



# **The Laws of Shofar**

## **הלכות שופר**

*Introduction*

*The Definition of the Mitzvah*

*The Amount of Blasts*

*Interruptions During Tekiat Shofar*

*Reciting Vidui or the Yehi Ratzon Prayer Between the Tekiot*

*Women and the Mitzvah of Shofar*



Tanach



Talmud (Chazal)



*Rishonim*



*Acharonim*



*Contemporary Poskim*

## INTRODUCTION

The holiday of Rosh Hashana is certainly a multi-faceted one according to Jewish tradition. Its observance generally includes spending a large amount of time in shul in prayer, which includes the recitation of the unique additions to the *Mussaf* service of *Malchuyot*, *Zichronot*, and *Shofarot*, eating festive meals including the *simanim* (foods eaten on Rosh Hashana as an auspicious omen, such as apples), and reciting *tashlich* next to a body of water. However, the primary mitzvah associated with Rosh Hashana, and the only biblical one, is the mitzvah of *tekiat shofar*, blowing the *shofar*. For this reason, we will focus on the blowing of the *shofar* in this *shiur*, and address a number of issues and practical halachot related to this significant mitzvah.<sup>1</sup>

The Torah presents the mitzvah of blowing *shofar* twice in the sections discussing the various *chagim* (holidays).



### Vayikra 23:24

Speak to the children of Israel, saying: In the seventh month, on the first of the month, it shall be a Sabbath for you, a remembrance of [Israel through] the *shofar* blast, a holy occasion.

### 1. ויקרא כג:כד

דַּבֵּר אֶל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, לֵאמֹר: בַּחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי בְּאֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ, יְהִיֶה לָכֶם שַׁבָּתוֹן – זְכוֹרֹן תְּרוּעָה, מִקְרָא-קֹדֶשׁ.



### Bamidbar 29:1

And in the seventh month, on the first day, there shall be a holy convocation for you; you shall not perform any mundane work. It shall be a day of *shofar* sounding for you.

### 2. במדבר כט:א

וּבַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי בְּאֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ, מִקְרָא-קֹדֶשׁ יְהִיֶה לָכֶם – כָּל-מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה, לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ: יוֹם תְּרוּעָה, יְהִיֶה לָכֶם.

The Torah does not offer a reason for this mitzvah, but the *Sefer HaChinuch* suggests that since Rosh Hashana is considered the *Yom HaDin*, the Day of Judgment, the *shofar* serves as an arousal to doing *teshuva* (repentance) and conquering our *yetzer hara* (evil inclination).



### Sefer HaChinuch, Mitzvah 405

The basis of the mitzvah [is the following]: Since man is a physical being, he will not awaken unless something provokes him, such as in the case of war, where they blow and shout in order to properly arouse themselves to wage war. Similarly, on Rosh Hashana, which is the day designated from time immemorial to judge all the creatures of the world...

### 3. ספר החינוך | מצויה תה

משרשי המצווה, לפי שהאדם בעל חומר, לא יתעורר לדברים כי אם על יד מעורר, כדרך בני אדם בעת המלחמה, יריעו אף יצריחו (פירוש: יצרחו), כדי שיתעוררו יפה למלחמה, וגם כן ביום ראש השנה, שהוא היום הנועד מקדם לדון בו כל באי עולם...

1. In this framework, we will focus mainly on aspects of *shofar* that are relevant to everyone. We will not address many other aspects of the mitzvah that are more pertinent to the *ba'al hatokea*, the one who blows the *shofar*, such as the length of the blasts, mistakes made during the blowing, and the halachot of the *shofar* itself.

therefore each person needs to arouse his own nature to ask for mercy for his sins from the Master of Mercy. For God is a merciful and compassionate God, who bears sin, iniquity, and transgression and cleans those who return to Him with all of their heart. The sound of the *shofar* greatly arouses the hearts of all who hear it, and certainly this is so concerning the sound of the *terua*, i.e., the broken sound. Aside from the arousal provided by it, it also serves as a reminder for a person, that when he hears the broken blasts, he should shatter the evil inclination in his heart for the desires of the world and for sin...

על כן צריך כל אחד להעיר טבעו לבקש רחמים על חטאיו מאדון הרחמים, כי אל חנון ורחום הוא, נושא עוון ופשע וחטאה ונקה לשבים אליו בכל ליבם. וקול השופר מעורר הרבה לב כל שומעיו, וכל שכן קול התרועה, כלומר הקול הנשבר. ומלבד ההתעוררות שבו, יש לו לאדם זכר בדבר, שישבור יצר ליבו הרע בתאוות העולם ובחטאים, בשומעו קולות נשברים...

Another reason given for blowing the *shofar* on Rosh Hashana is based on the **Gemara** in ***Rosh Hashana*** that mentions that the blowing conjures up the memory of *Akeidat Yitzchak* (the binding of Yitzchak on the altar).

#### **n** Masechet Rosh Hashana 16a

**Rabbi Abbahu said: Why does one sound a blast with a *shofar* from a ram's horn on Rosh Hashana? The Holy One, Blessed be He, said: Sound a blast before Me with a *shofar* from a ram's horn, so that I will remember for you the binding of Isaac, son of Abraham, and I will ascribe it to you as if you had bound yourselves before Me.**

#### **4. מסכת ראש השנה טז.**

אמר רבי אבהו: למה תוקעין בשופר של איל? – אמר הקדוש ברוך הוא: תקעו לפני בשופר של איל, כדי שאזכור לכם עקידת יצחק בן אברהם, ומעלה אני עליכם כאילו עקדתם עצמכם לפני.

In addition to the aforementioned reasons, many other reasons are given by the commentaries in order to explain the essence of this mitzvah.<sup>2</sup>

2. For example, the Rambam in *Hilchot Teshuva* (3:4) famously states that it hints at repentance (similar to the *Sefer HaChinuch*) and uses the expression “wake up, you who sleep, from your slumber... and inspect your deeds, repent, and remember your Creator.” In addition, Rav Saadia Gaon offers ten different reasons for the mitzvah (two are the ones mentioned here), and many later commentaries also suggest various explanations. [Addition of the English editors]

## THE DEFINITION OF THE MITZVAH

In order to properly understand the halachic parameters of the mitzvah of *shofar*, it is important to clarify the nature of the mitzvah: Is the essence of the mitzvah to blow the *shofar* or to hear the *shofar*? On one hand, it is of course impossible to hear the *shofar* without it being blown, and only when it is blown does one hear it. If so, perhaps the mitzvah is the blowing of the *shofar*, and whenever one person is appointed to blow, all those that hear the blasts are considered as having blown themselves. On the other hand, perhaps there is no mitzvah to blow at all and the mitzvah is to hear the *shofar*. If so, all those who hear it fulfill the mitzvah simply through listening (including the blower himself), and the blowing is only a means in order to be able to hear the *shofar*. A practical halachic ramification of this question is whether the wording of the *beracha* should be "*lishmoa kol shofar*," "to hear the sound of the *shofar*" or "*al tekiat shofar*," "on the blowing of the *shofar*." From the language of the **Rambam** in the **Mishneh Torah**, it is clear that he holds that the essence of the mitzvah is to hear the *shofar*.



### Rambam, Hilchot Shofar 1:1, 3

1. It is a positive biblical commandment to hear the sound of the *shofar* on Rosh Hashana, as it says: "It shall be a day of blowing for you"...
3. ...If one blew with a stolen *shofar*, he has fulfilled his obligation; as the commandment is only listening to the sound – even though the listener did not touch it or pick it up, [he has fulfilled his obligation]; and there is no law of theft regarding the sound...

### 5. רמב"ם | הל' שופר א:א, ג

- א. מצוות עשה של תורה לשמוע תרועת השופר בראש השנה, שנאמר: "יום תרועה יהיה לכם" (במדבר כט, יא)...
- ג. ...שופר הגזול שתקע בו – יצא, שאין המצווה אלא בשמיעת הקול, אף על פי שלא נגע בו ולא הגביהו השומע, ואין בקול דין גזל...

The **Rambam** in his responsa also states explicitly that the mitzvah is to hear the *shofar*.



### Responsa of the Rambam, Siman 142

**Question:** what is the difference between the [language of] "to hear the sound of the *shofar*" and "blowing the *shofar*"?

**Answer:** The distinction is very great indeed. For the mitzvah is not to blow the *shofar*, rather to hear the *shofar*.

### 6. שו"ת הרמב"ם | סימן קמב

**שאלה:** מה ההבדל בין "לשמוע קול שופר" ובין "על תקיעת שופר"?

**התשובה:** ההבדל ביניהם גדול מאוד. וזה שהמצווה המחוייבת אינה התקיעה, אלא שמיעת התקיעה...

In contrast to the Rambam, **Rabbeinu Tam** (cited by the **Rosh**) and the **Sefer Mitzvot Gedolot (Semag)** hold that the essence of the mitzvah is to blow the *shofar*.

**Rosh, Rosh Hashana 4:10**

...Rabbeinu Tam writes that one must recite the blessing of “*al tekiat shofar*” (on blowing the *shofar*), for that action [the blowing] is the completion of the mitzvah.

**7. רא"ש | ראש השנה ד':**

...ורבנו תם כתב, שיש לברך “על תקיעת שופר”, משום דעשייתה היא גמר מצוותה.

**Sefer Mitzvot Gedolot, Positive Mitzvah 42**

It is a positive mitzvah to blow the *shofar* on Rosh Hashana, as it says, “it shall be a day of blowing for you.”

**8. ספר מצוות גדול | עשין סימן מב**

מצות עשה לתקוע בשופר בראש השנה, שנאמר “יום תרועה יהיה לכם” (במדבר כט, יא).

The simple reading of the **Gemara** in **Rosh Hashana** cited in the next source seems to support the opinion of the Rambam that the essence of the mitzvah is to hear the *shofar*, since it states that one who blows the *shofar* into a pit does not fulfill his obligation if the sound he heard was an echo, but those standing in the pit do fulfill their obligation, as they heard the blasts directly.

**Masechet Rosh Hashana 27b**

It was taught in the Mishna: If one **blows a *shofar* into a pit or into a cistern**, he has not fulfilled his obligation if he heard the echo. **Rav Huna says: They taught this only with respect to those standing at the edge of the pit. But those standing in the pit itself have fulfilled their obligation.**

**9. מסכת ראש השנה כז:**

“התוקע לתוך הבור או לתוך הדות” וכו'. אמר רב הונא: לא שנו אלא לאותן העומדים על שפת הבור, אבל אותן העומדין בבור – יצאו.

The **Tur** in fact quotes this passage from the Gemara in support of the opinion of the Rambam that the mitzvah is to hear the *shofar*.

**Tur, Orach Chaim Siman 585**

Before one blows, one must recite the *beracha* “to hear the sound of the *shofar* [*lishmoa kol shofar*]” and not “to blow [*litkoa*],” as it [fulfilling the mitzvah] is not dependent on blowing the *shofar*, but on hearing it. As we learned in the Mishna: One who blows into a pit has not fulfilled his obligation.

**10. טור | או"ח סימן תקפה**

וקודם שיתקע, יברך “לשמוע קול שופר” ולא “לתקוע”, דלאו בתקיעה תליא מילתא אלא בשומע, כדתנן: “התוקע לתוך הבור כו' לא יצא” (ראש השנה כז:).

However, other *sugyot* seem to support the opinion of Rabbeinu Tam that the essence of the mitzvah is blowing, such as the **Mishna** in **Rosh Hashana** that states that one can only fulfill the obligation of *shofar* if the person whom one heard blow it is obligated in the mitzvah himself. The reason is that if the obligation was merely to hear the *shofar*, it should not matter whether the one blowing it is obligated in the mitzvah or not.

### ח Mishna, Rosh Hashana 3:8

...A deaf-mute, a mentally deranged individual, or a minor may not fulfill the obligation on behalf of others. This is the general rule: All those who are not obligated with regard to a [particular] matter cannot fulfill the obligation on behalf of others.

### 11. משנה | ראש השנה ג:ח

...חרש, שוטה וקטן – אין מוציאים את הרבים ידי חובתן. זה הכלל: כל שאינו מחוייב בדבר – אינו מוציא את הרבים ידי חובתן.

In order to resolve this mishna with the opinion of the Rambam, the **Chazon Ish** explains that the nature of the mitzvah of *shofar* is unique: The mitzvah is to hear the *shofar*, as the Rambam stated, yet one must hear it from a person who is obligated in the mitzvah, as one has to hear a *shofar* sound that qualifies as a mitzvah, i.e., from one who is obligated. A similar phenomenon exists regarding the mitzvah of *tzitzit*, where one who is obligated must tie the knots, even though the mitzvah is to wear the garment. So too here, even though the mitzvah is to hear the *shofar*, nevertheless, the “*hechsher mitzvah*,” the preparation for the mitzvah, i.e., the blowing, must be done by one who is obligated.

