



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

### Gittin Daf Daled

- **Q:** Our Mishna said that **R' Gamliel** says even when a get is brought from Rekem or Cheger, the shaliach must say BNBN. **R' Eliezer** said that BNBN must be said even if the get is brought from Kfar Ludim to Lud. Now, **Abaye** explained that the machlokes here is regarding cities close to EY or surrounded by EY (the city is outside EY but is surrounded by EY, because it juts into the border of EY), and **Rabbah bar bar Channa** said he saw these cities and saw that they are considerably close to EY. Now, based on this maybe we can say that the machlokes in the Mishna is as follows. The **T"K** holds that the reason for saying BNBN is because the people of chutz laaretz are not familiar with the requirement of lishma, and since the cities of chutz laaretz that are very close to the border of EY are familiar with these laws there would be no need to say BNBN when bringing from these cities. However, **R' Gamliel and R' Eliezer** hold that the reason BNBN is said is because we will not be able to find witnesses to confirm the signatures on the get. Therefore, even though the cities are very close to EY, since there is not a lot of traffic travelling between these cities and EY, BNBN must be said! **A: Rabbah and Rava** can each explain the Mishna in a way that everyone would agree with them.
  - **Rabbah** would say that all agree the reason that BNBN is said is because of unfamiliarity with the halachos of lishma. The machlokes in the Mishna is that the **T"K** holds that the cities of chutz laaretz that are close by are also familiar with these halachos, and therefore BNBN is not said when a get is brought from them. **R' Gamliel** says that only cities that are totally surrounded by EY are familiar with these halachos. **R' Eliezer** says that even a get brought from a surrounded city must say BNBN so as not to differentiate among the cities of chutz laaretz.
  - **Rava** would say that all agree that the reason that BNBN is said is because of the concern that we will not have witnesses to confirm the get. The machlokes is that the **T"K** holds that the cities very nearby EY have traffic travelling to EY and therefore we will be able to find witnesses who can confirm the get. **R' Gamliel** says that there is only such traffic from cities surrounded by EY, not from ones that are simply nearby. **R' Eliezer** says that even a get coming from a surrounded city must have BNBN said so as not to differentiate between the cities of chutz laaretz.
- **Q:** Our Mishna said that the **Chachomim** say that one bringing a get *to* EY and one bringing a get *from* EY needs to say BNBN. This would suggest that the **T"K** holds that one taking a get *from* EY need not say BNBN. Maybe we can say that the machlokes is that the **T"K** holds the reason for BNBN is like **Rabbah** said, and therefore when taking a get from EY there is no need to say BNBN, whereas the **Chachomim** hold like the reason of **Rava**, and therefore, when bringing a get from EY to chutz laaretz the same concern exists and BNBN must be said? **A: Rabbah and Rava** can each explain the Mishna in a way that everyone would agree with them.
  - **Rabbah** would say that all agree that the reason that BNBN is said is because of unfamiliarity with the halachos of lishma. The machlokes in the Mishna is whether we have to be goizer to say BNBN in a case when the get is going from EY to chutz laaretz to make sure that BNBN will always be said when the get is going from chutz laaretz to EY. The **T"K** would say that we are not goizer, and the **Chachomim** would say that we are goizer.
  - **Rava** would say that all agree that the reason that BNBN is said is because of the concern that we will not have witnesses to confirm the get. The view of the **Chachomim** is actually just a clarification of the view of the **T"K**, and is not a different view.

- **Q:** The Mishna said, if one brings a get from one province to another in chutz laaretz he must say BNB. This implies that if it is brought *within* one province in chutz laaretz, BNB need not be said. This is a proof to **Rava** and problematic for **Rabbah**!? **A:** That is the wrong inference. The inference should be that if the get is brought from one province to another in EY, BNB need not be said. Understood as such, it is a proof to **Rabbah**.
  - **Q:** The Mishna explicitly says that if one brings a get within EY, BNB need not be said, so that can't be the inference of the earlier part of the Mishna!? **A:** If we only had that part of the Mishna we would think that it is only b'dieved that BNB need not be said, but that l'chatchila it should be said. Therefore, the Mishna says it again, explicitly, to teach that it is even l'chatchila.
  - **Q: Others** made an inference from the Mishna as a question on **Rava**. They said that the inference from the Mishna is that from one province to another within EY there would be no need to say BNB. This is problematic according to **Rava** and a proof for **Rabbah**!? **A:** To that the Gemara says that the wrong inference is being made. The proper inference should be that within one province in chutz laaretz there would be no need to say BNB.
    - **Q:** The Gemara asks, does that mean that if a get is brought from one province to another in EY he would have to say BNB? If so, the Mishna should simply say "when a get is brought from one province to another he must say BNB", and not specify chutz laaretz!? **A:** When a get is brought from one province to another within EY there is no need to say BNB. The reason is that people are oleh regel, and because of that we will always be able to find people to confirm the signatures on the get.
      - **Q:** What about after the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed? **A:** Since there is a system of courts set up throughout EY, they will always be able to find people to confirm the signatures on the get.
- **Q:** The Mishna said, that **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** said, BNB must be said even when a get is brought from one place of rulership to another within the same city. **R' Yitzchak** gave an example of this and used a city in EY that was under two ruling parties. According to **Rava** this makes sense, but according to **Rabbah**, since it is within EY he should not need to say BNB!? **A:** **Rabbah** agrees with **Rava's** reason. He adds a second reason of lishma. So, although in this case the reason of lishma does not apply, since **Rava's** reason applies, **Rabbah** would agree that BNB must be said.
  - **Q:** If so, what is the actual difference between **Rabbah and Rava**? **A:** The difference would be where 2 people brought a get from chutz laaretz (according to **Rava** there is no need to say BNB and according to **Rabbah** it must be said). Another difference would be where a get is brought within one province in chutz laaretz. According to **Rava** there would be no reason to say BNB and according to **Rabbah** it would have to be said.
- **Q:** A Mishna says, if one brings a get from chutz laaretz and cannot say BNB, then if there are witnesses who can confirm the signatures on the get, that would suffice. The Gemara there explains that the Mishna is talking about a case where a shaliach took the get and then became a deaf-mute before saying BNB. Now, this Mishna fits well according to **Rava**, but is problematic according to **Rabbah** (how will confirmation of the signatures take the place of saying BNB)!? **A:** The Mishna is talking about a time after which all people were learned in the halachos of lishma.
  - **Q:** If so, even if a shaliach is able to say BNB, why does he need to do so? **A:** We make them do so as a gezeira in case people once again become unfamiliar with the halachos of lishma.
  - **Q:** Why doesn't this gezeirah apply in a case where the person is not able to say BNB? **A:** The case of a person becoming a deaf-mute after becoming a shaliach is very uncommon, and the **Rabanan** are not goizer for an uncommon case.

- **Q:** The **Rabanan** are goizer and require a woman who is a shaliach to say BNB, even though the case of a woman being a shaliach is uncommon!? **A:** They did so to make sure not to differentiate between one type of shaliach and another.
  - **Q:** If so, when the husband himself brings the get he should have to say BNB so as not to differentiate, and yet a Mishna says that he does not have to say BNB!? **A:** The whole purpose of saying BNB is to prevent the husband from coming later and claiming that the get was passul. When he himself brings the get we do not have that concern and that is why there is no need for him to say BNB.