



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Portion of the Get

Bar Hedyah wanted to bring a *get* to *Eretz Yisroel*. Rabbi Achi, who was appointed to oversee *gittin* told him that he is obligated to stand by each and every letter of the *get*. Rabbi Ami and Rabbi Assi told him that he is only required to be there by one line. They added: And if you will want to act stringently (*and be there the entire time*), it will discredit all other *gittin* (*which were not done in this manner*).

Rabbah bar bar Chanah brought a *get* to *Eretz Yisroel*. Half of it was written in his presence, but half was not. Rabbi Elozar told him that even if you only saw one line of it being written *lishmah*¹, it would be sufficient.

Rav Ashi said: It is enough if he heard the sound of the quill scratching against the parchment.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* to support Rav Ashi: If one brings a *get* from abroad, and he and the scribe were on two different floors of a house, even though he was going in and out of the house the entire day, the *get* is valid.

The *Gemora* asks: If the scribe is on the upper floor and the agent is below, how could he make the declaration? He cannot see him! This proves that it is

sufficient if he hears the sound of the quill scratching against the parchment. (5b3 – 6a1)

In and Out

The *braisa* had stated: If he and the scribe were on two different floors of a house, even though he was going in and out of the house the entire day, the *get* is valid.

The *braisa* asks: Who was going in and out of the house? If it was the agent, why was it necessary to state that case? If he was on a different floor, where he could not see the scribe at all, the *get* is valid; certainly, in this case, where at least he saw part of the *get* being written, the *get* should be valid!? Rather, it must be the scribe was going in and out of the house.

The *Gemora* asks: Is this not obvious? Why should the *get* be invalidated because he was going in and out of the house?

The *Gemora* answers: The *braisa* is referring to a case where he went to the market and then returned. You might think that a different person there (*with the same name*) told him to write a *get* for his wife. The *braisa* teaches us that we are not concerned for that. (6a1)

Bavel

¹ For the sake of the woman

It was stated: Rav said that Bavel has the status of *Eretz Yisroel* with respect of *gittin* (and a *get* brought from one province to another province in Bavel would not require the declaration). Shmuel said that Bavel is like any other land outside of *Eretz Yisroel*.

The *Gemora* notes: Perhaps they are arguing about the following issue: One holds that the reason for the declaration is because people are not familiar with the *halachah* of *lishmah*, but the people in Bavel, however, are familiar (and therefore, it has the same status as *Eretz Yisroel*). The other one holds that the declaration is required because people are not available to authenticate the signatures, and this would be applicable in Bavel as well.

The *Gemora* asks: Do you truly think this explanation is correct? But we said previously that Rabbah agrees to Rava (that the declaration is also required in order to authenticate the signatures)?

Rather, the *Gemora* explains that they both maintain that the declaration is necessary in order to authenticate the signatures. Rav holds that since in Bavel, there are many Talmudic Colleges (and students are traveling from all different parts of the country), it would be easy to find witnesses to authenticate the signatures. Shmuel, however, holds that the students are preoccupied with their studies (and would not be able to recognize the signatures).

The *Gemora* provides support for this explanation by that which Rabbi Abba said in the name of Rav Huna: From the time that Rav had come to Bavel (and established a Talmudic College in Sura), we considered ourselves like *Eretz Yisroel* with respect to *gittin*.

Rabbi Yirmiyah asked on Rav from our *Mishna*: Rabbi Yehudah says: From Rekem eastwards is considered “abroad,” and Rekem itself is like those areas to the East (and if one brings a *get* from Rekem, he would be required to testify that it was written and signed in his presence). From Ashkelon southwards is considered “abroad,” and Ashkelon itself is like those areas to the South. From Akko northwards is considered “abroad,” and Akko itself is like those areas to the North. Now, Bavel, is north of *Eretz Yisroel*, as it is written: *Hashem* said to me, “From the north (referring to Bavel) the evil will break forth.” [Evidently, Bavel is not like *Eretz Yisroel* with respect to *gittin*!?] And the *Mishna* states further: Rabbi Meir says: Akko is like *Eretz Israel* with respect to *gittin*. It would seem that Rabbi Meir argues only in regards to Akko, which is in close proximity to *Eretz Yisroel*; however, Bavel, which is further away, he would agree that it is not regarded as *Eretz Yisroel*!?

