



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Gittin, Daf א״ד – Daf ט״ד

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf א״ד--81-----

### MISHNA

- If a man wrote a get to divorce his wife and then changed his mind and didn't follow through with the divorce, **B"Y** say she is passul to marry a Kohen, and **B"H** say even if a get was actually given to a woman, but it was given with a certain condition, and the condition was never fulfilled, she may still marry a Kohen.

### GEMARA

- **R' Yosef the son of R' Menashe of Dvil** asked **Shmuel**, how should we pasken in the following case? A rumor has emerged about a certain Kohen that he wrote a get for his wife, and yet she continues to live with him. Should we separate them? He answered, she must leave him, but this matter needs investigation.
  - **Q:** What does it mean that there needs to be further investigation? It can't be that it means we have to see if we can be mevatel the rumor, because in Neharda'a, which was where **Shmuel** was from, they would never try to be mevatel rumors!? **A:** Rather, we must investigate whether when people say a get was "written", they mean that a get was given or not.
    - **Q:** Even if they refer to giving as writing, they also refer to writing as writing, so there is no reason to believe that the Kohen gave a get to his wife!? **A:** That is true. However, if they refer to writing as giving as well, we must be concerned that he is rumored to have given a get to his wife, and she will have to leave him.
    - **Q:** **R' Ashi** has said that we don't concern ourselves with rumors that put a woman's status into question when the rumor began after she was married!? **A:** We would not make her leave her first husband. When the Mishna says she must leave, it means that if she then got married to a second husband, who is a Kohen, she would have to leave him.
      - **Q:** By doing so you are causing people to question the validity of the children of the first husband!? **A:** Since we only make her leave the second husband, and not the first, people will say that the first husband must have divorced her right before he died, and it will not lead people to question the validity of the children.
- **Rabbah bar bar Channa in the name of R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yehuda bar Illai** said, look at the difference between the earlier generations and the later ones. The "earlier generations" refers to **B"Y** (who said that a Kohen may not marry a woman whose first husband just wrote a got for her without giving it to her). The "later generations" refers to **R' Dosa**, who in a Braisa says that a woman who was captured by goyim may still eat terumah (and we do not assume that she was raped).
  - **Rabbah bar bar Channa in the name of R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yehuda bar Illai** said, look at the difference between the earlier generations and the later ones. The early generations would bring all their tevel into the house through the front door, so that it should become chayuv in maaser D'Oraisa, whereas the later generations would bring it in through the roof or a back door so that it should be patur D'Oraisa.

### MISHNA

- If a man divorces his wife and then spends the night with her in a hotel, **B"Y** say she does not need a second get, and **B"H** say that another get is required.
  - **B"H** only require a second get when she is getting divorced from a nissuin. However, if they have gotten divorced from eirusin, she would not need another get, because they do not feel comfortable with each other (and we therefore do not need to assume that they had bi'ah).

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## GEMARA

- **Rabbah bar bar Channa in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the machlokes is only where they were seen to have had bi'ah. In that case **B" S** say that a person would have bi'ah for purposes of zenus, and therefore we need not be concerned that a new kiddushin was made, and **B" H** say that a person would not do so, and therefore we assume that the bi'ah was done to form a new kiddushin. However, if they were not seen to have had bi'ah, all agree that a second get would not be needed.
  - **Q:** The Mishna said that **B" H** agree that a second get would not be needed if the divorce is for an eirusin. Now, if the case is that they were seen to have had bi'ah, why would a new get not be needed just because they were only in eirusin? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where they were not seen to have had bi'ah. **R' Yochanan's** statement was made according to **R' Shimon ben Elazar**, who says in a Braisa exactly as **R' Yochanan** said.
  - **Q:** If our Mishna is discussing where they were not seen to have had bi'ah, what is the basis of the machlokes? **A:** The case is that there are witnesses to their seclusion, but not witnesses to an actual bi'ah. **B" H** say that we say the witnesses to the seclusion are considered witnesses to a bi'ah as well, and **B" S** say that we do not say that. **B" H** also hold, that if the divorce is from eirusin, since they are not comfortable with each other, in that case we will *not* say that the witnesses to seclusion are considered to be witnesses to a bi'ah as well.
  - **Q:** We have learned that **R' Yochanan** always follow an anonymous Mishna, so how can we say that he argues with our Mishna? **A: Rabbah bar bar Channa**, who said this version of **R' Yochanan**, will disagree with the Amora who says that **R' Yochanan** always follows the anonymous Mishna.

## MISHNA

- [The **Rabanan** instituted a get called a “get mekushar” to be the get written by a Kohen when he wants to divorce his wife, the get would be folded after each line or so, and the fold would need to be signed by a witness. This was done for each fold, and there must be a minimum of 3 folds.]
- If a woman remarried based on a “bald get” (a get mekushar that was missing a signature on one of the folds), she must leave both husbands, and she is subject to the strict list of penalties mentioned (a few Mishnayos back).
- **Ben Nanas** says anyone may sign a bald get so that it not be passul (even someone who is typically passul to be a witness). **R' Akiva** says, the only type of passul witness who may sign is a relative who would be a valid witness if not for the fact that he was a relative.
- What is a bald get? Any get mekushar that has more folds than signatures.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is a bald get passul? **A:** It is a gezeirah for the possibility that the husband had told all people present to sign on the get, and one did not do so.