### פ Chazon Ish, Orach Chaim 29:4

Similarly, regarding the blowing of the *shofar*, one only fulfills the obligation of hearing if it is from the sound of a *shofar* that qualifies as a mitzvah. Therefore, one cannot fulfill the obligation through [the blast of] a deaf mute, mentally deranged individual, or minor, or one blowing absentmindedly. Similarly, [one does not fulfill the obligation] if one's fellow [who is blowing] did not intend to fulfill the obligation on his behalf, as for him [the listener] it is not considered a sound of the *shofar* that constitutes a mitzvah...<sup>3</sup>

### 12. חזון איש | או"ח כט:ד

וכן לעניין תקיעת שופר – אינו יוצא בשמיעה אלא בקול שופר של מצווה, והלכך אינו יוצא מחרש שוטה וקטן ולא ממתעסק. וכן כשלא כיוון חברו להוציא, דלדידה לא הווי קול שופר של מצווה...

The **Shulchan Aruch** rules in accordance with the Rambam that the formulation of the *beracha* is in fact “to hear the sound of the *shofar*.”

### ס Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim 585:2

Before one blows, one should recite the *beracha* of “to hear the sound of the *shofar*” and recite the *beracha* of *shehechyanu*.<sup>4</sup>

### 13. שולחן ערוך | או"ח תקפה:ב

קודם שיתקע יברך לשמע קול שופר ויברך שהחינו.

3. Rav Soloveitchik (Rosh Hashana Machzor, p. 448) offers a very similar explanation that listening alone is insufficient to fulfill the mitzvah. Rather, the one who blows must also have the express intent to fulfill the obligation on the part of the listeners. [Addition of the English editors]

4. It should be noted that the Rema adds here that the same *berachot* are recited even when the *tokea* (blower) has already fulfilled his obligation previously. However, some *Acharonim* hold that in that case, it is preferable for those listening to recite the *beracha* themselves. See *Mishna Berura* 585:5 and *Piskei Teshuvot* there. In addition, it should be noted that there is a dispute whether *shehechyanu* is recited on the second day of Rosh Hashana. According to the *Shulchan Aruch* (600:3), it is not recited, while according to the Rema, it is recited. [Addition of the English editors]

## THE AMOUNT OF BLASTS

Another important issue to analyze concerning the blowing of the *shofar* is how many *shofar* blasts one must hear in order to fulfill the mitzvah, and what type of sound they must be. The **Gemara** in **Rosh Hashana** addresses this issue after first deriving that we indeed use a *shofar* to fulfill the mitzvah of blowing on Rosh Hashana from the halacha of blowing the *shofar* during the *Yovel* (Jubilee) year. Following that, it derives that each series of *tekiot* (*shofar* blasts) consists of a longer blast, known as a *tekia*, followed by a series of shorter blasts, known as *terua*, followed by another *tekia*.

### ח Masechet Rosh Hashana 33b

**The Sages taught** in a *baraita*: **From where** is it derived **that** the soundings of Rosh Hashana must be performed **with a shofar**? **The verse states:** “**Then you shall make proclamation with the blast of the shofar** on the tenth day of the seventh month....” (*Vayikra* 25:9). From this **I have derived only** with regard to Yom Kippur **of the Jubilee Year**. **From where** do I derive that the soundings of **Rosh Hashana** must also be with a *shofar*? **The verse states:** “**Of the seventh month.**” **Since** there is **no** need for **the verse to state:** “**Of the seventh month,**” as it already states: “On the Day of Atonement,” **what** is the meaning when **the verse states:** “**Of the seventh month**”? This comes to teach **that all** the obligatory soundings of the seventh month **must be similar to one another.**

**And from where** is it derived **that** the *terua* sound is **preceded by a straight blast**, i.e., a *tekia*? **The verse states:** “**Then you shall make proclamation with the blast of the shofar [shofar terua]**” (*Vayikra* 25:9). **And from where** is it derived **that** the *terua* sound is **followed by a straight blast**? **The same verse states** again: “**You shall make proclamation with the shofar.**”

The ***Shulchan Aruch*** rules in accordance with this principle, but also adds (based on another passage found in the Mishna) that one must blow the series of *tekia-terua-tekia* three times, for a total of nine blasts.

### 14. מסכת ראש השנה לג:

תנו רבנן: מניין שבשופר? תלמוד לומר: “והעברת שופר תרועה” (ויקרא כה, ט). אין לי אלא ביובל, בראש השנה מניין? תלמוד לומר “בחדש השביעי”, שאין תלמוד לומר “בחדש השביעי” (פירוש: שאין לי שום צורך במילים “ביום השביעי”, שהרי נאמר אחר כך “ביום הכיפורים”), ומה תלמוד לומר “בחדש השביעי”? שיהיו כל תרועות של חודש שביעי זה כזה.

ומניין שפשוטה (פירוש: תקיעה) לפנייה? תלמוד לומר: “והעברת שופר תרועה.” ומנין שפשוטה לאחריה? תלמוד לומר: “תעבירו שופר.”

## Ⓝ Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim 590:1

How many blasts does one have to hear on Rosh Hashana? Nine, as it says “*terua*” regarding the Jubilee year and Rosh Hashana three times. Each *terua* has a straight blast [*tekia*] preceding it and a straight blast [*tekia*] after it. And there is a tradition that all the blasts of the seventh month are the same, both those of Rosh Hashana and those of Yom Kippur during the Jubilee year. Each one has nine blasts: *Tekia-terua-tekia; tekia-terua-tekia; tekia-terua-tekia*.

## 15. שולחן ערוך | או"ח תקצ"א:

כמה תקיעות חייב אדם לשמוע בראש השנה? תשע, לפי שנאמר: “תרועה” ביובל ובראש השנה שלוש פעמים, וכל תרועה – פשוטה לפנייה ופשוטה לאחריה, ומפי השמועה למדו, שכל תרועות של חודש השביעי אחד הן, בין בראש השנה בין ביום הכיפורים של יובל – תשע תקיעות תוקעין בכל אחד משניהם: תר”ת, תר”ת, תר”ת.

The nature of a *tekia* is relatively straightforward: It is a longer type of sound.<sup>5</sup> But what exactly is the nature of the *terua*, the shorter blasts? The **Gemara** in **Rosh Hashana** in the section immediately preceding the previous passage presents a dispute about this issue. One opinion holds that a *terua* is three very short blasts, what we call a *terua*, which represents a short cry, while the other holds that a *terua* consists of three slightly longer blasts, what we call *shevarim*, which represents a slightly longer cry.

## Ⓝ Ibid.

The mishna states: **The length of a *terua* is equal to three whimpers.**<sup>6</sup> **But isn’t it taught** in a *baraita* that the length of a *terua* is equal to the length of three *shevarim*, i.e., broken blasts, which presumably are longer than whimpers? **Abaye said: In this matter, the *tanna'im* certainly disagree. As it is written: “It is a day of sounding [*terua*] the shofar to you” (Bamidbar 29:1), and we translate this as: It is a day of *yevava* to you. And it is written about the mother of Sisera: “Through the window she looked forth, and the mother of Sisera wailed [*vateyabev*]” (Shoftim 5:28). One Sage holds that this means moanings, broken sighs, called *shevarim*. And one Sage, the *tanna* of the Mishna, holds that it means whimpers, called *teruot*.**

## 16. שם

שיעור תרועה כשלש יבבות. והתניא: שיעור תרועה כשלשה שברים! אמר אביי: בהא ודאי פליגי, דכתיב “יום תרועה יהיה לכם” (במדבר כט, יא), ומתרגמינן: “יום יבבא יהא לכוון”. וכתוב באימיה דסיסרא: “בְּעַד הַחֹלֹן נִשְׁקָפָה וַתֵּיבֵב אִם סִיקְרָא” (שופטים ה, כח). מר סבר: גנוחי גנח (רש”י: כאדם הגונח מליבו, כדרך החולים שמאריכין בגניחותיהן), ומר סבר: ילולי יליל.

The **Gemara** in **Rosh Hashana** also records an enactment of Rabbi Abbahu that one should blow a *shevarim* together with a *terua* since he was uncertain as to which was the correct form of the *terua* according to the Torah.

- The question of the actual minimum length of a *tekia* is a bit complex and depends on the length of the *terua*, which itself varies for each set (depending on whether a *shevarim*, *terua*, or *shevarim-terua* is blown). The details of this subject are beyond the purview of this *shiur* but are dealt with at length in the *Shulchan Aruch* (*siman* 590) and commentaries there as well as by Rav Moshe Harari, *Mikra’ei Kodesh, Hilchot Rosh Hashana*. [Addition of the English editors]
- It should be noted that although the simple meaning of this line is that one must blow three short sounds for each *terua* blast (which is the interpretation of Rashi), other *Rishonim* understand each of these short sounds of the *terua* to equal three even shorter sounds, for a total of nine. The *poskim* dispute which approach is accepted as the halacha, but the accepted custom is to blow nine very short sounds for each *terua*, as is well-known. [Addition of the English editors]

### Ⓝ Masechet Rosh Hashana 34a

**Rabbi Abbahu instituted in Caesarea:** First a *tekia*; next three *shevarim*, broken sounds; followed by a *terua*, a series of short blasts; and, finally, another *tekia*. The Gemara asks: **Whichever way you look at it**, this is difficult. **If**, the sound the Torah calls a *terua* is a **whimpering**, i.e., short, consecutive sounds, **one** should perform a *tekia-terua-tekia* set. **And if** he holds that a *terua* is **moaning**, i.e., longer, broken sounds, **he** should sound: *Tekia*, three *shevarim*, and then another *tekia*. Why include both a *terua* and a *shevarim*? The Gemara answers: Rabbi Abbahu **was uncertain whether** a *terua* means **moaning or whimpering**.

### 17. מסכת ראש השנה לד.

אתקין רבי אבהו בקיסרי: תקיעה, שלשה שברים, תרועה, תקיעה. מה נפשך? אי ילולי ליל – לעביד תקיעה תרועה ותקיעה, ואי גנוחי גנח – לעביד תקיעה שלשה שברים ותקיעה! מספקא ליה אי גנוחי גנח, אי ילולי ליל.

The *Shulchan Aruch* rules in accordance with Rabbi Abbahu that one should blow three series of *tekia-shevarim-terua-tekia*, but also states that as part of this expanded obligation, one should blow three series of *tekia-shevarim-tekia* and *tekia-terua-tekia* as well, as any one of these combinations may be the correct understanding of the *terua*.

### Ⓝ Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim 590:2

This *terua* mentioned in the Torah – we are in doubt if this is the whimpering known as *terua* or whether it is what we call *shevarim*, or perhaps both of them together. Therefore, in order to remove any doubt, one must blow *tashrat* (*tekia-shevarim-terua-tekia*) three times, *tashat* (*tekia-shevarim-tekia*) three times, and *tarat* (*tekia-terua-tekia*) three times.

### 18. שולחן ערוך | או"ח תקצב:

תרועה זו האמורה בתורה, נסתפק לנו אם היא היללה שאנו קורים "תרועה", או אם היא מה שאנו קורים "שברים", או אם הם שניהם יחד. לפיכך, כדי לצאת ידי ספק, צריך לתקוע תשר"ת שלוש פעמים, ותש"ת שלוש פעמים, ותר"ת שלוש פעמים.

The *Mishna Berura* elaborates on the uncertainty described in the *Shulchan Aruch* and the method of resolving it based on the sources we have seen above.

### Ⓝ Mishna Berura 590:5–6

**We are in doubt** – The fact that we translate "*terua*" as "*yevava*" shows that it is a sound that a person makes when crying and wailing. Yet we are still in doubt whether this refers to someone who moans from his heart, similar to those who are sick who make short sighs one after the other that are slightly elongated, which is called "*goneach*." This is how people start to cry, and is what we call "*shevarim*." Or perhaps this refers to one who cries and whimpers, making short sounds one after the other, which is what we call "*terua*"; or perhaps it [*terua*] is both of these sounds together.

### 19. משנה ברורה | תקצ:ה-ו

נסתפק לנו וכו' – מדמתרגמינן "תרועה" – "יבבא" אלמא, שהוא כקול שאדם משמיע כשהוא בוכה ומייליל. ועדיין אין אנו יודעין אם הוא כאדם הגונח מליבו – כדרך החולה שמשמיע קולות קצרים קול אחר קול ומאריך בהם קצת, והוא הנקרא "גונח", והוא דרך הבוכה בתחילת בכייתו, וזהו מה שאנו קורין "שברים" – או כאדם המייליל ומקונן, שמשמיע קולות קצרות תכופות זה לזה, והוא מה שאנו קורין "תרועה", או אם הוא שניהם כאחד:

**Tashat three times** – And one does not fulfill one's obligation by hearing the *tashrat* (*tekia-shevarim-terua-tekia*) combination, for perhaps the Torah intended only that the *shevarim* be blown, in which case there is a break between the *shevarim* blast and the last *tekia* blast with the *terua* [in between]. For this reason, one must also blow the *tarat* (*tekia-terua-tekia*) combination, and does not fulfill one's obligation with the *tashrat*. For perhaps the Torah's intent was for the *terua* alone, and there is a break because of the *shevarim* between the [first] *tekia* and the *terua*.

