

We learnt in a *Braisoh* like *Rav Chisdoh*

תניא כוותיה דרב חסדא -

Overview

The גמרא cites a [new/different] ברייתא in support of רב חסדא that items which require a שינוי מקום, do not require a new ברכה in a case of אחרונה במקומן. Our תוספות discusses why this new ברייתא, and not the previous one (on the top of this עמוד).

פירש רשב"ם¹ הא דלא מייתי כרב חסדא מרבנן² דרבי יהודה -

The רבנן explained the reason the גמרא did not cite the view of the רשב"ם in the previous ברייתא, who argue with ר"י, as a support for ר"ח -

משום דבההיא לא קתני בהדיא יין³ -

Is because in that previous ברייתא it does not state explicitly, 'wine' –

תוספות comments:

וזה פירש לפי שיטתו⁴ דגרסינן הכא יין -

But this explanation is valid only according to the רשב"ם's view that we are גורס in the latter ברייתא, the word 'יין' –

תוספות offers his explanation:

ויש לומר משום הכי לא מייתי סייעתא מינה -

And one can say that it is on account of the following that the גמרא did not bring a proof to ר"ח from the previous ברייתא -

משום דאיכא דאמרי בסנהדרין (דף כה,א) דבמה⁵ נמי לפרש -

¹ בד"ה תניא.

² The רבנן in that ברייתא maintain that if people left the meal in order to go to shul, they are not required to make either a ברכה ראשונה or a ברכה אחרונה. If we would assume that this ברייתא is discussing a case where they were partaking of a meal that requires a ב"א במקומן, this would support the view of רב חסדא that by ב"א במקומן there is no דברים שטעונין ב"א. It is only ר' יהודה, who argues and maintains that they do require a new ברכה, unless they left over some of the participants at the meal. We can support ר"ח from the view of the רבנן.

³ See דברים שטעונין (שבעת המינים) are considered as well as all the דברים שטעונין ב"א. However, according to the רשב"ם the earlier ברייתא does not mention wine, so therefore we are not certain that they were eating במקומן ב"א. However, in the second (later) ברייתא it does state יין (according to the רשב"ם, and our גירסא), therefore it is a valid proof to ר"ח.

⁴ However, תוספות disagrees and is not יין גורס in either ברייתא. See [TIE footnote # 18 & 19] תוס' קא,ב ד"ה אלא. In addition, תוספות maintains that יין (and all the מינים [except for מזונות]) are not included in the ב"א במקומן (see there, footnotes # 16 & 17).

⁵ there maintains that when ר' יהודה qualifies the words of the חכמים by saying 'אימתי' (when is this so), he is not arguing with them but merely clarifying the position of the חכמים, however when he says 'במה דברים אמורים', he is arguing with the חכמים. However, ר' יהושע בן לוי maintains that whether he says אימתי or במה, he is merely explaining the view of the חכמים but not arguing with them.

Because there are those in סנהדרין who maintain that when ר' יהודה states **in ברייתא**, **it also** means that he is **explaining**⁶ the words of the חכמים, but not arguing –

ואף על גב דחזרו מיייתי ראיה לרב חסדא⁷ דטעמא דשינוי מקום דצריך לברך -

And even though in the ברייתא it states that when **they return**, they are not obligated to make a new ברכה, nevertheless the גמרא **brings proof** from this ברייתא to ר"ה who maintains that **לברך** א"צ לברך, even when they did not return, **for the reason** why **שינוי מקום would require a blessing** (if we would disagree with ר"ה) -

משום שעמידתו ממקומו היא גמר אכילתו והוא הדין⁸ נמי חזרו:

It is because standing up from your place and leaving indicates finishing your meal, so the same rule would also apply even if you returned to the original place.

Summary

The rule of **לברך** א"צ לברך (by במקומן ב"א במקומן) is whether one is eating in a new place or returning to the old place.

Thinking it over

The ברייתא and רשב"ם are explaining why no proof was brought from the first ברייתא. Why can't we say (as the גמרא answered according to ר' יוחנן) that the ruling of the חכמים in that ברייתא is even if עקרו לא (meaning טעונו ב"א במקומן), so there is no proof to ר"ה; the only reason it states עקרו is to inform us that even by טעונו ב"א במקומן, still ר' יהודה maintains that we need a new ברכה if no one was left over. However, in the latter ברייתא since there is no מחלוקת we can assume that עקרו means ⁹טעונו ב"א במקומן!

⁶ In the ברייתא above ר"י stated בד"א, which according to ריב"ל means that he is not arguing with them, but rather this is the view of the חכמים that if no one was left over at the meal one is liable to make a new ברכה, therefore there is no support for ר"ה (according to ריב"ל).

⁷ Seemingly they are two different cases. The ברייתא is ruling that a new ברכה is not required when they return to their original place of eating. How can we prove from this the ruling of ר"ה that לברך א"צ לברך even if you eat in a different place?!

⁸ The reason why שינוי מקום should require a new ברכה (not like ר"ה), is not because you are in a new place. But rather because you left your original place. Therefore, it makes no difference whether you eat in the new place or return to your old place, the rule would be the same in both cases either צריך לברך or שינוי מקום לברך. Therefore, once we know the ruling by חזרו that לברך א"צ לברך, the same rule will apply to going to a new place, for there is no difference.

⁹ See גליון הש"ס להגאון רע"א.