

Makos Review Lesson 77 - DAF 15B-16A:

1. **Question:** What is the source of their argument?
2. **Answer:** They argue about whether or not Safek (doubtful) warning is considered warning;
 - **R. Yochanan** says that it is good warning. He holds Bitlo v'Lo Bitlo, so the Lav is not 'complete' until he is Mevatel (nullifies) the Aseh;
 - At the time he transgresses the Lav, we can give only Safek warning (we do not know whether or not he will Mevatel the Aseh. Nevertheless, he is lashed);
 - **Reish Lakish** says that it is not proper warning. He holds Kiymo v'Lo Kiymo, so one is lashed for the Lav itself (just he can exempt himself from lashes if he will fulfill the Aseh). He receives definite warning. HASRA'AS SAFEK AND LAV SHE'EIN BO MA'ASEH
3. Each of them teaches like he taught elsewhere.
4. **R. Yochanan and Reish Lakish:** If Reuven swore 'I will eat this loaf today' and he did not eat it, he is not lashed;
5. **R. Yochanan:** He is not lashed because this Lav does not come through an action;
6. **Reish Lakish:** He is not lashed because he cannot receive definite warning (perhaps he will eat the loaf later), and Safek warning is invalid. (R. Yochanan does not give this reason because he rules that a Safek warning is. Valid.)