



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Closing Specification

The *Gemora* asks: According to Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah who uses the words in the Torah *from the seeds to the skin* to teach us that a *nazir* is not liable until he eats two seeds and a skin, where does he derive the closing specification? (*The Chachamim had expounded the nazir verse as follows: “A nazir should abstain from wine and aged wine” is a specification. “From anything made from the grapevine” is a generalization. “From the seeds to the skin” is a specification. This teaches us that the prohibitions applicable to the nazir are only things that are similar to the specification, such as the fruits of the vine, but not the vine itself. The Gemora is asking: How does Rabbi Elozar ben Azaryah derive this teaching if he uses the last clause to teach us something else?*)

The *Gemora* answers: Perhaps he holds like Rabbi Elozar, who expounds the *nazir* verse differently. (*Rabbi Elozar disagreed with the Chachamim and held that a nazir is prohibited to eat even the leaves and the shoots from the vine. He expounded the verse as follows: “A nazir should abstain from wine and aged wine” is a limitation. “From anything made from the grapevine” is an extension. This teaches us that a nazir is forbidden from eating the leaves and the shoots from the vine. It emerges*

that the verse “from the seeds to the skin” is available to teach us that a nazir is not liable until he eats two seeds and a skin.)

Alternatively, we can answer that he holds like the *Chachamim*, and nevertheless, the verse *from the seeds to the skin* is still available for the closing specification, for if the verse would only be teaching his *halacha* (*that a nazir is not liable until he eats two seeds and a skin*), the Torah should have written this phrase together with the other specifications (*a nazir should abstain from wine and aged wine*). Why was it written after the generalization of *from anything made from the grapevine*? It is to derive the closing specification.

The *Gemora* asks: Perhaps the verse is only meant for the closing specification (*and not for his halacha that a nazir is not liable until he eats two seeds and a skin*)?

The *Gemora* answers: If the verse would only be used for the closing specification, the Torah could have written *from the seeds to the skins* (*both in the plural form*), or *from the seed to the skin* (*both in the singular form*). Why did the Torah write *from the seeds to the skin*? It is used for the generalization and specification exposition and

also for the *halacha* that a *nazir* is not liable until he eats two seeds and a skin. (35a)

Specification – Generalization - Specification

The *Gemora* asks: According to Rabbi Elozar, who states that the *nazir* verse is used in a limitation and extension format, where does he derive a specification – generalization - specification format?

Rabbi Avahu says: It is derived from the following verse [Shmos 22:9]: *If a man gives his friend a donkey, a bull, a lamb. This is a specification. Or any animal is a generalization. Animal for safekeeping is a closing specification. This specification – generalization - specification teaches us that it must be similar to the specification (which would teach us that the laws of safekeeping do not apply to debt documents which do not have an inherent value or land which is not moveable).*

Rava says: It is derived from the following verse [Vayikra 1: 10]: *(And if his offering is brought from the sheep or from goats as a burnt offering he shall sacrifice it an unblemished male.) From the sheep is a specification. Sheep is a generalization (since it connotes all types of sheep). Sheep or from goats is a closing specification. This specification – generalization - specification teaches us that it must be similar to the specification (which would teach us that an animal must be unblemished to be*

brought on the Altar and a sheep that is in its second year can also be brought as a korban).

Rav Yehudah of Diskarta asked Rava: You could have mentioned an earlier verse [Vayikra 1: 2]: *(When a man from among you brings a sacrifice to Hashem; from animals, from cattle or from the flock you shall bring your sacrifice.) From animals is a specification. Animals is a generalization (since it connotes even wild animals). From cattle or from the flock is a closing specification. This specification – generalization - specification teaches us that it must be similar to the specification (which would teach us that a wild animal may not be brought as a korban).*

Rava answers and says that it cannot be derived from that verse, for it can be said that the word *animals* is not excluding wild animals, for a *chayah* is included in a *beheimah*.

Rav Yehudah disagrees and says that by the fact that the Torah specified *from cattle or from the flock (and that is certainly excluding all chayos)*, it is therefore a specification and generalization and it therefore must be similar to the specification. (35a – 35b)

Necessity for all those Specifications, Generalizations, Limitations and Extensions

(The Chachamim had expounded the nazir verse a specification – generalization - specification format.) The *Gemora* asks: Where do we find this

type of exposition elsewhere (*that its halachos must be similar to the specification*)?

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* (referring to the money of *ma'aser sheini*; a tenth of one's produce that he brings to Yerushalayim and eats there in the first, second, fourth and fifth years of the Shemittah cycle; it can also be redeemed with money and the money is brought up to Yerushalayim, where he purchases animals for *korbanos*): (And you shall turn that money into whatever your soul desires; cattle, sheep, new wine or old wine, or whatever your soul desires, and you shall eat there before Hashem, your God, and you shall rejoice, you and your household.) And you shall turn that money into whatever your soul desires is a generalization. Cattle, sheep, new wine or old wine is a specification. Or whatever your soul desires is a closing generalization. This generalization - specification - generalization (the *Rosh* says that a specification - generalization - specification is basically the same as a generalization - specification - generalization) teaches us that one may only purchase items with *ma'aser sheini* money that are products of things themselves produced by the earth (*this would include birds, but it would exclude fish, which does not get its nourishment from the ground, and it would also exclude water and salt, which is not produced from other foodstuff*). (35b)

The *Gemora* asks: What is the closing generalization for? Even without it, the result would be the same (*a generalization and than a specification would teach us that all specifications*

must be similar to the specification, and that is the same way we would expound it with the final generalization)!

The *Gemora* answers: With the closing generalization, we are able to derive other cases that are similar to the specifications (*without it, we would say that only the specifications mentioned are included in the halacha*).

The *Gemora* asks: What is the closing specification necessary when we have a specification - generalization - specification (*wouldn't the verse be expounded the same without it*)?

The *Gemora* answers: Without the closing specification, we would have said that the generalization is adding onto the specification and everything should be included (*the closing specification is necessary to teach us that only things that are similar to the specification are included*).

The *Gemora* asks: what is the difference between a generalization - specification - generalization and a specification - generalization - specification?

The *Gemora* answers: When there are two generalizations, we even include cases that are similar to the specification in one way, whereas when there are two specifications, the included cases must be similar in two ways.



The *Gemora* asks: What is the difference between a specification and then a generalization, where we say that the generalization adds on and includes everything, and a limitation and then an extension, where we also say that everything is included?

The *Gemora* answers: If we would expound the *nazir* verse in a “specification and then a generalization” format, we would have included leaves and shoots (*hard ones*) in the prohibition. However, with a “limitation and then an extension” format, we would only include the leaves, but not the shoots. (35b)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Summary of the Specifications, Generalizations, Limitations and Extensions

Generalization and a specification – only the specifics mentioned are included.

Specification and a generalization – everything is included.

Generalization, specification and a generalization – other cases must resemble the specifications mentioned at least in one way.

Specification, generalization and a specification - other cases must resemble the specifications mentioned in two ways.

Limitation and extension – everything except for one thing is included.

Extension and limitation - other cases must resemble the limitations mentioned.

Extension, limitation and extension - everything except for one thing is included.

Limitation, extension and limitation – there is no such type. (Hame’or)