

ידי¹ קידוש יצאו - They have fulfilled the obligation of reciting *Kiddush*

Overview

The גמרא cites a dispute between רב and שמואל regarding the קידוש made in the בית הכנסת (but קידוש was recited on שבת). According to רב the people fulfilled the obligation of reciting קידוש (but did not fulfill the obligation of reciting a בפה"ג), however שמואל maintains that they are not even יוצא קידוש, since we require that the קידוש is in the place where we eat. קידוש clarifies the various opinions and the actual ruling regarding this קידוש.

אף על פי שלא שתו רק שיטעמו המברך² או אפילו אחד מהם -

This ruling of רב that the people who heard the קידוש in shul are יוצא, is valid even though that did not drink from the קידוש wine, as long as the one reciting the blessing tastes the wine, or even if any one of the listeners drinks, they are all יוצא -

כדמוכח בסוף בכל מערבין³ (עירובין דף מ, ב) ולכתחלה צריך שיטעמו כולם -

As is evident in the end of מערבין; פרק בכל מערבין; however, initially everyone is required to taste the קידוש wine –

rules: תוספות

ונראה דהלכה כשמואל דאמר אין קידוש אלא במקום סעודה⁴ -

And it appears to תוספות that the ruling is like שמואל who maintains that קידוש is not valid unless it is done in the place of the meal -

ואף על גב דבעלמא הלכה כרב באיסורי וגם רבי יוחנן סבר לקמן⁵ כרב הכא הלכה כשמואל -

And even though that generally the ruling is like רב in matters of איסור, and also ר' - שמואל the הלכה is like רב, nonetheless here in this dispute the הלכה is like רב, later agrees with רב, יוחנן

דרב הונא ורבה ואביי כולהו סברי בסמוך⁶ אין קידוש אלא במקום סעודה -

- במקום סעודה קידוש can be only רב and ר"ה and רבה all maintain shortly that קידוש

¹ גירסא 'ידי קידוש יצאו ידי יין לא יצאו' (דקדוקי סופרים) brought in תוס' גירסא.

² The גמרא asks if he makes כפור on שהחיינו (cited shortly in 'תוס') discusses whether one makes שהחיינו on קידוש he will not be able to drink (because it is already יו"כ), and we know 'המברך צריך שיטעמו' (יו"כ), and if he will give it to a child to drink that also is inappropriate (for the child may continue to drink on יו"כ even when he is older). In any event we see that even if a child drinks, he is also יוצא (otherwise how can the גמרא suggest that a child should drink).

³ See רש"י there (ד"ה ליתבי) that the reason one needs to drink from the קידוש is שלא יהנה. משום דגנאי הוא לכוס של ברכה. So as long as someone drinks, they are all יוצא.

⁴ Therefore, the people who hear קידוש in shul are not יוצא, since they will not have their meal there, but rather in their homes.

⁵ קא, א (at the bottom of the page).

⁶ קא, א.

וכן פסק במגילת סתרים⁷ -

– שמואל **he similarly ruled** like ספר מגילת סתרים **And in**

continues with a related issue:

והמקדש שדעתו לאכול במקום אחר יכול להוציא את האוכלים שם⁸ דלדידהו הוי מקום סעודה -
And one who makes קידוש, where his intention is to eat elsewhere, nevertheless
he can be מוציא those that eat there (where he is making קידוש), since for them it
is מקום סעודה -

וכן משמע דמסתמא אחד מבני העיר⁹ היה מקדש בבית הכנסת¹⁰ ומוציא האורחים¹¹ -
And it seems so from our גמרא, since presumably it was one of the city people
who made קידוש in shul and was מוציא the guest (who ate in the shul) -
והיכא דליכא אורחים סמוך לבית הכנסת¹² אין לקדש דהויא ברכה לבטלה דקיימא לן כשמואל -
So therefore (since the הלכה is like שמואל), in a shul where there are no guests, who
are eating near the sanctuary, קידוש should not be made, for it is a ברכה in vain,
since we rule like שמואל -

rejects an opposing view:¹³

ואין לומר¹⁴ במקדש כאן על דעת שרוצה לאכול במקום אחר מודה שמואל דיש קידוש¹⁵ -
And one cannot say that if one makes קידוש with the intent that he wishes to eat
elsewhere, שמואל admits that it is a valid קידוש –

והא דפליגי בסתמא¹⁶ -

And the case where רב and שמואל argue is when the was no intention at all to eat
elsewhere, in that case (only) שמואל maintains that if he did not eat where he made קידוש, he is not
– יוצא (since it is a מקום סעודה), but if he intended to eat elsewhere, he is יוצא –

⁷ The ספר מגילת סתרים was authored by רבינו נסים גאון.

