



דף לב:

כל כהן שהרג את הנפש לא ישא את כפיו

Yeshaya HaNavi, in decrying the corrupt behavior of B'nai Yisrael, tells the nation in the name of Hashem, ובפרישכם כפיכם אעלים עיני מכם, גם כי תרבו תפלה אינני שומע ידיכם דמים מלאו - "when you spread your hands (in prayer) I hide my eyes from you. When you pray copiously I do not listen, [because] your hands are full of blood" (Yeshaya 1:15).

R' Yochanan takes this posuk to mean that a Kohen whose hands are bloodied from murder may not [raise his hands to] perform *Bircas Kohanim*.

Tosfos in Yevamos (7a, שנאמר, ד"ה) explains the correlation between the mitzvah of *Bircas Kohanim* and murder. Hands that are responsible for a person's death cannot be a conduit for conferring Hashem's blessing on Klal Yisrael because there is a well-known principle, אין קטיגר נעשה סניגר - a prosecutor cannot act as a defense lawyer. Therefore, although a murderer is not prohibited from performing other mitzvos, he is prohibited from participating in *Bircas Kohanim*.

The Rambam¹ rules that a Kohen who killed a person is barred from performing *Bircas Kohanim* even after he does t'shuva (meaning, even the Kohen repented he still is forbidden from performing *Bircas Kohanim*).

The Bach² notes that the above-cited posuk seems to support the Rambam's ruling. The

phrase "גם כי תרבו תפלה" (even if you offer many prayers) implies that even if the murderer earnestly repents, his blessings are, nevertheless, not accepted. Even though his sin may be expiated through t'shuva, he still cannot perform *Bircas Kohanim* due to the principle of אין קטיגר נעשה סניגר.

It is worth noting that only the sin of murder is an impediment to *Bircas Kohanim*, but not other sins. This is because the logic of אין קטיגר נעשה סניגר does not apply to sins which are not committed with one's hands. [The only other sins that disqualify a Kohen from performing *Bircas Kohanim* are idolatry, marriage with a divorcee, and deliberately coming in contact with a corpse.³]

The Ramoh,⁴ citing Rashi and the Tur, says that the custom is to allow a repentant murderer to perform *Bircas Kohanim*. This is because we don't want to shun ba'alei t'shuva since that could discourage potential repenters from returning to the fold.

Several authorities⁵ maintain that only if the killing was accidental do we allow the Kohen to perform *Bircas Kohanim* after t'shuva, but not if he murdered במזיד - deliberately.

The Maharsham⁶ discusses the case of a Kohen who, in his anger, threw a menorah at his friend. A few days later the victim suddenly collapsed and he eventually died, and the doctors attributed his death to the menorah blow. The Maharsham ruled leniently and

permitted the Kohen to perform *Bircas Kohanim* after accepting upon himself a repentance program and asking forgiveness at the victims grave in the presence of ten people.

Several factors contributed to this ruling. Firstly, the Maharsham argued that such a murder comes under the category of פושע (negligence) rather than מזיד (deliberate) because it was not premeditated. Secondly, since the victim did not die immediately we must consider the possibility that there were other contributing factors to his death (despite the doctor's evaluation).⁷

The sefer She'arim Metzuyanim b'Halacha⁸ cites the T'shuvos Bais Dovid who questions whether a Kohen who was drafted in to the army and killed enemy soldiers is disqualified from *Bircas Kohanim*.

The T'shuvos Kinyan Torah⁹ maintains that a Kohen who kills enemy soldiers during a war is not disqualified from *Bircas Kohanim* because his act of murder is classified as an אונס - unpreventable or forced.¹⁰

[Note: Al Hadaf is not intended as a guide for practical halacha. Its sole intent is to discuss and present a cross-section of views, interpretations and explanations of the Gemara.]

דף לג.

קידוש אע"ג דמקדש בצלותא מקדש אכסא

Rav Yochanan says that originally, *havdalah* was not recited after Shabbos over a cup of wine but only during the *shemoneh esray* of maariv (i.e., אתה חוננתנו), because b'nai Yisrael were mostly too poor to afford wine. Subsequently, when the economic situation improved, the אנשי כנסת הגדולה (sages of the Great Assembly) instituted *havdalah* over a cup of wine. Later, when the nation became impoverished again, the sages enacted to recite *havdalah* once again during maariv. However, this time they decreed that if one can afford to, he should recite *havdalah* over wine in addition to the recitation of *havdalah* during maariv.

The Gemara (end of 33a) cites a braysoh which says (according to the Gemara's

emendation) that one should preferably not repeat *havdalah* over wine after he already recited it during maariv because this would constitute a ברכה שאינה צריכה - needless bracha.

The Gemara in conclusion (beginning of 33b) cites Rava who rules that one should repeat *havdalah* over a cup of wine even if he already recited *havdalah* during maariv. Rava argues that just as [on the eve of Shabbos] we recite kiddush over a cup of wine despite the fact kiddush was already recited during maariv (i.e., the bracha of ברוך מקדש השבת), so too, one should repeat *havdalah* over a cup of wine even after reciting it during maariv.

- There is a mitzvah min haTorah to sanctify the day of Shabbos by reciting kiddush on the eve of Shabbos. This mitzvah is derived from the posuk זכור את יום השבת לקדשו (remember the day of Shabbos and sanctify it), see Tosfos in Pesachim 106a, ד"ה זכרהו.

The Magen Avraham¹¹ infers from our Gemara that one fulfills the Biblical mitzvah of kiddush upon reciting the bracha מקדש השבת during maariv. Consequently, he says that the kiddush that one recites over wine (after maariv) is only a mitzvah *miderabbanan* - (a rabbinically mandated mitzvah).

[R' Akiva Eiger¹² adds that one fulfills the biblical mitzvah of kiddush merely by making mention that the day is Shabbos. Thus, he says that one fulfills the mitzvah of kiddush min hatorah merely by greeting his friend "good Shabbos".]

The Minchas Chinuch¹³ cites a Gemara in Pesachim 117b which says that kiddush must include זכר ליציאת מצרים - a remembrance of the exodus from Egypt. How then, asks the Minchas Chinuch, can one fulfill the mitzvah of kiddush during maariv when there is no mention of yetzias Mitzraim in the Shabbos maariv? [As to the Magen Avraham's proof from our Gemara, the Minchas Chinuch suggests that the Gemara is referring only to kiddush of Yom Tov (or to the kiddush recited on Yom Tov that falls on Shabbos) since the maariv *shemoneh esray* of Yom Tov makes mention of yetzias Mitzraim.]

The Maharam Shick,¹⁴ in defense of the Magen Avraham, suggests that one can fulfill the mitzvah of kiddush during *shemoneh esray* because yetzias Mitzraim is mentioned in the third passage of shema which is recited just prior to *shemoneh esray*.

דף לד.

אם אין שם כהן אלא הוא לא ישא את כפיו

1] The Mishna says that if there is only one Kohen in the synagogue and he is the *shaliach tzibur* (chazan) he should not recite *Bircas Kohanim* because when he turns to face the congregation he might get confused and he might not be able to continue reciting *chazaras haShatz* (i.e., שים שלום).¹⁵ If, however, the Kohen feels certain that he will not get confused he is permitted to recite *Bircas Kohanim*.

[The Magen Avraham¹⁶ asserts that concern about the chazan's confusion was relevant when they did not have siddurim. However, today when we daven from a siddur, every chazan is classified as one who is מובטח - confident - that he won't get confused.]

R' Yehoshua ben Levi (Sotah 38b) states that a Kohen who remains in his place and does not ascend the platform to perform *Bircas Kohanim* is in violation of three mitzvos; (a) כה ושמרו את שמי (c) אמור להם (b) תברכו.¹⁷

In light of this, it is difficult to understand why the Mishna exempts a Kohen who is a *shaliach tzibur* from *Bircas Kohanim* just because of the remote possibility that he might get confused. Why should the possibility of confusion for *chazaras hashatz* override the mitzvah min haTorah of *Bircas Kohanim*?

The Rosh¹⁸ infers from the term אמור להם - tell them - that a kohen who refrains from *Bircas Kohanim* is in violation of the mitzvah only if he was summoned to perform *Bircas Kohanim*. If the Kohen was outside the shul when the *shaliach tzibur* announces "כהנים", he is not in violation of the mitzvah of *Bircas Kohanim*.

Accordingly, if the *shaliach tzibur* is a Kohen and he does not perform *Bircas*

Kohanim he is not in violation of the mitzvah - as long as no one announces "כהנים" - since he was not summoned. [If, however, someone erroneously announces "כהנים" then, indeed, maintains the Hagaos Maimonios,¹⁹ the *shaliach tzibur* is obligated min haTorah to recite *Bircas Kohanim* despite the possibility of confusion.]