He asked the question and he answered it himself: The *Mishna* is referring to all places besides Bavel (for there is a legitimate reason to differentiate between Bavel and all other lands outside *Eretz Yisroel*). (6a1 – 6a2)

Bavel's Borders

The *Gemora* asks: What are the borders of Bavel?

Rav Pappa said: The borders of Bavel with respect to *gittin* are the same as they are with respect to lineage (the *Babylonian Jews* were reputed to have preserved their racial purity more strictly than the Jews of any other area, and the *Gemora* in *Kiddushin* discusses its boundaries). Rav Yosef said: With respect to *gittin*, they all agree that Bavel extends until the second willow swamp past the bridge (which was used to cross the *Euphrates River*). (6a2 – 6a3)

Declaration Rules

Rav Chisda rules that if the agent was going from Ctesiphon to Bei Ardashir, he would be required to make the declaration; however, if he was going from Bei Ardashir to Ctesiphon, he would not be required to make the declaration.

The Gemora explains: Let us say that this (Rav Chisda's ruling) is because he maintains that (the declaration is necessary because) they (people living abroad) are not familiar with the law of *lishmah*.

The Gemora questions this: Do you truly think this explanation is correct? But we said previously that Rabbah agrees to Rava (*that the declaration is also required in order to authenticate the signatures*)?

The Gemora explains the reason for this: Rather, everyone agrees that the declaration is necessary because we need to authenticate the signatures. Since the people from Bei Ardashir would go to the market in Ctesiphon (*and leave there signed documents*), the people there would recognize their signatures. However, the people of Bei Ardashir would not recognize the signatures from Ctesiphon because they were busy with the markets.

Rabbah bar Avuha ruled that it was necessary for the agent to make the declaration even if he was merely going from one row of houses to a different one. Rav Sheishes required the declaration even from one neighborhood to another. Rava ruled that it was necessary even in the same neighborhood.

The Gemora asks: But isn't Rava the one who holds that the declaration is necessary because the signatures

need to be authenticated (*and that should not be a concern in the same neighborhood*)?

The Gemora answers: The people of Mechuza were different because they traveled a lot.

Rav Chanin said over the following incident: Rav Kahana brought a *get* either from Sura to Nehardea or from Nehardea to Sura; he did not know which, and consulted Rav as to whether he was required to declare that it was written and signed in his presence or not. Rav said to him: You are not required, but if you do, it will be effective.

The Gemora asks: What did Rav mean by these last words?

The Gemora explains: He meant that if the husband came and contested the *get*, they would pay no attention to him, as it has been taught in the following *braisa*: A man once brought a *get* before Rabbi Yishmael, and asked him whether he was required to declare that it was written and signed in his presence or not. Rabbi Yishmael to him: My son, where is it from? He replied: My teacher, I am from K'far Sisai. Rabbi Yishmael said to him: It is necessary for you to declare that it was written and signed in your presence, so that the woman should not require witnesses in case the husband wishes to contest the *get*. After the man left, Rabbi Ilai came in and said to Rabbi Yishmael: Isn't K'far Sisai surrounded by the border of Eretz Israel, and is it not closer to Tzipori than Akko is, and doesn't our *Mishna* tell us that Rabbi Meir says: Akko is like Eretz Israel with respect to *gittin*? And even the *Chachamim* disagree only in regard to Akko, which is some distance away, but not in regard to K'far Sisai which is close by!?

Rabbi Yishmael said to him: Be quiet, my son, be quiet.

Since the issue has been declared permissible, let it remain so. [*It is evident that the declaration is effective even when it is not necessary.*]

The Gemora asks: But he (R' Yishmael) also said (to the agent that the declaration was necessary) "so that the woman should not require witnesses (in case the husband wishes to contest the *get*)? [Evidently, the declaration was not required because of the general reasons.]

