

NOTES

פְּרָטָא מִנָּא לִיה – From where does he derive the detail – The Rabbis do not learn a specific *halakha* from the verse “from pits to grape skin” (Numbers 6:4). Rather, they derive from here the general methodology of a detail, a generalization, and a detail.

ואי בעית אימא: כרבנן. And if you wish, say in accordance with the Rabbis – In other words, Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya interprets the verses in the same manner as the Rabbis. However, he maintains that one derives two matters from the phrase “from pits to grape skin.” First, he learns the methodology of a detail, a generalization, and a detail, which he derives from the fact that this phrase is written after the generalization rather than alongside the other details. Second, he learns the additional *halakha* that a nazirite is liable for consuming two seeds and a skin eaten together.

לכתוב או שני – Let it write either two grape seeds, etc. – In other words, if the verse was merely teaching that seeds and skins are forbidden parts of the grape, it should have stated both of them either in the plural or the singular. The fact that it states: “From pits to grape skin,” indicates that it is referring to a single fruit. Apparently, the Rabbis reject this proof by claiming that the verse is simply speaking of the usual case, as a grape has one skin and several seeds.

וכל בהמה... לשומר וכו' – Or any animal...to guard, etc. – Some commentaries explain that the generalization of “or any animal” refers to all creatures that can be called animals, including undomesticated animals such as bears and lions. The addition of “to guard” teaches that the verse is dealing only with animals that can be guarded, which excludes undomesticated animals (Commentary on *Nazir*; see *Tosafot*). Others maintain, in keeping with alternative versions of the text, that this verse teaches that the oath of the bailee applies only to movable items, not to land.

ואם מן...הצאן וכו' – And if... from the flock, etc. – Some commentaries explain this exposition in the following manner: “And if his offering is from,” excludes an animal that has been used for a transgression; the generalization “the flock” indicates that the entire flock is included, even an animal that has been used in that manner; and the last detail “whether of the sheep or of the goats” means that the generalization includes only animals similar to the detail, i.e., those which have not been used for a transgression. In other words, the generalization teaches that if the transgression in question does not involve the body of the animal itself, e.g., an animal used for bestiality, but it was merely utilized in the performance of a sin, such as Shabbat desecration, or if it was harnessed for plowing with another animal, it may be sacrificed (Commentary on *Nazir*).

Other commentaries are puzzled by this explanation, as there is no reason to think that the phrase “whether of the sheep or of the goats” refers to animals used for a transgression at all (*Tosafot*; Rosh). They therefore explain that this teaches that a ram, i.e., a male sheep in its second year, can be sacrificed as a burnt-offering as well as a lamb, which generally refers to an animal in its first year. Meanwhile, the detail teaches that one may not sacrifice a blemished animal or a *tereifa*, an animal with a wound that will cause it to die within twelve months (Rabbeinu Azriel, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*).

בדרך שפרט לך בגזיר מחרצנים ועד וג' ולרבי אלעזר בן עזריה, דקא מוקים להאי מחרצנים ועד וג' לומר שאינו חייב עד שאיכל שני חרצנים וג', פְּרָטָא מִנָּא לִיה? סבר לה ברבי אלעזר, דְּדְרִישׁ מִיַּעַט וְרִיבָה.

ואי בעית אימא: כרבנן. דאי סלקא דעתך כדאמר רבי אלעזר בן עזריה – לכתביה רחמנא להאי מחרצנים ועד וג' גבי פְּרָטָא, למאי הלכתא בתביה בתר כָּל־ל – שְׁמַע מִיָּנָה לְמִידְוִינְיָה בְּכָל־ל וּפְרָט.

ואימא בוליה להכי הוא דאָתא. אם כן לכתוב או שני חרצנים או שני וגים או חרצן וג', למאי הלכתא בתב רחמנא מחרצנים ועד וג' – שְׁמַע מִיָּנָה לְמִידְוִשׁ בִּיה כָּל־ל וּפְרָט, ואיכא נמי לְמִידְוִשׁ בִּיה: עַד שְׂאִיכַל שְׁנֵי חָרְצָנִים וְג'.

ורבי אלעזר, דְּדְרִישׁ מִיַּעַט וְרִיבָה, פְּרָט וְכָל־ל וּפְרָט מִנָּא לִיה?

אמר רבי אבהו: נפקא ליה מהאי קרא: 'וכי יתן איש אל רעהו חמור או שור או שה' – פְּרָט; 'וכל בהמה' – כָּל־ל; 'לשומר' – חֹזֵר וּפְרָט. פְּרָט וְכָל־ל וּפְרָט – אי אתה דן אלא בעין הפְּרָט.

