

Daf Hashvuah Gemara and Tosfos Rosh Hashana Daf 33
By Rabbi Chaim Smulowitz
limudtorah.onlinewebshop.net
Subscribe free or to sponsor: tosfosproject@gmail.com

Starting Mesechta Taanis, I'll be only writing on the Halacha Gemaras.

Daf 33a
New Sugya

The Mishna says you can't cut off the Shofar, whether it's with a tool that involves a rabbinical prohibition or whether it's with a tool that involves a Lav. The Gemara explains: the tool that's a rabbinical prohibition is a sickle (which is irregular). A tool that involves a Lav is a knife (which is regular). The Gemara asks: if the Mishna already said that you can't cut it with a rabbinical prohibited tool, of course we know that it's prohibited to use a Torah prohibited tool. (So, why mention it?) The Gemara answers: the Mishna is in the format of; "this is forbidden, and we don't need to tell us that this other thing is forbidden."

New Sugya

The Mishna says he's allowed to put water or wine in the Shofar. The Gemara makes the implication that you may put in water and wine, but not urine. The Mishna is like Abba Shaul. As we learned: Abba Shaul says you may put in wine and water to clean it, but it's forbidden to put in urine because of the honor (of the Mitzvah).

New Sugya

The Mishna says that you don't stop children from blowing. This implies that you do stop women from blowing. However, we have a Braisa that says that we don't stop children or women from blowing on Yom Tov. Abaya reconciles the two; the Mishna is R' Yehuda and the Braisa is R' Yossi. As we're taught in a Braisa: R' Yehuda says; the Pasuk says "tell the sons of Israel to lean (on the Korban)," which implies that the daughters of Israel don't lean. R' Yossi and R' Shimon say that it's permissible for women to lean, (although it's not an obligation).

R' Tam says: although our unnamed Mishna is like R' Yehuda, the Halacha is like R' Yossi, since (we usually Paskin like him) since his reasons are the most understandable. We also have actual stories of doing an action from a Psak of a Rav, like, that Michal the daughter of Shaul put on T'filin. Also, the wife of Yona went up to the Beis Hamikdash during the Regel. Also, we see the Gemara in Chagigah, that they brought the Korban to the Ezras Nashim, and they allowed the women to lean on it to give them satisfaction.

She's permitted to make a Bracha on any Mitzvah that's time-related. Although she's exempt from those Mitzvos, but she does it anyhow like Michal the daughter of Kushi (i.e., Shaul) who (we assume) made a Bracha. A proof to this: the Gemara in Bava Kama brings R' Yosef who (originally) said that, if anyone tells me that the Halacha is like R' Yehuda (that blind people are exempt from Mitzvos), I will make a holiday for the Rabanan. (Since he was blind, so he gets

extra reward for Mitzvos) since he performs Mitzvos though he's not obligated. However, if it's true that those who are exempt from a Mitzvah can't make a Bracha on it, why would he celebrate? After all, it's going to make him lose saying Brachos on Tzitzis, Lulav, T'filin, Megila, Chanukah lights, Sukka, Havdalah, Kiddush, the Brachos of Sh'ma for both day and night and all other Brachos. After all, we say in Bava Kama if someone wants to be a pious person, he should fulfill everything regarding Brachos. (Thus, it's not logical that he would be happy if he lost the ability to make Brachos.)

Another proof: the Gemara in Pesachim says that the blind person is exempt from saying the Hagadah. The Gemara asked from R' Sheishes and R' Yosef, who were both blind, and they said the Hagadah in their houses. The very fact that they were Moitzie others shows that they must be obligated. The Gemara answers: they must have held that Matzah nowadays are only obligated by the rabbis. However, we see that the Gemara never had a question how did they make the Brachos if they weren't obligated. This proves that, whenever someone is exempt from a Mitzvah, they can make a Bracha on it.

Tosfos is bothered by the question: isn't he making an unnecessary Bracha, which the Gemara says that you transgress the Lav of "not carrying (Hashem's name in vain)?"

