

כְּעֵינִי – IN THE SHAPE OF BREAD ROLLS, חֲיִיבִין – THEY ARE SUBJECT to *challah*.^[1] בְּלִמּוּדֵינִי – But if he made them IN THE SHAPE OF simple BOARDS, פְּטוּרִים – THEY ARE EXEMPT from *challah*.^[2]

The Gemara discusses the status of *kuva* baked in the ground:^[3] חֲיִיבִין לֵבֵן יוֹסֵף – Abaye said to Rav Yosef. הַיּוֹסֵף הָאֵלֶּיךָ – This *kuva* that is made in the ground, דְּאֲרַעָא – what blessing do we recite upon it? אָמַר לֵיהּ – [Rav Yosef] said to him: מִי סָבַרְתָּ נְהִמָּא הוּא – Do you really think that it is actually bread? גּוּבְלָא בְּעֵלְמָא הוּא – It is merely a baked dough,^[4] וּמְבָרְכִין עֲלֵיהּ בּוֹרָא מִיְנֵי מְזוֹנוֹת – and we recite on it the blessing the One Who creates species of sustenance.^[5] מַר זוּטְרָא קִבַּע סְעוּדָתֵיהּ עֲלֵיהּ – Mar Zutra established his meal around [*kuva* made in the ground] וּבִרְךָ עֲלֵיהּ הַמוֹצֵיא לֶחֶם מִן – and recited on it the blessing the One Who brings forth bread from the earth before eating and the three blessings of *Bircas HaMazon* after eating.^[6] אָמַר מַר בַּר רַב אֲשִׁי – Mar bar Rav Ashi said: וְאָדָם יוֹצֵא בְהֵן יְדֵי חוֹבְתוֹ בְּפֶסַח – And a person can fulfill with them [*kuva* breads] his obligation to eat matzah on Pesach. מַאי טַעְמָא – What is the reason for

this? לָחֶם עֵינֵי קְרִינָן בֵּיהּ – Because we can apply to it the designation *bread of poverty*.^[7]

The Gemara cites another ruling of Mar bar Rav Ashi: הָאֵי דּוּבְשָׁא – And Mar bar Rav Ashi said: וְאָמַר מַר בַּר רַב אֲשִׁי – This date honey, מְבָרְכִין עֲלֵיהּ שְׁהַבֵּל נִהְיָה בְּדַבְרֵי – we recite upon it the blessing that everything came into being through His word.^[8] מַאי טַעְמָא – What is the reason? בְּעֵלְמָא הוּא – It is mere “sweat” [i.e. moisture exuded from the fruit, rather than the fruit itself].

The Gemara explains: מַר בַּר רַב אֲשִׁי – Mar bar Rav Ashi’s view in this matter is in accordance with whom? כִּי הָאֵי תַנָּא – It is in accordance with this Tanna [R’ Yehoshua] whose view is recorded in the following Mishnah: לִבְשֵׁי תְּמָרִים וְיֵינִין תְּפוּחִים – For we learned in a Mishnah:^[9] וְחוּמֵץ סְפֻגִיּוֹת וּשְׂאֵר – If a non-Kohen inadvertently eats DATE HONEY OR APPLE CIDER OR VINEGAR OF LATE-SEASON GRAPES^[10] וְשְׂאֵר – OF TERUMAH fruits, שֶׁל תְּרוּמָה – R’ ELIEZER OBLIGATES him to pay THE PRINCIPAL PLUS A FIFTH,^[11] וְרַבִּי – WHILE R’ YEHOShUA EXEMPTS HIM from payment altogether.^[12]

NOTES

1. He took pains to form the dough into the shape of actual bread rolls. Thus, [though he has baked them in the sun,] it is evident that he has made them [to be eaten] as bread [and not to be added to *kutach*] (*Rashi*). [Accordingly, the second Baraisa is using the term *bread made for kutach* to denote bread baked in the same manner as bread used for *kutach* (i.e. it was baked in the sun), rather than to denote bread that was actually made for *kutach*.] See next note.

2. That is, he simply spread the dough out to bake in the sun, and was not particular about the shape (*Rashi*). [It is thus evident that he does not plan to eat it as bread, but rather to use it as one of the ingredients of *kutach*.]

