



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

***Todah Derivatives and Bread***

The *Gemora* cited a *braisa* which said that only the *todah* requires breads, but not its offspring, *temurah* exchange or its substitutes.

Rabbi Yochanan says that this is true only after the original *todah* was offered, but before it was offered, breads must be brought.

Rav Amram clarifies which case Rabbi Yochanan is referring to. It is not the case of a substitute for an obligatory *todah*, as the *braisa* already teaches this. It is not the case of a substitute for a voluntary *todah*, as that is considered an additional *todah*, and would need breads both before and after the original *todah* is offered. It is not the case of an offspring of a voluntary *todah*, since it is considered the remnant of a *todah*, which does not need breads, neither before or after the *todah* is offered. The *Gemora* concludes that Rabbi Yochanan is referring to the case of an offspring of an obligatory *todah*, and he is teaching that one may fulfill his obligation with the produce of a sacrifice, i.e., its offspring.

The *Gemora* says that Abaye followed the same reasoning as Rav Amram, to reach the same conclusion.

The *Gemora* cites Rav Yitzchak bar Yosef who quotes Rabbi Yochanan explicitly discussing some of these cases:

Original <i>Todah</i>	New animal	Before Original Offered	After Original Offered

Voluntary	Substitute	Required – considered an extra voluntary <i>todah</i>	
	Offspring	Not Required – considered remainder of a <i>todah</i>	
Obligatory	Offspring	Required – produce of a sacrifice	Not Required

Shmuel says that the ruling about any animal in relation to a *chatas* determines whether the same situation in relation to a *todah* would need bread. If the animal, when related to the *chatas*, would die, it does not need bread, while if it would graze (*until it develops a blemish*), it does need bread.

Rav Amram challenges Shmuel’s rule from a *chatas* case which grazes, but which does not need bread in a case of *todah*. The *braisa* earlier said that the substitute for a lost *todah* does not need bread, even though the Sages say that if one found his lost *chatas*, the substitute grazes.

The *Gemora* answers that Shmuel follows Rebbe, who says that a substitute for a lost *chatas* is put to death.

The *Gemora* says that even according to Rebbe, if one initially designated two *chatas* animals, with one serving as a potential substitute, the one not used grazes. However, in the analogous case of *todah*, the substitute still does not need bread, challenging Shmuel’s rule.

The *Gemora* answers that Shmuel follows Rabbi Shimon, who says that any substitute for a *chatas* is put to death, and no

animals related to a *chatas* ever graze. All Shmuel was teaching was the first possibility – that if the *chatas* related animal dies, the analogous *todah* animal does not need bread. This includes the case of a *chatas*'s offspring, and disputes Rabbi Yochanan's position that the offspring of an obligatory *todah* requires bread if offered before the original *todah* is offered.

Rabbi Abba says that if one designated an animal as a *todah*, along with its bread, and then lost the bread, he must replace it, as the animal necessitates the bread. However, if he lost the animal, he need not replace it, since the bread does not necessitate the animal. (79b – 80a)

### ***Todah, and its Bread***

Rava says that if one designated money for a *todah*, the remainder left after buying the animal may be used to buy the bread. However, if he designated money for the bread of a *todah*, the remainder left after buying the bread may not be used to buy the *todah* animal.

The *Gemora* says that is based on the verse which states “if he will offer *“on the sacrifice of the todah – breads.”* Rabbi Abba says that this verse shows that the breads are also called “*todah*,” as the verse lists them right after the mention of the *todah*. The *Gemora* explains that this verse shows that breads are called *todah*, but not that *todah* is called bread, and therefore only the remainder of the money designated for a *todah* can be used for the bread, but not vice versa. (80a – 80b)

### ***Which are Substitutes?***

Rava discusses one who designated a *todah* (A), then lost it, designated a substitute (B), then lost the substitute, then designated a substitute (C) for it, and finally found the first two:

Offered...	Needs bread?
------------	--------------

	A	B	C
A	(Y: <i>todah</i> )	N: substitute	Y: considered extra <i>todah</i>
C	Y: not replaced, still <i>todah</i>	N: replaced by C	(Y: <i>todah</i> )
B	N: replaced by B	(Y: <i>todah</i> )	N: substitute

Abaye says that in all cases, only the one offered needs bread, but the others don't, since we consider all of them to be substitutes for each other.

Rabbi Zeira says the same rule as Rava to the case of a *chatas*, to rule which animal is put to death, as a substitute, or grazes instead:

Offered...	Put to death?		
	A	B	C
A	N/A	Y: substitute	N (Grazes): not a substitute
C	N (Grazes): not replaced by C	Y: replaced by C	N/A
B	Y: replaced by B	N/A	Y: substitute

Abaye disagrees in these cases as well, and says that all the remaining animals are put to death in any case, as they are all considered substitutes of each other.