Alternatively, the Yeshuas Yaakov²⁰ cites Rabbeinu Peretz who asserts that the Torah does not obligate a Kohen to recite *Bircas Kohanim* unless there are a minimum of two Kohanim present. He deduces from the posuk's use of the plural term להם אמור - tell them - that if there is only a single Kohen present he is not obligated to recite *Bircas Kohanim* min hatorah. Thus, he suggests that the Mishna refers to a case in which there is only one Kohen present in the synagogue and therefore the concern about possible confusion takes precedence over *Bircas Kohanim* - since there is no mitzvah min hatorah to recite *Bircas Kohanim* when there is only one Kohen present.

2] The Mishna deals only with the case of a *shaliach tzibur* who is the only Kohen in the shul, but does not specify as to what the halacha is when there are other Kohanim present besides the *shaliach tzibur*.

The Shulchan Aruch²¹ follows the position of the Maharam of Rothenburg who explains that when there are other Kohanim present who can bless the congregation, then the *shaliach tzibur* should not perform *Bircas Kohanim* even if he is confident that he will not get confused. The Mishna is lenient in allowing a *shaliach tzibur* to perform *Bircas Kohanim* (when he is confident) only if he is the only Kohen available to perform *Bircas Kohanim*.

The Yeshuas Yaakov takes an opposite approach. He maintains that the Mishna succumbs to the concern about possible confusion only when the *shaliach tzibur* is the only Kohen present - since in that case there is no mitzvah min hatorah for him to perform *Bircas Kohanim* (since there is only a single Kohen present - as explained above). However,

in a case in which there are other Kohanim present (in addition to the *shaliach tzibur*), then they are all under biblical obligation to perform *Bircas Kohanim*.²² Therefore, in such a case the biblical mitzvah of *Bircas Kohanim* which is incumbent on the *shaliach tzibur* overrides the concern that he might get confused.

דף לה:

הרבה עשו כר' ישמעאל ועלתה בידן

1] The posuk לא ימוש ספר התורה הזה מפיו - the Torah shall not depart from your mouth - indicates that one must study Torah incessantly, leaving one no time to engage in other activities. R' Yishmael maintains that this posuk is not to be taken literally because one must spend time earning a livelihood as indicated by the posuk in the second passage of *shema* וואספת דגנך וגו' - you shall gather in your grain etc.²³

R' Shimon bar Yochai maintains that ideally, one should engage only in the study of Torah (in conformance with the aforementioned posuk ומוש וגו'). He says that one who does will merit to have מלאכתו נעשית על ידי אחרים - his livelihood miraculously provided for by others. R' Shimon bar Yochai maintains that the posuk וואספת דגנך וגו' (which indicated one must work for a living) is relevant only in times of spiritual decline when the Jewish nation is not worthy of such a great measure of Divine assistance.

The Gemara says that many people conducted themselves in accordance with R' Yishmael's advice (i.e., they combined Torah study with earning a livelihood) and were successful, whereas many tried R' Shimon bar Yochai's approach and failed.

R' Chaim of Volozin²⁴ explains the reason most of the people who tried R' Shimon's approach failed, is that they were not capable of dedicating their lives entirely to Torah study. He says, however, that there were some exceptional individuals who were capable of absolute dedication to Torah study, and those individuals were successful with R' Shimon bar Yochai's approach (i.e., their needs were

provided for by others while they studied Torah day and night).

The Rambam²⁵ writes that if an individual dedicates his life entirely to the service of Hashem and to the study of Torah, and he divests himself of all worldly pursuits, he is sanctified as a holy person ("kodesh kodashim") and he will be privileged to have all his needs provided for, just as the Kohanim and Levi'im who served in the Bais Hamikdash had their needs provided for by others.

The Brisker Rav²⁶ writes in the name of the Vilna Gaon that the words of the Rambam are premised on R' Shimon bar Yochai's statement in our Gemara. Even though the Gemara says that many people tried R' Shimon's approach and failed, thus implying that the halacha follows R' Yishmael who advocates engaging in an occupation,²⁷ the Gemara means to say that the majority of the people who tried R' Shimon's approach failed. However, there are a few exceptional individuals in each generation for whom R' Shimon bar Yochai's approach is viable.

2] The Gemara in Menachos 99b relates that Ben Damma once asked his uncle R' Yishmael whether he was permitted to study the Greek sciences (inasmuch as he was already well versed in the entire Torah). R' Yishmael, citing the posuk לא ימוש וגו', responded that it was prohibited for one to diminish his study of Torah (even after one studied the entire Torah).

The Ravyah²⁸ notes an apparent contradiction in the words of R' Yishmael. In our Gemara R' Yishmael permits detracting time from Torah study to work for a living, thus indicating that the words of the posuk לא ימוש וגו' are not taken literally. However, in Menachos R' Yishmael indicates that the words of the posuk לא ימוש וגו' are taken literally, because he deduces from this posuk that one must spend all his time in Torah study without any time allotted for the study of Greek sciences.

Horav Yosef Engel²⁹ answers that R' Yishmael does in fact take the words of the

posuk לא ימוש literally, and it is for that reason that he prohibits the study of Greek sciences. He points out that Rashi explains the reason one must combine Torah study with earning a livelihood (according to R' Yishmael) is that if one lacks the means of sustaining himself he will eventually be forced, due to his poverty, to discontinue his Torah study altogether (see Avos 2:2). Therefore, even though the Torah insists that "Torah study shall not depart from your mouth," R' Yishmael permits one to detract time from Torah study to earn a living - based on the posuk of ואספת דגניך - because he does not view working to earn a living as a conflict to Torah study, but rather as something necessary to facilitate continued Torah study.

3] The Bircai Yosef³⁰ notes a contradiction in the words of R' Shimon bar Yochai. The Gemara in Menachos 99b cites R' Shimon b' Yochai as saying that one fulfills the mitzvah of לא ימוש merely by reciting *shema* in the morning and in the evening, whereas our Gemara cites him as saying that one should spend every moment of the day studying Torah without detracting time even for earning a living.

In resolution of this contradiction, the Maharam Shick³¹ suggests a novel approach. The passage of *shema* speaks of קבלת עול מלכות - accepting the yoke of Heaven upon oneself. If one recites the morning and evening *shema* with the proper devotion and he accepts upon himself עול מלכות שמים, any activity that he engages in throughout the course of his day will be performed לשם שמים - for the sake of Hashem. R' Shimon bar Yochai (in Menachos) means to say that one who properly recites the morning and evening *shema* and performs all his mundane activities לשם שמים is permitted to engage in earning a living. Since he performs his work for the sake of Heaven, his work is not in conflict with the dictum of לא ימוש וגו' ("not departing from Torah study"). In our Gemara, R' Shimon speaks of an ordinary person who does not perform all his daily activities לשם שמים. Such a person (according to R' Shimon)

is prohibited from detracting from his Torah study to earn a living because his work is considered to be in conflict with לא ימוש וגו'.

Alternatively, the Bircai Yosef explains that even though R' Shimon is of the opinion that one fulfills the minimum daily Torah study requirement of לא ימוש התורה וגו' with the recital of *shema*, every person has an obligation to become well-versed in the entire Torah (see Kiddushin 30a, וישננתם, שיהו דברי תורה מחודדים, בפיק). To accomplish this one must study incessantly (see Ran in Nedarim 8a, ד"ה הא, קמ"ל).

דף לו.

כיון דאית ליה הנאה מיניה בעי ברוכי

Rav Yehuda in the name of Shmuel says that if one drinks a mixture of beet juice with olive oil (called an anigrion drink) to soothe his sore throat, he should recite the bracha "borei pri ho'eitz" (which is the bracha recited on fruit - since olive oil is the primary ingredient). The Gemara explains that Shmuel is teaching a chiddush (novelty), namely, that even though the drink is taken as a רפואה - remedy - and not for pleasure, it still requires a bracha - because one derives pleasure when drinking it. Tosfos (ד"ה כיון) notes that if one takes a bitter tasting medicine, from which one does not derive any pleasure (upon swallowing), he does not recite a bracha.³²

Horav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach zt"l³³ asserts that one should not recite a bracha on a pleasant tasting remedy, such as an anigrion drink, unless it is a food that a person would occasionally eat even when not needed for medicinal purposes. However, if one takes a medicine which he would never eat under ordinary circumstances (when not needed for his illness), he does not recite a bracha even if it has a pleasant taste.

Many other authorities³⁴ disagree and require a bracha on any pleasant tasting medicine, whether or not it is the type of food or drink he would eat under ordinary circumstances.

