

7 Sivan 5774  
June 5, 2014



Rosh Hashanah  
Daf 28

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

**Tzvi Gershon Ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for his neshamah and may his soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

### **PUNCTURED AND SEALED**

➤ The Mishna discusses the halachah of a shofar that that was punctured and then closed up. The braisa states that whether it was sealed with material of a shofar or other material, it is still unfit for use. Rabbi Nosson maintains that if he sealed it with material from a shofar, the shofar is fit for use. Rabbi Yochanan qualified Rabbi Nosson’s ruling and states that the shofar will be valid when it was sealed with material from a shofar only in a case that a majority of the shofar remained intact. (27b)

### **SPLIT ALONG ITS WIDTH**

➤ The braisa rules that if a shofar is cracked along its width, it will be valid providing that there is still enough of the shofar remaining that the blower can hold the shofar in his hand and portions of the shofar will be visible on either side of his hands. (27b)

### **ECHOS**

➤ One who blows into a pit and hears the sound of the shofar’s echo does not fulfill the mitzvah. Rav Huna explains the ruling of the Mishna to be referring to the people who are standing outside the pit; however those that are inside the pit have fulfilled their obligation since they do not hear the sound of the echo. The Gemora cites contradictory braisos regarding blowing into a pit and reconciles them through Rav Huna’s distinction. (27b)

### **PART OF A TEKIAH**

➤ Rabbah rules that if one blows inside a pit and comes up from the pit while he was blowing; he has discharged his obligation. We are not concerned that he will lift his head out of the pit while the shofar is still inside the pit and therefore he will be hearing the echo of the shofar. If one heard a portion of the sound of the shofar before dawn and the remainder afterwards: he does not fulfill his obligation since one must hear the shofar when it is daytime. (27b – 28a)

### SHOFAR FROM A KORBAN

➤ Rav Yehudah rules that one should not blow with a shofar from a korban olah but if he did, he fulfills his obligation. If one blew with a shofar from a korban shelamim, he does not fulfill his obligation. This distinction is based on the halachos of me'ilah. A korban olah is subject to the laws of me'ilah and therefore once the korban is used for his own purposes, he has committed me'ilah and the shofar loses its sanctity and he has fulfilled his mitzvah. A shelamim is not subject to the laws of me'ilah and therefore retains its sanctity and that is why he does not fulfill his mitzvah with it. Rava disagrees and maintains that he does not fulfill his obligation with a korban olah either. This is because the me'ilah does not take effect until after he used the shofar. Rava retracts from his rulings and rules that he fulfills the mitzvah by an olah and a shelamim. The reason given is because mitzvos were not given for the sake of deriving benefit; rather they were given as a yoke upon a person. (28a)

### DERIVING BENEFIT

➤ If one makes a vow not to derive benefit from his friend, it is permitted for his friend to blow shofar for him. This is because of Rava's statement in the Gemora that the mitzvos were

not given for the sake of deriving benefit; rather they were given as a yoke upon one's neck.

Rava states further that if one makes a vow not to derive benefit from a spring, he may immerse himself in a spring during the winter season but not during the summer. This is because there is a physical pleasure derived from the spring during the summer. (28a)

### INTENT BY A MITZVAH

➤ They sent to the father of Shmuel a halachah that if the Persians forced someone to eat matzah on Pesach night, he has fulfilled his obligation. Rava states that this would indicate that one who blows a shofar on Rosh Hashanah for the purpose of playing a song (*or to chase away evil spirits*) and not for the sake of the mitzvah has fulfilled his obligation. The Gemora states that there is a distinction between the two cases. Perhaps one needs proper intent in order to fulfill the mitzvah and he will not have discharged his obligation by shofar but by matzah, he has. The reason offered in the Gemora is that by matzah, even though he was coerced, he nonetheless ate the matzah and derived pleasure from it. The fact that he derived benefit from the matzah attributes the eating to him even though he did not have proper intention for the mitzvah. The Gemora states that

it appears from here that Rava would maintain that mitzvos do not require intent in order to fulfill the mitzvah. The Gemora qualifies this ruling that even if one can fulfill the mitzvah without intending to, he must know that a shofar is being blown and it was not merely the braying of a donkey. (28a – 28b)

## INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

### EATING MATZAH WITHOUT RECLINING

➤ The Gemora state that if the Persians forced someone to eat matzah, he has fulfilled his obligation of eating Matzah on Pesach.

Rav Shach asks that the person should not be considered as if he discharged his obligation since he ate the matzah without reclining and the halachah is that one who eats matzah without leaning has not fulfilled his mitzvah. He continues that even if he did recline it should not be regarded as leaning because reclining under duress (being forced to eat) is the exact opposite of freedom and the sole purpose of the obligation to recline is in order to indicate freedom.

Rav Elyashiv shlita, in his Haggadah shel Pesach answers that a person that has the ability to recline and doesn't has not fulfilled his obligation of eating matzah while leaning since he is lacking

in the mitzvah of showing freedom; however someone who cannot recline is not regarded as being deficient in the mitzvah of leaning. A student by his Rebbe or a kohen in the Temple Courtyard fulfills the mitzvah of eating matzah even though they cannot recline.

Reb Dovid Solovetchik shilta answers that the case is speaking about where the person did recline and the action of leaning is sufficient for one to fulfill the mitzvah even though the person is not feeling freedom.

## DAILY MASHAL

### DERIVING BENEFIT FROM A MITZVAH

➤ If one makes a vow not to derive benefit from his friend and his friend blew shofar for him, he has fulfilled his obligation. This is because of Rava's statement in the Gemora that the mitzvos were not given for the sake of deriving benefit; rather they were given as a yoke upon one's neck.

The Ran cites an interesting Baal Hameor who writes that this is so only if the mitzvah was a Biblical mitzvah; however, for a Rabbinical mitzvah, for example a person who made a vow not to derive benefit from his friend and his

friend blew trumpets on a fast day (*which is only a Rabbinical mitzvah*), he must leave the shul, as we do not say that the mitzvos were not given for the sake of deriving benefit by a Rabbinical mitzvah.

The Ran questions that if so, how can the person stay past the first nine blasts on Rosh Hashanah, as the remaining blasts are not Biblical but Rabbinic? Perhaps we can answer that even though the remaining blasts are Rabbinic but they are considered to be part of the Biblical mitzvah.

What is the difference between a Biblical mitzvah for which we say that the mitzvos were not given for the sake of deriving benefit and a Rabbinical mitzvah that we do not? How are we to understand this Baal Hameor?

Mitzvos were not given for the sake of deriving benefit means that the mitzvos are given as yoke upon one's neck. Perhaps we can say that a Biblical mitzvah is qualitatively stronger than a Rabbinical mitzvah (*for example when it comes to a doubt on a Biblical mitzvah, we rule stringently and yet we are lenient on a Rabbinical mitzvah*). Therefore, the strength of the commandment that is Biblical negates any benefit from the *mitzvah*. A Rabbinical *mitzvah*, however, is not as

strong and cannot negate the benefit from the mitzvah.

The Keser Dovid elaborates and writes that while a Biblical mitzvah has one step (from Hashem to us directly), a Rabbinical mitzvah has two steps, from Hashem to us via the mitzvah of "lo sassur" - do not sway from the teachings of the Sages.