

Hilchos Havdala

(Simanim 296-299)

Yoni Rabinovitch

Introduction	2
Is Havdalla deoraisah or derabanan?	2
Havdallah in Tefilla and Al Hakos	3
Women and Havdallah	4
The Text of Havdallah	6
זמן of Havdallah	6
Issur to Do Melacha Before Havdalla	7
Saying המבדיל בין קודש לחול	8
Eating and Drinking Before Havdalla	9
On Which Items Can You Make Havdallah	12
Not Bread	12
Chemar Medinah	12
Bessamim / בשמים	14
Why do we make this Bracha?	14
What Should be Used for Besamim?	16
Nusach Habracha	16
Halachos of Besamim and What Can Be Used	16
Birkas HaNer	17
Reason for this Bracha	17
What Type of Bracha is It?	17
Birkas Haner As Part of Havdalla	18
Getting Hana'ah from the Flame	19
Someone who can't see well making borei me'orei ha'eish:	20
Requirements of the Ner Itself	20
The Seder of Havdalla	23
Sit or Stand?	23
Holding the Kos:	23
Minhagim relating to Siman Tov	24

Introduction

Is Havdalla deoraisah or derabanan?

- I. **Rambam 29:1** Deoraisah from זכור – בכניסתו וביציאתו. **Sefer Hachinuch 31** says the same. [**Smag 29** similarly thinks it's deoraisah as well, but learned from זכרת in the Dibbros Acharonos.]
- A. The acharonim are bothered by where Rambam got this from, as we don't have any source which says this. Presumably, he just had a different גירסא in the gemara in **Pesachim 106a** (see Mafte'ach). However, **Maggid Mishnah 29:1** argues that he learned it from ולהבדיל, which the gemara in **Shvuos 18b** quotes in the context of Havdalla. It seems he's saying this is how Rambam knew it was subsumed in Zachor, and not an independent limud.¹
- B. **Minchas Chinuch 31:5** asks that if it's deoraisah from Zachor, then how come Chazal weren't mesaken a hazkaras yetzias mitzrayim, if the limud of יציאת מצרים is from a gzierah shavah to the word zachor?
1. **Minchas Chinuch** suggests that the "main" limud of zachor is to kiddush, and therefore it suffices to say it in kiddush alone, although he notes this is a קצת צ"ע.
2. **Later acharonim** (see Rav Rimon fn. 2) have suggested that saying אמת ואמונה in tefilla right before shemoneh esreh suffices, similar to the **Beur Halacha 271's** suggestion that saying this suffices according to the MA for one's קיום of kiddush in tefilla mideoraisah.
3. **RSZA** quoted in SSC 58:fn. 18 argues that it's all just one long קיום, and not two separate mitzvos, so once we say it in kiddush, that suffices even though we don't repeat this in havdallah.
- II. Other Rishonim learn that the חיוב is deoraisah but from the word להבדיל alone – this can be found in the **Rash Mishantz's** teshuva at the end of **אגרות הרמ"ה**, and is also משמע from the **Ra'avya 717** and **Sefer Hayashar 62**.
- A. **R' Elchanan Wasserman Kovetz Shiurim Beitzah 12** learns this way as well in **Maggid Mishnah**.
- B. Similarly, The **Olas Tamid** quotes **Avudraham** as saying that men are חיייב mideoraisah and women are chayavos miderabanan. **R' Lebowitz** said he didn't understand how that could be, but according to the above shitah, it could fit nicely.
1. I later looked it up inside and saw that this seems to be exactly what he says²:
- III. There's a third shitah of **Rabbeinu Tam** (quoted in Shu"t HaRosh 11:3), the **Rosh Nazir 4a**, **Smak 283 + others** who think it's דרבנן, as Zachor is only about kiddush, and להבדיל is just as Asmachta.
- A. **RAE 296:Taz 7** proves from **Tosfos Shvuos 20b (and other Tosfosin)** that Tosfos thinks it's דרבנן. If it were deoraisah, the components of the mitzvah for kiddush and havdalah should be the same. Since **Tosfos** says the Kos by kiddush might be a חיוב deoraisah, the fact that havdalla was originally instituted only in tefilla demonstrates it's

¹ **PMG 296 AA:1 + MZ 7** notes it sounds from Rambam like the whole limud is from זכור and nothing to do with ולהבדיל.

² ספר אבודרהם ברכת המצות ומשפטיהם
אבל מצות דרבנן נראה להם לתקן גם לנשים מטעם שאף הן היו באותו הנס. וכתב ר"ת שהנשים חייבות בשלש סעודות שאף הן היו באותו הנס של מן דלחם משנה לקטו כולם בערב שבת. וכן חייבות לבצוע על שתי ככרות. ועוד דבעשה דרבנן שוות בכל עד כאן. ומצאתי כתוב שהנשים חייבות בהבדלה מדרבנן כיון שחייבות בקדוש כמו שאמרנו למעלה ממה שנאמר (ויקרא ו) ולהבדיל בין הקדש ובין החול

only miderabanan, since if it were mideoraisah, the same deoraisah dinnim should apply.

1. One possible rejection is that Tosfos holds like the Maggid Mishnah's limud of להבדיל, in which case, it's not learned from זכור that we would have a drasha of זכרהו על היין, and Tosfos could still think it's deoraisah!

Havdallah in Tefilla and Al Hakos

- I. **Brachos 33a** says that Havdalla was originally instituted by אנשי כנה"ג to be just said in Tefilla. When the community became more wealthy, they instituted it על הכוס only. Once they became impoverished again, they were mesaken to say it in Tefilla as well, so that it wouldn't keep switching. Someone who couldn't afford to do it על הכוס though no longer had to do so (**Rashba there + SA HaRav 294:1-2**).
 - A. This gemara is pretty clear that Havdalla *al hakos* is certainly only miderabanan.³
 - B. Why were they comfortable getting rid of havdalla al hakos, but not kiddush al hakos? Potentially, it's because making kiddush al hakos is deoraisah, unlike havdalla. However, for those rishonim who think that the Kos itself is דרבנן, what's the chiluk?
 1. **Tzlach Brachos 33a** argues there was no point, since even if you don't have wine, you can make kiddush on bread, which the person certainly has in order to fulfill seudos shabbos, so there was no reason to be mesaken anything.
 2. In contrast, **the Rav** argued that the goal of kiddush al hakos was to be the haschalah to one's oneg shabbos, to signify we're being מתענג davka for Shabbos and not for ourselves. It could be for this reason that the role of the wine at kiddush is greater than at havdalla, as the shtiyah by the fromer is actually a chelek of the seudah. [He argues this is the reason for the din of סעודה במקום סעודה.]
- II. Because we have both ways of being mekayem havdalla, if you forgot to say it in tefilla, you aren't chozer, since you can still say it al hakos. However, **SA 294:1** from **Brachos 33a** says that if you then *also* ruined the ideal of הבדלה על הכוס of קיום by eating beforehand (טעה בזו), then you have to repeat shemoneh esreh as well.⁴
 - A. **Rashba** writes that it's considered a טעות even if you did melacha prior to being מבדיל על הכוס. However, **Beur Halacha** says we can paskin against this Rashba and are somech on the Rambam, and all the other Rishonim who don't say anything about melacha.
 1. Why don't they say the same is true by melacha? **Dirshu 15** quotes פתחי תשובה that it's only considered a ta'us by eating or drinking before the kos since the kos is specifically matir those activities; however, the kos isn't specifically matir melacha — that's מותר through just לחול בין קדש לחול alone. **Rav Rimon fn. 13** notes it also makes a lot of sense per **the Rav's** idea (to be discussed later) that the goal of havdalla al hakos is specifically to differentiate between the seudos shabbos and seudos shel Chol. As such, one has ruined the main point by eating, while doing melacha isn't a stirah to the goal of havdalla al hakos.
 2. However, if you ate before havdalla and then went ahead and said havdalla al hakos (which is a very likely scenario, as people don't know this halacha), **Beur Halacha** ד"ה צריך לחזור notes a machlokes acharonim whether one has to daven again, or if he's יוצא בד"ע. **SSC 59:22 + Rav Rimon fn. 15** paskins not to daven again since it's a safek דרבנן and potential bracha levatala.

³ Surprisingly, **the Mefarsh on Nazir 4a + Tosfos HaRosh 20b** think that havdalla al hakos is mideoraisah, just like they say by kiddush. This is a lichorah a direct stirah to this gemara.

⁴ **ARUH** asks what kind of knas this is and why it's not brachos levatala. He answers that since that's what they were mesaken, it's no longer levatala, but it's still a peculiar takana.

