

O.C. *siman* 681 : Using Chanukah Candles for Havdalah (and the Order)**The development of: *Se'if* 1**

USING A CHANUKAH CANDLE FOR HAVDALAH

The *Ohr Zarua*¹ quotes the following in the name of the *Yerushalmi*¹:

R' Abuha said²: One may not say the bracha by havdalah over a "candle"³ - or over fragrant spices - of a Mitzvah.

What is he referring to as "of a Mitzvah"? R' 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 four species⁴ on Sukkos; on the departure of the Shabbos, one does not say the bracha by havdalah over it. After all, Rabbah said: It's assur to smell a willow of the Mitzvah [since it was set aside for the Mitzvah (*Rashi to Sukkah 37b*)].

[A **parallel point** seems clearly to have been left as understood - the fact that by a Chanukah "candle", too, it's assur to "make use" of it (see above 673:1). In addition, the Tur and Avudraham emphasize that the reason that this makes it unusable as a havdalah candle is that a havdalah candle must be "used" in order for the bracha to be said (*Brachos 51b* {see the *Halachos of Shabbos* - O.C. 298:4}).]

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* rules⁵: **On the departure of the Shabbos, one may not use the Chanukah "candle" for havdalah; because one may not derive benefit from its light, and one cannot say the bracha over the "candle" [by havdalah] unless one "uses" its light.**

The *Mishnah Berurah* writes that actually, this is only true when following the *minhag* to do the Mitzvah of Chanukah candle-lighting before *havdalah* [see the next *se'if*]. In that case, when one gets to *havdalah*, the candle is already *assur* as a Chanukah candle. But there's nothing wrong with using the same candle for both Mitzvahs in the *reverse* order, as follows: One would first use the candle for *havdalah*, then put it out, and then re-light it for the Chanukah Mitzvah. In fact (concludes the M.B), using the same candle for both would then be the *best* thing to do, for "once one Mitzvah has been done with it - let another Mitzvah [also] be done with it" (*Shabbos 117b*).

¹ The Tur^o (here) and the Avudraham^o also cite such a *Yerushalmi* (briefly). The *Ohr Zarua* says it's in the eighth chapter of *Brachos*. It does not seem to appear in our text of the *Yerushalmi* at all.

² source's wording: "R' Abuha in the name of R' Yochanan, [and] R' Yose bar R' Chanina, [said:]".

³ 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).

⁴ source's wording: "of the '*hoshana*'."

⁵ His words are in fact none other than the words of the Tur in the name of the *Yerushalmi*.

[This is surprising, since the Gemara explicitly says [*Pesachim* 8a, 103b] and the *Shulchan Aruch* likewise rules [in the Halachos of Shabbos (O.C. 298:2)] that the choicest way to do the Mitzvah (of the *bracha* by *havdalah*) is with a torch-like flame (which means at least two wicks together {*Rema* & *Mishnah Berurah* *ibid.*}, which a Chanukah candle cannot be {see above 671:4})! Perhaps we can explain that the *Mishnah Berurah* is only referring to someone whose "torch" is none other than "holding the wicks of two candles together" (so he could then light them *separately* as Chanukah candles), or a case where a torch-like flame was unavailable regardless.]

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

IS IT MORE IMPORTANT TO PUT THE "TADIR" FIRST, OR TO DELAY "ESCORTING THE DAY OUT"?

[an introduction to the main subject of our se'if (which follows afterwards)]

The Gemara (*Brachos* 51b⁵) [with Rashi]:

The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa⁶: *Beis Shammai say: One who is saying kiddush [on Shabbos or Yom Tov*] says the bracha over the day [i.e. "Who sanctifies" etc.] first, and then afterwards says the bracha over the wine. [Two proofs:] (1) It is the day that causes [this instance of using] the wine to arrive; (2) At a point when "the day became holy" already [i.e. when he accepted the day upon himself or "when the stars come out"] - the wine had not yet arrived [i.e. and just as the day arrives first - so too its bracha should come first].* **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] enables⁷ the kiddush to be said. An additional 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.⁸ And the Halacha [concludes the Baraisa] is like the position of Beis Hillel.*

The Gemara clarifies: *What is the need for "an additional point"? [The answer is that the Baraisa means to continue by saying:] If someone will argue: "But when Beis Shammai argued in favor of the bracha over the day coming first - two proofs were found, and when you argued 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," etc.*

Later [52a], the Gemara asks: *Is it really true that Beis Shammai hold that the bracha over the day is more important? Wasn't it taught in a Baraisa: When someone 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! [Shouldn't the bracha of havdalah come first, if Beis Shammai hold that the bracha pertaining to the day always does?]*

⁶ This Baraisa elaborates on the subject of the Mishnah's list of "matters [of disagreement] between *Beis Shammai* and *Beis Hillel* concerning a meal."

⁷ source's wording: "causes". [Rashi *interprets* it to mean "enables".]

⁸ As we derive (*Zevachim* 89a) from what the Torah says about the "*Tamid*" offering (Rashi).