The Re'ah³⁵ maintains that if one is coerced to eat a food, he does not recite a bracha even though he experiences a measure of pleasure when swallowing the food. One does not bless Hashem for food which was forced upon him against his will.³⁶ Likewise, if one has no appetite and he is forced to eat [certain foods] in order to remain alive, he does not recite a bracha because it is considered as though he is being coerced to eat. [In the Gemara's case of one who drinks an anigrion to soothe his sore throat, it is not considered a coerced drink since the person is not suffering from a life threatening illness.]

The Shulchan Aruch³⁷ follows the opinion of the Rosh who maintains that a person is obligated to recite a bracha even on food that he is compelled to eat due to an illness, and even if it is non-Kosher food that he is compelled to eat. The Magen Avraham³⁸ comments, however, that if the sick person (who is forced to eat non-kosher food) is repulsed by non-kosher food, he does not recite a bracha on it since the food does not provide him with any enjoyment.

דף לז:

היה עומד ומקריב מנחות אומר ברוך שהחינו

The braysoh says that one who offers a korbon mincha (meal offering) recites the bracha "*shehecheyanu*". The Rishonim offer several explanations of this:

- (a) Rashi says that the braysoh is referring to a Yisrael who brings a korbon mincha after a long lapse of time.
- (b) Rashi (Menachos 75b, k'sav yad) suggests that the braysoh is referring to a Yisrael who brings a mincha for the first time in his life.
- (c) Alternatively, Rashi (ibid.) says that the braysoh refers to a Kohen performing avodah (service in the Bais Hamikdash) who is offering someone's mincha for the first time in his life.
- (d) Tosfos says since the avodah of the Kohanim was based on a semi-annual rotation, with each Kohen having a chance to serve in the Bais Hamikdash twice a year, the Kohanim would recite *shehecheyanu* when it was their

turn to serve, just as one recites *shehecheyanu* when eating a fruit from the new season's crop.

(e) Alternatively, Rashi (Menachos 75b) says that the braysoh is referring to the korbon minchas haomer. Since the omer is offered from the new crop of barley, the Kohen recites *shehecheyanu* upon offering that mincha - just as *shehecheyanu* is recited upon eating a fruit from the new season's crop.

(f) Similarly, the Rambam³⁹ writes that when a Kohen offers a mincha from chodosh (the new crop of grain), he recites *shehecheyanu*.

2] Several laws regarding the recital of *shehecheyanu* are gleaned from this braysoh.

- The Ramoh in Yoreh Deah⁴⁰ writes that when one fulfills the mitzvah of כִּיסוּי הַדָּם (covering the blood of fowl) for the first time in his life he should recite *shehecheyanu*. The Shach⁴¹ explains that the Ramoh derived this halacha from our Gemara as explained by Rashi (p'shat B and C)

- The Ramoh in Orach Chaim⁴² rules that if a fruit ripens twice a year, *shehecheyanu* is recited the first time the fruit is eaten in each new season. The Magen Avraham⁴³ adduces proof to the Ramoh's ruling (i.e., that *shehecheyanu* may be recited more than once a year) from Tosfos (p'shat D) who says that the Kohanim recited *shehecheyanu* each time they began their turn to serve - even though the Kohanim had a turn to serve twice a year.

The Yad Aharon⁴⁴ deduces from this Gemara that *shehecheyanu* may be recited on a new fruit even if it is not noticeably different from last year's fruit. The Rambam (and Rashi, p'shat E and F) indicate that *shehecheyanu* is recited on a korbon mincha which comes from the new crop of grain even though there is no noticeable difference between flour manufactured from new grain and flour manufactured from old grain. [This is contrary to the Shelah⁴⁵ who indicates that *shehecheyanu* should not be recited on wine made from the new year's crop of grapes because such wine is not noticeably different from wine manufactured from grapes of a previous year.]

דף לח.

דובשה דתמרי מברכין עליו שהכל

1] Mar bar Rav Ashi says that on date honey we recite the blessing of שהכל נהיה בדברו, rather than *borei pri ho'eitz* because the liquid that is released from a fruit (such as honey) is considered זיעה בעלמא - mere sweat (or moisture) - rather than the actual fruit. The only fruit juices that are considered as the fruit itself are the juice of grapes and olives (i.e., wine and oil).

The Rashba says that the reason juice of fruit is considered זיעה בעלמא is that most fruit are [grown with the intent to be] eaten whole. However, the juice of vegetables which are grown to be used in soups, is considered as the vegetable itself and it requires the same bracha as the vegetable, i.e., *borei pri ho'adama* (cf., below דף לט).

According to the Rashba, orange juice that is produced from oranges grown especially for the purpose of making juice requires the bracha *borei pri ho'eitz*. R' Shlomo Zalman Auerbach⁴⁶ explains that even if the majority of oranges in the world are used for eating, if a particular variety is used mostly for juice, its juice requires the *bracha borei pri ho'eitz* (according to the Rashba).

[The Mishna Berurah,⁴⁷ however, rules that one should recite shehakol on all fruit juices even if produced from juice oranges (because there are Rishonim who dispute the Rashba's assertion, see below דף לט).]

2] תמרי ועבידנהו טרימא מברכין בורא פרי העץ

The Gemara says that if dates are crushed into a cake-like form (called *terima*) they still require the same bracha as the fruit in its original form, i.e., *borei pri ho'eitz*.

The Terumas Hadeshen⁴⁸ rules that if a fruit is completely mashed - to the extent that it no longer retains a trace of its original form or shape, it is no longer considered a fruit, and one should recite shehakol on it. However, he says if a certain fruit is usually eaten in such a mashed and altered form, then it retains its

original bracha even if it is completely mashed and is no longer recognizable.

R' Shlomo Zalman Auerbach⁴⁹ points out accordingly, the proper bracha for chocolate should be *borei pri ho'eitz*. Even though the cocoa beans are completely ground and do not retain their original shape, since the beans are grown specifically for the manufacture of chocolate, they should retain their original bracha of *borei pri ho'eitz*.

The Igros Moshe,⁵⁰ however, writes that the proper bracha for chocolate is שהכל נהיה בדברו and this is the accepted *minhag*.⁵¹

דף לט.

מיא זסלקא כסלקא

Rav Papa says that the bracha required on soup made from cooked vegetables is the same as the bracha required on the vegetables themselves, i.e., *borei pri ho'adama*.

The Rishonim question how to reconcile Rav Papa's ruling with Mar bar Rav Ashi's ruling cited above on 38a regarding fruit juices. They ask why the bracha for vegetable soups is *borei pri ho'adama* when the bracha for fruit juices is *shehakol*.

The Rashba⁵² (mentioned above) explains that the bracha for fruit and vegetable juices depends on the usual manner in which those foods are eaten. Since dates and other fruits are usually used for eating and not for making juice, the juice that comes from them is considered זיעה בעלמא (mere sweat or moisture) and does not retain the original bracha of the fruit. Vegetables (such as beets and turnips), on the other hand, are usually used for making soup, and therefore the soup made from these vegetables retains the original bracha of the vegetables.

The Bach⁵³ rules that the bracha for prune juice is *borei pri ho'eitz* because prunes are commonly used for their juice.⁵⁴ The Magen Avraham,⁵⁵ however, disagrees with this ruling. He maintains that the key difference between fruit juice and vegetable soup is that the vegetables used in soups are usually grown for the purpose of soup making. Even though a

large percentage of prunes are used for juice, the plums (from which the prunes come) are grown primarily for eating. Only a small percentage of plums are eventually dried and turned into prunes. Therefore, he maintains that the bracha for prune juice is *שהכל נהיה בדברו*, no different from the bracha for other fruit juices, since most plums are not grown for the purpose of making prune juice.⁵⁶

The Rosh explains that the difference between soups and juices lies in the fact that the soup-vegetables are cooked, whereas the juice-fruits are squeezed. The soup absorbs the full flavor of the cooked vegetables and therefore retains the bracha *borei pri ho'adama*. Juices, however, which are made from squeezed fruit do not have the same flavor as the actual fruit. Juice, therefore, is considered *זיעה בעלמא* and requires a *shehakol*. According to the Rosh, fruit juices that are made from cooked fruit, such as prune or fig juice, retain the bracha of the fruit and require the bracha *borei pri ho'eitz*.

- Tosfos (דף לח, סוף ד"ה האי) postulates that the bracha for anything that is taken as a beverage is *שהכל נהיה בדברו* (except for wine and olive oil), regardless of its manner of production and the purpose for which the fruit is grown.⁵⁷

דף מ

אמר רב טול ברוך טול ברוך אין צריך לברוך

After reciting a bracha on food (or on a mitzvah) one must immediately partake of the food (or perform the mitzvah) without any *hefsek* - interruption. If one talks between reciting a bracha and eating the food, he must repeat the bracha.⁵⁸

The Gemara says that saying something after a bracha that is relevant to the bracha (or to the meal⁵⁹) is not considered a *hefsek*, and one who does so need not repeat the bracha.⁶⁰

R' Yochanan says that asking for salt before partaking of the bread is not considered a *hefsek* because after reciting *hamotzei* on bread it is a mitzvah to eat the first piece with salt.

