



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 and its Exchange

Rabbi Chiya had 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.

Rav Illa was once ill, and Abaye and the other Rabbis came to visit him. While sitting there they said: If the law is in accordance with Rabbi Yochanan who ruled that the bread is sanctified even though it was outside the wall of the Courtyard (*at the time of the slaughtering*); then let him bring the bread and put it down outside the wall of the Courtyard and let him then stipulate:

If the remaining animal is...

- the *todah*, then here is its bread;

- the exchange, it should be regarded as unconsecrated bread.

Rav Illa replied: This is not a solution, for there are four loaves (*as the terumah*) which must be waved and what should one do? Should the *Kohen* wave them outside? But it is written that the waving must be ‘*before Hashem.*’ Should he wave them inside? He is then bringing unconsecrated food into the Courtyard. It is therefore impossible to do so.

Rav Shisha the son of Rav Idi asked as follows: If the law is in accordance with Chizkiyah who ruled that forty out of the eighty loaves are sanctified (*when one slaughtered a todah over eighty loaves*); then let him bring another animal and bring with it eighty loaves, and let him then stipulate:

If the remaining animal is...

- the *todah*, then let this one be a *todah* as well and these eighty loaves should be the bread for both of them;
- the exchange, then let this one be a *todah* and forty out of the eighty loaves should be consecrated.

The *Gemora* answers: This is no solution, for there would then be a diminution of the opportunity for eating of the loaves. [*Eight loaves must be given to the Kohen, for there might be two todah offerings here. It is*



possible, however, that only four of them are holy. The Kohen might not eat all eight loaves and after they become nassar, they will need to be burned. We are not permitted to cause the disqualification of kodashim.]

Rav Ashi said to Rav Kahana: If the law is in accordance with Rabbi Yochanan who ruled that if one designated a pregnant animal as a *chatas* (sin offering), and she gave birth, his atonement may be made, if he desires, with the animal itself, and, if he prefers, his atonement may be made with her offspring; then let him bring here a pregnant animal (and declare it to be a *todah*) and wait until it gives birth, and let him also bring eighty loaves and stipulate:

If the remaining animal is...

- the exchange, then let the mother and its offspring be *todah* offerings and these eighty loaves should be the bread for both of them;
- the *todah*, then let the mother be a *todah* offering and the eighty loaves should be the bread for them, and the offspring shall be a remnant *todah* (which he is allowed to do in this case – for the fetus is legally regarded as being part of the mother; he is not designating a complete animal as a remnant; and the halachah is that such a *todah* does not require bread).

Rav Kahana replied: Who can tell us that the reason for Rabbi Yochanan's ruling is that he is of the opinion that if someone were to leave the fetus unconsecrated it would remain so (and that is why there is an option of consecrating it as a *todah* and it would require bread, or as a remnant *todah* and it will not require bread)? Perhaps he holds that if he left it unconsecrated, it will not be a reservation (but rather, it would automatically

be a remnant *todah* – which would not require bread); and the reason for Rabbi Yochanan's ruling is because he is of the opinion that a man may receive atonement with an animal (the offspring) which is regarded as a benefit to *hekdesh* (for it will either be offered as a sacrifice instead of its mother, or it will be offered as a remnant sacrifice).

Ravina once visited Damhorya, and Rav Dimi the son of Rav Huna of Damhorya said to Ravina: Let him bring another animal and say (as a vow), "Behold I accept upon myself to bring a *todah* offering," (and designate the new animal as such), and then let him bring another animal and with it eighty loaves and stipulate:

If the remaining animal is...

- the exchange, then let these two animals be *todah* offerings and these eighty loaves should be the bread for both of them;
- the *todah*, then let the animal which I designated for my vow be a *todah* as well, and these eighty loaves should be the bread for both of them, and let the third animal be as a security (for the vow; and it would not require breads).

He replied: The Torah said: *Better that you not vow than that you vow and do not pay*, and yet you say that he should proceed to vow initially? [Upon attempting many different solutions, the Gemora is forced to conclude that when a *todah* offering was mixed with its exchange and one of them died, there is no option to offer the remaining animal.] (80b – 81a)

Mishna

If one says, I accept upon myself to bring a *todah* offering," he must bring it and its bread from *chullin*

(unconsecrated property; he cannot use *maa'aser sheini* money for this, for one cannot fulfill a vow with anything but unconsecrated property). If he said, "I accept upon myself to bring a *todah* from *chullin*, and its breads from *ma'aser*," he must bring it and its bread from *chullin* (for once he obligates himself in a *todah*, the bread obligation comes automatically). If, however, he says, "I accept upon myself to bring a *todah* from *ma'aser*, and its breads from *chullin*," he brings them according to what he said. If he vowed, "It and its bread should come from *ma'aser*," he brings them according to what he said. However, he should not bring the bread from the wheat of *ma'aser sheini*; rather, it should be from the money of *ma'aser sheini* (the produce that is *ma'aser sheini* can be redeemed onto money which is then brought to Yerushalayim to be used to buy food and eat it there). (81a – 81b)

Vow of a Todah and its Bread

Rav Huna said: If a man said, "Behold I accept upon myself to bring the breads of a *todah* offering," he must bring a *todah* offering and its bread. The reason for this is because he surely knows that bread alone cannot be offered, so he obviously meant a *todah* offering together with its bread; and when he said, "The bread of a *todah* offering," he merely was stating the final words of his vow.

