

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) The Biblical source for the requirement to blow a shofar (cont.)

The Gemara concludes quoting a Baraisa that identifies the source for many of the Biblical requirements for shofar blowing on Rosh HaShanah.

A detail regarding the methodology employed by the Baraisa is clarified.

Another Baraisa is cited that provides an alternative source for the requirement to blow a tekiah before and after a teruah.

The Baraisa proceeds to identify the source of the requirement to blow three sets of tekiah-teruah-tekiah.

The Gemara clarifies and records the exchange between the two Tannaim at the end of the Baraisa regarding the sources for the requirement to blow three sets of tekiah-teruah-tekiah.

2) R' Avahu's enactment

R' Avahu enacted that one should blow tekiah-shevarim/teruah-tekiah.

The Gemara clarifies that this enactment is the result of a doubt regarding the correct sound of a teruah. It was in addition to blowing a series of tekiah-shevarim-tekiah and tekiah-teruah-tekiah.

3) Pausing between shofar blasts

R' Yochanan rules that if one heard nine shofar blasts at nine different hours of the day the mitzvah is fulfilled.

A Baraisa echoes the same position.

The Gemara unsuccessfully questions whether R' Yochanan maintains this position.

A Baraisa teaches that the trumpet blasts and berachos recited on fast days are not essential to one another, but the berachos and shofar blasts of Rosh HaShanah and of Yom Kippur of Yovel are essential to one another.

Rabbah explains why the blasts and berachos are essential to one another on Rosh HaShanah

4) The connection between the berachos and the shofar blasts

(Overview...continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that three sets of three blasts must be sounded?

2. What was R' Avahu's enactment?

3. Is there a requirement to blow the shofar together with the recitation of the berachos of Musaf?

4. Explain the dispute between the Chachamim and R' Gamliel.

Distinctive INSIGHT

Taking a breath between the sounding of שברים-תרועה

תקיעה, שלשה שברים, תרועה, תקיעה

The Rishonim argue about the proper sounding of the שברים-תרועה sound. Is this a combined sound of two parts, a שברים followed by a תרועה, or is it a single blast, comprised of parts called שברים and תרועה?

Rabeinu Tam holds that although the three sounds which make up a regular שברים must be sounded in one breath. Nevertheless, the שברים and תרועה sounds, when featured together, should not be sounded in one continuous breath. The reason is that each sound represents a different sentiment. שברים is the sound of a groan, while the short blasts of a תרועה mimic the sound of one who is crying. A person does not express these two emotions at one time, so the person blowing the shofar should not combine them in one breath.

Ramban (to Sukkah 53b) writes that according to Rabbi Yehuda, the combination of תקיעה-תרועה-תקיעה is one extended mitzvah, featuring two solid blasts surrounding one broken unit. Although these three sounds should not be blended together in one continuous flow (תרומת הדשן end of #142), there should still not be an interruption of taking a breath between them. Therefore, the שברים-תרועה sound, when blown as a fulfillment of the תרועה, should not be blown with a breath in between. This is also the opinion of Tosafos (ערכין י"ד"ה אין) and Rosh (סימן י').

Shulchan Aruch (590:4) rules that our custom is to blow the initial sounds before the Amidah (תקיעות דמיושב) in one breath, but during the תקיעות of שברים-תרועה sound is done in two breaths. Rema rules that the מעומד and מיושב are each to be sounded with taking a breath in between the שברים-תרועה. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated by Rabbi & Mrs. Shiya Wechsler
 in memory of his father
 ר' יצחק אהרן בן הרב צבי דוב, ע"ה

HALACHAH Highlight

A possible Biblical commandment overrides a Rabbinic prohibition

שתי עיירות בא' תוקעין ובא' מברכין הולכין למקום שתוקעין ואין הולכין למקום שמברכין

If there are two cities; in one they will blow the shofar and in the other they will make a berachah (Musaf), he should go to the place that they will blow the shofar and should not go to the place where they will make the berachos (Musaf).

According to the Gemara's conclusion if a person has a choice between going to a town that may have a shofar or going to another town that definitely has a שליח ציבור who will discharge the obligation to daven, one should travel to the place that may have the shofar. The reason is that even the possibility of fulfilling a Biblical commandment is a higher priority than the certain fulfillment of a Rabbinic mitzvah. Although the Gemara presents this principle in the context of giving priority to the Biblical mitzvah over a Rabbinical mitzvah, nonetheless, Poskim apply this principle even to the extent that a biblical mitzvah can override possible Rabbinic prohibitions.

