



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

Sotah Daf Vuv

MISHNA

- The following sotahs may not eat terumah (if their husbands are Kohanim): a woman who admits to having been mezaneh; if witnesses come and say that she was mezaneh; a woman who refuses to drink the mei sotah; a woman whose husband does not want her to drink the mei sotah; a woman who had bi'ah with her husband after her seclusion with the other man.

GEMARA

- **R' Amram** said, **R' Sheishes** taught us a halacha which he then said can be proven from our Mishna. The halacha is, that if there are witnesses that a sotah was actually mezaneh and those witnesses are overseas and not present to testify, the mei sotah will have no effect on the woman. This can be seen in the pasuk that says "v'aid ein bah" – which teaches that if there is witness to the znus then the mei sotah will not affect the woman. We can see this from our Mishna as well. The Mishna said, if witnesses testify that she was mezaneh she may not eat terumah. When did these witnesses come? If they came before she drank the mei sotah, then she is a confirmed sotah and obviously may not eat terumah. It must be that they came after she drank the mei sotah, and even so we say that although she didn't die the witnesses are believed to say that she was mezaneh. If the waters don't lose their ability to check on her innocence then her staying alive must mean she is innocent. Yet, we see that we believe the witnesses. Therefore, this proves that if there are witnesses to the znus, the waters lose their power to affect the sotah. **R' Yosef** asked, maybe the fact that there are witnesses does not prevent the mei sotah from affecting the woman? Maybe the reason that she wasn't affected after drinking in the case of the Mishna was because she had some other merit that saved her from dying and which delayed the punishment from taking affect?
 - The machlokes between **R' Sheishes** and **R' Yosef** is how a zechus delays the punishment. According to **R' Sheishes** a zechus may delay the death, but the woman begins to deteriorate immediately (so the Mishna can't be talking about this case, because it would be noticeable that she drank and was guilty). According to **R' Yosef** everything gets delayed, and that is why it is possible that the Mishna's case is where she had some zechus that delayed the punishment after drinking.
 - **Q: R' Simi bar Ashi** asked, **R' Shimon** says in a Mishna that we cannot say that a zechus would prevent the effects of the mei sotah, because if so it would lose the effectiveness of scaring the women to admit to guilt before drinking (because they will say to themselves that they have some zechus that will prevent the onset of the punishment), and also, when a woman drinks and nothing happens, instead of people saying that she is innocent from sin, they will say that she is truly guilty, but has some zechus that is preventing the punishment from taking affect. Based on this, we should not say that the existence of witnesses prevents the punishment, because then here again people will say that she is truly guilty and is not being punished only because there must be witnesses! **A:** This is not problematic, because we can say that according to **R' Shimon**, just as a zechus doesn't prevent the punishment, the existence of witnesses will not prevent punishment either, however **R' Sheishes** doesn't hold like **R' Shimon**.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, a Mishna says that the Korbon Mincha of a sotah is burned (and not brought onto the Mizbeach) if she admits to being mezaneh, or if witnesses come and testify that she was mezaneh. Now, when did these witnesses come? If they came before the mincha was put into a kli shareis, then the mincha should be redeemed and

lose its kedusha! It must be that they came after the mincha was put into a kli shareis. Now, if we say that even though there are witnesses the mei sotah would have the power to prove her innocence or guilt, then when the mincha is brought and put into a kli shareis it was done so properly and therefore must now be burned and not offered. However, if we say that when there are witnesses the water loses its power to punish her, then the placing of the mincha in the kli shareis was done in error, so why must it be burned? It should simply lose its kedusha!? **A: R' Yehuda** of Diskarta said, the case is where the witnesses testify that the woman was mezaneh in the Azarah (and not at the time of the previous seclusion). Therefore, at the time that the mincha was placed into the kli shareis it was done properly and that is why the mincha became kadosh.

- **Q: R' Mesharshiya** asked, the young Kohanim escort her in the Azarah, so how could she have been mezaneh there? **A:** She was mezaneh with one of those Kohanim. **A2: R' Ashi** said, she had to go to the bathroom, in which case the Kohanim were not watching her, and she was mezaneh then.
- **R' Pappa** said, that the witnesses actually testified that she was mezaneh during the original seclusion, and therefore the mincha was brought in error and should have no kedusha. The reason the mincha is burned is because of a gezeirah of the **Rabanan** so that people not say that something taken from a kli shareis may be treated without kedusha.
 - **Q: R' Mari** asked, a Braisa says that if after the mincha was put in a kli shareis, but before the kometz was offered, witnesses testified that she was mezaneh during the seclusion, the mincha must be burned. If the witnesses are proven to be "aidem zomamim" (they are proven as being false) the mincha loses its kedusha. Now, in this case the **Rabanan** should also make their gezeirah and the mincha should be burned in this last case as well!? **A:** If the witnesses become aidem zomamim it becomes public knowledge, and therefore there would be no confusion if the mincha in that case is not burned.
- A Braisa says the halacha of **R' Sheishes**, but based on a different reason. The Braisa says the word "tehora" in the pasuk is seemingly extra and therefore teaches that the mei sotah loses its power to check her innocence if there are witnesses that exist that can testify that she was mezaneh. The letter "vav" in the word "u'tehora" teaches that if she has a zechus it can delay the punishment. The word "hee" teaches that if the zenus is a matter of common knowledge (all are talking about it) then the mei sotah will also not prove her guilt.
 - **Q: R' Shimon** can say that he doesn't darshen the extra "vav", but how does he darshen the extra word of "tehora"!? **A:** He agrees that if there are witnesses who can testify that she was mezaneh, the mei sotah will not prove innocence or guilt. However, since this is a very unlikely case, he is not concerned that people will say that a woman who was unaffected by the mei sotah is guilty and that there must be witnesses who know of her guilt. Rather, they will say that she must be innocent.