

מתני' הוציאו לו את הכף ואת המחתה, חפן מלא חפניו ונתן לתוך הכף הגדול לפי גדלו והקטן לפי קטנו, וכך היתה מדתה. נטל את המחתה בימינו, ואת הכף בשמאלו.

גמ' מחתה תנא ליה נטל את המחתה ועלה לראש המזבח וחותרה ויורד! התם מחתה דגחלים, והכא מחתה דקטורת. דתנא: הוציאו לו כף ריקן מלשבת הכלים, ומחתה גדושה של קטורת מלשבת בית אבטינס.

"חפן מלא חפניו ונתן לתוך הכף הגדול לפי גדלו והקטן לפי קטנו וכך היתה מדתה". כף ביום הכפורים למה לי? "מלא חפניו והביא" אמר רחמנא!

משום דלא אפשר, דהיכי נעביד? נעיל והדר נעיל – הבאה אחת אמר רחמנא, ולא שתי הבאות.

נשקליה לקטורת בחופניו ונחתיה [למחתה] עלה, וליעול, כי מטי התם היכי לעביד? נשקליה בשיניה ונחתיה למחתה – השתא לפני מלך בשר ודם אין עושין בן, לפני מלך מלכי המלכים הקדוש ברוך הוא על אחת כמה וכמה!

הלכך, לא אפשר. ובין דלא אפשר – עבדינן כדאשכחן בנשיאים.

MISHNA They brought out the spoon and the coal pan to the High Priest so he may perform the service of the incense. **He scoops his handfuls from the incense and places it into the spoon.** The High Priest with large hands fills the spoon with incense in an amount corresponding to the large size of his hands, and the High Priest with small hands fills the spoon with incense in an amount corresponding to the small size of his hands. **And this was the measure of the spoon, i.e., it was made to correspond to the size of his hands. He took the coal pan in his right hand and the spoon in his left hand.**^h

GEMARA The Gemara expresses surprise at the statement of the mishna. In an earlier mishna, the *tanna* already taught that the High Priest must bring the coal pan: **He takes a coal pan and ascends to the top of the altar and rakes and descends.** Why does the *tanna* mention the taking of the coal pan again? The Gemara explains: **There** the mishna deals with the coal pan of burning coals, and **here** the mishna is referring to the coal pan of incense, which he would later scoop out. **As it was explicitly taught in a baraita: They brought out an empty spoon for him from the chamber of vessels, and a coal pan heaped with incense from the Chamber of the House of Avtinas.**

§ The mishna taught: **He scoops his handfuls from the incense and places it into the spoon.** The High Priest with large hands fills the spoon with incense corresponding to the large size of his hands, and the High Priest with small hands fills the spoon corresponding to the small size of his hands, and this was the measure of the spoon, according to the size of his hands. The Gemara asks: **Why do I need a spoon on Yom Kippur?** After all, the Merciful One states: "And he shall take a coal pan full of coals of fire from off the altar from before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small and bring it within the veil" (Leviticus 16:12). This verse suggests that the handfuls are brought by hand rather than in a vessel.

The Gemara answers: The High Priest uses a spoon because it is impossible to perform the service otherwise. The Gemara elaborates: **As what should we do? Let him bring in the coal pan and then bring in the incense? The Merciful One states one act of bringing for the coals and the incense, and not two acts of bringing.**

Instead, let him take the incense by his handfuls and place the coal pan on top of his two handfuls and enter, carrying it all in one go. This suggestion is also impractical, as when he arrives there, in the Holy of Holies, what should he do? How can the High Priest put down the coal pan where it is? **Let him take the coal pan in his teeth and lower it. Now, before a king of flesh and blood one would not do so, as it is disrespectful. All the more so, one would not act in this manner before the King of kings, the Holy One, Blessed be He.**

The Gemara concludes: **Therefore, it is impossible for the High Priest to behave in another way, and since it is impossible to act in any other manner, he actsⁿ as we find with regard to the sacrifices of the princes during the dedication of the Tabernacle.** On that occasion, the princes brought spoons filled with incense: "One golden spoon of ten shekels full of incense" (Numbers 7:14).

HALAKHA

הכף והמחתה – The spoon and a vessel filled with very fine incense is brought out to the High Priest. He scoops a handful of incense, which he places in the spoon. Next, he takes the coal pan in his right hand and the spoon in his left. Due to the weight of the coal pan and its heat, the High Priest is permitted to carry it in his right hand, although ideally he should carry the spoon in his right hand (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 4:1).

