

MORDECHAI 105B

MORDECHAI 12:35-37A

BESB

Mar 12:35 And [while] Yeshua was teaching in the Bet Mikdash (Temple), he responded [to Ye'lammedenu] (May our teacher teach us – concerning the Messenger of the covenant)]^a by saying, How do the Soferim say that Messiah is the son of David?

Mar 12:36 For David himself said by the Ruach HaKodesh, "This is the word of the LORD to my master: Sit at My right hand, until I make your enemies your footstool." (MT-Psa. 110:1; LXX-Psa. 109:1)

Mar 12:37 Then David calls himself "master" (i.e. Messiah) [because the LORD said to him sit at My right hand.]

GREEK TEXT

³⁵ Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ Πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς υἱὸς ἐστὶν Δαβὶδ;

³⁶ αὐτὸς γὰρ Δαβὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου

³⁷ αὐτὸς οὖν Δαβὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον

DELITZSCH HEBREW TRANSLATION

וַיִּשְׁוֶע מְלִמֵּד בַּמִּקְדָּשׁ וַיֵּעַן וַיֹּאמֶר אֵיךְ יֹאמְרוּ הַסּוֹפְרִים כִּי הַמְּשִׁיחַ בֶּן־דָּוִד הוּא: ³⁶ הֲלֹא דָּוִד אָמַר בְּרוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ נְאוֹם יְהוָה לְאָדְנִי שֵׁב לִימִינִי עַד־אֲשִׁית אֵיבֶיךָ הָדָם לְרִגְלֶיךָ: ³⁷ הִנֵּה־דָּוִד בְּעֶצְמוֹ קָרָא־לוֹ אָדוֹן

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Mordechai 12:35-37a	1
Delitzsch Hebrew Translation	1
INTRODUCTION	2
The Messenger	2
Will the Real Sofer please Stand	3
David by the Ruach HaKodesh	5
How do the Soferim say that Messiah is the son of David?	6
Sit at my Right Hand	6
Kurie and Lord	7
Conclusion	8
Connections to Torah readings	9
Torah Seder	9
Tehillim	9
Ashlamatah	10
Mitzvot	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Questions or Reflection	10

^a In the NT ἀποκρίνομαι occurs only in the mid. in the sense "to answer" etc. What is answered may be a request or a speech, not just a question. The aor. in the NT is 7 times mid. ἀπεκρινάμην and 195 times pass. ἀπεκρίθην. Theological dictionary of the New Testament. 1964-c1976. Vols. 5-9 edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Vol. 10 compiled by Ronald Pitkin. (G. Kittel, G. W. Bromiley & G. Friedrich, Ed.) (electronic ed.) (3:944). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

INTRODUCTION

AND [WHILE] YESHUA WAS TEACHING IN THE BET MIKDASH (TEMPLE), HE RESPONDED [TO YE'LAMMEDENU] (MAY OUR TEACHER TEACH US – CONCERNING THE MESSENGER OF THE COVENANT)]

While the translation to Mordechai always bears my name, I am certain everyone knows that this is actually a joint effort between His Eminence Rabbi Dr. Yoseph ben Haggai and me. In our conversation to thresh out this week's translation of Mordechai, we noted several things. The opening remarks of the pericope demanded some sort of explanatory translation due to the textual anomalies. These anomalies may be for a number of reasons, such as tampering with the text ect. Many so-called scholars would like to make verse 34 of our previous pericope some sort of end to ANY further questions made by Soferim, Tz'dukim and P'rushim. The P'shat explanation to verse 34 is that no one asked him (Yeshua) any further questions AT THAT TIME. This leads us to the present pericope, where someone undoubtedly presents some sort of question to Yeshua. His Eminence has aptly pointed this out in his commentary. Therefore, I will not try to recapture or echo His thoughts. I will try to offer my insights into this complex pericope.

The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament and Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature (BDAG) have presented definitions of the Greek word ἀποκρίνομαι *apokrinomai* that suggest that Yeshua responded or replied to a query. Because the previous pericope was initiated by a session of teaching using the Socratic Method, I have deduced that the Hebrew concept of “Yelammedenu Rabbenu (May our master teach us)” was the most appropriate translation. However, I do not wish to take full credit for the full translation. The insight presented by His Eminence bridged the gap missing concerning the material of the Yelammedenu, “the Messenger of the Covenant” which I lacked.

