

O.C. *siman* 676 : The Order of the *Brachos* and the Lighting

The development of: *Se'if* 1

The Shulchan Aruch's ruling for *se'if* 1 is quoted at the very end of the *se'if*.

THE *SUGYA* OF THE *BRACHOS* OF CHANUKAH CANDLES

The Gemara (*Shabbos* 23a²):

Rav Chiya bar Ashi said in the name of Rav: One who lights a Chanukah "candle"¹ 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*".²

Rav Yehudah detailed the differences: On the first day, one who *sees* "is *mevareich*" **two** [*brachos*], and one who **lights** "is *mevareich*" **three** [for there's one *bracha* specifically for the act of lighting, as mentioned soon]. From then on, one who **lights** "is *mevareich*" **two** [*brachos*], and one who *sees* "is *mevareich*" **one**. What *bracha* does he deduct [i.e. cut out] after the first night? He deducts the *bracha* of "time" [i.e. "*shehecheyanu*"].

The Gemara asks: Let him [rather] deduct the *bracha* of the miracle [i.e. "*she'asah nissim*"]! [Why is it specifically the *bracha* of "time" ("*shehecheyanu*") that needs to be deducted?]

The Gemara answers: There was "[a manifestation of the] **miracle**" on **all** the days. [After all, they lit from the container of oil all eight days. As for the *bracha* of "time" ("*shehecheyanu*"), once He "caused us to reach" the **beginning** of this special time - that is all there is to "causing us to reach it", and reaching the other days does not increase this or add to it³ (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".⁴

The Gemara asks: Where did He "command us" [this]? [After all, the *Mitzvah* is merely *Rabbinical*! (Rashi)]

Rav Avya answers that the source is: The *pasuk*^{*} (*Devarim* 17:11) "You shall not turn away [i.e. act differently from the decisions of the Sages]."

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 This case will be explained in *se'if* 3.

³ Rashi's own wording is merely: "[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'."

⁴ When the *Rif*^o and *Rosh*^o copy out this line of Gemara, they follow with the text of the other two *brachos*; perhaps that is their version of the Gemara itself.

And Rav Nechemiah said the source is: *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]."

THE CORRECT WORDING OF THE BRACHOS

The *Yerushalmi* (*Sukkah* 14a) says: "...and commanded us concerning the Mitzvah of ["the lighting of" (version of *Yerushalmi* brought by the *Beis Yosef*)] the Chanukah 'candle'."⁵ The *Beis Yosef* brings the *Shibolei HaLekket*, who holds that this is in fact the authoritative version, based on the *sugya** in *Pesachim* (7b) about which *brachos* read "commanded us *to do*" such-and-such, and which of them read "commanded us *concerning*" such-and-such a Mitzvah. The *Shibolei HaLekket* says that there are two points to be proven from there:

(1) It's impossible to consider the version "*to light*" (from the statement in the *Bavli*) as a clear source about this; because if it were a clear source, the Gemara in *Pesachim* would have quoted it to support the approach that this is the wording of *brachos* in general (just as that Gemara *does* quote *other* such sources, that discuss other Mitzvahs). [However, that is not sufficient reason to *decide* in favor of the version "concerning", since the version "*to light*" is in fact the version *we* find in the *Bavli*, and there *are* authorities (the *Shibolei HaLekket* himself deals with "HaRav R' Yosef") who likewise quote the *bracha* with that wording.]

(2) One clear conclusion from that *sugya* (as explained by the authorities) is that if a Mitzvah can be done by means of a representative ["*shaliach*"], then its *bracha* has to be worded as "concerning".⁶ (This point is raised by the *Ran*^o as well, in *Pesachim*.)

However, the *Beis Yosef* decides in favor of "the version of the authorities", which is "*to light*" (and he adds that this is in fact the *minhag*). As for the proof (i.e. part 2), he points out that the *Ran* resolved it, as follows: Since by Chanukah candles, if someone isn't doing the lighting himself, he has to "join together [in partnership] with coins" [see below (677:1), where this is discussed (concerning "guests")], which is "because one can only be *yotzei* [this Mitzvah] through that which is one's own"⁷, consequently such a Mitzvah is *not* considered "able to be done through others."

Separate from all this, there is the issue of the word "*shel*" [to light the candle "*of*" Chanukah]. The *Shulchan Aruch* [quoted soon] does not include it [and that is also the version of the *Ba'al HaIttur*^o and the *Me'iri*^o], but the *Mishnah Berurah* rejects that (because the Gemara and all the [other] authorities *do* have the word). The *Mishnah Berurah* also brings the Maharshah^o, who holds that the words "*shel*" and "*Chanukah*" should be said *together as one word*, but then he brings from the *Pri Megadim*^o that the *minhag* is *not* to be particular that way. (The *Mishnah Berurah* concludes by writing [a] that the *bracha* of "*she'asah nissim*" ends "in this time" - not "*and in this time*"; and [b] that the end of "*shehecheyanu*" is pronounced "lezman hazeh" and not "lazman hazeh".)

⁵ The *Yerushalmi* is discussing whether all *brachos* of Rabbinical Mitzvahs share the "generic" form: "...commanded us concerning the Mitzvah of [the authority of] the elders." The focus is not really whether to use "concerning" or "to" (or whether to generalize with "the Mitzvah of the Chanukah candle" or to specify "lighting" - and **that** is a point about which our *Bavli* was actually fairly clear).

⁶ The position of the Rambam is that if a representative ["*shaliach*"] is in fact *not* used, then the *bracha* is worded as "to do". [This is discussed in *Shulchan Aruch* volume *Yoreh Dei'ah* (265:2).] However, the Rambam himself writes that in the case of Chanukah candles, the wording *always* is "*to light*", so he too seems to be ignoring the principle from *Pesachim*.

⁷ These words (which are the *Ran*'s) are not found in the *Beis Yosef*'s version of this answer.

