

MORDECHAI'S PERICOPE #92

MORDECHAI 10:1-12

Mordechai 10:1-12

1 Arising from that place, he came in to the borders of Judea beyond the Yarden and again congregations came to him and as his practice was, he instructed [them] in halakha.

2 And, the P'rushim came questioning him, "Is a man allowed to divorce his wife?" attempting to test him. 3 But he answered, saying on the one hand, what did Moshe command? 4 They answered saying, "Moshe permitted a bill of divorce [Heb. Get] to set her free." 5 And Yeshua answered saying, "[He] wrote this mitzvah [for] you [because] of the stubbornness (unyielding) of your heart.

6 But Beresheet [says], "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." [Gen 1:27]. 7-8 "Therefore will a man leave his father and his mother, and will cleave unto his wife: and they will be one flesh" [Gen 3:24]. 9 Then what God has joined together man cannot separate.

10 And in the house, his talmidim asked him again about the [answer he gave]. 11 And I say, if a man divorces a woman [without a Get] and he marry another [woman] he commits adultery against her. 12 and if she divorces her husband [without a Get] and marry another [man] she commits adultery.

Greek

Κακειθεν ἀναστὰς ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας διὰ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου Καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς

2 καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι πειράζοντες αὐτόν 3 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τί ὑμῖν ἐνετείλατο Μωσῆς; 4 οἱ δὲ εἶπον, Μωσῆς ἔπετρέψεν βιβλίον ἀποστασίου γράψαι καὶ ἀπολῦσαι 5 Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην

6 ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς· ὁ Θεός. 7 ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ 8 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν· ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ μία σὰρξ 9 ὁ οὖν ὁ Θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω

10 Καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν 11 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται ἐπ' αὐτήν· 12 καὶ ἂν γυνὴ ἀπολύσῃ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς καὶ γαμηθῇ ἄλλω, μοιχᾶται

DELITZSCH HEBREW TRANSLATIONⁱ

2 וַיִּקָּם מִשָּׁם וַיֵּלֶךְ אֶל־גְּבוּל יְהוּדָה מֵעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן וַיִּקְהֵלוּ עוֹד אֵלָיו הַמּוֹן עִם וַיְלַמְדֵם כַּפֶּעַם בַּפֶּעַם: ^{DLZ Mark 10:}
וַיָּגִשׁוּ אֵלָיו הַפְּרוּשִׁים לְנִסּוֹתוֹ וַיִּשְׁאַלוּהוּ וַיֹּאמְרוּ הֲיֻכַּל אִישׁ לְשַׁלַּח אֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ: ³ וַיַּעַן וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם מִה־צָּוָה
אֶתְכֶם מִשָּׁה: ⁴ וַיֹּאמְרוּ מִשָּׁה הַתִּיר לְכָתֵב סֵפֶר כְּרִיתוֹת וּלְשַׁלַּח: ⁵ וַיַּעַן יֵשׁוּעַ וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם מִפְּנֵי קִשְׁי לְבַבְכֶם
כָּתַב לְכֶם אֶת־הַמִּצְוָה הַזֹּאת: ⁶ אֲבָל מִרְאשִׁית הַבְּרִיאָה זָכַר וַיִּקְבֶּה בְּרָא אֶתֶם אֱלֹהִים: ⁷ עַל־כֵּן יַעֲזֹב־אִישׁ
אֶת־אָבִיו וְאֶת־אִמּוֹ וְדָבַק בְּאִשְׁתּוֹ: ⁸ וְהָיוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם לְבֶשֶׁר אֶחָד וְאִם־כֵּן אִפּוּא אֵינִם עוֹד שְׁנַיִם כִּי אִם־בֶּשֶׁר אֶחָד: ⁹
לְכֵן אֵת אֶשְׁר־חִבֵּר אֱלֹהִים לֹא יִפְרִידֵנוּ אָדָם: ¹⁰ וְהָיוּ בְּבֵית וַיָּשׁוּבוּ תְלִמִּידָיו לְשֵׂאל אֹתוֹ עַל־זֹאת: ¹¹ וַיֹּאמֶר
אֲלֵיהֶם הַמְּשַׁלַּח אֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ וְלִקַּח אַחֶרֶת נָאֵף הוּא עָלֶיהָ: ¹² וְאִשָּׁה כִּי תַעֲזֹב אִישָׁהּ וְהָיְתָה לְאִישׁ אַחֵר נֹאֶפֶת
הִיא:

