Mishnah in Depth Week 4: 5:3-6:7

Source Sheet by Leora Balinsky

Mishnah Gittin 5:5

(5) Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Gudgeda testified before the Sages about the case of a deaf-mute woman who was married off by her father when she was a minor, so that her marriage took effect by Torah law. He said that she can be released from her marriage through a bill of divorce, whether as a minor or after she reaches adulthood. Although as a deaf-mute woman she is not legally competent to give her consent, the divorce is effective because divorce does not require the woman's consent.

And similarly, he testified about the case of the minor daughter of a non-priest who was orphaned from her father and then married off to a priest by her mother or brother, so that her marriage took effect by rabbinic law. He said that nevertheless she may partake of *teruma*, although by Torah law it is prohibited for one who is not in a priestly household to partake of *teruma*. And furthermore if this girl dies, then her husband inherits her estate. It is not said that because the validity of the marriage is by

משנה גיטין ה':ה'

(ה) הֵאָיד רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן גָּדְגְדָה עַל הַחֵרֶשֶׁת שֶׁהִשִּׂיאָה אָבִיהָ, שֶׁהִיא יוֹצְאָה בְגֵט.

וְעַל קְטַנָּה בַת יִשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁנִּשֵׂאת לְכֹהֵן, שֶׁאוֹכֶלֶת בַּתְּרוּמָה, וְאָם מֵתָה, בַּעְלָה יוֹרְשָׁה.

וְעַל הַמָּרִישׁ הַנָּזוּל שֶׁבְּנָאוֹ בַבִּירָה, שֶׁיִּטֹל אֶת דְּמָיו, <mark>מִפְּנֵי</mark>



rabbinic law and not Torah law he is not entitled to inherit from her. And Rabbi Yohanan ben Gudgeda further testified about a stolen beam that was already built into a large building [bira], that the victim of the robbery **receives** only the value of the beam but not the beam itself, **due to an** ordinance instituted for the penitent. By Torah law, a robber is obligated to return any stolen item in his possession, provided that its form has not been altered. If one stole a beam and incorporated it into a building, then by Torah law he would have to destroy the building and return the beam. In order to encourage repentance, the Sages were lenient and allowed a robber to return the value of the beam. And lastly, Rabbi Yohanan ben Gudgeda testified about a sin-offering that was obtained through robbery but that was not publicly known to have been obtained in that manner. He said that it effects atonement for the robber who sacrifices it, **for the benefit of the altar**, as will be explained in the Gemara.

Mishnah Gittin 5:8 These are the matters that the

וְעַל חַטָּאת הַגְּזוּלָה שֶׁלֹּא נוֹדְעָה לְרַבִּים, שֶׁהִיא מְכַפֶּרֶת, <mark>מִפְּנֵי</mark> תִקוּן הַמִּזְבֵּחַ:

משנה גיטין ה׳:ח׳ (ח) וְאֵלִּוּ דְבָרִים אָמְרוּ <mark>מִפְּנֵי</mark> Sages **instituted on** account of the ways of peace, i.e., to foster peace and prevent strife and controversy: At public readings of the Torah, **a** priest reads first, and after him a Levite, and after him an Israelite. The Sages instituted this order **on account of the ways of peace**, so that people should not quarrel about who is the most distinguished member of the community. Similarly, the Sages enacted that **a** joining of courtyards is placed in **an old house** where it had regularly been placed **on account of the ways** of peace, as will be explained in the Gemara.

The Sages enacted that the pit that is nearest to the irrigation channel that supplies water to several pits or fields **is filled first on account of** the ways of peace. They established a fixed order for the irrigation of fields, so that people would not quarrel over who is given precedence. Animals, birds, or fish that were caught in **traps** are not acquired by the one who set the traps until he actually takes possession of them. Nevertheless, if another person comes and takes them, it **is considered robbery** on account of the ways of peace. Rabbi Yosei says: This is full-fledged robbery. Similarly, a lost item found by a

ַ<mark>דַרְכֵי שָׁלוֹם</mark>. כֹּהֵן קוֹרֵא רִאשׁוֹן, וְאַחֲרָיו לֵוִי וְאַחֲרָיו יִשְׂרָאֵל, מַפַּנִי דַרְכֵי שַׁלוֹם.

