One who comes upon his daughter

- על בתו ¹ של

Overview

The משנה enumerates הבא על בתו, among those who do not receive קנס on account of מהוייב מיתח (since they are all מחוייב מיתח בי"ד). The issue here is how is it possible that there should be קנס at all by בא על בתו , since the קנס of a נערה belongs to the father! One possible explanation is that she was ונתגרשה before he was תוספות יוע לקמן לה, in which case the קנס belongs to her (according to μ). Our תוספות offers another option.

למאי דמוקי מתניתין בפרק בן סורר (סנהדרין דף עג,ב ושם) במפותה - 2

According to how רב פפא has established our משנה here, in פרק בן סורר that we are discussing a מפותה -

צריך לאוקמה בשבא עליה ובגרה 3 כדפרישית 4 לעיל:

It is necessary to establish this case, where he was בא עליה before she was a בוגרת, and the העמדה בדין, as I explained previously.

Summary

If the daughter was a מפותה, the העמדה בדין was after she became a בוגרת.

Thinking it over

Is there any difference, regarding הבא על בתו, whether he is exempt from paying her the קנס, because technically there is no קנס (since קנסה לאביה, or she is מוחל, etc.), or that he is exempt from paying on account of קים ליה בדרבה מיניה?

-

 $^{^{1}}$ This תוספות references the לו,ב on לו,ב.

² The daughter was seduced by the father. רב פפאן there found it necessary to establish our מפותה in the case of a הסומד in order to resolve a certain difficulty there, עיי"ש.] This presents a difficulty, since we are assuming that it is a situation of מפותה (see 'Overview'), so she receives no קנס קנס, for generally a מפותה (who was מחל ברצון) is לאביה the סומד is only when מוחל she cannot be מוחל but if it is קנסה לעצמה מוחל she is לאביה. The question remains, how is it possible the whole idea of קנס אל בתו של הבא על בתו but if she is a מפותה.

³ The פיתוי was when she was a ביתוי, however. she took her father to די"ם, to collect the קנס when she was a בוגרת, in which case the rule is that since the דוגרת was when she is a בוגרת the קנס belongs to her (see לקמן מא, בדין). We cannot argue that she was מחל for since the פיתוי took place before קנס belongs to her father and she cannot be shown that בגרה she can claim the קנס from her father. We need not establish it in a case of נמארסה ונתגרשה.

⁴ אשת ד"ה ועל אשת .