

Notes on
2 Samuel
2003 Edition
Dr. Thomas L. Constable

Introduction

Second Samuel continues the history begun in 1 Samuel. Please see my comments regarding 2 Samuel's title, date, authorship, and scope in the introductory section of the 1 Samuel notes.

OUTLINE

(Continued from notes on 1 Samuel)

- V. David's triumphs chs. 1—8
 - A. The beginning of David's kingdom 1:1—3:5
 - 1. David's discovery of Saul and Jonathan's deaths ch. 1
 - 2. David's move to Hebron 2:1-4a
 - 3. David's overtures to Jabesh-gilead 2:4b-7
 - 4. Ish-bosheth's coronation over Israel 2:8-11
 - 5. The conflict between Abner and Joab 2:12-32
 - 6. The strengthening of David's position 3:1-5
 - B. The unification of the kingdom 3:6—5:16
 - 1. David's acceptance of Abner 3:6-39
 - 2. David's punishment of Ish-bosheth's murderers ch. 4
 - 3. David's acceptance by all Israel 5:1-12
 - 4. David's additional children 5:13-16
 - C. The establishment of the kingdom 5:17—8:18
 - 1. David's victories over the Philistines 5:17-25
 - 2. David's moving of the ark to Jerusalem ch. 6
 - 3. The giving of the Davidic Covenant ch. 7
 - 4. The security of David's kingdom ch. 8
- VI. David's troubles chs. 9—20
 - A. David's faithfulness ch. 9
 - B. God's faithfulness despite David's unfaithfulness chs. 10—12

1. The Ammonite rebellion ch. 10
 2. David's unfaithfulness to God chs. 11—12
- C. David's rejection and return chs. 13—20
1. Events leading up to Absalom's rebellion chs. 13—14
 2. Absalom's attempt to usurp David's throne chs. 15—20
- VII. Summary illustrations chs. 21—24
- A. Famine from Saul's sin 21:1-14
1. Saul's broken treaty with the Gibeonites 21:1-6
 2. David's justice and mercy 21:7-9
 3. David's honoring of Saul and Jonathan 21:10-14
- B. Four giant killers 21:15-22
- C. David's praise of Yahweh ch. 22
- D. David's last testament 23:1-7
- E. Thirty-seven mighty men 23:8-39
1. Selected adventures of outstanding warriors 23:8-23
 2. A list of notable warriors among The Thirty 23:24-39
- F. Pestilence from David's sin ch. 24
1. David's sin of numbering the people 24:1-9
 2. David's confession of his guilt 24:10-14
 3. David's punishment 24:15-17
 4. David's repentance 24:18-25

Exposition

V. DAVID'S TRIUMPHS CHS. 1—8

The first 20 chapters of 2 Samuel are divisible into four units each of which ends with a list of names that is four verses long (1:1—3:5; 3:6—5:16; 5:17—8:18; 9:1—20:26).¹ The first two units conclude with lists of David's sons that were born to him first in Hebron and then in Jerusalem. The second two units end with lists of David's officials. This structural division is helpful to observe because it clarifies the writer's intent in 2 Samuel: to provide a record of the consolidation of Israel's monarchy. The first three units are generally positive and describe David's triumphs whereas the last unit is generally negative and relates David's troubles.

In chapters 1—8 the writer's fertility motif reaches a climax in his description of David's reign. 1:1 and 8:13 form an *inclusio* that surrounds this section.²

"The thesis of the author—that Israel is blessed with fertility when the nation (and the epitome of the nation, the king) is following the [Mosaic] covenant—is demonstrated in these chapters."³

A. THE BEGINNING OF DAVID'S KINGDOM 1:1—3:5

The present section begins with Yahweh's destruction of Saul's line and ends with a summary of David's fecundity. In the middle we find the record of David's anointing as king over Judah (2:1-7). In 1:1—3:5 we see the Israelites turning to David as their king. They saw David as their source of deliverance and blessing. Furthermore David's forces were overcoming those of Saul.

1. David's discovery of Saul and Jonathan's deaths ch. 1

First Samuel 31 and 2 Samuel 1 record the transition that took place in the royal leadership of Israel. 1 Samuel 31 contains the factual account of Saul's death.⁴

An Amalekite's account of Saul and Jonathan's deaths 1:1-16

The young Amalekite must have been a mercenary soldier who had joined Saul's army. It seems more likely that this man's account of Saul's death was not accurate rather than that he had had some hand in killing Saul in view of 1 Samuel 31:1-6 and 1 Chronicles 10.⁵

¹Ronald F. Youngblood, "1, 2 Samuel," in *Deuteronomy-2 Samuel*, vol. 3 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, pp. 802-3.

²*Ibid.*, p. 805.

³John A. Martin, "Studies in 1 and 2 Samuel," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 141:561 (January-March 1984):37.

⁴Leon Wood, *Israel's United Monarchy*, p. 168, saw no reason why both accounts could not be true.


⁵See Robert P. Gordon, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*, pp. 208-9; Bill T. Arnold, "The Amalekite's Report of Saul's Death: Political Intrigue or Incompatible Sources?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological*

He was able to take Saul's crown and bracelet and probably returned to David with his story to ingratiate himself with him. Mount Gilboa stood some 80 miles north of Ziklag, so it probably took the young man three or four days to make the trip. Ironically God had commanded Saul to annihilate the Amalekites (1 Sam. 15:3), and David had just returned from slaughtering a portion of them (v. 1; 1 Sam. 30). Now one of them claimed to have killed the king who disobeyed God by not killing all the Amalekites.

One writer saw in Saul's "leaning on his spear" (v. 6) "... a parable of his tendency to rely on human effort rather than on divine resources (cf. Isa 10:20; 31:1, where 'rely' translates the same Heb. verb as 'leaning' does here)."⁶

The biblical writer constructed this chapter chiastically to focus the reader's attention on the Amalekite's story and David's reaction to it (1:6-12).

- A David strikes the Amalekites 1:1
- B David questions an Amalekite 1:2-5
- C The Amalekite tells his story 1:6-10
- C' David reacts to the Amalekite's story 1:11-12
- B' David questions the Amalekite again 1:13-14
- A' David strikes the Amalekite 1:15-16



The Amalekite soldier undoubtedly thought David would have been glad Saul was finally dead since Saul was David's rival for the throne.⁷ However, David was sad instead. Saul was the Lord's anointed. Furthermore David's soul brother Jonathan had died as had many other Israelite soldiers. David must have had the young Amalekite executed because he believed his story. "Your blood is on your own head" (v. 6) means the blood you have shed is the cause of your own death.⁸

⁶*Society* 32:3 (1989):289-98. Flavius Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, 6:14:7, believed the Amalekite was telling the truth.

⁶Youngblood, p. 806.

⁷Compare Doeg the Edomite's willingness to slay God's anointed priests at Nob to please Saul (1 Sam. 22:18).

⁸See Charles Mabee, "David's Judicial Exoneration," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 92:1 (1980):92-107.

"The author of Samuel established a deliberate connection between the two stories [i.e., this one and the story of the Benjamite fugitive's report in 1 Sam. 4:12-17] in order to set up an analogy between the fates of Saul's house and of Eli's. . . . The comparison indicates that there is a clear rule of law which connects a leader's conduct with his fate and the fate of his house. A degenerate leader, whether it is himself who has sinned or his sons, will ultimately be deposed . . . or come to a tragic end, just as Eli and his sons die on the same day, and so do Saul and his."⁹

David's lament for Saul and Jonathan 1:17-27

Students of David's lament over Saul and Jonathan's deaths have called it the Song of the Bow (cf. v. 22).¹⁰ Many people in Judah learned and sang it (v. 18). The Book of Jasher (v. 18) is no longer extant (cf. Josh. 10:13).

"How the mighty have fallen" is the key refrain in the song (vv. 19, 25, 27). It forms an *inclusio* that brackets the entire poem as well as occurring in the middle. The strophes gradually diminish in force with the falling away of the sorrow expressed therein.¹¹ The lament lauds the fallen heroes, mourns their deaths, and praises their bravery, inseparable love, and Saul's virtues (vv. 19-24). It then expounds David and Jonathan's friendship (vv. 25-26) and concludes with a final sigh of grief (v. 27).

Jonathan had remained loyal to Saul as his father and as the Lord's anointed even though Saul had many faults. The reference to "your beauty" or "your glory" (v. 19) may be a reference to Jonathan (cf. 1 Sam. 14:4-5, 10, 12-13).¹² Gath and Ashkelon (v. 20) were the easternmost and westernmost cities in Philistia respectively and therefore probably represent the totality of that nation.¹³ The Hebrew words translated "beloved" or "loved" and "pleasant" or "gracious" (v. 23) refer to physical attractiveness and fundamental devotion respectively.¹⁴

"Taken together the two words articulate a peculiar and precious bonding with David."¹⁵

⁹Moshe Garsiel, *The First Book of Samuel: A Literary Study of Comparative Structures*, p. 106.

¹⁰Laments over the deaths of individuals are not uncommon in the Old Testament (cf. 1 Kings 13:30; Jer. 22:18; 34:5; Ezek. 28:12-19; 32:2-15). The only other of David's laments over an individual's death recorded in Scripture was for Abner (3:33-34).

¹¹C. F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*, p. 289, argued for three strophes while William H. Shea "Chiasmus and the Structure of David's Lament," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105:1 (1986):13-25, saw five and Youngblood, p. 810, seven.

¹²David Noel Freedman, "The Refrain in David's Lament Over Saul and Jonathan," in *Ex Orbe Religionum: Studia Geo Widengren Oblata*, part 1, p. 120, wrote that the Hebrew word *hassebi*, translated "your glory or beauty," should be "the gazelle," and that this was a nickname for Jonathan.

¹³David L. Zapf, "How Are the Mighty Fallen! A Study of 2 Samuel 1:17-27," *Grace Theological Journal* 5:1 (1984):113.

¹⁴They occur again together in verse 26 but in reverse order where we read "love" and "pleasant" or "dear."

¹⁵Walter Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel*, pp. 216-17.

Saul's reign had been good for Israel economically. He had been a source of some blessing because he was God's anointed even though he also caused sorrow (v. 24).

"The separate treatment of Jonathan in a fake coda [v. 25] subtly shows David's preference for him [over Saul]."¹⁶

David considered Jonathan's love better than that of women (v. 26).¹⁷ David was not alluding to some perverted type of love that he shared with Jonathan but to covenant and political loyalty.¹⁸ He probably meant that they enjoyed a oneness that most married couples do not because of their deep and strong commitment to Yahweh as well as to one another. The "weapons of war" that had perished (v. 27) may refer to the Israelite soldiers who had perished in the battle. They probably refer to Saul and Jonathan metaphorically (cf. the metaphorical reference to Jonathan in v. 19).¹⁹

Even when Saul died, David acted properly toward the Lord's anointed. This shows his regard for Yahweh's leadership over Israel. Jonathan would have succeeded Saul on the throne customarily, but now he was dead, too. Even though David saw in the deaths of these men the removal of obstacles to his coronation, he did not rejoice.

In the Saul and David narrative just completed (1 Sam. 16—2 Sam. 1) the importance of the anointed one surfaced many times. To be right before God and to enjoy His blessing one had to respond properly to His anointed. This always holds true especially concerning God's anointed, Jesus Christ. As Yahweh's anointed David was to lead Israel in its battles. David began doing this with a shepherd's tools rather than with those of a warrior showing he would be an ideal leader. He led as a shepherd. Many in Israel, even the royal family of Saul as well as many outside the nation (among the Philistines, Amalekites, et al.), recognized that God was bringing blessing to Israel through David. Like the ark David went into exile in Philistia, but the Philistines sent him back because he was a greater threat than a help.²⁰ This shows that God had been with David as He had been with the ark.

The major conflict between Saul and David in 1 Samuel 16 through 2 Samuel 1 contains eight sub-conflicts: God's Spirit left Saul and came upon David at his anointing (ch. 16). Goliath and Saul conflicted with David (17:1—18:5). Saul conflicted with David and

¹⁶Zapf, p. 121.

¹⁷The Hebrew word translated "love" here appears as "friendship" in Psalm 109:4-5 (NIV).

¹⁸See Youngblood, p. 816; Robert North, "Social Dynamics From Saul to Jehu," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 12:4 (1982):112.

¹⁹See Stanley Gevirtz, "David's Lament Over Saul and Jonathan," in *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel*, p. 95. For additional studies of this song, see James Kennedy, "David's Lament over Saul and Jonathan: II Sam. 1:19-27," *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 32 (1916):118-25; William L. Holladay, "Form and Word-Play in David's Lament over Saul and Jonathan," *Vetus Testamentum* 20:2 (April 1970):153-89; and William H. Shea, "David's Lament," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 221 (February 1976):141-44. Gale A. Yee argued that this passage is a parody and was the basis for Isaiah 14:4b-21 in "The Anatomy of Biblical Parody: The Dirge Form in 2 Samuel 1 and Isaiah 14," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50:4 (October 1988):565-86.

²⁰Martin, pp. 36-37.

Saul's household (18:6—20:42). Saul and Doeg conflicted with David and Israel's priests (chs. 21—22). Saul conflicted with David in the wilderness (chs. 23—26). Saul and his heirs conflicted with the Philistines (chs. 27—29). The Amalekites conflicted with David (ch. 30). Finally Saul and Jonathan conflicted with the Philistines (1 Sam. 31—2 Sam. 1).

The basic conflict between Saul and David recalls the one between Samuel and Eli's sons. Saul was the epitome of what Israel wanted in a king. David on the other hand was the youngest son in his family, a shepherd, and even a surprise to Samuel as God's choice. David became what the ark had been earlier in 1 Samuel: the source of blessing for the godly and of trouble for the ungodly. He was largely the fulfillment of Hannah's desire for an anointed one (1 Sam. 2:10).²¹

Both Samuel (1 Sam. 7) and David (1 Sam. 17:1—18:5) defeated the Philistines who had no regard for Yahweh, though they did acknowledge His power. In contrast, Saul was never able to do so except with Jonathan's help. Only those deeply committed to Yahweh could overcome His enemies (cf. Mark 9:14-29).

2. David's move to Hebron 2:1-4a

"Without doubt this portion [of 2 Samuel, i.e., chapters 2—8] forms the crux of the book. Here the fertility motif reaches a peak. The thesis of the author—that Israel is blessed with fertility when the nation (and the epitome of the nation, the king) is following the covenant—is demonstrated in these chapters. The king, the ark (representing the presence of God and the Word of God, the covenant), and fertility are all intertwined in a beautifully artistic way."²²

David again expressed his dependence on God by asking in prayer where God wanted him to relocate. He realized that he could not make the wisest choice alone since he did not have God's perspective. He wanted God to use him most effectively, so he allowed God to place him in that spot. The territory of Judah was the logical choice since that was David's tribal homeland and where he had the greatest acceptance (cf. 1 Sam. 30:26-30).²³ Verse 1 gives the key to David's triumphs, namely, his dependence on God. Verse 2 gives the key to his tragedy, namely, his relationships with women (cf. Gen. 2:24). This was David's second anointing (in 1011 B.C.; cf. 1 Sam. 16:13). It represented a formal acknowledgment that the people of Judah viewed David as the Lord's anointed.

3. David's overtures to Jabesh-gilead 2:4b-7

"The much later crisis of I Kings 12 suggests that the Davidic hold on the north is never deeply established. In our chapter we are given two episodes of David's attentiveness to the north. One (vv. 4b-7) is a

²¹Ibid., pp. 39-40.

²²Ibid., p. 37.

²³See the map "Israel in the Time of David" in Joyce Baldwin, *1 & 2 Samuel*, p. 48.

peaceable act of friendship. The other (vv. 8-32) is an act of confrontation and hostility."²⁴

The people of Jabesh-gilead were very loyal to Saul (cf. 1 Sam. 11:1-13; 31:11-13). David took special pains to express his sorrow over Saul's death to those residents to show that the antagonism that had existed between Saul and himself was one-sided. If he could win their favor, David could gain a foothold of support in northern Israel. We see in these verses how David sought peace and unity with those who had been loyal to Saul in Israel. First, he took the initiative in contacting them (v. 5a). Second, he paid them a sincere compliment (v. 5b). Third, he obliquely reminded them that he was now the Lord's anointed (v. 6). Finally, he offered a "treaty of friendship" (vv. 6b-7).²⁵

"David wishes to take Saul's place as suzerain of Jabesh-Gilead. Since treaties did not automatically continue in force when a new king took the throne, it was necessary for David actively to seek a renewal of the pact."²⁶

David's support at this time came mainly from the Judahites. Hostilities had existed between the Israelites in the northern tribes and those in the South for many generations.²⁷

4. Ish-bosheth's coronation over Israel 2:8-11

David's overtures to the Jabesh-gileadites were very important. Saul's commander-in-chief and cousin, Abner, was working to install Saul's youngest son, Ish-bosheth (called Eshbaal in 1 Chron. 9:39), as his father's successor. This was not a move that Yahweh had ordained (cf. 1 Sam. 13:14). David was God's anointed. Abner, Saul's cousin, was simply doing what was customary in the ancient Near East and in the process securing his own future, he hoped. Mahanaim was only 16 miles south of Jabesh-gilead in Transjordan. It became the center of Saul's supporters at this time (cf. v. 29).

Abner's initiative ignited conflict between Saul's and David's houses that occupied the writer's attention in 2:8-32. This section is chiasmic in its arrangement and focuses on Abner's killing of Asahel (vv. 18-23).²⁸ Whereas David was seeking peace and unity (vv. 4b-7), Abner was seeking power and victory (vv. 8-32; cf. Ps. 120:7).

Ish-bosheth (lit. man of shame, *bosheth*, "shame," being substituted for *baal*, "lord," on occasion, cf. 1 Chron. 8:33; 9:39; Jer. 3:24; 11:13; Hos. 9:10) appears only in chapters 2—4. He may be the Ishvi of 1 Samuel 14:49. Since he did not die in battle with Saul and his brothers, he may have been somewhat cowardly. This possibility may find support in

²⁴Brueggemann, p. 220.

²⁵Delbert R. Hillers, "A Note on Some Treaty Terminology in the Old Testament," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 176 (1964):47. Cf. Deut. 23:6; 1 Sam. 25:30.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷For a review of these hostilities, see Eugene H. Merrill, *Kingdom of Priests*, pp. 223-28.

²⁸Youngblood, p. 822.

the fact that Abner, rather than he, was the real leader of Saul's forces. The people of Judah made David their king (v. 4), but Abner singlehandedly made Ish-bosheth king over "all Israel" (v. 9). This was not God's will since God had chosen David to succeed Saul (1 Sam. 13:14). Abner's act fueled conflict between the northern and southern inhabitants of the land.

"The distinctive concepts of 'Judah and Israel' evolved during David's kingdom in Hebron, and after a period of reunification these entities were allowed to live on in the United Monarchy, though without an official division."²⁹

When David eventually became king of all Israel and Judah, seven and one-half years later, he ended Ish-bosheth's two-year reign. Evidently it took Abner over five years to establish Ish-bosheth on Israel's throne. Abner put his personal preferences and cultural precedent (that a son of Saul would succeed his father) over God's will. Consequently life became very complicated and problems followed in Israel, as always when people behave as Abner did.

5. The conflict between Abner and Joab 2:12-32

Travelers can visit the pool of Gibeon today. It lies about three miles northwest of Gibeah.

"The pool is a cylindrical shaft thirty-seven feet in diameter and thirty-five feet deep. Its five-feet-wide spiral stairway, which winds downward around the inside wall of the pool in a clockwise direction, continues below the floor level to an additional depth of forty-five feet."³⁰

There the forces of Ish-bosheth and David met for a peace conference (v. 13). Abner broke off the peace talks, however, by suggesting that the two sides determine which of them would win in a battle by champions (cf. 1 Sam. 17).³¹ Twelve soldiers from each side (v. 15), perhaps representing each of the twelve tribes, engaged in hand-to-hand combat to decide the leadership of the nation. The fight was a draw so the battle between the two armies escalated. Joab's men finally got the upper hand. Abner warned Asahel twice to stop pursuing him and to fight with someone else that he might be able to defeat (vv. 21-22). He evidently wanted to avoid a blood feud with Joab's family that might go on for generations. Nevertheless Asahel kept pushing Abner who finally killed him rather than simply knocking him out.

"'Every man' who 'stopped when he came' to the place where Asahel had died (v. 23) does not refer to travelers or others who stop to pay their

²⁹Zechariah Kallai, "Judah and Israel—A Study in Israelite Historiography," *Israel Exploration Journal* 28:4 (1978):257.

³⁰Youngblood, p. 825.

³¹See F. Charles Fensham, "The Battle Between the Men of Joab and Abner as a Possible Ordeal by Battle?" *Vetus Testamentum* 20:3 (July 1970):356-57.

respects, as many commentators believe (e.g., Baldwin, Hertzberg), but to David's men, Asahel's pursuers, who stand transfixed in horror at the death of a fallen comrade . . ."32

Many of David's soldiers stopped, but Joab and Abishai continued to pursue Abner. The other soldiers from Benjamin, Saul and Abner's tribe, rallied around Abner, and the hostility climaxed when they took a stand to defend themselves on a hilltop (v. 25). Abner tried to call a truce (v. 26), but Joab correctly blamed him for starting the conflict in the first place (v. 27; cf. v. 14). Joab agreed to the truce and both armies went home. Abner's side lost 360 soldiers in this fight, and 19 of Joab's men died.

This incident accounts for the personal hostility that later resulted in Abner's death and the disintegration of Ish-bosheth's throne. Note that David played no part in it. God worked through Joab and Abner to place His anointed on the throne of all Israel. This passage shows how hostilities between the two factions in Israel escalated, as they often do in modern nations, neighborhoods, and families. First, the opposing parties stopped talking (v. 12). Next, they started fighting (v. 13). Then, Asahel kept pushing (v. 23). Finally, Abner insisted on defending himself (v. 23).


6. The strengthening of David's position 3:1-5

The first verse in this chapter summarizes 2:8-32. The point of the remaining verses is that during the seven and one-half years that David ruled Judah he grew stronger because God was blessing him.³³ David resorted to further polygamy even though God had commanded Israel's kings not to multiply wives (Deut. 17:17). He undoubtedly married the women mentioned to cement political alliances, as was common in the ancient Near East.³⁴

³²Youngblood, p. 826. Cf. 20:12.

³³Many of the sections of 2 Samuel, beginning with this pericope plus 1 Samuel 31, were restated in 1 Chronicles. For the parallel references, see Youngblood, p. 803; William D. Crockett, *A Harmony of the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles*, pp. 106-41; James D. Newsome Jr., ed., *A Synoptic Harmony of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles*, pp. 23-79; or, for the Hebrew, Abba Bendavid, *Parallels in the Bible*, pp. 31-70.

³⁴Abraham Malamat, "Aspects of the Foreign Policies of David and Solomon," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 22:1 (1963):8.



The site of Geshur (v. 3) was northeast of the Sea of Chinnereth (Galilee) and north of Jabesh-gilead. The Israelites were to make no covenants with the inhabitants of the Promised Land (Exod. 23:32; 34:12). That is where the king of Geshur lived. Perhaps if David had relied less on foreign alliances he would not have had to fight as many battles with his neighbors as he did. Unfortunately he spent a large portion of his total reign as king fighting battles.

B. THE UNIFICATION OF THE KINGDOM 3:6—5:16

The writer also documented God's blessing on David in this record of how David wisely unified the nation of Israel and became the leader of all 12 tribes.

"The story of how David became king of all Israel follows, in most essentials, the same outline already established in the account of his accession to kingship over Judah (1:1—3:5). Both begin with a warrior trying to curry David's favor (an unnamed Amalekite, 1:1-13; Saul's army commander Abner, 3:6-21) and continue with the execution or murder of the warrior (1:14-16; 3:22-32), which is followed by a lament uttered by David (over Saul and Jonathan, 1:17-27; over Abner, 3:33-34). Near the center of each literary unit is a brief report of the anointing of David as king (over Judah, 2:1-7; over Israel, 5:1-5). David and his men are then successful in defeating their enemies (2:8—3:1; 5:6-12), and each unit concludes with a list of sons/children born to David (in Hebron, 3:2-5; in Jerusalem, 5:13-16). The similarities between the two sections point to the careful craftsmanship of a single author, who now sets about to tell his readers that just as the house of David has replaced Saul and his house in southern Canaan (1:1—3:5), so also David's house is about to replace that of Saul in the rest of the land as well (3:6—5:16)."³⁵

³⁵Youngblood, pp. 832-33.

1. David's acceptance of Abner 3:6-39

Abner was the strong man in Israel. Ish-bosheth was simply a figurehead (v. 11). Abner's loyalty to the house of Saul is clear from his actions so far. However there was conflict between Ish-bosheth and Abner. In the ancient Near East the king's concubines were his tools for raising up heirs if the queen could not bear children or even if she could. Ish-bosheth regarded Abner's act as a sign of disloyalty. He seemed to be trying to have an heir by a royal concubine who could have, according to custom, become king one day (cf. 16:22; 1 Kings 2:22). We do not know whether this was Abner's plan or not. He implied denial of that motive but not the act. In any case, this incident resulted in Abner shifting his support from Ish-bosheth to David. Perhaps it was the last straw for Abner who had recently suffered a devastating defeat by David's men and who must have seen that he could not win.

"It was the exclusive right of the successor to the throne to cohabit with the concubine of the deceased king, who came down to him as part of the property which he inherited [according to ancient Near Eastern custom, not according to the Mosaic Law]."³⁶

"It may be that Abner, as *de facto* ruler of all Israel, offered David his allegiance in exchange for the position of *sar saba'* [commander of the army], the equivalent of his office in Eshbaal's army and the post currently held by Joab. V. 12 suggests something of the sort when it speaks of a *personal* deal between these two men."³⁷

The fact that Michal was Saul's daughter was clearly part of the reason David requested her (v. 13). Reunion with her would have tied David in to Saul's house and made him more acceptable to the northern tribes.

"By making her his queen he would divide the loyalties of citizens in the north: did loyalty to Saul's memory mean that they should be the subjects of his son, Ish-bosheth, or of his daughter? By such means David could weaken his opponent without killing a single Israelite soldier and without causing any resentment at all."³⁸

It was contrary to God's will for David to remarry Michal (Deut. 24:1-4). God graciously blessed David in spite of his disobedience (vv. 2-5, 12-16).

Abner lobbied for David with Israel's leading men (v. 17) on the basis that they had previously favored David. Perhaps Abner and Ish-bosheth had blocked their efforts. He also did so because David was the Lord's anointed king (v. 18). The Benjamites needed

³⁶Keil and Delitzsch, pp. 301-2.

³⁷James Vanderkam, "Davidic Complicity in the Deaths of Abner and Eshbaal: A Historical and Redactional Study," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99:4 (1980):531-32.

³⁸David F. Payne, *I & II Samuel*, pp. 168-69.

special courting since Saul was a Benjamite. Abner probably expected a political appointment in David's administration for his efforts.

There were many reasons why Joab disliked Abner. He hated him because he was the rival commander-in-chief and because he evidently had a superior character in some respects (cf. v. 38). He also opposed Abner because he was a threat to Joab's career advancement if the alliance went through. Mostly Joab opposed Abner because Abner had killed his brother, Asahel, in battle (v. 30). Joab murdered Abner in a city of refuge, Hebron, where God had prohibited the taking of revenge (Num. 35:22-25). Abner may have been too sure of his own importance in David's eyes to suspect that one of David's officers would dare to attack him. David was very careful to let everyone know that Abner's murder was Joab's doing and not his. If it had been David's doing, he would have lost the support of the northern tribes.

"Rarely in the Old Testament has a narrator gone to such lengths, as has the writer of this passage, to preserve the good name of one of his characters. In one way and another, he assures us that neither David's heart nor his hand was set against Abner: Joab acted on his own account."³⁹

Why did David not execute or at least punish Joab? The writer did not record the answer. However, we notice that David was characteristically too slow to discipline members of his own family when they deserved it (cf. Ammon, Absalom, et al.). Some interpreters of the Hebrew text believe what David wished on Joab's descendants was that they would continually experience diseases, violent death, and poverty. This is what God promised to bring on those of His people who despised His will (cf. Deut. 21:1-9).⁴⁰

"We need not doubt David's genuine respect for Abner, but the funeral is also a media event. It is like a U.S. president with the returned body of a soldier from an unauthorized war. The president must lead national mourning, which is genuine, but at the same time must stage a media event designed to legitimate policy."⁴¹

For the first time the writer referred to David as "King David" (v. 31).⁴² Now that the threat of the north had died with Abner, David's throne was secure enough to warrant this title.

