

22 Elul 5772
Sept. 9, 2012



Brachos Daf 39

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"n

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

Blessing on Cooked Vegetables

The *Gemora* suggests that this dispute (*about the blessing to be said over cooked vegetables*) is found amongst the *Tannaim*, for once two disciples were sitting before Bar Kappara, and they brought before him cabbage, *durmaskin* (*an herb called orache*) and partridge meat. [*Both the cabbage and durmaskin were eaten only after being cooked.*] Bar Kappara gave permission to one of them to recite the blessing (*and to discharge the obligation of the others*), and he jumped up and recited the blessing (*of She-hakol*) over the meat. The other disciple laughed at him (*for he maintained that the blessing should be recited over the vegetable*), and Bar Kappara became angry. He said: I am not angry with the one who recited the blessing, but with the one who laughed. [*He explained:*] If your colleague acts like one who has never tasted meat in his life (*and that is why he concluded that the blessing should be recited over it, for the meat was more appealing to him than the vegetables, and the rule is: when two foods with the same blessing are before a person, he recites the blessing over the food which is more appealing to him*), is that any reason for you to laugh? Then he reversed himself and said: [*He explained:*] I am not angry with the one who laughed, but with the one who recited the blessing. If there is no wisdom here (*for you do not consider me a Torah scholar*), is there not old age here (*and for that reason, you should have consulted with me*)? It was taught in a *braisa*: Neither of them lived the year out.

Now, does their difference (*of opinion between the two disciples*) lie in this: the one who recited the blessing maintained that the blessing over both cooked vegetables and meat is '*She-hakol nih'yeh bid'varo*' -- 'that everything came into being through His word,' and therefore the food which was more appealing to him took precedence, while the one who

laughed held that the blessing over cooked vegetables is '*Borei peri ha'adamah*' -- 'the One Who creates the fruit of the ground,' and that over meat is '*She-hakol nih'yeh bid'varo*' -- 'that everything came into being through His word,' and therefore the vegetables should take precedence (*for 'Borei peri ha'adamah' is regarded as a 'more specific' blessing than 'She-hakol,' and the rule is that a blessing with more specificity to it takes precedence over a blessing that is more general*).

The *Gemora* disagrees and states that all may agree that for both cooked vegetables and meat the blessing is '*She-hakol nih'yeh bid'varo*' -- 'that everything came into being through His word,' and their difference (*of opinion*) lies in the following: one disciple maintained that what is more appealing should take precedence, and the other held that the cabbage should take precedence, because it provides sustenance.

Rabbi Zeira said: When we were at Rav Huna's school, he told us that with regard to the heads of turnips (*when eaten raw*), if they are cut into large pieces, the blessing is '*Borei peri ha'adamah*' -- 'the One Who creates the fruit of the ground,' but if they are cut into small pieces, the blessing is '*She-hakol nih'yeh bid'varo*' -- 'that everything came into being through His word' (*for the cutting into fine pieces is a change for the worse*). But when we came to Rav Yehudah's school, he told us that for both the blessing is '*Borei peri ha'adamah*' -- 'the One Who creates the fruit of the ground,' and the reason for their being cut into very small pieces is to make them taste sweeter.

Rav Ashi said: When we were at Rav Kahana's school, he told us that over a dish of cooked beets, in which a lot of flour is not added, the blessing is '*Borei peri ha'adamah*' -- 'the One Who creates the fruit of the ground,' but for a dish of cooked turnips, in which a lot of flour is added, the blessing is '*Borei*



minei mezonos -- 'the One Who creates species of sustenance.' He then retracted and said that the blessing for both is '*Borei peri ha'adamah*' -- 'the One Who creates the fruit of the ground,' since the reason why a lot of flour is added in it is only to make it stick together.

Rav Chisda said: A dish of cooked beets is beneficial for the heart and good for the eyes, and needless to say for the digestive tract.

Abaye said: This is only if it is left on the stove until they make a "tuch tuch" sound (*from being boiled*).

Rav Pappa said: It is obvious to me that the water of cooked beets is just the same as the beets themselves (*and the blessing over the "soup" is 'Borei peri ha'adamah'*), and the water of cooked turnips is just the same as the turnips themselves (*and the blessing over the "soup" is 'Borei peri ha'adamah'*), and the water of all cooked vegetables is just the same as the vegetables themselves (*and the blessing over the "soup" is 'Borei peri ha'adamah'*). Rav Pappa, however, inquired: What about the water of cooked dill? Is its main purpose to sweeten the taste (*of the dish, and therefore 'ha'adamah' should be recited*), or is its purpose to remove the evil odor (*from the dish, and therefore 'She-hakol' should be recited*)?