ותש"ת שלוש פעמים וכו' – ואין יוצא במה שתקע תשר"ת, דדילמא כוונת התורה על שברים לחוד, וקמפסיק בתרועה בין שברים לתקיעה אחרונה, לכך חוזר ותוקע שברים לחוד. ומחמת זה הטעם, צריך לתקוע גם כן תר"ת, ואין יוצא במה שתקע תשר"ת, דדלמא כוונת התורה על תרועה לחוד, והפסיק מתחילה בשברים בין תקיעה לתרועה:

Based on the accepted halacha as described, it seems that the basic obligation for hearing the *shofar* is to hear thirty blasts: Twelve of *tashrat* (the series of *tekia-shevarim-terua-tekia* is four blasts, three times each), nine of *tashat* (*tekia-shevarim-tekia* is three blasts, three times each), and nine of *tarat* (*tekia-terua-tekia* is three blasts, three times each).

This is in fact the amount that is usually blown for those individuals who are unable to attend the *davening* in shul or cannot remain for all of the blasts. The accepted custom, though, is to blow one hundred blasts in total during the course of the *davening*, which is divided into a few different segments. The first series of thirty *tekiot* (*shofar* blasts) is blown before *Mussaf* and this series generally fulfills the Torah obligation of the mitzvah. The second series of thirty is generally blown during the repetition of the *Mussaf Amida*,<sup>7</sup> with ten being blown after each of the additional *berachot* of *Malchuyot*, *Zichronot* and *Shofarot*.<sup>8</sup> The final forty are usually blown following the end of the repetition, toward the end of the *davening*.

The concept of blowing one hundred *tekiot* is already mentioned by the *Aruch*, cited in *Tosafot*.



### Tosafot, Rosh Hashana 33b

...The *Aruch* also explains that they would do this, (as he explains in his entry "*erev*"): Those who are stringent to blow thirty when seated and thirty silently [in the silent *Mussaf Amida*]<sup>9</sup> and thirty during the order [of the repetition of the *Amida*], this is parallel to the hundred cries of the mother of Sisera. And the other ten blasts are at the end of the *tefilla*, [as mentioned above on 30a regarding] the sound of the *shofar* of individuals who are blowing themselves, this can make it ten: *Tashrat tashat tarat*, totaling one hundred...

### 20. תוספות | ראש השנה לג:

...ובערוך נמי פירש שהיו עושין כן, שפירש בערך "ערב", דהלן דמחמרי [ועבדי] שלושים כדיתבין, ושלושים בלחש ושלושים על הסדר – כנגד מאה פעיות דפעיא אימיה דסיסרא, ואלין [עשרה] אינון כשגומרין כל התפילה קול תקיעיא דיחידאי מיתבעי למיהווי [עשרה] – תשר"ת תש"ת תר"ת, והם מאה...

7. In some communities, mainly Chassidic and Sefardic communities (or those who follow *Nusach Sefard*) the custom is to also blow thirty *tekiot* during the silent *Amida* in addition to the thirty in the repetition, in which case only ten *tekiot* are blown at the end of *davening*. This custom is already mentioned in the *Aruch* cited below. [Addition of the English editors]

8. We will discuss the nature of the first thirty blasts, known as the *tekiot d'meyushav*, and the second thirty, known as the *tekiot d'meyumad*, and the difference between them, at more length in the following section. [Addition of the English editors]

9. See footnote 3 above.

According to the *Aruch*, the significance of the one hundred *tekiot* is that it corresponds to the one hundred cries of Sisera's mother while waiting for her son, who was a prominent Philistine general, to return home during battle with Israel (which he did not, as he was killed by Yael), as described in *Sefer Shoftim* ch. 4–5. Many of the *Acharonim* mention this custom of blowing one hundred *tekiot*, including the ***Shulchan Aruch HaRav*** and the ***Aruch HaShulchan***.

### ⌘ Shulchan Aruch HaRav, Orach Chaim 596:1

...And there are other places where the custom is to blow a total of one hundred blasts, meaning that they blow [blasts] after the *tefilla* to complete one hundred blasts together with the *tekiot d'meyushav* (lit. blasts sitting down, i.e., those blown before *Mussaf*) and *me'umad* (lit. standing up, i.e., those during *Mussaf*).

### ⌘ Aruch Hashulchan, *ibid.*

Our custom is to blow [an amount of blasts] after the *tefilla* that completes a total of one hundred blasts, parallel to the hundred wails of the mother of Sisera, as the *Aruch* writes, as cited by *Tosafot* and the *Rosh*. The *Tur* writes in the name of Rav Amram [Gaon] that after the *Tefilla* we blow a *terua gedola* without a *tekia* in order to confuse the Satan, but this is not our custom.

### 21. שולחן ערוך הרב | או"ח תקצו:א

...ויש נוהגין לתקוע מאה קולות, דהיינו: שתוקעין אחר התפילה להשלים מאה קולות עם התקיעות של מיושב ושל מעומד.

### 22. ערוך השולחן | שם

אנחנו נוהגים לתקוע אחר התפילה להשלים עד מאה קולות נגד מאה פעיות דפעיא אימיה דסיסרא, כמו שכתב הערוך, והביאוהו התוספות והרא"ש בפרק ד דראש השנה. והטור כתב בשם רב עמרם, דאחר התפילה מריעין תרועה גדולה בלא תקיעה כדי לעררב השטן, ואין אנו נוהגין כן.

What exactly is the connection between Sisera's mother crying and our blowing of *shofar* on Rosh Hashana? Why would our number of *tekiot* be based on the amount of her crying? **Rav Soloveitchik** addresses this question and offers a beautiful explanation.

### ⦿ 23. Rav Soloveitchik, Rosh Hashanah Machzor pp. 650–652

In the course of her song of praise for this victory, the prophetess Deborah portrayed the mother of Sisera waiting at her window for her son's victorious return from the battle against the Israelites, just as he had indeed returned triumphant from the battlefield so many times in the past (*Shoftim* 5:28). Yet, although overtly anticipating her son's triumphant return, Sisera's mother tragically sensed that this time, he would in fact never come home again...

Why does the story of a pagan mother awaiting her barbaric son form the halachic basis for the customary number of *shofar* sounds that are blown on Rosh Hashana? Because upon hearing the piercing tones of the *shofar*, we must experience a similar emotion to that which she experienced; as we awaken from spiritual complacency, we must witness our own illusions being relentlessly shattered. The word *terua* is defined in the Gemara as *yebava*, a form of

the very same word used to depict the rhythmic sobbing of Siserā's mother, as described by Deborah in her song. (Taken from "Before Hashem," pp. 6–8, Lecture on Questions about Rosh Hashana)

**Rav Moshe Harari** (From the *Mercaz HaRav* yeshiva in Jerusalem) summarizes the customs concerning when the *tekiot* are sounded and the minor difference between Ashkenazim and Sefardim in his popular series on the Jewish holidays called *Mikra'ei Kodesh*.



### Mikraei Kodesh, Rosh Hashana

11:3

Although according to the strict halacha, it is sufficient to hear these thirty blasts on each day of Rosh Hashana; nevertheless, the custom of the Ashkenazim is to hear one hundred blasts each day. The custom of the Sefardim is to hear one hundred and one blasts. The first thirty are blown after the reading of the *Haftara* before *Mussaf*, and are called the *tekiot d'meyushav* (blasts while sitting down), since the people are permitted to sit during these blasts. The rest of the blasts are blown during *Mussaf* and are called *tekiot d'me'umad* (blasts while standing), since one is obligated to stand for them.

### 24. מקראי קודש (הרב הררי) |

ראש השנה יא:ג

אף שמעיקר הדין די לשמוע בכל יום מימי ראש השנה שלושים תקיעות אלה, מכל מקום נהגו האשכנזים לשמוע מאה תקיעות בכל יום. והספרדים נהגו לשמוע מאה ואחת תקיעות. את שלושים התקיעות הראשונות תוקעים לאחר קריאת ההפטרה ולפני תפילת מוסף, והן נקראות "תקיעות דמיושב" (כיוון שבהן הציבור רשאי לשבת), ואת שאר התקיעות תוקעים בתפילת מוסף, והן נקראות "תקיעות דמעומד".

**Rav Ben-Zion Uziel** in his *Mishpetei Uziel* also mentions the custom and emphasizes the severity with which customs such as these that have been so widely accepted are treated. He also suggests an additional significance to the number one hundred in this context.



### Responsa Mishpetei Uziel, Vol. 3

Miluim 5:5

...The custom among all the communities of Israel is to blow one hundred blasts of the *shofar* on Rosh Hashana. They based this on the verse written in the psalm recited on Rosh Hashana: "All the nations will clap hands [*kaf*]" (*Tehillim* 47:2). The numerical value [*of kaf*] is one hundred, and they blow a *tekia gedola* after that. And heaven forbid that one change the custom of the Jewish people, which was instituted and accepted by our Sages, may their memory be blessed. Anyone who alters [the custom], the Sages are not pleased with him.

### 25. שו"ת משפטי עוזיאל |

כרך ג, מילואים ה:ה

...כבר נהגו בכל תפוצות ישראל לתקוע מאה תקיעות שופר בימי ראש השנה. ואסמכוהו אקרא, דכתיב במזמור של יום ראש השנה: "כָּל הָעַמִּים תִּקְעוּ כָף" (תהלים מז, ב) – בגימטריא מאה, ותקיעה גדולה אחריהם. וחלילה לשנות מנהגם של ישראל, שהוא מתוקן ומקובל מרבתינו ז"ל. וכל המושג – אין רוח חכמים נוחה הימנו.

### RABBI BEN-ZION UZIEL – THE MISHPETEI UZIEL (1880–1953)

Rav Ben-Zion Meir Chai Uziel was the Sefardic Chief Rabbi of Mandatory Palestine from 1939 to 1948, and of the State of Israel from 1948 until his death in 1953.

His father, Rav Joseph Raphael (*Av Bet Din* of the Sefardic community of Jerusalem & president of the community council), passed away when Ben-Zion was fourteen years old, and Ben-Zion began delivering Torah *shiurim* for pay until one of his relatives was able to support him. Rav Uziel began teaching at Yeshivat Tiferet Yerushalayim at the age of twenty, and became Rosh Yeshiva there four years later. He later founded Yeshivat Machazikei Torah for Sefardic young men.

In 1911, Rav Uziel was appointed *Hacham Bashi* (Turkish term for Sefardic Chief Rabbi) of Jaffa and surrounding areas, where he worked closely with Rav Avraham Yitzchak HaKohen Kook, who was the spiritual leader of the Ashkenazi community. Immediately upon his arrival in Jaffa, he began to work vigorously to raise the status of the Sefardic congregations there. Being ideologically similar to Rav Kook, their affinity helped in establishing a harmonious relationship between the two communities.

During World War I, Rav Uziel was active as a leader and communal worker. His intercession with the Ottoman government on behalf of persecuted Jews and of Jewish soldiers of the Ottoman army eventually led to his being exiled to Damascus. Although he was permitted to return to Palestine following World War One, he was appointed Chief Rabbi of Salonika two years later, a position he accepted for three years. When he returned, he was accompanied by many Jews from Salonika who were motivated by him to make *aliya*. He became Chief Rabbi of Tel Aviv in 1923, and in 1939 was appointed Chief Rabbi of Palestine.

Rav Uziel was an advocate for strong relationships between the indigenous Arab population of the new State of Israel and Jews. He spoke fluent Arabic and believed in peace and harmony between the two parties. He was strongly against the isolationist outlook of segments of the chareidi community, and was also opposed to religious coercion. He held a global worldview, and saw the Jewish religion as having a message for the whole world. To that end, he was an advocate for secular and especially scientific knowledge, and strived to understand the latest scientific discoveries. He preached for working for a living and felt strongly that yeshiva students should not live on handouts. In addition he was also against the concept of army deferments for yeshiva students.

Rav Uziel authored a number of halachic works, including the Responsa *Mishpetei Uziel*, *Hegyonei Uziel*, and *Piskei Uziel*, many of which addressed modern halachic issues with an appreciation for the modern reality, including conversion, autopsy, and women voting (an issue concerning which he was one of the first rabbis to publicly support).

### FURTHER IYUN

For a discussion about why there is no problem of *bal tosif* (adding to the mitzvot) when adding additional *tekiot* to those required, see page 340.

## TEKIOT D'MEYUSHAV AND TEKIOT D'ME'UMAD

We mentioned in the previous section that the first sixty *shofar* blasts are divided up into two sections, those before *Mussaf*, known as the *tekiot d'meyushav*, and those recited during the repetition of the *Amida*, known as the *tekiot d'me'umad*. As noted briefly by Rav Harari above, the *tekiot d'meyushav*, the blasts of sitting, are called such since one is halachically allowed to sit when hearing them, while the *tekiot d'me'umad* are referred to by this term since one is obligated to hear them while standing. In addition to their significance in helping to reach a total of one hundred *tekiot*, these two sections are significant for a reason already discussed by the **Gemara** in **Rosh Hashana**.

### נ Masechet Rosh Hashana 16a

**Rabbi Yitzchak says: Why does one sound a shofar blast on Rosh Hashana? Why do we sound a blast? The Merciful One states "Sound a shofar"! Rather, why does one sound a staccato series of shofar blasts [terua] in addition to a long continuous shofar blast [tekia]? Sound a terua? The Merciful One states: "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall be a solemn rest unto you, a memorial proclaimed with a blast [terua]". Rather, why does one sound a tekia and then terua while the congregation is still sitting, and then sound again a tekia and a terua while they are standing? In order to confuse the Satan.**

### 26. מסכת ראש השנה טז:

אמר רבי יצחק: למה תוקעין בראש השנה? – למה תוקעין? רחמנא אמר תקעו! אלא: למה מריעין? – מריעין? רחמנא אמר "זכרון תרועה!" אלא: למה תוקעין ומריעין כשהן יושבין, ותוקעין ומריעין כשהן עומדין? כדי לערבב השטן.

