

O.C. *siman* 674 : When is it *Muttar* to Light One Candle From Another?**The development of: *Se'if* 1**THE *SUGYA*' OF LIGHTING FROM ONE CANDLE TO ANOTHER CANDLE

The Gemara (*Shabbos* 22a²):

There was a disagreement: Rav said [that] one **may not** light from one [Chanukah] "candle"¹ to another [Chanukah] "candle", and Shmuel said [that] one **may**.

Abbaye reported: In all of the matters of "the master" [i.e. Rabbah bar Nachmeini²], he followed the position of Rav, except for the following three, in which he followed the position of Shmuel: (1) One may light from one "candle" to another "candle", [etc.].

There are two explanations of Rav: One of the Sages was sitting before Rav Ada bar Ahavah; and as he was sitting he said, "The reasoning of Rav is [that] to light from one 'candle' to another is **a disgrace** to the Mitzvah" [i.e. Rav is talking about where someone wants to light a "kisem" (i.e. a wood chip or toothpick or the like) from one Mitzvah 'candle' - and then to light the rest of the 'candles' from the "kisem" (Rashi - based on the Gemara later)].³ Rav Ada bar Ahavah said "to them" [i.e. to those who were present], "Pay no attention to him - the reasoning of Rav is [that] someone who lights from one 'candle' to another is **weakening** the Mitzvah" [for it looks like "taking away the light" and drawing a little of the oil's moisture (Rashi)].

So the practical difference between the two explanations⁴ would be: If one were to light from one "candle" to another "candle" [i.e. **without** a "kisem" (Rashi)].

[On daf 22b, Rav Sheishes challenges Rav with a certain Baraisa, and the Gemara's conclusion on the point is that the Menorah's "candles" **could** be lit from one another (at least if it was done **directly**), and therefore:] In the end of the day, according to the one who said that Rav said it's assur because of **weakening** the Mitzvah - [then] it is a difficulty! **The Gemara concedes:** That is [indeed] a difficulty.

The Gemara then asks: What was there about this [i.e. what was concluded]?

And Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua responded: I look at the following: If we say [about the independent question⁵ (which the Gemara brings and discusses afterwards)] that "the lighting makes the Mitzvah" - [then]

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

² Rashi. Abbaye always refers to Rabbah as "the master" ["*Mar*"], because he was Abbaye's teacher (Rashi to *Shabbos* 5b). [Rashi to Bava Metz'ah 107a adds that Rabbah had raised him in his own home.]

³ The *Mishnah Berurah* explains that the reason *not* to consider it a disgrace would be because he's doing it in order to light a Mitzvah candle right afterwards.

⁴ I.e. regarding Rav's position. For it soon becomes clear that if we say Rav was referring to it being *assur* because of "weakening", that means Shmuel *agrees* about "disgrace", so according to *that* explanation Shmuel holds it's *assur* to do it with a "*kisem*" (whereas according to the *other* explanation Shmuel holds it's *always muttar*).

⁵ Whose main practical effects are discussed throughout *siman* 675.

one **may** light from one "candle" to another "candle" [i.e. since in so doing he is performing the Mitzvah itself]. [On the other hand,] 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 is not all that much of a Mitzvah (Rashi)].

In the end, the Gemara (ibid. 23a) establishes that "the lighting makes the Mitzvah" [as discussed further in *siman* 675].

To summarize: (1) **Rav Ada bar Ahavah** said Rav holds it's *assur* to light from one candle to another *even directly* (because that's "weakening") - and the Gemara said that's "difficult"; (2) "**Some Sage**" said Rav holds it's *assur* because it's a "disgrace" (which means *only indirectly*); (3) What Rav holds to be *assur* - **Shmuel** holds it's *muttar* - and that's what Rabbah followed; and (4) Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua said that it's only *muttar* if we say "the lighting makes the Mitzvah" - which is in fact the established conclusion.

We then find the following analysis in Tosafos [a "clarification" will be given afterwards]:

Question: "What was there about this?!" - that's surprising! What's the Gemara asking; and also, what does Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua mean [by responding], "We look [at it] - If the lighting etc.?" - Isn't it **apparent** what the Halacha is?

After all, we should reason as follows: We **have** to say that Rav and Shmuel disagreed about a case with a "kisem", and about whether to say it's *assur* because of **disgrace** to the Mitzvah. After all, the one who explained Rav with the reasoning of "weakening the Mitzvah" was refuted! [As for how to rule,] the Halacha should be like Shmuel, for Rabbah acted in accordance with his position. Therefore, even lighting by means of a "kisem" is *muttar*! [So what is there to "look at"?)

