You shall not bow down to them nor worship before them/their divinities, for I am He, the Lord your God, a jealous god, who visits the sins of wicked fathers on rebellious children, on the third and fourth generation of my enemies.

1. טפיא is an addition. For the idea that the Lordpunishes even the pagan divinities themselves Cf. e.g. BzR 96:5 (p. 1196) and parallels.
2. Almost certainly added secondarily from Onkelos, since it is absent in both WRM and M. Roma.
3. All of the later recensional lines have העריה whereas both Genizah texts have לדרשו. There is no way to decide between them on text critical grounds. Exegetically, however, one might prefer the Genizah version, since it distinguishes between the idols themselves and the pagan divinities (העריה) that they represent, a distinction almost certainly intentionally eliminated by the change to לדרשו. On the other hand, מדרשים is a good early Aramaic usage with which a later tradition might have felt uncomfortable inasmuch as it intimates divine status to the idols.
4. כנעני is obviously an interpretive (or alternative) doublet of פזון, "jealous one and avenger." But both are already a part of the earliest recoverable PT text of our passage. The originally independent status of these two renderings (of BH כנעני) is demonstrated by the various PT traditions to Ex 34:14, Deut 4:24, 6:15 in which generally only one of the two elements is found.

For the Tannaitic origin of this interpretation of the troublesome BH כנעני see Mekhilta BabHodesh 6 (p. 226):
וכנעני שמע안ת לא בא - דיבר רבי יחס נבון - הבאים אני נבון - כנעני אני נבון. מחל מבעד红酒א דכנלי דכל דתות נהגי יכדרים רוחם.

For the absence of a conjunction on מדרשים, cf. Neo at Ex 34:14 and Dt 5:9.
But I keep (track of) devotion and good deeds for thousands of generations for my righteous ones who love me and for those who keep the commandments of my Torah.

1. For הגדת see, too, M.Roma. FrP פְּדֵי יְאָרֹדִי (found also in懈bone thease [see above, Introduction, N15]) is, therefore, a cross recensional variant derived from a Pa type.
1. Parma is the only text that repeats the long introduction (עסיפת...ךדוי) for each Commandment. To save space, we have omitted it from here on.
Oh My people Children of Israel, let none of you swear falsely in the name of the Word of the Lord his God, for on The Great Day of Judgment the Lord will not acquit anyone who swears falsely in his name.

2. R. Benyamin "משה" (see Introduction, N6) writes with regard to the Third Commandment (p. 217):

ומהל אל מתוחין תבידיו ו EITHER ARGUMENT OR BOTH ALIKE. אם היה VL.

לבל נאמדי מפי-לילה (ך) (ךך ויהיו התיה ער(deg) ויהיו התיה ער(deg)

איסר לאAYS איסר לאAYS איסר לאAYS איסר לאAYS איסר לאAYS

(For Rabbinic sources see ad v.3). Note that, as discussed above, M. Roma and other Italian mahzorim also have introductory material only for the first two Commandments, thus this may well be an Italian practice. On the other hand, a tradition that all Israel heard all of the Commandments is also found in rabbinic literature (see e.g. Mekhila Bat Hodesh 4 (p. 218)), and it seems clear from an obscure passage in דלתות עין סודות (see v. 2, N 2) that in early 13th Cent. Ashkenaz more than just the first Two Commandments had this preface. According to A. Shinan, "Form and Content," p. 114, the Haggadah MS Br.Mus. Or. 2737 also has this preface with each Commandment.

3. Note the late, Eastern Aramaic type syntax. See to v. 12.

4. This is the exception that proves the rule for the spelling of the 3ms pronominal suffix defectively in the Genizah mas. After all, the use of vowel letters was still at the choice of the scribe, and clarity was always more important than any abstract orthographic principle. The expected form וית אל pesso, while perfectly acceptable for "the God" or "her God," is somehow insufficient, even for the modern reader, to convey the meaning "his God."

