6.3.4 32b (משנה ב) → 33b (משנה ב)

ו) וּלְקַחְתָּם לָכֶם בַּיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן פְּרִי עֵץ הָדָר כַּפֿת תְּמָרִים וַעֲנַף עֵץ עָבֹת וְעַרְבֵי נָחַל וּשְׁמַחְתֶּם לְפְנֵי ה' אֱלֹהֵיכֶם שָׁבְעַת יָמִים: ויקרא כג, מ

בּדְלָכֶיהְ דָרְכֵי נֹעָם וְכָל נְתִיבֹתֶיהָ שָׁלוֹם: מש*לי ג, יו*בּבְּלוֹם הָלְבִיעִי ... וְצוֹם הָעשִׁירִי יִהְיֶה לְבֵית יְהוּדָה לְשָׁשׁוֹן וּלְשָׁמְחָה וּלְמַעֻדִים טוֹבִים וְהָ**אֶמֶת וְהַשְּׁלוֹם אֱהָבּוּ**: זכריה ח, יט

בּבְּקף וְהַנֵּעְתָם אֶּלָבְת אֵזוֹב וּטְבַלְתֶּם בַּדָּם אָשֶׁר בַּפַּף וְהַנֵּעְתֶם אֶל הַמַּשְׁקוֹף וְאָל שְׁתֵּי הַמְזוּזֹת מִן הַדָּם אֲשֶׁר בַּפָּף ... שמות יב, כב

בּילוֹי וְשִׁרָת יָה וַיְהִי לִי לִישׁוֹעָה זֶּ**ה אֵלִי וְאַנְתָהוּ** אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי וַאָרמְמֶּנְהוּ: שמות טו, בּ

- I. משנה ב parameters of validity for הדס
 - a. Essential invalidity: stolen or withered
 - b. Theoretical nonexistence: if coming from אשירה tree or עיר הנדחת
 - c. Local issues: if the top was cut off or the leaves fell off invalid
 - d. *Unique issue*: if there are more berries than leaves invalid
 - a. Fix: if he removes the berries and there are now more leaves valid
 - b. However: he may not remove them on יום טוב
- II. ענף עץ עבות outlining definition of ענף עץ עבות: leaves cover branch (הדס=)
 - a. Challenge: perhaps it refers to an olive branch?
 - i. Rejection: requires עבות ("chain")
 - b. Challenge: perhaps it is a דולב (plane-tree)
 - i. Rejection: requires leaves that cover tree
 - c. Challenge: perhaps it refers to oleander
 - i. Rejection (אביי): per v. 2 must be pleasant; רבא used v. 3 to reject on same grounds
- III. ברייתא must be braided
 - a. ענף עץ עבות .דאב"י →a tree that tastes like its fruit הדס
 - b. עבות if not עבות ("chained"), invalid
 - i. Meaning of רב יהודה): if 3 leaves come out from a single "nest"
 - ii. בהנא even if they grow out in twos and ones (student would deliberately seek that kind)
 - 1. אמימר used to refer to that kind as אמימר (invalid)
- IV. ברייתא if a majority of the leaves fall off, as long as it still has the "braid" (3) valid
 - a. *Note*: there is an inherent inconsistency if a majority are gone, less than 3 remain
 - i. Answer (אביי): could be with Egyptian הדס, which has 7 leaves if 4 fall out, still has 3
 - ii. Observation: שם לווי is valid even though it has a שם (nuance-name)
 - 1. Reason: עבות extends and allows multiple types
 - b. Related בנייתא if a majority of its leaves dry up and only 3 moist ones remain כשר
 - i. א' חסדא. must be on top of each one
- V. Analyzing the next clause נקטם (if the top of the הדס is cut off invalid)
 - a. עולא בר חיננא: if it was cut off and a bud grew there it is valid
 - i. Question (ייש"ט): if the top was cut off on עיו"ט and the bud grew on יו"ט is it valid?
 - 1. Inotherwords: is there a notion of דחוי (rejection) in re objects of מצוה?
 - ii. Challenge: why not answer from אין דחוי כסוי הדם 's comment on ר' יוחנן 's comment on אין דחוי
 - iii. Answer: perhaps מיקו was in doubt and ruled לחומרא (and wouldn't apply לקולא, as here) תיקו
 - b. Suggestion: perhaps this issue (דחוי אצל מצוות) is a dispute among תנאים:
 - i. *If*: he took the (majority) buds off on יו"ט it is invalid; ארשב"צ validates
 - 1. Assumption: they agree that לולב צריך אגד we infer סוכה from סוכה
 - 2. Dispute: whether we hold that there is דחוי אצל מצוות
 - a. Rejection: all agree אין דחוי; dispute is whether we infer לולב מסוכה) OR
 - b. Perhaps: dispute whether לולב require אגד parallel to ר' יהודה/חכמים:
 - 1. לולב .חכמים does not require אגד
 - a. They agree: that it is ideal as הידור מצוה (v. 5)
 - 2. אגד requires לולב :*ד' יהודה* (vv. 1,4)

- VI. Analysis of next clause if there were more buds than leaves, invalid
 - a. מסדא (version1): citing רב only if bunched in one place; if in 2 or 3 valid
 - i. Challenge (דבא): if bunched in 2 or 3 places, considered "spotted" and invalid
 - b. הדס only if the buds are black; if green, they are of at type with the רב valid
 - c. *Note (פ"פ*): red buds are like black (invalid)
 - i. Per: ר' חנינא's ruling (re דם) black blood was red and soured
- VII. Analysis of subsuent ruling if he removed the buds (so that they are no longer a majority) כשר
 - a. Question: when did he remove them?
 - i. If: before he bound the לולב with the לולב should be obvious that it is valid
 - ii. Rather: it must be after אגד but it was rejected ab initio
 - 1. Inference: דחוי ab initio isn't דחוי (must be "accepted" first)
 - 2. Rejection: it was after מעיקרא but אגד holds that אגוד is just "designation" not yet מעיקרא

VIII.Final clause – may not take buds off on יו"ט

- a. *Implication*: if he did remove them it is valid
- b. Clarification: when did they go black?
 - i. If: before יו"ט it was rejected ab initio
 - 1. Inference: דחוי מעיקרא isn't
 - ii. Rather: it was blackened on יו"ט
 - 1. If so: it was נראה (fit and then unfit)
 - 2. Inference: נראה ונדחה can become fit again (חוזר ונראה)
 - iii. Rethink: it was blackened before יו"ט
 - 1. And: we may infer about לא הוה דחוי)
 - 2. But: we may not infer about ונראה חוזר ונראה חוזר ונראה
- c. ברייתא we may not take them off on ראב"ש; יר"ט permits
 - i. Challenge: he is מתקן מנא (making הדס fit for use)
 - ii. Answer (ר' אשר): if he was picking them off to eat (not to make הדס fit)
 - 1. And: ראב"ש holds like his father (ר"ש) דבר שאין מתכוין מותר
 - 2. Challenge: אביי ורבא agreed that מיק רישיה allows that פסיק רישיה is forbidden
 - 3. Defense: in this case, he has another הדט →has no benefit from the הדט
- d. ברייתא comes loose on יי"ט, he may tie it like a bundle of vegetables
 - i. Question: why not make a bow?
 - ii. Answer: it is per קשר, who holds (שבת טו:א) that a bow is a proper קשר
 - 1. Challenge: if it is יהודה, he requires a proper אגד
 - 2. Answer: this תנא accepts יר' יהודה 's ruling about a bow, but not about אגד