

## Insights from the Meshech Chochma

### רב מאיר שמחה הכהן מדווינסק זצ"ל פְּרֻשֵׁת צו־שִׁבְת הַגְּדוּל תִּשְׁפ"ה

Shulie Plawes

הַכֹּהֵן הַמִּחְטֵא אֶתְהּ יֹאכְלֶנָּה בְּמָקוֹם קֹדֶשׁ תִּאָכַל בְּחֹצֵר אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד... וְאֲשֶׁר יִזֶּה מִדָּמָה עַל הַבְּגָד אֲשֶׁר יִזֶּה עָלֶיהָ תִּכְבֵּס בְּמָקוֹם קֹדֶשׁ. וְכִלֵּי חָרָשׁ אֲשֶׁר תִּבְשַׁל בּוֹ יִשָּׁבֵר וְאִם בְּכִלֵּי נְחֹשֶׁת בְּשָׂלָה וּמִרְק וְשִׁטְף בְּמַיִם. (פרק כ' יט-כא)

*The Kohen who offers (the animal) as a sin offering shall eat of it; it shall be eaten in a holy place: in the Courtyard of the Ohel Moeid. ...and if its blood is splattered upon a garment, whatever it has been splattered upon you shall wash in a holy place. An earthen vessel in which it was cooked shall be broken; but if it was cooked in a copper vessel, that should be purged and rinsed with water.*

Our passage adds to the laws of the *Korban Chatas* which were given earlier in *Parshas Vayikra*. Ramban questions why is it so imperative that the garment with blood on it *you shall wash in a holy place*? He explains that the Torah is strict regarding the blood of a *Chatas*-offering that was absorbed in a garment because it wants us “to treat (the blood) as before it was sprinkled on the Altar,” which may not be taken outside the curtains i.e., outside the Temple Courtyard. We know that the blood of a *korban* may not be taken חוץ לַעֲזָרָה until after the עֲבוֹדַת הַדָּם has been performed. Ramban is adding that if the blood has been absorbed by a garment, the absorbed blood and hence the garment may not be taken outside of the Courtyard because it is being treated as *before* it was sprinkled on the Altar. It retains its original קְדוּשָׁה and for this reason, תִּכְבֵּס בְּמָקוֹם קֹדֶשׁ.

Rav Meir Simcha uses this Ramban to explain why when the pasuk discusses where the Kohen is permitted to eat of the *Chatas*, it writes בְּמָקוֹם קֹדֶשׁ תִּאָכַל and adds בְּחֹצֵר אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, whereas with regards to washing the blood-stained garment of the Kohen, it just writes תִּכְבֵּס בְּמָקוֹם קֹדֶשׁ? Furthermore, a Tosefta in Zevachim tells us concerning פסוק כא, which writes that the earthen and copper vessels must be broken or washed respectively, to have these done in the place where the *Chatas* is eaten i.e., בְּחֹצֵר אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, and yet the pasuk itself makes no mention of it. Why leave this out?

His answer begins with a piece which he developed in his other magnum opus, the Ohr Somayach. There he takes us to זבחים נו. which discusses the status of לְשִׁבוֹת בְּנוֹיּוֹת בַּחֹל which discusses the status of לְשִׁבוֹת בְּנוֹיּוֹת בַּחֹל chambers which were built in unconsecrated spaces of the Temple Mount but opened to consecrated space i.e., the Courtyard-these לְשִׁבוֹת interiors are holy. Kohanim are permitted to eat (even) קֹדֶשׁ הַקֹּדְשִׁים within them. We are also told that there is no prohibition from bringing טוֹמְאָה into them. The Ohr Somayach adds that this leniency is only regarding the eating of *karbanos*. The slaughtering and blood service of even קֹדְשֵׁי קָלִים may not be done there. If so, based on Ramban’s statement that the blood of a *Chatas*-offering that was absorbed in a garment “must be treated as before it was sprinkled on the Altar,” one must say

