



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Brachos, Daf לו – Daf מב

This week's Week In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf לו---36-----

- With regard to the bracha to be made when eating flour, **R' Yehuda** says it is a borei pri ha'adamah and **R' Nachman** says it is a shehakol.
  - **Rava** told **R' Nachman** – **R' Yochanan** and **Shmuel** agree with **R' Yehuda** because they both say that one makes a borei pri ha'etz on olive oil even though it has changed from a solid to a liquid, so on flour which has changed from a solid to a powder the borei pri ha'adamah should remain as well.
    - The Gemara says, this comparison is not necessarily valid, because it may be that oil is the main purpose of olives so a "ha'etz" is made, but since flour is not the main purpose of wheat (bread is the ultimate purpose), a shehakol should be made!?
    - **Q:** We find that **R' Zeira** in the name of **R' Masna** in the name of **Shmuel** said that a shehakol is made on barley flour, but doesn't mention wheat (which is more prestigious than barley). It must be because wheat flour needs a ha'adama!? **A:** Wheat flour needs a shehakol as well, but if the Braisa would have mentioned wheat, we would have said that barley flour needs no bracha at all, because it is unhealthy.
- With regard to the bracha for eating the soft part of the palm tree, **R' Yehuda** says one makes a borei pri ha'adamah since it is considered a fruit, and **Shmuel** says it is a shehakol since it will eventually harden into wood.
  - **Shmuel** said to **R' Yehuda** that his shita makes sense, because a ha'adamah is made on a radish even though it too eventually hardens like wood. The Gemara says this is not a valid comparison, because radishes are planted to eat whereas the palm tree is not planted to eat the soft part of the tree – that may be why it is a shehakol.
    - **Q:** A "tzlaf" tree has many edible parts but is planted for the berries, yet one makes a ha'adamah on the other parts although that is not the purpose of the planting!? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, a "tzlaf" tree is planted to eat whatever is edible and therefore a ha'adamah is made. A palm tree is harmed by the eating of the soft parts and therefore a shehakol is made.
  - Although **Shmuel** praised **R' Yehuda's** shita, the halacha still follows **Shmuel**.
- **R' Yehuda** in the name of **Rav** says, with regard to a tzlaf tree of orlah in Chutz Laaretz (where orlah is only D'Rabanan), one may eat the shells of the berries, but not the berries themselves.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that one makes a ha'etz on the shell of the berries, so it must be that it is considered a fruit. If so, how may it be eaten during orlah? **A:** **Rav** holds like **R' Akiva** who is more meikel and says that the shells have no chiyuv of ma'aser, because they are not fruits.
    - He didn't simply say that the halacha follows **R' Akiva**, because we would think that it follows him even in E"Y. He teaches us that in chutz laaretz we follow the view that is lenient in E"Y. He further teaches that the halacha follows him in chutz laaretz even regarding something that is a D'Oraisa in E"Y (like orlah) not only for something that is only D'Rabanan (like maaser of trees).
    - **Ravina** saw **Mar bar R' Ashi** in chutz la'aretz following the shita of **R' Akiva** – eating the shells and throwing away the berries of a tzlaf of orlah. **Ravina** asked that since we follow the meikel, we should follow **Beis Shammai** who say that a tzlaf is possibly a vegetable and therefore should not be subject to orlah D'Rabanan!? **Mar bar R' Ashi** said, the shita of **B"R** when opposed by **B"H** is considered to be non-existent and can't be followed, even as a meikel. **R' Akiva** can be followed when opposed by **R' Eliezer** – it does not make his shita as non-existent.
      - **Q:** Orlah applies to the shell of a fruit as well as the fruit. So, although this tzlaf shell is not considered a fruit, it should be assur to eat as a shell?! **A:** **Rava** said, a shell that falls