מְעָרְבִין בְּבַיִת יָשָׁן, <mark>מִפְּנֵי דַרְבֵי</mark> **שָׁלוֹם**. בּוֹר שֶׁהוּא קָרוֹב לָאַמָּה, מִתְמַלֵּא רָאשׁוֹן, <mark>מִפְּנֵי דַרְבֵי</mark> שָׁלוֹם.

מְצוּדוֹת חַיָּה וְעוֹפּוֹת וְדָגִים יֵשׁ בָּהֶם מִשׁוּם גָּזֵל, <mark>מִפְּנֵי דַרְכֵי</mark> שָׁלוֹם.

ַרְבִּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמֵר, גָּזֵל גָּמוּר.

מְצִיאַת חֵרֵשׁ שׁוֹטֶה וְקָטָן, יֵשׁ בָּהֶן מְשׁוּם גָּזֵל, <mark>מִפְּנֵי דַרְכֵי</mark> שָׁלוֹם. deaf-mute, an imbecile, or a **minor** is not acquired by him, since he lacks the legal competence to effect acquisition. Nevertheless, taking such an item from him is considered robbery on account of the ways of peace. Rabbi Yosei says: This is full-fledged robbery. If a poor person gleans olives at the top of an olive tree and olives fall to the ground under the tree, then taking those olives **that are beneath it is** considered **robbery** on account of the ways of peace. Rabbi Yosei says: This is full-fledged robbery. One does not protest against poor gentiles who come to take gleanings, forgotten sheaves, and the produce in the corner of the field, which is given to the poor [*pe'a*], although they are meant exclusively for the Jewish poor, **on** account of the ways of peace.

Mishnah Gittin 5:9

(9) A woman may lend utensils to her friend who is suspect with regard to eating produce that grew in the Sabbatical Year after the time that such produce must be removed from the house and may no longer be eaten. The utensils that she may lend her include: A winnow, a ַרַבִּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמֵר, נְזֵל גָּמוּר.

עָנִי הַמְנַקֵף בְּרֹאשׁ הַזַּיִת, מַה שֶׁתַּחְתָּיו גָּזֵל, <mark>מִפְּנֵי דַרְכֵי שָׁלוֹם.</mark> רַבִּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמֵר, גָזֵל גָּמוּר.

אֵין מְמַחִין בְּיַד עֲנִיֵּי גוֹיִם בְּלֶקֶט שִׁכְחָה וּפֵאָה, <mark>מִפּּנֵי דַרְכֵי שָׁלוֹם</mark>:

משנה גיטין ה׳:ט׳

(ט) מַשְׁאֶלֶת אִשָּׁה לַחֲבֶרְתָּה הַחֲשׁוּדָה עַל הַשְּׁבִיאִית, נָפָּה וּכְבָרָה וְרֵחַיִם וְתַנּוּר, אֲבָל לֹא תָבֹר וִלֹא תִטִחַן אָמָה.

sieve, a mill, and an oven. Lending her such utensils is not considered aiding in the commission of a transgression. But she may not select the grain from the chaff or grind wheat with her, i.e., she may not actively assist her in the performance of a sin. The wife of a *haver*, one who is devoted to the meticulous observance of mitzvot, especially the halakhot of ritual purity, teruma, and tithes, may lend the wife of an am *ha'aretz*, one who is not scrupulous in these areas, a winnow and a sieve, and she may even select, grind, and sift with her. But once the wife of the am ha'aretz pours water into the flour, thereby rendering it susceptible to ritual impurity, the wife of the *haver* may not touch anything with her, because one may not assist those who commit transgressions. And **all of** the allowances mentioned in the mishna **were stated only** on account of the ways of peace. And one may assist gentiles who work the land **during the** Sabbatical Year, but one may not assist Jews who do this. Similarly, one may extend greetings to gentiles on account of the ways of peace.

