

## **O.C. *siman* 675 : The Lighting Makes the Mitzvah (not the setting in place)**

### **The development of: *Se'if* 1**

THE LIGHTING "MAKES" THE MITZVAH (NOT THE "SETTING IN PLACE"), so *that's* what has to be for the Mitzvah's sake

The Gemara (*Shabbos* 22b<sup>2</sup>):

**The Sages asked:** *Do we say that the lighting makes the Mitzvah, or that the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah? [Which does the Mitzvah chiefly depend on (Rashi)?]*

**The Gemara concludes with a proof:** *R' Yehoshua ben Levi said: [23a] If a glass lantern had been burning the entire day [of Shabbos] [having been lit for the Mitzvah on the eve of Shabbos (Rashi)], then on the departure of Shabbos one puts it out and then once again lights it [for that night's Mitzvah (Rashi)]. Now, we can understand this well if you say the lighting makes the Mitzvah [because then **that** is what has to be re-done for the sake of "that night's Mitzvah"]. But if you would say the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah, [then] the statement should not read "one puts it out and then once again lights it"! [Rather,] it should have read "one puts it out and [then] picks it up and places it back down and only **then** lights it"!*

**And one final proof:** *We word the bracha: "...who sanctified us with his Mitzvahs - and commanded us to **light** a Chanukah 'candle'<sup>1</sup>!"*

**From all this, the Gemara concludes:** *The lighting makes the Mitzvah.*

The Tur<sup>o</sup> chooses the Halacha of R' Yehoshua ben Levi as the main practical effect of our principle (that the lighting makes the Mitzvah). First, however, he emphasizes the basic idea *behind* that Halacha: that if a "candle" was sitting in place [i.e. unlit] without any intent that it be for the Mitzvah, then what has to be done is to *light* it [i.e. for the sake of the Mitzvah], but there's no need to *remove* it (from its place) and then *set it in place* for the sake of the Mitzvah.

The Tosafos (quoting "the *Riva*") mentions that R' Yehoshua ben Levi is referring to a lantern which was lit on Friday afternoon *as a Shabbos candle*. On the other hand, Rashi wrote<sup>2</sup> that the lantern was lit as the *Friday night Chanukah candle*, indicating that even *then* it needs to be re-lit after Shabbos. The *Mishnah Berurah* explains that this is because "each day [of Chanukah] is a separate matter."

The *Shulchan Aruch* incorporates that Rashi [while the rest of his wording is taken from the Tur], as he rules: **The lighting makes the Mitzvah, and not the "setting in place"; [which means] that if it was sitting in its place - not for the sake of the Mitzvah of Chanukah - he lights it there; and he does not have to remove it and [then] set it [back] in place for the sake of the Mitzvah of Chanukah; Therefore, [in the case of] a "glass" [lantern] which had**

<sup>1</sup> The word "*ner*" is traditionally translated "candle", but the earlier sources generally do not use the word to refer to solid candles. Rashi explains that in the days of the Gemara, earthenware "lamps" were used; his full description is brought above (671:3).

<sup>2</sup> To keep things clearer, this point was omitted from the quote of Rashi which we included with the Gemara.

**been burning the entire day - having lit it on the eve of Shabbos for the Mitzvah of Chanukah: on the departure of Shabbos one puts it out and [then once again] lights it for the sake of the Mitzvah.** [The rest of the *se'if* follows the next two subjects.]

The *Mishnah Berurah* writes the Gemara's last proof (the *bracha*); and he points out that based on the same logic, we can conclude that in the case of Shabbos and Yom Tov\* candles as well, it's the lighting that makes the Mitzvah.<sup>3</sup> (The *Mishnah Berurah* in the Halachos of Shabbos [to O.C. 263:10] applies this by saying that lighting Shabbos candles in a place where they're not relevant at all is totally invalid [similar to our Gemara of "lighting indoors and then bringing outdoors", discussed soon].)

#### SOMEONE WHO LIT THE CANDLE BUT STOOD THERE HOLDING IT

The Gemara (*Shabbos* 22b<sup>2</sup>):

**The Gemara brings a proof** [during the above discussion]: Rava said: If someone was holding a Chanukah "candle" and merely standing there [i.e. he was holding it from when he lit until it went out (Rashi)], he didn't do anything. Let us derive from this that the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah!

