

## O.C. *siman* 682 : The Halachos of "*Al HaNissim*" on Chanukah

### The development of: **Se'if 1**

The Shulchan Aruch's ruling for *se'if* 1 (with the Rema) follows the development of four subjects:

#### "AL HANISSIM" IN THE REGULAR SHEMONEH ESRAY

The Gemara (Shabbos 24a<sup>2</sup>):

**The Sages asked:** *Is it appropriate to mention<sup>1</sup> the subject of Chanukah in the Mussaf Shemoneh Esray<sup>2</sup>? [This question itself will be discussed in se'if 2.]*

**[So we see that in the regular Shemoneh Esray it's obvious to them that one has to mention it. This is because the prayer of Shemoneh Esray is said in congregation, and (thus) there is a publicizing of the miracle (Tosafos). After all, the days of Chanukah were "established" for "thanksgiving and saying Hallel" (Rashi - see above 670:1).**

**This is also apparent from the earlier Gemara about "Al HaNissim" in Birkas HaMazon (see soon), where the Gemara adds:]**

**Rav Sheishes said to them:** *It's like by the Shemoneh Esray [in the following way]: Just as regarding the Shemoneh Esray, the appropriate place [for "Al HaNissim"] is in the bracha of "thanksgiving" [i.e. "Modim"]<sup>3</sup>, likewise regarding Birkas HaMazon - the appropriate place is also in the bracha of "thanksgiving" [i.e. "Nodeh"].*

It is also explicit in "*Tractate Sofrim*" [see note to 676:4] that this "mentioning" [which the authorities (as early as the *Gaonim*) call "*Al HaNissim*"] is said in the *Shemoneh Esray*<sup>4</sup> [as quoted in the last subject of this *se'if*].

In the *Sha'ar HaTziyun*, he brings that although the correct place for "*Al HaNissim*" is in the *bracha* of "thanksgiving" [i.e. "*Modim*"], nevertheless, if one mistakenly said it in the *bracha* of "Service" [i.e. "*Retzay*"] (and then finished the *Shemoneh Esray*), then his saying it out of place this way is not a "*hefsek*" ["interruption"] - so he does not have to "go back" [i.e. his *Shemoneh Esray* is good enough this way "after the fact"].

The *Mishnah Berurah* writes [in the Halachos of *Ma'ariv* (*siman* 236 n7)] that on the first night of Chanukah, it's *muttar* to announce "*Al HaNissim*" (as a reminder) immediately before the congregation begins the *Shemoneh Esray*. In the *Sha'ar HaTziyun* (ibid. n4), he adds that it's *muttar only* in *Ma'ariv*. Rav Yaakov Chaim

<sup>1</sup> source's wording: "What is [the Halacha about whether one ought] to mention".

<sup>2</sup> The Gemara (and the authorities) do not generally use the name "*Shemoneh Esray*". It is usually referred to simply as "prayer".

<sup>3</sup> Here again, Rashi explains: "After all, the whole matter of Chanukah was instituted mainly for thanksgiving." The *Beis Yosef* also borrows these words, but he [uncharacteristically] alters them to: "for the whole matter of Chanukah is fundamentally thanksgiving."

<sup>4</sup> However, it *also* says there that it's mentioned in *Birkas HaMazon*, which does *not* fit well with the Gemara's ruling (later in this *se'if*).

Sofer<sup>o</sup> [*Kaf HaChayim* ibid. n17] writes that when "*Al HaNissim*" is *not* announced beforehand, the "*chazzan*"<sup>f</sup> raises his voice for the words "*Al HaNissim*" within his *own* (silent) *Shemoneh Esray*.

IF ONE DID NOT SAY IT (IN THE REGULAR *SHEMONEH ESRAY*)

The Tosefta\* (*Brachos* 3:14):

***On any day which does not have a Mussaf service, such as Chanukah or Purim: In Ma'ariv, Shacharis, and Mincha, one prays "Shemoneh Esray" [i.e. the daily "eighteen" brachos] and adds a supplement "based on the event" in the bracha of thanksgiving [i.e. "Modim"]; [In fact,] if he did not say it - we (do not) have him "go back" so he can say it.***