INDEX

- [Delitzsch Hebrew Translation](#)
- [Introduction](#)
- [Monkeying with the Text](#)
- [Yeshua' Father](#)
- [Yeshua' Hakham](#)
- [Another Possibility](#)
- [Who is Shimon?](#)
- [His practice was...](#)
- [He instructed them](#)
- [What did Moshe command?](#)
- [Beresheet Says](#)
- [In the House](#)
- [Yeshua, Hillel and Shammai](#)
- [In Conclusion](#)
- [Connection to Torah Readings](#)
- [Related Mishnayot](#)
- [Endnotes](#)

INTRODUCTION

The opening of our pericope sees Yeshua moving towards the south and east. We are not told the exact region where these events took place. We can approximate the location with little difficulty. The pericope does not pinpoint the location because this is not the purpose of the pericope. It seems that Yeshua' move is one that will take him to his destination to Yerushalayim.

Monkeying with the Text

Scholars suggest that the opening language is difficult. There are two explanations for these difficulties. Firstly, scholars often neglect, reject or ignore the Hebraisms of the Nazarean Codicil. Secondly, the texts are changed to alter their meaning. However, scholars seem to suggest that this whole section of the text (Mark 10:1-12) has been altered from its original.^a Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer takes three pages of his commentary notes to try to solve this problem.^b All of this is important for the understanding of the whole of our text. If we realize the text has been altered, then it will be easily understood why we have applied certain forensics to the text at hand.

Why are texts of the Nazarean Codicil often altered? I would think that the answer to this question would be obvious. If you do not like or agree with the text, just change it. As any scholar will tell you, this compounds the problem of translation. Because the text is fraught with anomalies, we have applied some hermeneutics that have opened the truth of what Yeshua was saying.

“And again congregations came to him and as his practice was, he instruct [them] in halakha.”

Here I am amazed at what I read. “And again congregations **came to him.**” My observation is that the congregations **seek him out for halakic decisions.** It is evident here the Yeshua is a Hakham. While we do not have all the specifics of Yeshua' Rabbinic education we can piece together parts of the puzzle that will give us a better understanding of his training. While we

^a Vincent Taylor, The Gospel according to Mark, The Greek Text with Introduction Notes, and Indexes, MacMillan & Co, 195 pg 416-421

^b Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Critical & Exegetical Handbook To the Gospels of Mark and Luke, Endinburgh, pgs 157-160

only have bits and pieces of the puzzle, we can actually get a good picture of Yeshua' Torah education.

Yeshua' Father, Yoseph ben Yaakov

The early stages of his life demonstrate Yeshua' remarkable understanding of the Torah. Hakham Shaul^c records that he was able to interact with the Rabbis who sat in the Temple precincts on his visit to Yerushalayim during the Festival of Pesach.^d According to H.L. Strack and Gunter Stemberger, this would have been the age which the education of a young Jewish boy would have finished his elementary studies of Torah.^e If the child was to progress further he must find a Torah Master (Hakham) to teach him.

Abot 5:21 *He would say, (Judah b. Tema) At five to Scripture, ten to Mishnah, thirteen to religious duties, fifteen to Talmud ...*

This would tell us that his father for these years at home most likely taught Yeshua. It was the responsibility of the Father to teach his boys the Torah. If he was not able to teach them himself, he was to provide them with a teacher.

