

Chapter Six

Mishnah על פירות – In what manner^[1] does one recite the blessing on fruits?^[2] על פירות – בורא פרי העץ – *Blessed are You, Hashem, On the fruits of trees one says:* – האילן הוא אומר – *except for wine, חוץ מן היין* – *the One Who creates the fruit of the tree, one says:* – *the One Who creates the fruit of the vine.*^[4] – בורא פרי הנץ – *And on the fruits of the ground*^[5] one says: – *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground,*^[6] – חוץ מן הפת – *except for bread, בורא פרי הארץ* – *the One Who brings forth bread from the ground.*^[7] – ועל הירקות הוא אומר – *And on greens, too, one says:* – *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground.*^[8] – רבי יהודה אומר – *R' Yehudah says:* On greens one says: – בורא מיני – *the One Who creates species of herbage.*^[8]

Gemara The Gemara seeks a source for the Mishnah's underlying assumption that one must recite a blessing before eating:

דתנו רבנן – *From where are these things known?* – מנא הני מילי – *For the Rabbis taught in a Baraisa:* “קדש הלולים לה” – *The verse And in the fourth year all its fruit shall be HOLY FOR PRAISES TO HASHEM*^[9] – מלמד ששעונים ברכה לפנייהם ולאחריהם – *TEACHES THAT THEY REQUIRE A BLESSING BEFORE eating THEM AND AFTER eating THEM.*^[10] – מאן אמר רבי עקיבא – *BASED ON THIS, R' AKIVA SAID:* – אסור לאדם שיטעום כלום קודם שיברך – *IT IS FORBIDDEN FOR A PERSON TO TASTE ANYTHING BEFORE HE RECITES A BLESSING.*^[11]

The Gemara challenges the use of this verse as a source for reciting a blessing on foods:

– *But does this expression קדש הלולים* – והאי, קדש הלולים – *holy for praises come to teach this law* (that a blessing is required before and after eating)? – *Why, this double expression (hillulim) is needed to teach other laws, as follows:* – חור דאמר רחמנא אחליה ודור אכליה – *One expression of hillul*^[12] is needed to indicate that the Merciful One says regarding the fruit of the fourth year: *Deconsecrate it and then eat it.*^[13] – ואידך – *And the other expression of hillul is needed to teach that דבר השעון שירה טעון חלול* – *only something that requires song*^[14] requires deconsecration, ושאינו טעון שירה

NOTES

1. The word כיצד is a contraction of באי זה צד, *in what manner* (Rambam, *Commentary to the Mishnah*).

2. The Mishnah's question seems to assume prior knowledge of the fundamental requirement to recite a blessing before partaking of a food. The Rishonim suggest that this fundamental requirement has indeed already been alluded to in the Mishnah above, 11a and 20b (see *Tosafos* and *Rabbeinu Yonah*).

3. All blessings begin with the clause: *Blessed are You, Hashem, our God, King of the universe* [there is an Amoraic dispute below, 40b, whether the words “King of the universe” are essential]. Our Mishnah, which details the different blessings recited for different foods, omits this opening clause because it is common to all blessings (Rambam, *Commentary to the Mishnah*; see also *Magen Avraham* 215:5 with *Machatzis HaShekel*).

4. Because of wine's special importance, the Sages instituted a separate blessing for it (*Rashi*).

5. I.e. those which grow from the ground but are not “fruit of the trees” (see Gemara below, 40a-b).

6. [The Hebrew words ארץ and ארקה both mean *ground*. In Mishnaic Hebrew, however, the word ארקה refers almost exclusively to *soil* (the material) rather than to the ground itself, which the Mishnah generally calls ארץ. Thus, the Mishnah states that “on the fruits of the aretz” (the Mishnaic word for *the ground*), one says the blessing: the One Who creates the fruits of the *adamah* (the Scriptural word for *the ground* – at least in the expression “fruit of the ground” – as in *Deuteronomy* 26:2 and *Genesis* 4:3). For the *Mishnah* refers to the fruits of the ground in its own style of Hebrew, whereas the *blessings* are formulated according to the Biblical expression for “fruits of the ground” (see *Tos. Anshei Shem*; see also *Meiri* and *Ritva*; cf. *Shenos Eliyahu*).]

7. As in the case of wine, the Rabbis instituted a separate blessing for bread, because of its special importance (*Rashi*).

[In this case, the blessing employs the word ארץ for *ground*, following the Scriptural precedent of the verse (*Psalms* 104:14): לְרוּצִיָּא לֶחֶם, *to bring forth bread from the ground* (*Ritva*; see also *Meiri*).]

[The commentators discuss why the Mishnah does not also mention the exclusion of those grain products whose blessing is *the One Who creates species of sustenance* (see *Pnei Yehoshua* and *Sifsei Chachamim* here, and *Tzalach* to 35b אומר שמאל 35b).]

8. R' Yehudah requires a higher degree of specificity with regard to blessings. Thus, he considers the blessing *the One Who creates the fruits of the ground* inappropriate for “herbage” (such as cabbage and other

greens, in whose cases the plant itself is eaten as food) and for “seeds” (such as grains, legumes and the like, whose seeds are eaten, rather than the plant itself). Thus, he rules that the specific blessing *the One Who creates species of herbage* is recited on greens (see *Rashi*). [Similarly, he rules (as taught by a Baraisa below) that a specific blessing – בורא מיני, *the One Who creates species of seeds* – is recited on the “seeds” subgroup (see below, 37a, with *Rashi* ירדוהו רבי יהודה).]

[R' Yehudah agrees, however, that the blessing *the One Who creates “the fruits” of the ground* is indeed the specific and appropriate blessing for “fruits” of the ground, such as turnips, gourds and melons (see *Meiri*, *Ramban*; see also *Meromei Sadeh* here; cf. *Shaagas Aryeh* §23).]

9. *Leviticus* 19:24. The preceding verse states that when one plants any tree which bears edible fruit, the fruits grown during the first three years are prohibited. [These forbidden fruits of the first three years are known as *orlah*.] The present verse then states that the fruits of the fourth year (*revai*) are to be *holy* [i.e. eaten in Jerusalem in the manner of *maaser sheni* – see *Tosafos*, who cite the derivation] for *praises to Hashem*. This last expression indicates that the eating of these fourth-year fruits occasions two statements of praise (i.e. blessings) to Hashem (see *Rashi*).

10. The “praises to Hashem” mentioned in the verse are the blessings occasioned by the eating of the tree's fruits, which is permitted on this year (see *Rashi*).

11. R' Akiva adds that from the Torah's prescription for reciting blessings when eating the fourth-year fruits, we can extrapolate that the eating of *all* foods occasions the recitation of blessings [see Gemara below] (*Peirush HaRashbatz*; cf. *Tzalach*).

12. The expression *hillulim* (plural) is expounded as if the word *hillul* (singular) is written twice.

13. The Hebrew letters ה and ח are similar [in both form and pronunciation] and are therefore interchangeable for purposes of exposition. The expression הליל, *praise*, can therefore be expounded as חלול, *deconsecration*. This comes to teach that if one chooses to eat the fruits of the fourth year outside of Jerusalem, he must [as in the case of *maaser sheni*] first redeem the fruits by deconsecrating them onto money (see *Rashi*, and *Yerushalmi*, *Pe'ah* 7:5, cited here by *Gilyon HaShas*; cf. *Rashba*). [And – as in the case of the redemption money of *maaser sheni* – the money is brought to Jerusalem, where one uses it to buy foods to be eaten there (*Rambam*, *Hil. Maaser Sheni* 9:4).]

14. The reference is to the psalms sung by the Leviim in the Temple during the sacrificial service (see below).

בכעון זה חולץ קלס ע"כ
ע"כ: תוס' ד"ה ולמאן
נ"י שיה מרובה. וכן כח
רבינו יצחק ונא"ס וחמשה
י כיון דלמאן חולץ
חולץ מחמשה ליבני חולץ
על דבר שחלץ טרסה ונ"ס:

אצל חכם ילך אצל חכם מאי
ות כדי שלא יבא לידי מעילה
מים שנא' לה' הארץ ומלאה
דם לא קשיא כאן קודם ברכה
כאן

but something that does not require song does not require deconsecration. That is, the sanctity of the fourth-year fruits applies only to grapes, which are the only fruits over which the Leviim in the Temple sing songs of praise to God.^[15] And this is as stated by R' Shmuel bar Nachmani in the name of R' Yonasan; שמואל בר נחמני אמר רבי יונתן מנין שאין אומרים שירה אלא על – From where do we know that we [i.e. the Leviim in the Temple] do not utter song^[16] except over wine? שניאמר – For it is stated: *And the vine said to them: "Shall I withhold my wine which gladdens God and men?"*^[17] – Now, if we indeed understand that [wine] gladdens men, in what way does it gladden God? מנין שאין אומרים שירה אלא על – From here we derive that we [the Leviim in the Temple] do not utter songs of praise to God except over wine.^[18] Thus, the two *hillul* expressions are needed for something else! How can one be used to teach the blessing requirement?

The Gemara narrows the scope of its challenge:

Now, this word *hillulim* is an acceptable source for the blessing on foods according to the one who teaches the Mishnaic texts that deal with the fourth-year fruits as reading THE FOURTH-YEAR fruit of a SAPLING,^[19] and whose view, therefore, is that the law of the fourth-year fruit applies to all fruit trees. Obviously, he does not expound the word *hillulim* as teaching that this law applies only to “something that requires song” (i.e. the vineyard); thus, there is one “*hillul*” available to teach that a blessing must be recited on food.^[20] But according to the one who teaches these Mishnaic texts as reading: THE FOURTH-YEAR fruit of a VINEYARD, and whose view, therefore, is that the law of the fourth-year fruit applies only to the fruits of the vine – something he apparently derives from the word *hillulim*^[21] – what is there to say? Neither of the two mentions of *hillul* is available to teach the requirement to recite a blessing on food!^[22] The Gemara now documents the different readings of the

Mishnaic texts referred to above: For it was stated: R' Chiya and R' Shimon the son of Rebbi teach different versions of the Mishnaic texts regarding the law of the fourth-year fruit: One teaches the texts as reading: THE FOURTH-YEAR fruits of a VINEYARD, whereas one teaches the texts as reading: THE FOURTH-YEAR fruits of a SAPLING.

The Gemara further narrows the scope of its challenge: And even according to the one who teaches the Mishnaic texts as reading: THE FOURTH-YEAR fruits of a VINEYARD, this word *hillulim* is still an acceptable source for the blessing on foods, if he derives that the law of the fourth-year fruit is limited to the fruit of the vine through the *gezeirah shavah* detailed in the following Baraisa: For it was taught in a Baraisa: REBBI SAYS: IT IS STATED HERE, regarding the fruits of the fourth year: TO INCREASE FOR YOU ITS “PRODUCE,”^[23] AND IT IS STATED THERE, in the passage regarding mixed species in a vineyard: AND THE “PRODUCE” OF THE VINEYARD.^[24] JUST AS THERE, “produce” refers specifically to the fruit of A VINEYARD, SO TOO HERE, in the passage concerning the fourth-year fruit, “produce” refers specifically to the fruit of A VINEYARD. According to this opinion, one mention of *hillul* remains available to teach about the blessing on food. But if he does not derive it through a *gezeirah shavah* but rather through expounding the word *hillul* to indicate that “only something that requires song requires deconsecration,”^[25] from where is the requirement to recite a blessing on food known to him?^[26]

The Gemara reconsiders its last narrowing of the scope of the challenge:

And even if he does derive that the law of the fourth-year fruit applies only to grapes through a *gezeirah shavah*, leaving one *hillul* available to teach the law of blessings,^[28] granted that we have found a source for the blessing recited after eating [the food],^[29] –

NOTES

15. The Scriptural songs recited during the offering of the [communal] sacrifices on the Altar were sung only while the wine libations, which accompanied the sacrifices, were poured on the Altar [as the Gemara will soon derive from Scripture] (see *Rashi* here, and *Tamid* 33b; see also *Tosafos* here). By stating the expression *hillul*, praise, with regard to the fourth-year fruits, the Torah indicates that [although the *orlah* restrictions mentioned in the previous verse apply to the fruits of all trees (see *Baal HaMaor* here, folio 26b; cf. *Rashi* to *Sotah* 43b) – viz. the fruits of the vineyard (see *Rashi*). [The fruits of other trees, however, are permitted for consumption unreservedly in the fourth year.]

16. See preceding note.

17. *Judges* 9:13. This verse is part of a parable in which the trees of the forest ask the vine to serve as their king. The vine declines, for as a king he would have to stop working to produce his wine, which gladdens both God and man.

18. The “gladdening of God” (so to speak) mentioned in the verse is an allusion to the praises sung by the Leviim when the wine libation is poured on the Altar.

19. The Gemara below cites a dispute regarding the text of the Mishnahs dealing with the laws of the fourth-year fruits. According to some, the texts of all the these Mishnahs read רבי רבי, the fourth-year vineyard. According to this reading, the law of the fourth-year fruits applies only to grapes. According to others, the texts of all the Mishnahs read נטע רבי, the fourth-year sapling. According to this reading, the law of the fourth-year fruits applies to the fruits of all trees (see *Rashi*

here, and below חר חר תני).

20. [He agrees, though, that the other mention of “*hillul*” (see above, note 12) is needed to teach the law of deconsecration. And though the extra mention of *hillul* apparently indicates only one of the two blessings occasioned by eating, the Gemara below will explain how the second blessing, too, can be derived from a single mention of *hillul*, without the need for a second such expression. See, however, references cited at end of note 30.]

21. As above, note 15.

22. For one mention of *hillul* is needed to teach “deconsecrate and then eat,” and the other is needed to teach that the *revai* laws apply only to grapes.

23. *Leviticus* 19:25.

24. *Deuteronomy* 22:9.

25. For if he derives that *revai* applies specifically to grapes from the *gezeirah shavah*, he does not have to derive it again from the word *hillul*.

26. [It was known that some adherents of the view that the law of fourth-year fruit applies only to grapes derived this from the word *hillul*, for this exposition is cited by the Gemara above in the initial part of its challenge.]

27. See above, note 22.

28. We just said above that according to this view there was no difficulty. But the matter is not quite so simple, as the Gemara proceeds to point out.

29. If we have only one *hillul* available to teach about only one blessing on food, we will apply it to the blessing after eating, since this is the type of blessing found elsewhere in the Torah – namely, with regard to the blessing after meals, where the Torah states (*Deuteronomy* 8:10): And

but **from where** do we know that a blessing must be recited **before** eating it?^[30]

The Gemara addresses the last question:

הא לא קשיא – This is not a difficulty, **דאיתא בקל וחומר – for** once we know that a blessing must be recited afterwards, it can be derived through the following *kal vachomer* that a blessing must be recited beforehand as well: **בשהוא שבע מכרר – For if when he is satiated, he recites a blessing,** **הוא לא קשיא – is it not certain** that he must do so **when he is hungry?**^[31] The Gemara thus defends its assertion that *hillul* is an acceptable source for the blessings on food even according to the one who teaches “the fourth-year vineyard” but derives it through a *gezeirah shavah*.

Still, the Gemara objects to this assertion:

אשכחן ברים – Granted that we have found a source for reciting a blessing before and after eating the fruits of the vineyard,^[32] **שאז מיניו מנין – but from where** do we know that a blessing must be recited when eating other species as well?

The Gemara answers:

דיליף מכרם – For one derives it from the requirement found with regard to the vineyard, as follows: **מה ברים דבר שנהנה וטעון ברכה – Just as the fruit of the vineyard is something from which one derives benefit and the law is that it requires a blessing when partaking of it and deriving the benefit (as derived from the word *hillul*),** **אף כל דבר שנהנה טעון ברכה – so too, any other thing from which one derives benefit requires a blessing when partaking of it and deriving the benefit.**^[33]

The Gemara objects:

איכא למפרך – It is possible to refute this extending of the law, as follows: **מה לברם שכן חייב בעוללות – What comparison can you make to a vineyard, which is unique in that it is subject to the obligation of *oleilos*?**^[34]

The Gemara answers:

קמה תוכיה – Let standing grain demonstrate that the obligation to recite a blessing is not tied to the law of *oleilos*.^[35]

The Gemara objects:

מה לקמה שכן חייבת בחלה – What comparison can you make to standing grain, which is subject to the obligation of *challah*?^[36]

The Gemara answers:

ברם יוכיח – Let the vineyard demonstrate that the obligation to recite a blessing is not tied to the law of *challah*.^[37] **והדר הדין – And the argument repeats.**^[38] **לא ראי זה כראי זה – In the final analysis, the nature of this one is not like the nature of that one,** **ולא ראי זה כראי זה – and the nature of this one is not like the nature of that one.**^[39] **הצד השוה שבהן דבר שנהנה וטעון ברכה – Their common characteristic is that it is something from which one derives benefit and it requires a blessing when partaking of it.** **אף כל דבר שנהנה טעון ברכה – So too, any other thing from which one derives benefit requires a blessing when partaking of it.**

The Gemara still objects:

מה להצד השוה שבהן שכן יש בו צד מובהק – What comparison can you make to the stated cases sharing the common characteristic, each of which has in it an Altar aspect?^[40] **ואתי נמי דאית ביה – And though an olive would also come within the scope**

NOTES

you will eat and be satiated and bless Hashem your God . . . (see Rashi; see also note 35 below).

30. Thus, the Gemara challenges the assertion that *hillulim* is an acceptable source for the blessings recited both before and after eating according to the one who teaches “the fourth-year vineyard” but derives it through a *gezeirah shavah*. [The Gemara apparently could also have asked this question above, according to the one who teaches “the fourth-year sapling.” See *Tzalach*, who addresses this issue; see also *Hagahos R' Elazar Moshe Horowitz*.]

31. If when he is satiated he is commanded to recite a blessing to thank Hashem for his satiety [as derived from one mention of *hillul*], is it not certain that he must thank Hashem when he is about to assuage his hunger with a creation that Hashem has prepared for him? (Rashi below, 48b). [The Rishonim note that elsewhere the Gemara adopts an opposite line of reasoning – see *Tosafos*, *Rashba* and *Ritva*.]

32. Which is what the verse containing the word *hillul* refers to, according to this master, who teaches “the fourth-year vineyard.”

33. This type of derivation is called a *מצינו*, *mah matzinu* [literally: just as we find . . .]. In the absence of any contrary indication, a specific case mentioned in the verse is taken to be a model for all other cases having the same essential characteristics.

34. *Oleilos* are underdeveloped grape clusters like an עילל, *immature youth*], which the Torah commands the vineyard owner to leave for the poor (Leviticus 19:10). The Mishnah in *Pe'ah* (7:4) defines *oleilos* as grape clusters possessing neither a *kaseif* (shoulder) nor a *nateif* (drooping part), but which consist rather of a single row of grapes (Rashi).

[Rashi apparently understands “*kaseif*” and “*nateif*” in the manner of *Raavad* (to *Toras Kohanim* ad loc.), who explains that the developed cluster has secondary branches growing along the entire length of the central branch. At the top of the cluster, the high concentration of secondary branches causes the grapes to bulge outward like shoulders. Towards the bottom of the cluster, the secondary branches are less concentrated, so that the grapes droop down. Thus, the secondary branches toward the top of the cluster are called *kaseif* and those toward the bottom are called *nateif*. By defining *oleilos* as clusters with neither *kaseif* nor *nateif*, the Mishnah refers to a central branch that bears grapes without generating any secondary branches – neither towards the top nor towards the bottom. (See, however, commentators to *Pe'ah* ad loc. for several different explanations.)]

Once we have found a unique feature of grapes – viz. that they are subject to the mitzvah of *oleilos* – we can no longer derive the law that

other foods require a blessing by comparing them to grapes. For it may be that the Torah requires one to recite a blessing when eating grapes only because they are subject to the mitzvah of *oleilos*, but it does not require one to recite a blessing when eating other foods, which are not subject to the mitzvah of *oleilos*.

35. For there is no obligation of *oleilos* associated with standing grain, yet one must recite a blessing when eating bread [made from one of the five grains: wheat, barley, spelt, oats or rye], as it is written (Deuteronomy 8:9-10): *A land where you will eat bread without poverty . . . you will eat and be satiated and bless Hashem, your God* (see Rashi). Thus, we can derive the law concerning other foods from the law that bread (which is not subject to *oleilos*) requires a blessing.

[Perhaps, the Gemara here uses the expression *קמה*, *standing grain*, to refer to bread, because of the parallel discussion in *Bava Metzia* 87b, where *standing grain* is indeed the subject of the verse cited there.]

36. [*Challah* is the portion that must be separated and given to the Kohen from doughs made of the five species of grain (see *Numbers* 15:20, *Challah* 1:1).] Perhaps, the blessing the Torah mandates when one eats bread is related to the *challah* obligation, which does not apply to other foods. How, then, can we derive the blessing requirement with regard to other foods by comparing them to bread?

37. For a blessing is required when eating grapes, though they are not subject to the *challah* obligation.

38. I.e. you could object again that the case of the vineyard is unique in that it is subject to *oleilos* and thereby begin the cycle of arguments and counterarguments all over.

39. The expression “the nature of this one is not like the nature of that one” introduces the derivation of *צד השוה*, *tzad hashaveh*, the common characteristic. This derivation presumes that a law found in two contexts results from characteristics common to both rather than from characteristics unique to each. Therefore, once we isolate the characteristics common to the two contexts, we can conclude that any other context possessing these characteristics is also subject to the common law, even if this third context differs from the first two in regard to their unique features.

Thus, the Gemara will proceed to isolate the characteristics common to the two contexts in which the Torah states the requirement to recite a blessing when eating – the cases of vineyard and standing grain.

40. The vineyard yields wine for libations, and standing grain [i.e. wheat and sometimes barley] yields flour for meal offerings (Rashi). It might

לוי רמי כתיב לה' הארץ ומי

הן נקראות

of this law, since it too has an Altar aspect,^[41] the obligation to recite a blessing on foods that have no Altar aspect could still not be derived. – ? –

Before answering the objection, the Gemara digresses to question the challenger's last statement:

וזית מצד מוכנה אתי – But must an olive come within the scope of this law only through its sharing the common feature of having an Altar aspect?^[42] וְהָאֵלֶּיךָ בְּהֵרֵיָא בְּתֵיבָא בִּיהַּ כֶּרֶם – Why, the term *kerem* is explicitly written with regard to [the olive], דְּבִתֵּיב – as it is written: And he burned from the the piles of produce to the standing grain to the olive *kerem* (grove).^[43] – ? –

The Gemara replies:

כֶּרֶם זֵית אֶקְרִי כֶּרֶם סְתָמָא לֹא – Rav Pappa said: אָמַר רַב פָּפָא – It [an olive grove] is called *kerem zayis*, but it is not called simply *kerem*, unmodified.^[44]

Its digression complete, the Gemara returns to address the original question:

מַה לְהֵצֵר – In any event, it remains difficult: מִכָּל מְקוֹם קִשְׁיָא – What comparison can you make to the stated cases sharing the common characteristic, which have an Altar aspect to them? How, then, do we derive the obligation to recite a blessing on foods that do not have an Altar aspect?

The Gemara therefore suggests a different derivation for the requirement to recite a blessing when eating food:

אֵלֶּיךָ דְּלִיף לָהּ מִשְׁבַּעַת הַמִּינִין – Rather, one derives it from the requirement to recite a blessing when eating one of the seven species.^[45] מַה שְּׁבַעַת הַמִּינִין דְּכִר שְׁנֵהֶנָּה וְטַעַן בְּרַכָּה – Just as each of the seven species is something from which one derives benefit and the law is that it requires a blessing when partaking of it and deriving the benefit,^[46] אִף כָּל דְּכִר שְׁנֵהֶנָּה טַעַן – so too, any other thing from which one derives benefit requires a blessing when partaking of it and deriving the benefit.

The Gemara seeks to refute the above analogy:

מַה לְשַׁבַּעַת הַמִּינִין שְׁכֵן חֵיבִין בְּבִכּוּרִים – What comparison can you make to the seven species, which are subject to the obligation of *bikkurim*?^[47] וְעוֹד – And furthermore, even if we could

compare other foods to the seven species, הַתִּינָה לֹא תִּתְּנֵי – granted that this would be an acceptable source for reciting a blessing after eating [the food], which is the only blessing stated by the Torah with regard to the seven species, לְפָנֵינוּ מִינִין – but from where would we know that a blessing must be recited before eating [the food]?

The Gemara answers the “furthermore” question (in the same way it answered an identical question above):^[48]

דִּאתֵיָא בְּקַל – This, in itself, is not a difficulty, הָא לֹא קִשְׁיָא – for if it could be established that a blessing must be recited afterwards, it could be derived through the following *kal vachomer* that a blessing must be recited beforehand as well: כְּשֹׂהוּא שְׂבַעַת מְכַרְךָ – For if when he is satiated, he recites a blessing, כְּשֹׂהוּא רָעֵב לֹא כָּל שְׂכֵן – is it not certain that he must do so when he is hungry?^[49]

The first question, however, remains unanswered: How can the law for other species be derived from that of seven species, which have the special feature of being subject to *bikkurim*? Furthermore, the Gemara asks:

וּלְמָאן דְּתַנִּי טַעַן רַבְעִי – And even according to the one who teaches the Mishnaic texts that deal with the fourth-year fruits as reading THE FOURTH-YEAR fruit of a SAPLING, and who thus has the word *hillul* available to teach the blessing requirement with regard to the fruit of all trees,^[50] הָא תִּינָה כָּל דְּכִר שְׁנֵהֶנָּה – granted that this is an acceptable source for reciting a blessing on anything that is subject to planting, which is the context of the passage in which the word *hillul* is written. דְּלֹא בִּר טַעַנָּה – But foods that are not subject to planting, כְּגוֹן בָּשָׂר בִּיציִים – from where is it known to him that they require a blessing?

Having shown that no Scriptural source – according to any view – adequately accounts for the requirement to recite a blessing on all foods, the Gemara concludes:

אֵלֶּיךָ סְבָרָא הוּא – Rather, [this requirement] is based on reason, אִסּוּר לֹא לְאָרְצָא שְׁנֵהֶנָּה מִן הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה בְּלֹא בְּרַכָּה – which dictates that it is forbidden for a person to derive benefit from this world^[51] without first reciting a blessing.^[52]

NOTES

be, then, that the requirement to recite a blessing applies only to those foods that are put on the Altar.

41. Olive oil is mixed with meal offerings (*Rashi* to *Bava Metzia* 87b).

42. The challenger has just stated that the blessing requirement for olives could be derived from the common characteristic. The Gemara objects that this derivation, though incontestable, would be unnecessary, as there is seemingly a more direct way to learn that the law applies to olives.

43. *Judges* 15:5. [The verse describes how Samson burned the Philistines' fields by tying torches to the tails of foxes.] Thus, since we derive through a *gezeirah shavah* that the “produce” referred to in the *hillulim* verse is “*kerem* produce,” it is as if the verse states explicitly that the law of *revai* and the associated requirement of reciting a blessing when eating it applies to the fruit of the olive grove (*kerem zayis*).

44. The term *kerem* by itself means exclusively “vineyard.” Only when the word *zayis* is added does it mean “olive grove.” Hence, the *gezeirah shavah*, which is based on the words “and the produce of the *kerem* (unmodified),” teaches only that the laws of *revai* and the associated requirement of reciting a blessing apply to *kerem*, unmodified, i.e. a vineyard. That a blessing must be recited when eating olives, however, must be derived from the common characteristic.

45. There are seven species for which the Land of Israel is praised in the verse: *A land of wheat, barley, grape, fig and pomegranate; a land of oil-olives and date-honey* (*Deuteronomy* 8:8).

46. As the Torah states two verses later (v. 10): *And you will eat and be satiated and bless Hashem, your God* (*Rashi*). [The Gemara here follows the Tannaic view (below, 37a; 44a) that the blessing requirement

stated in this verse refers to all seven species. See also *Rashba* to 44a [ד"ה ורבנן].

47. *Bikkurim*: The Torah obligates landowners in Eretz Yisrael to bring the first fruits of each year's crop to the Temple and give them to the Kohen (see *Deuteronomy* 26:1-11). The Gemara in *Menachos* 84b derives by means of a *gezeirah shavah* that this mitzvah applies only to the seven species for which the Torah praises Eretz Yisrael (see *Rashi*). Perhaps, the blessing the Torah mandates when one eats the seven species is related to the *bikkurim* obligation, which does not apply to other foods. How, then, can we derive the blessing requirement with regard to other foods by comparing them to the seven species?

48. See *Tzlach* and *Sheleimah Mishnas*, who discuss why the Gemara repeats the same question and answer.

49. See above, note 31.

50. And according to whom the Gemara above asserted that *hillul* is an acceptable source for the requirement to recite a blessing when eating any type of food – an assertion the Gemara will now challenge.

51. The reference is to bodily pleasures, such as eating, drinking and smelling, where the benefit actually enters the body (see *Ramban's* comments below to the eighth chapter; see also *Darchei Moshe, Orach Chaim* 216:1 and *Magen Avraham* 216:1).

52. Because by neglecting the blessing, one thereby violates the common-sense notion that it is only fitting to acknowledge and thank the One Who created the item from which one is about to derive pleasure (see *Rashi*).

Accordingly, the verse cited above (*hillulim*) for the blessing prior to eating is not the true source, but rather a linkage to a Scriptural verse [אֶקְרִי] of the requirement based on reason (*Tosafos*), which has the

ביצד מברכין פרק ששי ברכות

לה

עין משפט
נר מצוה

ביצד מברכין וכו' חזן מן היין. שמחך חשיבותו קצתו לו ברכה
לעצמו וכן הפס: **טורח מיני דשאים**. לפי שיש בכלל פרי
האדמה דשאים ורעשים כגון קטניות ורבי יהודה בעי היכר ברכה לכל
מין ומין: **ג** קדש הלולים. כגמט רבעי כתיב ומשעם שני הלולים
טעון בחילולו כשהחללנו בשנה תורה אור

ביצד מברכין על הפירות *על פירות
האילן הוא אומר בורא פרי העין
חזן מן היין שעל היין הוא אומר בורא פרי
הגפן ועל פירות הארץ הוא אומר בורא פרי
האדמה חזן מן הפת שעל הפת הוא אומר
המציא להם מן הארץ *ועל הירקות הוא
אומר בורא פרי האדמה רבי יהודה אומר
בורא מיני דשאים: **ג** מנא ה"מ *דחננו
רבינו ר' יוחנן *קדש הלולים לה' מלמד שמעונים
ברכה רפניהם ולאחריו מברך אומר ר' ע
אסור לאדם שיטעום כלום קודם שיברך
והאי קדש הלולים להבי הוא דאמא האי
מבעי ליה חד דאמר ר' חננאל *אחליה ודור
אכליה ואידך דבר המעון שירה טעון חלול
ושאינו טעון שירה אין טעון חלול וכדור'
שמואל בר נחמני אי' יונתן בעין ['] שאין
שמואל בר נחמני אלא על היין שנאמר *ותאמר
לם הגפן החדלתי את חירוש המשמח
אלהים ואנשים אם אנשים משמח אלהים
במה משמח מבאן שאין אומרים שירה אלא
על היין הניחא למאן דחני ['] נמער רבעי
אלא למאן דחני כרם רבעי מאי איכא
למימר דאחמר ר' חייא ור' שמעון ברבי *חד
דחני כרם רבעי וחד דחני נמער רבעי *ולמאן
דחני כרם רבעי הניחא אי יליף ג"ש דחניא
ר' אומר נאמר כאן *לחוסף לכם תבואתו
ונאמר להלן *ותבואת הכרם מה להלן כרם
אף כאן כרם אייתר ליה חד הלול לברכה
ואי לא יליף גזרה שוה ברכה מנא ליה ואי
נמי יליף גזרה שוה אשכחן לאדריזי לפניו בעין
הא לא קשיא *דאיתא בקל דחומר *כשהוא
שבע מברך כשהוא רעב לא כל שכן אשכחן
כרם שאר מינין בעין דיליף מברם מה כרם
דבר שנחנה ומעון ברכה אף כל דבר שנחנה
מעון ברכה איכא למפרך מה לברם שכן חייב
בעוללות קמה חוכיה מה לקמה שכן חייב
בחלה כרם יוכיח *וחור הדין לא ראי זה כראי
זה ולא ראי זה כראי זה הצד השוה שבהן
דבר שנחנה ומעון ברכה אף כל דבר שנחנה
מעון ברכה מה להצד השוה שבהן שכן יש
בו צד מוכח ואית' נמי זית דאית' ביה צד מוכח
וזית מצד מוכח אית' והא בהדיא כתיב ביה
כרם רכח *ויבער מגדיש ועד קמה ועד
כרם זית אמר *רב פפא *כרם זית אקרי כרם
סחמא לא אקרי מ"מ קשיא מה להצד השוה שבהן שכן יש בהן צד מוכח
אלא דיליף לה משבעת המינין מה שבעת המינין דבר שנחנה ומעון ברכה
אף כל דבר שנחנה מעון ברכה מה לשבעת המינין שכן דייבין בבכורים
ועוד התינו לאדריזי לפניו בעין הא לא קשיא דאית' בקל דחומר כשהוא שבע
מברך כשהוא רעב לכ"ש ולמאן דחני נמער רבעי הא חניח כל דבר נמיעה
דלא בר נמיעה כגון בשר ביצים ודגים מנא ליה אלא סברא הוא אסור לו
לאדם שיהנה מן העולם הזה בלא ברכה: תי' *אסור לו לאדם שיהנה מן
העוה"ז בלא ברכה *יובל הנהנה מן העוה"ז בלא ברכה מעל מאי תקנתיה יב' אצל חכם מאי
עביר ליה דאם עביר ליה איסורא אלא אמר רבא יב' אצל חכם מעיקרא וילמדנו ברכות כדי שלא יב' ליד מיעלה
אמר רבי יהודה אב' שמואל בלא ברכה כאלו גזרה מקדשי שמם שאל' *האיך וכלא
ר' לוי רבי כתיב לה' הארץ ומלואה וכתוב *השמים שמים לה' והארץ נתן לבני אדם כרם
כאן

הרביעית שהוא מותר בחילול: האי
מכני ליה. הלולים לשון חלולים חד
מיניהו אחא לארזי חליליה והר
חלילה הוציאה לחולין ע"פ פדיון אס
כאח לאוכלו חוץ לירושלים וחד לממך
שלא נאמרה תורת רבעי אלא בכרם
שנא' קדש הלולים דבר שחללין בו
טעון חלול וזהו יין: שאין אומרים.
הלוי שיר של קרבן במקדש אלא על
היין כשנמסרין נכסי מוכח: **ה** יאחזק
למ"ד ט"ו. כולה קיומא דפרכא הוא
והי' הניחא הא דילפת ברכה מהכא
למאן דחני נמער רבעי דאית' ליה כל
פירות הארץ כדפרכא רבעי ולא דריס
מהכא דבר דטעון הלול טעון חלול
איתר ליה חד הלול לברכה: **ה** יאחזק
לממך. הא מיבעי ליה למדרש שאין
חלול אלא במקדש: הלול: חד חני כרם
רבעי. בכל מקום שיש במשנה נמער
רבעי חני חיה כרם: **ה** יאחזק אי יליף
ב"ש. דריס למלחיה ב"ש *ואייתר
ליה חד הלול לברכה: **ה** יאחזק לאחרי.
דאשכחן ברכה המון דכתיב ואלכלת
ושבעת וברכת (דברים ח): חייב
בשוללות. וברמך לא העולל (ויקרא ט)
איתר עוללות כל שאין לן פסיונין לא
כחף ולא נמך אלא שורה יחידית של
ענבים: קמה חוכיה. דאשכחן
דאחריה רחמנא ברכה דכתיב חאלל
זה לחם וגו' (דברים ח) וסמך ליה
ואכלת ושבעת וברכת: **ז** מוכח. ויין
לנכסים וסלת למנוח: **ז** מנין.
האומרים בזהך חסד ושעורה וגו'
(שם) ובפרייהו כתיב ואלכלת ושבעת
דברכה: שן טעונים כדריס. דהכי
אמרין כדמחומ (פ"ט ד' פד): כאלמר
כאן ארץ *כי באתי אל הארץ (דברים
ט) ואלמר להלן ארץ חסד ושעורה מה
להלן שבה הארץ חף כאן שבה הארץ:
אלא סברא הא. דלחוריהו אית' ליה
פירכא למאן דחני כרם ויליף ברכה
מז' המינים איכא פירכא שכן טעונים
בכורים ולמאן דחני נמער רבעי איכא
למפרך התינו מה דבר נמיעה דלא
בר נמיעה מנן אלא סברא הוא דכיון
דנכסה לרין להודות ליה שבראס:
מעל. כשהנה מן ההקדש דכתיב
לה' הארץ ומלואה כדאמרין לקמן:
לאמר ברכה. הרי הלא לבני אדם:
גזול

כ"ה פ"ה

ספסוף פ"ה

ספסוף פ"ה

ספסוף פ"ה

אחליה והר אכליה. תימה
למה לי קרא הא בפ"ב
דקדושין (ד' ד'): גמרינן קדש קדש
ממעשר שני ח"כ גילף ממעשר שני
וי"ל אי לא קרא דהלולים הוא אמינא
דלדרכה גילף למומרא קדש קדש
משביעית ואין לו פדיון. עוד פ'
רבי חננאל אכל שלישית ושביעית שמעשר
כי מעשר שני ממש ודוקא בזמן
שמעשר שני טובא כמו בשלל ראשונה
ושניה ורביעית וחמישית לשמטה
טובה חלול אכל שלישית ושביעית שמעשר
עני דוקא איתא לא קמ"ל חלולים:
ש אין. אומרים שירה אלא על היין.
פירוש אין אומרים שירה על
שום אכילת מוכח. כגון זריקת דמים
וגסוך המים כן אס על היין אכל
ודאי מנינו שירה בלא יין כגון הלל
שבשמינית פסחים (המודד נמער ד'
סד') (ע"פ בחסות):
ולמאן דחני כרם רבעי וכו'.
ועתה קיימא לן דרבעי
טובא אף בח"ל מיהו בכרם טובא ולא
בשאר חילנות דל המיקל בזהך הלכה
כדמור בח"ל *וכרם רבעי בזמן הזה
מחללין על *שזה פרוט' ושחוקי ומטיילי
לנהר וכן מפורש בשאלות דרב אחאי
(פרכא קדושים סיון ק):
ואית' נמי זית כמה הל'. ואל'ם
איכא למפרך מה להלך השוה
שכן חייבים בלוקט דפרט בכרם הייט
לקט משא"כ בזית דלוקט בלוקט וי"ל
דמיהא ליה למפרך פירכא אפי' יא
הלך השוה משא"כ זית מיניה מ"מ
קאמר דשאר מינים לא ידע מיניה:
תינו לאחרי. דעיקר ברכה
לאחריזי דכתיב ואלכלת
ושבעת וברכת: **רפניו** לב"ש.
לאו ק"י הוא דאס כן סתא ברכה
דלפניו דמאורייתא ולעיל פרק מי
שמו (דף כה). משמע גבי בעל קרי
דלא דלורייא הוא ואפי' רבי יהודה
לא פליג אלא משום דעשאן כהלכות
דרך ארץ (ס' ד' כה *):
דבר שאין גזול מן הקרקע. כגון
בשר וחלב. ואל'ם מאי איתר
בשר אשיל ירקות נמי לא איתר ליה
וי"ל דאיכא למימר קמה חוכיה ולפי'
רש"י יחא דגרים דלאו בר נמיעה
מנין וליכא למימר דאחא משאר
חילנות דאיכא למפרך. מה להבך שכן
חייבים בפיה: **אלא** סברא הוא
אסור לאדם שיהנה בו. וקרא דכתיב
לעיל אסמכתא בעלמא והגמרא היה
סבור מחמתה דלמוד גמור הוא:
כאן

ולמאן דחני כרם רבעי וכו'.
ועתה קיימא לן דרבעי
טובא אף בח"ל מיהו בכרם טובא ולא
בשאר חילנות דל המיקל בזהך הלכה
כדמור בח"ל *וכרם רבעי בזמן הזה
מחללין על *שזה פרוט' ושחוקי ומטיילי
לנהר וכן מפורש בשאלות דרב אחאי
(פרכא קדושים סיון ק):
ואית' נמי זית כמה הל'. ואל'ם
איכא למפרך מה להלך השוה
שכן חייבים בלוקט דפרט בכרם הייט
לקט משא"כ בזית דלוקט בלוקט וי"ל
דמיהא ליה למפרך פירכא אפי' יא
הלך השוה משא"כ זית מיניה מ"מ
קאמר דשאר מינים לא ידע מיניה:
תינו לאחרי. דעיקר ברכה
לאחריזי דכתיב ואלכלת
ושבעת וברכת: **רפניו** לב"ש.
לאו ק"י הוא דאס כן סתא ברכה
דלפניו דמאורייתא ולעיל פרק מי
שמו (דף כה). משמע גבי בעל קרי
דלא דלורייא הוא ואפי' רבי יהודה
לא פליג אלא משום דעשאן כהלכות
דרך ארץ (ס' ד' כה *):
דבר שאין גזול מן הקרקע. כגון
בשר וחלב. ואל'ם מאי איתר
בשר אשיל ירקות נמי לא איתר ליה
וי"ל דאיכא למימר קמה חוכיה ולפי'
רש"י יחא דגרים דלאו בר נמיעה
מנין וליכא למימר דאחא משאר
חילנות דאיכא למפרך. מה להבך שכן
חייבים בפיה: **אלא** סברא הוא
אסור לאדם שיהנה בו. וקרא דכתיב
לעיל אסמכתא בעלמא והגמרא היה
סבור מחמתה דלמוד גמור הוא:
כאן

ג יליון הש"ס
גבי חללים ודור אכליה.
גירסא פ"ה דש"ס
אב' אב' דרסא ודכא
לא מתמשי כגון בין ס'
לח. וכן הוא גירסא
פ"ה דרסא פ"ה דרסא
דלא דגרים אלו לע
מלכות: **ש** שם חז' דרס
כרס. פ"ה דרסא פ"ה דרסא
רש"י דרסא קלא ודכא:
שם דרסא וד' איתר.
וכן זה חלוקה קלא פ"ה
דכ"ה: **ח** חסד דרסא ודכא
ט"ו שוה דרסא. וכן הוא
גירסא ודכא ודכא
ל' יין ודכא חלול
חלול מתמשי ל' ידכא חלול
ד' דרסא פ"ה דרסא ודכא

א מ"ה פ"ה חס' חס'
ברכות ספסוף פ"ה חס'
ש"ס חס' חס' חס' חס'
ספסוף חס' חס' חס' חס'
ב מ"ה חס' חס' חס' חס'
ש"ס חס' חס' חס' חס'
ספסוף חס' חס' חס' חס'
ג מ"ה חס' חס' חס' חס'
ש"ס חס' חס' חס' חס'
ספסוף חס' חס' חס' חס'
ד מ"ה חס' חס' חס' חס'
ש"ס חס' חס' חס' חס'
ספסוף חס' חס' חס' חס'
ה מ"ה חס' חס' חס' חס'
ש"ס חס' חס' חס' חס'
ספסוף חס' חס' חס' חס'

(ועי' חס' חס' חס' חס')
קדש וכו' וכו' וכו' וכו'
קדושים חס' חס' חס' חס'

(ועי' חס' חס' חס' חס')
כ' דרסא חס' חס' חס' חס'

(לקמן חס' חס' חס' חס')
דרסא חס' חס' חס' חס'
ורסא חס' חס' חס' חס'

(ועי' חס' חס' חס' חס')
ורסא חס' חס' חס' חס'
חלוקה חס' חס' חס' חס'

The Gemara cites a Baraisa that expands on the concept just mentioned:

אָסור לוֹ לְאַדָּם – The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: שִׁיחָה מִן הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה בְּרֵכָה – IT IS FORBIDDEN FOR A PERSON TO DERIVE BENEFIT FROM THIS WORLD WITHOUT first reciting A BLESSING. וְכָל הַנִּהְנֶה מִן הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה בְּרֵכָה – AND WHOEVER DERIVES BENEFIT FROM THIS WORLD WITHOUT first reciting A BLESSING מַעַל – HAS COMMITTED AN ACT OF ME'ILAH.^[53] מַאי – WHAT IS HIS REMEDY? וְלָךְ אָצֵל חָכָם – HE SHOULD GO TO A SAGE.

