

Translations of Central Quotations (more literally)

O.C. SIMAN 670 : THINGS THAT ARE ASSUR OR MUTTAR ON THE DAYS OF CHANUKAH

Se'if 1

*Chanukah's status as a "Yom Tov"**

Shabbos 21b⁴: What is [the origin of (see Rashi)] Chanukah? [It is] as the Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: On the twenty-fifth of Kislev [begin] the days of Chanukah - of which there are eight - on which [one may] not eulogize, and on which one may not fast; For when "the Greeks" went into the (*Heichal* [i.e. Sanctuary building] within the) [*Beis HaMikdash**] - they "contaminated" all the oils in the (*Heichal* [i.e. Sanctuary building] within the) [*Beis HaMikdash**]; And when the Hasmonean family leadership overpowered and defeated them - they checked and only found one container of oil - which was left with the seal of the *kohen gadol* - and there was only [enough] in it to light [the Menorah for] one day; a miracle was performed with it - and they lit [the Menorah] from it [for] eight days; By a different year [i.e. in the following year (see *Bereishis* 17:21)], they [i.e. the Sages of that generation (Rambam)] established them - making them *Yamim Tovim** with respect to "thanksgiving" and [saying] Hallel [i.e. but not as being *assur* in *melacha** (Rashi)].

Se'if 2

Festive meals on Chanukah

Pesikta Rabasi 6: R' Chanina said: On the twenty-fifth of Kislev, the work of the *Mishkan** was finished, and it was left "folded up" [i.e. unassembled] until the first of Nissan when Moshe assembled it. [ibid.] So does this mean that Kislev - when [the] work was finished - [simply] lost out? No: What is [the meaning of the *pasuk** (Melachim I 7:51)] "And it was completed" ["*VaTishlam*"]? *HaKadosh Baruch Hu** said: "It is upon Me [i.e. My responsibility] to pay back ["*Leshaleim*"] to him [i.e. Kislev]". What did *HaKadosh Baruch Hu* pay back to him [i.e. Kislev]? The rededication of the House of the Hasmoneans.

The miracle of the cheese

Kitzur Shulchan Aruch (139:3): The decree was terrible upon the daughters of Israel, for they [i.e. the Greeks (had)] decreed that [any] virgin who is [or "any woman engaged" (*Mishnah Berurah*'s version)] to be married must have relations with the official first. And [ibid.] the miracle was performed through a woman: The daughter of Yochanan the *Kohen Gadol* [whose name was Yehudis (*Kol Bo* 44)] was very beautiful, and the enemy ruler demanded [lit. "requested"] that she lie with him. And 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 go to bed and fall asleep. And that's what happened; and she cut off his head and brought it to Yerushalayim, and when their general [or "the army" (*Kol Bo*'s version)] saw that their ruler was lost - they ran away.

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

*Se'if 3**More about eulogizing on Chanukah*

Mo'ed Kattan 27b¹: **Rav Pappa said:** There is no [status of] "festival" [that can stand] in opposition to a Torah scholar [i.e. he *can* be eulogized then (Rashi)], and all the more so with Chanukah or Purim. This is true [about eulogizing him] "before him" [i.e. where the body is], but [when] "not before him" - [it's] not [that way]. [But] that's not [true]: Rav Kahana eulogized Rav Zevid of Nehardea at *Pum Nahara* [i.e. not where the body was, though it was one of the above days]! Rav Pappi said: That was on the day of the report [being heard], and [that is] comparable to "before him".

More about fasting on Chanukah

Rosh HaShanah 18b⁴: **Rav Kahana challenged** [the position that after the Destruction, the holidays of *Megillas Ta'anis* were cancelled] (by quoting the following Baraisa): **It happened** [once] that they [i.e. the townspeople] decreed a fast day [over lack of rain] during Chanukah in [the city of] Lod; and R' Eliezer went [to the bathhouse] and washed and R' Yehoshua [went to the barber] and had a haircut [- which are Assur on such fast days (so deduces the Ra'avyah {3:854}; see *Ta'anis* 12b)], and they said to them [i.e. to the people] "Go out and fast [i.e. now you shall have to fast] over the fact that you fasted!" [- and their days were after the Destruction]! **Rav Yosef said:** Chanukah is different, because there is a [unique] Mitzvah [in connection with it]." **Abbaye said to him:** So let it be cancelled [i.e. along with the other holidays of *Megillas Ta'anis*] - and let its Mitzvah be cancelled [with it]! **Rather, Rav Yosef [retracted and instead] said:** 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)].

O.C. *SIMAN* 671 : THE BASIC SYSTEM OF CHANUKAH CANDLES (AND THEIR LOCATION)*Se'if 1**One should take the Mitzvah of lighting Chanukah candles very seriously*

Shabbos 23b²: **Rav Huna said:** Someone who is "*ragil*" [i.e. regular and persistent] about the "candle" [of Shabbos and Chanukah (Rashi)] will have sons who are Torah scholars [as it is written: "a Mitzvah is a candle - and the Torah is light", i.e. through these Mitzvah "candles" will come the light of the Torah (Rashi)].

How seriously one should take the Mitzvah (financially)

The Mishnah in *Pesachim* 99b¹: **Even "the poor of Israel"** [i.e. the poorest Jew] may not eat without reclining; **And he shall not have** [given to him by the *tzedakah* administrators (Rashbam)] fewer than four cups of wine - and even if [it is] from the "*tamchui*" [that he is supported - nevertheless if the *tzedakah* administrators do not provide him with the four cups - then he has to sell his clothing or borrow or hire himself out (Rashbam)].

The Gemara (below 112a²): [That's] obvious! It was necessary only [to teach that it's true] even according to R' Akiva, who said "Make your Shabbos [like] a weekday and don't be dependent upon [other] 'creatures' [i.e. people]", [so the Mishnah comes to teach that] here - for the sake of publicizing the miracle - he agrees. A

Baraisa of the House of Eliyahu taught: Even though R' Akiva said "Make your Shabbos [like] a weekday and don't be dependent upon [other] 'creatures' [i.e. people]", but he does prepare a little something in his home. What is that? Rav Pappa said: "*kasa d'harsena*" [small fish fried in the oil of their innards and with flour (Rashi to *Shabbos* 118b)].

Se'if 2

How many candles to light each night

Shabbos 21b²: **The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa:** The [basic] Mitzvah of Chanukah ["candles"] is [just] a "candle" [for a] man and his household [i.e. every night]; and [for] the "*Mehadrin*" [i.e. "Mitzvahs pursuers" (Rashi) or "Mitzvah enhancers" (*Rabbeinu Chananel* and others)] - a candle for each [person]; and [for] the "*Mehadrin of the Mehadrin*" [i.e. those who are "the most" *Mehadrin*] - *Beis Shammai* say [that for] the first day [one would] light eight [candles and] from then on [one would] constantly decrease [the number from night to night], and *Beis Hillel* say [that for] the first day [one would] light one [candle and] from then on [one would] constantly increase [the number from night to night]. Ulla said: Two *Amora'im* "in the west" [i.e. in the Land of Israel] disagree about it (R' Yose bar Avin and R' Yose bar Zevida): One said [that] the reasoning of *Beis Shammai* is [to have the "candles"] corresponding to the [number of] days that are "coming in" [i.e. that are "on the way"] - and the reasoning of *Beis Hillel* is [to have the "candles"] corresponding to the [number of] days that are "going out" [i.e. that have already arrived]; and one said [that] the reasoning of *Beis Shammai* is [to do it] parallel to [the pattern of] the bulls of Sukkos [which decrease in number each day] - and the reasoning of *Beis Hillel* is because [of the rule that] we "raise [things] up" in holiness and we do not "lower" [them].

Tosafos (*Shabbos* *ibid.*): "The *Ri*" holds that *Beis Shammai* and *Beis Hillel* are speaking [about "the best way"] only based off of [the level called] "a 'candle' [for a] man and his household"; for [that way] it's a greater enhancement [of the Mitzvah], since it's recognizable - when one continually increases or decreases - that it's according to the [number of] days "that are coming in" or "that are going out". But if [one] makes a 'candle' for each person, then even if he would increase from then on - it would not be recognizable, for [onlookers] would [just] think that there are that many people in the house.

Se'if 3

A "candle" with two "mouths"

Shabbos 23b¹: Rav Yitzchak bar Redifah said in the name of Rav Huna: A "candle" which has two "mouths" counts for two people.

Rashi (*Shabbos* *ibid.*): For their "candles" were earthenware [lamps], and [were] covered, and one [would] make a hole on [one] side of the cover - [in order] to insert the wick through it - and that's the "mouth", and higher up from the top of the cover there's [an opening with] space - and [through there] one fills it with oil - and it goes in bit by bit through the hole. So if [a similar "candle"] has *two* holes - [i.e. it has holes] on *both* sides, then it "counts for two people" - i.e. for the "*Mehadrin*" who have a "candle" for each person.

*Se'if 4**A dish filled with oil*

Shabbos 23b¹: **Rava said:** [If someone] filled a dish with oil and put wicks in it all around, [then if] he covered it with [some other] vessel - it counts for a number of people, [but if] he did not cover it with a vessel - he has made it like a significant fire [for the fire joins at the middle and that doesn't look like (the light of) a "candle" (Rashi)] and it doesn't even count for one [person].

*Se'if 5**Places for the candles other than the entrance*

Shabbos 21b³: **The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa:** A Chanukah "candle" - [its] Mitzvah is to place it at the entrance to his house - on the outside [to publicize the miracle (Rashi)]; [And] if [someone] has been living in an "aliyah" (i.e. an upper floor "apartment") [and (therefore) he has no place (on the ground level) where he can place his "candles" (Rashi)] - [then] he places it [indoors (Rashi)] by a window which is "near" [i.e. "facing" or "closest to"] the public domain; And in a time of danger [for the Persians had a law that on their religious holiday no one was allowed to have a "candle" lit other than in their house of idolatry (Rashi - from *Gittin* 17a)] - one places it on his table and that is sufficient.

An "obligatory" extra candle ("shamash")

Shabbos 21b³: **Rava said:** One needs another "candle" - to use its light [i.e. to make the matter recognizable (Rashi)]; And if there's a significant fire [i.e. nearby] - it [i.e. another "candle" (Rashi)] is not needed [because he'll use the light of the significant fire, so it's recognizable that the (Chanukah) "candle" is (there) for a Mitzvah (Rashi)]; And if he is an important person [and therefore not accustomed to making use of a significant fire (Rashi)], [then] even if there's a significant fire, he still needs another "candle".

Me'iri^o (*Shabbos* *ibid.*): I hold, based on the *sugya*^{*}, that they said "one needs another candle" only by [someone who] "places it on his table"; But any [time] that one places it by the entrance - he doesn't need another "candle", even if he stands right there, as long as he doesn't go and make use of its light specifically for some activity. And I have in fact seen some Rabbis having the practice of standing [right] there and speaking with their friends with no other "candle". Just that in [actual] practice, it's my *minhag* to light another "candle" even without a need to make use [of one], and we [all] have the *minhagim* [we received] from our fathers and our teachers.