Concerning the end of "*shehecheyanu*", the *Pri Megadim* refers to "the great grammar expert R' Shlomo Zalman Henna", who wrote⁸ that it's pronounced "*laz'man hazeh*".

On the other hand, Rav Ovadiah Yosef⁹ [*Yabia Omer* 3:35] records that "our [*Sefardi*] *minhag*" is to say the first *bracha* without the word "*she!*", like the wording in the *Shulchan Aruch*.

SAYING BRACHOS WITHOUT DOING ANY LIGHTING OR EVEN SEEING

The *Me'iri*^o to *Shabbos* 23a:

If someone does not have anything with which 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 "*shehecheyanu*" by himself on the first night, and "*she'asah nissim*" [alone] on all the other nights; and this appears to be correct.

The basic authorities say no such thing. However, the *Sha'ar HaTziyun* writes that in the case of "*shehecheyanu*", at least, it is possible to reason as follows: "Just like we rule generally [i.e. regarding *Yom Tov**] that one can say '*shehecheyanu*' even in the marketplace [i.e. and not only with *kiddush* or candle-lighting]⁹, for it refers to the [day of the] *Yom Tov* itself; [so] it's possible that the same is true for this [case] - that it refers to the time of Chanukah itself, in which miracles and wonders were performed, just that 'initially' they [i.e. the Sages] attached it to the time of [the] lighting." (But even regarding that idea, he concludes that it needs further examination.)¹⁰

IF SOMEONE FORGOT THE BRACHOS

The *Mishnah Berurah* brings from R. Akiva Eiger^o that if he remembered about the *brachos* before he finished lighting all the candles, then he says *all* the *brachos* at that point [if his first candle is still burning (*Sha'ar HaTziyun*)]¹¹; but that if he already finished lighting - *then* he says "*she'asah nissim*" (and "*shehecheyanu*" when that's relevant) [for his situation is certainly no lesser than when someone merely *sees* candles (*Sha'ar HaTziyun*)].

⁸ Actually, the *Pri Megadim* himself only makes the reference, and says that the source "is not in my possession."

⁹ This Halacha is taken from *Eiruvin* (40b); see also below in *se'if* 3.

¹⁰ It seems possible to make a separate challenge to the idea that the "*shehecheyanu*" refers to "the time itself", as follows: When the first day of Chanukah is Shabbos, we light (and say all three *brachos*) before sundown on Friday afternoon, and then light Shabbos candles afterwards [see below *siman* 679]. But according to the *Me'iri*'s approach, how can we say the "*shehecheyanu*" before Shabbos, when it is *not* "the time of Chanukah" yet? Now, someone might respond that the lighting is considered "accepting Chanukah early" in that case. But how is that possible, since that would automatically mean "accepting Shabbos early" along with that, and then how could we light Shabbos candles afterwards? In contrast, if the "*shehecheyanu*" refers to the *Mitzvah*, then it makes sense - for in *that* case the *Mitzvah* of lighting happens to come before the "holiday" of Chanukah.

¹¹ The apparent difficulty is that "*Brachos* on *Mitzvahs* are said *before* the *Mitzvah* act" (see "Principles", and *se'if* 2 below). R. Akiva Eiger bases his leniency on a combination of three factors: (1) authorities who hold that one can say a *bracha* even on a mere "enhancement" of a *Mitzvah* (i.e. the "extra" candles), (2) authorities who hold that "after the fact" one can say a *bracha* even *after* doing the *Mitzvah* act, and (3) the idea that it's still considered "*before* doing the *Mitzvah* act" for the entire *duration* of any "ongoing" *Mitzvah*. In conclusion, although in the *Sha'ar HaTziyun* he says the *Pri Megadim*^o considers the issue doubtful, he himself leans in favor of R' Akiva Eiger (in the case mentioned).

IF SOMEONE DID NOT SAY THE BRACHA OF "TIME" ["SHEHECHEYANU"] ON THE FIRST NIGHT

The Gemara (*Eiruvin* 40b³):

[The Gemara has just explained 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".]*

The Gemara remarks: *This in fact is the only approach that makes sense, because if the words were to refer to saying the bracha of "time" ["shehecheyanu"] - is there then a relevance to the bracha of "time" ["shehecheyanu"] all seven days?*

But the Gemara responds: *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 it on the next day, or on another day [of Yom Tov].*

The Tur and *Beis Yosef* bring authorities who say (based on this Gemara) that if someone didn't say "shehecheyanu" on the first night - he says it on the next night (that he remembers to).

The *Mishnah Berurah* brings from the Levush^o that they're only talking about including the "shehecheyanu" at his lighting (of other nights); but once he already lit on a given night, he cannot say "shehecheyanu" that night any more. (Then, in the *Sha'ar HaTziyun*, he explains that the intent of this ruling is merely that the person has to wait and say "shehecheyanu" along with his lighting on a later night *instead*; but if he remembers after lighting on the *eighth* night, in which case he *cannot* wait for any "lighting on a later night", then the Halacha needs further examination: perhaps *then* we should rely on the approach that "shehecheyanu" refers to the time of Chanukah itself [as discussed just above, by "saying brachos without lighting or seeing"].

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* writes in *se'if* 1: **One who is lighting on the first night says three brachos: "...to light a Chanukah 'candle'," and "...Who performed miracles" ["she'asah nissim"], and "...Who kept us alive" ["shehecheyanu"]; and if he did not say the bracha of "time" ["shehecheyanu"] on the first night, [then] he says [that] bracha on the second night or when he remembers.**

The development of: *Se'if* 2

THE ORDER FOR THE SECOND NIGHT

As the Gemara from the beginning of the *siman* said, we "deduct" the bracha of "time" ["shehecheyanu"].

