

lyun Halacha is sponsored by the Dr. Philip & Mrs. Leah Mehler Family Foundation In memory of their parents Dr. Irving & Mrs. Bernice Mehler & Mr. Gedalja & Mrs. Miriam Zupnik לעילוי נשמת ר' יצחק מאיר בן אליהו ובריינא בת אברהם ע״ה ור' גדליה בן אברהם מנחם הכהן ומרים בת ישראל ע״ה

Kiddush Bimakom Se'uda by Rabbi Chaim Yeshaya Freeman

How does one establish kiddush bimakom se'uda?

Must one repeat kiddush if he eats his meal in a different place than where he recited kiddush?

The obligation to recite *kiddush* (or hear another recite it) on Shabbos, both by night and by day, is well known. Less known, and even less understood, is a requirement known as *kiddush bimakom se'uda*, that the *kiddush* must take place in the location of one's meal. This article will explore the source and some of the basic halachic details of this requirement.

The source: The Gemara (Pesachim 101a) cites a dispute between Rav and Shmuel regarding the recitation of *kiddush* in shul with intent to eat at home. Rav rules that one who recites *kiddush* in shul has fulfilled the obligation of *kiddush*. Shmuel argues that one has not fulfilled the obligation. The Gemara explains that the ruling of Shmuel is in line with another statement of Shmuel that *kiddush* is invalid unless it is recited in the place where the meal is eaten. This halacha is referred to as *kiddush bimakom se'uda* (*kiddush* in the place of the meal).

The Gemara then relates that Rav Huna once recited *kiddush* in his house, intending to eat there, but his lights were extinguished and he was unable to eat. Rav Huna transferred his meal to his son's home where there was light, and he recited *kiddush* again and ate there. The Gemara proves from the fact that Rav Huna recited *kiddush* again in the place of his meal that he agrees with Shmuel that *kiddush* is invalid unless it is recited in the place where the meal is eaten.

The Gemara continues with another incident, relating that Rabbah, when making *kiddush*, would tell his students to eat something to validate the *kiddush* as occurring at the place of the meal. This was due to a concern that by the time they would go to their lodgings, their lamps would have already gone out and they would be unable to make *kiddush* and eat at their lodgings, thus missing the mitzvah of *kiddush*. The Gemara thus shows that Rabbah also agrees with Shmuel that *kiddush* is invalid unless it is recited in the place where the meal is eaten.

Tosafos (Pesachim 100b s.v. *yidei*) write that although the halacha usually follows the opinion of Rav in matters of *issur* (prohibitions, as opposed to matters of monetary law), here the halacha follows Shmuel, since both Rav Huna and Rabbah follow his opinion. This is codified in the Shulchan Aruch (Orach Chaim 273:1).

The reasoning for the requirement: The Rashbam (Pesachim 101a s.v. *af*) offers two reasons for this halacha. The first is based on a verse in Isaiah (58:13), "and you shall proclaim the Shabbos a delight." He expounds this verse as follows: In the place where the Shabbos is "proclaimed" (i.e., where *kiddush* is recited), there should be "delight" (i.e., the Shabbos meal). Alternatively, since *kiddush* should be recited over wine, as stated in the Beraisa (ibid. 106a), it is fitting that it be recited over wine drunk at a meal, which is more significant than wine drunk

without the accompaniment of a meal.

The Rosh (Pesachim 10:5) cites the first reason of the Rashbam with one slight variation. He expounds the verse in Isaiah as follows: There should be "delight" (i.e., the Shabbos meal) in the place where the Shabbos is "proclaimed" (i.e., where the Kiddush is recited). Rabbi Moshe Feinstein (Igros Moshe Orach Chaim 4:63[2]), in a lengthy responsum, discusses the difference between the reasoning of the Rashbam and the Rosh and the practical halachos which emerge from the two opinions.

In a nutshell, Rabbi Feinstein writes that the Rashbam understood that the requirement of *kiddush bimakom se'uda* is actually a condition for the Shabbos *se'uda* (meal), that the *se'uda* must be eaten in conjunction with *kiddush*, while the Rosh understood that it is a condition for *kiddush*, that *kiddush* must be recited in the place where the *se'uda* will be held.

What constitutes a meal?: There are three opinions in the *poskim* regarding what is considered a "meal" for the purpose of *kiddush bimakom se'uda*. The Shulchan Aruch (ibid.:5) cites the Ge'onim who rule that eating a small amount of bread or drinking a cup of wine (which, according to many *poskim*, includes grape juice¹) is considered a meal, but fruit is not. The Mishna Berura (273:21,22) explains that the minimum amount of bread is a *kezayis* (olive's volume) and the minimal amount of wine is a *revi'is*².

