

**Daf Ditty Pesachim 106: *Netilat Yadayim* Before Kiddush**



**Alsatian washing station  
with the caption שאו ידיכם קדש וברכו את ה'**

ושמוע מינה אומר ב' קדושות על כוס אחד  
 וש"מ ב"ש היא ואליבא דרבי יהודה רב אשי  
 אמר טעמו פגמו וכוס של ברכה צריך שיעור  
 חדא מילתא היא וה"ק מ"ט טעמו פגמו משום  
 דכוס של ברכה צריך שיעור רבי יעקב בר  
 אידי קפיד אהצבא פגימא רב אידי בר שישא  
 קפיד אכסא פגימא מר בר רב אשי קפיד  
 ה"אפילו אהביתא פגימתא ת"ד זכור את יום  
 השבת לקדשו וזכרתו על היין אין לי אלא  
 ביום בלילה מעין ת"ל זכור את יום השבת  
 לקדשו בלילה מעין אודבה עיקר קדושא  
 בלילה הוא קדיש דכי קדיש תדלת יומא  
 בעי לקידושי ותו בלילה מעין ת"ל זכור את  
 יום תנא מיהדר אלילה וקא נסיב ליה קרא  
 דיממא ה"ק זכור את יום השבת לקדשו  
 וזכרתו על היין בכניסתו אין לי אלא בלילה  
 ביום מעין ת"ל זכור את יום השבת ביום  
 מאי מברך אמר רב יהודה בפה"ג רב אשי  
 איקלע למהווא אמרו ליה ליקדיש לן מר  
 קדושא רבה הבו ליה סבר מאי ניהו קדושא  
 רבה אמר מברי כל הברכות כולן בפה"ג  
 אמרי ברישא אמר בפה"ג ואגיד ביה חזייה

ושמוע מינה: אומר שתי קדושות על כוס אחד. ושמוע מינה: בית שמי  
 היא, ואליבא דרבי יהודה.

And learn from it that if one has only one cup of wine, he may recite two sanctifications over one cup, as the *baraita* states that one may recite two entirely unrelated blessings over a single

cup. And learn from it that this *baraita* is according to the ruling of Beit Shammai, in accordance with the explanation of Rabbi Yehuda, who says that Beit Shammai maintain that one should recite the blessing over fire before the blessing over spices.

תָּנוּ רַבָּנַן: "זָכוֹר אֶת יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ" — זוֹכְרֶהוּ עַל הַיַּיִן. אֵין לִי אֶלָּא בַּיּוֹם, בְּלֵילָה מִנַּיִן? תִּלְמוּד לֹמַר: "זָכוֹר אֶת יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ".

The Sages taught in a *baraita* with regard to the verse: “Remember the day of Shabbat to sanctify it” (Exodus 20:7): **Remember it over wine**, through the recitation of *kiddush*. I have **only** derived that there is a mitzva to recite *kiddush* **during the day**, as the verse is referring to the day of Shabbat. **From where** do I derive that one must also recite *kiddush* **at night**? **The verse states**: “Remember the day of Shabbat to sanctify it,” which indicates that one should also remember Shabbat as soon as it is sanctified.

”בְּלֵילָה מִנַּיִן“?! אֲדַרְבֵּהּ, עֵיקַר קַדּוּשָׁא בְּלֵילָה הוּא קַדִּישׁ, דְּכִי קַדִּישׁ —  
תַּחֲלַת יוֹמָא בְּעֵי לְקִידּוּשֵׁי! וְתוֹ: ”בְּלֵילָה מִנַּיִן תִּלְמוּד לֹמַר: זָכוֹר אֶת יוֹם,  
תָּנָא מִיְהִדֵּר אֲלֵילָה וְקָא נְסִיב לִיה קָרָא דִּימָמָא!?”

The Gemara expresses surprise at this last question: **From where** is it derived that one must recite *kiddush* **at night**? Is this the appropriate question? **On the contrary**, the **essential** mitzva of *kiddush* **is to sanctify** the day **at night**, as one **must sanctify the beginning of the day**, i.e., Friday night; there is no reason to sanctify Shabbat in the middle of the day, i.e., in the morning. **And furthermore**, the continuation of the *baraita* states: **From where** do we derive the obligation of *kiddush* **at night**? **The verse states**: “Remember the day of Shabbat.” The *tanna* is seeking a source for *kiddush* **at night**, and yet he **cites** a verse that is referring to the day.

הָכִי קָאמַר: "זָכוֹר אֶת יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ" — זוֹכְרֶהוּ עַל הַיַּיִן בְּכַנְיִסְתּוֹ, אֵין לִי אֶלָּא בְּלֵילָה, בַּיּוֹם מִנַּיִן? תִּלְמוּד לֹמַר: "זָכוֹר אֶת יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת".

The Gemara answers that **this is** what the *tanna* is saying: “Remember the day of Shabbat to sanctify it” is a mitzva to **remember it over wine when it begins**. I have **only** derived the obligation to recite *kiddush* **at night**; **from where** do I derive that one must also recite *kiddush* **during the day**? **The verse states**: “Remember the day of Shabbat.” The emphasis of the word day indicates that one must recite *kiddush* again during the day.

בְּיוֹם מַאי מְבָרְךְ? אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה: "בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הַגֶּפֶן". רַב אֲשִׁי אֵיקְלַע  
לְמַחֲזָא, אָמְרוּ לֵיהּ: לִיקְדִישׁ לָן מָר קִידוּשָׁא רַבָּה (הִבּוּ לֵיהּ).

The Gemara asks: **During the day**, when one does not recite the same *kiddush* as at night, **what blessing does one recite? Rav Yehuda said:** Before the meal, one brings a cup of wine and simply recites the usual blessing over wine: **Who creates the fruit of the vine.** The Gemara relates that **Rav Ashi happened to** come to the city of Meḥoza. The Sages of Meḥoza **said to him** on Shabbat day: **Will the Master recite for us the great kiddush?** And they immediately **brought him** a cup of wine.

סֵבֵר: מַאי נִיהוּ "קִידוּשָׁא רַבָּה"? אָמַר, מְפָדִי כָּל הַבְּרָכוֹת כּוּלָּן "בּוֹרָא פְּרִי  
הַגֶּפֶן" אָמְרֵי בְּרִישָׁא, אָמַר "בּוֹרָא פְּרִי הַגֶּפֶן" וְאֵגִיד בֵּיהּ. תַּזְיִיה לְהֵהוּא סָבָא  
דְּגַחִין וְשִׁתִּי, קָרִי אֲנַפְשִׁיהּ "הֶחֱכַם עֵינָיו בְּרֵאשׁוֹ".

Rav Ashi was unsure what they meant by the term great *kiddush* and wondered if the residents of Meḥoza included other matters in their *kiddush*. **He thought: What is this great kiddush** to which they refer? **He said** to himself: **Since** with regard to **all the blessings** that require a cup of wine, **one first recites** the blessing: **Who creates the fruit of the vine**, I will start with that blessing. **He recited: Who creates the fruit of the vine and lengthened it** to see if they were expecting an additional blessing. **He saw a particular elder bending over his cup and drinking**, and he realized that this was the end of the great *kiddush*. **He read** the following verse **about himself:** **"The wise man, his eyes are in his head"** (Ecclesiastes 2:14), as he was alert enough to discern the expectations of the local residents.

אָמְרֵי בְּנֵי רַבִּי חִיָּיא: מִי שְׁלָא הִבְדִּיל בְּמוֹצָאֵי שַׁבַּת — מְבָדִיל וְהוֹלֵךְ בְּכָל  
הַשַּׁבָּת כּוּלוֹ. וְעַד כַּמָּה? אָמַר רַבִּי זִירָא: עַד רְבִיעֵי בְּשַׁבַּת.

As stated above, **the sons of Rabbi Ḥiyya say: One who did not recite havdala at the conclusion of Shabbat may recite havdala anytime** over the course of **the entire week**. The Gemara asks: **And until how many** days of that week have passed may one still recite *havdala*? **Rabbi Zeira said: Until the fourth day of the week**, Wednesday, after which it is no longer considered the same week as the previous Shabbat.

אָמַר רַב בְּרוּנָא אָמַר רַב:

**Rav Beruna said that Rav said:**

הַנוֹטֵל יָדָיו לֹא יִקְדֵּשׁ. אָמַר לְהוּ רַב יִצְחָק בַּר שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר מֵרְתָא: אֶפְתִּי לֹא  
 נָח נִפְשִׁיהָ דְרַב שְׁכַחְנִינְהוּ לְשִׁמְעֵתִיהָ. זְמַנֵּי סְגִיָּאִין הָוּה קְאִימָנָא קַמִּיהָ  
 דְרַב, זִמְנִין דְחֻבִּיבָא עָלֶיהָ רִיפְתָא — מְקַדֵּשׁ אֲרִיפְתָא. זִמְנִין דְחֻבִּיבָא לִיָּה  
 חֻמְרָא — מְקַדֵּשׁ אַחֲמָרָא.

As stated above, **the sons of Rabbi Ḥiyya say: One who did not recite *havdala* at the conclusion of Shabbat may recite *havdala* anytime over the course of the entire week.** The Gemara asks: **And until how many days of that week have passed may one still recite *havdala*? Rabbi Zeira said: Until the fourth day of the week, Wednesday, after which it is no longer considered the same week as the previous Shabbat.**

אָמַר רַב הוּנָא אָמַר רַב: טַעַם אֵינוֹ מְקַדֵּשׁ. בְּעָא מִיָּנִיהָ רַב חָנָא בַּר חִינָנָא  
 מִרַב הוּנָא: טַעַם מָהוּ שְׁיִבְדִּיל? אָמַר לִיָּה, אָנִי אֹמֵר: טַעַם — מְבַדִּיל, וְרַב  
 אָסִי אָמַר: טַעַם — אֵינוֹ מְבַדִּיל.

