

NOTES

Tzihin – ציחין: According to the commentaries, tzihin is similar to tzahana. However, it might be considered a more specific term, thereby excluding minced sardines (Tosafot; Commentary on Nedarim), or a more general term, thereby including fish brine and gravy as well (Ran; Rosh).

Whey [kum] – קום: Most commentaries define this as milk serum. The Ra'avad, however, maintains that kum is the milk itself, which is hardened before being made into cheese.

HALAKHA

Milk is forbidden to him – מן החלב: One who vows that milk is forbidden to him is permitted to partake of whey, and one who vows that whey is forbidden to him is permitted to partake of milk (Rambam Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhhot Nedarim 9:8; Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 217:11).

Cheese is forbidden to him – מן הגבינה: One who vows that cheese is forbidden to him is prohibited from eating all types of cheese, whether salted, unsalted, moist, or dry (Rambam Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhhot Nedarim 9:8; Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 217:11).

LANGUAGE

Whey [kum] – קום: From the root kuf, vav, mem, which means to stand. It was expanded to denote freezing, congealing, and souring. The part of the milk that congeals becomes cheese, and what remains from the standing milk is whey, a liquid that was mixed into drinks or dough.

גמ' תנאי רבי שמעון בן אלעזר אומר: "דג שאני טועם" – אסור בגדולים ומותר בקטנים: "דגה שאני טועם" – אסור בקטנים ומותר בגדולים: "דג דגה שאני טועם" – אסור בין בגדולים בין בקטנים.

אמר ליה רב פפא לאביי: ממאי ד'דג שאני טועם' גדול הוא – דכתיב 'וימן ה' דג גדול לבלוע את יונה'. והכתיב 'ויתפלל יונה אל ה' אלהיו ממעי הדגה!'

הא לא קשיא; דלמא פליטה דג גדול ובלעיה דג קטן. אלא 'והדגה אשר באור מתה' – קטנים מתו גדולים לא מתו! אלא: דגה משמע גדולים ומשמע קטנים, ובגדרים הלך אחר לשון בני אדם.

"הנודר מן הצחנה" כו'. אמר ליה רבינא לרב אשי: אמר "הרי עלי ציחין" מאי? תיבעי.

מתני' הנודר מן החלב מותר בקום, ורבי יוסי אוסר. מן הקום – מותר בחלב. אבא שאול אומר: הנודר מן הגבינה – אסור בה בין מלוחה וטפלה. הנודר מן הבשר

GEMARA It is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: If one says: Fish [dag] is konam for me, and for that reason I will not taste it, he is prohibited from eating large fish and permitted to eat small fish. If one says: Fish [daga] is konam for me, and for that reason I will not taste it, he is prohibited from eating small fish and permitted to eat large ones, as this term is commonly used with regard to small fish. If one says: Fish [dag] or fish [daga] are konam for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he is prohibited from eating both large and small fish.

Rav Pappa said to Abaye: From where is it derived that the phrase: Fish [dag] is konam for me, and for that reason I will not taste it, a reference to a large fish? As it is written: "And the Lord prepared a great fish [dag] to swallow up Jonah" (Jonah 2:1). The Gemara asks: But isn't it written in the following verse: "Then Jonah prayed to the Lord his God out of the belly of the fish [daga]" (Jonah 2:2)? This indicates that a large fish can be referred to as a daga as well.

The Gemara answers: This is not difficult, as perhaps a large fish spat him out and a small fish then swallowed him. Rather, the baraita is difficult according to the following verse: "And the fish [daga] that were in the river died" (Exodus 7:21). Is it possible that the small fish died but the large ones did not die? The Gemara answers: Rather, the biblical word daga evidently indicates large fish and also indicates small fish. However, with regard to vows one should follow the language of people, and the word daga is used only in reference to small fish.

The mishna teaches that one who vows that tzahana is forbidden to him is prohibited from eating minced sardines as well, but he is permitted to eat fish brine and to eat fish gravy. Ravina said to Rav Ashi: If one said: Tzihin^N are hereby forbidden to me, what is the halakha? Is this the same as tzahana or not? The dilemma remains unresolved.

