



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Baraisa (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its clarification of the earlier-cited Baraisa (14b).

2) Standard procedure for offering a Korban Minchah

The Mishnah's assertion that every Korban Minchah requires oil and frankincense is challenged.

In response to this challenge the Gemara explains the true intent of the Mishnah.

A Baraisa discusses the מנחת חוטא.

One of the points in the Baraisa is clarified.

3) Clarifying R' Gamliel's statement

A Baraisa presents a longer version of R' Gamliel's statement in the Mishnah.

4) MISHNAH: The Mishnah continues its description of the sotah procedure.

5) The earthenware cup

R' Yishmael asserts that the earthenware cup must be new.

The source (a gezeirah shavah) for R' Yishmael's assertion is identified.

The validity of the gezeirah shavah is challenged.

Rabbah points to another source that the earthenware utensil must be new.

Rava explains that Rabanan who allow the use of an old earthenware utensil would agree that if it became blackened it is invalid.

Rava inquires whether a blackened earthenware utensil that was whitened could be used for the sotah.

The Gemara unsuccessfully attempts to resolve this

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the meaning of the term למשחה?
2. What does the korban of a metzora accomplish?
3. How much earth was used in the bitter waters?
4. Why did the Kohen turn right when he entered the Sanctuary?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The sin of the wealthy and the sin of the poor

התינה עשירה, עניה מאי איכא למימר וכו'

The Mishnah and Baraisa cite many illustrations of how the experience of the Sotah woman parallels the various aspects of her sin. The meal offering she brings is from barley, which is described as an animal food, rather than from wheat, which is human food. In the Mishnah, Rabban Gamliel pointed out that because the woman acted impulsively and followed her animal instincts, her offering should be brought from a food that is typically used as animal feed.

The Baraisa quotes Rabbi Meir who explained that the barley offering is the retribution corresponding to the woman's misdeed of feeding delicacies to her adulterous partner in order to attract him. Now, as a response, we use animal feed for her offering. Rabban Gamliel questions Rabbi Meir, as he notes that this cause and effect only reflects the scenario for a wealthy woman, who could afford special foods to feed her accomplice. However, it stands to reason that a poor woman who is accused of sin would not have fed her partner such fancy treats. The barley offering must be, explains Rabban Gamliel, due to her animalistic act, rather than the particular foods she might or might not have served.

In the Baraisa earlier (8b), Rabbi Meir mentioned no fewer than twelve aspects of the sin which each correspond to the details found in the sotah procedure. The commentators note that many of those aspects, again, do not seem appropriate for the experience of a poor woman. For example, "She spread a fancy cloth upon her head for the adulterer, so we remove her head covering. She wore a nice belt, so we use a coarse rope to hold up her clothing. She used fine goblets to give him wine, so we have her drink water from an earthenware cup." How can these each be explained in terms of the retribution for a poor woman who probably did not do these things?

יגל יעקב explains that perhaps these items do, in fact, apply even to a poor woman. She might have borrowed a nice scarf or fine tableware to advance her sinful ways. Also, the price of wine is not beyond the budget of even a poor woman.

Furthermore, it could be that the Gemara is only concerned about explaining why the offering is of barley, which is unusual. The other aspects of the sotah procedure are done in order to disgrace the woman, although they do not necessarily correspond to the specific act as perpetrated by a poor woman and her partner. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
By Rabbi and Mrs. Sam Biber
In memory of their mother
מרת רבקה זלדה בת ר' חיים יחזקאל הכהן, ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

A mikveh whose water changed color

דומיא דמים מה מים שלא נשתנו אף כלי שלא נשתנה

It [the utensil] must be similar to water, just like the water has not changed, so too the utensil cannot have changed

Teshuvos Mishkanos Yaakov¹ expressed uncertainty about the practice of heating up large quantities of drawn water in order to warm the mikveh. One of the concerns about this practice is that when the water is heated on a daily basis its appearance changes as a result of its proximity to smoke from the fire. If the water's appearance were to become altered as a result of the smoke it would become disqualified based on a comment in our Gemara. The Gemara declares that the utensil used by the kohen to have the sotah drink the bitter waters may not have an altered appearance similar to the waters that may not have an altered appearance. A challenge to this approach is that Tosafos² notes that if dye was poured into a mikvah and changed its appearance it would not become disqualified, so why should mikvah water that has a smoky appearance become disqualified due to a change of appearance? Answers Mishkanos Yaakov that the two cases are not similar. When dye is poured in water the appearance of the water changes, but the water has not, as opposed to water that is exposed to smoke where the water itself changes color.

Pischei Teshuvah³ rejects the ruling suggested by Mish-

inquiry.

(Overview. Continued from page 1)

6) Clarifying the Mishnah

The reason the kohen turns to the right is explained.

A Baraisa is cited that elaborates on the topic of the dirt taken from the floor of the Beis Hamikdash.

A second Baraisa is cited that maintains that the earth was brought into the Beis Hamikdash. ■

kanos Yaakov and describes it as an extreme stringency. He explains that when the Gemara states that the water did not change it did not intend to indicate that if the water was to change it would be disqualified, rather it was merely stating that under normal conditions the appearance of the water does not change. In his analysis of the matter he concludes that a mikveh does not become disqualified unless a liquid is poured into the mikvah that alters the appearance of the mikveh and it is a liquid that may not be used to make a kosher mikveh. Since smoke does not have these characteristics it will not disqualify a mikvah even if it changes its experience.

On a related note Teshuvos Mishnah Halachos⁴ addresses the question of a mikveh whose water changed color as a result of its regular use and he ruled that it is kosher for use and there is no need for any hesitation. ■

1. שו"ת משכנות יעקב סי' מ"ד והובא בפת"ש המובא לקמן
2. תוס' ד"ה ומה מים
3. פתחי תשובה יו"ד סי' ר"א ס"ק י"ט
4. שו"ת משנה הלכות ח"ז סי' קמ"ח ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The sin of fasting

נזיר נמי חוטא הוא

On today's daf we find the opinion of Rav Elazar Hakefar who holds that a nazir is a sinner.

A certain man used to fast in an effort to come close to Hashem. When this man learned from Ta'anis 11 that all who fast are called sinners, he was understandably disconcerted. He immediately consulted with the Ridvaz, zt"l, regarding this issue. Was he truly a sinner for fasting?

The Ridvaz replied, "People say in

the name of Rav Eliezer of Metz, zt"l, that only one who fasts out of anger is a sinner, not one who fasts to come closer to Hashem. But this is surely not true since we learn that one who fasts is a sinner from nazir. Chazal say that a nazir is called a sinner for merely depriving himself of wine. Apparently, one who deprives himself of all sustenance is even more of a sinner. But I have found that Rav Eliezer of Metz himself writes the opposite of what people say in his name for the above reason. It is important to note that although one who fasts is called a sinner it is still permitted to fast since one who fasts for the sake of heaven gains much more than he loses.

The Ridvaz continued, "The Ritva also says this is permitted, and proves it from the halacha regarding one who fasts on Shabbos to neutralize a bad dream that worried him. Even though he must fast to atone for his sin of neglecting oneg Shabbos, he still may fast since the good that comes out of the fast outweighs the bad of the fast."

The Ridvaz concluded, "It is important to keep in mind that although the sages said that fasting is more efficacious than a sacrifice because a sacrifice merely costs money while one who fasts gives of his very flesh to Hashem, one who fasts too much is a sinner whose loss is greater than his gain!" ■

