Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician?
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In addition to his brothers, זכריה and יחזקאל, was an active, if not the most active, character throughout דוד’s reign. However, the character of יואב and his brothers is foggy and puzzling. Although many of us have been taught to classify figures in Tanach into the roles of either יוחנן or דויד, it is exceedingly difficult to categorize; a simplification of their character would be trivializing and damaging rather than beneficial. This analysis attempts to discover the complexity of יואב’s true character and uncover the dynamics of his relationship with דויד.

Possibilities

There are two basic approaches that one can take regarding יואב:

One possibility is to suggest that יואב was immoral and power hungry, nevertheless a great soldier upon whom דויד was dependent. This suggestion is supported chiefly by the fact that יואב killed זכריה, jednak, and ושעון. As we will later see, whoever were killed by יואב were both זכריה and Doch and were both זכריה and Doch. It is logical that יואב, considering his unsteady relationship with דויד, would consider both men threats to his esteemed position, and would do anything to maintain his job — even kill them. Indeed, דויד removed from his post after יואב killed זכריה, jednak, and replaced him with Doch. Although this theory may not be the only possible incentive for יואב’s acts, it is consistent with דויד’s reactions to the death of these men, all of whom were his political enemies. In fact, it is evident throughout the story of דויד that not only were they not tolerated, but they were perhaps detested by a very forgiving.
king. This is also powerfully indicative that ישבך led an immoral and irreligious existence.

However, a deeper look into ישבך’s actions and character reveal a challenge to this theory. Not only did ישבך ostensibly accomplish positive things for בית דוד, as we have seen in the list of ישבך’s appearances in תנ"ך, but he also made three statements that are inconsistent with he who kills in vain:

1. ישבך led ממלכת דוד in a war against אבנר, בית שאול, led by אבנר. ישבך killed אבנר and pursued אבנר and surrounded him, at which point point אבנר cried his famous declaration, "הנני להזיר את המלחמהذهبמהו" (.newLine ישבך). ישבך unquestioningly accepted this offer of peace without questioning, and instead of killing אבנר, responded, "אני המושג טוב ביד אלהים: מי שאמר עתה את מלחמאותו (.newLine ישבך). ישבך swore by God that if אבנר would have expressed his desire to stop fighting earlier, he would have agreed then to stop immediately as well. ישבך’s use of God’s Name and his immediate willingness to forgive אבנר for initiating the fight display a significant degree of spiritual greatness.

2. ישבך and Sterniel אחריו were led into battle against אבנר. After seperating their army into two camps, one led by Sterniel and the other by ישבך, they devised a startegy that whichever camp became overpowered by ישבך would be rescued by the other camp. It is then that ישבך delivered a powerful speech to the army: "והם נחלקים בני עונמה מבית אלוהים; והמשה עתב בינוינו (NewLine ישבך). Rarely in Tanach do we see such a passionate and moving declaration spoken by a Jewish leader or general before war. Perhaps ישבך’s character is delineated in this statement through his mentioning that although בית müssen must put forth physical effort, they are fighting for the Glory of God rather than their own, and their fate lies in God’s Hands, regardless of their physical strength.

3. ישבך and Sterniel chased after בליי, who had rebelled against בית ממלכת דוד, and his men surrounded the city to prevent בליי’s escape. A woman called out to ישבך from inside the city, "אני שלמה אומני ישראלי אשה מבסקת להחיית ניר ולא ישארו: מכל תלול התחלadies (NewLine ישבך). The woman, thinking ישבך was about to destroy the city, begged ישבך to spare her life because she was a righteous Jewish mother. The woman also pleaded with him not to destroy a city that lies in Israel. ישבך responded, ישבך asserted he only wished to kill בליי pthreadılmış יהוה_Anズ fora AkvE ישבך, who was a righteous Jewish mother, and therefore deserved death. His intent was not to kill freely and unnecessarily.

It is clearly problematic to suggest and impossible to prove that ישבך was wholly and thoroughly “bad”.

We therefore present the second possibility: that ישבך was a great person who was tragically unappreciated by דוד.
This theory is of course supported by אבִי's three statements listed above, in addition to the fact that אבִי was extremely loyal to דוד. For instance, when אבִי fought and led into a sweeping victory, he sent a message at the last moment, saying, "If the army would have lost, it would be a disgrace."

Athaliah told דוד to fight the final battle against עיר and capture the city himself, so that אבִי would not be given credit for the victory. This story expresses the loyalty and faith with which אבִי subjugated his prestigious position and the honor it naturally warrants to his king. Similarly, when אבִי wanted to count the nation, a terrible sin, דוד did his utmost to discourage אבִי, saying, "One must count the nation, but do not do it!"

Although אבִי did not heed his advice and it would therefore seem extraneous for the רעה to recount אבִי's plea, perhaps it is stated to infer אבִי's desire to abstain from sin and prevent his master and king from sinning.

Of course, it is no surprise that this second possibility concerning אבִי's character must be countered by the fact that he murdered three people for no obvious reason, and was, along with דוד, despised by אבִי despite his intense loyalty towards the latter.

Upon examining both theories, it is obvious that neither apply to אבִי; he is a much more complicated figure than one that can be called "good" or "bad." In order to successfully discover who אבִי was and understand his relationship with דוד, the opinions of historians regarding specific stories concerning אבִי must be examined. The four major events in אבִי's life that can be analyzed to best uncover his cryptic character are:

1. The murder of באֶר (׳י 6:3)
2. The murder of יִשְׁי (׳י 1:18, יִשְׁי 1:18)
3. The murder of נֹבאָם (׳י 7:2)
4. אבִי's death at the hands of נְבָר (ם 26:27)

Each of these stories will be analyzed in depth with the help of the הָנָר, הֶרֱשִׁים, and contemporary scholars in attempt to discover whether or not אבִי sinned and why דוד hated him. Finally, I will suggest a theory regarding אבִי and his relationship with דוד.

אמבר

The אבִי all maintain that באֶר deserved to die, although there is much debate concerning why he deserved death, and whether it was for this reason that אבִי killed him. Also, the question of whether אבִי sinned bothers the אבִי a great deal. The commentaries of רַבֶּנִיה, רַבֶּנִיה, רַבֶּנִיה, and רַבֶּנִיה are particularly intriguing.

Raven attempts to prove that באֶר deserved to die by quoting the fa-
mous exchange between יאב ויווח and יאב ויווח, יאב ויווח asks why יאב ויווח killed ושאלה why he killed יאב ויווח for his brother. יאב ויווח responds that maybe יאב ויווח killed יאב ויווח to be נצל זומ for his brother because it was an act of defense in wartime. The response to יאב ויווח is that יאב ויווח had no control over where he attacked יאבל, while יאב ויווח asks if maybe יאב ויווח had no control over where he attacked יאבל.