**The Gemara counters:** No, there it's because otherwise someone who sees it could say [i.e. think]: "[It seems that] it's for his [personal] needs that he's holding it [and not for the Mitzvah]."

The Tur and *Shulchan Aruch* bring this Halacha [as quoted after the next subject], as well as the reason from the "countering" (since we hold that "the lighting makes the Mitzvah" as above). The Taz<sup>o</sup> says that if someone holds the candle *only for a short time* after lighting it, that's not a problem<sup>4</sup> [as implied by the above Rashi]. But the *Mishnah Berurah* decides in favor of the later authorities who reject this<sup>5</sup>.

#### SOMEONE WHO LIT INDOORS AND THEN BROUGHT THE CANDLE OUTSIDE

The Gemara (*Shabbos* 22b<sup>3</sup>):

**The Gemara brings a proof** [during the above discussion]: Rava said: If someone lit his Chanukah candle indoors and [then] brought it out [i.e. to the "outside" of his entranceway where it belongs (Rashi)], he didn't do anything. Now, we understand [that] if you say the **lighting** makes the Mitzvah - that's why he didn't do

<sup>3</sup> The *Sha'ar HaTziyun* refers us to the *Eliyahu Rabbah*<sup>o</sup>. The latter says that Rashi seems to base our principle ("the lighting make the Mitzvah") on the Menorah, and based on that - the Maharshaf<sup>o</sup> and the Taz<sup>o</sup> hold it does *not* apply to Shabbos candles. The *Eliyahu Rabbah* himself disagrees, based on the *bracha* - and an explicit *Mordechai*<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Here the Taz says he was *yotzei* (which would apparently only tell us it's okay "after the fact"). In the previous *siman*, however, he uses his position from here to explain how it can be *muttar* to light from one candle to another candle directly, which implies that here too he means that it's *muttar* even "initially".

<sup>5</sup> The *Mishnah Berurah* describes them as saying not to do it (which would apparently only tell us it's a problem "initially"). However, if they reject the Taz's distinction completely, it should follow that they hold he was not *yotzei* even "after the fact" (like the Gemara said about our case). [And see the previous footnote.]

anything [because since the lighting is the fundamental act of the Mitzvah, it needs to be done in a "place of obligation" (Rashi)]. But if you say the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah - [then] how come he didn't do anything?

**The Gemara counters:** No, there as well [like in the previous subject], it's because otherwise someone who sees it could say [i.e. think]: "[It seems that] it's for his [personal] needs that he lit it [and not for the Mitzvah]."

Based on this [and the previous subject], the *Shulchan Aruch* rules [as did the Tur], concluding the *se'if*: **Nevertheless** [i.e. although the "setting in place" doesn't "make" the Mitzvah], **one has to light it in the place where he's putting it, i.e. if he lit it indoors and [then] brought it out - he was not yotzei, for someone who sees [it] says [i.e. thinks]: "It's for his [personal] needs that he's lighting it"; And similarly, if he lights it and holds it in his hand in its place - he was not yotzei, for someone who sees [it] says [i.e. thinks]: "It's for his [personal] needs that he's holding it."** Now, some clarification is needed here:

It would seem that in *this* case, the *Shulchan Aruch* [and Tur] should not have used the reason from the Gemara's "countering"! After all, the Gemara only needed that explanation to defend the position that "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah; but once we conclude that *lighting* makes the Mitzvah - then "we understand" Rava *without* that reason [because the lighting needs to be done in a "place of obligation", as Rashi explained]!

But if we focus on the phrase they added, "one has to light it in the place *where he's putting it*", we can understand their intent. Shouldn't they have said "in the place where he's *obligated* to put it"? After all, Rashi clearly interprets Rava as considering "indoors" *not* to be the "place of obligation", and *that's* the problem which comes from "the lighting makes the Mitzvah"! From this we understand: The Tur and *Shulchan Aruch* are pointing out that the concern about "someone who sees it" makes it a problem to light one's candle *anywhere but where he's actually leaving it* (even if *both* places are ones "of obligation"), since *the moving from place to place* is what gives the onlooker his impression.

The *Mishnah Berurah* uses this approach. He elaborates: When everyone had to light "by the 'outside' of his entranceway" [see above 671:5], then *everywhere* else was "invalid to light" more simply [i.e. because "lighting makes the Mitzvah" as above]; but "nowadays when we light indoors" [i.e. so that *is* a "place of obligation"] - one still is not *yotzei* by lighting in one place and leaving it elsewhere, because of "someone who sees it".

