

## מסכת גיטין · דף ט"ו ע"ב

Elucidated Talmud · Statement and Proof · Navy & Gold Edition

### THE SUGYA

In this daf, we continue our deep dive into the sugya of validating a get when the shliach cannot testify on the entire document himself. The Gemara focuses on a case where the shliach testifies on his own signature and joins with another witness to validate the second signature, exploring why the Chachamim declared this invalid. We will see a beautiful discussion between Rava and Rav Ashi regarding whether this is due to a gezeirah—lest people mistakenly apply this lenient standard to ordinary financial documents—or because a get cannot be validated through a combination of two different types of halachic credibility.

To clarify these principles, the Gemara analyzes our Mishnah's ruling regarding a shliach who testifies that the get was written in his presence but only half of it was signed in his presence. We will see how this Mishnah is understood according to Rava, Rav Ashi, and Rav Chisda. Finally, the Gemara brings a fascinating parallel discussion from Hilchos Shabbos regarding whether two different types of halachic partitions can combine to form a single ten-handbreadth boundary.

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

### STATEMENT

הוא ואחר מעידין על חתימת יד שני – פסול.

If **he**, the agent, **and another** person **testify on the signature of the second** witness, the get is **invalid**.

### QUESTION

מאי טעמא?

What is the reason for this?

### ANSWER

אתו לאיחלוףי בקיום שטרות דעלמא, וקא נפיק נכי ריבועא דממונא אפומא דחד סהדא.

Because people might **come to confuse** this with the general ratification of documents of the world, and as a result, **money minus a quarter** will go out based on the mouth of one witness.

### OBJECTION

מתקרי לה רב אשי: מי איכא מידי, דאילו מסיק ליה איהו לכוליה דיבורא, כפר; השתא דאיכא חד בהדיה, פסול!?

Rav Ashi objects to this: Is there any situation where if he himself would complete his entire statement by saying 'It was written in my presence and signed in my presence' the get is **valid**, and now that there is another witness with him to help, it is **invalid**!?

### STATEMENT

אָלֵא אָמַר רַב אָשִׁי: אֶפִּילוּ אוֹמֵר "אֲנִי הוּא עַד שְׁנִי" – פְּסוּל.

Rather, Rav Ashi said: Even if the agent says, "I am the second witness" who signed, it is invalid.

#### EXPLANATION

מַאי טַעְמָא? או כולו בקיום הגט, או כולו בתקנת חכמים.

What is the reason? A get must be validated either entirely through the ratification of the get like other documents, or entirely through the Rabbinic decree of the agent's declaration.

### מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

#### MISHNAH

תָּנוּ: "בְּפָנַי נִכְתָּב כּוּלּוֹ, בְּפָנַי נִחְתָּם חֲצִיו", פְּסוּל.

We learned in our Mishnah: If the agent says, "In my presence all of it was written, and in my presence half of it was signed," it is invalid.

### גְּמָרָא GEMARA

#### QUESTION

אֵיזֶה חֲצִיו הֵיכִי דָּמִי?

With regard to the other half of the signatures, what are the circumstances?

#### OBJECTION

אִילִימָא דְּלִיכָא דְּקָא מְסַהִיד עָלֶיהָ כָּלָל; הֲשֵׁתָא אֶחָד אוֹמֵר "בְּפָנַי נִכְתָּב" וְאֶחָד אוֹמֵר "בְּפָנַי נִחְתָּם", דְּהָאִי קְמַסְהִיד אֲכֻלָּה פְּתִיכָה וְהָאִי קְמַסְהִיד אֲכֻלָּה חֲתִימָה, פְּסוּל; חֲצִיו מִיבַעֲיָא!?

If we say that there is no one who testifies about it at all, now if one says "In my presence it was written" and one says "In my presence it was signed," where this one testifies on all the writing and that one testifies on all the signing, it is invalid; is it necessary to state that only half of it being testified to is invalid?!

#### EXPLANATION

אָלֵא או כְּדִרְבָּא או כְּדִרְב אָשִׁי, וְלֹאפוֹקִי מְדִרְב חֲסֵדָא.

Rather, it must be referring to a case where there is additional testimony, either according to Rava where the agent joins another to testify on the second signature, or according to Rav Ashi where he testifies on his own signature, and this is to exclude the opinion of Rav Chisda who invalidates even with a full ratification of the second signature.

#### ANSWER

אָמַר לָהּ רַב חֲסֵדָא: וְלִטַּעְמִיהּ, "בְּפָנַי נִכְתָּב אֲבָל לֹא בְּפָנַי נִחְתָּם" לָמָּה לִּי?

