ג. אין להפסיק בין תפילין של יד לשל ראש אפילו אם לא בירך בעצמו אלא שמע הברכה מחבירו ויצא מדין "שומע כעונה", שמכיון שיוצא בברכת חבירו אינו עדיף מאם בירך בעצמו, וכמו שבברכת עצמו אסור להפסיק, הוא הדין בזה. [ראה ביאוה"ל ד"ה אם]

ומי שנפטר בברכת להניח תפילין מחבירו שמברך מדין "שומע כעונה", והמברך שח בין תפילין של יד לשל ראש, אין השומע צריך לחזור ולברך, כיון שהוא עצמו לא עשה שום הפסק, וספק ברכות להקל. [יבי"א ח"ח סי' כד בהערה]

Day 27

One person reciting *lehani'ah* for another

50) Albert and Ezra were putting on tefillin at the same time, and Albert suggested that Ezra recite the blessing out loud on behalf of them both. Ezra complied, Albert responded Amen and they both began tightening the straps of their *tefillin shel yad* and winding them around their arms.

Suddenly, Ezra spoke before putting on his *tefillin shel rosh*. He now must recite an additional blessing before he puts it on. Albert, however, does not need to recite an additional blessing since he did not speak. Although some *Poskim* ruled that both men must recite an additional blessing in this case, we follow the principle of *safek berakhot lehakel*.[72]

—

by interrupting with speech [the blessing of *lehani'ah*] between his *tefillin shel yad* and *tefillin shel rosh*. The *Artzot Hahayim* disagreed, explaining that this is just like someone who put on a *tallit katan* without a blessing and then recited a blessing to put on his *tallit gadol*. That blessing covers his *tallit katan* as well, as the *Shulhan Arukh* ruled (8:10). In this case as well, when he recites the blessing of *lehani'ah* before putting on his *tefillin shel rosh*, that blessing covers his *tefillin shel yad* as well. Therefore, there is no basis for reciting an additional blessing.

This ruling is correct for Sefardic Jews who do not normally recite any blessing when putting on the *tefillin shel rosh*. For Ashkenazic Jews who always recite a second blessing when putting on the *tefillin shel rosh*, the correct procedure in this case would be to recite both blessings of *lehani'ah* and *al mitzvat tefillin* when putting on the *tefillin shel rosh*. No additional [third] blessing is necessary to rectify the interruption.

72. The *Aharonim* debated this halakha. According to the *Hikre Lev*, when Ezra interrupted by speaking, he created a problem for Albert as well. Albert depended on Ezra's blessing, and once Ezra invalidated the blessing's ability to cover the *tefillin shel rosh*, it is invalidated for Albert as well. The *Bet Oved* (page 47a, #40), however, ruled that once Albert listened to the blessing and responded Amen, it is as if he had recited his own blessing. In fact, even if had listened but not responded Amen, it still would count for Albert as if he had recited his own blessing. That is the meaning of the halakhic principle of *shome'a ka'one* – the person who listens is identical to someone who speaks. Therefore, although Ezra spoke and needs to recite an additional blessing, Albert does not need to since he did not speak. The *Peri Megadim* and the *Zekhor le'Avraham* concurred with the ruling of the *Bet Oved*. The responsa *Lev Hayim* (Vol. II, #8), however, refuted the *Bet Oved's* ruling.

Regarding a case of someone who recited the blessing of *hamotzi* on behalf of a group eating together, the *Mishna Berura* (167:43) ruled that if he spoke before tasting the bread, his blessing is invalidated for the entire group. The *Petah Hadevir* (167:5) discussed this issue at length, but did not come to a definite conclusion.

The *Ben Ish Hai* (*parashat Emor* halakha 16) ruled that if the person who recited *hamotzi* spoke before eating, he must repeat the blessing but the others do not. This is likewise the ruling of the *Sede Hemed* and Maran the Rishon Letziyon (responsa *Yabia Omer* Vol. VIII, footnote to #24; *Halikhot Olam* Vol. I, page 348), based on the principle of *safek berakhot lehakel*. See the *Yalkut Yosef Berakhot English Edition* Vol. I, 167:26.

