

MORDECHAI 113—115A

MORDECHAI 14:22—25

BESB	GREEK TEXT
Mar 14:22 And Yeshua received bread (the afikomen) and said Ha-Motsi and broke it, and he gave to them and said, receive this, it is [analogous of] my [Jewish] body [politic].	²² Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν Λάβετε φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου
Mar 14:23 And he (Yeshua) said grace (Birkat Hamazon), after they ate (the meal), and taking the cup (the 3 rd one of redemption), after saying Ha-Gefen and gave to them, and they all drank out of it.	²³ καὶ λαβῶν τὸ ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες
Mar 14:24 And he said to them, This is [analogous of] my life (the blood) of the [renewal of the] Covenant, which is poured out for the many (the Gentiles).	²⁴ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν
Mar 14:25 Amen ve amen I say to you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day that I drink it (or, I am refreshed/strengthened) anew in the kingdom (governance) of G-d [through the Hakhamim and Bate Din as opposed to human kings].	²⁵ ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ

DELITZSCH HEBREW TRANSLATION

¹⁷ וַיְהִי בְעֶרְבַּ וַיְבֵא עִם־שְׁנַיִם הַעֲשָׂרָה: ¹⁸ וַיִּסְבוּ וַיֹּאכְלוּ וַיֹּאמְרוּ יִשׁוּעַ אָמֵן אָמַר אֲנִי לָכֶם אֶחָד מִכֶּם יִמְסְרֵנִי וְהוּא אֵיךְ אֵתִי: ¹⁹ וַיִּחַלּוּ לְהִתְעַצֵּב וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו זֶה אַחֵר זֶה הַכִּי אֲנִי הוּא: ²⁰ וַיַּעַן וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלֵיהֶם אֶחָד מִשְׁנַיִם הַעֲשָׂרָה הוּא הַטַּבֵּל עִמִּי בִקְעָרָה: ²¹ הֲזֵן בְּזֶה־הָאָדָם הַלֵּךְ יֵלֵךְ כְּכַתּוּב עָלָיו אָבֵל אוֹי לְאִישׁ הוּא אֲשֶׁר עַל־יָדוֹ יִמְסַר בְּזֶה־הָאָדָם טוֹב לְאִישׁ הוּא שְׁלֵא נוֹלָד:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Mordechai 14:22—25	1
Delitzsch Hebrew Translation	1
INTRODUCTION	2
Order —14:22—23	2
Covenant — 14:24	4
Ritual Hermeneutics	4
The Third Cup	6
The Gentile Equation	7
Amen ve Amen — 14:25	8
Conclusion	8
Connections to Torah readings	8
Torah Seder	8
Tehillim	8
Ashlamatah	9
Special Ashlamatah — I Hoshea	9
SPECIAL ASHLAMATAH — II Micah	9
Mitzvot Implied by the Nazarean Codicil	9



INTRODUCTION

How do we know that we are reading the readings associated with Shabbat Shuba?

How does the present pericope represent a sermon preached on Shabbat Shuba?

ORDER

14:22—23

While scholars quibble over Second Temple period practices and the order of the Pesach Seder, they miss the whole point of our pericope. Likewise, most scholar's want to institute the "Eucharist" without a understanding of the true order and meaning of the Pesach Seder and the Greek word order of our present text. The present context of the Pesach Seder relates to the events, which follow the Pesach Meal called "Shulchan Aruch" or "the Prepared Table." Hakham Tsefet does not elaborate on the details of the Seder or those events, which took place in the earlier parts of the Seder. Why?

Life is structured by the Torah! Hakham Tsefet demonstrates a life that follows the structure of the Torah and related mitzvot. The basis of the "Ten Words" as found in the Torah Seder lays the foundation for the order of Jewish life. Hakham Tsefet relates to the Torah Seder's ordered life by use of the Pesach Seder's order to teach us about the structured life mandated through the "Ten Words."