אֵשֶׁת חָבֵר מַשְׁאֶלֶת לְאֵשֶׁת עַם הָאָרֶץ, נָפָה וּכְבָרָה, וּבוֹרֶרֶת וְטוֹחֶנֶת וּמַרְקֶדֶת עִמָּה, אֲבָל מִשֶׁתַּטִּיל הַמַּיִם, לֹא תִגַּע עִמָּה, לְפִי שֶׁאֵין מַחֲזִיקִין יְדֵי עוֹבְרֵי עֲבַרָה. וְכֶלָן לֹא אָמְרוּ אֶלָּא <mark>מִפְּנֵי</mark> דַ**רְכֵי שָׁלוֹם**.

וּמַחֲזִיקִין יְדֵי גוֹיִם בַּשְׁבִיאִית, אֲבָל לֹא יְדֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, וְשׁוֹאֲלִין בִּשְׁלוֹמָן, <mark>מִפְּנֵי דַרְכֵי שָׁלוֹם</mark>:

Mishnah Horayot 3:8

(8) A priest precedes a Levite. A Levite precedes an Israelite. An Israelite precedes a son born from an incestuous or adulterous relationship [mamzer], and a mamzer precedes a Gibeonite, and a Gibeonite precedes a convert, and a convert precedes an emancipated slave. When do these halakhot of precedence take effect? In circumstances when they are all equal in terms of wisdom. But if there were a *mamzer* who is a Torah scholar and a High Priest who is **an ignoramus**, a *mamzer* who is a Torah scholar precedes a High Priest who is an ignoramus, as Torah wisdom surpasses all else.

Mishneh Torah, Kings and Wars 10:12

... our Sages commanded us to (even) visit the gentiles when ill, to bury their dead in addition to the Jewish dead, and support their poor in addition to the Jewish poor for the sake of peace. Behold, Psalms 145:9 states: 'God is good to all and His mercies extend over all His works' and Proverbs 3:17 states: 'The Torah's ways are pleasant ways and all its paths are peace.'

משנה הוריות ג׳:ח׳

(ח) כּהֵן קוֹדֵם לְלֵוִי, לֵוִי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, יִשְׁרָאֵל לְמַמְזֵר, וּמַמְזַר לְנָתִין, וְנָתִין לְגַר, וְגֵר לְעֶבֶד מְשֶׁחְרָר. אֵימָתַי, בִּזְמַן שֶׁכָּלָן שָׁוִין. אֲבָל אִם הָיָה מַמְזֵר תַּלְמִיד חָכָם וְכֹהֵן גָּדוֹל עַם הָאָרֶץ, מַמְזֵר תַּלְמִיד חָכָם קוֹדֵם לְכֹהֵן גָּדוֹל עַם הָאָרֶץ:

משנה תורה, הלכות מלכים ומלחמות י׳:י״ב

אֲפִּלּוּ הָעַכּוּ"ם צִּוּוּ חֲכָמִים לְבַקֵר חוֹלֵיהֶם וְלִקְבֵּר מֵתֵיהֶם עָם מֵתֵי יִשְׁרָאֵל וּלְפַּרְנֵס עֲנִיֵּיהֶם בִּכְלַל עֲנִיֵּי יִשְׁרָאֵל מִפְּנֵי דַּרְכֵי שָׁלוֹם. הֲרֵי נֶאֱמַר (תהילים קמה, ט) "טוֹב ה' לַכֵּל וְרַחֲמָיו עַל כָּל מַעֲשָׂיו". וְנֶאֱמַר (משלי ג, יז) "דְּרָכֶיהָ דַרְכֵי נֹעַם וְכָל

Rav Aaron Lichtenstein זצ"ל, "The Human and Social Factor in Halacha"

