



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

Shavuos Daf Chuf Gimmel

- **Rava** said, from our Mishna we can prove the concept of **R' Chiya bar Avin**, that "eating" includes drinking as well. Our Mishna said, if one makes the oath "I will not eat" and he then eats and drinks, he is only chayuv one korbon. Now, if drinking is included in eating, that is why the Mishna had to teach us that he is only chayuv one korbon. But, if drinking is not included in "eating" why would we think that drinking would make him chayuv for violating the oath not to "eat"? **Abaye** said to **Rava**, the next part of the Mishna suggests the opposite. The Mishna says, if one makes the oath "I will not eat and I will not drink" and he then eats and drinks, he is chayuv two korbanos. Now, if drinking is included in "eating", then when he said "I will not eat" it already included a prohibition to drink, so what did the second oath add that would make it an effective oath!? If he said "I will not drink" twice and then drank, he would not be chayuv two korbanos! **Rava** said, this part of the Mishna is talking about a case where the person first said "I will not drink" and then said "I will not eat", because although drinking is included in "eating", eating is not included in "drinking".
 - **Q:** If the case of the Mishna is as **Rava** proposed, why does the first part of the Mishna give the case where he said "I will not eat" and he then ate and drank and is only chayuv one korbon? Why doesn't it give the case of "I will not eat and I will not drink" and he then ate and drank, in which case he would still only be chayuv one korbon? By giving this case we would definitely know that when he only says "I will not eat" he is certainly only chayuv one korbon!? **A:** Rather, the second case of the Mishna is where he first said "I will not eat" and then said "I will not drink". The reason he is chayuv two korbanos is that by saying "I will not drink" he is showing that when he said "I will not eat" he did not mean to include drinking. Therefore, it is a totally separate oath.
- **R' Ashi** said, from our Mishna we can prove the concept of **R' Chiya bar Avin**, that "eating" includes drinking as well. Our Mishna said, if a person makes the oath "I will not eat" and then ate things that are unfit to be eaten or drank something that is unfit for drinking he is patur. This suggests that if he drank something fit for drinking he would be chayuv. We see that drinking is included in "eating".
 - The Gemara says this is no proof. The Mishna may be referring to a person who said, "I will not eat and I will not drink".

SHVUAH SHELO OCHAL V'ACHAL PAS CHITTIN...

- **Q:** Why do we assume that his mentioning of the three types of breads are meant to be three separate oaths? Maybe they were enumerated only to make it clear that he does not mean to include other types of bread in his one oath? **A:** If so, he should have said "wheat, barley, or spelt" without mentioning "bread".
 - **Q:** Maybe he mentioned "bread" to be clear that he is not referring to a prohibition of chewing on these kernels? **A:** If so, he should have mentioned "bread" once, not for each type of grain.
 - **Q:** Maybe he said "bread" each time so that we not think he was prohibiting wheat bread, and the chewing of the barley and spelt kernels? **A:** If so, he should have said "bread of wheat, and of barley, and of spelt".
 - **Q:** Maybe he said "bread" each time so that we not think he was prohibiting only a mixture of the 3 in a bread? **A:** If so he should have said "bread of wheat, and likewise of barley, and likewise of spelt". The fact that he repeated "bread" each time means that he meant it as 3 separate shevuos.

SHEVUAH SHELO ESHTAH V'SHASAH MASHKIN HARBEI...

- **Q:** Regarding bread it was the multiple mentions of “bread” that made us say that he meant it as 3 separate oaths. In this case of drinks, why does the Mishna say that when he said “I will not drink wine, oil, or honey” and then drank all 3 he is chayuv 3 korbanos? Maybe he mentioned all three only to exclude the prohibition of any other beverages!? **A: R' Pappa** said, the Mishna is discussing where these 3 beverages were lying in front of him, and he therefore should have just said “I will not drink these”. The fact that he listed them out tells us that he meant to make 3 oaths.
 - **Q:** If he would have said “these” we would say that he meant “I may not drink these, but I may drink other drinks of this kind” (i.e. I will not drink this wine, oil, and honey, but will drink other wine, oil, and honey)? **A:** He could have said “I will not drink anything like these”.
 - **Q:** If he would say that, we would say that he meant to only prohibit drinking these in the amounts that were before him, but in other amounts it would be mutar!? **A:** He could have said, “I will not drink from this assortment of drinks”.
 - **Q:** If he would say that, we would say that he meant to only prohibit drinking these types of beverages, but these beverages in front of him would remain mutar!? **A:** He could have said “I will not drink these or their type”.
 - **R' Acha the son of R' Ika** said, the case is that he was being pressured to drink and was being told “come and drink with us wine, oil, and honey”. He could have simply answered with an oath that “I will not drink with you”. The fact that he listed these 3 means that he meant to make 3 separate oaths.
- A Mishna says, if a person says to another, “Give me my wheat, barley, or spelt that I have in your possession” and the other person responded with an oath that “You have nothing in my possession”, and it turns out that this second person was lying, he would only be chayuv one korbon. However, if he had responded with an oath that, “You do not have wheat, barley, or spelt in my possession”, he would be chayuv a korbon for each species. **R' Yochanan** said, if there was only a perutah of value in all the species combined, they would combine to make him chayuv a korbon.
 - **R' Acha and Ravina** argue – one says in this second case he would only be chayuv for the specifications that he made, but not for the general denial, and the other says he would be chayuv for a general denial as well, making him chayuv four korbanos.
 - **Q:** Would they also argue in the case with the breads in our Mishna? **A: Rava** said, if he would be chayuv in general in our Mishna, then the specific oaths would not take effect, because they are already under oath from the general oath. In the case with the denial, he would be chayuv for each oath of denial that he makes. Therefore, these cases can't be compared.

SHEVUAH SHELO OCHAL...

- **Q:** The Mishna seems to contradict itself!? The Mishna says that if he makes the oath “I will not eat” and then ate or drank inedible or undrinkable items he is patur. The Mishna then says, that if he makes the oath “I will not eat” and then ate neveilos, treifos, etc. (which are also unfit to be eaten) he would be chayuv!? **A:** The first part of the Mishna is where he says in general “I will not eat”. The second part of the Mishna is where he said specifically “I will not eat neveilos, treifos, etc.”.
 - **Q:** Why would the oath take effect on neveilos, treifos, etc.? He is already assur to these things from the Torah!? **A: Rav, Shmuel, and R' Yochanan** all said that the case is where he adds permitted food items to his oath. **Reish Lakish** said the case would be according to the **Rabanan** where he specified that the oath should take effect on less than a kezayis, and according to **R' Akiva** even where he didn't make a specification, because he holds that a person means for his oath to take effect even on the smallest amount.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** didn't want to answer like **Reish Lakish**, because he wanted to answer in a way that the Mishna can follow all views. But, why didn't **Reish Lakish** answer like **R' Yochanan**? **A:** He would say that we only say the concept of “issur kolel” when the second issur comes on its own, not when it is self-created like in the case of an oath.