



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

Zevachim Daf Vuv

- **Q:** Does a korbon which is offered not lishma (which is valid but does not fulfil the obligation of the owner), provide a kappara for the aveira for which it was brought? **A: R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, it would make sense that it does not bring a kappara, because if it did, why would another korbon have to be brought?
 - **Q:** If it does not provide a kappara, then what is the point of bringing it at all? **A: R' Ashi** explained, that **R' Shisha** meant to say, if it does not bring a kappara we can understand why both korbanos are brought – the one offered not lishma is brought because it was a korbon that was made kadosh lishma, and the person later brings another korbon to get his kappara. However, if we say that the first one brings a kappara, why is the second one brought?
- **Q:** Does an olah bring a kappara for an assei that was violated after the korbon was designated as an olah or not? Do we say that it is no different than a chatas, and therefore it will only bring a kappara for a violation committed prior to its designation, or do we say that an olah is different than a chatas in that a single olah can serve as a kappara for the violations of many different assei's, so maybe it can also bring a kappara for a violation that took place after its designation? **A:** We can answer from a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk regarding olah says "v'samach...v'nirtza", which suggests that the smicha is what brings the kapparah. Now, we know that the kapparah comes from the offering of the blood, not the smicha! Rather, the pasuk is teaching that if one is not careful with the smicha and does not do it, the pasuk considers it as if he did not get his kapparah, although he did get it. Presumably, what this means is that although he will have a kappara for the assei's that he was oiver before he designated this olah he will not have a kapparah for violating the assei of smicha, because that did not happen until after the designation.
 - **Rava** said, this does not answer the question. Smicha can be done until the shechita, which means that the assei of smicha is not violated until after the shechita. We know that the olah cannot provide a kapparah for an assei that is violated after its shechita. Our question is whether it can provide a kappara for an assei that was violated after its designation, but before its shechita, and that is not something that is addressed by the Braisa.
 - **R' Huna bar Yehuda** said to **Rava**, we can understand the Braisa as meaning that the person gets a kappara, even for the assei of smicha, but that there is no acceptance by Hashem and it is not pleasing for Him, but the person does not bring another korbon. In fact, we find this in a Mishna. The Mishna says that the leftover oil used by the Kohen in a metzora tahara process should be put onto the metzora's head. **R' Akiva** says, if it is put on his head there is a kappara and if not, there is not. **R' Yochanan ben Nuri** said, this is only a residual mitzvah, and therefore, whether he put it on his head or not, there is a kappara, but we consider it as if there is no kappara. Now, presumably, the Mishna means that although there is a kappara, there is no acceptance by Hashem and it is not pleasing for Him, but the person does not bring another korbon. We see this concept here as well. **Rava** said, that is not what the Mishna means. The Mishna means that if the oil is not put on the metzora's head, there is a kappara that comes about from putting the oil on the thumbs of the metzora, but there is no kappara for putting the oil on his head (since it was not put on his head) and he therefore must still do that.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer the question (whether an olah can bring a kappara for an assei that was violated after the olah was already designated) from a Braisa. The Braisa says,

R' Shimon says, why are the male goats brought as korbanos on Shavuot? They are brought to bring a kappara for tumas Mikdash ukidashav. Once the first one had its blood offered on the Mizbe'ach, why is the second one needed? It is for tumah that happened between this one and that one (between the offering of the first goat and the second goat). Now, if the tumah happened after the bringing of the first goat, it means that this assei was violated after the designation of the goats and we see that the korbon still brings a kappara for it! **A:** The Braisa can be talking about where the goats were not designated at the same time, and the second goat is therefore mechaper for tumah that happened between the *designation* of the first goat and the *designation* of the second goat.

- **Q:** That would mean that the pasuk that requires two korbanos to be brought is only referring to a case where they were not designated at the same time? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, we are discussing korbanos of the tzibbur and, as **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, a korbon tzibbur does not get its designation until immediately before its shechita. This is based on a stipulation of Beis Din.
 - **Q:** **R' Yosef the son of R' Shmuel** asked **R' Pappa**, we find that **R' Shimon** does not agree with this concept!? Also, we find that **R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, does the second korbon bring a kappara for an assei that was violated between the zrika of the first korbon and the zrika of the second korbon? We see that they are asking about an assei that was violated after the shechita, which would suggest that they were certain that an assei violated after designation would certainly get a kappara!? **A:** The Gemara says that this second question can be answered by saying that maybe **R' Yirmiya** was asking about both cases – can it bring a kappara for an assei violated after the animal's designation, and if you say that it can, what about for an assei that was violated after the shechita.