NOTES

h: ובין דלא אפשר עבדינן – This consideration explains why it is permitted for the High Priest to carry the spoon in his left hand, despite the fact that in general, carrying items in one's left hand during the Temple service invalidates the rite. Since there is no other way to carry the spoon, the Torah permits the High Priest to use his left hand here.

The native is on the ground, etc. – יציבא בארעא וכו' – This saying is based on the verse: "The stranger who is in the midst of you will rise above you higher and higher, and you shall come down lower and lower" (Deuteronomy 28:43).

And even when the two of them are equal – ואפילו בזמן ששניהן – שוין: The commentaries discuss this passage at great length. As *Tosafot Yeshanim* point out, the incident involving Yishmael ben Kimhit actually indicates that the spoon had a greater capacity than the coal pan, which means that the two were not, in fact, equal. The Maharsha suggests that the phrase: Like the act of, introduces a new question: What can be done in a case like that of Yishmael ben Kimhit, when the spoon is larger than the coal pan, and therefore the first solution is not applicable? At this stage, the Gemara provides its second answer, i.e., that the two vessels differ in temperature. Most of the later commentaries reject this interpretation, as do the Rambam and the *Me'iri*. One commentary raises a difficulty with the Maharsha's interpretation by noting that even in the case of Yishmael ben Kimhit, the shovel was heavy only due to its long handle and the sheath that covered it, not because of its contents (*Li Lishua*).

But the selection [zered] of my mother rose to the roof – וורד – אימא עלה לגג: In the Jerusalem Talmud it is stated that this is a metaphor involving wood-gathering women. Yishmael ben Kimhit is saying that his mother's bundle of twigs [*zeradim*] was the largest.

With a certain Arab – עם ערבי אחד: According to the Jerusalem Talmud and various *midrashim*, this episode refers to an Arab king, which explains why the High Priest went out to talk to him.

A drop sprayed – נתזה צינורא: One of the enactments established by the courts of the Hasmoneans was that gentiles are considered to be ritually impure to the same extent as a *zav*. Consequently, their saliva is like that of a *zav*, which the Torah explicitly declares to be ritually impure (see Leviticus 15:8).

LANGUAGE

Officer [*hegmon*] – הגמון: From the Greek ἡγεμών, *hegemon*, meaning the overseer of a Roman province. It is also a title for an important minister or prince.

נטל את המחתה בימין ואת הכף בשמאל. יציבא בארעא וגיורא בשמי שמיא!

זו מרובה וזו מועטת. ואפילו בזמן ששניהן שוין, וכמעשה דרבי ישמעאל בן קמחית – זו חמה וזו צוננת.

אמרו עליו על רבי ישמעאל בן קמחית שהיה חופן ארבעת קבין במלוא חפניו, ואומר: כל הנשים ירדו, וורד אימא עלה לגג. איבא דאמרי: בערסן, וכדרבה בר יונתן. דאמר רבה בר יונתן אמר רבי יחיאל: ערסן יפה לחולה.

ואיבא דאמרי: בשכבת זרע, וכדרבי אבהו דרבי אבהו רמי: בתבי: "ותורני [חיל] למלחמה" וכתבי: "המאזני חיל!" אמר דוד לפני הקדוש ברוך הוא: רבנו של עולם, זריתני וזריתני.

אמרו עליו על רבי ישמעאל בן קמחית: פעם אחת סיפר דברים עם ערבי אחד בשוק, ונתזה צינורא מפיו על בגדיו, ונכנס ישבב אחיו ושמש תחתיו, וראתה אמן שני כהנים גדולים ביום אחד.

ושוב אמרו עליו על רבי ישמעאל בן קמחית: פעם אחת יצא וסיפר עם הגמון אחד בשוק, ונתזה צינורא מפיו על בגדיו, ונכנס יוסף (עם) אחיו ושמש תחתיו, וראתה אמן שני כהנים גדולים ביום אחד.

§ The mishna taught that the High Priest took the coal pan in his right hand and the spoon in his left hand. The Gemara questions this arrangement by citing a well-known maxim: The native is on the ground^N and the stranger is in the heavens; i.e., this is the opposite of what one would expect. The main component of the mitzva is the incense, while the coal pan is required only for burning the incense. Consequently, the High priest should carry the spoon, which contains the main component of the service, in his right hand, and the accessory in his left hand.

