

U

THE AARVITH SERVICE IN ITS HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT.

AN ESSAY treating of the subject of the historical development of the Aarvith service, setting forth the growth of the third daily prayer, the importance of the tefillath Aarvith, the combination of the shma of the evening and the tefillath Aarvith, the shma al hamitta, an analysis of the Aarvith prayers, the time of the day for the recitation of the Aarvith, the Aarvith as a congregational service, and the Kiddush and Habdala.

SUBMITTED to the Faculty of the Hebrew Union College as part requirement for the degree of Rabbi.

respectfully,

Joseph Fink

Feb. 1, 1919.

Rec. 8/78

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	page.
<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	I
<u>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</u>	II.
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1-3.
<p style="margin-left: 40px;">Jewish prayer in general; evolution of prayers; the three services of the day; Aarvith Payutin; general outline.</p>	
<u>CHAPTER I</u> ----- <u>THE GROWTH OF THE DAILY PRAYERS</u>	4-10.
a) Periods of prayer in early times.	4.
b) The three daily recitations of prayers.	6.
c) Prayer as an accompaniment to the sacrifices	7.
d) The Shma of the evening.	8.
<u>CHAPTER II</u> ----- <u>THE TEFILLATH AARVITH</u>	11-17.
a) The Tefillath Aarvith; whether optional or oblig- atory.	11.
b) The two interpretations of the significance of the tefilloth.	13.
c) The early Aarvith compared with the Mincha in form and time of recitation.	15.
<u>CHAPTER III</u> ----- <u>THE COMBINATION OF THE SHMA AND THE TEFILLAH OF AARVITH.</u>	18-26.
a) The question whether the tefillah of Aarvith should precede or follow the shma.	18.
b) The Neila service and the Aarvith.	21.
c) The shma and its benedictions. - Hashkevenu and the principle of joining "geullah" with tefillah.	24.

page
27-31.

CHAPTER IV ----- THE SHMA AL HAMITTA -----

- a) The tendency of the Rabbis to conserve old customs- 27.
- b) The new significance of the Shma al Hamitta.----- 28.
- c) The accompanying berachoth of the Shma al Hamitta----- 29.
- d) Additional prayers to the Shma al Hamitta.----- 31.

CHAPTER V ----- AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRAYERS. ----- 32-50.

- a) Various rituals. ----- 32.
- b) The Aarvith prayers preceding the shma. ----- 33.
- c) The shma. ----- 36.
- d) The benedictions following the shma. ----- 40.
- e) The shortened tefillah - םללל ןללל ----- 43.
- f) The closing eulogy - ןללל ןללל ----- 46.
- g) The private prayer - Tachnun ----- 47.
- h) The tefillah. ----- 47.

CHAPTER VI ----- TIME OF THE DAY FOR THE RECITATION OF AARVITH-51-53

- a) In the early period - no fixed time. ----- 51.
- b) Time for the recitation of tefillath Aarvith fixed- 52.

CHAPTER VII ----- THE AARVITH AS A CONGREGATIONAL SERVICE ----- 54-56.

- a) The tefillah of Aarvith not repeated by the reader--54.

CHAPTER VIII ----- THE KIDDUSH AND THE HADBALAH. ----- 57-60.

- a) The Kiddush. ----- 57.
- b) The Hadbalah. ----- 58.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I.

Abudraham, Sefer: Prague, 1784.

Adler, E.N.: Liturgy of the Jews of Persia, in J.Q.R. vol. X. p. 601.

Anram, Seder Rab: Warsaw 1865.

Baer, S.: Seder Avodath Israel.

Bousset, W.: Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter.

Büchler, A.: The Blessing ברכה ירושלמי in the Liturgy, in J.Q.R. vol. XX p. 799 ff.

Dembitz, L.N.: Jewish Services in Synagogue and Home.

Elbogen, I.: Eingang und Ausgang des Sabbats nach talmudischen Quellen, in Festschrift zu Israel Lewy's Siebzigsten Geburtstag. p. 173-187.

Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung.

Two articles 1) פירוש על שמע (2) עבר לפני התיבה in J.Q.R. vol. XIX, p. 229 ff. and p. 704 ff. respectively.

Encyclopedia, Jewish: articles, Liturgy, Maarib, Prayer.

Realencyklopadie: Articles, Gebet, Gottesdienst.

Goldstein, M.A.: Gebet und Glaube (התפלה והאמונה).

Graetz, H.: History of the Jews. vol. I, II, VI.

Herzfeld, L.: Gesch. d. Volkes Israel XXIV. Exkurs. Ueber die erste Entwicklung des Synagogen Gottesdienstes.

Jawitz, W.: סקור התפילות Die Liturgie des Siddur und ihre Entwicklung.

Josephus: The Antiquities of the Jews.

Bibliography (cont.)

Kohler, K.: Jewish Theology.

The Psalms and their Place in the Liturgy.

Ueber die Ursprünge und Grundformen des synagogalen
Liturgie.

Landshuth, L.: ^לבְּקוֹר בְּרַבָּה commentary to Edelmann's Siddur ^לבְּקוֹר בְּרַבָּה.

Mischcon, A.: Studies in the Liturgy: ^לבְּקוֹר בְּרַבָּה in The Jewish Re-
view vol.I. p.358 ff.

^לMe'sichtah Sofrim: ed. by Joel Mueller.

Oesterly, W.O.E.: The Psalms in the Jewish Church.

Oesterly and Box: The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue.

Pineles, H.M.: ^לדְּרַשׁ שֶׁ בְּיָמֵינוּ.

Rashi: Siddur Rashi ed.by Buber and Freimann.

Saadia: Der Siddur des Rabbi Saadia Gaon, von J.Bondi.

Schechter, S.: Fragments from Cairo Genizah, in J.Q.R.vol.X p.654.

Schürer, E.: A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus
Christ. Second Division vol.II.and in German edition
index "Gebet."

Singer, S.: Daily Prayerbook, Notes by Israel Abrahams.

Vitry, Nachsor, ed. by S.Hurwitz.

Zunz, L.: Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden.

Die Ritus des synagogalen Gottesdienstes.

Die synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters.

Bible: Various references.

Talmud, Babli: Berachoth, Megilla, Menachoth, Pesachim, Rosh Hash-
onah, Shabboth, Taanith, Tamid, Yoma.

Talmud, Jerushalmi: Berachoth, Pesachim, Taanith.

Shulchan Aruch, Orach Hayyim.

Bibliography (Cont.)

Kizzur Shulchan Aruch, Hilchoth Tefillath Aarvith.

Siddurim of various minhagin.

Sifre on Deuteronomy.

Midrash Raba: various references.

Tanhuma: Pinhas.

"Turim" Orach Hayyim.

"Yad" Hilchoth Tefillah.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

II.

Aar.	----	Aarvith.
Ant.	----	"The Antiquites of the Jews." Josephus.
b	-----	Babli.
Ber.	----	Berachoth.
ch.	----	chapter.
Chron.	-	Chronicles.
comm.	---	commentary.
Dan.	----	Daniel.
Deut.	---	Deuteronomy.
Ex.	-----	Exodus.
Gen.	----	Genesis.
H.	-----	Hilchoth.
Is.	-----	Isaiah.
j.	-----	Jerushalmi.
J. Q. R.	---	Jewish Quarterly Review.
Jer.	----	Jeremiah.
K.	-----	Kings.
Levit.	-	Leviticus.
M.	-----	Mishna.
Meg.	----	Megilla.
Neh.	----	Nehemiah.
Nu.	-----	Numbers.
O. H.	----	Orach Hayyim.
P.	-----	page.
Pes.	-----	Pesachim.
Ps.	-----	Psalms.
R.	-----	Rabbi, Rab, or Rabban.
R. H.	----	Rosh Hashonah.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS (cont.)

Sam. ---- Samuel.

Shabb. -- Shabbath.

Taan. --- Taanith.

Tef. ---- Tefillah.

Yad. ---- "Yad ha Hazakah" Maimonides.

Zach. --- Zachariah.

'ס ---- סנהג.

'סב ---- סבסב.

'ס ---- סים.

'פ ---- פרשה.

ש"ק ---- קריאת שמע.

INTRODUCTION

Jewish prayer in general. The Jewish liturgy is the product of years of development. Its roots penetrate deep into the life of the Jewish people. Unlike many of the other products of the Jewish genius, the liturgy is not the result of the speculative or halachistic bent of mind of the Jew. The liturgy above everything else is the product of the soul of the Jew. In it he expressed his wishes and hopes, both national and individual. Through it he poured out to God his innermost longing. The prayers, therefore, could not have been reasoned out, but were poured out of his soul and were then given definite shape and form. All phases of the life of the Jew were included in his liturgy. There were prayers for physical health, wisdom, prosperity and prayers for resurrection, destruction of apostates, reestablishment of the national state. The roots of the liturgy like those of a tree, which permeate into every part of the surrounding soil, extended into every corner of the life of the Jew. These prayers, then, entered into the trunk or the formation period when they were given fixed forms. Then the liturgy ^{branched} out into different minhagim. But the life and source of the Jewish liturgy was ever the soul of the Jew reaching upward toward God, although seeking expression through definite forms and rituals.

Evolution of prayers. The development of the prayers was evolutionary—from the individual prayer to the communal service. This development extended over a long period of years. We shall not concern ourselves with this aspect of the development of the prayers, only in so far as it bears directly on the Aarvith service and contributes toward the unfoldment of that one phase of

the liturgy of Israel to which this essay is devoted.

The three services of the day. The hours of prayer for the Jew finally crystallized in the morning (Shachrith), afternoon (Minha), and evening (Aarvith) services. In the synagogue to-day, these three times for prayer are strictly observed, with an almost equal importance and sanctity attached to each. The subject of this essay is the third service of the day-the Aarvith. To-day, it is usually recited in the synagogue a short while after night-fall. However, if the individual prays alone, he very often waits until a very late hour in the evening before reciting the Aarvith. The historical development of this Aarvith service will be attempted by the writer of this essay.

Aarvith Payutim. We shall not concern ourselves with the payutim which were later added to the Aarvith, because they do not form part of the established, authoritative Aarvith service recited in the synagogue every day. They were merely later embellishments, added for special occasions and do not serve as an integral part of the Aarvith service with which this essay is concerned.

General Outline. We will discuss the subject of the development of the Aarvith service under the following heads: 1) The Growth of the Daily Prayers, which will deal with the crystallization of prayer in the three periods of the day-morning, afternoon, and evening-and with especial emphasis on the growth and early development of the last ~~three~~ of these three services. 2) The Tefillath Aarvith, which will treat of the question whether the tefillath Aarvith of the day was considered obligatory or optional (חובה or שו"ת). 3) The Combination of the Shma and the Tefillah of Aarvith, which will treat of the arrangement of the Shma

3

of the evening and of the tefillath Aarvith in their present order and the principles involved in their arrangement. 4) The Shma al Hamittah, which will concern itself with the reasons for the preservation of the Shma al Hamittah after the Aarvith service had been established; the significance of this shma and its accompanying prayers. 5) An Analysis of the Aarvith Prayers, which will treat of the Aarvith prayers, their origin, composition and purpose. 6) Time of the Day for the Recitation of the Aarvith, which will concern itself with the question when the time for the recitation of the Aarvith became fixed. 7) The Aarvith as a Congregational Service, which will describe how the Aarvith tefillah is recited when prayed in a congregation. 8) The Kiddush and Habbalah, which will treat of these two prayers which are recited in the synagogue (and at home) at the entrance and exit of the Sabbath, respectively.

4

CHAPTER I--- THE GROWTH OF THE DAILY PRAYERS.

a) Periods of Prayer in Early Times. In the very early periods of Jewish life there were neither fixed prayers nor fixed times for prayer.^① A man prayed when his soul was burdened with sorrow or when he experienced great joy; he prayed for the fulfillment of a wish or for success in battle; he prayed at times of sickness for the recovery of his health, or at times of drought for rain and abundant crops. His prayers were therefore spontaneous both in time and in form. They were not externally superinduced upon him but were born of the needs of his own soul in contact with the everyday experiences of his life. (See Psalm 25; I Sam. 11; Jer. 31:9 et seq.)

As time progressed, the opinion seems to have prevailed that certain fixed times of the day were more propitious for prayer than others. These periods of the day were the morning and the evening - or at the rising and setting of the sun - the two periods which mark the changes of the day, thus manifesting God's power.^② Prayers then came to be regularly recited by cer-

Note ^① Tradition reports that at least one prayer a day was obligatory from the time of Moses to Ezra. ("Yad" Tefillah 1:3). This tradition reported by Maimonides, could not have been originated by him because he gives it as a tradition. It therefore must have been an old tradition transmitted through the ages and here written down and accepted by Maimonides.