**Rav Huna said that Rav said:** One who has **tasted** any food on Shabbat night may **not recite *kiddush*** anymore that night, as one must recite *kiddush* before he eats. Instead, he recites *kiddush* during the day before the meal. **Rav Ḥana bar Ḥinnana raised a dilemma before Rav Huna:** If one **tasted** food at the conclusion of Shabbat before reciting *havdala*, **what is the *halakha*** with regard to whether he may **recite *havdala***? **He said to him: I say** that one who has **tasted** food may still **recite *havdala***. **And Rav Asi said:** One who has **tasted** food may **not recite *havdala***.

## Tosafos

תוס' ד"ה זוכרהו על היין

*Tosfos discusses whether Kiddush al ha'Kos is d'Oraysa or de'Rabbanan and various details concerning the recital of 'Vayechulu'*

דזכירה כתיב על היין 'זכרו כיון לבנון' (הושע יד), 'זכירה דודיך מיין' (שיר א).

(a)

Because "Remembering/mentioning" is said in connection with wine - "His memory is like the wine of the Levanon" (Hos 14); "We will remember Your friendship more than wine" Shir 1).

והאי 'זכירה' היינו קידוש, ד'ויכולו' לא מצינו על הכוס אלא בתפלה, כדאמר בשבת (ד' קיט:), ולא ניתקן על הכוס אלא להוציא בניו ובני ביתו,

(b)

This Zechirah refers to Kiddush; We do not find 'Vayechulu' over a Kos, only in Tefilah, as the Gemara says in Shabbos (Daf 119.), and they only instituted it over a Kos in order to render Yotzei one's children and family.

ומה שרגילין לומר 'ויכולו' אחר התפלה בקול רם ...

(c)

And the reason that we recite 'Vayechulu' loudly after the Amidah ...

היינו משום י"ט שחל להיות בשבת, שמתפללין 'אתה בחרתנו' ואין אומר 'ויכולו' בתפלה.

(d)

Is because of Yom-Tov which falls on Shabbos, when we say 'Atah Bechartanu' in the Amidah, which does not include 'Vayechulu'.

ותקנו נמי לומר בכל שבתות שלא לחלק בין שבת לשבת;

So, they instituted to say it every Shabbos, so as not to draw a distinction between one Shabbos and the other.

ונראה דקידוש על היין אסמכתא היא.

(e)

It seems however, that Kiddush over wine is an Asmachta (hinted in the Torah, though really, it is mi'de'Rabbanan).

והא דאמר במי שמתו (ברכות ד' כ:): 'נשים חייבות בקידוש היום דבר תורה?'

(f)

And when the Gemara says in 'Mi she'Meiso' (B'rachos, Daf 20:) that 'Women are Chayav Kiddush min ha'Torah' ...

היינו דוקא קידוש היום, אבל על היין לא הויא אלא מדרבנן ...

(g)

That refers specifically to Kiddush, but not to wine, which is only mi'de'Rabbanan ...

כדמשמע בריש נזיר (ד' ג:): דקאמר "מין ושכר יזיר" - 'לאסור יין מצוה כיון הרשות'.

(h)

As is implied at the beginning of Nazir (Daf 3:) where the Gemara says "mi'Yayoin ve'Sheichar Yazir" - 'to forbid the wine of Mitzvah like the wine of R'shus'.

ופריך 'מאי ניהו קידושא והבדלה? מושבע ועומד מהר סיני הוא, דאיצטריך קרא למיסר?'

1.

What is that asks the Gemara, Kiddush and Havdalah? Is one obligated to have wine from Har Sinai, that one needs to prohibit it?

אלא כי הא דאמר רבא 'שבועה שאשתה', וחזר ואמר 'הריני נזיר', איצטריך קרא, דנזירות חל עליו אף על פי שמושבע ועומד הוא

2.

It must therefore refer to what Rava said, that if someone declares that he will drink wine, and then that he will be a Nazir, a Pasuk is needed to teach us that the Nezirus takes effect, even though he is under oath to drink wine.

ועוד מצינו למימר דקידוש על היין דבר תורה. אבל הא דאמר המברך צריך שיטעום, זהו מדרבנן.

It may well be however, that Kiddush over wine is min ha'Torah, and it is only the obligation to drink it that is mi'de'Rabbanan.

**תוס' ד"ה הנוטל ידיו לא יקדש**

*Tosfos discusses the reason for this ruling.*

פירש רשב"ם ובסדר דרב עמרם - משום היסח הדעת.

(a)

The Rashbam and Seder R. Amram Gaon explain that this is on account of Hesech ha'Da'as.

וקשה, דהא רב גופיה קאמר בפ' כל הבשר (חולין דף קו:): 'נוטל אדם ידיו שחרית, ומתנה עליהם כל היום?'

(b)

But Rav himself in Perek Kol ha'Basar (Chulin, Daf 106:) allows one to wash one's hands in the morning (to eat bread) and to stipulate that it covers the whole day.

וי"ל, דתנאי לא מהני אלא היכא דלא שכיחי מיא, כגון שאין לו מים בסמוך או יש לו וצריך לדברים אחרים ...

(c)

Stipulation only helps there where water is not common - i.e., that there is not at hand or that one needs the water that one has for something else ...

אבל היכא דשכיחי מיא, ויש לו בסמוך, לא יועיל תנאי.

1.

But where water is available, and on hand, it does not help to stipulate.

כדמשמע התם דקאמר 'אמר להו רבא להנהו בני פקתא דערבות "כגון אתון דלא שכיחי לכו מיא, משו ידיכו מצפרא ואתנו עלייהו כולי יומא".'

2.

As is implied there, when Rava said to the inhabitants of the valley of Arvos 'People like you, for whom water is not available, wash your hands in the morning, and stipulate for the entire day'.

איכא דאמרי בשעת הדחק ופליגא דרב, ואיכא דאמרי אף שלא בשעת הדחק, והיינו דרב'.

3.

Some say in a case of emergency, and Rava disagrees with Rav; whereas others maintain, even not in a case of emergency, and he concurs with Rav'.

משמע דרב נמי איירי בלא שכיחי מיא, כדקאמר 'כגון אתון דלא שכיחי לכו מיא', וקאמר 'היינו דרב'.

4.

The Gemara implies that Rav also speaks where water was not easily available, and it concludes that 'he concurs with Rav'

וה"ר אלחנן מפרש 'הנוטל ידיו, לא יקדש' - משום דמיחזי כנוטל ידיו לפירות, דהרי זה מגסי הרוח.

(d)

ha'Rav Elchanan however, explains that 'Someone who has washed his hands should not recite Kiddush' because it looks as if he is washing is hands for fruit (i.e. wine), and Chazal describe someone who does so as conceited.

## RECITING TWO "KEDUSHOS" ON ONE CUP OF WINE

**Rav Mordechai Kornfeld** writes:<sup>1</sup>

*Our Daf* proves from a Beraisa that one may recite both Birkas ha'Mazon and Havdalah on a single cup of wine.

The Beraisa apparently contradicts the Gemara earlier (102b) which says, "*Ein Osin Mitzvos Chavilos Chavilos*" -- "we may not package Mitzvos together" when there is another option. How can these two statements be reconciled?

**RASHBAM** and **TOSFOS** explain that the Gemara here refers to a situation in which there is no other option (for example, one has enough wine for only one cup).

**RAMBAM** (Hilchos Shabbos 29:12-13) rules that only the blessings of *Kiddush* and *Birkas ha'Mazon* may not be recited on one cup of wine. The blessings of *Kiddush* and *Havdalah* (such as when Yom Tov occurs on Motza'ei Shabbos), or *Havdalah* and *Birkas ha'Mazon*, however, *may* be recited on one cup, even l'Chatchilah.

The Rambam's opinion is consistent with the implication of the Gemara earlier (102b) which specifies *Kiddush* and *Birkas ha'Mazon* as two different Kedushos, but it does not mention *Havdalah* and *Birkas ha'Mazon*. **RABEINU CHANANEL** (102b) and the **MAGID MISHNEH** explain that *Havdalah* and *Birkas ha'Mazon* both mark the end of an event (*Havdalah* marks the end of Shabbos; *Birkas ha'Mazon* marks the end of a meal). *Kiddush*, on the other hand,

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.dafyomi.co.il/pesachim/insites/ps-dt-106.htm>

denotes the *beginning* of Shabbos. Therefore, it is considered a separate Kedushah which cannot be recited on the same cup as Birkas ha'Mazon.

The **NETZIV** (in **MEROMEI SADEH**) points out that the Gemara here, which says that Havdalah and Birkas ha'Mazon may be recited on one cup, provides strong support for the Rambam.

## **WASHING HANDS BEFORE KIDDUSH**

*Our daf* quotes Rav Bruna, who proposed that "one who washes his hands (Netilas Yadayim) may not recite Kiddush." The Gemara then relates that Rav used to recite Kiddush over bread when he was in the mood for bread, and he would recite Kiddush over wine when he was in the mood for wine. The Gemara views Rav's conduct as a refutation of Rav Bruna's assertion and proves that Rav Bruna was incorrect.

What did Rav Bruna mean when he said that a person who washed his hands may not recite Kiddush? How did Rav's conduct disprove Rav Bruna's statement?

**RASHI** and the **RASHBAM** explain that one who has washed his hands should not recite Kiddush because it would be an interruption (Hesech ha'Da'as) between washing his hands and the recitation of ha'Motzi over the bread. Rather, he should have someone else recite Kiddush for him. (The Rashbam points out that this situation is b'Di'eved; one should not wash his hands before Kiddush, as the Gemara says in Shabbos (51b), according to Beis Hillel.)

The Gemara proves from the conduct of Rav that Kiddush is *not* considered an interruption. Rav would wash his hands and then recite Kiddush over bread, and he was not concerned that this constituted a Hesech ha'Da'as.

(Although Rav recited Kiddush over *bread* and not wine, **TOSFOS** (DH Mekadesh) suggests that Rav would sometimes wash his hands with intention to recite Kiddush over bread, and afterwards he would change his mind and recite Kiddush over wine. The fact that Rav washed his hands first even though he knew that he might change his mind proves that Kiddush over wine is not considered an interruption between washing the hands and the blessing over the bread. See also **CHAZON YECHAZKEL** for another approach to the Rashbam's opinion.)