We are at a loss as to who was Yeshua' Hakham. Before, I discuss the possibilities and my thesis on that subject; I would like to discuss briefly the education Yeshua received from his Father Yoseph ben Yaakov. The Nazarean Codicil is, for the most part silent with regard to Yoseph ben Yaakov. We have very little information about him and his character. We conclude that he was a carpenter. Other than, this tidbit of information, a great deal about him unknown. However, we can logically deduce some information. It should be evident that he was most likely a Torah Scholar himself. How can we surmise this was true? We see two of his siblings master the Torah. The first being our Master Yeshua and the second being his brother Yaakov. Due to the rural surroundings of the Galilee, we can conjecture that Yoseph ben Yaakov was responsible for the Torah education of his boys. Yeshua accepts the mantle of Messiah and Yaakov accepts the role of Nasi for the Bet Din in Yerushalayim.^f

Mordechai 1:1. ¶ *The beginning {The choicest or chief part} of the Masorah (Tradition/Oral Law) is Yeshuah the Messiah, the Son of God (i.e. Ben Elohim = the Judge);*

While everyone is looking at Yeshua as the "son of G-d," and trying to explain what that really means, the text plainly tells us that he is the "son of a (the) Judge." Consequently, we have a possibility Yoseph ben Yaakov was actually a Judge. This is easily explained by understanding that each community needed a Bet Din. It would then be possible for Yoseph ben Yaakov to have been a Judge for the local Bet Din. I will not elaborate on the structure of the local

^c That Hakham Shaul was the Hakham behind the text of Luke and Acts see. "Howard Heber Evans, St Paul the Author of the Acts and of the Third Gospel Wyman & Sons.

^d Luke 2:41-51, The Language used by Hakham Shaul suggests that Yeshua was able to enter into a viable halakic debate with the Rabbis. However, this debate seems to change the views of the Rabbis he interacted with. The "amazement" in related to the idea of persuasion. In other words, Yeshua at the age of 12-13 was able to persuade the Rabbis that his views of the Torah were correct.

^e H.L. Strack and Gunter Stemberger, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, Fortress Press pg 9

^f For the idea, the Yaakov is the Nasi of the Bet Din see the Hakham Shaul's Acts of the Talmidim 15:13.

Synagogue here. I will only note that because of his apparent understanding of Torah,^g Yoseph may very well have been the Hakham of his community.

Yeshua' Hakham

Given the above information we can surmise that there is a possibility that Yeshua' Torah teacher was actually Yoseph ben Yaakov, his father. To some this may sound farfetched. However, it is well within the realm of the plausible. Given the possibility that Yeshua and Yaakov were so knowledgeable has to give some merit to Yoseph ben Yaakov regardless of other possibilities. We have several traditions about Yoseph and Miriam (Joseph and Mary). The typical traditional view is that Yoseph is possibly much older than Miriam is. This may be a literal fact, or it may be a hint that Yoseph ben Yaakov was an Elder (Zakan) or a Hakham. I would like to think that this is entirely within the realm of possibility. This may even account for why Yeshua returns home in the story of Hakham Shaul (Luke 2:39ff).

Baba Metzia 2:11 *[If he has to choose between seeking] what he has lost and what his father has lost, his own takes precedence. . . . what he has lost and what his master has lost, his own takes precedence. . . . what his father has lost and what his master has lost, that of his master takes precedence. For his father brought him into this world. But his master, who taught him wisdom, will bring him into the life of the world to come. But if his father is a sage, that of his father takes precedence.*

[If] his father and his master were carrying heavy burdens, he removes that of his master, and afterward removes that of his father.

*[If] his father and his master were taken captive, he ransoms his master, and afterward he ransoms his father. **But if his father is a sage, he ransoms his father, and afterward he ransoms his master.***

Note the final statement of this Mishnah. Here the Mishnah alludes to the possibility of the Father being a Torah Scholar and Hakham.

Another Possibility

Sanhedrin 19b *R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in R. Jonathan's name: He who teaches the son of his neighbour the Torah, Scripture ascribes it to him as if he had begotten him, as it says, Now, these are the generations of Aaron and Moses;^h whilst further on it is written, These are the names of the sons of Aaron: thus teaching thee that Aaron begot and Moses taught them; hence they are called by his name.ⁱ*

We have another thesis that may account for two remarkable details of Yeshua' Rabbinic understanding. Above we note that these congregations seek out Yeshua. One of the greatest Rabbis of the age in which Yeshua lived was Hillel. The details of just how the School of Hillel influenced Yeshua' teachings and education are sketchy at best. However, almost all Scholars who study the Hebraic origins of Christianity will readily admit that Yeshua and Hillel's teachings have a great deal in common. There must be some explanation for this element.

