

O.C. *siman* 670 : Things that are *Assur* or *Muttar* on the Days of Chanukah**The development of: *Se'if* 1**

CHANUKAH'S STATUS AS A "YOM TOV"

The Gemara (*Shabbos* 21b⁴):

Question: What is [the origin of] Chanukah?

Baraisa (from *Megillas Ta'anis*¹): On the twenty-fifth of Kislev, the eight days of Chanukah [begin]. On these days, one may not eulogize, and one may not fast. [The institution of Chanukah, with this festive nature, resulted from the following:] When the Greeks² went into the Beis HaMikdash³, they contaminated⁴ all of the oil there. [Later,] when the Hasmoneans⁵ overpowered and defeated the Greeks, they searched and found only one container of oil, which remained with the seal of the kohen gadol. There was only enough oil in it to light [the Menorah] for one day. [However,] a miracle was performed with it - and they lit [the Menorah] from it for eight days. In the following year, [the Sages of that generation (Rambam)] "established" those days - making them *Yamim Tovim*^{*} with respect to "thanksgiving" and saying Hallel [but not as being *assur* in *melacha*^{*} (Rashi⁶)].

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* starts the *se'if* by ruling: **On the twenty-fifth of Kislev ["begin" (Rema)] the eight days of Chanukah; and they are *assur* in eulogizing and in fasting, but they are *muttar* in *melacha*.**

[The rest of *se'if* 1 follows the next subject. In addition, more about eulogizing and fasting will be discussed in *se'if* 3, and the Halachos of the above "thanksgiving and saying Hallel" are discussed in *siman* 682 and *siman* 683.]

¹ The Sages established a number of holidays because of miracles which happened on certain days. They recorded the details in a work called "*Megillas Ta'anis*". Some of the holidays are listed there as "days that it's [only] *assur* to fast", and the others are described as "days that it's *assur* to eulogize [as well]". Subsequently, almost all of these holidays were cancelled, but Chanukah was not. (*Ta'anis* 15b [with Rashi], *Rosh HaShanah* 18b)

² The Hebrew "*Yevanim*" is traditionally translated "Greeks". Whether or not the oppressors of the Jews at the time of the Chanukah miracle should be described as "Greeks" is beyond the scope of this project.

³ source's wording: "into the *heichal*". (The term "*heichal*" generally refers to the "main Sanctuary building" of the *Beis HaMikdash*.)

⁴ I.e. they caused the oil to become *tamay* [non-physically contaminated], and therefore it was no longer valid for the lighting of the Menorah. [As for *how* they caused this, see below.]

⁵ source's wording: "Hasmonean family leadership".

⁶ The *Gra* writes that in *Megillah* (5b) we see that this is a general rule: When *Megillas Ta'anis* says that a day is a *Yom Tov*, this does not mean to say that the day is *assur* in *melacha*.

The *Beis Yosef* here examines some questions about the story⁷:

(1) One can ask: Even if the container was sealed with the seal of the *kohen gadol*, why was it clear that its oil was not *tamay*? It's true that even if someone *tamay* would *touch* the container on its outside, the container and its oil would not become *tamay* (for an earthenware container cannot be made *tamay* like that - but rather only by contact on its *inside*). However, one should still have to be concerned that it was *moved* - which *would* make it *tamay* (at least if the decree had already been made that non-Jews contaminate like a *zav*⁸ - which includes contaminating by moving).

Tosafos's answer: Because of this, we must say that the container was found sealed in the *ground* - which showed that no one had even *moved* it.

The *Ran*'s answer: They definitely didn't even *see* it (and *that's* how we know that they didn't move it), because if they had found it, they would have broken it in order to see if it contained gold or pearls, once they saw that it was sealed with the seal of the *kohen gadol*.

Incidentally, Rashi's wording is: "And he [i.e. the finder] realized that they had not touched it." That sounds like Tosafos's answer. It also could mean what the *Ran* said.

(2) Another question: Why did they need to light from that container for [exactly] eight days?

One can answer: All the Jews had to be considered "*Tamay meis*" [impure by contact with a dead body - see "Principles"], so they needed to wait seven days from when they had been contaminated, and then it would take one day to press the olives and prepare the oil from them.⁸

The *Ran*'s answer: Pure oil was available at a distance of four days' travel from them, so it took eight days for going there and coming back.