Another tradition, reported by the Talmud, is that at the time of Ezra the prayers were ~~written and established~~, in time forgotten and then reestablished at the time of Gamliel. b. Megilla 18a ובי סאחר דפארה ועשרים זקנים ומתם במה לביאים תקנו תפלה עלה סדר שמעון
אמי הסדיר? שבחוס וחקר וסרום. These traditions, however, are, as will be later shown, unreliable and inaccurate.

Note ^② J. Ber. 7a R. Schmu'el bar Nachmeni says, that the prayers were introduced at these hours (morning, noon and evening) to correspond with the three times in which the day changes. Also in Berashith Raba we find this same statement with the additional prayer: בערב צריך
אדם למר ימי כצון מלפניך ה' אלהי שמוציאני מאפלה ואורה (See also j. Ber. 4,1)

tain individuals at these periods of the day.^③ Whether these times for the recitation of the prayers were original with the Jews or whether they were taken over from some other people (e.g. the Persians) is not our concern. What concerns us, is to find out the antiquity of the evening prayer by attempting to show that even in very early times it became a custom to recite some form of prayer toward the close of the day.

Although the report in Nehemiah IX seems to imply that there was then already some form of religious service, yet we have no clear evidence to maintain that at such an early period in Israel's history prayer already became a fixed institution and constituted a definite form of service. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence to prove that religious service - and especially the Aarvith service - was not a fixed form of service and was not couched in particular terms and forms until a much later period in Israel's historical development. Those men who accept the talmudic report that Ezra and the Men of the Great Synagogue instituted and formulated the prayers, have involved themselves in great difficulties in maintaining their theories in view of the later concrete historical evidence to the contrary, furnished by other parts of the Talmud. The talmudic report of the authorship of the prayers may be considered an attempt - perhaps unconscious - to

Note ③ . Josephus in Ant. IV 212 reports the tradition that it had been the duty of every Jew to say his prayers twice a day - morning and evening. (See also I Chron. 23:30).

add sanctity and authority to the prayers by thus ascribing them to olden times.^④

b) The Three Daily Recitations of Prayers.

The first definite statement of reciting prayers three times a day is found in the Book of Daniel 6:11, where it is remarked that "three times every day he kneeled upon his knees and prayed and offered thanks before his God, as he had been doing before that time." This would show that at that period there were some pious individuals who recited prayers three times a day - morning, afternoon and evening. This, then, indicates that at this time (time of the Maccabees) the practice of praying three times daily already existed. Perhaps Psalm 55:18 ערב ובקר וצהרים אשמח ואהמם "At evening, morning and noon will I make my complaint and moan," alludes to the same practice. At least, this verse was understood by the Rabbis to refer to this practice. Because in Midrash Tehillim 55:18 in interpreting this verse we find: אמר ר' שמואל סיבן

"R. Samuel says that from this we learn that a man should recite three tefilloth a day." Although the date of this psalm has not been definitely determined, yet, since we are certain of the date of Daniel we may safely say that at the time of the Maccabees this practice existed. Furthermore the statement in Daniel, "as he had been doing before this time" shows that the practice certainly existed previous to the time of the Maccabees. We, however, have no means of determining how long

Note ④. In b.Ber.33a R. Jochanan says: איש בנסת חגדולא תקנו להם אישכא. To give the prayers even greater authority we find that in b.Ber.26b, Jose bar Hanina says: תפלות אבות, and in j.Ber.4,1 we find the statement: אבות הראשונים התקינו. The Aarvith is ascribed to Jacob. (b.Ber.26b; j.Ber.7a-b) עקב תקן תפלת ערבית שנאמר ויפלג במקום וילן שם ואין פגיעה אף. The report of the Rabbis ascribing the prayers to the

7

before this time this practice of reciting prayers three times a day had been observed.

But this custom of reciting prayers three times a day was not, even at the time of the Maccabees, a generally observed - nor even generally recognized - one, and certainly there was not yet a definite evening service. All that can be said with a certainty, is that at the time of the Maccabees at these periods of the day, some of the people recited prayers to God, but that these prayers were fixed and determined can certainly not be maintained.^⑤

c) Prayer as an Accompaniment to the Sacrifices.

The arguments advanced above are corroborated by other evidence obtained from the position of prayer during the time of the second Temple. Because, in the time of the second Temple there were certain prayers associated with the temple sacrifices in the morning and afternoon. We know from abundant evidence that temple worship played an important part in the life of the people at the time of the second temple. As the sacrifices were offered up, the Levites recited prayers of thanksgiving and praise. (I Chron. 23:30; Neh. 11:17). There was, therefore, a basis in the

Men of the Great Synagogue - like these other reports - is merely another instance of that general tendency of the Rabbis to ascribe a higher antiquity and authority to certain matters by ascribing the authorship to some great personality or personalities in the Past.

Note^⑤. Herzfeld (in "Gesch. des Volkes Israel" p. 133) maintains that quite a while before the Maccabees the type of prayers was already known and that also a shema, a tefillah, and reading of the Torah were practiced. Therefore at the time of the Maccabees, he thinks, these prayers were already in a redacted although not in a final form. This is hardly probable as will be seen from evidence later advanced. At the time of the Maccabees there was certainly no Aarvith service.

religious worship of the temple for a morning and afternoon service, but there was none for the Aarvith except the Neila which was recited at just about sunset,^(b) or at the time of the closing of the temple gates (לִפְנֵי שַׁעַר הַמִּזְבֵּחַ) - and which may be considered the temple equivalent of what later became the synagogal Aarvith service.

The prayers which were recited in the temple along with the sacrifices, became firmly rooted in the religious life of the people, so that as the complement of the sacrificial cult and corresponding to it the recitation of prayers became essential; and it is probable, that the references in Daniel 6:11 and Psalm 55:18 are merely reflections of the gradual development and independance of the prayer-worship from the sacrificial cult. So that, at this period in Israel's historical development, there were prayers recited together with the sacrifices of the temple, and independant of them when the worshipper prayed away from the temple.

d) The Shma of the Evening. Apart from the above mentioned prayers and entirely independant of them and of the temple service, there were regularly recited in the homes of the people the shma of the morning and of the evening, based on the biblical injunction שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה יְחִיד (Deut. 6:7). This practice of reciting the shma in the morning and the evening is very old^(c) and was no doubt

Note (b) . תפילת נעילה זמנה כדי שישלם אותה סוף שקיעת החמה. ("Yad" 3:6) See below ch. III p. 21-22

Note (c) . Without entering into a discussion as to whether the shma is biblical or rabbinical, I would merely state, that it must have been sophoric. (See דרכי של תורה p. 19-20).

religiously observed by all.^⑧

What this shma of the home consisted of, is an important study although not entirely relevant to the subject matter of this essay. But in passing to broadly outline it, we find that in its earlier form, the shma of the evening itself had consisted of two chapters only.^⑨ It had been preceded by one or two benedictions;^⑩ and one benediction following the shma in the morning and two in the evening.^⑪ However the second benediction after the shma of the night, i. e. the Hashkevenu, is different in character from that of the other benedictions in that it is somewhat of the character of a real prayer. It is a prayer for God's protection during the night. Immediately after its recitation, the worshipper retired for the night.

Note ⑧ . We find numerous statements in the Talmud to the effect that the shma must be recited twice a day - in the morning and evening. (Mishna Ber. 1:3; b. Ber. 8b-9a). The recitation of the shma was accepted by all as a חובה (Menachos 43a). He who failed to recite it was condemned as an עובר עבירה. b. Ber. 47b. Mishna Tamid 5:1 reports that the shma was recited in the temple.

Note ⑨ . In early times the שמונה עשרה was omitted from the evening shma. (see below p. 37.)

Note ⑩ . Although the Mishna Ber. 1:4 states that both the shma of the morning and the evening were preceded by two benedictions yet the Mishna in Tamid 5:1 speaks of one preceding benediction (ברכה אחת). (see also b. Ber. 11b; and below p. 35).

Note ⑪ . It is quite probable that the morning and evening recitations of the shma had been similar in every respect - both having been preceded by two and followed by one benediction. The Hashkevenu stood as a tefillah to the evening shma and not originally merely as a concluding benediction. The command בשובך ובקומך does not imply any change in the prayers of the shma. On the contrary, it implies that the same prayers were recited at these two times. The benedictions of the shma, therefore, were originally probably the same for the morning and evening.

10

Summary. We have, therefore, seen that during the time of the second temple, there were two orders of prayer running independant of each other for the periods of the beginning and the close of the day. There were, on the one hand, the prayers which were recited together with the sacrifices as an accompaniment to the daily offerings - the sacrifices of the morning and the afternoon in the temple - and which also may have been recited independant of the sacrifices when away from the temple. (e.g. Dan. 6:11; Ps. 55:18). On the other hand, there was the recitation of the shma for the morning and the evening. How the Aarvith came to be developed as an independant service in addition to the services of the morning and afternoon, is the question with which we must now concern ourselves.

CHAPTER II ---- THE TEFILLATH AARVITH.

a) The Tefillath Aarvith; whether optional (רשות) or obligatory (חובה).

After the destruction of the temple and sacrifices had ceased, we find that the prayers to be recited daily were given a definite order and form. It is reported in the Talmud b.Ber.28b that:

שמעון הפקולי הסדיר ש"ג ברכות לפני רבן גמליאל על הסדר ביבנה

"Simon hapekuli arranged the eighteen benedictions in their order before ^{R.}Gamliel at Jabneh." The expression used הסדיר, shows that he did not originate them but only arranged them. As to what forms existed prior to this time we cannot attempt to say. But it is significant, that at about this same period a controversy arose over the question whether the tefillah of Aarvith was obligatory (חובה) or optional (רשות). This dispute, in regard to the tefillath Aarvith, was between the very same ^{R.}Gamliel (II) and R. Joshua. b.Ber.27b; j.Ber.7c. R.Gamliel maintained that it be considered obligatory; while Joshua considered it only optional. This dispute proves first, that the Shachrith and Minha prayers were accepted by all as obligatory. It was only the tefillah of Aarvith that was in question. This dispute further proves, that the tefillah of Aarvith already existed as a third equal service of the day. It was only the binding force of this tefillah that was questioned. No definite decision was reached. Even many later authorities disagreed on this same question, e.g. Abaya argued that it was a חובה while Raba argued that it was a רשות⁽¹²⁾. Yet the majority opinion

Note (12). Later authorities like Maimonides, Jacob ben Asher, Bertinoro, still consider the tefillah of Aarvith a רשות. Maimonides says ("Yad" Tef.1:6) ואין תפילת ארבעת הברכות שחרית ומנחה

was in favor of R. Gamliel, and though theoretically no definite decision was given on this question,⁽¹³⁾ yet from the point of view of practice we are safe in assuming that from this time the tefillah of Aarvith was generally accepted as somewhat obligatory. But it certainly must have been instituted previous to this time, and indeed it must have already been an established custom to recite it, else no controversy would have arisen over this question. The decision of this controversy then, was merely that, this custom generally received official sanction. Henceforth, it was considered a religious duty to recite the tefillah of Aarvith regardless of the theoretic disagreement amongst the Rabbis.⁽¹⁴⁾ It was the will of the people that established this prayer as obligatory. As Maimonides states: ("Yad" Tef.1:6) ואין תפילת ארביית חובה בתפילת שחרית וסניחה, ואף על פי כן נהגו כל ישראל בבית מקדשות מושבותיהם להתפלל ארביית וקבלה עליהם. Therefore, from the point of view of practice, the tefillath Aarvith became an established חובה at about the beginning of the second century C.E.

(Note) ben Asher states ("Turim" O.H. דף ס' ר"ח) ובשי"ע ה"ז יתפלל תפילת ארביית ואינה חובה. Bertinoro in his commentary on M.Ber.4:1 concludes, that in the dispute between R. Gamliel and R. Joshua those holding it to be optional were right but that the later generations have assumed the evening tefillah as a duty.

Note ⁽¹³⁾. In the Talmud we frequently find statements to the effect: אפוקי סמך דאמר תפילת ארביית רשות קט"ז דחובה b.Ber.4b, which shows that the question was not finally settled.