**TOSFOS** (DH ha'Notel) quotes **RABEINU ELCHANAN** who explains that Rav Bruna meant that a person who washes his hands before Kiddush should not recite Kiddush on wine, because

he will appear arrogant. The Gemara in Chulin (106a) says that one who washes his hands for fruit (or fruit juice, such as wine) is considered arrogant. Instead, one who washed his hands before Kiddush should recite Kiddush over bread.

The Gemara disproves this approach from the conduct of Rav, who used to wash his hands *before* he chose whether to make Kiddush over bread or over wine, and even after he washed, he would sometimes recite Kiddush over wine. (Even though the Gemara does not clearly state that Rav would wash his hands before he chose how he would recite Kiddush, this is Rabeinu Elchanan's understanding of the Gemara.)

**RABEINU TAM** (cited by Tosfos) explains that Rav Bruna maintained that one does *not* need to recite Kiddush "b'Makom Se'udah." Since he does not need to recite Kiddush in the place where he intends to eat his meal, he should not wash his hands before Kiddush, because perhaps he will decide not to eat (since he is not obligated to eat after Kiddush), and his blessing of "Netilas Yadayim" will be a Berachah l'Vatalah.

When the Gemara disproves this by showing that Rav sometimes recited Kiddush over bread, it does not mean that Rav actually recited his Kiddush over the bread. (Rabeinu Tam asserts that Kiddush may not be recited over bread.) Rather, the Gemara means that Rav would sometimes eat a meal after he recited Kiddush, and sometimes he would not eat a meal, because he maintained (101a) that Kiddush does not need to be recited "b'Makom Se'udah." Rav washed his hands even before he chose whether to eat or not. This proves that one *may* wash before Kiddush, even though Kiddush does not need to be "b'Makom Se'udah," and there is no concern that he will decide not to eat after he has washed.

**BA'AL HA'ME'OR** says that this Sugya is connected to the following Sugya, which discusses whether a person may recite Kiddush or Havdalah if he has already started to eat (which he was not allowed to do). Rav Bruna stated that not only is a person not permitted to recite Kiddush if he eats before Kiddush (as Rav Yosef said in the name of Shmuel), but even if he merely washes his hands in preparation to eat, he may not recite Kiddush. Since it is a disgrace to Kiddush to eat beforehand, to prepare to eat is also a disgrace to Kiddush.

The Gemara relates that Rav would wash his hands and then recite Kiddush over bread. If it is disgraceful to Kiddush to wash beforehand just as it is disgraceful to Kiddush to eat beforehand, then Rav should not have been able to recite Kiddush over bread at all. (According to the Ba'al ha'Me'or, this Sugya is not in accordance with the Halachah. The Halachah is that one who eats before Kiddush may recite Kiddush.)

**RIF** writes, "We see from Rav that Kiddush depends on personal preference and not on Netilas Yadayim." The Rishonim argue about what the Rif means to say.

**RA'AVAD** says that Rav Bruna's statement that "one who washes his hands may not recite Kiddush" means that one may no longer recite Kiddush over *wine*, because when he washed his hands, he showed that he planned to recite Kiddush over bread. Once he decided not to recite Kiddush over wine, he cannot change his mind and he must recite Kiddush over bread. The Gemara then demonstrates that Rav used to decide whether to make Kiddush over wine or bread even *after* he washed his hands, which proves that it "depends on personal preference (Chavivus) and not on Netilas Yadayim."

**RAN** suggests a different interpretation for the words of the Rif. Rav Bruna meant that one is not *allowed* to recite Kiddush over bread. One who washes before Kiddush reveals that he does not want to use wine. He thereby loses the option to recite Kiddush over wine, because he showed that he does not like wine. However, he also cannot recite Kiddush over bread, because, according to Rav Bruna, one is never allowed to recite Kiddush over bread. Therefore, he must have someone else recite Kiddush for him.

The Gemara then proves from Rav that one *is* allowed to recite Kiddush over bread. The Gemara disproves only one of Rav Bruna's two rulings. Rav Bruna ruled that one may not recite Kiddush over bread, and that one who washed with intent to recite Kiddush over bread may not recite Kiddush over wine (and therefore he cannot recite Kiddush at all). The Gemara disproves only his first point, that bread cannot be used for Kiddush. The Gemara does not disprove his second ruling, that once a person shows that he does not like wine, he may not recite Kiddush over wine.

This explanation is most consistent with the words of the Gemara. Rav Bruna said that "one who washes his hands may not recite Kiddush," which implies that he may not recite Kiddush *at all* (unlike the explanations of Tosfos (b), Rabeinu Tam (c), and the Ra'avad (e)). Furthermore, the Gemara does not say that Rav would recite Kiddush over wine "when he had washed his hands." Rather, the Gemara says merely that he would recite Kiddush over wine when he wanted to; it does not mention that he washed his hands before that Kiddush, which implies that he did *not* wash his hands before he recited Kiddush over wine (again, unlike the explanations of Tosfos, Rabeinu Tam, and the Ra'avad). Had he washed, he would *not* have been able to recite Kiddush over wine, but only over bread. The Ran asserts that this is also the way the **RAMBAM** (Hilchos Shabbos 29:9) understands the Gemara.

## The Great Kiddush

Steinzaltz (OBM) writes:<sup>2</sup>

From the passage (Ex 20:7) “Remember the day of Shabbat to sanctify it,” our Gemara learns that we are obligated to sanctify *Shabbat* by making *kiddush* not only at night, but during the day, as well. Rav Yehuda comments that the *Shabbat* morning *kiddush* consists solely of the blessing over wine – *Borei pri ha-gafen*.

*The Gemara relates that Rav Ashi happened to come to the city of Mehoza. The Sages of Mehoza said to him on Shabbat day: Will the Master recite for us the great kiddush? And they immediately brought him a cup of wine. Rav Ashi was unsure what they meant by the term great kiddush and wondered if the residents of Mehoza included other matters in their kiddush. He thought: What is this great kiddush to which they refer? He said to himself: Since with regard to all the blessings that require a cup of wine, one first recites the blessing: Who creates the fruit of the vine, I will start with that blessing. He recited: Who creates the fruit of the vine, and lengthened it to see if they were expecting an additional blessing. He saw a particular elder bending over his cup and drinking, and he realized that this was the end of the great kiddush. He read the following verse about himself: “The wise man, his eyes are in his head” (Kohelet 2:14), as he was alert enough to discern the expectations of the local residents.*

One very straightforward question raised with regard to *kiddush* on *Shabbat* morning is why the simple blessing of *Borei pri ha-gafen* should be considered *kiddush* at all. It appears to be simply a *berakha* that is typically made over a cup of wine. The Mekhtam suggests that since drinking a cup of wine is a requirement specifically on *Shabbat* morning, it honors the *Shabbat* and, as such, is considered to be *kiddush*. The Tosafot Ri”d adds that during the week someone can choose to include wine in his meal or refrain from doing so. Since the cup of wine opens the meal on *Shabbat*, it is appropriate to begin with *kiddush*.

The expression *Kiddusha Rabba* – the great *kiddush* – for a blessing that simply consists of *Borei pri ha-gafen* seems a bit odd. Rashi and the Rashbam explain that it refers to the fact that *Borei pri ha-gafen* is a much more common blessing than *kiddush*, which is said only once a week, so it is said with greater frequency. According to Rabbenu Yehonatan it receives that title because of the role that this blessing plays in honoring the *Shabbat*. The Mekhtam suggests that it is *lashon Sagi Nahor* – an expression used by the Talmud to suggest the opposite of its simple meaning. Since we do not want to “belittle” this very simple blessing we switch its name to “the great *kiddush*.”

## Summary

### 1) Blemished wine

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://steinsaltz.org/daf/pesahim106/>

R' Ashi notes that two of the halachos previously deduced from the Baraisa are really one. Therefore, it is not possible to derive them as separate lessons. The Gemara records different degrees of caution that Amoraim practiced concerning blemished wine.

## 2) Kiddush

A Baraisa is cited to serve as the source for the mitzvah to recite kiddush on Shabbos. Two difficult parts of the Baraisa are clarified. R' Yehudah rules that Kiddush during the daytime requires nothing *כִּי בִּרְאֵי הַגִּפְנִי*. The Gemara relates an incident in which R' Ashi was able to derive the correct way to recite *רְבֵה קִידוּשָׁא*.

## 3) Havdalah

The sons of R' Chiya ruled that one who did not make havdalah on Motza'ei Shabbos can make havdalah during the rest of the week. R' Zeira explained that the last time is Tuesday at sunset.

R' Yaakov bar Idi notes that the berachah on the flame may only be recited on Motza'ei Shabbos.

## 4) Washing before kiddush

R' Bruna in the name of Rav taught that one who washed for bread before kiddush should not recite kiddush but rather listen to another's recitation. R' Yitzchok bar Shmuel bar Marta claimed that Rav himself would at times wash and make kiddush on bread rather than on wine. 5) Eating before kiddush or havdalah R' Huna in the name of Rav ruled that one who ate before Kiddush may no longer recite Kiddush on Friday night. R' Chana bar Chinana asked R' Huna: What is the halacha if someone ate before havdalah? R' Huna informed him that there is a dispute on this matter.

A related incident is recorded. Two additional opinions on this matter are recorded. R' Yosef in the name of Shmuel rules that one who eats may recite kiddush and havdalah, whereas Rabbah in the name of R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel ruled that one who eats may not recite Kiddush or havdalah.

**Rabbi Elie Kaunfer** writes:<sup>3</sup>

Have you ever been in a situation where you were supposed to know the answer to a question, but you weren't sure? What if this was in public, before a large crowd? Would you ask the assembled to find out the answer? Or just take a guess?

In today's daf, we have such a scenario, concerning the proper way to recite Kiddush over wine on Shabbat day. The Talmud recognizes that reciting Kiddush on Friday night is intuitive — that is when the day is sanctified (*mekudash*). So why say Kiddush again the next day? After all, the day has long been sanctified!

