

A MINOR FOR ZIMMUN (Y. Ber. 7:2, 11c) AND RECENSIONS OF YERUSHALMI

by

BARUCH M. BOKSER

University of California at Berkeley

I

The literary and historical study of rabbinic literature increases our understanding of rabbinic texts and enables us to isolate different stages in the history of traditions. Amoraic teachings, in particular, have undergone a complex process of enunciation, interpretation, transmission, adaption, and application prior to their incorporation into their present contexts. They have likewise received literary enrichment and suffered recasting in the course of their integration into wider units and of the overall compilation of gemara. Accordingly, the extant versions may not reflect the most fundamental or original use and import of a tradition. Once aware of these processes we can, moreover, better appreciate the concerns which elicited and shaped the early stages of the teachings as well as the later ones which may have contributed to the transformations.¹

1. See the works of Chanoch Albeck, J. N. Epstein, Joseph Heinemann, Hyman Klein, Saul Lieberman, Jacob Neusner, E. S. Rosenthal, Abraham Weiss, David Weiss Halivni, as well as of Moshe Assis, M. S. Feldman, Shamma Friedman, Israel Francus, David Goodblatt, Abraham Goldberg, David Rosenthal, and others. For references and full bibliography see Shamma Friedman, "A Critical Study of Yevamot X with a Methodological Introduction," *Texts and Studies. Analecta Judaica*, ed. H. Z. Dimitrovsky, 1 (1977): 275–321; David Goodblatt, "The Babylonian Talmud," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* [= ANRW],

The present paper focuses on one set of teachings which have undergone such changes. It deals with one tradition which is attributed to Samuel and which originally glossed Mishnah but which later was applied to a different, Palestinian amoraic, issue. The tradition treats a minor's obligation to participate in the *zimmun*, the "Invitation" to Grace After Meals. Masters in both Palestine and Babylonia differed in their understanding of several aspects of this issue and their diverse stances affected their evaluation and understanding of Samuel's opinion. The examination of the pericope is particularly noteworthy as the results of the internal analysis find confirmation in a different and earlier recension of the text, in Genesis Rabba. We thus have the unusual opportunity to verify what some might call "speculative" talmudic criticism. The study also throws light on the question of the nature of recensions of the Palestinian Talmud and the meaning of the scribal notation גרש, found in Genesis Rabba manuscripts.

II

Mishnah Ber. 7:1–2 rules that three individuals who eat together must preface their Grace After Meals with an "Invitation" to say the Grace. This Summons consists of a series of refrains by which a leader invites others to Praise and say Grace and the listeners respond.² Mishnah Ber. 7:3 gives the opening formula of the Summons. With three individuals it opens with "Let us praise . . ." Mishnah 7:1–2 lists those counted and excluded from the quorum to make up the three. A comment in y. Ber. 7:2, 11b attributed

2.19 (Berlin, in press), especially chap. 4; and Baruch M. Bokser, "An Annotated Bibliographical Guide to the Study of the Palestinian Talmud," *ANRW*, 2.19, especially chaps. 8–13.

See also Baruch M. Bokser, "Two Traditions of Samuel: Evaluating Alternative Versions," in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, ed. Jacob Neusner, 4 vols. (Leiden, 1975), 4: 48–52 [n.b.: on pp. 52, 1. 12, 53, 1. 12, and 54, 1. 18 read "Tefillah" for "Shema"]; idem, *Samuel's Commentary on the Mishnah, Its Nature, Forms, and Content* (Leiden, 1975); and Anthony J. Saldarini, "'Form Criticism' of Rabbinic Literature," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 (1977): 257–74.

2. On Grace After Meals and the "Summons" see *Encyclopedia Judaica*, s.v. "Grace After Meals," and the literature cited there; M. Ber. 7:3; J. N. Epstein, *Introduction to the Text of the Mishnah*, 2d ed. (Jerusalem, 1964), pp. 430–31; Chanoch Albeck, *Shishah sidrei Mishnah*, vol. 1: *Seder Zera'im* (Jerusalem, 1959), pp. 27 and 336–37; Saul Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-fshutah*, 8 vols. (New York, 1955–73), 1: 8–9 [= TK]; Joseph Heinemann, *Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and the Amora'im* (Jerusalem, 1964), chap. 4, pp. 67–77, especially 73–77; and Gary G. Porton, *The Traditions of Rabbi Ishmael*, pt. 1 (Leiden, 1976), pp. 13–15. See below, text to nn. 40–43.

to Samuel focuses on the exclusion of “minors.” The most fundamental formulation of the tradition consisted of a Mishnah commentary but it has become somewhat obscured by its presentation within a *sugya* that responds to a different, though related issue (A–D).

M. Ber. 7:1–2:³

Three who ate together are required to summon Grace.

(*M. Ber. 7:1A*)

Women, and slaves and minors (*u-qetanim*)—they do not summon Grace with them.

(*M. Ber. 7:2A*)

y. Ber. 7:2, 11b:⁴

A. It was taught, a minor (*qatan*), and (*ve-*) the Scroll of the Torah—they count as an adjunct (*senif*) [to make up the ten].

B. Said R. Yudan, Thus is the teaching [in A]: A minor for the Scroll of the Torah—they count as an adjunct.⁵

3. שלשה שאכלו כאחת חייבין לזמן. נשים, ועבדים, וקטנים אין מוסיפין עליהן.

4. תני קטן וספר תורה עושין אותו סניף. אמר ר' יודן כיוי מתניתא קטן לספר תורה עושין אותו סניף. מאימתי עושין אותו סניף? ר' אבינא אמ' איתפלגין רב חונה ורב יהודה תריהון בשם שמואל, חר אמ' כדי שיהא יודע טיב ברכה חזרנה אמי' שיהא יודע למי הוא מברך.

On the *y.* see (a) the MSS: *The Palestinian Talmud Leiden MS. Cod. Scal. 3. A Facsimile* with Introduction by Saul Lieberman (Jerusalem, 1970), vol. 1 [abbreviated as = L MS]; *Talmud Yerushalmi. Codex Vatican 133*. Index by A. P. Sherry (Jerusalem, 1971) [= V MS]; MS of *y.* with *Commentary of Solomon ben Joseph Sirillo*, ed. Ḥayim Yosef Dinkels (Jerusalem, 1967) [I thank the British Museum for providing me with a microfilm of MSS 403–405 = Or. 2822, 2823, 2824, and Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, for MS Hebr. 7389, both of *y.* with Sirillo's Commentary] [= S]; Louis Ginzberg, *Yerushalmi Fragments from the Genizah* (New York, 1909; reprint ed., Jerusalem, 1969) [= YFG]; (b) the special editions with modern commentaries: Zacharias Frankel, *Talmud Yerushalmi. Seder Zera'im, 'Ahavat Siyyon*, vol. 1: *Berakhot and Pe'ah* (Vienna, 1874; reprint ed., Jerusalem, 1971); Dov Baer Ratner, *Ahawah Zion We-Jeruscholaim. Berakhot* (Vilna, 1901; reprint ed., Jerusalem, 1967); A. M. Luncz, *Talmud Yerushalmi*, vol. 2 [= *Ber. chap. 6–Pe'ah chap. 1*] (Jerusalem, 1909); and (c) the critical notes in Mordechai Yehudah Leb Sacks, *Diqduqei soferim la-Talmud ha-Yerushalmi*, vol. 1: *Berakhot* (Jerusalem, 1943), p. 33; and J. N. Epstein, *Introduction to Amoraitic Literature* [= IAL] (Jerusalem, 1962), p. 364. In addition to the commentaries in the Vilna 1922 (reprint ed., New York, 1959) edition of *Talmud Yerushalmi*, I have consulted the numerous commentaries to *M. Ber. 7:2* and *b. Ber. 47b–48a* and codifiers of the law of Grace After Meals who cite and explain parts of *y. Ber. 7:2*. Ratner provides an index to many of these works. See nn. below for specific references.

5. Frankel; Ratner, pp. 166–67; and Chanoch Albeck, in *Midrasch Bereschit Rabba*. eds.

C. From when do they count as an adjunct (*me-'eimatai 'osin 'oto senif*)?⁶

D.I. R. Avina said, R. Ḥuna and R. Yehudah, both of them in the name of Samuel, dispute [the matter]:

2. One says, When he knows the character of the blessing (*kedei she-yehe yode'a tiv berakhah*).⁷

3. And the other said, When he knows to whom he says a blessing (*she-yehe yode'a le-mi mevarekh*)⁸.

Women, slaves, and minors are required to say Grace After Meals (M. Ber. 3:3) but may not be counted to make up the number to summon Grace and thus say Grace communally. Samuel's comment, D, defines the category of a minor. We shall now review the tradition's present location, A–D, and trace how it has been reworked.