There are differing versions of the text regarding whether it says we "do not" have him go back. The *Beis Yosef* brings the Rif<sup>o</sup>, who concludes that the correct Halacha is *not* to "go back", because the Gemara itself (*Shabbos* 24a) brings a Baraisa which says that's true whenever there's no *Mussaf* (just that its examples of "days without *Mussaf*" are *fast* days). The *Beis Yosef* also brings Tosafos and the Rosh<sup>o</sup>, who reach the same conclusion from these two sources.<sup>5</sup> (He then explains that the underlying logic here is that one only "goes back" over the supplement of a day which is Torah-mandated [as a "holiday"].) He ends by saying that this is in fact the *minhag* (*not* to "go back"); unlike the position of the Ra'avyah<sup>o</sup> (as brought by the *Mordechai*<sup>o</sup>) that since saying "*Al HaNissim*" is a universal practice, and the person certainly had in mind that he would say it (in the appropriate *bracha*), consequently if someone did not say it - then he must "go back" so he can say it.<sup>6</sup>

The Tur mentions the position of *Rabbeinu Tam*<sup>o</sup>, that whenever one does not have to "go back", he is still *allowed* to "go back" as long as he has not yet "uprooted his feet" [at the end of the *Shemoneh Esray*]. [This issue is mainly discussed in the Halachos of *Shabbos* (294:5).] But the Tur points out [just as he does over there] that this is not the accepted Halacha; so one *may not* go back<sup>7</sup> - once he has said the Name of Hashem in the "closing *bracha*" of "*Modim*" [i.e. "*hatov shimcha*"].<sup>8</sup> The *Mishnah Berurah* writes that once this point has passed, then what one should do is to recite the "*harachaman*" version (saying the "*Al HaNissim*" as a "request"<sup>9</sup>) [see below by "one who did not say it" in *Birkas HaMazon*] before the *pasuk*<sup>\*</sup> "*Yih'yu leratzon*" [at the conclusion of his *Shemoneh Esray*].

<sup>5</sup> However, they imply that the Baraisa in the Gemara would not have been a clear proof, had it not been for the "explicit" Tosefta.

<sup>6</sup> This concept of "turning something into an obligation" has precedent in the Halachos of *Ma'ariv*. (The Tur mentions it in O.C. 235, and the *Mishnah Berurah* in O.C. 237).

<sup>7</sup> The Tur and *Shulchan Aruch* over there say that in fact, the *opposite* is true: If one finished his *Shemoneh Esray*, then he *can* "go back" and repeat it, because a "voluntary *Shemoneh Esray*" is *muttar*. This point (which is based on O.C. 107) is beyond the scope of this volume.

<sup>8</sup> Conversely, once he *has* said the Name of Hashem, he *must* finish the *bracha* - and proceed immediately with the next *bracha* (*Mishnah Berurah* 114 n32, *Sha'ar HaTziyun* 188 n18).

<sup>9</sup> It seems that this could refer to one's intent, or to a slightly different wording (such as "May it be Your will to perform miracles", etc.).

## "AL HANISSIM" IN BIRKAS HAMAZON

The Gemara (*Shabbos* 24a<sup>1</sup>):

*The Sages asked: Is it appropriate to mention<sup>10</sup> the subject of Chanukah in Birkas HaMazon? Should we say that since it is merely a Rabbinical holiday - we do not mention it [since Birkas HaMazon is said at home, and therefore there is not very much publicizing of the miracle (Tosafos)]? Or, perhaps we should rather say that for the sake of publicizing the miracle [i.e. at least somewhat] - we do mention it?*

*Rav Huna's answer<sup>11</sup>: One does not mention it [i.e. he does not have to (Rashi)]; and if he's going to mention it - he mentions it in the bracha of thanksgiving [i.e. "Nodeh"].*

[The similar statement of Rav Sheishes (which is afterwards in the same Gemara) was quoted at the beginning of this *siman*.] In "*Tractate Sofrim*" [see note to 676:4], it says that it is "mentioned", which seems to be in disagreement with our Gemara. However, the *Beis Yosef* in the Halachos of *Birkas HaMazon* (O.C. 187) ends the subject with the words: "[However,] the authorities wrote with no reservation that one *does* have to mention it," which is how the *Shulchan Aruch* writes here [as quoted soon]. Still, we find in the *Mishnah Berurah* there [to *siman* 188:10 (n33)] that the "mentioning" remains in the category of being technically "optional".<sup>12</sup>

The *Mishnah Berurah* adds that we do not "mention Chanukah" in a "bracha derived from three" [i.e. "*Al HaMichyah*" and the like].<sup>13</sup>

## IF ONE DID NOT SAY IT (IN BIRKAS HAMAZON)

The *Beis Yosef* in the Halachos of *Birkas HaMazon* (O.C. 187) points out that the Halacha is obviously<sup>14</sup> that the person does *not* "go back" so he can say it. Then, the *Beis Yosef* brings the Ra'avyah<sup>15</sup> - again holding that since it's

<sup>10</sup> source's wording: "What is [the Halacha about whether one ought] to mention".