The description of Abner as "a prince and a great man" who had fallen that day in Israel (v. 38) has inspired eulogizers in funerals for generations. David's good public relations

³⁹Gordon, pp. 216-17.

⁴⁰See also Steven Holloway, "Distaff, Crutch or Chain Gang: The Curse of the House of Joab in 2 Samuel III 29," *Vetus Testamentum* 37:3 (July 1987):370-75, who suggested that David prayed that Joab's household would never be without a corvée-worker, namely, a person forced to work without pay.

⁴¹Brueggemann, p. 230.

⁴²The writer had referred to David as the king previously (2:4, 7, 11; 3:17, 21-24), but he never used the title "King David."

were essential for support, but they would not avert divine discipline for his disobedience.

2. David's punishment of Ish-bosheth's murderers ch. 4

"Saul the king is dead, Jonathan the heir apparent is dead, Abinadab and Malki-Shua (two of Jonathan's brothers) are dead (1 Sam 31:2), Abner the commander of the army is dead—and no other viable claimants or pretenders continue to block David's accession to the throne except Saul's son Ish-Bosheth and Jonathan's son Mephibosheth. Chapter 4 removes them from the scene, one explicitly and the other implicitly."⁴³

Beeroth (v. 2) was a town near the border of Benjamin, possibly two miles south of Gibeon. Gittaim (v. 3) stood near the Israelite-Philistine border west of the central Benjamin plateau.

The writer introduced the information in verse 4 parenthetically here to prepare for what he would write about Mephibosheth in chapter 9. Mephibosheth was unfit to rule for two reasons: he was too young, and his physical condition made it impossible for him to provide military leadership. Evidently his condition emboldened his assassins to attempt their cowardly and ambitious plot.⁴⁴

The repetition of the telling of Rechab and Baanah's act in verses 6 and 7 stresses its atrocious, opportunistic nature.

"The gift of Ish-Bosheth's head [to David, v. 8] is at the same time the gift of the kingdom."⁴⁵

David's designation of Ish-bosheth as "a righteous man" (v. 11) implicitly denied him the title of king. Even though Ish-bosheth was Saul's son and so had a claim to the throne, he had not been anointed as king. David's treatment of the corpses of these two men and Ish-bosheth's (v. 12) also showed the people that Ish-bosheth's murder was not an act that he ordered or approved (cf. Matt. 26:52).⁴⁶ Ironically the long struggle between Ish-bosheth's men and David's men began and ended by a pool (cf. 2:13).

"With the death of Ish-Bosheth, no other viable candidate for king remains for the elders of the northern tribes. Meanwhile David sits in regal isolation, above the fray as always, innocent of the deaths of Saul,

⁴³Youngblood, p. 843.

⁴⁴Symon Patrick, *A Commentary Upon the Two Books of Samuel*, p. 364.

⁴⁵David M. Gunn, "David and the Gift of the Kingdom," *Semeia* 3 (1975):17.

⁴⁶See Mabee, pp. 98-107. Vanderkam, pp. 521-39, argued that David both desired and planned the murder of Abner.

Jonathan, Abner, and now Ish-Bosheth. The way is open for his march to the throne of Israel."⁴⁷

"In 2 Samuel 2—4, 9—20, and 1 Kings 1—2 we have a coherent story of accession, rebellion, and succession. The theme of giving and grasping is central, providing a key to David's fortunes."⁴⁸

Note David's inconsistency in his dealings with Ish-bosheth's murderers and Abner's murderer, his nephew Joab. David succeeded at work, but he failed at home. He did not deal with the members of his own family as he should have, but he was more careful to manage the affairs of his government properly.⁴⁹

3. David's acceptance by all Israel 5:1-12

In 1004 B.C. David became king of all Israel and Judah.⁵⁰ This was his third anointing (cf. 1 Sam. 16:13; 2 Sam. 2:4). The people acknowledged David's previous military leadership of all Israel as well as God's choice of him to shepherd His people as their king.

"In the ancient East, shepherd at an early date became a title of honor applied to divinities and rulers alike."⁵¹

This is the first time the Bible refers to a specific human ruler as a shepherd,⁵² though as an analogy the term appears earlier (Num. 27:17) and with reference to God (Gen. 48:15; 49:24). The New Testament refers to David's greatest son, Jesus Christ, as the "Good Shepherd" (John 10:11, 14), the "Great Shepherd" (Heb. 13:20), and the "Chief Shepherd" (1 Pet. 5:4).

The fact that Samuel had anointed David when he was a youth was evidently now common knowledge in Israel. Therefore we should regard previous resistances to his assuming the throne after Saul's death as rebellions against the known will of God. The covenant (v. 3) was an agreement between the people and the king before God.⁵³ Probably it included a fresh commitment to the Mosaic Covenant.

⁴⁷Youngblood, p. 847. One cannot help but note the similar career of Jesus Christ who now sits in regal isolation above the fray below awaiting His universal acknowledgement as king.

⁴⁸Gunn, p. 14.

⁴⁹The home, not one's work, is the proving ground for church leadership. This is because the church is, or should be, more like a family than a business (cf. 1 Tim. 3:1-13; 5:1-2).

⁵⁰See Merrill, p. 243.

⁵¹*New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, s. v. "Shepherd," by E. Beyreuther, 3:564. For example, King Hammurabi of Babylon (ca. 1792-1750 B.C.) referred to himself as the shepherd of his people. See James B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, pp. 164-65, 177-18.

⁵²Patrick, p. 368. Cf. Isa. 44:28; Jer. 3:15; et al.

⁵³P. Kyle McCarter Jr., *II Samuel*, p. 131; Brueggemann, p. 239.

"Thirty years old (v. 4) was regarded as an ideal age at which to take on responsibility (cf. Num. 4:3; Lk. 3:23)."⁵⁴

Three prominent descendants of Jacob began their ministries at or near the age of 30: Joseph (Gen. 41:46), David (v. 4), and Jesus (Luke 3:23). The total years David reigned were 1011-971 B.C.

"[Verses] 6-16 highlight key events of David's entire reign and are followed by summaries of his experiences in the military (vv. 17-25), cultic (ch. 6), and theological (ch. 7) arenas."⁵⁵

Jerusalem was an excellent choice for a capital. It stood on the border between Benjamin and Judah so both tribes felt they had a claim to it. It was better than Hebron in southern Judah far from the northern tribes, or Shechem, Shiloh, or some other northern town that would have been too far from the Judahites. Joshua had captured Jerusalem (Josh. 10), but shortly after that the native inhabitants, the Jebusites, retook it (Judg. 1:21). It seems to have remained in Jebusite control since then. Its elevated location made it fairly easy to defend. David may have chosen Jerusalem also because he appears to have seen himself as the spiritual successor of Melchizedek, a former king of Jerusalem in Abraham's day (Gen. 14; cf. Ps. 110:4-6).⁵⁶ One scholar estimated that the population of the city at this time was about 2,500 people.⁵⁷

"Jerusalem is usually described as a city-state, and the position envisaged after its storming by David and his troops is that it remained a city-state; the coming of David meant only a change of city ruler. . . . The inhabitants remained, but their fortress had now become the personal possession of David and was under his control."⁵⁸

The interchange concerning the blind and the lame (vv. 6, 8) seems to be "pre-battle verbal taunting" (cf. 2 Kings 18:19-27).⁵⁹ The Jebusites claimed that their town was so secure that even disabled inhabitants could withstand an invasion.⁶⁰ David countered by taking them at their word and applying "the blind and the lame" to all the Jebusite inhabitants of Jerusalem. His hatred was for the Jebusites, using the figure that they themselves had chosen to describe themselves, not for literally blind and lame people. "The blind and the lame" evidently became a nickname for the Jebusites as a result of this event.

⁵⁴Baldwin, p. 195.

⁵⁵Youngblood, p. 853.

⁵⁶See Eugene H. Merrill, "Royal Priesthood: An Old Testament Messianic Motif," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150:597 (January-March 1993):58.

⁵⁷F. E. Peters, *Jerusalem*, p. 11.

⁵⁸Gwilym H. Jones, *The Nathan Narratives*, p. 135.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, p. 125.

⁶⁰Another view is that the Jebusites meant that they would fight to the last man. A third option is that the expression refers to the custom of parading a blind and lame woman before the opposing army as a warning of what would befall treaty-breakers. This view assumes David had previously made a treaty with the Jebusites. See Gordon, p. 226.

Joab captured the city for David, and from then on people referred to it as the City of David and Zion (1 Chron. 11:6).⁶¹ The Millo (a transliteration of the Hebrew word, v. 9) probably consisted of terrace-like fortifications on the hill's east side. Some of the older commentators and others who did not have access to recent archaeological discoveries viewed the Millo as a large tower or castle.

"As was characteristic of all the great walled cities of Canaan, Jerusalem had a vertical water shaft connecting with a tunnel leading to an underground water supply outside the walls."⁶²

It was through this secret passage that Joab took the city.⁶³

"Two of the most significant events in world history now took place. The first was when David became king of a united Israel. The second was when he made Jerusalem the capital of his united realm."⁶⁴

The writer identified the key to David's success in verse 10. The Lord chose David as His anointed by sovereign election. David had nothing to do with that. However, Yahweh continued to bless David because David related to God properly.

The information we have about Hiram, the king of Tyre, indicates that he reigned there about 980-947 B.C.⁶⁵ That would mean Hiram's reign coincided with only the last nine years of David's reign and the first 24 years of Solomon's reign. This information helps us see that David built his palace (v. 11) late in his reign. Verse 11 therefore evidently does not describe something that took place immediately after David captured and fortified Jerusalem (vv. 6-10). It was a later project. The writer probably mentioned it here because it illustrates another important evidence of David's control over all Israel.

"David has joined the nations. David is a practitioner of alliances and accommodations. . . . Jeremiah later sees that cedar and its accompanying opulence will talk Judean kings out of justice (Jer. 22:13-18). Verse 11 sounds like a historical report, but it is in fact an ominous act of warning."⁶⁶

⁶¹See the map "Wars during the Reign of David," Baldwin, p. 222. The name "Zion" (meaning unknown) appears only six times in the historical books of the Old Testament, though it occurs over 150 times in the Old Testament. It was a popular poetic name for the city.

⁶²Merrill, *Kingdom of . . .*, p. 236.

⁶³Another view is that David took control of the water source itself and in that way forced the Jebusites to surrender. See Gordon, p. 227.

⁶⁴Payne, p. 177.

⁶⁵Frank M. Cross, "An Interpretation of the Nora Stone," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 208 (December 1972):17. William F. Albright had previously dated his reign from about 969-936 B.C. in *The Archaeology of Palestine*, p. 122.

⁶⁶Brueggemann, p. 246.

Verse 12 is key to understanding why David prospered as Israel's king. David realized that Yahweh was Israel's real sovereign. Saul was never willing to acknowledge this and viewed himself as the ultimate authority in Israel. In contrast, David regarded his own kingship as a gift from God. He realized, too, that God had placed him on the throne for the Israelites' welfare, not for his own personal glory. Saul failed here as well. David had a proper view of his role in Israel's theocratic government.

Second Samuel 5:10-16 is most likely a summary of David's entire reign followed by his military (5:17-25), cultic (i.e., formal worship; ch. 6), and theological (ch. 7) achievements. This pattern follows the conventional annalistic style of documenting the reigns of kings that was common in the ancient Near East.

4. David's additional children 5:13-16

Again David sinned by multiplying wives (Deut. 17:17). Nevertheless in spite of this sin God continued to bless him with fertility because he was God's elect and, for the most part, God's obedient servant. Fortunately God does not cut off all His blessings because His servants are less than perfect.

"This is the first time that concubines are mentioned in connection with David (cf. also 1 Chron 11:21)—and it is also the only time that the phrase 'concubines and wives' occurs in the Bible (the usual order is 'wives and concubines'; cf. 19:5; 1 Kings 11:3; 2 Chron 11:21; Dan 5:2-3, 23). By placing the word 'concubines' in emphatic position, the narrator is perhaps deploring David's proclivity for the trappings of a typical Oriental monarch, including a harem."⁶⁷

In all parts of this section (3:6—5:16) the writer placed emphasis on God's blessing of David and the nation that came about as Judah and Israel united under David's anointed leadership.

C. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE KINGDOM 5:17—8:18

"As the story of David's accession to kingship over Judah (1:1—3:5) parallels that of his accession to the throne of Israel (3:6—5:16), each concluding with a list of his sons (3:2-5; 5:13-16), so the account of his powerful reign (5:17—8:18) parallels that of his court history (chs. 9—20), each concluding with a roster of his officials (8:15-18; 20:23-26)."⁶⁸

1. David's victories over the Philistines 5:17-25

God's greatest blessing on David and Israel, the ultimate in fertility, came when God covenanted with David to make his line of descendants everlasting (ch. 7). However

⁶⁷Youngblood, p. 859.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 861.

before that took place, God blessed His anointed with victories over his enemies and peaceful conditions.

"So long as David was king only of Judah, the Philistines were content to tolerate his rule, but when he was proclaimed king of all Israel he became too powerful to be trusted, hence these two concerted efforts to divide his territory, and so weaken his effectiveness."⁶⁹

"Although by no means the only battles King David fought against the Philistines (cf. 8:1), these serve as a paradigm to summarize the continuing conflict."⁷⁰

The first battle 5:17-21

The battle described in these verses appears to be the one retold in 23:13-17. It could have taken place between David's anointing as king over all Israel (v. 17; cf. v. 3) and his capture of Jerusalem (vv. 6-9)⁷¹ or perhaps shortly after he had conquered Jerusalem.⁷² The stronghold (v. 17) in the first case may have been the cave of Adullam (23:13) northwest of Hebron (v. 3) about 11 miles.⁷³ If this battle took place after the capture of Jerusalem, the stronghold probably refers to Zion (v. 7). The valley of Rephaim (v. 18; 23:13) was just southwest of Jerusalem where the Philistines massed for battle. Bethlehem, the site of the Philistine garrison (23:14), stood beside this valley. The Philistines probably wanted to defeat David at once before he could take the offensive and begin to establish himself and expand his kingdom.

God granted David's request for his sovereign's strategy, and victory followed for Israel. Baal-perazim (lit. lord of breakthroughs) memorialized the Lord's victory (v. 20). Notice how David acknowledged Yahweh's ultimate authority over Israel in contrast to how Saul did not. The Philistines' idols that they carried into battle to secure victory (blessing) proved useless, so the Philistines abandoned them (v. 21). The Israelites then burned them (1 Chron. 14:12).

The second battle 5:22-25

This time in response to David's prayer the Lord prescribed an attack from the rear (v. 23). The sound of marching in the tree tops among which the Israelites took cover (wind?) would be the sign that the Lord was going before his army to strike the enemy (v. 24; cf. Acts 2:2). The name "Gibeon" replaces "Geba" in the text in the parallel account of this battle (1 Chron. 14:16). Gibeon is probably correct. If David pursued the Philistines through the Aijalon valley, he probably went through Gibeon northwest of

⁶⁹Baldwin, pp. 202-3.

⁷⁰Youngblood, p. 862.

⁷¹Keil and Delitzsch, p. 323; Merrill, *Kingdom of . . .*, pp. 237-38.

⁷²J. Carl Laney, *First and Second Samuel*, p. 95.

⁷³Gordon, p. 229; Payne, p. 180.

Jerusalem rather than Geba to the northeast. Gezer stood in the Shephelah 14 miles west of Gibeon on the Philistine border.

These victories cleared the Philistines from the hill country of Judah and Benjamin and made it possible for David to establish a secure capital in Jerusalem. Had he not defeated them his reign would have gotten off to a much weaker start. Saul had also begun his reign by defeating the Philistines (1 Sam. 7).

2. David's moving of the ark to Jerusalem ch. 6

This chapter also reveals David's viewpoint on God and what resulted from it.

"In light of . . . Akkadian and Phoenician parallels . . . we are in a position to understand 2 Samuel 6 as the record of a historically unique cultic event, viz., the ritual dedication of the City of David as the new religious and political capital of the Israelites, the people of Yahweh. The purpose of the ceremony was the sanctification of the City of David for the installation of the ark in the hope that Yahweh's presence would assure the success of David's government and the welfare of the people."⁷⁴

Chapter 6 has a symmetrical construction.

- "A David's unsuccessful attempt to transport the ark (6:1-5)
- B Judgment against Uzzah (6:6-11)
- A' David's successful attempt to transport the ark (6:12-19)
- B' Judgment against Michal (6:20-23)"⁷⁵

The first move 6:1-11

Baale-judah (v. 2) may have been the later name of Kiriath-jearim (cf. Josh. 15:9-10).⁷⁶ This was where the ark had evidently rested since the Israelites had moved it from Bethshemesh in Samuel's days (1 Sam. 6; cf. Ps. 132:6-8).⁷⁷

David wanted to bring the ark into his capital because it symbolized the Lord's presence. As we have seen, David did not believe superstitiously that the ark for its own sake would bring blessing wherever it went. He viewed Yahweh as the real source of blessing. However, he wanted the people to see that it was important that Israel's God, and what represented Him, should be at the center of national life. Unfortunately he did not move the ark according to the specifications of the Mosaic Law but according to customary practice (cf. 1 Sam. 6:7-8). Priests were to carry it on poles (Exod. 25:14), not on a cart.

⁷⁴P. Kyle McCarter Jr., "The Ritual Dedication of the City of David in 2 Samuel 6," in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*, p. 276. Cf. Brueggemann, p. 249.

⁷⁵Youngblood, p. 868.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 869.

⁷⁷Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Kiriath-jearim and the Ark," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969):146-47.

Furthermore no one was to touch it (cf. Num. 4:19-20). God's symbolic entrance into Jerusalem was a cause for great celebration. David was apparently angry because he expected God to bless his efforts. God taught him that obedience is more important than good intentions and religious ritual (1 Sam. 15:22). David learned a lesson about God's holiness, too.

"He who had experienced wonderful protection over the years from the Lord his God, and had known unusual intimacy with him, had to come to terms with the fact that he had overstepped the mark, and presumed upon the relationship, by failing to observe the regulations laid down to safeguard respect for God's holiness. Though Jesus taught us to call God our Father, he also taught us to pray 'hallowed be they name,' implying the need to pay careful attention lest privilege becomes presumption."⁷⁸

The death of Uzzah was a lesson similar to the deaths of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10:1-2), Achan (Josh. 7), and Ananias and Saphira (Acts 5:1-11). All these people failed to take God seriously at the beginning of a new phase of His kingdom rule. What we do is important, but how we do it is also important. Coming close to doing God's will is not enough even though we have the best of motives; David wanted to honor God. We need to practice radical obedience; we need wholehearted commitment to God's will as His disciples.

During the three months the ark stayed with Obed-edom David evidently did some Bible study and discovered how God had said His people should move it (cf. 1 Chron. 15:1-13). Obed-edom came from the Levitical town of Gath-rimmon in Dan (Josh. 21:24; 19:45). His house appears to have been on the southwestern hill of Jerusalem.⁷⁹

The second move 6:12-23

David also observed that the ark's presence in Obed-edom's house resulted in blessing for its host. This made him more eager than ever to install the ark in Jerusalem.

Verse 13 probably means after the priests had taken six steps other priests sacrificed an ox and a fatling (fatted calf). This happened every time the priests carrying the ark took six steps.⁸⁰

David wore a priestly garment (v. 14; cf. 1 Sam. 2:18) as he praised the Lord (v. 13).⁸¹ Why did God not express his wrath over David functioning as a priest? Were not the priests the only individuals who could offer sacrifices to the Lord?

⁷⁸Baldwin, p. 208. Cf. Gordon, p. 232.

⁷⁹R. A. Carlson, *David the Chosen King*, p. 79.

⁸⁰See McCarter, "The Ritual . . .," pp. 273-74, 277, n. 1; or Carlson, pp. 80, 86, for the Assyrian parallel custom.

⁸¹Some scholars believe the ephod David wore was a brief loincloth and that Michal despised him for displaying himself inappropriately, e.g., Anthony Phillips, "David's Linen Ephod," *Vetus Testamentum* 19:4 (October 1967):485-87. For a rebuttal of this view, see N. L. Tidwell, "The Linen Ephod: 1 Sam. II 18 and 2 Sam. VI 14," *Vetus Testamentum* 24:4 (October 1974):505-7.

"The white ephod was, strictly speaking, a priestly costume, although in the law it is not prescribed as the dress to be worn by them when performing their official duties, but rather as the dress which denoted the priestly character of the wearer (see at 1 Sam. xii. 18); and for this reason it was worn by David in connection with these festivities in honor of the Lord, as the head of the priestly nation of Israel (see at 1 Sam. ii. 18)."⁸²

"The suggestion has been offered that David assumed 'something of the role of priest-king' when, wearing a linen ephod, he danced before the ark as it was brought into Jerusalem, and also 'sacrificed oxen and fatlings' (II Sam. 6:13-19).⁸³ This episode is unusual, but it need not be interpreted in this way, and to do so is contrary to other factors soon to be noticed. David's dancing should be thought of only as an expression of holy enthusiasm for the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem, and as an attitude of humility as king before almighty God. . . .

"That David wore a linen ephod—which was ordinarily worn only by priests, true enough (see I Sam. 22:18)—can be explained as a way of showing his association with the priests and Levites who were officiating in carrying the ark and in performing the sacrifices. It may also have been a further way of showing humility, since a linen ephod was a modest dress in comparison with David's ordinary royal robes. As for the sacrificing of oxen and fatlings, one need not think that David offered these himself. It was he who ordered this done, but the work certainly was performed by priests and Levites that he had invited to be on hand. After all, considerable work is involved in sacrificing, and a large number of animals were sacrificed. The work of many men would have been required [cf. 1 Kings 3:4]."⁸⁴

Note that David's radical obedience resulted in his experiencing and expressing great joy, as seen in his celebrating. Whereas people often think that complete obedience to God will make them less happy, the opposite is true. We only experience full joy when we follow God's will completely (cf. Rom. 12:1-2). David felt anger and fear the first time he tried to bring the ark into Jerusalem (vv. 8-9), but when he observed the Mosaic Law carefully he felt great freedom and joy.

Michal apparently did not understand David's reasons for bringing the ark into Jerusalem. She seems to have regarded kingship in Israel as her father had.⁸⁵ He had believed the

⁸²Keil and Delitzsch, p. 336.

⁸³For a study of non-Levites functioning as priests in Israel, see Carl E. Armerding, "Were David's Sons Really Priests?" in *Current Issues in Biblical Patristic Interpretation Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students*, pp. 75-86. Sidney Smith, "The Practice of Kingship in Early Semitic Kingdoms," in *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship*, pp. 22-73, showed that royal kingship was not uncommon in the ancient Near East.

⁸⁴Wood, pp. 61-62.

⁸⁵Gordon, p. 234.

human king was the ultimate authority and that everyone should honor him. By referring to Michal as "the daughter of Saul" (v. 16) the writer linked her attitude with her father's.

"Her idea seems to have been that the king should avoid mixing with the people, and be aloof and inaccessible. As it was, *she despised him* for the very qualities that made him great, namely, devotion to the Lord and spontaneity in worship."⁸⁶

The tent David had pitched for the ark in Jerusalem (v. 17) was not the tabernacle of Moses (2 Chron. 1:3-6). The writer did not explain why David did not move the central sanctuary from Gibeon to Jerusalem. Probably he did not want to offend the northern tribes. His blessing the people (v. 18) and giving them cakes made with fruit (v. 19) was a sign to them that their God, who was now in their midst, would bless them as He had promised. Fruit was a common symbol of fertility in the ancient Near East.⁸⁷ Solomon later decorated his temple with figures of fruits. Cake also connoted plenty, prosperity, and blessing.

"The bringing of the Ark to Jerusalem was an event of major theological significance. . . . David wanted to make the Jebusite city not only the center of his rule but also the center of the worship of the Lord.

"By bringing the Ark to his new Jebusite capital, David was attempting to bind the tribes and the central government more firmly."⁸⁸

Whereas the people responded to David's leadership enthusiastically, David's own wife rejected it. She despised her husband for his humility before the Lord. He had behaved as a servant of God. She thought he should have behaved in a more distinguished manner. David promised her that the Lord would give him distinction. He did not need to claim that for himself. The honor of Yahweh was more important to David than his own dignity. In this he set us all a good example. As a result of her attitude toward God and His anointed, Michal suffered barrenness the rest of her life. This was, of course, the opposite of fruitfulness and fertility that result from responding properly to God and His anointed.

"While the Lord's blessing on Obed-Edom resulted in a large number of descendants for him . . . , David's intended blessing on his own household (v. 20) was effectively nullified by Michal's tragic criticism of her husband."⁸⁹

"The final sentence of the chapter, which may imply some sort of judgement [*sic*] on Michal for her sarcasm, forecloses any possibility that

⁸⁶Baldwin, p. 209.

⁸⁷Martin, p. 38.

⁸⁸Homer Heater Jr., "A Theology of Samuel and Kings," in *A Biblical Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 126.

⁸⁹Youngblood, p. 878.

David and Michal will produce an heir who will be able to unite Davidide and Saulide loyalties."⁹⁰

It may be that God shut Michal's womb as a judgment on her for her attitude. I think it is more probable, in view of the record of antagonism that precedes verse 23, that we should infer that David had no more intimate relations with her. He had other wives and concubines, and he could have fulfilled his sexual desires without Michal. If this interpretation is correct, we have here another instance of David failing God in his family relations. He should have taken the initiative to heal the breach in his relations with Michal that this chapter records and not to have allowed them to continue. Even when we are right, as David was, we must be sensitive to the feelings of those who are wrong, as Michal was, and seek to resolve interpersonal conflicts.

"The writer . . . does not question the historically crucial fact of David's divine election, so prominently stressed by the king himself at the beginning of his speech; but theological rights do not necessarily justify domestic wrongs, and the anointed monarch of Israel may still be a harsh and unfeeling husband to the woman who has loved him and saved his life."⁹¹

The writer emphasized that those who follow God's covenant prosper, but God cuts off those who do not. The Philistine idols could not deliver the Philistines (5:21), but the ark of God brought blessing to His people (ch. 6).

Most scholars have placed David's bringing the ark into Jerusalem near the beginning of his reign.⁹² They have done so because of where the writer placed this incident in the text. However a few have argued that this event occurred toward the end of David's reign.⁹³ The basis for this view is 1 Chronicles 15:1 that says David pitched a tent for the ark after he built houses for himself. Those who hold this second view believe—properly, I think—that the houses in view were David's palace structures that Hiram helped him build (5:11). Since Hiram reigned in Tyre only during the last nine years of David's reign, the building of his palace must have occurred late in David's reign (ca. 980-978 B.C.). After that, David built a tent for the ark and brought the ark into Jerusalem as the writer recorded in this chapter (ca. 977 B.C.). However these houses may have been David's original dwellings in Jerusalem that his palace complex later replaced. If so, 1 Chronicles 15:1 may describe conditions at the beginning of David's reign. This seems unlikely to me.

⁹⁰Gordon, p. 230.

⁹¹Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, pp. 124-25. Cf. 1 Sam. 18:20, 28; 19:11-17.

⁹²E.g., J. R. Porter, "The Interpretation of 2 Samuel VI and Psalm CXXXII," *Journal of Theological Studies* N.S. 5 (1954):161-73. Porter also believed David introduced a Canaanite New Year type festival at his coronation that this chapter describes. This view has no textual support.

⁹³E.g., Merrill, *Kingdom of . . .*, pp. 239, 262-63.

3. The giving of the Davidic Covenant ch. 7

In response to David's desire to honor God (ch. 6), God promised to honor David with a line of descendants that would continue to rule Israel (ch. 7). Thus God would not only establish David's reign as long as he lived but forever. This chapter along with 1 Samuel 7 and 12 is one of the most important in 1 and 2 Samuel theologically.

