

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

Mav the studing of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and mav their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Mentioning Chanukah in Birkas Hamazon

The *Gemora* inquires whether one should mention *Chanukah* in *Birkas Hamazon*. Perhaps there is no need, since *Chanukah* is only Rabbinic, or perhaps it is necessary, to publicize the miracle.

Rava quotes Rav Sechorah in the name of Rav Huna saying that one need not mention it, but if he does, he should do so in the blessing of thanks.

Rav Huna bar Yehudah went to the house of Rava, and he thought he should mention it in the blessing of Yerushalayim, just as one does when mentioning other special days (e.g., *Shabbos and Yom Tov*). Rav Sheishes told him that just as one mentions it in the blessing of thanks in *Shemoneh Esrei*, one mentions it in the blessing of thanks in *Birkas Hamazon*. 924a)

Mentioning Rosh Chodesh in Birkas Hamazon

The *Gemora* inquires whether one mentions *Rosh Chodesh* in *Birkas Hamazon*. Even if one need not mention *Chanukah* in *Birkas Hamazon*, perhaps one must mention *Rosh Chodesh*, as it is from the Torah, or perhaps one need not mention it since work is not forbidden on it.

Rav says that one must mention it, while Rabbi Chanina says one need not.

Rav Zerika says that we should follow Rav, as Rabbi Oshaya agrees with him, as we see from *braisa* taught by Rabbi Oshaya. The *braisa* states that days that have a *Mussaf* sacrifice, such as *Rosh Chodesh* and the intermediate days of *Yom Tov*, one mentions the day in the blessing of the service in all three

prayers, and he must repeat the prayer if he forgot it. There is no *Kiddush* on wine, but one must mention them in *Birkas Hamazon*. On days that have no *Mussaf*, such as the Monday and Thursday of fast days for rain, and the fast days of the *Ma’amados* – assemblage for the sacrifices, one mentions the fast day in the blessing of *Shome’a Tefillah* – Hashem hears prayers in all three prayers, but need to repeat the prayer if he forgot it. These days are not mentioned in *Birkas Hamazon*. (24a)

Mentioning Chanukah in Mussaf

The *Gemora* inquires whether one must mention *Chanukah* in the *Mussaf* prayer (of *Shabbos or Rosh Chodesh*). Since *Chanukah* has no *Mussaf* of its own, perhaps one need not mention it, or perhaps the obligation to mention it in *Tefillah* applies to any *Tefillah* of the day, including *Mussaf*.

Rav Huna and Rav Yehudah say that one does not mention it, while Rav Nachman and Rabbi Yochanan say that one does mention it.

Abaye told Rav Yosef that Rav Huna and Rav Yehudah’s position follows Rav.

Rav Gidal quotes Rav saying that when *Rosh Chodesh* is on *Shabbos*, one doesn’t mention it in the blessing of the *Haftarah* from the Prophets, since *Rosh Chodesh* on its own does not have a *Haftarah*.

The *Gemora* challenges the comparison, as *Rosh Chodesh* never has a *Haftarah*, while *Chanukah* does have its own three prayers aside from *Mussaf*.

Rather, the *Gemora* says that it is similar to another statement of Rav (cited by Rav Achdevoi in the name of Rav Masnah) that if

Yom Tov falls out on *Shabbos*, one doesn't mention it in the *Haftarah* at *Minchah*, since *Yom Tov* on its own has no *Haftarah* at *Minchah*.

The *Gemora* concludes that we do not rule this way, but rather follow Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, who says that if *Yom Kippur* falls out on *Shabbos*, one mentions *Shabbos* in the *Ne'ilah* prayer. Although *Shabbos* on its own does not have *Ne'ilah*, any prayer said on *Shabbos* must include a mention of *Shabbos*.

The *Gemora* challenges this ruling from a ruling by Rava that if *Yom Tov* falls out on *Shabbos*, one does not mention *Yom Tov* in the *mai'ain sheva* - abridged repetition of *Shemoneh Esrei* the chazzan says at *Ma'ariv*, since *Yom Tov* has no *mai'ain sheva* on its own.

