



Likkutei Sichos

Volume 18 | Shelach | Sichah 5

Baking Belief

Translated by Rabbi Mendel Rapoport

General Editor: Rabbi Eliezer Robbins | Editor: Rabbi Y. Eliezer Danzinger

Content Editor: Rabbi Zalmy Avtzon

© Copyright by Sichos In English 2023 ◦ 5783

A note on the translation: Rounded and square brackets reflect their use in the original *sichah*; curly brackets are interpolations of the translator or editor. The footnotes in curly brackets are those of the translator or editors and do not correspond to the footnotes in the original. Words in bold type are italicized in the original text.

Great care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of the translation, while at the same time maintaining readability. As in all translations, however, the possibility of inadvertent errors exists.

Feedback is appreciated — please send comments to: info@projectlikkuteisichos.org

1.

IS THERE A MEASUREMENT?

On the verse,¹ “The first portion of your dough, you shall separate *challah* for a gift; as in the case of the gift of the threshing floor, ²so shall you separate it,” Rashi comments:

As in the case of the gift of the threshing floor — for which no amount is specified, and unlike the gift taken from the tithe {given by Levites to Kohanim} for which an amount is specified. However, the Sages did specify an amount: for a householder, one twenty-fourth {of the dough} and for a baker, one forty-eighth.

We need to clarify:

a) Rashi only references halachic teachings from the Midrash or of our Sages when it is crucial to understand the *pshat*,³ as Rashi himself states, “My intention is **only** to clarify the verse according to *pshat*.”⁴ Consequently, it is understood why Rashi explains, “for which no amount is specified, and unlike the gift taken from the tithe, for which an amount is specified,” because he thereby clarifies the verse’s intention in specifying, “the gift of the threshing floor,” and unlike other kinds of “gifts.” Why, however, is the continuation of Rashi’s comments, “However, our Sages did specify an amount...,” relevant to the explanation of the verse?

b) Even if we assume Rashi quotes the amount required for *challah* in order to point out that our Sages did place a measure, even while the verse itself did not, we must still clarify: Why must Rashi specify the exact measurements our Sages prescribed? Seemingly, this is entirely irrelevant to the *pshat* interpretation of the verse. This does not align with Rashi’s intention to explain the *pshat* and not teach laws.

¹ *Bamidbar* 15:20.

² {*Terumah*, the gift of grain to the Kohen.}

³ {The plain meaning of Scripture. Though there are many levels and depths of interpretation on the Torah, Rashi adopts a straightforward approach.}

⁴ *Bereishis* 3:8. Rashi continues there: “and for Aggadah, which resolves the words of Scripture with each word stated in its proper framework.”

c) Even if we will explain, although not smoothly, that Rashi wants to provide the reader with an understanding of the measurements for *challah*, it would suffice to say, “for a householder, one twenty-fourth,” the measurement relevant to most people. [In fact, *Targum Yonasan*,⁵ although his commentary is generally further from *pshat* than Rashi’s, only quotes the first measurement of one twenty-fourth.] Why must Rashi also add, “for a baker, one forty-eighth”?

d) Furthermore, seemingly, the continuation of Rashi’s comments contradict the first clause: First, Rashi explains that the verse says, “the gift of the threshing floor,” to emphasize that *challah* is like “the gift of the threshing floor... for which no amount is specified, and **unlike** the gift taken from the tithe, for which an amount is specified.” In other words, not only does the verse not prescribe a measurement for *challah*, but the verse says clearly, “as in the case of the gift of the threshing floor, **so shall you separate** it.” Meaning the verse specifies that we should separate *challah* **without** a precise measurement. How does this fit (according to the *pshat*) with Rashi’s concluding statement: “However, the Sages did specify an amount”? This leads to the next question:

e) Even if Rashi wants (for whatever reason) to point out that “the Sages did specify an amount” and the details, it would have been more appropriate to include these details in his explanation on the following verse, “you shall give a gift to Hashem,”⁶ where Rashi comments, “Since we have not yet heard of an amount for the dough portion {*challah*}, it says, “you shall give” — there should be enough for giving {that is, enough to be considered a gift of some significance}.” There, it would be appropriate to say that, “the Sages did specify an amount: for a householder... and for a baker....”

[This would mirror how we find this idea expressed in *Sifri*. On the verse, “you shall give a gift to Hashem,” *Sifri* comments: “The gift should be a quantity that can be considered a gift to the Kohen. From here we derive the measurement of *challah* for a householder....”]

