

Laws of Blessings Chapter 8 (Auto Translated)

English

Auto Translated

Shiur Overview

Summary of Shiur – Laws of Blessings Chapter 8, Rambam

Halacha 1: Blessings on Tree Fruits

Words of the Rambam: On all tree fruits one blesses at the beginning "borei pri ha'etz," and at the end "borei nefashot rabot v'chesronan al kol ma shebarata l'hachayot bahem nefesh kol chai. Except for the five species mentioned in the Torah, and they are grapes, pomegranates, figs, olives, and dates – on these one makes a beracha achat me'ein shalosh.

Explanation: On all tree fruits one makes borei pri ha'etz before eating, and borei nefashot rabot after eating. The exception is the five species from the shivat haminim (grapes, pomegranates, figs, olives, dates) – on them one makes a beracha achat me'ein shalosh after eating (although before eating is also borei pri ha'etz).

Insights and Explanations:

1. **Structure of Chapter 8 in the context of Hilchot Berachot:** The first chapter gave the general foundations of berachot, and chapters 2-7 went through details of hamotzi, seuda, etc. Chapter 8 continues to berachot on other foods (fruits, vegetables, beverages, etc.).

2. **Why specifically the five fruit species receive a different beracha acharona:** They are part of the shivat haminim, which are **the praise of Eretz Yisrael** – "tikun ha'aretz." In beracha achat me'ein shalosh one mentions "al ha'aretz v'al hapeirot," which shows that the foundation of the importance is the connection to Eretz Yisrael.

3. **Shivat haminim she'hem eser:** An interesting calculation – the shivat haminim divide into ten: chita and se'ora divide into **the five types of grain** (two types of wheat, three types of barley), and the five fruits (grapes, pomegranates, figs, olives, dates). On five one makes birkat hamazon (grain/bread), on five one makes beracha achat me'ein shalosh.

Halacha 1 (continued): Blessings on Fruits of the Ground, Vegetables, and Other Foods

Words of the Rambam: On all fruits of the ground and vegetables – one blesses on them at the beginning borei pri ha'adama, and at the end borei nefashot rabot. And things whose growth is not from the ground, such as meat, cheese, fish, eggs, water, milk, honey and the like – one blesses at the beginning shehakol nihiyeh bidvaro, and at the end borei nefashot rabot.

Explanation: Three levels of initial blessings: (1) borei pri ha'etz – on fruits from trees; (2) borei pri ha'adama – on vegetables and fruits of the ground; (3) shehakol nihiyeh

bidvaro – on everything that doesn't grow from the ground (meat, cheese, fish, eggs, water, milk, honey).

Insights and Explanations:

1. **The order from general to specific:** The blessings go from general to specific. **Shehakol** is the most general – everything is "nihiyeh bidvaro." **Borei pri ha'adama** is more specific – it grows from the ground. **Borei pri ha'etz** is even more specific – it grows from a tree. The more important/special something is, the more specific blessing one makes.

2. **Question: Why didn't meat receive a special blessing?** Meat is an important thing – all sacrifices are meat, "ein simcha ela b'basar"! Why wasn't a special blessing established for meat?

3. **A possible answer: Usually one eats meat within a meal,** with bread. As Rashi says: **"limadcha Torah derech erez, shelo yochal adam basar ela im ken yesh lo pat"** – meat is a "companion" to bread, and is automatically exempted through birkat hamotzi. Therefore, there was no need to establish a separate blessing for it.

4. **Reasoning about "shehakol" on meat:** Meat, cheese, fish, etc. require more human work (shechita, processing), it's not as directly from the ground as a fruit. "Shehakol nihiyeh bidvaro" fits because even human work comes from the Almighty. But it's also recognized that an animal is also "from nature" – it's a creation that the Almighty created.

Halacha: The Law of Water – Not to Satisfy Thirst

Words of the Rambam: Water – when one drinks not to satisfy thirst (not because he is thirsty), for example he wants to swallow something or rinse his mouth – he doesn't need to make any blessing, neither before nor after, because he has no enjoyment from the water.

Explanation: Water receives a blessing (shehakol) only when one drinks it because one is thirsty. If one drinks for another reason (to swallow a bone, rinse the mouth), there is no enjoyment, and no blessing.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **Why is water different from other beverages:** Water has **no taste**, therefore if one drinks it not for thirst, there is no enjoyment. But with other beverages (like milk) – even if one drinks it to swallow medicine, one still has enjoyment from the taste, and one must make a blessing.

2. **Question about drinking water on doctor's orders:** Today doctors say one should drink lots of water for health, not necessarily because one is thirsty. Does one need to make a blessing? One could compare it to when a doctor says to eat more bread – that's also a kind of "need," and one could argue it's like "to satisfy thirst" in a broader sense. But it remains an open question.

3. [**Digression: Chassidic custom not to drink plain water**]: A chassidic custom is mentioned that one doesn't drink plain water (water is desire). Humorously brought up: if a chassidic Jew drinks only liquor, he can't make shehakol on water. The joke: why does he make shehakol? Because "doesn't he deserve a glass of liquor?" – i.e., he has enjoyment from the liquor, not just because he needs to drink.

Halacha: Extracting Juice from Fruits

Words of the Rambam: One who extracts fruits and removes liquids from them – blesses on them at the beginning shehakol nihiyeh bidvaro.

Explanation: When one squeezes out juice from fruits (makes juice), one makes shehakol, not borei pri ha'etz, even though it comes from a tree fruit.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **Why not borei pri ha'etz?** One might have thought that juice from a fruit should have the same blessing as the fruit itself. But the beverage is **changed** – it has become something else. The juice is like "things whose growth is not from the ground" – it's no longer the fruit itself, but a beverage that came out from the fruit.

2. **This is a principle in berachot:** When fruits become "changed" – when they are transformed from their original form to something else – the blessing can change. This is the beginning of a larger topic about shinui tzura in foods.

Halacha: Wine – Changed for the Better

Words of the Rambam: On wine one blesses at the beginning borei pri hagafen, and at the end beracha achat me'ein shalosh.

Explanation: Wine is an exception to the rule that liquids from fruits receive shehakol. Wine receives its own blessing – borei pri hagafen – and a beracha acharona me'ein shalosh.

Insights and Explanations:

- **The reason why wine is different:** Grapes become **changed for the better** – the change from grapes to wine is an **improvement**, not a downgrade. Therefore, it not only doesn't receive shehakol (like other liquids), but it receives a **new, more important blessing** – borei pri hagafen.

Halacha: Olive Oil – Blessing and Laws

Words of the Rambam: When drinking oil in cooked water and the like – one makes borei pri ha'etz. **When drinking oil alone when his throat doesn't hurt** – one makes shehakol.

Explanation: Olive oil is also a case of changed for the better (like wine), because the main purpose of olives is for oil. Therefore, when one drinks oil in a normal way (e.g., mixed in soup or cooked water), one makes borei pri ha'etz. But when one drinks oil alone without a reason (not choshesh b'grono), one makes shehakol.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **Why wasn't a new special blessing made for oil (like borei pri hagafen for wine)?** Because usually one doesn't eat/drink oil by itself – it's used as an ingredient. Therefore, a separate blessing wasn't established.

2. **But oil does have the law of changed for the better** – because the main purpose of olives is to make oil. Therefore, when one drinks oil (in a normal way), one makes borei pri ha'etz – because **this is the main tree fruit**, not that one changed something to something else, but **this is the purpose**.

3. **Choshesh b'grono – oil with cooked water:** A person whose throat hurts drinks oil as medicine. Usually oil alone isn't tasty (a heavy fatty thing), but when one mixes it with cooked water (a kind of soup) or cooked vegetables, one has enjoyment from the drinking – then one makes borei pri ha'etz.

4. **Drinking oil alone when his throat doesn't hurt:** Someone who drinks oil alone without his throat hurting – this is not the normal way to drink oil. He has no enjoyment from the taste of the oil. He makes shehakol, **not borei pri ha'etz**, because the enjoyment is lacking. **But a blessing must still be made** – not like water, where one only needs to make a blessing when one has enjoyment. With oil one does make a blessing (shehakol), but not the important blessing (borei pri ha'etz).

5. **Discussion about "enjoyment":** With choshesh b'grono the person has enjoyment from what the oil does to his throat – that's also a kind of enjoyment/taste. With one who drinks without a reason, he has no enjoyment at all – not from taste, not from healing.

Halacha: Fruits/Vegetables That Are Cooked – Change from Their Way

Words of the Rambam: Fruits or vegetables that are normally eaten raw, and if one cooked or boiled them – one blesses on them at the beginning shehakol nihiyeh bidvaro.

Explanation: Fruits or vegetables that one usually eats raw – if one cooked them, one makes shehakol, because this is not the way to eat them, and the change is a downgrade.

Insights and Explanations:

- **Cooking vs. boiling:** Cooking means cooked with other ingredients/spices; boiling means plainly cooked in hot water. Both cases – if the way is to eat it raw – one makes shehakol.

- The principle: when one does something with a food **opposite to its way**, it becomes less important, and one makes shehakol instead of the proper blessing.

Halacha: Vegetables Normally Boiled – If Eaten Raw

Words of the Rambam: Vegetables that are normally eaten boiled, such as cabbage and turnip – if one ate them raw, one blesses on them at the beginning shehakol.

Explanation: Conversely – vegetables that one usually eats cooked (like cabbage, turnip, potatoes, squash), if one eats them raw, one makes shehakol.

Insights and Explanations:

- The same rule as above, just reversed: with vegetables whose main way is cooked, eating raw is a downgrade.

- **Example:** A raw potato – has no taste, it's not the way, one makes shehakol.

Halacha: Things Eaten Either Raw or Cooked

Words of the Rambam: Things that are normally eaten either raw or cooked – whether eaten raw or cooked, one blesses on them the proper blessing: if it's a tree fruit – borei pri ha'etz, ground fruit or vegetables – borei pri ha'adama.

Explanation: Things that one eats either raw or cooked – one always makes the correct blessing (ha'etz or ha'adama), because both ways are the normal way.

Insights and Explanations:

- "**Ground fruit or vegetables**" – a reasoning: "vegetables" means literally green growths (leafy things, leafy vegetables), and "ground fruit" means things like tomatoes, cucumbers – fruits that grow from the ground. No proof was brought, but it makes sense.

Halacha: Vegetable Broth

Words of the Rambam: Vegetables that are normally boiled – **that one boiled** – what is the law on the water/soup?

Explanation: When one cooks vegetables that the way is to cook, the soup (mei shelikot) has the same law as the vegetables themselves – borei pri ha'adama.

Insights and Explanations:

1. "**Cooked as cooked**" – the water from the vegetables has the same law as the vegetables themselves. The reason: the water itself has no taste; it received the taste from the vegetables. When one cooked **intentionally** to get the taste in the water, this is the main thing – and one makes borei pri ha'adama.

2. **Distinction between boiling and squeezing:** Both times one gets a liquid from the fruit – but with boiling it's the normal way to cook, so the water is part of the normal eating. With squeezing – extracting juice – this is not the normal way one eats most fruits. If today it were the way (like with orange juice), it might be different.

Halacha: Date Honey

Words of the Rambam: Date honey one blesses on it at the beginning shehakol.

Explanation: Honey from dates (date syrup/honey) – one makes shehakol, not borei pri ha'etz, even though dates themselves are from the shivat haminim.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **Question:** Why shouldn't date honey have a law of changed for the better, like wine (from grapes) and oil (from olives)? Honey is also a very important thing!

2. **Answer:** The distinction is that with dates **one eats the fruit itself** – that's the main use. Date honey is a **downgrade** from that, because the main date is eaten as a fruit. Therefore, date honey has the law of all other fruit liquids – shehakol. (Not like wine, where the main purpose of grapes is for wine, and not like oil, where the main purpose of olives is for oil.)

Halacha: Dates Mashed by Hand

Words of the Rambam: But dates that one mashed by hand, and removed their pits, and made them like dough – one blesses on them borei pri ha'etz and beracha acharona me'ein shalosh.

Explanation: Dates that one crushed with the hand, removed the pits, and made like a dough – one makes borei pri ha'etz and beracha me'ein shalosh, because this is still the fruit itself, just in a different form.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **The distinction between date honey and dates mashed by hand:** With honey one takes only the juice/syrup – this is no longer the fruit. With mashing by hand one still eats **the entire date** – just in a crushed form.

2. **The emphasis is on "by hand"** – with the hand. This means a minimal change. When one uses a **machine**, it might be that one no longer sees the dates, and then it's perhaps a different law.

3. "**Therefore honey**" – the Rambam says "therefore honey" (not "therefore dates") – this shows that the shehakol is specifically on the **honey** (the juice/syrup), not on every form of crushed dates.

4. **[Digression: Fruit leather, fruit candy, and similar questions]:** A longer discussion about modern applications:

- **Fruit leather:** Seemingly borei pri ha'etz, because it's made from the entire fruit (not just the juice), similar to "dates mashed by hand."

- **Dried mango:** Seemingly borei pri ha'etz, because it's still the fruit.

- **The main question:** What is the definition of when a fruit loses its "nature of fruit"? The distinction seems to be: **if one still sees the fruit** (like with mashing by hand) vs. **if one no longer sees the fruit** (like with a machine that grinds it completely).

- One opinion: when one mashes a banana for a child so it becomes a puree – it no longer has "nature of fruit." The second study partner disagrees – he thinks that as long as one eats the entire fruit (not just the juice), it's still borei pri ha'etz.

- With fruit leather made from real fruits (not artificial), it seems one should make borei pri ha'etz. But when it's a mixture of more than one fruit, or when one doesn't see at all what it is – it's more complicated. The matter wasn't completely resolved.

Halacha: Sweet Canes (Sugar Cane)

Words of the Rambam: Sweet canes – and one cooks them in water until it thickens and stands – the consensus of the Geonim is that one blesses borei pri ha'adama. And some said borei pri ha'etz. And so they said that one who sucks those canes blesses borei pri ha'adama. And I say that this is not a fruit, and one only blesses on it shehakol. The honey of roots that changed through fire should not be greater than date honey that didn't change except shehakol.

Explanation: The Rambam brings a dispute of the Geonim about sugar cane. One cooks them in water until it becomes thick – this is sugar. The Geonim held borei pri ha'adama; others held borei pri ha'etz. Also on sucking (chewing) the canes themselves they said borei pri ha'adama. The Rambam disagrees: he holds that this is not a fruit at all, and one only

makes shehakol. His proof: date honey, which is only squeezed without any change through fire, is already not "fruit" (one makes shehakol) – all the more so sugar which was completely changed through cooking.

Insights and Explanations:

1) The dispute of the Geonim: tree or ground?

The Geonim all agree that sugar cane is a "fruit" – the question is only whether it's a tree (borei pri ha'etz) or a small growth (borei pri ha'adama). The doubt is because a cane is tall like a tree, but it's not clear if it has the status of a tree.

2) Sucking the canes – what is the law?

When someone takes the canes entirely and sucks out the sweetness (motetz), the Geonim also said borei pri ha'adama. According to the opinion that holds borei pri ha'etz on sugar, it might be that on sucking one makes only adama – because sucking is a weaker way of eating.

3) The Rambam's innovation: "And I say that this is not a fruit"

The Rambam disagrees with all the Geonim. He holds that sugar is not a fruit at all, and one only makes shehakol. His proof is a kal vachomer: date honey – which is only squeezed from dates without any major process – one already makes shehakol. All the more so sugar, which was completely changed through cooking in fire ("changed through fire"), one shouldn't make any fruit blessing on it.

4) Major dispute in learning the Rambam – two ways

Way A (the Kesef Mishne / Beit Yosef's way): The Rambam says two separate claims: (1) the canes themselves are not a fruit – therefore on sucking one makes shehakol; (2) even if one would agree that the canes are a fruit, the sugar that comes out after cooking is certainly not better than date honey, which is shehakol.

Way B (the Maggid Shiur's strong position): The Rambam speaks only about one thing – whether the sugar (the product after cooking) is still a "fruit" or not. The Rambam doesn't go into the inquiry of whether the canes themselves are a fruit. His only claim is: the sugar is a "new thing" that was completely changed, and therefore it's no longer a fruit – with a proof from date honey. "A person doesn't speak this way, and also the Rambam doesn't speak this way" – that one should insert two separate claims in one sentence without any sign.

5) The Kesef Mishne's answer to the Tur

The Tur answers the Geonim against the Rambam's proof from date honey: with dates one eats the date itself, so the honey is just a side thing. But with sugar cane the entire purpose of planting them is to make sugar. Therefore, the sugar is the main fruit.

