

This *amud* has no Gemara text, as in the classic Vilna layout it is entirely filled with the commentary of *Tosafot*.

HALAKHA

On the condition that this heap contains one hundred *kor* – **על מנת שיהא בכרי הזה מאה בור**: If one says: I am hereby a nazirite on the condition that this heap of grain contains one hundred *kor*, and when he went to measure the heap discovered that it was stolen or lost, he is not a nazirite. The *halakha* is lenient with regard to uncertain naziriteship, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 2:9).

BACKGROUND

Kor – **כור**: The *kor* is the largest measurement of volume mentioned in the Talmud. The *kor* contains thirty *se'a*, which in modern measurements is somewhere between 240–480 ℓ. This significant variation is due to a fundamental dispute among the later halakhic authorities concerning halakhic measurements.

אילימא רבי טרפון – מי הווי נזיר? בין דבשעתא דקא נור לא ידע אי פלוני הוא ואי לא, מי חלה עליה נזירות? והתניא, רבי יהודה אומר משום רבי טרפון: אין אחד מהן נזיר, לפי שלא נתנה נזירות אלא להפלאה!

If we say it is the opinion of Rabbi Tarfon, even in a case where the individual in question came before us and identified himself, is the one who claimed to know his identity **be a nazirite? Since at the time when he vowed he did not know whether** the subject of their debate is so-and-so or not, does naziriteship take effect with regard to him? But isn't it taught in a *baraita* (*Tosefta* 3:19) that Rabbi Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Tarfon: In the case of the mishna **not one of the six people is a nazirite, since naziriteship is imposed upon someone only if** the vow is stated with explicitness [*hafla'a*]¹ enunciated. The Torah says that a vow must be “clearly” pronounced, as the verse states: “When either man or woman shall clearly utter [*yafli*] a vow, the vow of a nazirite” (Numbers 6:2). This verse indicates that his vow is valid only if it is explicit.

אלא רבי יהודה דכרי הוא. דתניא: “הריני נזיר על מנת שיהא בכרי הזה מאה בור” והלך ומצאו שנגנב או שאבד, רבי שמעון אוסר, ורבי יהודה מתיר.

Rather, the mishna represents the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, as stated with regard to a heap of grain. As it is taught in a *baraita* (*Tosefta* 2:9): If someone said: **I am hereby a nazirite on the condition that this heap of grain contains one hundred *kor***,^{HB} a measurement of volume, and when he went to measure it he discovered that the heap was stolen or lost, so that the amount it held cannot be determined, **Rabbi Shimon deems him prohibited** in all the *halakhot* of naziriteship, as the heap might have contained one hundred *kor*. **And Rabbi Yehuda deems him permitted**, as he maintains that the *halakha* is lenient in cases of uncertain naziriteship. Rabbi Yehuda's reasoning applies equally to the case of the mishna.

רבי שמעון סבר: בין דאילו לא נגנב, דלמא הווי ביה מאה בור, והווי נזיר – השתא נמי הווי נזיר. והכא נמי בין דאי אתא לקמן וידעינן דפלוני הואי – הווי נזיר, השתא נמי הווי נזיר.

As for Rabbi Shimon, who disputes the ruling of the mishna, he holds with regard to the heap of grain: **Since if the heap had not been stolen perhaps it might have contained one hundred *kor* and he would have been a nazirite, now too, he is a nazirite** due to the uncertainty. **And here too**, in the case of the mishna, **since if that person would have come before us and we would have known that he was so-and-so**, the one who took the vow **would have been a nazirite**, consequently, **now too, he is a nazirite** as a result of the uncertainty cast by the unknown identity of the individual.