5. The text of NMg (לֵשַׁנָּה) is grammatically preferable to Geniza "לֵשַׁנָּה," though the Tannaitic שֵׁדֵשׁ is suspect because of its literal correspondence to MT and Onkelos. Unlike Onkelos (and the P/Mahzor texts influenced by it) the PT texts are each consistent in their translation of the repeated BH שֵׁדֵשׁ. The Rabbis distinguished, albeit in different ways, between שֵׁדֵשׁ and שֵׁדֵשׁ, but they generally included a false oath (in addition to an unnecessary one) in the term שֵׁדֵשׁ: cf. e.g. the midrashim cited by Kasher 75, ad loc., pars. 2.84.2. Thus the text of the PT is certainly not incompatible with rabbinic exegesis. As for the Okin rendition, first 2, then 3, then 2. The text of the PT is certainly not incompatible with rabbinic exegesis. As for the Okin rendition, first 2, then 3, then 2.
Oh My People Children of Israel, be mindful of the Sabbath Day to sanctify it.

1. M. Roma also understand בָּנָי is an obvious misreading of בְּנֵי, influenced by the text of the next Commandment. FrP ℣ < Onk.

2. Since, in spite of NDM, the PT text to Deut BH seems to use the root דָּשַׁל rather than דָּשָׁל, where attested here would seem to be the result of influence from verse 12. Cf. above to בְּנֵי.
Six days shall you work and do all your labor.

And the seventh day is Sabbath and rest before the Lord your God. You shall do no labor — you, and your sons, and your daughters, and your servants, and your maidservants, and your cattle, and your proselytes who are in your cities.
Proto-P/Mahzor

For in six days the Lord created and completed the heaven and the Earth and the seas and all that is in them, and He rested on the Seventh Day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath Day and sanctified it.

1. "And because of the abundant love he had for it, he desired it more than all the days, and taught it to the Children of Israel." This LJIJA addition to the PT text, difficult and hence corrupted in all the witnesses, must be related to PpP at Gn 2:2 where MT יָּכֹל יִּכָּל is interpreted as יִּכָּל יָּכֹל. That such an interpretation was widely known in early European circles is evidenced by the Sokolinskij Targum of Gn 2:2 as the source for the liturgical phrase מַעְלָה בְּנֵי דָּרוֹן דְּרֵאֶה יִתְנַשֵּׁה יָּכֹל הַמֶּלֶךְ מַעְלָה בְּנֵי דָּרוֹן דְּרֵאֶה יִתְנַשֵּׁה יָּכֹל יִּכָּל יִּכָּל. 

2. This form is used more frequently than is נ in this construction, but either is possible.
Exod 20:12

וַיְהִי עַל כָּל הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר שָמָּם שָמָּה וּשְׁמִית בָּאֲלָמָא וְהַיָּד דְּבַר הַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר.

וַיִּקָּרֶה יְהוָה אֵל הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר שָמָּה וּשְׁמִית בָּאֲלָמָא וְהַיָּד דְּבַר הַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר.

וַיִּקָּרֶה יְהוָה אֵל הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר שָמָּה וּשְׁמִית בָּאֲלָמָא וְהַיָּד דְּבַר הַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר.

וַיִּקָּרֶה יְהוָה אֵל הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר שָמָּה וּשְׁמִית בָּאֲלָמָא וְהַיָּד Дְּבַר הַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר.

וַיִּקָּרֶה יְהוָה אֵל הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר שָמָּה וּשְׁמִית בָּאֲלָמָא וְהַיָּד Дְּבַר הַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר וְהַפְּרוּפֵר.
56

Stephen A. Kaufman and Yeshayahu Maori

Proto-P/Mahor

דיבר אלו אשרי יימא דוד

וכו והזוחל פָּרָה

היה רועו והוה נח בְּכֵיתוֹ שְׁאַר

וּלְכָלִּים יִקְּרֵ-wifeֲוָוֶם יִשְׁכֹּֽנְּו

הוֹרִים צִיוּרֶנָּם וּסְלָבֵּרֶנָּם לֵיהֶם לְאֶנֶיֶּנָם לְיִשְׁכֹּנָּן.