The Kesef Mishne answers: "One can see that the Tur didn't live in a place where they plant sugar cane." Because in places where they grow sugar cane, they also sell the canes themselves for licking and sucking. Therefore, there is a way to eat the canes themselves – just like with dates – and the honey/sugar remains a side thing.

6) Critique of the Beit Yosef's way of learning the Rambam

"The Beit Yosef has a custom of reading into poskim" – he learns into the Rambam things that the Rambam doesn't say. The Beit Yosef's claim that the Rambam means that the cane itself is not a fruit (because it's a stick/reed) is a nice reasoning, but it doesn't fit with the Rambam's language. The

Rambam speaks only about one point: whether the product (sugar) is still a "fruit" or not.

7) The Rambam's principle: What does "fruit" mean?

The fundamental principle of the Rambam's position: the Rambam thinks only about one question – is the product still "the fruit" or is it already a "new thing"? He doesn't go into the inquiry of "why this is made" (purpose). He only asks: is it different from the original thing, or not?

8) Orange juice – a practical question

It's touched upon that the question of squeezing fruits is very relevant for orange juice, because oranges are planted specifically for juice. Seemingly one could argue that because this is the purpose, one should make borei pri ha'etz. But the conclusion is that no one makes borei pri ha'etz on orange juice – the rule remains that all fruits except wine and oil, when one squeezes out juice, one makes shehakol.

Methodological Note: How to Learn Rambam

One may not learn first the Kesef Mishne and then the Rambam, because then one already reads the Kesef Mishne's interpretation into the Rambam's words. The correct way is: first learn what the Rambam writes himself, understand the plain meaning, and only then bring commentators – including the Kesef Mishne and others. The Rambam wrote for people who will only learn Rambam, without other sources, and therefore one must be able to understand his text alone.

Halacha: Kor (Palm Heart)

Words of the Rambam: The kor, which is the head of the palm that is not like white wood, and they cook it – that the kor is not a fruit, and the proof is that it resembles beams.

Explanation: The kor (palm heart) is the soft inner part of the tip of a date palm. The Rambam rules that it's not a fruit, and the proof is that it's similar to korot (beams/trunks) – it's a part of the tree itself, not a fruit. Therefore, one makes shehakol.

Insights and Explanations:

1. The Rambam says clearly his reasoning: the kor is not a fruit because it's similar to korot – it's a piece of the tree's structure, not a product that the tree brings forth. One doesn't need to squeeze in other explanations.

2. **Important distinction:** The palm tree does have normal fruits – dates. The kor is a second product from the same tree, but it's not the fruit. This is a tree that has two products – one is the fruit (dates – borei pri ha'etz), and the second is a side thing (kor – shehakol), because it's not a fruit.

Halacha: Capers

Words of the Rambam: Capers of the caper bush – and they cook it alone first, because it's not a fruit, rather the aviyonot of the caper bush are the fruit, which are like the form of thin small dates, and they eat them as fruit.

Explanation: The caper bush has different parts that people eat. The capers (the bud/outer part) are not the fruit, therefore one makes borei pri ha'adama on them (not ha'etz). The real

fruits are the aviyonot – small sticks similar to small dates – and on them one makes borei pri ha'etz.

Insights and Explanations:

1. The Rambam puts the kor and the caper together in one halacha, because both are examples of trees that have two products: one is the real fruit (borei pri ha'etz), and the second is a side product that people eat but is not the fruit.

2. **Distinction between kor and capers:** On the kor one makes **shehakol** (because it's literally a part of the tree, similar to korot), but on capers one makes **borei pri ha'adama** – it's a smaller level down from ha'etz, but not as far as shehakol. One must understand the distinction: why does the kor receive shehakol and the capers receive adama, when both are not the fruit of their tree.

3. **[Digression: Parallel to cinnamon]:** Cinnamon is an example of a tree where the tree itself has a taste – one cuts off pieces of the tree and eats it. This is a case of "taste of its wood and fruit are equal." But in the Rambam one doesn't see a clear halacha that when one eats the tree itself one makes borei pri ha'etz – "fruit of the tree" means what the tree produces, not the tree itself. The tree itself is ground fruit.

Halacha: Pepper and Ginger

Words of the Rambam: Pepper and ginger, when they are fresh – one blesses on them at the beginning borei pri ha'adama. Dried – they don't require a blessing neither before them nor after them.

Explanation: On fresh (moist) pepper and ginger one makes borei pri ha'adama. But when they are dried, one makes nothing – not before eating and not after eating – because in dried state they are no longer food, but a spice that one puts in a pot to give taste.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **Why no blessing on dried?** Because no one eats dried pepper or ginger as food. One puts pieces in a pot to give taste – this is not "eating." The Rambam's rule is that foods that are not fit for eating and beverages that are not fit for drinking – one doesn't bless neither before them nor after them. This is not determined by the individual's opinion – if the world holds that this is not fit for eating, you're a "strange creature" if you eat it. All laws of blessings are built on an objective norm, not on individual preferences.

2. **Question of Rabbeinu Yona – why not borei pri ha'etz on fresh pepper?** Rabbeinu Yona asks: pepper is a product of a tree (according to his understanding), and it's obligated in orlah – why doesn't one make borei pri ha'etz? He answers: since the taste of its wood and fruit are equal – the pepper tree itself has the same taste as the fruit. When one can cut off a piece of the tree and eat it with the same taste, the fruit is not special by itself – the entire tree is like ground fruit, and everything that grows from it also receives only borei pri ha'adama.

3. **Rabbeinu Yona's second question – etrog:** Etrog is also taste of its wood and fruit are equal, and yet one makes borei pri ha'etz! He answers: with etrog it's very clear what is the fruit and what is the tree – one can clearly distinguish. But with pepper (and similar plants like cinnamon) it's not clear what is the fruit and what is the tree, because the tree itself has a taste.

4. **Major question: What does "pepper" mean in the Gemara/Rambam?** What we call today "pepper" (bell peppers, hot peppers) is not a tree at all – it's a kind of vegetable/vine (vine/bush) that grows from the ground. It's simply ground fruit. If so, Rabbeinu Yona's question (why not tree fruit?) is not relevant. The Rabbeinu Menachem (a commentator on the Rambam) holds that pepper is obligated in orlah, which means he holds it's a tree. But today's rabbis say that most poskim hold that pepper (what we call pepper) is not obligated in orlah – it's not a tree. It must be that the pepper of the Gemara and Rambam is a completely different plant from what we call today "pepper" – it's a different species that is actually a tree. One should look in Aruch Erech Aleph for more information.

Halacha: List of Things on Which One Makes Shehakol – Gemara Berachot

Words of the Gemara (Berachot): Bread that spoiled, wine that soured, a cooked dish that lost its form, fallen fruits that are unripe, beer, vinegar, locusts, salt, mushrooms and fungi – on all of them one blesses at the beginning shehakol nihiyeh bidvaro.

Explanation: The Gemara brings a list of things on which one makes shehakol: (1) bread that spoiled – even if one still uses it (makes kugel/casserole), because it lost the importance of bread, one no longer makes hamotzi/mezonot but shehakol; (2) wine that spoiled; (3) a cooked dish that lost its form; (4) fruit that fell before ripening; (5) beer; (6) vinegar (wine that became vinegar); (7) locusts; (8) salt; (9) mushrooms and fungi.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **Salt – a mineral with a blessing:** Salt is a mineral, not something that grows from the ground. Borei pri ha'adama means things that grow from the ground, not "dead things." However, when one finds a way to eat a mineral, one makes shehakol – because shehakol is the general blessing for everything that doesn't have a special blessing.

2. **Mushrooms and fungi – not growths of the ground:** Mushrooms and fungi are not "growth from the ground" in the simple sense. They do come from under the ground, but they don't have roots like a plant – they are a fungus (with mycelium). They can grow on a wall, in air, not only in soil. Therefore, one makes shehakol and not borei pri ha'adama.

Halacha: Final Blessing of Shehakol – Borei Nefashot

Words of the Rambam: On all things on which one makes shehakol, one blesses after it borei nefashot rabot v'chesronan al kol ma shebarata l'hachayot bahem nefesh kol chai.

Explanation: The Almighty created people with their needs ("v'chesronan" – their lacks/desires), and He created all things to satisfy the desires – "l'hachayot bahem nefesh kol chai."

Insights and Explanations:

- **Text difference between Rambam and our custom:** The Rambam brings the text **without** a conclusion (without "baruch" at the end). Our custom is to say "baruch chai ha'olamim" – a bit of a conclusion without shem u'malchut. This is a remarkable difference that needs to be understood.

Halacha 9: Wine Sediment – Water on Wine Dre**Halacha 9: Wine Sediment – Water on Wine Dregs**

Words of the Rambam: Wine sediment on which one placed water – if he placed on it three and found four – one blesses on it borei pri hagafen, for this is diluted wine. But if it produced less than the majority – even if it has the taste of wine – one blesses on it at the beginning shehakol.

Explanation: When one pours water on wine sediment (wine dregs) in order to extract the wine that is absorbed between the dregs: if one pours in 3 measures of water and 4 measures come out, it means 1 measure is wine – this is a quarter wine, which is enough for "diluted wine" (a third wine is the measure), and one makes borei pri hagafen. But if less than the measure of dilution comes out – even if one tastes wine flavor – one only makes shehakol.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **Major innovation – one doesn't go by taste with wine:** The Rambam says explicitly "even if it has the taste of wine" – one only makes shehakol. This means that with wine one doesn't go by taste, but by the proportion of actual wine. This is seemingly against the rule of ikar and tafel, where one goes by what the person wants.

2. **Question:** Why shouldn't one say that the person drinks this for the wine taste, and the water is only tafel? He's not drinking plain water – he's seeking the wine taste!

3. **Answer:** Wine is a "significant thing" with a special important blessing (borei pri hagafen). To deserve the important blessing, it must have the status of wine – not just a taste of wine. Water with wine taste is a "nice beverage" but not wine. The importance of borei pri hagafen requires actual wine, not just taste.

4. **[Digression: Practical question – grape juice with seltzer:]** If someone mixes grape juice (which seemingly has the law of wine, because it comes from grapes) with seltzer or water – does one go by the same measure of diluted wine? **First side:** Yes, one needs at least a third grape juice. **Second side:** Seltzer is different – one pours it in not to weaken the wine, but to give bubbles/gas. This is perhaps a completely different question. **Note:** It's not so simple that commercial grape juice is actually 100% grape juice.

5. **Fundamental question – whether the law of dilution applies only to wine:** An important inquiry: whether the rule of "dilution" (proportion-based, not taste-based) is a special law only for wine/borei pri hagafen, or also for other blessings? **With borei pri hagafen:** One goes by proportion, not by taste – because wine has a special important blessing, and one needs the status of "wine" to deserve the blessing. **With borei pri ha'etz (theoretically):** If one had a liquid that deserves borei pri ha'etz, and one mixes it with water – one would perhaps go by taste, because borei pri ha'etz doesn't have the same special importance. **Conclusion:** This could be a special law in the Rambam – that the law of dilution (proportion-based) is specific to wine/borei pri hagafen, but with other beverages one goes by taste.

Halacha: Mistake in Blessings – Made a Wrong Blessing

The Rambam's Words: If one blessed on tree fruits borei pri ha'adama – he fulfilled. If one blessed on ground fruits borei pri ha'etz – he didn't fulfill. But on everything, if he said shehakol nihiyeh bidvaro – he fulfilled, even on bread and wine.

Explanation: Borei pri ha'adama is a general blessing on everything that grows from the ground, including tree fruits (because trees also grow from the ground). Therefore, if one says adama on tree fruits – he fulfilled. But if one says ha'etz on vegetables – he didn't fulfill, because it's simply not true. Shehakol is fulfilled on everything, even on bread and wine.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **The logic of "general goes on specific, but specific doesn't go on general":** A general language (like adama or shehakol) includes also the specific (tree fruits), but a specific language (like ha'etz) doesn't include the general (vegetables). When one says borei pri ha'etz on a vegetable, one said something that is false – it's not tree fruit at all.

2. **Innovation in understanding blessing – "placing God's name on the thing":** A blessing is not just thanks, but a "placement" – one brings forth God's name on the thing, almost a kind of holiness. When one says "Baruch Ata Hashem Elokeinu Melech Ha'olam," one makes a "holy moment." This helps understand why beracha levatala is so serious – one placed God's name on nothing. Chassidic books say that blessing is "drawing down abundance" – this is a chassidic interpretation, but the idea that blessing is a placement of God's name is original in the Gemara itself.

3. **Practical difference:** If one understands that the main blessing is bringing forth God's name on the thing, one better understands why shehakol is fulfilled on everything – because the main thing, the placement of God's name, is there. Chazal added important specific blessings, but if one thanked the Almighty without the importance – one fulfilled the main thing.

Halacha: Mistake in Language but Correct Intention – "Stumbled in His Speech"

The Rambam's Words: One who takes a cup of beer in his hand... and erred and said borei pri hagafen – we don't make him repeat. And so if ground fruits were before him and he said borei pri ha'etz, or if a grain dish was before him and he said [another blessing] – he fulfilled. Because at the time he mentioned the Name and Kingship he only intended the proper blessing for that species, and that is the essence of the blessing.

Explanation: Someone holds a cup of beer (shehakol), he knows it's beer, he begins "Baruch Ata Hashem Elokeinu Melech Ha'olam" with intention on beer, but at the end he says by mistake "borei pri hagafen" – we don't make him repeat. The principle: when he said shem u'malchut (this is the essence of the blessing), he meant the correct thing. The mistake was only a "stumble in speech" at the end.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **The Rambam's principle – intention at shem u'malchut is the main thing:** "Shem u'malchut" – that is "Baruch Ata Hashem Elokeinu Melech Ha'olam" – is the essence of the blessing. If at that moment the person knew what he's making a blessing on, the blessing is valid, even if he

erred in the conclusion/ending. If one had asked him at the moment of "Melech Ha'olam" – "what are you making a blessing on?" – he would have answered "on beer, shehakol."

2. Dispute between Rambam and Ra'avad: The Ra'avad argues very strongly. He holds that one goes entirely by what comes out of the mouth, not by what the person thought. According to the Ra'avad, if he said borei pri hagafen on beer, we make him repeat.

3. The reverse case – mistake in intention: What if he holds a cup of beer, but at "Baruch Ata Hashem Elokeinu Melech Ha'olam" he thought it was wine, and only at the end did he notice it's beer? Seemingly according to the Rambam's reasoning he didn't fulfill, because his intention at shem u'malchut was on wine. The Rambam doesn't rule on this case explicitly – perhaps because it's a doubt in the Gemara, and doubtful blessings are lenient.

4. How can such a mistake happen? It's a "stumble in speech" – he was distracted, or he was singing a havdala tune with a friend and the wrong words came in. The Rambam doesn't speak of someone who doesn't know what he's holding (a closed box), and not of someone who doesn't know the halacha – but of someone who knows everything correctly but had a speech error.

5. Understanding of "intention" – not a sentence in the head: "Intention" in this context doesn't mean that one has a sentence in the head. Intention means: if one asks you what you're doing, you say it. Therefore, one can't make a "condition" (as the Butchatcher Rav said) that "always when I say Baruch Ata Hashem, I mean on what is actually there" – this is not how intention works. Intention is not an abstract declaration, but a concrete awareness of what one is doing at the moment.

6. In practice – how the Acharonim rule: The Mishna Berura and other Acharonim don't rule like the Rambam. But in practice, even according to them, one can be lenient and not repeat, because it's a dispute of Rishonim, and doubtful blessings are lenient – either way one comes out not repeating.

Halacha: Doubt Whether One Made a Blessing

The Rambam's Words: All blessings, if one is in doubt whether he blessed or not – he doesn't go back and bless, neither at the beginning nor at the end.

Explanation: When a person is in doubt whether he made an initial blessing on food (fruit blessings, shehakol, etc.), or a final blessing (me'ein shalosh, borei nefashot), he doesn't need to repeat. This is different from birkat hamazon, where it's a biblical doubt and one must repeat.

Insights and Explanations:

- **Rabbinic doubt is lenient:** The principle is the well-known rule that rabbinic doubt is lenient. All initial blessings (shehakol, borei pri ha'etz, ha'adama, mezonot) and all final blessings (me'ein shalosh, borei nefashot) are rabbinic, therefore in a doubt one goes leniently and doesn't repeat. The Rambam emphasizes "neither at the beginning nor at the end" – not the initial blessing and not the final blessing.

- **Connection to the previous topic:** The same principle of rabbinic doubt being lenient also helps with other doubts in blessings – for example when one is in doubt between the

Rambam's position and another position, one can be lenient and not repeat.