*Se'if 6**"Initially" the candles should be "low"*

Shabbos 21b⁴: **The Mishnah says elsewhere** (*Bava Kamma* 62b): [In the case of] a spark which goes out from under a [blacksmith's (Rashi)] hammer - and [then] goes out and damages [property] - he [i.e. the blacksmith] is obligated [to pay]; [In the case of] a camel which is loaded up with flax and is passing through the public domain - and its

^{*} see Glossary ^o see Bibliography O.C. = volume *Orach Chayim* (of *Shulchan Aruch*, etc.)
© 2008 Rabbi Dovid Lipman. All rights reserved

flax [partially] moves [i.e. protrudes] into a shop and is ignited by the shopkeeper's "candle" and [then the flax] ignites a whole building - the owner of the camel is obligated [to pay - because he shouldn't have loaded it with so much that it would move into a shop (Rashi)]; [but if] the shopkeeper left his "candle" outside - [then] the shopkeeper is obligated [to pay]; R' Yehudah says: By a Chanukah "candle" he [i.e. the shopkeeper (Rashi)] is exempt [because he had the right to leave it there for the Mitzvah's publicizing (Rashi)]. Ravina said in the name of Rava: This [last point (Rashi)] tells [us that by] a Chanukah "candle" - the Mitzvah is to place it within ten [tefachim* high], because if it would enter your mind [to say that] above ten [tefachim high is just as good] - [then] he should say to him [i.e. to the shopkeeper] "You should have placed it [i.e. the Chanukah "candle"] above [the height of] a camel and its rider" [i.e. like the explicit Mishnah (Bava Basra 27b - discussed in Shulchan Aruch volume Choshen Mishpat 155:27) about the required height for a tree to be allowed to hang out into the public domain]. Maybe [it's just that the Sages' judged that] if we trouble [a person] that much - he'll come to neglect the Mitzvah [entirely]!

Rashba^o (Shabbos ibid.): I am astonished at this: Still, how did [Ravina/Rava] know [that the specification is to be] within ten [tefachim]? [ibid.] One can answer that he holds that once you eliminate [the specification of] twenty amahs* like [the maximum specification for] a sukkah and a "mavoi" [an "alleyway" jointly used by multiple "courtyards" in which carrying on Shabbos is to be made muttar by means of a crossbeam at its entrance from the public domain (see Gemara of next subject)] - SO YOU [must instead] fix upon [the specification of] ten [tefachim] which is likewise the minimum [specification] of a sukkah; for certainly the Sages gave this some familiar specification from among the fixed specifications of the other Mitzvahs; and once you eliminate twenty [amahs] - which is much higher than "a camel and its rider" - you fix upon ten [tefachim]. [ibid.] And as regards a ruling for [the practical] Halacha: We rule like what Ravina said in the name of Rava; for we don't discard what was clear to Rava and Ravina - and choose [instead] what the Gemara said in response [to their proof] merely in the form of a "maybe" [- and also (because) there is a greater publicizing of the miracle (that way) for it's unusual to leave so low something made for light - (Rosh^o)], and so ruled Rabbeinu Chananel^l.

The candles must not be "too high" (i.e. this is crucial even "after the fact")

Shabbos 21b⁵: Rav Kahana said: Rav Nassan bar Menyumi expounded (i.e. explained) in the name of R' Tanchum: [22a] A Chanukah "candle" which was placed higher than twenty amahs* [off the ground] is invalid [because the eye (of people) does not reach it and (therefore) it lacks publicizing of the miracle (Rashi)]; just like [the similar Halacha] by [the "s'chach" (covering) of] a sukkah and [by] a "mavoi" [an "alleyway" jointly used by multiple "courtyards" in which carrying on Shabbos is to be made muttar by means of a crossbeam at its entrance from the public domain] (i.e. the crossbeam cannot be higher than twenty amahs [see Eiruvin 2a]).

Tosafos (Shabbos ibid.): He should put it out and lower it, and [then] light it again [with the bracha (Mishnah Berurah)]; for he can't [just] "lower it and leave it" while it's still lit [because (of the principle that) "the lighting is what accomplishes the Mitzvah" (Beis Yosef), and he (originally) lit in an invalid place (Mishnah Berurah)].

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

Se'if 7

The candles generally belong "in the nearest tefach" on the left hand side (of the "entrance")*

Shabbos 22a¹: Rabbah said: A Chanukah "candle" - [its] Mitzvah is to place it in the tefach nearest to the entrance [because if he would place it any farther - it wouldn't be recognizable that the owner of the house placed it there (i.e. intentionally and with purpose) (Rashi)]. And where does one place it? Rav Acha the son of Rava said: To the right [as a person enters (Rashi)]; Rav Shmuel of Difti said: To the left. And the Halacha is "to the left" - so that the Chanukah "candle" will be to the left and the mezuzah to the right [and (thereby) one will be surrounded with Mitzvahs (Mishnah Berurah)].

Lighting in the synagogue

Rivash^o (responsum 111): This *minhag*, to light in the synagogue, is a *minhag* of the ancient righteous [ones], for the purpose of publicizing the miracle, because we are not able - each [person] in his home - to fulfill the Mitzvah in the [ideal] way in which it was instituted, which is to place it at the entrance to his house - on the outside; [ibid.] and (since) now we are suppressed by the power of the nations - [ibid.] and each person lights at the entrance of his house - from the inside, and there is only a publicizing of the miracle for his household alone. Therefore, they started the *minhag* to light in the synagogue - to carry out the publicizing of the miracle. [ibid.] And even though we do not say a *bracha* over a *minhag*, that's [only] by a simple *minhag*, such as the *minhag* of the willow [branch on Sukkos] - which is only simple beating; But this one [is as mentioned no simple *minhag* and therefore] we say the *bracha* over it. Nevertheless, no one is *yotzei* with that lighting in the synagogue, and everyone must light again in his house.

Kol Bo 44 (& 50) [with Beis Yosef here]: To "cause to be yotzei" someone who is not expert and [someone] who is not particular regarding this [Mitzvah] [the Beis Yosef applies this to the out-of-town guests who have no house to light in (like the Kol Bo himself implies in his siman 50) just as kiddush in the synagogue was instituted for guests who eat and drink in the synagogue (as discussed in O.C. 269)]; [and] also because it's (an enhancement of the Mitzvah and) a publicizing of the miracle [before the entire populace - and to "arrange the brachos" before them - and also so that those who see (it) who have no house to make the bracha there (on their own lighting) will be yotzei their obligation; (ibid. (concerning how kiddush in the synagogue has the same purposes)) (and) this constitutes a great publicizing for His Name - and a sanctification of His name - as we bless Him "in congregations" (siman 50)] (and a commemoration of the [Beis Ha]Mikdash).

Who does the lighting in the synagogue

The Mishnah in *Yoma 31b¹*: He [i.e. the *kohen gadol* on *Yom Kippur*] made an quick killing cut [into the throat of the "Tamid" offering], and another [*kohen* (Rashi)] completed the slaughter "on his behalf" [because the "collecting of the blood" can only be done by the *kohen gadol*, so he needs to hurry up and go collect it (Rashi)].

The Gemara (ibid. 32b⁴-33a¹): [One] could [think that if] he didn't complete [the slaughter - then] it would be invalid [ibid.] - by Rabbinic [decree - since when slaughtering offerings it's so central to get out the necessary blood (Rashi)]; [33a] [so] therefore it was taught [about this (i.e. the following teaching was stated explicitly - although it could have been understood by extension of other taught material - in order to shed this light on our subject)] "the majority of one [vital pipe needs to be cut] for a bird [to be

^{*} see Glossary ^o see Bibliography O.C. = volume *Orach Chayim* (of *Shulchan Aruch*, etc.)
© 2008 Rabbi Dovid Lipman. All rights reserved

slaughtered], and the majority of two [pipes] for a [land] animal" [i.e. to teach that even in the case of *offerings* that's all that really needs to be cut (Rashi)]. And once [we know] that there is no [decree of] being invalid even Rabbini- cally - [so then] why do we need [at all for anyone] to complete [the slaughter]? It is [still] a Mitzvah to complete [the slaughter - in order to get the blood out well (Rashi)].

The basic position (and orientation) of the candles in the synagogue

Menachos 98b²: The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: They [i.e. the tables which Shlomo made (Rashi)] were positioned [oriented to the] east and west [i.e. their lengths were (aligned) with the length of the *Beis (HaMikdash)* (Rashi)] - [these are] the words of Rabbi [i.e. R' Yehudah HaNasi]; R' Elazar bar R' Shimon says: north and south. What is the reasoning of Rabbi? He derives it from the Menorah; just as [the] Menorah [was oriented to the] east and west - so too these [should be oriented to the] east and west. And [concerning] the Menorah itself - from where do we know it? From [the fact] that it is written by the western "candle" "Aharon ... shall set it up ... before Hashem" [i.e. toward the west (Rashi)] - from this [we can] infer that all [the other "candles"] are not "before Hashem"; and if it would enter your mind [to say that the Menorah was oriented to the] north and south - [then] all [the other "candles"] are also [equally] "before Hashem"! And R' Elazar bar R' Shimon - what is [his] reasoning? He derives it from [the] Ark; just as [the] Ark [was oriented to the] north and south [as set forth in an earlier Gemara (Rashi)] - so too these [should be oriented to the] north and south. And Rabbi - let him also derive [the Halacha of the tables] from [the] Ark! [He holds that] we extrapolate [the Halacha of something which is] outside [the *heichal*³] from [something else which is] outside [the *heichal*], and we do not extrapolate [the Halacha of something which is] outside [the *heichal*] from [something which is] inside [the *heichal*]. And R' Elazar bar R' Shimon - let him also derive [the Halacha of the tables] from [the] Menorah! He would say to you [that] the Menorah itself was positioned [oriented to the] north and south. But isn't it written "Aharon and his sons shall set it"? [The explanation is] that they were turned to the sides [i.e. the wick-hole of the middle "candle" (pointed) west, while those of the others (pointed) toward the middle one (Rashi)], as taught in a Baraisa: "The seven 'candles' shall shine pointing in the direction of the 'face' of the Menorah" [i.e. the middle "candle" - which rests upon the main (shaft) of the Menorah (Rashi)] - [this] teaches [us] that their "faces" were turned toward the middle "candle"; R' Nassan says: From here [we learn] that "middle is best" [concerning the three (men) who read on Monday and Thursday - the middle one reads four (*pesukim*⁴) and the others each read three (Rashi)].

Whether in the synagogue one can only light in the presence of ten

Kesubos 7b¹: Rav Nachman said: Huna bar Nassan told me [that] a Baraisa teaches: From where [do we know that] "the *bracha* of *chassanim*" [i.e. "*Sheva Brachos*"] is [only said] with [at least] ten [men present]? - [It is] as it says (Ruth 4:2 [when Boaz marries her]): "And he took ten men from [among] the elders of the city, and he said to them 'sit here'." R' Abahu [on the other hand] said: [That Halacha is derived] from here (*Tehillim* 68:27): "In 'congregations' [which can't mean less than an 'assembly' as it says (*Bamidbar* 20:8) 'congregate the assembly' - and in *Brachos* (21b) we learn that an 'assembly' is at least ten - from the ten spies (i.e. all but Yehoshua and Kalev) who were called (*Bamidbar* 14:27) 'this evil assembly' (Rashi)] bless [the] G-d Hashem - over the 'source' of Israel [i.e. marriage]". [ibid.] And R' Abahu - what does he derive with that *pasuk*⁵ of Rav Nachman's? To him, that was necessary

^{*} see Glossary [°] see Bibliography O.C. = volume *Orach Chayim* (of *Shulchan Aruch*, etc.)
© 2008 Rabbi Dovid Lipman. All rights reserved

[in order] to expound [that when it says (*Devarim* 23:4) that Jews are *assur* in marriage to] "an Ammonite" [the masculine form is a calculated one - teaching that only a *man* from the nation of Ammon is *assur*] but not an Ammonitess, [and likewise] "a Moabite" - but not a Moabite*ss* [i.e. because without this Halacha his whole marriage to Ruth would have been *assur*], [and this is in fact the *only* reasonable explanation,] for if it would enter your mind [to say that they were gathered] for the *bracha* - [then could it be that] it would not have been sufficient if they would not have been elders? And the other [one]? [He'll retort:] If it enters *your* mind [to say that they were gathered] for the expounding - [then could it be that] it would not have been sufficient if there would not have been ten? [But actually, R' Abahu would insist:] Yes - [in order] to publicize the matter, [just] as Shmuel said to Rav Chuna of Baghdad: Go out and bring me a group of ten, and [thus] I will say to you in their presence: "[In the case of] someone who grants [ownership of something] to a fetus [by means of an agent (Rashi)] - [the fetus] acquires [ownership of it]"

Se'if 8

The basic idea of having to light by every entrance because of "suspicion"

Shabbos 23a³: Rav Huna said: A courtyard which has two entrances needs two "candles". Rava said: We only say [this when the two entrances emerge] from two directions [(although) even if one is in the north and one is in the east (Rashi)]; but [if they emerge] from one direction - it's not necessary. What is the reasoning? [ibid.] So really it's because of the "suspicion" of the people of that city; [for] sometimes they pass by one [entrance] and do not pass by the other [entrance], and they [might] say [i.e. think] "just as he didn't light by *this* entrance [i.e. as I just saw - so I suppose that] he didn't light by *that* entrance either".

