

24 Elul 5772
Sept. 11, 2012



Brachos Daf 41

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

Mishna

Over anything which does not grow from the ground, one says: '*She-hakol nih'yeh bid'varo*' -- 'that everything came into being through His word.' Over vinegar, *novelos*, and locusts, one says, '*She-hakol nih'yeh bid'varo*' -- 'that everything came into being through His word.' Rabbi Yehudah says: Over anything to which is a result of a curse (such as vinegar, which is wine that soured), no blessing is said.

If one has several varieties before him, Rabbi Yehudah says that if there is among them something of the seven species¹, he makes the blessing over that, but the Sages say that he may make the blessing over any food that he pleases. (40b)

Grow from the Ground

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Over anything which does not grow from the ground, such as the meat of cattle, wild animals, and birds and fish, one says, '*She-hakol nih'yeh bid'varo*' -- 'that everything came into being through His word.' Over milk, eggs and cheese one says, '*She-hakol*.' Over bread which has become moldy and over wine that has spoiled, and over cooked food which has become spoiled, one says, '*She-hakol*.' Over salt and over salt water, and over truffles and over mushrooms, one says, '*She-hakol*.'

The *Gemora* asks: This would imply that truffles and mushrooms do not grow from the ground. But has it not been taught in a *braisa*: If one makes a *neder* (a vow) prohibiting himself from "fruits of the earth," he is forbidden to benefit from the fruits of the ground, but he is permitted in truffles and mushrooms. If,

¹ of which Eretz Yisroel was praised; they are: wheat, barley, grapes, figs, pomegranates, oil olives and dates

however, he said, "All growths from the ground are forbidden to me," he is forbidden in all of them – even from truffles and mushrooms!?! [Evidently, they are regarded as things which grow from the ground!?!]

Abaye answers: They do indeed grow from the ground, but their nourishment does not come from the ground (but rather, from the air).

The *Gemora* asks: But the *braisa* states: over anything which does not grow from the ground (and then proceeds to include truffles and mushrooms in that group)?

The *Gemora* answers: the *braisa* should read as follows: Over anything which does not draw nourishment from the ground.

The *Mishna* had stated: Over *novelos* (one says, "*She-hakol*").

The *Gemora* asks: What are *novelos*?

Rabbi Zeira and Rabbi Ila'a disagreed on this matter: One said: They are fruit (*dates*) parched by the sun. The other said: They are dates blown down by the wind (*off the tree*).

The *Gemora* asks from our *Mishna*: Rabbi Yehudah says: Over anything to which is a result of a curse, no blessing is said. [Seemingly, he is referring to the three things just mentioned: vinegar, *novelos* and locusts.] This accords with the view of the one who says that *novelos* are fruit parched by the sun, for then it can rightly be called something which is a result of a curse. But if we say they are dates blown down by the wind, what type of curse is there?

The *Gemora* answers: This expression relates to the other things mentioned (*vinegar and locusts*).

Some reported the above discussion as follows: According to the view of the one who says that they are fruit parched by the sun, it is understandable that we should say '*She-hakol*' (and not *ha'eitz*; for they have been changed for the worse), but according to the one who says that they are dates blown down by the wind, we should say, '*Borei peri ha'eitz*'?

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, all agree that *novelos* in general (when they are not modified – like that of our *Mishna*) are fruit parched by the sun. The difference arises over (the term) *novelos* of the date-palm, since we have learned in a different *Mishna* (regarding *dema*²): The following things are treated leniently with regard to *dema* (because since they are of little value, it is not worth it for the '*am ha'aretz*' to cheat over it; accordingly, one who purchases these items from them do not need to separate *ma'aser* from them): *Shisin*, *rimin*, *uzradin*, *benos shuach*, *benos shikmah*, *gufnin*, *nitzpah* and the *novelos* of the date-palm.