The Gemara explains: The service is performed in this manner for reasons of comfort, as this coal pan is greater in weight, since it holds the coals, and that spoon of incense weighs less. And even when the two of them are equal,^N when the spoon contains three *kav* of incense like the action of Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimhit, who could hold several *kav* in his exceptionally large hands, nevertheless, this coal pan is hot and must be held carefully in the right hand, and that spoon of incense is cold and is easily carried in the left.

§ Since the Gemara has mentioned Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimhit, it discusses him further. They said about Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimhit that his hands were so large that he would scoop up four *kav*, which he would hold by his handfuls, and say: All the women selected the best they could for their children, but the selection of my mother rose to the roof,^N i.e., my mother chose the best. Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimhit is referring to himself, as he matured to a great height and stature. Some say he was referring to his mother's selection of flour, in accordance with the statement of Rabba bar Yonatan. As Rabba bar Yonatan said that Rabbi Yehiel said: Flour is beneficial and healthy for the sick. Since his mother ate this flour when she was pregnant with him, her son grew heartily.

And some say this reference to selection is a euphemism for semen, in accordance with a statement of Rabbi Abbahu, as Rabbi Abbahu raised a contradiction between two verses. It is written: "For You have girded me [*vatazreni*] with strength for battle" (11 Samuel 22:40), and it is written in a parallel verse: "Who girds me [*hame'azreni*] with strength" (Psalms 18:33). What is the difference between these two expressions? David said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe: You selected me [*zeritani*] with the best drop of semen that my mother absorbed, with which, You fashioned me [*zeraztani*] within her. This accounts for the variant forms of this expression.

The Gemara continues to discuss Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimhit. They said about Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimhit: Once he was talking to a certain Arab^N in the market on Yom Kippur, and a drop of saliva sprayed^N from the Arab's mouth onto the clothes of Rabbi Yishmael, who was the High Priest at the time. This spittle rendered him ritually impure by rabbinic law, like the ritual impurity of a *zav*, preventing him from serving in the Temple. And his brother Yeshevav entered and served as High Priest on that day in his stead. And, consequently, their mother saw two of her sons serving as High Priests on a single day.

And they further said about Rabbi Yishmael ben Kimhit: Once he went out and talked to a certain officer [*hegmon*]¹ in the market, and a drop of saliva sprayed from the officer's mouth onto the clothes of Rabbi Yishmael, and his brother Yosef entered and served as High Priest in his stead. And, again, their mother saw two of her sons serving as High Priests on a single day.

תָּנוּ רַבָּנַן: שְׂבָעָה בָּנִים הָיוּ לָהּ לְקַמְחִית וְכוּלֵן שָׁמְשׁוּ בְּכֹהֲנֵה גְדוּלָה. אָמְרוּ לָהּ חֲכָמִים: מַה עָשִׂיתְ שְׂזִבִית לְכֶךְ? אָמְרָה לָהֶם: מִיָּמִי לֹא רָאוּ קוֹרוֹת בֵּיתִי קְלָעֵי שְׂעָרַי. אָמְרוּ לָהּ: הֲרִבָּה עָשׂוּ בְּךָ, וְלֹא הוֹעִילוּ.

תָּנוּ רַבָּנַן: "בְּקוֹמְצוֹ" – שְׂלֵא יַעֲשֶׂה מִדָּה לְקוֹמֵץ. אֵיבַעֲנָא לָהּ: מַהוּ שְׂיַעֲשֶׂה מִדָּה לְחַפְיָנָה?

הַתָּם הוּא דְכָתִיב "בְּקוֹמְצוֹ", אֲבָל הַכָּא דְלֹא כְתִיב בְּחַפְיָנִי אֲלֵא "מְלֵא חַפְיָנִי קְטוֹרֶת סַמִּים דְּקָה" – לֹא. אוּ דִילְמָא: יִלְיָן 'מְלֵא' מְלֵא? מְקוֹמְצוֹ?

הָא שְׂמַע: וְכֶךְ הִיָּתָה מִדְּתָה. מֵאֵי לָאוּ, שְׂאָם רְצָה לַעֲשׂוֹת מִדָּה אַחֲרָת – עוֹשֶׂה! לֹא, הֲכִי קָאָמְרוּ: וְכֶךְ הִיָּתָה חוֹזֵר וְחוֹפְנָה לְפָנִים.