Tosfos answers: that's only a rabbinic Drasha (i.e., Asmachta, and you don't transgress the Torah's prohibition.) As we say in Brachos, if you're not sure if you said Emes V'yatziv or not, you need to repeat it, and we don't forbid it for the Safeik that it's a Bracha for no reason. Although the Gemara in Trumah says that there is a prohibition to mention Hashem's name for no reason, as it says "you should fear Hashem your G-d," that's only if it doesn't come in the form of a Bracha.

However, Tosfos concludes: a blind person is not much of a proof to a woman. After all, although the Torah exempts a blind person, but the Rabanan obligate him. After all, the Gemara in Pesachim says that R' Sheishes and R' Yosef must have held that Matzah nowadays are only obligated by the rabbis, and that's why they can be Moitzie others. This proves that they're rabbinically obligated, (or else they couldn't Moitzie others who are rabbinically obligated.) Therefore, they may make Brachos the same way as we make Brachos on the Chanukah lights and other rabbinical obligations.

However, we can push off that proof (from Pesach): since it's possible that someone who's not obligated at all can be Moitzie someone who's rabbinically obligated. Like by a minor that may Bentch and be Moitzie his father, and the same way he can finish (the Torah reading by getting) the seventh Aliya (on Shabbos). He can also be Moitzie others when reading the Megila according to R' Yehuda.

However, we could infer from the Gemara in Megila: R' Yehuda says: anyone who didn't see light in their life (i.e., are blind) shouldn't be "Poras Sh'ma" (i.e., be the Chazan to be Moitzie people Barachu and Birchas Sh'ma, because he can't praise Hashem for the lights that he had never benefited from). This implies that if he did see, even if he became blind afterwards, he may do so (i.e., be Moitzie others). However, (we may ask), why could he? After all, R' Yehuda himself held that the blind are exempt from all Mitzvos from the Torah. However, if we say that they're rabbinically obligated, it makes sense.

We can say, according to this, why R' Yosef would be glad if he wasn't obligated from the Torah, and he still does the Mitzvos, since, for this reason (i.e., that he has a rabbinical obligation), he can make the Bracha on all Mitzvos, and to say "you commanded us," since he's rabbinically obligated. As the Gemara says in Shabbos; where were we commanded (on rabbinical Mitzvos)? From the Pasuk of "don't stray (from what the rabbis tell you)."

However, (we can't compare it to) a woman who's not even rabbinically obligated in positive time-based Mitzvos. As we see the Gemara in Brachos says: the Gemara originally wanted to say women are only rabbinically obligated in Kiddush, (but she's exempt from the Torah since it's time-based). On that, the Gemara asks: if so, we should rabbinically obligate them in all Mitzvos Asei that's time-based. (So, we see the Gemara takes it simply that they're exempt.) Also, we see the Gemara in the beginning of Sukka says that women are totally exempt from Sukka, even rabbinically. Therefore, we're back to the question: how can they say "you commanded us" (in the Bracha)?

However, we find that the Yerushalmi (in Makos) gives another answer on the contradiction between R' Yehuda (that a blind person is exempt from all Mitzvos) and that he can't be Moitzie others in the Bracha on the lights if he never saw anything, (but he can be Moitzie others if he became blind later in life). As the Yerushalmi asks the contradiction, and answers: we refer to someone living in a dark house, he can't be the Chazan for the Birchas Sh'ma. It seems to explain "someone who never saw light in his life," as someone who was born (and remained) in a cave, but isn't physically blind. The Yerushalmi in Megila also asked this question, but the text in the Yerushalmi in Makos and in Megila don't fit well.

However, in our Gemara in Megila (Bavli) implies not like that, but it refers to an actual blind person. As the Gemara explains R' Yehuda's reason is because he never had any benefit from the lights. However, the reason for the Rabanan who permit is like R' Yossi who saw a blind person with a torch. He asked: why do you need the torch? He answered: as long as the torch is in my hand, people will see me, and they save me from falling into ditches and thorns. However, this reason wouldn't apply to a person who can see well, but he was born in a cave and never saw the sun.