The key essential to Jewish life is order. The title of our Prayer book is Siddur, "order." The title of the Passover ceremony is "Seder," "Order." The "order" of the Seder is very ancient. We have the basic structure listed in the Mishnah. Scholars such as Mary Healy tell us that the central element of the Passover, the lamb is missing in the Markan texts.^a This is because we are at the point in the Seder where the "lamb" has been consumed. At this juncture of the Pesach Seder, the focus is not on a lamb. The present focus is on the "bread," the "cup" and Hallel.

Because the Greek copyists (MONKeys) had no understanding of Pesach and Ritual Hermeneutics they butchered the texts not realizing and not caring that the Seder follows a very specific order.

This verse is one of the more problematic verses in the Nazarean Codicil. Entire denominations and theologies have been built on the Greek word εὐχαριστήσια *eucharistio* {yoo-khar-is-teh'-o}. Likewise, I must say that I struggled with this word for several minutes as I went through the possible translations and lexical data. I have recently suggested that Hakham Shaul's first letter to the Corinthians is based on the hagaddah or, a Nazarean Hagaddah in and of itself. Likewise I recently stated that Christians base the "eucharist" on a place in the Pesach Seder, which brings the bread, matzah — afikomen before the third cup of wine. My understanding that Yeshua "blessed" εὐλογέω *eulogeo* {yoo-log-eh'-o} in verse 22 was not problematic. To "bless" meant that Yeshua simply said "Ha-Motsi," or that he blessed G-d for bring the bread from the earth (matzah in this case). However, the Greek word εὐχαριστήσια *eucharistio* {yoo-khar-is-teh'-o} does not fit with the idea that Yeshua "blessed" saying 'Ha-Gefen," blessing G-d for the fruit of the vine.

^a Healy, M. (2008). *The Gospel of Mark* (Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, p. 285

New King James

22 And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, blessed and broke it, and gave it to them and said, "Take, eat; this is My body."

23 Then He took the cup, and when He had given thanks He gave it to them, and they all drank from it. (Mar 14:22-23 NKJ)

My Translation

Mar 14:22 And Yeshua received bread (the afikomen) and said Ha-Motsi and broke it, and he gave to them and said, receive this, it is [analogous of] my [Jewish] body [politic].

Mar 14:23 And he (Yeshua) said grace (Birkat Hamazon), after they ate (the meal), and taking the cup (the 3rd one of redemption), after saying Ha-Gefen and gave to them, and they all drank out of it.

Firstly, we must understand that the “sentence”^a as found in the Greek Nazarean Codicil often covers “trans-verse”^b parameters. In other words, we look to a “verse” believing this to be a concise statement wrapped up in the constraints of a “verse.” This is not true of Greek or Hebrew. We must keep in mind that the “chapter and verse” invention is very late in the history of scripture. Therefore, sometimes, as is our present case things get a bit jumbled up. Moreover, in order to set them strait, for them to be intelligible in another language they need a bit of unscrambling. This is because the Greek verb and sentence structure is not exact as it is in English or Hebrew. Greek writers often place words at the beginning of a sentence to stress importance. Here the cup is central to the thought of verse 23. Therefore, I have worded the sentence so that the ideas all flow together. This reveals exactly what happened in the scene about which we are reading. The structure now flows in the true order of the Pesach Seder and order of occurrence.

Yeshua says the Birkat Ha-Mazon^c, because they have just finished the meal. The next step in the Seder is to eat the afikomen, a piece of matzah, which was hidden and returned. Scholars have hesitated to suggest that the practice of the afikomen existed during Second Temple Times.^d The language of the Markan text strongly suggests that the afikomen was in fact a part of Yeshua’ Pesach Seder. However, for further clarification, rather than translating λαβῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον *labōn arton* as Yeshua “took” the bread; the text should read that Yeshua received the bread (afikomen) after it had been “redeemed” or “returned.”^e

After eating the “afikomen,” the Birkat Ha-Mazon is recited. The εὐχαριστήσα *eucharisteo* {yoo-khar-is-teh'-o} of our verse is the Birkat Ha-Mazon or the “Grace after the Meal.”

^a In the readings for [Sivan 23, 5771](#) His Eminence writes about chapters and verses. The following is an excerpt on verses. To read about chapters and verses in both the Old and New Testament please follow the [Sivan 23, 5771](#) link.