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

off the fruit before it is detached from the ground is not assur as a shell for purposes of orlah, and the shell of this tzlaf falls off before it is detached.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, a Mishna says that the shell of a pomegranate has a din of a shell for orlah purposes, although we know that it falls off before it is detached from the ground like a tzlaf!? **A: Rava** answered, a pomegranate shell remains on the fruit until it is ripe and is therefore considered a shell for purposes of orlah. A tzlaf shell falls off before ripening and that is why it is not considered a shell for purposes of orlah.
- **Q: R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** says a shell of a date is assur for orlah even though it falls off before ripening?! **A: R' Nachman** holds like **R' Yose** of a Mishna, that an unripe date is considered to be a fruit (and its shell is therefore a shell of a fruit for orlah purposes). **Rava** holds like the **Rabanan** that unripe fruits are not considered fruit for orlah purposes.
- **Q: R' Simi of Neharda'ah** asked, the **Rabanan** only argue with **R' Yose** about unripe grapes, but agree that other unripe fruits are “fruit” for orlah, meaning that their shells would be “shells”, and would therefore prohibit the tzlaf shells?! **A: Rava** says a shell is assur only if the fruit can't survive without it. A tzlaf berry can live without the shell, and the shell is therefore not assur as orlah in chutz la'aretz.
- With regard to the bracha for eating pepper (the spice) – **R' Sheishes** says one makes a shehakol. **Rava** says no bracha at all is made (it is not fit to be eaten and therefore one would not even be chayuv for eating it on Yom Kippur).
  - **Q: A Braisa** says that **R' Meir** says that a pepper tree is chayuv is orlah. This means it is a fruit which is fit to eat and surely needs a bracha?! **A: When moist** it is fit to eat (which is what the Braisa is referring to), and when dry it is not fit to eat (which is what **Rava** is referring to).
    - This same answer can be given to a similar question regarding ginger.
- With regard to the bracha for eating a mixture of flour, honey and oil (“chavitz”) and “daisa” which is made in a similar fashion (mixed and cooked with a lot of honey), **R' Yehuda** says one makes a shehakol (the honey is the main ingredient) **R' Kahana** says he makes a borei minei mezonos (flour is the main ingredient).
  - **R' Yosef** says that **R' Kahana's** shita seems to be correct, because **Rav and Shmuel** both say that any mixture which contains one of the 5 grains requires the making of a borei minei mezonos.

