



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

Zevachim Daf Beis

MESECHTA ZEVACHIM

PEREK KOL HAZEVACHIM -- PEREK RISHON

MISHNA

- All korbanos that were shechted not for their own sake (e.g. an Olah that was shechted for the sake of a Shelamim) are valid, except that they do not count to satisfy the obligation of the owner. The exceptions to this rule are a Chatas and a Pesach, which become passul when they are not offered for their own sake. The Pesach becomes passul when it is offered in this way in its proper time (Erev Pesach), and the Chatas is passul when it is offered in this way at any time.
 - **R' Eliezer** says, an Asham also becomes passul when it is shechted not for its own sake. The Pesach becomes passul when it is offered in this way in its proper time (Erev Pesach), and the Chatas and Asham are passul when they are offered in this way at any time. **R' Eliezer** explains, a Chatas is brought for a sin and an Asham is brought for a sin – just as a Chatas is passul when it is offered not for its own sake, the same will be true for an Asham.
 - **Yose ben Choni** says, a korbon that is shechted for the sake of a Pesach or for the sake of a Chatas is passul.
 - **Shimon the brother of Azarya** said, if a korbon is shechted for the sake of a different korbon of greater kedusha than itself, it is valid. If it is shechted for the sake of a korbon of lesser kedusha, it is passul. For example, if kodshei kodashim were shechted for the sake of kodshei kalim, they will be passul, but kodshei kalim that were shechted for the sake of kodshei kodashim will be valid. Similarly, if a Korbon Bechor or a Korbon Maaser was shechted for the sake of a Shelamim it will be valid, but the reverse would be passul.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why did the Mishna say “except” that they do not count for the obligation of their owners? Why couldn't it just say, they are valid “but” they do not count for the obligation of their owners? **A:** The Mishna is teaching that they don't count for the obligation of their owners, but they remain in their original state of kedusha, and therefore it would be assur to make any more changes during the remaining parts of the Avodah (e.g. all intent must be for the sake of this korbon).
 - This is as **Rava** said, that if an Olah is shechted not for its sake, it is still assur to offer its blood not for its sake. We can say this is based on logic and we can say it is based on a pasuk. The logic would be – just because there was one change that was made improperly, does that mean that we should go ahead and make more improper changes!? The pasuk would be “motza sifasecha tishmor v'asisa kasher nadarta laHashem Elokecha nedava...” The pasuk refers to the korbon as a neder and then as a nedava – this doesn't make sense!? Rather, the pasuk is teaching that if the korbon was brought properly, it will be considered a fulfillment of the obligation of the owner. If not, it will not fulfil the obligation, but will still be treated as a nedava. Now, it is not mutar to make improper changes to a nedava!
- **Ravina** said to **R' Pappa**, you missed the shiur last night where **Rava** posed contradictions and answered them. **Ravina** repeated what was said in the shiur. Our Mishna says, “All korbanos that were shechted not for their own sake are valid but don't count to fulfil the obligation of the owner”. This suggests that it is only because it was specifically done not for its own sake.

However, if it was without any specific intent it seems that it would even fulfil the obligation of the owner. We see from here that no specific intent is the equivalent of having proper intent. However, there is a Mishna regarding a get that says that any get that is written not for the sake of that particular woman is passul, and over there we know that even when it is written without any specific intent it is also passul!? **Rava** answered, when animals are made kadosh as korbanos they take on the designation of the korbon for which they were given, and therefore, even without specific intent are considered to be for their own sake. A woman is not considered “designated” to be divorced, and therefore, without specific intent the get is not considered to be for her sake.