רבא אמר: נפקא ליה מהאי קרא 'ואם מן' – פְּרָט; 'הצאן' – כָּל־ל; 'בבשים ועזים' – חֹזֵר וּפְרָט.

פְּרָט וְכָל־ל וּפְרָט – אי אתה דן אלא בעין הפְּרָט.

in the manner that it specified with regard to a nazirite: “From pits to grape skin” (Numbers 6:4). The Gemara asks: And according to the opinion of Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, who establishes this verse: “From pits to grape skin” (Numbers 6:4), as serving to say that a nazirite is liable only if he eats two grape seeds and a grape skin, if so from where does he derive the detail? It is unclear how he applies this method of a detail, a generalization, and a detail, as according to his interpretation, the phrase “from pits to grape skin” does not serve to limit the previous generalization but to state a different *halakha*. The Gemara answers: Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Elazar, who interprets this by saying that a verse restricts and amplifies.

And if you wish, say instead that Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya holds in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis^N that this is a case of a detail, a generalization, and a detail. As, if it should enter your mind that the verse is merely teaching that which was stated by Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya, let the Merciful One write this phrase: “From pits to grape skin,” alongside the other details of wine and vinegar. For what halakha did the Torah write: “From pits to grape skin,” after the generalization? Conclude from it that you should derive this halakha by means of the method of a generalization and a detail.

The Gemara asks: But if so, you can say that the entire phrase comes only for this purpose, for a generalization and a detail, and Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya should not derive his *halakha*, that a nazirite is liable only if he eats two grape seeds and a grape skin, from this verse at all. The Gemara answers that Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya would say: If so, let the Torah write either two grape seeds^N and two grape skins, with both terms in the plural, or a grape seed and a grape skin, with both terms in the singular. For what *halakha* did the Merciful One write: “From pits to grape skin”? Learn from it that one should interpret it in the manner of a generalization and a detail, and one can also interpret from it that a nazirite is liable only if he eats two grape seeds and a grape skin.

The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Elazar, who interprets by the method of restriction and amplification that even tendrils and the leaves of a grapevine are included in the prohibition, from where does he derive the method of a detail, a generalization, and a detail?

Rabbi Abbahu says: He derives it from this verse, which deals with a bailee: “And if a man deliver to his neighbor a donkey, or an ox, or a sheep, or any animal to guard, and it dies... the oath of the Lord shall be between them both” (Exodus 22:9). The phrase “a donkey, or an ox, or a sheep” is a detail; “or any animal” is a generalization that includes all animals; and in the phrase “to guard”^N the Torah detailed again. This is a detail, and a generalization, and a detail. In this case, you may deduce that the verse is referring only to items similar to the detail; i.e., items that can be guarded.

Rava said: Rabbi Elazar derives the method of a detail, a generalization, and a detail from this verse: “And if his offering is from the flock, whether of the sheep or of the goats, for a burnt-offering, he shall offer it a male without blemish” (Leviticus 1:10). The phrase “and if his offering is from” is a detail, as it indicates part but not all of something, “the flock”^N is a generalization that includes animals that have been used sinfully, and when it stated: “Sheep,” and: “Goats,” the Torah has detailed again.

This is a detail, and a generalization, and a detail, and therefore you may deduce that the verse is referring only to items similar to the detail. The details teach that only animals that copulated with a person may not be brought as offerings.

אמר ליה רב יהודה מדיסקרתא לרבא: וליילף
 מן הדיו קרא: "מן" – פרט; "הבהמה" – כלל;
 "בקר" ו"צאן" – חזר ופרט. פרט וכלל ופרט –
 אי אתה דן אלא כעין הפרט.

Rav Yehuda of Diskarta said to Rava: And let Rabbi Elazar derive the method of a detail, a generalization, and a detail from this earlier verse, which appears in the same chapter: "From animals, from the herd or from the flock, you shall bring your offering" (Leviticus 1:2), in the following manner: "From" is a detail that excludes an undomesticated animal; "animals"^N is a generalization which includes undomesticated animals (see Deuteronomy, chapter 14); and when it states: "Herd," and: "Flock," the Torah has detailed again. This is a detail, and a generalization, and a detail, and therefore you may deduce that the verse is referring only to items similar to the detail, i.e., domesticated animals.