O.C. *SIMAN* 672 : THE LIGHTING TIME FOR THE CHANUKAH CANDLES

Note that the order of the se'ifim is reversed.

Se'if 2

The end of the lighting time (according to the Gemara)

Shabbos 21b¹: But they brought a contradiction to [the above] from a Baraisa: Its Mitzvah is from sundown until "no foot remains" in the marketplace [i.e. the "feet" of the Tarmodeans (Gemara soon afterwards) - "who are still around until about a half hour after sundown - until they reach their homes" (Rif)]; [so] isn't this [time limit's relevance] that if it went out [within this time - then] he lights it again? No, [its relevance is] that if he didn't light it [yet - then within this time limit] he [still] lights it, etc.

Rashba (ibid.): It's not [coming] to say that if one does not light within this limit [then] he does not light [any more] - for after all we learned in a Mishnah (*Megillah* 20a): "Any [Mitzvah] that is to be done by night - is valid [to be done] throughout the night"; rather, [the Gemara here merely means] that [if he misses the limit] he did not do the Mitzvah properly.

Rambam (Chanukah 4:5): [If] by mistake or on purpose [someone] didn't light as the sun comes down - he continues to [have the Mitzvah to] light until "no foot remains" in the marketplace; And how much is this time [period's length]? - about a half hour or [a little] more; [If] this time passed [i.e. and someone *still* didn't light yet] - he does not [have the Mitzvah to] light [any more].

The amount of oil to use

The above Gemara concludes: **Another explanation:** [The "range of time" is meant] as a "specification".

The Rif's two approaches: (1) It's like saying that one must put [enough] oil in it so that it will continue burning until that [time] specification; (2) If it was [already] "burning away" until that [time] specification [already came], and one wanted to put it out or to use its light, [so then] he has permission.

Se'if 1

The "beginning of the time of the Mitzvah" is sundown

The Rashba^o explains the Baraisa's "Its Mitzvah is": **It makes sense [to say] that it [i.e. this "beginning time"] is not crucial, for after all, certainly one could light just before sundown if he wanted to - for after all there [still] is a publicizing of the miracle [in that]. And [this is] similar to what [the Sages] said below (23b) by the Shabbos "candle" - that "the pillar of fire 'filled in for' [i.e. overlapped in time with] the pillar of cloud" - and [they used that] to tell [us] that [by the Shabbos "candle" as well] when one lights just before sundown it's recognizable that he's lighting it for the sake of Shabbos; and here too [we can say] similarly. [So the Baraisa means] just that the "main Mitzvah" which obligates him to light is only from sundown. And the proof [to my point] is the lighting of the Chanukah "candle" on the eve of Shabbos. [ibid.] But still, I understand from the words of the author of the [Sefer] "Halachos" [Gedolos (Beis Yosef from Ran) - i.e. the Behag^o] that it [really] means [that one can light] only from sundown.**

Beis Yosef quoting R. Yitzchak Abouhav citing *Orchos Chayim*: **Someone who lit while it was still day (i.e. even by a week-night) because he was occupied [i.e. he would not have been able to light later (Mishnah Berurah)] - he was *yotzei* (although this is [only] when it's in the last "half of the *mincha*"); for it's not more stringent than *havdalah* - about which we say (Brachos 27b) "he prayed [the *Shemoneh Esray*] of the departure of Shabbos during [the afternoon of] Shabbos". However, he has to put in more oil than the [standard] amount for lighting - so that it will burn until "none of the feet of the Tarmodeans remains."**

Someone who lit "too few candles" and wants to fix that

The *Beis Yosef* in the name of the *Orchos Chayim*^o: **Someone who lit only two "candles" on the third night - or three on the fourth night: this happened in Lunil, and they [i.e. the local authorities] were stringent [in their ruling and thus required] that he light what his [original] lighting was missing; and he doesn't need to say the *bracha* again, because the *bracha* that he made at the start - he made (it) over the obligation of all the "candles".**

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

O.C. SIMAN 673 : OILS AND WICKS THAT ARE VALID FOR CHANUKAH

*Se'if 1**To make use of the light of a Chanukah candle*

*Shabbos 21a*³: Rav Huna said: [The] wicks and oils which the Sages said "one may not light with them by Shabbos ['candles']" - one may not light with them by Chanukah ["candles" either], whether on Shabbos or on a weekday. Rava said: What is the reasoning of Rav Huna? - he holds [that if] it went out - he is responsible for it [to fix it - and therefore one must do it properly to begin with - (in case then) he may be negligent (Rashi)], and [that] it's *muttar* to make use of its light [(and) therefore on Shabbos (they're) *assur* (because) perhaps he would adjust (the "candle" to improve the flame) (Rashi)]. And Rav Chisda said: One may light with them [by Chanukah] on a weekday, but not on Shabbos. He holds [that if] it went out [21b] - he is not responsible for it, and [that] it's *muttar* to make use of its light. R' Zeira said in the name of Rav Masnah (and some say [that] R' Zeira said [it] in the name of Rav): [The] wicks and oils which the Sages said "one may not light with them by Shabbos ['candles']" - one may [nevertheless] light with them by Chanukah, whether on Shabbos or on a weekday. R' Yirmiyah said: What is the reasoning of Rav? - he holds [that if] it went out - he is not responsible for it, and [that] it's *assur* to make use of its light [so there's no reason to be concerned about him adjusting it (Rashi)].

What kind of "making use" is assur

*Shabbos 22a*¹: Rav Yehudah said: Rav Assi said (in the name of Rav): "It's *assur* to hold money out toward the Chanukah "candle" [i.e. to inspect or count the coins (Rambam)]"; [however,] when I said this before Shmuel, he said to me: "And does a 'candle' then have sanctity?" Rav Yosef challenged that: And [according to you - wouldn't we have to ask] "does blood then have sanctity?", for it was taught in a Baraisa: [It is written] "And he shall spill" [and right afterwards] "and he shall cover" - [this teaches that] he [has to] cover it with that [same limb] with which he spilled it [i.e. his hand (Rashi)], [meaning] that he cannot cover it with his foot - for the Mitzvahs shall not be disgraceful to him; [so] here too [that's why it's *assur* in the case of the "candles"] - for the Mitzvahs shall not be disgraceful to him. [ibid.] Rather, Rav Yosef said: The "father" of all of these [things being *assur*] is [the above Halacha about] blood.

Rosh^o (*Shabbos 2:6*): Even though it was already ruled above that it's *assur* to make use of its light [for] any use, [still] we need that [statement] of "holding money out"; because that which we say above that it's *assur* to make use of its light - that's only [said about] a "fixed" use [i.e. a focused and purposeful one] - for one who sees [it] says [i.e. thinks] "[It seems that] it's for the sake of this use that he lit it and not for the sake of a Mitzvah"; but [as for] a "momentary" use - [obviously] for *that* he didn't light it; and [so now] Rav Assi informs us that even a "momentary" use that's disgraceful is *assur*, because [since] his hands are next to the candle in order to examine them [i.e. the coins] well - [so therefore] it's *assur*; And this is also implied by the wording, as he said "toward the Chanukah 'candle'," and he didn't say "It's *assur* to hold money out by its light."

Which "oils and wicks" one should use for the lighting (on a weeknight)

Shabbos 23a¹: R' Yehoshua ben Levi said: All oils are fitting for the [Chanukah (Tosafos)] "candle", and olive oil is the choicest. Abbaye said: Originally, "the master" [i.e. Rabbah] would try to use sesame oil, [as] he would say "this [oil] drags [out] the light more [i.e. it lasts longer (Rashi)]"; [but] once he heard this [statement] of R' Yehoshua ben Levi - [from then on] he tried to use olive oil, [as] he would say "the light of this [oil] is clearer."

"Oil that is to be burned" (i.e. contaminated terumah oil)

The last *Yerushalmi* in *Terumos* (59a): What is [the Halacha about] lighting "oil that is to be burned" for Chanukah? The House of R' Yannai say: One may light "oil that is to be burned" for Chanukah. R' Nisa said: [As for] me - I am not knowledgeable about my father; [but] my mother used to say to me, "Your father would say, 'Someone who doesn't have oil which is *chulin* [i.e. that which has no sanctity at all] lights for Chanukah with oil that is to be burned'."

Which one is the "shamash"

The Tur^o brings a responsum of his brother ("HaRav R' Yechiel"): [Question:] Chanukah "candles", [by] which one simply lights one extra ["candle"] to [have] a "shamash", and he didn't specify which one of them [was in fact to be the "shamash"]; [Is it true that] he could afterwards choose whichever he wants to be the "shamash" - even the first or [one of] the middle ones; or [perhaps he can choose] only the last one (and that's what makes sense [i.e. to me, the questioner])? Answer: [When it comes to] Chanukah "candles" - one should not interrupt [between] them; therefore - the last one becomes [the one that's] not for the sake of [being] a [real] Chanukah "candle", [the purpose of which is] so that if he will make use of their light - it will be the light of that "candle" that he uses; And [you should know however that] the name "shamash" does not apply to it - for the "shamash" is the one with which he lights the [other] "candles".

Solid Chanukah candles which got mixed up with others (such as ones that were only a "shamash")

Tosafos (*Yevamos* 81b): I hold that the explanation of the latter [item of the Baraisa], when [the contaminated piece of meat] got mixed up with [pure ones] that were *chulin* [i.e. having no sanctity at all] is because after it becomes "*batel*" [i.e. if we'll say that it can] then it's worthy of honoring with - and therefore everyone agrees that it [in fact] doesn't become "*batel*"; but the earlier [item of the Baraisa], when [the contaminated piece of meat] got mixed up with pure pieces of *chatas*^{*} [offerings], in which case even if it would "come up" [i.e. become "*batel*"] - it's not worthy of honoring with - for "honoring" isn't relevant before the *kohanim* in the [*Beis Ha*]Mikdash [for the *kohanim* don't consider themselves indebted to each other (i.e. over what they get to eat) - for they're all equal, as it is written "it shall be for all the sons of Aharon - (each) man (just) like his brother" (Tosafos to *Chulin* 100a)], and consequently it "comes up" [i.e. becomes "*batel*"] (according to the first *Tanna*).