The *Gemora* explains these items: *Shisin*, explains Rabbah bar bar Chanah in the name of Rabbi Yochanan, are a type of figs. *Rimin* are *kandei* (lotus). *Uzradin* are sorbapples. *Benos shuach*, explains Rabbah bar bar Chanah in the name of Rabbi Yochanan, are white figs. *Benos shikmah*, explains Rabbah bar bar Chanah in the name of Rabbi Yochanan, are sycamore figs. *Gufnin* are winter grapes. *Nitzpah* is the caper fruit. *Novelos* of the date-palm are explained differently by Rabbi Zeira and Rabbi Illa'a. One said: They are fruit (dates) parched by the sun. The other said: They are dates blown down by the wind (off the tree).

Now, according to the one who says that they are fruit parched by the sun, it is well with what the *Mishna* teaches (concerning them) that they are things are treated leniently with regard to *dema*. This would imply that if there is a doubt about them, they are exempt from the *ma'aser* obligation, but if there is no doubt (that *ma'aser* was not separated from it), they are subject to it. But according to the view of the one who says that they are dates blown down by the wind, are the definite ones subject to *ma'aser*? [How can that be, seeing that they are ownerless (and the law is that ownerless fruits are not subject to *ma'aser*)?]

The *Gemora* answers: With what case are we dealing here? It is referring to a case where one gathered them into a pile, for Rabbi

² produce purchased from an *am ha'aretz*; since we are uncertain if *ma'aser* was separated, one is obligated to separate *ma'aser rishon* from it; *ma'aser sheini* (in the first, second, fourth and fifth years of the *Shemittah* cycle) must be separated and eaten in *Yerushalayim*

Yitzchak said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan, who said in the name of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov: If *leket* (one or two ears of grain that fall from his hand while harvesting must be left for the poor), *shihc'chah* (produce that is left behind during the harvesting are left for the poor) and *pe'ah* (leaving over a corner of the field for the poor) are gathered into a pile, they become subject to *ma'aser* (since people will think that this is a regular harvest).

Some reported the above discussion as follows: According to the view of the one who says that they are dates blown down by the wind, it is understandable that in one place (our *Mishna*) *novelos* simply are spoken of (for all agree by parched dates that the blessing of *She-hakol* is recited), and in the other *Mishna*, it is referred to as *novelos* of the date-palm (for each *Mishna* is referring to something else). But according to the view of the one who says that they are fruit parched by the sun, in both places we should have stated *novelos* of the date-palm, or in both places *novelos* simply? [Why would we switch the terminology?] The *Gemora* concludes that this indeed is a difficulty. (40b – 41a)

Precedence

The *Mishna* quotes a dispute between Rabbi Yehudah and the *Chachamim* as to when there are numerous foods, which one to make the *brachah* on first. Rabbi Yehudah says that if there is one of the seven species, then we always make the *brachah* on that food first. The Sages argue that whatever the person prefers takes precedence.

Ulla explains that they argue when all the foods share the same *brachah* (and one is trying to make one *brachah* to cover everything), where Rabbi Yehudah maintains that if there is one of the seven species present, then the *brachah* should be recited over it. The Sages, however, argue that whatever the person prefers takes precedence. However if the blessings are different, then everyone agrees that he says the *brachah* on one and then he says the *brachah* on the other. [Rashi explains this as follows: One had a radish – *ha'adamah* before him, and an olive – *ha'eitz*. If he recites the *ha'adamah* first on the radish, his obligation for the olive would be discharged, for we have learned that one who recites *ha'adamah* on a fruit of the ground has, after the fact, fulfilled his obligation. Ulla teaches that this is not the case. That *halachah* only applies if he recited the '*ha'adamah*' on a fruit of the tree itself; it does not apply, however, in a case where he made the *ha'adamah* blessing on a vegetable. Therefore, in this case, there are two different blessings available, and there is no preference at all as to which blessing should be recited first.]