שְׂמַעְתָּ מִנֵּה: חוֹפֵן וְחוֹזֵר וְחוֹפֵן!

דִּילְמָא שְׂאָם רְצָה לַעֲשׂוֹת מִדָּה – עוֹשֶׂה, אֵי נִמְי: שְׂלֵא יַחֲסֹר וְשְׂלֵא יוֹתֵיר.

תָּנוּ רַבָּנַן: "מְלֵא קוֹמְצוֹ", יָכוֹל מְבוֹרֵץ – תְּלַמּוּד לּוֹמֵר "בְּקוֹמְצוֹ", אֵי "בְּקוֹמְצוֹ" – יָכוֹל אֲפִילוּ בְּרֵאשֵׁי אֲצָבָעוֹתָיו, תְּלַמּוּד לּוֹמֵר "מְלֵא קוֹמְצוֹ" – בְּדָקְמָצֵי אֵינְשֵׁי. הָא בִּינְיָדָה חוֹפָה שְׂלֵשׁ אֲצָבָעוֹתָיו עַל פִּיסַת יָדוֹ, וְקוֹמֵץ.

The Sages taught in a *baraita*: Kimhit had seven sons,^N and they all served in the office of the High Priesthood, as High Priests or as his substitute. The Sages said to her: What good deeds did you perform to merit this? She said to them: In all my days, the beams of my house never saw the braids of my hair, as she was extremely modest and was strict about covering her hair even inside her own house. They said to her: Many women did so and did not succeed^N to such a degree; you must have been granted a special gift from God.

S The Sages taught: "And he shall take up from it his handful, of the fine flour of the meal-offering, and of its oil" (Leviticus 6:8). This verse teaches that he should not measure an amount for the handful^N of a meal-offering with a utensil, but he should separate it directly by hand.^H A dilemma was raised before the Sages: What is the *halakha* as to whether the High Priest may measure an amount for the handful of incense? Must the incense also be scooped by hand?

The Gemara explains the two sides of the dilemma: Perhaps there, in the case of the handful of a meal-offering, it is different, as it is written "in his handful," which indicates that he must use his hand rather than a vessel. However here, where it is not written: In his hands, but "and his hands full^B of sweet incense beaten small" (Leviticus 16:12), perhaps this teaches that the handfuls of incense need not be taken directly by hand, and the High Priest may use a vessel to scoop out the required amount. Or perhaps this *halakha* is derived by means of a verbal analogy between "full" and "full," from "his handful," which is stated regarding the meal-offering. If this verbal analogy is accepted, the High Priest may likewise scoop the incense only by hand.

The Gemara suggests: Come and hear an answer from the mishna: And this was the measure of the spoon. What, is it not correct to infer from the mishna that although the required measure is a handful, the High Priest is not obligated to scoop with his hand, and if he wanted to measure a different amount, he may measure the incense with a vessel? The Gemara rejects this contention: No, this is what the mishna said; this is what it means: And so too, the High Priest would return and scoop the incense inside the Holy of Holies in precisely the same manner.

The Gemara asks: If so, I can learn from this that the High Priest scoops the incense, and again scoops. That is, after scooping once, the High Priest repeats the action and scoops again in the Holy of Holies. This issue is subject to a dispute in the Gemara below.

The Gemara rejects this claim: No; perhaps the mishna indeed means that if he wanted to measure a different amount, he may measure the incense with a vessel. The language of the mishna does not conclusively prove which interpretation is correct, and it is possible that the Gemara's previous inference from the mishna is accurate. Consequently, the issue of whether or not the High Priest scoops incense a second time in the Holy of Holies cannot be considered resolved. Alternatively, the mishna may mean that the High Priest must take neither less nor more, and therefore this statement has no bearing on the dispute with regard to his scooping.

S The Sages taught: "His handfuls" (Leviticus 2:2). I might have thought it should be overflowing from the handful, and therefore the verse states: "His handful" (Leviticus 6:8), which indicates a precise amount. If the *halakha* is based solely on the phrase "his handful," I might have thought the priest may pinch a small amount even with just his fingertips, not with his entire finger. Therefore, the verse states: "His handfuls" (Leviticus 2:2), meaning as people usually take a handful, i.e., with their whole hand. How should he perform this service? He scoops by closing his three fingers over the palm of his hand, and takes a handful from the flour of the meal-offering.