At the plane of substantive content, we may regard the quest for harmony as the underpinning of a number of halakhot, if not of whole halakhic areas, *mi-de-oraita*. From a certain perspective, the mandate of *bet din* is not only juristic but social, and its primary function in that connection is the preservation of comity. Or, to take an individual example, the laws of harhakat shekhenim are intended not only to avert inflicting damage, but positively, to promote interpersonal civility.¹² And, of course, the point is fully explicit as regards *takkanot de-rabbanan*, with respect to which the link is variously formulated. It may be viewed, as in the Yerushalmi's explanation of eruvei hatserot, as an impetus to promote camaraderie, in positive terms. It may be the source of ordinances, instituted *mi-penei darkhei shalom*, intended to forestall possible friction. And, more sharply, it may underlie halakhot legislated *mishum eva*, with an eye to averting potential enmity, not only between Jew and Gentile but within the Jewish community proper, whether the resentment of a mate or the vindictiveness of a parent. The primary chord, the need to preserve and enhance interpersonal and communal harmony, is uniformly clear, however.

Mishnah Gittin 6:1

(1) With regard to one who says to another: Receive this bill of divorce for my wife, or: Deliver this bill of divorce to my wife as my agent, if the husband seeks to retract his designation and cancel the agency, he can retract it until the document reaches his wife's possession. However, in the case of a woman who said to an agent: Receive my bill of divorce for me, and the

משנה גיטין ו׳:א׳

(א) הָאוֹמֵר הִתְקַבֵּל גַּט זֶה לְאִשְׁתִּי אוֹ הוֹלֵךְ גַּט זֶה לְאִשְׁתִּי, אָם רָצָה לַחֲזֹר, יַחֲזֹר. הָאִשָּׁה שֶׁאָמְרָה, הִתְקַבֵּל לִי גִּטִּי, אָם רָצָה לַחֲזֹר, לֹא יַחֲזֹר. אָם רָצָה לַחֲזֹר, אִי זְמֵן לָה, אָם רָצָה לַחֲזֹר, יַחֲזֹר. וְתֵן לָה, אָם רָצָה לַחֲזֹר, יַחֲזֹר. husband handed the bill of divorce to her agent, **if** the husband **seeks to** retract his decision to divorce his wife upon receipt of the bill of divorce by the agent, he cannot **retract** it. Once the bill of divorce is transferred to her agent, its legal status is like that of a bill of divorce that was handed directly to her, and the divorce takes effect immediately. Therefore, if the husband said to the agent whom the woman designated to receive the bill of divorce: I do not want [ee ifshi] for you to receive the bill of divorce for her; rather, deliver it and give it to her, then if the husband seeks to **retract** his designation and cancel the agency, he can retract it until it reaches his wife's possession. Since the husband does not agree to have the divorce take effect upon receipt by his wife's agent, he changes the designation of the agent and designates him as his own agent for delivery. Therefore, the divorce takes effect only when the bill of divorce reaches his wife's possession. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: **Even** a woman **who** did not instruct the agent: Receive my bill of divorce for me but **says: Take my bill of divorce for me,** thereby designates the agent as an agent of receipt on her behalf. Therefore, **if** after handing the bill of divorce to the

ַרַבָּן שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל אוֹמֵר, אַף הָאוֹמֶרֶת טֹל לִי גִּטִּי, אִם רָצָה לַחֵזֹר, לֹא יַחֲזֹר: agent the husband **seeks to retract** his decision and cancel the agency, **he cannot retract** it.

Mishnah Gittin 6:2

(2) A woman who said to an agent: Receive my bill of divorce for me, requires two sets of witnesses to confirm that she was divorced when the agent received the bill of divorce. She requires **two** witnesses **who** say: In our presence she said to the agent: Receive my bill of divorce on my behalf, and two who say: In our **presence** the agent **received** the bill of divorce and tore it. This testimony is effective even if two people **are the first** pair of witnesses **and** the same two **are the latter** pair of witnesses, **or** if there is one witness from the first pair of witnesses and one witness from the latter pair, and one additional witness joins with them as the second witness in both testimonies. With regard to **a betrothed young** woman, she and her father are each eligible to **receive her bill of divorce,** and the divorce takes effect at the moment that either of them receives the bill of divorce. Rabbi Yehuda said: Two hands do not have the right to **acquire** an item on behalf of one person **as one. Rather**,

