THE TARGUMIM TO EXODUS 20: 
RECONSTRUCTING THE PALESTINIAN TARGUM
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Introduction*

The field of Targumic Studies demands of its students expertise in a variety of otherwise separate disciplines and methodologies. Fortunately, it also attracts students with many varied concerns. It is for this reason that the opportunity for experts of diverse backgrounds and interests to study targumic texts and topics together in the framework of the Institute for Advanced Studies has proven to be such a valuable experience. It is likewise for this reason that the authors of this paper decided to devote many of their precious hours at the Institute to the joint study of targumic texts.

It was somewhat by accident that we arrived at what proved to be the fortuitous choice to begin our work with the Targumim to Exodus 20. Looking for a text that combined halakhic and aggadic material, we chanced on that one text for which more recensions are known than any other;¹ and in the course of our confrontation

*Full bibliographical information regarding the editions/MSS from which Aramaic texts are cited is found in the list of abbreviations to the texts, below, pp. 35-36 All references in this article are to works cited there. Other abbreviations: Ber.R. = Bereshit Rabba (ed. J. Theodor and Ch. Albeck; Berlin 1912-1936); Kasher, TS = M. M. Kasher, Torah Shelemah (Jerusalem-N.Y. 1927- [Hebrew]); Mekhilta = Mechilla d’Rabbi Ishmael (ed. H. S. Horovitz and I. A. Rabin; Frankfort a.M. 1931); Midrash Aseret ha-Dibrot = in A. Jellinek (ed), Bet ha-Midrash Sammlung, I (Leipzig 1853) 62-90; Siphre Deut. = Siphrâ ad Deuteronomium (ed. H. S. Horovitz and L. Finkelstein; Berlin 1939); Wa.R. = Wawyikra Rabba (ed. M. Margulies; Jerusalem 1953-1960).

¹There are several reasons why so many versions of this pericope are known:
   a. The liturgical reading of the Decalogue on Shavuot resulted in the inclusion of the Palestinian Targum to that passage, along with numerous liturgical poems, in the early European
with this multiplicity of texts, important, general issues in the study of the Pentateuchal Targumim began to present themselves to our attention—issues and problems whose solutions become apparent only because of the availability of multiple targumic renditions of this passage. It is to these broader issues, rather than to the many details of targumic interpretation preserved in our texts, that we wish to direct our attention here. The two major subjects of concern to us are (A) The European mahzor traditions, their relationship to the text of Fragment Targum MS Paris 110, and the implications of this relationship for the history of the Palestinian Targum in general and the fragment Targum in particular; and (B) Can one reconstruct a single Palestinian Targum and, if so, what is the proper use to be made of each of the several witnesses in the process? We believe that such a reconstruction can be accomplished, and we present both our reconstruction and the evidence on which it is based as a crucial part of our study. As an addendum Mahzorim (see below), as well, undoubtedly, in the inclusion of that text in "Fragment Targum" MS Paris 110.

b. Several fragmentary texts are known from the Cairo Genizah. Indeed, to a certain extent the fact that these passages occur in the mahzor traditions is not independent of their attestation in the Genizah: MS CC, a single, double-sided, single-column sheet that continues on with the Onkelos text at the end of the decalogue itself, as do Vitry and Worms, is very close to the Mahzor text tradition and may well be from a mahzor. Genizah MS F, one of the more ancient and more reliable of Genizah "Targum" texts, is, as we learn from its colophon, a collection of readings for festivals: הָדוַרְשָׁתָם לְעַקְבָּק בֵּין יִתְנָה בְּנֵי זָמָתָם. יְהוָה מִבְרָא מִמְּסָפִים שָׁלֹל הָדוַרְשָׁתָם לְעַקְבָּק בֵּין יִתְנָה בְּנֵי זָמָתָם. יְהוָה מִבְרָא מִמְּסָפִים שָׁלֹל. Klein has also been able to reconstruct another early Genizah manual of festival readings of the Palestinian Targum: his MS AA.

c. The existence of the Parallel text of the Decalogue in Deuteronomy 5, providing an additional exemplar of Neofiti and Neofiti marginalia, as well as Pseudo-Jonathan and Fragment Targum MS Br (=Genizah MS Br). (The Onkelos text of Deuteronomy is for all practical purposes identical to that of Exodus and has been ignored in this study.) Klein’s MS Q (JTS 605 fol. 30), has not been included in our study as it is certainly not an example of the Palestinian Targum. It is a very unusual text, a kind of targumic commentary on Onkelos in late, artificial, Onkelos-like Aramaic that must be classed with the "tosepha" texts. It contains a hint of the Palestinian tradition, but nothing of value for our reconstructions. (Other, similar Genizah texts are being studied and published by R. Kasher.)

d. In Fragment Targum MS P110 an additional copy of the Targum to Commandments 7-10 is found together with reshuyot inserted after Deut 7:10; see Klein, Fragment-Targums, 117ff.
we deal briefly with yet another general issue, the relationship between early chapters and later chapters in targumic manuscripts.

The very existence of multiple renditions becomes especially productive with the availability of machine readable texts of the lengthy targumic texts (both Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan have over 600,000 characters!) and computer programs to help in the preparation of aligned texts and in statistical analyses of large bodies of textual data. In the preparation of our material we were able to take advantage of the machine readable versions of Neofiti, the Genizah fragments of the Palestinian Targum, and the Fragment Targums prepared by Michael Sokoloff for his recent dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic.2 E. G. Clarke kindly provided the machine readable text of Pseudo-Jonathan that he had prepared in the course of his concordance work.3 Our sincere thanks to them both.4

As we shall demonstrate, our pericope is somewhat unusual in terms of the history of its targumic traditions. Nevertheless, we are convinced that its special character does not affect the relevance of conclusions based upon it. On the contrary, the very extent of the available data has enabled us to discern important principles here—principles of prime importance for understanding the history of the Pentateuchal targumic texts in general and the Palestinian Targum in particular.

2Michael Sokoloff, A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (Ramat-Gan 1990). Sokoloff’s Genizah texts are based on the new edition by Michael L. Klein, Genizah Manuscripts. We have not had the opportunity to collate all the computerized material with the last proofs of Klein; therefore, the reader should rely on Klein’s readings and photographs. We do know that for some reason the abbreviation for the Tetragrammaton is inconsistently rendered in Sokoloff’s m-r texts. What is here indicated as ‘n frequently corresponds to actual m or m* in the MSS.

3See E. G. Clarke, et. al., Targum Pseudo-Jonathan.

4Kaufman provided the computer programs to prepare verse by verse aligned texts and statistical analyses. All text manipulation was done on an IBM PC-XT computer, programmed in Turbo Pascal 3.0. The aligned texts we have been able to make use of in our weekly seminars at the Institute have proven very helpful in understanding the interrelationship among the targumic witnesses. In the not too distant future Kaufman hopes to be able to publish aligned texts of all the Pentateuchal targumim. All the texts are now available to him except for Onkelos. If anyone knows of the whereabouts of a high quality, machine readable edition, please let him know.
A. P110, The Mahzor Tradition and the Origin of the Fragment Targum

The liturgical handbooks from Ashkenaz, France, and Italy known as מזוזות רומא and give eloquent witness to the custom of the Jews of Central Europe (until about 1400 C. E.) to accompany the Pentateuchal reading in the synagogue on the Seventh Day of Pesah (Ex 13:17-15:26) and the First Day of Shavuot (Ex 19-20) with the recitation of a Palestinian Targum to those verses (see below for details). The "meturgemanim" were also accustomed to preface these targumic readings with various introductions in Aramaic (ר'ושי),

5 in both prose and poetry (piyyut), and to add additional—frequently substantial—material to many of the verses.6

When we began to compare the various targumim to the Decalogue, it was only natural, then, to include the Palestinian Targumic text found in the MS used for the printed edition of Mahzor Vitry,7 as well as the Targum in the Worms Mahzor, recently published in an exceptional facsimile edition.8 It immediately became clear that the text of the Targum in these two (Ashkenazic) mahzorim and that of MS Paris 110 of the fragment Targum shared many elements not found in the other

5Inasmuch as it is not always clear whether a particular addition functions as an introduction or as an illustration to Targum text, henceforth we include the "reshuyot" in our more general term "expansions."


