



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Shavuos Daf Chuf Beis

AMAR LAHEN HEICHAN MATZINU BIMIDABEIR UMEIVI KORPON...

- **Q: R' Akiva** said that there is no other case of a person becoming chayuv a korbon for something that he said. The Gemara asked, we have the case of a person who curses Hashem, who must bring a korbon for what he said!? **A:** He is referring to a case of someone who speaks and makes something assur, not someone who speaks and commits an aveira.
 - **Q:** There is the case of nazir, who prohibits with his speech and brings a korbon!? **A:** He was referring to bringing a korbon for his speech. A nazir brings a korbon to permit himself to drink wine.
 - **Q:** There is the case of something made hekdesch, which becomes assur because of what the person says and yet he brings a korbon if he violates that by benefitting from the item!? **A:** He was referring to something that becomes assur only to the person who spoke, and hekdesch becomes assur to everyone in the world.
 - **Q:** There is the case of konamos, which becomes assur only to that person and yet he must bring a korbon if he violates what he said!? **A: R' Akiva** holds that konamos are not subject to me'ilah and would therefore not make him chayuv to bring a korbon.
- **Rava** said, the machlokes between **R' Akiva** (that any minute amount makes him chayuv) and the **Rabanan** (that only a kezayis makes him chayuv) is only where the person didn't specify an amount in his oath. If he did specify the oath to include even the smallest amount, all would agree that eating even the smallest amount makes him chayuv. The reason for this is that specification is like eating a whole being (it is significant and is not limited to being larger than a kezayis).
 - **Rava** said, the machlokes is only regarding an oath of "I will not eat". However, if the oath was "I will not taste", all agree that he would be chayuv for even the smallest amount. We don't say that "I will not taste" is simply a figure of speech, for which he would only be chayuv for eating a kezayis.
 - **R' Pappa** said, the machlokes is only regarding oaths. However, regarding konamos all would agree that any small amount would make him chayuv. The reason is, that he doesn't mention the word "eating" and is therefore considered as if he specified even the smallest amount.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that two pieces of food assur by 2 different konamos combine to make a kezayis, but if they were made assur with a shavuah they do not combine. Now, if no minimum amount is needed, why do we need them to combine? **A:** The Braisa is discussing where he said "Eating from this is assur to me with konam". Therefore, a kezayis is needed.
 - **Q:** If he said that regarding two different pieces of food, why do they combine? **A:** The case is that he said, "Eating from both of these pieces is assur to me as konam".
 - **Q:** If that is the case, then why in the case of shavuah do they not combine? **A: R' Pinchas** said, regarding a shavuah, where the two pieces would result in two separate korbanos, they don't combine. Regarding konamos, where there would only be one korbon, the two pieces combine.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says that **R' Meir** says that konamos are like shavuos in that the pieces won't combine. Why wouldn't konamos combine? **A:** We must reverse the Braisa so that **R' Meir** says shavuos are like konamos, in that they both combine, and **R' Meir** does not hold like **R' Pinchas**.

- If he said “benefit from me should be assur to my wife as konam if I ate today” and he had eaten neveilos, treifos, shekatzim, or remasim, his wife would become assur to benefit from him.

GEMARA

- **R’ Chiya bar Avin in the name of Shmuel** said, if someone makes the oath “I will not eat” and he then drank, he is chayuv. This can be derived either based on logic – people say “let’s eat” and they then go and eat and drink, or based on a pasuk – as **Reish Lakish** learns from the pasuk that says “v’achalta lifnei Hashem...tirosh’cha” (you should eat...your wine) that drinking is included in the term “eating”.
 - **Q:** Maybe this refers to eating wine added to a food dish!? **A: R’ Acha bar Yaakov** said, the pasuk says one should use his ma’aser sheini money to buy animals, wine, “sheichar”, etc., and then says “v’achalta sham”.
 - **Q:** Maybe this also refers to eating wine added to a food dish!? **A:** The pasuk says “sheichar”, which means it is an intoxicating substance (when added to a food it is no longer intoxicating).
 - **Q:** Maybe “sheichar” doesn’t refer to a liquid, but rather refers to an intoxicating food, like certain figs? **A:** We learn from a gezeirah shava from nazir, that “sheichar” refers to wine.