"... 2 Samuel 7 is rightly regarded as an 'ideological summit,' not only in the 'Deuteronomistic History' but also in the Old Testament as a whole."⁹⁴

The Davidic Covenant recorded here receives more attention in the Old Testament than any other covenant except the Mosaic Covenant.⁹⁵

"This chapter was to become the source of the messianic hope as it developed in the message of prophets and psalmists."⁹⁶

"Two types of official judicial documents had been diffused in the Mesopotamian cultural sphere from the middle of the second millennium onwards: the political treaty which is well known to us from the Hittite empire and the royal grant, the classical form of which is found in the Babylonian *kudurru* documents (boundary stones). . . . The structure of both types of these documents is similar. Both preserve the same elements: historical introduction, border delineations, stipulations, witnesses, blessings and curses. Functionally, however, there is a vast difference between these two types of documents. While the 'treaty' constitutes an obligation of the vassal to his master, the suzerain, the 'grant' constitutes an obligation of the master to his servant. In the 'grant' the curse is directed towards the one who will violate the rights of the king's vassal, while in the treaty the curse is directed towards the vassal who will violate the rights of his king. In other words, the 'grant' serves mainly to protect the rights of the *servant*, while the treaty comes to protect the rights of the *master*. What is more, while the grant is a reward for loyalty and good deeds already performed, the treaty is an inducement for future loyalty."⁹⁷

The Davidic Covenant is a covenant of grant rather than a treaty, as are the covenants God made with Noah (Gen. 9:8-17), Abraham (Gen. 12:1-3; 15:1-21; 17:1-27), and Phinehas (Num. 25:10-13). The Mosaic Covenant was a treaty.

⁹⁴Gordon, p. 235. Cf. A. A. Anderson, *2 Samuel*, p. 112; Brueggemann, p. 253.

⁹⁵Jon D. Levenson, "The Davidic Covenant and Its Modern Interpreters," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41:2 (1979):205-6.

⁹⁶Baldwin, p. 236. Cf. Brueggemann, p. 257; Carlson, p. 127; Gordon, p. 236.

⁹⁷Moshe Weinfeld, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90:2 (1970):184-85.

David's desire to honor God 7:1-3

It was when God had subdued all of David's enemies that He gave this covenant to him (vv. 1, 9). Those enemies included the Ammonites with whom David was at war when he committed adultery with Bathsheba and had her husband Uriah murdered (ch. 11). Thus it seems clear that God gave the Davidic Covenant to David *after* he had committed these sins rather than before as the order of events in the text implies. We have already seen that the order of events in the text is not strictly chronological but primarily theological, to make the spiritual emphases that are traceable through the Books of Samuel. The traditional interpretation is that this chapter is in chronological order and that the rest that David experienced was a result of a lull in fighting.

The Israelites had anticipated entering into rest in the Promised Land since their wilderness wanderings (Deut. 12:9). Joshua had given them a measure of rest (Josh. 21:44; 22:4; 23:1). Now with David's victories they enjoyed a larger measure of rest than they had anytime previously in their history (v. 1; cf. v. 11; 1 Kings 5:4; 1 Chron. 22:9, 18; 23:25; 2 Chron. 14:7; 15:15; 20:30).

"David completed what Joshua had begun: the taking possession of Canaan. It is this completion of Joshua's work which is reflected in II Sam. 7:1, 11. Now David plans to build a temple as the sequel of the LORD's having granted him rest from his enemies."⁹⁸

In the ancient Near East the people did not consider a king's sovereignty fully established until he had built himself an appropriate palace.⁹⁹ The people of ancient Near Eastern countries also regarded the kings as the vice-regents of their gods. Therefore they viewed the temples of the gods as the palaces of the true kings. This view existed in Israel as well. David thought it inappropriate for him as second-in-command to live in such a magnificent palace while his commander-in-chief's dwelling was only a temporary much less impressive structure.¹⁰⁰ The Canaanites often built a temple in honor of a god who gave them victory over their enemies.¹⁰¹

God's purpose to honor David 7:4-17

The promises Yahweh made to David here are an important key to understanding God's program for the future.

God rejected David's suggestion that he build a temple for the Lord and gave three reasons. First, there was no pressing need to do so since the ark had resided in tents since the Exodus (v. 6). The tent it currently occupied was the one David had pitched for it in Jerusalem (6:17), not the tabernacle that stood then at Gibeon (1 Chron. 16:1, 39).

⁹⁸Wolfgang Roth, "The Deuteronomistic Rest Theology: A Redaction-Critical Study," *Biblical Research* 21 (1976):8.

⁹⁹Merrill, *Kingdom of . . .*, p. 274; A. Leo Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, pp. 95-98.

¹⁰⁰Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, 2:282-83.

¹⁰¹Frank M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and the Hebrew Bible*, p. 243.

Second, God had not commanded His people to build Him a permanent temple (v. 7). Note in verse 7 that before God raised up Israel's kings He Himself had dealt with the tribes of Israel, during the judges period. At that time the leaders of the tribes were responsible to shepherd the Israelites in their areas.¹⁰² Third, David was an inappropriate person to build a temple since he had shed much blood (v. 5; 1 Chron. 22:8; 28:3). David had become ritually unclean because of all the killing he had been responsible for during his long reign. This was not true of Solomon (cf. 1 Kings 6:1).

"Fine temples both hinder and help the worship of God; it all depends on the worshipper."¹⁰³

"The real issue is that both the initiative to build a temple and the choice of the person for the task must come from God and not from an individual king."¹⁰⁴

Notice that it was not because God was disciplining David or had rejected him that He prohibited David's good intention. God was simply redirecting His servant.¹⁰⁵ He was to be a ruler (v. 8), not a temple builder. Similarly God does not always permit us to carry out our desires to honor Him, such as becoming a pastor or missionary. He sometimes makes this impossible because He wants us to serve Him in other ways. A realization of this fact would relieve many Christians from false guilt and shattered dreams.

"The irony in v. 6 must not be missed: Although God condescends to accompany his people on their journey with a tent as his dwelling (v. 6b), a tent carried by them, all along they have in fact been carried by him (v. 6a)."¹⁰⁶

God had blessed David in the past by choosing him as Israel's shepherd-king, by being with him in blessing, and by cutting off all David's enemies (vv. 8-9a). He would bless him in the future with a famous reputation (v. 9b), rest from all his enemies (v. 11a), and an everlasting dynasty (house, vv. 11b-16).¹⁰⁷ Thus some of God's promises to David would find fulfillment during his lifetime (vv. 8-11a) and others after his death (vv. 11b-16).¹⁰⁸

¹⁰²See Patrick V. Reid, "Sbty in 2 Samuel 7:7," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37:1 (January 1975):17-20; and Donald Murray, "Once Again 't 'hd Sbty Ysr'l in II Samuel 7:7," *Revue Biblique* 94:3 (July 1987):389-96.

¹⁰³Payne, p. 188.

¹⁰⁴Michiko Ota, "A Note on 2 Sam 7," in *A Light Unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers*, p. 406. Cf. Carlson, p. 109.

¹⁰⁵Charles R. Swindoll, *David: A Man of Passion and Destiny*, pp. 162-68.

¹⁰⁶Youngblood, p. 887.

¹⁰⁷There are four promises: a great name for David (v. 9b), a homeland for Israel (v. 10), undisturbed rest from all Israel's enemies (vv. 10-11), and a royal dynasty and kingdom for David and his heirs forever (vv. 11-16).

¹⁰⁸Cf. Bruce K. Waltke, "The Phenomenon of Conditionality Within Unconditional Covenants," in *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison*, p. 130.

"The promise of a 'great name' is reminiscent of God's covenant with Abraham (Gn. 12:2), and suggests (though the word 'covenant' nowhere appears in these verses) that the Davidic kingship is being incorporated into the Abrahamic covenant. This is reinforced by the reference to God's people Israel dwelling in their own place, undisturbed by enemies (v. 10), a reference to Genesis 15:18-21 and Deuteronomy 11:24. Moreover, the covenant word *hesed*, God's 'steadfast love' (v, 15), ensures the fulfillment of the promises, which are here unconditional, though the need for chastisement is foreseen."¹⁰⁹

David would have a seed for whom God would establish a kingdom (v. 12). God repeated to David at this time that his successor would be Solomon (cf. 1 Chron. 22:9-10). This son would build the temple David wanted to construct (v. 13). His right to rule, symbolized by the throne, would remain forever (v. 13).

"Up to this time, there had been no dynasty in Israel. Saul's son had generously and spiritually submitted himself to David. Now God promised David an eternal seed and an eternal throne. One of David's own sons would succeed him to the throne, and his throne, like David's, would be established forever. Much of the rest of 2 Samuel deals with the identification of that son. . . . God's sovereign choice of David's line will never be abrogated even though discipline must come when disobedience takes place. This theme underlies much of the argument of 1 and 2 Kings."¹¹⁰

The importance of this promise of a house (i.e., dynasty) is apparent in that references to it frame the future hope (vv. 11a, 16).

Verse 12 poses a chronological problem. It seems to say that Solomon had not been born yet. However if God gave the Davidic Covenant late in David's reign, Solomon must have been alive since he began ruling shortly after this as an adult. The solution lies in the meaning of the Hebrew word *zera* translated "descendant." This word means seed. *Zera* and "seed" are both collective singulars in their respective languages and can refer to either one descendant or many descendants (Gen. 13:15; 17:18; cf. Gal. 3:16). Part of what God promised David here pertained to Solomon, part to all David's posterity, and part to Jesus Christ (cf. Matt. 3:17). In verse 12 it seems to be David's posterity that is in view as coming forth from him.¹¹¹

"In the Old Testament the relation between father and son denotes the deepest intimacy of love; and love is perfected in unity of nature, in the communication to the son of all that the father hath. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand (John iii. 35). Sonship therefore includes the government of the world. This not only applied to

¹⁰⁹Baldwin, p. 36.

¹¹⁰Heater, p. 119. Note the similar theme of Abraham's heir in Genesis 12—22.

¹¹¹See S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, p. 275.

Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, but also to the seed of David generally, so far as they truly attained to the relation of children of God."¹¹²

If David's son sinned, God would discipline him, but He would never remove the right to rule from him (vv. 14-15). Thus David's house (dynasty), his kingdom (the people of Israel and their land), and his throne (the right to rule) would remain forever.

"In general terms the line would not fail. Yet in particular terms, benefits might be withdrawn from individuals."¹¹³

"The failure of the kings generally leads not to disillusion with kingship but to the hope of a future king who will fulfill the kingship ideal—a hope which provides the most familiar way of understanding the significance of Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ coming in his kingdom."¹¹⁴

"YHWH irrecoverably committed himself to the house of David, but rewarded or disciplined individual kings by extending or withholding the benefits of the grant according to their loyalty or disloyalty to His treaty [i.e., the Mosaic Covenant]."¹¹⁵

Note that God did not promise that the rule of David's descendants would be without interruption. The Babylonian captivity and the present dispersion of the Jews are interruptions (cf. Rom. 9—11). However the privilege of ruling over Israel as king would always belong to David's descendants.

"This promise, generally described as the Davidic covenant, is technically in the form of a royal grant by which a sovereign graciously bestowed a blessing, usually in the form of land or a fiefdom, upon a vassal. This may have been in return for some act performed by the vassal in behalf of his lord, or it may have been simply a beneficence derived from the sheer love and kindness of the king¹¹⁶ The latter clearly is the case here, for the promise of eternal kingship through David had been articulated long before the birth of David himself. From the beginning it was the purpose of God to channel his sovereignty over his own people (and, indeed, over all the earth) through a line of kings that would eventuate in the divine Son

¹¹²Keil and Delitzsch, pp. 348-49. Gerald Cooke, "The Israelite King as Son of God," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73:2 (June 1961):202-25, concluded that God only spoke of the king as His son in an adoptive sense. This was true of Israel's kings who preceded Messiah, but God spoke of Messiah as His Son in a real sense (Matt. 3:17).

¹¹³William J. Dumbrell, *Covenants and Creation*, p. 150.

¹¹⁴John Goldingay, *Theological Diversity and the Authority of the Old Testament*, p. 70.

¹¹⁵Waltke, p. 135. Cf. Gordon, p. 240.

¹¹⁶Weinfeld, pp. 184-203, esp. 185-86.

of God himself. That line, David now came to understand, would begin with him."¹¹⁷

The Davidic Covenant is an outgrowth of the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen. 12:1-3, 7).¹¹⁸ There God promised a land, seed, and blessing to the patriarch. In time God gave further revelation regarding each of these promised blessings (cf. Deut. 30:1-10; 2 Sam. 7:5-16; Jer. 31:31-34). The Davidic Covenant deals with Abraham's descendants primarily and God's provision of leadership for them specifically. In Deuteronomy 30 God explained the land aspects of His promise more fully, and in Jeremiah 31 He expounded the blessing promise. These are the major revelations that clarify God's promises to Abraham, but they are not the only ones.

"The Davidic Covenant is the centerpiece of Samuel and Kings. David, as a type of the ideal king (both in position and often in practice), appears 'between the lines' in chapters 1—15 and dominates the lines in chapters 16—31. Seeing the centrality of the Davidic Covenant enables the reader to pick up the argument of 1 Samuel and to see how it moves inexorably toward 2 Samuel 7."¹¹⁹

"After the conquest of Canaan when Israel's loyalty to YHWH lapsed, YHWH's protection of his people also lapsed. By the time of Samuel and Saul, the Philistines threatened the very existence of Israel. The institution of the Davidic covenant, vested in a vassal [the Davidic king] loyal to the suzerain [Yahweh], constituted an earnest of protection, vouchsafed but virtually impossible to realize in the Sinaitic covenant. The suzerain-vassal model as a legal framework for both the Sinaitic and Davidic covenants validated the basis on which YHWH's protection was to be obtained. There now existed no provision for national protection other than within the framework of a suzerain-vassal type of relationship with YHWH. But the Davidic covenant did away with the necessity that all Israel—to a man—maintain loyalty to YHWH in order to merit his protection. In the analogy of suzerain-vassal relationships, David's designation as YHWH's 'son' and 'firstborn' (2 Sam 7:14; Pss 2:6-7; 89:27) legitimized him as Israel's representative—as the embodiment of YHWH's covenant people, also called his 'son' and 'firstborn' (Exod 4:22). With regard to Israel's protection, the Davidic covenant superseded the Sinaitic covenant, but only because of Israel's regression in her loyalty toward YHWH (compare

¹¹⁷Merrill, *Kingdom of . . .*, p. 275. Cf. Ps. 2:2, 7-9; 18:43, 50; 45:7; 72:8-11, 17; 101:5-8; 110:1-2, 4-7. See also Matitiah Tsevat, "The House of David in Nathan's Prophecy," *Biblica* 46 (1965):353-56.

¹¹⁸For an excellent discussion of the Davidic Covenant, see J. Dwight Pentecost, *Thy Kingdom Come*, pp. 140-55. See also Cleon L. Rogers Jr., "The Promises to David in Early Judaism," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150:599 (July-September 1993):285-302; and idem, "The Davidic Covenant in the New Testament," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150:600 (October-December 1993):458-78; and 150:601 (January-March 1994):71-84. See also Robert L. Saucy, *The Case for Progressive Dispensationalism*, pp. 59-80.

¹¹⁹Heater, p. 120.

1 Sam 8:7). Henceforth, the king stood as proxy between YHWH and his people."¹²⁰

The descendant of David through whom God will fulfill His promises completely is Jesus Christ.¹²¹ In view of what God said of Him in Luke 1:32-33, there are five major implications of the Davidic Covenant for the future. God must preserve Israel as a nation. He must bring her back into her land. Jesus Christ must rule over her in the land. His kingdom must be earthly, and it must be everlasting.¹²²

"All conservative [Christian] interpreters of the Bible recognize that the promise has its ultimate fulfillment in Christ. Again the amillennial and premillennial differences in explaining eschatology come to the fore, however. The amillennial position is that Christ is now on the throne of David in heaven, equating the heavenly throne with the earthly throne of David, whereas the traditional premillennial view is that the Davidic throne will be occupied at the second coming of Christ when Christ assumes his rule in Jerusalem."¹²³

"The difficult questions that separate dispensational and non-dispensational interpreters relate to how many of the covenant promises have been fulfilled in Christ's first coming and present ministry and how many remain for the future. Two key elements of the covenant promise stand at the center of the controversy: (1) a royal dynasty or house, and (2) a kingdom with universal blessing."¹²⁴

God did not condition His promises to David here on anything. Therefore we can count on their complete fulfillment.

"The overriding theological principle is that Yahweh's word is infallible."¹²⁵

David's prayer of thanksgiving 7:18-29

"The heartfelt response of King David to the oracle of the prophet Nathan is one of the most moving prayers in Scripture . . ."¹²⁶

¹²⁰Avraham Gileadi, "The Davidic Covenant: A Theological Basis for Corporate Protection," in *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration*, p. 160. For similarities between the Davidic Covenant and Hittite and Neo-Assyrian suzerain-vassal agreements, see Weinfeld; Philip J. Calderone, *Dynastic Oracles and Suzerainty Treaty*; and F. Charles Fensham, "Clauses of Protection in Hittite Vassal-Treaties and the Old Testament," *Vetus Testamentum* 13:(1963):133-43.

¹²¹For the Jewish view that the nation of Israel, not a personal Messiah, would fulfill these promises, see Matitiahu Tsevat, "Studies in the Book of Samuel," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 34 (1963):71-82.

¹²²J. Dwight Pentecost, *Things to Come*, pp. 114-15.

¹²³John F. Walvoord, "The New Covenant," in *Integrity of Heart, Skillfulness of Hands*, pp. 192-93.

¹²⁴Saucy, p. 66.

¹²⁵Dennis J. McCarthy, "II Samuel 7 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84 (1965):136.

Structurally the prayer moves from thanksgiving for the present favor (vv. 18-21) to praise for what God had done in the past (vv. 22-24) to petition for future fulfillment of God's promises (vv. 25-29). David included humility (v. 18), gratitude (v. 19), praise (v. 22), remembrance (vv. 23-24), and acknowledgment (vv. 25-29) as ingredients in this prayer. Normally Israelites stood or kneeled to pray. Perhaps David sat to pray because he was a king.¹²⁷

In this prayer David revealed a proper attitude toward himself, toward Yahweh, and toward their relationship. Ten times he referred to himself as Yahweh's servant. Eight times he called God his Master (Heb. *Adonai*). David saw his own role in the larger context of God's purpose for Israel. In all these particulars David contrasts with Saul. We also see why God blessed him personally and used him as a channel of blessing to others.

"Thus it came about that David gave up his intention of building the Temple. Though he was king of Israel, he accepted that he had to defer to a higher authority, that of the God of Israel, to whom he owed his calling through the prophet Samuel, his preservation in mortal danger at the hand of Saul, and his accession to the throne by common consent of the people. Recognition on the part of the king that he owed the throne of his kingdom to the sovereign Lord God involved humble acceptance of the role of servant, *thy servant*, as David calls himself ten times over in this prayer. David was far from perfect, as the subsequent narrative is to demonstrate, but he had grasped this all-important truth about himself, and it was because he valued so highly his call to serve the Lord God that he was sensitive to rebuke and repented when he stepped out of line. For this reason, he knew forgiveness and restoration of fellowship, both of which had eluded Saul because he could never bring himself to take his hands off the reins of government, or readily admit to being in the wrong. Saul, by clinging tenaciously to what he regarded as his kingly prerogative, lost the kingdom; David, more concerned about honouring the Lord than guarding his own reputation, had his kingdom made sure for ever."¹²⁸

Chapter 7 is a high point in the fertility motif that runs through 1 and 2 Samuel. Here the ultimate in blessing came to David. If the giving of this covenant followed David's sins with Bathsheba and Uriah, as I believe it did, we have extraordinary evidence of God's grace. God chose to bless David in spite of his sins because over all David was a man who sought to glorify God and to serve Him acceptably with his life. The covenant came in response to David's desire to honor God in Israel by helping the people perceive His true position as head of the nation (ch. 6).

We should probably date God's giving of this covenant after David completed his own palace and the new tent for the ark in Jerusalem. It also probably took place after David

¹²⁶Youngblood, p. 896.

¹²⁷Gordon, p. 241.

¹²⁸Baldwin, pp. 218-219.

moved the ark to Jerusalem, recovered from Absalom and Sheba's rebellions, took the ill-fated census of the people, and purchased the site of the temple. This seems most likely in view of textual references that make it clear that these events took place in this order. Probably David received the Davidic Covenant about 973 B.C.¹²⁹

4. The security of David's kingdom ch. 8

"From the religious heights of chapter 7 we descend again to the everyday world of battles and bloodshed in chapter 8. The military action picks up where the story left off at the end of chapter 5."¹³⁰

Chapter 8 evidently describes the conquest of David's enemies that took place before David brought the ark into Jerusalem (ch. 6) and received the Davidic Covenant (ch. 7). An apparent problem with this view is the statement, "Now after this," in verse 1. However since 7:1 says God had given David rest from all his enemies, chapter 8 must precede chapter 7 and probably chapter 6. "After this" most likely refers to the battles with the Philistines the writer recorded in 5:17-25. Following those battles David had one or more other conflicts with the Philistines described in 8:1. The chief city of the Philistines (v. 1) was Gath (cf. 1 Chron. 18:1). The writer described David's military campaigns from west (v. 1) to east (v. 2) to north (vv. 3-11) to south (vv. 13-14) suggesting victory in every direction, total success thanks to Yahweh (vv. 6, 14).

"The Philistines considered themselves the legitimate heirs of the Egyptian rule in Palestine and their defeat by David implied the passage of the Egyptian province of Canaan into the hands of the Israelites."¹³¹

In the East, David defeated the Moabites, executed one-third of their soldiers, and obligated them to pay tribute (v. 2).

To the northeast, David subdued the king of Zobah (v. 3). The antecedent of "he" is probably Hadadezer.¹³² The "River" is probably a reference to the Euphrates, the most important river in that area. There is a discrepancy in the number of horsemen David took in battle (v. 4). Probably the figure in 1 Chronicles 18:4 is correct. Second Samuel 8:4 has suffered a textual corruption.¹³³ There are many minor textual corruptions in the Hebrew text of 1 and 2 Samuel, probably more than in any other book of the Old Testament.¹³⁴ David evidently captured 7,000 horsemen and preserved enough horses for 1,000 chariots. Hamstringing the horses involved severing the large tendon above and

¹²⁹See the "Chronology of David's Life" in my notes on 1 Samuel 16.

¹³⁰Payne, p. 193.

¹³¹Abraham Malamat, "The Kingdom of David & Solomon in its Contact with Egypt and Aram Naharaim," *Biblical Archaeologist* 21:4 (1958):100.

¹³²Keil and Delitzsch, p. 358.

¹³³Gleason Archer, *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*, p. 184; Keil and Delitzsch, p. 360.

¹³⁴For an introduction to the study of this subject, see Martin, pp. 209-22.

behind their hocks, which correspond to human ankles, to disable them. Evidently David had plenty of horses and did not need to use all that he captured in war.¹³⁵

The word "Syrian" (vv. 5-6) is a later word that came to replace "Aramean." At the time of David's conquest, people called the residents of the area around Damascus Arameans and the area Aram. Damascus at this time was not as powerful as it became later. Aramea was northeast of Canaan. David had previously defeated these people.¹³⁶

"Whether they [the gold shields, v. 7] were made of solid gold or simply bossed with gold or supplied with golden fittings is impossible to say (contrast the shields mentioned in 1 Kings 10:16-17; 14:26)."¹³⁷

Hamath (v. 9) was farther northwest than Zobah and Aram. Solomon later used the bronze, silver, and gold articles that David captured to build his temple (vv. 8, 10-12).

The battles summarized in verses 3-12 probably occurred after the ones reported in chapters 10—12.¹³⁸

There is another textual omission in verse 13. Perhaps while Israel was at war with the Arameans the Edomites seized the opportunity to invade Israel and proceeded toward Israel as far as the Valley of Salt. This valley lay at the south end of the Salt (Dead) Sea. David evidently defeated the Edomites there after defeating the Arameans (cf. Ps. 60:1; 1 Chron. 18:12).¹³⁹ Edom, of course, was Israel's neighbor to the southeast. The writer of Samuel could have written much more about David's military victories, but he chose to move on to emphasize other aspects of his character in the chapters that follow.

"Recapitulating David's military victories during his years as king over Israel and Judah in Jerusalem, vv. 1-14 parallel the account of the defeat of the Philistines (5:17-25) in the overall structure of the narrative of David's powerful reign (5:17—8:18; . . .). The summary may not be intended as all-inclusive, since other wars and skirmishes are mentioned later in the book (cf. ch. 10; 21:15-22; 23:8-23).

"The section leaves no doubt about the fact that David's armies were invincible and that no nation, however numerous or powerful its fighting men, could hope to withstand the Israelite hosts."¹⁴⁰

The real reason for David's success emerges clearly, however: "The Lord helped David wherever he went" (vv. 6, 14).

¹³⁵Cf. Yigael Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Discovery*, p. 285.

¹³⁶See my note on 10:15-19.

¹³⁷Youngblood, p. 906.

¹³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 904; John A. Bright, *A History of Israel*, p. 202, n. 38; Leon Wood, *A Survey of Israel's History*, p. 226.

¹³⁹Keil and Delitzsch, p. 364.

¹⁴⁰Youngblood, p. 901.

Verses 15-18 constitute a summary of David's administration and conclude this section of Samuel that records the major important features of David's reign (cf. 20:23-26). God established his empire firmly. He had relocated his capital, subdued his enemy neighbors, brought the ark into Jerusalem, and received the Davidic Covenant. The writer probably listed David's military victories last in chapter 8 because the formal record of a king's accomplishments normally ended this way in the official records of ancient Near Eastern monarchs.¹⁴¹ The writer of the Book of Kings followed the same procedure in recording the reigns of the succeeding kings of Judah and Israel. These selected events from David's reign show God's blessing on him and on Israel through him. Because he was the Lord's anointed who followed God faithfully, Yahweh poured out blessing and fertility.

"The *recorder* (Heb. *mazkir*), whose title derived from the Hebrew 'to remember' had a most important role at court, with responsibility for keeping the king informed, advising him, and communicating the king's commands. Interestingly, the Lord is also depicted, like the human king, as having 'recorders', though the word is translated 'remembrancers' (RV, AV mg.); their responsibility was to keep reminding him of his stated intentions until they were completed (Is. 62:6). This is an aspect of prayer which is easily overlooked, though it is implicit in the Lord's prayer: 'thy kingdom come, thy will be done . . .'"¹⁴²

The "secretary" (v. 17) was similar to a secretary of state.¹⁴³ The Cherethites and Pelethites formed David's private bodyguard (cf. 15:18; 20:7, 23; 1 Kings 1:38, 44; 1 Chron. 18:17). The Cherethites were evidently Cretans and the Pelethites Philistines. Though both groups came to Canaan from Crete, the Cherethites were native Cretans and the Pelethites had only passed through Crete during their migration from their original homeland, Greece.¹⁴⁴ Together they constituted a corp of foreign mercenaries that served as David's bodyguard (cf. 1 Sam. 30:14).

"Royal bodyguards were often made up of foreigners whose personal loyalty to the king was less likely to be adulterated by involvement in national politics (cf. 1 Sa. 28:2)."¹⁴⁵

David's sons were in some sense priests. "Chief ministers" (v. 8) is literally "priests."¹⁴⁶ Apparently they functioned in a mediatorial capacity but not by carrying out sacerdotal functions that were the exclusive responsibilities of the Levitical priests.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴¹See my note on 1 Samuel 14:47-52.

¹⁴²Baldwin, pp. 224-25. See also J. A. Thompson, *1, 2 Chronicles*, p. 153.

¹⁴³Youngblood, p. 911.

¹⁴⁴See *New Bible Dictionary*, s.v. "Cherethites," by T. C. Mitchell.

¹⁴⁵Gordon, p. 247.

¹⁴⁶See Armerding, pp. 75-86; J. Barton Payne, "1, 2 Chronicles," in *1 Kings-Job*, v. 4 of *Expository's Bible Commentary*, p. 399.

¹⁴⁷G. J. Wenham, "Were David's Sons Priests?" *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 87:1 (1975):79-82. He believed "priests" is a mistranslation and that the proper reading should be "administrators (of the royal estates)." Cf. 1 Chron. 18:17.

David's kingdom stretched from the Gulf of Aqabah and the Wadi of Egypt on the southeast and southwest respectively to the Euphrates River on the northeast.¹⁴⁸ David did not have complete sovereignty over all this territory, however. Some of his neighbor kingdoms were tribute-paying vassal states. Israel lost control of most of this territory later. Since God had promised Abraham's descendants permanent possession of the Promised Land (Gen. 13:15), David's kingdom did not constitute a fulfillment of the land promise in the Abrahamic Covenant.