The implications of this are twofold: First, יאב ויווח killed יאבל to avenge יאבל’s blood, as opposed to other reasons for which יאבל deserved to die. Second, יאב ויווח’s reason for killing י אבל is completely justifiable, because יאבל died an unnecessary death. יאב ויווח then quotes רדיק in his answer, who states that all of the curses with which יאבל condemned יאבל after he killed יאבל, fulfilled themselves in יאבל’s descendents. יאב ויווח comments that this occurred because יאבל did not utilize the character of (justice) to curse יאבל, and was therefore incorrect to have cursed him. In fact, יאבל knew that יאבל deserved to die and was going to command יאבל to kill יאבל anyway.

It does not explain whether יאבל felt that יאבל deserved to die for killing יאבל or for another reason, the most obvious being that he was מרדן. Regardless, it is very perplexing why he was angry at יאב ויווח if he wanted יאבל killed. יאבל’s belief that יאבל deserved to die and fury for יאב ויווח’s act implies that he felt that יאב ויווח’s motivation to kill יאבל was impure. This could be either the fact that יאב ויווח killed יאבל for personal reasons in avenging his brother’s blood, or perhaps יאבל suspected that יאב ויווח felt threatened by a man whose peace treaty had been accepted by יאבל and whom יאבל might appoint as his new chief general.

In any case, יאב ויווח elucidates clearly that יאבל deserved to die and יאבל’s act was justified. He does not, however, explain יאבל’s anger towards יאב ויווח satisfactorily.
and, when had an opportunity to kill שאלת, In both instances, אבר did not sufficiently protect and prevent from being vulnerable to רד. The article cites this as an act of being מרד צדקה that deemed אבר deserving of death.

However, אבר killed because the latter killed אבר, as the recount, עשה, maintains that אבר could not avenge his brother’s blood because he was killed in war, during which the halacha does not apply. Therefore, רד was angry at אבר because should not have been killed for killing ‏לך than for being שאלת but rather for being צדקה.

אבר also comments on אבר’s and רד’s relationship, with the assertions that cursed אבר to be רד צדקה because the bearers of these ailments are considered halachically dead. This implies that could not kill אבר, and the best that he could do is curse him with afflictions that made him “almost dead.” Although it is not clear why could not kill אבר according to רד צדקות, it can only be for one of two reasons: a) needed אבר; or b) knew “deep down” that אבר had acted correctly. However, he detested bloodshed too much to admit that אבר’s death was justified. Again, is not clear concerning רד’s feelings towards אבר.

In fact, there is a general conflict among the רד צדקות in terms of reconciling אבר killing a man who deserved death and רד’s negative reaction. Most agree that אבר deserved death, and also that רד was correct to be angry. Thus, the source of רד’s anger must stem from the nature of the act, rather than the act itself.

Two contemporary scholars, Prof. David Seri and Rabbi E. M. Goitein, author of חכם דוד, suggest that actually supported and appreciated אבר, but could not publicly display his alliance with him for political reasons. Specifically, Prof. Seri maintains that although אבר’s motivations for killing אבר were unclear, he undoubtedly had a justifiable reason. Moreover, had genuinely felt that was wrong to kill אבר, he would have put אבר to death immediately. Rather, on his deathbed he told שלמה, אבר, 'I am not specifying to kill אבר. Ultimately, however, שלמה killed אבר for political reasons, to help establish a peaceful and just reputation for his kingdom.

Regarding אבר’s death and אבר’s guilt, Rabbi Goitein adds that not only did אבר deserve death because he failed to defend from רד שאלת and killed unnecessarily, but also because he sinned in two other areas: a) suggested that twelve of his men and twelve of אבר’s men fight for pure entertainment: קמור על התForRowים ומשתוק כלמתי (שב' כ') and it led to a bloody war, and b) he put his name before רד when he proposed a peace treaty to רד (שב' כ'). For these reasons, אבר
felt that ביטחון showed too much loyalty towards אָבָרֶן. Furthermore, as אָבָרֶן’s cousin, it is highly unlikely that would have abandoned his royal lineage. Furthermore, another proof that אָבָרֶן was not truly seeking peace with דוּד is that after did dine with דוּד and officially “signed the contract,” he returned peacefully to his house. If אָבָרֶן had truly considered himself a member of דוּד rather than one of דוּד, he would not have returned home (certainly not peacefully!) for fear of his life. Rabbi Goitein concludes that although privately sanctioned דוּד’s death, he publicly distanced himself from דוּד and his aggressive killings to maintain his image of a benevolent and kind leader. However, Rabbi Goitein suggests, דוּד committed one fatal error which culminated in his being killed without a trial. This mistake shall be explained when we investigate the story of דוּד and his death at the hands of דוּד.

In conclusion, if דוּד was indeed justified in killing דוּד’s consequent fury towards him is extremely perplexing. Although it can be suggested that דוּד was completely wrong and דוּד was right to be angry at him, most instead go out of their way to justify דוּד. Clearly, דוּד was a more complex figure than we originally proposed. To further investigate this matter and the general nature of דוּד’s character, we turn to the second major event in דוּד’s life, the story of אָבֶּסלוֹם.

אָבֶּסלוֹם

אָבֶּסלוֹם, after being returned from exile by his father דוּד for killing his half-brother אָבָרֶן, won the hearts of the Jewish people and led a large group of Jews into rebellion against דוּד. דוּד put אָבֶּסלוֹם in charge of the army, and sent them to pursue דוּד and his men after giving them the warning, "לעַן לְלַעַן אָבֶּסלוֹם" (שבוּ לְיהוָה), which is generally understood as a command to spare אָבֶּסלוֹם’s life. Nevertheless, דוּד unhesitatingly killed אָבֶּסלוֹם immediately upon reaching him in the forest, despite his awareness that דוּד would be less than thrilled. דוּד’s knowledge of this is evident in his speech to אָבֶּסלוֹם, who asked דוּד if he could run to דוּד and tell him that the war was over: "וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ דוּד הַאֲשֶׁר שָׁבָּרָה אֲחָסָדָא...כִּי נְלַע בִּהְמֶל מַהְתָּא (שֹׁבֵר לְיהוָה)."

When heard from another messenger that although the rebellion had been put down, was dead, he lamented bitterly: "בָּנִי אָבֶּסלוֹם בָּנִי בָּנִי: "וְיָדְתָּ אוֹסְרָא אֲשֶׁר אָבֶּסלוֹם מַתָּא מִי תַּחְתִּי אָבֶּסלוֹם בָּנִי בָּנִי (שֹׁבֵר לְיהוָה)."

heard that was in mourning rather than rejoicing that he was still king and the Jewish kingdom was saved and he confronted David with a powerful admonition: "הָבֶּשָּׁת הוֹמֵשׁ אִלּוֹ כְּעֶבֶדָּר...לֹא תֹּאכְלָה אַתָּא שָׁמָיוֹא שָׁמָיָא אֲתָא עָבֶּשָּׁךְ...כִּי אֵא אָבֶּסלוֹם מַתָּא מַתָּא מַמְתָּא (שֹׁבֵר לְיהוָה)."

