



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

### Sanhedrin Daf Nun Aleph

- **Q:** The Braisa began by saying that we would think the daughter of a Kohen gets sreifa even if she was mechalel Shabbos. Now, one who is mechalel Shabbos gets skila (which is more stringent than sreifa), so how would we think that she is different and only gets sreifa!? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa is following the view of **R' Shimon**, who says that sreifa is more stringent. We would think that since the Torah is more strict with Kohanim in that they have more mitzvos, maybe this woman would get sreifa for chilul Shabbos. The pasuk therefore teaches that she only gets sreifa for zenus.
  - **Q:** Why would we think that she would get sreifa for chilul Shabbos when her father only gets skila? **A:** We would think that he only gets skila, because we find that he is allowed to do the Avodah on Shabbos (which includes acts that are normally assur on Shabbos), but she may not do the Avodah and therefore gets a more stringent punishment for chilul Shabbos.
- **Q:** The Braisa said that we would think that the pasuk is even discussing an unmarried daughter of a Kohen. Now, the pasuk says "liznos", which refers to adultery, which means we are referring to a married woman!? **A:** The Braisa follows the view of **R' Elazar**, who says that when an unmarried man has relations with an unmarried woman, she is considered to be a zonah.
- **Q:** The Braisa said that maybe "aviha" teaches that she gets sreifa if she is mezaneh with her father, but not when she is mezaneh with other people. How could that be? **Rava** has said in the name of **R' Yitzchak bar Avudimi** that from a gezeira shava of "heina" and a gezeira shava of "zima" we learn that any daughter (not just the daughter of a Kohen) that is mezaneh with her father is put to death by sreifa, so the pasuk wouldn't need to teach that as being special for the daughter of a Kohen!? **A:** We would think that the word "aviha" comes to teach that the gezeira shava of **Rava** should not be made, and that this treatment only be given to the daughter of a Kohen.
- **Q:** The Braisa said that the word "ubas ish Kohen" teaches that this applies even when the daughter of a Kohen married someone other than a Kohen. Why would we think she loses the status of "the daughter of a Kohen" if she married anyone other than a Kohen? Also, the pasuk never suggests that she has to be married to a Kohen!? **A:** The pasuk says "ki seicheil liznos". We would think that this means that this applies only when she has profaned herself now for the first time. Therefore, the daughter of a Kohen who has already "profaned" herself by marrying someone other than a Kohen (in the sense that she may no longer eat terumah) is not included in this pasuk.
  - This does not follow the view of **R' Meir**, who says in a Braisa that if the daughter of a Kohen married someone that is passul (e.g. a nasin or a mamzer) and is then mezaneh, she gets chenek, not sreifa.
- **Q:** The Braisa ended off by saying that **R' Eliezer** said, with her father there is sreifa, and with her father in law there is skila. What does this mean? If it means that if she is mezaneh with her father or with her father in law, then this is not something that is unique to the daughter of a Kohen, because any woman who is mezaneh with her father gets sreifa and with her father in law gets skila!? Rather, we will say that "with her father" means she is mezaneh while she is an arusa, and "with her father in law" means she was already a nesuah. If so, who does this ruling follow? The **Rabanan** hold that as a nesuah she would get sreifa, but as an arusah should would get skila, **R' Shimon** holds that as a nesuah or an arusah she would would get sreifa, and **R' Yishmael** holds that as an arusah she would get sreifa, but as a nesuah she would get chenek!? **A: Ravin in the name of R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said, he is following the shita of the **Rabanan**, and this is what **R' Eliezer** means. If the punishment that she is supposed to get is less than what a woman would get if she was mezaneh with her father (this refers to a nesuah who

is mezaneh, who gets chenek, which is less than what a daughter would get for being mezaneh with her father, because she would get sreifa), then if this nesuah is the daughter of a Kohen she gets the misah that a daughter would get if she was mezaneh with her father – i.e. she would get sreifa. If the punishment that she is supposed to get is greater than what a woman would get if she was mezaneh with her father (this refers to an arusa who is mezaneh, who gets skila, which is greater than what a daughter would get for being mezaneh with her father, because she would get sreifa), then if this arusa is the daughter of a Kohen she gets the misah that a woman would get if she was mezaneh with her father in law – i.e. she would get skila.

