



# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## Maseches Sotah, Daf כ – Daf ט

Daf In Review is being sent I'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H vI'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf כ---2-----

### MESECHTA SOTAH

#### PEREK HAMIKANEI -- PEREK RISHON

#### MISHNA

- Regarding one who was “mekaneh” (warned her not to seclude herself with a particular man) his wife, **R' Eliezer** says the kinuy (warning) must be done in front of two people and the “stirah” (the seclusion) can be attested to by even one witness or even by the husband himself, and she would then be subject to drinking the “mei hamarim”. **R' Yehoshua** says that even the stirah must be witnessed by 2 witnesses.
- How is one mikaneh his wife? If he tells her in front of two people “Do not speak to so-and-so” and she then goes and speaks to that person, she remains mutar to her husband, and may still eat terumah if her husband is a Kohen. If, however, she secluded herself with that man and remained secluded for the amount of time it takes for the beginning of tashmish, she becomes assur to her husband, assur to eat terumah if her husband is a Kohen, and if her husband were to then die without children, she would have to get chalitza from his brother, and could not do yibum.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** We just completed Mesechta Nazir. Why would Mesechta Sotah be taught following Nazir? **A:** It is based on the statement of **Rebbi**, who said in a Braisa that the parsha of sotah is followed by the parsha of nazir in the Torah, because when one sees the disgrace of a sotah he will separate himself from wine. That is the reason the Tanna taught Nazir and Sotah in succession.
  - **Q:** If so, the Tanna should have first taught Sotah and then Nazir? **A:** Since the Tanna taught Perek Hanoder in Mesechta Kesubos, he followed that with Mesechta Nedarim. After teaching Nedarim, it made sense to teach Nazir (which is a type of neder). Once he taught Nazir he then taught Sotah for the reason of **Rebbi**, given above.

#### HAMIKANEH

- The Mishna says “if someone was mikaneh”, which suggests that this is not something that should initially be done. The Mishna follows the view that it is assur for one to be mekaneh his wife.
- **R' Shmuel bar R' Yitzchak** said that when **Reish Lakish** would begin teaching Sotah he would say that a pasuk teaches that a person is paired with a woman based on his deeds. **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** would say based on a pasuk, pairing together a man and woman is “as difficult” to Hashem as doing Kriyas Yam Suf.
  - **Q: R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said that 40 days before an embryo is formed a Bas Kol calls forth and announces its destined match. We see that it is not based on a person's deeds! **A:** A person's first marriage is predestined. A person's second marriage is based on his deeds.

#### R' ELIEZER OMER MIKANEI LAH AHL PI SHNAYIM...

- **Q:** They only argue with regard to the number of witnesses needed for the stirah. However, they would both agree that if even one witness saw that she was actually mekaneh with the man, she would be prevented from drinking the mei hamarim. In fact, a Mishna says this as well. Where do we see from the Torah that a single witness is believed for this matter? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the wife who was mekaneh with the man says – “v'aid ein bah” – which means that somehow we are certain that she was mekaneh, but there were not two witnesses there. It must therefore mean that there was one witness (or else how do we know) and we see that one witness is sufficient to be believed in this case.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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'sih". There is seemingly no reason to say the word "echad". The pasuk does so to teach that whenever the pasuk says the word "aid" by itself it refers to two witnesses, unless the Torah adds the word "echad".
  - **Q:** This seems to say that if not for the pasuk with "echad" we would think that the pasuk by sotah means that there were no witnesses at all. How can that be? If there were no witnesses how do we even know that she was mezaneh with the man? **A:** We would have understood the pasuk of "aid ein bah" to teach that a single witness is not believed. With the teaching of the other pasuk we know that the word "aid" means two witnesses, and as such the pasuk can't mean that they are not believed. We can therefore learn that the pasuk means there is one witness, and that single witness is believed.
  - **Q:** How could we say that we would have thought that the pasuk means to teach that a single witness is not believed and that two witnesses would be needed? If that were to be the case, the pasuk should not have mentioned anything about witnesses at all, and we would learn out from all monetary matters in the Torah, that just as in those cases two witnesses are always required, it would be required here too! **A:** We would have thought that although in other places one witness is not believed, we would think that in the case of sotah one witness is believed, because there is "raglayim l'davar" (circumstantial evidence), of her being warned and then secluding with the man, that suggests as the single witness is saying, and therefore the single witness should be believed.
  - **Q:** How could we think that the pasuk comes to teach that a single witness is *not* believed, which would mean that the pasuk is teaching a situation of heter to her husband, when the pasuk says "she was not forced", meaning that the pasuk is saying why she is assur to husband!? **A:** We would think that the pasuk is teaching that even with two witnesses she is only assur when she was not forced. The pasuk of "aid echad" therefore teaches that the pasuk by sotah means that there is a single witness, and that single witness is believed.

R' YEHOASHUA OMER MIKANEI LAH AHL PI SHNAYIM...