THE MESSENGER

This week's Torah Seder, Psalm and Ashlamatot build on the “covenant of peace” that HaShem made with Phin'chas.^a In this week's Targum of B'Midbar, the author notes the connection between Phin'chas and the “messenger of the covenant.”

B'Midbar 25:12 Swearing by My Name, I say to him, Behold, I decree to him My covenant of peace, **and will make him an angel of the covenant**, that he may ever live, to announce the Redemption at the end of the days.^b

The Ashlamatah of Malachi repeatedly mentions the “messenger.”^c The Targum reports that Phin'chas is the “messenger of the covenant” with special message. That message is “to announce the **redemption at the end of the days.**”

Prayerfully we should not have to elaborate on the understanding that the idea of an “angel” (Heb. Malak) is that of a “Messenger.” This is true of both Hebrew and Greek.

Therefore, the connection made to the Torah Seder, the Ashlamatah's “messenger” and the Yelammedenu is accurate and solid.

While Rashi fails to make this connection, His Eminence Rabbi Yitzchaq Magiriso, like the Targum notices the connection of the “messenger of the covenant” in our Torah Seder. Consequently, between the Targum and His Eminence Yitzchaq Magiriso we have a solid connection between Phin'chas and the “messenger of

^a Cf. B'Midbar 25:12 —Mal2:5

^b Targum Pseudo Jonathan (B'Midbar 25:12)

^c Cf. 2:7; 3:1

the covenant.”^a His Eminence Yitzchaq Magiriso connects Phin’chas with Eliyahu haNavi. This is noteworthy since our special Ashlamatah is 1 Kings 18:46-19:21

WILL THE REAL SOFER PLEASE STAND

HOW DO THE SOFERIM SAY THAT MESSIAH IS THE SON OF DAVID?

I would first draw attention to the Socratic method of teaching illuminated by the text. I have already mentioned this briefly in the last pericope, so I will not try to elaborate here in any detail. What is of interest, that Yeshua begins his teaching with interrogation. “How do the soferim say that Messiah is the son of David?” Hakham Tsefet builds on the materials of last week’s pericope by his reference to the idea of hermeneutic. We might reword our translation a bit to reflect the hermeneutic of the soferim. How is it that the soferim have hermeneutically deduced that Messiah is the Son of David (Mashiach ben David)? This demonstrates that Yeshua was...

1. Familiar with Rabbinic exegesis and hermeneutic
2. Yeshua used Scribal hermeneutics to determine teaching subjects and materials
3. Yeshua’s teaching style is mirrored in the Mishnaic interrogative^b
4. Yeshua’s teachings followed the Triennial Torah reading cycle
5. Yeshua, through hermeneutic applications understood and taught the Messianic role

To bridge the gap between last week’s soferim and the soferim of the present pericope we need to look at a statement made by Marie Sabin. Marie Sabin notes that Yeshua acted as a sofer himself.

By interweaving these three parts, Mark shows Jesus speaking as a scribe himself, that is, as a teacher of Scripture. Mark shows Jesus using a method typical of Jewish Scripture scholars and Wisdom teachers of the first century. The effect of this interweaving is to suggest that love of God implies love of neighbor and that both together are what constitute true worship.^c

Again, this comment is based on last week’s pericope. Nevertheless, this comment has applicable information for our present discussion. Yeshua followed these “scribal hermeneutics” consistent with the hermeneutics of Hillel. Why is it important to know that Yeshua followed the hermeneutics of the School of Hillel? Before we can accurately decode the message of Yeshua, we must be able to understand his exegetical method of hermeneutic.

Sabin also notes that Yeshua is intent on presenting questions.^d This Mishnaic system engages the student rather than using the homily method of teachings. The Greek term συζητούντων *suzeteo* used for “drash” in last week’s pericope is redundantly use by Hakham Tsefet. Hakham Tsefet and his sofer Mordechai use this nomenclature six times^e throughout Mordechai’s Mesorah. The only other writer in the Nazarean

^a Magiriso, Rabbi Yitzchok, The Torah Anthology: Vol. 14 - First Journeys (Me'am Lo'ez Series), p. 226

^b m. Ber.1:1 From what time may they recite the Shema in the evening? m. Ber. 1:2 From what time do they recite the Shema in the morning?

