



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Gittin, Daf ౧ – Daf ౧౦

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf ౧--60-----

- The people of the Galil asked **R' Chelbo**, may we use a “chumash” (one of the 5 sefarim of a Sefer Torah, written as would a Sefer Torah, on parchment, etc.) to read for the tzibbur? He was unsure of the answer. They then asked **R' Yitzchak Nafcha**, and he too was unsure. They then asked in the Beis Medrash and they answered based on the statement of **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yochanan** who said that if even one section of a Sefer Torah is missing, it may not be used for reading for the tzibbur.
 - The Gemara says this is not a good comparison, because the chumash is not missing anything that was intended to be written, so it may be different. Still, **Rabbah and R' Yosef** both said that a chumash may not be used to read for the tzibbur out of respect for the tzibbur.
 - **Rabbah and R' Yosef** said, if a sefer is written only containing the portions of the nevi'im needed for the haftorah readings, it may not be used for reading for the tzibbur, because one is not supposed to write less than entire books of Tanach.
 - **Mar bar R' Ashi** said it is even assur to handle such sefarim on Shabbos, since it is assur to use to read (and is therefore muktzeh).
 - However, the Gemara says that both these rulings are incorrect, for we find that **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** would read from books of aggadah (which is Torah shebaal peh and may not be written) on Shabbos. The reason is, that we say, that since we had no choice but to write these books to prevent these teaching from being forgotten, we say that **Rabanan** allowed them to be written under the premise of “eis laasos La'Shem”, and therefore it is not muktzeh either. The same can be said regarding the sefer of only the haftorah portions. Since many communities could not have all the Sifrei Nevi'im, the **Rabanan** allowed the haftorah portions to be written in a Sefer and used to be read from for the tzibbur.
- **Q: Abaye** asked **Rabbah**, may a sefer containing only a small portion of the Torah be written for the sake of teaching a child or not? This is a question if you hold that the Torah was given in pieces, because we can say that since it was given in pieces it may be written in pieces, or we can say that since it was eventually put together it may no longer be written in pieces. It is also a question if you hold that the entire Torah was given at once, because maybe we say since it was given whole, it may not be written in part, or maybe we say that since there is no choice but to write small portions for a child, we may do so. **A: Rabbah** answered, we may not write such a sefer, because a Torah may not be written in less than its full form.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that the parshas sotah was written alone on a golden tablet!? **A: Reish Lakish in the name of R' Yannai** said, it was written in abbreviated form, which is allowed.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the Kohen would look at the tablet and write the parsha. This suggests that it was written out in full form!? **A:** It means he wrote it “like” it was written, but different, because on the tablet it was abbreviated, and the Kohen wrote it out in full form.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says the Kohen would write as stated on the tablet the words “Ihm shachav...” and “Ihm lo shachav...”? **A:** The beginning of each pasuk was written out, but the remainder of each pasuk was written in abbreviated form, and that is why it was allowed.
 - We see from a Braisa that it is actually a machlokes among Tanna'im. The **T"K** says that an incomplete sefer may be used only if the intention is to eventually complete the sefer, and **R' Yehuda** says it is mutar as long as an entire topic is written in the sefer.
- **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Bena'ah** said that the Torah was given down in pieces (in separate topics, and was later combined into one), as we see that Dovid referred to the Torah as “megillas sefer” (which suggests it was in smaller pieces). **Reish Lakish** said, the Torah was given complete, as the pasuk says “lakoach es Sefer HaTorah hazeh”.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yochanan** says the other pasuk is referring to after the Torah was combined into one. **Reish Lakish** will say that “megilla” can refer to the complete Torah as well, as we see in other pesukim. He can also say like **R' Levi**, who said that there were 8 parshiyos that were needed to be taught on the day that the Mishkan was put up for the first time. These parshiyos are from various places in the Torah, so for that day they were clearly written on separate, smaller portions. It may be the reason why the entire Torah is referred to as a megilla.
- **R' Elazar** said, the halachos of the Torah are mostly in the Written Torah, and a minority are in the Oral Torah, as a pasuk suggests this as well. **R' Yochanan** said, most are in the Oral Torah and a minority are in the Written Torah, as is suggested by another pasuk.
- **R' Yehuda bar Nachmeini**, the Meturgaman of **Reish Lakish** darshened, one pasuk says “ksav lecha es hadevarim ha'eileh” and another pasuk says “ki ahl pi hadevarim ha'eileh”. This teaches that the Written Torah may not be taught orally, and the Oral Torah may not be written.
 - **R' Yishmael** taught a Braisa, that the word “eileh” teaches that only “these words”, of the Written Torah, may be written, but the Oral Torah may not be written.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, the pasuk teaches that a special bris was made between Hashem and the Yidden only because of the Oral Torah – the pasuk says “ki ahl pi hadevarim ha'eileh karati itcha bris v'es Yisrael”.

ME'ARVIN B'BAYIS YASHAN MIPNEI DARKEI SHALOM

- **Q:** Why must it be kept in the same place? It can't be for the honor of the owner of the house, because we find that a community owned shofar was moved from **R' Yehuda to Rabbah to R' Yosef to Abaye** and finally to **Rava**, and we were not concerned for their honor!?! **A:** An eiruv should be kept in the same place because if it is moved, when people go into that house and don't see the eiruv they will think that there is no longer an eiruv and that people are carrying against halacha.

BOR SHEHU KAROV L'AMAH...