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the following *Mishna*: Dill, as soon as it has imparted some flavor to a dish of food, it is no longer subject to the restrictions of *terumah*, and it is no longer susceptible to food *tumah*. This proves that its main purpose is to sweeten the dish, does it not? The *Gemora* concludes that it does. (39a)

Blessing and the Breaking of Bread

Rabbi Chiya bar Ashi said: Over dry bread which has been put in a bowl (*to soak*), the blessing is '*Ha-motzi*' -- 'the One Who brings forth bread (*from the ground*).' [*This is so even though the bread is now in small pieces.*]

The *Gemora* notes that this view conflicts with that of Rabbi Chiya, for Rabbi Chiya said: The bread should be broken with the conclusion of the blessing (*and accordingly, the blessing here should have been recited on a whole loaf*).

Rava asked on this. What is the reason regarding (*why Ha-hamotzi should not be recited over*) the dry bread? It is because that when the blessing is concluded, it is concluded over a broken piece; but when it is said over a whole loaf (*what is the advantage, seeing that*), it finishes over a broken piece (*as well*)!?

Rather, said Rava, the blessing is said first and then the loaf is broken.

The *Gemora* notes that the Nehardeans conducted themselves as prescribed by Rabbi Chiya (*breaking the bread as the blessing is being concluded*), while the Rabbis acted as prescribed by Rava (*breaking the loaf only after the blessing is concluded*).

Ravina said: Mother told me, "Your father acted as prescribed by Rabbi Chiya, for Rabbi Chiya said: The bread should be broken with the conclusion of the blessing, whereas the Rabbis acted as prescribed by Rava.

The *Gemora* issues a ruling: The *halachah* is in accordance with Rava, who says that one says the blessing first and afterwards breaks the loaf.

It has been stated: If pieces of bread and whole loaves are brought before a person, Rav Huna says that the blessing may be said over the pieces (*and if the pieces are larger than the whole loaf, the blessing should be recited over the pieces of bread*) and this discharges his obligation as well for the whole loaves, whereas Rabbi Yochanan says that the *mitzvah* is better performed if the blessing is recited over the whole one. If, however, the piece of bread is made of wheat and the whole loaf is made of barley, all agree that the blessing is recited over the piece of bread made of wheat, and this discharges his obligation as well for the whole loaf made of barley.

Rabbi Yirmiyah bar Abba said: There is the same difference of opinion between the following *Tannaim* (*cited in a Mishna elsewhere*): *Terumah* should be given from a small whole onion rather than from the half of a large onion. Rabbi Yehudah says: Not so, but rather from the half of a large onion. Are we to say that the point at issue between them is the following: one master (*R' Yehudah*) maintains that its significance takes precedence (*and therefore, with regard to blessings as well, the*

broken wheat bread will take precedence over the whole barley loaf), while the other master holds that its being whole takes precedence?

The *Gemora* disagrees: Where a *Kohen* is present (and available to receive the *terumah*), all agree that its significance takes precedence. Where they differ is when there is no *Kohen* present, since we have learned in a *Mishna*: Wherever there is a *Kohen* present, one separates *terumah* from the choicest produce (even though they might not keep as long); where there is no *Kohen* present, one must separate *terumah* from the produce which keeps for longer. Rabbi Yehudah said: *Terumah* is in all cases given from the choicest produce.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: A God-fearing man will seek to satisfy both. Who is such a person? It is Mar the son of Ravina, for Mar the son of Ravina used to put the broken piece under the whole loaf and then break the bread.

A teacher of *braisos* recited the following *braisa* in the presence of Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak: One should place the broken piece under the whole loaf and then break and say the blessing. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak He said to him: What is your name? Shalman, he replied. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said to him: You are harmony and your teaching is harmonious, for you have made harmony between the disciples.

Rav Pappa said: All admit that on (the first night of) *Pesach*, one puts the broken piece of *matzah* under the whole one and then breaks (the *matzah*). What is the reason for this? The Torah speaks of 'bread of poverty' (and since a poor man eats broken pieces, it should appear as if we are breaking from the broken one).

Rabbi Abba said: On *Shabbos* one should break bread from two (whole) loaves. What is the reason for this? It is because the Torah speaks of a 'double portion' (referring to the *manna* in the Wilderness – where they received double on *Shabbos*).