---

<sup>3</sup> Myjewishlearning.com

The Talmud says one must make Kiddush during the day because of the verse: “*Remember the Sabbath Day*” (Exodus 20:7). They note that the word “day” is superfluous in the text, since it could have simply read: Remember the Sabbath. So “day” comes to emphasize the need to mark Shabbat during the daytime. Still, it doesn’t seem that everyone knew what liturgy to recite in order to make this Kiddush during the day. Which brings us to the following story:

**Rav Ashi happened to come to the city of Mehoza. The sages of Mehoza said to him on Shabbat day: Will the Master recite for us the great *Kiddush*? And they immediately brought him a cup of wine.**

Imagine you are Rav Ashi. You have been invited to the great city of Mehoza, and you are handed the cup of wine to make Kiddush during the day (also known as: “the great kiddush” — this itself may be a euphemism for the lesser kiddush). But it turns out: You have no idea how they say Kiddush here in Mehoza! You could ask the host quietly: “Can you remind me how it goes?” But this is Rav Ashi, one of the greatest scholars of the generation. Is it possible he doesn’t know how to say Kiddush on Shabbat morning? So Rav Ashi decides to take an educated guess:

**He thought: What is this great Kiddush to which they refer? He said to himself: Since with regard to all the blessings over a cup of wine, one first recites: “Who creates the fruit of the vine,” he recited: “Who creates the fruit of the vine” and lengthened it (to see if they were expecting an additional blessing).**

Rav Ashi decides to wing it and use his common sense. Since all the blessings over wine start with “Blessed are You, Lord our God, who creates the fruit of the vine,” perhaps this one does, too! He recites it, and then he pauses to see if the assembled crowd expect him to say more. But then redemption comes from an elderly man in the crowd:

**He saw a particular elder bending over his cup and drinking (and realized that this was the end of the great Kiddush). He read the following verse about himself: *The wise man, his eyes are in his head* (Ecclesiastes 2:13).**

Once the old man drank, Rav Ashi knew he had finished the blessing. This is striking because in contrast to the full Kiddush said on Friday night, which concludes with the line “who sanctifies (*mekadesh*) Shabbat,” nowhere in the one line blessing over the fruit of the vine which here qualifies as Shabbat day Kiddush is the root word “holy” (*kodesh*) which gives its name to Kiddush! Nonetheless, this single line is the “Kiddush” for Shabbat day. Indeed, while many modern customs differ as to the opening verses recited on the daytime Kiddush, they all end the same way: “who creates the fruit of the vine” (with no mention of sanctifying).

Why did Rav Ashi risk winging it? Did he actually intuit the answer? Or was the old man cutting him a break, and letting him off the hook even though he didn’t do the correct liturgy? The Talmud doesn’t tell us.

Sometimes leaders need to take a risk instead of exposing their own ignorance. They might sacrifice too much standing if they admit their lack of knowledge. However, this isn’t the only model of what to do when one doesn’t know the answer.

Elsewhere in rabbinic literature, we learn the story of Rabbi Eleazar Hisma. He is asked to lead the Shema and the Amidah, but he admits he does not know how. The people say to him: They call you “rabbi” for nothing! Rabbi Eleazar Hisma, mortified, went to his teacher Rabbi Akiva, and told him what happened. Instead of berating his student, Rabbi Akiva simply asks: Do you want to learn? Rabbi Eleazar says yes, and Rabbi Akiva teaches him. Then he goes back to the place where he had failed; this time, he leads the prayers successfully.

Sometimes, admitting a lack of knowledge isn’t possible or advisable. But sometimes, admitting that one is ready to learn — even something one should already know — is the pathway to greatness.

### *The old man and the Kiddush of Rav Ashi*

חזייה להווא סבא דגחין ושתי

When Rav Ashi was invited by the people of Mechuza to recite קידושא, he was unsure about the precise local practice.

He proceeded in a deliberate manner, and after he said the berachah of פרי בורא he quickly looked around the room and noticed a certain old man who leaned over to begin to drink. Rav Ashi was relieved as he realized that he had completed Kiddush. Tosafos notes that the conduct of the old man must be analyzed.

The Gemara (Berachos 47a) rules that those who listen to a blessing are not allowed to partake of the food until the one who recited the berachah first tastes from his food. How, then, could this old man have reached over to drink before Rav Ashi?

**Tosafos** gives two answers. The Gemara in Berachos is dealing with a case where the berachah recited was a berachah over food. Here, the person who recites the berachah must eat first. Our Gemara is speaking about reciting Kiddush, which is actually a ברכה המצווה—a blessing for a mitzvah. Although the berachah is over the wine, this is technically a fulfillment of the mitzvah to say Kiddush, and we find that a person who has already fulfilled his obligation may recite such a berachah for another person. Rav Ashi did not even have to partake of the wine at all, and the people there could have used his berachah to fulfill the mitzvah of Kiddush.

Another answer of Tosafos is that there is not necessarily any difference between Birkas Hayayin and המצווה ברכה in this regard. The difference is, however, that in Mechuza, when Rav Ashi said the berachah, every person in the room had his own cup in front of him. Therefore, as Rosh (#16) explains, the berachah of Rav Ashi immediately counted for each person and his personal cup, and the old man could drink immediately, without worrying whether Rav Ashi had partaken from the wine in the cup which was in his hand. Tosafos in Berachos explains that the old man did not actually intend to drink before Rav Ashi. He noticed that Rav Ashi had hesitated so slightly and was looking to see whether the Kiddush was over. The old man gestured to him by leaning over to his cup that, indeed, the פרי בורא was adequate, and that the Kiddush was over.

*How can a husband be motzi his wife in Kiddush on Friday night?*

זכור את יום השבת לקדשו זוכרהו על היין בכניסתו וכו'  
"Remember the Shabbos day to make it holy," remember it with wine  
when you bring it in...

The Mitzvah of Kiddush is Biblical in origin. But the Rishonim (1) argue whether Kiddush upon a cup is an official drasha from the Torah or it is only a d'rabanan and the pasuk is an asmachta (lends support to the law).<sup>4</sup>

The Achronim point out that according to the opinion that the Mitzvah of Kiddush is Biblical in origin, but the fact that it is done upon the cup is rabbinical (i.e., the opinion of the Rambam), once the husband has davened at shul and said the berachah of השבת ה אתה ברוך השבת he has fulfilled his Biblical obligation in Kiddush, and when he subsequently says Kiddush on a cup, it is only a rabbinical injunction.

But his wife (who did not daven maariv) is still Biblically obligated to say Kiddush. If this is so, how can the husband's rabbinical obligation on a cup be motzi the Biblical obligation of his wife?

There are a number (2) of answers to this question. HaRav S. Vosner zt"l (3) writes that it is proper for a husband to have specific intent during his davening to not fulfill his Biblical obligation in Kiddush in order that he will fulfill his Biblical obligation when he says Kiddush on a cup. This is apparently the opinion of the Mishna Berura (4) as well.

1. דלהרמב"ם [בהלכות שבת פכ"ט ה"א, ובהלכות נזיר פ"ז ה"א] על הכוס מדרבנן. וכ"כ תוס' בנזיר ד' ע"א, וסוכה דף ל"ח. ומאידך רש"י בנזיר ד' ע"א כתב שמדאורייתא. ובה"ל בריש סימן רע"א הוכיח שכן דעת הרשב"א ראש ור"ן. ותוס' כאן, וכן בשבועות כ' ע"ב, הסתפקו, והביאו ב' תירוצים בזה
2. א) דבה"ל הנ"ל כתב סברא שלא כיון בתפלה לקיים מצות קידוש. ומכיון שמצוות צריכות כונה לעיכובא, וא"כ הקידוש על הכוס מצוותו מדאורייתא. וכן עי"ש בדע"ת למהרש"ם, וכן עי' בחדושי חת"ס באו"ח סימן כ"א. ומאידך למ"א בסימן רע"א ס"ק א' כתב שבתפלה יצא י"ח קידוש דאורייתא וכ"כ בתוס' רי"ד כאן והביאו בדע"ת הנ"ל. ב) שי"א שלא יצא י"ח קידוש בתפלה מפני שלא הזכיר בו יציאת מצרים, (ועי' בבה"ל הנ"ל בזה) ובדע"ת שם הביא די"א שא"צ להזכיר יצי"מ אלא בפסח. ושי"א שיצא י"ח יצי"צ בק"ש. ג) בבה"ל (שם ס"ב בסוד"ה דאיתקש), הביא דלגרע"א כשאומרת שבת שלום אפשר שגם האשה קיימה את המ"ע דקידוש, אבל באה"ל שם לא ס"ל כן. ד) ולראשונים שעל הכוס דאורייתא, אין בעיה, אבל הוא מחלוקת וכנ"ל. ה) אם תתפלל המדרת לכר"ע
3. בשו"ת שבט הלוי ח"א סימן נ"ד. ועי"ש שזה דלא כמהר"ם שי"ק
4. במ"ב רע"א ס"ק ב' וז"ל וטוב יותר שיצא אז המ"ע דאורייתא משיצא תה. עכ"ל ודו"ק ■

Rav Dovid Brovsky writes:<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.dafdigest.org/masechtos/Pesachim%20106.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.etzion.org.il/en/shiur-14-netilat-yadayim-9>

In previous *shiurim*, we discussed the importance of washing one's hands (*netilat yadayim*) before eating bread. We recorded the harsh words that the rabbis employ when describing those who are not careful regarding *netilat yadayim* (see, for example, *Eduyot* 5:6, *Shabbat* 62b, and *Eirubin* 21b). However, one might ask, when one has no water with which to wash one's hands, may one eat without performing *netilat yadayim*? This situation has always been a source of great confusion; the *Mishna Berura* cites R. Shlomo Luria (*Yam Shel Shlomo*) who criticized those who would clean their hands in wet grass when they didn't have water for *netilat yadayim*!

This week, we will discuss one who is unable to obtain water for *netilat yadayim*. The Gemara offers two solutions to this problem.

## Wrapping One's Hands in a Cloth

The Talmud (*Chullin* 107b) questions whether one may wrap one's hand with a cloth and eat bread:

The question was raised: May one eat with a cloth [wrapped around the hand] or not? Must we fear that [the bare hand] will touch [the food] or not? ... R. Tachlifa b. Abimi [said] in the name of Shmuel, "They permitted the use of a cloth for those that eat *teruma*, but they did not permit the use of a cloth for those that eat *taharot*." And R. Ami and R. Assi were priests.