“The first person to divide New Testament chapters into verses was Italian Dominican biblical scholar Santi Pagnini (1470–1541 CE), but his system was never widely adopted. Robert Estienne created an alternate numbering in his 1551 edition of the Greek New Testament. The first English New Testament to use the verse divisions was a 1557 translation by William Whittingham (c. 1524-1579 CE). The first Bible in English to use both chapters and verses was the Geneva Bible published shortly afterwards in 1560. These verse divisions soon gained acceptance as a standard way to notate verses, and have since been used in nearly all English Bibles.”

^b I use the phrase “trans-verse” only as a means of describing how we think of verses in the contemporary setting. What appears to be “trans-verse” is not actually trans-verse at all.

^c Grace after meals

^d There is a great deal of controversy and opposition to the belief that we can know the “Order” of the Pesach Seder from the first century. While I do believe it is a difficult task, I believe that the present materials attest to the Order and practice of the Pesach Seder much as it stands in contemporary Hagaddot.

^e Thematically I believe this is a connection to Shabbat Shuba. The Afikomen was hidden from sight and has now returned to conclude the Passover Meal.

John Bowman does not see the initiation of the εὐχαριστήσα *eucharisteo* {yoo-khar-is-teh'-o} in Mark.^a John Bowman does not see the initiation of the εὐχαριστήσα *eucharisteo* {yoo-khar-is-teh'-o} in Mark because he understands the process of “Ritual Hermeneutic.”^b

COVENANT

14:24

I wish only to comment here superficially. We MUST realize that the central theme of Covenant has its foundation in the Torah as a structured way of life. To violate the Torah brings about an abrogation of Covenantal standards. This does NOT excommunicate the person who has violated the Torah Standard. This is because the idea of Teshubah is built into the fabric of the Torah. Therefore, doctrines that suggest that G-d needed a “human sacrifice” to propitiate for sin are a fallacy.

Mark 14:24 And he said to them, This is *analogous* of my life (the blood) of the *renewal* of the Covenant, which is poured out for the many (the Gentiles).

In a review of the textual variants I found that the dominant portion of texts do NOT use the word **καινός** *kainos* {kahee-nos'} (new). My research discovered the oldest texts such as the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus omit the word **καινός** *kainos* {kahee-nos'} (new).^c On the other hand, to put it differently the latter texts of the Greek “New Testament” have been amended to add the idea of a “New Covenant.” Therefore, there is no such thing as a “New Covenant.” If we realize that everything Yeshua did was a renewal of the Torah, we will better understand his relationship to covenantal terminology. The Nazarean Codicil must be understood as Yeshua’s Mesorah, establishment of a system of Oral Elucidation of the Torah from the Messianic perspective.^d

RITUAL HERMENEUTICS

Ritual hermeneutic is a method of interpreting ritual through hermeneutic or defining the meaning of a ritual through a process of hermeneutic. This process is very precarious when we confine the materials within the infrastructure of P’shat. This is because “ritual” is often associated with festival or more esoteric practices such as ceremony or prayer. Therefore, “ritual hermeneutic” would be better suited for higher hermeneutic levels. However, because we have a “ritual practice” in P’shat materials we must interpret from P’shat. We might say that there is a “P’shat Ritual Hermeneutic” as opposed to the other levels of PRDS hermeneutic levels. The highest and most capable hermeneutic for interpreting ritual, festival and prayer processes would be Sod. However, because our present material is P’shat we must strip the ritual of all of it Sod apparel. Therefore, we must deduce that “ritual hermeneutic” is subject to the applicable PRDS hermeneutic. In other words, when we see a ritual within a particular text we must determine the level of hermeneutic and therein confine the ritual to the specific level of hermeneutic. Ritual Hermeneutic interprets the ritual within the confines of the materials in which we find it. Our present ritual, the Pesach Seder must be confined to the level

^a Bowman, J. (1965). *The Gospel of Mark, The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah*. Leiden E.J. Brill. p. 266

^b I will elaborate on “Ritual Hermeneutics” below. While the phrase does exist among limited scholars in some measure, I have adopted the phrase to explain how we must interpret rituals such as the Pesach Seder within the varied levels of Rabbinic Hermeneutics (PRDS). “Ritual Hermeneutics” helps us realize how the Rabbis of antiquity (Tannaim) transformed the rituals of the Temple into practical daily life through the Siddur, Machzorim and other halakhic materials such as Mishneh Torah.

