Introduction to פרקים ד' וה' – השולח והניזקין

One of the mandates of the בית דין הגדול is to ensure that the law remains flexible such that when a social fissure appears, ordinances are passed in order to close them up. For instance, when the practice of השמטת כספים leads to a reticence to lend money – a violation of several Toraic norms – the ב״ד הגדול must legislate to promote the social welfare. In this case, the particular legislation is known as פרוזבול This consideration is called העוקון העולם This consideration is called חיקון העולם I sto ensure the first one is a העקות העולם is included here in גיטין. In the thematic/associative style common to the משנה אולים, the rest of the ordinances are presented here.

18.04.01

32a (משנה א׳) → 33a (משנה א׳).)

- I If a man sends a us to his wife and wants to cancel (the us or the dispactch)
 - a If he encountered the שליח
 - b or sent another שליח after him to cancel it is null
 - c If he caught up with his wife
 - d or sent another שליח to his wife to cancel it is cancelled
 - i *Providing*: he (or his agent) got to the wife before the גע did
 - 1 *Challenge*: this is obvious
 - 2 *Answer*: if he had tried to cancel it before, this should act retrospectively קמ״ל –
 - גט where he was and formally cancel the בי״ד where he was and formally cancel the גע
 - iii To promote מפני תיקון העולם ordained that they not do this מפני תיקון העולם
- II Justification:

ii

- a הגיע (and not סד"א (הגיע he's just harassing her קמ"ל and not
- b sent a סד"א שליח the 2^{nd} agent is no stronger than the 1^{st} שליח b
- c Got to his wife first סד"א he's certainly trying to harass her קמ"ל
- d If he sent a שליח to her first סד"א that's certainly just harassment קמ"ל –
- III Formulae:
 - a If he says בטל or "I no longer want it" this is valid
 - i Implication: "בטל" means "it should be cancelled", not "it was never valid"
 - ii Challenge: if a recipient of a gift states בטל that is a valid cancellation of the gift (retroactively)
 - iii Answer (בטל is an equivoke; in each case, the effective interpretation is accorded
 - b *If*: he says "it is invalid" or "it is no va" this is ineffective (since it's not true)
- IV Tangential Ruling (אביי) is like שליח מתנה is like שליח
 - a Practical application: הולך לאו כזכי
 - i *Meaning*: the dispatcher may cancel the *ι* as long as it hasn't reached the wife's domain
- V רב נחמן בר יצחק's dilemma:
 - a If someone declares that a partcular גט "should be as a shard of pottery" (יהא כתרס) etc. valid (declaration of intent)
 - b If someone declares that a particular גט "is as a shard of pottery" (חרס הוא) invalid (not true)
 - c Dilemma: what if he says "behold, it is a shard of pottery" (הרי הוא חרס) is this valid (intent) or invalid (description)?
 i Answer: this certainly declaration of intent (valid) as in הרי הוא הקדש
- VI Status of א where the agency has been cancelled
 - a הלכה the גט may be reused ר' נחמן
 - i *even though*: we accept ייחון 'ז's ruling that a woman who accepted delayed קידושין may retract her agreement before the time comes due; since that is speech canceling speech; here, the גע hasn't been cancelled, only the dispatch
 - b הי ששת the גט may no longer be used
- VII Analysis of penultimate clause the original practice that necessitated תקנת ר"ג הזקן
 - a ר' נחמן: He would cancel in front of 2 –
 - - i response (ג"ד): 2 are also called a בי"ד, as per the wording of דיינים " are called מביעית י"ב מבוני (שלוני (פרוני (ש"ב): the מביעית ווווי isn't going to go on unnecessarily (understood that there is a third (פרוני מבוני מבוני))
 - ii $2^{nd} \operatorname{proof}(r't)$: in same משנה, it states that the עדים זיינים sign below; דיינים::עדים $\rightarrow 2$
 - 1 *deflection*: each as per his number (עדים -2; -3)
 - (a) reason for stating עדים and דיינים:
 - (i) it's valid even if it's written from the perspective of דיינים and signed by עדים or vice-versa

© Yitzchak Etshalom 2016