Rav Sheishes says that even if one instructs his household members, *גביל לתורא* - "feed the ox" - it is not a *hefsek*. Feeding one's animals is relevant to the meal because Rav says that it is prohibited for one to eat before feeding his animals.

Following are several examples of interruptions addressed by the authorities:

(a) The Emek Bracha⁶¹ maintains that if one realizes after he recited a bracha on food that the necessary *terumah* and *maaser* was not separated from the food, he should separate the *terumah* and *maaser* and it is not considered a *hefsek*. He compares separating *terumah* to saying *גביל לתורא* - feed the ox - in that both must be taken care of before one is permitted to partake of his meal.

(b) The Ritzbah⁶² maintains that if one recites a bracha on bread on motzoei Shabbos and realizes that he has not yet recited *havdalah*, he must recite *havdalah* before taking a bite of the bread because it is prohibited to eat before *havdalah*.⁶³ The Ritzbah asserts, however, that the recital of *havdalah* constitutes a *hefsek* and after *havdalah* he is required to repeat the bracha on the bread. [The Ritzbah explains that reciting *havdalah* is different from saying *גביל לתורא* because the requirement to feed one's animals before he eats is *min hatorah* whereas the *issur* to eat before *havdalah* is only *miderabbanan*.⁶⁴]

(c) R' Shlomo Zalman Auerbach⁶⁵ considers a case in which one recited a bracha on a certain food and then remembered that he has vowed not to eat that food. He suggests that appealing to *chacham* (sage) to annul the vow (*hataras neder*) perhaps would not constitute a *hefsek* since it is not directly related to the meal.⁶⁶

(d) The Chayai Odam⁶⁷ applies the concept of our Gemara to one who erred in middle of *shemoneh esray* (e.g., he forgot to recite *משיב הרוח*) and does not know halachically how to conduct himself. Based on our Gemara, the Chayai Odam permits him to walk to get a *sefer* so that he could search for the halacha. Since this is necessary to enable him to continue

davening, his walking and looking for a *sefer* is not considered a *hefsek*.

דף מא:

א"ר חייא יין פוטר כל מיני משקין

R' Chiya asserts that one who recites a bracha on wine is exempt from reciting a bracha on other beverages (that he drinks at that time). Rabbeinu Yona explains that this refers to both the *bracha rishona* (the blessing recited prior to eating and drinking) and the *bracha acharona* (the blessing recited after eating). One who drinks juice after wine (before a *bracha acharona* was recited on the wine) is exempt from reciting the blessing *shehakol* before drinking the juice and he is also exempt from reciting *borei nefashos* after the juice.

[The Pri Megadim⁶⁸ indicates that wine not only exempts beverages that require the bracha *shehakol* (and *borei nefashos*), but even beverages that require the bracha *borei pri ho'eitz* (and the bracha *acharona* of על העץ ועל פרי העץ). He says, for example, that according to the Rosh who says that fig juice retains the bracha of figs (see above דף ל"ט) and requires the bracha *borei pri ho'eitz* and the *bracha acharona* על העץ ועל פרי העץ, if one drinks wine and also fig juice, he need not recite any bracha before or after drinking the fig juice. The bracha על הגפן ועל פרי הגפן that he recites after the wine exempts him from reciting על העץ ועל הפירות after the fig juice.]

The Mordechai⁶⁹ rules that wine exempts other beverages only if they are on the table and in his presence when he recites the bracha on the wine. [Horav Mordechai Bannett in his glosses on the Mordechai maintains that even if the beverages were not on the table, if he had the intention to drink them when reciting the bracha on the wine, it is sufficient and he is exempt from reciting a bracha on the beverages.⁷⁰]

The Mishna Berurah⁷¹ maintains that the beverages that were brought to the table afterwards not only require a separate bracha *rishona* but a separate bracha *acharona* as well. He is of the opinion that beverages that were

not included in the *borei pri hagafen* that was recited before drinking the wine, may also not be included in the על הגפן recited after the wine.

The Shulchan Aruch HaGraz⁷² disagrees and asserts that the על הגפן recited on the wine covers all beverages - even those which were subject to their own *bracha rishona*.

The Kaf HaChaim⁷³ cites the T'shuvos Bais Dovid who considers the case of one who recites שהכל on juice prior to drinking wine. He says that the bracha על הגפן recited on the wine does not exempt him of the obligation to recite *borei nefashos* since that obligation took effect before he drank the wine.

The Magen Avraham⁷⁴ and Pri Megadim⁷⁵ indicate that even in such a case where the beverage was drunk before the wine, the על הגפן recited after the wine exempts one from reciting *borei nefashos* on the beverages.

דף מב.

תכף לנטילת ידים ברכה

The Gemara states "גמר אסור לאכול" - "once one finishes his meal he is forbidden to eat". In explanation of this statement, the Gemara cites R' Chiya bar Ashi who said in the name of Rav, תכף לנטילת ידים ברכה - one must recite *bircas hamazon* immediately after washing מים אחרונים (lit., the final waters, meaning, the water used at the end of the meal for washing one's hands prior to *bircas hamazon*). The meaning of גמר אסור לאכול is that once one washes *mayim acharonim* he is forbidden to eat.

In a related Gemara in Pesachim 103b, Rav says that once one announces his intention to recite *bircas hamazon* (i.e., he states, הב לן וניברך - "bring [a cup of wine] and let us recite *bircas hamazon*"), he is forbidden to continue drinking. Rashi (ibid.)⁷⁶ explains the statement "הב לן וניברך" signals the end of one's meal and that the person is מסיח דעת (diverts his mind) from eating. Therefore, once a person pronounces this statement he is prohibited to drink (or eat) until after he recites *bircas hamazon*.

Other Rishonim⁷⁷ maintain that Rav only means that one may not continue eating without

reciting a new *bracha rishona*. They are of the opinion that if one decides to continue eating after announcing *הב לן וניברך*, he is not obligated to first recite *bircas hamazon*, but rather he is obligated only to recite a new *bracha rishona* on the food.

The Shulchan Aruch,⁷⁸ in codifying this halacha, draws a distinction between washing *mayim acharonim* and announcing *הב לן וניברך*. If one wishes to eat after announcing *הב לן וניברך* he need only to recite a *bracha rishona*. When one is *מסיח דעת* from his meal (such as by announcing *הב לן וניברך*) and then decides to eat more, he can no longer rely on the original *bracha rishona* that he recited prior to the meal and he must therefore recite a new *bracha rishona* before continuing his meal. However, there is no reason for him to recite *bircas hamazon* if he decides to continue eating. On the other hand, once a person washes *mayim acharonim*, he must immediately recite *bircas hamazon* without interruption because there is a principle *תיכף לנטילת ידים ברכה* - *bircas hamazon* must immediately follow *mayim acharonim*

Many authorities⁷⁹ disagree with this ruling and are lenient even with respect to one who washed *mayim acharonim*. They argue although there is a rule that one must recite *bircas hamazon* immediately after *מים אחרונים*, if one changes his mind and decides to continue eating, he could disregard the first washing and satisfy the rule *תיכף לנטילה ברכה* by washing *מים אחרונים* again and reciting *bircas hamazon* immediately after the second washing.⁸⁰ Therefore, they maintain that one who feels the urge to eat after he washed *mayim acharonim* may do so provided he recites a new *bracha rishona*.⁸¹

דף מג:

**נוח לו לאדם שיפיל עצמו לתוך כבשן האש
ואל ילבין פני חבירו ברבים**

The Torah (Bereishis 38:25) relates that Tamar was prepared to allow herself to be cast in a fiery furnace rather than publicly humiliate Yehuda. R' Shimon bar Yochai derives from

this incident that it is better for a person to forfeit his life than to cause his friend embarrassment.

The Gemara in Pesachim 25a lists three serious sins (i.e., idolatry, adultery and murder) which must be avoided at all costs, even at the expense of one's life. For the sake of other mitzvos, however, one is not required to forfeit his life, as the posuk states *וחי בהם* - you should live by the mitzvos - and not die by them.

In light of R' Shimon b' Yochai's statement, Tosfos (Sotah 10b, *ד"ה נוח*) asks why the prohibition of *הלבנת פנים* - causing embarrassment - is not listed in Pesachim as a fourth sin for which one must forfeit his life.

Tosfos answers that the Gemara in Pesachim only enumerates those mitzvos which are explicit in the Torah. The sin of *halbonas panim* is omitted from the list because it is not explicit in the Torah (but is deduced from the posuk *לא תשא עליו חטא*, Vayikra 15:17).