^c Sabin, Marie Noonan, The Gospel According to Mark, Liturgical Press 2006 p.110

^d Ibid. p 112

^e Cf. Mark 1:27, 11; 9:10, 14, 16; 12:28

Codicil to use the Greek συζητούντων *suzeteo* is Hakham Shaul who uses this nomenclature four times in 1st and 2nd Lukas^a.

Mordechai 9:10 And they kept (guarded and held) his saying to themselves, and they discussed (*drash*) with one another the rising from the dead would mean. ¹¹ And they inquired (*drash*) of Him, saying, Why do the scribes (*most likely the "scribes of the Prushim"*)^b say it is necessary for Eliyahu come first?

This demonstrates that Yeshua did not simply "teaching" his talmidim. Yeshua was making his talmidim "stand."^c The sofer of last week's pericope proved to be a Hakham from the School of Hillel. The soferim of Pericope 63 (Mordechai 9:10ff) may well be soferim from the Hillelite school as well. This week's soferim are most likely also from the same school. One further bit of logic would indicate that the soferim spoken about by Yeshua were from the School of Hillel is that his teachings, hermeneutics and ministry all aligned themselves with the School of Hillel. It would therefore, be most reasonable to note that Yeshua would cite the soferim of the School he attended unless he was making a polemic.

Making such connections and drawing on the Severah of logical hermeneutic also creates a problem. The problem is that the characters that play on the stage of the first century are limited. I will not try to trace all the characters on the stage in this present commentary. What the Nazarean Codicil does not do is give the name of our last week's sofer. Exactly why we do not know, again, it may be that Hakham Tsefet did not feel the need to illuminate his identity for us, or there may have been some tampering with the text. Regardless, it is noteworthy to mention that Rabban Gamaliel ben Shimon (grandson to Hillel) was a key player in the time of Yeshua. Christianity developed many legends about characters that played on the stage of the first century. According to Emil Schurer, Christianity developed many traditions concerning Rabban Gamaliel.^d

A German monk of the twelfth century calls the Talmud a "commentary of Gamaliel's on the Old Testament," Gamaliel is, here plainly the representative of the old Jewish scribes^e

The comment making Rabban Gamaliel the "representatives of the soferim" is germane to our discussion. That Rabban Gamaliel "represents the soferim" makes it possible that he was the Sofer of our last pericope. Several factors would attribute to the plausibility of this thesis.

1. Gamaliel would have spent a considerable amount of time at the Temple^f (the location of Yeshua's present teachings) because of his position as Nasi^g
2. Latter intervention on behalf of Yeshua's talmidim by Gamaliel could show familiarity between Yeshua and Gamaliel^h

^a Cf. Luke 22:23, 24:15; Acts 6:9; 9:29

^b Some versions read ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς

^c Cf. m. Abot 1:1

^d Schürer, "Geschichte," ii. 365, note- 47 (Note taken from the Jewish Encyclopedia

<http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=51&letter=G&search=Gamaliel%20I>)

^e Bacher, "Die Jüdische Bibelexegese," in Winter and Wünsche, "Jüdische Literatur," ii. 294 also from

<http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=51&letter=G&search=Gamaliel%20I>

^f I will also note here that we are not given a specific location in the Temple for this discussion. Some scholars have tried to say that Yeshua was in the place where the Sanhedrin sat, while other try to say that he was in the court of the gentiles. While any of these locations are possible, we are not given this information. This is most likely because it is not germane to the discussion.

^g b. Shab. 15a Hillel and Simeon [his son], Gamaliel and Simeon wielded their Patriarchate during one hundred years of the Temple's existence.