Note ⁽¹⁴⁾. In b.Ber.6b we find the interesting statement: אמר רב הונא פליגי ר' יוחנן אדס דתיר בתפילת הסניחה... ר"י אומר אף בתפילת ארביית. This shows the emphasis placed by some of the Rabbis on the tefillah of Aarvith, perhaps due to the fact that some of the people still considered it רשות and were lax in reciting it.

b) The Two Interpretations of the Significance of the Tefilloth.
 Unfortunately, R. Gamliel and R. Joshua did not state their reasons why they held their respective opinions about the tefillath Aarvith. But, may we not assume, that the difference of opinion between these two Rabbis represented two distinct tendencies of thought in regard to the origin, function and importance of the tefilloth? The one tendency of thought, was to consider the tefilloth the exact substitutes for the sacrifices, b. Ber. 26b תפילות תאמין תיב' ד'

והקריא, that is, the tefilloth were instituted to correspond with the daily sacrificial offerings. Although this statement is ascribed in the Talmud to Joshua b. Levi, who is a later authority, yet he is here undoubtably giving expression to a tendency of thought which had existed long before his time. In the statement made by R. Joshua that the tefillath Aarvith be considered a תפילה, we find an expression of this tendency of opinion about the significance of the tefilloth. Since the Tefillah of Aarvith did not serve as a direct substitute for a sacrifice which had been offered in the temple, R. Joshua maintains, that it should be considered merely a תפילה, because there was no sacrificial basis for its recitation. This tendency of thought wanted the tefilloth to be based on, correspond with and to be considered substitutes for, the sacrifices that had been offered up in the temple, thus complying in spirit with the words of Hoseah 14:3 ונשבעה פרי' ונשבעה

ו"א "and we shall repay the steers (of sacrifice) with (the prayer of) our lips." This tendency of thought persisted through the generations of Rabbis; some maintaining that the tefilloth are the equivalent of sacrifices and indeed, some even maintaining that the tefilloth are higher than sacrifices. b. Ber. 32b: ו"א אף על פי שזבחין עדיין קיימין

אף על פי שזבחין עדיין קיימין. Some said that as soon as the

The prayer was just the reverse.

temple was destroyed and sacrifices ceased, the gates of prayer were opened for man. b.Ber.32b: אמר ר' אבהו שחרב בית המקדש ונפתחו שערי תפלה. The tefilloth were, therefore, considered by some to be the direct substitutes for the sacrifices. (b.Meg.31b). The Shachrith tefillah naturally substituted for the morning sacrifice, and the Minha tefillah for the afternoon sacrifice. There was no sacrifice offered in the temple at night so that the Aarvith tefillah could not be made to correspond with, or serve as substitute for, any sacrifice.¹⁵ Therefore R. Joshua, in his dispute with R. Gamliel advocates that the tefillah of Aarvith be considered a תפלה, since it did not substitute for a definite sacrifice.

On the other hand, there was the other - and opposite - tendency of thought. The Rabbis who held this view maintained, that since sacrifices had now ceased, no distinction should be made between the different tefilloth of the day. They desired to divorce the tefilloth from any connection with the sacrifices. They wanted the tefilloth of Shachrith, Minha and Aarvith to be equally important. The tefilloth, according to this tendency of thought, were not merely substitutes for the sacrifices but were established by the patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac and Jacob) and were therefore independant of the sacrifices. b.Ber.26b: אמר ר' חנינא אמר תפלות. ל' יוסי ב"ר חנינא אמר תפלות. While Jose bar Hanina who makes this statement is, as

Note¹⁵. However when it became an established custom to recite the Aarvith tefillah, they tried to give it a sacrificial basis. Since some parts of the sacrifice burned on the altar all night, they said that the Aarvith should be made to correspond with and substitute for this: b.Ber.26b אמר ר' חנינא אמר תפלות. שוקרי אברים שלא נתעבדו מערב קרבנים והולכים בהם תפלה.

was Joshua ben Lewi, a later authority yet he, too, is here giving expression to a tendency of thought which had existed long before his time. Gamliel, therefore, in advocating that the tefillah of Aarvith be considered a *חובה*, is giving expression to the opinion of the significance of the tefilloth held by the Rabbis of this tendency of thought. Since the tefilloth were not substitutes for the sacrifices but had existed long before the sacrifices had been offered up in the temple, then certainly, he argued, the tefillath Aarvith, like the other tefilloth of the day should be considered a *חובה*. Why make a distinction between the tefilloth by considering the Aarvith tefillah merely a *זמנה* while you consider the other tefilloth of the day obligatory? Very consistently, therefore, he argued its adoption as a *חובה*.

We therefore see, that there were these two interpretations in regard to the significance of the tefilloth. The one emphasized that the tefilloth are the direct substitutes for the sacrifices and therefore the Aarvith tefillah, which did not directly substitute for a sacrifice, should merely be considered optional. The other interpreters of the significance of the tefilloth maintained, that the tefilloth were not the direct substitutes for the sacrifices but on the contrary, had existed long before the sacrifices had been instituted and therefore all the tefilloth of the day were of equal importance. Those of this opinion, therefore, advocated that the tefillah of Aarvith be considered obligatory (*חובה*).

c) The Early Aarvith Compared with the Minha in Form and Time of Recitation.

But now the question arises, Of what did this early Aarvith ser-

night. (b. Ber. 26b.) But it is questionable whether this was really the reason, in early times, for the recitation of the Aarvith at any hour during the night. May it not be, that this reason for its recitation at any time during the night, was merely an attempted explanation of the fact that there was no reason for limiting the recitation of the Aarvith to a special time? There was always, even in later times, a certain laxness in regard to the recitation of the ~~recitation~~ of the tefillah of Aarvith, and certainly in earlier times, there was no definite hour for the recitation of Aarvith because there was no reason for limiting its recitation to such an hour. We, therefore, see, that although the Aarvith may have been at this time like the Minha - consisting of a tefillah - yet theoretically, it was of much less importance as a daily prayer.

CHAPTER III---THE COMBINATION OF THE SHMA AND THE
TEFILLAH OF AARVITH.

a) The Question Whether the Tefillah of Aarvith Should Precede or Follow the Shma.

There must, however, have been a need felt somehow to fix a time for the recitation of the tefillath Aarvith and thus make it equal to the other two tefillath of the day. Especially must this need have been felt by those who advocated that it be considered a דבר. But, in order to understand better how the time of the recitation of the tefillath Aarvith was determined and fixed, let us here consider what night prayers were now recited.

In the first place, there was the tefillath Aarvith which could be recited at any time during the night. Besides this Aarvith tefillah, there was the recitation of the Shma with the Hashkevenu, recited at home immediately before retiring - a practice considered obligatory by all. Now, since the hour of retiring was not long after nightfall, the time for the recitation of the shma and of the tefillah were near to each other, so that the tefillah of Aarvith was recited a very short while before the shma of the evening. Since, in the case of the Shachrith service, the order of prayer was provided in a definite form-consisting of the shma and its benedictions and then immediately followed by the tefillah; and since the tefillath Aarvith was now advocated to be a דבר and recited regularly almost immediately before the evening shma, the tendency on the part of those advocates was to make the Aarvith like the Shachrith in all other respects also, that is, they tried to model the order of prayers of the Aarvith after the Shach-

rith (i.e. to have first the shma and its ^{benedictions} and then the tefillah.) Furthermore, since the shma and its benedictions of the morning and the evening (excepting Hashkevenu) had been the same, it was natural to expect that this tendency to model the order of the evening service after the morning service, should arise. Since in the morning, they recited first the shma and then the tefillah, it was natural that having once had the same recitation of the shma for the morning and evening, they should seek to model the order of service in the evening after that of the morning. This tendency to combine the shma and the tefillah of Aarvith in their present order, is clearly brought out in a discussion in the Talmud between Joshua ben Lewi and Jochanan. b. Ber. 4b. Joshua ben Lewi advocates that the tefillah of the day should be placed between the recitations of the two shmas of the day, i.e. the first and the last recitations of the day should be the shma; and that between these two, all the tefilloth should be recited. אין תפלה בין שתי שמות. In other words, he opposes this new order-combination of the shma and the tefillah of Aarvith. He desires to continue the old order of recitation, that is, to recite the tefillah at nightfall and then this tefillah to be followed by the shma with its benedictions.

On the other hand, R. Jochanan emphasizes the principle of combining the "geullah" with the tefillah. b. Ber. 4b. אין תפלה בלילה

אין תפלה בלילה אין תפלה בלילה אין תפלה בלילה

He wanted, that in the evening, as in the morning, the shma should precede the tefillah because he claimed that, just as in the morning there is the joining of the geullah with the tefillah, so this principle should be maintained also in the evening. In other words, he advocated that the Aarvith should be modeled exactly after the morn-

this account, first, that the Aarvith was accepted as a אָרײַט and its recitation was required of everyone. In the second place, it is evident from this account, that the order of recitation was considered to be, first, the shma, and then the tefillah. We also see from this account what reasons prompted the Rabbis, or some of them, to put the tefillah after the shma of the evening. At any rate, this baraita certainly bears out our statement (above p.20) that in the time of R. Jochanan the order of Aarvith was firmly established.

We, therefore, now see that the shma, which had been recited immediately before retiring, was now moved up and recited in the Aarvith service, thus forming a service exactly like the morning, with the "geullah" immediately preceding the tefillah.⁽¹⁷⁾ The result of this rearrangement of the prayers was, that the Aarvith service was now composed of the tefillah which Gamliel II had declared a שְׁמַע and the shma and its benedictions which had been the old home prayers recited before retiring.

b) The Neila Service and the Aarvith.

I would here interrupt the trend of development of this essay, in order to indicate a very interesting fact in the development of the Aarvith service. There is evidence to the effect that at one time, the Neila was considered the evening prayer. (j. Ber. 4, 1). The hour of its recitation corresponded with the hour for the recitation of the Aarvith prayers, and the substance of the two prayers (before the combination of the shma and the tefillah in

Note (17). See below p.24 ff. the discussion about Hashkevenu and the other prayers which apparently form a break between the geullah and the tefillah of Aarvith.

the Aarvith took place) was practically the same. We know that Rab tried to substitute the Neila service for the Aarvith. The latter service in his days was already becoming to be considered a תפלה and recited by the great majority of the people. He accordingly interprets the Neila to mean, not the closing of the temple doors (as does Jochanan), but the closing of the doors of heaven and on the basis of this interpretation he maintains that this service may be recited after dark. j.Taan. 4:1: אַבְתִּי הָאֶת

נְעִילָה? רַבִּי דְקִיסְרִין אָמַר אֵתפֹּאֵל רַב וְרַב יוֹחָנָן רַב אֶמֶר בְּנִעְלֵית שְׁעַר שָׁמַיִם וְרַב יוֹחָנָן אֶמֶר בְּנִעְלֵית שְׁעַר הַיָּדָא

Rab, in addition, maintains that the recitation of the Neila frees one from reciting the Aarvith: b.Yoma 87b: אֶמֶר רַב

אֶמֶר רַב (also j.Ber. 4:1; j.Taan. 4:1); and we

know that Rab consistently recited his evening prayers at the Neila hour: אֶמֶר רַב בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם דְּרַב הִיא סִתְחִיף הַתְּפִלָּה בְּעוֹד הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ בָּרָאשׁ

to "Yad" Tefillah ch. 1: בְּסֵף שָׁנָה (הָאֵילָנוֹת דִּהְיוּ זֶמֶן נְעִילַת שְׁעַר הַיָּדָא)

7)). Jochanan, on the other hand, who, we saw was very instrumental in effecting the combination of the shma and the tefillah of Aarvith, wanted to emphasize the importance of Aarvith, and therefore stated that the Neila service could be recited during the day only. דְּרַב יוֹחָנָן פִּלַּג עַל רַב וְאֶמֶר אֵין תְּפִלָּת נְעִילָה

אֶתפֹּאֵל רַב יוֹחָנָן. Jochanan's opinion was accepted. Furthermore, we have a different phase of this same discussion brought out in the controversy (given above p. 19) between Jochanan and Joshua ben Levi, and from this controversy we can better understand why Jochanan differed so strongly with Rab on the question of the recitation of the Neila service. Rab, who wanted to establish the Neila as the evening tefillah, practically maintained the same as Joshua ben Levi that תְּפִלָּת בְּאַרְבַּע תְּקוּוֹת in that, the Neila had consisted only of the shemoneh esra and

ne shma. Therefore, in maintaining that the Neila service should be recited at night he practically advocated the old order of recitation, in that this Neila would be first recited and then followed by the shma before retiring, since there would be no possibility of combining the Neila with the shma, because that would be contrary to the temple service. We, therefore, find Rab supporting Joshua in his principle of *אין קורין שמואל בלילה*.

Jochanan, on the other hand, who wanted to create a distinct Aarvith service modeled after the morning service, maintained that the Neila could be recited only during the day, thus eliminating the possibility of substituting the Neila for the Aarvith tefillah, which was recited after nightfall.