Similarly, the *Darkei Moshe* brings from the *Mahari Veil*<sup>6</sup> that "one must leave it, in the place it was lit, for a half hour."<sup>6</sup> The *Mishnah Berurah* brings this, and although he mentions that there are later authorities who disagree<sup>7</sup>, nevertheless he concludes by bringing the *Pri Megadim*<sup>8</sup> who decides that one certainly should be

<sup>6</sup> This means that even if the candle *in fact sat* in one place for some time [which *clearly* satisfies "the lighting makes the Mitzvah"], one still may not move it to any new place (until "a half hour"). [It also seems to include that one may not pick it up and move it - even if he then puts it back down in its *original* place. (This contributes to "the practical difficulty of the *Mishnah Berurah*" by the first subject of *siman* 674 above.)]

<sup>7</sup> In the *Sha'ar HaTziyun*, he refers to what the *Magen Avraham*<sup>9</sup> brings in the Halachos of Shabbos (O.C. 263). From that *Magen Avraham*, it seems clear that this lenient position holds it's *muttar* to move the candle even immediately after it's lit [i.e. rejecting the whole approach of the Tur, *Shulchan Aruch*, and *Mishnah Berurah*, that was just discussed].

concerned over this "initially". [Actually, in the *Sha'ar HaTziyun* above (to 672:2 by "the amount of oil to use"), he brings that one should not move them for as long as they burn - even *past* a half hour.<sup>8</sup>]

(The *Beis Yosef* brings from R. Yitzchak Abouhav<sup>o</sup> that "nowadays that we light indoors" [as above 671:5], we need not be so concerned about "people passing to and fro". However, the *Mishnah Berurah* does not mention that [and see further in the next subject, about the synagogue lighting].)

*We can ask*: What if someone discovered that his "*menorah*" was blocking the doorway? Should he be allowed to move it over a little, so that he (and others) will be able to get through?

#### MOVING THE SYNAGOGUE "*MENORAH*" (WITH CANDLES BURNING) TO ITS YEAR-ROUND REGULAR PLACE

The *Beis Yosef* quotes R. Yitzchak Abouhav<sup>o</sup>, who brings from the *Nimukei Yosef*<sup>f</sup>:

***There was a vessel*** in the synagogue, inside of which they lit "candles" all year, to provide light.<sup>9</sup> One time, "candles" were prepared, for the purpose of being Chanukah "candles", in that vessel; and after the lighter had lit the Chanukah "candles" - he raised the vessel by means of its rope<sup>10</sup> in order to position it in its special year-round place.

***And the Nimukei Yosef opposed the lighter*** - insisting that he shouldn't do that. For even though those standing in the synagogue heard the bracha of Chanukah at the time of the lighting [so to **them** it's clear that these candles are for the *Mitzvah*], nevertheless an onlooker who was **not** there at that time could say [i.e. think]: "It's for his [personal] needs that he lit it." Therefore, he commanded that the lighter should not raise it, but rather he should leave it down below - below ten *tefachim*<sup>\*</sup> [i.e. the correct height for Chanukah candles, as discussed above 671:1].

***The Nimukei Yosef added*** that there is reason to question even **this** [solution], because the people will still make use of its light. After all, since all year they are used to lighting a "candle" in that vessel to make use of its light, so now also, even if it's not kept at its usual place [up high], still it's impossible that the Chanukah "candles" not serve those standing there - in place of the "candles" they were used to (given that there's no [extra] "candle" sitting together with the Chanukah "candles"<sup>11</sup>). In conclusion [he said], what's appropriate is to "innovate" [the use of] a separate vessel for Chanukah.

<sup>8</sup> In addition, see by "applying the lighting times to nowadays" (above 672:2) concerning the possibility that for "us", the relevant time period *itself* may be longer than a half hour.

<sup>9</sup> The *Pri Megadim*<sup>o</sup> explains how this vessel was used year-round [based on the rest of the story]: It was hung by a rope, in such a way that it could be lowered [like a pulley] down near the ground when it was to be lit, and then raised up high for the rest of the time it would be providing light.

<sup>10</sup> source's wording: "he moved the rope in his hand so as to raise the vessel."

<sup>11</sup> source's wording: "in the place of the Chanukah 'candle'."

