

דְּכַתִּיב: "זאת". בְּשָׁנִי אֲנָשִׁים וּשְׁנֵי בּוֹעֲלִין –
 דְּכּוּלֵי עֲלָמָא לָא פְּלִיגֵי דְהָאִשָּׁה שׁוֹתָה
 וְשׁוֹנָה, דְּכַתִּיב: "תּוֹרַת".

כִּי פְּלִיגֵי – בְּאִישׁ אֶחָד וּשְׁנֵי בּוֹעֲלִין, בְּשָׁנֵי
 אֲנָשִׁים וּבּוֹעֵל אֶחָד.

as it is written: "This is the law of jealousy." The word "this" is a restricting term and excludes that possibility. With regard to two different husbands and two different paramours, where her first husband suspected her with regard to one paramour during her first marriage and the second husband suspected her with regard to a different man during the second marriage, everyone agrees that the woman drinks and repeats, as it is written: "This is the law of jealousy," in all cases of jealousy.

They disagree when there is one husband and two paramours, i.e., where one husband warned her with regard to a second paramour after she survived her first ordeal. They also disagree in a case of two husbands and one paramour, i.e., if her second husband accused her with regard to the same paramour on account of whom she was compelled to drink by her first husband.

This serves to exclude two – זאת לְמַעוּטֵי תַרְתֵּי: Rashi explains the logic behind the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. If one man warns his wife a second time after she was already found to be innocent, no matter whether he suspects a different paramour or the same one, it appears that his suspicions are unfounded and he is simply a quarrelsome person.

The opinions are justified as follows: **The first *tanna* holds** that the phrase “**the law of jealousy**” serves to **include all of these** cases. In almost all cases the woman drinks and repeats. The word “**this**” serves to **exclude** only the case of **one husband and one paramour**, in which she does not drink and repeat.

And the Rabbis mentioned later in the *baraita* hold that the word “**this**” serves to **exclude all of these** cases. The woman almost never drinks and repeats. The phrase “**the law of jealousy**” serves to **include** only the case of **two husbands and two paramours**, in which she does drink and repeat.

And Rabbi Yehuda holds: The word “**this**” serves to **exclude two^N** of the cases, and the phrase “**the law of jealousy**” serves to **include two**. The word “**this**” serves to **exclude** the **two** cases of **one husband and one paramour** and **one husband and two paramours**. In neither of these cases does the woman drink and repeat. The phrase “**the law of jealousy**” serves to **include two** cases, i.e., **two husbands and one paramour**, and all the more so **two husbands and two paramours**. In both of these cases, the woman must drink and repeat.

תֵּנָא קַמָּא סָבַר: “תּוֹרַת” – לְרַבּוּי כּוּלָּהּ, וְזֹאת” – לְמַעוּטֵי אִישׁ אֶחָד וּבּוֹעֵל אֶחָד.

וּרְבִנְיָ בְּתַרְאֵי סָבְרִי: “זֹאת” – לְמַעוּטֵי כּוּלָּהּ, “תּוֹרַת” – לְרַבּוּי שְׁנֵי אַנְשִׁים וּשְׁנֵי בּוֹעֲלִין.

וּרְבִי יְהוּדָה: “זֹאת” – לְמַעוּטֵי תַרְתֵּי, “תּוֹרַת” – לְרַבּוֹת תַרְתֵּי. “זֹאת” לְמַעוּטֵי תַרְתֵּי – אִישׁ אֶחָד וּבּוֹעֵל אֶחָד, אִישׁ אֶחָד וּשְׁנֵי בּוֹעֲלִין. “תּוֹרַת” לְרַבּוּי תַרְתֵּי – שְׁנֵי אַנְשִׁים וּבּוֹעֵל אֶחָד, שְׁנֵי אַנְשִׁים וּשְׁנֵי בּוֹעֲלִין.

הדרן עלך היה מביא

מתני' הִיָּה נוֹטֵל אֶת מִנְחָתָהּ מִתּוֹךְ כְּפִיפָה מִצְרִית וְנוֹתְנָהּ לְתוֹךְ בְּלֵי שָׂרֵת וְנוֹתְנָהּ עַל יָדָהּ. וְכֵהֵן מִנִּיחַ יָדוֹ מִתַּחְתֵּיהָ וּמִנִּיפָהּ. הַיָּנִיף וְהָגִישׁ קִמְצוֹ וְהִקְטִיר, וְהִשְׁאָר נֹאכַל לְכֹהֲנִים.

