

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Taking revenge

R' Yochanan in the name of R' Shimon ben Yehotzadak teaches that a scholar must take revenge and bear grudges.

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges this statement.

Details regarding the prohibitions against bearing a grudge and taking revenge are clarified.

### 2) Using fingers for the lottery

R' Chisda explains, based on a Baraisa, that only sick kohanim put out two fingers for the lottery.

The Gemara challenges the Baraisa's statement that a Kohen who puts out two fingers is counted as one from a second Baraisa.

The contradiction is resolved.

The term פקיע used in the Baraisa is defined and Abaye applies that definition to a second source.

### 3) The race up the ramp

A Baraisa retells a second story that occurred when two kohanim were racing up the ramp. In the second story one Kohen stabbed the other. R' Tzadok stood up and gave a drosha regarding the severity of the sin of murder.

The Gemara demonstrates that the story of the Baraisa occurred earlier than the story of the Mishnah.

The Gemara explains that R' Tzadok's drosha was intended to make the people cry and it was not meant to be halachically accurate.

The attitude and response of the father of the victim is analyzed.

### 4) Removing ash from the mizbeach

A Baraisa cites two opinions regarding the laws related to removing the ashes to a place outside of Yerushalayim.

A statement of the Yeshiva of R' Yishmael is cited to explain Tanna Kamma's position that the clothing worn to remove the ashes should be inferior to the clothes used to separate the ashes.

According to Reish Lakish, Tanna Kamma and R' Eliezer disagree whether blemished kohanim could perform the task of removing and separating the ashes whereas according to R' Yochanan they only disagree about the removal.

Their respective positions are explained.

The Gemara begins to demonstrate that the dispute between Reish Lakish and R' Yochanan is also a dispute between Tannaim. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *Murder at the finish line*

ומעיקרא סבר אקראי בעלמא הוא

The Gemara reports two mishaps which occurred as kohanim raced to be the first to perform the mitzvah of תרומת הדשן. The sages realized that the system of open competition to arrive first was dangerous. They therefore instituted a selection system of פיוס to determine who would do this service. The conclusion of the Gemara is that the incident where one kohen actually killed the other happened first, but it was thought that this was an exceptional situation, and that there was no need to change the system itself. When they later saw that roughness and pushing resulted in broken bones, they realized that the open forum system itself was dangerous and had to be changed.

Sfas Emes explains that the first misfortune of the death of one of the kohanim initially did not cause a re-evaluation of the race format, because the perpetrator was obviously רשע שיח. ש"ח notes that the fellow had a knife ready to attack, and his violent reaction was obviously based upon a harbored anger, followed by a pre-meditated act. His murderous act was therefore not attributed to the competitive nature of the race to do the service, but rather to an אקראי, an aberration.

Later, when one kohen shoved the other over the side of the ramp resulting in a serious injury, the sages concluded that it was too dangerous to allow even routine rushing and pushing to continue. People were apt to get hurt, even without malicious intent on the part of the other kohanim. This is why they reacted to the incident of the broken leg, although they had not responded to the earlier, more serious case of murder. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Explain the difference between bearing a grudge and taking revenge.
2. How did the Gemara demonstrate that the story involving a stabbing happened first?
3. What do the words ולבש בגדים אחרים teach?
4. What is R' Yehudah's objection to the use of the Kohen Gadol's garments for removing the ashes?

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Mrs. Rivka Wiznitzer  
in memory of her husband  
Mr. Abraham Wiznitzer  
ר' אברהם בן ר' שמואל ע"ה*

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Ari Weiss  
As a zechus for a refua shelaima for  
Moshe ben Ariella Gila*

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Being forgiving of a personal offense

וא"ר יוחנן משום רש"ב יהוצדך כל ת"ח שאינו נוקם ונוטר כנחש אינו ת"ח והכתוב לא תקום ולא תטור ההוא בממון הוא דכתיב וכו'.

And R' Yochanan states in the name of R' Shimon ben Yehotzadak: Any scholar who does not take revenge and bear a grudge like a snake is not a scholar. [The Gemara asks:] Doesn't the pasuk say, Do not take revenge and do not bear a grudge. [The Gemara answers:] The pasuk refers to monetary matters.

The outcome of the Gemara is that there is a prohibition against taking revenge or bearing a grudge if one is harmed financially. One has an obligation to remove<sup>1</sup> from one's mind the pain the other inflicted. If, on the other hand, one was hurt physically by another or one's honor was disgraced there is no prohibition against keeping the memory of the event<sup>2</sup> in one's heart until the offending party asks forgiveness<sup>3</sup>. Other authorities<sup>4</sup> maintain that the prohibition against bearing a grudge or taking revenge applies even when physically abused, and the only exception<sup>5</sup> to the prohibition is a talmid chacham who was publicly<sup>6</sup> disgraced. Since the offense involved a disgrace to Torah, the talmid chacham is permitted to remember the event until the offending party asks forgiveness. The Chofetz Chaim<sup>7</sup> followed the latter, strict position.