Answer [1]: Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua (and the Gemara at this point) does not consider Rabbah's following Shmuel as being authoritative [i.e. rather, he holds we rule like **Rav** since it's an issue of "what's *assur*"⁶ (Rosh)]. [Furthermore, although the explanation of "weakening" was refuted, nevertheless (Rosh)] he's asking the following question: Does the "setting in place" make the Mitzvah - and [therefore,] because of "disgrace to the Mitzvah", it's *assur* according to Rav to do it **even directly**⁷ (equally like with a "kisem")? Or, do we say that the **lighting** makes the Mitzvah - and [therefore] it's *muttar* (just like by the Menorah⁸)? (But we are **certainly** not concerned over it being a "**weakening** of the Mitzvah".) And [then,] the Gemara establishes that the **lighting** makes the Mitzvah, and [therefore] it's *muttar* [to do it **directly**].

Answer [2] (in the name of "the Rivam"): Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua is **really** asking what the Halacha is according to **Shmuel** - for the Halacha is like him; just that [in order to clarify Shmuel's leniency] he's asking the following: Do we hold like the Gemara said above - that according to the one who

⁶ When these two disagree, the Halacha generally follows Rav by issues of "what's *assur*", and Shmuel by monetary issues (*Bechoros* 49b).

⁷ As Rashi explained (above), if the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah, then *lighting* is not all that much of a Mitzvah. If so, it could be considered a *disgrace* to use the lit Mitzvah candle for the "non-Mitzvah purpose" of "merely lighting" the new candle.

⁸ I.e. even if we say that the only reason it's *muttar* for the Menorah's candles to be lit from one another is because by the Menorah the *lighting* makes the Mitzvah - that doesn't make a difference here if we say that by Chanukah *as well* the lighting makes the Mitzvah (as opposed to the previous "side" where we said that by Chanukah the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah, so *then* Chanukah could be different, and the Gemara's earlier proof from the Menorah can be avoided - at least if we use the "disgrace" reasoning). [This point comes across more clearly in Tosafos's second answer.]

said Rav's reasoning was because of **disgrace** to the Mitzvah [then] it's **muttar** to light from one "candle" to another "candle" **directly** even according to Rav (and if so they're disagreeing by a case with a "kisem" - and Shmuel holds it's muttar even in a case with a "kisem")? Or, perhaps we do not hold that way, but rather we say that even in 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 [where the **lighting** makes the Mitzvah]) - 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 response is that we see that the Gemara asks this question - and concludes that the **lighting** makes the Mitzvah; consequently, even according to Rav one **may** light **directly** from one "candle" to another like by the Menorah, and therefore according to **Shmuel** it's muttar even in a case with a "kisem".

To clarify somewhat: In both answers, Tosafos expounds the same "new issue" (that if the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah, we can say that there's "disgrace" even by lighting *directly*). The *difference* between the answers is the following: Since the "new issue" is really about Rav's position⁹, answer [1] explains that the Gemara is now following Rav; but answer [2] says the discussion of Rav is only in order to understand *Shmuel*. As a result, when the Gemara concludes that *lighting* makes the Mitzvah, which eliminates the "new issue", both answers are left with the original understanding of Rav (i.e. that it's *assur* only *indirectly*), just that answer [2] holds that *we* rule like *Shmuel* (which would mean that it's *muttar* even *indirectly*).

*However, we really have to see **four** approaches of the early authorities (regarding the final Halachic analysis of the sugya):*

(1) **In one approach, the Rosh**^o says like answer [1] of Tosafos, which means it's *muttar* only *directly*. In addition, **the Rambam** simply rules that it's *muttar* to light from one Chanukah candle to another, and the *Ran*^o points out that this implies it's *muttar* only *directly*.

(2) The **Ra'avad**^o then adds to the Rambam's words: "and with a '*kisem*'," and the *Ran* *himself* also says that this is the correct conclusion from the *sugya*. The *Gra* points out that this is the conclusion according to answer [2] of Tosafos [as explained above].

