أو لأسهل فكر، شرح:

لا يجوز للمرأة أن تقبل الهدايا من أي شخص آخر إلا من الأسرة أو الزملاء. إلا أن الصبي الذي يبلغ من العمر 18 سنة في المنزل الذي يقيم فيه، يمكنه أن يقبل الهدايا من أي شخص آخر.

وهذا لأن الهدايا من الأسرة أو الزملاء تتعلق بالثقافة الإسلامية. بينما الهدايا من الآخرين قد يكونون مجودين.

وهذا بخلاف الفقه الإسلامي.

وكل ذلك تحت الإشراف والdığını.

والأمر في ذلك من الفقه الإسلامي:

لا يجوز للمرأة أن تقبل الهدايا من أي شخص آخر إلا من الأسرة أو الزملاء. إلا أن الصبي الذي يبلغ من العمر 18 سنة في المنزل الذي يقيم فيه، يمكنه أن يقبل الهدايا من أي شخص آخر.

وهذا لأن الهدايا من الأسرة أو الزملاء تتعلق بالثقافة الإسلامية. بينما الهدايا من الآخرين قد يكونون مجودين.

وهذا بخلاف الفقه الإسلامي.
HAYDALAH in the blessing of WHO GRACIOUSLY ENDOWS UNDER-STANDING.

The Gemara finally refutes Rav Huna’s opinion that our Mishnah uses ‘or’ to mean day:

Come, learn a proof. — For the academy of Shmuel taught: — On the NIGHT of the FOURTEENTH of Nissan, we search for CHANUKAH by the light of a CANDLE. This Baraisa parallels our Mishnah, which states “the ‘or’ of the fourteenth we search etc.” — Thus we see that ‘or’ is used in our Mishnah to mean night.

Having proven that our Mishnah uses ‘or’ in the sense of night, the Gemara reconciles the opinion of Rav Huna with this conclusion:

— Rather, whether it is Rav Huna or Rav Yehudah, everyone agrees that ‘or’ is used in our Mishnah to mean night.

— And they do not actually disagree about anything; it is only that the statement of one master reflects the custom of his locale, while the statement of the other master reflects the custom of his locale.

— In the locale of Rav Huna they call night ‘light’; whereas in the locale of Rav Yehudah they call it simply ‘night’.

The Gemara asks why our Mishnah did not use the more common term for night:

— And as for our Tanna, why did he not state “night”?

The Gemara answers:

— [Our Tanna] used a refined expression.

— And this practice accords with R’ Yehoshua ben Levi’s teaching.

— R’ Yehoshua ben Levi said: “In his locale “light” was used as a euphemism for night. This is similar to calling a blind personZNapy, abundant light [as in Berachos 58a and Chagigah 5b] (Aruch [קנה ע] וZnapy). [In this form of speech, something that carries a negative connotation is called by a word that means the opposite. People would use such euphemisms for reasons of delicacy and refinement.] A person should never emit a coarse expression from his

NOTES

15. When the time for eating it ends (i.e. at daybreak on the second day), the time for burning the leftover meat begins.

16. Leviticus 7:17.

17. For the verse specifies “day” (see Rashi).

18. Each amidah of the Sabbath and Yom Tov (except for the Masaal prayer of Rashi Hachana) consists of seven blessings — the three standard opening blessings, the three standard closing blessings, and one middle blessing that mentions the character of the day. A special feature of each Yom Kippur amidah is the viduy — the confession of one’s sins — recited (by the individual) at the close of the amidah.

19. As the Baraisa is recorded in Yoma 87b and Niddah 8b, it states at this point: ידע, ya נאמר (literally: closing) is a prayer unique to Yom Kippur, which is recited just before the end of the day.

20. That is, one recites the three opening blessings and three closing blessings, and one middle blessing that contains a synopsis of the usual middle blessings. This synopsis is the Havineinei blessing that the Rabbis instituted as a substitute where circumstances do not permit the recitation of the full Shemoneh Esrei (see Berechos 23b-30a; with commentaries). This Tanna maintains that the Rabbis allowed substitution of this abridged Shemoneh Esrei at the close of Yom Kippur as well, in order not to burden people [who have been fasting all day] with the recitation of the full Shemoneh Esrei (Rashi to Yoma 87b; see Melo Haarem).

