

HALOCHOSCOPE

such cases the amount for *kvius* is an egg, according to all opinions. The laws of *kiddush* and *sukah* overlap. Plans to spend an extended time in the *sukah* doing other things could help *kvius*. The *brocha* on the performance of the *mitzvah* is said on the main activity. Practically, eating a minimal amount before spending time is *kovaia*. He must still eat the *kvius* for regular bread. A snack at a particular time of day, such as coffee and cake after *shacharis*, then time spent studying before full breakfast, is considered *kvius* by some.

In practice, we follow the view that the *brocha* may only be recited on 'mezonos'. There is no clear ruling on the *shiur*. If one eats it as a party, such as the invited friends in the case of our question, he may say *laishaiv basukah* on a little more than an egg-volume. [See refs for other sections]

E) Havdalah on Sukos

Tefilah does not require *sukah*. It is done in *shul*, rather than in the home. Likewise, *havdalah* does not require a home. Those who usually fulfill it in *shul* may do so on *Sukos* as well. The one reciting it drinks it outside the *sukah*. Since it does not require *sukah*, one could not recite *laishiv basukah* on it in a *sukah*. Some maintain that one may recite *laishaiv basukah*. One idea to support this is that *Shabbos* is *kovaia* for tithes, and *havdalah* is part of *Shabbos*. Another source maintains that the view that requires the *brocha* on all activities is invoked in combination with the view that wine requires *sukah*.

In practice two prevailing *minhagim* are cited: (i) to recite *havdalah* in the *sukah*, rather than the house, but to recite no *brocha*. (ii) to require a *brocha*. There is further discussion on when the *brocha* is recited. Some recite it after the other *brochos*. Others maintain that it would be considered an interruption. It is not a meal that requires this *brocha*, but part of the general *yeshivas sukah*. Therefore, it should not be recited between the *brocha* and the wine. Some say that to satisfy all opinions, one should eat *melaveh malka* immediately following *havdalah*. Some suggest eating some *mezonos*. In regard to the *brocha*, these opinions consider the fact that one plans to do the eating later sufficient to say a *brocha* at the beginning. The order is still an issue. Perhaps we may add, one would normally eat the *mezonos* right away. Only because one may not eat before *havdalah*, do we say *havdalah* first. In this sense, the *havdalah* is needed for the eating *kvius*. [See OC 639:4 TZ 14 MB etc. Luach Bais hakness, Ezras Torah. Luach ertz Yisroel. Minchas Shlomo II:58:38. Shmiras Shabbos Kehilchasa 48:n45 58:n103. Rivevos Efraim I:428. Ain Chaim p. 55. Shevet Halevi VI:42:2. Kol Hatorah 33 p. 35.]

In conclusion, *havdalah* may be recited in *shul*. The whole cup should be drunk. The *minhag* in these countries is not to recite *laishaiv basukah* when drinking *havdalah* wine. If one eats there immediately afterwards, there are three views: recite it first; recite it on the food; recite it after *havdalah* before drinking the wine. If one has a party of invited guests to drink wine and then eat *mezonos*, it would seem that one may recite *laishaiv basukah* on the *havdalah* before drinking the wine, and exempt the others with it.

Sponsored by Manny and Elisheva Schreiber in memory of his father, Yonah ben Moshe, Kurt

C. Screiber, a"h, whose *yahrzeit* is on the 26th of Tishrei א

© Rabbi Shimon Silver, September 2013.

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

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 the opportunity for the brocha?

The issues:

In last issue:

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

In this issue:

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

D) Wine

Wine is the subject of debate. It is not usually drunk just to satisfy thirst. Often wine is part of a meal, as a supplementary item. It is also drunk separately, in a meal-like manner, such as seated or reclining while devoting an extended period of time to it. It is also eaten with a group, which is the true meaning of the word 'party'. In *Tanach*, the term is *mishte yayin*. Accordingly, some maintain that it requires a *sukah*, and that one may recite *laishaiv basukah* when drinking it. Actually, in this view the *brocha* is requisite. Others disagree, maintaining that it is not a meal, and can truly be treated as a snack. Alternatively, any drinking is not the type of activity that requires a *sukah*.

The poskim rule that one should not drink wine outside the *sukah*. It should be drunk during a meal, or with something that definitely requires the *brocha laishaiv basukah*. In the earlier generations, they argued their positions and ruled accordingly. Thus, one followed his ruling or that of the *rav* of his community. Later generations could choose one view, the other view, the prevailing *minhag* or consensus, or conditions might have changed. When the debate is inconclusive, one could try to satisfy all the opinions, or leave the question open. All of these are possible with regard to wine.

This raises a few issues. How much wine requires a *sukah*? This will be discussed in the next section. For the purposes of our question, it might be possible to make *havdalah* in *shul* without requiring a *sukah*. If one does not drink enough, it does not require the *brocha laishaiv*, even according to the stringent view. Since it is an open question, other considerations could be added to allow exceptions, including *havdalah* in *shul*.

What about drinking together with other foods? Is wine the 'main' course? Assuming

that the other foods require the *brocha*, what if one drinks the wine first? Is this the beginning of the eating? Could this be combined with the possibility that we follow the stringent view? Would it be recited after *hagafen*, as we raised with regard to *hamotzie*? Is it considered a necessary part of the meal? Or would it be considered an interruption? Could one recite it before *hagafen*, since some poskim maintain that it should always be recited then? Could one combine the view that it is recited any time one goes into the *sukah*, if one intends to eventually eat a meal? In light of the existence of so many different views, many of which are not decided, followed, or rejected outright, all of these considerations are taken into account, as we shall see. [See refs to sections B & C.]

