

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
לעילוי נשמת צבי בן יחזקאל יוסף גרין, מחסידי דעעש  
From the Grin family, Sao Paulo, Brazil

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Tzara'as during a period of nezirus (cont.)

Rami bar Chama concludes his successful challenge to R' Chisda's view that it is only in reference to a short nezirus that the Mishnah rules that tzara'as days are not credited towards the nezirus, but if one observes a long nezirus term the tzara'as days do count towards the nezirus term.

R' Ashi presents another successful challenge to R' Chisda's view from a Baraisa that discusses whether the time one is a metzora, a zav or a zavah count towards the nazir's period of nezirus.

2) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents a dispute related to the type of tumah that carries liability for entering the Beis Hamikdash.

### 3) Tracing the source of the Mishnah's ruling

The Mishnah gives the impression that R' Eliezer heard this halacha from R' Yehoshua ben Chananyah when a Baraisa indicates that he heard the halacha from R' Yehoshua bar Mamal.

The Gemara accepts that R' Eliezer heard this halacha from R' Yehoshua bar Mamal and formulates from this a principle that when attributing a halacha from many teachers it is only necessary to mention the first and last sources.

R' Nachman bar Yitzchok cites an example of this principle.

4) **MISHNAH:** R' Akiva argues to R' Eliezer that a quarter-log of blood from a corpse should require a nazir to shave his head. R' Eliezer rejects this assertion and went to R' Yehoshua for approval for his position. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
By Mr. and Mrs. Jonah Bruck  
In loving memory of their grandfather  
ר' שלום בן ר' שמעון, ע"ה  
Mr. Samuel Bruck o.b.m.

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
By Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Rubín  
in loving memory of our father  
ר' לייזר בן ר' אבא לייב, ע"ה

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
לעיני ר' מיכאל בן ר' שלמה יהודה Breiner ז"ל,  
Sponsored by his children

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *Giving credit where credit is due*

שמע מינה כל שמעתתא דמתאמרה בבי תלתא קדמאי ובתראי אמרינן,  
מציעאי לא אמרינן

The Mishnah quotes a halacha in the name of Rabbi Eliezer who heard it from Rabbi Yehoshua. The halacha is that any tumah from a corpse for which a nazir must shave his head, is a level of tumah for which a person would be liable on its account if he entered the Beis Hamikdash. Any tumah, however, for which a nazir need not shave his head is a level of tumah for which a person would not be liable on its account if he entered the Beis Hamikdash.

The Gemara cites a Baraisa in which we find a discussion between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Meir regarding the halacha of the Mishnah, and in the Baraisa it is evident that Rabbi Eliezer heard this halacha from Rabbi Yehoshua bar Mamal, and not from Rabbi Yehoshua [ben Chananya] as reported in our Mishnah. In order to resolve this inconsistency, the Gemara presents an answer, and it then makes a general observation. It must be that Rabbi Eliezer actually heard this lesson from Rabbi Yehoshua bar Mamal, but Rabbi Yehoshua bar Mamal had heard it from Rabbi Yehoshua ben Chananya. Thus, the information was accurately attributed in the Mishnah to its original source, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Chananya. The observation is that when quoting a source of information, and the tradition dates back to several names over generations, it is appropriate to cite the first source and the most recent source, but the intermediate people along the line of tradition need not be identified. This explains why, in the Mishnah, Rabbi Eliezer did not mention Rabbi Yehoshua bar Mamal, who was an intermediate source between Rabbi Yehoshua ben Chananya and himself.

Regarding this rule, Yad Malachi (#339) notes that it is important that we attribute credit to the correct sources, as the rule is that by attributing credit to the proper source, we merit to bring redemption to the world (see Megilla 15a). The Chid"א points out that if at all possible, full credit to all sources is best, but if this is not possible, then it is adequate to note the most recent and the original sources of the information.