The *Terumas HaDeshen*^o (103): Question: [Let's say a number of] people lit in one house, and one Chanukah candle got mixed up among two candles that are "shamash" [candles], and all of them are sitting there burning - and we don't know which of the candles is the Chanukah candle. [Is the Chanukah candle] *muttar* by

^{*} see Glossary ^o see Bibliography O.C. = volume *Orach Chayim* (of *Shulchan Aruch*, etc.)
© 2008 Rabbi Dovid Lipman. All rights reserved

[means of] becoming "*batel*" within the majority - and [therefore] it's *muttar* to derive benefit from the three of them - or not? Answer: I hold that it's not "*batel*". Although we rule that [by] all things which are *assur* - if they're [mixtures of] solid things one becomes "*batel*" within two - and it's *muttar* [to take from] the entire mixture - [but] here they are "something counted"; for after all, we light [Chanukah candles] "by count" each night; And "something counted" - even if it's being *assur* is [merely] Rabbinical - does not become "*batel*", as the *Sefer HaTerumah*^o ruled on [the issue of] the [Baraisa of "the 'litra' of dried figs" [*Beitzah* 3b]. And if you'll say that the only [thing] called "something counted" is something which is measured *in the marketplace* by counting (and not by weight [or] by estimation); and [only] in *that* way is it recognizable that it's a "significant" thing (and therefore it's not "*batel*"), but [in contrast] these candles - even [after] granting [the fact] that we light them "by count" - [but] nevertheless if they were being sold out of a store in a place where most things are sold by weight (such as in "*eret lo'eiz*" [a foreign country]) they [too] would be sold by weight for usage purposes, and consequently they should *not* be [included] in the "significant" things, and [therefore such a candle should be] "*batel*" within the majority! (And lighting "by count" - that's [merely] because of the Mitzvah obligation, for that's its Mitzvah.) [Still,] I hold [it's *correct*] to say: Nevertheless, once they got mixed up after they were lit for Mitzvahs, and now they're "something counted" as regards their [own] concern, [so therefore] even though with respect to "the mundane and the like" this is not "something counted" - [nevertheless for the matter at hand] it can well be considered "something counted". And we find similar reasoning, even to be lenient, in Tosafos and the Rosh^o in the chapter "*Gid HaNasheh*" (i.e. *Chulin* 100a) - and likewise in Tosafos in the chapter "*Ha'arel*" (i.e. *Yevamos* 81b), etc., [ibid.] so we see here that even though the *chulin* piece (and the like) *is* worthy of "honoring" with, [still in] the other [case where they're pieces of] *chatas* [offerings] - once they're not considered worthy of "honoring" with - as regards their [own] concern (the way they are now) - we go after [that] to be lenient; so all the more so [do we use such reasoning] in the opposite direction [here] - to be stringent.

Se'if 2

If he himself accidentally put out his own candle while trying to fix it

The *Beis Yosef* brings a responsum of the Rashba^o (1:539): It makes sense [to conclude] that he is not obligated to [re-]light it, since it's like [the Gemara's case of when] "it went out", for "the lighting makes the Mitzvah" - and he already lit it; And if he *is* going to [re-]light it - he does not say a *bracha* on [the re-lighting], because after all - he already *did* the Mitzvah of lighting.

Se'if 3

An "old candle"

"*Tractate Sofrim*" [see note to 676:4] (20:3): And it is *assur* to light with an "old candle"; and if he only has an "old" one - he [must] "whiten it" by fire [i.e. blowtorch it] (very) well.

*Se'if 4**Changing the wicks each night*

"Tractate Sofrim" [see note to 676:4] (20:4): **And there is no [need for] concern over changing its wick, [but rather one may continue] until it is finished.**

O.C. SIMAN 674 : WHEN IS IT *MUTTAR* TO LIGHT ONE CANDLE FROM ANOTHER?

*Se'if 1**The sugya* of lighting from one candle to another candle*

Shabbos 22a²: **It was stated: Rav said: One may not light from one "candle" to another "candle" [of Chanukah (Rashi)]; and Shmuel said: One may light. [ibid.] Abbaye said: [In] all of the matters of "the master" [i.e. Rabbah bar Nachmeini (Rashi)] he acted in accordance with [the position of] Rav - except for these three [that follow] in which he acted in accordance with [the position of] Shmuel: One may light from one "candle" to another "candle", etc. [ibid.] One of the Sages was sitting before Rav Ada bar Ahavah - and he was sitting and [at the same time] he was saying: "The reasoning of Rav is because of disgrace to the Mitzvah" [i.e. that he lights a "kisem" (i.e. a wood chip or toothpick or the like) from a Mitzvah "candle" - and from *that* he lights the rest (Rashi - based on the Gemara later)]; He said to them: "Pay no attention to him - the reasoning of Rav is because he is weakening the Mitzvah" [for it looks like someone who is taking away the light - and drawing a little of the moisture of its oil (Rashi)]. What is [the case where there is a difference] between them? There is [a case where there is a difference] between them - if one were to light from one "candle" to another "candle" [i.e. without a "kisem" (Rashi)]. [ibid. 22b] Rav Sheishes challenged [Rav with a certain Baraisa], etc.; [and the Gemara's conclusion on the point is:] In the end of the day, according to the one who said [that Rav said it's *assur*] because of weakening the Mitzvah - it is difficult! It is [indeed] difficult. What was there about this [i.e. what was concluded]? Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua said: I look [at the following]: If [we say that] the lighting makes the Mitzvah - [then] one may light from one "candle" to another "candle" [i.e. since in so doing he is performing the Mitzvah itself]; And if [we say that] the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah - [then] one may not light from one "candle" to another "candle" [for then lighting isn't so much of a Mitzvah (Rashi)].**

Tosafos (*Shabbos* ibid.): **"What was there about this?" - [That's] surprising: What's [the Gemara] asking; and also, what does he mean [by responding], "We look [at it] - If the lighting" etc.; Isn't it apparent that the Halacha is like Shmuel? - for after all, Rabbah acted in accordance with him [i.e. with his position]; and if so - [lighting by means of] a "kisem" is also *muttar*: because we *have* to say they're disagreeing by [a case with] a "kisem" and about [whether to say it's *assur* because of] disgrace to the Mitzvah; for after all, the one who explained Rav's reasoning [as being] because of "weakening the Mitzvah" was refuted! So [we] have to say that he [i.e. Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua (and the Gemara at this point)] does not take Rabbah's words [as being] "essential" [i.e. authoritative] (i.e. rather he holds we rule like Rav since it's an issue of "what's *assur*" [Rosh]); and [although the explanation of "weakening" was refuted, nevertheless (Rosh)] he's asking whether the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah - and [therefore] it's *assur* according to Rav [to light] from one "candle" to another**

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

"candle" [i.e. even *directly*] because of "disgrace to the Mitzvah" [equally] like with a "*kisem*"; or [do we say that] the lighting makes the Mitzvah - and it's *muttar* [just] like in the case of the Menorah [i.e. whose "candles" the Gemara in the middle of the *sugya* said could be lit from one another *directly*] - for we are [certainly] not concerned over [it being a] "weakening of the Mitzvah"; and [then] it establishes that the lighting makes the Mitzvah - and [therefore] it's *muttar* [to do it *directly*].

Alternatively, I found in the name of [the] *RIVA*"M, [the explanation is] that he is [really] asking [what the Halacha is] according to Shmuel - for the Halacha is like him; and he is [therefore] asking if we hold as was said above - that according to the one who said [Rav's reasoning was] because of disgrace to the Mitzvah - [then] it's *muttar* to light from one "candle" to another "candle" [i.e. *directly*] according to Rav; and if so they are disagreeing by [a case with] a "*kisem*" - and Shmuel holds it's *muttar* [even] by [a case with] a "*kisem*"; or perhaps we do not hold that way; and [rather we say that even by a case of lighting *directly*] from one "candle" to another "candle" there's also [a problem of] disgrace to the Mitzvah - and Rav holds it's *assur* - for the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah, and [as such] it's not comparable to the Menorah; and [therefore] Shmuel only holds it's *muttar* [by lighting *directly*] from one "candle" to another - but by [a case with] a "*kisem*" he agrees that it's *assur*; and the conclusion is [that] we see that we ask [this question] and solve [it by concluding] that the lighting makes the Mitzvah - and [so] according to Rav one *may* light [*directly*] from one "candle" to another like by the Menorah, and according to Shmuel it's *muttar* even by [a case with] a "*kisem*".

O.C. *SIMAN* 675 : THE LIGHTING MAKES THE MITZVAH (NOT THE "SETTING IN PLACE")

Se'if 1

The lighting makes the Mitzvah (not the setting in place) so that has to be for the Mitzvah's sake

Shabbos 22b²: (For) it was asked by "them" [i.e. the Sages]: [Do we say that] the lighting makes the Mitzvah, or [that] the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah [i.e. which does the Mitzvah chiefly depend on (Rashi)]? [ibid.] Come and hear [a proof]: for R' Yehoshua ben Levi said: [23a] A "glass" [lantern] which had been constantly burning the entire day [having been lit for the Mitzvah on the eve of Shabbos (Rashi)] - 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; but if you say the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah - [should] this [statement read] "one puts it out and [then once again] lights it"?! - [surely] it should [have read] "one puts it out and [then] picks it up and places it [back] down and [only then] lights it"! And furthermore, from [the fact] that we [word] the *bracha* "...who sanctified us with his Mitzvahs - and commanded us to *light* a Chanukah 'candle'," [let's] derive from this [that] the lighting makes the Mitzvah! [Let's indeed] derive [it] from this.

Someone who lit the candle but stood there holding it

Shabbos 22b²: Come and hear [a proof]: for Rava said: [If] one was holding a Chanukah "candle" and [merely] standing [i.e. he was holding it from when he lit until it went out (Rashi)] - he didn't do anything; [let's] derive from

this [that] the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah! There, [it's because otherwise] one who sees [it] says [i.e. thinks]: "It's for his [personal] needs that he's holding it."

Someone who lit indoors and then brought the candle outside

*Shabbos 22b*³: Come and hear [a proof]: for Rava said: [If] one lit it 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 if you say [that] the lighting makes the Mitzvah - [so] that's why he didn't do anything [because since this is its (fundamental) Mitzvah (act) - 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? There, as well, [it's because otherwise] one who sees [it] says [i.e. thinks]: "It's for his [personal] needs that he lit it."

Moving the synagogue "menorah" (with candles burning) to its year-round regular place

The *Beis Yosef* quotes R. Yitzchak Abouhav^o, who brings from the *Nimukei Yosef*^f: One time, he [i.e. the *Nimukei Yosef*] saw in the synagogue that they had lit the "candles" in the vessel [in] which they lit all year to provide light, for in that vessel - "candles" were set up to [be] Chanukah "candle[s]"; and after the lighter had lit the Chanukah "candle[s]" - he moved the rope in his hand so as to raise the vessel [and thereby] to position it in its special year-round place. And he [i.e. 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, nevertheless someone who sees [it] who wasn't there at that time could say [i.e. think]: "It's for his [personal] needs that he lit it." And therefore, he commanded that he should not raise it - but rather that he should leave it [down] below - below ten [*tefachim**]. And he said that there is still [reason] to question *this*, because they still make use of its light; and since all year they are used to lighting it to make use of its light, [so] even though it's *not* in its place - since there is no [extra] "candle" in the place of the Chanukah "candle[s]" - it's impossible that the Chanukah "candle[s]" not serve those standing there instead of the "candle(s)" they were used to. Therefore, for purposes of Chanukah, what's appropriate is to "innovate" [the use of] a separate vessel.

R. Yitzchak Abouhav writes his *own* position on this: I hold that since the candle-lighting in the synagogue is merely a (practiced) *minhag*, and [therefore] we are not concerned that it be by the entrance - [but] rather [it's done] before the (*heichal* [i.e. the]) *Aron HaKodesh**; [consequently] one should not be so particular because of "those who come in and those who go out" regarding it. And furthermore, even in the home we light only for the members of the household nowadays; and if so, according to this, one should not be so concerned for people passing to and fro; and all the more so in the synagogue, for after all, all those who come there know that these "candles" are for Chanukah. 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."

