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Many who read and study this chapter are 1st or 2nd generation students of R. B. Thieme, Jr., so that much of this vocabulary is second nature. One of Bob’s contributions to theology is a fresh vocabulary along with a number of concepts which are theologically new or reworked, yet still orthodox. Therefore, if you are unfamiliar with his work, the definitions below will help you to fully understand all that is being said. In addition to this, I will use a number of other more traditional technical theological terms which will be used and therefore defined as well.

**Definition of Terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelic Conflict</td>
<td>There is a great unseen war which is going on between fallen and elect angels. This has been going on since the fall of Satan known as the Angelic Conflict. We, as having volition, will resolve the Angelic Conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnality</td>
<td>Carnality is the opposite of spiritually. A person who is carnal has sinned, and is therefore out of fellowship with God. When such a one names his sin or sins to God, he is restored to fellowship and he is spiritual once again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Nation</td>
<td>Client-Nation, is a national entity in which a certain number of spiritually mature Christians (the salt of the earth) have formed a pivot sufficient to sustain the nation and through which God specifically protects this nation so that believers can fulfill the divine mandates of evangelism, communication and custodianship of Bible doctrine, providing a haven for Jews, and sending missionaries abroad. The United States is a client-nation to God. A client nation must have freedom: Freedom to seek God, freedom to use one’s own volition and self-determination to succeed or fail, freedom from anarchy and tyranny, freedom for evangelism, freedom for believers to hear Bible teaching without government interference and, therefore, to grow spiritually, and freedom to send missionaries to other nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degeneracy</td>
<td>Being involved in a set of sins which are both addictive and can become very time consuming. In many cases, such sins can take over a person’s life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degeneracy Agenda</td>
<td>Spending a significant portion of your life pursuing this or that degeneracy sin—whether it is the use of drugs, alcohol, chasing women, and/or having sex (with either gender). All of this takes time and planning out of your life, which takes valuable time from your place in God’s plan. This can be applied to any addictive sin (e.g., gambling).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edification Complex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Edification&quot; in the Greek is oikodômê (οἰκοδομη), which means a building or structure. The edification of the soul is accomplished by a building, or Edification Complex, that is constructed in the soul of the believer through the metabolization of Bible Doctrine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemological Rehabilitation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemological rehabilitation is the perception, metabolization and application of Bible doctrine to your own experience (2Cor. 6:11-12). The end result is the renovation of one’s thinking (Rom. 12:1–2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Installment Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the quality of David’s soul, God will only be able to turn him around by putting David under great pressure 4 times, each of which relates back to his sins of 2Sam. 11. This will be covered in greater detail under David’s Soul and the Harsh Discipline of God (this represents an update from R. B. Thieme, Jr.’s 1980’s era Doctrine of Installment Discipline).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensive Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you have sinned, and God begins to discipline you, you go through 3 stages: (1) warning discipline (God lets you know that you have sinned and you need to get back into fellowship); (2) intensive discipline (God increases or intensifies the discipline to a point where, it really, really hurts); (3) the sin unto death (God begins the process of removing you from this world because you refuse to rebound).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interlocking Systems of Arrogance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also known as the arrogance complex. The interlocking systems of arrogance refers to many clusters of sins which have a tendency to interlock with one another. Entering into this complex is more than carnality and it is different from reversionism. This doctrine is covered in much greater detail in 2Sam. 11 (HTML) (PDF).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laws of Divine Establishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The laws of divine establishment are a system of laws and principles which provide for the preservation as well as for the prosperity of the human race. These laws apply to both believer and unbeliever alike.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rebound</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naming your sins to God, so that God temporarily forgives you and restores you to fellowship with Him. See in this chapter Restoration to Fellowship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restorative Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a believer gives into the lusts of his soul continually, this can change that believer’s soul. Often the result is addictive behavior where a pleasurable addiction takes over the soul. God’s harsh discipline first guides such a believer to restoration to fellowship and then it continues as blessing to cure that addiction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reversionism</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting out of fellowship through sinning, and then remaining out of fellowship for a long time. Often, such a believer reverts to his behavior as an unbeliever. This is called reversionism. This is going further than simple carnality, which is being out of fellowship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right man/right woman (RM/RW)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concept that God has provided for almost all people out there the perfect partner (of the opposite gender, of course). This relationship is the basis for much of our enjoyment of life, for believers and unbelievers alike.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sin unto Death</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is not a particular sin, but the point at which harsh discipline is no longer working on the believer, so God takes the believer out of this world in a very painful way. For more information, see <a href="http://gracebiblechurchwichita.org/?page_id=539">http://gracebiblechurchwichita.org/?page_id=539</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

An Introduction to 2Samuel 12

Introduction: In the previous chapter, it is clear that David has done egregious wrong. In 2Sam. 12, Nathan brings David to the point of recognizing and naming his own sin to God through a parable. Because what David did was so evil, he would be subject to fourfold discipline, which David himself will call for (not realizing, at the time, that it was his own discipline that he was setting up). The first installment of discipline was the death of this child which was his and Bathsheba's, which death is recorded in this chapter.

At the end of this chapter, Joab completes his siege of Rabbah, and David comes in to take the credit (as per Joab's humility).

The foregoing chapter gave us the account of David's sin; this gives us the account of his repentance. Though he fell, he was not utterly cast down, but, by the grace of God, recovered himself, and found mercy with God.

Matthew Henry’s Alternate Outline

1. David’s conviction (the message of Nathan the prophet):
   1) First, by a message Nathan brought him from God, which was a parable that obliged him to condemn himself (2Sam. 12:1–6);
   2) Then, by the application of the parable, in which Nathan charged him with the sin (2Sam. 12:7–9);
   3) And, finally, the pronounced sentence upon him, (2Sam. 12:10–12).
2. David’s repentance and remission, with a proviso (2Sam. 12:13–14). We would call this rebound
3. The sickness and death of the child, and his behaviour while it was sick and when it was dead (2Sam. 12:15–23), in both which David gave evidence of his repentance. This is the cursing of divine discipline.
5. The taking of Rabbah (2Sam. 12:26–31), which is mentioned as a further instance that God did not deal with David according to his sins. God turns cursing into blessing.

It is really very difficult to divide up this chapter much differently than I have; but Henry breaks up the first section of the chapter into parts, so I took his outline for that reason.

From: Matthew Henry, Commentary on the Whole Bible; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12 chapter comments (edited).

Chapter Outline

Most of us have a very incomplete understanding of the doctrine of divine discipline. Even if you have studied under a very good pastor, it is likely that you do not understand the complete ramifications of the restorative discipline under which David will find himself. As we dig deep into this chapter, we will see that there is more going on here than, “David commits a sin, God disciplines David, and now David is back into fellowship.” For many of us, we understand this aspect of discipline quite well. We are out of fellowship, God puts us first under warning discipline, which—if we don’t respond—He then increases to intensive discipline, and finally—for those who remain out of fellowship—dying discipline (the sin unto death). We do go through these steps with David, and David
confesses his sin, and he is back in fellowship, but it is at that point that God begins to pour on the discipline. R. B. Thieme, Jr. developed this doctrine as *Installment Discipline*. However, there is more to it than that. David will be in and out of fellowship many times during installment discipline. The installment discipline, properly speaking, is designed to, among other things, to restore David’s corrupted soul (corrupted by sexual arrogance). Much of the time when these things are brought to bear in David’s life, David is in fellowship and making good decisions. Therefore, this is not discipline to get David back into fellowship. And, as you certainly know, Jesus Christ died spiritually on the cross to pay for all of our sins (God the Father laid upon God the Son the punishment for the sins which we deserved). Therefore, David cannot pay for his own sin. None of us can. My point here is, the “discipline” that David undergoes is not the sort of discipline that we are familiar with. God is applying pressure upon David to turn him around—to correct the deep soul flaws which David has. God takes this time to make David into a better person and the pressure brought to bear upon David is tremendous. We might call this restorative discipline or corrective discipline which is designed to reach even into David’s soul to turn him around. This is applied with great vigor over a period of 10 years, after David has confessed his sin to God, in order to cure—and I do mean, cure—David’s sexual degeneracy. In case you do not think this is pertinent, God the Holy Spirit devotes more time to this portion of David’s life than nearly anything else. And if you suffer from any addictive sin (drugs, drinking, homosexuality, or skirt-chasing), this chapter and the many which follow are all about you.

Now, to give some more details: David sinned greatly in 2Sam. 11 (HTML) (PDF). He stayed home when his troops went out to war against the Ammonites. In the previous year or so, David did go out with Joab to fight the Aramaeans, in a war that changed ancient history (2Sam. 10:15–19). However, during this past spring, David remained at home (2Sam. 11:1). He got up and saw a beautiful woman across the way from his rooftop, and he wanted her. After finding out who she was, David called for her to be brought to his palace, despite the fact that, she was the wife of one of his soldiers. David had sex with her and impregnated her (2Sam. 11:2–5). That caused David to try to deceive her soldier husband, Uriah. He got Uriah to come back to Jerusalem on false pretenses, but was unable to talk him into going to his home and staying the night with his wife (2Sam. 11:6–13). Therefore, David sent a message with Uriah to take back to the battlefield, telling General Joab to see that Uriah dies in battle (2Sam. 11:14–16). David lusted after that which belonged to another man; he committed adultery with this woman—he may have raped her; he was deceptive in his meetings with her husband; and he then had her husband murdered. So David has committed a number of sins, and has broken at least 3 commandments. There is nothing to suggest that David recognized his evil or named his sins to God in all of 2Sam. 11.

David’s sexual degeneracy reaches back to when he became king over Judah; by that time, he had a handful of women that he married, made his mistresses, and had children by. However, this degeneracy had not yet begun to dramatically impact his life. However, in 2Sam. 11, David suddenly does some things that seem to come right out of the blue: he is attracted to a woman; he finds out that she is married, yet he still brings her to his palace and has sex with her. Then he tries to deal dishonestly with her husband, and eventually, has him killed. So, David’s life is clearly off the tracks.

In this chapter, God sends Nathan to David (2Sam. 12:1a). This appears to be a legal matter for which Nathan needs advice. He tells David about a rich man and a poor man, and how the rich man takes the one lamb of the poor man to enjoy for a meal, despite his own vast livestock holdings (2Sam. 12:1b–4). David is angered and pronounces an immediately punishment, which would be a fourfold punishment of the rich man (2Sam. 12:5–6). Then Nathan tells him, “You are the man!” (2Sam. 12:7a). David is the rich man who has stolen the little ewe lamb (Bathsheba) from the poor man (Uriah). God then identifies Himself to David, through Nathan, and then defines David’s sin (2Sam. 12:7b–9). David’s pronouncement of punishment would be applied to him directly by God (2Sam. 12:10–12). David confesses his sin and Nathan reassures David that he would not die in this punishment (2Sam. 12:13).

In phase I of David’s punishment, the child resulting from this adulterous relationship would die (2Sam. 12:14). We are told in the text that God struck the child with illness (2Sam. 12:15b). David will eat very little and lay down on the ground, petitioning God for the life of this child (2Sam. 12:16). David’s servants are quite concerned by this and they attempt to get David to rise up and eat (2Sam. 12:17).
After a week, the child dies, and David’s servants are aware of this, but David is not. His servants discuss the situation, afraid to tell David, because of how he has been for the past 7 days (2Sam. 12:18). However, after hearing that his child has died, David gets us, bathes himself and puts on a change of clothing, and goes to worship God (2Sam. 12:19–20a). Then he returns and has a meal (2Sam. 12:20b). His servants are confused by this, and David explains that, while the child was alive, David could petition for the life of that child; however, now that the child has died, David no longer can affect the outcome (2Sam. 12:21–22). This child would not return to him, but he would go to his child (2Sam. 12:23). We believers understand this to mean that, children who die before the age of accountability, are saved and go to the presence of God. After this, David comforts his wife: he lies with her, and she conceives and then bears the son Solomon (2Sam. 12:24–25).

In the last section of this chapter, Joab calls upon David to lead the final assault on the Ammonite city of Rabbah (2Sam. 12:26–28). Now, although this appears to be completely disconnected from the context, this is Joab trying to save David from facing a revolution. Joab has figured out enough of this sordid story to know that David could face a revolution over his behavior and that Joab himself would be the person people would rally to as their leader. Joab understands that this is not a part of the plan of God, so he tries to head this off at the pass, by making David the hero of the taking of Rabbah. This reveals great humility on the part of Joab. David brings an army, they take down Rabbah, and put the people of Rabbah into slavery (2Sam. 12:29–31a). The same thing is done throughout the cities of Ammon (2Sam. 12:31b). As an aside, just in case you find this distasteful, all of this is legitimate. What David and Joab do to this people is reasonable and right.

One more abbreviated look on this entire chapter:

**Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge Gives a Condensed Description of 2Samuel 12**

- 2Sam. 12:1–6 Nathan’s parable of the ewe lamb causes David to be his own judge;
- 2Sam. 12:7–14 David, reproved by Nathan, confesses his sin, and is pardoned;
- 2Sam. 12:15–23 David mourns and prays for the child while it lives;
- 2Sam. 12:24–25 Solomon is born, and named Jedidiah;
- 2Sam. 12:26–31 David takes Rabbah, and tortures the people thereof.

From: Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge; by Canne, Browne, Blayney, Scott, and others about 1880, with introduction by R. A. Torrey; courtesy of E-sword, 2Sam. 12 chapter introduction (slightly edited).

Chapter Outline

Charts, Maps and Short Doctrines

At this point, we will get more into the *meat* of this chapter. This portion of David’s life—his sin and punishment—take up a huge portion of the Word of God (2Sam. 11–20). Therefore, we need to recognize the importance of this study. This sin that David committed simply indicates how far he has fallen into degeneracy.

You may recall that, in 2Sam. 11, we gave a great deal of introductory discussion as to the nature of David’s sins, and how they are much different than simply committing a sin, naming it to God, and moving on with your life. What David did in 2Sam. 11 will impact his country and his own life for the next decade or so. This is so important that, hundreds of men have commented on David’s sin in a number of different contexts. Even today, those who doubt the Word of God go back to David and this sin, and snotily say, “The Bible says David is a man after God’s Own heart, and yet here, he commits adultery and then has the innocent husband killed. That does not sound like a man of God to me!” As if they would know.

At the beginning of 2Sam. 11 *(HTML) (PDF)*, we studied several different opinions and viewpoints about David’s sin here. Is he just out of fellowship? Is he in reversionism? Ought we to look further into our concept of sin and give it more definition? As the study of the previous chapter continues to percolate in my mind, there are 2 sets of explanations which I find to be most appropriate: the concept of interlocking systems of arrogance, originally developed by R. B. Thieme, Jr.; and the concept of degeneracy sins which are addictive in nature.
We studied the interlocking systems of arrogance in the previous chapter in great detail, but we need to take another look at degeneracy.

### Degeneracy Sins (Addictive Behavior)

1. Not all sins function the same way in our life. We may give in to this or that sin, now and again, but these sins do not dramatically impede our spiritual growth nor do they consume our lives.
2. However, there are sins which potentially can stop us dead in our tracks, keeping us from spiritual growth, and sometimes transforming our lives, to where these sins become first and foremost in our lives.
3. We will classify these types of sins as degeneracy sins. Committing such sins once or twice is not degeneracy; committing such sins with great regularity, where much of our life is spent preparing to commit such sins, is degeneracy.
4. David has fallen into sexual degeneracy.
5. Sins of degeneracy are sins where we continue to dig ourselves deeper and deeper into sin.
6. Most often, these sins involve some kind of pleasure, often from sex, drinking, drugs or even over-eating.
7. The commission of these sins goes beyond the weakness of the sin nature. These are not simply a person’s individual weakness; these are sins which that person continue to pursue with greater effort and greater frequency.
8. There seems to be an effect of repetition and time when it comes to degeneracy sins. This repetition digs out a rut which often keeps us there. That is, the more we repeat the sin, the harder it is not to commit that sin.
9. Degeneracy sins can begin small and develop to a point where they consume much of a person’s life.
10. There seems to be a diminished capacity to resist such sins, as repetition of these sins continues. It is not necessarily that the person is completely unable to stop committing these sins; but that he chooses not to.
11. There also appears to be an inability to objectively appreciate the effect of these sins on one’s own life.
12. David was a skirt-chaser. He loved women. In his culture, David could get away with having many wives, and few people took a dim view of this.
13. However, the ability to temporarily satisfy a sin of degeneracy does not minimize that sin in any way, nor does it keep that sin from taking up too much of your life.
14. David had so many wives and mistresses that he stopped keeping track of all their names and stopped worrying about which child belonged to which wife (apart from his first few children). 2Sam. 5:13–16
15. However, his sin with Bathsheba made it clear that David was in a hole and he continued to dig himself deeper into that hole. His sins of degeneracy had led him to a place where he committed sins against others that he would have never considered before.
16. If you have ever driven a vehicle over open land and got stuck in the dirt, you will find that, when you rev up the engine, you will just dig yourself deeper at the point where you got stuck. This is how a sin of degeneracy affects us.
17. The carry this analogy further, we find that we must either seek outside help to get the car out of the rut or try an outside approach (e.g., putting boards under the wheels of the vehicle in order to get traction).
18. One of the common steps in addiction recovery is trusting in a higher power (God) to help you, guide you out, or to depend upon. Political correctness has kept many addiction organizations from specifically identifying God.
19. By the time of 2Sam. 11, David discovered that, as king, he could send his troops off to war, and that took many of the men out of Jerusalem. That gave David a greater chance to chase women.
20. David wakes up in the early evening, has a sexual urge, and yet does nothing to satisfy the urge with one of his (approximately) 20 wives and mistresses. Most of us males think, with 20 women, that is going to be quite enough variety. The fact that David did not turn to one of his wives or mistresses indicates that he was trapped in addictive behavior; he was digging himself further into a rut with degeneracy sins.
21. David’s son, Solomon, had 1000 wives and mistresses, and that was not enough for him. The Song of Solomon is all about his pursuit of another women, even though he had 1000 women of all nationalities to choose from. That is clearly being trapped in addictive behavior.
22. Degeneracy sins can include various sexual addictions, including homosexuality, a desire for sexual relations with children, and/or an addiction to pornography; as well as alcoholism, drug addiction and an
23. There have been several studies which indicate that there is a genetic component to addictive behavior. One study, for instance, showed that, of identical twins, if one person was a homosexual, there was a 50% chance that his identical twin was homosexual. This indicates a clear genetic predisposition but one which is not determinative.

24. Along the same lines, there seems to be genetic evidence for alcoholism. Charlie Brown may be predisposed genetically toward alcoholism, but that may or may not develop in his lifetime. The same thing is certainly true of drug addiction. Having this soul defect is not determinative; you can choose not to participate in the first place.

25. I recall an article which was purposely a setup. It begins describing the effects of a particular sin, and the results of that sin. The way the article begins, one immediately thinks that it is homosexual behavior which is being discussed, but it turns out to be alcoholism. The twist of the article is, all the percentages of negative results which are true of the alcoholic are even more pronounced for the homosexual.

1) As I read somewhere on the internet, “This is how God made you (an alcoholic), enjoy it. Drink all you want.”

2) This is how the world wants us to view these genetic weaknesses, in some instances. That is, if you have a desire to experiment with homosexual sex, then go ahead and try it out. Quite obviously, that is not the Biblical approach.

26. There seems to be an addictive personality, that has one set of addictions, and, after overcoming that, falls prey to another set of addictions. This would probably indicate both a genetic and a volitional component.

27. You cannot fall into addictive behaviors apart from your own free will. This is one of the attacks of the present-day, political homosexual movement—they claim that there is no choice involved, that being homosexual is ingrained from birth, and cannot be changed, and that even those who claim to be transformed, if they find themselves tempted, this is evidence that they have not been transformed. Some even bring God into this, along with love, and try to approximate homosexual relationships with heterosexual relationships. This is wrong on many counts.

1) A heterosexual relationship can result in a child, and marriage serves to protect both the mother and the child. You have no doubt heard of shotgun weddings; this was a somewhat warped version of understanding this principle. There is no such protection required in a homosexual union.

2) A heterosexual marriage combines two fundamentally different creatures: a man and a woman. These genders are different from birth. At one time, the women’s lib movement tried to convince us that gender differences were placed there by society, but that has since been shown to be false.

3) Homosexuality is not as widespread as it portends to be. The National Health and Social Life Survey (NHSLS), found that only 2.8 percent of the men and 1.4 percent of the women said they thought of themselves as homosexual or bisexual.

4) Fidelity is a very important part of a heterosexual marriage. An act of infidelity can destroy a marriage. Few committed homosexuals depend upon sexual fidelity.

5) A lifelong commitment among heterosexual couples is much more likely than that between homosexual couples.

6) Marriage is an institution recognized by nearly all cultures over all recorded history. Homosexuality, bestiality, pederasty and polygamy have all existed almost since the beginning of time, but always as a perversion and never as the norm of any society.

7) For a traditional marriage, it is not unusual for lifelong partners to enter into a lifelong commitment, without ever having sex with one another or with others. In fact, this was, at one time, the norm. Virgin marriages and making a lifetime commitment to one another as virgins simply does not occur in a homosexual relationship.

8) It is obvious that many of these differences are a matter of degree, but the difference in degree is generally quite dramatic.

28. For many, committing these sins (sexual sins, drunkenness, the use of drugs) tends to dig oneself deeper into a degeneracy hole.

29. Their lives become obsessed with committing these sins, to the exclusion of other legitimate activity.
Degeneracy Sins (Addictive Behavior)

30. I’ve known alcoholics and have seen them drink themselves to the point where they lose their jobs, their families, their homes, and/or their cars.

31. I have known drug addicts. Drug abusers can get to a point where the will rob their own family members in order to continue using drugs. I have known drug addicts whose physical changes and mental changes are so stark as to make them almost unrecognizable to friends and family.

32. A 1978 study showed that 43% of male homosexuals have had 500 or more partners. That is obsessive behavior.

33. A 1981 study showed that only 2% of male homosexuals could be classified as monogamous or semi-monogamous. Again, this is behavior far outside of the norm and indicates addictive behavior more than it does personal satisfaction.

34. There are several passages in the Bible which allude to degeneracy sins:
   1) 2Sam. 11 is all about how overcome David is with lust that he would take a woman in adultery—possibly by rape—and then have her husband killed.
   2) Song of Solomon is all about Solomon, the man who is chasing after the woman in this book, despite having 1000 wives and mistresses.
   3) Rom. 1:21–27 Because knowing God, they did not glorify Him as God, nor were thankful. But they became vain in their reasonings, and their undiscerning heart was darkened. Professing to be wise, they became foolish and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into a likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and four-footed animals, and creeping things. Because of this, God gave them up to impurity in the lusts of their hearts, their bodies to be dishonored among themselves, who changed the truth of God into the lie, and worshiped and served the created thing more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. Because of this, God gave them up to dishonorable passions, for even their females changed the natural use to that contrary to nature.
   And likewise, the males also forsaking the natural use of the female burned in their lust toward one another, males with males working out shamefulness, and receiving back within themselves the reward which was fitting for their error. Here, God gives these up to their dishonorable lusts, allowing them to burn in lust toward those of the same gender. So the Bible clearly recognizes that, when it comes to this sort of behavior, the desire to commit these sins is very strong.

35. The solution for sins of degeneracy does not appear to be any different from the solution to all forms of carnality (being out of fellowship). Rebound (naming one’s sins to God) and turning toward the truth of the Word of God (the inculcation of Bible doctrine into one’s soul; or, epistemological rehabilitation). This is not reading the Bible for yourself, but putting yourself under the authority of a knowledgeable pastor-teacher who consistently teaches the Word of God. Personally, I believe that there is no reason why a believer should be taking in doctrine less than a daily basis.


For additional research of homosexuality, let me suggest:
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1751579/posts
http://www.conservapedia.com/Homosexuality

This doctrine is also found in 2Sam. 11 (HTML) (PDF).

Application: There is an extremely important take-away in all of this: these degeneracy sins tend to take up a lot of time and injure a lot of other people. I do not know how many days God has given you to live on this earth as a believer in Jesus Christ, but I know it is a finite number. What you cannot afford to do is to fall into one of these degeneracy sins, and thereby trap yourself in a degeneracy spiral for several years. God has a plan for your life, and if you are spending 5 or 10 or 20 years chasing skirt, drinking yourself into oblivion, living the homosexual lifestyle, or whatever, you cannot fulfill God’s plan for your life.
**Application:** What is particularly problematic about these degeneracy sins is, they take up a lot of time. Chasing skirt, for instance, requires you to meet and woo various women, set up dates, and pursue this encounter to a sexual end. All of that requires time, and this will distract you from your RM/RW relationship. In fact, this could keep you from establishing a RM/RW relationship. So it is with any of these sins—they take up a tremendous amount of time.

God, in this discipline of David—discipline for blessing—which occurs after David committed these sins, will remind David daily of the consequences of his sins. You see, let’s say Uriah’s grave was put right outside the front of David’s palace, and every time that David walks in or out of the palace, he sees it and feels a tinge of guilt. No big deal. However, if David is feeling pain and pressure and difficulties, all of which are a result of his life of skirt-chasing, that is going to eventually sink into his thick head.

**Application:** Why does God spend 8 or 9 chapters on this? So that you do not waste 5, 10 or 20 years of your life in some degeneracy sin. Ideally speaking, you will look at David’s life, see what he did, note the 10 years of discipline which he endured after naming his sins to God, and think, “You know what, this particular lust is simply not worth it. It would be a dramatic waste of my time on this earth to pursue this particular degeneracy agenda. And besides, I am not so sure how enthusiastic I can get about God beating me within an inch of my life for attempting to satiate my lusts.”

**Chapter Outline**

There is a time element to all of this. Although most children are born 9 months after conception, premature births are not unusual; and, once and awhile, a woman may carry a child to 9 months + a week or two or three. It is quite obvious that there was a time frame problem with Bathsheba convincing her husband that the son she would bear is his. This suggests that, prior to going to war, there was no sex for Uriah the Hittite. We speculated some on that—there could have been trouble in the marriage, or, this could have been a good luck charm in their abstinence; or, it is also possible that married people just did not have as much sex, as the result, invariably would be a child. In any case, the time between Uriah last having relations with his wife and David committing adultery with her was such that, Uriah would never be convinced that the child was his.

So, David brings Uriah home and tries to get him to have relations with his wife. This would have occurred about a month after David had sex with Bathsheba. This deception takes a few days, and David has no luck with this approach. Because David is unable to manipulate Uriah, he then has Uriah killed, which occurred maybe 1–2 months after David cuckolded him.

Here is where the time factor becomes interesting. Nathan comes to David (in this chapter) and God judges David through Nathan. Part of this original judgment involves the child born to Bathsheba. This child is mentioned in 2Sam. 11:27 and 2Sam. 12:14–19. Therefore, it is possible that God waits several months—up to a year—before sending Nathan to him. Although the narrative does not demand that Bathsheba bear this child first; the narrative suggests that the birth occurs before God sends Nathan to David. In other words, God waits for awhile before lowering the boom on David. Although this is all speculation, perhaps God was allowing David some time during which he reflects back upon his sin, and, without prompting, recognize how heinous his behavior has been. Now, God knows in eternity past that David is not going to do this; however, God still allows David some time on his own before stepping in.