LANGUAGE

Explicitness [*hafla'a*] – **הפלאה**: The root *pele*, from which the term *hafla'a* is derived, is close both linguistically and conceptually to the root *pala*, which refers to a difference, distinction, or separation. The notion of distinction is apparent from the verse: “So that we are distinguished [*ve'niflinu*], I and Your people, from all the people that are on the face of the earth” (Exodus 33:16). The verse concerning the vows of a nazirite, which states: “When either man or woman shall

clearly utter [*yafli*] a vow” (Numbers 6:2), can be explained in two ways. Some commentaries say this denotes wonder [*pele*]. In other words, someone performs a wondrous undertaking by abstaining from the delights of the world and becoming a nazirite. Alternatively, *yafli* means separation, i.e., he separates himself. It is for this reason that the Gemara says: A nazirite vow must be stated with explicitness, i.e., he must separate himself unambiguously, without any hint of doubt.

מתני' רָאָה אֶת הַכּוֹי, וְאָמַר "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר שְׁזָה חַיָּה", "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר שְׁזָה אִינוּ חַיָּה", "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר שְׁזָה בְּהֵמָה", "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר שְׁאִין זֶה בְּהֵמָה",

MISHNA Someone saw a kosher animal with characteristics of both a domesticated animal and a non-domesticated animal [*koy*],^{HB} and said: I am hereby a nazirite if this is a non-domesticated animal; and another individual said: I am hereby a nazirite if this is not a non-domesticated animal; and a third person said: I am hereby a nazirite if this is a domesticated animal; and a fourth said: I am hereby a nazirite if this not a domesticated animal.

"הֲרִינִי נְזִיר שְׁזָה חַיָּה וּבְהֵמָה", "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר שְׁאִין זֶה לֹא חַיָּה וְלֹא בְּהֵמָה", "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר שְׁאִין אֶחָד מֵכֶּם נְזִיר", "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר שְׁאִין אֶחָד מֵכֶּם נְזִיר", "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר שְׁכֹלְכֶם נְזִירִין" – הֲרִי כֹּלֶן נְזִירִין.

The mishna continues: A fifth person added: I am hereby a nazirite if this is a non-domesticated animal and a domesticated animal, and a sixth person said: I am hereby a nazirite if this is neither a non-domesticated animal nor a domesticated animal. Someone who heard all the above statements said: I am hereby a nazirite if one of you is a nazirite, and another one stated: I am hereby a nazirite if not one of you is a nazirite, and a final person said: I am hereby a nazirite if all of you are nazirites. In this case, they are all nazirites.^N

גַּמ' תַּנִּי חֲדָא: תְּשַׁעָּה נְזִירִים, וְתַנְיָא אִידְךָ: תְּשַׁע נְזִירִיּוֹת. בְּשִׁלְמָא תְּשַׁעָּה נְזִירִין – כְּגוֹן דְּהָיִי גְבַרֵי טְפִי, דְּאִיתְּפִיס וְאִזְלֵי בֵּיהּ.

GEMARA With regard to the ruling of the mishna that they are all nazirites, it is taught in one *baraita* that this case involves a total of nine nazirites, and it is taught in the other *baraita* that there are nine sets of naziriteship here. The Gemara clarifies: Granted, one can understand the *baraita* that says that there are nine nazirites, for example, if there were many people who associated their naziriteship with the status of this *koy*, each with one of the statements listed above.

Saw a *koy* – רָאָה אֶת הַכּוֹי – If several people walking along the way saw a *koy*, and one of them said: I am hereby a nazirite if this is a non-domesticated animal, and another declared: I am hereby a nazirite if it is a domesticated animal, and a third added: I am hereby a nazirite if it is not a non-domesticated animal, while the fourth said: I am hereby a nazirite if it is not a domesticated animal, and a fifth stated: I am hereby a nazirite if it is a non-domesticated animal and a domesticated animal, while the last one vowed: I am hereby a nazirite if it is neither a non-domesticated animal nor a domesticated animal, they are all nazirites. This is because a *koy* is like a non-domesticated animal with regard to certain *halakhot* and like a domesticated animal with regard to other *halakhot*, while it has the status of both with regard to other *halakhot*, and has the status of neither with regard to yet other *halakhot*. The same *halakha* applies if these people saw an androgynous person, and vowed in a similar manner with regard to the individual's identity as a male or female (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a*, *Hilkhot Nezirut* 2:10).