STORIES Off the Daf

The Shofar and the Chatzosros

ותקעתם תרועה...ותרועה יתקעו

Rav Shach, ז"ל, once related: "It is interesting to note that the Chofetz Chaim, ז"ל, only cites a contemporary Gadol in his Mishnah Berurah a single time. In hilchos Rosh HaShanah, he writes that it is correct to blow the shofar out of the right side of one's mouth. In the Beur Halachah, he cites Rav Meir Simcha of Dvinsk, ז"ל, who refers to Rosh HaShanah 34 to provide an explanation. There, we extrapolate some halachos of the shofar from the laws of חצוצרות/trumpets. He adds that since the verse says clearly that when they blew the battle trumpets during Gidon's war, they held the torches in their left hands and their shofaros in their right, we see that they blew from the right side.

Rav Shach continued, "The truth is that the Chofetz Chaim, ז"ל, only brought a halachah from a contemporary Gadol to provide a reason for a custom. But it remains curious why he cites the Ohr Someach and no one else? My theory was

always that it had to do with a certain argument that existed between the two Torah giants. The Chofetz Chaim held that even if the government threatens to shut down a yeshiva, it must refuse to incorporate secular studies into its schedule. The Ohr Someach, on the other hand, held that it is more important for the yeshivos to stay open, and they should therefore teach the secular subjects. The Chofetz Chaim and Rav Meir Simchah had a number of heated exchanges about the matter. I always felt that the citation was a peace-offering from the Chofetz Chaim toward Rav Meir Simchah."

Rav Shach concluded, "Even though this was just my own theory, I always felt certain that I was correct. I once met Rav Mendel Zaks, ז"ל, the son-in-law of the Chofetz Chaim and presented it to him. He affirmed that this indeed had been the Chofetz Chaim's intention, and he had even told this to the group of בעלי בתים with whom he learned the Mishnah Berurah in Radin. We must learn from our gedolim how to convey to those whom we may have insulted that we didn't mean anything personal. Even if we did it לשם שמים! ■

Teshuvos Halachos Ketanos¹ considered the halachah of a person who is uncertain whether he recited the berachah of על המחיה. His conclusion is that even in circumstances of doubt the berachah should be recited. His rationale is that there are Poskim who maintain that על המחיה is a Biblical obligation, therefore, although there is the possibility that one may violate the prohibition against reciting an unnecessary berachah, nonetheless, since reciting an unnecessary berachah violates only a Rabbinic prohibition we apply this principle that the possibility of fulfilling a Biblical mitzvah overrides the concern for the Rabbinic prohibition.

Rav Moshe Sofer², the Chasam Sofer, issues a similar ruling in a case where there is a doubt whether a baby should have his circumcision on the second day of Yom Tov. Although there is the possibility that the child is not required to have his circumcision on that day, and the circumcision would constitute a violation against the Rabbinic prohibition against מלאכה on the second day of Yom Tov, nonetheless, the possibility of fulfilling a Biblical mitzvah takes priority and overrides the concern for a possible violation of a Rabbinic prohibition. ■

1. שו"ת הלכות קטנות ח"א סי' קמ"ג
2. שו"ת חת"ם סופר יו"ד סי' ר"ג ■

(Overview...continued from page 1)

The Gemara infers that, ideally, the shofar should be sounded in the order of the berachos.

A related incident is recorded that teaches that the requirement to sound the shofar in the order of the berachos applies only when one davens with the tzibbur. A Baraisa supports this distinction between an individual and a tzibbur.

The last ruling of the Baraisa teaches that given the choice one should travel to a city that may have a shofar rather than to a city where he will only fulfill the obligation to daven Musaf.

5) Clarifying the dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Gamliel

A Baraisa records the exchange between Tanna Kamma and R' Gamliel whether individuals are obligated to daven when the tefillah will be recited by the shaliach tzibbur.

R' Yochanan maintains that Chachamim conceded to R' Gamliel whereas Rav maintains that the dispute continues.

A related incident is recorded.

The Gemara questions whether, in fact, R' Yochanan ever asserted that Chachamim conceded to R' Gamliel. ■