



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Prioritizing brachos for different foods

Ulah opines that the disagreement in the Mishnah applies where the two foods share the same bracha, R' Yehudah maintains that the food from the seven species takes priority, and the Rabanan maintain that the food a person prefers to eat takes priority. However, where the foods require different brachos everyone agrees that both brachos must be recited.

R' Ami and R' Yitzchak Nafcha disagree whether the מחלוקת is limited to a case where the two foods share the same bracha or even in a case where the two foods require different brachos.

As part of the Gemara's discussion, a disagreement is mentioned whether the pasuk that praises the seven species is teaching us how to prioritize brachos or if it is teaching us different shiurim.

R' Hamnuna taught that whatever food is listed closer to the word ארץ takes a higher priority even if it is only closer to the second mention of the word ארץ.

2) The bracha on foods that are not part of the meal

There is a disagreement which brachos must be said on foods that are not part of the meal. R' Pappa rules that foods that are normally eaten with the meal and are served during the meal do not require any bracha. Foods that are normally not part of the meal that are brought during the meal require only a bracha rishonah and if they are served after the meal they require a bracha rishona and achrona.

Ben Zoma taught that although bread will exempt other foods from a bracha this rule does not apply to wine since wine always requires its own bracha. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. When faced with a mixture of different foods how does one determine which bracha to make?

2. How does one prioritize the brachos of foods from the seven species?

3. Why does one make the bracha on dates before pomegranates if pomegranates appear earlier in the pasuk?

4. What is the rule for making brachos on foods served during a meal?

Distinctive INSIGHT

When Does Bread Exempt Other Foods in a Meal?

פת פוטרת כל מיני מאכל ... אמר רב פפא הלכתא

The halacha is that when bread is eaten at a meal, it exempts one from the need to recite a bracha upon all foods eaten at the meal. This is true for foods that are eaten to enhance the bread, and it is also true for foods which are not eaten with the bread, as long as they are eaten to satiate and for nutritional value. Even though foods in this second category are not eaten with the bread, these are eaten as part of the meal, and the bread is the essential element of the meal. This is to the exclusion of fresh fruit, for example, which is generally not eaten as part of the main meal. However, if the fruit is eaten as the main dish for the meal, then it, too, would be exempted by the bracha said upon the bread.

If a person does not want to eat bread, and he takes a bite only in order to exempt himself from reciting brachos on other foods, the Magen Avraham (177:#1) expresses a doubt whether this is adequate. On the one hand, these foods are eaten as part of the meal, and whenever bread is eaten it has the priority rating to have the entire meal be secondary to it. On the other hand, in this particular case, these items are not being eaten with or due to the bread. Perhaps because he is eating less than a k'zayis of bread, these items would then need their own bracha.

Igros Moshe (O.C. 4:41) rules that that it depends upon whether the bread is eaten in a manner whereby Birkas HaMazon would have to be said. If the small amount of bread is eaten at the rate of a k'zayis within a time of אכילת פרס, and Birkas HaMazon would have to be said, then the bread exempts the other foods. If, however, less than a k'zayis of bread is eaten, this cannot be considered a "meal of bread", and a bracha would have to be said on every item separately. This decision would have to be made at the beginning of the meal, to avoid making unnecessary brachos. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By the Gertzfeld, Shapiro, Rubinstein, and Knopf families
In loving memory of the
1st Yaharzeit of
ר' גדלי' בן ר' יחיאל מיכל ז"ל

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
by the Goldfeder and Teichman families
in honor of the birthday of Gershon Bassman

HALACHAH Highlight

Combining less than a required measure of a salty food and a full measure of accompanying bread

אמר רב פפא הלכתא: דברים הבאים מחמת הסעודה בתוך הסעודה – אין טעונים ברכה, לא לפנייהם ולא לאחריהם.

Rav Papa said that the Halacha is that items that are eaten as a part of the meal and in the course of a meal do not require a blessing, neither before nor after.