MISHNA One who vows that milk is forbidden to him^H is permitted to partake of whey [kum],^N the liquid that separates from milk when it is made into cheese. But Rabbi Yosei prohibits him from partaking of whey. If one vows that whey is forbidden to him, he is permitted to partake of milk. Abba Shaul says: One who vows that cheese is forbidden to him^H is prohibited from eating it whether it is salted or unsalted. One who vows that meat is forbidden to him

Perek VI Daf 52 Amud a

NOTES

Sediments of boiled meat [kifa] – קיפה: Most commentaries explain that these are the leftover bits of meat, gravy, or stew that stick to the sides of the pot and harden. The Rambam, on the other hand, defines kifa as spices.

HALAKHA

When he says: This meat is forbidden to me – בזמן שיאמר בשר זה עלי: If one vows the following: This meat is hereby forbidden to me, he is prohibited from eating all foods to which that particular piece of meat gave flavor, including its gravy and spices (Rambam Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhhot Nedarim 5:11; Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a 216:9).

מותר ברוטב ובקיפה, ורבי יהודה אוסר. is permitted to eat gravy and sediments of boiled meat [kifa].^N But Rabbi Yehuda maintains that he is prohibited from eating them.

אמר רבי יהודה: מעשה ואסר עלינו רבי טרפון בביצים שנתבשלו עמו. אמרו לו: כן הדבר, אימתי – בזמן שיאמר "בשר זה עלי", שהנודר מן הדבר ונתערב באחר, אם יש בו בנותן טעם – אסור.

Rabbi Yehuda said: There was an incident where one took such a vow and Rabbi Tarfon prohibited us from even eggs that were cooked with meat. The Rabbis said to him: Indeed so, but when is this the halakha? When he says: This meat is forbidden to me,^H referring to a specific piece of meat. This is because in the case of one who vows that an item is forbidden to him, and it becomes mixed into another item, if the latter contains an amount of the forbidden food that gives it flavor, i.e., the forbidden food can be tasted in the permitted food, the mixture is forbidden. However, if one vows that meat in general is forbidden to him, without specifying a particular piece, only the meat itself is forbidden, not the gravy, sediments, or eggs cooked with that meat.

הַנּוֹדֵר מִן הַיַּיִן – מוֹתֵר בְּתַבְשִׁיל שְׂיֵשׁ בּוֹ טַעַם יַיִן. אָמַר "קוֹנָם יֵינִי זֶה שְׂאִינִי טוֹעִים" וְנִפְלַל לְתַבְשִׁיל, אִם יֵשׁ בּוֹ בְּנוֹתָן טַעַם – הֲרִי זֶה אָסוּר.

Likewise, **one who vows that wine is forbidden to him is permitted to eat a cooked dish that has the flavor of wine.**^N However, if he said: **Wine is *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste it, and the wine fell into a cooked dish, if the dish contains an amount of the wine that gives it flavor, it is forbidden.**

NOTES

Permitted to eat a cooked dish that has the flavor of wine – מוֹתֵר בְּתַבְשִׁיל שְׂיֵשׁ בּוֹ טַעַם יַיִן: It is permitted because the vow mentions wine, not the taste of wine. In the next case of the mishna, where he says: This wine, the vow refers to specific wine, and therefore, even a taste of it violates the vow. This explanation is according to the standard version of the Talmud. However, according to the version of the text before the Ran, the vow in the next case does not refer to specific wine. He explains that in that case the mixture is forbidden because the vow refers to tasting wine, not drinking it.

Perek VI
Daf 52 Amud b

גַּמְ' וְרַמְיָנָהּ: "מִן הַעֲדָשִׁים" – אָסוּר בְּאִשִּׁישִׁים, וְרַבִּי יוֹסִי מוֹתֵיר!

GEMARA The mishna cited a dispute between Rabbi Yosei and the Rabbis, in which Rabbi Yosei ruled that one who vows that milk is forbidden to him is prohibited from eating whey as well. **And the Gemara raises a contradiction between this ruling and Rabbi Yosei's opinion in a later mishna (53b): One who vows that lentils are forbidden to him is prohibited from eating *ashishim*,^{NL} a dish made from lentils. But Rabbi Yosei permits it. Apparently, Rabbi Yosei holds that if the forbidden food changes in form, it is permitted, contrary to his opinion with regard to whey.**

לֹא קִשְׂיָא: מִרְ בֵּי אֶתְרֵיהּ וּמִרְ בֵּי אֶתְרֵיהּ. בְּאֶתְרָא דְרַבְנִין קָרוּ לְחֵלְבָא חֵלְבָא וְלִקְוִמָא קְוִמָא, בְּאֶתְרֵיהּ דְרַבִּי יוֹסִי לִקְוִמָא נִמְי קָרוּ לִיהּ "קְוִמָא דְחֵלְבָא".

