



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

### Sotah Daf Chuf Ches

SHENE'EMAR UVA'U UVA'U

- **Q:** Is the drasha based on the “vav” of “uva’u” or is it based on the repetition of the entire word “uva’u”? **A:** In the next part of the Mishna it is the same **R’ Akiva** who darshens the extra vav of “v’nitma’ah”. It must be that he is darshening the extra vav of “uva’u” as well.
  - **Q:** In that drasha of “v’nitma’ah”, is **R’ Akiva** darshening the vav or is he darshening the repetition of the entire word? **A:** From the fact that **Rebbi** argues and says that the drasha is based on the repetition of the word “v’nitma’ah”, we can learn that **R’ Akiva** must be darshening the letter vuv.
  - According to **R’ Akiva** there are 6 drashos (the word “uva’u” is written 3 times, each time with a vuv, thus allowing for 6 drashos). One drasha teaches the command regarding her and one is for the command regarding the bo’el. One is for the carrying out of the curse regarding her and one is for the carrying out regarding the bo’el. One is to teach the order of the curse for her and one is for the order of the curse regarding the bo’el. According to **Rebbi** (who doesn’t darshen the vuv) there are only 3 drashos. The 3 drashos are the same as those darshened for **R’ Akiva**, but in each case only regarding the woman, not the bo’el.
    - **Q:** How does **Rebbi** know the concept that just as the waters check her they also check the bo’el? **A:** He learns it as stated in a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk says “latzbos beten v’lanpil yareich” – which refers to what will happen to the bo’el. This can’t refer to what will happen to the woman, because regarding her the pasuk says “v’tzavsah vitna v’nafla y’reicha”.
      - **R’ Akiva** says the pasuk of “latzbos beten...” teaches that the Kohen tells her that first her stomach will be affected by the waters and then her thighs, and it is important that she is told this so that she will not think the waters are working improperly when her stomach is struck before her thighs. **Rebbi** says, if this is all it is teaching, the pasuk should have used the words “bitna” and “y’reicha”. The fact that it uses “beten” and “yareich” also teaches that this will happen to the bo’el as well. Also, don’t say that the words only teach that the bo’el is punished as well, and does not teach that the actual punishment happens first in the stomach, because then the pasuk should have said “bitno” and “y’reicho”. The fact that it says “beten” and “yareich” teaches both these concepts.

AMAR R’ YEHOShUA KACH HAYA DORESH ZECHARYA...

- A Braisa says, the pesukim of sotah mention the word “nitma’ah” 3 times – “ihm nitmi’ah”, “nitma’ah”, and “v’nitma’ah”. **R’ Akiva** says, one teaches that the sotah becomes assur to the husband, one teaches that she becomes assur to the bo’el, and one teaches that she becomes assur to eat terumah (as a sotah she is assur to eat terumah whether married to a Kohen or the daughter of a Kohen). **R’ Yishmael** says, we don’t need a pasuk to teach that this woman would be assur to marry a Kohen, because if a divorcee, who may eat terumah (if she is the daughter of a Kohen and was divorced without children) may not marry a Kohen, then surely a sotah, who may not eat terumah, may not marry a Kohen. The Braisa asks, why in one pasuk does the Torah say “if she did become tamei” and “if she didn’t become tamei” and then mention the drinking of the waters? If she is known to have become tamei there is no reason for her to drink the waters, and if she is known to be innocent, why would we even give her the waters to drink at

all? Rather, the pasuk is teaching that as long as she is a safek (we are uncertain whether or not she was mezev) she is assur to her husband, etc. From here we can learn regarding the tumah of a sheretz. If regarding a sotah, where the Torah does not treat a shogeg like a meizid, or an oneis like willing, still the Torah treats a safek like a case of certainty (in that she is assur), then surely regarding a sheretz, where shogeg is treated like meizid, and oneis is treated like willing, safek will be treated like a case of certainty and will be tamei. We also learn a further comparison to sotah. Just like sotah takes place in reshus hayachid, so too a safek case of sheretz is only tamei when it takes place in reshus hayachid. Also, just like sotah involved things (i.e. people) who have the ability to be asked regarding the possible tumah, so too sheretz is only tamei when the safek involves something with the ability and intellect to be asked. From here we say that something that has the ability and intellect to be asked and there is a safek tumah in reshus hayachid regarding it, it is deemed tamei. If the safek happens in the reshus harabim, it is deemed tahor. If the thing does not have the ability and intellect to be asked, then a safek regarding it, even in reshus hayachid, will be deemed tahor.

- **Q: R' Akiva** made a statement regarding her eating terumah, and **R' Yishmael** responded regarding her allowance to marry into Kehuna!? Also, how would **R' Akiva** learn that she is assur to marry into Kehuna? We can't say that **R' Akiva** holds that since a safek is considered like a case of certainly tamei by sotah a pasuk is not needed to teach that she can't marry into Kehuna, because if that is true, there would be no reason to have a pasuk to teach that she is assur to eat terumah either (since if she was for sure tamei she would not be allowed to eat terumah), and yet **R' Akiva** says a pasuk is necessary to teach that!? **A: R' Akiva** says there are 4 words that are available for drasha in the pesukim (the 3 mentions of "nitma'ah" and one of which has a "vuv", which allows for an additional drasha) – one teaches she is assur to the husband, one that she is assur to the bo'el, one that she may not marry into Kehuna, and one that she may not eat terumah. **R' Yishmael** does not darshen the vuv, and therefore only has 3 available drashos – one to teach that she is assur to the husband, one that she is assur to the bo'el, and one that she is assur to eat terumah. With regard to the issur for her to marry into Kehuna, that is learned from the kal v'chomer.
  - **Q:** Why does **R' Yishmael** say that the issur of terumah is learned from the pasuk and the issur of Kehuna is learned from the kal v'chomer? Maybe the pasuk teaches the issur of Kehuna which would mean that she is actually mutar to eat terumah!? **A:** He says that just like the issur to her husband and to the bo'el apply even during the life of the husband, so too the third drasha must apply to terumah, which can also apply during the husband's lifetime. However, the issur of Kehuna can *only* apply after his lifetime (during his lifetime would mean the she was divorced, in which case she would anyway be assur to Kehuna), and therefore is not the halacha that is taught by the pasuk. **R' Akiva** would either say that we don't need to compare the issurim to those of the husband and the bo'el, or he can say that although the issur to Kehuna may be learned from a kal v'chomer, the Torah went ahead and taught it to us through a pasuk anyway (which is something that is often done in pesukim).