

HALOCHOSCOPE

This week's question:

During *Sukos*, should *havdalah* be recited in *shul*? If so, should the person reciting it drink the entire cup of wine?

If *havdalah* is recited in the *sukah*, should one also say the *brocha laishaiv basukah*? If so, when should it be recited? What if one also eats some cookies after *havdalah*? May one invite others for *havdalah* and cookies to give them an opportunity for the *brocha*?

The issues:

In this issue:

- A) *Hvadalah* in *shul*
- B) What requires the *brocha laishaiv basukah*
- C) Which foods require a *sukah*

In next issue:

- D) Wine
- E) Being *kovaia*, fixing a meal or a *shiur*, minimum amount
- F) *Havdalah* on *Sukos*

A) *Havdalah* in *shul*

There is a major difference between *kiddush* in *shul* on *Shabbos* evening, debated by the Talmud, and *havdalah* at the end of *Shabbos*. *Kiddush* requires *mekom seuda*, it must be recited where one eats. Thus, in *shul*, where nobody eats a *seuda*, there should be no reason to recite *kiddush*. Originally, visitors and the poor, who had no home to eat, ate in *shul*. Nowadays, this *kiddush* is still recited in many *shuls*. Since it was originally instituted, it is considered a part of the service. We still need to recite it again at home. Since no-one is fulfilling his obligation with this *kiddush*, the wine need not be drunk by the adult reciting it. In order to make the *brocha* legitimate, the wine must be drunk by somebody. Otherwise, the *brocha* on the wine is in vain. Ideally, a child may drink it. He need not drink the entire amount. Even on a small amount of food or drink, a *brocha rishona* is recited. If there is no child, the adult drinks the entire amount. The adult may not eat or drink before *kiddush*. He could say he relies on this *kiddush*, and drink some wine. However, he does not have a *mekom seuda*. By drinking the full cup, he may consider the wine itself a *mekom seuda*. Some say that the cup must contain a *revi'is* and a half. This '*kvius seuda* for wine' actually a controversial issue, which will be discussed later. However, for the purposes of this *kiddush*, it is relied on.

Havdalah need not be *bimkom seuda*. Therefore, it may be recited anywhere, and any listener can discharge his obligation with it. Therefore, the wine must be drunk by the adult reciting *havdalah*. *Havdalah* is recited in *shul* for the convenience of those who do not have wine to recite it at home. The amount of wine that must be drunk is most of the cup. Sometimes, the cup holds exactly a *revi'is*, the minimum required amount for

kiddush and *havdalah*. When drinking most of this, or just over half, one fulfills the *mitzvah*. However, this poses a problem with the *brocha acharonah*. The poskim debate the amount needed for a *brocha acharonah* on a fluid. Some say it is the same as on a solid, a *kezayis*, olive volume. Others require a *revi'is* for fluids. A *revi'is* equals three *kezaysim*. Thus, one who drinks just over half a *revi'is* is caught between the two opinions. Does he recite the *brocha acharonah* or not? To satisfy both, he would drink the full cup.

Our question is, does this raise the issue of eating outside a *sukah*? The maximum one may eat outside a *sukah* is slightly more than an egg-volume. This is equal to two *kezaysim* plus. If the person reciting *havdalah* would drink just over half of the cup, and it was an exact *revi'is*, he would avoid drinking outside the *sukah*. The amount drunk would still be less than an egg-volume. If he must drink the full cup, he would raise this issue. He could not drink some in *shul*, and leave to drink the rest in a *sukah*. For non-breads one may not split his eating place. [See Psachim 100b-101a Sukah 26b, Poskim. Tur Sh Ar OC 210:1 269 295 296:7, commentaries. Ar Hash. Halochoscope XIII:6.]