Although did not respond (perhaps because he recognized the truth of אָבֶּסלוֹם’s words and was stunned and embarrassed) he
clearly never forgave for killing his son, to the point where after the rebellion he replaced with מ العسكرية former יב with יב as his own. Replacing an extremely loyal and successful general with a man who wanted יב’s life may seem illogical; simultaneously the act elucidates just how angry יב was at יב. Furthermore, when יב instructed יב to kill יב, one of his reasons seems to have been because יב had killed יב. As the poet יב רדוי wrote ( quoting יב), it was difficult to understand whether יב was justified for killing יב, and again, why יב was so angry. Theפרשני, רלביץ, מלקיס, and Rabbi Goitein, have fascinating and helpful insights into this story.

suggests that יב was aware of the emotional impact that יב’s death would have on יב; nevertheless he willingly killed him to save יב’s kingdom from the destructive hands of the royal prince himself. From the words יב suggests that מרגת יב struck יב first so that it would be he who would ultimately be held responsible for יב’s death, although his soldiers were the ones who actually killed יב. This interpretation implies that יב was willing to sacrifice his reputation and personal relationship with יב in order to save the kingdom, in contrast to previous textual implications that יב acted to gratify his uncontrollable anger, which directly conflicted with the kingdom’s welfare. Although יב did expect יב to be deeply saddened at the loss of his son, מרגת ליבא adds, he was nevertheless stunned to hear that יב felt that his son’s death was a result of an unjust act. In fact, יב was enraged not only because he felt that יב did not deserve to die, but because he maintained that יב was actually a יב claimed that his son wanted to rule under him rather than kill him, and he took full responsibility for יב’s death because he considered the tragedy his own punishment for taking יב and killing her husband יב ( quoting יב). M יב.

Furthermore, יב’s eulogy (ibid.) highlights יב’s despair that his son, who simply wanted to rule as a son under his father’s rule, had been mistaken for a traitor and had been ruthlessly killed. When יב heard that יב was mourning his son’s death and considered it an unnecessary act of bloodshed, he was shocked, angry, and hurt that יב was so blind and naive. In his most aggressive and passionate confrontation with יב, יב shed his subservient persona towards him by coming uninvited, and expressing how wrong יב was to have turned the nation’s victory into a tragic day of mourning. יב divides יב’s speech to יב into four separate admonitions:

1. did want to kill יב and the rest of the royal family. He wanted to be king right then (as proof he took יב’s concubines, a defiant act of de-
claring himself king) and if he had suceeded, the rest of דוד's death was justified not only because he rebelled, but also because he was a רוד, and the "דרר, had a halachic right to kill him. This is expressed in יאבר's statement, "because he rebelled, but also because he was a רוד," as referring not to דוד but to יאבר, who considered דוד's friends his enemies, and דוד's enemies, his friends.

2) Even if it is assumed that יאבר did not want to kill דוד, he employed the help and support of דוד's enemies to rebel against the kingdom, and that alone rendered him deserving of death. מֶלכִים interprets the phrase יאבר as referring not to דוד but to יאבר, who considered דוד's friends his enemies, and דוד's enemies, his friends.

3) Even if let his love for יאבר get the better of him and chose to forgive his son for rebelling, he should have been killed only for the good of the nation and not for the good of himself. As king, דוד was more responsible to his subjects than he was to himself: יאבר's final argument was a personal defense for his killing יאבר maintained that if יאבר had not been killed, the war would have continued until יאבר and his army won and inevitably killed all of דוד. This is highlighted in the statement, יאבר did not answer because the latter was clearly correct. יאבר was more concerned with רוד than with יאבר and he and his army threatened the welfare of the entire nation. Exceptions, יאבר felt, cannot be made whether or not a rebel was heir to the throne.

Moreover, both יאבר and Rabbi Goitein support יאבר's killing of דוד. In fact, they cite the instance of יאבר blowing the shofar after he killed דוד as proof that he sought only justice and not unnecessary bloodshed, contrary to דוד's perception of him. Immediately after יאבר died, the explains, יאבר's blowing the shofar's army, because all that was needed to stop the rebellion was the death of their charismatic leader. The juxtaposition of יאבר's death and יאבר's blowing the shofar amplifies his focus on executing only the acts that were absolutely necessary to achieve the ultimate goal of peace while sparing as many lives as possible. Again, it is ironic and tragic that יאבר hated יאבר because he felt that יאבר was the cause of sin and death amongst the nation.

Finally, יאבר's innocence concerning יאבר can also be proven from discussion in the מֶלכִים, or rather, the lack of discussion in the מֶלכִים. After יאבר asks why יאבר kills דוד and it is proven that דוד deserved to die, instead of asking about יאבר's (whose story comes chronologically after יאבר), he addresses the death of יאבר. יאבר's silence regarding יאבר is of a stranger and less justifiable nature.
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implies the explicit cause of his death: who threatened both and the nation that he was destined to protect.

Far more than and , it is extremely difficult to understand 's motivations for killing . In fact, throughout the whole post-story, no one succeeded in acting in his own self-interest despite their intentions to do so. Nobody acted in his self-interest, that is, except for himself, who was strangely passive. The story is as follows: was killed and rebuked for mourning him. in turn replaced with as his new . Not only is this strange because 's former chief general and helped execute the entire rebellion that led to a civil war and 's death, but did not even officially beg or seek peace with him!! However, it is clear that 's replacing the most excellent and loyal in the history of the Jews and hiring instead a potential "shady character" has no relevance to 's credentials; rather, the , specifically and , comment that it was a retaliation against , unforgiven by for the murder of . After and revolted against , the latter instructed to pursue and apprehend and return in three days. obeyed, but returned late. When met while chasing , he greeted and took hold of his beard as if to kiss him. As lost his guard, stabbed him to death with his sword and removed 's bowels from his body. The two most prevalent issues in this troubling tale are whether deserved to die, and whether killed for this very reason. Again, it is far more difficult to justify the death of than the deaths of and , partially because, as opposed to the latter two, simply didn't do anything. There is nothing in the text that makes it apparent that deserved death, and what is more, the manner in which killed is shocking and horrific. In this story, the do not jump to 's defense. Although most agree that deserved death because he was by returning to later than he commanded, the question remains regarding 's motivations. Most troubling, however, is the 's silence regarding guilt. , one of the few who address this issue, both maintain that killed because he feared losing his position to the latter. Conversely, the , in its tendency to defend , states that killed only because he was by returning late to . Supposing that this is true and was right to kill him, the cruel manner in which died must be addressed. That 's killing cannot be justified because he gave him no warning.
The issues of יואב’s incentives and questionable innocence is addressed the least regarding יואב, and certainly not answered satisfactorily. Moreover, of all the other stories in which יואב appears, it is here that he is defended the least, which perhaps sheds light on why יואב was condemned and killed by בת דוד. Although we know from the פרשנים that it is possible to prove that יואב, אבלשולם, acabăr, and יואב deserved to die, יואב killed them through unnecessary means of trickery, and for this reason he deserved punishment. We now arrive at our last stop in our journey through the primary events in יואב’s life: his death.