NOTES

They are all nazirites – הֲרִי כֹּלֶן נְזִירִין: This mishna is apparently the continuation of the previous one (Commentary on *Nazir*; *Tosafot*). As such, the naziriteship is effective even if the condition was unfulfilled, in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai. However, there is an opinion that this mishna can even be reconciled with the ruling of Beit Hillel, which would mean it is accepted as *halakha*. The reason for this is that although there is a structural similarity between this mishna and the previous one, there is also one crucial difference between them: The first case involves an uncertainty that is about to be clarified, as it will soon be discovered who is approaching them. Therefore, the naziriteship takes effect only if the condition was fulfilled. By contrast, with regard to the case of a *koy*, the uncertainty will not be resolved. Consequently, they are all considered nazirites, either definite nazirites according to some commentaries, or uncertain nazirites (see Commentary on *Nazir* and *Tosafot*).

Tosafot also cite an opinion that the first six individuals are uncertain nazirites while the last three are definite ones. Others state that although the mishna is essentially in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai, even Beit Hillel agree that one of the last three, i.e., the one whose condition is fulfilled, is a nazirite (Meiri). The Rambam has an entirely different opinion, both in his Commentary on the Mishna and in the *Mishne Torah*. He maintains that the statements of all those who vow with regard to a *koy* are partly accurate, as a *koy* is a non-domesticated animal with regard to some areas of *halakha* and a domesticated animal with regard to others. Therefore, they are all definite nazirites, even according to the opinion of Beit Hillel.

BACKGROUND

Koy – כּוֹי: Many problems arise in trying to identify the *koy*. It is mentioned numerous times in the Mishna and the Gemara, not because it is a common animal, but rather, because it is useful in discussions that explore the *halakhot* of domesticated animals versus wild animals. As early as the mishnaic period, the Sages disagreed on the identification of the *koy*. Some maintain that it is a hybrid born to a goat and a deer or another kosher wild animal.

According to many researchers, the *koy* is identified as the water buffalo. There are allusions to this identification in some medieval rabbinic sources. Others reject this idea and claim that water buffalo did not live in Eretz Yisrael during the time of the Mishna, when the *koy* was first mentioned. Others maintain that the *koy* is the mouflon, a subspecies of wild sheep, although there are a number of opinions as to which specific subspecies of mouflon it may be. There is also uncertainty with regard to both the origin of the term *koy* and its proper vocalization.



Top: Water buffalo
Bottom: Mouflon

אֵלָא תִּשְׁעַ נְזִירִיּוֹת לְחֵד גְּבֵרָא הִיכִי
מִשְׁבַּחַת לָהּ? בְּשִׁלְמָא שִׁית מִשְׁבַּחַת
לָהּ כְּדַתְנִי.

However, how can you find these circumstances of nine sets of naziriteship in one person? Granted, you find six, as we learned in the mishna that there are six ways in which the nature of a *koy* can be expressed: It is a non-domesticated animal; it is not a non-domesticated animal; it is a domesticated animal; it is not a domesticated animal; is a non-domesticated animal and a domesticated animal; it is neither a non-domesticated animal nor a domesticated animal. One person could associate his acceptance of naziriteship with all of the above possibilities.

אָבַל תִּלֵּת הִיכִי מִשְׁבַּחַת לָהּ? אָמַר רַב
שִׁשֶׁת: כְּגוֹן דְּאָמַר "הֲרִינִי נְזִיר וְנְזִירוֹת
הִבֵּל עָלַי".