As most commentators explain Samuel's comment in terms of the preceding pericope, we review A–B. A deals with a case in which the full number of people are not present. The baraita may be understood in several

Julius Theodor and Chanoch Albeck (Berlin, 1903–1929; reprint ed. in 3 vols., Jerusalem, 1965), 3:1112, in his notes [continuation of p. 1111, 1.3] to the Genesis Rabba parallel to our *sugya* [discussed below], cite early medieval authorities who apparently do not include B. Some of their references need revision in light of improved editions of the medieval works; for example, R. Meshullam ben Moses, *Sefer ha-hashlamah*, in *Ginzei rishonim, Berakhot*, ed. Moshe Hershler (Jerusalem, 1967), p. 245, in contrast to Ratner, contains a version of B. Other recent critical editions confirm their citations; e.g., Yalqut Shime'oni, based upon the Oxford MS, ed. Isaac Shiloni, 2 vols. to date (Jerusalem, 1973–), 2: 783, to Gen. 42, #247, lacks B. While we remain unsure whether or not the y. text used by each author contained the clause, some explicitly state that different readings exist. Perhaps one of the variants consisted of the use of single or plural forms of the pronoun ('oto or 'otan) and object, *senif*, "adjunct" (*senif* or *senifin*). See Judah ben Isaac, Sir Leon, *Tosefot . . . 'al Masekhet Berakhot*, ed. Nisan Sachs, 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1969–1972), 2: 533–34, and R. Asher ben Jehiel [=Rosh], to Ber. Chap. 7, #20, in Vilna edition of Babylonian Talmud, against which I checked the first edition (Venice, 1520), and cf. *Tosefot* R. Judah Sir Leon, 2: 524, n. 452. The difference might imply whether or not the *vav*, "and," is disjunctive, conjunctive, or explicative. See below nn. 9 and 11 and the text thereto.

6. So = L, V, S, and others: *'ad matai 'osin 'oto senif* = YFG, p. 293. Some early medieval authorities including R. Meshullam, p. 245, lack this line. See below nn. 19 and 27 and the texts thereto.

7. So = L, V, S, YFG and Isaac ben Moses of Vienne, *'Or zaru'a* (Zhitomer, 1862; reprint ed., Brooklyn, n.d.) #197, 1: 30d (who supposedly cites R. Judah Sir Leon); *kedei she-yihyeh . . .* = Rabad in Nahmanides, *Novellae* (Jerusalem, 1928) to b. Ber. 48a; *keshe-yeda' = Sefer ha-hashlamah; kedei she-yeda' = Tosefot* R. Judah Sir Leon.

8. So = L, S, and Rabad cited in Nahmanides, *Novellae; keshe-yeda' = Sefer ha-hashlamah; kedei she-yeh . . .* = YFG, V MS, and OZ; *kedei she-yeda' = Tosefot* R. Judah Sir Leon.

ways. A *vav* usually translated as “and,” joins the entries of “minor” and “Scroll of the Torah.” If the *vav* is disjunctive, viz., means “or,” the text asserts that we may count either one to make up the required number. Alternatively, if the *vav* is conjunctive, viz., means “and,” the baraita requires both, e.g., a minor with the Scroll. The tradition does not identify the referent to which the minor and/or the Scroll is added. Commentators suggest it refers to a quorum of ten, the required number for saying the *full* or expanded Summons to Grace which mentions the Lord’s name, “Let us bless our God . . .” (so M. Ber. 7:3). This number elsewhere makes up the standard quorum for community liturgical purposes.⁹

The meaning of the word “adjunct” is made clear by its use at the very beginning of y. Ber. 7:2. A tradition attributed to Rabbi Judah the Patriarch as well as to R. Yehoshua ben Levi, a first generation Palestinian Amora, states that we may count a minor as an adjunct to make up the ten. Accordingly, the simple meaning of “adjunct,” *senif*, in A, supports the interpretation that the clause as a whole refers to “adjunct to ten.”¹⁰

In B, Yudan, a fourth generation Palestinian Amora, clarifies the baraita and apparently takes the *vav* as an explanatory *vav*, a usage found elsewhere.¹¹ We should therefore render the baraita thus: “a minor, that is, for the Scroll . . .,” which means, following many commentators, that a child may count as one of the seven individuals called to the Torah Scroll when it is read on the Sabbath.¹²

C employs the same language as A–B, ‘*osin 'oto senif*. This suggests that C deals with a quorum of ten, or following the interpretation of Yudan’s explanation, a quorum of seven. The question in C thus raises a matter rele-

9. See Eleazar Azikri, *Sefer haredim*, in Vilna edition of PT; Joshua Benvenisti, *Sedeh Yehoshu'a*, vol. 1: *Zera'im* (Constantinople, 1662), reprinted in *Yerushalmi Zera'im* (Jerusalem, 1972); and *Tosefot* R. Judah Sir Leon to b. 47b–48a. See Albeck, in *Bereschit Rabba* 3:1112, notes.

10. At one point in the *sugya* an anonymous authority compares the cases of “ten” and “three” and employs the term “adjunct” for both. The former usage has generated the latter formulation.

11. See Zacharias Frankel, *Mevo ha-Yerushalmi* (Breslau, 1870; reprint ed., Jerusalem, 1967), p. 95a; Aaron Hyman, *Toledot Tanna'im ve-'Amora'im*, 3 vols. (reprint ed., Jerusalem, 1964), 2: 616–17; Michael Higger, *O'zar ha-baraitot*, 10 vols. (New York, 1938–1948), 4: 418–19; Mordechai Margalioth, *Encyclopedia of Talmudic and Geonic Literature* (Tel Aviv, n.d.), pp. 476–77; and Chanoch Albeck, *Introduction to the Talmud, Bavli and Yerushalmi* (Tel Aviv, 1969), p. 332. See Bokser, *Samuel's Commentary*, p. 27, n. 56, and the references there to Epstein, Kutscher, and especially Lieberman. [The page reference to Kutscher should be to p. 1602 and not 1595.] See also *TK*, 5: 1273.

12. See, e.g., Sirillo, *Tosef. R. Judah Sir Leon*, and Benvenisti.

vant to the concerns of A—B: When is a minor counted to make up a required quorum?

D contains Samuel's tradition. Avina, a third generation Babylonian Amora who emigrated to Palestine, transmits it in the name of two second generation Babylonian Amoraim, Huna [Ḥuna = Huna] and Yehudah. Each of the latter two, students of Samuel, had reported the master's tradition in a different version. Avina, however, apparently did not know which tradent had transmitted which version.¹³ Both versions of Samuel's comment lack a referent, make up balanced glosses, and offer criteria which qualify a person.

According to the first view, D.2, a minor who knows the character, i.e., practices and makeup, of the blessing may be counted.¹⁴ The second master claims that the requirement is for the minor to know the referent of the benediction, the One Addressed. The first, D.2, thus employs a technical ability, or knowledge as a criterion, while the second, D.3, an abstract or theoretical one.

Assuming the criteria fit the matter being defined,¹⁵ the tradition— with its present conjunction—sets out when a person *may say* some type of blessing. The tradition itself does not say which. As Mishnah deals with the exclusion of an individual from saying the blessing, Mishnah cannot supply the subject. Can A—B, the immediately preceding pericope, clarify the subject? Yudan's interpretation of the baraita, B, cannot constitute the subject

13. Cf. Albeck, *Introduction*, p. 524.

On Huna and Yehudah, see Bokser, *Samuel's Commentary*, pp. 216–17. That Huna = Huna, see Frankel, *Mevo*, p. 73a, and E. Y. Kutscher, *Studies in Galilean Aramaic*, Translated and Annotated with Additional Notes by Michael Sokoloff [*Bar-Ilan Studies in Near Eastern Languages and Culture*] (Ramat-Gan, 1976), pp. 67–96, 103–5, especially p. 70.

On Avina, see Frankel, *Mevo*, p. 61b; Hyman, 1: 97–98; Margalioth, p. 41; and Albeck, *Introduction*, pp. 274–75.

14. See the usage of *yiv* elsewhere; C. Y. Kasovsky, *Thesaurus Mishnae*, 4 vols. (Jerusalem, 1957–1960), 2: 766, e.g., M. Ket. 1:8 and B.M. 1:8; C. Y. Kasovsky, *Thesaurus Thosephthae*, 6 vols. (Jerusalem, 1932–1961), 3:350, e.g., T. Soṭ 4:7, ed. Lieberman, p. 173, l. 146; and C. Y. Kasovsky, *Thesaurus Talmudis*, 39 vols. to date (Jerusalem, 1954–), 15: 85–86, and especially note the instances in b. B.B. 155b and A.Z. 57a–b [for which see *DS*, 120: 6] both preceded by the verb *yd'*, “to know,” and used to define a “minor” in terms of certain matters: business—knowledge of the practices of business; idolatry—knowledge of the practices of idolatry. See also Frankel, *Ahavat Siyyon*, ad loc., and cf. Benvenisti, Elijah Ben Loeb Fulda, *Talmud Yerushalmi [=Zera'im and Sheq.]* (Amsterdam, 1710; reprint ed., Jerusalem, 1971), and Albeck in *Bereschit Rabba*, 3:1113–14, note to l. 4.