<sup>11</sup> source's wording: "Rava said in the name of Rav Sechorah [who said] in the name of Rav Huna."

<sup>12</sup> The *Shulchan Aruch* there rules that even if only the *beginning* of a meal was on Shabbos [i.e. the person started eating bread before nightfall], that obligates "mentioning" Shabbos in *Birkas HaMazon*. The *Mishnah Berurah* there points out that the reverse is also true: Even if only the *end* of a meal was on *Rosh Chodesh* [i.e. the person began on the day beforehand but he ate bread even after nightfall], that obligates "mentioning" *Rosh Chodesh* in *Birkas HaMazon*. Then, the *Mishnah Berurah* presents the "problem" case: If *Rosh Chodesh* comes right after Shabbos, and someone had a meal in that afternoon in which he ate bread *both before and after nightfall*, then according to the above he should have to "mention" *both* Shabbos and *Rosh Chodesh*, which would be self-contradictory. How we deal with *that* difficulty is beyond the scope of this volume, but the *Mishnah Berurah* there brings that if in the above case it would be *Chanukah* that came right after Shabbos, there would be no question what to do: One would certainly "mention" only Shabbos, because "mentioning" Chanukah is regardless "merely optional".

<sup>13</sup> These *brachos* are said after certain significant (but not considered a meal) forms of dining. The Levush<sup>o</sup> (O.C. 208 n12) explains that "*Al HaNissim*" cannot be added to them, because it's "thanksgiving", and the only line of these *brachos* which is phrased as "thanksgiving" comes at the very end, where it's too late to insert anything.

<sup>14</sup> The *Beis Yosef* himself says that it's obvious because the Gemara does not even obligate us to say it at all. He also brings the Smag<sup>o</sup>, who quotes our Tosefta from two subjects ago; so he must mean that once we *prove* that one does not "go back" over the "*Al HaNissim*" of *Shemoneh Esray*, then *certainly* one doesn't "go back" when it comes to *Birkas HaMazon*!

<sup>15</sup> By *Birkas HaMazon*, the source brought for the Ra'avyah's position is the Hagahos Maimonios<sup>o</sup> to the second chapter of *Brachos*. (The *Beis Yosef* calls them the "new" ones; in the Frankel edition of the Rambam it's note 7, in older editions - note 8.)

universal practice, and the person had in mind to say it, so he must "go back" [as above by the *Shemoneh Esray*].<sup>16</sup> But the *Beis Yosef* again brings that the authorities disagree (and he singles out the *Terumas HaDeshen*<sup>o</sup> as disagreeing especially sharply with that position).

Finally, the *Beis Yosef* here (and there) brings the *Kol Bo*<sup>o</sup>, who says that when the one who forgot reaches the "*harachaman*" ["the Merciful One"] section of *Birkas HaMazon* [i.e. assuming that by then he in fact remembered], he should say one for Chanukah: "May the Merciful One perform miracles and wonders, just as You did for our forefathers in those days and in this time - in the days of Matisyah," etc. (and similarly for Purim). (In addition, the *Mishnah Berurah* says that if it is also *Rosh Chodesh*, then one should say the "*harachaman*" of Rosh Chodesh before this one,<sup>17</sup> because that one is "*tadir*" ["The more 'frequent' Mitzvah" - see "Principles".])