## GET KEIREI'ACH HAKOL MASHLIMIN ALAV

- **Q:** Why does **R' Akiva** say that other types of invalid witnesses may not sign? It can't be based on a concern that people will think that they are valid witnesses, because he lets relatives sign and the concern should exist there as well!? It can't be that he doesn't allow a slave to sign based on a concern that it may lead people to believe that he is genealogically pure, because why would he also not allow a robber to sign? **A:** He doesn't let a slave sign, because it may lead people to think that he was freed. He doesn't let a robber sign, because it may lead people to think that he did teshuva. He allows a relative to sign, because it can lead to no harm. All know that he is a relative.
- It was said in the name of **R' Adda bar Ahava**, the machlokes between **R' Akiva** and **Ben Nanas** is where the get has 7 folds and only 6 witnesses, or 6 and 5, 5 and 4, or 4 and 3. However, if there are only 3 folds and only 2 witnesses, all agree that the 3<sup>rd</sup> witness may be an invalid witness only for the reasons of being related.
  - **Q: R' Zeira** asked **Rabbah bar She'ilta**, 3 signatures for a get mekushar is like the necessary 2 for any other get. If so, it should need 3 fully valid witnesses!? **A:** He answered, I had this same question and

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

asked it to **R' Hamnuna**, who then asked it to **R' Ada bar Ahava**, and he answered that the entire concept is only D'Rabanan, and that is why it is allowed.

- A Braisa says like **R' Ada bar Ahava's** understanding of the machlokes as well.
- **R' Yosef** taught that the third witness must be a valid witness. He would have to change the wording in the Braisa to reflect this.
- **R' Yochanan** said, only one relative may be used on this get, not two. If 2 were used we would have to be concerned that the get will be confirmed with the signatures of 3 witnesses, of which 2 of those confirmed may be the relatives.
  - **R' Ashi** said, the Braisa suggests this as well, because it gives all the cases of one missing witness and says it may be filled with a relative. It never gives a case of two missing witnesses.
  - **Abaye** said, since the Mishna did not say which fold may be signed by the relative, it must be that they can sign on any fold – first, last, or anywhere in between. Also, we can learn that when this get is confirmed, we may use any 3 witnesses to be confirmed, and they need not be in order of how they signed the folds. If they needed to be in order, we could just say that the relative must sign after or before two valid witnesses, and in that way we would be able to allow more relatives to sign (since there would be no concern that two relatives' signature would be used to confirm the get). Since we do not allow that, it must be that the signatures to be confirmed do not need to be in order of how they signed the folds.
- When they came to **R' Ami**, he said even a slave may sign the fold of a get meksuhar (like **Ben Nanans** said).

### HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAZOREIK!!!

-----Daf דפ-----82-----

### PEREK HAMEGAREISH -- PEREK TESH'I

#### MISHNA

- If a man divorces his wife, and as he gives her the get he says to her “You are hereby mutar to any man but so-and-so”, **R' Eliezer** says she is divorced and may marry anybody except the man mentioned, and the **Chachomim** say she is not divorced at all. According to the **Chachomim**, the husband can validate this get by taking it back, giving it back to her, and this time saying “you are hereby mutar to any man”. If the restriction was actually written into the get, then even if he took it back and erased the restriction, the get is passul.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Is the word “but” in the restriction meant as “except” or does it mean “on the condition”? If it means “except”, then we would say that the **Rabanan** only argue in this case, because they argue that “except” makes the get less than a complete separation and is therefore passul. However, if he had said “on condition” they would agree that the get is valid like any other condition of a get. Or maybe, “but” means “on condition” and it is only there that **R' Eliezer** argues. However if he had said “except” he would agree that the get is passul. Which one is correct? **A:** **Ravina** said, a Mishna says all houses can become tamei from tzaraas “but” for those of goyim. This must clearly mean “except for”, because saying it means “on condition” in this context makes no sense at all!? **SHEMA MINAH** that “but” means “except”.
  - Our Mishna argues on a Braisa, where **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** clearly says that the machlokes applies only when he said “on condition”, but if he said “except”, all would agree that the get is passul.
    - According to the version of the Braisa, **R' Eliezer** would say “on condition” is valid just as any other condition. The **Rabanan** say this condition is different in that it does not allow for a total severance from her husband (since she may not marry a certain man). Therefore, it is passul.
    - According to our Mishna, **R' Eliezer** holds that the get is valid even where he says “except”. **R' Yanai** in the name of an elder explained, this is based on the pasuk that says “v'yatza v'huysa

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

l'ish acheir" – even if she may only marry one other man ("ish acheir") it is considered to be a valid get. The **Rabanan** say, that the word "ish" means "every man" and that is why this get would be passul.

