# Immediately; it is Kosher

# <u>Overview</u>

The גמרא cites a משנה which states that if a שליה lost a גט and he found it immediately; the גאביי Our הוספות explains that this rule is valid even according to אביי.

#### -----

אפילו אביי דחייש לתרי יצחק<sup>1</sup> אפילו היכא דלא הוחזק (יבמות דף קטו,ב) -Even according to אביי who is concerned for two people with the name of יצחק, even if it was not established that there are two people named יצחק, nevertheless -

בגט שמצאו לאלתר לא חייש דהתם הוי כמו לזמן מרובה דלא שייך התם<sup>2</sup> לאלתר: By a גט שמצאו לאלתר which was found לאלתר, even אביי is not concerned, for there (in the case of two נצחק) it is like a case of זמן מרובה, for there, לאלתר is not applicable.

## <u>Summary</u>

The concern that there may be other people with the same name, is neutralized if there is ample evidence that it must belong to the original person (as in a case where the the גט was found לאלתר).

## Thinking it over

answer seems so obvious; why was it necessary for תוספות to explain it to us?!

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The case there is where there was a person called אלותא, יצחק ריש גלותא (called קורטובא) to the city of אסמפיא, where he died. The people of אסמפיא, who did not really know this יצחק יצחק vell (they only knew his name יצחק ond his origin [קורטובא]), informed the people of אסמפי לגותא from אבויי לותא לגותא קורטובא from אביי יצחק ריש גלותא מיט אלותא אונותא פירש גלותא מינותא יצחק ריש גלותא אונותא יצחק ריש גלותא אונותא (קורטובא), nevertheless there is that concern that there may be another יש גלותא יצחק ריש גלותא (so his wife cannot remarry, or they cannot divide his estate, etc.). The apparent question is why there are we we may be not here by a called אנותא אונותא אונועוגע אונ

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In the case of the lost us, it is virtually impossible that this אט is from another couple with the same names, since it was found אלאלתר, so the other person could not have come in this short duration; however there (by אלתר), even if he died immediately upon his arrival to אספמיא that does not preclude that he is another עולה (for we do not know which איז עולה). The proof that אספמיא brovides here (that it must be the same us), is impractical there.