21. According to the Tannaiic view that Havdalah is inserted into the blessing of הַנִּסְתַּר, Who graciously endows understanding, one cannot substitute Havineinei for the evening Shemoneh Esrei after the Sabbath or Yom Tov, because Havineinei does not contain הַנִּסְתַּר, Who graciously endows understanding, as an independent blessing (Bereschos 29a; see Gemara there and Rashba for the reason that words of Havdalah are not simply added at the appropriate point in Havineinei). Accordingly, R’ Chana ben Gamillo holds that Havineinei cannot be substituted for the evening Shemoneh Esrei after Yom Kippur (see also Tosafos ad loc. and Ramban et al. to Niddah 8b).

22. This Baraisa is attributed below (7b) to the academy of R’ Yishmael (see Melo Haarem).

23. Rav Huna did not actually say “day”; rather, he said “light.” In his locale “light” was used as a euphemism for night. This is similar to calling a blind person (קנ), abundant light [as in Berachos 58a and Chagigah 5b] (Aruch [קנה ק]). [In this form of speech, something that carries a negative connotation is called by a word that means the opposite. People would use such euphemisms for reasons of delicacy and refinement.]

24. As did the academy of Shmuel (Rashi).

The Gemara has no problem with the Tannaiic statements quoted above which also state “or” “because in those contexts it is clear that ‘or’ means night. It challenges only the Tanna of our Mishnah [whose use of the term ‘or’ is unclear, since it is possible to search for chanetza at daybreak] (Chidukei HaRan).

25. It is a mitzvah and it is also the practice of pure-minded people to use refined language (Rashi; see next note).
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mouth — for Scripture deviated by adding eight letters so as not to omit a coarse expression from its mouth, as it is stated.

Rav Pappa notes a case in which the Torah deviates even further in order to teach this lesson:

Rav Pappa said: — The Torah added nine letters to teach the value of refined speech, for it is stated: If there be among you a man who is not tayar, [because of] an incident at night, as opposed to: a man who is tayar.

Ravina said: — In fact that verse adds ten letters, for there is also the Sefor Tovah.

Rav Acha bar Yaakov cites an example in which the deviation is greater still:

Rav Acha bar Yaakov said: — The Torah added sixteen letters to teach the value of refined speech, for it is stated: because he said: An incident has occurred; he is not tayar, for he has not been cleansed, as opposed to: Because he said: A tayar incident has occurred.

The Gemara quotes a related Baraisa:

— This can be derived from Scripture, FOR IN THE CASE OF A ZAV, who is a man, (SCRIPTURE) CALLS IT (i.e. an object that he contaminates) Ridding equipment.

WHEREAS IN THE CASE OF A WOMAN (SCRIPTURE) CALLS IT "A SEAT."

The Torah does not mention "riding" in reference to a woman, since this is indecent.

The Baraisa cites two more sources:

— And it says: You should have chosen the language of the wise.

— And it says: My lips express refined knowledge.

The Gemara questions the need for these last two sources:

— For what reason did the Baraisa continue: and it says etc.? Why is the first proof not sufficient?

The Gemara answers that the Baraisa cited further sources to negate the following arguments:

— If you argue that this statement (i.e. the first proof) proves that refined speech is needed only in Biblical verses, but not in Rabbinic teachings, come learn a second proof:

— And it says: You shall choose the language of the wise, which implies that even wise people use choice language.

— If you argue that this statement (i.e. the second proof) requires refined speech only in Rabbinic teachings, but not in ordinary matters, come learn a third proof:

— And it says: My lips express refined knowledge, which implies that refined language should be used in all situations.

The Gemara raises a difficulty with the Baraisa’s first source:

— But is it true that “riding” is not written in connection with a woman?

— Why, it is written: Then, Rebecca arose with her maidens, and they rode upon the camels.

NOTES

32. I Samuel 20:26. When King Saul noted that David was not at his side, he suggested a reason for David’s absence.

33. It would have been sufficient to say: אשה בערב, a tayar incident has occurred. But instead of describing the incident simply as אשה, tayar, which has only three letters, the verse says: בים, ימי וሿ, he is not tayar for he has not been cleansed, which comprises nineteen letters. This is an addition of sixteen letters (Rashi; see Hagahos Yavetz).