Gemara asks:

וְלָךְ אָצֵל חָכָם – He should go to a sage? What kind of remedy is that? מַאי עָבִיר לֵיהּ – What can [the sage] do for him now? הָאֵל עָבִיר לֵיהּ אִיסוּרָא – Why, he has already committed the transgression! – ? –

The Gemara answers:

וְלָךְ אָצֵל חָכָם מַעֲיָקְרָא – אֵלָא אָמַר רַבָּא – Rather, Rava said: וְלִמְדֵנוּ בְּרֵכוֹת – The Baraisa means that one should go to a sage initially, and [the sage] will teach him the laws of the blessings, כְּדִי שֶׁלֹּא יָבֵא לִידֵי מַעֲלָה – so that he should not come to commit *me'ilah* by deriving benefit without first reciting a proper blessing.^[54]

The Gemara cites a related statement:

אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל – Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: כָּל הַנִּהְנֶה מִן הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה בְּרֵכָה – Whoever derives benefit from this world without first reciting a blessing בְּאִילוֹ – is regarded as if he has derived benefit from the consecrated property of God in Heaven. שְׁנָאֵמַר „לֵה“ – For it is stated: *To Hashem belongs the earth and its fullness.*^[55]

The Gemara elaborates further:

ר' לֵוִי רָמִי – R' Levi contrasted two verses, noting an apparent contradiction and presenting the resolution: „לֵה“ הָאָרֶץ – In one verse it is written: *To Hashem belongs the earth and its fullness*, which implies that man's use of the earth and its fullness would constitute trespass on God's property. וּבְתִיב „הַשָּׁמַיִם שְׁמַיִם לֵה“ וְהָאָרֶץ נְתַן לְבְנֵי אָדָם – But in another verse it is written: *As for the heavens – the heavens are Hashem's, but the earth He has given to mankind,*^[56] which implies that the earth is man's to use. How are these two verses to be reconciled? לֹא קָשִׁיָּא – We must say that there is no contradiction: בְּאֵן קוֹדֵם בְּרֵכָה – Here (in the verse which states that the earth belongs to Hashem), it refers to *before* one recites a blessing,

NOTES

force only of a Rabbinic directive (*Rashba*; see *Peirush HaRashbatz*, and *Tzlach* below שְׁמוּאֵל אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה; see, though, *Pnei Yehoshua*).

53. *Me'ilah* is the unauthorized use of Temple property [which is consecrated to God] (see *Leviticus* 5:15-16). Since *to Hashem belongs the earth and its fullness* (*Psalms* 24:1), one who derives pleasure from anything in this world without reciting a blessing has in effect made unauthorized use of God's property, a crime akin to the unauthorized use of consecrated Temple property (see *Rashi*, based on the Gemara below).

54. Accordingly, when the Baraisa asks: "What is his remedy?" it does

not inquire about the remedy for one who has already eaten without a blessing. Rather, it inquires about the remedy for someone who does not know the laws of the blessings. Since such a person cannot eat without committing *me'ilah*, what remedy is there so that he may be able to eat? To this the Baraisa replies that the remedy for him is to go to a sage and learn the laws of the blessings (*Rabbeinu Yonah*; see also *Cheifetz Hashem* and *Meromei Sadeh*).

55. *Psalms* 24:1.

56. *Ibid.* 115:16.

סחמא לא אקרי מ"ם קשיא מ
אלא דיליף לה משבעת המינין
אף כל דבר שנוגה מעון ברכה
ועוד התינו לארדיו לפני מנן
מברך כהנא רעב לכיש ולמא
דלא בר נסעיה כגון בשר ביצי
לארס שיהנה מן העולם הזה
העדה"ז בלא ברכה *וכל תהנה
עבדי ליההא עבדי ליה אמר רא
אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל כלה
ר' לוי רמי כתיב לה הארץ ומלוא

DE 199

הוא – כאן לאחר ברכה – whereas here (in the verse which states that Hashem has given the earth to man), it refers to after one recites a blessing.^[1]

The Gemara cites a related statement:

R' Chanina bar Pappa said: כל הנהנה – אמר רבי חנינא בר פפא – Whoever derives benefit from this world without first reciting a blessing – מן העולם הזה בלא ברכה – הוא נקרא – is regarded as if he robs the Holy One, Blessed is He, and the Assembly of Israel.^[2] שגאמר „גזול אביו – For it is stated: *He who robs his father and his mother and says, “It is no crime,” is a companion to a destructive man.*^[3] ואין „אביו“ אלא הקדוש – ואמו ואומר אין פשע חבד הוא לאיש משחית – Now, his father is a reference to none other than the Holy One, Blessed is He, – שגאמר „הלוא הוא אביו קדש“ – as it is stated: *Is it to Hashem that you do this . . . ? Is He not your Father, your Master . . . ?*^[4] – ואין „אמו“ אלא בנות ישראל – And his mother is a reference to none other than the Assembly of Israel, – שגאמר „שמע בני מוסר אביו ואל תטש תורת אמו“ – as it is stated: *Heed, my son, the discipline of your father, and do not forsake the instruction of your mother.*^[5] מאי „חבד הוא“ – What is the meaning of he is a companion to a destructive man? – אמר רבי חנינא בר פפא – It means that he is a companion to Yarovam ben Nevat, – חבד הוא לירבעם בן נבט – שגאמר את ישראל – who destroyed the loyalty of Israel to their Father in Heaven.^[6]

The Gemara cites another exposition of R' Chanina bar Pappa:

R' Chanina bar Pappa contrasted two verses, noting an apparent contradiction and presenting the resolution: – בתיב „ולקחתי דגני בעתו וגו“ – In one verse it is written: *and I will take [back] “My” grain in its time etc.*,^[7] which indicates that the grain is God's, and not for man to use. – וכתוב „ואספת דגנך וגו“ – But in another verse it is written: *And you will gather in “your” grain etc.*,^[8] indicating that the grain is yours (i.e. man's). How are these two verses to be reconciled?

באן – לא קשיא – We must say that there is no contradiction: כאן – Here, in the verse which

states that “you will gather your grain,” it refers to a time when Israel does the will of the Omnipresent, כאן – כאן בומן שאין ישראל עושה רצונו של מקום – whereas here, in the verse which states that the grain belongs to God, it refers to a time when Israel does not do the will of the Omnipresent.^[9]

The Gemara cites a relevant Baraisa:

The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: „ואספת דגנך“ – The verse states: *AND YOU WILL GATHER IN YOUR GRAIN.* מה – תלמוד לומר – For WHAT reason did SCRIPTURE have TO SAY this?^[10] – לפי שגאמר „לא ימוש ספר התורה הזה מפיו“ – FOR SINCE IT IS STATED: *THIS BOOK OF THE TORAH SHALL NOT DEPART FROM YOUR MOUTH,*^[11] – יכול דברים בכתבן – IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE to think that THE WORDS of Scripture here are meant literally AS THEY ARE WRITTEN, i.e. that one must study Torah every waking moment and would thereby be precluded from earning a livelihood. – תלמוד לומר „ואספת דגנך“ – THE TORAH therefore STATES: *AND YOU WILL GATHER IN YOUR GRAIN*, which bids us to LEAD, together WITH (TORAH STUDY), a life CONDUCTED IN THE WAY OF THE WORLD, i.e. Torah study should be combined with the earning of a livelihood.^[12] דברי רבי – These are THE WORDS OF R' YISHMAEL. – ושמעאל – CAN IT BE as you say? – אם חורש בשעת חרישה – If A MAN PLOWS AT THE TIME OF PLOWING – וזורע בשעת זריעה – AND SOWS AT THE TIME OF SOWING – וקוצר בשעת קצירה – AND HARVESTS AT THE TIME OF HARVESTING – ודש בשעת דישא – AND THRESHES AT THE TIME OF THRESHING – וזורה בשעת הרוח – AND WINNWS AT THE TIME OF THE blowing WIND, – תורה מה תהא עליה – WHAT WILL BECOME OF THE study of TORAH if people will be so preoccupied with their livelihoods?! Certainly, then, the ideal situation meant by the Torah cannot be the combining of Torah study with the earning of a livelihood. – אלא בומן שישראל עושה רצונו של מקום – RATHER, the literal meaning of the verse in *Joshua* can be reconciled with the verse in *Deuteronomy* as follows: AT A TIME WHEN the people of ISRAEL DO THE WILL OF THE OMNIPRESENT, על – מלאכתן נעשית על – THEIR WORK IS DONE for them BY OTHERS, שגאמר „ועמדי זרים ורעו צאנכם וגו“ – AS IT IS STATED: *AND STRANGERS WILL ARISE AND SHEPHERD YOUR FLOCKS etc.*,^[13] and the people of Israel will thus be able to devote themselves exclusively to Torah

NOTES

1. Everything in the world was created for the glory of Hashem [see *Isaiah* 43:7]; thus, man may not make use of anything until he blesses Hashem for it, thereby fulfilling the function for which it was created in the first place (see *Maharsha* to end of 35a).

2. The person who neglects to make the blessing robs God of the blessing due Him (*Rashi*; see *Pnei Shlomo*). [Alternatively, he has stolen from God because, as the Gemara has just stated, the property from which one benefits belongs exclusively to God until the blessing is recited (*Maharsha* *ibid.*; see also *Rashi* to *Sanhedrin* 102a אביו).] And he also robs the Assembly of Israel (i.e. the Jewish people) of their crops, which fail as the result of their imitation of his sin [see end of note 5] (*Rashi*).

3. *Proverbs* 28:24.

4. *Deuteronomy* 32:6. Thus, God is called our “father.”

5. *Proverbs* 1:8. [The Torah, which *Deuteronomy* 33:4 calls the heritage of the Congregation of Jacob (the entire Jewish nation), is here referred to as the instruction of your mother (see *Rashi* to *Proverbs* ad loc.). Thus, mother is a metaphor for the Jewish nation, the Assembly of Israel.]

The person who treats the blessing obligation lightly (*he says, “It is no crime”*) causes others as well to treat it lightly and neglect it. Thus, not only does he sin, but he causes many others to sin as well (see *Rashi*).

6. Yarovam ben Nevat was the first king of the Ten Tribes of Israel, which broke away from the Kingdom of Judah during the reign of Rechavam, son of Solomon (see *I Kings* 12:20). Yarovam had a deep fear that his subjects would return to the rule of Rechavam if they would continue to serve God in the Temple in Jerusalem. He therefore out-

lawed the tri-annual festival pilgrimage to Jerusalem, for which he substituted pilgrimages to idolatrous centers in his own kingdom (*ibid.* verses 28-33; *II Kings* 17:21).

Just as Yarovam led Israel astray by inducing them to worship idols, so does one who eats without pronouncing a blessing lead others astray [see end of note 5] (*Rashi*).

7. *Hosea* 2:11. In this verse, God says that He will take back His grain and wine etc. from His faithless nation.

8. *Deuteronomy* 11:14.

9. For then God takes the grain away from them, demonstrating to them that He is its true owner (*Rashi*).

10. The verse states: *And I will give the rain of your land in its time . . . “and you will gather in” your grain, your wine and your oil.* Why does the verse not state simply: *And I will give the rain of your land in its time . . . grain, wine and oil?* Is it not obvious that one would gather in the produce of his fields? (*Tzlach*).

11. *Joshua* 1:8.

12. This verse *and you will gather in your grain* is evidence that one should engage in work that provides him with sustenance. For if one will rely on others for his sustenance, he will eventually abandon his Torah study [altogether] (*Rashi*; see *Avos* 2:2). [Thus, engaging in a livelihood is not at all precluded by the verse *this Book of the Torah shall not depart from your mouth*, for, on the contrary, this verse obligates one to do what is necessary to ensure his continued study of Torah.]

13. *Isaiah* 61:5.

שמואל ב. [יחמל נח.]

ס' ה' צ' ע' ק' ר'

stated: *I have removed the sacred from the house.*^[28]

The Gemara adds:

אפילו חצר קובעת – But R' Yochanan says: Even the courtyard of the house^[29] establishes the tithing obligation, שְׁנָאֵמַר – as it is stated: and they shall eat within your gates and be sated.^[30]

The Gemara discusses the part of the Mishnah which states: חוץ מן היין וכו' – EXCEPT FOR WINE etc. [for on wine he says: the One Who creates the fruit of the vine].

The Gemara asks:

מאי שניא – Why is wine different from other “fruits of the tree” in that it alone is assigned its own blessing, specifying the type of tree that produces the fruit? אי לימא משום דאשתני לעלויא – If you say that because it has changed for the better, it changes with regard to the blessing as well, והרי שמן – why, there is the case of olive oil, which has also changed for the better, ולא אשתני לברכה – yet it does not change with regard to the blessing! The Gemara documents this last assertion: דאמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל – For Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel, וכן אמר רבי יצחק אמר – and so said R' Yitzchak in the name of R' Yochanan: שמן ויין מברכין עליו בורא פרי העץ – On olive oil, one recites the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the tree. Why, then, does wine have its own, specific blessing and not olive oil?

The Gemara answers:

אמר – They say in answer to this question: הנה – There, in the case of olive oil, though it has changed for the better its blessing does not change, משום דלא אפשר – because it is not possible to formulate for it a blessing that specifies the type of tree. היכי נברך – For how should we recite the specific blessing for olive oil? נברך בורא פרי הדין – Should we recite as the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the olive

[tree]?^[31] פירא גופיה ויין אקרי – This would not be possible, because the fruit itself is also called “olive.” Thus, this formulation of the blessing would be unacceptable, since it admits the interpretation that God creates the fruit of the olive fruit, which is untrue, as God creates the olive, but it is man who produces the olive’s “fruit” (i.e. the oil).^[32]

The Gemara rejects this answer:

ויברך עליה בורא פרי עץ ויין – But let us recite on [olive oil] the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the olive tree (mentioning “tree” explicitly)^[33] – ? –

The Gemara therefore introduces a different factor to account for the distinction between wine and oil:

אמר זוטרא – Rather, Mar Zutra said: Wine sustains, whereas oil does not sustain.^[34]

The Gemara refutes this answer as well:

וישקה לא ויין – But is it so that olive oil does not sustain? הנודר מן המזון – Why, we have learned in a Mishnah:^[35] מותר במים ובמלח – ONE WHO VOWS TO ABSTAIN FROM SUSTENANCE IS PERMITTED to partake of WATER AND SALT. והיונה בה – And in the traditional discussion regarding this Mishnah,^[36] we raise the following difficulty concerning it: מים ומלח הוא ולא – The Mishnah implies that only water and salt are not called sustenance, אקרי מזון – but all other [foods] are called sustenance.^[37] ויבטל דרב – Let us say that this is a refutation of Rav and Shmuel, דאמרי אין מברכין בורא מיני מזונות אלא בהמשת המינין – who say that we recite the blessing the One Who creates species of sustenance only on foods made from the five species of grain.^[38] ואמר רב הונא – And, as recorded there, Rav Huna says in answer to this question: באומר כל הדין עלי – There is no refutation, because the Mishnah is not referring to someone who vowed to abstain from that which is called “sustenance,” but rather to someone who made a vow saying: “Anything that sustains is prohibited to me.”^[39] אימא משקה ויין –

NOTES

require tithing on the Biblical level. See further details in *Meiri* here, and in *Rambam, Hil. Maaser* 3:1-4; 4:1-2.

R' Yannai agrees that one is Rabbinically forbidden to make a regular meal (אכילת קבע) of produce brought into the house in an abnormal manner unless one first tithes the produce (*Rashi*; see also *Tosafos*' citation of *Rashi*). One is permitted, however, to continue to snack from such produce, or to feed it to his animal unreservedly.

28. *Deuteronomy* 26:13. This verse forms part of the declaration that the Torah bids a farmer in Eretz Yisrael to state after the third year and sixth years of the *shemittah* cycle, after fulfilling his obligation to separate and distribute the requisite tithes. The person declares before Hashem: *I have removed the sacred from the house, and moreover I have given it to the Levi and to the convert, to the orphan and to the widow, in accordance with Your entire commandment that You have commanded me . . .* The words from the house indicate that the tithing obligation takes effect when the produce enters the house. [Actually, from this verse alone, we can derive only that the produce must “enter the house” but not that it must do so through the “main entrance.” That essential component of R' Yannai's exposition is supplied by the Gemara in *Bava Metzia* 88a, which states that R' Yannai derives it from the preceding verse (cited by R' Yochanan below – see note 30), which makes mention of *within your gates* (see also *Rashi* to *Gittin* 81a כרי ליהיב (לחייבו)).]

29. “Courtyard” in this context refers to an enclosed area [in front of the house] with specific residential features (see *Maasros* 3:5; *Rambam, Hil. Maaser* 4:8).

30. *Deuteronomy* 26:12. The verse states: *When you have finished tithing every tithe of your produce in the third year, the year of tithing, you shall give to the Levi, to the convert, to the orphan, and to the widow, and they shall eat within your gates and be sated.* R' Yochanan expounds the expression “you shall give to the Levi . . . within your gates” to indicate that the tithing obligation takes effect as soon as the

produce enters “the gate” (*Rashi* to *Bava Metzia* 88a), i.e. the entrance to the courtyard in front of the house (*Rambam, Hil. Maaser* 4:7; *Rashba*, cited by *Shitah Mekubetztes* to *Bava Metzia* 88a).

31. The Hebrew word ויין, olive, can refer either to the olive itself or to the olive tree. (see *Deuteronomy* 28:40 *with Rashi*). [The same is true of other fruit names in Hebrew – e.g. תאנה, fig [tree] (*Genesis* 3:7), תפוח, apple [tree] (see *Shir HaShirim* 2:3).]

32. *Rashi*. In the case of the blessing on wine, however, the word ויין, vine (which is used in the blessing) refers specifically to the vine; the fruit of the vine is the grape, which is indeed God's creation (*ibid.*).

33. Evidently, then, it is not for lack of a suitable formulation that a specific blessing was not designated for olive oil. Thus, we return to the original question: Why was a specific blessing designated for wine (because it was changed for the better) and not for oil (which was also changed for the better)?

34. Since [in addition to having changed for the better (*Meromei Sadeh*)] wine sustains, it is significant enough to deserve a blessing that is specific to it (*Rashi*).

35. *Eruvin* 26b.

36. *Ibid.* 30a.

37. Since they are forbidden to the person as a result of his vow to abstain from “sustenance.”

38. Wheat, barley, oats, spelt and rye. [Foods processed from these grains carry the special blessing מיני מזונות, the One Who creates species of sustenance (see details in *Orach Chaim* 208:2 ff; see also *ArtScroll's The Laws of Berachos* 8:5).]

39. All foods other than water and salt sustain a person to some degree and are therefore prohibited when one vows to abstain from anything that “sustains.” However, only the five grains, which provide man with

Evidently, oil does sustain.^[40] – ? –

The Gemara proposes another answer:

אֵלָא חֲמַרָא סְעִיד וּמִשְׁקָא לֹא סְעִיד – Rather, the difference between wine and oil is that wine satiates, whereas oil does not satiate.^[41]

The Gemara challenges this assertion:

וְהָא רַבָּא הָהוּא – But does wine indeed satiate? וְהָא חֲמַרָא מִי סְעִיד – Why, Rava would drink wine all day long on Pesach eve – so that he would whet his appetite^[42] – וְנִיבּוֹל מַצָּה טָפִי – and thereby eat the matzah in the evening with more relish.^[43] – ? –

The Gemara answers:

פּוֹרְתָא סְעִיד – A lot of wine whets the appetite, – טוֹבָא גְרִיר – whereas a little bit satiates.^[44]

The Gemara persists:

בִּלְל – But does [wine] satiate at all (i.e. under any circumstances)? וְהָכֵתִיב, וַיֵּין וְשִׂמְחָה לִבְכֹּ־אָנוּשׁ . . . וְלֶחֶם לִבְכֹּ־אָנוּשׁ – Why, it is written: *And wine gladdens the heart of man . . . and bread, the heart of man it does satiate etc.*,^[45] which implies that – נִהְיָא הוּא דְסְעִיד חֲמַרָא לֹא סְעִיד – it is only bread that satiates, but wine does not satiate. – ? –

The Gemara answers:

אֵלָא חֲמַרָא אִית בֵּיה תְרִיתִי סְעִיד וּמִשְׁמָחָה – No, do not infer this from the verse. Rather, the verse means that wine has two qualities – it satiates and gladdens. נִהְיָא מִסְעֵד סְעִיד שְׂמֻחָה – Bread, however, only satiates, but it does not gladden.

The Gemara persists:

וְנִבְרִיךְ עֲלֶיהָ שְׁלֹשׁ בְּרָכוֹת – But if so, that wine satiates, – אי הָכֵי – we should recite after drinking it the three blessings of *Bircas HaMazon*^[46] as we do after eating bread!^[47] – ? –

The Gemara answers:

לֹא קִבְעִי אִינְשֵׁי סְעוּדָתֵיהוּ עֲלֵיהּ – People do not establish their meal around [wine].^[48]

This prompts the Gemara to inquire:

אָמַר לִיה רַב נַחְמָן בַּר יִצְחָק לְרַבָּא – Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said to Rava: אִי קִבְעַ עֲלֵיהּ סְעוּדָתֵיהּ מֵאֵי – And if one did establish his meal around wine, what would be the law? Would he be required to recite the three blessings of *Bircas HaMazon* afterwards?

Rava replies:

לְכַשְׁיָבָא – He said to [Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak]: אֵלִיָּהוּ וַיֹּאמֶר אִי הָיָא קְבִיעוּתָא – When the prophet Elijah will come and tell us whether it [the establishing of a meal around wine] is considered the establishment of a meal, we will consider the issue. – הַשְׁתָּא מִיָּתָא בְּטָלָה דְעֵתוּ אֶפְלָל כָּל אָדָם – As for now, at any rate, his attitude in establishing a full meal around wine is considered abnormal by almost any other person.^[49] And since it is not normal for people to consider the drinking of wine to be a bona-fide meal, the three blessings of *Bircas HaMazon* are not recited afterwards, even though the person is satiated.

The Gemara now analyzes the previously quoted ruling regarding the blessing on olive oil:

אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר – [The text] itself cited above stated: גּוֹפָא – וְכֵן אָמַר – Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel, – שְׁמוּאֵל – רַבִּי יִצְחָק אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן – and so said R' Yitzchak in the name of R' Yochanan: – שְׁמֵן זַיִת מְכַרְכִּין עָלָיו בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הָעֵץ – On olive oil, one recites the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the tree*.

The Gemara analyzes the ruling:

וְהִכִּי דְמִי – What is the circumstance referred to in this ruling? – אִילִימָא דְקָא שְׁתִּי לִיה (מִשְׁתָּה) – If we say that the ruling refers to where one is drinking the [olive oil] as is,^[50] – אַוּוּקִי מִיָּק לִיה – why, drinking it as is surely harms him!^[51] – דְתִנָּא – For it was taught in a Baraisa: – הַשְׁוֵתָה שְׁמֵן שֶׁל תְּרוּמָה – ONE WHO inadvertently DRINKS OIL OF TERUMAH – שְׁמֵן אֶת הַקֶּהֱן וְאִינוּ – Pays the principal and does not pay the

NOTES

his basic sustenance, are called by the name *מִיָּן*, *sustenance* [i.e. the primary sources of sustenance]. Therefore, the blessing of *מִיָּן*, *the One Who creates species of sustenance*, is recited only on the five grains (see *Rashi* and *Rosh Yosef*; cf. *Rashi* to *Eruvin* 30a באומר ד"ה כל הון עלי).

40. Since all foods other than water and salt are prohibited when one vows to prohibit anything that sustains, it is evident that olive oil also provides sustenance. Evidently, the reason a specific blessing was designated for wine and not for oil cannot be because only wine provides sustenance.

41. Although olive oil indeed sustains, it does not satisfy one's appetite as does wine (see *Rashi*).

Thus, the Gemara concludes that the reason for wine's special blessing is that it has changed for the better and it also satiates (see *Meromei Sadeh*).

42. Literally: draw his heart.

43. It is a mitzvah to eat matzah on the first night of Pesach (*Exodus* 12:18), and the general obligation to beautify mitzvos (see *Shabbos* 133b, *Bava Kamma* 9b) applies to the mitzvah of eating matzah as well. One should therefore build up his appetite before eating the matzah so that he eat it with relish – a beautification of the mitzvah (see *Rashi* and *Rashbam* to *Pesachim* 99b לא יאכל ד"ה and *Rambam*, *Hil. Chametz U'Matzah* 6:12). It was Rava's practice to drink wine throughout the day of Erev Pesach in order to build up his appetite for eating matzah that night. Evidently, wine does not satisfy one's appetite, but on the contrary makes one hungry!

44. See *Tosafos* גריר טובא ד"ה; cf. *Ravyah* §150, cited by *Kovetz Shitos Kamai*; see *Orach Chaim* 471 with *Mishnah Berurah* 6-8 and *Beur Halachah* ד"ה ויין.

45. *Psalms* 104:15.

46. *Bircas HaMazon* [the Grace After Meals] originally consisted of

three blessings, derived by the Gemara below (48b) from Scripture. [Though the Rabbis subsequently added a fourth blessing (*ibid.*), *Bircas HaMazon* is still referred to as "three blessings" since only three of them are based on Scripture.]

47. If wine satisfies one's appetite as bread does, *Bircas HaMazon* should be recited after wine as it is after bread. The Sages in the Baraisa cited below (37a), however, rule that on wine as well as on the other seven species (see above, 35a note 44) only the one-blessing abridgment of three is recited (see *Rashi*).

48. [That is, they do not make wine the basis of a full meal. And the obligation to recite the three blessings of *Bircas HaMazon*, derived from the verse (*Deuteronomy* 8:10): *And you will eat and be satiated and bless Hashem your God . . .*, applies only to foods on which one establishes his meal, viz. the five species of grain. See *Mishnah* and *Gemara*, 44a, and *Gemara* 38a.]

49. [The principle of אָדָם כָּל אֶפְלָל, *his opinion is considered abnormal* [literally: is nullified] by [almost] any [other] person (found throughout the Talmud), states that (in most situations) normal behavior is defined by the prevailing attitude, not by the behavior of the individual in question.]

50. The word *מִיָּק* (enclosed by parentheses in our editions) is similar to the reading *מִשְׁתָּה*, which is the text found in *Rif* and *Rabbeinu Yonah*. In *Nimukei Yosef* the reading is *לְמִשְׁתָּה*, where he drinks the oil.

51. And a blessing should therefore not be recited altogether (*Rashi*; cf. *Rambam*, *Hil. Berachos* 8:2 with *Kesef Mishneh*; see also *Peirush HaRashbatz* to 36a). For a blessing on food is required only when one consumes food in a manner classified as "eating" (or "drinking"), as it is written (*Deuteronomy* 8:10): *And you will "eat" . . . and bless Hashem, your God*. Consequently, the harmful drinking of olive oil, which cannot be classified as "drinking," does not warrant a blessing (*Rashi*).

additional FIFTH. הַסֵּךְ שֶׁמֶן שֶׁל תְּרוּמָה – ONE WHO inadvertently
 ANOINTS HIMSELF WITH OIL OF *TERUMAH* מִשְׁלֵם אֶת הַקֶּרֶן וּמִשְׁלֵם
 אֶת הַחוּמֵשׁ – PAYS THE PRINCIPAL AND PAYS THE ADDITIONAL
 FIFTH.^[52] אֵלָּא דָּקָא אָבִיל לִיהָ עַל יְדֵי פֶת – Will you say, rather,
 that the ruling that one recites *borei pri ha'eitz* on olive oil refers
 to where one eats it by means of eating bread on which the oil is
 smeared as a condiment?^[53] אִי הָכִי הוּיָא לִיהָ פֶת עֵיקָר וְהוּא טָפֵל –
 But if so, then the bread is the primary food and [the oil] is but
 a subordinate food, וְהִנֵּן – and we learned in a Mishnah.^[54]
 זֶה הַבְּלֵל – THIS IS THE RULE: בֵּל שְׂהוּא עֵיקָר וְעָמוּ טָפֵלָה – In
 WHATEVER case you have a food that IS PRIMARY AND A SUBORDI-

NATE food IS eaten WITH IT, מְבַרֵךְ עַל הָעֵיקָר וּמוֹטֵר אֶת הַטָּפֵלָה –
 ONE RECITES THE BLESSING ON THE PRIMARY food AND this
 DISCHARGES his blessing obligation for THE SUBORDINATE as well.
 Why, then, should any blessing be made on the oil smeared on the
 bread? אֵלָּא דָּקָא שְׁחִי לִיהָ עַל יְדֵי אֲנִיגָרוֹן – Rather, we must say
 that the ruling refers to where one drinks [the olive oil] by
 means of drinking *anigaron* into which it is mixed,^[55] דָּאֵמַר
 רַבָּה בַּר שְׁמוּאֵל – as described by Rabbah bar Shmuel, who said:
 אֲנִיגָרוֹן מֵיָא דְסִלְקָא – *Anigaron* is a soup made from the water of
 cooked beets; אֲבִסְיָגָרוֹן מֵיָא – *oxygaron* is a soup made from
 the water

NOTES

52. A non-Kohen who eats *terumah* inadvertently must repay the *terumah* he has eaten plus a fifth (see *Bava Metzia* 54a), as it states (*Leviticus* 22:14): *And if a man will eat of the holy* [i.e. *terumah*] *inadvertently, he shall add its fifth to it and shall repay the holy to the Kohen*. The “eating” referred to here in the Torah refers to eating or drinking, as well as “anointing [in the case of oil],” which Scripture includes in the category of “drinking” (see *Terumos* 6:1 and *Tos. Yom Tov* there). The Baraisa cited here indicates that whereas a non-Kohen who anoints himself inadvertently with *terumah* oil is considered to have “drunk” it and thus pays the principal plus a fifth, one who actually drinks the oil does *not* pay the additional fifth, since the “eating” mentioned in the verse refers to the normal, beneficial act of eating, whereas the drinking of olive oil is harmful

[see *Rambam, Hil. Terumos* 10:8]. Rather, the one who drinks the olive oil is considered as merely destroying it, for which he is liable to the principal [Rabbinically (*Tos. HaRosh*)] but not the additional fifth (see *Rashi*).

53. Eaten in this way, the olive oil is not harmful but beneficial (*Mishnah Berurah* 202:28; see also *Tos. HaRosh*).

54. Below, 44a.

55. *Anigaron*, mentioned several times in Mishnaic literature (see *Rashi* and *Hagahos Yavetz*; see *Rashi* to *Yoma* 76a רִיחָה אֲנִיגָרוֹן), is a kind of [beet] soup [see *Gemara* below] into which olive oil is added (*Rashi*; see also *Rashi* to *Yoma* *ibid.*). When eaten as an ingredient in *anigaron*, the olive oil is not harmful but beneficial (*Tos. HaRosh*).

of all varieties of cooked vegetables.

The Gemara objects to this answer as well:

But if so, then the *anigaron* is the primary food and the oil is only a supplement, and we learned in a Mishnah: *THIS IS THE RULE*: In *WHATEVER* case you have a food that IS PRIMARY AND A SUBORDINATE food is eaten WITH IT, *ONE RECITES THE BLESSING ON THE PRIMARY* food AND thereby DISCHARGES his blessing obligation for THE SUBORDINATE food as well. Why, then, should the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the tree* be recited on the oil?

The Gemara answers:

What are we dealing with here in this ruling? We are dealing with one who feels pain in his throat, and drinks *anigaron* mixed with olive oil in order to soothe his sore throat.^[1] And that which *anigaron* mixed with a lot of oil is drunk to soothe a sore throat is as was taught in the following Baraisa: *ONE WHO FEELS PAIN IN HIS THROAT* – MAY NOT INITIALLY BATHE [HIS THROAT] WITH OIL ON THE SABBATH,^[2] *אֲבָל נוֹתֵן שֶׁמֶן* – BUT HE MAY POUR A LOT OF OIL INTO *ANIGARON* AND SWALLOW it.^[3]

The Gemara objects:

But if Shmuel and R' Yochanan refer to where one drinks the olive oil when mixed into *anigaron*, then it is obvious that one recites *the One Who creates the fruit of the tree* when drinking this mixture, since the oil is primary. Why did Shmuel and R' Yochanan have to teach us this?^[4]

The Gemara answers:

It is not obvious, for you might have said that *since his intent* in drinking this mixture is for a remedy and not for pleasure, *he should not recite a blessing on it altogether*.^[5] Therefore, he [the one who states this ruling – i.e. Shmuel and R' Yochanan] informs us that *since one derives pleasure from it, one must recite a blessing*.^[6]

The Gemara cites an Amoraic dispute on which the ruling cited above will be brought to bear:

Regarding the blessing on wheat flour,^[7] Rav Yehudah says one recites: *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*,^[8] whereas Rav Nachman says one recites: *that everything came into being through His word*.^[9] Rav Yehudah, Rava said to Rav Nachman: Do not dispute the ruling of Rav Yehudah, for both R' Yochanan and Shmuel take the same stand as he does in this matter. For Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel, and so said R' Yitzchak in the name of R' Yochanan: On olive oil, one recites the blessing: *the One Who creates the fruit of the tree*. Evidently, even though [the olive] has been changed from a solid into a liquid, it retains its original status with regard to blessings. Here, with regard to wheat flour, too, even though it has been changed from a solid to a powder, it retains its original status with regard to blessings.

NOTES

1. Since it is the oil that produces this soothing effect, a large quantity of oil must be added to the *anigaron*, which makes the oil the primary food and the *anigaron* but a supplement (*Rashi*). Therefore, one recites *ha'eitz* on the mixture [rather than *haadamah*, which is usually recited on *anigaron* (see below, 39a)].

[*Rashi's* comments here suggest that he concurs with the view of *HaRav Yosef* (cited in *Tur*, *Orach Chaim* 202) that what makes the oil the primary food is the fact that it is present in large measure, not the fact that one needs the oil as an emollient. The Gemara mentions the fact that the person has a sore throat only because that is the usual situation in which one would add large amounts of oil to *anigaron*. But even if one were to drink such *anigaron* for non-therapeutic purposes, the oil would be considered the primary food and one would recite *ha'eitz*. Other *Rishonim* (also cited by *Tur* there), however, disagree and maintain that the oil is considered primary only when the mixture is drunk to relieve a sore throat. See *Shulchan Aruch*, *Orach Chaim* 202:4.]

2. That is, one may not sip oil in order to hold it on the affected area and then spit it out (*Rashi*, as explained by *Divrei David*). For since he does not swallow the oil, it is clear to all that he is engaging in a therapeutic procedure to relieve his sore throat. And the Rabbis forbade the performance of obvious therapeutic procedures on the Sabbath to relieve minor aches and pains, so that one not come to violate the Biblical prohibition against *grinding* in preparing medicines (*Rashi*).

3. I.e. he may drink the oil (after mixing it into *anigaron* – see end of note), and hold it on the affected area before swallowing. For since he swallows the oil in the end, it is not apparent that he is performing a therapeutic procedure. And the Rabbis forbade on the Sabbath only procedures that are obviously intended for therapy. But procedures which are not obviously intended for therapy are permitted even when they are indeed being done for such purposes (see *Rashi*). By the same token, one would be permitted to drink pure oil, hold it on the affected area and then swallow it. The Baraisa mentions mixing the oil with *anigaron* only because that is the usual case in which one would drink the oil, because drinking pure olive oil is harmful, as mentioned in the Gemara above (*Divrei David* in explanation of *Rashi*; cf. *Tosafos* et al.).

4. *Tzlach* asks that perhaps the main thrust of Shmuel and R' Yocha-

nan's ruling was to teach that one recites the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the tree* rather than the more specific blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the "olive" tree* suggested by the Gemara above (35b). He answers that this could not have been the purpose of their ruling, since this is already known from our Mishnah, which states that *the One Who creates the fruit of the tree* is recited on all fruit products with the sole exception of wine. [Accordingly, the Gemara above could have in this way proven from the Mishnah itself that no special blessing was instituted for olive oil. Nevertheless, the Gemara there chose to cite the ruling of Shmuel and R' Yochanan as proof, for reasons explained by *Tzlach* here.]

5. The blessing for food or drink was instituted only when one's consumption of the food is deemed "eating" or "drinking" (see 35b note 51). Accordingly, when one takes a medicine from which he derives no pleasure whatsoever, no blessing is recited (see *Tosafos* כיון כיון). One might think, therefore, that even when one takes a medicine whose consumption is pleasurable, he still does not recite a blessing, since his main intent is for medical purposes and not for "eating" or "drinking."

6. Even though the person's primary purpose in drinking it is for medicinal reasons rather than for pleasure.

7. According to *Rashi*, *Rif* and *Rav Hai Gaon*, the Gemara is discussing regular wheat flour. [*Tosafos* and *Rosh*, however, maintain that since regular flour is barely edible, all would agree that *shehakol* is recited on it, since it is certainly not in the usable state for which it was originally planted (see below). Rather, they assert, the Gemara is referring either to coarse or toasted flour, which is more edible than regular flour. See also *Rabbeinu Yonah* and *Rashba*.]

8. Just as one would recite before eating raw wheat kernels, whose blessing is *haadamah*, as taught in a Baraisa below [37a]. The fact that the kernels have now been ground does not change their status with regard to the blessing (see *Rashi*). [*Rashi's* comments here in *יהאדמותני* reflect a different reading in the Gemara – see *Rashash*.]

9. Rav Nachman holds that since the flour has been ground and thus changed from its original state, it is no longer classified as "the fruit of the ground," and that specific blessing is no longer appropriate. Therefore, the general *shehakol* blessing is recited instead.

The comparison is rejected:

מי דמי – Is it [the case of wheat flour] comparable to the case of olive oil? – **There**, in the case of olive oil, it does not have another improvement that is destined to be done to it, i.e. it has assumed the final usable form for which it was originally planted. **Here**, in the case of wheat flour, it has another improvement destined to be done to it by being processed into bread.^[10]

The Gemara challenges Rav Nachman's position:

ובי אית ליה עלויא אחרניא לא מברכין עליה בורא פרי האדמה אלא – But is it so that when it has another improvement destined to be done to it, we do not recite on it the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground* but rather the general *shehakol* blessing? – **Why**, R' Zeira said in the name of Rav Masna, who said in the name of Shmuel: – **On raw pumpkin and on barley flour** – **we recite the blessing that everything came into being through His word.** – **Is it not implied that on flour of wheat we recite the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the ground?**^[11]

The Gemara replies:

דחישי נמי שהכל נהיה בברו – **No**, do not draw this inference. – **Rather**, Shmuel agrees that on flour of wheat, too, one recites *that everything came into being through His word*.

The Gemara asks:

– **But then let him teach us** that we are to recite a *shehakol* on the flour of wheat, and we would know that **certainly** the same applies to the flour of barley!^[12] – ? –

The Gemara answers:

– **Shmuel could not have formulated his ruling** the way you propose. For **if he had taught us** that *shehakol* is recited on the flour of wheat, and said nothing about barley, – **I would have said that this applies only to the flour of wheat**, – **but** – **on the flour of barley, one does not recite any blessing at all.** – **Therefore, he informs us**, by specifying *barley* flour, that even barley flour requires a *shehakol*.^[13]

The Gemara challenges this answer:

– **But why would anyone think that no blessing is recited on barley flour? Is it less of a food than salt or brine**, which requires a blessing? – **For we learned in a Baraisa:**^[14] – **ON SALT AND ON BRINE**^[15] – **ONE RECITES the blessing THAT EVERYTHING CAME INTO BEING THROUGH HIS WORD.** – ? –

The Gemara defends its answer:

– **No**, it was indeed **necessary** to teach that barley flour requires a blessing, and this could not have been derived from the fact that a blessing is recited even on salt or brine. – **For it might have entered your mind to say that** – **a person is apt to throw some salt or brine into his mouth and swallow it; therefore, eating it is considered a normal pleasure, on which one must recite a blessing.** – **But barley flour**, – **since it is bad for one's stomach, as it causes intestinal worms**, – **people are not apt to eat it and one should therefore not recite a blessing on it at all.**^[16] – **Therefore, he informs us that** – **since one derives pleasure from eating the [barley flour], one must recite a blessing on it.**^[17]

The Gemara cites an Amoraic dispute regarding the blessing on palm shoots:

– **On palm shoots**,^[18] – **Rav Yehudah says** one recites *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*. – **But Shmuel says** one recites *that everything came into being through His word*.

