



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h**

**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

The *Gemora* attempts to prove from the following *Baraisa* that one who recites the Priestly Blessing is assumed to be genealogically fit: It can be presumed that someone is a *Kohen* if we have observed him reciting the Priestly Blessing in Bavel (for they investigated there to see if he was a *Kohen* prior to allowing him to recite the Blessing), or if he ate *chalah* (a certain part of the dough must be separated and given to a *Kohen*; it has similar *halachos* of *terumah*) in Surya (a land that was conquered privately by David, but nevertheless considered part of *Eretz Yisroel*, according to this *Tanna*), or that he received the Kohanic gifts (the *foreleg, jaw and abomasums* from a non-consecrated slaughtered animal).

We see from this *Baraisa* that one who recites the Priestly Blessing is presumed to be a *Kohen*, and it would stand to reason that he is regarded as being genealogically fit. The *Gemora* rejects the proof: Perhaps the *Baraisa* only means that he is permitted to eat *terumah*.

The *Gemora* asks: But this case should be similar to the other case of the *Baraisa*, where one who ate *chalah* is presumed to be a *Kohen*. Just as one who eats *chalah* is presumed to be genealogically fit, so too, one who recites the Priestly Blessing is presumed to be genealogically fit.

The *Gemora* answers (thereby rejecting the proof from the *Baraisa*): No, the eating of the *chalah* itself merely [serves as evidence] regarding *terumah*, [for] he holds that *chalah* nowadays is Rabbinical and *terumah* is Biblical and one raises [a person] from Rabbinical *chalah* to Biblical *terumah*, and [it is] as Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua reversed [the words of] the Rabbis. (25a2 – 25a3)

The *Gemora* cites another *Baraisa*: It can be presumed that someone is a *Kohen* if we observed him reciting the Priestly Blessing or that he received *terumah* at the granaries in *Eretz Yisroel*. However, in Surya or in any place that the messengers from *Beis Din* regarding Rosh Chodesh would reach (there would be established courts in those locations), the Priestly Blessing would be a proof, but not the receiving of *terumah* (since there, *terumah*, was only a Rabbinical obligation). Bavel has the same *halacha* as Surya. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said: In former times, Alexandria of Egypt was regarded like Surya since there were established *Beis Din*'s there.

We see from this *Baraisa* that one who recites the Priestly Blessing is presumed to be a *Kohen*, and it would stand to reason that he is regarded as being genealogically fit. The *Gemora* rejects the proof: Perhaps the *Baraisa* only means that he is permitted to eat *chalah*.

The *Gemora* asks: But this case should be similar to the other case of the *Baraisa*, where one who received *terumah* at the granaries is presumed to be a *Kohen*. Just as one who received *terumah* at the granaries is presumed to be genealogically fit, so too, one who recites the Priestly Blessing is presumed to be genealogically fit.

The *Gemora* answers (thereby rejecting the proof from the *Baraisa*): The *Baraisa* means that one who ate *terumah*, which nowadays, is only Rabbinical, is presumed to be a *Kohen*, and we elevate him to the status of allowing him to eat *chalah* nowadays, which is Biblical.

The *Gemora* provides support that nowadays, *terumah* is Rabbinical and *chalah* is Biblical. For Rav Huna, the son of Rabbi Yehoshua found the Rabbis in the Beis Medrash of Rav sitting and saying: Even according to the one who says that *terumah* nowadays is only Rabbinical, *chalah* is Biblical, for during the seven years that they conquered *Eretz Yisroel* and during the seven years that they divided up the land, there was an obligation upon them to separate *chalah*, but there was no obligation upon them to separate *terumah*. And I said to them: On the contrary; even according to the one who says that *terumah* in these days is Biblical, *chalah* is Rabbinical. For it was taught in a *Baraisa*: [It is written:] ‘In your coming’. If ‘in your coming,’ you might think as soon as two or three spies had entered it? [Therefore] it is said in your coming’. I have spoken of the coming of all and not of the coming of a portion of you. Now when Ezra brought them up [to *Eretz Yisroel*], not all of them went up with him (so there is no Biblical obligation to separate *chalah* nowadays). (25a3 – 25b1)

The *Gemora* cites another *Baraisa*: It can be presumed that someone is a *Kohen* if we observed him reciting the Priestly Blessing or that he received *terumah* at the granaries in *Eretz Yisroel*, or that there was testimony regarding his parents.

The *Gemora* asks: If there was testimony, there is no necessity for any presumptions?

The *Gemora* explains the *Baraisa*: The Priestly Blessing is compared to testimony. Just as testimony regarding his parents establishes him to be genealogically fit, so too, one who recites the Priestly Blessing is presumed to be genealogically fit.

The *Gemora* rejects the proof: The *Baraisa* means that testimony regarding a presumption is regarded as a presumption itself (*witnesses testified that they observed this man reciting the Priestly Blessing*).

