



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

Zevachim Daf Mem Beis

- **Reish Lakish** had said that **R' Meir** agrees that piggul intent is not effective on less than a full matir, and that when there is an initial intent and then silence, we follow the initial intent.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, that with regard to blood applications of the inside Mizbe'ach, if a piggul intent was had during the first application or even during the second or third application, **R' Meir** says it is piggul with a chiyuv kares and the **Chachomim** say that there is no kares until the intent was on the full matir. This seems to show that **R' Meir** holds that piggul is effective even when the intent is on less than the full matir!? **A:** **R' Yitzchak bar Avin** said, the Braisa is discussing where the intent was had during the shechita, which is considered to be a full matir.
 - **Q:** If so, why do the **Rabanan** say that it is not piggul? **A:** **Rava** said, the **Rabanan** of the Braisa is the view of **R' Eliezer** of a Mishna who says that an avodah done with part of a korbon is not considered to be an avodah. Therefore, an intent during the shechita of a korbon whose blood is needed for only part of the blood applications (e.g. one of the animals used for the Yom Kippur avodah), would not create piggul.
 - **Q:** **Rava** has said that **R' Eliezer** agrees that a person is chayuv for making even one blood application outside the Mikdash, which would mean that he would similarly hold that a piggul intent regarding the one application would create piggul!? If so, how could the **Rabanan** say that it is not piggul!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said the Braisa is discussing where the first application was done with a piggul intent, the second was done in silence, and the third was again done with piggul intent. **R' Meir** holds it is piggul, because the second one is considered to have been done with piggul intent as well. The **Rabanan** don't make that assumption and therefore say it is not piggul. The chiddush is, that we would think that the fact that he had the intent during the third one again shows that the second was not done based on his initial intent.
 - **Q:** **R' Ashi** asked, the Braisa doesn't make any mention of the Kohen being silent!? **A:** Rather, **R' Ashi** said, the Braisa is discussing where the Kohen had piggul intent during the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd application, and was silent during the fourth. We would think that **R' Meir** would agree that we don't say that the 4th was done based on his initial intent, because if so, why did he need to have the intent during the 2nd and 3rd as well? The Braisa teaches that **R' Meir** says this is piggul as well.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says, "whether during the 1st or the second...", not that it was during both!? This is a KASHYEH.
 - **Q:** The Braisa was explained to mean that **R' Meir** says it is piggul and a chiyuv kares whether he had the piggul intent during the first, second, or third applications. Now, we have learned that there is no kares for piggul unless all the blood avodos are done. However, if there is a piggul intent regarding one of the earlier applications, it is as if the later applications are not made at all, so there should not be kares!? **A:** **Rabbah** said, the case could be where the blood of a different animal was used for each of the applications (the blood spilled in between), and therefore it is considered to be a complete avodah. **Rava** said, it can be that there were not multiple animals. The reason there is kares is that

the applications after the intent are considered valid to the extent that they create piggul.

- **Q:** A Braisa says, that with regard to a mincha, if piggul intent is had during the offering of the kemitza, and the levonah is offered in silence, or if the kemitza is offered in silence and the levonah is offered with piggul intent, **R' Meir** says it is piggul with kares and the **Chachomim** say there is only piggul when the intent is on the full matir. This second case (kemitza in silence and the levonah with piggul intent) shows that **R' Meir** holds that piggul can be created with an intent on less than the full matir!? **A:** The Braisa means, that the kemitza was offered silently when the levonah was previously offered with piggul intent.
 - **Q:** First of all, that would be the same thing as the first case!? Secondly, the Braisa clearly says “and after that the levonah was offered...”!? This remains a KASHYEH.