R. Yitzchak Abouhav then writes his *own* position on this:

*The candle-lighting in the synagogue is merely a minhag (which is why we are not concerned that it be by the entrance, but rather it's done before the Aron HaKodesh<sup>\*12</sup>). Therefore, when it comes to that lighting, one should not be so concerned about what onlookers might think<sup>13</sup>. Furthermore, even in the home, we light only for the members of the household nowadays [as discussed above 671:5]; and therefore, one should not be so concerned for "people passing to and fro"; all the **more** so with the synagogue, for after all, all those who come there know that these "candles" are for Chanukah.<sup>14</sup>*

The Magen Avraham mentions this leniency for the synagogue, but concludes that "one *should* be concerned [about this] 'initially'," and it's *that* ruling which the Mishnah Berurah quotes.

### **The development of: *Se'if 2***

#### HAVING THE NECESSARY AMOUNT OF OIL BEFORE LIGHTING

The Rosh<sup>o</sup> (Shabbos 2:7):

*We already learned* [above 672:2] about there being a "specification" of the amount of oil which has to be used for Chanukah "candles"<sup>15</sup>.

*So now we can clarify that:* Since "the lighting makes the Mitzvah", one needs to put that amount of oil in "the candle" [i.e. the container to be used] **before** lighting; but if he said the bracha and lit and [only] **afterwards** he added oil until he reached that amount, he was not *yotzei* his obligation.

Accordingly, the Shulchan Aruch writes: "**There is someone who holds**"<sup>16</sup> **that since "the lighting makes the Mitzvah," one needs to put oil in "the candle" according to "the specification" before lighting; but if he said the bracha and lit and afterwards he added oil [reaching] up to "the specification" - he was not yotzei his obligation.**

In this case where one is not *yotzei*, the Mishnah Berurah brings the ruling of those who hold that he lights again *without* a Bracha<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> source's wording: "before the *heichal*." [Regarding the point he's making, see above in *siman* 671, *se'ifim* 5 and 7.]

<sup>13</sup> source's wording: "one should not be so particular because of 'those who come in and those who go out'."

<sup>14</sup> R. Yitzchak Abouhav concludes: "And also, it would seem that since he already lit them in an inappropriate place - it's [considered] like [a case where] 'it went out' - where [the Halacha is that] 'he is not responsible for it.'" [This point seems very difficult to understand.]

<sup>15</sup> The word "*ner*" is traditionally translated "candle", but the earlier sources generally do not use the word to refer to solid candles. Rashi explains that in the days of the Gemara, earthenware "lamps" were used; his full description is brought above (671:3).

<sup>16</sup> *Shulchan Aruch* language for a reliable but uncorroborated source.

<sup>17</sup> See the discussion above [within 673:2] by "lighting in such a way that the candle cannot survive" (e.g. where it's windy).

The *Shulchan Aruch* rules in the Halachos of Kiddush (O.C. 271:15): "If the cup [of wine] spills before he drinks even a little bit from it, he brings [i.e. prepares] another cup [of wine] and says the *bracha* on it." The *Mishnah Berurah* there brings that if it turned out that there hadn't been wine in the cup in the *first* place, then it's even worse. However, he also brings that if there was some other wine in front of him that he wanted to use [such as a bottle intended for general drinking], then it's as if he said the original *bracha* on *that* wine, and he should drink some of that wine right away - without any other *bracha*.

*We can ask:* What about by Chanukah candles? If someone said the *bracha*, and then he discovered that the "*menorah*" lacked oil, but there was some other oil somewhere in front of him, should he be allowed to pour from that oil right away and then light, without having to say a new *bracha*?

### The development of: **Se'if 3**

#### CHANUKAH CANDLE-LIGHTING BY A WOMAN

The Gemara (*Shabbos* 23a<sup>1</sup>):

*Now that we say "the lighting makes the Mitzvah":* [Therefore,] if someone who's deaf or insane or a minor lit it - he didn't do anything [i.e. even if an adult set it in place (*Ran*)].

*As for a woman:* She **definitely** lights; for R' Yehoshua ben Levi said: Women are obligated in the Mitzvah of a Chanukah "candle",<sup>18</sup> for they too were [involved] in that miracle.

**[Rashi explains:** For the Greeks decreed upon all virgins who are getting married - that they have relations with the official first; and the miracle was performed through a woman.]