15. See below nn. 32 and 45–50 and the texts thereto. See Saul Lieberman, *Siphre Zutta* (New York, 1968), pp. 15–16, *TK*, 1:84. Cf. Yom Tov Ishbili, *Hiddushei ha-Riitba, Masekhet Sukkah*, ed. Eliyahu Lichtenstein (Jerusalem, 1975) to b. Suk. 29a = cols. 260–61.

of D, for Yudan lived after Samuel and the masters who, in D, transmit his tradition.¹⁶ On the other hand, if A represents a tannaitic baraita Samuel theoretically could directly refer to it. As it ostensibly deals with the Summons to Grace, Samuel too could deal with that issue. This would accord with the *sugya's* wider topic of Grace and the Summons thereto. But, as we shall see, while Samuel does refer to the "Summons," he does not treat it in terms of the issue as presented in A.¹⁷

To recapitulate, Samuel's comment refers to the Summons for Grace. In terms of the wording of D we are not informed whether this refers to the version of the Summons for three people or the expanded one for ten people. Certainly the question in C wants us to understand the tradition in the latter terms and takes Samuel as commenting on "adjunct for ten." But the question is secondary and postdates the tradition. As we have already seen, it accords with the problematic of the wider *sugya* and accordingly fulfills redactional needs to apply Samuel's comment to the issue of "adjunct to ten." In general, such anticipatory questions are late and postdate the traditions which they introduce.¹⁸ We now turn to concrete evidence to support the suggestion that Samuel's tradition, with a different conjunction, referred to Mishnah.

First, while C appears in most texts of y., at least two medieval works in their citations of A–D lack C or an analogue to it.¹⁹ Whether or not these

16. Naturally if B is not original to the text, we would have an additional factor precluding it as Samuel's referent. See above, n. 6.

17. If D concerns "Grace," that would accord with the use of the word *senif*, "adjunct," which in our context is used to refer to the expanded Summons to Grace, when ten people are present. See n. 8 and the text thereto. Among the several reasons which preclude the view that Samuel refers to A one may include the observation that only Palestinians are associated with the term *senif*, "adjunct." The fact that A–B immediately precedes C–D does not pose a problem. In y., traditions often do not refer to their immediately preceding pericopes. See Bokser, *ANRW*, "Guide," chap. 9, B, and the literature cited there. Accordingly, there is the possibility that the formulation, if not the teaching, of the baraita is amoraic. On amoraic baraitot, see Benjamin De-Vries, "Baraita," *EJ*, 4: 189–93; Goodblatt, *ANRW*, chap. 4.1a; and Bokser, *ANRW*, "Guide," chap. 8, D.3, and the literature cited there, especially Lieberman, Higger, Epstein, Goodblatt (1975), and Moreshet. On our passage see further below, n. 33 and the text thereto.

18. See Bokser, *Samuel's Commentary*, pp. 107, 116, and also Abraham Weiss, *Studies in the Literature of the Amoraim* (New York, 1962), pp. 33–34, especially *Studies in the Talmud* (Jerusalem, 1975), pp. 236–37, and David Weiss Halivni, *Sources and Traditions*, vol. 2: *Seder Moed From Yoma to Hagiga* (Jerusalem, 1975), pp. i–xii.

19. R. Meshullam in *Sefer ha-hashlamah*, and Abraham ben David, in *Temim de'im* (Warsaw, 1897), #1, p. 1a. Nahmanides in his *Milhamot ha-shem* on Isaac Alfasi, *Hilkhot*, lacks B and C, though in *Novellae* to b. Ber. 40a presents C—and interestingly enough as part of a citation of Abraham ben David.

works represent an actual literary tradition of *yerushalmi*, they do reflect the fact that to understand Samuel's comment one need not rely on C. Second, our suggested referent does not demand an extraordinary reading of the pericope. It is assumed, for example, in Maimonides' and Sirillo's commentaries to *M. Ber. 7:2* which employ the two versions of Samuel's comments in D and set them out as *definitions* of Mishnah's mention of a "minor."²⁰ Third, a different recension of the *sugya*, in *Genesis Rabba*, provides a text free from the above difficulties and in which Samuel explains Mishnah.

III

Genesis Rabba 91.4, eds. Julius Theodor and Chanoch Albeck, 3:1111–1118, contains a *sugya* parallel to *y. Ber. 7:2*. The two versions exhibit several differences in wording, in formulation, especially in clauses which bridge or spell out implications of the traditions, and in the sequence of the materials. Such differences are common between PT and Gen. R. analogues and scholars argue that they are due to the fact that each text represents a different recension of *y*. Many scholars further claim that Gen. R. used *y*. in a state prior to its completion as represented in PT MSS and editions, i.e., a recension of *y*. earlier than that of the PT itself. Several of the differences in the *y. Ber. 7:2 sugya* accord with the latter argument and confirm our analysis of Samuel's comment. As we shall see, Gen. R. presents Samuel's comment in a state which has not been redactionally and completely incorporated into its *y*. context.²¹

The sequence of the *sugya* in Gen. R. justifies our focus on Samuel's tradition and its introductory question alone and not in terms of what in PT precedes, i.e., the baraita and its interpretation, A–B or an equivalent thereto.²² We, therefore, first turn to the sequence of the materials.

20. Sirillo comments on Mishnah as part of his commentary on *y*. For Maimonides, see *Mishnah 'im perush Rabbenu Mosheh ben Maimon*, ed. and trans. Yosef Qafih, 7 vols. (Jerusalem, 1963–1968), 1: 82, and cf. Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, *Berakhot* 5:7.

21. As to recensions of *y*., and the bibliography thereto, see nn. 54–57. Albeck in his notes to the passage, 3: 1111–12, 1. 3, and 1112–13, 1. 3 [especially top of p. 1113], specifically relates several of the differences to differences in recensions.

22. Our discussion is based upon *Midrash Bereschit Rabba, Codex Vatican 60*. A page index by A. P. Sherry (Jerusalem, 1972). Albeck, in *Bereschit Rabba*, 3:1111–1118, prints the London MS and records variants from other MSS [but not Vatican 60] and early printed editions. Vatican 30, generally today considered the best MS of Gen. R. includes only the opening and clos-

Gen. R., in contrast to PT, does not juxtapose A–B and C–D. It presents A–B, with slight variation in wording, earlier in the *sugya* and Samuel's comment later. The latter ends the section of y. Ber. 7:2 which focuses on the minor. Samuel's comment has thus reversed places with a "story" in which a Palestinian master tells of his childhood and which explicitly avers that a minor—without the two hairs of physical maturity—cannot count to make up the number to summon Grace. In PT, Samuel's tradition is at the penultimate position and the story at the ultima; in Gen. R., Samuel—preceded by a question but not A–B—stands ultima and the story penultima.²³

ing phrases of the *sugya* and notes that the section in extension is in y. Ber. See Albeck's notes, ad loc., and his "Introduction," *Einleitung und Register zum Bereschit Rabba* (Berlin, 1931–1936), printed with Theodor and Albeck, *Bereschit Rabba*, 2d ed. (Jerusalem, 1965), vol. 3, Introduction, pp. 107–8; E. S. Rosenthal, "Leshonot soferim," in *Yuval Shay. [A Jubilee Volume dedicated to S. Y. Agnon]*, ed. Baruch Kurzweil (Ramat Gan, 1958), pp. 293–324, especially 312–13. As the *sugya* in a recension different from PT appears in Vat. MS 60 and substantively in the remaining MSS other than Vat. 30, the section represents not merely a late addition to the text. See below.

On Vatican MS 30, available in photographic reprint, *Midrash Bereshit Rabba MS. Vat. Ebr. 30*. With an Introduction and Index by Michael Sokoloff (Jerusalem, 1971), see Sokoloff's "Introduction," and his references to other literature, especially his articles in *Leshonenu* 33 (1969): 25–42, 135–49, 270–79, and Kutscher, *Studies*; and Lewis M. Barth, *An Analysis of Vatican 30* (Cincinnati, 1973), and the literature cited there. Vat. MS 60 is considered an important early witness to the text of Gen. R., inferior to Vat. 30 but superior to the London and other MSS. See Kutscher, *Studies*, pp. 12–13, n. 6; Barth, pp. 83–84; and Michael Sokoloff, "The Geniza Fragments of Genesis Rabba and Ms. Vat. Ebr. 60 of Genesis Rabba," Ph. D. diss., Hebrew University, 1971; rev. ed. (in press) [not seen].

The printed editions, based upon Venice, 1545 edition, as well as the first edition, Constantinople, 1512, on the basis of the PT add C–D after Gen. R.'s version of A–B and "correct" Gen. R.'s actual citations or analogues of A–B, where they later appear in Gen. R. See the list of variants in Albeck, and "Introduction," pp. 113, 126, especially 128. A Yemenite MS which accords with the readings in the printed editions, does not represent a manuscript support for these readings, as the MS copies the Venice, 1545 edition. See Albeck, "Introduction," pp. 115–17, and 117, n. 2.