Rabbeinu Yona⁸² explains the reason sparing a friend embarrassment takes precedence over one's life is that the Gemara in Bava Metzia 58b likens *halbonas panim* to *שפיכת דמים* (spilling blood, i.e., murder) because when a person is humiliated the color (blood) drains from his face. Rabbeinu Yona explains that one must forfeit his life to avoid *halbonas panim* because causing embarrassment is considered a *תולדה* (subcategory) of murder.

According to Rabbeinu Yona the reason *halbonas panim* is not listed in Pesachim among the cardinal sins for which one must forfeit his life rather than transgress, is that *halbonas panim* is a subcategory of murder and it is therefore included under the general category of murder.

The Meiri implies that our Gemara is not stating an actual halachic ruling;⁸³ it just means to underscore the severity of embarrassing someone, as we find that Tamar was even prepared to forfeit her life to avoid humiliating Yehuda (even though she wasn't required to do so). According to the Meiri there is no grounds for Tosfos' question, because according to the

letter of the law one is not obligated to forfeit his life to avoid *halbonas panim* and therefore **פנים הלבנת** is not listed in Pesachim among the three cardinal sins.⁸⁴

The Binyan Shlomo⁸⁵ suggests that Tosfos rejected the Meiri's notion that Tamar acted altruistically above the letter of the law (**לפנים** (משורת הדין), for Tosfos is of the opinion that it is forbidden for one to conduct himself stringently and sacrifice his life when he is not halachically required to do so. [Indeed, the Rambam⁸⁶ rules that needlessly sacrificing one's life is tantamount to committing suicide. See Tosfos to Sanhedrin 74a, and Al Hadaf ibid.] Therefore, Tosfos deduced from the fact that Tamar was prepared to sacrifice her life, that she was halachically required to do so.⁸⁷

דף מד.

מברך על העיקר ופותר את הטפלה

The Mishna states a rule that whenever one eats a primary food (called **עיקר**) and a subordinate food (called **טפל**), he recites a bracha only on the *ikkar* and is exempt from reciting a bracha on the *tofel*. The Mishna says, for example, that if one eats some salted food and then he eats bread for the purpose of absorbing the salt, and not for the purpose of satisfying his hunger, the person recites a bracha only on the salted food and not on the bread. In such a case, the person is exempt from reciting *hamotzie* as well as *bircas hamazon* on the bread.⁸⁸

Tosfos (סוף ד"ה באוכלי) asserts that the bracha on the *ikkar* does not exempt the *tofel* unless the *tofel* was in the person's presence when he recited the bracha on the *ikkar* (and the person intended to eat the *tofel* afterwards). However, if one recites a bracha on a salty fish without intending to eat bread at the time, and then afterwards decides to eat some bread to absorb the salt, he must recite a bracha on the bread.⁸⁹

The Chazon Ish⁹⁰ suggests two possible reasons for why a *tofel* does not require a separate bracha. (a) The *tofel* is ancillary to the

principal food and is therefore considered too insignificant to require its own bracha. (b) Since the *tofel* is an ancillary to the *ikkar* it is subject to the same bracha as the *ikkar*, and thus the bracha recited on the *ikkar* covers the *tofel* as well.

The Chazon Ish adduces proof from Tosfos to the second approach. According to the first approach, even if one did not originally intend to eat the *tofel*, the *tofel* should still be exempt from a bracha since in the end it is being eaten as an ancillary to the *ikkar*. According to the second approach, Tosfos is understandable because the *tofel* is actually always subject to a bracha (just that it is usually covered by the bracha on the *ikkar*). When one recites the bracha on the *ikkar* without intending to eat the *tofel*, the bracha on the *ikkar* does not cover the *tofel* in such a case, and the *tofel*, therefore, requires its own bracha.⁹¹

The Shulchan Aruch Hagraz⁹² writes when a person was not thinking about eating the *tofel* when he originally recited the bracha on the *ikkar*, the *tofel* is not only subject to its own *bracha rishona*, it is also subject to its own *bracha acharona* and it is not covered by the *bracha acharona* recited on the *ikkar*.⁹³

דף מה.

דחנקה אומצא

The Mishna on 44a states that one who drinks water to quench his thirst recites the blessing *shehakol neheyeh bedivoro*. The Gemara (beginning of 45a) explains that if a person is choking on a piece of meat and takes some water to clear his throat, he does not recite a bracha on the water. Tosfos says that in such a case a person is also exempt from reciting a *bracha acharona* (i.e., *borei nefashos*) after drinking the water.

Other examples of cases in which a person is exempt from reciting a bracha on water are:

- Taking water to wash down a pill.
- Drinking water to wash away a bitter taste.
- Drinking water because of a diet requirement.

• Drinking a lot of water prior to a fast day (or prior to going out in the heat) to ensure that one remains sufficiently hydrated.

In all these cases if one is not thirsty when drinking the water, a bracha should not be recited on the water.⁹⁴

The Gemara on 35a explains the reason a bracha must be recited before eating or drinking is **אסור לו לאדם שיחנה מן העולם הזה בלא ברכה** - it is forbidden to derive pleasure from this world without a bracha. Since water does not have a taste it is not considered pleasurable to drink unless one is thirsty. Therefore, one who drinks water when he is not thirsty is not required to recite a bracha even though he may have a good reason for drinking the water.

Tosfos asserts that other beverages which do have a taste require a bracha even if one drinks them when he is not thirsty, since one derives pleasure from their taste. Tosfos proves this from the Gemara on 36a which says that if one drinks olive oil for medicinal purposes, he should recite the blessing *borei pri ho'eitz* since he derives pleasure from the taste, even though he is not taking the olive oil to quench his thirst.⁹⁵

The Tenuvas Yehuda⁹⁶ asks that if one drinks water to dislodge meat from his throat, the water should be considered a *tofel* to the meat, since he is drinking it for the purpose of washing down the meat. [Consequently, even if one were to drink a pleasant-tasting juice to dislodge the meat he should be exempt from a bracha since the drink is a *tofel*.]⁹⁷

The Tenuvas Yehuda answers that the person obviously did not originally anticipate choking on the meat. Since when reciting the bracha on the meat he did not intend to wash it down with a drink, the drink is subject to a separate bracha even though it is a *tofel* (as we learned above). Therefore, the Gemara does not base the exemption (of water taken to dislodge meat from one's throat) on the fact that the water is considered a *tofel* but rather on the fact that water only requires a bracha when it is taken to quench one's thirst.

דף מו.

ואורח מברך כדי שיברך בעל הבית

1] R' Yochanan says in the name of R' Shimon bar Yochai that the host should honor his guest with leading the *bircas hamazon* (zimun) so that the guest can bless the host. The Gemara explains that at the conclusion of *bircas hamazon* the guest inserts the following blessing, **יהי רצון שלא יבוש בעל הבית וכו**, - may it be the will of Hashem that the host not be humiliated...and may he be very successful etc.⁹⁸

The Chadashim Gam Yeshanim wonders why this bracha, which is a **תקנות חז"ל** (rabbinic ordinance), is not printed in most siddurim. The Tur⁹⁹ indicates that the prayer of **הרחמן** **הוא יברך את בעל הבית הזה** that is commonly recited at the conclusion of *bircas hamazon* takes the place of the **יהי רצון** that the Gemara refers to. The Madanei Yom Tov¹⁰⁰ finds it difficult to understand why we recite a different version of the blessing than that which is stated in the Gemara.