(3) One final question: Why did they establish the holiday for all eight days? If the oil in the container was enough for one night, it works out that the miracle was performed only for *seven* nights!

One can answer: They divided the oil in the container into eight parts. Each night they put [only] one part into the Menorah, and [nevertheless] it burned until the morning, so it works out that a miracle was performed on all the nights.

One can also answer: After they put the proper amount of oil into the Menorah - the container remained as full as it was to start with, so the miracle was recognizable even on the first night. **Alternatively:** On the first night - they put all the oil into the Menorah, and its "candles" burned throughout the night, and in the morning they found the Menorah to still be full of oil (and so on for all the nights [except the last])⁹.

The *Mishnah Berurah* adds the following points:

(1) The Rambam's expanded version of the story: During the period of the second *Beis HaMikdash*, when [certain] evil kings ruled, they established decrees upon Israel - blocking them from their religious observance, and not letting them occupy themselves with Torah and Mitzvahs. They also "helped themselves" to the Jews' property and to their daughters, and they went into the *Beis HaMikdash*¹⁰ - and made breaches in it and contaminated "its

⁷ This seems unusual for a Halachic work. Perhaps Chanukah is unusual: Since its Mitzvahs are "to publicize the miracle", that makes it important to try to understand what happened.

⁸ This answer seems to correspond to the words of the Rambam, who mentions pressing the olives.

⁹ It seems that in these last two answers, the first day counts because a miracle *happened* then, but the last day also counts because the "seventh miracle" didn't *accomplish* anything until then.

¹⁰ source's wording: "into the *heichal*". (See our footnote earlier.)

taharos" [i.e. those things that were purposefully being kept from becoming tamay]. [In this way,] Israel suffered a lot from them, and they put great stress on the Jews, until the G-d of our Fathers took mercy upon them - and rescued the Jews from their hands, saving them. [At that time,] the Hasmonean *kohanim gedolim* overpowered and killed them, and rescued Israel from their hands, and control returned to Israel for over two hundred years - until the second Destruction. [Finally,] when Israel overpowered and eliminated their enemies - it was the twenty-fifth of Kislev, etc. [At this point, they proceed to describe the miracle, as in the Gemara above.]

(2) The name "Chanukah": It's short for "*Chanu*" ("they rested" from their enemies) *Kaf-Hei* (i.e. on the twenty-fifth). [This is the reason mentioned in the *Ran* (and in the *Machzor Vitry*) and also quoted by a number of other early authorities (such as the *Kol Bo* and the *Tur*). The *Kitzur Shulchan Aruch* adds that in those days they celebrated the rededication ("Chanukah") of the *Beis HaMikdash*, which our enemies had defiled (as discussed under the subject of "Festive meals" in the next *se'if*).]

(3) There is a *minhag* for the poor people to collect *tzedakah* door-to-door on Chanukah.¹¹

A "MINHAG" NOT TO DO MELACHA

The *Tur* says that if a place has a *minhag* not to do *melacha* throughout the days of Chanukah, then the *minhag* is valid and they cannot be lenient, in keeping with the principle (*Pesachim* 51a) that even when something is *muttar* according to the strict Halacha, it can still be *assur* for some people as a *minhag*.¹² The *Beis Yosef* disagrees: When something has a *component* which is already *assur*, and the people's *minhag* is merely to extend that - for it to be *completely assur*, then the rule from *Pesachim* can apply, because it is as though there were a decree "*Ha Atu Ha*" ["if we'll allow *this*, people will eventually come to do *that*"]. However [concludes the *Beis Yosef*], there's no proof that the rule applies even to something which actually has no shred of being *assur* even partially. This is also what the *Mishnah Berurah* writes; and he also brings from the *Chacham Tzvi* (responsum 89) that therefore one should protest at such a *minhag*, since idleness is an *aveirah* [since it leads to mental instability (*Kesubos* 59b)].

Still, the above is all referring to a *minhag* not to do *melacha* all day. However, the *Tur* writes that it is the *minhag* of women that they do not do *melacha* while the candles are burning, and that this is binding. The *Beis Yosef* says that the *minhag*'s purpose is to be a reminder that it's *assur* to use the candles' light [as discussed below 673:1].

