

YESHIVAT HAR ETZION
ISRAEL KOSCHITZKY VIRTUAL BEIT MIDRASH (VBM)

TALMUDIC METHODOLOGY
By Rav Moshe Taragin

For easy printing go to:
www.vbm-torah.org/archive/metho71/13metho.htm

Shiur #13: *Haktara*

The scheduling of the morning *tamid* and the *ma'aracha* of the *mizbeiach*

In *Parashat Tzav*, the Torah describes the maintenance of coals and ashes on the outer altar of the *Mikdash*. Each morning, a *Kohen* would remove the previous day's accumulated ashes, and others would begin constructing the wooden pyre or *ma'aracha* to enable sacrificing the next day's ashes. The *pesukim* in *Tzav* also demands a constant fire upon the altar and concludes by describing the daily "menu" of *korbanot*. The *Olah* is sacrificed and the fats of the *Shelamim* offered. This list of *korbanot* is cited by Rava (primarily in *Pesachim* 58b *Yoma* 33a in a *gemara* that recurs throughout *shas*) as demonstrating that the morning *tamid* should be the first *korban* offered and the evening *tamid* should be the last *korban* offered upon the outer altar.

Tosafot (see above *gemarot*) consistently question the need for this *limud*, as the *gemara* in *Zevachim* (89a) already establishes a sequencing scheme for *korbanot*. Based on a *pasuk* that prioritizes the sacrifice of a *tamid* before that of a *mussaf*, the *gemara* infers that any *tadir* (frequently occurring) mitzva will UNIVERSALLY precede a less *tadir* mitzva. A *korban tamid* is by definition the most frequent *korban*; it should therefore precede other *korbanot* based on the *tadir* principle, without need for Rava's additional *pasuk*.

One answer recurs in the aforementioned Tosafot throughout *Shas*. Although the *Korban Tamid* ITSELF precedes other *korbanot* because of its frequency, the *haktara* (burning of animal parts) does not. Rava's additional *pasuk* instructs that even the burning of animal parts should precede the burning of animal parts (*eivarim*) of other *korbanot*.

This solution offered by Tosafot creates an interesting distinction between the basic *korban* and the *haktara* of the animal parts. The fact that the essential *korban tamid* is sequenced prior to the other *korbanot* based on the *tadir* principle, while the *haktara*, is not prioritized based on *tadir* suggests that *haktara* IS NOT an essential part of the *korban*, but rather a separate ceremony. Interestingly, Tosafot in *Zevachim* (2a, s.v. *kol*) assert a dramatic difference

between *haktara* and the other elements of a *korban*. Although typically all the stages of a *korban* must be performed "*le-sheim ba'alim*" (on behalf of the owner of the *korban*), the *haktara* does not have to be performed with this intent. This discrepancy between *haktara* and the other types of *avodot* is consistent with Tosafot's view that *haktara*'s SCHEDULING cannot be equated with the overall schedule of a *korban*. A separate *pasuk* is required by Rava to sequence the *haktara* of the *tamid* prior to the *haktara* of other *korbanot*.

The distinction between the sacrifice and the *haktara* also underscores the nature of scheduling *haktara* of *tamid* first! The *pasuk* may not simply be indicating which, among competing sacrifices, comes first, but rather establishing the ingredients of the actual *ma'aracha* pyre. The *ma'aracha* consists of wood piles AND THE *KORBAN TAMID*, all other *korbanot* are sacrificed upon this pyre. Unlike the standard *tadir* halakha, which evaluates "which" sacrifice (and ultimately which mitzva) should be performed "when," the unique *pasuk* scheduling *haktara* designates the morning *korban* as PART of the actual *ma'aracha* UPON WHICH all other *korbanot* are sacrificed.

The concept that the framework upon which *korbanot* are burnt consists of BOTH WOOD AND THE *TAMID SHEL SHACHAR*, is reflected by several interesting *halakhot*. An interesting difference would emerge if the *korban tamid* were unavailable. Presumably, if its scheduling is based PURELY upon the *tadir* principle, its absence would not hinder the offering of other *korbanot*. The *tadir* principle demands that if two *korbanot* PRESENT themselves, the more frequent one must be offered first; if only one *korban* is available, it may presumably be immediately processed independent of *tadir* concerns. This position is articulated by R. Elchonon Wasserman in his comments to *Pesachim* (58). In fact, this position is stated clearly by the Ra'avad in his comments to *Tamid* (28b).

The Rambam's language describing this schedule seems more rigid. He writes (*Temidin U-Musafin* 1:3) that it is forbidden to sacrifice ANY *korban* prior to the *tamid shel shachar*. It would appear that the Rambam would disagree with the Ra'avad and forbid processing a different *korban* even if the *tamid shel shachar* is unavailable. Perhaps he would view the *tamid* as an essential element of the *Ma'aracha*, without which a viable BASE for further *korban* sacrifice has not been established. The entire schedule must grind to a halt.

Another interesting question surrounds a situation in which a *korban* was already sacrificed (*shechita*) prior to the *tamid*. Should THAT *korban* be processed first, since its ceremonies began already, or should that *korban* be halted, allowing the *tamid shel shachar* to be inserted? Regarding the standard sequencing of *tadir* the *gemara* in *Zevachim* (89b) is quite clear that if a less frequent *korban* were started prior to a more frequent one, the started *korban* should be completed first.

This question is raised by the *Mishnah Le-Melekh* in his comments to the aforementioned Rambam. If the scheduling of the *tamid* is based purely on the *tadir* component, it should follow the guidelines of *tadir*; thus, if another *korban* were illegally sacrificed prior to the *tamid* it would be completed first. If the *haktara* of the *tamid* is necessary to build the *ma'aracha* basis for the daily *korbanot*, the other option would result; the *korban* would be halted even if the *shechita* had already commenced. This logic is asserted by the Chazon Ish in his comments to *Menachot* (33:10).

Yet an additional scenario involves a case in which two *korbanot* are sacrificed simultaneously. Several *Acharonim* (*Kovetz Shiurim to Pesachim* and the *Mikdash Dovid*) argue that the *tadir* requirement can be met by performing two *mitzvot*, - in our case sacrificing two *korbanot* - SIMULTANEOUSLY, as the *tadir* mitzva is not DELAYED by the JOINT performance. If the *tamid shel shachar* sequencing were based solely upon *tadir* requirements we may allow TWO *korbanot* (the *tamid* as well as other *korbanot*) to be offered jointly. However, the additional requirement to build the *ma'aracha* with the morning *tamid* would demand that the *tamid* be burnt. before any other *korban* is burnt upon the *ma'aracha*,

Finally, if the scheduling if the *tamid* first is indeed driven by *tadir* concerns as well as the proper construction of a *ma'aracha*, we would insist that the *tamid* is not just slaughtered first, but also burned on the *mizbeich* first. From a practical standpoint, this question could be very pivotal. After all, the *shechita* of the *tamid* is performed before daybreak and the sprinkling of blood happens very quickly. The primary delay of *korbanot* occurs while performing the *haktara* of the *tamid*. If the *tamid* is prioritized because of *tadir* concerns, its prior *shechita* may be sufficient. However, if the *tamid* is necessary to contribute to the daily *ma'aracha*, it must be completely burnt before any other sacrifices are placed upon the *ma'aracha*.