

# Is There a "Right" Way to Light on Chanukah? Source Packet

Notes to Teachers and Students:

- The separations of the texts are for the purpose of clarity and organization of comprehension questions.
- The Sefaria translation includes elucidation from Rabbi Steinzaltz.

## 1. Talmud Shabbat 21b

ּתָנוּ רַבָּנַן: מִצְוַת חֲנוּכָּה, נֵר אִישׁ וּבֵיתוֹ. וְהַמְהַדְּרִין, נֵר לְכָל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד.

וְהַמְּהַדְּרִין מִן הַמְהַדְּרִין, בֵּית שַׁמַּאי אוֹמְרִים: יוֹם רִאשׁוֹן מַדְלִיק שְׁמֹנָה, מִכָּאן וְאֵילָךְ פּוֹחֵת וְהוֹלֵךְ. וּבֵית הָלֵל אוֹמְרִים: יוֹם רִאשׁוֹן מַדְלִיק אַחַת, מִכָּאן וְאֵילָךְ מוֹסִיף וְהוֹלֵךְ.

אָמַר עוּלָּא: פְּלִיגִי בַּהּ תְּרֵי אָמוֹרָאֵי בְּמַעְרְבָא, רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בַּר אָבִין וְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי בַּר זְבִידָא. חַד אָמַר טַעְמָא דְּבֵית שַׁמַּאי כְּנֶגֶד יָמִים הַנִּכְנָסִין, וְטַעְמָא דְּבֵית הָלֵּל כְּנֶגֶד יָמִים הַיּוֹצְאִין. וְחַד אָמַר טַעְמָא דְּבֵית שַׁמַּאי כְּנֶגֶד פָּרֵי הַחַג, וְטַעְמָא דְּבֵית הָלֵּל דְּמַעֲלִין בַּקֹדֶשׁ וְאֵין מוֹרִידִין.

אָמַר רַבָּה בַּר בַּר חָנָה אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: שְׁנֵי זְקֵנִים הָיוּ בְּצַיְדָּן. אֶחָד עָשָׂה כְּבֵית שַׁמַּאי וְאֶחָד עָשָׂה כְּדִבְרֵי בֵּית הָלֵּל. זֶה נוֹתֵן טַעַם לִדְבָרָיו כְּנָגֶד פָּרֵי הַחַג, וְזֶה נוֹתֵן טַעַם לִדְבָרָיו דְּמַעֲלִין בַּקֹדֶשׁ וְאֵין מוֹרִידִין.

The Sages taught in a *baraita*: The basic *mitzvah* of Hanukkah is each day to have a light kindled by a person, the head of the household, for himself and his household. And the *mehadrin*, i.e., those who are meticulous in the performance of mitzvot, kindle a light for each and everyone in the household.

And the *mehadrin min hamehadrin*, who are even more meticulous, adjust the number of lights daily. Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel disagree as to the nature of that adjustment. Beit Shammai say: On the first day one kindles eight lights and, from there on, gradually decreases the number of lights until, on the last day of Hanukkah, he kindles one light. And Beit Hillel say: On the first day one kindles one light, and from there on, gradually increases the number of lights until, on the last day, he kindles eight lights.

Ulla said: There were two *amora'im* in the West, Eretz Yisrael, who disagreed with regard to this dispute, Rabbi Yosei bar Avin and Rabbi Yosei bar Zevida. One said that



the reason for Beit Shammai's opinion is that the number of lights corresponds to the incoming days, i.e., the future. On the first day, eight days remain in Hanukkah, one kindles eight lights, and on the second day seven days remain, one kindles seven, etc. The reason for Beit Hillel's opinion is that the number of lights corresponds to the outgoing days. Each day, the number of lights corresponds to the number of the days of Hanukkah that were already observed. And one said that the reason for Beit Shammai's opinion is that the number of lights corresponds to the bulls of the festival of *Sukkot*: Thirteen were sacrificed on the first day and each succeeding day one fewer was sacrificed (*Numbers* 29:12–31). The reason for Beit Hillel's opinion is that the number of lights is based on the principle: One elevates to a higher level in matters of sanctity and one does not downgrade. Therefore, if the objective is to have the number of lights correspond to the number of days, there is no alternative to increasing their number with the passing of each day.

