



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 Beis

- The Gemara earlier quoted a Braisa which quoted a number of pesukim. One of those pesukim said that when a daughter stands to inherit her father's estate (e.g. she has no brothers), she must marry someone from her father's shevet, which would make sure that the estate stays within the shevet.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked, the pasuk refers to a case where the girl's mother and father are from different shevatim. This results in the mother's estate being transferred to her husband's shevet (via the daughter who is marrying someone from her husband's shevet). If so, the halacha that the daughter must marry within her father's shevet doesn't solve the problem of estates moving from one shevet to another!? **A:** It may be that we are not concerned about the mother's estate, because that has already been "removed" from her father's shevet when she got married.
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, who says that we consider the mother's estate as having already been removed from her shevet, and therefore are no longer concerned with further transfer? **A: R' Yeimar** said to **R' Ashi**, it must be that we consider the mother's estate as having already been removed from her shevet, because if not, the requirement to make the daughter marry a man from her father's shevet accomplishes nothing for the mother's estate.
      - **Q:** It may be that the Torah requires the daughter to marry a man whose father is from the same shevet as her father and whose mother is from the same shevet as her mother (thus leaving the estate in the same position as it was with the daughter)? **A:** If that is what the Torah meant, the pasuk should have said that this is the requirement. However, the pasuk only says that she must marry a man from her father's shevet!
        - It may be that she is actually required to marry a man whose father is from the same shevet as her father and whose mother is from the same shevet as her mother. The pasuk only mentions the requirement of the fathers being from the same shevet, because if it would mention the mothers also, we would be confused and think that it is even ok for the daughter to marry a man whose father comes from the shevet of her mother and whose mother comes from the shevet of her father.
- There are 2 Braisos regarding the requirement that a daughter who inherits her father's estate having to marry into her father's shevet. One Braisa says that the concern is that if she marries into another shevet, the estate would eventually be inherited by her son, who would be from a shevet other than that of her father, and the other Braisa says that the concern is that it would be inherited by her husband, who would be from a shevet different than that of her father.
  - The first Braisa bases its view on the pasuk of "v'lo sisov nachala livnei Yisrael mimateh ehl mateh". This must be referring to her son, and not her husband, because another pasuk refers to inheritance by the husband when it says "v'lo sisov nachala mimateh limateh acher".
  - The second Braisa bases its view on the pasuk of "v'lo sisov nachala mimateh limateh acher". This must be referring to her husband, and not her son, because another pasuk refers to inheritance by the son when it says "v'lo sisov nachala livnei Yisrael mimateh ehl mateh".
  - **Q:** Both Braisos agree that "v'lo sisov nachala mimateh limateh acher" refers to inheritance by the husband. How does this pasuk suggest that it is referring to the

husband? **A: Rabbah bar R' Shilah** said, the pasuk uses the word "ish", which must refer to the husband.

- **Q:** The other pasuk also uses the word "ish"!? **A:** Rather, **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, the pasuk uses the word "yidbiku" (attach) which must refer to a husband (a marital relationship).
- **Q:** The other pasuk also uses the word "yidbiku"!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said the pasuk says "yidbiku matos" (the shevatim attach) and this only happens through marriage and therefore refers to the husband. **A2: R' Ashi** said, the pasuk uses the word "acher", and a son would not be referred to as "acher". Therefore, it must refer to the husband.