⁵ And in Rashi on *Bamidbar* 18:29.

⁶ *Bamidbar* 15:21.

f) Conversely, we can ask: Since Rashi *does* include the distinct measurements that our Sages prescribed — for a householder, one twenty-fourth; for a baker, one forty-eighth — why does Rashi not explain, as the *Sifri* does, the reason for the distinction between householders and bakers?

Apparently, Rashi feels that once he specifies the measurements, the distinction is self-understood.

2.

THE MEASUREMENT OF CHALLAH

The explanation can be understood straightforwardly: When the verse says, “as in the case of the gift of the threshing floor, so shall you separate it,” which, as Rashi explains, means “for which no amount was specified,” we can infer that even the slightest amount would suffice.

Over here, however, this does not align well with the simple understanding of the verse: The continuation of the verse says, “The first portion of your dough, you shall separate **challah** for a gift,” Rashi explains: “You shall separate one *challah* for the sake of Hashem.” And Rashi translates “*challah* — in Old French, *tortel*,” which means “a loaf.”

In light of this, we must clarify: How can we suggest that separating *challah* is “like the threshing floor” which has no measurement, as discussed, when the verse itself says, “separate **challah** for a gift” — and *challah* (a loaf) clearly has a measurement?⁷

⁷ It should be noted that this is also Rashi’s halachic opinion (*Sefer Hapardes LeRashi*, “*Hilchos Pesach*,” sec 131; *Machzor Vitri*; *Siddur Rashi*, et al): “One who wishes to separate *challah* from dough recites the blessing: ‘...Who has sanctified us with His commandments and commanded us to separate a gift,’ as ‘...to separate *challah*,’ is not a blessing. The meaning of *challah* is a cake or a loaf, and it wouldn’t make sense to say in a blessing “...to separate as a loaf.” The verse says, ‘separate *challah* for a gift,’ meaning, one of the cakes should be separated as a gift.... The fact that the **verse** calls it *challah* shows that its simple meaning is something like a “loaf.”

For this reason, Rashi explains further that although “no amount is **specified**... however” (since the verse describes this as “*challah* — *tortel*” therefore) “the Sages did specify an amount.”⁸

Put differently, even though “*challah* (here means) a loaf,” unqualified, the noun “*challah*,” nevertheless, implies that a portion of some importance must be set aside and not just crumbs, etc. Consequently, the Sages established, for *challah*, a set measure also quantitatively.

3.

THE NEED FOR BOTH AMOUNTS

However, to simply say, “the Sages did specify an amount” is not enough: Since, “*challah* — a loaf” has no specific measurement (there can be various sizes of loaves), we might assume that the Sages gave a fixed measurement in the size of **this** {offering of} “*challah*” **by itself**⁹ — just as the Torah does regarding “*challah*” for the sacrifices.

Therefore, Rashi points out that **here** the Sages specified a measurement that is **relative** to the size of the dough: “For a householder one twenty-fourth, and for a baker one forty-eighth.”¹⁰

The specified measurement given by the Sages is not arbitrary but is derived from the verse that refers to the offering as *challah*. Therefore, Rashi doesn't need to explain the reason for the different measurements of a

⁸ In contrast, with regards to the *minchah* offering (*Vayikra* 2:4), the *todah* offering (*Vayikra* 7:12), and the *Lechem Hapanim* (*Vayikra* 24:5), Rashi (on *Vayikra* 2:1 and 7:12) mentions a specific measurement and it is not just simply a loaf. Therefore, Rashi does not mention in those comments that *challah* means a “loaf.”

⁹ {I.e., not an amount that is relative to the amount of dough being baked. See *infra*.}

¹⁰ The intended meaning of Rashi's statement, “**However**, the Sages did specify an amount,” is not that the Sages provided a detailed measurement to the *challah* referred to in the Torah, and that this is considered a biblical measurement (**similar** to how this is explained by *Radvaz* on the Rambam, “*Hilchos Terumah*,” beginning of ch. 5 and by *Gur Aryeh* mentioned in sec. 4). This is because: (a) it is the opposite of “the case of gift of the threshing floor,” {to which the Torah compares it} and (b) nowhere in the Torah do we find any distinction between householders and bakers. or the like.

householder and a baker because it is self-understood based on the simple meaning of the verse:

The loaves baked by a householder, who is not a professional, are relatively large and are **all** intended to be consumed by him and the members of his family. Therefore, the **challah** he needs to take for the Kohen is a larger measurement — one twenty-fourth. In contrast, a baker's loaves are intended for all sorts of customers (for the rich and poor, etc.), and therefore, he also bakes smaller loaves. And he makes a living only from the profit that remains after covering his expenses of flour, firewood, etc. Consequently, the measure of *challah* that he gives to the Kohen is smaller: one forty-eighth.