The Gemara does not explain though what the notion of "confusing the Satan" actually means. The **Tur** explains the following:

### ט Tur, Orach Chaim, Siman 585

Rav Yitzchak says... in order to confuse the Satan. The explanation [of this passage is] why do we blow while seated before *Mussaf*, and then blow again? [For since the main institution was to blow] parallel to the order of the *berachot* [of the *Mussaf Amida*], why we do we precede this with the seated blasts? It is in order to confuse the Satan. The explanation is: In order that he will be confused with the first blast before the *tefilla* and will not denounce us during the *tefilla*. And some commentaries explain that due to the first

### 27. טור | או"ח סימן תקפה

אמר רבי יצחק: למה תוקעין ומריעין כשהן יושבין, וחוזרין ותוקעין ומריעין כשהן עומדין? כדי לערבב השטן. פירוש: למה תוקעין מיושב קודם מוסף, וחוזרין ותוקעין, [שכיוון שעיקרם נתקנו] על סדר ברכות (פירוש: על סדר הברכות בתפילת העמידה), למה מקדימין לתקוע מיושב? "כדי לערבב השטן", פירוש: כדי שיתערבב מיד בתקיעה ראשונה שלפני התפילה, ולא יקטרג בשעת תפילה. ויש מפרשים, שמכח תקיעה ראשונה

*tekia*, the [Satan] gets confused by the second, and this is mentioned in the *Yerushalmi*: "...when he hears the first blast he becomes somewhat confused, and says, "perhaps this is the day of the great *shofar* [i.e., the redemption]?" When he hears the second blast, he thinks that this is certainly the time and becomes frightened and confused, and doesn't have time to denounce us."

מתערבב בשנייה. והכי איתא בירושלמי: "בְּלֶע הַמְּוֹת לְנֶחֱח' (ישעיה כה, ח), וכתוב 'וְהָיָה בַיּוֹם הַהוּא יִתְקַע בְּשׁוֹפָר גָּדוֹל' (שם כז, ג): כד שמע קול שופר חדא זימנא – בהיל ולא בהיל, אומר: "שמא ההיא זימנא דשופר גדול". כד שמע תניינא, אומר: "ודאי מטא זמניה", ומירתת ומתערבב, ולית ליה פנאי למיעבד קטיגוריא.

According to the *Tur*, there are two possible ways that the first set of *tekiot* would confuse the Satan: Either the blasts themselves would prevent him from effectively denouncing us during the ensuing *tefilla*, or they would cause the Satan to think that perhaps the final redemption has arrived, and upon hearing the second set, he would be convinced that it indeed has arrived, and this concern would prevent him from preparing his case against the Jewish people.

These approaches still do not explain why the custom was to sit for the first set of *tekiot*. **Rav David ben Zimra**, commonly known as the **Radbaz**, provides an answer as to why this was the case.



### Responsa of the Radbaz, 4:25

...Furthermore let our master teach us why the community does not stand during the blasts...

**Answer:** I have already written to you that the main blasts are those that are parallel to the *berachot* [of *Tefillat Mussaf*]... but the seated blasts are only to confuse the Satan before the *tekiot deme'umad*. Due to the dignity of the community [*kavod hatzibur*], they did not see fit to trouble them to stand, since they would later hear the *tekiot d'me'umad*. But they obligated the blower to stand like the rule of the actual *mitzvah*, which is performed standing, or due to the dignity of the community. Therefore, one who did not hear the blasts during the order of the *berachot* [of the *Mussaf Amida*] and comes to hear them now has to stand...

### 28. שו"ת רדב"ז | ד:כה

...עוד ילמדנו רבינו, למה אין עומדין הקהל בשעת התקיעות...

**תשובה:** כבר כתבתי לכם, שעיקר התקיעות הם אותם שעל סדר הברכות (של תפילת מוסף)... אבל תקיעות דמיושב – אינם אלא כדי שיהיה השטן מעורבב בתקיעות דמעומד, ומשום כבוד הציבור לא ראו להטריח עליהם לעמוד, כיוון שעתידים לשמוע תקיעות דמעומד. והצריכו לתוקע שיעמוד כדין המצווה, שהיא מעומד. אי נמי, משום כבוד ציבור. ומעתה, מי שלא שמע התקיעות על סדר הברכות, ועתה בא לשמוע אותם – צריך לעמוד.

According to the Radbaz, one need not stand for the *tekiot d'meyushav* since the *tekiot* blown during the *Amida* together with the *berachot* of *Malchuyot*, *Zichronot*, and *Shofarot* are considered the primary *tekiot*.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, the Sages did not trouble the people to stand for the *tekiot d'meyushav* that come before.

However, the Radbaz notes that the *tokea* (*shofar*-blower) is required to stand while blowing. The **Tur** clarifies that this halacha is derived from the halacha of *sefirat ha'omer*.



### Tur, Orach Chaim Siman 585

The blower stands in preparation for blowing, as he must blow while standing, as the verse says, "It shall be a day of a blast for you [*lachem*]," and we derive this [standing] from the word "*lachem*" written regarding *sefirat ha'omer*. And *sefirat ha'omer* itself is while standing, as it is written, "*mehachel chermesh bakama*," "from [the time] the sickle is first put to the standing crop" (*Devarim* 16:9); do not read it *bakama* [standing grain], rather *bakoma* [while standing up]... but the primary blasts are really the *me'umad* ones, which are parallel to the *berachot* [of *Mussaf*].

### 29. טור | או"ח סימן תקפה

ועומד התוקע לתקוע, שצריך שיתקע מעומד, דכתיב "יום תרועה יהיה לכם", וילפינן מ"לכם" דכתיב גבי עומר. וספירת העומר מעומד, דכתיב "מִהַחֵל חֶרְמֶשׁ בְּקֶמֶה" (דברים טז, ט) – אל תקרי "בְּקֶמֶה" אלא "בְּקוֹמָה"... אבל לעולם עיקר תקיעה היא מעומד, שהיא על סדר ברכות.

Although as we have seen the congregation need not stand for the *tekiot d'meyushav*, the **Mishna Berura** notes that the custom today is that everyone stands for all of the *tekiot*.



### Mishna Berura 585:2

...The Sages did not trouble the public to stand when hearing the blasts due to the honor of the community... But nowadays the custom is to stand even during the blasts that are blown before *Mussaf*; nevertheless they are still called the "*tekiot d'meyushav*" since one is permitted to sit. If an individual hears these blasts with intention to fulfill his obligation, and will not hear the blasts corresponding to the *berachot* [of the *Amida*], he ideally must stand [even] according to the strict halacha.

### 30. משנה ברורה | תקפה:ב

...והצבור השומעים התקיעות לא הטריחום לעמוד משום כבוד צבור... ועכשיו נהגו הצבור לעמוד כולם גם בשעת התקיעות שתוקעין קודם מוסף, ואף על פי כן נקראין "תקיעות דמיושב" מאחר שרשות לישוב בהם. ואם יחיד שומע תקיעות לצאת בהם ואינו עתיד לשמוע על סדר הברכות צריך מדינה לעמוד לכתחלה.

10. It should be noted that this issue is somewhat complex, and *Rishonim* discuss at length which of these two sets of *tekiot* is considered the primary one. See, e.g., *Ba'al HaMa'or* and *Milchamot* (*Rosh Hashana* 10b–11a in the pages of the Rif), as well as the *Rosh Hashana Machzor* of Rav Soloveitchik, p. 446. Rav Soloveitchik also explains (Introduction, p. xxii) that if we adopt the approach that the *tekiot d'me'umad* are the primary ones (whereby we require the *shofar* be blown together with the *berachot* of *Mussaf*), it highlights the relationship between the *shofar* and *tefilla*, possibly indicating that the experience of blowing the *shofar* should parallel and mirror that of praying to Hashem. See also p. 614, where Rav Soloveitchik expands on the symbolism of the *shofar* as a nonverbal prayer demonstrating our emotion in a manner that is sometimes difficult to do verbally. [Addition of the English editors]

## INTERRUPTIONS DURING TEKIAT SHOFAR

We have seen so far that the *tekiot d'meyushav* and *tekiot d'me'umad* are considered two distinct series of *tekiot* that have somewhat different functions and halachot. Nevertheless, many *Rishonim*, including the **Rambam**, maintain that since all of the *tekiot* are designed to fulfill the mitzvah of *shofar* on Rosh Hashana in its maximal form, one must not interrupt between them.



### Rambam, Hilchot Shofar 3:11

The one that blows when they [the people] are seated [is the same one that] blows parallel to the *berachot* when they stand. And one may not talk between the seated blasts [*tekiot d'meyushav*] and the standing blasts [*tekiot d'me'umad*]...

### 31. רמב"ם | ה' שופר ג'יא

זה שתוקע כשהן יושבין – הוא שתוקע על סדר הברכות כשהן עומדים. ואינו מדבר בין תקיעות שמיושב לתקיעות שמעומד...

The **Hagahot Maimoniot** cites **Rabbeinu Simcha** who goes a step further with regard to interruptions and conversation during the *tekiot d'meyushav* themselves. He argues (according to the interpretation of the *Hagahot Maimoniot*) that since one is still in the midst of fulfilling the Torah mitzvah of *shofar*, one would have to repeat the *beracha* again if one interrupts, regardless of whether one is blowing the *shofar* or listening to another blow it.



### Hagahot Maimoniot, ibid. #9

...Rabbeinu Simcha writes, "if the blower spoke between the *beracha* and the set, [or in the middle] before he completes the end of the set, he must repeat the *beracha*, similar to one who speaks between the donning of the *tefillin* [*shel rosh* and *shel yad*]." Now perhaps his intention is [he must recite the *beracha* if it is] before the completion of the set of seated blasts, for after that he has fulfilled all the doubts [and cannot recite the *beracha*]. Rabbeinu Simcha also writes that "just as the blower must not talk during this time, so too the listeners must not speak, since the blower is their emissary and he fulfills their obligation, and an emissary is like the person himself, and it is as if the listener himself is blowing."

### 32. הגהות מיימוניות | שם אות ט

...ורבינו שמחה כתב: "אם סח התוקע בין הברכה ובין הסדר, עד שמסיים כל הסדר – חוזר ומברך כמו סח בין תפילה לתפילה". ושמא רצונו לומר עד שמסיים סדרים שמיושב, שאז יצא מידי כל הספקות. עוד כתב רבינו שמחה, שכשם שאין לתוקע להסיח בינתיים – כך אין לשומעין להסיח, הואיל והתוקע הוא שלוחן ומוציאן, ושלוחו של אדם כמותו, וכאילו השומע עצמו תוקע. עד כאן:

The **Shulchan Aruch** and **Rema** rule in accordance with the Rambam that it is forbidden to speak about anything other than the blasts or the *tefilla* between the *tekiot d'meyushav* and *tekiot d'me'umad*. However, if one did, the Rema rules that one need not repeat the *beracha*.

### ⌘ Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim 592:3

Neither the blower nor the community should speak between the seated blasts and the standing blasts.

**Rema:** But [interruptions] regarding issues related to the blasts or the *tefilla* are not considered interruptions. However, [even] if he spoke about unrelated matters, he need not repeat the *beracha*. And it is obvious that one may not speak between the *beracha* and the blasts unless it relates to the blasts.

### 33. שולחן ערוך | או"ח תקצב:ג

לא ישיח לא התקוע ולא הציבור בין תקיעות שמיושב לתקיעת שמעומד.

**הגה:** מיהו בעניין התקיעות והתפילות אין הפסק. ואם דברים בטלים סח – אין צריך לחזור ולברך. ואין צריך לומר שלא ישיחו בין ברכה לתקיעות, אם לא בעניין התקיעות.

The **Mishna Berura** elaborates on the reason for the Rema's ruling that one need not repeat the *beracha* if one spoke during the *tekiot deme'umad*.

### ⌘ Mishna Berura 592:13

**He need not repeat the *beracha*** – This is not comparable to one who spoke between putting on the *tefillin* [*shel rosh* and *tefillin shel yad*]. For there they are two separate mitzvot, whereas here [all the blasts] are one mitzvah. Therefore, even if one spoke about unrelated matters during the seated blasts, one need not repeat the *beracha*, similar to one who spoke after eating some [of the bread] after reciting [the *beracha* of] *hamotzi*, where one doesn't need to repeat the *beracha* since it is all part of one meal. Nevertheless, the *Acharonim* advocate that if one spoke between the *shevarim* and *terua* in the set of *tashrat*, even regarding matters related to the blasts, although he need not repeat the *beracha*, he has not fulfilled his obligation and must repeat the blasts of that set.

### 34. משנה ברורה | תקצב:ג

אין צריך לחזור ולברך – ולא דמי לסח בין תפילין לתפילין. דהתם שתי מצוות הן, מה שאינו כן הכא, דכולה חדא מצווה היא. ועל כן אפילו שח דברים בטלים בין תקיעות דמיושב עצמן – אינו צריך לחזור ולברך [מידי דהווי מי שמדבר אחר שטעם מעט מברכת "המוציא", דאינו צריך לחזור ולברך, דכולה חדא סעודה היא]. ומכל מקום מצדדים האחרונים, דמי ששח בתשר"ת בין שברים לתרועה – אף מענייני התקיעה – אף שאין צריך לחזור ולברך, מכל מקום לא יצא, וצריך לחזור ולתקוע אותו סדר.