We, therefore, find that there were at least these two distinct tendencies in regard to the Neila and the Aarvith services. The one tendency advocated that the temple Neila-service should serve as the Aarvith, and therefore opposed the combination of the shma and the tefillah of Aarvith, because the shma did not form part of the Neila service. We found that Rab and Joshua ben Levi were two of the representatives of this tendency of thought. On the other hand, there was the opposite tendency, which advocated the combination of the tefillah and the shma of Aarvith into a distinct Aarvith service modeled after the Shachrith. They considered the Neila a distinctively temple service and limited the hour of its recitation to the time when the temple doors were closed. R. Jochanan was one of the advocates of this view. These two tendencies undoubtedly prevailed before this time, but in the discussion between Jochanan and Rab, we find a clear expression of the two different and

opposite views.

c) The Shma and its Benedictions.— Hashkevenu and the Principle of Joining Geulla with the Tefillah.

The Aarvith service, after the combination of the tefillah and the shma had taken place, was, as was pointed out, similar in order and form to the morning service. Yet, there remained a very important difference between the two services. The morning shma was preceded by two benedictions and followed by one. The evening shma, however, was followed not only by the regular concluding geullah benediction but also by the Hashkevenu which had served in place of a tefilla in the old night prayers of the home. בשחר סביך שתיס לפניך ואחרי אחריתך

ובערב שתיס לפניך ושתיס אחריתך אכריבך ואחרי קצרה

"The morning shma is preceded by two (benedictions) and followed by one, but the evening shma is preceded by two and followed by two"—the Hashkevenu being now regarded merely as one of the concluding benedictions of the shma. Mishna Ber. 1: 4; b. Ber. 2a, 4b. This difference between the two services, in the number of benedictions following the shma, presented quite a difficulty, because one of the reasons for combining the shma and the tefillah of Aarvith, was in order to establish the order-relation of geullah to tefillah in the evening, just as in the morning. With the Hashkevenu prayer as the last concluding benediction of the shma, we cannot have the geullah immediately preceding the tefillah, since the geullah is the end of the first benediction after the shma, and the Hashkevenu, therefore, clearly forms an interruption. This difficulty, however, was removed by the Rabbis, in that they maintain that, since the Hashkevenu was part of the evening shma, before the combination of the shma and the tefillah of Aarvith took place, so even after this time, the Hashkevenu should still be included after the shma, and the Hashkevenu and the geullah

benedictions are to be considered one long geullah benediction preceding the tefillah. b. Ber. 4b, 9b: ואי אמרת בעי' לסמוך הא לא קא

סמך גאולה לתפלה דקא בעי' לסמוך השביב'נו? אמרי' ביון דתקנו רבנן
השביב'נו בגאולה אריבתא דמיא

"And if you say that we must combine (the geullah with the tefillah) why behold we do not combine the geullah with the tefillah because Hashkevenu must be recited. They answer, since the Rabbis instituted Hashkevenu, it is to be considered one long geullah". The Rabbis try to support this claim by calling attention to a similar interruption in the morning service in the form of ה' שפתי תפתח immediately preceding the tefillah; and they argue, just as in the morning, this phrase preceding the tefillah is not considered an interruption between the geullah and the tefillah, so likewise in the case of the Hashkevenu. b. Ber. 4b: ביון דתקנו רבנן לסמוך ה' שפתי תפתח

בתפלה אריבתא דמיא הבא נמא' ביון דתקנו רבנן לסמוך השביב'נו
בגאולה אריבתא דמיא

The comparison, however, is not quite correct. In the one case (morning) there is merely a single phrase inserted between the geullah and the tefillah and indeed this phrase may even be considered part of the tefillah, while in the evening there is inserted a complete benediction. Furthermore, the explanation given by the Rabbis that the Hashkevenu is a "geullah arichta" is rather artificial. What could constitute an interruption between the geullah and tefillah if not the insertion of a prayer ~~of a prayer~~ like the Hashkevenu between them? There is therefore an evident contradiction in the reasoning of the Rabbis. They admit that the shema is followed by two distinct benedictions and yet to overcome the difficulty of combining the geullah with the tefillah they try to make one long benediction out of the two. But the fact is, that the Rabbis could not be so emphat-

ic in regard to the uninterrupted combination of the geullah benediction of the shma with the tefillah of Aarvith, because they could not depart so radically from the earlier form of the recitation of the shma; and since the Hashkevenu was part of the shma, the Rabbis considered it more essential to keep the shma of the evening intact, than to observe the uninterrupted combination of the geullah with the tefillah of the evening. The fact of having the Hashkevenu follow the shma, was a too well established order to be changed out of consideration for the later tendency to model the Aarvith after the Shachrith by observing the uninterrupted combination of the geullah with the tefillah. Hence, the Rabbis gave this explanation of Hashkevenu (that it is merely a geullah-arichta) as an excuse in order to maintain the old form of the shma. Further proof of the fact that the explanation of Hashkevenu as a lengthened geullah benediction is merely an excuse, is proved by the fact, that later the Rabbis did not hesitate to insert the *סוף " ברכך "* and *יכא עיניו* (see below p. 43 ff.) before the tefillah of Aarvith when they found it necessary to do so. We, therefore, find that the evening shma is, as stated above, preceded and followed by two benedictions - the last being Hashkevenu and considered a *אחרי כן ארחתא* - a lengthened geullah benediction.

21

CHAPTER IV-----SHMA AL HAMITTA.

a) The Tendency of the Rabbis to Conserve Old Customs.

We have seen above, that while advocating a new arrangement of the evening shma, yet the Rabbis dared not radically change the accompanying berachoth of the shma-although this would have been the logical consequence of the new order. Thus, we saw, that the Hashkevenu remained in the service even though it interrupted the much desired combination of the geullah with the tefillah. This attitude of the Rabbis toward conserving the old order of things, and their disinclination to change or depart from the earlier form of prayers, is also shown in another respect. We have already mentioned (p. 8-9) the old custom that had existed of reciting the shma before retiring- קריאת שמע

לפני השינה. This custom was very old and was considered by some to be a biblical injunction, because of the word לָשֹׁכֵב "at thy lying down" found in Deut. 6: 7. With the new order-combination of the Aarvith, this custom should have been logically dropped, having been replaced by the Aarvith. However this did not occur. The older custom of reciting the shma before retiring was retained and a new reason or significance given to it. Thus Joshua ben Lewi says ש"ס בבית הכנסת שאין זקנותה אצ"פ שוקא ק"ש בבית הכנסת שאין זקנותה

לפני השינה. b. Ber. 4b. "Even though one has recited the shma in the synagogue yet it is considered meritorious to recite it before retiring." The old custom of reciting the shma before retiring for the night, was not and could not be entirely forgotten. It persisted, because old established customs can not be easily and suddenly given up.

b) The New Significance of the Shma al Hamitta.

However, a new significance new became attached to the recitation of this shma al hamitta. Thus: אמר ר' יצחק ב"ה קורא ק"ש בלילה

b. Ber. 5a. "Rabbi Isaac says: whoever reads the shma before retiring is (protected) as if he holds a sword with two edges in his hand." However, as stated before, the original significance given to the recitation of the shma before retiring was taken away from it and a new significance given to it. This new significance was, that the recitation of it kept away evil powers or spirits during the night. b. Ber. 5a. ב"ה קורא ק"ש בלילה

מה שמע אצלו אדם. Also in j. Ber. 2d: משהו מזיקין בדי' ה' מן

זרין זקרות שמע בביתו בערב? בשביל זהבריה את המזיקין.

"Why did they say that a man should recite the shma in the evening at home? In order to chase away the evil spirits." The original religious significance of the shma al hamitta was absorbed by the Aarvith, so that, although the Rabbis desired to retain this old custom, yet they did not greatly emphasize the importance of its recitation.

Scholars, they said, are not required to recite it. b. Ber. 4b-5a. אמר ר' יוסי מאי קרא יצחק ואף תחטאו אצלו בלילה על משבבתם ודוסן סוף (במס)

אמר רב נחמן אמר תלמיד חכם הוא אין צריך "R. Jose asks, what is the meaning of the verse, "Tremble, and sin not; commune with your heart upon your bed and be still, Selah?"

R. Nachman says, if he is a scholar he does not have to (recite it)."

Abbaya, however, still adds a short prayer for them to say. b. Ber.

אף תלמיד חכם מבעי לטיטר חד פסקא דרמי בגון בידך אפקיד רוחי פדמא

אמר ר' אבהו, "Even a scholar should recite one verse e. g. 'In

thy hand do I commit my spirit; thou redeemest me, O Lord, the God of truth." (Ps. 31: 6).

c) The Accompanying Berachoth of the Shma al Hamitta.

However, we may safely say, that for the mass of the people, this older custom of reciting the shma before retiring was regularly observed.¹³ But now a new difficulty presented itself. Since the

shma and its benedictions were recited in the Aarvith, the accompanying berachoth to the shma could not well be repeated with the shma before retiring, because that would certainly be

reciting benedictions for no purpose, because they have^{ve} already been recited with the shma in the Aarvith. The result was, that in ^{el}this stead, other accompanying prayers were introduced. The Talmud in b. Ber. 60b gives the following prayer to be recited before retiring:

הַמְבַרֵךְ אֶת שְׁמוֹתָיִם עַל מִשְׁתֵּי אֹמֶר שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל
עַד וְהָיָה אִם שָׁמוֹעַ וְאֹמֶר בְּרוּךְ הַמְּפַלֵּחַ חֲבָלֵי שֵׁנָה עַל עֵינַי וְתַגְמוֹתָ עַל עַפְפִּי
וּמְאִיר לְאִישׁוֹן בְּתַעֲיִן יְכָלֵךְ אֶתְּךָ שֶׁתִּשְׁבִּי בְּנֵי לְשֹׁנוֹ וְתֵן חֲלָקִי בְּתוֹרָתְךָ וּתְהַלֵּלֵנִי
יְדֵי מַצוֹה וְאֵל תְּהַלֵּלֵנִי יְדֵי עֲבִירָה וְאֵל תְּבַאֲרֵנִי יְדֵי חֶסֶד וְאֵל יְדֵי צְדָקָה וְאֵל יְדֵי
רַחֲמִים וְאֵל יְדֵי בְּדִין וְיִשְׁלֹט בִּי יֵצֶר טוֹב וְאֵל יִשְׁלֹט בִּי יֵצֶר רָע וְתַצְלֵנִי מִכָּל פְּגָעָה רָעָה
וּמִכָּל אִסּוּרֵי רָעִים וְאֵל יִבְהַלֵּנִי חֲלוּמוֹת נְעִים וְהַרְהוּרִים נְעִים וְתֵהָא מִשְׁתֵּי שְׁלֵמָה
לְפָנֶיךָ וְהָאֵר עֵינַי פָּנֵי אִישׁ הַטּוֹת בְּאֵי הַמְּאִיר לְעוֹלָם בּוֹלֵן בְּבִבּוּדָא.
"He who enters (his bed chamber) to retire for the night, should
recite from ^{שמע ישראל} till ^{שמע ישראל} and then recite, "Blessed
be He who maketh the bands of sleep to fall upon my eyes and
slumber upon mine eyelids; and giveth light to the apple of the
eye. May it be thy will, O Lord my God, to suffer me to lie
down in peace, and give me my share in thy Law, and that Thou

Note 13. Some late authorities strongly emphasize the
recitation of the shma before retiring. e. g. Jacob ben Asher
in "Turim" H. Aarvith states: ^{בב"ש} (ק"ש) אותה ^{מה שאנו קורין אותה} בְּמֵה שָׁאֵנוּ קוֹרֵין אוֹתָהּ לְפָנֵי מִשְׁתֵּינוּ וְאוֹתָהּ שֶׁל בִּהֵב
אֵינָה אֵלָּא בְּדִי לְעֻמּוֹד בְּתַפְּלָה מִתּוֹךְ דְּבָרֵי תוֹרָה.

cance of the older custom of reciting the shma al hamitta, was almost completely absorbed by the Aarvith, and the shma al hamitta became merely a sort of formal relic of the older custom. The parts of its recitation^{to} were limited and changed, in order to avoid duplication of prayers with the Aarvith.

d) Additional Prayers to the Shma al Hamitta.

The interpretation now generally given to the shma al hamitta - that the recitation of it protects one from evil spirits during the night - involved other additions in keeping with this new interpretation. Therefore יושב בסתר עליון (Ps. 91) was added; יי

אברהם (Ps. 3) was added; השכנתינו was included in it, etc.

