

HALOCHOSCOPE

This week's question:

This week's (double issue), last week's, and next week's question:

Shavuos fell on *Erev Shabbos*. The second day *Yomtov* was also *Shabbos*. For Israelis, it was not *Yomtov*, but *Shabbos*. The following two questions arose:

(i) A *Ben Eretz Yisroel*, resident of Israel, is visiting *Chutz Laaretz*, outside of Israel. He is a guest of a family residing *Chutz Laaretz*. On Friday night, this family says a *Yomtov Kiddush*, adding in the words to include *Shabbos*. The Israeli, despite being present in *Chutz Laaretz*, is not observing *Yomtov*. For him, *kiddush* should be the regular *Shabbos* version, without any mention of *Yomtov* and without the additional *brocha shehecheyanu*. Does he fulfill his obligation of *Shabbos kiddush* by listening to the host saying the *Yomtov kiddush* with the additional *Shabbos* phrases? Or should he rather recite his own *Shabbos kiddush* quietly? If he can satisfy his obligation with the hosts *kiddush*, should he have his own cup of wine and drink before the host says *shehecheyanu*? If he need not do this, but may listen to the hosts saying *shehecheyanu*, may he respond *amein* to the additional *brocha*? For the local residents, *shehecheyanu* is a necessary part of *kiddush*. For the Israeli, it is an interruption.

(ii) When should the Israeli say *yizkor*? In Israel, he would say it on the first day of *Yomtov*, which is the only day. He would not say it on *Shabbos*, which is also *Isru Chag*, a post-holiday semi-festive day. *Isru Chag* has some special status with regard to eulogizing and the like. One does not recite *tachanun*, and on a *Shabbos* whose date has no *tachanun* during the week, one does not say *hazkaras neshamos*, mentioning the souls of the departed. However, if he says *yizkor* on the first day, it mars the *Yomtov* for the non-Israelis. Should he say *Yizkor* with the local people on *Shabbos*, even though for him it is no longer *Yomtov*, and is *Isru Chag*?

The issues:

- A) *Yomtov Shaini shel galuyos*, second day of *Yomtov*
- B) Israeli residents in *Chutz Laaretz* on the second day of *Yomtov*; *zizul yomtov*
- C) *Kiddush* on *Shabbos* and *Yomtov*
- D) *Kiddush* in our situation
- E) *Hefsek*, interruptions in *Kiddush*

In this issue:

Hefsek continued

F) *Hazkaras neshamos*, or *yizkor*

Next week:

Hazkaras Neshamos continued

G) Leaving *shul* for *yizkor*

Hefsek continued

We mentioned the issues for the Israeli resident with regard to hearing the

Yomtov/Shabbos kiddush recited by the *ben Chutz Laaretz* host, and fulfilling his obligation. First, the *Kiddush* is a *Yomtov kiddush*. There are insertions added for *Shabbos*. Assuming that it is really also a *Shabbos kiddush*, this might work for those observing *Yomtov* on that day. Those who do not observe *Yomtov* really need to recite a dedicated *Shabbos kiddush*. Perhaps it is also considered a dedicated *Shabbos kiddush*. If so, why are the *Yomtov* sections not considered a *hefsek*, extraneous interruption? Second, the hosts observing the second day of *Yomtov* are also reciting *shehecheyanu*, since it is considered the second day of *Yomtov Rishon* for them. One may not recite extra things between *kiddush* and drinking the wine on a regular *Shabbos*. Is *shehecheyanu* considered a *hefsek* for the Israeli resident? Furthermore, assuming that he fulfills his obligation with the recital of the host, is *shehecheyanu* considered *brocha levatalah* for the guest?

The guest does not recite the words himself, but listens to the host reciting it. He is relying on the rule of *shomaia ke'oneh*, hearing is like saying. Since he does not say the words, he cannot be considered saying something as a *hefsek*, nor reciting a *brocha levatalah*. We should elaborate, but first discuss the concepts of *hefsek* in this context.

