



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

Menachos Daf Pey Aleph

- A Braisa had said that 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. The Gemara has offered a number of possible solutions to be able to offer the remaining animal, but each solution has been rejected. The Gemara continues to offer possible solutions.
 - **Q:** When **Abaye and the Rabanan** went to visit **R' Eila** they said, according to **R' Yochanan** who says that if the todah breads are outside the Azarah when the todah is shechted, the breads still become kadosh, we can give the following solution. The owner can bring breads and put them outside the Azarah and stipulate that if the remaining animal is the todah, these should be its breads, and if it is not the todah, these breads should remain chullin. He can then go and shecht the remaining animal!? **A:** This won't work, because there must be a tenufah done to the 4 loaves taken as terumah by the Kohen. This tenufah cannot be done outside the Azarah, because the pasuk says it must be done "lifnei Hashem". The breads cannot be brought into the Azarah, because there is an issur to bring chullin into the Azarah. Therefore, this solution is not feasible.
 - **Q:** **R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** asked, according to **Chizkiya**, who says that when a todah is shechted with 80 loaves only 40 of them will become kadosh, the owner should be able to do the following. He should bring another animal and 80 loaves of bread. He should say, if the remaining animal is the todah, this new animal is also a todah and here are the 80 breads that are needed for both animals, and if the remaining animal is the temurah, this new animal is a todah and these are its breads, and then let 40 out of the 80 become kadosh!? **A:** This is not a viable solution, because this shortens the allowable time for eating these breads that are possibly todah breads.
 - **Q:** **R' Ashi** asked **R' Kahana**, according to **R' Yochanan**, who says that if one designated a pregnant animal for his chatas and the animal gave birth, he has a choice to bring his chatas either from the designated animal or from the offspring, we can propose the following solution. The owner should bring a pregnant animal as a todah and wait for it to give birth. Then he should bring 80 breads and stipulate as follows – if the remaining animal is temurah, then this new animal and the offspring should both be todos and here are their 80 breads, and if the remaining animal is a todah, then this new animal is also a todah and the 80 breads are for these two todos, and the offspring is a leftover from a todah and is offered without breads!? **A:** **R' Kahana** said, it may be that even according to **R' Yochanan** the offspring may be used in the place of its mother, but not as a new, independent offering. Therefore, it cannot be that the mother and the offspring both need breads.
 - **Q:** **R' Dimi the son of R' Huna of Hamdurya** said to **Ravina**, maybe the owner should bring an animal and obligate himself ("harei alai") to bring a todah. He should then bring 80 loaves along with yet another animal and stipulate as follows – if the remaining animal is the temurah, then these two new animals are todos and here are their 80 breads, and if the remaining animal is the todah, then the first new animal is also a todah and here are the 80 breads for these two todos, and the second new animal is brought as achrayus (which does not need to be offered with breads)!? **A:** **Ravina** said, the pasuk teaches that one should not make nedarim, so therefore we can't use this solution since it would require the person to make a neder to bring a todah.

MISHNA

- If a person says “harei alai todah”, he must bring the todah and the breads from chullin (he may not use maaser, because he has created a personal obligation).
- If he says, “I obligate myself to bring a todah from chullin and its breads from maaser”, he must bring the todah and the breads from chullin (the breads are an accompaniment to the todah and therefore when he obligated himself to bring the todah from chullin, that automatically includes the breads as well).
- If he says, “I obligate myself to bring a todah from maaser and the breads from chullin”, he must do as he said.
- If he says, “I obligate myself to bring a todah and its breads from maaser”, he should do as he said. However, he should not bring the breads from wheat of maaser sheini, rather he should use money of maaser sheini to purchase them.