יראַב’s Death

The story, although not surprising, is a tragic and troubling tale. On his deathbed, "told to remember what יואב did to him, השאר יואב and to act according to his own wisdom. יואב heard that he was a wanted man, and, seeing that it had worked for רואַב, ran to the אָלְמַך and grabbed onto the 통 hakkoh ב יוהויע שולמה. קרותのもהبث sent commanding him to leave the המב and give up his life, but יואב refused. יואב’s Bahar relayed יואב’s refusal to השאר and the latter gave בינהו permission to kill יואב at the altar. יואב was thereupon killed and buried in the desert. The two primary issues that present themselves in this story are: a) whether or not יואב deserved to die, and why, and b) whether יואב told השאר to kill for this reason. Furthermore, the actual content of the story must be examined; namely, יואב’s reasoning in running to the אָלְמַך for salvation, the significance in the verbal exchange between יואב and השאר, and השאר’s speech in which he permitted יואב to kill at the altar. יואב’s actions would be justified because these men deserved to die. Although the commentaries do not generally come to the defense of יואב’s character at large, they leave room for speculation: If יואב had not killed בינהו, would he have then been considered a spiritual role model and overall hero in Jewish history?

The Rishonim agree that יואב died because he killed בינהו, with trickery. Their opinions diverge, however, regarding the defense of יואב’s character. The מְבֵית מְבֵית suggests that the reason why יואב deserved to die and the reason why יואב commanded יואב to kill him are one and the same: יואב had killed with cunning and trickery. This theory, while acknowledging יואב’s sin, does imply that, had יואב not killed בינהו, יואב’s actions would be justified because these men deserved to die. Although the commentaries do not generally come to the defense of יואב’s character at large, they leave room for speculation: If יואב had not killed בינהו, would he have then been considered a spiritual role model and overall hero in Jewish history?
Among others, אברנהייל, דרייק and מארק propose that from the words, "יפן בינתו כמסדה" (מ"א:ב'ג), it can be derived that היה pst opened a house for the poor and was buried there so that these people could pray that his soul be admitted to the next world. Moreover, ד"ר elaborates by quoting three words, ייפה כמסדה, that illuminate היה’s excellent character:

1. מ"א:ב'ג היה פתח בינתו למל khiến בינתו של יה pst מסדה, כligt היה מובטח למל. כligt היה מת.
2. מ"א:ב'ג היה פתח בינתו אלא כת מנהיגין, נפשו ישראל מסדה. (ישים, מ"א:ב'ג, פרק 3, הלכה 1).

These statements display היה’s powerful and pervasive role as a political and spiritual leader of the Jews. Overall, it can be safely assumed after examining the commentaries of the Rishonim that although היה deserved to die because he commited a terrible sin, killing בינה, he lived an outstanding spiritual existence besides being the physical power behind היה’s throne.

Contemporary scholars also contribute significantly to this chapter in היה’s life. Prof. Seri suggests that because היה did not specify to שלמה to kill יה pst, as he was not necessarily deserving of death. Rather, יה pst killed as a political maneuver to disconnect בינה יהpst from the deaths of אבשלום, אביגאל, and Amnon, and, in an effort to create a reputation of being a just, "people-friendly" king. Seri continues to explain why יה pst ran to the אשם. In אשם, God commanded: יושב אדומית אל האשם יה pst אל האשם, ויה pst יזרע על האשם את המ镯 במימים תקועה. ליה pst הלך. If a murderer runs to the altar to be saved, he should be taken away from it and killed. If יה pst ran to the אשם hoping to be saved, it can be inferred that he did not consider himself a murderer, but recognized that his life was sought for political reasons. Seri suggests that not only was יה pst not deserving of death for murder, but he was also not a אדום pst for following יה pst for four reasons:

1. יה pst was the next in line to be the king, because his older brothers אבשלום and Amnon were dead, and the next in line,/Internal citation marker 14, did not wish to be king. This is one reason why יה pst believed that יה pst was rightfully deserving of the kingship.

2. יה pst said that he was going to be king and יה pst did not protest (숙וקה ח السعود, פ' 30:10), which insinuates consent (숙וקה ח السعود).

3. יה pst did not necessarily know that יה pst had been appointed king, due to its clandestine nature.

4. יה pst himself was never punished for rebelling against יה pst; he was punished only for taking the king’s concubine, אליס[newline]
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Thus, although he does not go so far as to suggest that אב וב committed no sin, Seri concludes that, had אב וב been given a fair trial, he would have been found completely undeserving of death.

In contrast, Rabbi Goitein assumes that אב וב did deserve to die, and suggests two possibilities why:

1) The answer given in the השעוהawah יואדא דע יואדא מי יואדא נפשיה השעוהawah יואדא deserved to die because he was מורד וב by following אב ובו and killing אב ובו, whose life דוד commanded him to spare.

2) אב וב died because he killed using trickery. As opposed to Prof. Seri, Rabbi Goitein quotes the השעוהawah יואדא to be referring specifically to one who kills אב ובו as it says,15 The answer given in the השעוהawah יואדא ראניו because he thought that השעוהawah יואדא wanted to kill him for political reasons, including the fact that אב ובו’s loyalty to השעוהawah יואדא was cast into heavy doubt due to his having supported אב ובו. Knowing the halacha that one who kills with trickery or cunning will not be saved from the altar,17 it must be inferred that אב וב did not put himself in that category; rather, he considered himself a victim of political strategy and assumed that escaping to the המשה would save his life.

In truth, however, wanted to kill אב וב to punish him for his criminal rather than political acts. Rabbi Goitein quotes the השעוהawah יואדא who maintains that אב וב was killed solely because he murdered אב ובו and אב ובו cunningly and without warning. Regardless of these two possibilities for the cause of אב וב’s death, one political and one criminal, Rabbi Goitein maintains that אב וב’s character is of outstanding caliber. He quotes the השעוהawah יואדא who come to אב וב’s defense, and adds two textual proofs concerning his superior nature:

1) In השעוהawah יואדא, הזד הרע Rebels against השעוהawah יואדא after he saw that וד וב and מזא חדא אומצה were dead: כי סצא וד וב אומצה יוו מזא חדא שרא עצא.

