

"This was the offering of Nachson the son of Aminadav" (7:17) "This was the offering of Nesanel the son of Tzuar." (7:23)

The *Torah* concludes each of the twelve paragraphs which describe the dedication offerings of the *Nesiim* with the above *pesukim*. We should note the *Torah's* refrain in its description of these offerings. Indeed, *Chazal* expound upon the preciousness of these offerings before Hashem. "*The offering of the Nesiim is as precious to Hashem as the "song" Bnei Yisrael sang by the Red Sea, for there it says: This is my G-d; and here it says, "this is the sacrifice of Nachson."*

Horav Shlomo Breuer Z"l suggests that this reference by *Chazal* to the "*Shira*" is intended to clarify the apparent redundancy of these *pesukim*. Indeed, if one takes into account that not one letter of the *Torah* is superfluous and that numerous laws are derived from one single letter, it is almost incomprehensible that the *Torah* reserves a complete paragraph for each of the *Nesiim's* offering! He states that this ostensibly pointless repetition of the contribution of each tribe is used by the *Torah* to express a fundamental truth. Twelve different men may offer an equal contribution, but each individual gift carries its own value before Hashem. The actual gift does not determine its significance. Rather, it is the individual who contributes, the spirit in which he gives, and the joy which emanates from this act. Twelve *Nesiim* may offer the same contribution, but each performs a unique act.

Similarly, together Moshe and *Bnei Yisrael* sang *Shira* after the splitting of the Red Sea, but they did not sing this song in the plural form of "ubheukt vz". Rather, everyone sang his own personal "hke vz". Although six hundred thousand men together expressed themselves with the exact same words, each individual's words sustain a unique meaning. Thus, we note the parallel between "hke vz" and "icre vzw" in that each statement expresses the individuality of the speaker.

We might suggest an addendum to this exposition. Indeed, individuality in *Torah* endeavor is an inherent component of *mitzvah* performance. We must emphasize the fact, however, that the *Nesiim's* contributions were identical. Their intentions, actions, and goals were all in compliance with Hashem's imperatives. Their individuality lay only in the mode of personal expression of these same *mitzvos*.

All too often we seek to justify a delineation from the correct traditional manner of serving the Divine by applying the famous dictum of "these and those are both the words of Hashem." One cannot legitimize *Torah* alienated statements using this often misinterpreted Rabbinic dictum. *Chazal's* statement refers to various differences of opinion among *Torah* scholars within the framework of *Torah* Law. *Chazal* definitely do not give credence to anyone who desires to glorify words or actions which are antithetical to *Torah* Law. Individuality within the parameters of *Halacha* is commendable and praiseworthy. Trespassing beyond these boundaries, however, intimates an arrogant form of impudence which may be interpreted as blasphemy.