

# HALOCHOSCOPE TOI

After reciting *Havdalah*, one must drink the wine. If the person reciting it did not drink more than one sip, have the listeners fulfilled their obligation?

The issues:

(A) *Havdalah* on wine

(B) The *Shiur*, amount, necessary for *Havdalah*; how much of it must be drunk?

(A) *Kiddush* and *Havdalah* on wine

The Torah instructs us to remember the Shabbos day to sanctify it. The word remember can also mean “mention,” i.e., to mention Shabbos to make it holier for us than each other day of the week. Thus, we use words to formally sanctify Shabbos as it begins, distinguishing it from the preceding days. *Kiddush* means sanctification. To highlight the holiness, we also distinguish it from the following days, by reciting *Havdalah*, “distinction,” at the end of Shabbos. The Rabbis instituted an additional Mitzvah to recite *Kidusha Raba*, Kiddush on Shabbos by day.

Some Talmudic references imply a Scriptural obligation for Kiddush. There is a reference in the *Mechilta* to both Kiddush and Havdalah being Scriptural. The Talmud says that the *Scriptural* obligation applies equally to men and women. Yet, the Talmud asks, can a self-imposed ban apply to wine drunk for Mitzvah purposes?: “Are people obliged to recite Kiddush and Havdalah from the time of the giving of the Torah?”, implying that the obligation is Rabbinical.

One answer to this is that the Mitzvah to verbalize Kiddush and Havdalah is Scriptural. The Mitzvah to do it with wine is Rabbinical. Deriving the Mitzvah to remember it with wine, is considered *Asmachta*, a Scriptural link to a Rabbinical Mitzvah. [Indeed, many commentators maintain that “mentioning” Shabbos, to make it holy is fulfilled first during the Tefila at Maariv. Later reciting it on a cup of wine is a Rabbinical obligation.] Or, the Scriptural Mitzvah does apply to reciting Kiddush over a cup of wine. However, the obligation to drink the wine is Rabbinical. A third view is that the Talmudic reference is not to be taken rhetorically, but literally, meaning that there is a Scriptural obligation for both Kiddush and Havdalah. The Talmud says that initially the Rabbis instituted Havdalah to be recited during *Shemone Esrei* at *Maariv* on *Motzoei Shabbos*, then added the obligation to recite it on wine. Accordingly, the commentaries say that in the view that gives this

answer the entire Mitzvah of Havdalah is Rabbinical.

As with many Mitzvos, one can fulfill the Mitzvah to recite the words through listening to another person, known as *Shomeia Ke'oneh*, listening is like saying. The listener need not drink the wine, and in the case of Havdalah, it is preferred that no-one else but the person reciting it drinks it. Having instituted the Mitzvah to drink wine, a *Brocha* is required. This is both a *Birchas Hamitzvah*, Brocha recited for a Mitzvah, and a *Birchas Hanehenin*, Brocha recited before benefitting from food. [See Mechilta Yisro 20:8, Brochos 20b 33a 51b-53b Pesachim 106a 117b Nazir 4a Shvuos 18b 20b (Tosafos), Poskim. Rambam Shabbos 29:1 Chinuch 31 (Minchas Chinuch), Tur Shulchan Aruch Orach Chaim 271 294-298, commentaries.]

### ***(B) The Shiur of the Kos; How much to drink?***

The size of the *Kos*, cup holding the wine for Havdalah is meant to be a *Revi'is*, literally, a quarter of a *Log* measure. This is the amount needed for certain Scriptural Mitzvos, as determined by the Talmud. The same amount is applied to the Mitzvos of Kiddush and Havdalah, and to any Mitzvah requiring a *Kos*. Let us assume that a *Log* is a pint. A *Revi'is* would be four ounces, or half a cup.

To arrive at a true equivalent, the Talmud compares this volume measure to linear measures. The volume of a *Mikvah*, ritual bath for spiritual purification, is meant to be forty *Seah*. A *Seah* equals six *Kav*. A *Kav* contains four *Log*. Thus a *Seah* contains ninety-six *Revi'iyos*. The linear measurements for a *Mikvah* are one *Amah* (the average span from the tip of the middle finger to the point of the elbow) length, by one *Amah* width, by three *Amos* high. In linear measurements *Revi'is* is given as a fraction of *Mikvah* measurements as two by two finger widths by two and a half plus a fifth fingers high. [In our language 2 x 2 x 2.7 fingers.] Depending on the contexts, the Talmud gives varying lengths for an *Amah* for different applications. Basically, it can range from five *Tefachim* (fist-widths) to six *Tefachim*. Each *Tefach* is assumed to be four finger widths, and the thumb knuckle is used as the width of the finger. Then, an additional half thumb width is sometimes added. To complicate matters, the Talmud gives specific measurements for the *Revi'is* in comparable solid measurements of volume, the equivalent of one and a half eggs, or three olives equal a *Revi'is*.

In addition, after all is basically resolved, the Poskim hotly debate the true amounts of both of these, according to our modern measurements. In the United States many follow the opinion of one leading authority whose measurements were between 2.9 fl. oz. and 4.3 fl. oz. Thus, for scriptural obligations the larger measurement is used and for Rabbinical obligations, the smaller. Many others prefer to

use the same *Kos* for both and therefore use the larger measurement for both. Some try to satisfy a more stringent view requiring 5.6 fl. oz. or round it up to 6 fl. oz.