On a personal note, God has greatly blessed me to allow me to exegete His Word. I don’t have a schedule that I have to meet; I don’t have a particular book that I must complete at a particular time, so this allows me to form questions as I exegete a book, to ruminate, and to go back and make corrections where they are necessary. Much of my background is in mathematics—and I particularly enjoyed proofs—so that, I often view much of what I study in the Bible as a puzzle. For instance, twice in this chapter, God tells David that He will discipline David out in the sun. Why “in the sun” and why is this said twice? On my second passthrough on this chapter, it began to fit together and to make sense. Another question occurred to me (many occur to me as I work on a chapter): why is the prophecy about David’s mistresses being taken more clear? Why doesn’t God say, “Your son,
Absalom, is going to violate the 10 mistresses that you leave behind”? With word processing software, I can bury these questions as hidden comments or as a part of the hidden document summary, so that they are always there, eating away at me, until God the Holy Spirit reveals why this, and why that. What this has done is given me greater respect for the Word of God, because it becomes clear that, this or that phrase, this or that doubling, are not things simply thrown in at random, but that every jot and tittle has meaning and purpose (in fact, many have multiple purposes). It is a great blessing to be able to do this.

You may or may not have an interest in this, but I go through this chapter 4 times, as I do most other chapters of the Bible. I first exegete it word-by-word, and add in a few doctrines and commentary as I go. Usually, I spend a day on each verse or two (for me, a “day” is 2–3 hours). Then I go back over the chapter again, verse-by-verse, seeing if there is anything which I left out, if there is anything which ought to be explained better, and I add a little text. This can increase the size of the volume by 50% or more. During this second pass-through, I read what about 10 different commentators have said, and see if they have observed anything which I missed. Then I have about a dozen books which I go through—manners and customs books; figures of speech, and a set of Geisler’s books—and I see if they have any insight that I may have missed. Then, I sit down with my notes from R. B. Thieme, Jr.’s Bible class, and see if I missed anything else. This final step, I have only begun to do recently. When faced with these final chapters of Samuel, I knew that I might be out of my depth; so I have gone back and re-listened to Bob’s David Series, to help me flesh out anything that I may have missed. At some point in time, I will append the rest of my notes in Samuel with any information or observations which Bob made.

At one time, I had hoped to exegete the entire Bible; then, recognizing that I probably won’t live forever in a non-resurrected body, maybe I should hope for just exequing the Old Testament. At this point, I am hoping to complete Samuel; and then go back and redo Genesis (my first attempt at exegeting this book embarrasses me).

Enough about me; let’s see what is going on with David’s life:

If I was arranging the chapter divisions, this portion of 2Sam. 11:27 would mark the beginning of 2Sam. 12. Therefore, I will repeat the exegesis and commentary of the last portion of 2Sam. 11:27.

As you will see in the translations below, many English translators agree with this alternate organization. The division of the Bible into chapters and verses was not inspired and occurred long after the original text was committed to writing.

And so the thing which David did was evil in the eyes of Y’hovah.

What David did was evil in the sight of Jehovah.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts: Note: I compare the Hebrew text to English translations of the Latin, Syriac and Greek texts, using the Douay-Rheims translation²; George Lamsa’s translation, and Sir Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton’s translation as revised and edited by Paul W. Esposito, respectively. I often update these texts with non-substantive changes (e.g., you for thou, etc.). I often use the text of the Complete Apostles’ Bible instead of Brenton’s translation, because it updates the English text.

² I have begun to doubt my e-sword Douay-Rheims version, so I now use www.latinvulgate.com.
The Septuagint was the earliest known translation of a book (circa 200 B.C.). Since this translation was made before the textual criticism had been developed into a science and because different books appear to be translated by different men, the Greek translation can sometimes be very uneven.

When there are serious disparities between my translation and Brenton’s (or the text of the Complete Apostles’ Bible), I look at the Greek text of the Septuagint (the LXX) to see if a substantive difference actually exists (and I reflect these changes in the English rendering of the Greek text). I use the Greek LXX with Strong’s numbers and morphology available for e-sword. The only problem with this resource (which is a problem for similar resources) is, there is no way to further explore Greek verbs which are not found in the New Testament.

The Masoretic text is the Hebrew text with all of the vowels (vowel points) inserted (the original Hebrew text lacked vowels). We take the Masoretic text to be the text closest to the original. However, differences between the Masoretic text and the Greek, Latin and Syriac are worth noting and, once in a great while, represent a more accurate text possessed by those other ancient translators.

In general, the Latin text is an outstanding translation from the Hebrew text into Latin and very trustworthy (I say this as a non-Catholic). Unfortunately, I do not read Latin—apart from some very obvious words—so I am dependent upon the English translation of the Latin (principally, the Douay-Rheims translation).

Underlined words indicate differences in the text.

Bracketed portions of the Dead Sea Scrolls are words, letters and phrases lost in the scroll due to various types of damage. Underlined words or phrases are those in the Dead Sea Scrolls but not in the Masoretic text.

Latin Vulgate
And this thing which David had done, was displeasing to the Lord.
Masoretic Text (Hebrew)
And so is evil the word that did David in eyes of Y’howah.
Peshitta (Syriac)
But the thing that David had done displeased the LORD.
Septuagint (Greek)
And the thing which David did was evil in the eyes of the Lord.

Significant differences: There are 2 possible choices for the second to the last verb, and this is also reflected in the Latin and Syriac as opposed to the Greek (the Greek translates this with a noun and a verb).

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV
The LORD was angry at what David had done,...
Easy English (Pocock)
But God was not pleased with the thing that David had done.
Easy-to-Read Version
But the Lord did not like the bad thing David had done.
Good News Bible (TEV)
But the LORD was not pleased with what David had done.
The Message
But GOD was not at all pleased with what David had done,... The Message places the end of verse 27 at the beginning of 2Sam. 12.
New Century Version
...but the Lord did not like what David had done.
New Life Bible
But what David had done was sinful in the eyes of the Lord.

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

American English Bible
However, this whole thing appeared wicked in the eyes of Jehovah.
Ancient Roots Translinear
But the word that David did offended Yahweh’s eyes.
But the LORD considered David's actions evil.

NIRV: But the Lord wasn't pleased with what David had done.

New Simplified Bible: However, Jehovah considered David's actions evil.

Revised English Bible: But what David had done was wrong in the eyes of the LORD.

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

Bible in Basic English: But the Lord was not pleased with the thing David had done.

Complete Jewish Bible: But ADONAI saw what David had done as evil.

HCSB: However, the LORD considered what David had done to be evil.

JPS (Tanakh—1985): But the L ORD was displeased with what David had done,... Several translations, including the Tanakh, place the final sentence of this chapter with the chapter that follows.

NET Bible®: But what David had done upset the LORD [Heb "and the thing which David had done was evil in the eyes of the Lord." Note the verbal connection with v. 25. Though David did not regard the matter as evil, the Lord certainly did.].

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

American KJV: But the thing that David had done displeased the LORD.

Context Group Version: But the thing that David had done displeased YHWH.

Heritage Bible: And the word that David had done was evil in the eyes of Jehovah..

Modern KJV: And the thing which David had done was evil in the eyes of Jehovah.

New RSV: Nathan Condemns David

Syndein: But the thing that David had done was evil in the eyes of Jehovah/God.

World English Bible: But the thing that David had done displeased Yahweh.

Young’s Updated LT: ...and the thing which David has done is evil in the eyes of Jehovah.

The gist of this verse: What David did was evil in the sight of God.

---

**2Samuel 11:27f (This could be seen as 2Samuel 12:1a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (i) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is often typical for each sentence—in fact, each thought—to begin with a wâw consecutive (or a wâw conjunction) in the Hebrew. However, it is not necessary in an English translation to include a connective at every such juncture, as our language does not necessarily require that for successive thoughts or actions.

| rá’a’ (רָא’) [pronounced raw-GAHG] | to make a loud noise; to be evil [from the idea of raging or being tumultuous]; to be bad, to displease; possibly to be unpleasant and embittering; to break, to shatter | 3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect | Strong’s #7489 BDB #949 |

E-sword has the following verb instead:
2Samuel 11:27f (This could be seen as 2Samuel 12:1a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yâra ( יָרָ֣א) [pronounced yaw-RAH]</td>
<td>to grieve, to displease</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong's #3415 BDB #438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This will be discussed below in great detail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dâbâr ( דָֽבָ֖ר) [pronounced daw'-VAWR]</td>
<td>word, saying, doctrine, thing, matter, command</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong's #1697 BDB #182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'âsher ( אַשֵּׁ֣ר) [pronounced ash-ER]</td>
<td>that, which, when, who, whom</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
<td>Strong's #834 BDB #81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'âsâh ( עָשַׁד) [pronounced gaw-SAWH]</td>
<td>to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong's #6213 BDB #793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid ( דַֽוִּיד)</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong's #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b ( ב) [pronounced b']</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'êynayim ( עֵינָ֣יֵם) [pronounced ĕy-nah-YIM]</td>
<td>eyes, two eyes, literal eye(s), spiritual eyes; face, appearance, form; surface</td>
<td>feminine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong's #5869 (and #5871) BDB #744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This phrase is literally in their eyes, but it can be translated in their opinion, in their estimation, to their way of thinking, as they see [it]. Together, the bêyth preposition and the construct 'îynêy ( וְיָנֵ֣י) [pronounced ĝee-NAY], literally mean in the eyes of; it can be understood to mean in the opinion of, in the thinking of, in the estimation of; as ____ sees things to be.

| YHWH ( יהוה) [pronunciation is possibly yho-WAH] | transliterated variously as Jehovah, Yahweh, Y'howah | proper noun | Strong's #3068 BDB #217 |

Translation: And so the thing which David did was evil in the eyes of Y'howah. While his army went off to war, David stuck around Jerusalem. Although he had about 20 wives and mistresses to choose from, he awoke one afternoon, saw another woman (Bathsheba) and greatly desired her. Even after finding out that she was the wife of one of his soldiers, David called for her to be brought to the palace and he had sex with her. Although the text is not clear, it is possible that he raped her. This is discussed in greater detail in 2Sam. 11 (HTML) (PDF). However, the reason that rape is suspected is, David’s punishment is going to involve rape (the rape of his daughter and the rape of his wives and mistresses). When it turns out that Bathsheba was impregnated by David, he tried to get her husband back to Jerusalem and back home, so that he thinks the child is his. The husband, Uriah, cannot be coaxed to the bed of his wife, because his fellow soldiers are at war; so David has this gallant man killed. The thing which David did was evil in the eyes of Y'howah.

---

3 R. B. Thieme, Jr. estimates that David had 30–35 wives and mistresses in his 1972 David series, lesson #264.
The way this is written, with the birth of the child of this adulterous union being mentioned in 2Sam. 11:27a: When the time of mourning had passed, David sent a messenger to Bathsheba and he had her relocated to his palace. Consequently, she became his wife and gave birth to a son. This suggests that God waits a few months before sending Nathan to speak to David. God is allowing David to choose to recover on his own, if he so chooses.

Nathan Comes to David

You will notice that, in these first 14 verses, Nathan is going to do almost all of the talking. David really has very little to say here. He is able to recognize the evil and arrogance and selfishness of the rich man, and he will pronounce judgment over the rich man, but that is but 2 verses. Near the end, David will acknowledge his sin before God, and that will take up a half of a verse. So, almost everything which is said here is God speaking through Nathan.

Slavishly literal: Moderately literal:

And so sends Y*howah Nathan unto David; and so he comes unto him; and so he says to him, “Two of men in a city one—one rich and one being poor.

Therefore, Y*howah sent Nathan unto David, so he went to him. Nathan [lit., he] said to David [lit., him], “[There are] two men in a certain city—one rich and the other poor.

Therefore, Jehovah told Nathan to go to David, so Nathan went to him. Nathan said to David, “There were two men in a certain city—one rich and one poor.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

| Latin Vulgate | And and the Lord sent Nathan to David: and when he was come to him, he said to him: There were two men in one city, the one rich, and the other poor. |
| Masoretic Text (Hebrew) | And so sends Y*howah Nathan unto David; and so he comes unto him; and so he says to him, “Two of men in a city one—one rich and one being poor. |
| Peshitta (Syriac) | AND the LORD sent Nathan the prophet to David. And he came to him and said to him, There were two men in a certain city, the one rich and the other poor. |
| Septuagint (Greek) | And the Lord sent Nathan the prophet to David; and he went in to him, and said to him, There were two men in one city, one rich and the other poor. |

Significant differences: The Greek and Syriac both have the prophet following Nathan.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

| CEV | The LORD was angry at what David had done, and he sent Nathan the prophet to tell this story to David: A rich man and a poor man lived in the same town. |
| Easy English (Pocock) | The *Lord sent Nathan to David. Nathan went to David and he said, ‘Two men lived in one city. One man was rich. The other man was poor. |
| Easy-to-Read Version | The Lord sent Nathan to David. Nathan went to David. Nathan said, “There were two men in a city. One man was rich. But the other man was poor. |
| Good News Bible (TEV) | The LORD sent the prophet Nathan to David. Nathan went to him and said, ‘There were two men who lived in the same town; one was rich and the other poor. |
But GOD was not at all pleased with what David had done, and sent Nathan to David. Nathan said to him, "There were two men in the same city--one rich, the other poor.

Nathan Rebukes David
So the Lord sent Nathan the prophet to tell David this story: "There were two men in a certain town. One was rich, and one was poor.

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

American English Bible
So, Jehovah sent the Prophet Nathan to David. he went in and said to him, `There were two men who lived in the same city, one was rich, and the other was poor.

Ancient Roots Translinear
Yahweh sent Nathan to David. He came to him and said to him, "Two men were in one city, one rich and one destitute.

God's Word™
So the LORD sent Nathan to David. Nathan came to him and said, "There were two men in a certain city. One was rich, and the other was poor.

New American Bible
The LORD sent Nathan to David, and when he came to him, he said: "Judge this case for me! In a certain town there were two men, one rich, the other poor.

NIRV
David's Son Dies
The Lord sent the prophet Nathan to David. When Nathan came to him, he said, "Two men lived in the same town. One was rich. The other was poor.

New Jerusalem Bible
Yahweh sent the prophet Nathan to David. He came to him and said: In the same town were two men, one rich, the other poor.

Revised English Bible
The L ORD sent Nathan the prophet to David, and when he entered the king’s presence, he said, "In a certain town there lived two men, one rich, the other poor.

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

Bible in Basic English
And the Lord sent Nathan to David. And Nathan came to him and said, There were two men in the same town: one a man of great wealth, and the other a poor man.

Complete Jewish Bible
ADONAI sent Natan to David. He came and said to him, "In a certain city there were two men, one rich, the other poor.

HCSB
So the LORD sent Nathan to David. When he arrived, he said to him: There were two men in a certain city, one rich and the other poor.

JPS (Tanakh—1985)
...and the L ORD sent Nathan to David. He came to him and saidm, "There were two men in the same city, one rich and one poor.

NET Bible®
Nathan the Prophet Confronts David
So the LORD sent Nathan [A few medieval Hebrew mss, the LXX, and the Syriac Peshitta add "the prophet." The words are included in a few modern English version (e.g., TEV, CEV, NLT).] to David. When he came to David [Heb "him"; the referent (David) has been specified in the translation for clarity.]. Nathan [Heb "he"; the referent (Nathan) has been specified in the translation for clarity.] said [The Hebrew text repeats "to him."]., "There were two men in a certain city, one rich and the other poor.

New International Version
Nathan Rebukes David
The LORD sent Nathan to David. When he came to him, he said, "There were two men in a certain town, one rich and the other poor.

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

Concordant Literal Version
And Yahweh sends Nathan unto David, and he comes unto him, and said to him: 'Two men have been in one city; One rich and one poor;"
And the LORD sent Nathan to David. He came to him and said to him, "There were two men in a certain city, the one rich and the other poor.

The gist of this verse: God sends the prophet Nathan to David, and Nathan begins telling David a parable (which David does not at first see as an hypothetical or as just a story).
Although the first part of this verse reads: Therefore, Y*hovah sent Nathan unto David,...; God came to Nathan and He told him to go to David. We do not know how God appeared to Nathan (I would assume a dream), but, in whatever form, God would have spoken to Nathan (even though these details are left out of the narrative).

As an aside, we know very little about the “Nathan” side of this narrative, because Nathan did not record this information (in my opinion). This narrative will appear to center more on David, so we have no back story on Nathan. Nathan just shows up here. He comes out of nowhere. Although we know that he is sent by God, we do not know where he has been or what he has been doing. We know almost nothing about Nathan personally. This would suggest that David recorded this narrative, as most of it is more centered on David himself. That is, from his point of view, what is recorded here is stuff that David actually experienced.

In retrospect, David knew that God despised that which he did; and, given what Nathan will say to him, it is clear that Nathan was sent by God. However, Nathan is not the focus of this narrative. Given the details which we have and the details that are missing, it would be reasonable to think that David wrote most of these chapters of the Word of God.

David originally went to Nathan a decade or so previously when he was thinking about building a Temple—a permanent place in which Jehovah Elohim would be worshiped—back in 2Sam. 7. This in itself was a marvelous passage. We found out that, man is designed to be capable of independent thinking. That is, David came up with this idea on his own. God did not somehow implant this idea into him, nor did David read the Scriptures and say, “Hey, it says here, I ought to be building a Temple.” Based upon his own thinking, David comes up with what would be considered an original thought. The Jews have long held the Land of Promise. David has established his kingdom with Jerusalem as the capital city. He has a beautiful palace that was built for him by Hiram, king of Tyre. Therefore, there is no need for the Ark of God to continue to be kept in a semi-permanent tent. That tent was designed to be moved about. However, at this point, there is no reason to continue with a semi-permanent tent; why not build a permanent building in which Israel could worship God? This is a logical thought process which David went through.

David’s idea did not catch God by surprise—that is hardly the case. But the concept is, we are all capable of independent thought, and that we have not been programmed to think in this or that way. There are some limitations upon man—just like we cannot simply decide to sprout wings and fly—but God designed us to be able to think originally and independently.

When David first spoke to Nathan and said, “I am thinking about building a Temple; what do you think?” Nathan, perhaps even a little overwhelmed that David is speaking to him and values his opinion on the matter, says, “Sounds good to me.” God later spoke to Nathan and told him, “David is not going to be the one to build a Temple for Me.” The primary reason for God would not allow David to build this Temple is typology. David is a type of Jesus Christ in His first and second advents. The Jews have long held the Land of Promise. David has established his kingdom with Jerusalem as the capital city. He has a beautiful palace that was built for him by Hiram, king of Tyre. Therefore, there is no need for the Ark of God to continue to be kept in a semi-permanent tent. That tent was designed to be moved about. However, at this point, there is no reason to continue with a semi-permanent tent; why not build a permanent building in which Israel could worship God? This is a logical thought process which David went through.

Before, David called for Nathan; now, God sends Nathan to David. David is so far gone that, he does not even once turn to God and say, “I name my sin to You; I have made such a mess of things; what can I do?” David is beyond that. He is beyond the point where God can reach him directly. God will have to speak to David through an intermediary, and God will speak to David by a parable. That is, God, through Nathan, will speak to David and appeal to his natural nature. Although David is inside of the interlocking systems of arrogance, he still has, as a part of his nature, a sense of justice and right and wrong. Even though David is deep in degeneracy, a skirt-chaser who has just had a noble and innocent man killed, David still has embers of his decent self barely kept alive inside himself. Nathan will seek to reach that part of David’s nature, in order to cause him to recognize what it was that he has done.

---

This is a reference specifically to those with the gift of teaching in any dispensation.
Nathan’s Objectivity in the Use of his Spiritual Gift

1. There are a variety of gifts which the Holy Spirit distributes at salvation; not all of the enumerated in the New Testament. Believers like James Strong developed Strong’s concordance; 1000’s of unknown believers preserved the Word of God over many centuries prior to the printing press, and some write commentaries.

2. God requires faithfulness of His workers, no matter what their spiritual gift (or gifts) are. You may or may not think that your gift is all that much, but it still requires spiritual growth and the application of doctrine to your life. Therefore, you must be faithful in the execution of your spiritual gift.
   1) Let’s look at it this way: you probably have a job, and your boss is probably not looking over your shoulder 8 hours a day making sure that you are doing your work. However, you don’t start goofing off the moment he wanders off. You continue to do your work, whether the boss is standing right behind you or not.
   2) The same is true with the execution of our own spiritual gift (or gifts). We must faithfully execute the plan of God which He has put before us.

3. The power of teaching is found in the power of God the Holy Spirit and in the Word of God; it is never found in the personality of the person exercising his spiritual gift.

4. In this chapter, Nathan was sent on a dangerous and difficult mission. He has the necessary spiritual growth to do what God has put before him. Wisdom is the application of doctrine to experience, and that is what Nathan did in this chapter. He had the gift of prophecy (not many people had specific spiritual gifts in the Old Testament).

5. Suppose Nathan approached David in self-righteousness. He confronts David and tells him what a lousy person he is, and then lays out, publically, David’s sins. Every jaw in the palace would drop.
   1) David is the highest authority in Israel. Approaching him with self-righteousness essentially attacks David’s authority and embarrasses David publically.
   2) For those in the palace who did not know what happened, this would have shocked them.
   3) However, this approach would not necessarily deal directly with David’s sinfulness. David may have been shocked or taken aback, but this may not have reached deep enough into his soul to change him in any way. Hell, David may have even had Nathan locked up.
   4) Even though David is in authority and 100% wrong, Nathan cannot approach him in such a way as to attack his authority.
   5) There is the grace principle in authority orientation. If your boss has made a mistake, you do not necessarily embarrass him publically. You do not sent an email to everyone in the office outlining his wrongdoing. Some respect must be paid to the authority, despite the failings of the person in authority.
   6) David was an absolute jerk. However, God did not call upon Nathan to call David a jerk. Unless you are parents, you do not generally confront people about their carnality. That is not your job in life. You do not confront others with respect to their failures.
   7) Now, this is very different if you are in charge of someone. Under those circumstances, you can deal directly with that person’s sin or failing—whether you are that child’s coach, teacher, or a drill sergeant, or the department head, etc. However, even then, there is a proper way to brace someone and an improper way to do this. Someone may fail, and you are his superior; you do not necessarily publically embarrass them (although, that might be reasonable in some instances).

6. Having any sort of spiritual gift does not mean that God can or will use you. No matter how great your gift is, or how wonderful you are, humanly speaking, if you are arrogant, then God cannot use you.
   1) Some churches and Christian organizations love getting a hold of a celebrity who has been recently converted and use him to their advantage. This may draw in a few more bodies into the church.
   2) However, that does not mean that God is using that church or that celebrity.
   3) Works done in the energy of the flesh are worthless and will be burned at the Judgment Seat of Christ.

7. A person who lacks authority-orientation or fro cannot be used by God. Nathan was not an arrogant man. He was not self-righteous and he did not look down his nose at David. Nathan was authority oriented and he recognized David’s political authority. Similarly, David recognized Nathan’s authority in the spiritual realm (although, it is not clear that David fully respected Nathan’s authority at this point in time).
### Nathan’s Objectivity in the Use of his Spiritual Gift

1. What appears to be the case is, Nathan comes to David to get a judicial ruling.
2. David has no idea that the parable that Nathan puts before him is a parable. He believes that this is an actual case, and that he is to help Nathan decide the correct outcome for this matter.
3. Therefore, when Nathan shows up, David is not submitting to Nathan’s spiritual authority; he is simply doing Nathan a favor by deciding a judicial matter.

8. Nathan recognizes and respects David’s authority in the temporal realm. There are a variety of authority, some temporal and some spiritual. Nathan’s spiritual authority will kick in when David judges himself.
9. In the spiritual realm, God uses prepared people. If you are arrogant, God will not use you. If you are unprepared (without spiritual growth), God will not use you. If you lack authority orientation, God will not use you.
10. God wants to use David, but He cannot because David is deep into the interlocking systems of arrogance. He is ruled by his sexual lusts. By the way, this is great grace, that God wants to use David. God could have stomped David into the ground, and raised up a stone to be a better ruler than David, but He did not. God will use Nathan to start to turn David around, so that God can continue to use David.

1) Do not ever think that you are indispensable to the plan of God. God chose to use David, but He did not have to.
2) Had David remained in his lusts—had David continued to resist God—then God would have removed David from this life with the sin unto death.
3) Therefore, do not ever think that God cannot get along without you. He can remove your or I in an instant. When we get to the point where we are unteachable, and there is no being turned around, God will remove us from this life.

11. We do not execute the plan of God based upon having a great personality. There is nothing wrong with having a personality, but that is not the issue. Doctrine in the soul is the issue. If you have that, you can execute the plan of God, even with your personality, good or bad.
12. One’s personality and one’s are a facade which often covers over the nature of a person’s soul. I knew this very gorgeous gal that I dated. She looked like a model. However, as her looks faded, the quality of her soul became more and more apparent.
1) Movie stars get by on looks and often on a personality which is not even theirs.
2) To those who know them personally, these are not necessary great or wonderful people.
3) However, because they are very attractive, and because they have learned to project this or that personality, they are admired and desired.

13. We do not know how many prophets there were in Israel. There were more than just Nathan. However, God chose Nathan to speak to David because Nathan had authority orientation and because Nathan did not approach David out of self-righteousness. Nathan is confronting David not just over a sin, but over a lifestyle.
14. Furthermore, David himself had to acknowledge this. It was not good enough for Nathan to show up and tell David how he had sinned. This requires finesse.
15. Nathan will teach David by finesse. David will understand who is he and what he has done and how God will beat him down, because of Nathan’s teaching.
16. Nathan will put together a great story which will capture David’s attention and imagination, and, by the end of the story, David ends up judging himself. Nathan had to finesse David from being subjective and controlled by lust, to a point where, David can see himself objectivity. In order to do this, David could not be distracted by self-righteousness or personality quirks of Nathan.

---

### The New Testament Gift of Pastor-teacher

1. Just like Nathan mentioned above, the pastor-teacher must be both grace orientated and authority
The New Testament Gift of Pastor-teacher

2. Grace orientation means, the pastor realizes that he depends upon God in all things. That is, he is not some great pastor-teacher because he is a great man, but because he depends upon God’s grace.

3. The pastor-teacher has before him a period of preparation, he has God the Holy Spirit, and he has a myriad of resources upon which to depend. He is standing upon many shoulders, who have, in turn, stood upon many other shoulders. This is grace.

4. That the pastor-teacher can dig so much out of the Bible is the grace of God.

5. Authority orientation means, the pastor-teacher understands and properly applies his authority; and recognizes that the authority of the Trinity and the authority of the Word of God are over him.

6. Therefore, a pastor-teacher must teach what he finds in the Word of God, even if it steps all over him personally.

7. The larger the congregation, the less a pastor can do. He must be self-disciplined and organized; and he must be able to delegate authority.

8. The pastor must recognize that his primary duty is teaching the Word of God, and teaching it as often as he possibly can. If a pastor is physically and mentally capable of studying the Word of God for 8 hours a day (or, whatever), then that ought to be his focus. Everything else is secondary.

9. In order for a pastor to teach, there must be good discipline within the church when teaching the Word of God. A pastor cannot tolerate talking, passing notes, or anything else which detracts from the teaching of the Word of God.