NOTES

Kimhit had seven sons – שְׂבָעָה בָּנִים הָיוּ לָהּ לְקַמְחִית: Apparently, the brothers were not all the sons of a single man, which is why only the mother was praised and not the father (Maharsha).

Many did so and did not succeed – הֲרִבָּה עָשׂוּ בְּךָ וְלֹא הוֹעִילוּ: In the version of this episode that appears in the Jerusalem Talmud, the Sages informed Kimhit that she deserved to be rewarded with successful sons due to her modesty. In the Gemara here, however, the Sages note that her modesty could not have been the sole cause of the family's greatness. Since other modest women do not all merit this achievement, other factors must have been involved in Kimhit's mother's particular case (see *Me'iri*).

That he should not measure an amount for the handful – שְׂלֵא יַעֲשֶׂה מִדָּה לְקוֹמֵץ: According to the Rashba, it is obvious that the priest is obligated to scoop a handful directly with his hands. Rather, the phrase "his handful" teaches that he may not even pour his handful into a vessel designed for this purpose before once again collecting the flour by hand (*Tosafot Yeshanim*).

BACKGROUND

קְלָא חַפְיָנִי קְטוֹרֶת – Hands full of incense



Priest scooping hands full of incense

HALAKHA

The manner of taking a handful – דֶּרֶךְ קְמִיצָה: How is the handful of a meal-offering taken? The priest extends his fingers over his palm and scoops out the flour (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 13:13).

BACKGROUND

With his thumb above and with his little finger below – בגודלו – מלמעלה ובאצבעו קטנה מלמטה. After the priest would smooth out the handful, he would be left with a smaller portion.



Position of priest's hand after smoothing

NOTES

Then resolved...is doubtful – הדר פשטה...ספק נהו – *Tosafot* question the nature of the answer provided by merely a statement that the status of the flour is in doubt. *Tosafot* suggest that the doubt in this situation is not merely an inability to resolve the question, but a fundamental category for which there is no solution. This is similar to one opinion with regard to the definition of twilight, i.e., that it is a period of doubt, positively defined by the Torah as an intermediate period. It has been pointed out that instances of pure doubt require different treatment than cases where it is simply unclear how to categorize a situation.

HALAKHA

Remainders that became reduced – שירים שחסרו – In a case where a priest took a handful of the meal-offering, and the meal-offering was subsequently lost, the handful is not burned. However, if some of the meal-offering that was not taken in the handful remains intact, the handful is burned. The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Pesulei HaMukdashin* 1:20).

Whatever is partly burned in the fire – כל שממנו לא שים – If part of an item is burned on the altar, it is prohibited to burn any of the part not designated for burning (Rambam *Sefer Avoda*, *Hilkhot Issurei Mizbe'ah* 5:5 and *Kesef Mishne* there).

ובמחבת ובמרחשת מוחק בגודלו מלמעלה, ובאצבעו קטנה מלמטה, וזו היא עבודה קשה שבמקדש. זו היא ותו לא! והא איבא מליקה, והא איבא חמינה! אלא: זו היא מעבודות קשות שבמקדש.

אמר רבי יוחנן, בעי רבי יהושע בן עוזא: בין הבינים של מלא קומצו מהו? אמר רב פפא: דגנאי – לא תיבעי לך דודאי קומץ הוא, דבראי – לא תיבעי לך דודאי שירים הוא

כי תיבעי לך – דביני ביני, מאי? אמר רבי יוחנן הדר פשטה יהושע [בן] עוזא: בין הבינים ספק נהו.

היכי עביד? אמר רבי חנינא: מקטיר קומץ לחודיה תחלה, והדר בין הבינים. דאי אמרת בין הבינים ברישא – דילמא שירים נהו, והווי להו שירים שחסרו בין קמיצה [להקטרה], ואמר מר: שירים שחסרו בין קמיצה להקטרה – אין מקטירין עליהן את הקומץ.

אי הכי, השתא נמי איקרי כאן: כל שממנו לא שים הרי הוא בכל תקטרו!

אמר רבי יהודה בריה דרבי שמעון בן פוי: דמקטיר ליה לשום עצים, ברבי אליעזר. דתנא, רבי אליעזר אומר: "לריח ניחוח" – אי אתה מעלה, אבל אתה מעלה לשום עצים.