GEMARA

- **R’ Huna** said, if a person obligated himself to bring “todah breads”, he must bring a todah and the breads. The reason is, that a person knows that he can’t offer only breads and therefore certainly meant to obligate himself to bring the todah and the breads. The reason he only mentioned the breads is that he only stated the second half of the statement.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said that if a person said, “I obligate myself to bring a todah from maaser and the breads from chullin”, he must do as he said. Now, according to **R’ Huna** why don’t we say that we look at the final part of the statement and require him to bring the todah from chullin as well? **A:** This case is different, because we view the second part of the statement as a stand-alone statement as if he said that he will bring breads to accompany someone else’s todah (which is an allowable thing to do). Therefore, it can be viewed independently and is treated as such.
 - **Q:** If so, why in the case of the Mishna where the person said, “I obligate myself to bring a todah from chullin and its breads from maaser”, must he bring the todah and the breads from chullin? Let us view this as someone who is bringing a todah to satisfy someone else’s bread obligation and therefore only the todah should have to be brought from chullin!? **A:** One can bring bread to satisfy a todah obligation, but there is no concept of bringing a todah to satisfy a bread obligation.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if someone obligates himself to bring a todah without breads, or to bring a korbon without nesachim, we force him to bring the todah and the breads, or the korbon and the nesachim. This implies that if he had only obligated himself to bring todah breads we would not force him to bring a todah along with it!? **A:** If he said only “todah breads” he would have to bring a todah along with it. The reason the Braisa did not give that case is because it could not also say the parallel for the case of nesachim (that if he obligates himself to nesachim he must also bring the korbon, because one may actually bring nesachim without a korbon).
 - **Q:** When a person obligates himself to bring a todah without breads, or to bring a korbon without nesachim, why don’t we view the second part of his statement as a retraction of his promise to bring the korbon (since he knows that a todah cannot be brought without breads and that a korbon cannot be brought without nesachim)? **A:** **Chizkiya** said, this Braisa follows **B”S** who say that when a person makes a contradictory statement, we follow the first part of the statement. **R’ Yochanan** said the Braisa can even follow **B”H**, because the Braisa may be talking about a case where the person then said, had I known that I must bring breads I would have added that to my promise. The reason the Braisa says that we force him to bring the breads is that the case is that the person then wanted to retract his promise.
 - A Braisa says that if a person obligates himself to bring a todah without breads, or to bring a korbon without nesachim, we tell him that he must bring the breads and the nesachim. If he says, “Had I known I would not have made this neder”, we force him to bring the breads or nesachim anyway. This fits well according to **Chizkiya**. Even **R’ Yochanan** would say that this Braisa must follow the view of **B”S**.

HEE V'LACHMAH MIN HAMMASER YAVI

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to say that he should bring the korbon from maaser. Why couldn't he bring it from chullin if he chooses? **A: R' Nachman and R' Chisda** said, the Mishna means to say that if he *wants* to, he may bring the korbon and the breads from maaser.

V'LO YAVO MEICHITEI MAASER SHEINI...

- **R' Nachman and R' Chisda** said, this means that he should not use actual wheat of maaser sheini, but he may use wheat that was purchased with money of maaser sheini.
- **R' Yirmiya** said to **R' Zeira**, he may not bring the todah from wheat of maaser sheini, but may use wheat that was purchased with money of maaser sheini. **R' Zeira** said, I say that even wheat that had been purchased with money of maaser sheini may not be used (rather, he can use money of maaser sheini to buy wheat specifically for the breads). **R' Zeira** said, I will give your reason and my reason. Your reason is that we learn that a todah may be purchased with maaser sheini from the case of shelamim, and shelamim is learned via a gezeira shava of "sham" from maaser, and you say that just as the shelamim is something purchased with money of maaser sheini and is not maaser sheini itself, the same must be done for the todah. I say that just as a shelamim is not from a species of maaser sheini, the same must be for a todah. Therefore, if there is wheat that was purchased with money of maaser sheini it is considered to be of a species of maaser sheini and may not be used for a todah. What must be done is for the money to be used specifically for wheat for the todah. In that way, it is considered to be a todah, and not a species of maaser sheini.