Rav Chisda could say to you: And according to your reasoning, why do I need the clause in the Mishnah of "In my presence it was written but not in my presence was it signed" to teach that it is invalid?

EXPLANATION

אֵלֶּא לֹא זֶה אֵף זֶה קֵתָנִי, הֵכָא נָמִי לֹא זֶה אֵף זֶה קֵתָנִי.

Rather, the Tanna teaches in the style of 'not only this, but also that', and here too, the Tanna teaches 'not only this, but also that'.

STATEMENT

אמר רב חסדא: גידוד חמשה ומחיצה חמשה – אין מצטרפין, עד שיִהא או כולו במחיצה או כולו בגידוד.

Rav Chisda said: An embankment of five handbreadths and a partition of five handbreadths do not join together to form a partition of ten, unless it is either entirely a partition or entirely an embankment.

STATEMENT

דרש מרימר: גידוד חמשה ומחיצה חמשה – מצטרפין.

Mareimar expounded: An embankment of five and a partition of five do join together.

RULING

והלכתא: מצטרפין.

And the halacha is: They join together.

QUESTION

בעי אילפא: ידים – טהורות לחצאין, או אין טהורות לחצאין?

Ilfa raised a dilemma: Can hands become pure in halves, or do they not become pure in halves?

QUESTION

היכי דמי?

What are the circumstances?

OBJECTION

אילימא דקא משו בי תרי מרביעית, והא תנן: מרביעית נוטלין לידיהם, לאחד ואפילו לשנים!

If we say that two people wash from a quarter-log of water, but didn't we learn in a Mishnah: From a quarter-log we wash hands, for one and even for two!

OBJECTION

ואלא דקא משי חדא חדא ידיה, והתנן: הנוטל ידו אחת בנטילה, ואחת בשטיפה, ידיו טהורות!

But rather, is it that he washes his hands one by one? But didn't we learn in a Mishnah: One who washes one hand with pouring and one with dipping, his hands are pure!

OBJECTION

ואלא דקא משי פלגא פלגא דידיה, והאמר רבי ינאי: ידים – אין טהורות לחצאין!

But rather, is it that he washes half and half of his hand? But didn't the school of Rabbi Yannai say: Hands do not become pure in halves!

#### ANSWER

לֹא צָרִיכָא, דְּאִיכָא מְשָׁקָה טוּפַח.

No, it is necessary for a case where there is moisture that is wet enough to wet other things.

#### QUESTION

וְכִי אִיכָא מְשָׁקָה טוּפַח מַאי הוּי? וְהֵתֵנָּן:

And when there is moisture that is wet enough to wet other things, what of it? But didn't we learn in a Mishnah:

#### SUMMARY

The Gemara concludes that a get is invalid if the shliach attempts to validate it using a combination of his own shlichus testimony and standard signature ratification. Rav Ashi explains that we require a get to be validated entirely through one halachic track—either fully through the rabbinic decree of the shliach's declaration, or fully through standard court ratification. This principle is tested against the Mishnah's case of a shliach who witnesses only half the signing, which the Gemara uses to analyze the views of Rava, Rav Ashi, and Rav Chisda. Ultimately, the Gemara connects this concept of combining different halachic mechanisms to a dispute between Rav Chisda and Mareimar regarding Hilchos Shabbos, where we rule leniently that an embankment and a partition can indeed join together to form the required ten-handbreadth boundary.

#### לְמַעַשָׁה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In today's daf, Rav Ashi teaches us a profound principle about how we establish truth and validity. He explains that a get cannot be validated by a combination of two different types of credibility; it must be authenticated "either entirely through the ratification of the bill of divorce, or entirely via the rabbinic decree." We cannot patch together half of one system and half of another to make something kosher. It has to be complete, consistent, and whole.

How often in our own avodah do we try to live in two different worlds at the same time, patching together a spiritual life out of contradictory pieces? We might try to bring the standards of the street into our homes, while still expecting our children to have pure yiras Shamayim. Or we try to run our businesses with a bit of worldly corner-cutting, while expecting our tefillah to be perfectly pure. The Gemara is teaching us that real, lasting spiritual structures cannot be built on half-measures and mixed systems.

To build a true bayis ne'eman in Yisrael, and to truly stand before Hashem, we need consistency. Our inside must match our outside, and our standards in one area of life must align with our standards in another. When we strive for this wholeness, our avodah becomes solid, beautiful, and enduring.

Today, choose one area of your life where you have been compromising or mixing standards, and bring it into complete alignment with your true values of yiras Shamayim.