Oh My people Children of Israel, take care, each one of you, with respect to the honor of his father and the honor of his mother, so that your days may be many upon the land that the Lord your God is giving you.

1. The rest of the verse (whose closest parallel is Mid. Aseret HaDibrot p. 77) is a patently late Aramaic addition.
2. See to the Ex/DT Neofiti text (Addendum), v. 7.
Targumim to Exodus 20

Exod 20:13

1. From this point on we generally omit the Deut texts of PsJ and Neo, because they are so close to those of Exodus and would only burden our tables with redundant material. For the Neo Deut text see Addendum.
Oh My people Children of Israel, you shall not be murderers, neither comrades nor colleagues with the murderers, and let no one in the assembly of Israel be seen with murderers, so that your children may not arise after you and learn, even they, to be murderers; for because of the sins of the murderers the sword appears upon the Earth.

2. Only אָלֹם could lie behind both אָלֹם and אָלָם.

3. The alternation אָלֹם / אָל (אָלֹם) for "also" is a common one in PT texts. Both are legitimate PTA forms. The distributional evidence suggests that אָל (אָל) is originally an adverbial form (so, too, אָל אֵל), whereas אָלֹם is generally a clause initial conjunction. Note, e.g., this passage from Genizah MS E to Gen 30:15.

4. Clearly a certain amount of leveling has occurred in the various texts as regards the use of דָּבָר as opposed to דַּבָּר in the descriptions of the דָּבָר מִלְוָה מִלְוָה punishments appended to Commandments 6-10; see Addendum ad n7. Obviously the phrasing of these punishments is dependent on frequent rabbinic statements such as Aboth 5:9.

Unfortunately, however, there appear to be very few exact rabbinic parallels to this material. In fact only for "adultery" have we been able to find a relatively exact parallel (Ber. R. 26:5, p. 248 and parallels):

מֵתוֹנָה וַאֲרֵי אוֹר לֶמֶצָּה = בַּכּל מַכְכֶה אֵשֶׁת עָנָדְרֵיתָהוּ מעָנָדְרֵיתוֹ בָּאָלָם

Oh My people Children of Israel, you shall not be adulterers, neither comrades nor colleagues with the adulterers, and let no one in the assembly of Israel be seen with adulterers, so that your children may not arise after you and learn, even they, to be adulterers; for because of the sins of the adulterers plague comes upon the Earth.

1. Possibly יִנְתִּיר. See to the Ex/Dt Neofiti text (Addendum), v.5.
Oh My people Children of Israel, you shall not be thieves, neither comrades nor colleagues with the thieves, and let no one in the assembly of Israel be seen with thieves, so that your children may not arise after you and learn, even they, to be thieves; for because of the sins of the thieves famine comes upon the Earth.
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Exod 20:16 (13)

GCh

בָּהּ לֹא תְשַׁוֵּא

NMc

וְלֹא תִּשְׁאַל עֹלָיו

EFa

וְלֹא תִּשְׁאַל עֹלָיו

VTR

Omk

וְלֹא תִּשְׁאַל עֹלָיו

PsJ

וְלֹא תִּשְׁאַל עֹלָיו

Nee

וְלֹא תִּשְׁאַל עֹלָיו

G F

וְלֹא תִּשְׁאַל עֹלָיו

Fr P

וְלֹא תִּשְׁאַל עֹלָיו

PIM

ประเม

שִׁקַּקְוֹתָן

NMc

שִׁקַּקְוֹת

EFa

שִׁקַּקְוֹת

VTR

Omk

שִׁקַּקְוֹת

PsJ

שִׁקַּקְוֹת

Nee

שִׁקַּקְוֹת

G F

שִׁקַּקְוֹת

Fr P

שִׁקַּקְוֹת

PIM
Oh My people Children of Israel, you shall not be false witnesses, neither comrades nor colleagues with the false witnesses, and let no one in the assembly of Israel be seen with false witnesses, so that your children may not arise after you and learn, even they, to be false witnesses; for because of the sins of the false witnesses the clouds evaporate and the rain does not fall and famine comes upon the Earth.