Five major conflicts and reversals of fortune occur in chapters 2—8. Saul's men conflicted with David's men (2:1—3:5), Saul's kingdom conflicted with David's kingdom (3:6—5:16), and the Philistines conflicted with David (5:17-25). Saul's line conflicted with David and the ark (chs. 6—7), and the nations conflicted with David (ch. 8).

God's blessing came on Israel when the people had a proper attitude toward Him, which their proper attitude toward the ark symbolized (6:12-19). Preceding this attitude a series of conflicts resulted in David's forces gaining strength and Saul's forces losing strength. God reduced Saul's line to one crippled boy (4:4), and He condemned Michal to remain childless (6:20-27). Later He cut off the rest of Saul's line (21:1-14). On the other hand, God promised David descendants who would endure and reign forever (ch. 7). In the fullness of time the ultimate Anointed One, Jesus Christ, issued from him.

VI. DAVID'S TROUBLES CHS. 9—20

Chapters 9—20 contrast with chapters 2—8 in that this later section is negative whereas the earlier one was positive. It records failure; the former records success. Compare the similar narrative of Saul's triumphs (1 Sam. 7—12) and his troubles (1 Sam. 13—31).

"The crumbling of the empire in these chapters is far from anticlimactic. It is an outworking of the fertility principle which the author has been presenting throughout the entire book. Even David, the successful king, is not above this principle. When he disobeyed the covenant he was judged, and since he was the king the whole nation was judged with him. Sexual sin (related to the fertility motif) was the cause of David's downfall, and his fall was followed by sexual sins in his family."¹⁴⁹

David got into trouble when he stopped being humble before God and became arrogant. He was not as bad as Eli and his sons or Saul in this respect. Had he been, God would have cut him off too instead of giving him the Davidic Covenant. Chapters 9—20 show the effects of being arrogant before God.

Scholars frequently refer to chapters 9—20 along with 1 Kings 1 and 2 as "the succession narrative."¹⁵⁰ The reason for this is that the passage deals with matters that lead up to

¹⁴⁸See the map "The Kingdom of David" in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: Old Testament*, p. 462.

¹⁴⁹Martin, p. 39.

¹⁵⁰They follow Leonhard Rost, *The Succession to the Throne of David*.

Solomon's succession of David as Israel's king.¹⁵¹ Other scholars prefer to call this unit "court history" since it deals with a broader range of subjects than just Solomon's succession to the throne.¹⁵²

"Virtually all scholars agree that this is one of the finest examples of history writing from the ancient Near Eastern world. It is at the same time a masterpiece of biography and storytelling what with its ingenious interweaving of plots and subplots, its brilliant character sketches, and its attention to artistic touches such as climax and denouement."¹⁵³

Chapters 9—20 begin with information about the survivors in Saul's family (ch. 9) as does the next major section of the book, chapters 21—24 (21:1-14).

A. DAVID'S FAITHFULNESS CH. 9

The story of David's kindness to Mephibosheth (ch. 9) helps to explain David's subsequent acceptance by the Benjamites. It also enables us to see that the writer returned here to events in David's early reign.

"It is, in my personal opinion, the greatest illustration of grace in all the Old Testament."¹⁵⁴

If Mephibosheth was five years old when Jonathan and Saul died on Mt. Gilboa (4:4), he was born in 1016 B.C. When David captured Jerusalem in 1004 B.C., Mephibosheth was 12. Now we see Mephibosheth had a young son (v. 12). Perhaps he was about 20 years old. People frequently married in their teens in the ancient Near East. So perhaps the events of chapter 9 took place about 966 B.C.

David's kindness (Heb. *hesed*, loyal love, vv. 1, 3, 7) to Jonathan's son, expressed concretely by allowing him to eat at David's table (vv. 7, 10-11, 13), shows that David was, at the beginning of his reign, a covenant-keeping king (cf. 1 Sam. 20:14-17, 42). This was one of David's strengths.¹⁵⁵ His goodness to Mephibosheth was pure grace, entirely unearned by Saul's son. Yet the story is primarily about loyalty.

Ammiel (v. 4) was the name of Bathsheba's father (1 Chron. 3:5), but that man and the one named here do not appear to be the same individual. Lo-debar was about 10 miles

¹⁵¹David M. Gunn, "Traditional Composition in the 'Succession Narrative'," *Vetus Testamentum* 26:2 (April 1976):214-29, doubted that the succession narrative was a source the writer used as did Peter R. Ackroyd, "The Succession Narrative (so-called)," *Interpretation* 35:4 (1980):383-96.

¹⁵²E.g., Vanderkam, p. 522, n. 2; James W. Flanagan, "Court History or Succession Document? A Study of 2 Samuel 9—20; 1 Kings 1—2," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91:2 (1972):172-81.

¹⁵³Merrill, *Kingdom of . . .*, pp. 251-52. See also Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 357.

¹⁵⁴Swindoll, p. 169.

¹⁵⁵Leo G. Perdue, "'Is There Anyone Left of the House of Saul . . . ?' Ambiguity and the Characterization of David in the Succession Narrative," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 30 (October 1984):67-84, presented an interesting study of the complexity of David's character.

northwest of Jabesh-gilead in Transjordan and 10 miles south of the Sea of Chinnereth (Galilee). David provided for Mephibosheth's needs in Jerusalem, but Ziba and his family cultivated Mephibosheth's land and brought the produce to David. Thus the produce of his land paid the cost of Mephibosheth's maintenance. The writer may have stressed the fact that Mephibosheth was lame (vv. 3, 13) to remind us of the sad fate of Saul's line because of his arrogance before God. Mephibosheth really had trouble standing before God and His anointed.

"Given David's loathing for 'the lame and the blind' since the war against the Jebusites (2 Sam 5:6-8), one is brought up short by his decision to give Jonathan's son Mephibosheth, 'lame in both feet' (9:3, 13), a permanent seat at the royal table. . . . Is David willing to undergo such a daily ordeal just in memory of his friendship with Jonathan, as he himself declares, or as the price for keeping an eye on the last of Saul's line? Considering David's genius for aligning the proper with the expedient, he may be acting from both motives."¹⁵⁶

The sensitive reader will observe many parallels between Mephibosheth and himself or herself and between David and God. As Mephibosheth had fallen, was deformed as a result of his fall, was hiding in a place of barrenness, and was fearful of the king, so is the sinner. David took the initiative to seek out in spite of his unloveliness, bring into his house and presence, and adopt as his own son Mephibosheth. He also shared his bounty and fellowship with this undeserving one for the rest of his life because of Jonathan, as God has done with us for the sake of Christ (cf. Ps. 23:6).

In what sense can the affairs recorded in this chapter be considered part of David's troubles? We have here one of David's major attempts to appease the Benjamites. As the events of the following chapters will show, David had continuing problems with various Benjamites culminating in the rebellion of Sheba (ch. 20). Not all of David's troubles stemmed from his dealings with Bathsheba and Uriah.

B. GOD'S FAITHFULNESS DESPITE DAVID'S UNFAITHFULNESS CHS. 10—12

These chapters form a sub-section within the Court History portion of 2 Samuel.¹⁵⁷ The phrase "Now it happened" or "Now it was" (10:1; 13:1) always opens a new section.¹⁵⁸ Descriptions of Israel's victories over the Ammonites (10:1—11:1; 12:26-31) frame the

¹⁵⁶Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*, p. 255. James S. Ackerman, "Knowing Good and Evil: A Literary Analysis of the Court History in 2 Samuel 9—20 and 1 Kings 1—2," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109:1 (Spring 1990):43; Perdue, p. 75; John Briggs Curtis, "East is East . . .," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80:4 (1961):357; and David Payne, p. 197, shared the same opinion.

¹⁵⁷Youngblood, p. 920.

¹⁵⁸Wolfgang Roth, "You Are the Man! Structural Interaction in 2 Samuel 10-12." *Semeia* 8 (1977):4; John I. Lawlor, "Theology and Art in the Narrative of the Ammonite War (2 Samuel 10—12)," *Grace Theological Journal* 3:2 (1982):193.

David and Bathsheba story.¹⁵⁹ The parallel passage in 1 Chronicles (19:1—20:3) spans 2 Samuel 10—12 while omitting the David and Bathsheba incident. The motif word *salah* ("send") appears 23 times in this section but only 21 times in the rest of the Court History. Its occurrence may signal the development of a power motif here.¹⁶⁰

1. The Ammonite rebellion ch. 10

This section prepares for David's adultery with Bathsheba (ch. 11) by giving us the historical context in which that sin took place. It also shows David's growing power that led to his sinning.¹⁶¹

This event must have taken place early in David's reign, probably after his goodness to Mephibosheth (ch. 9). Again David showed kindness to a son for his father's sake, but this time the objects of David's kindness were Gentiles. In this instance David's kindness (Heb. *hesed*, v. 2; cf. 9:1) was neither appreciated nor reciprocated, as is still the case occasionally. The evidence for this is as follows. King Nahash of Ammon had just died. This king had threatened Jabesh-gilead at the start of Saul's reign (1 Sam. 11:1-11) so Nahash must have reigned longer than 40 years. However he must not have reigned much longer than that. If he had done so, he would have had an unusually long reign. Furthermore, when the Ammonites humiliated David's soldiers (v. 4) they showed no fear of Israel. This would have been their reaction only at the beginning of David's reign, not after he had subdued all his enemies. Probably Hanun shaved the beards of David's messengers vertically to make them look very foolish (cf. Isa. 7:20).¹⁶² Military victors humiliated their captives by exposing their buttocks (cf. Isa. 20:4). Notice that Hanun's advisors assumed David's worst motives rather than the best, which is a temptation for many people.

"As the hair on Samson's shorn head ultimately grew back (Judg 16:22) and proved to be a bad omen for the Philistines, so also the regrowth of the beards of David's men would portend disaster for the Ammonites."¹⁶³

The fact that Zobah, Aramea, and other northeastern enemies of Israel would ally with Ammon also suggests that this event took place before David had brought them under his authority (v. 19; cf. 8:3-8). Perhaps 993-990 B.C. are reasonable dates for the Ammonite wars with Israel.¹⁶⁴

The first battle took place at Medeba in Transjordan (v. 8; cf. 1 Chron. 19:7). Note Joab's commendable spirituality in verse 12. David first had Joab lead his army against the

¹⁵⁹Similarly descriptions of David sparing Saul's life (1 Sam. 24 and 26) frame the David and Abigail story (1 Sam. 25).

¹⁶⁰Lawlor, p. 196; Randall C. Bailey, *David in Love and War: The Pursuit of Power in 2 Samuel 10—12*.

¹⁶¹For a helpful study of the structure and narrative technique of this pericope, see Lawlor. David's growing power had previously led to his sinning by marrying Abigail (1 Sam. 25:39).

¹⁶²Youngblood, p. 922.

¹⁶³Ibid., p. 923.

¹⁶⁴Merrill, *Kingdom of . . .*, p. 244.

enemy (v. 7), but later David himself went into battle and led his soldiers (v. 17). Later David would stay behind in Jerusalem and let Joab lead again (11:1). Similarly Jesus Christ is allowing His followers to engage in spiritual warfare now. However the time is coming when He will personally return to the scene of opposition and subdue other Gentile enemies who have rejected his grace (cf. Rev. 19:11-16).

Another textual problem exists in verse 18. Probably 1 Chronicles 19:18 is correct in recording 7,000 charioteers.¹⁶⁵ Probably the writers of Samuel and Chronicles used different terms to describe the same fighting force in verse 6 and 1 Chronicles 19:6-7a, and in verse 18 and 1 Chronicles 19:18.¹⁶⁶

2. David's unfaithfulness to God chs. 11—12

These two chapters form a unit as is clear from their chiasmic structure.

- "A David sends Joab to besiege Rabbah (11:1).
- B David sleeps with Bathsheba, who becomes pregnant (11:2-5).
- C David has Uriah killed (11:6-17).
- D Joab sends David a message (11:18-27a).
- E The Lord is displeased with David (11:27b).
- D' The Lord sends David a messenger (12:1-14).
- C' The Lord strikes David's infant son, who dies (12:15-23).
- B' David sleeps with Bathsheba, who becomes pregnant (12:24-25).
- A' Joab sends for David to besiege and capture Rabbah (12:26-31)."¹⁶⁷

Even though David had been faithful to Jonathan in keeping his covenant with him (ch. 9), he was not faithful to Jehovah in keeping His covenant with Israel (i.e., the Mosaic Covenant). The writer's main point in this section, I believe, was the following. Disobedience to God's revealed will in the Law of Moses resulted in lack of blessing symbolized by infertility and death. Another view is this.

"The Bathsheba interlude occurs in 2 Samuel 11—12 primarily to indicate the birth and choice of Solomon, but much is learned about God's covenant dealing with His king."¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁵See Keil and Delitzsch, p. 380.

¹⁶⁶Zane C. Hodges, "Conflicts in the Biblical Account of the Ammonite-Syrian War," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 119:475 (July-September 1962):238-43.

¹⁶⁷Youngblood, p. 927.

¹⁶⁸Heater, p. 144.

This is perhaps the second most notorious sin in the Bible, after the Fall. It has probably received the most attention from unbelievers in movies and other forms of entertainment. Unbelievers love to gloat over the sins of godly people.

David's adultery with Bathsheba 11:1-5

While Joab was continuing to subdue the Ammonites the following spring by besieging Rabbah (modern Amman, the capital of Jordan; cf. 10:7), David was residing in Jerusalem (11:1). By mentioning the fact that normally kings led their armies into battle in the spring, the writer implied that David was not acting responsibly by staying in Jerusalem.¹⁶⁹

"... leading his troops into battle was expected to be the major external activity of an ancient Near Eastern ruler..."¹⁷⁰

"Our most difficult times are not when things are going hard. Hard times create dependent people. You don't get proud when you're dependent on God. Survival keeps you humble. Pride happens when everything is swinging in your direction. When you've just received that promotion, when you look back and you can see an almost spotless record in the last number of months or years, when you're growing in prestige and fame and significance, that's the time to watch out... especially if you're unaccountable..."

"Our greatest battles don't usually come when we're working hard; they come when we have some leisure, when we've got time on our hands, when we're bored."¹⁷¹

David's temptation followed an age-old pattern: he saw, he desired, and he took (cf. Gen. 3:6; James 1:14-15). He could not help seeing, but he could have stopped watching, lusting, sending for Bathsheba, and lying with her. "Very beautiful" translates a Hebrew phrase that describes people of striking physical appearance (cf. Gen. 24:16; 26:7 [Rebekah]; Esth. 1:11 [Vashti]; Esth. 2:7 [Esther]; 1 Sam. 16:12 [where a cognate expression describes David]). Perhaps Bathsheba was not totally innocent, but that does not vitiate David's guilt. It seems reasonable to assume that she could have shielded herself from view if she had wanted to do so.

"The bathing itself may have been for the purpose of ritual purification and would therefore not only advertize Bathsheba's charms but would serve as a notice to the king that she was available to him."¹⁷²

¹⁶⁹Saul also got into trouble when he stayed in Gibeah and Jonathan took the lead in fighting the Philistines (1 Sam. 14:1-2).

¹⁷⁰Youngblood, p. 928. Cf. 1 Sam. 8:5-6, 20.

¹⁷¹Swindoll, p. 183.

¹⁷²Eugene H. Merrill, "2 Samuel," in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: Old Testament*, p. 467.

Bathsheba's father, Eliam (v. 3), was apparently the son of Ahithophel, David's counselor (cf. 15:12; 23:34).¹⁷³ Uriah may have been a mercenary from one of the Syro-Hittite states to Israel's north. Alternatively he may have been the son of Hittites who had immigrated to Israel when the Hittite Empire was crumbling.¹⁷⁴ Probably he was a member of the native Canaanite tribe of Hittites that inhabited the Promised Land before the Conquest (cf. Gen. 23:3-15; Num. 13:29; et al.).

David then "took" Bathsheba—we could translate the Hebrew word "he collected" her—and so abused his royal power. Evidently this was a "one night stand;" David and Bathsheba appear to have had sex only on this one occasion. The Mosaic Law required that both a man and a woman who had sexual relations bathe to remove ritual uncleanness so they could participate in public worship (Lev. 15:18). Ironically Bathsheba was careful to keep this command of the law even though she had violated a much more important one. Sin tends to distort our sense of what is truly important so we focus on relatively unimportant duties.

"The only recorded speech of Bathsheba, brief though it is ["I am pregnant," v. 5], sets in motion a course of action which ultimately results in her husband's death."¹⁷⁵

Why did Bathsheba inform David that she was pregnant? Could she not have told her husband alone. Was she hoping that David would acknowledge her child and that the child would then enjoy royal privileges?

About five years later David's oldest son, Amnon, followed in his father's footsteps (13:14). Since David was born in 1041 B.C. and this incident took place about 992 B.C., David was close to 49 years old when he committed adultery.

"The king who is content to be given the kingdom (2 Sam 2—4) nevertheless seizes with violence the woman of his desire. The theme of seizure then erupts in the rape of Tamar, the taking of Amnon's life and (in political form) the major incident of the rebellion of Absalom."¹⁷⁶

"This king who took another man's wife already had a harem full of women. The simple fact is that the passion of sex is not satisfied by a full harem of women; it is *increased*. Having many women does not reduce a man's libido, it excites it . . . it stimulates it . . . One of the lies of our secular society is that if you just satisfy this drive, then it'll be abated."¹⁷⁷

¹⁷³See Hayim Tadmor, "Traditional Institutions and the Monarchy: Social and Political Tensions in the Time of David and Solomon," in *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays*, p. 247. If so, this may throw light on Ahithophel's later decision to abandon David and support Absalom when Absalom tried to overthrow his father.

¹⁷⁴Richard H. Beal, "The Hittites After the Empire's Fall," *Biblical Illustrator* 10:1 (Fall 1983):81.

¹⁷⁵Lawlor, p. 197.

¹⁷⁶Gunn, "David and . . .," p. 35.

¹⁷⁷Swindoll, p. 182.

David's murder of Uriah 11:6-25

David compounded his sin by trying to cover it up rather than confessing it. He tried three cover-ups: a "clean" one (vv. 6-11), a "dirty" one (vv. 12-13), and a "criminal" one (vv. 14-17).¹⁷⁸

David's suggestion that Uriah go home and "wash his feet" (v. 8) may have been an encouragement to enjoy his wife sexually since "feet" is sometimes a euphemistic reference to the genitals (cf. Exod. 4:25; Deut. 28:57; Isa. 7:20).¹⁷⁹ Whatever David intended, his hypocrisy is clear. Note the present that David sent home with Uriah. David was setting up this soldier to cover his own sin. However the king underestimated faithful Uriah's commitment to David for whom he had been fighting in Ammon. Though Bathsheba's husband was a Hittite, he appears to have been a godly believer in Yahweh as well as a dedicated warrior. He was one of David's best soldiers, one of his "mighty men" (cf. 23:39).

"Uriah's name ["Yahweh is my light"] turns out to be Yahwist, after all. In the heart of the imperial phalanges we find an orthodox Israelite, quietly observing the wartime soldier's ban against conjugal relations (cf. I Sam. 21:4-7)."¹⁸⁰

Uriah's reference to the ark being in a temporary shelter (v. 11) probably refers to its location at Kiriath-jearim. However some interpreters believe that "tents" should be left untranslated and that the reference is to Succoth.¹⁸¹

"Astonishingly, this Hittite mentions the covenant symbol before everything else that has influenced his behaviour. He is aware also of his solidarity with the fighting men at the front, over whom he will not steal an advantage. Both of these considerations applied even more forcibly to the king, who had final responsibility for the war, and had laid much stress on covenant loyalty himself, but now a foreigner is showing him to be despicably lax."¹⁸²

David's next plan was to get Uriah drunk hoping that in that condition he would return home to sleep with his wife (v. 13), but again David underestimated Uriah.

"The despicableness of the king's behaviour contrasts with the noble figure of the wronged Uriah, several times referred to as 'the Hittite' (vv. 3, 6, 17,

¹⁷⁸Walter Vogels, "David's Greatness in His Sin and Repentance," *The Way* 15:4 (1975):246.

¹⁷⁹Gale A. Yee, "'Fraught With Background': Literary Ambiguity in II Samuel 11," *Interpretation* 42:3 (July 1988):245; Uriel Simon, "The Poor Man's Ewe-Lamb," *Biblica* 48 (1967):214.

¹⁸⁰Joel Rosenberg, *King and Kin: Political Allegory in the Hebrew Bible*, p. 132.

¹⁸¹Youngblood, p. 934.

¹⁸²Baldwin, p. 233.

24), as if to emphasize that, whereas the king of Israel was so obviously lacking in principle, the same could not be said of this foreigner."¹⁸³

David's brazen rebellion against God's will comes out clearly in his third plan. He ordered Uriah to carry his own death warrant to Joab (vv. 14-15).¹⁸⁴ Joab's reply (vv. 19-21) mimicked David's instructions (v. 15).

"David, God's anointed and a great king, is otherwise poles apart from a petty thug like Abimelech [cf. v. 21; Judg. 9:50-54]. . . . [But] that David is likened to Abimelech has—because of the very distance between them—the effect of diminishing his image. The more so since Abimelech fell at a woman's hands while at the head of his army: David falls at a woman's hands precisely because he plays truant from war."¹⁸⁵

About seven years later David's son, Absalom, ordered his followers to strike down his brother, Amnon, for raping Absalom's sister, Tamar (13:28).

"It was ironic that David, the protector of justice, would so pervert justice in the Uriah-Bathsheba incident."¹⁸⁶

Some other innocent soldiers beside Uriah died because of David's orders concerning the battle strategy (v. 24). Thus he was really responsible for their deaths too.

David's response to his sins 11:26—12:15a

At first, David piously tried to salve Joab's conscience for his complicity in Uriah's death (11:25). The Hebrew word translated "displease" literally means "be evil in your sight." David was calling what was sin something other than sin (cf. 1 John 1:9). What David had done was not only evil in Joab's eyes, but, of infinitely greater importance, it was evil in God's eyes. David further hardened his heart and covered up his sin by marrying Bathsheba (11:27).

"The Hebrew phrase translated 'had her brought [NIV]' (v. 27) is literally 'sent and collected her' and emphasizes the abuse of royal power that David is increasingly willing to exercise. . . ."¹⁸⁷

"How could a man—a man after God's own heart—fall to such a level? If you are honest about your own heart, it's not hard to understand."¹⁸⁸

¹⁸³Gordon, pp. 253-54.

¹⁸⁴Compare wicked Queen Jezebel's similar action in 1 Kings 21:9-11.

¹⁸⁵Sternberg, pp. 221-22.

¹⁸⁶Heater, p. 120.

¹⁸⁷Youngblood, p. 938. The same phrase appears in 1 Sam. 14:52 where it describes Saul's method of recruiting soldiers.

¹⁸⁸Swindoll, p. 194.

Here are some suggestions for guarding yourself against similar sexual sin. First, realize that there is nothing that will guarantee you immunity from sinning in this way. We face the choice to yield to sexual temptation over and over again, and overcoming it once or many times is no guarantee that we will always overcome it (cf. 1 Cor. 10:12). Second, cultivate your daily commitment to the Lord. We cannot afford to live one day out of fellowship with Him. We can strengthen our hearts against temptation that may assail us during the day by recommitting ourselves to pleasing Him and obeying Him daily in prayer before we encounter the temptations of that day. Third, cultivate intimacy with your spouse, if you are married. Covetousness is less of a problem, though it will always be a problem, if you are content with the person whom God has given you. Contentment is something that we learn (cf. Phil. 4:11). Fourth, cultivate accountability with your mate, if you are married. Voluntarily tell your spouse where you have been, what you have been doing, and who you have been with. Do not wait for your mate to ask you these questions, but volunteer this information. If you do this regularly and know that you are going to have to do it, because you have made a commitment to yourself to do it, it will affect what you do. Fifth, anticipate temptation and avoid it. If you know that a particular individual attracts you strongly, do not spend too much time with him or her. Furthermore, refrain from saying anything to such a person that you would not say if your or that person's spouse was standing there with you.

About one year passed between the events of chapter 11 and those of chapter 12. This seems clear from the fact that God struck David and Bathsheba's child shortly after Nathan confronted David with his sin (12:15). God graciously gave David months to confess his sin, but when he did not, the Lord sent Nathan to confront him. These must have been months of inner turmoil for David.

"David wasn't relaxing and taking life easy, sipping lemonade on his patio, during the aftermath of his adultery. Count on it . . . he had sleepless nights. He could see his sin written across the ceiling of his room as he tossed and turned in bed. He saw it written across the walls. He saw it on the plate where he tried to choke down his meals. He saw it on the faces of his counselors. He was a miserable husband, an irritable father, a poor leader, and a songless composer. He lived a lie but he couldn't escape the truth.

"He had no joy. ('Restore to me the joy of Thy salvation' Ps. 51:12.) He was unstable. He felt inferior and insecure. ('Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a steadfast spirit within me' Ps. 51:10.) Sin does that to you. It's part of the wages that sin inevitably demands. A carnal Christian will dance all around and try to tell you, 'Everything's fine. Don't press me. I'm really free . . . really having fun . . . I'm doing well. You just haven't any idea.' But down inside it's there. Everything is empty, hollow, joyless, pointless. A true Christian cannot deny that. True guilt is there. Oppressively there. Constantly there."¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁹Ibid., p. 199.

Finally the Lord sent His prophet to confront the king. This required considerable courage on Nathan's part since David could have hardened his heart and had the prophet executed.

"In confronting someone in his sin, the timing is as important as the wording. Simply to tighten your belt, grab your Bible and, at your convenience, confront a person who is in sin is unwise. Most importantly, you need to be sure that you're sent by God. Nathan was."¹⁹⁰

Nathan's parable (cf. 14:1-20; 1 Kings 20:35—42; Isa. 5:1-7; Jer. 3:1-5) appealed to David's compassion as a shepherd and drew an emotional response from the king (12:5).¹⁹¹ Just like the man in the parable, David deserved to die, but David deserved to die for adultery (Lev. 20:10) and murder (Lev. 24:17). Hypocritically David ordered the man in Nathan's story to make restitution appealing to the Mosaic Law (Exod. 22:1) that he himself had disregarded. The man in the parable was not under a death sentence according to the Mosaic Law.¹⁹² David was reacting emotionally. He seems to have been trying to get rid of his own guilty conscience by condemning someone else while subconsciously passing judgment on himself.¹⁹³ It is interesting that four of David's sons died, perhaps as a divine fulfillment of the fourfold restitution that David ordered. They were David's first child by Bathsheba (v. 18), Amnon (13:28-29), Absalom (18:14-15), and Adonijah (1 Kings 2:25).¹⁹⁴

"You are the man!" (12:7) is certainly one of the most dramatic sentences in the Bible. Since several months had passed since David had committed his gross sins they were probably not on his mind when Nathan entered his presence and told his story. We see a prophet exercising authority over a king here. This was always the case in Israel's monarchy as we shall see repeatedly in the Books of Kings.¹⁹⁵ David had abused the great blessings that God had given him. Notice that the Lord said that He had done five great things for David (12:8), but David had done four sinful things in spite of God's goodness (12:9). He had despised God by disobeying His Word as though he were superior to it. David had seen what had happened to Saul for rejecting God's word.

David's punishment would be twofold: his own fertility (children) would be the source of his discipline, and God would remove the sources of his fertility (children) from him (12:11). The executions of these sentences follow in the text (13:11-14, 38-39; 16:22;

¹⁹⁰Ibid., p. 200.

¹⁹¹See Simon, pp. 207-42; and Peter W. Coxon, "A Note on 'Bathsheba' in 2 Samuel 12, 1-6," *Biblica* 62:2 (1981):247-50.

¹⁹²See Anthony Phillips, "The Interpretation of 2 Samuel xii 5-6," *Vetus Testamentum* 16 (1966):242-44.

¹⁹³Baldwin, p. 236. See J. P. Fokkerman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*, vol. 1: *King David*, p. 77.

¹⁹⁴Jones, p. 103.

¹⁹⁵See William Sanford LaSor, "The Prophets during the Monarchy: Turning Points in Israel's Decline," in *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration*, pp. 59-70.