[Naturally, the Gemara counters: "On what basis do you conclude that this last Baraisa is from the teachings of Beis Shammai?" However, the Gemara does proceed to prove "that it is indeed from the teachings of Beis Shammai (and according to the particular version of R' Yehudah)". So now we disregard this last counter-argument, and it is a difficulty!]

*So the Gemara answers: Beis Shammai hold that "bringing the day in" [i.e. kiddush] is different from "escorting the day out" [i.e. havdalah], as follows: when it comes to "bringing the day in", the more we advance it - the better; whereas when it comes to "escorting the day out", the more we **delay** it - the better, so that it shouldn't be like a burden upon us.*

The principle of "*tadir*" [that the more "frequent" Mitzvah should be done first], and the principle of delaying "escorting the day out", are both mentioned here. Can we also infer which of the two principles is the more important one?

The *Gra* says that we can see it from the position of *Beis Shammai*. *Beis Shammai* say that the *bracha* pertaining to the day comes first, even if this causes the *bracha* over the wine - which is "*tadir*" - not to be first. In effect, they are saying that the importance of the *bracha* pertaining to the day outweighs that of the "*tadir*" being first. Nevertheless, they say that *havdalah*, which is a *bracha* pertaining to the day, is *last*, because we have to delay "escorting the day out". It follows that if "delaying escorting out" outweighs "*brachos* of the day" which outweighs "*tadir*", then **"delaying escorting out" must outweigh "tadir"**. [Of course, *Beis Shammai*'s high value for "*brachos* of the day" is disputed by *Beis Hillel*, but we have no reason to think that they disagree about the relative values of "*tadir*" and "delaying escorting out".]

The Taz^o disagrees, and says that we should be learning from *Beis Hillel*, which will prove the opposite! For when *Beis Hillel* say that the *bracha* over the wine comes first because it's "*tadir*", they are actually saying that this outweighs "bringing the day in" earlier, since *that* would have been accomplished if the *bracha* pertaining to the day would have been first! The Taz then states that making "bringing the day in" *earlier* should be *at least* as important as *delaying* "escorting the day out", so if *Beis Hillel* say "*tadir*" outweighs "bringing the day in" earlier, that also tells us that **"tadir" outweighs "delaying escorting out"!**

The *Gra* says that the Taz's reasoning can be refuted by a detail from the Halachos of Pesach (O.C. 489:9), where we find the following discussion: When it's necessary to include "counting the *omer*" [see "Principles"] in a Friday night *Ma'ariv* in the synagogue [or the eve of a *Yom Tov*^{*}, such as the second night of Pesach], the *kiddush* in the synagogue is said *before* "counting the *omer*", in order to make "bringing the day in" earlier. In addition, on the departure of Shabbos [or of the last day of Pesach], the *havdalah* in the synagogue is said *after* counting, in order to delay "escorting the day out".⁹ Now, what if the last day of Pesach falls on a Sunday, so that "the eve of the last day of Pesach" is *also* "the departure of the Shabbos"? We have learned [*Pesachim* 103b, O.C. 473:1] that on such nights, the *kiddush* and *havdalah* are joined under one cup of wine, so when should we count? Should we count *before* the *kiddush/havdalah*, in order to delay the "escorting out" of Shabbos, or *afterwards*, in order to make the "coming in" of *Yom Tov* earlier? Well, the *Shulchan Aruch* there codifies the ruling of the *Terumas HaDeshen*^o, that we *count*

⁹ This point actually relates to our subject itself, since *havdalah* is more "*tadir*" than counting the *omer*. However, the *Gra*'s point does not depend on this, but rather only on the *third* case (where "bringing in" and "escorting out" conflict), as will become clear.

first [because we can see from a Rashbam^o in *Pesachim* that "delaying escorting out" is more essential]. *So it's not true* that making "bringing the day in" earlier is as important as delaying "escorting the day out" (as the Taz claimed), and it could easily be that even though *Beis Hillel* value "*tadir*" over "making the bringing in earlier", but they *might* say "*tadir*" is *less* than "delaying escorting out"! So again, it makes sense to rely on the above proof that at least *Beis Shammai* value "*tadir*" less than "delaying escorting out", since we have no proof that *Beis Hillel* dispute them on that point.

WHETHER LIGHTING THE CHANUKAH CANDLE OR SAYING *HAVDALAH* IS THE ONE TO DO FIRST

The *Beis Yosef*, who is referring to the *havdalah* and Chanukah-lighting of the synagogue [see above 671:7], brings from the Avudraham^o that "some have the *minhag*" to say *havdalah* first [because it's more "*tadir*" (*Mishnah Berurah* - see above)]. However, he also brings the *Terumas HaDeshen*^o, who says that the Chanukah lighting is first, in order to delay "escorting the day out" [and also (because) there is "publicizing of the miracle" in the lighting (*Mishnah Berurah*)]; and the *Darkei Moshe* brings likewise from the Maharil^o, the Agur^o, and the *Kol Bo*^o, and concludes by saying that this is in fact the *minhag*.