- III. Most poskim say that havdalla al hakos is certainly דרבנן since we say אתה או ברוך המבדיל or ברוך המבדיל beforehand. However, according to the **Chasam Sofer OC 21** by kiddush, that we're mechaven davka not to be yotze in shul, the same is true when we say אתה חוננתנו or ברוך המבדיל, that there's implicit da'as not to be yotze so that we can do the קיום deoraisah al hakos (**PT 2 from other acharonim**)

Women and Havdallah

- I. Women Making Havdalla for themselves (and others):
 - A. Are women chayavos at the same level as men? If you hold like Rambam that it's deoraisah based on זכור, they'd be chayavos too, but if the חיוב is miderabanan (or deoraisah based on a different pasuk), women would be peturos due to מעשה ז"ג and couldn't be motzi men.⁵
 - B. **SA 296:8** quotes the **Orchos Chayim** as a א"י that women shouldn't make havdalla for themselves in case they aren't chayavos — **Rema** paskins this lehalacha.
 1. **Bach** is מתפלל on the Rema — women are able to volunteer brachos according to Ashkenazi minhag! He disagrees with Rema and thinks women *can* make havdalla for themselves.
 2. Three answers:
 - a) **MA** considers that maybe women can't offer a bracha when the *entire* mitzvah is a bracha. Only when they're doing a ma'aseh can they offer the brachos connected to them. He says this would explain the practice that women don't say Birkas Halevana.⁶ However, despite this defense, he thinks that Bach is really correct, and the acharonim aren't convinced even by his "limud Zechus" of the Rema:
 - (1) **PMG** asks why he would say that a woman can say birchos ק"ש then.
 - (2) **Aruch Hashulchan** asks that there *is* a ma'aseh here since you have to drink from the kos!
 - (3) What's the sevara for the MA's chiluk? **Machatzis Hashekel** explains that a ma'aseh alone is meaningful even for a woman who isn't metzuveh since גדול המצווה ועושה implies the אינה מצווה is still doing something productive. Once they're able to do the ma'aseh and it's meaningful, we allow her to make a bracha on it as well. However, if there's nothing but the bracha, there's no ma'aseh that we can pin as inherently meaningful, so we don't allow her to make a bracha. This would answer both **PMG + ARUH's** questions, but I'll admit I don't fully understand it, since why can't you say the bracha itself is meaningful when that itself is the mitzvah?!
 - b) **Taz** has a tremendous Chiddush that women are able to offer brachos for mitzvos that are deoraisah (like ק"ש), but not mitzvos that are דרבנן (lichorah, this means מדרבנן).
 - (1) Big נפקא מינה for birkas halevana and sefiras ha'omer (maybe) that women then wouldn't be able to say the bracha. **PMG + SA HaRav 296:KA:3** ask on him that leshitaso, women shouldn't be able to make a bracha on Hallel of Rosh Chodech, the mitzvos on the 2nd day of RH, or Lulav on Chol Hamoed, but we've never heard of that!

⁵ **Ritva Pesachim 54a, Meiri Brachos 20b + Maggid Mishnah 29:1** all entertain that even if it's דרבנן, it's instituted as an extension to the mitzvas zachor of kiddush on Friday night, and therefore women would still be chayavos.

⁶ Maybe would also mean they can't say ברכה"ת, but not מוכרח, since it's deoraisah, and a matir to learn. Even שו"ע says women say that one.

- c) See below beshem רצפ"פ for another explanation in the Har Tzvi.
3. **MB 35** raises another issue that women have a minhag not to drink from the havdala wine; this is another possible explanation for why women don't say havdallah for themselves. As such, it's better for someone else to be motzi her.
- a) However, **MB** Paskins like **Bach + MA** that a woman *can* make havdala for herself if no one else is around, or if the men have already been yotze themselves in shul (since we can't say יצא מוציא if the women aren't chayavos).⁷
- b) At the same time, if a woman doesn't know how to make havdalla, **Rav Rimon fn. 20** from **ARUH 296:5 + others** says a man can be motzi her even if he's already been yotze.
- (1) Note that *whenever* relying on יצא מוציא (even when one man is being motzi another man), the listener should ideally make the birkas haner themselves if able to (and the mavdil should ideally not answer אמן), since some acharonim (**SA HaRav 297:9 + Chazon Ish 35:7**) think that יצא מוציא doesn't apply to birkas haner. Me'ikar hadin though, he could make the bracha, as **MB 298:36** paskins lekula on this shailah. See separate section on this by birkas haner. In terms of the Besamim, as long as the mavdil smells from the besammim, it's not an issue of hefsek for them to make ב"ב again. All this is written in detail in **Piskei Teshuvos 296:18**.
4. Why don't they drink from the wine?
- a) There's a myth that it has something to do with a beard. צ"ע where that came from. **Chazon Ish** quoted in **Ma'aseh Ish 5:93** once quipped that "only one who grows a beard should make havdalla" turned into "one who makes havdalla grows a beard."
- b) **Shlah Hakadosh**: Kabbalistic reason since Chavah ate from עץ הדעת which was grapes and caused separation between herself and Adam, it's inappropriate for her to eat from the grapes that caused the problem for havdallah. [I heard an added piece that her sin caused the loss of an אור הגנוז that they could see everything, and Hashem decided to take it away at the end of Shabbos, which is what caused Adam to make a fire and see.]
- c) However, see **Shu"t Har Tzvi OC 1:154** beshem **Rav Meltzer** that if women are peturos, then the brachos between בפה"ג and the end of havdallah are a hefsek, and she can't drink based on the original בפה"ג. See above that this may also explain the Rema why they shouldn't make havdalla alone. [He himself admits this isn't glatt since if they're chayavos misafek, then they're really chayavos and it isn't a hefsek.]
- II. There's another question that's connected to this, which is whether women are chayavos in the birkas haner. **Beur Halacha 296:8 לא יבדילו ד'** raises the possibility that it's become subsumed in the mitzvah of havdalla, so if she's chayeves in havdalla, she's chayeves in the birkas haner. However, he leans towards saying it's an independent bracha/mitzvah miderabanan to recognize the creation of fire on Motzei Shabbos.
- A. Even if women are Peturos, **RSZA** in **SSC 61:fn. 69** argues that not only Ashkenazim, but even Sefardim could make this Bracha since a) we don't say וצונו and b) the Bracha

⁷ **Rav Ovadya in YO 4:OC:23** says Sefardi women can say havdalla as well, since the SA seems to side with the majority of rishonim who think women are chayavos. It comes out all agree that me'ikar hadin, a woman can make havdalla for herself when there's no alternative.

itself is the mitzvah and not a birkas hamitzvah, so he thinks even Sefardim could say it.⁸

- B. Even if they can make the Bracha though, if they're פטור from the Bracha, it should be a hefsek in havdalla itself, like **RAE** (quoted by Beirur Halacha 298:5 אין ד"ה) says with respect to ברכת הנר made on a Ner that's פסול for the Bracha. **SSC 61:24 from RSZA** says for this reason that a woman in fact should *not* make the birkas haner in havdalla, but should say it separately afterwards if she wants. [See there that he notes that (leshitaso) it's not even פשוט she can say אמן when someone e/se is being motzi her.]
1. However, **Rav Rimon pg. 667** disagrees and says she should make the normal havdalla. This is based on **SSC there fn. 69, Teshuvos Vehanhagos 1:266 + others** who note that the Beirur Halacha's מסקנה is really quite contested. **Birkei Yosef 693:1, Tzitz Eliezer 14:43 + YO 4:OC:24:9**, amongst others, all think that they're chayavos in בורא מאורי האש as it was instituted as part of the mitzvah of havdalla itself. This is also clear from **Ritva Pesachim 54a ד"ה וכיון**. As such, a woman can make havdalla for herself in the same way a man does.

The Text of Havdallah

- I. Gemara **33a**: Why is אתה חוננתנו said in the bracha of חונן? Gemara says it's either because it's a chochma to be able to be מבדיל or because "מתוך שהיא חול" – פשוט is this means just that they put it in the first Bracha of bakashos since it has to do with Chol. However, **Gra based on Yerushalmi** understands this to mean you have to say אתה חוננתנו / havdalla before you can make bakashos.
- A. The Rishonim debate what the text of Attah Chonantanu should be, and we in fact do like none of them. What's behind our minhag to put it half-way in between the Bracha of אתה חונן
- B. ? **Beirur HaGra** explains we're being מחמיר for both shitos about why it's said in אתה חונן; according to the מ"ד that מתוך שהיא חכמה, the Yerushalmi says one must first mention the idea of חונן דעת before one can mention havdalla. According to the מ"ד that מתוך שהיא חול, one has to say a havdalla before he says the request of "חננו" – מאתך דעה בינה והשכל – thus, we place the havdalla right in the middle of the bracha.

זמן of Havdallah

- I. In theory, havdalla can be said both in Tefilla and al hakos before Shabbos actually ends. This is clear from **Brachos 27b**.
- A. **Rambam 29:11** explains (leshitaso) that, like kiddush, the timing for mentioning the difference between Shabbos and Chol is flexible, and it can therefore be done a little before the actual time where that chiluk is made.
- B. In this case, you wouldn't make a Bracha on Ner, and wouldn't have any reason to make it on besamim either, since the Neshama yeseirah hasn't left yet (**SA HaRav 299:10**; see **Rav Rimon fn. 37**)
- C. Despite that the gemara and some Rishonim (e.g. Rambam) sound like this is לכתחילה, **SA 293:3** based on **Tosfos there + Rosh 4:6** says that doing so is בדיעבד and should only be done so in a sha'as hadchak or for a dvar mitzvah. Additionally, **Bach 293 ד"ה וכתב** notes it's a דבר תמוה לרבים to do so, and **MB 9** adds that since we regularly say mincha until shekiah, it's inappropriate to daven ma'ariv before then.

⁸ **Rav Moshe CM 2:47:2** has the same idea. **RSZA** notes that this is the exact reverse sevara of the MA above. See there where he deal with it.

1. As such, we only rely on this when it's a real sha'as hadchak, like chayalim who have to leave right at the end of Shabbos.
 2. Similarly, **YO 6:YD:33** says that if someone finds out they're an Onen on Shabbos, they should daven and do havdalla while it's still daytime, unlike **MB 71:10** who says not to.
- II. When is the latest one can make havdalla? This is a machlokes in **Pesachim 106a + 107a**. **Most Rishonim** paskin you have until Tuesday night, and that's how **SA 299:6** paskins, although he quotes the opinion of the **Rif** (that you only have until Sunday evening when the halachic day ends) and **Geonim** (that you only have until you eat) as א"י.
- A. Rema says we paskin like the first dei'ah, such that an Ashkenazi certainly has until Tuesday night. However, in this case, one wouldn't say a Bracha on the Ner, nor on Besamim (**MB 299:18**). Ner is specifically שי"ך to motzei shabbos when fire was created, and besamim is about appeasing the neshamah after the Neshama yeseirah has left, which also is only שי"ך to havdalla.
 - B. On Motza'ei Yom Tov, you only have until the following evening, as the concept that "Sunday through Tuesday is part of the last week" isn't relevant (**MB 16** from **RAE**).

