

O.C. *siman* 684 : The Order of the Torah Reading on Chanukah

The development of: Se'if 1

THE TORAH READING OF CHANUKAH ON WEEKDAYS (GENERAL GUIDELINES)

The Mishnah (*Megillah* 30b³):

[For the Torah reading] on Chanukah, we read from the section [in the parsha of "Naso" (Tur^o)] describing the offerings of the princes of the tribes. [For that was a "dedication of the altar", and in the time of the Chanukah miracle as well there was a "dedication of the altar" (Rashi).]

The Tur^o clarifies the reason for the choice of that section, by referring to the Midrash which said that "the work of the Mishkan^{*} was finished on the twenty-fifth of Kislev" [quoted in full above (670:2)]. He also writes that the reading consists of three *aliyahs*. [The fact that this is true of Chanukah (and of Purim, i.e. any day when there is no *Mussaf* service) is not stated explicitly, but can be deduced from the Mishnah in *Megillah* (21a),¹ and from the Gemara (ibid. 22a).²] (The *Mishnah Berurah* mentions that the Torah reading is followed by "half-Kaddish".)

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* starts the *se'if* by ruling: **We read from [the section on] the offerings of the princes, which is in the parsha of "Naso"**.

The remaining parts of the *se'if*, which include more precise guidelines, follow the coming subjects. To understand the details, let's note the structure of the *pesukim*^{*} in the entire section which is to be discussed:

- (1) Before "the princes", there is a section on the *bracha* given by *kohanim* (*Bamidbar* 6:22-27).
- (2) Then, the offerings of the princes are introduced (ibid. 7:1-11).
- (3) Next are the twelve identical descriptions of the princes' daily offerings (ibid. 7:12-83).
- (4) "*Naso*" concludes with a summary of the above, and one transitional *pasuk* (ibid. 7:84-89).
- (5) The next *parsha*, "*Beha'alo-secha*", begins with a section on the Menorah (ibid. 8:1-4).

¹ It states there (translated loosely): "On Monday, on Thursday, and at *Mincha* on Shabbos, we read with three *aliyahs* - no less and no more, etc. [Other kinds of days (and their *aliyah* amounts) are then listed, and the Mishnah concludes:] This is the rule: On any day which has a *Mussaf* service but is not a *Yom Tov*^{*} - we read with four *aliyahs*; on a *Yom Tov* - five; on *Yom Kippur* - six; on Shabbos (morning) - seven." This implies that *any time* there isn't even a *Mussaf* service - we read with three *aliyahs* (just like Monday and Thursday).

² It's pointed out there that on fast days the "*Aneinu*" supplement is said, and the question is asked whether this has a significance for those days similar to having a *Mussaf* service; and the Gemara clearly assumes as obvious that if it's *not* like having a *Mussaf* service, then we read with only three *aliyahs*.

[Note: In the Shulchan Aruch's order for the se'if, the following subject comes **after** the one we will discuss afterwards.]

THE BASIC SYSTEM OF THE DAILY READING (I.E. FOR DAYS TWO THROUGH SEVEN, WHEN IT IS A WEEKDAY)

As will quickly become clear, the "essential" reading of each day is the mini-section describing the offerings of one prince, whose "day number" (which the Torah states at the start of each mini-section) corresponds to what number day of Chanukah it is. This results in a complication: Any single Torah reading must always consist of at least *ten pesukim*^{*}, and the above mini-sections each contain exactly *six pesukim*. Now, on the first and eighth days, this could be irrelevant, if it's deemed appropriate for the first day's reading to start *before* its own mini-section, and/or for the eighth day's reading to extend *past* its own mini-section. Still, at least on days two through seven, we need to know whether it's appropriate to include in the reading *the mini-section which corresponds to a different day of Chanukah*.

The instructions in "*Tractate Sofrim*" [see note to 676:4] (20:11) are as follows:

On the eight days of Chanukah, we "read in advance"³, which means that we read [the mini-section that begins] "*On the second day*" - even at the reading of the **first** day, and we read "*On the third day*" even on the **second** day; and similarly with "*On the fourth day*", "*On the fifth day*", "*On the sixth day*", "*On the seventh day*", and "*On the eighth day*". In this manner, we complete the required amount of *ten pesukim*^{*} [per Torah reading].

On the other hand, the Tur^o here writes:

On the second day, the kohen reads from "*On the second day*" until [and not including] "*One bull - a child of the cattle*" [i.e. exactly three *pesukim*], and the levi reads from there until [and not including] "*On the third day*" [i.e. exactly three more *pesukim*], and the ordinary "*yisrael*" goes back and reads again - from "*On the second day*". And on each [subsequent] day, we [continue to] do likewise.

The *Gra* points out that there is a similar disagreement in the Halachos of Sukkos (O.C. 663:1) [note that in the Tur and *Shulchan Aruch*, that precedes our discussion in the Halachos of Chanukah]. The Torah reading for the *Chol HaMo'ed* days of Sukkos is as follows: Each day, we have to read the *pesukim* about the *Mussaf* offering for that day of Sukkos. However, in the *pesukim* about each day, there are only enough for one *aliyah*. Now, in the Diaspora, each day of *Chol HaMo'ed* is considered to be "in doubt" as to whether it's really the day of Sukkos that the calendar says it is - or in fact it's one day within Sukkos *earlier*. As a result, we can definitely read the *pesukim* of two days' worth of *Mussaf* offerings, which is enough for two *aliyahs*. We can also concoct a third *aliyah* which is not identical to any other, i.e. by reading the *pesukim* of *both* of the appropriate two days *together*. Still, on *Chol HaMo'ed*, we read *four aliyahts*! Addressing this, the Tur and the *Shulchan Aruch* over there rule like the position of the Rif^o and the Rosh^o, that for the missing *aliyah* we read the set of *pesukim* of one of the two relevant days - the first, to be specific - even though that's an exact repetition of the first *aliyah*. On the other hand, the *Rema* writes that "our [*Ashkenazi*]

³ There is actually a version of the text which reads: "we do not '[read in] advance'." However, by preferring the other version, the position that we do "read in advance" (i.e. in contrast with the Tur quoted below) is depicted more clearly.

minhag" is like the position of Rashi, that for the missing *aliyah* we read the *pesukim* of the *next* day's offerings, even though it's not really appropriate for the current day of *Chol HaMo'ed*.