### -----Daf י"ז---37-----

- In one place **Rav and Shmuel** say that any food containing (“kol sheyesh bo”) something of the 5 grains requires a mezonos. In another place they say that any food that is of (“kol shehu”) the 5 grains requires a mezonos. Both statements are necessary. If they would just say “kol shehu” we would say a mezonos is necessary only when the pieces are noticeable, but not in a true mixture. If they would just say “kol sheyesh bo”, we would think that a mixture is mezonos only if it has from the 5 grains, but rice and “dochan” when not in a mixture need mezonos also. They say “kol shehu” to teach that only the 5 grains need a mezonos, not rice and “dochan”.
  - **Q: A Braisa** says that rice and dochan bread need a bracha before and after like a stew made out of the 5 grains. Presumably that means a mezonos and an ahl hamichya!? **A: The Braisa** means that they are like a stew of the 5 grains in that they need a bracha before and after, however the brachos are a shehakol and a borei nifashos.
    - **Q: A Braisa** says that rice is exactly like a stew of the 5 grains? **A: That follows R' Yochanan ben Nuri** who says that rice is a true grain and rice bread needs hamotzi and birchas hamazon.
    - **Q: A Braisa** says that rice bread that is cooked and still in large pieces needs mezonos and ahl hamichya. That can't follow **R' Yochanan ben Nuri**, because he would say to make hamotzi and birchas hamazon. It must be the **Rabanan** who say rice needs a mezonos and ahl hamichya!?  
**TEYUFTA of Rav and Shmuel!**
- A Braisa says, if one chews wheat kernels he needs to make a borei pri ha'adamah. Although another Braisa says he must make a “borei minei zera'im”, that Braisa follows **R' Yehuda** who says in our Mishna that one must make more specific brachos.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** One Braisa says that rice bread that is cooked and still has large pieces requires a mezonos and an ahl hamichya. However, another Braisa says one makes a Borei Nefashos!? **A: R' Sheishes** said, the first Braisa follows **R' Gamliel** and the second Braisa follows the **Rabanan**, as we see that they argue about this in a Braisa.
  - **Q:** The end of that first Braisa says that if there is a mixture which includes wheat bread and there are no pieces visible in it, it requires a mezonos and an ahl hamichya. The problem is that **R' Gamliel** would hold that in such a case birchas hamazon would have to be said!? **A:** Rather, we must say that the first Braisa follows the **Rabanan**, and change the words so that in the beginning it says that one who eats rice makes a borei nefashos.
- At first **Rava** said, the “rihata” (mixture of flour, honey and oil) of the villagers needs a mezonos because the flour is the main ingredient. The rihata of the city people needs a shehakol because the honey is the main ingredient. **Rava** then decided that both kinds need a mezonos because **Rav and Shmuel** said that anything containing the 5 grains needs a mezonos.
- **Rav Yosef** said, “chavitza” – a mixture with kezayis size pieces of bread needs a hamotzi and bentching. If the pieces are smaller than a kezayis, it needs a mezonos and ahl hamichya. **R' Yosef** brings a proof from a Braisa that says that a Kohen makes a hamotzi on a korban mincha, which is broken into kezayis size pieces and mixed with oil.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, if that’s true, then according to **R' Yishmael** who says that the mincha is broken back to flour one should not make a hamotzi. That can’t be correct, because a Braisa says that one may use this mincha made of pieces each less than a kezayis for his matza on pesach!? This means it is bread and needs a hamotzi, not like **R' Yosef** said!? **A:** The Braisa means that it can be used for matzah only if it is kneaded back together to a kezayis sized piece.
    - **Q:** The verbiage of the Braisa suggests that it can be used for matzah even in its broken state, without kneading it back together!? **A:** Rather, one can be yotze with smaller pieces if they are broken from a piece that is larger than a kezayis which is still intact at the time of the bracha. It is only then that the smaller pieces are classified as bread even though they are smaller than a kezayis.
    - With regard to how we pasken on this issue, **Rav Sheishes** paskens that chavitza needs hamotzi and bentching even if the pieces of bread are smaller than a kezayis. **Rava** agrees as long as the pieces still look like bread.
- If one makes “Trokanin”, some say there is a chiyuv challah, but **Ravin in the name of R' Yochanan** said there is not. **Abaye** explains that Trokanin is bread made by pouring a flour-water batter into a hole in the oven floor and letting it bake.
  - **Abaye** says that “Trisah” is patur from challah. Some explain that “Trisah” is a flour-water batter that is poured onto the stovetop, some explain it to be bread of “Hindika”, and others say it is bread made for “kutach” (a dairy dip) which is baked in the sun.
- **R' Chiya** taught a Braisa that says that kutach bread is patur from challah. Another Braisa says it is chayuv in challah. **R' Yehuda** explains in the second Braisa that if it is made in the shape of bread, it is chayuv. If not, it is patur.

### -----Daf פל 38-----

- 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’eitz 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.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- 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’etz and an “ahl ha’etz”.
      - 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

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.