Two points about Rashi's explanation:

- (1) The story he refers to is mainly discussed above (670:2 by "The miracle of the cheese").
- (2) He mentions the women being involved in "being in trouble" and *also* in "the bringing of the miracle itself". In Tosafos (to *Megillah* 4a and *Pesachim*<sup>19</sup> 108b), we see that there is a general disagreement which *one of those two* is the true focus of "they too were in the miracle" (by Chanukah candles [here], the reading of the *Megillah* [O.C. 689:1<sup>20</sup>], and on Pesach night [O.C. 472:14]).

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* starts the *se'if* by ruling: **A woman does light a Chanukah "candle", for she too is obligated in it.** [The rest of the *se'if* follows the next subject.]

<sup>18</sup> The word "*ner*" is traditionally translated "candle", but the earlier sources generally do not use the word to refer to solid candles. Rashi explains that in the days of the Gemara, earthenware "lamps" were used; his full description is brought above (671:3).

<sup>19</sup> The Tosafos there also explains two more points: (1) The reason we need the reasoning that "they too were in the miracle" is that otherwise we would apply the Mishnah's rule (*Kiddushin* 29a) that women are exempt from positive time-bound Mitzvahs. (2) The reasoning of "they too were in the miracle" does *not* "work" to obligate women in a time-bound positive Mitzvah which is Torah-mandated (such as sitting in the *sukkah*); rather, it is a reasoning which the Sages use by Rabbinical Mitzvahs.

<sup>20</sup> Where the *Beis Yosef* explains a "practical" effect that results from this disagreement: whether a *slave* has to read the *Megillah*.

The *Mishnah Berurah* writes (quoting the *Magen Avraham*<sup>o</sup>) that the fact that she "does light" means she lights "on behalf of all the members of the household." In the *Sha'ar HaTziyun*, he explains two points that these words can teach us:

(1) Not only does a woman who lives *alone* light for *herself* (which is the basic meaning of the second half of the *Shulchan Aruch's* sentence - that she's obligated), but she can even "cause others to be *yotzei*" with her lighting. This is clear from the Gemara, since by "someone who's deaf or insane or a minor" it's certainly talking about "causing others to be *yotzei*"<sup>21</sup>. (The *Mishnah Berurah* adds: Accordingly, a man can make a woman his representative ["*shaliach*"] to light for him<sup>22</sup>, as long as he is there to hear the *bracha* {and even if he doesn't answer "*amen*" he is *yotzei* - "after the fact"}, and the same is true about a man being a representative for a woman. [See below (676:3) for an analysis of this Halacha, and also see below (*siman* 679) where the *Mishnah Berurah* says the representative says the main *bracha* "...to light a Chanukah candle", but the one being represented can say the rest by themselves.)

(2) It could also mean that *the only case* in which she actually lights is where she is the *only one* in the household who is lighting. The *Sha'ar HaTziyun* brings authorities who say this - that the wife of the household does not light *separately* [i.e. even when doing the "enhancement" of having everyone in the household light (discussed above 671:2<sup>23</sup>)], because "*ishto k'gufo*" ["one's wife is like his own person" - see "Principles"]. (In the *Mishnah Berurah*, he brings the *Olas Shmuel*<sup>o</sup>, who adds that she *can* light {with a *bracha*} if she wants to {in keeping with the *Ashkenazi* practice by positive time-bound Mitzvahs in general<sup>24</sup>}).

Concerning a woman who is away from home, see the Halacha of a "guest" (below 677:1).

The *Mishnah Berurah* also makes reference to another point about women "lighting separately":

In the *Olas Shmuel* (responsum 105), we find that he actually uses a novel reasoning to explain "the *minhag*" [i.e. in Poland] that women did not participate in the "enhancement" of having everyone in the household light. He quotes the above-mentioned Tosafos (to *Megillah* 4a), who holds that "they too were involved" must mean that they "also were in trouble", because (to quote Tosafos): "the language 'they too' implies that they are secondary." The *Olas Shmuel* proposes that at the time of the miracle of Chanukah, the women had *less* trouble than the men, and that the Sages accordingly assigned them a secondary role in the Mitzvah, or at least in its "enhancement".

<sup>21</sup> For with respect to *themselves*, the Gemara already *knew* they are not obligated. After all, if we *don't* know it yet, how does "lighting makes the Mitzvah" prove it? Rather, the Gemara was talking about them trying to use an *act* of theirs to "cause to be *yotzei*" someone *else*.