¹¹ The *Mishnah Berurah* says to see the *Pri Megadim* as to the reason. The *Pri Megadim*'s words were unclear to me, but I feel that this is what he might be saying: The Rambam mentioned the Greeks' abuses in three areas - Torah, "*Avodah*" [the Service of Hashem], and property; so it's proper on Chanukah for us to do Mitzvahs in all these three fundamental areas (see *Pirkei Avos* 1:2): Hallel and "*Al HaNissim*" in the "*Avodah*" of prayer, the "lights" parallel to the Torah [see *Mishlei* 6:23 (quoted below 671:1)], and *tzedakah* with our property.

¹² The Baraisa there (and in *Nedarim* 15a) says that "You can't do something - even if it's *muttar* - in the place of those who have the *minhag* that it's *assur*". This includes two points: (1) that such a "*minhag*" is valid at all, (2) that even someone who *doesn't* have this *minhag* sometimes has to act as if he did. Part (1) is dealt with in *Shulchan Aruch* volume *Yoreh Dei'ah* 214 (by the Halachos of *nedarim** - since the above Gemara in *Nedarim* indicates that the obligating power of a *minhag* comes from the principle of a *neder*). Part (2) is dealt with above by the Halachos of Pesach (468:4). [But actually there are two reasons for someone who doesn't have a *minhag* to have to act as if he did: (a) to prevent "*machlokes*" [arguments and discord] between Jews, (b) so those who have the *minhag* won't "learn" from him that they can discard the *minhag*. In the Halachos of Pesach, it's talking about reason (a), based on the Mishnah (*Pesachim* 50b). But our Baraisa (based on the Gemara context) seems to actually be talking about reason (b), which explains why the statement of the Baraisa is basically just a way of saying that such a *minhag* can be valid (so we have to be careful not to "teach" people otherwise).]

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* continues: **And women have the *minhag* not to do *melacha* while the candles are burning, and "there is someone who holds"¹³ that they may not be lenient about this.**

The *Mishnah Berurah* writes that there is also a valid *minhag* "in some places" that men also do not do *melacha* while the candles burn; it's just that the original *minhag* was only for women, because of the miracle that happened through a woman [discussed below in *se'if* 2 - under the subject of "The miracle of the cheese"].

The *Magen Avraham* brings that the relevant time ("while the candles burn") is while burning candles "are to be found" [even if only] in the synagogue (i.e. until around midnight). But the *Mishnah Berurah* writes that the time is while the candles burn in *one's own* house (i.e. about a half hour [as explained below 672:2]).¹⁴

We can ask: (1) There are many versions of "*melacha* being *assur*"; for example, much more is *assur* on Shabbos than on *Chol HaMo'ed*. To what should the *minhag* of "while Chanukah candles burn" be compared?

(2) Below [672:2 by "How much oil is needed", and in 677:4 by "The left-over oil"], we learn that some authorities hold that if the candles continue to burn even after a half hour - then it continues to be *assur* to use their light. According to that, should the *minhag* not to do *melacha* also continue?

The development of: *Se'if* 2

FESTIVE MEALS ON CHANUKAH

The Tur^o brings from the Maharam^o (of Rottenburg) that the Sages established Chanukah only for "thanksgiving" and saying Hallel [as we see from the above Baraisa], so therefore extra feasting on Chanukah falls into the category of a "non-Mitzvah meal".¹⁵ (The *Beis Yosef* notes that the *Mordechai*^o in *Pesachim* also brings this Maharam.) On the other hand, the *Darkei Moshe* brings R. Avraham^o (of Prague) who says that the above Baraisa is only discussing the aspects of Chanukah instituted because of the miracle, but there is a second aspect - the dedication of the *mizbayach*^{*} - which naturally calls for feasting.

This aspect is seen in the Midrash (*Pesikta Rabasi* 6):

R' Chanina said: *The work [of manufacturing the components] of the Mishkan^{*} was completed on the twenty-fifth of Kislev, but the mishkan was left unassembled until the first of Nissan (when Moshe assembled it).*

If so, does this mean that Kislev - when the work was completed - [simply] lost out?

¹³ *Shulchan Aruch* language for a reliable but uncorroborated source.

¹⁴ The Levush^o brings another reason for the whole *minhag* (in addition to that of the *Beis Yosef*): "So that they won't let their minds wander from remembering the miracle - therefore they make at least that period like a *Yom Tov*." The *Eliyahu Rabbah*^o comments there, that the *Magen Avraham's* explanation of "while the candles burn" fits only with *this* reason. If so, it seems that the *Mishnah Berurah's* words fit together neatly: He brings the *Beis Yosef's* reason, so of course he won't agree to the *Magen Avraham's* explanation.