-----Daf 77-----39-----

- **Q:** Maybe we can say that the question of what bracha to make on cooked vegetables is a actually a machlokes between Tanna'im, in the following story. **Bar Kappara** had cooked vegetables and bird meat in front of him and asked a talmid to choose one and make a bracha. The talmid chose the bird meat. A second talmid laughed. **Bar Kappara** was angry at each of them: at the one who laughed and assumed the first talmid was wrong for choosing the meat, he said that maybe the talmid wanted the meat more and therefore made a bracha on it first; at the one who made the bracha, he said that he should have asked **Bar Kappara** which item and bracha should be eaten and made first. Maybe the first talmid held that cooked vegetables are a shehakol, and since all the brachos were the same he chose to make the bracha on the item that he liked most, whereas the second talmid held that cooked vegetables are a ha'adama, and he therefore felt that the vegetables should be eaten before the meat because of the more prestigious bracha of ha'adama, which is why he laughed? **A:** It could be that all hold that cooked vegetables are a shehakol. The basis of the argument is whether we choose the item for the bracha based on personal preference, or we choose the cabbage since that is something that totally satisfies a person.
- With regard to the proper bracha to make on turnip heads – **R' Huna** says if it is cut into large pieces one makes a ha'adama and if it is cut into small pieces one makes a shehakol. **R' Yehuda** says, in either case he makes a ha'adama, because cutting it into small pieces enhances its taste and therefore is not a reason for it to lose its bracha.
  - **R' Ashi** said that **R' Kahana** originally said that beet stew is a ha'adama because very little flour is added to it, whereas turnip stew is a mezonos because a lot of flour is added to it. He then said they are both ha'adama, because the flour is only added for bonding purposes.
    - **R' Chisda** said, beet stew is good for the heart, the eyes and for digestion. **Abaye** said, that is only when the beets are thoroughly cooked.
  - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, beet soup, turnip soup and all vegetable soups are ha'adama. What about dill in an otherwise shehakol stew? If dill is there for flavor it is ha'adama, but if it is there to take away the odor of the stew, the bracha on the stew should remain a shehakol, so what is the halacha? **A:** The Gemara brings a Mishna which says, that after dill of terumah has "*imparted its flavor*" into a dish, it no longer has the status of terumah. From the verbiage we see that dill is used to impart flavor, and therefore its use would require a ha'adama.
- **R' Chiya bar Ashi** says that a hamotzi can be made on small pieces of bread even if a whole loaf is available to him. **R' Chiya** said the bracha should be made on a complete loaf and the loaf should be broken during the bracha. **Rava** agrees with **R' Chiya** but says the loaf should be broken after the bracha is completed. The Gemara paskens like **Rava**.
- **R' Huna** says that a complete loaf is not important. Rather, it's the size of the bread that is important in deciding on what to make the bracha. **R' Yochanan** says a complete loaf is best for the bracha. However, all would agree that if the loaf is of barley bread and there is a piece of wheat bread (wheat is superior quality) one makes the bracha on the piece of wheat bread.
  - **R' Yirmiya bar Abba** said we can say this is a machlokes among Tanna'im regarding terumah, where there is a machlokes if one should rather give the terumah from a piece of a larger onion or from a whole smaller onion. The Gemara says this is not a valid comparison, because in that case all would agree that if a Kohen is present and there is no concern that the onion would spoil, he should give from the piece of the more prestigious onion. The machlokes there is only when there is no Kohen present,

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

and the machlokes is whether we should give from the most prestigious or from the one with the longer shelf-life.

- **Mar brei D'Ravina**, when he had a loaf and a larger piece (exact point of machlokes), he would hold both together and break the loaf, in this way following both shitas (looking like he is eating from the broken piece, but in actuality eating from the whole loaf).
  - A Braisa says to do this as well.
  - **R' Pappa** said, on Pesach this should for sure be done because that is proper for “lechem oni”, to eat as a poor person – eating the broken pieces before the whole.
- **R' Abba** said, on Shabbos we use 2 whole loaves, based on the pasuk that says “Lechem Mishneh”. **R' Ashi** said that **R' Kahana** would only break one of the loaves after making the bracha on both. **R' Zeira** would cut a piece large enough for what he would need for the entire meal. **R' Ami and R' Assi** would use the bread that was used for the eruv chatzeiros – they explain that since it was used for a mitzvah they wanted to use it for another mitzvah as well.
- One may not speak between making the hamotzi and eating the bread. If after the bracha but before eating the bread one said to the people at the table “take some bread”, **Rav** says that is not a hefsek, but if he said “bring salt or dips for the bread” it is a hefsek, **R' Yochanan** says even that is not a hefsek. If he said “prepare the food for the animals” it is a hefsek. **R' Sheishes** says it is not a hefsek because one must feed his animals before eating himself (therefore feeding the animals is considered necessary for the bracha since he may not eat until his animals are fed).