^g I have stated that Yoseph is a Hakham based on the fact that both Yeshua and Yaakov seem to be above standard in their Torah education.

^h Num. III, 1.

ⁱ Under the earliest system of education, children were taught at home by their fathers, until Joshua b. Gamala reorganised the system by setting up schools in every town (B.B. 21a). Although that system was completely in vogue in the days of R. Samuel b. Nahmani, his dictum here might indicate that some virtue was still ascribed to private teaching by the parent or his proxy. It is doubtful whether it would simply refer to an ordinary elementary school teacher.

Hakham Shaul' is faithful to tell us just how strictly Torah observant Yeshua' relatives are.^j When the strictly Torah observant Miriam,^k Yeshua' mother and Yoseph ben Yaakov bring Yeshua to the Temple for Brit Milah, she and Yoseph encounter Shimon waiting in Yerushalayim for something. Most people read those Remez words to mean that Shimon was an old man because he, after blessing Yeshua was ready to depart in peace. I will not conjecture on the Remez of these texts here in our P'shat commentary. I will however, suggest from P'shat and logic that the text say no such thing. The simple text tells us that he was waiting in Yerushalayim for the Comforter of Yisrael.^l What was he waiting for? Messiah's appearing! That Shimon is ready to "depart in peace" has NOTHING to do with his age!

Who is Shimon?

If the dates that we have from scholarly sources were remotely accurate, we would surmise that Shimon ben Hillel had not yet ascended to the Presidency of the Sanhedrin. The event would not happen for another ten to fifteen years. He has only waited in Yerushalayim for the Comforter of Yisrael to appear. Now that he has seen what he has waited for he can "depart (from Yerushalayim) in peace." This tells us that Shimon ben Hillel did NOT live in Yerushalayim.

Hillel's lineage or genealogy is as follows, Hillel the Elder (as he is often referred to) Shimon ben Hillel and then Gamaliel ben Shimon. Hillel's son Shimon succeeded him as the president of the Great Sanhedrin and Gamaliel succeeds his father Shimon in the same manor.^m Other than this, we have little or no knowledge of Shimon. Because Shimon is ready to depart in peace from Yerushalayim in peace after the Brit Milah of Yeshua, I would conjecture that he could have returned home to the land of his Father (Tzfat) where he may have taught Yeshua and Yaakov for that matter. If this were what actually happened, it would account for the strong influence of Hillel's philosophy in the teachings of Yeshua.

Why is there so much silence about this Hakham's life? While it remains an enigma at present, we constantly uncover data that reveals the truth behind the scenes.

Many teachers try to invest Yeshua with a supernatural knowledge that dissociate from him of his true persona. I do not believe that for the first instant any of this is true or necessary.

I have here recorded this material for three reasons. First, we have very little recorded data telling us about Yeshua' Rabbinic education. Second, I would conjecture that it was Shimon ben Hillel who gave Yeshua his Rabbinic education and *semikah* (Rabbinic ordination) for varied reasons. Hillel the Elder is reported to have died in about the year 10 C.E.ⁿ Thirdly, we note in the commentaries of Rashi and Rabbi Yitzchok Magiriso the following.

Rashi: 1 These are the descendants of Moses and Aaron Yet only the sons of Aaron are mentioned. However, they are considered descendants of Moses because he taught them Torah. **This teaches us that**

^j Luke 1:6 Note that Zachariah and Elisheva are righteous/generous through faithful Torah observance. They are so Torah observant that Hakham Shaul describes them as "blameless."

^k Some recent scholarship suggests that Miriam may have had seeds of Chasidim in her lineage.

^l The Greek text reads παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ the Greek word παράκλησιν is better understood when we read Yochanan 14:16 where we are told that another παράκλητος would come. This indicates that Yeshua as Messiah was a παράκλητον comforter.

