Our Mishnah delineates different cases of people permitted or forbidden to eat terumah. One is a Kohen who cohabited with a Yisroel; she cannot eat terumah until their child is born.

This opens up to a bigger sugya – when a Yisroel woman is married to a Kohen and has children, she continues to be allowed terumah even after he passes away. In what merit can she eat: does her husband’s hetter remain, or is the hetter now through her child?

The Rambam says that a child from a Kohen enables her to eat terumah “just like his father did” (Terumos 6:19). Rav Chaim Kanievsky shlit’a explains that the Rambam is hinting how it works. Just like when the father was alive she was allowed terumah since she was his “kinyan kaspo,” so too, his son continues the hetter. It’s as if if the father is still alive. (Derech Emunah; in Biyur Hahalacha he points out that the son can permit her even more than his father, as in our sugya, so the wording of the Rambam seems inexact. See his explanation.)

Other Rishonim expressed the same idea, such as Rashbam on Bava Basra 141b. Gilyonei Hashas (on daf 86) quotes a teshuva from Tashbetz concerning a woman who married a man with differing minhagim from her own. He rules that she should follow her husband’s kehilla, just like a Yisroel lady marrying a Kohen permits her terumah. “His wife is like his own body,” as Chazal put it. And even when he dies, if he leaves behind a son she still continues with his minhagim.

Why does the son’s presence help? We certainly won’t say her son is like her own body! It must be that a child does not permit terumah to his mother on his own accord, but simply keeps up her connection to her husband. Indeed, even a mamzer son of a Kohen permits her terumah, although a Kohen mamzer cannot eat terumah. Once again, we see that a child makes it as if his father is still alive.

However, other Rishonim seem to learn differently. On the earlier Mishnah (67a), “a fetus cannot feed terumah” to his mother, Rashi and the Nemukei Yosef comment that it’s because he is not yet considered a Kohen. Yet, asks Ateres Shmuel, Tosfos proves that even a non-Kohen grandson can allow his grandmother to eat terumah? He cites the resolution of Rav Avraham Gurwitz shlit’a
that grandchildren are a different category. And that is why a mamzer may allow terumah – to a grandmother. Besides, Rashi apparently holds that offspring of a Kohen permit their mother terumah by their own power. He notes that Rashi keeps stressing “she eats because of her son the Kohen,” implying that he is the factor here.

A third way to comprehend this halacha is that both aspects are true. Chazal derive this concept from two different pesukim, and there are two forms of it. In Niddah 44a it says that “those born in [a Kohen’s] house shall consume his food” may be read “shall give to eat” of terumah, to their mother. And the verse “she has no seed” teaches us that even a mamzer prohibits his Kohen grandmother from terumah, and the converse is that he enables a Yisroel to have it.

The two facets have different natures. That which a mamzer permits his mother to eat terumah is only when her union was through proper marriage. He merely maintains the bond between her mother and the Kohen. On the other hand, if the child is not born through marriage, only kosher offspring have this ability, if he himself may eat terumah. This train of thought was developed by several gedolim of our generation, particularly Rav Shmuel Rozovsky (Shiurei Rav Shmuel on daf 35a).