הִיָּה מִשְׁקָה וְאַחַר כֵּן מִקְרִיב אֶת מִנְחָתָהּ. רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אוֹמֵר: מִקְרִיב אֶת מִנְחָתָהּ וְאַחַר כֵּן הִיָּה מִשְׁקָה, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "וְאַחַר יִשְׁקָה אֶת הָאִשָּׁה אֶת הַמֵּיִם." אִם הִשְׁקָה וְאַחַר כֵּן הִקְרִיב אֶת מִנְחָתָהּ – כְּשֶׁרָה.

גמ' אָמַר לִיה רַבִּי אֱלֶעָזָר לְרַבִּי יֵאֱשִׁיָּהוּ דְרִיָּה: לָא תֵיתֵב אֲבָרְעָךְ עַד דְּמִפְרִשְׁתָּ לָּהּ לְהָא מִילְתָּא: מִנֵּן לְמַנְחַת סוּטָה שְׁטַעוּנָה תְּנוּפָה? מִנָּא לָן? "וְהַיָּנִיף" בְּתֵיב בְּהַ! בְּבִעְלִים מְנַלָּן?

אֲתֵינָא "יָד" מִשְׁלֵמִים. בְּתֵיב הַכָּא: "וְלִקַּח תְּבַחֵן מִיַּד הָאִשָּׁה", וְכֵתִיב הַתָּם: "יָדוֹ תְּבִיאֲנָה",

מָה כָּאן בְּהֵן – אִף לְהֵלֵן בְּהֵן. וּמָה לְהֵלֵן בְּעֵלִים – אִף כָּאן בְּעֵלִים. הָא בִּיעֵד? מִנִּיחַ יָדוֹ תַּחַת יְדֵי הַבְּעֵלִים וּמִנִּיף.

"הַיָּנִיף וְהָגִישׁ קִמְצוֹ וְכוּ' הִיָּה מִשְׁקָה וְאַחַר כֵּן מִקְרִיב אֶת מִנְחָתָהּ." הָא אֲבָרְבָּהּ!

MISHNA He would take^N her meal-offering out of the Egyptian wicker basket made of palm leaves in which it was lying and would put it into a service vessel and then place it on her hand.⁴ And the priest would then place his hand underneath hers^N and wave it together with her. The priest waved it and brought it near to the southwest corner of the altar, removed a handful^B from it, and burned the handful; and the remainder was eaten by the priests.

The priest would force the woman to drink the bitter water of a *sota*, and afterward he would sacrifice her meal-offering.⁴ Rabbi Shimon says: The priest would sacrifice her meal-offering and afterward he would force her to drink, as it is stated: "And the priest shall take a handful of the meal-offering, as the memorial part of it, and burn it upon the altar, and afterward he shall make the woman drink the water" (Numbers 5:26). But Rabbi Shimon concedes that if the priest first forced her to drink and afterward^N sacrificed her meal-offering, it is still valid.

GEMARA Rabbi Elazar said to Rabbi Yoshiya of his generation,⁶ i.e., his contemporary: You shall not sit on your feet^N until you explain this matter to me: From where is it derived that the meal-offering of a *sota* requires waving? The Gemara expresses surprise at the question: From where do we derive this? It is explicitly written with regard to the meal-offering of a *sota*: "And the priest shall take the meal-offering of jealousy out of the woman's hand, and shall wave the meal-offering before the Lord, and bring it unto the altar" (Numbers 5:25). Rather, the question is as follows: From where do we derive that the waving is performed by the owner, i.e., the woman, and not only by the priest?

Rabbi Yoshiya answered: This is derived by means of a verbal analogy between the term "hand" written here and "hand" from the peace-offering: It is written here, with regard to the meal-offering of a *sota*: "And the priest shall take the meal-offering of jealousy out of the woman's hand" (Numbers 5:25), and it is written there, with regard to the peace-offering: "He that offers his peace-offerings unto the Lord... His own hands shall bring the offerings... that the breast may be waved before the Lord" (Leviticus 7:29–30).