Halacha: Forgot a Blessing and Already Put Food in Mouth

The Rambam's Words: If one forgot and put food in his mouth and didn't bless – if it's a beverage, he swallows it and blesses at the end. And if it's food, if throwing it out would make it disgusting – such as figs and grapes – he moves it to one side and blesses. And if they are things that if he spits them out they don't become disgusting – such as beans and peas – he spits it out of his mouth until he blesses.

Explanation: Three categories when one forgot to make an initial blessing and already put food in mouth:

1. **Beverage (drink):** One swallows it down and makes afterward a blessing (final blessing).

2. **Foods that become disgusting when spit out (figs, grapes):** One puts it to the side in the mouth and makes the blessing.

3. **Foods that don't become disgusting (beans, peas, candy, hard things):** One spits it out, makes the blessing, and puts it back in.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **"Blesses at the end" with beverage – what does it mean?** "At the end" means a **final blessing** – as one sees from the previous language "neither at the beginning nor at the end," where "at the beginning" means initial blessing and "at the end" means final blessing. Therefore, with beverage one misses the initial blessing completely – one swallows it down and only makes a final blessing (borei nefashot).

2. **Why can't one hold it in the mouth and make a blessing with beverage?** Because it's dangerous – one can choke. With the swallowing passage not free to make a blessing when one holds liquid in the mouth.

3. **"One shouldn't bless with a full mouth":** The principle why one must remove or move aside the food is because one may not make a blessing with a full mouth. Additionally: an initial blessing must be **before** one eats, not while one is eating – therefore if it's already in the mouth it's a problem.

4. **Distinction between "moves to one side" and "spits out":** With figs and grapes that become disgusting when spit out (because they're already half-chewed), one can't require that he spit it out – therefore one only puts it to the side. But with hard things (beans, peas, candy) that don't become disgusting, the law is that one should actually spit it out, make the blessing with an empty mouth, and then eat. With grapes for example, even when one hasn't yet chewed it, one puts it to the side – because when spitting it out it will become disgusting.

Halacha: Many Species – Order of Blessings

The Rambam's Words: One who eats many species – if they have the same blessing, he blesses on one of them and exempts the rest. And if they are different blessings, he blesses on each one the proper blessing. And which species does he bless first?

Explanation: When one has different foods before him: if they all have the same blessing (for example all shehakol), one makes one blessing and it exempts everything. If they have different blessings, one makes on each food separately. The question is: which blessing does one make first?

Insights and Explanations:

1. **When one has a preference:** The Rambam's rule is that when one wants one food more than the other, one makes first on what one wants to eat first.

2. **"He doesn't want this more than that" – a rare case:** The Rambam speaks of a case where the person has absolutely no preference. This is almost never relevant in practice – because almost always a person has a preference. Only with such a "strange person" for whom nothing matters, is there a halachic order.

3. **[Humorous comment:]** The person who has absolutely no preference is such a "pious fool" who instead of saying "let's eat" says "let's make a blessing" – for him the blessing is the main thing, not the eating.

Halacha: The Seven Species Come First – Order of the Verse

The Rambam's Words: The seven species with which the Land of Israel was praised come first. Whatever comes first in the verse comes first for blessing. And the seven are those enumerated in this verse: "A land of wheat and barley and grapevine and fig and pomegranate, a land of olive oil and honey." And honey is dates. And dates come before grapes.

Explanation: When one has no preference, one goes by the order of the seven species. The order is determined by the verse, with a special rule: what is closer to the word "land" is more important.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **The rule of "close to land":** The word "land" appears **twice** in the verse – once at the beginning ("a land of wheat and barley and grapevine and fig and pomegranate") and once in the middle ("a land of olive oil and honey"). Each "land" begins a new list, and what is closer to "land" is more important.

2. **Dates come before grapes – how?** Seemingly grapevine (grapes) appears earlier in the verse than honey (dates). But the calculation is: grapevine appears three words after the first "land" (land – wheat – barley – **grapevine**), but honey/dates appears only two words after the second "land" (land – olive oil – **honey**). Because dates is **closer** to its "land," dates is more important than grapes.

3. **The logical foundation:** When one names a land by a fruit ("this is the land of..."), it's a sign that the fruit is very important there. The closer the fruit stands to the word "land," the more important it is.

4. **"Honey is dates":** The Rambam interprets that "honey" in the verse means dates, not regular honey. Regular honey is shehakol; even date honey (the juice/syrup) is shehakol – the verse speaks of dates themselves.

5. **Seven species even outside the Land:** The law of seven species coming first applies even when the fruits grow in America – it's the **species** that the Land of Israel is known for, not specifically fruits that come from the Land of Israel.

6. **Connection to blessing of the Land:** The reason why the seven species come first is because birkat hamazon has to do with blessing of the Land – "and on the Land and on the food," "and you shall bless Hashem your God on the good Land" – therefore one makes first on what has a connection with the Land of Israel.

7. **Discussion: whether olive/dates come before barley:** If what is closer to "land" is more important, olive (right after the second "land") should come before barley (two words after the first "land")! **Answer:** Wheat and barley are a **different category** – they are mezonot/hamotzi, not fruits. The entire discussion of order of precedence is only between fruits. Additionally, when one makes mezonot or hamotzi, one usually doesn't make other blessings (because the other things are tafel). The shiur leaves this open – "you'll look at the poskim" – but the simple way in the Rambam is that mezonot has a special importance that makes it first.

Halacha: Text of Me'ein Shalosh on Fruits and Wine

The Rambam's Words: The one blessing that is me'ein shalosh on the five fruit species and on wine – on fruits one says "on the tree and on the fruit of the tree and on the produce of the field and on the desirable, good and spacious land" etc. On wine one says "on the vine and on the fruit of the vine and on the produce of the field and on the desirable land" etc. And one concludes on both "on the Land and on the fruits." And if he was in the Land of Israel he says "on the Land and on its fruits."

Explanation: The beginning is different – on fruits one says "on the tree and on the fruit of the tree," on wine one says "on the vine and on the fruit of the vine" – but the end is the same: "on the Land and on the fruits." In the Land of Israel one says "on the Land and on its fruits."

Insights and Explanations:

- **The Rambam's conclusion vs. our text:** The Rambam says that on wine one concludes "on the Land and on the fruits" – not "on the Land and on the fruit of the vine." This is different from our custom (according to the Rema), where we say for wine an extra conclusion "on the vine and on the fruit of the vine."

Halacha: Adding "The Good and Beneficent" in Me'ein Shalosh

The Rambam's Words: And there is one who adds in the blessing that is me'ein shalosh before the conclusion "for You are God, good and beneficent" which is like a fourth blessing. And there is one who says not to say "the God, good and beneficent," for they only established a fourth blessing in birkat hamazon alone.

Explanation: Two positions: (1) one adds "for You are God, good and beneficent" in me'ein shalosh, so it should be like a fourth blessing, (2) one doesn't say it, because a fourth blessing was only established for birkat hamazon.

Insights and Explanations:

- **The Rambam doesn't rule:** The Rambam brings both positions without ruling what one should do. Seemingly one can do what one wants.

- **The background:** There was a custom to make the me'ein shalosh into a mini "like birkat hamazon" with all four elements – hazan, land, Jerusalem, and the good and beneficent.

Halacha: Combining Me'ein Shalosh When One Ate Multiple Species

The Rambam's Words: If one ate dates and drank wine and ate a dish from the five grain species – he blesses "on the sustenance and on the provision and on the vine and on the fruit of the vine and on the tree and on the fruit of the tree and on the produce of the field and on the desirable, good and spacious land" etc., and concludes "on the Land and on the sustenance and on the fruits."

Explanation: When one ate three types of things that all have me'ein shalosh – grain species, wine, and fruits – one puts everything together in one blessing. The order is: first on the sustenance (grain species), then on the vine (wine), then on the tree (fruits).

Insights and Explanations:

1. **The order shows importance:** From the order – first sustenance, then vine, then tree – one sees that it goes by importance. Grain species is the most important, then wine, then fruits.

2. **The nature of combining:** With birkat hamazon there is no such thing as combining different blessings. But with me'ein shalosh one puts together three separate blessings into one large blessing. It's not that one exempts the other – each species gets its own mention within the blessing.

3. **Difficulty with "its fruits" in the Land of Israel with combined blessing:** When one is in the Land of Israel and says "on the Land and on the sustenance and on its fruits" – to whom does "its fruits" belong? To "the Land" or to "the sustenance"? Logically it means fruits of the land, but "the sustenance" cuts between "the Land" and "its fruits," which makes difficult language. Various suggestions are discussed – perhaps "on the Land and on its fruits and on the sustenance" (so "its fruits" should be adjacent to "the Land"), or "on its sustenance" – but both are rejected: "its fruits" must be adjacent to "land" for it to make sense, and "its sustenance" doesn't fit because sustenance (satiation) is not something that comes directly from the land like fruits. The matter remains open.

Halacha: Borei Nefashot Cannot Be Combined with Me'ein Shalosh

The Rambam's Words: If one ate meat and drank wine – he blesses on the vine and on the fruit of the vine, and blesses borei nefashot rabot on the meat.

Explanation: When one ate meat (shehakol/borei nefashot) and drank wine (on the vine), one makes two separate final blessings. One cannot combine borei nefashot with me'ein shalosh.

Insights and Explanations:

1. **Why can't one combine?** Me'ein shalosh is a long blessing, and Chazal didn't want to make a person say me'ein shalosh twice. But borei nefashot is a short blessing, so it's not a burden to say it separately.

2. **But fruits that are not from the seven species are included:** When one ate figs/grapes (seven species) together with apples/pears (not seven species), one only makes one me'ein shalosh, and the words "on the fruit of the tree" include also the apples and pears. The apples would have received borei nefashot alone, but when one already says "on the fruit of the tree" in me'ein shalosh, they are also included.

3. **Why does this work with fruits but not with meat?** When one says "on the tree and on the fruit of the tree," one mentions fruits in general – this includes also fruits that are not seven species. But when one says "on the vine and on the fruit of the vine," one mentions nothing about meat – meat is not a fruit, not a tree, not a vine. Therefore, me'ein shalosh cannot exempt meat.

4. **[Innovation – explanation with Rabbeinu Yona/Tosafot:] Borei nefashot is a blessing on "extras":** The Almighty created two categories: (1) **Main foods** – fruits, grain, wine – that one can live on, and on these are the important blessings (borei pri ha'etz, ha'adama, me'ein shalosh). (2) **Extras/pleasure things** – like meat, which one doesn't need to have to live (as Tosafot says that an apple is made for pleasure, not for life necessity). On this is borei nefashot – a separate, short blessing on the "extra" things. Therefore, when one says "on the vine" or "on the tree," one speaks about the main foods, and it has nothing to do with meat which is in a completely different category. "This is a good explanation, this makes sense of the halacha."

| Full Transcript

Laws of Blessings Chapter 8 – Blessings on Fruits

Opening: Sponsorship and Campaign

Speaker 1:

We are learning Laws of Blessings Chapter 8. Yes, Laws of Blessings, and this chapter will discuss the laws of blessings on fruits.

Before we speak about blessings, one must bless a blessing to Hashem, the head of the providers, for the sponsor of our shiur, from the day the world was created, our esteemed sponsor is called the pious rabbi, the generous one, Rabbi Yoel Wetzberger. Everyone should learn from him, especially now

when these days there is a campaign going on for the beit midrash of my dear friend, the gaon Rabbi Yitzchak, who teaches various shiurim. Besides the beautiful shiur that he teaches us, he has other various shiurim full and overflowing with Torah and wisdom. Very good, and he has great portions from whoever supports it. They actually set up the campaign that if one learns with Rabbi Yoel, he will match with Hashem's name up to one hundred, two hundred, three hundred thousand dollars. Everyone should think to send in, and it will be a great encouragement and a great help.

And I said this at the previous campaign, that this works, whoever has done it has understood better. Whoever gives money for our campaign, it is a segulah that he should both

keep up with the shiur and also understand it. And remember, the Rambam is not the shiur, the Rambam is all the Torah that one learns. But do we agree that it is a segulah? It works. It is tried and tested, and it works like this. Whoever gives money for the Torah, he understands it. I mean the segulah is that even if he doesn't learn with the shiur, he still has a portion in the shiur. But if he learns with the shiur, then it is truly "that which the eye has not seen."

Halacha 1: Blessings on Tree Fruits

Speaker 1:

The Rambam says, Laws of Blessings on Fruits. The Rambam says a halacha, we have already learned that there is a Torah-level law of Birkat HaMazon, but the blessing beforehand is rabbinic, and as we have already said, they established for each different type a blessing, for each type of food. Aha, very good. One can look at it like this: in the first chapter the Rambam stated the main principles of blessings, and now he goes through all the details. He went through until the sixth chapter with details of HaMotzi, including entering into a dairy meal and so on, and now he continues to the next blessings on other foods.

The Rambam says, **on all tree fruits one blesses at the beginning "borei pri ha'etz,"** and thanks the Almighty for the trees, **and at the end one says "borei nefashot rabot,"** that the Almighty created people, and created people's needs, and people's pleasures and deficiencies that they lack. And one thanks **"al kol mah shebarata,"** all the things that the Almighty created, all the good foods, **"lehachayot bahem nefesh kol chai."**

The Rambam says, **except for the five species written in the Torah,** except for five species of fruits, one does not make the blessing of wheat, borei nefashot, but rather a different blessing, **"and they are grapes and pomegranates and figs,"** grapes, pomegranates, figs, **"olives and dates,"** olives and dates. It is very interesting, because there are five of the seven species.

On these things one blesses **"beracha achat me'ein shalosh,"** although the blessing of pri ha'etz is the same, but at the end one makes a beracha achat me'ein shalosh, a longer blessing.

Explanation: Why the Five Species Receive a Special Final Blessing

First of all, it's simply interesting, why seemingly? Because these are the seven species, and therefore this is the main thing, "kol pri asher teva'rech," but it doesn't say specifically the land. But they learned that this is an enactment for the land, and these fruits are the praise of the children of the land, they belong to the Land of Israel specifically. Seemingly in the Land of Israel only these fruits used to grow, not other things and the like. And also because it is important, there are the five species, there are also the five types of grain. The seven species, wheat and barley, are divided into five, you have two types of wheat and three types of barley, and then it comes out that there are actually ten species. The seven species which are ten, because on five of them one makes bentching, and on the other five one makes beracha achat me'ein shalosh.

The Rambam tells us, these five species that have something to do with the Land of Israel, because that is seemingly the matter, that one says "al ha'aretz ve'al hamazon," and

therefore one should say differently "haketuvim baTorah." In the beracha achat me'ein shalosh one mentions the land.

Halacha 1 (continued): Blessings on Ground Fruits, Vegetables, and Other Foods

Speaker 1:

So, he says, **"all fruits of the earth,"** all other fruits of the earth not from the tree, and the same thing with vegetables, the things that grow as vegetables, vegetables, grow on the floor, **"one blesses on them at the beginning 'borei pri ha'adamah,'" one makes a blessing before eating "borei pri ha'adamah," "and at the end 'borei nefashot rabot."**

Discussion: The Order of Blessings – From General to Specific

Speaker 2:

Okay. Yes. It means, borei pri ha'etz is a special one, it means everything that comes out of the earth, but there is then the special fruit that the earth gives out through trees, one makes a blessing on the tree. Yes, but borei pri ha'etz is everything, including borei pri ha'etz.

Speaker 1:

True, true, true. Or wait, like before it has such importance.

Speaker 2:

No, the more important, the more special, one comes and makes a blessing on the specialness in it, on the tree.

Blessing on Things That Don't Grow From the Earth

Speaker 1:

"And things that are not grown from the earth," things that don't grow, **"such as meat and cheese and fish,"** fish, dairy, cheese, fish, eggs, water, milk, honey, **"and similar things,"** all things that are not grown from the ground, what does one make on this? **"At the beginning one blesses 'shehakol nihiyeh bidvaro,'" everything the Almighty created, "and at the end 'borei nefashot rabot."**

Discussion: Why Shehakol on Meat?

It's an interesting blessing, because borei pri ha'etz one understands, it's very direct, the Almighty placed a power in the earth to produce fruits. For these things a person usually has to work to have meat, he has to catch animals, and animals had to eat a lot of grass. But shehakol nihiyeh bidvaro, also what people do is the Almighty's...

Speaker 2:

An animal is from nature.

Speaker 1:

An animal is a thing that grows, and one must slaughter it. Water comes out from...

Speaker 2:

No, one says that it's more involved with human work, but he brings a proof.

Speaker 1:

But everything comes from the Almighty.

Speaker 2:

True, true.

Speaker 1:

Yes, it seems to me, I actually said this to myself, that the Almighty together with the people who performed according to the halacha. But the Almighty gave people the wisdom.

Speaker 2:

But shehakol nihiyeh bidvaro is more general. Also all other things, except for tree and ground, everything is from the word of the Almighty.

