

## 6.3.3

31b (הלכה כר' טרפון) → 32b (נקטם ראשון...)

1	ולקחתם לכם ביום הראשון פרי עץ הדר פאת תמרims וענף עץ עבת וערבי נחל ושמתם לפני ה' אלהיכם שבעת ימים: ויקרא כג, מ
2	דרכיה דרכי נעם וכל נתיבותיה שלום: משלי ג, יז

- I. Continued analysis of משנה א – if the head of the לולב was cut off, invalid
- a. **דב הונא** but if it was merely cracked, valid
  - b. **Challenge: ברייתא** rules that the following are invalid לולבים:
    - i. **Invalid:** bent, thorny, **cracked**, crooked like a scythe or completely hardened
      1. **However:** if it has only begun to harden – still valid
    - ii. **Defense (ר"פ):** the “cracked לולב” of the ברייתא is where it has completely split like two prongs
      1. **Revisiting the “crooked לולב” רבא** – only if it is hooked forward; backward is natural
        - a. **ד"נ**: two versions – if the side is **כלפניו** (פסול) or **כלאחוריו** (כשר)
    - iii. **Note (רבא):** a לולב with leaves on only one side is a “בעל מוס” and invalid
- II. Continued analysis of משנה א – if the leaves are off – invalid; if separated – valid
- a. **נפרצו ד"פ** means that he made it like a broom (leaves fully detached, bound on to central branch)
    - i. **And: נפרדו** means that they have separated from each other, but are still on branch
  - b. **Question (ר"פ):** what if the תימות (where top leaves join) is split?
    - i. **Proposed answer: ריב"ל** ruled that if the תימות is gone, invalid
      1. **Assumption:** same rule applies if it is split
      2. **Rejection:** if it is completely gone, it is invalid (**חסר**)
    - ii. **Alternate version: ריב"ל** ruling should be read as “split” is as if it is gone → **פסול**
- III. Analysis of יהודה ר"י's requirement to bind לולב
- a. **Source (in ר"י's name):** v1 – read כפות as כפות (bound) → if separated, bind together
    - i. **Question (רבינא לר"א):** how do we know that כפות תמרים is לולב? Perhaps חרותא (w/separated leaves)?
      1. **Defense:** must be כפות (bound)
    - ii. **Question:** perhaps it is the base (which is all one – “super-כפות”)?
      1. **Answer:** כפות implies that it could be separated, but we bind it
    - iii. **Question:** perhaps it refers to כופרא (soft branch of palm tree)
      1. **Answer:** per v. 2 – must be pleasant – that branch is sharp and thorny
    - iv. **Question (לרבינא):** perhaps we require two branches (per כפות – plural)?
      1. **Answer:** it is written defective – כפת (implying 1)
      2. **Challenge:** if so, perhaps we only require one leaf?
        - a. **Answer:** that is called a כף, not כפת
- IV. Analysis of next clause – ציני הר הברזל are valid as לולב
- a. **אב"י** only valid if the top of one leaf reaches the base of the next one
    - i. **Support: ברייתא** which invalidates ציני הר הברזל against our משנה
      1. **Resolution:** if leaves overlap, valid; if not – invalid
      2. **Note:** some read אב"י's qualification as a resolution to contradiction between ברייתות
    - b. **Tangent:** tradition of ריב"ז as to location and identity of ציני הר הברזל (but cf. Wars IV, 8:2)
- V. Final clause – לולב which is 3 טפחים – enough to shake – is valid
- a. **שמואל** the שעור of וערבה is ג"ט; a לולב is ד"ט, so that the לולב will protrude 1 טפח from others
  - b. **ד' יוחנן** the spine of the לולב must protrude above הדס by 1 טפח
    - i. **Therefore:** read our משנה as “3 טפחים and enough to shake” (=1 more טפח)
  - c. **ר"ט**, commenting on שיעורים, notes that the אמה used is 5 טפחים (i.e. each טפח is 1/5 bigger)
    - i. **Challenge: שמואל** ruled like ר"ט but also ruled that the הדס וערבה are 3 (standard?) טפחים
      1. **Answer1:** he was inexact
        - a. **Challenge:** one might be inexact לחומרא, not לקולא
      2. **Answer2 (per רבינא's report):** ר"ט ruled that the 6 טפחים fit into an אמה of 5
        - a. **Therefore:** actual שיעורים are smaller than usual → דק and it was לחומרא