



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

Sotah Daf Yud Tes

PEREK HAYA NOTEL -- PEREK SHLISHI

MISHNA

- He would take the Korbbon Mincha from the palm fiber basket and put it into a kli shareis, which he would then put in her hand. The Kohen puts his hand under hers and they do "tenufah". He does tenufah and brings it to the Mizbe'ach, then does kemitza and offers it on the Mizbe'ach. The remaining flour is then eaten by the Kohanim.
- He would first give her to drink the waters and only then offer the mincha. **R' Shimon** says, he would first offer the mincha and then give her the waters to drink, as the pasuk says "v'achar yashkeh es ha'isha es hamayim". However, if he first gave her to drink and then offered the mincha, it would be valid.

GEMARA

- **Q: R' Elazar** asked **R' Yoshiya** of his generation, how do we know that the mincha of a sotah requires tenufah? **A:** He answered, because the pasuk says "v'heinig". **Q:** He asked, but how do we know that it must be done by the woman? **A:** He answered, we have a gezeirah shava on the word "yad" from sotah to shelamim. This teaches that just as by sotah the Kohen must do the tenufah, the same is by a shelamim. And, just as by a shelamim it must be done by the owner, the same is by a sotah. The way this is done is that the Kohen puts his hand under the hand of the owner and together they do tenufah.

HEINIF V'HIGISH KAMATZ...

- **Q:** The Mishna already said that the mincha was brought before the waters were given to drink. How can it then suggest that the mincha was done afterwards? **A:** The Mishna means to say that regarding the drinking it is actually a matter of machlokes between the **Rabanan** and **R' Shimon**.

V'IHM HISHKA V'ACHAR KACH HIKRIV ES MINCHASA K'SHEIRA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "v'hishka" (he shall give her to drink) twice. **R' Akiva** explains, this teaches that if after erasing the megillas sotah into the water she refuses to drink, we force the water into her. **R' Shimon** says, the pasuk said "v'hishka", so why does it then say "v'achar yashkeh"? It is teaching that she is only given to drink after everything else is done – this means that she is not given to drink until after the kemitza is offered, until after the megilla is erased, and until after she accepts the oath upon herself.
 - **Q:** The rule that she is only given to drink after the kemitza is offered makes sense, because **R' Shimon** is following his own view as stated in our Mishna. What is meant that we must erase the megilla before she is given to drink? That is obvious, because before erasing, there is nothing to give her to drink!? **A: R' Ashi** said, he means that she is not given to drink for as long as there remains an impression on the parchment. It must be entirely erased before she is given to drink.
 - **Q: R' Shimon** said she cannot drink until she accepts the oath upon herself. Does this mean that the megilla can be written before the acceptance of the oath, but she just cannot drink? We have learned that **Rava** said, a megilla written before the oath is accepted is passul!? **A: R' Shimon** mentioned that along with the others, but indeed had no reason to say so, because the megilla could not even be written at that time.
- **Q:** What is the basis for the machlokes between the **Rabanan** and **R' Shimon** in our Mishna? **A:** There are 3 pesukim that mention her drinking. One pasuk says "v'hishka", another pasuk says "v'achar yashkeh", and another pasuk then says "v'hishka". The **Rabanan** say that the first pasuk

teaches she is given to drink before the mincha is offered, the second pasuk teaches that she cannot be given to drink if the megilla was not completely erased, and the third pasuk teaches that if after the megilla is erased she refuses to drink, we force her to do so. **R' Shimon** holds that the second pasuk teaches the basic halacha that she must drink after the mincha is offered, the first pasuk teaches that if she drank before the mincha is offered it is still valid, and the last pasuk teaches that if after the megilla is erased she refuses to drink, we force her to do so. The **Rabanan** say that the Torah would not in the *first pasuk* teach the halacha of the b'dieved case.

- **Q:** The Braisa quoted above said that **R' Akiva** says we force her to drink if she refuses to do so after the megilla was already erased. However, another Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** says we place a metal piece in her mouth to force it open so that we can force her to drink if she refuses after the megilla has been erased. **R' Akiva** says, the point of her drinking is to prove her guilt, and her refusal is the biggest proof of her guilt, so there is no need to force her. However, **R' Akiva** says, if she refuses after the mincha is brought, we force her to drink. Now, from here we see that **R' Akiva** says we do not force her to drink!? **A:** First we will explain why **R' Akiva** in this second Braisa seems self-contradictory and says there are times that we do force her to drink. He holds that it depends on how she is refusing to drink. If she does so calmly, that is an admission of guilt. However, if she does so in a panic, that may be because although she is innocent, she is scared that the waters will kill her anyway. Therefore, in that case we force. The same can be said to explain the seeming contradiction of **R' Akiva** in the Braisos.
 - **Q:** There is still a contradiction in the statements of **R' Akiva**, because in the first Braisa he says the determining point in time is the erasing of the megilla, and in the second Braisa he says it is the time that the kometz is offered!? **A:** There are differing views between two Tanna'im as to what was the view of **R' Akiva**.
 - **Q:** If she refused to drink and it was done calmly, and she then says that she is willing to drink, do we say that the refusal was an admission of guilt and she therefore cannot retract that now and drink, or do we say that her later retraction shows that the refusal must have been done out of fear and was not an admission of guilt? **A: TEIKU.**
- The father of **Shmuel** said, they must put a bitter substance into the water before erasing the megilla, because the pasuk refers to the water as "mei hamarim" – the bitter waters, meaning they are already bitter before the megilla is erased into it.