We already realize that the Tur here is consistent with his ruling there (to choose "repeating" over "straying"). The *Gra* says that both sides of the disagreement choose the same approach here as they did there. Sure enough, the *Darkei Moshe* here (concerning Chanukah) says "the [Ashkenazi] *minhag*" is that the [ordinary] "*yisrael*" reads the mini-section of the *next* day's prince [i.e. "reading in advance" like "*Tractate Sofrim*" said⁴].

Accordingly, the S.A picks up [again, note that this piece of the *se'if* is being quoted out of order], agreeing again with the Tur: **On the second day, the *kohen* reads "On the second day" - until "one bull - a child of the cattle", and the *levi* - until "On the third day", and the [ordinary] "*yisrael*" goes back and reads [again] "On the second day", and [the readings continue] with this pattern, for each [subsequent] day.** Predictably, the *Rema* inserts: **[However,] some hold that the [ordinary] "*yisrael*" reads from [the mini-section of] the day afterwards, i.e. "On the third day", and so on for each [subsequent] day; and that is [indeed] "the [Ashkenazi] *minhag*."**

The *Mishnah Berurah* writes that if the *pesukim* of the wrong day were read, then "after the fact" that's good enough (i.e. reading from the correct day is not *crucial*). [The *Sha'ar HaTziyun* cites the source for this as the Chida^o, who is a *Sefardi* authority, and as such is referring *even* to the approach of the *Shulchan Aruch* (as is the *Sefardi* practice), which is to *strongly avoid* straying from the correct day's mini-section. Naturally, all the *more* so, it's obvious that the *Mishnah Berurah* can apply it for *Ashkenazim* as well.]

The *Gra* concludes by pointing out that the Tosefta seems to support the approach of the Tur and the *Shulchan Aruch*. A few authorities suggest that this is why the *minhag* in the Land of Israel is to follow that approach (i.e. even among *Ashkenazim*); i.e. because the tradition of the *Ashkenazim* in the land of Israel, in the majority of cases, is to follow the positions of the *Gra*.

As for the Halacha of the Chida (that "after the fact" even "the wrong day" is okay), Rav Yaakov Chaim Sofer^o [*Kaf HaChayim* n8] brings a disagreement about whether he's only referring to a case where the *Sefer Torah* was already returned to the *Aron HaKodesh*^o, and not when it's still on the *bimah*^o. (He also brings that if a synagogue "missed" some day's reading [as in the Chida's case], they do not "make it up" the next day.)

[Remember that in the *Shulchan Aruch*'s order, the following subject comes **before** the one we just discussed.]

THE FIRST DAY'S READING (AND ITS ORDER WHEN THAT'S A WEEKDAY)

The logical starting point here is the Tur^o:

***The first thing we read for Chanukah is the starting pasuk*^{*} (*Bamidbar* 7:1): "And it was - on the day when Moshe completed", etc. [On the other hand,] there are some places where they begin with the *bracha* given by the *kohanim* (*ibid.* 6:22-27); and that's a fine *minhag*, because the miracle was performed**

⁴ The *Darkei Moshe* here calls this the position of the *Hagahos Maimonios*^o. For the parallel decision in the Halachos of Sukkos, the *Darkei Moshe* there cited the *Maharil*^o.

through kohanim. And the order is as follows: On the first day, one begins with the pasuk of "the day when Moshe completed", and the introductory pesukim (i.e. from that point on) are read with the kohen and levi, and the [ordinary] "yisrael" reads the pasuk of "on the first day" (ibid. 7:12) [i.e. and proceeds to complete the day's mini-section].

Concerning **where exactly to start**, the Rambam writes that it's with the *bracha* of the *kohanim* (as opposed to the above Tur, which clearly favors leaving that out and starting with the introduction, i.e. "on the day when Moshe completed"). As for **how to divide the day's reading into three**, the *Darkei Moshe*⁵ goes along with the basic approach of the above Tur (assigning the day's mini-section to the [ordinary] "yisrael"), and clarifies that the *kohen* reads only until "before the *Mishkan*"* (i.e. the end of *Bamidbar* 7:3), and the *levi* reads the rest of the introduction. (A *minhag* contrary to the Tur's basic approach is brought in the *Rema* [as quoted soon].)

The *Shulchan Aruch* picks up [again, note that the previously quoted piece of the *se'if* was out of order], first ruling like the Rambam about "starting": **And we begin with the *bracha* of the *kohanim***. The *Rema* inserts: **[However,] some hold that we begin [with] "on the day that Moshe completed," and that's our [Ashkenazi] minhag**. The *Shulchan Aruch* continues ("dividing" like the Tur): **And one reads "this" [i.e. all the *pesukim* until the end of the "introduction"] for the *kohen* and *levi*, and the [ordinary] "yisrael" reads "on the first day"**. The *Rema* inserts: **[However,] some hold that the *kohen* reads the entire [introductory] "*parsha*" - until [just before the *pasuk*] "on the first day", and the *levi* and the [ordinary] "yisrael" read "on the first day" [etc.], and that's "the [Ashkenazi] minhag"**.

The *Mishnah Berurah* implies that the two above ways of "dividing" are *equally* valid. On the other hand, he writes that a *minhag* for the *kohen* to read *only* the *bracha* of the *kohanim* is an improper *minhag* (and must be abandoned), because all three *aliyahs* need to include "the material of the day" (i.e. the general section on the offerings of the princes).

THE EIGHTH DAY'S READING (AND ITS ORDER WHEN THAT'S A WEEKDAY)

Just as in the previous subject, there are two issues here: exactly where to end, and how "divide" into three.