34. Leviticus 16:9.

35. Based on ibid. v. 23 (see Rashi).

36. A zav is a man who experienced an emission similar (but not identical) to a seminal discharge. A zwah is a woman who experienced uterine bleeding not at her normal time. If either a zav or a zwah sits or leans on an object without touching it, that object becomes tayar. In reference to a zav the Torah uses the example of “riding equipment” (i.e. a saddle), while in connection with a zwah the Torah simply says that she contaminates that which she “sits” upon. Although a zav and a zwah share the same laws in regard to both “riding” and “sitting,” the Torah did not mention riding in the case of a (female) zwah, for it is indecent to speak of a woman who rides, since her legs are apart while astride the horse (Rashi and Maharash; see also Tosafos).

37. Job 15:5. Eliphaz rebuked Job for not having chosen “the language of the wise” (Rashi ad loc.). Thus we see that it is a mitzvah to use wise (i.e. refined) speech (Rashi here).

38. Ibid. 33:3. This verse too suggests that a person should use pure, refined language (Rashi).

39. One might have thought that only the Torah, which issued directly from God, is written in such a refined manner. The Sages, however, need not be so careful in composing a Mishnah or Baraisa (Rashi).

40. The words, wise, are the Torah scholars (Maharsha, based on Sotah 21b).

41. The word ידע, my lips, indicates speech of a personal mundane nature (Maharsha: see Meromer Sadeh for another explanation).
The Gemara answers:

There, because of the fear involved in being on top of camels, it is normal for a woman to ride.[43]

The Gemara raises another objection:

But it is written: So Moses took his wife and sons and caused them to ride (i.e. mounted them) on the donkey.[44] — ? —

The Gemara answers:

There,

NOTES

43. A woman who sits on a camel is afraid of falling, because of its height. Therefore, she would “ride” the camel [i.e. she would place her legs on opposite sides of the camell], so that she could clutch it with her legs on the same side]. Since it is the practice even of modest women to “ride” camels, it is not indelicate to speak of this (see Sfas Emes; see also Hazahos R’ Elazar Moshe Harmonitz)
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The Gemara raises another problem:

But it is written: And it happened [that] she was riding on a donkey. – The Gemara offers three answers:

1. There, because of the fear of night, it is normal for a woman to ride.
2. And if you wish, say that because of the fear of night there was not sufficient reason for her to ride; however, because of the fear of David there was cause to ride. – And if you wish, say that the fear of David was also not sufficient cause; – but because of the fear of the mountain there was cause for her to ride.

The Gemara above (3a) recorded various instances in which the Torah avoided using the word tamei. The Gemara therefore asks: – And is the word tamei not written in the Torah? The Torah mentions this word numerous times!

The Gemara answers:

– Rather, wherever they (i.e. a coarse expression and its more refined substitute) are equal in length, [Scripture] uses the more refined expression; but wherever [the more refined expression] is longer, [Scripture] uses the more concise expression.

The Gemara supports this answer: – This is in accordance with that which Rav Huna said in the name of Rav, – and some say that Rav Huna said it in the name of Rav who said it in the name of R’ Meir: – A person should always teach his student in a concise manner.

The Gemara objects: – And it is so that wherever [the two expressions] are equal in length, –