- **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, the Braisa doesn't say anything about "greater" or "less", so how can we explain like this!? **A:** Rather, **R' Yirmiya** said, that he is following the view of **R' Yishmael**, and this is what **R' Eliezer** means. "With her father" – if she is only an arusah, then she gets sreifa. "With her father in law" – if she is a nesuah and is mezaneh with her father in law she gets skila, and if she is mezaneh with any other person she would get chenek.
  - **Q: Rava** asked, how can you say that "with" is explained in two different ways? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, that he is following the view of **R' Shimon** with regard to the order of severity among the death penalties, and **R' Eliezer** holds that a nesuah is like an arusah – just as an arusah is moved one level higher (from skila to sreifa) so too a nesuah is moved one level higher (from chenek to skila).
    - **Q: R' Chanina** asked, **R' Shimon** clearly holds that a nesuah and an arusah both get sreifa!? **A:** Rather, **Ravina** said, that **R' Eliezer** is following the view of the **Rabanan**, and we must reverse the words of **R' Eliezer** to say – "with her father" (meaning, as an arusa) she gets skila, and "with her father in law" (meaning, as a nesuah) she gets sreifa.
- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha in the name of Rav** said, the halacha is as **Ravin** said in the name of **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina**.
  - **R' Yosef** asked, are we paskening for the times of Moshiach (there is no death penalty now)!? **Abaye** said, you can say the same thing regarding learning of the korbanos! Rather, we learn and are rewarded for doing so. The same is regarding the death penalties. **R' Yosef** said, I was asking that we were only trying to explain a statement of **R' Eliezer**, not asking regarding the halacha, so why did we come out with a psak?
- **Q:** Where do we find the view of **R' Yishmael**? **A:** A Braisa says, **R' Yishmael** says, the pasuk of "ubas ish Kohen ki seicheil liznos" refers to the daughter of a Kohen who is a naara hame'orasa. It does not refer to a nesuah based on the following logic. All married women (whether a nesuah or arusah) are included in the pasuk that says that an adulterer gets chenek. The pasuk singles out only an arusah and says that she gets skila. The same would be for the daughter of a Kohen. As a nesuah she is included as any married woman, but as an arusah she is treated differently, and gets sreifa. **R' Akiva** says, the daughter of a Kohen, whether a nesuah or an arusah, gets sreifa. The gezeira shava of "aviha" teaches that if she is mezaneh as a single girl she does not get sreifa. **R' Yishmael** asked, if you darshen the gezeira shava you should say that just as the other pasuk of "aviha" speaks of a naara hame'orasa, so too sreifa is only given to the daughter of a Kohen who is an arusah!? **R' Akiva** said, the pasuk could have said "bas", but instead says "ubas", which comes to include a nesuah for sreifa as well. **R' Yishmael** asked, because you darshen the extra "vuv" should we take her out to sreifa? If you darshen it to be inclusionary, it should even include a single girl, and if the gezeira shava is darshened to be exclusionary, it should even exclude a nesuah!?
  - **Q:** According to **R' Akiva** the gezeira shava is used to exclude a single girl and the "vuv" is used to include a nesuah. What is **R' Yishmael's** question? **A:** He holds that the "vuv" comes to teach that the gezeira shava should not be darshened.
  - **Q:** What does **R' Yishmael** darshen with the "vuv"? **A:** He uses it like a Braisa taught by the father of **Shmuel bar Avin**, to teach that this rule for the daughters of Kohanim even applies to the daughters of Kohanim who have a mum (and are not fit to do the Avodah).

- **R' Akiva** would learn this rule from the pasuk of “v'heim makrivim v'hayu kodesh”. **R' Yishmael** says, from that pasuk we know that the Kohanim with a mum are still kodesh, but we wouldn't know that their daughters have the same status as daughters of other Kohanim.
- **Q:** What does **R' Yishmael** learn from the words “es aviha hee michaleles” (**R' Akiva** used this for the gezeira shava)? **A:** He uses it for the drasha of **R' Meir** in a Braisa, that this pasuk teaches that this girl's father is no longer treated as kodesh, and is no longer given honor, and is cursed for having given birth to her, raised her, and issued her.
  - **R' Ashi** said, this is the basis for people to refer to a rasha as “a rasha the son of a rasha” even if the father was not actually a rasha.

#### ZU MITZVAS HANISKALIN

- **Q:** What has been taught that the Mishna says “this is the procedure of skila”? **A:** In the last perek we learned that we take the person out to be stoned, and the place was twice the height of a man, etc. Now that we want to move onto the procedure of sreifa, we first sum up the discussion of skila, and then move on.