Speaker 1:

Right, the point is, it goes from general to specific. Generally speaking, everything is shehakol, just as we will also learn about the fact that it is exceptional. Then there is adamah, then there is tree from the adamah.

Speaker 2:

I don't think that you can say that the shehakol is more basic.

Speaker 1:

Certainly it is more basic. Shehakol is more a deed for all the camps.

Speaker 2:

No, that's the meaning. I added to you another wheat from the adamah.

Speaker 1:

But the halacha, the word halacha works like this, generally speaking, everything is what the Almighty does. Now, when you have a special thing, one speaks about it specifically. So, one can even say that everything is shehakol. Then, everything is also from the earth, except for meat and cheese etc. You go buy things that are not just nihiyeh bidvaro, but they also came out from the earth, it has a certain importance, he says, from the adamah.

Question: Why Didn't Meat Receive a Special Blessing?**Speaker 2:**

Tell me that vegetables are more important than meat? I don't understand this. It's very difficult for me. Because I would have made a special blessing for meat, it's a whole thing, meat, it's an important thing. I don't know what the explanation is, there must be other versions somewhere where it says that one makes a special blessing on meat. In borei pri ha'adamah it's more because the Almighty created it, you don't have to work so hard for it, the pickle comes out that the Almighty speaks to. Meat one has to work more for.

Speaker 1:

True, but understand what I'm saying, then a portion of the borei pri ha'adamah becomes HaMotzi and a portion of them becomes further HaGafen. More or less the categories decide how they work. I'm still thinking, one must understand why meat doesn't get an extra blessing, it's strange to me, I don't know why.

Speaker 2:

For a time one makes oneself many times. Today one eats quinoa, or what can you say, anything that has high protein, these are very... You ask a question, what happens when in a time when certain foods become the king? Did they look at it that way seemingly. When you speak about meat, it bites, perhaps today people eat more eggs than in the past, could be. But I say, meat has always been an important thing, you can't say not. All sacrifices, and "there is no joy except with meat."

Speaker 1:

Could be actually about this, that you stand yes, one made an extra blessing. Why exactly like that one is a set with meat, when one wants to say a blessing. It's a good question, a great glutten is "ochel vesovei'a." If someone wants to look up or tell

us some reasoning about this, he can write it in the notes group.

Speaker 2:

See, meat didn't receive an "al hashechitah," it didn't receive a blessing for itself. I think, perhaps because usually one eats meat within the meal anyway. Rashi says, "**the Torah teaches you proper conduct, that a person should not eat meat unless he has bread.**" The bread comes with the meat, it comes as an accompaniment. The meat accompanies the bread.

Speaker 1:

The Gemara already spoke about this, it's strange.

The Law of Water – Not to Quench One's Thirst**Speaker 1:**

The rabbi drinks wine, because he likes it, not because...no, shelo. Water one drinks when one is thirsty, so that the throat should have enough water. Then one makes shehakol. What there is is because someone drinks water for another reason, for example he wants to rinse his mouth, or he wants to swallow something down, he must make a blessing neither before nor after, because he has no enjoyment from the water.

But on other things it is seemingly less relevant, because one feels the taste, one has enjoyment. Even if someone drinks milk because he wants to swallow down medicine, he still has enjoyment from the milk.

Speaker 2:

Right. Water has no taste. So automatically if not for thirst there is no taste.

Discussion: Drinking Water on Doctor's Orders**Speaker 1:**

I don't know, for example today there are people who drink water many times simply because the doctor said so. I'm not sure if one makes a blessing on this. What is the enjoyment from it? It's not... One can perhaps say yes, but one can think.

I also thought that about this, that the Chassidic Jews who never eat any plain water, one only drinks like this, it's a Torah that water is desire. But could be that it's true about the stringency, a Chassidic Jew cannot simply water, God forbid, true? So automatically he wouldn't have been able to make any shehakol.

Speaker 2:

If it were so, the Rambam would have specified like water to quench one's thirst. He says by "not to quench one's thirst" one doesn't need to. Yes, but he doesn't say... I mean that when it's such a thing as swallowing down medicine. On the other hand, the Rambam doesn't bring the example from the Gemara, he only brings you clearly the truth that he needs to swallow down something, a bone. It's true, one can say to quench one's thirst, everyone knows what he means. But the Rambam didn't specify this by the blessing. He says, there is a strange thing, why would a person drink not to quench his thirst.

Speaker 1:

Okay, it happens, he is stuck in his throat. If someone, the doctor tells him drink a lot of water, just as the doctor tells him eat a lot of bread. Actually, put into your diet water, instead of other things drink water. One can say it like this, and one can say otherwise too.

Digression: Chassidic Joke About Shehakol**Speaker 2:**

Okay. Let's just say that... Okay. You know the story, a Chassidic Jew drinks for whatever, all kinds of... before making a l'chaim, he can't make a shehakol. He asks a question, he can drink water. What is the answer? The answer is that a Jew drinks, why does he make a shehakol? Doesn't he get a glass of schnapps?

Speaker 1:

Ah, very good.

Halacha 2: Squeezing Fruits – Juice from Fruits**Speaker 1:**

"One who squeezes fruits and extracts liquids from them," there is a branch that is built on great laws of fruits. One will learn what one takes fruits, when things become changed, when fruits become, when a fruit becomes from a fruit to something else. **"One who squeezes fruits and extracts liquids from them,"** he made juice. **"One blesses on them at the beginning shehakol,"** one makes a shehakol. It's not good this.

"One blesses on them at the beginning shehakol," one makes a shehakol. By the way, seemingly one should make ha'etz. But ha'etz one makes on the fruit. The liquid is a different thing, but on the liquid one makes a shehakol. The liquid is like things that are not grown from the earth, like other foods.

Seemingly the word is what is not...

Halacha 2 (continued): One Who Squeezes Fruits and Extracts Liquids

Speaker 1: Part, put into your diet water, instead of other things, drink water. One can say it like this, and one can say otherwise too.

Speaker 2: Okay, I understand. Just say that... Okay.

Digression: A Joke About Shehakol

Speaker 1: You know the story, a Chassidic Jew drinks for whatever all kinds of... before making a l'chaim, he wants to be able to make a shehakol. And he asks a question, he can drink water. What is the answer? The answer is, a Jew drinks because he wants to make a shehakol, doesn't he get a glass of schnapps.

Speaker 2: Ah, very good.

The Halacha: Blessing on Juice

Speaker 1: **"One who squeezes fruits and extracts liquids from them,"** when one takes fruits... when things become changed, when a fruit becomes from a fruit to something else. **"One who squeezes fruits and extracts liquids from them,"** he made juice, **"one blesses on them at the beginning shehakol."** One makes a shehakol. Squeezing, not good the threshold. **"One blesses on them at the beginning shehakol."** One makes a shehakol, although seemingly one should have had to make ha'etz. But ha'etz one makes on the fruit. The liquid is a different thing, on the liquid one makes a shehakol. The liquid is like things that are not grown from the earth, like other foods. Seemingly the fruit is what is not important. To satisfy the soul of Israel.

In short, there are two fruits that when one extracts liquids there is a different law. **"On wine one blesses at the beginning 'borei pri hagafen,' and at the end beracha**

achat me'ein shalosh." The wine becomes changed for the better, the olives become more important. The wine is a new pre-blessing and a beracha achat me'ein shalosh. The grapes, yes.

Halacha: Olive Oil

Speaker 1: But oil doesn't have the law that one must only make a shehakol which is less important. There is no new blessing that it should be more important.

Speaker 2: Okay, oil, usually one doesn't drink oil.

Speaker 1: No, I'm saying why they didn't make a new blessing on oil, because usually one doesn't eat it by itself like that. But oil is also like the category of wine, that it is changed for the better. It became important. But the main olives were made for oil. So automatically, when one drinks oil one makes borei pri ha'etz, because that is the main fruit of the tree. It's not like one changed something with something. That is the purpose.

One Who Has Throat Pain – Oil with Cooked Water

Speaker 1: He says, **"Rav Yehuda said in the name of Shmuel: One who has throat pain should not gargle with oil first."** Why does a person drink oil? Because he wants to be very, he wants to make a massage from inside on his throat. **"When drinking oil with cooked water and similar things,"** there is a way, usually oil on the throat is not tasty, it's a heavy fat thing, but it's mixed with cooked water, with some soup, we will see later that cooked water is a type of soup, and similar things, yes, cooked vegetables, that he eats it.

Behold in his drinking, he had enjoyment from the drinking, he indeed found a way how to eat the oil in a tasty way. **"But when drinking oil alone,"** but he drank oil alone, **"when he doesn't have throat pain,"** when his throat doesn't hurt him, it's not at all the normal way to drink oil then, **"he blesses on it shehakol, because he doesn't enjoy the taste of the oil,"** he didn't have enjoyment from the taste of the oil. A blessing one must still make, only water one needs only when one has enjoyment. A blessing one must still make, but not borei pri ha'etz because there is no enjoyment. So it comes out, yes. The explanation is not enjoyment from the taste of the oil, he has enjoyment from something else, I don't know exactly what one says it.

Discussion: What Does "Enjoyment" Mean by Oil?

Speaker 2: Ah, he says that the explanation is, ah, one who drinks oil alone, he drinks just oil, but it has no taste, he has no enjoyment from it. Enjoyment from oil one has only when it helps something for the throat pain situation. Only then is it normal to drink oil by itself. When it's normal, one sees that the person drinks because it's a normal way, he does differently from the normal custom of people. But the one who is not, it's above, someone who drinks when he doesn't have throat pain makes a shehakol, that is because he doesn't enjoy, because you are simply not enjoying like that, why are you doing it? I understand nothing from him.

Speaker 1: But the doctor ordered him.

Speaker 2: No, the doctor ordered is the previous person.

English Translation

Speaker 1: No, the doctor told him that he should have this oil, not for his throat.

Speaker 2: Whatever it is, what's the explanation? How is it called a taste? Does "choshesh b'grono" (concerned for his throat) mean that he has some pleasure from the taste?

Speaker 1: No, he does have pleasure, he has pleasure from what it does to his throat, some kind of taste, something like that, what should we say.

Speaker 2: Because the second one who eats, also eats for some reason. Why is the second one exempt from anything?

Speaker 1: No, he tells you already "choshesh b'grono," and he does it in a way that it should have a taste, "b'shoteh shemen b'mayim shelukhin" (when drinking oil in boiled water), that's the point.

Speaker 2: Yes, but if he had drunk boiled water he also wouldn't, because for "choshesh b'grono" he couldn't make a blessing, because he didn't have pleasure, it wasn't at all. When does a person do the whole thing that he mixes together oil with - because that's not a normal thing to do.

Law 3: Fruits or Vegetables That Are Normally Eaten Raw

Speaker 1: Fruits or vegetables that are normally eaten raw, fruits or vegetables that are usually eaten raw, if one has made them so they shouldn't go out from their **cooking or boiling**, one has cooked them with other foods, or boiling means one has cooked them plain in hot water, so it seems to me that was the explanation in other places, boiling means cooked plain, and cooking means cooked with other ingredients. **One blesses on them initially "shehakol nihiyeh bidvaro" (by whose word all things came to be)**, because this is not the fruit, it has become changed, and it has become less important, because the main fruit is eaten raw.

Vegetables That Are Normally Eaten Boiled

Speaker 1: But **vegetables that are normally eaten boiled**, vegetables that the normal way is to eat cooked, **such as cabbage and turnip**, like cabbage and I don't know what... turnip, what does one eat lately, that's carrots, I don't know what... the things that one usually eats cooked, squash, I don't know what, right?

Speaker 2: Yes.

Speaker 1: It's the opposite, the vegetable is viewed as the main vegetable is cooked, one doesn't make yet, it's not yet outside the act. **If one ate them raw, one blesses on them initially shehakol**. Good, that's like for example a potato, someone eats a raw potato, so he makes a shehakol, because a raw potato has no taste, someone eats it, it's not the normal way, that's what he means to say, that this is the thing.

Things That Are Normally Eaten Either Raw or Cooked

Speaker 1: And things that are normally eaten either raw or cooked, if one eats them either raw or cooked, one can always make the blessing appropriate to them, if it is a tree fruit "borei pri ha'etz" (who creates the fruit of the tree), or a ground fruit or vegetables "borei pri ha'adamah" (who creates the fruit of the ground).

Speaker 2: What does "pri ha'adamah or vegetables" mean? I don't know what the Rema means when he says "pri ha'adamah or vegetables."

Speaker 1: Vegetables are green, like all leafy things, and "pri ha'adamah" would mean tomatoes, cucumbers.

Speaker 2: Could be, yes. Vegetables could mean literally the green things, all the green growths.

Speaker 1: What you're saying makes sense, I have no proof, but it makes sense.

Law 4: Boiling Water - Soup from Vegetables

Speaker 1: Okay, **vegetables that are normally boiled, that one has boiled**, a person has made such a soup from vegetables that the normal way is to cook. Now there's a novelty, earlier we spoke about eating the fruits themselves in the boiling. It says that not only that, even the soup from the vegetables, **what is the law that one should bless on them "borei pri ha'adamah"?** But there is a way that yes, for example if beforehand he actually cooked it, to have the water, the water should get a taste from the dates. A conclusion **boiling water is like the boiled items**, the water from the vegetables has the same law as the vegetables, which is an important place, not just if one drinks it like that, because the water itself has no taste, the water has now received the taste from the vegetables, and that's why one cooks it, so that's the law of "borei pri ha'adamah." But not in every way, only actually when the vegetable itself is cooked, not when it's water alone.

Law 4 (Continued): Date Honey

Speaker 1: Date honey one blesses on it initially shehakol. Not like... it doesn't have the law like honey that we learned.

Speaker 2: Excuse me, date honey is a thing. They learned about wine and they learned about oil. Why shouldn't there be an extra blessing "nishtaneh lema'aliyuta" (changed for the better) on honey? It's honey after all.

Speaker 1: Very good. It doesn't help, one won't make a blessing "nishtaneh lema'aliyuta" on honey. There's something that you don't do, I can't help you. Honey is also very important... perhaps not on the level of wine and oil, but in any case, date honey is not... because the dates one eats themselves, and since one eats the dates themselves, and this one eats in the form of date honey, it's less important. It's a downgrade, because one eats the dates themselves. The date honey is like all other fruit juices that one makes a shehakol.

Speaker 2: But there is indeed something like a sort of date honey or date sauce, I don't know what one makes indeed today, yes?

Dates That One Crushes by Hand

Speaker 1: But dates that one crushes by hand, but dates that one has crushed by hand and removed their pits and made them like dough, on which one makes **"borei pri ha'etz" and a final blessing "me'ein shalosh" (abridged form of grace)**, because that's not called honey, because that's just actually more honey-like a bit, because he crushed it with his hands, so it became very soft, the honey from it came out, and you feel the honey, but you're still eating the whole date. You eat "borei pri ha'etz" and you say a final blessing "me'ein shalosh."

Speaker 2: Right, honey is when one takes only like... not that one smears the whole date, but something like the sauce from it.

Speaker 1: Okay.

Discussion: Modern Applications - Fruit Leather and Candy

Speaker 2: But here many struggle, for example one makes sorts of candies with things from fruit. The difference between dates crushed by hand or something that one makes other changes so it should become a... so what? For example the dried things that one makes a dried mango. Seemingly one makes a tree blessing.

Speaker 1: Here it's dates crushed by hand. The emphasis here is on the word "by hand." There when one uses a machine one no longer sees the dates. Here comes in the point when one does see or when one doesn't see the fruit. Because it's very relevant to a lot of food. You know, rice cakes, things that one cooks, or...

Speaker 2: But rice cake is rice, I'm not talking about that.

Speaker 1: Or whatever, fruit. I mean fruit leather for example. Well, seemingly one should make a tree blessing, I don't see why not.

Speaker 2: Because he said "crushed by hand" is still the same, because you're still eating the date. It's still the same thing. What is fruit leather? One took a piece of flesh?

Speaker 1: The emphasis here is on the word "crushed by hand." It's not a major... if a person took a banana, if one made from it that it became such a... it's like it stands to mash for a child that it became into such a mush, is also... he says that it no longer has the character of the fruit.

Speaker 2: I don't know, I don't agree. It seems to me from the law... I don't know, I don't see... I haven't seen the hand. The hand is perhaps because one uses a machine. It's prohibited at all the difference. I would have thought to say the law for the reason. How does he say there? He says "therefore honey," he doesn't say "therefore dates." Let's say this way, the law is "therefore honey."

Speaker 1: What's the practical difference? So it means, that one crushes it together?

Speaker 2: The honey.

Speaker 1: The practical difference is what? That you do eat fruit leather. You do eat dates crushed by hand, you do eat fruit leather.