So the complete ruling of the *Shulchan Aruch* (with the *Rema*) for *se'if* 1 is: **[On] all eight days of Chanukah, one says "Al HaNissim" in Birkas HaMazon - in the bracha of the Land ["Nodeh"], and in the prayer [of Shemoneh Esray] - in the bracha of "Modim" [thanksgiving]; [On the other hand,] if one did not say it, he need not "go back" [to it]** (here there is a reference [apparently from the *Rema*] to above [in the Halachos of Shabbos] O.C. 294:4-5 [i.e. the above-mentioned rules for when "one need not repeat"]); **however, if one remembered [while he was still] in that bracha, [then] so long as he did not say the Name [of Hashem] yet - and even if he remembered between "attah" [Blessed "are You"] and "Hashem" - he must go back.** The *Rema* adds: **Some hold<sup>18</sup> that when one forgot "Al HaNissim" in Birkas HaMazon, [then] when he reaches the "harachaman" [section] he should say: "May the Merciful One [harachaman] perform miracles and wonders for us - just as You did for our forefathers in those days in this time, in the days of Matisyahu", etc.** (After that, there's another reference, here to the *Rema*'s having already written this in the Halachos of *Birkas HaMazon* {O.C. 187:4}.)

When the Tur taught us that one "goes back" if he has not said the Name of Hashem in the "closing Bracha" of "Modim", that means *repeating* the Name of Hashem which is said shortly *before* the "closing bracha". Furthermore, while the Tur only said this about the *Shemoneh Esray* (where "*Al HaNissim*" is an actual obligation), the *Shulchan Aruch* implies that it's true about *Birkas HaMazon* as well (where there are also Names of Hashem

<sup>16</sup> Those who cite the Ra'avyah with respect to *Birkas HaMazon* refer to a *Yerushalmi* in *Brachos* (55b), which says that one does not repeat *Birkas HaMazon* over "mentioning" *Rosh Chodesh*, because on *Rosh Chodesh* there is no Mitzvah of eating (a bread meal). This is mainly discussed in the Halachos of *Birkas HaMazon* (O.C. 188:7), based on the *Bavli* (*Brachos* 49b) which says the same thing. Apparently, the Ra'avyah's version of the *Yerushalmi* said that on Chanukah the opposite is true; i.e. one *does* have to eat, and consequently one *does* "go back" over its "mention" in *Birkas HaMazon*. Now, anyone would agree with the above-mentioned "obvious" logic of the *Beis Yosef*, that such a *Yerushalmi* cannot possibly fit with the *Bavli*'s saying there's no obligation to "mention" Chanukah in *Birkas HaMazon* at all. But it seems that the Ra'avyah only brought his *Yerushalmi* to show that if the "mention" *would* be viewed as an obligation, then one would have to "go back" in *Birkas HaMazon* since on Chanukah one "has to eat" (in contrast with *Rosh Chodesh*); but of course, in order to say that we view it as an obligation, the Ra'avyah certainly needs his reasoning that "it's universal and he had it in mind." [Parenthetically, for our own discussion of whether "Chanukah meals" are a Mitzvah, see above (670:2).]

<sup>17</sup> From this *Mishnah Berurah*, we see that the references here are to the "*harachaman* section" near the end of *Birkas HaMazon*. There appears to be another position - that the references are to the "*harachaman*'s immediately after the fourth bracha [i.e. right after "*al yechasreinu*".]

<sup>18</sup> From the way the *Mishnah Berurah* discusses this "*harachaman*" (as mentioned above), it seems that he's saying it is the accepted Halacha. Indeed, the *Rema* in the Halachos of *Birkas HaMazon* (187:4) writes it without the phrase "some hold".

between "Al HaNissim" and the "closing bracha"), despite the fact that "Al HaNissim" in *Birkas HaMazon* is not an actual obligation. [The *Mishnah Berurah* (*siman* 582 n16) says the same thing regarding a similar "supplement which is not an actual obligation" ("u'chesov lechayim tovim" in the Days of Repentance).]

Incidentally, the *Mishnah Berurah* brings (from the *Pri Megadim*) that even on Shabbos Chanukah, when one is obligated to eat because it's Shabbos, one still does not "go back" over not having said "Al HaNissim".<sup>19</sup>

#### THE WORDING OF "AL HANISSIM"

The following version appears in "*Tractate Sofrim*" [see note to 676:4] (20:8):

*One says [as follows] in the bracha of "thanksgiving" ["Modim"]: "And the appreciation of [Your] wonders, and the Kohanim's deliverance which You performed in the days of Matisyahu the son of Yochanan the Kohen Gadol and the Hasmonean and his sons; and so too, Hashem our G-d and the G-d of our forefathers, [please] perform with us miracles and wonders - and we shall give thanks unto Your Name forever; Blessed are You Hashem - the Good" [etc.]. And so too, one also mentions the miracles of Mordechai and Esther in the Bracha of "thanksgiving" ["Modim"]. And both of them are mentioned in Birkas HaMazon.*

