



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

Gittin Daf Samach Vuv

MISHNA

- If a person was thrown into a pit and he said "whoever hears me should write a get for my wife", those who hear his voice should write and give a get to his wife.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why are we not concerned that it was a "sheid" (demon) who yelled it out? **A: R' Yehuda** said, they saw a human form who was calling it out.
 - **Q:** Demons can take the form of humans as well!? **A:** They saw that the form had a shadow (which a demon does not have).
 - **Q:** Demons also have shadows!? **A:** He saw a shadow of the shadow, which is something a demon does not have.
- **Q:** Why are we not concerned that it was the co-wife who announced that, just to cause problems!? **A: R' Yishmael** taught a Braisa that in times of danger (like this man in the pit) we are meikel to have the get written and given even though we are less than sure, because this may be the only opportunity for this woman to get divorced.

MISHNA

- If a healthy person says "write a get for my wife", he is doing so only to taunt his wife (since he did not instruct to have it delivered).
 - It once happened that a healthy person said "write a get for my wife" and after the get was delivered he went to the roof, fell off and died. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** said, if he "fell off" because he committed suicide, then the get is valid. If the wind blew him off, the get is not valid.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna says that if a healthy person doesn't say "give it" the get is passul. Then the Mishna brings a story where it says it is valid!? **A:** The Mishna is missing words and should say, if the husband's intentions later become clear, the get will be valid, as can be seen from the story...
- **Q:** A person went into a shul and found a teacher there with his son and a third person. The person told these 3 people, "Two of you write a get for my wife". The teacher then died before the get was given over. Do we say that a person has in mind to even appoint the son as a shaliach even though the father is there, and therefore, since the father is no longer around, the son and the third person should act as the shluchim, or do we say that he only had in mind that the father and the third person should be the shluchim, and now that the father is no longer around, there are no longer two shluchim available? **A: R' Nachman** said, a person would not appoint a son when the father is there, and **R' Pappi** said, a person would do so.
 - **Rava** paskened like **R' Pappi**.

MISHNA

- If a man tells two people "give a get to my wife", or if he tells three people "write a get and give it to my wife", these people must write a get and give it to his wife. If he told three people "give a get to my wife", they may have others write a get and deliver it, because they were appointed as a Beis Din to get this process done. This is what **R' Meir** said, and is a halacha that was said by **R' Chanina of Ono** after he learned it in prison (from **R' Akiva**). **R' Yose** said, we told **R' Chanina**, we have a kabbalah that even if a person told the Great Sanhedrin in Yerushalayim "give a get to

my wife”, they must learn how to write, write the get, and then deliver it (and they can’t have other people write it for them).

- If a man tells 10 people “write a get and give it to my wife”, one of them must write it, and two of them must sign it. However, if he said “all of you write”, then one must write it and all 10 must sign the get. Therefore, if one of them died, the get becomes batul.

GEMARA

- **R’ Yirmiya bar Abba** said, the yeshiva of **Rav** sent to **Shmuel**, if a man tells 2 people to write and deliver a get, and these 2 people then have a sofer write the get, but they sign the get and deliver it, is the get valid or must they actually write the get as well? **Shmuel** answered, this woman would have to leave her husband, but this question requires further thought.
 - **Q:** What is meant that the matter requires further thought? If you say it is because the husband’s instruction is mere words, and **Shmuel** was uncertain whether words can be transferred to another, that can’t be, because **Shmuel in the name of Rabbi** paskens like **R’ Yose** who says that words cannot be transferred!? **A:** Rather, **Shmuel** was uncertain whether the instruction of “write a get” means that they should sign it, or that they must actually write it.
 - **Q:** We can answer from our Mishna, which says that the instruction to write a get means they themselves must write it!? **A:** He is equally as uncertain regarding the Mishna, whether it means that they must sign the get or actually write the get.
 - **Q:** It is clear that the Mishna must mean they write the actual get, because the Mishna said that **R’ Yose** said even the Great Sanhedrin must learn to write if they are appointed. Now, clearly the members of the Sanhedrin knew how to sign their names, so when it says they must learn, it has to be referring to the actual get!? **A:** It may be that there are newly appointed judges who don’t know how to sign their name, and that may be what is referred to in the Mishna.
 - **Q:** If “write the get” means to sign the get, which means that they may ask someone else to write the get, this is problematic, because we said before that **Shmuel** paskens that words may not be transferred, so how can they ask someone else to write the get!? **A:** If you say that “write the get” refers to signing the get, then it is as if the husband specifically told them to find someone to actually write the get, and in that case even **Shmuel and R’ Yose** would say it may be done.
 - **Q:** How can we say that **R’ Yose** would agree in this case that they may have someone else write the get? A Mishna says, if a sofer wrote the get and a witness signed, it is valid. **R’ Yirmiya** explained, this means that if the sofer wrote and signed and another witness signed, the get is valid. **R’ Chisda** said, this Mishna must follow **R’ Yose** who says that words cannot be transferred to a shaliach (and the husband must have directly asked the sofer to write the get, because if he asked others who may then appoint the sofer, they will ultimately allow the sofer to sign so as not to embarrass him, and since the husband never asked him to sign, the get would be passul. Therefore, to prevent this from happening, the **Rabanan** would have to institute that a sofer may not be a signor on the get. Since that was not instituted, it must be that we are not concerned for this situation, because a sofer cannot write the get without being specifically told by the husband to do so). If **R’ Yose** agrees in a case where the husband tells them that they can appoint a sofer, this concern would still be a concern. From the fact that it is not a concern, it must be that **R’ Yose** does not allow the witnesses to appoint a sofer even if the husband told them that they may!? **A:** Since we have learned that although if the husband gives such an instruction the get is valid, still such a thing should not be done, this situation will be very uncommon, and that is why the **Rabanan** did not have to be goizer for this case.
 - **Q:** That is an answer if you hold that this type of instruction is not supposed to be done. However, if you hold that it may be done, how

will we address this concern? **A: R' Yose** really holds that the witnesses may never appoint someone else to write the get, whether they were not given explicit permission to do so, or even if they were. **Shmuel** agrees with **R' Yose** only in the case where the husband did not give them permission to do so, but argues in the case where the husband did give permission.