ובציור הפוך, שהמברך לא הפסיק בין התפילות, אבל השומע הפסיק, ודאי שהשומע צריך לחזור ולברך על תפילין של ראש. ואפילו אם הפסקו של השומע בין התפילות היה בעוד שהמברך כבר הספיק להניח תפילין של ראש, יש על השומע לחזור ולברך על התפילין של ראש. [ראה הלכה ברורה עמ' מח-מט]

נא. אין להפסיק בהנחת התפילין אפילו אם מניחים תפילין בלא ברכה, כגון בציור: שחלץ התפילין על דעת להניח אחר כך שאין מברך עליהם (כמבואר לקמן הלכה ס') או הנוהגים להניח תפילין בחול המועד, או המניחים תפילין דרבינו תם. בכל אלו אין להפסיק בין הנחת התפילין של יד להנחת התפילין של ראש. והטעם, משום שלכתחילה צריך שיהיו סמוכין ותכופין זה לזה, דכתיב והיה לך לאות על ידך ולזכרון בין עיניך, שיהא הוייה אחת לשתיהן. [ראה משנ"ב ס"ק כח]

Now, if Ezra had not spoken but Albert did, Albert needs to recite an additional blessing before putting on his *tefillin shel rosh*. Although Ezra, who is the person who actually recited the first blessing, did not make any interruption, Albert must rectify his own error by reciting a second blessing. This is the halakha even if Ezra completed putting on his *tefillin shel rosh* before Albert spoke.[73]

When putting on tefillin without blessings

51) Even when someone puts on tefillin without reciting any blessings, it is still forbidden to interrupt between the *tefillin shel yad* and the *tefillin shel rosh*. For example, if someone took off his tefillin for some reason, intending to put them back on shortly afterward, he does not repeat the blessing when putting them back on. Even so, he must not interrupt while putting them on. The same applies when putting on tefillin "of Rabbenu Tam." The reason for this is that the Torah states "וְהָיָה לְךָ לְאוֹת עַל יָדֶךָ וּלְזִכָּרוֹן בֵּין עֵינֶיךָ – It shall be for you a sign on your arm and a reminder between your eyes." This wording suggests that the act of putting on a set of tefillin should be performed as one continuous act.

---

73. In the *Yosef Berakhot English Edition* Vol. I, 167:25, it is explained that according to the *Roke'ah*, if one person recited the blessing of *hamotzi* on behalf of a group and ate bread without interruption, then even if someone in the group speaks before tasting the bread he will not have to repeat the blessing. Maran in the *Bet Yosef* disagreed, claiming that the fact that the person who recited the blessing did not interrupt will not help those who did interrupt by speaking. The responsa *Rav Pe'alim* and Maran the Rishon Letziyon (in *Halikhot Olam*) ruled according to the *Roke'ah's* opinion, based on the principle of *safek berakhot lehakel*.

It follows, therefore, that if Albert spoke, he should still be able to rely on Ezra, who put on his *tefillin shel rosh* without interruption. The *Halakha Berura* (page 49), however, ruled that the two cases are not identical, and in this case Albert will need to recite an additional blessing. There is a strong argument in favor of the *Halakha Berura's* ruling. In this case, there are two arguments to say that Albert must recite an additional blessing. First of all, the halakha might follow the Rama's ruling that one must always recite a second blessing to put on *tefillin shel rosh*. Second, perhaps the halakha regarding the blessing of *hamotzi* is that the person who spoke must repeat the blessing, following Maran's ruling. Since Maran ruled that an additional blessing is necessary, this double argument should be sufficient to rule stringently in this case. See the footnote to HaKeter's edition of *Yafe Lalev* (*Siman* 158, footnote 21).