### -----Daf 40-----

- **Rava bar Shmuel in the name of R' Chiya** said, the one making the hamotzi should not do so until all those who are being yotzeh with his bracha have salt or dip in front of them.
- When making the bracha at the house of the Reish Galusa. **Rava bar Shmuel** did not wait. He explained that the superiority of that bread obviated the need for salt or dip.
  - **Rava bar Shmuel in the name of R' Chiya** also said, one totally empties his bladder of urine only when he urinates while sitting (when standing he doesn't allow his bladder to empty for fear that the urine may bounce off the ground onto himself as the stream gets closer). **R' Kahana** said, if one urinates onto loose dirt where there is no fear of the urine bouncing back, he empties his bladder even while standing. If one doesn't have loose earth he can urinate off a cliff where there would be no fear of bounce back as well.
  - **Rava bar Shmuel in the name of R' Chiya** also said, for health purposes one should eat salt after all foods and drink water after all drinks. Not eating salt after foods and not drinking water after drinking causes bad breath during the day and causes the disease called “askarah” at night.
  - A Braisa says, one should have his food “float in water” (i.e. drink a lot after eating) to prevent intestinal diseases
  - **R' Mari in the name of R' Yochanan** said, eating lentils once every 30 days prevents the askarah disease. Eating it every day causes bad breath.
  - **R' Mari in the name of R' Yochanan** also said, eating mustard once every 30 days prevents diseases. Eating it every day causes faintness of the heart.
  - **R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav** said, one who regularly eats small fish will not have to deal with any intestinal sicknesses and will generally have a healthy body.
  - **R' Chama the son of R' Chanina** said, one who regularly eats “ketzach” (a seed grown in the Arab countries) will be prevented from suffering heart pains. However, a Braisa says that the smell of ketzach is very harmful.

R' YEHUDA OMER BOREI MINEI DISHA'IM

- **R' Zeira** or **R' Chinina bar Pappa** said, we do not pasken like **R' Yehuda**. He then explained that **R' Yehuda's** view is based on the pasuk “Baruch Hashem Yom Yom”.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Zeira** or **R' Chinina bar Pappa** also said, the ways of humans are different than those of Hashem. People can only fill empty containers, not full ones. Hashem fills the people who are already full of Torah with even more Torah, but the ones who don't learn Torah are not filled with Torah until they themselves begin to learn.

### MISHNA

- If one makes a ha'adama on fruits of the tree he is yotzeh. If he makes a ha'eitz on things that grow from the ground, he is not yotzeh. If he made a shehakol on anything he is yotzeh.

### GEMARA

- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said that **R' Yehuda** is the Tanna of our Mishna who holds that the fruit of the tree is considered to come from the ground, because by bikkurim **R' Yehuda** says that although the tree had been chopped down after the fruit was picked, one may still say "Min ha'adama asher nasata li". The fruit is from the ground and the tree is just a means for delivery of that fruit.

### AHL PEIROS HAARETZ

- **Q:** It is obvious that one won't be yotzeh if he makes a ha'eitz on things that grow from the ground!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said this halacha is necessary according to **R' Yehuda** who says that the "Eitz Hada'as" was wheat, so wheat is called a "tree". One would therefore think a ha'eitz can be made. The Mishna therefore teaches that a ha'eitz is only made on a fruit that comes from a branch that will produce more fruit in the future. If the branch will not produce more fruit after this fruit is picked, the bracha on the fruit is a ha'adama.