<sup>22</sup> However, in the *Bi'ur Halacha* he applies here what the Sages said in *Brachos* (20b): "A son can say a *bracha* for his father ... and a wife can say a *bracha* for her husband, but let a curse come upon a man whose wife and children say *brachos* for him". [The main place to discuss *that* is above in the Halachos of *Birkas HaMazon* (O.C. *siman* 186), by the subject of that Gemara.] However, when a man is away from home, there is nothing wrong with his wife lighting for him [as we learn at the beginning of *siman* 677 below], "since the obligation falls chiefly upon the *house*." [Presumably that means that therefore, the Mitzvah "mainly belongs to" whoever is at the head of the house, at the time.]

<sup>23</sup> See also the subject of "Which members of the household are 'included' with the head" (above 671:2, at the end of the *se'if*).

<sup>24</sup> I.e. that this is not considered her saying an inappropriate *bracha*. This is mainly discussed above by the Halachos of *tzitzis* (O.C. 17:2). [The subject of an inappropriate *bracha* is found in the Halachos of *brachos* (O.C. 215:4).]

The *Mishmeres Shalom*<sup>o</sup> (48:2), on the other hand, notes that the early authorities<sup>25</sup> explicitly describe the "enhancement" as calling for "a candle for each and every one [in the house] - *both men and women*." However, he, too, notes that the local *minhag* was that even single girls did not light "separately". He says that "it's possible" to explain that it's improper for girls to light while their own mother does not [which is because of "*ishto k'gufo*", as mentioned]. However, he points out that if a woman and her daughters are *the only ones home*, then *all* of them ought to light (which seems to follow from the *Olas Shmuel's* approach, as well). [We should point out that according to his explanation, *any* women or girls in the household who are not the daughters of the lady of the house should *always* be lighting separately.] He admits that the local *minhag* did not make any such distinction, but he suggests that this was merely due to ignorance.

Interestingly, although the *Mishnah Berurah* makes reference to the *Olas Shmuel's* ruling (that "women" do not have to participate in "a candle for everyone"), the *Sha'ar HaTziyun* implies that he only *accepts* it in the case where the *Olas Shmuel* is *agreeing with earlier authorities*, i.e. wives (when their husbands are lighting).

#### CHANUKAH CANDLE-LIGHTING BY SOMEONE WHO'S DEAF OR INSANE OR A MINOR

We saw in the above Gemara that it is "nothing" (even to "cause others to be *yotzei*" [*Sha'ar HaTziyun*, brought above]). The *Mishnah Berurah* adds that this is "even if others are 'standing over them' - because there's no Mitzvah obligation upon them." [This principle, that someone who's not obligated in a certain Mitzvah cannot "cause others to be *yotzei*", is mainly discussed above in the Halachos of the *shofar* (O.C. 589:1).]

However, the *Beis Yosef* brings the position of the *Ba'al HaIttur*<sup>o</sup>, that a minor who has already reached the stage of "training" ["*chinuch*"] can "cause to be *yotzei*" even an adult (wherever this is the *minhag*)<sup>26</sup>. [The issue here (as explained by the Tosafos brought by the *Beis Yosef* in *siman* 689) is whether someone whose obligation is "doubly" Rabbinical (such as a minor {whose "training" is Rabbinical} lighting Chanukah candles or reading the Megillah {which *even for adults* are Rabbinical Mitzvahs}) can "cause to be *yotzei*" someone whose obligation is "singly" Rabbinical (such as an adult who needs to do one of the above Mitzvahs).]

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* continues the *se'if* by ruling: **But if someone who's deaf or insane or a minor lit it - he didn't do anything, even if an adult set in place; and "there is someone who holds"<sup>27</sup> [that] in the case of a minor who reached [the stage of] "training" - it's *muttar* [i.e. for him to be the one who lights].** The *Rema* adds: **[On the other hand,] for us [i.e. the *Ashkenazi minhag*] that every member of the household lights separately [as explained above 671:2], [consequently] a minor who reached [the stage of] "training" has to light as well [i.e. because this is "for himself", even if for others he cannot (*Mishnah Berurah*)].**

<sup>25</sup> He cites the *Machtzis HaShekel*, who brings this language in the name of the *Shiltei HaGiborim*<sup>o</sup>. The language of the Rambam is the same, word for word.