^c John R. Donahue S.J., D. J. (2002). *Sacra Pagina, The Gospel of Mark* (Vol. Volume 2). (S. Danial J. Harrington, Ed.) Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press. p. 396

^d I tread lightly here, trying to choose my words carefully. My choice of “Messianic” does not mean “Messianic” in the modern sense and use of the word. “Messianic” means that we look at the Torah as Yeshua would have or, looking at the Torah through the eyes of Messiah.

of P'shat because we are reading P'shat materials. Therefore, we must use the “Ritual Hermeneutics” of P'shat to decode Pesach.

Accordingly, when certain ritual actions are rehearsed ceremonially, we often move from the P'shat to the Midrashic interpretation of those actions without ever noticing that we have made a transition. Consequently, we must caution about making Midrashic, Remez or Sod interpretations of P'shat materials. Having established a “ritual hermeneutic” for P'shat, we can now look at the text through the vision of P'shat rather than jumping the fence of our corral.

Adela Collins tells us that verse 22 is terse lacking any idea of transubstantiation at this event.^a Her suggestion is that the verse has other meanings.^b Nevertheless, she correctly notices that there can be NO transubstantiation from the present materials. Again, the Ritual hermeneutic within P'shat demands a simple explanation, NOT Spiritual elucidation. Those who have read Spiritual data into this text have violated P'shat ritual hermeneutics.

Therefore, the “body” must be a literal body NOT an esoteric explanation of the physical body of Yeshua. The physical body of Yeshua cannot be “broken” and interpreted as an esoteric transubstantiation or metaphor of the establishment of a NEW “Congregation” or ceremony! The Congregation of Yeshua always has been Yisrael and will always be Yisrael.^c The Gentile who will join the congregation of Yisrael has always been subject to Torah observance and ALWAYS will. Consequently, there is not an establishment of a NEW COVENANT, New Congregation or Ceremony, which abrogates the previous. This is nothing more than the lie of REPLACEMENT Theology invented through anti-Semitism.

The broken body of Messiah must be understood as the people of G-d, the Bne Yisrael as they have been scattered throughout the world in the present diaspora. Hakham Tsefet, through ingenious means and use of the theme of **Shabbat Shuba** has told us, through the mechanism of P'shat ritual hermeneutics that the people of Yisrael must be dispersed throughout the world, only to “Return” at the appointed time to drink the cup of the kingdom, Governance of G-d. Furthermore, our Ritual Hermeneutic reveals that there is no institution of the εὐχαριστήσια *eucharistea* {yoo-khar-is-teh'-o} in Mark. By definition the establishment of the εὐχαριστήσια *eucharistea* {yoo-khar-is-teh'-o} in Mark means that there must be a command of “remembrance.”^d

Francis Moloney^e sees “eucharistic” practices in Mark^f but does not see the “institution” of the “Eucharist” in Markan materials. Here I wish to circumvent the entire eucharistic myth with reference to the practices of Yeshua as an Orthodox Jewish Hakham.

Deu 8:10-14 ¹⁰ "When you have eaten and are full, then you shall bless the L-RD your God for the good land which He has given you. ¹¹ "Beware that you do not forget the L-RD your God by not keeping His commandments, His judgments, and His statutes which I command you today, ¹² "lest-- when you have eaten and are full, and have built beautiful houses and dwell *in them*; ¹³ "and when your herds and your flocks multiply, and your silver and your gold

^a Collins, A. Y. (2007). Mark, A Commentary (Hermeneia, A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible ed., Vol. Mark). (H. W. Attridge, Ed.) Fortress Press. p. 655

^b Collin's words are that the verse has symbolic and metaphoric notions. However, these are not phrases used within a P'shat hermeneutic. Therefore, we must suggest that the language is “analogous.” Collins suggests that the “analogous” (my rewording) is found in the words of Hakham Shaul's Remez writing to the Congregation of Corinth. Here is will not delve into the issue for the sake of time and space. These words need to be addressed else ware.

