



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

### Sotah Daf Chuf Vuv

ME'UBERES CHAVEIRO...

- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, the machlokes about whether we give a woman who can't have children the waters to drink is only regarding a woman who can't have children because of age or some type of injury. However, all would agree that an ailunis is never given to drink and does not collect on her kesubah. This is based on the pasuk of "v'niksa v'nizri'ah zarah" – which teaches that only someone for whom it is normal to have children, and not ailunis for whom it is not normal to have children.
  - **Q:** The Gemara quotes a Braisa which clearly says that an ailunis is subject to drinking the mei hamarim!? **A: R' Nachman** would say that it is a machlokes Tanna'im whether an ailunis is excluded from drinking based on the pasuk above. There is a Braisa in which **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says that the ailunis is never given to drink based on this pasuk, and **R' Nachman** would follow that view.
    - **Q:** How would the **Rabanan** (who argue on **R' Shimon ben Elazar**) darshen the pasuk? **A:** They use the pasuk as taught in a Braisa, where **R' Akiva** says the pasuk teaches that if the sotah was innocent and she was someone incapable of having children, the waters make it that she could then have children. **R' Yishmael** says this can't be, because then every woman who could not have children would make herself into a sotah to drink the waters as a cure! Rather, the pasuk means that if she would have painful childbirths, she would then have easier ones. If she had girls, she would then have boys. If she had short children, she would then have tall ones. If she had dark children, she would then have lighter ones.
    - **Q:** The Braisa also said that a woman who may marry a mamzer, who marries a mamzer and becomes a sotah must either drink the waters or forfeit her kesubah. The seems obvious!? **A:** We would have thought that we don't want her to drink the waters and bring about more mamzeirem into the world. The Braisa therefore teaches that she does drink the waters, since the marriage is a permitted one.
    - **Q:** The Braisa said that the wife of a ger or of a freed slave is given the waters to drink. This seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that the pasuk of "daber ehl Bnei Yisrael" teaches that this only applies to "Bnei Yisrael", and not to geirem and freed slaves.
      - **Q:** Maybe that assumption is correct and it should only apply to Bnei Yisrael? **A:** The word "v'amarta" is an inclusion and comes to include geirem and freed slaves.

EISHES KOHEN SHOSEH...

- **Q:** This seems obvious!? Why would we think that she should be treated different than any other woman? **A:** The pasuk regarding sotah says "and she was not forced, she will be assur", which suggests that if she was forced into the act, she would be mutar. Now, the wife of a Kohen is assur to him even if she was forced to be mezaneh. Therefore, we would think that the concept of giving the sotah to drink does not apply to the wife of a Kohen.

UMUTERES L'BAALA

- **Q:** It seems obvious that if she is found to be innocent she is mutar to her husband!? **A: R' Huna** said, the Mishna is referring to the case where she begins to deteriorate after drinking the waters.

- **Q:** If she begins to deteriorate, that means that she was mezanah and should therefore be assur to her husband!? **A:** The case is where other parts of her body begin to deteriorate (not her thighs and stomach). We would think this is a sign that she was forced to be mezanah, and if she is the wife of a Kohen she should therefore be assur to him. The Mishna teaches that even in this case she would be mutar to her husband.

#### EISHES SARIS SHOSEH

- **Q:** This seems obvious!? **A:** We would think the that pasuk of “mibaladei isheich” teaches that the husband must also be capable of full bi’ah (and the saris is not).

#### AHL YIDEI KOL ARAYOS MIKANIN

- **Q:** This seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that the mention of “v’nitmi’ah” twice in the pasuk teaches that she becomes assur to the husband and the adulterer, and we would say that since in this case she doesn’t *become* assur to the adulterer (because she was already assur to him as one of the arayos) maybe the sotah process will not apply.

#### CHUTZ MIN HAKATAN...

- This is based on the pasuk that says “ish”, which teaches that if the other “man” is a minor, she does not become a sotah.
- **Q:** What does the Mishna refer to when it says “and one who is not a man”? It can’t come to exclude a man who is impotent, because **Shmuel** says such a man may be the subject of kinuy and stirah!? It can’t come to exclude a goy, because **R’ Hamnuna** says that a goy can be the subject of a kinuy and stirah!? **A: R’ Pappa** said, it comes to exclude an animal and teaches that there is no concept of zenus with an animal, and therefore a warning for a woman not to seclude with an animal is not considered to be a valid warning.
  - **Q:** If an impotent man can be the subject of a kinuy (although he has no zerah), what is meant by the pasuk regarding sotah that says “shichvas zerah”? **A:** A Braisa teaches, as explained by **R’ Sheishes**, that a warning for her not to be mezanah with a man in an unnatural way is not considered to be a valid warning.
    - **Q: Rava** asked, a bi’ah done in an unnatural way is considered to be a full-fledged bi’ah (learned from the words “mishkivei isha”)!? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa is teaching that a warning not to lie together with another man with their bodies touching is a not valid warning.
      - **Q: Abaye** asked, that is an act of pritzus, but would not be an act that would make her assur to her husband!? **A: Abaye** said, the Braisa is teaching that a warning not to have his eiver even touch her private area is considered not to be a valid warning.
        - **Q:** This makes sense according to the view that such an act is not halachically considered to be bi’ah. That is why a pasuk is needed to teach that such an act does not bring about the laws of sotah. However, according to the view that such an act is considered to be bi’ah, such an act will certainly bring on the laws of sotah!? **A:** The Braisa is teaching that a warning of lying together is not a warning. The Torah had to teach this, because we would think that sotah is about the husband objecting to certain conduct, and since the husband is objecting to this conduct it should make her a sotah. The Torah therefore teaches that this is not so, and she does not become a sotah from this warning.