D) *Being kovaia*

As mentioned, the Talmud says that one may eat *achilas arai*, snacks, outside the *sukah*. Formal eating is called *achilas kva*. In general terms, formalizing eating is called being *kovaia seuda*. This involves making the eating into an official meal, with a setting and a time devoted to it. When using bread, a meal is automatically considered fixed for the individual. To be considered a group meal, such as for a *mezuman*, quorum of three, the group must be *kovaia*. They formally convene as a group for the purpose of the meal.

Achilas kva for *sukah* is not the same as *seudas kva*. In terms of minimums, for an olive-sized piece of bread, one must recite *bircas hamazon* at the end, at least Rabbinically. If one is satiated, this is also enough to require *bircas hamazon* Scripturally. For *sukah*, we have mentioned that a little more than an egg-sized amount is required for *achilas kva*. An egg-sized piece is still considered *arai*. This is a little over the size of two olives. [In practical terms, these volumes are debated by contemporary poskim.]

For '*mezonos*' foods, the poskim debate the amount of *kvius* for *sukah*. As a bread substitute, they must form the staple for a meal or be eaten in an amount considered a normal complete meal. As a staple, this would be the amount as the bread of that same meal. Many people eat a small portion of bread and supplement the meal with side dishes and supplementary dishes. It must also be eaten with intent to substitute it for bread. In such instances it becomes 'bread' and requires *bircas hamazon*. When eaten as a meal in its own right, it must be eaten in the amount a normal person would consider his whole meal of bread. The Talmud uses the measure of a half standard loaf. The poskim consider this to be the volume of four eggs. [A minority view considers it three egg volumes.]

For *achilas kva* of *sukah*, some maintain that the *shiur* for *mezonos* is the same as for *kvius seuda*, four eggs volume. One could not recite *laishaiv basukah* unless he eats that amount of *mezonos* food. If it is baked, he would need to wash and recite *bircas hamazon*! Others maintain that it is the same as for bread itself, for even bread requires a different *shiur* for *sukah* than for a meal. Thus, according to these poskim, slightly more than one egg volume is sufficient to recite *laishaiv basukah*. In regard to our discussion, these opinions would be taken into consideration if one wishes to add some *mezonos* food to make the requirement for *laishaiv basukah* more relevant. One might be able to combine some views to require *laishiav* when drinking some wine and some cake.

According to the stringent view on fruit, how much is *achilas kva*? The passage in the Talmud on fruit cites a few different sources recording instances of eating inside or outside a *sukah*. In the first source, three instances are cited. One sage refused to taste

food outside the *sukah*, another refused to eat two dates outside the *sukah*, and both asked that water be taken into the *sukah*. The third sage ate less than the volume of an egg outside the *sukah*. The clear implication is that all three are cases of exemptions from the obligation of *yeshivas sukah*. Some practiced personal stringency.

The Talmud goes on to discuss the volume of a date. This is the minimum one can be held liable for eating on *Yom Kippur*. Is it more or less than an egg volume? Three answers are proposed. (i) The volume of two dates without their pits can be less than an egg. This implies that the reason the sage was really exempt, though he practiced personal stringency, is due to the *shiur*. Thus, fruit must be included in the requirement for *sukah*. Its *shiur* is just over an egg volume. It is possible that even this volume might not be considered a worthwhile stringency had it not also been eaten in a manner of *kvius*. This issue will be discussed shortly. (ii) The dates could easily add up to the volume of an egg (or more). However, fruit is always exempt from *sukah*. In this view the stringency was due to the food. It is still considered a worthwhile *chumra* if eaten with *kvius*.

At this juncture the Talmud cites a second source. A group of scholars were offered grapes during their studies. They ate them outside a *sukah* in an *arai* manner. This could refer to the *shiur* or the manner. Had they eaten in a qualified *kva* manner, they would have presumably been required to take them into a *sukah*. The view that exempts fruit from *sukah* could say that the point is that fruit is always considered *arai* by comparison to bread, regardless of the *shiur* and manner of eating. Or they ate them with bread, but without *kvius*. Had there been *kvius*, *sukah* would have been required due to the bread.

(iii) The fruit would indeed require a *sukah* had it been eaten in the requisite volume. However, other sources show that two dates can be less than an egg volume.

Ruling on this passage depends on various issues, including: how one views the conclusion on the size of a 'normal' date without its pit; how one determines the volume of *kvius* for fruit; the manner of eating for fruit; the number of opinions on each side; the assumptions, questions and defenses; which opinion is most authoritative. Accordingly, some prominent poskim rule that fruit requires a *sukah*. One of the lenient poskim rules that the stringent view should be taken into account. The third view, followed by most communities, exempts fruit. This third posek is bothered by the opinion of the second that one should always eat fruit in the *sukah*. Where do we see this in the Talmudic statements? Some say that the implication is that the sage ate all of his fruit in the *sukah*, regardless of volume. Others say that he meant that even when the amount eaten could be *achilas kva*, one may eat it informally, but he acted stringently. An interesting example is cited from the same source. A sage refused to taste something being cooked outside the *sukah*. This is not *kvius* in any way. It was practiced as personal stringency. We may assume that the other instance of the two dates was done in a similar manner. Even had it been an egg size, it was eaten informally. Yet the Talmud would imply that this volume would require a *sukah*. Thus, the stringent view would treat fruit like bread.

Other examples of virtual *kvius* include a gathering to drink wine. For the purposes of tithing, produce must be fully processed. However, *achilas kva* is forbidden even before the crop has been processed. *Kva* can be accomplished for this by eating on *Shabbos*. The poskim consider *kiddush birkom seuda* with a small amount of *mezonos*. In