The Rambam says **the reading ends** at the end of the *parsha* (of "*Naso*"). This means that after the day's mini-section, we will also read the mini-sections of princes nine through twelve, and the summary of all the offerings (along with the one "transitional" *pasuk** at the end of the *parsha*). The Tur^o writes "anonymously" exactly that; and then he adds that "there are some places" where they read all the way through the first mini-section of "*Beha'alo-secha*", "in order to complete [the reading] of Chanukah with 'the order of the candles' [in the Menorah],"

⁵ Our text of the *Darkei Moshe* cites the *Sefer HaMinhagim*^o as saying this. However, that source actually sets forth the *minhag* written in the *Rema* [quoted soon]. The *minhag* described by the *Darkei Moshe* can be found in *glosses* to the *Sefer HaMinhagim* (citing the *Ohr Zarua*^o); it has been suggested that the text of the *Darkei Moshe* be emended accordingly.

and he says that this too is "a fine *minhag*". This *minhag* is also what it says to do in "*Tractate Sofrim*" [see note to 676:4], and the *Gra* brings a basis for saying there's an even deeper relevance.

That source is what the Midrash says about these very *pesukim* (*Tanchuma*⁶ *Beha'alo-secha* 5):

[Aharon, the prince of the tribe of Levi, had not offered anything together with the princes of the other twelve tribes.] So Aharon lamented, "Woe is to me, for perhaps because of my sins - the tribe of Levi is not accepted by HaKadosh Baruch Hu!"*

So HaKadosh Baruch Hu said to Moshe: "Go and say to Aharon: Do not be afraid - you are designated for something greater than this!" And thus it is written (Bamidbar 8:2): "Speak to Aharon and say to him: When [the time comes] - you 'raise up' [and light the 'candles'⁷ of the Menorah]!"

For HaKadosh Baruch Hu was telling Aharon: When it comes to the offerings (which the other princes just initiated) - they will only be practiced while the Beis HaMikdash still stands. But as for "the candles" - they shall shine⁸ forever! ["And what 'candles' could He be saying would outlast the Beis HaMikdash and its offerings, if not those of Chanukah, which came about through Aharon's descendants the kohanim?" (Ramban, beginning of "Beha'alo-secha").]

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* ends the *se'if* (ruling like the *minhag* from the Tur): **On the eighth day, we begin [with] "On the eighth day", and we complete the entire *parsha*, and we [also] read the first "*parsha*" [i.e. mini-section] of "*Beha'alo-secha*".** The *Rema* adds: **And "the *minhag*" is to conclude: "so he made the Menorah."** [This *Rema* seems very strange, since the *Shulchan Aruch* already ruled like that position.]

As for **how to "divide"** the reading into three, the *Darkei Moshe* brings from the *Sefer HaMinhagim*⁹ that the *kohen* and *levi* share the day's mini-section as usual, and the [ordinary] "*yisrael*" reads the rest⁹. This is also what the *Mishnah Berurah* writes.

However, *we can ask*: Does that "division" fit with the *Shulchan Aruch's* approach of "repeating rather than straying" discussed above? Perhaps the *Shulchan Aruch* [and consequently *Sefardim*] would insist that the [ordinary] "*yisrael*" must *also* read from "that day's material" (just that *he* would then *continue* until the end of the reading)!

⁶ The *Gra* cites the "*Pesikta*" (apparently an obscure one). Our *Tanchuma* is cited by the Ramban (at the beginning of the *parsha*), and his explanation of *that* seems to match the *Gra's intent*, in any case.

⁷ 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).

⁸ source's wording: "*forever* 'in the direction of the "face" of the Menorah' [they shall shine]." The focus of the quoting of a *pasuk* in the Midrash is often what it says immediately *after* the part of the *pasuk* which is explicitly quoted; in this case, the word "*ya'iru*" - "they shall shine".

⁹ A gloss to the Mahari^l points out that on *this* day, the *levi* could have received an "entire day" of his own (i.e. that of the ninth prince), but the correct choice is for us to have the *aliyah* honorees [i.e. as many of them as possible] reading from "the day's obligation".

The development of: *Se'if 2*

THE TORAH READING OF SHABBOS CHANUKAH

Most holidays which fall on Shabbos entirely displace the weekly *parsha*. However, from the Gemara about "the Torah reading when *Rosh Chodesh Teiveis* is on Shabbos" [in the next *se'if*], we will see that this is not true about *Rosh Chodesh* or Chanukah, but rather - each of the two calls for taking out an extra *Sefer Torah*, from which to read the day's material.

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* writes [as did the Tur^o]: **On the Shabbos which is within Chanukah, we take out "two scrolls" [i.e. two *Sifrei Torah*]; from the first, the *parsha* of the week is read; and from the second, [the material] for Chanukah is read.** [The remaining parts of the *se'if* follow the next two subjects.]

The *Mishnah Berurah* explains that as usual, the weekly *parsha* is divided into the main seven *aliyahs* of Shabbos (at least), after which "half-Kaddish" is said. He adds that the Chanukah reading [which is of course "*maftir*"] is reduced to being just the mini-section of that day's prince (and this is a general rule for whenever Chanukah *shares* the Torah reading), but on the *first* day of Chanukah - we start with the "introductory" *pesukim*^{*} [i.e. *Bamidbar* 7:1-11] first.

THE "*HAFTARAH*" OF THE *SHABBOSIM* OF CHANUKAH

The Gemara (*Megillah* 31a⁴):

[When it comes time for the "*haftarah*" (i.e. on the Shabbos of Chanukah)],¹⁰ we read a passage called "the 'candles'¹¹ of Zechariah" [because of the *pasuk*^{*} which it contains: "I saw, and behold - an entirely golden candelabra {'menorah'}" (*Mishnah Berurah*)].

And if two Shabbosim fall out on Chanukah: On the first one, we read the passage called "the 'candles' of Zechariah"; and on the latter one, a passage called "the candles of Shlomo".