The Gemara explains the rationale for each position:

– **Rav Yehudah says** one recites *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground* on the palm shoot, – **because it is considered a fruit.**^[19] – **But Shmuel says** one recites *that everything came into being through His word*, – **since it eventually hardens and becomes inedible; therefore, even now it is not considered a "fruit."**

Shmuel finds merit in his disputant's position:

– **Shmuel said to Rav Yehudah:** – **Sharp one,**^[20] **it seems more reasonable**

NOTES

10. Rav Nachman argues that a fruit changed from its natural state is classified as a "fruit" only if it has been changed to the state in which the purpose of its being planted is achieved. Thus, olive oil is deemed a "fruit" (warranting the blessing *the One Who creates the "fruit" of the tree*), though it is no longer in its natural state, because it is in the state for which it was originally planted. Flour, however, is not a "fruit," because it is neither in its natural state (wheat kernels) nor in the state for which it was originally planted (bread). Therefore, the blessing *the One Who creates the "fruit" of the ground* is inappropriate, and *Shehakol* is recited instead (see *Rashi*).

11. For by specifying *barley* flour, which is inferior to wheat, Shmuel implies that in the case of the superior wheat, the flour retains the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground* (*Rashi*).

12. For if even on the superior wheat flour we recite only the general *shehakol* rather than the specific *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*, it goes without saying that on the inferior barley flour only a *shehakol* would be recited.

13. [And it is also for this reason that Shmuel did not mention simply "flour" without specifying which type. For had he not mentioned a type, we would naturally have interpreted it as meaning *wheat* flour, and we would have thought that no blessing at all is recited on barley flour.]

14. *Mesoras HaShas* emends this to read *תתקין*, since what follows is a Baraisa, not a Mishnah. [Usually, *we have learned*, introduces the citation of a Mishnah, and *תתקין*, *it was taught*, the citation of a Baraisa.] However, it is possible that the Gemara will sometimes use the word *תתקין* to introduce a Baraisa – see *Tosafos* to *Chullin* 87b and *Rashba*

to *Chullin* 14a הלוקח ברו.

15. See *Hagahos HaBach* §1 and *Targum HaLaaz* ע' שלמיייר; cf. *Ritva*.

16. [For eating it is not considered a normal "pleasure," that a blessing should be required.]

17. [This is different from the case of olive oil that is drunk as is, where no blessing at all is recited (according to *Rashi*) because of the oil's harmful effects (see 35b note 51). For the harmful effects of drinking plain oil pervade the entire body, so that ingestion of the oil is not deemed to be "drinking" at all. Eating barley flour, on the other hand, does provide essential food benefits, albeit with limited side effects. Thus, its ingestion is indeed deemed "eating" and a blessing is therefore required (see *Diurei David* to 35b דמי.)]

18. As the branches of the palm tree grow each year, the new growth is soft and edible. By the following year, it hardens into wood (*Rashi*). [Other *Rishonim*, however, explain that *קורא* refers to *palm hearts*, a white pith that grows at the top of the tree and hardens during the winter (see *Rav Hai Gaon* and *Rambam*, *Commentary* to *Uktzin* 3:7; see also *Rash*, *Rosh* and *Rav* there, and *Aruch* קר.)]

19. Since it is edible and it grows from the ground, it is considered a "fruit" of the ground. [However, it is deemed to be only a fruit of the ground, and not a fruit of the tree, since it is not the tree's primary fruit (*Diurei David*; see also below, note 28).]

20. Shmuel often called his disciple, Rav Yehudah, by this name because of the latter's sharp analytical abilities (*Aruch* ע' שן, first explanation; see another explanation there [cited by *Mesoras HaShas* to *Chagigah* 15b]).

והוא וזה ח"כ לפלוג וליהוי בדרידה
ולו בשנייה שרי כבולנו חלוצה דהא
שקטתה ע"כ פ' הר"י לא יעצמו
ידיהם וזהו חלוצה דהא קרי עליה
יעזר ואח"כ כבולנו והיינו שטמא
הספר משום דקא מוכחא מילתא
דשקטתה קרי חמוק אי ג' יושב
ברוש רש"י לא יעצמו להשקות
ל' טקן הוא לתוך חנינון ואפילו
שקטתו אי בולנו (ג) בשנייה בלא
ידיה: **כיון** דלית ליה הנאה מיניה
ע"כ דרבי: ונראה הדברים (ד)
ע"כ ארס שמה"מ מקין כל המשקין
ע"כ לשתות דלית ליה הנאה מיניה
בשני דרבי ואי חית ליה הנאה
ידיה, בלא הרשאה בשני דרבי:
לכתב שמואל כספריים לא
גרסי' ולשון ה"א הוא
קמחא וכו': **קמחא** דחסי'
קמחא דלא מיירי קמחא ממא דאס'
לא ישיב' ביה ברכה דברא פרי
דמא חלוצה מיירי בקמחא שקרין
קמחא'עיר לא בקמח שטמא
שטמא שועל שמיבשין בטור:
א נטעי חסי' דעשתא דקורא.
וסבר גמ' כותיה דשמואל וא"כ
קון לנבי גפריס דלא נטעי חסי'
עשתא חלוצה חזכרין עלייהם השכל
קון דברא דקוני שקד' כשרים כשרים
כלים קליפתם חילונה ולא נטעי
ו דעשתא דהכי למיכל לבו שבה
יוס כ' אס לאטול געריעין שנהן
יחבשלו חזקד עלייהם גמ' שסכ':
קליפי

שחיקת סמינים שהיא מלאכה :
תחלה . כלומר למחלה לא יתן
השמן בפיו לשם ערשור כי אם
לשם בליעה ואם צא להשהותו ישהט:
לדעת ליה הנאה מנייה . לבד הרשעה
ש' לו הנאה א"ל: והלכתה וכו' עוד
פטר לה לא גרביהן וכו' : הוא :
קמחא דחמין . וכולל קמח חטים כמות
שהוא : בורא פרי האדמה . כמח
טובס חמין דחמין לקמן . בפירוקן
(ד' לו) : שמדבר בורא פרי האדמה :
לחשתי . וגרע הואיל ולא חשתי
לעלויל מעלייהא : במחלה קאי .
והוא ליה כדסמינ חמין : הלא אית
ליה עגילא חסדיה . הלכך יאז מחלל
פרי ולכלל דרך חילתו לא בא אבל
האמן מיד בא בשניו לכלל דרך
חילתו ועיקר הפרי לכן נטעוה
הלכך פרי חמין : מורחא . מורחא
שערי מחלל דס"ל בחמין בפס"א
דחסיב : ומי גרע ממלה וחמין .
והכי חסבא דרעיתן לזה חבטי
ברכב: חמין . שגמירא(6) : קואליני .
תולמינ דשכמיינינ : לדעת ליה הנאה
באכילה : קורא . רך של דקל
כשעצפו גדלים בכל שנה ושנה כדרך
כל האילנות הנטוע בשנה זו וך ובשנה
שניה מתקשה וענשה פן : לען חופי
לחשתי . שאם אינו תולש ענשו
הוא מתקשה כעץ : ארעחא דשגאל .

וְלֹא־שָׁחַד כִּי וְחָמוּ שֹׁמֵרָה : כָּל־
 מִי עֵץ : אֲדַעְתָּהּ אֲדַרְחָה : שֶׁ-
 פָּרִיז : מִינִי נֶלְפָה : מִינִי לָקַח : שֶׁ-
 שִׁגְדִּילִים בּוֹ כְּמֵה מִינִי אֲחִילָה קָרִי
 לִיה מִינִי : תַּחֲמוּת : בְּחֹרֶךְ הַטִּילִים
 גְּדִילִים כְּמִין תַּחֲמוּת וְבוֹלְטִין צִעֲלֵה
 כְּמוֹ שֶׁצִּילָן עַל עֵרֶב : אֲחִיּוּת :
 הָאֵל אֲכַלֵּם : קִשְׁיִימוֹן : הָאֵל קִלְיֶפֶה
 גְּדוֹלָה שֶׁכִּבְדִּיתָ הַפָּרִי כְּעֵין קִלְיֶפֶה
 הַגְּדִילֵה כִּבְדִּי אֲחִיּוּם דִּקְסָ : לָקַח
 נָעָעִי אֲנִיכִי אֲדַעְתָּהּ אֲדַרְחָה : אֲחִי
 אֵל כְּפִילִים וְלֹא הַתַּחֲמוּת שֶׁאֲבִיל
 מִמֶּעֱטִין אֵל הָאֵילִין בְּכָד : דִּקְלָא לֹא
 נָעָעִי אֲחִיכִי אֲדַעְתָּהּ : אֲחִיכִי אֵל
 הַקֹּרֵא שֶׁהֲאִבֹלֵט מִחֶמֶס עֲנַפִּי הָאֵילִין :
 עֵרֶלֶה כְּחוֹלֵה אֲחִיכִי : מְדַבֵּר סוֹפֵרִים
 הָאֵל : דַּבֵּל הַמִּקְוֵל בְּחָדָר : בְּגִדֵּלֶה
 הַלֵּלֶה כְּחוֹמוֹ כְּחוֹלֵה לֶאֱרֵךְ : דְּכִין
 לְחִינָה מִן הַטֹּהֵר הֵלֶךְ אֲחֵר הַמִּקְוֵל :
 גְּבִי מַעֲשֶׂה : הָאֵל דִּרְשׁ לִגְבִי מַעֲשֶׂה
 אֲחִיכֵר מַעֲשֶׂה דְּרִשְׁתָּהּ דְּרִשְׁתָּהּ
 גּוֹפֵה דְּרַבְּקָה שֶׁהִטְוִה לֹא חִיבִיה
 לְנֶשֶׁךְ אֵלֶּה זֶנֶן חִירוֹת וְיֹהֵר : כְּלִלִים
 כְּדָרִם : קֹסֶרֶךְ מִין יִרְקֵה הָאֵל : מִ"מ
 לְכ"פ הָאֵל לֹא סָפֵק עֵרֶלֶה ו' (3)
 הָאֵל מִ"מ מִסְתַּכֵּה דְּפִרְכִּיךְ דְּרִבְעִיָּה
 הָאֵל וְלִמְיָרֵךְ שֶׁלֶךְ הַפָּרִי עֲלֵמוֹ מוֹחֵר
 כְּחוֹלֵה לֶאֱרֵךְ וְהָאֵל בְּחָדָר סָפֵק הָאֵל
 וְתֵן סָפֵק עֵרֶלֶה כ' : וְכֹסְפִירִי אֲרִים
 צוּרֵה כְּשֶׁכֶּךְ חִירוֹ וְהַטְוִיהָ עַל גְּבוֹל
 אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל : וְכֹחוֹלֵה לֶאֱרֵךְ : הַלּוֹקֵה
 מִן הַחֲשׂוֹר עַל הַעֲרֵלֶה וְיֹדֵעַ הָאֵל
 שֶׁיֵּשׁ בְּכַדְרֹסוֹ קִטְעוֹת וְנִסְיָנוֹת : יוֹדֵר
 וְלוֹקֵה : הַיֵּמוֹת אֵל עַיִן שֶׁסָּפֵק
 הָאֵל אֵם יִבִּיא מִן הַנִּסְיָנוֹת :
 וְיִבְלֶדֶךְ

[illegible]

לקמן מ: נדרים נה:
[פי' בערוך מרק והסוד
נא"ח פי' ר"ד פי' מי
מלה ורבינו הא"י פירש
אומית שהוא הקפץ]

[illegible]

הגהות הב"ח
(ה) רש"י ד"ה ומת
ו' וס' ופלא' בדברים.

ס' ערלע וס' וסלי הא' מ"ת : (ג) חת' ד"ה לא יערעט וס' אז טולט. ר' ר"ב עיין לקחן דף ל"ח ע"א גבי שחיטת רכב :

שלמיריא. ר"כ פ"י מי חלה : (כ) ד"ה מ"ח לכ"ט ו

to rule as you say. – דָּהָא צָנוֹן טוֹפוּ לְהַקְשׁוֹת – For a radish, too, eventually hardens if left in the ground to full maturity.^[21] וּמִכְרִינָן עָלֶיהָ בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה – yet we recite on it the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the ground when eating it in its edible state. The same should apply to palm shoots.

The Gemara, however, rejects the comparison: – בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה – But in truth this comparison made by Shmuel between palm shoots and radishes is not valid. – דְּבִנְיָא דְּרַדִּישׁ – For people plant radishes with the intent of eating the soft radish.^[22] – דְּבִנְיָא דְּתַנְחָא – But people do not plant palm trees with the intent of eating palm shoots.^[23]

The Gemara challenges this premise: – בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה – But is it indeed so that wherever people do not plant with the intent of this particular part of the plant being used as food, we do not recite on it a blessing that is specific to it, but rather the general *shehakol* blessing? – וְהִיא צִלְחָא דְּתַנְחָא דְּפִרְתָּא – Why, there is the caper bush, which people plant only for the sake of the caper berry,^[24] – וְתַנְחָא – yet we learned in a Baraisa:^[25] – Regarding the blessings recited ON the VARIOUS TYPES OF CAPER produce,^[26] – ON THE LEAVES AND THE DATE-LIKE OUTGROWTHS^[27] – אֹמְרִי בּוֹרָא פְּרִי – ONE RECITES THE ONE WHO CREATES THE FRUIT OF THE GROUND.^[28] – AND ON THE BERRIES^[29] – אֹמְרִי בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הָעֵץ – ONE RECITES THE ONE WHO CREATES THE FRUIT OF THE TREE. Thus, we see that one does recite *haadamah* on the caper leaves and date-like outgrowths, though they are not the edibles intended when the bush is planted! – ? –

The Gemara answers: – אֹמְרִי בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה – Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: – דְּבִנְיָא דְּרַדִּישׁ – People do indeed plant the caper bush with the intention of eating all that sprouts,^[30] – דְּבִנְיָא דְּתַנְחָא – but people do not plant the palm tree with the intention of eating the palm shoots.^[31]

The Gemara concludes:

– וְאֵף עַל גַּב דְּקִלְסִיָּה שְׂמוּאֵל לָרֵב וְהוֹדָה – And even though Shmuel praised Rav Yehudah for his position in this matter,^[32] – הִלְכָּתָא – the halachah accords with Shmuel, who says that one recites *shehakol* on palm shoots.

The Gemara cites a ruling regarding the caper bush, which it will challenge from the Baraisa cited above:

– אֹמְרִי בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה – Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: – צִלְחָא דְּתַנְחָא – In the case of a caper bush of *orlah* outside the Land of Israel,^[33] – הַקְפְּרִיסִין – one throws away the berries and eats the husks.^[34]

The Gemara asks:

– לְמִימְרָא דְּאֲבִינֹת פְּרִי וְקְפְּרִיסִין לֹא פְּרִי – Is this to say that the berries are considered a fruit of the tree and the husks are not considered a fruit of the tree? – וְרַמִּינָהּ – But note the contradiction between them [this ruling and the Baraisa cited above]: – עַל מִינֵי נִצְפָּה – Regarding the blessings recited ON the VARIOUS TYPES OF CAPER produce, – אֹמְרִי בּוֹרָא פְּרִי – ONE RECITES THE ONE WHO CREATES THE FRUIT OF THE GROUND. – וְעַל הַתְּמָרוֹת – AND ON THE BERRIES AND ON THE HUSKS covering them – אֹמְרִי בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הָעֵץ – ONE RECITES THE ONE WHO CREATES THE FRUIT OF THE TREE. From the Baraisa's ruling that one recites *ha'eitz* on the husks, we see that they too are considered the tree's "fruit," and by the same token they should be encompassed by the *orlah* prohibition. – ? –

The Gemara answers:

– הוּא דְּאֹמְרִי בְּרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא – While it is true that this Baraisa contradicts Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav, he is not refuted by it, for he has said his ruling in accordance with the view of R' Akiva. – דִּתְנִן – For we learned in a Mishnah:^[35] – אֹמְרִי בְּרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא – R' ELIEZER SAYS: – תְּמָרוֹת וְאֲבִינֹת וְקְפְּרִיסִין – THE CAPER BUSH REQUIRES TITHING of its DATE-LIKE OUTGROWTHS, BERRIES AND HUSKS. – אֹמְרִי בְּרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא – R' AKIVA SAYS: – אֵין מִתְעַשֵּׂר אֶלָּא אֲבִינֹת בִּלְכָּד – IT DOES NOT REQUIRE

NOTES

21. Radishes that are left too long in the ground will eventually harden [to the point that they are no longer edible] (*Rashi*).

22. *Pugla* is the Aramaic name for radishes at the edible stage (*Rashi*).

23. [The Gemara rejects Shmuel's proof to his disputant by arguing that *shehakol* should be recited on palm shoots on different grounds. Even if the palm shoots would not eventually harden, *haadamah* would not be recited, because the tree is not planted with the intent to eat the shoots. Hence, the shoots are not deemed a "fruit," and the blessing *Who creates the "fruit" of the ground* is inappropriate (see *Rabbeinu Yonah* end of *ד"ה קורא*; *Tur*, *Orach Chaim* 204).]

24. The Gemara presently assumes that just as people plant palm trees with the sole intent of eating their dates, so too do people plant caper bushes with the intent of eating only the berries.

25. See above, note 14.

26. The words *צִלְחָא* and *נִצְפָּה* are synonymous, both referring to the caper bush. The "various types of caper" refers to the various edibles that grow on a single caper bush [and not to different varieties of caper] (*Rashi*).

27. The *תְּמָרוֹת* [literally: dates] are edible date-like protuberances that grow on the caper leaves, similar to those that develop on willow leaves (*Rashi*).

28. Although they grow on a tree, the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the "tree"* is not recited on them, as only the tree's primary fruit is called "the fruit of the tree." The secondary "fruits," however, can indeed be classified as the fruits of the *ground* (see *Rashba* below *ד"ה רבי אליעזר*).

29. [The terms *אֲבִינֹת* and *פְּרִיָּה* both refer to the caper berry.]

30. [Although the primary fruit of the caper bush is indeed the berry,]

one plants the bush in order to eat the leaves and the date-like outgrowths as well, since removing them does not reduce the eventual size and output of the bush (see *Rashi*).

31. Since removing the shoots reduces the tree's branches (*Rashi*). Hence, the shoots are not deemed to be "fruit," and *shehakol* is recited on them.

32. By saying, "Sharp one, it seems more reasonable [to rule] as you [say]."

33. Where the prohibition against *orlah* is only Rabbinic (*Rashi*).

[The Torah commands (*Leviticus* 19:23): *When you will come to the land and plant any food tree, you shall treat its fruit as forbidden – for three years they shall be forbidden to you, they shall not be eaten*. Though this verse refers specifically to Eretz Yisrael [as it states: *When you come to the land* – see *Kiddushin* 36b-37a], we are taught that *orlah* applies even outside Eretz Yisrael by force of "a halachah" (*Orlah* 3:9). The Gemara in *Kiddushin* 38b cites an Amoraic dispute as to whether this "halachah" is Rabbinic or whether it is a Biblical *Halachah LeMoshe MiSinai*. *Rashi* explains this *sugya* here according to the view that this "halachah" is Rabbinic – see *Pnei Yehoshua* and *Tzlach*.]

34. The laws of *orlah* apply only to the fruit of a tree (see verse cited in previous note). Rav Yehudah holds that although the caper bush produces many different edible foods, only the berry, which is the primary fruit of the tree, is considered its *fruit* (see above, note 28). All the other edible growths of the caper bush (including the husks that cover the berries) are not deemed to be *fruits* of the tree and are therefore not encompassed by the *orlah* prohibition. [The Gemara below will explain why Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav stated this ruling specifically with regard to a caper bush that grows outside of Eretz Yisrael.]

35. *Maasros* 4:6.

TITHING of anything **OTHER THAN THE BERRIES ALONE**, מפני פרי שדוה פרי – **BECAUSE [THE BERRY] alone IS considered the FRUIT.**^[36]

The Gemara asks:

וְנִימָא הֶלְכָּה בְּרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא – **But then let him [Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav] say simply that the halachah follows R' Akiva** (in the matter of his dispute with R' Eliezer).^[37] Why did Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav formulate an independent ruling?

The Gemara answers:

אִי אָמַר הֶלְכָּה בְּרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא – **If he had said, “The halachah follows R' Akiva,”** הָיָה אָמִינָא אֶפְיֻלָּי בְּאַרְצָא – **I would have said that he means that the halachah follows R' Akiva even with regard to orlah in the Land of Israel.** By formulating an independent ruling with regard to *orlah* of the caper bush outside of Eretz Yisrael, **הָיָה אָמִינָא אֶפְיֻלָּי בְּאַרְצָא** – **he [Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav] informs us that it is only with regard to orlah of the caper bush outside Eretz Yisrael that he follows R' Akiva,** כָּל הַמִּיּוֹקֵל – **because of the principle that whoever holds the lenient position in a dispute with regard to orlah in the Land of Israel, הֶלְכָּה בְּמִוְתוֹ בְּחוּצָה לְאֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל – the halachah follows him with regard to orlah outside the Land of Israel.**^[38] **אָכֵל בְּאַרְצָא לֹא** – **But with regard to orlah of the caper bush in the Land of Israel, Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav does not follow R' Akiva.**^[39]

The Gemara is not satisfied with this answer and asks:

וְנִימָא הֶלְכָּה בְּרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא בְּחוּצָה לְאֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל – **But then let him [Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav] say simply, “The halachah follows R' Akiva with regard to a caper bush that grows outside the Land of Israel,”** דְּכָל הַמִּיּוֹקֵל בְּאַרְצָא הֶלְכָּה בְּמִוְתוֹ בְּחוּצָה לְאֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל – **and we would understand that this is because of the principle that whoever holds the lenient position in a dispute with**

regard to fruits that grow in the Land of Israel, the halachah follows him with regard to fruits that grow outside the Land of Israel, and that the halachah does not follow him with regard to fruits that grow in Eretz Yisrael. Why did Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav formulate an independent ruling?

The Gemara answers:

אִי אָמַר הֶלְכָּה בְּרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא – **If he had said this** (i.e. simply that the halachah follows R' Akiva with regard to a caper bush that grows outside Eretz Yisrael), הָיָה אָמִינָא הֵי מִיּוֹקֵל גִּבִּי מִעֲשֵׂר אֵילָן – **I would have said that this (that the halachah follows R' Akiva outside Eretz Yisrael) applies only with regard to the tithe of trees,**^[40] **אָכֵל גִּבִּי עֵרְלָה נִמִּי דְּבִאֲרָא** – **which in the Land of Israel itself is required only by Rabbinic decree.**^[41] **אָכֵל גִּבִּי עֵרְלָה נִמִּי דְּבִאֲרָא** – **But with regard to orlah, which in the Land of Israel is prohibited by Biblical law, הָיָה אָמִינָא בְּחוּצָה לְאֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל נִמִּי נִגְזָר – I would say that outside the Land of Israel, too, we should decree it forbidden.**^[42] **הָיָה אָמִינָא בְּחוּצָה לְאֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל נִמִּי נִגְזָר** – **He [Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav] therefore informs us (by formulating an independent ruling stating specifically that caper husks of orlah outside Eretz Yisrael are permitted) that we adopt R' Akiva's lenient position with regard to fruits outside Eretz Yisrael even in the case of orlah, which is Biblically forbidden in Eretz Yisrael.**

The Gemara cites an incident relevant to this matter:

רַבִּינָא אֲשֶׁכְּחֵיהּ לְמַר בַּר רַב אֲשִׁי דָקָא וְרִיק אַבְיוֹנוֹת וְקָאֵבִיל קְפָרִיסִין – **Ravina once found Mar bar Rav Ashi throwing away the caper berries and eating the husks of an orlah tree outside Eretz Yisrael.**^[43] **מַאי דַּעְתָּךְ – [Ravina] said to him: What is your opinion in this matter, as reflected by your eating the husks?** **בְּרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא דִּמְיֻקֵּל** – **Is it not that you are acting in**

NOTES

36. Since R' Akiva considers the berry alone to be the fruit, he would rule that the berry alone is subject to *orlah* [as Rav Yehudah rules in the name of Rav], and that only on the berry is *ha'eitz* recited [unlike the Baraisa, which rules that *ha'eitz* is recited on the berries and on the husks] (see *Rashba*).

[As just explained, the Baraisa certainly does not reflect the view of R' Akiva. Apparently, then, it reflects the view of R' Akiva's disputant – R' Eliezer – who rules that the caper's berries, husks and date-like outgrowths must be tithed, but not the leaves. The date-like outgrowths might not be considered the tree's fruit (as the Baraisa rules that *haadamah* rather than *ha'eitz* is recited on them), yet require tithing Rabbinically just as vegetables do. And though the Baraisa rules that one recites *haadamah* on the leaves as well, this does not mean that the leaves require tithing, for the Rabbis might have been lenient in the Rabbinic matter of “vegetable tithes” and excluded the tree's leaves from this law, though not its date-like outgrowths (see *Rashba*; see also *Ramban*).]

[It emerges from this Gemara that whatever is considered a “tree fruit” with regard to *orlah* is considered one with regard to the *ha'eitz* blessing as well, and vice versa. The tithing obligation, however, can apply even to things that are not “tree fruits.” (See *Ramban*, who explains why R' Akiva does not subject the non-fruit parts of the caper to the law of “vegetable tithes,” as R' Eliezer does.)]

37. Had Rav said simply that the halachah follows R' Akiva (that only the berries of the caper bush are subject to tithes), we would have known that with regard to *orlah* only the berries are forbidden, but the husks are permitted.

38. Since *orlah* that grows outside Eretz Yisrael is forbidden only Rabbinically, we follow the lenient position (*Rashi*). [See *Chazon Ish*, *Kilayim* 1:8 and *Orlah* 11:7, who considers whether this is a different rule from the general principle of סְפִיקָא דְּרִבּוֹן לְקִילָא, one may act leniently in unresolved questions of Rabbinic law.]

[Although R' Akiva's ruling says nothing directly about the law of *orlah*, it emerges from that ruling that only the caper berry and not the husk is forbidden as *orlah*. Hence, he is the one who “holds the lenient position with regard to *orlah* in the Land.”]

[This rule “whoever holds the lenient position in the Land . . .” applies not only to uncertainties regarding *orlah*, but also to uncertain-

ties regarding other laws that Biblically apply only in Eretz Yisrael but were Rabbinically extended to lands outside Eretz Yisrael (see *Shabbos* 139a).]

39. Though the general rule is that the halachah follows R' Akiva in his disputes with a colleague [*Eruvin* 46b], Rav finds R' Eliezer's position in this matter more reasonable and therefore conforms to it by forbidding [as a stringency] even the husks of the *orlah* caper berry that grows in Eretz Yisrael (see *Ramban*).

40. Which is the case being discussed by R' Akiva and his disputant, who argue about which parts of the caper bush must be tithed.

41. Biblically, only grain, wine and olive oil must be tithed (see *Deuteronomy* 12:17, 14:23, 18:4). The tithing of all other fruits and vegetables is only Rabbinic (see *Rashi*). [Though most Rishonim agree with *Rashi* in this matter, others hold that the tithing of all fruit trees is Biblical (see, for example, *Rambam*, *Hil. Terumos* 2:1,6 and *Hil. Maaser* 1:9). Though our Gemara here seems clearly to support the former view, the proponents of the latter view will explain that the Gemara here does not refer to the tithe of trees specifically, but means rather that all tithes are only Rabbinic nowadays even in Eretz Yisrael, in the absence of the *Beis HaMikdash* (see *Tzlach*).]

Thus, had Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav said only that “the halachah follows R' Akiva with regard to trees that grow outside Eretz Yisrael,” one might have thought that he adopts R' Akiva's leniency outside Eretz Yisrael only with regard to exempting the husks and date-like outgrowths from tithes, as even if one were to come to mistakenly extend this leniency to capers that grow in Eretz Yisrael, no Biblical violation would be involved.

42. Even in matters of uncertainty like the husks of the caper bush. For if one were to act leniently with regard to the husks of *orlah* capers outside Eretz Yisrael (which is technically permitted because it is the lenient position in a matter of Rabbinic law), people might come to adopt the same leniency even in Eretz Yisrael and thereby be in possible violation of a Biblical prohibition (as R' Eliezer forbids the husks as *orlah*). Thus, I would think that Rav's leniency does not extend to permitting the caper husks of *orlah* outside Eretz Yisrael.

43. [These sages lived in Babylonia, not in Eretz Yisrael.]

accordance with the view of R' Akiva, who is lenient in this matter?^[44] – **But then let master (i.e. you) also act in accordance with the view of Beis Shammai, who are even more lenient and would permit even the berries, as will now be demonstrated:**

For we learned in a Baraisa:^[45] – **With regard to THE CAPER BUSH, BEIS SHAMMAI SAY:** – **It constitutes KILAYIM when planted IN THE VINEYARD.**^[46] – **BUT BEIS HILLEL SAY:** – **It does NOT constitute KILAYIM when planted IN THE VINEYARD.**^[47] – **Both THESE AND THOSE [Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel] AGREE THAT [THE CAPER BUSH] IS SUBJECT TO the laws of ORLAH.**

Ravina develops his argument by first analyzing the Baraisa: – **Now this Baraisa is inherently difficult!** – **First you say in the Baraisa: With regard to THE CAPER BUSH, BEIS SHAMMAI SAY: It constitutes KILAYIM when planted IN THE VINEYARD. Evidently, in their view, [the caper bush] is a type of vegetable.**^[48] – **But then it states:** – **Both THESE AND THOSE [Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel] AGREE THAT [THE CAPER BUSH] IS**

SUBJECT TO the laws of ORLAH, – **from which it is evident that in Beis Shammai's view it is a type of tree!**^[49] In order to reconcile Beis Shammai's two rulings, we must say that **– this in fact poses no difficulty, בית שמי ספיקי מספקא להו –** for it must be that Beis Shammai are uncertain whether the caper bush is a tree or a vegetable. – **Therefore, they rule that one must act here (with regard to kilayim) stringently, and treat the caper bush as a vegetable, and that one must act here (with regard to orlah) stringently, and treat the caper bush as a tree.**

Ravina concludes his argument:

– **In any event, – according to Beis Shammai, it [even the caper berry] is but questionable orlah,**^[50] – **and we learned in a Mishnah:**^[51] – **QUESTIONABLE ORLAH**^[52] – **that grew IN THE LAND of Israel IS FORBIDDEN,**^[53] – **AND if it grew IN SYRIA,**^[54] **IT IS PERMITTED,**^[55] – **AND if it grew IN a place OUTSIDE THE LAND of Israel, further away than Syria,**^[56] **ONE MAY GO DOWN to an orchard that contains orlah and non-orlah trees and is owned by a Jew whose observance of the orlah laws is suspect,**^[57]

NOTES

44. I.e. because R' Akiva holds the lenient position in this matter, and the halachah follows the lenient position with regard to *orlah* outside Eretz Yisrael. (Accordingly, Mar bar Rav Ashi was simply following the ruling above of Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav.) Alternatively, Mar bar Rav Ashi held entirely with R' Akiva, and would have eaten the caper husks even in Eretz Yisrael (see *Divrei David* א"ר א"ר at length; see also 36b note 34).

45. *Tosefta*, *Kilayim* 3:14 [see above, note 14].

46. The Torah (*Deuteronomy* 22:9) forbids the planting of grain or vegetables in a vineyard. It is, however, permitted to plant fruit trees in a vineyard (see *Rambam*, *Hil. Kilayim* 1:6 and 5:6). Beis Shammai apparently regard the caper bush as a vegetable [because of its diminutive size (*Rabbeinu Yonah*)], and therefore consider it *kilayim* when planted in a vineyard (see Gemara below).

47. Beis Hillel hold that since the caper is a perennial, with the plant regrowing each year from the same roots, it is classified as a tree [see below, 40a note 55] despite its diminutive size, and hence does not constitute *kilayim* in a vineyard (*Rabbeinu Yonah*).

48. See note 46.

49. As only a tree is subject to *orlah* – see above, notes 33 and 34.

50. Since the *orlah* prohibition applies only to the fruit of trees, and Beis Shammai are uncertain whether or not the caper bush is classified as a tree.

51. *Orlah* 3:9.

52. I.e. a fruit that might or might not be *orlah*. For example, it is unknown whether the tree on which it grew is more than three years

old. Alternatively, a non-Jew picked and brought fruit from an orchard containing *orlah* and non-*orlah* trees and it is unknown whether the fruit before us is from the *orlah* or non-*orlah* trees (*Rashi* to *Kiddushin* 38b ד"ה ודינו דשני לן).

53. Since *orlah* is a Biblical prohibition in Eretz Yisrael, we must act stringently in a case of doubt, in accordance with the general rule that ספיקא דאורייתא לחומרא, one must act stringently in unresolved questions of Biblical law.

54. Syria is Aram Tzovah, which was conquered by King David and annexed to the Land of Israel (*Rashi*). Despite the annexation, it does not have the halachic status of Eretz Yisrael, because (in the opinion of this Mishnah) the conquest of an individual (e.g. King David) does not have the legal force of a national conquest to confer the status of Eretz Yisrael on the conquered territory (*Rashi* to *Kiddushin* 38b ד"ה בסוריא). [Regarding what constitutes "individual" or "national" conquest, see *Rashi* to *Gittin* 8b ד"ה כיבוש יחיד and *Tosafos* to 8a ד"ה כיבוש שם.]

55. This Mishnah rules that questionable *orlah* outside of Eretz Yisrael is permitted. [This permit of "questionable *orlah* outside Eretz Yisrael" is readily understandable according to the view that *orlah* which grows outside of Eretz Yisrael is forbidden only by Rabbinic decree (see above, note 33). The Mishnah's permit, though, holds true even according to the view that *orlah* is Biblically forbidden outside Eretz Yisrael by force of a *Halachah LeMoshe MiSinai* (ibid.), as that *Halachah LeMoshe MiSinai* specifically excepts questionable *orlah* (see *Kiddushin* 39a).]

56. *Rashi* to *Kiddushin* 38b ד"ה ובחוצה לארץ.

57. *Rashi*; cf. *Rashi* to *Kiddushin* 38b ד"ה יורד.

יד א ב מיי ס"ח מהג'
ברכת ה' ב שש
פסוק כו קדשע אר"ח ס'
ר ב עקיף ד :
מן ג מיי פ"ח מכללות
שנת ה' כד קדשע
אר"ח ס' שכה עקיף לב
[ר ב אלפס שנת ס"ט
יד דף מד] :

[illegible]

גליון השם
גם כחיל
וקשה
לחקוראני.
כדחיתח שנת
97 קס:

פירחין מר.
 חגיגה קו:
 ר"ה כ"ד:
 כחננוס יכ"ד.
 ג. קדושין לז.
 [ג:] כ"ק יד.
 קו: ט: ג'קין
 פת: כ"ב קלג:
 ט"ג חג:
 סטכדיין פ:
 כ"ח חג:
 מ"ה ח. כ"ב:

४३८
५३८

לקחן מ: נדרים נה:
 (פי' נפרוד מרק וכסוד
 נחיה פי' ר"ד פי' מי
 תלה ורנינו ה"י פיר
 וומים שחא בקף)

[illegible]

2007/06/06 2007/06/06

(א) רש"י ד"ה ומת
וכו' ומאין הדברים .

וּלְקַח – AND BUY fruit from him, וְיִבְלֹכֶר שְׁלֵא יִרְאֶנּוּ לֹקֵט – PROVIDED THAT HE DOES NOT SEE [THE SELLER] GATHER the fruit from the trees.^[1] Accordingly, argues Ravina, you (Mar bar Rav Ashi) should eat even the caper berries of the young bush outside of Eretz Yisrael, since Beis Shammai (who are uncertain whether *orlah* applies to the caper bush altogether) would permit them outside of Eretz Yisrael as questionable *orlah*! – ? –

The Gemara answers:

רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא בְּמִקּוֹם רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר עֲבָדִין כְּנֹחִיהָ – When the view of R' Akiva is in contrast to that of R' Eliezer, we can act in accordance with [R' Akiva], since R' Eliezer's opposition does not render R' Akiva's view null and void.^[2] וְבֵית שְׁמַאי בְּמִקּוֹם בֵּית – But the view of Beis Shammai in contrast to that of Beis Hillel is of no authority.^[3]

The Gemara questions the permit of eating the husks of an *orlah* caper berry outside Eretz Yisrael:

בִּלְפָּנֵי – But let it emerge that the *orlah* husk is forbidden because it is deemed a protector of the fruit, וְנִתְפַּק לִיהָ דְּנִעְשָׂה שׁוּמֵר לְפָרִי – and the Merciful One says in His Torah: and you shall treat its fruit (es *piryo*) as forbidden.^[4] אֶת־הַשֹּׁפֵל לְפָרִי – The word *es* comes to include in the prohibition that which is auxiliary to its fruit.^[5] וְיָמַי – And what is this auxiliary that is referred to? שׁוּמֵר לְפָרִי – It is the protector of the fruit.^[6] Thus, the Gemara asks, granted that the husk is only a questionable fruit, let it be forbidden because it is a definite protector of the fruit! How, then, can Rav Yehudah and Mar bar Rav Ashi permit eating the *orlah* caper husks that grow outside the Land of Israel?

The Gemara answers:

הֵיכָא אֲמַרִּין דְּנִעְשָׂה שׁוּמֵר לְפָרִי – In Rava said: אָמַר רָבָא –

what case do we say that it [something protecting the fruit] is deemed a “protector of the fruit”?^[7] הֵיכָא דְאִיתִּיהָ בֵּין בְּתָלוּשׁ – Only where it is present on the fruit both when the fruit is detached from the tree and when it is attached to the tree. הֵיכָא בְּמַחוּבֵּר אִיתִּיהָ בְּתָלוּשׁ לִיתִּיהָ – Here in the case of the caper berry husk, however, it is present on the fruit when the fruit is attached to the tree, but when the fruit is detached from the tree [the husk] is no longer present on the fruit.^[8] Hence, the husk – since it does not cover the detached berry – is not in the category of a “protector of the fruit” to which the *orlah* prohibition applies.

The Gemara challenges Rava's definition of what qualifies as a “protector of the fruit”:

אֲבַיֶּה חֲבִיב – Abaye challenged him from the following Mishnah:^[9] פִּיטָמָא שֶׁל רִמּוֹן מְצַטְרֵף – THE PITAM^[10] OF THE POMEGRANATE COMBINES with the pomegranate with regard to the *tumah* of foods.^[11] וְהֵנֶץ שֶׁל אֵין מְצַטְרֵף – BUT ITS NEITZ^[12] DOES NOT COMBINE with it. מִדְּקָאֵמֵר הֵנֶץ שֶׁל אֵין מְצַטְרֵף – Now, from the fact that [the Mishnah] says that the *neitz* does not combine with the pomegranate to complete requisite volume with regard to the *tumah* of foods, אֵלֶּמָּה דְּלֹא אֻכְלָהּ – it is evident that [the *neitz*] is not deemed to be a food. וְהָיָה גַּבִּי – Yet we learned in a Mishnah regarding *orlah*: קְלִיפֵי קְלִיפֵי – RINDS OF POMEGRANATE AND ITS NEITZ, חֲזִיבִין חֲזִיבִין – WALNUT SHELLS AND THE PITS of fruits, בְּעֶרְלָה – ARE SUBJECT TO THE ORLAH PROHIBITION. If the *neitz* is not a food (as evident from the Mishnah in *Uktzin*), then its being subject to *orlah* must result from its being deemed a “protector of the fruit.”^[13] Now, the *neitz* dries and falls off the detached fruit, yet it is deemed a “protector.” Does this not disprove Rava's

NOTES

1. Not only is questionable *orlah* permitted in these lands (as it is in Syria), but one may even approach the orchard owner and request fruits, though he is in effect instructing the owner to pick the fruits from his orchard and create a condition of questionable *orlah*. [No doubt surrounds the fruits before they are picked, since it is known which trees are less than three years old and which are older.] However, one may not buy fruit that he actually sees the owner pick from an *orlah* tree (see *Rashi* here and to *Kiddushin* *ibid.*; cf. *Hagahos HaBach* there and *Bach*, *Yoreh Deah* 294; see also *Meiri*, *Ran* and *Tos. Ri HaZaken* there; see also *Chazon Ish*, *Kiddushin* §148).

[In Syria, however, it is permitted only to buy fruits that have already become questionable *orlah* (e.g. the orchard owner is selling fruits from his stand). But it is forbidden to ask the owner to initially create a situation of doubtful *orlah* (*Rashi* to *Kiddushin* *ibid.*). The law for Syria is more stringent than for the rest of the Diaspora, because Syria is the land closest to Eretz Yisrael, and thus most easily confused with it (*Rashi* *ibid.*).]

2. [This explanation assumes that Mar bar Rav Ashi followed R' Akiva only with regard to *orlah* outside Eretz Yisrael (see 36a note 44). If, however, Mar bar Rav Ashi ruled entirely in accordance with R' Akiva (*ibid.*), then the meaning here would be that in disputes between R' Eliezer and R' Akiva, the halachah follows R' Akiva unequivocally (*Divrei David* cited there).]

3. [In general, the halachah unequivocally accepts Beis Hillel's view over that of Beis Shammai, so that for us the disputed issue is no longer considered a matter of uncertainty.] Therefore, the status of the caper berry as a tree fruit is not in doubt at all, but is considered to be definite (*Rashi*).

4. *Leviticus* 19:23.

5. We find throughout the Talmud Tannaim who expound the word *אֶת*, *es* (whose simple function is to designate the object of the predicate), as coming to include something additional in the stated law. The Gemara here is citing a tradition that in this verse *אֶת* “אֶת־פְּרִי”, the word *es* comes to include the fruit's auxiliaries (see *Pnei Yehoshua*).

6. Such as the inedible peels, shells or husks. The verse thus teaches that the “protector of the fruit,” though not a fruit in its own right, is

also subject to the *orlah* prohibition.

7. [That is, an “auxiliary to the fruit,” which is subject to the *orlah* prohibition.]

8. The husk falls off the caper berry when the berry begins to ripen (*Rashi*).

9. *Uktzin* 2:3.

10. The *pitam* is the sprout atop the pomegranate, similar to the one atop an apple or a quince (*Rashi*). [*Rav* (to *Uktzin* *ibid.*), however, explains that the *pitam* is the pestle-like protuberance at the top of the pomegranate, similar to the protuberance atop an *esrog*.]

11. In order for a *tamei* food to convey *tumah* further (to another food or drink), its volume must be at least that of an egg (see *Rambam*, *Hil. Tumas Ochalin* 4:1). [According to some Rishonim, an egg-volume is also the minimum size the food must be in order to initially contract *tumah* (see *Tosafos* to *Pesachim* 33b לאִיתָּהּ 33b).] This Mishnah teaches us that a pomegranate (or section thereof) that has the volume of an egg only in combination with its attached *pitam* does indeed have the requisite volume with regard to the laws of food *tumah*.

12. The *neitz*, which grows around the *pitam* (see *Rashi* to *Chullin* 118b דְּרִיטָמָא; *Rash* and *Rav* to *Uktzin* *ad loc.*), is to the pomegranate what the husk is to the caper berry [both protect the fruit but fall off while the fruit is still attached] (*Rashi*).

