

---

# TSEFET'S PERICOPE #76

---

זֶה קֹרְבַן אַהֲרֹן

“Zeh Qorban Aharon”

“This is the offering of Aaron”

Vayiqra (Leviticus) 6:12 – 7:38

My Translation

Greek

## 1 Peter 3:1-7

<sup>1</sup> Similarly, women (*wives*) should be subject to their own man (*Husband*), in order that the (*husband*) disobedient to the word (*Torah*) will by the woman's (*wife's*) manner of living (*halachic observance*) will turn back (the husband) without direct intervention, discussion or argument <sup>2</sup> as they observe the purity of your reverential<sup>a</sup> conduct (*halachic observance*), <sup>3</sup> who without extraneous braiding of hair and gold necklaces or adornment of ornamental clothing. <sup>4</sup> But *let* the soul's hidden true scrupulous person (*character*) which is humble in its steadfast<sup>b</sup> (in peace –*Shalom*) spirit, which is precious before G-d. <sup>5</sup> For in this manner holy women of the past hoped in G-d adorning themselves, submitting to their own husbands. (*adorning themselves in subordination to their husbands*) <sup>6</sup> As Sarah obeyed Avraham's words habitually calling him “my lord:” you become her daughters in appropriate conduct also without fear or intimidation. <sup>7</sup> Likewise, you men (*Husbands*) living with (them) through knowledge according to the weakness of their vessel, assigning honor to the wife as a fellow heir of gracious (*chesed*) life, in order not to be impeded in your prayers (personal convictions).

**1 Peter 3:1** Ὁμοίως γυναῖκες ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ἵνα εἴ τις ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς ἄνευ λόγου κερδηθήσονται <sup>2</sup> ἐποπτεύσαντες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνῆν ἀναστροφήν ὑμῶν <sup>3</sup> ὣν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἕξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος <sup>4</sup> ἀλλ ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ ἡσυχίου καὶ πραέως πνεύματος ὁ ἔστιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ πολυτελής <sup>5</sup> οὕτως γάρ ποτε καὶ αἱ ἅγαι γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεὸν ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτάς ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν <sup>6</sup> ὡς Σάρρα ὑπήκουεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα ἧς ἐγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαθοποιούσαι καὶ μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν <sup>7</sup> Οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως συνοικοῦντες κατὰ γνώσιν ὡς ἀσθενεστέρω σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν ὡς καὶ συγκληρονόμοι χάριτος ζωῆς εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν

---

<sup>a</sup> TDNT 9:198ff

<sup>b</sup> The Greek word ἡσυχίος (*hēsukhios*) seems to imply someone who is seated (steadfast) in tranquility and quiet. See TDNT 2:362ff

---

## DELITZSCH HEBREW TRANSLATION

---

DLZ **1 Peter 3:1** וְכֵן אֲתַנְּה הַנְּשִׁים הַכֹּנְעֵנָה לְפָנָי בְּעֲלִיכֶן לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר יִקְנֶוּ בְּאֵין־אִמֶּר וּדְבָרִים עַל־יְדֵי מַעֲשֵׂי הַנְּשִׁים מִי שְׂאִינָם שְׂמַעִים לְדַבֵּר: <sup>2</sup> בְּרֵאוֹתֶם כִּי תִצְנַעְנָה לְכַת בִּירְאָה: <sup>3</sup> וּפְאָרְכֶן אֱלֹהֵי מִבְּחוּץ בְּמַחְלָפוֹת שַׁעַר וְעַדִּי זָהָב וּלְבִישֵׁת מַחְלָצוֹת: <sup>4</sup> כִּי אִם־הָאָדָם הַצָּפוֹן פְּנִימָה בְרוּחַ עֲנוּה וְהִשְׁקִט אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִכְלֶה הוּא יִקָּר בְּעֵינֵי אֱלֹהִים: <sup>5</sup> כִּי כֵן הִתְקַשְׁטוּ לְפָנִים גַּם־הַנְּשִׁים הַקְּדוֹשׁוֹת הַמִּיַּחְלוֹת לְאֱלֹהִים בְּהַכְנָעַן לְפָנָי בְּעֲלִיָּהֶן: <sup>6</sup> כְּשֶׁרָה אֲשֶׁר שָׁמְעָה בְּקוֹל אֲבִרְהָם וַתִּקְרָא־לוֹ אָדוֹן אֲשֶׁר אֲתָן הָיִיתָ לָּהּ לְבָנוֹת בַּעֲשׂוֹתְכֶן הַטוֹב וְלֹא תִירָאנָה מִפְּחָד: <sup>7</sup> וְכֵן אֲתֵם הָאֲנָשִׁים שְׁבוּ עִמָּהֶן בְּתַבּוּנָה כִּי־כָלִי רָפָה הָאֲשֶׁה וַתְּנוּ־לָהּ כְּבוֹד כִּי גַם־לָהֶן יִשְׁחַלֵּק בְּנַחֲלַת מַתְּנַת הַחַיִּים פְּרֻתְפִּלְאוֹ מִתְּפִלוֹתֵיכֶם:

