



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

### Sotah Daf Gimmel

- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, we see from the pasuk that a person does an aveirah in private (the woman) and Hashem makes it a public matter (He makes the husband warn her and it becomes public).
  - **Reish Lakish** darshens a pasuk to teach that a person only does an aveirah if a "ruach shtus" enters him.
- **The Yeshiva of R' Yishmael** taught a Braisa that says the reason a single witness is believed to say that a sotah was mezaneh is because of the circumstantial evidence – i.e. the fact that she was warned and then secluded with this man and only then was seen to be mezaneh by the witness.
  - **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, in the order of the pesukim the kinuy requirement comes after the stirah and the tumah (i.e. the zenus), not before!? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk says "v'avar", meaning that the warning already happened previously, before the stirah.
    - **Q:** We find other psukim where the word "v'avar" does not mean "previously"!? **A:** It depends on the context of the pasuk. With regard to sotah, there would be no reason to warn her after she already did stirah and tumah. Therefore, it must mean that the warning happened previously.
- **The Yeshiva of R' Yishmael** taught a Braisa that a husband only warns his wife if a "ruach" from Heaven enters him, as the pasuk says "ruach kinah".
  - **Q:** What is meant by a ruach? **A:** The **Rabanan** say it means a ruach of tumah and **R' Ashi** says it means a ruach of tahara.
    - It is logical to say that it refers to a ruach of tahara, because a Braisa brings a machlokes where **R' Yishmael** says that a person *may* warn his wife (but there is no obligation to do so) and **R' Akiva** says that a person *must* warn his wife. Now, if a warning is in response to a ruach tumah, would we say that a person must or even may follow it? Absolutely not. It must be that a warning comes from a ruach of tahara.
- We just mentioned the Braisa which brings a machlokes where **R' Yishmael** says that a person *may* warn his wife (but there is no obligation to do so) and **R' Akiva** says that a person *must* warn his wife. The Braisa continues, the pasuk regarding a Kohen becoming tamei to his immediate family says "lah yitamah". **R' Yishmael** says he *may* become tamei and **R' Akiva** says he *must* become tamei. The pasuk regarding a non-Jewish slave says "l'olam bahem taavodu". **R' Yishmael** says a master *may* work this slave forever, and **R' Akiva** says that he *must* work him forever.
  - **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Abaye** (or **R' Mesharshiya** asked **Rava**), shall we say that this machlokes applies to every mitzvas assei that there is in the Torah!? **A:** He answered, it is only in regard to these three cases, based on how to darshen the pesukim.
    - With regard to the sotah warning, **R' Yishmael** says that since there is an issur to hate another Yid, we would think that a husband is forbidden to have such feelings to warn his wife. The pasuk therefore teaches that he *may* do so, and need not be concerned with the issur. **R' Akiva** says that the pasuk mentions kinuy a second time, which makes it obligatory. **R' Yishmael** says that the second mention of kinuy is only because there is a second mention of "v'nitmi'ah" (once for when she became tamei and once for when she did not become tamei), but not for purposes of its own drasha.

- With regard to the Kohen becoming tamei, **R' Yishmael** holds that since there is a lav for the Kohen to become tamei to meisim, we need the pasuk of “lah yitamah” to teach that in this case it is *permitted*. **R' Akiva** says we learn it is permitted from the pasuk of “ki ihm lish'eiro”. Therefore, the pasuk of “lah yitamah” must be teaching that it is obligatory. **R' Yishmael** says that the drasha of “lah yitamah” is needed to teach that the Kohen may become tamei to his relative who has died, but may not become tamei to the limb of a relative that has been severed (it gives off tumah like a meis). **R' Akiva** says, that can be learned from the word “lah”. The word “yitamah” is extra and teaches that it is obligatory. **R' Yishmael** says the word “yitamah” is not needed and is not to be darshened. It is only stated along with the word “lah”, which is needed for the drasha.
    - With regard to the working of non-Jewish slaves, **R' Yishmael** says this pasuk of “I'olam bahem taavodu” is needed to teach that although there is mitzvah to kill out the 7 nations of Kinaan, if a male of a different nation had a son with a woman of the seven nations, this son may be purchased as a slave and need not be killed. Therefore the pasuk is only *allowing* for this, and is not teaching an obligation. **R' Akiva** says this can be learned from the pasuk of “mayhem tiknu”. Therefore, the pasuk of “I'olam bahem taavodu” teaches an obligation that they are to work for you forever. **R' Yishmael** says the pasuk of “bahem” is needed to teach that a Jewish slave is not to be treated in this way. **R' Akiva** says this can be learned from the end of the pasuk which specifically mentions Jewish slaves and says they may not be put through hard work. **R' Yishmael** says this can be learned from there as well, and the word “bahem” is written only for stylistic purposes.
- **R' Chisda** said, znus is to a house like a karya worm is to a sesame seed (i.e. it totally destroys it). **R' Chisda** also said that anger is to a house like a karya worm is to a sesame seed (i.e. it totally destroys it).
  - Both of these statements were made regarding the woman of the house (being involved in znus or being angry). However, if the man engages in this conduct, it is bad, but will not destroy the house.
  - **R' Chisda** said, originally, before the Yidden did aveiros of znus, the Shechina would dwell with each and every Yid. After the aveiros were done, the Shechina removed itself from their homes.
  - **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonason** said, whoever does a single mitzvah in this world will have that mitzvah precede him and go before him in Olam Habah, and anyone who does a single aveirah in this world has the aveirah cling to him and go before him in Olam Habah. **R' Elazar** says the aveirah is tied to him like a dog.
- A Mishna says, if not for the pasuk that says that a single witness is believed to say the woman was mezaneh, we would say that a single witness is not believed, because if two witnesses are needed for the stirah, which does not make the wife assur to her husband permanently, then certainly two witnesses should be needed to say she was mezaneh, which would make her assur permanently. The pasuk of “v'aid ein bah” therefore teaches that a single witness is believed. Now, we would make a kal v'chomer and say that if the zenus only needs one witness, then surely the stirah should only need one witness! To prevent this kal v'chomer, the pasuk says “ki matza bah ervas *davar*”, and we learn a gezeirah shava of “davar” to the “davar” written in regard to monetary matters, and this teaches that just as monetary matters always need two witnesses, the same is for the stirah.
  - **Q:** We said earlier that the halacha that two witnesses are needed for the stirah is learned from the pasuk of “bah”, not this gezeirah shava!? **A:** That is actually what the Mishna means. The Mishna means to say that the gezeirah shava is needed for a regular case (where there was no warning or stirah) of witnessing an act of znus. Based on the gezeirah shava there must be two witnesses to that act, because one witness would not be believed.