7Ed. S. Hurwitz, 2nd ed., (Nurnberg 1923). Undoubtedly, however, Vitry is the least satisfactory of all the textual witnesses. The Vitry text of our passage as compared to the other witnesses was already studied by Jean Potin, La fête juive de la Pentecôte (Paris 1971). His study was not available to us until our own had been completed.

8See above, n. 6.

9Here and below we include both Germany and northern France under the term "Ashkenaz."
targumic witnesses; that they clearly all belonged to a single recensional family termed by us P/Mahzor. Taking our cue from a note by Michael Klein,\(^{10}\) we also compared the text of MS Parma 2411, which turned out to be another member of this family.\(^ {11}\)

The P/Mahzor family is characterized by two clear features in our chapter: 1) substantial expansions vis-à-vis the other witnesses to the Palestinian Targum, 2) the obvious influence of Targum Onkelos, an influence far more extensive than that found in the other targumic texts to our passage. Within the family, Paris 110 (PrP) and Parma (PRM) are even more closely related in terms of their wording and, in particular, in the sharing of expansions unique to them dealing with the justifications for the various commandments, expansions generally unparalleled elsewhere in preserved rabbinc literature.

Our choice of the convenient, descriptive term P/Mahzor to refer to this recensional line should not be taken to mean that this recension is necessarily characteristic of all the targumic texts in the known mahzorim. Indeed, our investigations have shown that this is not the case. For the sake of a broader point of view, we have also investigated an Italian mahzor, here called M. Roma (MS Sassoon 405).\(^ {12}\) The latter it turns out, is not a member of this family. For example, the introductory passages רְבֵיתִי נֵצַע מֶשֶׁרֶךְ etc., in P/Mahzor for the Commandments beyond the first two (a practice not found in the other witnesses), is not found in Mahzor Roma. (See, too, our notes to v. 7 for further evidence as to synagogue practice in Italy.) The phrase ונֵצַע מֶשֶׁרֶךְ is unique to the P/Mahzor family, as opposed to ונֵצַע מֶשֶׁרֶךְ in the other texts, whereas Mahzor Roma ten times has the latter text.\(^ {13}\) A simple solution would at first seem to present itself: that P/Mahzor represents the common tradition of Ashkenaz, as opposed to the Italian

\(^{10}\) *Fragment Targums I* (20 n. 30).

\(^{11}\) This MS (MS Biblioteca Palatina di Parma 2411—DeRossi 1107) containing the Haggadah for Passover with the Targum at its end, appears to be of 13th century Spanish origin. For another example of our "mahzor" Targumim in a Haggadah MS see British Museum MS Or. 2737 (Sephardic, ca. 14th century); see G. Margoliouth, *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum II*, (London 1965) 203. See below ad v. 7. Unfortunately this MS is not available to us at this time.

\(^{12}\) Written in 1415 in יָפָן יָמִין. For a description see the catalogue *Oheid Dawid I* (ed. D. S. Sassoon; London 1932) 276 ff.

\(^{13}\) Also two additional Italian mahzorim, which we had the opportunity to examine (one from a private collection which apparently dates from the fourteenth century and the second Ms JTS Mic. 4510 from 1468) follow M. Roma in both matters referred to above.
tradition, but such a solution is not certain. In any case, what is clear and what must be emphasized is that these four MSS (Fp, VTR, WRM, PRM) constitute a single recensional line of the Palestinian Targum and that only by treating them as such a single recensional line are we able to proceed in our reconstruction of the Palestinian Targum. Further research into the targumic texts to these passages preserved in other mahzor MSS may well shed additional light on the history of the Palestinian Targum.

In his composition פָּרָשָׁתָו אֲלָבָסְיִי, an Italian sage of the thirteenth century, several times informs us that first they would translate the verses of the Ten Commandments using Targum Onkelos and then recite the "Yerushalmi" Targum. However, as far as we know, no evidence for such a practice has actually been found in the mahzorim. Wherever a mahzor has a targum for the specific verses of the Song of the Sea and the Decalogue themselves, only the Palestinian Targum is given. But with regard to the verses surrounding the Song (i.e. Ex 13:17-end of ch. 14, 15:19-26) and the Decalogue (Ex 19:1-20:1, 20:18 [15] ff.) there is no uniformity. The four MSS of the P/Mahzor family proceed as follows: Vitry (printed edition) has PT of Ex 13:17, followed by Onkelos for

---

14 Even though there is no a priori evidence that MS Parma has any relationship to Ashkenazi traditions.

15 In the work מָזְבָּחַת מִלְּעָלַת אֲשֶׁר נִשְׂמָח, attributed to R. Hayyim Paltiel, published from a MS written in 1305 (Ashkenazic script), we find a description of the order of a synagogal reading of the Decalogue (see E. D. Goldschmidt, *On Jewish Liturgy, Essays on Prayer and Religious Poetry* [2nd ed.; Jerusalem 1980] 58) (= *Kiryat Sefer* 24 [1947-48] 82). We learn, for example, that the Fourth Commandment ended with מַלְכָּת לְבָא אַלּות as in the lengthy P/Mahzor version, whereas the Fifth Commandment ended with מַלְכָּת לְבָא אַלּות as in the shorter text of the other PT witnesses. Our author ends the Seventh Commandment with unique phrases מַלְכָּת לְבָא אַלּות, while the Ninth has מַלְכָּת לְבָא אַלּות, like P/Mahzor as opposed to the other texts. (Goldschmidt *On Jewish Liturgy, 58*, n. 148) is not sure if this description belongs to the הָעֵדֶת מַלְכָּת מִלְּעָלַת לאַלּות. Concerning R. Hayyim Paltiel (see I. Sh. Lange, *Alei Sefer* 8 [1980] 140-146 [Hebrew]). R. Hayyim, of the 13th century, was born and educated in France, and possibly lived also in Germany. His "Minhagim" reflects the French custom, but also (as all his works) German influence. In general, it is possible to consider the "Minhagim" as part of the Ashkenazic tradition (cf. n. 9).

16 Ed. Schmelzer (see above n. 6) 187 ff.

17 Including the long addition on the early exodus of the Ephraimites and its relationship to the "dry bones" found in P and the other Mahzor texts (except Parma) as well as in Pς and Genizah Tosephta MS X.
vv. 18-29. V. 30 to the end of the Song (15:18) are PT, followed again by Onkelos. Ch. 19 is Onkelos, 20:1 a combination, 20:2-17 (14) strictly PT, followed by Onkelos through 20:26. M. Worms has PT for Ex 13:17, followed by PT for 14:30 and the Song (15:1-18). Of Ex 19 only the Onkelos to vv. 1-11 is given, followed by the PT for the Decalogue. Vv. 18(15) ff. are essentially Onkelos, but with strong influence from the PT; whereas the final verse (26) is PT with Onkelos influence! In Fragment Targum MS Paris 110 we find a PT text for Ex 13:17-15:26; 19:1-20:18a; 20:25-26. Beyond Ex 13:17 (see n. 17), Parma is the same as FrP, except that it stops at the end of the Song of Moses (Ex 15:18) and at the end of the Decalogue (20:17(14)).

As mentioned above, in the mahzorim we find comprehensive Aramaic expansions—generally in poetry—to certain verses connected with the Song of the Sea and the Commandments of the Decalogue (especially the first seven Commandments). Usually, these expansions appear as additional material rather than as integral parts of the Targum, connected to the verse in question in terms of content and serving as either an introduction to the verse or an illustration of it. These poetic expansions were composed in different periods and locales: Some, for example, are attributed to R. Meir b. Yishaq, an eleventh century cantor from Worms, yet others are from later periods. Others are much earlier; a few stemming even from Byzantine Palestine.