- **R' Yehoshua** darshens the pasuk of "v'aid ein bah" (which teaches that a single witness is believed) to teach that a single witness is believed "bah" – only regarding her (to say that she was mezaneh), but is not believed regarding a kinuy or regarding a stirah. **R' Eliezer** darshens the pasuk to only be teaching the drasha of "bah", but not regarding the kinuy.
  - **Q:** Why doesn't **R' Eliezer** darshen "bah" to also teach that a single witness is not believed regarding stirah? **A:** He says that there is a hekesh from stirah to the case of her actually being mezaneh (the pasuk says "v'nistirah v'hee nitma'ah) that teaches that a single witness is believed regarding the stirah as well.
    - **Q:** A pasuk makes a hekesh from kinuy to the case of her being mezaneh as well!? **A:** The pasuk of "bah" teaches that kinuy needs two witnesses, and it is more logical to say that "bah" is teaching regarding kinuy, because stirah is more stringent in that it makes her assur to her husband as a case of actual znus.
      - **Q:** Maybe kinuy is considered more stringent, because that is the root that makes her assur through her later stirah!? **A:** The kinuy is meaningless without the stira, and therefore is more lenient. Although a stirah without a kinuy is also meaningless, since stirah is the beginning of the possibility for znus, it is considered more stringent.
- Our Mishna does not follow the version of **R' Eliezer** in a Braisa. The Braisa says that **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda in the name of R' Eliezer** says that the kinuy can be made on the basis of a single witness or even on the basis of the husband alone, but she drinks the mei hamarim only on the basis of two witnesses (two witnesses are needed for the stirah). The **Chachomim** said to **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda**, there is no end to this.
  - **Q:** What is the reason of **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda**? **A:** He darshens the pasuk of "bah" to teach that for stirah, two witnesses are necessary.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why doesn't he darshen the pasuk to teach that kinuy needs two witnesses? **A:** There is a hekesh between kinuy and the case of actual znus, which teaches that kinuy only needs one witness to be effective.
- **Q:** The pasuk makes a hekesh between stirah and zenus as well!? **A:** That hekesh is used to teach that the minimum time needed for stirah is the time it takes for an act of tashmish.
- **Q:** What is meant by the words of the **Chachomim** that "there is no end to this"? **A:** They mean to say that if the husband is believed to say he was mekaneh, he may easily lie and say that he was, bringing about situations of sotah.
  - **Q:** In our Mishna **R' Eliezer** says that the husband is believed regarding stirah. Why is that any less of a problem of potential abuse of the system? **A: R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the **Chachomim** meant to say that even according to **R' Eliezer** of the Braisa (and certainly according to **R' Eliezer** of the Mishna) this concern exists.
    - **Q:** This makes it sound as if the Mishna is a more obvious cause for this concern. However, the Mishna is less of a cause for concern, because there was a true prior kinuy made to two witnesses!? **A:** The **Chachomim** meant that there is cause for concern in our Mishna, and *certainly* there is cause for concern in the Braisa (the more obvious case is the case of the Braisa).
- **R' Chanina** of Sura said, in today's times a person should not be mekaneh his wife (even if there are no witnesses), because maybe we pasken like **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** (who says that no witnesses need be present) and if his wife then secludes with the man she will be assur to her husband forever, since there is no mei sotah to prove her innocence.
- **Reish Lakish** said, the word "kinuy" (which means warning and usually means jealousy) is so used, because this warning causes jealousy and anger between her and others.
  - He must hold that a kinuy can be made without any witnesses, and when this is done, people then see this woman separate herself from society and become angry with her (not knowing that she was warned by her husband).
- **R' Yeimar bar R' Shlemya in the name of Abaye** said, the word "kinuy" is used, because this warning brings to anger between husband and wife.
  - He must hold that the kinuy must be done in front of two people, which makes this a matter of public knowledge and is embarrassing, and leads to fights between husband and wife.
  - According to both understandings of the word "kinuy" it denotes causing anger. Based on this we can say that they both hold that it is assur for a man to be mekaneh his wife.
    - **Q:** According to the view that it is mutar to be mekaneh one's wife, what is the meaning of the word "kinuy"? **A:** It is a word meaning "warning" like we find such use in a pasuk.

### -----Daf λ---3-----

- 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.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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 yitamh” 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 “l'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 “l'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.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **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.

