

פרק ו'

- (3A) (a) דוד arranges to have the ארון brought to ירושלים⁵²
- (b) The tragedy of עזא.⁵³
- (c) The ארון stops off at the house of עבד אדום הגתי for 3 months and then דוד resumes his plan.⁵⁴
- (d) The celebration of the return of the ארון.
- (e) מיכל confronts דוד.
- (4B) The mode of transporting the ארון.⁵⁵
- (4A) Compare to the story of the death of נדב ואביהו.⁵⁶
- (4B) How could דוד wear an אפוד בד?⁵⁷
- (3B) (a) Why does דוד respond to מיכל by referring to שאל?⁵⁸
- (b) מיכל and children.⁵⁹
- (5) פירוש רש"י לדברי הימים.⁶⁰

פרק ו'

- (3A) (a) 1-5
- (b) 6-9
- (c) 10-12
- (d) 13-19
- (e) 20-23

(4B) 3

(4A) 6-9

(4B) 14

(3B) 21

REVIEW OF 'פרק ו'

דוד brings the ארון from the house of אבינוב to ירושלים. He ignores the command of the תורה to carry the ארון on the shoulders of בני קהת and he transports them on a wagon drawn by cows. The ארון slips and עזא tries to keep it from falling. When he touches it, he dies. This causes a cessation in the celebration and the ארון is left in the house of אדום הגתי for 3 months, and his house is blessed for the duration. דוד then removes the ארון again to resume his plan amidst great celebration and dance. דוד is girt with an אפוד בוד and dance profusely before the ארון. מיכל, דוד's

wife sees this and considers this behavior unbecoming of a king. She chastises דוד who responds sharply himself, reminding her that she is now the wife of the king, not the daughter of the king. The chapter ends with an implication of estrangement between דוד and מיכל.

- chapter takes place right after **איש בשת**'s death, **דוד** ruled over all of Israel in **חברון** for 5 years.
- (52) Recall the travels of the **ארון** taken by the **פלשתים** in **אבינדב** at **ה-ו** **פרקים א'** **שמואל**. The last stop was at the house of **אבינדב** at **גבעה**, **שם ז:א**. The next story involves **אבינדב**'s son, **עזא** (also spelled **עזה** - See **שמואל א'** footnote #193).
- (53) **עזא**'s story is very difficult to teach. what did he do wrong? What should he have done? See the treatment of Nehama Leibowitz. Studies on the Parsha, Shmini, chapter 5 and Y. Yaacovson, **חזון המקרא**, הפטרת שמיני pp. 255-264.
- (54) Contrast the success the **ארון** brings **אדום** here, with the havoc it wreaks at **ה-ו** **שמואל א'**. See **שמואל א'** notes 46-48.
- (55) The **תורה** explicitly instructs that the **ארון** should be carried on the shoulders of the descendants of **קהת**. See **ז-ט** **במדבר ז:** **ט-ז** which makes this clear. How could **דוד** therefore err on something every schoolchild could know? **רש"י** at **כ"ה** says that **דוד** knew this **הלכה**, but for **הוראת שעה**, wanted to return the **ארון** home the way it came from the **פלשתים** (cf. **פירוש** **שמואל א' ו:ז**). This answer also appears in the **פירוש** attributed to **דברי הימים א' יג:ז**, **רש"י**. The Vilna Gaon, in his commentary to **דברי הימים א' טו:ב** says that **דוד** thought the

command of "בכתף ישאו" was only relevant to the זור המדבר when the ארון was carried very often, but not to subsequent generations.

(56) עזא generally viewed נדב and אביהו as dying the death of the righteous. A brief overview of the מודשים on them brought down in אישי התנ"ך would lead to this conclusion. If so, the choice of this reading as the פרשת שמיני of הפטורה (when it is not a special שנת) reveals that עזא also died the death of the righteous. Notice the various hints at נדב ואביהו in the name of עזא בן אבינדב. Also the גמטריא of אביהו & נדב and עזא or עזה are all quite similar.

(57) See Rabbinic Reflections, Violation of Torah Law in the Books of Joshua, Judges and Samuel, chapter 15.

Chapter 15

Violation of Priestly Laws

Torah

Ex. 28: 2,6,40

Make sacral vestments for your brother, Aaron for dignity and adornment. They shall make the ephod of blue, purple and crimson yarns, and of fine twisted linen, worked into designs. And for Aaron's sons also you shall make tunics, and make sashes for them, and make turbans for them for dignity and adornment.

Prophets

A) I Sam. 2:18

Samuel was engaged in the service of the Lord as an attendant, girded with a linen ephod.

B) Ibid. 22:18

(And Doeg the Edomite went and struck down the priests himself: that day he killed eighty five men who wore the linen ephod.

C) II Sam. 6:14

David was girt with a linen ephod.