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* continues to write [as did the Tur^o]: **And [the honoree] reads as the "*haftarah*" [the passage beginning with] "Exult and be happy" ["*Rani VeSimchi*"] (*Zechariah* 2:14); and if two *Shabbosim* fall out within it, [then] on the second, [the honoree] reads as the "*haftarah*" from [the passage called] "the 'candles' of Shlomo", in [the book of] *Melachim*. [The latter apparently must refer to the section which includes *Melachim* I 7:49, which tells of "*menorahs*" which Shlomo made.] The *Rema*'s addition follows the next subject.**

¹⁰ source's wording: "We 'end off' with 'the candles of Zechariah'."

¹¹ 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 *Darkei Moshe* brings from the *Sefer HaMinhagim*^o that Chanukah is not mentioned in the *brachos* of the "haftarah".

The *Beis Yosef* brings (from the *Ran*) that although "the candles of Shlomo" are *earlier* than "the candles of Zechariah" [i.e. in both Biblical and chronological order], and we would have assumed that *they* [i.e. those of Shlomo] should therefore be the ones to take precedence, nevertheless the reverse is true, because "the candles of Zechariah" pertain to the future. [Perhaps this means that "those candles" are therefore more *relevant* to us.] In the *Ran's* commentary to the Gemara, he gives a different answer: "Because Zechariah mainly prophesied during [the time of] the second *Beis HaMikdash* - and the miracle [of Chanukah] was [also] performed during [the time of] the second *Beis HaMikdash*."

THE "HAFTARAH" WHEN THERE IS A GROOM

The Avudraham^o [in the Halachos of weddings] writes that on the Shabbos when a groom is within his seven days of feasting, there was a universal *minhag* that when it was time for the "haftarah", they would read *pesukim*^{*} beginning with "I shall rejoice greatly" ("*Sos Asis*") [*Yeshay'ah* 61:10].¹² The basics of this *minhag* are mainly discussed by the Halachos of *Rosh Chodesh* (O.C. 425:2 and 428:8 [and see the *Mishnah Berurah* to O.C. 265, n20]). [More recently, the *Aruch HaShulchan*^o reported [O.C. 425 n3, 428 n7], "As for us, we know nothing at all of such a *minhag*."] However, before discussing the application by Chanukah, we need some background:

The Mishnah says (*Megillah* 24a) [translated loosely (and with Rashi)]: "We may 'skip around' during a 'haftarah' (although in the Torah reading we may not), if the locations are close enough to each other that the reader will be able to roll the scroll to the new location by the time the interpreter finishes telling the congregation the meaning of what was just read (whereas for the congregation to have to just wait there quietly would not be respectful)." The Gemara (ibid.) brings a Baraisa which says that "we may not 'skip around' from one book of the 'Navi' to another (but we may 'skip' *forward* within the twelve Minor Prophets)." All this is mainly dealt with in the Halachos of reading the Torah (O.C. 144:1).

After explaining the above, the *Beis Yosef* there brings the following *Terumas HaDeshen*^o (20):

Question: *If so, what is the justification of the minhag in Austria (and other places), that when a wedding occurs in the week of Shabbos Chanukah¹³ (and they have to use the Chanukah passage for the "haftarah" - because that's codified in the Gemara), they use some of the pesukim of the "haftarah passage for a groom" [just explained] as a supplement to the "haftarah" of that Shabbos? The "passage of Chanukah" is not in the same book of the "Navi" as the "passage of a groom", so why aren't we particular about this "skipping" from one book of the "Navi" to another?*

¹² "*Sos Asis*" is also the name of the last "haftarah of consolation" [see O.C. 428:8] (in "haftarah", texts it's the "haftarah" of the *parsha* of "*Nitzavim*", and continues through *Yeshay'ah* 63:9).

¹³ Besides Chanukah, the *Terumas HaDeshen* also says the same about the four *parshas* (which in are discussed in the next *siman* of the *Shulchan Aruch*).

Answer: *It cannot be resolved properly according to all of the authoritative commentaries. I heard that the early Austrians said that since **the Mordechai** there (in the name of the Ra'avyah^o) explains that the reason not to "skip around" is out of respect for the congregation (i.e. so they won't have to wait), and that was only relevant in those days - for all their books [i.e. even of the "Navi"] were written as a scroll, like our Sefer Torah, so they would have to take up time with their rolling; but in our times, when "haftarah" books are written in "notebook" [i.e. bound] form, and one can mark a page so as to find quickly any "haftarah" one wants to, then there is no need for concern about "skipping" from one book of the "Navi" to another. However, **Rashi** explained that the reason not to "skip around" is because of confusion (and "skipping around" from one book of the "Navi" to another is judged as causing **too much** confusion); and according to that reason, we **cannot** make the above distinction. Nevertheless, if both passages would be within one book of the "Navi" (just that the distance between them were "such that the interpreter would stop"), then the above reasoning is enough; because on this point, Rashi himself explained that the issue is only the respect for the congregation [which, as mentioned, is not an issue for us]. One could also answer that since we do not have the practice of public interpreting, we are not concerned about confusion.¹⁴ Still, my ruling concerning the above minhag is: Where it is the minhag already - that may continue, but where it is not the minhag yet - it should not be adopted to start with.*

Then, the *Beis Yosef* brings two positions which defend this "skipping" more confidently, by saying that the "passage of a groom" is not really read in the formal fashion of a "haftarah reading". (One argues that "it's recited by heart," and the other says "it's merely a song.")

To summarize: Although we may not "skip" from one book of the "Navi" to another, there are three possible justifications for doing it in order to read "the passage of a groom": (1) It's not really read in the formal fashion of a "haftarah reading", (2) Even if it is, maybe it was only a problem when they had an "interpreter", (3) Even if that's not true, maybe it's not a problem if we can "skip" quickly to a marked page. (And even if we reject even this last reason for "skipping" to *another* book, at least it justifies "skipping" a great distance within *one* book.)

