



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

Sotah Daf Chuf Zayin

- **Shmuel** said, a person should rather marry a woman who is widely rumored to have been mezaneh, rather than marry the daughter of such a woman. The reason is that the first woman does not come from questionable yichus (at worst she is a zonah, who is mutar to marry into Klal Yisrael), whereas the second woman has questionable yichus (her mother may have been mezaneh as a married woman or with an ervah). **R' Yochanan** said, a person should rather marry the daughter and not the mother (who is rumored to have been mezaneh), because the daughter has a chazaka of kashrus (we say that most bi'ahs of a woman are with her husband and this daughter therefore has a chazaka of kashrus), whereas the woman does not have a chazaka of heter (if she is mezaneh she will become assur to her husband, and because she is rumored to do so, we have to be afraid that she will become assur to her husband).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a man may marry a woman who is rumored to be meznaeh. This contradicts **R' Yochanan!**? **A: Rava** said, clearly the Braisa can't be understood as stated, because it would not suggest that a man should l'chatchila go and marry such a woman! Therefore we must change the Braisa to read "if a man marries such a woman he may remain married to her". Once we have to change the Braisa, we should also change it to say "the daughter of a woman rumored to be mezaneh", rather the woman herself.
 - The Gemara paskens that a person should rather marry the daughter of such a woman, than the woman herself, because **R' Tachlifa of Eretz Yisrael in the name of R' Avahu** said, the children of a woman who is mezaneh are mutar to marry into Klal Yisrael, since most of her bi'ahs are with her husband.
 - **Q: R' Amram** asked, what if she is rumored to be extremely involved in zenus? Would the children still be mutar to marry into Klal Yisrael? According to the view that a woman only conceives near the time of her period, the children would definitely be assur, because the husband does not know when that time is and could not have been more careful then to make sure that his wife was not mezaneh at that time. The question is according to the view that a woman conceives near the time that she goes to the mikvah. Do we say that since that time is known, the husband can be careful to watch her so that she isn't mezaneh, and therefore any child she has is from him, or not? **A: TEIKU.**

V'EILU SHE'BEIS DIN...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk uses the double verbiage of "ish ish" to teach that the wife of a deaf-mute, a shoteh, a shamum (insane man), a man who has travelled overseas, or a man who was in prison, may be warned by Beis Din not to seclude herself with a particular man, and the warning makes her lose her kesubah. We would think that the warning can even make her drink the waters as well. The pasuk therefore says "v'heivi ha'ish es ishto", which teaches that only the husband can bring the sotah to drink. **R' Yose** says, that Beis Din's warning can serve as the basis for this sotah to drink when the husband is freed from prison and then brings her himself.
 - **Q:** What is the machlokes between the **Rabanan** and **R' Yose**? **A:** The **Rabanan** say that the pasuk says "v'kinei...v'heivi", which teaches that the one who gave the warning must bring her to drink, and therefore the husband cannot bring her to drink based on the warning of Beis Din. **R' Yose** does not agree with this requirement.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk of "asher tisteh isha tachas ishah" makes a hekesh from the husband to the wife and visa-versa.
 - **Q:** With regard to what halacha is this said? **A: R' Sheishes** said, just as if he were blind the laws of sotah would not apply (based on the pasuk of "v'nelam mei'einei ishah"), so

too if she was blind the laws of sotah would not apply. **R' Ashi** said, just as if she were lame or missing a hand she would not drink (based on the pasuk of "v'hemid haKohen es ha'isha" and "v'nassan ahl kapeha"), so too if he was lame or missing a hand she would not drink. **Mar bar R' Ashi** said, just as a mute woman does not drink the waters (based on the pasuk of "v'amra ha'isha amen amen"), so too if the husband is mute the woman does not drink the mei sotah.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK ARUSAH!!!

PEREK K'SHEIM SHEHAMAYIM -- PEREK CHAMISHI

MISHNA

- Just as the waters check her they also check him. This is learned from the pasuk that says "uva'u" and "uva'u". Just as she becomes assur to the husband, she also becomes assur to the adulterer. **R' Akiva** said this is based on the word "v'nitma'ah", which could have been written as "nitma'ah". **R' Yehoshua** said that **Zecharya ben Hakatzav** darshened the pasuk this way as well. However, **Rebbi** said that the source is the double mention of the word "nitma'ah" and "v'nitma'ah".
- On that day **R' Akiva** darshened the pasuk that says "v'chol kli cheres asher yipol meihem ehl tocho kol asher b'tocho yitmah" – instead of saying "tamei" the pasuk says "yitmah", which teaches that an earthenware keili can make something tamei as a sheini, which then has the power to make something tamei as a shlishi. **R' Yehoshua** said, if only **R' Yochanan ben Zakai** could be alive to have heard this drasha, because **R' Yochanan** would say that the later generations will come to be lenient regarding a shlishi l'tumah since there is no source in a pasuk, and now his talmid, **R' Akiva**, darshened this from a pasuk.
- On that day **R' Akiva** darshened – one pasuk says that the cities of the Levi'im included a 2,000 amah perimeter around the city, and another pasuk says it was only 1,000 amos. We must explain this to mean that 1,000 amos of open space was given to them and the 2,000 amos that were measured was for the sake of knowing the techum for Shabbos. **R' Eliezer the son of R' Yose Haglili** says, 1,000 amos was open space and the 2,000 amos refer to the measure of the fields and vineyards that were given to them.
- On that day **R' Akiva** darshened the pasuk of "Az yashir Moshe....vayomru *leimor*" – the word "leimor" teaches that Klal Yisrael responded to Moshe's shira after each phrase, as people say Hallel. **R' Nechemya** says they responded as people saying Shema, not Hallel.
- On that day **R' Yehoshua ben Hurkinas** darshened from pesukim that Iyov served Hashem out of love (not fear of punishment). **R' Yehoshua** said, if only **R' Yochanan ben Zakai** could be alive to have heard this, because **R' Yochanan** darshened from a pasuk that Iyov only served Hashem out of fear of punishment, not out of love, and now **R' Yochanan's** talmid's talmid darshened that Iyov served Hashem out of love.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Who is the "him" that the Mishna says is checked by the waters? It can't mean the husband, because what did he do wrong? It can't mean that if the husband had bi'ah with her after the seclusion the waters would then "check him" as well, because in that case the waters don't even check her (based on the pasuk of "v'nikah ha'ish mei'avon")!? Rather, the "him" must be the adulterer. However, why doesn't the Mishna use the term "bo'el" as it does later on, instead of using the pronoun of "him"? **A:** The Mishna is referring to the adulterer. In the beginning of the Mishna, where the Mishna begins with the pronoun "her" it also uses the pronoun "him". Later in the Mishna, when the Mishna uses the term "baal" (husband) it uses the term "boel" to refer to the adulterer.