^h Cf. Second Lukas (Acts) 5:34

3. The similarity of ministerial style and content makes it plausible to believe that this may have been an encounter with Gamaliel^a
4. Like Yeshua, Gamaliel was of Davidic lineage^b
5. Mishnah Berakhot tells us that Rabban Gamaliel, the direct descendant of Hillel and Hakham Shaul's teacher-mentor, was not able to suspend the yoke of the Kingdom for even one hour.^c
6. Gamaliel's legacy was that of establishing honor for the house (School) of Hillel^d

Therefore, the "scribal hermeneutic" deducing that David was the progenitor to Messiah is most likely from the School of Hillel. This teaching may have been a contemporary thought. There is a further piece of logic deduced in conjunction with this point. As noted above Hillel, Gamaliel and their School touted talmidim of Davidic decent. Therefore, it would have been a subject of interest and relevance for that school of thought. Consequently, I would surmise that the "soferim" who deduced that David was the progenitor of Messiah were from the School of Hillel.

DAVID BY THE RUACH HAKODESH

Firstly, let us understand the nature of the comment. The comment establishes the Prophetic character and qualities of David HaMelek. Secondly, it establishes the Prophetic character of the Psalms. The Psalms were not just "Songs." His Eminence Rabbi Dr Yoseph ben Haggai has pointed out that the Psalms were "Davidic Midrash." However, the Psalms also qualify as Davidic prophecy.

The cited Psalm^e demonstrates that David received the words of this Psalm in a prophetic manner.

"THIS IS THE WORD OF THE LORD TO MY MASTER"...

We must be clear in understanding what Yeshua and Hakham Tsefet are saying here. Confusion is the result of poor hermeneutic and sluggish understanding. The previous pericope, which we have retreated to above, will also elucidate what is being said here, clearing up any possible confusion.

HaShem spoke to David! HaShem (The LORD) spoke to my master (David)! The theme of the previous pericope was the Shema, "*Hear, Israel. The LORD our God is one LORD.*" Yeshua is **NOT** claiming to be HaShem! What is Yeshua trying to say? In the advent that some sluggard scholar gets anything else confused, Yeshua is NOT claiming that David is HaShem either! NOR is David claiming deity for himself! Yeshua is demonstrating that David received by prophetic unction the understanding that Messiah would stem from his ancestry.

^a The Dictionary of the Ancient Rabbis attributes the origin of the rabbinic maxim "tikkun ha-olam" or the betterment and repair of the world to Rabban Gamaliel. This tells us that Gamaliel and Yeshua's message was the same. Hence, we would expect Gamaliel to show leniency to Yeshua's talmidim. Concisely, Yeshua's message concerning the Governance of G-d bears a great deal of similarity to Gamaliel's tikkun ha-olam. See Git. iv. 1—3, See also Neusner, Jacob, Dictionary of the Ancient Rabbis, Selections from the Jewish Encyclopedia, Hendrickson Publishers 2003 p.151 This Dictionary is based on entries from the Jewish Encyclopedia.

^b Because Hillel the Elder is of Davidic lineage we must note that this same lineage is passed to his grandson Rabban Gamaliel See Yitzhak Bauxbaum, The Life and Teachings of Hillel, Jason Aaronson Inc. 1973 p.9, n.1 p.303

^c m. Berakot 2:2,5 This statement is strong evidence that Gamaliel and Yeshua may have had an encounter in Pericope 105a (Mordechai 12:28-34). The central message of the Shema is that of Unifying G-d and accepting the Yoke of the Kingdom.

^d Neusner, Jacob, Dictionary of the Ancient Rabbis, Selections from the Jewish Encyclopedia, Hendrickson Publishers 2003 p. 152

^e Cf. MT-Psa. 110:1; LXX-Psa. 109:1

HOW DO THE SOFERIM SAY THAT MESSIAH IS THE SON OF DAVID?

The Soferim from the School of Hillel have concluded that Messiah is the Son of David or “Ben David.” Here Yeshua refers to Mashiach ben David rather than Mashiach ben Yoseph. The concept of “Mashiach ben Yoseph” in and of itself is an indicator that Mashiach ben David would come later.

Beresheet 30:24 And she called his name Joseph;⁸ and said, The LORD shall add to me another son.

By implication, the title “Mashiach ben Yoseph” means that another Messiah will come, or I might say that another aspect of Messiah would be added in the future. This additional aspect of Messiah was labeled “Mashiach ben David.” Here I do not want to mislead the reader. The concept of Messiah is “partially” developed out of the Davidic prototype. I use “partially” here because the first mention of Messiah according to rabbinic thought is Beresheet 1:2. Christian scholars note that Beresheet 3:15 is a mention of Messiah. Subsequently, the Messianic concept is a collage of images from the Tanakh.