The Gemara has thus distinguished in the case of bread baked in the sun between that which is formed into rolls (which is subject to *challah*) and that which is shaped haphazardly (which is exempt from *challah*). Some Rishonim maintain that the distinction is Rabbinic. On the Biblical level, however, there is no *challah* obligation in either case, since a substance is not classified as “bread” unless it is baked in an oven [or in a pan without liquid]. The *challah* obligation for rolls that are to be baked in the sun was decreed by the Rabbis because of the tendency to confuse such rolls with the oven-baked variety, or because one might change his mind and bake them in an oven (see *Rosh* to *Pesachim* 2:16; *Rash* to *Challah* 1:5). Accordingly, *hamotzi* would not be recited on either type of sun-baked bread, since neither is actually classified as “bread” (see *Orach Chaim* 168:16 with *Beur HaGra*).

Rabbeinu Tam (cited by *Tosafos* 37b לחם ד”ה, *Tosafos* to *Pesachim* 37b ד”ה רבולי, and *Rosh* to *Pesachim* 2:16), however, holds that bread made from a thick dough (in contrast to a soft batter) is always classified as bread and Biblically subject to *challah*, regardless of how it is processed – that is, whether it is baked in an oven or in the sun, or even if it is cooked in water. And the reason the Gemara here exempts board-shaped *kutach* bread from *challah* is that such bread was not intended to be eaten as bread (see *Rabbeinu Yonah*, and *Challah* 1:8). Accordingly, one does recite *hamotzi* on sun-baked rolls. [Regarding the practical halachah in this matter, see *Orach Chaim* 168:13, and *Shach*, *Yoreh Deah* 329:4.]

[The foregoing dispute pertains only to a thick dough. In the case of a soft batter, however, all agree that it is classified as bread only when baked in an oven or in a pan without liquid. See *Yoreh Deah* 329:2.]

3. *Kuva* baked in the ground is how Abaye (above, 37b) identified the *terokanin* discussed there.

4. Since it is made from a very soft batter, it is more like “pastry” [generally eaten as a snack] than like “bread” [generally eaten as the staple of a meal] (see *Magen Avraham* 168:40 and next note).

5. [Even though a soft batter that is baked in an oven is classified as “bread” with regard to *challah* (*Yoreh Deah* 329:2) and with regard to reciting *hamotzi* (*Orach Chaim* 168:14), the *kuva* batter is very soft, and thus differs so markedly from a bread dough that *mezonos* is the more

appropriate blessing (see *Magen Avraham* 168:40; cf. *Beur Halachah* to *Orach Chaim* 168:15).]

6. This is the law for all baked goods that are classified as bread with regard to *challah* (because of the way they are kneaded or baked – see note 2), but are normally eaten as a snack rather than as the basis of a meal (see *Orach Chaim* 168:6-8). When one eats them as a snack, he recites *mezonos* beforehand and *Al HaMichyah* afterwards; when establishing one’s meal around them, one recites *hamotzi* beforehand and *Bircas HaMazon* afterwards.

[As to what constitutes “establishing one’s meal around it,” see *Orach Chaim* 168:6 with *Mishnah Berurah* §24.]

7. [Also rendered: *bread of affliction*.] The Torah (*Deuteronomy* 16:3) calls matzah by this term; thus, one fulfills his Pesach obligation only with matzah that is so classified (see 37b note 26; *Pesachim* 36a). [One might have thought that *kuva*, since it is sometimes used as a snack bread, is classified as “rich bread” and thus lacks the “bread of poverty” designation necessary for the mitzvah of eating matzah on Pesach. Alternatively, one might have thought that *kuva*, which is baked in the ground, lacks the “bread” designation (see *Beis Yosef*, *Orach Chaim* 168 טרוקנין; see also *Ramban* and *Ritva* to end of 39b).]

[*Rabbeinu Chananel*’s remarks here suggest that one fulfills his matzah obligation with *kuva* bread only when he actually establishes his meal around it. See, however, *Minchas Chinuch* 10:5 וְהָיָה דְּקָרַק (הרב המחבר).]

8. Even though the honey comes from dates, upon which one recites the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the tree*.

9. *Terumos* 11:2.

10. Grapes that grow at the end of the season never ripen fully. They have an acrid flavor and are used to produce vinegar (*Rashi*).