NOTES

1. The expression of “riding” refers only to the sons, and not to their mother (Rosh Yosef).
2. I Samuel 25:20. Abigail was riding down a mountain at night to beg David not to punish her husband Nabal for insurrection.
3. I.e. with a leg on each side of the animal (see 3a note 36).
4. The thought of her meeting with David caused her such agitation that she was in danger of falling off the donkey.
5. Because she was riding down a slope, she was afraid of falling.
6. That is, the more refined expression is not longer than the less refined one (Rashi).
7. Literally: [its] words are many.
8. The Torah usually uses the more concise phrase, even if it is not refined, in order to convey that a teacher should use concise language in teaching students. The benefit of concision is that a short text is more readily retained than a long one. In the examples cited above, however, the Torah used longer phrases in order to teach the value of refined speech (Rashi).
9. The commentators object that if conciseness is more important than refinement, why does Scripture use longer (but more refined) language on more than one occasion? One would have sufficed to teach the importance of refined language. In view of this difficulty, Chisdai HaRan demonstrates the need for each of the verses cited above (see also Maharsha). See, however, Beal HaMoar and Rabbenu David for an alternative approach to our Gemara.
10. In the verse cited above from I Samuel.
11. Although the verse could have said רמאו (without a vav), it chose to say ירמאו in order to teach that the more concise expression is preferable even if it is less refined (Rashi; see Maharsha and Maharsha; cf. Tosefot). (See Menachem Meishiv Nefesh and Tazlach, who discuss why the Gemara does not answer as it did before, that the term רמאו was used here for other reasons.)
12. He said “other thing,” which is known to be a euphemism for “pig” (see Rabbienu Chananel). Although he used a euphemism, he was faulted for having chosen such a distasteful simile.
13. See Toras Chaim for a reason why the Gemara records what the second student said.
14. Rabban Yochanan ben Zakai or (according to the second version) R’ Yochanan.
15. The Hebrew verb for harvesting is דינע in reference to grapes and פון in reference to olives.
16. Foodstuffs cannot become tamei unless they were first made susceptible to tuma through being wetted by any of these seven liquids – wine or grape juice, bee’s honey, olive oil, milk, dew, blood and water (Machshirin 6:4). When grapes are harvested, juice often comes out of them and wets their outer surface. Therefore, if one uses a tamei utensil to harvest grapes, they will become tamei (see Shabbos 17a for the particulars of this law). To prevent this, the law is that one must use tahor utensils. In the case of olives, however, this is not necessary, because the sap that initially oozes out of the olives is not classified as “olive oil,” which can render foodstuffs susceptible to tuma. Only the juice that comes out later (e.g. at the olive press) is deemed “olive oil” (Rashi; see Shabbos 17a and Tosefot ibid. דינע ופון; see also Tosefot here הירא המים).
17. The only difference between the questions of the two students is in the language. This student said “tumaḥ,” whereas the first one said “not ... taharah.”
18. The commentators ask why the first student was praised for his choice of words in a case where the alternative was more concise. One
Another such incident:

— There were three Kohenim who had each received a share of the lechem hapanim,\[^{18}\] — One said to [the others]: “A piece the size of a bean reached me.” — One said: “A piece the size of an olive reached me.” — And one said: “A piece the size of a lizard’s tail reached me.”\[^{19}\]

And one said: They investigated the lineage of [the third one],\[^{20}\] — and they found him in some disqualifying genealogical flaw.\[^{21}\]

The Gemara asks how an acting Kohen could be genealogically unfit:

— But we have learned in a Mishnah\[^{22}\] — ONE DOES NOT INVESTIGATE FROM a Kohen who brought offerings on the ALTAR AND UPWARD\[^{23}\] because it can be assumed that a Kohen who serves in the Temple is genealogically fit.\[^{24}\] — ? —

The Gemara offers two answers:

— Do not say that he had some disqualifying
genealogical flaw; rather say that he had previously displayed some disqualifying haughtiness.\[^{25}\]

— And if you wish, say: There it was different, because he compromised himself.\[^{26}\]

The Gemara digresses:\[^{27}\]

— There was an Aramean who would go up and eat pesach offerings in Jerusalem.\[^{28}\] — He once said to R’ Yehudah ben Beseira: “It is written: any stranger may not eat from it (i.e. a pesach offering);\[^{29}\]”

answer is that the phrase "any stranger" is ambiguous, although concise, is ambiguous because it could mean: “one must harvest olives in a state of tumah” — which is obviously not true. Therefore, the first student's choice of words was superior (Ran; see there for another explanation, according to which the teacher was praising the second student; see also Meiri).

18. The bread that remained on the Shulchan in the Temple from one Sabbath to the next. On the Sabbath, it was removed and distributed among the Kohenim.

19. This is a coarse expression, because a כִּיפַל, lizard, is one of the eight sherasatim whose carcasses convey tumah (see Leviticus 11:29,30).