Marie Sabin notes that Yeshua juxtaposes Psalm 110 against 2Samuel 7:12b—14, 16^a

2Sa 7:12b—14, 16 I will set up your seed after you, who shall come out of your bowels. And I will make his kingdom sure.¹³ He shall build a house for My name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever.¹⁴ I will be his Father, and he shall be My son. If he commits iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the sons of men.

¹⁶ And your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before you. Your throne shall be established forever.

The question presented by Yeshua needs to be restated for clarity. How is David able to say that he would be the progenitor of the Messiah? In addition, how are the soferim able to deduce that Messiah would be the son of David?

David makes this deduction by the Ruach HaKodesh. The Soferim of the School of Hillel are able to deduce hermeneutically from the above-cited Psalm that HaShem was speaking to David prophetically of the Davidic Messiah. The 2nd Samuel passage is only one of a number of passages that could be cited to substantiate that the Messiah would be the son of David.

SIT AT MY RIGHT HAND

The Hebrew word “y’shv” means, “to sit.” However, this is only an elementary definition of the word. The Hebrew word “Yeshiva” also means, “to sit.” Its uses developed into the idea of study, which in turn became the academy and court sessions. It is noteworthy to examine the similarity between the “sitting” of the Judges in the Sanhedrin and the “sittings” of the Hakhamim in the Yeshivot or academies. Their office (the Sanhedrin) is educational as well as judicial.

Rashi translated the opening words of this Psalm “wait at my right hand.” The rationale behind Rashi’s translation is that of waiting for HaShem to resolve difficulties for David who was already anointed King of Yisrael while Shaul (Saul) was still the acting king. Rashi’s translation indicates static waiting and patience. The difficulty with this is that the verb “y’shv” is active. This creates a question. How does one “sit” actively? Because the Hebrew word “Yeshiva” also means, “to sit” we can logically understand that HaShem is telling David, who is already anointed (Mashiach) King needs to study and prepare for the day when he

⁸ Joseph: that is, Adding

^a Sabin, Marie Noonan, The Gospel According to Mark, Liturgical Press 2006 p.111

will ascend the throne. Exactly when, where and how David fell in love with the Torah is unknown. Likewise, when, where and how David attended Yeshiva is unknown. Nonetheless, Psalm 119 makes it evident that David had an overwhelming love for and knowledge of the Torah.

Psalm 122:1 A Song of Ascents, of David. I was glad when they said to me, "Let us go to the house of the LORD."

David possessed an overwhelming desire to be in the "House of the LORD." Contextually we must understand that David is not referring to the Mishkan or subsequent Temple. How can I make such a deduction?

Psalm 122:2 Our feet are standing **Within your gates, O Jerusalem,** ³ Jerusalem, that is built As a city that is compact together; ⁴ To which the tribes go up, even the tribes of the LORD-- An ordinance for Israel-- To give thanks to the name of the LORD. ⁵ For their thrones were set (*y'shv*) for judgment, the thrones of the house of David.

David never saw the physical Temple stand in Yerushalayim. Therefore, David had to have something else in mind. Here I would venture that David loved to go to the Esnoga^a to study Torah. David's waiting was not static "waiting" for G-d to make his enemies his footstool. David's "waiting" was "siting," dynamic, active study of Torah preparing to be King of Yisrael.

His Eminence Rabbi Dr Yoseph ben Haggai cites a Targum to Psalm 110 that sheds light on this thought.

The LORD *spoke by his decree to give me the dominion in exchange for sitting in study of Torah.* "Wait at my right hand until I make your enemies a prop for your feet." ANOTHER TARGUM: The LORD *said in his decree to appoint me ruler over Israel, but the LORD said to me, "Wait for Saul of the tribe of Benjamin to pass away from the world; and afterwards you will inherit the kingship, and I will make your enemies a prop for your feet."*

What did David study while he was in Yeshiva? Perhaps the question is better stated by asking it a bit differently. What would a soon to be King of Yisrael study in Yeshiva? David would most likely have been interested in the halahkot, which applied to Kings and kingly rule over Yisrael. His deep love for Torah demonstrated that he wanted to be the best King he could be. Consequently, David proved to be the best King Yisrael ever knew. This earned David the title "Messiah" (anointed King).