^m Shabbat 15a

ⁿ Yitzhak Bauxbaum, The Life and Teachings of Hillel, Jason Aaronson Inc 1973 pg45

whoever teaches Torah to the son of his fellow man, Scripture regards it as if he had begotten him - [Sanh. 19b]

On the day that the Lord spoke to Moses they became his descendants, because he taught them what he had learned from the Almighty.

Rabbi Yitzchok Magiriso details in some length a commentary on the positive results of teaching another man's son the Torah.^o

Therefore, I would summarily contend that Shimon ben Hillel could have been Yeshua' Hakham.

His practice was

The Greek vocabulary uses εἰώθει *eiothei*, which I believe, is a reference religious practice in this case. The same word is used in Luke 4:16 where we are told that it was his practice (custom) to attend services of Shabbat. This is not some simple personal practice or custom. It is the religious practice of the Jewish people. Rabbis with rabbinic education were valuable and often sought after to make halakic decisions.

H.L. Strack and Gunter Stemberger tell us that rabbinic sermons from the period were often structured for continued discussion outside the Synagogue in Schoolhouse or educational settings. These lectures may have been the foundational materials for rabbinic academic studies. The Hakham's talmidim would have been able to answer questions relative to their special field of studies.^p The thematic system seemed always to include questions and answers. Here in our present pericope we see the question and answer system in play. The P'rushim ask Yeshua about divorce. This in turn must have been stimulated by Yeshua' discourse on Numbers chapter three and the reciting of genealogies found in that chapter. Some scholars suggest that the ability to ask and answer questions was the mark of a Hakham.^q

Because he is, a Hakham Yeshua is qualified to answer question from the congregations. As a Hakham, he is skilled in the Torah and Oral Torah capable of answering any question within those materials.^r Again, H.L. Strack and Gunter Stemberger record that the *semikah* often made use of the formula. May he teach? He may! May he Judge? He may! May he permit? (Cancel or annul vows, grant divorce) He may!^s

With this insight we can better realize why he was sought after and why the P'rushim wanted to ask him questions.

“He instructed [them] in halakha”

Here the Greek text ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς, should be understood as he “instructed in halakha.” Here Yeshua is not teaching in the classic lecture system. As noted above, the Socratic interaction is vital to the Rabbinic method of instruction. When the talmid is engaged in the discussion, he retains the information much better. This instruction in halakha caused the P'rushim to question him reading divorce.

^o Rabbi Yitzchok Magiriso, The Torah Anthology: Vol. 13 - First Journeys (Me'am Lo'ez Series), Moznaim Pub Corp (June 1, 1983) pg. 46-48

^p H.L. Strack and Gunter Stemberger, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, Fortress Press pg. 244

^q Dr Brad Young, Meet the Rabbis, Hendrickson Publishers, Third Printing 2008 pg 32

^r Ibid pg30 See also b. Ta'anit 10b

^s H.L. Strack and Gunter Stemberger, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, Fortress Press pg. 13 See also Sanhedrin 5a

2 And the P'rushim came questioning him, "Is a man allowed to divorce his wife?" attempting to test him.

What did Moshe Command?

But he answered, saying on the one hand, what did Moshe command? ⁴ They answered saying, "Moshe permitted a bill of divorce [Heb. Get] to set her free." ⁵ And Yeshua answered saying, "[He] wrote this mitzvah [for] you [because] of the stubbornness (unyielding) of your heart.

There are dubious scholars that would like to tell us that Moshe invented some system whereby a man can find fault in a woman and divorce her.^t I will hold my tongue and wonder where these asinine pseudo-scholars come up with this disseminate speech. These Bible thumpers want to say that every word in the Bible is the "Word of G-d." Then they turn around, talk for the other side, and say that Moshe invented divorce. Will someone please give me a break? The same G-d who invented marriage, invented divorce! These obstinate, stupid pseudo-scholars are the same monkeys that love to contort the Biblical text to read for their agendas. Yeshua is NOT saying that Moshe said divorce a woman for just any cause. Nor is he saying that the thought originated in the mind of Moshe. G-d in His infinite wisdom created man with flaws. G-d gave divorce because there are situations that deem it necessary.