Many similar expansions, although in prose, were already incorporated into the Palestinian Targum text at an early stage and appear in all the witnesses. In such cases, when the expansion is short, the contextual connection with the verse is usu-
ally at the end of the expansion.\textsuperscript{20} Larger expansions are usually inserted between the beginning and end of the biblical verse. It is quite possible that originally these prosaic expansions, too, were additions to the Targum that only in the course of time were incorporated into the text, just as was later to happen with other expansions in the P/Mahzor tradition. A good example of such a process of incorporation is Worms Mahzor, p. 106a, where we find the first half of the PT to Ex 15:2 (somewhat different from the other recensions, to be sure):

followed immediately by a substantial prose expansion, typical of rabbinic numeric lists, beginning:

At the end of the addition we find the targum to the conclusion of the verse:\textsuperscript{21}

This is followed (after the Hebrew lemma for the next verse) by another prose expansion, independent of the Targum to the verse:

Finally, we find the narrative expansion on the אֲרֻבָּתָךְ הָיִיתָן, known from the standard PT, which, in typical fashion, is integrated with the biblical verse (אָסָפָה הָאֶשׁ בְּלָהַשׁ) at its end:

Such expansions must be divided into three types: (I) expansions found in all the sources in the same place; obviously these belong to a relatively ancient stratum of the PT;\textsuperscript{22} (II) expansions found in the P/Mahzor family at one verse but connected

\textsuperscript{20}E.g. the argument between the Sea and the Land over the bodies of the Egyptians at Ex 15:12; and cf. ארבע קניית discussed below.

\textsuperscript{21}Note the absence of a targumic rendition of MT אָלֶיהָ אֵשׁ above.

\textsuperscript{22}E.g. that to 15:12 mentioned above, n. 20.
with another verse in the other texts, and (III) expansions only found in the P/Mahzor group. As regards types II and III, the close stemmatic relationship between P110 and the Mahzor texts is clear.

The other side of this same coin is the necessity of viewing the material unique to the P/Mahzor recensional line as separate from the Palestinian Targum itself. This conclusion is based on considerations of language and content (to be discussed in part B, below) as well as considerations of structure and distribution. There is every reason to believe that the tripartite typological scheme of the expansions detailed above reflects a chronological relationship. Those expansions found in all witnesses are earliest; those only in P/Mahzor are latest; and those in all the traditions but in a different place in P/Mahzor are somewhere in between.

Of particular importance in this respect is the nature of the inclusion of the piyyut הארי משב in P/Mahzor. This composition, like the others mentioned above, is not integrated into the Targumic text, but serves rather as an introduction to the Targum of the Song of the Sea. Is it at all reasonable to assume that it is a part of the PT solely on the basis of its presence in MS Paris 110? We would respond in the negative: We do not, indeed we cannot, doubt that this piyyut is ancient, perhaps even antedating the final formulation of the PT itself. Nor would we reject out of hand the suggestion that it was originally composed to be recited in the synagogue in conjunction with the Torah reading and/or its Targum. But we see absolutely no reason to conclude from currently available evidence that הארי משב was a part of the Palestinian Targum when the latter received its canonical form ca. 500 C.E. or before. That same PT did include many expansions—the prosaic expansions of type (I) alluded to above (the usual term, "paraphrase," is a substantial understatement)—but הארי משב was not one of them. The bare fact that the piyyut is found

---

23 E.g., found at 15:3 in P/Mahzor but elsewhere in PT witnesses at 14:13-14. The expansion הארי לילית is at 15:18 in P/Mahzor, whereas in other PT texts it is found at Ex 12:42.

24 E.g., the piyyut הארי משב before Ex 14:30 (cf. n. 26 below) and many of the prosaic expansions to the Decalogue; see aligned TEXTS.

25 Of course, there are also PT expansions wherein differences in location exist among other recensions of the PT (i.e. not just P/Mahzor vs. the others). It seems reasonable to assume that these, too, were incorporated into the PT at a later period than those whose position was certain.

26 In Mahzor Vitry, p. 306, after the Targum to v. 29, the author writes:
in P/Mahzor is insufficient to demonstrate its role as a part of the PT. The fact that it is found only in P/Mahzor demonstrates rather that its intimate connection with the Targum is late; and the same conclusion perforce applies to any expansion found only in that group.\textsuperscript{27}

Thus we must take issue with J. Heinemann who attempted to prove that several piyyutim not at all associated in the known witnesses with the PT tradition are nonetheless an integral part of the PT.\textsuperscript{28} He argued as follows: כל המשם is found in a PT text (that is to say, in Fragment Targum MS Paris 110 and Mahzor Vitry). Hence it is an original part of the PT; and even though only this Aramaic piyyut is preserved as a part of the Targum itself, this is sufficient to demonstrate that other, similar Aramaic piyyutim—strewn throughout the Mahzorim or in MS P110—should also be considered to belong to the PT. We find little of merit in his argument. Undoubtedly, expansions of each of the three types entered into the targum tradition in a liturgical context, in the manner alluded by R. Yehudah b. Barzilai of Barcelona in his Payt מפרת התנינא, but only those of type (I) can with certainty be ascribed to the PT in its relatively fixed formulation at the end of the Amoraic period.\textsuperscript{29} Absent additional evidence, type (III) expansions must be deemed late additions to the Targum.

Of course, the history of the Palestinian Targum beyond its earliest stages is not merely one of expansion. Eventually quite the reverse became the norm—resulting in the "Fragment Targums." The problem of their raison d’être is particularly well il-

\textsuperscript{27}Outside of the pericopes of the Song of the Sea and the Decalogue, of course, "that group" is, for now, only MS Paris 110.

\textsuperscript{28}Remnants" 150-151 (=Ha-Sifrut 363-364).

\textsuperscript{29}Ed. Y. Shor, (Berlin 1902) 258: In addition to it he recites the Targum Yerushalmi—demonstrates that for him the piyyut was not itself part of the Targum.

\textsuperscript{29}Cf. S. Lieberman, Sina\textit{i} 4 (1939) 244.
luminated by our material. In the interweaving of Palestinian Targum with Onkelos found in the mahzor texts we find a possible model for the preservation of larger bits and pieces of the Palestinian Targum.31 Here we see repeated witnesses to the liturgical process through which Palestinian targumic renditions were preserved in place of Onkelos either for Pentateuchal readings of particular liturgical importance or where the PT was significantly different from Onkelos. Only in the liturgical, mahzor MSS, however, did such a combination of PT material with Onkelos appear as a single targumic rendition. In Bible MSS the full Onkelos text was preserved. The fragment targum tradition itself was forced to develop (presumably in the cantorial realm) in order to preserve those unusual readings from the onslaught of Onkelos. This is certainly the case for Fragment Targum P, whose closest recensional relatives are the liturgical MSS.32

Additional evidence for the traditional point of view on the origin of the Fragment Targum is presented by our material: As we have noted, P110 breaks off precisely where the other members of its textual family switch to the Onkelos text (Genizah CC, Vitry, Worms) or stop (Parma), and when P110 returns, Worms (but not Vitry; Genizah CC is not preserved at this point) also returns to the Palestinian text (partially). Is Onkelos used in those mahzorim because the Palestinian tradition was simply unknown for those verses, or is the Palestinian tradition missing for those verses because it was customary simply to use Onkelos at that point (probably because the texts were so similar to each other)?33

B. Recovering the Palestinian Targum

We have already discussed the possible relationship between the absorption of late poetic compositions into the targumic/liturgical tradition and the presence of sub-