The *Beis Yosef* and *Darkei Moshe* raise an issue: When it comes to Chanukah lighting, how do we apply the principle that "brachos on Mitzvahs are said before the Mitzvah act" [see "Principles"]? The *Darkei Moshe* brings from the Maharil^o that all the brachos are said before even *starting* to light, on *all* nights. Now, below (*se'if* 5) we will see that one argument against adding the candles to one's "menorah" "starting with the left-most position and ending with the right" is that this means each night's *right-most* candle is the "main" one (because in this system it's the "new" one), so that candle *should* be lit immediately after the bracha, but instead one always starts with the left-

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

most one [for reasons explained below, in that *se'if*]. However, the *Beis Yosef* brings in the name of *Rabbeinu Yonah*¹² that even though one starts lighting with the "older" candles [which we may interpret to mean the left-most one, as in the above "argument"], nevertheless the second *bracha* (the *bracha* of "the miracle" ["*she'asah nissim*"]) is not said until just before lighting the "newest" candle (since that one, chiefly, is the one that represents the "addition" [of another day] to the miracle). Still, concludes the *Beis Yosef*, although this counters the above "argument" quite neatly¹², nevertheless¹³ it's a little difficult to say that the lighting on the various days is done differently that way; and the *Darkei Moshe* likewise says that one should follow the Maharil.

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* rules: **From the first night and onward, one "is mevareich" two [brachos]: "...to light", and "...Who performed miracles" ["she'asah nissim"]**. The *Rema* then adds: **And he says all the brachos before he starts to light** [i.e. even *after* the first night].

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

THE BRACHA OF "ONE WHO SEES"

As the Gemara from the beginning of the *siman* said, "one who sees" says "*she'asah nissim*", and on the first night he also says "*shehecheyanu*". (The *Beis Yosef* brings from "an *Ashkenazi* responsum" that once someone says "*shehecheyanu*", even if only on "seeing", he does not say it again for the rest of that Chanukah even when lighting, in line with *Eiruv* (40b) which says that [if¹⁴] the *bracha* of "time" ["*shehecheyanu*"] is said "out in the marketplace" - [then] one does not have to say it again over a cup [of *kiddush* wine].)

However, not all cases are included in the Halacha of "one who sees", as the early authorities explain:

Rashi brings¹⁵: *This bracha was designated only for someone who did not light by his house yet, or for someone sitting on a ship.*

The Rashba¹⁵ and the Ran¹⁵ add more conditions: *...that others did not light for him in his home, and he's not going to light later that night. Otherwise, he does **not** have to say a bracha, for we never find [such a thing as] a case where someone is yotzei [lit. "goes out of"] a Mitzvah - and says a bracha again over "seeing". [And it follows, similarly, that one does not say a bracha over "seeing" if later he is going to be able to say a bracha over "lighting" (Mishnah Berurah).]*

¹² The only reason that the right-most candle is being considered the "main" one is because it's the "newest" - which links it to the "addition" to the miracle. Therefore, it's the *bracha* of "the miracle" ["*she'asah nissim*"] that needs to be said right before lighting that candle (and not necessarily any other *bracha*).

¹³ The *Beis Yosef* seems to consider "countering the above argument" a reason that we should accept the position of *Rabbeinu Yonah*. Maybe this is based on the *actual existence* of a *minhag* like what the "argument" is against (see in *se'if* 5 below).

¹⁴ This seems to be the way this Gemara is being analyzed here (i.e. that the "not needing to repeat" can be applied to Chanukah). As for whether "*shehecheyanu*" can be said on Chanukah "even in the marketplace" *itself* (i.e. even *without* seeing candles), see above in *se'if* 1.

¹⁵ source's wording: "in the name of 'Rabbeinu Yitzchak ben Yehudah', that he said in the name of 'Rabbeinu Yaakov'."

The *Beis Yosef* seems to consider all this to be one single approach, and he writes that the Rosh^o and the *Mordechai*^o say likewise. The *Gra*, however, says that there is a disagreement: Rashi and the *Mordechai* do not agree that there's no *bracha* on "seeing" for someone who had others lighting for him in his home [and it's a very strong position among the authorities (*Sha'ar HaTziyun*)]. But the *Mishnah Berurah* points out that even if we grant that, it's still "unsafe" to say the *bracha* in that case, since "doubts about *brachos* call for being lenient" [see "Principles"].

The *Shulchan Aruch* includes all of the conditions [as explained], and rules: **Someone who did not light, and is not going to light later that night, and [others] are not lighting for him in his home either: when he sees a Chanukah "candle"¹⁶ - he says the *bracha* "she'asah nissim"; [In addition,] on the first night he also says the *bracha* "shehecheyanu", and if afterwards - on the second or third night - he does light, he does not say the *bracha* "shehecheyanu" again.** [See below (677:3) under the subject "Details about when others light for him at home", where the *Shulchan Aruch* and *Rema* seem to contradict what the *Shulchan Aruch* (and *Mishnah Berurah*) wrote over here - so unreservedly - about that case.]

The *Mishnah Berurah* adds one more condition [to which even Rashi and the *Mordechai* would agree (*Sha'ar HaTziyun*)]: that the "*bracha* over seeing" is not said by someone who "joined [in partnership] with coins" (see below (677:1), where this is discussed {concerning "guests"}) [since it's considered as if he himself said the *bracha* (thus giving thanks for the miracle) when he heard it¹⁷ from *that* lighter (i.e. even if he didn't see the candles at *that* time) (*Sha'ar HaTziyun*)].

The *Mishnah Berurah* then combines the subjects of this *se'if*, as he raises the issue of someone who had others light for him on the first night (so *they* said "*shehecheyanu*"), and on a later night he lights on his own. He writes that since we just ruled that "others lighting at home" is considered as if he himself lit [or at least there's a "doubt" that we should perhaps say that way], consequently the "*shehecheyanu*", as well, is not say "again".