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

*Se'if 2**Having the necessary amount of oil before lighting*

The Rosh^o (*Shabbos* 2:7): Since "the lighting makes the Mitzvah", one needs to put [an amount of] oil in "the candle" [i.e. the container to be used] according to "the specification" [i.e. for the amount of time it has to burn (discussed above 672:2)] *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.

*Se'if 3**Chanukah candle-lighting by a woman*

Shabbos 23a¹: And now that we say "the lighting makes the Mitzvah", [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*)]. [But] a woman definitely lights; for R' Yehoshua ben Levi said: Women are obligated in [the Mitzvah of] a Chanukah "candle", for they too were in that miracle.

Rashi (*Shabbos* *ibid.*): 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.

O.C. SIMAN 676 : THE ORDER OF THE BRACHOS AND THE LIGHTING

*Se'if 1**The sugya* of the brachos of Chanukah candles*

Shabbos 23a²: Rav Chiya bar Ashi said in the name of Rav: One who lights a Chanukah "candle" has to "be *mevareich*" [i.e. say (at least one) *bracha*]; And Rav Yirmiyah said: [Even] one who [merely] *sees* a Chanukah "candle" has to "be *mevareich*". Rav Yehudah said: [On] the first day - one who sees "is *mevareich*" two [*brachos*] and one who lights "is *mevareich*" three; [and] from then on - one who lights "is *mevareich*" two [*brachos*] and one who sees "is *mevareich*" one. What [*bracha*] does he deduct [after the first night (Rashi)]? He deducts [the *bracha* of] "time" [i.e. "*shehecheyanu*"]. But let him deduct [the *bracha* of the] "miracle" [i.e. "*she'asah nissim*"]! There was "[a manifestation of the] miracle" on all the days [for after all - all eight (days) they lit from the container (of oil), but (as for the *bracha* of) "time" - once He "caused us to reach" the *beginning* of "the time" - (that's all there is to) "He caused us to reach" (Rashi)]. What *bracha* does one [who lights] say? He says the *bracha*: "...who sanctified us with His Mitzvahs - and commanded us to light [the] 'candle' of Chanukah." And where did He "command us"? [After all, it's merely Rabbinical! (Rashi)] Rav Avya said: [It is derived] from [the *pasuk** (*Devarim* 17:11)] "You shall not turn away [i.e. act differently from the decisions of the Sages]"; Rav Nechemiah said: [It is from the *pasuk** (*Devarim* 32:7)] "Ask your father - and he will tell you; your elders - and they will 'say to you' [i.e. direct you]."

Saying brachos without doing any lighting or even seeing

The *Me'iri* to *Shabbos* 23a: Someone who doesn't have [anything] to light, and isn't in a place where he'll be able to see [any Chanukah "candles" either]: Some hold that he says the *brachos* "*she'asah nissim*" and

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

"shehecheyanu" by himself on the first night, and **"she'asah nissim"** [alone] on all the [other] nights; and these words appear [to be correct].

If someone did not say the bracha of "time" ["shehecheyanu"] on the first night

Eiruvin 40b³: This [i.e. the explanation that the words "seven" and "eight" (in *Koheless* 11:2) refer to mentioning *Yom Tov** in a *bracha* all seven or eight days (and not to saying "shehecheyanu")] in fact [is the only approach that] makes sense; [because] if it would enter your mind [to explain that it refers to saying the *bracha* of] "time" ["shehecheyanu"] - is there then [a relevance to the *bracha* of] "time" ["shehecheyanu"] all seven [days]? That's not a difficulty [because "shehecheyanu" in fact is relevant to all seven days], since if one does not say [that] *bracha* today [i.e. on the first day of *Yom Tov*] - he says the *bracha* on the next day or another day [of *Yom Tov*].

Se'if 3

The bracha of "one who sees"

Rashi (*Shabbos* 23a): I found [written] in the name of "Rabbeinu Yitzchak ben Yehudah", that he said in the name of "Rabbeinu Yaakov", that this *bracha* was designated only for someone who did not light by his house yet, or for [someone] sitting on a ship.

The Rashba and the Ran (to *Shabbos* ibid.) add more conditions: ...and [only for someone that] "they didn't light for him in his home", and he's not going to light later that night; [but] otherwise - he does not have to say a *bracha*; for we have not found [a case where] one is *yotzei* [lit. "goes out of"] a Mitzvah and says a *bracha* again over "seeing" [so (it follows that similarly) one does not say a *bracha* over "seeing" if later he is going to be able to say a *bracha* over "lighting" (*Mishnah Berurah*)].

Se'if 4

"HaNeiros Hallalu" ["These candles"]

Right after the *bracha*, it says in "*Tractate Sofrim*" (20:6): **And one says: These "candles" ["ha'aylu"; Rosh's version: "hallalu"] we light over the-salvations ["haYeshu'os"; Rosh's version: "haTeshu'os"] and-over the-miracles and-over the-wonders which ["asher"] You-performed for-our-forefathers by means-of Your-kohanim that-are-holy ["haKedoshim"]; and-all (the-Mitzvahs-of) the-eight days-of Chanukah - these "candles" ["they" (Tur)] are-holy, and-there-is-no permission for-us to-make-use of-them - but-rather only to-see-them; in-order to-give-thanks ["and-Hallel-praise" (Tur)] to-Your-Name ["that-is-great" ("haGadol") (Tur)] over Your-wonders and-over Your-miracles and-over Your-salvation ['yeshu'asecha'].**

Se'if 5

The order of the lighting (with respect to how the candles stand by the entrance)

Zevachim (62b): **All the turnings which you turn - they should only be in the way of the right.**

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

The *Mordechai*^o (*Shabbos* 2:267) [when listing practices of the Maharam^o (of Rottenburg)] applies that: **And when he would light the "candles", he would begin "to the left side" and [then] turn to the right side.**

The *Terumas HaDeshen*^o (106): **The people of Austria (and all its subsidiaries) begin on the right side, and light in the way [i.e. direction] that we - the people of the covenant - write [i.e. in Hebrew (from right to left)]. [As for the Gemara of "turning toward the right",] (1) it's possible that they consider this approach "turning toward the right", and (2) even if this approach is not [considered] "turning toward the right" - I hold [it's still possible] to justify the *minhag*: For nowadays in most places - and [in] the vast majority of the [Jewish] world - even [by] Torah scholars, they don't have *mezuzahs* in the "winter house" in which they light. If so, they have to light on the right [side] of the entranceway [i.e. from the point of view of someone going *in* (which the person lighting - who's on the inside facing *out* - would call "the left side of the doorway")] next to the *tefach*^{*} nearest to the entrance (as it says in the *Mordechai* that [it applies] even for "us" who light indoors). And if so, that candle which is opposite his right is always the closest to the entrance - and that is [where] he has to start [from], for it's the main [candle] of the Mitzvah - for it would have been enough [just] with that one if he hadn't wanted to be [one] of the "enhancers" ["*Mehadrin*"]; but [as for] the Maharam - he had a *mezuzah* by his entrance, and if so - he had to light on the left [side] of the entranceway, and if so - the "candle" closest to the entrance [was] always opposite his left. And one [might] ask: If so, why does [the Maharam] need the reasoning of "all the turnings" etc. - this [above] reasoning should have been enough for him! [But] one can answer (that) the practical effect [would be] if the "candles" were arranged from the side of the entrance [out in a line] toward the wall that's opposite the entrance, such as if the entrance were in the east - and the "candles" were arranged from east to west; so then, he needs to face south - and to start with the "candle" that's closest to the entrance (and he shouldn't face north - and start with that same "candle") - because of "all the turnings" etc.**

O.C. *SIMAN* 677 : THE HALACHOS OF A "GUEST" CONCERNING CHANUKAH CANDLES

Se'if 1

The basic principle of being a "guest" on Chanukah (i.e. the difference in whether one is married)

Shabbos 23a¹: Rav Sheishes said: An "*achsenai*" [=guest (Rashi)] is obligated in [the Mitzvah of] a Chanukah "candle". R' Zeira said: At first, when I was in "the house of the teacher" [i.e. *yeshiva*], I would "join [in partnership] with *perutos* [i.e. coins]" with the "*ushpiza*" [=host (acc. to above Rashi {whereas if "*achsenai*" would mean "tenant", then "*ushpiza*" would be his landlord})]; After I took a wife [and sometimes I was a guest (in order) to learn Torah (Rashi)], I said: "Now I certainly don't need to, because they're lighting for me in my home."

If many people live together in one courtyard

The Tur writes in the name of "Rav Sar Shalom": **Many people who live in one courtyard - the strict Halacha is that they join [in partnership] in the oil and they are all *yotzei* with one "candle"; but for an "enhancement" of**

^{*} see Glossary ^o see Bibliography O.C. = volume *Orach Chayim* (of *Shulchan Aruch*, etc.)
© 2008 Rabbi Dovid Lipman. All rights reserved

the Mitzvah - each one lights for himself by the entrance of his house; and if [someone] opens a [separate] gate for himself - he is *obligated* to light [there], because of "suspicion".

Se'if 3

Details about when "others light for him at home"

The *Beis Yosef* quotes the *Mordechai*^o: Nevertheless [i.e. even though if "they light for him at home" then he does not have to light on his own (*Beis Yosef*)], he [still] needs to *see* [a Chanukah "candle"], as we say [in the] nearby [Gemara (see above *siman* 676)]: "One who sees - on the first day he says two *brachos* [and] from then on [he says] one"; And so says "the *Ri*" that the *minhag* of people who would go to the trade fair - and no Jew lived in that city - [is that] they light in the house of the non-Jew [where they stay].

The *Beis Yosef* brings R. Yitzchak Abouhav^o as quoting the *Orchos Chayim*^o: Someone who goes to a village where there are no Jews, and stays there overnight on Chanukah: Even if he has no house of his own, we heard that the *minhag* of "*haRav R' Meshulam*" was to light with a *bracha*, as a commemoration of the miracle. [ibid.] Someone who is going on a boat - or if he is in a house of non-Jews - he lights with *brachos*, and he places it on his table; and it's not comparable to a "guest" which we said [about him] that if "they light for him in his home" he doesn't have to join [in partnership], because there it's different - for there is a publicizing of the miracle in the lighting of his "host".

The *Beis Yosef* quotes the *Terumas HaDeshen*^o: A guest who is married: If he wants to light with a *bracha* as an "enhancement", that's just fine.

Se'if 4

The left-over oil and wicks

The Midrash (*Tanchuma* to *Naso* {chapter 29} and *Pesikta Rabasi* {beginning of section 3}): A Chanukah "candle" which [had] left over oil in it by the first day - one adds a bit to it and lights it by the second day; and if it [had] left over by the second day - one adds to it by the third day and lights it; and so on by the other days; but if it [had] left over by the eighth day - one makes a significant fire for it ["and burns it" (*Pesikta* & the authorities' version)] by itself. Why? Once it was set aside for the Mitzvah - it's *assur* to make use of it.