The *Gemora* asks from a *braisa* which says that if a person has an olive and a radish, he should recite the *brachah* on the radish (*ha'adamah*) and exempt the olive. [*This is in direct contradiction to Ulla's statement!?*]

The *Gemora* answers that the case referred to in this *braisa* is where the radish was the primary food (*and the olive was eaten only to lessen the sharpness of the radish; therefore, it is subordinate to the radish and is exempted by a ha'adamah*).

The *Gemora* asks that Rabbi Yehudah, in the end of the *braisa*, says we make a *brachah* on the olive first, for the olive is a fruit of the seven species. Does Rabbi Yehudah not hold of that which we learned in a *Mishna*: This is the general rule: If one food is primary and another food is eaten as a subsidiary to it, a blessing is recited over the primary food, and this suffices also for the subordinate one!? And you cannot answer that Rabbi Yehudah does not, in fact, hold of this ruling, for a *braisa* stated: Rabbi Yehudah said: If the olive came due to the sharpness of the radish, one recites the blessing on the radish and the olive is exempted!?

The *Gemora* answers that the first part of the *braisa* is discussing a case where the radish is the primary food. [*In that situation, everyone agrees, because of the principle of ikar and tofel (main and complementing food), that we always make the brachah on the main food and exempt the complimentary one.*] The difference of opinion between Rabbi Yehudah and the Sages is really over a different matter altogether, and it is as if there are some missing words in the *braisa*, and it should read as follows: If radish and olives are before a person, he recites a blessing over the radish and this serves for the olive also. When is this the case? This is when the radish is the primary item; but if the radish is not the primary item, all agree that he says a blessing over one and then a blessing over the other (*for one does not discharge the other, and there is no preference as to which brachah should be recited first*). However, if there are two varieties of food which have the same blessing (*such as an olive and an apple*), he recites the blessing over whichever he prefers. Rabbi Yehudah, however, says that he recites the blessing over the olive, since it is of the seven species.

[*The Gemora cites an Amoraic dispute regarding this.*] Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Yitzchak Nafcha argue as follows: One opinion says that the argument applies when the blessings over the two kinds of food are the same; Rabbi Yehudah holds that the one belonging to the seven species takes precedence, while the Sages maintain that the species preferred by him takes precedence; but where the blessings are not the same, both agree that a blessing is first said

over one and then over the other. [*This is identical to Ulla's explanation.*] The other said that Rabbi Yehudah and the Sages disagree even when the blessings are not the same (*and the Gemora will explain this below*).

The *Gemora* asks: Now, according to the view of the one who says that the dispute arises when the blessings are the same, we find no difficulty (*for R' Yehudah holds that the food of the seven species takes precedence and the Sages hold that the food which he likes better takes precedence*), but according to the view that they differ also when the blessings are not the same, on what point do they differ (*for in this case, both blessings must be recited, and one cannot discharge the other*)?

Rabbi Yirmiyah replied: They differ on the question of precedence, for Rav Yosef, or as some say, Rabbi Yitzchak, said: Whatever comes earlier in this verse has precedence in the matter of blessing, for it is written: A land of wheat and barley and vines and figs and pomegranates, a land of oil olives and (*date*) honey. [*R' Yehudah agrees with this, and certainly in a case where one food is from the seven species and one food is not, the food of the seven species takes precedence in the order of blessings.*]

The *Gemora* notes that this teaching disagrees with the teaching of Rabbi Chanan, for Rabbi Chanan said: This entire verse was stated in order to teach the following rulings regarding measurements: The word *wheat* teaches us that which we learned in the following *Mishna*: If a person enters a house that was afflicted with *tzara'as* carrying his clothing on his shoulders and shoes and rings in his hands (*and they were not being worn*), both he and his belongings become *tamei* immediately. If he was wearing his clothing and had shoes on his feet and rings worn on his fingers, he becomes *tamei* immediately, but his clothing, shoes and rings only become *tamei* if he tarries in the house the amount of *kedei achilas haperas* - the amount of time it takes one to eat a half a loaf of bread. The bread must be wheat bread and not barley bread, and the bread must be eaten with a relish, while he is reclining. [*The reason for this is that wheat bread is eaten quicker than barley bread, and one eats quicker while reclining and while eating the bread with relish. We see that a person is not stricter than an animal, for the clothing that he carries is tamei immediately – just like an animal; the kal vachomer still holds up.*]