The Gemara distinguishes between "*okhlei teruma*" (kohanim who eat *teruma*) and "*okhlei taharot*" (those who eat *taharot*, i.e. people who eat non-sacred food as if they were eating sacrificial food). Rashi explains that since *kohanim* are accustomed to eating *teruma* they are particularly careful not to touch the *teruma*. Others, however, are not accustomed to eating in such a manner, and therefore they may not eat without first washing their hands.

The *Rishonim* disagree as to whether this passage refers to the *netilat yadayim* performed before eating bread as well. Most *Rishonim*, including the Rosh (*Chullin* 8:18), Ra'avad (*Hilkhot Berakhot* 6:18) and Talmidei Rabbeinu Yona (*Berakhot* 42a s.v. *mahu*), explain that while the Talmud permitted a *kohen* who eats *teruma* to eat with his hands wrapped in a cloth, they did not also permit an ordinary person who wishes to eat bread to merely cover his hands. The Rambam (*Hilkhot Berakhot* 6:18), however, writes: "A person may wrap his hands in a cloth and eat bread ... although he did not wash his hands." The *Beit Yosef* (*OC* 163) concludes that one should *not* wrap one's hands and eat bread, as most *Rishonim* disagree with the Rambam.

The *Beit Yosef*, however, notes that another Talmudic passage may be relevant to our discussion. The Talmud (*Chullin* 122b), in the midst of discussing the halakhic significance of "four *mil*," the time it takes to walk a distance of four *mil* (approximately 72 minutes), states:

R. Abbahu said in the name of Resh Lakish: For kneading, for prayer, and for washing the hands, the standard is four *mil*. ... R. Yose b. R. Chanina said: This 'teaching applies only to the distance ahead of him, but [as for going] back he need not turn back even one *mil*.

R. Acha b. Yaakov said: From this [can be inferred that] a distance of one *mil* he need not turn back, but a distance of less than a *mil* he must turn back.

The Gemara, regarding *netilat yadayim*, implies that one who is traveling and does not have water with which to wash his hands should delay eating bread for the time it takes to travel four *mil* (72 minutes) in order to reach water. If he has already passed a place with water, but he is still within a “*mil*’s distance, he should return to wash his hands. The Gemara does not state what one should do if he is further than the above-mentioned distances from water.

The *Beit Yosef* cites the *Roke'ach* (328), who implies that in such a case one would be completely exempt from washing one’s hands. Indeed, the Gra (163:1) notes that this is the view of all authorities. The *Arukh (erekh gabal)*, however, rules that when one is more than a four *mil* distance from water ahead of him or one *mil* behind him, he may eat bread without washing, as long as he wraps his hands in a cloth.

The *Shulchan Arukh (OC 163:1)* rules in accordance with the *Arukh*, that if one has no water within four *mil* ahead of him or one *mil* behind him, he should wrap his hands in a cloth. The Rema adds that one may eat with a spoon. The *Mishna Berura (163:4-5)* notes that the *Acharonim* disagree with the Rema. In fact, many *Acharonim*, including the *Chayei Adam*, *Kitzur Shulchan Arukh*, and *Arukh Ha-shulchan*, don’t even mention this leniency. Furthermore, although according to the Rema covering one hand might be sufficient, the *Acharonim* conclude that one should cover both hands.

The *Bi'ur Halakha* explains that when one is on a train, which can obviously travel four *mil* in much less time than 72 minutes, he still calculates the time it takes to *walk* four *mil*, i.e., 72 minutes, and not that actual distance of four *mil*. Similarly, when one is traveling by car and has no water with which to wash his hands, he should continue traveling up to 72 minutes, or return up to 18 minutes, in order to find water for *netilat yadayim*.

If one is not traveling, but rather sitting in his house or in an area without access to water, the *Acharonim* debate whether he must travel the time it takes to walk four *mil*, 72 minutes (*Magen Avraham 163:1, Shulchan Arukh Ha-Rav 163:1*), or one *mil*, 18 minutes (*Chayei Adam 40:11, Mishna Berura 163:3*), in order to obtain water for *netilat yadayim*.

The discussion above applies not only to one who has water, but to one who does not have a vessel with which to pour the water over one’s hands as well.

The Ritva (*Pesachim 48a*) writes that one should only rely upon such leniencies in extenuating circumstances, such as when one is weak due to the journey. Furthermore, some *Poskim* rule that one should preferably wash one’s hands with soda, or even fruit juice (see *Shulchan Arukh 160:12*; see also <http://www.vbm-torah.org/archive/blessings/08berakhot.htm>) when water is not available. Generally, the *Acharonim* suggest being stringent and not eating bread without washing one’s hands unless one is very weak or ill.

## **Relying Upon the Morning *Netilat Yadayim***

The Talmud (*Chullin* 106b – 107a), seemingly, provides another solution for one who knows that he will not have access to water for *netilat yadayim* during the day.

Rav said: A person may wash his hands in the morning and stipulate that it shall serve him the whole day long. R. Avina said to the inhabitants of the valley of Aravot: People like you that have not much water, may wash the hands in the morning and stipulate that it shall serve the whole day long. Some say: This is allowed only in a time of need but not at ordinary times; hence it is at variance with Rav's view. Others say: This is allowed even at ordinary times, and so it corresponds with Rav's view.

Rav suggests that one may wash one's hands in the morning, keeping in mind that this washing will also serve as the *netilat yadayim* before eating bread later in the day. The Gemara cites a debate regarding whether Rav's suggestion could be used in any ordinary circumstance, or only in extenuating circumstances.

This passage raises a number of questions. First, is the *halakha* in accordance with those who limit Rav's suggestion, or with Rav himself? Secondly, what is the nature of this stipulation, when and how can one make it, and how can the *netilat yadayim* performed in the morning serve as the *netilat yadayim* for the entire day?

The *Rishonim* debate whether the *halakha* is in accordance with Rav himself, or the more limited variation of Rav. Rabbeinu Chananel (cited by Talmidei Rabbeinu Yona, *Berakhot* 41b s.v. *u-le'inyan*) rules like the stricter opinion and only allows one to wash in this manner in extenuating circumstances. Most *Rishonim*, however, including the Rosh (*Chullin* 8:12), the Rashba (*Chullin* 106b s.v. *u-le'inyan*), Talmidei Rabbeinu Yona (*ibid.*), and the Rambam (*Hilkhot Berakhot* 6:17) allow one to wash in this manner in any circumstance. The *Shulchan Arukh* (164:1) rules in accordance with the lenient opinions. Many *Acharonim*, however, including the Maharshal (*Yam Shel Shlomo, Chullin* 8:22, *Teshuvot* 94), permit one to rely upon Rav only in extenuating circumstances. Based upon the comments of Rabbeinu Peretz on the *Semak* (181), they consider a traveler to be in extenuating circumstances.

The *Acharonim* debate the nature of this "stipulation." Some (see *Magen Avraham* 164:6) claim that there is actually no need to stipulate (*tenai*), but rather one must have the intention to keep one's hands clean until he eats bread. Others assume that the Gemara does refer to a stipulated condition, and they debate whether one must verbalize this condition or whether it is sufficient to merely have this condition in mind. The *Eliya Rabba* (164:1) summarizes the opinions and concludes that one should merely have the condition in mind. The *Aruk Ha-Shulchan* (164:1), however, rules that one should verbalize the condition, in order that it be clear that he is washing in order to eat bread as well.

Furthermore, although Rav stated that "one may wash his hands in the morning and stipulate that it shall serve him all day long," the *Acharonim* discuss whether this only works when one stipulates during the morning *netilat yadayim*. The *Tur* (164; see Rabbeinu Tam cited by *Tosafot Chullin* 106b s.v. *notel*) writes that this only works for the morning washing. R. Yoel Sirkis, in his commentary to the *Tur*, the *Bayit Chadash* (*Bach*), explains that since the blessing of

“*al netilat yadayim*” is recited only in the morning, one may only use the morning washing for the rest of the day.

The Rema (164:1; see *Beit Yosef* 164), however, explains that there is nothing unique, *per se*, about the morning *netilat yadayim*. Rather, “[a stipulation] only works when the washing was not performed for the sake of eating, similar to the *netilat yadayim* of the morning. However, if he washed for the sake of eating then the stipulation does not work.” The *Acharonim* explain that when the washing is done with the intent of eating, one must eat immediately (see *Pesachim* 106b). However, when the washing is done for another purpose, such as for prayer, or after leaving the bathroom, then as long as one has in mind to keep one’s hands clean until he eats, the *netilat yadayim* can permit one to eat bread later in the day. In such a case, he would not recite the blessing of *al netilat yadayim*. The *Magen Avraham* (164:6) notes that one may certainly wash for one meal and have in mind that it will serve for a meal later in the day as well.

The *Shulchan Arukh* writes that one should be careful “not to divert one’s thoughts from them (i.e., his hands).” The Rema adds that one should be careful that they do not become soiled. The *Mishna Berura* (164:4) explains that one’s hands should not come into contact with feces, nor should they touch areas of the body which are normally covered and therefore often sweaty (see *Shulchan Arukh* 164:2).

## Conclusion

In conclusion, when one is unable to obtain water for *netilat yadayim* later in the day, one may wash his hands in the morning, or for prayer, or after leaving the bathroom, and stipulate, preferably verbally, that “with this washing I will be permitted to eat for the entire day.” He should not divert his attention from his hands, and should ensure that they are not soiled, by feces or by touching parts of the body which are usually covered, before he eats bread. Some even suggest wearing gloves (*Mishna Berura* 164:4).

The *Eliya Rabba* (164: 2) cites the *Sheyyarei Kenesset Ha-Gedola*, who writes that “nowadays, it is not customary to stipulate... as even in extenuating circumstances one cannot be careful not to soil one’s hands, and therefore they refrain completely from employing this stipulation.” He cites the *Agur*, who expresses a similar sentiment. The *Arukh Ha-Shulchan* (164:2) concurs and adds that indeed he has never heard of anyone adopting this practice. He concedes, however, that one who is traveling among non-Jews and cannot find water may rely upon this ruling. The *Mishna Berura* (164:4) also concludes that it depends upon the circumstance and the degree of need, and that under extreme circumstances one can rely upon this stipulation as long as he is careful not to be distracted from protecting his hands. He even suggests keeping one’s hands covered by his sleeves, and certainly if he finds water later in the day he should wash again.

