



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Sotah Daf Yud Ches

- **Q: Rava** asked, if the Kohen wrote two megillos sotah – one for each of two sotah's, and he then erased them into a single cup of water, what is the halacha? Do we say that the writing has to be done lishma for the sotah, and it was. Or do we say that even the erasings have to be lishma into her own cup of water as well, and that was not done in this case? Even if we say that the erasing must be done lishma, what about if he erased each megilla into its own cup of water and then mixed the two cups of water together? Do we say that since the erasing was done lishma it is valid, or do we say that each sotah is not drinking her own personal water and therefore it is passul? If we say that it would be passul, what would be the halacha if he then split the water into two separate cups and they each drank one cup, do we say that the situation is considered to be rectified and it is valid, or do we say that the water she ends up with is not exclusively hers all along, and therefore it remains passul? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Q: Rava** asked, what if the sotah drank the water through a straw-like medium? Do we say it is normal to drink this way and it is valid, or is it not normal and is therefore passul? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Q: R' Ashi** asked, if some of the water spilled, is it sufficient for her to drink whatever remained in the cup or not? **A: TEIKU.**
- **R' Zeira in the name of Rav** said, the pesukim state two oaths said by the Kohen. Why are two oaths necessary? One is said before the megilla is erased and one is said afterwards.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, in the order of the pesukim, both oaths are stated before the megilla is erased!? **A: Rava** said, one oath has a curse along with it, and the other does not.
 - **Q:** What is meant by the oath with a curse? **A: R' Amram in the name of Rav** said, the Kohen says "I am making you swear that you were not mezaneh, *because* if you were, the waters will go in you..."
 - **Q: Rava** asked, that is not "an oath of a curse" (as the pasuk says), that is an oath and a separate curse!? **A: Rava** said, it must be that the Kohen says to her "I am making you swear that if you were mezaneh the waters will go in you..."
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, that statement contains a curse, but does not really contain an oath!? **A: R' Ashi** said, the Kohen says "I am making you swear that you were not mezaneh, *and* if you were, the waters will go in you..." (this is different than "because", since the oath is going on the curse as well, and the curse is not simply a reason for her to take the oath seriously).

MISHNA

- Why does the woman answer to the Kohen "Amen, Amen" (why does she say Amen twice)? She is saying Amen to the curse and Amen to the oath. She is saying Amen that she wasn't mezaneh with this man, and Amen that she was not mezaneh with any other man. She is saying Amen that she was not mezaneh as an arusah or as a nesuah. Amen that she was not mezaneh as a shomeres yavam or after having been married with yibum. She says Amen that she was not mezaneh, and Amen that if she was, the waters should go into her and cause her to die. **R' Meir** says, she also uses the double expression to say Amen that she was not mezaneh and Amen that she will not be mezaneh in the future.
- All agree that she cannot be made to swear regarding the period of time before she was an arusah or the period of time after she gets divorced. He cannot even make her swear that if they get divorced and remarried that she will not be mezaneh with someone during the period that she is divorced. The general rule is, for any zenus that would not make her assur to her husband, he cannot make her swear regarding that.

GEMARA

- **R' Hamnuna** said, if a shomeres yavam is mezaneh, she becomes assur to her yavam. This can be learned from our Mishna. The Mishna says that she says Amen that she was not mezaneh as a shomeres yavam. The Mishna also says that we can only make her swear for a zenus that would make her assur to her husband. Therefore, it must be that a shomeres yavam who is mezaneh becomes assur to the yavam. However, in Eretz Yisrael they said that the shomeres yavam would not become assur to the yavam. When the Mishna says that she is made to swear about the period when she was a shomeres yavam, it is following the view of **R' Akiva**, who says that if the woman is mezaneh in a way that is only assur with a lav (a shomeres yavam is only assur to be with another man based on a lav) becomes assur to her husband (or yavam). However, the **Rabanan** would disagree with this and would say that she would remain mutar to the yavam.
- **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, if a man and woman divorced and remarried, and the woman then becomes a sotah, can the husband make her swear that she was not mezaneh during the first marriage as well? Also, if a woman becomes a sotah after entering into yibum, can the yavam now make her swear that she was not mezaneh during her marriage with the dead brother? **A:** The Mishna said, the general rule is that he can make her swear if the zenus she is swearing about would make her assur to him. In both these cases, that earlier zenus *would* make her assur to him, and therefore he can make her swear regarding them.

R' MEIR OMER AMEN SHELO NITMEISI...

- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** does not mean that by swearing regarding the future, the waters will kill her now if she would have been mezaneh in the future. Rather, she swears now, and if she is mezaneh in the future, the waters bubble up in her and kill her then, after the zenus.
- **Q: R' Ashi** asked, according to **R' Meir**, can he make her swear regarding a future marriage that he may have with her (if they get divorced and remarried) or not? Do we say that now she does not become assur to him, so he cannot make her swear regarding that, or since at that time in that marriage she would become assur, he can make her swear now regarding that as well? **A:** Our Mishna said that he cannot make her swear regarding zenus that takes place after they get divorced and before they get remarried. This suggests that he could make her swear regarding zenus that takes place after the remarriage happens.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “zos Toras hakenaos” (the plural is used for “jealousies”), which teaches that a woman may be put through the sotah process more than once (for different instances of warnings and seclusions). **R' Yehuda** says, the word “zos” teaches that she may only be put through the sotah process once. **R' Yehuda** said, it once happened that **Nechunya** the ditch digger testified that a woman was put through the sotah process twice, but we only accepted this testimony when each episode was with a different husband, not when it was the same husband. The **Chachomim** said, a woman can never be put through the sotah process twice – whether with one husband or with two different husbands.
 - **Q:** What does the **T”K** do with the word “zos” and what do the **Chachomim** do with the word “toras”? **A: Rava** said, if there is one husband and one adulterer, all would agree that a woman cannot be put through the process a second time, based on the word “zos”. If there are two husbands and two adulterers, all would agree that she can be put through the process twice, based on the word “toras”. The machlokes is where there is one husband and two adulterers, or one adulterer and two husbands. The **T”K** says that this would be included in “toras” (and a second process can be done), whereas the **Rabanan** say this would be included in “zos” and a second process cannot be done. **R' Yehuda** says “zos” excludes two cases (when there is one husband and one adulterer, and when there is one husband and two adulterers) and “toras” includes two cases (when there are two husbands and one adulterer or two husbands and two adulterers).

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HAYA MEIVI!!!