---

## SHALOM BAYIT

---

Hakham Tsefet makes a flawless transition between themes. The theme of subordination continues with a new emphasis. I find Hakham Tsefet's tack and diplomacy remarkable. Scholars often paint a crude picture of Hakham Tsefet. Most scholars suggest Hakham Tsefet was impetuous, verbose and impulsive. The present pericope paints a picture of a true Hakham. Hakham Tsefet's appeal is first to the woman of the house. However, his appeal is not isolated to the woman or wife. He equally appeals to the man and husband. Both parties are equally responsible for Shalom Bayit. I have chosen the phrase "Shalom Bayit" for specific reasons. I believe that this perfectly fits our present pericope. Shalom is a powerful Hebrew word that encompasses much more than just the idea of "peace." The root to this word speaks volumes. I will focus only on the thought of wholeness. Before a home can be, "whole" all parties must be equally devoted to the welfare of the house and relationships within that house. There must be mutual devotion and respect. No house can survive disrespect and totalitarian oppression. Hakham Tsefet has more than alluded to this in his previous lectures. He has brought the illustration home so to speak. The house and family are the nucleus of the entire community. If the house is not functioning according to the plan of G-d, the community will also be deficient.

---

## THE HOUSE OF G-D AND THE HOME

---

Continuing the thought from above we must come to realize that model of the House of G-d. The Beit HaMikdash was a place that "housed" the Shekinah. Order and structure permeated the Beit HaMikdash. The Shekinah is sensitive to order and structure. The Jewish life is one of order. We use words like Siddur and Seder to describe daily and ritualistic life. When the order of the family is disrupted not all the sacrifices in the world can set things straight. However, when the Home is permeated with Shalom, sacrifice is no longer requisite. When the home fails society collapses. When the home fails, the Beit HaMikdash is no longer capable of solving problems between G-d and man. When the dining room table is no longer an altar the altar of the Temple is pointless. When the hidden chambers of the home are polluted, it is as if we have polluted the altars of G-d. Nothing in the Temple services could reconcile the home when shalom was not present. The range of things that cause a home to be dysfunctional also affects the relationship the community has with G-d. When shalom has left the house there is no comfort. When there is no shalom in the house it will leave us only with mourning the loss of a

real house. We might take this analogy to a higher level in discussing the relationship between G-d and man. When we have failed in our faithful obedience, there is nothing but mourning. The House of G-d is pointless and of no affect. Likewise, no altars and sacrifices will solve the attitudes of the heart. When we lose sight of the fact that, we are a part of something bigger than we are we are destroying the Temple. That Temple may be the Holy House of G-d, our personal being and or our home. Then periods of mourning often cause introspection. This introspection will cause us to evaluate our errors. When we have begun to see the true source of a problem hope and comfort will begin to infuse our being. I believe this is an evidence for contending that the present pericope makes a transition from mourning to comfort. Destruction continues in ignorance. As long as we are ignorant of a problem, we will be unable to solve it.

---

### “ZEH QORBAN AHARON”

---

Vayikra 6:13 This is the offering of Aaron and his sons, which they shall offer to the Lord, on the day when [one of them] is anointed:

It seems so apropos that our Torah Seder begins with the korban of Aaron and his sons. By extension, I suggest that this is not merely Aaron and his sons. I would like to draw attention to the fact that I believe that this is the “House of Aaron.”