B) *Laishaiv basukah*

This is a *brocha* on the *mitzvah* of *yeshivas sukah*, literally, dwelling in the *sukah*. A *brocha* on a *mitzvah* is usually recited before the performance of the *mitzvah*. Thus, once we define the *mitzvah* of dwelling in the *sukah*, the *brocha* should be recited immediately before the activity. It would need to be some kind of active *mitzvah*, rather than a passive one. The poskim debate the exact definition of the *mitzvah*, based on interpreting the Talmud's definition. The Talmud defines the *mitzvah* as “*taishvu ke'ain taduru*” - live there the way you live permanently in your home. This entails taking one's best furnishings into the *sukah*. In terms of activities, it involves eating, sleeping, spending leisure time and studying Torah there.

This leads to a debate on the nature of the *mitzvah* act. In one view, it is the act of sitting down to do one of these activities. This is the literal translation of *taishvu*, you shall sit. The addition of *ke'ain taduru* tells us what we should be sitting down to do. According to this view, the *brocha* should be recited before sitting down to do anything in the *sukah*. For example, on *Yomtov* night, one must recite the *brocha* before beginning anything. First he recites *kiddush*, then *laishaiv basukah*, then he sits down. On other days, he would stand and say the *brocha* before sitting down to eat.

The other view contends that if the entire *mitzvah* is to be viewed this way, it is better to recite the *brocha* before entering the *sukah*. *Taishvu* can also mean to stay there and not to move on, a passive state. Anyone spending an extended time in the *sukah* fulfills this. If he sits down to eat, he has not yet fulfilled the main part, the time spending. Therefore, before spending the time, i.e., after sitting down, he can still recite the *brocha*.

There is further debate on how this is fulfilled at mealtimes. Some say it should be recited before *hamotzie*. It should not interrupt between *hamotzie* and eating the bread. Others maintain that, in light of the opinion cited here later that the *brocha* is always recited at a meal, one should show that he means to relate the two. Accordingly, reciting it after *hamotzie* is not an interruption. It is necessary for the meal. Even speaking at this juncture would not be considered an interruption if it was necessary for the meal.

The Talmud records a debate on how often the *brocha* should be said. In one view, it

is said at the beginning of *Sukos*. This view apparently considers *yeshivas sukah* to be one protracted *mitzvah*. It begins on the first day and continues for seven days. The other view considers it a new *mitzvah* each day. A fresh *brocha* is recited every day. If one interrupts his performance of the *mitzvah*, such as by leaving his *sukah* for a while, he recites it again when he returns. This concept of *hesech daas*, taking one's mind off the *mitzvah*, is based on *tefilin*. Talmudic sages wore *tefilin* all day. Sometimes, they had to remove them for a while, during which they could not perform the *mitzvah*. They would recite a new *brocha* when they put them back on.

Theoretically, one should be able to recite the *brocha* on any of the activities we listed as part of the general *mitzvah* of *yeshivas sukah*. The early poskim maintain that one should indeed do so. An opinion is cited requiring a *brocha* on each individual activity, even if the performer stayed in his *sukah* all the time, from his very first *brocha*. The prevailing *minhag* is to recite it only when eating. This is strange, since sleeping is considered in some ways more stringent than eating. While snacking outside the *sukah* is permitted, napping is not. One resolution is that one could not recite it on sleeping in case he does not sleep. This is also difficult to understand, since even spending time there is considered a fulfillment of *yeshivas sukah*. Presumably, the concern is that he will leave before he can spend sufficient time for this.

The better known answer is that eating is considered the main activity. Sleeping, spending leisure time, Torah study and the like are all considered secondary. Thus, *brocha* is recited on the primary activity and exempts the need for a *brocha* on the secondary item. This concept comes from the laws of *birchos hanehenin*, *brochos* on food. If one has a dish with two foods of different *brocha* types, he recites the *brocha* on the primary food. The secondary food is considered encompassed by the main food.

People consider eating a meal the main type of activity of *taduru*, living permanently in a house. This is the type of activity one would go into his home to do, and while there do the other kinds of activity. Apparently, one would not specially enter his home to do one of the other activities listed, if he plans to enter to eat later on anyhow. The poskim even cite a *minhag* to recite it many times a day, even if he did not leave the *sukah* between meals. Others reject this view. They maintain that as long as one has not stepped out of his *sukah*, he need not repeat the *brocha*. [See *Sukah* 28b 35b-36a, *Poskim*. *Tur Sh Ar OC* 639:1 2 8 643:1-3, commentaries.]