אמר ליה: מן האי ליבא למשמע מינה, דאי
 מהתם הוה אמינא: "הבהמה"

Rava said to Rav Yehuda of Diskarta: One cannot derive the method of a detail, a generalization, and a detail from this verse, as if the source were from there, I would say the phrase "animals"

NOTES

From is a detail, animals, etc. – מן פרט, הבהמה וכו' – Some commentaries explain that the term "from" excludes undomesticated animals, while the inclusion of "animals" teaches that burnt-offerings can be from animals that are older or younger than those specified by the Torah for other offerings (Commentary on *Nazir*). Others maintain that the verse includes a wild ox, which is not kept alongside other domestic animals, and therefore might not be considered part of the herd. Nevertheless, as it is classified as a domesticated animal, it may be sacrificed as an offering.

Perek VI
 Daf 35 Amud b

חיה בכלל בהמה.

is referring even to undomesticated animals, as an undomesticated animal is included in the general category of animal.^H

אמר ליה: חיה בכלל בהמה? הא כתיב
 "בקר" ו"צאן", והוה ליה פרט וכלל, ואי
 אתה דן אלא כעין הפרט.

Rav Yehuda of Diskarta said to Rava: How can you suggest that in this verse an undomesticated animal is included in the general category of animal? It is written: "Herd" and: "Flock,"^N and this entire phrase is a detail, and a generalization, and a detail, from which you may deduce that the verse is referring only to items similar to the detail, which are herd and flock, not undomesticated animals.

ומגילן דהכי הוא – דתניא:

§ The Gemara asks: And from where do we derive that it is so,^N that in the methodology of generalizations and details, the generalizations are similar to the details? It is as it is taught in a *baraita*: The verse states with regard to the mitzva to bring money for the second tithe^B to Jerusalem: "And you shall bestow the money on all that your heart desires, on cattle, on sheep, on wine, and on strong drink, and on whatever your soul requests" (Deuteronomy 14:26).

HALAKHA

An undomesticated animal is included in the category of animal – חיה בכלל בהמה: An undomesticated animal is considered like a domesticated animal with regard to the prohibition against eating blood. However, the blood of repugnant creatures, creeping animals, fish, and grasshoppers, all of which are not categorized as animals, is not included in this prohibition (Rambam *Sefer Kedusha*, *Hilkhot Ma'akhalot Assurot* 6:1).

BACKGROUND

Second tithe – מעשר שני – The second tithe was a tenth of the produce that remained after *teruma* had been given to the priests and the first tithe had been given to the Levites. It was separated during the first, second, fourth, and fifth years of the Sabbatical cycle. After the second tithe was set aside, it was brought to Jerusalem to be consumed there by its owner. If the journey to Jerusalem was long, making it difficult to carry all the second tithe there, or if the produce became ritually impure, it could be redeemed for an equivalent sum of money. If the owner redeemed his own produce he had to add one-fifth of its value. This redemption money was brought to Jerusalem, where it could be spent only on food.

NOTES

It is written, herd and flock – הא כתיב בקר וצאן: In other words, although undomesticated animals are generally included in the term animal, this detail excludes undomesticated animals. Furthermore, if undomesticated animals are excluded by the second detail, they are excluded by the first detail (*Tosafot*).

ing amplifications and restrictions (Rabbeinu Azriel, cited in *Shita Mekubbetzet*; see *Eiruvin* 27b).

And from where do we derive that it is so – ומגילן דהכי הוא: Some commentaries explain: How do we know that in the case of a detail, a generalization, and a detail, the verse is referring only to items similar to the detail (Commentary on *Nazir*)? According to this interpretation, the question is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, who derive the verse written concerning the nazirite by the method of generalizations and details (*Tosafot*). However, this explanation entails several difficulties. Why does the Gemara answer by citing a new example, when it has just mentioned several instances of a detail, a generalization, and a detail? Some commentaries answer that the Gemara wanted to cite a case involving a dispute between the Rabbis, who employ a generalization and a detail, and Rabbi Elazar, who interprets the same verse as involv-

Another fundamental difficulty is that the Gemara initially inquires about the method of a detail, a generalization, and a detail, and yet the proof it cites refers to a generalization, a detail, and a generalization. Some say that because these two methods are similar, as they differ only in minor aspects, one can derive one from the other (Rosh; see Meiri and Rid). Rabbeinu Peretz maintains that this entire line of questioning is problematic, as the method of a generalization, a detail, and a generalization is one of Rabbi Yishmael's thirteen principles of exegesis listed in the introduction to *Torat Kohanim*, the Midrash to Leviticus, and it clearly states there that the case of a detail, a generalization, and a detail refers only to that which was specified in the detail. Why, then, is the Gemara puzzled by this exegetical principle? He answers that the Gemara is not addressing the basic assertion that a case of detail, a generalization, and a detail is treated like the detail. Rather, it is referring to a specific feature of this principle: From where we derive that this exposition includes even items that are similar to the detail in only one or two aspects, as stated by the Gemara later.