The *Gemora* deflects this, as *mai'ain sheva* in principle would not be said on *Shabbos*, and is only said to avoid danger (for people who would otherwise be left alone). Therefore, *Yom Tov* is not mentioned, as it is not a bona fide prayer. However, in the case of *Chanukah*, we mention it in all prayers of the day. (24a – 24b)

Lighting with Cooked Tallow

The *Mishna* said that one may not light a candle from tallow. Nachum Hamadi says that one may light with cooked (i.e., liquid) tallow, while the Sages say that one may not use tallow, cooked or not.

The *Gemora* asks what the difference is between the first opinion and the Sages and says that they differ on whether one may light with cooked tallow mixed with permitted oil, as Rav Bruna allows, although it is unclear who allows it and who does not. (24b)

Prohibited and Permitted Oils

The *Mishna* says that one may not light on *Yom Tov* with *shemen seraifah* – oil of burning, i.e. of impure *terumah*, which must be burned. Rabbi Yishmael says one may not light with *itrans* due to the honor of *Shabbos*. The Sages allow all oils – sesame oil, nut oil, radish oil, fish oil, gourd oil, *itrans*, and *neft*. Rabbi Tarfon says one may only light with olive oil. (24b)

Burning Impure Terumah

The *Gemora* asks why one may not light on *Yom Tov* with impure *terumah* oil, and answers that one may not burn holy items on *Yom Tov*.

The *Gemora* offers the following sources for this rule:

1. Chizkiya taught a *braisa* which learns from the verse about burning *nossar* – leftover sacrifice meat that one burns it after *Yom Tov*. The verse says that you shouldn't leave over from the Pesach sacrifice until the morning (i.e., of *Yom Tov*), and the leftover from the sacrifice *ad boker* – until the morning, you should burn in fire. The repeated phrase "until the morning" teaches that one must wait the next morning, after *Yom Tov*, to burn it.
2. Abaye says that the verse refers to the *olah* sacrifice of each *Shabbos* [brought on] its *Shabbos*, implying that one may not burn the sacrifice on a weekday on *Shabbos* or *Yom Tov*.
3. Rava says that the verse about *Yom Tov* permitting work for food preparation says *hu levado* – only it shall be done. The word *hu* – it excludes work for items that enable food preparation (e.g. fixing a knife), while the word *levado* – only excludes a circumcision that isn't on the eighth day, which we logically would have thought would override *Yom Tov*. We learn from the case of circumcision that a *mitzvah* which must not be done on this day, including burning something holy to dispose of it, may not be done on *Yom Tov*.
4. Rav Ashi says that since *Yom Tov* is both a positive and negative commandment, it is not overridden by the active *mitzvah* to dispose of holy items. (24b – 25a)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Chanukah in Birkas Hamazon

The *Gemora* inquires whether one should mention *Chanukah* in *Birkas Hamazon*.

Tosfos (24a mahu) explains that although one must mention it in *Tefillah*, the *Gemora* was unsure of *Birkas Hamazon*. *Tefillah* lends itself more readily to publicizing the miracle, since it is said

publicly in the synagogues, while *Birkas Hamazon* is said at home.

Work on Rosh Chodesh

The *Gemora* inquires whether one must mention *Rosh Chodesh* in *Birkas Hamazon*. Although it is from the Torah, work is not forbidden on it.

Tosfos (24a o dilma) notes that the *Gemora* in Megillah considers *Rosh Chodesh* a day in which people will not miss work by having a longer reading of the Torah, implying that people do not work on *Rosh Chodesh*. Tosfos explains that although there is no formal prohibition of work, there is a custom to avoid work.

Mentioning a Fast

The *Gemora* quotes a *braisa* which states that on fast days one mentions the fast day at the three Tefillos – *Ma'ariv*, *Shacharis*, and *Minchah*.

Rashi explains that technically one should mention it in all three *Tefillos*, since the fast day has begun at night, even though we do not actually fast until the morning.

Rashi further explains that our custom is not to mention it at night, and not even in the morning, lest the person praying not be able to complete the fast. We only mention it at *Minchah*, at which point the fast is almost over, and we can assume that the person praying will complete it successfully.