The Gemara answers: This is **not difficult**. The opinion of this Sage is **in accordance with the custom of his locale, and the opinion of that Sage in accordance with the custom of his locale. In the Rabbis' locale^{NH} they call milk, milk and whey, whey, whereas in Rabbi Yosei's locale they also call whey, milk whey.** In the latter location, the word milk is used in reference to whey, and therefore one who vows there that milk is forbidden to him is prohibited from eating whey as well.

LANGUAGE

Ashishim – אִשִּׁישִׁים: The source of this word is obscure. Although it appears in the Bible (see Hosea 3:1), most Bible commentaries interpret that it means goblets or cups, perhaps similar to the word *ashashit*, lantern. This interpretation does not fit the context of the Gemara. Other biblical commentaries, however, explain that it means cakes (Rashi on Song of Songs 2:5), which fits the context here according to the Jerusalem Talmud.

HALAKHA

בְּאֶתְרָא דְרַבְנִין וכו' – The Rema cites the Ran, that in a place where whey is called milk whey, one who vows that milk is forbidden to him is prohibited from eating whey as well (*Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'at* 217:11).

תִּנְיָא: הַנּוֹדֵר מִן הַחֶלֶב – מוֹתֵר בְּקוֹם, מִן הַקּוֹם – מוֹתֵר בְּחֶלֶב. מִן הַחֶלֶב – מוֹתֵר בְּגִבְיָנָה, מִן הַגִּבְיָנָה – מוֹתֵר בְּחֶלֶב. מִן הָרוֹטֵב – מוֹתֵר בְּקִיפָה, מִן הַקִּיפָה – מוֹתֵר בְּרוֹטֵב. אִם אָמַר "בְּשֵׁר זֶה עָלַי" – אָסוּר בּוֹ וּבְרוֹטְבוֹ וּבְקִיפוֹ.

It is taught in a *baraita*: **One who vows that milk is forbidden to him is permitted to partake of whey. One who vows that whey is forbidden to him is permitted to partake of milk. One who vows that milk is forbidden to him is permitted to eat cheese. One who vows that cheese is forbidden to him is permitted to partake of milk. One who vows that gravy is forbidden to him is permitted to eat sediments of boiled meat. One who vows that sediments of boiled meat are forbidden to him is permitted to eat gravy. If one said: This piece of meat is hereby forbidden to me, he is prohibited from eating it, and from its gravy, and from its sediments.**

הַנּוֹדֵר מִן הַיַּיִן – מוֹתֵר בְּתַבְשִׁיל שְׂיֵשׁ בּוֹ טַעַם יַיִן. אָמַר "קוֹנָם יֵינִי זֶה שְׂאִינִי טוֹעִים" וְנִפְלַל לְתוֹךְ הַתַּבְשִׁיל, אִם יֵשׁ בּוֹ טַעַם יַיִן – הֲרִי זֶה אָסוּר.

One who vows: Wine is forbidden to me, is permitted to eat a cooked dish that has the flavor of wine. However, if he said: This wine is *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste it, and the wine fell into a cooked dish, if the dish contains an amount of the wine that gives it flavor, it is forbidden.

NOTES

Ashishim – אִשִּׁישִׁים: The Rambam defines *ashishim* as a dish made from lentils and flour. In the Commentary on *Nedarim*, *ashishim* is defined as bread into which lentil flour was mixed. The Ran cites the Jerusalem Talmud, in which it is stated that *ashishim* consists of fried lentils flavored with honey. According to *Tosafot* and the Meiri, *ashishim* is the waste product of lentils.

that in the case of *ashishim* the opposite was true. Where the Rabbis lived it was referred to as lentil *ashishim*, and in Rabbi Yosei's town it was merely called *ashishim*. Therefore, a prohibition on lentils includes *ashishim* only in the location of the Rabbis.

