



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Gittin Daf Tes Vuv

PEREK HAMEIVI BASRA -- PEREK SHEINI

MISHNA

- If a shaliach brings a get from chutz laaretz and says befanai nachtav but not befanai nechtam, or he says befanai nechtam but not befanai nachtav, or he says befanai nechtav the entire get but befanai nechtam only half of the signatures, or befanai nechtav half the get but befanai nechtam the entire get, in each of these cases the get is passul.
- If one person says befanai nechtav and another person says befanai nechtam, the get is passul.
- If two people say befaneinu nechtav and one person says befanai nechtam, the get is passul. **R' Yehuda** says the get would be valid.
- If one person says befanai nechtav and two people say befaneinu nechtam, the get is valid.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The first Mishna of the Mesechta already taught that the shaliach must say BNB, so why does this Mishna have to repeat that requirement? **A:** Based on the first Mishna alone we would have thought that l'chatchila it should be said, but b'dieved if it is not said the get remains valid. This Mishna therefore teaches that if BNB is not said, the get is passul even b'dieved.

BEFANAV NECHTAV CHETZYO U'BEFANAI NECHTAM KULO PASSUL

- **Q:** Which half does he say was written in front of him? If it refers to the first half, why would it be passul? **R' Elazar** has said that even if one line of the get (the essential part of the get, of which the first half is a part) is written lishma, that is sufficient and the shaliach need not see beyond that!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the Mishna is referring to the second half of the get (which is non-essential).

BEFANAI NECHTAV KULO U'BEFANAI NECHTAM CHETZYO PASSUL

- **R' Chisda** said, even if two other people come and confirm the second signature, the get would be passul. The reason is, the signatures must either be confirmed totally by a regular confirmation, or totally by the enactment of BNB. To combine the two is not allowed.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, how can it be that if one person (the shaliach) would testify about the signature the get would be valid, but now that 2 people are testifying about the signature the get becomes passul!? **A: Rava** therefore said, what we can say is that if the shaliach testifies alone with regard to one signature, and then joins another person to testify regarding the second signature, the get would be passul. The reason is that this can lead to confusion regarding other cases of confirming signatures, because we are essentially relying on one person for $\frac{3}{4}$ of the confirmation (we rely on him totally with regard to one signature and 50% with regard to the second signature. This can lead to confusion regarding a case where one signing witness confirms his own signature and acts as one witness regarding confirmation of the second signature on a monetary document. In that case we may not rely on one person to that degree. Therefore, we cannot rely on the shaliach to this degree regarding get either, so as not to get confused with a monetary case).
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, how can it be that if the shaliach confirms all signatures on his own he is believed, but because there is a second person who joins him regarding one of the signatures it now becomes passul!? **A: R' Ashi** therefore said, what we can say is that if the shaliach says befanai nechtam on the first signature and then says "I am the second signing witness on the get", the get is

passul. The reason is, that the get must be confirmed either completely based on the enactment of BBNB or completely based on regular confirmation.

- **Q:** Our Mishna said, if the shaliach says befanai nechtav the entire get but befanai nechtam only one of the signatures, the get is passul. What is being said about the other signature? If he is saying that there is no one to confirm that signature at all, then this halacha of the Mishna is obvious, because the Mishna said that if one person says befanai nechtav the entire get and the other says befanai nechtam on both signatures the get is passul. If so, it is obvious that saying befanai nechtam on only one signature would make the get passul!? Rather, we must say that the Mishna is teaching something new, and because we must say that the less novel teaching is likely what is being taught, we will say that the Mishna is teaching either like **Rava** said or like **R' Ashi** said, and not like **R' Chisda**!? **A: R' Chisda** would answer, why did the Mishna teach the case of where the shaliach says befanai nechtav but not befanai nechtam? If the Mishna teaches it is even passul when he says befanai nechtam on half, then surely it is passul when he doesn't say befanai nechtam at all! Rather, we will say that the Mishna is using the approach of "lo zu ahf zu" – which means that the Mishna teaches a smaller chiddush and then a bigger chiddush, even though the smaller chiddush could have been learned from the case of the bigger chiddush. The same can be said for the other cases, and therefore mention of where he says befanai nechtam on only one of the signatures can be taken at face value that nothing is being said about the other signature, and although this could have been learned from the next part of the Mishna, the Mishna is using the "lo zu ahf zu" approach.
- **R' Chisda** said, if a pit is 5 tefachim deep and there are walls from ground level that reach 5 tefachim high, they do not combine to form a wall of 10 tefachim (which would help to make the pit into a reshus hayachid). Rather, to enclose a reshus hayachid the enclosure must be all above ground walls, or all dug out walls below ground. **Mareimar** darshened that these two types of walls do combine. The Gemara paskens that these walls do combine.
- **Ilfa** asked, can hands become tahor by using half measures or not?
 - **Q:** What is the question?
 - If he means to ask whether 2 people can be "metaher" their hands with one cup holding a revi'is of water, a Mishna clearly says that that would be fine!?
 - If he was asking whether a person can wash his hands separately (each hand is thus considered to be a "half measure"), we learn from a Mishna that that is also fine!?
 - If he was asking whether a person can wash half his hand and then wash the other half of his hand, we have learned that **R' Yanai** said that that may not be done!?
 - If he was asking if someone can wash half his hand, leaving it moist, and then washing the other half of the hand, we have learned a Mishna that that would still not be good for taharah!?
 - **A:** The question is where he only washes half the hand and leaves it wet enough to be able to make something else wet enough that it too can make something else wet. Although we have learned a Braisa that says in that case the liquids would be considered connected, we would think they are considered connected only in regard to the concept of mikvah. His question is whether this "connection" applies to the concept of making hands tahor as well.