23. The variation in sequence may be highly significant. The arrangement of material in y. is a product and a reflection of its editing. The place of Samuel's comment, in Gen. R., at the end may accord with our observation elsewhere that in y., Babylonian traditions sometimes are appended at the end and thus do not make up an integral part of the y. *sugya*; *Samuel's Commentary*, pp. 77–80, esp. 79–80 and n. 216. The Palestinian circles who placed C before Samuel's tradition and placed both, C–D, in the midst of the *sugya*, apparently see the issues through what may be called a Palestinian perspective: "A minor cannot serve as an adjunct to three." See Saul Lieberman, *Talmud of Caesarea [Supplement to Tarbiz 2]* (Jerusalem, 1931), pp. 20–25, especially 22–23, from whom I quote: "That arranger [of y.] chose and deleted whatever did not fit the approaches of the yeshivot of the land of Israel; he is the one who deleted the Babylonian approaches to the explanation of Mishnah. . . . And the arranger partially changed

The following chart lays out the sequence of *y.* in both Gen. R. and PT:

<i>PT</i>	<i>Gen. R.</i>
1. Yehoshua b. Levi and Rabbi: minor as adjunct to 10.	1'. same [= #1]
2–3. Question and answer on #1.	2'–3'. same [= #2–3]
4. Tradition re 9 as 10.	
5–6. Question and answer on #4: 9 “with a minor.” ²⁴	
7. If minor for 10, why not for 3?	
8. Answer.	
9. Minor and Torah Scroll. [=A]	4'. same [= #9]
10. Explanation of #9. [=B]	5'. same [= #10] 6'. as #4 7'–8'. as #5–6 9'. as #7 [with variation and addition ²⁵]
11. Introductory question. [=C]	10'. Story [= #13] 11'. Introductory question. [as #11, but differs]
12. Samuel's tradition. [=D]	12'. same [= #12 with different conjunction]
13. Story: Person with two hairs and no young minors.	

The sequence thus proves that Samuel's comment is not integrally connected to the baraita in A and its explanation, B. Moreover, Gen. R.'s ver-

the language of R. Yermiah [in a pericope Lieberman immediately above reviewed] in accord with the approach of the Land of Israel." See also Bokser, *Samuel's Commentary*, pp. 152, n. 467, 156, nn. 475–476, and *ANRW*, chap. 12. On the presence in our context of a "Palestinian approach" see nn. 39 and 52 and the texts thereto; the fragment of the "Ma'asim li-vene'i 'Ereš Yisra'el," published in Mordechai Margalioth, *Hilkhot 'Ereš Yisra'el min ha-genizah* (Jerusalem, 1973), p. 44, ll. 13–15, and in Z. M. Rabinowitz, "Sepher Ha-Ma'asim Livnei Erez Yisra'el—New Fragments," *Tarbiz* 41 (1972): 275–305, 285, especially Rabinowitz's footnote, pp. 285–86; and Goldberg, cited in n. 39 below. As to implications of this suggestion, see below.

24. See Sacks, *Diqduqei*, p. 32, n. 2; Albeck, *Bereschit Rabba*, 3:1112, n. 2; Epstein, *IAL*, p. 364, n. 7, and Rabinowitz, "New Fragments," p. 286.

25. See Albeck, *Bereschit Rabba*, 3:1112–13, n. 3; see also Sacks, *Diqduqei*, p. 32, n. 4, and Epstein, *IAL*, p. 364, n. 10.

sion of the question that introduces Samuel's tradition differs from that in PT. We must now examine that question and Samuel's tradition.

IV

*Gen. R. 91.4*²⁶

A'. And until when is he counted a minor (*ve-'ad 'eikhan yihyeh qaṣan*).²⁷

B'1. Said R. Avina, R. Huna and R. Yehudah, in the name of Samuel, dispute [the matter]:

B'2. One said—Until he may know how to say a blessing (*'ad she-hu yode'a le-varekh*).²⁸

B'3. And the other said—Until he may know the character of the blessing (*'ad she-hu yode'a ṭiv berakhah*).²⁹

The attributions in the Gen. R. and PT versions match. The traditions themselves, however, open differently. In PT, we have, "When he knows . . ." which sets forth the definition of the *new* status or change in status, as

26. Gen. R. #91 [Theodor and Albeck, 3:1113–14], according to Vatican Codex 60, p. 332: 'עד איכן יהיה קטן? א' ר' אבונא אחפלאגן ר' חונה ורבי יהודה תרניהון בש' שמואל, חר אמ' עד שהוא יודע לברך וחרנה א' עד שהוא יודע שב ברכה.

27. So Vat. 60. Relying on Albeck's list of variants: *ve-'ad kammah yehe qore* = London MS; *ve-'ad 'eimatai* [or: *matai*] *yehe qore* = correction in London MS and Yalquṭ Shime'oni [for the latter Albeck relied on the early editions, the readings of which are confirmed by the Oxford MS, in Yalquṭ Shime'oni (Jerusalem, 1973), p. 783]. The latter mistaken reading probably was generated by an incorrect filling out of an abbreviation *q'*. For example, the *q'* in a reading such as *ve-'ad kammah* [or *'eikhan*] *yihyeh q'* was taken as *qore*, "to read" in place of *qaṣan*, a "minor." The author of this mistake may have been motivated by an interpretation in y. that Samuel's comment relates to a minor who is called up to the reading of the Torah Scroll. See the above discussion on the meaning of B of PT, and Albeck, in *Bereschit Rabba*, 3:1113, l. 4, for an example how one may mistakenly justify the reading *qore* and for his citation of an interpretative gloss from the London MS's margin. Some later MSS conflate both "readings": *ve-'ad kammah qaṣan* [or *yehe qaṣan*] *qore*. The printed editions have been "corrected" on the basis of the PT: *u-me-'eimatai hu qore ba-torah*. See above, n. 22. Note the reading in Zedekiah b. Abraham Anav, *Shibbolei ha-leqei ha-shalem*, ed. Solomon Buber (Vilna, 1886); reprint ed. with notes by Yeruḥam Liner (New York, 1959), #153, p. 60 [= p. 119], *'ad kammah yihyeh niqra qaṣan* "Until when is he called a 'minor'?" The latter's sequence and wording of the whole *sugya* indicate that it cites Gen. R. and not PT.

28. So Vat. 60 in addition to two readings which Albeck cites. London and others contain variations thereof, all with *'ad she-* with the exception of the printed editions and Yemenite MS which were "corrected" to accord with the PT: *mi-shehu yode'a*. See n. 22.

29. So Vat. 60. London and other witnesses have variations thereof, all with *'ad she-*. Again printed editions and Yemenite MS are corrected to accord with PT, (*she-yode'a*) *le-mi mevare-khin*. See n. 22.

when a minor may be counted for the Summons. In Gen. R., on the other hand, we find, "Until he . . ." which sets forth until when a person remains in a given state, as when a minor is excluded from the Summons, the issue of M. Ber. 7:2.

We find additional differences as well. While one of each pair employs the verb, "to know," follows with an object, and offers the same criterion, the "character of the blessing," in PT this version comes first, and in Gen. R. second. The other tradition in each pair employs the verb "to know" and then the prefix *le-*, "to," before the object. In one case we find, "to know to whom he says a blessing," and in the other, "to know how to bless." Evidently there has been some confusion in the transmission.³⁰ If the Gen. R. version represents the fundamental formulation of the traditions, the differences between their criteria are insignificant. One refers to a child's physical ability or knowledge of how to bless, while the second to the character of the blessing. In the PT, on the other hand, the differences are sharp and, accordingly, that version probably is closer to the original.³¹

If we assume that the types of criteria formulated fit the context into which they are used,³² Samuel's tradition in Gen. R. sets out until when someone remains in his or her present status and *unable* to say a certain blessing. This is inappropriate to the status of an adult, for then the person has become part of the group that is liable and able to say the blessing. But it does accord with M. Ber. 7:2's reference to a "minor." Thus in Gen. R., Samuel's comment explains M. Ber. 7:2.

We also have additional evidence to exclude an "adult" as Samuel's referent, to prefer Gen. R.'s formulation, and to accept our analysis of y. PT's version of Samuel's comment and especially the introductory question assume that Samuel refers to an "adjunct of ten." But in the context of Summons to Grace this term appears only in traditions attributed to Pales-

30. In this regard, we do not consider the readings in the printed editions and Yemenite MS. See nn. 22, 28, 29.

31. The argument in the text holds unless one understands *iv* in a different way. See Maimonides to M. Ber. 7:2 and Albeck, in *Bereschit Rabba*, 3:1114, notes. The usage elsewhere of *iv*, however, supports our comments. See above, n. 14, and the text thereto.

Moreover, as we shall see, D.2, accords with a tradition in b. attributed to Nahman, a master who had access to Samuel traditions. It requires a minor "to know to whom they bless" before he can be counted, *yode'a le-mi mevarekhim*. See below nn. 35–38, and the text thereto. Of course, the b. tradition may have generated the "correction" of y. If so, the version in Gen. R. would constitute the original reading. See below, the analysis of Tos. Ber. 5:18 which relates to M. Ber. 7:2.

32. See nn. 17 and 33.

tinians. In PT we find it in a baraita that lacks a b. parallel, in traditions attributed to Palestinians, and in anonymous parts of y. gemara. One of the y. traditions does appear in BT but, significantly, attributed to the first generation Palestinian Amora, Yehoshua ben Levi.³³ On the basis of usage, it is thus highly unlikely that Samuel focuses on the issue of “adjunct to ten.”