As mentioned above, the *Yam Shel Shlomo* observed that many people mistakenly believe that one can wipe one’s hands on wet grass and then eat bread. The *Chayyei Adam*, in a similar vein, writes that this halakha is often misunderstood or misapplied, and many people wash their

hands once and then eat the entire day, without properly protecting their hands, and often without reciting the *birkat ha-mazon* after eating.

Interestingly, R. Eliezer Waldenberg, in his Responsa *Tzitz Eliezer* (8:7) asks: which method discussed above is preferable for a person who knows that he will not have access to water later in the day – wrapping one’s hands in a cloth or stipulating that the morning *netilat yadayim* should be effective for the entire day? He opines that wrapping one’s hands is the preferable method, as the conditional washing of one’s hands is simply too difficult to perform properly. He notes that the *Kaf Ha-Chayim* arrived at a similar conclusion.

## **Washing Before Kiddush: Just for Yekkes?**

**Rabbi Yaakov Hoffman** writes:<sup>6</sup>

Most people view the practice of washing before *Kiddush* as a quirk of the “Yekkish” community. This *minhag*, however, was actually widespread (though not universal) among medieval Jewry – both Sephardic and Ashkenazic (*Shorshei Minhag Ashkenaz*, vol. 2 pp. 258ff). Indeed, the custom has no unique association with Germany per se. Observance of this *minhag* is now mostly limited to German Jews simply because of their general conservatism vis-à-vis ancient *minhagim*.

Customs relating to the timing of washing have changed over time partly because the relevant Talmudic discussion is ambiguous (*Pesachim* 106). The Gemara opens with a statement of Rav Bruna in the name of Rav prohibiting reciting *Kiddush* after *netilat yadayim*. Rav Yitzchak b. Shmuel b. Marta vociferously contests Rav Bruna’s ruling and counters that Rav would sometimes recite *Kiddush* over bread – which obviously means he washed before *Kiddush* – and sometimes over wine, depending on his mood. The difficulty lies in understanding how, precisely, Rav Yitzchak undermines Rav Bruna’s opposition to washing before *Kiddush*.

*Seder Rav Amram Gaon* – one of the earliest works of Jewish liturgy and attendant laws – interprets the *sugya* as follows: Washing one’s hands, an act associated with eating bread, indicates

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.jewishpress.com/judaism/halacha-hashkafa/washing-before-kiddush-just-for-yekkes/2019/09/05/>

that one wishes to dine rather than drink. In Rav Bruna's view, a person who washes his or her hands prior to *Kiddush* has forfeited the opportunity to recite *Kiddush* – the only recourse is to hear *Kiddush* from another. Rav Yitzchak rejects Rav Bruna's wholesale prohibition since one can recite *Kiddush* over bread, which would allow – indeed, require – a preceding handwashing. Even Rav Yitzchak, however, agrees that when it comes to reciting *Kiddush* over wine, one must wash after *Kiddush*.

Thus, according to Rav Amram's approach – which the Rif and Rambam follow as well – a general custom to wash before *Kiddush* is contrary to *halacha* (see Rif, *Pesachim* 22a with Ran; Rambam, *Hilchot Shabbat* 29:9-10).

The Rashbam, however, explains that Rav Yitzchak points to Rav's practice of reciting *Kiddush* over bread as proof that *Kiddush* per se is not an interruption between washing and eating the meal (*Pesachim* 106 s.v. *natal*). Thus, one may recite *Kiddush* over wine after *netilat yadayim*.

Other *Rishonim* maintain that this *sugya* is completely irrelevant insofar as practical *halacha* is concerned. Both Rav Bruna and Rav Yitzchak are working with the opinion of Rav, who maintains that one may recite *Kiddush* independently of the meal. According to normative *halacha*, however, one must say *Kiddush* where the meal takes place; *Kiddush* is thus considered part of the *se'udah* process, and one may wash for the meal beforehand (*Tosafot*, *Pesachim* 106b s.v. “mekadesh a'rifta”; see also *Ba'al HaMa'or*, *Pesachim* 26b [in the Rif]).

But even if washing before *Kiddush* is allowed, doing so is not necessarily preferred. The Mishnah, in fact, clearly states that one should prepare one's cup of wine before *netilat yadayim* (*Berachot* 8:2) in order to minimize the extent of the interruption between washing and *ha'motzi* (*Berachot* 52b). This statement implies that one should ideally make *Kiddush* before washing (Rashbam, *Pesachim* 106b s.v. “da'chaviva”).

Some commentators, however, reject this assertion by claiming that the *mishnah* refers only to general wine drinking. *Kiddush*, in contrast (which is closely associated with the meal), does not constitute an inappropriate *hefsek* (*Tosafot, Pesachim* 106b s.v. “*zimnin*”; *Shitah Mekubetzet, Berachot* 52b).

There is thus ample halachic basis for the practice to wash before *Kiddush*. How, then, did a formerly widespread *minhag* become limited to German Jewry?

The expulsion from Spain seems to have precipitated the custom’s demise among Sephardim. The religious and physical upheaval during this period paved the way for a break with traditional Spanish practices and an openness to new halachic rulings. Rav Yosef Karo, the preeminent post-expulsion Sephardic authority, argues that one should follow the stringent opinion requiring washing after *Kiddush* since there is no downside to doing so, although he acknowledges the plethora of opinions that allow washing first (*Beit Yosef* and *Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chayim* 271:12).

Another reason that virtually all Sephardim nowadays wash after *Kiddush* is that many Spanish Jews assimilated into Middle Eastern Jewish communities where such was apparently already the custom. The endorsement of the Arizal helped further entrench the practice of reciting *Kiddush* first (*Kaf HaChayim* 271:76).

The *minhag* to wash before *Kiddush* persisted longer among Ashkenazim – in fact, the Rema is emphatic in his glosses to *Shulchan Aruch* that the custom should not be changed (*Orach Chayim* 271:12). Despite the Rema’s admonition, however, most later *Acharonim*, including the Vilna Gaon, argued that reciting *Kiddush* before washing – and thereby satisfying all opinions – was preferable (*Taz* 271:14, *Bei’ur Ha’Gra ad loc.*). It was apparently under their influence that the *minhag* began to change, especially in Eastern Europe. The rise of the chassidic movement,

which exchanged many ancient Ashkenazic customs for those of the Arizal, also contributed to the increase in popularity of washing after *Kiddush*.

Some Ashkenazic authorities during this time period found themselves conflicted. On the one hand, they were sympathetic to the stringent opinion that requires washing after *Kiddush*, at least *l'chatchila*. On the other hand, they were uncomfortable with the idea of completely abandoning a venerable *minhag*. One such *posek* was the Bach, who proposed an original solution to the problem (*Orach Chayim* 271 s.v. “*ve'chen haya*”).

The Bach notes that the entire disagreement about whether to wash before or after *Kiddush* pertains only to the person reciting *Kiddush* aloud. Only speaking potentially constitutes an improper *hefsek* between *netilat yadayim* and the meal. Those listening to *Kiddush*, however, face no such problem.

Indeed, even Rav Bruna – whose opinion Rav Yitzchak rejects due to its excessive stringency – allows *listening* to *Kiddush* between washing and *ha'motzi*. Therefore, argues the Bach, one who recites *Kiddush* aloud should follow the stringent opinion to wash after *Kiddush*, but those who listen to *Kiddush* should continue adhering to the ancient practice of washing beforehand.

The Bach's logic seems unassailable and is explicitly endorsed by later authorities such as the Chayei Adam (2:6:12) and Mishnah Berurah (271:58). It is therefore unclear why few today follow it. Perhaps people prefer for there to be as little break as possible between washing and eating bread for all assembled (heard from R. M.M. Karp). Yet, having at least some of the party remain in place between *Kiddush* and *ha'motzi* may be a better fulfillment of the requirement of *Kiddush bimkom se'udah* (reciting *Kiddush* in the place of the meal; cf. *Korban Netanel, Pesachim* 10:16:9).

The Bach's approach also presents a practical advantage: It is more efficient for the assembled to wash before *Kiddush* and then transition seamlessly to the meal than to assemble at the table for *Kiddush*, then get up to wash, then return to the table to eat. The latter procedure is even more cumbersome on Sukkot and at large gatherings. People should therefore be aware that the option of following the Bach is freely available in such situations, even if one usually washes after *Kiddush*. Of course, there is also no impediment to adopting the approach of the Bach in general if one so chooses.

Most *poskim* mention no difference between the nighttime and daytime *Kiddush* in relation to the question of when to wash. The Tur writes, however, that one may certainly wash before *Kiddush* for the day meal (*Orach Chayim* 289). The daytime *Kiddush*'s brevity – it consists solely of the blessing of *borei pri ha'gafen* – precludes it from being considered an interruption between *netilat yadayim* and *ha'motzi*.

In light of the Tur's comments, it is odd that many nowadays who wash before *Kiddush* do so at night but not during the day. It is possible that the daytime *Kiddush* came to be viewed as less connected with the meal since people often recite it before an earlier snack of cake rather than at the *se'udah* proper. Furthermore, some authorities believe that the Biblical verses recited nowadays before the daytime *Kiddush* should not intervene between washing and *ha'motzi* since their recitation is a later development. In any event, the Bach's compromise is certainly appropriate for the daytime *Kiddush* as well.

**In conclusion:** Although mostly limited to the German-Jewish community today, the custom to wash before *Kiddush* was historically widespread among both Sephardim and Ashkenazim. Starting circa the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the *minhag* to wash after *Kiddush* gained popularity out of deference to the authorities who believe the Talmud requires it.

The disagreement about the order of *netilat yadayim* and *Kiddush* relates exclusively to one who recites the words of *Kiddush*. Those listening may certainly wash beforehand. Thus, the Bach (and others) suggest that one adopt the best of both worlds – the assembled should wash before *Kiddush* but the one who recites *Kiddush* should wash after. There is no halachic impediment whatsoever to following this compromise view if one is so inclined.