משנה גיטין ו':ב'

(ב) הָאִשָּׁה שֶׁאָמְרָה, הִתְקַבֵּל לִי גִּטִּי, צְּרִיכָה שְׁתֵּי כִתֵּי עֵדִים, שְׁנַיִם שֶׁאוֹמְרִים בְּפָנֵינוּ אָמְרָה וּשְׁנַיִם שֶׁאוֹמְרִים בְּפָנֵינוּ קַבֵּל וְקָרַע, אֲפִלּוּ הֵן הָרִאשׁוֹנִים וְהֵן וְהָאַחֲרוֹנִים, אוֹ אֶחָד מִן הָרָאשׁוֹנִים וְאֶחָד מִן הָאַחֲרוֹנִים וְאֶחָד מִצְּטָרֵף אִמָּהֶן.

נַעֲרָה הַמְאֹרָסָה, הִיא וְאָבִיהָ מְקַבְּלִין אֶת גִּטָּה. אָמַר **רַבִּי יְהוּדָה**, אֵין שְׁתֵּי יָדַיִם זוֹכוֹת כְּאַחַת, אֶלָּא אָבִיהָ מְקַבֵּל אֶת גִּטָה בִּלְבָד. וְכֹל שֶׁאֵינָה יְכוֹלָה לְשָׁמֹר אֶת גַּטַה, אֵינַה יְכוֹלָה לְהָתִגַּרָשׁ: her father alone receives her bill of divorce on her behalf. And there is another principle: Any female who is unable to safeguard her bill of divorce is unable to be divorced.

Mishnah Gittin 6:3

(3) In the case of **a minor girl who** said to an agent: Receive my bill of divorce for me, it is not a valid bill of divorce until the bill of divorce reaches her possession. Therefore, if the husband seeks to retract his decision before his wife receives the bill of divorce, he can retract it, as a minor does not designate an **agent.** Consequently, the agent is not an agent for receipt, and the divorce does not take effect when the husband hands the document to the agent. The agent is an agent for delivery, and the divorce takes effect when the bill of divorce enters the wife's possession. And if her father said to the agent: Go out and receive my daughter's bill of **divorce on** her behalf, then **if** the husband seeks to retract his decision, he cannot retract it. As a father can receive the bill of divorce on behalf of his minor daughter, he can designate an agent for receipt, and the divorce takes effect when the husband hands the document to

משנה גיטין ו׳:ג׳

(ג) קְטַנָּה שֶׁאָמְרָה הִתְקַבֵּל לִי גִּטִּי, אֵינוֹ גֵט עַד שֶׁיַּגִּיעַ גֵּט לְיָדָה. לְפִיכָך אִם רָצָה הַבַּעַל לַחֲזֹר, יַחֲזֹר, שֶׁאֵין קָטָן עוֹשֶׁה שָׁלִיחַ. אֲבָל אִם אָמַר לוֹ אָבִיהָ, צֵא וְהִתְקַבֵּל לְבִתִּי גִטָּה, אִם רָצָה לְהַחֲזִיר, לֹא יַחֲזִיר.

הָאוֹמֵר תֵּן גַּט זֶה לְאִשְׁתִּי בְמָקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי, וּנְתָנוֹ לָה בְּמָקוֹם אַחֵר, פָּסוּל.

הֲרֵי הִיא בְמָקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי, וּנְתָנוֹ לָה בְּמָקוֹם אַחֵר, כָּשֵׁר.

הָאִשָּׁה שֶׁאָמְרָה הִתְקַבֵּל לִי גִטִּי בְמָקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי, וְקִבְּלוֹ לָה בְּמָקוֹם אַחֵר, פָּסוּל. רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר מַכְשִׁיר.

