



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

### Zevachim Daf Mem Aleph

- **Q:** The Gemara had quoted **R' Yishmael** who said that the word "lapar" in the pasuk regarding the par helam davar refers to the par helam davar. The Gemara asks, why would there need to be a reference to the par helam davar in a pasuk that specifically speaks about the par helam davar!? **A: R' Pappa** said, it is because we need the par helam davar to serve as the source to teach through a hekesh that the diaphragm and kidneys of the chatas goat offered for the sin of avodah zara must also be burned on the Mizbe'ach just like those of the par helam davar. Now, the halacha that the diaphragm and kidneys of the par helam davar must be burned is itself only learned from a hekesh from the par of the Kohen Gadol. Now, something that is learned from a hekesh cannot then teach further through another hekesh. By stating the word "lapar", the pasuk makes it as if this halacha was written in regard to the par helam davar itself, and it can therefore be taught further based on a hekesh.
  - A Braisa says like **R' Pappa**. The Braisa says, why does the pasuk say "lapar"? In regard to the pasuk of the chatas goat the pasuk says "chatasam", which refers to the chatas goat, and "shigigasam" which refers to the par helam davar, and the hekesh between them teaches that the diaphragm and kidneys of the chatas goat must be burned just as those of the par helam davar. Now, how can something that itself is only known through a hekesh be taught further through another hekesh? The extra word "lapar" in the pasuk of par helam davar makes it as if this halacha was written in regard to the par helam davar itself, and it can therefore be taught further based on a hekesh.
    - **Q:** Why does the Braisa say that there is a hekesh needed in this pasuk when the pasuk regarding par helam davar already established a hekesh between par helam davar and the chatas goat? **A: R' Pappa** said, if we only had the hekesh in the pasuk of par helam davar we would think to limit it to halachos regarding blood applications, which are the subject of the pasuk. The second hekesh is needed to teach that it even applies to the halachos of the burning of the diaphragm and the kidneys.
- **Q: R' Pappa** stated earlier that the reference to the Yom Kippur par in the pasuk is not there to teach that all its blood applications are essential. **R' Huna the son of R' Nossan** asked, the Tanna said that the reference teaches that all the halachos apply to the Yom Kippur par, which would include the halacha that all the blood applications are essential!? **A:** It is actually a machlokes among Tanna'im regarding how to learn this reference. The yeshiva of **Rav** learned like **R' Pappa** said and the yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** learned as **R' Huna** said.
  - The yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** asked, why is it that the halacha of burning the diaphragm and the kidneys is stated explicitly regarding the par of the Kohen Gadol and not regarding the par helam davar? It is a mashal to a king who was upset at his dear friend for an offense that he committed, but minimized discussing the sin so as not to embarrass him (so too Hashem minimizes the discussion of the par helam davar, which comes for the sin of Klal Yisrael).
  - The yeshiva of **R' Yishmael** asked, why is it that regarding the par of the Kohen Gadol the pasuk uses the words "paroches hakodesh", but not regarding the par helam davar? It is a mashal to a king's people who sinned against him – if it is a minority of the people his rule remains intact, but if it is a majority it does not.

LEFIKACH IHM NASSAN KULAN K'SIKNAN...

- A Mishna says, if a Kohen had piggul intention during the burning of the kemitza of the mincha but not during the burning of the levonah, or visa-versa, **R' Meir** says it is piggul and carries kares, and the **Chachomim** say there is no piggul until the intent is had during the entire matir (the permitter of the rest of the korban).

- **Reish Lakish** said, don't think that **R' Meir** holds this way because he says piggul is effective when the intent is on less than all of the matir. Rather, the case of the Mishna was where he offered the kemitza with the intent and then offered the levonah in silence, or visa-versa, and he holds that when one does something he does so based on his initial intent. We can learn that this is the basis of **R' Meir** based on our Mishna. The Mishna says that if 3 applications were done properly and one was done improperly it is passul but there is no kares. This implies that if one was done improperly (presumably meaning with piggul intent) and the rest are done properly (presumably meaning in silence) it would be full piggul. Now, whose view does this follow? It can't follow the **Rabanan**, because they hold that one cannot create piggul on less than the entire matir. Rather, it must follow **R' Meir**. If the reason of **R' Meir** is because he holds that piggul can be created on less than the entire matir, then why is it not piggul in the first case? Rather, it must be that he holds that we follow the original intent!
  - **R' Shmuel bar Yitzchak** said this is no proof. It may be that when the Mishna says "properly" it refers to a "proper piggul" and teaches that when there was full piggul intent during the first three applications but not during the last, it is passul but there is no kares, because we do not say that the last one was done on the basis of the original intent.
    - **Q:** When the Mishna says, "Therefore, if he did the first 3 properly and one improperly it is passul and there is no kares", it is clear that "properly" refers to a proper application, not to a proper piggul intention, and "improperly" is meant to contrast that!? **A: Rava** said, "improperly" refers to an intent for beyond its place and "properly" refers to full piggul of beyond its time. **R' Ashi** said that "improperly" refers to an intent of not lishma.
      - **Q:** This suggests, that if the last one was done with no intent, there would be kares, which would mean that the Mishna holds that we follow the original intent!? **A:** The Mishna only said this to be symmetrical with the first part of the Mishna that says that it is piggul and there is kares. Therefore, it says here that it passul and there is no kares. However, in truth, even if the last application was done without any intent, it would not be piggul.