In light of this, we can readily understand why Rashi notes the two measurements of the householder and the baker. Just as the general basis for why the Sages established an amount is because the verse uses the words, “you shall separate *challah* (*tortel*) for a gift,” as mentioned above, the word *challah* is also the reason to differentiate between the measurement required of a baker and a householder (namely, because there is a difference in {the sizes of} the loaves they bake).

There is another reason that Rashi quotes both measurements:

Rashi previously stated that the measurement of dough that obligates a person to separate *challah* is, “an *omer* for each individual which equates to forty-three and one-fifth eggs.”¹¹ If Rashi would have merely said, “for a householder, one twenty-fourth,” we would have understood the Sages as maintaining that a respectable measure is one that is greater than an “egg,” and this contradicts many previous laws which utilize the measurement of an “egg.”¹² Consequently, Rashi continues, “for a baker, one forty-eighth” — that it's possible for the measurement to be less than the size of an “egg.”

¹¹ *Bamidbar* 15:20; see Rashi.

¹² For example: Rashi on *Vayikra* 11:34 (at the end).

4.

TWO ELEMENTS TO CHALLAH

From among the wondrous ideas that can be derived from Rashi's comments:

There is a halachic discussion regarding the paradox in Rashi's interpretations. Namely, in **this** verse, Rashi says, "for which no amount is specified... however, the Sages did specify an amount: for a householder, one twenty-fourth {of the dough} and for a baker one forty-eighth." This implies that there is no biblical measurement at all for *challah*. But in the verse, "a gift for Hashem," Rashi says, "there should be in it enough for giving, {i.e., enough for a gift of some significance}" meaning, *challah* does have a biblical measurement:

Re'em maintains¹³ that when Rashi comments, "*a gift for Hashem* — there should be in it enough for giving," Rashi means that this scriptural phrase serves only a biblical support,¹⁴ while there is no actual biblical measurement for *challah*.

Gur Aryeh says that the clause "there should be in it enough for giving," only refers to fulfilling the mitzvah. The term *challah*, however, can certainly apply to something even smaller than this measurement.¹⁵

*Nodah BeYehuda*¹⁶ explains at length that separating *challah*, in fact, has two elements: (a) removal of the prohibition of *tevel*¹⁷ from the dough, which permits the dough to be eaten; (b) the primary mitzvah — to confer a gift to the Kohen. The difference between these two elements: In order to extricate the dough from the prohibition of *tevel*, there is no biblical measurement, and even a tiny bit would permit the dough to be eaten. However, to fulfill the mitzvah of **giving** *challah* to the Kohen, the **Torah** prescribes an amount {that is fixed,

¹³ In his comments on Rashi, *Vayikra* 15:21, s.v. "Titnu."

¹⁴ {In the original, "אסמכתא בעלמא."}

¹⁵ See *Radvaz* on *Mishneh Torah*, "*Hilchos Bikurim*," beg. of ch. 5; see *Maskil L'David*, ad loc.

¹⁶ Responsa, second ed., "*Yoreh Deah*," sec. 201.

¹⁷ {*Tevel* means produce from which *terumah* and *maaser* were not separated; hence, the produce not be eaten until these required tithes are taken.}

depending on whether the dough belongs to a householder or a baker, but regardless of the quantity of the dough} — one twenty-fourth (or one forty-eighth) of an **isaron**.¹⁸ In accordance with this {biblical} measurement {of *challah* that must be given}, the Sages obligated that every batch of dough have *challah* separated from it according to the size of the batch — for a householder one twenty-fourth of his batch of dough; and for a baker, one forty-eighth.

Consequently, on the verse, “as in the case of the gift of the threshing floor, so shall you separate it,” which is relevant exclusively to separating *challah* (to permit the dough to be eaten), **Rashi** explains, “for which no amount is specified.” Meaning, biblically, there is no minimal measure, but the Sages set a particular amount for each batch of dough depending on its quantity.

In contrast to the verse, “From the first portion of your dough you shall **give** a gift to Hashem,” which addresses the gift to the Kohen, Rashi explains, “Since we have not yet heard of an amount... it says, “you shall give” — there should be in it enough for **giving**.” In order to fulfill the mitzvah of conferring a gift to a Kohen, there is a biblical measurement (one twenty-fourth or forty-eighth of an *isaron*).