Barley mentioned in the verse teaches that which we learned in the following *Mishna*: The bone of a human that is the size of a barley kernel generates *tumah* through touching or by being carried, but does not generate *tumah* by being under a tent. [*The corpse or even part of a corpse will generate tumas ohel (tumah*



under a roof).]

The word *vine* mentioned in the verse teaches us that a nazir must drink a *revi'is*, a quarter log of wine (in order to incur the punishment of lashes for having violated his vow).

The word *figs* teaches us that one is liable for carrying on *Shabbos* if he carries from one domain to another the size of a dried fig.

The word *pomegranates* mentioned in the verse teaches us that which we learned in the following *Mishna*: Since the householder does not throw out utensils so easily, the utensils are considered susceptible to *tumah* until they contract a hole the size of a pomegranate. [A craftsman sells his utensils, so for a craftsman, even a utensil with a small hole is considered unfit for use and is thus no longer susceptible to *tumah*.]

The words *a land of oil producing olives* teaches us that *Eretz Yisroel* is a land whose every measurement is the size of olives.

The *Gemora* asks: Is it every measurement? But we just mentioned above other measurements (which are not the size of olives)?

The *Gemora* answers: Rather, *Eretz Yisroel* is a land whose majority of measurements are the size of olives. [This ruling refers to the laws governing the consumption of *cheilev*, *blood*, *nosar*, *pigul*, *tamei*, *neveilah*, a *tamei animal*, the *flesh of a dead person* regarding *tumas ohel*, and *touching neveilos*.]

The words *date honey* teaches us that a large date is the minimum size that one is liable for eating on *Yom Kippur*.

The *Gemora* notes that the other opinion understood that all these measurements are not written explicitly in the verses, but rather, they are Rabbinic and the verse is merely a support. [These measurements are in fact Biblical, for they are *Halachah L'Moshe MiSinai* - that Hashem told Moshe to pass down orally, and the Rabbis explained them.]

Rav Chisda and Rav Hamnuna were seated at a meal, and dates and pomegranates were brought before them. Rav Hamnuna took some dates and said a blessing over them. Rav Chisda said to him: Doesn't the master agree with that which Rav Yosef, or as some say, Rabbi Yitzchak, said: Whatever comes earlier in this verse has precedence in the matter of blessing? He replied: This (the date) comes second after the word '*land*,' and this (the pomegranate) comes fifth (after '*land*'). [Since dates are closer to the word '*land*' - the second one written in the verse, it is more significant than

pomegranates, which are mentioned fifth after the word '*land*' - the first one in the verse.] He replied: Would that we had feet of steel, so that we could always (follow you) and listen to you! (41a - 41b)

Food during a Meal

It was stated: If they brought before them figs or grapes during the meal (where he ate bread), Rav Huna said they require a blessing before eating them (since they were being eaten out of desire to eat something sweet, they are not regarded as being "part of the meal"), but not one afterwards (since *Birchas Hamazon* covers them). And so said Rav Nachman: They require a blessing before eating them, but not one afterwards.

Rav Sheishes argues and says that they require a blessing before and after eating them, for there is nothing that requires a blessing beforehand but not afterwards except breads that comes with *kisnin* (something baked that is eaten as a snack).

The *Gemora* notes that this is in disagreement with Rabbi Chiya, for Rabbi Chiya said: The *brachah* on bread exempts all foods, and the *brachah* on wine exempts all drinks.