- 
1. This Talmudic passage is the only one in which Chazal mention the possibility of reciting *Kiddush* on bread. Rabbeinu Tam, however, argues that even this passage refers to *Kiddush* said over wine, and that *Kiddush* said over bread is not a valid halachic practice (Tosafot, *Pesachim* 106b s.v. “mekadesh a rifta”).
  2. Furthermore, washing before *Kiddush* on Sukkot reduces the interruption between saying the blessing of *leishev ba'sukkah* and eating the meal.
  3. It is not immediately clear why saying *Zachor* or *V'Shamru* should be different from saying *Vaychulu* at the nighttime *Kiddush*. Although saying *Vaychulu* is a much older practice, it, too, is not a halachically indispensable part of *Kiddush*. See *Shorshei Minhag Ashkenaz*, vol. 2, pp. 300ff.

**Leading the “wash before Kiddush”** camp are Rabbeinu Tam and the Ri (Tosfot *Pesachim* 106b) (both of France), the Rosh (*Pesachim* chapter X siman 16) (German origin) and the Rema (OC 271, 12).

Based on a remark of Rabbi Yitzchak, who observed Rav washing his hands before reciting *Kiddush* over bread, they point out that the recital of *Kiddush* after *netilat yadayim* and before eating bread does not constitute an interruption (*Pesachim* 106b).

This is because the halacha rules in favor of Shmuel, who maintains that *Kiddush* must be recited over food – ein *Kiddush ela bemakom seudah* (*Pesachim* 101a) – and against Rav, who maintains that *Kiddush* can be recited in the absence of food."

1. First, the **Bet Yosef** says in OC 271 that many people told him that this Minhag was the minhag in Spain (*Edot Hamaarav* of Europe), and the **Rashba** (Barcelona) wrote in *Shut* about this minhag, not the Rosh (Germanic immigrant in Spain) only.

2. The most discussed about this Minhag is if there is or, not a **problem of interruption** between washing hands and Birkat Ha'motzi. The Tosfot gives some arguments **to defend the minhag** (Kiddush is not hefsek according to the Halacha, which stated that Kiddush is recited only at the meal place, to recite and prepare kiddush is a short and easy occupation which has no problem of serious interruptions between washing and motsi (no Hesech Hadaat) ...).
3. One discussion treated a **Bedieved case**: is it allowed to continue after the kiddush without washing hands a second time? If the answer is yes, the interruption came from the man **who recited Kiddush** only or even from others who are quite by hearing only (*Shomea Keone*)?
4. For the **reason from which appeared the institution of the Minhag**, some Acharonim said "Lo plug" to unify the custom of Kiddush on wine and Kiddush on bread.
5. For the **conservation of the minhag** (despite its problems), some Acharonim conserve it partially (for the man who recite no, but for persons who are hearing him yes), see the answer of Adam (Rashbam in Pesachim 106b accredited such a way according to all amorayim opinions), some other conserve it totally or cancel it totally.
6. In Yekke communities there are 2 minhagim, Hamburg (conserving the minhag of the Rosh) and Frankfurt (following the Shulchan Aruch and most Acharonim {including Gra and Taz})

## Netilat Yadayim Before Kiddush

**Norbert Strauss** writes citing

**Rabbi Binyomin Shlomo Hamburger**<sup>7</sup>

There are various reasons that were debated by the Rishonim as to whether one should wash his hands before or after kiddush on Shabbat and Yom Tov.

Some reasons for washing after kiddush are that you should not make any interruption between washing and making motzi. Also, one should not wash hands before eating fruit (and wine is considered a fruit), since it is not a requirement. And furthermore, halacha requires the eating of bread immediately after washing.

The washing before kiddush also has reasons. For example, halacha allows a person when washing his hands in the morning to stipulate that this washing exempts him from *netilat yadayim* all day. Therefore, kiddush would not be an interruption. Also, it ensures that, regardless of the washing location, kiddush will be recited in the immediate proximity where the meal will be taken, which

---

<sup>7</sup> "Shorshei Minhag Ashkenaz" <https://jewishlink.news/features/33003-netilat-yadayim-before-kiddush>

is the most preferable way of reciting kiddush in the context of the meal. And finally, it was customary in the time of Chazal to perform *netilat yadayim* before kiddush.

There were various customs during the time of Chazal and later during the Ge'onim, some arguing for, and some against one or the other explanation, resulting in different minhagim in different parts of the Jewish world.

The practice to wash before kiddush became standard in the communities of Central Europe and was accepted as the exclusive custom in Poland for many years despite the objection expressed by several Polish poskim.

The Vilna Gaon's practice of reciting kiddush before washing brought many changes in the original custom.

German communities throughout generations followed the practice of washing before kiddush despite some dissent amongst the rishonim. A small minority, consisting mostly of Jews of Polish origin, followed the view that everybody recites kiddush before washing.

Today the custom of washing before kiddush is known exclusively as the practice of the German community, thus preserving an old tradition, shared originally by many other communities.

Now the reader might wonder why I present these views to you, which no doubt is an "old story" to many.

When I lived in my father's house in Washington Heights after we had all been reunited in 1941, it never entered my mind that there was any other way except to wash before kiddush. My father washed before kiddush, and when we were invited to others in the area, everybody washed before kiddush.

But when I moved out of Washington Heights to Englewood in 1977, I was suddenly confronted with that "strange" custom of washing after kiddush whenever we found ourselves as guests at a table other than "yekkes." My wife, whose family was from Galicia, had naturally adopted whatever my minhagim were when we married. So, for my wife this "strange" minhag was a homecoming and what she had seen in her father's house.

It became quite a bit awkward when I went for *netilat yadayim*, when everybody was ready to listen to kiddush. Even explaining my minhag to the host and the assembled guests did not help, since the smirks ("Aha, a yekke") were not comfortable.

I did not think it was necessary under the circumstances to ask a rabbi, and I changed my minhag to conform with the rest of the community. Now I comfortably wash before or after kiddush depending on the host's minhag.

## **Hands on Shabbat and Holidays Before Kiddush**

## DREW KAPLAN WRITES:<sup>8</sup>

While a common practice amongst Jews is to wash one's hands for a Shabbat or holiday meal is to do so following *kiddush* and prior to the blessing over the bread/*hallah*, there is another practice that is done. And that is to wash one's hands first, followed by *kiddush* and then the blessing over the bread/*hallah*.

The first practice is described by Rabbi Yosef Karo in his well-known work, *Set Table* (OH 271.12):

אחר שקידש על כוס נוטל ידיו ומברך על נטילת ידים ואם נטל ידיו קודם קידוש גלי דעתיה דריפתא חביבא ליה לא יקדש  
על היין אלא על הפת

*After one sanctifies (or, colloquially, one makes kiddush) upon a cup, one washes one's hands and blesses "on raising of hands" (or, colloquially, one says the hand-washing blessing). And if one washes one's hands before kiddush and one favors the bread, one should not make kiddush on the wine, rather just on the bread.*

The second practice is described by Rabbi Moses Isserles in his gloss on the above text:

ויש אומרים דלכתחלה יש ליטול ידיו קודם הקידוש ולקדש על היין וכן המנהג פשוט במדינות אלו ואין לשנות רק בליל  
פסח כמו שיתבאר סימן תע"ג

*And there are those who say that it is preferable from the outset to wash one's hands prior to kiddush and to make kiddush on the wine. And such is the common custom in our lands and one should not change from doing this, except on the night of Passover, as will be explained in section 473.*

This custom, that Rabbi Isserles mentions as having been done by Jews in Poland,<sup>(1)</sup> seemed to be a pretty important one of identity for Polish Jews, as he says not to deviate from it. Interestingly, Rabbi Isserles makes only one exception – the night of the Passover seder when the delay between making kiddush and breaking bread would be very long. Rabbi Isserles also feels very strongly about customs, <sup>(2)</sup> and this custom does not seem to be any different.

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://mattersofinterest.info/prekiddushhandwashingcustom/>

Whenever I mention this practice to people, the first question is “*Isn’t this interrupting between hand-washing and the blessing over the bread?*” In answering, who says there’s a hard and fast rule against speaking between handwashing and making the blessing over bread? In fact, when one reads elsewhere in Rabbi Karo’s *Set Table*, one finds the following (OH 166.1):

יש אומרים שאין צריך ליזהר מלהפסיק בין גטילה להמוציא ויש אומרים שצריך ליזהר וטוב ליזהר. ואם שהה כדי הילוך  
כ”ב אמה מקרי הפסק

*There are those who say that one need not be careful from interrupting between raising [of the hands] (i.e., hands-washing) and the blessing over the bread. And there are those who say that one should be careful. And it’s good to be careful. And, if one waited enough time to walk 22 cubits, it is called an interruption.*

Rabbi Caro presents two separate opinions about not interrupting between hands-washing and blessing over the bread: one that says one should be careful and one says there is no requirement to do so. It is important to note that he does not use the language of forbidding of interruptions or speech between these two activities. His comment about being careful not to interrupt is simply that it’s good to be careful – not that one is required to not interrupt.

Thus, when considering that interruptions are okay, making *kiddush* prior to saying the blessing over bread is not problematic.

- 
1. Joseph Davis, “The Reception of the *Shulhan Arukh* and the Formation of Ashkenazic Jewish Identity,” *AJS Review* 26, no. 2 (2002), 265: “Isserles used ‘these lands’ to mean the lands of Poland. The ‘customs of these lands’ that Isserles codified in his notes to the *Shulhan Arukh* were the customs of the Polish Jews.”
  2. Rabbi Asher Siev, “The Period, Life and Work of Rabbi Moses Isserles” (PhD diss., Yeshiva University, 1943), 65: “The elevation of the *minhag* to the level of *Halacha* may also be credited to R. Isserles, for it was he who upheld the Ashkenazic *minhag* against the *Bet Yoseph* and continually sought to explain and justify it.”

