סימן קעח

דין שינוי מקום

א. העוקר ממקומו באמצע אכילתו, פעמים שצריך לחזור ולברך, וכפי שיתבאר לקמן. ולכתחילה אין לעקור ממקומו לכל הדעות בכל אופן, עד שיברך ברכה אחרונה. [משנ"ב בהקדמה לסי' קעח, ובס"ק לז]. ולא יעסוק בשום דבר עד שיברך, כי קרוב לודאי שישכח מלברך. [חיי אדם כלל נט ס"א]

שינוי מקום באמצע סעודת פת

ב. לכתחילה לא ילך למקום אחר בתוך סעודתו קודם שיברך ברכת המזון. ואפילו דעתו לחזור למקומו הראשון לאחר מכן, ולסיים סעודתו ולברך ברכת המזון. [ראה הליכו"ע ח"ב עמ' לח]

Siman 178

Changing Locations During Meals

Avoid changing location when eating

1) Depending on the circumstances, if someone changed locations while he was eating he might have to recite another blessing in order to continue eating afterward. This will be explained below. All *Poskim* agree that it is incorrect to ever change one's location until one recites the appropriate *berakha aharona* for the food or beverage he has consumed.[64] Whenever someone has eaten, he must not engage in any activity until he recites the appropriate *berakha aharona*. If he does begin another activity, it is likely that he will forget altogether to recite the necessary blessing.

Day 66

Changing Location When Eating Bread

Don't leave before reciting *Birkat Hamazon*

2) When eating a meal, one should not go anywhere before reciting *Birkat Hamazon*. This is the rule even if the person fully intends to come back, finish his meal and recite *Birkat Hamazon*.[65]

64. In certain cases, it is permissible to change locations in the midst of a meal. One example is people who eat while walking down the road, as explained below in halakha 21. There are other situations where people have the same halakhic status as people walking down the road, as explained below in halakhot 22-24.

If someone knew when he first recited a blessing for his food or beverage that he will move to another room before he finishes eating or drinking and he began eating or drinking intending to move, it is permitted as explained below in halakha 18. This follows the ruling of Rama, who decided in favor of Rav Hasda's position. The *Ben Ish Hai* argued that in this case it is permissible for him to change locations even according to Maran, equating this case to one of someone who begins eating while walking down the road. This will be explained at length in the footnote to halakha 18.

65. Maran the Rishon Letziyon (*Halikhot Olam* Vol. II, page 38) explained, based on the words of Rama (178:2), that it is forbidden to go anywhere lest one forget

ג. היה אוכל סעודת פת בבית זה, ופסק סעודתו והלך לבית אחר, ורוצה להמשיך לאכול שם, אין לו לברך על מה שכבר אכל, וגם לא יברך על מה שבא כעת לאכול, ואפילו לא הניח מקצת חברים. ורק בסיום סעודתו יברך על כל מה שאכל בבית ראשון ובבית השני. [ע"פ הליכו"ע ח"ב עמ' מ ובהערה שם. וע"ע אול"צ ח"א סי' יז, ח"ב עמ' קד]

Continuing a meal in a second house

3) If someone was eating a meal including bread, and then he went to another house and he wishes to continue his meal there, he does not have to recite *Birkat Hamazon* for what he ate in the first house before continuing to eat. Likewise, it is not necessary for him to recite the blessing of *hamotzi* in order to continue eating.[66] This is the rule even if none of his colleagues remained in the first house after he

to recite *Birkat Hamazon* altogether. The *Ben Ish Hai* ruled that even if someone wishes to go somewhere else in order to perform a mitzvah, he still may not leave the place he is eating before reciting *Birkat Hamazon* unless it is a case of *mitzvah overet*. That is, it will be impossible to perform that mitzvah if he takes the time to recite *Birkat Hamazon* first. The *Mishna Berura* (*Bi'ur Halakha*) ruled that it is always permissible to leave one's location in order to fulfill a mitzvah, even if it would be possible to postpone it until after reciting *Birkat Hamazon*, and Maran the Rishon Letziyon concurred with this opinion. This ruling appears as well in *Yalkut Yosef* (Vol. III, page 216).

The *Halakha Berura* (page 217) pointed out, however, that this debate is based on the Rama who ruled according to Rav Hasda. Maran, however, ruled according to Rav Sheshat that changing location necessitates another blessing even when eating bread, regardless of the reason one changes locations. Certainly the halakha requires Sefardic Jews to take Maran's ruling into account, and therefore one should always avoid changing locations even if it is for the sake of performing a mitzvah. In practice, therefore, we must follow the ruling of the *Ben Ish Hai*. Since the ruling found in *Halikhot Olam* follows the opinion of Rama only, in practice it should not be followed. Therefore, in this collection of halakhot that entry from the *Halikhot Olam* was omitted.

66. As explained in the preface, Maran ruled according to Rav Sheshat that even when eating bread a change of location necessitates a new blessing. Furthermore, Maran ruled that in this case it is first necessary to recite *Birkat Hamazon* over what one had eaten in the first location and then to recite a new blessing over the food one is about to eat in the new location. Rama, however, ruled according to Rav Hasda that the rules of changing location do not apply when someone eats bread since he is always connected to the place where he began his meal. Therefore, no extra blessings are necessary and the person can simply recite *Birkat Hamazon* when he finishes eating in his new location.