I will draw attention to the facts at hand. G-d through Moshe established a system whereby a man and woman could annul their marriage. I will not try to capture any particular scenario here because the possibilities are endless. However, one thing that goes unnoticed is the fact that divorce is permitted, ONLY when a Bet Din grants a bill of divorce (Heb. Get). An entire tractate of the Mishnah is devoted to this subject.^u The materials and details of that divorce are established in a Get, a divorce contract. The argument concerning the bill of divorce (Heb. Get) should be studied at length from the Tractate Gittin in the Mishnah. I will only surmise here that the Get is mandatory for the finalization of the divorce. No Get, no divorce, end of statement. ^v

Beresheet Says

6 But Beresheet [says], "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." [Gen 1:27]. 7-8 "Therefore will a man leave his father and his mother, and will cleave unto his wife: and they will be one flesh" [Gen 3:24].

To reconstruct the monkey business I have resorted to the source from which Yeshua cited. It is evident that Yeshua is quoting from Genesis. Therefore, we have cited directly from that source.

The roots of these sayings are very deep. I believe that the P'rushim understood exactly what Yeshua was saying. However, I am absolutely convinced that contemporary fatuous scholars do NOT! Yeshua is telling us about the ideal marriage. For those who do not know what I am talking about, this marriage everybody wants but nobody has. Marriage partners remain together because they are committed to their relationship. However, life happens. And, the Torah paints life as it IS. The Torah opens with chaos and continued with death and chaos. Our responsibility is to repair that damage. This CANNOT happen if we remain as the fatuous

^t D'varim 24:1ff

^u See Tractates Ketubah, Kiddushin and Gittin

^v I realize that there are mitigating circumstances. These circumstances will need to be carried before a Bet Din for resolution.

pseudo-scholars who are unwilling to budge from their preconceived STUBBORN ways! Those who are stubborn about having their way will not be able to continue a positive relationship with anyone, much less a spouse.

Today we are bombarded with a “have it your way” and “you deserve a break today” mentality. I will not lecture on marriage here. Marriage is work, and those that work at it are able to maintain a good marital relationship. Those who through stubborn selfishness will not concede and are bent on selfishness will end in divorce.

In the House

What is the real meaning of the saying Yeshua has given the P'rushim?

10 And in the house, his talmidim asked him again about the [answer he gave].¹¹ And I say, if a man divorces a woman [without a Get] and he marry another [woman] he commits adultery against her.¹² and if she divorces her husband [without a Get] and marry another [man] she commits adultery.

Here are the real problem verses and here is where we believe that the Monks monkeyed with the text. Some scholars believe that these verses were later added and other simply want to drag other versions of the Gospels^w into the text to explain it. The truth being, none of the other accounts explains what Yeshua said in private to his talmidim. From the entire arguments one thing is certain, the text has been altered in some way. Therefore, forensics must be applied to the text.

I have spent some time above dealing with Yeshua' Rabbinic education and ordination above. My reason for spending this time is to establish the fact the Yeshua was founded in Rabbinic thought. While there were disagreements between the School of Hillel and the School of Shammai, the both agreed on one thing. In my words and the words, I heard on a lecture by His Eminence Rabbi Akiva Tatz, a woman could be liberated from marriage by one of two ways. Either she receives a Get or the husband dies. Or, to put it another way, if you do not get a Get you to not get a divorce. (Pun intended)

Let me be clear. The text HAS been altered! The only way to read this text is to insert the words “**without a Get.**” A man or woman cannot simply call their spouse on the telephone and say “I do not like you anymore, consider yourself divorced.” If a man or woman does not receive a bill of divorce, they are still married. If at that point they are with another man or woman, adultery has occurred.

