



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

Bava Basra Daf Kuf Yud

- **Rava** said, when one is looking to marry a woman he should check into her brothers, as we learn from the pasuk that says that "Aharon married Elisheva bas Aminadav *the sister of Nachshon*". Once we say she was the daughter of Aminadav, we already know she was the sister of Nachshon. The pasuk is teaching that one should check into the brothers of the girl he is looking to marry.
 - A Braisa says, most sons are like the brothers of the mother.
- The Gemara darshens the pesukim of the conversation between the people of Dan and Yehonason, the Kohen of the avodah zara. The Gemara explains the pesukim to mean that they asked him, "you come from Moshe Rabbeinu, so how is it that you are now a priest for avodah zarah!?" He told them, I have a kabbalah from my grandfather Moshe that it is better for a person to hire himself out for avodah zarah rather than to have to rely on others to live. However, he misunderstood the lesson. What Moshe meant was that a person should do an "avodah zarah" – unfamiliar work that he is uncomfortable doing, rather than to come onto others to live. As we find that **Rav** told **R' Kahana** to skin carcasses and make money doing so, and don't say that doing such work is below his status.
 - When Dovid saw that Yehonason loved money, he put him in charge of the royal treasury, and Yehonason ended up doing a full teshuva.

V'HABANIM ES HA'AV

- **Q:** How do we know that a son inherits before a daughter? **A:** The pasuk says that if a man dies and has no sons, the inheritance passes to his daughter. This suggests that if there is a son, the son takes precedence.
 - **Q: R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, maybe the pasuk should be understood to mean that if there is only a son, he inherits. If there is only a daughter, she inherits. If there is a son and a daughter neither of them inherit?
 - **Q:** Who then should inherit? The ruler of the city!? **A: R' Pappa** explained, what I meant to say is that maybe when there is a son and a daughter, they divide the estate equally?
 - **A: Abaye** answered **R' Pappa**, if a son and daughter inherit equally, the pasuk would not have to say that when there is no son the daughter is the sole heir. That would be obvious. It therefore must be teaching that a son takes precedence over a daughter.
 - **Q:** Maybe the pasuk is teaching that a daughter is also an heir? **A:** We should know that from another pasuk that says, "v'chol bas yoreshes nachalah".
 - **R' Acha bar Yaakov** said, that we learn that a son takes precedence over a daughter from the daughters of Tzelaftchad, who said, "why should the name of our father lose out from his family just because he had no son?" From here we see, that if he did have a son, the son would take precedence.
 - **Q:** Maybe it was the daughters of Tzelaftchad who said that, because the laws of inheritance were not yet given and they thought that a son would take precedence, but once the laws were given maybe the law in fact is that a son does not take precedence? **A:** Rather, we must come onto the earlier pasuk used by the Gemara.
 - **Ravina** said, we learn that a son takes precedence over a daughter from the pasuk of "hakarov eilav", which teaches that the closer relative takes precedence (and a son is considered to be a closer relative than a daughter).
 - **Q:** In what way is a son a closer relative? If it is from the fact that a son can stand in the father's place to do yi'ud, that doesn't show closeness. A daughter

can't do that because a woman cannot do yi'ud!? It can't be based on the fact that a son can redeem his father's field that was given to hekdesch, because we know that a son can do that based on the fact that he prevents his mother from being subject to yibum. Since a daughter would also prevent her mother from being subject to yibum it may be that a daughter may also be able to redeem her father's field that was given to hekdesch!? **A:** Rather, we must come onto the pasuk used by the Gemara earlier.

- We can say that we learn that a son takes precedence over a daughter from the pasuk of "v'hisnachaltem osam livneichem achareichem", which suggests that a son inherits, but not a daughter.
 - **Q:** Based on this understanding of the pasuk, when the pasuk says "l'maan yirbu yimeichem vimeivneichem", does that also mean to say that the bracha only applies to one's sons, but not his daughters? **A:** With regard to a bracha it surely means to include daughters as well. However, the pasuk of "v'hisnachaltem" discusses inheritance, and therefore can be teaching that a son takes precedence over a daughter.

V'HA'ACHIN MIN HA'AV NOCHALIN UMANCHILIN...

- **Q:** How do we know that only paternal brothers inherit, but maternal brothers do not? **A:** **Rabbah** said, we learn a gezeira shava from the sons of Yaakov. Just as there they were paternal, but not all were maternal, brothers. The same is with regard to inheritance.
 - **Q:** Why can't we learn this from the pasuk that says "mimishpachto v'yarash osah" (of his family and he shall inherit), and we have learned that only a paternal family is called "family"? **A:** In fact we do learn the concept that inheritance is limited to paternal brothers from this pasuk. **Rabbah's** drasha is used to teach that yibum is limited to paternal brothers as well.