In the Halachos of Rosh Chodesh (O.C. 425:2), the *Beis Yosef* again discusses similar "skipping"¹⁵, and concludes with justification (1), and in the *Shulchan Aruch* rules that it's *muttar* [as he also did above (144:2)]. The *Rema* disagrees, saying the *minhag* is not to "skip" from one book of the "Navi" to another, and he continues: "However, if the [second] 'haftarah' [passage] is in the same [book of the] 'Navi' [as the first], [then] one may [in fact] do this [i.e. 'skip'];¹⁶ and 'so it is' if on [Shabbos] *Rosh Chodesh* (or on *another* Shabbos with a 'haftarah' which we do not 'push

¹⁴ The *Terumas HaDeshen* elaborates here: "If so, the original Halacha that one may not 'skip' must have been referring specifically to places where they had the practice of interpreting. (Indeed, even in those days there were places where they did not interpret.) This is not so 'forced', because the Mishnah itself used a specification that referred to interpreters (saying 'one may skip only to the point when the interpreter will stop'), which indicates that it's referring to 'places where one interprets'."

¹⁵ He is referring to when Shabbos falls on the first day of a two-day *Rosh Chodesh*. The Halacha is that the main "haftarah" passage is the one for "Shabbos *Rosh Chodesh*". The question is: Can *some* of the passage used for "tomorrow being *Rosh Chodesh*" also be read as a *supplement*?

¹⁶ The *Terumas HaDeshen* himself made this distinction (as above), and in his second volume (ruling 94) he applied it to the "haftarahs of consolation", which are from the book of *Yeshay'ah*, except they are some distance earlier than the "passage of a groom" [besides for the last "haftarah of consolation", which is the "passage of a groom", as noted in our earlier footnote].

aside' [i.e. in favor of the 'passage of a groom']) there was a wedding [in that week]." This language is a bit unclear: "So it is" that *what?* - that then "one may skip" *if it's in the same book* (like the "haftarah for Shabbos Rosh Chodesh" itself is), or that then "one may skip" *regardless* (which would be saying that "skipping" to the "passage of a groom" is more lenient than by any other [presumably because of justification (1), just that the *Shulchan Aruch* applied it "generally", and the *Rema* would be applying it only to the "passage of a groom"])?

Well, let's see how the *Rema* here concludes our *se'if*: **And if a wedding falls out by this Shabbos, [then] we use the [passage] of Chanukah as the "haftarah"**.

The *Mishnah Berurah* brings the *Eliyahu Rabbah*^o, who notes the implication of the clear and simple language of the *Rema*: *always* the passage of Chanukah, and *only* the passage of Chanukah. Parenthetically, the *Mishnah Berurah* uses this [and "the *minhag*"] to decide against a position brought by the *Magen Avraham*^o, that if there is a *second* Shabbos Chanukah then the "passage of a groom" can be read *instead* (because material pertaining to Chanukah was already read *last* week). Returning to our main issue, the *Sha'ar HaTziyun* points out that we see here that it's not correct even merely to *supplement* some of the "passage of a groom" (because it would mean "skipping" from one book of the "*Navi*" to another). [This is also the explicit ruling of the *Mishnah Berurah* in the other locations (O.C. 144 n12 and 425 n12).¹⁷]

The *Mishnah Berurah* here says the reason that the passages for Chanukah take precedence over the "passage of a groom" is [the importance of] "publicizing the miracle". Now, it's true that this point will be used below (concerning *Rosh Chodesh*), but the *Mishnah Berurah's* using it *here* seems extremely difficult, because there is a much more basic reason: only the Chanukah passages are codified in the Gemara (as the *Terumas HaDeshen* explained, and as the *Mishnah Berurah* *himself* says in the Halachos of *Rosh Chodesh* (*siman* 425 n12))!

The development of: *Se'if 3*

THE TORAH READING WHEN ROSH CHODESH TEIVEIS IS ON SHABBOS

The Gemara (*Megillah* 29b⁴):

R' Yitzchak Nafcha said: *When Rosh Chodesh Teiveis is on Shabbos - we bring three Sifrei Torah and read from them as follows: In one, we read from "the material of the day" [i.e. the weekly Parsha], in another we read from the material of Rosh Chodesh, and in the other one we read from the material of Chanukah.*

¹⁷ The *Yad Efrayim* (in O.C. 425) says that the *Magen Avraham* and the *Levush*^o hold that one "skips" to the "passage of a groom" even on Chanukah (i.e. regardless of it being in a different book of the "*Navi*"). However, the *Yad Efrayim* himself proves that the *Rema* does not hold that way.

The Tur^o says that in this case, the *Rosh Chodesh* reading begins from the *pasuk*^{*} (*Bamidbar* 28:9): "And on the Shabbos day" [thereby mentioning *Rosh Chodesh* and Shabbos, as is always done when the two coincide (O.C. 425:1)], and it should be the seventh *aliyah*. [As for *why* the *Rosh Chodesh* material is read first, see the next subject.]

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* starts the *se'if* by ruling: **If *Rosh Chodesh Teiveis* falls on Shabbos, we take out "two scrolls" [i.e. two *Sifrei Torah*], and [in the first *Sefer Torah*] six [*aliyah* honorees] read from the weekly *parsha*; and in the second [*Sefer Torah*] one [*aliyah* honoree] reads from [the material] of *Rosh Chodesh* - and he begins [with] "And on the Shabbos day"; and in the third [*Sefer Torah*] - the "*maftir*" reads from [the material] of Chanukah ...** [The end of this sentence follows the next subject.]

The *Mishnah Berurah* clarifies a few details:

(1) When we are finished reading from the first *Sefer Torah* (i.e. the weekly *parsha*), the second is placed next to it, and the first is then lifted up and rolled closed. (No "Kaddish" is said at this point. [After all, the seven *aliyahs* of Shabbos have not yet been completed.]

(2) When we are ready to say "Kaddish" - i.e. after we read from the *second Sefer Torah* (i.e. the *Shabbos Rosh Chodesh* reading), the third is first placed next to it.