The *Gemora* asks from our *Mishna*: If, however, he says, "I accept upon myself to bring a *todah* from *ma'aser*, and its breads from *chullin*," he brings them according to what he said. But why is this so? Since he said, "Its bread from *chullin*," he ought to bring both the *todah* and its bread from *chullin*!?

The *Gemora* answers: There it is different, for since he said, "the *todah* from *ma'aser*"; when he says later, "its bread from *chullin*," it is to be taken as if he had said, "I accept upon myself to bring the bread for So-and-so's *todah* offering." [Just as he must bring the bread for his friend's *todah*, so too here, he must bring *chullin* bread for his *todah* that is coming from *ma'aser*.]

The *Gemora* asks: If so, then in the first case of the *Mishna* as well – when he says, "I accept upon myself to bring a *todah* from *chullin*, and its breads from *ma'aser*," and the ruling is that he must bring it and its bread from *chullin*; it should also be taken as if he had said, "I accept upon myself to bring the *todah* for So-and-so's bread offering" (and he should be allowed to bring the bread from *ma'aser*)!?

The *Gemora* answers: How can you compare the two cases? It is understandable that bread might be brought for another's *todah* offering; but is a *todah* offering ever brought for another's bread?

The *Gemora* asks on Rav Huna from the following *braisa*: If a man said, "I accept upon myself to bring a *todah* offering without the bread," or he said, "an animal offering without its libations," they force him to bring the *todah* with the bread or the animal with the libations. Now this is so only because he said, "a *todah* offering," but where he did not say "a *todah* offering" (rather, he said that he accepts to bring *todah* breads), he would not be required to bring anything at all!?

The *Gemora* answers: In truth, it would be just the same even though he did not say "a *todah* offering," but since the *Tanna* wished to state the case of an animal offering without its libations, where he could not have stated the

reverse case of: "its libations without the offering," he also stated the case of the "*todah* without bread."

The *Gemora* asks (*on the braisa*): Why is this so? Surely this is a vow where its "opening" (*a reason where the Sage can claim that the vow is not effective from the outset*) accompanies it (*for "without bread" or "without libations" is a retraction on his vow*)!?

Chizkiyah answers: The *braisa* is in accordance with Beis Shammai who maintain that one must always consider the first words of a man's expression, for it was taught in a *Mishna*: If one said, "I am hereby a *nazir* from dried figs," or "from pressed figs," Beis Shammai says: He is a *nazir* (*even though a nazir is not forbidden to eat figs*). Beis Hillel says: He is not a *nazir* (*he cannot be a nazir since he mentioned figs, and he is not forbidden in figs because he said nezirus, not a vow*). [*Beis Shammai considers his first statement as the primary one and therefore he is a nazir; Beis Hillel regards this as an immediate retraction.*]

Rabbi Yochanan answers: You may even say that this is in accordance with Beis Hillel, for we are dealing with a case where the man said, "Had I known that one cannot vow in this manner (*of bringing a todah without bread*), I would never have vowed in this manner, but in that (*to bring a todah with its bread*). When the *braisa* says that he is forced (*to bring the todah with its bread*), it is referring to a case where he wishes to change his mind now.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* to support Chizkiyah: If a man said, "I accept upon myself to bring a *todah* offering without bread," or he said, "an animal offering without its libations," and when they said to him that he must

bring a *todah* with the bread or an animal with the libations, he replied, "Had I known this, I would never have vowed at all," they force him to fulfill his vow, and they say to him the following verse: *Observe and listen*. Now this is well according to Chizkiyah (*for it is in accordance with Beis Shammai*), but it is difficult according to Rabbi Yochanan!?

The *Gemora* answers: Rabbi Yochanan would reply that this *braisa* undoubtedly represents the opinion of Beis Shammai.

The *Gemora* asks: What is the meaning of 'Observe and listen'?

Abaye said: 'Observe' means to bring the *todah*, and 'listen' means to bring its bread. Rava said: 'Observe' means to bring the *todah* with its bread, and 'listen' means that you should not be in the habit of doing so (*to vow to bring a todah without its bread*). (81b)

DAILY MASHAL

Yaakov Sacrificed a Todah

The need to eat the *todah* loaves within a day and a night causes the owner of the sacrifice to invite many diners to his table "and because of the large amount of bread, the miracle will be known to many diners" (*Sforno, Vayikra 6:2*). *Parshas Vayeitzei* states that after Yaakov was saved from Lavan, he offered "a sacrifice on the mountain and called his "brothers" to eat bread" (*Bereishis 31:52*). We can say that this sacrifice was a *todah* and that his invitation to his family to eat bread was to eat the *todah* loaves to make the miracle known (*Beer Miryam, 102-364*).