

1 The gemora continues discussing hilchos brochos, and specifically what concepts cause certain foods to require one kind of brocha, as opposed to seemingly similar foods needing a different brocha.

1 The **גמרא** continues...

הלכות ברכות

What causes certain foods **one** ברכה

while **similar** foods a **DIFFERENT** ברכה

2 Our gemora begins by presenting a machlokos as to what brocho we say, when one eats Kimcha D'Chiti - flour made from wheat. Rav Yehuda holds that we say Borei Pri Hoadomo, just as we would on wheat itself. Reb Nachman holds that we now say only a Shehakol. The gemora introduces us to Rava who sides with Rav Yehuda, and says that the reason why Reb Yehuda holds that you continue to make a HoAdomo on the wheat flour is because he holds "אף על גב דאשתני במלתיה קאי", even though the food has changed from its original form, it still retains its original brocho. Similar to Shemen Zayis - olive oil, where both Reb Yochanan and Shmuel hold that you continue to say Borei Pri HaEitz - the same brocho made on the olive itself. However the gemora disagrees with this comparison and says the reason why Shemen Zayis retains its original brocho is because **לית ליה עלויא אחריןא**, that upon becoming olive oil, it has already achieved its final and intended form. Whereas Flour **אית ליה עלויא אחריןא** and is seen as being in a temporary, in-between-stage, on its way to becoming bread, which is its final and intended form. Therefore only a Shehakol is said.

2 **קמחא דחיתי**
Flour made from Wheat

ר' נחמן **שהכל נהיה בדברו**

ר' יהודה **בורא פרי האדמה**

רבא **אע"ג דאשתני במלתיה קאי**
it retains its **original** ברכה

רב יוחנן **שמואל שמן זית בורא פרי העץ**
same as on the **olive**

אית ליה עלויא אחריןא **לית ליה עלויא אחריןא**

3 The gemara asks: If its true that on Kimcha D'Chiti / wheat flour we say a shehakol - then why didn't Shmuel include Kimcha D'Chiti in his אמרא, that von חייא אקרא - Raw Pumpkins and on קמחא דשערי - Barley flour we say a shehakol. The gemora answers, the truth is that Shmuel could have mentioned just Wheat flour and we would automatically understand that on barley flour one would also make a shehakol, since it is of lesser quality, however he chose to rather mention Barley flour because he was concerned that some might feel that you don't make any brocho at all when eating raw barley flour, since it could be harmful to your stomach. He therefore rather mentioned Barley flour, as opposed to Wheat flour, to teach us that even though it could be harmful, however since its harmful effects are limited, and there is some pleasure in eating it, a shehakol is still required.

3 **שמואל קמחא דשערי**

שהכל נהיה בדברו

ברכה No At All **could be harmful to your stomach**



4 Next item discussed in the gemora is - קורא What brocho do we say when eating Palm Shoots Rav Yehuda says, Borei Pri HoAdomo Shmuel Says, Shehakol. The gemora explains, The reason why Rav Yehudah says HoAdomo, is because Palm Shoots in its early stages are soft and are edible. Whereas Shmuel says Shehakol, because it will eventually become inedible, when it becomes hard, and turns into wood. Interestingly, Shmuel then turns around to his student Rav Yehudah and strengthens his position by comparing palm shoots to Tzenon / radish, which even though it will eventually become hard as wood, we still say a brocho of Borei Pri HoAdomo over it! But in truth, the gemora says, the reason why we say HoAdomo over radishes is because it is planted with the intent of eating radishes, however palm trees are not planted with the intent to eat the palm shoots.



5 The gemora now begins to examine Tzelaf - the Caper Bush, which besides having its main edible fruit - the Eyomuos/Berries, also has three other byproducts that are to some degree edible: The Kafrisin/husks; the Allim/leaves; and Temorim/date like out-growths. Amar Reb Yehuda amar Rav: Tzelaf shel Orloh - the first three years of a young caper bush "Zorek es hoEvyonos" you must throw away the berries - its main fruit, "v'Ochel es haKafrisin", but you may eat the husks. Which indicate that only its Evyomos are considered fruits, since it alone is subject to the laws of Orlah. However, the gemora says this is in contradiction to the following braisa:



6 The Braisa says: that on the Allim and Temorim of the caper bush we say a Borei Pri HoAdomoh, and on the Evyonos and Kafrisin we say Borei Pri ho'etz. We see from here that Kafrisin are also considered a fruit of the tree since its brocho is borei pri ho'etz, so how can Rav Yehuda in the name of Rav say it may be eaten during its first three years - it is orlah! The gemora answers that Rav Yehuda holds like Rebbe Akiva how says that only the Evyonos of the caper bush are mechuyav b'maaser, indicating that he holds that the only edible part of the caper bush are the Evyonos. The gemora then goes on to tell us that in truth Rav Yehuda didn't need to make an independent statement and could have just relied on Rebbe Akiva's statement to teach us about orlah in chutz l'oretz - since "kol hamaikol b'oretz, halocho k'moso b'chutz l'oretz" - that whoever holds the lenient position in Eretz Yisroel, the halocho follows him in chutz l'oretz, however since giving maaser on the caper bush - which Rabbe Akiva is talking about - is only m'd'Rabbonin, as opposed to orlah - which Rav Yehudah is talking about - is min haTorah, we would not necessarily learn out one from the other. He therefore made his clear statement that in chutz l'oretz, they only the Evyonos of the caper bush are subject to the din of orlah, while the Kafrisim - the husks may be eaten.



7 The Gemara now begins a discussion on what constitutes a "Shomer L'pri" a protector of the fruit" and would therefore be considered as part of the fruit. The gemora asks, since the Kafrisin/husks are a "shomer l'pri", they should be considered Orlah, as the posik says וערלתם ערלתו את פריו, the words את teaches us את התפל לפריו that which comes along with the fruit, which eludes to the "shomer l'pri" - which in our case is the Kafrisin.

Rava attempts to answer this by explaining, that in order to consider something as a "shomer l'pri" it needs to remain attached to the fruit up until it is picked, and since the Kafrisin fall off before the fruit is picked it is therefore not considered a "shomer l'pri".

Abaye challenges his explanation from a breisa which states that even though the "Netz" of a Rimon" which is an outgrowth that covers the pomegranate, is not considered as part of the fruit, it is however chayuv b'Orlah, since it is a "shomer l'pri". And yet we know that the Netz dries up and falls off the Rimon when it is picked!

8 Rava amends his explanation and says that to be considered a "shomer l'pri" it must be there atleast untill the fruit ripens, however the Kafrisin are attached only in the early stages while the fruit is just a bud. The gemora then asks: but Rav Nachman says that even a very immature date is already considered a fruit. The gemora answers by showing that Rav Nachman holds like Reb Yossi, however Rava holds like the Chachomim who say that a Smadar / young grape bud is not chayuv b'Orlah because it is not yet considered a fruit.

However Rav Simi M'Neardo'ah shows from a mishneh in Sheviis that the chachmin hold like that only for certain specific fruits, however Shaar Kol HaEelonos - Misheyotzi" all other fruit are considered fruits as soon as they spout - including the Evyonos of the caper bush! Which effectively make the Kafrisin a "shomer l'pri" This forces Rava to ammend his statement one last time, and says that "what constitutes a Somer l'pri - "d'chi shoklus lai l'shomer mayis peirah" when the protector of the fruit is removed, the fruit dies." And since if the kafrisin is removed, the evyonos don't die, the kafrisin is not considered a "shomer l'pri".

7

It says in the תורה

וערלתם ערלתו את פריו

את - את התפל לפריו

שומר לפרי
Protects the Fruit

Subject to the Laws of ערלה

קפריסין
Husks
are a שומר לפרי

8

רבא

שומר לפרי
ATTACHED
until it's picked

קפריסין
FALL OFF
before it's picked

NOT
a שומר לפרי

רבא

שומר לפרי
דכי שקלת ליה לשומר
מייית פירא

When the protector of the fruit is
REMOVED the fruit dies

קפריסין
Husks
not a שומר לפרי

9 Towards the end of the blatt, the gemora presents a machlokos as to what brocho to say on Peppercorn that are used as spices. Rav Sheishes holds that we say a shehakol, and Rava holds that no brocho at all is made, just like raw ginger, but this is only when they are dried and are therefore not considered edible on their own.

The final topic discussed is what brocho to make on Chovitz Kedaira / a kind of porridge made from flour, honey and oil, and also on Daissa / a porridge made from coarse wheat.

While on Daissa alone everyone agrees that its brocho is a Mezonos, however when the Daissa is made similar the Chovitz kedaira - in that it is mixed and cooked with a large amount of honey - Rav Yehuda then holds the brocho is shehakol, since the honey is dominant, while Rav Kahana holds the brocho is Mezonos, since he agrees with Rav and Shmuel who say that " כל שיש בו מוחמשת המינים מברכין עליו בורא מיני מזונות " any food that contains within it one of the 5 grains, a Borei Minei Mizonos is said over it.