***Safek berakhot lehakel* when Maran ruled that a blessing is necessary**

Based on the principle of *safek berakhot lehakel*, the halakha should follow the ruling of Rama in this case, and indeed several *Aharonim*, including the *Ben Ish Hai* (*parashat Beha'alotekha* halakha 2) and the *Kaf Hahayim* Sofer (178:14) ruled in this manner. The *Or Letziyon* (Vol. I, #17), however, reasoned that in this case we should follow the ruling of Maran despite the principle of *safek berakhot lehakel*. This is because when the person follows Maran's ruling and recites *Birkat Hamazon* on what he has eaten in the first location, he does nothing wrong. Then, when he wishes to resume eating, he of course must recite the blessing of *hamotzi* again. According to Rama these blessings were unnecessary, but even so, he is not guilty of reciting a blessing in vain (*berakha levatala*). At worst, he is guilty of creating a situation where he recites more blessings than would have been necessary (*berakha she'enah tzerikha*). Since he has done this in order to satisfy Maran's ruling, he has done nothing wrong at all.

The *Birkat Hashem* (Vol. III, page 440) also ruled that one should follow Maran's ruling in this case, but for a different reason. He argued that it must be permissible to recite *Birkat Hamazon* and *hamotzi* before resuming to eat. If the person would not recite these blessings, it turns out that according to Rambam and Maran he is eating and drinking without reciting the necessary blessing. Hence, he cannot be considered guilty of reciting unnecessary blessings.

Maran the Rishon Letziyon (*Halikhot Olam* Vol. II, page 40) did not agree with either of these arguments, and he ruled that one must not recite any blessings before resuming to eat in the second location. Both the *Yalkut Yosef* (Vol. III, page 209) and the *Halakha Berura* (*Otzerot*

אמנם אם הסיח דעתו, יש לו לברך על מה שרוצה לאכול אחר כך. [רמ"א ס"ב]

left. If, however, he had *hesah hada'at*, meaning that he forgot about eating altogether during his interruption, it is necessary for him to recite a new blessing in order to resume eating.[67] When he finishes his meal in the second house, he recites *Birkat Hamazon* to cover all that he ate in both houses.

Yosef #6) explained why the reasoning of the *Or Letziyon* and that of the *Birkat Hashem* are both faulty.

The *sefer Berakh et Avraham* (#24:1, page 35a) states that our custom is to follow the ruling of Maran in this case, and the custom overrides the principle of *safek berakhot lehakel*. Maran the Rishon Letziyon (*Halikhot Olam* Vol. II, footnote on page 40) countered that in our communities there is no clearcut custom and therefore we revert to the classic principle of *safek berakhot lehakel*. He also noted the *Or Letziyon*, alluding to the fact that he rejected his ruling.

There is a reliable basis to recite the extra blessings

Although in principle we say *safek berakhot lehakel* even when Maran ruled that a blessing is necessary, if someone insists on following Maran's opinion and recite the blessing, no one can protest his decision. Therefore, Maran the Rishon Letziyon (*Halikhot Olam* Vol. II, footnote on page 40) wrote that if someone wishes to follow Maran's opinion in this case and recite *Birkat Hamazon* for the food he ate in the first location and another blessing of *hamotzi* to resume eating, he may do so. This is likewise the ruling of the *Halakha Berura* (page 206).

Colleagues remaining in the first location

Maran ruled in the *Shulhan Arukh* (178:1) that if several people eat together and some of them change locations and then return, it is not necessary to recite new blessings as long as some of the group remained the entire time in the first location. The rules regarding changing location apply only when all those who ate in the first location left for somewhere else. Only then do we consider the first meal ended and any subsequent eating is a new meal. In practice, however, even if someone all alone was eating bread and he changed locations he does not need to recite any new blessing since we follow Rama's opinion based on the principle of *safek berakhot lehakel*. Someone who decides to follow Maran's ruling in this case, which is permissible as explained above, must realize that if his colleagues remain at the first location he is exempt from reciting any new blessings after he returns even according to Maran.

67. According to the *Even Ha'ozer*, it is not necessary to recite a new blessing even if someone had a *hesah hada'at* and totally forgot that he was in the middle of a meal. This is based on the opinion of Rabbenu Nissim and Rabbenu Yona, cited in the *Shulhan Arukh* (179:1), that the rule of *hesah hada'at*, that if one's thoughts leave a subject completely it is considered an interruption of that activity, applies to drinking but not to eating. According to this opinion, it would be unnecessary to recite *hamotzi* even if the person who changed locations had a complete *hesah hada'at* from eating. The *Ben Ish Hai* (*parashat Beha'alotekha* halakha 2) and the *Kaf Hahayim* Sofer (178:20) took the opinion of the *Even Ha'ozer* into consideration in their rulings. The *Mishna Berura* (*Bi'ur Halakha*) dismissed this opinion, however, explaining that the case in *Siman* 179 is where the person eating remained in one place but his thoughts left the activity of eating. The *Rishonim* reasoned that often a person thinks that he no longer wishes to eat and afterward changes his mind, and therefore it is not an interruption of his meal. In this case, where he both changed his location and also stopped thinking about eating, the *hesah hada'at* definitely necessitates a new blessing to resume eating.

The *Halakha Berura* (page 212) ruled that in this case a new blessing is necessary, based on a *safek sefeka*. First of all, the halakha might follow those *Poskim* who disagreed with the *Even Ha'ozer*. Even if his ruling is correct, perhaps the halakha is like the opinion of Maran that changing locations necessitates a new blessing even if there is no *hesah hada'at*. Normally we refrain from reciting a blessing even when there are compound arguments to say that it is necessary, but since in this case it concurs with Maran's ruling, we follow the rule of *safek sefeka* and not the principle of *safek berakhot lehakel*.