Just as here, in the case of the *sota*, the priest waves the offering, so too there, in the case of the peace-offering, the priest waves the offering. And just as there, in the case of the peace-offering, the owner waves the offering, so too here, in the case of the *sota*, the owner waves the offering. How is this accomplished? The priest places his hand beneath the hands of the owner and then waves the offering with the owner.

§ The mishna states: The priest waved it and brought it near to the southwest corner of the altar, removed a handful from it, and burned the handful. Yet the continuation of the mishna states: The priest would force the woman to drink, and afterward he would sacrifice her meal-offering. The Gemara asks: Didn't the mishna state in the previous phrase that the offering was already sacrificed?

BACKGROUND

Removed a handful – קִמְצוֹ: Most meal-offerings require that a handful be removed by a priest and burnt on the altar. This rite parallels the rite of slaughtering performed in the case of an animal offering. However, the slaughtering of an offering may be performed by a non-priest, whereas removing the handful from a meal-offering may be performed only by a priest. According

to many authorities, the priest would remove the flour with only the three middle fingers of his right hand, using his thumb and little finger to remove any surplus flour from his closed fingers. He would then place the flour in a sacred service vessel in order to consecrate it. Since the priest had to scoop out a precise amount of flour, this was one of the more difficult services in the Temple.

NOTES

He would take, etc. – הִיָּה נוֹטֵל וְכוּ': The subject of this sentence is not explicit in the mishna. Rashi and Rabbi Ovadya Bartenuara explain that the husband takes the meal-offering, as the mishna continues: And the priest would then place his hand, indicating that the priest was not involved beforehand. However, *Tosafot* and the Meiri explain that ideally, the priest was the one who would take the meal-offering. The reference to the priest in the continuation of the mishna merely means that from that point onward the priest must perform the actions, and a non-priest is not permitted to do so. This explanation is based on the Jerusalem Talmud (see *Melekheth Shlomo*).

The priest would then place his hand underneath hers – וְכֵהֵן מִנִּיחַ יָדוֹ מִתַּחְתֵּיהָ: In the Jerusalem Talmud it is asked: Why is it not improper for the priest to touch the woman's hand? The conclusion is that since this was only for a short time, there is no reason for concern lest the priest's desire be stimulated. Some explain that the priest did not actually touch her; his hands held the vessel, lower down than her hands, and did not touch her hands directly (*Tosefot HaRash*).

If the priest first forced her to drink and afterward, etc. – אִם הִשְׁקָה וְאַחַר כֵּן וְכוּ': It is stated in the Jerusalem Talmud that the Rabbis concede that if the priest sacrificed the meal-offering before giving the *sota* the water to drink, the offering is valid.

You shall not sit on your feet – לָא תֵיתֵב אֲבָרְעָךְ: One understanding of this expression is based on the principle that difficult subjects are learned while one is seated, while simpler subject matter is learned while standing (see *Megilla* 21a). Rabbi Elazar intended to indicate that due to Rabbi Yoshiya's extensive knowledge, this was a simple matter for him and he would not need to sit down and consider the matter much in order to provide a correct answer (*Minha Hareva*).

HALAKHA

וְנוֹתְנָהּ עַל יָדָהּ וְכוּ' – וְכֵהֵן מִנִּיחַ יָדוֹ מִתַּחְתֵּיהָ: After the woman drinks the water, the service vessel with the meal-offering is placed on the woman's hands. The priest places his hand under hers and waves it to the east of the altar in the same manner as all other wavings; he waves it to and fro to each side, and also up and down. After the waving, the priest brings the meal-offering near to the southwest corner of the altar, removes a handful, and burns it. The remainder is eaten by the priests in the same manner as other meal-offerings (Rambam *Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Sota* 3:15).

The priest would force the woman to drink the water and afterward he would sacrifice her meal-offering – הִיָּה מִשְׁקָה וְאַחַר כֵּן מִקְרִיב אֶת מִנְחָתָהּ: The priest first forces the woman to drink the bitter water and afterward he sacrifices the meal-offering, in accordance with the unattributed opinion in the mishna. If the priest sacrificed the meal-offering first and afterward forced her to drink, the offering is valid, as indicated later in the Gemara and as stated explicitly in the Jerusalem Talmud (Rambam *Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Sota* 4:14).

