# Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o"h <br> Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"h 

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

And why does not the Tanna [of the Baraisa] also mention the case of the Kohen's gifts? ${ }^{1}$ - He can explain it to you [as follows]: When terumah is consecrated as such, since it is not redeemed, no mistake can be made with it. ${ }^{2}$ But in these cases [of the bechor and Kohen's gifts], since they are consecrated only for their value, the Kohen may make a mistake with them, thinking that their holiness is redeemed for the four zuz [i.e., the sela] and thus will come to treat them after the manner of chullin. ${ }^{3}$
${ }^{1}$ Of a butcher who separates the Kohen's gifts or that of a shepherd who gives up the bechor, in each of which cases he may receive a sela from another Jew who said to him: Here is a sela and give it etc.
${ }^{2}$ Since everybody is aware that terumah cannot lose its holiness, and therefore the Kohen on whose behalf the sela was paid by the Jew will not mistakenly use it as chullin.
${ }^{3}$ For if the Kohen chose to sell to an Jew the bechor's flesh, or the shoulder etc., he can do so and the latter is no longer required to eat the flesh roasted and with mustard, the royal manner of eating, as the Kohen is compelled to do, and thus he may be led to give the flesh to dogs to eat, treating it as mere chullin.
${ }^{4}$ Outside of Eretz Yisroel.
${ }^{5}$ The ruling mentioned here is not applied, because the giving of such terumah is only a Rabbinic enactment, and therefore we are not particular with reference to it.

Rava said: Terumah from abroad ${ }^{4}$ is not subject to the ruling of a Kohen who helps in the threshing floors. ${ }^{5}$ Rav Chama gave it to his attendant. ${ }^{6}$

Shmuel said: Terumah from abroad is nullified in a larger quantity. ${ }^{7}$ Rabbah ${ }^{8}$ nullified it in a larger quantity and used to eat it in the days of his tumah.

Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua, when he happened to have wine of terumah [from abroad], used to mix two ladles of chullin with one ladle of terumah, and after that he would add one [ladle] and take one. ${ }^{9}$
${ }^{6}$ Who was a Kohen, in lieu of payment for his services, and he had no fears about its being similar to the case of a Kohen who helps in the threshing floor.
${ }^{7}$ One measure of terumah is nullified in two of chullin, and it is not required that the one measure of terumah should be nullified in a hundred, as is the case with terumah in Eretz Yisroel. Also, after being nullified, the whole mixture may be eaten by a non-Kohen or by the Kohen himself in his days of tumah.
${ }^{8}$ Who was a Kohen, being a descendant from the House of Eli.
${ }^{9}$ And proceeded to act thus until all the terumah was nullified, there being always a greater quantity of chullin to neutralize the terumah.
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Shmuel further said: Terumah from abroad one may go on eating, leaving the separation for afterwards. ${ }^{10}$

Shmuel further said: Terumah from abroad is forbidden only for one whose tumah issues from his body; ${ }^{11}$ and this is the case only regarding eating, but regarding touching, there is no objection. ${ }^{12}$

Ravina said: Therefore a woman during menstruation may separate the cchallah ${ }^{13}$ and a Kohen who is a minor, ${ }^{14}$ eats it; and if there is not a Kohen who is a minor, she takes it on the point of the shovel ${ }^{15}$ and throws it in the oven, and then separates other challah ${ }^{16}$ in order that the law of challah may not be forgotten and an adult Kohen eats it.