(3) **The Rosh's other approach** is to use *two* "new issues": First of all, he uses the "new issue" of Tosafos [that if the "setting in place" makes the Mitzvah, we can say that there's "disgrace" even by lighting *directly*]; in a moment we'll see how. His other "new issue" is as follows: He says that the intent of the Gemara's question "What was there about this?" was to ask whether the "difficulty" which was reached beforehand is a complete "refutation" or not; and Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua is answering that it's *not* a complete refutation - and that we in fact adopt (i.e. stringently) the position that the disagreement *was* about "weakening", and when it comes to "disgrace" Shmuel *agrees*. So it's in *that* context that Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua raises the "new issue" of Tosafos - to clarify whether this "agreement" by *Shmuel* makes it *assur* even *directly*; and the conclusion is that it doesn't. So according to this approach, the Halacha is *still* that it's *assur* *indirectly*, like with the Rosh's other approach (i.e. answer [1] of Tosafos), just

⁹ After all, if *Shmuel* held such a stringent position, how could there be *any* case where Rav would be more stringent than Shmuel?

that *then* he was saying it on the side of *Rav*, and now he's saying it in *Shmuel*. (And the *Ran* writes that the Ramban^o also rules that it's *muttar* directly but *assur* indirectly; and the Rosh says that this is the Rif's ruling as well¹⁰.)

(4) The Rosh then brings that the *Sefer HaTerumah* rules that it's **always** *Muttar* [like those listed in (2) above], and the Rosh himself explains his reasoning as follows: Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua is disagreeing with what the Gemara concluded (beforehand); *we*, therefore, reject *his* position. The Rosh then responds to that argument, saying that even if it's a disagreement, we should still rule like Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua - since that would be "ruling like the later authority" [see "Principles"].¹¹

To summarize these conclusions: The *Ran*, Ra'avad, and *Sefer HaTerumah* (and Tosafos's answer [2]) hold that it's *muttar* even *indirectly*. The Rif, Rambam, Ramban, and Rosh (and Tosafos's answer [1]) hold that it's *muttar* *only directly*. [As for the *Shulchan Aruch's* ruling in practice, that must wait for the *next* subject.]

The *Beis Yosef* ends by bringing the *Terumas HaDeshen*^o (107), who says that even according to the position that it's *muttar* even directly, one must concede that it's *assur* whenever there's reason to be concerned that the "*kisem*" may go out before it even *reaches* the "destination" candle, since then no "next Mitzvah" will have been accomplished at all.

The *Mishnah Berurah* deals with a practical difficulty: The *Pri Megadim*^o explains that one may not (at least "initially") move a Chanukah candle after it's lit (as explained below 675:1 [by "taking it outside"], based on the *Mahari Veil*). Separate from that, most of the later authorities rule that the candle *to be lit* must be in place at the lighting time itself - and not even a *moment* later (also explained below 675:1 [by "holding in ones hand"] - *not* like the Taz). If so, how is it possible to light from one Chanukah candle to another "directly"? - Both have to be standing in their places!¹² In the *Mishnah Berurah*, he answers that we're talking about touching extremely long wicks to each other¹³. (In the *Sha'ar HaTziyun*, he brings the *Pri Chadash*^o, who clarifies this by saying that the candle "to be lit" is considered "in place" even if he pulls its wick, so long as he doesn't actually *remove* it from the "candle".)

THE PRACTICAL HALACHA (AND *MINHAG*) ABOUT THE ABOVE

When the Gemara establishes that "the lighting makes the Mitzvah" [as mentioned above], the Tosafos says that "if so, it's *muttar* to light from one 'candle' to another 'candle'; however, since 'the world' has been acting stringently [in the

¹⁰ His basis for this is just like how the Ran explained the Rambam [as brought above]: The Rif leaves the original language "from one candle to another candle", implying that only doing it *directly* is *muttar*.

¹¹ Of course, this counter-argument would not be relevant with respect to Tosafos's answer [2] (although the conclusion is the same), since in *that* approach, Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua is *not disagreeing* with the earlier Gemara.

¹² In the *Sha'ar HaTziyun*, he mentions the *Eliyahu Rabbah*^o, who explains that we're talking about moving the already-lit candle towards the about-to-be-lit candle. As for the problem of "moving it after it's lit", the *Sha'ar HaTziyun* says that *Eliyahu Rabbah* must hold that since "moving it after it's lit" is a problem *only because* someone who sees it would conclude that the candle is for personal use - so here that's not a concern, since onlookers will see that he's only moving it to light another Chanukah candle.

¹³ In the *Sha'ar HaTziyun*, he brings that the Rashba^o and the *Maggid Mishneh*^o write explicitly this solution [which the Gemara itself said concerning the Menorah], and that this itself disproves the position of the Taz^o (that one *can* set a candle in place even a few moments *after* lighting it).

matter], the *minhag* is not to be changed." (The *Beis Yosef* brings this, and the *Darkei Moshe* brings that the *Hagahos Maimonios*^o and the *Mordechai*^o say the same.) The Tosafos's simple wording of "candle to candle" appears to be referring to *direct* lighting [which indeed everyone agrees is *muttar* by the end of the *sugya*], meaning that even for *that* the *minhag* is to be stringent. The *Rema* describes the *minhag* this way explicitly [as quoted soon].