Rav Moshe Feinstein^o [*Igros Moshe* O.C. 1:190] discusses this *bracha* on "seeing candles yourself":

The position of the above *Mordechai* is that seeing the candles - and then saying the *bracha* which mentions the miracle - is actually an entirely independent obligation. It is on that basis that he holds [as will be discussed below (677:3)] that if someone is in a place where there are no Jews, then he lights with *brachos* even if "they're lighting for him in his home" - in order to fulfill that obligation.

In fact, even though the Rashba and the Ran hold that the *bracha* over seeing is only said by someone who has no one lighting for him [and who isn't lighting himself], they still certainly admit that it is at least a "Mitzvah enhancement" when someone sees candles by himself. After all, otherwise, it would not make sense for there *ever* to be a *bracha* over seeing. The *Pri Megadim*^o even says they admit that there's an actual *Mitzvah* to see candles.

¹⁶ 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).

¹⁷ In keeping with the principle that "one who hears is considered as if he answers," which is derived in *Sukkah* (38b), and applied in the *Shulchan Aruch* in the Halachos of *brachos* (O.C. 213:2) and in countless places (with many details and complexities).

The Rashba and the Ran merely hold that it is not an *obligation*, or at least not one which is *independent* of the Mitzvah of lighting.

Knowing this, we can explain the "contradiction", that here in *siman 676*, the *Shulchan Aruch* brings the position of the Rashba and the Ran "anonymously", whereas below (677:3), he brings only the position of the *Mordechai* (calling it a position which "some hold"). [See below (ibid.) for how the *Mishnah Berurah* deals with this.] The explanation is as follows: The case *over there* is when someone has reason to actually *light* candles (and his only reason not to light is that he would be *yotzei* anyway with his wife's lighting back at home), so if he *does* light (by "detaching himself" from his wife¹⁸ as we will explain in a moment), it's definitely not a wasted *bracha* (as opposed to here, where the person is *only* seeing, so if the *Mordechai* is wrong then it's a wasted *bracha*). That's why over there, the *Shulchan Aruch* holds that one *should* light in order to see the candles, *just in case* the *Mordechai* (who holds it's *required*) is correct. However, we have to explain why the *Shulchan Aruch* would approve of a husband using "intent not to be *yotzei* with his wife's lighting" in order to light with the *brachos*, since he himself (in the *Beis Yosef*) rejects this mechanism [as explained below (ibid.)], considering it "causing an inappropriate *bracha*." The answer is as follows: The *Pri Megadim* explains that the *Beis Yosef* only rejected this because in general, there is no Mitzvah enhancement at all in the husband "detaching" from his wife. Now, according to what we explained above, that all the authorities agree that there is at least a "Mitzvah enhancement" in a person seeing candles by himself - that explains why the *Shulchan Aruch* endorses "lighting separately" in circumstances where that enables one to see candles.

There is another ramification of saying that the *bracha* which mentions the miracle is like an independent Mitzvah (even according to the Rashba and the Ran). The *Mishnah Berurah* has ruled, citing the *Pri Megadim*, that any time someone has a representative [*"shaliach"*] light Chanukah candles *for* him, the one being represented has to "stand by" at the lighting. The *Mishnah Berurah* says this above (by 675:3) about a woman lighting for a man - so he has to be there and hear her *brachos* - and vice versa.¹⁹ [Note: When discussing a similar case in *siman 679*, the *Mishnah Berurah* writes that the representative says the main *bracha* "...to light a Chanukah candle", but the one being represented can say the rest by themselves (because they can't be less than "one who sees"). However, the point here is that either way, we see that the representative cannot say all three *brachos* *by himself*, in the absence of the one being represented.] Let's analyze this:

We know that the general rule about a Mitzvah being done by a representative is that the representative says the *bracha* of the Mitzvah (and the one he's representing does not even need to *be* there). The proof is that the Mishnah (*Terumos* 1:6) says it's *assur* for a person who is mute to separate *terumah*, because the *bracha* is lost²⁰; but it also says (ibid. 4:4) that it's *muttar* to "send out" a representative to separate *terumah*; clearly, the representative will be able to say the *bracha*. The *Magen Avraham* [in the Halachos of Pesach - O.C. 432 n6] explains that this is because even the representative "is doing a Mitzvah." We see from this that the Mitzvah which the

¹⁸ R. Moshe Feinstein points out that the regular "enhancement" of having "everyone in the household light" would not apply to the husband here, because just as the wife does not participate in that "enhancement" (and light separately) when her husband is at home lighting, because of "*ishto k'gufa*" ["one's wife is like his own person"] as discussed above [see 675:3 and the end of 671:2], the same would apply here in reverse. Rather, here we will be discussing whether it's even *muttar* for him to light separately.

¹⁹ The *Mishnah Berurah* also writes similarly about a "guest" (below 677:1 by the description of "joining").

²⁰ The Mishnah does not spell out that reason, but it's obvious. Similarly, the same Mishnah says that one may not separate *terumah* under conditions where it's *assur* to say a *bracha*.

representative is doing for someone can be considered as if it is his own.²¹ If so, why should we say differently when it comes to Chanukah candles - that the one being represented needs to "stand by" at the lighting?

"The Rav of Riga" has proposed answering this by saying that on Chanukah it's different, because one is obligated to *see* Chanukah candles. But that is not the accepted Halacha. As we discussed above, it's only the position of the *Mordechai* that seeing is an independent obligation, and the *Shulchan Aruch* has decided in favor of those who disagree²²; so it shouldn't be all that crucial for the one being represented to "stand by" just so he can see the candles!

