



Today's Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Brachos Daf Lamed Ches

- With regard to “Kuba D’ara” (which is what **Abaye** said is the “terokanin” in the previous Gemara), **R’ Yosef** says it requires a mezonos. **Mar Zutra** would be kove’ah a seudah on it and would make a hamotzi and bentch. **Mar bar R’ Ashi** says one can use it as matzah on Pesach because it is considered “lechem oni”.
- With regard to date honey, **Mar bar R’ Ashi** says it requires a shehakol. The reason is that honey is not the actual fruit, it is “sweat” of the fruit, and therefore a borei pri ha’etz is not made. This view follows the view of **R’ Yehoshua** in a Braisa where he says that the juices of any fruits other than grapes and olives are therefore a non-Kohen who drank the juices of other fruits of terumah would not be chayuv.
- With regard to “Terima” (crushed, but not liquefied, fruit), **Rava** says is considered like the original fruit (he brings a proof from the fact that one may do this to fruit of Terumah) and therefore requires a ha’etz. The Gemara paskens like **Rava**.
- With regard to “Shatisa” (made from flour of moist kernels that were toasted), **Rav** says one makes a shehakol and **Shmuel** says one makes a mezonos.
  - **R’ Chisda** says they are not arguing. When it is made thick, for eating, it is a mezonos. When it is made thin, for medicinal purposes, it is a shehakol.
    - **Q: R’ Yosef** asked, a Braisa allows preparing loose “Shatisa” on Shabbos. If, as **R’ Chisda** said, it is for medicinal purposes, that would not be allowed on Shabbos?! **A: Abaye** said, it may be for medicinal purposes and still it is allowed on Shabbos, because it looks like food (in which case medicinal uses on Shabbos is permitted). Still, one would possibly think that a bracha should not be made on this because it is for medicinal purposes. Therefore, **Rav** teaches what should be made.

SHE’AL HAPAS HU OMER HAMOTZI...

- A Braisa says, the proper bracha is “Hamotzi lechem min ha’aretz”. **R’ Nechemia** says it is “Motzi lechem min ha’aretz”.
  - **Rava** explains, all agree the verbiage needs to be past tense and that “Motzi” is past tense. They only disagree regarding the word “Hamotzi”. The **Rabanan** say it is also past tense and **R’ Nechemia** says it is not.
  - The Gemara paskens like the **Rabanan** (Tosfos explains that “Hamotzi” is better because it separates the “mem” of “Motzi” from the “mem” of “Haolam”).

V’AL HAYIRAKOS HU OMER...

- The Mishna discusses vegetables right after discussing bread to teach that just as bread was changed through fire, we are discussing vegetables that were changed through fire (i.e. cooked vegetables are “ha’adamah”).
  - **R’ Chisda in the name of Rav** said that cooked vegetables are ha’adamah, and **Ulla in the name of R’ Yochanan** said they are shehakol. **R’ Chisda** says they don’t argue. Rather, vegetables which are generally not eaten raw (cabbage, beets, pumpkins) are a shehakol if eaten raw and a ha’adamah when eaten cooked, whereas vegetables that are generally eaten when raw (garlic, leek) are a ha’adamah when eaten raw and a shehakol when cooked.
  - **R’ Nachman in the name of Shmuel** said that cooked vegetables are ha’adamah, and **Ulla in the name of R’ Yochanan** said they are shehakol. **R’ Nachman** said that they do

in fact argue, for a Braisa has a machlokes about this as well. The Braisa brings a machlokes whether one may use cooked matzah on pesach (does it lose the name "bread", same question as does it lose the name "vegetable"). The Gemara says that a proof cannot be brought from there because one might disallow cooked matzah because it loses the taste of matzah, which is necessary for the mitzvah. That reason doesn't apply in the case of the proper bracha for vegetables.

- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, cooked vegetables are ha'adamah, and **R' Binyamin bar Yefes in the name of R' Yochanan** said it is shehakol.
  - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, when **Ulla** said that **R' Yochanan** said it is shehakol he was mistaken based on this statement of **R' Binyamin bar Yefes**.
  - **R' Zeirah** said that **R' Chiya bar Abba** is a more reliable source of **R' Yochanan's** shita: (1) He is more exact in his learning the statements of **R' Yochanan**, (2) he would review all his learning in front of **R' Yochanan** every 30 days, (3) **R' Yochanan** paskened to make a ha'adamah on a cooked bean, (4) **R' Yochanan** himself made a bracha before and after on a salted (for a while so it had the same status as being cooked) olive. Presumably he made a ha'eitz and an "ahl ha'eitz".
    - The Gemara says, this last proof is not strong because maybe he made a shehakol and borei nefashos.
  - **Q: R' Yitzchak bar Shmuel** asked, a Mishna says that one cannot use cooked maror on Pesach. From here we see that cooked is not the same as raw and should therefore need a different bracha!? **A:** The case of maror is different because in order to be yotzeh the mitzvah of maror it needs to have the taste of maror, and cooking changes the taste.
  - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, how could **R' Yochanan** make a bracha on a salted olive? Since he didn't eat the pit, he by definition ate less than the size of an olive (kezayis), and such an amount does not require a bracha!? **A:** The size needed to make a bracha is a medium sized olive. **R' Yochanan's** olive was large enough that even without the pit it was the size of a medium sized olive with the pit.