



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Menachos Daf Pey

- **Shmuel** said, in any case that a chatas would have to be left to die, in the corresponding case of a todah the korbon would not require the accompanying breads. In any case that a chatas would be left to graze and get a mum, the corresponding case of todah would require the accompanying breads.
 - **Q: R' Amram** asked, the Braisa quoted earlier said, what do we learn from the pasuk of "todah yakriv"? It teaches that if a todah was designated and then lost, and another animal was designated as a replacement and the first one was then found, either one may be offered. We would think that the second animal to be offered also requires breads to be brought along with it. The pasuk therefore says "yakrivenu", which teaches that only one requires breads, not both. Now, in the corresponding case of chatas this animal would be left to graze, as we see in a Mishna. The Mishna says, in a case where a chatas animal was lost, a replacement was designated, and the original animal was found before the replacement was shechted, **Rebbi** says, one animal is offered as a chatas and the other is left to die, and the **Rabanan** say, a chatas is only left to die if the owner has received a kapparah with another animal. If a kapparah was not yet had, the animal would be left to graze. We see that according to the **Rabanan** the replacement is left to graze and yet in the corresponding case of todah the accompanying breads would *not* be brought!? **A: Shmuel** holds like **Rebbi**, who says that if the animal is still lost when the replacement is designated, the animal is left to die.
 - **Q:** What would be the case of a chatas left to graze according to **Rebbi**? **A:** The case would be like **R' Oshaya** says, that if a person brings two animals for a chatas – one for the chatas and one for achrayus, he may use whichever one he wants and the other is left to graze.
 - **Q:** The corresponding case of todah would *not* require the accompanying breads to be brought, so this would not fit with the second part of **Shmuel's** statement!? **A: Shmuel** holds like **R' Shimon**, who says that when one animal is used for a chatas, the other animal is always left to die.
 - **Q: R' Shimon** never holds that the animal is left to graze, so how can that fit with **Shmuel's** statement? **A: Shmuel** actually only said the first part of the statement – that in any case that a chatas would have to be left to die, in the corresponding case of a todah the korbon would not require the accompanying breads. His point is to teach that he doesn't hold like **R' Yochanan**, who says that a person can fulfill his obligation with the offspring of hekdesch. **Shmuel** teaches that this is not the case.
- **R' Abba** said, if a person designates an animal for a todah and designates the accompanying breads, if the breads were then lost he can bring replacement breads, but if the animal is lost he may not bring another todah to accompany the breads. The reason is that the breads are an accompaniment to the korbon, but the korbon is not an accompaniment to the breads.
- **Rava** said, if one designates money to buy a todah and there was money left over after purchase of the animal, he may use the remaining money to purchase the breads. If he designated money for the breads and there was left over money, he may not use that money for purchase of the todah.

- The Gemara explains that the breads are referred to as “todah” (and therefore money designated for the todah may be used for the breads) but the todah is not referred to as “breads” (and therefore money designated for the breads may not be used for the todah).
 - **Rava** also said, if a person obligated himself to bring a todah and separated an animal for this todah and this animal was then lost, and he then separated a replacement animal and it too was lost, and he then separated another replacement animal, and the first two animals were then found, so that all 3 animals are now available, if he uses the first animal for his obligation, the second animal is brought without breads (it is a replacement for a todah which wasn’t used for the obligation, which the Braisa said is brought without breads) but the third is brought with breads (it is considered to be a donated todah). If he brings the third animal for his obligation, the second animal is brought without breads, but the first animal is brought with breads. If he brings the second animal for his obligation, both of the others are brought without breads. **Abaye** said, no matter which one is brought, the other two do not require breads, because they are all considered to be replacements for the other.
 - **R’ Zeira** said, the same is true for chatas. If an animal was separated for his chatas and this animal was then lost, and he then separated a replacement animal and it too was lost, and he then separated another replacement animal, and the first two animals were then found, so that all 3 animals are now available, if he uses the first animal for his obligation, the second animal is left to die and the third is left to graze and get a mum. If he brings the third animal for his obligation, the second animal is left to die and the first is left to graze and get a mum. If he brings the second animal for his obligation, both of the others are left to die. **Abaye** said, no matter which one is brought, the other two are left to die, because they are all considered to be replacements for the other.
 - **Q:** It seems obvious that this would be the case for chatas based on the rule that we gave above for todah!? **A:** We would have thought to say that regarding a todah it is possible to say that the person means to bring another donated todah, and maybe that is why the first and the third animals are considered to be disconnected from each other. However, regarding chatas we would say that they are connected to each other in all cases. **R’ Zeira** therefore teaches that the case of chatas is like the case of todah.
- **R’ Chiya** taught a Braisa that says, if a todah became mixed with its temurah (and we don’t know which one is which), and one of the animals then died, the remaining animal has no remedy to be offered. We can’t offer it with breads, because maybe it is the temurah, which must be offered without breads. We can’t offer it without breads, because maybe it is the todah, which must be offered with breads!
 - **Q:** What is the case of the Braisa? If he obligated himself to bring a todah (“harei alai”) he must bring another animal to fulfil his obligation, so he can bring another animal with breads and stipulate that if the remaining animal is really the todah the breads should be for it, and if the remaining animal is really the temurah then the breads are for the new todah he is now bringing!? **A:** The case is where he said “harei zu”, without undertaking a personal obligation. Therefore, he cannot bring a new animal as achrayus for the initial animal.
 - **Q:** The ones who learned in front of **Rebbi** (Rashi says this refers to **Levi**) said, why can’t he bring breads and say, if the remaining animal is a todah, here are the breads, and if it is the temurah, the breads should be chullin? **A: Rebbi** said, he can’t do that, because it is assur to bring chullin into the Azarah.
 - **Q:** Why can’t he bring another animal and breads and stipulate that if the remaining animal is the temurah, the new animal should be a todah with the breads, and if the remaining animal is the todah then these are the breads and the new animal should be a shelamim? **A: Rebbi** said, doing so would limit the allowable time of eating the Shelamim (which can normally be eaten for 2 days, but would now have to be eaten for only one day in case it is truly a todah), which can unnecessarily lead to nossar.

- **Q: Levi** asked **Rebbi**, why can't he bring another animal and breads and stipulate that if the remaining animal is the temurah, the new animal should be a todah with the breads, and if the remaining animal is the todah then these are the breads and the new animal should be a leftover todah (which is supposed to be brought without breads)? **A: Rebbi** said, I am surprised that **Levi** would suggest such an answer. We cannot bring an animal as a "leftover" ("leftover" is what happens to offspring of a korban or to a replacement that is not needed, one cannot make something "leftover" in the first instance)!
- **Q: R' Yitzchak bar Shmuel bar Marsa** said to **R' Nachman**, why can't he bring another animal and breads and stipulate that if the remaining animal is the temurah, the new animal should be a todah with the breads, and if the remaining animal is the todah then these are the breads and the new animal should be a temurah? **A: R' Nachman** said, one who makes temurah gets malkus! Should we say that he may go ahead and make temurah for this purpose!?