⁸ He can be מוציא them even though he himself will not be יוצא with this קידוש, since for him it is not סעודה; similar to a person who already made קידוש, and nevertheless he can be now מוציא others by making another קידוש.

⁹ The גמרא states אותן בני אדם שקידשו בביהכנ"ס וכו' ושמואל אמר אף ידי קידוש לא יצאו. From this statement it seems obvious that the ones who make קידוש were city people not the guest, for otherwise, why are they not יוצא ידי קידוש, since for them it is מקום סעודה. And nevertheless, the גמרא continues that קידוש can be made (by these העיר) in order to be מוציא the guest.

¹⁰ The מקדש was not יוצא since presumably he went home to eat, and nevertheless the guests who remained to eat in the shul were יוצא from him.

¹¹ See shortly (קא,א) in the גמרא that according to שמואל, we make קידוש in shul in order to be מוציא the guest, who eat in the shul.

¹² See עיי"ש later (קא,א ד"ה דאכלו) that the guest did not eat in the actual shul, but rather in the nearby rooms.

¹³ This view would maintain that we can make קידוש in shul even if there are no guest.

¹⁴ This is the view of רבינו נסים in מגילת סתרים. See 'Thinking it over' # 1.

¹⁵ It can be considered סעודה, since he intends that his סעודה will be elsewhere.

¹⁶ Therefore, if he intends to eat at home, the קידוש is valid and he is יוצא, so we can make קידוש in shul even if there are no guest.

negates this approach:

מדפריך ולשמואל למה לי לקדושי בבי כנישתא -

Since the גמרא asks, 'and according to שמואל why do we make קידוש in the'; but according to this (discredited) view, there is no question, we can make קידוש (and it is not a לבטלה), for since the מקדש has intent to go home, he is¹⁷ יוצא. Therefore, this proves that even if he had intent to eat elsewhere, it is not considered סעודה, and he is not יוצא.

qualifies this ruling:

ומיהו ממקום למקום בבית אחד כגון מאיגרא לארעא -

However, from one place to another place in one house, for instance from the roof to the ground -

נראה דמודה שמואל אם קידש באיגרא כדי לאכול בארעא דחשיב קידוש במקום סעודה -

It appears to תוספות that שמואל will agree that if he made קידוש on the roof, in order to eat on the ground that it is considered סעודה -

וכן מוכח בירושלמי¹⁸ דקאמר רבי יעקב בשם שמואל -

- שמואל in the name of ר"י stated in תלמוד ירושלמי, where קידש בבית זה ונמלך לאכול בבית אחר צריך לקדש -

'if one made קידוש in this house and reconsidered to eat in another house he is required to make קידוש again in the house where he will eat. -

רבי אחא בשם רבי אושעיא אמר רב מי שסוכתו עריבה עליו -

- one whose סוכה is dear to him, רב, quoted ר"א in the name of ר"א

מקדש ליל יום טוב האחרון¹⁹ בביתו ועולה ואוכל בסוכתו²⁰ -

Can make קידוש the night of the last day of סוכה in his house and then go up and eat in his 'סוכה' (even though it is not where he made קידוש) -

אמר רבי בון ולא פליגי²¹ מאי דאמר רב בשלא היה בדעתו לאכול בבית שקידש²² -

do not argue; what רב said (that he may eat in the סוכה, even though he made קידוש in the house) is in a case where he had no intention to

¹⁷ And he can be מוציא all the others who have no other family members at home.

¹⁸ ברכות פ"ו ה"ו.

¹⁹ This presumably took place in ארץ ישראל, so it is the night of הושע"ר, where one may no longer eat in the סוכה, for it is considered תוסף.

²⁰ This seems to contradict what was said in the name of שמואל that if he eats in another house, he needs to make קידוש again.

²¹ ר"ב is offering a חידוש; seemingly we know that רב ושמואל argue whether we require סעודה or not, so therefore we can understand their conflicting rulings that according to שמואל a new קידוש is required, but not according to רב. Nevertheless ר"ב is מחדש that in this case (only), שמואל will agree to רב, since he had in mind to eat in the סוכה.