Tosfos (24a ta'anios) explains that the *Chazzan* says it at *Shacharis* as well, as the fast has begun, and presumably *someone* from the congregation will fast, making it a valid prayer.

The Rif rules like the *braisa* cited by the *Gemora*.

The Ba'al Hama'or says that on fasts that begin in the morning, one should not mention the fast at night, as he still has not started his fast.

The Shulchan Aruch (OH 565 1,3) states that one must mention the fast in *Tefillah*, and cites those who only mention it at *Minchah*.

The Shulchan Aruch rules that on a communal fast day, all should mention it in all *Tefillos*, while the Rama says that custom in his region is to mention it only in *Minchah* for all fast days.

The custom of Sefardim is primarily to follow the Ba'al Hama'or, with the exception of *Tishah b'Av*, in which they mention it in all *Tefillos*, as it already began at night. (See Chazon Ovadia on Arba Ta'anios p 71)

The Haftarah Brachos

The *Gemora* discusses whether one must mention *Chanukah* in the *Mussaf* of the intervening *Rosh Chodesh* and *Shabbos*. Among other statements, the *Gemora* cites Rav Gidal in the name of Rav saying that if *Rosh Chodesh* is on *Shabbos*, one does not mention *Rosh Chodesh* in the blessing of the *Haftarah*, since the *Haftarah* is only due to *Shabbos*. The *Gemora* concludes that we do not rule like the statements it cited, but rather like Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi, who says that one must mention *Shabbos* in the *Ne'ilah* of *Yom Kippur*, even though there is no *Ne'ilah* on *Shabbos* itself.

Rashi and the Rif include Rav Gidal's statements in the list of ones the *Gemora* rejects, but Tosfos (24b v'lais) says that Rav Gidal's is accepted, because *Rosh Chodesh* doesn't ever have its own *Haftarah* at all, as opposed to *Shabbos* and *Chanukah*, which do have *Tefillos* on their own.

The Rosh and the Ran cite Rabbeinu Yonah as agreeing with Rashi, but explain that they only say that one mentions *Rosh Chodesh* in the last *brachah* of the *Haftarah*, but it is not included in the conclusion of the *brachah*.

The Rambam (Tefilla 12:16) also rules like this.

The Shulchan Aruch (OH 284:2) cites the ruling of Tosfos, mentions the opinion of the Rif and the Rambam, but concludes that the custom follows Tosfos.

A similar question is whether one should mention *Chol Hamoed* in the *brachah* of the *Haftarah* of *Shabbos Chol Hamoed*. In principle, just as the custom is to not mention *Rosh Chodesh*, one should not mention *Chol Hamoed*, as it has no *Haftarah* of its own.



The Darkei Moshe (OH 663:2) cites a custom of mentioning *Chol Hamoed* in the *brachah* of the *Shabbos Haftarah* only on Sukkos. He suggests that this is because each day of Sukkos had a different number of sacrifices, and we therefore reflect that by mentioning its presence in the *brachah* of the *Haftarah*.

The Gra (Ma'aseh Rav 226) disputes this ruling, and says that we do not mention *Chol Hamoed* in either case. See Kaf Hahayim (490:78) and Chazon Ovadia (Hilchos Sukos p 219) for a discussion of the Sefardi custom.

Is Rosh Chodesh Tefillah without ya'aleh v'yavo considered Tefillah?

By: Meoros HaDaf HaYomi

Our *sugya* is the source for one of the most well-known laws in hilchos *Tefillah*. If a person forgets to mention *ya'aleh v'yavo* in *Shemoneh Esrei* for *Rosh Chodesh* or *Chol Hamoed*, he must repeat his *Shemoneh Esrei* (Shulchan Aruch O.C. 422:1). If he omitted *ya'aleh v'yavo* from the *berachah* for *avodah* (*retzeih*) and noticed his mistake before beginning *modim*, he should recite *ya'aleh v'yavo* immediately. If he noticed any time between the beginning of *modim* and the end of *Shemoneh Esrei*, he must return to *retzeih* and proceed from there. If he is accustomed to reciting petitions such as "*Elokai, netzor*" at the end of *Shemoneh Esrei*, this is considered part of *Shemoneh Esrei* and he may still return to *retzeih*. If he noticed after completing *Shemoneh Esrei* entirely, he must return to the beginning of *Shemoneh Esrei*.