18:15). Verses 9 and 10 of the twelfth chapter have been called "the literary, historical, and theological crux and center of 2 Samuel as a whole."¹⁹⁶

"As David 'took' Uriah's wife (vv. 9-10), so the Lord will 'take' David's wives (v. 11). As the Lord 'gave' Saul's property and Israel's kingdom to David (v. 8), so he says that he will now 'give' David's wives to someone else, to 'one who is close to you' (v. 11)—ironically, an expression earlier used of David himself in similar circumstances (see 1 Sam 15:28; 28:17 . . .)."¹⁹⁷

"Just as David willfully takes Bathsheba for himself (II Sam. 11:2-4), so Amnon forces Tamar (II Sam. 13:8-14), Absalom enters the royal harem (II Sam. 16:22), and Adonijah tries to claim his deceased father's concubine (I Kings 2:13-17)."¹⁹⁸

"We need to remember that, like many sins, David's were carried out *secretly*—at least for a while [12:12]. One of the things that accompanies the promotion of individuals to higher positions of authority is an increase in privacy. This closed-door policy maintained by those in high office brings great temptation for things to be done in secret. Unaccountability is common among those in command. So it was with David."¹⁹⁹

Psalm 32:3-4 probably records David's misery during the time between his sinning and his confessing. This psalm, and especially Psalm 51, give further insight into David's feelings when he confessed his sins. God spared David's life by pure grace; normally David would have died for his sins (Lev. 20:10; 24:17). His pardon came as a special revelation from God through Nathan (12:13). David's confession was genuine. He called his sin what it was rather than trying to cover it up or explain it away, which was Saul's typical response. Moreover he acknowledged that his sin was primarily against Yahweh, not just against Bathsheba and Uriah.

"Repentance has its reward (*cf.* 1 Sa. 7:3)."²⁰⁰

"This was the turning-point in the life of David, and the clearest indication that he was different from Saul in the most essential relationship of all, that of submission to the Lord God. For that reason he found forgiveness, whereas Saul never accepted his guilt or the rejection that followed from it."²⁰¹

¹⁹⁶Youngblood, p. 944. Compare David's earlier curse of Joab's house in 3:29 where "never" also is in view.

¹⁹⁷Ibid., p. 945.

¹⁹⁸P. Kyle McCarter Jr., "'Plots, True or False': The Succession Narrative as Court Apologetic," *Interpretation* 35:4 (October 1981):359.

¹⁹⁹Swindoll, p. 196.

²⁰⁰Gordon, p. 258.

²⁰¹Baldwin, p. 239.

Whereas the Lord removed the guilt of David's sin (forgiveness) he did not remove the consequences of it (discipline). Someone has said that after you hammer a nail in a board you may remove the nail, but a hole remains.

"Just as judges today sometimes commute a sentence, so too God has the right and the power to modify or even cancel his own decisions in the light of the human response. In this case David's immediate signs of remorse allowed immediate forgiveness; but the deed itself could not be undone, and some consequences were inevitable."²⁰²

"David's voyeurism in 2 Sam 11:2 and Nathan's curse in 12:11 foreshadow Absalom's rooftop orgy (16:20-22)."²⁰³

This is how God deals with sin normally. He removes the guilt that would result in damnation, but He usually allows at least some of the consequences to follow and uses these for discipline and instruction. Notice how God's punishment fit David's crimes (cf. Gal. 6:7). In David's case the infant he fathered died.

"God could not ignore David's sin and thus let unbelievers impugn the holiness of His character."²⁰⁴

The death of one child and the birth of another 12:15b-25

Why did God take the life of this child since its parents sinned?

"That the child should be punished for what David did seems wrong. We need to remind ourselves, however, that even today innocent children suffer from the things their parents do. The more pointed question deals with whether God should be credited with the cause of the suffering. I once sat at the funeral of a child who had been accidentally killed by a drunk man riding through the community on a motorcycle. In the funeral message the minister tried to convince those of us present that God had a purpose in the child's death as though it were something God had planned. I was revolted by what he said because he took an evil event and made God the cause. In understanding Nathan's interpretation of the child's illness we need to separate the physical cause and the religious interpretation or application. Whatever the child's illness, both Nathan and David saw it as connected with David's sin and raised no questions about it as we do."²⁰⁵

²⁰²Payne, p. 209.

²⁰³Jon D. Levenson and Baruch Halpern, "The Political Import of David's Marriages," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99:4 (1980):514.

²⁰⁴Laney, p. 109.

²⁰⁵Kenneth L. Chafin, *1, 2 Samuel*, p. 309.

"When David slept with the woman and created new life, the woman did not belong to him but to Uriah. The child cannot belong to David. He cannot enrich himself through his sin, and in a sense, justice is done to Uriah."²⁰⁶

David prayed for the child's recovery, lying on the ground as Uriah had previously slept (11:9, 11). However when God took its life, David knew the time for praying was over. Praying for the dead finds no support in this passage or anywhere else in Scripture. David's servants apparently believed he would become hysterical with grief when he learned the child had died (v. 19). The king was probably referring to the grave rather than to heaven when he said, "I shall go to him . . ." (v. 23). In the context the issue was the inevitability of death, not what happens after death. The child could not come back to life, but David would someday join him in death. Scripture is silent on the eternal state of dead infants, but we can find great comfort in knowing that the Judge of all the earth will do right (Gen. 18:25).

The birth of David and Bathsheba's second son, Solomon (whose name comes from the Hebrew word *shalom*, peace), was a blessing from the Lord. He had another name, Jedidiah (lit. beloved of Yahweh). The former was perhaps a throne name that David gave him to anticipate his reigning as king.²⁰⁷ Solomon was born about 991 B.C. The fact that God allowed him to live and even made him David's successor on the throne is testimony to God's great grace to David (cf. Rom. 5:20). The statement, "Now the Lord loved him," (v. 24) is the Hebrew way of saying the Lord chose him.²⁰⁸

God's faithfulness to David 12:26-31

In spite of David's rebellion God granted his army victory over the Ammonites. David's military leaders evidently executed the defeated warriors (1 Chron. 20:3) and forced many of the people to do labor of various kinds to support Israel (v. 31).²⁰⁹

Chapters 10—12 contain very important revelation that helps us understand the complexity of God's righteous ways. We often think too superficially about the way God deals with sin in His people's lives. We see in these chapters that David's great sins did not completely wash out his past record of godly behavior. God continued to bless him in part because God had chosen him as His anointed, but also because he genuinely had a heart for God. His sins had terrible consequences, as we shall see, but God did not cast David off. The most important factor seems to be David's basic heart attitude toward God. In this he was very different from Saul, and it is for this reason, I believe, that David

²⁰⁶Vogels, p. 251.

²⁰⁷Shemaryahu Talmon, *King, Cult, and Calendar in Ancient Israel: Collected Studies*, p. 152.

²⁰⁸Heater, p. 145. Cf. Mal. 1:2-3.

²⁰⁹On the crown mentioned in verse 30, see Siegfried H. Horn, "The Crown of the King of the Ammonites," *Andrews University Seminary Bulletin* 11:2 (1973):170-80. For an explanation of David's actions in verse 31, see G. C. O'Ceallaigh, "And So David Did to All the Cities of Ammon," *Vetus Testamentum* 12 (1962):179-89.

did not end as Saul did. When David sinned, he confessed his sin. When Saul sinned, he made excuses.²¹⁰

C. DAVID'S REJECTION AND RETURN CHS. 13—20

This is the longest literary section in the Court History of David (chs. 9—20). It records Absalom's antagonism to David that resulted in the king having to flee Jerusalem, but it ends with David's defeat of his enemy and his return to reign. There are obvious parallels with the experience of Jesus Christ.

"If the integrity of chapters 13—20 as a literary unit of the highest order is beyond question (cf. Conroy, p. 1), it is equally clear that the section contains two readily distinguishable subsections: chapters 13—14, which may be characterized as exhibiting for the most part a 'desire/fulfillment of desire' pattern, and chapters 15—20, which prefer a 'departure/return' pattern . . ." ²¹¹

1. Events leading up to Absalom's rebellion chs. 13—14

David's disobedience to the Mosaic Covenant resulted in a cutting back of his personal blessing and of his effectiveness as an instrument of blessing to Israel. These chapters record this restriction of blessing even though blessing characterized the total course of David's life more than judgment.

These chapters record "family tragedies."²¹² Bathsheba's first-born child by David died, and three other of David's sons did as well because of his sin. Chapter 13 records the death of his first-born. The chapter is chiasmic in design focusing on Amnon's rape of Tamar and his change of heart from love (lust) to hate.²¹³

Amnon's rape of Tamar 13:1-22

Maacah bore Absalom while David was reigning in Hebron (3:3). He was David's third-born. Amnon, his first-born, was also born in Hebron but by Ahinoam (3:2). Both sons may have been in their late teens or early twenties at this time. Tamar (lit. "Palm Tree," cf. Song of Sol. 7:7-8) was evidently born in Jerusalem (1 Chron. 3:4-9) so she would have been younger than both of these two brothers. The event described in this chapter probably occurred about 987 B.C.²¹⁴

²¹⁰For a structural analysis of chapters 10—12, see Roth, "You Are . . ."

²¹¹Youngblood, 954. "Conroy" is Charles Conroy, *Absalom Absalom! Narrative and Language in 2 Sam 13—20*.

²¹²Mats Eskhult, *Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique in Biblical Hebrew Prose*, pp. 58-59.

²¹³George P. Ridout, *Prose Compositional Techniques in the Succession Narrative [2 Samuel 7, 9—20; 1 Kings 1—2]*, pp. 50-56. Many of the literary units in 1 and 2 Samuel were constructed chiasmatically. The chiasms from this point on in 2 Samuel are easier to identify. See Youngblood, who usually offered a chiasmic diagram at the beginning of his discussion of each section.

²¹⁴Merrill, *Kingdom of . . .*, p. 245.

The story that unfolds is a case of frustrated teenage lust. Evidently Amnon had no desire to marry Tamar, which he probably could have done with David's consent (cf. Gen. 20:12).²¹⁵ The grisly episode is very contemporary and requires little clarification.

"The dialogue in the story of Amnon and Tamar . . . looks like a conscious allusion to the technique used in the episode of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. Amnon addresses to his half-sister exactly the same words with which Potiphar's wife accosts Joseph—"Come to bed with me!" (Gen. 39:7)]—adding to them only one word, the thematically loaded 'sister' (2 Sam. 13:11). She responds with an elaborate protestation, like Joseph before her."²¹⁶

David had violated God's will by "sleeping" (Heb. *skb 'm*) with Bathsheba, possibly with her consent. Amnon, however, violated God's will by "laying" (Heb. *skb 't*) Tamar, forcing her against her will (v. 14; cf. 11:4).²¹⁷

Jonadab may have been trying to secure his own political future with Absalom (vv. 3-5, 32-35).²¹⁸

Quite clearly Amnon's attraction to Tamar was only selfish infatuation. When he had satisfied himself, he hated her and wanted no more contact with her (v. 15). Contrast Amnon's attitude toward Tamar after the rape with that of pagan Shechem toward Dinah in a similar incident (Gen. 34:2-3). Amnon hated Tamar, but Shechem loved Dinah. Likewise David continued to love Bathsheba after their affair.

Absalom consoled Tamar with a view to taking vengeance for her and gaining his own advantage. He probably saw in this incident an opportunity to bring Amnon down and advance himself as a candidate for the throne. The writer did not mention Chileab, David's second-born son (3:3), in the Court History. Perhaps he had already died. Tamar remained "desolate" (v. 20), a term in Hebrew that means unmarried and childless, which was a living death for a Jewish woman (cf. 20:3).²¹⁹

David may have taken no action against Amnon because he was the crown prince. Perhaps, too, he realized that people would regard him as a hypocrite for punishing Amnon since he himself had been guilty of a similar crime. Nevertheless Amnon deserved to die (Lev. 20:17).

"The results of David's sin with Bathsheba became evident in his relations with his sons, for how can a father discipline his children when he knows

²¹⁵Anthony Phillips, "NEBALAH—a term for serious disorderly and unruly conduct," *Vetus Testamentum* 25:2 (April 1975):237.

²¹⁶Alter, p. 73.

²¹⁷David M. Gunn, *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation*, p. 100.

²¹⁸Andrew Hill, "A Jonadab Connection in the Absalom Conspiracy?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 30:4 (December 1987):387-90.

²¹⁹Conroy, p. 35, n. 70.

that he has done worse than they? When David's son Amnon rapes Tamar . . . David is very angry (II Sam. 13:21), and yet David takes no action, for he, too, has committed his own sexual offense. The upshot is that Tamar's brother, Absalom, murders Amnon (II Sam. 13:29), but David again does nothing, for he, too, has a murder on his head."²²⁰

"David is as clearly unable to control his sons' passions as he is his own."²²¹

"If David had exerted himself as the situation required, he might have prevented that initial estrangement between himself and Absalom which was finally to plunge the nation into civil strife."²²²

Absalom's murder of Amnon 13:23-39

References to two years (v. 23) and three years (v. 38) bracket this literary unit.

Amnon's murder 13:23-29

Absalom patiently and carefully plotted revenge on Amnon.

". . . As the sheep of Absalom would lose their wool (vv. 23-24), so David's firstborn, the potential shepherd of Israel, would lose his life (vv. 28-29)."²²³

Absalom finally killed his brother at Baal-hazor 15 miles north-northeast of Jerusalem two years later (ca. 985 B.C.). As Amnon's rape of Tamar reprised David's adultery with Bathsheba, so Absalom's execution of Amnon mirrored David's murder of Uriah (cf. Gal. 6:7). David's sons were chips off the old block.²²⁴

The aftermath of Amnon's murder 13:30-39

The writer may have devoted so much text to straightening out the rumor that Absalom had killed all the king's sons to stress God's mercy in not cutting off all of them. At first report David probably thought God had judged him severely, but it became clear that God had been merciful. Jonadab may have been a member of David's cabinet (v. 3). Evidently he and Absalom had hatched the conspiracy against Amnon to remove the heir apparent to the throne.²²⁵ Jonadab knew precisely what had happened.

²²⁰Paul J. and Elizabeth Achtemeier, *The Old Testament Roots of Our Faith*, p. 94.

²²¹Youngblood, p. 966. Cf. Jared J. Jackson, "David's Throne: Patterns in the Succession Story," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 11:3 (July 1965):189.

²²²Gordon, p. 264.

²²³Youngblood, p. 968.

²²⁴Fokkelman, p. 125.

²²⁵Hill, p. 390.

Absalom fled to his maternal grandfather (3:3) who lived in the kingdom of Geshur that lay northeast of the Sea of Chinnereth (Galilee).²²⁶ There he stayed for three years (until ca. 982 B.C.). This sets the scene for the next crisis in David's family.

So far at least six consequences of David's sins against Bathsheba and Uriah have surfaced (cf. 12:10-11). First, the child that Bathsheba bore died. Second, Amnon raped Tamar. Third, Absalom broke off communication with his brother, Amnon. Fourth, Absalom murdered Amnon. Fifth, Absalom left the country and his family. Sixth, David had become an even more passive father. This family had become dysfunctional.

"Grace means that God, in forgiving you, does not kill you. Grace means that God, in forgiving you, gives you the strength to endure the consequences. Grace frees us so that we can obey our Lord. It does not mean sin's consequences are automatically removed. If I sin and in the process of sinning break my arm, when I find forgiveness from sin, I still have to deal with a broken arm."²²⁷

"When David sowed to the flesh, he reaped what the flesh produced. Moreover, he reaped the consequences of his actions even though he had confessed his sin and been forgiven for it. Underline it, star it, mark it deeply upon your conscious mind: *Confession and forgiveness in no way stop the harvest*. He had sown; he was to reap. Forgiven he was, but the consequences continued. This is exactly the emphasis Paul is giving the Galatians even in this age of grace [Gal. 6:7]. We are not to be deceived, for God will not be mocked. What we sow we will reap, and there are *no exceptions*."²²⁸

More Christians have probably memorized 1 John 1:9 than Romans 6:12-13. First John 1:9 deals with how to handle sin *after* we have committed it; it is corrective theology. Romans 6:12-13 deals with how to handle sin *before* we commit it; it is preventive theology. We need to pay more attention to Romans 6:12-13. The purpose of 2 Samuel 13 is to help the reader prevent this type of sin rather than help us recover from it having fallen. It is a strong warning against letting our passions lead us because of the consequences that will follow.

Joab's scheme to secure Absalom's pardon 14:1-20

Evidently Joab (David's commander-in-chief and nephew by his half-sister, Zeruah) concluded that it would be politically better for David and Israel if David brought Absalom back to Jerusalem from Geshur (cf. vv. 7, 13-15). Absalom was, of course, now David's heir to the throne by custom, though Yahweh had designated Solomon to succeed his father. David had a great love for Absalom even though he was a murderer (v. 1; cf.

²²⁶In this he followed the example of his ancestor Jacob who fled to Aramaean kinsmen in the Northeast (Gen. 28:10; Carlson, p. 164).

²²⁷Swindoll, p. 211.

²²⁸John W. Lawrence, *Life's Choices*, p. 39.

13:37, 39). David had a large capacity to love; he loved God and many other people greatly.

The story Joab gave the actress from Tekoa (10 miles south of Jerusalem) to tell duplicated David's own problem with Absalom (cf. the story that God had put in Nathan's mouth, 12:1-4). By putting the murderer to death, the woman's hostile relatives would have deprived her of her means of support (v. 7; cf. the story of Cain and Abel, Gen. 4:1-8). By putting Absalom to death, David would have deprived himself of his heir, which Joab evidently perceived Absalom to be. Since David promised not to execute the woman's son (v. 11) it was inconsistent for him to refrain from pardoning Absalom (v. 13). The wise woman urged David to remember the LORD his God, specifically, His mercy (v. 11).

"David's reference to the 'hair' of the woman's 'son' is both ironic and poignant: The hair of his own son Absalom was not only an index of his handsome appearance (cf. vv. 25-26) but would also contribute to his undoing (cf. 18:9-15)."²²⁹

The woman's references to "the people of God" (i.e., Israel, v. 13; cf. vv. 14-15, 17) point to popular support for Absalom and a common desire that David would pardon him and allow him to return to Jerusalem.

David had personally experienced God's mercy and had escaped death for his adultery and murder (12:13). The woman appealed to David to deal with Absalom as God had dealt with him or the nation would suffer (v. 14). Verse 14 is a key verse in this chapter. The wise actress reminded David that God does not take away life, that is He does not delight in punishing people. Rather He plans ways by which guilty people can enjoy reconciliation with Himself. The Cross is the greatest historical proof of this truth. Judgment is God's "strange" work; mercy is what He delights to display. Thus David should be godly and make a way to show mercy to Absalom rather than punishing him with death, according to Joab.

David knew that Joab wanted him to pardon Absalom. He sensed that the woman's arguments had come from him (vv. 18-19). Joab had written the script for the little skit that she had performed (vv. 19-20).

"Ironically, Joab's demise begins at precisely the point where another woman (Bathsheba) is sent to the king by a thoroughly self-interested [?] statesman (Nathan) in order to foil the succession of the next in line after Absalom (Adonijah) and so to secure the crown for Solomon (1 Ki 1.11-31)."²³⁰

²²⁹Youngblood, pp. 978-79.

²³⁰George G. Nicol, "The Wisdom of Joab and the Wise Woman of Tekoa," *Studia Theologica* 36 (1982):101. J. Hoftijzer, "David and the Tekoite Woman," *Vetus Testamentum* 20:4 (October 1970):419-44, noted the parallels between this incident and Abigail's appeal to David in 1 Samuel 25:24.

Absalom's return to Jerusalem 14:21-33

Joab's masquerade proved effective. David agreed to allow Absalom to return to Jerusalem (v. 21). However even though he did not execute him, neither did David restore Absalom to fellowship with himself (v. 24). His forgiveness was official but not personal. This led to more trouble.

Verses 25-27 give information about Absalom that helps us understand why he was able to win the hearts of the people. He was not only handsome but also a family man.

"A strong growth of hair was a sign of great manly power . . ." ²³¹

"What Absalom proudly considers his finest attribute will prove to be the vehicle of his ultimate downfall (cf. 18:9-15)." ²³²

Two hundred shekels (v. 26) equal five pounds in weight. Absalom was attractive physically but not correspondingly attractive to God spiritually because he put his own ambitions before God's plans. In these respects he was similar to Saul.

Absalom then lived in Jerusalem for two years, about 982-980 B.C. (v. 28; cf. 13:38). During these years he resented David's treatment of him. He regarded himself as a prisoner in Jerusalem. He was willing to suffer death for his murder of Amnon or to receive a true pardon, but the present compromise was unbearable (v. 32). When Absalom pressed for a personal reconciliation with his father, David finally conceded (v. 33), which David should have done at least two years earlier.

I believe David handled Absalom as he did partly because David's conscience bothered him; he himself had sinned greatly. This seems clear from 14:1-20. David's approach offended Absalom and contributed to his desire to seize the throne from his father.

The entire chapter is the story of a father and king caught between his responsibilities to be both just and merciful. Every parent and leader has found himself or herself in David's position. God Himself had to find a solution to this dual responsibility. The chapter deals with how to discipline. David's solution was to compromise. He tried to punish Absalom by keeping him in exile but not executing him. Then he allowed him to return to Jerusalem but not to have fellowship with himself. Both of these compromises failed and only made the relationship worse. God's solution is to be merciful, to forgive and welcome back warmly and quickly (cf. 12:13; Matt. 6:12, 14-15; Luke 15:11-24). Perhaps David was reluctant to pardon Absalom because his son did not repent, at least the text says nothing about his doing so. Nevertheless David's lack of true forgiveness bred a bitter attitude in Absalom that resulted in his organizing a *coup* to overthrow his father (ch. 15). The law demands justice, but "mercy triumphs over justice" (James 2:13). A police officer who pulls you over for speeding can give you justice (a citation) or mercy (a warning). A murderer on death row can receive justice (execution) or mercy (a

²³¹Keil and Delitzsch, p. 411.

²³²Youngblood, p. 985.

governor's pardon). The offender's attitude plays a part in the decision in every case, but ultimately the choice belongs to the person in power. A godly person will plan ways so the estranged may come back into fellowship (v. 14).

2. Absalom's attempt to usurp David's throne chs. 15—20

Absalom was never Yahweh's choice to succeed David (cf. 12:24-25; 1 Chron. 22:9-10). Therefore his attempt to dethrone the Lord's anointed was contrary to God's will and doomed to fail from the beginning. Even though he was personally fertile as a result of God's blessing (14:27), his plan brought God's punishment on himself, even his premature death, rather than further blessing.

Absalom's conspiracy 15:1-12

Two sub-sections each begin with a reference to time (vv. 1, 7) and form a literary "diptych" (i.e., two complementary panels).²³³ The first six verses explain how Absalom undermined popular confidence in the Lord's anointed for four years. The last six relate his final preparations to lead a military revolution against David.

"Whatever the reason, he exhibited the same patient scheming and relentless determination which he had already shown when he set out to avenge the rape of his sister (chapter 13); the leopard had not changed his spots. His hatred for Amnon at least had had some excuse, but now it became clear that he had no affection for his father either. Apart from his love for his sister Tamar, he appears to have been a cold, ruthless and above all ambitious man."²³⁴

Absalom spent four years (v. 7, probably 980-976 B.C.) quietly planning a *coup*.²³⁵ He did this by securing military weapons and supporters (v. 1; cf. 1 Kings 1:5), criticizing his father's administration (vv. 2-3), promising to rule better than David (v. 4), and exercising personal charm and flattery (vv. 5-6). David was at this time (980-976 B.C.) building his palace in Jerusalem, then constructing a new dwelling place for the ark, and finally making preparations for the temple (5:9-12). This may be the reason David was not meeting the needs of his people as well as he might have done. It accounts for David's surprise when Absalom's *coup* began as well.

Perhaps Absalom chose Hebron as the place to announce his rebellion because that was his birthplace, and his support may have been strongest there. Some in Hebron may have resented David's moving his capital from there to Jerusalem.²³⁶ Ahithophel (v. 12) was Bathsheba's grandfather (11:3; 23:34). Ahithophel's support of Absalom may suggest that

²³³Fokkelman, p. 165.

²³⁴Payne, p. 227.

²³⁵That "four" is the correct number rather than "40" seems clear from other chronological references. The Septuagint and Josephus, 7:9:1, also have "four."

²³⁶Laney, p. 113.

the general public did not know about God's choice of David's successor. Ahithophel came from a town in Judah (Josh. 15:51).

Absalom's rebellion against God's anointed king is similar to the reaction of the Jews to Jesus, the Lord's Messiah. They did not want Him to reign over them. Consequently Jesus departed from them and returned to heaven from which he will return to reign over them eventually.

David's flight from Jerusalem 15:13-37

The people of Israel had formerly given the kingdom to David as a gift (5:1-3), but now they took that gift from him (v. 13).²³⁷ David knew that Absalom was popular with the people. Evidently he fled Jerusalem to save his own life and to spare the capital from destruction. Perhaps Absalom planned to destroy David's capital as well as to kill the king and reassert Judean supremacy. Clearly David planned to return to Jerusalem (v. 16). He was fleeing from an attack, not going into exile. The Cherethites and Pelethites were David's bodyguard. The 600 men from Gath (v. 18) were probably mercenary soldiers. These foreigners were loyal to David even when his own son deserted him.

"Ancient kings quite often preferred to employ foreign bodyguards, since they were unlikely to be affected by local political considerations or won over by local political factions."²³⁸

David later repaid Ittai, another former resident of Gath, for his loyalty by making him commander of one-third of his army (18:2). David urged Ittai to return to Jerusalem and to remain loyal to him there (v. 19), but Ittai insisted on accompanying the king. Ittai's commitment to David (vv. 19-22) recalls Ruth's commitment to Naomi (Ruth 1:16-17). David crossed the Kidron Valley immediately east of Zion and moved up the Mount of Olives that lay on the other side of the valley. In this he anticipated the movement of his descendant, Jesus Christ, who also crossed the Kidron Valley to pray on Mt. Olivet during His passion (John 18:1).

At this time there were two leading priests in Israel, Zadok (who was also a prophet, v. 27) and Abiathar. Probably Zadok was responsible for worship in Jerusalem where David had built a new structure to house the ark. Abiathar seems to have functioned for many years as David's personal chaplain. Earlier Zadok had been in charge of the Gibeon sanctuary (1 Chron. 16:39-42). God's "habitation" (v. 25) most likely refers to the new tent David had recently completed in Jerusalem (cf. 1 Chron. 15:1).

These facts suggest another reason for Absalom's rebellion and the support he enjoyed. Many of the Israelites probably considered David's projects of building a new tabernacle and bringing the ark into Jerusalem inappropriate since Jerusalem was a formerly Canaanite stronghold. Many other people may have shared Michal's reaction (6:16-20).²³⁹

²³⁷Gunn, "David and . . .," p. 22.

²³⁸Payne, p. 231.

²³⁹Ibid., p. 185.

David's complete submission to God's authority over his life is admirable (v. 26). The phrase "the fords of the wilderness" (v. 28) probably refers to the place people forded the Jordan River near the wilderness of Judah (cf. 17:22). David did not believe superstitiously that the presence of the ark would insure his victory (cf. 1 Sam. 4:3).

David trudged up the Mount of Olives attired for mourning (v. 30), praying as he wept (v. 31). On Mt. Olivet David was still only a few hundred yards from the City of David. It rises about 200 feet above the city to its east. Walking barefoot (v. 30) symbolized "the shameful exile on which he is now embarking (cf. Isa 20:2-3; cf. similarly Mic 1:8)."²⁴⁰ David's friend (i.e., counselor) Hushai came from a family that evidently lived on Ephraim's southern border between Bethel and Ataroth (Josh. 16:2).²⁴¹ He was probably quite old.

Chapter 15 teaches us a lot about friendship. Absalom is the negative example, and David's supporters as he left Jerusalem are the positive ones. David lost Absalom as a friend because he failed to reach out to him in forgiveness. David won the friendship of many others in Israel because he had a heart for God that expressed itself in loving kindness for people (cf. Matt. 22:37-39). This made people love David, and we see the marks of their friendship in their dealings with David in this chapter. The king's servants modeled true servanthood by offering to do whatever David needed them to do (vv. 15-18). Ittai expressed his friendship by being a companion to David (vv. 19-23). Zadok and Abiathar became informants and made sure their friend had the information he needed to guarantee his welfare (vv. 24-29). Hushai was willing to hazard his own safety to defend David in the presence of his enemies (vv. 30-37). These people proved to be "sheltering trees"²⁴² for their friend in his hour of need.