All these added passages were recited to express the idea that the evil spirits (| ת') will be prevented, through the recitation of these prayers, from doing one any harm during the night. This new interpretation, therefore, became the official^{ly} recognized purpose for the recitation of the shma al hamitta; and therefore, the prayers recited in its service were arranged, and selected to correspond with, this interpretation.

The shma al ha^Mmitta then continued through the ages as a distinct recitation^t of prayers, but it came to be considered of less importance than the Aarvith, although as pointed out above, this was in a sense, the very origin of the Aarvith service. We have, therefore, seen what changes the Aarvith service and its component parts underwent in this period of years - from the original, sporadic, customary observance to the final adoption of the Aarvith as an authoritative and obligatory service.

CHAPTER V ---- AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRAYERS.

a) Various Rituals.

To attempt an exhaustive analysis of the character and composition of the prayers of the Aarvith is not entirely within the scope of this essay. We shall, however, in order to understand more clearly the historical development of the Aarvith service, trace, in general, the outline and the historical basis of the prayers of which it is composed.

The prayers were not from their very origin as they are to-day. It was a long and complicated process that brought them to their present form. As the ages passed, the prayers changed in form and composition. Interpolations and additions were frequently made through the years of the development of the Aarvith, so that it is often difficult to discern the original contents from later accretions.

The prayers were combined and put in written order very late. After the close of the Talmud, the prayers were written down and combined and ordered in form. It was, perhaps, at the ^{time} of the "Traktat Sofrim" that this process was begun. The oldest collection of prayers that we have, is the one hundred prayers of Gaon Natronai. (860). The first complete prayerbook is that of Gaon Amram (875). In the passing years, a great number of minhagim arose. Zunz names more than sixty. Merely, in passing, to indicate a few of the important ones, I would say, that there were at the beginning, two important groups of prayers (1) minhag of Palestine, (2) of Babylon. We find fragments of each in the Talmud, but no distinct order of either has been preserved to us. The existing various rituals rep-

resent some form of combination of the two earlier rituals with a preponderance of the one or the other.

The most important rituals are:

1. The German Ritus, which is in two parts (a) the western סנהא
לפניו and (b) eastern סנהא פוילי. The Palestinian ritual predominating.
2. The Italian סנהא גאליאני or סנהא גאליאני, also the Ritus of the Wälschen (סנהא וואלשען). The Palestinian ritual predominating.
3. The Roman or Greek Ritus (סנהא רומאניא).
4. The German Minhag (סנהא גערמאניש) is the best evidence of the order of the Babylonian prayers.
5. The transition between the two groups, is the rituals of the communities of Avignon, Carpentras, Montpellier.

We shall not concern ourselves with any of these in particular, but merely with the Aarvith service and its constituent parts, in general.

b) The Aarvith Prayers Preceding the Shma.

The Aarvith, in all texts, begins with Psalms 78:38 (והוא כחן) and 20:10. (יהוה הושיעני). The Machsor Vitry has in addition to these two verses, Deut. 4:31 and some responsive reading of collected verses between the congregation and the reader.⁽²⁰⁾

The traditional reason given for the inclusion of the verses והוא כחן, etc. in the Aarvith, is, that the other services of the day (shachrith and Minha) corresponded, in point of time and purpose:

Note (20). Baer in his "Seder Avodath Israel" Tef. Aarvith. p. 163 pref-
aces the Aarvith with Psalm 134 and the three verses of Psalm 76: 8;
84: 13; 20: 10; each verse to be recited three times but he states: אין
גדול כבודו רב עשרים וארבעה וברוך הוא ביום יום
אין זושא א"ה ס' ר"ח בתב בשם שפטי גבורים שנהגו לאשרו משום דאמרינן
(ב. באר) אדם בא מן השדה בערב גם רגל פקרות קורא ואח"כ קורא ק"ש ומתפלל
והא"י ז"ל לא היה אומר המזמור רק הפסוקים ה' צבאות אמן וכו'

with temple sacrifices, which acted as atonement for sins. But, since the Aarvith did not correspond with any sacrifice, a special appeal for forgiveness of sins had to be made, and this appeal is found in the verses **וְהוּא רַחוּם**. Another reason for the inclusion of these verses is given by Jacob ben Asher in the "Turim". H. Aarvith (**ס'לז**)

אפי' שנהגו לעלות ערבית אחר שחטאו כל היום ובמזלות סתב' להם
 אבך נהגו לומר אחר המזלות והוא רחום וגם ספני שאומרין אותו ג' פעם
 בשעת המזלות כי יש בו י"ג תיבות הרי ג' פעמים ט"ז תיבות בסנין המזלות

"Since they were accustomed to administer the stripes in the evening after they had sinned all day and the stripes acted as an atonement for them, they were therefore accustomed to recite **וְהוּא רַחוּם** after the stripes. Also, since they recited it three times when the stripes were being administered, because there are thirteen letters in it, thus totaling thirty-nine letters for the three times (that it is recited) and thus equaling the number of stripes."

Still another tradition is, that, since all men sin during the day they should recite **וְהוּא רַחוּם** in the evening, thus praying to God to forgive their sins and failings of the day. (Machzor Vitry **פ'ו**)

The Aarvith then continued with **ברכו** found in Mishna Ber. 7: 3 given by R. Ishmael (120). In the early times there was no answer to **ברכו**. The reader recited it merely to announce that the service had begun. Later when it became part of the service the answer **ברוך** was added; and in the second century we find it accepted by all. It is evident, that it could have been introduced into the Aarvith only after the Aarvith became congregational, because it had a place in the service only when the service was congregational. Since the Aarvith did not become a congregational service until late in its historical development, the **ברכו** must have been a late introduction.

The first benediction preceding the shma is the יוצר אור. It is possible that originally both the morning and the evening benedictions were the same. In b.Ber.11b Abbaya says: גוף אור בליל

חשך וחשך בליל אור, thus proving that the same benediction was recited both morning and evening, because it had the mention of both of these periods of the day in it.

The benediction as we have it to-day, begins with אשר בדברו and closes בא"ה המעריב ערבים. Although Abudraham, Jacob ben Asher (in the "Turim" H.Aarvith ס' רף) and others (the נוסח in general) omit from ה' צבאות till ועד because it interrupts the main thought of the benediction, yet most minhagim end with the words ה' צבאות שמו. (Elbogen, "Jud. Gott. in Gesch. Ent" p.100). The substance of the thought of the benediction is, the changing of the seasons and times.

The second benediction is the אהבת עולם. (b.Ber.11b). There is evidence that at one time it was the only benediction before the shma. (ברכה אחת M.Tamid 5:1; b.Ber.11b). The question of the beginning of this benediction is discussed in the Talmud. (b.Ber.11b). They ask whether it should be אהבה רבה or אהבת עולם - a difference between Babylonian and Palestinian talmudists. They decide that אהבה רבה should be recited in the morning, thus implying that אהבת עולם should be recited in the evening. All minhagim recited אהבת עולם at night.⁽¹⁾ The discussion was primarily about the morning benediction. The Rabbis give the following phraseology, b. Ber.11b: ואהבת עולם אהבתך על בן משבתך חסד. Because it

Note⁽¹⁾. In gaonic times in Pumbeditha they had אהבת עולם in the morning Sura had אהבה רבה in the morning and אהבת עולם in the evening. Amram has accepted the compromise. But Abudraham has אהבת עולם in both benedictions.

does not begin with ברכה קטורה it is often called ברכה קטורה . The words and thought of the benediction are taken from Jer. 31:2; Deut. 33:4; 6:1; Neh. 9:13-14; Ps. 119:23; Joshua 1:8.

c) The Shma.

⁽²²⁾ The shma is preceded by the three words שמע ישראל to be recited by the individual when he prays alone and not with the congregation. In Talmud b. Shabb. 119b we find that these three words are said to equal שמע . There is a mystical reason given for the insertion of these words. If one should count up the words of the shma he will find two hundred and forty-five, which, plus שמע ישראל equal the mystical number, two hundred and forty-eight - מספר which point to the number of bones in the human body or to the number of positive commands. (מספר עשרה). The reader, who does not say שמע שמע ישראל , recites שמע ישראל out loud, thus making up the number. (Shulchan Aruch O.H. א"ס and זוהר פ' וירא בסתר). Abudraham reproves the use of these words on two grounds. First, we must not say anything that interrupts the reading of the shma. Second, the name of God cannot be used simply to fill out a number of words.

The essential part of the shma is the verse which declares the unity of God.⁽²³⁾ We therefore read in b. Ber. 13b that Judah Hanassi recited only the first verse as his shma. $\text{שמע ישראל יהוה אחד}$. After this verse, we find an interruption in the

Note⁽²²⁾. There are numerous hints in the Talmud to the effect that at one time the ten commandments must have preceded the recitation of the shma. M. Tamid 5:1; b. Ber. 11b; 12a. $\text{וקורין עשרת הדברות שמע והיה אם}$ שמע ישראל , "and we recite the ten commandments, the shma...." Also in j. Ber. 3c we find: $\text{מפני מה קורין שתי פרשיות הללו בכל יום}$ $\text{מפני ששעשרת הדברות באוין בהן}$, "why do we recite these two chapters every day... R. Lewi says, because the ten commandments are included in them."

Note⁽²³⁾. We find the statement, that if a man recites this verse and then falls asleep we do not wake him to recite the other paragraphs of the shma, because we consider that his duty is fulfilled. b. Ber. 13b.

shma in the form of *ברוך שם אל*. This verse is taken partly from Ps. 72: 19. In the olden times it was recited in the temple after the pronouncing of God's name. (b. Joma 3: 8; ch. 4: 1). It is based on the verse in Deut. 32: 3. ⁽²⁴⁾ (Sifre on Deut. 32: 3).

We find that the Mishna discusses why the different parts of the shma are placed in the position in which we find them to-day. (M. Ber. 2: 1). *והיה אם שמוע יניאמר שוהיה אם שמוע נוהג בין ביום ובין בלילה*. (M. Ber. 2: 1). From this it is evident that the third part of the shma (*ויהי* Nu. 15: 37-41) was not originally recited in the Aarvith. Indeed, in Mishna Ber. 1: 5, we find a statement which seems to indicate the exact time when the recitation of *ויהי* in the evenings was begun. *מזבירין יציאת מצרים בלילות אמר רבי אבהו בן חנניאל* *עזריה הרי אני אל ואזניתי שתאמר יציאת מצרים בלילות עד שדרשה בן זוטא* Maimonides interprets this statement of Eliezar ben Azariah to mean that before this time *ויהי* was not recited in the evenings, and that this interpretation of scripture now gave the people a reason for reciting it. The reason for its omission previous to this time was, that this part of the shma dealt mainly with the *מצות* and the interpretation given to *ויראתם אותו* was *פירוש לבבות* (b. Shabb. 27b)-that it must be said at a time when the *מצות* can be seen, namely, in the day only. Therefore the Tallith was worn at day and not at night. b. Shabb. 27b.- j. Ber. 3: 3 *שהלבבות פטור מן* *המצות*, "for the garment worn at night does not require fringes." However, since the shma was supposed to consist of a combination of these biblical paragraphs, (as M. Ber. 1: 2 and Josephus IV: 8: 13, know it) in order to maintain the uniformity of the shma, many worshippers

Note⁽²⁴⁾. It was inserted here according to b. Pesachim 56a in honor of the patriarch Jacob.

in Palestine, instead of omitting the ויאמר altogether in the evening, reciting only the first and last verses. b. Ber. 14b. דבי אתא

שמאל בר יהודה אמר במערבא ערבית דבר אל בני ישראל ואמרת

עלהים אני אלהים אמר. "When Schmu'el bar Judah came, he said that in Palestine, in the evenings, they recite: 'Speak unto the children of Isreal and say unto them, I am the Lord your God'.."

When one does not recite ויאמר and the exodus, it is recommended that a short prayer mentioning the exodus be said. b. Ber. 14b:

חייא בר רב אמר, אמר אני ה' אלהים צריך לומר אמת לא אמר אני ה' אלהים אינו צריך לומר אמת, והא בעי לאדבורי יציאת מצרים דאמר ה' מודים אנחנו לך ה' אלהינו שהוצאתנו מארץ מצרים ופדיתנו מבית עבדים ועשית לנו נסים וגבורות על הים ושרנו לך.

"Chiya bar Rab says: if he recited 'I am the Lord your God' he must say, 'True'. If he has not recited, 'I am the Lord your God' he need not say 'True'; but it is necessary to mention the exodus from Egypt, so he says thus, 'We give thanks unto thee, O Lord our God, That Thou hast taken us out of Egypt and redeemed us from the house of bondage and hast performed miracles and great deeds for us at the sea....' Or in j. Ber. 1: 9 f. 3d. מודים אנחנו לך שהוצאתנו ממצרים

ופדיתנו מבית עבדים יהודות לשמך.