### -----Daf 7---4-----

- A Braisa says, when the Mishna quoted earlier says “the first testimony” that refers to the stirah. When it discusses the “the later testimony” it refers to the act of znus. For how long must the stirah be? For the amount of time for tumah, which is the amount of time needed for bi'ah, which means the amount of time needed for “hara'ah” (the beginning of bi'ah), which is the time it takes to walk around a palm tree (“hakafas dekel”) – this is the view of **R' Yishmael**. **R' Eliezer** says it is the time it takes to dilute a cup of wine. **R' Yehoshua** says the time it takes to drink that cup. **Ben Azzai** says it is the time it takes to roast an egg. **R' Akiva** says it is the time it takes to swallow that egg. **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** says the time it takes to swallow 3 eggs. **R' Elazar ben Yirmiyya** says it is the time it takes for a weaver to tie a string. **Chanin ben Pinchas** says it is the time it takes for a woman to stick her hand into her mouth to remove a toothpick. **Plimo** says it is the time it takes for her to stick her hand into a basket and take a loaf of bread, which is hinted to in a pasuk as well.
  - **Q:** Why does the Braisa have to give all the different measurements of time (tumah, bi'ah, hara'ah)? **A:** If it would only say tumah, we would think it is the time needed for the bi'ah and for time he needs to convince her to do the bi'ah. The Mishna therefore says “bi'ah”, which means the time for only the bi'ah alone. If it would have said “bi'ah”, we would say that the time for a complete bi'ah is needed, so the Mishna therefore says “hara'ah”. If it would only say hara'ah, we would think we need the time for hara'ah and the amount of time it takes for him to convince her to engage in this act, the Mishna therefore also say “tumah”. The Mishna then explains, that this amount of time is the time it takes to walk around a palm tree.
  - **Q:** Another Braisa is very similar to this but has some differences. The Braisa says that the amount of time needed for stirah is the amount of time for tumah, which is the amount of time needed for bi'ah, which means the amount of time needed for “hara'ah” (the beginning of bi'ah), which is the time it takes for “chazaras hadekel” (presumably meaning to walk around a palm tree) – this is the view of **R' Eliezer**. **R' Yehoshua** says it is the time it takes to dilute a cup of wine. **Ben Azzai** says the time it takes to drink that cup. **R' Akiva** says it is the time it takes to roast an egg. **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** says it is the time it takes to swallow that egg. The Gemara assumes that “hakafas dekel” and “chazaras dekel” is the same measure. In the last Mishna **R' Eliezer** argued on this measurement and here he agrees to it!? **A:** **Abaye** said, “hakafas dekel” refers to walking around the tree, and “chazaras dekel” refers to the amount of time it takes for the branches of the tree to return to their natural position after having been blown by the wind.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Ashi** asked, is chazaras hadekel the amount of time it takes to go back after being blown, even though the branch is still moving, or is it when the branches return to a complete standstill? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Q: In the last Braisa R' Eliezer** said the amount of time is the time it takes to dilute a cup of wine, and here he says it is the time of chazaras hadekel!? **A:** These are two different ways to describe the same amount of time.
- **Q: In the last Braisa R' Yehoshua** said the amount of time is the time it takes to drink a cup of wine, and here he says it is the time it takes to dilute a cup of wine!? **A:** His view is the amount of time it takes to dilute *and* drink the cup of wine.
  - **Q:** Why can't we give the answer we gave above, that the two measurements are the same amount of time just described differently? **A:** Because that would mean that he agrees with **R' Eliezer**, which can't be, because he argues.
- **Q: In the last Braisa Ben Azzai** said the amount of time is the time it takes to roast an egg, and here he says it is the time it takes to drink a cup of wine!? **A:** These are two different ways to describe the same amount of time.
- **Q: In the last Braisa R' Akiva** said the amount of time is the time it takes to swallow an egg, and here he says it is the time it takes to roast an egg!? **A:** His view is that amount of time it takes to roast *and* eat the egg.
  - **Q:** Why can't we give the answer we gave above, that the two measurements are the same amount of time just described differently? **A:** Because that would mean that he agrees with **Ben Azzai**, which can't be, because he argues.
- **Q: In the last Braisa R' Yehuda ben Beseira** said the amount of time is the time it takes to swallow 3 eggs, and here he says it is the time it takes to swallow one egg!? **A:** His view is the amount of time it takes to eat one egg. In the first Braisa he was saying to **R' Akiva** – you hold the time needed is the time it takes to roast and swallow an egg, you should keep the description to one act and say that the time needed is the time it takes to swallow 3 eggs (which the same amount of time), and is a more easily understood description.
- **Q: R' Elazar ben Yirmiya** said it is the time it takes for a weaver to tie a string. **R' Ashi** asked is this talking about where the strings to be tied are near each other or far apart? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Q: Chanin ben Pinchas** said it is the time it takes for a woman to stick her hand into her mouth to remove a toothpick. **R' Ashi** asked, is the splinter wedged between her teeth or not? **A: TEIKU.**
- **Q: Plimo** says it is the time it takes for her to stick her hand into a basket and take a loaf of bread. **R' Ashi** asked, is the bread wedged into the basket or not? Is the basket a new basket (which makes taking the bread more difficult) or not? Is the bread warm (which is more difficult to grab onto) or cold? Is the bread of wheat (more difficult to grab hold of) or barley? Is the bread made with soft dough (more difficult to grab onto) or hard dough? **A: TEIKU.**
- **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** says, all these Tanna'im gave the amount of time that they would have needed for hara'ah.
  - **Q: Ben Azzai** was never married, so how did he know? **A:** He was married for a short time and was then divorced. **A2:** He gave the time that he was taught by his rebbi. **A3:** He was told the amount of time from Heaven.
- **R' Avira** darshened, sometimes in the name of **R' Ami** and sometimes in the name of **R' Assi**, that we can learn from a pasuk that someone who eats bread without washing his hands first, it is as if he was mezaneh with a zonah. **Rava** said, that pasuk should be darshened differently, to teach that one who is mezaneh with a zonah will ultimately have to beg for bread.
  - **R' Zrika in the name of R' Elazar** said, anyone who disrespects the mitzvah of netilas yadayim deserves to die.
  - **R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav** said, when one washes before eating bread he should lift his hands upwards. When he washes after eating he should lower his hands downward. A Braisa says this first

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

point as well, and explains, if the hands are not held up, the tamei water may then drip down and make the hands tamei again.

- **R' Avahu** said based on a pasuk, if one eats bread without drying his hands, it is as if he ate tamei bread.
- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** darshened a pasuk to teach that a haughty person will ultimately sin by being mezaneh with a married woman. **Rava** darshened the pasuk differently and said, it means that even if someone learns a lot of Torah, if he is then mezaneh with a married woman he will be trapped in Gehenom.
- **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Shimon ben Yochai** said, a person who is haughty is considered as if he worships avodah zarah. **R' Yochanan** himself said, this person is considered as if he denies the existence of Hashem. **R' Chama bar Chanina** said, it is as if he was mezaneh with arayos. **Ulla** said, it is as if he built a bamah.
- **Q:** The pasuk that discusses a haughty person says “yad l'yad lo yinakeh”. What does this mean? **A: Rav** said, this means that a haughty person, even if he believes in Hashem like Avrohom Avinu (regarding who the pasuk uses the term “yadi”), he will not escape the punishment of Gehenom. The **Yeshiva of Shila** said, the pasuk means that even if the haughty person is worthy to have received the Torah like Moshe Rabbeinu (regarding who the pasuk says “mimino aish das lamo”), he will not escape Gehenom. **R' Yochanan** said, the pasuk means that even if the haughty person does a lot of tzedaka and chessed in a hidden way, he will not escape the punishment of Gehenom.