Produce of produce, etc. – פְּרִי מִפְּרִי וכו'. One may use second-tithe money to buy only items that are fit to be eaten by people and that are grown from the ground or that grow from something that grows from the ground. In other words, they must be similar to the examples stated in the Torah (Deuteronomy 14:26): Flock, herd, wine, and strong wine (Rambam *Sefer Zerd'im, Hilkhot Ma'aser Sheni* 7:3).

NOTES

What difference is there between restriction and amplification, etc. – מאי איכא בין מיעט וריבה וכו'. The Rashba claims in his responsa that the text of this entire passage was corrupted, as there are numerous alternative versions of the text, and he goes so far as to say that no two editions of this Gemara include the exact same text here. There are an especially large number of versions of this section because the standard text presents many difficulties. First, it is generally assumed that the method of amplifications and restrictions leads to *halakhot* of a broader scope than do the methods of details and generalizations, whereas the Gemara here indicates the opposite (see *Tosafot*). The Rashba states that this is not difficult, as it results from an essential difference between the two methods. When a verse is interpreted by means of details and generalizations, either the details limit or nullify the generalization, or the generalization includes the details. Either way there is an inherent connection between the clauses. By contrast, if the verse is interpreted by amplifications and restrictions, each clause is distinct. Consequently, it is possible for the method of a generalization and a detail to include more cases.

Another difficulty is that this passage is apparently self-contradictory, as the Gemara here indicates that if the method of amplifications and restrictions is applied, then only tendrils are included, which is the reverse of the earlier statement of the Gemara (34b) that Rabbi Elazar, who derives the verse written concerning a nazirite employing the method of amplifications and restrictions, includes leaves as well. Various answers have been suggested for this difficulty. Some say that the method of amplifications and restrictions does not in fact lead to the inclusion of leaves and that nevertheless, Rabbi Elazar derived this *halakha* from the phrase: "Anything that is made" (Numbers 6:4), as the term "anything" is an inclusion (Commentary on *Nazir*). Others maintain that the Gemara's statement: Tendrils, yes, they are included in the prohibition, whereas leaves, no, they are not included, should not be taken literally, as it simply means that something is excluded, either leaves or branches (Commentary on *Nazir*; Rabbi Avraham min HaHar). Yet others explain similarly that these leaves are not the same as the ones mentioned earlier, but are hard, inedible leaves, like branches (*Tosafot*).

An entirely different version of the text reads: Whereas the one who interprets by amplifications and restrictions includes even leaves, the one who interprets by details and generalizations says tendrils, yes, leaves, no (*Shita Mekubbetzet*, citing Rama). If this version is accepted, the difficulties enumerated are resolved. Yet another alternative reading is: Whereas the one who interprets by details and generalizations includes even branches, the one who interprets by amplifications and restrictions says: Tendrils, yes; branches, no (Rid).

וְנָתַתְּ הַכֶּסֶף כְּבֹל אֲשֶׁר תֵּאָוֶה נִפְשְׁךָ – כָּלֵל, "בְּבִקְרוֹ וּבִצְאוֹן וּבִינֵי וּבִשְׂכָר" – פֶּרֶט; וּבְכֹל אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁאַלְךָ נַפְשְׁךָ – חֹר וְכֹלֵל.

כָּלֵל וּפֶרֶט וְכֹלֵל אִי אֶתָּה דָן אֶלֶּא בְּעֵין הַפֶּרֶט; מִה הַפֶּרֶט מְפֹרֵשׁ: פְּרִי מִפְּרִי וְגִידוּלֵי קִרְקַע – אֶף כֹּל פְּרִי מִפְּרִי וְגִידוּלֵי קִרְקַע.

מִבְּדִי, כָּלֵל וּפֶרֶט וְכֹלֵל – בְּעֵין פֶּרֶט אֶתְּמַר דֵּינֵינוּ, כָּלֵל אֶתְּמַר מֵאֵי אֶהְיֶי? אֶהְיֶי לְאוֹסוּפֵי כָּל דְּדָמֵי לֵיהּ.

