



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

***Machavas, Marcheshes,
Challos and Rekikin***

If a person said: I take upon myself to bring in a *machavas* (the loaves are hard, for they were fried on a shallow, flat griddle, and the fire burns off the oil), he must not bring a *marcheshes* (the loaves are soft, for they are fried in a deep pan, and the fire doesn't burn off the oil). If he said: I take upon myself to bring in a *marcheshes*, he must not bring a *machavas*.

What is the difference between a *machavas* and a *marcheshes*? The *marcheshes* has a cover to it, but the *machavas* has no cover; these are the words of Rabbi Yosi HaGelili. Rabbi Chanina ben Gamliel said: A *marcheshes* is deep and what is prepared inside of it quivers (the loaves are soft and spongy; this is due to the depth of the pan, for the fire does not burn away the oil), whereas a *machavas* is shallow and what is prepared inside of it is hard.

The *Gemora* asks: What is Rabbi Yosi's reason? If you will say that *marcheshes* is so called because it is offered to atone for the stirrings of the heart, as it is written: *My heart is aroused with a good thing (one's sinful thoughts in his heart are covered and hidden from all; accordingly, the offering must be prepared in a covered vessel)*, and *machavas* because it is offered for the utterings of the mouth, as people say, "He is emitting sounds" (one's sinful talk, such as slander, is spoken openly without concealment; the offering too must be prepared in an open vessel without a cover)? But the opposite might just as well be said, namely, *machavas* is so called because it is offered for the secret thoughts of the heart, as

it is written: Why have you fled secretly, and *marcheshes* because it is offered for the movement of the lips, as people say, "His lips were moving"!?

The *Gemora* answers: We must say that it is established so by an oral tradition.

The *Mishna* had stated: Rabbi Chanina ben Gamliel said etc.

The *Gemora* explains: *Marcheshes* is a deep vessel, for so it is written: And any *minchah* that is prepared in a *marcheshes* (the term "in" indicates that the pan had some depth to it); the *machavas* is shallow, for so it is written: And on the *machavas*.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Beis Shammai said: If a person said, "I take upon myself to bring a *marcheshes*" (and he does not say "in a *marcheshes*"), the vow must be set aside until Eliyahu HaNavi comes. They are in doubt as to whether these *minchah* offerings (a *machavas* or *marcheshes*) refer to the vessel or to the pastry prepared inside of it. But Beis Hillel said: There was a vessel in the Temple called *marcheshes*, resembling a deep mould, which gave the dough that was put into it the shape of Barothean apples and Grecian acorns. Furthermore it is written: *And all that is prepared in the machavas and on the marcheshes*. Evidently, these terms refer to the vessels and not to the dough prepared inside of it. [Accordingly, if one makes such a vow, he would need to bring the vessel to the Beis Hamikdash.]

If a man said, "I take upon myself to bring a *minchah* offering baked in an oven," he may not bring what is baked in a

kupach (a small stove; has room for the placement of one pot) or on tiles (which were heated in a furnace) or in Arabian cauldrons (huge pots used for baking bread). Rabbi Yehudah says: If he wants, he may bring what is baked in a *kupach* (for that is also called “an oven”).

If he said, “I take upon myself to bring a baked *minchah* offering” (but he does not specify if he wants to bring *challos* – loaves, or *rekikin* – wafers), he may not bring half in *challos* and half in *rekikin*. Rabbi Shimon permits it, since both kinds are regarded as the same offering.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: Baked in the oven. It may not be baked in a *kupach* or on tiles or in Arabian cauldrons. Rabbi Yehudah says: Oven is stated twice, in order to permit even that which is baked in a *kupach*. Rabbi Shimon says: Oven is stated twice; once to teach that it must be baked in an oven, and once that it becomes sanctified by the oven.

The *Gemora* asks: But does Rabbi Shimon truly hold this view? Surely it was taught in a *Mishna*: Rabbi Shimon says: Accustom yourself to say that the *shte halechem* and the *lechem hapanim* are valid, whether they were made in the Courtyard or in Beis Pagi (a walled area outside the Courtyard; evidently, the oven did not sanctify it, for otherwise, they would become disqualified on account of leaving the Courtyard)!

Rava answered: Say rather that Rabbi Shimon said that the flour should be consecrated for the oven.

