



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

MISHNAH: One may send to an idolator a thigh in which there is yet the gid hanasheh, because its place is known.¹

GEMARA: [The Gemara makes an inference:] Only a whole thigh one may [send] but not if it was cut up. But what are the circumstances? If we are speaking of a place where they do not proclaim it,² then one should be allowed to send it even though it was cut up, for no [Jew] would buy it from him. And if we are speaking of a place where they do proclaim it, then one should not be allowed to send even an entire thigh,³ for he [the idolater] will cut it up and sell it! — If you wish I can say that it is a place where they do proclaim it, and if you wish I can say that it is a place where they do not proclaim it. If you wish, I can say that it is a place where they do proclaim it, [and yet there is nothing to fear] because the cutting up [of the thigh] by an idolater is recognizable.⁴ And if you wish, I can say that it is a place where they do not proclaim it, [and yet it is forbidden to

send a portion] lest he should give it to the idolater in the presence of another Israelite. Alternatively, I can say, [it is forbidden] because he thereby deceives him,⁵ and Shmuel holds that it is forbidden to deceive people even idolaters.

The Gemara notes: This view of Shmuel was not expressly stated but was inferred from the following incident: Shmuel was once crossing on a ferryboat and he said to his attendant, “Reward the ferryman.” He rewarded him, but [Shmuel] became angry. Why was he angry? — Abaye said: Because he [the attendant] had a tereifah hen and he gave it to the ferryman representing it as one that was slaughtered properly. Rava said: Because he [Shmuel] told him to give him [the idolater] anpek (strong pure wine) to drink, and he gave him mixed wine to drink.⁶ And what if it was only inferred? — Because according to the one who says that he gave him a tereifah hen, it can be said [that Shmuel was angry with his attendant] for keeping with him [a forbidden

¹ We need not be concerned lest another Jew, seeing the idolater receiving the thigh from this Jew, will assume that the gid hanasheh had been removed and will buy it from the idolater, because it can easily be seen whether the gid hanasheh has been removed or not.

² That an animal was found to be tereifah. This is the custom where all the butchers are Jews. Where the practice of announcing it is not in vogue, there Jews are not allowed to buy meat from idolaters under any circumstances, for the Jewish butchers may have disposed of the tereifah animal to an idolater and did not trouble to make this fact known.

³ Unless the gid hanasheh had been removed beforehand, for the idolater might cut it up in portions and sell it to Jews, and when cut

up, it is no longer easy to ascertain whether the gid hanasheh has been removed or not.

⁴ A whole thigh, therefore, may be sent but not a portion of one.

⁵ Lit., ‘steals his mind’, i.e., creates a false impression upon him. The idolater would be delighted in the thought that his Jewish friend is sending him meat fit for his own table, and would be the more grateful to him, whereas in reality the meat sent was not fit for his own table as the gid hanasheh had not been removed from it, and so the gratitude of the idolater will have been falsely earned.

⁶ And the idolater thought it was unmixed wine.

thing]. And according to the one who says that he told him to give him anpek, it can be said [that Shmuel was angry] because anpek really means unmixed wine.

It was taught: Rabbi Meir used to say: A man should not urge his friend to dine with him when he knows that his friend will not do so.⁷ And he should not offer him many gifts when he knows that his friend will not accept them. And he should not open [for a guest] casks of wine which are to be sold by the shopkeeper,⁸ unless he informs [the guest] of it. And he should not invite him to anoint himself with oil⁹ if the jar is empty. If, however, the purpose is to show the guest great respect, it is permitted.

The Gemara asks: But surely this cannot be right. For Ulla once came to Rav Yehudah's house and the latter opened up for him casks that were later to be sold by the shopkeeper!

The Gemara answers: He must have informed him of this fact. Or if you wish, I can say that the case of Ulla is different, for he was so dear to Rav Yehudah that he would have opened for him even those that were not [to be sold by the shopkeeper].

⁷ He is merely gaining the gratitude of his friend through something which he had no intention of doing. This is the reason in all the cases mentioned.

⁸ It was not unusual for a private person when about to open a barrel of wine for his table to make arrangements with a shopkeeper to dispose of that which is left after the meal; a necessary arrangement, for once the barrel has been opened the wine will in a very short time turn sour. To open up a barrel of wine for a guest without informing him of the arrangement with the shopkeeper is taking credit for something one has not merited.

⁹ Knowing full well that his friend will not do so.

¹⁰ It was the custom to drink wine at the house of a mourner, and over each cup of wine certain blessings and appropriate words of consolation to the mourners were recited. The visitors would come

Our Rabbis taught: A man should not go to the house of a mourner¹⁰ with a bottle in which the wine shakes about,¹¹ neither should he fill it with water because he thereby deceives him. If, however, there is a large assembly present, it is permitted.¹²

Our Rabbis taught: A man should not sell to his fellow shoes made of the hide of an animal which died, [representing them] as made of the hide of a living animal which was slaughtered, for two reasons: first, because he is deceiving him, and secondly, because of the danger.¹³

A man should not send to his fellow a barrel of wine with oil floating at the mouth of it.¹⁴ It once happened that a man sent his friend a barrel of wine, and there was oil floating at the mouth of the barrel. He went and invited some guests to partake of it. When they came and he found that it was only wine he went and strangled himself.¹⁵

The guests may not give from what is set before them to the son or daughter of the host, unless they have the host's permission to, do so. It once happened that a

bringing with them bottles of wine; and one must not deceive people by coming with a bottle filled with water or only half-filled with wine.

¹¹ It contains only a little wine and therefore shakes about in the bottle.

¹² If this man wishes to enhance the mourner's prestige in the eyes of the large gathering of people, he may do so, for they will say, "how worthy he must be that this person honored him so lavishly."

