

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Avin and R' Avahu both explain that the first case of the Mishnah deals with a case of one who knowingly alters the designation of a korban, whereas the second case deals with one who mistakenly alters a korban's designation.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) Clarifying R' Yehoshua's position

It is deduced from R' Yehoshua's comment in the Mishnah that he holds that if a mitzvah has a limit, there is liability if he errs while attempting to perform the mitzvah.

This understanding is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains that the anonymous opinion in our Mishnah who differentiates between animals fit and unfit is R' Shimon. A Baraisa is cited that teaches the dispute between R' Shimon and R' Meir on this point.

R' Bibi in the name of R' Elazar teaches that according to R' Meir even if one offered a calf designated as a shelamim as a korban Pesach he would be exempt.

R' Zeira unsuccessfully challenged this teaching.

R' Nachman taught that R' Meir would exempt one who slaughtered an unconsecrated animal as a korban Pesach.

Rava unsuccessfully challenged this teaching.

4) One who makes a mistake while trying to perform a mitzvah

Reish Lakish ruled that if one has korban meat and nosar meat before him and mistakenly ate the nosar he is liable.

R' Yochanan ruled that if one has relations with his wife when she was a niddah he is liable, but if one had relations with his yevamah when she was a niddah he is exempt from liability.

Two explanations are presented to explain R' Yochanan's opinion.

The Gemara explains why R' Yochanan distinguishes between one's wife and one's yevamah.

The Gemara unsuccessfully seeks a Tannaic source to support R' Yochanan's opinion regarding the case of the yevamah. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
לע"נ מרת געלא בת ר' משה ע"ה
By the Schwabacher Family

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
Mr. and Mrs. Michael Daniels
In loving memory of their mother
מרת בלומא מרים בת ר' שמעון ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

Never enough review

תנא מינייה ארבעין זימנין ודמי ליה כמאן דמנחא בכיסיה

The Gemara points out that after reviewing the understanding of the Mishnah forty times, Rav Yitzchok bar Yosef "had it in his pocket." This expression is noteworthy, for we generally find things stored in boxes, and the like. Why is this information described as being in his pocket?

The Vilna Gaon (קול אליהו) suggests that our sages might be referring to the rule we find in Bava Metzia (21b), that a person who has something of value in his possession is consciously alert to check on its status at all hours to make sure it is intact. The Gemara reports: "A person checks his pockets constantly." In reference to Torah, this would mean that although R' Yitzchok bar Yosef had mastered this information, he reviewed it regularly to make sure that he would not forget it, just as he would check the status of a treasure he might keep in his pocket. This is unlike something which is stored in a box at one's home, which does not need to be checked constantly.

There are some who note that R' Yitzchok bar Yosef in our Gemara is the one who reviewed the explanation of this Mishnah forty times. Yet, he is the same person whom both Abaye and Rava identify as being an unreliable source of information (Yevamos 64b). If he studied and reviewed his lessons so many times, why was he nevertheless considered unsuccessful?

In Igros Moshe (Y.D. 1:141), R' Moshe Feinstein explains that the intent of R' Yitzchok bar Yosef in reviewing forty times was to master the material. Yet he meant for it

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. Explain כל היכא דאית ליה קצבה מחייב ר' יהושע.
2. What is the dispute between R' Eliezer and R' Meir concerning a mistaken milah on Shabbos?
3. According to R' Meir, what circumstances exempt a person for mistakenly offering a korban on Shabbos?
4. How does the Gemara prove that eating terumah is considered an avodah?

HALACHAH Highlight

Review of Torah study

תנא מיניה ארבעין זימעין ודמי ליה כמאן דמנחא בכיסיה
He learnt it from him (R. Avahu) forty times and he retained it as if it was resting in his pocket.

In the Gemara Chagiga¹ it says, that one is not entitled with the accolade of “oved Elokim” until he reviews his studies 101 times. The Gemara in Eiruvin² writes that Moshe set up his teachings to allow for everyone to review them four times. If so, what is the exact amount one must review his studies?