13. Which are included in the *orlah* prohibition, as indicated by the Torah's expression “*ess*” *piryo* (*Rashi*; see above, note 5). [This status of “protector of the fruit” also accounts for the Mishnah's inclusion of the inedible pomegranate rinds and walnut shells in the *orlah* prohibition. As to why the *orlah* prohibition applies to pits, though they do not protect the fruit, see *Rosh* §4 and *Rashba* קְלִיפֵי קְלִיפֵי.]

[Though the *neitz* is a protector, and protectors do combine with the fruit with regard to food *tumah* (which is why the *pitam* combines; see *Uktzin* 1:1), the Mishnah in *Uktzin* rules that the *neitz* does not combine, because it is a protector on top of another protector (the *pitam*). Only the direct protector of the fruit, such as its peel or shell or *pitam*, combines to make up the requisite egg-volume (*Rashi* above דְּרִיטָמָא, from *Chullin* 119b).]

לפיכך נבדקו:

contention that the husk of a caper berry is not deemed a “protector” because it falls from the fruit after the fruit is picked?

Rava concedes this objection, and therefore modifies his qualification:

היבא אמרינן דנעשה להו – אלא אמר רבא – Rather, Rava said: In what case do we say that it [something protecting the fruit] is deemed a “protector of the fruits”? – Only where it is present on the fruit at the time of the fruit’s completion (i.e. ripening). האי – This caper husk, however, is not present on the fruit at the time of the fruit’s completion, as it falls off before the fruit ripens.^[14]

The Gemara challenges this answer as well:

אני – Is this indeed so that a protector that falls from the fruit before ripening is not deemed a “protector”? – אמר רב נחמן – Why, Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: הני מתחלי דערלה אסירי – These calyxes^[15] that cover dates of *orlah* are prohibited, הואיל ונעשו – since they are deemed “protectors of the fruits.” – Now, when are they protectors of the fruits? – בכופרא – At the date’s immature stage, before it ripens. – וקא קרי ליה שומר לפירי – Yet, [Rav Nachman] calls it a “protector of the fruits”? – ? –

The Gemara answers:

רב נחמן סבר לה דרבי יוסי – Rav Nachman, who considers the date calyx a “protector of the fruit,” though it falls off before the date is mature, holds as does R’ Yose.^[16] – For we have learned in a Mishnah:^[17] רבי יוסי אומר – R’ YOSE SAYS: סמך – A GRAPE BUD^[18] on an *orlah* vine IS PROHIBITED BECAUSE IT IS considered A FRUIT.^[19] Just as R’ Yose considers the unripe grape to be “fruit,” so too does he consider the unripe date to be a fruit, and its calyx, therefore, a “protector of the fruit.” – ופליגי רבנן עליה – But the Rabbis [i.e. the Tanna Kamma of that Mishnah] disagree with him and permit budding fruit of *orlah*, not classifying them as “fruits.”^[20]

The Gemara challenges this answer as well:

מתקיף לה רב שימי מנהרדשא – Rav Shimi of Nehardea objected

to it: – ובשאר אילני מי פליגי רבנן עליה – But do the Rabbis, who dispute R’ Yose with regard to grape buds, disagree with him with regard to fruits of other trees? – והתנן – Why, we have learned in a Mishnah:^[21] – FROM WHEN MAY WE NOT CUT DOWN fruit TREES DURING THE SEVENTH [YEAR]?^[22] – בית שמאי אומרים – BEIS SHAMMAI SAY: – כל האילנות משויצאו – ALL TREES may not be cut FROM WHEN THEY BRING FORTH the incipient fruits.^[23] – ובית הלל – THE CAROB TREES may not be cut FROM WHEN THEY FORM CHAINS,^[25] – והגפנים משויצאו – AND THE GRAPEVINES may not be cut FROM WHEN THEY FORM grapes the size of a *geru’a*.^[26] – AND THE OLIVE TREES may not be cut FROM WHEN THE *NEITZ* DEVELOPS around the fruit.^[27] – ושאר כל האילנות משויצאו – AND ALL OTHER TREES may not be cut FROM WHEN THEY BRING FORTH the incipient fruits. – ואמר רב אסי – And to explain the term “*geru’a*” mentioned in the Mishnah, Rav Assi said: הוא בוסר – *Boser*^[28] is the same as *geru’a*, which is the same as the white bean.

The Gemara interrupts to explain Rav Assi’s statement:

– פול הלכך סלקא דעתך – Can it enter your mind to say that Rav Assi means literally “the white bean”? Why, he is discussing grapes, not beans! – אלא אימא שיעורו כפול הלכך – Rather, say that Rav Assi means that its size is like that of the white bean. Rav Assi thus teaches that the terms *boser* and *geru’a* are synonymous, and refer to developing grapes when they have grown to the size of a white bean.

We see, then, from Rav Assi’s explanatory comment, that the *geru’a* (or *boser*) stage mentioned in the Mishnah is a later stage than the *semadar* stage (as the grape bud, when the blossoms first fall off, is much smaller than a white bean). Accordingly, Rav Shimi presents his challenge:

– מאן שמעת ליה דאמר בוסר אין סמך לא – Now, about whom have you heard that he says that *boser* – yes, it is considered a fruit – but a grape bud is not considered a fruit? – רבנן – You have heard this about the Rabbis who dispute R’ Yose with regard to *orlah*. Thus, it is their opinion – and not R’ Yose’s – which is

NOTES

14. [Rava postulates that a “fruit” is not classified as such until it ripens. Hence, any “protector” – such as the caper husk – that falls off before the ripening stage is not deemed “a protector of the fruit” and is thus not subject to *orlah*. The *neitz* of a pomegranate, on the other hand, is a protector of the fruit, since it is still on the pomegranate during the ripening stage.]

15. The calyx is to the date what the husk is to the caper berry (*Rashi*). [Both fall off the fruit prior to the ripening of the fruit.]

16. Who classifies dates as “fruit” even before they ripen. In his view, then, the calyxes – which protect the unripened dates – are indeed deemed “protectors of the fruit” (*Rashi*).

17. *Orlah* 1:7.

18. That is, the developing grape after the blossoms fall off and each grape is individually discernible (*Rashi*; see *Shir HaShirim* 2:13,15 and 7:13).

19. R’ Yose argues with the Tanna Kamma, who states earlier in the Mishnah that the *orlah* prohibition does not apply to grape buds [because they are not yet considered “fruits”].

20. And the halachah follows the Rabbis, the majority view (though Rav Nachman rules differently). Therefore, Rava rightfully explains that the caper husks are permitted because they fall off before the caper berry ripens and are thus not considered protectors of the fruit (*Rashi*).

21. *Sheviis* 4:10.

22. Though there is a general prohibition against destroying fruit-bearing trees (see *Deuteronomy* 20:19-20), it is permitted to cut them down if they produce but a small amount of fruit, or if the wood of the tree is more valuable than its fruit, in which case such cutting is not

considered “destructive” (see commentaries to *Sheviis* ad loc., and *Tosafos* here). With regard to the *shemittah* [the seventh, “Sabbatical” year], however, the Torah commands that the crops of Eretz Yisrael not be cultivated, but only eaten (*Leviticus* 25:1-7). It emerges from this command that during *shemittah* one may not cut fruit trees on which young fruits are growing even under these normally permitted circumstances. For by cutting the trees one destroys the fruit that is growing on them [as he prevents them from maturing to the edible stage]. This is a violation of the Torah’s directive (*ibid.* v. 6): *And the Sabbath produce of the land shall be yours “to eat,”* which implies: but not to destroy (see *Rashi* and *Tosafos*). Once the fruits have matured to the edible stage (defined in the Mishnah *ibid.*), though, the tree may be cut under the normally permitted circumstances, as this no longer prevents the fruits from being eaten (*Mishnah ibid.*).

Thus, during *shemittah* a fruit tree may not be cut from the time its budding fruits are classified as “fruit” until those fruits ripen. The Mishnah now defines, with regard to various fruits trees, the points at which the budding fruits are classified as “fruit.”

23. *Rashi*; cf. *Rashi* to *Pesachim* 52b משיצאו.

24. [Beis Hillel hold that with regard to certain trees, the fruits must be further developed for the prohibition against cutting the tree during *shemittah* to apply.]

25. From when the tree appears to be forming chains of carob (*Rashi*).

26. The Gemara below will define this size.

27. From when the *neitz* grows around the olives (*Rashi*).

28. The grape is called *boser* at a certain early stage of its development (see, for example, *Isaiah* 18:5 and *Jeremiah* 31:28).

א. חסד ורחמים

מִיָּמֵינוּ דְּרַבִּי כִּמְמוֹן עַל שְׂקִיָּים נְחִימָה דְּרַבִּי צְרֵפָה וְנִכְמְלָה: בְּאֵר דְּנִתְּ

המורה. קרי' זה הדין דא' המורה שיהיה שם:

[illegible]

reflected by this Mishnah in *Sheviis*.^[29] וְקַמְנִי שֶׁאֵר כָּל הָאֵילָנוֹת – Yet the Mishnah states that all the other trees may not be cut during *shemittah* from when they bring forth the incipient fruits, as this would constitute destroying *shemittah* fruits. Evidently, it is only with regard to grapes [and carobs and olives] that the Rabbis do not consider the fruit bud to be a fruit. But with regard to other fruits, such as the date and the caper berry, the Rabbis agree with R' Yose that the immature fruit is considered a fruit from the moment it is brought forth. This refutes Rava's contention that the caper husk is not considered a "protector of the fruit" because it falls from the berry before the berry reaches the "fruit" stage! – ? –

Rava concedes this objection as well, and offers yet another reason to account for why the caper husk is not considered a "protector of the fruit":

הֵיכָא אֲמַרְיִן דְּהוּי שוּמֵר – אֵלָא אֲמַר רַבָּא – Rather, Rava said: **One who chews and swallows** – In what case do we say that it [something protecting the fruit] is deemed a "protector of the fruit"? הֵיכָא דְכִי שֶׁקֶלֶת לִיה – In a case where if you remove the protector, the fruit dies. – לְשׁוּמֵר מֵיִית פִּירָא – Here, in the case of the caper husk, however, if you remove it the fruit does not die.^[30]

The Gemara adds:

וְשֶׁקֶלֶת לִגְן דְּרִמוּנָא וְנִכְשׁ – הֵנָּה עֹבְדָא – There was an incident where they removed the *neitz* of a pomegranate and the pomegranate withered, and they removed the husk of the caper berry and the berry survived.^[31]

In conclusion:^[32]

וְהִלְכְתָּא כְּמַר בַּר רַב אֲשִׁי – And the halachah accords with Mar bar Rav Ashi, who would discard the caper berries of *orlah* and eat the husks.^[33] – דְּרִיק אֵת הָאֲבִינֹת וְאָכִיל אֵת הַקְּפָרִיסִין – And since with regard to *orlah* they [the husks] are not classified as fruits of the tree, לְגַבִּי

with regard to the laws of blessings as well they are not classified as fruits of the tree, וְלֹא מִכְרִינֵן – and we do not recite on them the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the tree*, but rather the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*.^[34]

The Gemara cites an Amoraic dispute regarding the blessing on peppers:

רַב שֶׁשֶׁשׁ – Regarding the blessing on pepper berries,^[35] פֶּלְפִּלִי – Rav Sheishess says: One recites *that everything came into being through His word*.^[36] – רַבָּא אֲמַר לֹא כְּלוּם – Rava says: One recites *nothing at all*.^[37] – וְאִדְרָא רַבָּא לְטַעְמִיהּ – And in ruling so, Rava follows his opinion expressed elsewhere as well. כֵּס פֶּלְפִּלִי בְיוֹמֵי דְכַפּוּרִי – For Rava said elsewhere: **One who chews and swallows** pepper berries on Yom Kippur is exempt.^[38] – כֵּס וְגִבְלִיל בְיוֹמֵי דְכַפּוּרִי פֶטוּר – Similarly, one who chews and swallows ginger on Yom Kippur is exempt. Just as Rava does not consider the consumption of pepper berries to be "eating" with regard to liability for eating on Yom Kippur, so too does he not consider it "eating" with regard to the laws of blessings, and he rules that one does not recite any blessing when "eating" pepper berries.

The Gemara challenges Rava's ruling:

מִיִּיבִי – They challenge Rava's ruling that the pepper berry is considered inedible from a Baraisa, which states: הֵיכָא רַבִּי מֵאִיר – מִמִּשְׁמַע שְׁנֶאֱמַר, וְנִצְרְלָתָם עֲרַלְתּוֹ – R' Meir would say: FROM THE IMPLICATION OF THAT WHICH IS STATED: *YOU SHALL TREAT ITS FRUIT AS FORBIDDEN*,^[40] אִינִי יוֹדַע שֶׁעַץ מֵאֲכָל – DO I NOT KNOW THAT IT IS speaking about A FOOD TREE?^[41] – הוּא – אֵלָא מָה תִּלְמֹד לֹמַר, עַץ מֵאֲכָל – THEN WHAT DOES THE TORAH mean TO TEACH BY STATING explicitly: "FOOD" TREE? לְהַבִּיא עֵץ – It comes TO INCLUDE in this law A TREE WHOSE WOOD AND FRUIT ARE EQUAL IN TASTE.^[42] – וְאִידְרָא – AND

NOTES

29. [Were it not for Rav Assi's statement, however, one could suggest that the *geru'a* is the same as the grape bud, and that this Mishnah does reflect R' Yose's opinion (*Rashi* to *Pesachim* 53a).]

30. Rava now maintains that a covering can be deemed a "protector of the fruit" only if its presence is essential to the viability of the fruit. While this is true of the date calyxes and the pomegranate *neitz*, it is not true of the caper husk (as the Gemara will soon show), which is why it does not qualify as a "protector of the fruit."

31. [Above (36a), *Rashi* explained that the word פֶּרְקָא refers to the caper berry, whereas here it apparently refers to the caper husk. *Rashash* there addresses this issue, and also observes that the reading of *Aruch* here is: דְּשֶׁקֶלֶת לְיִצָּא דְפֶרְקָא וְהוּי בִּטְיָא, one removed the protector of the berry and the fruit matured (see *Peirush HaRashbatz* to end of 36a). According to this reading, the word פֶּרְקָא here as well refers to the berry.]

32. The following segment appears in parentheses in our editions. The Rishonim note that it is not part of the actual Talmudic text, but rather the Geonic ruling of the *Baal Halachos Gedolos* which became incorporated into the text (see *Rosh* and *Rabbeinu Yonah*).

33. In consideration of R' Akiva's opinion (above, 36a) that the caper berry husks are not classified as "fruits of the tree."

34. Some Rishonim (see *Tosafos* and *Rosh*) reject this Geonic ruling, arguing that it is only with regard to *orlah* outside Eretz Yisrael that Mar bar Rav Ashi adopts the lenient position and follows R' Akiva (see, though, 36a note 44). Since with regard to *orlah* in Eretz Yisrael, however, the halachah follows R' Eliezer, who does consider the caper husk to be a fruit, that is the position we follow with regard to blessings, and we recite *ha'eitz* on the caper husk – both in Eretz Yisrael and outside of it – as ruled by the Baraisa cited on 36a. *Rabbeinu Yonah*, however, maintains that the halachah follows R' Eliezer in Eretz Yisrael not because the matter is conclusively decided in favor of his view, but because the matter remains one of uncertainty and we must

therefore adopt the stringent position with regard to Biblical law. And since the matter is one of uncertainty, we should indeed recite *haadamah* on the caper husk (as the Geonim rule), because even those who consider the husk a fruit agree that if one recited *haadamah* on it, he has fulfilled his obligation (as taught by the Mishnah below, 40a). *Rambam* (*Hil. Maaser Sheni* 10:3) rules in accordance with R' Akiva (that the husk is *not* a fruit) even with regard to the Biblically prohibited *orlah* in Eretz Yisrael (and this appears to be *Rif's* ruling as well – see *Tzalach*; cf. *Rabbeinu Yonah*). According to his ruling, it is definite that *haadamah* is the proper blessing to be recited on caper husks. See *Orach Chaim* 202:6, and *Beur HaGra* there and *Beur HaGra*, *Yoreh Deah* 294:1; see also 36a note 44 and *Divrei David* cited there.

35. The reference here is to those peppers that are used as spices rather than eaten plain, and not to peppers generally eaten as vegetables.

As the Gemara below concludes, the dispute here is with regard to the blessing on dried pepper berries (see *Rabbeinu Chananel*).

36. Rav Sheishess considers the dry pepper berry [when eaten as is] to be changed for the worse from its original state. Hence, its blessing is *shehakol*, as Rav Nachman said above with regard to wheat flour [see 36a notes 9 and 10] (*Ramban*).

37. For Rava considers the pepper berry by itself to be inedible.

38. An abnormal eating is referred to as כְּסִיקָה, *chewing* (*Rashi*).

39. He does not thereby incur *kares* (excision) which is the punishment for "eating" on Yom Kippur (*Rashi*; see *Leviticus* 23:29; *Kereisos* 2a).

40. *Leviticus* 19:23. The verse reads: *When you will come to the land and plant any food tree, you shall treat its fruit as forbidden – for three years they shall be forbidden to you, they shall not be eaten.*

41. The modifier "food" is apparently superfluous, as it is evident from the context of the passage that a food tree is meant.

WHICH tree IS IT? זֶה הַפֶּלְפֶּלֶן – THIS IS THE PEPPER tree.
 לְלַמֶּדְךָ שֶׁהַפֶּלְפֶּלֶן חַיִּיבִין בְּעֵרְלָה – THIS comes TO TEACH YOU THAT
 PEPPERS ARE SUBJECT TO ORLAH.^[43] וְלַלְמֶדְךָ שֶׁאֵין אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל
 חֲסֵרָה כָּלִים – AND it also comes TO TEACH YOU THAT THE LAND OF
 ISRAEL IS NOT LACKING ANYTHING, אֶרֶץ אֲשֶׁר לֹא
 חֲסֵרָה כָּלִים – AS IT IS STATED: A LAND
 IN WHICH YOU WILL EAT BREAD WITHOUT POVERTY, YOU WILL NOT
 LACK ANYTHING IN IT.^[44] Evidently, pepper berries are edible;
 otherwise, the *orlah* prohibition would not apply to them. Does
 this not contradict Rava's ruling that one who eats pepper berries
 on Yom Kippur is exempt?

The Gemara answers:

It is not difficult. הָא בְּרִיבְתָּא – This Baraisa,
 which considers the pepper berry a "food" to which the laws of
orlah apply, deals with moist [i.e. fresh] pepper berries, הָא
 בִּבְשָׁתָא – whereas this ruling of Rava, which considers it
 inedible, deals with dry pepper berries, which are used as spices
 and are not fit to be eaten alone.

The Gemara now challenges Rava's second ruling:

The Rabbis said to Mereimar: אָמְרִי לִיה רַבִּנָּן לְמִרְיָם
 – Did Rava really say that one who
 chews and swallows ginger on Yom Kippur is exempt, because
 it is inedible? וְהָא אָמַר רַבָּא – Why, Rava said elsewhere:
 הָאִי – This electuary^[45] that comes
 from the land of the Hindus^[46] is permitted,^[47] וְהָא אָמַר רַבָּא
 – and we recite on it the blessing *the One Who
 creates the fruit of the ground*. Evidently, Rava does consider
 raw ginger edible, as he does not forbid the cooked paste as "food
 cooked by a gentile."^[48] – ?

The Gemara answers:

It is not difficult. הָא בְּרִיבְתָּא – This second
 ruling of Rava, which considers raw ginger edible, deals with
 moist ginger, הָא בִּבְשָׁתָא – whereas this first ruling of Rava,
 which considers ginger inedible, deals with dry ginger.

The Gemara cites an Amoraic dispute regarding the blessing to
 be recited on certain other foods:

Regarding the blessing on potted *chavitz*,^[49] וְכֵן
 – and similarly, regarding the blessing on *daissa*,^[50] רַב
 – One recites *that everything came into being through His word*. רַב
 – But Rav Kahana says: בּוֹרָא מִיְּמֵי מַזּוֹנוֹת – One
 recites *the One Who creates species of sustenance*.^[51]

The Gemara explains the case that is in dispute:

Regarding plain *daissa*, בְּדִיּוּסָא גְרִידָא – all agree that one recites *the One Who
 creates species of sustenance*. בִּי פְלִיגִי – When do they
 disagree? בְּדִיּוּסָא בְּעִין חֲבִיץ קֶדְרָה – With regard to *daissa* that
 is made similar to potted *chavitz*, in that it is mixed and cooked
 with a large amount of honey. רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שֶׁהֵבֵל – Rav
 Yehudah says that one recites *that everything came into being
 through His word*, סָבַר דּוּבְשָׁא עֵיקַר – because he holds the
 honey to be the primary ingredient of this food.^[52] רַב כְּהָנָא אָמַר
 – Rav Kahana says that one recites *the One
 Who creates species of sustenance*, סָבַר סְמִידָא עֵיקַר – because
 he holds the flour to be the primary ingredient.^[53]

– It seems more reasonable to rule in accordance with Rav
 Yehudah in this matter. רַב וְשְׁמוּאֵל דְּאָמְרֵי תְרוּוּיָהּ – For Rav
 and Shmuel both say: כָּל שֵׁשׁ בּוֹ מִחֲמִשַּׁת הַמִּינִין – In the case of
 any food that contains something of the five species of grain,^[54]
 – we recite on it the blessing *the One Who creates species of sustenance*.

The Gemara now turns its attention to the ruling of Rav and
 Shmuel just quoted:

– [The text] itself stated: רַב וְשְׁמוּאֵל דְּאָמְרֵי תְרוּוּיָהּ –
 Rav and Shmuel both say: כָּל שֵׁשׁ בּוֹ מִחֲמִשַּׁת הַמִּינִין – In the
 case of any food that contains something of the five species of

NOTES

42. The term *food tree* is expounded as teaching that the *orlah* prohibition applies even to the fruit of that tree whose wood is itself a kind of food, as it tastes like its fruit.

43. Were it not for this special Scriptural indication, one would have thought that the pepper is classified as a "vegetable" rather than a "tree" and is thus not subject to *orlah* (Rashi to *Succah* 35a ד"ה חייבין ובערלה; cf. *Tosafos* there).

44. *Deuteronomy* 8:9. And *Leviticus* 19:23, which speaks of planting "food trees" (i.e. peppers) in Eretz Yisrael, teaches us that *you will not lack anything* includes peppers (Rashi to *Succah* 35a; see *Sifsei Chachamim* here).

45. A paste made with ground ginger and honey (see Rashi to *Yoma* 81b; see also *Rabbeinu Yonah* here and *Mordechai* §116).

46. Rashi renders הַיְּהוּדִי as *Cushim* (see also Rashi to *Yoma* 81b), which is usually translated as *Ethiopians*. Many scholars, though, identify the Cush mentioned in Scripture as an area in the vicinity of present-day India. This appears to be the opinion of Rashi in *Succah* 36a ל"ו ד"ה וְהָא אָמַר רַבָּא, where he states that Cush is closer to Bavel than it is to Eretz Yisrael. See also Schottenstein ed. of *Megillah*, 11a note 60. (See also Rashi to *Avodah Zarah* 16a ד"ה בפרולא דינורא, who renders דינורא as *India*.)

47. It is not forbidden as "food cooked by a gentile" [בשול נכרי] nor is there the concern that it absorbed non-kosher flavors when cooked in the Hindu's utensils (Rashi).

In order to erect a barrier against excessive socializing with gentiles, which might lead to intermarriage, the Rabbis forbade Jews to eat food cooked by a gentile (see *Mishnah*, *Avodah Zarah* 35b and Rashi there). This prohibition does not apply, however, to foods that can be eaten raw (see *Avodah Zarah* 38a). Rava rules that ginger can be eaten raw, and the ginger electuary cooked by a gentile, therefore, is not forbidden as "food cooked by a gentile" (Rashi to *Yoma* 81b).

There is no concern that the ginger electuary absorbed non-kosher flavors from the utensils used in its preparation, because the manufacturers generally prepare the electuary with utensils reserved exclusively for such use. Alternatively, even if standard utensils were used, they are assumed not to have been used previously on that day [see *Tosafos* to *Avodah Zarah* 38b ד"ה אי משום ר"ה, who explain the rationale], in which case whatever non-kosher flavors they might have absorbed previously are already rancid when the new food is cooked in it. And there is also no concern that the gentile mixed in wine or other forbidden substances, since a manufacturer would not do so for fear of compromising his reputation (*Mordechai* §116).

48. Rashi to *Yoma* loc. cit.

49. [Literally: congelation of the pot.] *Chavitz* is a porridge made of flour, honey and oil (see Rashi). [Rashi remarks that this explanation appears in the text below. The passage Rashi refers to is absent from our texts (see also *Aruch* ע' אברושך with *Mussaf HaAruch*), but appears in other editions as a marginal addition from *Halachos Gedolos* (see *Dikdukei Soferim* to 37a and §30 there). The word אברושך (read: אברושך – see *Dikdukei Soferim* loc. cit.) in Rashi is an Aramaic word used in the passage referred to by Rashi.]

50. This is a porridge made of coarse wheat grits, the wheat being pounded in a mortar rather than ground into flour (see Rashi).

51. See 35b notes 38 and 39.

52. The honey is the main ingredient [by volume]. Alternatively, one eats this dish primarily for its honey content, and the flour is added simply to flavor and enhance it (see *Rashba* [printed in some editions on 37b]).

53. Rav Kahana holds that wherever flour is mixed into a dish to enhance it (and not merely as a binder), the flour is considered the primary food, as Rav and Shmuel rule below (*Rashba* here and to 37b).

54. See 35b note 38.

קרב נא זאגט וואך צעמאלס פאר אירע
 .

..

grain, מְבָרְכִין עָלָיו בּוֹרָא מִיְּנֵי מִזְוֹנוֹת – we recite on it the blessing *the One Who creates species of sustenance*. וְאֵיתָמַר – And it was also stated: רַב וּשְׁמוּאֵל דְּאָמְרֵי תְרוּוֹיָהּ – Rav and Shmuel both say: כָּל שֶׁהוּא מְחַמֶּשֶׁת הַמִּינִין – In the case of any food that is of the five species of grain, מְבָרְכִין עָלָיו בּוֹרָא – we recite on it the blessing *the One Who creates species of sustenance*.

The Gemara explains the need for these seemingly identical rulings:

וְצָרִיכָא – And it was necessary for Rav and Shmuel to teach us both rulings. דְּאֵי אֲשָׁמְעִין כָּל שְׁהוּא – For if he [i.e. Rav and Shmuel] had taught us only the rule that *mezonos* is recited on “any food that is of the five species,” הָיָה אָמֵינָא – I might have said that *mezonos* is recited . מִשּׁוּם דְּאֵיתִיָּה בְּעִינָהּ – only because it [the grain] is present in its pure form.^[55] אֲכָל עַל יָדֵי – But where the grain is present only as part of a mixture,^[56] I would say that the grain is not considered primary and *mezonos* is not recited.

NOTES

55. [I.e. it is the primary component (by volume) of the food, and all other elements are merely subordinate (see *Rosh* §7 and *Maadanei Yom*

Tov there §6).]

56. [And the grain is but a minority component of the mixture.]

לְךָ – Therefore, he [i.e. Rav and Shmuel] teaches us as well that *mezonos* is recited on “any food that contains something of the five species of grain,” even though the grain is but a minority component.^[1] – וְאִם אֲשַׁמְעֶינָם בִּלְשׁוֹן בֹּרָא – And if he [i.e. Rav and Shmuel] had taught us only the rule that *mezonos* is recited on “any food that contains something of the five species of grain,”^[2] – הָיָה אָמֵינָא – I might have said on the basis of this ruling alone as follows: בִּלְשׁוֹן בֹּרָא – On any food that contains something of the five species – yes, we recite *mezonos* – even though the grain is but a minority component; – אֲבָל אוֹרֵז וְדוּחָן – but on a similar food containing *orez* or *dochan* as its grain,^[3] – no, we do not recite *mezonos*, because it is present only as part of a mixture and not in its pure form. – אֲבָל אֵיתִיהָ בְּעִינֶיהָ – But if it [the *orez* or *dochan*] is present in its pure form, – נִמְאָא אֶפְּלִי אוֹרֵז – then we would say even with regard to *orez* and *dochan*, too, – מְבָרְכִין עָלָיו בּוֹרָא מִינֵי מִזְנוֹת – that we recite on it the blessing the One Who creates species of sustenance.^[4] – Therefore, he [i.e. Rav and Shmuel] teaches us the ruling of – כָּל שֶׁהוּא מִמַּחֲשֵׁת הַמִּינִים – any food that is of the five species – הוּא דְּמְבָרְכִין עָלָיו בּוֹרָא מִינֵי מִזְנוֹת – it is on it alone that we recite the blessing the One Who creates species of sustenance.^[5] – לְאַפּוֹקֵי אוֹרֵז וְדוּחָן – This is to exclude *orez* or *dochan*, – דְּאֶפְּלִי אֵיתִיהָ בְּעִינֶיהָ – for even if it is present in its pure form, – לֹא מְבָרְכִין בּוֹרָא מִינֵי מִזְנוֹת – we do not recite on it the blessing the One Who creates species of sustenance.

The Gemara asks:

– וְאִם כֵּן הָיָה – But is it so that on *orez* [and *dochan*] we do not recite the blessing the One Who creates species of sustenance? – וְהָתֵנָּה – Why, it was taught in a Baraisa: – הֵבִיאוּ לִפְנֵי פֶת אוֹרֵז וּפֶת דוּחָן – If THEY BROUGHT BEFORE HIM *OREZ* BREAD OR *DOCHAN* BREAD, – מְבָרְךְ עָלָיו תְּחִלָּה – HE RECITES ON IT A BLESSING AT THE BEGINNING, before eating, AND AT THE END, after eating, AS one does when eating PORRIDGE made from one of the five species of

grain. – וְגַבִּי מַעֲשֵׂה קֶרֶךְ תֵּנָּה – And regarding porridge made from one of the five species of grain, it was taught in a Baraisa: – בְּתִחְלָה מְבָרְךְ עָלָיו בּוֹרָא מִינֵי מִזְנוֹת – AT THE BEGINNING, before eating, ONE RECITES ON IT THE BLESSING THE ONE WHO CREATES SPECIES OF SUSTENANCE, – וְלְבִסּוֹף מְבָרְךְ עָלָיו בְּרָכָה אַחַת מִעֵין שְׁלֹשׁ – AND AT THE END, after eating, ONE RECITES ON IT THE ONE-BLESSING ABRIDGMENT OF THREE.^[6] – ? –

The Gemara answers:

– כִּמְעַשֵּׂה קֶרֶךְ וְלֹא כִּמְעַשֵּׂה קֶרֶךְ – When the first Baraisa likens *orez* bread and *dochan* bread to porridge, it does not mean to equate them entirely. Rather, it means that they are like porridge yet unlike porridge. – כִּמְעַשֵּׂה קֶרֶךְ דְּמְבָרְכִין עָלָיו תְּחִלָּה וְסוֹף – They are like porridge in that we recite on it at the beginning and at the end a blessing different from the one recited on bread.^[7] – וְלֹא דְאֵילּוּ כִּמְעַשֵּׂה קֶרֶךְ – Yet they are unlike porridge – בְּתִחְלָה בּוֹרָא מִינֵי – in that whereas in the case of porridge – מִזְנוֹת – at the beginning one recites the One Who creates species of sustenance – וְלְבִסּוֹף בְּרָכָה אַחַת מִעֵין שְׁלֹשׁ – and at the end one recites the one-blessing abridgment of three, – וְהָאֵלּוּ – here, in the case of *orez* and *dochan* bread, on the other hand, – בְּתִחְלָה מְבָרְךְ עָלָיו שְׁהֵבֵל נְהִיָּה בְּדִבְרוֹ – at the beginning one recites on it the blessing that everything came into being through His word, – וְלְבִסּוֹף בּוֹרָא נֶפְשׁוֹת רַבּוֹת וְחֻסְרוֹנָן עַל כָּל מָה – and at the end one recites the One Who creates numerous living things and their deficiencies; for all that He has created etc.^[8]

The Gemara persists:

– וְאִם כֵּן הָיָה – But is a cooked *orez* dish not considered like actual grain porridge with regard to its blessing? – אֵלּוּ הֵן מַעֲשֵׂה קֶרֶךְ – Why, it was taught in a Baraisa: – תְּשֻׁבּוֹת – THESE ARE the PORRIDGES on which one recites *mezonos* and *Al HaMichyah*.^[9] – חֵילָקָא – A porridge made of GRITS^[10] SPLIT INTO HALVES, – טְרִגִּיס – or of GRITS SPLIT INTO THIRDS, – סוֹלֶת – or of FINE FLOUR,^[11] – וְרִיז – or of GRITS SPLIT INTO QUARTERS, – וְעֶרְסָן – OR of GRITS SPLIT INTO FIFTHS,^[12] – וְאִם כֵּן – OR of *OREZ*.^[13]

NOTES

1. Because of its significance, the grain is automatically considered the primary ingredient, and the blessing is therefore recited on it (see *Rashba* here, and 36b note 53).

2. Seemingly, this ruling alone would have been sufficient, for if *mezonos* is recited on any dish containing one of the five species, certainly it is recited on a dish that is made primarily of such grain. Why, then, did they state the second ruling?

3. *Rashi* here translates *orez* as “millet,” and *dochan* as “panic grass.” *Tosafos*, however, identify *orez* as “rice” [which is the generally accepted definition (*Beis Yosef*, *Orach Chaim* 208 כתב *Rid* ומו”ש רבינו וכן כתב *Mishnah Berurah* 208:25)], and *dochan* as “millet.”

4. That is, we might have thought that Rav and Shmuel specify the “five species of grain” because those are the only grains that are considered the primary food with regard to blessings even if they are a minority component. *Orez* and *dochan*, however, are not that significant that they should be considered primary when they are but a minority component of a much larger mixture. But if they are indeed the sole or primary component of a food (“in its pure form”), then indeed one would recite *mezonos* when eating them.

5. Which is the prior blessing instituted for מִזְן, a term that denotes a primary source of sustenance (see 35b note 39).

6. This is *Al HaMichyah*, which is a one-blessing abridgment that synthesizes the three Biblically indicated blessings of *Bircas HaMazon* [as well as the fourth, Rabbinically ordained, blessing of *HaTov VeHaMeitiv*] (see *Rashi*, and Gemara below, 44a).

7. And the main thrust of the Baraisa’s comparison to porridge is to teach us that one does not recite *hamotzi* or *Bircas HaMazon* on *orez* bread or *dochan* bread [for it does not have the status of “bread” but rather of porridge and the like] (see *Pnei Yehoshua*; see also *Tzalach* and *Meromei Sadeh*; see also *Chidushei HaGra*).

8. This is the general blessing (*Borei Nefashos*) said after all foods other than those for which the three blessings of *Bircas HaMazon* or the one-blessing abridgment of three is recited (see Gemara 44b and *Orach Chaim* 207).

Tosafos explain the expressions in this blessing as follows: “Their deficiencies” refers to those things that supply a creature’s fundamental needs, such as bread and water. “All that He created . . .” refers to the extras, such as apples and similar fruits, that are not essential for life but which God created for His creatures to enjoy. [*Rashba* (*Teshuvos* §823), however, explains חֻסְרוֹנָן, their deficiencies, as referring to the needs themselves rather than to that which supplies those needs, and is apparently the source for the alternative explanation cited in *Tur*, *Orach Chaim* 207; see there for the exact text of the full blessing.]

9. See *Rashi*.

10. Of wheat [or one of the other species of grain] (see *Rashi* here, and above כִּמְעַשֵּׂה קֶרֶךְ).

11. [Although it is indeed true that one recites *mezonos* on a porridge made of fine flour, its inclusion here seems out of order. See *Hagahos HaBach* who deletes it from the text. See also *Dikdukei Soferim*.]

12. *Rabbeinu Yonah* here (folio 26a, top) asserts that *mezonos* is recited on grain porridges only if the kernels are split and thus bind together in cooking. Where the kernels are whole and do not bind together in cooking, however, *haadamah* is recited, just as the Baraisa below rules with regard to raw kernels (see also *Rabbeinu Yonah*’s remarks further on, end of דְּרִיָּה וּדְפֵת שְׁעוֹשִׁין; see also *Tosafos*, end of הַכּוֹסֶס). [This assertion is actually found in a passage of *Halachos Gedolos* that appears in some Talmud manuscripts as a marginal note – see above, 36b note 49.] See further on this matter in *Magen Avraham* 208:2 and *Mishnah Berurah* 208:4.

13. That is similarly processed (see details in *Orach Chaim* 208:7 with *Beur Halachah* עַד שְׁנִתְמַחְךָ).

א' צ"ח סימן כח
[ועק"ר עס]

רך - סבור (ו) היה שיצרך ג' ברכות
 ל כל ז' מינין ג' ברכות שלמות ופי
 ג' ענינו וא"ת לר"ג לאמר ג' ברכות
 יכול להיות שלא יטעה כלל מן כוס
 בא' פ"אנו שותה צביעות רק מלא
 א' פסחים ק"ה : ד"ה ש"מ :
 תבילת

[לפיל פ.א.י.]

וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע ה' בְּקוֹל מִצְרָיִם וְיֵצֵא מִמִּצְרָיִם
וְיָבֹאוּ אֶל הַיָּם וְיִשְׁמַע ה' בְּקוֹל יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיֵצֵא
מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל וְיָבֹאוּ אֶל הַיָּם וְיִשְׁמַע ה' בְּקוֹל
יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיֵצֵא מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל וְיָבֹאוּ אֶל הַיָּם

מלין קאמ"ש צהר"ם
[ש"ס]

Thus, we see that one does recite the grain porridge blessing on *orez* porridge! – ? –

The Gemara answers:

רבי יוחנן – Whose authorship is reflected in this Baraisa? – It is authored by R' Yochanan ben Nuri, who considers *orez* a grain like the five species. – For it was taught in a Baraisa: R' Yochanan ben Nuri says: *OREZ* IS A SPECIES OF GRAIN like the five species, AND ONE IS LIABLE TO KARES FOR EATING ITS CHAMETZ on Pesach, AND A PERSON CAN FULFILL WITH IT HIS OBLIGATION to eat matzah ON PESACH.^[14] But the Rabbis hold that one does not recite the grain-porridge blessing on rice porridge, for they do not consider rice a grain like the five species.^[15]

The Gemara persists:

But do the Rabbis hold that *mezonos* is not recited on cooked or baked *orez*? Why, it was taught in a Baraisa: ONE WHO CHEWS and swallows^[16] raw WHEAT RECITES ON IT THE BLESSING THE ONE WHO CREATES THE FRUIT OF THE GROUND. If HE GROUND IT into flour, BAKED IT into bread AND then COOKED IT in a pot, the law is as follows: WHEN THE PIECES of bread ARE INTACT,^[17] it is still considered “bread” and therefore AT THE BEGINNING HE RECITES ON IT THE BLESSING THE ONE WHO BRINGS FORTH BREAD FROM THE EARTH, AND AT THE END HE RECITES ON IT the THREE BLESSINGS of *Bircas HaMazon*. IF THE PIECES of bread ARE NOT INTACT any longer, having dissolved in cooking, it is no longer considered “bread” and therefore AT THE BEGINNING HE RECITES ON IT THE BLESSING THE ONE WHO CREATES SPECIES OF SUSTENANCE, AND AT THE END HE RECITES ON IT THE ONE-BLESSING ABRIDGMENT OF THREE.^[18] ONE WHO CHEWS

and swallows raw *OREZ* RECITES ON IT THE BLESSING THE ONE WHO CREATES THE FRUIT OF THE GROUND. If HE GROUND IT into flour, BAKED IT into *orez* bread AND then COOKED IT in a pot, EVEN THOUGH THE PIECES of the *orez* bread ARE INTACT and it is therefore still considered *orez* “bread,” AT THE BEGINNING HE RECITES UPON IT THE BLESSING THE ONE WHO CREATES SPECIES OF SUSTENANCE, AND AT THE END HE RECITES ON IT THE ONE-BLESSING ABRIDGMENT OF THREE. Now whose authorship is reflected in this Baraisa, which states that *mezonos* is recited on *orez* bread (“even though the pieces are still intact”)? AILYMA R' Yochanan ben Nuri, who says that *orez* is a species of grain like the five species, this cannot be, because in his view one would have to recite the blessing the One Who brings forth bread from the earth beforehand and the three blessings of *Bircas HaMazon* afterwards even in the case of *orez* bread that was cooked (provided that its pieces remained intact).^[19] Is it not, rather, clearly authored by the Rabbis, who rule that *orez* is not a grain like the five species,^[20] and yet the Baraisa states that one recites *mezonos* on *orez* bread!^[21] And it thus represents a refutation to the ruling of Rav and Shmuel, who say that *mezonos* is recited only on the five species of grain. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, it is a refutation.^[22]

The Gemara now analyzes the Baraisa just cited:

– The master stated in the Baraisa: ONE WHO CHEWS and swallows raw WHEAT RECITES ON IT THE BLESSING THE ONE WHO CREATES THE FRUIT OF THE GROUND.

The Gemara asks:

But it was taught in a different Baraisa: ONE WHO CHEWS and swallows raw wheat recites the

NOTES

14. One can fulfill his obligation to eat matzah on the first night of Pesach by eating *orez* matzah.

R' Yochanan ben Nuri holds that *orez* is as much a grain as the five species, and all the laws applying to those five species (see *Challah* 1:1-2) apply to *orez* as well. Accordingly, one would recite *hamotzi* and *Bircas HaMazon* on *orez* bread, and *mezonos* and *Al HaMichyah* on *orez* porridge.

15. And Rav and Shmuel's ruling, excluding *orez* and *dochan* from the blessings instituted for the five species of grain, was said in accordance with the majority view of the Rabbis who dispute R' Yochanan ben Nuri (see *Challah* 1:4, 3:7, and *Pesachim* 35a).

16. See 36b note 38.

17. That is, they did not dissolve as a result of cooking (*Rashi*, see 37b note 34). Some explain “the pieces are intact” to mean that they remain firm enough so that they can be taken out without falling apart (*Tosafos*). [Other Rishonim, however, explain this to mean that the bread did not break up into pieces less than the size of an olive (see *Rabbeinu Yonah*, citing *Yerushalmi*; *Tosafos* to 37b חביצא; see also *Orach Chaim* 168:10, and below, 37b note 14).]

18. [As one would make on a porridge made of the five grains.]