11. A non-Kohen who eats or drinks *terumah* inadvertently must pay the principal value of what he has eaten and an additional fifth (see above, 35b note 52). R’ Eliezer holds that the juices of fruit are like the fruit itself. Thus, a non-Kohen who inadvertently drinks the juice of a *terumah* fruit must pay the principal plus a fifth.

12. In R’ Yehoshua’s view, the only fruit juices that are considered like the fruit itself are the juice of grapes and the oil of olives (see *Terumos* 11:2-3; *Chullin* 120b). But the juices of all other fruits (which are the subject of this Mishnah) are considered to be mere “sweat.” Thus, the non-Kohen has not consumed the fruit itself and has not become liable to payment (*Rashi*; see below, note 20).

[Late-season grapes, since they will never ripen, are considered with regard to their juices like other fruits, whose juices are but mere “sweat” (see *Mishnah Berurah* 202:50). Regarding when a fruit juice is considered mere “sweat” and when it is considered “fruit,” see *Chazon Ish*, *Orach Chaim* 33:5. See also *Orach Chaim* 202:7 with *Mishnah Berurah*.]

Thus, Mar bar Rav Ashi follows R’ Yehoshua, who holds that the juice

The Gemara cites an inquiry:

אמר ליה ההוא מרבנן לרבא – One of the Rabbis [i.e. disciples] said to Rava: **What is [the law] regarding the blessing to be recited on *terima*?**^[13] לא הוה אדעתיה דרבא מאי קאמר ליה – At first, Rava did not understand^[14] what [the disciple] was saying to him [i.e. what he meant by “*terima*”]. ותיב רבינא קמיה – Ravina was sitting before Rava at that time and אמר – said to [the disciple]: **Is it the *terima* of sesame that you are talking about?**^[15] או דקורטמי קא – Or is it the *terima* of saffron that you are talking about?^[16] או דפורצני קא אמרת – Or is it the *terima* of grape pits that you are talking about?^[17] **In the meantime, Rava called to mind what the disciple meant by *terima*.**^[18] אמר ליה – [Rava] said to him: **השילתא ודאי קא – Surely, you are talking about something crushed, and you have reminded me of something, namely, that which Rav Assi said: הא תמרי של – These dates of *terumah*, מותר לעשות מהן טרימא – it is permitted to make *terima* from them, ואסור לעשות מהן שכר – but it is forbidden to make beer from them.**^[19]

The Gemara concludes:

אמר ליה ההוא מרבנן לרבא – And the law is that if one took dates and he made them into *terima*, מברכין עלוניהו בורא – we recite on them the blessing *the One Who creates the fruit of the tree*. מאי טעמא – What is the reason? במלתיהו קיימי בדמעיקרא – For they remain in their state,

just as they were originally, before being made into *terima*.^[20]

The Gemara discusses the blessing recited on another food: **רב אמר שהכל – What blessing is recited on *shattisa*?**^[21] נהיה בדברו – Rav says: *That everything came into being through His word*. **ושמואל אמר בורא מיני מזונות – But Shmuel says: the One Who creates species of sustenance.**

The Gemara explains:

אמר רב חסדא – Rav Chisda said: **ולא פליגי – And they do not disagree.** **הא בעבה – This ruling of Shmuel, that *mezonos* is recited, is said with regard to thick *shattisa*, והא ברבה – whereas this ruling of Rav, that *shehakol* is recited, is said with regard to loose *shattisa*.** **עבה לאכילה עבדי לה – Thick *shattisa* is made for eating,**^[22] **רבה לרפואה קא עבדי לה – whereas loose *shattisa* is made for therapeutic purposes.**^[23]

The Gemara challenges the previous statement, that the loose *shattisa* is made for therapeutic purposes:

אמר רב יוסף – Rav Yosef challenged this assertion from the following Baraisa: **ושוין שבוהשין את השתות בשבת – BUT THEY AGREE THAT WE MAY STIR THE loose *SHATTUS* ON THE SABBATH,**^[24] **ושותין זיתום המצרי – AND that WE MAY DRINK THE EGYPTIAN *ZISOM* on the Sabbath.**^[25] **ואי סלקא דעתך לרפואה קא מבזין – Now, if it should enter your mind that one who drinks loose *shattisa* intends it for therapeutic purposes, why would the Baraisa permit mixing it on the Sabbath? רפואה בשבת מי שרי – Is doing a therapeutic procedure on the Sabbath permitted?**^[26]

