

People call it the New Moon [reish yarha] – קרו אִינְשֵׁי רִישׁ יָרְחָא: *Reish yarha* can also be translated to mean the beginning of the month. Since the meaning of vows is determined based upon the colloquial meaning of the terms used in the statement of the vow, the first day of the New Moon is considered the beginning of the following month, even though it is technically the last day of the previous month.

Wine is *konam* for me and for that reason I will not taste it this year – קוֹנָם יַיִן שְׂאֵנִי טוֹעֵם הַשָּׁנָה: The author of the *Bah* emends the text of the Gemara here to match the text of the mishna as it appears on 63a: Wine is *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste it for the entire year.

HALAKHA

People call it the New Moon – קרו אִינְשֵׁי רִישׁ יָרְחָא: If one takes a vow and states that it applies for this month, the vow expires before the following New Moon, even if the upcoming New Moon is celebrated for two days. This is because people consider the first day of the New Moon to be the beginning of the upcoming month, even though it actually completes the previous one (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:3; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'a* 220:4).

Wine is *konam* for me and for that reason I will not taste it for a day – קוֹנָם יַיִן שְׂאֵנִי טוֹעֵם יוֹם: The *halakha* in a case of one who vowed: Wine is *konam* for me, and for that reason I will not taste it for a day, remains uncertain. Therefore, it is forbidden to him for twenty-four hours, as if he said: One day. However, if he tasted it after nightfall of that day, he is not flogged. As this dilemma was not resolved by the Gemara, one must rule stringently, as in all cases of uncertainty involving Torah law (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:2; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'a* 220:1).

HALAKHA

Actually, the case is that he said his vow should apply this year – לְעוֹלָם דְּאָמַר הַשָּׁנָה: If one takes a vow and applies it for this year, it applies until the end of the year, and is no longer in effect on Rosh HaShana. If he takes a vow for one year or for a year, the vow remains in effect until the following year on the same date that he originally took the vow, even in the case of a leap year. The ruling in the case of a vow taken for a year is due to the fact that the Gemara did not issue a definitive ruling, and therefore one must be stringent, as the case pertains to Torah law (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:4; *Shulhan Arukh*, *Yoreh De'a* 220:7; see *Korban Netanel*).

מהו דתימא: ראש חדש לשעבר הוי, ולא ליתפסר – קא משמע לן: קרו אִינְשֵׁי רִישׁ יָרְחָא.

This is lest you say that the first day of the New Moon is part of the previous month, and therefore the vow should expire at the end of that day, and wine should not be forbidden to him during the upcoming month. The *tanna* therefore teaches us that since people call it the New Moon^{NH} of the upcoming month, it is viewed as part of the upcoming month, and the vow applies to the new month.

”שָׁנָה זוֹ – אָסוּר בְּכֹל הַשָּׁנָה בּוֹלָה.”

§ The mishna states that if one says: **This year**, it is forbidden to him for the entire remainder of the year, and that Rosh HaShana is considered part of the upcoming year.

איבעיא להו: אמר “קונם יין שאני טועם יום” מאי דיניה, ב”היום” או ב”יום אחד”?

A dilemma was raised before the scholars: If one said: **Wine is *konam* for me**, and for that reason I will not taste it for a day,^H what is the *halakha* in his case? Is it considered as though he said **today**, and he is prohibited from consuming wine until nightfall, or is it considered as though he said **one day**, in which case the vow takes effect for a period of twenty-four hours?

תא שמע ממתניתין: “קונם יין שאני טועם היום” – אין אסור אלא עד שתחשך. הא “יום” – ביום אחד דמי.

The Gemara suggests: **Come and hear a proof from the mishna**: If one says: **Wine is *konam* for me**, and for that reason I will not taste it today, he is prohibited from drinking wine only until the conclusion of that day, at nightfall. The Gemara infers that this *halakha* only applies if he said the word today; therefore, if he said the vow applies for a day, it is considered comparable to a case where he said **one day**, and the vow is in effect for twenty-four hours.

אימא סיפא: אמר “יום אחד” – אסור מיום ליום, הא “יום” – ב”היום” דמי. אלא מהא ליבא למשמע מינה.