According to what we explained: that a blind is rabbinically obligated in Mitzvos, and women are not, we need to give some reason for being stricter to the blind. We can answer: because he's at least the same type of person who's obligated in these Mitzvos (i.e., male). Also, we don't want him (not to have any Mitzvos) because then he'll be like a non-Jew. After all, if we exempt him from all Mitzvos, he's not acting at all like a Jew. However, if we exempt a woman from all time-based positive Mitzvos, she'll still have plenty of Mitzvos she's obligated to do.

Ri b. R' Yehuda brings a proof that a woman can make a Bracha on time-based positive Mitzvos: the Gemara in Megila says; everyone can get an Aliya and be counted for the seven Aliyos, even a woman and even a minor, although a woman is not obligated to toil in Torah, as the Gemara in Kiddushin and Eiruvim say.

However, R' Tam says that this is no proof. After all, the Bracha made before and after an Aliya is not on the Mitzvah of learning Torah. After all, you make it if you already said the Bracha

of V'harev Na, or were Yoitza with the Bracha of Ahava Rabbah, you have to make another Bracha when having the Aliya. Another proof: when you don't have a Levi in Shul, you call the Kohain up again in the place of the Levi, and he makes the Brachos again despite just making them for the first reading.

Another reason for this not to be a proof: it's possible that a woman only can have an Aliya in the middle Aliyos, since they didn't originally make a Bracha. As the Gemara in Megila says; the first person made a Bracha before the reading and the last one made a Bracha at the end. However, today, they all make Brachos because of a decree for those who came in late (who might think there's no Bracha before reading the Torah) and those who leave early (who might think there's no Bracha after reading the Torah). However, (this may not be true) since the term "they count for the seven" implies, at the end of the seven.

However, we can't bring a proof from what we see that a minor needs to Bentch, even though he's exempt from Mitzvos. This is no proof to allow a woman (to make a Bracha on Mitzvos she's exempt from). After all, the minor will eventually be obligated in this Mitzvah (when he grows up). Plus, you're obligated to train him to do the Mitzvos. Also, the minors aren't obligated in the Lav "don't say G-d's name in vain."

The Mishna says that you may help them to blow until they know how to. R' Elazar explains that this is permitted even on Shabbos. We learned similarly in a Braisa; we help them blow until they know how to, even on Shabbos. We don't stop them from blowing on Shabbos, and we don't need to say that it's permitted on Yom Tov. The Gemara asks: this as a contradiction. First you say you can help them blow until they learn how, which means that we can L'chatchila tell them to blow. Yet, it then says that you don't stop them from blowing, which implies; don't stop them, but you can't tell them to L'chatchila blow.

The Gemara reconciles: it's not difficult, one refers to a minor that is old enough to train, the other refers to a minor that's too young to train.

Tosfos points out that there are two versions of the text. From Rashi, it seems the text reads like this; we help them blow until they know how to, even on Shabbos. We don't stop them from blowing on Shabbos, and we don't need to say that it's permitted on Yom Tov. The Gemara asks this as a contradiction. First you say you can help them blow until they learn how, which means that we can L'chatchila tell them to blow. Yet, it then says that you don't stop them from blowing, which implies; don't stop them, but you can't tell them to L'chatchila blow. The Gemara reconciles: it's not difficult, one refers to a minor that is old enough to train, the other refers to a minor that's too young to train.

Rashi explains: when they come to the age of training, you help them blow until he learns, and of course, you don't stop them.

Tosfos asks: how can you say that you can help a minor who's old enough to train with blowing on Shabbos, since there is no Mitzvah on Shabbos (to blow) Shofar.

Another question: it says by a minor that didn't reach the age of training that you don't stop him from blowing on Shabbos, but you can't tell him L'chatchila to blow. Why not? After all, even if he reached the age to be trained you're allowed to help him blow.

However, perhaps you can answer: when we say that you don't L'chatchila tell him to blow, that means that you don't have any obligation to tell him to blow. After all, you're not obligated to teach him since he didn't reach the age to train him. However, there is no prohibition to tell him to blow.

