



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

Sotah Daf Beis

MESECHTA SOTAH

PEREK HAMIKANEI -- PEREK RISHON

MISHNA

- Regarding one who was "mekaneh" (warned her not to seclude herself with a particular man) his wife, **R' Eliezer** says the kinuy (warning) must be done in front of two people and the "stirah" (the seclusion) can be attested to by even one witness or even by the husband himself, and she would then be subject to drinking the "mei hamarim". **R' Yehoshua** says that even the stirah must be witnessed by 2 witnesses.
- How is one mikaneh his wife? If he tells her in front of two people "Do not speak to so-and-so" and she then goes and speaks to that person, she remains mutar to her husband, and may still eat terumah if her husband is a Kohen. If, however, she secluded herself with that man and remained secluded for the amount of time it takes for the beginning of tashmish, she becomes assur to her husband, assur to eat terumah if her husband is a Kohen, and if her husband were to then die without children, she would have to get chalitzah from his brother, and could not do yibum.

GEMARA

- **Q:** We just completed Mesechta Nazir. Why would Mesechta Sotah be taught following Nazir?
A: It is based on the statement of **Rebbi**, who said in a Braisa that the parsha of sotah is followed by the parsha of nazir in the Torah, because when one sees the disgrace of a sotah he will separate himself from wine. That is the reason the Tanna taught Nazir and Sotah in succession.
 - **Q:** If so, the Tanna should have first taught Sotah and then Nazir? **A:** Since the Tanna taught Perek Hanoder in Mesechta Kesubos, he followed that with Mesechta Nedarim. After teaching Nedarim, it made sense to teach Nazir (which is a type of neder). Once he taught Nazir he then taught Sotah for the reason of **Rebbi**, given above.

HAMIKANEH

- The Mishna says "if someone was mikaneh", which suggests that this is not something that should initially be done. The Mishna follows the view that it is assur for one to be mekaneh his wife.
- **R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchak** said that when **Reish Lakish** would begin teaching Sotah he would say that a pasuk teaches that a person is paired with a woman based on his deeds. **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** would say based on a pasuk, pairing together a man and woman is "as difficult" to Hashem as doing Kriyas Yam Suf.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said that 40 days before an embryo is formed a Bas Kol calls forth and announces its destined match. We see that it is not based on a person's deeds!? **A:** A person's first marriage is predestined. A person's second marriage is based on his deeds.

R' ELIEZER OMER MIKANEI LAH AHL PI SHNAYIM...

- **Q:** They only argue with regard to the number of witnesses needed for the stirah. However, they would both agree that if even one witness saw that she was actually mezaneh with the man, she would be prevented from drinking the mei hamarim. In fact, a Mishna says this as well. Where do we see from the Torah that a single witness is believed for this matter? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the wife who was mezaneh with the man says – "v'aid ein bah" – which means

that somehow we are certain that she was mezaneh, but there were not two witnesses there. It must therefore mean that there was one witness (or else how do we know) and we see that one witness is sufficient to be believed in this case.

- **Q:** Maybe the pasuk means that there is no witness at all? **A:** This can't be, because a pasuk says "lo yakum aid echad b'sih". There is seemingly no reason to say the word "echad". The pasuk does so to teach that whenever the pasuk says the word "aid" by itself it refers to two witnesses, unless the Torah adds the word "echad".
 - **Q:** This seems to say that if not for the pasuk with "echad" we would think that the pasuk by sotah means that there were no witnesses at all. How can that be? If there were no witnesses how do we even know that she was mezaneh with the man? **A:** We would have understood the pasuk of "aid ein bah" to teach that a single witness is not believed. With the teaching of the other pasuk we know that the word "aid" means two witnesses, and as such the pasuk can't mean that they are not believed. We can therefore learn that the pasuk means there is one witness, and that single witness is believed.
 - **Q:** How could we say that we would have thought that the pasuk means to teach that a single witness is not believed and that two witnesses would be needed? If that were to be the case, the pasuk should not have mentioned anything about witnesses at all, and we would learn out from all monetary matters in the Torah, that just as in those cases two witnesses are always required, it would be required here too! **A:** We would have thought that although in other places one witness is not believed, we would think that in the case of sotah one witness is believed, because there is "raglayim l'davar" (circumstantial evidence), of her being warned and then secluding with the man, that suggests as the single witness is saying, and therefore the single witness should be believed.
 - **Q:** How could we think that the pasuk comes to teach that a single witness is *not* believed, which would mean that the pasuk is teaching a situation of heter to her husband, when the pasuk says "she was not forced", meaning that the pasuk is saying why she is assur to husband!? **A:** We would think that the pasuk is teaching that even with two witnesses she is only assur when she was not forced. The pasuk of "aid echad" therefore teaches that the pasuk by sotah means that there is a single witness, and that single witness is believed.