However, how can you find these circumstances of the other three sets of naziriteship? The statements: If one of you is a nazirite, and: If one of you is not a nazirite, are necessarily expressed by individuals who did not make the initial six statements, as these last three statements address the group of people who made the first six statements. **Rav Sheshet said:** It is possible in a case where nine people issued the statements mentioned in the mishna, and someone said: **I am hereby a nazirite and the naziriteship of all of them are incumbent upon me.** Since each of the nine people is obligated to observe a term of naziriteship, this last one is obligated to observe nine terms.

הדרן עלך בית שמאי

מתני' שלשה מינין אסורין בנזיר: הטומאה והתגלחת והיציא מן הגפן. וכל היציא מן הגפן מצטרפין זה עם זה. ואין חייב עד שיאכל מן הענבים כזית.

MISHNA Three types of actions are prohibited for a nazirite:^H The contraction of ritual impurity from a corpse, and the shaving of one's hair, and eating or drinking any substances that emerge from the vine. The mishna adds: **And all products that emerge from the vine combine^H with one another to the amount that renders a nazirite liable to receive lashes. And he is liable only if he eats an olive-bulk of the grapes.^{NH}**

NOTES

Only if he eats...of the grapes – עד שיאכל מן הענבים: In this context, the term grapes clearly includes grape seeds and grape skins as well. Some cite the Gemara's explanation that the reason the mishna specifies grapes is to counter Rabbi Elazar's opinion that the leaves and tendrils of a vine are also forbidden (Commentary on *Nazir*). Others maintain that this is the opinion of Rabbi Akiva alone, as in the continuation of the mishna, whereas the ruling of the initial version of the mishna is that one is liable even from the amount of a quarter-log (*Shita Mekubbetzet*). There are also commentaries that maintain the opposite, and

maintain that this is in accordance with the initial version of the mishna, as the phrase: Of the grapes, indicates that the amount of an olive-bulk applies only to foods and not to drinks. This is in contrast to Rabbi Akiva's opinion that all substances are combined to the amount of an olive-bulk (Meiri). Yet others contend that in the case of grapes and other edible grape byproducts everyone agrees that a nazirite is liable from the amount of an olive-bulk. They disagree only concerning the amount he must drink to be liable to receive lashes (*Tosafot* on 38b, citing Rabbeinu Tam).

משנה ראשונה אומרת עד שישתה רביעית יין. רבי עקיבא אומר: אפילו שרה פיתו ביין, ויש בה כדי לצרף כזית – חייב. וחייב על היין בפני עצמו, ועל הענבים בפני עצמן ועל החרצנים בפני עצמן, ועל הזגים בפני עצמן. רבי אלעזר בן עזריה אומר: אין חייב עד שיאכל שני חרצנים זוג.

An initial version of the mishna^B says that a nazirite is liable to receive lashes only if he drinks a quarter-log of wine. Rabbi Akiva says: Even if he soaked his bread^{NH} in wine and the two together contain enough to combine to the amount of an olive-bulk, he is liable. And furthermore, a nazirite is liable to receive lashes for consuming wine by itself,^H and for grapes by themselves, and for *hartzanim* by themselves, and for *zaggim* by themselves, as each of these is forbidden separately by the Torah. Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says: He is liable only if he eats an olive-bulk that includes at least two *hartzanim* and one *zag*, in accordance with the verse "From *hartzanim* to *zag*" (Numbers 6:4), where the first term is in the plural and the second in the singular.

The mishna discusses the meaning of these terms: **Which parts are *hartzanim* and which are *zaggim*? The *hartzanim* are the outside parts, the skin of the grape, while the *zaggim* are the inner parts, the seeds. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda. Rabbi Yosei says: The opposite is the case and this is the mnemonic so that you should not err: It is like a bell [*zog*]^L worn by an animal, in which the outer part, which corresponds to the skin of a grape, is called *zog*,^H and the inner portion of the bell, the clapper, which corresponds to the seeds in a grape, is called *inbal*.^L**

HALAKHA

Even if he soaked his bread – אפילו שרה פיתו: Permitted food does not combine with forbidden food to form an amount that would render one liable to receive lashes. Consequently, in the case of one who soaks his bread in wine, he is liable to receive lashes if there was a quarter-log of wine, roughly three egg-bulks, in a half-loaf of bread, and the nazirite ate that half-loaf. The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis rather than that of Rabbi Akiva (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 5:5; see 37a).