However, it seems to Tosfos to explain it in the opposite way. You don't stop a minor that reached the age of training from blowing, but you can't L'chatchila tell him to blow, since there is a rabbinical prohibition to blow this day. However, you're not obligated to stop him (from doing this rabbinical prohibition) since, if it wasn't for the fact it was Shabbos, there would be a Mitzvah to blow the Shofar. However, you tell a minor that's not old enough to train to blow, i.e., that it's permitted to tell him, not that there is an obligation to tell him to blow.

Tosfos continues: the other version of the text is like this explanation. It says; "until they learn, even on Shabbos, but you don't stop them from blowing on Yom Tov." This implies that you stop him on Shabbos. On that the Gemara asks: but didn't we originally say that you don't stop them on Shabbos? The Gemara reconciles: one refers to a minor that's old enough to train and the other refers to a minor that's not old enough to train.

Tosfos is bothered by the following: (how can you say that we help the minor that's not old enough to train to blow?) After all, we see the Gemara in Yevamos says: you shouldn't tell a minor on Shabbos to bring you a key or seal. Rather, you just leave him to uproot (what's growing) and to throw (in a street). Abaya established the case to refer to uprooting from a flowerpot without a hole and throwing in a Karmulas (and not a real Reshus Harabim) which are only rabbinically prohibited. He established it this way so we shouldn't prove that Beis Din aren't obligated to separate a minor from eating Neveila. Anyhow, we see from there that you can't give a minor a rabbinical prohibition. So, how can you give the minor a Shofar to blow on Shabbos?

Tosfos answers: still, we allow him to help him blow even on Shabbos, and it's not like other rabbinical prohibitions, since there are times that blowing on this day is a Mitzvah.

Tosfos concludes: our explanation that, when it says the line of (not) to stop him, it refers to those who are old enough to train, is implied in the Gemara in Erichin. As it says there; the term "everyone is obligated to blow the Shofar" comes to include a minor who is old enough to train, as the Mishna says "you don't stop the children from blowing."

Daf 33b New Sugya

The Mishna says that if he doesn't blow with intent, he's not Yoitza. (The Gemara assumes that it's only if he didn't intend at all to make a sound), but if you (intended to blow) but the intent was to make a musical note, then you're Yoitza. Let's say that this is a proof to Rava who says; if someone blows to make a musical note, he's Yoitza. The Gemara rejects the proof: perhaps the Mishna refers to blowing for a musical note as "blowing without intent" (since it's not intended for the Mitzvah).

The Mishna then says: if you heard it from one who blows without intent, you're not Yoitza. This implies that if you hear it from someone who intends to blow (for the Mitzvah) for himself, you're Yoitza. Let's say that this is a disproof to R' Zeira who told his attendant to have in mind for him to be Yoitza when he blows for him. The Gemara rejects this: (really, you're not Yoitza if you hear it from someone blowing for the Mitzvah if he doesn't have you in mind. The only reason the Mishna frames it that he didn't have any intent), since the Mishna starts speaking of blowing without intent, it frames the end case about blowing without intent.

New Sugya

The order of the blowing is that you have three sets of three. The amount of the length of a Tekiah is the same as the amount of the length of three Truos. The amount of a Truah is like three Yevavas (cries).

Tosfos quotes Rashi who explains "three Yevavos": it refers to three tiny sounds.

Later, the Gemara will bring that R' Avahu enacted in Ceserea to blow 'Tashrat' (Tekiah, Shevarim Truah, Tekiah) 'Tashat' (Tekiah, Shevarim, Tekiah) and 'Tarat' (Tekiah, Truah, Tekiah). This is because he was in doubt what's the definition of 'Truah' of the Torah. Is it what we call Truah, which is like weeping, or is it Shvarim, which is like groaning. Or, is it Shvarim Truah, since you need both to make the Torah's Truah, since it might be a combination of groaning and weeping.

Tosfos says: you need to be careful when you blow Shvarim that each Shever shouldn't be as long as the three Yevavos, the three tiny sounds. After all, if you do, it would be a Tekiah and not a Shever, since the amount for a Tekiah is like a Truah, and a Truah is like three Yevavos.

