## 18.01.03; 4b (תנן המביא גט ממדה"י) $\rightarrow 6a$ (אשכחיה ואמר ליה)

- I Continued challenges to רבה (לפי שאין בקיאין לשמה)
  - a Challenge #1: משנה א:ג: if he can't state בפ"ג ובפ"ג, let it be validated by testimony about the signatures
    - i Our explanation of "can't state" *cannot mean* "deaf mute", as he is an invalid agent (ב:ה)
    - ii Rather: he handed the גג over while competent and became חרש before making the declaration
    - iii *Explanation*: this supports רבא (as the solution is to validate the signatures)
    - iv Defense: לאחר שלמדו (the courts in the Diaspora mastered the process)
    - v Challenge: if so, then even if he can declare בפ"נ ובפ"ג, validating the signatures ought to be sufficient
    - vi Answer: we don't allow it as a precaution against the Diaspora courts reverting to their unschooled ways
    - vii Challenge: if so, we should disallow it even in case of אינו יכול (e.g. person who became deaf at this point)
    - viii Answer: this is an unusual case, and רבנן generally don't apply their גזירות to unusual cases
    - ix Challenge: the wife bringing it herself is uncommon and we require בפ"נ
    - x Answer: we don't want to distinguish between various agents
    - xi Challenge: if so, why not require the husband to make the declaration if he brings it?
    - xii Answer: no reason declaration is only protection against his potential challenge of the validity
  - כרב הונא: S ruling –if 2 bring a גע, no need for בפ"נ ובפ"נ, since they could also validate the signatures
    - i Explanation: entire focus is קיום הגט
    - ii Defense: לאחר שלמדו
    - iii *Challenge*: if so, even 1 bringing it shouldn't have to declare בפ"נ ובפ"נ
    - iv Answer: precaution against matters returning to their earlier (sorry) state
    - v Challenge: if so, even 2 should have to declare
    - vi Answer: 2 bringing a רבנן is unusual, and רבנן don't generally apply גזירות to unusual circumstances
    - vii (rest of argument follows ix-xii above)
  - c challenge #3: if someone brings a ג and doesn't declare בפ"נ ובפ"נ if the signatures are validated, it's valid
    - i answer: לאחר שלמדו
    - ii Challenge: didn't we continually stress that the decree is maintained as a precaution?
    - iii *Answer*: in this case, she already married (based on the גע)
    - iv Challenge: if so, the wording shouldn't be "שלא אמרנ"., rather "she already married"
    - v Answer: indeed the reason we are lenient is that she already married and we don't force a divorce
      - 1 *Explanation*: the only reason we require בפ"נ ובפ"נ is to protect against husband's potential challenge if he isn't challenging it, why should we?
- II רבא and רבה parallel to רבא and רבא
  - a Alignment: ריב"ל evidently maintains that the reason if בקיאות לשמה as per his response when 2 brought a גט
- III Procedure of a שליח handing over a גט to the woman
  - a In front of 2 שליח (inferred from story where he instructed the שליח to hand it over in front of 2)
  - b In front of 3 ר' חנינא (by default)
  - c Explanation of dispute:
    - i Suggestion: if it's בקיאין, we need witnesses (2); if השטר, we require בי"ד of 3
      - 1 Rejection: די holds בקיאין (above)  $\rightarrow$  יוחנן maintains it to be קיום הגט, yet he requires only 2
      - 2 Additionally: רבא accepts רבה (→ all should require 3)
    - ii Rather: dispute is whether the שליח) can become a דיין for the same case (עד נעשה דיין)
      - 1 Challenge: all agree that in a case עד נעשה דיין, מדרבנן
    - iii Finetuning: since a woman could bring the גע, they may rely on her as a third;
      - l *Contra*: all know that a woman can't be reckoned as a דיין, they won't make that mistake
  - d Support for ברייתא ב' with dispute בפ"ג וabout what to do if he gave her the גע w/o declaring בפ"ג ובב"ג ובב
    - i ממזרים the new husband must divorce her and the children are ממזרים
      - 1 explanation: ר"מ maintains that any deviation from rabbinic verbiage in יוציא והוולד ממזר גיטין
    - ii *רבנן*; take it back and give it to her <u>in front of 2</u> and declare בפ"נ ובפ"נ
- IV Standard of observation that the גע was properly prepared לשמה
  - a בר הדיא brought a גי in front of ר' אחי (in charge of גיטין) and told to testify about each letter rejected
  - b האי ור' אסי no need; requiring such a thing will libel the earlier ר' אמי ור' אסי (מוציא לעז על גיטין הראשונים) גיטין
  - c אלעזר all that is needed is to testify to one line being written לשמה
  - d סופר even if he heard the סופר preparing the quill and parchment for this woman sufficient
    - i supporting כשר even if he was upstairs and סופר downstairs or vice-versa, כשר; even if the סופר went out in the middle and returned מוך (we're not concerned that he was hired in שוק for another איז in the meantime)