According to the *Mishna Berura*, the Rema holds that speaking during the *tekiot* (even during the *tekiot d'me'umad*) is different than speaking in between the *tefillin*, which are considered two different mitzvot. Based on this understanding, it is clear that the Rema does not rule in accordance with Rabbeinu Simcha, who did require reciting a new *beracha* if one spoke in between the *tekiot d'meyushav*.

What is the halacha if one needs to use the facilities in between the beginning of the *tekiot* and their conclusion? May one recite the *beracha* of *asher yatzar* recited upon exiting the bathroom? The **Piskei Teshuvot** addresses this issue and states that most *poskim* do permit one to recite the *beracha*.



### Piskei Teshuvot, Orach Chaim 592, #4

And concerning reciting the *beracha* of *asher yatzar* before the conclusion of the *tekiot d'me'umad*... practically the other *poskim*<sup>11</sup> permit reciting *asher yatzar*, since this halacha of not speaking until after the *tekiot d'me'umad* is not mentioned in the Gemara, and its source is in the Rif, Rambam, and Rosh; therefore, its halacha is similar to an interruption between *Baruch She'amar* and *Yishtabach* [i.e., *Pesukei D'zimra*] where the *Mishna Berura* (55:8) states that it is permitted to recite *asher yatzar*, and certainly during the *tefillot* of Rosh Hashana, which is long...

### 35. פסקי תשובות, או"ח תקצב, ס"ק ד

ובענין לברך ברכת אשר יצר טרם גמר תקיעות דמעומד... למעשה הסכימו שאר הפוסקים להתיר לברך ברכת אשר יצר כיון שדין זה דאיסור שיחה עד אחרי תקיעות דמעומד לא מוזכר בגמ', ומקורו בדברי הרי"ף הרמב"ם והרא"ש, לכן דינו כדין הפסקה בין ברוך שאמר לישתבח המבואר במ"ב (נה:ח) שמותר לברך ברכת אשר יצר, וכל שכן בתפילת ראש השנה שארוכה היא...

## Reciting Vidui or the Yehi Ratzon Prayer Between the Tekiot

Now that we have a general understanding of the issue of interruptions during *tekiat shofar*, we can address a specific question of whether it is permitted even *lechatchila* (*ab initio*) to recite the special prayer printed in many *machzorim* in between the sets of the *shofar* blasts. In the Sefardic *machzorim*, it is referred to as "*vidui*," while in the Ashkenazic *machzorim* it is one referred to as the "*yehi ratzon*." Is one permitted to say these prayers during the *tekiot d'meyushav* in between the *tashrat* and *tashat* or the *tashat* and *tarat*?

In order to understand the dispute among the *Acharonim* about this point, we need to better understand the nature of the enactment of Rabbi Abbahu that was mentioned in the previous section. As mentioned there, the Gemara explains that Rabbi Abbahu instituted the practice of blowing *shevarim-terua* as the *terua* (placed in between the *tekia* blown before and after). This was due to the question of whether the word *terua* mentioned in the Torah refers to an extended moan or short whimpers. At first glance, this would seem to be based on uncertainty as to exactly how to blow the correct *terua*, and that is how the *Shulchan Aruch* understood it (above, source 18).<sup>12</sup> The *Shulchan Aruch*, in turn, based his opinion on the **Rambam**, who says explicitly that uncertainty existed as to how to blow the *terua*.

11. The *Piskei Teshuvot* also made reference to a minority opinion of the *Pnei Yehoshua* that one may not recite *asher yatzar*, but says here that most authorities disagree. [Additions of the English editors]
12. This would also seem to be the understanding of Rabbeinu Tam quoted in Tosafot (*Rosh Hashana* 33b). Tosafot there note that the custom in France and Germany concerning the *tekiot* blown during the *chazarat hashatz* (repetition of the *Amida* in *Mussaf*), which were blown after each of the three additional *berachot*, was to blow *tashrat* three times after the *beracha* of *Malchuyot*, *tashat* three times after *Zichronot*, and *tarat* three times following *Shofarot* (for a total of thirty). But Rabbeinu Tam questioned why they did not rather blow a set of *tashrat*, *tashat* and *tarat* for each *beracha* because of the uncertainty of Rabbi Abbahu, to ensure that each series of *tekiot* after each *beracha* is blown correctly. Rabbeinu Tam did indeed rule that *tashrat* should be blown after each *beracha* due to the uncertainty (though he refrained from changing the custom excessively and did not institute *tashrat*, *tashat*, and *tarat* after each).

**Rambam, Hilchot Shofar 3:2**

With regard to the *terua* mentioned in the Torah, we are uncertain about it due to the many years and length of the exile, and we don't know what the nature of it is... therefore we do them all.

**36. רמב"ם | ה' שופר ג:ב**

תרועה זו האמורה בתורה, נסתפק לנו בה ספק לפי אורך השנים ורוב הגליות, ואין אנו יודעין היאך היא... לפיכך אנו עושין הכל.

However, the **Rosh** cites the opinion of **Rav Hai Gaon** (also cited in the Ran, *Rosh HaShana* 10a in the pages of the Rif) that all of the variations for the definition of a *terua* (i.e., *shevarim*, *terua*, and *shevarim-terua*) are considered valid *terua* sounds, and one fulfills his obligation with any of them. According to Rav Hai, the purpose of Rabbi Abbahu's enactment was so that everyone would follow the same practice.

**Rosh, Rosh Hashana 4:10**

Rav Hai Gaon wrote in a responsum: "Do not think that a doubt arose during the times of Rabbi Abbahu... This was the case from time immemorial that there were different customs among Israel: Some communities sounded the *terua* as "*yevavot kalot*" [what we call *teruot*]. Other communities sounded heavier moans, which are known as *shevarim*. But both these and those [communities] fulfill their obligation, as the heavier *shevarim* are considered *terua*, and the *yevavot kalot* are considered *terua*. This seemed like a dispute, even though it was not a dispute... but the Sages of this locale agree that *shevarim* are considered *terua*, and the Sages of that locale agree that *yevavot* are considered *terua*. When Rabbi Abbahu came, he saw fit to institute that all of *Am Yisrael* would follow one practice, and not have [differences] between them that would appear to the unlearned people as a dispute.

**37. רא"ש | ראש השנה ד:י**

כתב רב האי בתשובה: אל תחשבו, כי נפלה בימי ר' אבהו ספק בדבר זה... וכך היה הדבר מימים קדמונים מנהג לכל ישראל: מהם עושים "תרועה" יבבות קלות. ומהם עושים יבבות כבדים, שהן "שברים". אלו ואלו יוצאין ידי חובתן, כי שברים כבדים "תרועה" הן, ויבבות קלות "תרועה" הן. והיה הדבר נראה כחלוקה, אף על פי שאינה חלוקה... וחכמים של הללו מודים כי "שברים" תרועה הם, וחכמים של הללו מודים כי "יבבות" תרועה הן. וכשבא ר' אבהו ראה לתקן תקנה, שיהו כל ישראל עושין מעשה אחד, ולא יהא ביניהם דבר שלהדיוטות נראה כחלוקה.

The question of whether one can recite *vidui/yehi ratzon* in between the sets may hinge upon this dispute between the *Rishonim*: If only one set is actually correct (e.g., *tarat, tarat, tarat*), but we are in doubt which set it is (the opinion of most *Rishonim*), then it would be prohibited to interrupt between the *beracha* and the performance of the mitzvah. However, if one accepts the approach of Rav Hai Gaon that all of them fulfill the requirements of a *terua*, then one has already fulfilled one's obligation with the first set, (*tashrat, tashrat, tashrat*), and it would be permitted to recite the additional prayers in between the sets.

The **Mishna Berura** appears to take the first approach. He rules that although it is permitted to interrupt between the *tekiot d'meyushav* and the *tekiot d'me'umad* about matters related to the *tekiot* or with the *tefilla* itself, nevertheless one may not interrupt during the *tekiot d'meyushav* themselves. Therefore, he rules that one should not recite the *vidui/yehi ratzon* – rather, one should contemplate the words should one wish without verbalizing it.

### ⌘ Mishna Berura 592:12

**But the tefillot are not considered an interruption** – In other words, it is permitted to speak between the *tekiot d'meyushav* and the *tekiot d'me'umad* about those matters. See *Derech Chaim* who holds that from the time of the *beracha* until the end of the *tekiot d'meyushav* it is prohibited to interrupt even with *tefillot*. Therefore, one should not recite the *yehi ratzon* that is printed in the *machzorim* interspersed in the *tekiot d'meyushav*. Rather, one should contemplate it in one's heart and not verbalize it. Alternately, one may say the *yehi ratzon* at the conclusion of the *tekiot d'meyushav*.

### 38. משנה ברורה | תקצב:יב

והתפילות אין הפסק – רצונו לומר, דבין תקיעות דמיושב למעומד שרי לכתחילה להשיח מעניינם. ועיין ב"דרך החיים", שדעתו דבין הברכה עד סוף תקיעות דמיושב אסור להפסיק אפילו בתפילות, לכן לא יאמר ה"ייהי רצון" הנדפס במחזורים בין התקיעות דמיושב, רק יהרהר בליבו ואל יוציא בפיו, או שיאמר ה"ייהי רצון" אחר גמר התקיעות דמיושב.

However in the **Sha'ar HaTziun**, the **Chafetz Chaim** cites the opinion of **Rav Yaakov Emden** who is lenient. The *Chafetz Chaim* consequently concludes that one should not rebuke those who are lenient.

### ⌘ Sha'ar HaTziun, 592:15

But the opinion of the Gaon, our master Rav Yaakov Emden, in his siddur is to be lenient. In his opinion, the intention of the *Magen Avraham* [the original source of the ruling] was only to be stringent between the *beracha* and the [first] blast. Therefore, where the custom is to be lenient, one should not rebuke them.

### 39. שער הציון | תקצב:טו

ודעת הגאון מורנו הרב רבי יעקב עמדין בסידורו להקל בזה. ולדעתו, כוונת ה"מגן אברהם" הוא להחמיר רק בין ברכה לתקיעה. ועל כן במקום שנוהגין כן – אין למחות בידם.

**Rav Ovadia Yosef** cites the **Arizal**, who was also lenient on this issue. According to the *Arizal* (and the other *poskim* that follow him),<sup>13</sup> it is important to recite the *vidui* between the *tekiot*, and according to the **Zohar**, all of the sets are actually valid (and there is no problem of interrupting).<sup>14</sup>

13. Rav Benzion Abba Shaul (Responsa *Ohr Letzion, Orach Chaim* 1:39) Rav Mordechai Eliyahu (Responsa of the Chief Rabbinate, Vol. 1, year 5748–5749, *siman* 176), and other Sefardic *poskim* also rule this way.

14. This is the language of the *Zohar* (Vol. 3, *Parshat Pinchas*, p. 231b): Regarding this, the Babylonians (Jews) don't know the secret of the *yevava* [*shevarim*] and the *yelala* [*terua*]; and they do not know that both are needed. The *terua* is a harsh judgment, while the three *shevarim* are a softer judgment, [similar to] one who moans from his heart, which is lighter. The Babylonians did not know which one is needed and therefore did both. But we [those living in *Eretz Yisrael*] do know, and we do both [as both are needed], and everything is done according to the way of truth.



### Responsa Yechaveh Daat 1:55

...However, in the *Shaar Kavanot* (p. 90a) it states that the Arizal would recite *vidui* silently during the *tekiot d'meyushav* such that his ears couldn't hear it. He would say that the statement in the Zohar prohibiting specifying one's sins on Rosh Hashana is only when confessing them aloud. But [saying them] silently at the time of the blowing of the *shofar*, when the Satan is confused and does not pay attention to denounce us, then the words of the *vidui* join together with the sound of the *shofar*.<sup>15</sup> Similarly, the *Shelah* writes "that it is appropriate to recite the *vidui* between the sets"...

### 40. שו"ת יחוה דעת | א:נה

...אמנם בספר "שער הכוונות" (דף צ עמוד א) נאמר, שהאר"י ז"ל היה נוהג להתוודות בלחש בעת תקיעת שופר דמיושב, באופן שלא היה משמיע לאזניו. והיה אומר, כי מה שאמרו בספר הזוהר, שאסור לפרש חטאיו בראש השנה – זהו דוקא כשמתוודה בקול רם, אבל בלחש בעת תקיעת שופר – שאז מתערבב השטן, ואינו משגיח לקטרג – אז דברי הווידי עולים בהתחברות קול השופר, עד כאן. וכן כתב בספר "שני לוחות הברית", שנכון להתוודות בין סדר לסדר...

