29.8.3

79b (משנה ד2) → 81a (ליקום ולינדור בתחילה)

Note: our סוגיא invokies the famous 5 "dead חטאת mich are זולד ותמורת חטאת שעברה שנתה, (2) חטאת שנתכפרו או מתו בעליה and חטאת מחטאת and חטאת invokies the famous 5 "dead מתור", which are זולד ותמורת מולדים invokies the famous 5 "מולד ותמורת חטאת invokies the famous 5 "מולד ותמורת חטאת invokies the famous 5 "מולד ותמורת חטאת and המולד ומולד ומולד

ז. אָם עַל תּוֹדָה יַקְרִיבֶנּוּ וְהִקְרִיב עַל זֶבַח **הַתּוֹדָה** חַלוֹת מַצוֹת בְּלוּלֹת בַּשֶּׁמֶן וּרְקִיקֵי מַצוֹת מְשָׁחִים בַּשָּׁמֶן וְסְלֶת מֻרְבֶּכֶּ וְסְלֶת בְּלְּבֶּלְת בְּּשְׁמֶן: *ייקרא ז, יב* 2. יָדִיו תְּבִיאֶינָָה אֵת אִשֵּׁי ה' אֶת הַחַלֶּב עֻל הֶחָזֶה יְבִיאֶנּוּ אֵת הֶחָזֶה לְהָנִיף אֹתוֹ תְּנוּפָה **לְפְנֵי ה'**: ייִקרא ז, ל

3. טוב אֲשֶׁר לֹא תִדֹר מִשֶּׁתִדוֹר וְלֹא תְשַׁלֵם: *קהלת ה, ד*

- I משנה דב: 3 "sub-תודות" that are offered without
 - a If: he set aside a תודה and it got lost and he designated a replacement then found the original
 - b If: the תודה gave birth (but had been pregnant at time of הקדש)
 - c If: he (violated the law) and effected תמורה
 - d Per: v. 1 only התודה requires לחם, not its "seconds"
- II ברייתא: interpreting v. 1:
 - a התודה → if he got a substitute תודה (for אבודה) and lost one was found, may offer either w
 - i But: יקריבנו indicates that he may only offer לחם with one of them
 - ii Note: תודה is inclusive, התודה exclusive (for לחם)
 - b בפרה, but if before, requires bread, כפרה, but if before, requires bread
 - i Question (ר' עמרם): cannot refer to חליפי תודה which is obligatory ("עלי תודה")
 - 1 Reason: both scenarios covered in our משנה
 - 2 Cannot refer: to substitute for חודת ("זו") –in either case, must bring bread (both are full חודות)
 - 3 Cannot refer: to the baby of a תודת נדבה in either case, no bread, as it is מותר תודה
 - 4 Must refer: to baby of a תודת חובה (treated like the "lost" תודה that was found)
 - (a) Reason: ר' יוחנן holds that a person may gain ינורע via the profit of הָדָש (the baby born after הָלְדָש)
 - (b) Support: אביי came to same resolution, explicit מימרא of supports this position
- III שמואל equation: associating "unusable" חודות with "surplus" תודות
 - a Rule1: any circumstance where the חטאת is killed (see note) in parallel case, תודה is brought without bread
 - b Rule2: any circumstance where the חטאת would be allowed to graze (and redeemed after תודה (מום brought with לחם
 - i Challenge (ר' עמרם): above-cited לחם (on v. 1) indicates that "replacement" comes with
 - 1 But: parallel case "grazes", per חכמים (if original found before substitute offered) contra רבי
 - 2 Answer: דבי follows שמואל, that even in this case it is killed, as long as it was lost when 2nd was designated
 - (a) Question: in what case does רבי mandate grazing?
 - (b) Answer: in case he originally set aside 2 animals, one for backup (which then grazes until a blemish...)
 - (i) But: in parallel case to that, תודה comes withou לחם
 - 3 Answer: ממואל, who doesn't allow for grazing at all
 - 4 Challenge: שמואל set both up (rules #1 and #2), including grazing
 - (a) Answer: שמואל only said rule #1 (rule #2 was an errant report
 - (i) Teaching: against וולד, that the וולד may not be used for essential אין מתכפר בשבח הקדש) כפרה
- IV Miscellany regarding liability for תודה
 - a מודה if he identified תודה and its נדבה and its נדבה, if the bread is lost, he brings in lieu; if ווידה is lost, no liability
 - Reason: bread is brought on account of the תודה, not vice-versa
 - לחם if he set aside money for his תודה and there was surplus, he may use it for the לחם
 - i But: if he set aside money for the מתדה and there was a surplus, he may not use it for the תודה
 - ii Reason: per ר' כהנא bread is called "תודה" (v. 1), but חודה is not called "לחם"
 - c אנדה if he designated a ntirn, it was lost, then he designated a substitute and it was lost, designated a third and then the lost ones returned and all three are there
 - i If: he used the 2nd one, 1st and 3rd are brought without bread
 - Reason: 2nd's bread "covers" the 1st and 3rd was a substitute for the 2nd
 - ii However: if he used either the original or final designee, the other of those two require
 - 1 Reason: 3rd was a substitute for #2, not #1
 - iii Dissent (אביי): any of them "exempts" the other two from לחם
 - 1 Reason: all are substitutes for the 1st one