### V' AHL KULAN IHM AMAR SHEHAKOL...

- **R' Huna** says shehakol will not suffice for bread and wine. **R' Yochanan** says it even suffices for bread and wine.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can say that this machlokes is the same as a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, if someone says, "This bread is beautiful, blessed is Hashem who created it", **R' Meir** says he is yotzeh, **R' Yose** says he is not yotzeh because he changed from the Chachomim's prescribed bracha. Maybe we can say that **R' Huna** holds like **R' Yose** and **R' Yochanan** holds like **R' Meir**? **A:** It may be that **R' Meir** allows it there only because the word bread was mentioned, but he would agree that a shehakol would not be sufficient. Also, it may be that **R' Yose** disallows it there because this person made up his own bracha, but a shehakol (which is a bracha instituted by Chazal) may be sufficient.
- Binyamin the shepherd ate bread and said "Blessed is the Master of this bread". **Rav** said he was yotzeh (although it was his own form of bracha).
  - **Q: Rav** says that a bracha must mention "Hashem" to be considered a valid bracha!? **A:** Binyamin said "Blessed is Hashem, the Master of this bread".
  - When he said he is yotzeh, he meant for the bracha before eating. Obviously, he would have to say birchas hamazon as well.
  - Although we already learned that one may make a bracha in any language, the chiddush is that it does not even have to be in the exact form that Chazal instituted the bracha.
  - **Rav** says that a bracha must mention "Hashem" to be considered a valid bracha. **R' Yochanan** says a bracha must mention "Melech Ha'olam" to be considered a valid bracha.

### MISHNA

- A shehakol is said on things that don't grow from the ground, including vinegar, "novlos", and grasshoppers. **R' Yehuda** says one does not make a bracha on things which are considered a curse.
- If one has a choice of a number of food items on which to make a bracha, **R' Yehuda** says he should choose one of the shivas haminim on which to make the bracha. The **Chachomim** say he chooses whichever he prefers.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says that one makes a shehakol on mushrooms, because they don't grow from the ground. Another Braisa says that if someone swears not to have hana'ah from things that grow from the ground he cannot eat mushrooms!? **A: Abaye** said, they grow from the ground, but do not nourish from the ground. The first Braisa should be changed to say they don't "nourish" from the ground.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## V' AHL HANOVLOS

- **Q:** What are “novlos”? **A: R' Zeira and R' Ila'a** argue – one says they are dates burned by the sun and the other says they are dates blown off the tree by the wind.
  - **Q:** Sun burned dates should be a shehakol because they changed for the worse, but wind-blown dates are not changed for the worse, so why not make a ha'eitz? **A:** Obviously our Mishna refers to sun burned dates. The machlokes regarding novlos refers to the term “novlos temarah” used in a Mishna is Mesechta Demai.