All authorities agree that if someone makes a false charge against his friend there is no obligation to forgive the offending party even if he asks for forgiveness. Nonetheless, it is an act of humility to be forgiving even in such a case,<sup>8</sup> and in fact, the Tefilas Zakah, customarily recited before Yom Kippur, includes a statement of forgiveness to those who made false claims against a person the past year. [See footnote for details regarding these issues<sup>9</sup> which were the cause of the destruction of the second Beis

HaMikdash.] ■

1. ע"י רש"י ד"ה איני. וכ"כ רבינו יונה בשע"ת אות ל"ח. ורמב"ם סוף הלכות דעות שכתבו שצריך שימחה את הדבר מליבו. וכן פסק בספר חפץ חיים בלאוין חט ט'. וכן ע"י באהבת חסד סוף פ"ד ודו"ק
2. כמש"כ בגמ' דנטיט מליביה. ויש נפ"מ מכך שאינו מוחל בליבו. וכדפרש"י ז"ל ואם בא אחר לנקום נקמתו בקיום המשפט ישתוק. עכ"ל. ובמאירי רואים עוד נפ"מ מכך. שע"ז שהת"ח אינו מעבורו מליבו ומצטער כל יום. ע"ז חבירו נענש לו ידו אין מכניסין אותו למחיצתו של הקב"ה [ואע"פ שלא התפלל שחבירו יענש] ולכא"ו תוס' ומאירי חולקים בזה
3. רש"י ד"ה דמפייסו. וכ"ה ברמב"ם הנ"ל
4. החינוך במצוה רמ"א ורמ"ב. וכן דייק בבאר מים חיים בח"ח לאוין ח' ט'. מהרמב"ם וע"ש מש"כ בדעת היראים וסיעתו [שמשמע מהם כפשטות סוגיין]
5. וכדפירש הבמ"ח הנ"ל עפ"י הגמ' בריש העמוד כאן. ודין ת"ח בזמה"ז ע"י בש"ך חושן משפט סוף סימן א'. והח"ח בהלשה"ר כלל ח' ס"ד כתב וז"ל ואפילו בזמנינו אם הוא רק ראוי להורות ויגע בתורה נקרא ת"ח עכ"ל
6. ודע שיש ג' דעות אימתי אסור לת"ח למחול על בזונו. שרש"י ומאירי סתמו בזה. ומאידך הרמב"ם בסוף הלכות תלמוד תורה כתב שרק אם ביזו את הת"ח בפרהסיא אסור לו למחול. [וזה מה שהביא הח"ח כאן]. ולכס"מ שם הרשב"ש בשם הראב"ד אם ביזוהו לא ימחול. ואם רק לא כיבדוהו ימחול. וכ"ז בת"ח. שכשמתבזה. מתבזה בכך התורה. משא"כ כל אדם נכון שימחול מ"מ כמפורש במאירי. וכן ע"י ברמ"א אר"ח סימן תר"ו ס"א
7. שם בבמ"ח [בד"ה היוצא]. דספק דאורייתא לחומרא כרמב"ם וחינוך ודלא כיראים וסיעתו הנ"ל. ומאידך במ"ב סימן קנ"ו סתם כיראים. וצ"ע. ומ"מ מדי ספק דאורייתא לא יצא. ובספר אורח מישרים פ"כ ס"ד. כתב שגם למקילים לנקום וליטור בצער הגוף מ"מ אסור לשנאותו אא"כ ברשע כבח"ח בהלשה"ר כלל ח' אות ה'. אמנם במ"ב סימן תר"ו ס"ק ט' משמע שא"צ להסיר השנאה מליבו אא"כ ביקש ממנו מחילה. ומ"מ נכון למחול וכדאשכחן בתפילה זכה וכדלהלן
8. באר"ח סימן תר"ו סוף ס"א. ובמ"ב שם ס"ק י"א ובתפלה זכה רואים עוד חידוש שאע"פ שלא ביקש מחילה מ"מ טוב למחול [לכה"פ בעיוה"כ]
9. על שנאת חנם. בגמ' לעיל ט' ע"ב. ועל ביזוי ת"ח בגמ' בשבת דף קי"ט ע"ב ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The bite of the snake

כל תמיד חכם שאינו נוקם ונוטר כנחש אינו תלמיד חכם

"Any Torah scholar who does not take vengeance and bear a grudge like a snake is not a true scholar."

The Shelah HaKadosh, zt"l, writes that although a snake strikes purposefully, it does not derive any pleasure from the act of biting itself. Similarly, a Torah scholar is forbidden to derive any pleasure from doling out harsh criticism of others when necessary. He must do it, but only when it is

purely for the sake of heaven. As the Maayan Chaim, zt"l, points out, a snake only bites when it is commanded to do so by Hashem! The Ben Ish Chai, zt"l, adds that a harsh reaction is only justified if the talmid chacham has first waited to ensure that the one who sinned against him is not remorseless and will not come to ask for forgiveness.

Rav Meir Ma'arim of Kobrin, zt"l, never took revenge against anyone, and always acted in a kind and conciliatory manner. Someone once approached him and asked how he could justify such mildness when our Gemara clearly indicates the opposite course of action.

The Rav explained, "Just imagine what

the consequences would be if I abandoned my normal manner and tried instead to exact vengeance from those who antagonize me. After I leave this world, the heavenly court will surely ask why I behaved with such atrocious middos and violated so many Torah prohibitions. If I cite this Gemara as my justification, all those assembled will all get a good laugh at my expense. 'Look who thinks he's a talmid chacham!' they are likely to exclaim."

Rav Meir concluded, "While it's true that I may have some explaining to do after my time is up about why I sometimes didn't react more strongly, at least I won't be made into a laughingstock for having made a miscalculation!" ■