Issur to Do Melacha Before Havdalla

- I. **Shabbos 150b** quotes אסור לו לאדם שיעשה חפציו קודם שיבדיל וראב"י. From here, we learn there's an issur melacha even once shabbos has ended until one does Havdalla. Why does this issur exist? There's three shitos in the Meforshim about this:
 - A. It could be that midrabanan, Chazal extended the kedushas shabbos, such that one needs to make some verbal distinction before melacha becomes מותר. This seems to be how **MB 299:33** explains ("עדיין חל במקצת קדושת שבת עליו"), based on **Levush + Eshel Avraham Mibotchoch**.
 - B. It could be a din in kavod shabbos that it's inappropriate to start doing melacha immediately without "saying goodbye" to Shabbos. **Rashi Shabbos 150b המבדיל** ד"ה spells out one should be מלווה the מלך before doing melacha. Similarly, **Halachos Ketzuvo**⁹ (Shabbos 31) says that it's because one has to ask *reshus* from the King before one "leaves" Him, and **Orchos Chaim Havdalla 31** spells out you should demonstrate it's hard for you to leave Shabbos and start doing melacha.
 - C. There's a third possibility that it's not a din in Shabbos, but a din in Havdalla, that one shouldn't start doing activities when one has a mitzvah (of Havdalla) they need to do. The **Griz (Shabbos 29:5)** argues this is the shitas ha**Rambam** (there) who bundles this halacha with the halacha that one can't eat before havdalla, which is for the aforementioned reason.
- II. A few מנהגים:
 - A. **Rabbeinu Yerucham 12:20**, quoted by **Rema 299:10**, thinks you *can* do melachos that are אסור on Shabbos so long as they don't involve any tircha. Rema mentions this, but sides with most rishonim that all melachos are prohibited.¹⁰
 1. פשט in Rabbeinu Yerucham seems to be like the second or third approach, as only involved melachos are a problem. **ARUH 299:21** argues it fits the second category, while **Griz** argues it's due to the third.
 - a) Griz also notes it's משמע this way from the gemara that it's not an issur meleches shabbos per se, but is just a problem of שיעשה חפציו, like doing melacha before Davening in the morning. He thinks even the **Rambam** holds

⁹ Gaonic work published anonymously

¹⁰ See also **MA** who thinks R' Yerucham was only meikil after one has fulfilled havdalla in tefilla.

this way, as although he says in **29:5¹¹** that one can't eat or do "melacha" before then, he uses this exact same lashon by eating before davening in **Tefilla 6:4¹²**!

2. Despite this, **MB 299:39 (+ Sha'ar Hatziyun 51)** paskins against Rabbeinu Yerucham (although **Taz 9** thinks one can follow him).
 - B. Can one ask a Chiloni to drive them after Shabbos? Even if not causing them to break shabbos, you're certainly going to cause them to do melacha prior to Havdala. **Tzitz Eliezer 11:34** argues it's תלוי on the above: If it's a hemshech of Shabbos (like reason #1), there's an issue with more melacha. But if the 2nd or 3rd possibility, there's no additional issur with each act of melacha: There's either one general issue that they aren't saying goodbye to shabbos before doing melacha, or no additional issue if the person will never fulfill the mitzvah of havdalla to begin with.
 1. Lema'aseh, **Tzitz Eliezer** argues either reason 2 or 3 is correct, and he's meikil based on this lomdus.
 2. Cf. **Teshuvos Vehanhagos 2:161** who argues even if the first reason is correct, one can be meikil since the continuation of Shabbos doesn't mean that each and every melacha is a problem, but that there's a general (single) prohibition to violate Shabbos after Shabbos has ended.
 - C. Another nafka minah: Can one do melachos of Ochel nefesh after yom tov ends before saying ברוך המבדיל? I saw **RSZA** in dirshu 299:33 was meikil, presumably because he viewed it as a hemshech of Yom Tov. However, I saw **Rav Kook** (quoted in **שדה אברהם 19:11**) pointed out it should be assur lefi those who learn it's a chiyuv in havdalla.
- III. Exceptions to the issur melacha (from **PT Os 13**):
- A. **SA HaRav** argues there's no issur of דבר דבר ופנץ, and one can talk about any melacha and do amirah lenochri. One can also violate Uvdin Dechol, including hachana issurim (**MB 40**) and anything that's just a גזירה (and not a מלאכה), like dancing and playing instruments (**Eshel Avraham Butchotch**). **PT fn. 111** also notes one can take medicine then.

המבדיל בין קודש לחול

- I. **Shabbos 150b** adds that in מערבא, they would say "המבדיל בין קודש לחול" and then do melacha. There's a big machlokes rishonim though what this means:
 - A. **Rif Arvei Pesachim** implies (as **Ran + others** understand) that it means you actually have to say havdalla, but the chiddush is just that you can say one "havdalla" (המבדיל) (בין קודש לחול) in havdalla al hakos and don't need all three (בין אור לחושך + בין ישראל) (לעמים) to be yotze.
 - B. **Ritva there + Rosh Pesachim 10:11** say you have to say an independent bracha even ("המבדיל בין קודש לחול... Baruch attah...") שלא על הכוס
 - C. **Rashi though** says you can just say this line ("המבדיל בין קודש לחול") and invokes that it's "להיכרא בעלמא, ללוות את המלך." He adds that certainly if you said havdalla in tefilla that this would suffice.
 1. Leshitaso, Tur quotes that the **Rosh** thought this was insufficient.
- II. **Griz on Rambam 29:5** argues the above machlokes is תלוי on the reason for the issur:

¹¹ אסור לאדם לאכול או לשתות יין, משיקדש היום--עד שיקדש. וכן משייצא היום, אסור לו להתחיל לאכול ולשתות, ולעשות מלאכה, או לטעום כלום--עד שיבדיל; ולשתות המים, מותר...

¹² אסור לו לאדם שיטעום כלום או שיעשה מלאכה, מאחר שיעלה עמוד השחר, עד שיתפלל תפילת שחרית

- A. **Rif** thinks it's a din in havdalla that you can't do melacha until you're yotze havdalla, so was forced to understand that the only way to matir melacha is to actually make הבדלה.
 - B. **Ritva + Rosh**, as well as **Rashi**, think it's a din in Shabbos (for either of the first two reasons). As such, one can matir melacha without being yotze havdalla, as long as they say whatever suffices as a hekter to end Shabbos or to be melaveh it properly
 - 1. **Rashi** says this explicitly, but **Griz** notes it's also muchrach **Ritva + Rosh** hold this way: If they require shem umalchus, that means Chazal instituted Shem umalchus to serve some function. It's not mistaber that they'd require this bracha to fulfill the mitzvas havdalla, if you then still need to be yotze havdalla al hakos. It must be this is a separate kiyum from havdalla, and since the function is completely different, it's שייך that they were mesaken a bracha in order to matir melacha.
 - C. In terms of the shitas Ha**Rambam**, **Griz** had noted that he seems to imply it's a din in havdalla. At the same time, he agrees you don't actually need to say havdalla.
 - 1. How does this make sense? **Rav Rimon** quotes **Rabbeinu Prachya** who explains that he thinks the issur is nove'a from the מצוות הבדלה מה"ת. Once one says havdalla bedibur, that suffices to fulfill the חיוב deoraisah, and that gets rid of the issur. [Cf. Brisker Rav inside.]
- III. Lema'aseh, **SA + Rema 299:10** paskin like **Rashi** that one just needs to say המבדיל בין קודש לחול to do melacha if they didn't havdalla in tefilla, and **MB 34** adds from the **Levush** that it's best to say "ברוך" first.
- A. **PT fn. 100** quotes from **Ben Ish Chai + Kaf Hachaim 59** that even if one was mavdil in tefilla, it's best to say המבדיל ברוך, since some rishonim think that havdalla in tefilla doesn't suffice, and you davka need to say a separate amirah.
 - 1. However, lichorah this isn't an issue, since those rishonim who think it doesn't work in tefilla are leshitassam that you need to make an independent bracha of ברוך המבדיל. Since we don't paskin that way, it seems there's no reason to be מחמיר about this.
 - B. When Shabbos goes straight into Yom Tov, one should say ברוך המבדיל בין קודש לקודש (MB 299:36). **PT fn. 102** argues one is still yotze when they say the normal ברוך המבדיל text.
 - C. See **PT fn. 101** who argues if one is in a bathroom and needs to cut toilet paper or the like, it's better to be meharher in your mind "ברוך המבדיל" (which **א"א מבוטשאטש** here thinks suffices) and rely on **Rabbeinu Yerucham** than to say the words, as he considers them שבקדושה דברים, or at least עשיית מצוה, which is a discussion in the poskim in 76.

Eating and Drinking Before Havdalla

- I. **Pesachim 107a** says it's אסור to be טועם כלום prior to havdalla, and that "מיתתו באסכרה". **Rambam 29:5** paskins this way.
- II. What's the reason for this issur?
 - A. **Eishel Avraham Botchoch 299:1** thinks it's just a concern one won't say havdalla, but **most** reject this, since we don't find that even te'imah is אסור before doing any

standard mitzvah.¹³ Rather, **MB Sha'ar Hatziyun 299:6** spells out there's some independent issur with respect to eating before havdalla. What's the beiur?

1. The Rav (Shiurim Lezecher Abba Mari 2:131-134) argues that the goal of havdalla al hakos is to differentiate between סעודות השבת + סעודות החול. As such, any achilah once shabbos has ended prior to making havdalla is inappropriate.

III. There's a machlokes Rishonim when this issur begins:

- A. **Piskei Riaz Pesachim 10:1:21** says it starts at tzeis and Ba'al Hame'or Pesachim 21b BDPH implies this as well. **Rambam ibid.** also says "משיצא היום" which sounds like tzeis.¹⁴

1. This makes sense if the whole point is to be mechalek from seudos of Chol, or because the main חיוב havdalla doesn't start until Shabbos is certainly over.