הָבֵא לִי גִטִּי מִמָּקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי

the agent. With regard to **one who** says to an agent: Give this bill of divorce to my wife in such and such a place, if the agent deviated and gave it to her in another place the divorce is **invalid.** However, if he said to the agent: Give this bill of divorce to my wife, **she is in such** and such a place, without explicitly instructing the agent to give her the document there, and he gave it to her in another place the divorce is valid. With regard to the woman who when designating her agent for receipt said to her agent: Receive my bill of divorce for me in such and such a place, and he received it for her in another place, the divorce is **invalid;** and **Rabbi Elazar deems** it **valid.** If she said to him: Bring me my bill of divorce from such and such a place, and he brought it for her from another place, it is valid. Because he is an agent for delivery, the woman is not particular where he receives the bill of divorce, as the divorce takes effect only when the bill of divorce reaches her possession.

Mishnah Gittin 6:4

(4) An Israelite woman married to a priest partakes of *teruma*. If she says to an agent: **Bring me my bill of**

משנה גיטין ו׳:ד׳ (ד) הָבֵא לִי גִטִּי, אוֹכֶלֶת בַּתְרוּמָה עַד שֶׁיַּגִּיעַ גַּט לְיָדָה.

וֶהֶבִיאוֹ לָה מִמָּקוֹם אַחֵר, כָּשֵׁר:

divorce, designating him as an agent for delivery, **she** continues to partake of *teruma* until the bill of divorce reaches her possession. However, if she says: **Receive my bill of divorce for me,** thereby designating him as an agent for receipt, it is **immediately** prohibited for her to partake of *teruma*. Since the divorce takes effect when the husband hands the bill of divorce to the agent, the concern is that the agent encountered the husband nearby. If the woman said to the agent: Receive my bill of divorce for me in such and such a place, then even if he received it elsewhere, she continues to **partake of** teruma until the bill of divorce reaches that place. Rabbi Elazar prohibits her from partaking of teruma immediately.

הִתְקַבֵּל לִי גִטִּי, אֲסוּרָה לֶאֶכֹל בַּתְרוּמָה מִיָּד. הִתְקַבֵּל לִי גִטִּי בְמָקוֹם פְּלוֹנִי, אוֹכֶלֶת בַּתְרוּמָה עַד שֶׁיַּגִּיעַ גֵּט לְאוֹתוֹ מָקוֹם. רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹסֵר מִיָּד:

Mishnah Gittin 6:5

(5) With regard to a husband who says to two people: Write a bill of divorce and give it to my wife, or: Divorce her, or: Write a letter and give it to her, they should write the document and give it to her. In each of those cases his intent is clear. He is instructing them to effect her divorce. However, one who said:

משנה גיטין ו':ה'

(ה) הָאוֹמֵר, כִּתְבוּ גֵט וּתְנוּ לְאִשְׁתִּי, גָּרְשׁוּהָ, כִּתְבוּ אָגֶרֶת וּתְנוּ לָה, הֲבֵי אֵלוּ יִכְתְבוּ וְיִתֵּנוּ. כִּּטְרוּהָ, כַּרְטוּהָ, עֲשׂוּ לָה כַּנִּמוֹס, עֲשׂוּ לָה כָּרָאוּי, לא אָמַר כִּלוּם. Release her, or: Sustain her, or: Treat her according to the law [nimus], or: Treat her appropriately, said nothing, as none of these expressions clearly expresses his desire to divorce his wife. At first the Sages would say: In the case of **one who is taken out** in a neck chain [kolar] to be executed and who said: Write a bill of divorce for my wife, these people **should write** the document and give it to his wife even though there was no explicit instruction to give it to her. They then said: Even with regard to one who sets sail and one who departs in a caravan to a far-off place and says: Write a bill of divorce to my wife, his intention is to write the bill of divorce and give it to his wife. Rabbi Shimon Shezuri says: Even if one who is dangerously ill gives that instruction, they write the bill of divorce and give it to his wife.