"We give thanks unto thee that thou hast taken us out of Egypt and redeemed us from the house of bondage to give thanks unto thy name." The mentioning of the exodus was one of the most essential parts of the prayer, indeed it is maintained that originally only the closing verse ⁽⁴⁵⁾ (Nu. 15: 41) i. e. referring to the exodus, belonged to the

Note ⁽²⁵⁾. Elbogen states (Jud. Gott. in Gesch. Ent. p. 24-5) that when the two preceding parts were halachistically interpreted to mean the tefillin and the mazuza, the first part of ויאמר was then added and given this same halachistic interpretation-referring to the שם שמים.

יִשְׂרָאֵל. ⁽²⁶⁾ This "exodus-prayer" was recited in the evening as well as in the morning, as evidence from Josephus and the statement of Eliezar be Azariah show.

The recitation of יִשְׂרָאֵל with the שְׁמָא passages was not at any time in the historical development of the liturgy, considered obligatory in the evening. It gradually became a custom to recite it, no doubt due to the desire of the people to preserve and maintain the uniformity of the shma. It did not immediately spring into a custom, but developed over a period of years. In b. Ber. 14b we find that Abbaya recited it in the evening but said:

אֲתָנִיף מִתְחִילִין דְּקָא מִתְחִילִין בְּעֶרְבָא וְבִין דְּאֲתָנִיף בִּגְמָרָא
גְּמָרִין דְּהָא אֲמַר רַב בְּהַגָּא אֲמַר רַב יִתְחִיל וְאִם הִתְחִיל גְּמָרָא

"Therefore we begin to recite it, because they began to recite it in Palestine and since we have begun to recite it we also finish it (or continue it) for R. Kahana said in the name of Rab that one should not begin to recite it but if he has begun he should finish it." We thus see, that theoretically it was considered preferable not to recite it, but in practice the custom arose to recite it and this custom was not - or perhaps could not be - checked. ⁽²⁷⁾

The joining together of "The Lord your God" with "true" is an old custom attested by the Talmud (b. Ber. 14b). The reason for it is perhaps none other than devotional, although the words joined together (וַיְהִי אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱמֶת) are found in Jer. 10:10.

Note ⁽²⁶⁾. The recitation of the "exodus" in the liturgy is very old, because it seems from Jer. 23:7 that mention of the exodus had been made in public worship even during the time of the first temple.

Note ⁽²⁷⁾. Even Maimonides still considers the recitation of the שְׁמָא passages of וַיֵּאמֶר in the evening not quite proper but he adds: שְׁמֵי שְׁמֵי שְׁמֵי בְּיָמֵינוּ קוֹרְאִין אֶתְּךָ בְּיָמֵינוּ מִפְּנֵי שֶׁיֵּשׁ בָּהּ זִכְרוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל מִצָּרִים וְעוֹשֶׂה לָּהֶם נִסִּים וּמִצְדָּקֵי בְּיָמֵינוּ מִצָּרִים בְּיָמֵינוּ (הַלְלוּת ק"ש 113)
"God"

d) The Benedictions Following the Shma.

The prayers of the Aarvith, as has already been pointed out, were not written at one time by one Rabbi and then arranged into a service by him. The development of the prayers stretched over a long period of years and were arranged and modified by different individuals. At the time of Jechanan and Joshua ben Lewi, when the order of the Aarvith was established, the benediction following the shma was the same as in the morning. פיזתיה אמרה שאין אמר דברים

But Joshua ben Lewi asks: Why is it that we say psalms after it? It is explained: פתר לה באמת ויצ"ב ש
שחרית "He interpreted[†] to mean the Emeth Veyazib of the morning."

It is evident from this statement, that the Emeth Veyazib was recited in the Shachrith and the Aarvith. The change was made by Rab, who arranged the "Emeth Veemunah" for the Aarvith only. b. Ber.

12a: אמר רבה בר חנינא סבא משמיה דרב כל שא אמר אמר ויצ"ב
שחרית ואמר ואמנה ערבית לא יצא ידי חובתו

"Rab said: whoever has not recited Emeth Veyazib in the morning and Emeth Veemunah in the evening has not fulfilled his obligation"

The Aarvith prayers were then, through this period of their historical development, taking definite shape and form. The אמר ואמנה then became an obligatory part of the Aarvith, and great emphasis was placed upon its recitation. The reason given for the use of the word אמנה in the Aarvith, instead of ויצ"ב, is based on

the biblical verse (Ps. 92: 3): להגיד בבקר חסדך ואמנתך בלילות
 "To tell in the morning of thy kindness and of thy faithfulness in the nights."

In content, this benediction is merely a collection of biblical verses. The אמנה is Ps. 119: 86. The האמונה גדולות is Job

9:10 (not found in the siddurim of ספרד and Rome). השם נשמו is Ps.66: 9; הסדרה is Deut. 33: 29; אתה ומופתים is Ps.105: 27
א' בטובך is Ps.136: 13,14; את כדפיה ס is Neh. 9: 11; סו is Ex.15: 11; ⁽²⁸⁾ יס"י is Ex.15: 18; ב' פדה Jer. 31: 10.

In regard to the geullah, we find a short form of it given in Talmud b. Ber. 14b and j. Ber. 1, 9, f. 3d (quoted above p. 38). Whether this was the established form of the geullah or only what was considered the minimum of its contents, is open to question. In Siddur Rab Amram in place of the usual verse of the geullah we find:
ויקיים לנו ה' אלהינו סלבותו בבודו ותפארתו קדושתו וקדושת שמו
הגדול הוא ה' אלהינו יחוס וירחם עלינו וירוח לנו סהרה סבא
זר תינו ויסהר אגאלנו גאולה שלמה בקרוב ברוך אתה ה' גאל ישראל

In our rituals to-day, there is considerable difference in the form of the closing of this "geullah" benediction.

Following immediately after the geullah is the Hashkevenu. That this was originally a night prayer is evident from the context. It is mentioned in Talmud b. Ber. 4b, 9b, Rashi and Tosefot to b. Ber. 11a (אתה ארובה). It is the Hashkevenu to which the Talmud refers in the term גאולה ארובה . (see above p. 25). Although in the position in which it now stands, it forms the concluding benediction of the shma, yet originally it was ^{not} merely a benediction of the shma. It belonged to the night prayers recited before retiring - and it stood in place of - and served as - a tefillah. Immediately after reciting the Hashkevenu (in the old night prayers

Note²⁸. In many old rites (Amram and a large number of Genizah texts) before "the Lord shall reign forever and ever", comes a phrase: "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou founded power." (Ps. 8: 3). This Psalm (8) is a night Psalm, ("When I look upon thy heavens, the work of thy hands, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained") and the whole of the psalm is prefixed to the service when the evening prayer is read after nightfall. (Abraham: in "Singer Daily Prayer Book," note on גאולה ארובה p. cxi.)

of the home) one went to sleep. It is the only real night prayer in the Aarvith and is undoubtedly very old.

The phraseology of this prayer, in the various rituals, differs greatly. The text as we have it in our prayerbook (Singer) is, with a few minor changes, found in the Machsor Vitry. It is probably based on Ps. 4:9:

| בשלום יחדו אשכבה ואיש

altogether will I lay me down and sleep." We find a very interesting version in the J.Q.R. vol. 10, where E. N. Adler on the Ritual of the Persian Jews presents a manuscript text with the following version:

השכיבנו ומצילנו אתה ובסתך בנפירחמך הרבים תסתירנו
בדבר שנאמר הנה לא ינום ולא ישן שומר ישראל ברוך
שומר את עמו ישראל לעד מבדל דבר רע.

There is a distinction made between the closing eulogy of everyday and that of Sabbaths and Holydays. This distinction is very old. In Midrash Tehillim Psalm 6 we find:

אמר ר' יהושע
בן לוי אין אלו שבע מצות שבקריאת שמע... ואפי' שאין מצות ציצית
בערבית מוסיפין פורס סבת שלום בשבת ויום טוב, ובחול

Joshua ben Lewi said; these are the seven commandments....., since the commandment concerning ציצית is not present in (applicable to) the evening, we add, "who spreadest the tabernacle of peace" on Sabbath and on holydays; and on week days, "who guardeth his people Israel." This custom, however, was not universal because there were many places where פורס was said on weekdays. In Tanhuma Pinhas we find:

אם בא אדם מן הדרך
בערב שואלין לו שלום, וקורין ק"ש וחותרין בשלום הפורס סבת שלום

"When a man comes.....in the evening, we inquire of his peace, recite the shma and we close with peace, "who spreadeth out the tabernacle of peace." Also in j. Ber. 4:5 (8c) the statement is made:

ר' אבון בגי' אלתפיתת תל שבז הפיות אתפאלין עלין בברכה בקריאת שמע ובתפלה
בקריאת שמע פורס סבת שלום עלינו ועל עמו ישראל ועל ירושלים

And in Midrash Raba Levit.ch.9: גדול שלום שבז הברכות... חותמין בשלום
"Great is peace for all the benedic-
tions....close with peace; the shma, "who spreadeth the tabernacle
of peace." On the other hand there are places where they close on
Friday night, as on weekdays, with: שומר עמו ישראל לעד. This
is attested by Abudraham who says that in שו"ת אבייב"א and שו"ת אבי
this practice of closing Hashkevenu on Friday night with... שומר עמו
obtained.

There are a very large number of different versions of this
prayer. In Seder Rab Amram we find both concluding eulogies, and he
decides that the ופרוס should be recited on Friday nights and
שומר עמו on weekdays.

To indicate some of the biblical quotations in Hashkevenu we
find that ופרוס עליו is Ps. 106: 8; ויהי בעדנו is Ps. 3: 4;⁽²⁹⁾
ובצל בנפך is Ps. 91: 1; ושומר צאתנו is Ps. 121: 8; שומר עמו is Ps.
121: 4. (ויבא אף סוף תהיון is Neh. 9: 31.)

e) The Shortened Tefillah - ברוך " לעולם.

A prayer which has been inserted after the Hashkevenu⁽³⁰⁾ and which is
recited on weekdays only is the ברוך " לעולם. It is a collection

Note⁽²⁹⁾. In the Siddurim of the Sephardim, the closing ופרוס עלינו fol-
lows immediately after ויהי בעדנו and the part ויהי בעדנו till ופרוס עלינו
is not read on Sabbaths and Holydays. Because, they say, we
should not ask God to guard us - the Sabbath or festival is in itself
a pledge of watchful care; nor should we think of sword or pestilence
on these days.

Note⁽³⁰⁾. See above (p.24 ff.) as to the abandonment of the principle
of the principle of joining "geullah" with "tefillah" in the Aarvith.

of biblical verses containing God's name eighteen times. At one time, it was supposed to serve as a substitute for the shemoneh esra. All agree that it is a substitute for the tefillah (Tosefot b. Ber. 4b, and others): ^{אגם יש באותם פסוקים י"ח אצורות בגד י"ח ברבות} God's name is mentioned eighteen times in those verses to correspond with the eighteen berachoth of the shemoneh esra. " Undoubtedly, the insertion of a long prayer at this point, between Hashkevenu and the tefillah, could be meant only as a substitute for the tefillah. Otherwise, it would clearly form a decided break in the continuity of the prayers - an occurrence which the Rabbis desired to avoid - especially when it came between the geullah and the tefillah. It is, therefore, evident, from its context and its position in the service that the ^{אצור} ^{ברוך} served as a shortened form of the tefillah of Aarvith.

The reasons for its introduction into the Aarvith service differ. One maintains that since the synagogues - being located in the fields - were distant from the homes, the worshippers could not remain until after nightfall because it was then dangerous to go home. They, therefore, introduced this prayer as a substitute for the long Aarvith tefillah. ^{בפסוקים} ("Turim" H. Aarvith. ^{ומה שנהגין להפסיק} ^{וקדיש} ^{וראו עלינו} ^{אפי' שבימים ראשונים היו בתי בנסיות שלחם בשדות והיו יראים להגאחר שם עד זמן תפלת ערבית ותקנו אומר פסוקים אלו שיש בהם י"ח אצורות בגד י"ח ברבות שיש בתפלת ערבית.}

Others say, that it was introduced at a time when there was a ban against the Jewish religion and the Jews were not permitted to recite their Tefillah, therefore ^{אצור} ^{ברוך} was introduced as a substitute to save time. But all agree, that although the reason for introducing this prayer into the service in time disappeared, yet the prayer was retained because of the desire of the Rabbis

and the people, not to wilfully abolish any of the prayers.

