

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Identifying people in Tanach

A Baraisa teaches how to determine whether the ancestor's of a person mentioned in Tanach were righteous or wicked.

R' Nachman asserts that Malachai is Mordechai.

A Baraisa is cited that refutes this assertion.

Another Baraisa records a dispute whether Malachai is Ezra or Malachai is a different person.

R' Nachman cites evidence for the position that Malachai is Ezra.

### 2) Rachav

A Baraisa identifies four women of exceptional beauty, one of which was Rachav.

Another Baraisa teaches how different women, including Rachav, inspired lust.

R' Yitzchok and R' Nachman discuss the consequence of mentioning Rachav's name.

### 3) Exposition of the Megilla (cont.)

The exposition of the verses of the Megilla continues.

After citing a teaching from R' Elazar in the name of R' Chanina related to the Megilla the Gemara proceeds to cite more of his teachings.

The Gemara resumes its exposition of the Megilla.

Related to the discussion of the Megilla the Gemara mentions the incident of Pharaoh's daughter's hand stretching to reach the basket that contained Moshe.

Many opinions are recorded to explain why Esther invited Haman to her party.

The exposition of the verses of the Megilla continues. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### Attributing credit to the source of information

אמר רבי חנינא כל האומר דבר בשם אומר מביא גאולה לעולם

Rabbi Elazar in the name of Rabbi Chanina teaches that properly attributing credit to the source of any information leads to redemption for the world. Yet, this statement is found in Pirkei Avos (6:6), where the statement is cited, and its source is identified as the episode of Mordechai informing Esther about the plot of Bigsan and Seresh, and Esther conveying that information in the name of Mordechai. What, then, is the point of Rabbi Chanina teaching a lesson found in Pirkei Avos?

Maharsha writes that the sixth chapter of Avos is not part of the Mishnah, but it is rather a collection of Beraisos, as indicated by the introductory clause of that chapter: "שנו חכמים בלשון המשנה—The sages taught, using the language of the Mishnah." It could be, that Rabbi Chanina was not familiar with this Baraisa, but he arrived at this conclusion on his own. This answer, though, does not explain why Ravina and Rav Ashi, who compiled the Gemara, included this statement in the name of Rabbi Chanina, rather than relying on the Baraisa in Avos, the more genuine source, which already presented this information.

This statement of Rabbi Elazar in the name of Rabbi Chanina is part of a series of statements which he issued. Ravina and Rav Ashi included this comment to associate it with the comment which immediately follows it. "When a righteous person passes from this world, his generation has lost him, but he has not suffered a loss. It is as a pearl, lost to its owner. Wherever it is, it is still intact. It is just that its owner has lost track of it. So, too, when a righteous person passes on. His soul continues its existence, but just not here on earth." This statement is puzzling, because the soul of a righteous person can no longer grow in Torah and mitzvos once it has left this world! In what way can it be compared to a pearl which suffers no loss due to its being concealed from its owner?

The lesson is that as long as students in this world continue to study the words of their rebbe, even after he passes on, the words resonate in the spiritual realm, and the soul of the rebbe continues to rise and thrive. His Torah lessons remain relevant and current, and his death has not affected this growth. This concept parallels the idea that repeating information in someone's name is to his credit, and this is why Ravina and Rav Ashi attributed these statements to Rabbi Chanina. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is Daniel called דניאל in the Megilla?  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. How do we know that one should not treat the blessing of a simple person as unimportant?  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. What were the reasons that Esther invited Haman to the party?  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Who was unable to sleep that fateful night?  
\_\_\_\_\_

## HALACHAH Highlight

*Does a non-Jew acquire the property of his wife?*

חצי המלכות ולא כל המלכות ולא דבר שחוצך למלכות ומאי ניהו בנין בית המקדש

*Half the kingdom but not the entire kingdom; And not something that would divide the kingdom. What is that? The building of the Beis Mamikdash.*

