The Chicago Center
Digest
Mishna Berura
THE DAILY RESOURCE FOR MISHNA BERURA YOMI
Shabbos, June 18 2022 ■ י"ט סיון, תשפ"ב
סימן קע"ח סעיף ג'

Overview

Siman 178 Seif 3:

There is an opinion that maintains that if one was in a garden and wants to eat from different trees, once he recites the beracha on the fruit of one tree he is not obligated to recite a beracha on the fruit of other trees as long as he had in mind to eat from the other trees when he recited the beracha. If he goes from one garden to another he must recite another beracha even if they are close to one another and even if he had in mind to eat fruit from both gardens.

- Shulchan Aruch refers to where the garden is surrounded by a wall. According to some authorities Shulchan Aruch refers to where it is not surrounded by a wall and another beracha is not required since he had in mind to eat from the other trees. Accordingly, in the previous seif it must refer to where he did not have in mind to eat from the other side of the tree. (M.B. 37)
- Chaye Adam distinguishes between a garden that is surrounded by a wall and one that is not. When surrounded by a wall, intent to eat from the other trees is not necessary and it is assumed that one will eat from the other trees but when it is not surrounded by walls one must have in mind when he recited the beracha that he will eat from the other trees. (M.B. 38)
- Changing one's place is comparable to moving from one house to another and intent is not effective. (M.B. 39)
- If one recited a beracha on a fruit with the intent to eat there and then he changed his place, he did not discharge his obligation to recite a beracha [According to Biur Halacha this is limited to where he moved from one house to another]. Chaye Adam writes that even holding onto the fruit and eating does not change the fact that he switched locations if he did not have in mind to move from one room to another. This applies l'chatchila but b'dieved it is not necessary to repeat the beracha if he only changed rooms. (M.B. 39)

Halacha Highlight

Eating in a garden

Shulchan Aruch Siman 178 Seif 3

שאם היה בגן

That if one was in the garden

Shulchan Aruch discusses one who would like to move from one location to another within a garden. He cites an opinion that maintains that one who intends to eat from different trees in the garden does not have to recite a beracha when he moves from one tree to another as long as he had in mind when he recited his original beracha that he would be eating from multiple trees. The reason an additional beracha is unnecessary is that Shulchan Aruch refers to a garden that is surrounded by a wall making the entire area a single domain. Other authorities explain that Shulchan Aruch refers to a garden that is not surrounded by walls and the reason a new beracha is not required is that he had intent to eat from the other trees when he originally recited the beracha. For this reason Shulchan Aruch introduced this halacha with the words יש מי שאומר "There is an opinion" to indicate that it reflects the minority opinion of Ra'avad.

The conclusion of the Poskim is that if one visits a garden that is surrounded by walls it is considered a single house and one may move from one location to another location without having to recite a second beracha. It is even permitted to go from one structure in the garden to another or even from a structure to an open area since it is considered as though one is moving from one room in a house to another. If the garden is not surrounded by walls but he had in mind when he originally recited the beracha rishona to move from one area to another he would not be required to recite a second beracha. If he did not have in mind to eat in a second location but the two places are visible to one another there is a dispute whether a second beracha is required and in such a case another beracha should not be recited (ספק ברכות להקל). If the second location is not visible to the first location all opinions would agree that a second beracha is required (פסקי תשובות אות י"ד).

Stories to Share

Field Trip

ש"ע, ס' קע"ח, ד': "שאם היה בגן..."

One family liked to take a tent with them for day trips. They did not enjoy sleeping in a tent, but liked to take long hikes and found a tent a perfect way to rest on their journey. The father wondered what the halachah was regarding their tent. Although a house is clearly a different domain, a tent which is erected for a short period may well count only as part of the field or orchard one is in. Or it may well be that despite its impermanence such a tent counts like any other home, since it is adequate shelter?

They also liked to take "jawbreaker"-type candies that could be kept in the mouth for a long time, which provided a steady stream of energy for long hikes. This too seemed to present a question. Perhaps when they came to what was obviously a new domain they had to make a new berachah, like the halachah of 'one orchard to another' brought on today's amud? Just like having in mind to eat from a second orchard does not discharge the berachah on fruit from the second orchard, perhaps one who is walking may need to make a new blessing if he goes out of the forest to a field, or from one field to the other, or the like?

When these questions reached Rav Nissim Karelitz, zt"l, he replied that the man was mistaken on both counts. "It seems clear that one who makes a berachah in a tent—even one put up for a few hours while travelling, must make a new blessing if he leaves the tent just like one who leaves a permanent house.

"As far as one who makes a berachah on a candy and spends a lot of time on it, he certainly doesn't need to make a new blessing at every stop along his way!"

חוט שני, ברכת הנהנין וכו', ע' קע"ו