The *Mishna* had stated: If he said, “I take upon myself to bring a baked *minchah* offering,” he may not bring half in *challos* and half in *rekikin*.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa*: When you bring teaches us that bringing a *minchah* offering is a matter of free choice. Rabbi Yehudah said: From where do I know that if a man said, “I take upon myself to bring a baked *minchah* offering,” he may not bring half in *challos* and half in *rekikin*? It is because it is

written: An offering of a *minchah*. One offering I said to you, but not two or three offerings. Rabbi Shimon said to him: Is the term ‘offering’ stated twice in the verse? It is stated only once, and concerning it, the torah mentions *challos* and *rekikin*; accordingly, if he so desires he may bring *challos*, or he may bring *rekikin*, or he may bring half in *challos* and half in *rekikin*. He then (crumbles them back into flour) mixes them with oil and performs the *kemitzah* from the two types. If when taking the *komeitz*, there came into his hand only one of the two types, it is valid. Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah says: From where do I know that if a man said, “I take upon myself to bring a baked *minchah* offering,” he may not bring half in *challos* and half in *rekikin*? It is because it is written: And every *minchah* offering that is baked in the oven, and every *minchah* offering that is prepared in the marches, and on the machavas, shall be the Kohen’s that offered it. And every *minchah* offering mixed with oil or dry, shall all the sons of Aaron have. Just as the term ‘every’ in the latter cases refers to two distinct kinds (dry and oily) so the term ‘every’ in the former case refers to two distinct types.

Rabbi Yehudah counters: Since the expression ‘with oil’ is stated twice in the verse, it is as though the expression ‘offering’ had been repeated.

Rabbi Shimon argues: Had the expression ‘with oil’ not have been repeated, I would have said that the offering must consist half of *challos* and half of *rekikin*, but not of *challos* alone or of *rekikin* alone; we are therefore taught otherwise.

The *Gemora* asks: Isn’t the opinion of Rabbi Yosi the son of Rabbi Yehudah identical with that of his father?

The *Gemora* answers: The difference between them is in the case where one actually did so. [According to Rabbi Yosi, it would be invalid if he brought half *challos* and half *rekikin*.] (63a – 63b)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, KOL HAMENACHOS

Preparing the Omer

Rabbi Yishmael said: On the *Shabbos* (on the sixteenth of *Nissan*), the omer was taken out of three *se'ahs* of barley (sifted until one *se'ah* of fine barley was garnered). On a weekday, five *se'ahs* were used. But the Sages said: Whether on the *Shabbos* or on a weekday, it was taken out of three *se'ahs*. Rabbi Chanina the vice-Kohen Gadol said: On the *Shabbos* it was harvested by one man with one sickle into one basket, and on a weekday, it was harvested by three men into three baskets and with three sickles. But the Sages said: Whether on the *Shabbos* or on a weekday, it was harvested by three men into three baskets and with three sickles.

The *Gemora* asks: The opinion of the Sages is quite clear, for they hold that a tenth of the finest flour can be obtained out of three *se'ahs*, and therefore it is done the same way - whether it was a *Shabbos* or a weekday. But what is the explanation for the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael? If he holds that a tenth of the finest flour can be obtained only out of five *se'ahs*, then on a *Shabbos* too, five should be necessary; and if it can be obtained with merely three *se'ahs*, then on a weekday too, three *se'ahs* should be sufficient!?

Rava answers: Rabbi Yishmael is of the opinion that a tenth of the finest flour can be obtained out of five *se'ahs* without exerting much effort, but much effort is needed when only three are used. On a weekday, therefore, it is taken out of five *se'ahs*, as this would give the best results; but on the *Shabbos*, it is better that the *Shabbos* be desecrated by one work, namely sifting, (*being repeated many times*), rather than by many labors being performed only once. (63b)

DAILY MASHAL

Minchah Offering

The Keren Orah suggests that the *minchah* offering symbolizes a regular person. A person's Torah and Mitzvos

are similar to the part of the *Minchah* that is separated during the *Kemitzah* process, which sanctifies part of the *Minchah* to be offered directly on the *Mizbe'ach*. A person's mundane acts are similar to the rest of the *Minchah*. The rest of the *Minchah* is eaten by *Kohanim* in order to give them strength to do the *Avodah* in the *Beis ha'Mikdash*. Similarly, a person's mundane acts give him strength in order to serve *Hashem*.

One of the reasons why the Jewish people were originally deserving of punishment in the *Megillah* story was because there was a lack of in-depth Torah learning. The *Gemora* in *Bechoros* (5b; see Rashi there) says that *Amalek* attacked the Jews only because "they (the Jews) weakened their hands from [studying] the words of the Torah." Only when the Jewish people rectified their flaws were they able to conquer *Amalek*. Similarly, *Haman*, who was from *Amalek*, succeeded in passing his evil decree only because the Jews "were lazy in the study of Torah" (*Megilah* 11a).

Mordechai therefore was trying to show the children about the *Kemitzah* that the *Keren Orah* explained had on one level represented Torah learning. Therefore *Mordechai* wanted to stress the importance of learning Torah at precisely that time. When *Haman* realized the weight of *Mordechai's* actions he exclaimed that the *kemitzah* had defeated his 10,000 silver talents. With the Torah learning *Mordechai* was able to nullify the power of *Amalek* over the Jewish people.