### -----Daf 7-----5-----

- **Q:** Where do we find a warning in the Torah against being haughty? **A: Rava in the name of Zeiri** said, in the pasuk that says “shimu v'haazinu ahl tighbahu”. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the warning can be learned as follows, one pasuk says that haughtiness causes one to forget Hashem, and another pasuk says that one is not allowed to forget Hashem.
- **R' Avira** darshened, sometimes in the name of **R' Ami** and sometimes in the name of **R' Assi**, a pasuk teaches that a haughty person will eventually be diminished and will be lost from this world. However, if he does teshuva, he will live out the years as he was supposed to.
  - A pasuk says that Hashem is with the people lowly of spirit. **R' Huna and R' Chisda** argue: one says Hashem lifts these people up to Him, and the other says that the Shechina comes down to be with these people.
    - The Gemara says that the second approach seems correct, as we find that Hashem rested His Shechina on Har Sinai, and did not bring Har Sinai up above the other mountains.
      - **R' Yosef** said, we can learn from Hashem to love lowliness and humbleness, as we see that Hashem chose Sinai over all the other mountains.
- **R' Elazar** said based on a pasuk, any person who is haughty is fit to be cut down like an asheirah tree. He then said based on another pasuk that a haughty person will not be revived at techiyas hameisim. He then said based on another pasuk, that the Shechina laments over a person who is haughty.
- **R' Avira or R' Elazar** darshened a pasuk to show that Hashem is so different than us people. People like to socialize with other people of their social status, whereas Hashem, Who is the Exalted, rests His Shechina on the lowly people.
- **R' Chisda or Mar Ukva** darshened a pasuk to teach that Hashem says about the haughty person – “I and he cannot dwell together in the world”. There are those who darshen this pasuk in this way, but as referring to people who speak lashon harah.
- **R' Elaxandri** darshened a pasuk to teach that the haughty person cannot bear the smallest of punishments.
- **R' Chiya bar Ashi in the name of Rav** said, a talmid chochom has to have an eighth of an eighth of haughtiness. **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, this haughtiness crowns him like bristles do to the stalks.
  - **Rava** said, someone who has haughtiness deserves to be in cheirem. Someone who has none at all also deserves to be in cheirem.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, a person should not desire even a small amount of haughtiness, because the pasuk refers to it as the “abomination of Hashem”.
- **Chizkiya** said based on a pasuk, a person’s tefillos are only heard by Hashem if he makes his heart soft like flesh (i.e. humble).
  - **R' Zeira** said, the type of tzaraas regarding which the Torah writes the word “basar” also speaks about its healing. The type of tzaraas regarding which the Torah writes the word “adam” does not discuss the healing. This is because if one is soft like basar (i.e. humble), he is more quickly healed from tzaraas.
- **R' Ashi** said based on a pasuk, any person who is haughty will ultimately be made to become lowly.
- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, come and see how great the humble people are before Hashem. In the times of the Beis Hamikdash, if a person brought a korban, he received credit for bringing that one korban. However, regarding a humble person the pasuk says that “zivchei (plural) Elokim ruach nishbara”. Moreover, his tefillos are never looked at as being disgusting to Hashem.
  - **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** darshened a pasuk to teach that one who appraises his ways in this world will merit to see the salvation of Hashem.

### KEITZAD MIKANEH LAH...

- **Q:** The Mishna contradicts itself – first it says that a warning not to talk to another man is considered a warning for stirah, so we see that talking is considered stirah, and then the Mishna says that if she afterwards only talks to the man she does not become assur to her husband, meaning that talking is *not* stirah!? **A: Abaye** said, that the Mishna means to say that a warning of “don’t talk to him” is actually *not* a valid warning, and even if she were to *seclude* with the man afterwards she would not become a sotah, and even if there was a valid warning given, *talking* to the man would not be considered stirah. To become a sotah the woman must be warned not to *seclude* with him and then must *seclude* with him.

### V'IHM MEIS CHOLETZES

- **Q:** Why can’t she do yibum? **A: R' Yosef** said, the pasuk says regarding a sotah who is divorced “v’yatza v’huysa l’ish acher”. This teaches that she is only allowed to marry “another man” and not the yavam.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, if so she should also not be required to do chalitza!? **A: R' Yosef** answered, if the husband were alive she would certainly need a get. If so, she now is required to have chalitza as well.
  - **Another version** says that **R' Yosef** said the reason she can’t do yibum is that the Torah tells a husband that suspects his wife of znus to divorce her so that his house not be destroyed, so how can we say that the Torah would say she should be taken in yibum!
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, if so, she should not be allowed to marry any man ever again!? **A: R' Yosef** said, another man decides to marry her willingly. Yibum is something that is forced upon the yavam, so the Torah would not require the yavam to marry such a woman.
  - **Another version** says that **R' Yosef** said, when the husband divorces his wife for suspicion of adultery and she then marries another man, the Torah refers to that second husband as “acher”, meaning he is inferior to the first husband, because he is taking a woman who was sent away based on her involvement with znus, so we cannot say that the Torah instructs the yavam to take her as a wife!
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, if so, when she marries another man and that man then dies without children she should not be allowed to do yibum, because the Torah wouldn’t force the yavam to take such a woman (as you said regarding the yavam of the first husband)!? **A: R' Yosef** answered, the reason she is subject to yibum from that second marriage is because she lived with the second husband without being suspected of adultery and can be thought of as having done teshuva.
  - **Rava** said, the reason the sotah cannot enter into yibum is based on a kal v’chomer – if she is assur to the one she was mutar to (i.e. her husband), she is surely assur to the one who was assur to her all along (i.e. the yavam).
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, based on this, if a Kohen Gadol marries a widow and then dies without children the widow should not be subject to yibum, because if she is assur to her husband then she is surely assur to the yavam (as was said above), and yet we know that in this case she would be



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

subject to yibum!? **A: Rava** said, that case is very different, because she was in fact *never* mutar to her husband the Kohen Gadol.