נב. לדידן בני הספרדים שאין אנו מברכים על תפלין של ראש ברכה בפני עצמה, אם טעה ובא לברך על תפלה של ראש, ונזכר אחר שהתחיל לומר ברוך אתה ה', לא יסיים "למדני חוקיך" כדי שנראה כקורא פסוק, שאם יעשה כן יהיה הפסק בדיבור בין תפלה של יד לתפלה של ראש, אלא יש לו לסיים הברכה לברך "על מצות תפילין" כהסוברים שמברכין על תפלה של ראש בפני עצמה. [באו"ח פי' וירא ה"ז, כה"ח ס"ק נו]

Began a second blessing

52) Since Sefardic Jews do not normally recite a separate blessing when putting on the *tefillin shel rosh*, if someone forgot and began to recite such a blessing, saying בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה ה', he should not change those words into a verse by concluding with the words לַמְּדֵנִי חֻקֶּיךָ. If he would do so, he would then be guilty of interrupting between his *tefillin shel yad* and *tefillin shel rosh*, and he would be obligated to recite the blessing of *al mitzvat tefillin* anyway. Therefore, he should simply continue, completing the blessing of *al mitzvat tefillin* and putting on his *tefillin shel rosh*, which is the correct procedure for putting on tefillin according to many *Poskim*.[74]

74. The *Ben Ish Hai* explained that reciting the verse of *Lamedeni Hukekha* is not at all connected to the mitzvah of tefillin and therefore it is considered an interruption. By simply continuing and completing the blessing, the person at least fulfills the mitzvah correctly according to some *Poskim*. Normally, a Sefardic Jew who recites a second blessing when putting on his *tefillin shel rosh* is considered to be guilty of reciting a blessing in vain. In this case, however, he has no choice but to recite the blessing of *al mitzvat tefillin* one way or the other. Therefore, the best choice is to recite the blessing straightaway.

The same issue arises for a Sefardic cantor who began to recite the blessing of *shehe<u>h</u>eyanu* for the mitzvah of blowing the shofar on the second day of Rosh Hashanah, realizing his error after reciting the words בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה ה'. This was discussed in *Yalkut Yosef Yamim Nora'im English Edition* (footnote to *Siman* 585:6) and the conclusion of that discussion is similar to that of this halakha – the cantor should simply complete the blessing and rely on the Ashkenazic *Poskim*.

The *Ben Ish Hai* stated that "if he would say *lamedeni hukekha* it would constitute an interruption. This implies that if the person would have said only *barukh* or *barukh Atta*, it would not constitute an interruption. This is difficult to understand, for as explained above, even one word constitutes an interruption. [Most likely, the *Ben Ish Hai* meant that even if he would complete the verse, it would not help the situation since it would still be an interruption.]

Alternatively, it is possible to reconcile this according to a concept cited the *Yalkut Yosef Yamim Nora'im English Edition* (footnote to *Siman* 582:48): Harav Shelomo Zalman Auerbach is cited asserting that simply speaking words is not an interruption unless those words demonstrate that the speaker's mind has wandered off the subject. In this case, since the person recited the words *barukh Atta* intending to begin a blessing for the mitzvah of tefillin, he has not taken his mind off the subject and it would not be considered an interruption.

We can compare this to someone who recited the blessing of *hamotzi* and then said, "Bring me some salt," before biting his bread, and then the others retorted, "There is salt right in front of you on the table. Although his interruption was totally unnecessary and unwarranted, it does not constitute an interruption since he thought it was necessary. In this case as well, since this person thought that he needed a second blessing for putting on his tefillin, the words *barukh Atta* that he uttered are not considered an interruption. Once he adds the words *lamedeni hukekha*, however, his purpose is to avoid being guilty of reciting a blessing in vain, which is a different subject altogether. That is considered a bona fide interruption.