10. Although the pastor-teacher is a servant to those that he teaches, this is in that particular realm. That is, he must dedicate himself to the study and teaching of the Word of God, and he does that day in and day out, to serve his congregation. However, that servitude does not mean that you can call upon the pastor to do whatever it is that you want him to do (visit you in the hospital, counsel you, etc.).

11. Giving to the church does not mean that you have some special in with the pastor or that you can tell him what to do. There is a board of deacons and they can choose to fire the pastor; but you, as a parishioner, have no special privileges.

12. All churches are filled with people who have sin natures. The old sin nature rejects all legitimate authority and seeks, in many cases, illegitimate authority. Obviously, the pastor faces not only all of these sin natures, but finds himself smack dab in the middle of the Angelic Conflict as well. Therefore, there will be pressures and difficulties.

13. Hence, the importance for the pastor to be grace oriented and authority oriented.

14. There is no substitute for the teaching of God’s Word. A church cannot get by with programs, a point system, a wonderful and energetic choir, a crack staff of counselors, etc. The people in the church must grow based upon the Word of God.

15. Therefore, the primary function of the church is the accurate communication of doctrine. All that goes on within the walls of the church must facilitate that teaching. Everyone involved in this ministry must run interference for the pastor-teacher. A quarterback might be able to run with great speed and agility, but, if there is no blocking, he cannot go 2 feet. Those involved in the administration of the church must therefore do what they can to allow the pastor to study and teach. Those in the congregation must also participate in this blocking (whether it be by prayer or in keeping your life under control so that you don’t think you need to come down and see the pastor every 5 minutes.

16. With the proper teaching and blocking, a pastor can lead his congregation to spiritual maturity.
### 2Samuel 12:1b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (i) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bôw (דָּב) [pronounced boh]</td>
<td>to come in, to come, to go in, to go, to enter</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #935 BDB #97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’el (אֵל) [pronounced ehl]</td>
<td>unto; into, among, in; toward, to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to</td>
<td>directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied); with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #413 BDB #39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...so he went to him. Nathan is under God’s authority. He willingly goes to David. We actually have the word unto here because, as king, David positionally has the respect of Nathan.

**Application:** You may not like the President, your governor, your mayor or the policeman who just stopped you for speeding, but they have authority over us in specific instances and we are to respect that authority.

The more relaxed translation, so far, is: Therefore, Jehovah told Nathan to go to David, so Nathan went to him. I have inserted a few words here, but it better conveys what happened, based upon the reasonable assumption that God went to Nathan, in some form, and then told Nathan to go to David.

Nathan’s authority at this point will not be an issue with David. When he comes to David at first, it is going to be as a friend asking legal advice. Nathan will assert his authority after a bit, but only once David has realized the heinous nature of his own sins.

Notice what else we do not know: is Nathan personally aware of what David did? Has he heard rumors? Did God tell him what David did? Nathan will launch into a parable, which David did not recognize as being a parable—did God suggest this parable to Nathan? Did Nathan put this together in his mind as he walked to the palace? Or, when he began to speak to the king, did the Holy Spirit guide him? These are details that Nathan would have known, but details which are irrelevant to the narrative at hand. What is relevant is, David’s sin, and what God will do about it. What is relevant is, how will David respond to Nathan’s parable, and will he recognize himself in this parable? What is relevant is, what will David do, upon hearing the entire parable and then realizing that this is all about him?

This narrative, which is quite extensive, is important to us—that is why we find it recorded in the Word of God. There are millions of believers who, in one way or another, have been trapped by their own degeneracy, or trapped within the interlocking systems of arrogance, as a result of their own volition.

### 2Samuel 12:1c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (i) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’âmar (אָמַר) [pronounced aw-MAHR]</td>
<td>to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #559 BDB #55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel 12:1c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לָּעַם) [pronounced ʾlām]</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to, belonging to</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition; with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: Nathan [lit., he] said to David [lit., him].... Here, rather than the more respectful unto, Nathan speaks to David. David, even in his condition, respects Nathan. However, he may not respect Nathan’s authority at this point. God is going to have to reach David through a parable. A parable is a made-up story, but the characters and situations are familiar to a hearer of that era.

Nathan is not going to David and saying, "Listen to this parable, King David." He is appealing to David as the supreme court judge of Israel. He is bringing to David a legal case over which David has jurisdiction, and he is asking for David’s ruling in the matter. David will hear this case, be able to think of it objectively, and he will render a fair judgment, never realizing that this case is actually about him (until the end).

I want you to see this next dozen verses in this light: David is not engaged in idle chit-chat with Nathan (along the lines of, “Okay, David, what would you do if such and such occurred?”); nor does he recognize that this is a parable (Nathan does not say to him, “Now listen to this story, David, and give me your opinion.”). David thinks that this is an honest-to-goodness court case to which Nathan is privy, and Nathan is asking for David’s ruling in this situation. There are reasons that Nathan is presenting this case to David, rather than bringing in the two men; but David is not concerned as to the reason. Nathan, as a prophet, has cred with David.

If you have ever talked to a doctor, lawyer, psychologist, high governmental official, a judge, you might begin discussing with that person a personal experience of yours or an experience of close friends of yours, in order to elicit their professional opinion. That is how David sees this.

J. Vernon McGee: Nathan is going to tell David a story. It is a story that will reveal David as though he were looking in a mirror. The Word of God is a mirror that reveals us as we really are. Nathan is going to hold up a mirror so that David can get a good look at himself.¹

2Samuel 12:1d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shânēy (שָנֶה) [pronounced shān-ā]</td>
<td>two, two of, a pair of, a duo of</td>
<td>dual numeral construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #8147 BDB #1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾānâsiyûm (אָנָסִי) [pronounced uh-NAW-seem]; also spelled ʾîyshîyûm (אִישִי) [pronounced ee-SHEEM]</td>
<td>men; inhabitants, citizens; companions; soldiers, followers</td>
<td>masculine plural noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #376 BDB #35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hâyâh (הָיָה) [pronounced haw-YAW]</td>
<td>to be, is, was, are; to become, to come into being; to come to pass</td>
<td>3rd person plural, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #1961 BDB #224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ J. Vernon McGee; I & II Samuel; Thru the Bible Books; Eternal life Camino Press, 1976, La Verne, CA; p. 228.
### 2Samuel 12:1d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ב&quot; (b) [pronounced b&quot; ]</td>
<td>in, into, through; at, by, near, on, upon; with, before, against; by means of; among; within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִיְר (yīër) [pronounced geer]</td>
<td>encampment, city, town</td>
<td>feminine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #5892 BDB #746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְכָּחַד (yēḵāḏ) [pronounced eh-KHAWD]</td>
<td>one, first, certain, only; each, every; but it can also mean a composite unity; possibly particular; anyone</td>
<td>numeral adjective</td>
<td>Strong’s #259 BDB #25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָשִּׁיְר (âsiyr) [pronounced ġaw-SHEER]</td>
<td>rich; wealthy; can be used as a substantive to mean the rich, the wealth, a rich man</td>
<td>masculine singular adjective; can be used as a substantive</td>
<td>Strong’s #6223 BDB #799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ו” (or ו) ( và , và )</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wāw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְכָּחַד (yēḵāḏ) [pronounced eh-KHAWD]</td>
<td>one, first, certain, only; each, every; but it can also mean a composite unity; possibly particular; anyone</td>
<td>numeral adjective</td>
<td>Strong’s #259 BDB #25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רֹוְש (rōwsh) [pronounced roosh]</td>
<td>to be in want, to be needy, to be poor</td>
<td>Qal active participle</td>
<td>Strong’s #7326 BDB #930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** "[There are] two men in a certain city—one rich and the other poor. If you went through the Hebrew exegesis above, you have noticed that the word יְכָּחַד (yēḵāḏ) [pronounced eh-KHAWD] occurs 3 times, and it is used differently all 3 times. All of this takes place within the space of 10 words, where 3 of them are the same word, and yet, each of these 3 times, we use a different word to translate יְכָּחַד (yēḵāḏ) [pronounced eh-KHAWD]. The exact literal translation is given at the beginning of this exegesis. However, the way a word is translated is sometimes determined by the context, and the few words around it. Therefore, יָהוָה sent Nathan unto David, so he went to him. Nathan [lit., he] said to David [lit., him], "[There are] two men in a certain יְכָּחַד (yēḵāḏ) city—one יְכָּחַד (yēḵāḏ) rich and the other יְכָּחַד (yēḵāḏ) poor."

This will be a parable. There is a story, to which David can fully relate, and David is going to find out that this has direct application to him, once Nathan completes the story. However, it is very important to understand, David doesn’t think that Nathan is just coming up to him and chatting him up about some made-up story. This is not some hypothetical which Nathan has just conjured up in order to make conversation. David is a judge; this is a
part of his responsibility as king over all Israel, so it would make sense to David that Nathan would come to him with a legal problem or a legal question. David believes what Nathan is telling him. He has no reason not to.

Why does God use parables? When a person is directly attacked for something that they do, they immediately go on the defensive. They listen to enough of what they are being told to recognize that they are being attacked, and they do not hear anything after that. What is in their mind is, “How do I explain myself?” or “Well, I never!” or “Listen, this is really what happened.” Surely you have seen two people argue politics before, and neither person listens to what the other one is saying; they are just resting and regathering their thoughts in order to argue their case. The only reason they stop and allow their opponent to say a few things is, they have run out of things to say, and they need to stop and regroup for a moment. I personally enjoy watching political pundits hash things out, but so often, a person will take a question and pivot away from that question, in order to make a barely related point. At best, they deflect what the other person says, in order to say what they want to say; at worst, they ignore completely what they other person says.

So it is with a personal attack. Nathan needs David to look at himself objectively. Therefore, Nathan is going to engage David’s full intellect and sense of compassion here. Nathan does not immediately attack David; he explains a situation—which David envisions as being true—and gets David to look at this situation objectively, which David will do. David is going to fully wrap his mind around this situation and determine what is the right and good outcome. Then, Nathan drops the bomb on David, “Now listen here, I am really talking about you!” Nathan will do that after David is both emotionally involved and after David pronounces judgment upon the cad in this story (which cad is David).

The second reason that Nathan uses a parable is, he wants David to pronounce judgment upon himself. He wants to get David to a point where he is fully engaged in this story, clearly recognizes who is right and who is wrong, and automatically, as the sovereign of the land, pronounce judgment over the rich man. Quite obviously, Nathan cannot go to David and say, “Listen, buddy, this is what you did. What punishment do you think you deserve?” David would laugh him out of the palace and/or lock Nathan up for insubordination. By using this approach, David will both see his actions objectively and, as king, pronounce judgment over himself.

**Application:** Have you ever noticed that it is quite easy to fix the lives of other people? You consider you Uncle Fred, and you think, “He would be a lot better off if he just stopped drinking.” Or, “Aunt Faye would have better friendships if she would just stop gossiping.” It is easy to look at other people and their lives and often determine how they could turn their lives around. However, it is not quite as easy for you to look at your own life, and determine what you need to do in order to fix this or that. We often learn about ourselves through the perfect mirror of the Word of God (James 1:23), which oft times puts us in touch with our own shortcomings that, were it not for the Bible, we would not recognize them.

**Application:** It is normal for the man to desire women, and some of us have thought, from time to time, that having a wife in this city and another wife in that city and a third wife elsewhere would be ideal. Movies have been written with this very theme in mind. We learn from David and Solomon that, there are simply not enough women in the world to satisfy us; and that our true satisfaction in life is based upon a relationship with one woman—it is that soul connection which is key, not the attraction of the bodies or the variety which is out there. God has given us the examples of David and Solomon, so that we do not all feel as if, we need to try this out, just to see if it works.

**Application:** This is what you must teach to your teenaged son. You must explain to him that, women are very attractive and that he will find himself attracted to many women. However, the lives of David and Solomon indicate that there is no soul satisfaction in sleeping around. In other words, you cannot satisfy the soul through giving into a physical lust. The soul is satisfied by interlocking with another soul and making that relationship permanent through marriage.

**Application:** This soul meshing with a person of the opposite sex is what homosexuals miss; they do not understand that God has designed the male and female souls to interlock, as it were. I have recently done some research in this field, and it is common for homosexuals to have many sexual partners—8/year is about average.
Most homosexual males have had in excess of 100 partners. Even in a committed relationship between homosexuals, fidelity is not a strong consideration. That is, they cannot find soul compatibility with another male; and they cannot find sexual compatibility with another male. They are nearly always on the prowl. For many homosexuals, after they have had several hundred partners, and they are still out there looking for a new hookup, it ought to occur to them, something here is wrong.

Anyway, we learn many things from the Word of God, so that we do not have to repeat the mistakes of the past. We see these lives objectively, and we understand what their problems are; and, ideally speaking, we are able to take this and apply it to ourselves.

The Bible is going to spend about 10 chapters on David’s polygamy, his adultery, and the results of these sins. This emphasis is extremely important. If God is going to spend 10 chapters on anything, then we ought to sit up and take notice. 10 years of David’s life is down the drain because of sexual arrogance. Our time here on earth is limited. For some believers, that can be half of their Christian lives. David is able to recover, in part, because he is a man after God’s Own heart. Now, do you need to be so stupid as to repeat David’s mistakes? And not only do we these 10 or so chapters, but we also have the illustration of Solomon and how, even after having a 1000 women to choose from, was still chasing after the Shulamite woman, like a dog in heat. Now, if you are a male, and you have 1000 women to choose from, can you imagine chasing after one more woman, because 1000 is not enough? Don’t spend too much time on this. Simply understand that we have the illustration of Solomon here, so that we are not so foolish as to think that, all we need is just one more woman, and this would satisfy us. It would not.

The New American Bible tells us: *This utterance of Nathan is in regular lines in Hebrew, resembling English blank verse.*

In many English translations, you may notice that these verses are formatted differently; this is to indicate that Nathan is speaking in Hebrew poetry here. My thinking is, the meter of the words will contribute to the emotional involvement that David will develop.

---

**Lyrics to Marat Sade**

Four years he fought and he fought unafraid
Sniffing down traitors by traitors betrayed
Marat in the courtroom
Marat underground
Sometimes the otter and sometimes the hound

Fighting all the gentry and fighting every priest
The business man the bourgeois the military beast
Marat always ready to stifle every scheme
Of the sons of the ass licking dying regime

---

Lyrics to Marat Sade

We've got new generals our leaders are new
They sit and they argue and all that they do
is sell their own colleagues
And ride upon their backs
Or jail them
Or break them
Or give them all the ax
Screaming in language that no one understand
Of the rights that we grab with our own bleeding hands
When we wiped out the bosses
And stormed threw the wall of the prison you told us would outlast us all

Marat we're poor
And the poor stay poor
Marat don't make us wait any more.
We want our rights and we don't care how
We want a revolution
Now

Now, I am anti-revolution; I understand that is against God's plan. However, when I hear this song sung, I am strongly moved, even against my own values. My point is, sometimes a story or a viewpoint can be made more powerful when it is presented in a way that is outside simple narrative. It can be more effective; it can grab one's attention more readily.

Video [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DcJKxrDczSo](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DcJKxrDczSo) beginning at 1:50.


Chapter Outline

At the end of v. 4, we will gather up all that Nathan says, and present it in the way that Nathan presented it.

Therefore, Jehovah told Nathan to go to David, so Nathan went to him. Nathan said to David, “There were two men in a certain city—one rich and one poor. If you have read ahead, or have heard this chapter explained before, you understand that David is the rich man and Uriah is the poor man. However, at this point in Nathan's parable, David has no idea. He does not even know that this is a parable.

J. Vernon McGee can’t help but make an observation of politics at this point: I do not often discuss politics, but I would like to put down a principle in this world of sin today. I recognize that political parties say they have solutions for the problems of the world because they want their candidates to be elected to office. I have no confidence in man. I do not believe that any politician today is going to champion the poor. This never has been done and it never will be done. Let us not kid ourselves about that.6 Let me add to this, one political party contends that it is for the little man and for those in poverty, but when that party is in power, more people become poor and more people lose their jobs at the bottom, because their solutions always exacerbate the problems they are trying to solve. Even if one was to see their concern with the poor as legitimate, still, what they do results in more poor. We can illustrate this with our present President (Barack Obama—I write this in 2011). He has been president for nearly 3 years; he had complete party control in Congress, and enacted several laws which he may have believed were good for the poor. The result? Higher unemployment, and, even today, with the unemployment situation improving slightly, unemployment among Blacks is still

---

6 J. Vernon McGee; I & II Samuel; Thru the Bible Books; Eternal life Camino Press, 1976, La Verne, CA; p. 229.
growing.  Whether this is intentional or not, I cannot say. But, it would not be a stretch to suggest that the Democratic party wants a large number of people to depend upon government, and, therefore, vote Democratic.

Nearly every single translation continues v. 2 in v. 3.

To a rich one was a flock and a herd much exceedingly;... 2Samuel 12:2 The rich man had a great many flocks and herds;...

The rich man owned a great many flocks of sheep and herds of cattle;...

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin Vulgate</td>
<td>The rich man had exceeding many sheep and oxen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masoretic Text (Hebrew)</td>
<td>To a rich one was a flock and a herd much exceedingly;...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshitta (Syriac)</td>
<td>The rich man had exceedingly many flocks and herds;...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septuagint (Greek)</td>
<td>And the rich man had very many flocks and herds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences: None. The use of the plural simply indicates the common usage of those words in a different language.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEV</td>
<td>The rich man owned a lot of sheep and cattle,...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-Read Version</td>
<td>The rich man had very many sheep and cattle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Message</td>
<td>The rich man had huge flocks of sheep, herds of cattle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Living Translation</td>
<td>The rich man owned a great many sheep and cattle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American English Bible</td>
<td>Now, the rich man had huge flocks and herds,...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Roots Translinear</td>
<td>The rich man had sheep and oxen multiplied a hundredfold,.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s Word™</td>
<td>The rich man had a very large number of sheep and cows,...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Bible</td>
<td>The rich man had flocks and herds in great numbers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bible in Basic English</td>
<td>The man of wealth had great numbers of flocks and herds;...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Jewish Bible</td>
<td>The rich man had vast flocks and herds,...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIV – UK</td>
<td>The rich man had a very large number of sheep and cattle,...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scriptures 1998</td>
<td>“The rich one had flocks and herds, very many.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concordant Literal Version</td>
<td>The rich has flocks and herds very many;...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


8 To take this one step further: our government always seems to be in favor of big business over little business. If a large bank begins to fail, government steps in to prop it up. If a small bank becomes insolvent, it is sold to a larger bank. Why? It is much easier to control those in the banking industry if there are only a few real players.
Modern KJV

The rich one had exceeding many flocks and herds,...

Syndein

The rich man {in reality David} had a great many flocks of sheep and herds of cattle,...

Young’s Updated LT

The rich had flocks and herds very many;...

**The gist of this verse:** Nathan first describes the rich man as owning a lot of livestock.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lamed (CAD)</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to, belonging to</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘āshîyr (’şiyr)</td>
<td>rich; wealthy; can be used as a substantive to mean the rich, the wealth, a rich man</td>
<td>masculine singular adjective; can be used as a substantive</td>
<td>Strong’s #6223 BDB #799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hâyâh (hawh)</td>
<td>to be, is, was, are; to become, to come into being; to come to pass</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #1961 BDB #224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsô’n (tsión)</td>
<td>small cattle, sheep and goats; flock, flocks</td>
<td>feminine singular collective noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #6629 BDB #838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w* (or v)</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bâqâr (báwr)</td>
<td>bull, cow, ox, collectively: herd, cattle, oxen</td>
<td>masculine singular collective noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1241 BDB #133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>râbâh (râôh)</td>
<td>to make [do] much; to multiply, to increase; to give much; to lay much; to have much; to make great; many [as a Hiphil infinitive construct]</td>
<td>3rd person feminine singular, Hiphil imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7235 BDB #915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also spelled tsâ’dôn (tsión) [pronounced tseh-OWN].

When the Hiphil is followed by an infinitive and gerund—or by a finite verb,—it can mean much.

The Hiphil infinitive absolute is often used as an adverb: in doing much, very much, exceedingly great (the latter two with the adverb m*ôd).

m*ôd (môd) [pronounced m*-ODE] | exceedingly, extremely, greatly, very | adverb | Strong’s #3966 BDB #547 |

**Translation:** The rich man had a great many flocks and herds;... David is listening carefully to Nathan, assuming that this is a real situation which requires David to give his true and honest opinion.

You will note that the literal translation is different from the nearly literal translation. When you have the construction to him was...; the concept here is, that person possesses the things which are to be named.
So far, we know that the rich man in question possesses a great deal of wealth with regards to cattle and sheep. This is, of course, analogous to David having many wives and mistresses (2Sam. 3:2–5 5:13–16.).

It would have been a better idea for a portion of v. 3 to be included with v. 2, at this juncture.

...and so to the poor [one] nothing all for if a ewe-lamb, small, which he acquired. And so he made her live and so she is growing up with him and with his sons together. From his morsel [of bread] she eats and from his cup she drinks, and in his bosom she lies down and she is to him like a daughter.

...but the poor man [there is] nothing except a small ewe-lamb which he had acquired. He restored her [life] and she has grown up together with him and his sons. She ate from his bread [lit., morsel (of bread)] and drank from his cup, and she lays down in his bosom—she became like a daughter to him.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

**Latin Vulgate**

But the poor man had nothing at all but one little ewe lamb, which he had bought and nourished up, and which had grown up in his house together with his children, eating of his bread, and drinking of his cup, and sleeping in his bosom: and it was unto him as a daughter.

**Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**

...and so to the poor [one] nothing all for if a ewe-lamb, small, which he acquired. And so he made her live and so she is growing up with him and with his sons together. From his morsel [of bread] she eats and from his cup she drinks, and in his bosom she lies down and she is to him like a daughter.

**Peshitta (Syriac)**

But the poor man had nothing but one little ewe lamb which he had purchased, and preserved, and reared; and it grew up with himself and his children in common; it ate of his bread and drank of his cup, and slept in his bosom, and was to him as a daughter.

**Septuagint (Greek)**

But the poor man had only one little ewe lamb, which he had purchased, and preserved, and reared; and it grew up with himself and his children in common; it ate of his bread and drank of his cup, and slept in his bosom, and was to him as a daughter.

**Significant differences:**

In the Greek, we would expect the verb to preserve to be followed by the feminine singular pronoun, but it is not (the same is true in the Latin). The Syriac leaves this verb out altogether. The Latin adds in an additional relative pronoun.

The Latin leaves out that she grows up with him.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

**CEV**

...but the poor man had only one little lamb that he had bought and raised. The lamb became a pet for him and his children. He even let it eat from his plate and drink from his cup and sleep on his lap. The lamb was like one of his own children.

**Easy English (Pocock)**

But the poor man had only one young sheep, which was female. He had bought it and he looked after it. The little sheep grew up with the man and his children. It ate the same food as the man. It drank from his cup. It even went to sleep while the man held it. The little sheep was like a daughter to the man.
But the poor man had nothing, except one little female lamb that he bought. The lamb ate from the poor man's food and drank from the poor man's cup. The lamb slept on the poor man's chest. The lamb was like a daughter to the poor man.

...while the poor man had only one lamb, which he had bought. He took care of it, and it grew up in his home with his children. He would feed it some of his own food, let it drink from his cup, and hold it in his lap. The lamb was like a daughter to him.

The poor man had nothing but one little female lamb, which he had bought and raised. It grew up with him and his children as a member of the family. It ate off his plate and drank from his cup and slept on his bed. It was like a daughter to him.

The poor man owned nothing but one little lamb he had bought. He raised that little lamb, and it grew up with his children. It ate from the man's own plate and drank from his cup. He cuddled it in his arms like a baby daughter.

In some translations, the lamb is described as like a daughter to the poor man:

- American English Bible: But he protected it and fed it, and it grew up with his children. It ate the same bread, drank from his cup, and slept inside his robe, for it was just like a daughter to him.
- Ancient Roots Translinear: It lived and grew together with him and with his sons. It ate of his morsels, drank of his cup, lay in his bosom, and was to him as a daughter.
- God's Word™: He reared her, and she grew up in his home with his children. She would eat his food and drink from his cup.
- New American Bible: He nourished her, and she grew up with him and his children. She shared the little food he had and drank from his cup and slept in his bosom.
- Revised English Bible: He reared it, and it grew up in his home together with his children. It shared his food, drank from his cut, and nestled in his arms.

In other translations, the emphasis is on the lamb's presence in the poor man's home:

- Bible in Basic English: But the only thing that the poor man owned was a small female lamb that he had bought. But he protected it and fed it, and it grew up with his children.
- Complete Jewish Bible: It had grown up with him and his children; it ate from his cup, sleeping in his arms.
- HCSB: He reared it, and it grew up with his children. It shared his food, drank from his cup, and nestled in his arms.
- NET Bible®: He reared it, and it grew up alongside him and his children [Heb "his sons."]
describe past actions that were repeated or typical.] eat his food [Heb "from his morsel."]], drink from his cup, and sleep in his arms [Heb "and on his chest [or perhaps, "lap"] it would lay."]]. It was just like a daughter to him.

NIV – UK

...but the poor man had nothing except one little ewe lamb that he had bought. He raised it, and it grew up with him and his children. It shared its food, drank from his cup and even slept in his arms. It was like a daughter to him.

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

Concordant Literal Version

And the poor one has nothing, Except one little ewe-lamb, Which he has bought, and keeps alive, And it grows up with him, And with his sons together; Of his morsel it eats, And from his cup it drinks, And in his bosom it lies, And it is to him as a daughter;"

Context Group Version

...but the poor man had nothing, except one little ewe lamb, which he had bought and fed: and it grew up together with him, and with his sons; it ate of his own morsel, and drank of his own cup, and lay in his bosom, and was to him as a daughter..

exeGeses companion Bible

...but the impoverished has naught
- except one little ewe lamb
which he chatteled and livened:
and it grows together with him and with his sons:
it eats of his own morsel and drinks of his own cup
and lies down in his bosom as his daughter.

NASB

"But the poor man had nothing except (C)one little ewe lamb
Which he bought and nourished;
And it grew up together with him and his children.
It would eat of his bread and drink of his cup and lie in his bosom,
And was like a daughter to him.

New RSV

...but the poor man had nothing but one little ewe lamb, which he had bought. He brought it up, and it grew up together with him, and with his children; it used to eat of his meagre fare, and drink from his cup, and lie in his bosom, and it was like a daughter to him.

Syndein

...but the poor man {referring to Uriah the Hittite} had nothing except one ewe lamb {his wife, Bathsheba}, which he had bought and raised up so that it grew up with him and his children and shared his food/"of his own morsel" he used to eat and drink from his own cup and even slept in this arms.

World English Bible

...but the poor man had nothing, except one little ewe lamb, which he had bought and raised. It grew up together with him, and with his children. It ate of his own food, drank of his own cup, and lay in his bosom, and was to him like a daughter

Young’s Updated LT

...and the poor one has nothing, Except one little ewe-lamb, Which he has bought, and keeps alive, And it grows up with him, And with his sons together; Of his morsel it eats, And from his cup it drinks, And in his bosom it lies, And it is to him as a daughter.