NOTES

of fruits other than grapes and olives is mere “sweat”; thus, *shehakol* rather than *ha'eitz* is recited. [The reason Mar bar Rav Ashi issued his ruling specifically with regard to date honey is that one would have thought that date honey is an exception, since the Torah (*Deuteronomy* 8:8) refers to “honey” as one of the fruits for which Eretz Yisrael is praised. Mar bar Rav Ashi teaches us, therefore, that the reference is not to the honey that oozes from the date, but rather to the date itself (*Tzalach*; cf. *Rashba* end of תמרים של תמרים).]

13. As will be seen shortly in the Gemara, *terima* refers to a solid that has been somewhat crushed, but has not been completely mashed (*Rashi*). [Some explain “completely mashed” to mean that the solid has been reduced to the point that it can no longer be classified as a “food” but rather as a “liquid” (see *Magen Avraham* 202:18, and *Perishah* to *Tur* ad loc., cited there in *Hagahos R' Akiva Eiger*).]

14. [Literally: it was not on his mind.]

15. That is, sesame seeds that are crushed to extract their oil (*Rashi*).

16. It was common to crush saffron and then mix it with wine for use as a drink (*Rashi*).

17. I.e. the residue of crushed grapes, consisting primarily of grape seeds, which is soaked in water to produce a fermented beverage called *temed* (see *Rashi*).

18. From Ravina's remarks to the questioner, Rava understood what the questioner had meant (*Rashi*).

19. *Terumah* that is *tahor* may be eaten, but not destroyed, even if the destruction comes about through the process of food preparation [e.g. where the *terumah* will become an inedible byproduct] (see *Terumos* 11:1). Rav Assi teaches that it is permitted to make a date paste out of *terumah* dates [as this does not constitute a “destruction” of the dates]. But one may not make beer out of dates, since converting the date from a food to a drink constitutes “destroying” the fruit (*Meiri*).

Now, if the fruit that has been crushed to form *terima* would be considered no longer existent, it would be forbidden to manufacture *terima* from *terumah* fruits as this would constitute the destruction of those fruits. From the fact that Rav Assi permits making *terima* from dates of *terumah*, we see that *terima* is considered but a modified form of the original fruit. Hence, the blessing on *terima* remains *ha'eitz*, as in the case of the original fruit (see *Rashi*).

20. I.e. they remain “fruit,” albeit modified, and they therefore retain the *ha'eitz* blessing.

[As mentioned above (note 13), if the fruit is actually liquefied, it is no longer considered to be in its original state. In that case, *shehakol* is

recited instead of *ha'eitz* (see *Orach Chaim* 202:7). This applies, however, only to fruits that are normally eaten in solid form. However, fruits that are normally eaten in liquid form (and are planted with the intent that they be eaten in such a form) retain their “fruit” status even in liquid form, for it is in that form that they achieve the purpose for which they were planted. Thus, they remain “processed fruits” and *ha'eitz* is recited (see *Meiri*, end of תמרים, *Terumas HaDeshen* §29 and *Meromei Sadeh*; see also above, 36a notes 9 and 10).]

21. *Shattisa* is a dish made from the flour of kernels that were toasted while still moist (*Rashi*). Such flour remains sweet, and is mixed with oil, water and salt to form *shattisa* (*Rashi* to *Shabbos* 155b; cf. *Rashi* to *Eruvin* 29b; ר"ה שחיתא).

22. And retains its original status [as grain] (*Rashi*). Therefore, *mezonos* is recited.

23. And since it is consumed as a medicine rather than as a food or beverage, *shehakol* is recited (*Meiri*). And though *ha'eitz* is recited on *anigaron*, which is also drunk for therapeutic purposes [above, 35b-36a], *anigaron* is different because it is a beverage that is often drunk by healthy people as well. It is uncommon, however, for healthy people to drink loose *shattisa*, though they will do so on occasion (see *Meiri*; see also *Rashba*; see, however, note 37, second paragraph).