^c While I say that Congregation is that of Yisrael, we must realize that Yeshua gained a staggering amount of followers from the Bne Yisrael of every rank and stature. The Gentile equation was a part of Yeshua's universal vision. However, the Gentile was to join the Bne Yisrael and become One through the acceptance of Jewish Halakhah.

^d Moloney, F. J. (2002). The Gospel of Mark, A Commentary. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers. p. 285

^e Ibid

^f Cf. Mar. 6:41; 8:6-7; 14:22

are multiplied, and all that you have is multiplied; ¹⁴ "when your heart is lifted up, and you forget the L-RD your G-d who brought you out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage;

The “**thankfulness**” of the Jew and the Birkat Ha-Mazon find their basis in the above-cited passages. The Birkat Ha-Mazon is made up of four blessings.

1. The first blessing is a blessing of thanks for the food
2. The second blessing is a thanks for the land
3. The third blessing concerns Jerusalem
4. And, the fourth is a blessing of thanks for G-d’s goodness

One need not look hard at this blessing to realize the antiquity of the practice.

From the Birkat Ha-Mazon, the Rabbis deduced that there should also be a blessing before food is eaten. Each type of food has its particular type of blessing. The blessing of the “Bread, Ha-Motsi” was said in all the cited passages of Mark listed in the footnote. What is so amazing about all of this is that the “Motsi” is a rabbinic interpretation.

Nonetheless, the Rabbis of antiquity determined logically that we should make a B’rakha before partaking certain foods. This addendum to the Torah’s mentioned “grace” was derived from hermeneutic practice called “Kal va komer.” The logic says that since we are obligated to say the Birkat Ha-Mazon after eating food we should say a B’rakha before eating as well. Actually, this is only good common sense and did not really need much of a hermeneutic to establish this halakhic practice. If the western practice were modified just a little, it would be closer to Orthodox Jewish practice, or following the practice Yeshua followed. However, the Birkat Ha-Mazon would still be required after the meal per the Biblical mandate mentioned above.

Consequently, we have set of Markan passages where Yeshua concurs with the rabbinic interpretation of saying a blessing over food (Blessing G-d) “BEFORE” it is eaten. From this rabbinic practice, other religions have deduced that it is proper to say a blessing over food before eating. Albeit they “bless the food” rather than G-d.

Therefore, the practice of Blessing G-d, with thanksgiving before and after eating any type of food is rabbinic deduced from the above cited passages. The Birkat Ha-Mazon is the Jewish way of thanking G-d for His generosity in the above mentioned areas. If there is such a thing as the “eucharist” so to speak, it is of rabbinic interpretation. Its abuse by other religions is another attempt at replacement theology. Applying the idea of “eucharist” as a substitute to the Birkat Ha-Mazon is ludicrous. The practice of the Birkat Ha-Mazon has existed now for millennia. The asinine idiosyncrasy of so called scholars literally amazes me.

Let me summarize my thoughts on this particular matter before concluding this commentary on Mark 14:22-25.

The Greek scholars have most likely MONKeyed with the text, possibly rewording or reorganizing the structure of Mark 14:22-24. With this rewording and reorganization of the text, they were able to masterfully take an ancient Jewish practice and turn it into an abomination. If they did not reword or reorganize the wording of Mark 14:22-24 they have allowed their anti-Semitic predilections to again, masterfully take an ancient Jewish practice and turn it into an abomination. There is NO “eucharist,” from a Christian perspective presented, instituted or alluded to in ANY of Hakham Tsefet’s materials. Therefore, when reading Hakham Shaul’s materials on the Pesach Seder we MUST filter them through the P’shat ritual hermeneutic of Hakham Tsefet! Therefore, “Holy Communion” as practiced by Christianity is another form of replacement theology and an abomination in the eyes of G-d!

