

21 Elul 5772
Sept. 8, 2012



Brachos Daf 38

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Bread Baked in the Ground

Abaye asked Rav Yosef what *brachah* is made on a loaf of the ground? Rav Yosef said that it is just a simple mixing of dough (*for it is a very soft batter*), and not proper bread, and therefore one says *Mezonos* on it (*for it is more like a pastry – a snack, and not a meal*). Mar Zutra would make a meal out of it, and then say *Hamotzi* and a full *Birkas Hamazon* (*Grace after Meal*) afterwards. Mar bar Rav Ashi says that one may fulfill his obligation to eat *matzah* (*on Passover*) with such loaves, as it is *lechem oni – bread of poverty*, the verse’s term for *matzah*. (38a)

Fruit Juice

Mar bar Rav Ashi also says that one says *She-hakol* on date honey, as it is only considered an excretion and not the fruit itself.

The *Gemora* notes that this is consistent with Rabbi Yehoshua, who says that if one mistakenly drinks date honey, apple juice, and vinegar of unripened grapes of *terumah*, he isn’t liable for the standard “additional fifth” payment to the *Kohen*, as this is not considered actual fruits of *terumah*. (38a)

Mashed Fruits

A sage asked Rava what *brachah* one makes on *terima*, but Rava didn’t know what he meant. Ravina was sitting there, and he asked the sage whether he meant a *terima* of sesame, karkum, or grape leaves? From Ravina’s questions, Rav remembered what *terima* meant, so he told the sage that he obviously meant something mashed, and he reminded him of

Rav Assi’s statement that one may make *terumah* dates into a *terima* mash, but not into beer, indicating that the mash is still considered the original fruit. The *Gemora* therefore rules that one says *Ha’eitz* on date mash, as it is considered to be in its original form. (38a)

Flour and Water

The *Gemora* cites two opinions about the *brachah* for *shetisa*, a dish made of flour from roasted grain kernels. Rav says one says *She-hakol*, while Shmuel says one says *Mezonos*.

Rav Chisda says that they are not disagreeing, as Rav is referring to a thin consistency, which is used as a medicine, while Shmuel is referring to a thick consistency, which is for eating.

Rav Yosef challenges this from the *Mishna* which says that one may mix *shetos* (i.e., *shetisa*) on *Shabbos*, indicating that it is not medicinal, as one may not prepare medicine on *Shabbos*.

Abaye deflects this, as the *Mishna* also says that one may eat or drink any foods, even for medicinal purposes. Therefore, *shetisa* is a food which one may eat on *Shabbos*, even if it is effective as a medicine.

Another version says that Abaye concluded that the *Mishna* means that one may ingest *shetisa*, even if he also gets a health benefit from it.

The *Gemora* explains that although the *Mishna* teaches that it is a food, we may have thought that one says no *brachah*, since he is eating it for the express purpose of medicine. Rav and



Shmuel therefore had to teach that one makes a *brachah*, as he nonetheless gets benefit from eating it. (38a)

Text of the Brachah on Bread

The *Mishna* said that bread, although it grows from the ground, has the special *brachah* of *Hamotzi*.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* in which the Sages say that the text of the *brachah* is *Hamotzi lechem – the one who brings bread [out of the ground]*, while Rabbi Nechemia says that the text is *motzi lechem – [the] one who brings bread [out of the ground]*.

Rava explains that both opinions agree that one may say *Motzi*, as this implies a past tense, as we find in the verse which refers to Hashem as the strong One, *motziam – who took them out from Egypt*. Their dispute is about the word *Hamotzi*. The Sages say that this also implies past tense, as we find in the verse, which says that Hashem is *Hamotzi – the One who took out for you water from a hard rock*. Rabbi Nechemia says that it only implies present tense, as the verse at the time of the slavery in Egypt refers to Hashem as *Hamotzi – who is taking you out from under the burdens of Egypt*. The Sages say that this verse should be read to mean that when Hashem will take the Jewish people out, He will ensure that they will know that He is *Hamotzi – the one who took you out...*

