



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

Gittin Daf Pey Zayin

MISHNA

- If two men sent identical gittin to their wives (the men and the women had identical names) with a shaliach and the shaliach mixed up the gittin (so he doesn't know which get was written for which woman), he must give both gittin to each of the women. Therefore, if one of the gittin were lost, the second get is batel, because we don't know whose it is.
- If 5 people wrote a "klal" (a common text) in the get – for example the get said "I, so-and-so, am divorcing my wife, so-and-so, and I, so-and-so, am divorcing my wife, so-and-so", and the witnesses are signed on the get, the get is valid for all 5 couples and the get must be given to each of the women.
 - If a separate "tofes" was written for each of the couples, and the witnesses signed below, only the last get, with which the signatures are read, is valid.

GEMARA

- **R' Yirmiya** said, our Mishna does not follow **R' Elazar** – since he says that eidei mesira are the essential witnesses, the get in the first case would be passul, because the witnesses don't know which get is divorcing which woman. **Abaye** said, the Mishna can follow **R' Elazar** as well, because although he requires that the get be written lishma, he does not require that the get be given over lishma, and therefore the get will be valid.

CHAMISHA SHEKASVU KLAL...

- **Q:** What is meant by the "klal" and what is meant by the "tofes"? **A:** **R' Yochanan** said, if there is one date for all 5 sections, that is "klal", and if there is a separate date for each section, that is "tofes". **Reish Lakish** said, even if there is one date it is called a tofes. The case of klal is if all the names are written in one joint clause ("I, so-and-so, and I, so-and-so...hereby divorce our wives so-and-so, and so-and-so...").
 - **Q:** **R' Abba** asked, according to **R' Yochanan** that there is one date, but the names are written in different clauses, why are we not concerned that the witnesses are only signed to the last clause on the get and is therefore only valid for that last couple? **A Braisa** says that if there is a get, where after the text of the get the husband wrote to send regards to someone, and the witnesses are signed under that, we are concerned that they are signing to the regards and not to the get. If so, we should certainly be concerned that in our case they are only signing to the last clause!? **A:** We have learned that **R' Avahu** said in the name of **R' Yochanan** that in the Braisa the get is only passul if there is no conjunctive "and" at the beginning of the section giving the regards. If there is, it would be valid. We can therefore say, that in the Mishna as well, the case is where each clause is connected with the conjunctive "and", making the entire document valid.
 - **Q:** According to **R' Yochanan**, who says that if there is a separately written date for each clause it is considered a tofes and the get would be passul, why don't we simply say it is passul because this is a case of a get that is not written and signed all in the same day, which we have learned is passul!? **A:** **Mar Keshishia the son of R' Chisda** said to **R' Ashi**, we have learned in the name of **R' Yochanan**, that although a separate date was written for each clause, the same date was written, so it was all written in the same day.
 - **Q:** **Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, according to **Reish Lakish**, that the case of klal is that all the names were in one big clause, that seems to be the case of two women being divorced with one get, and we learn from the pasuk of "v'kasav lah" that such a get is passul!? **A:** After this joint clause, there is then a separate clause for each couple.

- **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, why is this different than the case of a Braisa where a master gives all his possessions to his two slaves, where the halacha is that they are koneh and must then each free the other one? If a single document can suffice to free 2 slaves, it should also work to divorce 2 women!? **A:** The Gemara says, we explained the Braisa as discussing where there are 2 documents!
 - There is a Braisa that says like **R' Yochanan** and a Braisa that says like **Reish Lakish**. The Gemara says that according to **Reish Lakish**, if there is a combined clause containing all the names, and then there is a separate clause for each couple, if each clause then has its own date, it would still be considered a tofes and not a klal.

MISHNA

- If there are 2 gets written on one piece of parchment, with each get being in its own column, and there are 2 Hebrew signing witnesses that sign under the get on the right and extend to under the get on the left (when signing in Hebrew the witnesses writes his name first and then his father's name), and there are then 2 Greek signing witnesses that sign under the get on the left and extend to under the get on the right (when signing in the Greek way, the witness first writes his father's name and then his name), the get with which the first set of witnesses is read, is valid (if the upper witnesses were the ones who wrote in Hebrew, the right get is valid, and if the upper ones were the Greek method, the left get is valid).
- If there was first a witness who signed Hebrew, then one who signed Greek, then another Hebrew and then another Greek and the signatures extend from under one get to the other, both gittin are passul.