However, already in the writings of the *Gaonim*<sup>20</sup> we find the more familiar version:

*Over the miracles ["Al HaNissim"], and over the mighty deeds, and over the victories ["teshu'os"], and over the battles, and over the redemption ["pedus"], and over the salvation ["purkan"], which You performed for our forefathers, in those days, at this time: In the days of Matisyah the son of Yochanan the Kohen Gadol, [the] Hasmonean, and his sons, when the wicked Greek<sup>21</sup> kingdom rose up against them - against Your people Israel, to make them forget ["leshak'cham"] Your Torah ["miTorasecha"], and to separate them from the rules that You want; And You, with Your great mercies, stood up for them in the time of their trouble: You fought their fight, judged their judgment, avenged their vengeance. You delivered the strong into the hands of the weak, and the many into the hands of the few, and the wicked into the hands of the righteous, and the impure ["temayim"] into the hands of the pure, and the [wanton] sinners into the hands of those involved in Your Torah. And for Yourself, You made a great and holy Name in Your world; and for Your people Israel, You worked a great victory ["teshu'ah"] - and a salvation ["purkan"] - as [clear as] this very day. And afterwards, Your sons came to the focal point ["devir"] of Your House, and they cleared Your heichal\*, and they purified ["tiharu"] Your Beis HaMikdash, and they lit "candles"<sup>22</sup> in Your holy courtyards; and they established eight days with the saying of Hallel and with thanksgiving unto Your Name. And just*

<sup>19</sup> To understand this Halacha, see the above footnote about the Ra'avyah's reasoning.

<sup>20</sup> In particular, we are referring to what we found in the "*Seder Rav Amram Gaon*".

<sup>21</sup> The Hebrew "*Yevanim*" is traditionally translated "Greeks". Whether or not the oppressors of the Jews at the time of the Chanukah miracle should be described as "Greeks" is beyond the scope of this project.

<sup>22</sup> 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).

*as You performed a miracle with them, so too, Hashem our G-d, [please] perform with us miracles and wonders in this time, and we shall give thanks unto Your great Name uninterruptedly ["selah"].*

[Concerning the "request" at the end of both the above versions, see below in se'if 3.]

The *Beis Yosef* and *Darkei Moshe* (and the *Mishnah Berurah*) bring several detailed points [apparently focusing on versions more like that of the *Gaonim*]:

(1) The *Beis Yosef* brings from the *Orchos Chayim*<sup>23</sup> that the "Hasmonean" ["*chashmonai*"] is Yochanan<sup>23</sup>, and that some hold that the name comes from the *pasuk*\* (*Tehillim* 68:32), "The great ones [*chashmanim*] will bring."

(2) From the same source: Some hold that the word "wicked" (associated with the "Greek kingdom") is a noun [i.e. it means: " - the wicked one"]. According to that, it's pronounced "*haRish'ah*", as in the *pasuk* (*Zechariah* 5:8), "This is the wicked one."<sup>24</sup> However (the *Orchos Chayim* himself says), it is more correct to pronounce it "*ha'Resha'ah*", as an adjective, like the *pasuk* (*Yechezkel* 3:18), "from his wicked path."

(3) From the same source: One can ask: Why do we say "and the [wanton] sinners into the hands of those involved in Your Torah," which are not opposites (like all the others)? One can answer: It's based on the *pasuk* (*Tehillim* 119:51) "[Wanton] sinners mocked me exceedingly, [but] I did not swerve from Your Torah."

(4) The *Darkei Moshe* brings from the Avudraham<sup>25</sup>: [a] One says that the "kingdom rose up against Your people" (i.e. without the extra "against them" in between). (The *Mishnah Berurah* also brings this, adding, "unless he says 'and against Your people' [i.e. so that the word 'them' refers to the named protagonists].") [b] In the phrase, "to make them forget<sup>25</sup> Your Torah," the word for "Your Torah" is simply "*Torasecha*" (i.e. "*miTorasecha*" is incorrect).

(5) The *Mishnah Berurah* writes that at the beginning one says "*And*" over the miracles [etc.], and that at the end one says "these eight days 'of Chanukah'."