5.

SET ASIDE A GIFT FOR HASHEM

Based on the above explanation {sec. 2-3}), Rashi’s approach is as follows:
(a) Even the **separation**, as biblically mandated, must have a respectable size removed: “*challah* — *tortel*.” And a minute measure, or crumbs, etc., are insufficient.

(b) The specific measurement instituted by our Sages is unrelated to the “gift” to the Kohen. Rather, it is related to the measurement of *challah* that the Torah prescribes for the **separation**.

¹⁸ {The size of $43 \frac{1}{2}$ regular sized eggs.}

The simple reason for this, one may posit: The straightforward understanding of the verse implies that not only the clause, “you shall set aside a gift for Hashem,” addresses the mitzvah of separating a gift for **Hashem**, but also the clause from the second verse, “you shall give a gift to Hashem” does as well. Also, neither clause addresses the act of conferring this gift to the Kohen since the second verse itself also explicitly states that this is a “**gift** for Hashem.”¹⁹ (The element of giving a gift to the Kohen is addressed later on, in *parshas Korach*).²⁰ The fact that the verse repeats, “you shall give” (even though this carries the same connotation as “you shall set aside”) is only because, “**since** we have not yet heard of an amount...” as Rashi comments on this verse.

6.

CHALLAH AND IDOL-WORSHIP

From the “wine of Torah”²¹ in Rashi’s comments:

The midrash states:²²

Why was the section of laws regarding *challah* juxtaposed to the section of laws regarding idol-worship? To teach you that whoever fulfills the mitzvah of {separating} *challah* is considered as if he has negated idolatry; while whoever neglects the mitzvah of *challah* is considered as if he has validated idolatry.

This midrash is entirely incomprehensible: What is the connection between (a) the mitzvah of *challah*, which entails a simple act that a Jew does with a batch of dough and (b) negating idolatry, which evinces the core of our faith and the foundation of the entire Torah?

We must further clarify: The wording of the midrash, “whoever fulfills the mitzvah of *challah* is considered as if he has **negated** idolatry, while whoever

¹⁹ Therefore, according to Rashi, giving the gift to a Kohen is not a separate mitzvah, with a different measurement, for no other measurement is stated for the giving of the gift to the Kohen. See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 8, p. 34 and fn. 24.

²⁰ See Rashi on *Bamidbar* 18:8, “the **twenty-four** gifts of the priesthood”; see Rashi on *Bamidbar* 5:10.

²¹ {The deeper teachings of Torah.}

²² *Vaykira Rabbah*, ch. 15, par. 6.

neglects the mitzvah of *challah* is considered as if he has **validated**,” implies that we are addressing an idol that already exists, and by observing this mitzvah, we “**negate**” this idol, and by neglecting this mitzvah, we “**validate**” this idol. Seemingly, even if these concepts are related, the midrash should have said, “whoever fulfills the mitzvah of *challah* is considered as if he has denied idolatry while whoever neglects the mitzvah of *challah* is considered as if he has affirmed (observed) idolatry...,” or the like.

7.

IT BELONGS TO HASHEM

The explanation:

One of the explanations for the idea of *challah*, “the first portion of your dough, you shall separate *challah* for a gift”: In order for a person to receive his livelihood and all of his needs (which are all generally included in “dough” — bread and sustenance which is the primary element of livelihood),²³ he must first plow, sow, and harvest (as is expressed in the mishnah regarding the prohibitions on Shabbos).²⁴ These are activities that are essential according to nature, no different for a Jew or a non-Jew. Consequently, a person can make the following mistake: (a) {He may think that} his livelihood is unrelated to Hashem and he receives his livelihood through his own efforts and by natural means; and (b) even if we assume Hashem set up this natural system — that when a person plows, sows, etc., he receives his livelihood — nevertheless, once Hashem has set up this process, a person’s livelihood itself is unrelated to Hashem.

The mitzvah of *challah* addresses this error: “The first portion of your dough, you shall separate *challah* for a gift.” Even before he enjoys his bread, he acknowledges (and performs a physical act to express his awareness) that the “first” — the entire beginning of the dough (which includes all of his needs, as

²³ See Rashi on *Bereishis* 31:54: “Any food may be termed “bread,” (see *Bereishis* 43:32 and *Shemos* 18:12).