In the Rabbis' locale, etc. – בְּאֶתְרָא דְרַבְנִין וכו' – According to the Commentary on *Nedarim*, the Gemara's answer is that there is no fundamental dispute between Rabbi Yosei and the Rabbis. Rather, the ruling depends on the vernacular. In Rabbi Yosei's locale, whey was referred to as milk whey, and therefore a prohibition on milk would include whey, whereas in the Rabbis' locale whey was simply called whey. Accordingly, the proposition must logically continue

The Ran, however, contends that there is a fundamental disagreement between Rabbi Yosei and the Rabbis. Rabbi Yosei maintains that the criteria for being included as the object of a vow is being identified by name. Therefore, *ashishim* is not included in a prohibition on lentils, although it is a lentil dish. Whey, however, is referred to as milk whey in the vernacular, and it is therefore included in a prohibition on milk. Conversely, the Rabbis maintain that anything that has been substantially transformed from its previous state is no longer included in the vow. Consequently, whey is permitted while *ashishim* is forbidden.

Grapes are forbidden to him, etc. – מן הענבים וכו'. One who vows that grapes are forbidden to him is permitted to partake of wine, even if it is freshly squeezed. Similarly, one who vows that olives are forbidden to him is permitted to consume olive oil (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 5:13; 9:14; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 216:12).

Is it specifically because he said: That I will not taste them – שאיני טועם דוקא – One who vows that these grapes are forbidden to him is prohibited from eating the grapes, their juice, and anything to which they give flavor. Likewise, if one says: Grapes are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he is prohibited from tasting them, their juice, and anything to which they give flavor. The reason is that Rami bar Hama's dilemma was left unresolved, and where there is an uncertainty with regard to a Torah prohibition, one must act stringently (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 5:13; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 216:12).

NOTES

Is it specifically because he said these, etc. – אלו. This dilemma is explained in several ways. The Rid maintains that Rami bar Hama's dilemma is whether oil and wine are forbidden only if one said both the word these and the phrase: I will not taste, or is either element of the vow sufficient. The Rashba disagrees, claiming that reference to tasting is certainly not sufficient. Rather, the dilemma is whether reference to a specific type of produce is enough to render its juice forbidden, or whether reference to tasting must be included as well. The Ran explains that it is obvious to Rami bar Hama that one of these two elements is sufficient and the other is not. He is uncertain as to which element is the sufficient one.

מתני' הגודר מן הענבים – מותר ביין, מן הזיתים – מותר בשמן. אמר "קונם זיתים וענבים אלו שאיני טועם" – אסור בהן וביוצא מהן.

גמ' בעי רמי בר חמא: "אלו דוקא, או שאיני טועם" דוקא?

אי סלקא דעתך "אלו" דוקא: "שאיני טועם" למה לי? הא קא משמע לן: דאף על גב דאמר "שאיני טועם" אי דאמר "אלו" – מיתסר, ואי לא – לא.

אמר רבא, תא שמע: "קונם פירות האלו עליו" "קונם הן לפי" – אסור בחילופיהן ובגידוליהן. הא ביוצא מהן – מותר!

הוא הדין דאפילו ביוצא מהן אסור, והא עדיפא ליה לאשמועינן, דחילופיהן בגידוליהן דמי.

תא שמע: "שאיני אוכל" ו"שאיני טועם" – מותר בחילופיהן ובגידוליהן. הא היוצא מהן – אסור. אידי דלא נסיב ברישא יוצא מהן, לא נסיב נמי בסיפא יוצא מהן.

תא שמע, אמר רבי יהודה: מעשה ואסור רבי טרפון עלי ביצים שנתבשלו עמו. אמרו לו: אימתי – בזמן שאמר "בשר זה עלי", שהגודר מן הדבר ונתערב באחר, ויש בו בנותן טעם – הרי זה אסור.

ב"אלו" לא קא מיבעיא לן דדוקא הוא. כי מיבעיא לן ב"שאיני טועם", דוקא או לאו דוקא?

MISHNA One who vows that grapes are forbidden to him^h is permitted to partake of wine. One who vows that olives are forbidden to him is permitted to partake of oil. However, if one said: Olives and grapes are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste these items, he is prohibited from tasting them and the wine and oil that emerge from them.