The house of Aaron must be “anointed.” These “anointed ones” were responsible for the ceremonial aspects of the House of G-d. Aaron and his House are given the ceremonial leadership of G-d’s house.

In the first century, the Pharisees began to emulate the Aaronic model. This emulation was by Divine design. I say this because I believe that G-d wanted to pattern EVERY house after this model. This emulation was very much requisite for the coming Diaspora.

---

### THE CONNECTION BETWEEN OUR PERICOPE AND THE SEASON.

---

I could not help but notice that the household servants of the Torah Seder are Aaron and his sons (house). I believe that Hakham Tsefet looks at the Temple and sees the home. The woman of the home works at the altar (the dining table ect). I use this analogy for several reasons. Primarily, I believe that Hakham Tsefet wants to bridge the gap between his previous theme of servitude and the transition mourning from to comfort.

---

### WHEN IS A PRIEST NOT A PRIEST?

---

When the home is in order, the role model is the Husband. The Husband serves as a Ner Tamid. His light should never go out. However, we should ask the question of what happens when he fails in his priestly duties? When the man (husband) fails in his Priestly duties, he has neglected the Word of the Torah.<sup>c</sup> When the Priest fails in his Priestly duties someone else must take up the slack so to speak. In the household, this is the G-d-fearing woman (wife). The Temple MUST continue the daily Tamid offerings. This is the proper order. When the Husband rejects or

---

<sup>c</sup> Similarly, women (*wives*) should be subject to their own man (Husband), in order that the (*husband*) disobedient to the word (*Torah*) will by the woman’s (*wife’s*) manner of living (halachic observance) will turn back (the husband) without direct intervention, discussion or argument

abandons Torah observance, he needs a model to look at. In all reality, this is NOT the proper order. Nevertheless, tikkun often used unorthodox methods.

### Ὅμοίως

ὁμοίως (*homoiōs*) is a connection to the themes of the previous pericopes. Hakham appeals to willing subjection as opposed to forced subjugation. The Greek text here tells us that subjugation must be willingly. The vocabulary is that of exhortation rather than an explicit command. Why does Hakham Tsefet first appeal to the woman of the house? Firstly, we must look at the context in which Hakham Tsefet makes his appeal. His appeal to the woman is due to a dysfunctional husband. Any woman on the planet, in her right mind, will have no problem submitting to a godly man. However, it will take the appeal of a Hakham to beseech the woman who lives with a dysfunctional husband to remain in that situation. Hakham Tsefet appeals to the woman as the Priestess of the home. The loss of the Temple must be restored. A woman of true shalom and hope is never afraid.

### τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ

This is a general principle to all wives. However, Hakham Tsefet addresses those with special problems. We must make a further analogy here. The vocabulary is that of someone who is NOT persuaded rather than someone who is faithless. It is possible that the Husband is intentionally disobedient or perhaps not intentional yet disobedient in some halachic practice. The unpersuaded Husband seems to be nonobservant in some particular matter of halachic observance rather than being wholly non-believing. The vocabulary is difficult. It may be that the husband in question is not convinced in some area of halacha. This point may have the greater weight. If a woman came to believe in Yeshua as Messiah, she might also realize that he taught halachic practices that were not acceptable in other schools or regions. Her faithfulness to the Mesorah of the Master would eventually convince her husband who may not be convinced that this is acceptable halacha.

However, the lexical information seems to imply that the Husband is disobedient in some halachic area rather than the above-proposed theory.

### ἀπειθέω 1aor. ἠπειθήσα;

- (1) in relation to God *disobey, be disobedient* (RO 11.30);
- (2) of the most severe form of disobedience,<sup>d</sup>

Primary use seems to be that of disobedience and refusal to conform. The contumacious husband will eventually be convinced by the fearful (G-d fearing) wife. The conquering woman never speaks a word. This is because actions speak louder than words. The silent faithfulness of the woman is of great advantage or profit.

### φόβος (*phobos*)

On occasion, this word, which typically means “fear”, is translated to mean “a god.” In Sparta there was a war temple to φόβος. *Phobos* was Ares or the Roman Mars. However, the idea being presented by Hakham Tsefet is that of “reverential awe.” Why does Hakham Tsefet use such vocabulary? The “woman of Honor” is a woman who conducts herself like Messiah. This analogy is drawn from the previous pericope. The woman in mention is one of great conviction and moral integrity.