And in a case of a meal-offering prepared in a pan and with regard to a meal-offering prepared in a deep container, when the flour was fried before being scooped and was therefore hard, the priest smooths with his thumb any flour that was overflowing above his handful, and with his little finger he smooths the flour that was pushing out below.⁸ And this precise taking of a handful of a meal-offering is the most difficult sacrificial rite in the Temple. The Gemara asks: This one is the hardest rite, and no other? But there is pinching, which is also considered extremely difficult, and there is taking the handful of incense, another complex rite. Rather, this taking of a handful of a meal-offering is one of the most difficult rites in the Temple.

Rabbi Yohanan said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Uza'a raised a dilemma: What is the *halakha* with regard to the flour that remains between the fingers of his handfuls? Is this flour considered to be part of his handful, or is it considered part of the remainder of the meal-offering? The Gemara elaborates: Rav Pappa said that with regard to the flour that is on the inside, toward the hand, do not raise the dilemma, as it is certainly part of the handful. Likewise, with regard to the flour that is on the outside, do not raise the dilemma, as it is certainly part of the remainder of the flour, like the rest of the meal-offering.

Rather, let the dilemma be raised with regard to the flour between the inside and the outside. What is the status of this flour? Rav Yohanan said: Yehoshua ben Uza'a then resolved his own dilemma: The flour that is between is doubtful,⁹ and should be treated as questionable in status.

The Gemara asks: How does one perform the Temple service in this doubtful case? Rabbi Hanina said: The priest first burns the handful by itself, and then he burns the flour that was between. For if you say that he should first burn the flour that was between, perhaps they are remainders, and they are therefore considered like remainders that became reduced between taking the handful and burning, as the priest has taken flour from the remainders of the meal-offering. And the Master said: With regard to remainders that became reduced¹⁰ between taking the handful and the burning, one may not burn the handful on their account.

The Gemara asks: If so, that there is uncertainty as to whether or not this flour is considered part of the remainder of the meal-offering, now too, if the priest burns the in-between flour after burning the handful, one should apply here the principle: Whatever is partly burned in the fire¹¹ of the altar is subject to the prohibition do not burn. This principle states that if part of an item is burned on the altar, one who burns any other part of it, which is not designated for burning, has violated a prohibition. In this case, if the in-between flour is considered part of the remainder of the meal-offering, the priest who burns it transgresses that prohibition.

Rav Yehuda, son of Rabbi Shimon ben Pazi, said that the priest does not burn the flour as part of the meal-offering but burns it for the purpose of wood. In other words, he does not burn the flour as part of an offering but merely as fuel for the altar, which is permitted in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer. As it was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Eliezer says: "But they shall not come up for a sweet savor on the altar" (Leviticus 2:12). This verse indicates that you may not bring up leaven and honey as a "sweet savor," an offering. However, you may bring up leaven and honey and other materials for the purpose of wood.

דקמצי שמיני – דקמצי שמיני: The Rambam does not cite this conclusion at all. In his view, once the Gemara states that handfuls are taken in the usual manner, there is no longer any concern about the flour that remains between one's fingers. The Torah did not require greater care with regard to this handful than any other, and therefore the in-between flour is not part of the handful (*Me'iri*; see *Sifah Yitzhak*).

בין הביניים פשט וכו' – Bein habeinayim, pashat, etc. – This mnemonic is referring to the dilemmas posed by Rav Pappa, most of which are left unresolved. The mnemonic is corrupted here and is incomplete in various manuscripts.

מן – מהו? היצודים מהו? What is the *halakha* if he took from the sides – **היצודים מהו?** The *Me'iri* explains this case slightly differently: The priest places his hand on its side in the flour, so that the flour on the edges of the vessel enters his hand. Rashi on *Menaḥot* explains this similarly.

הניחא לרבי אליעזר, אלא לרבנן מאי איכא למימר? אמר רב מרי: דקמצי שמיני. השתא דאתית להכי, רבי אליעזר נמי, לכתחילה דקמצי שמיני.

The Gemara asks: It works out well according to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, but according to the opinion of the Rabbis, who reject Rabbi Eliezer's *halakha*, what can be said? Rav Mari said: The solution is that fat priests take the handfulsⁿ of meal-offerings, as their fleshy fingers press against everything between them, and therefore no flour remains between the fingers. The Gemara states: Now that you have arrived at this conclusion, according to Rabbi Eliezer as well, it is appropriate that fat priests should take the handfuls *ab initio*, to avoid a situation of doubt.

