

13.7.4

69a (משנה ה') → 70a (סיום הפרק)

1. אם אִדְנִיּוֹ יָתֵן לוֹ אִשָּׁה וְיִלְדָה לוֹ בָּנִים אוֹ בָנוֹת הָאִשָּׁה וְיִלְדֶיהָ תִּהְיֶה לְאִדְנִיָּהּ וְהוּא יֵצֵא בְּגִפּוֹ: שְׁמוֹת כּא.ד.
 2. וּבֵת כֶּהֵן כִּי תִהְיֶה אֶלְמָנָה וְגִרּוּשָׁה וְזָרַע אִין לָהּ... וְיִקְרָא פֶּרֶק כּבִּיב

- I אכילת תרומה: various problematic ביאות that do not affect תרומה
- a do not generate (nor invalidate from) תרומה
- i Examples:
- 1 If a ישראל seduced a בת כהן, she still eats תרומה
 - (a) If she became pregnant, she doesn't eat
 - (i) Question: why aren't we concerned that she's pregnant?
 1. support: ruling in משנה that women switched under חופה must be separated for 3 months
 2. answer #1: concern not extended to תרומה
 3. challenge: if given a גט "1 hour before death", woman may not eat תרומה
 4. answer #2: only concern about pregnancy if "married", not בזנות
 5. challenge (to statement about concern when "married"): a בת כהן marries a ישראל, she may eat תרומה immediately upon his death – no need to clarify if she's pregnant
 - a. answer (ר' חסדא): may only eat for first 40 days, when עובר "doesn't count"
 - (b) If the foetus was taken out, she eats
 - 2 if a כהן seduced/raped a בת ישראל, she doesn't eat תרומה (unless the man is לבוא בקהל)
 - (a) If she became pregnant, she still doesn't eat
 - (b) If and when she gives birth – she eats
 - b בת ישראל has no effect – doesn't invalidate a בת כהן and doesn't generate אכילה for a בת ישראל
 - i similarly, if a שוטה gave קידושין and died, she is exempt from חליצה
 - c dispute between רב/שמואל of status of baby born of ארוסה who had ייחוד with her ארוס in her father's house
 - i version #1:
 - 1 רב: child is a ממזר
 - (a) rationale: if she is promiscuous with her fiancé, she may be promiscuous with others; no רוב upon which to rely here
 - 2 שמואל: child is a ספק ממזר ("שתוקי")
 - 3 רבא's ruling should be followed if she demonstrates promiscuity with others; otherwise, it should be assumed to be the fiancé's
 - (a) proof: from our משנה: if the מפותה gives birth, she eats תרומה, based on the assumption that the child is the כהן's; ק"ו to this case, where she is already "permitted" to the fiancé
 - 4 אביי: perhaps our משנה refers to a case where no other paternity is possible (e.g. they are imprisoned together) and רב would extend his ruling even if she demonstrated no promiscuity vis-à-vis others (assuming that her loosened inhibitions with her fiancé reflect a general mien)
 - ii version #2: (if she had relations with her fiancé, all agree that the child is his; discussion only if we don't know)
 - 1 ממזר: רב
 - 2 רבא: reasonable only if she was loose with others but not with him;
 - (a) proof: our משנה wouldn't have to substantiate that it is his otherwise; ק"ו to a case where she is already "permitted" to the fiancé
 - 3 אביי: perhaps רב would extend it even if she was loose with him as well, משנה is a case where she demonstrated no promiscuity at all
 - d effect of an עבד
 - i only invalidates via ביאה but not (nor is he מאכיל) as זרע (no ייחוס as per v. 1)
 - e effect of a ממזר
 - i same as anyone else; invalidates and generates eating – v. 2 includes any זרע
- II משנה ג' – curiosity of the כה"ג who could invalidate while generating eating
- a case: בת כהן marries a ישראל, gives birth to daughter (invalidating her from eating); husband dies
 - i Daughter marries כהן, gives birth to son (husband then dies) who could be כה"ג –
 - ii His existence confirms mother's status as connected to כהונה allowing mother to eat
 - iii His existence confirms grandmother's status as connected to ישראל, disallowing her from eating