C) Which foods require sukah?

As mentioned, eating is one activity that must be done in a *sukah*. Regarding *brocha*, it is the main activity. However, not all eating is included in this central activity. The Talmud says that one need not eat *achilas arai*, snacks, in the *sukah*. The Talmud presumes and defines this as the same type of food that would otherwise form the basis of a formal meal, but much less of it. The Talmud then debates the amount, concluding that it is up to the volume of an egg. At this point, the reference is to bread. Yet, says the Talmud, one who eats even less than this and even drinks his water in the *sukah*, is commended. We learn from this that drinking water does not require a *sukah*.

The Talmud discusses the basic obligation to eat in the *sukah*. All agree on the obligation to eat there on the first night. On all other nights (and days) it is optional. If one

would wish to eat foods that do not require *sukah*, he could. Here, too, we learn that not all foods require *sukah*. There is a view that if one could not eat a piece of bread on the first night he may make up for it on a subsequent day. The problem is that if he eats a bread meal on a subsequent day, though not obliged, he could be eating that day's meal. He opted to use bread. Nothing makes it obvious that it is making up for the original *mitzvah*. Therefore, he must eat more than the usual. Some commentaries suggest that the ideal would be to eat a second bread meal, similar to the third meal eaten on *Shabbos*.

The Talmud says that this requirement may be satisfied with *minei targima*. Often this means a dessert type of food, brought in as a sweet treat at the end of the meal. It is not just a snack, which is exempt from *sukah*. The question is, what exactly is it? One commentary includes anything from fruit to cakes. Other maintain that it cannot refer to fruit. The Talmud, in a different passage, records a debate on whether fruit is included in the requirement for *sukah*. Evidently, the aforementioned view rules strictly, or at least, wishes to include the strict view in this reasoning. In our situation, the stringency requiring *sukah* turns into a leniency to discharge the obligation. The others maintain that fruit is exempt. Since they rule leniently there, one could not fulfill his obligation with fruit to make up for his missed fulfillment on the first night. Accordingly, they maintain that *minei targima* must mean fish and eggs, or anything one would use as a supplementary dish to bread in a meal. A third view maintains that it seems to mean foods made of the five bread grains, but are not bread. This would include baked foods such as cakes and cookies or pies, and cooked dishes such as oatmeal or pudding, or in modern terms, pasta. This was known to the early authorities as vermicelli or *vermeizels*.

In keeping with our earlier discussion, one could only recite the *brocha laishaiv basukah* on foods that definitely require a *sukah*. One should not take the stricter opinions lightly. Nonetheless, the consensus is to rule with the lenient views, at least with regard to fruit. One may practice personal stringency to refrain from eating fruit outside the *sukah*. However, he may not recite the *brocha laishaiv basukah*.

The second view poses more of a problem. It appears that the consensus is to rule leniently here, too. Only '*mezonos*' foods or real bread require a *sukah*. Nonetheless, initial objections to this view are made in speculative form. This opinion is not rejected outright. Therefore, meat and the like should require a *sukah*, and when they are eaten, one should be able to recite *laishaiv*. The reason it is not said on these foods could be due to their not being used as a main dish of a meal. We mentioned the prevailing practice to only recite *laishaiv* on eating because this is the main activity one goes into the home/*sukah* to do. This main activity is usually a bread meal, with the added supplementary dishes. One could not rightfully recite the *brocha* on a supplementary dish if he plans to eat bread. Therefore, one does not recite it at all on a dish whose main purpose is as a supplement to bread. '*Mezonos*' is not eaten as a supplement to bread. In fact, it can sometimes be eaten in place of bread, with other foods supplementing it [see section E]. Thus, one could recite *laishaiv basukah* on cakes, but not on meat. [See Sukah 26a-27a Yuma 79a-b, Poskim. Tur, Sh Ar OC 639:2-3, commentaries.] *to be continued ...*

© Rabbi Shimon Silver, September 2013.

Subscriptions and Sponsorships available. (412) 421-0508. halochoscope@hotmail.com