The *Gemora* provides an example for this: A man once came before Rabbi Ami and said to him, “I presume that this other

fellow is a *Kohen*.” Rabbi Ami asked him, “What did you see?” He answered him, “I saw that he read first in the Synagogue.” Rabbi Ami asked him, “Did he read as a *Kohen* or as a prominent man?” The man replied, “A Levi read immediately after him (*indicating that the former was indeed a Kohen*). Rabbi Ami elevated him to the *Kehunah* on the strength of the man’s testimony. (25b1)

The *Gemora* records a related incident and ruling: A man once came before Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi and said to him, “I presume that this other fellow is a *Levi*.” Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi asked him, “What did you see?” He answered him, “I saw that he read second in the Synagogue.” Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi asked him, “Did he read as a *Levi* or as a prominent man?” The man replied, “A *Kohen* read immediately before him (*indicating that the former was indeed a Levi*). Rabbi Ami elevated him to the status of *Levi* on the strength of the man’s testimony. (25b1)

The *Gemora* records a related incident and ruling: A man once came before Rish Lakish to him, “I presume that this other fellow is a *Kohen*.” Rish Lakish asked him, “What did you see?” He answered him, “I saw that he read first in the Synagogue.” Rish Lakish asked further, “Did you observe that he received *terumah* at the granaries?” Rabbi Elozar asked Rish Lakish, “And if there are no granaries, will we be forced to abolish *Kehunah*?”

A different time, Rish Lakish and Rabbi Elozar were sitting before Rabbi Yochanan. A similar case (*as above*) was presented to Rabbi Yochanan. Rish Lakish asked him, “Did you observe that he received *terumah* at the granaries?” Rabbi Yochanan asked Rish Lakish, “And if there are no granaries, will we be forced to abolish *Kehunah*?” Rish Lakish turned and looked at Rabbi Elozar with displeasure and said, “You have heard something from the blacksmith’s son (*Rabbi Yochanan*) and you did not say it to us in his name?” (25b2)

Rebbe and Rabbi Chiya issued rulings: One elevated a son to the *Kehunah* on the testimony of his father, and one



elevated a brother to the status of *Levi* on the testimony of his brother.

The *Gemora* states: We can prove that it was Rebbe who elevated a son to the *Kehunah* on the testimony of his father, for it has been taught in the following *Baraisa*: If one comes and says, "This is my son and he is a *Kohen*," he is believed with respect to allowing him to eat *terumah*, but he is not believed with respect to allowing him to marry a woman (*of untainted descent*). These are the words of Rebbe. Rabbi Chiya said to him: If you believe him in respect to *terumah*, believe him also in respect to marrying a woman, and if you do not believe him to allow him to marry a woman, do not believe him in respect to *terumah*. Rebbe answered him: I believed him to allow him to eat *terumah* because it is the father's hands to allow him eat *terumah*, but I do not believe him in respect to marrying a woman because that is not in his hands.

The *Gemora* concludes that this indeed is a proof. And since it was Rebbe who elevated the son to the *Kehunah* on the testimony of his father, it follows that it was Rabbi Chiya who elevated the brother to the status of *Levi* on the testimony of his brother.

The *Gemora* asks: But according to Rabbi Chiya, what is the difference between the two cases? Why is the son different that he is not elevated because he is related to his father, a brother too, should not be elevated because he is related to his brother? The *Gemora* answers: The brother is believed when he was talking casually (*without being aware of its legal ramifications*).

The *Gemora* provides an example for this: Rav Yehudah related in the name of Shmuel: It happened once that a man was talking casually and said, "I remember when I was a child and rode on my father's shoulder, they brought me out from school and removed my shirt and immersed me in a *mikvah* so that I could eat *terumah* in the evening." And Rabbi Chiya continued the man's report, "And my friends separated from me and called me 'Yochanan, the *chalah*-eater.'" And Rebbe

elevated him to the *Kehunah* on the strength of his own testimony. (25b2 – 26a1)

#### Point to Ponder

Our *Gemora* records that the Jewish people weren't obligated to separate *terumos* and *ma'asros* during the seven years in which they conquered the land of Israel and the seven years in which they divided it up among the tribes.

Rashi explains that this is because the Torah only requires one to tithe the crops which you planted and which are uniquely yours, which wasn't the case until the land had been divided.

Rav Tzvi Pesach Frank asks: According to this reasoning, why is one ever obligated to tithe produce which grew in Jerusalem, which was never divided up among the tribes, and which should be considered as the rest of the land of Israel prior to its division among the tribes?

#### DAILY MASHAL

##### Blessings with One Hand

It is written: *Like so you should bless the Children of Israel*. The *Gemora* states that this verse refers to the "raising of the hands" (the Priestly Blessing), and our *Gemora* derives from here: "You" (Kohanim) should bless, and not *zarim* (non-Kohanim).

The Torah Temimah writes: I heard from a trustworthy person in Vilna, who heard from his elderly father that heard from the Goan Rav Yechezkel Landa, head of the Bais Din in Vilna that at the chuppah of Rav Landa, the Vilna Goan placed one hand on Rav Landau's head when he conveyed the Priestly Blessing. When asked about the incident, the Vilna Gaon said that we only find blessing with two hands by the Kohanim in the Bais HaMikdash.

It appears to the Torah Temimah that many Rabbis and righteous people are not careful about this matter and offer blessings to others with two hands.