In the next *se'if*, we see that the issue of lighting from one candle to another candle applies by other Mitzvah candles as well. However, the *Darkei Moshe* points out, the *Mordechai* implies that the *minhag* to be *extra* stringent is only by Chanukah candles. The *Darkei Moshe* explains this using the reason "Rabbeinu Simcha" gives for the *minhag*: "If the candle he's using to light [all] the others goes out, he shouldn't re-light it from the ones that are [already] lit (in order to finish lighting); [for] even though it's *muttar* to light from one candle to another candle, nevertheless the practice is to be stringent - and this *minhag* is not to be changed; and the reason is that the basic Mitzvah is 'one candle [for] a man and his household' [as discussed above 671:2], and the others are merely optional - as an 'enhancement' of the Mitzvah; therefore, [i.e. all the *more* so,] if one of the candles went out - one should not light it from the others - because there's no Mitzvah in that lighting, for we rule '[if] it went out - he is not responsible for it'¹⁴."

Finally, the *Darkei Moshe* brings the *Nimukei Yosef*^o, who says that whole problem¹⁵ of lighting from one candle to a second candle is "only while the first candle is burning for its Mitzvah; but when it *already* burned for its Mitzvah [time period (as the *Rema* explains - quoted soon)] - it becomes *muttar* to light from it." He also brings that the same applies to synagogue candles [as explained in the next *se'if*, they're considered Mitzvah candles too]; i.e. that when they need to be put out [anyway], it's *muttar* to light from them.

Now, the *Shulchan Aruch* only discusses the "basic Halacha" (with the stringent position "anonymous"): **One may light one Chanukah "candle" from another Chanukah "candle"; and [that's true] only for lighting from this one to that one with no intermediary; but to light from this one to that one by means of a "non-Mitzvah candle"¹⁶ - [that's] *assur*; [On the other hand,] some hold that this is also *muttar*, unless it's in such a way that there's [reason] to be concerned that the non-Mitzvah "candle" will go out before it will light the other (Mitzvah) "candle".** But the *Rema* brings the *minhag* from Tosafos (i.e. even *more* stringently): **[However,] the *minhag* is to be stringent by Chanukah "candles" - not even to light from one "candle" to another "candle"; because its main Mitzvah is only one "candle" - and the rest is not so much of a Mitzvah - and therefore one should not light this one from that one; [Still,] all this is only while they are still burning for their Mitzvah, but after the time**

¹⁴ This last case is not brought by the *Rema*. But the *Mishnah Berurah* does write it, and in the *Sha'ar HaTziyun* he writes that he's astonished at the Levush^o for writing the opposite. However, "Rabbeinu Simcha" implied that it's only a problem according to the *minhag* to be stringent, whereas the *Mishnah Berurah* is talking about it being *assur* even by the strict *Halacha* (which is the implication of a *Mordechai* that the *Darkei Moshe* also brings).

¹⁵ source's wording: "the fact that one may not light from one candle to another candle." [This would seem to refer to lighting *indirectly*, which is *assur* even according to the strict *Halacha*. On the other hand, by looking at the next case where "the same applies", we seem to see that it's actually talking about lighting a totally non-Mitzvah candle. But we see soon that the *Mishnah Berurah* rules leniently *only* (1) when coming to light a Mitzvah candle, and *also* (2) only if he does it *directly*. Perhaps this can be clarified after we note that above (672:2), we learned that it could be problematic to "use" the candles even *after* the time period is over.]

¹⁶ *Shulchan Aruch*'s Hebrew: "*ner shel chol*" (lit. "a candle [that's] not of holy [function]").

of the Mitzvah has passed - they are *muttar* to derive benefit from, [so] all the more so [it's clear that] it's *muttar* to light [others] from them.

The *Mishnah Berurah* clarifies a few points:

(1) The "*shamash*" [which was explained in the "second half" of 673:1 above] is considered a "non-Mitzvah candle" in our context. However (says the *Mishnah Berurah*), the Maharshal^o writes that in the synagogue, the "*shamash*" is called a "Mitzvah candle" just like the other candles; "and therefore those who light their [personal] candles (by means of their servants) from a synagogue candle - [i.e.] even from the '*shamash*' - should be sharply reproofed, except [on] the departure of Shabbos (to provide light in the dark alleys - in order to walk to one's home)."