Speaker 2: No, no, no. The honey means that there's no fruit at all, it's only something the sap, the water that comes out from the date. But you take the whole date, even you take out a part, you take out the green, you don't want to eat the seeds, but you make from that some use, so seemingly it belongs to candy. A fruit leather, such a thing, seems to me that it's... you mean it depends if it's made from real fruits, today that it can be made from plastic, I don't know what. But the dates is seemingly the fruit is recognizable, there are places where it's really one doesn't see what it is, and it's a mixture of more than one fruit, okay, if it's crushed one can make from plastic, he says, I don't know what one makes other fruit leather from it, and I say, but what is the fruit leather that's actually made from fruits.

Law 5: Sweet Canes (Sugar Cane) - Blessing on Sugar

Words of the Rambam: Dispute of the Geonim and the Rambam's Position

Speaker 1: The fruit leather, such a thing seems to me, I mean it depends if it's made from the real fruit. Today it can be that it's made from plastic, I don't know what. Here by the dates seemingly the fruit is recognizable. There are places

where it's really, one doesn't see what it is, and especially if it's mixed from more than one fruit.

Okay, if it's crushed, one can make from plastic. I don't know what one makes today's fruit leather from. If it was fruit leather that was actually made from fruits, and it became into a juice and afterwards it becomes dried out, it's still a problem. If then it's different. If it's actually on the process, they would have already blessed according to the whites. So I think. One can ask the... I see he brings that you want to say that the Rambam speaks. No, the Rambam seems yes, it's completely... the Rambam says explicitly no miracle, it became a dough.

If you want to argue that one speaks only if it remained such a piece, I don't know, it's not clear. It didn't become sometimes or what. Okay. It's very relevant, because the question becomes on juices, from certain juices, orange juice and others. No, but orange juice becomes the question because one plants it initially for orange juice. Okay, that's another question that one will see next week. But this is a dispute of the poskim, because seemingly the law is that no one makes a tree blessing on orange juice as I know, and seemingly the reason is because all fruits, even it's for a piece, but it's another thing.

I'll tell you why, because there are pieces. I want the juice, I want it to be different. Every fruit except for wine and oil becomes out. That's the rule. Seemingly one actually doesn't make a blessing on orange juice. Do you want to argue that it wouldn't have become... on dates one also doesn't make. On date juice one also doesn't make a blessing. No, it's not. It's a shehakol. It's a shehakol. Even it became. So, clearly above, all these fruits remain shehakol, become shehakol. So seemingly that's the law. Yes, one speaks about the orange juice, about the next law. Let's go further. Yes, it says... no, the next law doesn't speak of making a juice. It doesn't say clearly about a juice. It's sugar. The Rambam, that it becomes salt. Yes, one must go see. I don't see that it's relevant, because juice is not the same thing as salt. Salt is one thing, and juice is a second thing. A drink from fruits is not a fruit. So it seems to me the law.

Sweet canes, sweet canes. Canes is how is it called today? Sugar sticks. Sugar cane it's called. Sugar cane, yes. But the Rambam translates it as "sweet reeds." **And one cooks them in water, one cooks off the juice from them until it thickens and stands on the king,** one makes from it such a powder. And that's sugar. **All the Geonim said, the Geonim said that one makes "borei pri ha'adamah."** One should make "borei pri ha'adamah" because... okay, let's see. One should make "borei pri ha'adamah," and others held that one makes "borei pri ha'etz," because this is a cane, and it's tall. They weren't sure if the cane is a "borei pri ha'etz," or it's like a small growth, like a "borei pri ha'adamah" that grows on small grasses, or it's a tree. On this there was a dispute.

And so they said that one who sucks these canes, if someone takes the canes entirely and he sucks it, he chews it, he sucks out the sweetness, **also blesses "borei pri ha'adamah."** Seemingly according to the opinion that said "borei pri ha'adamah," yes? That's the opinion that said that this is a weaker way of eating. Perhaps on this one makes adamah, and on that one makes etz. That's what he means.

In any case, the consensus of the Geonim, the agreement of the Geonim was that this is a fruit. The question is only

whether it's a tree or ground, but everyone accepts that it's a fruit.

Question: Why Is It Similar to Boiling Water?

But why is it similar to boiling water like that? It's like... ah, so you remember the dispute that we had a second ago, what's worse, when it's food or hunger. But here it seems, it's like boiling water, that one cooks it in water, like a vegetable or a fruit that one cooks. What then, if it's made for that, the law is that one makes on that actually.

Discussion: Difference Between Boiling and Squeezing

Speaker 2: What's the difference between boiling and squeezing? Let's ask the question this way. What's the difference between boiling and squeezing? Isn't it the same thing?

Speaker 1: I don't know. The difference is only what is the way. The way is to boil certain vegetables, and it's not the way to squeeze certain fruits. If that is indeed the way today, then it is. Could be, I don't know. I don't know.

The Rambam's Position: "And I Say"

The Rambam says, **and I say**, let's see what the Rambam says. The Rambam says this way, the Rambam disagrees. **The Rambam says that this is like other fruits, and one doesn't bless on it shehakol.** That's the simple meaning that a throat has a taste. It must be, it must be today also such things, for example cinnamon is also a throat that has a taste.

Speaker 2: No, no, no, the Rambam doesn't say that way. No, no, that's not what the Rambam says. The Rambam doesn't say that other fruits are the canes. No, no, he says two things. First that it's not a fruit, the canes are not a fruit, so one must make a shehakol. And afterwards he says, on the sugar from it is another reason, **"the honey of canes that changed through fire should not be greater than date honey that didn't change except through everything."** The Rambam holds that even if one extracts juice, first **"and I say that it's not a fruit,"** even the extract should seemingly make a shehakol, and on the sugar certainly, the sugar he wonders even more why should one say that one should make on it "borei pri ha'etz" or adamah. There is a law that even date honey that one doesn't need the whole process, one gives a squeeze and honey comes out, and yet it's no longer called the fruit itself, so why should one say that this is called the fruit itself?

Speaker 1: Ah, okay, you're saying why does it fall out? If initially even the fruit itself when one extracts juice one doesn't make adamah, so all the more so.

Speaker 2: Yes, but on the two things he's more certain. That's how I learn the foundation of the Mishneh Torah. But I wouldn't have learned that way, I would have said...

Even if we admit, he says, even if I would have admitted.

Speaker 1: Yes, I know. I would have translated this way, I would have translated that the Rambam says this way, that the water, the salt, the sugar, that's not a fruit, and so he says on that, **"the honey of canes should not be greater than date honey."** I don't see that he says extra on the dispute. One must translate his language, his sentence is not...

Question: Why Is It Similar to Boiling?

Why did the Rambam indeed understand what is boiling? Why should this be similar to boiling?

Now he asks the question, he doesn't ask the question on the Rambam, he asks the question on the Gemara of date honey. Why date honey? Date honey I can still understand, because he still eats the dates. Those boiled ones, that's the way how one eats the applesauce through cooking.

Speaker 2: You mean to say, you also don't eat the education after being? Ah, one squeezes, one doesn't know how the canes go, first one cooks it and afterwards how the work how.

The Tur's Answer and the Kesef Mishneh's Response

Just a nice piece, the Kesef Mishneh brings the Tur, that the Tur says, I can answer the Geonim this way, that the honey one eats the dates themselves, so if you eat the honey and dates you should make a shehakol, but the sugar, the entire purpose of making the canes is to make sugar.

So, the sugar is the fruit, it's the fruit one always speaks of, what is the purpose of this tree? What did people find? One sees later thank God, why this thing, this is the fruit. He says, these pieces that one can make from this milk, that's the fruit. So the Tur says, so one should say, so one must make "borei pri ha'adamah" or "borei pri ha'etz."

Chunk 3 Translation

Says the Kesef Mishneh on this: "Va'ani omer" (and I say), that one can see that the Tur did not live in a place where they plant sugar canes. Because I know that in places where they sell, they also sell types where the canes themselves are to lick and suck. So there is a way to eat the canes themselves, just as with date honey one eats the date itself, so the honey... This is how the Kesef Mishneh answers the Rambam.

Two Ways of Learning the Rambam

Very interesting. Simply put, I mean the normal way of learning the Rambam is what Yosef disagrees with me about. The normal way of learning the Rambam is that the Rambam says nothing about what the halacha is regarding sucking the canes, he doesn't say. I can say he holds that essentially when one sucks the canes one does make ha'adamah, as you say even from the... he said so.

What he says is that the... his main argument is that the water with dust or whatever the rest of the sugar that comes out, is certainly weaker than date honey, where Rashi is no longer arguing, that's his argument. Date honey is after all just a piece of the date, since it's not just waste, but something that is extracted, one doesn't make shehakol, one makes ha'etz. Certainly the honey which is completely changed. He doesn't go into at all, the Rambam doesn't go at all into this inquiry of why this is made. The Rambam doesn't speak at all about this question, the Rambam speaks only about one question: Is this a fruit or is this a thing made from the fruit which is similar to date honey or to squeezing?

Discussion: How to Learn "Va'ani Omer"

Speaker 2: The Rambam doesn't hold that way. But the Rambam says: "And so they say," and afterwards he says: "Va'ani omer." But the way you say it, he should have finished the... he should have said "the bottom line" is such and such, "va'ani omer." So, he should have said "and one who sucks those canes makes borei pri ha'adamah." So I don't agree.

Speaker 1: And I don't agree with the Beit Yosef. The holy Beit Yosef, v'chol asher b'shem Yosef yichuneh (and all that is called by the name Yosef), he says a very good explanation, and he's right, but the reason that the Beit Yosef brings from

the Rambam that the cane is sweet, and it is edible, and therefore the sugar is the main fruit thereof, I will disagree, because I don't trust the Beit Yosef's way of learning the Rambam. The Beit Yosef has a custom of reading into poskim, and he reads into the Rambam.

But one must learn the Rambam, and listen up. But here, on this, you catch, the Beit Yosef's fits very nicely in the Rambam.

Speaker 2: No, it doesn't fit, because the Rambam doesn't say, he doesn't say at all that this is the argument. He says that this is the argument, and the second part about what the Geonim argue about, what is the difference from my cane, doesn't enter into the Rambam. The Rambam thinks only about one thing: Is it different from the thing, is it not different? And on this he says, one says it's a fruit, he doesn't hold that the canes are not a fruit. A cane is a cane. Why shouldn't one make ha'adamah? What, there wasn't a halacha that one doesn't make ha'adamah on grass? Does such a halacha exist? Who told you such a halacha? But eating a tree that perhaps has taste, one also makes ha'adamah which is...

Speaker 1: No, no, okay, we'll see soon.

Soon you'll see more things. We'll see more things. No, no, we've only discovered that this and this cane has some sweetness, and two ways how to get the sweetness. Either you must... listen up, listen up. The Rambam doesn't say that. The Rambam says that when he says "this is not a fruit," he doesn't mean the sucking, he means the honey. Did anyone hold that the sugar is a fruit? Yes, the Geonim. He makes a comparison to this. Why is there a comparison? What is the fruit? The ground. The question is, is the sugar still a fruit of the ground, or is it already a new thing? Says the Rambam, I hold that the "extraction" that you make is a new thing, it's a different thing, and therefore it's not a fruit. About this he speaks, he brings a proof on this itself. It doesn't make sense that someone would say two things in one sentence. He says, "I say so, and I have a proof," and Tosafot comes and says no, he doesn't say "I say so," he means one thing, and when he says "I have a proof," he means a second thing. It's grabbing the rope. One can't learn a sentence that way. Does a person speak that way? People don't speak that way, and also the Rambam doesn't speak that way. It doesn't make sense.

Summary: What Does the Rambam Hold?

Speaker 2: What does the Rambam hold about canes?

Speaker 1: I don't know what he holds. I know that he holds that this is not a fruit, the honey, the sugar that comes out. Is that the opinion, still the opinion?

Speaker 2: I heard what you said, but the piece "no saying" and "even though" doesn't fit. It certainly doesn't fit. What fits much worse is that a person should say a sentence...

Methodological Note: How One Learns Rambam

When he said earlier he meant something else, and the proof is on a second argument entirely. It doesn't make a drop of sense.

And one may not learn first the Kesef Mishneh and afterwards the Rambam, because afterwards one already thinks that the Rambam meant what the Kesef Mishneh meant. One must first learn what it says, and afterwards see if it fits, and investigate the explanation. And so we also learn other commentators who are not the Kesef Mishneh, and it's also not the first partition.

Halacha 6: Kor - The Top of the Palm Tree

Says the Rambam further: "The kor, which is the top of the palm tree that is not like white wood, and they cook it first because the kor is not a fruit, and the proof is that it resembles beams."

The Rambam says what he means, one doesn't need to shout and squeeze things that he doesn't say, because he says what he means. I'm already shouting at you, but normally by the halacha... You'll think I'm asleep, but I won't shout.

Kaprisin of Tzalaf

"Kaprisin of tzalaf."

Tzalaf is something like a confusion in the generations that we encounter little, but in Chazal it's very important. What is this tzalaf? In a few mishnayot in Zeraim, what is this? So, do you know what it is? I'm sorry, I don't know. It's some kind of stinking... okay.

"And they cook it separately first, because it is not a fruit, rather the aviyonot of tzalaf are the fruit, which are like the form of thin small dates, and they eat them as fruit etc."

The tzalaf is a controversial plant, where there are people who find taste in other parts of it, and this is called the kaprisin. On this the Rambam rules, that the true fruit thereof, by those who understand, is the aviyonot which are like small dates, and on this one makes borei pri ha'etz.

The Difference Between Tzalaf and Dekel

It could also be that the explanation is that a... okay, we'll see pepper and ginger for example. There are things like cinnamon. Cinnamon one cuts off pieces from the tree itself. The tree has like taste of its wood and fruit are equal, the tree has a taste, the tree has a... like the canes and sugar, ginger and sugar. On this one does make a blessing.

The problem of the tzalaf and the dekel is only that they do have fruits. A dekel has fruits, they still have dates. A tzalaf... yes, very good, I understand, I understand, but a dekel also has normal fruits. Not the... one doesn't plant the tree for the sake of this. I know what a kora is. It's the... one buys it in the store. I already know what you're saying, the list.

The same thing the tzalaf. There are the kaprisin which is not a fruit, but it has normal... you can see the pictures. It's such a flower, and it also grows, as the Rambam says, such dates, people eat it. I've never eaten it, I don't know. It's still called in English caper approximately. Caparis it says here, from Latin, I don't know what.

And then one makes ha'etz on this, because you see that the Rambam puts here two things in one halacha. There are two such trees that have two products. One of them is the fruit of the tree, and the second is such a side thing, it doesn't come in. One must know why on the kora one makes shehakol and on this one makes adamah. It's still a smaller level.

Halacha 7: Pilpelin and Ginger

"The pilpelin and ginger, pepper and ginger."

What is ginger? Ginger is cinnamon or... I don't know. Ginger... isn't ginger... isn't ginger... ginger. Aha, so says Google. One puts it in charoset, yes.

So, "when they are fresh", when it's fresh, when it's the fruit itself, "one blesses on them first borei pri ha'adamah". But "dried", dried pepper, "require no blessing neither before them nor after them", because

they are no longer called food, they acquire a new category of spices. And eating, it's not whole, it's incidental, it's something that one puts in not even incidentally. The Rambam has, sometimes is still a... no one eats the dried... one puts pieces in the pot to give taste in the pot, and that's not called eating. No eating stands there.

Yes, the Rambam will later say that one who eats food that is not fit for eating is a strange creature. **And so foods that are not fit for eating, and drinks that are not fit for drinking, one blesses neither before them nor after them.** Yes, always the matter doesn't mean like people who think that every person can make for himself what the world is. The world holds that this is not fit for eating, you're twisted, you're a strange creature. All halachot are built on this that there is such a thing that you're a strange creature. Today they say that you're unique, you're an individual. No, that's not the individual.

Question of Rabbeinu Yonah: Why Not Borei Pri Ha'etz?

Rabbeinu Yonah asks why does one make on pilpelin, which is fresh, borei pri ha'adamah, why shouldn't one make borei pri ha'etz, because pilpelin is a piece of the tree, or a piece of the leaf, a piece of a... pilpelin is... pilpelin is... So, one must make, one must make, he says, borei pri ha'etz, because it's a part of a tree.

He says, Rabbeinu Yonah answers, the reason why he thinks one must make borei pri ha'adamah is because it's not like extracted from the wood so strongly, because he says that the tree of the pilpelin also has a taste of pilpelin. What do we find? Pilpelin means pepper, if you eat a lot of pepper...