Rav Nachman, Rav Amram and Rami bar Chama were sailing in a boat. Rav Amram went away to ease himself. A certain woman came, approached and asked them: Is it allowed for one made tamei through a corpse that he
${ }^{10}$ Even delaying the separation until the end.
${ }^{11}$ Such as a zav, zavah or niddah.
${ }^{12}$ And although he makes the terumah tamei, we do not trouble, as there is no obligation to preserve it in a state of taharah.
${ }^{13}$ The Kohen's share of the dough, since as regards coming in contact, there is no restriction on a woman who is a niddah. ${ }^{14}$ The woman herself being tamei through a tumah which issues from the body, and therefore only a minor but not an adult Kohen may eat it. And even an adult Kohen, if he bathes and purifies himself from pollution is considered as a minor in this respect. Another reason why it says 'a minor' is because a minor is not subject to pollution and thus did not become tamei. Still another reason is because challah can be of a small quantity which is only sufficient for a minor, as the expression later on 'on the point of a shovel' indicates.
should immerse and eat terumah from abroad? ${ }^{17}$ Said Rav Nachman to Rami bar Chama: And have we [in these days] sprinkling [on the tamei]? ${ }^{18}$ Rami bar Chama replied to him: Should we not take into consideration the views of the Elder? ${ }^{19}$ While this was going on, Rav Amram arrived. He said to them: This is what Rav said: One made tamei through a corpse, immerses and eats of the terumah from abroad. ${ }^{20}$ The law however is not in accordance with his view.

Mar Zutra reported in the name of Rav Sheishes: One made tamei through a sheretz immerses and eats the terumah from abroad. The law however is not in accordance with his view.

The Mishnah had stated: A bechor is eaten year by year etc. Since [the Mishnah] says: If a blemish appeared on it during its first year, we infer that we count according to its own year. ${ }^{21}$ From where is this proved: As Rav Yehudah reported in the name of Rav: Scripture says:
${ }^{15}$ Avoiding direct contact, for we are endeavoring as far as possible to prevent her touching it.
${ }^{16}$ This implies that where there is a minor who is a Kohen we do not demand the separation of two challahs. In places, however, near Eretz Yisroel, two challahs are required to be separated, one for the fire and the other for the Kohen.
${ }^{17}$ Without the sprinkling and waiting for sunset, for complete purification.
${ }^{18}$ As there is no sprinkling there is no need for awaiting sunset.
${ }^{19}$ Rav Amram. It is not proper to give a decision in his absence.
${ }^{20}$ And he does not need to wait for sunset in order to complete his purification.
${ }^{21}$ So that if it was born in Nissan, he may keep it until the following Nissan, and we do not need to consider that a new year commences in Tishrei in this connection.

You shall eat it before Hashem your God, year by year. Now, what year is it which enters into another? One must say it is the year of a bechor. ${ }^{22}$ The school of Rebbe, however, taught: The text 'year by year' denotes one day in this year and one day in the next year, and teaches that a bechor may be eaten for two days and a night. ${ }^{23}$ And according to the school of Rebbe, from where do they derive this? ${ }^{24}$ - They infer it from dedicated sacrifices. ${ }^{25}$ And as regards to dedicated sacrifices themselves, from where do we deduce this? - Said Rav Acha the son of Yaakov: Scripture says: A lamb of the first year, implying the year of the lamb, but not the year counted according to the Creation. ${ }^{26}$ And from where does Rav derive that a bechor may be eaten for two days and a night? - He derives it from the text: And the flesh of them shall be yours as the breast of the waving and as the right thigh: Scripture compares it to the breast of the waving and the right thigh of shelamim. Just as there they may be eaten for two days and a night, so here it may be eaten for two days and a night. And [what says] the other [to this]? - From that text one could say that it refers to the breast of the waving and the right thigh of a todah offering. And the other? - Scripture says: Shall be yours, thus adding another 'being' in connection with the bechor. And the other? - If we go by that text, we could say that it teaches concerning a blemished bechor that he gives it to the Kohen, as we do not find this stated [explicitly] in the whole of the Torah. And the other? - It says: And the flesh of them, intimating that an unblemished as well as a blemished bechor [may be eaten]. And the
${ }^{22}$ For such a year enters into the new year commencing in Tishrei.
${ }^{23}$ If he slaughters it on the last day of its first year he may continue eating it on the first day of the second.
other? - The text: And the flesh of them refers to the bechors of all the Jews.
${ }^{24}$ That the bechor's year is counted from its birth.
${ }^{25}$ From other dedicated sacrifices, which are offered up a year old counting from their birth.
${ }^{26}$ I.e., commencing in Tishrei.

