- הוא דלא מזבין לה הא יעודי מייעד לה

Selling, he cannot sell her, but מייעד, he can be מייעד her

Overview

רבה בר אבוה posed a query whether יעוד confers on the אמה העבריה a status of נישואין or אירוסין. In response the גמרא cited a ברייתא, which states that once (the master was מייעד her), the father cannot resell her. We can infer that the father is only limited in regard to selling her, but he can be מייעד her. מייעד explains what is meant that the father can be מייעד her.

תוספות responds to an anticipated difficulty:²

לאו דוקא יעודי מייעד אלא רצונו לומר קדושי מקדש לה³

The גמרא does not mean precisely that he cannot be מייעד her, rather the גמרא means to say that he can be מקדש her to someone (even) after the יעוד –

תוספות explains how the גמרא inferred from the ברייתא that the father can be מקדש her: 4

- דאי לא היה יכול לקדשה אמאי קאמר שוב אינו רשאי למוכרה For if the father cannot be מקדש her (after יעוד), why does the ברייתא state, 'the father can no longer sell her' -

פשיטא אפילו לקדשה אינו יכול כל שכן למוכרה - 5

It is obvious that he cannot sell her; if he is not able even to be מקדש her, **certainly** he is not permitted to sell her!

תוספות offers an alternate understanding of the גמרא:6

- ויש מיישבין הגירסא 7 זבוני הוא דלא מזבין לה הא לשאר מילי מצי עביד

 $^{^1}$ The אמרא concluded that if יעוד נישואין, the father loses all his rights to his daughter after נישואין, so how can you say הא יעודי מייעד לה.

² What does it mean that he can be מייעד her. He cannot sell her again to a master that the master should be מייעד her, since the ברייתא clearly states (that after יעוד) the father cannot sell her.

³ See (also) רש"י, ד"ה הא.

⁴ Perhaps the ברייתא means he cannot sell her and he also cannot be מקדש her.

⁵ The authority a father has over his daughter to be מקדש her is stronger than his power to sell her. He can sell her only while she is a מערה, but he can be מקדש her even while she is a נערה. Therefore if the rule was that the father cannot even be מקדש her, the ברייתא should have so stated and we would understand that he certainly cannot sell her. [Alternately it seems that the right to be שקדש her (where she is settled into married life, which is what every woman looks forward to), is much more benevolent and acceptable than selling a daughter into slavery. If he loses the beneficial right of קידושין, he should certainly be refused the (inconsiderate) right of selling her to עבדות.]

⁶ The previous explanation is wanting; why does the גמרא גמרא מיעד לה , when it really means to say הא קדושי מקדש לה.

 $^{^{7}}$ According to the אישבים of גירסא of הא יעודי מייעד לה is precise; however it does not mean that the father can be

And there are those who resolve the גירסא of הא יעודי מייעד, as follows: we infer from the ברייתא that the father cannot sell her, but regarding other things, the father can still do them as an authority over his daughter – including - קידושין -

- וקא מתמה גמרא הא יעודי מייעד לה כלומר היכי אמרינן דשאר מילי מצי עביד And the גמרא is astonished by this inference and asks, 'הא יעודי מייעד לה'; meaning how can you say that he has control over other things -

: "והא כבר יעודי מייעד לה ואי אמרת נישואין עושה אין לאביה רשות בה ודוחק sher, and if we assume that נישואין עושה is נישואין עושה, the father has no rights over her after נישואין. But it is an implausible understanding of the גמרא.

Summary

הא יעודי מייעד לה means that he can be מקדש her, or possibly יעודי מייעד is not part of the inference (which is the unstated הא מילי מצי עביד), but part of the question.

Thinking it over

What (other) difficulties are there with the explanation of the ויש מיישבים?9

. . . .

מייעד (meaning מקדש) her, but rather that the אדון was already מייעד her.

⁸ The simple understanding of the גמרא is that הא יעודי מייעד is an inference from the statement זבוני, but not as the יש מיישבים have it that הא יעודי מייעד לה is part of the question after an assumed, but not mentioned inference (הא לשאר מילי מצי עביד). This is not the (usual) syntax of the גמרא.

⁹ See footnotes # 7 & 8.