He asks so, pilpelin is a food tree, and there is orlah on it, so why shouldn't one make borei pri ha'etz? Let's look in the laws of orlah. He says so, since the taste of its wood and fruit are equal, one can also take this down, which one sees that the tree from which he held pilpelin, one can also cut off a piece of the wood of the tree and eat. Therefore it becomes taste of wood and fruit equal, and the fruits are like borei pri ha'adamah, because one can make pepper also from the tree itself, so the tree is pri ha'adamah, and everything that grows in it, it means that the fruit is not special for itself.

He now asks another question, there is etrog on which one must make borei pri ha'etz because it's taste of wood and fruit equal. He says, no, etrog is very clear here that here there is a fruit and here there is a tree. But there are trees, he says, where it's not so clear what is the fruit and what is the tree. Like cinnamon or other things where the tree itself has a taste.

Discussion: What is Pilpelin?

Speaker 1: I'm afraid one must know what he means pilpelin, because we who translate pilpelin as pepper, pepper is not a tree, it's ground, it's like a type of vegetable that grows on a vine. It's not a tree.

Speaker 2: Yes, you have all kinds of pepper, black, red, I don't know, it's not a tree. I mean it's a vine.

Speaker 1: He brings a proof from the world, one must look in Aruch entry alef, what it says there.

Speaker 2: No, but what is it? Is it more than a vegetable?

Speaker 1: No, it's a vine. Do you know what a vine means? Such a bush approximately. So, in short, it's not a tree. A bush is pri ha'adamah. It grows up and so on, apparently it's adamah. If when you eat a pepper, what blessing do you make? Adamah, right? I can only one on it.

Speaker 2: Regular pepper and hot pepper is the same thing, a different type.

Speaker 1: Ah, I don't know. Perhaps that's a tree. It grows in a similar way, it's perhaps a different type. It could be that the Rambam meant, perhaps pilpelin in the Mishnah... In short, one must know if you meant the same thing. Perhaps he means some other plant.

Discussion: Cinnamon and the Blessing on a Tree

Speaker 2: But it's very interesting that if one eats cinnamon, one doesn't usually eat cinnamon, so your answer is it's just such a spice. But if one for example eats cinnamon, the question is that one must make borei pri ha'etz, because he's eating a piece of a tree. Have you ever seen how they make cinnamon? They cut off pieces from the tree, and the tree has a taste.

Speaker 1: But I don't see, I haven't found the halacha. You innovated a halacha, which you assume there is such a halacha. I don't see in the Rambam, I haven't found such a halacha, that if one eats the tree... When you eat a piece of the tree, it's borei pri ha'etz. Pri ha'etz means what grows on a tree. The tree itself is pri ha'adamah.

I heard such a kind of thing, I don't know, I'm not a great pillar. I only know what it says in the two halachot in the Rambam. And the Rambam had to say that there is such a tree that has two fruits.

I saw the Kesef Mishneh learned regarding the koras, but it's lengthy. But the Rambam wrote for people... It doesn't make sense to figure out a new thing. The Rambam wrote for people who don't know, apparently he wrote for people who will only learn Rambam. So that's my permission to learn only Rambam.

And in the Rambam we found, yes, as you say by the koi, by these things, we found that there is a tree where pri ha'etz doesn't mean only a fruit of a tree, it's the tree itself. Product, that's what the tree puts out.

Speaker 2: If a... it's the case that a pilpel is there over I don't know why has that worked, must he eat it knows not why kaprot of wood, why make borei pri adamah because it is not a fruit? Why is borei pri adamah? Why isn't borei pri adamah? Why not borei pri adamah? Why not borei pri by and the questions! Why is the top of the palm and say the tzalaf is not a fruit what is the question, it's not food it's little, at least a difference, you know what the difference is.

Speaker 1: Kor, what does one eat there, does one eat a piece of the tree?

Speaker 2: Okay, a good question when one eats, it's not mentioned that pilpul is subject to orlah, through argument.

Speaker 1: I already know what Rabbeinu Menuach meant, but I see that today's rabbis say that most rabbis hold that pilpul should not have orlah. It means pepper, what we call pilpul.

Speaker 2: Why does Rabbeinu Menuach say, I hear. Must check the source of Rabbeinu Menuach.

Speaker 1: No. I'm just looking, what it says about pilpul, it's not clear that... It must be that it's a different halacha. They say... ah, they say. Ah, the Gemara says the Gemara in Berachot. So, they say that the thing we're talking about is not the same thing. Pilpul of the Gemara is something else, and it's

a tree. A completely different thing. We're not talking about that.

So, Rabbeinu Menuach, I know what the Rambam is talking about, from it. What you understand here. So Rabbeinu Menuach is right. If we're talking about the Gemara's pilpul... we're talking about from the Gemara in Berachot which talks about pilpelin. And about that the Rambam speaks. It says right after the chapter. The tree is indeed a tree. So says the person, but what we call today pilpelin, it's peppers, not a tree at all. So say the rabbis of the time. Further already.

Halacha 8: Bread That Became Moldy, Wine That Soured, Dish That Spoiled

Says the Rambam, "Bread that became moldy", bread that became spoiled, "and wine that soured", wine that also became spoiled, "and a dish that in its making", a dish that became spoiled, that lost its appearance, "wilted things that have no defect"...

Halacha 8 (continued): Things on Which One Makes Shehakol - Gemara Berachot List

Speaker 1:

Discussion of the Gemara in Berachos on Pepper

We're talking about a Gemara in Berachos that discusses pepper, and that's what we're discussing here. It appears right after the karpas. Back then it was actually a tree.

That's what the person says. But what we call pepper today, which is pepper, is not a tree at all. That's what the rabbis of our time say.

Further, it states in the Gemara: **Bread that has become moldy, wine that has soured, a cooked dish whose form has changed, fruits that have become overripe, beer, vinegar, locusts, salt, truffles and mushrooms – on all of these one recites first Shehakol nihyeh bidvaro.**

On all these things one makes a Shehakol.

Explanation: Bread That Has Become Stale

This means: On bread one normally makes Hamotzi, but once it has undergone ipush, even if one still uses it, one makes kugel or chavita, whatever you want, one still gives it the name "bread that has become moldy," bread that is no longer in the category of bread, but now one still eats it, it's Shehakol, because it has already lost the importance of bread. The same thing is with wine and vinegar and beer. That means, one no longer makes Shehakol on it, or originally one would have had to make Hamotzi or Mezonos, one no longer makes Hamotzi or Mezonos, because it has already become stale, it has already lost the...

Innovation: Salt and Mushrooms – Minerals and Fungus

And then he says an innovation, on what one makes on locusts, on grasshoppers, and what one makes on salt. Why should one make Borei pri ha'adamah on this? It's a mineral. It's an interesting thing. Yes, salt is a mineral, but we see here that when someone finds a way to eat a mineral, one must make a Shehakol. It doesn't come from Borei pri ha'adamah. Adamah is from the earth. Borei pri ha'adamah is things that grow from the earth, not dead things.

Truffles and mushrooms, also, truffles and mushrooms are not gidulo min ha'aretz. They do come from under the earth, but they don't have roots. It's a fungus. There is the

mycelium, whose roots are indeed something there under the earth, but it's not a plant. It can grow in the air on the wall too.

Speaker 2:

No, but how they grow, there are in the wall such...

Speaker 1:

It doesn't have roots. It's different, it's a fungus. It's not a plant. But on all these things one makes Shehakol nihyeh bidvaro. Shehakol nihyeh bidvaro is the general rule for all foods, everything that doesn't have a specific blessing.

The Final Blessing for Shehakol – Borei Nefashos

The Rambam says, what is the after-blessing for Shehakol? Besides blessing Shehakol, one blesses afterward **Borei nefashos rabos v'chesronan al kol mah shebarata**. He says, the Almighty created people and He also created their desires, as we say "v'chesronan," or nefashos itself means desires. And the Almighty created all these things to fulfill all these desires, **l'hachayos bahem nefesh kol chai**.

Question: Why "L'hachayos Bahem Nefesh Kol Chai"?

Okay, I need to think. Why specifically does one say "l'hachayos bahem nefesh kol chai"? I don't know. As if, everything requires a blessing afterward. Every thing, if one eats a shiur one needs a blessing afterward, requires a blessing before. That's simple. I already know what the line says. And what is novel "to add what"? Even on plain water? What is something that we know requires a blessing before and requires a blessing after?

Textual Difference: Rambam and Our Custom

And one also needs to think about the text of the blessing. I see, here the Rambam brings the text of the blessing, and he doesn't have any closing here. We say "Baruch Chai ha'olamim." Do you see? We say differently. The Rambam says "Chai ha'olamim," by us we say "Baruch," we make a bit of a closing. Without a name, but we make a closing. This is something that needs to be understood. Okay.

Law 9: Dregs – Water on Wine Sediment

Dregs, section 9. The Rambam says this, yes. **Dregs upon which one placed water**. A person has dregs, he has sediment from wine or from whatever must that he made, and he wants to still extract the bit of wine that is absorbed between the dregs, he says, he pours water on it.

The Law of Diluted Wine – Proportion of Wine

So, if there is indeed a lot of wine in the dregs, more will come out than what he poured in. So, **he placed upon them three**, he pours in three cups of water, and below, after he squeezes it out into that, there are four. So it's clear that the fourth cup or the fourth revi'is is the wine that was between the dregs. Therefore this is proper wine, because you know that such diluted wine that has a third wine **one recites on it Borei pri hagafen, for this is diluted wine**, this means diluted wine, and yes.

But if he extracted less than the majority, if he poured water on dregs and more came out than what he poured in, such that there was indeed a bit of wine between the dregs, but less than the majority came out, there isn't a whole revi'is of wine against the three waters. **Even if it has the taste of wine**, even if it has a taste of wine, **one recites on it first Shehakol**, one makes a blessing of Shehakol. One doesn't go by the taste, rather one goes that it's actually wine.

Discussion: Can We Learn From Here to Other Beverages

Question: Grape Juice with Seltzer

Speaker 1:

Blessings on fruits of the tree, Borei pri ha'adamah. What's an interesting law, for example, one can quickly make from here a calculation, for example, if someone drinks grape juice with seltzer or something, such a thing, will one make a blessing of Shehakol as long as the majority is the seltzer? Or is it a different type of law, because there one pours in a finished beverage, and he says that the seltzer is in order to give a fizz, to give a bubble. I don't know, I'm just thinking.

But if a person mixes water with orange juice or with any other... Okay, orange juice is Shehakol. If the law is like... If the law here, here he's not really speaking in the law, here the question is whether it's called wine. The question of dilution, of how dilution works.

Speaker 2:

Yes, true, but if one would accept, this is the straightforward law, there are perhaps other ways to think, but the straightforward law, if grape juice is called wine... One needs to know about grape juice, they don't mean with dilution.

Speaker 1:

No, one needs to know, it's not so... The grape juice makers say it's grape juice, but one needs to know if one can believe them, because they play around with it.

Digression: The American Grape Juice Industry

I heard that it's not so simple how one makes it properly. That the main thing is American grape juice, something is played around with.

Speaker 2:

Very good, he can blackmail with this.

Speaker 1:

No, people say that the standard meant that Rabbi Ephraim Shlomo's hundred percent grape juice is technically hundred percent, with some bit of Torah he has.

Return to the Question: The Law of Dilution by Grape Juice

In any case, one needs to be precise, if it has the law of wine it's actually very good. If it has the law of wine, then it's up to three quarters grape juice. If he has already used the leniency that only one can use it.

So one says perhaps as a joke, someone came to the rabbi, the British rabbi, someone said that he can pour in water. He says, "But I don't mean grape, I mean must, whatever, I now have must, I want to make wine, I don't have wine, I make must." Ah, true, then it's seemingly true, up to three quarters water.

Question: Do We Go by Taste by Other Beverages

But I, ah, I mean yes, it could be that there are other types of laws. The question here is what has the name wine. But when a person mixes just two types, it's an extra law, when a person mixes just two types, whether one goes by the taste. If someone mixes water with must, the must is more dominant, he'll feel like he's drinking must, not like he's drinking water that has no taste.

Speaker 2:

But in total, this is indeed the law of diluted wine. This is indeed properly the law of diluted wine, of the leniency of diluted wine. Diluted wine means, I don't want to drink such

strong wine, I want to make it weaker, I put in water. So there's a certain ratio that's still called wine, and a certain ratio...

You're saying that one can't learn from here, because here it's speaking that it's barely wine, it's only the dregs, and then it's still wine.

Speaker 1:

I'm saying, he takes some wine, I have a point.

The question about mixing grape juice with seltzer, seemingly one won't be able to learn from here, as you say, because here is a law of what is called diluted wine. But other times there's a question of what is the main thing of the beverage, perhaps one goes by the taste. When a person mixes just two beverages, it's an extra question, indeed there's a case like Shmuel and Rav, because all other beverages are anyway Shehakol.

Question: If Someone Makes Borei Pri Ha'etz on Orange Juice

But let's say, if someone makes a Borei pri ha'etz on orange juice, because one plants it for an orange, whatever, no one does, and he mixes it with water, I'm saying, if someone rules this way, and he mixes it with water, will one also say that one will go with the same ratio, that every beverage has something like dilution? Or will one say that one goes by the taste?

Speaker 2:

Wine has here a law that there's a way that people drink wine, and only because of that can one make a Borei pri hagafen. Exactly, you see that not, it doesn't go at all that way, the taste doesn't change.

Speaker 1:

It seems, you're talking about such a thing of primary and secondary. But I don't know, why shouldn't one say?

Speaker 2:

You're asking a question. Why shouldn't one say, why does he drink the water at all? Let me finish a sentence. Why does he drink the water at all? What, there is indeed in the wine, so the water is enough, the dregs is indeed the main thing, and this is indeed secondary.

Answer: Wine is an Important Thing

Speaker 1:

The answer is seemingly to this, somewhat a good question. The answer that one can think to this is that wine is such an important thing, this is not an important thing. Water with the taste of wine, he doesn't take any vine. Then the laws are different. A vine is an important blessing, this is not the importance. The Rambam says indeed this **even if there is in it the taste of wine**, to exclude what you're saying. That normally one would go by taste.

That means, earlier we learned that what means primary and secondary? The taste that you like more. Why does he eat the herring and not the egg kichel? Because he likes the herring, because that's good for him. So the person seeks here to drink wine. I can think that it's five times the same case.

Speaker 2:

It's completely different, one doesn't go by the taste of the herring, one goes by what you want to eat. It's a whole different thing. But what is the person drinking here? As if he's

going to drink the dregs, it's not essentially like another water, essentially this is an important beverage.

Speaker 1:

It's not! It's a nice beverage, it's water with the taste of wine, but it's not wine.

Conclusion: This is Perhaps a Special Law by Borei Pri Hagafen

Speaker 2:

No, I'm saying it could be because of this the law is only by Borei pri hagafen. My question is, let's say, let's say that there's a way of putting together a Borei pri ha'etz, a liquid Borei pri ha'etz. Yes, if there is such a thing as a liquid Borei pri ha'etz, if one plants it for that?

Speaker 1:

Simply, in reality there isn't, but theoretically I could say. Theoretically I would say that then the rules are completely different, one goes completely by taste, because Borei pri ha'etz they didn't establish a special important blessing like Borei pri hagafen is different for the better. Here it's clear, it's no longer the important thing that's called wine. There's an important thing that's called wine, that has Borei pri hagafen, this no longer has the level of importance. So other times there perhaps one does go by taste. One needs to know, I'm saying from here, it could be this is a special law by the Rambam. One needs to perhaps look further in the Gemara.

Transition to Law 10: Changes in Blessings

Speaker 1:

Good. Now we're going to learn what is approximately what he made the chapters for before. Here you are sitting from now and further, the next few weeks here every person will need to conduct himself here properly and lawfully, as it should be, otherwise not correct, not properly made the blessing, and this is the law.

The first law is this: **Baruch atah Hashem Elokeinu melech ha'olam Borei pri ha'adamah**, you ask me it's indeed pri ha'etz, to say when Borei pri ha'etz, what happens here? You made a...

Law 10: Errors in Blessings – The Rules of General and Specific

Speaker 1:

So other times one needs, perhaps one does go by taste. One needs to know, I'm saying from here, it could be that this is a special law by the Rambam, one needs to perhaps look further in the Gemara. Good.

Now we're going to learn, approximately before this he made the chapters, here until now, from now and further, the next bunch of laws, it's speaking that someone made a mistake, he made an error, he didn't make the correct blessing, what is the law.