וְתוֹ: פֶּרֶט וְכֹלֵל וּפֶרֶט – בְּעֵין הַפֶּרֶט דֵּינֵינוּ, פֶּרֶט אֶתְּמַר בְּתֵרָא מֵאֵי אֶהְיֶי? אִי לֹא פֶּרֶט אֶתְּמַר בְּתֵרָא הִוּוּ אֶמְנֵא נַעֲשֶׂה כָּלֵל מוֹסָף עַל הַפֶּרֶט.

וּמִבְּדִי, תֵּרִין כָּלֵלִי וּפֶרֶטֵא, וְתֵרִין פֶּרֶטֵי וְכֹלֵלֵא – (כָּלֵלֵא) בְּעֵין פֶּרֶטֵא דֵּינֵינוּ, מֵאֵי אִיכָא בֵּינֵי וּבִינֵי?

אִיכָא, דְּאִילוּ תֵּרִתִּין כָּלֵלִי וּפֶרֶטֵא, אִי אִיכָא פֶּרֶטֵא דְּדָמֵי לֵיהּ אֶפִּילוּ בְּחֹד צַד – מִרְבִּינֵן. תֵּרִי פֶּרֶטֵי וְכֹלֵלֵא, אִי אִיכָא פֶּרֶטֵא דְּדָמֵי מִשְׁנֵי צַדִּין – מִרְבִּינֵן, בְּחֹד צַד – לֹא מִרְבִּינֵן.

מִבְּדִי פֶּרֶט וְכֹלֵל – נַעֲשֶׂה כָּלֵל מוֹסָף עַל הַפֶּרֶט, וְאִיתְרַבֵּי כָּל מִילֵי, וּמִיַּעַט וְרִיבָּה נִמְי – רִיבָּה הַכֵּל וְאִיתְרַבֵּי כָּל מִילֵי. מֵאֵי אִיכָא בֵּין מִיַּעַט וְרִיבָּה לְפֶרֶט וְכֹלֵל?

The *baraita* elaborates: The phrase "And you shall bestow the money on all that your heart desires" is a generalization, as no particular type of food is specified. The phrase "on cattle, on sheep, on wine, and on strong drink" is a detail, as specific foods are mentioned. And when the verse concludes: "On whatever your soul requests," it then generalized again, as no specific type of food is stated.

Since the verse is formulated as a generalization, and a detail, and a generalization, you may deduce that it is referring only to items similar to the detail. Just as the items mentioned in the detail are clearly defined as the produce of produce,^h i.e., not only the produce itself but also items that come from it, such as grapes from a seed, and they are also items grown from the ground, as all of these items grow from the ground or receive their main sustenance from it, so too, the generalization includes all items that are the produce of produce and are grown from the ground. This includes birds, but it does not include fish, water, or salt.

§ The Gemara discusses a series of problems with regard to these and other methods of halakhic exegesis: Now, in the case of a generalization, and a detail, and a generalization, one derives that all items which are like the detail are included. However, if that is so, what purpose does the last generalization stated in the verse serve? The same conclusion would be reached if the verse had stated merely a generalization and a detail. The Gemara answers: The purpose of the last generalization is to add all that is similar to it, i.e., even those articles or cases not explicitly listed among the details.

And furthermore, in the case of a detail, and a generalization, and a detail, one again derives that all items which are like the detail are included. If so, what purpose does the last detail stated in the verse serve? The same conclusion would apply if there was simply a detail and a generalization. The Gemara answers: If it were not for the last detail, I would say that the generalization becomes added to the detail, which is broadened in all possible ways. Therefore, the last detail limits the generalization to items or cases that are similar to the detail.

The Gemara continues this line of questioning. And now that it has been established that both with regard to two generalizations and a detail, i.e., a generalization, a detail, and a generalization, and two details and a generalization, i.e., a detail, a generalization, and a detail, one derives that all items that are like the detail are included, what difference is there between this method and that one? The two methods are apparently identical.

The Gemara answers: There is a difference between them, as whereas in a case of two generalizations and a detail, if there is another detail that is similar to the detail specified in the verse even in one aspect, one includes it, due to the two generalizations. By contrast, in the case of two details and a generalization, if there is another detail that is similar to the one mentioned in the verse in two aspects, one includes it. However, if it is similar in only one aspect one does not include it, as the *halakha* is limited by two details.

The Gemara asks another question: Now, in the method of a detail and a generalization, the generalization becomes added to the detail, and all matters are included by the generalization. And the method of restriction and amplification also amplifies and includes everything, and therefore all matters are included in both cases. If so, what difference is there between the method of restriction and amplificationⁿ and that of a detail and a generalization?