And he is liable for wine by itself – וחייב על היין בפני עצמו: If a nazirite ate an olive-bulk of grapes, and the same amount

of seeds, skins, or raisins, and he drank a quarter-log of wine, he is liable to receive five sets of lashes, as each of these involves a separate violation of a prohibition. In addition, he is flogged a sixth time for violating the prohibition (Numbers 30:3): "He shall not profane his word" (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 5:8; see 38b).

The outer part is called *zog* – החיצון זוג: If a nazirite ate the outer skin of a grape or its seeds he is liable to receive lashes, in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 5:2).

HALAKHA

Three types are prohibited for a nazirite – שלשה מינין: A naziriteship vow includes three prohibitions: Shaving one's hair, contracting ritual impurity imparted by a corpse, and eating and drinking products of the vine (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 1:1, 5:1).

All products that emerge from the vine combine – כל היציא מן הגפן מצטרפין: All products of the vine combine to form the requisite amount to violate the nazirite prohibitions. Consequently, if a nazirite combines grapes, raisins, and unripe grapes, along with a grape skin and seed, and together they constitute the volume of an olive-bulk, he is liable to receive lashes if he eats it. He is also liable if he consumes an olive-bulk by eating them one after the other until they amount to an olive-bulk or if he drinks a quarter-log of a mixture of wine and vinegar (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 5:3).

Only if he eats an olive-bulk of the grapes – עד שיאכל מן הענבים כזית: A nazirite is liable to receive lashes if he eats an olive-bulk of an edible product of the vine or drinks a quarter-log of the juice of a grape (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhot Nezirut* 5:2).

BACKGROUND

An initial version of the mishna – משנה ראשונה: This refers to an ancient Mishna that was in existence long before Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi. Some statements of *tanna'im* were formulated even in early generations; some *mishnayot* date back to the early days of the Second Temple. Statements of the initial Mishna are sometimes cited in Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's Mishna, followed by the version formulated by later Sages. The mention of an initial version of the mishna might be followed by a statement of Rabbi Akiva, as his version of the Mishna and that of his students, e.g., Rabbi Meir, formed the basis of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's Mishna. It is often clear in a particular discussion that a mishna is referring to an earlier version of its ruling, as later Sages dispute the explanation and precise formulation of statements they heard from their teachers. Likewise, Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel dispute the meaning of certain initial versions of *mishnayot*.

NOTES

Even if he soaked his bread – אפילו שרה פיתו: All the commentaries agree that Rabbi Akiva disputes the initial version of the mishna concerning the amount of wine for which a nazirite is liable. According to the initial version of the mishna it is a quarter-log, whereas Rabbi Akiva maintains that it is an olive-bulk. However, some maintain that Rabbi Akiva is stating another novel ruling, that a nazirite is liable not only for drinking pure wine but also for a mixture that contains wine, even if there is not enough wine to render him liable on its own (see 37b).

LANGUAGE

Bell [*zog*] – זוג: Apparently related to the Persian *zang*, meaning bell.

***Inbal* – עינבל:** Apparently from the Greek *εμβολος*, *embolos*, meaning nails or spikes that are inserted into other objects, or a tongue put in a vessel and so forth. There are different versions of this term in the Jerusalem Talmud, e.g., *anbol*, *imbol*, and *imbolot*.

NOTES

Tendrils – לולבין: Most commentaries maintain that this refers to the tops of vine branches when they are still blossoming and soft (see Rabbi Avraham min HaHar). However, some explain that this refers to the soft tendrils that sprout on a vine (Commentary on Nazir).