19. For in his view, *orez* is a grain just like the five grains.

20. Which precludes *orez* bread from being classified as bread on which *hamotzi* and *Bircas HaMazon* are recited.

21. [For although *orez* is not a grain like the five species, it does, nevertheless, satisfy one's hunger and provide basic sustenance like the grains. Therefore, the blessing the One Who creates species of sustenance is appropriate. (See *Meromei Sadeh*.)]

22. In practice, then, we follow the Baraisa and recite *mezonos* on

cooked rice. [Though the Baraisa speaks of a case in which the *orez* was first made into bread, the same would apply even if it was prepared as a porridge to begin with. This is indicated by the Baraisa's statement that *mezonos* is recited “even though the pieces of *orez* bread are intact.” This implies that the same applies if they have dissolved, which is no better than *orez* made into porridge to begin with (*Beis Yosef*, *Orach Chaim* 208 ר"ה האוכל אורז).]

Though the Baraisa also states that *Al HaMichyah* is recited after eating cooked rice, the Gemara below will emend that ruling of the Baraisa.

Rif notes that this Baraisa (which states that *mezonos* is recited on *orez* bread) refutes only the second ruling of Rav and Shmuel (“anything that is from the five species . . .,” which implies that *mezonos* is not recited on a dish made of *orez* or *dochan*). But the Baraisa does not refute their first ruling (“anything that contains something of the five species . . .,” which implies that *mezonos* is not recited on foods that contain *orez* or *dochan* as a minority ingredient). The Baraisa states only that *mezonos* is recited on a food made primarily of *orez*. With regard to a food that simply contains some *orez*, we remain with Rav and Shmuel's first ruling, which indicates that *mezonos* is not recited on it. See *Magen Avraham* 208:11.

Tosafos (ר"ה חביצא) also note that the Baraisa refutes Rav and Shmuel's position only with regard to *orez*. The Baraisa says nothing, however, about *dochan*, and it may be that the halachah indeed follows Rav and Shmuel with regard to *mezonos* not being recited on *dochan*. This is indeed the view of *Rif*, and *Rambam*, *Hil. Berachos* 3:10. See, however, *Rabbeinu Yonah* and *Rosh* §8, who maintain that *dochan* is equated with *orez*; thus, just as one recites *mezonos* on *orez* (as stated in the Baraisa), so too on *dochan*. See *Orach Chaim* 208:8 and *Beur Halachah* there.

blessing *THE ONE WHO CREATES SPECIES OF SEEDS*. – ? –

The Gemara answers:

It is not difficult. – *This second Baraisa*, which rules that the blessing for wheat kernels is *the One Who creates species of seeds*, follows R' Yehudah, who requires a greater specificity of blessings.^[23] – *And this first Baraisa*, which rules that *haadamah* is recited on wheat kernels, follows the Rabbis, who maintain that the general blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground* suffices for all fruits of the ground. – *As we learned in the Mishnah*:^[24] – *AND ON VEGETABLES ONE SAYS the blessing: THE ONE WHO CREATES THE FRUIT OF THE GROUND.* – R' Yehudah says one recites: *THE ONE WHO CREATES SPECIES OF HERBAGE*.^[25]

The Gemara further analyzes the Baraisa cited above:

– *The master stated in the Baraisa*: *ONE WHO CHEWS and swallows raw OREZ* – *one who chews and swallows raw OREZ* – *recites on it the blessing THE ONE WHO CREATES THE FRUIT OF THE GROUND.* – *If he ground it into flour, BAKED IT into orez bread AND then COOKED IT,* – *even though the pieces of the orez bread are intact,* – *at the beginning he recites on it the blessing THE ONE WHO CREATES SPECIES OF SUSTENANCE,* – *and at the end he recites the ONE-BLESSING ABRIDGMENT OF THREE.*

The Gemara asks:

– *But it was taught in a different Baraisa regarding this very case of orez*: – *at the end one recites NOTHING AT ALL.*^[26] – ? –

The Gemara answers:

– *Rav Sheishess said*: – *It is not difficult.* – *This Baraisa* which rules that the

one-blessing abridgment of three is recited after *orez* is the opinion of Rabban Gamliel, – *whereas this Baraisa* which rules that “nothing at all” is recited after *orez* is the opinion of the Rabbis, who dispute him in the following Baraisa:^[27] – *For it was taught in a Baraisa*: – *THIS IS THE RULE*: – *Regarding the blessing to be recited after eating ANY food THAT IS OF THE SEVEN SPECIES,*^[28] – *One recites the THREE BLESSINGS of Bircas HaMazon.* – *One recites the ONE-BLESSING ABRIDGMENT OF THREE.*^[29] – *AND there was an incident involving Rabban Gamliel and the Elders,* – *who were reclining in an upper story in Jericho,* – *and they brought before them dates*^[30] – *and they ate,* – *and Rabban Gamliel gave R' Akiva permission to recite the blessing after eating.*^[32] – *R' Akiva hastened to recite*^[33] (without consulting Rabban Gamliel) *the one-blessing abridgment of three*, in keeping with the Sages' view and in contrast to that of Rabban Gamliel. – *Rabban Gamliel said to him* in rebuke: – *Akiva! until when will you continue to poke your head into a matter of dispute between me and my colleagues?*^[34] – *[R' Akiva] said to him*: – *our master, even though you say thus and your colleagues say thus, you have taught us, our master, that in matters of dispute between an individual and a majority, the halachah accords with the majority.*

The Baraisa continues:

– *R' Yehudah says in [Rabban Gamliel's] name*:^[35] – *After eating ANY food THAT IS OF THE SEVEN SPECIES*

NOTES

23. “Fruits of the ground” is a general category that also includes the subcategories *seeds* [e.g. grains and legumes, whose seeds are eaten, rather than the plant itself] and *herbage* [in whose case the plant itself is eaten] (see 35a note 8). R' Yehudah holds in our Mishnah (as the Gemara will soon cite) that the *herbage* subcategory requires its own blessing, because (as the Gemara explains on 40a) he requires a specific blessing for a subcategory. Similarly, he holds that the *seeds* subcategory requires the specific blessing *the One Who creates species of seeds* (see Rashi).

24. Above, 35a.

25. The Rabbis, who do not require so great a specificity of blessings and therefore state in the Mishnah that the more general *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground* is the blessing instituted for the subcategory of *herbage*, would also hold that this is the blessing recited on the subcategory of *seeds*. R' Yehudah, who states in the Mishnah that the more specific blessing *the One Who creates species of herbage* was instituted for the subcategory of *herbage*, would also hold that the more specific blessing *the One Who creates species of seeds* was instituted for the subcategory of *seeds*.

26. I.e. one recites nothing at all of the blessing instituted for the fruits for which Eretz Yisrael is praised [i.e. the three blessings of *Bircas HaMazon* or the one-blessing abridgment of three]. Rather, one recites afterwards simply the *Borei Nefashos* blessing, as one does after other foods that are not among the seven species for which Eretz Yisrael is praised (Rashi; cf. *Teshuvos HaRashba* §823, who presents a different explanation of why *Borei Nefashos* is called “nothing at all”).

27. [That the dispute between Rabban Gamliel and the Rabbis pertains to the after-blessing for *orez* emerges at the end of the Baraisa.]

28. For which Eretz Yisrael is praised in *Deuteronomy* 8:8. These are: wheat, barley, grapes, figs, pomegranates, oil olives and dates.

29. This dispute between Rabban Gamliel and the Sages is also recorded in the Mishnah below, 44a (see Gemara there, where the dispute is explained).

30. In Talmudic times, people ate their meals in a reclining position. Rabban Gamliel and the Elders were reclining and waiting for the food to be served.

31. Dates are the “honey” listed among the seven species [see note 28] (Rashi).

[Jericho was “the city of dates,” as stated in *Judges* 1:16 [see *Targum ad loc.*] (*Sifsei Chachamim*).]

32. That is, to be the one to recite the blessing on behalf of all the participants (see *Tosafos*, *Rashba* and *Ritva*).

33. [Literally: jumped up and recited]; see *Sheleimah Mishnas* to 39a *ד"ה קפץ וברך*; see also *Tzlach* here.

34. [R' Akiva was a student of Rabban Gamliel and the Elders, and Rabban Gamliel rebuked him for taking sides in a dispute between his mentors.]

35. Rashi (see *Tosefta* 4:13). [What follows is not a quote from Rabban Gamliel, but rather R' Yehudah's report of a different version of the dispute, according to which it emerges that Rabban Gamliel holds an additional view not ascribed to him by the first version.]

בורא נפשות רבות וחסרונם • כמו לחם ומים שאף אפשר בלא
הם* ועל כל מה שברא להחיות בהם נפש כל חי כלומר
על כל מה שצמחם שגם אם לא בראם יכולין העולם לחיות בלא הם
באלה בראש כי אם להצמחם בעתהם כמו תפוחים ודיוגל בהן ומסיים

הקדמ"ל כל שאר. דאט"ז דטלוו מחד מינא בעינן דליהוי מחמשה
הבחינן וזי לא לא מצרכין עליה בורא מיני מוואות: ארזי. מ"ל:
דוחו. פנ"ן. במעשה קדמה. צרכה שמצרכין על מעשה קדמה
של מחמשה מיני: צרכה אחת מענינ' ג'. צרכה פרחו (דף מד.) מפ'

הנה על תמיהה כי: ואורז לאו מעשה
 הקדשה - דקא מספק ליה מכלל מעשה
 הקדשה לברכה אחרת: אלץ קא מעשה
 הקדשה - לעינן ברכה: חילוקא קאן (3)
 וקדשו ורעונו - מפרש ליה בחבור קאן (3)
 - חילוקא - חסי דמחברי
 חילוקא דהא למרי: טרידי - חדא
 תלחלח - רזי - חדא לארבע: עינן -
 קדש לתש: אא מני - קא מחסיתא
 וקדשי חורו כמנעש קדשי רבי יומא
 בן טרי: היצ אבל כעץ לא ורבע לא
 והנאלי סי - וליא והכלות והכלות
 גדולות הוא: הססס - כמות שהיא:
 וכלה וכלה - לאחר שפלה בטר
 עשה להם חור ובכלה במים:
 שפלה וקדשות קיימות - שלא נמוס
 בבבול: ברכה אחת מעין א' - על
 תמיהה ופירש לה הכללה וכלה פקין
 קדש (מי) עשר לא: אלא לאו מני
 היא - וקדשי במי' והיובחא דרב
 שמואל: אא רבי יהודה סי - אא
 וקדשי בורא מיני ורעמי ר' יהודה
 וקדשי לכל מין ורעמי פקין (דק מ.)
 דמחברי לקון בעירקין (דק מ.)
 אליביה הלך לירקות בורא מיני
 שאלי לחפין חריש ימיה בורא
 ורעמי ורעמי ורעמי ורעמי בורא
 לירקות בעריא ולא בעיני לכל מין
 מיני מעין ברבסו: ולא כלס - כלומר
 און טעון מפרסו פירוש ארץ ישראל
 ולא כלס אלא בורא נפשות רבות
 תכלת מירי דליתיא משעבת מים
 ורעמי (ד) וסס דבס
 האמור בשעבת המינין שהבש
 ב מן התמרים: קסז ויבדי -
 אחרת - משמו - על ר"ג:
 ולא

קמ"ל כל שיש בו ואי אשמעין כל שיש בו
הוא אמינא כל שיש בו חמשת המינים אין
"אבל אורו דוחן לא משום דע" תעורבת
אבל אתיה בעיניה נימא אפילו אורו דוחן
נמי מברכין עליו בורא מיני מוונות קמ"ל כל
שהוא חמשת המינים אורו דמברכין עליו
בורא מיני מוונות לאפוקי אורו דחמשת דאפילו
אתיה בעיניה לא מברכין בורא מיני מוונות
ואורו [דוחן] לא מברכין בורא מיני מוונות
ולתניא הביאו לפניו פת אורו ופת דוחן מברך
עליו בתחלה וסוף כמעשה קדרה וגבי מעשה
קדרה תניא ב' בתחלה מברך עליו בורא מ"מ
ולבסוף מברך עליו ברכה אחת מעין שלש
כמעשה קדרה ולא כמעשה קדרה כמעשה
קדרה דמברכין עליו בתחלה וסוף ולא כמעשה
קדרה דאילו כמעשה קדרה בתחלה בורא
מיני מוונות ולבסוף ברכה אחת מעין ג' ואילו
הכא בתחלה מברך עליו שהכל נהיה בדברו
ולבסוף בורא נפשות רבות וחסידיו על כל
מה שברא ואורו לאו מעשה קדרה הוא
והתניא אלו הן מעשה קדרה וחילקא מרגיש (ב)
סולת *וריו וערסן ואורו הא מני רבי יוחנן בן
גורא דתניא *רבי יוחנן על בן טורי אומר אורו
מין דגן הוא וחיובין על בן חמצו כרת אורו
יוצא בו ידי חיבתו בפסח אבל ידבן לאורבנן
לא והתניא * * * הכוסס את החטה מברך
עליה בורא פרי האדמה *מתנה אפאה וכשלה
בזמן שהפרוסות קיימות בתחלה מברך עליה
המציא לחם מן הארץ ולבסוף מברך עליה
ג' ברכות אם אין הפרוסות קיימות בתחלה
מברך עליה בורא מיני מוונות ולבסוף מברך
עליה ברכה אחת מעין ג' *הכוסס את האור

מחלקת המחקר

מסמכים

[לעפיל פאג]

אם הפרוסות קיימות - יש מפרשים
דהיינו כשהלחם אינו שרוי
במים כ"כ שאם יקח הפרוסה שלא
ישבר: **רש"י** פי' אורז מ"ל.
ויש מפרשים ר"יזו ולהאי פירוש יש
לפרש דדוקון היינו מ"ל:

תיבתא דרב ושמאל - באורז
אבל אדוחן לא הוי
מיוצתא ואפשר דהוי הלכתא טייתיהו
ולא מברכינן עליה בורא מיני מזונות:
הבוסס חטה לריק לבדק עליה
בורא פרי האדמה.

שֶׁהָרִי אֶפְּלוֹ בְּקִמְחָא דְּחִיטֵי אֲמַרִּין
לְעֵיל (ה) מְזַכְרִין עֲלֶיהָ בַּפֶּה"ל וְלִרְבִּ
נִחְמֵן לֹא ס"ל הֵכִי מִשּׁוּם דְּלִשְׁתֵּנוּ
וּמִיָּהוּ בְּלֹאֲחֲרֵיו יִשְׁלַסְפֵּק מֵאִי מְזַכְרִין

ואם נזכרין על החמה ועל הכלכלה
 ומסיים על האדמה ועל פרי האדמה
 וללא אשכנן ברכת על החמה ועל
 הכלכלה אלא היבא דברין עלייהו
 ברישא קודם אכילה בורא מיני
 ממונות ור"מ הגיה במצור קט' על
 האדמה ועל פרי האדמה כ' וזכר
 בו ר"ל אשכנן בשם מקום כך
 יצא ונקטן (ק' מה) מפרש ברכה
 אחת מהם ג' וקמח בחמשת המינים
 ועל הארץ ועל פרי הארץ ועל פרי
 הארץ ועל השירות ועל האדמה
 ועל פרי האדמה לא הוסיף ועוד
 וקמח בורא על הכוס את החמה
 ונזכר כ"ח פרי האדמה וקמח
 הכדאי מטט ואפוא פת עד אם אין

(ה) ב'ה' ס'גרים וזר
 ס'ל וזמית סולת
 מתקן: (כ) ס'סולל הירקות
 סולא וזמית: (ג) ס'ידי
 חילקל וזר' במשק קמן.
 ח'ל'ס'ס'מ'מ'ס'ק'ד'ק'ר
 חילקל ס'גרים וזמית
 חילקל ס'ל וזמית
 ס'גרים ח'ל'ס'ס'מ'מ'ס'ק'ד'ק'ר
 ס'ל וזמית: (ד) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ד'ס' (פ) וזמית ד'ס'
 ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (ז) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (ח) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (ט) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (י) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (יא) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (יב) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (יג) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (יד) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (טו) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (טז) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (יז) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (יח) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (יט) ס'ס'ס'ס'
 ס'ל וזמית: (כ) ס'ס'ס'ס'

גמ' בססס ס' : ע'
רבי' [למילי עיב
ד' כס] מנצלה ועיב ד'ה
דחכמיס : [וביומא ט'ה
ד'ה שססס] : תוס' ד'ה
בססס ס' : שח' חכמיס
כילי ל'ה כסכא וז'
לקנן מיד ע"א : תוס'
ד'ה כון : דלמי
שוח' בקביעות רק מל'
לונגמי : ע' לקנן ל'ס
ע"א תוס' ד'ה כנר :

[חולין ק"ל ע"ב במד"ב
[ו"ט]

ר' סבור (ו) היה שיכרך ג' ברכות
ל כל ג' מינין ג' ברכות שלמות וכי
נעצמו וא"ם לר"ב דלחמא ג' ברכות
יכול להיות שלא ישתה כלל מן סם
בא פ"א"ע שותה צקביעות רק מלא
ו' פסחים ק"ה : ד"ה ש"מ] :

חב"א

או מין דגן ולא – BUT IS NOT A SPECIES OF GRAIN, ולא מין דגן הוא – OR A SPECIES OF GRAIN BUT HE DID NOT MAKE IT INTO BREAD, רבן גמליאל אומר שלש ברכות – RABBAN GAMLIEL SAYS that one recites the THREE BLESSINGS of *Bircas HaMazon*,^[1] והכמים אומרים ברכה אחת – BUT THE SAGES SAY that one recites the ONE-BLESSING abridgment of three.^[2] כל שאינו לא משבעת – And with regard to ANYTHING that is similarly significant but THAT IS NOT one OF THE SEVEN SPECIES NOR A SPECIES OF GRAIN,^[3] כגון פת אוזו ודוחן – SUCH AS OREZ BREAD OR DOCHAN BREAD, רבן גמליאל אומר ברכה אחת משני שלש – RABBAN GAMLIEL SAYS that one recites afterwards the ONE-BLESSING ABRIDGMENT OF THREE, והכמים אומרים ולא כלום – BUT THE SAGES SAY that one recites afterwards NOTHING AT ALL.^[4] Accordingly, Rav Sheishess explains that the Baraisa which prescribes *Al HaMichyah* as the blessing after baked and cooked *orez* reflects the view of Rabban Gamliel here. The Baraisa which prescribes *Borei Nefashos* reflects the view of the Rabbis (Sages) here.

The Gemara refutes Rav Sheishess' answer:

במאי אוקימתא – How have you interpreted it [i.e. the Baraisa on 37a, whose last clause prescribes *Al HaMichyah* as the blessing after cooked and baked rice]? ברכן גמליאל – As being in accordance with the view of Rabban Gamliel. אימא סיפא – But say and consider the latter clause of the first part of that Baraisa, which states with regard to wheat bread that was then cooked: אם אין הפרוסות קיימות – IF THE PIECES of bread ARE NOT INTACT, they are no longer considered "bread" and therefore בתחלה מברך עליה בורא מיני מזונות – AT THE BEGINNING HE RECITES ON IT THE BLESSING THE ONE WHO CREATES SPECIES OF SUSTENANCE, ולבסוף מברך עליה ברכה אחת מעין – AND AT THE END HE RECITES ON IT THE ONE-BLESSING ABRIDGMENT OF THREE. מני – Now, whose view is reflected in this clause of the Baraisa? אי רבן גמליאל – If you wish to say that it is the view of Rabban Gamliel (as would necessarily follow from Rav Sheishess' assertion that Rabban Gamliel is the author of this Baraisa's last clause), we would be confronted with the following difficulty: השתא אבותבות ואדייקא אמר רבן גמליאל – Now that even on dates and on *daissa* Rabban Gamliel says that the three blessings of *Bircas HaMazon* are recited,^[5] אם אין הפרוסות קיימות מיבעינא – then if the food contains actual bread except that the pieces are not intact, can there be any doubt that *Bircas HaMazon* is recited?^[6] אלא פשיטא רבן – Rather, it is obvious that this Baraisa (which prescribes *Al HaMichyah* for a dish into which bread was added and dissolved) reflects the view of the Rabbis^[7] and not that of Rabban Gamliel, and Rav Sheishess' resolution is thus refuted. – ? –

The Gemara counters:

But if so, that the first Baraisa is authored by the Rabbis, as you have just demonstrated, קשיא דרבנן אדרבנן – the ruling of the Rabbis there (that one recites the one-blessing abridgment of three after eating *orez*) contradicts that ruling of the Rabbis recorded in the second Baraisa (that "nothing at all" is recited after *orez*)^[8] – ? –

The Gemara concludes:

Do not reject because of this the interpretation that the first Baraisa is authored by the Rabbis. Rather, conclude that indeed the first Baraisa is authored by the Rabbis. ותני גבי – And emend that first Baraisa so that it should read with regard to *orez*: ולבסוף אינו מברך עליו ולא כלום – AND AT THE END, after eating *orez* bread, HE DOES NOT RECITE ON IT ANYTHING AT ALL.^[9]

The Gemara cites a ruling of Rava:

With regard to the blessing recited on this *rihata*^[10] of the villagers, המפשי ביה – who add a lot of flour to it, מברך בורא מיני מזונות – one recites on it the blessing the One Who creates species of sustenance. What is the reason? מאי טעמא – Because the flour is the primary ingredient. דמחזא ולא מפשי – With regard to the *rihata* of the city dwellers,^[11] who do not add a lot of flour to it, מברך עליו שהכל נהיה בדברו – one recites on it the blessing that everything came into being through His word. What is the reason? מאי טעמא – Because the honey is the primary ingredient. עיקר אידי ואידי בורא – Rava then reconsidered and said: Both on this and on that [i.e. on either type of *rihata*] one recites the One Who creates species of sustenance. For it is Rav and Shmuel who both say: כל שיש בו מחמשת המינים – In the case of any food that contains something of the five species of grain, even if the grain is but a minority ingredient, מברכין עליו בורא מיני מזונות – we recite on it the blessing the One Who creates species of sustenance. Thus, even on *rihata* of the cities, which contains only a small amount of flour, we recite *mezonos*.

The Gemara cites a different ruling:

With regard to the blessing recited on this *chavitzta*,^[12] דאית ביה פוררין כנות – that which has in it pieces of bread the size of an olive, בתחלה מברך עליו המוציא לחם מן הארץ – at the beginning, before eating, one recites on it the blessing the One Who brings forth bread from the earth; ולבסוף מברך עליו שלש ברכות – and at the end, after eating, one recites on it the three blessings of

NOTES

1. Obviously, Rabban Gamliel would rule so even if it were a species of grain that one *did* make into bread. The Baraisa specifies "anything that is of the seven species but not a species of grain, or a species of grain but he did not make it into bread" because those are the cases in which the Sages (below) dispute Rabban Gamliel. Would it be a species of grain and made into bread, however, the Sages would agree that *Bircas HaMazon* is recited (see *Rashi*).

2. [So far, R' Yehudah's report of the dispute is substantively the same as the Tanna Kamma's.]

3. [Tangentially, this double wording implies that some of the five species of grain are not considered varieties of wheat and barley (mentioned in the verse) and are thus not deemed to be among the seven species for which Eretz Yisrael is praised. See *Rashash* here, but see also his comments to *Pesachim* 36b.]

4. [I.e. *Borei Nefashos* (see 37a note 26).]

5. The Baraisa at the top of this *amud* states that according to Rabban Gamliel, *Bircas HaMazon* is recited on "a species of grain that he did not make into bread," which includes *daissa* (*Rashi*).

6. I.e. if Rabban Gamliel prescribes *Bircas HaMazon* for *daissa*, whose grain never had the status of bread, would he not certainly prescribe it for a dish into which actual bread was added and dissolved? (*Rashi*).

7. Who dispute Rabban Gamliel and hold that only *Al HaMichyah* is recited on a non-bread dish of grain. And they hold that the same applies to bread that was cooked and dissolved and has thus lost the status of "bread" (*Rashi*).

8. In other words, we are back to the original contradiction between Baraisos that Rav Sheishess sought to resolve.

9. Thus emended, the first Baraisa agrees with the second.

10. *Rihata* is another name for *chavitz* cooked in a pot [see above, 36b note 49] (*Rashi*).

11. *Rashi*. [See *Rashi* to *Arachin* 14a דמקריס אחד; see also *Targum Onkelos* to *Numbers* 22:39.]

12. A cooked dish made with small pieces of bread (see *Rashi* and *Ritva*; *Tosafos* and other *Rishonim*, though, explain this differently – see notes 14 and 34).

דגהית דגריא
 [א] גמ' (פרוקין חייבין
 בחלס) תא"מ :
 [ב] שם כי תא"מ רבין
 אר"י פרוקין חייבין
 בחלס. כנ"ל :

היה עומד ומקריב מנחות. פס"ז
בכל היום מתקדש המזבח
והזבח גדול הוא היום עומד ומקריב
ששעמם בבקר המקריב וכן ליפגם נעלן
ללללכלכלן משמע דלכסן קאי וגרלה
לכסלן העומד לקריב ראשון
ושמשרתו וכו' משמרתו היו וכל שנה
ותקדשות משמרת חזרתם אם כן כל
ושמשרתיהם משמרת חלל' פ' פעמים
בשנה וכיון שיש להם זמן קצוב
וזכרונם קשה ויהיו ולא יפריש' המנחות
מזבן. פס"ח. פס"ט. דקאי אמנות
ולא נאירא דלכ' היכי קאמר
חזן חזן הוא וכו' והא אמרינן
מנחות ז' (נ): כל המנחות בלות
מנחה ודלכא דקאי לחמשת מיניו וס'
לקס מכל מיני לחמשת כוית כו' :
אמר רבא והא דלכא עליה
טוריתא דנמלא . וכן
קיימא לן דרבא בדרבא הוא וליכא
ענין שיהי' פסוקי כוית כיון דלכא
טוריתא דנמלא לפעין המנחה ואשילו
בשבעת לפירות פ"ח. והא דמשמע
יירטלמי דפסוקי קיימות כן בזוית
אשילו שכן דרך הלכות טוריתא
שנעמחא בזוית חבל פעמים דאשילו
מפחות מכוית חילת טוריתא דנמלא :
טוריתא . דנמלא . גרלה דייט
שקטני' טוריתא (במס' ואם הסיס
מחמת הפורין חלל ליה
טוריתא דנמלא וכן היה רגיל בדיט
דחמין ללכן פטורין במים בלילה
ללאכן בשחר בלא ברכת המנחה
בללל ברכת המזון בלא לחלל כד'
יפתחוק ראשון ויחלל להביד האלה :
הם העשוי' לכוות פסור מן
החלה . והייט כשעשאו
לגומדים ופס"ח . פס"ט . פס"י
תחמה וקסא דהא אמרינן במסכת
גלה (פ"א משה : כל שחתלו עיסה
וסופגין סופגין חייבין בחלה וכל
מחמת חתולו סופגין וסופו עיסה חייבין
מחי חתולו סחתלו סופגין וסופו
מחי סופגין פסור מן החלה ופסק
אם כן צביביל' וירשול'א"ס
התחלתן עיסה מברכין עליהן המזלי'
צביבו בחלה אף על פי כסו :
ויהיה אמר 'מעשה

(ה) ולא מין דגן הוא או מין דגן ולא עשאו פת ר"ג אומר שלש ברכות וחכ"א ברכה אחת כל שאינו לא משבעת המינין ולא מין דגן כגון פת אורז ודוחן ר"ג אומר ברכה אחת מעין שלש וחכ"א ולא כלום במאי אוקימנא כ"ר א"א סיפא דרישא אם אין הפרוסות קיימות בתחלה מברך עליה בורא מיני מזונות ולבסוף מברך עליה ברכה אחת מעין שלש מני אי ר"ג והשתא אכותבות ואדיימא אכד ר"ג ברכות אם אין הפרוסות קיימות מבעיא אלא פשיטא רבנן איהכי קשיא דרבנן אדרבנן אלא לעולם רבנן ותני גבי אורז ולבסוף אינו מברך עליו ולא כלום : אמר רבא האי ריהמא דהקלאי דמפשי ביה קמחא מברך במ"מ מ"ט דסמכא עיקר דמחזיק דלא מפשי ביה קמחא מברך עליו : שהכל נהיה בדברו מ"ט דובשא עיקר דתורז אמר רבא אידי ואידי במ"מ דרב ושמואל דאמרי תרווייהו כל שישבו מחמשת המינים מברכין עליו בורא מיני מזונות א"ד יוסף *האי חביצא דאית ביה פרוזין כוית בתחלה מברך עליו המציא לחם מן הארץ ולבסוף מברך עליו שלש ברכות דלית ביה פרוזין כוית בתחלה מברך עליו בורא מיני מזונות ולבסוף ברכה אחת מברך עליו שלש אמי ר"ב יוסף מנא אמינא לה *דהנאי יהיה עומד ומקריב מנחות בירושלים אומר ברוך שהחיינו קיימנו והגיענו לזמן הזה נמלך לאכל מברך מן הארץ המציא לחם מן הארץ ויכול פותח ביות א"ל אביי אלא מעתה לחנא דבי ר"י יאמר פורקן עד שמחזיק לסלחן ה"נ דלא בעי ברוכי המציא לחם מן הארץ וכי חימא ר"ה והתניא לקט מכויל כוית ואכל אם חמץ הוא עגוש כרת ואם מצה הוא אדם יוצא בו די חיבתו בפסח הכא במאי עסקין בשעורין אי הכי אימא סיפא והוא שאכלן בכדי אכילת פסח ואי בשעורין האי שאכלן שאכלו מיבעי ליה הכא במאי עסקין בבא מלחם גדול מאי היה עלה אמר רב ששית *האי חביצא אף על גב דלית ביה פרוזין כוית מברך עליו אימא עליה תורתא דנחמא שרוקנין חייבין בחלה [א] וכי אתא רבין א"ר יוחנן שרוקנין [א] שפורין מן החלה מאי שרוקנין אמר אביי גובא דארעא ואמר אביי *מיריתא פסחיה מן החלה מאי מיריתא אימא דאמרי גביל מרתה ואימא דאמרי *נחמא דהגרקא ואימא אב"י *לחם העשוי לכותח תני רבי חייא לחם העשוי לכותח פסור מן החלה ומה ר' חנינאי חייב בחלה ההם כדקתני מעשה ר' יהודה אומר 'מעשיה מביחין עליה עשאו כעבין

תוריתא דנאמ'. תואר מראי
בכירה וטות' בחובו מים וק
טותים קמח ומים בכלי ובות'
נאמא דהדקא. בלג שאופין
בינים ושמן: לחם העשוי לפ
ברכת מעין שלג על המז

וְיוֹק שָׁאם עֲשׂוֹה פֶת הַכַּל מוֹדִים שְׁלֵרִין
 אֶחָם מִן דָּוָן הוּא אֶלֶף שָׁלֹם עֲשׂוֹה פֶת
 ס: מִתְחַלּוֹת מִתְחַלּוֹת. הַלְוֹה לְעִנֵּל
 יוֹדֵן שֶׁלֶם: כִּי יֵצֵא אִימָה מִיֵּדֶךָ לְרִישָׁא
 הַרְחֵק מִתְחַלּוֹת דְּמִתְחַלּוֹת גְּבִי הַכֹּסֶם אֶת
 הַמִּתְחַלּוֹת הַרְחֵק רִישָׁא יִדְדֵה וְחִתִּי
 סִיפָא אִין הַכְּרוֹסוֹת קִימּוֹת ס':
 הַשָּׂמָה. אִשְׁלִינּוֹ דִּיֵּשִׁים אֲמֵר רִישָׁא
 בְּחִתִּי: בְּחִתִּיִּיא אֶת מִין דָּוָן רִישָׁא
 עֲשׂוֹה פֶת מִבְּרֵךְ אֲחִירִי ג' בִּדְרוֹת:
 אִין הַכְּרוֹסוֹת קִימּוֹת. שְׂבַחְתֵּלְתוּ פֶת
 מִשְׁתָּה הִיא: מִיִּנְעִיל. וּבְשִׁנְתוּ מִי
 גִּיעַ מִדִּיִּסָּא: אֶלֶף לֹאָר רִבְנָן הִיא.
 דְּלִפְתִּי גְבִי דִיִּסָּא בְּרִבְנָן אֶתֵּר וְהִיא
 נְמִי מִשְׁתִּנְתוּ לֹאָר פֶת הוּא וְהִיא
 דִּיִּשְׁלִינּוֹ: וְהִלְכָהּ לֹאָר גְּבִיִּסְרִין: יִרְחִישָׁא:
 הוּא חֲצִין קִרְדֵּה: דְּחֻקְלָא. גְּבִי כִפֶּר:
 דְּלִפְתִּי בִּיה קִתְּמָה. שְׂמִירִים בִּזְקָמָה:
 דְּמִתְחַלּוֹת. גְּבִי כִרְך: הַכִּיֵּלָא. כְּעִין
 שְׁלִי"קוֹק שְׂמִירִין בְּחוּךְ הַלֵּלֶם
 לֵחִם: מִנָּה אֲמִינָה לֵה. דְּחִפְרִין
 עוֹמֵד מִבְּרִין הַמְּוִלִּיא: הִיא. יִכְרָל
 שׁוֹמֵר: וְחִקְרִיב מִנְחָה. וְחִבְנָה לִכְכֵּן
 לְהַקְרִיב: לְרֹמֵם בְּחוּךְ שְׁחִישִׁי. אֶס
 לֹאָר הִיֵּבֵר מִנְחָה זֶה וְיִמִּים בְּרִים: עֲנֵל
 לֹאָלֶךְ. הִכֵּן: וְתִנֵּי עֲנֵל. כְּלוֹמֵר
 וְתִנֵּן עַל הַמִּנְחָה מִנְחָה מִתְחַלּוֹת וּמִנְחָה
 מִרְחֶשֶׁת הַקְּרִיבֹת כְּעִין אֲשִׁיּוֹת:
 וְיִכְרָל שִׁחְתָּן. כְּלוֹמֵר בִּזְנוֹן קוֹדֶם
 קִמְיָה וְעוֹשֶׂה רֹחֵן פִּתְיוֹן כִּיִּדִּים
 כִּרְכִּיבִים פִּתוּס אִוִּית פִּתוּס (וְיִקְרָה ב)
 אֶלֶלֶם פִּתְיוֹן כִּיִּדִּים מִבְּרֵךְ עֵינֵן
 הַמְּוִלִּיא: פִּרְדֵּן. לְמִנְחָתוֹת אֲשִׁיּוֹת
 עַל הַמִּתְחַבֵּב וְעַל הַמִּתְחַבֵּב קוֹדֶם
 קִמְיָה עַד שְׂמִחֹתוֹן לִכְלֵת. גִּיעַ נְמִי.
 לְעִנֵּי אֶלֶף דְּקִינִי מִבְּרֵךְ הַמְּוִלִּיא:
 הַתְּנִיחָה לְקֵץ מִשְׁכָּן. פִּתְיוֹת הַמִּנְחָה:
 בֵּית ס'. וְדִקְלָאֵר יוֹלָא בִּזְרִי
 חֻבּוֹבֹתוֹ בְּפֶסֶם מִשּׁוֹם אֲחִילֵת מִלֵּה
 מִלְּתוֹת שְׂשֵׁה הִיא דְּחִיבִי מִבְּרֵךְ צִנְעֵר לִכְלֵל
 לֵחִם וְהֵסֵם לֵחִם בְּעִין דְּחִיבִי כֵּה
 לֵחִם עֲנִי אֶלֶלֶם לֵחִם הִיא וּמִבְּרֵךְ
 הַמְּוִלִּיא וְהֵם מִתְּנִיחִין עַל כִּרְכֵּךְ דְּבִי
 שְׂמִינְתֵּמְלָא הִיא דֵּה אֶתֵּר לֵחִם מִשְׁכָּן
 בֵּית אֶלֶלֶם בְּפִתְיוֹת פִּתְיוֹת מִשְׁכָּן
 קִי: בְּשִׁעְרֵן. כִּשְׁחֹר וְגִבֵּן יוֹד
 חֹחֵר וְאֶתֵּן. עֵרֶן לֵשׁן אֲחִילֵת פִּרְס. שֵׁלֵם
 הֵיאָה שְׂאֵלֶךְ כְּדִי אֲחִילֵת פִּרְס. שֵׁלֵם
 שֵׁשֶׁה מִשְׁתַּחֲוֵּל לִכְלֵל שְׁעוֹר כִּיֵּם
 עַד שְׂמֵר אֲחִילֵת הַשְּׁעוֹר יוֹדֵר מִכְּדִי
 אֲחִילֵת חִי כִכֵּר שֶׁל שְׂמֵרָה בְּיִים דֵּהִי
 חֲזִי אֶרְבַּעֶה בְּיִים שְׂשֵׁה לִירֹךְ שְׂשֵׁה
 אֲחִילֵת וְחֵם שֵׁה יוֹדֵר אֶת אֲחִילֵת
 וְנִשְׁתַּרְפֵּת וְהוּא לִיֵּה לִכְלֵל חֵם יוֹדֵר הִיֵּם
 חֲזִי יוֹדֵר לִמְחֹר וְחֵם חֻיֵּב בִּים אֶס
 וְחֵם הוּא: וְחֵם בְּשִׁעְרֵן וְהוּא שְׂאֵלֶךְ.
 שְׂשֵׁן יוֹדֵר מִיִּנְעִי לֵיֵם: בְּעִי. וְשֵׁלֵם
 שְׂשֵׁן הִיא וְדִקְלָאֵר מִיֵּם הִיא דְּקִמְיָה
 תְּחִיבִי לְמִיֵּהוּ לֵחִם בְּבֵל מִלְּחֵם גְּדוֹל
 כִּשְׂחֹר מִן הַלֵּחִם שֵׁלֵם וְפִרְס טוֹל אֶלֶל
 כִּשְׂחֹר כִּשְׂחֹר כִּשְׂחֹר לֵחִם בְּפֶסֶם:
 אֶתֵּן יוֹלָא בִּזְרִי יוֹדֵר חֻבְנָה מִלֵּה בְּפֶסֶם:
 חֵסִי: כִּשְׂחֹר דְּלִרְעָא. עוֹשֶׂה מִקֹּס מִלֵּל
 כִּכְמוֹ שְׂטוֹשִׁין בְּחֵלֶם: גְּבִיל מִנְחָה.
 בְּקָה וְאִשְׁכִּי: עַל הַכִּירָה כִּשְׂחֹר נִקְחָה:
 וְהוּא שְׂשֵׁה אֶתֵּר מִדִּי בְּשֵׁן אֶתֵּר מִכִּי
 אִין אִשְׁכִּי אֶתֵּר בְּחֵרֵר אֶלֶף בְּחֵמָה:
 כְּעִין
 וְעַל הַכִּלְכֵּלָה וְר' יִחְיָאל דֵּל הִיא
 מִשְׁכָּן

מכאן

מכאן

Bircas HaMazon.^[13] דלית ביה פרוירין פונית – And with regard to *chavitzta* that does not have in it pieces of bread the size of an olive, בתחלה מכרע עליו בורא מיני מזונות – at the beginning one recites on it the blessing *the One Who creates species of sustenance*, ולבסוף ברכה אחת מעין שלש – and at the end one recites the one-blessing abridgment of three.^[14]

Rav Yosef adduces support for his position:

אמר רב יוסף – Rav Yosef said: מנא אמינא לה – From where do I know to say this?^[15] דתניא – For it was taught in a Baraisa: הנה עומד ומקריב מנחות בירושלים – If ONE WAS STANDING AND OFFERING *MENACHOS* IN JERUSALEM for the first time in many days,^[16] אומר ברוך שהחיינו וקיימנו והגיענו לזמן הזה – HE SAYS: *BLESSED are You, Hashem, etc. WHO HAS KEPT US ALIVE, SUSTAINED US AND BROUGHT US TO THIS SEASON*.^[17] נטלן – When HE [the Kohen] TAKES [THE *MENACHOS*] TO EAT THEM,^[18] מכרע המוציא להם מן הארץ – HE RECITES THE BLESSING *THE ONE WHO BRINGS FORTH BREAD FROM THE EARTH*. ותני עלה – And the Mishnah states with regard to [the baked *menachos*]:^[19] וכולן פותחין פונית – AND ALL OF THEM ONE BREAKS before *kemitzah* INTO PIECES THE SIZE OF AN OLIVE.^[20] Hence, when the Kohen eats the remainder of the baked or fried *minchah*, he is eating olive-size pieces of bread, and the Baraisa states that he recites *hamotzi*. Thus, we see that *hamotzi* is the

blessing for a cooked dish containing pieces of bread the size of an olive.^[21]

The Gemara raises an objection:

אבל אלא מעתה – אומר רבי אבהו – Abaye said to [Rav Yosef]: *But it should follow, then, that רבי ישמעאל דאמר פורקן עד למנא דבי רבי ישימאל – according to the Tanna of R' Yishmael's academy, who says that in the breaking of the fried menachos, ONE CRUSHES THEM UNTIL HE RETURNS THEM TO THEIR FLOUR state*,^[22] הדין נמי דלא כבי כרובי המוציא להם מן הארץ – so too would he say that one does not need to recite on them the blessing *the One Who brings forth bread from the earth*!^[23] ונבי תימא הכי נמי – And if you should say that it is indeed so that one does not recite *hamotzi* on the *minchah* according to this Tanna, והתניא – why, this cannot be, for it has been taught in a Baraisa: לקט מכולן פונית ואכלן – IF ONE GATHERED FROM ALL OF THEM^[24] little pieces that add up to bread THE SIZE OF AN OLIVE AND ATE THEM, אם חמץ הוא – IF IT WAS *CHAMETZ* and he ate it on Pesach, ענוש כרת – HE WOULD BE PUNISHED WITH *KARES*; ואם מצה הוא – AND IF IT WAS UNLEAVENED BREAD, אדם יוצא – AND IF IT WAS UNLEAVENED BREAD, A PERSON COULD FULFILL WITH IT HIS OBLIGATION to eat matzah ON PESACH.^[25] Now, from the fact that one fulfills his obligation to eat matzah on Pesach with this collection of little bits, we see that they are classified as “bread.”^[26]

NOTES

13. Since the pieces of bread are the size of an olive, they are still classified as bread [even though they were made into *chavitzta* (see end of next note)].

14. Since the pieces of bread in the *chavitzta* are less than the size of an olive, they are no longer classified as bread and are treated merely as cooked grain.