The Mishna Berura (273:25) cites Rabbi Akiva Eiger and the Tosafos Shabbos who write that many Rishonim argue that drinking wine is not considered establishing a meal. The Mishna Berura therefore concludes that one should only be lenient under extenuating circumstances. In addition, the Mishna Berura (ibid.:27) cites an opinion that the person making *kiddush* must drink a *revi'is* in addition to the *melo lugmav* (a cheekful; generally its size is slightly more than half a *revi'is*) which is supposed to be drunk as part of the *kiddush* itself. In the Sha'ar Hatziyun (ibid.:29), the Mishna Berura concludes that for daytime *kiddush*, a *revi'is* suffices even for the person reciting *kiddush* if one is short on wine.

The Mishna Berura (ibid.) cites the Magen Avraham that eating *mezonos* is certainly considered a meal, as it is more filling than wine.

The Mishna Berura (ibid.:26) cites the Shiltei Giborim that even eating fruit is considered a meal. The Mishna Berura (273:26) cites the Magen Avraham that one should not rely on this opinion, but continues that if one feels weak and does not have *mezonos*, he may rely on this opinion and eat fruit. However, he adds that this leniency should only be used on Shabbos day when the requirement of *kiddush* is Rabbinic, and not on

¹ See The Radiance of Shabbos pg. 107 fn. 31

 $^{^2}$ Opinions vary as to the size of a *revi*'is, with some as small as 3 fl. oz. and some as large as 5.2 fl. oz.

Friday night when the requirement of *kiddush* is a Scriptural obligation.

The Vilna Gaon (cited in Bi'ur Halacha 273:5 s.v. *kasvu*) rules that only eating bread is considered a meal.

These various opinions can perhaps be understood based upon the aforementioned dispute between the Rashbam and the Rosh, as understood by Rabbi Feinstein. According to the Rashbam that the requirement is that the Shabbos meal be eaten in conjunction with *kiddush*, the definition of a meal is bread, as this is the requirement of the Shabbos meal – this would be in agreement with the Vilna Gaon's position. However, according to the Rosh that the requirement is that *kiddush* be recited where the *se'uda* is held, anything that is considered a "meal" suffices, even if it does not fulfill the obligation of the Shabbos *se'uda*. The question then becomes what is, indeed, sufficient for a minimal meal.

Kiddush for one who is unable to have a *se'uda*: There is a dispute among contemporary *poskim* regarding one who is ill and unable to eat a *se'uda*³. The Minchas Yitzchok (8:30[5]) writes that in such a scenario, there is no requirement to recite *kiddush* at all. He compares this to when Yom Kippur occurs on Shabbos; there is no requirement to recite *kiddush* over a cup of wine⁴. However, the Tzitz Eliezer (12:24) argues that such a person is obligated to recite *kiddush*. He therefore says that one who cannot eat should hear *kiddush* from somebody else or recite it himself, over a cup of wine (which should be drunk) if possible, or even without a cup of wine⁵.

Changing locations: There are three categories regarding changing locations for the meal from the place of *kiddush*⁶. The first category is moving to a different building⁷. Such a change of location is quite problematic, as it is definitely not considered the same location, and one has not fulfilled *kiddush bimakom se'uda* at all. This is evident from the aforementioned Gemara, where Shmuel rules that one has not fulfilled the obligation of *kiddush* by reciting *kiddush* in shul if he plans on eating in his home. In such a case, therefore, one must repeat *kiddush* in the place of the meal (Shulchan Aruch ibid.:2).

The Tur (Orach Chaim 273:1) cites an opinion of the Sar Shalom that if one can see the place where he made *kiddush* from the room where he is eating, that is considered *kiddush bimakom se'uda*. This opinion is cited in the Shulchan Aruch (Orach Chaim 273:1). The Mishna Berura (273:7)

writes that one should not rely upon this leniency except in extenuating circumstances where one is unable to hold the meal in the location of *kiddush*⁸.

The second category is moving to eat in a different room in the same building. The Gemara (Pesachim 101a), after citing the ruling of Shmuel, states that Shmuel's students assumed that their *rebbi's* ruling only applies when one moves from one house to another house. Rav Anan bar Tachlifa told them that on many occasions, he observed that Shmuel would descend from the roof to the ground floor, where he would be eating the meal, and only then would recite *kiddush*, and so even two different rooms within one building poses a problem. If one did move to another room, *kiddush* must be repeated (Shulchan Aruch ibid.).