The Gemara rejects this proof: But say the latter clause of the mishna: If he said that wine is forbidden to him for **one day**, he is prohibited from drinking wine from the day he took the vow to the same time on the following day. This indicates that it is only if he said: One day, that the vow takes effect for twenty-four hours; but if he said it takes effect for a day, it is comparable to a case where he said **today**, and the vow takes effect only until nightfall. Rather, no inference is to be learned from this mishna.

אמר רב אשי, תא שמע: “קונם יין שאני טועם השנה” – נתעברה השנה – אסור בה ובעיבורה. היכי דמי?

Rav Ashi said: **Come and hear a resolution to this question from the following mishna** (63a): If one vowed: **Wine is *konam* for me**, and for that reason I will not taste it this year,^N then if the year was extended, i.e., declared to be a leap year, he is prohibited from drinking wine in it and its intercalated month. The Gemara inquires: **What are the circumstances?**

Perek VIII

Daf 61 Amud a

אילימא בדתקני – למה לי למימר? אלא לאו דאמר “שנה” – אלא “שנה” ב”השנה” דמי, ו”יום” נמי ב”היום” דיניה.

If we say that it is exactly as it teaches, why do I need to state this *halakha*? It is obvious that a year means that entire year, even if it is a leap year. Rather, is it not referring to a case where he did not say that the vow applies this year, but rather, he said that it applies for a year, and the mishna teaches that the vow applies for the remainder of that year? Apparently, saying that a vow applies for a year is comparable to saying it applies this year; and similarly, the *halakha* in a case where one accepts a vow for a day should also be like the *halakha* in a case where one accepts a vow for today.

לא, לעולם דאמר “השנה”. ומהו דתימא הלך אחר רוב השנים, ולא אית בהו עיבור, קא משמע לן.

The Gemara refutes this argument: **No, actually**, the case in the mishna is that he said his vow should apply this year,^H and it was necessary to state this *halakha* lest you say: **Follow the majority of years, which do not have an intercalated month**, and his vow should be understood as referring to a twelve month period. The *tanna* therefore teaches us that the phrase this year means that the vow should last until the end of the year.

NOTES

Any wine that I taste for a Jubilee – יִינֶה שְׁאֲנִי טוֹעֵם יוֹבֵל – The Ran maintains that this is not the actual language of the vow. Rather, the case refers to one who took a vow for this Jubilee. The Gemara was not precise in reporting the language of the vow because that is not the main point it is addressing here; rather, the main point is whether the Jubilee Year itself is the end of the previous cycle of fifty years, or the beginning of the next cycle.

BACKGROUND

Jubilee – יוֹבֵל: The first of these fifty-year cycles began in the fifteenth year after the conquest of Eretz Yisrael during the leadership of Joshua. The year that concludes each Jubilee period is called the Jubilee Year, and the *halakhot* of this special year are enumerated in the Torah (Leviticus 25:8–24). Observance of the Jubilee Year ceased before the end of the First Temple period, although the system of counting the fifty-year cycle may have continued after that time. As noted in the Gemara, there is a controversy among the *tanna'im* as to whether the Jubilee Year was reckoned as the first year of the new Sabbatical cycle, in which case the Jubilee cycle would be only forty-nine years, or whether the fiftieth year that followed the seventh Sabbatical cycle was an additional year external to the seven-year Sabbatical cycles, in which case the Jubilee cycle would be fifty years.

איבעיא להו: אמר יין שאני טועם יובל מאי, שנת חמשים בלפני חמשים או בלאחר חמשים?

תא שמע, דתנאי פלוגתא דרבי יהודה ורבנן: "וקדשתם את שנת החמשים שנה" – שנת החמשים אתה מונה, ואי אתה מונה שנת חמשים ואחת. מכאן אמרו: יובל אינו עולה למנין שבוע. רבי יהודה אומר: יובל עולה למנין שבוע.

אמרו לו לרבי יהודה: הרי הוא אומר "שש שנים תזרע שדך" – ואין כאן אלא חמש!

אמר להם: לדבריכם, הרי הוא אומר "ועשת את התבואה לשלש השנים" – הרי כאן ארבע!

אלא איכא לאוקמה בשאר שני שבוע, דילי נמי – איכא לאוקמה בשאר שני שבוע.

"עד הפסח אסור" כו'. למימרא דרבי מאיר סבר לא מעייל איניש נפשיה

A dilemma was raised before the Sages: If one said: Any wine that I taste for a Jubilee^{N8} is hereby forbidden to me, what is the *halakha*? Is the fiftieth year considered as before fifty, i.e., is it included in the vow, or is it considered as after fifty, in which case it is not included in the vow?