- We have learned that farmers that have fields along a river, **Rav** says the downstream fields are to be watered first and **Shmuel** says the upstream fields are to be watered first.
 - If the water is strong enough to water all the fields all would agree that everyone may take water. The machlokes is where there is not enough water and the water must therefore be diverted. **Shmuel** says the upper people are closer to the water and therefore have first right. **Rav** says the lower people have first rights to the water, because they use it without having to divert it from anyone else.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says that the closer water hole has rights to the water first!?! **A:** **Shmuel** said that **Rav** would say that case of the Mishna is where the owner of the bor does not need to divert the water in order for it to fill the bor. The chiddush is that we would think that we tell the owner to plug up his bor so that it not fill with water. The Mishna teaches that he need not do so as long as he is not diverting the water.
 - **R' Huna bar Tachlifa** said, since we don't know who to pasken like, the halacha will be that the stronger party wins.
 - **R' Simi bar Ashi** went to **Abaye** and asked him to learn with him. **Abaye** said I need the day to learn on my own. He asked **Abaye** to learn with him at night, and **Abaye** said I have to water my fields at night. **R' Simi bar Ashi** told him, I will water your fields by day and we can learn at night. **Abaye** agreed. **R' Simi bar Ashi** went to owners of the field more upstream from **Abaye** and told them that the downstream people have rights to the water first. He then told the people more downstream from him that the upstream people get the water first. He then went and diverted the water to **Abaye's** fields, making the watering an easy job. When **Abaye** heard what he did, he refused to eat from the produce of that year.
 - People near the Shanvasa River diverted water into a semicircle that watered their fields and then poured back into the river. The people upstream from this diversion said that the diversion is causing the river to overflow upstream. **Abaye** told the people who made the diversion, you must dig it deeper to prevent the river from overflowing. The people said, if we do so it will cause the irrigation channel to dry up! **Abaye** said, if so then close the whole diversion, because you have no right to cause damage to the upper fields.

METZUDOS CHAYA V'OFOS V'DAGIM YEISH BAHEN...

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If the trap has a receptacle to it, all would agree that taking from it is true theft. The machlokes is where a string or a hook is used, and there is no receptacle. That is where there is a machlokes.

METZIYAS CHEIREISH SHOTEH...

- **R' Chisda** said, **R' Yose** means that it is truly stealing on a D'Rabanan level.
 - **Q:** If so, how does he differ from the **T"K**? **A:** According to **R' Yose**, if the minor went to Beis Din they would require the other person to give the found item back to him. According to the **T"K** Beis Din would not require it to be returned.

-----Daf נ"ד---61-----

ANI HAMIKAKEF B'ROSH HAZAYIS MAH SHETACHTAV...

- A Braisa says, if the poor person picked up the olives and then put them down, taking those olives from him would be true stealing.
- **R' Kahana** was traveling to Hutzal and he saw a person throwing sticks at a date tree to knock off dates. **R' Kahana** took some of the dates from the ground and ate them. The person told him, "I have picked up those dates and then put them on the ground, so taking them is stealing!" **R' Kahana** said, you must be from the place of **R' Yoshiya**, who teaches the halachos to his people.

EIN MEMACHIN B'YAD ANIYEI NACHRIM B'LEKET...

- A Braisa says, we give tzedaka to poor goyim along with poor Yidden, we visit sick goyim along with sick Yidden, and we bury dead goyim along with dead Yidden, all for the sake of darkei shalom.

MISHNA

- A woman may lend her sifters, her hand mill, and her oven to another woman even if the borrower is suspected of not keeping the halachos of shmitta (i.e. she keeps the produce beyond the time of biur, when she is supposed to get rid of it), but she may not help her in the sorting or grinding process (because that would be helping someone to do an aveirah).
 - The wife of a chaver (who is especially careful regarding maaser and tahara) may lend her sifters to the wife of an ahm haaretz (who is not careful regarding maaser or tahara), and she may even help her in the sorting, grinding, and sifting process, but once water is added to the mixture (at which point it becomes fit to become tamei), she may no longer touch the item, because a person is not allowed to help someone do an aveirah.
 - These leniencies were allowed for the sake of darkei shalom.
- One may help a goy who is working the land during shmitta, but may not help a Yid who is doing so. One may also greet a goy, for purposes of darkei shalom.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is it assur to help the woman who is suspected regarding shmitta, but it is not assur to help the woman who is suspected regarding maaser? **A: Abaye** said, this is because *most* ahm haaretz do give maaser. The suspicion is therefore only D'Rabanan, and therefore we may help them. The suspicion regarding shmitta was a D'Oraisa suspicion. **Rava** said, the Mishna is discussing an ahm haaretz according to the definition of **R' Meir** (who says it refers to someone who eats chullin that is tamei), and since it is only a concern D'Rabanan, one is allowed to help him.
 - **Q:** Since the Mishna later says that once water has been mixed in she may no longer help, it would suggest that up until that point we are not dealing with concerns of tumah, which is contrary to **Rava's** explanation!? **A:** Both parts are discussing tumah. However, the earlier part is discussing tumah of chullin, which is only an issue D'Rabanan, and the second part is discussing tumah of Challah, which is an issue D'Oraisa.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that it is assur to grind for one who eats tamei produce. This is contrary to what **Rava** just said!? **A: Abaye** said, the Braisa is discussing a Kohen who is suspected of eating terumah that is tamei, which is an issue D'Oraisa.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The same Braisa says that one may take his tahor produce and give it to be watched by someone who himself eats his own produce while tamei (and we are not concerned that the person will touch it and make it tamei). Now, according to this last answer that the Braisa is discussing a Kohen, there is a problem, because a Braisa says that one may not give his terumah to be watched by a Kohen ahm haaretz, because he feels a connection to terumah and will likely touch it and make it tamei. If so, why does the first Braisa allow the produce to be given to be watched by a Kohen ahm haaretz? **A:** **R' Illa** said, the first Braisa is discussing where the terumah was in a sealed earthenware keili, which cannot become tamei by being touched on the outside. That is why it may be given to the Kohen ahm haaretz.
 - **Q:** Why are we not concerned that the Kohen's wife will move the keili while she is a nidah, in which case the keili and its contents would become tamei!? **A:** **R' Yirmiya** said, the first Braisa is discussing produce that was not "muchshar l'kabel tumah", and the second Braisa is discussing produce that was "muchshar l'kabel tumah".
- **Q:** A Mishna says that if wheat is given to an ahm haaretz to grind, we are not concerned that he switched it for produce for which maaser was not given or for produce of shmitta, but we are concerned that he made the wheat tamei. We see that we must be concerned that he makes it tamei!? **A:** We already answered that the first Braisa was discussing produce that was not muchshar l'kabel tumah! The one who brought this Mishna as a question, meant to use it for another question. This Mishna says we are not concerned that a person switches the produce that he got for produce for which maaser was not given, however there is a Mishna that says that we suspect that a mother in law may switch the produce given to her by her son in law!? To that the Gemara answers, that the Mishna itself gives the reason as being that the mother in law is embarrassed to give her son in law spoiled bread, so if the bread from his produce would spoil she would take from her own and use it. Therefore, it is only in that case that we need to be concerned for switching.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that we must also be concerned that an innkeeper switches the produce that is given to her!? **A:** That is because the innkeeper wants to give the talmid chochom the freshest bread that she can. Therefore, after a few days she will switch to her produce to make new bread. However, generally there is no concern that an ahm haaretz will switch produce.
 - **Q:** a Braisa says that the wife of an ahm haaretz would take from the produce she is grinding and give it to her friend who is helping her grind. Now, she may not do so, because she is actually stealing from her husband, and yet she does. If she is suspected of stealing, she should surely be suspected of switching produce!? **A:** It is only there that we have this concern because she feels that if the friend is helping her to grind, so she may give her some food. However, with regard to a regular ahm haaretz there is no such concern.