The gist of this verse:

Nathan the prophet continues the parable (which David does not recognize as being a parable). The poor man has nothing but this little female lamb which he has raised up with his own family, as if she is a daughter to him.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>va (or v) (ו, or ה)  [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple waw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lamed (ל) [pronounced l]</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to, belonging to</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruwsh (רוש) [pronounced roosh]</td>
<td>to be in want, to be needy, to be poor</td>
<td>Qal active participle with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #7326 BDB #930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a Qal active participle, this can be translated the poor, the needy.

| אֵין (אֵן) [pronounced ân] | nothing, not, [is] not; not present, not ready; expresses non-existence, absence or non-possession; [there is] no [none, no one, not] | particle of negation; substantive of negation | Strong’s #369 BDB #34 |
| קָול (קָול) [pronounced kohl]; also kol (קול) [pronounced kol] | all, all things, the whole, totality, the entirety, everything | masculine singular noun without the definite article | Strong’s #3605 BDB #481 |

Literally, these two words mean nothing of all... However, together, they mean none, nothing, [there is] nothing [to]. The words nothing at all express this combination very well.

Now, if we take the verb to be from the previous verse, this gives us the poor man had [owned] nothing... Vv. 2 and 3a belong together as one sentence, which, by ellipsis, would carry the verb to be to the second phrase.

| kîy (כי) [pronounced kee] | for, that, because; when, at that time, which, what time | explanatory conjunction; preposition | Strong’s #3588 BDB #471 |
| ’îm (אימ) [pronounced eem] | if, though; lo, behold; oh that, if only; when, since, though | primarily an hypothetical particle | Strong’s #518 BDB #49 |

Together, kîy ’îm (כי אימ) [pronounced kee-eem] act as a limitation on the preceding thought, and therefore should be rendered but, except, except that, unless and possibly only. However, these particles are not used in a limiting way if they follow an oath, a question or a negative. Then they can be rendered that if, for if, for though, that since, for if, but if, indeed if, even if; except for, but.

| kibsâh (קִבְּשָׂה) [pronounced kihb-SAW] | ewe-lamb, lamb, a female lamb | feminine singular noun | Strong’s #3535 BDB #461 |
| qâṭān (קָטָן) [pronounced kaw-TAWN] | small, young, unimportant, insignificant | feminine singular adjective | Strong’s #6996 BDB #881 |
| ’āsher (אָשֶׁר) [pronounced uh-SHER] | that, which, when, who, whom | relative pronoun | Strong’s #834 BDB #81 |

Also spelled kabsâw (קָבָשָׂו) [pronounced kahb-SAW].
2Samuel 12:3a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qânâh (קָנָה) (pronounced kaw-NAWH)</td>
<td>to get, acquire, obtain; [of God] to found, to originate, to create; to possess; to redeem [His people]; [of Eve] to acquire; to acquire [knowledge, wisdom]; to buy [purchase, redeem]</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7069 BDB #888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a far greater emphasis on this verb in the realm of possessing, buying or purchasing than there is in the realm of creating. There are some scholars who would eliminate the meanings to found, to originate, to create.

Translation: ...but to the poor man [there is] nothing except a small ewe-lamb which he had acquired. We should put vv. 2 and 3a together to get: The rich man had a great many flocks and herds; but to the poor man [there is] nothing except a small ewe-lamb which he had acquired. Nathan continues with this parable, that David does not realize is a parable. The rich man has all of these flocks and herds, and the poor man only has this little ewe lamb which he has acquired (or purchased). There is no information about whether this lamb was purchased or how she was acquired. The verb is non-specific in this area.

According to Gill: men in those times and countries did not receive portions with their wives, but gave dowries to them, and for them.9 Wesley also speaks of men purchasing their wives in that day.10

According to Keil and Delitzsch, there was a custom in that day of keeping lambs in the home as pets, much as we do with dogs; and that Arabs have continued with this custom.11

2Samuel 12:3b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו) (pronounced wah)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>châyâh (חָיָה) (pronounced khaw-YAW)</td>
<td>to cause to live, to make alive; to keep alive, to preserve; to call back to life; to restore life; to rebuild [a city]</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Piel imperfect; with the 3rd person feminine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #2421 &amp; #2425 BDB #310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: He restored her [life]... The verb here is châyâh (חָיָה) [pronounced khaw-YAW], which means, to cause to live, to make alive; to keep alive, to preserve; to call back to life; to restore life; to rebuild [a city]. Strong's #2421 & #2425 BDB #310. The implication is, this little lamb was near death and the poor man brought her back to life. This might have explained why the poor man was able to purchase this little ewe lamb—as if he purchased a very sickly lamb.

---

9 Dr. John Gill, *John Gill’s Exposition of the Entire Bible*; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:3.
10 John Wesley; *Explanatory Notes on the Whole Bible*; courtesy of e-sword, 2Sam. 12:3.
11 Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*; from e-Sword; 2Sam. 12:3. They reference Bochart, *Hieroz.* i. p. 594
Bear in mind that, all of this time, this is really about Uriah the Hittite and his wife, Bathsheba. Whereas, we ought to be careful as to how far to push this analogy, what is said here is not necessary for the general story. This suggests that, when Uriah found Bathsheba, she was in difficult straits, possibly to the point where Uriah nursed her back to life. Obviously we do not know that back-story, but the analogy suggests that Uriah was honorable and caring in his treatment of Bathsheba, and that, if he found her in a bad place, physically and emotionally, he restored her to health and to emotional stability.

If this is the case—and, bear in mind that I am pushing this analogy to suggest that it is—then her father would have been a part of this package deal. That is, given that her father, Ahithophel, will join the revolutionary army, and given that his counsel is like the counsel of God’s (2Sam. 16:23), he was obviously a brilliant man, and one who cared about his daughter. So, for whatever reason, the parable suggests that Bathsheba had fallen on hard times, which means that he had fallen on hard times as well. Perhaps he was a disabled veteran, able to think in terms of military logistics and tactics, but unable to participate as a soldier. This might explain how they had fallen on hard times.

All of this is conjecture, and pushing the analogy, but it is a reasonable scenario, which does not violate what we know about Uriah, Bathsheba and Ahithophel.

### 2Samuel 12:3c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wâ (or vê) (î, or i) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gâdal (אָגַד) [pronounced gaw-DAHL]</td>
<td>to be [become] great; to grow; to be greatly valued [celebrated, praised]; to twist together, to bind together</td>
<td>3rd person feminine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #1431 BDB #152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘îm (יִמְּ) [pronounced ĝeem]</td>
<td>with, at, by, near; like; from</td>
<td>preposition of nearness and vicinity; with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5973 BDB #767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wâ (or vê) (î, or i) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘îm (יִמְּ) [pronounced ĝeem]</td>
<td>with, at, by, near; like; from</td>
<td>preposition of nearness and vicinity</td>
<td>Strong’s #5973 BDB #767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bânîym (בָּנוֹיָם) [pronounced baw-NEEM]</td>
<td>sons, descendants; children sometimes rendered men</td>
<td>masculine plural noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yachad (יָחָד) [pronounced YAHKH-ahd]</td>
<td>union, joined together, unitedness, together, in unity</td>
<td>masculine singular noun/adverb</td>
<td>Strong’s #3162 BDB #403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and she has grown up together with him and his sons. The young lamb, which the poor man has nourished back to health, grows up with him and his children (literally, sons).

The intent of the analogy could have simply been to indicate how much that the poor man loved his little ewe lamb. However, if we push this analogy, the suggestion is, Uriah already had sons and that he was an older man than...
Bathsheba (say 10–20 years older), and that he took Bathsheba in as a wife while having sons close to her age. Again, this is only conjecture, based upon the analogy.

**2Samuel 12:3d**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>min (ָנ) [pronounced min]</td>
<td>from, off, out from, out of, away from, on account of, since, than, more than</td>
<td>preposition of separation</td>
<td>Strong’s #4480 BDB #577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>path (ּח) [pronounced pahth]</td>
<td>a fragment, a morsel, a piece [of bread]</td>
<td>feminine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #6595 BDB #837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ְֲּק (וּק) [pronounced aw-KAHL]</td>
<td>to eat; to devour; to consume; to destroy</td>
<td>3rd person feminine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #398 BDB #37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** She ate from his bread [lit., morsel (of bread)]... In this parable, the man is quite poor, so he is not represented here as having bread but as having a morsel of bread. However, he shared with this lamb as if she were his own flesh and blood.

To go with the analogy, perhaps Bathsheba and her father Ahithophel were destitute, and Uriah was poor; but he freely shared with her, as his wife. Now, most of you may think, “Well, duh, she is, after all, his wife.” However, not all marriages are like that. There are a number of marriages where the wife is treated as a 2nd class citizen, where the husband sinks all kinds of money into his own personal hobbies, wants and desires, but allows his wife nothing. So, this man is poor, but he shares what he has with the lamb.

**2Samuel 12:3e**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w (ה) (or w) (י or י) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple waw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min (ָנ) [pronounced min]</td>
<td>from, off, out from, out of, away from, on account of, since, than, more than</td>
<td>preposition of separation</td>
<td>Strong’s #4480 BDB #577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōwכ (וּו) [pronounced kohç]</td>
<td>cup [literal or figurative]; a kind of unclean bird (possibly a night owl)</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with a 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #3563 BDB #468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shâthâh (שַתָּה) [pronounced shaw-THAW]</td>
<td>to drink [actually or metaphorically]; to drink together [at a banquet]; to feast; to sit</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #8354 BDB #1059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and drank from his cup,... Again, this is a picture of the poor man sharing what little he had with his ewe-lamb.
### 2Samuel 12:3f

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wâw (or vâw) (i or i) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bê (b) [pronounced bê]</td>
<td>in, into, through; at, by, near, on, upon; with, before, against; by means of; among; within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chêyq (nîq or nîq) [pronounced khayk]</td>
<td>bosom, hollow [portion of a chariot], lower [bottom] [portion of the altar]; midst</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #2436 BDB #300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shâkab (šâkab) [pronounced shaw-KAH'V]</td>
<td>to lie down, to lie down [to sleep, to have sexual relations, to die; because of sickness or humiliation]; to relax</td>
<td>3rd person feminine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7901 BDB #1011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and she lays down in his bosom... This indicates safety and protection, which, in the ancient world, and this phrase is even more meaningful when it was written than it is today. However, most people who have dogs are able to fully relate to this.

### 2Samuel 12:3g

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wâw (or vâw) (i or i) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>háyâh (hây) [pronounced haw-YAW]</td>
<td>to be, is, was, are; to become, to come into being; to come to pass</td>
<td>3rd person feminine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #1961 BDB #224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>làmed (l) [pronounced l']</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to, belonging to</td>
<td>directional/reational preposition; with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaph or kâf (k) [pronounced kâf]</td>
<td>like, as, just as; according to; about, approximately</td>
<td>preposition of comparison or approximation</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bath (bath) [pronounced bahth]</td>
<td>daughter; village</td>
<td>feminine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1323 BDB #123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...—she became like a daughter to him. This little ewe-lamb which the poor man acquired and nursed back to health, has become like a daughter to him.

Again, by pushing the analogy, it is very much as if Uriah is an older man, who has married this younger woman, who is nursed back into health and treated with great kindness and protection.
Application: Men can behave despicably toward their own wives; however, this is more rarely the case with a daughter. The analogy suggests that Uriah loved his wife Bathsheba very much, and was the protector of her soul and body.

In this one verse, we find a number of things which seem to parallel our relationship to God through Jesus Christ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Analogy to Being in Christ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2Samuel 12:3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the poor man [there is] nothing except a small ewe-lamb which he had acquired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He preserved her [or, he made her live]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and she has grown up together with him and his sons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She ate from his bread [lit., morsel (of bread)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and drank from his cup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and she lays down in his bosom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—she is like a daughter to him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the Old Testament, there are numerous parallels to the gospel of Jesus Christ. The poor man and the rescuing of his little ewe lamb is the type; Jesus Christ rescuing us from our sin nature by means of His death on the cross is the antitype.

Chapter Outline

Charts, Maps and Short Doctrines

Nathan continues with this court case which he has brought before David. David does not see this as some story or a parable or something to idly discuss; David understands that Nathan is going to make a ruling on this situation, and he is listening intently to all of the facts in order to render his royal decision.
And so comes a traveler to a man of the wealth and so he has compassion to take from his flock and from his herd to prepare for a traveler, the one coming to him. And so he takes a ewe-lamb of the man—the one being poor. And so he prepares her for the man—the one coming unto him.”

A traveler came to the man of wealth, yet the rich man [lit., he] spared to take from his [own] flock or from his [own] herd [in order] to prepare [a meal] for the traveler, the one who came to him. Consequently, he took the ewe-lamb of the man—the one who is poor—and he prepared it for the man who came to him.”

An out-of-town guest came to the rich man, yet the rich man decided not to take an animal from his own flock or herd in order to prepare a meal for his guest. Consequently, he took the female lamb from the poor man and he prepared it for his out-of-town guest.”

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

**Latin Vulgate**

And when a certain stranger was come to the rich man, he spared to take of his own sheep and oxen, to make a feast for that stranger, who was come to him, but took the poor man's ewe, and dressed it for the man that was come to him.

**Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**

And so comes a traveler to a man of the wealth and so he has compassion to take from his flock and from his herd to prepare for a traveler, the one coming to him. And so he takes a ewe-lamb of the man—the one being poor. And so he prepares her for the man—the one coming unto him.

**Peshitta (Syriac)**

And there came a guest to the rich man, and he refused to take of his own herds or flocks to make a banquet for the guest who had come to him, but he took the poor man's ewe lamb and prepared it for the guest who had come to him.

**Septuagint (Greek)**

And a traveler came to the rich man, and he refused to take of his flocks and of his herds, to prepare for the traveler that came to him; and he took the poor man's lamb, and prepared it for the man that came to him.

**Significant differences:**

The verb of the second phrase is difficult, and so the English translation of the Syriac and Greek used slightly different verbs to indicate the meaning (the actual Greek verb is a correct match for the Hebrew verb). The idea is to present the rich man as wanting to spare the animals of his own cattle.

The English of the Latin and Syriac do not repeat the personal pronoun for the second noun in the series (oxen, flocks). These versions also have to make a feast for instead of the more sedate to prepare.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

**CEV**

One day someone came to visit the rich man, but the rich man didn't want to kill any of his own sheep or cattle and serve it to the visitor. So he stole the poor man's little lamb and served it instead.

**Easy English (Pocock)**

One day, a traveller came to visit the rich man. The rich man wanted to prepare a meal for his guest. But the rich man did not want to kill one of his own sheep or cows. Instead, he took the poor man's little female sheep. He cooked it as a meal for his guest.'

**Easy-to-Read Version**

“Then a traveler stopped to visit the rich man. {The rich man wanted to give food to the traveler.} But the rich man did not want to take anything from his own sheep or cattle to feed the traveler. No, the rich man took the lamb from the poor man. The rich man {killed the lamb} and cooked it for his visitor.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good News Bible (TEV)</td>
<td>One day a visitor arrived at the rich man's home. The rich man didn't want to kill one of his own animals to fix a meal for him; instead, he took the poor man's lamb and prepared a meal for his guest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Message</td>
<td>&quot;One day a traveler dropped in on the rich man. He was too stingy to take an animal from his own herds or flocks to make a meal for his visitor, so he took the poor man's lamb and prepared a meal to set before his guest.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life Bible</td>
<td>Now a traveler came to the rich man. But the rich man was not willing to take from his own flock or his own cattle, to make food for the traveler who had come to him. Instead, he took the poor man's female lamb and made it ready for the man who had come to him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Living Translation</td>
<td>One day a guest arrived at the home of the rich man. But instead of killing an animal from his own flock or herd, he took the poor man's lamb and killed it and prepared it for his guest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American English Bible</td>
<td>Well, someone who was traveling along stopped in to see the rich man, and he didn't want to take anything from his own flocks or herds to prepare [a meal] for the stranger, so he took the lamb that belonged to the poor man and cooked it for the person who was coming to visit.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Roots Translinear</td>
<td>A nomad came. The rich man spared from taking his sheep and oxen to make for the traveler coming to him. He took the lamb from the destitute and made it for the man coming to him.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God's Word™</td>
<td>&quot;Now, a visitor came to the rich man. The rich man thought it would be a pity to take one of his own sheep or cattle to prepare a meal for the traveler. So he took the poor man's lamb and prepared her for the traveler.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRV</td>
<td>&quot;One day a traveler came to the rich man. The rich man wanted to prepare a meal for him. But he didn't want to kill one of his own sheep or cattle. Instead, he took the little female lamb that belonged to the poor man. Then he cooked it for the traveler who had come to him.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jerusalem Bible</td>
<td>When a traveller came to stay, the rich man would not take anything from his own flock or herd to provide for the wayfarer who had come to him. Instead, he stole the poor man's lamb and prepared that for his guest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Simplified Bible</td>
<td>»Now, a visitor came to the rich man. The rich man thought it would be a pity to take one of his own sheep or cattle to prepare a meal for the traveler. So he took the poor man's lamb and prepared it for the traveler.«</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised English Bible</td>
<td>One day a traveller came to the rich man's house, and he, too mean to tak something from his own flock or herd to serve to his guest, took the poor man's lamb and served that up.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today's NIV</td>
<td>&quot;Now a traveler came to the rich man, but the rich man refrained from taking one of his own sheep or cattle to prepare a meal for the traveler who had come to him. Instead, he took the ewe lamb that belonged to the poor man and prepared it for the one who had come to him.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bible in Basic English</td>
<td>Now a traveller came to the house of the man of wealth, but he would not take anything from his flock or his herd to make a meal for the traveller who had come to him, but he took the poor man's lamb and made it ready for the man who had come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Jewish Bible</td>
<td>One day a traveler visited the rich man, and instead of picking an animal from his own flock or herd to cook for his visitor, he took the poor man's lamb and cooked it for the man who had come to him.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now a traveler came to the rich man, but the rich man could not bring himself to take one of his own sheep or cattle to prepare for the traveler who had come to him. Instead, he took the poor man's lamb and prepared it for his guest.

The gist of this verse: Nathan continues with this case that he is presenting to David. The rich man has a guest, but he does not want to take one of his own animals to prepare a meal for his guest, so he takes the poor man's lamb and prepares it for his guest.
It is often typical for each sentence—in fact, each thought—to begin with a wâw consecutive (or a wâw conjunction) in the Hebrew. However, it is not necessary in an English translation to include a connective at every such juncture, as our language does not necessarily require that for successive thoughts or actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bôw (בּוּ) [pronounced boh]</td>
<td>to come in, to come, to go in, to go, to enter</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #935 BDB #97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hêlek (הֶלֶךָ) [pronounced HAY-lek]</td>
<td>traveler, wayfarer; literally, a going of, a journey, way; possibly a flowing of a stream</td>
<td>masculine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1982 BDB #237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לֵ) [pronounced l']</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to, belonging to</td>
<td>directional/reational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>îysh (יָשָׁה) [pronounced eesh]</td>
<td>a man, a husband; anyone; a certain one; each, each one, everyone</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #376 BDB #35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’âshîyr (אָשִׁיר) [pronounced gaw-SHEER]</td>
<td>rich; wealthy; can be used as a substantive to mean the rich, the wealth, a rich man</td>
<td>masculine singular adjective; with the definite article; can be used as a substantive</td>
<td>Strong’s #6223 BDB #799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nathan has previously identified the two men in this court case to David: one man is rich with a large cattle ranch; and the other man is poor, having only a small ewe-lamb which he apparently nursed back to health, and which lamb had become a part of his family.

**Translation:** A traveler came to the man of wealth,... A guest from out of town comes to the rich man. It is common in the ancient world, when a guest came to you, to prepare an unusually large feast for the guest. This often involved slaughtering an animal and serving barbeque. Whereas, not as many people keep animals for slaughter any more; the custom of serving barbeque to guests has continues.

Some\(^{12}\) take this to mean the devil, who tempts David at this point with Bathsheba. I don’t know if I buy that; but this could refer to the lust pattern of David’s sin nature and David succumbing to that lust.

---

### 2Samuel 12:4b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>châmal (כָּם) [pronounced khaw-MAHŁ]</td>
<td>to spare, to be sparing of anything; to use sparingly; to pity, to have compassion, to show mercy</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #2550 BDB #328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לַמֶּד) [pronounced l']</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to, belonging to</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâqach (לָחָךְ) [pronounced law-KAHKH]</td>
<td>to take, to take away, to take in marriage; to seize</td>
<td>Qal infinitive construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #3947 BDB #542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min (מִן) [pronounced min]</td>
<td>from, off, out from, out of, away from, on account of, since, than, more than</td>
<td>preposition of separation</td>
<td>Strong’s #4480 BDB #577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsôn (צֹהַן) [pronounced tsohn]</td>
<td>small cattle, sheep and goats, flock, flocks</td>
<td>feminine singular collective noun; with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #6629 BDB #838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also spelled ts”ōwn (צ”הון) [pronounced tseh-OWN].

| w (or v) (ו) (י, or י) [pronounced weh] | and; even; in particular, namely; when, since, seeing, though; then | simple wāw conjunction | No Strong’s # BDB #251 |

The wāw conjunction is used as a simple copulative, used to connect words and sentences, in which case it is usually rendered and. It can be used to explain one noun or clarify one noun with another, in which case it is rendered even or yea (see Job 5:19 Dan. 4:10). The wāw conjunction can introduce two nouns, where the first is the genus and the second is the species; in which case, we would render it and particularly, and specially, and namely, and specifically (and it can be used the other way as well) (see 2Kings 23:2 Psalm 18:1 Isa. 1:1 2:1 Zech. 14:21). It can be prefixed to a verb also by way of explanation; it could be reasonably rendered as a relative pronoun (who, which) (see Gen. 49:25 Job 29:12 Isa. 13:14). It can be used to begin an apodosis (the then portion of an if...then... statement) (see Gen. 2:4, 5 40:9 48:7). It is used between words and sentences in order to compare them or to mark their resemblance (1Sam. 12:15 Job 5:7). When doubled, it can mean both...and... (Num. 9:14 Joshua 7:24 Psalm 76:7). It can be prefixed to adversative sentences or clauses and rendered but, and yet, although, otherwise (Gen. 2:17 15:2 17:20 Judges 16:15 Ruth 1:21 Job 15:5 6:14). And, what we were after, is the wāw conjunction can be used in disjunctive sentences; that is, it can be rendered or (which will help us to understand what Jephthah does) (Ex. 21:17 Lev. 5:3 Deut. 24:7). Finally, the wāw conjunction can be used before causal sentences and rendered because, for, that, in that (Gen. 18:32 30:27 Psalm 5:12 60:13); before conclusions or inferences, and therefore rendered so that, therefore, wherefore (2Kings 4:41 Isa. 3:14 Ezek. 18:32 Zech. 2:10); and before final and consecutive sentences, which mark an end or an object: in order that (Gen. 42:34 Job 20:10 Isa. 13:2). To paraphrase Gesenius, frequently, it is put after verbs and sentences standing absolutely, especially those which imply time or condition and is reasonably rendered then.\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{13}\) H. W. F. Gesenius, *Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament*; ©1979 by Baker Books; p. 234. When I give a slightly different rendering to a word which I have, 99% of the time, been translating one way, I thought that I should include some documentation for a different usage.
Translation: ...yet the rich man [lit., he] spared to take from his [own] flock or from his [own] herd... It is customary to prepare a great meal for one’s guests, and yet the rich man looks out over his herd and his flock, and chooses to spare them. For whatever reason, for however long it took him to think this over, the rich man decided not to take these animals from his own stock.

Bear in mind, this is all analogous to David and his sin with Bathsheba. Recall that he had about 10 wives and 10 mistresses, and many men think about this and figure, “That’s fantastic. If you have the much of a choice, how could you look outside of your plural marriage?” David is king, and with all of his wives and mistresses, he could have called for any one of them to be summoned to him. Yet, he thinks about his wives and his mistresses (his own flock and his own herd), one-by-one, and decides, “No, she’s going to complain about her position in the family; no, not her, she’s going to start talking up our son as my successor; this one is going to ask me for some spending money; this other one cannot seem to stop talking; and all I want is some sex.” So despite having at least 20 women to choose from, David took Uriah’s wife.

Quite obviously, there is less of a soul connection between David and many of his wives and mistresses. It takes time to get to know another person—sometimes years—so David certain had little soul connection with all of his mistresses and some of his wives. Furthermore, going outside the marriage for another woman is less of a big deal when one has many wives. A husband of one wife, tempted to stray, generally has a well-established deep personal relationship with his wife. The relationship often involves shared memories, shared difficulties, and, if God has blessed them, shared children. The husband in this case, ideally speaking, would have many things that would pop into his soul, about his own wife, about the cost of infidelity, which would dramatically hurt his wife and possibly destroy his family. So, you may have, at first, thought that having many wives would help to keep a man from straying; but one good wife is the key (along with an honorable soul, of course).
### 2Samuel 12:4c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>`ârach (הָרָךְ) [pronounced aw-RAHKH]</td>
<td>a wanderer, traveler, wayfarer</td>
<td>Qal active participle used as a substantive</td>
<td>Strong’s #732 BDB #72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bôw (בּוֹ) [pronounced boh]</td>
<td>the one entering [coming, going] [in]; he who enters [goes, comes] (in)</td>
<td>Qal active participle with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #935 BDB #97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmèd (לָֽמֶד) [pronounced ‚l]</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to, belonging to</td>
<td>directional/reational preposition; with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...[in order] to prepare [a meal] for the traveler, the one who came to him. The rich man then thinks this over. He looks at his own cattle, and he thinks about it, and he decides to spare them. His motive for doing so is really not germane to the decision that David will render.

This is David in his palace and he has decided that he wants to have sex; but when thinking over his various wives and mistresses, he does not choose to spend time with any one of them.

### 2Samuel 12:4d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wåw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâqach (לֹאַקַח) [pronounced law-KAHKH]</td>
<td>to take, to take away, to take in marriage; to seize</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3947 BDB #542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‚èth (אֵת) [pronounced ayth]</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kibsaḥ (כִּבְשָׁה) [pronounced kihb-SAWARE]</td>
<td>ewe-lamb, lamb, a female lamb</td>
<td>feminine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #3535 BDB #461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also spelled kabsâw (כָּבָּֽשָֽׁו) [pronounced kahb-SAW].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‚îysh (אֵישׁ) [pronounced eesh]</td>
<td>a man, a husband; anyone; a certain one; each, each one, everyone</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #376 BDB #35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rûwsh (רֹעַשׁ) [pronounced roosh]</td>
<td>to be in want, to be needy, to be poor</td>
<td>Qal active participle with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #7326 BDB #930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a Qal active participle, this can be translated *the poor, the needy.*
Translation: Consequently, he took the ewe-lamb of the man—the one who is poor—;... So this rich man, unwilling to slaughter any of his own cattle, sees the little ewe-lamb that belongs to the poor man, and decides to slaughter than animal for his guest. He give no thought to any of the back story.

David saw Bathsheba bathing, and he was very attracted to her. Paying no attention to the fact that she is a woman who belongs to another man, David simply took her, just as the rich man took the ewe-lamb of the poor man.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (֤) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wāw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘āsâh (אׇשָ) [pronounced gaw-SAWH]</td>
<td>to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect; with the 3rd person feminine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #6213 BDB #793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (ל) [pronounced l¨]</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to, belonging to</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘îysh (אׇש) [pronounced eesh]</td>
<td>a man, a husband; anyone; a certain one; each, each one, everyone</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #376 BDB #35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bôw (אׇק) [pronounced boh]</td>
<td>the one entering [coming, going] [in]; he who enters [goes, comes (in)]</td>
<td>Qal active participle with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #935 BDB #97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘el (אׇל) [pronounced ehl]</td>
<td>unto; into, among, in; toward, to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to</td>
<td>directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied); with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #413 BDB #39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and he prepared it for the man who came to him.” The rich man takes this ewe-lamb and he slaughters it and prepares it for his out-of-town guest.