- **Q: Abaye** asked, if the wife of a Kohen was raped (in which case she becomes assur to him) and he then died without children, she should not be subject to yibum, because if she is assur to her husband she must surely be assur to her yavam, and yet the halacha is that if the Kohen had a brother who was a chalal she would be subject to yibum to that brother!? **A: Rava** said, this issur only applies to a Kohen and therefore there is no issur for the chalal at all. However, when the wife was a sotah, there is an issur to the yavam as well, since he is an extension of the first marriage, and in the first marriage she was a sotah.

-----Daf 1--6-----

### 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,

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

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.

### -----Daf 7-----

#### MISHNA

- What is the process that is done after the wife ignored the warning and secluded with the man? The husband takes her to the Beis Din of his locale, and they give him two talmidei chachomim to accompany them to Yerushalayim so that he be prevented from having bi'ah with her on the way. **R' Yehuda** says that the husband is trusted not to have bi'ah with her, and therefore no one is sent along with them.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** The Mishna says that 2 people accompany them, which makes for a total of 3 men and the one woman. This seems to support **Rav**, who says that 2 men are trusted with a woman (with regard to halachos of yichud) only in

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the city, but outside of a city a woman may only be alone with 3 men, because if there are only 2 men and one of them have to go to the bathroom, that will mean that there is one man left with the woman? **A:** This Mishna is no support of **Rav**. It may be that 2 men are generally enough. However, in this case we need 2 men besides the husband so that there can be 2 witnesses against the husband if he has bi'ah with his wife (they are not there for purposes of yichud).

- **Q:** The Mishna says that he needs two *talmidei chachomim* to escort him. This seems to support **Rav's** other statement that 2 men are sufficient for purposes of yichud only if they are decent men, but if they are immoral men, even 10 men with a woman would be a problem for purposes of yichud? **A:** The Mishna does not support this statement. It may be that the only reason that *talmidei chachomim* must be sent in the case of the Mishna is because we need to send people who know how to warn him to prevent him from having bi'ah with his wife.

R' YEHUDA OMER BAALAH...

- A Braisa explains that **R' Yehuda** believes the husband based on a kal v'chomer: if he is believed not to have bi'ah with his wife who is a nidah, which carries the kares penalty, then surely he can be believed regarding the sotah, which only carries a lav. The **Rabanan** say the exact opposite is true: since nidah carries the kares penalty he is afraid and we can trust him not to have bi'ah. However, since sotah is only a lav, he cannot be trusted.
  - **Q:** Another Braisa says that **R' Yehuda** bases his opinion on the pasuk of "v'heivi ha'ish es ishto", and not on the kal v'chomer!? **A:** Initially he based it on the kal v'chomer. When it was refuted by the **Rabanan** in the Braisa, he then found a source in the pasuk.

MISHNA

- They would bring the woman to Yerushalayim and the Sanhedrin would scare her (to try and get her to admit her guilt), in the same way that they would scare witnesses in capital trials. They say to her, "My daughter, wine causes many bad things, light-heartedness causes many bad things, immaturity causes many bad things, and bad neighbors cause many bad things. Act for the sake of Hashem's Great Name and admit your guilt so that His Name not be erased by the waters". They then tell her things that she doesn't even deserve to hear (they tell her how earlier tzaddikim would admit to their guilt). If she admits her guilt, she writes a receipt for her kesubah and gets divorced. If she continues to claim innocence, they take her up to the Mizrach Gate which is opposite the Niknor Gate, which is where they give the sotah to drink, and is where they make tahor the women who have given birth, and where they make tahor the metzoras.

A Kohen then grabs her shirt at the neckline and pulls it. If it rips slightly, so be it. If it rips a lot, so be it. He continues ripping until her chest is uncovered. He then uncovers and unbraids her hair. **R' Yehuda** says, if her chest was attractive they would not uncover it, and if her hair was attractive, they would not uncover and unbraided it.

If she was dressed in white, the Kohen then dresses her in black. If she was wearing gold jewelry, they are removed to make her seem ugly. They then brought rope and tied her clothing above her chest so that they should not fall off.

Whoever would want to come and watch this process was welcome to come, except for her slaves and maidservants, because they would give her the confidence to withstand the pressure to admit her guilt. All women may come and watch so that they learn a lesson (as stated in a pasuk) never to act like this woman acted.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that she must be taken to the big Beis Din (i.e. the Sanhedrin) in Yerushalayim? **A:** **R' Chiya bar Gamda in the name of R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, we learn a gezeirah shava on the word "Torah" that teaches that the Beis Din of 71 must be involved.

U'ME'AIMIN ALEHA...

- **Q:** A Braisa says, just as we push her to admit, we also push her to drink the waters, and we say to her, if you are certain of your innocence then you should stick to it and drink the waters, because you have nothing to fear if you are innocent. Our Mishna says that we only discourage her from drinking, and do not encourage her!? **A:** Our Mishna is discussing before the Name of Hashem was erased, in which case we discourage her so that the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Name not be erased. The Braisa is discussing once it was already erased, in which case we encourage her to drink the waters, so that she should not remain assur to her husband.

V'OMER LIFANEHA...

- A Braisa explains that they would tell her stories from the Torah. They would tell her that Yehuda owned up to his aveirah and was therefore zocheh to Olam Habbah, and the same was with Reuven, and they both even received rewards in Olam Hazeh as well (we learn from a drasha of pesukim that they admitted to their sins).
  - **Q:** Yehuda had to publicly admit to his sin so that Tamar should not be killed, but why did Reuven have to publicly admit to his sin? We have learned that **R' Sheishes** said that it is better not to reveal one's sins in public!? **A:** He did so just so that Yaakov should not suspect any of the other brothers to have been involved in the moving of his bed into Leah's tent.

IHM AMRAH TIMEI'AH ANI...