"Meanwhile David showed a commendable attitude very much in contrast to Absalom's arrogance. He was completely willing to submit to God's will (verses 25f.), whatever that might prove to be. Such willingness to surrender leadership at the right time is another hallmark of good leadership."²⁴³

The kindness of Ziba 16:1-4

"David now encounters Ziba (vv. 1-4), the first of two men with links to the house of Saul (the other is Shimei [vv. 5-14]). Although Ziba attempts to ingratiate himself to him and Shimei curses him, David treats each with courtesy. The brief account of the king's kindness to Ziba (vv. 1-4) has obvious connections with the narrative of his kindness to Mephibosheth (ch. 9) . . ."²⁴⁴

²⁴⁰Youngblood, p. 997.

²⁴¹Cf. Carl G. Rasmussen, *Zondervan NIV Atlas of the Bible*, p. 227.

²⁴²Samuel Taylor Coleridge, "Youth and Age," in *Poems That Live Forever*, p. 256.

²⁴³Payne, p. 232.

²⁴⁴Youngblood, pp. 998-99.

Ziba's report of Mephibosheth's reaction to the news that Absalom had rebelled seems to have been untrue (cf. 19:24-28). Perhaps he believed Absalom would kill his master and then David would reward him. David accepted Ziba's report too quickly without getting all the facts perhaps because Ziba showed himself to be a friend of David by sustaining him in his flight. We sometimes accept a friend's analysis of the motives of another person too quickly if we do not bother to get all the facts. Here David slipped because he too willingly accepted the complimentary words of a friend.

Shimei's curse 16:5-14

This second descendant of Saul demonstrated a reaction to David that was the opposite of Ziba's. Ziba had been ingratiating and submissive, but Shimei, a "reptile of the royal house of Saul,"²⁴⁵ was insulting and defiant (cf. Gen. 12:3).²⁴⁶ The focus of the chiasm in this section is Abishai's desire for Shimei's execution (v. 9; cf. 1 Sam. 17:46; 2 Sam. 4:7).

Bahurim evidently stood on the east side of Mt. Olivet but not far away (cf. 3:16; 17:18). Shimei's charge that David was a man of bloodshed (v. 8) was true. David had murdered Uriah. However, Shimei meant David was responsible for the murders of Abner and Ish-bosheth, which was not true. David appears to have felt his present distress might be God's punishment for that sin (vv. 10-11). He hoped that by showing Shimei mercy God might be merciful to him (v. 12; cf. 22:26). David's attitude was entirely different from Abishai's (v. 9; cf. 1 Sam. 26:8) and Abishai's brother Joab's who often seized the initiative from God. "Sons of Zeruah" was probably a disparaging form of address (cf. 1 Sam. 10:11; 20:27).

"This is an interesting theological view, that coming from the hate-filled rantings of an apparent madman might be the voice of God to David. The willingness to listen to one's critics and even to one's enemies may be the only way to discover the truth of God. The natural tendency is to surround ourselves with friends who are often reluctant to tell us the things we need to know. This opens the possibility that we may do well at times to listen to people who wish us harm but tell us the truth. Here again we see David's willingness to expose himself to God's word for his life and to God's judgment upon his life."²⁴⁷

Here, in contrast to the previous pericope, David succeeded. He did not let the criticism of a critic elicit an improper response from him. Rather he listened for the voice of God in Shimei's words (vv. 10-11). Sometimes the complementary words of a friend (vv. 1-4) are more difficult to handle than the curses of an enemy. David showed some growth here; previously he had reacted violently to the disdain of an enemy, namely, Nabal (cf. 1 Sam. 25:26, 32-34). For David to control his temper was a greater victory than his slaying

²⁴⁵Alexander Whyte, *Bible Characters*, p. 297.

²⁴⁶Youngblood, p. 1000.

²⁴⁷Chafin, p. 338.

Goliath (Prov. 16:32). Times of stress bring out the best and the worst in people. This was true of David's flight from Absalom as it had been true during his flight from Saul.

The counsel of Ahithophel and Hushai 16:15—17:29

This is the central unit of chapters 5—20, and its central focus is the judgment that Hushai's advice was better than Ahithophel's (17:14). This advice is the pivot on which the fortunes of David swung in his dealings with Absalom.

Hushai was loyal to David primarily because David was the Lord's anointed (v. 18). His words to Absalom implied that he was supporting the revolution, but everything that Hushai said could have been taken as supporting David, which he did. They are masterful double entendre. He was really serving David in the presence of his son Absalom (v. 19).

"Hushai has kept his integrity, Absalom has been blinded by his own egoism, and the reader is permitted to see one example of the outworking of God's providence."²⁴⁸

In the ancient East people regarded the public appropriation of a king's concubines as an act that signaled the transfer of power to his successor.²⁴⁹ Here Absalom broke the Mosaic Law (Lev. 18:7-8) to gain power. By following Ahithophel's advice Absalom brought about one of the judgments God had predicted would come on David for his sin (12:11-12). This act was also a great insult to David, and it jeopardized Absalom's inheritance rights (cf. Reuben's similar sin, Gen. 35:22; 49:3-4). The king was reaping what he had sown (Gal. 6:7). Absalom's immorality may have taken place on the very roof where David had committed adultery (cf. 11:2).

"David had illicitly slept with a woman who was not his wife (cf. 11:4), and now his son is counseled to follow in his father's footsteps."²⁵⁰

In 17:9 Hushai warned that if only a small group of Absalom's men pursued David and David defeated them, the news would spread that Absalom had lost the battle. The people would then side with David. He proposed the ultimate flattery, namely, that Absalom himself should lead his troops into battle (v. 11). Yahweh sought to bring calamity on Absalom (v. 14) because Absalom sought to overthrow the Lord's anointed.

Enrogel (v. 17) was just south of Zion near where the Hinnom and Kidron Valleys join.²⁵¹ Ahithophel may have believed that Hushai's advice would result in Absalom's defeat and David's ultimate return to Jerusalem,²⁵² or he may have committed suicide out of humiliation (v. 23).

²⁴⁸Baldwin, p. 264.

²⁴⁹de Vaux, 1:116.

²⁵⁰Youngblood, p. 1007.

²⁵¹See Gunn, "Traditional Composition . . .," p. 224, for parallels between verses 17-22 and the story of the spies at Jericho (Josh. 2).

²⁵²Gordon, p. 282.

"All the utterly real issues between people and people and between God and people that swirl throughout II Samuel 9—20, I Kings 1—2 also swirl about Jesus as he moves toward the cross. One must think that the Gospel writers were acutely aware of this when they depicted Jesus' Maundy Thursday walk to the Mount of Olives in ways so graphically reminiscent of the 'passion' of the first *Meshiach* in II Samuel 15:13-37. Even the detail of Judas' betrayal of Jesus, and his subsequent suicide, have no remote parallel anywhere in Scripture, with the remarkable exception of Ahithophel, who betrayed the Lord's anointed and thus opened the door to suicidal despair (II Samuel 17:23)."²⁵³

Mahanaim on the Jabbok in Transjordan had been Ish-bosheth's capital (2:8). Probably David went there because the inhabitants favored him for his goodness to Mephibosheth, Saul's grandson. Amasa was the son of Jithra (or Jether) an Ishmaelite (not Israelite; cf. 1 Chron. 2:17) and the son of Joab's cousin Abigail. Absalom's army also camped in Transjordan in the Gilead hills probably south of Mahanaim.

Those who helped David included Shobi (v. 27), the son of Nahash, who had been king of Ammon, and who was probably the brother of Hanun, the present Ammonite king who had humiliated David's well-wishers (ch. 10). Ammon was presently subservient to Israel. David and Joab had subdued Ammon about 14 years earlier (12:26-31). Machir had been the host of Mephibosheth before David assumed his support and moved him to Jerusalem from Lo-debar (9:1-5). Barzillai was a wealthy supporter of David from Rogelim, a town farther to the north in Gilead. Shobi, Machir, and Barzillai demonstrate other characteristics of true friends: they initiated help for David and supplied him abundantly with his needs and wants.

If all Christians are God's anointed (and we are, 1 John 2:27), even though former friends disappoint, forsake, and betray us, the Lord will preserve and protect us (cf. Heb. 13:5-6). He will even raise us from the dead to keep His promises to us (cf. Heb. 11:19). Our responsibility is simply to follow the Lord faithfully in spite of opposition, as we see David doing in this story.

The end of Absalom 18:1-18

"In the overall structure of 15:1—20:22, the story of Absalom's death (18:1-18) provides a counterpoise to that of Shimei's curse (16:5-14 . . .). Just as in the earlier narrative an adversary of David (Shimei) curses him (vv. 16:5, 7-8, 13), so also here an adversary of David (Absalom) opposes him in battle (vv. 6-8); just as in the earlier account David demands that Shimei be spared (16:11), so also here David demands that Absalom be spared (vv. 5, 12); and just as in the earlier episode a son of Zeruah (Abishai) is ready to kill Shimei (16:9), so also here a son of Zeruah

²⁵³James A. Wharton, "A Plausible Tale: Story and Theology in II Samuel 9—20, I Kings 1—2," *Interpretation* 35:4 (October 1981):353.

(Joab, v. 2) is ready to kill Absalom—and indeed wounds him, perhaps mortally (vv. 14-15)."²⁵⁴

The mustering of David's troops 18:1-5

The writer referred to David no less than five times in this section as "the king" leaving no doubt as to who was the legitimate ruler and who was really in charge. Perhaps David instructed his three commanders to deal gently with Absalom not only because he was his son, but because God had dealt gently with David for his sins.

"The truth was that David acted as a father but not as a king—as if he and Absalom had had some minor domestic quarrel which could be put right by an apology and a handshake. He failed to see Absalom as a traitor and a rebel, whose actions had caused a great deal of harm to the stability and welfare of the kingdom, to say nothing of the great loss of life in the civil war (verse 7). Yet every parent will feel a good deal of sympathy with David's viewpoint."²⁵⁵

The battle between David and Absalom's armies 18:6-8

The location of the forest of Ephraim is unknown, but it was probably in Gilead (cf. Judg. 12:1-5).²⁵⁶ As early as the judges period so many Ephraimites had settled in Gilead that the western Ephraimites called the Gileadites "fugitives of Ephraim" (Judg. 12:4).²⁵⁷ How the forest devoured more of Absalom's men than David's soldiers did (v. 8) is not clear, but that it did suggests that Yahweh assisted David's men by using the forest somehow to give him the victory.

Absalom's death 18:9-18

"The mule was a royal mount; losing his mule [v. 9] Absalom has lost his kingdom."²⁵⁸

The text says Absalom's head caught in an overhanging oak branch (v. 9). Josephus interpreted this, perhaps in view of 14:26, as his hair got caught in the tree.²⁵⁹

"The great tree, inanimate though it is, has proved more than a match for the pride of Absalom."²⁶⁰

²⁵⁴Youngblood, p. 1017.

²⁵⁵Payne, p. 245.

²⁵⁶Cf. LaMoine DeVries, "The Forest of Ephraim," *Biblical Illustrator* 10:1 (1983):82-85.

²⁵⁷George Adam Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 335, n. 2.

²⁵⁸Conroy, p. 60.

²⁵⁹Josephus, 7:10:2.

²⁶⁰Baldwin, p. 270.

"The reader who recalls 14,26 will almost certainly visualize Absalom's hair in connection with the entanglement . . . and will easily draw a contrast between promise and pride on the one hand and humiliation and doom on the other."²⁶¹

The soldier who found Absalom wisely obeyed the orders of David. There are many evidences throughout the David saga that David had an excellent communications network. The soldier's parenthetic comment, "There is nothing hidden from the king," (v. 13) is just one evidence of this (cf. 14:20). Likewise there is nothing hidden from David's greatest son, Jesus Christ, who knows all that happens under His authority.

Despite David's instructions Joab wounded Absalom, probably mortally, on the spot (v. 14). Perhaps Joab feared David would have pardoned Absalom's sin thus giving him another opportunity to revolt.

We must be careful to conduct our spiritual warfare according to our King's instructions rather than taking matters into our own hands, as Joab did.

Absalom's burial was in keeping with what the Mosaic Law prescribed for a rebellious son (Deut. 21:20-21). God cut Absalom off because he rebelled against the Lord's anointed rather than blessing him because he was David's eldest son. This was the third son that David had lost because of his sins against Bathsheba and Uriah.²⁶²

Instead of having a line of kings succeed him all Absalom left behind was a stone monument (stele) that he had erected to himself (v. 18). His three sons (14:27) must have died prematurely (v. 18).

"It is possible, however, that one or more of his sons were unwilling (for whatever reason) to perpetuate their father's memory."²⁶³

In the ancient world a son normally erected a memorial to his father when his father died if he was famous. Moreover people also expected him to imitate his father and thus become a living memorial to his name.²⁶⁴ Absalom failed to receive either form of honor. Absalom lived like Eli's sons and Saul, and he died as they did.²⁶⁵ The King's Valley (v. 18) is the Kidron Valley. The 52 foot high tomb or pillar of Absalom that marks the spot today, just east of the temple area, is an early first century A.D. Hellenistic or Roman sepulcher.²⁶⁶

²⁶¹Conroy, p. 44, n. 4.

²⁶²See my comment on 12:6.

²⁶³Youngblood, p. 1021.

²⁶⁴Boyu Ockinga, "A Note on 2 Samuel 18.18," *Biblische Notizen* 31 (1986):32.

²⁶⁵For some interesting additional insights into Absalom gleaned from the text, see Roy Battenhouse, "The Tragedy of Absalom: A Literary Analysis," *Christianity and Literature* 31:3 (Spring 1982):53-57.

²⁶⁶W. Harold Mare, *The Archaeology of the Jerusalem Area*, p. 195. We should not confuse it with the memorial referred to in this text, though the present one may stand on the same spot as the older one.

Absalom's attempt to usurp David's throne proves again that disobedience to God's covenant (i.e., the Mosaic Law) resulted in lack of fertility (blessing) in Israel. The enemies of the Lord's Anointed will never succeed. Because of his sin David had to flee Jerusalem, and he experienced much heartache. Because of his sins Absalom died without honor. Nevertheless in spite of his sin God restored David to power because of God's elective choice of him as His anointed and because of David's heart for God.

God had promised to punish David for his disregard of the Mosaic Covenant and the Lord. Still he did not say He would cut him off as He had cut Saul off (12:10-12). The following chapters (18:19—19:43) record Yahweh's restoration of His anointed after discipline.

David's reaction to the news of Absalom's death 18:19—19:8

Ahimaaz wanted to be the first to tell David the news of his victory since messengers often received a reward for bringing good news. Joab discouraged him thinking he would also report that Absalom was dead. David would not have rewarded that news and might have slain its bearer (cf. ch. 1). Joab sent "the Cushite" (v. 21), possibly one of Joab's servants (cf. v. 15), to tell David the bad news. Cushites came from the upper Nile region of Egypt (Nubia, modern Ethiopia).²⁶⁷ Joab may have selected this man because he was a foreigner and therefore more expendable than an Israelite.

David seems to have concluded that a single runner bore good news because if the army had suffered a defeat many people would have been retreating to Mahanaim. Ahimaaz may have lied about not knowing Absalom's fate (v. 29), or he may have been telling the truth. The Cushite then arrived with the news of Absalom's death (vv. 31-32).

"There is a clear rule of law which connects a leader's conduct with his fate and the fate of his house. A degenerate leader, whether it is himself who has sinned or his sons, will ultimately be deposed (see the story of Samuel and his sons) or come to a tragic end, just as Eli and his sons die on the same day, and so do Saul and his. This law holds true of David also; . . . just as in the stories of the death of Eli, Saul and their sons, in the story of Absalom there appears a runner who announces the evil tidings of his death in battle (II Sam. 18:19-32); and before that, in the story of Amnon's murder, a rumor comes to the king of the killing of all his sons, although it is found that only Amnon had been killed (II Sam. 13:30-36). With this, the criticism of all four leaders described in the book of Samuel, together with their sons, reaches its conclusion."²⁶⁸

"The description of Absalom's demise resonates with allusions to Abraham's binding of Isaac in Genesis 22. . . . Both Absalom and the ram

²⁶⁷J. Daniel Hays, "The Cushites: A Black Nation in the Bible," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 153:612 (October-December 1996):396-409.

²⁶⁸Moshe Garsiel, *The First Book of Samuel: A Literary Study of Comparative Structures, Analogies, and Parallels*, p. 106.

are caught in a thicket (*sobek/sebak*). Whereas Abraham is commanded not to send forth his hand (*'al tislah yadeka*) unto the lad (22:12), Joab's soldier refuses to send forth his hand (*lo' 'eslah yadi*) unto the son of the king (18:12). And finally, Abraham offers up the ram in place of his son (*tahat beno* [22:12]). It takes a while for David to help us perceive this analogy, but finally he makes it clear: 'would that I had died in place of you (*tahteka*), O Absalom, my son, my son.'"²⁶⁹

David responded here similarly to the way he did when he heard of Saul's death (ch. 1). Certainly David was correct to weep over Absalom's death. However, Joab was also correct to warn David of the consequences of failing to thank his soldiers for saving his life and kingdom. David should have tempered his personal sorrow since Absalom had rebelled against the Lord's anointed. Since David had slain Uriah with the sword, God punished David by slaying his son, the fruit of his fertility, with death by the sword, too (12:9-10; cf. Gal. 6:7).

Joab's execution of Absalom cost him his position, at least temporarily (v. 13). Nevertheless his rebuke of the king (vv. 5-7) was good as well as needed.

A true friend—and Joab was a true friend to David here—will be willing to take personal risks to confront a friend in love. A wise person, such as David, will accept strong advice from a friend who really cares.

David's emotions were sometimes inappropriate, loving those whom he should have hated and hating those whom he should have loved (v. 6). Similarly Amnon had hated Tamar whom he should have loved (13:15). These emotions were common to father and son, both of whom committed serious injustices.²⁷⁰

David's return to Jerusalem 19:9-43

"In the overall structure of chapters 15—20 (more precisely 15:1—20:22), the literary unit describing the return of 'King David' (v. 11) to Jerusalem (vv. 9-43) parallels that depicting his flight (15:13-37) caused by Absalom's rebellion . . ." ²⁷¹

The only thing the people could do after Absalom had fallen was to return to their former king (vv. 11-12). Absalom had found his strongest support among the people of Judah. David did not want the Judahites to conclude that by supporting Absalom they had become his enemies. David extended pardon to them and informed them that he still regarded them as his closest kin. This wise political move helped unite the nation again.

²⁶⁹Ackerman, p. 50.

²⁷⁰Stuart Lasine, "Melodrama as Parable: The Story of the Poor Man's Ewe-Lamb and the Unmasking of David's Topsy-Turvy Emotions," *Hebrew Annual Review* 8 (1984):117.

²⁷¹Youngblood, p. 1032.

" . . . David's reference here [v. 12] is not to blood ties, though they may be present, but rather that mutual covenant commitments must be honored because the vows assume fidelity through thick and thin."²⁷²

David also forgave the Benjamites who had hoped for his downfall and had seen it as punishment for taking Saul's place on the throne (vv. 16-30). Shimei had actively opposed David, Ziba had misled him (apparently), and Mephibosheth had not supported him. Mephibosheth's failure to trim his toenails and his beard and to wash his clothes expressed his desire to remain ceremonially unclean while David was in exile (cf. Exod. 19:10, 14).²⁷³ By forgiving all of these Benjamites David again secured the support of this difficult tribe.²⁷⁴ A generation later, when the kingdom split in two, the tribe of Benjamin remained attached to Judah. Abishai had become an "adversary" (Heb. *satan*) to David in the sense that he opposed David's purpose to pardon Shimei.²⁷⁵

David may have divided the fields between Mephibosheth and Ziba to determine which of them was telling the truth or because he could not tell (v. 29). Solomon followed a similar procedure and threatened to divide a living baby to determine which of two mothers was telling the truth (1 Kings 3:24-25). Mephibosheth offered the entire estate to Ziba (v. 30). His action argued his innocence.²⁷⁶

Barzillai's support (vv. 31-39) undoubtedly represents that of others in Transjordan. By honoring him and his representative, Chimham, David cemented good relations with the tribes across the Jordan.²⁷⁷

The other Israelites (vv. 40-43) also rallied behind David again. The little "who loves the king most" contest they held with the Judahites illustrates their support. Thus almost the whole nation again united behind the Lord's anointed. This was a blessing from God.²⁷⁸

This section is a remarkable testimony to the power of forgiveness (cf. Matt. 6:12, 14-15; 18:21-22; Luke 7:47; 17:3). David had not forgiven Absalom, and perhaps the consequences of his lack of forgiveness encouraged him to take a different approach with his subjects after Absalom's death. We see in David's dealings with Amasa (vv. 11-15) that forgiveness wins over former enemies. We see in his dealings with Shimei (vv. 16-

²⁷²Walter Brueggemann, "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gn 2,23a)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32:4 (September 1970):536.

²⁷³Cf. McCarter, *II Samuel*, pp. 417, 421.

²⁷⁴Later David urged Solomon to execute Shimei (1 Kings 2:8-9; cf. Gen. 12:3).

²⁷⁵See Peggy Day, "Abishai and *satan* in 2 Samuel 19:17-24," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49:4 (October 1987):543-47.

²⁷⁶David Damrosch, *The Narrative Covenant: Transformations of Genre in the Growth of Biblical Literature*, p. 247.

²⁷⁷Chimham may have been Barzillai's son (cf. 2 Kings 2:7), a tradition that some manuscripts of the Septuagint preserved.

²⁷⁸David M. Gunn, "From Jerusalem to the Jordan and Back: Symmetry in 2 Samuel XV-XX," *Vetus Testamentum* 30:1 (January 1980):109-13, showed that the chiasmic literary structure of chapters 15—20 identifies an undercurrent of deterioration in the general relations that David enjoyed with his subjects at this time.

23) that forgiveness gives time for people to change. We see in his treatment of Mephibosheth and Ziba (vv. 24-30) that forgiveness placates irreconcilable adversaries. We see in his relations with Barzillai and Chimham (vv. 31-39) that forgiveness causes blessing to overflow on others. We see in the section revealing the final reactions of the Israelites and the Judahites (vv. 40-43) that forgiveness lays a strong foundation for the future.

The rebellion of Sheba 20:1-22

"The account of Sheba's rebellion against David serves as a counterpoise to the story of Absalom's conspiracy (15:1-12) in chapters 15—20, which constitute the major part of the narrative that comprises chapters 13—20 (more precisely, 13:1—20:22), the longest definable literary section of the Court History of David (chs. 9—20 . . .)." ²⁷⁹

Not all the people of Israel followed David. Some lined up behind Sheba, a discontented Benjamite who sought to split the kingdom as Jeroboam did 45 years later. He sounded his rebel call in Gilgal and then proceeded north gathering supporters.

"It is no coincidence that independence is declared in practically identical terms in the cry of 2 Sam 20:1b and 1 Kgs 12:16. Sheba ben Bichri was before his time—so a 'worthless fellow.' After Ahijah's intervention, the time had come." ²⁸⁰

The notation of David's dealings with his ten concubines (v. 3; cf. 15:16; 16:21-22) shows that the king behaved in harmony with the spirit of the Mosaic Law. The Law prohibited a woman who had had relations with two consecutive husbands from going back to her first husband (Deut. 24). The Law did not address David's case specifically, but Deuteronomy 24 was what seems to have guided his decision.

"The presence of concubines suggests how much the monarchy has embraced the royal ideology of the Near East, which is inimical to the old covenant tradition. David takes a drastic step of confining the concubines and presumably having no more to do with them. His action is most likely a concession and conciliatory gesture to the north. . . . In making this move, David not only distances himself from his own former practice but also offers a contrast to the conduct of Absalom (16:21-22)." ²⁸¹

David had promoted Amasa by making him commander of the army in Joab's place (17:25), probably because Joab had killed Absalom (19:13). Unfortunately Amasa moved

²⁷⁹Youngblood, p. 1042.

²⁸⁰Anthony F. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1—2 Kings 10)*, p. 83. This was another premature act, like the Israelites demanding a king before God gave them David.

²⁸¹Brueggemann, *First and . . .*, p. 330. David's action may also indicate that his temporary exile drove him back to the Lord and increased his desire to please Him.

too slowly (v. 5), so David put Abishai in charge (v. 6). The writer probably referred to the soldiers as "Joab's men" (v. 7) because they had formerly been under Joab's command.

Joab greeted Amasa in a customary way (v. 9).²⁸² He kissed the man he was about to slay, as Judas did later (Luke 22:47-48). Solomon avenged Joab's murder of Amasa when he came to power (1 Kings 2:32). Perhaps David did not execute him because he owed Joab so much for serving him as he had done, and Joab was an effective commander who advanced David's interests. Leaders still publicly decry the methods of people whom they privately encourage.

Abel Beth-maacah lay about 90 miles north of Gilgal and four miles west of Dan. Sheba had far fewer soldiers than Joab did (vv. 11, 14). The saying, "They will surely ask advice at Abel [Beth-maacah]," (v. 18) means people regarded the residents of that town as wise. The city was a mother in Israel (v. 19) in the sense that it exercised a beneficent maternal influence over its neighboring villages.²⁸³

"Abel is characterized in the proverb as a city with a long reputation for wisdom and faithfulness to the tradition of Israel. It is, therefore, a mother in the same way Deborah was: a creator and hence a symbol of the unity that bound Israel together under one God Yahweh. And it is the wise woman's implicit appeal to this unity that stops Joab in his tracks."²⁸⁴

"The inheritance of the Lord" (v. 19) refers to Israel (cf. 21:3). Evidently Sheba, though a Benjamite, lived in the hill country of Ephraim (v. 21). David's rule was again secure with the death of Sheba, another man who rebelled against the Lord's anointed and died for it.

"Wise words override ruthless policy. At the end, not only the woman and the city are saved; something of David's dignity and self-respect are also rescued from Joab's mad, obedient intent."²⁸⁵

"In an earlier incident, another 'wise woman' had co-operated with Joab and had undertaken the delicate task of bringing the king to a new viewpoint (2 Sa. 14:1-20)."²⁸⁶

This story teaches much about wisdom and folly.

²⁸²Keil and Delitzsch, p. 454. See Edward A. Neiderhiser, "2 Samuel 20:8-10: A Note for a Commentary," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 24:3 (September 1981):209-10, for further explanation of how Joab deceived Amasa.

²⁸³Similarly "daughters" represents a city's satellite villages (e.g., Judg. 1:27; et al.).

²⁸⁴Claudia V. Camp, "The Wise Women of 2 Samuel: A Role Model for Women in Early Israel," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43:1 (January 1981):28. The epithet "mother in Israel" describes only Deborah elsewhere in the Old Testament (Judg. 5:7).

²⁸⁵Brueggemann, *First and . . .*, p. 332.

²⁸⁶Baldwin, pp. 280-81. Compare also Abigail's wise counsel to David (1 Sam. 25).

"First of all the woman saw the problem realistically; the danger must have been clear enough to everyone in Abel, but there may have been some false hopes of rescue or intervention. Secondly, she did something about it—she did not wait for somebody else to act but took the initiative herself. Then she argued her case, challenging the rightness of Joab's actions; and he was forced to agree with what she said. So a compromise was reached; and finally she took steps to fulfil [*sic*] the terms agreed. In other words, wisdom was a combination of intelligent insight and bold action. The Old Testament rarely separates the intellectual from the pragmatic: wisdom is not simply knowing but also doing."²⁸⁷

The wise woman contrasts with foolish Joab who, nonetheless, showed wisdom himself when he listened to and cooperated with the woman. Sometimes very devoted people, such as Joab, can do much damage similarly in a church. Talk solved a problem that war would only have complicated. Wisdom saved the woman, her city, David's reputation, Joab's career, and many innocent lives. Her wisdom in action bears four marks: seeing the problem, acting to correct it, arguing her case persuasively, and fulfilling her responsibilities. God's glory evidently motivated and guided her actions (v. 19). Sheba's folly is clear in that he was easily offended, unable to muster support, and initiated a fight he could not win.

David's administrators 20:23-26

"With Joab's return to the king in Jerusalem, the grand symphony known as the Court History of David reaches its conclusion for all practical purposes (at least as far as the books of Samuel are concerned . . .). The last four verses of chapter 20 constitute a suitable formal coda, serving the same function for the Court History that the last four verses of chapter 8 do for the narrative of David's powerful reign . . ."²⁸⁸

This list of David's chiefs of state concludes a major section of Samuel (2 Sam. 9—20, "David's troubles") just as a former list closed another major section (2 Sam. 2—8, "David's triumphs"). Probably this list reflects David's administration toward the end of his reign. The former list evidently describes David's cabinet at an earlier time.