15. Rav Ovadia Yosef suggests that there should be a *safeik sefeika*, a double doubt, allowing for leniency: Perhaps the halacha follows Rav Hai Gaon that all the forms of *terua* are valid, and even if the halacha follows the Rambam and the other commentaries that only one type is actually valid, there is still a doubt that perhaps the first set (*tashrat*) is the valid one, and if one recites the *vidui* afterward, it is not an interruption, as one has already fulfilled one's obligation. Nevertheless, he ultimately rejects this logic and argues that it is all the same uncertainty, and not a double doubt. Furthermore, he writes that following the enactment of Rabbi Abbahu, even Rav Hai Gaon would agree that one must hear all the blasts and one may not interrupt in between them.

## WOMEN AND THE MITZVAH OF SHOFAR

According to the basic halacha recorded by the **Shulchan Aruch**, women are exempt from the mitzvah of *shofar*, as it is a time-bound mitzvah (*mitzvat aseh shehazman gerama*).

### Ⓝ Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim 589:3

A woman is exempt as this is a time-bound mitzvah.

### 41. שולחן ערוך | או"ח תקפט:ג

אישה פטורה, משום דהווי מצוות עשה שהזמן גרמא.

Nevertheless, women have accepted upon themselves to fulfill this mitzvah as an obligation, as mentioned by **Rabbi Akiva Eiger**. For this reason, women generally try to attend shul on Rosh Hashana.

### Ⓝ Responsa of Rabbi Akiva Eiger, Mahadura Kamma 1, Hashmatot

...And it seems that in truth they are not obligated in this mitzvah, since it is a time-bound mitzvah. Nevertheless, most of our women are stringent upon themselves, and are careful and zealous to fulfill most time-bound mitzvot, such as *shofar*, *sukka*, *lulav*, and also *kiddush* on Yom Tov, and this is considered as if they have accepted it upon themselves...

### 42. שו"ת רבי עקיבא איגר | מהדורה קמא א, השמטות

...ולזה נראה, דבאמת אינן בחיוב המצווה זו, כיוון דהווי זמן גרמא. אלא דמכל מקום רוב נשי דידן מחמירין לעצמן, וזהירות וזריזות לקיים רוב מצוות עשה שהזמן גרמן – כגון שופר, סוכה, לולב, וכן בקידוש יום טוב – והווי כקיבלו עליהו...

Although women may fulfill the mitzvah, there is a famous dispute as to whether they may recite the *beracha* upon doing so. According to the **Shulchan Aruch**, they should not recite the *beracha*, while according to the **Rema**, they should recite it.

### Ⓝ Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim 589:6

Although women are exempt from [the mitzvah of *shofar*], they may blow. And likewise, after [a man] has already fulfilled his obligation, he may blow again to allow the women to fulfill their obligation. However, they do not recite a *beracha* and no one recites a *beracha* on their behalf.

**Rema:** The custom is that women do say a *beracha* on a time-bound mitzvah; therefore here too, they should recite a *beracha* for themselves. But others who have already fulfilled

### 43. שולחן ערוך | או"ח תקפט:ו

אף על פי שנשים פטורות – יכולות לתקוע. וכן אחר שיצא כבר – יכול לתקוע להוציאן. אבל אין מברכות, ולא יברכו להן.

הגה: והמנהג, שהנשים מברכות על מצוות עשה שהזמן גרמא, על כן גם כאן תברכה לעצמן. אבל אחרים

their obligation should not recite the *beracha* for them if they are blowing just for women.<sup>16</sup> But if one blows for a man who is obligated, [another] may recite the *beracha* for him, even though he has already fulfilled his obligation...

לא יברכו להן אם כבר יצאו ואין תוקעין רק לנשים. אבל אם תוקעין לאיש המחוויב – מברכין לו, אף על פי שכבר יצאו...

As is the case for most halachic issues, Ashkenazic custom regarding this issue follows the Rema, while Sefardic custom generally follows the *Shulchan Aruch*. Nevertheless, the **Kaf HaChaim** comments on the ruling of the Rema that the custom in some areas is that even Sefardic women recite the *beracha*.

### א Kaf HaChaim 589:31

**And the custom is that women do recite a *beracha*, etc.** – This is the custom of the Ashkenazim, following the ruling of Rabbeinu Tam and those who held like him... And also with regard to Sefardim, if there are places where women have the custom of reciting the *beracha*, one should not rebuke them... And also because where there is a custom, we do not apply the principal of “*safeik brachot lehakel* [one is lenient in matters of uncertainty related to *berachot*],” as is known.

### 44. כף החיים | או"ח תקפט:לא

והמנהג שהנשים מברכות, וכו' – היינו מנהג בני אשכנז, שנוהגים כדעת רבינו תם ודעמיה, כמו שכתוב לעיל אות כג. וגם בבני ספרד: אם יש מקומות, שנוהגין הנשים לברך – אין למחות, כמו שכתוב באות הנזכרת. וגם, כי במקום מנהג לא אמרינן “ספק ברכות להקל”, כוונדע.

**Rav Ovadia Yosef** notes that a woman who has accepted upon herself to hear the *shofar* every year may not nullify the custom (or any other positive custom that she has voluntarily accepted upon herself) on a permanent basis unless she performs *hatarat nedarim* (annulment of vows).

### פ Responsa Yabia Omer, Vol. 2, Orach Chaim 30

I was asked regarding a woman who had the custom of hearing the *shofar* on Rosh Hashana and similarly fulfilling other mitzvot that are time-bound, such as sitting in the *sukka* and shaking a *lulav*. But now that she is unable due to sickness and the like... the question is whether she needs to do *hatarat nedarim* due to her previous practice, when she had not stated she was doing so *bli neder*.

...However, we can still say that in the instance of sickness and the like, in such cases women didn't accept upon themselves to perform positive time-bound mitzvot. [Rather] they performed them on the assumption that they would only fulfill them when possible, but where it isn't possible they would not need to perform *hatarat nedarim*.

### 45. שו"ת יביע אומר | חלק ב, או"ח ל

נשאלתי, באישה שנהגה כמה שנים לשמוע קול שופר בראש השנה, וכן לקיים שאר מצוות עשה שהזמן גרמא – כגון לשבת בסוכה וליטול לולב – ועתה היא אנוסה מחמת חולי וכיוצא בזה... אם צריכה התרה על מה שנהגה כן, ולא הזכירה שיהיה “בלי נדר”.

...אולם עדיין יש לומר, שבמקרה של חולי וכיוצא בזה לא קבלו הנשים עליהם לקיים מצוות עשה שהזמן גרמא, ועל דעת כן נהגו לקיימם רק היכא דאפשר, אבל היכא דלא אפשר – לא יצטרכו לעשות התרה.

16. For this reason, if there is a second *shofar* blowing following the *tefilla* for all those who missed the regular *tekiot*, the *tokea* should not recite the *beracha* himself if only women are present (if there are men, the halacha is subject to the dispute mentioned in footnote 4). Rather, each one should recite the *beracha* themselves, or alternatively, one woman may recite the *beracha* for everyone else. [Addition of the English editors]

...How much more so in our case may one be lenient without *hatara*, for there are some *Acharonim* who hold that even if they want to nullify their custom altogether, it would be permitted. Now although it is worthy to take into account the stringent opinions, nevertheless where one is unable to do so for a specific year and intends to return and perform the mitzvah in future years, there is no need for annulment, for they only accepted it on this basis [that they perform the mitzvah only when possible]. I have found that the Gaon, our master Rav Yosef Chaim Sonnenfeld, in his responsa *Salmat Chaim* (1:88) writes that in this case it isn't considered a vow, for since she is unable to blow the *shofar* for herself, she didn't accept it upon herself. But for this reason, if she wants to completely nullify her custom, she does require *hatara*...

...ומעתה כל שכן בנידון דידן, שיש להקל בלא התרה, מכיון שיש כמה אחרונים הסוברים שאפילו אם ירצו לבטל מנהגן לגמרי רשאות. ונהי שראוי לחוש לדעת המחמירים, מכל מקום כשיש אונס לשנה אחת, ודעתם לחזור למנהגם הקודם לשנים הבאות, אינן צריכות התרה, שעל דעת כן נהגו. ומצאתי להגאון מורנו רבי יוסף חיים זוננפלד בשו"ת "שלמת חיים" (א:פח) שכתב, דלא חשיב כהאי גוונא נדר, כיוון שאין בידה לתקוע בשופר – לא קבלה עליה... ומשום הכי אם רוצה לבטל מנהגה בהחלט – צריכה התרה...

Nevertheless, Rav Ovadia adds that in order to remove any doubt, it is best that her husband have her in mind when he performs *hatarat nedarim* on the eve of Rosh Hashana.



#### Ibid.

...However to cover all concerns it is best that her husband have her in mind when he performs *hatarat nedarim* that we are accustomed to doing on the eve of Rosh Hashana. For even regarding vows, a husband may become an emissary for his wife... and certainly for a custom, as many have the custom of saying: Permit for us and for our wives... and all this I say on the side of the ideal option. But the strict halacha is that no *hatara* is needed for women who have accustomed themselves to fulfill all of the time-bound positive mitzvot...

#### 46. שם

...ומיהו לרווחא דמילתא, טוב שיכוון בעלה עליה בהתרת נדרים שנוהגים לעשות בערב ראש השנה. שהרי אף בנדריים בעל נעשה שליח לאשתו, היכא דמכנפי וקיימי... וכל שכן במנהג בעלמא, וכמו שנוהגים לומר "שתתירו לנו ולנשינו"... וכל זה אני אומר על צד היותר טוב. אבל מעיקר הדין – אין צורך להתרה לנשים, שנהגו לקיים כל מצוות עשה שהזמן גרמן...

## SUMMARY OF THE LAWS OF SHOFAR

---

### *Definition of the Mitzvah*

---

1. **Rambam/Tur** – To hear the *shofar* blasts.
2. **Rabbeinu Tam/Semag** – To blow the *shofar*.
3. **Gemara Rosh Hashana** – Even the blower does not fulfill the mitzvah when hearing the echo of the *shofar* alone, which supports the Rambam.
4. **Mishna Rosh Hashana** – One must hear the *shofar* from a person who is obligated in the mitzvah, which supports Rabbeinu Tam.
5. **Chazon Ish** – Although the mitzvah is to hear the *shofar*, one must hear it from a “*kol shofar shel mitzvah*,” meaning that the blower is an intrinsic part of the process.
6. **Shulchan Aruch** – Rules that the formulation of the *beracha* is to hear the *shofar*.

---

### *The Amount of Blasts*

---

1. **Rosh Hashana 33b/Shulchan Aruch** – The Torah obligation is to hear nine blasts on Rosh Hashana.
2. **Rosh Hashana 33b** – It is uncertain whether a *terua* is a very short sound called a whimper (*terua*) or a slightly longer sound called a moan (*shevarim*).
3. **Rosh Hashana 34a** – Rabbi Abahu instituted blowing a *shevarim* and a *terua* due to the question as to what the sound *terua* actually is (*shevarim* or *terua*).
4. **Shulchan Aruch** – Everyone needs to hear a minimum of thirty blasts to remove any doubt, consisting of three series of *tashrat*, *tashat*, and *tarat* each.
5. **Aruch/Shulchan Aruch HaRav** – The accepted custom is to blow one hundred blasts, corresponding to the cries of the mother of Sisera.
6. **Aruch Hashulchan** – Ashkenazic custom is not to add a *terua gedola* at the end of the hundred blasts.
7. **Mikraei Kodesh** – Sefardic custom is to hear one hundred and one blasts, the last one being a *terua gedola*, while Ashkenazic custom today is to blow one hundred *tekiot*.

8. **Mishptei Uziel** – Suggests an allusion to the number one hundred from *Tehillim* 47 and declares that the Sages are not pleased with anyone who deviates from this custom.

---

### *Tekiot D'meyushav and Tekiot D'me'umad*

---

1. **Rosh Hashana 16a** – We blow the *tekiot* before *Mussaf* while sitting and the ones during *Mussaf* while standing in order to confuse the Satan.
2. **The Tur's Explanation of "Confusing the Satan"** – The primary blasts are during the *tefilla*. We blow beforehand either:
  - a. So that this will confuse Satan and he will not be able to denounce us before the primary blasts.
  - b. So that the Satan thinks the redemption is coming and will not bother to denounce the Jewish people.
3. **Radbaz** – we sit during the first thirty *tekiot* because these are not the main ones and the Sages didn't trouble the people to stand for them.
4. **Tur** – The main mitzvah of *shofar* blowing must be performed while standing based on a parallel to the mitzvah of *sefirat ha'omer*.
5. **Mishna Berura** – The Ashkenazi custom is to stand even for the blasts before *Mussaf*.

---

### *Interruptions During Tekiat Shofar*

---

1. **Rambam** – One should not speak between the *tekiot d'meyushav* and the *tekiot d'me'umad*.
2. **Rabbeinu Simcha** – If the blower spoke between the *beracha* and the end of the first set of blasts, he needs to repeat the *beracha*.
3. **Shulchan Aruch** – Neither the blower nor those listening to the *shofar* may speak between the *tekiot d'meyushav* and the *tekiot d'me'umad*.
4. **Rema** – If he spoke about unrelated matters, he doesn't repeat the *beracha*.
5. **Mishna Berura** – Even if one spoke within the first set of blasts, one doesn't repeat the *beracha*.
6. **Piskei Teshuvot** – One may recite *asher yatzar* in between the *tekiot* after using the facilities.