²² We see from this that even though he is moving from one place (the house) to another (the סוכה), nevertheless since it is in the same house and he had intent to move, he is יוצא with the קידוש, even according to שמואל. See 'Thinking it over' # 2.

eat in the house where he made קידוש, but rather in the סוכה -

ומאי דאמר שמואל בשהיה בדעתו לאכול בבית שקידש²³ -

And what שמואל said (that one has to redo קידוש) is when he initially intended to eat in the house where he made קידוש, and then changed his mind -

²⁴ resolves a possible difficulty: תוספות

והא דקאמר ולא פליגי²⁵ היינו ממקום למקום בחד בית²⁶ -

And this which ר"ב stated, 'and they (רב ושמואל) do not argue'; that is only from place to place in one house -

ולאו דוקא נקט בירושלמי קידש בבית זה ונמלך לאכול בבית אחר²⁷ -

And when the ירושלמי mentioned, 'he made קידוש in this house and reconsidered to eat in another house', it was not precise, for in such a case שמואל would maintain that he is not יוצא, it is only when it is in the same house that שמואל agrees that he is יוצא, if he initially had intent to eat elsewhere after קידוש -

ויתיישב שלא יחלוק הירושלמי עם הש"ס שלנו.

And this will answer so that that the ירושלמי will not argue with our גמרא.

discusses a tangential issue: תוספות

כתב בשם רב נטרונאי גאון בתשובות מקדשין בבית הכנסת²⁸ ונותן לתוך עיניו לרפואה -

It is written in the name of רב נטרונאי גאון in his responsa, 'we make קידוש in the shul and he puts some of the wine into his eyes for healing -

כדאמר (ברכות דף מג,ב) פסיעה גסה נוטלת אחד מת"ק מאור עיניו -

As the גמרא states, 'taking a large step removes one five-hundredth of one's eye-sight -

ואימת מהדרא ליה בקידושא דבי שימשי²⁹ -

²³ This is evident in the words of שמואל where it states, קידש בבית זה ונמלך לאכול בבית אחר.

²⁴ In the statement of שמואל it states בית זה and בית אחר. Regarding this ר"ב stated that שמואל will agree that if he had intent to move, he is יוצא קידוש, however according to תוספות understanding of the גמרא, the intent is effective only in one house (מאיגרא לארעא), but not לבית אחר. It would seem that the ירושלמי argues on our גמרא, and permits even מבית אחר according to שמואל.

²⁵ All agree that if he had intent to move, he is יוצא with the קידוש.

²⁶ Like the case of רב with the סוכה. However from one house to another שמואל argues and maintains that he is not יוצא.

²⁷ explained that the ruling of שמואל (that a new קידוש is required if קידוש אחר is in a case where he intended to eat שקידש בבית אחר. However if he intended to eat שקידש בבית אחר then even בבית אחר he is required to make a new קידוש, so why is the case of שמואל in the ירושלמי stated as מבית אחר (which may lead us to a mistaken conclusion that מבית אחר no new קידוש is required even if there was no intent to eat in the other מקום)?! תוספות replies that the ירושלמי (which states that a new קידוש is required לבית אחר [which is correct]) is לא דוקא, for in a case where he intended to eat שקידש בבית אחר even במקום אחר also requires a new קידוש.

²⁸ Presumably, he means even if there are no אורחים.

²⁹ According to ר"נ גאון, the גמרא's question on שמואל, 'why make קידוש in shul', is not understood, we need to make the קידוש to heal the eyes.

And when is it returned to him, by the **קידוש of שבת night** -

ומיהו באבי העזרי³⁰ כתוב³¹ דהאי רפואה מצי למיעבד בקידוש³² שבביתו:

However, in the **אבי העזרי** it is written that this healing can be done with the **קידוש in his house** (and it need not be done in the shul).

Summary

Initially everyone should drink from the **קידוש**, however if any one person drank, it is sufficient. The rule is like **שמואל** that **סעודה** **במקום** **אלא** **קידוש**, even if he had in mind to eat elsewhere, except if it was from place to place in one house, if he had in mind he is **יוצא**.

Thinking it over

How will **רבינו נסים** deal³³ with **תוספות** proof from the **גמרא's** question, **למה לי לקדושי**?

2. **תוספות** cites from the **ירושלמי** that the case of **רב** was where he never had in mind to eat where he made **קידוש**, but rather to eat in the **סוכה**.³⁴ However **רב** maintains that we do not require **קידוש במקום סעודה** (if he has in mind to eat elsewhere), so why is it necessary to say that he had in mind to eat in the **סוכה**, it should be permitted even **מבית לבית**?³⁵

³⁰ The **אבי העזרי** was authored by **ר' אליעזר בן יואל הלוי** (also known as the **ראב"ה**). He was one of the **תוספות**.

³¹ **סי' תקט**.

³² According to the **אבי עזרי**, the **גמרא's** question is understood (see footnote # 29).

³³ See footnote # 14.

³⁴ See footnote # 22.

³⁵ See **דבר שמואל** and **מהרש"א הארוך**, etc.