The *Shulchan Aruch* rules like the *Terumas HaDeshen*: **The Chanukah "candle"¹⁰ is lit in the synagogue before *havdalah*.** The *Rema* adds: **And all the more so - that in one's home one lights and afterwards says *havdalah*; for after all, he already "was *mavdil*" [i.e. did the Mitzvah of *havdalah*] in the synagogue.**

This *Rema* needs further discussion:

The *Mishnah Berurah* points out that the *Rema* cannot literally mean that he already was *yotzei* the Mitzvah, because we are certainly not referring to someone who had in mind to be *yotzei* with the *havdalah* of the "*chazzan*"^{*!} [After all, if he *did* have that in mind, then why would he be saying *havdalah* in his home at all?] Rather, he explains it to mean that he *heard* the *havdalah* (but he admits that the *Rema's* words are still seriously unclear).

Then, the *Mishnah Berurah* brings the position of the Taz, who (along with other later authorities) rejects the position of the *Shulchan Aruch* and *Rema* even about the synagogue itself, and holds instead like the *minhag* mentioned by the Avudraham, to say *havdalah* first. He refers to the *Bi'ur Halacha*, where he explains that the disagreement is found in a few earlier authorities as well, and that the *Gra* (along with other later authorities) *does* accept the position of the *Shulchan Aruch* and *Rema* (i.e. the *Terumas HaDeshen*). [One major proof of the Taz has been brought as the previous subject, along with how the *Gra* refutes it and proves the opposite from the same source.]

Therefore, the conclusion in the *Mishnah Berurah* [based on the conclusion of a number of later authorities (*Bi'ur Halacha*)] is that in the synagogue - the ancient *minhag* should be kept (to light [and say "*v'yiten lecha*"¹¹ (*Mishnah Berurah*)] before *havdalah*¹²); but as for at home, the Halacha is that "whatever you do - you're covered."

¹⁰ 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).

The *Kitzur Shulchan Aruch*^o (139:18) and the *Aruch HaShulchan*^o say "the *minhag*" is that in one's home, the Chanukah candles are lit *after* Havdalah¹³ (in contrast to the *Mishnah Berurah*, who gave no preference).

Regarding *for what time of night we should schedule* all these components of "ending Shabbos" (Ma'ariv, Havdalah, and Chanukah candles): The *Luach Eretz Yisrael*^f says not to schedule them "as late as we do at the departure of Shabbos in other weeks," based on the position of the *Gra*.¹⁴ On the other hand, Rav Moshe Feinstein^o [*Igros Moshe* O.C. 4:62] says that it's not *muttar* to light candles on the departure of Shabbos Chanukah any earlier than it is any other week. (He adds that if someone waits until seventy-two minutes after the sun's disappearance every week, he too should do the same on Chanukah.¹⁵) In other words, he holds that here one *cannot* follow the position of the *Gra*.¹⁶

[Note: In any case, it *would* seem reasonable to delay "*v'yiten lecha*" until everyone gets home and lights (as opposed to the above quoted *Mishnah Berurah*, who wrote that it is said before the synagogue *havdalah*), since this would not entail any deviation from the *Halachos* of the departure of Shabbos.]

¹¹ The *pesukim*^{*} about Heavenly blessing which it's the *minhag* to say on the departure of Shabbos (O.C. 295:1). According to the Avudraham, that the lighting is before *havdalah*, "*yiftach Hashem*" [his version of the set of *pesukim*] is said after *both*.

¹² The *Mishnah Berurah* also points out that if the person doing the actual lighting has not in practice said the *havdalah* of the *Shemoneh Esray* (i.e. "*Atah Chonantanu*"), than he of course has to say "*Baruch hamavdil bein kodesh lechol*" before he can do the *melacha*^{*} of lighting a fire [as set forth above in the Halachos of Shabbos (299:10)].

¹³ The *Aruch HaShulchan* brings another reason for this: *Havdalah* includes the *bracha* said over the use of fire, so how can one use fire *before* saying that *bracha*?

¹⁴ The *Luach* cites the collection "*Ma'aseh Rav*". This seems clearly to be based on the *Gra's* position that "*bein haShmashos*" [the intermediate twilight period - see "Principles"] starts when the sun disappears (i.e. *earlier* than the disagreeing authorities hold it is).

¹⁵ "Seventy-two minutes after the sun's disappearance" is the standard interpretation of the position of *Rabbeinu Tam*^o on how to calculate "when the stars come out" (based on his interpretation of "*bein haShmashos*") [see above 671:1 and "Principles"]. We should point out that R. Moshe Feinstein's "earlier time" for doing *melacha*^{*} on the departure of Shabbos (fifty minutes) is *also* based on *Rabbeinu Tam* (but that's beyond the scope of this volume).

¹⁶ R. Moshe Feinstein explains (based on *Pesachim* 51a) that one cannot follow the *Gra* when that means being *lenient* [since his position is not the one which the majority of authorities have accepted], unless one was a student of the *Gra personally*.