Let’s stop and summarize this parable.

**The Parable of the Rich Man and the Poor Man**

1. Nathan must reach David and get David to look at himself objectively. This cannot be done with a full-on attack on David and his sins.
2. Furthermore, Nathan cannot come to David and say, “Hey, listen to this parable; I think you will like it.” David would have either been suspicious or disinterested.
3. Nathan reaches David by asking him his judgment on a legal case, which is this parable.
4. Nathan is teaching by finesse; a simple story which will involve David and which will cause him to judge himself.
5. This particular parable is designed so that, no matter how far out David has gotten, he is still able to understand and render judgement against the rich man. He will become quite emotionally involved in the...
story, as David, despite his being trapped in interlocking systems of arrogance, still has a sense of right and wrong.

6. In order for this to work, David must remain objective up to the point of rendering judgment. It must not occur to him that Nathan is condemning him. David must condemn himself.

7. If Nathan does not speak to David correctly, David would immediately lose his objectivity and become angry with Nathan.

8. David can begin to exit the interlocking systems of arrogance by objectively evaluating himself and judging himself. *If we judge ourselves, we will not be judged* (1Cor. 11:31).

9. David becomes so involved in this parable, that he reacts to the meanness of the rich man in this story, not realizing that he is judging himself. If David is able to judge himself, then he is going to break out of his arrogance.

10. The psalms we will study will reveal that David has already experienced some warning suffering and discipline. However, the problem is twofold:
   1) David can get away with what he is doing, so he is not motivated to rebound or to recover.
   2) David is so far gone that, simply rebound coupled with the intake of doctrine is not going to turn him around.

11. David does not name his sin to God until hearing all of Nathan’s parable. The parable breaks through David’s subjectivity.

12. The key to this parable is not rich versus poor. The rich man is rich because he has the blessings of spiritual growth. Spiritual maturity often results in great blessing, represented here by wealth and power.

13. The parallels are quite obvious: David is the rich man, enjoying great grace blessing. Uriah is the poor man and the ewe lamb is Bathsheba. David’s will understand this instantly, see himself objectively, and be willing, at that point, to submit to Nathan’s spiritual authority.

Allow me to go off on a tangent here. One of the websites that I went to when comparing liberalism to Christianity stated that there were a huge number of times that the Bible refers to the rich and the poor (they had the exact number). The idea was to make the reader think, this was the thrust of the Bible—to deal with the plight of the poor. First of all, that is absolute nonsense—the thrust of the Bible is the message of the gospel of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ for our sins.

Secondly, that same person did not quote this particular passage about rich and poor to back up his evil thinking, because it did not apply. The Bible refers to the rich and poor on many occasions because that is simply a fact of life; there will always be rich and poor, in any society. In a Communist or Socialist society, the rich are a very few political leaders and possibly some favored bureaucrats; the poor is everyone else. In a capitalistic society, there are roughly an equal number of rich and poor. When a capitalistic society turns toward socialism, the number of rich decrease and the number of poor (relatively speaking) increase. Under liberal Democrat presidents, our country always has an increase of poor people. Under conservative Republican presidents, our country experiences an increase in rich people.

There is another related tangent I would like to mention. David, despite falling into degeneracy, still has norms and standards. I have talked to a number of liberals who lack any true norms and standards. They will argue their side and use false data—information that they know is false—to make a point. An illustration of this is American history: I was brought up in high school to believe that our founding fathers were deists. That is simply a lie, and it finds absolutely no support in the founding documents or in the writings of the founders. They were very religious men many of whom believed, the constitution was a religious document from the hand of God (I exaggerate but little at this point).
I have argued with some liberals who say, “You don’t have any proof of that statement;” and so, I offer up the proof. In almost all cases, they are already aware of the proof I am offering up, and they attack the proof from the edges. That is, the fundamental principle of the proof may be completely on point and accurate, but they attack the source or the person who said it or something which is pretty much irrelevant. My point here is, committed liberals, unlike David, have lost even their norms and standards. This parable (which David took to be real), grabbed David and angered him against the rich man. This is because he retained some true norms and standards. Many liberals lack simple honesty and if they know of something which does damage to their arguments, they will ignore it or pretend that they are not aware of it (until, of course, you bring it up, an experience I have had on many occasions).

If you are ever drawn to argue politics, you are going to notice at least three things about committed liberals: they are arrogant, they are self-righteous, and they are dishonest. I have a relative, and what strikes me in our discussion is, even though he is anti-Christian, that there is no discernable difference to him between Muslims and Christians and, furthermore, does not believe that Jesus Christ is God. However, his arrogance and self-righteousness are palpable, even when he writes a few words.

What Nathan says to David reads almost like poetry, and the New American Standard Bible seems to catch this and present it this way in their translation.

### The New American Standard Bible’s Translation of 2Samuel 12:1–5

1 Then the LORD sent Nathan to David And he came to him and said,

   "There were two men in one city, the one rich and the other poor.
2 The rich man had a great many flocks and herds.
3 But the poor man had nothing except one little ewe lamb
   Which he bought and nourished;
   And it grew up together with him and his children.
   It would eat of his bread and drink of his cup and lie in his bosom,
   And was like a daughter to him.
4 Now a traveler came to the rich man,
   And he was unwilling to take from his own flock or his own herd,
   To prepare for the wayfarer who had come to him;
   Rather he took the poor man's ewe lamb and prepared it for the man who had come to him."

5 Then David's anger burned greatly against the man, and he said to Nathan, "As the LORD lives, surely the man who has done this deserves to die."

This poetry is bookended by Nathan and David.

The obvious parallel is, David took Uriah’s wife, Bathsheba, and had sex with her.

David becomes so angry with the rich man that he interrupts Nathan and pronounces the sentence on this man.
And so burns a nostril of David in the man greatly. And so he says unto Nathan, “Living Y’howah, for a son of death the man the one doing this.”

2Samuel 12:5

David’s anger greatly burned against this man. Therefore, he said to Nathan, “[As] Y’howah lives, because the man did this [thing], [he is] a son of death.

David’s anger against this man burned greatly. Therefore, he said to Nathan, “As Jehovah lives, because this man did this evil thing, he deserves to die!

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

- **Latin Vulgate**
  
  And David’s anger being exceedingly kindled against that man, he said to Nathan: As the Lord liveth, the man that hath done this is a child of death.

- **Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**
  
  And so burns a nostril of David in the man greatly. And so he says unto Nathan, “Living Y’howah, for a son of death the man the one doing this.

- **Peshitta (Syriac)**
  
  And David’s anger was greatly kindled against the man; and he said, As the LORD lives, the man who has done this thing is worthy of death.

- **Septuagint (Greek)**
  
  And David was greatly moved with anger against the man; and David said to Nathan, As the Lord lives, because the son of death the man who did this thing shall surely die.

**Significant differences:**

*Nostril* can be translated *anger*. Although there is a definite difference between the Hebrew and the Greek in the first phrase, they convey the same essential idea, that David is angry. The Latin *appears* to lack the conjunction which begins the second phrase. The final phrase, *a son of death*, does not translate well into the English, and most translations have, instead, *deserving of death* (or words to that effect). This explains the Syriac not following suit here (at least, according to the English versio of the Syriac).

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

- **CEV**
  
  David was furious with the rich man and said to Nathan, "I swear by the living LORD that the man who did this deserves to die!

- **Easy English (Pocock)**
  
  David was very angry with the rich man. David said to Nathan, `The *Lord will punish that rich man. The man who did this evil thing deserves to die

- **Good News Bible (TEV)**
  
  David became very angry at the rich man and said, "I swear by the living LORD that the man who did this ought to die!

- **The Message**
  
  David exploded in anger. "As surely as GOD lives," he said to Nathan, "the man who did this ought to be lynched!

- **New Century Version**
  
  David became very angry at the rich man. He said to Nathan, "As surely as the Lord lives, the man who did this should die!

- **New Living Translation**
  
  David was furious. "As surely as the Lord lives," he vowed, "any man who would do such a thing deserves to die!

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

- **American English Bible**
  
  Well, David was outraged about this man and said, `As Jehovah lives, this man deserves to die!

- **Ancient Roots Translinear**
  
  David’s emotion flared a hundredfold with the man. He said to Nathan, "As Yahweh lives, the man that did this is a son of death!

- **God’s Word™**
  
  David burned with anger against the man. "I solemnly swear, as the LORD lives," he said to Nathan, "the man who did this certainly deserves to die!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New American Bible</td>
<td>David grew very angry with that man and said to Nathan: &quot;As the LORD lives, the man who has done this merits death!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRV</td>
<td>David burned with anger against the rich man. He said to Nathan, &quot;The man who did that is worthy of death. And that's just as sure as the Lord is alive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Simplified Bible</td>
<td>David became very angry with the rich man. He said: I swear by the living God Jehovah that the man who did this should die!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised English Bible</td>
<td>David was very angry, and burst out, ‘As the LORD lives, the man who did this deserves to die!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today’s NIV</td>
<td>David burned with anger against the man and said to Nathan, &quot;As surely as the LORD lives, the man who did this must die!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing): **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bible in Basic English</td>
<td>And David was full of wrath against that man; and he said to Nathan, By the living Lord, death is the right punishment for the man who has done this:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Jewish Bible</td>
<td>David exploded with anger against the man and said to Natan, &quot;As ADONAI lives, the man who did this deserves to die!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPS (Tanakh—1985)</td>
<td>David flew into a rage against the man, and said to Nathan, “As the LORD lives, the man who did this deserves to die!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET Bible®</td>
<td>Then David became very angry at this man. He said to Nathan, &quot;As surely as the LORD lives, the man who did this deserves to die! [Heb &quot;the man doing this [is] a son of death.&quot; See 1 Sam 20:31 for another use of this expression, which must mean &quot;he is as good as dead&quot; or &quot;he deserves to die,&quot; as 1 Sam 20:32 makes clear.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Advent Bible</td>
<td>And David's anger being exceedingly kindled against that man, he said to Nathan: As the Lord lives, the man that has done this is a child of death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIV, ©2010</td>
<td>David burned with anger against the man and said to Nathan, &quot;As surely as the LORD lives, the man who did this must die!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Amplified Bible</td>
<td>Then David's anger was greatly kindled against the man, and he said to Nathan, As the Lord lives, the man who has done this is a son [worthy] of death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordant Literal Version</td>
<td>And the anger of David burns against the man exceedingly, and he said unto Nathan, ‘Yahweh lives, surely a son of death [is] the man who is doing this,.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Conservative Version</td>
<td>And David's anger was greatly kindled against the man, and he said to Nathan, As LORD lives, the man who has done this is worthy to die.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Group Version</td>
<td>And David's anger was greatly kindled against the man; and he said to Nathan, As YHWH lives, the man that has done this is worthy to die.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exeGeses companion Bible</td>
<td>And David kindles his wrath mightily against the man; and he says to Nathan, Yah Veh lives! The man who works this is a son of death:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green’s Literal Translation</td>
<td>And David's anger glowed greatly against the man. And he said to Nathan, As Jehovah lives, surely the man who did this is a son of death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Names Version</td>
<td>David's anger was greatly kindled against the man, and he said to Natan, &quot;As the LORD lives, the man who has done this is worthy to die!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Bible</td>
<td>And the nostrils of David burned against the man exceedingly, and he said to Nathan, Jehovah lives! The son of man who did this shall die;...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New King James Version</td>
<td>So David's anger was greatly aroused against the man, and he said to Nathan, &quot;As the LORD lives, the man who has done this shall surely die!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndein</td>
<td>Then David's anger burned intensively against the man {the rich man -- who is actually David himself, but he does not know it yet} so that he {David} said to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nathan, "By the life/essence of Jehovah/God, the man who has done this thing is definitely doomed to death." {reference to the sin unto death}.  
And the anger of David burns against the man exceedingly, and he says unto Nathan, “Jehovah lives, surely a son of death is the man who is doing this.

**The gist of this verse:** David appears to interrupt Nathan, and he pronounces judgement immediately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (י)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chârâh (נַחַרָה)</td>
<td>to burn, to kindle, to become angry, to evoke great emotion</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #2734 BDB #354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’aph (אֲפֶה)</td>
<td>nose, nostril, but is also translated face, brow, anger, wrath</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #639 BDB #60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid (דָּבִיָּד)</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b (ב)</td>
<td>in, into, through; at, by, near, on, upon; with, before, against; by means of; among; within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’îysh (אִישׁ)</td>
<td>a man, a husband; anyone; a certain one; each, each one, everyone</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #376 BDB #35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m’îyod (מֵאָד)</td>
<td>exceedingly, extremely, greatly, very</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Strong’s #3966 BDB #547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** David’s anger against this man burned greatly. To me, this story seems unfinished, and it sounds as though David stopped Nathan, having heard enough. David listened, heard enough of what Nathan had to say, and just stopped him cold, because David burned with so much anger against the rich man. Nathan had not even asked the king for his judgment. Whether Nathan had more to say or not, we do not know, but David had clearly heard enough. Obviously, he took the facts of the case as Nathan presented them, as being accurate and unbiased (I am sure that you have heard a recollection of something which happened, and you have one idea of what happened; and then you hear the other perspective, and you find out, it is just the opposite of what you first believed). In this situation, David is reasonably assuming that Nathan is giving him the truth without an attempt to slant the story in either direction.

David is very much caught up in this case. This is not some hypothetical story to him. He has listened carefully; he has heard enough; and he is going to render his judgement against this man.

Now, bear in mind that David is inside of the interlocking systems of arrogance. Therefore, this judgment does not come from his carefully understood sense of justice, but it comes from David’s anger. However, David is the king of the land; and therefore, his motivation behind doing anything is not an issue. God the Holy Spirit wants
us to know that David pronounces this sentence out of anger; but since he is the king, he can choose to become emotionally involved in the cases over which he presides or not.

If you have children, there are times that they are going to do wrong, and it makes you smile; there are times they will do wrong, and you have no emotional reaction to what they have done; and there are times they will do wrong, and you are angered greatly. For instance, your young child has done something wrong, but he develops this remarkable story and imaginative narrative, in which he presents himself as the good guy; and you know he is lying to your face, and stretching the truth, but he is so young, so imaginative, and the story is so funny, that you are greatly amused by it. Or, on the other hand, he may have broken something which is irreplaceable and which you greatly love—and you are pissed off, even if he broke it by accident. No matter what your emotional involvement, you have to punish the kid, and to him, it makes little difference. Maybe he got a time-out or a spanking; either way, the punishment is the same (or ought to be). The same is true of David here; it does not matter whether he is emotionally involved or not in this case (he is obviously very involved). He is still the sovereign of the land, and therefore, his judgment will stand.

### 2Samuel 12:5b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s #: BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>а’umar (עמר) [pronounced aw-MAHR]</td>
<td>to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #559: BDB #55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘el (אל) [pronounced ehl]</td>
<td>unto; into, among, in; toward, to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to</td>
<td>directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied)</td>
<td>Strong’s #413: BDB #39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâthân (נהן) [pronounced naw-THAWN]</td>
<td>given; one who is given; transliterated Nathan</td>
<td>masculine singular, proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #5416: BDB #681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** Therefore, he said to Nathan,... Even though this is the simple verb to say; David is making an official proclamation; he is rendering his official judgment, coming from his authority as king over all Israel.

Notice that we have the preposition of respect here; David, despite his anger and despite his being inside the interlocking systems of arrogance, he is still respectful toward Nathan and he recognizes Nathan’s spiritual authority (to a limited degree, at this point).

### 2Samuel 12:5c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chay (חי) [pronounced KHAH-ee]</td>
<td>living, alive, active, lively, vigorous [used of man or animals]; green [vegetation]; fresh [used of a plant]; flowing [water]; reviving [of the springtime]; raw [flesh]</td>
<td>masculine singular adjective</td>
<td>Strong’s #2416: BDB #311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel 12:5c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YHWH (יהוה)</td>
<td>transliterated variously as Jehovah, Yahweh, Y’howah</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #3068 BDB #217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ..."[As] Y’howah lives,... You will note that, David, in his spiritual condition, has not altogether thrown Jehovah out of his thinking. His proclamation of guilt and sentencing is predicated on the life of Y’howah. Now, this may simply be a matter of self-righteousness, but David, in effect, is still saying that this is not simply his decision, but this decision will be right in the eyes of God.

2Samuel 12:5d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kîy ( כי ) [pronounced kee]</td>
<td>for, that, because; when, at that time, which, what time</td>
<td>explanatory conjunction; preposition</td>
<td>Strong’s #3588 BDB #471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bên ( בן) [pronounced bane]</td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
<td>masculine singular</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mâveth (موت) [pronounced MAW-veth]</td>
<td>death, death [as opposed to life], death by violence, a state of death, a place of death</td>
<td>masculine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #4194 BDB #560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘îysh (איש) [pronounced eesh]</td>
<td>a man, a husband; anyone; a certain one; each, each one, everyone</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #376 BDB #35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘âsâh (עשה) [pronounced gaw-SAWH]</td>
<td>the one doing, the one making, a constructor, a fashioner, a preparer</td>
<td>Qal active participle</td>
<td>Strong’s #6213 BDB #793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zô’th (זֹּחַ) [pronounced zoth]</td>
<td>here, this, this one; thus; possibly another</td>
<td>feminine singular of zeh; demonstrative pronoun, adverb</td>
<td>Strong’s #2063 ( &amp; 2088, 2090) BDB #260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...because the man did this [thing], [he is] a son of death. Putting these final phrases together is difficult, and you will note that almost all translators changed up the order of the text. The explanatory conjunction or inferential conjunction properly belongs with the participial phrase, the one doing this [thing].

The entire verse reads: David’s anger against this man burned greatly. Therefore, he said to Nathan, “[As] Y’howah lives, because the man did this [thing], [he is] a son of death. David is so angry with this man and he is so ready to give the sentence, that what he says is elliptical and switched around from what most would say. Most people would say, “Because this man did this evil thing, he is worthy of death.” However, David had to get that punishment out there as quickly as possible, because he was so emotionally involved in the rendering of this verdict. “Because—he is worthy of death—[because] he did this [evil] thing.” So David leaves out a few words and front-loads the punishment, because he is so angry at this rich man.

The phrase a son of death means that the rich man is worthy of dead; the rich man deserves to be executed. It is not unlikely that David is just so mad that he says something like, “I’ll execute this ass myself.” However, David
will seemingly revise his judgment in the next verse. After all, how can such a man make restitution if he ha been executed? So, David’s first reaction appears to be an overreaction, based upon his emotional involvement in this story.

As an aside, I want you to notice something here: David is filled with self-righteousness at this time. He has just heard about this rich man who took a little ewe-lamb from a poor family, and David is filled with rage, based upon self-righteousness.

**Application:** We see this sort of self-righteousness all of the time in the prison system. If a pedophile is brought into prison, he is dumped on by many of his fellow inmates. They may have committed murder, robbed homes, dealt in drugs, and yet, they look down upon the pedophile, seeing him as a man worthy of death. It may even be possible that, the greater the sins (crime), the greater the self-righteousness.

**Application:** It is my understanding, from hearing some interviews, that those in Mafia-type families have a very pronounced sense of right and wrong. In their life, there are things that associates and others did which they found to be despicable behavior. This is a person who has done things to cause whole neighborhoods to fear him; and yet, some underling will commit some minor infraction, and death may be order for the underling. Self-righteousness is a part of most sin natures.

**Application:** I have seen this same self-righteousness from those who see themselves as environmentalists. I knew two personally, which I once kept in touch with, and I could guarantee you that, at that time, I was far more conscientious about recycling and even, to some extent, my environmental footprint than they were (which is not a lot, but more than them). However, I did not buy into global warming as a man-made disaster arising on the horizon, and, for that reason, one of them heaped a great amount of scorn upon me.

**Application:** Part of self-righteousness is unfairly applying punishment to others that you would not apply to yourself. David has committed a far greater sin than the rich man in this parable, and yet, David does not stop to think about what he has done on his own; however, when it comes to this man, David is ready to give him the death sentence.

The sentencing of criminals was quite harsh in the ancient world. We get a taste of that here (even though David may simply be spouting off); and we will see strong retribution put upon the people of Ammon at the end of this chapter (2Sam. 12:31). Certainly, good arguments could be advanced in favor of returning ot harsher punishment, which would decrease crime, which would decrease court costs and incarceration costs.

Now, it must occur to David that he is sentencing a man to death for theft. Yet he still imposes an additional sentence upon him. It is reasonable to suppose that David is saying that this man deserves death, but the actual sentencing (v. 6) will follow.

---

**And the lamb he will recompense fourfold as a consequence of that he did the word the this and on the grounds that he showed no pity.”**

**Furthermore, he will recompense [the man for his] lamb fourfold as a consequence of having done this thing and because he showed no compassion.”**

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

Latin Vulgate 

He shall restore the ewe fourfold, because he did this thing, and had no pity.
The lamb he will recompense fourfold as a consequence of that he did the word
the this and on the grounds that he showed no pity.”
And he shall restore the ewe lamb fourfold because he did this thing and because
he had no pity.
And he shall restore the lamb seven-fold, because he has not spared.
The most obvious difference is, the Greek reads that he will restore the lamb
sevenfold. Also, the Greek leaves out the second clause. Although the final verb
in the Greek my appear to be different, it is a reasonable translation for the Hebrew
in the Masoretic text.
And because he didn't have any pity on the poor man, he will have to pay four times
what the lamb was worth.”
He had no pity when he did this. So he must hand over 4 sheep to the poor man.'
He must pay four times the price of the lamb because he did this terrible thing and
because he had no mercy.”
For having done such a cruel thing, he must pay back four times as much as he
took.”
He must pay for the lamb four times for doing such a thing. He had no mercy!'
He must repay four lambs to the poor man for the one he stole and for having no
pity.”
[But first] he should have to repay for the lamb with seven of his own, because of
what he did when he [killed] it.'
He will repay four lambs in reward for doing this word and over sparing nothing." And he must pay back four times the price of the lamb because he did this and had
no pity.”
The man must pay back four times as much as that lamb was worth. How could he
do such a thing? And he wasn't even sorry he had done it." For doing such a thing and for having shown no pity, he shall make fourfold restitution for the lamb.'
»For doing such a cruel thing he should pay back four times for the lamb he took,
for he had no compassion.«
He must pay for that lamb four times over, because he did such a thing and had no
pity.”
And he will have to give back four times the value of the lamb, because he has done
this and because he had no pity.
For doing such a thing, he has to pay back four times the value of the lamb - and
also because he had no pity.'
Because he has done this thing and shown no pity, he must pay four lambs for that
lamb.”
Because he committed this cold-hearted crime, he must pay for the lamb four times
over!” With the exception of the Lucianic recension, the Old Greek translation has
here "sevenfold" rather than "fourfold," a reading that S. R. Driver thought probably
to be the original reading (S. R. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text and the
New Advent Bible
He shall restore the ewe fourfold, because he did this thing, and had no pity.

NIV – UK
He must pay for that lamb four times over, because he did such a thing and had no pity.

The Scriptures 1998
“Also, he has to repay fourfold for the lamb, because he did this deed and because he had no compassion.”

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

Concordant Literal Version
...and the ewe-lamb he does repay fourfold, because that he has done this thing, and because that he had no pity.

Emphasized Bible
And he shall restore the lamb seven-fold [Masoretic text, “four-fold”], because he has not spared.

English Standard Version
...and he shall restore the lamb fourfold, because he did this thing, and because he had no pity.

Heritage Bible
And he shall make the lamb complete fourfold, because he did this word, and because he did not spare in pity.

Modern KJV
And he shall repay fourfold for the ewe lamb, because he has done this thing, and because he had no pity.

NASB
"He must make restitution for the lamb fourfold [Ex 22:1; Luke 19:8], because he did this thing and had no compassion."

Syndein
Furthermore, he must make restitution for the ewe lamb . . . four fold {see Exodus 22:1} because he did not have compassion."

Young’s Updated LT
And the ewe-lamb he does repay fourfold, because that he has done this thing, and because that he had no pity.”.

The gist of this verse: David decrees that the rich man needs to repay the poor man fourfold because he acted without any compassion; without any thought to the family he damaged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wî (or vî) (וִ) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾēth (אֵת) [pronounced ayth]</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kibsâh (כִּבְשָׂה) [pronounced kihb-SAW]</td>
<td>ewe-lamb, lamb, a female lamb</td>
<td>feminine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #3535 BDB #461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿshâlêm (שָׂלֶם) [pronounced shaw-LAHM]</td>
<td>to make secure, to keep safe; to complete (finish); to make good; to restore, to requite, to recompense (pay)</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Piel imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7999 BDB #1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿarḇaṭayîm (אָרְבָּתֵיימ) [pronounced ahr'-bah-TAH-yim]</td>
<td>fourfold, four times</td>
<td>adverb; dual of Strong’s #702</td>
<td>Strong’s #706 BDB #916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, he will recompense [the man for his] lamb fourfold... David is extremely upset over what this man has done, and he will require a fourfold restoration. It is from this and the chapters which follow that indicates to us that David will be punished in 4 installments—each installment of which may seem in itself as a reasonable punishment for what he has done.

Now, David is not just making up this punishment out of his head—and this is an important consideration, because it indicates that he still has some doctrine in his soul—he takes this out of Ex. 22:1, which reads: If a man steals an ox or a sheep, and kills it or sells it, he shall repay five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep. So, even though David had fallen quite a ways in the previous chapter, committing adultery and murder, he is still well-acquainted with the Law (personally, I had to look it up).

This is proof that, even though David is in sinful degeneracy or is residing inside of the interlocking systems of arrogance, entering in by means of sexual arrogance, he still knows the Word of God. A person who falls into reversionism goes backward, even to the point of requiring that he be re-taught from the very beginning, so that he can fully understand all of the basics and put it all together (Heb. 6:1–6).

### The State of David’s Soul

1. David obviously knows portions of the Word of God; he retains a lot of doctrine in his soul. However, he appears to be affected by a blind spot in his own life (he can evaluate the life of another, but cannot easily see the same act of sin in his own life).
2. David is clearly trapped in a downward degeneracy spiral (despite having 20+ wives and mistresses, David is still chasing skit, even when these women he chases are married).
3. Furthermore, David is clearly caught in the sexual arrogance gate.
4. In all of this, David clearly knew some portions of Bible doctrine; his answer was immediate—in fact, he appears to have interrupted Nathan to render a decision—with the final penalty being a reflection of the Mosaic Law.

