

מִסְכֵּת גִּיטִין • דֵּף ל"ב ע"א

Elucidated Talmud • Statement and Proof • Navy & Gold Edition

THE SUGYA

In this daf, we begin a beautiful and crucial new Mishna that deals with the halachos of a husband nullifying a get (bill of divorce) that is already on its way to his wife. The Mishna teaches us the basic parameters of how a husband can cancel the agency of his shliach (messenger), either by telling the shliach directly, sending a second shliach to stop him, or by reaching the wife herself before the get is delivered. We also learn about the famous takanah (ordinance) of Rabban Gamliel the Elder, who instituted that a husband may not nullify a get in a distant court without the wife's knowledge, a vital enactment made "mipnei tikkun haolam" (for the betterment of the world) to prevent agunos.

The Gemara then dives into a precise analysis of the Mishna's wording, showing us the deep psychological insight of our Sages. The Gemara explains why each specific scenario in the Mishna is necessary, teaching us that we do not simply assume the husband's cancellation is just a cruel attempt to vex his wife. We also begin a fascinating discussion regarding the exact lashon (terminology) a husband must use to successfully nullify the get, distinguishing between effective terms like "batel hu" and ineffective descriptions.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

EXPLANATION

שׁוֹפֵתָא בְּקוֹפִינָא דְמָרָא – רָפִיא.

The Gemara continues its explanation of the word yafri: Even **the handle in the hole of the hoe**, which is normally wedged in tightly, eventually **becomes loose**, and the word yafri refers to this loosening and separation.

STATEMENT

רַב יוֹסֵף אָמַר: אֲפִילוּ סִיכָתָא בְּדַפְנָא – רָפִיא.

Rav Yosef said: Even a peg hammered into the wall eventually becomes loose.

STATEMENT

רַב אַחָא בַר יַעֲקֹב אָמַר: אֲפִילוּ קִנְיָא בְּכוּפָתָא – רָפִיא.

Rav Aha bar Yaakov said: Even a reed woven into the basket eventually becomes loose.

STATEMENT

הֲדַרְזוּ עֲלֵהּ כָּל גִּט

May we return to you, "Kol Get"!

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

השולח גט לאשתו, והגיע בשליח או ששלח אחריו שליח, ואמר לו: "גט שנתי לך, בטל הוא" –
הרי זה בטל.

MISHNAH: One who sends a get to his wife with an agent, and he reached the agent along the way, or where he sent another agent after him to overtake him, and he said to him: "The get that I gave to you is void," behold, this get is void.

MISHNAH

קידם אצל אשתו או ששלח אצלה שליח, ואמר לה: "גט ששלחתי לך, בטל הוא" – הרי זה בטל.

If the husband reached his wife first before the agent arrived, or where he sent an agent to her to nullify it, and he said to her: "The get that I sent to you is void," behold, this get is void.

MISHNAH

אם משהגיע גט לידה – שוב אינו יכול לבטלו.

However, if he attempted to nullify it only after the get reached her hand, he can no longer nullify it, as she is already divorced.

MISHNAH

בראשונה הנה עושה בית דין במקום אחר ומבטלו, התקין רבן גמליאל הזקן שלא יהו עושין כן,
מפני תיקון העולם.

Initially, a husband would convene a Beis Din in another place and nullify the get there, without the wife or the agent knowing. Rabban Gamliel the Elder instituted that they should not do so, for the betterment of the world.

גמרא GEMARA

INFERENCE

גמ' "הגיעו" לא קתני, אלא "הגיע" – ואפילו ממילא, ולא אמרינן לצעורה הוא דקא מיפנין.

GEMARA: The Gemara notes: The Mishnah **does not teach**: "He overtook him", which would imply he pursued him intentionally, **but rather**: "He reached" him, meaning **even if** they met **incidentally**. And we do not say that since he did not pursue him, **he only intends to vex her** and does not truly mean to nullify the get; rather, the nullification is valid.

QUESTION

"או ששלח אחריו שליח" – למה לי?

The Gemara asks: "Or where he sent another agent after him" — why do I need this case? It is obvious that a person's agent is like himself.

ANSWER

מהו דתימא: לא אלימא שליחותיה דבתרא משליחותיה דקמא – דלבטליה, קא משמע לן.

The Gemara answers: It is necessary, **lest you say: The agency of the latter agent is not strong enough** to override the **agency of the former agent to nullify it**, and only the husband himself can do so. Therefore, the Mishnah **teaches us** that the second agent can indeed nullify the first agent's mission.

QUESTION

”קדם הוא אצל אשתו” – למה לי?

The Gemara asks: **“If he reached his wife first”** — **why do I need** this case? It is obvious that he can nullify it before it takes effect.

ANSWER

מהו דתימא: כי לא אמרינן לצעורה קא מיכנין – הני מילי לשליח, אבל לדידה ודאי לצעורה קא מיכנין, קא משמע לן.

The Gemara answers: **Lest you say: When we do not say “he only intends to vex her”** and the nullification is valid, **this applies only** when he speaks **to the agent**; but if he speaks **to her directly**, **he certainly intends only to vex her** and does not truly mean to nullify it. Therefore, the Mishnah **teaches us** that even in this case, the get is nullified.