---

### *Reciting Vidui or Yehi Ratzon Between the Sets of Blasts*

---

1. **Rambam** – There is a real doubt how to fulfill one's obligation of a *terua*.
  2. **Rosh/Rav Hai Gaon** – One can fulfill one's obligation with any of the different *terua* blasts.
  3. The question of reciting the *vidui* or *yehi ratzon* may depend on this dispute:
    - a. **Rambam** – One should not recite them.
    - b. **Rav Hai Gaon** – One may recite them.
  4. **Mishna Berura** – One should not verbalize them, but contemplate them in one's mind.
  5. **Shaar HaTziun** – Since Rav Yaakov Emden was lenient to say them, one shouldn't rebuke those whose custom is to do so.
  6. **Rav Ovadia Yosef** – One should not recite the *vidui* between the blasts.
- 

### *Women and the Mitzvah of Shofar*

---

1. **Shulchan Aruch** – Women are exempt from hearing the *shofar* as it is a time-bound mitzvah.
2. **Rabbi Akiva Eiger** – Women have accepted upon themselves to hear the *shofar*.
3. May women recite a *beracha* over the *shofar* blowing if the man blowing has already fulfilled his obligation?
  - a. **Shulchan Aruch** – Women may not recite a *beracha* over the *shofar*.
  - b. **Rema** – Women may recite a *beracha* in this situation.
  - c. **Kaf HaChaim** – Even some Sefardic women recite a *beracha*, and there is no need to protest.
4. **Rav Ovadia Yosef** – If she will not hear the *shofar* for one specific year but intends to hear it in future years, she does not need to do *hatarat nedarim*, though it is best if her husband has her in mind when he performs it.

## FURTHER IYUN

### *The Proliferation of Shofar Blasts and the Prohibition of Bal Tosif*

Rav Joel Kenigsberg (Boger, the Manhigut Toranit program)

According to the Torah, only nine *kolot* (blasts) of the *shofar* are required to be sounded on the day of Rosh Hashana. However, the **Gemara in Rosh Hashana** describes how, due to uncertainty as to the precise nature of the *shofar* blasts required by the Torah, the Sages enacted blowing a minimum of thirty blasts. At a later point in history, various other *kolot* were added until our present-day custom of one hundred or 101 *tekiot* was established.

This addition of *tekiot* above and beyond those required by the Torah raises a halachic dilemma. Why do these additional blasts not contravene the prohibition of *bal tosif* – the prohibition to add on to the Torah's commands? In this essay we will explore several classical approaches of resolving this issue, which will also shed light on the nature of the *bal tosif* prohibition.

#### The Prohibition of *Bal Tosif*

Twice in *Chumash Devarim*, the Torah prohibits us from adding on to its commands. The prohibition first appears in *Parshat Va'etchanan*:

לא תספו על הדבר אשר אנכי מצוה אתכם ולא  
תגרעו ממנו לשמור את מצות ה' אלקיכם אשר  
אנכי מצוה אתכם:<sup>1</sup>



“You shall not add to the matter that I command you, and you shall not detract from it, to observe the mitzvot of Hashem your God that I command you.”

It is repeated again in *Parshat Re'eh*:

את כל הדבר אשר אנכי מצוה אתכם אתו  
תשמרו לעשות לא תסף עליו ולא תגרע ממנו:<sup>2</sup>

“Everything that I command you, you should observe it, do not add to it, and do not detract from it.”

However, this prohibition appears to contradict another explicit verse in the Torah. In *Parshat Shoftim* we are told:

על פי התורה אשר ירוף ועל המשפט אשר  
יאמרו לה תעשה לא תסור מן הדבר אשר יגידו  
לה ימין ושמאל:<sup>3</sup>

“According to the Torah that they instruct you, and for the judgment that they tell you to do, do not deviate from what they tell you right or left.”

This verse serves as the source for the authority of the *Sanhedrin* to enact new decrees and safeguards<sup>4</sup> over and above that which is explicitly written in the Torah. Yet this authority stands

1. *Devarim* 4:2

2. *Devarim* 13:1

3. *Devarim* 17:11

4. The Ramban (*Hasagot* of the Ramban to the Ramban's *Sefer Hamitzvot, shoresh* 1), though, writes that the above *pasuk* only gives the Sages the authority to interpret the *pesukim* and explain halachot for which they have an explicit tradition, but does not include their authority to enact new rabbinic decrees. However, the question of how rabbinic decrees interact with the prohibition of *bal tosif* is certainly valid according to the Ramban as well.

in direct contradiction to the aforementioned prohibition of *bal tosif*. The *Rishonim* struggle to resolve this seeming paradox. The **Rambam**, for example, writes as follows:

הואיל ויש לבית דין לגזור ולאסור דבר המותר ויעמוד איסורו לדורות וכן יש להן להתיר איסורי תורה לפי שעה מהו זה שהזהירה תורה לא תוסיף עליו ולא תגרע ממנו, שלא להוסיף על דברי תורה ולא לגרוע מהן ולקבוע הדבר לעולם בדבר שהוא מן התורה בין בתורה שבכתב בין בתורה שבעל פה, כיצד הרי כתוב בתורה לא תבשל גדי בחלב אמו מפי השמועה למדו שזה הכתוב אסר לבשל ולאכול בשר בחלב, בין בשר בהמה בין בשר חיה אבל בשר העוף מותר בחלב מן התורה, אם יבוא בית דין ויתיר בשר חיה בחלב הרי זה גורע, ואם יאסור בשר העוף ויאמר שהוא בכלל הגדי והוא אסור מן התורה הרי זה מוסיף, אבל אם אמר בשר העוף מותר מן התורה ואנו נאסור אותו ונודיע לעם שהוא גזרה שלא יבא מן הדבר חובה ויאמרו העוף מותר מפני שלא נתפרש כך החיה מותרת שהרי לא נתפרשה, ויבא אחר לומר אף בשר בהמה מותרת חוץ מן העז, ויבא אחר לומר אף בשר העז מותר בחלב פרה או הכבשה שלא נאמר אלא אמו שהיא מינו, ויבא אחר לומר אף בחלב העז שאינה אמו מותר שלא נאמר אלא אמו, לפיכך נאסור כל בשר בחלב אפילו בשר עוף, אין זה מוסיף אלא עושה סייג לתורה וכן כל כיוצא בזה.<sup>5</sup>

According to the Rambam, the prohibition for the *beit din* to add to the Torah's commands applies only if they add new laws and claim that their source originates in the Torah itself. However, new decrees that are rabbinic in nature are permissible so long as that point is made clear – that these are additional enactments made by the Sages. Thus, Chazal had the authority to ban the consumption of

chicken along with milk, since they did not present that prohibition as being from the Torah (which includes only consuming meat and milk), but rather they presented it as being forbidden by rabbinic law.

The **Ra'avad**, in his comments to the Rambam, disagrees. According to the Ra'avad, since there is an obligation to safeguard the Torah's laws by enacting rabbinic decrees, any additional decrees would be permitted, even if it was implied that they are of Torah origin. The only way in which one would transgress the prohibition of *bal tosif*, says the Ra'avad, would be by altering a positive commandment such as *lulav*, *tefillin* or *tzitzit*.<sup>6</sup> The Rambam and Ra'avad thus argue whether *bal tosif* could apply to the enactment of rabbinic decrees and the extension of negative commandments in some cases, or merely to the fulfillment of positive commandments. Some have suggested that the argument is broader and relates to the very nature of the subject of this prohibition – according to the Rambam, the prohibition is addressed to the *beit din*, while according to the Ra'avad it would be addressed to the individual.<sup>7</sup>

### **Bal Tosif as it Applies to Tekiat Shofar**

Two of the major *Rishonim* address the glaring difficulty as to why the additional shofar blasts enacted throughout the ages would not be a violation of *bal tosif*.

**Tosafot** in two places in *masechet Rosh Hashana*<sup>8</sup> explain that *bal tosif* applies only when one adds additional elements to an existing mitzvah, such as adding an additional species to the *lulav* bundle on Sukkot, but **performing the same mitzvah twice** would not constitute

5. Rambam, *Hilchot Mamrim* 2:9

6. See Rashi to *Devarim* 4:2 where he gives examples of the prohibition of *bal tosif* "such as five *parshiyot* in *tefillin*, five species of *lulav* [i.e., the *lulav* and four more], and five *tzitzit*."

7. See below where we bring further sources from the Rambam to reject this explanation.

8. *Rosh Hashana* 16b and *Rosh Hashana* 28b

a violation. Thus, one may shake a *lulav* several times on the day of Sukkot, consume matzah multiple times on the night of Pesach, and blow the *shofar* on Rosh Hashana even beyond the minimum amount of blasts required by the Torah. According to this approach, our current practice would constitute the repetition of the mitzvah rather than signifying an addition to the Torah's command.<sup>9</sup>

The **Rashba** takes a different approach. In his commentary to the Gemara,<sup>10</sup> he quotes Tosafot's question and answer but responds that, in fact, the question does not even arise in the first place. According to the Rashba, *bal Tosif* is a prohibition that applies solely to **an individual** who adds additional commandments or elements to existing commands out of his own volition. When it comes to enactments by our Sages, however, they were given the authority to add on to the Torah's laws by virtue of the verse in *Parshat Shoftim*. The additional *shofar* blasts are an established practice dating back to the Gemara and thus do not constitute a prohibition.

At first glance there would seem to be a major disagreement between the Rashba and Tosafot. The Rashba implies that our extra shofar blasts do constitute an additional element to the Torah's command, but are nevertheless permitted, as they were enacted by the Sages. According to Tosafot, though, such is not the case. Rather, we are dealing with the repetition of a mitzvah, which is permitted in any event. What is the basis for the argument between these two great authorities?

One might surmise that the argument between Tosafot and the Rashba is similar to the argument between the Rambam and the Ra'avad. The Rashba seems to be following the Ra'avad's premise that the prohibition of *bal tosif* applies not to the *beit din*, but only to an individual. Thus, by following the Sages' enactment of *tekiot d'me'umad*,<sup>11</sup> there can perforce be no prohibition. Tosafot, by contrast, hold (as does the Rambam) that the *beit din* could theoretically transgress *bal tosif*, and thus they need to explain differently – that in this case we are dealing with the double performance of the unaltered mitzvah.

However, closer inspection reveals that this is not the case. First, although the Rambam emphasizes the role of the *beit din* regarding *bal tosif*, it is explicit in several places in the *Mishneh Torah* that the Rambam holds that an individual as well can transgress *bal tosif*.<sup>12</sup> The *Minchat Chinuch* explains that the Rambam's main discussion in the aforementioned passage is the verse of “לא תסור” and the authority of the *beit din* to enact new decrees. It is in this context that he relates to *bal tosif*, rather than aiming to give a broader definition of the scope of the prohibition, but in fact he agrees that an individual can transgress the prohibition.<sup>13</sup>

Furthermore, while the Rashba and Tosafot may have given different explanations as to how to resolve the question of *tekiat shofar* in regard to the prohibition of *bal tosif*, that does not necessarily indicate that they completely disagree on the nature of *bal tosif*. Several of the *Acharonim* suggest that Tosafot would

9. This explanation ties in with the Gemara's reasoning (*Rosh Hashana* 16b) for why we blow both *tekiot d'meyushav* before *Mussaf* and then *tekiot d'me'umad* again during *Mussaf*. The Gemara explains that this is in order to “confound the Satan”. As Rashi explains: כשישמע ישראל: מהבין את המצוות - מסתתמין דברין by repeating it again and again, even once we have discharged our obligation!

10. Rashba's commentary to *Rosh Hashana* 16a

11. The second set of *tekiyot*, which are blown as part of *Mussaf*, as opposed to *tekiot d'meyushav*, the first set of blasts, which are blown before *Mussaf*.

12. See, for example, *Mishneh Torah, Hilchot Tefilla* Ch. 14 and *Hilchot Lulav* Ch. 7.

13. *Minchat Chinuch, Parshat Re'eh*, Mitzvah 454

certainly agree with the Rashba that following certain types of rabbinic decrees would not constitute a violation of *bal tosif*, yet they maintain that this reasoning alone is not sufficient to explain the case of *tekiat shofar*. For example, the *Pnei Yehoshua* argues that the authority of the Sages is limited to circumstantial change that could not have been relevant at the time of *matan Torah* (such as the miracles of Chanukah and Purim), but where nothing has changed, the Sages would be unable to make a new decree without violating *bal tosif*.<sup>14</sup> The reasoning behind the extra shofar blasts (“to confound the Satan”) is something which had always been relevant, and for this reason Tosafot had to find an alternate answer to the question of why *bal tosif* would not apply. The *Aruch L’Ner* though rejects this explanation,<sup>15</sup> since there are many examples of rabbinic enactments not resulting from circumstantial change.<sup>16</sup> He argues that the additional *tekiot* are not a bona fide rabbinic decree (as evidenced from the fact that no additional *beracha* is said) but rather an established custom. Thus, the rabbinic immunity from *bal tosif* is lacking.