Given the above observations, a referent appropriate to Samuel’s comment could be a “minor,” *qatan*, who is excluded from participating in the blessing, which is exactly what we find in M. Ber. 7:2. Samuel thus refers to Mishnah and its mention of minors who are excluded from the Summons.³⁴

If Gen. R.’s formulation of Samuel’s comment preserves the literary form of his comment, the tradition had circulated as a gloss to Mishnah. Indeed the use of the formulation as a gloss without an explicit referent and not as an autonomous statement can account for the history of the tradition. Someone could have easily reapplied the gloss to another text without violating the substance of the comment. He had to change only the conjunction, from “until” to “when.”

Our analysis has offered both negative and positive proof to support the notion that Samuel glossed M. Ber. 7:2. We now turn to four supplementary observations which confirm Samuel’s interest in the Summons for Grace and which indicate that it was appropriate for someone to define the term “minor” in M. Ber. 7:2.

V

First, b. Ber. 48a, in its analogous *sugya* to y. Ber. 7:2, cites a tradition which is attributed to Naḥman and which is very close to one of the versions of Samuel’s comment:

And the *halakhah* does not follow all these [above] traditions. Rather it follows what R. Naḥman said, A minor who knows to whom they bless, They summon Grace with him.³⁵

33. See TK, 1:84, and n. 38.

34. See Samuel Jaffe b. Isaac Ashkenazi, “Yefeh to’ar,” digested in *Midrash Rabba* (Vilna, 1878; reprint ed. Jerusalem, 1961), loc. cit., and Maimonides’ and Sirillo’s comments to M. Ber. 7:2.

We note, it is not unprecedented for a tradition to be formulated in terms of “Until . . .” See b. Yev. 107b, a tradition of Samuel’s opens with ‘*ad she-*,’ “Until”; and in a purported citation of y., which Lieberman argues is a Gaonic gloss, TK, 5:1273–74, “‘A minor, *qatan*, does not . . .’ Until when, ‘*ad ‘eimatai*, . . .”

35. הלית הלכתא ככל הני שמעתתא אלא כי הא דאמר רב נחמן קטן היודע למי מברכין מומנין עליו.

Nahman's comment delineates the status which qualifies one to participate in the Summons. This accords with the perspective of PT's version of Samuel's comment—vis-à-vis that of Gen. R. Its criterion is identical with that of D.3., the second version of Samuel's tradition but, in contrast to the latter, it is formulated as an autonomous statement. It makes use of the language of M. Ber. 7:2, into which is glossed the phrase, "Who knows to whom they bless," *ha-yode'a le-mi mevarekhin*. The negative is removed from Mishnah's formulation, "They (do not) summon the Grace with him." The context clearly is defined by Mishnah and thus agrees with Gen. R.'s recension, "Summons for three," and not PT's—reworked—"adjunct for ten." To judge from the language of the comment itself, Nahman precludes other criteria and avers that his is sufficient.³⁶

Nahman, a second-third generation Amora, had access to Samuel's traditions,³⁷ and it is possible that he draws upon Samuel's teachings. While we remain unsure as to this possibility, Nahman's tradition does attest to the beliefs of those responsible for the *sugya*. They associate an early Babylonian with a version of the tradition which *y.* attributes to Samuel.³⁸

The placing of Samuel's comment in the context of "Summons for three" or "adjunct to ten," may reflect differing Babylonian and Palestinian notions. If so, it is not insignificant that the autonomous authority who reworked b. 47b–48a cites Nahman's comment as if it should be authoritative.³⁹

36. In addition to Rashi and Tosf. ad loc., see B. M. Lewin, ed. *Otzar ha-Gaonim*, 13 vols. (Haifa and Jerusalem, 1928–1943), vol. 1: *Tractate Berakhoth*, "Commentaries," pp. 82–83; Isaac Alfasi, *Hilkhot*; Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, "Hilkhot Berakhot," 5:7; Nahmanides, *Novellae* to b. 48a; especially Isaiah the Elder, *The Rulings of, Pisqei ha-Rid*, 7 vols. to date (Jerusalem, 1964-), vol. 1: *Berakhot*; and Lieberman, *TK*, 1:84–86. See Meyer Berlin, Shlomo Josef Zevin, and Jehoshua Hutner, *Talmudic Encyclopedia*, 15 vols. to date (Jerusalem, 1947-), s.v. "Zimmun," 12: 284–90, especially 286, for a survey of authorities who discuss the *sugya* and Nahman's comment, and especially Abraham b. Isaac of Narbonne, *Sefer ha-'eshkol*, ed. Shalom and Chanoch Albeck, 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1935–38), 1: 41, n. 3.

37. See Bokser, *Samuel's Commentary*, p. 218 and nn. 3–5.

38. On the association of the comments of Samuel and Nahman and M. Ber. 7:2, see R. Meshullam, pp. 244–45; R. David b. Levi of Narbonne, *Sefer ha-mikhtam*, in *Ginzei rishonim*, pp. 91–92; *Pisqei ha-Rid*, cols. 140–42; Dinkels, 'Emunat Yosef, in his edition of Sirillo, to y. Ber. 7:2, s.v. "nashim va-'avadim," Sachs notes to R. Judah Sir Leon, 2: 517, n. 398; and see Nahmanides, *Novellae*, and *Shibbolei ha-leqet*, #153, p. 118.

39. The possibility that the sources reflect Babylonian and Palestinian perspectives may correlate with the place of a story in the b. and y. *sugyot*. BT to conclude the *sugya* presents after Nahman's comment a story about Rabbah, Abaye, and Rava bar R. Hanan. [On the last name see *DS*, 253: 6, to which add *Babylonian Talmud, Codex Florence*, Florence National

VI

Second, in addition to the preceding confirmation of the second version of Samuel's comment, D.3., we also find attestation of the first one, D.2, as well as of Samuel's concern for the proper formulation of the summoning formula. This information is provided by a tradition of Samuel in b. Ber. 49b–50a and y. Ber. 7:3. The tradition relates to M. Ber. 7:3.

Mishnah Ber. 7:3 lists the different formulae for different occasions of the Summons for Grace:⁴⁰

M. Ber. 7:3A:

How do they summon [Grace]?

In the case of three [people]—he [the summoner] says, "Let us bless."

In the case of three and him [= in addition to the summoner]—he says, "Bless."⁴¹

Library II I 7–9, Introduction by David Rosenthal, 3 vols. (Jerusalem, 1972), 1: 99; and Yosef David Azulai, *Sefer petah 'einayim*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1959), 1: 35, col. b.] That story employs the language of Nahman's tradition and apparently attests its point. See commentaries, ad loc., e.g., Menahem b. Shelomoh ha-Meiri, *Beit ha-behira*, *Berakhot*, ed. Shmuel Daikman (Jerusalem, 1965), p. 180. As mentioned above, PT ends with a story which conveys the point that we count only a "minor" with two hairs, i.e., who has reached physical maturity. Thus b. and y. each ends with a story which reflects its perspective. This agrees with the general observation that gemara's choice and formulation of stories forms part of its arrangement and is shaped by redactional considerations. See nn. 54 and 23, to which add Abraham Goldberg, "R. Ze'ira and the Babylonian Custom in the Land of Israel," *Tarbiz* 36 (1967): 319–41, especially pp. 327–30. See also below, the reference to *TK*, 5:1275, ll. 18–19; and my forthcoming article, "Redactional Criticism of Rabbinic Literature: The Case of Hanina ben Dosa."

On b. Ber. 47b–48a, in addition to the aforementioned works, especially Nahmanides, *Pisqei ha-Rid*, and *TK*, see also Eliezer b. Joel Halevi, *Sepher Rabiah*, ed. Viktor Aptowitz, 4 vols. (Jerusalem, 1965), 1: 112–15, #128, and note, p. 490; Jonah Gerondi, *Novellae* to Alfasi; Aaron b. Joseph HaLevi of Barcelona, *Perush ha-Ra'H*, in *Rabbenu Yehonatan ha-Kohen ve-ha-Ra'H 'al Masekhet Berakhot*, ed. M. Y. Blau (New York, 1957), p. 151; and Aaron b. Jacob b. David ha-Kohen, *'Orhot hayyim*, [Part One] (Jerusalem, 1956), "Birkhat ha-mazon," #39–43, pp. 76–77; and Abraham Baer Dobsevege, *Sefer ha-mešaref* (Odessa, 1871; reprint ed., Jerusalem, 1970), pp. 16–17. See also *DS*, 251:100–253:8; especially the readings in Florence MS; Chanoch Albeck, *Studies in the Baraita and Tosefta* (Jerusalem, 1944), pp. 96–97, and *Introduction*, pp. 524, and 565, n. 27.

If Albeck, in *Sefer ha-eshkol*, 1: 41, n. 3, is correct, one of the Gaonim added the clause introducing and supporting Nahman's comment.