²⁴ *Shabbos* 74b.

discussed) — is “a gift for **Hashem**”: His attainments are not due to his own efforts on account of nature. Rather, “He {Hashem} gives you the strength to make wealth,”²⁵ and, “Hashem’s²⁶ blessing provides wealth.”²⁷

Furthermore, consider that Hashem “in His goodness renews each day, continuously, the work of Creation,” meaning, Hashem recreates the Creation from nothing, every moment.²⁸ It turns out then that not only does Hashem’s blessing clothe itself in nature and in a person’s efforts, but all elements of nature and all of a person’s efforts have no autonomous reality. Their entire existence is derived anew every instant from Hashem, who energizes them, enlivens them, and sustains them.

Therefore, “The first portion of your dough, you shall separate *challah* for a gift.” He does not give this gift as *tzedakah* (especially since our *parshah* does not address the gift to the Kohen [as mentioned above]. Rather, “*challah* you shall set aside a gift **for Hashem**”). He gives this to Hashem because in truth, it belongs to Him.

8.

A SUBTLE FORM OF IDOL WORSHIP

The sin of idol-worship, even in the revealed-dimension of Torah,²⁹ consists not only of actually serving an idol and accepting it as a deity, Heaven forbid. Rather, even if a person maintains that the stars and constellations (including the forces of nature) possess independent control and influence, then even though he believes Hashem created them and supplied them with their power, it is still considered a form of idolatry.³⁰ In truth, all the forces in nature are merely like an **ax** in the hewer’s hand, and they have no intrinsic power.

²⁵ {Devarim 8:18.}

²⁶ {Mishlei 10:22.}

²⁷ See *Derech Chaim* in the Introduction; *Kuntres Umaayon*, discourse 17; et al.

²⁸ *Tanya*, “*Shaar HaYichud VeHaEmunah*,” ch. 1.

²⁹ See *Mishneh Torah*, the beg. of “*Hilchos Avodah Zarah*.”

³⁰ See *Mishneh Torah*, *ibid.*: “...This was the essence of idol-worship.”

Also, they are not free to modify the influence they provide. They are purely garments through which we receive influence from Hashem.³¹

There is also a more subtle form of idol-worship: Not only when a person adopts the belief that there are forces outside of Hashem, so to speak, but even to maintain that there is some form of **reality** aside from Hashem. For in truth, “there is nothing aside from Him” — nothing exists outside of Hashem.

However, in the world and the workings of nature, this truth is not **apparent**: The world and nature appear to be an autonomous existence. Furthermore, the awareness that “there is an Owner³² to this mansion,”³³ is concealed to the extent that deep contemplation is required to recognize that Hashem actively controls the world and all that is upon it.

Consequently, when a Jew observes the mitzvah of *challah*, he recognizes and reveals that the “dough” — his livelihood earned through his efforts and natural means — comes entirely from Hashem. In this manner, he “**negates**” idol-worship. He undermines what appears in this world to be all-important, and even an autonomous power and influencer.

Conversely, when a Jew “neglects the mitzvah of *challah*” — when he does not recognize that his entire livelihood and all of his needs are provided by Hashem, it is “considered as if he has **validated** idolatry.” He validates the delusion that natural forces are independent existences. This happens because of his presumption that the influence {exercised by them in the world} is contingent on them alone.³⁴

Furthermore, if he negates the mitzvah of *challah* by accident, meaning, he **forgets** to separate *challah*, he still “validates” idol-worship, since forgetfulness is only possible for something that cannot be clearly seen. If something was clearly visible, a person could not forget about it. Since he forgot to separate

³¹ See also *Derech Mitzvosecha*, “Mitzvas Milah,” ch. 3; “Mitzvas Tiglachas Metzora,” ch. 3; *Kuntres Umaayan*, discourse 23, ch. 1; discourse 24 ff., et al.

³² {Meaning, Hashem runs the world.}

³³ See *Bereishis Rabbah*, beg. of ch. 39.

³⁴ See also *Likkutei Torah*, “*Shir Hashirim*,” 64d.

challah, meaning, he is not fully conscious that everything comes from Hashem, he thereby validates the existence of idol-worship, Heaven forbid, which is clearly visible in this world on its own.

9.

CORE FAITH AND ITS EXPRESSION

In light of this explanation, the different required measurements for *challah* are better appreciated: Just as any idol-worship, to any degree, is forbidden,³⁵ the same applies to *challah*. It, too, has no inherent measurement — a minimal **quantity** also suffices.