The Gemara in Kiddushin³ says, “Our Rabbis taught, ‘v’shinantom’ that they (the words of Torah) should be sharp in your mouth.” Rashi⁴ comments, “review them and delve into them to the point that if one asks you a question, you will not grope for an answer, rather you will be able to answer immediately.” If one⁵ does not retain his learning for an extended period of time, he will not be rewarded for the learning, rather he will receive reward for the effort involved in coming to the lecture.

Based on this, the Gra⁶ writes in his Shulchan Aruch that it is not enough to review the material two or three times, rather he is Biblically⁷ obligated to review many times (based on his retention capabilities), in order that he remember it well.

(Overview...Continued from page 1)

to be something he would then remember forever, without having to study it again at a later time. However, the truth is that it is not enough for Torah to be in one’s pocket. A person must always study, until the day he dies (Rambam, Talmud Torah 1:10), so as not to be in violation of the verse (Devarim 4:9) “Guard that [these laws] not be removed from your heart all the days of your life.” Whenever a person is not pursuing study, he is apt to forget. Therefore, a person cannot rely upon having studied a subject many times at one occasion, but he must rather study many times, over and over again. ■

He must review it to the point where he can be asked a question and not hesitate to answer “permitted” or “forbidden” as if he was literally⁸ in the middle of learning it. ■

1. בחגיגה דף ט'
2. בעירובין נ"ד ע"ב. ועע"ש בעמוד א' ברש"י בד"ה כאבן זו
3. בקידושין ל' ע"א
4. רש"י בד"ה יהו
5. כ"כ רש"י בברכות דף ה' ע"ב בד"ה אגרא דפרקא, בפירוש הגמ' שם
6. בשו"ע הגר"ז בהלכות תלמוד תורה פ"ב ה"ג
7. כ"כ שם מדין ושננתם. ועע"ש בהלכה ד', שסובר שגם עובר בל"ת דהשמר לך וכו' פן תשכח וכו'. ועע"ש בסס"ג וז"ל ועכשיו שתורה שבע"פ כתובה לפנינו א"צ לחזור מאה פעמים ואחת בשעת לימודו ממש רק שיזהר מאוד לחזור על הראשונות תמיד לפרקים קרובים בענין וכו' בלי גמגום כבשעת לימודו ממש. עכ"ל
8. כמפורש שם בסוף ס"ג, וכנ"ל ■

STORIES Off the Daf

For they are our life, and the length of our days...

תנא מיניה ארבעין זימעין ודמי ליה כמאן דמנחא בכיסיה...

In the Aleph-Beis, the letter “lamed” immediately precedes the “mem” to signify that Torah is only learned (“lamed”) properly when it has been reviewed a minimum of forty times (“mem”). What is the significance of the number forty? Why not thirty, or fifty for that matter?

The Ohr Zaruah, zt”l, explains that forty repetitions alludes to the forty days during which Moshe Rabbeinu received the Torah on Har Sinai. Forty reviews of the halachah allow it to pene-

trate the heart, because the Torah itself is a living thing. Every word contains deep secrets, the Torah itself has a soul. Just as an embryo is not formed until forty days have passed from conception, the living Torah also needs to gestate for “forty days” before it is fully ingrained within us.

In the year 5719 (1959), the integrity of the yeshivos of Eretz Yisroel was threatened: the Ministry of Defense demanded a summit with a number of renown Roshei Yeshivah to devise a means by which their students could be partially integrated into the Army. HaRav Yechezkel Abramsky, zt”l, headed the delegation, and when the time came to discuss the matter with the government’s representative, a sweet smile spread across the Rav’s face. “May I

open the issue with the statement I originally planned to deliver at the end?” The official assented.

Rav Abramsky immediately assumed a stern expression. “We came to inform your honor that this matter is not open to negotiation. The yeshivos and the Torah are the cradle of our life. Torah is a living dynamic, and when it comes to a living entity, one cannot entertain any discussion about dividing it into pieces and destroying its integrity!” The gaon fell silent as his point penetrated home.

To the official’s everlasting credit, he grasped the page carrying the meeting’s agenda...and overturned it, broadcasting the message that the argument was indeed over, carried by Rav Abramsky’s powerful words. ■