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

### "AL HANISSIM" IN THE SHEMONEH ESRAYOF MUSSAF

The Gemara (*Shabbos* 24a<sup>2</sup>):

**The Sages asked:** *Is it appropriate to mention<sup>26</sup> the subject of Chanukah in the Mussaf Shemoneh Esray?<sup>27</sup> [I.e. on the Shabbos and Rosh Chodesh that fall out during the days of Chanukah (Rashi).] Should*

<sup>23</sup> In *Megillah* (11a), *Matisyahu* and "the Hasmonean" are listed separately. This should prove that "the Hasmonean" cannot be *him*.

<sup>24</sup> He also brings a *pasuk* in *Yeshay'ah* (9:17), where the word is also a noun, except that there it means "wickedness".

<sup>25</sup> The word quoted above for "to make them forget" is "*leshak'cham*". We find this form in the Avudraham himself, as well. But in the *Darkei Moshe* (who also refers to additional sources for this point) and *Mishnah Berurah*, the familiar "*lehashkeecham*" is used. [This also seems to fit better with the Avudraham's "source *pasuk*" itself (*Yirmiyah* 23:37), "to make My nation forget ("*lehashkee'ach*") My Name."]

<sup>26</sup> source's wording: "What is [the Halacha about whether one ought] to mention".

<sup>27</sup> source's wording: "in *Mussaf(s)*". Rashi points out that it refers to prayer. As noted by the previous *se'if*, the Gemara (and the authorities) do not generally use the name "*Shemoneh Esray*"; it is usually referred to simply as "prayer".

we say that since we would not say *Mussaf* on Chanukah in its own right at all<sup>28</sup> - [therefore] we do not mention the subject of Chanukah in *Mussaf*? Or, perhaps we should rather say that since **this day itself** calls for saying *Shemoneh Esray* four times,<sup>29</sup> [consequently **this** *Shemoneh Esray* is no less deserving than the others (Rashi)]?

**Rav Huna and Rav Yehudah both said:** One does not mention it. **Rav Nachman and R' Yochanan both said:** One does mention it.

**In the end, the Gemara says that the Halacha is** [that one does mention it,] like that which R' Yehoshua ben Levi said: On Yom Kippur which falls out to be on Shabbos, one who says the *Shemoneh Esray* of Ne'ilah\* has to mention the subject of Shabbos, since **this day itself** calls for saying *Shemoneh Esray* four times [in the daytime (Rashi)]. The Halacha is **not** like the "other teachings" [of Rav Huna and Rav Yehudah and those who say similarly<sup>30</sup> (Rashi)].

Accordingly, the *Shulchan Aruch* rules: **In the [Shemoneh Esray of] Mussaf (of Shabbos and of Rosh Chodesh) as well, one has to mention [the subject] of Chanukah, even though there is no Mussaf [inherently] on Chanukah.**

#### IF ONE DID NOT SAY IT (IN MUSSAF)

The *Beis Yosef* says the *Hagahos Mordechai*<sup>o</sup> rules that one would have to "go back" so he can say it. He points out that the *Hagahos Mordechai* implies that others disagree with that. Therefore, the *Beis Yosef* explains that the *Hagahos Mordechai* himself is working with the approach of the Ra'avyah<sup>o</sup> [in the previous *se'if*], whereas according to our accepted ruling that even by a *regular Shemoneh Esray* one does not "go back", so how could we even *discuss* "going back" in *Mussaf*? Likewise, the *Mishnah Berurah* writes that one does not "go back". [The *Beis Yosef* here quotes a puzzling "responsum of the Rashba"; we omit it. (As the *Mor U'Ketzi'ah* points out, it's full of mistakes, and it doesn't seem that it can be from the Rashba at all.)]

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

#### TO REQUEST "JUST AS YOU PERFORMED" (ETC.) IN "AL HANISSIM"

As quoted above, the text from "*Tractate Sofrim*" concludes with the request: "And so too, [please] perform with us miracles," etc. The text we quoted from the *Gaonim* ended similarly: "And just as You performed a miracle with them, so too," etc.

<sup>28</sup> source's wording: "since it [i.e. Chanukah] does not have a *Mussaf* [service] in its own [right]."

<sup>29</sup> source's wording: "it's the day [itself] which has the obligation of four prayer [service]s."

