

Insights from the Meshech Chochma

רב מאיר שמחה הכהן מדווינסק זצ"ל

פְּרָשַׁת פִּינְחָס תְּשַׁפ"ו

Shulie Plawes

עֲלֵת תְּמִיד הָעֵשֶׂיָהּ בְּהַר סִינַי לְרִיחַ נִיחֹחַ אֲשֶׁה לָּהּ. (פרק כח' ו')

It is the continual-elevation offering that was done at Mount Sinai, for a satisfying aroma, a fire-offering to Hashem.

The final section of our Parsha delineates the *Musafim* קִרְבָּנוֹת that were regularly offered in the Beis HaMikdash on every *Shabbos*, *Rosh Chodesh* and *Moeid*. It begins by presenting the most regular of the קִרְבָּנוֹת, the twice daily עֲלֵת תְּמִיד.

Much ink is spilled over exactly what the Torah was alluding to with עֲלֵת תְּמִיד הָעֵשֶׂיָהּ בְּהַר סִינַי. Our pesukim are stating a commandment to bring the עֲלֵת תְּמִיד in the future, for what purpose does it reference a קִרְבָּן from the past and what קִרְבָּן is it? Rashi explains that הָעֵשֶׂיָהּ should be understood as בְּהָעֵשֶׂיָהּ בְּהַר סִינַי i.e., the future עֲלֵת תְּמִיד should be presented *like*, according to the protocols of, those תְּמִידִים that were performed in the days of the inauguration of the *Mishkan*. The Be'er Moshe, one of Rashi's super-commentaries, adds beautifully that this comparison hints to us that even though bringing the עֲלֵת תְּמִיד is an ongoing routine, the offering remains a נִיחֹחַ, as dear to Hashem as the first one brought at the time of the מְלוּאִים! Alternatively, Rashi says, by comparing the עֲלֵת תְּמִיד to the עֲלֵת הַר where it is written, וַיִּשָּׂם בְּאַגְנֹת (Moshe took half the blood) and placed it in basins, the Torah is telling us that the עֲלֵת תְּמִיד also requires a vessel in which to catch the blood.

Rav Meir Simcha's understanding of עֲלֵת תְּמִיד הָעֵשֶׂיָהּ בְּהַר סִינַי takes us first to חגיגה ו: where the Gemara discusses the עֲלֵת עֹלָה i.e., the עֹלָה offering which Klal Yisrael presented at *Har Sinai*. R' Chisda asks: "How should the pasuk in וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת נְעָרֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיַּעֲלוּ, שמות כד' ה' be understood? Should it be read as two separate halves, with the first part, וַיַּעֲלוּ עֹלוֹת, consisting of sheep-the usual animal brought-while the second part, וַיַּזְבְּחוּ זִבְחֵי שְׁלָמִים לָהּ פָּרִים means that *only* the שְׁלָמִים were bulls? Or perhaps both were bulls, i.e., פָּרִים refers to both the עֹלוֹת and to the שְׁלָמִים?" The Gemara further on tells us that the question is unresolved-תיקו. Tosafos there asks that earlier, we read of a disagreement as to what type of עֹלָה was brought by the וַיַּעֲלוּ עֹלוֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל i.e., was it the regular עֲלֵת תְּמִיד (as it says in our pasuk הָעֵשֶׂיָהּ) or perhaps an עֹלָת רְאִיָּה, for having "seen" the *Shechina*. If it was the former, we know that the עֲלֵת תְּמִיד may *only* be a sheep. What then was R' Chisda's dilemma? According to this opinion, clearly, פָּרִים can only be referring to the שְׁלָמִים! Tosafos answers, i.e., this opinion would say that the episode with the וַיַּעֲלוּ עֹלוֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל was before the Torah was given. At that time, it was permitted to bring the עֲלֵת תְּמִיד from a bull. The sheep-only rule was only *after Mattan Torah*. The Turei Even (Rav Aryeh Leib ben Asher Ginzberg, also known as the Sha'agas

Aryeh, whose *yahrzeit* was (טו' תמוז) asks that if as Tosafos proposed that before *Mattan Torah* the rules were “looser”, why did R' Chisda not also include the possibility that the *עולה* brought by the *ישראל בני נערי* could have been a bird? He answers that their *קרבן* was a *קרבן* *ציבור*, for which a bird may not be brought.

Rav Meir Simcha feels that the Turi Even's question is *לא קשׁיא מידי*, and he bases this on the following exegesis of Midrash Sifrei here: *עלת תמיד העשׁיה בהר סיני* is to be understood as the *עלת הר סיני* being likened to the *עלת תמיד*. Just as the *עלת תמיד* required *נסכים*, so too did the *עלת הר סיני*. R' Yossi HaGlili disagrees: *עלת הר סיני* is likened to the *עלת תמיד* in that both offerings give pleasure to Hashem. According to him, the *עלת הר סיני* did not have an accompanying *נסכים*. So that if there was the possibility of the *עלת הר סיני* being a bird, R' Yosi HaGlili's exegesis would be superfluous, for we know that there is never an accompanying *נסכים* with a bird offering!

Rav Meir Simcha concludes this piece with a “bonus” *לשיטתה*. Returning us back to: *חגיגה ו:* he points out that R' Yosi HaGlili is of the opinion that the *עלת הר סיני*, the *עולה* brought by the *ישראל בני נערי* was an *עלת תמיד*, but he also tells us that it did not require *הפישט וניתוח*, skinning and cutting into pieces. This is problematic because we know that the *עלת תמיד* *did* require *הפישט וניתוח*? The Gemara explains that in fact this requirement applied only *מאהל מועד ואילך*, from after *Mattan Torah*. Rav Meir Simcha's Sifrei gives us a much deeper understanding of R' Yosi HaGlili's position. Just as R' Yosi HaGlili in the Sifrei told us that the comparison between the *עלת הר סיני* and the *עלת תמיד* only referred to their both being *עלת תמיד* and did not apply with regards to the *עלת תמיד* *ולא להפישט וניתוח*, so too would he say *עלת הר סיני* *ולא להפישט וניתוח*. And that is exactly his opinion in: *חגיגה ו:*

Once again, our author weaves for us a beautiful tapestry with esoteric threads from all over *תורה שבעל פה*!

לזכר נשמת אבי מורי ר' ישראל מנחם בן ר' שלום ז"ל
לזכר נשמת אמי מורתי רחל בת ר' אלחנן אביגדור ע"ה
לזכר נשמת חמי מורי ר' יעקב נתן בן ר' ישראל שלמה ז"ל
ולזכר נשמת הרב יהודה בן ר' אברהם שמחה (קופרמן) זצ"ל
מחבר הגהות על ספר משך חכמה