



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Gittin Daf Lamed Daled

- Gidul bar Re'ilai sent a get to his wife. When the shaliach reached her she was weaving and told him to come back the next day to deliver the get. When the shaliach reported back to Gidul, he responded by saying "Baruch Hatov V'hameitiv". **Abaye** said, this response does not make the get batel. **Rava** said that it does. The point of machlokes is that **Abaye** holds that showing intent to void a get is not sufficient to void the get, and **Rava** says that it is.
 - **Rava** brought a proof from a story where **R' Sheishes** forced a husband to give a get. Before it was delivered, the husband told the witnesses, "**R' Sheishes** told you to let the get be void". Upon hearing what had happened, **R' Sheishes** required that another get be written. We see that intent without specific declaration is enough to void a get. **Abaye** said this is not a proof, because what happened was that the husband fully voided the get. The reason he then told it to the witnesses in this cryptic way was so that **R' Sheishes's** henchmen wouldn't come and beat him up for doing so.
 - **Abaye** brought proof from the case of where **R' Yehuda** forced a husband to write a get and the husband then voided it. This repeated a second time. When he forced it to be written a third time he told the witnesses to stuff their ears so that they cannot hear the husband's attempt to void the get again. Now, this husband was running after them trying to void the get, which shows explicit intent, and yet we see the get was not voided. **Rava** said this is no proof, because it may be that the husband was running after them to encourage them to deliver the get faster so that **R' Yehuda** would stop attacking him.
 - **Abaye** brought proof from the earlier case of the man who said a get should take effect if he does not return in 30 days, and at 30 days he was prevented from coming because the ferry didn't arrive to take him across the river. He therefore began yelling "Look! I am here" (to say that he doesn't want the get to take effect), and yet **Shmuel** said that the get does take effect even though there is clear intent on the husband's end to void the get. **Rava** said that is no proof. In that case he was not trying to void the get, he was trying to say that he fulfilled the condition in the get (by returning), but he had in fact not done so.
 - A person gave a get to his arusah and said, if we don't enter into nissuin in 30 days, the get should take effect. On the 30th day he said to the witnesses, "I am busy preparing for the wedding now" (I am doing everything possible to be ready, but it cannot be done, and the get should therefore not take effect). The Gemara says, the fact that he is an oneis doesn't help him, because we pasken that "ein oneis b'gittin". We can't say that the get is batel based on the husband's clear intent, because that is a matter of machlokes between **Abaye and Rava**. Therefore, the get will take effect.
 - A person gave a get to his arusah and said, if we don't enter into nissuin by Rosh Chodesh Adar, the get should take effect. On Rosh Chodesh Adar he said to the witnesses, "I thought I had said that we have until Rosh Chodesh Nisson, and that is why I am not ready yet". The Gemara says, the fact that he is an oneis doesn't help him, because we pasken that "ein oneis b'gittin". We can't say that the get is batel based on the husband's clear intent, because that is a matter of machlokes between **Abaye and Rava**. Therefore, the get will take effect.

- The Gemara paskens like **R' Nachman** (that a get only needed to be voided in front of 2 people), and like **R' Nachman** (that we pasken like **Rebbi** in both places mentioned where he argues with **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**), and like **Nachmeini** (which refers to **Abaye**, in the machlokes with **Rava**, above).

MISHNA

- Originally, they would write the name of the husband, the wife, and the city, as they were referred to in the place that the get was written. **R' Gamliel Hazaken** then instituted for the benefit of the world, that they write the name of the husband “and all other names he is known by”, and the same should be done for the wife.

GEMARA

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the people of chutz laaretz sent to **R' Gamliel**, the people who come from EY and are known here by different names, how can they divorce their wives (since people will not recognize their names as written in the get)? **R' Gamliel** thereby instituted that the names and all secondary names of the husband and wife must be written in the get, for the benefit of the world.
 - **R' Ashi** said, this is only if at the time and place of the writing it is known that the husband or wife goes by more than one name. **R' Abba** said that **R' Mari and R' Elazar** hold like that as well.
 - A Braisa can be brought as a proof as well. The Braisa first says that all names of the husband must be used and then says that any one name can be used. It must be that the first part of the Braisa is discussing where he was known to go by more than one name, and the second part of the Braisa is discussing where he was only known to have one name (even if he in fact was known by more than one name).
 - There was a woman who was referred to by most people as Miriam, and by some people as Sarah. The **Rabanan** said that her get must list Miriam first, since that is her primary name, and then should list her other names afterwards.

MISHNA

- Originally, a widow was only allowed to collect her kesubah from the inherited assets of the orphans if she first swore that she had not yet been paid her kesubah. Eventually, the Beis Din stopped allowing the widows to swear (making it impossible to collect her kesubah). **R' Gamliel Hazaken** then enacted that the widow should take on a neder prohibiting herself in anything that the orphans want her to be prohibited in, if she had already accepted payment, and after making that neder she can collect her kesubah. There was also an enactment (by **R' Gamliel** – Rashi) that witnesses must sign a get (and we should not rely on the eidei mesirah). Both these were enacted for the benefit of the world. Also, **Hillel** enacted pruzbul for the benefit of the world.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is the Mishna singling out a widow, that she must swear to collect from the orphans? Any creditor that wants to collect from orphans must swear before collecting!? **A:** The chiddush is that even a widow has to swear, and we don't say that the **Rabanan** allowed her to collect without swearing so that the prospect of marriage remain attractive for women.