24. To blend it thoroughly with its liquid components (*Rashi*), since the flour and other solids tend to settle out (see *Meiri*). [That the Baraisa here refers to “loose” *shattisa* (*shattus* and *shattisa* are one and the same) is evident from the fact that it refers to its mixing as *בוהשין*, we may “stir,” rather than *גובלין*, we may “knead” (*Tosafos*).]

In the first part of the Baraisa (not cited here), there is a Tannaic dispute as to whether it is permitted to mix thick *shattisa* on the Sabbath, employing a deviation from the normal manner of mixing to avoid the problem of *kneading* (see *Shabbos* 155b-156a). In the part cited here, the Baraisa proceeds to state that all agree that one may mix loose *shattisa* on the Sabbath [provided that one employs a deviation] (see there).

25. Egyptian *zisom* is a laxative made from barley or wheat, saffron, and salt (see *Pesachim* 42b). The Baraisa teaches that this does not fall under the category of taking medicine [which is forbidden on the Sabbath (see next note)], since *zisom* is also drunk as an ordinary beverage (*Rashi* to *Shabbos* 156a).

26. The Rabbis banned the taking of non-essential medicines on the Sabbath, so that people not come to perform the *melachah* of טוחן, grinding, in preparing medicinal compounds (see above, 36a notes 2-3).

Thus, Rav Yosef argues that if the usual intent in preparing loose

Abaye responds:

וְאֵת לֹא תִסְבְּרָא – אָמַר לִיה אַבְי – **And do you yourself not hold** that the loose *shattisa* would be permitted on the Sabbath even if it were made specifically for therapeutic purposes? וְהָא תָנִן – **Why, we have learned in a Mishnah:**^[27] כָּל הָאוֹכְלִין אוֹכֵל אֶדְמָה לְרִפּוּאָה בְּשַׁבָּת – **A PERSON MAY EAT ALL FOODS FOR THERAPEUTIC PURPOSES ON THE SABBATH** וְכָל הַמְשָׁקִין שׁוֹתָה – **AND HE MAY DRINK ALL BEVERAGES** for therapeutic purposes on the Sabbath!^[28] אֲלֵא מָה אֵית לָךְ – **And he may drink all beverages for therapeutic purposes on the Sabbath!**^[28] אֲלֵא מָה אֵית לָךְ – **Rather, what is there for you to say** in explanation of this Mishnah's permit?^[29] גְּבַרְא לְאֹכִילָה קָא מְכוּיִן – **It must be that there is no prohibition where the onlooker could say that the person intends to ingest the food or drink for purposes of eating, rather than for therapeutic purposes.**^[30] הֲבָא נְמִי גְבַרְא לְאֹכִילָה – **Here, too, in the Baraisa's case of loose shattisa, it may be prepared [and drunk] on the Sabbath, even though it is made primarily as a medicine, because the onlooker could say that the person intends to ingest the loose shattisa for purposes of eating, rather than for therapeutic purposes.**^[31]

Another version of the last part of Abaye's response:

אֲלֵא מָה אֵית לָךְ לְמִימַר – **A different version:**^[32] לִישְׁנָא אֶהְרִינָא – **Rather, what is there for you to say** in explanation of this Mishnah's permit? גְּבַרְא לְאֹכִילָה קָא מְכוּיִן וְרִפּוּאָה מְמִילָא קָא הוּיָא – **It must be that there is no prohibition where the onlooker could say that the person intends to ingest the food or drink for purposes of eating and the therapeutic effect occurs automatically as a result.** הֲבָא נְמִי לְאֹכִילָה קָא מְכוּיִן וְרִפּוּאָה מְמִילָא קָא הוּיָא – **Here, too, in the Baraisa's case of loose shattisa, it may be prepared [and drunk] on the Sabbath, even though it is made primarily as a medicine, because the onlooker could say that the person intends to ingest the loose shattisa for purposes of eating and the therapeutic effect occurs automatically as a result.**

The Gemara now explains the need for the ruling above regarding the blessing for *shattisa*:

וְצִיבָא דְרַב – **And the above ruling of Rav and**

Shmuel^[33] regarding the blessing for *shattisa* is necessary. דִּיאִי – **For were I to judge on the basis of this Baraisa alone,** which rules that loose *shattisa* may be prepared [and drunk] on the Sabbath, I would not know that it requires a blessing, for הוּיָא אֲמִינָא – **I would have said** that the Baraisa permits loose *shattisa* on the Sabbath because לְאֹכִילָה קָא מְכוּיִן וְרִפּוּאָה מְמִילָא – **the onlooker could say that [the person] intends to ingest it for purposes of eating and the therapeutic effect occurs automatically as a result.** אֲבָל הֲבָא – **But here, with regard to blessings,** בִּינִין דְלִבְתַּחֲלָה לְרִפּוּאָה קָא מְכוּיִן – **since to begin with he intends to drink the loose shattisa for therapeutic purposes,**^[34] לֹא לְבָרִיךְ עַלְוִיהּ כָּלֵל – **he should not recite a blessing on it at all.**^[35] קַמְשַׁמַּע לָךְ – **Therefore, [Rav] informs us, by issuing his ruling, that הַנְּאִי מִינִיהּ בְּעֵי בְרוּכִי – since he [the one who drinks loose shattisa for therapeutic purposes] derives the pleasure of drinking from it,^[36] he must recite a blessing.**^[37]

The Gemara discusses the part of the Mishnah that states:

שְׁעַל הַפֶּת הוּיָא אוֹמֵר הַמוֹצִיא וְכוּ' – **FOR ON BREAD ONE SAYS: THE ONE WHO BRINGS FORTH etc.**

The Gemara cites a Baraisa that discusses the precise formulation of the blessing on bread:

מָה הוּיָא אוֹמֵר – **The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa:** מָה הוּיָא אוֹמֵר – **WHAT DOES ONE SAY** when eating bread? הַמוֹצִיא לְחֶם מִן הָאָרֶץ – **He recites the blessing: "HAMOTZI" LECHEM MIN HAARETZ,** prefixing the prefix הַ, *ha*, to the word מוֹצִיא, *motzi*. רַבִּי נְחֶמְיָה אוֹמֵר – **But R' NECHEMYAH SAYS** that one recites: מוֹצִיא לְחֶם מִן הָאָרֶץ – **"MOTZI" LECHEM MIN HAARETZ,** without the prefix הַ, *ha*.

The Gemara explains the dispute:

בְּמוֹצִיא כּוֹלֵי עֲלָמָא לֹא פְלִיגִי דְאֶפִיק מִשְׁמַע – **Rava said:** אֲמַר רַבָּא – **With regard to the word "motzi," all agree that it connotes "that He has brought forth,"** i.e. the past tense, אֵל, דְּכַתִּיב, **for it is written: God, the One Who brings them forth from Egypt.**^[38] בִּי פְלִיגִי – **Regarding what do they**

NOTES

shattisa were to use it as a medicine, it would surely not be permitted to prepare it on the Sabbath (see *Tosafos* ו'יא ו'יב).

27. *Shabbos* 109b.

28. The Mishnah's emphasis of "all" foods and "all" beverages includes even foods and drinks that are made primarily for therapeutic purposes. As long as they are sometimes eaten or drunk for hunger or thirst, one may take them on the Sabbath even if he is doing so for medicinal purposes, as Abaye proceeds to explain (see *Tosafos* ו'יא ו'יב). [Alternatively, loose *shattisa* is certainly included in the Mishnah's permit to eat "foods" even for therapeutic purposes on the Sabbath, because it is not a therapeutic concoction, but simply a food that has been greatly diluted with water (see *Ritva*).]

29. Why did the Rabbis permit taking medicines that are sometimes taken as ordinary food?

30. And we must conclude that the Rabbinic prohibition against taking medicines on the Sabbath was issued only with regard to those medicines which not also foods, where it is obvious that he is involved in a medical procedure rather than in an act of eating. But where it is not evident that the person intends a medical procedure, then it is permitted even though that is indeed the person's intent (see *Orach Chaim* 328:20-21 with *Mishnah Berurah* §69).

31. Explanation of the Gemara follows *Eglei Tal, Tochein* 46:4.

32. [This version differs slightly in wording from the first one, but is substantively the same.]

33. See below, end of note 37.

34. [I.e. in a case where the therapeutic value of the loose *shattisa* is what prompts him to drink it to begin with.]

35. With regard to the ban against taking medicine on the Sabbath, the crucial factor is not the person's intent, but rather the appearance of his actions. Hence, the Baraisa permits one to drink loose *shattisa* on the

Sabbath even for medicinal purposes. But with regard to reciting a blessing, the crucial factor is the person's intent in eating the food. Hence, one would think that no blessing is recited when drinking loose *shattisa* for medicinal purposes.