-----Daf 62-----

- **R' Yose ben Hameshulem** testified in the name of his brother **R' Yochanan**, who said in the name of **R' Elazar ben Chisma**, if an ahm haaretz prepared dough and then asked a chaver to prepare the challah dough (the piece to be separated as challah) for him, he may not do so (a Kohen, seeing the chaver separating it, may think that the challah is tahor, when in fact it is tamei, because the ahm haaretz prepared the dough to begin with). However, a chaver may prepare the dough initially, may then separate a piece for challah and put it into a keili that cannot become tamei, and give it to the ahm haaretz like that, and we are not concerned that the ahm haaretz will make it tamei. Similarly, if an ahm haaretz prepared olives to be pressed, and then asked a chaver to prepare the terumah, the chaver may not do so (for the same reason as the last case), but the chaver may prepare the olives initially, may then separate the terumah and put it into his own keilim, and give it like that to the ahm haaretz.
 - **R' Yochanan** explained, the reason we were meikel (and are not concerned that the ahm haaretz will make the terumah or the challah tamei) is for the sake of the livelihood of the kneader and of the presser.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Both cases are needed to teach this, because if we would only give the first case we would think we are lenient there because a kneader's wages are minimal, and therefore we have to allow him to make whatever he can, but we should not be lenient by a presser, who makes higher wages. If we would just say the second case we would say that only there we are meikel, because a presser is a seasonal job, with less job opportunity, so we won't take an opportunity away from him, but we will not be meikel for a kneader.
- **Q: R' Yose ben Hameshulem** said that the chaver can initially knead the dough for the ahm haaretz, separate the challah, put it into keilim that cannot become tamei, and then give it to him. Why are we not concerned that the ahm haaretz will touch the challah? **A:** We tell the ahm haaretz that if he touches the challah, all the dough will revert to being tevel. This will stop him from touching it.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should be concerned that he will not care if it becomes tevel? **A:** He came to the kneader to try and remove the issur of tevel, so we can assume that he will not do something that in his mind would bring the tevel status back on.
- **Q:** He said that regarding the olives the chaver separates the terumah, puts it into his keilim, and gives it to the ahm haaretz. Why are we not concerned that the ahm haaretz will touch the terumah? It makes sense that in the case of the dough we don't have to be concerned, because he is using a strange keili which reminds him not to touch it, but why are we not concerned in this case? **A:** In this case he is to put the terumah into keilim of dung, of stone, or of unprocessed earth. These will also remind him not to touch the terumah inside.
 - **Q:** If so, why do we need the keilim to belong to the chaver? **A:** It means that the keilim are fit to be used by the chaver (that they are not mekabel tumah), like of the types mentioned above.

MACHZIKIN YIDEI OVDEI KOCHAVIM B'SHVI'IS

- **Q:** How can the Mishna allow us to help a goy on shmitta? **R' Dimi bar Shishna in the name of Rav** said that one may not work together with a goy in the field on shmitta, and one may not give a double "Shalom" greeting to a goy at any time. We see that we may not help him in the field!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to words of encouragement.
 - **R' Chisda** would greet a goy with "Shalom" before the goy would greet him, because typically the responder would say a double greeting, and **R' Chisda** wanted to avoid doing that. **R' Kahana** would say "Shalom to Mar" (having in mind his rebbi, instead of the goy).