However, let's analyze what we just learned from the *Magen Avraham* - that a Mitzvah which a representative is doing for someone can be considered as if it's his own. If so, a representative for lighting Chanukah candles can be considered as if he *himself* had a Mitzvah to light Chanukah candles an additional time, on the same night. There is actually a practical example of such a thing. We have learned (above 672:2) about "someone who lit too few candles and wants to fix that": The *Orchos Chayim*^o said that the person has to light the missing candles now, but he does not need to say the *bracha* again, because the *bracha* that he made at the start was for all the candles he was *supposed* to light. There are authorities who make the obvious deduction: If *at the start* the person only had in mind to light the smaller amount of candles (such as if that's all he *had*), just that afterwards he changed his mind (for example, if someone *gave* him some more candles), so *then* he would have a Mitzvah to light more candles *with* a new *bracha*. [Note: The *Mishnah Berurah* over there cites the *Pri Megadim*, who holds that even *then* there is no *bracha* (see there as to why).] Still, *how many brachos* would he say? Clearly, only the first *bracha* - "...to light a Chanukah candle"! After all, when it comes to the *bracha* which mentions the miracle, we see from the Gemara that even to repeat it *each subsequent night* is only done because "there was [a manifestation of the] miracle on all the days"; so lighting on the *same* night - on the identical miracle - would *not* call for repeating that *bracha*! And *certainly* one does not say the *bracha* of "*shehecheyanu*" more than once! Now, let's apply this back to the case of a representative: Since a representative for lighting Chanukah candles can only say the *bracha* because it's as if he *himself* had a Mitzvah to light Chanukah candles an additional time on the same night, so *that* only enables him to say the *first bracha*!²³ Consequently, since the Sages instituted that the Mitzvah of lighting Chanukah candles should be accompanied by *two* (or three) *brachos*, therefore, the one being represented has to be there; for that way, all the *brachos* will be able to be said, since if the one being represented is listening, it can be considered as if *he* is saying the *bracha* which mentions the miracle (and "*shehecheyanu*"). [Or, as the *Mishnah Berurah* says in *siman* 679, they could *actually* say those *brachos* by themselves (because they can't be less than "one who sees").]

²¹ Elsewhere in the same responsum, R. Moshe Feinstein deduces that this is because of "*arvus*", which is the Halachic principle that "all Israel are responsible for one another" (*Sanhedrin* 27b {and 43b}, *Shevu'os* 39a).

²² R. Moshe Feinstein notes that the Bach^o says just what "the Rav of Riga" said, but it doesn't help us, since the Bach adopts the position of the *Mordechai* (i.e. *disagreeing* with the *Shulchan Aruch* and the later authorities who accept the position of the Rashba and the Ran), so for *him* it makes sense (but not for "us").

²³ R. Moshe Feinstein explains that if the representative would light his own candles first, then he would have to leave out the other *brachos* when he's "representing"; and if he did the "*representing*" first, then he would have to leave out the other *brachos* when he lights his *own* candles. [He does not address a possibility that the representative could be someone who, for some reason, is not lighting candles of his own at all. This is also the place to ask: If someone says the *bracha* "over seeing", and ends up lighting later that night, does he say that *bracha* again, because now he's being obligated through a different kind of "activity"??]

A separate point which we need to understand about the *bracha* which mentions the miracle, which we can say even over "seeing" alone, is whether it's linked to the *Mitzvah* that's done with the candles. Concerning the lighting of Chanukah candles in the synagogue, the authorities write [see above 671:7] that although normally no one is *yotzei* his own *Mitzvah* with that, nevertheless, since the person who lights in the synagogue says the *bracha* of "*shehecheyanu*", consequently if he lights at home afterwards - then he generally cannot say that *bracha* a second time - but apparently he *does* repeat the *bracha* which mentions the miracle. I hold that this cannot be true; rather, both points should depend on the above-mentioned issue: If we say that the Sages only instituted that the *bracha* which mentions the miracle be said over candles which are *a fulfillment of the Mitzvah* (when lighting them or when seeing them), then I understand why the synagogue lighter repeats that *bracha*, since the synagogue lighting is a mere *minhag* (and not the real *Mitzvah*); but then we should say the same about "*shehecheyanu*"!²⁴ [Note: the *Mishnah Berurah* above *does* accept the authorities' distinction.]

However, it does make sense that the *bracha* which mentions the miracle should depend on the candles being a fulfillment of the *Mitzvah*.²⁵ This is relevant for someone who will not be lighting at all on some night, who says this *bracha* when he sees such candles; according to the above, he would *not* say it over seeing the candles in the synagogue.

[In line with this, *we can ask*: Would one say "the *bracha* of one who sees" when seeing candles lit by a minor? (See above 675:3 and below 677:2 about a minor's "obligations".) What about candles that have already burned for the required amount of time?²⁶ (See above 672:2 {by "the amount of oil to use"} about what it's already *muttar* to do with the candles then.) Finally, what if the one seeing is *incapable* of doing any lighting at the time; for example, if he sees the candles on Shabbos?]

²⁴ R. Moshe Feinstein points out a possible resolution of these authorities' distinction: They could hold like the reasoning which the *Sha'ar HaTziyun* suggested above in *se'if 1* (under the subject of "saying *brachos* without lighting or seeing"), that "*shehecheyanu*" is not really linked to the *Mitzvah*, but rather relates to the day, and so that's *not* repeated; whereas this is *not* true of the *bracha* which mentions the miracle. However, the *Sha'ar HaTziyun* (as mentioned there) does not accept this conclusively; and R. Moshe Feinstein himself sharply opposes it.

²⁵ R. Moshe Feinstein points out that the *Tosafos* (to *Sukkah* 46a) gives three reasons why a *bracha* over "seeing" was instituted over Chanukah candles specifically (as opposed to a *sukkah* for example): (1) because of "love of the miracle", (2) for the sake of those who have no house and cannot light by themselves, and (3) because the *bracha* was *already instituted* to be said at the lighting. According to the first reason, it *could* make sense that one would say the *bracha* even over non-*Mitzvah* candles, lit for mere "publicizing of the miracle".