As *Tosafos* and *Rabbeinu Yonah* understand *Rashi*, Rav Yosef's distinction between pieces the size of a *kezayis* and those smaller applies specifically to cooked pieces. [With regard to cooked pieces, the Baraisa on 37a distinguished between whether or not “the pieces are intact.” These Rishonim explain that according to *Rashi*, Rav Yosef is defining “the pieces are intact” as meaning that they are the size of a *kezayis*; “the pieces are not intact” means that they are smaller than a *kezayis*. See 37a note 17. See, however, *Pnei Yehoshua* אמר רב יוסף and *Divrei David*, who explain that according to *Rashi* the “cooked” aspect of *chavitzta* is not essential to Rav Yosef's distinction. Rather, his distinction between pieces the size of a *kezayis* and those smaller than a *kezayis* holds true even for pieces that are not cooked.] See also note 34.

15. I.e. that when the pieces of bread in the *chavitzta* are the size of an olive, they are still considered bread upon which *hamotzi* is recited (*Rashi*).

16. [*Rashi*.] *Rashi* explains that the reference is to a Yisrael, and that “offering” means that he handed the *minchah* over to the Kohen for the latter to offer it [as the Yisrael may not perform the service itself] (cf. *Tosafos* here, and *Rashi* to *Menachos* 75b).

17. For the privilege of performing a mitzvah that he has not performed for a long time. [See *Magen Avraham* 22:1, and *Meromei Sadeh* here, regarding the conditions under which the blessing of *shehecheyanu* is recited upon the performance of a mitzvah.]

18. [Only male Kohanim may eat *menachos* (*Leviticus* 6:9).]

Menachos are flour offerings. Some are brought as actual flour, while others are brought after the flour is made into bread through baking in an oven or frying on a flat pan or in a deep pan (see *Leviticus* 2:1-11).

19. The expression ותני עלה usually means: and a Baraisa stated with reference to this [Mishnah or Baraisa just cited]. Here, however, the expression means that the Mishnah [*Menachos* 75b] states with reference to the flat-pan or deep-pan fried (or baked) *menachos* (*Rashi*; see *Chidushei Maharam Banet* מנחת מחבת cf. *Pnei Yehoshua* and *Tzalach*). [In the parallel text that appears in *Menachos* 75b, the reading is simply: ותנן, and we learned in the Mishnah.]

20. All *menachos* whose remainder is eaten must undergo *kemitzah*. The Kohen forms a scoop with the three middle fingers of his right hand by bending them over his palm, and then fills this scoop by pushing it through the *minchah*. The portion of the *minchah* scooped out in this

manner is called the *kometz*, and is burned on the Altar. Those *menachos* which are baked or fried require *pesisah* [breaking up of the baked or fried breads], prior to *kemitzah* (see *Leviticus* 2:6; *Menachos* 75a; *Rambam*, *Hil. Maaseh HaKorbanos* 13:10).

21. *Tosafos* (based on their understanding of *Rashi* – see above, note 14) question how Rav Yosef can prove that *hamotzi* is recited on the *kezayis*-size pieces of cooked bread in *chavitzta* from the fact that it is recited on the *kezayis*-size pieces of *minchah*-bread, which are not cooked. *Tosafos* suggest that Rav Yosef draws his proof specifically from the case of fried *menachos*, considering frying the equivalent of cooking with regard to the laws of blessing (cf. *Pnei Yehoshua* and *Divrei David* cited in note 14).

22. I.e. he crushes them into fine meal before *kemitzah*. This Tanna argues with the Mishnah cited above, which states that in *pesisah*, the *minchah* is broken only into olive-size pieces.

23. Rav Yosef considers the fried *menachos* similar to *chavitzta*, and maintains that *hamotzi* is recited only if the *minchah*-pieces are at least the size of a *kezayis*. It would emerge, then, that according to the Tanna of R' Yishmael's academy, who holds that the *minchah* is eaten after it has been reduced to meal, *hamotzi* is not recited on it [but rather *mezonos*] (see *Rashi*). But this is not so, for the Tanna of R' Yishmael's academy agrees that *hamotzi* is recited, as the Gemara proceeds to prove.

24. From the broken pieces of *menachos* (*Rashi*; cf. *Tosafos* לקט; see next note).

25. One who eats a *kezayis* of *chametz* (leavened food made from one of the five species of grain) on Pesach is liable to *kares* (*Exodus* 12:15). Also, there is a positive command to eat a *kezayis* of matzah (unleavened bread made from one of the five species of grain) on the first night of Pesach (ibid. v. 18). The Baraisa states that if the *kezayis* that one ate is composed of different bits collected from various breads (such as the various types of baked or fried *menachos*), he is liable in the case of *chametz* and he has fulfilled his obligation in the case of matzah.

[The Baraisa cannot mean that one actually collected the bits of *chametz* or matzah from various *menachos*. For the *menachos* were not *chametz* (*Leviticus* 2:11), nor is a *minchah* fit for the mitzvah of eating matzah on Pesach (see *Tosafos*, *Rabbeinu Yonah* and *Rashash*). Rather, the Baraisa means (according to *Rashi*) that if a person collected various pieces of bread or matzah similar to a Kohen who collects various bits of the *menachos*, the person would be liable for eating *chametz* or would fulfill his mitzvah to eat matzah (see *Baal HaMaor* and *Meiri*).]

26. The designation לחם, bread, is essential for the fulfillment of the mitzvah to eat matzah (unleavened bread), which the Torah (*Deuteronomy* 16:3) describes as לחם עני, “bread” of affliction (*Rashi*).

[The *chametz* prohibition, however, is independent of the “bread” designation, and applies as long as the grain – in whatever form – has become leavened.]

(א) נב' (מחזקין חייבין
בחלה) תא"מ :
(ב) שם כי אחא רבין
ארי מחזקין חייבין
בחלה. כ"ל :

By the same token, the blessing over bread (*hamotzi*) must be recited when eating them, though each piece is less than a *kezayis*!^[27]

Rav Yosef answers:

הָכָא בְּמַאי עֲסִיקִין – What are we dealing with here in the Baraisa? בְּשֶׁעֶרְסָן – With a case where one formed [the pieces] into a dough and baked them, producing a new matzah bread.^[28]

The Gemara challenges this explanation of the Baraisa:

אִי הָכִי – If so, that the Baraisa is dealing with a case in which the matzah bits were remade into a single matzah, אֵימָא סִיפָא – consider the wording of the end of the Baraisa, which states: וְהוּא שְׂאֵבֶלְן בְּכָדִי אֲכִילָת פֶּרֶס – AND THIS IS provided THAT HE ATE THEM WITHIN THE SPAN OF TIME THAT IT TAKES TO EAT A HALF-LOAF of bread.^[29] וְאִי בְּשֶׁעֶרְסָן – And if the Baraisa is referring to where one formed them into a dough and remade the pieces into one large matzah, הָאִי שְׂאֵבֶלְן – this statement THAT HE ATE “THEM” שְׂאֵבֶלְן מִיִּבְבֵּי לֵיהּ – should have been expressed instead as “that he ate it.”^[30] – ? –

Rav Yosef therefore retracts his previous interpretation (that the Baraisa refers to where the bits were remade into a new matzah) and suggests a different explanation of the Baraisa:

הָכָא בְּמַאי עֲסִיקִין – Rather,^[31] what are we dealing with here? בְּכָא מִלְּחָם גָּדוֹל – With a small piece of bread that comes from a large bread, i.e. the original matzah from which the small piece has been taken is still at least a *kezayis* in size. Since the source bread is still classified as “bread,” the small pieces taken from it, too, retain that classification, though they are smaller than a *kezayis*.^[32]

The Gemara concludes:

מַאי הָנָה עֲלָה – What is the final outcome regarding it? Does one recite *hamotzi* on *chavitzta* in which the pieces of bread are less than the size of an olive? אָמַר רַב שְׁשִׁישׁ – Rav Sheishess said: אַף עַל גַּב דְּלִית בִּיהּ – Regarding this case of *chavitzta*, הָאִי חֲבִיצָא – even though it does not contain pieces of bread the size of an olive, מְבָרַךְ עָלָיו הַמוֹצִיא לֶחֶם מִן הָאָרֶץ – one recites upon it the blessing the One Who brings forth bread from the earth.^[33] אָמַר רַבָּא – Rava said: וְהוּא דְּאֵיבָא עָלֶיהּ – And this is provided that the appearance of bread is still upon it.^[34]

The Gemara discusses the status of certain types of bread-like foods with regard to the law of *challah*.^[35]

טְרוֹקָנִין חֲיִבִּין בַּחֲלָה – *Terokanin* are subject to *challah*.^[36] וְכִי

NOTES

27. Now, the author of this Baraisa must be the Tanna of R' Yishmael's academy, since it states that one gathered from the baked or fried *menachos* pieces totaling a *kezayis*, indicating that each piece was less than a *kezayis*. And it is only according to the Tanna of R' Yishmael's academy that the baked or fried *menachos* are broken into such small pieces. Thus, we see that even the Tanna of R' Yishmael's academy agrees that *hamotzi* is recited on pieces less than a *kezayis*! (see *Rashi*).

[Actually, the Baraisa (which considers *minchah* bits of less than a *kezayis* to be “bread”) presents a challenge to Rav Yosef regardless of who its author is. And Abaye apparently could have therefore objected to Rav Yosef on the basis of this Baraisa without mentioning the Tanna of R' Yishmael's academy altogether. See *Tzlach* וְלִהְיוּ רִלְכִי הַקִּירִים – who explains why the opinion of the Tanna of R' Yishmael's academy is introduced. See also *Menachem Meishiv Nefesh*.]

28. This “new” matzah is certainly considered “bread.”

29. The “loaf” referred to here is the loaf described by the Mishnah in *Eruvin* 82b as sufficing for two meals. Hence, a half-loaf is the amount eaten at one meal (see *Rashi* to *Eruvin* 82b לִבִּית הַמִּנּוּחַ). This loaf contains eight egg-volumes [of wheat], and the half-loaf, therefore, contains four egg-volumes (see *Rashi*). [*Rashi* here presents the view of R' Shimon in that Mishnah. According to R' Yochanan ben Berokah (there), however, the standard loaf contains six egg-volumes; thus, the half-loaf contains three egg-volumes (see *Orach Chaim* 612:4).]

The span of time that it takes to eat a *peras* [half-loaf] is the normal amount of time it takes to eat a half-loaf (four egg-volumes) in a single sitting. This span of time [generally reckoned at between three and nine minutes] defines a single act of eating. Now, one is liable for eating a prohibited substance only if he eats a *kezayis* of it. If one eats a *kezayis* of *chametz* on Pesach one bit at a time but within a *peras*-span, he is liable, for he has consumed an entire *kezayis* of *chametz* during one act of eating. If, however, he eats the *kezayis* over a longer span of time, he is not liable. For his eating of the *kezayis* is then spread over two (or more) acts of eating. It is as if he has eaten part of the *kezayis* on one day and part on the next, in which case he is certainly not liable (see *Rashi*).

[The same applies to the positive commandments concerning eating, such as the mitzvah of matzah on the first night of Pesach, where one must eat a certain minimum amount (usually a *kezayis*) of the commanded food. One fulfills his obligation if he eats the requisite amount within a *peras*-span, but not if he eats it over a longer time span. Accordingly, *Rashi* could have apparently explained the Baraisa's provision of “a *peras*-span” in terms of fulfilling the mitzvah of matzah also mentioned previously in the Baraisa. See *Tzlach* וְיִהְיֶה לָקֵט מְכוּלֵי כֹוִי – who addresses this issue.]

30. If he is eating them after they have been made into one large matzah, the singular *he ate “it”* should have been used instead of the plural *he ate “them”* (*Rashi*). See *Maharsha*, who asks why the Gemara

did not raise a similar objection from the phraseology of the first part of the Baraisa (see the answer proposed by *Pnei Yehoshua*). [Curiously, in our editions of the parallel *sugya* in *Menachos* 75b, the first part of the Baraisa indeed reads וְאָכְלוּ, and *he ate “it.”* See, however, *Dikdukei Soferim* there.]

31. [The parallel text in *Menachos* 75b indeed contains the prefatory word אָלָא, rather (*Ben Aryeh*), which is the Gemara's way of indicating that what follows is not a further refinement but a retraction. According to Rav Yosef's new interpretation, the Baraisa refers – as originally assumed – to where the person ate a *kezayis* of the collected bits as they are.]

32. Therefore, one fulfills with it his obligation to eat matzah on Pesach. [Here, again, the reference is not to actual *menachos*, which (according to the Tanna of R' Yishmael's academy) are crushed in their entirety into meal, but rather to a similar case of non-*minchah* matzah in which the source matzah remains intact (see above, end of note 25).] If, however, the original matzah has been [eaten or] entirely broken into pieces smaller than a *kezayis*, the pieces are no longer considered “bread” (according to Rav Yosef), and one does not recite *hamotzi* nor does one fulfill his obligation to eat matzah with such pieces (*Rashi*).

33. Rav Sheishess disagrees with Rav Yosef's ruling, and holds that *hamotzi* is recited on *chavitzta* whose bread pieces are smaller than a *kezayis*.

34. I.e. the bread pieces did not dissolve to the point that they are no longer recognizable as bread (*Rashi* to *Menachos* 75b; see *Mordechai* §119 with *Magen Avraham* 168:28).

Rava's provision refers to pieces that are smaller than a *kezayis*. But if the pieces are as large as a *kezayis*, *hamotzi* is recited even if they no longer have the appearance of bread (*Rosh* §10).

The halachah follows Rav Sheishess and Rava. Accordingly, *hamotzi* would be recited on a dish containing cooked or fried bread pieces the size of a *kezayis*, but not if the pieces are smaller than a *kezayis*, unless still recognizable as bread. [The *Shulchan Aruch* (*Orach Chaim* 168:10), however, adopts *Tosafos*' explanation of *chavitzta* as pieces of bread that are joined together with meat juice or milk, but are not actually cooked. Bread pieces that are cooked, however, have by definition lost “the appearance of bread,” and *hamotzi* is not recited unless they are the size of a *kezayis*. (Regarding bread pieces that are fried, see *Mishnah Berurah* there §56.)]

35. The *challah* obligation (see above, 35a note 36) applies only to a bread dough, for the verse states (*Numbers* 15:19): *When you will eat from the “bread” of the land, you shall set aside a portion for Hashem.* The Gemara now rules whether certain bread-like substances qualify as “bread,” making their doughs subject to *challah*.

36. I.e. *terokanin* are classified as “bread” and are therefore subject to *challah*. [The Gemara will soon explain what *terokanin* are.]

אָתָא רַבִּין אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן – And when Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he said in the name of R' Yochanan: טְרוֹקָנִין פְּטוּרִין מִן הַחֲלָה – *Terokanin* are exempt from *challah*.^[37]

The Gemara explains:

מַאי טְרוֹקָנִין – What are *terokanin*? אָבַיִי – Abaye said: כּוּבָא דְאַרְעָא – It is another name for *kuva* made in the ground.^[38]

A related ruling:

וְאַמַּר אָבַיִי – And Abaye said: טְרִיתָא פְּטוּרָה מִן הַחֲלָה – *Terisa* is exempt from *challah*.^[39]

The Gemara explains:

מַאי טְרִיתָא – What is *terisa*? אִיבָא דְאַמְרֵי גְבִיל מְרִתָּח – There are those who say that *terisa* is a scalded batter.^[40] וְאִיבָא – *Abaye* said: דְאַמְרֵי נִהְמָא דְהַנְדְּקָא – And there are those who say that *terisa* is

Indian bread.^[41] וְאִיבָא דְאַמְרֵי לֶחֶם הָעֵשׂוֹי לְכוּתָּח – And there are those who say that *terisa* is bread made for *kutach*.^[42]

The Gemara cites a related Baraisa:

ר' חִיָּיא – R' Chiya taught a Baraisa, which states: לֶחֶם הָעֵשׂוֹי לְכוּתָּח פְּטוּר מִן הַחֲלָה – BREAD MADE FOR *KUTACH* IS EXEMPT FROM *CHALLAH*.

The Gemara asks:

וְהָא תְּנִינָא – But it was taught in another Baraisa: חֵיִיב בְּחֲלָה – Bread made for *kutach* IS SUBJECT TO *CHALLAH*. – ? –

The Gemara answers:

הָתָם בְּדִקְתָּנִי טַעְמָא – There, in the second Baraisa, the situation is different, as the Baraisa there itself states: רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר – R' YEHUDAH SAYS: מַעֲשֵׂיהָ מוֹכִיחִין עָלֶיהָ – THE MANNER IN WHICH IT IS MADE INDICATES WHAT IT IS. How so? עָשָׂאן – If HE MADE THEM

NOTES

37. [According to *Rosh* (§11) and *Beur HaGra*, *Yoreh Deah* 329:7 (see also *Hagahos HaGra* here), R' Yochanan agrees that *terokanin* are subject to *challah*, and the reading here should be חֲטָיִיבִין בְּחֲלָה, are subject to *challah*.]

38. This is a bread-like substance made by pouring flour and water into a cavity dug into the base of the oven, where the mixture bakes as if in a pan (see *Rashi*). In this way, the batter – though very loose – is contained by the walls of the cavity until it turns to bread (*Tur*, *Orach Chaim* 168) [and it is therefore subject to *challah*, in the view of Abaye and in the view of R' Yochanan (according with the reading found in *Rosh* – see preceding note)].

39. For it is not classified as true bread. [The Gemara will now explain what *terisa* is.]

40. The scalded batter is made by mixing flour and water into a very loose batter. The batter is then poured directly onto the hot stove (*Rashi*). Since the batter is very loose, it spreads out on the hot stove and (unlike the *kuva* above) does not assume the form of bread. Therefore, it is not classified as “bread” and not subject to *challah* (see *Rosh* §11; *Tur*, *Orach Chaim* 168 and *Shulchan Aruch*, *Yoreh Deah* 329:5).

41. [Translation follows *Rashash*.] This is dough baked on a spit while being smeared constantly with oil and/or raw eggs (*Rashi*).

42. *Kutach* is a dip made from sour milk, moldy bread crusts and salt (see *Pesachim* 42a). The bread used for *kutach* was baked in the sun rather than in an oven (*Rashi*) [and was then broken up and put into the *kutach*]. Cf. *Ritva*.

IN THE SHAPE OF BREAD ROLLS, חֵיבִין – THEY ARE SUBJECT to *challah*.^[1] בְּלֻמְדִין – But if he made them IN THE SHAPE OF simple BOARDS, פְּטוּרִים – THEY ARE EXEMPT from *challah*.^[2]

The Gemara discusses the status of *kuva* baked in the ground:^[3] האבי לרב יוסף – Abaye said to Rav Yosef. אמר ליה אבי לרב יוסף – This *kuva* that is made in the ground, מאי מברכין – what blessing do we recite upon it? – אמר ליה – [Rav Yosef] said to him: מי סברת נהמא הוא – Do you really think that it is actually bread? – גובלא בעלמא הוא – It is merely a baked dough,^[4] ומברכין עלויה בורא מיני מזונות – and we recite on it the blessing *the One Who creates species of sustenance*.^[5] מר זוטרא קבע סעודתיה עלויה וברך עלויה המוציא להם מן – Mar Zutra established his meal around [*kuva* baked in the ground] and recited on it the blessing *the One Who brings forth bread from the earth* before eating and the three blessings of *Bircas HaMazon* after eating.^[6] אמר מר בר רב אשי – Mar bar Rav Ashi said: ואדם יוצא בהן ידי חובתו בפסח – And a person can fulfill with them [*kuva* breads] his obligation to eat matzah on Pesach. מאי טעמא – What is the reason for

this? לָהֶם עֲנִי קְרִינָן בֵּיהּ – Because we can apply to it the designation *bread of poverty*.^[7]

The Gemara cites another ruling of Mar bar Rav Ashi: האי דובשא – And Mar bar Rav Ashi said: ומברכין עלויה שהכל נהיה בדברו – we recite upon it the blessing *that everything came into being through His word*.^[8] מאי טעמא – What is the reason? ויפה – It is mere “sweat” [i.e. moisture exuded from the fruit, rather than the fruit itself].

The Gemara explains:

Mar bar Rav Ashi's view in this matter is in accordance with whom? – כי האי תנא – It is in accordance with this Tanna [R' Yehoshua] whose view is recorded in the following Mishnah: דבש תמרים ויין תפוחים – For we learned in a Mishnah:^[9] וחומץ ספוגיות ושאר – If a non-Kohen inadvertently eats DATE HONEY OR APPLE CIDER OR VINEGAR OF LATE-SEASON GRAPES^[10] OF – של תרומה – OR ANY OTHER FRUIT JUICES – מי פירות – R' ELIEZER OBLIGATES him to pay THE PRINCIPAL PLUS A FIFTH,^[11] ורבי – WHILE R' YEHOSHUA EXEMPTS HIM from payment altogether.^[12]

NOTES

1. He took pains to form the dough into the shape of actual bread rolls. Thus, [though he has baked them in the sun,] it is evident that he has made them [to be eaten] as bread [and not to be added to *kutach*] (*Rashi*). [Accordingly, the second Baraisa is using the term *bread made for kutach* to denote bread baked in the same manner as bread used for *kutach* (i.e. it was baked in the sun), rather than to denote bread that was actually made for *kutach*.] See next note.

2. That is, he simply spread the dough out to bake in the sun, and was not particular about the shape (*Rashi*). [It is thus evident that he does not plan to eat it as bread, but rather to use it as one of the ingredients of *kutach*.]

The Gemara has thus distinguished in the case of bread baked in the sun between that which is formed into rolls (which is subject to *challah*) and that which is shaped haphazardly (which is exempt from *challah*). Some Rishonim maintain that the distinction is Rabbinic. On the Biblical level, however, there is no *challah* obligation in either case, since a substance is not classified as “bread” unless it is baked in an oven [or in a pan without liquid]. The *challah* obligation for rolls that are to be baked in the sun was decreed by the Rabbis because of the tendency to confuse such rolls with the oven-baked variety, or because one might change his mind and bake them in an oven (see *Rosh* to *Pesachim* 2:16; *Rash* to *Challah* 1:5). Accordingly, *hamotzi* would not be recited on either type of sun-baked bread, since neither is actually classified as “bread” (see *Orach Chaim* 168:16 with *Beur HaGra*).

Rabbeinu Tam (cited by *Tosafos* 37b לוחם לרוב, *Tosafos* to *Pesachim* 37b ורובי, and *Rosh* to *Pesachim* 2:16), however, holds that bread made from a thick dough (in contrast to a soft batter) is always classified as bread and Biblically subject to *challah*, regardless of how it is processed – that is, whether it is baked in an oven or in the sun, or even if it is cooked in water. And the reason the Gemara here exempts board-shaped *kutach* bread from *challah* is that such bread was not intended to be eaten as bread (see *Rabbeinu Yonah*, and *Challah* 1:8). Accordingly, one does recite *hamotzi* on sun-baked rolls. [Regarding the practical halachah in this matter, see *Orach Chaim* 168:13, and *Shach*, *Yoreh Deah* 329:4.]

[The foregoing dispute pertains only to a thick dough. In the case of a soft batter, however, all agree that it is classified as bread only when baked in an oven or in a pan without liquid. See *Yoreh Deah* 329:2.]

3. *Kuva* baked in the ground is how Abaye (above, 37b) identified the *terokhanin* discussed there.

4. Since it is made from a very soft batter, it is more like “pastry” [generally eaten as a snack] than like “bread” [generally eaten as the staple of a meal] (see *Magen Avraham* 168:40 and next note).

5. [Even though a soft batter that is baked in an oven is classified as “bread” with regard to *challah* (*Yoreh Deah* 329:2) and with regard to reciting *hamotzi* (*Orach Chaim* 168:14), the *kuva* batter is very soft, and thus differs so markedly from a bread dough that *mezonos* is the more

appropriate blessing (see *Magen Avraham* 168:40; cf. *Beur Halachah* to *Orach Chaim* 168:15).]

6. This is the law for all baked goods that are classified as bread with regard to *challah* (because of the way they are kneaded or baked – see note 2), but are normally eaten as a snack rather than as the basis of a meal (see *Orach Chaim* 168:6-8). When one eats them as a snack, he recites *mezonos* beforehand and *Al HaMichyah* afterwards; when establishing one's meal around them, one recites *hamotzi* beforehand and *Bircas HaMazon* afterwards.

[As to what constitutes “establishing one's meal around it,” see *Orach Chaim* 168:6 with *Mishnah Berurah* §24.]

7. [Also rendered: *bread of affliction*.] The Torah (*Deuteronomy* 16:3) calls matzah by this term; thus, one fulfills his Pesach obligation only with matzah that is so classified (see 37b note 26; *Pesachim* 36a). [One might have thought that *kuva*, since it is sometimes used as a snack bread, is classified as “rich bread” and thus lacks the “bread of poverty” designation necessary for the mitzvah of eating matzah on Pesach. Alternatively, one might have thought that *kuva*, which is baked in the ground, lacks the “bread” designation (see *Beis Yosef*, *Orach Chaim* 168 טרדקן; see also *Ramban* and *Ritva* to end of 39b).]

[*Rabbeinu Chananel*'s remarks here suggest that one fulfills his matzah obligation with *kuva* bread only when he actually establishes his meal around it. See, however, *Minchas Chinuch* 10:5 (דין רונה ודקדק) (הרב המחבר).]

8. Even though the honey comes from dates, upon which one recites the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the tree*.

9. *Terumos* 11:2.

10. Grapes that grow at the end of the season never ripen fully. They have an acrid flavor and are used to produce vinegar (*Rashi*).

11. A non-Kohen who eats or drinks *terumah* inadvertently must pay the principal value of what he has eaten and an additional fifth (see above, 35b note 52). R' Eliezer holds that the juices of fruit are like the fruit itself. Thus, a non-Kohen who inadvertently drinks the juice of a *terumah* fruit must pay the principal plus a fifth.

12. In R' Yehoshua's view, the only fruit juices that are considered like the fruit itself are the juice of grapes and the oil of olives (see *Terumos* 11:2-3; *Chullin* 120b). But the juices of all other fruits (which are the subject of this Mishnah) are considered to be mere “sweat.” Thus, the non-Kohen has not consumed the fruit itself and has not become liable to payment (*Rashi*; see below, note 20).

[Late-season grapes, since they will never ripen, are considered with regard to their juices like other fruits, whose juices are but mere “sweat” (see *Mishnah Berurah* 202:50). Regarding when a fruit juice is considered mere “sweat” and when it is considered “fruit,” see *Chazon Ish*, *Orach Chaim* 33:5. See also *Orach Chaim* 202:7 with *Mishnah Berurah*.]

Thus, Mar bar Rav Ashi follows R' Yehoshua, who holds that the juice

כיצד מברכין פרק ששי ברכות

בעצן. עבודה ומקוספת בעלוקתאות נאות גלי דעתיה ללחם
עשאה: כלמדין. כנסתים בעלמא שלא הקפיד על עריסתם
והנחתו שניט במעמד קטן (פ"ד דף יב) עושה לו למודין לוחין לצור
של יין לכסותו: זיעה בעלמא הוא. ואלו פרי לברך עליו בורא פרי
העץ: וחומץ ספוגיות. כופי ענבים תורה אור

שאלו מחבשים עולמים ועושים מהן
חומץ: מחייב קין וחומץ. לשותה
ממנו בשוגג: ור' יהושע פורת.
דיועה בעלמא הוא ולין עס תרומה
חל עליו ולין לך פרי הניחן למשק
אלא זיתים וענבים בלבד והיינו כמר
בר רב אשי: טרימא מר. מה
מברכין עליו ושם טרימא כל דבר
הכחוש קלף וליט מרוסק: לא היה
אלענא דרבה. לא היה מבין מהו
שואל: א"ל. רבינא להאח מרבנן
אזו טרימא איה שואל: דקורטמי.
כרסם שטתים אורו וטתנין זו יין
ובסוין: או דשומשמי. להויה שמנן:
או דפירא. כחשת ענבים לתת
לחך החרגים מים לעשות תמר:
א"ל רבה תשילמא קא אמרת. מתוך
דבר רבינא הבין רבא את האללה
א"ל דבר משך שאלתי כמו דבי
תשילמא דשחיתס חולין (דף נג):
מותר לעשות מהן טרימא. שחית
מפסידה אלמא דבמילת קא ויין
דהי הוא מברכין עליה ב"פ העץ:
שחיתא. מחלל העשוי מקמח קליות
שנחבשו בבתר בעור שהשכלים
ליהם: ענה לאכילה עבדל.
במילת קיימא: שחיתין. מגיטין
צק לטרו יפה במימיו: זיתוס
המלחי. מפורש במסכת פסחים (דף
הב): וכל המשקים שותה. אלמא
לאכילה מכוין ורשאה ממילא היא
הכל נמי לאכילה מכוין כ" (ה) ד"ב
ורבינא דרב ושמאל. ואת"ג דתניא
לענין שבת דלכול הוא ומותר לאכלו
בשבת אלמא לומר דענין ברכה:
ה"ג דסד"ל כיון דלרשאה קא מכוין
לא לבנין קמ"ל כיון דלמחוי
מיניה. שהרי מחלל הוא בני ברכו:
והלכתא. ל"ג ומהלכות גדולות הוא:
דלפני משמע. שהולך כבר והא
הוא ברכה הגונה ולשעבר בעינין
שהרי כבר הולך הלחם הזה מן הארץ
שהוא בל ליהנות הימנו: דלפני אל
מואלס ממלכים. וכשתאמר פרשה
בלטם כבר ילכו: המולס לך מים:
וכבר הולך ויכני נחמיה סבר דמפיק
משמע. שפסיד להויה דכתיב המולס
אתם וכשתאמר פסוק זה למשק עדיין
לא ילכו המולס לך מים עדיין היה
מואלס כל ימי היוחס במדבר: דלפני
יתסן. שאני הוא שהולחתי אתם:
לשמיטין

המחשבה
ש"ס חולין קכ

ומהנין להם
דכ"ס פירא
פירא: כ"ס

הבית קי.

שבת קט.

שבת קט.
שבת קט.

הבית קי.
שבת קט.

במדרש כ
דברים ה
שמות ו

מחוספס אס וירמשי"ס חייבין בחלה משום (ג) עושה עיסתו בלח כרי
לחלקה פטורין מן החלה דלית בהו שיעורא חלה גבי וירמשי"ס נמי
פעמים מחלקין שחין משומין שיעור חלה בקדמה אחת אך היה מלריך
ליקח חלה בלא ברכה בשביל הספק וכל דבר שתחלתו כופענין וכופו
עיסה חייבין בחלה ובהמולא דקיי"ל
כרי' יוחנן פרק כל שעה (פסחים נא)
דפליגי ר' יוחנן ור' במעשה אילפס
ופליגי בבלינו רבא דהיינו תחלתו
כופענין וכופו עיסה אס נאפה בבתר
או בזירה או בזילפס בלא מים ושמן
דר"ל ס"ל דלא הוא חייב אלא כשנאפה
בבתר ואח"כ קלי מחתנין תחלתו
כופענין וכופו עיסה דחייב בחלה אכל
בזילפס פטור ורבי יוחנן מחייב
דמעשה אילפס כופו עיסה קרינן ביה
רק שלא יהיו משקין בזילפס דהיי
חיתא ביכולתו כל שאר תחתיו
חייב בחלה ומברכין עליו המולא אכל
אליהם אין מברכין עליו המולא
דלא הוא אלא גזלל בעלמא ומיחו אס
קבע סעודה עליו כמו בפסחים
מכרך המולא וכל דבר שתחלתו
כופענין וגם כופו כגון הגי כופענין
שמתענין לחון בשמן שקורין צויג'ס
פסורין מן החלה: ב"ר זוטרא
קבע סעודה עליו. וכן נ"ל ש' או
קבע סעודה עליו מברכין עליה
המולא וכן אס הר"ם בפסחים
שקבענין סעודה עליו לברך המולא
בפת תחלה כדי לפסוק מברכה שהיה
מחוספס או היה קביעותו קביעות
או לא: דהיינו דכופא דתמרי מברכין
עליו שכל. וכן משקין מכל מיני
פירות כר מחרש ויהר כדלמדין
גבי ערלה ואלאשק מה"ג שפירש
דמיירי שנקן לתוכן מים ושכר דין
אש"ג דמחא יס בן כותי כדדי אכילת
פרס לא מברכין עליו בורא מיני
מוזות אלס שכל ואל"י לרב ושמאל
דלמרי כל שיש בו מחמשת המינין

[ו] ה"ה פסחים נא
ד"ה דכ"ס

[פסחים פ"א מ"ג]

דעוהו הב"ח

(ה) ר"י ד"ה וכל
הבית קי ו' מכוין
סד"ל ואלס קמ"ל
ורבינא ו' ברכה סד"ל
ואלס קי מ"ה דמלח:
(ג) חת"ס ד"ה וכל
ורבינא חייבין בחלה
משום דתקן כשנאפה
בבן כדי לתקן סעודה
מן החלה דלית בה
שיעורא ח"כ ה"ה:
(ד) ד"ה ואלס ואלס
דלחן שכל אלס ואלס
בשתי קרי מ"ה ואלס
פסד ו' (ו) ד"ה ואלס
מ"ה. כ"ס פ"ה שחיתין
סד"ל ק"ה: (ה) ד"ה
ו' ו' ו' ד"ה ואלס
ל"ל ויתיה דכל תחת:
(ו) ד"ה ואלס ואלס
דלחיו שחיתין כ"ל
ויתיה כל תחת:
(ז) ד"ה ואלס ואלס
ד"ה שבת פ"ה שחיתין
לחילת אל"י דשחיתין
לרשאה אל ד"ה:

גליון השם

גבי ו"ה סבר המולא
דמפיק משום. פ'
מכרין י"ס פ"ה ו"ה:
רש"י ד"ה כלמדין
בפסחים. פ' חית פ"ה
מ"ה דלחיו: רש"י ד"ה
שחיתא מחלל פסחים
וכ"כ רש"י פ"ה י"ס:

שחיתא ענה מכרך בורא מיני מוזות קלישחא מכרך שכל ואף על פי שלרשאה נעשים היכא דלית ליה הגאה מיניה מכרך: והלכתא

The Gemara cites an inquiry:

אמר ליה ההוא מר פנן לרבא – One of the Rabbis [i.e. disciples] said to Rava: שרימא מהו – What is [the law] regarding the blessing to be recited on *terima*?^[13] לא הוה אדעתיה דרבא מאי קאמר ליה – At first, Rava did not understand^[14] what [the disciple] was saying to him [i.e. what he meant by “*terima*”]. יתיב רבינא קמייהו – Ravina was sitting before Rava at that time and אמר – said to [the disciple]: דשומשמי קא אמרת – Is it the *terima* of sesame that you are talking about?^[15] או דקורטמי קא אמרת – Or is it the *terima* of saffron that you are talking about?^[16] או דפורצני קא אמרת – Or is it the *terima* of grape pits that you are talking about?^[17] אדחכי והכי אסקיה רבא לדעתיה – In the meantime, Rava called to mind what the disciple meant by *terima*.^[18] אמר ליה – [Rava] said to him: שיליתא ודאי קא – Surely, you are talking about something crushed, and you have reminded me of something, namely, that which Rav Assi said: האי תמרי של – These dates of *terumah*, מותר לעשות מהן טרימא – it is permitted to make *terima* from them, ואסור לעשות מהן שכר – but it is forbidden to make beer from them.^[19]

The Gemara concludes:

והלכתא תמרי ועבדיהו טרימא – And the law is that if one took dates and he made them into *terima*, מכריזין עליוהו בורא – we recite on them the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the tree. – מאי טעמא – What is the reason? במלתיהו קיימי בדמעיקרא – For they remain in their state,

just as they were originally, before being made into *terima*.^[20]

The Gemara discusses the blessing recited on another food:

רב אמר שהכל – What blessing is recited on *shattisa*?^[21] נהיה דבריו – Rav says: *That everything came into being through His word*. – ושמואל אמר בורא מיני מזונות – But Shmuel says: *the One Who creates species of sustenance*.

The Gemara explains:

אמר רב חסדא – Rav Chisda said: ולא פליגי – And they do not disagree. – הוה בעיה – This ruling of Shmuel, that *mezonos* is recited, is said with regard to thick *shattisa*, – הוה פריה – whereas this ruling of Rav, that *shehakol* is recited, is said with regard to loose *shattisa*. – עבה לאכילה עבדי לה – Thick *shattisa* is made for eating,^[22] – רכה לרפואה קא עבדי לה – whereas loose *shattisa* is made for therapeutic purposes.^[23]

The Gemara challenges the previous statement, that the loose *shattisa* is made for therapeutic purposes:

אמר רב יוסף – Rav Yosef challenged this assertion from the following Baraisa: – ושוין שבוהשין את השתות בשבת – BUT THEY AGREE THAT WE MAY STIR THE loose *SHATTIS* ON THE SABBATH,^[24] – ושוין ויתוהם המצרי – AND that WE MAY DRINK THE EGYPTIAN *ZISOM* on the Sabbath.^[25] – ואי סלקא דעתך לרפואה קא מכין – Now, if it should enter your mind that one who drinks loose *shattisa* intends it for therapeutic purposes, why would the Baraisa permit mixing it on the Sabbath? – רפואה בשבת מי שרי – Is doing a therapeutic procedure on the Sabbath permitted?^[26]

NOTES

of fruits other than grapes and olives is mere “sweat”; thus, *shehakol* rather than *ha'eitz* is recited. [The reason Mar bar Rav Ashi issued his ruling specifically with regard to date honey is that one would have thought that date honey is an exception, since the Torah (*Deuteronomy* 8:8) refers to “honey” as one of the fruits for which Eretz Yisrael is praised. Mar bar Rav Ashi teaches us, therefore, that the reference is not to the honey that oozes from the date, but rather to the date itself (*Tzlach*; cf. *Rashba* end of חמרים של תמרים).]

13. As will be seen shortly in the Gemara, *terima* refers to a solid that has been somewhat crushed, but has not been completely mashed (*Rashi*). [Some explain “completely mashed” to mean that the solid has been reduced to the point that it can no longer be classified as a “food” but rather as a “liquid” (see *Magen Avraham* 202:18, and *Perishah* to *Tur* ad loc., cited there in *Hagahos R' Akiva Eiger*).]

14. [Literally: it was not on his mind.]

15. That is, sesame seeds that are crushed to extract their oil (*Rashi*).

16. It was common to crush saffron and then mix it with wine for use as a drink (*Rashi*).

17. I.e. the residue of crushed grapes, consisting primarily of grape seeds, which is soaked in water to produce a fermented beverage called *temed* (see *Rashi*).

18. From Ravina's remarks to the questioner, Rava understood what the questioner had meant (*Rashi*).

19. *Terumah* that is *tahor* may be eaten, but not destroyed, even if the destruction comes about through the process of food preparation [e.g. where the *terumah* will become an inedible byproduct] (see *Terumos* 11:1). Rav Assi teaches that it is permitted to make a date paste out of *terumah* dates [as this does not constitute a “destruction” of the dates]. But one may not make beer out of dates, since converting the date from a food to a drink constitutes “destroying” the fruit (*Meiri*).

Now, if the fruit that has been crushed to form *terima* would be considered no longer existent, it would be forbidden to manufacture *terima* from *terumah* fruits as this would constitute the destruction of those fruits. From the fact that Rav Assi permits making *terima* from dates of *terumah*, we see that *terima* is considered but a modified form of the original fruit. Hence, the blessing on *terima* remains *ha'eitz*, as in the case of the original fruit (see *Rashi*).

20. I.e. they remain “fruit,” albeit modified, and they therefore retain the *ha'eitz* blessing.

[As mentioned above (note 13), if the fruit is actually liquefied, it is no longer considered to be in its original state. In that case, *shehakol* is

recited instead of *ha'eitz* (see *Orach Chaim* 202:7). This applies, however, only to fruits that are normally eaten in solid form. However, fruits that are normally eaten in liquid form (and are planted with the intent that they be eaten in such a form) retain their “fruit” status even in liquid form, for it is in that form that they achieve the purpose for which they were planted. Thus, they remain “processed fruits” and *ha'eitz* is recited (see *Meiri*, end of חמרים, *Terumas HaDeshen* §29 and *Meromei Sadeh*; see also above, 36a notes 9 and 10).]

21. *Shattisa* is a dish made from the flour of kernels that were toasted while still moist (*Rashi*). Such flour remains sweet, and is mixed with oil, water and salt to form *shattisa* (*Rashi* to *Shabbos* 155b קלי ריח; cf. *Rashi* to *Eruvin* 29b שריח).

22. And retains its original status [as grain] (*Rashi*). Therefore, *mezonos* is recited.

23. And since it is consumed as a medicine rather than as a food or beverage, *shehakol* is recited (*Meiri*). And though *ha'eitz* is recited on *anigaron*, which is also drunk for therapeutic purposes [above, 35b-36a], *anigaron* is different because it is a beverage that is often drunk by healthy people as well. It is uncommon, however, for healthy people to drink loose *shattisa*, though they will do so on occasion (see *Meiri*; see also *Rashba*; see, however, note 37, second paragraph).

24. To blend it thoroughly with its liquid components (*Rashi*), since the flour and other solids tend to settle out (see *Meiri*). [That the Baraisa here refers to “loose” *shattisa* (*shattus* and *shattisa* are one and the same) is evident from the fact that it refers to its mixing as *בוהשין*, we may “stir,” rather than *בוקלין*, we may “knead” (*Tosafos*).]

In the first part of the Baraisa (not cited here), there is a Tannaic dispute as to whether it is permitted to mix thick *shattisa* on the Sabbath, employing a deviation from the normal manner of mixing to avoid the problem of *kneading* (see *Shabbos* 155b-156a). In the part cited here, the Baraisa proceeds to state that all agree that one may mix loose *shattisa* on the Sabbath [provided that one employs a deviation] (see there).

25. Egyptian *zisom* is a laxative made from barley or wheat, saffron, and salt (see *Pesachim* 42b). The Baraisa teaches that this does not fall under the category of taking medicine [which is forbidden on the Sabbath (see next note)], since *zisom* is also drunk as an ordinary beverage (*Rashi* to *Shabbos* 156a).

26. The Rabbis banned the taking of non-essential medicines on the Sabbath, so that people not come to perform the *melachah* of טחון, grinding, in preparing medicinal compounds (see above, 36a notes 2-3).