40. See above, n. 2.

41. כיצד מזמנין בשלשה אומי' נבדך בשלשה דווא אר' ברכו.

b. Ber. 49b–50a:

Said Samuel, Let a person never exclude himself from the community.⁴²

y. Ber. 7:3, 11c:

Samuel said, I do not exclude myself from the community.⁴³

In their discussions of the formulae in M. Ber. 7:3A, b. and y. cite Samuel's comment. Both Babylonian and Palestinian circles believed Samuel to be punctilious as to the appropriate formula by which to summon Grace. Given this concern it is understandable that he might employ the criterion of "one's knowledge of the character of the blessing" so as to evaluate a person's fitness to summon Grace.⁴⁴

Both versions of Samuel's comment thus receive support. Naḥman's tradition demonstrates an early Babylonian interest in a definition of a "minor," mentioned in M. Ber. 7:2. It is formulated in terms of the second version of Samuel's comment, D.3., and defines the end of the disqualified stage. A second independent tradition of Samuel, in b. Ber. 49b–50 and y. Ber. 7:3, 11c, attests that the alternative version, D.2, fits within Samuel's concerns.

VII

The third item which confirms our suggestion as to the original form of Samuel's comment—as a gloss on Mishnah—lies in the history of the mishnaic category "minor." Often a reference to a minor (*qaṭan* or *tinog*) is subject to a comment, definition, and limitation, both within Mishnah itself and Tosefta and within gemara. We find instances where one clause of Mishnah excludes a minor from liability or permission to perform some activity.⁴⁵

42. אמ' שמואל לעולם אל יוצי' אדם את עצמו מן הכלל.

43. שמואל אמר איני מוציא את עצמי מן הכלל.

44. For further analysis of this tradition, see Baruch M. Bokser, *Samuel's Commentary on the Mishnah, Part Two* (Leiden, in press).

We note that Samuel's comment does not reflect an exceptional interest in "youth." See b. Nid. 52b, where Samuel takes a lenient position in the very definition of "two hairs," the signs of "physical maturity"; b. Shab. 137b, to which see *TK*, 3:252 and the alternative version of the pericope in a fragment of the *She'iltot*, J. N. Epstein, "Sheiltot Fragments. B," *Tarbiz* 7 (1938): 15, ll. 12–14; b. M.Q. 14b; and b. San. 54b.

45. The reference often forms part of a list of "women, minors, and slaves," as in M. Ber. 7:2. See Kasovsky, *Thesaurus Mishnae*, 4: 1574a–b.

But another passage in that same Mishnah or one adjoining it, or in Tosefta limits Mishnah's rule and defines what type of minor is so excluded. Likewise a ruling excluding a minor often includes a clause modifying or defining the type of minor. There is thus no single standard as to who constitutes a "minor." Moreover, the language of the definitions is generally formulated in terms of their application and context. These examples appear throughout Mishnah and Tosefta, including, as we shall see, one in T. Ber. 5:18 which deals with M. Ber. 7:2.

M. Suk. 2:8 presents a general rule followed by a limitation-definition:

Women, and slaves and minors (*u-qeṭannim*) are exempt from the [requirement to have a] *sukkah*.

And every minor (*qaṭan*) who does not need his mother [= but moves about without her] is liable as to the *sukkah*.⁴⁶

T. Ḥag. 1:2–3, pp. 374–76, ll. 5–22, contains eleven distinct definitions of a "minor" tailored to different laws and one definition of "majority" comprehensively formulated. Note the pattern:

[If one] knows how to shake (*yode'a le-na'ne'a*), he is liable as to *lulav*; knows how to wrap [around a garment] he is liable as to fringes. . . . Knows how to watch over phylacteries, his father brings him phylacteries. . . . Knows how to slaughter—his slaughter is valid. . . .⁴⁷

Tosefta's specific principles are thus formulated in terms of whether or not a minor knows how or is able to do something.⁴⁸

46. נשים ועבדים וקטנים פטורים מן הסוכה וכל קטן שאינו צריך לאמו חייב בסוכה.

See the use of this criterion in T. 'Eruv. 6:12, p. 121, ll. 38–41; and TK, 3:425, and 5:1268–69. See also the references to a minor in M. Ter. 1:1, which is limited by M. Ter. 1:3 and T. Ter. 1:4, pp. 107–8, ll. 12–14 [to which see TK, 1:295]; M. Sheq. 1:3, to which see y. Sheq. 1:3, 46a; M. Suk. 3:5, where a definition is incorporated into the reference to a minor [to which see y. Suk. 3:15, 54a, TK, 5:1273, and the formulation in T. Ḥag. 1:2, presented below, text to n. 47]; M. Meg. 4:6 and y. Meg. 4:6, 75b; M. Ḥag. 1:1; M. Ket. 1:3, defined by T. Ket. 1:2, pp. 56–57, ll. 10–12, which contains the question: What is a minor (female) and what is a minor (male): A minor (male)—less than nine years and one day; a minor (female)—less than thirteen years and one day; M. Giṭ. 6:2–3 and T. Giṭ. 4:2, pp. 260–61, ll. 13–15; M. Hul. 1:1, where the "minor" is defined and limited later within M. Hul. 1:1 as well as in T. Hul. 1:3, p. 500, l. 23–24. See also M. Nid. 5:3–9.

47. יודע לנענע חייב בלולב יודע להחטף חייב בציצית . . . יודע לשפר תפלין אביו לוקח תפלין אליו. . . יודע לשחוט שחיטתו כשרה. . . חינוקה שהביאה שתי שערות חייבת בכל מצות בתורה. . .

48. Additional toseftan examples include: T. Ber. 2:13, p. 9, ll. 51–55; T. 'Eruv. 6:12, p. 121, ll. 39–41; T. Ket. 3:8, p. 65, ll. 36–39; T. Zev. 11:6, p. 496, ll. 3–5 [to which see T. Ḥag. 1:3]; T. 'Oholot 18:6, 8, p. 616, ll. 17, 35–36; and T. Nid. 5:4, p. 645, ll. 28–31; and the above cited

Samuel's definition of M. Ber. 7:3 thus *prima facie* is not unusual. It is natural to find a definition of Mishnah's rule and it is unexceptional to find it formulated in terms of the blessing and the youth's knowledge thereof. This suggestion finds confirmation in T. Ber. 5:18 which refers to M. Ber. 7:2's mention of a "minor."

VIII

The fourth supplementary evidence consists of T. Ber. 5:18, p. 28, ll. 36–38:

1. A minor who is able to eat an olive's amount—they summon Grace with him;
who cannot eat an olive's amount [= the minimum amount necessary to become liable to say Grace]—they do not summon Grace with him.
2. [And] they are not exacting *as* to a minor.
3. Whether he says, "Let us bless," whether he says, "Bless"—they do not seize him on that.
4. The fault-finders (*ha-naqdanin*) seize him on that [if he says, "Let us bless"].⁴⁹

Clause 1 defines the type of minor excluded and included. Tosefta thus follows the perspective of M. Ber. 7:2, which lists disqualifications, as well

examples which define M. Ter. 1:1 (T. Ter. 1:4); M. Ket. 1:3 (T. Ket. 1:2); M. Giṭ. 6:2–3 (T. Giṭ. 4:2); and M. Hul. 1:1 (T. Hul. 1:3). See also T. Nazir 3:17. Moreover, we have the example of T. Ber. 5:13, which deals with M. Ber. 7:2 and upon which we focus below, text to nn. 49–52.

See also Sifre Dt. #46, ed. Louis Finkelstein, *Sifre on Deuteronomy* (reprint ed., New York, 1969), p. 104; Mekhilta, Pisha, Bo, #3, ed. H. S. Horovitz and I. A. Rabin, *Mekhilta D'Rabbi Ismael* (reprint ed., Jerusalem, 1960), p. 12, ll. 5–6; Mekhilta de-Rashbi, Bo, to Ex. 12:4, ed. J. N. Eptstein and E. Z. Melamed, *Mekhilta D'Rabbi Sim'on b. Joḥai* (Jerusalem, 1955), p. 10, ll. 16–19; and Sifre Zuṭa, Shelah, ed. H. S. Horovitz, *Siphre D'Be Rab 1. Siphre ad Numeron adjecto Siphre Zutta* (reprint ed., Jerusalem, 1966), p. 288, l. 20 to p. 289, l. 1 [which like T. Hag. 1:23, has a cluster of references with the pattern, "Whoever knows how to . . . is liable as to . . .," *Kol she-yode'a le- hayyav le-* and "Whoever knows how to . . . is responsible . . .," *Kol she-hu yode'a le- . . . 'alav*]. See Lieberman, *Siphre Zutta*, pp. 15–16.

I do not include a full list of amoraic instances of definitions of a "minor." See, e.g., above n. 46, and b. 'Eruv. 82a [to which see *DS*, 323:5] and b. Suk. 28b [to which see *DS*, 84:2].

49. אין. Vienna MS =] קטן שיכול לאכול כוית מומנץ עליו שאין יכול לאכול כוית אין מומנץ עליו ואין [Erfurt MS and p.e. = איתו על כך.

See *The Tosefta*, 1:29, Brief Commentary, l. 38; *TK*, 1:85–86, and Lieberman's reference to Sirkis, and below n. 51.

as its opposite, those “counted.” While it is not formulated as a simple gloss, Tosefta does consist of what might have circulated as a “composite gloss.” That is, it employs the language of Mishnah with a gloss interpolated into it.