Problems with this Halacha are discussed by the Ramban^o (to *Shabbos* 21b) [after bringing it in the name of "a number of Gaonim]: If it's a tradition - then we'll accept it; [ibid. (explaining the Halacha's reason)] since he put it [in] and set it aside such that it be used up through the Mitzvah - it became *assur* to him forever as if he "dedicated it to Heaven" [i.e. vowed to donate it for Sanctuary use]; and it's not comparable to [left-over oil of] a Shabbos "candle" - which everyone agrees is *muttar* (for) after Shabbos; because that [oil] is "made use of" even in the duration of its Mitzvah [itself] - because that's what it's there for from the start - [so] therefore the Halacha of being "*assur* to benefit from" does not "rest on it" [i.e. become applicable to it]. And the truth of the

matter is that I would not have thought so [i.e. that by Chanukah it's any different], because it becomes *assur* while it's lit only because of disgrace to the Mitzvah, and once it goes out - it's logical that it should [then] be *muttar* - for its Mitzvah is complete already. [ibid. (after bringing the Rif, who said that the Gemara's words "as a {time} specification" tell us that it's *muttar* to make use of its light - or to put it out - once it has burned for the "specified" amount of time)] **And I hold [that] from this [we can prove] that if [the "candle"] left over oil in it - that it's *muttar* even by the first day [itself] - even to put it out and to use the left-over oil; for once [we say that] it's *muttar* to make use of its light [i.e. after "the time"] even while it is still burning like its Mitzvah [is to burn] - all the more so [it's clear] that if it goes out it's *muttar*; and even though one could say [in response to this argument that] these words [of the Gemara and the Rif are only said] by oil which went *beyond* the specification, but if it went out *during* its time [period] - [then] it's *assur* forever, for it was set aside for the Mitzvah; And [nevertheless] I do not hold [that it makes sense to say] this.**

If the above oil got mixed together with other oil

The Tur^o writes: **And if any of it gets mixed together with other oil, and there isn't sixty [times as much *muttar* oil] to make [the *assur* oil] "*batel*": The Maharam^o of Rottenburg wrote that one may not add [more *muttar* oil] to it [i.e. to the mixture] in order to make it [i.e. the *assur* oil] "*batel*"; and it's not comparable to branches that fell from a palm tree [directly] into an oven on *Yom Tov*^{*} - [in] which [case] one [may] "multiply prepared logs against them" [i.e. add more until there is a majority] and [thereby] make them "*batel*" (*Beitzah* 4b), because there it's different - for he does not derive benefit from them [i.e. the wood mixture] until *after* they're burnt up; but here, he derives benefit from it [i.e. the oil mixture] at the [very] time when the "candle" burns. (And it's also *assur* to keep it around, etc.,) [ibid.] Consequently, there is no solution for it [to be able to be used].**

O.C. *SIMAN* 678 : PRECEDENCE OF SHABBOS CANDLES OVER CHANUKAH CANDLES

Se'if 1

If one can only afford either a Shabbos candle or a Chanukah candle (not both)

Shabbos 23b¹: **Rava said: It is obvious to me [that between] the [basic obligation of a single (*Mishnah Berurah*)] "candle" of one's home [i.e. on Shabbos (*Rashi*)] and the Chanukah "candle" - the "candle" of one's home is greater [in importance - for someone too poor to buy oil for two "candles" (*Rashi*)], because of [the need for] "the peace of one's house" [just like the Gemara says (*Shabbos* 25b) that (the Mitzvah of) lighting Shabbos "candles" is called "peace" - because for the members of one's household to remain in the dark is a pain (*Rashi*), because one keeps tripping (*Rashi* to 25b)].**

If one can only afford either a Chanukah candle or wine for kiddush (not both)

Shabbos 23b¹: **Rava asked: [If one has to choose between] the Chanukah "candle" and "the '*kiddush*' ['sanctification'] of the day" [i.e. the Mitzvah of *kiddush*] - what is [the Halacha]; [Should we say that] "the '*kiddush*' of the day" is greater [in importance] - because it is [the more] frequent [Mitzvah], or perhaps [we should rather say that] the Chanukah "candle" is greater [in importance] - for the sake of the publicizing of the miracle?**

^{*} see Glossary ^o see Bibliography O.C. = volume *Orach Chayim* (of *Shulchan Aruch*, etc.)
© 2008 Rabbi Dovid Lipman. All rights reserved

After he asked it - he resolved it [and said]: The [basic obligation of a single (*Mishnah Berurah*)] Chanukah "candle" is greater [in importance], for the sake of the publicizing of the miracle.

The *Ran*^o (on these words): One can ask: And how do we push aside "the '*kiddush*' of the day", which is Torah-mandated, because of the [Shabbos] "candle" of one's home and the Chanukah "candle" [i.e. which are Rabbinical]? One can answer: We do *not* push it aside; for after all, it is possible to say *kiddush* over bread.

O.C. *SIMAN* 679 : CHANUKAH CANDLE-LIGHTING ON THE EVE OF THE SHABBOS

Se'if 1

Whether the Shabbos candle or the Chanukah candle is the one to light first

The *Ramban*^o (to *Shabbos* 23b): From [the fact] that we say: "[When choosing between] the [Shabbos] 'candle' of one's home and the Chanukah 'candle' - the 'candle' of one's home is greater [in importance]," I infer that even [regarding] coming first - one puts the [Shabbos] "candle" of one's home before the Chanukah "candle", for any [Mitzvah] - which is greater and more frequent than another - comes before it; but I saw [written] that the *Behag*^o said: "(And) when one has to light the Chanukah "candle" and the Shabbos "candle" - first he lights that of Chanukah and afterwards he lights that of Shabbos, for if he would light that of Shabbos first - it would become *assur* for him to light that of Chanukah, because he [would have already] accepted upon himself the Shabbos." And this reason is so very far-fetched; [ibid.] just the opposite: it's not because it *is* Shabbos that he is lighting, [but] rather it's because it is *not* Shabbos yet that he is lighting.

O.C. *SIMAN* 680 : PLACING CANDLES CLOSE TO THE ENTRANCE (THE NIGHT OF SHABBOS)

Note that the order of the se'ifim is reversed.

Se'if 2

Setting up the Shabbos Chanukah candles "attached to the door itself"

Tosafos (*Shabbos* 120b): As a result of this [i.e. opening or closing the door], the "candle" shakes, and the oil is distanced from the flame - or brought closer [to it], and that's [considered a *melacha*^{*} accomplishment of] "putting out" [a fire] - or "causing to burn"; [ibid.] And if [it were] not [for the concern] for "putting out" and "causing to burn", it should not be *assur* because of moving [the "candle" which is "*muktzeh*"], because with the [person's] closing of the door - it's not considered [that he is doing an act of] "moving", and it's also not [a case where the door becomes] a "support for something *assur* [to be moved]" [i.e. a "*bassis*"], etc.

The *Tur*^o here: (The *Maharam*^o of Rottenburg wrote: When I was in France, I saw that) "*HaRav R' Shmuel*" did not have a place behind the door to light Chanukah "candles", and he would attach them to the door itself - behind the door, and he supplied [the] reasoning for the matter: [ibid.] (and) one cannot say that when he opens or closes [the door] he leans the oil or the wax toward the wick - or distances it from it - and it comes

^{*} see Glossary ^o see Bibliography O.C. = volume *Orach Chayim* (of *Shulchan Aruch*, etc.)
© 2008 Rabbi Dovid Lipman. All rights reserved

out [that] he's "putting out" [a fire] or "causing to burn"; for after all, [the Gemara (ibid.) says:] "[Regarding] a 'candle' which is on top of a 'table' - one may tilt the 'table' and [in that way] it will fall," and we are not concerned about that which he's leaning the oil forward or backward; for in such a fashion "putting out" or "causing to burn" is not relevant, and even if it is relevant - "something which one does not intend" is *muttar*, and it is not a [case of] "cutting off the head" [i.e. a "*p'sik reisha*"]. And according to how "the *Ri*" [i.e. Tosafos] explained, [ibid.] that's *assur*; [ibid.] And [as for] that [case] of "a 'candle' which is on top of a 'table'," [the Tosafos] interprets it [to be referring only to a case] where there's no oil in it, for he considers it a [case of] "cutting off the head" [i.e. a "*p'sik reisha*"] if there's oil in it.

O.C. *SIMAN* 681 : USING CHANUKAH CANDLES FOR HAVDALAH (AND THE ORDER)

Se'if 1

Using a Chanukah candle for havdalah

The *Ohr Zarua*^o in the name of the *Yerushalmi*: **R' Abuha** in the name of **R' Yochanan**, [and] **R' Yose bar R' Chanina**, [said:] One may not say the *bracha* [by *havdalah*] over a "candle" - or over [fragrant] spices - of a **Mitzvah**. What is [he referring to as] "of a Mitzvah"? **R' Y.** [i.e. "Yosa"] said in the name of **Shmuel**: [By] "a candle" [he means] such as the Chanukah "candle" - on the departure of the Shabbos one does not say [the *bracha* by] *havdalah* over it; [by] "[fragrant] spices" [he means] such as the willow of the "*hosha'na*" [i.e. the four species] on **Sukkos** - on the departure of the Shabbos one does not say [the *bracha* by] *havdalah* over it; for **Rava** [or "**Rabbah**" (as in *Bavli Sukkah* 37b)] said: A willow of [the] **Mitzvah** - it's *assur* to smell it [since it was set aside for the Mitzvah (Rashi *ibid.*)].

Se'if 2

Is it more important to put the "tadir" first, or to delay "escorting the day out"?

Brachos 51b⁵: **The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa**: [There are the following] matters [of disagreement] between **Beis Shammai** and **Beis Hillel** concerning a meal: **Beis Shammai** say: One [who is saying *kiddush* on Shabbos or *Yom Tov** (Rashi)] says the *bracha* over the day [first] - and [then] afterwards says the *bracha* over the wine, for [it is] the day [that] causes [this instance of using (Rashi)] the wine to arrive; and [at a point when] "the day became holy" already [i.e. when he accepted the day upon himself or "when the stars come out" (Rashi)] - the wine had not yet arrived [i.e. and just as the day *arrives* first - so too its *bracha* should come first (Rashi)]; and **Beis Hillel** say: He says the *bracha* over the wine [first] - and [then] afterwards says the *bracha* over the day, for the wine [or bread *in place* of that (Rashi)] causes [i.e. enables (Rashi)] the *kiddush* to be said; [and] another point - the *bracha* of wine is frequent - and the *bracha* of the day is not [as] frequent, [and when choosing between something which is] frequent and [something which is] not [as] frequent - [the one which is] frequent comes first [as we derive (*Zevachim* 89a) from what the Torah says about the "*Tamid*" offering (Rashi)]; and the Halacha is like the words [i.e. position] of **Beis Hillel**. What is [the need for] "another point"? [It means to continue by saying:] And if you [will] say: "There [i.e. when **Beis Shammai** argued in favor of the *bracha* over the day coming first], two [proofs were found], and here [i.e.

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

when arguing the reverse], one [alone has been given]!", [then we will respond:] Here, too, there are two [proofs], [and the second is:] the *bracha* of wine is frequent - and the *bracha* of the day is not [as] frequent, [and when choosing between something which is] frequent and [something which is] not [as] frequent - [the one which is] frequent comes first. [ibid. 52a] And [is it really true that] *Beis Shammai* hold that the *bracha* over the day is greater [in importance]? But wasn't it taught in a Baraisa: Someone who comes into his house on the departure of Shabbos - he says the *bracha* over the wine and [then] over the light and [then] over the [fragrant] spices - and [then] afterwards he says [the *bracha* of] *havdalah* [itself]! [ibid.] But after all, from what [basis do you conclude] that [this last Baraisa] is [from the teachings] of *Beis Shammai*? [ibid.] [Let's] derive from this [which we omitted] that it is [indeed from the teachings] of *Beis Shammai* - and according to [the particular version of] R' Yehudah - and [so] disregarding [this last counter-argument] it is [in fact] a difficulty! *Beis Shammai* hold [that] "bringing the day in" [i.e. *kiddush* (Rashi)] is different from "taking [i.e. escorting] the day out" [i.e. *havdalah* (Rashi)]; [by] "bringing the day in" - the more we advance that - the better; [but by] "taking [i.e. escorting] the day out" - the more we delay it - the better, so that it shouldn't be like a burden upon us.

O.C. SIMAN 682 : THE HALACHOS OF "AL HANISSIM" ON CHANUKAH

Se'if 1

"Al HaNissim" in the regular Shemoneh Esray

Shabbos 24a²: It was asked by "them" [i.e. the Sages]: What is [the Halacha about whether one ought] to mention [the subject] of Chanukah in the *Mussaf* [*Shemoneh Esray*]'s?