8:15-18	20:23-26
Joab: army	Joab: army
Benaiah: Cherethites and Pelethites	Benaiah: Cherethites and Pelethites
Jehoshaphat: recorder	Adoram: forced labor
Seraiah: secretary	Jehoshaphat: recorder
Zadok and Ahimelech: priests	Sheva: secretary
David's sons: chief ministers (priests)	Zadok and Abiathar: priests
	Ira: priest

²⁸⁷Payne, p. 257.

²⁸⁸Youngblood, p. 1048.

The "forced labor" force, the *corvée*, was an age-old institution (cf. Deut. 20:10-11; 2 Sam. 7:12-13). It consisted of prisoners of war who worked on such public construction projects as highways, temples, and palaces. Adoram (Adoniram) later became a prominent figure in the apostasy of the Northern Kingdom (1 Kings 12:18-19).

Ira may have been a royal adviser in the same sense as David's sons had been previously. The Hebrew word *kohen* ("priest," v. 26) seems to have this meaning elsewhere (e.g., 8:18).²⁸⁹

This long section of David's troubles contains selected events that show that even the Lord's anointed was not above a principle by which God deals with all people. Obedience to the revealed will of God brings blessing to the individual and makes him or her a channel of blessing to other people. However disobedience brings divine judgment in the form of curtailed blessing (fertility). Here we also see the serious effects of arrogance before God.

". . . the narrator has invited the reader to pay particular attention to the social and psychological aftermath of adultery, as well as to the obvious fulfilment [*sic*] of God's judgment as pronounced by the prophet Nathan (2 Sa. 12:10-12)."²⁹⁰

Another major lesson is that rebellion against the Lord's Anointed cannot succeed. The parallels between David and Jesus Christ in these chapters stand out. Jesus, as David, suffered rejection at the hands of "His own," left His capital in apparent disgrace, but will return to rule and reign.

Seven sub-conflicts appear within this sixth major conflict section in Samuel. Mephibosheth and Jonathan's line conflicts with David's faithfulness (ch. 9). The Ammonite coalition conflicts with David (10:1—11:1). David's unfaithfulness to the covenant conflicts with Yahweh's faithfulness (11:2—12:25). Ammon conflicts with David (12:26-31). Amnon conflicts with Absalom (chs. 13—14). Absalom conflicts with David (ch. 15—18), and Sheba conflicts with David (chs. 19—20).

God's basic commitment to David resulted in his anointing, which guaranteed much blessing. David's basic commitment to God, his heart for God, resulted in his never losing a battle with a foreign nation, as far as the text records. David's occasional rebellion against the covenant resulted in some other losses (11:2—12:25; ch. 25).

Similarly God's election of the believer results in much blessing for him or her. The believer's commitment to God as lord of his or her life results in a life characterized mainly by victory. The believer's occasional rebellion against God's revealed will results in some defeat for him or her. Even an elect believer such as Eli's sons and Saul can

²⁸⁹Cf. Goldman, pp. 236, 319.

²⁹⁰Baldwin, p. 282.

experience a tragic life if he or she does not commit himself or herself to following God faithfully (Rom. 12:1-2).

VII. SUMMARY ILLUSTRATIONS CHS. 21—24

The last major section of the Book of Samuel (2 Sam. 21—24) consists of six separate pericopes that together constitute a conclusion to the whole book (cf. Judg. 17—21). Each pericope emphasizes the theological message of the book.²⁹¹

" . . . the final four chapters, far from being a clumsy appendix, offer a highly reflective, theological interpretation of David's whole career adumbrating the messianic hope."²⁹²

The structure of this section too is chiasmic.

- "A The Lord's Wrath Against Israel (21:1-14)
- B David's Heroes (21:15-22)
- C David's Song of Praise (22:1-51)
- C' David's Last Words (23:1-7)
- B' David's Mighty Men (23:8-39)
- A' The Lord's Wrath Against Israel (24:1-25)"²⁹³

A. FAMINE FROM SAUL'S SIN 21:1-14

In the first section (21:1-14), the writer reminds us that breaking covenants results in God withdrawing the blessing of fertility.

1. Saul's broken treaty with the Gibeonites 21:1-6

Internal references in 2 Samuel enable us to date this incident early in David's reign between Mephibosheth's arrival in Jerusalem and the beginning of the Ammonite wars. Probably God sent judgment on Israel for Saul's action soon after he died. Saul's concubine watched over the bodies of her slain sons until the famine ended. If this took place later in David's reign, she would have been very old. This is possible but unlikely. Also, David buried the bodies of Saul and Jonathan at this time. He would hardly have done this years later. The fact that David did not execute Mephibosheth suggests that this son of Jonathan had come under David's protection by this time. That took place after David moved his capital to Jerusalem. After the Ammonite wars began, David might not have had time for what the writer described here. Consequently a date of about 996-993 B.C. for this famine seems reasonable.

²⁹¹See Walter Brueggemann, "2 Samuel 21—24: An Appendix of Deconstruction?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50:3 (July 1988):383-97, for some helpful insights into these chapters.

²⁹²Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, p 275. See also Gordon, p. 298.

²⁹³Youngblood, p. 1051.

Characteristically David sought the Lord about the famine (v. 1; cf. Deut. 28:47-48). Sometimes natural catastrophes such as famines resulted from Israel's sins, but sin was not always the cause (cf. Job; John 9:2-3). There is no mention elsewhere in Samuel that Saul had broken the Israelites' treaty with the Gibeonites (cf. Josh. 9:3-27).²⁹⁴ David asked the Gibeonites what punishment would satisfy them and atone for (cover) Saul's sin of murder.

"Since the verb *kipper* ["atonement"] is used absolutely here, it is impossible to say from the construction alone whether it means to propitiate or to expiate. From the context, however, it is clear that it means both. David is seeking both to satisfy the Gibeonites and to 'make up for' the wrong done to them. It is equally clear that he cannot achieve the latter with the former. There is no expiation [removal] without propitiation [satisfaction]."²⁹⁵

"The inheritance of the Lord" probably refers to the nation of Israel (cf. 20:19). The Gibeonites were content to have seven (a number symbolizing completeness) of Saul's descendants (not necessarily sons) executed. This was in keeping with ancient Near Eastern and Mosaic law (the *lex talionis* or law of revenge, Num. 35:31).²⁹⁶ The Hebrew word translated "hang" (v. 6) means to execute in a way that the body suffers public humiliation (cf. Num. 25:4). Probably they suffered execution and then their bodies were hung up as a testimony to their offense.

2. David's justice and mercy 21:7-9

David showed himself to be a true son of Yahweh by keeping his covenant with Jonathan and by sparing Mephibosheth (cf. v. 2; 1 Sam. 18:3; 20:8, 16). However, he followed God's Law and executed seven of Saul's descendants including another Mephibosheth, Saul's son (v. 8). "Merab" (v. 8) is the correct name of another of Rizpah's sons. "Michal," the name that appears in the AV, is probably a scribal error.²⁹⁷ David could justly slay Saul's descendants if they had had a part in the execution of the Gibeonites. This seems to have been the case (v. 1; cf. Ezek. 18:4, 20). The execution took place in Gibeah, Saul's former home and capital, which was on a hill ("mountain," v. 9) of Benjamin. The barley harvest began in late March or early April when the feast of Passover took place. Since Passover memorialized the Israelites' liberation from oppression in Egypt this was an appropriate time for this event. By getting things right

²⁹⁴Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Did Saul Make Gibeon His Capital?" *Vetus Testamentum* 24:1 (January 1974):1-7, suggested that Saul had made Gibeon his capital, and after a falling out with the native Hivite inhabitants Saul slaughtered them. However there is nothing in the text that indicates he did this. Another possibility is that when Saul slew many of the priests at Nob he also executed many Gibeonites (1 Sam. 22:19).

²⁹⁵Paul Garnet, "Atonement Constructions in the Old Testament and the Qumran Scrolls," *Evangelical Quarterly* 46:3 (July-September 1974):134.

²⁹⁶See F. Charles Fensham, "The Treaty between Israel and the Gibeonites," *Biblical Archaeologist* 27:3 (1964):96-100, for records of broken treaties leading to natural calamities in other ancient Near Eastern literature.

²⁹⁷Driver, p. 352. Cf. 1 Sam. 18:19; 2 Sam. 6:23.

with the Gibeonites David brought Israel out from under God's oppression that Saul's sin had caused.

3. David's honoring of Saul and Jonathan 21:10-14

The writer did not mention how much time elapsed between the execution of Saul's descendants and the coming of rain.

"Leaving corpses without burial, to be consumed by birds of prey and wild beasts, was regarded as the greatest ignominy that could befall the dead . . ." ²⁹⁸

David's action ended the famine, and God again blessed Israel with rain and fertility. David also proceeded to give Saul and Jonathan honorable burials.²⁹⁹

Because Saul had been unfaithful to Israel's covenant with the Gibeonites, God punished the nation with famine (lack of fertility). When David, who followed the Mosaic Law, righted this wrong, God restored fertility to the land again. God reduced Saul's line from one of the most powerful-looking men in Israel, Saul, to one of the weakest-looking, Mephibosheth. David's faithfulness to his covenant with Jonathan shows he was a covenant-keeping king like Yahweh. Saul on the other hand broke Israel's covenant with the Gibeonites.

B. FOUR GIANT KILLERS 21:15-22

This record emphasizes the supernatural character of the victories David was able to enjoy because God fought for him by using various men in his army.

"The lists of heroes and heroic exploits that frame the poetic centre-piece represent human instrumentality, but not the underlying reality, which is Yahweh."³⁰⁰

The pericope may describe what happened when David was fighting the Philistines early in his reign (cf. 5:18-25), probably right after he became king of all Israel in 1004 B.C.³⁰¹ However it is really impossible to tell how the incidents recorded here relate to others mentioned in the book or even if they do.

"The giant" (vv. 16, 18, 20, 22) appears to have been the father or ancestor of all four of the huge Philistine warriors mentioned in this passage. However the Hebrew word translated "giant" (*raphah*) is a collective term for the Rephaim. The Rephaim were the mighty warriors who originally inhabited the Canaanite coastal plain (cf. Gen. 15:19-21;

²⁹⁸Keil and Delitzsch, p. 462.

²⁹⁹See my note on the significance of burial in the ancient Near East at 1 Sam. 31.

³⁰⁰Gordon, p. 298.

³⁰¹Merrill, *Kingdom of . . .*, pp. 237-38.

Deut. 2:11; 3:11, 13). They terrified ten of the 12 spies that Joshua sent out from Kadesh Barnea (Num. 13:33).

"The lamp of Israel" (v. 17) refers to David, the source of Israel's human guidance, prosperity, and well-being—its leading light. As God was a light to His people, so the king was a light as His vice-regent.

" . . . when a man dies his lamp is extinguished (Jb. 18:6; Pr. 13:9); David's death would be tantamount to the extinction of the life of the community (cf. La. 4:20). The figure of the lamp, which came to symbolize the Davidic dynasty as maintained by Yahweh (1 Ki. 15:4; Ps. 132:17), possibly derives from the world of the sanctuary, in which a lamp was kept burning 'continually' (see on 1 Sa. 3:3)."³⁰²

Gob (v. 18) was evidently another name for Gezer (1 Chron. 20:4).

The reference in verse 19 to Elhanan killing Goliath the Gittite (i.e., a resident of Gath) seems to contradict 1 Samuel 17. However 1 Chronicles 20:5 says that Elhanan killed Lahmi, the brother of Goliath. Evidently that is the correct reading.³⁰³ Sometimes David was able to slay his enemies personally, but at other times he had to rely on the help of others (v. 17).

The point of this brief section is that God blessed David with military victories far beyond anyone's normal expectations because he was God's faithful anointed servant. Yahweh brought blessing through him to Israel militarily as well as agriculturally (vv. 1-14). The first incident in the appendix (vv. 1-14) illustrates that breaking covenants reduces fertility, but this one (vv. 15-22) shows that God's favor results in supernatural victories.

C. DAVID'S PRAISE OF YAHWEH CH. 22

"It has long been recognized that 2 Samuel 22 is not only one of the oldest major poems in the OT but also that, because Psalm 18 parallels it almost verbatim, it is a key passage for the theory and practice of OT textual criticism."³⁰⁴

This psalm records David's own expression of the theological message the writer of Samuel expounded historically. Yahweh is King, and He blesses those who submit to His authority in many ways. Verse 21 is perhaps the key verse. David learned the truths expressed in this psalm and evidently composed it early in his career (v. 1).

This song shares several key themes with Hannah's song (1 Sam. 2:1-10). Both David and Hannah used horn as a figure of strength at the beginning (v. 3; 1 Sam. 2:1) and rock

³⁰²Gordon, p. 303.

³⁰³See Archer, p. 179.

³⁰⁴Youngblood, p. 1064.

as a figure for God (v. v. 2; 1 Sam. 2:2). They both referred to divine deliverance (v. 3; 1 Sam. 2:1-2) and ended by equating God's king with His anointed (v. 51; 1 Sam. 2:10). Thus these two songs form a kind of *inclusio* around the Books of Samuel and give them unity. Given the similarities each makes its own unique statement as well.³⁰⁵

This is a psalm of declarative praise for what God had done for David. It reflects David's rich spiritual life. While David focused attention on the Lord more than on himself, his emphasis was on the blessings Yahweh had bestowed on him.

We can divide the passage into four sections: the Lord's exaltation (vv. 1-4), the Lord's exploits (vv. 5-20), the Lord's equity (vv. 21-30), and the Lord's excellence (vv. 31-51).³⁰⁶

The reference to God's temple (v. 7) probably means heaven. "Arrows" (v. 15) is a figure for lightning bolts. God had drawn David out of the waters of affliction as Pharaoh's daughter had drawn Moses out of literal dangerous waters (v. 17). God had rewarded David (not saved him) because of his righteous conduct (v. 21). Cleanness (Heb. *bor*) of hands (v. 21) is a figure describing moral purity that derives from the practice of washing the hands with soda (*bor*).

"The psalmist is not talking about justification by works, much less about sinless perfection, but about 'a conscience void of offence [*sic*] toward God and men' (Acts 24:16)."³⁰⁷

God responds to people according to their conduct (vv. 26-27). He is astute (shrewd) to the perverted (crooked, v. 27) in the sense that He turns them into fools.³⁰⁸ The similes in verse 43 picture David's enemies as objects of humiliation and contempt.³⁰⁹

"It is . . . both serendipitous and satisfying that the Song of David, a psalm of impressive scope and exquisite beauty, should begin with 'The LORD' (v. 2), the Eternal One, and end with 'forever' (v. 51)."³¹⁰

D. DAVID'S LAST TESTAMENT 23:1-7

The combination of David's final song (in the text, ch. 22) followed by his last testament (23:1-7) recalls the similar combination of Moses' final song and his last testament (Deut. 32 and 33). This was David's final literary legacy to Israel.

³⁰⁵See Frank Moore Cross Jr., and David Noel Freedman, "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving—II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72:1 (1953):15-34.

³⁰⁶Merrill, "2 Samuel," pp. 477, 480.

³⁰⁷Gordon, p. 306.

³⁰⁸Youngblood, p. 1073; Carlson, pp. 251-52.

³⁰⁹Youngblood, p. 1075.

³¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 1077.

"Whereas the psalm in the previous chapter celebrates the delivering acts of Yahweh by which the Davidic supremacy was established, this little poem is composed around the theme of the dynastic covenant through which the continued prosperity of the Davidic house was vouchsafed."³¹¹

This poem also has a chiasmic structure focusing on the Lord speaking (vv. 3-4). His words describe the ideal king. They are messianic. However the passage also anticipates all of David's successors.

The same great spiritual themes come through here as in the previous chapter and in the whole historical account recorded in 1 and 2 Samuel. The ancients regarded the last words of any person as specially significant. The last words of Israel's great leaders were even more important. The last words of prophets were extremely important (cf. Gen. 49; Deut. 33; Acts 20:17-38; et al.). They often expressed lessons those who had walked with God for many years had learned.

The writer described David as simply the son of Jesse, a common Israelite, and as someone whom God had raised up, in contrast to a self-made man (v. 1; cf. Dan. 4:29-33). He always viewed himself as one whom God had chosen and anointed for his role in life (v. 1). He was the Lord's anointed and the sweet psalmist. These four descriptions of David picture his leadership in relation to his family, his political administration, his military forces, and his spiritual influence.

David claimed that the words that he had spoke had been received from God (v. 2). He thus gave God the credit for his inspiration. He also recognized God as the real ruler of Israel (v. 3). Many ancient as well as modern interpreters of this book have understood David's description of Israel's ruler in verses 3 and 4 as a reference to Messiah. It probably also describes David and his royal descendants. The figure of the dawning sun pictures the righteous ruler as a source of promise, joy, and blessing to his people (v. 4). The figure of the sprouting grass describes him as a source of prosperity, new life, and fertility (v. 4). David viewed his dynasty as such because God had made an everlasting covenant (the Davidic Covenant) with him (v. 5). This resulted in order, security, deliverance, and fulfillment of desire (v. 5). David believed that the covenant would result in increased blessing for his house (v. 5). The worthless would suffer the reverse fate, however, and even be burned up as useless (cf. Matt. 13:30).³¹²

To summarize, David believed that the Lord sovereignly initiates blessing, and those who value it cause His blessings to increase on themselves and others.

E. THIRTY-SEVEN MIGHTY MEN 23:8-39

One might conclude from 1 Samuel 22:2 that David's army, made up as it was of malcontents and distressed debtors, would not have been able to accomplish anything.

³¹¹Gordon, p. 309.

³¹²For a linguistic analysis of this pericope, see H. Neil Richardson, "The Last Words of David: Some Notes on II Samuel 23:1-7," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90:3 (1971):257-66.

This list testifies to God's blessing David and Israel militarily by enabling his warriors to accomplish supernatural feats and to become mighty men in war. Again, God's supernatural blessing is what this section illustrates.

1. Selected adventures of outstanding warriors 23:8-23

There were three warriors who received higher honor than all the rest (vv. 8-12): Josheb-basshebeth, Eleazar, and Shammah. What their relationship to The Thirty was is hard to determine.³¹³ Three men from The Thirty received special mention (vv. 13-17). Two others also received great esteem (vv. 18-23): Abisai, and Benaiah. This was evidently the same Benaiah who became the head of David's bodyguard (20:23), a position similar to the one that David had occupied in Saul's army (1 Sam. 22:14).

Josheb-basshebeth is an example of a spiritual warrior with exceptional strength (cf. Eph. 6:10). Eleazar demonstrated unusual stamina, persistence (cf. Isa. 40:31). Shammah's greatness lay in his supernatural steadfastness (cf. Eph. 6:14). The three warriors who took David's wish for water as their command and took a calculated risk (not wild recklessness) show remarkable sacrifice, dedication, and loyalty (cf. Matt. 6:33). These are all qualities necessary in and available to spiritual warriors of all ages by God's grace.

Perhaps the writer also mentioned the feats of Abishai and Benaiah because they feature in the preceding narrative. As Jesus had his circles of intimates (Peter, James, and John, the Twelve, and the Seventy), so did David.

2. A list of notable warriors among The Thirty 23:24-39

Thirty-two more soldiers obtained special distinction (vv. 24-39), including Uriah the Hittite (v. 39). The writer referred to them as "The Thirty." This designation seems to have been a title for their exclusive group (cf. v. 18). Since more than 30 names appear in this list of The Thirty it may be that when one died, someone else took his place. Asahel, the first name listed, and Uriah, the last, had, of course, already died by the end of David's reign.

The Thirty may have been "a kind of supreme army council which was largely responsible for framing the internal army regulations, deciding on promotions and appointments, and handling other military matters."³¹⁴

Compared with the list in 1 Chronicles 11 there are several variations in spelling, which occurs occasionally in the Hebrew Bible. Also some of the differences may be because some soldiers had replaced others. Perhaps in some cases the same man had two different names.³¹⁵

³¹³B. Mazar, "The Military Elite of King David," *Vetus Testamentum* 13 (1963):310-20. Merrill, *Kingdom of . . .*, p. 282, assumed they were over The Thirty.

³¹⁴Yadin, p. 277.

³¹⁵See the comparative chart in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: Old Testament*, pp. 478-79.

Note that each of these spiritual warriors received individual honor by God (cf. 1 Sam. 2:30). Each had a different background reflected in his identification in this list; his background did not determine his success. Each was a special blessing to David because David chose to follow the Lord faithfully.

The whole pericope (vv. 8-39) illustrates the fact that God enables those who follow His anointed faithfully and wholeheartedly to do great works of spiritual significance for Him.

F. PESTILENCE FROM DAVID'S SIN CH. 24

This last section of the book records another occasion on which God withdrew his blessing from Israel, this time because of David's sin (cf. 21:1-14). When David stopped trusting in Yahweh for protection and placed his confidence in his military personnel, God sent a serious disease that killed 70,000 men (v. 15).

"... chapter 24 provides a fitting conclusion to the story of David by calling attention, once more and finally, not only to his ambition and pride, but also to his humility and remorse."³¹⁶

"Every spiritual leader would do well to read this story once a year!"³¹⁷

1. David's sin of numbering the people 24:1-9

David probably ordered this census about 975 B.C.

"After the revolutions of both Absalom and Sheba it would have been reasonable for David to reassess his military situation against the possibility of similar uprisings or other emergencies."³¹⁸

In support of this hypothesis is the fact that Joab and the army commanders were able to take over nine months to gather the population statistics (v. 8). This suggests a very peaceful condition in Israel that characterized David's later reign but not his earlier reign.

The writer of Chronicles wrote that Satan (perhaps an adversarial neighbor nation since the Heb. word *satan* means "adversary") moved David to take the census (1 Chron. 21:1). Yet in verse 1 the writer of Samuel said God was responsible. Both were true; God used an adversary to bring judgment on the objects of His anger (cf. Job. 1—2; Acts 2:23).³¹⁹

³¹⁶Youngblood, p. 1095.

³¹⁷Swindoll, p. 282.

³¹⁸Merrill, *Kingdom of . . .*, p. 272.

³¹⁹See Robert B. Chisholm Jr., "Does God Deceive?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 155:617 (January-March 1998):11-12, 21-23.

". . . paradoxically, a divinely-sent affliction can be called a 'messenger of Satan' (2 Cor 12:7 . . .)." ³²⁰

We can identify perhaps four levels of causality in verse 1. God was the final cause, the primary instrumental cause was Satan, the secondary instrumental cause was some hostile human enemies, and David was the efficient cause. The Lord was angry with Israel for some reason. He evidently allowed Satan to stir up hostile enemy forces to threaten David and Israel (cf. Job 1—2). In response to this military threat, David chose to number the people. David's choice was not his only option; he chose to number the people. He sinned because he failed to trust God. The Lord did not force David to sin.

Quite clearly David took the census to determine his military strength. Taking a census did not constitute sin (cf. Exod. 30:11-12; Num. 1:1-2). David's sin was apparently placing confidence in the number of his soldiers rather than in the Lord.

"For the Chronicler in particular [cf. 1 Chron. 27:23-24], . . . the arena of David's transgression appears to be that taking a census impugns the faithfulness of God in the keeping of His promises—a kind of walking by sight instead of by faith." ³²¹

"Register" (vv. 2, 4) literally means to "muster" in preparation for battle. Joab proceeded in a counterclockwise direction around Israel.³²² The territory described included but did not extend as far as all the territory that God had promised to Abraham. There appear to have been 800,000 veterans in Israel plus 300,000 recruits (cf. 1 Chron. 21:5). In Judah there was a total of 500,000. The figure of 470,000 in 1 Chronicles 21 probably omitted the Benjamites (cf. 1 Chron. 21:6). Remember that the Hebrew word *elep* can mean either "thousand" or "military unit." Here it could very well mean military unit.³²³ The parallel account in 1 Chronicles 21 says that Joab did not number Levi and Benjamin because David's command was abhorrent to Joab (1 Chron. 21:6).

Joab wisely warned David of his folly (v. 3). Even such a man as Joab could see that what David planned to do was wrong. Nevertheless David chose to ignore his counsel (v. 4). He behaved as one who refuses to be accountable to anyone, which was easy for David to do since he was the king. The thing that David had done displeased the Lord, and He struck Israel (1 Chron. 21:7).

2. David's confession of his guilt 24:10-14

Apparently the census was complete before David acknowledged that he had sinned. Finally guilt for his pride penetrated his heart, and he confessed his sin and asked God for

³²⁰Youngblood, p. 1096.

³²¹Raymond B. Dillard, "David's Census: Perspectives on II Samuel 24 and I Chronicles 21," in *Through Christ's Word: A Festschrift for Dr. Philip E. Hughes*, p. 105.

³²²See Patrick W. Skehan, "Joab's Census: How Far North (2 Sm 24,6)?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 31:1 (January 1969):42-49, for a detailed study of his route. Rasmussen, p. 119, provided a map of Joab's route.

³²³Cf. Baldwin, p. 296; Gordon, p. 319; Anderson, p. 285; McCarter, *II Samuel*, p. 510.

forgiveness (v. 10). This response shows David at his best, as "the man after God's own heart." God graciously gave the king some choice about how He would punish the nation (v. 13). I believe that this is the only instance in Scripture where God gave someone the option of choosing his own punishment. Because David was the head of the nation his actions affected all Israel as well as himself personally. David's choice was whether he wanted a long, mild punishment or a short, intense one. He chose to leave the punishment in God's hands because he had learned that God is merciful (v. 14).

"War would place the nation at the mercy of its enemies: famine would make it dependent on corn-merchants, who might greatly aggravate the misery of scarcity: only in the pestilence—some form of plague sudden and mysterious in its attack, and baffling the medical knowledge of the time—would the punishment come directly from God, and depend immediately upon His Will."³²⁴

The rabbis assumed that David's reasoning was as follows.

"If I choose famine the people will say that I chose something which will affect them and not me, for I shall be well supplied with food; if I choose war, they will say that the king is well protected; let me choose pestilence, before which all are equal."³²⁵

3. David's punishment 24:15-17

An angelic messenger from God again brought death to many people throughout all Israel (cf. Exod. 12:23). The Angel of the Lord may have been the preincarnate Christ, but he could have simply been an angelic messenger whom God sent.³²⁶ Evidently God gave David the ability to see the angel who was killing the people as the angel entered Jerusalem prepared to kill more innocent victims of David's sin there (v. 17; cf. 2 Kings 6:17). David asked God to have mercy on the people since he was the sinner responsible for the punishment. He failed to appreciate the extent of the effects of his act when he ordered the census. Note David's shepherd heart in his reference to his people as "sheep" (v. 17).

"He is even willing to suffer (die?) for the sake of the sheep (v. 17)!"³²⁷

"Wanting more land and more people to rule, David finds himself with 70,000 fewer subjects."³²⁸

³²⁴Kirkpatrick, p. 228.

³²⁵Goldman, p. 345.

³²⁶See Youngblood, p. 1100-1.

³²⁷Gordon, p. 322.

³²⁸Dillard, p. 106. The 70,000 who died may have been 70 military units of soldiers. See Youngblood, p. 1100.

"Sin is really a selfish act. It's all about bringing ourselves pleasure caring little about the toll it will take on someone else."³²⁹

4. David's repentance 24:18-25

David proceeded to offer sacrifices in response to Gad's instructions (v. 18). David needed to commit himself again to God (the burnt offering) and to renew his fellowship with God (the peace offering, v. 25). God instructed him to present these sacrifices at the place where He had shown mercy (v. 16). David willingly obeyed (v. 19).

Araunah (Ornan, 1 Chron. 21) was a native Jebusite so probably his land had never been sanctified (set apart) to Yahweh as other Israelite land had (cf. v. 23; note "Yahweh *your* God"). David purchased the threshing floor for one and one-quarter pounds of silver. He insisted on purchasing the threshing floor because a sacrifice that costs nothing is no sacrifice at all (cf. Mark 12:43-44). The incident recalls Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah from Ephron the Hittite (Gen. 23:3-15), and it anticipates King Omri's purchase of a hill on which he built another capital, Samaria (1 Kings 16:23-24). The situations involving Abraham and David were both desperate. This spot was to become the site of Solomon's temple.