GEMARA With regard to the last ruling in the mishna, that one who vows: Olives and grapes are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste these items, he is prohibited from tasting them and the wine and oil that emerge from them, Rami bar Hama raises a dilemma: Is it specifically because he said these,ⁿ i.e., he referred to specific olives or grapes, or is it specifically because he said: For that reason I will not taste,^h i.e., he referred not to eating but to tasting?

The Gemara asks: If it enters your mind that it is specifically because he said these, why do I need the phrase: That I will not taste? The Gemara answers: This teaches us that even if he said: That I will not taste, only if he said the word these is he prohibited from tasting oil or wine, but if he did not say the word these, he is not prohibited from doing so. The dilemma therefore cannot be resolved by inference from the phrasing of the vow in the mishna.

Rava said: Come and hear a resolution to this dilemma from the mishna below (57a): If one says: This produce is *konam* upon me, or: It is *konam* to my mouth, he is prohibited from eating their replacements and anything that grows from them. It may be inferred that liquids that emerge from them are permitted. Evidently, referring to specific produce is not sufficient to render their juice forbidden. Rather, the prohibition in the mishna is apparently due to the phrase: And for that reason I will not taste.

The Gemara refutes this proof: The same ruling as in the mishna above is true with regard to liquids that emerge from the produce; they too are forbidden. And the reason this ruling isn't mentioned there is that it is preferable for that mishna to teach us that their replacements are forbidden just like what grows from them is forbidden, although they contain no substance of the forbidden item.

Come and hear a resolution from the continuation of that same mishna: If one says: This produce is *konam* upon me, and for that reason I will not eat them, or: This produce is *konam* upon me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he is permitted to eat their replacements and anything that grows from them. It may be inferred that liquids that emerge from them are forbidden. The Gemara rejects this argument: Since that mishna did not cite liquids that emerge from them in the first clause, it did not cite liquids that emerge from them in the latter clause either. Therefore, it cannot be inferred that liquids that come from the produce are forbidden.

Come and hear a resolution from the previous mishna (52a): Rabbi Yehuda said: There was an incident where Rabbi Tarfon prohibited me from eating even eggs that were cooked with meat. The Rabbis said to him: Indeed so, but when is this the *halakha*? When the one who took the vow said: This meat is forbidden to me, referring to a specific piece of meat. This is because in the case of one who vows that something is forbidden to him and it gets mixed into another food, and the latter food contains an amount of the forbidden food that gives it flavor, i.e., the prohibited food can be tasted in the permitted food, the mixture is forbidden. Evidently, referring to a specific food causes what emerges from it to be forbidden as well.

The Gemara reinterprets the dilemma: We do not raise the dilemma with regard to the word these, as using specifically this word is certainly sufficient to render the liquids that come from the produce forbidden. When we raise a dilemma, it is with regard to the phrase: That I will not taste it. Is this phrase mentioned by the mishna specifically to teach that using it in a vow is sufficient to render the juice forbidden, or is it not mentioned specifically for that purpose?

תא שמע: "דג דגים שאיני טועם" – אסור בהן, בין גדולים בין קטנים, בין חיים בין מבושלים, ומותר בטריית טרופה ובציר.

אמר רבא: וכבר יצא מהן.

Come and hear a resolution from the mishna above (51b): If one vows: **Fish or fishes are *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste them, he is prohibited with regard to all of them, whether large fish or small, and whether raw or cooked. But he is permitted to taste minced sardines and to taste fish brine.** The phrase: I will not taste, clearly does not render fish brine forbidden, although it contains that which emerged from fish.

Rava said: **But** there is no evidence from here, as the fish brine that is permitted by the mishna may be referring to brine that **already emerged from them** before the vow was taken, and was therefore not included in the fish that were rendered forbidden by the vow. The dilemma therefore remains unresolved.

Perek VI

Daf 53 Amud a

מתני' הנודר מן התמרים – מותר בדבש תמרים, מסתוניות – מותר בחומץ סתוניות. רבי יהודה בן בתירא אומר: כל ששם תולדתו קרויה עליו, ונודר הימנו – אסור ביצא הימנו, וחקמים מתירים.

