



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

### Sotah Daf Lamed Aleph

BO BAYOM DARASH R' YEHOSHUA BEN HURKINAS...

- **Q:** Why can't we just look and see if the word "lo" in the pasuk (regarding Iyuv) is written with a vuv (which would suggest that he served Hashem out of love) or with an aleph (which would suggest that it was done out of fear of punishment)? **A:** We find in other places that the word "lo" is written with an aleph and yet it is understood as if it was written with a vuv. Therefore, simply looking at how it is spelled will not be determinative of what is meant.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says that Iyuv was G-d fearing, and the pasuk says that Avrohom was G-d fearing. Just as Avrohom's fear was born out of his love for Hashem, the same is true for Iyuv. We see this was the case by Avrohom, because the pasuk says "zerah Avrohom ohavi".
- **Q:** What is the difference in the zechus of one who serves Hashem out of love and one who serves Hashem out of fear? **A:** A Braisa says that **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, we darshen pesukim to teach that the reward for serving Hashem out of love lasts to protect his descendants in this world for 2,000 generations, whereas the reward for serving Hashem out of fear lasts for only 1,000 generations.
  - **Rava** had two talmidim who each had a dream. One was read a pasuk in his dream that discussed fearing Hashem, and the other was read a pasuk that discussed loving Hashem. **Rava** told them that they are both complete tzadikim, and the only difference is that one serves Hashem out of fear and the other serves Hashem out of love.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK K'SHEIM SHEHAMAYIM!!!**

**PEREK MI SHEKINEI -- PEREK SHISHI**

MISHNA

- If a man warned his wife not to seclude with a particular man and she then secluded herself with that man, **R' Eliezer** says, even if the husband hears about the seclusion from "a little birdie" (i.e. an unreliable source) he must divorce her (if he chooses not to give her the mei hamarim) and pay her the kesubah. **R' Yehoshua** says he does not need to divorce her until everybody is talking about her actions.
- If the seclusion was established (by 2 witnesses according to **R' Yehoshua**, or by "a birdie" according to **R' Eliezer**) and a single witness then came and said that he saw her be mezaneh, she is not given to drink (and would be divorced and would lose her kesubah). Moreover, even if that single witness is a slave or maidservant they are believed to the point of making her lose her kesubah. If the witness is her mother-in-law, or her mother-in-law's daughter, or her co-wife, or her husband's brother's wife, or her husband's daughter, they are believed to say she was meznaeh and to prevent her from being able to drink the mei hamarim, but not to make her lose her kesubah.
  - We would think that a single witness would not be believed to say she was mezaneh, because if two witnesses are needed to establish the seclusion, which only makes her *temporarily* assur to her husband, then for sure two witnesses should be needed to establish that she was mezaneh, which makes her *permanently* assur to her husband! However, the Torah teaches that one witness is believed, when the pasuk says "v'eid ein bah" – which we understand to mean there are not two witnesses, but there is one witness.

- Based on this we would think to say that a single witness should be believed to establish the seclusion!?! However we have a gezeira shava that says differently. The pasuk regarding divorcing his wife says “ki matza vah ervas davar”, and another pasuk says “ahl pi shnayim eidim yakum davar”. This gezeira shava teaches that two witnesses are needed to establish an “ervas davar”, which would include this matter of seclusion.
- If one witness says she was mezaneh and another witness says she was not, or if one woman says that she was and another says that she was not, she is given the waters to drink. If one said she was mezaneh and two said that she was not, she is given the waters to drink. If two said that she was mezaneh and one said that she was not, she is not given the waters to drink.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna says that a single witness is not believed regarding the seclusion based on a gezeirah shava. We learned earlier that a single witness is not believed for the kinuy or the stirah based on the word “bah” in the pasuk of “v’eid ein bah”!?! **A:** The Mishna should be understood as if it said that regarding a kinuy and stirah a single witness is not believed based on the teaching of the word “bah”. Regarding other instances of zenus a single witness is not believed based on the gezeirah shava of “davar” “davar”.

#### EID OMER NITMEIS

- The only reason the witness is not believed is because there is another witness that contradicts him. If not for that, the single witness would be believed. This is based on the pasuk of “v’eid ein bah”, and “eid” refers to two witnesses (so there were not 2 witnesses, but there was one).
  - **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’ish”. There is seemingly no reason to say the word “echad”. The pasuk does so to teach that whenever the pasuk says the word “eid” by itself it refers to two witnesses, unless the Torah adds the word “echad”.
  - **Q:** If the Torah believes the single witness who says that she was mezaneh, how can another single witness come along and contradict him? **Ulla** said, that wherever the Torah believes a single witness, that witness is given the status of two witnesses. If so, the witness who says she was mezaneh is considered as two, so how can a single witness contradict what he says and cause that he should not be fully believed? **A:** **Ulla** said, we must change the words of the Mishna to read that if another single witness comes and contradicts the first witness, the woman is not given the waters to drink (precisely because the first witness is believed). **R’ Yitzchak** gave this answer as well. **A2:** **R’ Chiya** said, the Mishna’s wording should not be changed, and **Ulla’s** halacha only applies if the single witness was already fully accepted by Beis Din before the other witness came. However, if the two came together, since the first was never fully accepted yet, he would not get the status of two witnesses.
    - **Q:** The Mishna said, if one witness said she was mezaneh and two said that she was not, she is given the waters to drink. Now, this suggests that if it was one against one she would not be given to drink, which is contrary to what **R’ Chiya** said!?! **A:** **R’ Chiya** would answer, the later part of the Mishna suggests the opposite. The Mishna says if two witnesses say that she was mezaneh and one says that she was not, she is not given to drink. Now, this suggests that if it was one against one she would be given to drink. To explain this contradiction we must say that the Mishna is talking about witnesses who are normally passul (e.g. women, slaves, etc.), in which case **R’ Nechemya** says that we follow the side that has more people saying the testimony, even if it is two women against one man.
      - **Another version** of **R’ Nechemya** is that when we are dealing with witnesses who are otherwise passul, we follow the majority only when it is two women against one woman. However, if it was two women against one man it would be considered as if there was equal weight on both sides. According to this version, our Mishna is discussing where at

first one woman came and said testimony, and then another two women came and contradicted her testimony.

- According to this, both cases of this part of the Mishna are teaching regarding witnesses who are otherwise passul. The reason why we need two cases is that one teaches that we follow the majority view if it will lead to a chumra, and the other case teaches that we follow this view even if it will lead to a leniency.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK MI SHEKINEI!!!**