2) In השעוהawah יואדא, is described as an יאש שנל טסל ב וצל👀ו ב, someone who was needed by everyone in the nation.

These statements are clearly powerful implications of אב וב’s personal greatness and public influence. They are used by Rabbi Goitein to highlight the fact that אב וב was basically good, despite his killing through trickery and deceit; a sin that determined his untimely death.

There are two crucial statements in the השעוהawah יואדא that have not yet been examined; one concerns אב וב’s death, and one, his overall character and role within דווי’s kingdom. Although their implications contradict, it is unnecessary to reconcile them because the statements are made by different people. The first is a statement made by רב יוהuda in the name of אב וב who extrapolates
from Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician?

"השבח וה על דמו וול ראשה אושר פוגיבעליית, מיכה בלב, עימו וחו דודו שאמר, he did not seek out every fact and halacha in the Torah, and he obeyed a sinful command that was received through a letter while they disobeyed a sinful command that was verbally related to them. According to the קמר, this refers to שאול's instructions to kill the priests of Nov because they hid from שאול.

Responding to this קמר, Rabbi Goitein proposes three proofs regarding why it was easier for דוד and שאול to refuse שאול's command to kill the than for for שאול to refuse דוד's command to kill שאול:

1) Everyone, including שאול's servants, knew that were innocent. Conversely, שאול did not know whether or not שאול deserved to die. It is logical to assume that שאול did deserve death when taking into account that the message to kill him was from שאול, the last person who would ever consider killing someone if he was even slightly unsure of his being guilty.

2) שאול knew that שאול was acting irrationally and even madly concerning שאול; therefore they did not feel compelled to obey him.

3) שאול knew that שאול wanted to kill שאול because he feared that would overthrow his kingdom, and they recognized that this is an insufficient and blatantly wrong reason to have someone killed.

Even if one does not accept these arguments against the condemning tones of the קמר, it is crucial to keep in mind that it is contrasted by many other previously explored commentaries on the very same page, that come to שאול's full defense concerning both his acts and his character.

The second statement in שאול is made by בר אבא בר חנה, who derives from the words, "ויי הדוד נפשו מגפיפ אלל עימו ויאב בר רחוי על חכאם" (/piy: נ-ו:), that without שאול, שאול would not have been successful in war, and without שאול, שאול would not have been able to immerse himself in Torah. Although there are numerous other statements in שאול that we have already discussed concerning שאול’s spiritual excellence and outstanding persona, בר אבא בר חנה’s statement is exceedingly significant in that it stresses the powerful function and symbiotic dynamics that are at the core of שאול’s and שאול’s relationship.

In conclusion, the that we have examined prove that the men that שאול killed deserved to die. He erred not in the act of killing them but in the nature of his killing them, namely, his use of deceit and trickery. However, שאול’s sin and the reason for שאול’s anger towards שאול are inconsistent. Because the do not reconcile this inconsistency or explain שאול’s tumultuous and ambiguous confrontations with שאול, I would like to propose a theory concerning their relationship.
Two Antithetical Typologies

יהו and יוהו are dichotomous characters who, through their actions and personalities, elucidated each other’s tragic flaws, and to a lesser degree, greatness. יוהו’s ultimate goal as king was to establish a spiritually and physically perfect reign to pave the way for ממשה to build the Temple, a symbol of maximal connection with God through physical means. יהו interacted with man and God primarily on a spiritual level. He was not an ordinary warrior; his greatest fear was bloodshed. However, a physically perfect kingdom had to be established and all enemies had to be eliminated in order to maximize the kingdom’s spiritual potential. יהו, therefore, needed someone who could take care of the physical aspect of leadership. This is why יוהו was not only an integral member in the group of people who established יהו formas, but a necessary one as well. יהו and יהו each recognized that the other was needed to establish the kingdom, but יהו did not believe that יוהו acted in the interest of the nation’s welfare. Rather, יהו regarded יוהו as a hasty and bloodthirsty warrior while יוהו felt that he acted only in the interest of the king and his nation. The result of this friction was a strong mutual distrust and an urge to survive and lead independently of the other, while pretending that the other’s contribution was not necessary to establish a perfect kingdom.

There is one inconsistency in the otherwise identical dynamics with which the two related to each other: יוהו was in conflict regarding the way he felt about יהו; יהו was clearly not in conflict regarding the way he felt about יוהו and his brothers. יוהו had a problem: On the one hand, he was a subject and employee of the king, and felt strong loyalty to יהו and his nation. Furthermore, he possessed a deep desire to have the king’s approval. On the other hand, he thought that יהו’s leadership tactics were harmful to the nation and could barely resist the urge to take the law into his own hands and make all of the major political decisions in יהו’s stead. Also, despite his loyalty to יהו and desire for approval, he was regarded with suspicion and contempt instead of gratitude and respect. יוהו never resolved this conflict. Ultimately, however, יוהו found himself incompatible with יהו and rebelled with יהו in the hopes of establishing a more “normal” political system in which he would receive appreciation.

Moreover, יהו’s and יוהו’s major sins lie in contrast to one another and, despite their effort to correct each other’s, they not only failed, but plummeted more deeply into the depths of their personal weaknesses. יהו’s greatest sin, an event that shadowed over him all of his life, is taking בתי-שבע and killing her husband, יהו. יוהו saw את-שבע bathing, sent for her, and slept with her. He saw her because he was wandering the palace roof at
night, rather than going out to war with the rest of the army, as the king was required to do. דוד’s passivity directly led to his greatest sin, for which he and his children were severely punished. In fact, דוד’s unwillingness to act regarding what he feared was unnecessary bloodshed, came into conflict with בקעי’s tendency to act upon his every passionate whim. Both דוד and בקעי reprimanded each other for their extreme behavior, but neither of them succeeded in finding a functional medium to integrate a healthy balance of action and passivity, of physicality and spirituality. Nevertheless, דוד and בקעי shared the ultimate goal of establishing a kingdom most conducive to serving God.

Finally, there is one other subtle, yet truly striking point that is worthy of notice here. Consistently, throughout the ספר, דוד used the four-letter Name of הר購物, while בקעי in general referred to Him as נ-לעות.