(3) Actually, the "at-least-seven" *aliyahs* of Shabbos may be divided other ways if it is so desired, such as by having seven or more *aliyahs* for the weekly *parsha* alone [or even having only five (*Sha'ar HaTziyun*)].

Rav Yaakov Chaim Sofer^o [*Kaf HaChayim* n19] brings the reason that the third *Sefer Torah* needs to be placed next to the second at the time of "Kaddish" (and the first does not): Because the "Kaddish" needs to be "said over all three"; and although it's *clear* that the "Kaddish" is being said over the *first Sefer Torah* - because that one has already been read from - this is *not* clear about the *third* (so we place it on the *bimah*).¹

However (the *Kaf HaChayim* continues), all this is only true regarding *Ashkenazim*. For the *Sefardi minhag* is to say "Kaddish" *twice* whenever there is more than one *Sefer Torah*, so *they* say one "Kaddish" after the reading of the second *Sefer Torah* (since that's when the seven *aliyahs* of Shabbos are completed), and another "Kaddish" after reading from the third [so the above "placing" is not necessary].

[*We can ask*: What if all seven *aliyahs* were completed with the *first Sefer Torah*?]

THE "HAFTARAH" WHEN ROSH CHODESH TEIVEIS IS ON SHABBOS

We learned above (678:1) that the authoritative decision (in *Shabbos* 23b) is that publicizing the miracle of Chanukah takes precedence over a "more frequent"¹⁸ Mitzvah" [in that case, *kiddush*].

With that in mind, Tosafos (ibid.) deals with our subject:

***Rabbeinu Shimshon ben Avraham*¹⁹ holds that when *Rosh Chodesh Teiveis* is on Shabbos, the "*haftarah*" reading should be from the passage "*the 'candles*"²⁰ of Zechariah" [the "*haftarah*" of Chanukah - see**

¹⁸ Hebrew: "*tadir*". Usually this is given as a reason for a Mitzvah to be done *before* another [see "Principles"]. This Gemara, however, indicated that it could also potentially be a reason to displace a "less frequent Mitzvah" *entirely*.

above *se'if* 2], and not from the passage "The heavens are my throne" (*Yesha'yah* 66) which is the "haftarah" passage of an ordinary *Shabbos Rosh Chodesh*, for two reasons: (1) in order to publicize the miracle of Chanukah, (2) the "maftir" has just read from the material of Chanukah, and his "haftarah" reading should be related to the subject which he read about.

And to explain why the material of Rosh Chodesh came first in the Torah reading [which seems to contradict our preferring the publicizing of the miracle (above)], there are three approaches: (1) In the case of the Torah reading, it's possible to accomplish **both** (i.e. the "more frequent" [reading of Rosh Chodesh] and the "publicizing of the miracle" of Chanukah), so we accomplish both - and the "more frequent one" [i.e. Rosh Chodesh] comes **first**; but where it is not **possible** to accomplish both [i.e. by the "haftarah"], then "publicizing the miracle" takes precedence. (2) In the case of the Torah reading of Chanukah, there isn't such a significant publicizing of the miracle - for "candles" are not mentioned in it (as they are in the "haftarah" passage). (3) In addition, *Rabbeinu Shimshon* says, the Torah reading of Rosh Chodesh was put first **for the very purpose** of causing the "maftir" to read from the passage of Chanukah, so that consequently he will read from "the 'candles' of Zechariah" as the "haftarah" [and thus publicize the miracle]²¹.

The *Beis Yosef* quotes the *Rosh*^o, who follows the same logic to the same conclusion, and the *Beis Yosef* mentions that this is also what it says in the *Mordechai*^o.

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* finishes the sentence: [the "maftir" reads from the material of Chanukah] ... **and reads as the "haftarah" [the passage beginning with] "Exult and be happy" ["Rani VeSimchi"]**. [The remaining parts of the *se'if* follow the next three subjects.]

The *Bi'ur Halacha* addresses a case where the third *Sefer Torah* (i.e. the one rolled to the Chanukah passage) was opened up second by mistake. Now, concerning the effect of this on the Torah reading, that will be discussed in the subject after the next, and the *Bi'ur Halacha*'s own decision is that once we start reading "out of order", we *continue* with that "incorrect" order, *ending* with the *Shabbos Rosh Chodesh* reading. Therefore, one could have thought this would change the "haftarah" [i.e. based on reason (2) of *Tosafos* for why we chose the Chanukah "haftarah", i.e. because it relates to the subject about which we just read]. Nevertheless, the *Bi'ur Halacha* brings that in fact the Chanukah "haftarah" passage should still be used [because of reason (1)] (except that if the "haftarah" passage of *Shabbos Rosh Chodesh* was read instead - "after the fact" it's sufficient²²).

¹⁹ Also known as the "*Rash*" of *Shantz*, he was an early writer of "*Tosafos*", in which he is called "the *Rashba*" (not to be confused with *Rabbeinu Shlomo ben Avraham ibn Aderes* of Spain, who has become *universally* known as the *Rashba*).

²⁰ 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).

²¹ This last reasoning seems difficult, since even when there is *no "haftarah"*, the Torah reading of *Rosh Chodesh* comes before that of Chanukah (as explained in the next subject).

²² It is not clear whether this is true even when the *Sifrei Torah* were *not* "switched".

As mentioned above (in *se'if 2*), the *Shulchan Aruch* ruled in the Halachos of *Rosh Chodesh* (O.C. 425:2) that the *minhag* is to read a few *pesukim* from "*haftarah*" readings that were "displaced", as a *supplement* to the "overriding" reading (i.e. and there's no problem of "skipping from one book of the '*Navi*' to another"). It should then follow that the *Sefardi minhag* would be to read some *pesukim* of the "*haftarah*" passage of *Shabbos Rosh Chodesh*, after the "*haftarah*" passage of *Shabbos Chanukah*.