Double forgetfulness: In this article, we will focus on the interesting case of a doubly forgetful person who concluded davening on *Rosh Chodesh* and realized that he had forgotten *ya'aleh v'yavo*. He then repeated *Shemoneh Esrei* from the beginning, as is the *halachah*, and after completing *Shemoneh Esrei* realized that this time he recited "*morid hagesehem*" in place of "*morid hatal*," an error that would normally require one to repeat *Shemoneh Esrei*. What should this person do? Need he repeat *Shemoneh Esrei* yet again?

At the heart of this question lies an investigation into how our Sages viewed a *Tefillah* that lacked *ya'aleh v'yavo*, (or any of the other insertions whose omission would require one to repeat

Shemoneh Esrei). Do we consider it as if he has not davened at all? Or perhaps we consider it as if he has davened, but since he lacked a necessary insertion he must repeat the entire *Shemoneh Esrei* in order to recite the insertion.

If we consider it as if he has not davened at all: then the first *Tefillah* was not a *Tefillah* – since it lacked *ya'aleh v'yavo*; the second *Tefillah* was also not a *Tefillah* – because he confused *morid hagesehem* with *morid hatal*, and he therefore must daven a third time. However, if we consider each *Tefillah* to be a proper *Tefillah* despite the omission, then each *Tefillah* completes what the other one lacked, and he need not daven again.

The leading poskim throughout the generations debate this very issue. Many rule that he need not daven again (Gur Aryeh Yehudah O.C. §17; Mekor Chaim §108; Birkas Habayis 17:29), while others rule that both *Tefillos* are entirely invalid and he must indeed daven a third time (Mateh Efraim 582:21; Magen Giborim §104, Elef Hamagen s.k. 9; Resp. Likutei Tzvi §10; Resp. Maharshag I O.C. §52; et. al.).

He will most likely forget the third time: The author of Yagel Yaakov (O.C. §23) presents a different argument. Even if we were to consider both *Tefillos* to be invalid, we should not instruct such a person to daven a third time. If he erred in his davening twice, he will most likely err the third time as well. Only if he can assess his own concentration that this time he will certainly not err, then he should daven again.

Contemporary poskim (Levushei Mordechai *tinyana*, O.C. §12; Resp. Har Tzvi O.C. I §54; Minchas Yitzchak X §40) suggest that one should daven a third time and make a condition that if he is required to daven again he intends to herewith fulfill his obligation; and if he is not required then his *Tefillah* should be a voluntary *Tefillahs nedavah*. Thereby, all of the above opinions will be satisfied. As a basis for this decision, they draw upon the following *machlokes* Rishonim:

If a person forgot to include *ya'aleh v'yavo* on *Rosh Chodesh Minchahh*, he did not fulfill his obligation. If he noticed before nightfall, he must repeat *Minchahh*. If he noticed only after nightfall, when *Rosh Chodesh* is over, would he then need to daven a second *Shemoneh Esrei* after *maariv* as *tashlumin* (replacment) for the missed *Minchahh*? Some Rishonim hold that



he must daven a *Tefillahs tashlumin*, as if he did not daven *Minchah* at all. Others hold that he need not.

This *machlokes* appears to be based upon the same principles we discussed above. If *Shemoneh Esrei* of *Rosh Chodesh* without *ya'aleh v'yavo* is not a *Tefillah*, one needs to daven *Tefillahs tashlumin* after *maariv* (without *ya'aleh v'yavo*) to make up for it. But if the *Shemoneh Esrei* is merely a deficient *Tefillah*, and one need only daven again in order to make up reciting *ya'aleh v'yavo*, then there is no point in davening *Tefillahs tashlumin* after *maariv*, since he will be unable to recite *ya'aleh v'yavo* after the conclusion of *Rosh Chodesh* (Har Tzvi *ibid.*, *Minchas Yitzchak ibid.*). In this case, the *Shulchan Aruch* rules that one must daven again, making a condition that if he is exempt his *Tefillah* should be considered voluntary. The contemporary *poskim* apply this ruling to our case above, since the underlying principles are identical.