- **R' Yochanan** said, the basis for **R' Eliezer** is the pasuk that says that a Kohen may not marry a woman who is "grusha mei'isha" – even if she is only divorced from her husband, but may not marry any other man, she is still assur to a Kohen, which proves that the get is still valid. The **Rabanan** say that the issur of a divorcee to Kohanim is more stringent and that is why a Kohen couldn't marry such a woman, but in reality the divorce is passul.
- **Q: R' Abba** asked, what would be the halacha in the parallel case of kiddushin (he gave her kiddushin and said "you are mekudeshes to me and are assur to all other men except for so-and-so")? This is a question according to **R' Eliezer**, because maybe he only allows it by a get based of the drasha of the pesukim, but a kiddushin needs a full kinyan, which is lacking in this case. Or maybe the hekesh from gittin to kiddushin teaches that this kiddushin is valid as well? It is also a question according to the **Rabanan**, because maybe they say the get is passul because it doesn't fully sever, but kiddushin would be valid. Or maybe the hekesh from gittin to kiddushin teaches that this kiddushin is not valid as well? **A:** He then answered, that according to all, the hekesh would teach that kiddushin is just like gittin.
  - **Abaye** said, even if you hold like **R' Abba**, that **R' Eliezer** would say this kiddushin is effective, if Reuven gave a woman kiddushin and told her she is now assur to every man except his brother Shimon, and Shimon then gave her kiddushin and told her she is now assur to every man except his brother Reuven, and Reuven and Shimon both died childless, she would be subject to yibum to their brother Levi, and she is not considered to be "a wife of two men who have passed away" (which would be patur from yibum), because the kiddushin of Reuven was effective, but the kiddushin of Shimon was not (it did not make her assur to anybody that she wasn't already assur to). The case of "a wife of two men who have passed away" would be if Shimon had given her kiddushin without stating any exception. In that case, since the kiddushin of Shimon accomplishes to make her assur on Reuven it is somewhat of a kiddushin and she is therefore considered to be the wife of two men who have passed away.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, if the husband gave her the get and said "You are hereby mutar to any man except for Reuven and Shimon" and he then said "you are mutar to Reuven and Shimon", does he mean to leave everyone else mutar and add them as being mutar as well, or does he mean to make them mutar but everybody else assur? If you say he means to add Reuven and Shimon, then what about where he only added "you are mutar to Reuven", does he mean to make Reuven *and* Shimon mutar, and he only mentioned Reuven because he was first, or does he mean to single out Reuven? If you will say he means to single out Reuven, what about if he only added "you are mutar to Shimon", does he mean to single him out or do we say that he was the last in the group so he used his name, but actually refers to Reuven as well? **R' Ashi** asked, what if he added "you are mutar *even* to Shimon", does he mean to say Reuven as well or does he mean to add Shimon to the rest of men in the world, who she is mutar to (but does not mean that she should become mutar to Reuven) as well? **TEIKU**.