Conversely, just as idol-worship began with and is related to the sun, the moon, etc., and idols, etc. (or at least,³⁶ “he erected a brick and bowed to it”), similarly, “the Sages did specify an amount” regarding the mitzvah of *challah*.

The explanation: From the perspective of the soul’s essence, a person’s faith, the prohibition of idol-worship has no minimal measure. In other words, a person’s faith cannot tolerate any existence outside of Hashem, so to speak, as subtle as it may be. Therefore, the same applies to the positive {affirmation of Hashem}:³⁷ Regarding *challah*, essential faith has no amount, meaning, it has no requisite *quantitative* measurement. However, it is “**challah**,” possessing a requisite *qualitative* measurement (of importance). The **core** of a person’s faith on account of his soul is qualitatively unbounded by any boundaries.

However, “the **Sages** did specify an amount”: Regarding how this faith descends and is clothed in the soul’s wisdom³⁸ and intellect — {alluded to by the term} “the Sages”³⁹ — then just as idolatry has various measures as to a person’s mistaken belief in it, the same must apply to *challah*. The nullification and

³⁵ *Avoda Zara* 73b.

³⁶ *Avoda Zara* 46a.

³⁷ See also *Tanya*, “*Likkutei Amarim*,” chs. 19, 22, and 24.

³⁸ {In the original, “*chochmah*.”}

³⁹ {In the original, “*chachamim*”; those possessing wisdom.}

negation of idolatry (as manifest) in the person's **intellect** must possess a specific measurement.

As mentioned above, this notion of idolatry that *challah* is intended to prevent does not apply only to literal idol-worship. Rather, it also applies to the possibility that, in a person's mind, it is not absolutely inconceivable that natural law is of some import. And due to his familiarity with these natural forces, he might imagine that **they** are responsible for his livelihood. Therefore, in this respect, there is a distinction between a baker and a householder, as will be explained.

10.

CORE FAITH AND ITS EXPRESSION

Chassidus explains⁴⁰ that a layperson perceives Divine providence more frequently than does a Torah scholar:⁴¹ A layperson is involved in many business activities — purchasing and selling merchandise, etc., which all are affected by seasonal and geographic considerations,⁴² and by market fluctuations. This all demonstrates clearly how the Creator makes the person's business successful. Consequently, the layperson can witness Divine providence more often and more clearly than a Torah scholar, whose primary livelihood is regulated, provided for, etc.

This is the difference between a householder and a baker: A homemaker (who has been conferred with the primary responsibility to fulfill the mitzvah of *challah*)⁴³ bakes *challah* and bread for her own household, and is not usually familiar with the method and details of how the flour, wood, and other components are produced. She receives the final prepared ingredients, and

⁴⁰ See *Hayom Yom*, "Tishrei 7": "As the Mitteler Rebbe pointed out, lay people have an advantage over Torah scholars, in that the former can witness actual manifestations of G-dliness."

⁴¹ {In the original Hebrew, "*yoshev ohel*"; lit., "one who sits in tents." This refers to someone whose primary occupation is studying in the "tent" of Torah.}

⁴² {In the succinct original, "*tannai hazeman vehamakom*."}

⁴³ *Jerusalem Talmud*, "Shabbos," ch. 2, end of halachah 6; *Tanchuma*, beg. of "Noach"; *Bereishis Rabbah*, end of ch. 17; *Yalkut Shimoni*, remez 32.

consequently, she is not (so) cognizant of how the efforts to produce them are related to and depend upon Divine providence. Therefore, she must give a larger measurement, “one twenty-fourth,” since she needs a greater reminder not to forget that everything comes from Hashem.

In contrast, for a baker, who is a businessman, this is his livelihood, and it includes buying and selling and all the other business elements, So he sees a greater degree of Divine providence, how Hashem provides him with his livelihood. Therefore, for him it suffices to give a smaller measurement, “one forty-eighth.” This smaller measurement is enough to ensure he does not err and think that all his livelihood comes by dint his own natural efforts.

By observing the mitzvah of *challah*, we will merit that Hashem “make a blessing rest upon your house.”⁴⁴ We will bring a Divine blessing into all elements of our home, and it will be clear how they are aligned with Hashem’s will. Then we will also merit to be showered with tangible blessings in all our domestic matters — with children, good health, and livelihood, all in abundance.

— From talks delivered on the 26th of *Sivan* and *parshas Shelach*, 5736 (1976)

⁴⁴ *Yechezkel* 44:30.