Yeshua Hillel and Shammai

Eduyyot 1:3 Hillel says, “A full hin [three qabs] of drawn water [poured into a pool lacking forty seahs of suitable water] invalidates an immersion pool. [But a person (student) is liable to say a teaching in the language of his master—] ...*

Again, I have elaborated on Yeshua' Rabbinic education suggesting the Shimon ben Hillel could possibly have been his Hakham.^y Why did I choose Shimon ben Hillel? Because all of the teachings and halakic decisions that Yeshua makes, seem to be in favor of the School of Hillel. It is my understanding that once you pick your Hakham you do NOT have the option to switch

^w I use Gospel here only because it fits the description needed for clarity.

^x I have added the word “Student” for clarification. This thought as quoted in other places makes this thought clear.

^y I am perfectly aware that this is conjecture at this point. However, it is a thesis in process. Eventually I will either prove or disprove this thesis.

sides or pick another Hakham. Therefore, the teaching of Yeshua MUST side with the philosophy of the School of Hillel. This being the case we must realize that Yeshua would have sided with the School of Hillel in his halakic decisions. He would have rejected the stricter philosophy of Shammai and any other School that contradicted the philosophy of Hillel. Yeshua's speech was that of Hillel in accordance with the cited Mishnah above. One other constant that we have in Mishnah and Talmud is the repeated phrase, R. So and So son of So and So said in the name of R. So and So. This well applies to what Yeshua would have said in our present pericope. Yeshua would have repeated the words of his Hakham in a similar manner.

In Conclusion

This pericope is fraught with textual anomalies. Therefore, the forensics we have applied brought us to the conclusions we have cited above.

Yeshua and the School of Hillel argued against legalism, as did Hakham Shaul. Therefore, we cannot believe that Yeshua gave a legalistic answer to the question at hand, which would have agreed with the School of Shammai. We draw the conclusion that, divorce is fixed by the Bet Din and a Get.

Please understand that these issues are VERY problematic. My advice to anyone with marital difficulties is to seek out a Hakham and try to the best of their abilities resolve whatever issues they may have.

Berakhot 47a *R. Judah the son of R. Samuel b. Shilath said in the name of Rab: The guests may not eat anything until the one who breaks bread has tasted. R. Safra sat and stated: The statement was, 'May not taste. What difference does it make [in practice]? — [It teaches that] one must repeat the exact words of his teacher.*

Bekhorot 5a *He replied to him: [The words] [They were not sanctified] [of R. Johanan] mean, there was no need for the firstlings to be sanctified [in the wilderness].⁶ If so, then it is identical with our version [of the dispute between R. Johanan and Resh Lakish]? [It teaches us that a man must cite a ruling in the exact language of his master.^z*

Kiddushin 49b *What is meant by Torah? The exegesis [Midrash] of the Torah. Now, that is only if he says to her [On condition that I am] tinyana [learned]: but if he says to her, I am a tanna, he must have learned law, Sifra, Sifre and Tosefta.¹ On condition that I am a disciple [talmid], we do not say, such as Simeon b. Azzai and Simeon b. Zoma,² but one who when asked a single question on his studies in any place can answer it,³ even in the Tractate Kallah.⁴ On condition that I am a Sage, we do not say, like the Sages of Jabneh⁵ or like R. Akiba and his companions, but one who can be asked a matter of wisdom⁶ in any place and he can answer it. On condition that I am mighty, we do not say, [he must be] like Abner the son of Ner⁷ and Joab son of Zeruiah,⁸ but as long as he is feared by his companions on account of his strength. On condition that I am wealthy, we do not say, like R. Eleazar b. Harsom and R. Eleazar b. Azariah,⁹ but as long as he is honoured by his fellow citizens on account of his wealth. On condition that I am righteous, even if he is absolutely wicked, she is betrothed, for he may have meditated repentance in his thoughts. On condition that I am wicked, even if he is completely righteous, she is betrothed, for he may have meditated idolatry in his mind.*

^z Although there may be no actual difference in the ruling.