V'SHO'ALIN BISHLOMAN

- **Q:** We have just said that we may even give words of encouragement, so it is obvious that he can offer a greeting!? **A: R' Yeiva** said, the chiddush is that one may greet goyim even on their holiday.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HANIZAKIN!!!

PEREK HA'OMER -- PEREK SHISHI

MISHNA

- If a husband tells someone "Accept this get for my wife", or "Take this get to my wife", if the husband wants, he may retract the get at any time before it reaches the hand of his wife. However, if the wife told someone "Accept the get for me", then once that person received the get, the husband may no longer retract the get.
 - Therefore, if the husband tells the wife's shaliach that he does not want him to accept it for her, but instead wants him to take it to her, the husband may retract the get at any point until it reaches the hand of the wife. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, even if a woman tells someone "Take my get for me", and the husband gave the get to this person, the husband may not retract the get.

GEMARA

- **Q: R' Acha the son of R' Avya** said to **R' Ashi**, the only reason that the statement of "take this get to my wife" does not make her divorced as soon as the shaliach gets it is because the shaliach was not a shaliach l'kabalah. This suggests, that if he was made into a shaliach l'kabalah, "take" would prevent the husband from being allowed to

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

retract. We see that “take” is the equivalent of saying “be zocheh”!? **A:** It may be that saying “take” is not like saying “be zocheh”, and therefore the husband could retract after saying that. The reason the Mishna gave that case was so that we should not think that since the husband cannot make a shaliach l’kabalah for the wife, it should not be a get even when it reaches her hand since he said “accept for her”. The Mishna teaches that he means to say “accept and deliver it to her”.

- **Q:** The second case of the Mishna suggests that if the wife appoints a shaliach l’kaballah, then he would be koneh the get whether the husband tells him to “accept it for her” or whether he tells her to “take it to her”. This again seems to prove that saying “take” is like saying “be koneh”? **A:** It may be that he is only koneh if the husband tells him “accept the get”.
- **Q:** The Mishna says, if the husband tells the shaliach, “I don’t want you to accept it for her, rather I want you to take it and give it to her, he may retract the get”. This suggests that if he didn’t tell him “I don’t want you to accept”, he would not be able to retract, which suggests that saying “take” is like saying “be koneh”!? **A:** The Mishna may mean that the shaliach is koneh only when the husband tells him “this get is for you, take it to my wife”. But, if he simply says “take it to my wife” he would not be koneh for her.
- **Q:** It is obvious that a man can serve as a shaliach l’holacha, because a man can deliver a get to his wife. It is also obvious that a woman can serve as a shaliach l’kabalah, because a woman can accept a get from her husband. Can a man be a shaliach l’kabalah and can a woman be a shaliach l’holacha? **A:** Our Mishna said that if the husband told the shaliach to accept the get for his wife, he may still retract, but if the wife had told the shaliach to accept the get, he cannot retract. Presumably we are talking about one shaliach, and we see that the person can act as a shaliach l’holacha and l’kabalah.
 - It may be that the Mishna is discussing two different sheluchim – the man appointed a man, and the woman appointed a woman.
 - **A:** The Mishna said, if the husband tells the shaliach l’kabalah, “I do not want you accepting the get for my wife, rather I want you to take it and deliver it to her”, he may retract the get. This is certainly talking about one shaliach, and we see that he can act as a shaliach l’holacha and l’kabalah.
 - **Q:** This can teach that a man can be a shaliach l’kabalah, which may be based on the fact that a father can accept a get for his minor daughter. What about a woman acting as a shaliach l’holacha? **A: R’ Mari** said, a Mishna says that even the women who are not believed to say that someone’s husband has died, are still trusted to deliver a get. That refers to her acting as a shaliach l’holacha, and we see that she may serve as that shaliach. **A: R’ Ashi** said, that Mishna then says that a woman herself may deliver her own get as long as she says BNB. Again we see that a woman may act as a shaliach l’holacha.

-----Daf לׁו-----63-----

If a woman tells a shaliach “Bring me my get”, and the shaliach then tells the husband “Your wife told me to accept the get for her”, and the husband then gives the get to the shaliach and says “this get is for you like she said”, **R’ Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha in the name of Rav** said, even when the get reaches the woman, she is not divorced.