- d איזיא. same rule applies to חטאת (vis-à-vis מתה): if he designated a nun, it was lost, he designated a substitute which then got lost and he designated a third and all were found and all three were there
 - i If: he used the 2nd one, both #1 and #3 die
 - ii *However*; if he used the 1st or 3rd, the 2rd would die but the other would graze (as above)
 - iii Dissent (אביי): regardless of which one he offered, all are substitutes for 1st and other two die
- איר: אירא ''s use of "וכן" (comparing חטאות הודות) in the case of חטאות, we can't reason that he wants to make more of them חטאות (unlike תודה, where we entertain possibility of מרבה בתודות that the positions are consistent
- V ממורה of a תודה and one of them died and they were indistinguishable
 - a Ruling: there is no solution can't offer with bread (might be תמורה); can't offer without (might require לחם)
 - b Challenge: if he made a תמורה, the can bring another with לחם, stipulating that if the standing one is the תמורה, this one is the "real" אול with its יול אחריות, the other is brough אחריות and this is the bread of the principal
 - i Answer: ר' חייא' ruling was only in the case of הרי זו") נדבה
 - c *Challenge (ירושלים):* why not bring לחם and stipulate that if the animal is תמורה, the bread is וירושלים) (and eat in ירושלים).
 - i Rejection (רבי): we cannot bring עזרה into the תולין
 - d Challenge (ילוי): bring another animal with bread, stipulating that if principal is תודה, this is the תודה; and if principal is תודה, this is its bread and the new animal is a שלמים.
 - i Rejection: then he diminishes the permissible time for eating שלמים (per תודה 1 day)
 - e Challenge (לחם): bring animal and לחם; again stipulating that if principal is תמורה, this is the proper תודה; and if the principal is מותר תודה; this is its bread and the animal is מותר תודה
 - Rejection (רבי): we do not ab initio designate מותרות
 - E Challenge (ר' יצחק בר מרתא לר"נ): why not bring animal and loaves, stipulating that if principal is תמורה, this is the proper תמורה, if principal is תודה, this animal is its תמורה
 - i Rejection (ב"כ): making a ממורה is a violation incurring מכות we're not going to engineer it as a solution
 - g Proposal (students and אביי visiting אייביו): if we accept ר' יוחנן, that the loaves may be outside of the עזרה (but in the city) at time of חולין, employ ישריטה's first challenge and bread won't be in חולין as עזרה
 - Rejection: we need to wave the four תרומה-loaves 'לפני ה' (v. 2)
 - h Proposal (ר' ייחנן 'יחנן'): if we accept ר' יוחנן (contra ר' יוחנן) that if he brings 80 loaves, 40 may be sanctified, then he could bring another animal with 80, stipulating that the animal is a תודה as well, here are 80 loaves for the two; if not, only 40 of them are sanctified
 - i Rejection: he is thereby limiting the scope of permissible eating of the other 40 (which may be חולין
 - i Suggestion ("ר' אשי לר' כהנא): if we accept מרבי יוחנן that if he designated a חטאת that was pregnant and she gave birth, he has the choice of using the mother or the kid for כפרה, then he should bring a pregnant animal and 80 loaves, wait until she births then stipulate that if the principal is the תמורה, then he is using both as חנדה and the 80 loaves are for both; if the principal is the מותר תודה (חם מותר תודה)
 - i Rejection: we do not know if יור' 'r's reason is because the עובר may be seen as independent; it may be because (as above) a person may gain כפרה through the value-added of
 - j Challenge (הרי עלי תודה"): why not say "הרי עלי תודה", bring a third animal and 80 loaves, then stipulate that if principal is the תמורה, these two are the תודות with the 80 loaves; if the principal is תודה, the third animal here is "backup"
 - i Rejection: v. 3 advises against taking נדרים we aren't going to use that as a solution