2] The Rambam,¹⁰¹ in codifying this halacha, writes that when a guest leads the *bircas hamazon* he should append the blessing of **יהי רצון שלא יבוש וכו** to the fourth blessing of *bircas hamazon* (**הטוב והמטיב**). The Brisker Rav¹⁰² infers from the words of the Rambam that the guest's blessing is not a separate blessing but rather is an addendum to the bracha of **הטוב והמטיב**. Therefore, he asserts that the guest should insert the blessing of **יהי רצון** immediately following the bracha of **הטוב והמטיב** (i.e., immediately after he says the words **לעולם אל יחסרנו**), rather than at a later point - as printed in some siddurim. Furthermore, insists the Brisker Rav, upon concluding the bracha of **הטוב והמטיב** (i.e., **לעולם אל יחסרנו**), the guest should not pause for the listeners to answer **אמן**, but rather should continue immediately and recite the **יהי רצון**, and the listeners should answer **אמן** at the conclusion of **יהי רצון** since the **יהי רצון** is an addendum to the fourth bracha.¹⁰³ ■

דף לב

- 1) פרק ט"ו מהלי תפלה ה"ג.
- 2) או"ח סימן קכ"ח ד"ה כהן.
- 3) ע"י שו"ע או"ח סימן קכ"ח סעיף ל"ז מ' ומ"א, וכתב שם הרמ"א שיי"א דגם כהן שזנתה בתו לא ישא כפיו משום דכתיב ואת אביה היא מחללת.
- 4) סימן קכ"ח סל"ה.
- 5) ע"ש במשנ"ב וביה"ל.
- 6) ח"ה סימן ל'.
- 7) כלומר, אמרינן שמא הרוח בבלתו כדאמר ר' הושעיא בגיטין דף ע: (ונוכח סברא זו במג"א ס"ק נ"ב בשם הג"מ ומרדכי).
- 8) על קיצושו"ע סימן ק' ס"ק ט"ו.
- 9) ח"ב סימן ע"א.
- 10) וכתב מהר"ח סימן קי"ז וכן בפר"ח סעיף ל"ה דכהן שהרג מחמת אונס מיתה מותר לישא כפיו אע"ג דלענין רציחה אמרינן ירהג ואל יעבור, וע"י בשע"ח ס"ק צ"ט דמצדד להחמיר אף באונס, וכ"ז מיירי באונס גמור אבל אם אחד הלך ברצונו הטוב לצבא בלי כפייה מהמלכות יש לדנו לפושע, ע"י בספר שמ"ב קידושין דף כא, והיכי דלא הרג אלא עכו"ם י"א דלא נפסל אף אם הרגם במזיד, והפרמ"ג הביא בשם צידה לדרך אף אם לא הרג אלא עכו"ם מ"מ אסור לו לישא כפיו.

דף לג

- 11) סימן רע"א ס"א.
- 12) בגליון שו"ע שם.
- 13) מצוה ל"א, וע"ע בביה"ל ריש סימן רע"א שהאריך להקשות על שיטת מג"א.
- 14) מצוה ל"א, מובא בש"מ החדש.

דף לד

- 15) ע"י שו"ע סימן קכ"ח סוף סעיף כ"א דבגוונא דכוון המקרה לתפלת הש"ץ אז עדיף טפי שישיים המקרה שים שלום ולא הש"ץ, וכתב הבית יוסף דבגוונא שמשיים המקרה שים שלום תו לא שייך חשש טירוף, אולם הבי"ח כתב דאף כה"ג צריך שיהא הש"ץ מובטח שיכול לכוון לברכת המקרה, והמשנ"ב שם ס"ק פ"א כתב בשם אחרונים דטוב יותר שישיים הש"ץ בעצמו שים שלום ולא המקרה.
- 16) שם ס"ק לא.
- 17) כתב הרמב"ם סוף פט"ו מהלי תפלה דכהן שאינו עולה לדוכן בטל מצות נשה אחת וה"ל כעובר על ג' עשין.
- 18) מגילה פ"ג סימן כ"ב, ומובא ברמ"א שם סעיף כ'.
- 19) בהל תפלה פט"ו סק"ו, מובא ברמ"א שם ס"ב.
- 20) שם בס"י קכח.
- 21) שם סעיף כ'.
- 22) עכ"פ בגוונא שקורין להם "כהנים".

דף לה

- 23) ע"י ספר נפש החיים שער א' פ"ח דר"ל אף לדברי ר' ישמעאל אסור לפרוש מדברי תורה (אפי' זמן מועט) ומפרש דברי ר' ישמעאל "הנהג בהם מנהג דרך ארץ" ר"ל הנהג עם הדברי תורה מנהג דרך ארץ (כמש"כ רש"י), ר"ל גם בשעה שאתה עסוק בפרנסה ברעיוני מחשבתך תמא מהרהר רק בדברי תורה, וע"ע בחי' חת"ס כאן ובסוכה דף ל"ו דר"ל דלא התיר ר"י עבודת הקרקע אלא בארץ ישראל במקום שעובדת הקרקע היא גופה מצוה.
- 24) נפש החיים שם.
- 25) סוף הלי שמיטה ויובל.
- 26) ח"י מרן ר"י הלוי עה"ת פרשת חיי שרה, וכעין זה כתב גם הביה"ל בסימן קנ"ו.
- 27) כך קיי"ל בשו"ע או"ח סימן קנ"ו אדם לעסקיו משום דתורה שאין עמה מלאכה סופה להיות בטלה (על פי אבות ב-ב).
- 28) שו"ת ראבי"ה סימן קנ"ט, מובא בש"מ החדש.
- 29) בגליוני הש"ס כאן, וע"ש שם דלפי מש"כ הש"ך דיש גורסין במנחות "ר"ש בר יהוצדק" ולפ"י לא קשה מידי.
- 30) יו"ד סימן רמ"ו.
- 31) מצוה תכ"א, מובא בש"מ החדש.

דף לו

- 32) ע"י שו"ע או"ח סימן תע"ב ס"י דקיי"ל דאף מי ששונא יין או שהיין מזיקו מ"מ חייב לדחוק את עצמו לשתות ד' כוסות והעיר הגרש"ז אויערבאך זצ"ל האיד מותר לאדם כזה ששונא היין יכול לברך עליו כיון דלית ליה הנאה ממנו.
- 33) מובא בספר "ותן ברכה" (להר"י פנחס באדנער) פ"ג ס"ק 151.
- 34) ע"י ספר הנ"ל ס"ק 51, וכך פשוט משמעות הגמ' כאן ושו"ע סימן ר"ד ס"ח דצריך לברך על כל דבר שהחיד נהנה ממנו.

- 35) חידושי הרא"ה ריש פרק שלשה שאכלו, ודעה זו מובא ברמ"א או"ח סימן ר"ד סו"ס ח', וע"י שעה"צ שם סק"מ.
- 36) ע"י ספר הנ"ל שהעיר בשם הגרש"ז דבמקום שההורים כופין ילד לאכול צ"ע אם לחנכו אז לברך על האוכלין כיון שאוכל ע"י כפייה.
- 37) סימן ר"ד סעיף ט', ע"י שעה"צ ס"י ר"ד סק"מ דר"ל דגם הרמ"א מודה לד"ן זה, וכן קיי"ל בסוף תרי"ח בענין חולה שצריך לאכול ביה"כ.
- 38) סימן ר"ד סק"כ, מובא במשנ"ב ס"ק מ"ח.

דף לז

- 39) פ"ז מהלי תמידין ומוספין הי"ח.
- 40) סימן כ"ח ס"ב.
- 41) שם סק"ה, וע"ש שהביא חולקין על הרמ"א, וע"י ביאור הגר"א או"ח ריש ס"י כ"ב.
- 42) סימן רכ"ה סעיף ו', והב"י שם מסתפק בזה.
- 43) שם ס"ק י"ג.
- 44) שם (על ב"י שיטה כ"ט), מובא בבאר היטב ס"ק י"ג.
- 45) כך מדייק המג"א מדבריו סוס"ק י"א.

דף לח

- 46) מובא בספר "ותן ברכה" פרק כ"ג ס"ק 3, ועוד כתב שם דלא בעינן דוקא רוב, אלא כ"ז שדרך לנטוע הרבה ממין פירות אלו למיץ חשוב נטע אדעתא דהכי ומברכין עליו בורא פרי העץ לדעת הרשב"א.
- 47) ע"י סימן ר"ה ס"ק י"ד ובשעה"צ שם, וסימן ר"ב ס"ק נ"ד.
- 48) מובא ברמ"א או"ח סימן ר"ב ס"ז בשם י"א.
- 49) שו"ת מנחת שלמה סימן צ"א אות ב'.
- 50) ח"ג או"ח סימן ל"א.
- 51) גם המנחת שלמה כתב שנהגין לברך שהכל ונשאר צ"ע על המנהג, וע"י בהסכמתו לספר ותן ברכה שמצדד שם לישב המנהג.

דף לט

- 52) ח"י הרשב"א דף לח. ד"ה דבש.
- 53) סימן ר"ב סוף ד"ה ואם בשל הפרי.
- 54) כל"י לא מיבעיא לדעת הרא"ש (מובא לקמן) דברכתו העץ כיון שמבשלין הפרי במים הוי כמי סילקא, אלא אפי' לדעת הרשב"א הוי כמי סילקא כיון דדרך לבשלין.
- 55) שם ס"ק כ"ב.