The Sages told Rabbi Zeira that the son of Rav Zevid, the brother of Rabbi Shimon bar Zevid, is a great man, who is well versed in the rules of *brachos*. He told them to bring Rav Zevid's son to him when he arrives. When he arrived, they brought him to Rabbi Zeira. Rabbi Zeira gave him bread to make a *brachah* on, and he said *Motzi*. Rabbi Zeira wondered how they considered him well versed in *brachos*. If he would have said *Hamotzi*, it would have taught us how to rule on this *brachah*, and how to understand the verse correctly. However, now that he said *Motzi*, we learned nothing, as all agree that it implies past tense. The *Gemora* explains that he said *Motzi* to avoid entering the dispute of the Sages and Rabbi Nechemia. The *Gemora* rules like the Sages. (38a – 38b)

Cooked Greens

The *Mishna* continues with the *brachah* on greens.

The *Gemora* says that the *Mishna's* placement of greens after bread implies that just as bread is something which changed form due to heat (*i.e., baking*), so the greens includes something which changed form due to heat (*i.e., cooking*).

Ravnai cites Abaye saying that this teaches that one says *Ha'adamah* on cooked greens.

Rav Chisda taught in the name of our teacher (*i.e., Rav*) that one says *Ha'adamah* on cooked greens, but our Sages who came down from *Eretz Yisroel (i.e., Ulla in the name of Rabbi Yochanan)* says that one says *She-hakol*.

Rav Chisda himself says that anything that is initially *Ha'adamah* becomes *She-hakol* when cooked, and anything that is initially *She-hakol* becomes *Ha'adamah* when cooked.

The *Gemora* explains that examples of the first case are cabbage, beets, and gourds, and examples of the second are garlic and leeks.

Rav Nachman taught in the name of our teacher (*i.e. Shmuel*) that one says *Ha'adamah* on cooked greens, while our Sages who came down from *Eretz Yisroel* say that one says *She-hakol* on them.

Rav Nachman says that this depends on an earlier dispute of *Tannaim* about fulfilling the commandment of *matzah* with a cooked wafer. The *braisa* cites Rabbi Meir saying that one fulfills the commandment of *matzah* with a soaked or cooked wafer, while Rabbi Yosi says that one may not fulfill it with a cooked wafer.

The *Gemora* rejects this, as perhaps both Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yosi agree that one says *Ha'adamah* on cooked greens, but Rabbi Yosi disqualifies it for *matzah*, as one must taste the *matzah*, which is lost when cooked.

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba quotes Rabbi Yochanan saying that one says *Ha'adamah* on cooked greens, while Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefes quotes him saying that one say *She-hakol*.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says that Ulla, who heard incorrect information from Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefes, proceeded to



establish this mistake by attributing it to Rabbi Yochanan himself.

Rabbi Zeira was amazed how Rabbi Chiya bar Abba and Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefes are mentioned together in this dispute. Rabbi Chiya bar Abba is very precise when learning from his teacher, and reviewed all his learning every 30 days, but Rabbi Binyamin bar Yefes does neither.

In any case, when they asked Rabbi Yochanan about a *turmus* (*bean*) cooked seven times and served as dessert, and he said to say *Ha'adamah*. And furthermore, Rabbi Chiya bar Abba also said that he saw Rabbi Yochanan eat a salted olive (*which is tantamount to a cooked one*), and say a *brachah* before and after. If he considered it unaltered by salting, he said *Ha'eitz* before and al *Ha'eitz* after, but if he considered it altered, he would have said *She-hakol* before, but what did he say after (*for perhaps, a Borei nefashos is only recited after eating eggs or meat*)?

The *Gemora* deflects this, as he may have said *Borei nefashos* afterwards.

Rav Yitzchak bar Shmuel challenges this ruling from the *Mishna* about the species of *maror*, which says that one fulfills the obligation of *maror* (*on Passover*) with the green or its stalk, but not if they are pickled, cooked, or overcooked. If cooking a green doesn't alter it, why does one not fulfill the obligation with a cooked *maror*?

The *Gemora* deflects this, since one needs the full taste of *maror* to fulfill the obligation, so cooking makes it unfit. (38b)

What's a K'zayis?

Rabbi Yirmiyah asked Rabbi Zeira how Rabbi Yochanan said a *brachah* after eating one olive, as it was less than the minimum *k'zayis* – *olive size measurement* once he removed the pit.

