

דכתיב נתן ולא כתיב הסריח –

For it is written נתן, but it is not written הסריח

OVERVIEW

הר סיני (by worshipping the בני"י lost their fragrance at סיני) taught that even though the בני"י are still dear to the הקב"ה, nevertheless the בני"י are still dear to the הקב"ה, for the פסוק could have written הסריח ריחו and it chose a more refined expression to indicate their dearness to the הקב"ה. Our תוספות clarifies this proof.

anticipates a question: תוספות

אף על גב דאית ליה למכתב לישנא מעליא³ –

Even though it is necessary to write a refined language (נתן ריחו)⁴, and not use coarse language like הסריח –

responds: תוספות

מכל מקום הוה מצי למכתב עזב:

Nevertheless in order to satisfy לישנא מעליא, the פסוק **could have written עזב** נרדי (the fragrance **left** my spice), which would also indicate that there is no fragrance left at all; since it merely wrote נתן ריחו this indicates that it merely gave up some [but not all] of the fragrance.

SUMMARY

If there was no dearness of the בני"י after the עגל, the פסוק should have used a more severe term than נתן, it should have stated עזב (which would have denoted הסריח).

THINKING IT OVER

According to תוספות why did the גמרא write, 'ולא כתיב הסריח'; the גמרא should have written '?!ולא כתיב עזב'⁵

¹ My spice gave away (lost) its fragrance.

² The odor of my spice became repugnant.

³ There is seemingly no proof that חביבותא הוא גבן, because the פסוק meant הסריח, it was just written in a refined language.

⁴ See מהר"ם שי"ף that a person should not allow a דבר מגונה to come out of his mouth. See תפא"י.

⁵ See תפא"י.