- **Q:** How do we know that a korbon offered without specific intent is valid? It can't be based on the fact that our Mishna says “all korbanos that are offered not for their sake” instead of saying “all korbanos that are not offered for their sake”, because regarding get the Mishna also says “any get that is written not for the sake of the woman to be divorced is not valid” and doesn't say “any get that was not written for the sake of the woman is invalid”. Therefore, the order of the words can't show that without specific intent it is valid, because then a get should have the same halacha!? **A:** Rather, it is from another Mishna which says, “The case of ‘intending for the sake of the Pesach and then changing the intent to be not for the sake of a Pesach (in which case it would be passul)’ would be if he began with intent for a Pesach and then had intent for a Shelamim”. Now, the Mishna suggests that if he began with intent for a Pesach and then completed the Avodah without any specific intent, it would be valid. We see that no specific intent is like intent for its sake.
 - **Q:** This is no proof! It may be that it would be valid in that case only because we assume that when someone does something he does it based on his original intent (so it is considered as if he did the entire Avodah for the sake of the Pesach), but had he not had any intent at all, it may be that it would be passul!? **A:** Rather, we can see this from the end of that Mishna. The Mishna says, “The case of ‘intending not for the sake of the Pesach and then changing the intent to be for the sake of a Pesach’ would be if he began with intent for a Shelamim and then had intent for the Pesach.” Now, the Mishna suggests that if he began with no specific intent and then completed the Avodah with specific intent for Pesach, it would be valid. We see that no specific intent is like intent for its sake!
 - **Q:** This is no proof! It may be that it would be valid in that case only because we assume that when someone does something at the end it shows that this was his intent all along (so it is considered as if he did the entire Avodah for the sake of the Pesach), but had he not had any intent at all, it may be that it would be passul!? We can also say that nothing can be learned from this part of the Mishna, because it may just be that the Mishna gives this second case only because it is the reverse of the first case, but not that something should be learned from it! **A:** Rather, we can see this from the following Mishna which gives 6 intents that must be had when a korbon is being brought, with one of them being intent for its sake. **R' Yose** says, even if it is offered without this intent it is valid, because Beis Din made a stipulation that a korbon should be offered without specific intent. The reason they did so is to prevent someone from offering for the sake of the wrong korbon. Now, from the fact that Beis Din made this stipulation we can clearly see that a korbon offered without specific intent is valid, because if it would be passul, Beis Din would never have made such a stipulation.
- **Q:** How do we know that a get written without specific intent for that woman is passul? It can't be based on the Mishna that says, “If a person was walking through the market and heard sofrim talking (to their students) and saying ‘so-and-so is divorcing his wife named so-and-so, from such-and-such a place’ (and he instructs them to write this get as a training exercise), and the passerby says – that is my name, my wife's name, and my city, so I will use this for my divorce! He may not do so, because the get is passul.” This Mishna seems to show that no specific intent is passul. However, the reason it is passul in that case is like **R' Pappa** said, that since this is written as an academic exercise it is

not written for the purpose of divorce, and that is why it is passul! **A:** Rather, it can be seen from the next part of that Mishna which says, “Moreover, if a person wrote a get for his wife and then decided not to divorce her, and he then finds another man who has his name, whose wife has his wife’s name, and who lives in the same city, who wants to divorce his wife and is willing to use the get he wrote, he may not use it because it is passul.” This seems to show that a get must be written with specific intent in order to be valid!

- **Q:** This case may be different, because it was to be used for someone else’s divorce and that is why it is not considered to be “without specific intent”!? **A:** Rather, it can be seen from the next part of that Mishna which says, “Moreover, if a man has two wives with the same name and he wrote a get to divorce the older wife, he cannot then decide to use the get to divorce the younger wife.” This seems to show that a get must be written with specific intent in order to be valid!
- **Q:** This case may be different, because it was to be used for the divorce of the other wife and that is why it is not considered to be “without specific intent”!? **A:** Rather, it can be seen from the next part of that Mishna which says, “Moreover, if he tells the sofer to write the get for whichever one he later decides to divorce (they both had the same name), the get is passul.” This seems to show that a get must be written with specific intent in order to be valid!
- **Q:** This case may be different, because the reason it is passul may be based on the fact that we say that there is no “breirah”!? **A:** Rather, it can be seen from the following Mishna, which says, “One who writes the tofes of a get (without being instructed by a husband to do so) must leave the name of the man, of the woman, of the witnesses and the date, blank.” **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** (in the Gemara on that Mishna) says, when writing the get he must also leave blank the place for the statement of “harei aht muteres l’chol adam”, because that is the essential part of the get. We clearly see from here that a get must be written with specific intent for the woman to be divorced, and without specific intent it will be passul.