



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

Gittin Daf Mem Aleph

- If one designated his field as an apotiki and it then flooded and became ruined, **Ami Shapir Na'eh in the name of R' Yochanan** said the creditor cannot collect from any of the other properties, and **Shmuel's father** said the creditor may collect from the other properties.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, we must say that **Ami's** statement was said regarding the type of apotiki which is designated to be the exclusive source of payment for the loan (as opposed to the type that is to serve as one possible source of payment). A Braisa says this as well.
 - A Braisa says, if a man designates a field as an apotiki for a loan or for his kesubah obligation, the loan or kesubah may be collected from other properties as well. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, a loan can be collected from other properties (and if the apotiki was sold before collection, he must collect from the other properties). The kesubah is to be collected from the apotiki field. This is because it is not common for a woman to go to Beis Din and search for methods of payment, so we understand the apotiki as being of the type which serves as the sole source of payment, and therefore even if it was sold she can take it away from the buyer.

MISHNA

- **B"H** say, if a slave is only half freed, he works for his master one day and for himself one day. **B"S** said to them, you have provided a remedy for the master (he is getting his full share of the work), but have provided no remedy for the slave, because he cannot marry a maidservant since he is partially free, and cannot marry a Jew since he is partially a slave. Is he to sit and not get married? The world was created to produce children! Rather, for the benefit of the world, we force the master to free the second half and the slave then writes a note for the value of that half. **B"H** later retracted their view and agreed with the view of **B"S**.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if a person frees half a slave, **Rebbi** says the slave is koneh what was freed, and the **Chachomim** say he is not koneh.
 - **Rabbah** said, the machlokes is regarding a case where he freed the half with a get shichrur. **Rebbi** says a pasuk makes a hekesh between redemption with money and freeing with a get shichrur, and teaches that just as money can free half the slave, a get shichrur may do the same. The **Rabanan** darshen the gezeirah shava between a slave and a woman and learn that just as a woman cannot be released from her husband halfway, the same is true for a slave from his master. However, all agree that one can redeem half a slave with money.
 - **Q:** Maybe the machlokes is whether a gezeira shava takes precedence or a hekesh takes precedence? **A:** All agree that a gezeira shava takes precedence. However, **Rebbi** says this gezeira shava can be refuted by asking that a woman is different, because she does not leave the reshus of her husband with a kinyan of money. However, a slave that does become free with a kinyan of money maybe can also become halfway free with a get shichrur as well.
 - **R' Yosef** said, that the machlokes is regarding a redemption with money. **Rebbi** says that the pasuk of "v'hafdei lo nifdasa" teaches that the slave can be partially redeemed with

money, and the **Rabanan** say that the double verbiage is just a manner of speech and therefore doesn't teach that. However, with regard to a get shichrur, all would agree that it cannot accomplish partial freedom for the slave.

- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a person frees half his slave with a get shichrur, **Rebbi** says he is koneh half of himself, and the **Chachomim** say that he does not. We see the machlokes is even regarding freedom with a get shichrur!?! **A:** **TEYUFTA** of **R' Yosef**.
 - **Q:** We see from this Braisa that they argue regarding a get shichrur, but they don't seem to argue regarding money redemption. Maybe we can say that this is a **TEYUFTA** on **R' Yosef's** other point as well? **A:** It may be that they argue regarding a shtar shichrur and regarding money. The reason the Mishna only mentions the shichrur is to show the extent of **Rebbi**, that he says even the document is effective to free half a slave. Since **Rebbi** is the "matir", it is more important to teach the extent of his view.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, "v'hafdei lo nifdasa" teaches that a slave may be partially redeemed with money. A gezeira shava from "oh chupasha lo nitan lah" to "v'kasav lah sefer krisus" teaches that a get shichrur can be used to free her totally. How do we know that a get shichrur can be used for partial redemption as well? The pasuk makes a hekesh between redemption by money and by get shichrur, and teaches that just as money can be used for partial redemption, a get shichrur can as well. Now, according to **R' Yosef** (based on the new understanding after he was refuted) this Braisa follows **Rebbi**. However, according to **Rabbah**, the beginning of the Braisa follows everybody and the end only follows **Rebbi** (without noting that the shita is changing)? **A:** **Rabbah** would say exactly that – the beginning follows everybody and the end follows **Rebbi**. **A2:** **R' Ashi** said, the entire Braisa was authored by **Rebbi**, and that is why there is no mention that there is another view.
- **Q:** Our Mishna discusses a slave that was freed halfway. According to **Rabbah** we can say that he was halfway freed using money, and the Mishna can follow the view of everybody. However, according to **R' Yosef**, we need to say that the Mishna only follows **Rebbi**, and not the **Rabanan**!?! **A:** **Ravina** said, our Mishna is discussing a slave owned by partners and one of them freed his total share. In this way the Mishna can be following everybody.