

NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by tehillimzugger - 29 Oct 2012 18:46

All this talk about names lead me to think about the halachic ramifications of say, Chuna Feitel calling himself TehillimZugger. I'm sincerely hoping this thread will schlep Dov into the Beis Medrash; Zeh hacheili, B'ezer tzuri v'goeili:

A. Say Chuna Feitel is getting divorced [gasp!], would he be required to mention the name TehillimZugger in the Rabbinic Divorce document *commonly known as Get- an acronym popular legend suggests stands for "Gittel Trayna"- a famous dear devoted- klavta, who led many a husband running for said document*, or not?

[i]Please don't comment that this particular Chuna Feitel is not engaged yet, so how can he divorce- this is a sensitive issue, we don't want to hurt Chuna Feitel's sensitive feelings...[/i]

[The Talmudic precedent for this question may be found in Tractate Gittin [Babylonian, Vilna ed.] folio 34b: "A woman named Miriam, some refer to her as Sara".]

B. Independent of above answer, in the event he is required to cite username in document, would he be required to write "T.Z." or "TZuggs" and other nicknames associated with said username, or not?

[A halachic precedent may be found (although arguably, the cases discussed are not completely similar) in Responsums: Mahara"m Schick (E.H. §163), Maharsha"m (Vol. III §187)]

I plan on returning to this thread to discuss these [and other] points, first let's hear what the oilam thinks.

P.S. Hurricane Sandy delayed me considerably in posting this post, and I'm not sure when I'll be able to continue, first, let's get Dov in here... HEH HEH [Khalled! Arois fin biss medrash, goyatz!]

=====

Re: NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by Dov - 29 Oct 2012 18:49

OK, you got me in here. I am now calling the police to take you away cuz you are obviously a danger to yourself.

Put that bottle of Double-Oaked Woodford down, lad!

=====

Re: NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by tehylimzugger - 29 Oct 2012 18:51

YIPEEEEEEEE

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED!

=====

Re: NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by mr. emunah - 30 Oct 2012 15:48

If khaleed want's to give a get how many variants could he have? Kahleed, Khalid kaleed kalid Qhallid calead, and what not.

I have a different question for you, Could Khaleed be mekadesh RS with the hanaah that he saved her from Dapper Doktor, and if he would be mekadesh her would we say she'hinhig be'minhag ramaut? and would this be oni hamehapech bicharara? 8)

=====

Re: NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by Machshovo Tova - 30 Oct 2012 16:07

Dear Mr. Munee,

To change the subject, your signature says: Poseach et Yadecha...

Isn't that a contradiction in dialect? It should either be 'Poseach es' or Poteach et'. No?

As the possuk says (Kings I 18:21):

?? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ??? ????????

MT

=====

Re: NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by tehylimzugger - 30 Oct 2012 21:40

Just saw in Targum Yonatan this week's parsha- Avraham gave Hagar a get... may be related to our thread...

=====

Re: NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by Dov - 30 Oct 2012 22:04

[Machshovo wrote on 30 Oct 2012 16:07:](#)

?? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ??? ????????

That is the addict, BTW...and lots of non-addicts, too. But that's a side point.

Posted by tehillimzugger - 31 Oct 2012 00:06

The truth is that if this man is a proponent of the "Captain Kirk" theory. And will never allow anyone from the forum into his personal life [which means he won't recover and consequentially divorce...], there is no reason for him to mention it in the divorce document.

Posted by Machshovo Tova - 31 Oct 2012 14:58

?? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ??? ??????????

4 / 8

.. and the solution to the addiction (Kings I 18:39) -

???? ?? ??? ?????? ?? ?????? ??????? ?' ??? ??????? ?' ??? ???????

Surrender to Hashem.

MT

=====
=====

Re: NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by Gevura Shebyesod - 31 Oct 2012 15:05

And our friend Edge-man would use this as a source for his minhag of "prostration" too.

=====
=====

Re: NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by mr. emunah - 31 Oct 2012 16:47

[Machshovo wrote on 30 Oct 2012 16:07:](#)

Dear Mr. Munee,

To change the subject, your signature says: Poseach et Yadecha...

Isn't that a contradiction in dialect? It should either be 'Poseach es' or Poteach et'. No?

As the possuk says (Kings I 18:21):

?? ??? ??? ?????? ?? ??? ????????

MT

Yalla Ya la Yalili, Ya la yah la la la lay li loy lay li

TANTZ TANTZ TRUCK HABIBI! 8)

=====

Re: NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by mr. emunah - 31 Oct 2012 16:49

RE: It should either be 'Poseach es' or Poteach et'. No?

Also "Poteach" reminds me of a certain creep who's running for congress...

=====

Re: NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by mr. emunah - 31 Oct 2012 16:58

On a totally unrelated note, in the Newberry Award nominated tale : But no Green Elephants! (a subtle hack on all

those SAVE THE WHALES and GREENPEACE wackos) it mentions a bottle of Woodford

rolling on the ground. no for

those who are in the know, it is physically impossible for a Woodford bottle to roll, therefore we may need to

change the girsa to "spinning on the floor", or "laying on floor" vdoik.

A quick shout to my phriend TZ, in regard to tvilat Esra, the talmud says the reason is that TalmudHachams should

not be found like Roosters (as opposed to chickens) vdoik.

=====

Re: NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by tehilimzugger - 31 Oct 2012 17:01

Mr. stop making phun of me [is that a "pun"? hee hee] and please don't hijack this thread, this is a beis medrash, a holy place- phrom now on please respond to things by quoting them

=====

Re: NAMES! NAMES! NAMES!

Posted by Gevura Shebyesod - 31 Oct 2012 17:14

[mr. wrote on 31 Oct 2012 16:58:](#)

On a totally unrelated note, in the Newberry Award nominated tale : But no Green Elephants! (a subtle hack on all

those SAVE THE WHALES and GREENPEACE wackos) it mentions a bottle of Woodford
rolling on the ground. no for

those who are in the know, it is physically impossible for a Woodford bottle to roll, therefore we
may need to

change the girsa to "spinning on the floor", or "laying on floor" vdoik.

...

Not if you have the extra-good stuph...

=====