The Gemara answers: Come and hear, as it is taught in a *baraita* that there is a dispute between Rabbi Yehuda and the Rabbis: The verse states: "And you shall sanctify the fiftieth year" (Leviticus 25:10), from which it is derived: You count it as the fiftieth year, i.e., the Jubilee Year, but you do not count it as both the fiftieth year and the first year of the next Sabbatical and Jubilee cycles. From here they stated: The Jubilee Year is not included^H in the counting of the seven-year cycle^H of the Sabbatical Year. Rather, the year following the Jubilee Year is considered the first year of the next seven-year cycle. Rabbi Yehuda says: The Jubilee Year is included in the counting of the following seven-year cycle of the Sabbatical Year.

The Rabbis said to Rabbi Yehuda: Doesn't the verse state: "Six years you shall sow your field" (Leviticus 25:3)? But according to your opinion there are only five years here, in the Sabbatical cycle following the Jubilee Year, as the first year would be the Jubilee Year, when it is forbidden to sow one's field.

Rabbi Yehuda said to them: There is a difficulty according to your statement as well. Doesn't the verse state: "And it shall bring forth produce for the three years" (Leviticus 25:21)? The Torah promises the Jewish people that in the year preceding the Sabbatical Year, the land will bring forth enough produce to last for the duration of that year, for the Sabbatical Year, and for part of the following year, until the new produce grows. However, in the case of the Jubilee, there are four years to account for, as agricultural labor is prohibited in the forty-ninth year, which is a Sabbatical Year, and in the following year, which is the Jubilee Year.

Rather, you must say that it is possible to establish the verse as referring to the other years of seven-year cycles, i.e., other Sabbatical Years apart from the Sabbatical Year right before the Jubilee Year. With regard to my opinion also, it is possible to establish the verse you presented as a difficulty as referring to the other years of seven-year cycles, i.e., other Sabbatical cycles apart from the cycle immediately following the Jubilee. With regard to the dilemma cited previously, according to the Rabbis, just as the Jubilee Year does not count as part of the ensuing Jubilee cycle because it is considered the end of the previous Jubilee cycle, if one takes a vow and states that it applies for the Jubilee cycle, the Jubilee Year is included in the vow. According to Rabbi Yehuda, the Jubilee Year itself actually begins the next Jubilee cycle, and therefore if one takes a vow for the current Jubilee cycle, the Jubilee Year itself is not included.

It was taught in the mishna that if one vows that wine is forbidden to him until Passover, he is prohibited from drinking wine until the Festival arrives. However, if one vows that wine is forbidden to him until before Passover, there is a dispute as to whether the vow remains in effect until the beginning or the end of the Festival. The Gemara asks: Is this to say that Rabbi Meir, who holds that it is prohibited only until the beginning of Passover, maintains that a person does not place himself

HALAKHA

The Jubilee Year is not included, etc. – יובל אינו עולה וכו'. The Jubilee Year is not counted as one of the years of the Sabbatical cycle. Rather, the forty-ninth year is a Sabbatical Year, the fiftieth is the Jubilee Year, and the fifty-first is the first year of the cycle of the next Sabbatical and Jubilee cycles (Rambam *Sefer Zera'im, Hilkhot Shemitta VeYovel* 10:7).

The Jubilee Year is not included in the counting of the seven-year cycle – יובל אינו עולה למנין שבוע – If one took a vow for this Jubilee, it applies for all the years of the Jubilee cycle, including the fiftieth year itself, as the Rambam rules in accordance with the Rabbis concerning the counting of the years (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:5).

לְסַפֵּיקָא. וְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי סָבַר: מַעֲיִיל אֵינִי שׁ
נִפְשִׂיָה לְסַפֵּיקָא.

וְרַבְמִינְהִי: מִי שֵׁיִשׁ לוֹ שְׁתֵּי בֵּיתֵי בָנוֹת מִשְׁתֵּי
נָשִׁים, וְאָמַר: קִדְּשָׁתִי אֶת בֵּתֵי הַגְּדוּלָּה,
וְאֵינִי יוֹדֵעַ אִם גְּדוּלָּה שְׁבַגְדוּלוֹת, אִם
גְּדוּלָּה שְׁבַקְטָנוֹת, וְאִם קְטָנָה שְׁבַגְדוּלוֹת
שְׁהִיא גְדוּלָּה מִן הַגְּדוּלָּה שְׁבַקְטָנוֹת – כּוֹלֵן
אֶסְרוֹת, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר, חוּץ מִן הַקְּטָנָה
שְׁבַקְטָנוֹת.

רַבִּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמַר: כּוֹלֵן מוֹתְרוֹת, חוּץ מִן
הַגְּדוּלָּה שְׁבַגְדוּלוֹת!

אָמַר רַבִּי חֲנִינָא בַר אֲבָדִימִי אָמַר רַב:
מוֹחֲלָפֶת הַשְּׂטִיָּה. וְהִתְנַיָּא: זֶה הַכֹּלֵל, כָּל
שְׁזָמְנוּ קְבוּעַ וְאָמַר "עַד לְפָנַי". רַבִּי מֵאִיר
אוֹמַר: עַד שְׂנִיעָא, וְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמַר: עַד
שְׂנִיעָא.

מתני' "עד הקציר" "עד הבציר" "עד
המסיק" – אינו אסור אלא עד שניגיע.
זה הכלל: כל שזמנו קבוע, ואמר "עד
שניגיע" – אסור עד שניגיע, אומר "עד
שיהא" – אסור עד שניצא, וכל שאין זמנו
קבוע, בין אמר "עד שיהא" בין אמר "עד
שניגיע" – אינו אסור אלא עד שניגיע.

in a position of uncertainty, and Rabbi Yosei holds that a person does place himself in a position of uncertainty?^N

The Gemara raises a contradiction from the following mishna (*Kiddushin* 64b): In the case of **one who has two groups of two daughters**^H born to him from two women, e.g., he has two daughters from his first wife, and after his first wife died he remarried and had two daughters with his second wife, **and he said: I betrothed my older daughter to someone, but I do not know if I meant the older of the older group of daughters; or if I meant the older daughter of the younger group; or if I meant the younger daughter of the older group, who is nevertheless older than the older daughter of the younger group, then all three of those daughters are prohibited to marry another man due to the uncertainty, as he failed to clarify which daughter was betrothed.** This applies to all the daughters **apart from the younger daughter of the younger group, who is certainly not betrothed.** This is the statement of Rabbi Meir.

Rabbi Yosei says: **They are all permitted to marry, apart from the older daughter of the older group.** This demonstrates that according to Rabbi Meir, one must take into account any of the possible meanings of the imprecise expression: My older daughter, whereas Rabbi Yosei maintains that only the narrowest possible meaning of the phrase is taken into account. This contradicts the mishna here.

In response to this question, Rabbi Hanina bar Avdimi said that Rav said: **The attribution of the opinions is reversed,**^H i.e., the views stated in the mishna here must be reversed in order to reconcile them with the mishna in *Kiddushin*. **And it is indeed taught in a baraita that this is the principle:** With regard to any vow which specifies a fixed time, i.e., an event that occurs on a particular date, and one said that the vow applies until before that event, Rabbi Meir says the vow applies until the event ends, and Rabbi Yosei says that the vow is in effect only until the event arrives. This is another proof that the opinions in the mishna here must be reversed.

MISHNA If one takes a vow that something is forbidden to him until the grain harvest,^H or until the grape harvest, or until the olive harvest, it is forbidden to him only until the arrival of that season. **This is the principle:** With regard to any occasion whose time is fixed,^N and one said: **Until it arrives, it is forbidden to him until the specified occasion arrives.** If he said: **Until it will be, it is forbidden to him until the specified occasion ends.** And with regard to any occasion whose time is not fixed, i.e., it does not fall on a precise date, whether he said: **Until it will be, or: Until it arrives, it is forbidden to him only until the specified occasion arrives.**

HALAKHA

One who has two groups of two daughters, etc. – מי שיש לו שתי בתי בנות וכו' השיטתו: If one has two groups of two daughters each, from two wives, and all of them are young enough to be betrothed by him to men of his choice, and he said to a man: I betroth to you my older daughter, but he himself does not know if he meant the older daughter of the older or the younger group, or the younger daughter of the older group, they are all permitted to marry another man except the older daughter of the older group (Rambam *Sefer Nashim, Hilkhot Ishut* 9:9; *Shulhan Arukh, Even HaEzer* 37:18).

