not wait for those who answer "Amen" incorrectly.

The Gemara cites a Baraisa which discusses the correct manner of responding "Amen":

אין עונין לא אמן – The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: אין עונין לא אמן – WE DO NOT RESPOND with AN AMEN CHATUFAH,<sup>15</sup> ולא אמן ותומה – NOR with AN ABBREVIATED AMEN,<sup>16</sup> ולא יורוק ברכה מפיו – AND ONE SHOULD NOT THROW A BLESSING FROM HIS MOUTH.<sup>17</sup> בן עזאי – BEN AZZAI SAYS: כל העונה אמן ותומה – WHOEVER RESPONDS with AN ORPHANED AMEN, יהיו בניו ותומים – HIS CHILDREN WILL BE ORPHANS. Whoever responds with an Amen CHATUFAH, יתקטפו ימיו – HIS DAYS WILL BE SNATCHED AWAY.<sup>18</sup> Whoever responds with AN ABBREVIATED Amen, יתקטפו ימיו – HIS DAYS WILL BE ABBREVIATED. וכל

המאריך באמן – BUT WHOEVER IS LENGTHY WITH his AMEN responses,<sup>19</sup> מאריך בן לו ימיו ושנותיו – THEY LENGTHEN HIS DAYS AND HIS YEARS FOR HIM.

The Gemara returns to the subject of *zimun*:

רב ושמואל היו יתבי בסעודתא – Rav and Shmuel were sitting at a meal. אתא רב שימי בר חייא – Rav Shimi bar Chiya came by והיה קמסררהב ואכיל – and hurried to eat, so that the three of them should be able to join in *zimun*. אמר ליה רב – Rav said to him: מה דעתך לאיצטרופי בהון – What do you think, that by hurrying to eat you will be able to join with us in *zimun*? אנן אכילנא לן – We already finished eating our meal before you came, and your eating now cannot effect a *zimun* requirement. אמר ליה שמואל – Shmuel said to him: אלו מויתו לי ארדיליא – If they would bring mushrooms for me וגויליא לאבא – and young pigeons for Abba (i.e. Rav),<sup>21</sup> מי לא אכילנן – would we not eat them?<sup>22</sup> Thus, although we finished eating the food that was before us, we have not concluded our meal, and Rav Shimi can effect a quorum for *zimun* by joining us now.

The Gemara relates another incident related to *zimun*:

תלמידי דרב היו יתבי בסעודתא – Rav's students were sitting at a meal. על רב אחא – Rav Acha came in after they had begun and joined them. אמרי – They said: אתא גברא רבא דמברך לן – A great man has come who will lead the *zimun* and recite *Bircas HaMazon* for us.<sup>23</sup> אמר להו – [Rav Acha] said to them: מי סבריתו דגדול מברך – Do you think that the greatest one of the group recites *Bircas HaMazon* even when he arrives at the end of the meal? עיקר שבסעודה מברך – It is not so! Rather, a primary member of the meal (i.e. one who was there from the beginning) recites *Bircas HaMazon*.

The Gemara, however, concludes:

גדול מברך אף על גב דאתא – But the halachah is that גדול מברך אף על גב דאתא – והלכתא – the greatest one of the group recites *Bircas HaMazon*, even though he came at the end of the meal.

## NOTES

14. For when one stretches out the "Amen" excessively he ruins its pronunciation (*Tosafos* המאריך בלתי כהלכה).

15. I.e. an Amen pronounced with the *alef* vowelized by a חטף (א, that is, a *sheva*. *Chataf* is the old term for *sheva*, and *Rashi* always refers to it as such – see his commentary to *Genesis* 29:27, *Exodus* 3:22, 22:19, *Deuteronomy* 4:41). Rather, it should have been vowelized by a קמץ גדול (א, which *Rashi* calls פתח). An *Amen chatufah* (אמן) is pronounced "Emen," instead of the proper (אמן) "Amen" (see *Rashi*).

16. I.e. an Amen in which the *nun* at the end of the word is not enunciated clearly, so that the response sounds like "Amei," rather than the correct "Amen" (*Rashi*).

17. I.e. an Amen answered in a situation where one did not hear the blessing, but merely heard people responding "Amen" to a blessing. [This is called an "Orphaned Amen," because an Amen without a blessing is analogous to a child without parents] (*Rashi*).