Why was Gamaliel titled "Doctor of Law"?

^{2nd} Lukas (Act) 5:34 But one of the P'rushim named Gamaliel, a Doctor of the Law, honored by all the people, stood up in the Council (Sanhedrin) and gave orders to put the men (Yeshua's talmidim) outside for a short time.

Psalm 122:5 For their thrones were set (*y'shv*) for judgment, the thrones of the house of David.

I would imagine that Gamaliel was particularly interested in Torah "Law" for more than one reason.

1. He was the Nasi of the Sanhedrin or soon to be the Nasi
2. As Nasi he would be especially concerned with legal issues in the Torah
3. In short the Nasi was a type of King over Yisrael
4. He was a decedent of David and may have qualified as Messiah

KURIE AND LORD

THEN DAVID CALLS HIMSELF "MASTER" (I.E. MESSIAH)

^a Synagogue

The Nazarean Codicil uses the appellation “Rabbi” only in a direct address.^a Consequently, the Nazarean Codicil frequently uses the Greek word *Kurie* for Rabbi.

Matthew 8:1 When Yeshua came down from the mountain, large congregations followed him. ² And a leper came to him and bowed down before him, and said, "Lord, (κύριε, *kurie*) if You are willing, You can make me clean."

Here we see that Matityahu uses the Greek word κύριε, *kurie* for Rabbi. While we readily understand that, the appellation “Rabbi” began in the period just after the Nazarean Codicil^b we understand that before that time it would have been common nomenclature to call someone who mastered the skills of Torah education (κύριε, *kurie* (master). My thoughts here are not to prove or suggest that David HaMelek was a “Rabbi.” Rather I would suggest that before a King of Yisrael, including David, could be fully qualified to be “Master” I.e. Messiah of Yisrael, he needed proper Torah education. In this matter, David HaMelek becomes the prototypical King (Messiah). In some cases, this is evident. However, in other cases it is evident that certain Kings had disqualified themselves by following after idolatry.

Applying this to history would mean that as Messiah, Yeshua had to be properly educated in Torah. While I am certain that the above-cited Targum of Psalms 110 makes it clear that David studied Torah, we are not certain that ALL the Kings of Yisrael followed the same protocol. Historical evidence shows that there were positive Kings of Yisrael that followed the ways of the Torah and that others did not. As noted above we see that David was the prototype for Messiah. In a manner of speaking Messiah was to be the “King of Yisrael.” However, the system that both Yeshua and Gamaliel promoted was a new monarchy. The monarchy that they forwarded was one of the Bet Din rather than the monarchy of a single Monarch. By the time, the Temple^c was destroyed, Yisrael possessed Judicial Courts^d throughout Eretz Yisrael and major Jewish centers of diaspora.^e The new “King” (Messiah) of Yisrael was the Bet Din. The Messianic mission and character had taken the form of the Bet Din. While the Bet Din is said to have existed from the inception of Yisrael as a nation, the Bet Din assumes a multi-faceted role in the absence of a king and Temple. Furthermore, Yisrael’s move into diaspora would make Yisrael the Messiah to the world by its priestly and kingly presentation of the Torah. The acceptance of the Yoke of the Kingdom (Governance of G-d) in our last pericope demonstrates that Yeshua and Gamaliel were preparing Yisrael for the coming diaspora.

Today we “suffer the loss” of the Bet Mikdash as the result of defunct monarchy and priesthood. Yet, Yisrael has become a king and priest to the world in a new way. Hakham Shaul tells us that to the Jews the “oracles of G-d were committed.^f Through these “oracles”, we have the obligation to build a new Bet Mikdash. That Bet Mikdash is one of lively stones, alive and spiritual.^g

CONCLUSION

Perhaps I have exposed my neck to my critics. I have purported some ideas that may not fit the norm. Or, maybe I have captured what Hakham Tsefet was trying to say. With the coming of Tammuz the 17th we will begin a period of defamation and libel. Therefore, I would expect some sort of reprise for my thoughts. Reading the typical scholarly squawk on this pericope is actually rather nauseating. I am actually reminded

^a Schurer, Emil, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ Second Division Volume 1, Hendrickson Publishers. 2003 p. 316

^b Because the word ῥαββί is found in the Nazarean Codicil we must deduce that the appellation began to be used at or near the time of the Nazarean Codicil’s beings written down. Neither Hillel nor Shammai are referred to as ῥαββί. Nevertheless, the terms use must have begun about the time of the writing of the Nazarean Codicil.