The first law is this: **If one blessed on fruits of the tree Borei pri ha'adamah, seemingly it was implied that on fruits of the tree one should say Borei pri ha'etz. What happens if someone made Borei pri ha'adamah on fruits of the tree? He fulfilled, he was yotzei. But if someone said on fruits of the earth, what we call vegetables, things that grow on the earth, Borei pri ha'etz, he was not yotzei.** Let's finish the section and we'll explain. **But on everything, whatever he ate, if he made Shehakol nihyeh bidvaro, he fulfilled, he was yotzei,**

even on bread and on wine, even if he made on bread instead of Hamotzi, or on wine instead of Borei pri hagafen, he said Shehakol nihyeh bidvaro, Shehakol includes everything.

Explanation: The Levels of Importance in Blessings

So let's explain. We discussed that there are like levels of importance. Borei pri ha'adamah is generally on everything that the earth brings forth. So seemingly one would be yotzei with this also on all types of fruits. But the Sages added a blessing on fruits of the earth, on fruits of the tree, perhaps because it's more important, as Rabbi Yitzchak said that it's a tremendous thing, you plant once, planting a fruit tree is much more, it's not like planting every year, so perhaps comes a special blessing. The Sages made Borei pri ha'etz. So Borei pri ha'etz is however only something that grows on a tree.

So if someone made Borei pri ha'adamah instead of Borei pri ha'etz, he still thanked the Almighty, he just didn't say the importance that should have been said, he was yotzei. But if someone said on fruits of the earth, on vegetables, he said Borei pri ha'etz, he was not yotzei, because he said something that is not true, it's not fruit of the tree, the blessing doesn't come at all.

Shehakol is Yotzei on Everything

And Shehakol one is yotzei on everything, Shehakol is a general blessing. The same thing, Shehakol. Everything is indeed Shehakol nihyeh bidvaro. The logic is basically, because not a specific in the general... Also means it? Is not yotzei the enactment, because there is indeed a law, one needs to say differently. The point is however that the general language also goes on the specific, but the specific language doesn't go on the general. It's such a principle for all the camps.

Speaker 2:

No I think whether it's because the enactments of the Sages, whether the main thing is the word. The explanation of the words because Shehakol devarim means actually everything. Means Shehakol a rabbi says Borei pri ha'etz, he said a lie on a vegetable. It's simply the notion that this is the level of the enactments of the Sages. I already know the word lie.

Innovation: A Blessing is Placing God's Name on the Thing

Speaker 1:

A blessing is such a placement. A blessing is that on this they made the blessing. The Shehakol devarim is essentially in place of everything, but besides that which needs to make it there is a special blessing on it. The main thing is to thank the Almighty. But with this one the Sages added an importance. You thanked the Almighty without the importance. A blessing sees that almost every law will be difficult how one translates it.

A blessing is a bit more than that. A blessing means that one brings out God's name on the thing. It's a placement, like a sanctification almost. When one says a blessing of a sacrifice, a notion stands on a name. Not a natural notion. This is a second thing. A third thing. Placing God's name on the thing. One brings out, a blessing in Chassidic terms a blessing is changing forgetfulness. This is a way that one brings it out. But the Torah sees it this way. But the Torah sees it this way. But the Torah sees it to live wine and and he said blessed general on it. Yes. It's brought out that. Now it has become a holy

gathering, congregations. As I have... When a blessing I think mixes.

Chassidic works explain that a blessing is "mashneh mishkachah" (changes forgetfulness), drawing down upon the thing the highest level. This is already an interpretation, a Chassidic interpretation, but I think the idea is original, and in the Gemara you can see that it's an idea. It's a "chalal" (space), he brings out the Name of Heaven upon the thing, and this bringing out needs to be brought out upon the thing. In general, there is intellect with "garera" (arousal) upon everything. There is also a special thing called "borei pri ha'eitz" and the like.

If you think this way, you understand much better the issue of "brachah levatala" (blessing in vain), it's not such a problem. A brachah levatala, like he made a blessing in vain, he placed the Name of Heaven upon nothing. It's something like that kind of idea. So, okay, that's what I think.

Law 11: Error in Language but Correct Intention – "Kashal Bilshono" (Stumbled in His Speech)

Speaker 1:

Good. Now we're going to learn an interesting law about error, a certain type of error. Let's learn what the Rambam says. **"One who takes a cup of beer in his hand"**, a person took a cup of beer. Beer we already know is "shehakol". Why is beer shehakol? Why isn't it mezonot, since it's made from barley? We learned earlier that it's from those things that are like "ufsada" (deteriorated), it became weaker. It's not like the grape which became better. True, one could say that beer is an upgrade, but it's not. It's better, but it's not "tzurat hapat" (the form of bread). Tzurat hapat would be mezonot. It's not a "davar shemazin" (nourishing food). That's what we saw, yes. The only thing that loses its form and gets a new blessing is indeed "borei pri hagafen" and "hamotzi", but beer didn't receive that category.

The Rambam's Case: Intention at "Shem Umalchut" (Name and Kingship) Is the Main Thing

In any case, he took a cup of beer, and he wanted to make shehakol. He began, he knew that in his head there is beer, and he began to make a blessing on the beer. He said "Baruch atah Hashem Elokeinu melech ha'olam", but oops, he made a mistake in his words, **"and erred and said 'borei pri hagafen'"**. The Rambam says, **"we don't make him repeat it"**, we don't make him do it over. Why? The Rambam will say at the end why.

Very good. And now the Rambam says more examples. The same thing is if someone had fruits of the earth where one must make "borei pri ha'adamah", but by mistake he said "borei pri ha'eitz". Or he had a type of mezonot, a grain dish which because it doesn't have tzurat hapat one makes "borei minei mezonot", but he erred, he made a mistake. When he began saying "Baruch atah Hashem Elokeinu melech ha'olam", he thought that everything was fine, he knew what he had in his head, but at the end he said the wrong words.

The Rambam says, **"he fulfilled his obligation". Why? "Because at the time he mentioned the Name and Kingship"**, when he said "Baruch atah Hashem Elokeinu melech ha'olam", which is the main part of the blessing, **"his intention was only for the blessing appropriate for that type"**, his intention was good. When he began making

the blessing, he had in mind for that which when someone asks him, "What are you making a blessing on?", "I'm making a blessing on beer, shehakol". **"And this is the main part of the blessing"**. The error wasn't at "Baruch atah Hashem Elokeinu melech ha'olam", but at the end there was some stumbling in speech and he said "borei pri hagafen". So even though he erred, he fulfilled his obligation. He erred, at the end he fulfilled his obligation, because when he said "Baruch atah Hashem Elokeinu melech ha'olam", it was for the correct blessing on the correct food. Therefore we don't make him repeat it.

Dispute Between Rambam and Ra'avad

And on this the Ra'avad argues very strongly, and the Ra'avad doesn't understand the concept that because when he says the Name and Kingship he knows what he's making it on, he knows that he's holding in his hand shehakol, and it's understood that if someone would have asked him he would have said yes, shehakol, but he made a mistake. We don't go after that, we go entirely after what comes out of the mouth. So the Ra'avad says that according to the Rambam's law he should indeed have to repeat it. We go entirely after what we find.

The Opposite Case: Error in Intention

What would be if the Rambam would have said when it's the opposite, when he has an error, he's holding a cup of beer, and when he said "Baruch atah Hashem Elokeinu melech ha'olam" he thought it was wine, and at the end he gave a look inside and he noticed it's beer. Would the Rambam have said that he didn't fulfill his obligation or yes he fulfilled it? Seemingly he didn't fulfill his obligation, because that's what it implies, but then one can further say that we go leniently. The Gemara speaks about this question, and the entire sugya is built on a difficult Gemara, the Rishonim learn it through, but learning the Rambam and Ra'avad one can understand the reasoning and the concept simply.

So seemingly it would come out from the reasoning that one doesn't fulfill the obligation. That's how it seemingly perhaps stands in the Gemara, but it seems the Rambam doesn't rule on it, and it could be the reason he doesn't rule on it is because here it's a doubt, and it could be on the other hand, yes, certainly the Rambam also understands that what he said makes a difference, it fixed it. And the Rambam will say the next law, blessings are rabbinic, and with rabbinic matters we go leniently. So it's a doubt in the Gemara, the Rambam doesn't rule that he must repeat it if he knew he made an error in his intention in the first half of the blessing.

Even on this the Ra'avad disagrees, the Ra'avad argues that it doesn't make sense that one should rely on what he thought, and the Ra'avad disagrees from reasoning, he doesn't say here that it's stated in the Gemara, certainly it's built on how it appears in the Gemara, but the Ra'avad argues that it can't be that we go after what a person thought when he says "melech ha'olam", rather we go after what he says.

Discussion: How Can Such an Error Happen?

Speaker 2:

The question is what do people who think mean, how can a person actually think and say shehakol, that when he came...

Speaker 1:

But there is such a thing, the error of "borei pri hagafen" can sometimes be like we'll see. Sometimes it's a typo, sometimes

the person was distracted, simply not. The Rambam speaks of one who was like "kashal bilshono" (stumbled in his speech), because he was singing with a friend, he began saying a havdalah tune, and it came in... When he says by the Rambam, he didn't know that there is a shehakol here. I mean, one can go into this...

Speaker 2:

No, no, I understand. What happened? It's... the Rambam only speaks of a split-off, how do you say? It's a... a tongue... lapsus, lapsus. Yes.

Speaker 1:

The Rambam speaks of a person who makes an error, and not "kashal bilshono", he simply didn't pay attention, he doesn't even know what's in his head.

Speaker 2:

No, the Rambam doesn't speak of that. Then it would be an error. The Rambam tells you clearly that he knows what he's holding, and he makes a lapsus. No. Can you call it... if for example someone doesn't know which blessing one makes on bread, he has an error in law, not about what the law is. But, or it's a closed box and he doesn't know at all what he's holding, that's a different thing.

Innovation: A Blessing Is Placing the Name of Heaven – Therefore Intention at Name and Kingship Is the Main Thing

Speaker 1:

One can understand, if according to what I said earlier, you can understand it very well. If the main blessing is to say on the thing "Hashem our King, King of the world", you said it on the thing. The action is almost the main blessing, the "it was before him for some time". The language is to fit the language to what the reality is. The Rambam says, okay, it's not dangerous if it turned out that the language is an error.

Speaker 2:

Because here one would say the Butchatcher Rav, one can make a condition. He said, always when I say "Baruch atah Hashem Elokeinu melech ha'olam", I have in mind the thing that is in reality, and what is in the cup, on that I have in mind.

Speaker 1:

No, no, I understand, one can't make such a condition.

Speaker 2:

I wanted to get to practical law, can one make such a condition? Because if that's the word, if so, if that's intention, I can say, I'm always intending on what the truth is.

Speaker 1:

No, one can't. That's what I'm saying, intention is not the meaning. Intention is not the meaning that people think. It goes back to my thing, that intention is the meaning, like you said earlier, if you ask yourself what you're doing, you say that's what you're doing. Intention is not meaning what I have in my head, some sentence in my head, that's not the meaning of intention.

In Practice: The Ruling of the Acharonim

Okay, in practice, the Mishnah Berurah and likewise the other Acharonim say they don't rule like the Rambam here. It could be that given the doubt we go leniently with blessings, the rabbis, it could be that if someone has such a case, there's a dispute among Rishonim, it could be that in practice, the

Acharonim, it could be that one repeats it, even though here you still have a doubt whether the Rambam is right.

Speaker 2:

No, I'm saying that we still have a doubt. And with doubt we go leniently, rabbinic doubt, doubt of the Rav, and so on. Either way one can be lenient and not repeat it.

Law 12: Doubt Whether One Made a Blessing

Speaker 1:

The Rambam says further, "**All blessings, if one is in doubt whether he blessed or didn't bless**", when a person has a doubt whether he made a blessing on fruit blessings, on blessings before eating, "**he doesn't go back and bless**". Unlike Birkat Hamazon which is a Torah-level doubt where one must indeed make it.

Law 12 (Continued): Doubt Whether He Blessed – He Doesn't Repeat

Speaker 1: No, he says that we still have a doubt, with doubt we go leniently, doubt regarding the Rambam, doubt regarding the Rav, and so on. Either way we can be lenient and not repeat it.

The Rambam says further, "**All blessings where one is in doubt whether he blessed or didn't bless**", when a person has a doubt whether he made a blessing on fruit blessings, on blessings before eating, "**he doesn't go back and bless**". Unlike Birkat Hamazon which is a Torah-level doubt where one must indeed, here it's a rabbinic doubt. The same thing with the blessings of "me'ein shalosh" or "borei nefashot", "**neither at the beginning nor at the end**". All these blessings are rabbinic, and as it says in the books there is the well-known principle that with rabbinic doubt one can be lenient.

Law 13: Forgot and Put Food in His Mouth Without a Blessing

The Rambam says further, "**One who forgot and put food in his mouth and didn't bless**", he forgot and he already started eating without a blessing, he already put food in his mouth. "**If it is a drink**", if it's drinking, one can't spit out a drink and then take it in again, there's no way, he should swallow it, "**and bless at the end**", and afterwards make the blessing. That means, one doesn't make shehakol anymore, but rather makes a "borei nefashot". These are such things for example, it's strange, it comes out in the Rambam that one makes such a blessing after one has eaten. No, after one has eaten. Like that? After one has eaten? Or could it be "bless at the end" means he only makes an after-blessing?

Discussion: What Does "Bless at the End" Mean?

Speaker 2: The Rambam doesn't say it so clearly. It could be.

Speaker 1: No, simply he's right. The language "bless at the end" means that he makes a final blessing, like earlier, "neither at the beginning nor at the end". Once a blessing at the beginning, and once a blessing at the end. Ah, it could be.

Speaker 2: "At the end" means at the end of swallowing, at the end of swallowing the food.

Speaker 1: Yes, no, look at the previous line, "neither at the beginning nor at the end" means, not an initial blessing and not a final blessing. At the end means once a final blessing. Aha.

So he makes an after-blessing, he missed the blessing. What can you do? A blessing is only before eating, goodbye.

Fruits That If Spit Out Would Be Disgusting – Move Them to the Side

But if it's fruits **"that if spit out would be disgusting"**, if he's going to spit it out it will become disgusting, one can't make him spit it out, **"like figs and grapes"** which are already half chewed in his mouth, after blessing, he should put it to the side of his mouth and make the blessing, and afterwards he can swallow it. Because usually one makes the blessing with a full mouth, and the Rema says that this is not the proper way, put it to the side of the mouth and make the blessing.

Why can't one do this with water? Because with water one can't do this. For what reason? Danger, one can choke. Yes, one can't hold a drink in the mouth, in the throat, by the swallowing area not free to make a blessing, the Rema said earlier.

If They're Not Disgusting – Spit Them Out of His Mouth

"If they're not disgusting", if there are things that won't become spoiled, it won't be disgusting, **"like beans and peas"**, the Rema brings from the Gemaras, things that won't spit out, it won't be disgusting, it doesn't look disgusting, Master of the Universe, that one already put in the mouth like grapes, **"spit them out of his mouth until he blesses"**, even so he should spit them out. Perhaps it's hard, perhaps it's a candy. He should take it out of his mouth.

And it's also not just the disgustingness, but when a person has now taken a grape into his mouth, he hasn't chewed it yet, it's not necessarily the disgustingness. In short, if it's disgusting, and if however you can spit it out and afterwards put it back in your mouth, then "spit it out of his mouth", he should spit it out and make the blessing when he has nothing in his mouth, and afterwards he should eat. It's not ideal, it's not ideal to make the blessing because one has something in the mouth. Why? Because one doesn't say the blessing with a full mouth, or because the blessing must be before one eats it, one of the two.

Law 13 (Continued): One Who Eats Many Types – Order of Blessings

The Rema says, **"One who eats many types"**, if a person has in front of him a table with different foods, **"if they have the same blessing"**, if he's going to eat different things, for example what is shehakol, **"he blesses on one of them"**, he makes one shehakol **"and exempts the rest"**, he doesn't keep making more of the same type of blessing. So one makes the blessing on all the things in front of you and one is exempt. **"And if they are different blessings"**, but if it's different blessings, one blessing doesn't exempt the other, one food doesn't exempt the other, except as we spoke earlier during a meal, hamotzi and such things. So if it's not the same blessing, one makes on each one **"the blessing appropriate for it"**, one must make on each food an extra blessing.

Which Type Should He Bless First?

"And which type should he bless first?" Which one does one make first? Unless someone has, I don't know, an adamah with a mezonot with a shehakol. What he wants to eat first, on that he should make the blessing first. That means, I want to eat this first, I make that first. Simple as that.

But, **"and if he doesn't want this more than that"**, this is a very strange case, one must remember. People get very busy with these laws, but almost always when a person has two

foods and you ask him which you want to eat first, he has an answer to that. Then the answer is, he should eat which he wants to eat first. It happens that he's a strange person, it doesn't matter to him, he has no interest whatsoever in eating this differently from that, then there is a legal order.