### -----Daf 83-----

- A Braisa says, after **R' Eliezer** passed away, 4 Chachomim came together to refute his halacha – **R' Yose Haglili, R' Tarfon, R' Elazar ben Azarya, and R' Akiva**.
  - **R' Tarfon** said **R' Eliezer** can't be right, because if the woman is allowed to marry in that case, she may go ahead and marry the brother of the man she is not allowed to marry, and if her husband then dies without children, she would be incapable of performing the mitzvah of yibum. It cannot be that a get would be valid when it could possibly uproot a mitzvah in the Torah!
  - **R' Yose Haglili** said **R' Eliezer** can't be right, because how can it be that something is assur to one person but mutar to another? Either it is assur to everybody or mutar to everybody. Therefore, it must be that such a divorce is a not a valid divorce.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Elazar ben Azarya** said **R' Eliezer** can't be right, because a get must be something that totally severs the bond between husband and wife, and this husband and wife are still connected.
- **R' Akiva** said **R' Eliezer** can't be right, because according to him, this woman can get married to another man and have children, and if she is then widowed or divorced again, and then goes and marries the man that she wasn't allowed to marry under the first get, it will turn out that she was never divorced from the first husband, and all her children from the second husband then become mamzeirem! Clearly such a get cannot be valid. **Another reason** is, if the man that the husband said she may not marry is a Kohen, and after receiving this divorce the husband then died, it turns out that she is a widow with regard to this Kohen and a divorcee with regard to every other man, and yet she would be assur to this Kohen. If she becomes assur to the Kohen because of the part of her that is a divorcee (which is only a lav for the Kohen) then surely she should be assur to all men when there is a restriction in her divorce, which essentially leaves her as being a partly married woman (which is subject to the death penalty)! It must be that the divorce is not valid.
- **R' Yehoshua** said to all of them, we do not refute the lion after his death!
- **Rava** said all these arguments can be refuted except for the argument of **R' Elazar ben Azarya**. **R' Yose** said this in a Braisa as well.
- The Gemara goes through each of the 4 statements of the **Chachomim** and explains them.
  - The statement of **R' Tarfon**. The Gemara asks, he is not actually uprooting a mitzvah!? The Gemara explains, it means he is making a condition with the result that a mitzvah will be uprooted. The Gemara asks, the husband is not requiring her to marry the brother of the man who is assur to her under the get, so he is not stipulating to uproot something from the Torah!? The Gemara says, this means he is causing the possibility that the mitzvah will be uprooted. The Gemara asks, if so a person should not be allowed to marry a woman who is an ervah to his brother so that he not possibly uproot the mitzvah of yibum if he were to die without children!? The Gemara says, this is actually exactly what **Rava** meant when he said that **R' Tarfon** can be refuted.
    - We find that **R' Eliezer** agrees that if the husband said "you are mutar to every man *except* for so-and-so", once she marries another man and her second marriage terminates, she would even be allowed to marry the man who was made assur in her first get. Therefore, **R' Tarfon** must hold that **R' Eliezer** was referring to a case where the husband said "on condition", in which case it continues in effect even after a subsequent marriage.
  - The statement of **R' Yose Haglili**. The Gemara asks, we find that terumah and kodashim are mutar to some and assur to others!? The Gemara says, he was referring to the issur of a woman. The case of arayos is a case of a woman being assur to some and mutar to others!? He was referring to the issur caused by a marriage. A married woman is mutar to her husband and assur to everyone else!? That is what **Rava** meant that this statement can be refuted.
    - **R' Yose** must hold that **R' Eliezer** refers to where the husband said "except", because if he said "on condition" she would not be totally assur to the man, because the get does not make zenus with him assur.
  - The statement of **R' Akiva**. The Gemara asks, based on this concern we should not allow any condition for a get!? The Gemara says, that is what **Rava** was referring to when he said that this can be refuted.
    - We find that **R' Eliezer** agrees that if the husband said "you are mutar to every man *except* for so-and-so", once she marries another man and her second marriage terminates, she would even be allowed to marry the man who was made assur in her first get. Therefore, **R' Akiva** must hold that **R' Eliezer** was referring to a case where the husband said "on condition", in which case it continues in effect even after a subsequent marriage.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The second reason of **R' Akiva**. This reason must hold that **R' Eliezer** refers to where the husband said “except”, because if he said “on condition” she would not be totally assur to the man, because the get does not make zenus with him assur.
  - According to this, one reason of **R' Akiva** is based on when the husband says “except” and the other is based on when he says “on condition”. This was done, because **R' Akiva** heard that some people understand **R' Eliezer** as referring to “except” and others understand him as referring to “on condition”. Therefore, he asked a question for each possibility.
  - **Rava's** refutation of this reason is that you can't compare the issur of Kehuna to other issurim. **Rava** must hold like **R' Yanai's** version of the basis for **R' Elazar**, which is not based on the issur of Kehuna.
- **R' Yehoshua** had said that we can't refute the lion after his death. Although we find a Braisa where **R' Yehoshua** himself also disagrees with **R' Elazar**, he says that we cannot refute **R' Elazar** after his death.
  - **R' Yehoshua's** issue with **R' Elazar's** halacha is quoted in a Braisa. He said that there is a hekesh from the woman's status before her first marriage to her status before her second marriage – just as before her first marriage she is not bound to any man, so too before her second marriage she must not be bound to any man.
- We quoted a Braisa above that said, **R' Eliezer** agrees that if the husband said “you are mutar to every man *except* for so-and-so”, once she marries another man and her second marriage terminates, she would even be allowed to marry the man who was made assur in her first get. **R' Shimon bar Elazar** disagreed and said, it can't be that one person makes something assur and another person can come along and make it mutar!
  - **Q:** We find that a husband makes his wife assur to other men, and yet the yavam can make her mutar to other men!? **A:** The issur for a yevama to marry is based on the yavam, and that is why he can release her. If the issur was based on the first husband, his death would have released her.
  - **Q:** We find that a person can make an issur with a neder and a chochom can release him!? **A:** **R' Yochanan** has said that the release only comes from the person himself regretting the neder that he made, so it is he who releases himself.
  - **Q:** We find that a husband can release the issur of his wife with hafara!? **A:** The reason for that is like **R' Pinchas in the name of Rava** said, that a woman only makes a neder subject to the consent of her husband. It is that condition of her own that releases her neder.
- **R' Elazar ben Azarya** gave the reason that a get must be something that totally severs (based on the word “krisus”), and a restricted get does not do so, which is why it is passul.
  - **Q:** How do the **Rabanan** darshen the word “krisus”? **A:** The **Rabanan** use the word “krisus” to teach that it must be a document that fully severs the relationship (it can't be made on a condition that obligates the woman to do something forever or not to do something forever).
    - **R' Elazar** will learn this from the word krisus as well, because the pasuk could have said “kareis” and instead says “krisus”, which allows for a second drasha. The **Rabanan** don't darshen in this way and therefore only have one drasha.
- **Rava** said, if a man tells his wife “this is your get on the condition that you don't drink wine for as long as I live”, it is not a full severance and is therefore a passul get. If he said “for as long as so-and-so lives”, it would be a valid get.
  - **Q:** Why are the two cases different? In both cases she may outlive the subject of the condition and thereby may fulfill the condition and achieve complete severance!? **A:** The first case should be changed to where he says that she may not drink wine for as long as *she* lives.
- **Q:** **Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, if a man tells his wife, this is your get for today, but tomorrow you should no longer be divorced, what is the halacha? This is a question according to **R' Eliezer**, because it may be that he allows a restrictive get only when she becomes mutar to the other people on a permanent basis, but in this case it is only

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

temporary. Or maybe there is no difference and it would be a valid get? This is a question according to the **Rabanan**, because it may be that they disallow a restrictive get when it is not a complete severance, but this is a complete severance, and therefore the get will take effect forever? **A: Rava** then answered, it would make sense that according to everybody this get would be effective in making her divorced forever (not just for the one day).