31 Of course, one can hardly account for all of the minutiae of the Fragment Targums on this basis.


33M. Klein's objection to the argument that the fragment targums are not simply collections of variants to Onkelos (I 15-18) no longer seems valid. He based his argument on those few places where the text of Frag Targ P has "etc." (i.e. וְאָרֶץ) where its text should have been expected to be different from Onkelos (based in what we know from Frag Targ V and other PT texts). Now we can show that P reflects a PT text much more heavily "Onkelosized" than any other. Hence, where P has וְאָרֶץ there is every reason to assume that the text before the scribe of P was no different from Onkelos on those passages.
stantial expansions in the earliest reconstructable Palestinian Targum. But is it possible to establish the existence of a single such proto-Palestinian Targum?\textsuperscript{34} The great degree of recensional differences among the extant witnesses, mistaken ideas as to the nature of Pseudo-Jonathan and Fragment Targum P110 (and to some extent Neofiti as well), and preconceived notions as to the Sitz im Leben of the PT and the affect of that Sitz im Leben on its redactional history, have heretofore led researchers to believe that this is an insurmountable problem—to insist that one speak about the "Palestinian Targums" or "Palestinian Targum traditions" rather than "the Palestinian Targum."\textsuperscript{35} We believe that our chapter holds the key to demonstrating that such a pessimistic position is no longer necessary—that there was indeed such a thing as the Palestinian Targum and that in almost every case where the extant witnesses are numerous enough, the Targum may be reconstructed from the witnesses.\textsuperscript{36}

Prior to the discovery of MS Paris 110 of the Fragment Targum, the Cairo Genizah fragments and the manuscript of Neofiti, the text now commonly called Targum Pseudo-Jonathan was generally referred to as the Targum Yerushalmi (or Targum YI as opposed to the Fragment Targum of the V type—Targum YII). As extensive, recent research on this text has shown us, however, PsJ is not the Pales-

\textsuperscript{34}There are hundreds of places wherein the texts of Targum Onkelos and the Palestinian Targum are clearly interdependent. One might ultimately hope to recover some kind of proto-targum, the source of them both. The reconstruction of the archetypal Palestinian targum is a requisite preliminary step to such an endeavor. Clearly, however, the literary relationship between the PT and Onkelos is of a substantially different nature than that obtaining among the various witnesses to the PT.

\textsuperscript{35}That is to say, either that there never was a single Palestinian Targum text or that there was such a text but it can no longer be reconstructed. There have been a few voices raised in favor of the theory of a single, original PT text, but no one has ever sought to demonstrate how such a text could be or should be recovered, so the minority position has remained just that. Cf. Edward Morgan Cook, "Rewriting the Bible: The Text and Language of the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum" (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation 1986) 30 ff. and cf. Potin \textit{La fête} (above, n. 7) 38.

\textsuperscript{36}It remains feasible, though not probable, that the text we reconstruct is not the original, common PT text but rather the result of the work of editors who imposed uniformity on diversity at some stage of the process; cf. M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, \textit{Text and Language in Bible and Qumran}, (Jerusalem 1960) 175f. Even if that were the case, however, it would nonetheless be clear that the currently known PT variants do not reflect such an earlier stage, but are rather only variants from the unified text.
tinian Targum, nor even a Palestinian Targum. Large parts of it, to be sure, are a witness to the PT tradition, but nothing more. Anyone who today believes that almost anything found in PsJ must represent an ancient Palestinian targumic tradition (or even probably represents one) would perforce be totally confused and a priori incapable of reconstructing a single proto-PT.

Now we know that Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is a conscious attempt to combine the PT with Onkelos, with the addition of massive doses of midrashic material. It normally presents us with an abridged, heavily "Onkelosized" version of the Palestinian Targum replete with additions and substitutions from both classical and late rabbinic literature and lore, and not a few unique additions stemming, apparently, simply from the late author of the Targum.\(^{37}\) The language of those portions unique to it is a post Amoraic literary dialect that has been called by Kaufman "Late Jewish Literary Aramaic" (LJLA), as distinct from the dialect of Onkelos/Jonathan (to the Prophets)—Jewish Literary Aramaic (JLA)—and that of the Palestinian Targumim—Palestinian Targumic Aramaic (PTA).\(^{38}\) Only where the text of PsJ can be judged to be of PT origin on the basis of external criteria, can it be used to reconstruct the PT. Occasionally PsJ does exhibit a nearly pure

---


\(^{38}\)Stephen A. Kaufman, "Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Late Jewish Literary Aramaic," paper read at the Institute for Advanced Studies, Nov. 11, 1985, and idem, תרגום מאיתサン, נטרנוackets ידועים וידיעתי הם וידיעתי המצרי, ספיץ וידיעתי הידיעתי המחולים (Bar-Ilan Univ., in press). Working independently, Edward M. Cook reached much the same general conclusion with regard to the language of PsJ in his dissertation (above, n. 36).
underlying Palestinian text, but more often, as in the framework verses in Ex 20, it is much more Onkelos-like.\textsuperscript{39}

The liturgical significance of the Decalogue is undoubtedly responsible for its targumic renditions being somewhat unusual, however. Unlike the normal state of affairs in Pseudo Jonathan, in the PsJ text of the Decalogue itself, we confront a nearly pure Palestinian Targum tradition, with few, if any, abridgements, no Onkelosisms other than those shared with the relatively good witnesses to the Palestinian Targum, and few additions unique to Pseudo-Jonathan.\textsuperscript{40} Particularly striking is the absence of influences from the Mekhila, otherwise so characteristic of PsJ to Exodus.\textsuperscript{41} After the Decalogue, the normal PsJ pattern returns: In vv. 18(15) ff. we find at least six additions unique to PsJ, some of which have their proximate origin in the Mekhila. For example, in the first verse (18) after the Decalogue itself, MT והם כְּלָלָם כְּלָלָם is rendered by PsJ יְהֹוָה וַיִּנֶּת יִנְעֵשׁ וַיִּמָּרֵעַ המַזְּרוּע. The use of the root מֶרְעָה to translate MT עַרְעָה seems strange. The root itself is hapax in PsJ while all of the other targumic texts is common in PsJ; and in the Pentateuchal targumim עַרְעָה is only found elsewhere at Deut 19:6 to render MT בַּעֲדוֹן.\textsuperscript{42} It seems clear that PsJ is here dependent upon

\textsuperscript{39}Indeed, in the latter case, as throughout the Torah, it is possible (although, to our knowledge, it has never been done) to use the Onkelos-like texts of Pseudo-Jonathan as witness to a manuscript tradition of Onkelos just as we can use its PT portions as witness to the PT. The early mahzor MSS have also been inexcusably ignored in this regard. An example in our chapter is v. 21 where ולְפָּרָב (also found in the Onkelos text of Genizah ms CC) is an important variant to Onkelos.

\textsuperscript{40}In his somewhat confusing book, \textit{The Pseudo-Jonathan Targum and Its Relationship to Targum Onkelos} (Sudia Ephemерidis “Augustinianum” 9; Rome 1972) 69-90, C. J. Kuiper devotes a third of his study to our passage, totally failing to understand its special nature and hence a priori skewing his results. We have not found any enlightenment in his analysis. See S. A. Kaufman, \textit{JNES} 35 (1976) 61f. for a general critique of his methodology. Diez Macho (Neofiti vol. I, 113\textsuperscript{a}) already noted the special status of PsJ to our passage.

\textsuperscript{41}This relationship was already emphasized by D. Hoffmann, \textit{Zur Einleitung in die halachischen Midrashim}, (Berlin 1889) 74. See, too, Y. Maori, “The Relationship” (above, n. 37) 245; \textit{idem}, Proceedings of the 9th World Congress of Jewish Studies, Vol. A, Panel Sessions (Jerusalem 1985) 9-12; and E. Izhaki, “The Halacha” (above, n. 37) 245.