In the cases of both *kiddush* and *havdalah*, one recites a *brocha rishona* on the wine, then the *brocha* of *kiddush* or *havdalah*. Why is this not considered a *hefsek* between his *bircas hanehenin* on the wine and drinking it? The main reason is that he may not eat or drink before reciting *kiddush* or *havdalah*. Thus, the *kiddush* and *havdalah* are themselves necessary for the eating. They are not considered an interruption. This does not apply to the *brochos* on fire and *besamim*, spices. However, since the order of these *brochos* was instituted to be recited at the time one says *havdalah*, it is considered an extended *mitzvah* with no concern for *hefsek*.

An issue arises when one who has already recited *havdalah* to satisfy his personal obligation. There is a rule of *araivus*, the ability for another to help his fellow perform a *mitzvah* by inserting himself into the shoes of his fellow. Accordingly, that one may recite *havdalah* again to discharge the obligation of his fellow. While he could drink the wine himself, he should not normally recite a *bircas hanehenin* if he does not plan to drink. There are exceptions to this rule when the person listening is an absolute boor, but we do not rely on that generally. If he wishes to smell the *besamim*, he may recite the *brocha*. However, it is not recommended that he recites the *brocha* on fire at all. The listeners may recite it themselves. Besides not being really obligated, he would also be making a *hefsek* between the order of the other *brochos*.

Similarly, on *Motzai Yom Kippur*, we do not use *besamim*. The poskim debate whether we would use them if *Yom Kippur* also fell on *Shabbos*. The recommended procedure is to use them anyhow. As long as one smells them, there is no *brocha levatalah*. What about *hefsek*? Some say that the *safek*, chance, that one is obliged to do it is enough to remove the concern of *hefsek*. The other view maintains that a *safek* is insufficient for this. A definite obligation is no *hefsek*, which is also why it may be recited in *havdalah* on a regular *Motzai Shabbos*. Some say that one should say it after drinking the wine. Others maintain that if there is a *minhag* to say it, it is not considered a *hefsek*. A similar issue is raised with regard to the *minhag* to recite the name-giving at a *bris milah* between the *brochos* and drinking the wine.

Our case raises all of these issues. We mentioned two approaches to the concept of *hefsek*: it could be a *hesech daas*, taking one's mind off the original *brocha* and requiring a new *brocha* anyhow. Or it could be viewed as disconnecting the original *brocha* on the wine from drinking the wine. In our case, it is hard to argue *hesech daas*. The Israeli is still fully focused on the *kiddush* and the wine. The issue should only arise with regard to the view that there is a disconnection. If so, a new *brocha* is required. This might not apply when the Israeli did not say the *brocha shehecheyanu* or the additional insertions himself, but heard them with *shomaia keoneh*. When fulfilling *bircas hamotzie* on bread through a *botzaia*, one leader who recites the *brocha* and shares out the bread, certain rules apply regarding *hefsek*. Ideally, one is using the *brocha* of the other person for his own eating, and may not interrupt between the two. However, if the *botzaia* already ate a piece of the bread, some poskim maintain that the listeners fulfill the obligation to eat before interrupting with *hefsek* by the *botzaia's* eating. Just as his *brocha* works for them, his eating also works to connect the *brocha* to eating. Many poskim disagree. Since the *brocha* is for benefit, and one interrupted before the benefit, he must repeat the *brocha*.

However, in the case of *havdalah*, if the *mavdil* himself interrupted before drinking the wine, he need not repeat the whole *havdalah*, but must only repeat *hagafen*. In our case, the *mavdil* interrupted with insertions and *shehecheyanu* that he needed to say. Therefore, they were not considered interruptions for him. If the *shomaia* can fulfill his basic obligation with the *mekadesh*, the insertions and the like should not even have any effect on his basic *kiddush* obligation. This brings us back to the basic question of whether the *kiddush per se* works for him. Assuming it works, the insertions would not invalidate anything. Nor would the additional *brocha shehecheyanu* detract from his own *kiddush* for *Shabbos*. Nor would his listening be considered *brocha levatalah*.