---

<sup>d</sup> Friberg, Timothy, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller. Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament. Trafford Publishing, 2005

---

## DO YOU SEE WHAT I SEE?

---

V. 2 as they observe the purity of your reverential<sup>e</sup> conduct (*halachic observance*),

Hakham Tsefet tells us in a few words that the greater apparel is that of a genuine heart. Extraneous beauty has great physical appeal. This has its place in the marital life. Of this, there can be no doubt. It seems apparent that both the husband and wife should dress respectfully. By this, I mean that the husband should dress in an appropriate manner appearing as some beer-bellied deficient excuse for a man. However, the comments are initially directed to the woman. The woman should dress appropriately and respectfully.

When I read these words, I remembered the story of the brazen mirrors that the women gave for the construction of the copper laver. These women dressed so that the men who returned from excessive labor in Pharaoh's brickyard would appear appealing to their husbands. There is nothing wrong with the idea of pleasant appearance. However, contemporary society has lost all touch with the idea of real beauty. This applies on multiple levels. There is a difference between appeal and provocative. No place in scripture asks a woman to dress in such a manner. The true beauty of the woman is internal. However, today's society has lost all sight of this real beauty.

Hakham Tsefet lauds reverential awe. He further illustrates his point by drawing attention to one of the greatest women in Biblical history, Sarah. The Biblical narrative leaves us with a number of cases to make us realize that Sarah must have been extraordinarily beautiful. She was pursued on more than one occasion by men, which Avraham met. However, Hakham Tsefet mentions not her extraordinary beauty. His mention is her internal qualities of genuine hope and trust in G-d.

Who can find such a woman? Such a woman is a REAL gem.

The genuine beauty of the "soul's hidden true scrupulous person (character) which is humble in its steadfast" is precious before G-d. If this is the case of G-d's appreciation for a woman, we contend that it should be the husband's as well.

The Amplified Bible usually goes to extraordinary lengths to capture the idea of any given verse. The following is a quote from that Bible.

<sup>4</sup> But let it be the inward adorning {and} beauty of the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible {and} **unfading charm** of a gentle and peaceful spirit, which [is not anxious or wrought up, but] is very precious in the sight of God.

Some women have an **unfading charm**. I say this from experience. One legendary singer sang about a "Mystery Girl." This **unfading charm** is not found in dress, coercion or tyranny. The man who possesses such a gift realizes it. Not only does he realize it he treasures it.

Please do not misunderstand the appropriate need for apposite dress and adornment. Today if ever we need women who know how to dress in the apposite manner. Sarah did undoubtedly adorn herself. However, that beauty was so apropos that corrupt men wanted it. This is because like today, men and women are starving for the genuine.

---

<sup>e</sup> TDNT 9:198ff

---

## DAUGHTERS OF SARAH

---

As a man, I can think of no title greater than “Ben Avraham.” Hakham Shaul reassures us that all who are “of faith” are the children of Avraham.<sup>f</sup> I would think that the same should be true of “Bat Sarah.” By expressing the qualities of Sarah, a woman is titled “Bat Sarah.” What a great honor. Sarah’s hope reached supernatural heights. It reached beyond the realm of the natural and material and rested in the arms of G-d. Again, I think that Amplified Bible labors diligently to capture the whole idea of Hakham Tsefet’s words.

<sup>6</sup> It was thus that Sarah obeyed Abraham [following his guidance and acknowledging his headship over her by] calling him lord (master, leader, authority). And you are now her true daughters if you do right and let nothing terrify you [not giving way to hysterical fears or letting anxieties unnerve you].

Just as Avraham is, the “father” of the “faithful” Sarah is the mother of the obedient.

---

## TERROR AND INTIMIDATION

---

Here there seems to be a bit of play on words. Sarah’s obedient faithfulness is contrasted with intimidation. This word is only used one other time in the Biblical text. The Proverbs of Solomon suggest that fear and terror can be immediate.<sup>g</sup> However, Hakham Tsefet uses the word *πτόησις* (*ptoēsis*) in the sense of intimidation. We might read the text to understand that Avraham did not intimidate Sarah. Such is the case with a truly G-dly woman. She never needs to feel intimidated by her husband. Nor should her husband ever give rise to such an idea.

