#### We have Eaten and are Satisfied

So you will eat and be satisfied, and you will bless ADONAI your God for the good land he has given you (Devarim/Deuteronomy 8:10 CJB)

#### BEIT TEFILLAH



#### Shemot/Names Commonly called Exodus Torah Portion Mishpatim (Right Rulings/Judgements) Shemot/Exodus 21 - 24 Haftorah: 2<sup>nd</sup> Kings 11:17 - 12:17. Ketuvim Netzarim: Matthew 26:20-30

2

 According to the traditional counting of Maimonides/"RaMBaM," how many mitzvot/commandments are in this Torah portion?

A. 51
B. 66
C. 37
D. 42

 According to the traditional counting of Maimonides/"RaMBaM," how many mitzvot/commandments are in this Torah portion?

A. 51
B.
C. 37
D. 42

 According to the traditional counting of Maimonides/"RaMBaM," how many mitzvot/commandments are in this Torah portion?

A. 51
B.
C. 37
D.

- According to the traditional counting of Maimonides/"RaMBaM," how many mitzvot/commandments are in this Torah portion?
  - A. 51
    B.
    C.
    D.

#### Torah of the Redemption of a Hebrew Bondmaid

Shemot/Exodus 21:7 (JPCT) Now if a man sells his daughter as a maidservant, she shall not go free as the slaves go free.

Excerpts from Artscroll Commentary: "Sale" of a daughter. He (the father) is permitted to "sell" the daughter because the sale is expected to result in marriage either to the master or his son. In fact, if neither of the two marries her, the Torah regards it as a betrayal of the girl (v.8). If one of the two chooses to marry her, the purchase price received by the father will constitute betrothal money (Talmud Bavli, Kiddushin 18b)....The girl goes free without payment in one of three ways: (a) at the end of six years; (b) upon the advent of the Jubilee Year; and (c) when her puberty begins [intrepretation based on Ex 21:11].

#### **Torah of the Hebrew Bondmaid**

Shemot/Exodus 21:8 (NJPS) If she proves to be displeasing to her master, who designated her for himself, he must let her be redeemed; he shall not have the right to sell her to outsiders, since he broke faith with her.

Shemot/Exodus 21:8 (JPCT) If she is displeasing to her master, who did not designate her [for himself], then he shall enable her to be redeemed; he shall not rule over her to sell her to another person, when he betrays her.

#### **Torah of the Hebrew Bondmaid**

**ח** אָם-רָעָה בְּעֵינֵי אֲדֹנֶיהָ, אֲשֶׁר-לא (לוֹ) יְעָדָהּ--וְהֶפְדָהּ : לְעַם נְכְרִי לא-יִמְשׁל לְמַכְרַהּ, בְּבִגְדוֹ-בָהּ.

Artscroll Commentary: The word is spelled  $\forall \forall$  (did not) but it is pronounced ( $\forall \forall$ ) (for himself)....(O)ur verse indicates that the master had a moral obligation to arrange for the marriage to take place (*Ibn Ezra*). Taking both the spelling and the pronunciation into account, the verse is stating that he did not designate her for himself though he should have.

#### **Torah of the Hebrew Bondmaid**

**ּח** אִם-רָעָה בְּעֵינֵי אֲדֹנֶיהָ, אֲשֶׁר-לא (לוֹ) יְעָדָהּ--וְהֶפְדָּהּ : לְעַם נָכְרִי לא-יִמְשֹׁל לְמָכְרַהּ, בְּבִגְדוֹ-בָהּ.

Rashi Commentary. who did not designate her: For he should have designated her and married her, and the money paid for her purchase is the money of her betrothal. Here Scripture hints that it is a mitzvah [for the master] to perform ,עוד, designation for marriage, [with the maidservant] and it hints that she would not require any other betrothal. [I.e., neither money nor articles of value would have to be given to the girl's father in order to marry her. The money the father originally received for selling his daughter now would become the money of betrothal from her master.]-[From Kid. 19b]

#### **Mitzvot in the Torah Portion**

# <u>Shemot 21:10</u> Not to diminish a wife's food, clothing or marital rights

#### Shemot 21: 7-11

Exodus 21:7-11 (YLT) 7 'And when a man selleth his daughter for a handmaid, she doth not go out according to the going out of the men-servants; <sup>8</sup> if evil in the eyes of her lord, so that he hath not betrothed her, then he hath let her be ransomed; to a strange people he hath not power to sell her, in his dealing treacherously with her.<sup>9</sup> 'And if to his son he betroth her, according to the right of daughters he doth to her. <sup>10</sup> If another woman he take for him, her food, her covering, and her habitation, he doth not withdraw; (Exod. 21:7-10 YLT)