The amount required to be drunk will presumably be the same as the amount to be drunk for Kiddush. The Talmud debates this amount. One opinion says that one need only taste the wine. The other opinion, which the Talmud rules is the conclusive one, gives this amount as *Melo Lugmav*, enough to fill his cheeks. The actual terminology of the Talmud is also not clear. In one version it is *Melo Lugma*, a cheekful, in others, *Melo Lugmav*, in the plural, i.e., cheeksful. Furthermore, the implication is that there must be enough to fill the whole mouth and cheeks. In fact, the Talmud, in another context, implies that *Melo Lugmav* is more than a *Revi'is*. However, in our context the implication is that *Melo Lugmav* is less than a *Revi'is*. The Poskim resolve this by saying one must try to push all the wine into one cheek. This would imply that one with an exceptionally large mouth might be required to drink more than a *Revi'is*, even though the cup need be no larger than a *Revi'is*. Some Poskim maintain that a larger mouthed person must indeed use a larger amount for Kiddush. Others maintain that *Melo Lugmav* is less than a *Revi'is*, and that if one does have such large cheeks he need drink no more than a *Revi'is*.

Regarding the four cups drunk on Pesach night, the Talmud says that one need not drink the entire cup as long as he drinks the *Rov Kos*, the majority of the cup of wine. This implies that one must ideally drink the whole cup, but the majority is considered good enough. Thus, if the cup happens to hold more than a *Revi'is*, one would be required to drink more. Some Poskim conclude from this that for all Mitzvos one must drink the majority of the cup. Furthermore, they conclude that a normal *Kos* means a *Revi'is*, and *Rov Kos* is *Rov Revi'is*, i.e., just over half a *Revi'is*, which must be the same as *Melo Lugmav*. Thus, all of the passages in the Talmud refer to the same amount. Others maintain that one need never drink more than a *Revi'is* or *Melo Lugmav*, whichever is the smaller amount. *Rov Kos* is a unique requirement for the four cups of wine on Pesach.

The basis for these debates could shed light on our own situation. the question seems to be, what is the reason for the wine, or rather, for the drinking. We have already mentioned the view that even if the requirement for wine is Scriptural, the Mitzvah to drink it is Rabbinical. One reason offered for this is that it is disrespectful for the cup of wine, which had a *Brocha* recited on it, not to be benefitted from immediately. An additional reason is that it will look as though the *Brocha* on the wine itself was unnecessary. For this reason, according to many Poskim it is not necessary for the person who recited it to drink it himself, provided one of the

listeners drinks it. Even a minor, who is not obligated in the Mitzvah, may be designated to drink it.

As for the debate on the amount, those who require a constant Melo Lugmav maintain that the object is to drink an amount sufficient to placate a thirsty person. This need not be enough to make him full, but to put his mind at ease about his thirst. This is Melo Lugmav, which is Rov Revi's for the normal person. For the four cups on Pesach there is an additional level, to ideally drink the entire Revi's, if possible. For a bigger person, a relatively larger "Melo Lugmav" is needed to put his mind at ease. The other view maintains that one must drink a respectable amount. This is Melo Lugmav for an average man, and no more than a Revi's even for a large person. For Pesach the requirement is to drink most of the cup. If this adds up to less than one's Melo Lugmav, he must drink Melo Lugmav, but no more than a Revi's. According to both, there is a specific reason that he must drink the Melo Lugmav, and not a mere sip.

The Talmud says that one who does not drink Melo Lugmav does not fulfil his obligation. However, some Poskim explain that this means that he has not fulfilled it in the correct way. Thus, if he drank a small amount, then the rest was spilled, he need not recite Kiddush again. As for the listeners, even if the reciter's *Brocha* is invalidated for himself, the Poskim debate whether those who listen fulfil their obligation anyhow. For Havdalah, the ruling seems yet more lenient. If one made a mistake and did not drink Melo Lugmav he should not repeat Havdalah. First, some say Havdalah is totally Rabbinical. Those who maintain that it is scripturally required agree that it may be recited during Tefilah. Reciting it on wine is, then, Rabbinical. In addition, there is a view that if one finds the wine too bitter, Melo Lugmav simply means that he should swirl it around his cheeks. Though we do not follow this ruling, it may be invoked in combination with the other factors, so that the person does not repeat Brochos unnecessarily. [See Psachim 105b-106a 107a 108b 109a-b Eruvin 40b (Rashi), Poskim. Tur, Bais Yosef, Sh. Ar. O.C. 190:3 271:13-16 296:1 (Kaf Hachaim 16) Halochoscope VII:21.]

Accordingly, it appears that in our case, the listener has fulfilled his own obligation by hearing the recital on wine, especially since a small amount was also drunk by the reciter. Even the reciter fulfills his obligation in this instance.

This issue of Halochoscope is sponsored by Major and Mrs. Glenn Foxson in honor of the Bar Mitzvah of Andrew, Zev Pesach, this Shabbos. Mazel Tov.