The attribution of the opinions is reversed – מוחלפת השיטה: If one vows that something is forbidden to him until before Passover, it is forbidden only until the beginning of Passover, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, as clarified by Rabbi Hanina bar Avdimi. The Rosh and the Ramban claim that it is forbidden until the conclusion of the Festival, in accordance with Rabbi Yosei's opinion in the mishna, following the opinion of Rava in tractate *Kiddushin* (65a) that the opinions need not be reversed. Some (*Shakh, citing Bah*) say that whenever something is forbidden for a person until the arrival of the Festival, e.g., in the case of one who vowed until before Passover, he must ask a halakhic authority to dissolve the vow when Passover arrives, in case he is mistaken about the exact wording of his vow (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:7; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:11).

Until the grain harvest, etc. – עד הקציר וכו' : If one takes a vow prohibiting something to himself until the grain harvest, then whether he says that the vow applies until the grain harvest or until it will be the grain harvest, the vow remains in effect only until the arrival of that season. This is true of any event that does not have a fixed time. However, with regard to an event with a fixed time, if one vows with the phrase: Until it arrives, the vow remains in effect until the beginning of that event, whereas if he said: Until it will be, the vow remains in effect until the end of that event (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:7–8; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:12).

NOTES

A person does place himself in a position of uncertainty – מעייל איניש נפשיה לספיקא: There are two opinions presented in the mishna cited here (60a) and in tractate *Kiddushin* (64b) with regard to a case where one does not remember what his original intention was when he took a vow, or when he is not trusted to state his intention and it becomes necessary to interpret his wording literally. One *tanna*, identified in the mishna here as Rabbi Yosei, maintains that one places himself in a position of uncertainty, meaning that he may have intended for his vow to apply more broadly to cases that are not included

in the most limited possible interpretation of his statement. Consequently, his statement must be interpreted as broadly as possible. According to the other *tanna*, identified in the mishna here as Rabbi Meir, it is assumed that when one takes a vow, he has only the most limited and precise meaning of his words in mind.

Any occasion whose time is fixed – כל שזמנו קבוע: The Ran and the Meiri explain this principle as follows: If the duration of the event is definite, it is possible that when he vowed

by saying: Until, he meant until it ends. However, if its duration is not defined, he certainly did not mean for his vow to continue without a definite expiration date; consequently, he must have been referring to the beginning of the event. However, the Ritva explains that this refers to the beginning of the event rather than its duration; if the beginning of the event does not have a fixed time, then even if one said: Until it will be, the vow takes effect only until the beginning of that event. This appears to be the opinion of the Rambam as well.

Until the summer – עד הקיץ: If one takes a vow that an item is forbidden to him until the summer, or until it will be summer, the vow remains in effect until the local population begins harvesting figs in bulk and gathering them in baskets (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:9; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:16).

Until the summer has passed – עד שיעבור הקיץ: If one takes a vow until the summer has passed, the Rambam rules that the vow remains in effect until people fold up the mats upon which they dry their figs. It is ruled in the *Shulhan Arukh* that the vow applies until people put away the knives used for plucking figs (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 10:9; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 220:17).

One who vows that summer produce is forbidden to him – הנודר מפירות הקיץ: If one vows that summer produce is forbidden to him, only figs are forbidden to him, in accordance with the unattributed opinion in the *baraita* (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nedarim* 9:12; *Shulhan Arukh, Yoreh De'a* 217:24).

”עד הקיץ” – עד שיהא הקיץ – עד שיתחילו העם להכניס בכלכלות. ”עד שיעבור הקיץ” – עד שיקפילו המקצועות.

גמ' תנא: כלכלה שאמרו – כלכלה של תאנים, ולא כלכלה של ענבים. תנא: הנודר מפירות הקיץ – אין אסור אלא בתאנים. רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: ענבים בכלל תאנים.

מאי טעמא דתנא קמא? קסבר: תאנים מיקצצן בידיא, ענבים לא מיקצצן בידיא. רבן שמעון בן גמליאל סבר: ענבים נמי, כי מירדדן – מיקצצן בידיא.

”עד שיעבור הקיץ עד שיקפילו המקצועות” – תנא: עד שיקפילו רוב המקצועות.