Mishnah Gittin 6:6

(6) With regard to **one who was thrown into a pit** and thought that he would die there, **and he said** that **anyone who hears his voice should write a bill of divorce for his wife,** and he specified his name, her name, and all relevant details, בָּרִאשׁוֹנָה הָיוּ אוֹמְרִים, הַיּוֹצֵא בְקוֹלָר וְאָמַר, כִּתְבוּ גֵט לְאִשְׁתִּי, הֲרֵי אֵלּוּ יִכְתְּבוּ וְיִתֵּנוּ. חָזְרוּ לוֹמַר, אַף הַמְפָרֵשׁ וְהַיּוֹצֵא בִשְׁיָרָא.

> ַרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן שְׁזוּרִי אוֹמֵר, אַף הַמְסֻכָּן:

משנה גיטין ו׳:ו׳

(ו) מִי שֶׁהָיָה מֵשְׁלַךְ לְבוֹר וְאָמַר, כָּל הַשׁוֹמֵעַ אֶת קוֹלוֹ יִכְתֹב גֵּט לְאִשְׁתּוֹ, הֲרֵי אֵלּוּ יִכְתְבוּ וְיִתֵּנוּ.

הַבָּרִיא שֶׁאָמַר, כִּתְבוּ גֵט

those who hear him should write this bill of divorce and give it to his wife, even though they do not see the man and do not know him. A healthy man who said: Write a bill of divorce for my wife, but did not say to give it to her, presumably sought to mock her. Since he told them to write the bill of divorce and not to give it, it is not a valid bill of divorce. The mishna relates: There was an incident involving a healthy man who said: Write a bill of divorce for my wife, and then ascended to the roof and fell, and died. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: If he fell at his own initiative. taking his own life, it is a valid bill of divorce, as it is clear that he anticipated his death and instructed those listening to write the bill of divorce with the intent of giving it to her. However, **if the wind forced** him to fall, it is not a valid bill of divorce, as there was no clear intent to give her the bill of divorce.

Gittin 66a:13-14

GEMARA: The Gemara asks: Was **an incident** cited **to contradict** the *halakha* stated in the mishna? The *halakha* is that in a case where a healthy man said: Write a bill of divorce for my wife, the bill of ַלְאִשְׁתִּי, רָצָה לְשַׂחֶק בָּה.

ַמַעֲשָּׂה בְּבָרִיא אֶחָד שֶׁאָמַר, כִּתְבוּ גֵט לְאִשְׁתִּי, וְעָלָה לְרֹאש הַגַּג וְנָפַל וּמֵת.

אָמַר רַבָּן שָׁמְעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל, אָמְרוּ חֲכָמִים, אִם מֵעַצְמוֹ נָפַל, הֲרֵי זֶה גֵט. אִם הָרוּחַ דְּחָאַתּוּ, אֵינוֹ גַט:

גיטין ס״ו א:י״ג-י״ד

גְּמָ׳ מַעֲשֶׁה לִסְתּוֹר?! חַסּוֹרֵי מִיחַסְרָא, וְהָכִי קָתָנֵי: אָם הוֹכִיחַ סוֹפּוֹ עַל תְּחִילָתוֹ – הֲרֵי זֶה גֵּט; וּמַעֲשֶׂה נָמֵי בְּבָרִיא שֶׁאָמַר:

divorce is not valid. From the incident it is clear that under certain circumstances when a healthy man said: Write a bill of divorce for my wife, the bill of divorce is valid. The Gemara answers: The mishna is incomplete and this is what it is **teaching:** In the case of a healthy man who said: Write a bill of divorce for my wife, but he did not say to give it to her, presumably sought to mock her. However, if his ultimate actions **prove** the nature of **his** initial intent, that he seeks to give the bill of divorce because he is about to die, it is a valid bill of divorce. And there was an incident involving a healthy man who said: Write a bill of divorce for my wife, and he then ascended to the roof and fell and died. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: If he fell at his own initiative, it is a valid bill of divorce. However, if the wind forced him to fall, it is not a valid bill of divorce.