*Rashi* asks: The Gemara relates in Tractate *Succah* (51b) that the synagogue in Alexandria, Egypt was so large that it was impossible for all the congregants to hear the recitation of the blessings recited by the cantor, and therefore, flags would be waved to signal the congregants when to answer "Amen." This appears to contradict our Baraisa, which states that one who does not hear the blessing may not answer "Amen." *Rashi* answers that although the Alexandrian congregants could not hear the cantor verbalize the blessing, they knew to which blessing they were responding, and as such were permitted to answer "Amen." [Our Baraisa prohibits answering "Amen" only in a situation where one is unaware of what he is responding to. "Amen" is an affirmation of the blessing, and one cannot affirm without knowing what he is affirming.] Cf. *Tosafos*, *Succah* 52a וכוין. See *Shulchan Aruch*, *Orach Chaim* 124:8 for further examples of "Amen chatufah," "an abbreviated Amen" and "an orphaned Amen."

18. A blessing is a statement of gratitude to God, and should be recited in a respectful manner. Thus, it is improper to "throw a blessing from

one's mouth" by reciting it hastily, as if fulfilling an unwanted chore (see *Rashi*).

19. [The word *chatufah*, *chatufah*, has two meanings. One is, as explained above (see note 15), a letter that is pronounced with a חטף. The other meaning is "snatched away." In fact, when an Amen is pronounced with a חטף it is in a sense "snatched," since the *alef* is not drawn out properly. Ben Azzai expounds the dual meaning of *chatufah* as alluding that one who customarily answers with an Amen *chatufah* will have his days snatched away.]

20. I.e. he pronounces the word properly, avoiding an Amen *chatufah* or an abbreviated Amen. However, he does not stretch it out so long as to spoil the pronunciation (*Tosafos* המאריך בלתי כהלכה).

21. Shmuel respectfully referred to Rav as "Abba" (*Rashi*). Abba means literally: father; Shmuel used this term to connote "my prince and master," for Rav was the elder scholar (*Rashi* to *Yevamos* 57b ומהרה רבי ומורה). Others explain that Rav's name was actually Abba (see *Chullin* 137b). He was called Rav (i.e. master) in Babylonia in the same vein that R' Yehudah HaNasi was called Rebbi in Eretz Yisrael. However, his colleague Shmuel referred to him by name (*Tosafos*, *Yevamos* loc. cit. and *Rashbam*, *Pesachim* 119b אבא רבי; see also 49a note 2).

22. Shmuel was fond of eating mushrooms for dessert, while Rav had a liking for young pigeons. Shmuel thus said that since both would continue eating if a dessert to their liking was brought out, the meal was not yet over (*Rashi*).

23. As mentioned above (45b note 18), the outstanding member of the group is honored with leading the *zimun* and reciting *Bircas HaMazon*. The Gemara in *Bava Basra* (120a) states that in this regard, "greatness" in relation to other members of the group is determined by taking into account both Torah scholarship and age (see also *Rashi* to 45b (ד"ה לא הוה ברור). See, however, *Mishnah Berurah* 201:1, who mentions only Torah scholarship; see also *Einayim LaMishpat*.



The Mishnah stated:

אכל דמאי וכו' – If ONE ATE DEMAI etc. [we join in *zimun* on account of him].

The Gemara asks:

הא לא הוי ליה – But it is not suitable for him to eat!<sup>[24]</sup> Why, then, is he eligible to complete the quorum necessary for *zimun*?<sup>[25]</sup>

The Gemara answers:

כיון דאי בעי מפקר להו לנכסיה והוי עני – Since, if he desired, he could renounce ownership of his property and become a pauper, והוי ליה – and [the *demai*] would then be suitable for him,<sup>[26]</sup> now too, it is considered suitable, and he is thus eligible to complete the *zimun* quorum.<sup>[27]</sup> דתנן – For we learned in a Mishnah:<sup>[28]</sup> מאכלין את העניים דמאי – WE MAY FEED POOR PEOPLE DEMAI, ואת האכסניא דמאי – AND we may feed SOLDIERS DEMAI.<sup>[29]</sup> ואמר רב הונא – And Rav Huna said: תנא – It was taught in a Baraisa: ביה שמאי אוקרי – BEIS SHAMMAI SAY: אין מאכלין את העניים ואת האכסניא דמאי – WE DO NOT FEED THE POOR AND THE SOLDIERS DEMAI. Thus, the Mishnah just cited reflects the view of Beis Hillel.<sup>[30]</sup>

The next clause of the Mishnah stated:

מעשר ראשון שנטלה תרומתו – If one ate MAASER RISHON WHOSE TERUMAH HAS BEEN TAKEN [we join in *zimun* on account of him].