Tosafos (ibid.): In the [regular] prayer [of *Shemoneh Esray*], it's *obvious* to [them] that one has to mention [it], because [that] prayer is [said] in congregation, and [thus] there is a publicizing of the miracle.

Rashi (ibid.): After all, they [i.e. the days of Chanukah] were "established" for "thanksgiving and [saying] Hallel".

An earlier Gemara adds: Rav Sheishes said to them: [It's] like [by the] prayer [of *Shemoneh Esray* (in the following way)]: Just as [regarding the] prayer [of *Shemoneh Esray*, the appropriate place for "Al HaNissim" is] in [the *bracha* of] "thanksgiving" [i.e. "*Modim*"] (for after all, the whole matter of Chanukah was instituted mainly for thanksgiving (Rashi) , likewise [regarding] *Birkas HaMazon* - [the appropriate place is also] in [the *bracha* of] "thanksgiving" [i.e. "*Nodeh*"].

If one did not say it (in the regular Shemoneh Esray)

The Tosefta* in *Brachos* (3:14): [On] any [day] which does not have a *Mussaf* [service], such as Chanukah and Purim, [in] *Ma'ariv*, *Shacharis*, and *Mincha*, one prays "*Shemoneh Esray*" [i.e. the daily "eighteen" *brachos*] -

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

and says [a supplement which is] "based on the event" in the [*bracha* of] thanksgiving [i.e. "*Modim*"], and if he did not say it - we (do not) have him "go back" [i.e. so he can say it].

"Al HaNissim" in Birkas HaMazon

Shabbos 24a¹: It was asked by "them" [i.e. the Sages]: What is [the Halacha about whether one ought] to mention [the subject] of Chanukah in *Birkas HaMazon*; [should we say that] since it is [merely a] Rabbinical [holiday] - we do not mention [it] [since it is (said) at home, and (therefore) there is not very *much* publicizing of the miracle (Tosafos)], or perhaps [we should rather say that] for the sake of publicizing the miracle [i.e. at least somewhat] we [*do*] mention it? Rava said in the name of Rav Sechorah [who said] in the name of Rav Huna: One does not mention [it] [i.e. he does not *have* to (Rashi)], and if he's going to mention it - he mentions it in [the *bracha* of] thanksgiving [i.e. "*Nodeh*"].

The wording of "Al HaNissim"

"Tractate Sofrim" [see note to 676:4] (20:8): And one says in [the *bracha* of] "thanksgiving" [*"Modim"*]: "And the appreciation of [Your] wonders, and the *kohanim's* deliverance which You performed in the days of Matisyahu the son of Yochanan the *Kohen Gadol* and the Hasmonean and his sons; and so too, Hashem our G-d and the G-d of our forefathers, [please] perform with us miracles and wonders - and we shall give thanks unto Your Name forever; Blessed are You Hashem - the Good" [etc.]; and the miracles [of] Mordechai and Esther - one mentions them in [the *bracha* of] "thanksgiving" [*"Modim"*] [as well]; and both of them are mentioned in *Birkas HaMazon*.

And in the "*Seder Rav Amram Gaon*" we find: Over the miracles [*"Al HaNissim"*], and over the [deeds of] might(s), and over the victories [*"teshu'os"*], and over the battles, and over the redemption [*"pedus"*], and over the salvation [*"purkan"*], which You performed for our forefathers, in those days, at this time; In the days of Matisyah the son of Yochanan the *Kohen Gadol*, [the] Hasmonean, and his sons, when the wicked "Greek" kingdom rose up against them - against Your people Israel, to make them forget [*"leshak'cham"*] Your Torah [*"miTorasecha"*], and to separate them from the rules that You want; And You, with Your great mercies, stood up for them in the time of their trouble: You fought their fight, judged their judgment, avenged their vengeance - You delivered the strong (ones) into the hand[s] of the weak (ones), and the many into the hand[s] of the few, and the wicked (ones) into the hand[s] of the righteous (ones), and the impure (ones) [*"temayim"*] into the hand[s] of the pure (ones), and the [wanton] sinners into the hand[s] of those involved in Your Torah; And for Yourself, You made a great and holy Name in Your world, and for Your people Israel, You worked a great victory [*"teshu'ah"*] - and a salvation [*"purkan"*] - as [clear as] this very day. And afterwards, Your sons came to the focal point [*"devir"*] of Your House, and they cleared Your *heichal*^{*}, and they purified [*"tiharu"*] Your [*Beis HaMikdash*], and they lit "candles" in Your holy courtyards, and they established eight days with [the saying of] Hallel and with thanksgiving unto Your Name; And just as You performed a miracle with them,

^{*} see Glossary [°] see Bibliography O.C. = volume *Orach Chayim* (of *Shulchan Aruch*, etc.)
© 2008 Rabbi Dovid Lipman. All rights reserved

so too, Hashem our G-d, [please] perform with us miracles and wonders in this time, and we shall give thanks unto Your great Name uninterruptedly ["selah"].

Se'if 2

"Al HaNissim" in the Shemoneh Esray of Mussaf

*Shabbos 24a*²: It was asked by "them" [i.e. the Sages]: What is [the Halacha about whether one ought] to mention [the subject] of Chanukah in *Mussaf(s)* [i.e. the *Mussaf* prayer (of *Shemoneh Esray*) of the Shabbos and *Rosh Chodesh* (that fall out) during the days of Chanukah (Rashi)]; [should we say that] since it [i.e. Chanukah] does not have a *Mussaf* [service] in its own [right] - we do not mention [it], or perhaps [we should rather say that] it's the day [itself] which has the obligation of four prayer [service]s [and therefore this *Shemoneh Esray* is no less (deserving) than the others which are obligations on that day (Rashi)]? Rav Huna and Rav Yehudah both said: One does not mention [it]; Rav Nachman and R' Yochanan both said: One does mention it. [ibid. 24b] And the Halacha is not like "all these" teachings, but rather like that which R' Yehoshua ben Levi said: [On] *Yom Kippur* which falls out to be on Shabbos - one who says the prayer of *Ne'ilah*^{*} has to mention [the subject] of Shabbos - [for] it's the day [itself] which has the obligation of four [daytime (Rashi)] prayer [service]s.

Se'if 3

To request "Just as You performed" (etc.) in "Al HaNissim"

Tosafos (*Megillah 4a*): There are those that do not say "Just as", because the Sages said (*Brachos 34a*): "A person must never request his needs - neither in the first three [*brachos* of the *Shemoneh Esray*] nor in the last three *brachos*"; and that's senseless: for after all, that principle is only [applicable] by one who prays in singular (language) [i.e. for the individual], but [if it's] for the [general] public - [then] it's *muttar*; but [I] hold that one should not say it - for a different reason: because the Sages said (*Pesachim 117b*) that any [text for a] matter which is "pertaining to the future" was instituted [with its wording formulated] "pertaining to the future"; and a matter of thanksgiving is "pertaining to the past", and therefore they instituted [the form] "*Al HaNissim*" with respect to that [i.e. without "requests"], since it's "pertaining to the past".

O.C. *SIMAN* 683 : HALLEL IS COMPLETED ON ALL EIGHT DAYS OF CHANUKAH

Se'if 1

Hallel on the eight days of Chanukah

*Erchin 10a*⁴: R' Yochanan said in the name of R' Shimon ben Yehotzadak: [The following are the] eighteen days on which [even] an individual completes Hallel: the eight days of "the Festival" [i.e. Sukkos], (and) the eight days of Chanukah, (and) the first *Yom Tov*^{*} of Pesach, and the (first) *Yom Tov* of "the Celebration" [i.e. Shavuos]; and in the Diaspora [there are] twenty-one: the nine days of "the Festival" [i.e. Sukkos], (and) the eight days of Chanukah, (and) the [first] two *Yamim Tovim* of Pesach, and the two *Yamim Tovim* of "the Celebration" [i.e. Shavuos]. What is distinct about "the Festival" [i.e. Sukkos] that [explains the fact that] we say

^{*} see Glossary [°] see Bibliography O.C. = volume *Orach Chayim* (of *Shulchan Aruch*, etc.)
© 2008 Rabbi Dovid Lipman. All rights reserved

[Hallel then] every day, and what is distinct about Pesach [i.e. conversely] that [explains the fact that] we do *not* say [Hallel then] [10b] every day? [The days] of "the Festival" [i.e. Sukkos] are different [from one another] with respect to their offerings [since the number of bulls to be offered decreases with each passing day of Sukkos (Rashi)], [whereas the days] of Pesach are not different [from one another] with respect to their offerings. [Well, then on] Shabbos, which *is* different [from other days] with respect to its offerings, shouldn't one [also] say [Hallel]? It is not referred to [in the Torah] as an "appointed time" ["*mo'ed*"]. [But then on] *Rosh Chodesh*, which *is* called "an appointed time", shouldn't one [be obligated in accordance with this Halacha to] say [Hallel]? It is not [a day] "sanctified" with respect to doing *melacha*^{*}, [and that's a required factor as well,] for it is written (*Yeshu'ah* 30:29): "The 'song' [of the future] will be for you like [the Hallel 'song' of] the night when the festival becomes sanctified", [and we derive from that as follows:] a night which is sanctified "as a festival" [i.e. with *melacha* being *assur*] requires "song" [i.e. Hallel], and one which is not sanctified "as a festival" does not require "song" [i.e. Hallel]. [ibid.] But isn't there Chanukah, which has neither this [requirement] nor that [requirement (i.e. Chanukah is not called an "appointed time" and it is not "sanctified" with respect to doing *melacha*)], and [yet] one says [Hallel then]? [That's] because of the miracle. [But then on] Purim, [where likewise] there is a miracle, shouldn't one [also] say [Hallel]? R' Yitzchak said: [It's] because we do not say "song" [i.e. Hallel] over a miracle [that took place] outside the Land of Israel. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak challenged that: But isn't there [the case of] the "leaving of Egypt" [i.e. the original Exodus], which is a miracle [that took place] outside the Land of Israel, and [yet] we say Hallel [over it]? [It is] as taught in a Baraisa: Until they [i.e. the Jews] entered the Land of Israel, all lands were valid [candidates to host a miracle that would be cause] for saying "song" [i.e. Hallel]; [but] once they [i.e. the Jews] entered the Land of Israel, all [other] lands were not valid [candidates to host a miracle that would be cause] for saying "song" [i.e. Hallel]. Rav Nachman said: Its [Megillah] reading is its Hallel. Rava said: It is understandable [that Hallel should be said] there [i.e. over the original Exodus, which fits the *pasuk*^{*} in Hallel (*Tehillim* 113:1): "Praise [Hashem] O servants of Hashem" [implying that as a result of the miracle the Jews could be servants of Hashem] and not servants of Pharaoh; [but] here [i.e. by the miracle of Purim - could one say] "Praise [Hashem] O servants of Hashem" [implying that as a result of the miracle the Jews could be servants of Hashem] and not servants of Achashverosh?! - [when the book of Esther ends,] we are *still* the servants of Achashverosh!