## -----Daf 41-----

## HAYU LIFANAV MININ HARBEI...

- **Ulla** said, the machlokes in the Mishna is where the 2 items have the same bracha. In that case, **R' Yehuda** holds that if one is from the shivas haminim it has precedence and the **Rabanan** say that personal preference takes precedence. However, if the 2 items had different brachos, all would agree that a bracha must be said on each.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that if one has before him a radish and an olive he should make a bracha on the radish and need not then make a bracha on the olive!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to a case where the radish is the primary and the olive is secondary to it.
    - **Q:** The Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says he would make a bracha on the olive because it is of the shivas haminim. Now, does **R' Yehuda** not hold that when there is a primary and secondary a bracha is only made on the primary!? **A:** The Braisa is missing words. The machlokes in the Braisa was actually regarding a case where there were two items with the same bracha and the question is which item should the bracha be made on.
  - Others say the machlokes is even where the 2 items have different brachos, and although all agree that 2 brachos must be made, and **R' Yirmiya** explains that the machlokes would be which food gets its bracha made first. **R' Yehuda** says the shivas haminim bracha should come first and the **Rabanan** say that the food of personal preference should have the bracha made and be eaten first.
    - We see this concept of precedence from **R' Yosef** or **R' Yitzchak**, who says that the pasuk of “Eretz chita, u'seorah, v'gefen...” is teaching us a precedence order for brachos (e.g. if one wants to eat a raw kernel of wheat, which is a ha'adama, and a grape which is ha'etz, he would first eat the wheat because it is mentioned first in the pasuk).
    - This drasha of the pasuk to teach precedence argues on **R' Chanan**, who does not have the pasuk available to teach this precedence for brachos, because he says the pasuk lists the shivas haminim to teach us that each one is used as a measurement for some halacha:
      - Chita – achilas pras of wheat bread is the time one needs to be in a house with a negah to make his clothing tamei, Se'ora – a human bone fragment the size of a barley is metameh through touching and carrying, Gefen – the amount of solid grape product that a nazir must eat to be chayuv is equal to a revi'is of wine, T'eina – one is chayuv for carrying the size of a dried fig of food on Shabbos, Rimon – a hole the size of a rimon renders a keili useless even for regular users (as opposed to a merchant), Zeis Shemen – many shiurim are kezayis, D'vash – one who eats food the size of a date on Yom Kippur is chayuv.
      - **R' Yosef** or **R' Yitzchak** will say that these shiurim are an asmachta, and the main purpose of the pasuk is to give an order for precedence of brachos.
  - **R' Hamnuna** chose to eat dates before the rimon that was in front of him. **R' Chisda** asked, rimon comes first in the pasuk and accordingly the bracha should have been made on that?! **R' Hamnuna** responded that dates are closer to following the word “Eretz” than rimon (rimon is 5<sup>th</sup> and dates are 2<sup>nd</sup> after the pasuk's second mention of “Eretz”) and therefore have precedence.
- If one wants to eat fruit in middle of a meal in which he is eating bread, **R' Huna** and **R' Nachman** each say the fruit needs a bracha before but no bracha after (the bentching will cover that). **R' Sheishes** says that it needs a bracha before and after, because the only thing that gets a bracha before eating but not after eating is “pas habah b'kisnin” (cakes). **R' Chiya** says that it does not need a bracha before or after.



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Pappa** paskens: (1) something eaten as part of the seudah (e.g. to enhance the bread – Rashi) during the seudah, needs no bracha before or after; (2) food eaten during the meal to satisfy hunger (Rashi) but not needed for the bread (e.g. cabbage, beets) need a bracha before but not after; (3) food typically eaten after the meal (e.g. fruit – Rashi) that is eaten during the meal needs a bracha before and after.
- Talmidim asked **Ben Zomah**, if the hamotzi obviates the need to make another bracha on some items, why doesn't it obviate the need to make a hagafen on wine? He answered that wine always needs its own bracha because many brachos are made over wine (e.g. Kiddush, havdalah, brachos under the chuppah).
- **R' Huna** ate a large amount of “pas habah b'kisnin” (typically a mezonos and borei nefashos snack) and made a borei nefashos. **R' Nachman** told him, since most people would make a meal out of the amount that **R' Huna** just ate, he should bentch.
- **R' Yehuda** heard people making a hamotzi on pas habah b'kisnin and said one only makes a hamotzi on this when he is making a meal out of it, not if he's having it as a snack.

### -----Daf כג--42-----

- **R' Pappa** ate dessert after he had already finished eating his meal. They asked him, we have learned that one may not eat after finishing his meal unless he first bentches and makes a new bracha?! **R' Pappa** said, the ruling they are referring to says that one may not eat until after bentching only if all the food has already been removed from in front of him.
  - When **Rabbah** was a guest he ate dessert after the removal of the tables. He explained that as a guest, removal of tables does not signify the end of the meal, for the host may send more food.
  - **Rav** said, if one normally smears his hands with oil after the meal, his meal is not considered over until he smears the oil on his hands.
  - The Gemara paskens like **R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav**, who says that the meal ends when one washes mayim achronim.