- **Q:** We see from here that we allow for the writing of a receipt for an obligation (rather than requiring that the actual document be returned)!? **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna should read "she tears up the kesubah".
  - **Q: Rava** asked, the Mishna specifically says "she writes a receipt"!? **A: Rava** said, the Mishna is discussing a place where the custom was not to write a kesubah document. Therefore, the only way to prevent collection is to write a receipt.

V'IHM AMRAH TEHORAH ANI MAALIN OSAH L'SHAAREI MIZRACH

- **Q:** How can the Mishna mean that they have to take her up to the Mizrach Gate? She was already standing there by the Sanhedrin!? **A:** They would take her down the Har Habayis and back up to tire her and confuse her so that she confesses and obviates the need to erase the Name of Hashem. We find in a Braisa that **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says that we move around the witnesses to a capital case for the same reason, to unsettle them and hope that they will retract their testimony if it was untruthful.

-----Daf 7---8-----

SHESHAM MASHKIN ES HASOTOS...

- **Q:** A sotah is given to drink there, because the pasuk says she should be given to drink "lifnei Hashem". A metzora process must be done there as well, because the pasuk there says "lifnei Hashem". Why must the process for a woman who has given birth be done there? If the reason is simply because she must be standing near her korbon when it is brought, then a zav and zava should have to stand there as well when their korbanos are brought and the Mishna doesn't mention them!? **A:** The reason is because of her korbanos, and for that same reason a zav and zava must stand there as well. The reason they are not mentioned in the Mishna is because we choose the woman who has given birth as one example for the reason, but it means to include the zav and zava as well.
- A Braisa says, we do not give two sotos to drink at the same time, because if one is ready to admit guilt and the other is not, the first one may become emboldened by the second woman's defiance, and may therefore decide not to admit guilt as well. **R' Yehuda** says the reason 2 sotos may not be given to drink at the same time is based on the pasuk of "osah", which teaches that a sotah must be dealt with on her own, along with no other sotah.
  - **Q:** Why doesn't the **T"K** also learn from the word "osah"? **A:** The **T"K** is **R' Shimon**, who consistently darshens the intent of the pasuk and uses that to set the limits of the halacha. Therefore, he is darshening "osah", and explains the reason for the halacha is that a woman should not become emboldened to deny based on the denial of another sotah.
    - **Q:** What is the difference between the **T"K** and **R' Yehuda**? **A:** The difference would be where the sotah is trembling and visibly nervous. According to the **T"K**, there is no concern that this woman would become emboldened, and therefore she may be given to drink along with another sotah. According to **R' Yehuda**, even such a sotah must be dealt with on her own.
    - **Q:** Even if the woman is trembling, how can we give her to drink along with another sotah? We are not allowed to "bundle" mitzvos ("chavilos chavilos"), and a Braisa says based on this principle that we may not give 2 sotos to drink together!? **A: Abaye or R' Kahana** said, if a single Kohen gives both women to drink, that would be a problem of "bundling" mitzvos. However, if

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the drinks were administered by two Kohanim, it would not be problematic with regard to “bundling” of mitzvos.

### V'HAKOHEN OCHEIZ BIVGADEHA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “u’parah es rosh ha’isha”. We would think that only her hair is to be uncovered. The word “ha’isha” teaches that the woman herself must be uncovered as well. Once we know that even her body is to be uncovered, the pasuk of “u’parah es rosh ha’isha” teaches that if her hair is braided, the Kohen is to undo the braids.

### R' YEHUDA OMER IHM HAYA LIBAH...

- **Q:** From our Mishna it seems that **R' Yehuda** is concerned that seeing her uncovered will lead to people having improper thoughts, while the **Rabanan** are not concerned for that. However, in a Braisa regarding the skilah penalty, it is the **Rabanan** who say that a woman is killed with clothing (they seem to be concerned about causing improper thoughts), and it is **R' Yehuda** who says that she is killed without clothing (with minimal covering of her private areas, which suggests that he is not concerned about causing improper thoughts)!? **A: R' Rabbah** explained, in the case of sotah, this woman may walk out of Beis Din innocent, and the thoughts caused can therefore be problematic since the woman continues to live (which is why **R' Yehuda** is concerned). In the case of skilah, she is being killed, and any improper thought about her can therefore never be acted upon – as **Rava** says elsewhere, we are not concerned that thoughts created by looking at one woman will cause one to do an aveirah with another woman. **Rava** explained, that the **Rabanan** are also not contradictory to their own view, because although they are concerned for causing improper thoughts, by a sotah that concern is overridden by the need to teach all women a lesson to stay away from such behavior. When a woman is stoned, that itself is enough of a lesson, and therefore we will not uncover her and risk causing improper thoughts.
  - **Q:** Why not uncover her when we kill her and create even more of a deterrent to such behavior? **A: R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, the pasuk of “v’ahavta l’rei’acha kamocho” teaches that we are supposed to choose a pleasant death for one who must die, and therefore we must spare the embarrassment of the woman who will be stoned.
    - **Q:** Maybe this idea of **R' Nachman** is a matter of machlokes, and **R' Yehuda** doesn’t agree with it, which is why he says that a woman should be stoned when uncovered? **A:** All agree with the concept. The machlokes is that the **Rabanan** say that a woman would rather have a more difficult death (wearing clothing delays the death from stoning) if it can save her from embarrassment, and **R' Yehuda** says that she rather have a quicker death.

### HUYSA MECHUSA LEVANIM...

- A Braisa says, if she looks attractive in black clothing, we dress her in something else that makes her unattractive.

### HAYU ALEHA KLEI ZAHAV...

- **Q:** It would seem to be obvious that her jewelry must be removed!? We are trying to make her unattractive, so of course any jewelry should be removed!? **A:** We would think that wearing jewelry when wearing little else is actually unattractive. The Mishna therefore teaches that the jewelry should be removed.