\textsuperscript{42}Neofiti margin, Frag Targ V and P.
the occurrence of והרי in this context in the Mekhila, from which he has also taken the addition "12 miles":

The reliance of PsJ upon the Mekhila here explains another puzzling thing: the repetition of "12 miles" in v. 21(18) where MT ירمو אמש is rendered 또מ וצה אמש מחריק. Are they not standing 12 miles distant already? From the Mekhila's והרי לפרסים סקט מיל שער מיל we learn that they returned to their original position after every commandment, so that it is quite proper for the Mekhila to our verse (p. 237) to comment on אל שער מיל: יחמור אמש מחריק. As was his wont on many occasions, PsJ simply copied the Mekhila blindly.

Fragment Targum P is perhaps equally responsible for the pessimistic view of the Palestinian targumic tradition. Upon publication by M. Ginsburger, it was immediately obvious that this text was strikingly different from the previously known "Yerushalmi" texts (PsJ and FragTargs V/N/L), yet there was no apparent reason to doubt the antiquity of its traditions. With the subsequent discoveries of the Cairo Genizah materials and, finally, Neofiti, things became very confused indeed. Now, however, it turns out that the more texts you have, the better off you are! In those many places where all we have before us is the evidence of PsJ and Neo, one usually simply has nothing to work from in terms of reconstruction. Where Fragment Targums and Genizah texts are available, the task is not only much easier, it can almost always be accomplished. Even so, occasionally a clear solution is not always in sight, and we must leave a few question marks in our reconstruction. But our inability to reconstruct a single, original archetype for every line of the PT does not mean that there was never such a text, anymore than

43Mekhila, BaHodesh, 9, p. 236 (see also aligned TEXTS ad 18 [15], n. 1).
44Das Fragmententhargum (Berlin 1899).
45In this respect we find A. Shinan's suggestion (תוליהר ורשב של התרגומים המתקשט תוליהר, Tarbiz 51 [1982] 145ff.) that P and V are essentially a single recension rather ingenuous. Underlying P is a V-like recension, to be sure, but the claim that the great bulk of P material not found in V is part of a "fragment targum" recension is demonstrably erroneous.
46As soon as PsJ is understood for what it is and therefore excluded from immediate consideration, the divergences among the remaining PT traditions are almost always far less glaring than those found in most routine rabbinic texts.
does our inability to reconstruct the original Hebrew of the Book of Jeremiah mean that Jeremiah never preached in the streets of Jerusalem.

That Fragment Targum P belongs to the same recensional family as the Mahzor texts is immediately obvious. The many expansions found only in those four texts are clear from the aligned texts. As we have demonstrated above, this recensional line is clearly the most developed and latest of all the standard witnesses to the Palestinian Targum, and within this line, P110 represents the most developed text of all. The textual "pluses" common to this family are, as we have seen, of a substantially different nature than those common to the PT in all of its major witnesses, and, although a few (like מֵשָׁה לַרְדּוּ) are of substantial antiquity, most are late compositions incorporating popular lore rather than early rabbinic traditions.

Such pluses are not written in the dialect of the Palestinian Targum (PTA). Nor, for the most part, are they even written in the next typological step in the history of Literary Aramaic, Late Jewish Literary Aramaic (LJLA), the dialect of PsJ (see above) and the earlier Hagiographic targumim, e. g. Psalms and Job. Rather it may be described as a very late, Easternized version of LJLA which may be designated LJLA II. Obviously, such material cannot be deemed a part of the Palestinian Targum.

The special character of P110 is not limited to our passage. Unique additions, ranging in size from single words and phrases to lengthy poems are found throughout the Torah (e. g. Ex 12:2, 13:22, 15:18, Num 16:1, 22:30), additions regularly replete with corrupt forms, Hebraisms, and Eastern Aramaic syntagms. Everywhere P110 reflects the latest stages of Jewish Aramaic orthographic practice, even as compared to the other members of its recensional family. See, for example, such regular forms as Galilean (and colloquial Babylonian) בּוּ (before') or Babylonian Talmudized מְדֻמֶּשׁ ('first') and the characteristically late (even in some Ge-

47 Diez Macho, Neofiti vol. 1, 112ff., noted the "literary" character of Vitry and P110 to our passage, as well as the recensional relationship.

48 This issue is hardly a "red herring." We recall that when our Seminar studied the Targumim to Exodus 12 together, the composition on the dispute among the months found only in P110 was dutifully studied. No one at that time bothered to suggest that this long, minimally integrated expansion was not properly a part of the Targum, let alone that shorter, unique expansions and modifications in P110 should be considered to be of secondary origin.
nizah MSS!) and ßת Sass, spellings never found in FragTarg V. ⁴⁹ P110 regularly simplifies or Hebraizes unusual but good Aramaic forms, the result being not a few illegitimate lexical features unique to that manuscript. ⁵⁰ The influence of Onkelos on P110, as on the other members of its recensional line in our passage, is pervasive. ⁵¹ Once it began, the influence of Onkelos continued to make itself felt over and over again through the generations in each of the members of the group. In our passage, note, for example, the pattern of the use of singular vs. plural second person address in the Decalogue. Except for the First Commandment (v. 2), all the other Palestinian texts use the plural (unlike Onkelos), whereas these texts use the plural only where there is no Onkelos Vorlage, for in Onkelos the singular is used throughout. ⁵²

Thus both PsJ and FragTargP must be treated with special caution in attempting to reconstruct the Palestinian Targum. We must also operate within the methodological framework long since established by researchers in the field of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic: that the orthographic, grammatical, and lexical forms closest to those most often found in the PJA inscriptions and the best manuscript traditions (such as MSS Vatican 30 and Vatican 60 of Bereshit Rabba, and the earliest Genizah MSS, as demonstrated by Kutscher, Sokoloff, and others) and, though lacking such evidence, to the Samaritan and Christian dialects of Palestinian Aramaic, are to be selected or reconstructed a priori. ⁵³ In doing so, we

⁴⁹ In many of these orthographic features the Pentateuchal Targum in P110 parallels the Hagiographic targumim in that MS, even though the latter are in a different script. Therefore, to a certain extent, one must now question the blatant claim made by Ginsburger and recently echoed by Klein (The Fragment Targums I, 28), that the Hagiographic texts in P110 are “unrelated to our MS of an FT to the Pentateuch.”

⁵⁰ Of the 23 lexical items in Sokoloff’s JPA corpus unique to P110, we have found only three that appear to be legitimate Western Aramaic forms!

⁵¹ Cf. e.g. Num 24:23; חָסָר מִן הָעָם; Gen 49:1; יִרְשָׁע מִן הָעָם; Ex 15:13; דְּמַע מִן הָעָם. בְּרֵדַה מִן הָעָם.

⁵² Neofiti has a singular יִלּ at Ex 20:3, but as shown by the parallel in Deut, לְבֵין is the better Neofiti text.

⁵³ To some extent the rigid application of these methods has been overdone. Indeed Kaufman has recently called into question one of the basic theoretical presuppositions of this school of scholarship (תְּמוּנָה וְכָלְבָּה [above, n. 38]), albeit a presupposition rather peripheral to the issue at hand, so the basic theory as to the identification of original Palestinian Aramaic forms remains valid. One grows weary, however, of the endless supply of studies telling us of the lexical distribution of this or that Aramaic word (usually the same word that
are categorically and diametrically opposed to the untenable position espoused by
the small but vocal membership of the Kahle-Díez Macho school who, among
their arguments, argue for the antiquity of the Neofiti (or Pseudo-Jonathan) text on
the basis of inconsistencies of usage in those texts, inconsistencies similar to those
found in the Jewish Literary Aramaic texts from Qumran, such as alternations of "י
vs. "י and the emphatic state in final aleph vs. final heh. We find their position
inherently improbable, for it requires us to posit an original orthographic/lexical
tradition of mixed character that has somehow been preserved in Neofiti, PsJ, and
the Fragment Targums and in the latest of the Genizah manuscripts (although less
so). One would also have to assume that in the earlier and best Genizah
manuscripts the tradition would have been made to conform to 'good' Galilean
type Aramaic—a leveling process somehow unapplied in the more 'authentic',
albeit later texts of Neofiti and PsJ. But we rely not simply on inherent
improbability. It can be statistically demonstrated that for Neofiti at least some of
these features are inconsistencies that were introduced secondarily.

has been studied elsewhere by others, and we prefer not to add more than is necessary to
that list here. The reader will have to trust us! (With the imminent publication of Sokoloff's
dictionary and as work on the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon is begun, we look forward to
the day when there will no longer be a need for independent studies of lexical distribution)

54 Most recently M. C. Doubles in his 1962 St Andrews dissertation and subsequent,
derived articles (see Klein, Fragment Targums I, for references) and R. T. White in his Oxford
dissertation 'A Linguistic Analysis of the Targum to Chronicles with Specific Reference to its
Relationship with Other Forms of Aramaic' (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation 1961).