^c 70 C.E.

^d Bet Din

^e Cohen, Boaz, Everyman’s Talmud, Schocken Books 1949 p. 298

^f Cf. Romans 3:2

^g 1 Pe. 2:5

of the “Pac Man” game of the seventies where some little blob with its mouth opening and closing runs around a maze being chased by another blob with a bigger mouth wishing to consume him. The consensus is that Yeshua is trying to claim deity or superiority to David. I find nothing of the sort in the present pericope. While there may be an argument elsewhere, I find no such argument in this pericope. In the wake of contiguity, we have an answer to the question at hand. The repeated thought for the past several weeks is poor exegesis and hermeneutic. Last week’s pericope demonstrated a sofer, possibly and plausibly Gamaliel with marvelous hermeneutic skill. This week Yeshua plays on the skill of the soferim’s hermeneutic that Messiah would be from the Davidic lineage. I have deduced that the mentioned soferim were most likely from the School of Hillel. I do not find this thought outrageous. It all seems perfectly logical given the close association between the Davidic lineage of Hillel and his family tree. By citing Psalms 110:1 Yeshua is trying to tell us that the time of Messiah ben David is for a different time. This can also be derived from the present Torah Seder where the “Messenger of the Covenant” will announce the Redemption at the end of days. The Targum of Psalm 110:1 translates that passage in several different ways to illuminate the full range of thoughts captured by the verse. The Hebrew verb “y’shv” is translated “wait” and “sit.” However, neither sitting nor waiting are understood to be static. I opt for the translation of “sit”, rather than wait because the word sit means dynamic study. Nevertheless, the idea of dynamic waiting can mean being occupied with study while you wait.

Exactly when the soferim concluded that Messiah would be the son of David is a matter of further research. Yeshua’s question reveals that David himself derived the matter succinctly. However, contrary to many opinions, Yeshua was not making himself David’s master as translations and commentaries have it. Yeshua’s comments reveal the need for those in positions of leadership to engage in diligent study Torah while we sit waiting for our enemies to be made our footstool. The million dollar question is now who are our enemies? The wise and discerning will know.

Amen ve amen

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

CONNECTIONS TO TORAH READINGS

TORAH SEDER

Phin’chas is the “messenger of the covenant” as seen from the Targum Pseudo Yonatan. (B’Midbar 25:12) However, Phin’chas is also a prototypical David and Messiah. His anointing into the office of the Priesthood makes his a “Messiah.” His zealous persona is later seen in the person of David who was zealous for the Lord.

TEHILLIM

The Psalmist seems to play on the sovereignty of G-d. This can be seen as we look at the depicted character of David from Hakham Tsefet’s pericope. David waits (sits in Yeshiva) while the Lord brings his enemies to an end.

ASHLAMATAH

Malachi's words seem to capture the tone of all the Torah readings for the week including the theme for Hakham Tsefet's Yelammedenu.

SPECIAL ASHLAMATAH

The Special Ashlamatah shows Eliyahu ready to pass the mantle of Prophecy on to Elisha. In the same way, we see that David (like Elisha) waited for the mantle of Kingship to pass to him. Likewise, Elisha is a talmid (son) of Eliyahu. This waiting and sitting are a part of Yeshua's lesson in the present pericope.

QUESTIONS OR REFLECTION

1. What teaching method did Yeshua use in this pericope?
2. Does this method confirm or deny Yeshua used a Mishnaic style teaching method?
3. Why is it important to know that Yeshua followed the hermeneutics of the School of Hillel?
4. If Yeshua is NOT trying to claim that he is HaShem, what is Yeshua trying to say?
5. How is David able to say that he would be the progenitor of the Messiah?
6. How does one "sit" actively?
7. What did David study while he was in Yeshiva?
8. Why was Gamaliel titled "Doctor of Law"?