²⁶ It would seem difficult to believe that one has to "catch" the candles within their first half hour in order to say a *bracha* over seeing them. On the other hand, our *Gemara* didn't even mention the candles' still being *lit*; so it does seem that the Sages left it to us to understand when a candle is *considered* "a Chanukah candle".

The development of: **Se'if 4***"HANEIROS HALLALU"* ["THESE CANDLES"]

Right after the *bracha*, it says in *"Tractate Sofrim"*²⁷ (20:6):

Then one says [*hyphens join what's one word in Hebrew*]: *These "candles"*²⁸ [*"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-eight days-of Chanukah - these "candles"* [*"they" (Tur^o)*] *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"*].

[In *Tractate Sofrim* it says that after this, one says the *bracha* of *"shehecheyanu"* and then *"she'asah nissim"*, but we have already seen that the authorities put *"she'asah nissim"* before *"shehecheyanu"*, and the Tur says that *"HaNeiros Hallalu"* is after lighting.] The Rosh [and the *Hagahos Mordechai*^o (B.Y)] says the Maharam^o (of Rottenburg) followed this practice [of saying *"HaNeiros Hallalu"*] (and the Tur says that the Rosh himself did so as well).

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* rules: **After one has lit, he says: "These 'candles' we light over the salvations and over the miracles and over the wonders", etc.**

The *Magen Avraham*^o writes (in the name of the Maharshal^o): After one has lit the first candle [which is the basic obligation (*Mishnah Berurah* - see above 671:2)], he says *"HaNeiros [Hallalu]"* [and he finishes the lightings while saying it (*Mishnah Berurah*)]; and there should be thirty-six words besides the first two words - a hint to the number of candles (1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8=36) [as if to say: "These candles (are) thirty-six" (*Mishnah Berurah*)]. But after the *Mishnah Berurah* quotes this²⁹, he brings from the *Pri Megadim*^o that saying it after *all* of one's lighting is also just fine.

(In the *Sha'ar HaTziyun* he brings, that to get thirty-six words, one should not say "these candles - they are-holy." [This means one should skip the added "they" of the Tur. Based on the text above, even after we omit the other two "additions" of the Tur as well {i.e. "and-Hallel-praise" and "that-is-great"}, there are still thirty-nine words. I found two ways to shorten it by two more words: {1} by explaining that just like the words "these candles" at the *beginning* aren't part of the "count", similarly the repetition of those words in the *middle* doesn't count either, or {2}

²⁷ The Chida^o brings from the Ramban^o [and the *Me'iri*^o] that there are seven "minor tractates", and *"Tractate Sofrim"* is one of them. He brings from the Rosh^o that it's from [shortly] after the Gemara, and he himself defends that position by pointing out that *Amora'im* (even later ones) are brought in it.

²⁸ 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).

²⁹ The *Mishnah Berurah* also quotes the *Magen Avraham's* own addition, that the *eight* letters of the words *"haNeiros Hallalu"* hint to the *eight* days of Chanukah.

the *Sefardi* version - which ends with "over Your-miracles and-Your-wonders and-Your-salvation" without the two "over"s in between. Finally, to remove the one last word, instead of saying "which You performed" with *two* words {"*asher asisa*" } as in *Tractate Sofrim*, one could say it in *one* word {"*she'asisa*" } - which is indeed the more widespread version found in *siddurim*.)

Rav Moshe Shternbuch^o (*Teshuvos VeHanhagos* 1:394) on more about what to do right after lighting:

In a manuscript from the author of the *Chavos Ya'ir*, he writes that it's appropriate to stay by the candles to rejoice, and one should not light them and then go elsewhere. According to him, the most proper way to do the Mitzvah is to stay by the candles for a half hour [see above (672:2) that this is the standard amount of time that the candles are supposed to burn], and that's an excellent source for those who have the *minhag* to stay by the candles for some time, and to sing "*zemiros*" [i.e. songs to Hashem].

[This is also an appropriate place to quote the *Kitzur Shulchan Aruch*^o: "One should tell his household the story of the miracles which were performed for our forefathers in these days."]

The development of: **Se'if 5**

THE ORDER OF THE LIGHTING (WITH RESPECT TO HOW THE CANDLES STAND BY THE ENTRANCE)

The *Mordechai*^o (*Shabbos* 2:267) writes:

It says in Zevachim (62b): Any time you [have to] turn - it should only be toward³⁰ the right.

Therefore, when the Maharam^o (of Rottenburg) would light his "candles"³¹: He would begin [lighting] on the left side [i.e. with his left-most "candle"], and then turn toward the right side [i.e. finishing his lighting with the right-most "candle"].

The *Beis Yosef* brings that the *Maharik*^o expands on this as follows: If so, then one should use the right-most position of his "*menorah*" for the candle of the first night (and then add the position "one over to the left" for the second night, and so on). Why? Because "the added [candle] represents the miracle - since the *addition* of days added to the miracle," and the lighting begins after finishing the *brachos* [see above *se'if* 2] (one of which is the *bracha* of "the miracle" ["*she'asah nissim*"]). So this way, the lighter proceeds immediately from the *bracha* to "the candle of the miracle", because now *that* will always be the left-most one. (In contrast, if he used the *left-most* position on the first night {and added each night "one over to the right"}, then every night the *brachos* would be followed by lighting the original candle of the first night - since that one is on the left.)

³⁰ A more precise translation of the original might be: "in the way of the right."

³¹ 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).

Then, the *Beis Yosef* brings the analysis of the *Terumas HaDeshen*^o (106):

The Minhag of the people of Austria seems to contradict the Maharam and his Gemara: They begin on the right side [i.e. lighting the right-most candle first], and light in the direction that we Jews³² write [in Hebrew - from right to left].

My solution (1): It's possible that they consider this approach "turning toward the right" [i.e. the exact opposite of how the Maharam understands the Gemara - as explained further below].

