

קידוש בבה"כ – יצאו או לאו  
מאנים ("דרו") קפלן  
ראשונים עם ר' כ"ץ  
30 נובמבר 05 – 1 דצמבר 05

רבי, אני יודע שאתה רצה זה (פסחים ק: -קא.) Summary of the מחלוקת in the Talmud - חלק א'  
(בקוצר – סליחה)

There are two positions of the earliest Amoraim – that of רב and that of שמואל [around the latter part of the first half of the third century] – regarding whether or not one has fulfilled one's obligation of קידוש (this rabbinic obligation stems from a Tannaite saying (found in a ברייתא quoted on פסחים קו.) that the necessity of remembering the Sabbath (שמות כ:ה) is to be done over wine) by hearing it in *shul* on Friday night: רב says that one has, indeed fulfilled one's obligation, though needs to make a new blessing over the wine when people go back to their house for dinner; while שמואל says that the people there have not fulfilled their obligation in addition to needing making the blessing over wine once they return to their houses.

Shmuel's reasoning is clearly stated, such that קידוש must be performed in the location where one is dining, thus where one is not dining, one ought not make קידוש, as it would not count. Rav's reasoning is not stated, so it must be implicitly understood that he does not require one to dine in the same location as one makes one's קידוש. A סתמא then raises a problem for each of these sages: for Rav, what is the purpose of making קידוש at home, if one has already taken care of it at shul? For Shmuel, what is the purpose of making קידוש at shul if one fulfills no obligation? The answers provided for the questions raised (ostensibly by a second סתמא) were that for Rav, the קידוש in one's house is to fulfill the obligation of the members of his house, as they were not in attendance at shul (but if they were at shul, would there be *any* reason to make a separate home קידוש?); for Shmuel, the [second] סתמא answers that it is performed to fulfill the obligation of those אורחים who are staying at the shul, thus that is why there is still a קידוש performed at shul, while not fulfilling the obligation of most people.

The gemarra presents various later אמוראים to see what the precedent was that came after רב ושמואל: The second generation sage רב הונא (who took the reins of the academy in סורא after רב (!)) also seemed to have opined like שמואל, according to the gemarra. The third generation sage רבה, as

reported by אב"י, seemed to also have opined like שמואל, which is peculiar as אב"י reports that רבה usually follows רב and not שמואל. The gemarra (הד) (מסתמאי) then is forced to answer that רבה follows רב's stringencies, but not his leniencies. On top of this, the consensus is that we usually follow רב במחלוקות (a principle in halakhic decision making presented by the gemarra in various places).

ה'קב – Presentation of all the arguments of the position that wants to defend the practice of performing קידוש in the shul on Friday nights (the position of רב"ש and the טור), including the ד"ה די קידוש יצאו ("אין לומר" s'תוספות

1 – That the מחלוקת between רב ושמואל is not in general – unqualified, that is – but rather it is specifically when there is no specific דעת to eat elsewhere. Thus, if there is a specific דעת to eat elsewhere, then even שמואל would be מודה that one can make קידוש in one place and eat dine elsewhere. This argument utilizes the discussion which the ירושלמי records (מס' ברכות, בסוף) (פרק "כיצד מברכין?"), with רב'ס understanding that the מחלוקת between the two sages is one based on כוונה (הוא סברת רבינו נסים במגילת) (סתרים)

2 – The רב"ש records the following position taken by רבינו יונה – that of making a חילוק between Torah and Rabbinic obligations regarding קידוש. The Torah obligation regarding קידוש is that the necessity of זכירה (שמות כ"ח) is performed over wine (ברייטא בפסחים קו), but that the necessity of having wine where one is dining is rabbinic (איני יודע מאיפה זה, אבל זה למד מפסוק מישעיה נח:יג). Thus, while those who are in the shul who do not have their meal there, they can be יוצאים their Toraitic obligation of קידוש. So for those people who do not know how to make קידוש in their homes, they can fulfill at least their Toraitic obligation of קידוש.

3 – The position of רב נטרונאי as presented in the טור is that there is no requirement to *taste* the wine of קידוש, but rather it is only to *hear* – thus, once one has heard קידוש, one has fulfilled one's requirement. In addition to this reasoning, Friday night קידוש in shul is due to the element of רפואה, as this was the reason for the תקנה of this ritual.

4 – This last position is one that is not trying to justify the practice of Friday night קידוש in shul, but rather trying to deal with it taking place. That position is of the טור, where he suggests – since one cannot have קידוש except in the place of one's dining only applies to adults, whereas for minors, it would be fine. Thus, המקדש can give the יין to a קטן, as it is not

necessarily (according to him) that המקדש needs to taste (עיין בעירובין מ:), but rather one can give it to someone else to taste.

חלק ג – Responses to the position that wants to defend the practice of performing קידוש in the shul on Friday nights (“אין לומר”’s תוספות), (רא"ש, טור תוספות),

1 – responds directly to the position of his "אין לומר" by writing that one cannot say that as the supposition of the gemarra did not consider this possibility, but rather inquired as to the benefit of doing קידוש at all in shul. In order to fully answer the rest of the "אין לומר" position, תוספות needs to answer רבי בון's suggestion (בירושלמי) that if one has כוונה, one can make קידוש in one house and eat elsewhere. תוספות does so by changing the understanding as from house to house, to understanding it as from place to place within one house! Thus, no matter one's כוונה, one cannot continue one's meal to another house.

2 – תוספות also responds to רב נטרונאי's position that the קידוש of רפואה takes place in shul – rather that it could also take place in the home. The טור has an additional problem with this position as he quotes the wording being that of a language of תקנה for רפואה for Friday night קידוש in shul, whereas he says that that was not the reason for the תקנה, rather it was due to אורחים. It then follows if there are none, there is neither any קידוש.

3 – Piggybacking on the end of the last point, if there are no אורחים in shul, then there is not only no reason to make קידוש, but also it is a ברכה (introduced by the רא"ש). The טור also notes that רב האי says there is no קידוש in shul on Friday nights if there are no אורחים.

4 – The טור takes issue with רב נטרונאי's position that one can fulfill one's obligation of קידוש by merely hearing and not tasting because one is not יוצא as it is not a place of dining.

5 – The טור introduces the strongest language of the problem of doing קידוש in shul on Friday nights: "אסור לו לטעום עד שיקדש במקום סעודתו" – that it's *forbidden* to taste the wine until one is making קידוש in the place of one's meal! Thus, only if there are אורחים present is there any reason to make it. If there are none, there should be no קידוש.