that the garment may not be washed in these *לְשִׁבוֹת בְּנֵיּוֹת בַּחֹל וּפְתוּחוֹת לְקֹדֶשׁ* as they cannot be used for any of the *עֲבוֹדַת הַדָּם*. It would have to have its blood removed by washing it *only* within the perimeter of the Courtyard. It is therefore especially important that the Torah tells us with regards to eating the *Korban Chatas*, *בְּמָקוֹם קֹדֶשׁ תִּתְאַכַּל בְּחֹצֵר אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד*, which includes *לְשִׁבוֹת בְּנֵיּוֹת בַּחֹל וּפְתוּחוֹת לְקֹדֶשׁ* but that the *כִּיבוּס* of the blood-stained garment is specifically *בְּמָקוֹם קֹדֶשׁ*, only in the Courtyard itself, only in the place where the *עֲבוֹדַת הַדָּם* can be done.

Rav Meir Simcha continues and tells us that, based on this, it is also very *מְתָאִים* that when the Torah discuss the “fate” of the *כְּלֵי חָרָשׁ* and the *כְּלֵי נְחֹשֶׁת*, it does not say that the breaking or washing need to be done *בְּמָקוֹם קֹדֶשׁ* because unlike the washing of the garment, these *can* be done in the *לְשִׁבוֹת בְּנֵיּוֹת בַּחֹל וּפְתוּחוֹת לְקֹדֶשׁ* since, as mentioned earlier, the Tosefta in Zevachim told us that *שְׁבִירְתָּן מְרִיקְתָּן וְשִׁטְפִיתָּן בְּמָקוֹם אֲכִילְתָּן*. By coupling these activities to the *Chatas’ אֲכִילָה*, it allows them to be similarly done *בְּחֹצֵר אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד* and by derivation, *בְּלְשִׁבוֹת בְּנֵיּוֹת בַּחֹל וּפְתוּחוֹת לְקֹדֶשׁ*.

Finally, he uses this approach to answer a question posed to him by his prestigious son-in-law, Rav Avraham Luftvir, who unfortunately pre-deceased him with his untimely death in 1918 at the age of forty-eight. His query was based on a discussion in *זבחים צה*. regarding a Priestly garment upon which the blood of a *Chatas* has sprayed; if it then contracts ritual impurity outside of the Courtyard, it must be torn before it is brought back into the Courtyard to be laundered. Reish Lakish adds that if it is the robe of the *Kohen Gadol* upon which the blood of a *Chatas* has sprayed and then it contracted ritual impurity outside of the Courtyard, one does not tear it; rather, he brings it in to the Courtyard gradually, in portions less than the measure of a garment susceptible to impurity i.e., three by three fingerbreadths, and he launders it section by section as the robe crosses the threshold of the Courtyard. This is because it is stated regarding the *Kohen Gadol’s* robe, *לֹא יִקְרַע /It shall not be torn*. Rav Avraham asked his father-in-law why the robe cannot be passed through a window into one of the *לְשִׁבוֹת בְּנֵיּוֹת בַּחֹל וּפְתוּחוֹת לְקֹדֶשׁ*, since there is no prohibition of bringing *טומאה* into them, and proceed to wash the robe there? In a most gentle and loving way, Rav Meir Simcha reviews with his *אָיִר נִירוּ יְקִירֵי חֲתָנֵי יְקִירֵי נִירוּ יְקִירֵי* his piece from his *Ohr Somayach* and so washing the *Kohen Gadol’s* blood-stained robe in the *לְשִׁבוֹת בְּנֵיּוֹת בַּחֹל וּפְתוּחוֹת לְקֹדֶשׁ* would still not be permitted.

Once again, Rav Meir Simcha has shown us that in our vast *שִׁבְכֵתב*, *תוֹרָה שְׁבִבְכֵתב*, there is no such thing as an unintentional omission or commission!

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