

26.1.11

13b (משנה ה') → 14b (וקא מחוץ לך) (משנה ה')

- I Items which may not be sold to pagans as they will likely be used for ע"ז (as per עוור)
- a Fruit: אצרובצלין (cedar cones), בנות שוח (white figs) which have their stems attached
  - b Spices: frankincense
    - i Note: he may sell any of these in bunches of 3 מנה or more (approx. 3 lbs.)
    - ii Challenge: why aren't we concerned that he may then resell to other pagans for worship?
    - iii Answer: we aren't commanded on עוור לפני beyond direct enabling
  - c Animals: white roosters
    - i ד' יהודה he may sell a white rooster among a group of other roosters
    - ii And: he may sell a white rooster by itself, as long as he cuts off a finger (they won't offer אבר מחוסר to ע"ז)
  - d Anything else: may be sold if unspecified (for use); if he explicates that the use is ע"ז – prohibited
    - i ד' מ"מ added "a good date tree"
      - 1 Challenge: we aren't allowed to sell them anything which is attached to the ground (per תחנם)
        - (a) Answer: it means the fruit of a good date tree
        - (b) Tangential statement: ר' חסדא bemoaned the fact that we only have 5 chapters of ע"ז (in comparison with the hundreds in א"א's time) yet we don't properly understand them – using דקל טוב as an example
      - 2 He also added: חצב (squill)
      - 3 And: נקלס
        - (a) Note: the גמרא cannot identify נקלס, but gives it an alternate, equally obscure name
        - (i) Import: that if that other name (קורייטי) is ever identified, we will then know what נקלס is
- II ר' זבד (or ר' זירא)'s ruling re: the white rooster
- a If: the pagan requests "a rooster" – permitted to sell him a white rooster
    - i But if: he requests "a white rooster" – prohibited
    - ii Challenge: ר' יהודה's opinion in משנה – must be a case where the pagan requested "a rooster"
      - 1 Argument: cannot be a case where he explicitly asked for "a white rooster"
      - 2 And: ת"ק holds that even if he asks for "a rooster", may not sell - even among others
    - iii Answer (רנב"י): משנה is case where the pagan mentions a few colors (dispute חכמים)
      - 1 But: when he just asks for "this one and that one" - permitted
      - 2 Support: ברייתא – ר' יהודה only forbids if he explicitly asks for "this white rooster"
        - (a) And even: if he said "this white rooster" but he was making a party or had a חולה in his home – מותר
          - (i) Challenge: ruling (above) that if he is making a party for his son ('s wedding) - the ban only extends to doing business with him and on the day of the party → that is prohibited
          - (ii) Answer: the party intended here is a simple gathering, not a wedding feast
  - iv Challenge (to ר' זבד's ruling): end of משנה - all other items, by default are מותר, if explicit – אסור
    - 1 Meaning: סתם/מפורש cannot mean "white wheat"/"white wheat for ע"ז" – as both rulings are obvious
    - 2 Must mean: סתם – asked for "wheat"; מפורש – asked for "white wheat" → a "rooster", even סתם – prohibited
      - (a) Defense: original understanding correct; סד"א when he said לע"ז, he assumed that everyone feels ardor like him and he would get the ישראל to sell him the wheat if he said it was for ע"ז – קמ"ל (he means it)
  - b ר' אשי's questions:
    - i If: he asked for a white rooster and was given one with a missing finger and he took it
      - 1 Is it: permissible to sell him a proper white one, assuming that he isn't using for ע"ז
        - (a) Or: are we concerned that he is trying to deceptively purchase for ע"ז
        - (b) If: we answer in the affirmative
          - (i) What if: he asked for a white one but, when offered a black and a red one, he bought them
          - (ii) May we: sell him a white one, or must we be concerned that he is being deceptive? תיקו