PERSONALITIES

רַבִּי יֵאֱשִׁיָּהוּ דְרִיָּה – Rabbi Yoshiya of his generation: This title is used to distinguish this Rabbi Yoshiya, who was an *amora* and a contemporary of Rabbi Elazar, from the *tanna* of the same name. Rabbi Yoshiya was an *amora* of the third generation of *amora'im*. He lived in Eretz Yisrael and apparently was one of the older students of Rabbi Yohanan, as was Rabbi Elazar. His statements are recorded in the Jerusalem Talmud.

Rabbi Shimon and the Rabbis disagree, etc. – פְּלִיגֵי רַבִּי – שְׁמֵעוֹן וְרַבְּנָן וְכִי: It is explained in the Jerusalem Talmud that in addition to the dispute between them with regard to the proper understanding of the verses, Rabbi Shimon and the Rabbis also disagree with regard to which rite is central to the evaluation of whether the *sota* was unfaithful. Rabbi Shimon holds that the essential part of the evaluation is accomplished by the water, and the meal-offering is only a supplementary offering, whereas the Rabbis hold that the evaluation is accomplished primarily by the meal-offering, although the drinking of the bitter water is necessary in order to allow the curse to enter the women's body.

הָבִי קֶאֱמֹר: סֵדֶר מִנְחֹת כִּי־צֶדֶד הַמֶּנֶךְ
וְהַגִּישׁ קִמֹץ וְהִקְטִיר, וְהִשְׁאָר נֹאכָל
לְכֹהֲנִים.

וּבַהֲשָׂקָה גּוֹפָה פְּלִיגֵי רַבִּי שְׁמֵעוֹן
וְרַבְּנָן, דְּרַבְּנָן סָבְרִי: מִשְׁקָה וְאַחַר כֵּן
מִקְרִיב אֶת מִנְחָתָהּ, וְרַבִּי שְׁמֵעוֹן סָבַר:
מִקְרִיב אֶת מִנְחָתָהּ וְאַחַר כֵּן מִשְׁקָה,
שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "וְאַחַר יִשְׁקָה".

"וְאִם הִשְׁקָה וְאַחַר כֵּן הִקְרִיב אֶת
מִנְחָתָה – בְּשִׁרָה".

The Gemara answers: **This is what the mishna is saying: What was the sacrificial order of meal-offerings in general?** The priest waved the meal-offering and brought it near to the southwest corner of the altar, removed a handful from it, and burned the handful, and the remainder was eaten by the priests.

And as for the correct order for sacrificing the meal-offering of the *sota* and forcing her to drink, this itself is a matter about which Rabbi Shimon and the Rabbis disagree,ⁿ as the Rabbis hold that the priest would force the woman to drink and afterward he would sacrifice her meal-offering; and Rabbi Shimon holds that the priest would sacrifice her meal-offering and afterward he would force her to drink, as it is stated: "And the priest shall take a handful of the meal-offering, as the memorial part of it, and burn it upon the altar, and afterward he shall make the woman drink the water" (Numbers 5:26).

§ The mishna states: **But** Rabbi Shimon concedes that if the priest first forced her to drink and afterward sacrificed her meal-offering, the offering is still valid.

Perek III Daf 19 Amud b

HALAKHA

If the scroll was already erased and then the woman says I will not drink – נִמְחָקָה מִגִּילָה וְאוֹמְרַת אֵינִי שׁוֹתָה: Once the scroll is erased, if the woman says: I will not drink, she is forcibly compelled to drink (Rambam *Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Sota* 4:4).

Where the impression of the ink is still discernible – לְשִׁירֵי שׁוֹמוֹ נִכָּר: The scroll must be thoroughly erased so that the impression of the writing is not discernible. If the text is still discernible, it is invalid (Rambam *Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Sota* 4:10).

LANGUAGE

Forced [*me'arerin*] – מְעַרְעֵרִין: Some explain that this term is derived from the word *irur*, which means breaking and is used here to denote the opening of her mouth by force. Others explain that the term means to place liquid in one's mouth without swallowing. It is similar to the talmudic Hebrew terms *me'arer* and *megarger*. According to this explanation, here the term means that the water is poured down her throat.