#### Shemot 21: 7-11

Exodus 21:7-11 (NIV) <sup>7</sup> "If a man sells his daughter as a servant, she is not to go free as male servants do.<sup>8</sup> If she does not please the master who has selected her for himself, he must let her be redeemed. He has no right to sell her to foreigners, because he has broken faith with her. <sup>9</sup> If he selects her for his son, he must grant her the rights of a daughter. <sup>10</sup> If he marries another woman, he must not deprive the first one of her food, clothing and marital rights. (Exod. 21:7-10 NIV)

#### Shemot 21: 10

**Exodus 21:10 (CJB)** If he marries another wife, he is not to reduce her food, clothing or marital rights.

<u>Comment:</u> In past studies, we have taken this passage to mean that Yah acknowledged or accepted the custom of polygamy at that time. There are some good reasons for re-thinking this view.... Excerpts from Understanding the Torah's Polygamy Regulations (Exodus 21:7-11; Deuteronomy 21:15-17) by David Wilbur

Retrieved from: https://davidwilber.com/articles/understanding-the-torahs-polygamy-regulations

What about Exodus 21:7-11? This passage concerns the "selling of a young woman to a family as an intended wife for either the man or for his son (vs. 7-9), in a kind of indentured servitude vis-à-vis an arranged marriage for a family that is destitute and needs a daughter provided for."[3] This was a common practice in the ancient Near East that the Torah permitted and regulated in the best interests of the maidservant:

[3] J.K. McKee, *Men and Women in the Body of Messiah: Answering Crucial Questions* (Richardson, TX: Messianic Apologetics, 2018), pp. 273-274

#### Shemot 21: 7-11

Exodus 21:7-11 (NIV) <sup>7</sup> "If a man sells his daughter as a servant, she is not to go free as male servants do.<sup>8</sup> If she does not please the master who has selected her for himself, he must let her be redeemed. He has no right to sell her to foreigners, because he has broken faith with her. <sup>9</sup> If he selects her for his son, he must grant her the rights of a daughter. <sup>10</sup> If he marries another woman, he must not deprive the first one of her food, clothing and marital rights. (Exod. 21:7-10 NIV)

This is another passage that some people cite to say that God approves of polygamy. "After all," critics argue, "the text says that if the man takes 'another wife,' he still must provide for his first wife's needs, including her 'marital rights,' that is, her sexual rights! The man must keep both women as wives!"

First, even if we assume that this passage concerns polygamy, this still wouldn't be evidence that God approves of this practice. Similar to what we discussed above, this is an example of case law. As Richard Davidson explains, "Case laws do not legitimize the activity of the case described but only prescribe what should be done in such cases."[4]

[4] Richard Davidson, *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007), 191-192

Second, a careful reading of the text reveals that this passage actually has nothing to do with polygamy at all! Let me explain. When the passage speaks of the man taking "another wife to himself" in verse 10, many people assume that this refers to another wife in addition to the maidservant. But in reality, the text indicates that this is another wife instead of the maidservant. This means that verse 10 describes how the maidservant should be treated if her master takes someone else as a wife instead of her.

To summarize: if the master decides not to marry the maidservant, then she can be redeemed—that is, bought back. Alternatively, she and the master's son could get married. If that happens, then the master is to treat her not as a servant but as his daughter. If she is not redeemed, and if she doesn't marry the master's son, and if the master decides to marry someone else, then the master is still required to meet her basic needs. If he doesn't provide what she needs, the maidservant is to be considered a free woman and can leave.

Thus, this passage doesn't address polygamy; verse 8 already tells us that the master chose not to marry the maidservant.[5] Therefore, "another wife" in verse 10 should be understood as another wife instead of the maidservant, not in addition to her.

(note 5 on next slide)

[5] This is even clearer in the Hebrew. See J.K. McKee, Men and Women in the Body of Messiah: Answering Crucial Questions (Richardson, TX: Messianic Apologetics, 2018): "V. 8a in most Bibles is rendered as 'If she does not please the master who has selected her for himself' (NIV). There is a very subtle, yet significant, difference in the reading lo, 'for himself,' versus lo or 'not,' with only a handful of Hebrew witnesses reading with lo 'for himself.' Both sound exactly the same audibly, yet textually the superior reading is lo or 'not.'

[5] (cont'd) When 'not' is recognized as the correct reading, the clause asher-lo ye'adah translates as 'so that he does not choose her' or 'so that he did not designate her.' The textual issue of v. 8a is important because of what is seen in v. 10, 'If he takes to himself another woman...' Because of the man's rejection of the woman contracted to him (v. 8a), he is now free to take another as his wife (v. 10). No polygamy need be present." (274)

But what about the maidservant's "marital rights"? Doesn't this indicate that she is indeed a wife deserving of sexual rights? While this interpretation is reflected in several English Bible translations, the word onah (found only once in the entire Hebrew Bible), translated as "marital rights" in the ESV, does not mean conjugal rights. We know this because....