### -----Daf 75--84-----

- A Braisa says, if a man gives a get and says “this is your get on condition that you marry so-and-so”, she may not get married, but if she does, she does not need to leave the second husband.
  - **R’ Nachman** said, the Braisa means that she may not marry that man who is the subject of the condition, so that people not say that men give away their wives as gifts, but if she marries another man she need not divorce him.
    - **Q:** Can we say that for this gezeirah we will make the get valid and allow this married woman to stay married to another man!? **A: R’ Nachman** therefore said, the Braisa means that she may not marry the man named in the condition, as a gezeira that doing so would lead people to say that husbands gift their wives to other men. However, if she did marry this man we do not make her divorce, because we will not make her divorce for the sake of a gezeirah.
    - **Q: Rava** asked, saying “she may not marry the man named in the condition” suggests that she may marry other men. How can she do so if she did not fulfill the condition!? Do not think to say that we are comfortable that one day this marriage will terminate and she will then marry the man named in the condition, thereby fulfilling the condition, as we see that **R’ Nachman** says, if a person says I promise not to sleep today if I sleep tomorrow we allow him to sleep today because we are confident that he will then not sleep tomorrow. Our case cannot be compared to the case of **R’ Nachman**!? In the case of sleep, one can see to it that he will not sleep, but she cannot see to it that her marriage will be terminated thereby affording her the opportunity to then marry the man who is the subject of the condition, because she does not have the power to issue the divorce!? **A: Rava** therefore said, the Braisa means that she may not get married to that man or any other (she cannot marry that man as a gezeira so that people not say men gift their wives, and she cannot marry any other man, because she has not fulfilled the condition). However, if she does marry that man we do not force her to divorce, because we will not force a divorce on the basis of a gezeira, but if she marries any other man we do force her to divorce, because she has never fulfilled the condition. A Braisa clearly says like this as well.
- A Braisa says, if a man says “here is your get on condition that you go up to the sky” or “that you go down to the depths” or do some other physically impossible feat, it is not a valid get. **R’ Yehuda ben Teima** says a get “like this” is a get. **R’ Yehuda ben Teima** said a general rule, whenever a condition is made that is impossible to satisfy, he is simply trying to torment her, and the get is valid.
  - **R’ Nachman in the name of Rav** paskened like **R’ Yehuda ben Teima**. **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, a Mishna suggests this as well.
  - **Q:** What is the halacha if the husband says “this is your get on condition that you eat pig meat”? **A: Abaye** said this is another case of impossibility and would have the same result as the previous conditions (like going to the sky, etc.). **Rava** said, it is physically possible for her to eat the meat (for which she would then get malkus) and therefore the condition takes effect.
    - According to **Abaye**, when **R’ Yehuda** said his “general rule” he meant to include this type of case. According to **Rava**, when **R’ Yehuda** said “a get like this”, he meant to exclude a case like this.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a man gives a get and says “here is your get on condition that you have relations (legally or illegally) with so-and-so”, if the condition is fulfilled the get is valid, and if not, the get is not valid. If he said “on condition that you do not have relations with my father or your father” we are not concerned that she will have relations with them and the get is therefore valid. Now, the Braisa does not give the case of where he said “on condition that you have relations with my father or your father”. According to **Abaye** this makes sense, because

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

such a condition would not take effect, but according to **Rava** this condition should take effect and the Braisa should therefore mention it!? **A: Rava** would say, when dealing with eating pig meat, that is solely up to her and can therefore be fulfilled. When she must have relations with a particular person she can pay him to marry her and thereby fulfill that condition as well. However, having relations with a father is not something that she can make happen, because she will never convince him to have relations with her. Therefore, even **Rava** agrees that this condition would not take effect.

- Based on this, according to **Rava**, when **R' Yehuda** gave a general rule it was coming to include a condition to have relations with a father, and when he said “a get like this” he meant to exclude a condition to eat pig meat. According to **Abaye**, the general rule meant to include the case of eating pig meat, and “a get like this” meant to exclude where the condition was that she have relations with so-and-so.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that a condition that she eat pig meat is effective!? **A: Abaye** would answer, that Braisa only follows the view of the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Yehuda ben Teima**.
- **Q:** A condition which can only be fulfilled by doing an aveirah should be ineffective, because the person is making a condition against something written in the Torah, and any such condition is batull!? **A: R' Ada the son of R' Ika** said, in this case it is she who is doing something contrary to the Torah, not him, and therefore his condition stands.
  - **Q: Ravina** asked, she is only violating the Torah because of his condition, so it is he who is causing this violation!? **A: Ravina** said, the only time a condition becomes batul is when the Torah will definitely be violated (e.g. I will marry you on the condition that I don't have to give you food and clothing), but in this case the violation is not definite, because she can choose not to violate and not get divorced.

KEITZAD YAASEH YITLENU HEIMENAH...

- **Chizkiya** said, the Mishna, which requires the get to be taken back and re-given, follows **R' Shimon ben Elazar**, who says in a Braisa that when a get is given to a woman on the premise that it is a promissory note, the get must be taken back and re-given with the understanding that it is a get. **R' Yochanan** said that our Mishna can even follow **Rebbi** who argues in that Braisa and says the get need not be taken back, because in the Mishna, since the get accomplishes to make her assur to a Kohen, she was koneh it in some sense, and it therefore must be taken back and re-given.