THE TORAH READING WHEN *ROSH CHODESH TEIVEIS* IS ON A WEEKDAY

The Gemara (*Megillah 29b*⁴):

There was a disagreement: When *Rosh Chodesh Teiveis* is on a weekday, R' Yitzchak said that **three** aliyah honorees read from the material of **Rosh Chodesh** - and the fourth reads from that of *Chanukah*; and Rav Dimi of Chaifa said that **three** aliyah honorees read from that of **Chanukah** - and the fourth reads from that of *Rosh Chodesh*.

Each side can be defended: R' Mani said: It makes sense to say like R' Yitzchak (*Nafcha*²³) [that *Rosh Chodesh* is primary], because when choosing between something which is frequent and something which is not [as] frequent - the one which is frequent takes precedence²⁴. [On the other hand,] R' Avin said: It makes sense to say like Rav Dimi; for after all, who caused the fourth aliyah to materialize? - *Rosh Chodesh!* - therefore, the fourth aliyah honoree needs to read from the material of *Rosh Chodesh!*

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

The responses are as follows: Rav Yosef said: We pay no special attention to *Rosh Chodesh*. On the other hand, Rabbah said: We pay no special attention to *Chanukah*. And the Halacha is: We pay no attention to *Chanukah* (i.e. *Rosh Chodesh* is primary)²⁵.

For a reason why *Chanukah* is not put first because of "publicizing the miracle", see just above, by the subject of the "*haftarah*". In any case, the Tur points out that the situation calls for "taking out two *Sifrei Torah*."

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* continues the *se'if* by ruling: **[On the other hand,] if [this] *Rosh Chodesh* falls on a weekday, we take out "two scrolls" [i.e. two *Sifrei Torah*], and in the one [*Sefer Torah*] three [aliyah honorees] read from [the material] of *Rosh Chodesh*, and in the second [*Sefer Torah*] one [aliyah honoree] reads from [the material] of *Chanukah*.** [The remaining parts of the *se'if* follow the next two subjects.]

The *Mishnah Berurah* writes that in the first *Sefer Torah*, the reading of *Rosh Chodesh* is divided as follows: "*kohen* - [from the beginning] until 'a quarter of a *hin*' [i.e. *Bamidbar* 28:1-5], *levi* - [from there] until 'and its accompaniment [of flour-oil and wine offerings]' [i.e. *ibid.* 6-10], [ordinary] '*yisrael*' - [from there] until [the final] 'and its accompaniment'

²³ At this point in the text, the title "*Nafcha*" ["the smith"] appears. By the original statement, it does not.

²⁴ Literally: "comes first". (Usually, being more "frequent" [Hebrew: "*tadir*"] is given as a reason for a Mitzvah to be done *before* another [see "Principles"].)

²⁵ An alternate text reads: We pay no attention to *Chanukah* "whatsoever".

[i.e. ibid. 11-15]." He writes that in the second *Sefer Torah*, only the mini-section of that day's prince is read (as we cited in the previous *se'if*).

IF FOUR ALIYAHS WERE READ FROM THE *ROSH CHODESH* MATERIAL (I.E. BY MISTAKE)

Tosafos (*Megillah* 23a):

If it should happen on Yom Tov* that the congregation read the full number of required aliyahs, and [then they realized that] they had forgotten to read from "the day's obligation" [whose definition is discussed in the Halachos of reading the Torah (see *Mishnah Berurah* to O.C. 137:3)], then the *Sefer Torah* should be brought back - and another aliyah honoree should read from "the day's obligation". (Although it's *assur* to read extra aliyahs on Yom Tov, [in this case] the last one to read [before they realized what they forgot] is considered "as if he never read".)

However, if the same occurred on Chanukah, i.e. on the Rosh Chodesh (or Shabbos) that falls during Chanukah, in that case it is **not** necessary to "add an aliyah" in order to read the Chanukah material. For it is stated explicitly²⁶ [about weighing Chanukah's Torah reading against another] that "the Halacha is - we pay no attention to Chanukah whatsoever."

The *Beis Yosef* quotes the *Shibolei HaLekket*^o, who brings likewise, but adds the following twist:

In our own case, two Sifrei Torah were already taken out. Therefore, out of concern for the "tainting" [see "*Principles*"] of the reputation of the second *Sefer Torah*, it is necessary for a fifth aliyah honoree to read from the material of Chanukah. For one cannot suggest that the fourth aliyah honoree **himself** should read from the material of Chanukah from the **first** *Sefer Torah* (i.e. if he still has the opportunity to do so before he says the "closing bracha" over reading the parsha of Rosh Chodesh), because that would be "skipping around" [see the last subject of the previous *se'if*] - and one may not "skip around" (between two areas) in the Torah reading. Rather, now that the fourth aliyah honoree has begun to read from the material of Rosh Chodesh - he should finish [that] and say the "closing bracha", and a fifth aliyah honoree should "come up" after him - and **he** should read from the material of Chanukah in the second *Sefer Torah*. The logic for this is as follows: Better that our statement [i.e. the *Mishnah* in *Megillah* (21a)] "On Rosh Chodesh there are four aliyahs - no less and no more" should be disregarded, rather than that the reputation of a *Sefer Torah* be "tainted".

The *Beis Yosef* also quotes similarly (but more concisely) from the *Rokeiach*^o.²⁷

²⁶ Tosafos cites it as being "in [the Midrash (*Tanchuma*) which is called] 'Yelamdeinu.'" Commentaries point out that it is not found in our *Tanchuma* text. However, see in our earlier footnote, that an alternate text of the Gemara *itself* reads exactly like what Tosafos wrote.

²⁷ With two differences: (1) The *Rokeiach* interprets "we pay no attention to Chanukah whatsoever" to mean "even if we read none of it whatsoever". (2) He says (loosely translated): "If someone was just honored with an aliyah - it's *assur* for him to read again, except that a *kohen* can read [again] in the 'levi' position" [clearly *not* limiting the point only to reading in a second *Sefer Torah*].