It also seems that someone should stretch out the Tekiah of Tashrat more than the Tekiah for Tashat, and the Tekiah of Tashat more than the Tekiah for Tarat. After all, the Tekiah is as long as the Truah, and we blow Tashrat because we have a Safeik if (the Truah) is groaning and weeping together. Therefore, the Tekiah for Tashrat has to be as long as three Shvarim and three Yevavos. We also stretch out the Tekiah of Tashat as long as three Shvarim, since we do it for the Safeik if (the Truah) is groaning. The Tekiah for Tarat should be as long as a Truah, which is like weeping.

However, if you make any of those Tekios as long as the Tekiah of the Tashrat, it's not a problem, since you may lengthen them as much as you want. As we learned in the Mishna; if you lengthen the second (Tekiah) as long as two, you only can count it as one. Therefore, you don't need to worry if you make four or five Shevarim, since the Shevarim are in place of the Truah and it's like you're making a long Truah, like the way we stretch out the Truah.

However, the Riva and Ri b. R' Meir explain: that every Yevava is three tiny sounds, therefore, a Truah (that consists of three Yevavos) is nine tiny sounds. Therefore, its Tekiah will be the same length. According to this, you don't need to worry if you extend the Shevarim a little (since there is no Tekiah less than the length of nine tiny sounds). According to this, you need to stretch out the Tekiah of Tashrat like the length of three Shvarim plus nine tiny sounds.

Therefore, if you don't stretch those Tekios that long, and you make a longer Shvarim, you're not Yoitza either opinion. (After all, Rashi holds you need short Shvarim, and Riva needs a longer Tekiah.) R' Chananel explains the Truah like Rashi.

Nowadays, we're accustomed to blow sitting down thirty sounds after reading the Torah, three Tashrats, three Tashats and three Tarats. However, during Musaf, we blow Tashrat for Malchious, Tashat for Zechronos, and Tarat for Shofros. However, from our whole Sugya, it's fit to blow Tashrat, Tashat and Tarat for each Bracha, Malchious, Zechronos and Shofros. Or (at least, if you don't have a Shofar beforehand), to blow after Davening. However, we don't find anyplace that you blow beforehand. Like the Mishna says: if you make the Brachos (of Musaf), and afterwards you chanced on a Shofar etc.

However, Tosfos concludes: we find in the first Perek; why do we blow when we sit and blow again when we stand? In order to confuse the Satan. This would seem to describe the way we blow.

However, it would seem to me that we should blow a full Tashrat, Tashat, Tarat by each Bracha, Malchious, Zechronos and Shofros in order to cover all the doubts (what's considered to be a Truah) of R' Avahu. In the Aruch, it explains to do like this. As he writes; there are those who are strict and blow thirty while they sit, thirty during the quiet Shemona Esrei, and thirty during Chazaras Hashatz. This is done to represent the hundred cries that Sisro's mother cried. The other ten (that's missing from the count of a hundred), we blow after Davening, one set of Tashrat, Tashat, and Tarat, which is ten sounds to make the hundred.

However, R' Tam asks: our Minhag to blow Tashrat for Malchious, Tashat for Zechronos, and Tarat for Shofros seem to contradict each other (since you're only blowing a correct Truah for one of them). After all, if the correct Truah is represented by groaning and weeping, then they all should be Tashrat. If it's only groaning, then they should all be Tashat. If they're just weeping, then they should all be Tarat.

Therefore, R' Tam instructed his town to blow Tashrat by Zechronos and Shofros just like by Malchious. Therefore, it covers all doubts (since you have both Shvarim and Truaos in between Tekios) and it's (only L'chatchila not to be Yoitza this way) because of the break (of Shvarim between the Tekiah and Truah, and you have a Truah between the Shevarim and the last Tekiah). However, it's enough to do it this way (and not blow the whole Tashrat Tashat, and Tarat) so not to majorly change the custom. After all, (we don't say you're not Yoitza if there is a break between the blowing) as we'll say that, if you hear the nine (Torah required) sounds spread over nine hours during the day, you're Yoitza.