O.C. SIMAN 684 : THE ORDER OF THE TORAH READING ON CHANUKAH

Se'if 1

The Torah reading of Chanukah on weekdays (general guidelines)

The Mishnah (*Megillah* 30b³): **On Chanukah [we read] from [the description of the offerings of] the [tribes'] princes [for that too (i.e. like there was in the time of the Chanukah miracle) was a "dedication of the altar" (Rashi)].**

The basic system of the daily reading (i.e. for days two through seven, when it is a weekday)

"*Tractate Sofrim*" [see note to 676:4] (20:11): **We (do not) "[read in] advance" on the eight days of Chanukah and say [the section that begins] "On the second day" [i.e. even at the reading of first day], "On the third day" [i.e. even**

^{*} see Glossary [°] see Bibliography O.C. = volume *Orach Chayim* (of *Shulchan Aruch*, etc.)
© 2008 Rabbi Dovid Lipman. All rights reserved

at the reading of the second day], [and similarly with] "On the fourth day", "On the fifth day", "On the sixth day", "On the seventh day", [and] "On the eighth day", in order to complete [the universally required amount of] *ten pesukim** [per Torah reading].

The Tur^o here writes: On the second day, the *kohen* reads [from] "(And) On the second day" until [i.e. and not including] "One bull - a child of the cattle", and the *levi* [reads from there] until [i.e. and not including] "(And) On the third day", and the [ordinary] "*yisrael*" goes back and reads [again from] "(And) On the second day"; and so on for each day.

The first day's reading (and its order when that's a weekday)

The Tur^o: We begin with "And it was on the day when Moshe completed"; and there are some places where they begin with the *bracha* of the *kohanim*, and that's a fine *minhag* - because the miracle was performed through *kohanim*; and such is the order: On the first day one begins [with] "on the day when Moshe completed," and this [i.e. the set of introductory *pesukim** from that point on] is read with the *kohen* and *levi*, and the [ordinary] "*yisrael*" reads "on the first day".

The eighth day's reading (and its order when that's a weekday)

The Midrash (*Tanchuma Beha'alo secha* 5): Aharon did not offer [anything together] with the princes [of the other twelve tribes]; and he proceeded to say "Woe is to me, [for] perhaps because of me [i.e. my sins] - the tribe of *Levi* is not accepted [by Hashem]"; *HaKadosh Baruch Hu** said to Moshe: "Go [and] say to Aharon, 'Do not be afraid - you are designated for [something] greater than this';" therefore it says: "Speak to Aharon and say to him 'When you raise up' [and light the 'candles' of the Menorah]", [meaning:] "[When it comes to] the offerings [i.e. which the other princes just initiated] - they can be practiced throughout the time when the *Beis HaMikdash* is [still] around, but [as for] 'the candles' - forever "in the direction of the 'face' of the Menorah" [they shall shine].

Se'if 2

The "haftarah" of the Shabbosim of Chanukah

Megillah 31a⁴: And we "end off with" [i.e. read as the "*haftarah*"] "the 'candles' of Zechariah" [because of (the *pasuk** which it contains): "I saw, and behold - an entirely golden candelabra {'menorah'}" (*Mishnah Berurah*)]. And if two *Shabbosim* fall out [on Chanukah]: [On] the first one [we "end off"] with "the 'candles' of Zechariah", [and on] the latter one [we "end off"] with "the 'candles' of Shlomo".

The "haftarah" when there is a groom

The *Terumas HaDeshen*^o (20): Question: [Concerning] that which we say in the chapter of "One who reads the *Megillah* standing", that in the "*haftarah*" we may not "skip" from one [book of the] "*Navi*" to another [book of the] "*Navi*": If so, how was it justified to have the *minhag* in Austria - and in [other] "places that there are"

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

- [that] when a wedding occurs in [the week of the Shabbos of one of] the four *parshas*, or Chanukah, [so that] they have to read as the "*haftarah*" from [the passages assigned to] the four *parshas* or from [those of] Chanukah, because those are written in the Gemara; nevertheless, they *also* read as the "*haftarah*" [i.e. as a supplement] from the "*haftarah*" of a groom - some of [the *pesukim**] - until "your G-d will rejoice over you", and [they do this] even though the "*haftarah*" [passages] of the *parshas* and of Chanukah are not in the [same book of the] "*Navi*" as the "*haftarah*" [passage] of a groom, and we are not particular about "skipping" from one [book of the] "*Navi*" to another [book of the] "*Navi*"! Answer: I hold that it cannot be resolved properly according to all of the [authoritative] explanations [of the Gemara]. The truth is, I heard that the early Austrians resolved the *minhag* [by saying that] since in the *Mordechai*^o there (in the name of the Ra'avayah^o) it explains [that] the reason not to "skip [around]" in the Torah and in [the books of] the "*Navi*" is out of respect for the congregation, [i.e.] so that they won't have to just stand there quietly while they roll from one passage to another passage; and this insistence is only relevant to those days - for all their books [i.e. even of the "*Navi*"] were written as a scroll, like our *Sefer Torah*, so they would have to take up time with their rolling; but [as] for "us", when our "*haftarah*" [books] are written in "notebooks" [i.e. bound], and one can mark [the page] so as to find quickly any "*haftarah*" one wants to, [so then] there is no [need for] concern about "skipping" from one [book of the] "*Navi*" to another [book of the] "*Navi*". [ibid.] However, Rashi explained [that] the reason not to "skip [around]" [is] because of confusion (and therefore, within one [book of the] "*Navi*" one may "skip [around]" - because [since practical] rulings do not generally come from the words of the Prophets - [so] we are not particular about a minimal [level of] confusion; but [as for "skipping around"] from one [book of the] "*Navi*" to another [book of the] "*Navi*" - where there's *too much* confusion - we *are* particular); and according to this reason, we cannot make the above distinction. But nevertheless, if it would be within one [book of the] "*Navi*" - [just] that it's more [of a distance] "such that the interpreter would stop" - [then] the above reasoning is enough, because [about] this insistence itself, Rashi explained that it's only due to respect for the congregation. And one can also answer that for us, since we do not have the practice of public interpreting, we are not concerned about confusion (and that which the Gemara says "one may not 'skip'," that's only in the places where they had the practice of interpreting - for in those days as well there were places where they did not interpret; and it is not [too] "forced" to limit [the Gemara] this way, because after all, the Gemara gave the specification by reference to interpreters - for it says "one may only 'skip' to the point when the interpreter will stop" - [so] that proves [that] it's referring to places where one interprets). [ibid.] Still, I rule that [when it comes to] the above *minhag* about "*haftarahs*": Where it's the *minhag* - it is the *minhag* [and that may continue], and where it is not the *minhag* [i.e. yet] - it should not be adopted to start with.

Se'if 3

The Torah reading when Rosh Chodesh Teiveis is on Shabbos

Megillah 29b⁴: And R' Yitzchak Nafcha said: [On] *Rosh Chodesh Teiveis* which falls out to be on Shabbos - we bring three Torahs [i.e. *Sifrei Torah*] and read from them: [in] one [we read] from the material of the day, and [in] one [we read] from [that] of *Rosh Chodesh*, and [in] one [we read] from [that of] Chanukah.

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

The "haftarah" when Rosh Chodesh Teiveis is on Shabbos

Tosafos (*Shabbos* 23b): And "the *Rashba*" [*Rabbeinu* Shimshon ben Avraham of Shantz] holds that when *Rosh Chodesh Teiveis* falls out to be on Shabbos - then the "*haftarah*" reading should be from "the 'candles' of Zechariah" - in order to publicize the miracle, and not from "The heavens are my throne" which is the "*haftarah*" [passage] of [an ordinary *Shabbos*] *Rosh Chodesh*; and furthermore, since the "*maftir*" reads from [the material] of Chanukah - his "*haftarah*" reading should be "from" [i.e. related to] the subject [about] which he read; And [as for] the fact that we read from [the material] of *Rosh Chodesh* first, [that's] because by the Torah reading - since it's possible to accomplish *both* ([i.e. the "more] frequent" [reading of *Rosh Chodesh*] and the "publicizing of the miracle" of Chanukah) - [so] we accomplish both - and [the "more] frequent one" comes first; but where it is not possible to accomplish both [i.e. by the "*haftarah*"] - publicizing the miracle is greater [in importance]; and furthermore, by the Torah reading [of Chanukah] there isn't such a [significant] publicizing of the miracle - for "candles" are not mentioned in it (as [they are] in the "*haftarah*" [passage]); and in addition, "the *Rashba*" holds [that it makes sense to say] that for this reason [itself] the [Torah reading] of *Rosh Chodesh* was put first - so that the "*maftir*" will read from [the passage] of Chanukah, and will [consequently] read from "the 'candles' of Zechariah" as the "*haftarah*".

The Torah reading when Rosh Chodesh Teiveis is on a weekday

Megillah 29b⁴: It was said: [On] *Rosh Chodesh Teiveis* which falls out to be on a weekday - R' Yitzchak said [that] three [*aliyah* honorees] read from [the material of] *Rosh Chodesh* and one [reads] from [that] of Chanukah, and Rav Dimi of Chaifa said [that] three [*aliyah* honorees] read from [that] of Chanukah and one [reads] from [that] of *Rosh Chodesh*. R' Mani said: It makes sense [to say] like R' Yitzchak (Nafcha), because [when choosing between something which is] frequent and [something which is] not [as] frequent - [the one which is] frequent comes first. R' Avin said: It makes sense [to say] like Rav Dimi, [for after all,] who caused the fourth [*aliyah*] to materialize? - *Rosh Chodesh!* - therefore, the fourth [*aliyah* honoree] needs to read from [the material of] *Rosh Chodesh*. What was there about this [i.e. what was concluded]? Rav Yosef said: We pay no [special (Rashi)] attention to *Rosh Chodesh*; and Rabbah said: We pay no [special] attention to Chanukah. And the Halacha is: We pay no attention to Chanukah ("i.e. *Rosh Chodesh* is primary") [alternate text: "whatsoever"].

If four aliyahs were read from the Rosh Chodesh material (i.e. by mistake)

Tosafos (*Megillah* 23a): If it's *Yom Tov*^{*}, and the full number of required [*aliyahs*] were read, and [however] reading from "the day's obligation" was forgotten, [then] the *Sefer Torah* should be brought back - and another [*aliyah* honoree] should read from "the day's obligation", and [as for the fact that it's *assur* to read extra *aliyahs* on *Yom Tov*] - the last one to read is "as if it never was"; But [if the same occurred] on the Shabbos of Chanukah or on the *Rosh Chodesh* of Chanukah - [then] it is not necessary [to "add an *aliyah*" in order to read the Chanukah material], as it is [to be found] in [the Midrash (*Tanchuma*) which is called] "*Yelamdeinu*" - that the Halacha is [that] we pay no attention to Chanukah whatsoever.

^{*} see Glossary [°] see Bibliography O.C. = volume *Orach Chayim* (of *Shulchan Aruch*, etc.)
© 2008 Rabbi Dovid Lipman. All rights reserved

The *Beis Yosef* quotes the *Shibolei HaLekket*^o: **But now that [in our own case] two Torahs [i.e. *Sifrei Torah*] have [already] been taken out, [so] out of [concern for] the "tainting" of [the reputation of] the second *Sefer Torah* - it is necessary for a fifth [*aliyah* honoree] to read from [the material] of Chanukah; And one cannot say [i.e. suggest] that the fourth [*aliyah* honoree] *himself* should read from [the material] of Chanukah - from the *first Sefer Torah* ([i.e. if he still has the opportunity to do so] before he says the "closing [*bracha*]" over [reading] the *parsha* of *Rosh Chodesh*), because that would be "skipping [around]" - and one may not "skip around" (between two areas) in the Torah [reading]; Rather, now that the fourth [*aliyah* honoree] has begun to read from [the material] of *Rosh Chodesh* - he should finish [that] and say the "[closing] *bracha*", and a fifth [*aliyah* honoree] should "come [up]" after him - and he should read from [the material] of Chanukah in the second *Sefer Torah*; and [the logic is:] Better that our statement "On *Rosh Chodesh* [there are] four [*aliyahs*] - one may not [have] less than that and one may not [have] more than that" should be abandoned, and [just] let [the reputation of] a *Sefer Torah* not be "tainted".**