### V'ACHAR KACH MEIVI CHEVEL...

- **Q: R' Abba** asked **R' Huna**, is it essential that this rope be made of the palm tree fibers or not? If the reason for the rope is to hold up her clothing then it should not make a difference what it is made of. However, if the reason is also to degrade her as a “midah k’neged midah” punishment for using a belt to prepare herself for her znus, then it is important that the palm tree fibers be used, because they add to the denigration. **A: R' Abba** said, a Braisa clearly says that the reason for the rope was to hold her clothing up. Based on this, any type of string can be used.

### V'CHOL HAROTZEH LIR'OS BAH YIR'EH...

- **Q:** The Mishna first says that all are welcome to watch this process, which seems to include allowing men to come, but the Mishna then says that any women who want to come can, which suggests that men are not to come and see!? **A: Abaye** said, when the Mishna invites all to come and watch, it is only referring to women.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: Rava** asked, the Mishna says *whoever* wants to come can come, which would seem to include men as well!? **A: Rava** said, the Mishna means that men *may* come and watch, but women are obligated to come and watch.

### MISHNA

- In the way that a person conducts himself is the way that they deal with him from Heaven. With regard to a sotah: she beautified herself for zenus, so we make her appear unattractive; she revealed herself to sin, and Hashem then makes her sin known to all; she began the sin with her thigh and then the stomach, therefore in the punishment the thigh is affected first and then the stomach, and then the rest of her body is not spared from punishment either.

### GEMARA

- **R' Yosef** said, although we no longer give the death penalty today, the form of the penalties still exist. We see this where **R' Yosef** said and **R' Chiya** taught in a Braisa, that although after the Churban there is no longer any Sanhedrin, there still exists death in the forms of the 4 death penalties. For example, if someone is chayuv skilah he may fall off a roof or be trampled by a wild animal. If someone is chayuv sreifah, he may fall into a fire or be bitten by a snake. If someone is chayuv hereg, he may end up being given to the government (who punishes with beheading) or will fall into the hands of thieves (who kill with beheading as well). If someone is chayuv chenek, he may drown or die of a disease that prevents him from breathing.

### -----Daf 9-----

- A Braisa says, **Rebbi** would say, how do we know that Hashem deals with a person “midah k'neged midah”? It is based on a pasuk that says that Hashem will punish the Yidden with a precise measure of how they sinned (the word used for measure is “b'saasi'ah”, meaning with a se'ah). That pasuk teaches regarding large aveiros (a se'ah is a large measurement). How do we know that even small aveiros are dealt with in this way as well? Another pasuk says “ki chol” – *for every* measure (is dealt with an equal measure). How do we know that even if a person is not punished for each small aveirah that he does, these aveiros are collected together and eventually he gets punished for them all? The pasuk says “achas l'achas limtzo cheshbon” (adding one to another to determine the amount).  
The Braisa says we find this principle of “midah k'neged midah” by sotah: she stood at the doorway to be noticed, so she is then stood by the Kohen at the Shaar Niknor and is embarrassed; she put on a nice head covering to attract attention, the Kohen therefore removes her head covering; she beautified herself for him, therefore the first effect of the mei sotah is that her face changes color; she made up her eyes for him, so the waters cause her eyes to bulge; she braided her hair for him, therefore the Kohen undoes her braids; she beckoned him with her finger, therefore her nails fall out; she put on a nice belt for him, therefore the Kohen uses a rope of palm fibers to tie her clothing; she stretched out her thigh for him, therefore her thigh collapses; she took him onto her stomach, therefore her stomach swells up; she fed him fancy food, therefore her korbon is brought from barley which is generally animal food; she gave him to drink wine in fancy cups, therefore she gets the water to drink in an earthenware keili; she acted in hiding, therefore Hashem, Who secludes Himself in Heaven turns His attention to her; others say that she tried to hide her deed, therefore Hashem makes it known to all.
  - **Q:** Once we have the pasuk of “achas l'achas” why do we need the other pasuk that says “ki chol...”? **A:** This pasuk teaches that Hashem punishes “midah k'neged midah”.
  - **Q:** Once we know that Hashem deals this way even for smaller aveiros, why do we need the first pasuk that discusses the larger aveiros (se'ah)? **A:** It is needed for the idea of **R' Chinina bar Pappa**, who says that that pasuk teaches that Hashem does not punish a nation until it is time for it to be completely sent away.
    - **Q:** We find that **Rava** learns that Mitzrayim was punished at 3 separate times (during the times of Moshe, during the times of Paroh Necho, and will be again punished in the times of

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Moshiach)!? If you will try and answer that the Mitzrayim of later times was not the same Mitzrayim as in the times of Moshe, that is not a good answer, because a Braisa discusses that the issur for a Yid to marry a Mitzri before the 3<sup>rd</sup> generation even applied in the days of the Tanna'im, which means that the Mitzrayim then was the same Mitzrayim as in the times of Moshe!?! **A: R' Chinina bar Pappa** must have meant that Hashem waits to punish a king until He is ready to totally remove the king from power.