55 This applies to the emphatic form and other features. The frequency of alternation be-
 tween "י and "י, on the other hand, remains more or less constant throughout the PT tradi-
 tion (20-25%); excluding, of course, PsJ, which uses "י as a simple relative pronoun before verbal
and adjectival predicates, "י as the genitive particle, and▽, "which is," before
prepositional phrases. In all cases, however, "י is used much less frequently here than it is in
Qumran.

56 The evidence for this claim will be brought by Kaufman in "Of Beginnings, Ends, and
Computers in Targumic Studies" to be published in the J. A. Fitzmyer Festschrift. Here we
may just note that it is based on the observation made below (Addendum) as regards the rel-
ative accuracy of transmission of early as opposed to late chapters in the manuscript. If this
principle is correct, then any feature characteristic of the best Genizah manuscripts whose
frequency increases as we progress through the manuscript of Neofiti has obviously been
subjected to secondary modification in the course of the transmission of the Neofiti text; for if
the mixed character of the feature were original to the tradition, we would expect to find it
It stands to reason that those texts that evidence the least amount of orthographic and grammatical contamination a priori preserve the best textual tradition as well, for demonstrably they have been subject to the least amount of scribal mutilation. Nevertheless, this does not mean that we can reconstruct the PT simply by selecting the oldest available Genizah text by default. True, more often than not reasoned reconstruction on the basis of recensional families and stemmatic principles yields a text identical to that found in the best Genizah MSS. Where the "best" Genizah tradition stands alone over against the other witnesses, however, we may only select it when the differences from that text can be explained as subsequent divergences due to the normal repertoire of scribal errors and corrections.

In light of the above considerations, the following general principles are to be used in reconstructing the text of the Palestinian Targum:

1) Wherever possible, sub-families of related texts are established using the standard principles of manuscript study, chief among them, of course, the importance of shared errors. Fortunately, some of our work has already been done for us by M. Klein, who has demonstrated that Fragment Targum MSS V, N and L constitute a single recensional family.57 As detailed above, and in any case immediately obvious from the following aligned texts, Fragment Targum P110 and the Mahzor texts (VTR/WRM/PRM) constitute a single family,58 to which Genizah MS CC is allied. Therefore, beneath each verse we have first reconstructed the prototype of the P/Mahzor family. It is that prototype, rather than any of the individual manuscripts of the P/Mahzor family, that is subsequently used in comparison with the other texts in establishing the Utext.

It is also clear that Genizah MSS F and S are closely allied and that much of the main text of Neofiti and its marginalia, as well as the PT text underlying PsJ, and the FragTarg V text family are descendants of the same basic text as that found in the Genizah MSS. We have not attempted to present a separate prototype for this

---

57 The Extant Sources of the Fragmentary Targum to the Pentateuch,” *HUCA* 46 (1975) 115-137.

58 The major shared error, of course, is the omission of vv. 9-10. There are many shared additions. See discussion above, Part A.
group, however, for a simple reason: That prototype is for all practical purposes identical with archetypal Palestinian Targum.\(^{59}\)

As anyone who has ever undertaken such an exercise knows, though the general lines of relationship may be clear, there are always exceptions here and there where the distribution of a particular item cannot be explained by recourse to a simple stemmatic scheme. This by no means implies that all the extant witnesses are not, therefore, descendants of a single, original text. The targum to Qohelet, discussed in Prof. E. G. Clarke’s contribution to this volume, is a good example of a text—unquestionably a single literary document—wherein the manuscript traditions not infrequently do not follow the recensional distribution generally demonstrable. Most such instances are undoubtedly to be explained by the “Law of the Scribes,”\(^{60}\) but a substantial number of decisive examples will always defy such simple solutions. In our text there are two major instances of such cross-recensional problems: 1) The addition וְתוֹאֵמוּ דְּבָרָם מִשְׁמָרָת לֶמֶרֶס is found in PsJ, FrP and VTR; and 2) We find that only one Genizah text—MS CC—seems to be located on the P/Mahzor line (it may even be a page from a mahzor!), yet it consistently introduces each Commandment with עֲדֵי בְּנֵי יִשָּׂרָאֵל (like M. Roma, and two other Italian Mahzorim, see above), unlike the later members of that branch that uniformly have עֲדֵי בְּנֵי יִשָּׂרָאֵל. On the other hand, Genizah MS S, otherwise not particularly closely allied to the P/Mahzor line,\(^{61}\) has עֲדֵי בְּנֵי יִשָּׂרָאֵל throughout.\(^{62}\)

The astute reader will note that on occasion the reconstruction of a proto-version of a recensional family, based solely on its daughter texts, proves incorrect upon comparison with other earlier or parallel recensional groups. This is the case in any type of stemmatic reconstruction, and in no way invalidates our methodology.

\(^{59}\) Nevertheless, it may be possible to reconstruct an intermediate prototype for M. Roma and the PT underlying PsJ. Additional examples of Italian mahzorim need to be examined.

\(^{60}\) See Goshen-Gottstein, Text and Language, 45: “Wherever a reading in any witness—version or manuscript—can be explained by misreading, parallelism in the widest sense, syntactical or grammatical normalization or simplification, inversion of adjacent parts within a phrase, lexical or grammatical alternation or influence of verses of similar content, we have to suspect spontaneous creation...” In the case of targumic texts, we would add to this list “Conformity to the text of Targum Onkelos.”

\(^{61}\) The text of genizah MS S is of a mahzor type, however, in that after the Decalogue the MS contains Onkelos. In format it is biblical, i.e., with lemmata and custodes.

\(^{62}\) And note that PsJ has הָבָר once, at v. 3.
2) At any stage of the process, whenever any two Palestinian traditions agree on an expression, with the others matching Onkelos, the non-Onkelos form is assumed to be original. The same generally applies even if only one Palestinian text is non-Onkelos, especially if it is a Genizah text.

3) The preceding principle definitely does not apply to a reading unique to Pseudo-Jonathan—especially when PsJ uses a distinctively Late Jewish Literary Aramaic form—even when the unique text is paralleled in early rabbinic sources.

4) Fragment Targum P110 itself can be taken as representative of the PT text only when it is a second authority—not when it is unique.63

In our notes to the aligned/reconstructed texts we have attempted to justify our reconstruction only when the choice is not immediately obvious after the application of the above four principles.

Addendum: Of Beginnings and Ends

Our material demonstrates an important principle in the study of Targum Neofiti in particular, and medieval Jewish manuscripts in general: the end of a text is subject to fewer scribal improvements than its beginning.64 As is well known, most Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic MSS and all the canonical printed editions are unreliable, having been contaminated through the centuries by scribes influenced by their familiarity with the classical Jewish texts of the Bible and the Babylonian Talmud and, in the case of targum texts, Targum Onkelos. Scribes, like readers, generally began their work of transmission and "correction" at the beginning of the text. Moreover, in the case of the Palestinian Targum, there is ample evidence that earlier chapters of the Torah were copied much more frequently than the late chap-

63 Of course, many problems arise in the course of text analysis that lead to the formulation of additional, ad hoc "principles." For example, at v. 7 the unique Neofiti text אומ is less acceptable than ינשׁ not only because the former is unique but also because it is simply a literal (and in that sense, non-targumic) rendering of BH ישׁ. Until such time as we can subject substantial additional material to the same kind of analysis, we prefer not to attempt to anticipate all such minor principles.

