

29.1.9

10b (קמץ ועלה בידו) → 11b (ל) (קמ"ל)

1. והביאה אל בני אהרן הפהנים וקמץ משם מלא קמצו מסלתה ומשמנה על כל לבנתה והקטיר הפהן את אזכרתה המזבחה אשה ריח ניחח לה: ויקרא ב, ג.  
 2. והרים ממנו בקמצו מסלת המנחה ומשמנה ואת כל הלבנה אשר על המנחה והקטיר המזבח ריח ניחח אזכרתה לה: ויקרא ו, ח.

- I Analysis of penultimate clause of משנה – the pebble, salt or לבונה found in the קומץ (invalid)
- a justification: if only taught צרור – because it doesn't belong there at all
- i and: if only taught salt – because it wasn't part of the original מנחה → need קומץ
- II Analysis of the rule – חסר ויתר are invalid
- a challenge: if a rock (etc.) is inside, it's invalid anyways due to חציצה
- i answer (ר' ירמיה): could be a case where the rock is exactly in the middle – not a חציצה, but a problem of חסר
- b ancillary discussion between אבבי ורבא manner of קמיצה
- i רבא: as people do (closing their fingers on their palm)
- 1 challenge: we refer to 4<sup>th</sup> finger as "קמיצה"
  - 2 answer: pinky is used to even out the קומץ
    - (a) meaning: he fills with his entire fist – to ensure it's not deficient – then uses the pinky to level it out
    - (b) method: take all three fingers, cover entire palm –
    - (c) support: מרייתא on vv. 1-2; adds that in case of מחבת ומרחשת (where קמיצה is after אפייה), use thumb as well to even off top
    - (i) note: this is one of the 3 hardest עבודות (along with חפנית קטורת ביה"כ
- c series of queries about קומץ, all left unresolved with תיקו
- i ר' פ: if he does קמיצה with his fingertips, from the side or underneath – is it valid? (תיקו)
- ii ר' פ: if he does קמיצה with his fingertips, from the side or underneath – is it valid? (תיקו)
- 1 what if: he used his fingertips, from the side or took them in separate hands and brought them together? תיקו
- iii ר' פ: if he stuck the קומץ onto the side of the כלי שרת – is it a valid בכלי?
- 1 lemma1: does it need to be inside the כלי – and it is
  - 2 lemma1: does it require הנחה in the כלי – which doesn't happen – תיקו
- iv מר בר ר' אשי: if he turned the כלי upside down and stuck the קומץ on the inside bottom – valid בכלי?
- 1 lemma1: does it require הנחה inside – which there is
  - 2 lemma2: does it require "normal" placing – which this is not – תיקו
- III משנה ב: method of קמיצה – stretches out his fingers over his palm
- IV משנה ג: if he has too much oil, too little oil or too little לבונה - invalid
- a definition of "too much oil": ר"א – if he designated 2 לוגין for the עשרון
- i challenge: why doesn't he explain it as he took שמן of another מנחה or שמן חולין?
- 1 proposal: perhaps those don't invalidate
  - 2 rejection: if so, שמן would never invalidate a מנחת חוטא (it doesn't have its own)
- ii defense: ר"א meant that not only שמן חולין etc. but even if he set aside 2 לוגין – invalid
- iii Source (רבא): ר"א inferred from language of משנה – ריבה שמנה, instead of שמן ריבה לה שמן
- b Analysis of "too little לבונה": עויר ברייתא with opinions of minimal שמן
- i ר' יהודה: if it has at least two clumps – valid; only one – invalid
- ii ר' ש: even one clump is valid
- 1 Challenge: ר"ש is reported as ruling that if anything is missing from the לבונה – it's invalid
    - (a) Answer1: means "if anything is missing from the [last] clump"
    - (b) Answer2: that refers to a לבונה brought by itself (as a נדבה); the 1<sup>st</sup> ruling is for לבונה coming with מנחה
- iii Summary (ר' יוחנן) = as reported by יוסף בר יוסף: 3 opinions: (all inferred from v. 2 – על המנחה)
- 1 ר"מ: needs to be a full קומץ of לבונה at time of הקדש and at time of הקטרה
    - (a) Inference: same amount of לבונה as at time of being with מנחה
  - 2 ר"י: needs to be a קומץ of לבונה at time of הקדש and 2 "clumps" at time of הקטרה
    - (a) Inference: כל – allows for even 1 clump; ואת augments it to 2 clumps
  - 3 ר"ש: needs to be a קומץ of לבונה at time of הקדש and 1 "clump" at time of הקטרה
    - (a) Inference: כל (per יהודה) – and he doesn't infer anything from ואת

- iv *Additional ruling from ר' יוחנן (from ריב"י):* this 3-way dispute only applies to לבונה which comes with מנחה
  - 1 *But:* all agree that a לבונה brought on its own must have a full קומץ through הקטרה
    - (a) *Source:* v. 2 stipulates על המנחה – but not if independent
  - 2 *And:* dispute only applies to לבונה with מנחה, but לבונה which comes in ביזיכין (for לחם הפנים) – all agree that 2 קמצים are needed from beginning until הקטרה
    - (a) *Challenge:* this is obvious – these are לבונה which come on their own
    - (b) *Answer:* we might have considered them לבונה עם המנחה since they accompany לחם הפנים – קמ"ל
- v *Note:* among אמוראי א"י, dispute if the 3-way dispute is limited to לבונה הבאה עם המנחה (per report in ר' יוחנן's name above) or whether each חכם maintains his position here too.
- c *Inference from "too little לבונה":* but too much appears to be valid
  - i *Challenge:* ברייתא rules that too much is also invalid
    - 1 *Answer (רב"ח):* that's in a case where he designates 2 קמצים of לבונה (not just a big קומץ)
    - 2 *Therefore (רב"ח):* if he set aside 2 קמצי לבונה but one got lost
      - (a) *If:* it got lost before קמיצה – valid (wasn't yet set as part of the קרבן)
      - (b) *But if:* it got lost afterwards – already invalid as "too much לבונה"
    - 3 *Parallel:* if he designated 4 קמצי לבונה for לחם הפנים and 2 got lost
      - (a) *If:* they got lost before סילוק ביזיכין – valid
      - (b) *But if:* they got lost afterwards – too late and it is invalid
    - 4 *Challenge:* why add the second case; isn't it perfectly analogous to the first?
      - (a) *Answer:* סד"א that since the קומץ here (לחם הפנים) is pre-identified, once the time for סילוק ביזיכין comes, it should be considered as if it were already done and should be invalid (if it got lost after that point before the actual סילוק) – קמ"ל