In order to succinctly enumerate דוד and בקעי’s similarities, parallels and differences, a chart is very helpful:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>דוד</th>
<th>בקעי</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passivity led to his downfall</td>
<td>Action led to his downfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgave his enemies</td>
<td>Did not forgive his enemies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruled with mercy</td>
<td>Ruled with justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered בקעי destructive for the nation’s survival — but was dependent on him</td>
<td>Considered דוד destructive for the nation’s survival — but was dependent on him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinded by love</td>
<td>Blinded by anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relied on spiritual strength</td>
<td>Relied on physical strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered himself maintainer of the kingdom</td>
<td>Considered himself maintainer of the kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried to survive independently of בקעי</td>
<td>Tried to survive independently of דוד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relates to ”יה“</td>
<td>Relates to ”ל-לעות“</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To better understand how בקעי and דוד each envisioned a perfect kingdom and ideal servitude to God, it is crucial to examine the different Godly aspects that they each related to:
There are two popular approaches regarding the antithetical nature of the Names: One is that "ד-ל" denotes the Divine attribute of mercy while "ד-ל" denotes the Divine attribute of justice. The second is that "ד-ל" is mentioned regarding the interpersonally relating God of the Jews, and "ד-ל" is mentioned regarding an omnipotent Creator of nature. To best grasp this dialectic, one must turn to the two cases in the Torah in which the relationship between "ד-ל" and "ד-ל" most blatantly manifest themselves: the creation of the world and God's presentation of His attributes (בראשית בראשית; God, the Mighty Source, created nature. Throughout the entire account of creation, God is quite reasonably referred to as "ד-ל". In fact, the first time we see the use of "ד-ד-ל-ל" is still in conjunction with "ד-ל-ל". As soon as God created and breathed His own breath into man, the latent Name of Hashem, the Connecting Relater, presents itself. However, "ד-ל" is still juxtaposed with "ד-ל"; God created and participated in the union between man and woman, and through having children they connected and participated in the act of creation with the ultimate Creator. In other words, "ד-ל" is first used when man discovered his connection and likeness to God through his ability to create.

The second case in which the natures of "ד-ל" and "ד-ל" play a prominent role is the stated in the (שמועת ד': מיתות הדינה הרוחמיס, when God “showed” Himself to Moshe (שמועת ד': מיתות הדינה הרוחמיס, when God “showed” Himself to Moshe. Predictably, "ד-ל" is used in conjunction with "ד-ל"; God created and participated in the union between man and woman, and through having children they connected and participated in the act of creation with the ultimate Creator. In other words, "ד-ל" is first used when man discovered his connection and likeness to God through his ability to create.

Moreover, despite the fact that in the "ד-ל" is mentioned seven times, it is completely absent when God relates the to Moshe. Clearly, these Names present a very powerful dichotomy throughout the Torah that represents the two polar ways in which man discovers God. Finally, among a vast number of commentators and scholars that further pursue this topic, Prof. U. Cassuto succinctly enumerates seven primary differences between "ד-ל" and "ד-ל" that can be beautifully integrated into the characters of ד-ל and ד-ל:

1) "ד-ל" conveys the Jewish conception of God, in particular His ethical Character, and "ד-ל" conveys an abstract conception of a Supreme Deity that is the Creator and Ruler over nature.
2) "יהוה" is employed when He is depicted as a lucid and clear Being, while "א-לוהים" is employed when God is depicted as a hazy and obscure Being.

3) "יהוה" implies a majestic and glorious God; "א-לוהים" implies an ordinary God.

4) "יהוה" appears in direct relationship with a personal character, and "א-לוהים" appears as an outside Force above and beyond the physical universe.

5) "יהוה" is found in relation to the Jews; "א-לוהים" is found in relation to mankind.

6) "יהוה" is mentioned concerning the Jews’ tradition and "א-לוהים" is mentioned concerning humanity’s tradition.

7) "יהוה" portrays man’s simple and intuitive concept of God, while "א-לוהים" portrays the philosophical concept of thinkers who ponder the world and humanity.

In short, Prof. Cassuto suggests that the Tetragrammaton (the Name of Hashem), refers to God’s relationship with man, His personal connection with the Jews, and consequently, the ethical manner with which He relates to His creatures. In contrast, "א-לוהים" insinuates God’s rule over the general mass of mankind and His role as unattainable Creator, who, because of a lack of connection between Him and His creations, has no compassionate ethical code and acts with objective justice alone.23

This notion is completely consistent with the characters of יְהֹוָה and יִהוּד. יְהֹוָה refers to God as "א-לוהים" because יְהֹוָה personifies justice, while יִהוּד referred to God as "יהוה" because יִהוּד personifies love, brotherhood, and mercy. The misunderstanding between these two men that results from the tension of this dialectic does not reflect a “right and wrong” situation, in which either יְהֹוָה or יִהוּד related to God “the correct way.” Rather, it reflects a fundamental personality clash. This clash resulted in tragic misunderstanding which led both יְהֹוָה and יִהוּד to feel that they could not lead the nation together as an integrated duo, but were doomed to exist as opposing forces.24 There are four major instances in which the use of the names of יְהֹוָה and יִהוּד-א-לוהים best reflect the opposite characters of יְהֹוָה and יִהוּד, respectively: יְהֹוָה and יִהוּד. יְהֹוָה fled from שאול and came across his sleeping regime in the middle of the night. יִהוּד felt that it may be יְהֹוָה’s last opportunity to defend himself against שאול and offered to kill the latter, knowing that although יִהוּד is a רַדְוָה and had a right to kill יְהֹוָה, he would never do so on his own. יִהוּד urged שאול and assured יְהֹוָה that although technically he could kill שאול, he identified not with יִהוּד but with Hashem, the personal,
loving, and ethical God of the Jews. דוד expressed this by mentioning God’s Name Hashem five times in his refusal to allow the Jews to go to war. קי מתי שלחתי ויד הבישך את חמשה: הבסיי: הבסיי: הבסיי: הבסיי: הבסיי: הבסיי: הבסיי (שם כ: י-ו). דוד dissociated himself from יה’s formal conception of God, manifest in יה’s use of the Name emphasizing his own passionate relationship with God, manifest in his manipulation of the Name Hashem. This is further highlighted in the second example:

2) יה and יה led the Jews in war against each other. After killing יה and יה offered a cease-fire to יה, and the latter responded in emphatic assent, יה וה-לחים כללא בחרת כי מאבקר גילה המעי איש ממוחרי בחור, (שיבת בכלי). It is fascinating that this is the only place in יה where someone swore by the life of יה. Perhaps יה was trying to justify his belief in the greatness of God as יה-לחים, the just and mighty Creator, while refuting יה’s notion that God could only be related to as the “demeaning” image of a “Father-Figure,” implied by Hashem.

3) יה sent an אשת חכמה to convince יה to allow return to Yerushalayim by using a parable in which she described a parallel story that she claimed had happened to her family. In her speech, the woman referred to God as יה-לחים, although יה responded by referring to God with the Name of Hashem. The woman’s words can be equated with יה’s, since she functions in the story only to deliver his message, as the text clearly states: יהי יה את הדבורם פיהו (שם כ: י-ו). Although the woman referred to specific entities in a possessive form regarding יה (I.e., יה-לחים...מלאת יה-לחים...פסוקים י-ו), it is most significant that concerning יה, she said: יה אלהים (פסוקים א-ו). In fact, it is quite possible that יה suspected that this woman was sent by יה for the sole reason that the two utilized the Divine Names identically.