The Gemara asks:

פשיטא – It is obvious that the person is eligible to complete the

*zimun* quorum, since the food he ate is perfectly permissible!<sup>[31]</sup> Why must the Mishnah teach us this rule?

The Gemara answers:

לא צריכא אלא שהקרימו בשבליהם – [The Mishnah's ruling] is necessary only in regard to a case where [the Levi] preempted [the Kohen] and took the *maaser rishon* while the grain was still in ears, before the Kohen received *terumah gedolah*,<sup>[32]</sup> והפריש ממנו תרומת מעשר – and [the Levi] then separated *terumas maaser* from it, ולא הפריש ממנו תרומה גדולה – but did not separate *terumah gedolah* from it.<sup>[33]</sup> The Mishnah teaches that the *maaser rishon* may be eaten even though *terumah gedolah* was never separated from it.<sup>[34]</sup> וכדרכי אבהו – And this accords with a ruling of R' Abahu. דאמר רבי אבהו אמר – For R' Abahu said in the name of Reish Lakish: מעשר ראשון שהקדימו בשבליהם – *Maaser rishon* that one advanced ahead of the *terumah gedolah* while the grain was still in ears – פטור מתרומה גדולה – is exempt from *terumah gedolah*. שנתאמר – For it is stated in reference to *maaser rishon*:<sup>[35]</sup> „והרמתם ממנו תרומת ה' מעשר מן-המעשר” – And you shall separate from it Hashem's *terumah*, a tithe of the tithe. This connotes: „מעשר מן-המעשר” אמרתי לך – A tithe of the tithe is what I [God] have told you, the Levi, to separate as *terumah* from the tithe, ולא תרומה גדולה ותרומת מעשר מן – but not both *terumah gedolah* and *terumas maaser* from the tithe.<sup>[36]</sup>

## NOTES

24. See 45a note 2.

25. Since it is forbidden to eat *demai*, a *zimun* blessing recited as a result of eating it is brought about by a transgression. Such a blessing is considered blasphemous, for it is written (*Psalms* 10:3): *A thief who recites a blessing has blasphemed Hashem*. As a Baraisa (*Bava Kamma* 94a) explains: One who steals wheat, grinds it into flour, bakes it, separates *challah* from it and recites a blessing is not blessing God but blaspheming Him. [How, then, does the Mishnah rule that we recite the *zimun* blessing on account of one who ate *demai*?] (*Rashi*; cf. *Raavad* and *Rosh*, cited above, 45a note 10).

26. [The prohibition against eating *demai* (produce purchased from an *am ha'aretz* – ignorant person) was instituted when, with the passage of time, it became apparent to the Sages that many ignorant people were becoming less scrupulous in the separation of the various tithes.] Since, however, most ignorant people did separate the proper tithes – a statistic that may be relied upon under Biblical law – the Rabbis were lenient with the *demai* prohibition, and permitted it for the poor (*Rashi*).

27. Although he ate it without renouncing ownership of his property, it does not have the status of a prohibited food regarding *zimun*, since its prohibition is a weak one which can be circumvented (see *Ritva*; see also *Rosh Yosef* and *Pnei Yehoshua*).

28. *Demai* 3:1.

29. The local populace, who are responsible for feeding the king's soldiers who are returning from battle, may feed those soldiers *demai*. Even Jewish soldiers may eat *demai*, for since they are away from their home and property they are considered as paupers [see *Pe'ah* 5:4] (see *Rashi* here and to *Eruvin* 31b). [However, *Tosafos* here and to *Eruvin* 17b cite an opinion from *Talmud Yerushalmi* that אכסניא refers only to gentile soldiers.]