#### MISHNA

- If one makes a bracha on the wine before the meal, he need not make a bracha on the wine that he drinks after the meal.
- If one makes a bracha on the appetizer before the meal, he need not make a bracha on the dessert that he eats after the meal (assuming they are of the same bracha).
- If one made a hamotzi he need not make a mezonos on dessert, however the making of a mezonos on an appetizer does not take away the need to make a hamotzi on the bread.
  - **Beis Shammai** say, it does not even remove the obligation to make a bracha on a mezonos dish (this will be explained in the Gemara).
- If the group is sitting, each person must make his own bracha. If the group is reclining, one person can make the bracha and all the others can be yotzeh.
- If wine is brought during the meal, each person must make his own bracha. If it's brought after the meal, one person can make the bracha for all others to be yotzeh.
  - The one who makes the bracha on the wine also makes the bracha on the besamim, even though they do not bring out the besamim until after the meal.

#### GEMARA

- **R' Yochanan and R' Yehoshua ben Levi** say that the bracha on the wine before the meal only helps for the wine after the meal on Shabbos and Yom Tov (or after letting blood or taking a bath), when he knew that he would be drinking wine after the meal. During any other meal he will need a new bracha for each cup that he drinks.
  - **Q:** If one made a bracha on wine he drank *during* the meal, does that obviate the need for a bracha on wine after the meal?! Maybe it should, as does wine before the meal, but maybe it shouldn't because during the meal one doesn't truly drink, he merely sips to help the food go down and therefore maybe

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the bracha won't help?! **A: Rav and R' Nachman** say it does make him patur from having to make another bracha, and **R' Kahana, R' Sheishes, R' Huna, R' Yehuda** and all the talmidim of **Rav** said it does not make him patur from making another bracha.

- **Q: Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, our Mishna said, on wine brought during the meal each person makes his own bracha, but after the meal one makes the bracha for the rest. From here we see that although a bracha was made during the meal, a bracha is again made after the meal!? **A: R' Nachman** said, the 2 cases are 2, independent cases. The second case is, that if no wine was brought during the meal a bracha must be made after.

BEIRACH AHL HAPAS...BEIS SHAMMAI OMRIM AHF LO MA'ASEH KEDEIRAH

- **Q: Is B" S** arguing on the earlier part of the Mishna where the **T" K** says that one who makes a bracha on the bread obviates the need for a bracha on the mezonos, and certainly obviates the need for a bracha on the mezonos dish, and on that **B" S** is saying that not only does the cake (parperes) need a mezonos, but even a mezonos dish needs a bracha after the bread as well; or is he arguing on the later part of the Mishna where the **T" K** says that if one makes a bracha on the cake he still needs a bracha on the bread, but wouldn't need a bracha on a mezonos dish, and on that **B" S** is saying that even a mezonos dish will need a bracha as well? **TEIKU**.

HAYU YOSHVIN KOL ECHAD V'ECHAD...

- **Q: The Mishna** says that if the group is reclining one can make the bracha for the rest, but if they are sitting each person must make his own bracha. However, a Braisa says, if 10 people are sitting (not reclining) and eating, even though they are not sharing their food, one may make the bracha for the rest!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the Braisa's case is talking about where the group said "Let's go eat in a certain place". Since they decided and stated so, it is just as good as reclining for purposes of making them a "group" for brachos.
  - After burying **Rav**, his talmidim decided to sit down together to eat in a certain place. They weren't sure if one was allowed to make the bracha for the rest because they weren't reclining. An old man came and taught them the contradiction between our Mishna and the Braisa (as stated above) and the answer we just gave. He then told them, since you said that you will sit at that place and eat together, it is just as if you had reclined together, and one of you could make the bracha for all the others.