Elbogen⁽³¹⁾ assigns this prayer to Palestine. It is possible, he maintains, that in one land this, and in the other, the tefillah was recited. And so in Amram, we find them united in the order in which we have them to-day. It was probably written at the time of the Sabraim, because we find other prayers which consist of a combination of biblical verses (e. g. ה' בבוד in the morning) arranged at this time. After the recitation of these verses, the obligation of reciting the tefillah was considered fulfilled - especially since the tefillah of Aarvith was anyway theoretically considered a רשות.

The question whether one should remain seated or stand when reciting this prayer is interesting, in that it shows the importance attached^h to this prayer. The authorities disagree. Some say, one should remain seated else, if he stands, he will be thus fulfilling his obligation of reciting the tefillah of Aarvith, so that when he recites the following tefillah, he will be repeating it twice, which is not permitted. (באר היטב commentary to "Shulchan Aruch" O.H. (ס'רף)). Others maintain, that since this ברוך "אנו" was written to substitute for the tefillah, one should stand during its recitation just as one stands during the recitation of the tefillah. (Moses Isserles, Comm. to "Shulchan Aruch" O.H. (ס'רף)).

To indicate wherefrom these biblical passages have been taken, we find that : " ברוך is Ps. 89: 53; " ברוך is Ps. 135: 21; ברוך " is Ps. 72: 18-19; יה' בבוד is Ps. 104: 31; יה' שם is Ps. 113: 2; ב' א' is ISam. 12: 32; וי' is IK. 18: 39; " וה' is Zach. 14: 9;

Note (31). Elbogen: "Jud. Gott. in Gesch. Ent." p. 103.

is Ps. 33: 22; ⁽³²⁾ is I Chron. 16: 35; ⁽³²⁾ is Ps. 86: 9-10; ⁽³²⁾ is Ps. 79: 13; ⁽³²⁾ , these four berachoth are for the four berachoth in the Torah, Gen. 9: 26; 14: 20; 24: 27; Ex. 18: 10; ⁽³²⁾ is Job 12: 10; ⁽³²⁾ is Ps. 31: 6.

f) The Closing Eulogy - ⁽³²⁾.

The closing eulogy ⁽³²⁾ presents a messianic outlook and is entirely independant in thought and content of the preceding verses. Elbogen ("Jud. Gott. in Gescht. Ent." p. 105.) attempts to explain its insertion in the following manner. In the old Palestinian service, he says, the Hashkevenu had closed with ⁽³²⁾ or ⁽³²⁾. The Midrash Raba to Ps. 14: 7 states that the children would, in the evening, say ⁽³²⁾ ⁽³²⁾. But when in Babylon the eulogy ⁽³²⁾ was substituted, something had to be inserted to express the messianic hope and therefore we have inserted at this place in the service: ⁽³²⁾.

⁽³³⁾ In some siddurim we find that this closing eulogy is omitted e.g. the Machsor of Rome. Instead of ⁽³²⁾ they have ⁽³²⁾. There are different rituals that have different versions of this eulogy.

The biblical verses of this eulogy are: ⁽³²⁾ is Is. 52: 7; ⁽³²⁾ is found in ⁽³²⁾ but is not one

Note ⁽³²⁾. We find this verse in many versions. But in some, we find instead, the verse Ps. 106: 48. But this is wrong, because these eighteen verses are supposed to substitute for the tefillah and, therefore, in order to have God's name mentioned eighteen times we should recite the verse from Chron. (⁽³²⁾).

Note ⁽³³⁾. Isaac ben Gajjat (11th C.) saw a foreign element in ⁽³²⁾ and therefore did not want to interrupt the order of prayers with this. (Elbogen, "Jud. Gott. in Gescht. Ent." p. 105.)

verse in the bible. It is the combined beginning of three different verses i.e. Ps. 10: 16; Ps. 93: 1; Ex. 15: 18.

g) The Private Prayer - Tachnun.

It is most probable that in olden times the Aarvith tefillah was followed by תחנון - the private prayer. In Seder Rab Amram it is noted that it was the custom to recite this תחנון prayer in certain academies after the tefillath Aarvith.

והבי אסר רב שר
שזיס ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב של עיר מחסיא שמונת ליפול על פניו
(אדם) ולבקש רחמים אחר תפלת ערבית ואפילו בצבור וכן מנהג בבית רבינו שבבבל...

This custom, however, gradually died out. Even^N Maimonides ("Yad" Tefillah ch.5:15) states that it is not a generally accepted custom to recite תחנון after Aarvith, yet, he says, there are cer-

tain select individuals who still keep up the practice: מנהג פשוט
בבבל ישראל שאין נפילת אפים בשבתות וג', ולא בערבית שבבבל
יום, ויש יחידים שנופלים על פניהם בערבית

In the time of Moses Isserles the custom had completely ceased to be observed, because he definitely states (Shulchan Aruch, O. H. ס' ר"ז)
אין נופלים על פניהם לאחר ערבית

h) The Tefillah.

The tefillah - not in the form in which we have it to-day, but in its broad outlines - is an old prayer. In contradistinction to the shma, it was considered rabbinical in origin by everyone. b. Ber. 31a,

ק"ש..... דאורייתא תפלה דרבנן. Also its order, hour of recitation, and number of times to be recited daily was not based on any biblical injunction but was entirely rabbinical. (Maimonides, "Yad" Tefillah, ch.1: 1). אין מנן התפלה מן התורה, ואין משנה התפלה מן התורה ואין

Yet, it was considered the true prayer of the heart: זמן קבוע מן התורה

b. Taan. 2a: אילו היה עבודה שהיא בלבד הוי אומר זו תפלה, and had to be repeated by every Israelite, even women, slaves and children. (M. Ber. 3: 3).

Its origin is ascribed to נשים ועבדים וקטנים.... חייבים בתפלה.

ed by the Talmud to the Men of the Great Synagogue. (b. Ber. 33a, j. Ber. 11, 4 (f. 4d); b. Meg. 17b).

It is not within the scope of this essay to analyze each benediction of the tefillah, since the tefillah is common to all the services of the day and not distinctively of the Aarvith. We shall, therefore, concern ourselves with it only in so far as it is related to the special subject of this essay.

There are two definite statements in the Talmud, one regarding the origin and the other, the arrangement of the shemoneh esra. The one (quoted above p. 6) ascribes the origin to the Men of the Great Synagogue (אנשי בנסת הגדולה תקנו). The other ascribes the arrangement of the berachoth to Shimon Hapekuli in the time of R. Gamliel II. b. Ber. 28b; b. Meg. 17b: תר שמעון הפקולי הסדיר ש"ע

בכבודי לפני ר"ג. If we are to ascribe any historical authenticity to these reports (as does Elbogen), then the only possible interpretation of these statements is, that the composition of the tefillah began at the time of the Men of the Great Synagogue, and that it was finally ordered and arranged by Shimon Hapekuli. This interpretation is evident from the words employed תיקון and הסדיר⁽³⁴⁾.

There is abundant evidence to prove that certain benedictions of the Tefillah were recited long before the time of Shimon Hapekuli. (b. Joma 7:1, and others). But since this is not our concern, we shall not devote ourselves to it. Suffice it to say, that when ^{R.} Gamliel II declared the tefillah of Aarvith a חובה, he had a defin-

Note⁽³⁴⁾. The Rabbis saw this and they attempt to harmonize the two statements as follows: b. Meg. 18a: ובי מאחר דמאה ועשרים זקנים ואם כמה נביאים תקנו תפלה על הסדר שמעון הפקולי מאי הסדיר? שבוים וחזר וסדרום.

itely ordered tefillah in mind. No discussion concerning the order of the berachoth was deemed necessary. It was taken for granted, as we find R. Gamliel II, Joshua, Akiba - all authorities at the beginning of the second century - debating, whether all the eighteen berachoth or only a selection from them must be said daily. M. Ber. 4:3.

רבן גמליאל אומר בביתו ויום מתפלל אדם שמונה עשרה רבי יהושע

אומר מעין י"ח אומר גם שגורה תפלתו בפני יתבאר י"ח ואם לאו מעין י"ח

Also in what manner the additions concerning the rainy season and the Sabbath should be inserted. (M. Ber. 5:2; R.H. 4:5; Taan. I:1-2).

As pointed out above, (p. 12 ff.) the custom had already grown up at the time of Gamliel II to recite the tefillah of Aarvith. Hence, when he declared it a חיובה, he had a definite custom and a practically fixed tefillah (since it was arranged and ordered in his days) in mind. Even though a century after Gamliel, we find the statement made, that the berachoth were not to be recited exactly as written but (b. Ber. 29b) יבואו להוסיף בה דבר, "he may add to them";

and even though the order of the middle benedictions ^{was} were not fixed

הם סדר "the middle berachoth have no definite order"; yet, we can safely assume, that for the large mass of the people the tefillah was a definite, ordered arrangement of the berachoth. Indeed, we find that they would refer to the different berachoth by number, e.g. in b. Meg. 17b מה ראוי אומר גאולה בשביעית

and מה ראוי אומר רפואה בשמינית; which clearly proves that the berachoth were definitely fixed and ordered. The tefillah of Aarvith when declared obligatory was, therefore, in all probability, recited by the people in a definite systematized order.

The tefillah was recited three times a day - morning, afternoon and evening (j. Ber. 4:1 (f. 7a); b. Shabb. 24a; Berashith Rabax' ^{נ"ס}).

דמה תפלוז אדם מתפלל בבז יום, ר' שמואל בר נחמן אומר לפי שהיום

משתנה ג' פעמים בבז יום לפיכך צריך אדם להתפלל ג' פעמים בבז יום.

"How many tefilloth should a man recite each day? R. Schmu'el bar Nachman says, since the day changes three times each day, therefore a man should recite three tefilloth every day." But the tefillah in the other services of the day (Shachrith and Mincha) could not have been recited in its later accepted order until the time of Gamliel II, when it was arranged in a definite order-form. Since it was also in the time of Gamliel II that the tefillah of Aarvith was declared obligatory, we can safely conclude, that the age of the tefillah of Aarvith is equal to the age of the tefillah of the other services, since the arrangement and fixation of the tefillah in general was practically simultaneous with the time when it became an obligatory Aarvith recitation.

אין צורך להוסיף
הוא נכלל בתפלה
האחרונה

CHAPTER VI --- TIME OF THE DAY FOR THE RECITATION
OF AARVITH.

a) In the Early Period - No Fixed Time.

In the early days - before the combination of the shma and the tefillah of Aarvith took place - the tefillah of Aarvith had no fixed time for its recitation. M. Ber. 4, 1: תפלת הערב אין לה קבע (see above p. 16 note ①6). But the hour of its recitation usually began immediately after Mincha. On the other hand, the hour of the recitation of the evening shma - before the combination took place - was after the appearance of the stars, since the interpretation given to the passage in M. Ber. 1: 1 טענה שהבדלה

"From the time that the priests enter to eat of their offering" - was: "after the appearance of the stars." b. Ber. 2b. The time limit for its recitation is given differently by the different authorities. Eliezer says, until the end of the first watch; the Rabbis say until midnight; Gamliel says until dawn. M. Ber. 1: 1. We may, however, be certain, that before the tefillah and the shma of the evening were combined into an Aarvith service, the shma - as Shimon ben Jochai says - could be recited at any time during the night, because there was no fixed time by law for its recitation. b. Ber. 8b-9a:

"ש בן יוחי אומר פעמים שאדם קורא ק"ש שתי פעמים בלילה אחת קודם שיעלה עמוד השחר ואחרי שיעלה עמוד השחר ויצא בה ידי חובתו אחת של יום ואחת של לילה.

But there was only a generally accepted traditional hour for its recitation. b. Ber. 2b: טענה שהבדלה אדם נכנס לאכול פת בערב שבת דברי ר' מאיר וחבשים אומרים טענה שהבדלה זמנין לאכול בתרומתן סימן לדבר זאת הובב' ואעפ"י שאין ראיה לדבר זה לדבר שנאמר (neh 4:15)

b) Time for the Recitation of Tefillath Aarvith Fixed.

