

ועקרו רגליהם לילך לבית הכנסת כולי -

And they uprooted their feet to go to a synagogue, etc.

Overview

The cited ברייתא states that if people left in middle of their meal in order to go to Shul (presumably to ‘daven’); when the return they are not required to make neither a ברכה אחרונה (on what they already ate), not a ברכה ראשונה (for what they are going to eat).

מכאן משמע¹ שאם שכח להתפלל ונזכר באמצע סעודה והתפלל -

From this ברייתא here it seems that if one forgot to ‘daven’ and he reminded himself in middle of a meal, and he davened -

שאין צריך ברכה אפילו² לכתחלה³ -

That he is not required to recite even a ברכה ראשונה –

תוספות presents and rejects an opposing view:

ומה שהביא הרב רבינו יום טוב⁴ ראיה מפרק כיסוי הדם⁵ (חולין דף פז, א) -

And this which טוב הר"ר brought proof from פרק כיסוי הדם not in accordance with
- תוספות

דאמר מישתא וברוכי בהדי הדדי לא אפשר שצריך לברך ברכת המזון וליטול ידי' -

For the גמרא there explains the ruling of רב that it is forbidden to drink, since **it is impossible to drink and ‘bentch’ simultaneously**, so therefore when returning from shul, **there is the requirement to recite ברכה"ז** (for the past meal) **and wash the hands** (for the continuing meal) –

¹ See 'Thinking it over'.

² See the previous כשהו ד"ה תוס' that according to another ברייתא, even when one is not required to make a ב"א, nevertheless he is required to make a ברכה ראשונה (for whatever he intends to eat now). However, according to this ברייתא, one is not required even to make a ברכה ראשונה if he interrupted his meal in order to daven.

³ Presumably when in the ברייתא it states that they went to shul, it was in order to daven, and yet they do not require any new ברכה, not even a ברכה ראשונה. Additionally, the ברייתא is discussing leaving the meal; it seems obvious that if one davened in place, he certainly is not required to make a ברכה.

⁴ See רש"י 'ר' יו"ט ב"ר יהודה footnote # 3 that this could be (מכון אופק) ש'.

⁵ The ר' ייבא there cites the story of תלמידי דרב (see later קג,א, and כשהן [TIE footnote # 10]), where ר' ייבא told them that once they decided to bentch, they can no longer drink wine. See the ד"ה מישתא תוס' (in חולין)

is arguing that just as by תלמיד דרב, they cannot drink the wine since they decided to 'bentch', and one cannot drink and bentch at the same time, therefore since we cannot drink while we are bentching, it is considered as if we stopped drinking, and a new ברכה is required, similarly here by the davening, since one cannot eat and daven at the same time, it should be considered as if they were מסיח דעת from the meal, and require both a ב"א and נטילת ידים.

תוספות rejects this proof:

אינה ראייה דדוקא גבי ברכת המזון אמרינן הכי דהוי הפסק וגמר סעודה⁷ -

It is no roof, for only regarding ברהמ"ז, which is an interruption and the ending of a meal do we say this concept that one cannot drink and 'bentch' -

אבל תפלה אף על גב דמיכל וצלווי בהדי הדדי לא אפשר אין בכך כלום:

However, regarding prayer, even though it is impossible to eat and daven at the same time, it does not matter, and no new ברכות are required.

Summary

There is no need to either bentch or make a new ברכה, when one leaves his meal to go daven.

Thinking it over

תוספות writes 'משמע' מכאן⁸. It would seem that it is more than משמע, it is מוכח, evident! Why does תוס' write משמע?!⁹

⁷ תוספות seems to be saying that the notion of א"א בהדי הדדי, מישתא וברוכי בהדי הדדי א"א, does not mean that practically one cannot do two different things at the same time, but rather that these two things are conceptually opposed to each other; bentching indicates stopping to eat, and drinking indicates continuing to eat. They are two opposites, therefore since bentching indicates stopping to eat, one cannot continue to eat/drink. However here, davening does not indicate at all a cessation of eating, therefore the fact that we cannot eat and daven at the same time is irrelevant.

⁸ See footnote # 1.

⁹ מאירי קא, ב ד"ה ותירץ.