36. Since it is, after all, a beverage (see *Rashi*).

37. The blessing recited, however, is *shehakol*, because the person is drinking it for its therapeutic value (see above, note 23; see *Rama, Orach Chaim* 204:11).

[Other Rishonim (see *Tosafos* ו'יא ו'יב and *Rabbeinu Yonah*), however, maintain that the reason *shehakol* is recited on loose *shattisa* is that it is drunk as a beverage rather than eaten as a food (see *Orach Chaim* 208:6 with *Mishnah Berurah* §23). See also *Mishnah Berurah* 204:55. See *Tzlach*, who deals with how this approach fits with our Gemara.]

[The Gemara has explained that Rav's ruling was needed to preclude the notion that no blessing at all is recited on a food eaten as medicine. See *Rosh Yosef*, who questions why the Gemara did not say instead that Rav's ruling was needed to preclude the notion that *mezonos* is recited on loose *shattisa*. See also *Tzlach*, who addresses this question.]

[The Gemara has apparently discussed only the need for Rav's ruling (that *shehakol* is recited on loose *shattisa*), not the need for Shmuel's ruling (that *mezonos* is recited on thick *shattisa*). Accordingly, *Maharshal* emends the text above to read simply וְצִיבָא דְרַב, *And [the above ruling] of Rav is necessary*, without the word וְשִׁמּוּאֵל, *and Shmuel*. *Pnei Yehoshua* ו'יא ו'יב and *Tzlach* ו'יא ו'יב, however, in fact consider the need for Shmuel's ruling, and explain the Gemara in a way that it is addressing that as well. Accordingly, the text need not be emended.]

38. *Numbers* 23:22 (translation follows *Chochmas Manoach* – see end of note). As these words were uttered by Bilam nearly forty years after the exodus from Egypt, God is being referred to here as the One Who

disagree? בהמוציא – Regarding the connotation of the word “*hamotzi*.” רבנן סברי – The Rabbis [i.e. the Tanna Kamma of the Baraisa] hold that המוציא דאפיק משמע – “*hamotzi*,” too, connotes that He has brought forth, i.e. the term is used on the basis of what God has done, המוציא לך מים מצור – דכתיב,, המוציא לך מים מצור – for it is written: *the One Who brings forth for you water from the rock of flint*.^[39] But R’ Nechemyah holds that המוציא דמפיק משמע – “*hamotzi*” connotes that He brings forth,^[40] המוציא אתכם מתחת – שגאמר,, המוציא אתכם מתחת – as it is stated: *I am Hashem, your God, the One Who brings you forth from under the burdens of Egypt*.^[41]

The view of the Rabbis:

רבנן – And how do the Rabbis, who hold that *hamotzi* connotes what has been done in the past, explain the verse cited by R’ Nechemyah? – ההוא הדי קאמר להו קודשא בריך הוא לישראל – In that [verse], this is what the Holy One, Blessed is He, is saying to the Israelites: כד מפיקנא לכו – When I eventually take you out of Egypt, עבידנא לכו מלתא – I will perform for you miraculous things, כי היכי דידעיתו – so that you will know דאנא הוא דאפיקית ותכון ממצרים – that I am the One Who took

you out of Egypt, וידעתם כי אני ה' אלהיכם המוציא – דכתיב,, וידעתם כי אני ה' אלהיכם המוציא – as it is written: *and you will know that I am Hashem, your God, the One Who brings [you] forth* . . .^[42]

The Gemara records an incident related to this dispute.

משתבחין ליה רבנן לרבי זעירא [את] בר רב זבד אחיה דרבי שמעון – בר רב זבד – The Rabbis praised to R’ Zeira a certain scholar known as^[43] the son of Rav Zevid, the brother of R’ Shimon the son of Rav Zevid, דאדם גדול הוא ובקי בברכות הוא – saying in praise of him that he is a great man and an expert in the laws of blessings. אמר להם – [R’ Zeira] said to them: לביא לביא לביא – When he comes to you, bring him to me.^[44] זמנא חדא איקלע לגביה – One time he visited [R’ Zeira]. אפיקו ליה ריפתא – They brought out bread for him. פתח ואמר מוציא – He began reciting the blessing on bread^[45] and said “*motzi*” (rather than “*hamotzi*”). אמר – [R’ Zeira] remarked critically: דהוא שאומרים עליו דאדם גדול הוא ובקי – This is the one about whom they say that he is a great man and an expert in the laws of blessings? בשלמא אי אמר המוציא – It would have been well if he had said “*hamotzi*,”

NOTES

brought them forth (past tense) from Egypt (see *Rashi*). Thus, מוציא connotes in the past [as מוציאם is simply the word מוציא suffixed with a ם to denote them or their].