- **Q:** Presumably we can learn from here that the husband bases his instruction on what the shaliach said, because if he bases on what the woman said, then she should become divorced when the get reaches her hand!? **A: R’ Ashi** said, this is really no proof. If the case discussed was the reverse – where the wife told the shaliach to be a shliach l’kabalah and the shliach said he is a shliach l’holacha, and the husband then told the shliach “this get is for you like she said”, and on that case **R’ Nachman** would have said that she is divorced as soon as the get reaches the shliach, then that would be a proof that the husband instructs based on what the woman says, or if **R’ Nachman** would have said that she is divorced as soon as the get reaches her hand, that would prove that he holds that the husband instructs based on what the shliach says. However, in our case, since he says she is not divorced at all, it must be because he holds the shlichus becomes nullified, because the shliach said he will be l’kabalah and not l’holacha.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Huna bar Chiya** asked, our Mishna says, if a husband tells a shliach “accept this get for my wife” or “take this get to my wife”, he may retract the get. This suggests that if he does not retract, it is a valid get. However, this shouldn't be, because the husband does not have the ability to make a shliach l'kabalah. Rather, it must be that we say, that once he has decided to divorce her, we assume that he means to do whatever needs to be done to divorce her and he therefore means to make the shliach in whatever capacity necessary. If so, the same thing should be said in our original case, so why does **R' Nachman** say that she is not divorced? **A:** The cases are very different. In the case of the Mishna, the husband knows that he cannot make a shliach l'kabalah, and therefore he intends to make him a shliach l'holacha. However, in the case of **R' Nachman** he is given erroneous information and as such is mistaken as to his instruction. Therefore, she is not divorced.
- **Q: Rava** said, a Mishna says, if a girl who is a minor says to a shliach “accept my get for me”, it is not a get until it reaches her hand. Now, this means that when it does reach her hand the get is effective. However, since the husband does not make the shliach a shliach l'holacha she should not be divorced!? Rather, it must be that we say, that once he has decided to divorce her, we assume that he means to do whatever needs to be done to divorce her and he therefore means to make the shliach in whatever capacity necessary. If so, the same thing should be said in our original case, so why does **R' Nachman** say that she is not divorced? **A:** The cases are very different. In the case of the Mishna, the husband knows that a minor cannot make a shliach l'kabalah, and therefore he intends to make him a shliach l'holacha. However, in the case of **R' Nachman** he is given erroneous information and as such is mistaken as to his instruction. Therefore, she is not divorced.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a wife told a shaliach “bring me my get” and the shaliach tells the husband “your wife told me to accept the get for her”, or if the wife told him “accept my get for me” and the shaliach tells the husband “your wife told me to bring the get to her”, and the husband gives the get to the shaliach and says “take it and give it to her” or “be koneh it for her” or “accept it for her”, the husband may still retract the get, but once it reaches her hand she is divorced. Now, presumably the husband's response of “accept the get” or “be koneh the get” were when the shaliach told him that he was there to accept the get, and the husband's response of “take the get to her” was in response to the shaliach who said he was there to take the get to the wife. This refutes **R' Nachman**, because we see that she does become divorced in this case!? **A:** The response of “accept it” was to the shaliach who said he was supposed to take it to her, and the response of “take it to her” was said to the shaliach who said that he was there to accept the get for the wife. Therefore, it is different than **R' Nachman's** case.
 - **Q:** If this is the case, then when the husband said “accept it”, the wife had truly also said “accept it”, so why is she not divorced until it reaches her hand? It must be that the husband instructs based on what the shaliach says!? **A:** In **R' Nachman's** case the husband said “this is for you as she said”, but in the Braisa he said “accept it”. That is the difference.
- A Braisa says, if the woman told a shaliach “accept my get” and the shaliach tells the husband “your wife told me to accept her get”, and the husband responds by saying “take the get and give it to her” or “be koneh it for her” or “accept it for her”, he can't retract the get. **R' Nossan** says, where his response was “take it and give it to her” he may retract it, but in the other cases he may not retract. **Rebbi** says, in all these cases he cannot retract the get, but if he tells the shaliach “I don't want you to accept the get for her, rather take it and bring it to her”, then he can retract the get.
 - **Q: Rebbi** seems to be saying the same thing as the **T”K**!? **A:** He is teaching us the case of where he says “I don't want you to accept the get...” **A2:** The Braisa is teaching the that **T”K** is **Rebbi**.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Nossan**, if the husband said “heilach” (this get is for you..), is that the equivalent of him saying “be koneh” or not? **A:** Our Mishna said, if a husband tells someone “Accept this get for my wife”, or “Take this get to my wife”, if the husband wants, he may retract the get at any time before it reaches the hand of his wife. However, if the wife told someone “Accept the get for me”, then once that person received the get, the husband may no longer retract the get. Presumably the case is where the husband said “heilach” and follows the view of **R' Nossan**, and we see that saying “heilach” is like saying “be koneh”.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Gemara says this is no proof, because the case may be where he said “holeich” (take the get to her) and is following **Rebbi**, and is no proof of **R’ Nosson** at all.
- **Q:** Our Mishna said, therefore, if the husband tells the wife’s shaliach that he does not want him to accept it for her, but instead wants him to take it to her, the husband may retract the get at any point until it reaches the hand of the wife. This suggests that if he did not say “I don’t want you to accept it for her”, he would not be able to retract the get. Presumably, the case is that the husband told the shaliach “heilach” and follows **R’ Nosson** and proves that it is the equivalent of saying “be koneh”! **A:** The Gemara says this is no proof, because the case may be where he said “holeich” (take the get to her) and is following **Rebbi**, and is no proof of **R’ Nosson** at all.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a husband tells the shaliach “holeich” this get to my wife, then he may retract the get. However, if he says “heilach” this get for my wife, he cannot retract the get. **R’ Nosson** is the one who says that by “holeich” he may retract, so this Braisa must be following him, and the Braisa says that by “heilach” he may not retract. We see that according to him, saying “heilach” is like saying “be koneh”. **SHEMA MINAH.**
- If a woman told a shaliach “accept a get for me” and the shaliach tells the husband “your wife told me to accept the get for her” and the husband responds “take it and give it to her”, **R’ Abba in the name of R’ Huna in the name of Rav** said, the person becomes the shaliach of the wife to accept the get and of the husband to deliver the get, and therefore if the get was never delivered to her, it is a safek get.
 - **Q:** Shall we say that **Rav** was unsure whether “holeich” is the equivalent of “be koneh”, which is why he says the above get is a safek? This can’t be, because **Rav** says that if a person tells a shaliach “holeich” some money to someone else because I owe him that money, he may not retract. We see that **Rav** holds that “holeich” is the equivalent of saying “be koneh”! **A:** **Rav** is unsure. Therefore, in a case of money he is meikel and says it is as if he said “be koneh” and in a case of issur (gittin) he says that it is not.
- **Rav** says a woman may not make a shaliach l’kabalah to accept a get from her husband’s shaliach l’holacha, and **R’ Chanina** says that she may do so.
 - **Q:** What is **Rav’s** reason? **A:** Either because the husband would view that as an insult and would be mevatel the shlichus, or as a gezeirah for a case where the husband put the get into someone else’s field which was then bought by or gifted to the wife. In that case she is clearly not divorced, because the husband has not given the get to her (he does not even put it into her property, since at the time he put it there she did not own the property). The difference between these reasons would be where the wife made her shaliach before the husband made his shaliach. In that case there would be no need for the gezeirah, but it still may be viewed as an insult by the husband.
 - A man sent a get to his wife with a shaliach. When the shaliach reached the wife she told him “Let it remain by you” (i.e. be my shaliach l’kabalah). **R’ Nachman** said, if I would know that the halacha follows **R’ Chanina** I would say that this woman is divorced.
 - **Rava** asked, even according to **R’ Chanina** she should not be divorced, because this shaliach cannot go back to the husband as being his principle, because he is now the shaliach of the woman, and such a shlichus is not effective!? They asked this question to **R’ Ami** and he said that this makes the shlichus batul. They sent this question to **R’ Chiya bar Abba** and he said that we must consider it to be a safek whether she is divorced.
- There was a woman named “Nafasa”, and the witnesses mistakenly wrote the get for “Tafasa”. **R’ Yitzchak bar Shmuel bar Marsa in the name of Rav** said that the witnesses did their duties by writing the get and therefore are not charged with writing a new, effective get. **Rabbah** said they were instructed to write an effective get and did not do so, therefore they still have the authority under the original charge to write a new, effective get. **Rabbah** said, had they written an effective get but lost it before giving it to her, they would not be allowed to write a new get, because they did what they were charged to do. **R’ Nachman** said, they were charged with delivering the get and did not do so, therefore, they may write a new get and deliver it.
 - **Q:** **Rava** asked **R’ Nachman**, what if the husband had told them “write a get and give it to the shaliach” and the shaliach then lost the get? Do we say they have done their duties and have no authority to write a new get, or do we say that the husband only said to give it to a shaliach to save them the bother of