4) יה: Despite יה’s express instructions to spare his son’s life, יה killed יה, thereby ending the war and eliminating a national crisis. Instead of allowing his people to rejoice, יה turned the day into one of mourning and grief, and of course was furious at יה. The latter in turn severely rebuked יה for what יה deemed are backward values, and urged him to reach out to his people: יהאבחה את משך לעך את אנחך כי תחזרו יהו...כי יה נק, נקמת כי יניח יהו לעך והנהו... совсем יה נק נקמת כי יניח יהו לעך והנהו... совсем יה נק נקמת כי יניח יהו לעך והנהו... совсем יה נק נקמת כי יניח יהו לעך והנהו... совсем יה נק נקמת כי יניח יהו לעך והנהו...完全可以. יה pleaded with יה to stop mourning his son and resume his role as intermediary between God and His people. To stress how strongly he felt, יה went so far as to swear in the Name of Hashem, expressing his attempt to identify himself with יה, as if saying, “I am with you, יה, not against you. Listen to me so I can help you reestablish order and your role as charismatic and optimistic king, which you have temporarily lost. My loyalty to you even brings me to be willing to subjugate my personality to yours, so as not to oppose your will.”
Clearly, the Divine Names "יִהוָה" and "יְהֹוָה" are utilized to elucidate יִהוָה's just nature and רְאוּף's merciful character. יִהוָה is related to an abstract omnipotent Creator of humanity, a world in which everyone shares the same code of ethics, while רְאוּף is related to a personal Savior, a world in which the Jews have the privilege of having God's love and mercy bestowed upon them. This fundamental difference is portrayed throughout רְאוּף's reign in that he and יִהוָה forever remained opposing forces that could not, or would not, be integrated.

Conclusion

Now that it has been established that יִהוָה's presence was necessary to establish the kingdom because he was an extraordinary military leader, an actor, and a just ruler, and that רְאוּף's presence was equally necessary because he was a spiritual leader and a loving and merciful king, we must now return to the stories in which יִהוָה and רְאוּף appear and explain them in light of this necessary but ultimately tragic dialectic:

These recount the war between יִהוָה and רְאוּף, in which יִהוָה killed and was in turn later killed by יִהוָה. The latter did not kill immediately for killing רְאוּף but instead killed him when the war was over and peace reigned, an act for which יִהוָה criticized him and which is possibly a motivation for condemning יִהוָה to death. However, the text implies that יִהוָה accepted יִהוָה's gesture of peace because he was not aware that his brother was killed. יִהוָה probably offered peace to יִהוָה only because he knew that once יִהוָה discovered that יִהוָה killed his brother יִהוָה would refuse to stop fighting until he defeated יִהוָה and killed רְאוּף. However, the latter's speech to יִהוָה insinuated that the war was יִהוָה's fault: יִהוָה came upon the horrific realization that יִהוָה killed רְאוּף and called for peace before יִהוָה could discover what had happened. יִהוָה probably felt that יִהוָה was a sly murderer and a selfish liar; meanwhile, רְאוּף's blood was not avenged and ironically יִהוָה himself was the man who had innocently called off the war.

In, when יִהוָה offered a peace treaty to רְאוּף and it was accepted, יִהוָה of course assumed that it was another plot in which יִהוָה was pretending
to come peacefully while secretly plotting to manipulate him just before turning against him. Perhaps because was a descendant of as well as the fact that had a halachic right to be and avenge his brother’s blood, so killed .

However, typically misunderstood and assumed that was killed because was angry and lost self-control. This may explain why opens with the story of why abandoned ; we are told that his peace-treaty to was genuine. Furthermore, it is possible that brought twenty people with him as a symbolic gesture to express his regret for the bloodshed of the twenty men from that were killed. This misunderstanding between and laid the groundwork for the rest of their relationship, in which ’s mistrust of disabled them from working together.

Finally, it is significant that although the Name appears in this , the Name is completely absent. This implies that during this war, (represented by the use of the Name ) was powerless regarding the Jews’ fate, and , as physical leader, was in control. The military aspect of establishing the kingdom is, for better or for worse, not in ’s complete control.

In and led the Jews into a stunning victory over , before which delivered his famous proclamation. As the war came to a close and victory was inevitable, arrived to fight the last battle and silently faded out of the picture. This seems to be ’s ideal function: to fight wars for and give the glory that he earned over to and the kingdom. This concept also manifests itself in , when fought and sent a message to to come finish the war: . Again, this reflects what the relationship between was supposed to be: achieved and utilized material greatness to glorify ’s spiritually perfect reign.

This is the story of ’s rebellion, an event that permanently destroyed any hopes of reconciliation and integration between and . An important factor in ’s rebellion is that it was imminent, and this was probably recognized by both and . The harbinger of the rebellion in which this is most apparent is that, in his father’s absence, the manner in which spoke to his servants was that in which a king speaks to his subjects: . Furthermore, the fact
that escaped to his gentle grandfather rather than going to a distant city in Israel is sufficient evidence alone to assume that dissociated himself from. Perhaps the reason why did not want to return to him is because he knew that would rebel and cause a national state of emergency; even worse, feared that he would be forced to have him killed. Conversely, had no qualms about killing a even if he was ’s son. Consumed with the incentive of getting pardoned for being a so that would be compelled to forgive for being for to plotted to return home. When he did, of course, slowly began the process of rebellion. Lighting ’s fields on fire because could not convince to consent to seeing his son, and winning the hearts of the Jews masterfully set the groundwork for his plan. When he finally rebelled, is told, . From this statement that does not necessarily convey an act of rebellion, knew immediately to evacuate the palace. Due to the imminence of his rebellion, blamed for two reasons:

1) knew of ’s plan and still wanted him returned home so that he could be pardoned for killing, regardless of whether or not died.

2) specified to to spare ’s life but killed him nevertheless.

was perfectly aware of ’s sentiments towards him, and in confronted him with his famous speech that we mentioned previously. said five times to , emphasizing that had to stop mourning immediately and go out to the people that very day, or he would lose the loyalty of the people. The urgency in ’s message is further displayed in that he said seven times, reflecting his fragmented stream of consciousness and frantic tone. Although he knew that his killing completely severed any remaining bonds between them, remained devoted to and willing to sacrifice his own good graces with the king to save the nation from crisis and help reestablish his kingdom.

