



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

Bava Basra Daf Kuf Ches

**PEREK YEISH NOCHALIN -- PEREK SHEMINI**

**MISHNA**

- There are some relatives who both, inherit and hand down to each other (whichever of the two dies first will hand down to the other and the other thereby inherits from him – it is a reciprocal relationship). There are some relatives who inherit, but don't hand down. There are some who only hand down, but don't inherit. And, there are some who don't inherit or hand down.
  - The following relatives inherit and hand down to each other: a father his sons, a son his father, paternal brothers. All these inherit from each other and hand down to each other.
  - A man his mother, a man his wife, and the sons of sisters, are relatives who inherit but do not hand down.
  - A woman her sons, a wife her husband, and brothers of the mother, are relatives that hand down but do not inherit.
  - Maternal brothers (with different fathers) do not inherit or hand down to each other.

**GEMARA**

- **Q:** Why is it that the Mishna mentions that a father inherits his son before mentioning that a son inherits his father? Why would the Mishna begin with the tragic circumstance of a son dying in the lifetime of his father? Also, the pesukim of inheritance begin with a son inheriting his father!? **A:** The Tanna did this, because the halacha that a father inherits his son is learned from a drasha, and that makes it dear to him.
  - We see this drasha in a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk regarding inheritance says it should be given to "she'eiro" (his relative) – this comes to include a father. This teaches that a father inherits his son before the brothers of the son. We would think that a father should even precede the son of the dead son. The pasuk therefore says "hakarov", which teaches that the closer relative takes precedence (and a son is closer than a father).
  - **Q:** We have an inclusionary pasuk and an exclusionary pasuk, so why do we choose to include the son and to exclude the brother? **A:** We include the son, because he steps into his father's shoes regarding "yi'ud" and regarding redeeming a field from hekdesch so that it not go to the Kohanim at Yovel.
    - **Q:** Maybe we should include a brother, since he steps into his shoes in a case of yibum!? **A:** Yibum only exists when there is no son, so we see that the son is in a stronger position than the brother.
    - **Q:** It seems that without this answer we would say that a brother is in a stronger position. Why is that? We should say that a son is stronger, because he steps into the father's shoes for 2 things whereas the brother only does for one? **A:** The only way we know that a son is the one who steps into the father's shoes for redemption of a field is because we say that he is stronger than the brother, since there is no yibum if there is a son. Therefore, the whole strength of the son is based on that argument.