NOTES

The statement of Rabbi Akiva – דְּבַרֵי רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא: According to Rashi, Rabbi Akiva agrees with Rabbi Shimon that first the meal-offering is sacrificed and only afterward is she given to drink; however, Rabbi Akiva takes a more extreme position than Rabbi Shimon on this matter, asserting that if she were to drink first, it is considered as if nothing was done. By contrast, Rabbeinu Hananel asserts that Rabbi Akiva holds in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, who state that the woman should drink first. This explanation is based on an alternative version of the text. *Tosafot* note that later (20b) the Gemara apparently understands Rabbi Akiva's opinion as explained by Rashi; however, *Tosafot* explain that the *tanna'im* themselves disagree with regard to the opinion of Rabbi Akiva.

תַּנּוּ רַבְּנָן: "וְהִשְׁקָה" – מִה תִּלְמֹד
לוֹמַר? וְהִלָּא כָּבֵד נֶאֱמַר "וְהִשְׁקָה!"
שְׂאֵם נִמְחָקָה מִגִּילָה וְאוֹמְרַת אֵינִי
שׁוֹתָה, מְעַרְעֵרִין אוֹתָהּ וּמִשְׁקִין אוֹתָהּ
בְּעַל כִּרְחֹה, דְּבַרֵי רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא;

– רַבִּי שְׁמֵעוֹן אוֹמֵר: "וְאַחַר יִשְׁקָה" –
מִה תִּלְמֹד לוֹמַר? וְהִלָּא כָּבֵד נֶאֱמַר
"וְהִשְׁקָה!" אֵלּוּ לְאַחַר כָּל מַעֲשִׂים
כוֹלֵן הָאֱמוּרִין לְמַעְלָה. מְגִיד, שְׁלִישָׁה
דְּבָרִים מְעַבְּרִין בָּהּ: עַד שְׁלֵא קָרַב
הַקּוֹמֵץ, וְעַד שְׁלֵא נִמְחָקָה מִגִּילָה,
וְעַד שְׁלֵא תִקְבַּל עָלֶיהָ שְׁבוּעָה.

עַד שְׁלֵא קָרַב הַקּוֹמֵץ – רַבִּי שְׁמֵעוֹן
לְטַעֲמֶיהָ, דְּאָמַר: מִקְרִיב אֶת מִנְחָתָהּ
וְאַחַר כֵּן מִשְׁקָה.

עַד שְׁלֵא נִמְחָקָה מִגִּילָה, אֵלּוּ מֵאֵי
מִשְׁקָה לָהּ? אָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי: לֹא נִגְרַכָּה
לְשִׁירֵי שׁוֹמוֹ נִכָּר.

The Sages taught: What is the meaning when the verse states after the sacrifice of the meal-offering: "And he shall make her drink the water" (Numbers 5:27)? But isn't it already stated: "And he shall make the woman drink the water of bitterness that causes the curse" (Numbers 5:24)? The *baraita* answers: The repetition teaches that if the scroll was already erased and then the woman says: I will not drink,^h she is forced [*me'arerin*]^l to drink against her will. This is the statement of Rabbi Akiva.ⁿ

Rabbi Shimon says: What is the meaning when the verse states: "And the priest shall take a handful of the meal-offering, as the memorial part of it, and burn it upon the altar, and afterward he shall make the woman drink the water" (Numbers 5:26)? But isn't it already stated previously: "And he shall make the woman drink" (Numbers 5:24)? Rather, this verse indicates that the *sota* is given the bitter water to drink only after all the actions that are stated above are performed, i.e., erasing the scroll, sacrificing the meal-offering, and administering the oath. Therefore, this verse teaches that three matters preclude her from drinking: She does not drink until the handful is sacrificed, and until the scroll is erased, and until she accepts the oath upon herself.

The Gemara elaborates: She does not drink until the handful is sacrificed. Rabbi Shimon conforms to his line of reasoning stated earlier, as he says that the priest sacrifices her meal-offering and afterward forces her to drink.

The Gemara questions the second condition: She does not drink until the scroll is erased. Why does the *baraita* need to state this? But what could he give her to drink if the scroll was not yet erased into the water? Rav Ashi says: No, this *halakha* is necessary for an instance where the scroll was erased, but the impression of the ink is still discernible^h on the parchment. The woman does not drink until the scroll is totally erased.