- 56) וע"י בספר "ותן ברכה" פרק כ"ג ס"ק 9 שכי' שהיון יש שזיף מיוחד שנוטעין עד דעת ליבשן לעשות מהם מיץ פלומיין וממילא צ"ע למה מברכין על מיץ זו שהכל, וע"ש שכי' ליבש המנהג ע"פ תוס' ושו"ת הרא"ש המובא לקמן.
- 57) ע"י בביאור הגר"א סימן ר"ב ס"ד שהביא תוס', ותוס' לא ביאר למה מברכין על מי סילקא בפה"א, וע"י תוס' בדף לט. ד"ה מיא שלא כי אלא שיש לחלק ביניהם, וע"י מרדכי סימן קכ"ה שכי' שמע' דמי סילקא עיקרו לטבול בו ולכך חשוב כמאכל ולא כמשקה, וע"ע בב"י סימן ר"ה שכי' בשם שו"ת הרא"ש לחלק בין מי סילקא למי פירות וכתב שם דאין מברכין על מי ירקות בפה"א אפי' עיקר הבישול הוא לצורך הפרי אבל אם אין מבשלים הירקות אלא בשביל מימיהם אין מברכים על המרק אלא שהכל נהיה בדברו.

דף מ

- 58) ע"י מנחות דף לו. דאם הסיח דעתו בין תפילה של יד לתפילה של ראש צריך לברך שתיים, ופסק השו"ע או"ח ס"י קצ"ז ס"ו דאם שח בין ברכה לאכילה צריך לחזור ולברך, ומקרו מכאן דמבואר בגמ' דדוקא אם הפסיק לצורך סעודה לא הוי הפסק הא לא"ה הוי הפסק וצריך לחזור ולברך, וע"י סימן ר"ו ס"ג דלכתחילה אסור להפסיק בן ברכה לאכילה אפי' בשתיקה (יותר הכדי דיבור).
- 59) כ"כ המג"א ס"י קס"ז ס"ק י"ז בשם הבי"ח ובי"י, דאפילו אם הפסיק בדבר שאינו לצורך פרוסת המוציא אלא לצורך שאר הסעודה לא הוי הפסק, וע"ש בפרמ"ג דמשמ' דה"ה אם הפסיק ואמר להביא כלי הסעודה, וע"י ראש יוסף שנסתפק בזה.
- 60) וכי' הבה"ג פ"ז מהלי ברכות דכ"ז אינו אלא בדיעבד לענין דא"צ לחזור ולברך אבל לכתחילה אסור להפסיק אפי' לצורך הברכה, וכ"כ הרמ"א בסימן קס"ז בשם הכל בו.
- 61) להר"י פרמנצ'יק, מובא בספר מעון הברכה ד"ה הבא מלח, וע"י בד"ה אפי' גביל שכי' בשם הגרש"ז שר"ל דאולי הפרשת תרו"מ חשוב הפסק וחלוק מגביל לתורא, ע"ש, וע"י ר"ל דהפסק מחמת פיקוח נפש ג"כ חשוב הפסק כיון דאינו שייך להברכה אע"ג שמחויב ע"פ להפסיק.
- 62) מובא במג"א סימן רע"א ס"ק י"ב.
- 63) זהו שלא כדעת הרמ"א שם סו"ס ה' שכי' דבכה"ג שיאכל תחילה אע"פ שלא הבדיל.

64) ומבאר המחצה"ש דאע"פ שאין שום חיוב מדאי לאכול פתו בתבלין מ"מ כיון שהוא לצורך פרוסת המוציא לא חשוב הפסק, אבל אם הפסקי שלא לצורך פרוסת המוציא לעולם חשוב הפסק אא"כ יש חיוב מן התורה להפסיק.

65) מובא בספר מעון הברכה ד"ה אפי' גביל.

66) ומבאר שם דדוק גביל לתורא חשוב כצורך הסעודה כיון שנוגע בכל יום קודם כל סעודה שאוכל, משא"כ התרת נדרים לא חשוב צורך הסעודה כיון שאינו נוגע אלא לעיתים רחוקות.

67) כלל כ"ה ס"ט ובנשמת אדם שם.

דף מא 68) סימן ר"ב בא"ה ס"ק כ"ו, מדויק שם בדבריו דברכת על הגפן שאומרים אחר יין פוטר ברכה אחרונה של המי צמוקים אף לדעת הרא"ש דס"ל דברכתו "על העץ" (ולולי דבריו היה אפשר לטעם דברכתו של מי צמוקים על הפירות משום דחשוב כפרי ולא במשקה, ואין יין פוטר אלא משקה.

69) אות ק"ב מובא בט"ז סימן קע"ד סק"ב.

70) כן הביא המשנ"ב בשמו, וכן בשם הגר"ז (ע' שעה"צ סימן קע"ד סק"ה וסק"ו).

71) סימן ר"ח ס"ק ע"ב, וכן מבואר במג"א שם ס"ק כ"ד, וע' שלטי גבורים לבץ מדפי הרי"ד דמשמע דנספקתפ בזה שכי דאם שתי מים תחלילה לפניו היין שפטר דצדל לברך על כל אחת לפניו ולאחריה וכתנו כעין זה לקמ' דף מ"ד בשם הגר"ז בענין עיקר פוטר את הטפל.

72) שו"ע הגר"ז בסידור סוף סימן א' (וע' לקמן בדף מ"ד מה שהבאנו בשם הגר"ז, וצ"ע"ק).

73) סימן ר"ח בשם שו"ת בית דוד סימן פ"ז.

74) סימן רע"ד ס"ק י"ד, וע' מג"א סימן ר"ח ס"ק כ"ד שכי דאם אין המשקין לפניו בשעה שבידך על היין צריך לברך אח"כ על המשקין לפניו ולאחריהם, כמו שהבאנו לעיל בשם המשנ"ב, וצ"ע.

75) סימן ר"ב בא"ה ס"ק כ"ו.

דף מב

76) כ"כ רש"י בערבי פסחים, והביאו הטור ריש סימן קע"ט, וכ"כ הרשב"א כאן וז"ל - כיון שנקט ידיו אסור לאכול ואפי' בברכת המוציא דכיון שנטל ידיו לברכה קבל עליה לברוכי ואי אם הב ונברך הוא הדין והוא הטעם (וע' מה שהבאנו לקמן אות 88 בשם הבית יוסף).

77) הרי"ף בערבי פסחים ור"ן שם, וכ"כ רש"י בחולין דף פו: וכ"כ תוס' כאן ד"ה רבי זירא (בשם מה שמפרשים העולם).

78) כך משמע בשו"ע ריש סימן קע"ט, וע"ש בט"ז ומג"א.

79) ע' משנ"ב שם סק"ב.

80) הבית יוסף כתב דכיון שנטל ידיו להיות מזומן לברכה היה כהתחיל כבר בברכה.

81) ע' בשנ"ב שם סוף סק"ב שכי דחמור טפי להפסיק דביבור אחר נטילת מים אחרונים מלהפסיק באכילה, ולכו"ע אסור אפי' אם רוצה לרחוץ אח"כ פעם שנית [וראיית עובדא נוראה באיזה ספר בשם בעל הקהלת יעקב דבא לפניו אחד שכאב לו הרבה כתיפו, ואמר לו שידקדק על נטילת מים אחרונים ושלא להפסיק אחריו עד שיברך, ונרפא לו כאבו והיה לפלא, וביאר ד"תתפ לנטילה ברכה" מאותיות "כתף" ודו"ק].

דף מג

82) ר' יונה בפירושו על מס' אבות פ"ג משנה י"א כ' דהלבנת פנים הוי "תולדה" דרציחה, ור' יונה בשערי תשובה שער ג' סימן קל"ט כתב שהוא "אבק" רציחה.

83) המאירי כאן כתב דחו"ל אמרו דדומא הלבנת פנים לשפיכת דמים דרך "צחות" ובב"מ שם כתב דאמרו כן דרך "הערה", משמע דס"ל דאינו חיוב מעיקר הדין, והנה מהא דלא מצינו דין זה (נוח לו לאדם להפיל עצמו וכו') בספרי הרמב"ם משמע דס"ל כהמאירי דאינו חיוב גמור, וע' במגיה על המנחת חינוך (ממכון ירושלים) מצוה ר"מ ס"ק ה' שהבין בדברי המאירי דר"ל דהוי רשות, וע"ע בספר "זה השערי" על ספר שערי תשובה.

84) ע' ספר תיבת גמא (לבעל פרמ"ג) חקירה ה' שתמה מכח זה על קושית תוס' דמה"ת דחייב אדם מעיקר הדין למסור נפשו משום הלבנת פנים, אולי לא מסר תמר נפשה אלא לפניו משורת הדין.

85) ספר בנין שלמה עמ"ס סנהדרין דף ע"ד (דף צ"ד בדפי הספר, מובא בשו"ת בית דוד [לר' זאב לייטער] סימן פ"ה), וכן כ' בשו"ת בנין ציון ח"א סימן קע"ב (ותמה שם על תמיחה הפרמ"ג).

86) הל' יסודי התורה פ"ה ה"ד.