KASVO B'TOCHO

- **R' Safra** said, the Mishna means that if the condition is written into the get, the get becomes passul.
  - **Q:** That is exactly what the Mishna clearly says!? **A:** We would think that such an oral condition does not make the get passul only if the toref of the get was written before the condition was stated. **R' Safra** is teaching, that if the condition is oral, then even if it was said before the toref was written, the get is valid.
  - **Rava** said, the oral condition doesn't make the get passul only if the toref was already written at the time. If it was not, the get would become passul.
- A Braisa says, **Rebbi** says any condition written into a get makes it passul. The **Chachomim** say, a condition that would make the get passul if stated orally (like if he says “you are mutar to marry anybody except for so-and-so”), also makes the get passul if written. If a condition would not make the get passul if stated orally (if he says “on condition”) then it is not passul if written into the get either.
  - **R' Zeira** said, the machlokes is regarding a condition written before the toref. In that case **Rebbi** says we must be goizer even by a case of “on condition” for a case of “except for”, whereas the **Rabanan** say we do not need to be goizer like that. However, if it is written after the toref, all would agree that the get is valid. Based on this, the Mishna which we explained as referring to a case of “except for” can be explained either as being written before the toref, in which case it follows the view of the **Rabanan**, or it can be understood as referring to when it is written after the toref, and it follows **Rebbi** as well. **Rava** said, the machlokes is only when it is written after the toref. In that case **Rebbi** is goizer for a case when it is written before the toref and the **Rabanan** are not goizer. However, when it is written before the



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

toref, all would agree that the get would be passul. According to this, the Mishna is referring to a condition written after the toref and can only follow the **Rabanan**.

- **R' Avin's** father taught a Braisa in front of **R' Zeira** that said, if a get was written with a condition all agree that it is passul. **R' Zeira** asked, we have learned that **Rebbi** and the **Rabanan** argue!? He told **R' Avin's** father to change the Braisa to say “all agree that the get is valid” and the Braisa must be talking about where the condition was written after the toref.
  - **Q:** Why couldn't he keep the phrase of “it is passul” and say that the Braisa follows **Rebbi**? **A:** **R' Zeira** felt that it is more likely that a mistake was made from saying that it is passul to saying that it is valid, than to say a mistake was made and instead of saying “all agree” it actually only follows a single view.

-----Daf 75-----85-----

### MISHNA

- If a man gives a get to his wife and says “You are hereby mutar to every man except for my father and your father” or “my brother or your brother” or “a slave or a goy” or to anyone else with whom a kiddushin would not be effective, the get is valid.
- If he gave her the get and says “You are hereby mutar to every man except for, since you are a widow, the Kohen Gadol” or “since you are a divorcee or chalutza, a regular Kohen” or “since you are a mamzeres or nesinah, a regular Yid”, or “since you are a regular Yid, a mamzer or nasin”, or anybody else with whom kiddushin would be effective even if only through an aveirah, the get is passul.

### GEMARA

- The general rule (i.e. “or to anyone else...”) of the first part of the Mishna comes to include all other relationships that would bring on a kares liability. The general rule of the second part of the Mishna comes to include all other relationships that would bring a chiyuv lav.
- **Q: Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, what if the husband says “You are mutar to all people except regarding accepting kiddushin from a particular minor”? Do we say that now he is not someone capable of making a kiddushin and the get is therefore valid, or do we say that since he will one day be capable of giving kiddushin the get is passul? **A: R' Nachman** said, a Braisa says that a minor girl can accept a get to be divorced from the kiddushin accepted on her behalf by her father (which is D'Oraisa). This is so, even though this girl could not accept kiddushin on her own and therefore, through the hekesh, should not be able to accept a get either. We see, that since she one day will be capable of accepting kiddushin, she can accept a get today. Similarly, in **Rava's** case, since he will be able to accept kiddushin, the get would be passul.
  - **Q:** What if the husband says “except for men who are yet to be born”? Do we say that now they are not here and therefore the get is valid, or do we say that since they will eventually be here, the get is passul? **A: R' Nachman** said, the Mishna said that if he says “except for slaves or goyim” the get is valid. Now, those slaves or goyim may eventually convert to Judaism, and we see that the get is still valid. Obviously, we look at the current situation, and not who may be here at a later date.
    - **Q:** Slaves and goyim are not necessarily going to convert, but unborn babies will certainly be born!?
  - **Q:** What if he says “except for your sister's husband”. Do we say that since right now a kiddushin with him would not take effect (he is assur to her with kares unless her sister were to die), the get is valid, or do we say that since if the sister were to die he would become mutar, the get is therefore passul? **A: R' Nachman** answered, the Mishna said that if he says “except for slaves or goyim” the get is valid. Now, those slaves or goyim may eventually convert to Judaism, and we see that the get is still valid. Obviously, we look at the current situation, and not at a later date.
    - **Q:** Conversion is not a common thing, whereas death is, so the cases can't be compared!?
  - **Q:** What if the husband says, “you are mutar to all men except with regard to having zenus? Do we say that she is mutar in marriage to all men so the get is valid, or do we say that her marriage to the first

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

man still exists regarding a matter of bi'ah, and therefore the get is passul? **A: R' Nachman** said, the Mishna says, if he said "except for your father or my father" the get is valid. Now, that case must be talking about zenus, because they are assur in marriage, and yet we see that only with such people does a restriction on her zenus not invalidate the get, but with other people it seems that it would.