30. Rav Huna informs us of Beis Shammai's dissent so that if we find a Tannaic teaching which contradicts that of the Mishnah we should disregard it, as the halachah follows Beis Hillel (*Tosafos*). [According to this explanation, Rav Huna's statement is not a clarification of the Gemara's answer as to why one who ate *demai* is eligible for *zimun*. Indeed some versions of the text read רב הונא אמר, *Rav Huna said*, rather than אמר רב הונא, *And Rav Huna said* (see *Dikdukei Soferim*). However, see *Pnei Yehoshua* and *Hagahos Chasam Sofer, Orach Chaim* 196, for alternative approaches which do connect Rav Huna's teaching with the Gemara's answer. This would conform with our reading of אמר רב הונא, *And Rav Huna said*.]

31. See 45a note 3.

32. The obligation to separate *terumah* and *maaser* commences after מריח, the procedure of smoothing out the piles of processed grain. Thus, if *maaser rishon* was advanced to the Levi while the grain was still in the ears, it was not subject to the obligation of separating *terumah gedolah* at that time.

33. The proper sequence in separating the required portions is for the owner to first set aside approximately one fiftieth of the produce as *terumah gedolah* for the Kohen, and to then separate one tenth of the remaining produce as *maaser rishon* for the Levi. The Mishnah in *Terumos* 3:6-7 derives this from Scripture as follows: The Torah (*Deuteronomy* 18:4) refers to *terumah* as ראשית, *the first*, and it states (*Exodus* 22:28): *Do not delay your bikkurim and terumah*, thus prohibiting the delaying of the separating of *terumah*, which is “first,” until after *maaser*. Accordingly, if the owner separates *maaser* for the Levi prior to separating *terumah* for the Kohen, one fiftieth of that *maaser*, which should have been given to the Kohen, has been given to the Levi instead. Thus, there would appear to be two portions of *terumah* in the *maaser* that was given to the Levi: the standard one tenth of *terumas maaser* which the Levi is obligated to separate from the *maaser* that he receives, and the one fiftieth of *terumah gedolah* which should have been separated by the owner.

For example, if the crop equaled 100 bushels and the normative procedure was followed, a Kohen would first receive 2% of the total produce (two bushels), and a tenth of the remainder (9.8 bushels) would go to the Levi. By collecting his *maaser* prematurely, the Levi receives a tenth of the original total, or 10 bushels – an increase of .2 (one fifth of a) bushel – at the expense of the Kohen (see *Rashi*).

34. When the Mishnah states: *If one ate . . . maaser rishon whose terumah has been taken . . . we join in zimun on account of him*, it refers to the case where the *terumas maaser* was taken from the *maaser*, but the *terumah gedolah* was not taken from it, due to the advancement of the *maaser* to the Levi while the grain was still in ears. The Mishnah teaches that the Levi is not required to separate *terumah gedolah* from this *maaser rishon*, and thus, the produce is not *tevel* and is permitted for consumption (see *Rashi*).

35. *Numbers* 18:26.

36. The verse does not merely state: *And you shall separate from it maaser from the maaser*; it obligates the Levi to separate Hashem's *terumah* and then describes this *terumah* as *maaser from the maaser*. This description is understood to be exclusionary, teaching that the Levi is required to give only the *terumah* identified as *maaser from the maaser*, i.e. *terumas maaser* (*Rashi* to *Beitzah* 13b). Therefore, even when the Levi preempted the Kohen by taking the *maaser* from the

R' Abahu's teaching is questioned:

אָמַר לִיה רַב פָּפָא לְאַבַּיִי – Rav Pappa said to Abaye: אִי הָכִי – If it is so, that this verse specifically exempts the Levi from separating *terumah gedolah* from his *maaser rishon*, אָפִילוּ – then even if he preempted [the Kohen] and took the *maaser rishon* after the grain was heaped in a pile,

he should **also** be exempt from separating *terumah gedolah*! Yet the law is that the Levi *must* separate *terumah gedolah* in this case.<sup>[37]</sup> – ? –

Abaye responds:

אָמַר לִיה – He said to [Rav Pappa]: עָלֶיךָ אָמַר קָרָא – In response to the question you raise, Scripture states:

## NOTES

unprocessed ears, thus causing the Kohen to lose some of his *terumah*, he is exempted by Scriptural decree from having to repay that *terumah* from the *maaser*.

37. [This is clearly so, as even R' Abahu stated that the *terumah gedolah* is preempted only if the normal sequence of separation was altered while the grain was still *in ears*.]