In the previous chapter, we made reference to the Doctrine of Sexual Arrogance (HTML) (PDF) (WordDOC). This doctrine was taken from http://www.olismp.com/requireddoctrines.htm

### 2Samuel 12:6b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ᵅqeb (ךֶּפֶב) [pronounced AY-kehb]</td>
<td>as a reward of, on account of, as a consequence of, because, because that; that</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>Strong’s #6118 BDB #784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥasher (חשֵר) [pronounced uh-SHER]</td>
<td>that, which, when, who, whom</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
<td>Strong’s #834 BDB #81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 If the animal is still alive, then he returns the stolen property and makes a twofold restitution (Lev. 22:4).
15 The sin unto death is not a particular sin, but just indicates that a believer has come to the end of his rope insofar as discipline goes. God cannot curb his evil behavior with discipline, so God instead opts to bring the believer home.
### 2Samuel 12:6b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʹâsâh (.ask) [pronounced gaw-SAWH]</td>
<td>to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong's #6213 BDB #793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʹêth (ayth) [pronounced ayth]</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong's #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dâbâr (daw)-VAWR</td>
<td>word, saying, doctrine, thing, matter, command</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong's #1697 BDB #182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeh (zeh) [pronounced zeh]</td>
<td>here, this, this one; thus; possibly another</td>
<td>demonstrative adjective with a definite article</td>
<td>Strong's #2088, 2090 (&amp; 2063) BDB #260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...as a consequence of having done this thing... Giving a word-for-word translation of this portion of v. 6 is difficult; and nearly every word-for-word translation ignores the relative pronoun here. In any case, the idea is, this is a consequence of this rich man taking the poor man's ewe lamb.

### 2Samuel 12:6c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (i, or i) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple waw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʹal (al) [pronounced gah]</td>
<td>upon, beyond, on, against, above, over; on the ground of, because of, according to, on account of, on behalf of, with, by, besides, in addition to, to, toward, together with, in the matter of, concerning, as regards to</td>
<td>preposition of proximity</td>
<td>Strong's #5921 BDB #752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʹâsher (uh-SHER) [pronounced uh-SHER]</td>
<td>that, which, when, who, whom</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
<td>Strong's #834 BDB #81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lô (low) [pronounced low]</td>
<td>not, no</td>
<td>negates the word or action that follows; the absolute negation</td>
<td>Strong's #3808 BDB #518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>châmal (khaw-MAHL) [pronounced khaw-MAHL]</td>
<td>to spare, to be sparing of anything; to use sparingly; to pity, to have compassion, to show mercy</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong's #2550 BDB #328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and because he showed no compassion.” We had this exact same verb earlier in this chapter, back in v. 4, where the rich man shows compassion upon his own animals, and, therefore, takes the little ewe lamb of the poor man. David indicates that there is no compassion here whatsoever.
R. B. Thieme, Jr. points out\(^*\) that compassion is not emotion; compassion is the ability to see things from another person’s perspective. This is objective thinking. The rich man in the story had absolutely no compassion for the poor man; he gave little or no thought to the poor man and his love for his little ewe-lamb (which describes David in his taking of Bathsheba).

David’s entire decision is: **David’s anger greatly burned against this man. Therefore, he said to Nathan, “As Jehovah lives, because this man did this evil thing, he deserves to die! Furthermore, he will recompense this man for his lamb fourfold because he did this awful thing and because he showed absolutely no compassion.”**

McGee comments: **David sounds like a preacher, doesn’t he? It is so easy to preach to the other person and tell him his faults, analyze him, and tell him what to do. Most of us are amateur psychologists who put other people on our own little critical couches and give them a working over. That is David. David says, “Wherever that man is, we are going to see that justice is done.”**\(^{17}\)

Quite obviously, David was able to see the speck in the eye of this man who had sinned, but did not yet realize that he had a log in his own eye (Luke 6:41–42). On the other hand, David is not simply passing judgment; he is not just offering up his unsolicited opinion. David represented the high court of the land, so what David says, even in an informal setting, stands as the ruling of the law in the state of Israel. Therefore, David is issuing a legal ruling here.

---

**Chapter Outline**
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**God's Judgement of David**

And so says Nathan unto David, “You [are] the man! Thus says Y’hovah, Elohim of Israel, ‘I anointed you for king over Israel and I delivered you from a hand of Saul.”

Then Nathan said to David, “You [are] that man! Thus says Y’hovah, Elohim of Israel, ‘I anointed you as king over Israel and I delivered you from the hand of Saul.”

Then Nathan said to David, “You are that man! Thus speaks Jehovah, the God of Israel: ‘I anointed you as king over all Israel and I delivered you out of the hand of Saul.”

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

- **Latin Vulgate**
  - And Nathan said to David: “You are the man. Thus says the Lord the God of Israel: I anointed You king over Israel, and I delivered You from the hand of Saul.

- **Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**
  - And so says Nathan unto David, “You [are] the man! Thus says Y’hovah, Elohim of Israel, ‘I anointed you for king over Israel and I delivered you from a hand of Saul.

- **Peshitta (Syriac)**
  - And Nathan said to David, You are the man. Thus says the LORD God of Israel, I anointed you king over my people Israel and I delivered you out of the hands of Saul.

- **Septuagint (Greek)**
  - And Nathan said to David, You are the man that has done this! Thus says the Lord God of Israel: I anointed you to be king over Israel, and I rescued you out the hand of Saul.

**Significant differences:**

The Greek adds a few words to the first thing that Nathan says. It was likely in the text which they used, but apparently not found in the Hebrew, Syriac or Latin today.

\(^*\) From R. B. Thieme, Jr.’s 1972 David series, lesson 264.

\(^{17}\) J. Vernon McGee; *I & II Samuel*; Thru the Bible Books; @Eternal life Camino Press, 1976, La Verne, CA; p. 229.
The Syriac appears to insert *my people* into what God says. The Syriac also seems to use the plural of *hand*.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

**CEV**

Then Nathan told David: You are that rich man! Now listen to what the LORD God of Israel says to you: "I chose you to be the king of Israel. I kept you safe from Saul...

**Easy English (Pocock)**

Then Nathan said to David, "You have behaved like that rich man! The *Lord, the God of *Israel, says, "I *anointed you as king over *Israel. I rescued you from Saul.

**Easy-to-Read Version**

Then Nathan said to David, "You are that [rich] man! This is what the Lord God of Israel says: 'I chose [Literally, "anointed," to pour a special oil on a person's head to show that he was chosen by God to be a king, priest, or prophet.] you to be the king of Israel. I saved you from Saul.

**Good News Bible (TEV)**

"You are that man," Nathan said to David. "And this is what the LORD God of Israel says: 'I made you king of Israel and rescued you from Saul.

**The Message**

"You're the man!" said Nathan. "And here's what GOD, the God of Israel, has to say to you: I made you king over Israel. I freed you from the fist of Saul.

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

**American English Bible**

And Nathan said to David, `You are the man who did this. And this is what Jehovah the God of Israel says: I'm the One who anointed you to be king over Israel, and I'm the One who saved you from the hands of Saul.

**NIRV**

Then Nathan said to David, "You are the man! The Lord, the God of Israel, says, 'I anointed you king over Israel. I saved you from Saul's powerful hand.

**New Jerusalem Bible**

Nathan then said to David, "You are the man! Yahweh, God of Israel, says this, "I anointed you king of Israel, I saved you from Saul's clutches,...

**Revised English Bible**

Nathan said to David, ‘You are the man! This is the word of the LORD the God of Israel to you. I anointed you king over Israel, I rescued you from the power of Saul.

**Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):**

**Bible in Basic English**

And Nathan said to David, You are that man. The Lord God of Israel says, I made you king over Israel, putting holy oil on you, and I kept you safe from the hands of Saul;...

**Complete Jewish Bible**

Natan said to David, "You are the man. "Here is what ADONAI, the God of Isra'el says: 'I anointed you king over Isra'el. I rescued you from the power of Sha'ul.

**JPS (Tanakh—1985)**

And Nathan said to Dvid, "That man is you! Thus said the LORD, the God of Israel: 'It was I who anointed you king over Israel and it was I who rescued you from the hand of Saul.

**NET Bible®**

Nathan said to David, "You are that man! This is what the LORD God of Israel says: 'I chose [Heb "anointed."] you to be king over Israel and I rescued you from the hand of Saul.

**Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:**

**Concordant Literal Version**

And Nathan said unto David, `You [are] the man! Thus said Yahweh, Elohim of Israel, I anointed you for king over Israel, and I delivered you out of the hand of Saul;'

**English Standard Version**

Nathan said to David, "You are the man! Thus says the LORD, the God of Israel, 'I anointed you king over Israel, and I delivered you out of the hand of Saul.

**exeGeses companion Bible**

And Nathan says to David, You are the man! Thus says Yah Veh Elohim of Yisra El,
The Book of Samuel

I anointed you sovereign over Yisra El and I rescued you from the hand of Shaul;...

Heritage Bible
And Nathan said to David, You are the man! Thus says Jehovah God of Israel, I anointed you king over Israel, and I snatched you out of the hand of Saul;...

KJV (Scofield)
And Nathan said to David, Thou art the man. Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, I anointed thee king over Israel, and I delivered thee out of the hand of Saul.

LTHB
And Nathan said to David, You are the man! So says Jehovah, the God of Israel, I anointed you as king over Israel, and I delivered you out of the hand of Saul.

Syndein
And Nathan said to David, "You . . . {are} the man!" {no verb because it is dramatic} Thus says Jehovah . . . 'Elohiym/Godhead of Israel, "I have anointed/appointed you {David} King of Israel and have delivered you out of the hand of Saul.".

Young’s Updated LT
And Nathan says unto David, “You are the man! Thus said Jehovah, God of Israel, I anointed You for king over Israel, and I delivered You out of the hand of Saul.

The gist of this verse:
Nathan tells David that he is this man; then he begins to speak for Jehovah, the God of Israel.

---

**2Samuel 12:7a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'âmar (ואמר)</td>
<td>to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #559 BDB #55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâthân (שבע)</td>
<td>given; one who is given; transliterated Nathan</td>
<td>masculine singular, proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #5416 BDB #681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'el ( ובלי)</td>
<td>unto; into, among, in; toward, to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to</td>
<td>directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied)</td>
<td>Strong’s #413 BDB #39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid (דוד)</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** Then Nathan said to David,... Nathan will now turn this around on David, and allow David to see himself. We still have a preposition here which indicates respect or deference to David.

Nathan has allowed David to have his say and to pass legal judgment upon the rich man.

---

**2Samuel 12:7b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'attâh (אתה) [pronounced aht-TAW]</td>
<td>you (often, the verb to be is implied)</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, personal pronoun</td>
<td>Strong’s #859 BDB #61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hebrew/Pronunciation** | **Common English Meanings** | **Notes/Morphology** | **BDB and Strong’s Numbers**
---|---|---|---
îysh (אִישׁ) [pronounced eesh] | a man, a husband; anyone; a certain one; each, each one, everyone | masculine singular noun with the definite article | Strong’s #376 BDB #35

**Translation:**...“You [are] that man! The definite article may be reasonably translated *that, this*. There is no verb here. This indicates great power and great drama in what Nathan was saying. We might do the same thing with boldface and 3 exclamation marks.

Nathan is telling David that he is the rich man, whom David has just condemned. David thought, in his own arrogance, that this was hidden from everyone. He thought that no one was aware of his sin. He figured that he had committed this sin and hid it well from the public; and Nathan here exposes David as the one who steals the poor man’s ewe lamb.

Now, notice, there is no hint of self-righteousness in what Nathan says here. Nathan delivered an analogous situation, which David believed was a real situation; David then required very little thought in order to give his judgment in the matter. It is David who has judged himself. All Nathan does here is reveal to David what he has done, in an objective way.

**Application:** Whenever you are having a dispute with anyone, believer or unbeliever, stop for a moment and try to see your dispute from that person’s eyes. Certainly, there are crooks and liars out there; but take a moment and determine from that person’s point of view what it is he sees, and how he understands the situation. David fully understood the depths of his depravity because he stood back and look at this situation objectively (through Nathan’s guidance, of course).

J. Vernon McGee comments: *What is David going to do? He is going to do something unusual, I can assure you of that. Dr. Margoliouth has said this: “When has this been done—before or since? Mary, Queen of Scots, would declare that she was above the law; Charles I would have thrown over Bathsheba; James II would have hired witnesses to swear away her character; Mohammed would have produced a revelation authorizing both crimes; Charles II would have publically abrogated the seventh commandment; Queen Elizabeth would have suspended Nathan.” Years ago, the Duke of Windsor would have give up his throne for her...David did not do any of these things. His actions will reveal his greatness.*

---

**Hebrew/Pronunciation** | **Common English Meanings** | **Notes/Morphology** | **BDB and Strong’s Numbers**
---|---|---|---
kôh (כו) [pronounced koh] | so, thus, here, hence | adverb | Strong’s #3541 BDB #462

‘âmar (אמר) [pronounced aw-MAHR] | to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think | 3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect | Strong’s #559 BDB #55

YHWH (יְהֹוָה) [pronunciation is possibly yohh-WAH] | transliterated variously as Jehovah, Yahweh, Y’howah | proper noun | Strong’s #3068 BDB #217

---

18 J. Vernon McGee; *I & II Samuel; Thru the Bible Books; @Eternal life Camino Press, 1976, La Verne, CA; p. 230.
### 2Samuel 12:7c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>′エルוהים (ספרא)</td>
<td>God; gods, foreign gods, god; rulers, judges; superhuman ones, angels; transliterated Elohim</td>
<td>masculine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #430 BDB #43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל (יִשְׂרָאֵל)</td>
<td>God prevails; contender; soldier of God; transliterated Israel</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #3478 &amp; #3479 BDB #975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** Thus says Y’howah, Elohim of Israel,... This ought to be a new verse, and/or this ought to be connected to what the Lord God actually says to David (through Nathan).... We are unaware of a portion of the mechanics here. Did God tell Nathan to say this? Is Nathan simply speaking extemporaneously through the power of the Spirit? Although I suspect the latter, we really don’t know. In any case, what is important is what God actually says to David through Nathan.

David, at this point, has turned around to see himself. That this was a parable is suddenly clear to David. The evil and viciousness of this rich man in the story is David himself, and he recognizes this. Now God can speak directly to him, through Nathan.

### 2Samuel 12:7d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>′אָנֹכִי (אָנֹכִי)</td>
<td>I, me; (sometimes a verb is implied)</td>
<td>1st person singular personal pronoun</td>
<td>Strong’s #595 BDB #59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מַשָּח (טעֵת)</td>
<td>to smear, to anoint</td>
<td>1st person singular, Qal perfect; with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #4886 BDB #602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לַמֵּד (לַמֵּד)</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2Samuel 12:7d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The meanings of the lâmed preposition broken down into groups: 1 to, towards, unto; it is used both to turn one's heart toward someone as well as to sin against someone; 2 to, even to; in this sense, it can be used with a number to indicate the upper limit which a multitude might approach (nearly). 3 Lâmed can be equivalent to the Greek preposition eis (εἰς), meaning into, as in transforming into something else, changing into something else (Gen. 2:7). This use of lâmed after the verb hâyâh (יהָ) [pronounced haw-YAW] (Strong's #1961 BDB #224) is one thing becoming another (Gen. 2:7). 4 Its fourth use is the mark of a dative, after verbs of giving, granting, delivering, pardoning, consulting, sending, etc. This type of dative is broken down into several categories, but one includes the translation by, which would be apropos here. 5 With regards to, as to. Similar to the Greek preposition eis (εἰς) plus the dative. [Numbering from Gesenius]. 6 On account of, because, propter, used of cause and reason (propter means because; Gesenius used it). 7 Concerning, about, used of a person or thing made the object of discourse, after verbs of saying. 8 On behalf of anyone, for anyone. 9 As applied to a rule or standard, according to, according as, as though, as if. 10 When associated with time, it refers to the point of time at which or in which anything is done; or it can refer to the space of time during which something is done (or occurs); at the time of.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melek* (מלך) [pronounced MEH-lek]</td>
<td>king, ruler, prince</td>
<td>masculine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong's #4428 BDB #572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'al (על) [pronounced ָגהל]</td>
<td>upon, beyond, on, against, above, over; on the ground of, because of, according to, on account of, on behalf of, with, by, besides, in addition to, to, toward, together with, in the matter of, concerning, as regards to</td>
<td>preposition of proximity</td>
<td>Strong's #5921 BDB #752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yisrá'él (ישראל) [pronounced yis-raw-ALE]</td>
<td>God prevails; contender; soldier of God; transliterated Israel</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong's #3478 &amp; #3479 BDB #975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:**...‘I anointed you as king over Israel...** God begins reminding David of the powerful position which he holds. He is king over all Israel. God chose David when he was a young man—maybe 14 or 16 years of age—and anointed him as king over Israel. This is about 35 years ago. God is establishing David’s relationship to God and to Israel.

God is speaking to David in several ways. First of all, through the parable, God gets David to take an objective look at himself. Then God finds it necessary to remind David of their long-standing relationship which goes back to David when he is maybe 12 or 14 years old in 1Sam. 16. David needs to be taken back, and then brought up to speed with divine viewpoint.

### 2Samuel 12:7e

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w* (or v) (ו, or ו) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel 12:7e

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nâtsal (נַתַּסָל) [pronounced naw-TSAHL]</td>
<td>to snatch away, to deliver, to rescue, to snatch out of danger, to preserve, to recover</td>
<td>1st person singular, Hiphil imperfect; with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5337 BDB #664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min (מִן) [pronounced min]</td>
<td>from, off, out from, out of, away from, on account of, since, than, more than</td>
<td>preposition of separation</td>
<td>Strong’s #4480 BDB #577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yâd (יָד) [pronounced yawd]</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>feminine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #3027 BDB #388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yâd (יָד) [pronounced yawd] can connote power, strength, ability; control; leadership, guidance.

Shâ’ûwl (שָׁעַל) [pronounced shaw-OOL] which is transliterated Saul; it means asked for | masculine proper noun | Strong’s #7586 BDB #982 |

Translation: ...and I delivered you from the hand of Saul.  Many times, King Saul tried to kill David. He was extremely jealous of David, and again and again; he became filled with mental attitude sins, and would then come after David, often bringing his personal army with him. Saul had all the power of his army behind him; he had some control over the media in that day as well—that is, he could make it seem as if David is a revolutionary, bound and determined to bring Saul down. Saul had many ways to get to David to kill him, and yet, he was never successful. That is clearly a testimony to God’s protection, which David enjoyed.

David is to look back, recognize that God anointed him king over Israel at a very young age; and God kept David safe from a mentally unbalanced Saul. We studied how God kept David safe in 1Sam. 18–31. David wrote at least one psalm about this (Psalm 18 inscription).

And so I give to you a house of your lord and women of your lord in your bosom; and so, I give to you a house of Israel and Judah. And if a little and I would add to you as these and as these.

I gave you the palace of your lord and placed his women into your care. Furthermore, I gave the nation of Israel and Judah to you. And if this were too little, then I would have added even more blessings to these.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

Latin Vulgate

And gave you your master’s house and your master’s wives into your bosom, and gave you the house of Israel and Juda: and if these things be little, I will add far greater things unto you.
And so I give to you a house of your lord and women of your lord in your bosom; and so, I give to you a house of Israel and Judah. And if a little and I would add to you as these and as these.

And I gave you your master's daughters and your master's wives into your bosom, and I also gave you the daughters of Israel and of Judah; and if they were too few you should have told me, and I would have added to you twice that many.

And I gave you the house of your master, and the wives of your master into your bosom, and I gave to you the house of Israel and Judah; and if that had been too little, I would have given you even more.

The Syriac has daughters of your lord rather than house of your lord. The final sentence is difficult to translate, and even the Greek has 2 different pronouns at the end, instead of repeating the same pronoun. In all cases, it appears that the English translations seek to smooth out the meanings even more. The Syriac adds an additional phrase into the mix: you should have told me. Despite these differences, the gist of that final phrase is the same.

And so I give to you a house of your lord and women of your lord in your bosom; and so, I give to you a house of Israel and Judah. And if a little and I would add to you as these and as these.

And I gave you your master's daughters and your master's wives into your bosom, and I also gave you the daughters of Israel and of Judah; and if they were too few you should have told me, and I would have added to you twice that many.

And I gave you the house of your master, and the wives of your master into your bosom, and I gave to you the house of Israel and Judah; and if that had been too little, I would have given you even more.

The Syriac has daughters of your lord rather than house of your lord. The final sentence is difficult to translate, and even the Greek has 2 different pronouns at the end, instead of repeating the same pronoun. In all cases, it appears that the English translations seek to smooth out the meanings even more. The Syriac adds an additional phrase into the mix: you should have told me. Despite these differences, the gist of that final phrase is the same.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV
///and even gave you his house and his wives. I let you rule Israel and Judah, and if that had not been enough, I would have given you much more.

Easy-to-Read Version
I let you take his family and his wives. And I made you king of Israel and Judah. As if that were not enough, I gave you more and more.

Good News Bible (TEV)
I gave you his kingdom and his wives; I made you king over Israel and Judah. If this had not been enough, I would have given you twice as much.

The Message
I gave you your master's daughter and other wives to have and to hold. I gave you both Israel and Judah. And if that hadn't been enough, I'd have gladly thrown in much more.

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

American English Bible
It was I who gave you the house of your lord and brought his wives to your chest. And I'm the One who gave you the house of IsraEl and Judah. and if you had remained faithful, I would have given you even more!

Ancient Roots Translinear
I gave you your lord's house, and your lord's women in your bosom. I gave you the house of Israel and of Judah; and if too little, I would add to ||those|| for you.

New American Bible
I gave you your lord's house and your lord's wives for your own. I gave you the house of Israel and of Judah. And if this were not enough, I could count up for you still more.

NIRV
I gave you everything that belonged to your master Saul. I even put his wives into your arms. I made you king over the people of Israel and Judah. And if all of that had not been enough for you, I would have given you even more.

New Jerusalem Bible
I gave you your master's household and your master's wives into your arms, I gave you the House of Israel and the House of Judah; and, if this is still too little, I shall give you other things as well.

New Simplified Bible
»'I gave you his kingdom and his wives. Then I made you king over Israel and Judah. If this had not been enough, I would have given you twice as much.

Revised English Bible
I gave you your master's daughter and his wives to be your own. I gave you the daughters of Israel and Judah; and, had this not been enough, I would have added other favours as well.

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bible in Basic English</td>
<td>I gave you your master's daughter and your master's wives for yourself, and I gave you the daughters of Israel and Judah; and if that had not been enough, I would have given you such and such things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Jewish Bible</td>
<td>I gave you your master's house and your master's wives to embrace. I gave you the house of Isra'el and the house of Y'hudah. And if that had been too little, I would have added to you a lot more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPS (Tanakh—1985)</td>
<td>I gave you your master's house and possession of your master's wives; and I gave you the House of Israel and Judah; and if that were not enough, I would give you twice as much more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET Bible®</td>
<td>I gave you your master's house, and put your master's wives into your arms [Heb &quot;and the wives of your lord into your chest [or &quot;lap&quot;];.&quot; The words &quot;I put&quot; are supplied in the translation for stylistic reasons and for clarification.]. I also gave you the house of Israel and Judah. And if all that somehow seems insignificant, I would have given you so much more as well!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Advent Bible</td>
<td>...and gave you your master's house and your master's wives into your bosom, and gave you the house of Israel and Juda: and if these things be little, I shall add far greater things unto you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American KJV</td>
<td>And I gave you your master's house, and your master's wives into your bosom, and gave you the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been too little, I would moreover have given to you such and such things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Amplified Bible</td>
<td>And I gave you your master's house, and your master's wives into your bosom, and gave you the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been too little, I would have added that much again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Group Version</td>
<td>...and I gave you your master's house, and your master's women { or wives } into your bosom, and gave you the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been too little, I would have added to you such and such things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Standard Version</td>
<td>And I gave you your master's house and your master's wives into your arms and gave you the house of Israel and of Judah. And if this were too little, I would add to you as much more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Names Version</td>
<td>I gave you your master's house, and your master's wives into your bosom, and gave you the house of Yisra'el and of Yehudah; and if that would have been too little, I would have added to you many more such things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Bible</td>
<td>And I gave you your lord's house, and I gave your lord's wives into your bosom, and gave you the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that were too little, I would have added to you this and that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASB</td>
<td>'I also gave you (H)your master's house and your master's wives into your care, and I gave you the house of Israel and Judah; and if that had been too little, I would have added to you many more things like these!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New King James Version</td>
<td>I gave you your master's house and your master's wives into your keeping, and gave you the house of Israel and Judah. And if that had been too little, I also would have given you much more!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndein</td>
<td>&quot;I {God} gave you the material possessions of your lord/master {'adown} {Saul} and the wives of your lord/master {'adown} to care for and I have given to you the house of Israel and Judah. And if all of this had been too little, I would have done even more for you to make you happy.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young's Updated LT</td>
<td>And I give to you the house of your lord, and the wives of your lord, into your bosom, and I give to you the house of Israel and of Judah; and if little, then I add to you such and such things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The gist of this verse: Speaking through Nathan, God tells David that He had given him the house and possessions of his lord, Saul; and He gave to David Israel and Judah. If that were not enough, God says He would have given more.

2Samuel 12:8a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (י)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nàthan (נתן)</td>
<td>to give, to grant, to place, to put, to set; to make</td>
<td>1st person singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5414 BDB #678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmêd (לּ)</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by</td>
<td>directional/relation preposition with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’éth (éת)</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bayîth (בֹּית)</td>
<td>house, residence; household, habitation as well as inward</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #1004 BDB #108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’âdôwn (אָדָון)</td>
<td>lord, master, owner, superior, sovereign</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #113 BDB #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (ו)</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’éth (éת)</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’îshshâh (אִשָּה)</td>
<td>woman, wife</td>
<td>feminine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #802 BDB #61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’âdôwn (אָדָון)</td>
<td>lord, master, owner, superior, sovereign</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #113 BDB #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b (ב) (בֹּ)</td>
<td>in, into, through; at, by, near, on, upon; with, before, against; by means of; among; within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chêyq (כַּיָּק or כַּיָּ)</td>
<td>bosom, hollow [portion of a chariot], lower [bottom] [portion of the altar]; midst</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #2436 BDB #300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translation: I gave you the house of your lord and the women of your lord into your care [lit., bosom];... The first issue is the imperfect tense here, which indicates an ongoing action. God not only gave these things in the past, but He continues to give them.

What God gave to David involves figures of speech. God did not give to David the specific palace where Saul lived because Saul lived in a different city—he lived in Gibeah, which was in Benjamin. David lived in Jerusalem, which was near the border of Judah and Benjamin (in which tribe’s territory it was located depended upon the time). The point being, David may or may not have possessed the exact same house that Saul ruled from. The Old Testament does not even record a time when David went to Gibeah during his reign (although, he may well have). Hiram, the King of Tyre, built David a great palace in Jerusalem (2Sam. 5:11). Therefore, the house of David’s lord does not refer to the actual palace where Saul lived in Gibeah, but to the palace of the king, which is now in Jerusalem. God is not saying that, when David took over, the deed to Saul’s palace was also conveyed to him; we do not even know if this palace is still standing. Here, the house of your lord is a metonym for David’s possessions and responsibilities. Because he is king, he has all the things which a king would have. These things were not passed along to a son of Saul.

When I lived in California, Ronald Reagan had been elected governor, and, one of the perks was, he lived in the governor’s mansion. Governor Reagan had a new governor’s mansion built, so that he could be said to be given the mansion of the previous governor (Pat Brown?), even though he did not live in the previous governor’s mansion. Jerry Brown, the governor after Reagan, chose not to live in Reagan’s newly built mansion, but rented a place downtown so that he could walk to work.