64 Hence the new Neofiti grammar by David Golomb, A Grammar of Targum Neofiti, Harvard Semitic Monographs 34 (Chico 1985), based almost exclusively on Genesis, is ab initio of limited value. He would have been better advised to begin his research with Deuteronomy!
The result is that the earlier chapters of a heavily tradited text are subjected to a much greater degree of intentional modification than are later portions of the same text. A comparison of the Decalogue in the Neofiti text to Ex 20 with that of Deut 5 demonstrates this most clearly. The Deut text, like any text, is not, to be sure, without scribal errors, but it evidences far fewer signs of scribal tampering.

In the following table the Neofiti texts of Exodus and Deuteronomy of the Decalogue (where parallel) are aligned. Where the two texts differ, the text assumed to be closer to the hypothetical proto-Neofiti—a proto-Neofiti reconstructed on the principles developed above in part B of this study—is underlined. If the change involves orthographic or grammatical scribal "correction," it appears doubly underlined. Singly underlined text, therefore, represents forms preferable solely on textual grounds, i.e., scribal corruptions rather than scribal emendations. Included in the class of textual corruptions are instances such as פ in v. 3 and קָרְדָּפֶב in v. 6, where the inferior text tradition is due to the influence of Onkelos.

The results are definitive: Even in the case of error and corruption, Deut is by far the superior text: about 17 instances of preferred text in Deut to ten preferable forms in Ex. In the case of scribal tampering, however, the difference between the two passages is overwhelming: Deut has 54 preferred forms, Ex only nine. Thus it is clear that the Ex text has been subjected to a many more generations of copyist's activities than the text of Deut. How many more we cannot say.

That two scribes were responsible for these two different passages in the main text of Neofiti is quite irrelevant to our conclusions. It is clear that with the ex-

---

65 Genesis and Exodus constitute more than 80% of Klein's new publication of the Genizah fragments.

66 We say "about" because it is not always clear how to count words that have two separate preferable features in them, or phrases that occur more than once.

67 If we eliminate from consideration the nearly consistent preference in Ex for the inscription-like spelling נ instead of מ for the 3ms suffix, the ratio is an even more striking 54 to 5. There is good reason to believe that the latter spelling may be just as legitimate.

68 In principle, we suppose that one should be able to develop an approximate measure of the regular occurrence of scribal error/contamination in certain types of Jewish MSS that would give us the average number of errors per thousand words per scribal generation, along the lines of procedures used in the field of lexicostatistics and, with less success, in paleographic studies.

69 See Diez Macho, Neofiti vol. I, 23°.
ceptions of the first and last sections of the MS, which are clearly restored from another source. The Neofiti manuscript at our disposal was copied from a single earlier manuscript.

The Texts

Abbreviations used in the text tables are:


NMg: Neofiti marginalia (and interlinear).

Mg2: Neofiti second margin.

NfD: Neofiti, Deuteronomy.

NDM: NfD marginalia.

FrV: Fragment Targ MS V440 and recensional variants (L, N)—M. L. Klein, The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch According to their Extant Sources, I (Rome 1980).

Gxx: Genizah mss F, S, Br, BB and CC according to the edition of M. L. Klein: Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch (Cincinnati 1986).

GBr is the same as Fragment Targum Br to Deuteronomy.

FrP: Fragment Targum MS Paris 110 quoted from Klein.

FrA: addendum in MS Paris 110 at Deut. 7.

PRM: Parma—MS Parma 2411 (=DeRossi 1107). See "Introduction," n. 11.

---


71 See Kaufman, "Of Beginnings" (see n. 56). What has apparently not been noted before is that the MS on which Neofiti is based was itself divided, in terms of its orthographic traditions, into two rather different halves—i.e., that the tendency toward scribal "improvement" sharply decreases toward the end of Exodus (beginning of the parashah Wayyaqel).


Editorial Marks:

[ ] Missing in the MS.
^ ^ Interlinear addition.
< > Editorial addition.
{ } Editorial deletion.
[[ ]] Scribal deletion.
And the Word of the Lord spoke all the excellence of these Commandments, saying.

1. יְרִיבָה יְרִיבָה יְרִיבָה, as still preserved in PRM יְרִיבָה יְרִיבָה יְרִיבָה, almost certainly underlies FrP’s unusual יְרִיבָה יְרִיבָה יְרִיבָה.

2. In the better Genizah ms [תפלה] (like the spelling of the 3ms suffix in general) is more frequent than תפלה, but both are well attested. Since תפלה could be misconstrued as the emphatic form “the word” instead of “his word,” late ms regularly have, erroneously, תפלה, as here in FrV and PRM. As is well known, the main text of Neo, like PsJ and Onk, regularly avoids תפלה דנין in this expression, prompting a constant marginal correction. We see no reason not to posit the fuller text as the basic PT in all cases.
THE PALESTINIAN TARGUM

The First Commandment, as it would leave the mouth of the Holy One, may His name be praised, like meteors and like lightning bolts and like fiery torches - a fiery torch from His right and a fiery torch from His left - would fly and swoop in the air, and all Israel would see and be afraid. - and it would encircle the camps of Israel and return and engrave itself on the Two Tablets of the Covenant and say: Oh My people, Children of Israel, I am He, the Lord your God who redeemed and led you out redeemed from the land of Egypt, from the house of servants' bondage.

1. FrP’s regular spelling of this adjective without daleth is a late scribal change < BTA.
2. This reconstruction is supported by the text in Midrash Aseret HaDibros (p. 69).
3. Cf. also the following quotation from the early Thirteenth Century work Rabbinute de Geniza, ed. Erdei, 2:16, Jerusalem, 1970, p. 95.
4. VTR, FrP, 306 (p. 342) and cf. FrV to Gen 49:2 and FrV, Neve to Deut 6:4; BT Ber 3a (see H. Rabinowitz, Daquapi Sifrim) and Shabbat 119b. This formula later entered the “Kaddish” with the addition of ḫelqot lélaḵeř (and this, too, due to Tannaitic usage: cf. Sifre and FrV, Neve cited above). Therefore, it appears that in P/Mahzor, too, ḫelqot is influenced by the Kaddish, whereas Neve/P’s ḫelqot alone, in place of the original ḫelqot (as in the Genizah texts), is a separate development under similar influence.
5. The spelling ḫelqot is from Biblical Hebrew.
6. The spelling Ḫeleqot clearly results from a misreading of Ḫelqot in a ms without adequate spacing between words (influenced, of course, by Ḫeleq at the beginning of the verse). Thus Ḫeleq must have been restored in WRM from another text tradition.
7. The spelling Ḫeleq is certainly due to the influence of the repeated phrase Ḫereq in rabbinic literature, in both Hebrew and Aramaic (or a combination of both): cf. e.g. Sifre Deut 306 and cf. FrV to Gen 49:2 and FrV, Neve to Deut 6:4; BT Ber 3a (see H. Rabinowitz, Daquapi Sifrim) and Shabbat 119b. This formula later entered the “Kaddish” with the addition of ḫelqot lélaḵeř (and this, too, due to Tannaitic usage: cf. Sifre and FrV, Neve cited above). Therefore, it appears that in P/Mahzor, too, ḫelqot is influenced by the Kaddish, whereas Neve/P’s ḫelqot alone, in place of the original ḫelqot (as in the Genizah texts), is a separate development under similar influence.
8. The spelling Ḫeleq is from Biblical Hebrew.
9. The spelling Ḫeleq clearly results from a misreading of Ḫelqot in a ms without adequate spacing between words (influenced, of course, by Ḫeleq at the beginning of the verse). Thus Ḫeleq must have been restored in WRM from another text tradition.
10. The spelling Ḫeleq is certainly due to the influence of the repeated phrase Ḫereq in rabbinic literature, in both Hebrew and Aramaic (or a combination of both): cf. e.g. Sifre Deut 306 and cf. FrV to Gen 49:2 and FrV, Neve to Deut 6:4; BT Ber 3a (see H. Rabinowitz, Daquapi Sifrim) and Shabbat 119b. This formula later entered the “Kaddish” with the addition of ḫelqot lélaḵeř (and this, too, due to Tannaitic usage: cf. Sifre and FrV, Neve cited above). Therefore, it appears that in P/Mahzor, too, ḫelqot is influenced by the Kaddish, whereas Neve/P’s ḫelqot alone, in place of the original ḫelqot (as in the Genizah texts), is a separate development under similar influence.
11. Here WRM preserves the superior, original reading, as evidenced by Genizah, Ps., M.Roma, and the acrostic poem to our verse in Genizah MS G (Bod. MS Heb E33 26r). The traditions of the latter poem, as discussed below (v. 3), are related to the additional exegetical/liturgical traditions found in FrP. Ḫelahbod of FrP, PRM, and VTR appears to constitute an accomodation to the Mechilta’s (Balfodess 5, p. 222):
12. Otherwise, the repetition of VTR text in P/Mahzor appears to go furthest in this direction by changing this itself into an explicit reference to pagan worship: “out of the oppression of the Egyptians’ cult.” Undoubtedly,
this expression is taken directly from Onkelos to Ex 6:6. In the Onkelos passage, however, פָּרֹשׁ, פָּרֹשׁ, פָּרֹשׁ is merely "work." 7. Possibly Genizah ms F is right, and we should distinguish between the early Greek loanword "צַבֵי" (poor), "torch" and the later borrowing "צַבֵי" ("lamp.") Psalms 109:6 is the result of a leveling to the relatively frequent expression צַבֵי שֵׁם יְהֹוָא as a description of the Lord's power; cf. especially the reference to our story in Psalms' rendition of Deut 33:2: מַעִיב שֵׁם יְהֹוָא (where the PT texts all have הַלּוּכֵי). Cf. Mekhilta Bal-hodesh 9 (p. 235), Sifre Deut 33:2 (par. 343, p. 399), and Cant. Rab. 1:13 where Psalms 29:7: קָנָה יְהֹוָא בָּצֵי נַחֲלָת שֶׁמֶר is connected with this aggada.