The next issue would be whether he may say *amein* on the *shehecheyanu*. This question arises every night of *Yomtov* for women who said *shehecheyanu* when kindling the *Yomtov* light. Assuming they hear *kiddush* later from their husbands, the husband interrupts with *shehecheyanu*, which they are not obligated to say anymore. This raises the same issue we mentioned above. Furthermore, they should not be permitted to answer *amein*, for this would be a *hefsek*. Some poskim maintain that indeed, they should not answer *amein*. This ruling shows that the actual *brocha* is not considered a *hefsek* for them, and supports what we have shown. According to this view, the Israeli should also not respond *amein*. He should avoid making this conspicuous, in keeping with the issues of *machlokess* mentioned earlier. Others, however, rule that *amein* may be said by the women. Since *shehecheyanu* is part of the order of *kiddush*, *amein* is also part of it. According to this ruling the Israeli may respond *amein* as well.

The poskim debate this very question. The main two views are that the Israeli should try to say his own *kiddush* over his own cup of wine. He may say along with the host in an undertone, making sure to recite the regular *Shabbos kiddush*. Others contend that doing this will raise questions, and could just as well lead to *zilzul Yomtov*. They are of the opinion that the Israeli may fulfill his obligation of *Shabbos kiddush* by hearing the *Yomtov/Shabbos kiddush* of the host. The issues we raised are resolved in the way we explained them. Another view maintains that the Israeli should rather recite his *Shabbos*

kiddush on the bread, when he says *hamotzie*. All seem to agree that the guest may not recite his *Shabbos kiddush* along with the host and rely on the host's cup of wine. This will clearly raise questions and would be considered *zilzul Yomtov*.

One final consideration: the listeners need not drink any of the wine. This would help in saving them from the issue of disconnecting their *brocha* on the wine from the drinking. [See Brochos 40a Pesachim 52a 100b-102b Menachos 36a Chulin 87a, Poskim. Tur, Sh Ar OC 25:9 65:1 167:6 (MA19) 183:6 193:1 213:3 (Birkei Yosef I, Eshel Avraham) 271:13-15 424:3 (TaZ2, RAE, Match Efrayim, Ketzei Hamatach), commentaries. Nishmas Adam 5:9. Igros Moshe OC:IV:101 YD:III:100. Sdei Chemed Hey 12. Betzel Hachochma I:26. Be'er Moshe VII-VIII Bnei EY vChuL p.249.]

In conclusion with regard to the first question, the best approach is for the Israeli guest to ask the host whether he can have his own cup of wine for *kiddush*. He should recite the *kiddush* for *Shabbos* in an undertone together with the host as he recites the *Yomtov kiddush*. The next best approach is debated. Therefore, he may choose either of the following options: He may recite *kiddush* himself on bread after *hamotzie*. He should have his own *lechem mishneh*. Or he may rely totally on the *kiddush* of his host. He may respond *amein* to the *brocha shehecheyanu* as well.

F) Hazkaras neshamos

The universe was created with this world as the *Olam Hamaaseh*, the world of action. One earns his share in the World-to-come, and his reward and punishment, in this world. Opportunities for *mitzvos*, tests and good deeds are all amassed here, and in this way one prepares for his day of judgment after death. This implies that after death there is no more hope. The poskim cite sources in Tanach and the Talmud that indicate that though the departed soul can no longer do anything for himself, the living can accomplish positive changes on his behalf. In one source, King David repeated the name of his wayward son, Avshalom seven times. The Talmud says that he was praying for atonement, to raise Avshalom from Gehinom. Other sources mention Talmudic sages who interceded to save the departed souls from punishment or have them admitted to Gan Eden.

According to one source the departed require atonement, based on the language of the ceremony of the *eglah arufah*. This is a calf beheaded to atone for the local townspeople when there is an unsolved murder. Some poskim suggest that the Hebrew word *Yom Hakipurim*, in the plural refers to two atonements; one for the living and one for the dead. The dead can no longer atone for themselves. The living must include them in their own prayers. Thus, later generations atone for the sale of Yosef and for the golden calf. [Some sources say that the later generations are actually included in the guilt. However, others consider the prayers atonement for the departed.] ... *to be continued*...

On the parsha ... Separate from this congregation ... Shall one man sin and all are punished? Tell the congregation to rise up from ... Korach ... move away from the tents of ... [16:21-22, 24 26] Separating from the *tzibbur* is not called for. Therefore, Moshe knew that Hashem did not really want him to do that. However, separating the *tzibbur* from those who cause strife is right.

Sponsored by 'your name here' ❀

© Rabbi Shimon Silver, July 2023.

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