סדרי טהרות (to Oholos, #239) notes that it is actually sufficient to give credit to even one source, whether it be the original source or the most recent one. Our Gemara was concerned that as long as two sources are being cited, perhaps it would be necessary to then cite all sources, even the intermediate ones, for otherwise it might seem as a misrepresentation of the truth. The Gemara answers that it is nevertheless adequate to cite the most recent and the original sources to a statement. ■

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Giving a child two names

מצאתי את ר' יהושע בן פתר ראש

I found R' Yehoshua ben Peser Rosh

Chasam Sofer<sup>1</sup> notes that it was a recent innovation to give more than one name to a child. Historically, people were given one name and even Yaakov Avinu who had two names is never referred to by both names together. In all of Tanach, Shas and the writings of the medieval Poskim we rarely find people who had two names. Noda B'Yehuda<sup>2</sup>, in response to an inquiry by Rav Yishaya Pik, also wrote that early generations did not give their children two names. Rav Yishaya Pik asserted that R' Elazar Hakalir had more than one name since he included in his signature the name בריבי. Noda B'Yehudah rejected the proof and declared that he does not recall any place in Shas that a Tanna or Amora have two first names. The only names that come close are Abba Shaul and Abba Yosi but the name "Abba" is a title of distinction rather than a name. Similarly, the term בריבי is not a name but rather a title of distinction.

Teshuvos Afraksta D'anya<sup>3</sup> questioned the assertions made by Chasam Sofer and Noda B'Yehudah that we do not find Tannaim or Amoraim with two names from our Gemara. The Gemara mentions the name of R' Yehoshua ben Pasar Rosh and Tosafos<sup>4</sup> explains that Pasar Rosh was the name of his father. This would then be an example of someone in the period of the Tannaim who had two names. The Klausenberger Rebbe<sup>5</sup>, author of Teshuvos Divrei Yatziv, rejects this proof. Per-

# REVIEW and Remember

1. How does the Gemara attempt to prove that the days one has tzara'as do not count toward his nezirus?
2. What is the source that tzara'as days do not count towards one's nezirus count?
3. What is the dispute regarding the type of tumah that makes one liable for entering the Beis HaMikdash?
4. Is it necessary to cite the name of all the authorities who cite a halachic ruling?

haps the name Pasar is not a name that stands by itself nor is the name Rosh a name that stands by itself and it is only when combined that they constitute a single name. The Tosefta<sup>6</sup>, in fact, combines the two names into one and refers to him as פתירוש. Furthermore, the name that is recorded in the commentary of Rosh is "פתר הראש" which would indicate that the ראש is not part of his name; rather it is a reference to the place where he comes from, similar to R' Eliezer Hakalir, where Hakalir is not his name but a reference to his place of origin. ■

1. שו"ת חת"ס אה"ע ח"יב סי' י"ח.
2. שו"ת נודע ביהודה מהדו"ת אר"ח סי' קי"ג.
3. שו"ת אפרקסתא דעניא ח"ד סי' שע"א.
4. תוס' ד"ה דתניא.
5. שו"ת דברי יציב אה"ע סי' ק'.
6. תוספתא אהלות פ"ד ה"ז. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Giving credit where it is due

"כל שמעתתא דאמרה בבי תלתא..."

The Baraisa in Kinyan Torah (6:6), "Whoever recounts a Torah concept in the name of its originator brings redemption to the world," is well known. What are less known are the guidelines that are provided on today's daf. If there is a string of commentators, one needs only to provide the first and last references.

Someone once asked the Brisker Rav, zt"l, if it is an actual halachic prohibition to relate another's Torah thought without mentioning the name of the source.

"No, this is only a midas chassidus," was his somewhat surprising answer.

"But the Midrash Tanchumah in Bemidbar compares this to one who actually steals!"

"Correct," replied the Rav. "But that is only discussing one who relates the Torah of another as if it is his own. If one says, 'I heard such-and-such,' he has not transgressed the prohibition of stealing. He has merely failed to live up to a midas chassidus."

Rav Isser Zalman Meltzer, zt"l, in his seminal work "Even Haezel" wrote: "The Kesef Mishnah writes in the name of Tosafos..."

His son, Rav Tzvi Yehudah Meltzer, zt"l, asked him about this. "Why bring in the Kesef Mishnah at all? You don't relate to anything he says, just the Tosafos he brings. Why not just write 'Tosafos says...'"

Rav Isser Zalman answered, "I cited

the Kesef Mishnah because I felt gratitude for his work. When I was writing this piece, I had forgotten that Tosafos discusses this. Since I was reminded by seeing the Kesef Mishnah, I specifically quoted it in his name."

Someone asked Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach, zt"l, if it was true what people said, that he ruled a certain way about a particular halachah.

"I heard they say so, but it is baseless since I never said that," was his surprising answer.

"But why don't you publicize that this is a mistake?" the man asked.

Rav Shlomo Zalman's memorable reply was, "My door is open if people wish to ask. Why is it my job to correct every ruling people mistakenly say in my name?"

■