My solution (2) (i.e. even if their approach is **not** considered "turning toward the right"): 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 light³³. [In order to make sense of what follows, we must understand that when they lit in those days **inside** the "winter house", they generally would arrange the candles along the wall that's adjacent to the doorway, and only the "first" candle was "right by the doorpost" - so the others were gradually getting farther and farther from the entrance.] If so, the Halacha is (in keeping with the first subject of 671:7 above) that they have to light on the right side of the "entrance" way [i.e. from the point of view of someone going **in**³⁴ (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 entrance³⁵. As a result, the candle which is opposite his right is always the closest to the entrance - and **that's** where he has to start from, for **that's** the main candle of the Mitzvah - for it would have been enough just to light that one (if he hadn't wanted to be one of the "enhancers" ["Mehadrin"] (see above 671:2)). The Maharam, on the other hand, **had** a mezuzah by his entrance, and consequently he had to light on the left side of the "entrance" way [i.e. the **right** side as he faces **out**], and therefore the "candle" closest to the entrance was always opposite his left [and that's why **he** started **there** (so according to **this** solution, the Austrians and the Maharam do **not** disagree)].

Now one might ask [challenging solution (2)]: If so, why does the Maharam need the Gemara's reason ("turning" toward the right)? The above reasoning should have been enough!

But one can answer: The practical effect of the Gemara's reason would be as follows: If the "candles" were arranged from the side of the entrance [sticking out in a line] toward the wall that's opposite the entrance (such as if the entrance were on the eastern side of the room - and the "candles" were arranged from east to west), then, because of the Gemara's reason ("turning" toward the right) - he needs to face **south** (and to start with the "candle" that's closest to the entrance - which is then on his **left**), not to face **north** (and start with that same "candle" - which would then be on his **right**).

To summarize: **The position of the Maharik** [and the most straightforward understanding of the *Mordechai*] is that "the candles are added to the *menorah*" from right to left - and each night's lighting proceeds from left to right. **The Terumas**

³² source's wording: "that we - the people of the covenant - write".

³³ See the *Darkei Moshe* quoted at the end of *siman* 671, that this was the universal (*Ashkenazi*) practice in that period.

³⁴ The *Terumas HaDeshen* uses the word "*k'nisah*" here to describe the entrance (unlike in the rest of the Halachos of Chanukah, where "*pesach*" is used - which literally means "opening"), to show he means the right side going *in*. He chose that point of view because the Gemara itself did [as brought above 671:7].

³⁵ Above (671:7), we see that this is the correct place for the candles; the *Terumas HaDeshen* (as mentioned over there) holds that this applies "even for 'us' who light indoors". (In the responsum, he cites the *Mordechai* as his source for this.)

HaDeshen's solution (1) holds that the lighting proceeds from right to left [which according to the *logic* of the Maharik should call for "adding the candles to the *menorah*" from left to right], and **the Terumas HaDeshen's solution (2)** holds that the lighting always starts with "the one candle which is within a *tefach* of the entrance" (so that the above two positions about "turning toward the right" are only relevant to someone deciding *on which side of the candles he will be standing* when he lights).

The *Beis Yosef* writes that he holds the Maharik is correct, and he ends by saying, "and this is likewise our *minhag*." The *Darkei Moshe's* conclusion is the same (as he brings that it's also the position of the Maharik^o).

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* rules: **One should begin lighting on the first night with the right-most "candle"; and on the second night, when he'll add one "candle" next to it, he should start with - and say the *bracha* over - the added one, which is the left-most, in order to "turn" to the right; and similarly on the third night, when he'll add another one next to the first two "candles", he should start with the added one - and with it he should start the *bracha*, and afterwards he'll "turn" toward the right; and the same goes for every night; [consequently] it comes out that one always says the *bracha* over the added one - which represents the miracle, since as the days increased - the miracle was increased.**

A number of the later authorities do not accept this decision:

The Gra rules like the *Terumas HaDeshen's* solution (2). (He argues as follows: How could it be that "a person should abandon the main Mitzvah - the *tefach* nearest to the entrance - because of 'turning toward the right'?" As for the Maharik's reason of joining the *bracha* to the "added candle", the *Gra* points out: "That's only [relevant] for the 'Mehadrin of the Mehadrin!'") On the other hand, **the Levush^o** rules like the *Terumas HaDeshen's* solution (1). (He argues that it's not for naught that we write [Hebrew] the way we do, and he says that the way a *kohen* walks around the top of the *mizbayach*^{*} {from the ramp at the south to the south-east corner, etc.} also shows that one always *starts off* in the direction of the right hand side of his own body, and he adds that this is also a person's nature.)

The Taz^o agrees with the Levush, and he responds to the argument of the *Gra* by pointing out that one can avoid the issue of "the nearest *tefach*" with the arrangement mentioned at the end of the *Terumas HaDeshen*³⁶, having the *menorah* "stick out" (so one can "contrive" his "turning to the right" by means of which side of his "*menorah*" he stands on, and he can still begin right by the entrance). (The *Bi'ur Halacha* explains that the *Shulchan Aruch himself* simply *rejects* the whole approach of going after the "closest to the entrance", but he writes that in practice, if someone wants to follow the *Shulchan Aruch's* position and *also* to act in a way that deals with the *Gra's* argument, he too could have his *menorah* "stick out" [similar to what the Taz just said]. In the *Mishnah Berurah*, too, he writes that it would be "good and pleasant" if one could accomplish this; however, he brings a *different* way

³⁶ The *Magen Avraham^o* says that the Maharshah^l proposed arranging the candles "lengthwise, like a spit, so they'll all be equal concerning 'the *tefach* nearest to the entrance'." (The Maharshah's *own* position for this *se'if* is brought soon.) The Taz, when responding to the *Gra's* argument, advocates arranging "like the Maharshah wrote" (the *Gra* rejects the idea out of hand), and seems to explain it as being identical to the arrangement at the end of the *Terumas HaDeshen*.

out, which is to arrange *all* the candles within the space of the entrance itself³⁷. He points out that someone who does that will have to be careful not to open the door and bring in the wind - which could blow out the candles [see below 680:1] - during the half hour that the candles have to burn [as discussed above 672:2].)