- B. However, **Beiur Halacha 299:1 משתחשך ד"ה** quotes that **Rav Hai, Ritz Geius, Smag 29, Ittur + many others** all think the issur starts at shkiah, presumably due to it being a time of safek.

1. **SA 299:1** says the issur begins משתחשך and **Taz 299:1** understands he's being meikil. However, **MA 1 + most acharonim** think he means (and we should paskin) even shekiah is a problem. As such, **MB 1** says לכתחילה one should be מחמיר like most rishonim not to start after shekiah.

- a) There's another reason to prioritize eating before shekiah – besides the issur to eat before Havdallah – that לכתחילה we try and be mekayem the 3 seudos when it's vadai yom, like MB writes about eating on Friday night to have a kezayis of bread after tzeis. As such, one should be makpid to eat a kezayis of bread before shekiah for this reason as well.

2. However, בדיעבד if one hasn't yet fulfilled shalosh seudos by shekiah, they can be meikil to begin their seudah in conjunction with the sevara that עשה דחה ל' and the fact that this is the minhag (**Sha'ar Hatziyun 2**). This psak is accepted by almost all the contemporary acharonim – see Rav Rimon fn. 65 who quotes **ARUH, Teshuvos Vehanhagos 2:203, + Chazon Ovadya 2:390-393**, among others.

- a) If one hasn't started shekiah by the earliest reasonable time for when tzeis is (e.g. 25-30 minutes after shekiah in NY), it's too late to start eating.

3. **The MB there + Sha'ar Hatziyun 3** is even more meikil that one can eat even if one is just very hungry or thirsty, based on the shitah of Rabbeinu Tam. However, Rav Rimon ibid. argues (and our poskim would second this) that one can't rely on this, since we don't really follow Rabbeinu Tam even as a safek or senif.

¹³ **Derech Hachayim** (followed by **MB 299:1 + Sha'ar Hatziyun 4**) seems to think that the concern you'll forget to do the mitzvah applies half an hour before tzeis, but then the independent issur kicks in once it becomes actually tzeis. See **Rav Rimon end of fn. 65 + PT fn. 27** who quote various explanations for why we assume people will make Havdalla and aren't makpid about this "30 minutes beforehand" זמן. This is especially relevant in Israel and near the equator where 30 minutes before tzeis is already a few minutes before shekiah!

¹⁴ **ARUH 299:2** is medayek this way, although **Beiur Halacha 299:1 משתחשך ד"ה** understands him as being מחמיר without addressing this diyuk.

- IV. Even during this time, **Pesachim 105a + SA 299:1** are clear that you can still drink water prior to havdalla.¹⁵
- A. The reason water is allowed is because it has no chashivus whatsoever (ARUH 1). What about everything else - e.g. soda? **Salmas Chaim 273** was asked if someone who drinks coffee or tea should cause one to be mocheh, as MB in hilchos Pesach allows one to have tea after the seder, and considers it like water. Salmas Chaim answers one shouldn't make a mecha'ah, and the publishers argue it's because the gemara specifically emphasized **אסור** as **חמרא ושכרא**, so maybe it's only chashuv drinks that are a problem.
1. **Shulchan Shlomo 299:1 + Chut Shani**: One is allowed to drink tea without sugar, but not other drinks. [There are similar discussions about coffee, etc. in the morning before davening.]
 2. **Or Letzion 2:22:7** thinks only a choleh or zaken can drink coffee or tea before havdalla, even without sugar.
- V. If one started a seudah behetter, one is allowed to continue it past the end of Shabbos. This is implied by the gemara there, and although **SA 299:1** notes it's a machlokes Rishonim whether this means through bein hashmashos or even past tzeis, **Rema** writes we're נוהג lehakel even past tzeis.
- A. Why is this different than Kiddush where you have to stop immediately?
1. **Rabbeinu Bechayei** (Kisvei Rabbeinu Bechayei pg. 485) explains that it's actually a zilzul to suddenly stop your meal once Shabbos ends, as it looks like you're being "מגרש the King." Rather, the proper kevod Shabbos is to continue eating your shabbos seudah once you've already started – Rashbam there **הבדלה** says the same point bekitzur.
 - a) If so, the issur *should have been chal*, but just isn't because it would be poge'a in kevod Shabbos.
 2. In contrast, **The Rav** leshitaso explained that since the whole point is to be mechalek between seudos of Shabbos and shel chol, the whole issur isn't chal even fundamentally, as you're still having a seudas Shabbos.
- B. However, it's unclear what one has to eat or drink in order to continue eating. The gemara just uses a lashon of "seudah" sufficing, while someone who is just drinking does not suffice. Each drink is considered unrelated to the last one, so there's no המשך (Tosfos there).
1. If one started eating just mezonos before Shekiah, **ARUH 299:5 + others** say that you have to stop, since it's not a seudah. However, **Or Letzion 2:22:8** thinks one can be meikil, and **Shevet Halevi 8:36** adds there's more room to be meikil when using mezonos to fulfill one's חיוב of Shalosh Seudos.
 - a) **Rav Rimon fn. 69** paskins based on the above and **Chazon Ovadiah 2:395-6** that one should **לכתחילה** stop at shkiah, but if there's some need to keep eating, יש לו על מי לסמוך to continue.

¹⁵ Cf. **ARUH 299:1** who says we're נוהג not to drink based on Medrash in **Siman 291** that the neshamos go back to gehinnom. However, **Menuchas Ahavah 19:1** argues this is only relevant to מי נהרות, and not sink water. It's also hard to understand this, since the issue is all of bein hashmashos, and applies to drinking during a seudah as well then, as Rema there makes clear. Since we aren't מחמיר about this during סעודה שלישית, it's hard to understand why it should be a problem outside that context.

On Which Items Can You Make Havdallah Not Bread

- I. The Rishonim all paskin that you *cannot* make havdalla on bread, unlike by kiddush. They explain that bread has שייכות to kiddush due to the din of סעודה במקום קידוש. However, Havdalla and bread have nothing to do with each other, and therefore one is only able to make it al hakos like other brachos which were instituted that way. **SA 296:2** paskins this.
- II. There's a machlokes Rishonim though when it's יקנה"ז and you're anyways saying kiddush for Yom Tov along with havdalla for Shabbos. **SA** quotes two deios whether to make it on bread or on Chemar Medinah when you have no wine, but **Rema** says the ikar is that you should say it on bread.
 - A. **MB 15** just cautions that you should try extra hard to find wine in this case, since many rishonim (including Rif + Rosh) would say you're not yotze with bread.

Chemar Medinah

- I. **Pesachim 107a** tells the story of Ameimar who once came somewhere for Shabbos. When they didn't have wine, he refused to make havdalla on beer and fasted until he found wine the next day. The next year, he came again, and the same story happened; when Ameimar recognized this place never had wine and they used beer instead, he exclaimed, "א"ה חמר" i.e., it's a drink that's used in place of wine in that place, and he made havdalla. **SA 296:2** therefore paskins that one can make havdalla on beer or any other drink that's חמר מדינה, besides for water.
- II. What makes something חמר מדינה?
 - A. **Rashbam** there says it's only when there's no wine in the city. **MA 272:6** explains explains based on Ameimar fasting the first time that it doesn't mean *right now* there's no wine (as then Ameimar wouldn't have needed to fast), but that it's *normal* that there's no wine there.
 - B. **Other Rishonim** are even more מחמיר: **Ra'avya + Maharam** (quoted in **Tashbeitz Kattan 301**) says it has to be there's no wine in the whole *Medina*, which is presumably even bigger.
 - C. However, **Rambam 29:17** just says it needs to be that "מדינה שרוב יינה שיכר" without saying that wine is never matzui. **Beur Halacha 272:9 שמקדשין** understands Rambam lekula as above, and the **Piskei Riaz 10:1:29** is explicit this way too.
 - D. Nowadays, the above machlokes is very noge'a: We have wine, but wine is no longer the primary drink that it used to be. It could be that **Rashbam + Ra'avya** would say there is חמר מדינה, while **Rambam + Riaz** would say our alcoholic drinks are חמר מדינה.
- III. Lehalacha:
 - A. For Sefardim it seems like there's little room to be meikil: In three places where the **SA** mentions the option to use חמר מדינה (by kiddush in **272:9**, daytime kiddush in **289:2**), and birkas Hamazon in **182:2**), he writes "במקום שאין יין מצוי." **Rav Ovadya** (Chazon Ovadiah Shabbos 2:124) therefore says they cannot make havdalla on chemar medinah in most cases. [Although see **Or Letzion 2:22:2** for a mechudash read of the SA.]
 - B. However, the **Rema in 296:2** says the minhag is to make havdalla on beer on motzei Pesach because it's חביב עליו. **Rema in OC 182:2** by Birkas Hamazon similarly says that since wine is expensive, one can use other drinks for benching.
 1. **Taz 296:3, Beur Halacha** there הוא אם ד"ה + **ARUH 13** all understand him to mean that you can do this even if you *do* have access to wine, and the chiddush is that when a drink is Chaviv, the minhag is to treat it as equal with wine, and rely on

