

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) One who forgot to make a bracha before eating (cont.)

The Gemara identifies the pasuk which restricts a person from making a bracha with food in his mouth.

The requirement to make a bracha on food even if the person already began to eat only applies if he is still eating but if the eating is complete a bracha can not be made.

2) Asparagus

A lengthy discussion regarding the beneficial and detrimental effects of asparagus is presented.

3) Lessons from a malach

R' Yishmael ben Elisha shares three lessons he learned from a particular malach.

R' Yehoshua ben Levi shares three lessons he learned from the מלאך המות.

4) Ten requirements for a כוס של ברכה

R' Zaira or a Beraisa lists ten requirements for the cup of wine used for a mitzvah and the Gemara elaborates on those requirements.

5) The story of Ulah, R' Nachman and the kos of Birkas HaMazon

The Gemara tells the story of Ulah who sent the kos from Birkas HaMazon to R' Nachman and the violent reaction of R' Nachman's wife.

6) Misc. halachos

One may not speak after taking the kos shel bracha.

One should not use the second cup as the kos shel bracha.

The Gemara rules that one should recite Birkas HaMazon while sitting regardless of how one ate the meal.

הדרן עלך שלשה שאכלו

7) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah lists a number of disagreements between Bais Shamai and Bais Hillel that relate to halachos of the meal.

8) The first disagreement of the Mishnah

A Beraisa explains the point of disagreement between Bais Shamai and Bais Hillel whether the bracha on wine should precede the bracha on the day or should the order be reversed.

The Gemara rules like Bais Hillel that the bracha on wine comes first and the Gemara explains why it is necessary to rule like Bais Hillel in this disagreement. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By the Wolper, Handelman, Gassel and Glieberman families
In loving memory of their mother and grandmother

Gemara GEM

Disposable Kiddush Cups

עשרה דברים נאמרו בכוס של ברכה: טעון הדחה שטיפה חי וכו'

Ten things are said about the cup of blessing. One of them is that the cup should be "חי". According to one interpretation in Tosafos (50b - ד"ה מודים), this means that the cup itself should be complete. This is also the ruling brought in Shulchan Aruch (O.C. 183:3). Magen Avraham writes that this means that even if the cup itself is intact, but the base of the cup is broken, this goblet is invalid for use, unless one has no other cup.

Igros Moshe (O.C. 3:#39) discusses using a disposable cup for Kiddush. He writes that a disposable, one-time utility cup has no significance in terms of it being a vessel. In fact, it is less important as a utensil than does a silver cup that is broken, and therefore it should not be used for Kiddush and Birkas Hamazon. However, if there is no other cup available, it may be used.

Rabbi Shlomo Zalman Aurbach, zt"l writes that it is certainly permitted to use a disposable cup to make Kiddush. This opinion is also brought in the name of Rabbi Yaakov Kamemetsky, and it is also the ruling brought by the Tzis Eliezer. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that prohibits making a bracha with something in one's mouth?
2. How should a person hold a kos shel bracha?
3. According to the Gemara's conclusion, what is the correct body position for Birkas HaMazon?
4. What are the two reasons Beis Hillel holds that the bracha on wine should precede the bracha on the day?

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mrs. Shirley Halpert and family
In loving memory of
Rabbi Emanuel Halpert
הרב עמנואל בן ר' יצחק ז"ל

HALACHAH Highlight

The requirement of answering Amen

ועונין אמן אחר ישראל המברך

One answers Amen after a Jew pronouncing a blessing.

The Poskim discuss whether answering Amen is obligatory or voluntary. The Behag¹ states that whenever one hears another saying a blessing, he is required to answer Amen. The Rambam², similarly, rules that answering Amen to the blessing of another Jew is an obligation, even if one did not hear the entire blessing being pronounced. Other Rishonim³ as well appear to be of this view that answering Amen is compulsory.

Conversely, the Beis Yosef⁴ understands the Tur's position to be that answering Amen to a blessing is voluntary. This understanding of the Tur is upheld by other Poskim⁵ as well. However, the Ba"ch⁶ questions this view. According to the Beis Yosef, the Tur would be disagreeing with both the Behag, which he himself quotes⁷, and the Rambam. The Ba"ch notes that it is uncharacteristic of the Tur to disagree with the greats who preceded him without presenting evidence, especially since he quotes the Behag elsewhere without expressing disagreement. Thus, the Bach interprets the Tur to hold that answering Amen to a blessing heard in its entirety from a Jew is an obligation, and not voluntary. Only in regard to answering Amen after the blessing of a gentile would the Tur hold that answering Amen is voluntary.