- **Q:** It may be that this refers to marriage, not zenus, and he is stating that she may not go through the actions of a marriage with them, although the actions would not be effective.
- **Q:** What if the husband says, "you are mutar to all men except with regard to having bi'ah in an unnatural way"? Do we say that she is mutar to all men with regular bi'ah, and the get is therefore valid, or do we say that the pasuk of "mishkivei isha" teaches to compare all forms of bi'ah, and therefore he has left out a matter of bi'ah, and the get is therefore passul?
  - **Q:** What if the husband says, "you are mutar to all men except with regard to having them be meifer your nedarim"? Do we say she is mutar to all men and the get is valid, or do we say that since hafarah is a fundamental part of marriage, restricting that right would make the get passul?
  - **Q:** What if the husband says, "you are mutar to all men except with regard to eating terumah". Do we say she is mutar to all men and the get is valid, or do we say that since eating terumah is a fundamental part of marriage to a Kohen, restricting that right would make the get passul?
  - **Q:** What if the husband says, "you are mutar to all men except with regard to them inheriting you". Do we say she is mutar to all men and the get is valid, or do we say that since inheritance is a fundamental part of marriage, restricting that right would make the get passul?
  - **Q:** What if the husband says, "you are mutar to all men except with regard to accepting kiddushin with a document". Do we say she is mutar to all men by accepting kiddushin of money or bi'ah, and the get is therefore valid, or do we say that since all forms of kiddushin are compared to each other with a hekesh, he is considered to be restricting her right to kiddushin and the get is therefore passul?
  - In all these cases, the Gemara says **TEIKU**.

### MISHNA

- The essential part of the get is the phrase "You are hereby mutar to any man". **R' Yehuda** says the get must also say "and this document should be to you from me a document of banishment, a letter of abandonment, and a document of release, to go and marry any man that you want".
- The essential part of a get shichrur is the phrase "You are hereby a free woman" or "You are hereby to yourself".

### GEMARA

- **Q:** It is clear that if he writes to his wife in the get "You are hereby a free woman", the get is not valid. Similarly, if he writes to his slave "You are hereby mutar to every man" the get shichrur is not valid. What if he writes in the get to his wife "You are hereby to yourself"? Does he mean that the marriage is over and the get is valid, or does he mean that she can keep her earnings, but the marriage continues? **A: Ravina** told **R' Ashi**, our Mishna says that this phrase suffices to free a slave, who is totally owned by its master. Certainly then, this phrase would totally "free" the woman, who is not owned by the husband, and the marriage would terminate.
- **Q: Ravina** asked **R' Ashi**, what if he writes to his slave "I have no dealings with you"? **A: R' Chanin** said to **R' Ashi**, we see from a Braisa that when such language is used it serves as a get shichrur.

### R' YEHUDA OMER V'DEIN D'YEHEVEI LEICHI MINAI...

- The machlokes is that the **Rabanan** hold that partial declarations ("yados") are effective even if they are less than absolutely clear. Therefore, these additional phrases are not needed. **R' Yehuda** says that yados are only effective when absolutely clear, and therefore these additional phrases are necessary to say that the divorce is being effectuated by this document.
- **Abaye** said, special care should be given so that the words in the get be spelled in a way so that it cannot suggest another reading and understanding (he gives a number of examples).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Do we pasken like **R' Yehuda** (who requires the additional phrases) or like the **Rabanan**? **A:** We find that **Rava** instituted a text for gittin that did not include all the extra phrases. The text was “I release and banish my wife, who was my wife prior to this, from this day and forward”.
  - The Gemara says that is no proof, because the text of **Rava** did not even contain “harei aht muteres l'chol adam”!? Obviously there was more to the text than was presented. Therefore, it may be that all of **R' Yehuda's** phrases were meant to be included as well and were just not presented in the teaching.
  - **Rava's** use of the words “from this day” comes to exclude **R' Yose**, who says that the date on the document tells us that the get is automatically effective from that date.
    - The phrase of “and forward” excludes the case of where a man divorces his wife only for the day.

GUFO SHEL GET SHICHRUR HAREI AHT BAS CHORIN HAREI AHT L'ATZMEICH

- **R' Yehuda** instituted for sale documents of slaves that the following should be written “Our slave is destined to remain a slave, and is separated and removed from any freedom, and from any claims, and from any claims by the king or queen, and no other person has ownership over him, and he is free from any mum, and from boils that may come out on his face until 2 years after this sale whether new or old.