<sup>26</sup> The *Beis Yosef* quotes the *Ran*, who supports this with the *Yerushalmi* (*Megillah* 21a): "From then on it has been the *minhag* by the multitude 'to read it' [i.e. to consider a minor to be a valid Reader of the Megillah] in the synagogue."

<sup>27</sup> *Shulchan Aruch* language for a reliable but uncorroborated source.

The *Mishnah Berurah* questions (1) the fact that the *Shulchan Aruch* quotes the *Ba'al HaIttur*, and (2) the addition of the *Rema*:

(1) He brings the later authorities, who point out that the *Shulchan Aruch* himself [in the Halachos of the Megillah (689:2)] rules "anonymously" like those who disagree with the *Ba'al HaIttur*, and this shows that one cannot rely on the *Ba'al HaIttur*'s position here either.

(2) The *Magen Avraham*<sup>o</sup> below (to 677:2) brings from the *Shiltei HaGiborim*<sup>o</sup> that it's *not* necessary to include a minor in the "enhancement" of "a candle for everyone". The *Bi'ur Halacha* here points out that the *Me'iri*<sup>o</sup> says this as well, and the *Bi'ur Halacha* explains the reasoning: "Granted that one is obligated to train him; [however,] that's [only] by something for which there is an obligation from the 'strict Halacha' for an adult; but by this - where even by an *adult* there's no more [to it] than an 'enhancement of a Mitzvah' - by *that* one is not obligated to train a minor." The *Mishnah Berurah* here merely refers to what he writes in the *Bi'ur Halacha*, and then writes: "I hold that for a minor, one need not be so stringent - and it is sufficient that he light just one candle every night [as opposed to adding one more candle each night like an adult does (671:2)], according to everyone [i.e. even according to the *Rema*]." Judging from this, it's not so clear which way he rules. But the *Mishnah Berurah* *there* seems to lean in favor of the lenient position.

Note that in this entire discussion, "someone who is deaf" means a person who is also mute. A deaf person who *can* speak is like a normal person in all respects, Chanukah included (*Mishnah Berurah* at the end of *siman* 670 above).

Concerning a minor's Mitzvah to light, *we can ask*:

(1) The *Shulchan Aruch* rules below [677:2, as explained by the *Mishnah Berurah* there] that if a minor has reached the stage of "training", and he has his own house, then "he has to light". That implies that he does the Mitzvah with its full "enhancement", just as the *Shulchan Aruch* above *described* the Mitzvah (671:2), i.e. he adds another candle each night. Can this fit with the leniency brought by the *Mishnah Berurah* (as just mentioned) that a minor in *someone else's* house doesn't light at all, since his lighting would be a mere "enhancement"?

(2) The *Mishnah Berurah* writes in the Halachos of *kiddush* (O.C. 273 n16) that an adult can say *kiddush* for a minor, even if the adult himself is not being *yotzei* with that *kiddush*. Should the same be true here?

(3) Even if we cannot rely on the position of the *Ba'al HaIttur*, that a minor who "reached training" can "cause an adult to be *yotzei*"; still, couldn't such a minor be honored with lighting the *synagogue* candles, which are not really "causing anyone to be *yotzei*"?

#### SOMEONE WHO IS BLIND

The *Mishnah Berurah* writes: "The Maharshah wrote in a responsum (77) [that] if he [i.e. a blind man] is in a house where others are lighting, and he can 'join together with them [in partnership] with coins' [like some guests, as discussed below (677:1)], and they will say the *bracha* for him [as well] - [then] that's better [than him lighting for himself]; and similarly, if he has a wife - his wife lights for him; [However,] if he's in a separate house - and he doesn't have a wife - he should light 'by himself' through someone else's help; and see the *Sha'arei Teshuvah* [who says] that he should not say a *bracha* - and all the more so [it's clear] that he can't 'cause others to be *yotzei*'."

<sup>o</sup> see Glossary <sup>o</sup> see Bibliography O.C. = volume *Orach Chayim* (of *Shulchan Aruch*, etc.)  
© 2008 Rabbi Dovid Lipman. All rights reserved

(Parenthetically, at the end of the *siman*, the *Mishnah Berurah* says the later authorities write that even a "ger" [a convert to Judaism] can say [the *bracha* which has the words] "...who performed miracles for *our* forefathers".)