וְכֵן כִּהְנִיחַ וְדָוִד
 (על כהניו) לא כן!
 חָטָא חֵייל אִין חֲמִינִין
 עַל כְּהֻנֵּי דְדָוִדִים בְּחַתָּה.
 אִלּוּ מְחַזְקֵי עֵהוּ כּוֹלֵם
 כְּאִיִּין עֲבִיבֵי כְּהֻנֵּי
 דְדָוִדִים.

struck down the priests himself,
 that day he killed eighty five
 men who wore the linen ephod
 (I Sam. 22:18). But this is not so²
 for R. Hiyya taught, we didn't
 chose two high priests to
 minister at one time. Rather
 this teaches that they were
 all worthy of being high
 priests.

(C) (34) Targum Jonathan II Sam. 6:14

קִיבֵּי (כִּיבֵּי) יִוֹלֵד רִיבֵּי

David was girt with a tunic with
 sleeves of fine linen³.

Analysis of Rabbinic Resolution

§§ 31 and 34 indicate that Samuel and David never wore
 the linen ephod worn exclusively by the high priest. They
 instead wore a linen tunic which resembled the ephod. Thus the
 violation is denied. §§ 32 and 33 explain that the eighty five

2. That eighty five priests can be wearing the linen ephod at
 the same time.

3. The parallel passage in I Chron. 15:27 replaces the linen
 ephod with "a robe of fine linen" קִיבֵּי דִּילֵין. Targum's rendition of
 קִיבֵּי (כִּיבֵּי) in II Sam 6:14 is thus a translation of the words in
 Chron. (קִיבֵּי דִּילֵין in II Sam 13:18 is translated as קִיבֵּי (כִּיבֵּי)
 Thus קִיבֵּי (כִּיבֵּי) is the Aramaic for קִיבֵּי דִּילֵין.

priests of Nob were worthy of being high priests, and relate this by saying that they were worthy of wearing the linen ephod. Since more than one high priest could not minister at the same time, this means that only one priest actually did wear the linen ephod, and thus the violation is denied ⁴.

⁴. Medieval commentators explain that these eighty five priests did indeed wear the linen ephod, as did Samuel and David. See Radak and Abayanel. I Sam 22:18. However a close comparison between § 32 with §§ 31 and 34 shows that according to rabbinic literature all the priests did not actually wear the *אֵפֹד* of the high priests. This is also the plain meaning of § 33.

טן השמחה שישמח אדם בעשיית המצוה ובאהבת האל שצוה
 בהן - עבודה גדולה היא, וכל-המונע עצמו משמחה זו
 ראוי להפריע ממנו, שנאמר: תחת אשר לא-עבדת את-ה'
 אלהיה בשמחה ובטוב לבב (דברים כח. טו). וכל-המגסיי דעתו
 וחולק כבוד לעצמו ומתכבד בעיניו במקומות אלו - חוטא
 ושוטה. ועל זה הזהיר שלמה ואמר: אל-תתהדר לפני-מלך
 (משלי כח. י). וכל-המשפיל עצמו ומקל גופו במקומות אלו -
 הוא הגדול המכבד העובד מאהבה. וכן דוד מלך ישראל
 אמר: ונקלתי עוד מזאת והייתי שפל בעיני (סמאלג ה. כב)
 ואין הגדלה והכבוד אלא לשמח לפני ה', שנאמר: ותמלך יי
 דוד מפניו ומכרךר לפני ה' וגו' (סם טו).

(59) At כא:ח (59) we read the מיכל had a number of children.
 maintain (סנהדרין יט) that these were actually the children of
 מרב, born to עוראל (See יח-יט), but that מרב died and
 מיכל raised the children. They are therefore referred to as her
 own. Also, see above, #24. The same גמרא maintains that עגלה,
 mother of יתרעם was actually מיכל. If so, she did have children.
 Two solutions present themselves. (1) She had יתרעם before this
 event, (2) She had יתרעם the day she died. In fact חז"ל who present
 this question themselves, point to the second solution. Of course,
 פשוט there is no problem.

(60) Footnote 55 above refers to the פירוש of רש"י to דברי הימים.
 Most scholarly opinions consider that this commentary is not
 רש"י, and they cite the following reasons:

(1) רד"ק says in his introduction to דברי הימים that up to
 his day, no commentary to דברי הימים exists and for that
 reason he is writing one himself. One would think that

if someone as famous as רש"י had written one, someone else as famous as רד"ק would know about it! Actually the בעלי תוספות in .ט. יומא דף ט. make reference to a commentary to דברי הימים written by גאון רב סעויה which רד"ק apparently also was not familiar with.

(2) רש"י to דברי הימים often contradicts, and sometimes vehemently with similar comments made in parallel פסוקים in שמואל and מלכים.

(3) רש"י to דברי הימים cites רש"י! Nowhere else in his commentary does רש"י cite himself.

These and other reasons point to the direction that רש"י did not comment on דברי הימים. רש"י also did not finish ספר איוב. Towards the end of פרק מ' most texts of מקראות גדולות read עד כאן לשון רש"י מכאן ואילך אינו לשון רש"י. Who actually wrote these commentaries is a very complicated issue and beyond our scope here.

(61) There are 3 verses in ספר דברים where the formula precedes a מצוה. In the order that חז"ל give to their observance, the first is the appointment of a king, דברים יז:י, and the second is the destruction of עמלק, דברים כה:יט. These two were already commanded and observed to various extents. The third