QUESTION

”או ששלח אצלה שליח” – למה לי?

The Gemara asks: **“Or where he sent an agent to her”** — **why do I need** this case?

ANSWER

מהו דתימא: איהו הוא דלא טרח אדעתא לצעורה, אבל שליח, דלא איכפת ליה כי טרח – ודאי לצעורה קא מיכנין, קא משמע לן.

The Gemara answers: **Lest you say: He himself would not exert himself** to go with the intention of vexing her falsely; but sending **an agent, where he does not care** if the agent exerts himself, **he certainly intends only to vex her** and does not truly mean to nullify it. Therefore, the Mishnah **teaches us** that even this nullification is valid.

QUESTION

אם משהגיע גט לידה – אינו יכול לבטלו. פשיטא!

The Mishnah states: **If he attempted to nullify it only after the get reached her hand, he can no longer nullify it.** The Gemara asks: **Isn't this obvious?** Once she receives it, she is divorced!

ANSWER

לא צריכא דמהדר עליה מעיקרא לבטולי; מהו דתימא: איגלאי מלתא למפרע דבטולי בטליה, קא משמע לן.

The Gemara answers: **No, it is necessary** for a case **where he was pursuing the agent from the outset to nullify it**, but did not reach him until after she received it. **Lest you say: It is revealed retroactively that he had nullified it** in his mind from the beginning, therefore the Mishnah **teaches us** that since the actual nullification occurred only after she received it, it is too late.

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: ”פטל הוא”; ”אי איפשי בו” – דבריו קיימין.

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: If a husband said of a get: **"It is void,"** or **"I do not desire it,"** his words stand and the get is nullified.

BRAISA

"פסול הוא"; "אינו גט" – לא אמר כלום.

But if he said: **"It is invalid,"** or **"It is not a get,"** he has said nothing, because these terms imply there is an inherent defect in the document, which is not the case.

QUESTION

למימרא ד"בטל" לישנא דלביטיל משמע?!

The Gemara asks: **Is this to say that** the word **batel** implies a language of **"let it become void"** in the future, which is why it works to nullify the get now?

OBJECTION

והאמר רבה בר אביו, אמר רב ששת; ואמרי לה אמר רבה בר אביו: מקביל מתנה, שאמר לאחר

שפאתה מתנה לידו: "מתנה זו מבוטלת"; "תיבטל"; "אי איפשי בה" – לא אמר כלום.

But did not Rabba bar Aivu say that Rav Sheshet said — and some say Rabba bar Avuh said: In the case of a recipient of a gift who said after the gift came into his hand: **"This gift is nullified," "Let it be nullified,"** or **"I do not desire it"** — he has said nothing, because he already acquired it and cannot undo it with future-tense nullification.

OBJECTION

"בטלה היא"; "אינה מתנה" – דבריו קיימין. אלמא "בטל" מעיקרא משמע!

However, if he said: **"It is void [beteilah hi],"** or **"It is not a gift,"** his words stand, because these terms imply he never accepted it from the start. **Consequently,** we see that **batel** implies that it was void **from the outset**, which contradicts our Braisa where batel is used as an active nullification!

RESOLUTION

אמר אביי: "בטל"

Abaye said: The word **batel** has a double meaning...

SUMMARY

The sugya clarifies that a husband can nullify a get at any point before it reaches his wife's hand, even if he only met his shliach incidentally or sent a second shliach to deliver the cancellation. The Gemara explains that once the get enters the wife's possession, the divorce is fully in effect, and we do not say that a subsequent nullification retroactively reveals his prior intent to cancel it. Finally, the Sages teach that only specific, active terms of nullification (such as **"batel hu"** or **"I do not desire it"**) are halachically effective to void the get, whereas merely describing the get as invalid or as **"not a get"** has no legal effect whatsoever.

In our sugya, the Gemara analyzes the actions of a husband who goes to great lengths to nullify a get. We might have assumed that his frantic efforts, sending messengers, running after the agent, or even sending a messenger directly to his wife, were just a cruel game meant to vex and torment her, rather than a sincere legal nullification. Yet, the Gemara teaches us a profound principle: we do not assume a person acts purely out of a desire to cause pain. We take his actions seriously. If he went through the trouble, we must treat his words as real and consequential.

How often in our own lives do we look at the actions of those around us, our spouses, our children, or our neighbors, and immediately attribute the worst possible motives to them? When someone does something that upsets us or disrupts our plans, the yetzer hara rushes to convince us that they did it specifically to vex us, to push our buttons, or to cause us grief.

This sugya challenges us to rise above that cynical instinct. If the Torah commands us to assume a husband's exhausting efforts are driven by a real, substantive intent rather than a petty desire to torment his wife, how much more must we apply this *dan l'chaf zechus* to the people in our daily lives. Most people are not trying to hurt you; they are simply navigating their own complex lives, making their own choices, and dealing with their own struggles.

Today, when someone does something that frustrates you or disrupts your day, consciously stop yourself from saying, "They are just doing this to annoy me." Instead, choose to believe that they have a real, valid reason for their actions, and judge them with favor and compassion.