- the shitas haRambam. **Beur Halacha 296:2** **הוא אם ד"ה** spells out that one can be meikil any time one enjoys the drink over wine.
- a) Many acharonim (**Kovetz Teshuvos 1:57, Shevet Halevi 3:26 + others**) defend the practice of making havdalla (and kiddush in the morning) **חמר מדינה** based on the above Rema. They note that wine is no longer the foundational drink that it used to be, and even though it's still a chashuv drink, it's not the *only* chashuv drink, and therefore other alcoholic beverages can still have the status of **חמר מדינה**. See separate kiddush document as it relates to kiddush.
 - b) As noted, this hetter is only when it's Chaviv. If it's not, wine is certainly the best drink, and we don't rely on the Rambam **לכתחילה** without this. MB 296:8 spells this out.
 - c) If someone needs to drink something besides wine for some personal reason (e.g. diabetes or he needs to drive somewhere and can't have much alcohol), that's also reason to consider it Chaviv, and poskim are meikil (see **Shevet Halevi 5:32**). This is based on **Teshuvos Maimonios Hafla'ah 4** who says that if someone is noder from wine, we can consider beer **חמר מדינה** for him; you see there's a subjective/personal hagdara of **חמר מדינה**.
- C. In summary, for Ashkenazim, it's always best to have wine, since many rishonim think **חמר מדינה** is only שייך when there's literally no wine in the area. However, if someone has no easy access to Kosher wine,¹⁶ wants to make kiddush on something else for any reason, or generally likes a different drink more, there's fundamentally room to be meikil to make havdalla **חמר מדינה** on. [However, this is תלוי on which drinks are considered **חמר מדינה** – more on this below.]
- D. For Sefardim, only if they're in a place where there's no kosher wine or there's a **health** reason why they can't drink wine, we consider it **חמר מדינה** עבורו that they can use it (**YO 3:OC:19:6**).
- IV. Even once we establish there's a hetter to drink something besides wine and grape juice, the question becomes which drinks fit that hagdarah.
- A. **Rashbam 107a + SA 296:2** write that water cannot be **חמר מדינה**, but doesn't explain why it's fundamentally different.
- 1. What's the chiluk between water and **חמר מדינה**?
 - a) The **Shu"t Halachos Ketanos 1:9 (R' Yaakov Chagiz) + Shu"t HaRadal 4** both argue the fundamental criterion is that it has to be משכר. That's part of the definition of wine, and what enables other drinks to categorize them as "**חמר מדינה**".
 - (1) **Rav Ovadya YD 2:38 + YO 3:OC:19** paskins this way and says it's a bracha levatal if you make havdalla on any non-alcoholic drink.
 - b) **SA HaRav 272:10 + Ketzos Hashulchan 97:8** say that the hagdarah is something that people are kove'a seudah with. It's drunk normally in the context of a seudah. For this reason, **Ketzos Hashulchan + Minchas Shabbos 96:9** both say you can't use coffee or tea for this reason.
 - c) The **Aderes** (quoted in Rav Rimon pg. 707) noted that some gedolim *would* use such drinks, and argues the hagdarah is anything that's used לכבוד אורחים. Since tea and coffee are sometimes used, that suffices. **Rav Moshe OC 2:75** writes the same, but explains in more detail: **חמר מדינה** means a drink that one doesn't drink to quench one's thirst, but as a sign of kavod. Although we sometimes are mechabed guests with cold water and drinks, if they say they're not thirsty, that's reason enough for them not to have it. However, by wine, liquor

¹⁶ non-kosher wine is irrelevant, as you can't use it (**MB 272:24**)

and the like, if a guest were offered, he can't just say, "I'm not thirsty" and declining looks like he's deflecting the host's hospitality.

(1) **Rav Moshe** therefore writes there's room to consider milk (in his time) and tea as *חומר מדינה*, but it's not *פשוט* the latter works, since it's just *מים* *בעלמא* in its makeup. [See **ARUH 296:13** who has similar objections about lemonade.] He concludes one should only use them *בדוחק גדול*, considering it's already not *פשוט* one can use *חומר מדינה* when there's wine available.

(2) No one allows for milk any more, since people don't drink it as a *משקה חשוב* (or at all) nowadays. **MB 296:9** paskins that way (in his time) per the Birkei Yosef.

2. What about instant coffee? **Rav Rimon pg. 709** argues that Rav Moshe would allow it to the same extent he's *meikil* about tea, as they're both used *לכבוד אורחים*. In contrast, Halachos Ketanos + SA HaRav would both say it's not allowed since it's not *משקר* and isn't drunk in the context of a *seudah*. **SSC 60:6 + Tzitz Eliezer 8:16** both say one can be *meikil* in a *sha'as hadchak* when you have no wine or alcoholic beverages.

3. With respect to soft drinks and various carbonated beverages, it seems there's no reason to be *meikil*, and **Rav Moshe** explicitly rejects making *havdalla* on soda, since it's just used to quench one's thirst. **SSC 60:7** paskins *lechumrah* as well. **Rav Rimon** thinks that people drink high-quality drinks like Coke and Tropicana (only the "brand name" drinks) not only to quench thirst, but also as just their standard drink. As such, he thinks one can use these in a *sha'as hadchak gadol*.

B. The above presentation though is still incomplete, because there's another issue which **MA 272:6** raises, in the context of liquor for *havdalla*, that it has to not only be a certain type of drink but it also has to be "*שרוב שתיית ההמון היא [זה] בכל יום*." Meaning, besides for its properties for *kibud*, *seudah*, etc., it also has to be a drink which people *constantly* drink and not just on occasion. He argues this way based on the Rambam who writes that it's a city "*שרוב יינה שיכר*." **MB 296:9-10** paskins this way, such that any drink that isn't the standard drink that most people drink each day can't be *חומר מדינה*.

1. Practically then, **Rav Rimon pg. 712** notes it's very hard to designate liquor or any alcoholic beverage as *חומר מדינה*, since people don't drink anything alcoholic on a daily basis. It's for this reason that **Teshuvos Venhanhagos 4:77** writes that under the circumstances that one can make *havdalla* on *חומר מדינה*, one should use coffee or tea, which are drunk regular, and not beer or liquor. [One should also note if using liquor that **MB 296:9** cautions against using something so strong that you won't pour a *shiur* of it into a cup or drink the required *לוגמיו*.]

2. Other contemporary *poskim* don't seem bothered by this, and **Rav Rimon** argues it's based on communal standards and norms. If you live in a place where people drink beer, whisky, or other liquor daily, then you can use it. If not, it's better to use coffee.

בשמים / Bessamim

Why do we make this Bracha?

I. **Brachos 51b** says we make a bracha of *בשמים* *מבורא* in the course of *Havdalla*.

Rambam 29:29 spells out that this is "*מפני שהנפש דואבת ליציאת שבת, משמחין אותה, ומיישבין אותה בריח טוב*."

A. This is based on **Beitzah 16a** which spells out that *הקב"ה* gives everyone a *Neshamah Yeseirah* on Erev Shabbos, and takes it away on Motzei Shabbos. **Tosfos Beitzah 33b + others** spell out that we therefore smell *Besammim* in order to give us a *nechama* for

- that lost Nefesh. [Rambam doesn't spell it out this way, and may have understood that it's just the metzius of going from resting to working that causes tza'ar.]
- B. Both Tosfos ibid. and Rambam 29:28 say we don't make this bracha on motzei yom tov. Tosfos explains that there's no Neshama yeseirah given on Yom Tov. In fact, even when Shabbos goes into Yom Tov, although we lose the Neshama yeseirah, Tosfos Theresays the delicacies and special yom tov features serve in place of the Besamim, so we don't need them.
1. [See Yom Kippur notes for a machlokes **SA 624:3 + MB there** about whether to say it when it's motzei Yom Kippur that fell on Shabbos. Lema'aseh, we say it in that case, like the MB]
- II. Is this a חובה or a reshus?
- A. Brachos 53b says with respect to בורא מאורי האש that you don't need to be מחזר מחזר. The Rishonim discuss if this is true fro במ"ב as well:
1. **Ra'avad** (quoted by Rashba there) + **Rosh Brachos 8:3** both think that it's ar eshus, since the whole point is to make a person feel better. If he doesn't want to, he doesn't have to.
 2. In contrast, the **Meiri there** argues that this bracha was mandated since although it certainly gives the person Hana'ah, it also serves to demonstrate to a person the fact tthat they've lost their Neshama yeseirah, and is thus a form of kavod Shabbos.
 - a) For the Meiri, it's mistaber why we paskin like R' Chiya in **Pesachim 54a** to say במ"ב in the context of havdalla (ideally), since the whole point is to emphasize the difference between Shabbos and chol.
 3. Lehalacha, **SA 297:1** paskins it's a reshus like Ra'avad + Rosh, and you don't need to be מחזר מחזר. **Rav Rimon pg. 717** notes the fact that we say it in havdalla specifically (although it can be said outside that context) is either to add chashivus by making it הכוס, or because havdalla is the moment where we feel the preidah from Shabbos.
 - a) However, if one has them available, it sounds like it *is* a חיוב,¹⁷ which is explicit in the **Ritva Brachos 8:17**, that it's a חיוב when avaiable, but Chazal weren't matri'ach you to find besamim.
- B. Relatedly, there's a discussion in Rishonim whether one is able to make a borei minei besamim if the mevarech won't be neheneh. For instance, if the mavdil has a cold or can't smell for some reason, can he make the bracha for everyone else? **SA 297:5** paskins like the Tur that he *can* do so, which seems to take the tzad that this is a mitzvah of sorts and not just a standard הנהנין ברכת. However, **most acharonim** including **MB 13**, paskin against this SA and say he shouldn't make the bracha, in line with the above psak that it's more akin to a standard הנהנין ברכת.
- III. Because the purpose of this bracha is for each person to get Hana'ah from the besamim, each individual needs to smell it themselves, and can't be "yotze" through someone else's Hana'ah.
- A. At the same time, since this seems to partially be a mitzvah as well, **MB 297:13** says ברוב עם הדרת מלך one person should make the bracha on behalf of everyone else due to הדרת מלך. (This is said explicitly with respect to birkas haner in **Brachos 53a**.)
- IV. If one is far away from the one making havdalla, and he doesn't have besamim, we paskin that he can make this bracha independent of havdalla itself (**MB 13 ibid.**)
- A. As such, the person should either say another במ"ב after havdalla, or he can make sure not to be מסיח דעת until Havdalla is over, and then smell from the besamim when he's able to get access to them (**SSC 61:8**).

