

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Sending a thigh with the gid hanasheh to a gentile (cont.)

An incident related to announcing an occurrence of a tereifah is recounted.

It is noted that Rebbi's ruling is consistent with another of his rulings.

A second version of Rebbi's ruling is recorded.

According to this version it seems that there is a contradiction between two rulings of Rebbi.

The contradiction is resolved.

2) Meat that was out of sight

Rav ruled that meat that was out of sight is prohibited.

Numerous unsuccessful challenges to this ruling are presented.

It is noted that Rav's position was not stated explicitly, but it was rather inferred from a ruling of his.

The significance of the fact that it was only by inference is explained.

The circumstances are identified in which Rav would eat meat without concern that it was out of sight.

A related incident is recounted.

3) Foretelling

The Gemara explains how different Amoraim would foretell future situations.

An incident in which R' Yochanan acted upon a verse recited to him by a child is retold.

A Baraisa related to omens is presented.

R' Elazar explains that an omen is established if it repeats itself three times.

4) Meat that was out of sight (cont.)

R' Huna asked Rav whether it is necessary to be concerned if meat on a string was left unsupervised.

Rav answered that there is no basis for concern.

According to a second version, R' Huna issued a ruling that meat on a string that was left unsupervised is permitted.

A number of incidents related to meat that was out of sight are recounted. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Mr. and Mrs. David Segall
In honor of their anniversary and
for the yaharzeit of his father
ר' ישראל בן ר' שמואל הלוי ע"ה

Distinctive INSIGHT

Relying on omens and signs which portend the future

כל נחש שאינו כאליעזר עבד אברהם וכיונתן בן שאול אינו נחש

Rav is of the opinion that if meat is ever left without being directly supervised by visual contact, it may not be eaten.

The Gemara tells the story of Rav who was travelling to visit his son-in-law. When he arrived at the river, the ferry boat was just arriving, which Rav understood as a good omen. He declared, "This is a good omen that today will be a day of good tidings!" When he arrived at his son-in-law's house, he was greeted by the entire household who came out to see him, including the workers who were preparing the meat. Rav kept the meat in the house in his eyesight during the entire reception, and it was therefore not prohibited to be eaten. Rav nevertheless chose not to eat from it. Why did Rav not eat from this meat?

The Gemara suggests that perhaps it was because Rav felt that he had pronounced that the fortune of the day was set by an omen, and this was a violation of the Torah's directive in Vayikra (19:26) not to pronounce or follow omens.

The Gemara rejects this suggestion, because it is Rav himself who said that establishing an omen is only prohibited when it is done as we find with Eliezer, the servant of Avraham. When Eliezer went to find a wife for Yitzchak, he announced that the woman who would offer him and his camels water would be the one who would be the wife for Yitzchak. Eliezer apparently placed his complete faith in an omen, and he allowed it to determine his fate. Rav, however, did not conduct himself in any such manner, so refusing to eat the meat must have been for a different reason. The Gemara concludes that Rav never ate meat at a meal unless it was at a seudas mitzvah, and the meal at his son-in-law's house was a casual affair.

Tosafos discusses how to understand how Eliezer, the

Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is *בשר שנתעלם מן העין*?

2. What is the status of meat found in a city inhabited by Jews and gentiles?

3. At what point is an omen considered reliable?

4. What is *טביעת עין*?

HALACHAH Highlight

Concerns about a forged kashrus seal

אית לך טביעות עינא בגויה

Do you have visual recognition of it?