Mishnah Gittin 6:7

(7) If a man said to two people: Give a bill of divorce to my wife, or if a man said to three people: Write a bill of divorce and give it to my wife, these people should write the document themselves and give it to ״כּּתְבוּ גַּט לְאִשְׁתִּי״, וְעָלָה לְרֹאשׁ הַגָּג וְנָפַל וָמֵת, וְאָמַר רַבָּן שִׁמְעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל: אִם מֵעַצְמוֹ נָפַל – הֲרֵי זֶה גַּט, אִם הָרוּחַ דָּחַתּוּ – אֵינוֹ גֵט.

משנה גיטין ו׳:ז׳

ז) אָמַר לִשְׁנַיִם, הְנוּ גֵט לְאִשְׁתִּי, אוֹ לִשְׁלֹשָׁה, כִּחְבוּ גֵט וּחְנוּ לְאִשְׁתִּי, הֲרֵי אֵלּוּ יִכְתְּבוּ וְיִתֵּנוּ. אָמַר לִשְׁלֹשָה, הְנוּ גֵט לְאִשְׁתִי, הֲרֵי אֵלּוּ יֹאמְרוּ לַאֲחֵרִים her. If **he said to three** people: **Give** a bill of divorce to my wife, these people should tell others, and those others **will write** the document, because he designated the three people as **a court.** This is the statement of Rabbi Meir. And it is **that** halakha that Rabbi Hanina of Ono brought up from **prison** in the name of Rabbi Akiva, who was incarcerated there: I **received** a tradition from my teachers that **in** a case where a man says to three people: Give a bill of divorce to my wife, that these people should tell others and those others will write the document, **because he designated** the three people as a court. Rabbi Yosei said: We said [nomeinu] to the agent, Rabbi Hanina of Ono: We too **received** a tradition. However, it is a different one, **that even** if a man said to the High Court [Sanhedrin] in Jerusalem: Give a bill of divorce to my wife, that the members of the court should learn to write, and should write the document themselves, and give it to his wife. If a man said to ten people: Write and give a bill of divorce to my wife, one of the ten writes the bill of divorce **and two sign** it. If he said: All of you write the document, one of them writes the bill of divorce and all of them sign it. Therefore,

וְיִכְהְבוּ, מִפְּנֵי שֶׁעֲשָׂאָן בֵּית דִין, דִּבְרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר. וְזוֹ הְלָכָה הֶעֵלָה רַבִּי חֲנִינָא אִישׁ אוֹנו מִבֵּית הָאֲסוּרִין, מְקַבָּל אֲנִי בָּאוֹמֵר לִשְׁלֹשָׁה, תְּנוּ גֵט לְאִשְׁתִי, שֶׁיֹּאמְרוּ לַאֲחֵרִים וְיִכְתְּבוּ, מִפְּנֵי שֶׁיֹּאמְרוּ לַשְׁלֹשָה, אַם וְיִכְתְּבוּ, מִפְּנֵי שֶׁיְעַשָּׁאן בֵּית דִין. אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסֵי, שֶׁאֲפִלּוּ אָמַר לְבֵית דִין הַגָּדוֹל שֶׁבִּירוּשָׁלַיִם, תְּנוּ גֵט לְאִשְׁתִי, שֶׁבִּירוּשָׁלַיִם, תְנוּ גֵט לְאִשְׁתִי, שֶׁיִּלְמְדוּ וְיִכְתְּבוּ וְיִהֵנוּ.

אָמַר לַעֲשָׂרָה, כִּתְבוּ גֵט לְאִשְׁתִּי, אֶחָד כּוֹתֵב וּשְׁנַיִם חוֹתְמִין. כֵּלְכֶם כְּתֹבוּ, אֶחָד כּוֹתֵב וְכֵלָּם חוֹתְמִין.

לְפִיכָךְ, אִם מֵת אֶחָד מֵהֶן, הֲרֵי זֶה גֵט בָּטֵל: **if one of them died,** then **this is a bill of divorce** that is **null and void,** as he directed all of them to participate in the process.

Source Sheet created on Sefaria by Leora Balinsky