THE THIRD CUP

The Mishnah, tractate Pesachim discusses the Third Cup of the Passover Seder.

m. Pesachim 10:6 Therefore we are duty-bound to thank, praise, glorify, honor, exalt, extol, and bless him who did for our forefathers and for us all these miracles. He brought us forth from slavery to freedom, anguish to joy, mourning to festival, darkness to great light, subjugation to redemption, so we should say before him, Hallelujah.^a

The third cup of the Pesach Seder is the “Cup of Redemption.” It is also called the cup of thanksgiving.^b The Theological Dictionary admits that the so called “Last Supper” was the Passover.^c Drinking the “cup of the kingdom,” Governance of G-d, mean acceptance of the “Ten Words” and by extension the whole Torah. Here I reiterate the remarks I have made above. The practice of the “Pesach Seder,” as represented in Markan texts has been misrepresented and hijacked by the so-called “Church Fathers” to institute an abomination of replacement theology, which they call “Holy Communion” or “Eucharist.”

THE GENTILE EQUATION

The incorporation of Gentiles has always been a controversial issue surrounded by considerable debate. During the Second Temple period, murderous events took place within Judaism because of this debate.^d The School of Shammai was vehemently opposed to gentile interaction. The second book of Lukas (Acts) demonstrates how far reaching the eighteen Taknot of Shammai were.^e Yeshua’s acceptance of two gentile converts^f demonstrates that he believed that the message of the Torah was vital to the Gentiles. Likewise, he teaches us that the Gentiles needed to be “talmudized” as His Eminence Rabbi Dr Yoseph ben Haggai interprets Mattiyahu’s conclusory remarks.^g The Nazarean Bet Din struggled with the Gentile Equation in the Acts of Hakham Tsefet and Hakham Shaul.^h

Hakham Tsefet receives the commission to go to the Gentiles in II Lukas chapter 10. He then passes the mantle, so to speak to his talmid Shaul who has now mastered the Mesorah of the Master from his teacher Hakham Tsefet.

^a Neusner, J. (1988). *The Mishnah : A new translation* (250). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

^b Theological dictionary of the New Testament. 1964-c1976. Vols. 1-10 edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Vol. 10 compiled by Ronald Pitkin. (G. Kittel, G. W. Bromiley & G. Friedrich, Ed.) (3:734). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Here I am so amazed that the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament elaborates with accuracy the details concerning this cup calling it the כוס של ברכה, which it interprets as the “cup of thanksgiving.”

^c Ibid 3:732

^d Cf. b. Shab. 17a

^e Cf. Acts 10:28

^f And Yehudah Ish Keriyothe – Who is this man which the Christian Bibles mention as a disciple of Yeshua named “Judas Iscariot”? To answer this question we need to understand that of the twelve Talmidim (disciples) that Yeshua had, two were converts to Judaism. The first one was Shimon the Canaanite a Cushite (i.e. of Black African ethnicity – cf. Mark 3:18; Matt. 10:4), and the second one was Yeshudah Ish Keriyothe. The term “Ish Keriyothe” denotes that the person is not ethnically Jewish but either from the city of קיר / קירות (Qir / Qirothe) of southern Moab. If Yehudah Ish Keriyothe was of Jewish descent then his name would have been Yehudah MiKeriyothe as Mary from Migdol was called Mary Magdalena. Therefore, Yehudah Ish Keriyothe was not ethnically a Jew, but rather a son of a Moabite Arab that had converted to Judaism – “Yehudah the son of Shimon Ish Keriyothe” (cf. John 6:71, 13:26). Ellul 11, 5771

^g Cf. Matt. 28:16-20

^h While II Lukas (Acts) has been described as the “Acts of the Apostles” the truth of the matter is that the “Acts” mentioned in Hakham Shaul’s second addendum to his Mesorah (Luke) is a compendium of the activities of Hakham Tsefet and Hakham Shaul. For further elucidation, see Spell, D. (2006). *Peter and Paul in Acts*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.

My thesis is that Hakham Shaul’s wrote the book of Acts in order to demonstrate that he had learned from Hakham Tsefet and that he had mastered the Mishnaic Import of the School of Hakham Tsefet. I would further the thesis to suggest that Hakham Tsefet not only taught Hakham Shaul the Mishnaic Import of the Mesorah of Yeshua, but he also taught Hakham Shaul all four levels of Rabbinic Hermeneutics.

