



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

Gittin Daf Mem Beis

- **Rabbah** said, the machlokes between **Rebbi and the Rabanan** (whether a person can free half his slave) is only when he frees half his slave and leaves the other half in his possession. However, if he freed half the slave and sold the other half or gave the other half as a gift, since the entire slave is leaving his possession, all would agree that the slave is koneh half of himself.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, there is one Braisa that says, if a person gives all his possessions to two of his slaves, they each are koneh half the possessions and they free each other. There is a second Braisa that says, if a person says “all my possessions should go to my two slaves”, they are not even koneh themselves. Presumably we would say that the first Braisa follows **Rebbi** and the second Braisa follows the **Rabanan**, and we see that they argue even when the owner totally divests himself of the slave!? **A:** We can say that both Braisos follow the **Rabanan**. The first Braisa is discussing where he told each slave “all my possessions are given to you”, whereas in the second Braisa he said to each of them “half my possessions should be given to you”, and we assume he meant to give the same half to both of them, and because he is retaining half, they are not koneh themselves.
 - **Q:** The end of the second Braisa explicitly says, if the person says to each of the slaves “half my possessions are given to you”, they are not koneh. Obviously, the earlier part is not talking about that case!? **A:** The end of the Braisa is explaining that this is the case in the earlier part of the Braisa. This must be the understanding, because if the earlier part of the Braisa discusses where he gave each of them all of his possessions, there would be no reason to state the case of where he gives only half his possessions.
 - The Gemara says, this reason is no proof as to the intent of the Braisa. It may be that the Braisa has to say the case of half his possessions just so that it becomes clear that the earlier part of the Braisa is discussing where he gives all of his possessions.
 - **A:** We can say that the second Braisa is discussing where it was given in one document to both slaves, and such a document can't work to free them, just as one get can't work to divorce two women. The first Braisa is discussing where it was given to them in two separate documents. However, both Braisos can hold that freeing half a slave is effective if the owner is divesting himself of the entire slave.
 - **Q:** If the second Braisa is discussing where it was given in one document, why does it give the case of where he gave half his possessions to each slave? Even if he gave all his possessions to both slaves it would be ineffective, because it was given in one document!? **A:** The Braisa is saying that when it is in one document, even if he gives all his possessions to each of them, they will not be koneh. The Braisa then adds, that even if it was given in two documents, if he only gave half to each, they would still not be koneh.
 - **A:** We can say that both Braisos discuss where two documents were given, but in the first Braisa they were given simultaneously (and is therefore effective) and in the second Braisa they were given one after the other.

they grow up they each free the other one. In this Mishna, the slave (whichever one he is) is awaiting his get shichrur, and we see that he may eat terumah.

- The Gemara says this is no proof. In this case, if Eliyahu would come he could tell us which child is the Kohen and which is the slave, and the slave is therefore clearly “kinyan kaspō” at this point. With regard to a slave that is awaiting his get shichrur, because his monetary ownership was already removed, it may be that he is no longer called “kinyan kaspō” and may therefore not eat terumah.