- **Ameimar** learned that the statement of **R' Chinina bar Pappa** was based on a different pasuk.
  - **R' Hamnuna** said, Hashem waits to punish a person until his "se'ah" of aveiros is full.
  - **R' Chinina bar Pappa** darshened a pasuk in Tehillim to refer to a "palace of praise", and said this refers to Moshe and Dovid, who were zoche that the "palaces" they built (the Mishkan and the Beis Hamikdash) were never captured and used for the benefit of goyim. We learn from a pasuk that the Beis Hamikdash sunk into the ground, and we are taught that the Mishkan was hidden when the Beis Hamikdash was built. **R' Chisda in the name of Avimi** said, that the Mishkan was hidden under the tunnels of the Heichal.
- A Braisa says: a sotah set her eyes on someone not fit for her, and not only does she not get what she wanted, she even loses what she had (she is assur to her husband and to the other man). Any person who sets their eyes upon something that is not theirs, they don't get what they want and they even lose what they already have. We also find this by the snake who wanted Chava, and ended up not getting her and lost what he had (his ability to be upright, etc.). Hashem told the snake, I said you will be king over the entire animal kingdom, and now you will be cursed among all of the animal kingdom. I said you will walk upright, and now you will have to slither on your belly. I said that you will eat food like humans, and now you will only eat dust. The snake planned to kill Adam and marry Chava, and instead there is a forever lasting hatred from humans to snakes. We find this same concept by Kayin, Korach, Bilam, Doeg, Achitofel, Geichazi, Avshalom, Adoniyahu, Uziyahu, and Haman.

### B'YAREICH HISCHILA BA'AVEIRA...

- **Q:** How do we know that the thigh gets punished first? It is based on the pasuk of "b'seis Hashem es yireicheich nofeles v'es bitneich tzava". However, there is another pasuk that says "v'tzavsa bitna v'nafla yireicha"! **A: Abaye** said, the Kohen first curses the thigh and then the stomach (the curse is considered the beginning of the punishment), however, since the water first enters the stomach, it is the stomach that first feels the effects of the water.
  - **Q:** Even in the Kohen's curse the pasuk says "latzbos beten v'lanpil yareich"! **A:** That is written regarding the Kohen telling the woman the order in which the punishment will take place, so that she not think that the waters are not punishing in the proper order.

### MISHNA

- Shimshon followed his eyes and therefore his eyes were gouged out by the Pilishtim.
- Avshalom was extra proud of his hair, and therefore he was hung by his hair. Also, because he was mezaneh with 10 of his father's "pilagshim", he had 10 spears stuck into him. Also, because he stole three hearts – the heart of his father, the heart of Beis Din, and the heart of Klal Yisrael – therefore he had three staffs stuck into him.
- The concept of midah k'neged midah applies for the good as well.
  - Miriam waited by Moshe (when he was put into the river) therefore all the Yidden waited for her when she was a metzorah.
  - Yosef, who was the greatest of the brothers (as second to the king of Mitzrayim) buried his father, and therefore he himself was buried by Moshe Rabbeinu, who was the greatest of the Yidden.
  - Moshe buried Yosef, and therefore Hashem Himself buried Moshe. In fact, we learn from a pasuk that Hashem Himself buries all the tzaddikim.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, Shimshon rebelled with his eyes (he chose a woman who he said was "fitting in my eyes"), and he therefore suffered by the Pilishtim gouging out his eyes.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A pasuk says that his marrying this woman was the Will of Hashem!? **A:** He still also had the motive of following his eyes, and was therefore punished for that.
- A Braisa says, **Rebbi** said, Shimshon's downfall began in Aza (he was mezaneh with a zonah there) and he was therefore punished in Aza (the Pilishtim captured him there).
  - **Q:** An earlier pasuk says that he first married a woman from Timnas, so that should be considered the beginning of his downfall!? **A:** Since he married the woman it is not considered the beginning of his downfall.
- The pasuk says that Shimshon married a woman named Delila. A Braisa says, **Rebbi** said, she was rightfully called Delila (which means to remove) because she removed his strength, she removed his heart, and she removed his righteous actions (causing the Shechina to leave from him).
  - **Q:** The pasuk says that after tricking Delila with false sources of his strength, Shimshon then told her the truth and the pasuk says that Delilah knew that this time he was telling her the truth. How did she know that? **A: R' Chanin in the name of Rav** said, true words are recognizable (it explained why he never cut his hair or drank wine). **Abaye** said she knew that the tzaddik Shimshon would never say Hashem's Name in vain, and he introduced the true reason by saying that he was a "nezir Elokim".
  - The pasuk says that Delila pushed him to give the reason for his strength. **R' Yitzchak of the Yeshiva of R' Ami** said, she would move away from him at the very end of bi'ah which would make him suffer.
- The pasuk says that the Malach told Shimshon's mother (when she was pregnant with him) not to drink wine or eat anything tamei. **R' Yitzchak of the Yeshiva of R' Ami** said, the "tamei" things refer to things that are assur for a nazir to eat.
- The pasuk says that when Shimshon was dying of thirst Hashem made a miracle and brought forth water from the jawbone of a donkey. **R' Yitzchak of the Yeshiva of R' Ami** said, Shimshon desired a tamei thing (a non-Jewish girl) so he was only saved from a tamei thing (a donkey).
- The pasuk says "vatachel ruach Hashem l'faamo b'machanei Dan bein Tzara'ah u'bein Eshta'ol".
  - **R' Chama the son of R' Chanina** said, the ruach Hashem refers to the prophecy of Yaakov when he said "yehi Dan nachash alei derech", which was now fulfilled (by referring to Shimshon).
  - **R' Yitzchak of the Yeshiva of R' Ami** said, "l'faamo b'machanei Dan" teaches that the Shechina went before Shimshon like a bell, to accompany him wherever he went.
  - **R' Assi** said "bein Tzara'ah u'bein Eshta'ol" are the names of two large mountains that Shimshon uprooted and ground together.
- The Malach told Shimshon's mother "He will begin ("yacheil") to save the Yidden from the hands of the Pilishtim". **R' Chama the son of R' Chanina** said this refers to the oath of Avimelech (that his children will never start up with the Yidden) which was clearly desecrated ("huchal") and that is why Shimshon was allowed to fight them and not be bound by Avrohom's oath not to start up with the Pilishtim.
- The pasuk says that the boy grew up and Hashem blessed him. **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, Hashem blessed him by having abundant zerah (which allowed him to desire women of the Pilishtim, which then allowed him to save the Yidden).