בין הביניים פשט ומחץ ופזר וחשב בחפניות חבירו סימן. בעי רב פפא: בין הבינים של מלא חפניו מהו? מאי קא מבעיא ליה? אי גמר 'מלא' 'מלא' מהתם – היינו הך!

Bein habeinayim, pashat,ⁿ umahatz, ufizer, vehishev, bahafinat, haveiro: This is a mnemonic for the ensuing questions of Rav Pappa. **Rav Pappa raised a dilemma:** What is the *halakha* with regard to the in-between incense of his handfuls? The Gemara asks: What is his dilemma? If he derives the verbal analogy between “full” and “full” from his handfuls there, the case of the meal-offering handful, this case is the same as that one, and therefore the incense between his fingers is invalid. If Rav Pappa does not accept this verbal analogy, what is the basis of his dilemma?

רב פפא הכי בעי ליה: 'מלא חפניו והביא' בעינן – והא איכא, או דילמא 'ולקח והביא' בעינן – והא ליכא תיקו.

The Gemara explains that Rav Pappa raised the dilemma as follows: When the verse states: “And his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it within the veil” (Leviticus 16:12), does it mean that we merely require him to bring his handfuls, and that is fulfilled here, as in practice the High Priest brought full handfuls? Or perhaps we require that he must fulfill the following two commands in a similar manner: “And he shall take... and he shall bring” (Leviticus 16:12)? In other words, just as he must have the intention to take the flour, so too, he must intend to bring all of it. And that requirement is not fulfilled here, as he did not intend to bring the extra flour between his fingers. No answer was found for this question, and the Gemara concludes: Let it stand unresolved.

אמר רב פפא: פשיטא לי; מלא קומצו – בדקמצי אינשי. בעי רב פפא: קמץ בראשי אצבעותיו מהו?

Rav Pappa said: It is obvious to me that the act of his handfuls of a meal-offering should be performed *ab initio* in the manner that people usually take a handful, with their fingertips pointed downward. However, Rav Pappa raised a dilemma: What is the *halakha* if he took a handful with his fingertips,^h i.e., if he first put his palm into the vessel and filled his palm with flour by extending his fingers and drawing them in? Does this invalidate the taking of the handful or not?

מלמטה למעלה מהו? מן הצדדין מהו? תיקו.

Furthermore, what is the *halakha* if he took the handful with the back of his hand placed downward in the vessel, and with his fingers collected the flour upward into his palm? Lastly, what is the *halakha* if he took the flour from the sides,ⁿ by passing the back of his hand to and fro over the flour in the vessel with his fingers spread apart, so that the flour collects in his palm? As no answers were found for these dilemmas, the Gemara states: Let it stand unresolved.

אמר רב פפא: פשיטא לי; מלא חפניו – בדחפני אינשי. בעי רב פפא: חפן בראשי אצבעותיו מהו? מלמטה למעלה מהו? מן הצד מהו? חפן בזו ובו וקרובן זו אצל זו מהו? תיקו.

Likewise, Rav Pappa said: It is obvious to me that when the Torah states: “His hands full” (Leviticus 16:12), it means in the manner that people usually fill their hands, by placing the backs of their hands into the vessel and bringing their hands together. However, Rav Pappa raised a dilemma: What is the *halakha* if the High Priest scooped a handful with his fingertips?^h Again, what is the *halakha* if he took a handful from downward to upward? What is the *halakha* if he took a handful from the side? And what is the *halakha* if he scooped a handful with this hand and with this hand and brought them together? These questions are not answered either, and the Gemara states: Let it stand unresolved.

בעי **S** Another dilemma was raised by

HALAKHA

חפן בראשי אצבעותיו – קמץ בראשי אצבעותיו: If a priest takes a handful of the meal-offering with his fingertips or from the sides, it should not be burned *ab initio*, but if it was burned, the offering is valid, as this dilemma was left unresolved (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Ma'aseh HaKorbanot* 13:13 and *Kesef Mishne* there).

חפן בראשי אצבעותיו – קמץ בראשי אצבעותיו: If the High Priest takes a handful with his fingertips or from the sides, or from downward to upward, or if he takes a handful with each hand separately and subsequently brings them together, the incense should not be burned *ab initio*; but if it was burned, it is valid (Rambam *Sefer Avoda, Hilkhot Avodat Yom HaKippurim* 5:28).