¹⁷ The SA's lashon is "מברך על הבשמים אם יש לו."

- B. He certainly shouldn't make a בּמ"ב in the middle of havdalla, as he needs to be listening to the other brachos that the mavdil is making.

What Should be Used for Besamim?

- I. **Tur 297**, followed by **SA 297:4** says the minhag is to make בּמ"ב on haddasim specifically.
 - A. The reason for this according to the MB 8 is because it was used for the arba minnim, and so we want to continue doing mitzvos with those same items. However, Sefardim are נוהג to use any haddasim, based on Beis Yosef who says there's an inherent sod in haddasim unrelated to their use on Sukkos.
- II. However, Ashkenazim, per the **Rema there** says that although it's good to include some haddasim, since they're often too dry to be smelled, it's better just to use other besamim.

Nusach Habracha

- I. Theoretically, there are different brachos for smelling, depending on whether something comes from a tree (בּוֹרֵא עֵצִי בְשָׁמִים), a grass (עֵשְׂבִי בְשָׁמִים), from a fruit (הַנּוֹתֵן רִיחַ טוֹב). See **SA 216:2**.
 - A. Sefardim therefore make the appropriate bracha on whatever they're smelling at havdalla; e.g., if haddasim, they'll say בּוֹרֵא עֵצִי בְשָׁמִים.
 - B. However, Ashkenazim are נוהג to make a בּמ"ב no matter what, and the **MA 297 + others** from **Shlah** explains that because the עם הַמּוֹן aren't so well-versed in these Halachos, we're נוהג just to always make this same Bracha, since it's a catch-all Bracha, like שֶׁהַכֹּל.
 - 1. Because of this minhag, **MB 297:1** recommends making בּמ"ב on something that actually fits that Bracha, such as cloves¹⁸ or the like.

Halachos of Besamim and What Can Be Used

- I. **RSZA (quoted in SSC 61:fn. 32)** was מסופק whether you can make a בּמ"ב on synthetic scents. Although **Rav Ovadiah** (Chazon Ovadya Brachos 313) is meikil that one can make a Bracha, the psak for Ashkenazim is that we don't make a Bracha on synthetic aromas, unless they're mixed with natural ones.
- II. **SA 217:3** paskins based on **Rambam Brachos 9:8** that one can't make a Bracha on a smell that was just absorbed into a fabric. You need to have the source of the smell itself in order to make a Bracha. As such, if you have an empty besamim container, **MB 297:7** spells out that you cannot make a Bracha, unless there's some dust of the original item there.
- III. If you have oils which were scented with other fragrances, **SA 216:6** quotes a machlokes about what Bracha to make and whether to make a Bracha at all. He therefore recommends one shouldn't smell them at all. However, **MB 32 there** says one can choose to be meikil, based on many acharonim, and to make a borei minei besamim.
 - A. As such, if someone wants to make a Bracha on infused oils from a natural source, they can choose to do so. If those infused oils contain any actual parts of the original smell-source, they can do so לכתחילה (**SSC 61 fn. 32**)
 - B. Of note, essential oils are not the same thing as infused oils. Infused oils are literally the above shailah – a standard oil infused with smells from something else. Essential oils aren't necessarily oils at all, and are just a concentrated compound that's extracted from a plant or other source. Assuming it's a mostly natural occurring source, one could

¹⁸ It's really a big machlokes acharonim what Bracha to make on cloves, but because of the machlokes, the psak is to make a borei minei besamim, even outside the context of Havdalla – see **MB 216:16**.

certainly make a Bracha. If much of the smell is synthetic though, this would be less פשוט.

- IV. The **Mishnah in Brachos 51b + Gemara 53a** there says you can't make a Bracha on something intended just to remove a bad smell. As such, one can't make a bracha on deodorant, a bathroom air freshener, or the like, for Besamim (**SA 297:2**). The **Rema** spells out that one isn't even yotze their mitzvah בדיעבד with this.
- V. There's a question about whether one can use spices that are intended for cooking, as the smell might not be good/strong enough. The **Taz 108:10 + Shach in Nekuddos Hakessef** debate whether you can make a Bracha on ginger and pepper.
 - A. **MB 297:1** paskins that although the above spices should be avoided, if it's something that all agree has a strong, pleasant smell, you can make a Bracha on them. As such, one could use cloves or cinnamon. MB *ibid.* says allspice suffices as well.
 - 1. Some, including **SA HaRav Birkas Hanehenin 11:9 + Chazon Ish 35:5**, think that any time a spice is intended for cooking, you can never make a Bracha on them. However, **MB 297:10** based on **Taz** there paskins that the moment you take such a spice with intent to smell it, that suffices to consider it עשוי לריח. Despite this, the **Taz + MB** *ibid* recommend having designated havdalla spices, as that's a מצוה מן המובחר which goes back to Rabbeinu Efraim.

Birkas HaNer

Reason for this Bracha

- I. **Mishnah Brachos 51b** says that we make a Bracha on a Ner מוצ"ש. In **Pesachim 53b**, Shmuel explains "הואיל ותחילת ברייתו הוא." **Pesachim 54a** spells out (and is expanded upon in **Breishis Rabbah 11:2**) that the הקב"ה originally had a light (the אור הגנוז) go for 36 hours – from when Adam was created until Motzei Shabbos. As it became dark, the הקב"ה gave Adam the insight to bring two rocks together and make fire.
 - A. However, we also say בורא מאורי האש (במה"א) on motzei yom kippur, and **Breishis Rabbah** *ibid.* spells out that's because we were שבת from using fire the entire day.
 - B. The **Rishonim** (e.g. **Ritva Pesachim 54a**) understand that on motzei Shabbos, we're really saying this Bracha for *both* reasons: A) that it was created in this time, and B) Since we were unable to utilize throughout Shabbos. On Yom Kippur, we say the Bracha only because of reason B.
 - 1. Because these are the two reasons, we don't say it on motzei yom tov at all, since A) it wasn't created then, and B) we were able to use fires to cook the entire time.
 - 2. Based on this, there's a נפקא מינה that the fire for motzei yom kippur specifically has to be one that existed on YK (i.e. that was lit before YK), to emphasize that the same fire which was previously prohibited is now permitted. (See Hilchos YK document for details.) In contrast, we can say the Bracha on motzei shabbos on even a brand new fire, since that still fits with the first reason that fire was made then.¹⁹
- II. Because of the above reason, Birkas Haner is only said on motzei shabbos. If one didn't take care of it then, we don't make the Bracha on Sunday or another day, based on **Pesachim 106a**.

What Type of Bracha is It?

- I. Is Birkas Haner (Borei Meorei ha'eish) a Birkas hanehenin or a Birkas hashevach?

¹⁹ The above is how the **Ran to Pesachim 53b** explains it. Cf. **Ramban Brachos 53a** for a different take on the chiluk in dinnim.

- A. Tosfos on 45a** compares this bracha to other birchos hanehenin, implying he thinks it's a ברכת הנהנין. This is explicit in the Michtam Brachos 53b + other Chachmei Provence
1. The difficulty with this shitah, as noted by the **other rishonim**, is that we only ever say this Bracha on motzei shabbos, and not other times. By all birkas hanehenin, you say it whenever you get Hana'ah. Ritva Pesachim 54a, Rosh (Below) + Ran to Pesachim 53b, amongst others, are all clear that this is *not* a birkas hanehenin.
 2. Why not? **Tosfos Pesachim 53b** says that you don't get Hana'ah from a fire and **Ramban Brachos 53a** explains that we only make a birkas hanehein on a Hana'ah which makes contact or enters one's body. Light is something external (unlike smell, taste, and the like), and so we don't make a birkas hanehenin.
- B. Ramban, Ritva + Ran ibid.** all say that it's a birkas hashevach for הקב"ה helping us understand how to create fire. We only make the Bracha on motzei shabbos though either because that's when it's created or because the fact that we weren't able to utilize it makes us appreciate it more. [You don't make a birkas hashevach on something you're constantly exposed to.]
- C. Rosh 8:3** is clear this is not a birkas hanehenin, which is why you don't need to make a Bracha every time you get Hana'ah. At the same time, he says it's just a "זכר בעלמא" that fire was made on Motzei Shabbos. It sounds like it's not really a birkas hashevach either.
- D. Rashba 53a** asks the תנ"ך's question + answers that they're "הנאה כעין חובה".
1. **Beur Halacha 213:1 על ד"ה** understands this to mean it's a Birkas Hashevach. See **Beur Halacha 296:7 לעצמן** that **MA** holds it's a birkas hashevach as well.
- II. Some of the נפקא מינה:**
- A.** Do you have a חיוב to find a fire? We paskin in **Brachos 53b + SA 298:1** that you don't need to be מחזר after a fire, and **Ramban** spells out it's because we're never mechazer after any birkas hashevach. The **Rosh leshitaso 8:3** gives his answer that it's a זכר בעלמא.
- B.** Can you be motzi others in this Bracha if you already made it?
1. **Birkei Yosef 298:1** says you can definitely be motzi others even after you've been yotzer since it's a mitzvah. **Ritva Pesachim 54a + MB 298:36** paskin this way.
 2. However, **Elyah Rabbah, SA HaRav + Chazon Ish 35:7** all think that since it's not a חובה Mamash and therefore you can't be motzi others.
 - a) **Rav Rimon fn. 115** based on earlier acharonim (e.g., **Kaf Hachaim 298:2**) thinks one should be מחמיר לכתחילה that the listener should make this Bracha and not the mavdil if he's already been yotze
- C.** Can you get Hana'ah from fire/light before making a borei me'orei ha'eish? Because we paskin it's not a ברכת הנהנין, **MB 298:4** paskins that if one doesn't expect to get a Kos for havdalla for a little while, it's best to hold off on making the ב"מ until one can do so al hakos, even if they get Hana'ah from other fire before then.
- D.** See below for potential נפקא מינה about when to look at one's fingernails.