The Torah said soaked – אֶמְרָה תֹרֵה מְשֻׂרָת – Most commentaries accept the textual version and explanation of Rashi in tractate *Pesahim* (43b), that this *halakha* is derived from the term “soaked.” Rashi explains that something which has been soaked in wine is forbidden to a nazirite despite the fact that it is not entirely wine. Alternatively, the amplification “anything” includes a mixture that is not composed solely of forbidden substances (Rabbi Avraham min HaHar; Rabbeinu Hananel).

איבא, דאילו פרט וכלל – מרבין אפילו עליו ולולבין, ומיעט וריבה – לולבין אין, עליו – לא.

The Gemara answers: **There is** the following difference, as whereas in the method of a **detail and a generalization one includes** and renders forbidden to a nazirite **even leaves and tendrils of the vine**, with the method of **restriction and amplification one includes less**, as **tendrils, yes**, they are included in the prohibition, whereas **leaves, no**, they are not included.

אמר רבי אבהו אמר רבי יוחנן: כל איסורין שבתורה אין היתר מצטרף לאיסור, חוץ מאיסורי נזיר, שהרי אמרה תורה “משרת”.

§ Rabbi Abbahu says that Rabbi Yoḥanan says: With regard to all prohibitions that are written in the Torah, a permitted substance **does not combine with a forbidden substance**. If one eats a permitted food with a forbidden food and together they constitute the minimum prohibited measure, he is exempt from punishment for this act of consumption. This principle applies to all *halakhot* **except for the prohibitions of a nazirite**, who is liable for eating a mixture of that kind, as the Torah said with regard to a nazirite: “Neither shall he drink anything **soakedⁿ** in grapes” (Numbers 6:3). This verse indicates that a nazirite is prohibited from consuming not only wine and vinegar, but also any food that was soaked in these liquids.

Perek VI

Daf 36 Amud a

זעירי אמר: אף שאור בבל תקטירו. כמאן, ברבי אלעזר, דדריש “כל?”

Ze’iri says: Permitted and forbidden substances combine with regard to **the prohibition against offering leaven on the altar, as well,**^h as it states: “For any [*kol*] leaven and any [*kol*] honey shall be offered as a burnt-offering before the Lord” (Leviticus 2:11). This indicates that one is also liable for sacrificing leaven in a mixture in addition to the liability for sacrificing pure leaven. The Gemara asks: **In accordance with whose** opinion did Ze’iri issue his ruling? It is **in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who derives** from the term *kol* in the verse “You shall eat nothing [*kol*] leavened” (Exodus 12:20) that a mixture with part leaven is forbidden on Passover.

אי הכי, לענין חמץ נמי אין הכי נמי. אלא לאפקי מאבוי, דאמר: יש הקטרה בפחות מכוית, קא משמע לן: אין הקטרה בפחות מכוית.

The Gemara raises a difficulty: **If so**, then with regard to **the matter of leavened bread on Passover**, one should **also** be liable for eating leaven combined with a permitted substance, e.g., less than an olive-bulk of bread soaked in wine, so that the volume is now an olive-bulk. The Gemara answers: **Yes, indeed it is so. Rather**, when Ze’iri specifies that the prohibition applies with regard to sacrificing leaven in offerings, he meant to **excludeⁿ** the statement of **Abaye, who says: There is significance to sacrificing less than an olive-bulk of leaven on the altar**, i.e., one is flogged for sacrificing an offering of that kind. By noting that one is liable due to the fact that permitted substances combine with forbidden substances, **Ze’iri teaches us that there is no significance to sacrificing less than an olive-bulk**, and therefore this is not punishable by lashes.

HALAKHA

The prohibition against offering leaven as well, etc. – אף – שאור בבל תקטירו וכו' honey upon the altar. Even a trace amount of these substances

invalidates an offering. One who sacrifices an olive-bulk of a mixture containing leaven or honey is flogged (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Issurei Mizbe'ah* 5:1–2).

NOTES

Rather, to exclude – אלא לאפקי – Ze’iri could have stated the *halakha* that permitted food combines with forbidden food with regard to leaven on Passover, but he preferred to mention the *halakha* of burning leaven on the altar because he wanted

to take issue with Abaye’s opinion. In Abaye’s opinion, there is no need to apply the principle that less than an olive-bulk of leaven can combine with unleavened bread, as one is liable if he sacrifices even half an olive-bulk by itself.