Clause 2 deals with examining a minor, probably as to the presence of two hairs.⁵⁰ If so, its principle accords with that of clause 1. When a person exhibits the qualifications in clause 1 but not clause 2, the individual may be counted. While Samuel and Tosefta may offer different concrete criteria, they share the notion that a child who has reached a certain stage, even before physical maturity, may be counted.⁵¹ Moreover, Tosefta attests that Mishnah’s reference to a “minor” became subject to explanation already before Samuel’s day.⁵²

50. See *The Tosefta*, 1:29, Brief Commentary; *TK*, 1:85 to which cf. Albeck, *Studies*, p. 96. See also Yom Tob Ishbili, in *Ginzei rishonim*, p. 502, and Moses Margalioth, *Mareh ha-panim*, in editions of y., to y. Ber. 7:3.

51. See *TK*, 1:84, 1. 36, where Lieberman suggests that the definition in clause 1 deals with the youth’s “knowledge.” Lieberman further explains that clause 2 is a general principle. If so, it applies also to the Summons to Grace.

52. We may be able to correlate two readings of the toseftan baraita with the two basic positions as to a “minor.” First, if we assume that clause two of Tosefta refers to “two hairs,” which Lieberman suggests and which my text follows, Tosefta supplies a general rule: “They are not exacting as to a minor’s two hairs.” This does not contradict Samuel’s tradition. Clause 3 deals with the proper formula, the issue which Samuel addressed. It too is not necessarily inconsistent with Samuel. While it rules that the exact formula is not critical, it does not preclude one from having a preference.

Second, the above reading of Tosefta, on the other hand, does contradict the y. notion that physical maturity determines and not the requisite knowledge. But the latter position accords with a second reading of the baraita. Some texts of y. Ber. 7:3, which cites clauses 2–3, have in clause 2, “exacting as to the matter,” *ba-davar*, instead of *be-qatan*, “as to a minor.” As this reading is not supported by all the witnesses of y. [not in V MS, YFG], and poses other difficulties, Lieberman has argued that it is the result of a textual or scribal mistake. See *TK*, 1:85. But if the L and S MSS which do have *ba-davar*, “in the matter,” reflect an actual literary tradition, the situation would be different. We would then read clauses 2–3 as, “They are not exacting as to the matter, whether a person says, ‘Let us bless,’ or ‘Bless.’” This rendering more strongly states that the blessing formula is neither determinative nor significant. In addition, no longer does Tosefta preclude checking for “two hairs” or other signs of physical maturity. Both of these points are important to those masters, Palestinians, who hold that a youth remains a minor until he reaches physical maturity or hold that exceptions to Mishnah’s exclusion of a minor applied not to the summons of three but of ten. In the latter case alone does the youth become an adjunct. Naturally while this position accords with the “Palestinian” one, it is inconsistent with Samuel’s. If we assume Babylonians and Palestinians knew the baraita, people with different interpretations of Mishnah or autonomous positions could interpret Tosefta’s baraita in different ways and each could find support in it.

Our argument above may correlate with the beginning of y. Ber. 7:2 which cites clause 2, alone, contains the reading *be-qatan*, “a minor,” and reinterprets the text. Moreover, it may obviate a difficulty in b. 47b–48a. Gemara cites a tradition attributed to Yoḥanan which offers

IX

We have thus traced the history of Samuel's comment. We focused upon its wording and its place within its context in *y.* The Gen. R. parallel to *y. Ber. 7:2* supports the internal analysis and represents an early recension of *y.* and of Samuel's comment. Already in this "earlier" recension a question to introduce Samuel's tradition appears. In the later recension, as found in *y. Ber. 7:2*, the editor of the *sugya* used the tradition to focus on an issue which slightly differs and which fits into the wider topic of *senif*, "adjunct"—all this despite difficulties in chronology and usage. BT *Ber. 48a* attests that the substance of Samuel's comment circulated as part of an early Babylonian tradition relating to *M. Ber. 7:2*. *Y. Ber. 7:3* and *b. Ber. 49b–50a* indicate that Samuel, indeed, was concerned with the proper formulation of the Summons and thus it is appropriate for him to have used a blessing formula to determine whether or not to include a minor. The usage of "minor" in Mishnah and the need in Mishnah and Tosefta to define that category in language appropriate to the case at hand demonstrates that such a definition of *M. Ber. 7:2* would be appropriate. *T. Ber. 5:18* finally proves that the word "minor" in *M. Ber. 7:2* in fact did elicit a definition.

Samuel's comment thus forms part of a concern integral to Mishnah-commentary. Assuredly, a definition which specifies the type of "minor" limits Mishnah, but such limitations are found elsewhere as well. Samuel's

a criterion of physical maturity, *qaṭan poreah*. BT then as a support, *tanei nammei hakhei*, cites a version of *T. 5:18*, clauses 1–2. While clauses 2 in both are the same, the criteria in clauses 1 differ. BT's version requires that the youth have two hairs. BT follows with a question which focuses on the contradiction between the two clauses. The resolution somehow supports Yoḥanan's comment. Commentators differ in their analysis of the pericope and its terms. If Yoḥanan's baraita had *ba-davar* and not *be-qaṭan*, the two clauses would not contradict each other, and then clause 1 by itself could supply the support. Cf. Albeck, *Studies*, pp. 96–97. This analysis assumes that *b.* contains the version of the baraita inappropriate to Yoḥanan. This mistake may have been produced as part of the adaption of Yoḥanan's tradition to Babylonian transmissal and redactional consideration. Alternatively, if the *sugya* was completed with only a reference to the baraita, those who supplied the full text may have included the inappropriate version. Either way, it is the present inappropriate text which causes the exegetical problems. See Lieberman, *TK*, 1:84, 1. 36.

As to the presence of different version of baraitot, their effect on amoraic interpretations, and mistakes in their citations, see Bokser, *Samuel's Commentary*, pp. 101–2, n. 280, and "Guide," *ANRW*, 8. D. Saul Lieberman in particular has demonstrated this phenomenon in *y.*, e.g., *Hayerushalmi kiphshuto*, 1 vol. to date (Jerusalem, 1934), pp. 121, 157, and David Weiss Halivni repeatedly for *b.*, *Sources and Traditions*, 2 vols. to date (Jerusalem, 1968–). Our argument here accords with the existence of different Palestinian and Babylonian perspectives as to "Summons to Grace." See nn. 23 and 39 and the text thereto.

comment may have originated as a gloss to Mishnah.⁵³ This would explain how once it no longer circulated as a gloss onto Mishnah, it might require a question to introduce it, how it could also be applied to new contexts, and how the change of a preposition might yield a change in emphasis.

X

This paper has dealt with two recensions of a *y. sugya* and, accordingly, throws light on certain wider issues. The nature of recensions of *y.* plays a role in the discussion of the relationship of *y. Neziqin* and the rest of *y.* and in the nature of variations between Gen. R. parallels to *y.* and the version in *y.* itself. Israel Lewy, Saul Lieberman, J. N. Epstein, E. S. Rosenthal, and others have focused upon the distinctive elements of *y. Neziqin* and how that order differs from the rest of *y.* but differ as to whether those variations are due to differences in chronology and place (Lieberman) or only location (Epstein).⁵⁴ One aspect of the controversy hinges on the ability to distinguish between two types of recensions. When are recensions products of two contemporary circles and when the results of diachronic development? This study addresses this question and provides one answer in the evaluation of individual pericopes, viz., to focus on the nature of the variations. Specifically, does one version employ a more fundamental form and formulation

53. See n. 20 and Bokser, *Samuel's Commentary*, for examples of such a formulation.

54. When we need to differentiate between possible recensions of Yerushalmi and the text as preserved in printed editions and MSS we distinctively employ two different abbreviations. "Y" [= Yerushalmi] refers to the former and "PT" [= Palestinian Talmud] to the latter. Otherwise we use the abbreviations interchangeably. In general, see Bokser, "Guide," *ANRW*, chap. 12, especially 12. 1.e., and 3; 4, D.4; and 10. A. and D. 1. In particular, I refer to the following works: Israel Lewy, *Introduction and Commentary to Talmud Yerushalmi* B.Q. 1–6 [from *Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars Fraenckel'scher Stiftung*, 1895–1914] (Jerusalem, 1970); Saul Lieberman, *Talmud of Caesarea* [*Sup. to Tarbiz* 2] (Jerusalem, 1931), *Siphre Zutta* (New York, 1968), especially pp. 125–36, and "A Few Words by Julian the Architect of Ascalon, The Laws of Palestine and its Customs," *Tarbiz* 40 (1971): 409–17; Epstein, *IAL*, pp. 279–87, and 287–90; and E. S. Rosenthal, "Concerning the New MS to PT Neziqin," Paper delivered at The Seventh World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, Israel, August 8, 1977. This Spanish MS is Escorial G–I–3. See also Albeck, *Bereschit Rabba*, 3: Introduction: 66–84, and Barth, pp. 60–65, especially the literature cited in n. 68, to which add Baruch M. Bokser, "Two Traditions," pp. 48–52; and cf. E. Z. Melamed, *An Introduction to Talmudic Literature* (Jerusalem, 1973), pp. 573–75, and Edward A. Goldman, "Parallel Texts in the Palestinian Talmud to Genesis Rabba" (Rabbinic diss., Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1969), on which see the text to nn. 65–66 below. [I thank Prof. Goldman and the HUC Library for providing me with a microfilm of the last item.]

of a teaching and serve a function appropriate to an early stage of the tradition?