I mean the person who doesn't know what "he doesn't want this more than that" means, he mainly wants the blessing. He's such a "chassid shoteh" (pious fool) who instead of saying "let's eat", says "let's make a blessing". So the whole purpose here is the blessing, he wants to know what... the blessing is for him the more important part than the eating.

The Seven Species Come First – Whatever Comes First in the Verse Comes First for the Blessing

And approximately the same is with the seven species. The seven species with which the Land of Israel was praised comes first. Seemingly, because Birkat Hamazon has to do with the blessing of the Land, "and for the Land and for the food", "and you shall bless Hashem your God for the good Land". Therefore one should make that which has a connection with the Land of Israel. It's very interesting, even the seven species grow in America, but it's the type that the Land of Israel has abundance of. Yes, is that the case? Interesting thing. But the Sages didn't change the law.

Translation

The Rambam says, what is the order among the shivas haminim (seven species)? The Rambam says this: **"Kol hakodem bapasuk kodem lebracha"** (Whatever comes first in the verse comes first for the blessing). When someone has different items from the shivas haminim, which blessing does one make first? The Rambam says, we look at the verse - what comes first in the verse comes first. **"Vehashiv'a hem hamnuyim bapasuk zeh"** (And the seven are those enumerated in this verse). He says, which verse are we talking about? The verse that lists the fruits with which Eretz Yisrael was praised. He says the verse: **"Eretz chita us'ora v'gefen ut'ena v'rimon, eretz zayit shemen udvash"** (A land of wheat and barley and grapevines and fig trees and pomegranates, a land of olive oil and honey). So we go with this order. **"Udvash zehu hat'marim"** (And honey - this refers to dates). He says, the Rambam explains by the way, what is the honey that the verse ends with? We don't mean regular honey, which would be shehakol. Honey means when one eats dates. In fact, even when one eats the honey from the dates, the Rambam said it's a shehakol. The honey means the dates themselves. It's interesting, because one could have learned this seemingly from the verse itself, or it's from the enumeration.

And the same thing is also with oil, but oil is for a different reason, because it's not so readily fit for eating. Zayit shemen. Ah, both are written. Here by honey only the honey is written.

The Principle of "Karov La'aretz" - Dates Precede Grapes

The Rambam says this, besides the order of the verse being very interesting, because they were happy, okay, there's an order in the verse. There are still more categories in the verse. **"T'marim kodmin la'anavim"** (Dates precede grapes). Seemingly, why should dates precede grapes?

Speaker 2: Ah, ah, ah, but gefen (grapevine) comes earlier.

Speaker 1: The Rambam says, besides the order of the verse, there's also something about what's close to the word "eretz" (land). When one says about something, "This is the land

where such-and-such fruit grows," it's understood that the fruit is very important. That is, "the land of apples," it's understood that the apples there are very important. So what stands next to the word "erezt," again, what is close to the word "erezt," it's understood that this is a very important fruit. The point is that the word "erezt" appears twice in this verse, so the second time brings out again the importance of the honey and the olive oil. Because gefen appears right after "chita us'ora," whereas tamar appears only after "zayit shemen," it turns out that it's more important.

Speaker 2: No, I'm saying it makes sense, because you're thinking of someone speaking rhetorically. Someone says, "It's a city where you have the best things," and he lists, "This is the apple city," and then he says, "and this is the grape city." Obviously, you see what's important to him, because you're giving the name of the land based on the fruit.

Speaker 1: "Dvash zeh t'marim" (Honey - this is dates). The Rambam says, **"Ut'marim kodmin la'anavim"** (And dates precede grapes). Olives certainly, yes. He says, even dates precede grapes.

Speaker 2: You've now repeated what you said.

Speaker 1: Yes, I'm saying, the Rambam only calculated that dates precede grapes, but olives are also before grapes, right?

Speaker 2: Yes, that's obvious.

Discussion: Is Olive Before Barley?

Speaker 1: Olive is also before barley, seemingly. That would have been anyway. Also before barley, because what's closest to "erezt" is the most important, right? No, not before... not wheat, but barley, before barley seemingly. Olive should have gone before barley.

Speaker 2: No, I don't agree.

Speaker 1: Why?

Speaker 2: Why? Yes. Why did you stop specifically at gefen?

Speaker 1: The Rambam says honey, honey is compared to gefen.

Speaker 2: Again, chitin us'orim (wheat and barley) is hamotzi or mezonot.

Speaker 1: Okay, that's a different type of species. The whole question is only by the... And gefen is a gefen. The whole question is only between the... He doesn't say one with the Chatam Sofer's. And anyway, when one makes hamotzi, one doesn't usually make other blessings.

Speaker 2: Again, perhaps there's barley here, you have barley, on which you make borei minei mezonot, and there's olive. Are you sure one makes barley first? I don't know.

Speaker 1: Yes, yes, it's certain.

Speaker 2: Why? Isn't it written somewhere that one makes borei minei mezonot before other things? All the blessing of borei minei mezonot?

Speaker 1: There's no difference now. The whole reason why this comes first, is more or less written in the Rambam that usually when one makes mezonot one doesn't make other blessings. And I know that the Chatam Sofer didn't rule this halacha, but it's written more or less in the Rambam that usually when there's mezonot, the other things are secondary. On mezonot this was written in the Rambam.

Speaker 2: But not in this case, not when there's a table with many species and you want a little of this, a little of that.

Speaker 1: No, no, it was written. There's a doubt about this regarding a cooked dish, that it was written there. No one eats barley kernels alone, rather one eats it with a cooked dish, so that's the food. Wheat and barley is a plate of cereal. When did you last see someone go to a plate of barley? Cereal! I don't know what, there are missing things that are borei minei mezonot that one doesn't make borei pri ha'adama on.

Speaker 2: Yes, no, there are, I hold that there are.

Speaker 1: Oat cereal, oat groats, all these things, there's a plate there. Who says you should make that? We're talking about something simple, we're talking about a large smorgasbord.

In any case, in any case, you'll look at the poskim. One can find all kinds of explanations. But I'm just telling you, a simple way of reading the Rambam. One must sometimes try to do this.

Bracha Achat Me'ein Shalosh

Okay. Now the Rambam will say, there's a bracha me'ein shalosh (blessing that is an abridgement of three), as the Rambam has...

Law 14: Text of Bracha Me'ein Shalosh on Fruits and Wine

So this is the simple understanding, from this the Rambam speaks about dates and grapes, he doesn't say that one recites the entire verse. On the contrary, here if you want to look at the poskim, you'll find all kinds of answers, but I'm just telling you a simple way of reading this Rambam, one must sometimes go back to this.

Now the Rambam will say, there's a bracha me'ein shalosh that the Rambam said on borei minei mezonot, he also calculated on fruits and wine. He hasn't yet said how one says this, the text of the blessing. He says, **bracha achat she'hi me'ein shalosh** (one blessing that is an abridgement of three) that one makes on **chamishah minei hapeirot v'shel yayin** (the five species of fruit and wine), if one eats a measure of fruits and wine. Five species? Which five species? Ah, the five of the shivas haminim that are borei pri ha'etz. **V'shel yayin hi** (And of wine it is) the same type of blessing **shel minei hadagan** (as of grain species), the blessing that the Rambam already said earlier, the bracha me'ein shalosh, what we call al hamichya.

Aval al hapeirot hu omer (But on the fruits one says), the beginning is different, he says **"al ha'etz v'al pri ha'etz"** (on the tree and on the fruit of the tree), that is, one makes a blessing on the tree and on the fruit that the tree produces, **"v'al tnuvat hasadeh"** (and on the produce of the field), which the field yields, which the field produces, **"v'al erez chemda tova"** (and on a desirable, good land), this is already further along the order that the Rambam already mentioned earlier by al hamichya. **V'al hayayin** (And on the wine) one begins with **"al hagefen v'al pri hagefen v'al tnuvat hasadeh v'al erez chemda"** (on the vine and on the fruit of the vine and on the produce of the field and on a desirable land), **v'chotem bishtayim "al ha'aretz v'al hapeirot"** (and one concludes with two: "on the land and on the fruits"). One doesn't say, one doesn't conclude "on the land and on the fruit of the vine," but "on the fruits." That is, our text does have an extra conclusion also for "on the land and on the vine and on the fruit of the vine" at the end. Do you see what the Rama's position is? Gentlemen, we're now learning our Rambam.

The Rambam says, **v'im haya b'Eretz Yisrael** (and if he was in Eretz Yisrael), if he's in Eretz Yisrael, he doesn't say "on the land and the fruits," but he says "**al ha'aretz v'al peiroteha**" (on the land and on its fruits), on the fruits of Eretz Yisrael.

Adding "Hatov V'hameitiv" in Me'ein Shalosh

The Rambam says, **v'yesh mi shemosif bibracha she'hi me'ein shalosh kodem chatima** (and there is one who adds to the blessing that is an abridgement of three before the conclusion) a few more words, "**ki ata Kel tov umeitiv**" (for You are a God Who is good and does good), **ein bracha revit** (there is no fourth blessing), and the bracha me'ein shalosh mentions the eating, which is a piece of hazan (nourishment), and then one mentions the land and Jerusalem. The Rambam says that **v'yesh mi shemosif** (and there is one who adds), who it was, I don't know if it was a Mishnah in Tiberias, I don't know what, but there was a custom of adding to the bracha me'ein shalosh so that it should be a bracha me'ein revit (an abridgement of four), it should have everything, it should be a kind of Birkat Hamazon, one adds "ki Kel tov umeitiv ata" (for You are a God Who is good and does good) etc., **she'hi k'ein bracha revit** (which is like a fourth blessing). But **v'yesh mi she'omer shelo yomar "HaKel tov umeitiv ata", shelo tiknu bracha revit ela b'Birkat Hamazon bilvad** (and there is one who says not to say "The God Who is good and does good," that they only instituted a fourth blessing in Birkat Hamazon alone), the enactment of the Sages to add a fourth blessing is only specifically by Birkat Hamazon and not by me'ein shalosh. The Rambam doesn't say what one should do, he says this is one of the commentators on the Rambam says not what to do, he only says two versions, and seemingly one can do what one wants.

Law 15: Combining Me'ein Shalosh When One Has Eaten Multiple Species

Okay. The Rambam says, what happens if someone had two types of things or three types of things that come under the same bracha me'ein shalosh? What are the priorities? He drank wine, he ate dates, he ate dates, and he ate a borei minei mezonot from a cooked dish of the five species of grain. He makes it according to the order, he begins with "**al hamichya v'al hakalkalah**" (on the sustenance and on the nourishment) - ah, from this we see that this is considered the primary thing, which is more important - "**al hagefen v'al pri hagefen**" (on the vine and on the fruit of the vine), "**v'al ha'etz v'al pri ha'etz**" (and on the tree and on the fruit of the tree), and then one goes to "**v'al tnuvat hasadeh v'al erez chemda tova urechava**" (and on the produce of the field and on a desirable, good and spacious land) etc. And also at the end one says "**al ha'aretz v'al hamichya v'al hapeirot**" (on the land and on the sustenance and on the fruits).

Why did he say that he's talking about the order? He also says that one can combine them. Perhaps it's obvious? He says that one puts all of these together into one... It's just interesting, because for example in Birkat Hamazon, the main Birkat Hamazon, it's not such a thing, one says on each species. Birkat Hamazon is on food, on borei pri ha'adama, borei pri ha'etz, there are essentially extra blessings on each, but one puts it all together in one large blessing. It's not understood

that one exempts one from the other, they're extra blessings which are important in their own right. Yes.

Discussion: "Peiroteha" in Eretz Yisrael by Combined Blessing

It's interesting, I think, when one makes such a type in Eretz Yisrael, it's very difficult to say after al hamichya. You say al ha'aretz v'al peiroteha, that's correct. Al ha'aretz v'al hamichya v'al peiroteha, is a very difficult language.

Speaker 2: Does the Rambam bring at all the law of peiroteha?

Yes, immediately in Eretz Yisrael one says al ha'aretz v'al peiroteha. And what's the problem here? I'm saying, when it's al ha'aretz v'al hamichya ufeireteha, that's very difficult. He says al ha'aretz v'al peiroteha v'al hamichya, would be correct. Al ha'aretz v'al hamichya ufeireteha is difficult language.

Speaker 2: What's the problem? What's the difficult language?

Because the al hamichya cuts between the aretz and peiroteha. Peiroteha of the michya? What is that? It's not peiroteha of the michya, it's of the land.

Speaker 2: I don't see that it's a problem.

There are people below who argue that one can say al ha'aretz v'al peiroteha v'al hamichya. I don't understand why you say that, I mean I hold that it's exactly the opposite. Because peiroteha can only be used when it's adjacent to aretz.

Speaker 2: Then after it.

Below there's someone who says that one should say al michyata, but it doesn't seem so. Seemingly michya is not something that comes from the land. Michya is the sustenance. Peiroteha makes sense, that's seemingly the reason. But anyway.

Law 16: Borei Nefashot Cannot Be Combined with Me'ein Shalosh

Another law, that this is all when we've eaten the three important things that all have the same bracha me'ein shalosh. But what happens when one eats things whose after-blessing the Rambam said earlier is borei nefashot? He says, the Rambam, "**achal basar v'shata yayin**" (he ate meat and drank wine), he ate meat, which is a shehakol and a borei nefashot, and he drank wine, he makes an extra after-blessing. He makes al hagefen on the wine, and al hamichya v'al hakalkalah he makes a borei nefashot on the meat. You can't combine them. By me'ein shalosh one can combine three me'ein shalosh into one thing, but two vessels, I don't know exactly what vessels means. Borei nefashot cannot be included in the me'ein shalosh **achat al kol hanefashot harabot** (one for all the many souls). I mean, what should I tell you?

Discussion: Why Can't One Combine Borei Nefashot with Me'ein Shalosh?

Speaker 2: No, the simple meat didn't get an upgrade and it remained with its blessing. It didn't change because you ate it next to wine.

I understand, you understand that it is but what's funny, a person sat down, they arranged this for him, because they didn't want a person to say extra blessings and such. Tell me, why can't one make on dates and on wine twice al hagefen and then al hapeirot? Why is there one thing that makes it say two things?

I understand why Chazal didn't say for example that on every piece of bread one should bentsh, because bentsching takes a minute. Bracha me'ein shalosh also takes time, one can't make a person repeat bracha me'ein shalosh extra twice. A borei nefashot is a short blessing, so the meat keeps its blessing. One can't make a person, the Chazal estimated how much they're going to make a person exert himself with long blessings. But the meat keeps its borei nefashot, it keeps its borei nefashot, everyone is happy.

Fruits That Are Not From Shivas Haminim Are Included in Me'ein Shalosh

Speaker 2: But also on figs and on grapes, apples and pears and the like.

Sha, sha, where is it at all?

Speaker 2: Very good. But if he ate meat, which they had.

Also on figs and on grapes, apples and pears, one ate different fruits. But even things that are not shivas haminim, where one of them requires bracha me'ein shalosh. Right? Then, for the figs and grapes he needs to make an al ha'etz, and for the apples and pears he would seemingly have made a borei nefashot. Right? But he makes only **bracha achat me'ein shalosh, v'cholel hakol** (one blessing that is an abridgement of three, and includes everything). And he says the words "**al pri ha'etz**" (on the fruit of the tree), so he has in practice mentioned fruit, he has fulfilled the obligation for other fruit. **Mah she'ein kein** (which is not so) when one

makes an al ha'etz, an al hagefen, one doesn't mention any meat, one doesn't mention any treasure. It's interesting. It could be the point is that shehakol is a blessing on most foods, and this doesn't get mentioned.

[Innovation:] Why Does This Work for Fruits But Not for Meat?

This is the answer to what we learned about "he ate meat and drank wine," that there's an extra blessing on most things. As Rabbeinu Yonah said, according to this it's a nice point. On most foods that are not from the most important foods. The Almighty made two things, that the earth should produce fruits and all these things, and on this one can live. But one eats it like an apple. As Tosafot said from Tosafot. Tosafot says that one doesn't need an apple to live, an apple was made for pleasure.

So borei nefashot is an extra blessing on luxuries, on meat. When he makes al hagefen on wine, he hasn't said anything at all about the meat. Therefore, **mah shani** (what's different) he gets a privilege, when he says al ha'etz v'al pri ha'etz, it does have importance, he does make a longer blessing about the fig and olive and pomegranate, but he speaks about al hapeirot. **Mah she'ein kein** (which is not so) when he makes al hagefen, he hasn't mentioned anything of the meat, because nothing is written about the extra foods, about the...

It's an explanation, it's a good explanation, it's a chiddush, it's a good explanation, that this makes sense of the law. One, it has already finished the chapter.