¹⁵ In *Pesachim* (49a), it says that a Torah scholar may not participate in a non-Mitzvah meal. See also *Chulin* 95b.

No! For what is [the meaning of the pasuk* (*Melachim I 7:51*)] "And it was completed" ["VaTishlam"]? HaKadosh Baruch Hu* said: "It is My responsibility to pay back ["Leshaleim"] to Kislev".

What did HaKadosh Baruch Hu pay back to Kislev? The rededication of the House of the Hasmoneans. [For then, too, there was an eight day "rededication", since the Greeks had desecrated the Beis HaMikdash* (*Mishnah Berurah*).]

The *Darkei Moshe* then adds a second point, that the *minhag* is to say a lot of *Tehillim* and other praises at these meals, so that they will be in the category of a Mitzvah meal.

The *Shulchan Aruch* rules like the Maharam¹⁶: **The extra feastings added on these days are non-Mitzvah meals, for they [i.e. these days] were not instituted for feasting and rejoicing.** But the *Rema* adds the following: **But some hold that the extra feasting is somewhat of a Mitzvah because the dedication of the *mizbayach* was on those days, and the *minhag* is to sing praises at those many meals - and with that they are Mitzvah meals.**

The *Rema's* conclusion of the *se'if* follows the next subject. First, however, *this* part of the *Rema* needs clarification:

The *Rema* included both of the points which he brought in the *Darkei Moshe*, and their relationship is unclear: First, R. Avraham disagreed with the Maharam on the basis of even the mere fact that Chanukah is the time of the dedication of the *mizbayach* - praise or no praise. The second point is the *minhag* to sing praises in order that the meals be Mitzvah meals. Can the *Rema* be ruling like *both* points? The *Mishnah Berurah* brings that our accepted ruling is like "the 'some hold'," indicating that he only sees *one* position (which he then describes as recognizing "the combination"). How can we understand all of this?

It seems that we have to see a difference in what the *Rema* called "the extra feasting is 'somewhat of a Mitzvah'," as opposed to his second phrase, "they *are* Mitzvah meals." Apparently, just because it's "somewhat of a Mitzvah" to feast at a certain time, that isn't enough to *automatically* redefine the meals held at that time (transforming them into "Mitzvah meals"), *regardless* of how they are conducted. On the other hand, *how* a meal is conducted does not necessarily make the meal a "Mitzvah meal", either. Therefore, in order to change the status of Chanukah meals, we add the "praises", so that "how" the meal is conducted is *also* "somewhat of a Mitzvah". Now the *Mishnah Berurah's* interpretation of the *Rema* is clear: This "combination" of a semi-Mitzvah "how" and a semi-Mitzvah "when" results in a true "Mitzvah meal".

The *Bi'ur Halacha* brings that in any case, one's Chanukah rejoicing should be combined with "the joy of Torah" - and one should not cancel fixed study times. All the more so, he concludes, one must be careful not to abandon the praises of Hashem in favor of frivolousness such as gambling¹⁷.

¹⁶ The Rambam calls Chanukah "days of joy", which normally should imply that it's a Mitzvah to have festive meals. It seems strange that the *Beis Yosef* totally ignores this Rambam. But the *Mishnah Berurah* uses these words of the Rambam to describe "why it's *assur* to eulogize or fast" on Chanukah, implying that *this* is his understanding of that Rambam (and the Rambam does *not* mean that it's a Mitzvah to have festive meals). [Perhaps we can also similarly interpret the words of the Rashba^o (in responsum 1:699) that on Chanukah "there is joy and pleasure".]

¹⁷ Once we're talking about "how to spend the time" on Chanukah: (1) The *Kitzur Shulchan Aruch*^o adds that one should tell the story of the miracles of Chanukah to his household. (2) The *Divrei Yatziv*^o (O.C. 283:5) [the Klausenberger *Rebbe*] mentions the *minhag* to play with a

The *Gra* attributes to the Maharshal^o the principle of using "praising" to transform a meal into a Mitzvah meal. In addition, the *Mishnah Berurah* brings that this works even by a marriage of a Torah scholar's daughter to an unlearned man [i.e. the "model" non-Mitzvah meal from *Pesachim* 49a], and that the rule is that whenever a meal is for the purpose of praising Hashem, or publicizing the miracle (or the relevant Mitzvah of the time), then it's a Mitzvah meal. The *Pri Megadim*^o protests: If that would be true, people would create such leniencies for *any* meal (and he points out that the *Chavos Ya'ir*^o made a similar statement). But the *Mishnah Berurah* himself must hold that such "supplementing" only works "by combination" with the timing, as explained.