The Gemora answers: They did not conclude his (R' Yishmael) statement before him (R' Ilai). (6a3 – 6b1)

Rabbi Evyasar

Rabbi Evyasar sent to Rav Chisda the following ruling: One who brings a *get* from Bavel to Eretz Yisroel is not required to declare that it was written and signed in his presence.

The Gemora explains: Let us say that this (R' Evyasar's ruling) is because he maintains that (the declaration is necessary because) they (people living abroad) are not familiar with the law of *lishmah*, but these (people living in Bavel) are familiar (with the law).

The Gemora questions this: Do you truly think this explanation is correct? But we said previously that Rabbah agrees to Rava (*that the declaration is also required in order to authenticate the signatures*)?

The Gemora explains: Rather, everyone agrees that the declaration is necessary because we need to authenticate the signatures, and in this case, as there are always people going between Bavel and Eretz Yisroel, witnesses can easily be found.

Rav Yosef asked: Who tells us that Rabbi Evyasar is an authority who can be relied upon? And furthermore, is there not evidence to the contrary? For it was he who sent to Rav Yehudah: People who come from Bavel to Eretz Yisroel fulfill in themselves the following words of the Scripture: *They have given a boy for a harlot and sold a girl for wine and they have drunk.* [*This was because they left their wives and children in Bavel for an extended period of time.*] And Rabbi Evyasar wrote this verse without scored lines, although Rabbi Yitzchak said that a quotation of two Scriptural words may be written without scored lines, but not of three (*a halachah l'Moshe mi'Sinai teaches us that one is required to score lines into the parchment when writing a Torah scroll or a book of the Prophets or the Writings in order that it should be written neatly; Rabbi Yitzchak added that this halachah is applicable even when writing a letter*). It was taught in a *braisa* that three may be written without scored lines, but not four. [*In any event, this proves that Rabbi Evyasar cannot be relied upon with respect to halachic matters!?*]

Abaye said to him: Just because a man does not know Rabbi Yitzchak's rule does not mean that he is not a great scholar! If it were a rule established by logic, we might think so. But a rule that is purely an oral tradition, perhaps he never heard it.

And furthermore, Rabbi Evyasar is the authority whose view was confirmed by God in the following manner: Commenting on the text (*concerning the incident of the concubine in Giveah who angered a certain man; she ran away and was eventually killed, which brought about a civil war between the tribe of Binyamin and the rest of Klal Yisroel*): *And his concubine strayed from him*, Rabbi Evyasar said that the Levite found a fly on his plate because of her. Rabbi Yonasan said that he found a hair and became angry with her. Rabbi Evyasar

once met Eliyahu and asked him: “What is the Holy One, Blessed be He, doing?” Eliyahu answered, “He is discussing the concubine of Giveah.” Rabbi Evyasar asked him, “What is He saying?” Eliyahu replied, “He is saying, ‘My son Evyasar says like so, and my son Yonasan says like so.’” Rabbi Evyasar asked: Can there possibly, Heaven forbid, be uncertainty in Heaven?” Eliyahu replied: Both opinions are the words of the living God. He found a fly and was not particular about it, and then he found a hair and did become angry.

Rav Yehudah explained: He found a fly in his food and a hair in “that place” (*her pubic area*). The fly was merely disgusting, but the hair was dangerous (*since her hair could cause damage to his male organ*). Others say that he found both in his food; the fly was an accident, but the hair was due to her negligence.

Rav Chisda said: A man should never instill excessive fear in his household. The concubine of Giveah was terrorized by her husband and she was the cause of several myriads being slaughtered in Israel. Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: If a man instills excessive fear in his household, he will eventually commit the three major sins: illicit relations, bloodshedding, and the desecration of *Shabbos*.

Rabbah bar Chanah said: One must say to his household three things before *Shabbos*: Have you separated *ma’aser*? Have you made an *eruv*? Light the *Shabbos* candles. One must say these three things to members of his household in a gentle manner, so that they accept the instructions. (6b1 – 7a1)

DAILY MASHAL

These and These

The Gemara uses a well-known phrase in reference to a difference of opinion – “Both these and these are the words of the Living G-d.” How can two opposite statements both be true?