-----Daf 1D---86-----

### MISHNA

- There are 3 gittin that are passul, but if a woman gets remarried based on them the child will not be a mamzer:
  - A get that is handwritten by the husband and has no witnesses signed on it.
  - A get that has witnesses, but is not dated.
  - A get that is dated but has only one witness signed.All these 3 are passul, but if a woman gets remarried based on them the child will not be a mamzer.
- **R' Elazar** says, even if a get has no witnesses signed on it, but the get was given to her in front of witnesses, the get is valid. Also, such a document may even be used to collect from encumbered properties. This is because the reason that witnesses sign a get is for the benefit of the world (in case the witnesses can't be found later to testify to what they saw), and not because they are in any way needed to make the get valid.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna says that there are only 3 such gittin, however there is another such get, namely a get yashan, which also fits into this category!? **A:** If a woman remarries based on a get yashan she would not have to leave her second husband, whereas in the cases of the Mishna she would.
  - **Q:** There is a machlokes whether in the cases of our Mishna she would have to divorce her second husband. According to the view that she does not have to do so, why isn't the case of get yashan included in the Mishna? **A:** Once a get yashan is given, she may rely on it l'chatchila and remarry. The gittin in our Mishna may not be relied upon to remarry l'chatchila.
  - **Q:** There is also the case of the “get keirei'ach”, which is only passul D'Rabanan, and should be included in the Mishna!? **A:** By a get keirei'ach, the child she has from the second husband would be a mamzer.
    - **Q:** That is true according to **R' Meir**, but not according to the **Rabanan**!? **A:** If a woman remarries based on a get keirei'ach she would not have to leave her second husband, whereas in the cases of the Mishna she would.
      - **Q:** There is a machlokes whether in the cases of our Mishna she would have to divorce her second husband. According to the view that she does not have to do so, why isn't the case of get keirei'ach included in the Mishna? **A:** Our Mishna is not discussing a get mekushar, and that is why it is not listed.
  - **Q:** There is the case of a get that was not dated according to the local government, which is therefore assur D'Rabanan, and fits into the category of our Mishna!? **A:** If a woman remarries based on such a get she would have to leave her second husband, whereas in the cases of the Mishna she would not.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** There is a machlokes whether in the cases of our Mishna she would have to divorce her second husband. According to the view that she does have to do so, why isn't the case of this improperly dated get included in the Mishna? **A:** This view will say that our Mishna follows **R' Meir**, who holds that a get dated not according to the local kingdom will produce mamzeirem. Therefore it can't be included in our Mishna, where the cases do not produce mamzeirem.
- **Q:** The Mishna mentions "there are 3 gittin" in the beginning and again at the end. What is each mention of the number 3 coming to teach? **A:** The first mention of the number comes to exclude the cases that we just discussed above. The mention at the end of the Mishna comes to exclude the case of a Braisa that says that if the shaliach did not say BNB, **R' Meir** says that the child is a mamzer.

KASAV B'KSAV YADO V'EIN ALAV EIDIM

- **Rav** said, the Mishna is discussing where the get was handwritten by the husband.
  - **Q:** Which case was **Rav** referring to? He can't be referring to the first case, because the Mishna clearly says that the get was handwritten by the husband!? It can't be referring to the second case, because the Mishna says there are witnesses in that case, which means it makes no difference who wrote the get!? **A:** He is referring to the last case of where the get was dated and has only one witness signed. The Mishna is teaching that if the husband wrote it and it is signed by one witness, the child born is not a mamzeir. However, if a sofer had written the get and only one witness signed, the get would be passul and any child from a subsequent marriage based on this get would be a mamzer.
  - **Shmuel** said, the Mishna's last case even refers to a case where the sofer wrote it and one witness signed it, as we will learn in a Mishna that says that if a sofer writes and a single witness signs, the get is valid.
    - **Rav** says that Mishna must be discussing where the sofer signed as well, because if not, why does that Mishna say that the get is valid, which means l'chatchila? **Shmuel** says both Mishnayot are talking about a get written by the sofer and signed by a single witness. The difference is that our Mishna is dealing with a sofer who is not an expert, and therefore the get would be passul (he may have written it without explicit instruction of the husband) and the other Mishna is discussing an expert sofer, and that is why the get is valid.
- There were times when **Rav** would say that in the cases of our Mishna if the woman remarried she must divorce the second husband, and other times he would say that she need not divorce the husband. If the woman already had children with the second husband he said she need not get divorced. If she did not have children with him, he said she needs to get divorced.
  - **Q: Mar Zutra bar Tuvia** asked, a Mishna says, if a man was married to a few wives, one of which was an ervah to his brother, and he divorced that wife with a get like one of the 3 discussed in our Mishna, and the man then died without children, the halacha is that we require the other wives to have chalitza, but not yibum (if the divorce was fully valid even yibum could be done to the others, and if it was fully passul, even chalitza would not need to be done). Now, according to **Rav**, that this woman could remain married to her second husband, that would lead the others to think that the divorce was certainly good, and would have them even do yibum!? **A:** D'Oraisa the get is good and yibum could be done. Therefore, if yibum is ultimately done it would not be that big of a deal.
  - **Levi** said that a woman who remarries based on one of the gittin in our Mishna need never get divorced from her second husband. **R' Yochanan** said this as well, and said that **R' Chalafta** said this as well.

R' ELAZAR OMER AHF AHL PI...

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, we pasken like **R' Elazar** by gittin. When this was repeated to **Shmuel**, he said we even pasken like him for other documents as well.
  - **Q:** The Mishna says such a document can be used to collect from encumbered property, so how could **Rav** say that **R' Elazar** did not say his halacha by other documents? **A:** **R' Elazar** said his halacha regarding both, but **Rav** only held like him regarding gittin.
  - **R' Yaakov bar Idi in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi** also said that we pasken like **R' Elazar**, but **R' Yannai** said there is no effect of a get from this at all (there is no "re'ach haget").

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Yannai** does not hold of **R' Elazar**? **A:** He meant that according to the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Elazar**, such a get has absolutely no effect.
- **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina in the name of Reish Lakish** also said that we pasken like **R' Elazar**, but **R' Yochanan** said there is no effect of a get from this at all.
  - **Q: R' Yochanan** does not hold of **R' Elazar**? **A:** He meant that according to the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Elazar**, such a get has absolutely no effect.
- We find that **Rabbah the son of R' Huna** said that his father paskened like **R' Elazar** regarding gittin. **R' Chama bar Gurya in the name of Rav** paskened like this as well. **Ravin in the name of R' Elazar in the name of Rav** paskened like this as well.

-----Daf 87-----

### 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.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.