As for why Chanukah *isn't* like Purim (where feasting is even *required*), the *Mishnah Berurah* brings the explanation of the Levush^o: On Purim, the Jews' bodies were saved ("for even if Heaven forbid they would have abandoned their religion - he [i.e. Haman] would not have accepted them"), so our "thanksgiving" is with our bodies; but on Chanukah it was the Jewish *religion* that was saved (for that's all that Antiochus was decreeing against - as we say "to make them [i.e. the Jews] forget Your Torah and to separate them [i.e. the Jews] from the rules that You want" - so long as the Jews would also submit to his rule and give him taxes), so we *show* Him how thankful we are for *that*.¹⁸

THE MIRACLE OF THE CHEESE

The *Kitzur Shulchan Aruch*^o (139:3) brings the story [also in the *Kol Bo*^o (44), the *Ran*^o, and the *Mishnah Berurah*]:

The decree was terrible upon the daughters of Israel, for the Greeks had decreed that any woman engaged to be married¹⁹ must have relations with their official first. [In the end,] the miracle was performed through a woman: The daughter of Yochanan the Kohen Gadol [whose name was Yehudis (Kol Bo)] was very beautiful, and the enemy ruler demanded that she lie with him. [In response,] she told him that she would fulfill his request, and she fed him cheese dishes so that he would get thirsty and drink wine and become drunk - and consequently go to bed and fall asleep. [In fact,] that's [exactly] what happened; and she cut off his head and brought it to Yerushalayim, and when the [enemy] forces²⁰ saw that their ruler was lost - they ran away.

The *Darkei Moshe* brings the *Ran* in *Shabbos* (by page 10a of the Rif), who says [as does the above *Kol Bo*] that there is a *minhag* to eat cheese on Chanukah, to commemorate this miracle of Yehudis.

"Dreidel" (he refers to *B'nei Yissaschar* Kislev/Teves 2:25 as the original source), explaining that in the time of the Greeks, when the Jews gathered for a Mitzvah - they would play "Dreidel" in order to trick the Greeks).

¹⁸ It also seems appropriate to mention the answer of the Bach^o, which actually fits together with the Levush's beautifully: On Purim the sin which caused the decree was that the Jews enjoyed the feast of the wicked king, but on Chanukah it was because they slacked off in their Service of Hashem.

¹⁹ *Mishnah Berurah's* version. The *Kitzur Shulchan Aruch's* version is: "virgin who is to be married".

²⁰ *Kol Bo's* version. The *Kitzur Shulchan Aruch's* version is: "their general".

Accordingly, the *Rema* concludes the *se'if*: **Some hold that one should eat cheese on Chanukah, because the miracle was performed with the milk²¹ which Yehudis fed the enemy.**

The development of: *Se'if* 3

MORE ABOUT EULOGIZING ON CHANUKAH

The Gemara (*Mo'ed Kattan* 27b¹):

The Mishnah taught that it's Assur to eulogize on a "festival" [even Chol HaMo'ed].

Rav Pappa said: *The [above] status of "festival" cannot oppose a Torah scholar [i.e. he in fact can be eulogized then (Rashi)], and all the more so [it is clear that eulogizing a Torah scholar is muttar] on Chanukah or Purim.*

To clarify: *This is true about [eulogizing him] "before him" [i.e. where the body is], but when "not before him" - then it's assur to eulogize even a Torah scholar.*

The Gemara asks: *How can that be? Didn't Rav Kahana eulogize Rav Zevid of Nehardea at Pumbedra [i.e. not where the body was, though it was one of the above days]?*

Rav Pappi answered: *That was on the day the report was heard, and that itself is comparable to [eulogizing] "before him".*

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* rules: **Eulogy is assur then [i.e. on Chanukah], except for [eulogizing] a Torah scholar "before him".** The *Rema's* addition follows the next subject. [Actually, the above is mainly dealt with in *Shulchan Aruch* volume *Yoreh Dei'ah* (401:5), and in the Halachos of *Chol HaMo'ed* above (O.C. 547:6). This Halacha is also brought below in the Halachos of Purim (O.C. 696:3), and some of the points that are mainly dealt with over there can be applied here as well.]