All agree that the blessing should convey the sense that Hashem has brought forth (past tense) bread from the earth, since He has already brought forth the bread that one is about to eat (*Rashi*). And, as the Gemara has just said, all agree that the word מוציא without the prefix ה indeed connotes “in the past.” The question, as the Gemara will now explain, is only whether the word המוציא (with the prefix ה) also connotes the past.

As is well known, in Hebrew grammar the verb מוציא means he brings forth (denoting the present, or continuing action); הוציא means he brought forth (past); and יוציא means he will bring forth (future). The prefix ה added to the verb מוציא (to form המוציא) simply adds the definite article (changing the meaning to “the one” who brings forth) [or at times comes in place of ן, that, changing the meaning to that brings forth – see *Radak* to *I Kings* 11:9]. Thus, the Gemara cannot have meant that מוציא when used as a verb denotes the past tense. Rather, the Gemara understands that מוציא in this blessing is being used as a noun (a common usage in Hebrew), and means the One Who brings forth bread from the ground; that is, God, Who is the One constantly bringing forth bread from the earth. We desire, however, a noun form that denotes the one who does so and who has also done so in the past (as explained in the preceding paragraph). Accordingly, the Gemara brings a proof from the verse אל מוציאם אלו, מוציאם, God, the One Who brings them forth from Egypt, where מוציאם is necessarily being used as a noun [as it refers to the past, which the verb מוציא cannot do – see beginning of this paragraph] and is used to describe God because of what he has done in the past (see at length *Chochmas Manoach*, on whose comments our approach to this *sugya* is based).

39. *Deuteronomy* 8:15 (translation follows *Chochmas Manoach* – see end of preceding note). Moses is addressing the Israelites in the Wilderness at the end of the fortieth year, exhorting them that their future prosperity in the Land of Israel not cause them to forget

Hashem, Who has provided their water and other needs in the Wilderness these many years. Thus, the word המוציא, the One Who brings forth, used in the verse refers to the One Who has brought forth (past tense) water from the rock of flint (see *Rashi*).

40. I.e. the noun המוציא, the One Who brings forth, is used to describe God because of what He will do in the future, though He has not done so in the past (see *Rashi*).

41. *Exodus* 6:7. Moses is instructed to declare this in the name of God to the Israelites enslaved in Egypt. Since the redemption was yet to be, God is being referred to as המוציא, the One Who brings forth, solely on the basis of what He will do, not on the basis of what He has already done (see *Rashi*).

This usage is not at odds with the usage found in the verse (*Deuteronomy* 8:15) cited above by the Rabbis. On the contrary, the present verse indicates that God is referred to in *Deuteronomy* 8:15 as “the One Who brings forth water” because He would continue to produce for them water (for the duration of their stay in the Wilderness), not because He already had (*Rashi*).

42. This is the beginning of the verse cited by R’ Nechemyah. [The Rabbis point to the first part of the verse, וידעתם כי אני ה' אלהיכם, And you “will” know that I am Hashem your God . . ., which indicates that the reference is to the knowledge the Israelites will have in the future, after they are redeemed from Egypt. At that future point, they will realize that God is “the One Who brings them forth” because of what He has already done for them.]

[R’ Nechemyah, however, interprets וידעתם כי אני ה' not as a prediction, but as a command – and you “shall” know that I am Hashem – i.e. you shall recognize right now while you are still enslaved that I am Hashem, the One Who brings you forth, because of what I will do for you.]

43. Based on the reading of *Maharshal*; cf. *Dikdukei Soferim*.

44. Literally: when he comes to your hand bring him to my hand.

45. [See a slightly different version of this Gemara cited by *Rosh*, *Pesachim* 1:10.]