Rav Ashi said: I have observed Rav Kahana take two and break only one.

Rabbi Zeira used to break off (a large piece of bread) sufficient for the entire meal.

Ravina said to Rav Ashi: Doesn't he appear like a glutton?

He replied: Since every other day he does not act in this manner, and today (on *Shabbos*) he acts this way, he does not appear like a glutton (but rather, it is being done to demonstrate how dear the *Shabbos* meal is to him).

When Rav Ami and Rav Assi happened to get hold of a loaf which had been used for an *eruv* (which was used to allow people to carry objects on *Shabbos* in an enclosed courtyard), they used to recite over it the blessing, 'Ha-motzi lechem min ha'aretz' -- 'the One Who brings forth bread from the earth,' saying, "Since one *mitzvah* has been performed with it, let us perform with it still another *mitzvah*." (39a – 39b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Drinking Coffee Heated *By A Gentile*

The *Gemora* states: Anything which is normally eaten raw is not subject to the prohibition against gentile cooking. (*Water does not need to be heated and therefore should not be subject to this prohibition*.)

The Radvaz in his teshuvos (3:637) writes: It is permitted to drink coffee heated by a gentile and it is not subject to the prohibition against gentile cooking; even though coffee cannot be eaten in its raw state, it is something which does not eaten at a king's table as an accompaniment to the bread and therefore it is permitted. There is also no concern that they cooked something forbidden in those pots beforehand, since it is well known that they have designated utensils for the coffee (because otherwise, the taste of the coffee would be ruined). He concludes: One should not drink coffee in the accompaniment of gentiles since that will result in many transgressions.

It is brought like that in the Hagahos from the Maharikash (114) as well. He rules that one should be stringent about drinking coffee in a coffee house of gentiles, similar to the *halachah* regarding wine and beer. Furthermore, it is considered a *moishev leitzim* (i.e. a session of jesters) and should be avoided.

DAILY MASHAL

Bread Inside Bread

The Knesses Hagedolah in his sefer Ba'ey Chayei (Y"D 145) disagrees and maintains that coffee heated by a gentile is prohibited to drink. He states: Anything which is eaten or drunk at the royal table by itself, even if it does not come as an accompaniment to the bread is subject to the prohibition of gentile cooking. Furthermore, the requirement that the food must be something that accompanies bread on the royal table is limited to food items, not liquids. He continues: "Even though when I was younger, I would rely on those who ruled that it is permitted, I have now investigated it thoroughly and cannot find a reason for its permission and therefore I refrain from drinking it." He found that the Arizal prohibited drinking coffee heated by a gentile. He concludes that he is not prohibiting it for the public, but he himself refrained from drinking it.

Pri Chadash (114:6) writes that it is permitted based on Tosfos (Avodah Zarah 31b): Wheat is nullified in water in regards to reciting the blessing of *shehakol*, so too it is nullified in regards to the prohibition against gentile cooking. Similarly, the coffee is nullified in the boiling water that it is being cooked with and it is therefore not subject to the prohibition against gentile cooking.

Teshuvos Beis Yehudah (Y"D 21) objects to the reasoning of the Pri Chadash. Our *Gemora* rules: The proper blessing on water which was cooked with vegetables is *ha'adamah* and this is the ruling of the Shulchan Aruch (205:2). The reasoning is based on the fact that this is the common method for these vegetables. Accordingly, the blessing on coffee should be *ha'adamah* as well. Our custom of reciting *shehakol* on coffee is astounding, but we cannot add to this novelty by being lenient with the prohibition against gentile cooking.

Rabbi Yaakov Emden in his sefer Mor U'ktziah (204) writes that actually the proper blessing on coffee should be *ha'eitz* since it is a fruit from a tree and that was the original intent of those that planted the coffee beans; to drink from the liquid. He concludes that the custom is to recite a *shehakol* anyway, similar to date beer and barley beer.

Our *Gemora* says that he who has a whole loaf of barley bread and a slice of wheat bread "puts the slice inside the loaf and (says the *berachah* and) cuts it." Rashi had a version of the *Gemora* which says "he puts the slice **under** the loaf" and apparently this is the correct version as how can one put a slice inside a whole loaf? However, some justify the version "inside the loaf" and explain that the bread in Chazal's era in their region resembled *pita*. *Pita* is quite elastic and can be folded to put the slice inside it (*Milon Arami*, Melamed).