R' YEHOShUA OMER MIKANEI LAH AHL PI SHNAYIM...

- **R' Yehoshua** darshens the pasuk of "v'aid ein bah" (which teaches that a single witness is believed) to teach that a single witness is believed "bah" – only regarding her (to say that she was mezaneh), but is not believed regarding a kinuy or regarding a stirah. **R' Eliezer** darshens the pasuk to only be teaching the drasha of "bah", but not regarding the kinuy.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Eliezer** darshen "bah" to also teach that a single witness is not believed regarding stirah? **A:** He says that there is a hekesh from stirah to the case of her actually being mezaneh (the pasuk says "v'nistirah v'hee nitma'ah) that teaches that a single witness is believed regarding the stirah as well.
 - **Q:** A pasuk makes a hekesh from kinuy to the case of her being mezaneh as well!? **A:** The pasuk of "bah" teaches that kinuy needs two witnesses, and it is more logical to say that "bah" is teaching regarding kinuy, because stirah is more stringent in that it makes her assur to her husband as a case of actual znus.
 - **Q:** Maybe kinuy is considered more stringent, because that is the root that makes her assur through her later stirah!? **A:** The kinuy is meaningless without the stira, and therefore is more lenient. Although a stirah without a kinuy is also meaningless, since stirah is the beginning of the possibility for znus, it is considered more stringent.
- Our Mishna does not follow the version of **R' Eliezer** in a Braisa. The Braisa says that **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda in the name of R' Eliezer** says that the kinuy can be made on the basis of a

single witness or even on the basis of the husband alone, but she drinks the mei hamarim only on the basis of two witnesses (two witnesses are needed for the stirah). The **Chachomim** said to **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda**, there is no end to this.

- **Q:** What is the reason of **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda**? **A:** He darshens the pasuk of “bah” to teach that for stirah, two witnesses are necessary.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't he darshen the pasuk to teach that kinuy needs two witnesses? **A:** There is a hekesh between kinuy and the case of actual znus, which teaches that kinuy only needs one witness to be effective.
 - **Q:** The pasuk makes a hekesh between stirah and zenus as well!? **A:** That hekesh is used to teach that the minimum time needed for stirah is the time it takes for an act of tashmish.
- **Q:** What is meant by the words of the **Chachomim** that “there is no end to this”? **A:** They mean to say that if the husband is believed to say he was mekaneh, he may easily lie and say that he was, bringing about situations of sotah.
 - **Q:** In our Mishna **R' Eliezer** says that the husband is believed regarding stirah. Why is that any less of a problem of potential abuse of the system? **A:** **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the **Chachomim** meant to say that even according to **R' Eliezer** of the Braisa (and certainly according to **R' Eliezer** of the Mishna) this concern exists.
 - **Q:** This makes it sound as if the Mishna is a more obvious cause for this concern. However, the Mishna is less of a cause for concern, because there was a true prior kinuy made to two witnesses!? **A:** The **Chachomim** meant that there is cause for concern in our Mishna, and *certainly* there is cause for concern in the Braisa (the more obvious case is the case of the Braisa).
- **R' Chanina** of Sura said, in today's times a person should not be mekaneh his wife (even if there are no witnesses), because maybe we pasken like **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** (who says that no witnesses need be present) and if his wife then secludes with the man she will be assur to her husband forever, since there is no mei sotah to prove her innocence.
- **Reish Lakish** said, the word “kinuy” (which means warning and usually means jealousy) is so used, because this warning causes jealousy and anger between her and others.
 - He must hold that a kinuy can be made without any witnesses, and when this is done, people then see this woman separate herself from society and become angry with her (not knowing that she was warned by her husband).
- **R' Yeimar bar R' Shlemya in the name of Abaye** said, the word “kinuy” is used, because this warning brings to anger between husband and wife.
 - He must hold that the kinuy must be done in front of two people, which makes this a matter of public knowledge and is embarrassing, and leads to fights between husband and wife.
 - According to both understandings of the word “kinuy” it denotes causing anger. Based on this we can say that they both hold that it is assur for a man to be mekaneh his wife.
 - **Q:** According to the view that it is mutar to be mekanah one's wife, what is the meaning of the word “kinuy”? **A:** It is a word meaning “warning” like we find such use in a pasuk.