This is all that the *Shulchan Aruch* says explicitly about the Halachos of death and mourning on Chanukah. As for the Halachos of mourners, the *Beis Yosef* implies that they apply fully on Chanukah (as opposed to on Purim [as is explicit in the *Shulchan Aruch* below 696:4]), and so writes the *Mishnah Berurah*. The latter also writes that an *onen* [one whose relative is not yet buried - see "Principles"] lights Chanukah candles by himself - but only if he's the only member of the household who's home (and even then he may not say the *bracha*). [As for whether a mourner can be the "*chazzan*"* on Chanukah, see below (671:7).]

Concerning *Tziduk HaDin* [formal "acceptance of the judgment" - see "Principles"], the *Rema* refers to "above *siman* 420"; the *Mishnah Berurah* brings from there that [according to the Ashkenazi *minhag*, codified by the *Rema*] it is not said on any "days when *Tachanun* is not said" [see "Principles"], so that includes Chanukah [as discussed below in *siman* 683], but he adds that one *does* say *Tziduk HaDin* on the day before or after Chanukah.

[As for whether it's *muttar* to fast or eulogize one day before or after Chanukah, the *Mishnah Berurah* refers to the Halachos of Purim (O.C. 686:1).]

²¹ The *Kitzur Shulchan Aruch* also switches to "milk" at the end; I have no explanation for this.

MORE ABOUT FASTING ON CHANUKAH

If the *yahrtzeit** of one's father or mother fell on Chanukah, can he fast? The *Darkei Moshe* brings a source for a *minhag* to fast until midday, but he himself does not recognize it as an accepted *minhag*.

To address this question, the *Gra* cites the following Gemara (*Rosh HaShanah* 18b⁴):

[Chanukah is one of the holidays listed in Megillas Ta'anis (as seen from the Gemara brought above in se'if 1). One position in the Gemara here holds that after the Destruction, the holidays of Megillas Ta'anis were cancelled²².]

Rav Kahana challenged *[that position - by quoting the following Baraisa]: It happened [once] that the people of Lod decreed a fast day [over lack of rain] on Chanukah; and in response, R' Eliezer went to the bathhouse and bathed, and R' Yehoshua went to the barber and had a haircut (activities which are assur on such fast days²³), and they said to the people: "Now you shall have to fast over the fact that you fasted!" [And their days were after the destruction!]*

Rav Yosef's original answer: *Chanukah is different, because there is a [unique] Mitzvah [in connection with it].*

However, Abbaye challenged that answer: *So let Chanukah be cancelled [i.e. along with the other holidays of Megillas Ta'anis], and let its Mitzvah be cancelled [with it]!*

So Rav Yosef retracted and instead answered: *Chanukah is different, because its miracle is publicized [to the Jews (through its Mitzvahs) - to the point of treating it as though it were Torah-mandated - so it's not proper for it to be cancelled (Rashi)].*

Consequently, says the *Gra*, "all the more so" it's clear that it's *assur* to fast "just" for a *yahrtzeit*. [However, I don't understand why this would prove that it's *assur* to fast even only until midday.]

Accordingly, the *Rema* adds to the *se'if*: **And it's assur to fast [over its being] the day of one's father's or mother's death; And concerning if one fasted on Chanukah because of a dream, see above [O.C.] siman 568 se'if 5; And concerning Tziduk HaDin [an issue raised under our previous subject], see above in the Halachos of Rosh Chodesh (O.C. 420), and see below siman 683.**

The *Mishnah Berurah* writes that if one *did* fast on Chanukah, we apply the principle that one fasts an "atonement fast" over having fasted [like in the case of a dream, which the *Rema* referred to].²⁴

²² This is mainly dealt with in the Halachos of fasting (O.C. 573). Another relevant location is below in the Halachos of Purim (O.C. 686:1).

²³ So deduces the Ra'avyah (3:854); see *Ta'anis* 12b.

²⁴ This also seems to fit with the instructions that were given in the above Baraisa. However, Rashi says that there it only means to repent.