Rav Moshe Feinstein⁷ presents further evidence to bolster the position of the Taz⁸, that even the Tur is in agreement that

answering Amen is obligatory. He cites the Kitzur Piskei HaRosh⁹, which was authored by the Tur¹⁰, where it is written: "One need not answer Amen after students learning the blessings from their teacher." Rav Feinstein points out that if the Tur held that answering Amen was unnecessary, than he should have written: "One does not answer Amen after children learning the blessings." By writing that one need not respond, the implication is that generally one is obliged to answer Amen.

The Shulchan Aruch¹¹ quotes the language of the Rambam that answering Amen is compulsory. This seems to be echoed in the Mishnah Berura¹². ■

1. בה"ג (פ"ז דברכות, די"א ע"ג בדפוס ווארשא תרל"ה, ובמהד' רבי עזריאל הילדסהיימר בח"א ה' ברכת המזון עמ' 132), והוב"ד שתיקה בסמ"ג (מ"ע כז) ובטור (סי קצח) ועוד.
2. פ"א מהלכות ברכות הלכה יג
3. ע"י מאירי (ברכות פ"ח המשנה הי"א, עמ' 201) שכתב: "ולפי דרך למדת שחייב לענות אמן אע"פ שאינו חייב בברכה." ועוד.
4. ב"י או"ח סי' רטו ד"ה ויראה דעונין (סוף עמ' שנו במהד' מכון ירושלים)
5. בפרישה שם, וכן ראה בלחם משנה (פ"א מהל' ברכות הי"ג ד"ה ואע"פ שאינו חייב)
6. ע"י בב"ח שם. וכן ראה בט"ז שם (סי"ק ב). וכן ראה בביאור הלכה (שם סי"ב ד"ה חייב לענות)
7. סי' קצח
8. שו"ת אגרות משה ח"ד מחאו"ח (סי' קא אות א' ד"ה בדבר)
9. סי' רטו סי"ק ב'
10. פרק ח' מברכות אות ה'
11. ע"י שם הגדולים (מע"י ספרים, ערך קיצור פסקי הרא"ש) ובשדי חמד (כללי הפוסקים סי' יא אות טז - יז)
12. סי' רטו סי"ב ■

STORIES off the Daf

The Actions of Ulla

אדהכי שמעה ילתא קמה בזיהרא ועלתה לבי חמרא ותברה ד' מאה דני דחמרא

The Gemara tells us that Yalta was the wife of R' Nachman and the daughter of the exilarch. When she heard that Ulla said that it was unnecessary for her to be given the cup of bracha, she became quite angry and went down to the wine cellar where she destroyed four hundred barrels of wine. Ulla tried to placate her, but to no avail.

How could she have reacted in such an emotional and irrational fashion? Why was she so upset, and how could she have transgressed the law of "bal tash-

chis"?

Maharsha explains that she had desired the cup of blessing for the most pure of motives. She had to act dramatically in order to show that it was not the wine that she lacked by not being sent the cup, but rather it was the bracha which she missed. She demonstrated this by destroying the barrels of wine which remained, thus showing that the wine was all worthless to her – it was only the kos shel bracha which she desired.

Pri Megadim and Maharatz Chayes maintain that if a lesson can be taught by having something destroyed, the prohibition of wanton destruction does not apply. For example, at a wedding we sanction the breaking of a useful glass in order to create a proper mood of remem-

bering the destruction of Yerushalayim, or in order to temper a mood of excessive lightheadedness.

Ben Yehoyada points out that the gematria of ילתא is 441, which is equal to אמת, truth. This woman acted with altruistic motives. She owned these barrels, which she had received as part of her dowry. She was disappointed with Ulla, and she went to the cellar to break the seals of the barrels (not the barrels themselves), in order to immediately distribute the wine to the poor for Kiddush and Havdalah. She did this so that Ulla would no longer get any benefit from the wine, which she felt he mishandled by not sharing the kos shel bracha with her. Now that the wine was designated for the poor, Ulla would get no more. ■