1. See Addendum ad v.

2. Note that this tradition has switched the order of the justification clauses of the Ninth and Tenth Commandments. The unique מְשָׁלֵה יִבְּשָׁן, for which we have not found a parallel, would seem to be the result of censoring.

3. We have reconstructed with the definite form מִשְׁלֵה מְשָׁלֵה, parallel to the definite forms in the other commandments at this point; indeed this is precisely the text that turns up in M.Roma: מְשָׁלֵה מְשָׁלֵה, although there influence from Onk, which has שִׁמְלָה מְשָׁלֵה מְשָׁלֵה in the previous line, cannot be excluded. Our reconstruction with the participial form plus the noun "testimony" מְשָׁלֵה (plural מְשָׁלֵה) is based on G.F, PsJ, M.Roma, and, more importantly, the joint tradition of PsJ and Neo in Deuteronomy. G.F מְשָׁלֵה (plural מְשָׁלֵה) must be an error, since only an original מְשָׁלֵה can account for the uniform mistaken מְשָׁלֵה of the other texts.
Oh My people Children of Israel, you shall not be covetous, neither comrade nor colleagues with the covetous, and let no one in the assembly of Israel be seen with covetous, so that your children may not arise after you and learn, even they, to be covetous; and let none of you covet his neighbor’s house, and let none of you covet his neighbor’s wife, neither his servant nor his maidervant and neither his ox nor his ass, nor anything belonging to your neighbor; for because of the sins of the covetors the “empires” are incited against people and exile comes upon the Earth.
And all the people were seeing the voices and the torches and the sound of the Shofar and the mountain smoking; and all the people saw, and were shocked, and stood praying from afar.

1. The root "משש", "to smoke", although quite common in other Aramaic dialects, is rare in Jewish Aramaic (see Genizah Targ. MS F and FragTarg V to Ex 19:18 and YT Niddah 50b). Therefore, we have chosen it as the lectio difficilior.

2. Although מְדַבֵּית is closer to Onkelos 137 than PsJ מְדַבֵּית, we must reject the latter because it is a unique Hebrewism derived from Mekhilta BaHodesh 9 (p. 236):

3. G F מֶספָּה is a pure Galilean Ar. form that has crept into the text due to contamination from the nasi of מֶספָּה. Though seen frequently in PsJ and other LILA texts, and in the LILA type orthography of FrV, it (i.e. 3mpl perfect with final nasi on other than nasi verbs) does not appear in the better texts.

4. Cf. e.g. BT Ber. 6b הַתְּנֵיָתָא אָלָא שְׁמָה מִצְבָּא. Inasmuch as the absence of מִצְבָּא from Neo and FrV appears to be a contamination from Onkelos, we have maintained it, but with hesitation.
THE PALESTINIAN TARGUM

And they were saying to Moses: You speak with us and we shall listen; let the Word of the Lord not speak with us lest we die.

1. Onkelos, which regularly distinguishes between the two basic different meanings of MT שמע "to hear" (rendered שמע) and "to obey" (rendered בכם), is here followed by PsJ (and the Mahzor traditions, which are straight Onkelos in these verses) - a distinction avoided in the PT.
And Moses said to the people: Do not fear, for it was in order to test you that the glory of the Lord's presence has been revealed to you, and so that the Torah of the Lord would always be in your mouth, lest you be found guilty.