<sup>30</sup> source's wording: "And the Halacha is not like "all these" teachings, but rather like that which R' Yehoshua ben Levi said", etc. [Before this conclusion, the Gemara brought a number of other teachings in between, which we omitted here.]

However, this is questioned in a discussion in Tosafos (*Megillah* 4a):

**Some hold that one should not include a "Just as You performed" request<sup>31</sup>, because the Sages said (*Brachos* 34a): "A person must never request his needs in the first three brachos of the *Shemoneh Esray* or in the last three *Brachos*."**

**But that reasoning is senseless:** After all, that principle is only applicable when it comes to praying in the singular [i.e. for the individual], whereas praying for the general public is *muttar*.

**Still, I hold that one in fact should not say it for a different reason:** The Sages said (*Pesachim* 117b) that the text for a matter which is "pertaining to the future" was always instituted with its wording formulated "pertaining to the future".<sup>32</sup> Therefore, since thanksgiving<sup>33</sup> is a matter "pertaining to the past", they [must have] instituted the form "*Al HaNissim*" [without requests] so it would be [entirely] "pertaining to the past".

The Tur<sup>o</sup> brings an example to prove that a request for the public is *muttar* in the last three *brachos*: the supplement "*Ya'aleh VeYavo*", which is said in the Bracha of "Service" ["*Retzay*"] on most *Yamim Tovim*<sup>\*</sup> [in which we request that Hashem "take note of us" and help us]. In any case, the *Shulchan Aruch* does rule like this differentiation of Tosafos, in the Halachos of the *Shemoneh Esray* (O.C. 112:1). The *Mishnah Berurah* there explains the reasoning: The first three *brachos* and the last three *brachos* are indeed reserved for showing honor to Hashem; however, to express that the public depends on Him is *inherently* a demonstration of His honor.

As for our subject itself, the Tur reports that the Rosh<sup>o</sup> would not recite a "Just as" request; rather, he concluded "*Al HaNissim*" with the words: "And You performed for them miracles and wonders, in those days at this time." The *Me'iri*<sup>o</sup>, on the other hand, defends the request, saying that since in any case "*Al HaNissim*" is "primarily thanksgiving", so therefore "concluding with a little prayer doesn't hurt." The final analysis of the *Beis Yosef* (which includes bringing the *Orchos Chayim* as defending the "Just as" request, and mentioning that the Rambam supports it) ends with the conclusion: "Whatever you do - you're covered."

In fact, the *Shulchan Aruch* brings the stringent position of Tosafos and the Rosh "anonymously": **One does not say "Just as You performed" etc., but rather one concludes: "And You performed for them miracles and might[deed]s, in those days at this time"; [On the other hand,] some hold that one does say it [i.e. the "Just as" request].**

<sup>31</sup> source's wording: "There are those that do not say 'Just as'."

<sup>32</sup> This principle, as formulated by Tosafos, is not what the Gemara says. Rather, it lists cases where a *bracha* in the *Shemoneh Esray* is expressed in future tense, as opposed to a parallel *bracha* found elsewhere which says the same thing but in past tense. (For example, in the middle of the *Shemoneh Esray* there is a *bracha* which calls Hashem "the [future] Redeemer of Israel", whereas the parallel *bracha* after the *Sh'ma* {and on Pesach night} ends "Who redeemed Israel".) The Gemara repeatedly explains the reason for the difference: because in the *Shemoneh Esray*, "it's prayer." The Tosafos apparently interprets this as meaning that *there*, it's a matter which is "pertaining to the future". The *Mishnah Berurah* in the Halachos of *Sh'ma* (*siman* 66 n33) explains the idea as follows: "[The *bracha* here ends] 'Who redeemed Israel', [in] past tense, because it refers to the 'redemption of Egypt' [i.e. the original Exodus], but in [the parallel *bracha* in] the *Shemoneh Esray* prayer one says 'the [future] Redeemer of Israel', because 'it's prayer' - and [that means] one is praying about the future."

<sup>33</sup> This seems to refer to the *bracha* ["*Modim*"], and *not* to the requirement of *supplementary* "thanksgiving" in connection with Chanukah.

That seems to decide clearly in favor of Tosafos, but the *Mishnah Berurah* brings the *Beis Yosef's* conclusion that "whatever you do - you're covered."