

The Daf begins with a discussion of what type of an interruption between the brocho and eating is considered a hefsek and would require a new brocho, and what type of interruption is not be considered a הפסק, but rather a צורך ברכה for the purposes of the bracha, and therefore not require another brocho.

Offering others a piece of bread after the Hamotzi Rav says that is not considered a hefsek because it is considered בצרך ברכה / for the purposes of the bracha, however, he adds that requesting salt or relish would be a hefsek and he would have to make a new hamotzi. רבי יוחנו on the other hand says that even asking for salt and relish is also considered בארך ברכה / for the purposes of the bracha, but asking to prepare the food for the animals, that would be considered a hefsek.. אשת however says that even preparing food for the animals is not considered a hefsek because one is not allowed to eat before feeding his animals, as the possuk states ואכלת ושבעת ואכלת ושבעת / first the animals and then אורך ברכה ואכלת ושבעת - people, therefore this is also not considered a hefsik, only a צורך ברכה / for the sake of his brocho.

Rava bar Shmuel in the name of Rebbe Chiya said that everyone eating at the table sould have salt or relish in front of them before the brocho of hamotzei is said.

However, if the bread being served is of a very fine quality then this is not necessary, as was pointed out to him by the Resh Gellussa

Interruptions between ברכה and eating...

מורך ברכה מורך ברכה does not requires another ברכה ברכה another apiece of bread

Requesting salt or relish

Requesting food for animals

Requesting food for animals

Requesting food for animals





The Gemara then brings another two brief statements of רבא בר י וה the name of רב חייא, that are not necessarily related to our discussion

One: that it is better to urinate sitting down as this will ensure that the bladder empties completely.

And, another statement, that one should eat salt after he eats, and drink water after he drinks, as this will protect him from any harm from his food and drink.







The Gemara now returns its attention to our mishneh on daf lamed hey, and quotes רבי יהודה who says that on greens one makes a specific brocho of בורא מיני דשאים. After telling us that halocho is not like him. it goes on to explain that his opinion was based on a possuk that says "ברוך ה' יום יום ", which Rav Yehudah felt cannot mean that we bless Hashem only by day and not by night, but rather means that we must give him a different brocho for every day which reflects the unique nature - or blessings - of that particular day. Similarly, Rebbi Yehuda holds that each particular species requires a bracha appropriate to its uniqueness.



Next we being a new mishna which discusses what a person is to do when he makes the wrong brocho on a specific food.

If one mistakenly made האדמה on fruit, it is not a problem and he is yotzei, but if he made העץ on vegetables he is not yotzei. If however, he made a שהכל on any of them it is sufficient and he does not need to make another bracha.

The Gemara explains the reason for האדמה being sufficient for fruit is because they ultimately grow from the ground, as רבי יהודה holds regarding ביכורים, that even if the field or tree from which he is bringing the first fruits no longer exists, he can still say upon them the passuk " ואת הארץ שנתת לנו - and for the land you have given us" because ultimately fruits come from the gound which still exists. The Gemara then goes on to explains that while it would seem obvious, that making העץ on vegetables would not be sufficient, we would have thought that perhaps according to רבי יהודה who holds that the "Etz Hadaas" was "wheat", so that species which grow on the ground can also be called trees, and therefore, you could be yotzei with the brocho of העץ on vegetables. The mishna therefore needs to tell us that even according to him, when it comes to brachos, only if its branches survive from year to year, even after the fruit is removed, is it considered a tree, but not something which 









It says in the Mishneh: ועל כולן אם אמר שהכל יצא one can be yotzei by saying a שהכל ימי "everything"

The gemara introduces us to a machlokes whether this refers to all food items including bread and wine as well or besides bread and wine where their unique brachos are meakev because of their chashivus.

Rav Huna says everything means everything except pas and yayin, bread and wine

And Rebbe Yochanan says everything means everything, even bread and wine.

The Gemara then goes on to say that perhaps this is essentially the same machlokes we find in the ברייתא whether one can make up his own language for a brocho, such as saying שבראה פת זו ברוך המקום "the fruit of this tree is so beautiful, blessed be Hashem who created it", or do we say that one needs to stick to the exact language that Chazal instituted for brochos.

The Gemara says however, that there is a real difference between that breisa and our gemora, on the one hand, over there, one is at least specifying the type of food he is about to eat, and on the other hand, here, in our case, he is at least using the language of the bracha of which Chazal instituted for other foods.

The Next the gemora discusses, if one needs to say Birkas Hamazon after eating bread, and makes up his own bracha such as " בריך מרא
", Blessed is the master of this bread, without specifically mentioning Hashem's name.

The gemora introduces us to a machlokos between Rav ₪ Rebbe Yochanon which is based on their understanding of the passuk אל א שכחתי אולדי מעשרות said during וידוי מעשרות, Rav holds that the possuk is alluding to the mitzvah of making a brocho, and the words " ולא שכחתי " tells us that we should not forget to mentions Hashem's name in the brocho, therefore since Hashem's name was not mentioned he is not yotzei. But if he would have said " בריך רחמנא " then he would be yotzei - that is - at least the first brocho of Birkas Hamazon.

רב יוחנן however holds that the words ולא שכחתי tells us not only that Hashem's name must be mentioned, but also that Hashem is the כולך / ruler of the world- must also be mentioned, and if it wasn't, then he is not yotzei.

The new Mishna says that on things which do not grow from the ground one makes a Shehakol, and cites examples of vinegar, - נובלות. which is a kind of date that the gemara will explain, and locusts.

Rabbi Yehuda however disagrees with these examples, saying that since they are a result of a curse, we do not make a beracha on them at all.













The Mishna concludes by saying that one who has several types of foods that he intends on eating, Rabi Yehuda says to make the beracha on the fruits of the שבעת המינים, and the chachomim say to make the beracha on whichever he likes the best.



The Gemara brings a בר"ת which lists many of the types of foods upon which we make a שהכל because they don't grow from the ground, and includes mushrooms.

To which the Gemara asks that the בר"תasays that one who makes a neder from things growing from the ground is not allowed to eat mushrooms!

The gemara reconciles this by saying that the first שברייתא was referring to things that do not get nourished from the ground, and mushrooms although they do grow from the ground are not nourished from the ground.



The Gemara then explains what " נובלות " are, according to one opinion sun burnt dates, and according to another windblown dates.

The gemara asks that if Rav Yehuda refers to them as being the result of a curse, that would seem to indicate that they are in fact sun burnt dates - what is there to argue about?

Therefore the gemora answers we have to say that Rav Yehuda is talking only about the other things listed but not  $\min$ .









Alternatively, the Gemara says that the machlokes about נובלות can't be in our mishna, because if they are simply wind blown dates you would certainly make on them העץ, rather everyone agrees that the in our mishna are sun burnt dates, and the machlokes about what kind of dates it is refers to a mishna in demai which talks about ". נובלות תמרה".



The Gemara challenges this as well regarding the halacha of that mishna which is that these וובלות תמרם have a more lenient halacha, and says that it is true only in a specific case.

The gemara then asks why the two mishnayos would refer to this kind of dates by different names and leaves that as a standing question.





