The Chicago Center
Digest
Mishna Berura
THE DAILY RESOURCE FOR MISHNA BERURA YOMI
Sun, June 19 2022 ■ כ' סיון, תשפ"ב
סימן קע"ח סעיף ד'-ז'

Halacha Highlight

Returning to a meal of fruit

Rema Siman 178 Seif 7

וכן אם הפסיק בשאר דברי רשות

Similarly, if one interrupted for other voluntary matters

Shulchan Aruch (סע' ז') writes that napping during the meal does not constitute an interruption that would necessitate reciting a new beracha. Rema adds that the same is true with regards to any interruption that is voluntary rather than a mitzvah. As an example he mentions one who leaves the meal to relieve himself. Biur Halacha (ד"ה כגון) notes that in seif 2 we learned that it is only with regards to a meal of bread is changing one's location not an interruption to the meal. In contrast if one's meal was comprised of fruit or beverages it is subject to the halachos of a change of location and accordingly one would be required to recite a new beracha upon one's return from the bathroom. This is also implied in Mishnah Berurah's introduction to the siman where he writes that when it comes to fruit and beverages for which one is not required to recite the beracha acharona in its place it follows that immediately after one uproots his place he has lost his permanence and when he returns he must recite a new beracha.

There are other Poskim who disagree and asserts that going to the bathroom does not constitute an interruption. For example, Shulchan Aruch HaRav (סע' ח') asserts that Rema's intent was to be lenient even with regards to fruit when one made his meal on fruit. When it comes to bread Rema has already ruled that issues of changing one's place do not apply. Therefore, he must be addressing those foods for which a change of place would necessitate a new beracha and he is teaching that even though with regards to fruit when one changes his location a new beracha is required, if one left temporarily to relieve himself it is not considered a change of location as far as his meal of fruit is concerned. Rav Moshe Feinstein (אג"מ ח"ח סי' ט"ז אות ו') explains that since relieving oneself is not considered an interruption leaving to relieve oneself must also not constitute an interruption (חיי משה).

Stories to Share

Hatzalah in a Hurry

ש"ע, ס' קע"ח, ה' "ויש"א דדוקא מיני דגן..."

One man worked for Hatzalah as an ambulance driver. He would eat his meals in his vehicle when on call, and when summoned while eating, he would set his food aside and quickly rush to the address of the sick party, trying with all his might to help.

To his annoyance, it seemed as though within a minute of when he began eating whatever meal it was, he was immediately received a call. He obviously had to get out of the ambulance and help with the rest of the team. As we find on today's daf again, not everything requires an after-blessing where one eats it. The foods that don't require a new blessing every time one leaves from one domain to another. Since this man would often have a salad with crackers or the like, he wondered if he really needed to make a blessing on the salad when he returned to the ambulance. After all, he didn't need to make a new berachah on the mezonos, so perhaps the salad had the same halachah as the mezonos eaten in the same sitting? After all, maybe the mezonos acts as a kind of "shomer" so that the other food doesn't require a blessing?

When this question reached Rav Yosef Shalom Eliyashiv, zt"l, he ruled decisively. "He must certainly make a new blessing!"

פתחי הלכה, ע' קב, הערה 115 א'

Overview

Siman 178 Seif 4:

If one ate bread in one location and then ate bread in a second location he recites birkas hamazon in the second location. This is the custom of travelers who eat while they travel and then sit and recite birkas hamazon in the place that they finish eating.

- Even according to Shulchan Aruch who rules that one may not eat in the second location relying upon the beracha recited in the first location once he ate in the second location he recites the beracha there. According to Rema he ate in the second location b'dieved or if he had in mind to change locations when he recited hamotzi he may eat in the second location even l'chatchila. (M.B. 40)
- According to all opinions travelers may eat as they travel since they did not set for themselves a place to eat. If they thought to eat the meal where they recited the beracha and then decided to travel they are covered as long as they can see the original location but once they cannot see that original location it is considered as though they have changed locations. If the plan was to eat a little bit where they recited hamotzi and then eat the rest while travelling a new beracha is not required. In contrast if one began to eat in their home and then began to travel it is considered as though he went from one house to another and intent is ineffective if he was eating fruit but if he was eating bread another beracha is not required. (M.B. 42)

Siman 178 Seif 5:

Some say that the seven species require their beracha acharona to be recited in the place they were eaten. Others limit this halacha to grains. According to others this only applies to bread.

- If one left the place that he ate he must return to recite the beracha acharona. (M.B. 43)
- Later authorities agree that l'chatchila one should recite the beracha acharona on the seven species in the place where one ate. Similarly, if one changed locations while eating the seven species it is unnecessary for one to recite a new beracha rishona. Gra maintains that the middle opinion should be followed and even the fruit of the seven species are treated the same as other fruit. (M.B. 45)

Siman 178 Seif 6:

If one recalls in the middle of a meal that he has not yet davened and he gets up to daven, even if there is not sufficient time to finish the meal and then recite birkas hamazon he is obligated to interrupt the meal and may not eat until he davens but it still does not constitute an interruption.

- According to Shulchan Aruch this applies only if one davened in their home but walking elsewhere would constitute a change of location and according to Rema it is not an interruption unless one had a הסח הדעת. (M.B. 47)
- There is a disagreement whether he must wash netilas yadayim when he returns. This dispute is limited to where he davened in his home but if he left the house to daven all opinions agree that he must wash again without reciting the beracha. (M.B. 47)

Siman 178 Seif 7:

Napping during the meal is not an interruption. The same halacha is true if one interrupted for other voluntary activities, e.g. to relieve himself.

- Even if one napped for up to an hour it is not considered an interruption and another hamotzi is not required although he is obligated to wash and recite על נטילת ידים. Sleeping on one's bed is an interruption. (M.B. 48)
- One is required to wash his hands. (M.B. 49)