However, after the tefillah and the shma were combined and formed into an Aarvith service, the time of their recitation - and especially that of the shma - was moved up, as is shown from the account in b. Ber. 4b (באין השדה see above p. 20). It thus came to be recited very early in the evening at the time when men returned home from the day's work, and before partaking of the evening meal. This hour, then, was undoubtedly the generally accepted hour for ^{the} recitation of the Aarvith. The custom of reciting it after dark must be very late. We find that Amram emphasizes that if one recites the Aarvith ^{before} the appearance of the stars, he has not fulfilled his obligation. "Sedar Rab Amram: ק"ש ש"ז

הקורא קודם ראית הכוכבים לא יצא ידי חובתו. Also Maimonides "Yad" Tefillah ch. 3: 6 and Jacob ben Asher "Turim" Tef. Aarvith ^{ס' ר"ה} each state that the time for the recitation of the shma of Aarvith is after dark. Theoretically, this was true; but in practice, because of the difficulty of reassembling the congregation, they would recite the Aarvith before nightfall or immediately after Mincha. (35)

Note (35). "Turim" Tef. Aarvith (^{ס' ר"ה}). ומה שאנו קורין אותה קודם זאת הכוכבים... מתוך הדוחק נהגו בן זמני שהעבור מתקבצין לתפלת המנחה ואין קורין שם ומתפללים תפלת ערב עד צאת הכוכבים היה בן אחד הולך לביתו והיה שורח עליהם להתקבץ אח"כ ולא היו מתפללים בצבור ואפי' נהגו בן ועבשין נהגין להתפלל בצבור. ^{ערוך} clearly states: The מעריב תיבש את סמחה אע"פ שעדיין אינו יצא מפי שורח הצבור, שהי' קיצר שחן. Although theoretically the recognizes that the hour for the recitation of Aarvith should be after dark. This privilege of reciting it before nightfall is granted only to those who pray with a congregation but not when one prays individually: ^{אין} מתפלל בצבור אסור לו להתפלל תפלת ערבית קודם צאת הכוכבים.

This practice continued down to very late times: (S. Baer "Seder A-
vodath Israel" p.163. במדינת אשכנז ופולין מתפללין בצבור תפלת

ערבית מיד אחר תפלת מנחה ספני השורק, ואידאקר קדיש מתקבץ מתפלין והם יחידים

Although it was known that the required time for Aarvith - theo-
retically at least - was after dark.⁽³⁶⁾

Note^{QD}. We find a very interesting discussion in רבינו אשר Ber.
1:p.2(ח). He asks, which is better: to pray with the congregation
before the stars appear, or wait until the stars appear and pray
alone? He answers, that in Palestine they pray Aarvith with the con-
gregation but wait with the shma until the proper time (after
dark) and are not at all concerned about combining "geullah" with
tefillah. Therefore, he concludes, it is of greater importance for
us to recite the shma in its proper time than to combine geullah
with tefillah.

CHAPTER VII ---- THE AARVITH AS A CONGREGATIONAL
SERVICE.

a) The Tefillah of Aarvith Not Repeated By the Reader.

The reason generally given for the fact that the tefillah of Aarvith is not repeated by the reader - as is the tefillah of Shachrith and Mincha - is, that the tefillah of Aarvith was not considered obligatory. ("Yad" Tefillah ch. 9: 9: וְאֵין חַיִּב לְקַרְאָהּ בְּקוֹל (ש"ט) וְאֵין חַיִּב לְקַרְאָהּ בְּקוֹל (ש"ט) - and therefore this concession (viz. that it was not repeated by the reader) was made to those who maintained that it was optional. This reason appears to me to be very unsatisfactory, because, first; the tefillah of Aarvith was practically a חובה - it was recited regularly by all; then, why make this concession to the few who maintained that it was theoretically a ש"ט? Second, since originally the tefilloth were recited not by the individual worshippers in silence and then by the reader - as to-day - but were recited only by the reader out loud for the benefit of all the worshippers,⁽³⁷⁾ the failure to have the tefillah of Aarvith repeated by the reader in later history would not indicate that the tefillah of Aarvith was of less importance than the tefilloth of the other services, but rather that originally it was not recited at all in the congregation, since the reading of it by the reader was the only way that it was recited congregationally in the early times. This inference

Note⁽³⁷⁾. In talmudic times the people were silent. A reader recited the prayers for the congregation and the people merely responded with "Amen". (Joel Mueller in "Misichtah Sofrim" p.23.)

can further be supported by historical facts. In b. Shabb. 24b we read that even on Yom Tov the Aarvith was not recited congregationally except when it happened to fall on the Sabbath.

דאס רבא י"ט
 שם להיום בשבת שנים צבור הורד לפני התיבה ערבית אינו צריך
 להזכיר שם י"ט ששצאצא שבת אין שנים צבור יורד ערבית ב"ט

It was, therefore, only on the Sabbath that the Aarvith was recited by the people assembled in a congregation. Further proof of this contention is the fact, that for Friday night we find a condensed form of the tefillah of Aarvith which was repeated by the reader - the *מגן אבות* or the *ברכה אחת* *שבוע ברכות* (b. Shabb. 24b; "Yad" Tefillah ch. 9:10). We have this condensed form no doubt, because of the fact, that on Friday nights the congregational services were held, and since the tefillah of Aarvith came practically to be considered equally important with the other tefilloth, we, therefore, have this form of repetition of the tefillah⁽³⁸⁾ - which to all intents and purposes, was considered an exact repetition of the tefillah⁽³⁹⁾. The reason, therefore, for the failure to have the tefillah repeated by the reader in the Aarvith every evening is, because the Aarvith was not recited congregationally and therefore:

Note⁽³⁸⁾. The traditional reason for the recitation of *מגן אבות* is that it was introduced because of the fear of evil spirits: *בכחה זו נקראת מעין שבע ונתקנה משום סכנת מזיקים, שבתני בנסיות שלהם היו בשדה ונתקנו אותה בשביל בני אדם שמאחרים אבא כדי שיש יסוד תפלתם.* (Res. to Shabb. 24b.)

Also Maimonides ("Yad" Tefillah ch. 9:11) states: *ואם תקנו חכמים זה ספני שרוב העם באין להתפלל ערבית בלילי שבתות ויהיה שם מי שנתאחר אבא ולא השלים תפלתו וישאר לבדו בבדו"ב ובא לידי סכנה לפיכך חוזר ש"ץ ומתפלל בדי שיתעבבו בל העם עד שישלים המתאחר ויצא עמהם*

Note⁽³⁹⁾. In Seder Rab Amram it is noted that Rab Mosheh Gaon and Rab Natronai Gaon say that if one makes a mistake on Friday evening and does not recite *מגן אבות*; but if he heard the reader recite *מגן אבות* he has fulfilled his obligation.

there was no custom established for its repetition, as was the custom with the tefilloth of the other services of the day.

CHAPTER VIII --- THE KIDDUSH AND THE HADDALAH.

a) The Kiddush.

The Kiddush, which is recited on Friday evenings, both in the sunagogue and at home, was originally only a home service which was recited at the table over wine. b. Ber. 51b. Pes. 114a: כבר

before eat-
ing: (b. Pes. 100a) The origin
of it is ascribed by the Talmud to the Men of the Great Synagogue. (b. Ber. 33a, and others).

At about the beginning of the Amoraic period, the custom of attending congregational service on Friday evenings began. The Kiddush, then, also came to be included in the Friday evening synagogal service. In Babylon it began to be introduced earlier than in Palestine. j. Pes. 10: 3 (37c); j. Ber. 8: 1 (11d): נוהגין
בבבל
Because in Babylon, wine was not as common a drink as in Palestine (e. g. see story in b. Pes. 107a about the visit of Amemar to Sura) and since the Kiddush was to be recited over wine - and there was no wine to be obtained for most of the people - they introduced the Kiddush into the synagogal service.

Therefore, we see, that since there was no wine to be had at home; and since wine was considered necessary for the recitation of the Kiddush, the Kiddush was introduced into the synagogal service where wine could certainly be obtained for this purpose.

In b. Pes. 100b we find the discussion about בני אדם שקידשו
בבית הכנסת, which indicates that many considered their obligation fulfilled when they heard the Kiddush recited in the synagogue. However, the principle of: אין קידוש אלא במקום סעודה

was not forgotten or set aside; and thus the Kiddush came to be recited in both ^{la}places - at home and in the synagogue. But now the Kiddush at home was recited not only over wine but over other kinds of drink (b. Pes. 107a) and over bread (b. Pes. 106b).

Another fundamental reason given in the Talmud for the introduction of the Kiddush into the synagogue service is, in order that the travellers (אורחים) who eat in the synagogues may hear the sanctification of the day over the cup of wine, because a room was usually attached to the synagogue for the lodging and feeding of travellers. b. Pes. 100a. קדוש בבית כנסת לא פוקי אורחים ידי חובתן דאבאן ושתי ואנו בבית כנסת.

b) The Habdalah.

The origin of the Habdalah - recited on Saturday evenings - is ascribed to the Men of the Great Synagogue. (b. Ber. 33a, and others). Like the Kiddush, it was originally a home service only, recited over wine, after having partaken of the the סעודה שלישית 2 third Sabbath meal, and signified the ending of the Sabbath. b. Pes. 105b, Ber. 52a. הנבנים לביתו במוצאי שבת מברך על היין ועל האור ועל הבשמים ואחר כך אומר הבדלה על הבוס ואם אין לו אף בוס אחד מניח לאחר המזון ומשמשין בולן לאחריו

We thus see, that originally, these parts of the Sabbath prayers were recited separately, but later due to the scarcity of wine amongst the people, these were united and recited over one cup of wine. Indeed in j. Ber. I, 8 we have a recollection of the old custom by R. Judah Hanassi: רבי היה מפזרן וחוזר וכו' על הבוס

However, when in Babylon certain Palestinian customs were changed-or forgotten - and men were not permitted to eat immediately

before the ending of the Sabbath (b. Pes. 105a), then, the Habdalah had to be introduced into the Aarvith tefillah. But the question now arose, where in the tefillah should this Habdalah be inserted? Certain Tanaim differ. M. Ber. 5, 2: 'עקיבא אש' ^{סבירין... והבדלה בחזון הדעת} ^{ביבא רביעית בפני עשטה ל' אפיצור אוסר בהודאה}. For the Jews of Babylon, therefore, the Habdalah came to be recited twice - in the tefillah and over the cup of wine. However, in Palestine, where the necessity of inserting the Habdalah in the tefillah of Aarvith was not so strongly felt, it was not inserted; and therefore when the question is asked, why do the Rabbis disagree about the position of the Habdalah in the tefillah, if it is an established custom to recite it: j. Ber. 5, 2 (9b): ^{שסעין בכ ווא קומי רבי יוחנן, דבכ}; the answer is given: j. Ber. 5, 2 (9b): ^{גא' ידי שערקרה בבוס שבחור בתפלה}; that is, the essential recitation of the Habdalah was considered to be over the cup of wine and not in the tefillah.

In Babylon, a different explanation is attempted of the fact that at one time the Habdalah was recited in the tefillah and another time over the wine. b. Ber. 33a: ^{בתפלה קבעוה [הבדלה] בתפלה} ^{העשירו קבעוה על הבוס חזרו והעניו קבעוה בתפלה}. "At first they instituted it (Habdalah) in the tefillah; when they became wealthy they instituted it to be recited over wine; when they again became poor they instituted it in the tefillah." But, behind this statement, we can read the fact, that originally the ^{place} place of the Habdalah must have been at home over the cup of wine, and it was introduced into the tefillah only after wine became too great a luxury for the people. Indeed, it was always felt, that the essential recitation of the Habdalah was at home over the wine. As we find the statement made in the Talmud, that if one neglect to re-

cite the Habdalah in the tefillah he need not think that he has failed in the performance of his religious obligation, because he will recite it at home over the cup of wine. b.Ber.26b; 29a,etc. ט צ ה

ואם הזכיר...הבדלה בחוץ קדעת אין סתירין אותו מפני שיכול לאומרה על הבוס.

Although for the Habdalah - as for the Kiddush - when wine became a rare luxury for the majority of the people, it was not always absolutely necessary that it be provided, for the recitation of Habdalah; as we find in j.Ber.8,1 (11d): מבדילין בלא יין.

In regard to the wording of the Habdalah we find in j.Ber.5,2

(9b): ל'קטיה ל'זעורה בשם ל'חייא ד'ראשי צריך לומר החץ עלינו את ה'מים ששת ימי המעשה הבאים לקראתנו לשלום.

This text - with a few minor omissions - has been included in אתה

recited in the Saturday evening tefillah, in Berachah

אתה חוץ.

To summarize then, the Kiddush and the Habdalah were originally home services recited over a cup of wine. They were introduced into the synagogue service due to the conditions of the time. But the old custom of reciting them at home still persisted, so that these two services came to be recited twice, once in the synagogue and then at home. Their essential recitation, however, was always considered to be that one which was at home.