**Geneivas Daas: When is it considered deception?**

*The Rutgers Jewish Experience recently started using a database that allows the mass emails to look personal. So instead of “Hi Jewish Student,” their emails now say “Hi Jeff”. It gives it a more professional and personal touch.*

*They used it to promote their first event on Business Ethics, and sent out an email blast using the new system. At the event, a student approached me and said “Hi Rabbi Lewis, thank you so much for inviting me, how did you know I switched into the business school!”*

Question 1: Is using personalized emails unethical or deceptive?

Question 2: How should Rabbi Lewis respond to the student?

<http://halakhah.com/pdf/kodoshim/Chullin.pdf>

**Chullin 93b**

MISHNAH. ONE MAY SEND TO A GENTILE A THIGH IN WHICH THERE IS YET THE

SCIATIC NERVE, BECAUSE ITS PLACE IS KNOWN.

GEMARA. Only a whole thigh one may [send], but not if it was cut up. [WHY?]…

**94a**

….. Alternatively, I can say, [it is forbidden] because he thereby deceives him, and Samuel holds that it is forbidden to deceive people, even gentiles.

*[Rashi: The gentile thinks the Jew likes him a lot, so much that he took the trouble to remove the gid until it was fit for himself, and then gave it to his friend. But in reality, he did not remove the gid, and the gentile will in error regard the Jew as a closer friend]*

 This view of Samuel was not expressly stated but was inferred from the following incident. Samuel was once crossing on a ferryboat and he said to his attendant, ‘Reward the ferryman’. He rewarded him, but [Samuel] became angry. Why was he angry? — Abaye said: Because he [the attendant] had a trefah hen and he gave it to the ferryman representing it as one that was ritually slaughtered. Raba said: Because he [Samuel] told him to give him [the gentile] anpaka to drink, and he gave him mixed wine to drink.

 *And what if it was only inferred? — Because according to him who says that he gave him a trefah hen, it can be said [that Samuel was angry with his attendant] for keeping with him [a forbidden thing]. And according to him who says that he told him to give him anpaka, it can be said [that Samuel was angry] because anpaka really means unmixed wine.*

 It was taught: R. 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. 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, unless he informs [the guest] of it. And he should not invite him to anoint himself with oil if the jar is empty. If, however, the purpose is to show the guest great respect, it is permitted. But surely this cannot be right. For Ulla once came to Rab Judah's house and the latter opened up for him casks that were later to be sold by the shopkeeper! — 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 Rab Judah that he would have opened for him even those that were not [to be sold by the shopkeeper].

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

 Our Rabbis taught: A man should not sell to his neighbour 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.

*[Rashi: Perhaps it died as a result of a snake bite, and the poison is absorbed in the leather]*

**94b**

 What is the form of the proclamation? — R. Isaac b. Joseph said: ‘Meat has fallen into our hands for the army’. And why not proclaim, ‘Trefah meat has fallen into our hands for the army’? — They would not then buy it. Are we then not then deceiving them? — No. They are deceiving themselves, as in the following incident.

 Mar Zutra the son of R. Nahman was once going from Sikara to Mahuza, while Raba and R. Safra were going to Sikara; and they met on the way. Believing that they had come to meet him Mar Zutra said: ‘Why did the Rabbis take this trouble to come so far [to meet me]?’ R. 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’. Raba said to him, ‘Why did you tell him this; you have now upset him’? He replied: ‘But we would be deceiving him otherwise’. ‘No’ said Raba, ‘he would be deceiving himself’.

**Rashi:** They are deceiving themselves- *by not inquiring whether it was kosher or not. And that which we learned previously [94a] that [sending the cut up thigh] was deception was because there was an assumption that it was kosher, and similarly the case of the barrels of wine is when he says “I am opening them for you”, where he is surely deceiving him.*

**Tosfos** SV Inhu: …..it therefore seems that the earlier case was even where it was unspecified, but it is nevertheless forbidden because the guest can not assume that the barrels are going to be sold to the shopkeeper. However here they should know that the meat may be not kosher, and similarly Mar Zutra should have realized that they might be travelling for their own purposes.

**Tosfos** SV Veha: …. This is not at all comparable[ to the case of Ullah who was beloved to Rav Yehudah] because even though he sustained no loss bc the barrels were going to be sold anyway, he nevertheless did open them for Ullah, and since he would have opened them even had he not planned on selling them to the shopkeeper, he has no obligation to tell him. Here, however, they were not travelling to greet him.