

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

## **Gittin Daf Vuv**

- Rav says that Bavel has the same status of EY with regard to gittin (and therefore BNBN need not be said when bringing a get from Bavel), and Shmuel says it has the status of chutz laaretz.
  - Q: Maybe we can say that the machlokes is that Rav holds like Rabbah, and since the people of Bavel are learned they have the status of EY, and Shmuel holds like Rava, and it is a concern that finding people to confirm signatures in Bavel is also a problem? A: We have said that even Rabbah agrees with the reason of Rava! Rather, all agree with Rava, and the machlokes is that Rav holds that since the great yeshivos were located in Bavel, people are always travelling there and witnesses for confirmation will be found. Shmuel says the people in yeshiva are busy learning and are therefore not available to confirm signatures.
  - Q: R' Yirmiya asked, the Mishna lists the boundaries of EY and says that anything north
    of Akko (according to R' Yehuda this includes Akko as well) is considered to be chutz
    laaretz. Now, Bavel is north of Akko, so it must be considered chutz laaretz!? A: The
    Mishna means everything besides Bavel.
  - Q: What are the borders of Bavel for this purpose? A: R' Pappa said, the same boundaries that are used to determine Bavel for purposes of yichus are used for gittin as well. R' Yosef says, although there are differing opinions for purposes of yichus, for matters of gittin all agree that the border goes until the second willow near the bridge.
- **R' Chisda** required BNBN to be said for a get brought from Aktisfon to Bei Ardishir, but not visaversa.
  - Q: Maybe the reason is because the people of Bei Ardishir were fluent in the halachos of lishma while in Aktisfon they were not? A: We have said that even Rabbah agrees with the reason of Rava! Rather, the reason is that the people of Bei Ardishir would go to the market in Aktisfon, therefore the people of Aktisfon would be familiar with their signatures. The reverse was not true, because the people of Bei Ardishir were busy in the marketplace and didn't pay attention to the signatures of the people of Aktisfon.
- Rabbah bar Avuha would require that BNBN be said when bringing a get from one side of the street to the other. R' Sheishes would require from one neighborhood to another. Rava would require it even for a get brought within a neighborhood.
  - Q: Rava's reason is for the concern of not being able to confirm signatures, and within
    one neighborhood that concern doesn't exist!? A: The area of Mechuza is different,
    because the people are always travelling, and therefore never become familiar with
    each other's signatures.
- **R' Chanin** said, that **R' Kahana** once brought a get either from Sura to Naharada'a or visa-versa and asked **Rav** if he must say BNBN, and **Rav** said that it need not be said, but if it is said it is effective.
  - Q: What does that mean "it is effective"? A: That if the husband claims that the get is passul we would not pay attention to that claim. We find in a Braisa as well that R' Yishmael suggested to a shaliach that he say BNBN even though it was not required, because even when not required, if BNBN is said it dismisses a potential claim of invalidity by the husband.
- R' Evyasar sent to R' Chisda, if a get is brought from Bavel to EY there is no need to say BNBN.
  - Q: Maybe the reason is because he holds like Rabbah, and since the people of Bavel are learned there is no reason to say BNBN? A: We have already said that Rabbah holds of Rava's reason as well! The reason why BNBN need not be said is because there is a lot

- of travel between Bavel and EY and therefore we will find witnesses to confirm the signatures.
- Q: R' Yosef asked, who says that we are to follow R' Evyasar as a reliable opinion? In fact, we find that he once wrote a pasuk without making "sirtut" even though R' Yitzchak said that one may not write more than two words without sirtut! A: Abaye said, just because someone didn't have the kabbalah of the halacha of R' Yitzchak, that does not make him any less great. It is not as if he made a mistake in logic. In fact, we are told a story where we find that Eliyahu Hanavi met and spoke to R' Evyasar and mentioned that Hashem agreed with a pshat that R' Evyasar had said. This certainly proves that he was a great man. The pshat that was discussed was regarding the story of the Pilegesh B'Giva. The question was what the pilegesh had done that caused her husband to become so angry. R' Evyasar said he found a fly in his food and R' Yonason said he found a hair.
  - R' Yehuda said, he found the fly in his food, which disgusted him, and he found a hair in her private area, which was considered to be a sakanah for him. Others said that he found both these in his food, but finding a fly can be thought of as an accident (which is why he at first did not become angry), but when he then found a hair, which is only due to carelessness, he became angry.
  - **R' Chisda** said, we learn from the story of Pilegesh B'Giva that one should not instill a lot of fear in his house, because that is what happened in that story and the result was tens of thousands of Yidden being killed.
    - R' Yehuda in the name of Rav said, one who instills excessive fear in his
      house will ultimately come to be oiver on giluy arayos, shefichas damim,
      and chilul Shabbos.
  - Rabbah bar bar Chana said, when the Rabanan said that one must ask on Erev Shabbos whether his household has taken care of maaser, the eruv, and lighting candles, it must be said calmly, so that they will listen and accept these statements. R' Ashi said, I acted this way even without learning this from Rabbah bar bar Chana, since it is logical to be done this way.
  - R' Avahu said, one may never instill excessive fear in his house because doing so caused R' Chanina ben Gamliel to be given to eat (although Hashem saved him and he did not actually eat it) a piece of "eiver min hachai".