Hook [*kelabus*] – כְּלָבוּס: Apparently from the Latin *clavus*, which means a nail. From the description of the *ge'onim* it appears the *kelabus* was an object similar to large tongs in which bent nails were inserted in order to grasp metal articles during forging.

NOTES

A hook [*kelabus*] made of iron – כְּלָבוּס שֶׁל בַּרְזֶל: Although the commentaries disagree with regard to the exact meaning of the term *kelabus*, it appears that its purpose was not to open her mouth; rather, it was placed in her open mouth to ensure that her mouth remained open so that she could be forced to drink (see *Tosefta*). The *Tosefta* (2:3) cites the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who disagrees and holds that they opened her mouth with tongs.

The Gemara discusses the third condition: She does not drink until she accepts the oath upon herself. One might infer from this statement that it is only that she does not drink before she accepts the oath; however, the scroll is written for her before she accepts the oath. But didn't Rava say: With regard to a scroll of a *sota* that was written before she accepted the oath upon herself, whoever wrote it did nothing, and the scroll is rendered invalid. The Gemara responds: This was cited for no reason, as in fact the scroll is not even written before she accepts the oath upon herself, and nothing should be inferred.

The Gemara asks: With regard to what do the Rabbis and Rabbi Shimon disagree in the mishna? The Gemara answers: Three verses are written which pertain to drinking the bitter water: The first occurrence of the term is in the verse: "And he shall make the woman drink" (Numbers 5:24); the second: "And afterward he shall make the woman drink the water" (Numbers 5:26); and the last occurrence of the term is in the verse: "And he shall make her drink" (Numbers 5:27).

The Rabbis hold that the first occurrence of the term: "And he shall make the woman drink," is written to teach the *halakha* itself, i.e., that the priest first forces her to drink and afterward sacrifices her meal-offering. The second instance: "And afterward he shall make the woman drink," is necessary to teach that as long as the impression of the writing is still discernible, the *sota* is not given the bitter water to drink. The third verse, the last occurrence of the term: "And he shall make her drink," teaches that if the scroll was erased and then the woman says: I will not drink, she is forced to drink against her will.

And Rabbi Shimon holds that the second verse: "And afterward he shall make the woman drink the water" (Numbers 5:26), is written to teach the *halakha* itself, i.e., that the priest first sacrifices her meal-offering and afterward forces her to drink. The first occurrence of the term: "And he shall make the woman drink," teaches that if he forced her to drink and only afterward sacrificed her meal-offering, the offering is nevertheless valid. The last occurrence of the term: "And he shall make her drink," teaches that if the scroll was erased and then she said: I will not drink, she is forced to drink against her will.

The Gemara explains the Rabbis' opinion: And the Rabbis would respond to Rabbi Shimon that the verse does not begin the discussion with a *halakha* that is applicable only after the fact, and therefore the initial mention of the drinking is referring to the proper time for the ritual.

The Gemara asks: But does Rabbi Akiva in fact hold that the woman is forced to drink against her will? But isn't it taught in a *baraita* (*Tosefta* 2:3) that Rabbi Yehuda says: A hook [*kelabus*]¹ made of iron" is forcibly placed into her mouth, so that if the scroll was erased and she said: I will not drink, she is forced to drink against her will. Rabbi Akiva said: It is not necessary to force her to drink. Don't we need to force her to drink the water only in order to evaluate her fidelity? And isn't she established as having been evaluated when she refuses to drink, as she is essentially admitting her guilt? Rather, Rabbi Akiva's statement should be understood as follows: Until the handful is sacrificed she can retract her decision to drink the bitter water; however, once the handful is sacrificed she cannot retract her decision to drink.

The Gemara asks: But according to your reasoning in explanation of Rabbi Akiva's statement, this explanation itself should pose a difficulty for you. Why can't she retract her decision once the handful is sacrificed? And isn't she established as having been evaluated when she refuses to drink?

עד שלא תקבל עליה שבועה. מי שתא הוא דלא שתא, הא מיכתב כתבי לה? והאמר רבא: מגילת סוטה שכתבה קודם שתקבל עליה שבועה – לא עשה ולא כלום! כדרי נסבה.

