

1 גופא - רב ושמואל דאמרו תרווייהו כל שיש בו מחמשת המינין מברכין עליו בורא מיני מזונות any food that contains within it Chameishes haMinim - any of the 5 grains - its brocho would be a Borei Minei Mezonos The Gemora presents a second statement by Rav and Shmuel which seem to be teaching us the exact same halocho - כל שהוא מחמשת מיני מזונות כל שהוא מחמשת - כל שהוא מחמשת המינין that any food made from the Chameishes haMinim - any of the 5 grains - its brocho would be a Borei Minei Mezonos. The gemora asks: why do we need two separate statements? The gemora answer that - כל שהוא מחמשת המינין - teaches that only food made from any of the 5 grains require a mezonos, but not rice or millet. On the other hand המינין מחמשת המינין - teaches that even if other primary ingredients are mixed in along with any of the 5 grains, it still requires a mezonos. Based on the above, the gemora concludes that Rav and Shmuel hold that on Orez v'Dochan - Rice and Millet we don't say a מזונות only a Shehakol. The gemora challenges this conclusion from a breisa which states that on bread made from either rice or millet one makes the same brochoh as on porriage made from the 5 grains - in other words - מזונות! The gemora answers that this breisa that groups אורז ודוחן with the 5 grains goes according to רבי יוחנן בן נירי who holds that rice can become chometz, and therefore may be used to make matzoh, and its brocho is המוציא לחם מן הארץ. However the chachomin do not agree that you can be yotzeh with rice matzoh - therefore the gemora feels that the reason must be because they hold that rice is not a grain - as do Rav and Shmuel. The gemora does not accept this premise and introduces us to a breisa that says הכוסס את האורז מברך עליו בורא פרי האדמה, if someone chews rice, the brocho is Borei pri hoAdomoh, however טחנו אפאו and then cooked he would say a מזונות and an על המחיה afterwards.

2 Now since this breisa holds that you say Mezonos on the baked rice and not a Hamotzi, than obviously it cannot go according to Reb Yochanon ben Niri. We are therefore forced to say that this breisa goes according to the Chachomin, and that they hold, that on rice we say a mezonos, which means that it is considered a grain - contrary to Rav Shmuel. In conclusion the gemora says תיובתא דרב ושמואל - that it is indeed a refutation of Rav Shmuel's second statement of מזונות עליו בורא מיני מזונות - that a mezonos is made only on the 5 grains not on rice. The gemora now turns its attention to the beginning of the above mentioned breisa if someones chews מור הכוסס את האורז מברך עליה בורא פרי האדמה he swallows raw rice he says Borei pri hoAdomoh beforehand and a Borei Nefoshos afterwards. however טחנו אפאו ובשלו if it was ground, baked and then cooked he would say a מזונות and an על המחיה afterwards. The gemora asks, but there is another breisa that says לבסוף ולא כלום - that afterwards we don't say an "על המחיה" only a "בורא נפשות"! our breisa of HaKoses goes according to Rabban Gamliel, - זה הכלל כל שאינו משבעת המינים - if someone ate Bread made from Orez v'Dochan he says is Al Hamecyoh, whereas the Chachmin hold that only a Borei Nefoshos is said.



Review



3 The gemora asks: earlier in that breisa it discusses “אם אין הפרוסות קיימת - if regular bread made from wheat was then cooked, and the pieces are no longer recognizable as bread, than only a mezonos and al hamechyoh are said.

Now this statement cannot possibly go according to Rabban Gamliel because he holds זה הכלל כל שהוא משבעת המינים אומר שלש ברכות, that even on dates or daissa / porridge one say brichas hamozon – of course according to him no wheat bread needs to be visible! In the end the gemora concludes that this breisa must also be going according to the Chachomim, but since they clearly say “לבסוף ולא כלום” that baked \approx cooked rice needs a only a Borei nefoshos said afterwards - we therefore have no choice but to ammend the breisa so that it too says “לבסוף ולא כלום.”

3 The גמרא asks...

רבן גמליאל	אם
כל שהוא	אין הפרוסות
משבעת המינים	קיימת
אומר שלש ברכות	מזונות
(ברכת המזון)	על המחיה
↓	?
No bread	לבסוף
needs to be	ולא כלום
visible!	↓
	חכמים
	ולא כלום
	(בורא נפשות)

4 The next gemora begins with Rava originally saying that the amount of flour in a porridge determines if you say a mezonos on it or not. But he then reconsidered and said that he agrees with Rav \approx Shmuel who said, at the beginning of our daf, that as long as a porridge has some flour in it, a mezonos is to be made.

4

Originally...	רבא
Amount of flour	רב ושמואל
in a porridge	Even a
↓	SMALL
DETERMINES	amount
if you say	of flour
מזונות	↓
	מזונות

5 Next, - RavYosef introduces us to “Chavitza” - a cooked dish made with small peices of bread, and says: If the pieces are a the size of a kezayis, then we say Hamotzi \approx Birchhas Hamozon, however if the pieces are smaller than a kezayis we say a Mezonos \approx Al hamecyoh. Just like a Hamotzi was said on a Koban Mincha - a flour offering brought in the Bais Hamikdash, where the mincha was first broken into pieces not less than a kezayis before it was eaten.

5 רב יוסף הביצה

Cooked dish made with small peices of bread

Peices are	LESS
כזית	than a
↓	כזית
המוציא	מזונות
ברכת המזון	על המחיה
↘	
קרוב מנחה	
Pieces NOT less than a	
כזית	



6 However Abaya points to a Tanoth D'Bei Rabbe Yiesmoel that holds that those pieces were much much smaller than a kezayis and yet they still made a homotzi on the meincha. Rav Yossi answered that by menocho they left over at least one piece larger than a kezayis, therefore they were able to make a homotzi even on the smaller pieces.

The gemora concludes with Rav Sheshes saying that the halocho is that even if the pieces of bread in the Chavitza are less than a kezayis, a Hamotzi is still said - with Rava adding, but only if those pieces are still recognizable as bread after it was cooked.

6

?
אביי asked...
תני רבי רבי ישמעאל
They were **SMALLER** than a כזית

אמר רבי יוסף answered...
One pieces was left **LARGER** than a כזית

 רב ששת
Even if the pieces are **LESS** than a כזית

רבא - Still **RECOGNIZABLE** as bread

7 Our daf concludes with a brief discussion about breads that were made from a very watery batter and depending on how they were baked would determine if they were considered breads and therefore would be subject to the laws of "Challah".

7

Our daf concludes...

Bread made from a **watery** batter



How they were baked would determine if considered **BREAD**

חלה