May he be included in a minyan? The *Mishneh Halachos* (XI §76) presents another interesting question, which ostensibly might depend on our discussion. If a person omitted *ya'aleh v'yavo* and must daven again, may he be included as one of the ten men for a minyan? If we consider his first *Shemoneh Esrei* to be entirely invalid, he is now fully obligated to daven and may be considered part of a minyan no less than the others who had not davened yet at all. However, if we consider his *Shemoneh Esrei* merely a deficient *Tefillah*, and he need only daven again in order to include *ya'aleh v'yavo*, perhaps he should not be included in the minyan. The *Mishneh Halachos* rules that even if the first *Shemoneh Esrei* was valid he may be included in a minyan. Whatever the reason for his obligation may be, he is now obligated to daven, even if it is his second *Minchah* of the day.

Mentioning the day in a prayer that is not associated to the day

Shabbos Chol Hamoed is marked with two distinct forms of holiness – that of *Shabbos* and that of the Festival. Therefore, the *Shemoneh Esrei* prayers include mention of them both. Nevertheless, the accepted *halachah* is as the *Remo* writes (O.C. 490:9), “We do not mention Pesach in the *berachos* of the *haftorah*, neither in the middle of the *berachah* nor at its conclusion.” Although one of the *berachos* of the *haftorah* is dedicated to the holiness of the day, it mentions *Shabbos* alone and makes no mention of the Festival.

The *Vilna Gaon zt”l* cites our *Gemara* as the source for this *halachah*. In our *Gemara*, *Rav Gidel* cites in the name of *Rav* that when *Rosh Chodesh* occurs on *Shabbos*, the *berachah* after the *haftorah* should mention only *Shabbos*, and not *Rosh Chodesh*. “If not for *Shabbos*, we would not read (a *haftorah* from) Prophets on *Rosh Chodesh*,” he reasons. Since *Rosh Chodesh* is not a factor in the *haftorah* reading, it need not be mentioned in the *berachah*.

Based on this, it is well understood that the same should apply on *Shabbos Chol Hamoed*. If not for *Shabbos*, we would not read a *haftorah* on *Chol Hamoed*. Therefore there is no need to mention Pesach in the *haftorah's berachos*. This is in contrast to *Shemoneh Esrei*, where mention is made of both. Each one individually would have required its own mention in *Shemoneh Esrei*, and when they coincide they must both be mentioned.

Surprisingly, the *Sefer Haminhagim* by *Maha”ri Tirna* (p. 135, cited by the *Remo* in *Darkei Moshe Hilchos Sukkos*, 663:2) differentiates between *Chol Hamoed Pesach* and *Chol Hamoed Sukkos*. The above is true on *Shabbos Chol Hamoed Pesach*, he writes, but on *Shabbos Chol Hamoed Sukkos* we must conclude the *berachah* on the *haftorah* with, “Blessed are You, Hashem, Who sanctifies the *Shabbos*, Israel and the Festivals.” What reasoning could possibly be found to differentiate between the two? Indeed, the *Vilna Gaon* (*Maaseh Rav* 226) rejects this opinion, and writes that *Sukkos* is equal to *Pesach* in this regard.

However, the *Aruch Hashulchan* (490:5) and the *Remo* (*Darkei Moshe ibid.*) explain that *Sukkos* is distinct from *Pesach*, because on each day of *Pesach* the same *korbanos* were offered in the *Beis HaMikdash*. There is nothing to mark each day of *Chol Hamoed* as unique. However, each day of *Sukkos* had its own unique number of *korbanos*, one bull less than the day before. Therefore, even today when there is no *Beis HaMikdash*, each day is recognized with its own unique holiness that warrants mention in the *berachah* of the *haftorah*, even though it is *Shabbos* and not *Chol Hamoed* that requires the *haftorah* reading (See *Mishna Berurah* 490, s.k. 16).