GEMARA

- **Q:** When a witness signs, he signs in the format of "Reuven ben Yaakov eid". If so, in the first case of the Mishna, why don't we say that the get on the right is valid based on "Reuven" (based on their actual names being written under the get) and that the get on the left is valid based on "ben Yaakov eid" (stating the son of their father's name and "eid"), because a Mishna says that signing "the son of so-and-so, eid" is a valid signature!? **A:** The case is that the words "Reuven ben" are under the right column, and "Yaakov eid" are under the left column, which makes the left column passul.
 - **Q:** Why don't we say that "Yaakov eid" is by itself referring to a signature by Yaakov, and if so, the get on the left should be valid as well!? **A:** He didn't write the word "eid", which is essential to validate the signature. **A2:** We recognize the signature and know that it does not belong to Yaakov, but rather to his son Reuven. Therefore, the left get can't be valid with "Yaakov".
 - **Q:** Maybe Reuven signed it using his father's name? **A:** A person doesn't use his father's name without writing his own as well.
 - **Q:** Maybe he used his father's name as a symbol for his own, as we find that many Tanna'im and Amora'im would write symbols in place of their signature!? **A:** A person would not have the chutzpah to use his father's name as a symbol for his own.
- **Q:** Why don't we say that the upper two signatures make the get on the right valid and the lower two signatures make the get on the left valid? The fact that the upper two signatures are making a space between the get on the left and its signatures is not an issue, because the lines are not left blank, and therefore the space is not an issue!? **A: Zeiri** actually says that both gittin are valid for this reason. The Tanna of our Mishna must hold that we have to be concerned that the Greek witnesses signed in the Hebrew style, by placing their names before the names of their father, and in that way all the signatures are there to validate the get on the right.

EID ECHAD IVRI V'EID ECHAD YEVANI

- **Q:** Why don't we say that the right get is validated by one Hebrew and one Greek witness, and the get on the left by the other two? **A: Zeiri** actually says that both gittin are valid for this reason. The Tanna of our Mishna must hold that we have to be concerned that the Greek witnesses signed in the Hebrew style, by placing their names before the names of their father, and in that way maybe 3 out of the 4 signatures are there to validate the get on the right.

MISHNA

- If the text of a get completed one column and then continued into a second column, and the witnesses signed underneath (the second column) the get is valid.
- If witnesses signed on top of the page, on either side, or on the back (other than for a get mekushar), the get is passul.
- If two gets are written in a way that the top of each begins in middle of the parchment and they are then written each toward the other side of the parchment, and the witnesses sign in between the two gittin, they are both passul.
 - If they are written so that the ends of the two gittin are facing each other, and the witnesses sign in between, the get that has the witnesses signed properly beneath it is valid, and the other one is passul.
 - If the gittin are written one on top of the other on the page, and the witnesses sign in between, the upper get will be valid.
- If a get is written in Hebrew and has witnesses signed in Greek, or visa-versa, or even if one witness signed in Hebrew and other signed in Greek, or a get that was written by the sofer and signed by a single witness, the get is valid.
- If the witness signs “Reuven, eid”, it is valid. If he signs “the son of Yaakov, eid”, it is valid. If he writes “Reuven the son of Yaakov” without writing “eid”, it is valid. In fact, this is how the pure minded people of Yerushalayim would sign (so as not to write more than was necessary).
- If a get is written and uses the last names of the husband and wife instead of their father’s names, the get is valid.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we allow the get written in two columns? Why are we not concerned that they were originally two different gittin, and he cut off the date of the second column and the witnesses of the first column and made a get using a combination of the remaining aspects of the two? **A: R’ Abba in the name of Rav** said, the case is where there is blank space underneath the right column, so we know it wasn’t cut off.
 - **Q:** Maybe he cut off a lot of the top of the get on the left so that it fit with the unfinished get on the right, and the “new get” is therefore using the date of the unfinished get!? **A:** We will answer similarly here, that there is space above the get on the left, so there was nothing written there.
 - **Q:** Why are we not concerned that the husband initially wrote the first column to use to divorce his wife and he then decided not to divorce (which then makes the get passul), and he then changed his mind again and completed the get by writing on the left column!? **A:** The words “harei aht” are written at the end of the right column, and “muteres” is written in the beginning of the left column, which would suggest that both columns were written at the same time.
 - **Q:** Maybe he had stopped mid-sentence? **A:** We are not concerned to that extent.
 - **R’ Ashi** said, the case is that we can recognize that the parchment was never cut, so there is no concern.