---

## THE DUTY OF THE G-DLY MAN

---

**Likewise, you men (*Husbands*) living with (them) through knowledge according to the weakness of their vessel, assigning honor to the wife as a fellow heir of gracious (*chesed*) life, in order not to be impeded in your prayers (personal convictions).**

I have wavered back and forth between men and women throughout the commentary. This is because Hakham Tsefet does not present his information as if only to subordinate women. He appropriately addresses men as well as the women.

The contemporary husband is often given to selfishness and personal gratification. I do not categorize all husbands into this category. Men of genuine G-dliness are perfectly aware of the needs and character of their wives. It may be that some men walk with blinders on. This is really a form of dishonesty. This honesty is being dishonest with one’s self. The real man is not afraid to admit truth and face these issues head on. However, he need not conduct himself as a “bully” when he does so. Actually, it seems apropos to carry these issues to G-d in prayer. This does not mean that we do not face them.

I translate this verse to mean that the husband is aware of the wife’s weakness. Only then can he be aware of her needs and be of genuine help as a husband. It was the woman (wife) who was aware of the husband’s weaknesses that won him by her scrupulous conduct. Now the shoe is on the other foot. Men are more extraneous than women are. They are less emotional

---

<sup>f</sup> Galatians 3:17 and Romans 4:12

<sup>g</sup> Pro3:25

and often fail to notice frailties that are suited to women. Here Hakham Tsefet is aware of these characteristics and admonishes men to pay honest attention to the wife's needs and frailties. These are the qualities of a good husband.

---

## CONCLUSION

---

I will say in conclusion that the oppression of any gender leads to an impoverished society. The genuine beauty of a gender is in their love and faithfulness to G-d. If a person can find a mate that genuinely loves G-d they should cherish that person (male or female) with all of their being. They should honor that person and seek to cultivate Shalom Bayit with all of their being.

**#136** (Sh) The precept of the Kohen Gadol's Daily meal offering.

<b>Mitzvah</b>	<b>Torah Address</b>	<b>Oral Torah</b>
<b>P40</b>	Vayikra 6:13	Yoma 1:5

**Special Notes:** For the high priest to offer a meal offering daily

**#137** (Sh) The Kohen Gadol's Daily meal offering should not be eaten.

<b>Mitzvah</b>	<b>Torah Address</b>	<b>Oral Torah</b>
<b>N138</b>	Vayikra 6:16	Yoma 1:5

**Special Notes:** For the high priest to offer a meal offering daily

**P64** The procedure for the sin offering, as it is written "this is the law of the sin-offering" (Leviticus 6,18).

**P65** The procedure for the guilt offering, as it is written "this is the law of the guilt-offering" (Leviticus 7,1).

**P66** The procedure for the peace offering, as it is written "and this is the law of the sacrifice of peace-offerings" (Leviticus 7,11).

**P90** To burn the flesh of a sacrifice that has become unclean, as it is written "and the flesh that toucheth any unclean thing" (Leviticus 7,19).

**P91** To burn the flesh of a sacrifice that has been left over, as it is written "but that which remaineth of the flesh of the sacrifice on the third day shall be burnt with fire" (Leviticus 7,17).

**N129** That a person who is unclean shall not eat consecrated food, as it is written "but the soul that eateth of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, that pertain unto the LORD, having his uncleanness upon him, shall be cut off" (Leviticus 7,20).

**N130** Not to eat consecrated foods that have become unclean, as it is written "and the flesh that toucheth any unclean thing shall not be eaten" (Leviticus 7,19).

**N132** Not to eat the abomination of intended delay, as it is written "neither shall it be imputed unto him that offereth it; it shall be an abhorred thing, and the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity" (Leviticus 7,18); it is punished by excision.

**N139** Not to eat the flesh of sin offerings brought inside, as it is written "and no sin-offering, whereof any of the blood is brought . . . shall be eaten" (Leviticus 6,23).

**N184** Not to eat blood, as it is written "and ye shall eat no manner of blood" (Leviticus 3,17; Leviticus 7,26).

**N185** Not to eat suet, as it is written "ye shall eat no fat, of ox, or sheep, or goat" (Leviticus 7,23).