The Chicago Center
Digest
Mishna Berura
THE DAILY RESOURCE FOR MISHNA BERURA YOMI
Shabbos, Oct 8 2022 ■ י"ג תשרי, תשפ"ג
סימן תרמ"ה סעיף ו'-ז'

Overview

Siman 645 Seif 6:

If the top was clipped, meaning that the tops of the majority of upper leaves were clipped, the lulav is invalid. If the upper, middle leaf above the spine was clipped it is invalid. This invalidation applies when there is another lulav but when there is no other lulav we recite a beracha on this one.

- The upper leaves are the ones that extend above the spine. The amount that is clipped is not defined and Levush is stringent if even a small amount is clipped. (M.B. 26)
- It is invalid since it is not hadar. (M.B. 27)
- Many authorities explain that Rema is expressing an opinion more stringent than Shulchan Aruch and rules that if even the tiyomes is clipped the lulav is invalid and Vilna Gaon seems to subscribe to this position. (M.B. 28)
- If the lulav has two tiyomos and only one is clipped there is room to be lenient. (M.B. 29)
- Elya Rabba suggests that Rema's leniency is limited to where the tiyomes is clipped and even then only if it is partially clipped but if a majority of it is clipped one should not recite the beracha and certainly but not when the majority of upper leaves are clipped. (M.B. 30)

Siman 645 Seif 7:

If it is split and the two halves separated from one another so that they appear like two different leaves, the lulav is invalid. This is true even if the tiyomes is not split in a way that would invalidate the lulav due to having a split tiyomes.

- This is true even if it did not grow this way naturally. (M.B. 31)
- Once it separates and appears as two leaves it is invalid and one should be cautious about this. (M.B. 32)

Halacha Highlight

The disqualification of הימנק

Shulchan Aruch Siman 645 Seif 7
עד שנראו כשנים
Until it appears as two

Shulchan Aruch (סע' ז') discusses a lulav whose leaves separated from one another to the point that they appear as though they are separate leaves and rules that such a lulav is invalid. Rema adds that even though the split is not so long that the lulav would be invalidated due to split leaves (נחלקה התיומת) nevertheless, due to the very fact that it appears as though there are two leaves the lulav is invalid. Mishnah Berurah (ס"ק ל"ב) adds that one must be very cautious about this.

In the event that the split is very small, Da'as Torah (סע' ז') writes that the lulav is valid even though one can see that the leaf is split. The reason is that although one sees the split it is obvious that it is a single leaf that split slightly and if one were to lay the lulav down on its side the two halves would touch and while shaking the lulav the sides are close enough that they would touch one another. Chazon Ish also writes that if the tiyomes is split and the two sides separate from one another the lulav is not disqualified as a הימנק. It is only when the parts of the tiyomes are crooked and for that reason one can see that they are separate is the lulav in valid but if they are split but each half is straight the lulav remains valid.

If the leaves themselves are intact but the thorn-like material that sometimes extends from the top of the tiyomes is crooked and gives the appearance of הימנק, as long as the thorn-like material is short like one finds on many lulavim the lulav is valid. There would only be an issue if the thorn-like material is very long and crooked that it would be invalidated as a הימנק (חוט השני סוכות פי"ג סק"ב ד"ה עוד פרטים).