Thus, Rav Yosef argues that if the usual intent in preparing loose

במ' ור"ג ספר כספיה
דמסק מחמט. פ'
דחבון ים פ"ה ור"פ:
ישי' ד"ס כלסודין
נכסיו. פ' חית ס"ה
דמ' דכלים: רש"י ד"ה
חיתא חזקל כספי ס'
כ"כ רש"י חביון א' יב:

שאלו מתבטלים עולמים ועושים מהן
 חומן : מתיבב קדו ודומה : לשהיה
 ממנו שבוגג : וד' יהאע שפיר .
 דמינה בעלמא אהו ואלו שם תרומה
 חל עליו ואלו ק' פרי הניתן למקשה
 אלא וזיסם ומגבים בלבד והיטי כמר
 בר רב אשי : טרימא מה : מה
 מברכין עליו וס' טרימא כל דבר
 הכחוש קלם ואלו : מרובק : לא היה
 אדעתא דרבה : לא היה מבין מה
 שאל : א"ל . רבינא ליהא מרבנן
 איוו טרימא אהה שאל : דקורומי .
 כרסם שטכסא אהו וטוכסן ב' וין
 וסוכין : לא דשומאמי . להאיה שמקן :
 או שדלמי . כדסם עגבים לחם
 לתוך התרנגים מים לפסות תמד :
 א"ל רבא שאלתא אהו אמהא . מושך
 דברי רבינא הכין רבא אח השאלה
 א"ל דבר משוך שאלתא כמו בשי
 תיכלתא דשחיסת חולין (דף ג:) :
 משה לפסות מהן טרימא . שליט
 מפיסה אלמא דבמילת' קלר וכוון
 דהכי הוא מברכין עליה ב"ס הכן :
 שמימא . מאלל הכשי מקמח קלות
 שגזיבא בטרם בעוד שכלים
 לתים : עבד לאכליה עמלא .
 ובמילת' קיימא : ששהשין . מגיסין
 בקב לערבו יפה במימי : זימס
 אמרי . שפורסם במסכת פסחים (דף
 גנ:) : וכל המצוקים שמה . אלמלא
 לאכליה מטיין ורשאה ממילא היא
 הכה נמי לאכליה מטיין ב' (ה) : ה"ג
 ורשאה דרב ומאלל . ואמ"ר דהניחא
 לפני קדם דאכלי הוא ומורס : דכלה
 שבטא אלכסין למימד דשטון בלבו
 ה"ג דמ"ר מין דלרשאה קא מטיין
 לא לבני ביהה קמ"ל מין דמתחא
 מיניה . שהרי מאלל הוא בני ברוי :
 והכללות : ואלהבטס דנדלות ואל
 דאפיק משמע . שהאיה כבר והא
 דהי בררה הנוטה לשעבר בעיין
 שהרי כבר האיה הלחם הזה מן הארץ
 שהוא לא יחטא הימס : דכתיב אל
 מואלס ממאריס . ובגמארה פרשה
 בעלם כבר יאל : האהאיה ק' מים .
 וכבר האיהאריב דמיהה סבר דמיקא
 משמע . שהיחיד להאיה דכתיב האהאיה
 לחכסם ובגמאמר פסוק זה למשה עדיין
 לא יאל והאהאיה ק' מים עדיין היה
 מואלס לא ימי היחם במדבר : דאשקיקא
 יחסן . שאני הוא שאלתא לחכסם
 אשמיטין

מציא דאפיק משמע דכתיב ^אאל מציא
המציא דאפיק משמע דכתיב
נחמיה סבר המציא דמפיק מש
מצרים ורבנן הווא הכי קאמ
מפיקנא לכו עבידנא לכו מל
יובנן ממצרים דכתיב ^בוידועת
רבנן לרבי יורא [את] רב רב ז
הוא ובקי בברכות הוא אמר
הוא איקלע לנביה אפיק ליד
שאמרים עליו דאדם גדול הוא ^א

מִתֵּימָא עֲבָה מִבְּרַךְ בִּרְמִי מוֹמְטוֹת קִישָׁתָא מִבְּרַךְ שֶׁכֵּל וְאֵף עַל פִּי שְׁלִרְשָׁא'ל נַעֲשִׂית הִכָּא דְלִית לֵיהּ הֶאֱחָל מִימֵה מִבְּרַךְ :
וְהִלְכָא

Abaye responds:

וְאֵת לֹא תִסְבְּרָא – Abaye said to [Rav Yosef]: – **And do you yourself not hold** that the loose *shattisa* would be permitted on the Sabbath even if it were made specifically for therapeutic purposes? וְהָאֵין תֵּנִן – **Why, we have learned in a Mishnah:**^[27] – **A PERSON MAY EAT ALL FOODS FOR THERAPEUTIC PURPOSES ON THE SABBATH** וְכֵן הַמְשָׁקִין שׁוֹתָה – **AND HE MAY DRINK ALL BEVERAGES** for therapeutic purposes on the Sabbath!^[28] אֲלֵא מָה אֵינְךָ לֵךְ – **But here, with regard to blessings,** – **since to begin with he intends to drink the loose *shattisa* for therapeutic purposes,**^[34] – **he should not recite a blessing on it at all.**^[35] לָן קָמְשָׁמַע לָן – Therefore, [Rav] informs us, by issuing his ruling, that **the one who drinks loose *shattisa* for therapeutic purposes** – **since he [the one who drinks loose *shattisa* for therapeutic purposes] derives the pleasure of drinking from it,**^[36] **he must recite a blessing.**^[37]

Another version of the last part of Abaye's response:

אֲלֵא מָה אֵינְךָ לֵךְ לְמִימָר – **A different version:**^[32] – **Rather, what is there for you to say** in explanation of this Mishnah's permit? וְהָאֵין תֵּנִן – **Why, we have learned in a Mishnah:**^[27] – **A PERSON MAY EAT ALL FOODS FOR THERAPEUTIC PURPOSES ON THE SABBATH** וְכֵן הַמְשָׁקִין שׁוֹתָה – **AND HE MAY DRINK ALL BEVERAGES** for therapeutic purposes on the Sabbath!^[28] אֲלֵא מָה אֵינְךָ לֵךְ לְמִימָר – **But here, with regard to blessings,** – **since to begin with he intends to drink the loose *shattisa* for therapeutic purposes,**^[34] – **he should not recite a blessing on it at all.**^[35] לָן קָמְשָׁמַע לָן – Therefore, [Rav] informs us, by issuing his ruling, that **the one who drinks loose *shattisa* for therapeutic purposes** – **since he [the one who drinks loose *shattisa* for therapeutic purposes] derives the pleasure of drinking from it,**^[36] **he must recite a blessing.**^[37]

The Gemara now explains the need for the ruling above regarding the blessing for *shattisa*:

וְיִצְרִיקָא רַב – **And the above ruling of Rav and**

Shmuel^[33] regarding the blessing for *shattisa* is necessary. וְיִצְרִיקָא – **For were I to judge on the basis of this Baraisa alone,** which rules that loose *shattisa* may be prepared [and drunk] on the Sabbath, I would not know that it requires a blessing, for the Baraisa permits loose *shattisa* on the Sabbath because **the onlooker could say that [the person] intends to ingest it for purposes of eating and the therapeutic effect occurs automatically as a result.** – **But here, with regard to blessings,** – **since to begin with he intends to drink the loose *shattisa* for therapeutic purposes,**^[34] – **he should not recite a blessing on it at all.**^[35] לָן קָמְשָׁמַע לָן – Therefore, [Rav] informs us, by issuing his ruling, that **the one who drinks loose *shattisa* for therapeutic purposes** – **since he [the one who drinks loose *shattisa* for therapeutic purposes] derives the pleasure of drinking from it,**^[36] **he must recite a blessing.**^[37]

The Gemara discusses the part of the Mishnah that states:

וְעַל הַפֶּת הוּא אומֵר הַמוֹצִיא וכו' – **FOR ON BREAD ONE SAYS: THE ONE WHO BRINGS FORTH etc.**

The Gemara cites a Baraisa that discusses the precise formulation of the blessing on bread:

מָה הוּא אומֵר – **The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa:** – **WHAT DOES ONE SAY when eating bread?** – **He recites the blessing:** “**HAMOTZI**” **LECHEM MIN HAARETZ**, prefixing the prefix הַ, *ha*, to the word *motzi*. מוֹצִיא אומֵר – **But R' NECHEMYAH SAYS** that one recites: “**MOTZI**” **LECHEM MIN HAARETZ**, without the prefix הַ, *ha*.

The Gemara explains the dispute:

בְּמוֹצִיא בּוֹלִי עֲלֵמָא לֹא פִלְיָנִי דְאִפּוֹק מִשְׁמַע – **Rava said:** – **With regard to the word “*motzi*,” all agree that it connotes “that He has brought forth,” i.e. the past tense, אֵל, דְּכַתִּיב, – for it is written: God, the One Who brings them forth from Egypt.**^[38] – **Regarding what do they**

NOTES

shattisa were to use it as a medicine, it would surely not be permitted to prepare it on the Sabbath (see *Tosafos* (see *Tosafos* וראי *Tosafos*)).

27. *Shabbos* 109b.

28. The Mishnah's emphasis of “all” foods and “all” beverages includes even foods and drinks that are made primarily for therapeutic purposes. As long as they are sometimes eaten or drunk for hunger or thirst, one may take them on the Sabbath even if he is doing so for medicinal purposes, as Abaye proceeds to explain (see *Tosafos* וראי *Tosafos*). [Alternatively, loose *shattisa* is certainly included in the Mishnah's permit to eat “foods” even for therapeutic purposes on the Sabbath, because it is not a therapeutic concoction, but simply a food that has been greatly diluted with water (see *Ritva*).]

29. Why did the Rabbis permit taking medicines that are sometimes taken as ordinary food?

30. And we must conclude that the Rabbinic prohibition against taking medicines on the Sabbath was issued only with regard to those medicines which not also foods, where it is obvious that he is involved in a medical procedure rather than in an act of eating. But where it is not evident that the person intends a medical procedure, then it is permitted even though that is indeed the person's intent (see *Orach Chaim* 328:20-21 with *Mishnah Berurah* §69).

31. Explanation of the Gemara follows *Eglei Tal*, *Tochein* 46:4.

32. [This version differs slightly in wording from the first one, but is substantively the same.]

33. See below, end of note 37.

34. [I.e. in a case where the therapeutic value of the loose *shattisa* is what prompts him to drink it to begin with.]

35. With regard to the ban against taking medicine on the Sabbath, the crucial factor is not the person's intent, but rather the appearance of his actions. Hence, the Baraisa permits one to drink loose *shattisa* on the

Sabbath even for medicinal purposes. But with regard to reciting a blessing, the crucial factor is the person's intent in eating the food. Hence, one would think that no blessing is recited when drinking loose *shattisa* for medicinal purposes.

36. Since it is, after all, a beverage (see *Rashi*).

37. The blessing recited, however, is *shehakol*, because the person is drinking it for its therapeutic value (see above, note 23; see *Rama*, *Orach Chaim* 204:11).

[Other Rishonim (see *Tosafos* וראי *Tosafos* and *Rabbeinu Yonah*), however, maintain that the reason *shehakol* is recited on loose *shattisa* is that it is drunk as a beverage rather than eaten as a food (see *Orach Chaim* 208:6 with *Mishnah Berurah*, §23). See also *Mishnah Berurah* 204:55. See *Tzlach*, who deals with how this approach fits with our Gemara.]

[The Gemara has explained that Rav's ruling was needed to preclude the notion that no blessing at all is recited on a food eaten as medicine. See *Rosh Yosef*, who questions why the Gemara did not say instead that Rav's ruling was needed to preclude the notion that *mezonos* is recited on loose *shattisa*. See also *Tzlach*, who addresses this question.]

[The Gemara has apparently discussed only the need for Rav's ruling (that *shehakol* is recited on loose *shattisa*), not the need for Shmuel's ruling (that *mezonos* is recited on thick *shattisa*). Accordingly, *Maharshal* emends the text above to read simply וְיִצְרִיקָא רַב, And [the above ruling] of Rav is necessary, without the word וְיִצְרִיקָא, and Shmuel. *Pnei Yehoshua* שחיטת וראי *Tzlach* ויריבא, however, in fact consider the need for Shmuel's ruling, and explain the Gemara in a way that it is addressing that as well. Accordingly, the text need not be emended.]

38. *Numbers* 23:22 (translation follows *Chochmas Manoach* – see end of note). As these words were uttered by Bilam nearly forty years after the exodus from Egypt, God is being referred to here as the One Who

85

disagree? בהמוציא – Regarding the connotation of the word “*hamotzi*.” רבנן סבירי – The Rabbis [i.e. the Tanna Kamma of the Baraisa] hold that המוציא דאפיק משמע – “*hamotzi*,” too, connotes that He has brought forth, i.e. the term is used on the basis of what God has done, דכתיב,, המוציא לך מים מצור – for it is written: *the One Who brings forth for you water from the rock of flint*.^[39] But ר' נחמיה סבר – R' Nechemyah holds that המוציא דמפיק משמע – “*hamotzi*” connotes that He brings forth,^[40] המוציא אתכם מתחת – as it is stated: *I am Hashem, your God, the One Who brings you forth from under the burdens of Egypt*.^[41]

The view of the Rabbis:

– And how do the Rabbis, who hold that *hamotzi* connotes what has been done in the past, explain the verse cited by R' Nechemyah? – In that [verse], this is what the Holy One, Blessed is He, is saying to the Israelites: כד מפיקנא לכו – When I eventually take you out of Egypt, עבידנא לכו מלתא – I will perform for you miraculous things, כי היכי דידעיתו – so that you will know – דאנא הוא דאפיקיתו יתכון ממזרים – that I am the One Who took

you out of Egypt, וידעתם כי אני ה' אלהיכם המוציא – as it is written: *and you will know that I am Hashem, your God, the One Who brings [you] forth*...^[42]

The Gemara records an incident related to this dispute.

משתבחין ליה רבנן לרבי זעירא [את] בר רב זבד אחוה דרבי שמעון – The Rabbis praised to R' Zeira a certain scholar known as^[43] the son of Rav Zevid, the brother of R' Shimon the son of Rav Zevid, דאדם גדול הוא ובקי בברכות הוא – saying in praise of him that he is a great man and an expert in the laws of blessings. [R' Zeira] said to them: אמר להם – When he comes to you, bring him to me.^[44] – One time he visited [R' Zeira]. אפיקו ליה ריפתא – They brought out bread for him. פתח וזאמר מוציא – He began reciting the blessing on bread^[45] and said “*motzi*” (rather than “*hamotzi*”). [R' Zeira] remarked critically: זה הוא שאומרים עליו דאדם גדול הוא ובקי בברכות הוא – This is the one about whom they say that he is a great man and an expert in the laws of blessings? בשלמא אי – It would have been well if he had said “*hamotzi*,”

NOTES

brought them forth (past tense) from Egypt (see *Rashi*). Thus, מוציא connotes in the past [as מוציא is simply the word מוציא suffixed with a ם to denote them or their].

All agree that the blessing should convey the sense that Hashem has brought forth (past tense) bread from the earth, since He has already brought forth the bread that one is about to eat (*Rashi*). And, as the Gemara has just said, all agree that the word מוציא without the prefix ה indeed connotes “in the past.” The question, as the Gemara will now explain, is only whether the word המוציא (with the prefix ה) also connotes the past.

As is well known, in Hebrew grammar the verb מוציא means he brings forth (denoting the present, or continuing action); מוציא means he brought forth (past); and יוציא means he will bring forth (future). The prefix ה added to the verb מוציא (to form המוציא) simply adds the definite article (changing the meaning to “the one” who brings forth) [or at times comes in place of ך, that, changing the meaning to that brings forth – see *Radak* to *I Kings* 11:9]. Thus, the Gemara cannot have meant that מוציא when used as a verb denotes the past tense. Rather, the Gemara understands that מוציא in this blessing is being used as a noun (a common usage in Hebrew), and means the One Who brings forth bread from the ground; that is, God, Who is the One constantly bringing forth bread from the earth. We desire, however, a noun form that denotes the one who does so and who has also done so in the past (as explained in the preceding paragraph). Accordingly, the Gemara brings a proof from the verse מוציא אל מוצרים, God, the One Who brings them forth from Egypt, where מוציא is necessarily being used as a noun [as it refers to the past, which the verb מוציא cannot do – see beginning of this paragraph] and is used to describe God because of what he has done in the past (see at length *Chochmas Manoach*, on whose comments our approach to this *sugya* is based).

39. *Deuteronomy* 8:15 (translation follows *Chochmas Manoach* – see end of preceding note). Moses is addressing the Israelites in the Wilderness at the end of the fortieth year, exhorting them that their future prosperity in the Land of Israel not cause them to forget

Hashem, Who has provided their water and other needs in the Wilderness these many years. Thus, the word המוציא, the One Who brings forth, used in the verse refers to the One Who has brought forth (past tense) water from the rock of flint (see *Rashi*).

40. I.e. the noun המוציא, the One Who brings forth, is used to describe God because of what He will do in the future, though He has not done so in the past (see *Rashi*).

41. *Exodus* 6:7. Moses is instructed to declare this in the name of God to the Israelites enslaved in Egypt. Since the redemption was yet to be, God is being referred to as המוציא, the One Who brings forth, solely on the basis of what He will do, not on the basis of what He has already done (see *Rashi*).

This usage is not at odds with the usage found in the verse (*Deuteronomy* 8:15) cited above by the Rabbis. On the contrary, the present verse indicates that God is referred to in *Deuteronomy* 8:15 as “the One Who brings forth water” because He would continue to produce for them water (for the duration of their stay in the Wilderness), not because He already had (*Rashi*).

42. This is the beginning of the verse cited by R' Nechemyah. [The Rabbis point to the first part of the verse, וידעתם כי אני ה' אלהיכם, And you “will” know that I am Hashem your God..., which indicates that the reference is to the knowledge the Israelites will have in the future, after they are redeemed from Egypt. At that future point, they will realize that God is “the One Who brings them forth” because of what He has already done for them.]

[R' Nechemyah, however, interprets וידעתם כי אני ה' not as a prediction, but as a command – and you “shall” know that I am Hashem – i.e. you shall recognize right now while you are still enslaved that I am Hashem, the One Who brings you forth, because of what I will do for you.]

43. Based on the reading of *Maharshal*; cf. *Dikdukei Soferim*.

44. Literally: when he comes to your hand bring him to my hand.

45. [See a slightly different version of this Gemara cited by *Rosh*, *Pesachim* 1:10.]

בעבין. ערוכה ומקוטפת בגלוקסאות נאות גלי דעתיה ללחם
עשה: כלמדין. סכסכים בעלמא שלא הקפיד על עריסתם
ורגומתו שטט במועד קטן (פ"ד דף יב.) עושה לו למודין לחין לבזר
של יין לכסותו: זינע בעלמא הוא. ואיז פרי עליו בורא פרי
העץ: ויזמן פשוט. סופי ענבים תורה אור
שחן מתבטלים עולמים וטושים מהן
חומן: מחייב קרן והמשג. לשוטה
ממנו בשוגג: וד' יאשע פטור.
דזינע בעלמא הוא ואין סם תרומה
חל עליו ואין לך פרי היתין למסקה
אלא זינע וענבים בלבד והייט כמר
בר רב אשי: טרימא מה. מה
מברכין עליו וסם ערימא כל דבר
הכחוש קאם ואיז מרוקס: לא הוה
לדעתא דרבא. לא היה מבין מהו
שאל: א"ל. רבינא להווא מברכין
ליוו טרימא אחא שאל: דקודטמי.
כרסס סכסכים אורו וטחנין זו יין
וטחנין: או לשוממ. להווא שמן:
או דפולמי. כהיטע ענבים לתם
לחוד התרומים מים לעשות תמיד:
א"ל רבא תשילמא קא אמרת. מתוך
דבר רבינא הכין רבא אח השלש
א"ל דבר מעוך שאלתי כמו בטי
תשילמא דשמיטת חולין (דף ג.).
מותר לעשות מהו טרימא. שאיט
מפסודה אלמא דבמילת קאי וכוון
דבר: מברכין עליה ב"פ הפך:
שחיתא. מחלל הטעם מקמח קליות
שחיתא בפתור בעור שהבטלים
לחיים: ענה לאכילה עבירה.
לחיות קיימא: שחיתא. מניסין.
בכף לערבו יפה במימיו: זינע
האמרי. מפורש במסכת פסחים (דף
מב:.) וכל התעסקות שוטה. אלמא
לאכילה מבין ורשעה ממילא היא
הכל נמי לאכילה מבין ט' (ה) ה"ג
ורבינא דרב ושמאל. ואפ"ג דהניא
לענין שנה לזכור הוא ומותר לאכלו
בשבת אלמדין למימר דעשון ברכה:
ה"ג דמילא כיון לרשעה קא מבין
לא לבני ברכה קמ"ל כיון דמתאני
מיניה. שנהי מחלל הוא בטי ברוכי:
והלכתא. ל"ג ומחללם גדולות הוא:
לפיק משמע. שטוילא כבד והא
דחי ברכה הגונה דלשטבר בעין
שנהי כבד הווא הלחם הוה מן הארץ
שואל כל ליהטע הימנו: דמכחי אל
מוראם ממלרים. וכגאמרה פרשת
בלעם כבד יאלו: המוילא לך מים.
וכבר הווא: ורבי נחמיה סבד דמפיק
משמע. שטקיד להוילא דמכחי המוילא
אחס וכגאמור פסוק זה למשע עדיין
לא יאלו והמוילא לך מים עדיין הוה
מוילא כל ימי היותם במדבר: ולפיקות
יתכן. שאני הוא שטוילא אחס:
לשמעין

בעבין דייבין כלמודין פטורים א"ל אביי לרב
יוסף האי טובא דארעא מאי מברכין עליה
א"ל מי סברת נהמא הוא "גובלא בעלמא
הוא ומברכין עליה בורא מיני מזונות מר
ויוטרא יקבע סעודתיה עליה וברך עליה
המוציא לחם מן הארץ ושלא ברכות אמר
מר בר רב אשי "ואדם יוצא בהן די חובתו
בפסח מ"ס "לחם עוני קרינן ביה ואמר מר בר
רב אשי "האי דובשא דחמרי מברכין עליה
שהכל נהיה בברכו מ"ס זינע בעלמא הוא
כנאמן כי האי תנא דתנן "דבש תמרים ויין
תפודים ודומין ספוניות ושאר מי פירות של
תרומה רבי אליעזר מחייב קרן והימנו ורבי
הושע "פטור א"ל ההוא מרבנן לרבא שרימא
מרו לא היה אדעתיה דרבא מאי קאמר ליה
יחבי רבינא קמיה דרבא א"ל דרשומשי קא
אמרת או דקודטמי קא אמרת או דפרצני קא
אמרת אדהבי והבי אסקיה רבא לדעתיה אמר
ליה חשילתא ודאי קא אמרת ואדכרתן מלחא
הא דאמר רב אשי "האי חמרי של תרומה
מותר לעשות מהן שרימא ואמור לעשות מהן
שבר והלכתא "חמרי ועבדיננו שרימא
מברכין עליהו בורא פרי העץ מאי טעמא
במלחיהו קיימי כרמיקרא. שחיתא רב
אמר שהכל נהיה בברכו ושמואל אמר בורא
מיני מזונות אמר רב חסדא ולא פליגי "הא
בעבה הא ברכה עבה לאכילה עבדי לה רכה
לרפואה קא עבדי לה מרוב רב יוסף *ישוין
[י] שבחשין את השתות בשבת [י] ושוחין
זיתים המצרי ואי ס"ד לרפואה קא מבין
רפואה בשבת מי שרי א"ל אביי ואח לא
חסברא ווא "תנן כ"ל האוכלין אוכל ארס
לרפואה בשבת וכל המשקין שותה אלא מה
אית לך למימר גברא לאכילה קא מבין היג
גברא לאכילה קא מבין לישנא אדרינא אלא
מה אית לך למימר גברא לאכילה קא מבין
ורפואה ממילא קא הווא היג לאכילה קא
מבין ורפואה ממילא קא הווא וצריכא דרב
(ושמואל) דא מהאי "הא לאכילה קא מבין
ורפואה ממילא קא הווא אבל הכא "כיון
דלכתחלה לרפואה קא מבין לא לברך
עליה כלל קמ"ל כיון דאית ליה הנאה מיניה
בעי ברוכי: שעל הפה הוא אמר המוציא לחם מן
הארץ רבי נחמיה אמר מוציא לחם מן הארץ
אמר רבא במוציא כולי עלמא לא פליגי
אשמעין

מסופק אם וירמשי"ס חייבין בחלה משום (ב) עושה עיסתו בלחם כדי
לחלקה פטורין מן החלה דלית בהו שיטורא הכלל גבי וירמשי"ס נמי
פטורים מחלקן שאין משימין שיטור חלה בקדירה אחת אך היה מלכיד
ליקח חלה בלא ברכה בשביל הספק וכל דבר שתחלתו סופגין וסופו
עיסה חייבין בחלה ובהמוילא דקיי"ל
כרבי יוחנן פרק כל שעה (פסחים לו.)
דפליגי ר' יוחנן ור"ל במעשה אילפס
סופגין וסופו עיסה אם נאפה בפתור
או בכירה או באלפס בלא מים ושמן
דר"ל ס"ל דלא הוה חייב אלא כשנאפה
בפתור ואחא קאי מהמנין תחלתו
סופגין וסופו עיסה דחייב בחלה אבל
באלפס פטור ורבי יוחנן מחייב
דמעשה אילפס כופו עיסה קרינן ביה
רק שלא ידעו משקין באלפס דהכי
חיתא בירושלמי כל שהאור תחתיו
חייב בחלה ומברכין עליו המוילא אבל
אמילא אין מברכין עליו המוילא
דלא הוה אלא גובלא בעלמא ומיהו אם
קבע סעודתיה עליהו כמו בפסחים
מברך המוילא וכל דבר שתחלתו
סופגין וגם כופו כגון הכי סופגין
שמסגין אותן בשמן שקורין בוי"ש
*פטורין מן החלה: מר וזוהר
קבע סעודתיה עליה. וכן ניליש או
קבע סעודתיה עליה מברכין עליה
המוילא וכן לזה הר"ם בפסחים
שקבעין סעודתן עליהן לברך המוילא
בפתח תחלה כדי לפטורן מברכה שהיה
מסופק אי הוה קביעותיהו קביעות
או לא: דאמרי דבשעת דממרי מברכין
עליה שהכל. וכן משקין מכל מיני
פירות בר מחירוס ויהיה כדלמרינן
גבי ערלה "ולאשקין מה"ג שפירס
דמיידי שנתן לתוכן מים וזכר דיון
אפ"ג דמחא י"ס בן כיה כבדי אכילה
פרס לא מברכין עליו בורא מיני
מזונות אלא שהכל ואפי' לרב ושמואל
דאמרי כל שיש בו מחמשת המינים
מברכין עליו בורא מיני מזונות הכל
לא הוי כהו ממעט שטוריס(ו) ואין שבר
אלא טעמא בעלמא ועוד משום שיש
בו עלייה אחרינא בפת ועוד בשמים
אומר שהכל: "ישוין שומעין.
רבי(ז) ור"י פליגי גבי טען מים
לחוד המורסן ובקליטה מיירי מדקטני
וטוחנין ולא קטני לשון גבול והכי
דייקין הכס: "ואי ס"ד לרפואה
עבדי ליה רפואה בשבת מי שרי.
דאמר דכיון (ז) דכל שטקיד לרפואה
ואין רגילות לעשותו ללחוד אכילה
אסור בשבת וכו': (והא תנן כל
האוכלין וכו'. דמשמע מדנקט כל
האוכלין דאפי' (ו) כל שטקיד לרפואה
כיון שרואי לאכילה שפיר דמי מדנקט
כל ומסיק הגמרא ויריבא דרב
ושמואל דפשיטא (ו) דמתניתין שריא
אף על פי ששומד לרפואה אבל דרב
ושמואל אשמעין ללא לברך עליה כלל
דשקיד לרפואה לא לברך עליה כלל
קא משמע לן כיון דמתאני מיניה
בעי ברוכי ומכל מקום לא יברך
אלא שהכל כיון שאיט עשוי
לסעוד כי אם לשמות ואם כן כל
דבר שיש בו מחמשת המינים ואיט
עשוי לסעוד כי אם לשמות כגון
שכר וכו' וכלל בו מברך שהכל
וכהו נוגח פסק בה"ג והלכתא
והלכתא

מא א במי פ"ג מנל
ברכות הלכה פ
קודש ארץ חתן קמח
סוף טו:
בבא ז מ"י ט"ז מנל
מנל ומנל ט"ז
סוף ט"ז א"ח ט"ח סוף
סוף ג:
ג ד מ"י סוף מלמח
ברכות הלכה ד סוף
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גא הו מ"י סוף מנל
מלמח סוף ג:
גב ז מ"י סוף מנל
ברכות הלכה ד סוף
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גט ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גכ ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גד ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גה ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גו ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גז ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח
גח ז מ"י סוף ט"ח
סוף טו סוף ט"ח

for he would have then taught us the meaning of the verse,^[1] and he would have also taught us that the law is in accordance with the Rabbis.^[2] מאי – But with that which he says “*motzi*,” אלא דאמר מוציא – what is he teaching us?^[3]

The Gemara remarks:

– And the son of Rav Zevid’s reason for what he did, by saying “*motzi*,” was לאפוקי נפשיה מפלוגתא – to remove himself from a matter of dispute.^[4]

The Gemara concludes:

– And the law is that we recite on bread *hamotzi lechem min haaretz*, דקיימא לן ברבנן – for we hold in accordance with the Rabbis, דאמרי דאפיק משמע – who say that *hamotzi*, מוציא, connotes “the One Who has brought forth.”^[5]

The Gemara discusses the next part of the Mishnah which states:

– AND ON VEGETABLES ONE SAYS etc. [*the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*].

The Gemara notes:

– The Mishnah states the case of vegetables in juxtaposition with and thus similar to its case of bread, to teach us^[6] that מה פת שנשתנה על ידי האור – just as the case of bread refers to something that was transformed through fire, אף וירקות נמי שנשתנו על ידי האור – so, too, the case of vegetables refers to those that were transformed through fire, i.e. cooked vegetables.^[7] אמר רבנאי משמיה דאבאי – Rabbenai said in the name of Abaye: זאת אומרת שלקות – This juxtaposition says, in effect,

that on cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*. ממאי מדקתני וירקות דומיא דפת – From where is this known? From that which the Mishnah states the case of vegetables in juxtaposition with and thus similar to the case of bread.^[8]

The Gemara cites a public lecture given by Rav Chisda regarding the blessing on cooked vegetables:

– Rav Chisda announced in a public lecture: דרש רב חסדא – It was reported in the name of our teacher – משום רבינו – and who is this? Rav: שלקות מברכין עליהם בורא פרי – On cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*. ורבוחינו היורדין מארץ – And (Rav Chisda continued) our teachers who come down from the Land of Israel – ומנו עולא משמיה דרבי יוחנן – and who is this? Ulla – said in the name of R’ Yochanan: שלקות מברכין עליהן שהכל נהיה בדברו – On cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing *that everything came into being through His word*, which apparently contradicts Rav’s ruling in this matter.^[9] ואנאי אומר – And I, Rav Chisda, say to reconcile these seemingly contradictory rulings,^[10] that it depends on the vegetable: כל שתחלתו בורא פרי האדמה – In the case of any vegetable whose blessing in its initial state (i.e. when eaten raw) is *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*,^[12] שלקו שהכל נהיה בדברו – if one cooks it, the blessing now recited is *that everything came into being through His word*.^[13] וכל שתחלתו שהכל נהיה בדברו – And in the case of any vegetable whose blessing in its initial state is *that everything came into being through His word*,^[14] שלקו בורא פרי – if one cooks it, the blessing now recited is *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*.^[15]

NOTES

1. I.e. that the meaning of *Exodus* 6:7 is that you will know *then* – after I, God, deliver you from Egypt – that I am Hashem, the One Who brings you forth . . . (as the Rabbis above have explained this verse – see 38a note 42).

2. Who say that *hamotzi* is a reference to what God has already done (*Rashi*). [And thus it is also an acceptable formula for the blessing. (See, however, note 5.)]

3. All agree that “*motzi*” is a valid formula, and he has thus taught us nothing new (see *Rashi*). [Surely, the son of Rav Zevid did not mean to rule in accordance with the minority view of R’ Nechemyah.]

R’ Zeira holds that a person should formulate his blessings in a way that maximizes what can be learned from that formula. Thus, given the choice between *hamotzi* and *motzi* – both of which are acceptable according to the Rabbis – the son of Rav Zevid should have opted for *hamotzi*, which would have taught us both the meaning of the verse and that the halachah follows the Rabbis that one *does* fulfill his obligation by saying *hamotzi* (*Rosh*, *Pesachim* 1:10; see also *Taz*, *Orach Chaim* 167:4). See, however, note 5.

4. Not wishing to involve himself in the matter of dispute between R’ Nechemyah and the Rabbis, he gave preference to “*motzi*,” which is universally acceptable.

R’ Zeira, however, held that it would have been better for him to say “*hamotzi*,” as explained in the preceding note. [The Gemara below (50a) seems to indicate that, on the contrary, the avoidance of dispute in matters of blessings is preferable. See *Taz*, *Orach Chaim* 167:4, who addresses this difficulty.]

5. Therefore, one should recite the blessing in accordance with the view of the Rabbis, as explained in note 3.

Alternatively, the Rabbis’ formula “*hamotzi*” is preferable to “*motzi*,” since in the latter formula (האדמה מוציא לחם מן) ברך אתה ה' אלהינו מלך העולם מוציא לחם מן (הארץ), the succession of the words *haolam* and *motzi* creates consecutive *mem* (mem) sounds, which would tend to merge into one rather than being articulated distinctly. When reciting *hamotzi*, however, the ה, ha, sound intervenes between the two *mem* sounds, and thereby avoids the problem of merging (*Yerushalmi*, cited by *Tosafos* and *Rosh*; see *Ritva* for another explanation). [And though the succession of *mem* sounds occurs anyway in the words מן הארץ, the Sages had no choice but to

leave that expression as is, since it is taken from Scripture – *Psalms* 104:14 (*Tosafos*; *Rosh*).]

6. See *Pnei Yehoshua*, and *Tos. Anshei Shem* to the Mishnah.

7. In effect, then, the Mishnah is teaching that even though vegetables have been cooked, they retain their original status [as “fruits of the ground”] and one recites *haadamah* before eating them [as the Gemara will now state] (*Rashi*).

8. The words in parentheses are apparently redundant and are indeed absent from the text cited by *Rif* and *Rosh* (see *Mesoras HaShas*). [See, however, *Tosafos* מדקתני with *Maharsha*. See also *Dikdukei Soferim*, who cites a text in which it is rather the earlier words אומרת, this says, that are absent.]

9. Ulla would often travel from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia [which is called “going down” because Eretz Yisrael is higher than all the other lands (see *Kiddushin* 69a-b)]. In Babylonia, he reported the teachings of R’ Yochanan, one of the leading Amoraim of Eretz Yisrael.

10. See *Divrei David*, who explains what the rationale for the dispute would be.

11. *Rashi*; cf. *Rabbeinu Yonah* in explanation of *Rif*.

12. That is, a vegetable which is generally eaten raw and thus takes the *haadamah* blessing in its raw state (*Rashi*).

13. The transformation of flavor effected by cooking constitutes a significant change from the natural state. And since this change is for the worse (as the vegetable is generally eaten raw; see *Tosafos* לה משכוח לו *Tosafos*, *Rashba* et al.), the blessing *the One Who creates the “fruit of the ground”* is no longer appropriate (see *Rashi*). [If, however, the change would be for the better, the *haadamah* blessing would be appropriate, since the vegetable would be considered to be in the ultimate state envisioned by the one who planted it.]

14. That is, a vegetable that is generally not eaten raw, so that one who eats it raw recites only *shehakol* [since it is not yet in the state that its planter originally envisioned] (*Rashi*).

15. For it is only upon being transformed through cooking that it reaches the ultimate state envisioned by the one who planted it (*Rashi*; see 36a note 10). [Thus, only then can it appropriately be called a “fruit of the ground.”]

The Gemara questions Rav Chisda's statement:

בשלמא כל שתחלתו שהכל נהיה בדברו שלקו בורא פרי האדמה – Now, all is well with the second part of Rav Chisda's statement – any vegetable whose blessing in its initial state is that everything came into being through His word, if one cooks it, the blessing is the One Who creates the fruit of the ground – משבחת לה בכרובא וסלקא וקרא – for you find it in the cases of cabbage, beets, and pumpkins, which are generally eaten cooked and not raw. אלא כל שתחלתו בורא פרי האדמה שלקו – But the first part of Rav Chisda's statement – any vegetable whose blessing in its initial state is the One Who creates the fruit of the ground, if one cooks it, the blessing is that everything came into being through His word – היכי משבחת לה – how do you find it? Which vegetables are eaten specifically raw?

The Gemara answers:

אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק – Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: You find it in the cases of garlic and leek, which are generally eaten specifically raw.^[16]

The Gemara now cites Rav Nachman's public lecture on this matter:

דרש רב נחמן – Rav Nachman announced in a public lecture: It was reported in the name of our teacher – משום רבינו – and who is this? Shmuel: שלקות מכרכין עליהם – On cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the ground. ויורדים מארץ ישראל – And (Rav Nachman continued) our colleagues who come down from the Land of Israel – ומנו – and who is this? Ulla^[17] – said in the name of R' Yochanan: שלקות מכרכין עליהן שהכל נהיה בדברו – On cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing that everything came into being through His word. ואני אומר – And I, Rav Nachman, say that it [the matter of dispute between Shmuel and R' Yochanan] is a matter of Tannaic dispute.^[18] דהנא – For it was taught in a Baraisa: WE CAN FULFILL the obligation to eat matzah on Pesach WITH A WAFER OF matzah THAT WAS SOAKED in water, ובמבושל שלא נמוח – OR WITH ONE THAT WAS COOKED but THAT DID NOT DISSOLVE.^[19] דברי רבי מאיר – These are THE WORDS OF R' MEIR. ורבי יוסי אומר – BUT R' YOSE SAYS: WE CAN FULFILL the obligation WITH A WAFER OF matzah THAT WAS SOAKED in water, אבל לא במבושל אף על פי

שלא נמוח – BUT NOT WITH ONE THAT WAS COOKED, EVEN IF IT DID NOT DISSOLVE.^[20] Rav Nachman reasons that just as R' Meir holds that cooked matzah (if it has not dissolved) retains its original status, so too would he hold that cooked vegetables retain their original status as “fruits of the ground,” and their blessing would remain *haadamah*, as Shmuel rules. And just as R' Yose holds that cooked matzah (though intact) loses its original status, so too would he hold that cooked vegetables lose their original status as “fruits of the ground,” and their blessing would change to *shehakol*, as R' Yochanan rules.

The Gemara^[21] rejects Rav Nachman's analogy:

רבנן עלמא שלקות מכרכין – But this is not correct. But this is not correct. For it might be that all Tannaim agree [i.e. even R' Yose] that cooked vegetables retain their original status as vegetables and that we recite upon them the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the ground. ועד כאן לא קאמר – And thus far, R' Yose has not said there in that Baraisa – אלא משום דבעינן טעם מצה וליכא – more than that one cannot fulfill his obligation with cooked matzah because we require that the matzah have the taste of matzah,^[22] and it is not there if the matzah is cooked.^[23] אבל הכא – But here, with regard to the blessing on cooked vegetables, אפילו רבי יוסי מודה – even R' Yose agrees that cooking does not change the vegetable's status. Thus, one cannot relate the dispute between Shmuel and R' Yochanan to the dispute between R' Meir and R' Yose.^[24]

Both Rav Chisda and Rav Nachman have reported what R' Yochanan said regarding the blessing for cooked vegetables. The Gemara now cites a dispute between R' Yochanan's students as to their teacher's opinion in this matter:

אמר רבי חייא בר אבא אמר רבי יוחנן – R' Chiya bar Abba said in the name of R' Yochanan: שלקות מכרכין עליהם בורא פרי – On cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing the One Who creates the fruit of the ground. ורבי בנימין בר יפת אמר – But R' Binyamin bar Yefess says in the name of R' Yochanan: שלקות מכרכין עליהם שהכל נהיה בדברו – On cooked vegetables, we recite the blessing that everything came into being through His word. אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק – Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: קבע עולא לשבשתיה ברי בנימין – Ulla, who said in the name of R' Yochanan that one recites *shehakol* on cooked vegetables, ingrained his mistake^[25] in accordance with the testimony of R' Binyamin bar Yefess.^[26]

NOTES

16. Since they taste better raw than cooked. [Though it is plain to see that, on the contrary, these vegetables taste better when cooked, that enhancement of flavor results from the meat and salt with which they are cooked. Pure garlic and leek, however, taste better raw than cooked (*Tosafos*; see *Rama, Orach Chaim* 205:1 with *Taz* §3 and *Magen Avraham* §5).]

17. Rav Nachman was a [more] prominent personage [see *Sifsei Chachamim*] and [unlike Rav Chisda] referred to Ulla as “colleague” rather than “teacher” (*Rashi*).

18. [Literally: is recorded in the Tannaic sources as being in dispute.]

Unlike Rav Chisda, Rav Nachman takes these two rulings to be at odds with one another, as both refer to *all* cooked vegetables, whether generally eaten cooked or raw. Shmuel holds that in all cases, *haadamah* is recited on cooked vegetables, whereas R' Yochanan holds that *shehakol* is recited. And their dispute reflects an earlier dispute of Tannaim, as Rav Nachman proceeds to show (see *Rashi*).

19. Though the matzah has been soaked or cooked, it [retains its original status and] is still considered *לחם עני*, bread of affliction [see above, 37b note 26] (*Rashi*). [However, once it dissolves (see above, 37a note 17), it is no longer considered “bread,” and it is therefore no longer fit for the mitzvah of eating “bread” of affliction.]

20. [Rav Nachman assumes that] in R' Yose's view, bread that is cooked

is no longer considered “bread” (*Rashi*).

21. See *Rashba*.

22. See *Mishnah Berurah* 475:29; cf. *Maharatz Chayes* here.

23. All agree that it is necessary that matzah have the taste of matzah in order to be used for the mitzvah (see *Pesachim* 115a with *Rashi* and *Rashbam* ליה ומבטל ליה). The dispute between R' Meir and R' Yose is only whether the taste of cooked matzah is considered “the taste of matzah” (*Rashba*; cf. *Rabbeinu Yonah* and *Pnei Yehoshua*).

24. In practice, the cooking process affects different vegetables differently, and the blessing on the vegetable varies accordingly – see *Orach Chaim* 205:1 with *Mishnah Berurah* and *Beur Halachah*.

25. Translation based on *Rashi*. [Alternatively, this is to be rendered: established his rote, i.e. his body of memorized law (see *Mesoras HaShas*; see also *Aruch* [כ] שש).]