Mordechai 92 - Mark 10:1-12

Numbers 3:1. *These are the descendants of Moses and Aaron on the day that the Lord spoke to Moses at Mount Sinai.*

Numbers 3:1 Rashi *These are the descendants of Moses and Aaron Yet only the sons of Aaron are mentioned. However, they are considered descendants of Moses because he taught them Torah. This teaches us that whoever teaches Torah to the son of his fellow man. Scripture regards it as if he had begotten him -[Sanh. 19b]*

Eruvin 54b *Our Rabbis learned: What was the procedure of the instruction in the oral law? Moses learned from the mouth of the Omnipotent. Then Aaron entered and Moses taught him his lesson. Aaron then moved aside and sat down on Moses left. Thereupon Aaron's sons entered and Moses taught them their lesson. His sons then moved aside, Eleazar taking his seat on Moses' right and Ithamar on Aaron's left. R. Judah stated: Aaron was always on Moses right. Thereupon the elders entered and Moses taught them their lesson, and when the elders moved aside all the people entered and Moses taught them their lesson. It thus followed that Aaron heard the lesson^{aa} four times, his sons heard it three times, the elders twice and all the people once. At this stage Moses departed and Aaron taught them his lesson. Then Aaron departed and his sons taught them their lesson. His sons then departed and the elders taught them their lesson. It thus followed that everybody heard the lesson four times. From here R. Eliezer inferred: It is a man's duty to teach his pupil [his lesson] four times. For this is arrived at a minori ad majus: Aaron who learned from Moses who had it from the Omnipotent had to learn his lesson four times^{bb} how much more so an ordinary pupil who learns from an ordinary teacher.*

”D (B’Siyata D’Shamaya)
Aramaic: With the help of Heaven
Adon Dr. Eliyahu ben Avraham

CONNECTIONS TO TORAH READINGS

Torah Seder

Mordechai is connected to the Torah Seder through the idea of the right of G-d to redeem the firstborn. Yeshua as a firstborn instructs in halakha those congregations that sought him out. Numbers 3:12 and Mordechai 10:1

Likewise, because Numbers 3 is permeated with genealogical data (Numbers 10:1), Yeshua's teaching on divorce is relevant. The house of Levi was counted by the house of the father. Without a bill of divorce, it would be impossible to determine authenticity of pedigree.

Ashlamatah

Yeshua as a Hakham teaches and instructs halakha in the congregations across the Yarden. As a Hakham his voice is the voice of one of G-d's agents (Shalakim). Mikha tells us the voice of the calls out to the City and the wisdom of the Torah comes to those who sees your Name

^{aa} Lit., they were found in the hand of.

^{bb} Lit., thus.

(authority) they listen and harken to the staff of the One (G-d) Who appointed it. Mordechai 10:1 and Mikha 6:9 Also Yeshua leads the people as a flock Mikha 7:14

Tehillim

The boor is a man of stubbornness and stupidity. (Tehillim 92:7) Yeshua tells us that the stubborn or hard-headed will end in divorce. Brown Driver Briggs defines the boor as to be stupid, dull-hearted, and unreceptive. See H1197 compared to Greek G4641 **σκληροκαρδία**, as a stubborn attitude toward changing one's behavior *hardness of heart, stubbornness, insensitivity*^{cc}

The boor should be compared to the Golem of Abot 5:7 which contrasts the boor, clod Golem with the Hakham.

RELATED MISHNAYOT

For related Mishnayot see above cited Mishnayot and Tractate Ketubah, Kiddushin and Gittin

Endnotes

ⁱ The Delitzsch Hebrew New Testament was translated from the Elzevir 1624 Received Greek Text by the 19th century German scholar Franz Julius Delitzsch (1813 to 1890), co-author of the well-known multi-volume Keil and Delitzsch Commentary of the Old Testament. Delitzsch's New Testament was first published in 1877. Since the first publication his work has been republished with only minor revisions, and it has maintained its literal style for the Hebrew of Delitzsch's day. This was before Modern Hebrew was created, and consequently the Hebrew leans heavily on the Tanakh for vocabulary, words and expressions. Students of the Tanakh should therefore be able to understand Delitzsch's translation without much difficulty.

The current text was entered by Ewan MacLeod and proofread against a printed copy of Delitzsch's work. As Delitzsch's work goes back to 1877, it is now in the public domain.

^{cc} Friberg, Timothy, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller. Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament. Baker's Greek New Testament Library. Trafford Publishing, 2005 Pg. 351