Therefore, God giving David the house of his lord did not mean that God gave David the specific palace that Saul lived in, but the palace of the king, wherever David chose for that to be.

Understanding this helps to explain the second phrase (interestingly enough, many exegetes express confusion over only the second thing given David by God). So, the wives of Saul here (the wives [or, women] of your lord) are not literally Saul’s former wives (as far as I can recall, he had but one wife and one mistress). David, being the age of Saul’s sons, would not have been too interested in marrying any of Saul’s women. However, a privilege of a king is, culturally speaking, to have any woman in his kingdom (as we examined in the previous chapter, David had about 10 wives and 10 mistresses). It appears as if God allowed David several wives, without disciplining him for it. However, God allowed David’s sexual arrogance to play out, which landed him in this particular jackpot (which we will be studying for about 10 chapters).

The house and the wives are the perks of being king. David did not have Saul’s specific palace and he did not have Saul’s former wives and mistresses; he had the palace and the wives of the king.

Now, if David took responsibility for Saul’s wife and mistress—assuming that they were still alive when David took power—we really don’t know. If we were to take this literally, David would be living in Saul’s former palace in Gibeah watching over Saul’s women. We know that the former is not true, in the strictest literal sense.

God is actually listing many ways that David knows that this is God speaking to him (through Nathan). These things which God has done on David’s behalf would be seen as positive things. Let’s take that final phrase mst literally for a moment, and logically follow it out. Quite obviously, David did not look to be married to Saul’s wife or mistress, and there is certainly no recorded history of this occurring (apart from this verse). Part of having a wife is making certain that wife is taken care of for the rest of her life. Prior to marriage, the woman needs to ask herself, “Do I respect this man and am I willing to obey him?” The man is to look at the woman and say, “Am I willing to make certain that, no matter what comes to pass, that this women is taken care of? Will I take care of

David and Saul both had wives with the name Ahinoam. They are not the same woman. While Saul is still alive and pursuing David, David was off hiding from Saul. During this time, David married Abigail and then Ahinoam (1Sam. 25:39–44). The Bible distinguishes them in this way: Saul’s wife, Ahinoam, is called the daughter of Ahimaaz (1Sam. 14:50). David’s wife, Ahinoam, is said to be of Jezreel (1Sam. 25:43 27:3 30:5 2Sam. 2:2 3:2 1Sam. 3:1).

---

David and Saul both had wives with the name Ahinoam. They are not the same woman. While Saul is still alive and pursuing David, David was off hiding from Saul. During this time, David married Abigail and then Ahinoam (1Sam. 25:39–44). The Bible distinguishes them in this way: Saul’s wife, Ahinoam, is called the daughter of Ahimaaz (1Sam. 14:50). David’s wife, Ahinoam, is said to be of Jezreel (1Sam. 25:43 27:3 30:5 2Sam. 2:2 3:2 1Sam. 3:1).
her just as I take care of my own body?” Seeing that your wife is taken care of for the rest of her life is both an honor and a responsibility. Saul, by making a series of bad decisions, died the sin unto death, and left his wife and mistress out in the lurch. There is the slight possibility that David, symbolic of his eventual triumph over Saul, took responsibility for these women, assuming that they were still alive.

So, for me, I can find good arguments on both sides of this—whether to take this final phrase as being absolutely literal or to simply understand that David, as king over all Israel, was simply given wives and mistresses.

God tells David: “I gave you the palace of your lord and placed his women into your care.” This leads us to the question, do we interpret this literally or figuratively. That is, did David really take Saul’s wife and mistress to take care of, or does this mean, David had the wives and mistresses of a king?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do We Interpret 2Samuel 12:8a Literally or Figuratively?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>David Literally Cared for Saul’s Women</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments in favor of each position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul had at least one wife and one mistress. These would be called <em>wives</em> by God the Holy Spirit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrusting Saul’s wives in the care of David simply indicates that David was given the throne of Saul; his most precious possession—his wives—were under David’s care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fact that this is mentioned nowhere else in the Bible does not mean it did not occur. Given David’s concern to take care of Saul’s family (2Sam. 9), this would be in keeping with his character; and David may have chosen to do this so that no one else knew about this except for a couple of servants and, of course, God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul, in his concern over the future of his wives, may have whisked them to a new safe location before going to war against the Philistines. Or, Saul may have had a contingency plan for his wives and family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We know that Mizpah, Saul’s concubine, was still alive when David was amassing power, and had apparently hooked up with Abner (2Sam. 5:7–11). Since Abner was killed due to some political intrigue, that does leave her fate up in the air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In such a case, these would all still be alive. Again, we know that it would be in David’s nature to want to take care of these women, and yet do it without any fanfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the ancient world, many marriages were political. A king giving his daughter to a man, often signified a place of great authority to that man. David was married to Michal (1Sam. 18:20), even though their relationship had become quite strained (2Sam. 6:20–23).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Do We Interpret 2Samuel 12:8a Literally or Figuratively?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>David Literally Cared for Saul’s Women</th>
<th>David Was Simply Given Wives and Mistresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David’s son, who rebelled, will have sex with all of David’s mistresses, in order to indicate that he is now in charge (2Sam. 1 6:20–22).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We do know that Saul’s mistress was alive beyond his death and during David’s taking power. Now Saul had a concubine whose name was Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah. And Ish-bosheth said to Abner, "Why have you gone in to my father’s concubine?" Then Abner was very angry over the words of Ish-bosheth and said, "Am I a dog’s head of Judah? To this day I keep showing steadfast love to the house of Saul your father, to his brothers, and to his friends, and have not given you into the hand of David. And yet you charge me today with a fault concerning a woman. God do so to Abner and more also, if I do not accomplish for David what the LORD has sworn to him, to transfer the kingdom from the house of Saul and set up the throne of David over Israel and over Judah, from Dan to Beersheba." And Ish-bosheth could not answer Abner another word, because he feared him (2Sam. 5:7–11).

This certainly allows for the possibility that, David, as king, was given the deed to Saul’s palace, and that he restored the palace, and provided for the welfare of Saul’s still living wife and mistress there (whether they are alive at this time is another story).

When I read a verse in the Bible, I may tend to get overly concerned as to its interpretation, even though, whether we take this literally or not, may have no spiritual connotation. However, this is just the way my mind seems to work—whether this appears to be a spiritually significant point or not, I still have a desire to explore it, even if I come to a dead end.

Quite obviously both David and God understood whether to take this phrase literally or not. We may or may not have an opinion on this; but David, because of what God says here, knows that God is speaking to him through Nathan.

Since the word in this verse means women, then Saul’s daughter, Michal, would certainly be included; so, in her case, this verse is certainly to be taken literally. In order to take this verse completely literally, there would have been one other woman involved, which could have been Saul’s mistress or his other daughter. David would not necessarily have to marry either one; he would simply have to take care of them, which would have been in keeping with David’s graciousness (see 2Sam. 9).

## Chapter Outline

**Charts, Maps and Short Doctrines**

This same question has obviously occurred to other theologians, e.g. Clarke, who wrote: Perhaps this means no more than that he had given him absolute power over every thing possessed by Saul; and as it was the custom for the new king to succeed even to the wives and concubines, the whole harem of the deceased king, so it was in this case; and the possession of the wives was a sure proof that he had got all regal rights. But could David, as the son-in-law of Saul, take the wives of his father-in-law? However, we find delicacy was seldom consulted in these cases; and Absalom lay with his own father’s wives in the most public manner, to show that he had seized on the kingdom, because the wives of the preceding belonged to the succeeding king, and to none other.

From the Geneva Bible: The Jews take this to be Eglah and Michal, or Rizpah and Michal.

[God is speaking to David through Nathan]: “I gave you the house of your lord and the women of your lord into your care.” There is a 3rd interpretation here. The house of your lord does not necessarily refer to a literal house,

---

20 Adam Clarke, *Commentary on the Bible*; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:8.

21 Geneva Bible Translation Notes; courtesy of e-sword; 1599; 2Sam. 12:8.
but to a dynasty. As the king over all Israel, Saul essentially has established a dynasty, and that his sons and their sons after him would be on the throne over Israel. This dynasty, because of Saul’s accumulated sins culminating in the sin unto death, was cut off, and when David became king, his descendants would rule over Israel. Saul’s dynasty was cut off (which is a part of the narrative at the beginning of 2Samuel).

As king, David was now responsible for all of the women in Israel. Women today in the United States take this for granted. We have not been invaded by another country for nearly 200 years, so the idea of this occurring is outside of the realm of the thinking of most women. It would not occur to them that here, in the United States, because of men, they are protected. However, our armed forces and all of the weaponry and all of the technology is primarily because of guidance of our leaders and primarily because of men. When one becomes president, he becomes responsible for the women of the land. This responsibility shifted from Saul over to David.

This particular interpretation solves the problem of God letting David have many wives—that is not really in view here, if God is speaking of David taking responsibility for all of the women of Israel. God cannot be understood, by this interpretation, to give David many wives, of this personal pleasure, even though ideally, one wife is the ideal. Furthermore, David violates this responsibility by taking Bathsheba. She is a woman who should be under his care. She should be able to look to David for protection. However, David violated her, a married woman—a woman married to one of his greatest soldiers. She should have been able to look to David for protection under any circumstances, and yet he just used her to satisfy his own sexual desires.

**Application:** This is why it is heinous for teachers to sexually take advantage of their students. These children are placed in the care of that teacher; they are his or her responsibility for so many hours a week. The parents entrust their children to the school and the school then shifts this responsibility over to individual teachers. The teacher ought to be providing education, guidance, and direction to his students; he or she ought to be an example for his or her students. To do anything less violates a trust between the parents and teacher.

**Application:** When we look at a position of authority, we often think about the power of that position. We look at it and cannot wait until we start ordering people around or being able to fire someone that he have hated for a long time. However, more important than the power and authority is the responsibility which goes with a high position (in a company, a business, in a branch of the military, in a school, in government). Introspection is not necessary here; since we live in a democracy, we can look toward our Senator or Congressman or President, and determine, is this person there for the perks of power or is his sincere desire to do the will of the people, within the confines of his own beliefs? Is the job the result of a long-held desire to be in charge, or is it seen as a privilege and a responsibility? If you are a believer with any modicum of authority (including that of being a husband or a parent), then you must continually ask yourself these questions.

### 2Samuel 12:8b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (י) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wāw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāthan (נתן) [pronounced naw-THAHN]</td>
<td>to give, to grant, to place, to put, to set; to make</td>
<td>1st person singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5414 BDB #678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lāmed (ל) [pronounced l']</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ěth (א) [pronounced ayth]</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel 12:8b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bayith (bayith) [pronounced BAH-yith]</td>
<td>house, residence; household, habitation as well as inward</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong's #1004 BDB #108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִשְׂרָאֵל (yis-ray-EL) [pronounced yis-raw-ALE]</td>
<td>God prevails; contender; soldier of God; transliterated Israel</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong's #3478 &amp; #3479 BDB #975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וְ (or v) (I or I) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָוֵ֣דָ֑ה (yoo-DAW) [pronounced yoo'hoo-DAW]</td>
<td>possibly means to praise, to be praised; and is transliterated Judah</td>
<td>masculine proper noun/location</td>
<td>Strong's #3063 BDB #397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and I gave you the nation [lit., house] of Israel and Judah. This is David’s responsibility as well as his power. He has authority over both the north and the south (called Israel and Judah here), but, at the very same time, he has responsibility for all of these people—which responsibility he has ignored as king, over the past few years. His sexual lust—his sexual arrogance—has begun to take up more and more of his time on earth.

**Application:** We only have so much time on this earth, and when we spend this time lost in a downward degeneracy spiral (e.g., in sexual lust, in an alcohol or drug-induced stupor), we lose valuable time. We only have one chance to live this life; we have God’s plan, which He certain will reveal to us—which plan we will enjoy executing—and we have only so many minutes on this earth. Since we will enjoy the greatest blessing in God’s will, executing God’s plan, then we certainly do not want to spend hours each day out of fellowship, pursuing some lust, which lust will offer us no fulfillment whatsoever.

David’s responsibilities toward the people of Israel are multifarious and important. Part of the problem here is, David’s nation will break out into a civil war because of what he does here. A war on home soil—particularly a civil war—is unbelievably damaging to persons and property. David’s lack of discipline in the previous chapter, and his willingness to give into his lusts, will result in great pain and misery throughout Israel, because he is king. What David did in the previous chapter was only possible because he was king; the negative affect of what he did impacts all of Israel, because he is their king.

**Application:** The greater the authority that you have, the greater the responsibility which is yours; therefore, the greater the punishment God lays upon you for your missteps.

Israel and Judah were thought of as separate entities for quite awhile. David first had control of Judah as king (the southern kingdom) and then he had control of Israel (the northern kingdom), as mentioned in 2Sam. 5:5. One of the reasons that these 2 kingdoms were separate entities at times was, the Philistines used to always strike central Israel, which would split these two regions apart. There also seems to be a spiritual separation, where Judah tended to favor the Lord Who bought them, and the northern kingdom tended to go astray more often.

2Samuel 12:8c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וְ (or v) (I or I) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel 12:8c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>îm (খ) [pronounced eem]</td>
<td>if, though; lo, behold; oh that, if only; when, since, though</td>
<td>primarily an hypothetical particle</td>
<td>Strong's #518 BDB #49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mîrâṯ (ןנפ) [pronounced mî-RAHT]</td>
<td>a little, fewness, few</td>
<td>masculine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong's #4592 BDB #589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BDB lists this as a substantive; Owen as an adverb in Judges 4:19.

The wâw conjunction is used as 1 a simple copulative, used to connect words and sentences, in which case it is usually rendered and. 2 It can be used to explain one noun or clarify one noun with another, in which case it is rendered even or yea (see Job 5:19 Dan. 4:10). 3 The wâw conjunction can introduce two nouns, where the first is the genus and the second is the species; in which case, we would render it and particularly, and specially, and namely, and specifically (and it can be used the other way as well) (see 2Kings 23:2 Psalm 18:1 Isa. 1:1 2:1 Zech. 14:21). 4 It can be prefixed to a verb also by way of explanation; it could be reasonably rendered as a relative pronoun (who, which) (see Gen. 49:25 Job 29:12 Isa. 13:14). 5 It can be used to begin an apodosis (the then portion of an if...then... statement) (see Gen. 2:4, 5 40:9 48:7). 6 It is used between words and sentences in order to compare them or to mark their resemblance (1Sam. 12:15 Job 5:7). 7 When doubled, it can mean both...and... (Num. 9:14 Joshua 7:24 Psalm 76:7). 8 It can be prefixed to adversative sentences or clauses and rendered but, and yet, although, otherwise (Gen. 2:17 15:2 17:20 Judges 16:15 Ruth 1:21 Job 15:5 6:14). 9 And, what we were after, is the wâw conjunction can be used in disjunctive sentences; that is, it can be rendered or (which will help us to understand what Jephthah does) (Ex. 21:17 Lev. 5:3 Deut. 24:7). 10 Finally, the wâw conjunction can be used before causal sentences and rendered because, for, that, in that (Gen. 18:32 30:27 Psalm 5:12 60:13); before conclusions or inferences, and therefore rendered so that, therefore, wherefore (2Kings 4:41 Isa. 3:14 Ezek. 18:32 Zech. 2:10); and before final and consecutive sentences, which mark an end or an object: in order that (Gen. 42:34 Job 20:10 Isa. 13:2). To paraphrase Gesenius, frequently, it is put after verbs and sentences standing absolutely, especially those which imply time or condition and is reasonably rendered then. 11

| yâçâph (ךח) [pronounced yaw-SAHPH] | to add, to augment, to increase, to multiply; to add to do = to do again; to continue to | 1st person singular, Hiphil imperfect with the volutative hê | Strong's #3254 BDB #414 |
| lâmed (ך) [pronounced l'] | to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by | directional/relation preposition with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix | No Strong's # BDB #510 |
| kâph or kî (ך) [pronounced kî] | like, as, just as; according to; about, approximately | preposition of comparison or approximation | No Strong's # BDB #453 |
| hênnâh (ןנ) [pronounced hayn-nawh] | they, those; these [with the definite article] | 3rd person feminine plural personal pronoun | Strong's #2007 BDB #241 |

22 H. W. F. Gesenius, Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament; ©1979 by Baker Books; p. 234. When I give a slightly different rendering to a word which I have, 99% of the time, been translating one way, I thought that I should include some documentation for a different usage.
When the kaph preposition is doubled, it should be rendered as...and as, as...so; how...thus; as well...as.

Translation: And, if [this was too] little, then I would have added to you even more [lit., these (blessings) as well as those (blessings)]. Although a word-for-word translation here is hard to understand, what is being said is fairly easy to get. God would have been willing to give David even more than He did.

God has given us far more than we can imagine. His greatest gift to us is, of course, His Son. He who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all, how will he not also with him graciously give us all things? (Rom. 8:32).

Now, you may wonder—if only God had given David more wives and mistresses; maybe he would not be so likely to roam. That is simply not the case. Some men have one wife and this is their only sexual partner for life; and they both enjoy sex, qualitatively and quantitatively; whereas, there are men who make a full-time occupation of chasing skirt\(^{23}\), and they are frustrated, continually lustful, and without the slightest interest in the woman on their arm. Solomon will have 1000 wives and mistresses, and still, he chased after the woman in Song of Solomon, and was quite frustrated because he did not know her love. It is easier to be faithful to one woman than it is to 10. The key is not the physical attraction, but the soul coalescence.

David’s final relationship, with Bathsheba, will develop into a soul coalescence. Because of this, David will develop a relationship with their sons and actually bring them up as a father ought to. Because of David’s good relationship with his son, Solomon, we will have the books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon. Because David was a lousy father to the sons of his earlier marriages, Israel will fall into a civil war. He did not have a soul-to-soul relationship with his wives and mistresses; and he did not have a soul-to-soul relationship with their children by him. He may have felt emotional about them; he may have like these women and children from time to time; but David’s soul was not engaged with their souls, and so his children went astray.

As an aside, this is why male homosexuals do not tend to have lifetime relationships—God designed for the souls of the man and the woman to coalesce in the same way that their bodies fit together. Therefore, it is much more likely that a man and a woman to form a partnership which lasts their entire lifetimes. The key is the coalescence of souls, not being attracted to one’s partner’s body. Two male souls can coalesce in friendship (as can two female souls), but they do not coalesce in the kind of love that there can be between a man and a woman.

Although most English translations do not format this as such, but there appears to be an element of poetry in what God says to David in 2Sam. 12:7b–8.

\(^{23}\) Chasing skirt is an idiom which means that David spends much of his time pursing sexual relations with women. Since few women wear skirts any more, it may not have meaning for the younger generation.
What God Has Given David

Thus speaks Jehovah, the God of Israel:

‘I anointed you as king over all Israel and I delivered you out of the hand of Saul. I gave you the palace of your lord and placed his women into your care. Furthermore, I gave the nation of Israel and Judah to you. And if this were too little, then I would have added even more blessings to these.

David was given more than any of his contemporaries; on top of these things, for much of his life, David had inner happiness and peace.

God will now hit David right between the eyes with his sins. In v. 9, God will clearly lay out David’s wrongdoing.

Why have you despised a word of Y’hovah to do the evil in His eyes? Uriah the Hittite you have struck down in the sword; and his woman you seized to yourself to a woman; and him you have slain in a sword of sons of Ammon.

Why have you despised and disobeyed the Word of Jehovah by doing this evil in His sight? You struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword. You seized for yourself his wife to [be your] wife. You killed him with the sword of the sons of Ammon.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

- Latin Vulgate
  Why therefore have you despised the word of the Lord, to do evil in My sight? You have killed Urias the Hethite with the sword, and have taken his wife to be your wife, and have slain him with the sword of the children of Ammon.

- Masoretic Text (Hebrew)
  Why have you despised a word of Y’hovah to do the evil in His eyes? Uriah the Hittite you have struck down in the sword; and his woman you seized to yourself to a woman; and him you have slain in a sword of sons of Ammon.

- Peshitta (Syriac)
  Why have you despised the commandment of the LORD and have done that which is evil in the sight of the LORD? You have killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword and have taken his wife to be your wife and have slain him with the sword of the Ammonites.

- Septuagint (Greek)
  Why have you despised the word of the Lord, to do evil in His eyes? You have slain Uriah the Hittite with the sword, and you have taken his wife to be your wife, and you have slain him with the sword of the children of Ammon.

Significant differences: The Syriac has commandment instead of word. The original Hebrew text reads the evil, rather than that which is evil (the Greek actually matches the Hebrew word-for-word here; I do not know about the Syriac). The Latin has, inexplicable, my sight rather than his sight.

The Hebrew reads to yourself to wife; which is reasonably shortened to to be your wife (it does match word-for-word in the Greek). In the final phrase, the English
translation of the Syriac leaves off sons of. In both of those cases, I did the same thing in order to smooth out the translation.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

**CEV**

Why did you disobey me and do such a horrible thing? You murdered Uriah the Hittite by having the Ammonites kill him, so you could take his wife.

**Easy English (Pocock)**

But you did this evil thing. So, you acted as if God’s law has no value. You killed Uriah the *Hittite by the sword of the *Ammonites. Then you took his wife for yourself.

**Easy-to-Read Version**

So why did you ignore the Lord’s command? Why did you do the thing which he says is wrong? You let the Ammonites kill Uriah the Hittite, and you took his wife. In this way, you killed Uriah with a sword.

**Good News Bible (TEV)**

Why, then, have you disobeyed my commands? Why did you do this evil thing? You had Uriah killed in battle; you let the Ammonites kill him, and then you took his wife! You have killed him with an Ammonite sword!

**The Message**

So why have you treated the word of GOD with brazen contempt, doing this great evil? You murdered Uriah the Hittite, then took his wife as your wife. Worse, you killed him with an Ammonite sword!

**New Century Version**

So why did you ignore the Lord’s command? Why did you do what he says is wrong? You killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword of the Ammonites and took his wife to be your wife!

**New Life Bible**

Why have you hated the Word of the Lord by doing what is bad in His eyes? You have killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword. You have taken his wife to be your wife. You have killed him with the sword of the sons of Ammon.

**New Living Translation**

Why, then, have you despised the word of the Lord and done this horrible deed? For you have murdered Uriah the Hittite with the sword of the Ammonites and stolen his wife.

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

**American English Bible**

So, why have you treated the word of Jehovah as worthless by doing this wicked thing in His eyes? For, you cut down UriAh the Hittite with the broadsword and took his wife as yours, because, when the sons of AmMon killed him, it was you who really killed him.

**Ancient Roots Translinear**

Why despise the word of Yahweh by doing evil in his eyes? You smote Uriah the Central-Syrian with the sword, took his woman as your woman, and slew him with the sword of the sons of Amman.

**God’s Word™**

Why did you despise my word by doing what I considered evil? You had Uriah the Hittite killed in battle. You took his wife as your wife. You used the Ammonites to kill him.

**New American Bible**

Why have you spurned the LORD and done evil in his sight? You have cut down Uriah the Hittite with the sword; you took his wife as your own, and him you killed with the sword of the Ammonites.

**NIRV**

"Why did you turn your back on what I told you to do? You did what is evil in my sight. You made sure that Uriah, the Hittite, would be killed in battle. You took his wife to be your own. You let the men of Ammon kill him with their swords.

**New Simplified Bible**

»'Why have you disobeyed my commands? Why did you do this evil thing? You had Uriah killed in battle! You let the Ammonites kill him. Then you took his wife!

**Revised English Bible**

Why then have you flouted the L ORD’s word by doing what is wrong in my eyes? You have struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword; the man himself you murdered by the sword of the Ammonites, and you have stolen his wife.

**Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):**
Why then have you had no respect for the word of the Lord, doing what is evil in his
eyes? You have put Uriah the Hittite to death with the sword, and have taken his
wife to be your wife; you have put him to death with the sword of the children of
Ammon.

Bible in Basic English

Why then have you shown such contempt for the word of ADONAI and done what
I see as evil? You murdered Uriah the Hitti with the sword and took his wife as
your own wife; you put him to death with the sword of the people of 'Amon.

Complete Jewish Bible

So why have you shown such contempt for the word of ADONAI and done what
I see as evil? You murdered Uriah the Hitti with the sword and took his wife as
your own wife--you murdered him with the Ammonite's sword.

HCSB

Why then have you despised the command of the LORD by doing what I consider
evil? You struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword and took his wife as your own
wife--you murdered him with the sword of the people of Ammon.

NET Bible®

Why have you shown contempt for the word of the LORD by doing evil in my [So
the Qere; the Kethib has "his."] sight? You have struck down Uriah the Hitti with
the sword and you have taken his wife as your own [Heb "to you for a wife." This
expression also occurs at the end of v. 10.]! You have killed him with the sword
of the Ammonites.

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

Context Group Version

Why have you ignored YHWH, to do that which is evil in his eyes? You have struck
Uriah the Hittite with the sword, and have taken his woman { or wife } to be your
woman { or wife }, and have slain him with the sword of the sons of Ammon.

exeGeses companion Bible

Why despise you the word of Yah Veh
to work evil in his eyes?
You smote Uri Yah the Hethiy with the sword
and took his woman to be your woman
and slaughtered him with the sword
by the sons of Ammon:

Modern KJV

Why have you despised the Word of Jehovah, to do evil in His sight? You have
stricken Uriah the Hittite with the sword, and have taken his wife to be your wife,
and have killed him with the sword of the sons of Ammon.

New King James Version

Why have you despised the commandment of the LORD, to do evil in His sight?
You have killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword; you have taken his wife to be your
wife, and have killed him with the sword of the people of Ammon.

Syndein

"Why do you 'regard with contempt'/reject the word/'doctrinal communication
{dabar} of Jehovah/God, by doing what is evil in His eyes?" "You have murdered
Uriah the Hitti by means of the sword, you have taken to yourself his wife . . . {to
become} {now} your wife {means David has stolen her from Uriah via his murder}!
You have sacrificed/slaughtered him {Uriah} by means of the sword of the
soldiers/sons of Amon {terrorists}.

Young’s Updated LT

Why have You despised the word of Jehovah, to do the evil thing in His eyes?
Uriah the Hittite You have struck down by the sword, and his wife You have taken
To you for a wife, and him You have slain by the sword of the Bene-Amon.

The gist of this verse:

Nathan asks David “Why have you despised the Word of the Lord to do evil in His
eyes?” Then Nathan spells out what David did: he had Uriah the Hittite killed so
that he could take his wife Bathsheba as his own.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>maddu’ā (מָדַדַע)</td>
<td>why, wherefore, on what account, and it is probably a contraction of a word which means what being known</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Strong’s #4069 BDB #396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bâzâh (בָּזָה)</td>
<td>to despise, to regard with contempt, to hold in contempt</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #959 BDB #102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’êth (אֶת)</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dâbâr (דָּבָר)</td>
<td>word, saying, doctrine, thing, matter, command</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #1697 BDB #182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YHWH (יְהוָה)</td>
<td>transliterated variously as Jehovah, Yahweh, Y*howah</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #3068 BDB #217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לָمֶד)</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by</td>
<td>directional/relation preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘âsâh (גָּשָה)</td>
<td>to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture</td>
<td>Qal infinitive construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #6213 BDB #793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra’ (רָא)</td>
<td>evil, bad, wicked; evil in appearance, deformed; misery, distress, injury; that which is displeasing [disagreeable, unhappy, unfortunate, sad]</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #7451 BDB #948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b° (בּ)</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’ayin (אָיִין)</td>
<td>spring, fountain; eye, spiritual eyes</td>
<td>feminine plural noun with the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5869 (and #5871) BDB #744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This phrase is literally in their eyes, but it can be translated in his opinion, in his estimation, to his way of thinking, as he sees [it].