Rabba bar bar Ḥana said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: There were two Elders in Sidon, and one of them acted in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai, and one of them acted in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel. Each provided a reason for his actions: One gave a reason for his actions: The number of lights corresponds to the bulls of the Festival. And one gave a reason for his actions: The number of lights is based on the principle: One elevates to a higher level in matters of sanctity and one does not downgrade.



## 2. Talmud Eruvin 13b

אָמַר רַבִּי אַבָּא אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: שָׁלשׁ שָׁנִים נֶחְלְקוּ בֵּית שַׁמַאי וּבֵית הִלֵּל, הַלָּלוּ אוֹמְרִים: הֲלָכָה כְּמוֹתֵנוּ, וְהַלֶּלוּ אוֹמְרִים: הֲלָכָה כְּמוֹתֵנוּ. יָצְאָה בַּת קוֹל וְאָמְרָה: אֵלוּ וָאֵלוּ דִּבְרֵי אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים הֵן, וַהֲלָכָה כְּבֵית הִלֵּל.

Rabbi Abba said that Shmuel said: For three years Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel disagreed. These said: The *halakha* is in accordance with our opinion, and these said: The *halakha* is in accordance with our opinion. Ultimately, a Divine Voice emerged and proclaimed: Both these and those are the words of the living God. However, the *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel.

ּוְכִי מֵאַחַר שָׁאֵלּוּ וָאֵלּוּ דִּבְרֵי אֱלֹהִים חַיִּים, מִפְּנֵי מָה זָכוּ בֵּית הִלֵּל לִקְבּוֹעַ הַלָּכָה כְּמוֹתָן? מִפְּנֵי שֶׁנּוֹחִין וַעֲלוּבִין הָיוּ, וְשׁוֹנִין דִּבְרֵיהֶן וְדִבְרֵי בֵּית שַׁמַאי, וְלֹא עוֹד אֶלָּא שֶׁמַקְדִּימִין דִּבְרֵי בֵּית שַׁמַאי לְדִבְרֵיהֶן.

The Gemara asks: Since both these and those are the words of the living God, why were Beit Hillel privileged to have the *halakha* established in accordance with their opinion? The reason is that they were agreeable and forbearing, showing restraint when affronted, and when they taught the *halakha* they would teach both their own statements and the statements of Beit Shammai. Moreover, when they formulated their teachings and cited a dispute, they prioritized the statements of Beit Shammai to their own statements, in deference to Beit Shammai.



# 3. Mishnah Avot (Pirkei Avot) 5:17

ּכָּל מַחֲלֹקֶת שֶׁהִיא לְשֵׁם שָׁמַיִם, סוֹפָהּ לְהִתְקַיֵּם. וְשֶׁאֵינָהּ לְשֵׁם שָׁמַיִם, אֵין סוֹפָהּ לְהִתְקַיֵּם. אֵיזוֹ הִיא מַחֲלֹקֶת שָׁהִיא לְשֵׁם שָׁמַיִם, זוֹ מַחֵלֹקֶת הָלֵּל וִשְׁמַאי. וְשָׁאֵינָהּ לְשֵׁם שָׁמַיִם, זוֹ מַחַלֹקֶת קֹרַח וְכָל עַדַתוֹ:

Every dispute that is for the sake of Heaven, will in the end endure; But one that is not for the sake of Heaven, will not endure. Which is the controversy that is for the sake of Heaven? Such was the controversy of Hillel and Shammai. And which is the controversy that is not for the sake of Heaven? Such was the controversy of Korah and all his congregation.