¹³ As the animal may have died through the bite of a serpent and the hide of the animal may thereby have become contaminated.

¹⁴ Leading him to believe that the whole barrel contains oil.

¹⁵ Because of shame, for he had nothing else prepared to set before his guests.

man in a time of scarcity invited three guests to his house and he only had three eggs to set before them. When the child of the host entered, one of the guests took his portion and gave it to him, the second guest did likewise, and so did the third. When the father of the child came and saw him stuffing one [egg] in his mouth and holding two in his hands, he [in rage] knocked him to the ground so that he died. When the child's mother saw this she went up to the roof and threw herself down and died. He too went up to the roof and threw himself down and died. Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov said: Because of this three souls in Israel perished. What does he [Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov] tell us? — It means that the whole story was related by Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov.

Our Rabbis taught: If a man sends to his friend a whole thigh he need not remove beforehand the gid hanasheh; if [he sends it] cut up he must remove beforehand the gid hanasheh. To an idolater, however, whether he sends it cut up or whole, he need not remove beforehand the gid hanasheh. And for two reasons they said, a man should not sell to an idolater animals that have become neveilah or tereifah:¹⁶ first because he is deceiving him,¹⁷ and secondly because he in turn might sell it to another Israelite. A man should not say to an idolater, “Buy for me meat with this dinar,” for two reasons: first because of extortion,¹⁸ and secondly because they might sell him meat of a neveilah or tereifah animal.

¹⁶ Without informing him of this fact.

¹⁷ For an idolater when buying meat of a Jew believes that he is buying the meat of an animal that has been slaughtered properly, and it is forbidden to take advantage of his ignorance and to pass on to him tereifah meat.

¹⁸ Who would keep the dinar for themselves and at the same time force the butcher to supply them with meat to the value of a dinar without payment.

The Master said: To an idolater, however, whether [he sends it] cut up or whole, he need not remove beforehand the gid hanasheh.

The Gemara asks: But what are the circumstances? If we are dealing with a place where they do proclaim it,¹⁹ then in the case where it has been cut up why [do you say,] he need not remove beforehand the gid hanasheh? [Is it not to be feared that,] since no proclamation was made, people will buy from him? Obviously then we are dealing with a place where they do not proclaim it. Consider now the middle clause which reads: For two reasons, they said, a man should not sell to an idolater animals that have become neveilah or tereifah: first because he is deceiving him, and secondly because he in turn might sell it to another Israelite. If, as you say, we are dealing with a place where they do not proclaim it, then surely no one would buy from him. Obviously then we are dealing with the place where they do proclaim it.²⁰ Consider now the final clause which reads: A man should not say to an idolater, “Buy for me meat with this dinar,” for two reasons: first because of extortion, and secondly because they might sell him meat of a neveilah or tereifah animal. Now if, as you say, it is a place where they do proclaim it, then surely if there happened a tereifah it would have been proclaimed.²¹ Obviously then we are dealing with the place where they do not

¹⁹ That this day a tereifah animal was supplied to the idolater. On that day Jews would refrain from buying meat from the idolater.

²⁰ But for some unaccountable reason no proclamation was made on this day, so that there is the danger of Jews buying tereifah meat from the idolaters without being aware of the fact.

²¹ Since there was no proclamation on this day then the Jew should have no hesitation in sending the idolater to buy meat for him.

proclaim it; so that the position is: The first and last clauses deal with a place where they do not proclaim it, while the middle clause deals with a place where they do proclaim it!

Abaye answered: It is so. The first and last clauses deal with a place where they do not proclaim it, but the middle clause deals with a place where they do proclaim it.

Rava answered: The whole [Baraisa] deals with a place where they do proclaim it; and in the first and last clauses the case was that a proclamation had been made [this day],²² but in the middle clause the case was that no proclamation had been made.²³

Rav Ashi answered: The whole [Baraisa] deals with a place where they do not proclaim it;²⁴ but the ruling in the middle clause²⁵ is merely a precautionary measure lest he sell it to the idolater in the presence of another Israelite.²⁶

What is the form of the proclamation? — Rav Yitzchak bar Yosef said: Meat has fallen into our hands for the army.²⁷ And why not proclaim: Tereifah meat has fallen into our hands for the army? — They would not then buy it. Are we not then deceiving them? — No. They are deceiving themselves. As in the following incident. Mar

Zutra the son of Rav Nachman was once going from Sichra to Bei Mechoza, while Rava and Rav Safra were going to Sichra; and they met on the way. Believing that they had come to meet him he (Mar Zutra) said: Why did the Rabbis take this trouble to come so far [to meet me]? Rav Safra replied: We did not know that the Master was coming; had we known of it we should have put ourselves out more than this. Rava said to him: Why did you tell him this; you have now upset him? He replied: But we would be deceiving him otherwise. No. He would be deceiving himself.²⁸

²² So that all know that this day the idolater has been supplied with tereifah meat.

²³ Although such a proclamation should have been made.

²⁴ So that generally Jews would not buy meat from idolaters for they are supplied with tereifah meat and no announcement is made of this fact.

²⁵ That it is forbidden to sell to an idolater neveilah or tereifah.

²⁶ Who, on seeing the idolater receiving it from the Jew and not knowing that it is tereifah, would permit himself to buy it from the idolater. In the first clause, however, we are not concerned for this,

for there it refers to a private transaction, where a Jew sends a thigh to the idolater, and it is not likely that any other Jew would know of this; hence there is no reasonable ground for imposing a precautionary measure. On the other hand, the Tanna of our Mishnah does feel the necessity for such a measure.

²⁷ In towns where Jews mainly settled, it was not unusual to find that the only idolaters in the town were the soldiers of the army who were stationed there.

²⁸ Thinking that they had specially come to meet him.