As for a Halachic ruling, the *Mishnah Berurah* adds to the *Shulchan Aruch* by bringing the *Gra's* position, and he does not choose between them (but rather writes that "whatever you do - you're covered"); and then he refers to the Taz whom he brings in the *Bi'ur Halacha* (where he writes that the Taz is also "not to be pushed aside" [more details on that soon]). Finally, in the *Bi'ur Halacha*, he writes that all this is merely a discussion of *the most proper* order, but there is no difference between the approaches as far as *the basic fulfilling of the Mitzvah* goes.

In the *Sha'ar HaTziyun*, he says that the Maharshah *himself* holds like the *Gra*. It's just that for someone who wants to be "particular", he proposed setting up the *menorah* "lengthwise", as the *Magen Avraham* and the Taz bring.³⁸ In addition, after the Taz brings that Maharshah, he adds *another* way out (in case the former isn't possible): "He should arrange them against the wall in a line - from the right side of the entrance [from the point of view of someone *inside*, which is the *left* side of the "entrance" way from the point of view of someone *outside* - i.e. he's talking about where on the *right* side there was a *mezuzah* (*Bi'ur Halacha*)], and even though the other candles that he'll add will not all be in the *tefach* nearest to the entrance - there's no concern in that, since the *first* candle [i.e. that of the first night] is in that *tefach* - [that's] enough; and every night he should start [lighting] with the added one - that's [on] the right - which is [the side that naturally stands] prepared before a person, and he should light afterwards [all the way] until the candle which is next to the entrance³⁹." (The *Bi'ur Halacha* only brings this way out⁴⁰.)

Then, the Taz points out that in order to avoid "bypassing a Mitzvah" [see "Principles"], *only* the first candle (which he'll be starting with) should be at the lighter's right. (From the *Bi'ur Halacha* and *Mishnah Berurah*, we see that this is done by choosing where to stand.) The *Mishnah Berurah* writes that one should be careful about this issue according to *all* the approaches.

Turning back to the *Gra*, is there *any* application of "turning toward the right" that he would apply in the case of Chanukah candles? After all, in general, he holds that one has to start with the candle closest to the entrance, and from there one will have to proceed naturally, so as not to "bypass a Mitzvah"! However, if someone has his *menorah* "sticking out" (so he can stand on either side), or if he's not lighting by an entrance at all (which is the next subject), we *will* need to know how he understands "turning toward the right" - like the Maharam or like the Levush? In fact, the *Mishnah Berurah* implies that someone who wants to follow the *Gra* will choose the Maharam's explanation. [Perhaps that's because the only early authority behind the Levush is the *Terumas HaDeshen's* solution (1), and the *Terumas HaDeshen* himself only said it to explain the Austrian *minhag*, so since the *Gra* accepts solution (2) as the explanation of the Austrian *minhag* - consequently there is no more basis for saying differently than the Maharam.]

³⁷ In the *Sha'ar HaTziyun*, he says that his source said this in the name of the Maharshah, which would seem to indicate that *he* understands *this* way from those same words of the Maharshah (brought in the footnote above).

³⁸ See the above footnotes.

³⁹ This is the corrected version of the Taz. (Some printings read "next to the wall", which does not fit.)

⁴⁰ Perhaps he understands that the *Gra* totally rejects the "sticking out" arrangement [explained above].

[*We can ask*: How should all the above be applied for someone lighting outdoors? And what about someone who is left-handed?]

WHAT ABOUT WHEN SOMEONE ISN'T LIGHTING BY AN ENTRANCE AT ALL?

The *Mishnah Berurah* works it out: According to the *Shulchan Aruch*, the system is the same (since he always "ignored" the entrance), and according to the *Gra*, whichever candle was lit on the first night will come first [the *Gra* indicates that he considers *that* to be the "main Mitzvah"⁴¹], so that should be in the left-most position of one's "*menorah*" [in order to fulfill "turning toward the right" (*Sha'ar HaTziyun*)]. (Furthermore, the *Mishnah Berurah* says this is also true for someone lighting "within the space of the entrance itself", and apparently that he means to say that the candles are *all* in the "nearest *tefach*".) In the *Sha'ar HaTziyun* (n21), he explains that according to the above, in the synagogue, where the candles are added to the "*menorah*" from east to west [as explained in "more about positioning for the synagogue lighting" in 671:7 above] - so one should stand *south* of the "*menorah*" facing *north* according to the *Shulchan Aruch* (so that everything will work out as was just mentioned), and *north* of it facing *south* according to the *Gra*.

The Taz writes that in the synagogue, "he should always start with the added candle." Now, since his position is that one does the *lighting* from right to left, he must mean here that one adds the candles to the synagogue "*menorah*" from left to right. And he writes this right after saying that the candles have to be arranged from east to west. This seems difficult: The lighter could stand south of the "*menorah*" - facing north, so the east will be to his right, which means adding the candles from right to left, and then in order to light from right to left he'll be starting with "the first night's candle" and *not* with the extra one! This could prove that the Taz holds like the Maharik and the *Shulchan Aruch*, that the best candle to be lit right after the *bracha* is the *added* one (unlike the *Gra* who holds it's the *original first one* as mentioned above). If so, this would explain why the *Bi'ur Halacha* says that according to the Taz, in *any* case where one lights "not by an entrance" (like in a window or "within the space of the entrance itself"), one adds the candles into his "*menorah*" from left to right [so everything is done in *the exact mirror image* of the *Shulchan Aruch's* system].

⁴¹ As opposed to the Maharik, who emphasized lighting the "added candle" first because it represents the "extra day to the miracle" which the *bracha* of "the miracle" [*she'asah nissim*] relates to.