Rav Pappa said: The law is as follows: Foods that come because of the meal (as a relish for the bread, and it is eaten with the bread) when brought in the course of the meal require no blessing either before or after; food which does not come because of the meal, but are brought during the meal require a blessing before but not after, and foods that come after the meal (fruits as dessert) require a blessing both before and after.

They asked Ben Zoma: Why did the Sages say that foods that come because of the meal and are brought in the course of the meal - they require no blessing either before or after eating them? He said to them: It is because the bread exempts them. They asked him: If bread exempts all foods, should it not exempt wine as well (so why does wine which is drunk during a meal require its own blessing)? He answered that wine is different, since it causes a blessing for itself (by *kiddush* and *havdalah* - even when one is not particularly thirsty). (41b - 42a)



HALACHAH FROM THE DAF

Wine and other drinks

The *Gemora* cites the statement of Rabbi Chiya that bread exempts all foods, and wine exempts all drinks.

Tosfos (Berachos 41b Yayin) says that just as we do not rule like his statement about bread, as it only exempts foods related to the meal itself, so we do not rule like his statement about wine.

The Rosh and Rabbeinu Yonah disagree, and rule like Rabbi Chiya's statement about wine.

The Shulchan Aruch (OH 174:2) rules like Rabbi Chiya's statement about wine, saying that it exempts other drinks from both the *brachahs* before and after them.

The poskim discuss the details of when this applies, including whether one had to have the other drinks in mind or even present when drinking the wine. See Mishnah Berurah and Biur Halachah for a deeper discussion of the various positions on this question.

The Derech Hachayim, cited by the Mishnah Berurah (3) notes that one must have actually drunk from the wine, and not just heard someone else say the *brachah*. Although hearing one say the *brachah* suffices to fulfill the obligation of *kiddush*, it does not suffice to exempt other drinks.

Making a Brachah on a Tofel before the Ikar

The Rema (212:1) rules that if a person wants to make a *brachah* on the *tofel* first in order to eat the *ikar*, he only makes a *she'hakol* on the *tofel* since it is forbidden to eat anything in this world without saying a *brachah*. For example, if a person's sole reason in eating a cracker is so he won't drink whiskey on an empty stomach and feel ill, he should make a *she'hakol* on the cracker.

The source of this *halachah* is the Terumas HaDeshen who explains that any *tofel* loses its *brachah* completely, since it is part of the *ikar*. The source of the Terumas Hadeshen is from the *Gemora* of the radish and olive. Since the radish was eaten first, it exempts even the olive, which is one of the seven species, from a *brachah*. We see from this that the *tofel* has no importance whatsoever,

thereby losing its *brachah*. However, if the *tofel* is eaten first, then its *brachah* is *she'hakol* since we must make a *brachah* prior to receiving pleasure from anything.

The Magen Avrohom argues, that the Or Zarua, who the Terumas Hadeshen is based on, only means that we say *she'hakol* when the *ikar* is also *she'hakol*, since the *tofel* receives the *brachah* of *ikar*, which is *she'hakol*. If the *tofel* is a different *brachah* and it is eaten first, of course, we must make the appropriate *brachah*.

Let us consider the following: A person wants to take an apple out of the apple-danish to make a *ha'eitz*, is he allowed to?

According to the Rema, since the *tofel* has no *brachah*, there is absolutely no reason to take out the *tofel* first because you are causing an unnecessary *brachah* of *she'hakol*.

Perhaps one could ask that since he wants to make a *brachah* on the apple first, then it is considered *chaviv*, preferred, and the Rema rules that something *chaviv* is not *tofel*!

There are two opinions what *chaviv* is. One opinion says that *chaviv* is a food that one always prefers. The Rambam understands that *chaviv* is that which one wants now. According to the first opinion, there is nothing to discuss, unless one always prefers apples to *mezonos*. According to the Rambam, *chaviv* does not contradict the *halachah* of *tofel*, since the food is *tofel*, it is not the one that he wants to make a *brachah* on first.