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

delivery, but in truth they have the authority until the get is delivered? **Ravina** added, what if the husband had also said “write the get and give it to the shaliach and let him bring it to her”, does this mean they have authority until it is actually given to her? **TEIKU**.

R' SHIMON BEN GAMLIEL OMER AHF HA'OMERES TOL LI GITI...

- A Braisa says, if a woman tells a shaliach “take my get for me” or “lift my get for me” or “let my get be in your hand for me”, these are all verbiage of making the shaliach into a shaliach l'kabalah.

-----Daf 70---64-----

MISHNA

- If a woman told a shaliach to accept a get for her, she will need two sets of witnesses to prove that she is divorced – one set to say that she actually made the shaliach as a shaliach l'kabalah, and one set to say that they saw the shaliach accept the get and then tear it up. The same people can serve as both sets of witnesses, or you can also have one person who is common to both sets and a different person join to complete each set.

GEMARA

- If a get is in the hands of a 3rd party, and the husband says it was given to the 3rd party for safekeeping (but not to effectuate a divorce), but the 3rd party says he was a shaliach l'kabalah of the wife and the get was given to him to effectuate the divorce upon receipt, **R' Huna** says the husband is believed, because if he truly meant to give it for divorce he would have given it directly to the wife and not to a 3rd party, and **R' Chisda** says that the 3rd party is believed, because we see that the husband trusted this person to hold the get.
 - **Q: R' Abba** asked, a Braisa says, that although a litigant's admission is believed “like 100 witnesses”, the 3rd party is believed more than the litigants. This is not like **R' Huna** said!? **A:** The Braisa discusses a monetary case, where we trust the 3rd party because even if he is wrong, the person who gave him the money is said to be “mochel” the money to him. However, this concept of mechila does not apply to a get, because if it wasn't given properly the get cannot be effective.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that similarly, a 3rd party is believed regarding "gittin" as well!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to “gitei mammon” – monetary documents.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says and similarly the 3rd party is believed regarding documents (which would suggest that “get” means a divorce document)!? **A:** These are 2 separate Braisos, and the Tanna of each referred to commercial documents in a different way, but neither refers to a divorce document.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says that the woman must produce two sets of witnesses. According to **R' Chisda** we should simply believe the shaliach!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where he no longer has the valid get (it is torn and invalid), and that is why he is not believed.
 - **Q:** Once she brings witnesses that she appointed him as her shaliach, the fact that he has the torn get should be enough of a basis for him to say that he received the get!? **A: Rava** said, our Mishna is following **R' Elazar**, who says that eidei mesirah are the essential witnesses needed for a get.
 - **Q:** Why did the shaliach need to tear the get? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the Mishna is teaching that when there was a governmental ban against writing gittin, the **Rabanan** said that as soon as a get is given it should be torn to remove any sign that one was ever written.
 - **Rabbah** said, **R' Huna** would agree that if the woman said, the 3rd party told me that the husband gave him the get for the purpose of effectuating a divorce, she is believed.
 - **Q:** How can it be that the 3rd party himself is not believed, but she is believed? **A: Rabbah** meant that if the woman says, my husband gave the get to the 3rd party in front of me and it was given for the purpose of effectuating a divorce, she is believed with a miguy that she could have simply said that the get was given directly to her to effectuate a divorce.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If the husband says he gave a get to a 3rd party to deliver, and the 3rd party says the same and says he delivered it, and the woman says that the get was delivered to her but was lost, **R' Yochanan** says this is a “davar sheb'ervah”, and therefore 2 valid witnesses are needed to testify that she is divorced.
 - **Q:** Why don't we believe the 3rd party? **A:** He is not in possession of the get and therefore is not believed.
 - **Q:** Why isn't the husband believed? **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** has said that a husband is believed to say that he divorced his wife!? **A:** In this case he is not claiming that he divorced her. He is only claiming that he gave it to the 3rd party to be delivered.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that there is a chazaka that a shaliach has performed his shlichus (as **R' Yitzchak** says regarding kiddushin), and therefore we can assume that she is divorced!? **A:** That is only said l'chumra, not l'kula.
 - **Q:** Why isn't she believed based on **R' Hamnuna**, who says that a woman who tells her husband “you divorced me” is believed because she wouldn't have the chutzpah to lie to his face!? **A:** That is only when she has no one helping her claim. When she does, she does have the chutzpah. And here the husband and the 3rd party are helping her claim.