Amplifications and restrictions – רבוי ומיעוטי: The difference between these two exegetical approaches is the topic of a lengthy discussion that continues through 35b.

BACKGROUND

Tendrils – לולבין: This term usually refers to the soft parts of various plants. The tender ends of plants such as the caper bush and grapevine were eaten as a delicacy. Even the tops of palm trees were eaten in this way.



Blossoming caper flowers

HALAKHA

The vine itself, no – הִקְפֵן עֲצָמוֹ לֹא: The leaves of a vine, its sap, and its nascent fruit are all permitted to a nazirite, as they are neither fruit nor fruit waste, but are considered part of the tree (Rambam Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhhot Nezirut 5:2).

Fruit waste – פְּסוּלֵת פְּרִי: A nazirite who ate an olive-bulk of grape skins or seeds, or who drank a quarter-log of vinegar, the waste products of the fruit of the vine, is liable to receive lashes (Rambam Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhhot Nezirut 5:2).

גבו' "שְׁלִשָּׁה מִיַּיִן אֶסוּרִין בְּנוֹר הַטּוֹמְאָה" כו'. הַיּוֹצֵא מִן הַגֶּפֶן – אֵין, גֶּפֶן עֲצָמוֹ – לֹא. מִתְנַתֵּין דְּלֹא כְּרַבִּי אֲלֵעֹר, דְּתַנְיָא. רַבִּי אֲלֵעֹר אָמַר: אֲפִילוּ עָלֶיךָ וְלֹלְבִין בְּמִשְׁמַע.

איכא דאמרי לה אסיפא: אינו חייב אלא עד שיאכל מן הענבים ביות. מן הענבים – אין, מההפן עצמו – לא. מתנתין דלא כרבי אלעור, דתניא, רבי אלעור אומר: אפילו עליו ולולבין במשמע.

במאי קמיפלגי? רבי אלעור דריש ריבוי ומיעוטי, רבנן דרשי בללי ופרטי. רבי אלעור דריש רבוי ומיעוטי: "מיין ושכר יזיר" – מיעט. "מכל אשר יעשה מגפן היין" – ריבה.

מיעט וריבה – ריבה הכל מאי ריבה – ריבה כל מילי, מאי מיעט – מיעט שבשיתא.

ורבנן דרשי בללי ופרטי: "מיין ושכר יזיר" – פרט. "מכל אשר יעשה מגפן היין" – בלל. "מחרצנים ועד וג" – חזר ופרט. פרט וכלל ופרט – אי אתה דן אלא בעין הפרט. מה הפרט מפורש – פרי ופסולת פרי, אף כל – פרי ופסולת פרי.

אי מה הפרט מפורש פרי גמור, אף כל פרי גמור! אמרת: אם בן מה הניח לך הכתוב במשמעו שלא אמרו? ענבים לחים ויבשים – הא כתיבי, יזון וחומץ – הא כתיבי! הא אין עליך לדון בלשון אחרון אלא בלשון ראשון.

GEMARA The mishna taught that three types of actions are prohibited for a nazirite:

Contracting ritual impurity, shaving, and consuming products of the vine. The Gemara infers: That which emerges from the vine, yes, it is included in the prohibition; however, any part of the vine itself, other than its fruit, no, this is not forbidden. The Gemara comments: The mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar. This is as it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Elazar says: Even the leaves and tendrils^{NB} of the vine are included in the prohibitions of naziriteship.

Some say this statement with regard to the latter clause of the mishna: He is liable to receive lashes only if he eats an olive-bulk of the grapes. The Gemara infers: If he eats from the grapes, yes, he is liable, but if he eats from the vine itself, no,^H he is not liable. If so, the mishna is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar. This is as it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Elazar says: Even the leaves and tendrils are included in the prohibition.