According to the Magen Avrohom, a food that is *tofel* gets the *brachah* of the *ikar*. If so, saying a *ha'eitz* on the apple is the wrong *brachah*. In truth, the Magen Avrohom (168), by the *halachah* of eating *pas haba'ah b'kisinin* during a meal, discusses whether one could take out a piece of an apple out of a danish and make *ha'eitz* on it. He rules that it is an unnecessary *brachah*. The Magen Avrohom himself is of the opinion that all foods during a meal are considered *tofel* to the bread except fruits etc. In that case, the fruit is brought as part of the meal. Therefore, it has no *brachah* of its own. It is not recommended to take the *tofel* and say a *brachah* first.

Eating on Yom Kippur

The *Gemara* states that the source for any measurements, interpositions and partitions are all *Halacha LeMoshe MiSinai*, oral laws given to Moshe at Sinai that have no Scriptural basis. Rashi cites two examples of measurements, one being the olive-measure



for most forbidden foods, and second, the date-measure for eating on Yom Kippur.

There is an interesting discussion regarding the definition of the prohibition to eat on Yom Kippur. The question raised is as follows: Is the prohibition defined as eating *per se*, and the minimum measure that was established was the equivalent of the size of a date because that is what alleviates the hunger, or perhaps the prohibition is that one cannot alleviate his hunger, which is generally accomplished by eating a food that is the size of a date.

Although this may seem to be a question of semantics, this query actually has some serious halachic implications. Let us consider the following scenario: What would happen if one ate slightly less than the equivalent of a date right before Yom Kippur and he is still somewhat hungry. After Yom Kippur begins, he eats a little bit more and that eating combines with what he ate before Yom Kippur to alleviate his hunger. This person has alleviated his hunger on Yom Kippur, but he has done so without eating the entire forbidden measurement of food.

The *Ksav Sofer* writes that in such a situation, one has indeed transgressed Yom Kippur. It is clear that the *Ksav Sofer* maintains that the prohibition is that one cannot alleviate his hunger and the prohibition is not the eating *per se*.

In a similar vein, *Rabbi Chaim Ozer Grodzinsky*, in his *sefer Achiezer*, discusses intravenous feeding on Yom Kippur. If the prohibition is eating *per se*, then feeding intravenously would be permitted. If the prohibition is that one cannot alleviate his hunger, then feeding intravenously may be prohibited as well.

That Little Piece of Bread by the Sink in Restaurants

It is common in restaurants to leave a bowl of bread pieces by the *netilas yadayim* sink, so people can say *hamotzi* and exempt all the food they are eating with one *brachah*. Does this help?

The Magen Avrohom writes that if a person does not really want to eat bread, but rather, he just wants to exempt the other foods, it does not work. Since the whole reason that bread exempts food during the meal is because the foods are *tofel* to it, as they are considered accompaniments (like Rashi), if the bread is really not the main part of the meal, and he doesn't even want to really eat it, then it doesn't exempt anything else.

The Aruch Hashulchan argues that we don't use the understanding of Rashi, rather, food during a meal is exempt from a *brachah* since it is a part of the meal. Sitting down and making *hamotzi* begins a meal, and anything that is brought during the meal is exempted, since it is part of the meal. Foods that are not brought to be part of the main meal, i.e. the meat and potatoes, like fruit, we make a *brachah*. If we eat bread to make a *seudah*, it should exempt everything.

Reb Moshe Feinstein writes that even still, if a person eats less than a *k'zayis* of bread, it does not create a *seudah*, and it will not exempt the other foods from *brachos*. Therefore, if a person wants to exempt other foods from *brachos*, he should be sure to eat at least a *k'zayis*, about half a piece of bread, rather than a little piece (*unless you take several of them*). [*The purpose of the bread by the sink may also be in order that one should eat bread immediately after his washing, and that there shouldn't be an extended interruption between the two.*]