"At the same site where Abraham once held a knife over his son (Gen. 22:1-19), David sees the angel of the Lord with sword ready to plunge into Jerusalem. In both cases death is averted by sacrifice. The temple is established there as the place where Israel was perpetually reminded that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin (Heb. 9:22). Death for Isaac and for David's Jerusalem was averted because the sword of divine justice would ultimately find its mark in the Son of God (John 19:33)."³³⁰

"Small wonder, then, that the NT should begin with 'a record of the genealogy of Jesus Christ the son of David, the son of Abraham. . .'"³³¹

The writer probably recorded this incident not only because it accounts for the origin of the site of Solomon's temple, but because it illustrates a basic theological truth taught throughout the book. Whenever someone whom God has chosen for special blessing sins he or she becomes the target of God's discipline, and he or she also becomes a channel of judgment to others. Only repentance will turn the situation around. When David agreed to obey God's will revealed through Gad, he began at once to become a source of blessing again.

"No one need aspire to leadership in the work of God who is not prepared to pay a price greater than his contemporaries and colleagues are willing to

³²⁹Swindoll, p. 282.

³³⁰Dillard, p. 107.

³³¹Youngblood, p. 1104.

pay. True leadership always exacts a heavy toll on the whole man, and the more effective the leadership is, the higher the price to be paid."³³²

Much blessing came to Israel through the land David bought from Araunah the Jebusite. The fact that it was a threshing floor is interesting, too, since people threshed the blessing of fertility.

As mentioned previously, the writer composed this last major section of Samuel (chs. 21—24) in a chiasmic structure. Here is a similar diagram of it.

- A** Famine from Saul's sin 21:1-4 (narrative)
- B** Military heroes and victories 21:15-22 (list)
- C** David's psalm praise of God ch. 22 (poem)
- C'** David's tribute in praise of God 23:1-7 (poem)
- B'** Military heroes and victories 23:8-39 (list)
- A'** Pestilence from David's sin ch. 24 (narrative)

Hebrew writers often used this chiasmic literary structure to unify several different parts around one central concept. Here the center is quite clearly Yahweh. Praise of God reflects a right relationship to Him. This relationship results in blessing (strength, victories, etc.). When one is unfaithful to God, the result is judgment, famine, and pestilence.

Within each of these six final sections there is also a conflict. Saul and his sons conflict with David and Mephibosheth (21:1-14). The Philistine giants conflict with David's warriors (21:15-22). Evil and arrogant enemies of God conflict with righteous covenant-keepers (ch. 22). The blessed conflict with the worthless (23:1-7). Israel's enemies conflict with David's men (23:8-39) and, finally, David conflicts with Joab and Araunah (ch. 24).

All of Saul's sons perished except Mephibosheth because Mephibosheth, Jonathan's son, was in covenant relationship to David, a covenant-keeping son of Yahweh. The Philistine giants perished because God was with David. David's psalm recalls Hannah's psalm (1 Sam. 2:1-10). In both of these prayers the contrast between the arrogant and the humble before God stands out. David received the Davidic Covenant because of God's sovereign choice and David's typical obedience. God raised up and empowered many mighty men because David walked before God submissively. The nation suffered when David got away from God but prospered when he got right with God.

³³²J. Oswald Sanders, *Spiritual Leadership*, p. 169.

Conclusion

When 1 Samuel opened Israel was a loosely connected affiliation of tribes with little unity and loyalty. Judges led her, many of whom were weak and ineffective. Her worship was in disrepute due to corruption in the priesthood. She was at the mercy of her surrounding enemies. She was weak in influence and was struggling economically.

By the end of David's reign, 150 years later, Israel stood united as a nation behind a king who represented Yahweh's will faithfully. She had a revived priesthood that enjoyed support from the throne, and the prospect for a permanent temple located in the capital city was bright. She was militarily strong, and she controlled her environment politically and geographically. She enjoyed an influence in the world that was already powerful and growing. Furthermore her economy was strong.

David's most important contribution was probably uniting the political and religious life of Israel. He symbolized this by setting up both the political capital and the worship center of Israel in one place, namely, Jerusalem. This effectively united the covenant traditions of the patriarchs and Moses with the newer revelation of a human monarchy. David realized that he was not only Israel's political head but also her representative before God. He persuaded Israel of this dual role and so prepared her to function as the servant of the Lord in providing salvation for the other peoples of the world.³³³

These changes had taken place because Yahweh had brought fertility to Israel. When the Israelites followed the Mosaic Covenant, God's revealed will for them, obedience resulted in blessing and life. When they did not obey, they experienced discipline and death.

The writer employed various literary devices to emphasize his main spiritual lessons. Primary among these was conflict and resolution. In every major section there is at least one conflict, and often there are several, in which God either exalted the faithful, or put down the arrogant, or both. Another device is the reversal of fortune motif by which he showed that Yahweh can and does change people's lives as they respond to His Word, for good or for ill. A major chiasm, beginning with Hannah's prayer and ending with David's prayers, ties 1 and 2 Samuel together. Other occasional chiasms help the reader appreciate the writer's emphasis, such as the one in 2 Samuel 21—24.

"The broad theology of 1 and 2 Samuel is that God rules justly in the affairs of men. Furthermore, He requires that men live justly under His rule. The leader (whether judge or king) must represent Yahweh's justice in the rule of God's people. Failure to follow the patterns of righteousness established by God led to chastisement of the ruler and the people he ruled. This message was usually presented by a prophet who stood between God and the king as well as the people."³³⁴

³³³Merrill, *Kingdom of . . .*, p. 286.

³³⁴Heater, p. 146.

Bibliography

- Achteemeier, Paul J., and Elizabeth Achtemeier. *The Old Testament Roots of Our Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Ackerman, James S. "Knowing Good and Evil: A Literary Analysis of the Court History in 2 Samuel 9—20 and 1 Kings 1—2." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109:1 (Spring 1990):41-60.
- Ackroyd, Peter R. "The Succession Narrative (so-called)." *Interpretation* 35:4 (1980):383-96.
- Aharoni, Yohanan, and Michael Avi-Yonah. *The Macmillan Bible Atlas*. Revised ed., New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1977.
- Albright, William F. *The Archaeology of Palestine*. 1949. Revised ed. Pelican Archaeology series. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, Eng.: Penguin Books, 1956.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic, 1981.
- Anderson, A. A. *2 Samuel*. Word Biblical Commentary series. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- Archer, Gleason L., Jr. *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*. Regency Reference Library series. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982.
- _____. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Revised ed. Chicago: Moody Press, 1974.
- Armerding, Carl Edwin. "Were David's Sons Really Priests?" In *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students*, pp. 75-86. Ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975.
- Arnold, Bill T. "The Amalekite's Report of Saul's Death: Political Intrigue or Incompatible Sources?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 32:3 (1989):289-98.
- Bailey, Randall C. *David in Love and War: The Pursuit of Power in 2 Samuel 10—12*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 75. Sheffield, Eng.: JSOT, 1990.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. *1 & 2 Samuel*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries series. Leicester, Eng., and Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1988.

- Battenhouse, Roy. "The Tragedy of Absalom: A Literary Analysis." *Christianity and Literature* 31:3 (Spring 1982):53-57.
- Baxter, J. Sidlow. *Explore the Book*. 6 vols. London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1965.
- Beal, Richard H. "The Hittites After the Empire's Fall." *Biblical Illustrator* 10:1 (Fall 1983):72-81.
- Bellefontaine, Elizabeth. "Customary Law and Chieftanship: Judicial Aspects of 2 Samuel 14:4-21." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38 (1987):47-72.
- Bendavid, Abba. *Parallels in the Bible*. Jerusalem: Carta, 1972.
- Bentzen, Aage. "The Cultic Use of the Story of the Ark in Samuel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 67 (1948):37-53.
- Berlin, Adele. "Characterization in Biblical Narrative: David's Wives." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 23 (July 1982):69-85.
- Blaikie, William G. *The Second Book of Samuel*. 1893; reprint ed. Minneapolis: Klock and Klock, 1978.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Did Saul Make Gibeon His Capital?" *Vetus Testamentum* 24:1 (January 1974):1-7.
- _____. "Kiriath-jearim and the Ark." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969):143-56.
- Bright, John A. *A History of Israel*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "2 Samuel 21—24: An Appendix of Deconstruction?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50:3 (July 1988):383-97.
- _____. *First and Second Samuel*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching series. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1990.
- _____. "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gn 2,23a)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32:4 (September 1970):532-42.
- Bury, J. B.; S. A. Cook; and F. E. Adcock, eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History*. 12 vols. 2nd ed. reprinted. Cambridge, Eng.: University Press, 1928.
- Calderone, Philip J. *Dynastic Oracle and Suzerainty Treaty*. Manila: Ateneo University, 1966.
- Camp, Claudia V. "The Wise Women of 2 Samuel: A Role Model for Women in Early Israel." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43:1 (January 1981):14-29.

- Campbell, Anthony F. *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1—2 Kings 10)*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph 17. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1986.
- Carlson, R. A. *David the Chosen King*. Translated by Eric J. Sharpe and Stanley Rudman (notes). Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1964.
- Carter, Leslie. *Warring Faith*. London: Victory Press, 1961.
- Chafin, Kenneth L. *1, 2 Samuel*. The Communicator's Commentary series. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Chisholm, Robert B., Jr. "Does God Deceive?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 155:617 (January-March 1998):11-28.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. "Youth and Age." In *Poems That Live Forever*. Selected by Hazel Fellman. New York: Doubleday, 1965.
- Conroy, Charles. *Absalom Absalom! Narrative and Language in 2 Sam 13—20*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978.
- Constable, Thomas L. "Analysis of Bible Books—Old Testament." Paper submitted for course 685 Analysis of Bible Books—Old Testament. Dallas Theological Seminary, January 1967.
- Cooke, Gerald. "The Israelite King as Son of God." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73:2 (June 1961):202-25.
- Coxon, Peter W. "A Note on 'Bathsheba' in 2 Samuel 12, 1-6." *Biblica* 62:2 (1981):247-50.
- Crockett, William Day. *A Harmony of the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973.
- Cross, Frank M., Jr. *Canaanite Myth and the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- _____. "An Interpretation of the Nora Stone." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 208 (December 1972):13-19.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. and David Noel Freedman. "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving—II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72:1 (1953):15-34.

- Curtis, John Briggs. "East is East" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80:4 (1961):356-63.
- Darby, John Nelson. *Synopsis of the Books of the Bible*. 5 vols. Revised ed. New York: Loizeaux Brothers Publishers, 1942.
- Davis, John J., and John C Whitcomb. *A History of Israel*. Reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.
- Day, Peggy L. "Abishai and *satan* in 2 Samuel 19:17-22." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49:4 (October 1987):543-47.
- de Vaux, Roland. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. 2 vols. Translated by John McHugh. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
- DeVries, LaMoine. "The Forest of Ephraim." *Biblical Illustrator* 10:1 (1983):82-85.
- Damrosch, David. *The Narrative Covenant: Transformations of Genre in the Growth of Biblical Literature*. San Francisco: Harper, 1987.
- Dillard, Raymond B. "David's Census: Perspectives on II Samuel 24 and I Chronicles 21." In *Through Christ's Word: A Festschrift for Dr. Philip E. Hughes*, pp. 94-107. Edited by Robert W. Godfrey and Jesse L. Boyd III. Phillipsburg, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1985.
- Driver, S. R. *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*. 1913; 2nd ed. revised, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Dumbrell, William J. *Covenants and Creation*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1984.
- Eskhult, Mats. *Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique in Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Uppsala, Sweden: Uppsala University, 1990.
- Fensham, F. Charles. "The Battle Between the Men of Joab and Abner as a Possible Ordeal by Battle?" *Vetus Testamentum* 20:3 (July 1970):356-57.
- _____. "Clauses of Protection in Hittite Vassal-Treaties and the Old Testament." *Vetus Testamentum* 13 (1963):133-43.
- _____. "The Treaty between Israel and the Gibeonites." *Biblical Archaeologist* 27:3 (1964):96-100.
- Flanagan, James W. "Court History or Succession Document? A Study of 2 Samuel 9—20; 1 Kings 1—2." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91:2 (1972):172-81.

- Fokkelman, J. P. *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*. Vol. 1: *King David*. Assen: Von Gorcum & Co., 1981.
- Freedman, David Noel. "The Refrain in David's Lament Over Saul and Jonathan." In *Ex Orbe Religionum: Studia Geo Widengren Oblata*. pp. 115-26. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1972.
- Gaebelein, Arno C. *The Annotated Bible*. 4 vols. Reprint ed. Chicago: Moody Press, and New York: Loizeaux Brothers, Inc., 1970.
- Garnet, Paul. "Atonement Constructions in the Old Testament and the Qumran Scrolls." *Evangelical Quarterly* 46:3 (July-September 1974):131-63.
- Garsiel, Moshe. *The First Book of Samuel: A Literary Study of Comparative Structures, Analogies, and Parallels*. Ramat-Gan: Revivim, 1985.
- Gehrke, R. O. *I and II Samuel*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968.
- Gevirtz, Stanley. "David's Lament Over Saul and Jonathan." In *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel*, pp. 72-96. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization series, number 32. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Gileadi, Avraham. "The Davidic Covenant: A Theological Basis for Corporate Protection." In *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison*, pp. 157-63. Edited by Avraham Gileadi. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Goldingay, John. *Theological Diversity and the Authority of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987.
- Goldman, S. *Samuel*. London: Soncino Press, 1951.
- Gordon, Robert P. *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*. Library of Biblical Interpretation series. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, Regency Reference Library, 1986.
- Gunn, David M. "David and the Gift of the Kingdom (2 Samuel 2-4, 9-20, 1 Kings 1-2)." *Semeia* 3 (1975):14-45.
- _____. "From Jerusalem to the Jordan and Back: Symmetry in 2 Samuel XV-XX." *Vetus Testamentum* 30:1 (January 1980):109-13.
- _____. *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 6. Sheffield, Eng.: JSOT, 1978.

- _____. "Traditional Composition in the 'Succession Narrative'." *Vetus Testamentum* 26:2 (April 1976):214-29.
- Harton, George M. "Fulfillment of Deuteronomy 28-30 in History and in Eschatology." ThD dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1981.
- Hays, J. Daniel. "The Cushites: A Black Nation in the Bible." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 153:612 (October-December 1996):396-409.
- Heater, Homer, Jr. "A Theology of Samuel and Kings." In *A Biblical Theology of the Old Testament*, pp. 115-55. Edited by Roy B. Zuck. Chicago: Moody Press, 1991.
- Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. *I and II Samuel*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.
- Hill, Andrew E. "A Jonadab Connection in the Absalom Conspiracy." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 30:4 (December 1987):387-90.
- Hillers, Delbert R. "A Note on Some Treaty Terminology in the Old Testament." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 176 (1964):46-47.
- Hodges, Zane C. "Conflicts in the Biblical Account of the Ammonite-Syrian War." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 119:475 (July-September 1962):238-43.
- Hoftijzer, J. "David and the Tekoite Woman." *Vetus Testamentum* 20:4 (October 1970):419-44.
- Holladay, William L. "Form and Word-Play in David's Lament over Saul and Jonathan." *Vetus Testamentum* 20:2 (April 1970):153-89.
- Holloway, Steven W. "Distaff, Crutch or Chain Gang: The Curse of the House of Joab in 2 Samuel III 29." *Vetus Testamentum* 37:3 (July 1987):370-75.
- Horn, Siegfried H. "The Crown of the King of the Ammonites." *Andrews University Seminary Bulletin* 11:2 (1973):170-80.
- Jackson, Jared J. "David's Throne: Patterns in the Succession Story." *Canadian Journal of Theology* 11:3 (July 1965):183-95.
- Jones, Gwilym H. *The Nathan Narratives*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 80. Sheffield, Eng.: JSOT, 1990.
- Josephus, Flavius. *The Works of Flavius Josephus*. Translated by William Whiston. *Antiquities of the Jews*. London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1866.
- Kallai, Zechariah. "Judah and Israel—A Study in Israelite Historiography." *Israel Exploration Journal* 28:4 (1978):251-61.

- Keil, C. F. and Franz Delitzsch. *Biblical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*. Translated by James Martin. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960.
- Kennedy, James. "David's Lament over Saul and Jonathan: II Sam. 1:19-27." *American Journal of Semitic Languages* 32 (1916):118-25.
- Kirkpatrick, A. F. *The Second Book of Samuel*. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges series. Cambridge, Eng.: University Press, 1886.
- Kitchen, K. A. *The Bible In Its World*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1977.
- Laney, J. Carl. *First and Second Samuel*. Everyman's Bible Commentary series. Chicago: Moody Press, 1982.
- Lange, John Peter, ed. *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*. 12 vols. Reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1960. Vol. 3: *Samuel-Kings*, by Chr. Fr. David Erdmann and Karl Chr. W. T. Bahr. Translated, enlarged, and edited by C. H. Toy, John A. Broadus, Edwin Harwood, and W. G. Sumner.
- Lasine, Stuart. "Melodrama as Parable: The Story of the Poor Man's Ewe-Lamb and the Unmasking of David's Topsy-Turvy Emotions." *Hebrew Annual Review* 8 (1984):101-24.
- LaSor, William Sanford. "The Prophets during the Monarchy: Turning Points in Israel's Decline." In *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration*, pp. 59-70. Edited by Avraham Gileadi. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Lawlor, John I. "Theology and Art in the Narrative of the Ammonite War (2 Samuel 10—12)." *Grace Theological Journal* 3:2 (1982):193-205.
- Lawrence, John W. *Life's Choices*. Portland: Multnomah Press, 1975.
- Lemche, Niels Peter. "David's Rise." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 10 (November 1978):2-25.
- Levenson, Jon D. "The Davidic Covenant and Its Modern Interpreters." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41:2 (1979):205-19.
- Levenson, Jon D., and Baruch Halpern. "The Political Import of David's Marriages." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99:4 (1980):507-18.
- Mabee, Charles. "David's Judicial Exoneration." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 92:1 (1980):92-107.

- Malamat, Abraham. "Aspects of the Foreign Policies of David and Solomon." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 22:1 (January 1963):1-17.
- _____. "The Kingdom of David & Solomon in Its Contact With Egypt and Aram Naharaim." *Biblical Archaeologist* 21:4 (1958):96-102.
- Mare, W. Harold. *The Archaeology of the Jerusalem Area*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987.
- Martin, John A. "Studies in 1 and 2 Samuel." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 141:561 (January-March 1984):28-42; 562 (April-June 1984):131-45; 563 (July-September):209-22; 564 (October-December):303-14.
- Mazar, B. "The Military Elite of King David." *Vetus Testamentum* 13 (1963):310-20.
- McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr. *II Samuel*. Anchor Bible series. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1984.
- _____. "The Apology of David." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99:4 (1980):489-504.
- _____. "'Plots, True or False': The Succession Narrative as Court Apologetic." *Interpretation* 35:4 (October 1981):355-67.
- _____. "The Ritual Dedication of the City of David in 2 Samuel 6." In *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*, pp. 273-78. Edited by Carol L. Meyers and M. O'Connor. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. "II Samuel 7 and the Structure of the Deuteronomic History." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84 (1965):136.
- McKane, William. *I and II Samuel*. London: SCM Press, 1963.
- Merrill, Eugene H. "2 Samuel." In *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: Old Testament*, pp. 457-82. Edited by John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck. Wheaton: Scripture Press Publications, Victor Books, 1985.
- _____. *Kingdom of Priests*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987.
- _____. "Royal Priesthood: An Old Testament Messianic Motif." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150:597 (January-March 1993):50-61.
- Meyer, F. B. *David: Shepherd and King*. Condensed Christian Books series. Westchester, Ill.: Good News Publishers, 1960.
- _____. *Samuel the Prophet*. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, n.d.

- Millard, A. R. "Saul's Shield Not Anointed With Oil." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 230 (April 1978):70.
- Monson, James M. *The Land Between*. Jerusalem: By the author, P.O. Box 1276, 1983.
- Morgan, G. Campbell. *Living Messages of the Books of the Bible*. 2 vols. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1912.
- Murray, Donald. "Once Again 't 'hd Sbtv Ysr'l in II Samuel 7:7." *Revue Biblique* 94:3 (July 1987):389-96.
- Na'aman, Nadav. "The List of David's Officers (*Salisim*)." *Vetus Testamentum* 38:1 (1988):71-79.
- Neiderhiser, Edward A. "2 Samuel 20:8-10: A Note for a Commentary." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 24:3 (September 1981):209-10.
- New Bible Dictionary*, 1962 ed. S. v. "Cherethites," by T. C. Mitchell.
- New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Edited by C. Brown. 1975, 1976 and 1978 ed. S. v. "Shepherd," by E. Beyreuther.
- Newsome, James D., Jr. ed. *A Synoptic Harmony of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1986.
- Nicol, George G. "The Wisdom of Joab and the Wise Woman of Tekoa." *Studia Theologica* 36 (1982):97-104.
- North, Robert. "Social Dynamics From Saul to Jehu." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 12:4 (1982):109-19.
- O'Ceallaigh, G. C. "'And So David Did to All the Cities of Ammon.'" *Vetus Testamentum* 12 (1962):179-89.
- Ockinga, Boyu G. "A Note on 2 Samuel 18.18." *Biblische Notizen* 31 (1986):31-34.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. *Ancient Mesopotamia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Ota, Michiko. "A Note on 2 Sam 7." In *A Light Unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers*, pp. 403-7. Edited by Howard N. Bream, Ralph D. Heim, and Carey A. Moore. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974.
- Patrick, Symon. *A Commentary Upon the Two Books of Samuel*. London: Chiswell, 1703.
- Payne, David F. *I & II Samuel*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982.

- Payne, J. Barton. "1, 2 Chronicles." In *1 Kings-Job*. Vol. 4 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. 12 vols. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelin and Richard D. Polcyn. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1988.
- Pentecost, J. Dwight. *Things to Come*. Findlay, Ohio: Dunham Publishing Co., 1958.
- _____. *Thy Kingdom Come*. Wheaton: Scripture Press Publications, Victor Books, 1990.
- Perdue, Leo G. "'Is There Anyone Left of the House of Saul . . . ?' Ambiguity and the Characterization of David in the Succession Narrative." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 30 (October 1984):67-84.
- Peters, F. E. *Jerusalem*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Pfeiffer, Charles F., and Howard F. Vos. *The Wycliffe Historical Geography of Bible Lands*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1967.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Revised ed. New York: Harper, 1948.
- Phillips, Anthony. "David's Linen Ephod." *Vetus Testamentum* 19:4 (October 1967):485-87.
- _____. "The Interpretation of 2 Samuel xii 5-6." *Vetus Testamentum* 16 (1966):242-44.
- _____. "NEBALAH—a term for serious disorderly and unruly conduct." *Vetus Testamentum* 25:2 (April 1975):237-41.
- Porter, J. R. "The Interpretation of 2 Samuel VI and Psalm CXXXII." *Journal of Theological Studies* N.S. 5 (1954):161-73.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3rd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Rasmussen, Carl G. *Zondervan NIV Atlas of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1989.
- Reid, Patrick V. "Sbty in 2 Samuel 7:7." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37:1 (January 1975):17-20.
- Richardson, H. Neil. "The Last Words of David: Some Notes on II Samuel 23:1-7." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90:3 (1971):257-66.
- Ridout, George P. *Prose Compositional Techniques in the Succession Narrative [2 Samuel 7, 9—20; 1 Kings 1—2]*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1985.

- Rogers, Cleon L., Jr. "The Davidic Covenant in the New Testament." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150:600 (October-December 1993):458-78; and 150:601 (January-March 1994):71-84.
- _____. "The Promises to David in Early Judaism." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150:599 (July-September 1993):285-302.
- Rosenberg, Joel. *King and Kin: Political Allegory in the Hebrew Bible*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- Rost, Leonhard. *The Succession to the Throne of David*. Sheffield, Eng.: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1982.
- Roth, Wolfgang. "The Deuteronomic Rest Theology: A Redaction-Critical Study." *Biblical Research* 21 (1976):5-14.
- _____. "You Are the Man! Structural Interaction in 2 Samuel 10-12." *Semeia* 8 (1977):1-13.
- Sanders, J. Oswald. *Spiritual Leadership*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1969.
- Saucy, Robert L. *The Case for Progressive Dispensationalism*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993.
- Segal, M. H. "The Composition of the Books of Samuel." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 55 (1964-65):318-39; 56 (1965-66):32-50.
- Schwantes, Siegfried J. *A Short History of the Ancient Near East*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1965.
- Shea, William H. "Chiasmus and the Structure of David's Lament." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105:1 (1986):13-25.
- _____. "David's Lament." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 221 (February 1976):141-44.
- Simon, Uriel. "The Poor Man's Ewe-Lamb." *Biblica* 48 (1967):207-42.
- Skehan, Patrick W. "Joab's Census: How Far North (2 Sm 24,6)?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 31:1 (January 1969):42-49.
- Smith, George Adam. *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*. 22nd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.

- Smith, H. P. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*. International Critical Commentary series. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904.
- Smith, J. M. P. "The Character of King David." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 52 (1933):1-11.
- Smith, Morton. "The So-Called 'Biography of David' in the Books of Samuel and Kings." *Harvard Theological Review* 44 (1951):167-69.
- Smith, Sidney. "The Practice of Kingship in Early Semitic Kingdoms." In *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship*, pp. 22-73. Edited by Samuel H. Hooke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.
- Student Map Manual*. Jerusalem: Pictorial Archive (Near Eastern History) Est., 1979.
- Swindoll, Charles R. *David: A Man of Passion and Destiny*. Great Lives from God's Word series. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1997.
- Tadmor, Hayim. "Traditional Institutions and the Monarchy: Social and Political Tensions in the Time of David and Solomon." In *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays*, pp. 237-57. Edited by Tomoo Ishida. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1982.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. *King, Cult, and Calendar in Ancient Israel: Collected Studies*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986.
- Thiele, Edwin R. *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965.
- Thompson, J. A. *1, 2 Chronicles*. New American Commentary series. N.c.: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994.
- Tidwell, N. L. "The Linen Ephod: 1 Sam. II 18 and 2 Sam. VI 14." *Vetus Testamentum* 24:4 (October 1974):505-7.
- Tsevat, Matitiah. "The House of David in Nathan's Prophecy." *Biblica* 46 (1965):353-56.
- _____. "Studies in the Book of Samuel," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 34 (1963):71-82; 36 (1965):49-58.
- Tucker, Stanley D. "The Theology of the Book of Samuel: A Study of God's Humiliation or Exaltation of Leaders." *Biblical Viewpoint* 12:2 (1978):152-59.

- Vanderkam, James C. "Davidic Complicity in the Deaths of Abner and Eshbaal: A Historical and Redactional Study." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99:4 (1980):521-39.
- Vogels, Walter. "David's Greatness in His Sin and Repentance." *The Way* 15:4 (1975):243-54.
- Waltke, Bruce K. "The Phenomenon of Conditionality Within Unconditional Covenants." In *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison*, pp. 123-39. Edited by Avraham Gileadi. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Walvoord, John F. "The New Covenant." In *Integrity of Heart, Skillfulness of Hands*, pp. 186-200. Edited by Charles H. Dyer and Roy B. Zuck. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1994.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90:2 (1970):184-203.
- Wenham, G. J. "Were David's Sons Priests?" *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 87:1 (1975):79-82.
- Wharton, James A. "A Plausible Tale: Story and Theology in II Samuel 9—20, I Kings 1—2." *Interpretation* 35:4 (October 1981):341-54.
- Whitelam, Keith W. "The Defence of David." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 29 (June 1984):61-87.
- Whyte, Alexander. *Bible Characters*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1952.
- Wood, Leon. *Israel's United Monarchy*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979.
- _____. *A Survey of Israel's History*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Discovery*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963.
- Yee, Gale A. "The Anatomy of Biblical Parody: The Dirge Form in 2 Samuel 1 and Isaiah 14." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50:4 (October 1988):565-86.
- _____. "'Fraught With Background': Literary Ambiguity in II Samuel 11." *Interpretation* 42:3 (July 1988):240-53.
- Young, Fred E. "First and Second Samuel." In *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, pp. 273-305. Edited by Charles F. Pfeiffer and Everett F. Harrison. Chicago: Moody Press, 1962.

Youngblood, Ronald F. "1, 2 Samuel." In *Deuteronomy-2 Samuel*. Vol. 3 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. 12 vols. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelin and Richard P. Polcyn. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992.

Zapf, David L. "How Are the Mighty Fallen! A Study of 2 Samuel 1:17-27." *Grace Theological Journal* 5:1 (1984):95-126.