Rashi¹ explains that “foods that are eaten as part of a meal” means foods that are eaten as some kind of an accompaniment to the bread. Being that these foods are eaten as an adjunct to the bread, they are secondary to the bread, and included in the blessings made on the bread, both the first blessings and the concluding blessings.

Rav Yosef Karo² adduces proof from our passage to a question regarding the waiving of blessings for accompanying foods. The Mishnah³ states that if one eats a salty food and bread with it, he pronounces a blessing on the salty food and the bread is included in that blessing, being that the bread is secondary to the salty food. Rav Yosef Karo quotes a Kol Bo⁴ that wonders whether this exception from a blessing applies only to the preceding blessing (ברכה ראשונה), or to the concluding blessing (ברכה אחרונה) as well. Rav Karo states that it appears evident to him that both blessings are covered through the blessings for the primary food. He cites our passage which states that the subordinate foods “do not require a blessing neither before nor after.” This substantiates the view that the concluding blessing is also included.

Rav Moshe Feinstein, in Igros Moshe,⁵ was asked about a situation in which a person ate less than a kazayis of a salty food, and then ate as a secondary food more than a kazayis of bread. Rav Feinstein notes that the Halacha is that the final

blessing of the primary food would cover that of the secondary food. However, in this case a final blessing for the primary food is not warranted since less than the minimum measure was consumed. Following the above cited rule, the bread would also not require any final blessing, even though more than the minimum quantity of a kazayis was eaten and under regular circumstances that would be sufficient to require the person to recite the Birkas HaMazon. Is this in fact the case?

Rav Feinstein considers the possibility that the rule of inclusion of the secondary food’s final blessing in that of the primary food applies only when a final blessing is actually said for the primary food. However, in the event that no blessing is said for the primary food than possibly a blessing should be recited for the secondary food alone. Rav Feinstein focuses on the language of the Mishnah: **ופוטר את הטפלה** (and he exempts the secondary food of its blessing by reciting the blessing on the primary). The language suggests that although the secondary food would normally require a blessing in its own right, in this case it is covered by the blessing on the primary food. If the intent was that the secondary food does not require any blessing at all, then the language would have been **מברך על העיקר ואינו צריך לברך על הטפל** (and no blessing is required for the secondary food). Accordingly the person should need to say the blessing for the secondary food, since the primary food has no blessing. Rav Feinstein ultimately rules that the person should say **בורא נפשות**, the blessing for a full measure of the salty food. The reason is that we can at least consider the secondary food as combining with the primary to constitute a sufficient measure to obligate the primary food’s blessing. ■

- 1 ד"ה דברים הבאים וד"ה אין טעונים
- 2 אור"ח ריש סי' יר"ב
- 3 לקמן מד רע"א
- 4 סי' כד
- 5 ח"ד מחאו"ח סי' מד ■

STORIES off the Daf

The Order Makes a Difference

כל המוקדם בפסוק זה מוקדם לברכה שנאמר... ארץ שכל שיעוריה כזיתים

Someone approached the Gri”z from Brisk, and asked him to explain the rule about the sequence of foods in this verse and the priority in the order of the brachos which is learned from it. No matter what the case, he wondered, even if all the fruits would have equal status, the

Torah would have no choice other than to list them in some order. How do we know that the listing is meaningful?

When the Gri”z heard the question, he was physically shaken, and he responded tersely. “In our holy Torah we never say that there was no choice and that things had to have been written in some random order no matter what. When we find that one time the Torah says ‘Moshe and Aharon’ and later it says ‘Aharon and Moshe’, we are told that this teaches us that they were equal.

Without this drasha, we would have to conclude that whoever or whatever is listed first has some priority or advantage. We clearly see that if the Torah lists items in a sequence, this means that there is a meaningful order which is being set forth. If the Torah meant that all the fruits are all equal, it would have found a way to teach us that lesson specifically. Now, however, that they are listed as they are found in the verse, we must conclude that it is in order to teach us this halacha. ■