What was the controversy of Korah and his congregation? Bemidbar 16:1-3

וַיִּקַּח לְּרַח בָּן־יִצְהָּר בָּן־קְהָת בָּן־לֵגֵי וְדָתָּן וַאֲבִירָם בְּנֵי אֶלִיאֶב וְאָוֹן בָּן־פֶּלֶת בְּנֵי רְאוּבֵן: וַיָּקְמוּ לִפְנֵי משֶׁה וַאֲנָשִׁים מִבְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל חֲמִשִּׁים וּמָאתָים נְשִׂיאֵי עֵדֶה קְרָאֵי מוֹעַד אַנְשִׁי־שֵׁם: וַיִּקְהָלוֹּ עַל־מֹשֶׁה וְעַל־אַהָרֹן וַיֹּאמְרָוּ אֲלֵהֶם רַב־לָכֶם כִּי כָל־הָעֵדָה כֵּלָם קְדשִׁים וּבְתוֹכָם ה' וּמַדָּוּעַ תִּתְנַשְׂאָוּ עַל־קָהַל ה':

Now Korah, son of Izhar son of Kohath son of Levi, betook himself, along with Dathan and Abiram sons of Eliab, and On son of Peleth—descendants of Reuben — to rise up against Moses, together with two hundred and fifty Israelites, chieftains of the community, chosen in the assembly, men of repute.

They combined against Moses and Aaron and said to them, "You have gone too far! For all the community are holy, all of them, and God is in their midst. Why then do you raise yourselves above God's congregation?"

# Here is an explanation from *Malbim*, a 19th-century commentary:

חז"ל למדונו שמחלוקת שהיא לש"ש, כל כת משני צדדי החולקים מתאחדת בעצמה כי כלם מתכונים לתכלית אחת לש"ש, אולם מחלוקת שאינה לש"ש רק מפני אהבת הכבוד ואהבת עצמו, אז יש מחלוקת ונגוד גם בין האנשים שהתאחדו לעמוד בצד אחד, כי כל אחד מן היחידים מכוין תועלת עצמו ומתנגד לכונת חברו שהוא ג"כ מכוין תועלת עצמו, כענין שהי' מחלוקת גם בין קרח ועדתו, כי כל אחד מהעדה הרעה הזאת התכוין כוונה אחרת מתנגדת לזולתו,

Our Sages taught us that a *makhloket l'sheim shamayim* (debate for the sake of Heaven) is one where each of the two sides of the debate is equally dedicated to the ultimate purpose of "for the sake of Heaven." However, in a debate that is *lo l'sheim shamayim* (not for the sake of Heaven), members of one or both sides are motivated by



the pursuit of personal honor and status. Therefore, there is division even between the parties that came together to oppose the other side. Each has his own motivations, which may be in opposition to others in his group. (English explanation: Leah Herzog)

### 4. Talmud Bavli Yevamot 14b

Note to teachers and students: this section of the Talmud deals with who may and may not marry and the implications for the children of these marriages.

לא נִמְנְעוּ בֵּית שַׁמַּאי מִלִּישָּׂא נָשִׁים מִבֵּית הָלֵּל, וְלֹא בֵּית הָלֵּל מִבֵּית שַׁמַאי. לְלַמֶּדְךְ שֶׁחִיבָּה וְרֵיעוּת נוֹהֲגִים זָה בָּזֶה, לְקַיֵּים מַה שָׁנֵּאֵמַר: ״הָאֵמֶת וְהַשָּׁלוֹם אֵהָבוּ״.

Despite the fact that these *halakhot* entail important ramifications depending on whether or not these women were married or fit for marriage, or whether their offspring were fit for marriage, Beit Shammai did not refrain from marrying women from Beit Hillel, nor did Beit Hillel refrain from marrying women from Beit Shammai. This serves to teach you that they practiced affection and camaraderie between them, to fulfill that which is stated: "Love truth and peace" (*Zechariah* 8:19).