במאי קמיפלגי? תלתא קראי בתיבי: "והשקה" קמא, "ואחר ישקה", "והשקה" בתרא.

רבנן סברי: "והשקה" קמא – לגופו, שמשקה ואחר כך מקריב את מנחתה. "ואחר ישקה" – מיבעי ליה לשרישומו ניכר. "והשקה" בתרא – שאם נמחקה מגילה ואומרת "איני שותה", מערערין אותה ומשקה אותה בעל כרחיה.

ורבי שמעון סבר: "ואחר ישקה" – לגופו, שמשקה את מנחתה ואחר כך משקה. "והשקה" קמא – שאם השקה ואחר כך הקריב את מנחתה בשרה. "והשקה" בתרא – שאם נמחקה מגילה ואומרת "איני שותה", מערערין אותה ומשקין אותה בעל כרחיה.

ורבנן – בדיעבד לא פתח קרא.

וסבר רבי עקיבא משקין אותה בעל כרחיה? והתנא, רבי יהודה אומר: כלבים של ברזל מטילין לתוך פיה, שאם נמחקה מגילה ואומרת "איני שותה", מערערין אותה ומשקין אותה בעל כרחיה. אומר רבי עקיבא: כלום אנו צריכין אלא לבדוקה, והלא בדוקה ועומדת! אלא, עד שלא קרב הקומץ יכולה לחזור בה; משקרב הקומץ אינה יכולה לחזור בה.

ולישעמיהו, תיקשי לך היא גופה: משקרב הקומץ אינה יכולה לחזור בה – והלא בדוקה ועומדת!

In a state of good health – מִחֲמַת בְּרִיּוֹתָא: The Gemara explains later that if the woman admits that she is defiled, she is never given the water to drink. The discussion here refers to a woman who does not explicitly admit her guilt, yet refuses to drink. In this case, if she retracts her decision to drink while she is in good health and of clear mind, and she does not appear frightened, it is assumed that her refusal to drink is akin to a confession that she is defiled. However, if she appears frightened, it is possible that her refusal is due to fear that she will be harmed by the water even if she is innocent. In this case, if the scroll was already erased and the handful sacrificed, she is forced to drink so that the erasure will not be for nothing, as it is possible that she will be found innocent.

לֹא קִשְׂיָא: הָא דְקִהְדְרָא בְּהַ מִחֲמַת רְתִיתָא,
וְהָא דְקִהְדְרָא בְּהַ מִחֲמַת בְּרִיּוֹתָא.

וְהָכִי קֹאֲמַר: כָּל מִחֲמַת בְּרִיּוֹתָא – כָּלֵל כָּלֵל
לֹא שְׁתִּיָּא. מִחֲמַת רְתִיתָא – עַד שְׁלֵא קָרַב
הַקּוֹמֵץ, דְּאִבְתֵּי לָּא אִמְחֹק מְגִילָה, אִי
נִמְי אִמְחֹק מְגִילָה, דְּשְׁלֵא בְּדִין עֵבִיד
כְּהֻנִּים דְּמַחְקֵי – מְצִי הָדְרָא בְּהַ. מְשַׁקְרַב
הַקּוֹמֵץ, דְּבְדִין עֵבִיד כְּהֻנִּים דְּמַחְקֵי – לֹא
מְצִי הָדְרָא בְּהַ.

The Gemara answers: This is **not difficult**; this case, where she is forced to drink, is referring to a situation **where she retracts** her decision to drink **due to fear**, as her refusal is not viewed as an admission of guilt, and it is possible that if she drinks she will be found undefiled. **And that** case, where she does not drink, is referring to a situation **where she retracts** her decision **in a state of good health**.^N Since she does not appear to be afraid, her refusal is viewed as an admission of guilt.

And this is what Rabbi Akiva is saying: In any case where she retracts her decision to drink **in a state of good health, she does not drink at all**. With regard to a *sota* who retracts her decision **due to fear**, if she retracts her decision **before the handful is sacrificed, when the scroll has not yet been erased; or even if the scroll was already erased, since the priests acted incorrectly when they erased it beforehand; she can retract** her decision. **Once the handful is sacrificed, in which case the priests acted correctly when they erased the scroll, she cannot retract** her decision, and she is forced to drink against her will.