If he said: **Until the summer** [*kayitz*],^H or: **Until it will be summer**, the vow remains in effect **until the people begin to bring fruit into their houses in baskets**.^N If he said: **Until the summer has passed**,^H the vow remains in effect **until the people set aside** [*yakpilu*] **the knives** [*hamaktzuot*]^{LN} with which the figs are cut after being harvested, and return them to their place of storage.

GEMARA The Sage taught: The basket about which they spoke in the mishna is a basket of figs, and not a basket of grapes, which are gathered later than figs. It is taught in a *baraita*: **One who vows that summer** [*kayitz*]^L produce is forbidden to him^H is prohibited from partaking only of figs, as the fig harvest is called *kayitz*. **Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: Grapes are included** in the category of the summer produce, along with figs.^N

The Gemara asks: **What is the reason of the first tanna?** The Gemara answers: He holds that since figs are plucked [*mikkatzetzan*] by hand, while grapes are plucked not by hand but with tools, it is only figs that are considered summer [*kayitz*] produce. Conversely, **Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel holds that grapes, too, when they are sufficiently ripe,^N are plucked by hand.** Therefore, they can be considered summer produce as well.

§ The mishna states that if one said: **Until the summer has passed**, then the vow remains in effect until the people set aside the knives used to cut the figs. It was taught: This means until most people set aside their knives, even if there are still some individuals who have yet to do so.

LANGUAGE

Set aside [*yakpilu*] the knives [*hamaktzuot*] – שיקפילו – המקצועות: The root *kuf, peh, lamed*, which is alternatively spelled *kaf, peh, lamed*, has several related meanings. It can mean to remove and peel off a substance, to gather and arrange in a pile, or to fold clothes or woven materials. This variety of meanings is one reason for the many interpretations offered by the commentaries for the phrase *yakpilu hamaktzuot*.

The word *maktzuot*, knives, generally refers to tools used for smoothing wood, but it can also refer to special knives used for cutting. In this context, some maintain that it is not a knife at all but the mat on which partially opened figs [*ketziot*] were spread out. The figs were cut open in order to

facilitate the drying process, and were then left in the sun until they were dry enough to be preserved in that state or to be pressed into cakes.

Summer [*kayitz*] – קיץ: The Hebrew word *kayitz* has two distinct but related meanings: Summer and figs (see II Samuel 16:1–2). The relationship between the two meanings lies in the fact that figs are harvested in late summer. *Kayitz*, when used as the name of a type of fig or as a name for the fig harvest is also connected to the root *kuf, yod, tzadi*, meaning cutting or picking. As explained by the Gemara, figs are a common fruit that do not need to be harvested with a pruning hook, but can be easily cut by hand.

NOTES

To bring figs into their houses in baskets – להכניס בכלכלות: The Rambam explains that this refers to the time when people bring the baskets of figs into their houses. The Rosh interprets this phrase as referring to the placing of the harvested figs into baskets. He explains that this indicates that the season does not begin when people pluck the first few figs, but when they harvest the figs in large amounts, at which point they place them in baskets.

when these mats are folded and stored for the following year (Rambam; Rosh).

Set aside [*yakpilu*] the knives [*maktzuot*] – שיקפילו: Most commentaries (see *Tosafot* and Ritva) maintain that it means until they set aside the knives with which they cut the figs after they dried and were packed into round cakes. Rabbi Eliezer of Metz explains similarly, and adds that the meaning of the word *yakpilu* is: They fold, as the knives used were folding knives, which were folded away after use. Others explain that *maktzuot* are the mats upon which figs are laid to dry, and the mishna is referring to the stage

Grapes are included along with figs – ענבים בכלל תאנים: Since grapes are processed in a similar manner to figs, as some of them are left to dry as raisins, they can also be called summer [*kayitz*] produce, a phrase that refers to fruit left to dry in the sun (*Shita Mekubbetzet*).

Ripe [*miraddedan*] – מירדדן: *Tosafot* had a version of the Gemara text that read *mizardan*, which refers to the drying out of the vines, at which point the grapes can be plucked by hand. The version of the text used by the Meiri had the word *mizdarvan*, meaning that the grapes' juices begin to leak, at which stage they are no longer firmly attached to the stalk and can be plucked by hand. The version of the text cited in the *Arukh* is *miraddedan*. It is explained there that when the stems of the cluster thin, the grapes can be plucked by hand.