1. We have no choice but to give here the Neo text reading, for Psal is straight Onkelos. Neo AL אל אלו, although it is the least Onkelos-like of the variants, has little to recommend it in terms of the reconstruction of earlier stages, as compared to the text attested to by NMg, FrV and G F. The Hebrew verse seems to contradict itself and needs to be resolved. JPS and JPSA mean “forehead,” the location of the tephillin (see Neo to Ex 13:9, 16; Dt 6:8, 11:18). Thus Neo resolves the contradiction by making יד יד to refer to tephillin. Possibly, Neo prefers אל אל because it better emphasizes the idea that failure to don tephillin is a sin. Our reconstructed PT (מקובץ כפכף) is shown to be the correct text by the fact that it is precisely the text found in Neo at Ex 13:9 for BH. The extra aw of the Marginalia, FrGv and G F form suggests that it is not the result of “Onkelosization.”

2. Although the noun ח紀錄 (my) is masculine, the entire expression ממי כיו is, as here and in v.20, frequently treated as feminine in the PT. Cf. e.g. Neo Gen. 11:5; 17:22; 18:3, 18:33, Deut 20:4, 33:12.
Exod 20:22 (19)

The Lord said to Moses: Thus should you say to Children of Israel: You have seen that I have spoken with you from heaven.

Exod 20:23 (20)

You shall not make any deities of silver before Me; nor any deities of gold shall you make for yourselves.
Targumim to Exodus 20

And if you build a stone altar for My Name, you shall not build them hewn, for iron — the sword is made from it; were you to wield iron upon them, you would desecrate them.

1. Clearly PsJ is a late attempt to clarify and harmonize with Onkelos a syntactically awkward PT text, totally different from that of Onkelos, but based on a text more like Neo Mg2 than any other. As revealed by the unusual form מִבְּלָד, Mg2 itself here (as usual) is a late, LILA tradition. The verb מָדַר, otherwise strictly Literary Aramaic (Onkelos, Pseudo- Jonathan), is found in "PT" texts only here and in FrP to Ex 10:28. (The spelling with וֹנֵת is found in late Hagiographic Targumic MSS.) For the relationship between Neofiti’s "second" marginalia and PsJ (or what should rather now be better termed the LILA targumic tradition), see Lund and Foster (see Introduction N65), passim.
1. So in MS N. V has נֵדָם.
2. Though PsJ’s פָּסַף is significantly outweighed by witnesses to פָּסַף, "steps," we must reject the latter as an Onkelos form, since PsJ is supported by NMg. The word in the latter witness is unique in JPA, however, so we have chosen the PsJ form, a good plural of פָּסַף, "ascent." Cf. Heb. בֵּאָר, "ramp, ascent" in the Mekhilta ad. v., whence stems NMg שֶׁפֶת פָּסַף בֵּאָר. (b)
3. Although this reading is unique to PsJ, and thus we are in violation of text reconstruction principle 3, we find it hard to see why PsJ would have changed a reading common to the PT, Onkelos, and the MT here. PsJ is not averse to such explanatory changes, to be sure; but here, in light of the fact that the Jewish interpreters emphasize that the priests’ nakedness could not be seen in any case because they wore trousers, one is especially puzzled by PsJ’s rendition.

And you, Oh priests — the sons of Aaron — who stand and serve upon My altar, you shall not ascend to the top of My altar using ascent, so that your nakedness may not be seen upon it.
ADDENDUM

The Decalogue according to Targum Neofiti, Exodus and Deuteronomy
Orthographically and grammatically "unimproved" forms are double underlined
Single underlining indicates a preferable text tradition

20:2
הֲוָאָשׁ עַל כֶּלֶב אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר בְּתַנָּן יִרְאֶה הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר בְּתַנָּן יִרְאֶה

20:3
וְהֲוָאָשׁ עַל כֶּלֶב אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר בְּתַנָּן יִרְאֶה הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר בְּתַנָּן יִרְאֶה

[1]
1. Erased in both texts. Note how the hand of the censor does not fail to reach all the way to Deutoronomy.