There is a dispute among the Rishonim, however, if having specific intent during *kiddush* to hold the meal in a different room in the same house can fulfill the requirement of *kiddush bimakom se'uda*. Tosafos (Pesachim 100b s.v. *yidei*) say that this would fulfill he requirement, but the Ran (ibid. *dapei haRif* 20a s.v. *bei mar*) argues that it does not. The Shulchan Aruch (ibid.:1) rules in accordance with Tosafos that specific intent during *kiddush* to move the meal to a different room in the same house is considered *kiddush bimakom se'uda*. However, the Bi'ur Halacha (ibid.) writes that one should preferably follow the Ran's opinion and not rely on this leniency.

The Bi'ur Halacha (ibid.) rules that one may switch rooms in the same building if both the condition of intent and of seeing the place of *kiddush* are present.

The third category is relocating to eat in a different part of the room. It is important to note that the Ketzos Hashulchan (81:6) writes that eating within four *amos* (6-8 feet) of the place of *kiddush* is considered the same spot and is not relevant to this discussion. Moving more than four *amos* is considered changing places, and this case is a dispute among the Rishonim. Tosafos (Pesachim ibid. s.v. *aval*) write that as long as one is eating the meal in the same room, there is *kiddush bimakom se'uda*. However, the Rif (ibid. *dapei haRif* 20a) argues that moving to a different part of a room does not fulfill the requirement of *kiddush bimakom se'uda*.

The Shulchan Aruch (ibid.:1) rules in accordance with Tosafos that moving to a different part of the room fulfills the requirement that *kiddush* be recited in the place the meal is eaten. The Mishna Berura (273:3) writes that one should preferably be stringent to follow the opinion of the Rif and not move to a different part of the room unless one had specific intent to do so during *kiddush*. However, the Aruch Hashulchan (ibid.:2) argues that one is allowed to move to a different part of the room even without specific intent during *kiddush*.

In conclusion, one must be careful not just to recite or hear *kiddush* on Shabbos night and Shabbos day, but to also ensure that one properly <u>establishes *kiddush* bimakom se'uda</u> in order to fulfill this mitzvah.

⁸ It would seem that extenuating or not, *kiddush* is not repeated in such a case, (though it is preferable to hear *kiddush* from another who is reciting it anyway). Indeed, if one needn't repeat *kiddush*, there are serious halachic issues with reciting a *bracha* unnecessarily. For the nighttime *kiddush*, which contains a special *bracha*, one may not recite it a second time if not absolutely required. For the daytime *kiddush*, which is merely the blessing of *hagafen* over a cup of wine, it is simpler to create circumstances whereby the *kiddush* can be repeated; a halachic authority should be consulted.

<u>**Points to Ponder:</u>** May one delay beginning the se'uda after reciting kiddush?</u>

May one leave the place of kiddush and then return for the se'uda?

Iyun Halacha is a publication of the Denver Community Kollel Please consult with a qualified halachic authority for all practical questions of halacha

Halachic Editor: Rabbi Shachne Sommers · General Editor: Rabbi Mordechai Fleisher

5080 W. 14th Ave, Denver, CO 80204 · 303-820-2855 · info@denverkollel.org · www.denverkollel.org

To receive Halacha Weekly by email, contact info@denverkollel.org

³ This question is relevant when one anticipates being unable to eat a *se'uda* for the entirety of Shabbos. If one anticipates that he will be able to have a *se'uda* at a later point (for example, one is not feeling well Friday night but anticipates feeling better Shabbos day), one should wait until he is ready to eat a *se'uda* and recite the *kiddush* that he missed previously at his *se'uda*. If reciting the Friday night *kiddush* by day, the first section of *vayichulu* is omitted.

⁴ However, one may still be required to recite a *kiddush*-type declaration in such a case, possibly through recitation of *Shemone Esrei*; see Tzitz Eliezer 12:24(3).

⁵ This last case of *kiddush* without a cup of wine is relevant only for the nighttime *kiddush*, which has a special *bracha* of *kiddush*. Daytime *kiddush*, however, is merely a *hagafen* blessing (unless one failed to recite the nighttime *kiddush*, in which case I is recited by day), and one could not recite it without an actual cup of wine.

⁶ When one person recites *kiddush* and others are listening, each individual's location while listening is considered his place.

⁷ Two different apartments in the same building are treated as two different buildings (Radiance of Shabbos pg. 59 fn. 10).