The Gemara teaches that meat that was out of sight is prohibited for consumption unless it has an identifying mark, is visually recognizable or was bound and sealed. Teshuvos Chasam Sofer¹ presents a disagreement between himself and Rav Mordechai Benet whether one may rely upon a kashrus seal that is imprinted in clay. The question was where there was a concern that a gentile may have forged the seal but yet a Jew visually recognizes that it was not forged. The core of the question was whether visual recognition is strong enough to permit the meat when there is halachic basis to be concerned that the kashrus seal was forged. Rav Mordechai Benet was stringent based on the following argument. Just as when there are grounds to suspect that a gentile forged a kashrus seal when one does not visually recognize the seal, so too, one must suspect a forgery when one does visually recognize the seal. The reason is that one must be concerned that the forgery was done so well that it is visually indistinguishable from the authentic seal. Chasam Sofer disagreed and ruled that one may rely upon his visual recognition of the kashrus seal. His reasoning is that it is unlikely that there was a gentile capable of replicating the seal exactly as it was originally made. Furthermore, even if the gentile who designed the seal was drafted to make the forgery one may rely upon his visual recognition of the original seal since it is impossible to exactly replicate the same seal.

In earlier generations it was sufficient to seal meat with the

(Insight...continued from page 1)

trusted and faithful servant of Avraham Avinu, conducted himself in a questionable manner by letting an omen determine such a critical matter. The Gemara seems to say that he was in violation of the Torah's law not to rely upon omens.

Tosafos answers that according to one opinion, Eliezer was a Noachide, who was not commanded to avoid this type of conduct. And, according to the view that he was commanded to abide by it, we must say that he actually asked Rivka about her family before making any decisions. He used the sign of the water as an indication of her chessed, but he clarified the entire matter fully after that before presenting her with the jewelry.

Ra"n explains that omens are prohibited only when they are arbitrary and irrational signs of future events. Signals which are reasonable and indicative of certain tendencies may be used to determine decisions. Eliezer's observation of Rivka's chessed was a proper sign of her worthiness. ■

letter כ or נ since gentiles did not know how to form Hebrew letters². When that was no longer reliable slaughterers and butchers would sign their name on the packaging as a way of assuring that the meat was not exchanged for non-kosher meat³. Even nowadays the common custom is to rely upon the signature of the mashgiach to assure that the meat was not exchanged, although there are some Poskim who question the reliability of a mashgiach's signature since it could be easily forged.⁴ ■

1. שו"ת חתם סופר יו"ד סי' קט"ו.

2. עי' רמ"א יו"ד סי' ק"ל סעי' ח'.

3. עי' שו"ת מנחת יצחק ח"ב סי' ל"ה.

4. ספר כשרות והכשרים בהלכה סי' ב' פי"ב אות י"ג. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

A Seudas Mitzvah

ורב לא מתהניא מסעודת הרשות

On today's daf we find that Rav would only partake of a seudas mitzvah.

Rav Tzadok Hakohein of Lublin, zt"l, was exceedingly careful to always be involved in learning. To ensure that he would never go a day without learning a great deal, he would only eat if it was at a seudas mitzvah. When he was older, he once felt weak and simply could not sit down and study an entire tractate before eating something. Of course he could undo his vow, but how could he allow

himself to do so when he had kept this safeguard for so long?

When one of the people in shul realized the problem, he assuaged the elderly rav. "I am actually holding at the very end of a certain tractate. Why not let me make a siyum for you?"

Rav Tzadok agreed but before the siyum he began to speak with the young man in learning. It speedily became apparent that although he had learned the material, he did not know it well.

Rav Tzaddok thanked him again for his offer but demurred. "I have only eaten at a siyum of a tractate learned in depth..."

He found the energy in himself and quickly learned through a small tractate

and only then broke his fast.¹

Rav Shmuel Birnbaum, zt"l, the son-in-law of Rabbi Akiva Eiger, zt"l, was always learning. Like Rav Tzadok, he resolved at one point never to eat at a meal that was not a seudas mitzvah. But he wanted to ensure that he would never falter in this, no matter what. he therefore was determined to complete Maseches Beitzah every single day.

Once, when he was very busy with various needs of the community he simply did not have time to learn. Clearly, he also did not eat. This continued for the entire day. After it was already dark, he quickly learned through his chosen tractate and finally broke bread.² ■

1. מובא בקונטרס הכהן מלובלין

2. הקדמה לספר מעשה חושב על שער המלך