After killing , chased the . When he arrived at the city wall inside which was hiding, a woman called out to , asking him to spare her life. He responded, . was defending himself from those with the impression that he killed freely and thoughtlessly. Furthermore, the term is used in conjunction with the Name . Perhaps was utilzing this phrase to
identify with דוד, to indicate that he truly did not want unnecessary bloodshed.

wanted to count the people, a grievous sin, and tried to dissuade him. In contrast to the last time that יואש spoke to דוד, in which he harshly reprimanded him for mourning, here יואש spoke humbly and formally to דוד, expressing their cold and hostile relationship: יואש אל חנ創造 למך...ועניון יואש’s plea was rejected and דוד himself was sent to count the nation; loyalty compelled him to obey the king even though he clearly did not want to sin. In this story we see יואש’s basically good character typically conflicting with דוד ’s will.

rebuked him. 33 Again, allowed his love to blind him from reality. Perhaps this tendency influenced יואש to rebel, 34 as if stating, “I have had enough of being on דוד’s side where my family and I are not appreciated because דוד loves his enemies and hates his friends, and therefore resents my view on how to run the kingdom. Also, maybe joining יואש will force דוד to take opposition seriously and he will learn from whom he must truly defend himself and act upon it.”

discovered that he was a wanted criminal and ran to the עשה for refuge, after seeing that יואש, after doing so, was saved. This story is parallel with עשה’s death to highlight the traits that the brothers shared, and is in contrast with, יואש’s to delineate that, as is typical of יואש, the true enemy was forgiven and יואש never received gratitude or even forgiveness.

Regarding the parallels with עשה, both he and יואש rejected opportunities to escape or leave, and stubbornly refused to yield, dismissing the tragedy of losing their lives because they felt justified in their actions. Both יואש and יואש are portrayed as zealous and stubborn, manifest in the similarity of the words in each of the stories. יואש is used in conjunction with a refusal to yield (徉ב: ו + כָּא, כָּא: דָּא, and both were given objects to grab onto as opportunities to be saved. יואש كل אחוד מתהרותו, עמשא ענבר told told, the_psak recounts, יואש קרונות הפרוהפלה (משה: יואש כָּא), and concerning יואש, the_psak recount, יואש קרונת הפרוהפלה (משה: יואש כָּא). These parallels elucidate the common traits of יואש that are in stark contrast with דוד, and ultimately were the causes of their deaths. 35
Furthermore, regarding the contrast between זוטר and יואב, they both ran to the בית דוד for refuge, but אומנות, but in light of דוד’s tendency to forgive their enemies and hate מנה, it seems that both יואב and זוטר knew that this would occur. This is apparent in that יואב calmly walked to the altar, while יואב, in hopeless desperation, fled there: יואב עלול יותר מנה... (מְאָה בַּכָּה). The predictability of יואב’s fate is nonetheless tragic; due to the unwillingness of דוד to pardon יואב, particularly regarding אבשלום’s death, he was not in control of his fate.

We return to our original question concerning whether יואב was a יודיק or a רָשׁוֹ. I believe that the answer is that יואב was a יודיק, but not a perfect one. יואב did not fulfill his potential to be a great leader and an ideal second in command to דוד for two reasons: He sinned by killing with trickery, and consequently, in addition to him not sparing אבשלום’s life, דוד could not reconcile the differences that he had with יואב. Moreover, although they possessed antithetical personalities, יואב and דוד’s strengths were both necessary to establish the Jewish kingdom but neither recognized the other as a crucial component in creating an ideal reign. Had they accepted and integrated each other’s strengths, יואב and דוד would probably not have sinned in their leadership and would have succeeded in building the ultimate spiritual kingdom.

1 The stories in which יואב and יואב appear and their implications regarding their character must be analyzed: מְשַׁיחַ הָאֵבֶשָׁי - שיב פרק ב = negative שיב פרק ב and his soldiers “sport” and יואב agreed = negative יואב executed a stunning victory over יואב = positive יואב received a letter from יואב and he obeyed = negative יואב fought and right before he was about to win, sent message to יואב to come and fight the last battle so he could take the credit for the victory rather than יואב = positive יואב saw that יואב was upset over אבשלום’s absence, plotted to get him sent back = positive יואב wanted to kill יואב after he cursed יואב, and יואב was furious
Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician?

1. Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician?

= negative
killed after told him not to = negative
wanted to kill after he apologized to was furious = negative
rebuffed for mourning and turning his victory into a tragedy = positive
killed his former general and current = negative

Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician?

2. This war stemmed from the horrific tragedy that occurred at his suggestion to, that twelve of each of their men should “sport” against each other. The men murdered each other, and a bloody and completely unnecessary war erupted.

3. This statement alone suggests Avro’s just character; the woman assumed that if she could convince Avro that she is undeserving of death, he would unhesitatingly spare her life and the lives of the other inhabitants of the city.

4. Loyal, that is, until he rebelled and joined Avro’s son in his rebellion. This will be examined further on.

5. Mrs. Yael Ziegler

6. Either because was being or murderer committed to.

7. This in stark contrast to Avro’s fierce loyalty to, especially in war. For instance, he sent a message to to fight the last battle against Amon, when Avro’s victory was clearly imminent. The purpose of this, explained, is so that Avro would get the credit for winning the battle and not: Avro’s half-brother who rebelled against and whom saved after he ran to the for salvation, as the halacha prohibits murderers from being killed at God’s altar.

8. Mrs. Yael Ziegler

9. At first glance at the story of, it seems that Avro willingly destroyed any possibilities of peace between and when he killed the latter to avenge the death of his brother.

10. The cropper’s tidy

11. As opposed to.

12. The cropper’s tidy.
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14 Whom many say is Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician, as he is listed as second son in Genesis.
15 See Rambam’s Hilchet Malachim, who says that was Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician, as he is listed as second son in Genesis.
16 Rav Yaakov Medan also makes this distinction.
17 The story of Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician is a primary example.
18 For those who have read Rav Soloveitchik’s essay, “The Lonely Man of Faith” it is interesting to note that God creates Adam I with Adam II with Hashem. For detailed elaboration, see Rabbi Menachem Leibtag’s article on this subject.
19 Moreover, the relationship that Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician had with Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician mirrors the relationship that the other brothers had with Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician. This is because all three brothers shared the same basic traits and religious philosophies.
20 For a more in-depth study, compare Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician with Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician, and Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician with Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician. Also, examine the contexts in which Hashem’s Name is mentioned five times in Genesis.
21 From exile for killing his half-brother Amnon after the latter rapes Tamar, also his half-sibling.
22 As listed in footnote 1.
23 Although we know that Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician initiates the war - see ibid.
24 Mrs. Mali Brofsky.
25 ibid.
26 See ibid’s declaration in Genesis for an example.
27 In addition to what we have said before, that a) Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician was next in line to be king so this was not a true rebellion, b) Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician proclaimed himself king and Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician did not protest, and c) Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician might not have known that Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician had already been appointed king.
28 Note also that Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician are almost always mentioned in relation to each other - Devoted Hero or Cunning Politician, etc. This further highlights the point that they shared common fundamental personality traits.