The Gemara asks: With regard to what do Rabbi Elazar and the Rabbis disagree; what is the basis of their dispute? The Gemara explains: Rabbi Elazar interprets the verses employing the hermeneutical principle of amplifications and restrictions,^N while the Rabbis interpret them employing the hermeneutical principle of generalizations and details. The Gemara clarifies: Rabbi Elazar interprets the verses employing the principle of amplifications and restrictions, as the phrase: "He shall abstain from wine and strong drink" (Numbers 6:3), restricts the prohibition to wine and strong drink, and the subsequent phrase: "Anything that is made of the grapevine" (Numbers 6:4), amplifies the prohibition.

The Gemara elaborates: In this manner, the Torah restricts and amplifies, which, according to the principles of exegesis, amplifies and includes virtually all substances. What does it amplify and include? It amplifies and includes all matters and substances that come from the vine. What does it restrict? After all, the phrase "He shall abstain from wine and strong drink" must be excluding something. According to this interpretation, the verse restricts only one part of a vine, the branches. A nazirite who eats the branches of the vine has not committed a transgression.

And conversely, the Rabbis interpret the verses employing the principle of generalizations and details, as the phrase "He shall abstain from wine and strong drink" (Numbers 6:3) is an example of a detail, the phrase "anything that is made of the grapevine" (Numbers 6:4) is a generalization, and when the verse continues: "From pits to grape skin," it has given an example of a detail again. This is a detail, and a generalization, and a detail. According to this exegetical method, you may deduce that the verse is referring only to items similar to the detail: Just as the items mentioned in the detail are clearly defined as a fruit or fruit waste, i.e., grape seeds or skins, so too, everything forbidden by the generalization is a fruit or fruit waste,^H but not leaves or tendrils, as maintained by Rabbi Elazar.

The Gemara asks: If so, one can suggest an alternative derivation: Just as the items mentioned in the detail are clearly defined as a complete, i.e., ripe, fruit, so too, everything forbidden must be a complete fruit, excluding unripe fruit. Why, according to the Rabbis, are unripe grapes included in the prohibition? You will say the following counterargument: If so, what has the verse left you to derive from its meaning that it has not stated? If you say grapes and raisins, these are explicitly written; if you say wine and vinegar, these are also written. What, then, does the generalization come to add? Evidently, you cannot learn in accordance with the last version, which excludes unripe fruit; rather, you must learn in accordance with the first version, which includes this fruit and excludes only leaves and tendrils.

Unripe – גוהרקי: A nazirite who ate unripe grapes is liable to receive lashes, as they are also considered the fruit of the vine (Rambam *Sefer Hafla'a, Hilkhhot Nezirut* 5:2).

ומאחר שסופינו לרבות כל דבר, מה תלמוד לומר "מחרצנים ועד וג'?" לומר לך: כל מקום שאתה מוציא פֶּרֶט וּכְלָל – אי אתה רשאי למשכו ולדונו בעין הפרט,

The Gemara asks: **And as we eventually include everything** that is similar to the detail of fruit and the waste of fruit, **what is the meaning when the verse states: "From pits to grape skin"?** This serves to **tell you** a general principle of exegesis that applies throughout the Torah: **Wherever you find only a detail and a generalization, you cannot broaden it and learn that the generalization is limited to be like the detail**, by saying that the generalization merely clarifies the previous detail.

אלא נעשה כלל מוסף על הפרט, עד שיפרוט לך הכתוב בדרך שפרט לך בנייר.

Rather, the generalization becomes added to the detail so that it includes all matters, even those dissimilar to the detail, **until the verse specifiesⁿ** and adds another detail after the generalization, **in the manner that it specified with regard to a nazirite**, by inserting the phrase "from pits to grape skin" after "anything that is made of the grapevine." The exegetical method of: A detail, a generalization, and a detail, means that the generalization includes only something that is similar to the detail. In this particular example, leaves and tendrils are excluded.

אמר מר: מה הפרט מפורש – פרי ופסולת פרי, אף כל – פרי ופסולת פרי. פרי – עינב, פסולת פרי מאי היא – חומץ.