(2) He supports the *Darkei Moshe's* position that the *minhag* to be extra stringent is only by Chanukah candles. However, he refers to the *Pri Megadim*^o who writes that even by *other* Mitzvah candles one ought not to light one from another *indirectly*. [More on this in the next *se'if*.]

(3) One situation where there could be two Chanukah candles in the same house is from the second night and on. In that case, it's clear that the "added" candles are merely an "enhancement" (as mentioned). However [says the *Mishnah Berurah*], in another case, there's a distinction to be made: The *Magen Avraham*^o writes that if the cause is that there are two people lighting, and all of them are united under the financial support of one "head" of the household, then again everyone's candles (besides the "head"'s) are "enhancements" (so the *minhag's* reason applies) [see above 671:2 about these rules]. On the other hand [continues the *Mishnah Berurah*], the *Pri Megadim* writes that if the lighters are financially independent of one another, and merely "share" one home, then both of their candles are equally "Mitzvah candles", so *they* in fact *can* use the leniency of our *se'if* [but see the "practical difficulty" at the end of the previous subject].

(4) Concerning "after the time", one should only be lenient when (a) one is going to light a Mitzvah candle, and also (b) he should be lighting one from the other in the way which is *muttar* even "during the time" (i.e. *directly*). [To clarify this, note that above (672:2) we learn that it could be problematic to "use" the candles even after the time period is over.]

The development of: *Se'if 2*

DOES THIS "STATUS" OF BEING A "MITZVAH CANDLE" APPLY BY OTHER MITZVAHS

When the Tur brings the leniency of the *Sefer HaTerumah*^o (and then concludes by bringing that the Rosh^o disagrees), he "attaches" to "the *Sefer HaTerumah's* ruling" the following "addition": "And [when it comes to] a 'candle'¹⁷ of Shabbos or of the synagogue - all of them¹⁸ are considered [candles] of a Mitzvah, in the sense that one can light from one to another."

¹⁷ The word "*ner*" is traditionally translated "candle", but the earlier sources generally do not use the word to refer to solid candles. Rashi explains that in the days of the Gemara, earthenware "lamps" were used; his full description is brought above (671:3).

In addition, the *Darkei Moshe* brings the *Nimukei Yosef*¹⁸, who says that the same goes for a candle for Torah study, or for a woman who gives birth or any [other] sick person who is in danger.

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* rules: **"There is someone who holds"¹⁹ that [one it comes to] a "candle" of the synagogue and of Shabbos and of Chanukah - all of them are ["candles"] of a Mitzvah, and [therefore] one may light one from another.** The *Rema* continues: **And the Halacha is the same [for] a "candle" of Torah study or a "candle" for a sick person who needs a "candle"; and regarding a synagogue "candle", see above [O.C.] siman 154, se'if 14.**

However, the *Gra* shows us a different point of view about this entire issue: The *Ran*^o, he brings, asks: Once we rule [as explained above 673:1] that it's *assur* to make use of Chanukah candles even for a "holy use" (such as Torah study), so how could it possibly *not* be a "disgrace to the Mitzvah" to light from one candle to another (i.e. even though the next candle will also be "holy")? And he answers: "Because both [candles] are one Mitzvah - i.e. the Mitzvah of Chanukah candle[s] - and something is not 'cancelled out' by its own kind; but [as for] other Mitzvahs - [then] it appears like they are 'canceling out' one another²⁰." According to that reasoning, argues the *Gra*, lighting from a Chanukah candle to a candle of a *different* Mitzvah should in fact be *assur*! As for the *Sefer HaTerumah*, the *Gra* simply proposes that *he* hold like the *Ba'al Hattur*^o [above *ibid.*], that it *is* in fact *muttar* to make use of a Chanukah candle for a "holy" use, just like we already saw *here* [in *se'if* 1] that the *Sefer HaTerumah*'s position on "disgrace to a Mitzvah" is more lenient!

The *Mishnah Berurah* brings this, and he concludes by referring to another authority who also holds that by different Mitzvah candles it's *assur*.²¹ (And in the *Sha'ar HaTziyun*, he points out that according to the *Gra*, *any* candles of two different Mitzvahs may not be lit from one another.)

¹⁸ The *Beis Yosef* explains that the wording "all of them" is used [as opposed to "both"] because the *Sefer HaTerumah* himself put Chanukah candles together with the other two, as one list.

¹⁹ *Shulchan Aruch* language for a reliable but uncorroborated source.

²⁰ The language is "borrowed" from *Zevachim* (79a), which is referring to the "sandwich" of Pesach night.

²¹ As we emphasized above, the *Tur* also seems to consider this second ruling of the *Sefer HaTerumah* to be an "extension" of the first one.