However, Tosfos says: we can give a reason for our custom. It holds like the opinion later that the Torah only requires one Truah, and the other two is only from the Rabanan. Therefore, since they were Yoitza all the Sefeikos of what's needed, both for the Torah and rabbinic obligations, when we blow sitting, therefore, they didn't bother blowing during Davening except for what's needed for the Safeik of the Torah's blowing (obligation).

R' Shimshon b. Yona composed a Piyut; the beauty is to blow forty sounds. This is like our custom. The same wrote R' Amram, but he adds to make a single Truah without any Tekios.

Tosfos asks: how can we be Yoitza with the sitting blows? After all, later, we'll learn that the Tekios and the Brachos (of Davening) of Rosh Hashana and Yovel's Yom Kippur are necessary for each other. Therefore, you need to blow while Davening.

Tosfos answers: it's not difficult. Although the implications from Rashi's explanation there "if you make the Brachos without blowing, or blow without saying the Brachos, i.e., of Malchious, Zechronos and Shofros, (you're not Yoitza). However, it's impossible to explain it that way. After all, we'll learn later, if you have a choice to go to one of two cities, one blows Shofar and the other has a Chazan to Moitzie Davening, you go to the place that they blow and not to the one that's Davening. Also, our Mishna said: if you Daven, and afterwards you chance upon a Shofar, (you blow). These imply that you can Daven without a Shofar.

Rather, Tosfos concludes: the real explanation of "the Tekios and the Brachos are necessary for each other," that the Tekios are necessary for each other and the Brachos are necessary for each other. I.e., when you're saying Malchious, Zechronos and Shofros, either you make all three Brachos, or you don't make any Brachos. The same with the Tekios, if you're an expert to blow Tekiah, Shevarim and Truah, then blow. Otherwise, don't blow at all.

Tosfos asks: when we're Yoitza with the thirty sounds when we blow sitting, where we blow three Tashrats, which leads into three Tashats and three Tarats, why must you blow two Tekios (between sets of one type of Truah to the other)? After all, you'll be Yoitza with one. After all, if the real Truah is groaning and weeping, you were completely Yoitza with the first three Tashrats. If groaning by itself is the correct Truah, then you can use the last Tekiah of Tashrat, (which was unnecessary if the true Truah is groaning), for the beginning of Tashat. (According to that calculation), you can make the last Tekiah of Tashat be the first Tekiah of Tarat.

Tosfos gives a possible answer: since you make the Tekiah for the straight sound that comes after a Truah, they didn't want it to count as the straight sound before the Tekiah.

However, Tosfos asks: we find a case where you blow the second Tekiah as long as two Tekios so that you can use it as two Tekios, (one for the next set), and it would have worked if it wasn't for the fact that you can't cut a Tekiah in two. (So, we see that you can use the same Tekiah as the end of one set and the beginning Tekiah of the next set.)

If you blow the first Tekiah regular, but stretched the second Tekiah as long as two (in order to have it count for the beginning Tekiah of the next set), you can only count it as one Tekiah.

If someone already said the Brachos (of Musaf without a Shofar) and he afterwards chanced upon a Shofar, he blows a set of "Tekiah, Truah, Tekiah," thrice.

Just like the Chazan is obligated in praying, so too is every single person. R' Gamliel say that the Chazan is Moitzie the congregation from their obligation.

The Gemara asks: (the Mishna says that a Tekiah is as big as three Truos), yet the Braisa says that it's as big as one Truah. Abaya answers: our Mishna is counting all the Tekios and Truos of all the sets.

(I.e., the three Tekios need to be like the three Truos.) The Braisa only refers to one set, and no more. (So, the Tekiah of that set is as long as its Truah.)

The Gemara asks: (how can you say that it's as long as a Truah) if we learned in a Braisa that it's as big as three Shvarim? Abaya answered: these Tannaim must argue (and you can't reconcile them). As the Pasuk says: "it shall be a day of Truah for you." The Targum renders it "it's a day of 'Yevava' to you." By Sisro's mother it says "she watches out the window (for her son's return), and Sisro's mother 'Tevuv' (cries)." (So, we see that the term Yevava means a cry.) The Braisa holds those cries (are longer) groans. The Mishna holds they're (shorter) weeps.