This last point is echoed in the explanation provided by Rav Chaim Soloveitchik.<sup>17</sup> He begins with the basic premise that the Sages never enacted the blowing of additional *shofar* blasts. The enactment of Chazal was that those *tekiot* that are sounded on Rosh Hashana need to accompany the *berachot* of *Mussaf* – *Malchuyot*, *Zichronot* and *Shofarot*. Thus, in order to discharge one’s obligation on both a

Torah and rabbinic level it would be sufficient to have one set of shofar blasts alone – the *tekiot d’me’umad*.<sup>18</sup> The prevalent custom to blow twice, in order to confound the Satan, is simply that – a custom. The Sages who enacted when the *shofar* has to be blown never enacted that it has to be blown additional times. That was a custom that developed independently.<sup>19</sup>

Accordingly, explains Rav Chaim, Tosafot could not have answered that there is no *bal tosif* because we are following a rabbinic enactment – because there is no rabbinic enactment to blow the *shofar* twice! The blowing of the *tekiot d’meyushav* discharges the Torah obligation to hear the *shofar*, while the *tekiot d’me’umad* blown together with the *berachot* of *Mussaf* discharges our rabbinic obligation too. Were it not for the reasoning given by the Gemara (“to confound the Satan”) one set of blasts would have been sufficient, even on a rabbinic level.

The Rashba, by contrast, explains that although there is no rabbinic requirement to blow the *shofar* twice, we have still not discharged our rabbinic obligation to hear the *shofar* along with the *berachot* following the first set of *tekiot*. Thus, we are still obligated on a rabbinic level to hear the *shofar* again. Nonetheless, according to both the Rashba and Tosafot, the decree was to hear the shofar along with the *berachot*, not to blow additional blasts.

### A Third Approach

A third approach can be found in the commentaries of the **Ramban** and the **Ritva**. While not

14. *Pnei Yehoshua*, *Rosh Hashana* 16b

15. *Aruch L’Ner*, *Rosh Hashana* 16b

16. These include rabbinic prohibitions regarding Shabbat and forbidden relationships.

17. *Chiddushei HaGrach al HaShas*, *Rosh Hashana* 28b

18. This can be compared to the mitzvah of *kiddush* on Shabbat night. On a Torah level, it would be sufficient simply to say the words of *kiddush*. However, the Sages enacted that the *kiddush* should be said over wine.

19. Rav Chaim proves this premise through a careful analysis of the wording of the Rambam. See *Mishneh Torah*, *Hilchot Shofar* Ch. 3. In Halacha 7, the Rambam states that the community is **obligated** to hear the *tekiot* along with the *berachot* of *Mussaf*. In Halacha 10, where he details the order of additional blasts, the Rambam begins with the words “the **prevalent custom**.” In addition, the Gemara (*Rosh Hashana* 16b) questions the reason for these additional blasts without providing a source for a rabbinic enactment.

explicitly addressing the question of *bal tosif*, they suggest an alternate explanation of the *tekiot d'me'umad* that sheds light on our subject as well.

As mentioned previously, the original obligation of blowing nine *shofar* blasts mandated by the Torah were expanded to thirty *tekiot* due to uncertainty about the precise nature of the sound required by the Torah. It would follow that just as thirty blasts are required to discharge our obligation as part of *tekiot d'meyushav*, so too all thirty should be required to be blown as part of *tekiot d'me'umad*. However, this is not the case. The *Rishonim* provide several different customs as to how many blasts are to be blown along with *Mussaf*. The majority of the opinions brought do not require all thirty blasts, which would have alleviated all doubts as to the correct *terua*.<sup>20</sup>

Both the **Ramban**<sup>21</sup> and the **Ritva**<sup>22</sup> explain in their commentaries that the *shofar* blasts that accompany the *berachot* of *Mussaf* are of a different nature than the blasts before *Mussaf*. While the *tekiot d'meyushav* come to discharge our obligation of **hearing the shofar**, the *tekiot d'me'umad* come to discharge our obligation as part of **prayer itself**. It is less important what precise blast is blown; what is critical is that the prayer is accompanied by the cry of the *shofar*.<sup>23</sup>

We can now understand why these additional blasts constitute no violation of *bal tosif*. Rather than adding elements to the mitzvah of *shofar*, these blasts come to serve as part of a different mitzvah altogether.

In summary, we have seen that the prohibition of *bal tosif* exists as an explicit ban on

adding elements to the Torah's commands. The mitzvah of *shofar* would seem to be a case in point where we do exactly that. The *Rishonim* provide several explanations as to why our additional *tekiot* do not constitute a violation:

1. Tosfot explain that the prohibition is only to add elements to an existing mitzvah, but there is no prohibition to perform a mitzvah multiple times.<sup>24</sup>
2. The Rashba explains that since the additional blasts stem from a rabbinic decree, they fall under the authority of the Sages to make new enactments and do not violate *bal tosif*.
3. The Ramban and the Ritva understand the additional blasts to be a part of the mitzvah of prayer, rather than the mitzvah of *shofar* itself.

20. See *Shulchan Aruch* 592:1 and commentaries there

21. *Milchamot Hashem, Rosh Hashana* 11a

22. Ritva, *Rosh Hashana* 34a

23. These *Rishonim* point to a similar idea found regarding the blowing of instruments on fast days.

24. See also *Levush* (O.C. 585:3) who writes that, because the Torah used the term "יום תרועה", the implication is that the mitzvah of blowing the shofar applies the entire day. Thus, even though the minimum amount of *tekiot* is stipulated by the Torah, one may continue blowing the shofar the entire day, and every additional blast would constitute the fulfillment of the mitzvah.



Texas, USA

טקסט, ארה"ב

אלול תשס"ה

## נב. דרשת הרב בין תקיעות דמיושב לתקיעות דמעומד במקום צורך

### שאלה:

בעניין הדרשה שלי בראש השנה: אם אדבר לפני תקיעות השופר, מעט מאוד אנשים יהיו נוכחים. הדרשה מהווה זמן לקשר ביני ובין הקהילה, בתקווה שאוכל לעוררם לקשר עמוק יותר עם יהדותם בשנה הקרובה. האם מותר לומר את הדרשה לאחר שלושים התקיעות הראשונות?

### תשובה:

יש מקום להתיר לדרוש לאחר תקיעות דמיושב, ואפילו להמליץ על כך במקום שזה האופן היחיד שבו יגיעו הדברים לאוזני רבים מהאנשים, וזאת ההזדמנות לעורר אותם לתשובה, לכוונה בתפילה ובתקיעות ולחזוק חייהם כיהודים. עם זאת, מאחר שמקובל אסור לדבר בין התקיעות, כדי שלא יבואו לזלזל בכך ולהתיר גם דברים בטלים, מן הראוי שהרב ידגיש לציבור את הסיבות להחלטתו בדרשתו.

ולהלן הטעמים להתיר:

- א. האיסור לדבר בין התקיעות דמיושב לתקיעות דמעומד שנוי במחלוקת ראשוני. כמה ראשוני סוברים שמעיקר הדין מותר לדבר<sup>1</sup>, וחלקם מתיירים לציבור ואוסרים רק על התקוע<sup>2</sup>. להלכה פסק המחבר<sup>3</sup> לחומרה, אבל לאור הני"ל נראה שבמקום שיש צורך מצווה או בשעת הדחק וכדומה ודאי שיש לסמוך על המקלים.
- ב. מותר לדבר בעניין התפילות והתקיעות<sup>4</sup>, לכן מסברה יש מקום לומר שאם הדרשה תתרום ליותר כוונה בתפילה או להרהורי תשובה וכדומה, היא יכולה להיחשב כדיבור בעניין התפילות<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> יבעל המאור" (ראש השנה דף יב מדפי הרי"ף עמוד א), הר"ן (שם דף י"א מדפי הרי"ף עמוד א), ה"מגיד משנה" (הלכות שופר פרק ג הלכה יא).

<sup>2</sup> ה"מגיד משנה" הני"ל מדייק כך מהרמב"ם.

<sup>3</sup> שו"ע (או"ח סי' תקצב סעי' ג).

<sup>4</sup> הרמ"א (שם).

<sup>5</sup> יש לבסס סברה זו על המנהג הפשוט שהציבור אומר או שר עם החזן קטעים מסוימים מחזרת הש"ץ ומהפיוטים הנאמרים בה, גם כשמדובר בפיוטים שלא תוקנו מלכתחילה כאמירה של הציבור. הפוסקים לא שללו מנהג זה, מלבד בפיוטים בודדים שמנוסחם משתמע שהאומר הוא שליח הציבור, ולכן יש שראו באמירתם על ידי הציבור איסור של שקר או חשש של הוצאת שם שמים לבטלה (כך כתב ב"קיצור שלי"ה, וכן מודפס במחזורים רבים בשם האבודרהם, אף שיתכן שהאבודרהם לא התכוון לומר אלא שהיחיד לא יאמר פיוטים אלה בתפילת הלחש עצמה). מכך שהעירו דווקא על אמירת פיוטים אלה משמע שלא ראו פסול במנהג שהציבור שר עם החזן את שאר הפיוטים וקטעי תפילות, למרות שהם אינם חלק מתפילת הציבור.

נראה שההסבר לכך מצוי בדברי הט"ז (סי' תרכ"א ס"ק ב), שהסביר שאין איסור של הוצאת שם שמים לבטלה באמירה שעל-ידה יאנו מתעוררים ומתפללים ומכוונים למה שאנו צריכים, אף שהאמירה עצמה אינה תפילה שלנו. הט"ז דן בהזכרת חלקים מתפילת הכהן הגדול ביום כיפור בתפילתנו, אף שתפילות אלה אינן רלוונטיות לגבינו. מסתבר שאם יש לסמוך על סברה זו באיסור הוצאת שם שמים לבטלה, קל וחומר שיש לסמוך עליה לעניין הפסק בין תקיעות דמיושב לתקיעות דמעומד, ולכן התקבל המנהג הני"ל.



**ERETZ HEMDAH**  
Institute for Advanced Jewish Studies  
Jerusalem

ג. ה"אשל אברהם"<sup>6</sup> התיר לאדם חלש לאכול בין תקיעות דמיושב לתקיעות דמעומד, וכך הובא בספר "פסקים ותקנות" לרבי עקיבא אייגר<sup>7</sup>, שכך הורו רבי עקיבא אייגר ובית דינו בשעה שהייתה מגיפה בפוזנא והיה צורך להקדים ולאכול – כלומר, העדיפו הפסקה של אכילה וברכות בין תקיעות דמיושב לתקיעות דמעומד על אכילה לפני התקיעות בכלל.

היום נהגו להקל באכילה קודם התקיעות, כדי שתהיה דעתו מיושבת בתקיעות ובתפילות, וממילא יתכוון בהם יותר. על פי זה, קל וחומר שיש להתיר דיבור בין התקיעות דמיושב לתקיעות דמעומד כדי שהתפילה והתקיעות יהיו יותר ככוונה, ובפרט שהדיבור שבדרשה קשור לכוונה זו בקשר ישיר יותר מהברכות של האכילה.

"הליכות שלמה"<sup>8</sup> הצדיק את המנהג לומר את ניגוני התפילה עם החזן<sup>9</sup>, ודייק מלשון "שולחן ערוך הרב"<sup>11</sup> שדוקא "דברים בטלים" אסור לדבר בין התקיעות דמיושב לתקיעות דמעומד, ולכן כל מה ששייך לסדר התפילה (הניגונים הנ"ל) מותר. לפי דיוקו זה יש לומר שדרשת התעוררות וכדומה אינה "דברים בטלים" ומותרת. עוד הביא בשם "יסוד ושורש העבודה"<sup>12</sup> שמותר לומר תהלים בשעת חזרת הש"ץ, כשהחזן מאריך בניגונים (ולא בתפילה עצמה). אמירת תהלים גם היא אינה חלק מתפילת מוסף עצמה או מהתקיעות, ובכל אופן התיר, ואם כך יש לומר שהוא הדין לדרשה.

<sup>6</sup> בוטשאטש, בשו"ע (או"ח סי' תקפ"ט ס"א).

<sup>7</sup> פרק "הנהגות ותקנות" (סי' כ סעי' יב עמוד עג), וראה שם בהערות. דבריו ודברי ה"אשל אברהם" הובאו גם ב"הליכות שלמה" (לגרש"ז אוירבך, מועדים פרק ב הערה 10). וראה עוד ב"ציץ אליעזר" (ח סי' כא), שנושא ונותן בעניין הוראה זו (של רבי עקיבא אייגר וה"אשל אברהם) עם הרב ד"ר משה אויערבך.

<sup>8</sup> אף-על פי שבמקור הקולא היתה לחולים ולחלשים בלבד. עיין ב"מטה אפרים" (סי' תקפ"ט סעי' ב), ב"הליכות שלמה" (לגרש"ז אויערבך, מועדים, פרק ב סעי' א ו-ג) ושם ב"דבר הלכה" (א) ו"אורחות ההלכה" (הערות 4 ו-10); וכן בהערות בספר "פסקים ותקנות לרעק"א" וב"ציץ אליעזר" (הני"ל בהערה הקודמת), שדנו באיסור זה – מקורו, גדריו ותוקפו, ובהתרתו לצורך חולים וכדומה.

<sup>9</sup> מועדים פרק ב, "דבר הלכה" (כה) ו"אורחות ההלכה" (הערה 64).

<sup>10</sup> כמובא לעיל בהערה 5.

<sup>11</sup> סי' תקצ"ב סעיף ז.

<sup>12</sup> חלק ג חובת המועדות. שער יא - שער האיתון, פרק ד, סדר שופרות.

