## Ein Oness B'Gittin (Ketubot 2b/3a)

אָמַר רָבָא וּלְעִנְיַן גִּיטִין אֵינוֹ כֵּן אַלְמָא קָסָבַר רָבָא אֵין אוֹנֶס בְּגִיטִין

**Rava said:** And although delays caused by circumstances beyond his control exempt the groom from providing support to his betrothed at the time originally designated for the wedding, with regard to bills of divorce that is not so. Apparently, Rava maintains that unavoidable circumstances have no legal standing with regard to bills of divorce. If one stipulated that the bill of divorce will take effect only with the fulfillment of a condition, even if that condition was fulfilled due to circumstances beyond his control, the bill of divorce takes effect.

מְנָא לֵיהּ לְרָבָא הָא אִילֵּימָא מֵהָא דִּתְנַן ״הֲרֵי זֶה גִּיטֵּיךְ אִם לֹא בָּאתִי מִכָּאן וְעַד שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר חֹדֶשׁ״ וּמֵת בְּתוֹךְ שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר חֹדֶשׁ אֵינוֹ גֵּט מֵת הוּא דְּאֵינוֹ גֵּט הָאחָלָה הֲרֵי זֶה גֵּט...

The Gemara asks: From where does Rava learn this principle?...

אֶלָּא מֵהָא דְּהָהוּא דַּאֲמַר לְהוּ ״אִי לָא אָתֵינָא מִיכָּן וְעַד תְּלָתִין יוֹמִין לֶיהֶוֵי גִּיטָּא״ אֲתָא בְּסוֹף תְּלָתִין יוֹמִין וּפַסְקֵיהּ מַבָּרָא אֲמַר לְהוּ חֲזוֹ דַּאֲתַאי חֲזוֹ דַּאֲתַאי אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל לָאו שְׁמֵיהּ מַתְיָא

Rather, proof may be cited from this case, where a certain man who said to the agents with whom he entrusted the bill of divorce: If I do not return from now until after thirty days have passed, let this be a bill of divorce. He came at the end of thirty days, before the deadline passed, but was prevented from crossing the river by the ferry that was located on the other side of the river, so he did not come within the designated time. He said to the people across the river: See that I have come, see that I have come. Shmuel said: This is not considered to be a return. Apparently, even if the condition was fulfilled due to circumstances beyond his control, the condition is considered fulfilled.

וְדִלְמָא אוּנְסָא דִּשְׁכִיחַ שָׁאנֵי דְּכֵיוָן דְּאִיבְּעִי לֵיהּ לְאַתְנוֹיֵי וְלָא אַתְנִי אִיהוּ דְּאַפְסֵיד אַנַּפְשֵׁיהּ The Gemara rejects that proof: And perhaps unavoidable circumstances that are common and could be anticipated, e.g., the ferry is located at the other side of the river, are different, since he should have stipulated that exception when establishing the condition, and he did not stipulate it, he brought the failure to arrive upon himself. Although he regrets it now, at the time his intent was that even if the condition were fulfilled due to that circumstance, the divorce would take effect. In contrast, however, if the condition is fulfilled due to an uncommon circumstance that could not have been anticipated, the divorce would not take effect.

## אֶלָּא רָבָא סְבָרָא דְנַפְשֵׁיהּ קָאָמַר מִשּׁוּם צְנוּעוֹת וּמִשׁוּם פְּרוּצוֹת מִשּׁוּם צְנוּעוֹת דְּאִי אָמְרַתְּ לָא לֶהֱוֵי גֵּט

Rather, Rava is stating a *halakha* based on his own reasoning. Circumstances beyond one's control are not a factor in determining whether or not a condition is fulfilled, and this is **due to virtuous women and due to licentious women**. The Gemara articulates: There is concern **due to virtuous women**, **as, if you said: Let it not be a bill of divorce,** if the reason that the condition was not fulfilled was due to circumstances beyond his control,

## 3a

## זִימְנִין דְּלָא אֲנִיס וְסָבְרָה דַּאֲנִיס וּמִיעַגְּנָא וְיָתְבָה וּמִשׁוּם פְּרוּצוֹת דְּאִי אָמְרַתְּ לָא לֶיהֶוֵי גִּיּטָּא זִימְנִין דַּאֲנִיס וְאָמְרָה לָא אֲנִיס וְאָזְלָא וּמִינַּסְבָא וְנִמְצָא גֵּט בָּטֵל וּבָנֶיה מַמְזֵרִים

then **sometimes**, where he was not detained **unavoidably** but he fulfilled the condition willingly to effect the divorce, **and** the wife **thinks** that he was detained **unavoidably**, **she will sit deserted**, forever unable to remarry. **And** the concern **due to licentious women** is, **as**, **if you said:** Let it not be a bill of divorce, then **sometimes**, when he was detained **unavoidably** and **she thinks** that he was **not** detained **unavoidably**, she goes **and remarries**. **And** the result will be **that the bill of divorce is void**, **and her children** from the second marriage will be **mamzerim**, products of an adulterous relationship.