20. Because he had used a coarse expression.

21. I.e. a flaw that disqualifies him from being a Kohen. They discovered that he was a chalal (Rashi). [A chalal is one descended from a union between a Kohen and a woman who is prohibited only to Kohenim, e.g. a divorcee.] Cf. Tosafos.

22. Kiddushin 76a. This Mishnah teaches that before one gets married, he must make sure that his prospective wife is not a momzeress or other such person who is forbidden to him (Rashi ibid.; cf. Tosafos ibid.; see Rishitam there for the parameters of this law). To do so, he must investigate the status of a certain number of her ancestors, because genealogical disqualifications are transmitted from one generation to the next.

23. That is, if he found out that one of his prospective wife’s ancestors was a Kohen who served in the Temple, he need not investigate any of that Kohen’s ancestors.

24. All Kohenim are examined for disqualifying genealogical flaws before they are allowed to serve, as stated in Middos 5:4 (Rashi).

25. I.e. as a result of haughtiness, he had disparaged the holy offerings. He is therefore unfit to serve, because a Kohen who does not accept any aspect of the Kohenite service is disqualified (Rashi, from Menachos 18b; see Toras Chaim).

26. — and it is also written: any uncircumcised male may not eat from it.\[^{30}\] — But I, why I eat from the best of the best cuts of the pesach offering! R’ Yehudah ben Beseira asked him: ‘If you feed you from the fat tail?’ R’ Yehudah ben Beseira told him: ‘When you go up there again, tell them, ‘Feed me from the fat tail.”’ R’ Yehudah ben Beseira told him: ‘When he went up again, he told them: ‘Feed me from the fat tail.’ — They said to him in surprise: ‘The fat tail goes up to the Most High [i.e. it is burned on the altar]’!

27. This narrative does not involve coarse speech. It is recorded here because it involves someone whose behavior prompted an investigation into his personal status, as in the previous incident (Rashi; see Haggadah Yevetz).


29. Ibid. v. 48.

30. R’ Yehudah ben Beseira wanted to convince this Aramean that if they were not giving him any part of the fat tail, they were giving him only inferior, lean cuts of meat. [Maharsha adds that R’ Yehudah ben Beseira meant to tell the Aramean that the prohibitions against feeding the pesach offering to strangers or uncircumcised males applied only to the fat tail of the offering.] In this way R’ Yehudah ben Beseira hoped to trick the Aramean into asking for the fat tail when he went again [so that his fraud would be discovered] (Rashi).

31. The fat tail of a sheep is offered on the altar, as stated in Leviticus 3:9 (Rashi).

32. R’ Yehudah ben Beseira told me that you were giving me only lean cuts of meat. But I paid as much as any of you! (Rashi; see Rashi in Ein Yaakov).

33. Their suspicion was aroused because R’ Yehudah ben Beseira’s suggestion was contrary to the halachah.

34. R’ Yehudah ben Beseira himself did not execute him, because it was not within his power to do so (Rashi, הָלַכְתָּא אֵין בֵּן בּוּסַּרֵא). See Minchas Chinuch 514, Kivuro Shuirim 56 and Dvir Shmuelt for a possible reason why the Aramean was liable to capital punishment.

35. The Rishonim ask why R’ Yehudah ben Beseira himself did not travel to Jerusalem to offer his own pesach sacrifice (see Tosafos, Ran et al.; see also Mishneh Lamedesh to Hil. Korban Pesach 1:1 and Minchas Chinuch 514, who discuss the matter further).
and he came back crying. The abbis asked him: "Did Rav Kahana ass away?" R' Yehoshua answered them: "I did not say anything, for Scripture states: and one who utters an evil report is a fool." Another example:

Yochanan Chakukaah went out to the villages in the countryside to inspect the crops. When he came back, they asked him: "Did the wheat crop turn out well?" He answered them: "The barley crop turned out well." They said to him sarcastically: "Go and give the news to the horses and donkeys!" For barley is eaten by horses, as it is written: 

The Gemara asks:

What should [Yochanan] have said?

The Gemara gives two suggestions:

- He could have said: "Last year the wheat crop turned out well."
- Alternatively, he could have said: "The lentils turned out well."

NOTES

36. He did not want the Rabbis to realize the full severity of the situation suddenly, lest they succumb to shock (Rashi).

40. 1 Kings 5:8.