A Jewish man married a non-Jewish woman and continued to practice Judaism. As Pesach approached he posed the following question. Is it permitted for him to give all his chometz to his wife, instead of selling it to another non-Jew or perhaps the principle, *מה שקנתה אשה קנה בעלה* - what a woman acquires her husband acquires applies and it is an ineffective method of removing chometz from his domain. Rav Yaakov Reisher<sup>1</sup>, the Shvus Yaakov, demonstrates that this principle applies to non-Jews as it does for Jews from the fact that regarding matters of illicit relations the Torah recognizes the marriage of non-Jews, thus it is logical to assume that the principle what a woman acquires her husband acquires applies as well. The more difficult question is whether the principle applies if a Jewish man is married to a non-Jewish woman.

Shvus Yaakov answers that halacha requires a person to

destroy any chometz that, according to the government, is the financial responsibility of a Jew. Consequently, the Jew in question may not give his chometz to his "wife" since legally it remains in his possession. This thought is supported by a comment of Rav Shmuel Eliezer Eidels<sup>2</sup>, the Maharsha, to our Gemara. Maharsha questions how Chazal knew that when Achashverosh limited his offer to Esther to half the kingdom he communicated that he would not permit the construction of the Beis HaMikdash. Maharsha answers that he couldn't have meant literally half the kingdom since that would be an ineffective gift since whatever she would acquire would immediately become his based on the principle, what a woman acquires becomes her husband's, therefore he must have had different intentions, i.e. the Beis HaMikdash.

Rav Sholom Mordechai Schwadron<sup>3</sup>, addressing a different question, also examined the issue of whether this principle applies for non-Jews. After citing the opinions of Shvus Yaakov and Maharsha, he wrote that according to those Poskim<sup>4</sup> who maintain that this principle is a Rabbinic enactment rather than Biblical law, it is logical to assume that it was created for Jews rather than non-Jews. ■

1. שו"ת שבות יעקב ח"א סי' כ'
2. מהרש"א לסוגייתנו ד"ה עד חצי המלכות
3. שו"ת מהרש"ם ח"ב סי' ס"ג
4. ע' נודע ביהודה תניינא יו"ד סי' קנ"ח ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

*Bringing redemption to the world*

כל האומר דבר בשם אומר מביא גאולה לעולם

We find on today's daf that one who repeats a Torah concept in the name of the one who originally said it brings redemption to the world. Once, the Nodah B'Yehudah, zt"l, and Rav Yeshaya Pik, zt"l, were discussing the Magen Avraham who says that one who does not follow this dictum actually transgresses a negative prohibition. The Magen Avraham cites the Gemara in the first chapter of Nedarim as a source.

Rav Yeshaya said, "This is not found anywhere in Nedarim. I think that the source for this is in the Yalkut

Shimoni on Mishlei 22:22: 'Don't steal from the poor man, for he is downtrodden.' In its explanation of the verse, the Medrash cites Rav Chiya, who says that anyone who repeats a Torah concept from another but presents it as his own is really stealing from the originator of the idea."

The Nodah B'Yehudah disagreed, however. "I think that the source is the Medrash Tanchuma on Parshas Bamidbar :22#...'Rabbi Tanchum HaLavlar said in the name of the elders that it is a halachah l'Moshe m'Sinai that anyone who repeats another's idea but passes it off as his own transgresses the dictum not to "steal from the poor man." On the other hand, anyone who says something in the name of the one he heard it from brings redemption to the world!"

The Chida, zt"l, would say: "Not

only may you not 'steal your friend's tallis' by saying the idea in your own name. You may not even say, 'I heard...' without naming the one who said it!"

When telling this over, Rav Shmuel Hominer, zt"l, would qualify this teaching with another related idea from the Sefer Chasidim. In it, we find that when someone hears a d'var Torah and he suspects that it might not be accepted if he repeats it in the originator's name, then the teller should withhold the name of the source. Furthermore, if one feels that citing the name of the originator will prevent the listener from accepting the idea because the listener has a bias against the originator, one should indeed say it anonymously. ■