AMEN VE AMEN**14:25**

Mark 14:25 Amen ve amen I say to you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day that I drink it (or, I am refreshed/strengthened) anew in the kingdom (governance) of G-d [*through the Hakhamim and Bate Din as opposed to human kings.*]

The oath that Yeshua will not take the “fruit of the vine” could be problematic until we realize a few basic things. In short, I believe that we must realize that the Mesorah as an oral tradition of the Rabbis already existed. Yeshua’s statement might be understood as being interpreted that his Mesorah would be initiated before the weekly Shabbat when the next cup of wine, Kiddush would be consumed. This would mean that Yeshua predicted his death before the coming Shabbat.

**CONCLUSION**

The present pericope of Mordechai has been so abused that scholars can no longer see the forest for the trees. Weeding our way through the rubbish of a pile of commentaries makes us realize just how perverse the perversion of Jewish practice has become.

Hakham Tsefet did not intend to initiate some new liturgical ritual practice. Our exercise of P’shat ritual hermeneutics has clearly demonstrated that the “Church fathers had an anti-Semitic agenda in their invention of the “Holy Communion.” However, as I have stated above the so called “Holy Communion” they invented is an abomination and an aim at initiating a whole liturgy replacement theology.



Shana Toba UMetuca

I know my work and my limited understanding, a man who does not know how to understand words of understanding.

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

CONNECTIONS TO TORAH READINGS**TORAH SEDER**

The present pericope of Mark connects with the Torah Seder in verse 15 of chapter 5 where we are reminded of the Exodus from Egypt. The theme of Pesach, which is being celebrated in the present pericope of Mark is that of freedom from Egyptian slavery. D’Varim 5:15 — Mark 14:22-25

TEHILLIM

Amazingly, the Psalmist and Mark are on the same page in that the Pesach Seder recites the Psalms that we have as this week’s readings in alignment with the Torah Seder.

ASHLAMATAH

By way of analogy, the cities of refuge depict a fractured body of Yisrael. This fractured body is alluded to by Yeshua in the present pericope of Mordechai.

SPECIAL ASHLAMATAH — I HOSHEA

Hosea looks at the idea of offering the offerings of the lips as an offering to the L-RD. The present pericope looks at “thanksgiving” as an offering of the lips as well.

SPECIAL ASHLAMATAH — II MICAH

Verse 15 of chapter 7 recalls the Exodus and plays on the Pesach Seder as does Mark

MITZVOT IMPLIED BY THE NAZAREAN CODICIL^a

I have included this section because of noticing the Nazarean mitzvot that correspond with the Torah. The following mitzvot are implied. Their implication is the result of existence in Torah and observed in the Nazarean Codicil by the master of his talmidim.

1. Say HaMotsi when eating Bread (leavened or unleavened).
2. Say the Birkat Ha-Mazon (Bendigamos)
3. Say the appropriate blessing before eating foods
4. Eat the afikomen at the Pesach Seder
5. Drink four cups of wine at the Pesach Seder
6. Allow the gentiles who accept Yeshua into the congregation. Teaching them to keep the mitzvot and Mesorah of the Master.
7. Accept the Mesorah of the Master as a mandated discipline for life as a Nazarean Jew.

QUESTIONS OR REFLECTION

1. How do we know that we are reading the readings associated with Shabbat Shuba?
2. How does the present pericope represent a sermon preached on Shabbat Shuba?
3. Are the Church Father justified in establishing “Communion” form the present texts of Mark?
4. As Nazarean Jews, should we keep the Communion instituted by the Church Fathers?
5. Was Yeshua in agreeance with the School of Shammai concerning the Gentile equation?
6. What is the purpose of the Third Cup of the Pesach Seder?
7. How does the P’shat ritual hermeneutic help us determine the correct practice for Nazarean Jews?

^a Please note that I am referring to halahkot inferred only by the present text. This may relate to other halahkot but I will address these inferences when the text demands such attention. When other texts mirror or explicate the present text they will be added as noted below. The present halahkot are inferred by their presence in the Nazarean Codicil as well as Yeshua’s observance of them.