

These may eat *T'rumah*

הרי אלו אוכלים בתרומה –

OVERVIEW

שפחה ruled that if the baby of a כהנת got mixed up with the baby of her משרשיא, both children may eat תרומה. Our גמרא reconciles our גמרא with a seemingly contradictory גמרא.

anticipates a difficulty:

והא דאמרינן בפרק קמא דכתובות (דף יג,ב) גבי עשרה כהנים ופירש אחד מהם ובעל -
And this which stated in the first פרק of כתובות regarding ten כהנים who were before us and one of them separated himself from the group and was בועל a woman; the rule is -

הולד שתוקי¹ שמשתיקין אותו מדין כהונה² -
That the child is a שתוקי, meaning that we silence him from the rights of כהונה -
מדכתיב³ והיתה לו ולזרעו אחריו שיהא זרעו מיוחס אחריו⁴ -
Since it is written, 'and (the כהונה) shall be for him and his children after him' we expound this to mean that his children should be identified after him (the father) –

responds:

הא אמרינן בפרק נושאים על האנוסה (יבמות דף ק,ב) דזרעו מיוחס אחריו דרבנן -
However the גמרא states in האנוסה על האנוסה פרק נושאים that this requirement of זרעו is a Rabbinic decree -
וכי גזור רבנן בזנות⁵ בנישואין לא גזרו⁶ -
And when did the רבנן ordain this decree only in a case of זנות, however if it was a legitimate marriage they did not issue this decree –

offers an alternate solution:

¹ The term שתוקי (silenced) is generally used regarding a child whose father is not known. Whenever the child addresses anyone as his father, his mother silences him saying שתוק שתוק (this is not your father).

² See ד"ה מדין רש"י who writes; תרומה ולא יאכל תרומה.

³ במדבר (פנחס) כה,יג.

⁴ In the case of the ten כהנים, however, even though we know that the father of this child is a כהן, nevertheless since we cannot link him directly to his father, he may not eat תרומה. Similarly in the case of משרשיא since none of the children (one of them who is a כהן) can identify his father, they should not be permitted to eat תרומה. See 'Thinking it over' # 2.

⁵ In the case of the ten כהנים, the כהן who was פירש was בזנות, therefore his child is a שתוקי.

⁶ Here where the children were mixed up, the child was born from a proper נישואין, therefore there is no גזירה and he may eat תרומה.

אי נמי⁷ הכא לאחר שנולדו נתערבו:

Or you may **also** say that **here they became mixed up after they were born**; initially we were aware who was the child of the כהן and who his father was, therefore he is מיוחס even though that later they became mixed up

SUMMARY

The children may eat תרומה either because the requirement of מיוחס אחריו only excludes a case of זנות, not of נישואין, or the children were initially identified and got mixed up later.

THINKING IT OVER

1. Why is there a need for a second answer⁸ since the גמרא in יבמות states that בזנות גזרו בנישואין לא גזרו, therefore they may eat תרומה?!

2. In our case we know who is the father of the בן כהן, we just do not know which child is the בן כהן; obviously the בן שפחה does not need מיוחס אחריו, so we know who the father of the בן כהן is; it is not comparable to the case of עשרה כהנים where we do not know who the father is. How can תוספות compare the two cases?!

⁷ See 'Thinking it over' #1. See (also) אוצר מפרשי התלמוד # 241.

⁸ See footnote # 7.