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* continues the *se'if* by ruling: **[In addition,] if the "chazzan"*** [i.e. the reader] **mistakenly read four *aliyahs* from [the material] of *Rosh Chodesh*: If they did not take out a second "scroll" [i.e. *Sefer Torah*], [then] it is not necessary to read [the Chanukah material any] more; but if they [in fact] took out a second "scroll" [i.e. *Sefer Torah*] - [then] out of [concern for] its [reputation's] "tainting" - it is necessary for a fifth [*aliyah* honoree] to read from [the material] of Chanukah. [The *Rema*'s addition follows the next subject.]**

The *Mishnah Berurah* writes that "Kaddish" is said after the above-mentioned fifth *aliyah*, but only if it was *not* already said after the fourth.

The above *Shibolei HaLekket* ruled that a fifth man is needed only in the case where "the fourth *aliyah* honoree has begun to read from the material of *Rosh Chodesh*." *We can ask*: What should be done if he has not? If the reading was being done as if it were a regular *Rosh Chodesh*, then the reader has not yet read the main *pesukim* ("And on your *Rosh Chodesh* [day]s" etc.)! In that event, can we "abandon" the *Rosh Chodesh* passage at that crucial point and read the Chanukah passage as the fourth *aliyah*?

IF WE NEED TO READ FROM TWO *SIFREI TORAH* AND THE *BRACHA* WAS SAID "OVER" THE "SECOND ONE" FIRST

In the Halachos of reading the Torah (by O.C. 140:3), the *Beis Yosef* brings (from the Avudraham^o) that there was a disagreement about what to do if the second *Sefer Torah* (i.e. the one rolled to the Chanukah passage) was opened up first by mistake, and the *bracha* was said "over" it, and after the mistake was discovered - they rolled to the location of the reading for *Rosh Chodesh*; the question was then asked - is a new *bracha* required or not? It was then clarified (there) that this depends on whether manipulating the *Sefer Torah* is enough of an interruption to invalidate the first *bracha*. However, either way, it seems that the authorities involved agreed that immediately "switching" to *Rosh Chodesh* was the correct move.

Accordingly, the *Rema* here writes (concluding our *se'if*): **[On the other hand,] if one mistakenly began to read from [the material] of Chanukah, [then] he has to stop [and] to read from [the material] of *Rosh Chodesh*; and [as for] whether he has to say a [new] *bracha* on the *Rosh Chodesh* reading - see above [in O.C.] *siman 140*.**

Regarding whether a new *bracha* is needed, the *Bi'ur Halacha* says that the later authorities decided in favor of the position that one *does* need to say one. **However, he also brings [there and in the *Mishnah Berurah*] the *Taz*^o:**

The *Taz* says that the congregation is certainly *yotzei* their obligation "after the fact" even if they read the Chanukah material before the *Rosh Chodesh* material. Consequently, now that they already "started" with Chanukah, they should *not* have to "switch" to *Rosh Chodesh* (i.e. disagreeing with the *Rema*). He even asks: How *can* they "switch", when that will create a situation where we are not sure if a new *bracha* is needed?

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

The position of the *Magen Avraham*^o on this is not openly clear. In the Halachos of reading the Torah, he rules like the Taz. (He gives a different reason: because by the conflict of *Rosh Chodesh* and Chanukah, there is a position in the Gemara that Chanukah comes first even "initially" [and therefore "everyone should agree" that that's good enough "after the fact"].) Here, on the other hand, he explains the *Rema*.

The *Mishnah Berurah* cites the Taz, and then refers to the *Bi'ur Halacha* for "all the details". In the *Bi'ur Halacha*, he decides that the *Magen Avraham* definitely agrees with the Taz (and what he wrote here was *only* by way of explanation), and he brings a long list of later authorities who also agree with the Taz. [This implies that the *Bi'ur Halacha* himself is deciding in favor of the Taz. However, he also brings two authorities who "compromise", holding that reading the Chanukah material first is in fact good enough "after the fact", but this "after the fact" is only when the mistake is caught *after three pesukim*^{*} were read (and consequently that is relied upon as being the *entire* Chanukah reading for the day).] The *Bi'ur Halacha* then proceeds to explain that this whole disagreement only refers to a case where the *bracha* was in fact already *said* "over" the Chanukah material (or at least begun, with the words "*Baruch attah Hashem*" ["Blessed are You, Hashem"]). For if the *bracha* was not yet begun, he explains, then "everyone agrees" that they should roll this *Sefer Torah* closed, and read the *Rosh Chodesh* material first. (This is not considered "tainting" [see "Principles" and the previous subject] the reputation of the first *Sefer Torah*, he concludes, because the congregation will be going back to the first *Sefer Torah* and reading from it afterwards.)

In the case which the *Rema* and Taz disagree about, the only mistake was that the Chanukah reading was read *first*; but no one necessarily forgot that on *Rosh Chodesh*, the Chanukah reading all has to be read in one *aliyah*. We can ask: What if that was forgotten? In other words, what if only *half* of the mini-section of that day's prince was read (i.e. like the first *aliyah* on *other* days of Chanukah), and the *aliyah* honoree said the *bracha* *after* that reading, and only then was the mistake discovered? Should we then have to read the second half of the Chanukah reading as the next *aliyah* [so that the first *aliyah* won't be left "worthless"]? And if so, what should the third and fourth ones be? (After all, even though the Taz admits that after the one *aliyah* of Chanukah reading - the remaining three are read from the *Rosh Chodesh* material; still, maybe that's only because it's still possible to have the *aliyahs* "divided" in the way the Gemara specified. Here, if we say that at least two *aliyahs* need to be read from the Chanukah material anyway [or if *that* was already done by mistake], maybe then it's best to follow the rejected position from the Gemara - three *aliyahs* for Chanukah and then one for Rosh Chodesh!)

DETERMINING THE DAY OF A YAHRTZEIT WHICH IS ON CHANUKAH

The *Bi'ur Halacha* warns not to determine this by which *day of Chanukah* it originally was, but rather one must note the day of the *month* (since *Rosh Chodesh Teiveis* is sometimes two days, and sometimes only one).