2. Which form is preferable in such pairs as דוד or דרדר and (see. v. 14) is uncertain. This seems to be a lexical rather than a grammatical consideration.

3. Aside from the correct absolute form והי, we have not chosen a preferred text tradition for this phrase. The Neofiti Deut version is the only one in all of the Palestinian targum recensions that is phrased as an original targumic expansion on the word ירא using "to follow" requires the preposition מ. The others texts are all patently dependent on the unusual Onkelos addition: מפלטיקן מי הכרך דרכו, a phrase that itself can hardly be explained as anything but a development based on something like that found in Neof Deut, for דרכו goes with מפלטיקן, not with מ.

4. Neither form is correct (so, too, in v. 17). In JPA the correct usage is דרכ, as demonstrated by the Genizah texts and many times in Neofiti. Ex כי the JLA (Onkelos-Jonathan) slavish equivalent of MT occur in this usage. דרכ seems to be some sort of a compromise!

5. י, here and in the next line, is unique to Neofiti as an accommodation to the Hebrew MT. Thus, no judgment as to priority is possible.
6. The first and last alternations in this line are both grammatical and textual, inasmuch as the singular forms represent accommodation to an Onkelos type rendition of the Hebrew singular nouns "יְדֵי" and "יְדָי נַפְלֵי." Ex דִּבְרֵי הַיּוֹסֵפִים is due to a common feature in Neodoti, the use of the "plural" suffixes יִךְ and יִךְ- on plural nouns where classical Aramaic grammar leads us to expect forms without a יֹד.
7. See notes to our reconstruction of the original PT Exodus text. The Neofiti Exodus version for Commandments VI, VII, and VIII ("go out - come - come") seems to reflect the original sequence, but there is no evidence from the known Deut texts that such a sequence ever obtained there; for the only two witnesses to the Deut passage (N, Pa) agree in usingםót with all three commandments. Thus, neither of the Neofiti textual traditions is necessarily preferable. Ex 20:15 is corrupted from תנא, however.

8. Note how in the Deut text the spelling with single יד occurs the first time, but subsequently the double יד is maintained. This demonstrates the next, lower level of the application of the principle that we are here trying to establish, i.e. that on the basis of individual pericopes, as well, scribal modification is more apparent near the beginning of the text. Another good example of this principle is illustrated in the Deuteronomist text corresponding to v. 16 below where the root יָשָׁה (잣 in the Bible) is orthographically biblicized the first four times it occurs, but finally, in the last line, the scribe gave up! (See next note.) A similar pattern can frequently be demonstrated in the Hebrew Bible as regards the use of plene vs. defective spellings of multiple occurrences of the same word in close proximity.
9. This is a difficult feature to judge. Although all spellings with šin instead of samekh are undoubtedly influenced by Biblical orthographic practice, the better MSS and the inscriptions regularly write such words as רָתָן and לָשֶׁם with ש. Sokoloff will cite such words under ש. The distribution here, except for the element examined in the previous note, also suggests that רָתָן is the underlying spelling. We do not incorporate this example into our statistics.

10. As it stands, דָּלֶת is ungrammatical, but in fact the daletesh has been maintained from the original text: רַתָּן.

11. Probably an error, though just possibly an original attempt to reflect the difference in the underlying Hebrew text (דַּשא). sokoloff.

12. It is clear from the reconstruction of the PT (see THE TEXTS) that both the Ex and Deut texts of Neofiti have corrupted versions of the justification clauses of the last two Commandments. Deut is generally somewhat the better text, but we have not regularly indicated cases of textual superiority.

13. This word is always spelled without yod in the Genizah texts.

14. The form בֵּית is probably better than בֵּית (beginning of Ex line), but the matter is not certain. In
Geniza ms E, generally orthographically the most "Palestinian," נ"א is used twice as often as is נ' (as is the case in Neofiti in general), but the two forms are equally distributed in the other Genizah texts.