MISHNA One who vows that dates are forbidden to him^H is permitted to eat date honey.^N One who vows that late grapes^N are forbidden to him is permitted to eat vinegar of late grapes. Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says: In the case of any food that the name of its derivative is called after its name, i.e., the liquid that emerges from it bears its name, e.g., date honey or vinegar of late grapes, and one vows that the item itself, e.g., the grape, is forbidden to him, he is also prohibited from consuming the liquid that emerges from it. But the Rabbis permit this.

גמ' [חקמים] היינו תנא קמא!

GEMARA The statement of the Rabbis is identical to the statement of the first *tanna* of the mishna, who rules that one who vows that dates are forbidden to him is permitted to eat date honey. What is the difference between them?

איבא ביניהו הדא דתנא: כלל זה אמר רבי שמעון בן אלעזר: כל שדרבו לאכול, ודרך היצא ממנו לאכול, כגון תמרים ודבש תמרים, נדר בו – אסור ביצא ממנו, נודר מיצא ממנו – אסור בו.

The Gemara answers: **There is a difference between them with regard to that which is taught^N in a *baraita*: Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar said this principle: With regard to anything that is commonly eaten in its existing form, and it is also common to eat the liquid that emerges from it, for example, dates and date honey, if one vowed that it is forbidden to him, he is also prohibited from consuming the liquid that emerges from it. Similarly, if one vows that the liquid that emerges from it is forbidden to him, he is also prohibited from partaking of it.**

HALAKHA

Dates are forbidden to him, etc. – מן התמרים וכו' – One who vows that dates are forbidden to him is permitted to eat date honey, and one who vows that late grapes are forbidden to him is permitted to eat their vinegar, in accordance with the ruling of the first *tanna* in the mishna (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nedarim* 9:14; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'a* 217:13).

NOTES

Permitted to eat date honey – מותר בדבש תמרים: The commentaries raise a difficulty: There is a dispute in the mishna between Rabbi Yosei and the Rabbis whether one who vows not to partake of milk may eat whey (51b). The Gemara explains that both sides concede that it depends on the vernacular (52b). In a place where whey is called milk whey, it is forbidden, as the word milk is included in its name, and where it is merely referred to as whey, it is permitted. Accordingly, this mishna seems to contradict both sides of the dispute, as the phrase date honey includes the word date, and nevertheless it is permitted to one who vows that dates are forbidden to him. This problem exists with regard to vinegar of late grapes as well.

The Rashba answers that the two *mishnayot* are not comparable, as whey is not substantially transformed from its milk state, whereas date honey and vinegar of late grapes have changed from fruit to an entirely different substance. Therefore, the ruling for the latter foods is more lenient. The Ran explains

that whey is called milk whey after the milk from which it was extracted, whereas date honey is referred to as such only to differentiate between it and other types of honey. Therefore, according to the first *tanna* of the mishna, it is permitted.

Late grapes [sitvaniyot] – סתוניות: Most commentaries explain that *sitvaniyot* are grapes that do not ripen fully in the summer and remain on the vine until winter [*stav*]. These grapes never reach a fully ripened state and are barely edible, which is why they are used in the production of vinegar. The Rosh cites an alternate version of the text, which reads: *Sefoniyot*, which he takes to mean grapes from the end [*sof*] of the season. Others explain, probably in accordance with the version of the text cited by the Rosh, that it refers to poor-quality grapes from the ends of the vineyard (*Tosefot Rabbeinu Peretz*).

There is a difference between them with regard to that which is taught, etc. – איבא ביניהו הדא דתנא: What difference

is derived from Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar's opinion? Several commentaries explain that the Rabbis follow Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar's opinion that if the produce mentioned in the vow is not commonly eaten, the produce is permitted and its derivative is forbidden. This is contrary to the opinion of the first *tanna* that the produce is always forbidden and its derivative is permitted (Commentary on *Nedarim*; Ran). Another explanation, cited in *Tosafot*, is that the Rabbis agree with Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar's opinion only insofar as to prohibit the derivative of a type of produce that is not commonly eaten. Otherwise, they agree with the first *tanna*. A third opinion, also cited in *Tosafot*, is that the first *tanna* concedes that if the produce is inedible, its derivative is forbidden. The dispute is with regard to the produce itself: The first *tanna* holds that it is prohibited, whereas the Rabbis follow Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar's opinion that it is forbidden. This explanation posits that late grapes are in fact commonly eaten.