

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains what the Mishnah means when it says that the suspected wife was taken to the Eastern gate since she was already there.

The Gemara identifies the sources that teach that a sotah, a metzora, a woman who gave birth, a zav and a zavah must stand at Nikanor's Gate.

### 2) Giving two suspected wives the bitter waters to drink

A Beraisa presents a dispute related to the reason two sotahs may not drink the bitter waters at the same time.

The Gemara explains the rationale for Tanna Kamma's position.

It is suggested that the two positions are in dispute whether a woman who is trembling would be allowed to drink at the same time as her friend.

The possibility of two sotahs drinking from the same water is challenged from the principle that states that we do not do mitzvos in bundles.

Abaye resolves the challenge.

### 3) Clarifying the Mishnah

A Beraisa identifies the source that the sotah's hair and body are uncovered.

### 4) Concern for improper thoughts

The implication of the Mishnah that R' Yehudah is concerned about generating improper thoughts and Rabanan are not concerned about generating improper thoughts is challenged from a Beraisa that implies that they hold the opposite positions.

Rabbah resolves the contradiction in R' Yehudah's position.

Rava suggests a resolution for the position of Rabanan.

It is suggested that the dispute between R' Yehudah and Rabanan regarding the procedure for stoning a woman revolves around R' Nachman's principle that one should choose a favorable death for people who will be executed.

This assertion is rejected.

### 5) Clarifying the Mishnah

A Beraisa further elaborates on the details related to the clothing the sotah wears.

The necessity for the Mishnah to teach that the sotah removes her jewelry is explained.

R' Abba inquired whether the rope of palm fibers to tie up the sotah's garment is essential or whether anything that will hold up her garments is sufficient.

R' Huna demonstrates from a Beraisa that even a belt is acceptable.

A contradiction of implications in the Mishnah is noted

(Overview...Continued on page 2)

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### The great merit of Yosef Hatzadik

מי שנתחייב חניקה או טובע בנהר או מת בסרונוכי

The Midrash Tanchuma cites the verse in Tehilim (114:3): "הים ראה וינס—The sea saw and fled" and made the following comment. What did the sea observe? It saw the casket of Yosef approaching about whom it is written (Bereshis 39:12): "וינס ויצא החוצה—And he fled and he went outside." Kli Yakar (Parshas Vayeshev) suggests that the Midrash should be understood according to the teaching of our Gemara. Our Gemara states that although there is no longer a Sanhedrin to carry out the four types of execution, nonetheless, someone who deserves to be executed by strangulation will drown or some other way die due to loss of breath. The punishment for adultery is strangulation, thus the generation of flood was killed by drowning since they were involved in promiscuous activities. Since Yosef exercised great restraint when solicited by Potiphar's wife by fleeing and running outside he merited to save the Jewish People from drowning at sea. Accordingly, the Midrash is teaching that when the sea saw Yosef's casket approaching it split in the merit of Yosef's self-restraint but when the Egyptians approached, who were also a nation known for their immoral culture the sea came crashing down on them killing them for their behavior. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why is it necessary to send two Torah scholars to accompany a sotah and her husband to Yerushalayim?
2. Why did Beis Din attempt to frighten the Sotah?
3. What was the reward for Yehudah and Reuven for confessing their guilt?
4. Is it appropriate for a person to publicly admit his transgressions?

This week's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 לע"נ מרת רבקה בת ר' שרגא פייטל ע"ה

By her children

Mr. and Mrs. David Friedman

This week's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 In memory of Molkeejon Bat Moshe

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Bris milah for twins

אמר אביי ואיתימא ר' כהנא לא קשיא כאן בכהן אחד כאן בשני כהנים

Abaye, and according to others R' Kahana answered that there is a difference between a case of one kohen and a case of two kohanim

Rambam rules<sup>1</sup> that two sotahs may not be given the bitter waters to drink at the same time. Magen Avrohom<sup>2</sup> wonders why Rambam did not qualify this ruling in any way. When the Gemara asks about the permissibility of giving bitter waters to two sotahs due to considerations for the principle that prohibits doing mitzvos in bundles (אין עושין מצוות חבילות חבילות) the Gemara explains that there is a difference between a case of one kohen and two kohanim. Tosafos<sup>3</sup> explains that having the two sotahs stand by one kohen looks as if the mitzvah is burdensome whereas if the two sotahs are given bitter waters from different kohanim it does not appear like a burden and is permitted. Accordingly, why did Rambam categorically prohibit giving two sotahs to drink without distinguishing between a case of one kohen or two kohanim administering the bitter waters?

Magen Avrohom suggests that Rambam understood the Gemara's distinction between one kohen and two kohanim the opposite of Tosafos. If one kohen is administering the bitter waters he will not be able to give it to both of them simultaneously and since the two sotahs will not be drinking the waters at the same time there is no concern that it looks as though the mitzvos are a burden. When two kohanim are administering bitter waters to two sotahs it is possible for both

(Overview...Continued from page 1)

regarding who is authorized to watch the kohen carry out the sotah procedures.

Abaye suggests a resolution to the contradiction.

Rava rejects this explanation and offers an alternative explanation.

6) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah presents and gives some examples of the principle of מדה כנגד מדה - measure for measure.

7) **Measure for measure**

R' Yosef explains how Hashem utilizes the four types of executions even though Sanhedrin is no longer extant.

R' Meir elaborates on the principle of measure for measure and explains how the principle applies to a sotah. ■

women to drink the waters at the same time which gives the negative impression that the mitzvos are a burden.

This disagreement will have bearing, suggests Magen Avrohom, on the correct procedure for giving a bris milah to twins (or even two non-related babies). According to Rambam, bringing the babies into the room for one mohel is not problematic since the milah will be done separately for each baby. The restriction would apply if there were two mohalim who would do the milah simultaneously. Tosafos, on the other hand, would adopt the opposite perspective. Bringing both babies into the room at the same time would violate the principle against making mitzvos appear burdensome but it would be permitted to hire two mohalim to do the milah on the two babies simultaneously. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"ד מהל' סוטה ה"ב
2. מג"א סי' קמ"ז ס"ק י"א ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The value of the individual Mitzvah

לפי שאין עושין מצות חבילות חבילות

There was a man who hired two workers to do a certain job on his property. As expected, the job was easily completed that very day. The halacha is explicit about paying workers their wages by the end of the day, so the owner of the house approached the workers to pay them. As he presented them with a valuable coin, the employer said, "Here is one gold coin which covers the price of all your hard efforts."

However, the two workers were quite unsatisfied by his offer. "Why should we have to go to a money changer and change this coin into smaller coins? Each of us deserves to be paid half this sum in smaller denominations, and it's your job to procure them, not ours."

This dispute came before the Ben Ish Chai, ז"ל. "They may certainly refuse and the man who hired them must pay each what he is owed," said the Ben Ish Chai after hearing them out. "Not only that, but I will even go further: Even if they are willing to take the coin, he should not pay them both with one coin. The reason for this appears on Sotah 8. There, the Gemara forbids doing even

two of the same mitzvos at once, since this is doing mitzvos 'in bundles,' which reveals a lack of respect for each individual mitzvah. It appears as though the mitzvos are a burden which he wishes to get off his back as quickly as possible, as Rashi explains.

The Ben Ish Chai continued, "The same holds true in our case. The employer has a mitzvah to pay each worker his wages. How can he give them both their wages at the same time? It is only fitting that he exchanges the big coin for smaller denominations so he can pay each worker separately, so that he not perform mitzvos in bundles!" ■