We found that y. Ber. 7:2 differs from its parallel in Gen. R. 91.4 in the formulation of several traditions and clarifying comments and in the sequence of materials. As the Gen. R. version represents a *more fundamental form* of the tradition and is *logically prior* to that of PT it is preferable. It may, in addition, preserve the commentary gloss-form of the tradition which commented directly on Mishnah itself. We, therefore, concluded that PT adapted the version preserved in Gen. R.⁵⁵

Contemporary teaching and literary work theoretically could produce these different versions. But the text in PT in formulation is a reworking and development of the version in Gen. R. If Gen. R.'s y. originates at the same time as PT, its y. portions nevertheless are phenomenologically earlier than that of PT. Thus the present study supports Lieberman's contention that the PT (less Neziqin) in form constitutes a reworked version of the materials and that other, less reworked and thus phenomenologically earlier versions could have circulated.

This study supports an additional suggestion of Lieberman. The manner in which Samuel's tradition is reworked to fit what we described as a Palestinian perspective—vis-à-vis a Babylonian one—accords with Lieberman's view that the editors of PT reworked the text of PT to exclude Babylonian interpretations of Mishnah and to place material within a Palestinian framework, and even revised traditions accordingly.⁵⁶ Y. Ber. 7:2 provides an exemplary instance of this process and its existence is confirmed by the Gen. R. version. As this Palestinian "reworking" occurred *after* the formation of the Gen. R. version, this refining must derive from the *latter* stages of compilation and redaction of the materials, as Lieberman further argues.⁵⁷

The concern for the initial function and most fundamental formulation of Samuel's tradition has enabled us to posit an early stage of a teaching included within gemara and of gemara itself, and which to a significant degree Gen. R. preserves. PT used and adapted this tradition to its own problematic. Accordingly, when one evaluates discrete traditions and variations in analogues and parallels, one can employ means to transcend the final product.

55. See nn. 21–54 and the text thereto.

56. Lieberman, *Caesarea*, pp. 20–25, especially 22–23, and the quotation cited in n. 24, above.

57. *Ibid.* See also Bokser, "Two Traditions."

XI

A related issue concerns the manuscript and textual history of Gen. R. and PT and addresses the problem of whether one can distinguish between the final redaction and early scribal activity of the text. Vatican MS 30 to Gen. R., generally considered the best text of Gen. R., like the MSS of PT, contains sections with a notation גרש. Gen. R. 91.4 makes up one such text. Scholars discuss the meaning of this word and the nature of passages so annotated. The sections generally constitute *sugyot* which are found in full elsewhere, either in that work or in a different work, but only in part in the place so annotated. At times, though, scribes later filled in the passages.⁵⁸

Lieberman believes the term means “abbreviated,” and that scribes abbreviated the text, so noted it, and indicated that one can find it in full in another place. Later scribes generally filled in the deleted portions, sometimes incorrectly.⁵⁹ Epstein renders the term as “we learned,” and considers it the work of early scribes who abbreviated passages.⁶⁰ Rosenthal, in an examination of Vat. 30 to Gen. R., on the other hand, believes that the term constitutes a note *added* by “later editors” of the text to indicate that a relevant pericope *in extenso* appears elsewhere. Scribes later filled in the passages.⁶¹ Moshe Assis has tried to clarify the differences between these positions, examined parallels within y., and focused on the characteristics of these copyists.⁶²

Gen. R. 91.4, as mentioned, constitutes an instance of a גרש passage. Vat. MS 30 opens and closes with the wording of the beginning and end of the wider *sugya* and refers to its location in y. Ber.⁶³ Vat. 60 contains the best and unabbreviated version of the *sugya*. As noted, this accords with the

58. See the references to Albeck and Rosenthal in n. 22, to which add Epstein, *IAL*, pp. 324–30; Barth, pp. 11–12, 19, 21, 53–54; and Bokser, “Guide,” *ANRW*, 7. 2b, and 9.A.

59. Saul Lieberman, *On the Yerushalmi* (Jerusalem, 1929), pp. 12–13; “Emendations in Yerushalmi, F.b.,” *Tarbiz* 5 (1933): 107–10; and *Hilkhoth Ha-Yerushalmi* (*The Laws of the Palestinian Talmud*) of Rabbi Moses ben Maimon [*Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, 13] (New York, 1947), “Introduction,” p. 15, n. 128.

60. Epstein, *IAL*, pp. 324–30. See Melamed, pp. 578–79.

61. Rosenthal.

62. Moshe Assis, “Parallel Sugyot in the Jerusalem Talmud” (Ph.D. diss. Hebrew University, 1976), *passim*, especially pp. 5–13.

63. *R. Simon be-shem R. Yehoshu'a ben Levi R. Yose bar Sha'ul be-shem R. tinoq ve-* [word left incomplete at the end of a line] *'osin 'oto senif la-'asarah kol גרשה di-verakhot shenayim be-fat ve-'ehad yereq mezammenin man tenateh Rabban Sime' on ben Gamli'el*, in the Sokoloff (Jerusalem, 1971) reprint, p. 166b. See Rosenthal, especially p. 312.

observation that Vat. 60 represents an early witness to the text of Gen. R., second only to Vat. 30 but superior to the London and other MSS.⁶⁴

Rosenthal's theory does not best explain what we have uncovered. According to his approach we would assume the later editors of Gen. R., as reflected in Vat. 30, noted the relevance of y. Ber. 7:2, and made an annotation thereto, and a scribe later filled in the reference. This later, scribal activity would be reflected in the text of Vat. 60. But following our analysis, the extant PT could not have provided a model or source for Gen. R. For if so, the latter version would have matched that of PT, and not constituted, as it is, an earlier version of y. Accordingly, following this approach, the "later editors," whose notes are preserved in Vat. 30, and even the scribes who filled in the reference, e.g., those responsible for the tradition represented in Vat. 60, would have had to predate the editors of PT.⁶⁵ Chronologically this notion involves a date prior to the end of the fourth century, the conventional date for y.'s completion, if not earlier.

The above difficulty is obviated according to the alternative theory. Samuel's comment and the *sugya* in which it appears does not form an *addition* to Gen. R. first pointed to by *late editors* and later filled in by scribes. Rather it forms an integral part of Gen. R. and derives from a text of y. different from PT. It preserves an earlier version or recension of the text. The

64. See n. 22.

65. There is also the possibility that the notations in Vatican 30 come from those who relied on a text of y. which originated in the earlier period, and which predates the text of y. then current and which is preserved in PT.

The text analyzed in "Two Traditions" provides an analogue to our findings. There we demonstrated that Gen. R. preserves an earlier stage of a pericope than in y. Ber. 8:3, 12b. Samuel's tradition is inappropriately made dependent upon the preceding pericope with the introductory word, "therefore," *lefikhakh*. An examination of the MSS there yields additional information. In two locations in Gen. R. where Samuel's pericope appears, Vatican MS 30 lacks the text but other readings, including Vatican MS 60 have the "earlier recension." In Gen. R. #11, p. 90, Vatican MS 30 lacks the section along with the surrounding portion of Gen. R. (sections 7-16). Vatican MS 60 [Makor ed., p. 33] and other readings, however, contain the appropriate language to introduce Samuel's comment, '*atya ke-*, "it accords with . . ." In Gen. R. #82, p. 996, Vatican MS 30 [Makor ed., p. 147] deletes (or, following Rosenthal, abbreviates a reference to a parallel) with a גרש notation. Again Vatican MS 60 [Makor ed., p. 307] and the texts and MSS cited by Albeck have the appropriate bridging language, '*atyeh ki-de-Shemuel*.'

Vatican MS 60 thus preserves an early formulation, if not recension, of a tradition. Is it not more likely that Vatican MS 30 deleted the portion which Vatican MS 60 (and others) preserved than that Vatican MS 60 later "filled in" the reference first noted by the circle responsible for Vatican MS 30? See *Samuel's Commentary*, vol. 2.

editor of Vat. 30 abbreviated the section, which Vat. 60, however, preserved.⁶⁶

The present analysis has thus enabled us better to understand the textual history of Gen. R. and the character of sections marked by the notation גרש. Form criticism may accordingly assist not only in the exegesis and study of the history of traditions but also in the evaluation of the documents themselves.⁶⁷

66. Note that Vat. MS 60, though it represents a version later than the archetype of *Bereschit Rabba*, preserved in Vatican MS 30, may have been written a century before Vatican 30. See Barth, pp. 83–84, and Sokoloff, *Geniza Fragments*.

67. I thank Professors Joseph Dan of the Hebrew University, Jacob Milgrom of the University of California at Berkeley, Jacob Neusner of Brown University, and Gary G. Porton of the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana for their critical comments on earlier drafts of this paper.