

# Menachos – Simanim

## פרק ח – התודה היתה באה

### Daf 80 – דף פב – 80

#### 1. When does a תודה's offspring require לחם?

The Mishnah on the previous Daf taught that the offspring of a תודה, or the תמורה of a תודה, or if one's תודה was lost, and one designated another, and the original was found, all are sacrificed without לחם. A Baraisa clarifies that a replacement תודה (where the first was lost) may be brought for his obligation (with לחם), and the first animal is brought without לחם. Rebbe Yochanan says an extra תודה is only exempt from לחם if it was brought *בפירה* – *after* he gained *atonement* through bringing the original תודה, but if it was brought *בפירה* – *before atonement* through the original תודה, they do require לחם. The Gemara proves this does not refer to a “replaced” תודה, and adds that the offspring of a תודה נדבה (where he designated the mother as a תודה) never requires bread, because it is תודה דתודה – *a surplus todah*, an outgrowth of the first *todah*. The Gemara concludes he refers to the offspring of a חובה (i.e., where he said, “I am obligated in a תודה”), which does not require לחם if it is brought before the original תודה, because he holds *אדם מתכפר בשבח הקדש* – *a person can achieve atonement through benefit gained by hekdesh*. Shmuel disagrees with this ruling.

#### 2. If a replaced תודה was lost and replaced

Rava discusses one who designated an animal for his תודה obligation and it was lost, and he designated another in its place which was also lost, and he designated a third, *והרי שלשתן עומדות* – *and the first ones were found, and all three stand* available to be brought for his תודה obligation. If he brought the first תודה for his obligation, then the second animal does not require לחם (since it was its replacement), but the third does require לחם, since it was designated to replace the second animal, which was not brought as his תודה. Similarly, if he brought the third animal as his תודה, then the second does not require לחם (since its replacement was brought as the תודה), but the first animal does. However, if he brought the second animal as his תודה, both the first and third do not require לחם. Abaye says that regardless which animal is used for his obligation, the other two do not require לחם, because *כולהו חליפין דהדידי נינהו* – *they are all considered replacements of one another*. Rebbe Zeira applied Rava's rulings to a חטאת which was replaced twice: if the first or third animal was offered, the second is left to die, but not the remaining one. If the second is offered, both other animals must die. Abaye again argues that both remaining animals always die.

#### 3. A תודה which was confused with its תמורה and one died has no resolution

Rebbe Chiya taught a Baraisa: *תודה שנתערבה בתמורתה ומתה אחת מהן* – *if a todah became mixed with its temurah, and one of them died* and it is unknown which one, *חבירתה אין לה תקנה* – *the other animal has no resolution*. It cannot be brought with bread, since it may be a תמורה, which is brought without bread. It cannot be brought without bread, since it may be a תודה. The Gemara points out that if the owner said “עלי” – *“It is an obligation upon me to bring a תודה,”* then he must bring another animal anyway to fulfill his נדר. He can then stipulate that if the surviving animal is the תמורה, then the new animal is his תודה, and this is its לחם. If the surviving animal is the תודה, then this is its לחם, and the new animal is designated as its אחריות – *guarantee* (which is brought without לחם). Therefore, the Gemara concludes that the above ruling is where one said “הרי זו” – *“This animal is hereby designated as a תודה,”* and since he has no responsibility to replace it, he cannot designate an אחריות for it. Eight possible resolutions are suggested, and are all rejected.

#### Siman – Painter

**The painter** working on a portrait of an **offspring of a תודה חובה who wasn't sure if he should include breads in the picture**, asked his friend who was working on a chart outlining **which תודה needs breads in a case where the animal was lost and replaced twice and all were found**, while **another painter** was busy creating a masterpiece depicting a **תודה that was mixed with its תמורה and one died that had no תקנה**.



The painter working on a portrait of an offspring of a תודת חובה who wasn't sure if he should include breads in the picture, asked his friend who was working on a chart outlining which תודה needs breads in a case where the animal was lost and replaced twice and all were found, while another painter was busy creating a masterpiece depicting a תודה that was mixed with its תמורה and one died that had no תקנה.

### 3 things to remember

1. When does a תודה's offspring require לחם?
2. If a replaced תודה was lost and replaced
3. A תודה which was confused with its תמורה and one died has no resolution