MISHNA

- With regard to a naarah hame'orasa, the girl herself or her father may accept the get for her. **R' Yehuda** says, it cannot be that two people can be koneh for one person at one time, therefore, only the father has the authority to accept the get for her.
- Any girl who is not able to take care of her get (she is not mature enough, etc.) cannot be divorced.

GEMARA

- The basis for the machlokes is that the **Rabanan** hold that the Torah gave this naarah an additional method of accepting her get (so now there are 2 ways), and **R' Yehuda** holds that wherever the father can accept her get, she herself is not authorized to do so (so it is either one or the other, not both).

V'CHOL SHE'EINA YECHOLA LISHMOR ES GITAH

- A Braisa says, a minor who knows how to take care of her get can be divorced, and a minor who does not know how to do so cannot be divorced. What type of minor knows how to take care of her get? Any minor who can take care of her get and something else.
 - **Q:** What does the Braisa mean to say? **A: R' Yochanan** said, this means that if the girl would lose her get, she would take care of another object as if it is her get.
 - **Q: R' Huna bar Manoach** asked, such a person would be considered a shotah!? **A:** Rather, he says in the name of **R' Acha the son of R' Ika**, this refers to a minor who knows how to tell the difference between her get and another object.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of R' Assi** said, a minor who understands to throw away a stone and keep a nut has enough capacity to be able to be koneh for himself, but not for others. If a minor understands to borrow something and return it when asked, he has enough capacity to be koneh for himself and for others. **R' Yehuda** said, when I repeated this to **Shmuel**, he told me that “both of these are one”, which **R' Chisda** explained to mean that in both of these stages a minor may be koneh for himself but not for anyone else.
 - **Q: R' Chinina Vardan** asked, a Mishna says that one can set up a “shituf” (like an eiruv) by having his Jewish maidservant be koneh for everyone who shares the mavuy. This maidservant must still be a minor, because if she already grew “shte saaros” she would have gone free! And yet, we see that she can be koneh for other people. We see that a minor can be koneh for other people!? **A:** The case of shituf is different because it is only D'Rabanan, and that is why a minor can be koneh for other people in that case.
 - **R' Chisda** said that **R' Chinina** didn't argue with this answer. The Gemara explains, he could have said that the **Rabanan** only institute in a way similar to a D'Oraisa. **R' Chisda** would have said, that is only true when the subject of the D'Rabanan has a basis D'Oraisa. Shituf does not, so there is no need to institute similar to a D'Oraisa.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

○ **Q: R' Avya** asked, the halacha is that when a person redeems his own maser sheini he must pay a premium of 1/5. A Mishna says, one can get around having to pay that by having his Jewish maidservant redeem his maaser sheini. This maidservant must still be a minor, because if she already grew “shteis saaros” she would have gone free! And yet, we see that she can be koneh for other people. We see that a minor can be koneh for other people!? **A:** The Mishna is discussing maaser after the Churban, which is only D'Rabanan.

▪ **Q:** This can't be, because a Braisa says that there is only a concept of Jewish slaves when Yovel exists, and after the Churban, Yovel ceased to exist!? **A:** We must say that it is before the Churban, and the reason the maaser is only D'Rabanan is because it was grown in a flowerpot without a hole.

● **Rava** said, there are three categories of minors: 1) a minor who understands to throw away a stone and keep a nut has enough capacity to be able to be koneh for himself, but not for others, and this is also the type of orphaned minor who can be married off by her mother and would be required to do “mi'un” to annul the marriage; 2) young children (from the age of 6-8) can buy and sell moveable items, and such a minor can also accept a get even when she was married off by her father; 3) when they are old enough to make nedarim (a year before bar or bas mitzvah), their nedarim and their hekdesch take effect, and a minor of this type can even do chalitzah. The Gemara says, in order to sell the real property of his father, a child must be 20 years old.

-----Daf 70-----65-----

MISHNA

- If a minor girl told a shaliach “accept my get for me”, she is not divorced until the get reaches her own hand. Therefore, if the husband wants to retract the get, he may do until it reaches the girl's hand. This is all because a minor does not have the ability to appoint a shaliach. However, if her father told a shaliach “accept my daughter's get for her”, the husband would not be able to retract the get once it was received by the shaliach.
- If a man tells a shaliach, “give this get to my wife in a particular place” and he went and gave it to her somewhere else, it is passul. If the husband had told him “give this get to my wife, who can be found in this particular place”, and the shaliach then gave it to her in a different place, the get is valid.
- If a woman told a shaliach “accept my get for me in a particular place” and the shaliach accepted the get somewhere else, it is passul. **R' Elazar** says the get is valid. If the woman told the shaliach “bring my get to me from a particular place” and he brought it from a different place, the get is valid.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why does **R' Elazar** only argue in the case of the woman but not in the case of the man? **A:** Regarding a man, who chooses to divorce his wife, he means to be particular and if his instruction is not followed, the get is passul. Regarding a woman, since she can be divorced against her will, when she gives such an instruction we take it as her telling the shaliach where he can expect to find the get for acceptance.