The *Gemora* explains that Rabbi Zeira had to teach that these rules apply to a *chatas*, since we may have thought that only in the case of *todah* can we consider any of the animals to not be a substitute, since one can bring extra *todah* sacrifices. However, in the case of *chatas*, which one cannot bring any extras, we may have thought that all the remaining animals are put to death. Therefore, Rabbi Zeira had to teach that Rava's statement can be applied to a *chatas* as well. (80b)

### ***Todah or Exchange?***

Rabbi Chiya taught in a *braisa* that if a *todah* got mixed up with its exchange, and one of them died, there is no solution for the remaining animal, since a *todah* requires bread, but its exchange does not. The *Gemora* clarifies that if the original *todah* was obligatory, there is a solution, as he must bring a new animal with bread to fulfill his original obligation. He may then stipulate: If the remaining animal is -

- the exchange, the new animal with its bread is a *todah*.
- the *todah*, the bread is for it, and the new animal is a donation in case the *todah* would get lost, which is offered like a *todah*.

Rabbi Chiya is discussing a case of a voluntary *todah*, which one need not replace if lost, and therefore cannot be solved with this stipulation.

Those who learned in front of Rebbe asked why this cannot be solved by taking bread, and stipulating: If the remaining animal is -

- the *todah*, this is its bread.
- the exchange, the bread remains *chulin* – not consecrated.

Rebbe answered that the second clause may not be made, since one may not bring *chulin* into the courtyard.

The *Gemora* asks why one cannot solve it by taking an animal and bread, and stipulating: If the remaining animal is -

- the exchange, the new animal is a *todah*, and the bread is for it.
- the *todah*, the bread is for it, and the new animal is a *shelamim* sacrifice.

The *Gemora* answers that since we must treat the new animal as a *todah*, which is eaten for one day, the second clause may not be made, since this would effectively reduce the time for eating *shelamim* from the standard three days to the one day when a *todah* may be eaten.

Levi asked Rebbe why we cannot solve this by taking a new animal and bread, and stipulating: If the remaining animal is -

- the exchange, the new animal is a *todah*, and the bread is for it.
- the *todah*, the bread is for it, and the new animal is the remainder of a *todah*.

Rebbe rejected this solution, saying that it seems that Levi had no brain in his head, since one may not designate an animal as a remainder to begin with.

Rabbi Yitzchak bar Shmuel bar Marta asked Rav Nachman why one cannot solve it by taking a new animal and bread, and stipulating: If the remaining animal is -

- the exchange, the new animal is a *todah*, and the bread is for it.
- the *todah*, the bread is for it, and the new animal is another exchange for the *todah*.

Rav Nachman answered that making an exchange for a sacrifice is prohibited, and punished with lashes, so we cannot advise someone to do that to solve this situation. (80b – 81a)

### **INSIGHTS TO THE DAF**

#### ***Offspring of Sacrifice***

Rabbi Yochanan says that the offspring of an obligatory *todah* needs bread, when offered before the *todah*. The *Gemora* explains that Rabbi Yochanan holds that this offspring is considered the produce of something sanctified (the *todah*), and one may atone with it.

Tosfos (80a Mai) says that the *Gemora* is only discussing a case where the *todah* conceived after it was consecrated, and therefore its offspring is considered produce. However, if one sanctified a pregnant animal as a *todah*, the fetus's status depends on whether we consider a fetus to be a part



of its mother, or whether it is considered a separate animal. If we consider it a part of its mother, it has the status of “the offspring of a sacrifice,” while if we consider it a separate animal, the consecration is viewed as one who consecrates two animals, with one being the replacement if the other is lost.

### ***Breads for Temurah?***

The Rambam (Pesulai hamukdashin 12:8) rules that the *temurah* - exchange of a *todah* requires breads.

The *Gemora* (80b) cites the *braisa* of Rabbi Chiya, which says that if one mixed up a *todah* and its *temurah*, and then lost one, there is no solution for the remaining animal, since we do not know whether to bring breads for it.

This *braisa*, and the *Gemora's* discussion of it, assumes that the *temurah* of a *todah* does *not* require breads, and the Rambam (13) rules like this *braisa*.

The Rashash and Or Sameach note the seeming contradiction in the Rambam's position.

The Even Ha'ezel suggests the following explanation. The reason a *temurah* of a *todah* requires breads is due to the verse, which states that “it and its *temurah*” will be holy. The verse's grouping of the sacrifice and its *temurah* mandates that whatever is done to the original sacrifice must be done to the *temurah*. Therefore, in a standard case of one who makes a *temurah* from a *todah*, just as the *todah* is offered with breads, so is its *temurah*. The *temurah* does not inherently need breads, but only to make it similar to the sacrifice. In Rabbi Chiya's case, one of the animals has been lost and will not be offered. Therefore, if the remaining animal is the *temurah*, the original *todah* will not be offered. Since it will not be offered, there is no more requirement for the *temurah* to be offered with breads, leading to the problem Rabbi Chiya explains.

## **DAILY MASHAL**

### ***Not to Leave Food for Tomorrow***

We were especially commanded concerning a *todah* “on the day of its sacrifice it shall be eaten; he shall not leave of it till the morning” (Vayikra 7:15). Because a person who brings a *todah* because of miracles that occurred to him must become strengthened with trust in Hashem. If he leaves food till tomorrow, that is a sign that he worries lest Hashem won't provide him with his needs – that is a defect in his sacrifice! (*Meorah shel Torah*, Vayikra, 31).