8. The 1ca perfect ending of נִשְׁבָּה is clearly the more common form in the Palestinian tradition, especially with common verbs such as רָאָה and בָּרָא. Colomb's statement (Grammar [Introduction, n67], p. 125) that נִשְׁבָּה and נְשָׁבָה are "distributed evenly" in Neofiti is quite misleading. "I said," for example, in both early Geniza texts (ms A and E) and Neofiti, is always נְשָׁבָה.

9. This verse is the most difficult to unravel of all the tangles in our text. Up to the word פָּרֹשׁ all the witnesses are in essential agreement; so, too, once again beginning with פָּרֹשׁ. Between these two points we seem to be confronted with total anarchy! A priori this is not surprising in a text of such rich agadic content (for the parallels see Kashef, 75, ad loc. par. 75 and notes), but we have been able to make great progress in elucidating the history of the passage. First we may eliminate the agadic addition המתקוקח והכניסו בָּשֶׁר from the present text in its present form and the unique to Psalms 109:6, יִנָּהֲבוּ בֹּקֶץ יִנָּהֲבוּ בֹּקֶץ which is presented by the main text of Neo Ex as two separate traditions: The first is shared by NeoEx and the Genizah texts: (A)

(לֹא יָסִיר יְהוָא הַדוֹר הַדוֹר וְהָרָא המתקוקח עַל וַגִּיד הָיוֹצֵא אָמָר)

The second, given in the reconstructed text above by virtue of its numerical superiority, is that of NeoDt, the second version in NeoEx and, (with some changes) of Psalms (B):

(וַהֲרָא המתקוקח עַל וַגִּיד הָיוֹצֵא אָמָר)

(כִּי מַעִיב שֵׁם יְהוָא הַדוֹר וְהָרָא המתקוקח עַל וַגִּיד הָיוֹצֵא אָמָר)

Of course this second text is also that found in the PMahzor family (and cf. M. Roma: וַהֲרָא המתקוקח עַל וַגִּיד הָיוֹצֵא אָמָר).

From the point of view of textual integrity, (A) is much to be preferred. It presents a vibrant, continuous scene and includes the reference to the fright of the Israelites so central in the biblical text itself in v. 18 (Cf. e.g. BT Shabbat 85a and a closely related to our targumic text, Mid. Asarot HaDibrot, p. 69.) (B) is stiff and repetitive, and the participial forms do not fit well with the syntax as they do in (A). Nevertheless, there is no simple way to derive (B) from (A). But there is a simple solution: Both texts can easily be traced back to a common origin:

(כִּי מַעִיב שֵׁם יְהוָא הַדוֹר וְהָרָא המתקוקח עַל וַגִּיד הָיוֹצֵא אָמָר)

In (A) the phrase "וַהֲרָא המתקוקח" has dropped out by simple homoioteleuton. In (B) the first phrase "וַהֲרָא המתקוקח" is missing by homoioteleuton. In the reconstructed form all the requisite elements of the aggada are incorporated into a smooth whole.

In Neofiti, Dt as usual has the authentic, simple, common Neofiti-Psalms tradition. The addition of version (A) to the Ex text came late in the transmission history of Neo by virtue of the striking difference of the Genizah type tradition. It is widely recognized that Neo regularly brings alternative readings as doublings in its main text without any sign of their secondary origin — even so much as a conjunctive waw. (We assume that at some stage in the transmission process marginal readings were incorporated into the text.) Such doublings range in size from a single word to a complicated narrative. Cf. especially the well known examples in Gen. 44:18.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exod 20:3</th>
<th>PsJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בקורי הינו כח רוחなのか</td>
<td>הינו כח רוחなのか</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורגי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בקורי</td>
<td>בקורי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורגי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PsJ</th>
<th>Neo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורגי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בקורי</td>
<td>בקורי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורגי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PsJ</th>
<th>Neo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורגי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בקורי</td>
<td>בקורי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורגי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PsJ</th>
<th>Neo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורגי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בקורי</td>
<td>בקורי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורגי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PsJ</th>
<th>Neo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורגי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בקורי</td>
<td>בקורי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורגי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PsJ</th>
<th>Neo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורגי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בקורי</td>
<td>בקורי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורגי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PsJ</th>
<th>Neo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
<td>נכרתיו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הקורגי</td>
<td>הקורギ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Second Commandment, as it would leave the mouth of the Holy One, may His name be praised, etc. Oh My people
Children of Israel, you shall have no other god except for Me.
THE PALESTINIAN TARGUM

You shall not make for yourself an idol or an image or any representation of that which is in the heaven above or on the Earth below or in the water beneath the Earth.

1. הדוד, common to all PT traditions, is indicative of the relative lateness of the PT compared to Onkelos, where this word is absent. The (perhaps Byzantine period) polemical allusion is to icones (יווה) as distinct from statues (שלום). This addition is regularly found whenever images are prohibited: Ex 32:8, 19; Dt 4:16, 23,25; Dt 27:15. In Onkelos it appears only at Dt 4:16, where it corresponds to MT כל. On the censored Neo text see Gerard J. Kuiper (see Introduction N36), p. 80

2. The distinction between יאר "which is" (before prepositional phrases) and יד "which" (before verbs and adjectives) is always maintained in the Genizah ms, while the distinction has largely been nullified, as here, in the later recensions.
In the Genizah corpus, about one sixth the size of Neofiti and PsJ, פָּנָיו occurs 42 times, while in the main text of Neofiti it is used only 32 times (not at all in Numbers, but frequently in Deuteronomy!), and only 25 times in PsJ.