MISHNA

- If the wife of a Kohen told a shaliach “bring me my get”, she may continue to eat terumah until the get reaches her hand. However, if she told a shaliach “accept my get for me”, she must stop eating terumah immediately. If she told the shaliach “accept my get in a particular place”, she may continue to eat terumah for as long as it takes for the get and the shaliach to make it to that particular place. **R' Eliezer** says she becomes assur to eat terumah immediately.

GEMARA

- **Q:** It seems that the **T"K** would hold that although the shaliach accepted the get in a place other than the one instructed by the woman it would be a get once he then brought it to the place as instructed. However, in the previous Mishna we said that it would be a passul get!? **A:** Our Mishna is talking about where she told the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

shaliach, go and accept the get wherever you find my husband to be, but I don't want it to be effective until you reach this particular place.

V'R' ELAZAR OSER MIYAD

- **Q:** This is obvious, because in the last Mishna **R' Elazar** already said that she only means to point out where the husband is, and not to set the place as a place to make it effective. So what is the Mishna here teaching? **A:** It is necessary to teach in a case where she told him that her husband is to the east and the shaliach went to the west. We would have thought that in that case she may continue eating terumah. The Mishna teaches that since it is possible that the husband met the shaliach before he left the town, she must stop eating terumah immediately.
 - **Q:** If a person instructs a shaliach to make an eiruv for him using dates and the shaliach instead used figs, one Braisa says it is a valid eiruv and another Braisa says it is not valid!? **A: Rabbah** said, the Braisa that says it is passul follows the **Rabanan** of our Mishna, who say that an instruction must be followed because it is sincerely meant. The Braisa that says it is valid follows **R' Elazar**, who says that the instruction is meant to be helpful, but not something that must be done. **A2: R' Yosef** said, that both Braisos follow the **Rabanan**. The Braisa that says it is valid is where the shaliach used other fruit of the principle. The Braisa that says it is passul is discussing where he used someone else's fruit, and therefore it must be done with the fruit specified.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, if someone told a shaliach to make an eiruv in a tower and he instead went and made one in a dovecote, there is one Braisa that says it is valid and one that says it is passul. What distinction of "his own fruit" or "someone else's fruit" could be made to explain these Braisos? **A:** It can be that he means the fruit of the tower or the fruit of the dovecote, and the same answer can then be given.

MISHNA

- If a man says "write a get and give it to my wife" or he said "divorce her" or "write a letter and give it to her", the people may write a get and give it to her. However, if the husband told them "release her" or "provide for her" or "do for her as is customary" or "do for her as is befitting", his words are meaningless.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if a husband told someone "send her away", "abandon her", or "banish her", a get should be written and given to her. However, if he says "release her" or "provide for her" or "do for her as is customary" or "do for her as is befitting", his words are meaningless.
 - A Braisa says, **R' Nosson** says, if he said "patruha", a get should be written, but if he said "pitruha", his words are meaningless. **Rava** explained, **R' Nosson** was from Bavel, and in Aramaic the word "pitruha" refers to debts, not divorce.
- **Q:** What if the husband said "take her out" or "leave her" or "permit her" or "let her be" or "help her" or "do with her as the law requires"? **A:** We can answer one of these, because a Braisa says that "do with her as the law requires" is meaningless.

MISHNA

- Initially they said that if one is going out to be executed by the government, and he says "write a get for my wife", it should be written and given to her. They later said, that the same halacha would apply to one who is going off to sea, or going out on a caravan. **R' Shimon Shezuri** says, it also applies to someone who is dangerously ill.

GEMARA

- Geniva was being taken to be executed and he said "give 400 zuz to **R' Avina** from my wine in Nehar Panya". **R' Zeira** said, **R' Avina** should go get the money and then go to **R' Huna** for halachic support, because **R' Huna** holds that a gift is like a get – just as if he were to get free he could take back the gift, he would be able to do the

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

same with a get, and also, just like by a get it is given even if he only says “write it” and doesn’t say “give it”, so too the gift should be given even if he only said “give it” and didn’t say “be koneh it”.

- **Q: R’ Abba** asked, if they are really treated the same, then just as there can be a gift after death there should also be able to be a get after death, and we know that is not the case!? **A:** A get can’t take effect after death because at that point he is no longer her husband.
 - **Q: R’ Abba** meant to ask as follows. Geniva only gave away some of his property, and the halacha is that a person facing death who gives away less than all his possessions can only do so with a kinyan, and no kinyan was done here!? **A:** That is true for someone who is sick and facing death, because there is a chance that he will get better. However, someone being executed has no chance to be saved, and therefore he need not make a kinyan even in this case.
 - **Q:** If so, what was **R’ Abba’s** question? **A:** He meant to ask that Geniva made a meaningless statement, because he said “take money from the wine “ (and not “take the wine” or “take the proceeds from the wine”). **R’ Huna** held that this language was meant to give **R’ Avina** a lien on the wine.
 - In EY they agreed with this understanding of **R’ Huna**.

-----Daf 10---66-----

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 shluhim, or do we say that he only had in mind that the father and the third person should be the shluhim, and now that the father is no

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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 Rebbi** 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

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.