Rabbi Zeira answered that for purposes of the *brachah*, one only eat the size of an olive laden with oil, but not a large one, but Rabbi Yochanan's olive was a large one, leaving the minimum size even after removing the pit.

Rabbi Zeira proves this from a *Mishna* which says that the size of *k'zayis* is based not on a small or large one, but an average one, called *agori*. Rabbi Avahu explains that its proper name is *abruti*, but it is called *agori* as it has its oil *agur* – *enclosed* in it. (38b – 39a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Fruit Juice and Cooking

The *Gemora* says that one says *She-hakol* on date honey, as this juice is considered only an excretion.

The Rosh (12) cites the Behag who limits this statement to date honey mixed with water, but pure date honey is still *Ha'eitz*.

All other Rishonim disagree, and the Shulchan Aruch (202:8) therefore rules that only the juice of grapes and olives are considered the fruit itself, and all others are *She-hakol*.

The *Gemora* rules that cooked vegetables, which are normally eaten cooked, and their broth are *Ha'adamah*.

The Rosh (18) asks why this broth retains the *brachah* of vegetable, while the juice squeezed from a fruit is *She-hakol*.

The Rosh suggests that what is extracted from a fruit by cooking is more a part of the fruit than its juice. Therefore, it is possible that one would say *Ha'eitz* on water in which a fruit was soaked, as that is tantamount to cooking.

The Rashba disagrees, and explains that cooking vegetables is the normal way of preparing them, and therefore the product retains the *brachah*. However, fruit is not normally squeezed for its juice, and therefore the juice is *She-hakol*.

The Rosh (Responsa 4:15) says that the broth of cooked vegetables is *Ha'adamah* only when the cooking is normally done in order to eat the vegetables.

The Chazon Ish (OH 33:5) says that juice of oranges grown for juicing would be *Ha'eitz*, since this is the normal way of eating it.



In the case of fruit soaked or cooked in water, the Shulchan Aruch (202:10) cites both the Rosh (*on the Gemora*) and Rashba's position, while in the case of fruit juice, the Shulchan Aruch (205:2) rules like the Rosh.

See Ve'sen *Brachah* (Rabbi Bodner) page 438, note 29.1 for a discussion about the *brachah* on clear borscht.

Mashed Fruits

The *Gemora* rules that *terima* – *mashed fruit* retains its original *brachah*.

The Rishonim differ in their definition of a mashed fruit.

Rashi implies that *terima* is only partially mashed.

The Terumas Hadeshen (29) says that it still retains some of its original form, and is recognizable.

The Rambam (Brachos 8:4) says that one says *Ha'eitz* even if one made a cake out of figs.

The Mishnah Berurah (202:42) rules that as long as the fruit is recognizable, one should say *Ha'eitz*, but otherwise *She-hakol*.

The Ben Ish Hai (Rav Pe'alim 2:28) and Rav Ben Tzion Abba Shaul maintain that this is what the Rambam and Shulchan Aruch say as well, while Rav Ovadia Yosef (Chazon Ovadia *brachos* p. 132) says that they say that one would say *Ha'eitz* even if the fruit isn't recognizable.

See Yabia Omer (7:29 and addendums, p. 427) for a discussion of falafel balls.

Eating One Fruit

The *Gemora* asks how Rabbi Yochanan could have said a *brachah acharonah* on one olive, as it was less than a *k'zayis*, once he removed the pit. The *Gemora* answers that it was a large olive, leaving a *k'zayis* without the pit.

Tosfos (39a batzar) cites the Yerushalmi which answers the question by saying that one says a *brachah acharonah* on a *berya* – *full unit*, even if it is less than *k'zayis*.

The Rishonim differ on whether we accept the Yerushalmi, and what exactly the definition of a *berya* is.

The Rambam and Rif do not cite the Yerushalmi, indicating that they felt that the Yerushalmi is disputing the Bavli, and we therefore do not accept it.

The Rosh and Rabbenu Yonah suggest that the Yerushalmi was commenting on a different story, and we may therefore also rule like the Yerushalmi.

The Shulchan Aruch (210:1) cites these Rishonim, and therefore advises that one should not eat a full *berya* if not eating a full *k'zayis* measure.