87) ע' שו"ת "בית דוד" (מהג' ר' זאב לייטער) סוף סימן י"ח, וכן בסימן פ"ה שהביא כמה מראה מקומות בענין זה, וע' שו"ת מנחת שלמה (להגרש"ז אויערבאך צ"ל) ח"א סוף סימן ז' שמעורר דלפי תוס' ורבנו יונה צ"ב למה אינו מותר לחלל שבת כדי להציל אחד מהלבנת פנים (כיון דהלבנת פנים גרע מרציחה ואיבוד נפש).

דף מד

88) בתוס' ד"ה באוכלי מבואר דעסקינן שאכל המליח להשיב לבו ממתיקות הפירות ואח"כ אכל פת בשביל המליח, וע' שעה"צ סימן רי"ב סק"ט שביא דיש אחרונים המצדדים דדוקא באופן זה חשיב הפת טפל למליח.

89) לכאוי יש לחקור אם אחר שבידך על העיקר הלך ועירב הטפל לתוך העיקר ונעשין גוש אחד האם צריך לברך על הטפל בכה"ג אם לא היה דעתו עליו מעיקרא, וע' מג"א סימן רי"ב סוס"ב ב' שכי דלא מברכין על הטפל אלא שהכל כמו שהביא הרמ"א בענין מי שאוכל הטפל לפני העיקר.

90) או"ח סו"ס כ"ז, וע"ע בחי' ר' ארי' ל"ב ח"א ס"א ובאג"מ ח"א או"ח סי' מ"ב.

91) לפי"ז מובן פסק המג"א דמברכין על הפת שהכל, דכיון שהוא טפל להדגים צריך לברך עליו ברכת הדגים, וע' מג"א שם סק"ד.

92) סימן רי"ב ס"י.

93) והסברא צ"ב דלמה לא אמרינן דהברכה אחרונה כולל גם הטפל כיון שדעתו עליו, ומשמע מכאן לכאוי דכ"ז שלא היה דעתו עליו מעיקרא תו לא חשיב כטפל לו, וא"כ אזיל ראיות החזו"א, אולם הסברא צ"ב (ועוד, הרי במג"א שהבאנו לעיל מבואר דעדיין מיקרי טפל שהרי כתב דבכה"ג מברכין על הטפל שהכל, ועוד צ"ע מהא דהבאנו לעיל בדף מ"א בשם הגר"ז דס"ל דברכת על הגפן פוטר אפי' משקין שלא היו לפניו בשעת ברכת בורא פרי הגפן.

דף מה

94) כך מבואר בפוסקים, וע' משנ"ב סימן ר"ד ס"ז בביה"ל וע' ערוה"ש שם ס"ק י"ח (וע' ספר מעון הברכה שכי בשם האמרי אמת הדשותה מים לפני יום התענית ע"מ שלא יהא צמא למחר צריך לברך, וצ"ע לכאוי האיך יכול לברך כיון שאינו נהנה עכשיו מהמים).

95) ע"ש בערוה"ש שכי דכל משקין שאין לו טעם טוב דינו כמים דאינו טעון ברכה אא"כ שותה אותו משום צמאון.

96) מובא בש"מ החדש סוף דף מד:.

97) וכמובן יש לדון הרבה בזה, דמה"ת דהמים מיקרי טפל להבשר בכה"ג כיון שאינו שותהו אלא כדי שלא ליחנק ולא משום שרוצה עכשיו לאכול הבשר.

דף מו 98) ע' בספר "ילקוט המאירי" שמבאר דרשב"י לא אמר אלא "שלא יבוש בעה"ב" אבל לא הוסיף "שיהא נכסיו מוצלחים וכו", משום דרשב"י לשיטתו דס"ל לעיל בדף לה: דאין לאדם לעסוק בעניני עוה"ז וממילא ס"ל דאין שום ברכה ברבוי נכסים, ורבי שהוסיף ברכה זו ס"ל כר' ישמעאל.

99) סוף סימן קפ"ט.

100) על הרא"ש כאן אות ט', מובא במשנ"ב סימן ר"א סק"ה.

101) פ"ב מהל' ברכות ה"ז, וז"ל - כשמברך האורח אצל בעה"ב מוסיף בה ברכה לבעה"ב.

102) מפי השמועה, ומובא ב"הגדת בית לוי" (מהדורא ב' בהקדמה ל"ברך" אות ז').

103) ויש להעיר מהא דכתב הטור סו"ס קפ"ט דברכת האורח שאומרים אחר ברכה רביעית (וגם נוסח הרחמן שאומרים) לא חשיב הפסק בין ברהמ"ז לכוס של ברכה (ולכאוי ר"ל דכולו חשיב כברכה אריכתא) וא"כ י"ל דזהו כוונת הרמב"ם דברכת האורח חשיב כחלק מברכה רביעית ולכך לא חשיב כהפסק בין ברהמ"ז להכוס של ברכה, אבל אין כוונתו דהוי ממש כחלק מברכה רביעית עד כדי שאסור לענות אמן על ברכה רביעית עד אחר גמר ברכת האורח, ודו"ק.

AL HADAF DEDICATION FORM

I am interested in:

___ Dedicating a Daf \$120.

___ Sponsoring an entire issue \$500.

NOTE: IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTIFY US SIX WEEKS IN ADVANCE IN ORDER TO RESERVE A SPECIFIC DATE

DATE & TEXT OF DEDICATION:

___ Check is enclosed. Make tax deductible check payable to Al Hadaf.

___ Please charge my MasterCard/Visa/AMEX \$_____.

Card # _____ Exp. date _____

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

PHONE: _____

Notice about back issues & daf dedications:

Back issues from last cycle are available @ \$2.50 each to members (for orders of 10 issues and more), and to non-members (or for orders less than 10 issues) @ \$3.00 each:

[Note: You might want to consider ordering back issues for your son in Yeshiva.]

Mesechtas Berachos 4 issues, Shabbos 10, Eruvin 7, Pesachim 7, Shekalim 1, Yoma 5, Succah 3, Beitza 3, Rosh Hashana 2, Megilla 2, Moed Katan 2, Chagiga 2, Yevamos 9, Ksubos 8, Nedarim 6, Nazir 4, Sotah 3, Gittin 6, Kiddushin 5, Bava Kama 7, Bava Metzia 7, Bava Basra 11, Sanhedrin 7 Makos 1 Double issue, Sh'vuos 2 Dbl issues, Avodah Zorah w/Horias 5, Zevachim 7, Menachos 7, Chullin 9, Bechoros 4, Arachin 2, Temura 2, Meilah 2, Nidda 4. Overseas & Canada - additional charge for postage.

LIMITED TIME SPECIAL OFFER - FULL SET APPROX 175 ISSUES FOR ONLY \$350. - Enclose an additional \$100 to have the set sent in 8 customized binders.

MAIL/FAX FORM TO: Al Hadaf / P.O. Box 791 / Monsey, NY 10952 / (845) 356-9114

דף	This Al Hadaf was made possible by the following daf dedications...	יום	
לב		כא אדר ב	F
לג	Dedicated by Avraham Meir & family; * לז"נ אשתי הניא בת יצחק אייזק ז"ל	כב אדר ב April 2	SH
	; by Rabbi & Mrs. Berel Simpser לז"נ שלמה בן משה * ז"ל Simpser		
לד		כג אדר ב	S
לה	* לז"נ משה זעליג בן צבי ז"ל	כד אדר ב	M
לו	* לז"נ הרה"ג יהודא אריה בן ר' משה מנחם פאטאשניק זצ"ל ; by his daughters	כה אדר ב	T
לז		כו אדר ב	W
* לז"נ רחל מאירה ע"ה בת אברהם נ"י RACHEL MEIRA WEISMAN ; In loving memory of		כז אדר ב April 7	TH
לח	* לז"נ הרב דוד בן שלום ביטון ז"ל		
לט	* ז"ל Neuman לז"נ מוה"ר זישא ב"ר משה	כח אדר ב	F
	* לז"נ ר' אליהו בן ר' יחזקאל לעהרער ז"ל		
מ		כט אדר ב	SH
מא	* לז"נ ר' מאיר נתן ב"ר מנחם אריה בוקמן ז"ל	א ניסן April 10	S
	* לז"נ אברהם יצחק ב"ר נחום חיים ז"ל		
מב	* לז"נ פגל בת נפתלי הרץ ב"ר ז"ל	ב ניסן	M
מג		ג ניסן	T
מד	* לז"נ הינדא בת ר' מאיר ע"ה	ד ניסן	W
מה	* ז"ל Berlin לז"נ משה בן זאב וואלף	ה ניסן	TH
מו		ו ניסן	F

* Denotes Yartzeit

Cong. Al Hadaf
P.O. Box 791
Monsey, NY 10952
Ph. & Fx. 845-356-9114

See page 15 inside for information
about back issues and dedications

PERIODICALS
POSTAGE PAID AT SPRING VALLEY
NY & ADTL MAILING OFFICES