**Gil Student** writes:<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://hirhurim.blogspot.com/2005/11/triumph-of-textualism.html>

In the old days, there was a very widespread custom that was stamped out by leading rabbis who felt that it did not sufficiently conform to the Talmud. This despite explicit approval of the practice by scholars of the highest tier.

No, I am not referring to any example of the so-called Haredization of the Jewish community in the twentieth century. I am talking about a development in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the practice is washing one's hands (with a blessing) prior to reciting *kiddush* over wine and then proceeding directly to reciting a blessing over the *hallah*.

***Our Daf*** (*Pesahim* 106b) records a view that one who washes his hands may not recite *kiddush*, presumably because the *kiddush* is an interruption between the washing and reciting the blessing over the *hallah*. Another view is then presented that if one wishes, one may recite *kiddush* over *hallah* rather than wine and, presumably, wash one's hands before the *kiddush*. The simple understanding of this passage is that one may not wash before *kiddush* unless one is reciting *kiddush* over the *hallah*.

However, the practice developed to always wash before *kiddush*. Rashi (quoted in *Machzor Vitry* and *Sefer Ha-Orah*) and Rashbam (ad loc.) seem to permit the practice, albeit not *ab initio*, while Rabbenu Tam and the Ri (*Tosafos*, ad loc.) permit it even *ab initio*. There is ample testimony that the practice eventually became widespread in France and Germany, to the point that it was the personal practice of the Rosh. Rabbenu Tam was able to justify this practice textually by explaining that the initial opinion in the Talmud is entirely dismissed based on a disagreement elsewhere, and the concluding view is that one may always wash before reciting *kiddush*, even over wine.

In Sephardic lands, the Rambam (*Hilchos Shabbos* 29:10) rules according to the simple understanding of the Talmud but the practice of washing before *kiddush* was not halted by his ruling. Rashba (ad loc.) and Ritva (ad loc.) record that this practice was standard, and they attempted to justify it textually.

However, the Tur (*Orah Hayim* 271) opposed this practice -- despite the fact that his father, the Rosh, followed it -- because the simple understanding of the Talmud forbids it. This, even though he was well aware of Rabbenu Tam's textual justification of the practice. The *Shulhan Arukh* (*Orah Hayim* 271:12) rules like the Rambam, forbidding this practice. R. Yoel Sirkes, the *Bah* (ad loc.), explicitly states that this practice is widespread but that he opposes it because it contradicts the simple reading of the Talmud. He recommends a compromise, that the one reciting *kiddush* not wash beforehand but that everyone who is just listening may. His son-in-law, the *Taz*, goes further and rules like the Rambam, that this practice is entirely prohibited. Later authorities generally rule according to either the *Bah* or the *Taz*. This, despite the fact that leading Ashkenazic authorities, the Rema and the Maharshal, supported the practice of washing before *kiddush*. They were not able to preserve it from the stringency based on the authoritative Talmudic text, despite an available alternate reading.

By now, what was once a widespread custom in both Ashkenazic and Sephardic lands has been almost entirely wiped out. To my knowledge, it is still practiced by Jews of German heritage. Before the Holocaust, there were also some other pockets of tradition in which the custom was still practiced, but very small. The great contemporary defender of German-Jewish customs, R. Binyamin Hamburger, devotes a chapter in the second volume of his *Shorshei Minhag Ashkenaz* to this custom.

I find this to be an extremely interesting example of the great halakhists of the past four centuries preferring a simple reading of the Talmud over a practice that was established and justifiable (not to mention endorsed by great scholars). It seems to me to be an exception, but a noteworthy one.

## Washing Before or After Kiddush?

Avi Billett writes:<sup>10</sup>

*After I published this to the web, I found a more elaborate (and scholarly) discussion of the topic on hirhurim.blogspot.com - similar conclusions, though the directions bringing us there are very different. (See above)*

Having eaten at the homes of a number of "Yekkes" on shabbos, my wife and I have always admired the German custom to wash before the Kiddush, to allow for Kiddush to flow straight into the Ha'motzi and the eating of bread. "Typical yekkes, find a way to be efficient in these meals by cutting corners." It's true. How many people finally figure out where everyone is going to sit, only to have everyone get up again to wash for the bread? A little bit of frustration is easily removed through there being only one "general seating."

I hadn't looked up the law in a while, so I opened up the Shulchan Arukh to find this [I left the notes that link to the comments I record below in bold, underlined]:

**שולחן ערוך אורח חיים הלכות שבת סימן רעא**

**סעיף יב**

אחר שקידש על כוס, נוטל ידיו ומברך ענט"י ואם נטל ידיו קודם קידוש גלי דעתיה דריפתא חביבא ליה, לא יקדש **(נח)** על היין אלא על הפת.

**בז** וי"א דלכתחלה יש ליטול ידיו קודם הקידוש ולקדש על היין (הרא"ש ומרדכי פרק ע"פ (ורשב"א) והגה"מ **(סא)** :הגה ואין לשנות רק בליל פסח, כמו שיתבאר סי' תע"ג **(סב)** פכ"ט, והטור). וכן המנהג פשוט במדינות אלו.

<sup>10</sup> <http://arabbiwithoutacause.blogspot.com/2011/11/washing-before-or-after-kiddush.html>

The Mechaber (Rabbi Yosef Karo) writes: (58) After one has said the Kiddush over [the wine], one washes the hands and recites the blessing over the washing of the hands. If he washes his hands before the Kiddush, he is giving a clear indication that he prefers bread over wine, and he should make the Kiddush over the bread instead of over the wine

Rama: (61) 27 There are those that say that in the first place (l'khatchila) one should wash the hands before Kiddush, then make the Kiddush on the wine [presumably followed by the blessing on the bread]. And this is the obvious custom in these lands, (62) and one should not change except on the eve of Passover [at the seder, when we say the Kiddush first and wash for the matzah considerably later].

#### מגן אברהם סימן רעא ס"ק כז

כז וי"א דלכתחלה וכו' – דס"ל דאין הקידוש מקרי הפסק כיון דצורך סעודה היא ולכ"ע אסור למזוג הכוס בחמין כמ"ש סי' קס"ו ולמ"ד שם דאסור להפסי' אפי' לשפוך מהקנקן לכוס אסור אחר נטילה

**Magen Avraham 27** According to the Rama, the Kiddush is not considered an interruption (in one's concentration connecting the washing of hands to eating bread) because it is all part of the meal. The wine should be poured before people wash.

#### משנה ברורה סימן רעא ס"ק נח

(נח) אחר שקידש וכו' - ולא קודם [נח] כדי שלא יפסיק בהקידוש בין נט"י להמוציא [נט] אבל בני ביתו שאינם מקדשין (ב) בעצמן אלא יוצאין בשמיעתן מבעה"ב יוכלו ליטול ידיהם קודם

**Mishneh Brurah 58** Should wash after Kiddush – and not before [Kiddush] in order for the Kiddush not to be an interruption between the washing and the ha'motzi blessing. But the members of his household, who do not recite Kiddush by themselves and fulfill their obligation through his recitation, they can wash their hands before the Kiddush.

(סא) וי"א דלכתחלה וכו' - דס"ל דאין הקידוש מקרי הפסק כיון שהוא צורך סעודה ולכך יקדש על היין וישתה הכוס ואח"כ יברך המוציא ויבצע הפת וכיון דאינו הפסק ס"ל לרמ"א דטוב לנהוג כן לכתחלה משום דכשאין לו יין ומקדש על הפת בע"כ צריך ליטול ידיו קודם הקידוש [סא] וע"כ טוב לנהוג כן תמיד באופן אחד. ולמזוג את הכוס בחמין אחר הנטילה קודם המוציא ודאי אין לעשות כן לכו"ע כיון דצריך לדקדק יפה שימזוג כדרכו שלא יחסר ושללא יותיר הוי היסח הדעת

**Mishneh Berurah 61** There are those that say that in the first place (l'chatchila) one should wash the hands before Kiddush – because in their opinion, Kiddush is not considered an "interruption" because it is part of the meal. Therefore [one will have washed, then] make Kiddush over the wine, then say the blessing on the bread, and break the bread.

And since this is not considered an interruption, it is the opinion of the Rama that this a good practice l'chatchila. For when he does not have wine and he is saying Kiddush on bread, he also has to wash before saying the Kiddush.

And it is therefore good to be consistent in one's practice [– i.e., to always wash before saying the Kiddush]. But pouring hot drinks before Ha'motzi should not be done, because checking if you've done it properly and poured the right amount is definitely an interruption.

(סב) ואין לשנות - [סב] וכמה אחרונים כתבו דטפי עדיף לכתחלה לקדש על היין קודם נט"י וכדעת המחבר דבזה יוצא ( מדינא לכל הדעות ובכמה מקומות נהגו כדבריהם [סג] מיהו אם כבר נטל ידיו קודם קידוש בזה יש לעשות כהרמ"א דאעפ"כ יקדש על יין

**Mishneh Berurah 62** One should not change from this custom [of washing before the Kiddush] – Many Acharonim have written that it is preferred to say Kiddush on the wine before the washing of the hands, following the M'chaber's opinion, because through this one fulfills one's obligation according to all opinions. In some places they followed such an approach. However, if one washed the hands before Kiddush, one should certainly follow the Rama and make the Kiddush over wine [followed by the blessing on the bread].

### Summary

Following the snippets as provided, there are 2 ways to go about having the recitation of Kiddush flow straight into Ha'motzi.

1. Everyone except the person reciting Kiddush and Ha'motzi washes and sits down. Then, after he says Kiddush, he quickly washes – waiting for one person is not considered a 'hefsek'/interruption.
2. Everyone washes first (including the one saying the blessings), and the Kiddush is not considered a hefsek because it is part of the meal.

I like the argument that since Kiddush over bread would also require a washing before Kiddush (in the uncommon circumstance that a person has no wine or grape juice, this is standard procedure), one ought to be consistent and always wash first.

At the same time, there is certainly much to say for the argument that “Kiddush gets its own time” and that “washing and Ha'motzi get their own time.” In other words, say the Kiddush, then wash – as is the practice in most homes that I have visited – followed by Ha'motzi.

*Can we change our minhag? Without insulting our parents? I think the answer is YES, as long as we become consistent about it. (sic).*