The Gemara analyzes the details of this *baraita*. **The Master said** above: **Just as the items mentioned in the detail are clearly defined as a fruit or fruit waste, so too everything** forbidden to the nazirite by the Torah is a **fruit or fruit waste**. The Gemara clarifies: **The fruit mentioned by the Torah is grapes. What is fruit waste? Vinegar**, as in the verse: "He shall drink no vinegar of wine or vinegar of strong drink" (Numbers 6:3).

אף כל פרי" מאי היא – גוהרקי. "אף כל" דפסולת פרי – מאי היא? אמר רב כהנא: לאיתויי עינבי דכרין. "ועד וג'." אמר רבינא. לאיתויי דבין הבינים.

What is the statement: **So too everything** forbidden by the generalization is a **fruit**, serving to include? It serves to include **unripe^{HN}** grapes. And **what is the statement: So too everything**, forbidden by the generalization is a fruit or fruit waste, stated with regard to **fruit waste**, serving to include? Which fruit waste unspecified by the verse is added by means of this derivation? **Rav Kahana said: This serves to include grapes that have become wormy.^N** With regard to the phrase "from pits to grape skin," **Ravina said: This serves to include the part of the fruit that is in between^N** the seeds and the skin.

אמר מר: [אי] מה הפרט מפורש פרי גמור – אף כל פרי גמור! אמרת: אם כן מה הניח הכתוב במשמעו שלא אמרו, עינבים לחים ויבשים – הא כתיבי זין וחומץ – הא כתיבי! הא אין עליך לדון כלשון אחרון אלא כלשון ראשון. ומאחר שסופינו לרבות כל דבר, מה תלמוד לומר "מחרצנים ועד וג' – לומר לך: כל מקום שאתה מוציא פֶּרֶט וּכְלָל – אי אתה רשאי למשכו ולדונו בעין הפרט, אלא נעשה כלל מוסף על הפרט, עד שיפרוט לך הכתוב

The Gemara continues to analyze the *baraita*, which it cites at length. **The Master said** above: **If so, just as the items mentioned in the detail are clearly defined as a complete fruit, so too everything is a complete fruit. You say: If so, what has the verse left you to derive from its meaning that it has not stated? Grapes and raisins, these are written; wine and vinegar, these are written. You cannot learn in accordance with the last version; rather, you must learn in accordance with the first version. And as we eventually include everything, what is the meaning when the verse states: "From pit to grape skin"?** This serves to **tell you that wherever you find a detail and a generalization, you cannot broaden it and learn that the generalization is limited to be like the detail; rather, the generalization becomes added to the detail, until the verse specifies for you**

NOTES

Until the verse specifies – עד שיפרוט לך הכתוב: This is a paradigmatic example of the difference between a detail and a generalization, as opposed to a detail, a generalization, and a detail. If there is only a detail and a generalization, then the generalization is the decisive factor, and one includes everything implied by that generalization.

Unripe – גוהרקי: Most commentaries maintain that this means unripe grapes (see *Tosafot* and *Rosh*). Others claim that it refers to the small grapes found between the larger ones, but which are too small to reach a fully ripened state (Commentary on *Nazir*; see *Arukh*).

Grapes that have become wormy – עינבי דכרין: There are many textual variants of this term. Some commentaries maintain that it refers to grapes that have become wormy (Commentary on *Nazir*; *Tosafot*), whereas others claim that it means grapes that have gone sour (Rabbi Avraham min HaHar; Meiri).

In between – בין הבינים: Some commentaries explain that this refers to the fruit itself, specifically the part which is neither the skin nor the seeds. Others maintain that it means the small grapes lying between larger ones, as these grapes are unripe (Rabbeinu Tam). Yet others contend that it refers to the portion of the fruit that remains after the grapes have been pressed, which is inedible (Rabbi Avraham min HaHar; Commentary on *Nazir*).