26. Though Ulla above quotes R' Yochanan as ruling that *shehakol* is recited on cooked vegetables, Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak contends that Ulla did not actually hear R' Yochanan say so. Rather, Ulla heard this report of R' Yochanan's ruling from R' Binyamin bar Yefess, and committed it to memory until he came to believe that R' Yochanan actually ruled this way. This caused Ulla to report the ruling to the yeshivah in R' Yochanan's name (see *Rashi*).

R' Zeira objects to the recording of R' Yochanan's position as a matter of dispute:

R' Zeira pondered how this dispute between R' Chiya bar Abba and R' Binyamin bar Yefess ever became recorded in the yeshiva.^[27] וכי מה ענין רבי בנמינ בר יפת אצל רבי – Why, what comparison is there between R' Binyamin bar Yefess and R' Chiya bar Abba?^[28] רבי חייא בר – R' Chiya bar Abba is precise when memorizing a teaching from R' Yochanan his teacher, whereas R' Binyamin bar Yefess is not precise. ועוד רבי חייא בר אבא כל תלתיין יומין – And furthermore, every thirty days R' Chiya bar Abba would review his learning before R' Yochanan his teacher,^[29] ורבי בנמינ בר יפת לא מהדר – whereas R' Binyamin bar Yefess did not review in this manner. And furthermore, aside from this and aside from this, i.e. aside from these two general reasons for considering R' Chiya bar Abba's version reliable to the exclusion of the version of R' Binyamin bar Yefess, there is a direct proof that R' Yochanan never ruled that *shehakol* is recited on cooked vegetables.^[30] דהוה תורמסא דשלקי ליה שבע ומנין – For with regard to this *turmesa* bean, which they cook seven times in a pot – ואכלי ליה בקנוח סעודה – and they then eat it as a dessert,^[31] אתו ושאלו לרבי יוחנן – they came and asked R' Yochanan as to which blessing should be recited on it, מברכין עליוה בורא פרי האדמה – and he said to them: We recite on it the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*.^[32] ועוד – And furthermore, there is yet another direct proof that R' Yochanan never issued the ruling attributed to him by R' Binyamin bar Yefess. אמר רבי חייא בר אבא – For R' Chiya bar Abba said: אני ראיתי את רבי יוחנן שאכל בית מליו – I saw R' Yochanan eat a salted olive,^[33] וברך עליו תחלה – and he recited a blessing on it both at the beginning, before eating it, and at the end, after eating it. אי אמרת בשלמא

Now, this is fine if you say that in R' Yochanan's view cooked vegetables or those steeped in salt remain in their original status, – דילמא בורא נפשות רבות וחסרון על כל מה שברא – Perhaps, at the end R' Yochanan would recite on it *the One Who creates numerous living things and their deficiencies; for all that He has created*...^[37] But if you say that in R' Yochanan's view cooked vegetables or those steeped in salt do remain in their original status as vegetables,^[35] – בשלמא בתחלה מברך עליו שהכל יהיה בדברו – then although it is fine that at the beginning he would recite on it the blessing *that everything came into being through His word*, אלא – but at the end what blessing would he recite?^[36]

The Gemara answers:

– דילמא בורא נפשות רבות וחסרון על כל מה שברא – Perhaps, at the end R' Yochanan would recite on it *the One Who creates numerous living things and their deficiencies; for all that He has created*...^[37]

The Gemara now challenges the opinion of those that hold that cooked vegetables retain their status as vegetables: Rav Yitzchak bar Shmuel raised an objection from the following Mishnah:^[38] ירקות שאדם יוצא – THE bitter VEGETABLES WITH WHICH ONE CAN FULFILL HIS OBLIGATION to eat *maror* ON the first night of PESACH...^[39] יוצא בהן ובקלח שלהן – ONE CAN FULFILL the obligation WITH THEM (i.e. with the leaves) OR WITH THEIR STALKS... – אבל לא כבושין ולא שלוקין ולא מבושלין – BUT NOT if PICKLED, NOR if STEWED, NOR if COOKED.^[40] ואי סלקא דעתך – Now, if it should enter your mind that [cooked vegetables] remain in their original status as vegetables, then why does one not fulfill his obligation by eating stewed or cooked *maror*?

NOTES

27. Since R' Chiya bar Abba's testimony regarding R' Yochanan's position is so much more reliable than the testimony of R' Binyamin bar Yefess [as R' Zeira proceeds to demonstrate], the latter's testimony should have been rejected out of hand, and should never have been presented as a dissenting opinion. R' Zeira finds it inconceivable that R' Binyamin bar Yefess' opinion should even be mentioned together with that of R' Chiya bar Abba (*Rashi*, cf. *Rashba*).

28. Literally: what is R' Binyamin bar Yefess's association with R' Chiya bar Abba?

29. [Though תלמודיה, *his learning*, generally refers to one's entire body of learning, it does not seem reasonable to interpret it that way here. Rather,] the meaning here is that R' Chiya bar Abba would review (before R' Yochanan) on the thirty-first [alternatively: thirtieth; see *Tos. R' Yehudah HeChasid* and *Tos. HaRosh*] day that which he had learned during the preceding thirty days (*Tosafos*) in order to ensure the accuracy of what he had learned (*Ritva*). [See, however, *Be'er Sheva* to *Kereisos* 27a (רא"ה ורא"ב ארא), who seeks to demonstrate that the reference here is indeed to his entire body of learning.]

30. *Rashi*.

31. If cooked fewer than seven times, however, the *turmesa* bean remains bitter (see *Beitzah* 25b with *Rashi*).

32. Evidently, R' Yochanan holds that cooked vegetables retain their status as vegetables (*Rashi*).

33. I.e. one that has been packed in salt for many days (*Rashi*). This kind of salting has the same effect as heat (*ibid.*, from *Pesachim* 76a).

34. Just as cooked vegetables or those steeped in salt retain their original status, so too cooked or salted fruits. Thus, he recited on the salted olive *ha'eitz* before eating and *Al Ha'Eitz* afterwards, just as one would do for fresh olives.

35. And similarly, a salted olive would no longer be considered a "fruit of the tree."

36. Though the blessing that R' Yochanan reportedly made before eating the salted olive might have been *shehakol*, what is the blessing that he is reported to have made afterwards?

The Gemara's question is based on the view of Rav Yitzchak bar Avdimi (below, 44b) that *Borei Nefashos* is only recited after eating eggs or meat, but not after eating other foods. Accordingly, if the salted olive loses its status as a "fruit of the tree," rendering the blessing *Al Ha'Eitz* (which one usually recites after eating a fruit of the seven species) no longer appropriate, no blessing whatsoever would be recited afterwards (*Tzlach*; see also *Pnei Yehoshua*).

37. In other words, perhaps R' Yochanan follows the other Amoraim (below, 44b), who disagree with Rav Yitzchak bar Avdimi and hold that *Borei Nefashos* is recited after eating any food for which a different after-blessing is not prescribed. Thus, even if R' Yochanan's view is that a salted olive is no longer considered a "fruit of the tree," he would still have recited *Borei Nefashos* after eating it (*Tzlach*).

38. *Pesachim* 39a (see below, end of note 40).

39. On the first night of Pesach, one must eat *maror* [bitter herbs], as stated in *Exodus* 12:8.

40. *שלוקין*, *stewed*, refers to those which are cooked to a greater-than-average degree, and they are thus different from those that are simply cooked in the regular manner (see *Rashi*; see also *Rashi* to *Pesachim* 39a *שלוקין*; see also *Tos. HaRosh* here).

[This Mishnah, as cited by the Gemara here, differs markedly (though not substantively) from the way the Mishnah actually appears in *Pesachim* 39a. What the Gemara cites here resembles more closely the Baraisa cited on *Pesachim* 39b. *Dikdukei Soferim*, however, cites texts in which the Gemara's citation here begins with *but not pickled*..., which is an exact quote from the Mishnah there, and he notes that this seems to have been the reading of *Rashi* לא אכל כבושין.]

[illegible][illegible]

קִנּוּחַ סְעוּדָה אֶתְּ וּשְׂאֵלוֹ לֵר' אֲדָמָה וְעוֹד אָמַר ר' חִיָּיא בְר' אֲבִי הַבֵּיר ז"ל וְלֹא חֲחֻלָּה וּמִנֵּף אֵי אֲמַר

אשמועין מעמא ואשמועין דהלכתא כרבנ
אלא דאמר מציא מאי קמ"ל ואיהו דעבר
לאלאפוקי נפשיה מפלוגתא *והלכתא "המציא
לרס מן הארץ דק"ל כרבנ דאמרי דאפיק
משמע: ועל הירקות אומר וכו' : קתני ירקות
דומיא דפת מה פת שנשתנה ע"י האור אף
ירקות נמי שנשתנו ע"י האור אמר רבנאי
משמיה דרבנאי *יאת אומרט שלקות מברכין
עליהן בורא פ"י האדמה (ממאי מדקתני
ירקות דומיא דפת) דרש רב חסדא משום
רבינו ומנו רב שלקות כברכין עליהם בורא
פ"י האדמה ודבותינו הוודין מארץ ישראל
ומנו עולא משמיה דר' יוחנן אמר שלקות
ממברכין עליהן שהכל נהיה בדברו ואני
אומר *כל שחתלתו בורא פ"י האדמה שלק
ושהכל נהיה בדברו וכל שחתלתו שהכל נהיה
בדברו שלק בורא פ"י האדמה בשלמא כל
שחתלתו שהכל נהיה בדברו שלק בפה"א
שנשכחת לה בכרמא וסלקא וקרא אלא כל
שחתלתו בפה"א שלק שהכל היכי משכחת
לה א"ר נחמן בר יצחק משכחת לה 'בתומי
סבת' דרש רב נחמן משום רבינו ומנו
מטרימא שלקות מברכין עליהם בפה"א
שנשכחתו הוודין *ישראל ומנו עולא
משמיה דר' יוחנן אמר שלקות מברכין עליהן
ושהכל נהיה בדברו ואני אומר בשחלות
שנשיה רתניא *יוצאין ברקיע השרשי ובמבושל
שלא נמות דברי ר"מ ור' יוסי אומר *יוצאין
ברקיע השרשי אבל לא במבושל אע"פ שלא
נמות ולא היא דכ"ע שלקות מברכין עליהן
משום דעין כאן לא קאמר ר' יוסי התם אלא
משום דבר בעין מעם מצה וליכא אבל הכא אפי'
יבי יוסי מודה דאמר ר' חייא בר אבא א"ר יוחנן
שלקות מברכין עליהם בפה"א ור' בנימין
דפת א"ר יוחנן שלקות מברכין עליהם שהכל
נהיה בדברו א"ר נחמן בר יצחק קבע עולא
לשבששתה כ"ר בנימין בר יפת *תתי בה
" ויאו וכי מה ענין ר' בנימין בר יפת אצל
" חייא בר אבא ר' חייא בר אבא *ייוק
נמיר שמעתא מרבי יוחנן רביה ורבי בנימין
בר יפת לא דייק ועוד רבי חייא בר אבא
ככל תלזין יומין מהדר תלמודא קמה דר'
וחנן רביה ור' בנימין בר יפת לא מהדר
עוד בר מן דין ובר מן דין דההוא תורמסא
דרשלקי ליה שבע ומנין בקדשה ואכלי ליה
ויוחנן ואמר לזו מברכין עליה בורא פ"י
כא אמר ראתי את ר' יוחנן שאכל וית מליח
בשלמא שלקות במליתיהו קיימי בתחלה
סוף מברך עליו ברבא אחס חזיוו ויולשו

לתיירו קיימ' בשלמא בתחלה מברך ע'
ווא נפשות רבות והסרנן על כל מה
זמן יד חובתו בפסח יוצא בהן ובקלה
במלתיירו קאי שלוקין אמאי לא שאנ'
בי זירא רבי יוחנן היכי מברך על זית מ'

דקרא כמו שפירשטו ולמדט פירשן :
הכולל דאפיק הוא : מאי קאשמעט ב' .
ת ששטט פ' . ואפילו כדי במילתיה
פ' האדמה : שלקות . כל ירק שלק :
דעך כד המעט : כ' : משום רבי .
רב : שלקות אומר פ' האדמה
ורשמיט פ' ומואל יתא עולא אחר
רבי יוחנן שהכל . הכי הדבר
במחלוקת : ואני אומר . לישב
דבריהם שאין מחלוקין יש מהן פ'י
האדמה ויש מהן שהכל . כל . ירק
הגאל ח' שמחללו פ' האדמה שלק
אפיקה מחלליה לגביהו ואמר
הכל ולקח מוקף לה בחיול וכדי
וכל . ירק שאין דרש ליחלל חי
שמחללו אם אכלו פ' שהכל הוא
מזבן : שלק . והביאו לדרך אפילו
הוא טיגר פ'ו ומבדל בורה פ'י
האדמה : דעך רב נאמן . כ' :
משום רבי . שמואל : שלקות ממד
בורא פ' האדמה והכריז פ'י
רב נחמן מאבד ולא קרי עולא
רבותיה : אחר שלקות שהכל ואני
אומר . שהם מחלוקין בפלוגתא דרבי
מיאיר ורבי יובל ורבי שמואל
דבב' ר' יוחנן כולל מיני ירקות ח'
וחלוקין זה על זה שמואל כרימ' דאמר
מבטל קאי במלכות ור' יוחנן קאי
כר' יוסי : ויאלץ בביתא הפד'ו
במיני דני אכלת מלא של מלוא
וקריין ביה לחם עוני : אבל לא
במבטל . דעו לאי לחם איקרי :
אפילו ר' יוסי מודה . ולענין ברה
במילתיה קאי : אחר כך נאמן קעט
עולא לנשיבתי פ'י . גמתי . (עולא)
שאמר משום ר' יוחנן לעיל שהכל
למד וקבע שבוטו כרבי צימין עד
מאחזקתה בלבו ועבדין אומר צימין
האומר בשם ר' יוחנן : מהי דה
ר' יואל . במחלוקת זו שהזכירה צימין
האומר (ב) מה ענין להכריז דרבי
ר' צימין (א) אלל דרבי ר' חייל דרבי
אזא במחלוקת צימין האומר הכי
איט בראי למחוק עליו : בד מן דין
ובר מן דין . לבר פתחי ראיות
הללו שאמרתי צימין (א) צימין (ב)
כלום אלל רבי חייל קט על בור ראה
שלא אחר רבי יוחנן מימיו שלקות
שהכל : אפי' בורה פ'י האדמה .
אלמא אפי' דשלקיה קאי במלחיה :
שהכל אית מלחיה . פסיה מלוח זה
כמה ימים וקפ' (פסחיה עי') מלחיה
כרוסה : אבל לא בפסחיה . צירקות
של מרור היא טעיה בפרק כל שעה
(דף לה) . לומר שאין יואלץ בלן
שלוקין משום מרור אלמא כל
במלחיה קיימי . שלק ח' יתמוח פ'י
מבטל : דענינו טעם מרור ויובא :
לבר לענין ברה קס פ'י עליו :
בבר

לוי שהכל נהיה בדברו אלא
שברא מתיב רב יצחק בר
שלחן אבל לא כבושין ולא
התם דבעינן מעם מחד
לית' כיון דשקלא לנרעיניה
בצר

[צריף ורח"ש
ליסא לכל זס]

סקרים

ע"י פרש"י
פירושין פ.
[ה' תכ"ז]
לפילגאשין

החלק
השני
[כ]

[illegible]

பெரிய செய்தி

[illegible]

ס' סכסוך למודו

גליון השם
במ' ובלכתא כמנ'א .
פי' מורת חיים סוכד'
ז' עיל ר"ס ר"א :
תוס' ד"ס משכחת לז
ס' שלכ' כוז טוב אחר
בנישול כוז קודם לכן .
פי' ממני' ספ"ז דתרוומה
וכר"ט סס :

The Gemara answers:

שאי התם דבעינן טעם מרור וליכא – It is different there, in the case of *maror*, for we require the taste of *maror*, and it is not there if the bitter herb is pickled, stewed or cooked.^[41]

The Gemara raises a question on the incident cited above:

אמר ליה רבי ירמיה לרבי זעירא – R' Yirmiyah said to R' Zeira: רבי יוחנן היכי מברך על זית מליח – How did R' Yochanan recite a blessing on a salted olive after eating it? כיון דשקילא לגרעיניה – Why, once the pit is taken away,

NOTES

41. Thus, although the stewed herbs retain their status as “fruits of the ground,” which is the deciding factor with regard to the laws of

blessings, they cannot be used for the mitzvah of *maror*, since they do not retain their *taste* (see *Rashi*).

בְּצֵר לִיָּה שִׁיעוּרָא – it has **less than the amount** required for an after-blessing^[1] – ? –

R' Zeira answers:

מי סִבְרַת בְּזוּת גְּדוֹל בְּעֵינָן – He said to [R' Yirmiyah]: **Do you think that we need the volume of a large olive for consumption to qualify as “eating”?**
 – **We need only the volume of a medium olive** – **וְהָא אֵיכָא** – **and that there is in what remains of the olive eaten by R' Yochanan**);^[2] **וְהָוּא**
– and that salted olive which they brought before R' Yochanan and which he ate **וְזֵית גְּדוֹל הָהּ** – **was a large olive,**
– so that even though they removed its pit, – **כֵּן שִׁיעוּרָא** – **there still remained the required amount, which is the volume of a medium olive;**
– for we learned in a Mishnah:^[3] **וְזֵית** – **THE OLIVE THAT THEY [the Rabbis] SPOKE OF** when
 defining “eating” as consuming at least an olive’s volume^[4] **לֹא**
– is NEITHER the SMALL olive, NOR the LARGE olive,
– BUT RATHER THE MEDIUM olive. **וְהָוּא אֲגוּרִי** – **AND THIS IS THE AGURI olive.**^[5]

The Gemara elaborates on the *aguri* olive:

לֹא אֲגוּרִי שְׁמוֹ אֶלֶּא אֲבְרוּטִי – And R' Abahu said: Its true name is not *aguri*, but rather *avrut* is its true name. – אֲבָמְרִי לֵה סְמִירוּטִי שְׁמוֹ – Or, as some say it: Its true name is *samrusi*. – וְלָמָּה נִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ אֲגוּרִי – And why is it called *aguri*? – שְׁשִׁמּוֹנוֹ אֲגוּר בְּתוֹכוֹ – Because its oil is gathered (*agur*) within it.^[6]

The Gemara returns to the original discussion regarding the blessing for cooked vegetables:

נִימָא כְּתַנָּאי – Let us say that the question of whether cooked vegetables retain their original status with regard to blessings is essentially an argument between Tannaim. דִּהְווּ תַרְי תַלְמִידֵי – For there were these two disciples who were sitting before Bar Kappara. הֵבִיאוּ לִפְנֵי דְרוּב – They brought before him^[7] cabbage and *durmashkin*^[8] and partridge meat.^[9] נָתַן בַּר כַּפְּרָא רְשׁוּת לְאַחַד – Bar Kappara gave one of [the disciples] permission to recite the blessing.^[10] תַּרְעוּפֻן – Thereupon, [the disciple] hastened^[11] and recited a *shehakol* blessing on the partridge.^[12] לְגַלְגַּל עָלָיו חֲבִירוֹ – His colleague mocked him for having recited the blessing on the partridge, when he should have recited a blessing on the cabbage.^[13] בָּעַס בַּר כַּפְּרָא – Bar Kappara became angry, וְאָמַר – and he said: לֹא עַל הַמִּכְבֵּר – It is not with the one who wrongly recited the blessing on the partridge that I am now angry, אֱלֹא עַל הַמְלַלְגַּל – but rather it is with the one who mocked him that I am now angry. אִם חֲבִירֶךָ דֹּמָה כְּמִי שֶׁלֹּא טַעַם טַעַם בָּשָׂר – For if your colleague is like one who never tasted the taste of meat in his life,^[14] עָלִי – on what basis did you have the right to mock him? הָיָר וְאָמַר – [Bar Kappara] then said:^[15] לֹא עַל הַמְלַלְגַּל אֲנִי בֹעֵס אֱלֹא עַל הַמִּכְבֵּר אֲנִי – And it is not with the one who mocked that I am now angry, but rather it is with the one who wrongly recited the blessing on the partridge that I am now angry. וְאָמַר – And [Bar Kappara] said in explanation: אִם חֲכָמָה אֵין בְּאֵין זָקְנָה – Even if wisdom is not here, is greater age not

NOTES

1. The Torah states the requirement to recite an after-blessing (with regard to the seven species) with the words (*Deuteronomy* 8:10): וְאָכַלְתָּ וְשָׂבֵעַתָּ וְאָמַרְתָּ בְּרַחֲמֵי יְיָ אֱלֹהֶינוּ, וְיִבְרַךְ אֶתְּהָא, *And you will “eat” and be satiated and you will bless Hashem, your God.* And since the expression “eat” in the Torah denotes the consumption of at least an olive’s volume [a *kezayis*] (see below, 41a-b), the Torah in effect commands one to recite the after-blessing only if one eats an olive’s volume (*Rashi*; see *Tosafos* and *Rosh*). But in the single olive eaten by R’ Yochanan, there was not an olive’s volume of edible fruit, since the olive is composed partly of an inedible pit. How, then, did R’ Yochanan recite a blessing after eating less than an olive’s volume of the fruit? (see *Tosafos* and *Rosh*; see also *Sheleimah Mishnaso*).

[The Gemara's question is only with regard to making an *after-blessing* for less than a *kezayis*. But a prior-blessing must be recited on the smallest amount of food, since (as stated above, 35a) it is forbidden to derive [any] pleasure from this world without first reciting a blessing (*Tosafos*).]

2. [The words וְהָיָה אִתָּךְ, and there is, seem extra in light of the Gemara's elaboration that follows, and are deleted by *Rashash*.]

3. *Keilim* 17:8.

4. *Rashi*. [The same applies to the measure “*kezayis*” mentioned with regard to other laws (*Rashash*).]

5. I.e. the *aguri* olive is the medium olive (*Tiferes Yisrael* ad loc.; see also *Rashi* to *Yoma* 80a דריהו דהתניא). Alternatively, when they spoke of a medium “olive,” they did not refer to the mean of *all* olives, but rather to the mean of the *aguri* olives, of which there is also a variety of sizes (*Mishnah Acharonah* ad loc.).

6. I.e. the oil is not absorbed in the meat of the fruit as are the juices of apples and berries, but is rather collected in the fruit – as in the case of grapes – ready to emerge (*Rashi*; cf. *Yerushalmi* cited by *Eliyahu Rabbah* to *Keilim* ad loc.).

7. [Some texts read הֵבִיאוּ לַפְּנִיָּהֶם, *they brought before "them"* (see *Dikdukei Soferim*).]

8. *Durmaskin* is an herb called orache, or mountain spinach (*Rashi*, as rendered by *Targum HaLaaz*). The cabbage would not be eaten unless it was first cooked (see Gemara above, 38b) [and the orache, too, was cooked].

[*Rashi* cites others who translate *durmaskin* as prunes, but rejects that explanation; see below, end of note 12.]

9. Translation follows *Rashi*, as rendered by *Targum HaLaaz*.

10. [That is, to recite it aloud on behalf of the entire group, who would discharge their obligation to recite a blessing by listening to the recitation and answering "Amen."]

Though these foods were [apparently] brought out in the course of a meal, the blessing on the bread did not cover them since they were not being eaten with the bread. Hence, they required a separate blessing (*Rashi* below ד"ה וקח אין באן; see below, 41b with *Rashi* שלא מומחז ד"ה). [According to other Rishonim, however, these foods would not require a separate blessing if eaten in the course of a meal, even if they are not actually eaten with the bread (see *Tosafos* to 41b להכחא ד"ה).]

[According to some commentators, *Rashi* assumes that these foods were brought out in the course of the meal because, in *Rashi's* view, one cannot recite the blessing for food on behalf of other participants unless they are joined together at a bread meal (see *Sheleimah Mishnaso* and *Meromei Sadeh*; see also *Pnei Yehoshua* to *Tosafot* ד"ה וכן ו *Tzalach* to *Rashi* ר"ה אין באן .)]

11. [Literally: jumped.] I.e. without first consulting Bar Kappara as to which food he should recite the blessing on (see *Sheleimah Mishnaso*).

12. As the Gemara will explain, this disciple held that the blessing for all three foods was the same (see below), so that one blessing would cover them all. Therefore, he was supposed to recite that one blessing on the meat, because it was the food that appealed most to him [see Mishnah below. 40b].

[*Rashi* (above ד"ה דורמסקין) rejects the translation of *durmaskin* as “prunes,” for the blessing on prunes is the specific *ha'eitz* blessing, and the disciple would certainly not have made the general *shehakol* blessing on the partridge before making the specific *ha'eitz* blessing on the prunes. *R' Akiava Eiger* (in *Gilyon HaShas*) finds difficulty with *Rashi's* proof: Although prunes are indeed a “fruit of the tree,” the blessing on cooked prunes would be *shehakol*, according to this disciple (who holds that cooked vegetables lose their original status) and – by the same token – on cooked fruits as well! *Meromei Sadeh*, however, defends *Rashi's* proof. *Rashi* means that the blessing on the prunes must be *ha'eitz* because they are generally eaten raw rather than cooked. Hence, if the *durmaskin* were prunes, they were presumably being served raw, and their blessing indeed would have been *ha'eitz*.]

13. For reasons that the Gemara will explain.

14. And for whom the meat was therefore the most appealing of the foods (*Rashi*).

15. See *Maharsha* in *Chidushei Aggados*.

ביצד מברכין פרק ששי ברכות

כלל ליה שיעורא - וגבי ברכת פירות הארץ אכילה כתיבה ואכילה
בכיות : כיות שיעורא - לענין שיעור כל אכילות : אכילת פירות : מוזמן
ללכת ממנו שאינו נכלל בפרי כמסקה הפוסקים וכוונתם אלא אכילת
כמסקה ענינים : אף הן שלקות מעט שקורין אקדלש'ים

בצד ליה שיעורא - היינו דוקא בצרכה שלאחריו דבעינן שיעור
אכל בצרכה שלפניו אשילו פחות מכשיעור דאסור ליהנות
בעולם הוה בלא בצרכה בין לענין אכילה בין לענין שיהיה אכל בצרכה
שלאחריו בעינן שיעור מלא וגמיו על כן יש לומר לשמות מכוון של
בצרכה מלא וגמיו כדי שיכרך

בצד ליה שיעורא אמר ליה מי סברת כיות
גדול בעינן כיות בינוני בעינן (והא איכא)
והדא דאיתו לקמיה דרבי יוחנן וית גדול
היה דאע"ג דשקלאה לנרעיותיה פש ליה
שיעורא דחנן "וית שאמרו לא קמן ולא
גדול אלא בינוני והוה אגורי ואמר רבי אבדו
לא אגורי שמו אלא אברוס שמו ואמרי לה
סברוסי שמו ולמה נקרא שמו אגורי ששמו
אגור בחובו נימא כותנא דהגדו חרי תלמידי
ידעו יתבי קמיה דבר קפרא הביאו לפניו
כרוב ודורמסקין ופרגיות נחן בר קפרא
רשות לאחד מהן לברך קפץ וברך על
הפרגיות לגלג עליו חבירו כעס בר קפרא
אמר לא על המברך אני כועס אלא על
המלגלג אני כועס אם חביך דומה כמי שלא
מעם מעם בשר מעולם אתה על מה לגלגת
עליו חזר ואמר לא על המלגלג אני כועס
אלא על המברך אני כועס ואמר אם חבמה
אין כאן וקנה אין כאן תנא ושניהם לא הוציאו
שנחן מאי לאו ביה קא מיפלגי דמברך
סבר שלקות ופרגיות שהכל נהיה בדברו
הלכך חביב עדיף ומלגלג סבר שלקות ב"פ
האדמה פרגיות שהכל נהיה בדברו יהלכך
פירא עדיף לא דכ"ע שלקות ופרגיות שהכל
נהיה בדברו והכא ביהא סברא קא מיפלגי
מי סבר חביב עדיף ומי סבר כרוב עדיף
דיון אמר ר' יורא כי היינו בי רב הונא אמר
לן הני גרגילי דלפתא פרימינו פרימא רבא
בפד"א פרימא זוטא שהכל נהיה בדברו וכי
אתאן לבי רב יהודה אמר לן "אידי ואידי
בפד"א והאי דפרימינו טפי כי היכי דנמחק
מעמיה אמר רב אשי כי היינו בי רב כרנא
אמר לן תבשילא דסלקא דלא מפשו בה
קמחא בורא פרי האדמה דלפתא דמפשו בה
קמחא טפי בורא מיני מזונות והדר אמר
"אידי ואידי בורא פרי האדמה והאי דרשי
בה קמחא טפי לרבוך תבשילא עבדי לה
אמר רב חסדא *תבשיל של תרדין יפה ללב
וטוב לעינים וכו"ש לבני מעים אמר אביי
והוא דיתוב אבי תפי ועבדי *תוך תוך אמר
רב פפא פשיטא לי "מיא דסלקא כסלקא
ומיא דלפתא כלפתא ומיא דכולהו שלק
ככולהו שלק בעי רב פפא מיא דשיבתא
מאי למחוק מעמא עבדי או לעבורי וזהמא
עבדי לה ח"ש *השבת משנתנה מעם
בקדירה אין בה משום תרומה ואינה
מפסמא טומאת אוכלים שמע מינה למחוק

לחמיו מעין ג' ברכות "והר"י היה
אומר בצרכה נפשות כיון דללא בצרכה
חשובה היא אפי' בצרכה נפשות רבות ולא
מברכין בורא נפשות רבות ולא
נראה דיון דבורא נפשות חקטס
כגדעל הגפן כי היכי דעל הגפן בעי
שיעורא בצרכה נפשות רבות נמי בעי
שיעורא וזכרונתו ר' יוחנן היכי
ברך אית האל לא הוה שיעורא וקאמר
משום בריה דאשיל לא אכל אלא
פרידה אחת על ענב או פרידה אחת
של רמון בעי ברכי משום דבכריה
מברכין אשילו פחות מכיות וחולק על
גמרא דיון דמחשבת הכא איכא חס
הלכה כמותו של ירושלמי (ה) פריה יוסי
היה מפרש שהיושלים אשיל חולק על
גמרא שלט דהכא מיירי שהסברו
הגרענים ונמלה אפי' לא אכל
כברייא אכל אלא אשיל שלם אפי' חס
היה פרידה אחת של רמון מברך עליו
חולה וסוף וגמרא ירושל' היה סבר
שהיות היה שלם ולכן הולך לתוך
באורו ענין דאכל פרידה *דבריהם
ואין חולקים יחד וסוף כי בירושלמי
היכל דברך אומרוסא למיכליה
ונפל מידיה וסוף אחריתא בעי ברכי
זמנא אחריתא ופירך מאי שאל מחמת
המים פירוש דמברך לשמות והכי
אולי והכי אחריתא פירא וז"ל לברך
פעם אחרת ומשני הכא הוה דעסו
מחמת לא הוה יודע שילט לכן
אכל בחורמוסא לא ידע שילט מידו
ויאמר בריך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם
ועד משום דהוה בצרכה נפשות וכן
נכון לומר על כל בצרכה נפשות
בשכמל' דורמסקין פירש' דכסמון
משמע דמברכין עליהן בורא פרי
האדמה וא"כ בורא פרי העץ בעי
ברוכי ונראה שהוא מין כרוב :
נתן בר קפרא רשות לאחד מהן
לברך - ונראה דמיירי בצרכה
שלפניו דאי בשל אחריו הא אמרינן
(חולין קי) דלון מוזמן על הפירות
"ומיירי בהבט ואלו אין לו שום
הכנה אלא על הפת ולכן לברך
כל אחד על כל דבר הן בפירות הן
בין : חביב עדיף - וכן הלכה
אם יש לו שני מיני פירות לפניו חביב
עדיף ובורא פרי האדמה עדיף
משהכל נהיה בדברו דמברכת טפי
וחשובה לעולם מקריה ויברך על
אחת המין שש"ך זו פרי האדמה אף
על פי שאלתו המין שיש לברך עליו
שהכל חביב עליו ואם לפניו פירות
שהכל שוות ואחד מהן הוא מין
המין יברך חתלה על אותו של 'ו'
המין דעדיף : מיא דסלקא
כסלקא - מברכין עליה בורא פרי
האדמה אף על פי שאין בה אלא מים

כלל פ' ה'
מבנה ה'

[לוקח ב']

[דברים הם ואין ס'
נ']

הגדות הב"ח
(ה) חות' ד"ס ב"ר וס'
וא"ר יוסף ב"ר אבנא

גליון הש"ס

רש"י ד"ס דורמסקין ס'
ברכות
נפשי' - ק"ל הא גם
נפשי' עדיף משכיל אלא
דמברך סבר דשלקת
מברך שכל - וא"כ נ"כ
נפשי' אין נכנסו נפשי'
אלא שכל כמסא'
כסא' נ"כ וזו מלה
נפשי' רש"י ד"ס וסבד
סוף וס' קול סוף סוף
מסמך סוף פירא נפשי'
ד"ס ר' יעקבא - תוס'
ר' ב"ר וס' מלא נפשי'
מ"י שיעור - מ"י ל"ל ל"י
פירא' ד"ס מן ר"ג :
בא"ד ובר"ה וס' וס'
מ"י לקח מ"י סוף
ר' וס' וס' וס' וס'
חולין ק"י פירא וס' ד"ס
ש"ס :

וטעם הירקות מברך עליהן כאשר יברך על הירקות אע"ג דאמרין לעיל דמי פירות זיעה בעלמא הוא יש לחלק : פת נטמה בקערה
מברכין עליה המזיגה להם מן הארץ ופליגא דר' חייא - וא"כ היכי מיירי אם יש שלמה לפניו הא אמרינן בסמוך דכ"ע שלמה
עדיף ולי ליה אלא נטמה היכי פליג עלה ר' חייא הא מסקינן לעיל (דף לז) פרוין אף על פי שאין בהן כיות מברכין
עליהן המזיגה וא"כ ולי כהו חוריתא דנחמא וי"ל כהו דחכא שלמה לפניו וכלהו מן האדמה רב חייא בר אשי סבר דהוי
כמו שלמה מאחר שהיא חביבה [מברך עליה] ור' חייא ס"ל לירך שכלה בצרכה עס הפת ואם כן בעינן שכלה בצרכה
עס בליעת הפת וכיון שכלה קודם לכן שלמה עדיף אלא לי ליה שלמה מודה שיכרך על הפירות *המזיגה להם מן הארץ :
ואל

[וה"פ שם
מנחת סב'
ד"ס אשיל]

here? I.e. even if you would not consider me a greater scholar, am I not undeniably one who is older than you, and whom you should have therefore consulted as to which food to recite the blessing on?^[16] **הָיָא – It was taught in a Baraisa regarding these two disciples that Bar Kappara rebuked: וְשְׁנֵיהֶם לֹא הוֹצִיאוּ שָׁנָתָן – AND NEITHER OF THEM LIVED OUT THE YEAR.**

The Gemara now attempts to show that these two disciples of Bar Kappara, who were themselves Tannaim,^[17] disagreed as to which blessing is recited on cooked vegetables:

הָיָא – Now, is it not that they disagree in the following point? דְּמַבְרֵךְ סֵבֶר שְׁלֵקוֹת וּפְרָגִיּוֹת שֶׁהֵבֵל נִהְיָה בְּרֵבְרוֹ – Namely, that the one who recited the blessing on the partridge holds that the blessing both for cooked vegetables^[18] and partridge is *that everything came into being through His word*.^[19] הֵלֶכֶךְ חֲבִיב עֲדִיף – Therefore, since all three foods warrant the same blessing, the favorite food takes precedence, and the blessing is recited on it.^[20] וּמִלְּגֵל סֵבֶר שְׁלֵקוֹת בּוֹרָא פְּרִי – But the one who mocked holds that the blessing for cooked vegetables is *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*, פְּרָגִיּוֹת שֶׁהֵבֵל נִהְיָה בְּרֵבְרוֹ – while the blessing for partridge is *that everything came into being through His word*.^[21] הֵלֶכֶךְ פִּינְיָ עֲדִיף – Therefore, the fruit of the ground takes precedence with regard to blessing, since its blessing is more specific, and his colleague should have recited the blessing on the vegetable first.^[22]

The Gemara rejects this assertion:

לֹא – No, this is not necessarily so. דְּכוּלֵי עֲלָמָא שְׁלֵקוֹת וּפְרָגִיּוֹת – It might be that all [i.e. both disciples] agree that the blessing for both cooked vegetables and partridge is *that everything came into being through His word*. וְהָאִי בְּהָאִי – And here, it is in this point that they [the two disciples] disagree: מֶר סֵבֶר חֲבִיב עֲדִיף – One master [the one who recited the blessing on the partridge] holds that since both foods have the same blessing, the favorite food takes precedence with regard to blessing, וְיָמֵר סֵבֶר כְּרִיב עֲדִיף דְּרִינִין – while the other master holds that the cabbage takes precedence (over the partridge) because it provides sustenance.^[22]

The Gemara turns to discuss the proper blessing to be recited on a different food:

When we were at the academy of Rav Huna, אָמַר רַבִּי זִירָא – R' Zeira said: כִּי הָיוּנוּ בִּי רַב הוּנָא – he said to us: בְּרַמִּינְהוּ – In regard to these turnip heads, בּוֹרָא פְּרִי – if one cut them into large pieces, הָאֲדָמָה – the blessing for them is *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*;^[23] פְּרִימָא וּסְטָא – if he cut them into small pieces, שֶׁהֵבֵל נִהְיָה בְּרֵבְרוֹ – the blessing for them is *that everything came into being through His word*.^[24] וְכִי אָתָּאנוּ לְבֵי רַב יְהוּדָה – But when we came to the academy of Rav Yehudah, אָמַר לָן – [Rav Yehudah] said to us: אִידִי וְאִידִי בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה – For both these large pieces and those small pieces, the blessing is *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*. וְהָאִי דְּפִרְמִינְהוּ טְפִי – And that which they cut it excessively small כִּי הֵיכִי דְּנִמְתִּיק – is so that its taste should be sweeter.^[25]

The Gemara records what another Amora learned at the academy regarding the proper blessing on a particular food:

When we were at the academy of Rav Kahana, אָמַר לָן – he said to us: תַּבְשִׁילָא דְּסִלְקָא דְּלֹא מַפְשֵׁי בֵּה קִמְחָא – For the cooked beet dish, to which they do not add a lot of flour, בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה – the blessing is *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*.^[26] בְּרַמִּינְהוּ – But for the cooked dish of turnips, to which they add a lot of flour, בּוֹרָא מִינֵי מְזוֹנוֹת – the blessing is *the One Who creates species of sustenance*.^[27] וְהָדֵר אָמַר – But [Rav Kahana] then retracted and said: אִידִי וְאִידִי בּוֹרָא פְּרִי – For both this beet dish and that turnip dish, the blessing is *the One Who creates the fruit of the ground*, וְהָאִי דְּשָׁרִי בֵּה קִמְחָא טְפִי – and that which they pour more flour into it לְרִבּוּקִי בְּעֲלָמָא עֲבָדִי לָהּ – they do simply for purposes of adhesion.^[28]

Having discussed the blessing for the cooked beet dish, the Gemara describes the dish's benefits:

A תַּבְשִׁיל שֶׁל תְּרִדִין נֶפֶחַ לֵלֶב – Rav Chisda said: אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא – A dish of cooked beets is healthy for the heart – וְטוֹב לְעֵינַיִם – and is certainly good for the eyes, וְכָל שֶׁנֶּחֱסֵן לְבָנֵי מַעֲיָן – and is certainly good for the digestive tract. אָמַר אַבְי – Abaye said: וְהוּא יָשׁוּב וְהָיָה כִּי תִפְּסֵם – And this is provided that [the dish] sat on the stove until the beets became so soft that they made a bubbling “tuch tuch” sound while cooking.^[29]

NOTES

16. See *Rashi* and *Ritva*.

17. This is evident from the fact that the Gemara will now attempt to show from their respective views that the question of which blessing to make on cooked vegetables is, in the words of the Gemara above, כְּתָנָא, [an argument between] Tannaim. [Dikdukei Soferim, however, finds it surprising that the disciples of Bar Kappara (who, though considered a Tanna himself, lived at the beginning of the Amoraic era – see *Seder HaDoros* (ע' בר קפרא) should be reckoned “Tannaim,” and he cites other texts, in which the critical phrase כְּתָנָא is absent.]

18. In this case, the cooked cabbage and orache.

19. That the blessing on the meat is *shehakol* is stated in the Mishnah below, 40b (see *Rashi*).

20. See above, note 12.

21. The one who mocked held that the blessing for the cooked vegetables is *haadamah*. This blessing, because it is specific (“the fruits of the ground”), is more significant than the general *shehakol* blessing, and is recited on a more significant food [as evidenced by the fact that the Sages instituted a specific blessing for it]. Hence, the *haadamah* blessing should have come first (see *Rashi*).

22. As taught in a Baraisa below [44b], cabbage provides sustenance (*Rashi*).

[See *Ritva*, concerning which of the two explanations of the disciples' differences is considered the correct one with regard to the halachah.]

23. The Gemara is now referring to one who eats the raw vegetable [and is no longer discussing the case of cooked vegetables] (*Rashi*; cf. *Rashi*,

as cited by *Meiri*).

24. For in Rav Huna's view the fine dicing effects a change for the worse [from the turnip's original state; thus, it does not retain its status as a “fruit of the ground”] (*Rashi*; cf. *Ritva*).

25. [Thus, the fine dicing effects a positive change, and the turnip is considered to still be in the ultimate state envisioned by the one who planted it. (See also *Ritva*.)]

26. Though Rav and Shmuel ruled above that *mezonos* is recited on a food containing even a small amount of flour (see 36b-37a), that applies only where the flour is added as an essential food component [i.e. to enhance the flavor (*Rashba* to 37b דְּרִיבָּא) or so that the dish be more filling (*Tosafos* to 36b כִּלְיָא)]. The small amount of flour added to the beet dish, however, is done only to improve the dish's consistency; the flour is thus not an essential food component and is subordinate to the dish (see Gemara below; *Divrei David*).

27. For when that much flour is added to the dish, the flour is apparently intended for its food value as well. Thus, the ruling of Rav and Shmuel (see preceding note) applies, and *mezonos* is recited (*Divrei David*).

28. Rav Kahana concludes that even the considerable amount of flour added to the turnip dish is done only for purposes of adhesion and not for the flour's food value. Thus, the flour is subordinate to the dish even in this case (*Divrei David*).

29. [“Tuch tuch” is an imitation of the bubbling sound made by the cooking beets.]