Birkas Haner As Part of Havdalla

- I. Pesachim 54a** quotes a machlokes about whether to say birkas haner in the context of Havdallah, or the first moment one has access to a fire. We paskin to say it as part of the havdalla text.
- A. Rashi Kesubos 8a** makes it sound like this isn't anything fundamental, but is just because we want to give it the chashivus of being על הכוס.

- B. Rav Rimon pg. 739** based on similar ideas in Rishonim argues it might also be fundamental, that since במה"א emphasizes that which we couldn't do over Shabbos, it serves as a statement of the uniqueness of Shabbos, which fits conceptually into the framework of havdalla.
- C.** Whatever the reason, we paskin this isn't me'akev, so one can make במה"א alone if they need to, and it's just a לכתחילה that we try and do it in the context of Havdalla (**Rema 298:1**). In fact, on Motzei Shabbos that's Chal on Tish'ah B'av, our minhag is to make a birkas haner alone.
1. On the flip side, if you don't have a fire, you can still make havdalla without it, and find a candle later. You're not even mechuyav to find one if you can't, as אין מחזירין אחר הנר.

Getting Hana'ah from the Flame

- I. **Brachos 51b** says שיאותו לאורו עד. **SA 298:4** based on Rava in **53b** **there** says you don't need to actually get Hana'ah, but just to be close enough that you *could have* benefited from the light. **SA** spells out it needs to illuminate enough that you could distinguish between two different types of coins with that fire.
 - A. If someone is too far away from the candle to get benefit, they aren't yotze the mitzvah, and they should either have in mind to be yotze and run over to the fire once havdalla is completed (**SSC 61:23**) or have in mind they aren't being yotze, and then say the Bracha separately on a fire later when they're able to get close enough to one.
- II. Because you don't need to actually benefit from the light, **many poskim** (like **Rav Rimon pg. 742**) are meikil (at least בדיעבד) to make this Bracha even if the electric lights are on and the flame isn't providing any additional light. However, there are three reasons to require (at least לכתחילה) that a person turn off the lights:
 - A. **Some rishonim** do think that it's a birkas hanehenin, so if you want to be yotze that shitah, you need to actually benefit from the light.
 - B. **SSC 61:33** says it still needs to be that you'd be *able* to benefit from the fire's light, which isn't really the case so long as the lights are on.
 1. **Rivevos Efraim 2:115:32** says something similar, since you want to be able to actually benefit.
 - C. **Rav Schachter (+ Moadim Uzmanim 6:90)** both think you need to turn off the electric lights since Gemara 53a says a fire that's just lit לכבוד can't be used, and it has to be lit להאיר. **Rivevos Efraim** makes the same argument.
- III. Despite the above, **Pirkei Derebbe Eliezer 20** says one should look at one's fingernails and distinguish between them and the surrounding skin before making the Bracha. Looking at the fingernails is quoted as a minhag by **Rosh Brachos 8:3, Meiri 53b + others**. Another minhag mentioned by the **Geonim** (quoted by the Tur 298) was to look at the palms of one's hands.
 - A. Consequently, **SA 298:3** quotes that we're נזהג to look at our palms and nails, and **Rema** spells out that you buckle your fingers to be able to see both the nails and the palm at the same time. Al pi Kabbalah, Rema says to look at one's right hand. MB 11 adds that some are נזהג al pi Kabbalah to extend their fingers and look at their fingernails again after first doing like the Rema.
- IV. Should one look before or after making the Bracha? Lichorah, this is a simple מנהג of whether it's a birkas hanehenin (get Hana'ah after the Bracha) or birkas hashevach (say the Bracha after appreciating/seeing the fire).
 - A. From the **Pirkei Derebbe Eliezer** and **Rishonim** who quote it, it sounds like you look at your fingernails first.

1. This is how the **PMG** and **MB 296:31** paskin. **Rav Schachter** thinks this is correct as well.
2. However, **Chazon Ish**, **Rav Moshe (OC 5:9:9) + Siddur HaGra (2:141b)** thought you should say bracha first, and **Rav Rimon pg. 744** says this seems to be the minhag.
 - a) **Rav Moshe** explains even though it's not a birkas hanehenin, since the Bracha was נתקנה based on שיאותו עד, it's מתייחס to Hana'ah as well, and therefore the procedure should mimic that of a birkas hanehenin.
 - b) **Rav Rimon** quotes that Rav Lichtenstein used to do like both shitos.
- V. One needs to be able to actually see the fire (**SA 15**). If people are blocking, even if very bright from the flame, you aren't yotze (**PT 5**).

Someone who can't see well making borei me'orei ha'eish:

- I. **SA 13** says a סומא can't make a Bracha, since he wouldn't be able to distinguish between different coins (**MB 34**).
 - A. **PT 9** argues based on this, that even someone whose eye sight is very poor (even with glasses) shouldn't be able to make this Bracha, and should hear from someone else. However, since the poskim don't really bring this up, there's room to be meikil Bish'as hadchak.

Requirements of the Ner Itself

- I. **Brachos 51b** has a bunch of limitations on the type of fire one can use, such as that one can't use a נר לכבודו של מת, or a fire from a תנור וכיריים if it was lit for the purpose of cooking and not illumination. The klal of these dinnim (all paskined in **SA 298:9-12**) is that one can be mevarech only on a fire that was started for the purpose of illumination/light and not for other purposes.²⁰
 - A. For this reason, one can't make the Bracha on the Chanukah candles, a Ner Neshama, or a gas fire that was lit for cooking.
 1. However, **MB 29** says if one extinguishes one of these fires and relights them with intent for them to be a Ner Havdalla, that suffices to make a Bracha on them.
 2. When a gas fire was lit just for the purpose of havdalla, **RSZA in SSC 61 fn. 87** was מסופק whether this would suffice, or if the fact that this fire is always for cooking, it's always פסול for the bracha. Lichorah, it's more mistaber this should be fine, and **Piskei Teshuvos fn. 52** is meikil as well Bisha'as hadchak, adding in the Senif that the **Ra'avad** (mentioned in fn. above) thinks אור לבישול also suffices.
 - B. The **ARUH 14** raises the issue that we light our havdalla candles not for light, but for the mitzvah, and concludes it isn't a problem – since our intent is for the mitzvah, that automatically means we intend for light, as that's the way to be mekayem the mitzvah.
 1. [In fact, **SA 298:2** paskins that one should have a candle specifically for the purpose of havdalla, and although the acharonim aren't sure exactly why this should be (see **ARUH 6** there), this is certainly the minhag.]
 - C. See above that it's for this reason that **Rav Schachter + Moadim Uzmanim 6:90** say one should turn off the electric lights during במה"א, so that the fire is really there in order to create light.

²⁰ This is how **Rashi there + most Rishonim** learn. However, **Ra'avad** thinks a fire lit for the purpose of any hana'ah suffices, and that's why we say מאורי האש. He learns all those cases are excluded just because they were lit לכבוד in some form. See below that poskim will sometimes use his shitah as a senif lehakel.

- II. Avukah: **Pesachim 103b** says that an Avukah is the מוצה מן המובחר. However, it's not me'akev. What's the reason for this?
- A. Bepashtus, **Rav Rimon pg. 746** suggests it's a stronger light. However, **Ritva Pesachim 7b** suggests that it enables a greater קיום of **מאורי האש**, since more colors of fire are visible in an Avukah.
 - B. Either way, this halacha is paskined in **SA 298:2**, and the Rema adds that even two separate wicks suffices for this.
 - 1. **Beur Halacha ונר ד"ה** entertains that one thick wick suffices, but the acharonim generally don't accept this.
 - 2. **MB 298:8** emphasizes the two wicks should be separate from each other or it's just like one thick wick.
 - 3. **MB ibid.** adds based on the **MA** that the *fires* should join together. The **MA** is based on the halachos for bedikas chametz where we allow two separate flames that don't join together, despite that an avukah can't be used. **MA** proves from there that if the two flames don't join together, it doesn't have the status of an Avukah.
 - a) Most havdalla candles therefore have wicks which are separated a short distance but stuck in place so that the flames join together.
 - b) At the same time, **MB in Sha'ar Hatziyun 9** references **RAE** who rejects the **MA**. He argues there's no ra'ayah from Avukah by Bedikas Chametz, as that's really just a din that it needs to be ליכנס לחורים וסדקים, and the joined fire is what prevents that. However, for the purposes of havdalla, two separate flames in close proximity are considered an avukah. See hilchos Yom Tov notes that **Rav Schachter + other poskim** think one should rely on **RAE** for havdalla on yom tov, so that you don't run into questions of kibbui and Havarah שלא לצורך.
 - C. One could also use two matches (even though there's no wick), as **Gemara 53b + SA 298:8** make clear. In order to fulfill the hagdara of avukah spelled out above, one should *not* touch the matches together, but just have their flames join together.
 - 1. Al pi Kabbalah, there's an ענין to use wax specifically (**MA 298:3**). See **Piskei Teshuvos** for some of the reasons for this.
- III. Electric Lights
- A. One certainly can't make a Bracha on an LED or fluorescent light bulb, as there's no metal filament, and thus no halachic fire. However, there's a discussion whether you can make the ברכת הנר on an incandescent lightbulb, since it's halachically viewed as a fire.
 - B. The following are reasons some poskim were hesitant:
 - 1. There's a discussion if you can make a bracha when you see the Ner through a glass cover: The gemara in **Brachos 53b** has a vague line that one can't make a Bracha on a flame inside a פנס. What is this?
 - a) **Rashi** explains it's עששית, which sounds like a clear glass cover prevents one from making the Bracha.
 - b) In contrast, the **Rashba there** thinks that you *could* make a Bracha in this case, and the gemara is talking about some sort of metal chamber with small holes, such that it's not possible to really make out the flame (see **MB 298:37**).²¹

²¹ **Rashba** brings a ra'ayah seeing through glass is still considered ראייה from **Brachos 25b** that ערוה בעששית is אסור. However, **Beur Halacha 298:15 או ד"ה** rejects this ra'ayah, since even if it's considered "seeing," it could be there's a local requirement to במה"א that the fire be בגלוי like it was when Adam Harishon first created that fire. Alternatively, **Rav Rimon fn. 137** notes you could argue ערוה בעששית is אסור not because it's actually ראייה, but because the issur to say ק"ש there is because of חשש הרהור, which certainly exists irrespective of whether this is halachic "seeing."