The She’aris Nossan brings two parables to help us understand this concept. The first mashal focuses on understanding what Torah is, and the second mashal focuses more on how each individual can relate to Torah in his own way.

Mashal 1: An electric cable conducts electricity to whatever appliance it is connected to. If the appliance is a refrigerator, the electricity is creating cooling. If the appliance is a stove, the electricity is producing heat. This is not a contradiction; the cable conducts electricity that will empower whichever appliance it is connected to. So too Torah is a force that provides life and energy to each individual that connects to it, although the individual has his own expression of that force which is unique to him.

Mashal 2: A man is pacing to and fro in his apartment in a multi-story building. If you ask him where he is standing, he will respond that he is standing on the floor of his apartment. If you ask the tenant in the apartment below him what the noise is, he will respond that the noise is coming from the ceiling because the upstairs tenant is walking around. Neither of them are lying; each one is presenting his perspective that is different since they are in different positions.

However, it is a given that someone in a different building cannot realistically have a relevant opinion of his own on where the noise is coming from as he does not hear it. So too, anyone who is on the Torah wavelength can have a legitimate opinion that is unique to his experiences and his judgement.

Three Foundations

By: Rabbi A. Leib Schainbaum

And G-d tested Avraham. (22:1)

We see Avraham from three different perspectives: We see him as the paradigm of gemillas chesed, kindness, reaching out to all wayfarers. We see him using everything in his power to save the evil inhabitants of Sodom. Last, we see him going to the Akeidah with conviction, ready and willing to offer the ultimate sacrifice - his son. On the one hand, he is reaching out to a world of pagans, bringing them into his home, sustaining them both physically and spiritually. On the other hand, he is prepared to slaughter his son. Where is his "rachamei av," fatherly compassion, especially in light of his overwhelming prayers for the wicked citizens of Sodom? How do these three aspects of Avraham's behavior coincide with each other?

In his sefer "Eilah Ha'devarim," Horav Eliyahu Schlessinger, Shlita cites Horav Meir Shapiro, zl, who posits that three ideas/behaviors are essential prerequisites for every Jew. He homiletically interprets this into the Mishnah in Meseches Shabbos 2:7, quoted in our Gemora, which says, "Three things one should say on Erev Shabbos as it gets dark: 'Asartem?' 'Did you tithe, take Maaser from the foods?' 'Eiravtem?' 'Did you make an Eiruv, allowing people to carry on Shabbos?' 'Hadliku es ha'neir?' 'Did you light the candle so that people can walk freely and safely?'" He asserts

that "Asartem?" "Did you tithe?" implies that one should have the knowledge to distinguish between holy and mundane, between sacred and profane. He should know how to remove the sacred from the mundane, the spiritual from the material. Accordingly, the concept of division, between what is mine and what is not mine is addressed with the term, "Eiravtem?" "Did you make an eiruv?": symbolizing togetherness, bringing people together. The word "eiruv" also signifies arvus, collective responsibility for one's fellowman, realizing that one's actions, good or bad, have an effect on others. "Hadliku es ha'neir?" "Did you light the candle?": one must light up the way, illuminate a path so that he does not stumble upon hidden obstacles.

These three foundations were inherent in Avraham Avinu's actions and personality. His "hachnosas orchim," welcoming wayfarers, symbolized his exemplary acts of loving kindness to all people that were deserving. He was able to delineate between those that were sincere and those that were deceptive, between those who were l'shem Shomayim, for the sake of Heaven, and those who were not. Hence, he fulfilled the "Asartem," knowing when and how to separate the good from the bad, the holy from the mundane. Seeking zechusim, merits, for the people of Sodom was Avraham's way of demonstrating concern and responsibility for his fellowman. His sense of achrayos, responsibility, urged him to ask for and seek that "one tzaddik, righteous person in the city of evil". Thus, he fulfilled his obligation of eiravtem, sense of communal accountability. Last, his conviction and willingness to sacrifice his son at Hashem's command "lit the candle," illuminating the path for all Jews throughout the ages. Jewish life is replete with mesiras nefesh, self-sacrifice, an attribute that was demonstrated for us by Avraham Avinu.