....as Tim Hegg explains, "documents from other ancient Near Eastern cultures (such as those found in the Akkadian language) have similar laws, with this wording: 'food, clothing, and oil' or 'food, clothing, and shelter.' The Hebrew word [onah] could easily be cognate to the Akkadian terms used for 'oil' or 'shelter.'"[6]

[6] Tim Hegg, *Studies in the Torah: Exodus* (Tacoma, WA: TorahResource, 2014), 134

Thus, the passage's meaning is simply this: if after purchasing the maidservant for a bride the master decides not to marry her but instead marries someone else, then he must still provide for her basic needs: food, clothing, and shelter/oil. If he fails to provide for her, "she is to be set free without the need to pay any redemption price."[7] Once again, the text does not indicate polygamy.

[7] Tim Hegg, *Studies in the Torah: Exodus* (Tacoma, WA: TorahResource, 2014), 134

Thus, the passage's meaning is simply this: if after purchasing the maidservant for a bride the master decides not to marry her but instead marries someone else, then he must still provide for her basic needs: food, clothing, and shelter/oil. If he fails to provide for her, "she is to be set free without the need to pay any redemption price."[7] Once again, the text does not indicate polygamy.

[7] Tim Hegg, *Studies in the Torah: Exodus* (Tacoma, WA: TorahResource, 2014), 134

### How Long Until the Third Day: The Onah Digression

Does Friday Night to Sunday Morning = 3 Days in "the Jewish Method of Counting?"

#### How Long Until the Third Day?

**Exodus 19:15-16** (NASB) 15 He said to the people, "Be ready for the third day; do not go near a woman." 16 So it came about on the third day, when it was morning, that there were thunder and lightning flashes and a thick cloud upon the mountain and a very loud trumpet sound, so that all the people who *were* in the camp trembled.

The traditional Christian teaching that "Friday Night to Sunday Morning = Three Days in the 'Jewish Method of Counting'" comes from Talmudic commentaries centered on Exodus 19: 15 (in which onah is not actually present). Does the Talmud support this teaching?

The basic argument that three days and three nights can be less than a literal three days and nights (72 hours) comes from a rabbinic discussion which says that a day is an *onah* and part of a day is an *onah*, and it can take as few as four *onot* to equal three days or "the third day."

But, there is more to the story.

In the Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Shabbat is discussing Exodus 19: 15. The rabbis are discussing conjugal rights and marital purity, and when Israel ceased from marital relations:

Our Rabbis taught: if one [a woman] discharges... on the third day, she is clean; this is the view of R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah. R. Ishmael said: This [interval] sometimes comprises four periods, (*onot*, plural of *onah*) sometimes five, and sometimes six periods... Abstention [from intimacy] was effected on Thursday. Again, R. Ishmael holds with R. Jose that abstention was effected on Wednesday. But with whom does R. Akiba agree?

In the discussion, there is lots of debate. <u>The final analysis in the Talmud seems</u> <u>to say that the majority opinion for the</u> <u>length of on **onah** is twelve hours</u>.

[The word onah (Strong's #5772), in the feminine form onatah appears in Scripture at Exodus 21: 10, not meaning "time period" but "marital rights"].

The quote below comes from the Jerusalem Talmud, folio 12.1:

"R. Akiva fixed a day for an **onah** and a night for an **onah**; but the tradition is, that R. Eliezar ben Azariah said, 'A day and a night make an **onah**, and a part of an **onah** is as the whole.' And later in the same place, 'R. Ismael reckons a part of the **onah** for the whole." Does Friday Night to Sunday Morning = 3 Days in "the Jewish Method of Counting?" In the same Tractate Abud Zara in the

Babylonian Talmud, we read this:

How long is an Onah? .... R. Johanan makes an Onah equal to the length of a half a day and night. However, according to each version, the Onah equals twelve hours, since the one refers to the equinox and the other to the solstice season. Does Friday-Sunday = 3 Days in "the Jewish Method of Counting?"

The difficulty is that the idea of one onah equaling only part of a day takes one side against another in the Talmudic writings. You have some rabbis arguing that part of an onah makes a day, and others that a full 12 hours makes an onah.

It is a disagreement. So, the idea that "by Jewish reckoning part of a day equals a day" is difficult to maintain. What can be said is that some rabbi's held that part of an onah equals a day, while others did not.

Conclusion: The Talmud is only marginally helpful in defending "three days and three nights" = less than 72 hours.

It is certainly not universally held that 4 onot can equal three days, or even if Friday at 3pm to sunrise on Sunday would be 4 onot and so the statement that "by Jewish reckoning' Friday night to Sunday morning equals three days and three nights" is <u>misleading (or at least not the whole truth).</u>

#### **Questions or Insights?**