- c) Based on the **Yerushalmi Brachos 8:6** which says you can't make a Bracha on a candle that's in an "אספקלריה," **BY** paskins like Rashi and rejects the Rashba.
 - (1) However, **ARUH 298:14 + others** argue it's not a ra'ayah, and אספקלריה here means a mirror, not glass, but that seeing through clear glass certainly suffices.
 - (2) Consequently, for Sefardim who follow "מרן ש"ע," it's hard to be meikil to allow one to make a במה"א on an incandescent bulb, and **Rav Ovadiah YD 2:39 + elsewhere** says they shouldn't do so.
 - d) However, **many acharonim** disagree with the SA's psak and say we follow the Rashba. Amongst them are the **MA 298:20, Chayei Adam 8:34 + SA HaRav 298:21**.
 - e) The **Beur Halacha Seif 15 או ד"ה** discusses this at length and recommends being מחמיר (in the context of a fire in a glass lamp), but many poskim either disagreed with this conclusion, or think there's more reason to be meikil by an incandescent bulb where A) the normal way to see this "fire" is always through glass²², and B) The bulb literally can't exist without the glass enclosure.²³
2. **Har Tzvi OC 2:114** argues that it's not a fire (as noted, we don't paskin this way)
 3. **RSZA in Meeorei Eish 5** argues that there's no *flame* even if it's a halachic fire, and **Brachos 53b** implies we specifically need a flame.
 4. **SSC 61:fn. 105** adds that you're supposed to have multiple colors to the flame (which is how rishonim explain why we say בורא מאורי האש), and an incandescent bulb only has one.
- C.** Despite the above concerns, many poskim were not only meikil in theory, but in practice. **Rav Soloveitchik (Nefesh HaRav pg. 156)** quoted that **Rav Chaim Ozer** would say Borei Meorei Haeish on an incandescent bulb just to prove to everyone it was real fire. **Reb Chaim** is reported by **Shu"t Nachalas Shimon 15 + others** as having done the same. This is also the psak of the **Tzitz Eliezer 1:20:13**, and **Rav Rimom** reports that **Rav Lichtenstein** was comfortable making a Bracha on an incandescent bulb as well, and almost did one time, but they found two matches right beforehand.
1. לכתחילה, it's certainly better to use a candle, since A) there are a number of poskim who think this doesn't work even בדיעבד, b) You lose the hiddur of אבוקה (see **Tzitz Eliezer ibid** who notes this), and C) We have a hiddur to use wax specifically. However, if you're stuck, one can be meikil to use a bulb.
 - a) It's noteworthy that one still can't make a Bracha on *any* incandescent lightbulb. because one has a requirement to see the flame, as mentioned above. Consequently, if a bulb is frosted, you can't make the Bracha. It needs to be a *clear* glass bulb.
- IV.** Despite the above discussion about seeing through glass, the poskim (**Ketzos Hashulchan 99:6, YO 1:OC:18:6-8 + others**) all note the minhag is that people make the Bracha with their glasses on. The two main explanations are that a) this enables them to see it *better* and b) the din is that the *fire* needs to be uncovered, and there's no issue with you looking through your glasses if the fire can be seen without them.

²² This argument is offered by **Tzitz Eliezer 1:20:13:4**. See below that it's along these lines that poskim don't require people to lift their glasses off. Despite this, **Yechaveh Da'as 2:39** says we can't rely on sevaros like that alone.

²³ The tungsten filament needs to be in a sealed vacuum or inert gas environment to prevent it from oxidizing and burning out immediately. Because it reaches such high heat, if the glass were removed, it would immediately react with atmospheric oxygen and disintegrate.

The Seder of Havdalla

- I. See **MB 262:8** that one should be wearing their shabbos clothes for havdalla, and **262:4** that the Shabbos table should still be set when you say it.

Sit or Stand?

- I. **Kolbo 41** says we're נוהג to stand like one would stand to be melaveh someone away. Since we're being melaveh the מלך, one should stand.
- II. However, **Tosfos Brachos 43a** is bothered since you need a kevius to be motzi others, and therefore recommends that everyone sit. He raises the possibility that the fact that everyone gathered for havdalla works as a kevius, but leans against relying on this.
- A. Based on Tosfos, **SA 296:6** says to sit.
1. However, **Birchas Rosh ibid. + others** say that this was davka because their minhag was for everyone to drink from the כוס של הבדלה, so they needed to sit to create a קביעות on the bracha rishona. The rest of הבדלה is a birchas hamitzvah or other type of hana'ah which doesn't require kevius, so you can stand. This is משמע in Tosfos' lashon, and is said as well by **PMG MZ 296:5 + Beis Meir** on MA 4. **Rav Schachter** thinks this is correct. Despite all this, **Rav Ovadya YD 4:26** says one should still sit, as he's concerned that the במה"א + במ"ב might have the same rules as birkos hanehenin.
- B. **Rema** says to specifically stand, since we're being מלווה the King, as noted.
1. Based on the **Yerushalmi**, he adds that everyone should look at the Kos + Ner so they don't get distracted (**MB 3**).
 2. **Dirshu 24** says this was the minhag of the **Chofetz Chayim**; however, **Chazon Ish + Steipler** would sit for havdalla.
 3. See **MB 5** that one should definitely sit during the actual drinking since it's not דרך ארץ to drink standing up (this din is based on the **Hilchos Derech Eretz 4:1** which says a ת"ח doesn't eat or drink standing up.)
- III. When all the brachos are finished, the mavdil should drink immediately. **MB 296:6** quotes our minhag is that *only* the mavdil drinks, to ensure that he drank enough wine. He needs to drink a לוגמיו מלא (majority of a Revi'is), but ideally drinks a full revi'is so that he isn't נכנס into a safek about whether to make a אחרונה.

Holding the Kos:

- I. **Ra'avya 120** based on **Brachos 43b** says that one should hold whatever they're making a bracha on in their right hand. As such, you hold the cup in your right/strong hand for the ג' בפ"ה, the Besamim during במ"ב, and then move the cup into the strong hand afterwards. For righties, this is done after במה"א, since you need to look at your right hand's fingernails and palm (**MB 31**). All this is paskined in **SA 296:6**.
- II. However, there's another detail found in both the Ra'avya + SA that when holding the Besamim in the right hand, you should still hold the Kos in your left hand.
- A. The **ARUH 296:17** says this isn't required at all and is just a practicality if one didn't have a table, but you can put the Kos down, and he reports that's the minhag.
- B. However, **MB 30** says that this *is* a requirement, so that the brachos on besamim + ner will be considered "על הכוס." **Rav Rimon** therefore says one should be מחמיר to do so unless their minhag is like the ARUH not to be makpid.
1. **The Ra'avya** also mentions holding the besamim at the beginning in your left hand, and **SA** quotes this lashon. However, there's no real reason for this, and here we accept the ARUH that this is unnecessary. **Rav Rimon** notes this is the minhag

despite that some acharonim (like **Chayei Adam 8:24**) quote the SA about this as if it's a din.

- III. Obviously, all the rules of כוס של ברכה apply to the Kos shel havdalla. See separate kiddush document for the details of this.

Minhagim relating to Siman Tov

- I. Besides the pesukim we add at the beginning of havdalla, **Rema 296:1** adds a few other minhagim we have as a siman for Bracha. First, we pour out some wine as a Siman Bracha, second we use the wine that's spilled to be מכבה the candle, and third, we place the wine on our eyes, due to Chibuv mitzvah.
- A. The first minhag to pour out the wine is contested though:
1. **Taz 296:1** says that it's improper to dump the wine לאיבוד, and therefore, one should just overfill the Kos slightly, such that some of the wine overflows. **MB 5** spells out one should minimize how much wine overflows.
- B. The reason for the 2nd minhag is given by the **SA HaRav 5** says it's to show everyone that the Ner was lit for the purpose of the Mitzvah, so that we could make the Bracha.
1. Others point to a Medrash in **Otzar Medrashim** that says someone who blows out a candle will have children who are נכפים, and there's a minhag some have not to blow out *any* candle with their breath for this reason.
 2. In **Rav Ovadya's** he'aros on Rav Sonnenfeld's Salmas Chaim (published in **YO 9:OC:95**), he quotes **Rav Sonnenfeld** as being מחמיר. **Rav Ovadya** quotes that a few seforim quote such an idea from the **Kol Bo**; however, since no classic halachic sefarim mention this, he says "לכאורה י"ל שכיון שלא נזכר בש"ס אין לחוש כל כך."
- C. Finally, the idea of washing one's eyes (the third minhag) is based on the **Pirkei Derebbe Eliezer 20 + Teshuvos Hageonim** (quoted in **Ra'avya 547**) that doing this is a form of Chibuv Mitzvah. **Rav Natrona'i Gaon** (quoted in **Tosfos Pesachim 100b**) thought that this also serves as a refuah for poor eyesight, based on the idea that pessiah gassa takes away 1/500th of one's eyesight.
1. See **Piskei Teshuvos** for sources on the minhag some have to say, "מצוות ה' היא", "תתעשר וכו' after doing so.