**Translation:** Why have you despised the Word of Y*howah to do evil in His eyes? God set up His Law, and David knew this Law. We figured this out when David unsuccessfully tried to move the Ark of God, and then, later, figured out how to properly move it. That required a study of the Word of God. Therefore, David knew that what he was doing was wrong—it was completely against the Word of God. We know that David knows the Word of God, because he correctly determined the proper punishment for the rich man who stole the poor man’s ewe lamb, back in v. 6. Furthermore, most men could figure out that doing what David did was simply wrong.
To be specific, David has broken the 10th commandment, and has desired to take for himself his neighbor’s wife. Then David committed adultery with this woman, breaking the 6th commandment; and then he had her husband killed, breaking the 7th commandment. David is fully aware of these commandments.

**Application:** Societies and cultures tend to grow and develop norms and standards which the culture more or less agrees to. So a thief in one culture had his hand cut off; in another culture, that is seen as barbaric. In one culture, homosexuals are executed; in others they are even celebrated. This identify develops within smaller sized communities, where one may accept and even see value in having homeless people (most of whom are homeless due to alcohol and/or drug abuse). Nearby communities may see various people laying in the streets as a nuisance to be eliminated. You have no doubt heard, dozens of times, that you *can’t legislate morality*. However, this is what law is—a community develops norms and standards and codifies these norms and standards into law. So, the laws of a community reflect their norms and standards, which is, their morality. Therefore, in some countries, pornography of all sorts is available (under the concept of freedom of speech); but, in that same country, like Canada, quoting certain Bible verses is illegal.

God looks at a nation as a collective body and judges it in this way. We do this all of the time. We might want to go and visit Australia or Thailand, but have little interest in vision Iran, despite the fact that there are certain evil and unpleasant people in Australia and Thailand, and that there are certain some interesting people in Iran. We view countries as corporate entities, and we have opinions of these countries as a collective whole.

I mention this because, what David does, as king of the country, has an impact on the rest of the country. President Bill Clinton, whether you liked him or did not like him, had an effect on the morality of our country when it came to his affair with Monica Lewinski. This literally changed the United States as a national entity just as much as any legislation which he signed into law. This is why a national head of state has a good deal more responsibility does Charley Brown, citizen. David’s actions will affect the entire country; some will become more self-righteous because of what he has done; some will become more immoral, using David’s actions as an excuse. Because of David’s position as king, his sins have a far greater effect upon the country.

As has been suggested in the study of the previous chapter, these things which David did are probably the basis for the rebellion against him.

**Application:** As a believer in Jesus Christ, you are an ambassador for Him, and your behavior is an issue to God. People who know that you are a Christian look at your actions, and they may dismiss Christianity because they know who you are. In a congregation, the pastor-teacher has even greater responsibility. First of all, he is dealing with 20, or 200 or 2000 people who oscillate between the control of the sin nature and the control of the Holy Spirit; these same people find themselves in the midst of the Angelic Conflict, and are often subject to demonic attacks because of this. Therefore, an act of immorality on the part of a pastor-teacher would be like setting off a grenade in the middle of the congregation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Samuel 12:9b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hebrew/Pronunciation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾēth (אֵת) [pronounced ayth]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣwɨ̄rîyyâh (שִׂירִיָּה) [pronounced oo-ree-YAW]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also spelled Ṣwɨ̄rîyyâhûw (שִׂירִיָּהְו) [pronounced oo-ree-YAW-hoo].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2Samuel 12:9b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chittîy (חִיטִי) [pronounced khiht-TEE]</td>
<td>a descendant of Heth; transliterated Hittite</td>
<td>gentilic adjective; with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #2850 BDB #366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâkâh (נָכָּה) [pronounced naw-KAWH]</td>
<td>to smite, to assault, to hit, to strike, to strike [something or someone] down, to defeat, to conquer, to subjugate</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, Hiphil perfect</td>
<td>Strong #5221 BDB #645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b° (ב) [pronounced b°]</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chereb (כֶּרֶב) [pronounced khe-RE° V]</td>
<td>sword, knife, dagger; any sharp tool</td>
<td>feminine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #2719 BDB #352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** You struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword. Nathan makes it very clear that, what David did was personally kill Uriah the Hittite, one of his greatest soldiers. It does not matter that David did this by order and put it in the hands of Joab to carry out, where Uriah’s death was by many Ammonite soldiers—it was as if David personally killed Uriah himself.

United States law is very similar here. If you attempt to set up a contract with someone else to kill an enemy of yours, even if that person is an agent of law enforcement and not a criminal, you can be prosecuted as if you had attempted to murder someone face to face. Although this may involve different statutes, the penalties are quite similar.

David’s crime is recorded in 2Sam. 11:14–17.

### 2Samuel 12:9c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w° (or v°) (ו or ו) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple waw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’êth (אֵת) [pronounced ayth]</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’îshshâh (אֵשְׁשָׁה) [pronounced eesh-SHAW]</td>
<td>woman, wife</td>
<td>feminine singular noun with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #802 BDB #61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are times when it is not necessary to translate the waw conjunction In the English, if there is a long list of things, we usually use an and before the final item in the list. Also, sentences which are related may be strung together with waw conjunctions instead of waw consecutives. The latter often indicates successive action; the former a series of statements which are not listed in order of occurrence. In the English, it is not necessary to introduce each separate sentence with an and (in fact, it is improper to do so).
**Translation:** You seized for yourself his wife to [be your] wife. Interestingly enough, we do not find the word for adultery here, but one of the things which David did that was evil was to take Uriah’s wife to be his wife. Even though this is politically incorrect to say, there is ownership involved here. Uriah owned this woman. She belonged to him. He was responsible for her. Like all marriages, God designed that marriage to last until to death do you part.

That David took Bathsheba sexually while she was married is recorded in 2Sam. 11:4 and he took her to be his wife in 2Sam. 11:27 after having had her husband killed.

As was discussed in 2Sam. 11, Bathsheba, Uriah’s wife, was David’s right woman. The 2 lines to our Lord come through Bathsheba. Therefore, a relationship between David and Bathsheba was probably inevitable. We do not know when this would have occurred. This takes us into considerations of what if? War, being what it is, could very well have resulted in the death of Uriah the Hittite. It is reasonable to suppose that God would have brought David and Bathsheba together under different and far better circumstances. However, this was not David’s right to bring these things to pass by violating the laws of God—even if he looked at Bathsheba and instantly decided that she was his right woman.

**Application:** Love does not conquer all, nor is love to be over all. Integrity is more important than love. Integrity, with or without love, is a great and wonderful thing; love is only worthwhile when it is associated with integrity. God’s love for us is based upon His righteousness and justice. That is what makes His love certain and trustworthy. We know that we can depend upon God’s integrity; therefore, we know that His love is sound and meaningful.

Mankind is being observed by angels, and what is being observed here is, it is better to have a relationship with a person of integrity than with a person who feels all lovey-dovey toward you. The integrity of that person’s soul usually overrides everything that they do; the emotion of someone else’s soul changes from time to time. Integrity is stable; emotional love is not. Being loved by a person who has no integrity is like trying to grab the wind.

**Application:** You no doubt have, at one time or another, come a cross a woman who was totally unreliable, unpredictable and undependable, and yet, was totally in love with you or someone you know. What is the result? Her love is unreliable, unpredictable and undependable. One day, she is professing her undying love to you; the next day, she is plotting your death with her new lover. Her love is all emotion and it is tied to nothing; her love is a house built upon a foundation of sand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lâqach (הָגָח) [pronounced law-KAHKH]</td>
<td>to take, to take away, to take in marriage; to seize</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3947 BDB #542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לָמַד) [pronounced l’]</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לָמַד) [pronounced l’]</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>îshshâh (אִשְׁשַׁה) [pronounced eesh-SHAW]</td>
<td>woman, wife</td>
<td>feminine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #802 BDB #61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That David has, at some point, fallen in love with Bathsheba, is not an issue. In his present state, this means nothing. David has to get out of his lust spiral and develop his personal integrity before his love has any meaning. Apart from this, Bathsheba is just another notch in David's belt, and she will be soon replaced.

**Application:** God's discipline, that he will lay upon David, will make David a better husband, a better father and a better lover. This is because God will put enough pressure upon David so that he re-develops the integrity that he once had. His love for Bathsheba will mean something because God's discipline will turn him around.

**Application:** In case you had any doubts, God takes adultery very seriously. It does not matter if you are intruding upon a terrible marriage, or a marriage which appears to be headed toward divorce; God hates divorce and He hates adulterers. Therefore, you can spare yourself a lot of grief by never allowing yourself to get anywhere near a temptation like this. It does not matter if you are the man or the woman; and it does not matter what stories you hear from the other person. You should avoid adultery at all costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (ה or ו) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple waw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>êth (אתי) [pronounced ayth]</td>
<td>untranslated mark of a direct object; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>affixed to a 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong's #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hârag (⁄) [pronounced haw-RAHG]</td>
<td>to kill, to slay, to execute; to destroy, to ruin</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect with the 1st person singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong's #2026 BDB #246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This word can refer to killing as a result of ruthless violence (Gen. 4:8, 14–15 12:12 20:11) or in war (Num. 31:7–8 Joshua 8:24), as a result of God killing an individual or a people (Gen. 20:4 Ex. 4:23). This word can be used for the killing of animals (Num. 22:29 Job 20:16) and it can mean to destroy, to ruin (Job 5:2 Prov. 7:26 Jer. 4:31). Therefore, the context tells us whether we are dealing with a justified or unjustified act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b (ב) [pronounced b]</th>
<th>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</th>
<th>a preposition of proximity</th>
<th>No Strong's # BDB #88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chereb (כְרֶב) [pronounced khe-REV]</td>
<td>sword, knife, dagger; any sharp tool</td>
<td>feminine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong's #2719 BDB #352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bânîym (בָּנִים) [pronounced baw-NEEM]</td>
<td>sons, descendants; children; people; sometimes rendered men</td>
<td>masculine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong's #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ammôwn (אַמּוֹן) [pronounced gahm-MOHN]</td>
<td>hidden; transliterated Ammon</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong's #5983 BDB #769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is often transliterated Bene-Ammon and is a common designation for this country.

**Translation:** You killed him with the sword of the sons of Ammon. Interestingly enough, David's killing of Uriah is repeated; however, this time the means of his death is cited—David had Uriah killed by the sword of his enemy. The means of Uriah's death is particularly sad—Uriah was willing to give his life for his adopted country; he was
willing to die for his king. David had Uriah killed, not for the freedom of Israel, but so that David could take Uriah’s wife from him.

At the beginning of 2Sam. 11, I presented a multitude of theories to explain David’s behavior. David is not just some chump believer. God has given him the Holy Spirit. David has matured spiritually. Therefore, there is more going on here than a simple sin or the idea that David simply has fallen into protracted carnality (which he obviously has, but there is more to it than that). I think that, at this time, we can reasonably settle upon 4 things.

### Explaining David’s Sin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Text/Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protracted Carnality</td>
<td>David has gotten out of fellowship and has stayed out of fellowship for quite awhile. However, this is only one piece of the puzzle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degeneracy sins (addictive behavior)</td>
<td>Sins which are related to pleasure tend to have an addictive quality to them. Most often, these sins are related to sex, drugs and alcohol (although, some seem to be similarly affected by sins like gambling as well). As David collected more and more wives, his mind became more and more obsessed with sexual pleasure, until it consumed his life. Satisfying the addictive behavior only temporarily satisfies the lust for that particular pleasure. Hours later, that same lust will reemerge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlocking Systems of Arrogance</td>
<td>Through a sin which involves arrogance, we step into a complex which makes us more vulnerable to other sins of arrogance, which normally would not have affected us before. Using David as an illustration: David would never consider just cold-bloodedly murdering someone, particularly a fellow solider. However, after stepping tin the interlocking systems of arrogance through sexual arrogance, he was more willing, then, to engage in conspiracy arrogance as well (conspiring to have Uriah killed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind Spot Arrogance</td>
<td>Culturally, much of what David did to feed his sexual arrogance was legitimate. Kings tended to collect wives and mistresses, and people tended to accept that as legitimate behavior (despite what the Word of God says about it). So David, for many years, continued to do that which was culturally acceptable—to collect wives and mistresses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All this time, we know that David still has some doctrine in his soul and that he is in fellowship from time to time. When Nathan spoke to him about the rich man and the poor man, David knew the Law of Moses, and determined the correct punishment immediately. In fact, he appeared to cut Nathan off when he pronounced judgment on the rich man. Therefore, David did not have to consult legal counsel in order to come up with an appropriate punishment. Hence, David did have a ir amount of doctrine in his soul while committing these sins.

---

2Sam. 12:7–9  Then Nathan said to David, “You are that man! Thus speaks Jehovah, the God of Israel: ‘I anointed you as king over all Israel and I delivered you out of the hand of Saul. I gave you the palace of your lord and placed his women into your care. Furthermore, I gave the nation of Israel and Judah to you. And if this were too little, then I would have added even more blessings to these. Why have you despised and disobeyed the Word of Jehovah by doing this evil in His sight? You struck down Uriah the Hittite with a sword. You seized his wife for yourself and made her your wife. You killed him with the sword of the Ammonites. No doubt, this was in a room full of witnesses. This may have even occurred in court. As has been discussed, up until this time, many people had bits and pieces of this story. However, here, in public, Nathan lays it all out: “You, David, have despised the Word of Jehovah and have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite as your wife and then had him killed by the sword of the Ammonites.” No matter how many people knew this or that part of the story; this was the first time that these things had been said aloud in public, for all to hear. These are crimes which David has committed;
these are transgressions of an incredible magnitude. There must have been a stunned silence in that room, where one could have heard a pin drop. Would David order the execution of Nathan?

Although there is certainly much to be said for the privacy of the individual believer, David is the leader of his nation; he is the king over Israel. Therefore, he is treated differently. Most people had this or that piece of the puzzle which was David’s sins. Some knew about or suspected the adultery. Some knew about or suspected that Uriah was killed because of David. Nathan lays it all out here in the open.

**Application:** You may lust after power, but with that power comes all sorts of responsibility—responsibility in areas that you did not necessarily bargain for. The scandal of the day is a Congressman Anthony Weiner, who committed mental adultery with women online, and this became known. Now, had the congressman been a private citizen, we would know nothing about this. It is even possible that his wife would know nothing about this, at this point. However, as a person of great authority, his behavior becomes relevant and subject to being brought out into the open. The same is true for any person of authority: a teacher, a pastor-teacher, a corporate head. The greater your authority, the greater your responsibility.

**Application:** President Clinton changed the relationship between young men and women for at least a decade; he may have affected tens of thousands or even hundreds of thousands of teens by his behavior in the White House.

In vv. 10–11, God will lay out David’s punishment, which will be fourfold for what he has done.

**And now will not turn away a sword from your house as far as forever on account of that you have despised Me and so you take a wife of Uriah the Hittite to be to your to wife.’**

**2Samuel 12:10**

**Now, therefore, the sword will not depart from your house forever because you have despised Me and you have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife.’**

**2Samuel 12:11**

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin Vulgate</td>
<td>Therefore the sword shall never depart from your house, because you have despised Me, and have taken the wife of Urias the Hethite to be your wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masoretic Text (Hebrew)</td>
<td>And now will not turn away a sword from your house as far as forever on account of that you have despised Me and so you take a wife of Uriah the Hittite to be to your wife,’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshitta (Syriac)</td>
<td>Now therefore the sword shall not depart from your house forever; because you have despised me and have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septuagint (Greek)</td>
<td>Now therefore the sword shall never depart from your house, because you have despised Me, and you have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite, to be your wife.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences:** The English translation of the Latin and Greek have never instead of a negative later followed by forever; but the actual Greek is just like the Hebrew here.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

**CEV**

"Because you wouldn’t obey me and took Uriah’s wife for yourself, your family will never live in peace."
Therefore, in the future, your family will always fight. There will be constant wars. This is because you did not respect me. And so you took the wife of Uriah the Hittite for yourself.

So the sword will never leave your family. You took Uriah the Hittite’s wife. In this way, you showed that you did not care for me.’

This is because you did not respect me. And so you took the wife of Uriah the Hittite for yourself.

So, now the broadsword will not leave your house through the ages, because you treated Me with contempt by taking the wife of Uriah the Hittite as your wife.

Now therefore, since you have despised me and taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your own wife, your family will never again have rest from the sword.

Now the sword will never turn from your house unto forever, in reward for you despising me and taking the woman of Uriah the Central-Syrian to be your woman.’

For this, your household will never be free of the sword, since you showed contempt for me and took the wife of Uriah the Hittite, to make her your wife.’

Now therefore, the sword will never leave your house - because you have shown contempt for me and taken the wife of Uriyah the Hittite, to make her your wife.

Now therefore, the sword will never leave your house because you have despised me and taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your own wife.

So now some from your family, even in the future, will die by the sword, because you have turned against Me and have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife.

From this time on, your family will live by the sword because you have despised me by taking Uriah’s wife to be your own.
Now therefore the sword shall never depart from your house, because you have ignored me, and have taken the woman { or wife } of Uriah the Hittite to be your woman { or wife }.

God promises David that the sword would not depart from his house because David hated the Lord, showing this by taking the wife of Uriah the Hittite.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wâw (or vâw) (וָ (וָאָו)) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>`attâh (ָהַת) [pronounced ָהַת-תָּו]</td>
<td>now, at this time, already</td>
<td>adverb of time</td>
<td>Strong’s #6258 BDB #773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When followed by an imperative or an interrogative, wâw + the adverb `attâh mean and, thus, things being so, therefore, now therefore. Sometimes, the concept of time is lost when this combination is used to incite another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lô (לֹ (לֹא)) [pronounced low]</td>
<td>not, no</td>
<td>negates the word or action that follows; the absolute negation</td>
<td>Strong’s #3808 BDB #518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çûwr (כּוּר) [pronounced soor]</td>
<td>to turn aside, to depart, to go away</td>
<td>3rd person feminine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5493 (and #5494) BDB #693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chereb (כּרָה) [pronounced khe-RE³V]</td>
<td>sword, knife, dagger; any sharp tool</td>
<td>feminine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #2719 BDB #352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min (מִי) [pronounced min]</td>
<td>from, off, out from, out of, away from, on account of, since, than, more than</td>
<td>preposition of separation</td>
<td>Strong’s #4480 BDB #577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bayith (בָּיִת) [pronounced BAH-yith]</td>
<td>house, residence; household, habitation as well as inward</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #1004 BDB #108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ad (אָד) [pronounced ָד-ת]</td>
<td>as far as, even to, up to, until</td>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>Strong’s #5704 BDB #723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel 12:10a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‛ôwlâm (נֶפֶשׁ)</td>
<td>long duration, forever,</td>
<td>masculine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #5769 BDB #761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced ʼo-LAWM]</td>
<td>perpetuity, antiquity, f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uturity; what is hidden,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hidden time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together, they mean and from everlasting to everlasting, from eternity past to eternity future or from antiquity to everlasting, forever; for a lifetime (?); from a point in time to far into the future; to the end of this age.

Translation: Now, therefore, the sword will not depart from your house forever... There is a fairly long thought here, which should not have been separated into 2 verses. God is speaking through Nathan, telling David that the sword would not depart from his house forever. The sword refers to murder and to unwarranted violence. This plays out in the near future in 2Sam. 13  14 and 18 and will continue until 1Kings 2.

That the sword would not depart from David’s house forever indicates that there would continue to be rebellions and internal dissent during the time of David; and throughout much of his successors (as Israel and Judah would split into two kingdoms). For much of David’s life, he will face a disruption of his household. One of his sons would rape one of his daughters. Absalom, another son, would kill that son. Absalom will revolt against him. Near to the time of David’s death, there would castle intrigue as to his successor.

There are some exceptions to this. Once Solomon took control, he had a fairly peaceful and successful reign. Obviously, when Jesus is on David’s throne, there will be perfect environment (although Satan will launch a rebellion against Him at the end of the Millennium). So the sword here stands for strife, rebellion and intrigue.

I believe that the correct interpretation of this passage is to understand that this will apply to David specifically and to the entirety of his life. After all, this is a judgement of God against David, spoken through Nathan, so it is most reasonable to apply this specifically to David. Although there are things which occur later after David dies, these are normally associated with monarchies from time to time. However, the remainder of David’s life will defined by rebellion and revolution. Therefore, the forever in this verse is properly applied to the entirety of David’s life.

Every monarchy is different. There will be monarchies where the leader dies naturally in office, and, at that point, there may be a natural successor and there may be scuffling for the throne. A leader may not endear himself to the people and, at a certain point, when the leader is weak, there is rebellion. David will see internal unrest for the remainder of his monarchy. Furthermore, war will continue to plague Israel as well.

R. B. Thieme, Jr. likened the remainder of David’s life to the Sword of Damocles.24

The Sword of Damocles

First of all, we need to know what the Sword of Damocles is: Dionysius (II) was a fourth century B.C. tyrant of Syracuse, a city in Magna Graecia, the Greek area of southern Italy. To all appearances Dionysius was very rich and comfortable, with all the luxuries money could buy, tasteful clothing and jewelry, and delectable food. He even had court flatterers (adsentatores) to inflate his ego. One of these ingratiators was the court sycophant, Damocles. Damocles used to make comments to the king about his wealth and luxurious life. One day when Damocles complimented the tyrant on his abundance and power, Dionysius turned to Damocles and said, “If you think I’m so lucky, how would you like to try out my life?”

Damocles readily agreed, and so Dionysius ordered everything to be prepared for Damocles to experience what life as Dionysius was like. Damocles was enjoying himself immensely... until he noticed a sharp sword hovering...
The Sword of Damocles

over his head, that was suspended from the ceiling by a horse hair. This, the tyrant explained to Damocles, was what life as ruler was really like.

Damocles, alarmed, quickly revised his idea of what made up a good life, and asked to be excused. He then eagerly returned to his poorer, but safer life.¹

This, in many ways, describes the remainder of David’s life. We will study, in the subsequent chapters, rebellion, strife, and castle intrigue. Almost all of it will originate from within David’s own family and David’s large family is a result of his own sexual arrogance.


Chapter Outline

We spoke of what if? in the previous verse. This pretty much tells us what if. Had David simply allowed things to unfold as God had designed them, God would have given David about 20 years of internal and external peace, during which time he would have married Bathsheba (assuming her husband was naturally killed in battle), and that they would have spent that time raising a wonderful family, where David could have spent more time at home from war, enjoying that last couple decades of his life.

Had David not done what did, there would have been no revolution. With respect to exterior wars, God is quite capable of dealing with human history and keeping Israel out of war.

### 2Samuel 12:10b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ēqeb (עֵגֶב) [pronounced AY-kehb]</td>
<td>as a reward of, on account of, as a consequence of, because, because that; that</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>Strong’s #6118 BDB #784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kîy (כִּי) [pronounced kee]</td>
<td>for, that, because; when, at that time, which, what time</td>
<td>explanatory conjunction; preposition</td>
<td>Strong’s #3588 BDB #471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is unclear as to exactly what the difference is between ēqeb by itself or when followed by kîy.

| bâzâh (בָּזָה) [pronounced baw-ZAW] | to despise, to regard with contempt, to hold in contempt | 2nd person masculine singular, Qal perfect; with the 1st person singular suffix | Strong’s #959 BDB #102 |
| wa (or va) (ו) [pronounced wah] | and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because | wâw consecutive | No Strong’s # BDB #253 |
| lâqach (לָקָח) [pronounced law-KAHKH] | to take, to take away, to take in marriage; to seize | 2nd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect | Strong’s #3947 BDB #542 |
| ëth (אַתְ) [pronounced ayth] | generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward | indicates that the following substantive is a direct object | Strong’s #853 BDB #84 |
### 2Samuel 12:10b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ıshshâh (אשה) [pronounced eesh-SHAW]</td>
<td>woman, wife</td>
<td>feminine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #802 BDB #61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Úwrîyyâh (וערייה) [pronounced oo-ree-YAW]</td>
<td>flame of Yah; my light is Yah and is transliterated Uriah</td>
<td>masculine singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #223 BDB #22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also spelled Úwrîyyâhûw (וערייהו) [pronounced oo-ree-YAW-hoo].

Chittîy (נ疍י) [pronounced khiht-TEE] | a descendant of Heth; transliterated Hittite | gentilic adjective; with the definite article | Strong’s #2850 BDB #366 |

lâmêd (ל) [pronounced ′] | to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by | directional/relational preposition | No Strong’s # BDB #510 |

hâyâh (יה) [pronounced haw-YAW] | to be, is, was, are; to become, to come into being; to come to pass | Qal infinitive construct | Strong's #1961 BDB #224 |

lâmêd (ל) [pronounced ′] | to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by | directional/relational preposition with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix | No Strong’s # BDB #510 |

lâmêd (ל) [pronounced ′] | to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by | directional/relational preposition | No Strong’s # BDB #510 |

ıshshâh (אשה) [pronounced eesh-SHAW] | woman, wife | feminine singular noun | Strong’s #802 BDB #61 |

---

**Translation:** ...because you have despised Me and you have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife. You will notice how, even though Nathan is speaking, that it is now as if God is speaking directly to David. “You have despised Me.” In v. 9, David is said to despise the Word of the Lord; here, he is said to despise God directly.

Because David has disobeyed the clear teaching of the Word of God, which he knows, he therefore despises God. As has been previously studied, this appears to be degeneracy and being trapped inside the interlocking systems of arrogance. David appears to have retained some spiritual growth—in fact, he will soon make decisions which clearly reveal that he is a mature believer—so David is not simply out of fellowship and regression back to a point of spiritual babyhood. We may want to view it in terms of an edification complex. The edification complex is illustrated by a building which represents the spiritual maturity of the believer. David’s degeneracy is like having this completed edification complex, but someone has set off a bomb in one of the rooms, which has an effect upon the entire complex. In some cases, this destruction can eventually bring down the entire building and, in some cases, this can be repaired. David will repair his edification complex. See the [Doctrine of the Edification Complex](#) (for those who know this doctrine, it has been updated and expanded). So, think of David as a complete multi-story building, into which a grenade has exploded and destroyed several rooms. David can allow this to either destroy the remainder of the building or he can repair that which has been destroyed.
Application: We all have a very personal relationship with God (I am assuming that you are a believer in Jesus Christ). Whereas, God may not appear to you as a burning bush or come to you by means of a local prophet, his relationship to us is every bit as close as it is here to David. Much of the time, if we have enough doctrine, we know what God is saying to us, about this or that boneheaded move (for the 1% of nutjobs who read this, I do not mean that you hear an audible voice).

God is telling David that, because he has taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite as his own wife (and all that involved), the sword would not depart from his house.

So far, this is what God has said to David: Thus speaks Jehovah, the God of Israel: 'I anointed you as king over all Israel and I delivered you out of the hand of Saul. I gave you the palace of your lord and placed his women into your care. Furthermore, I gave the nation of Israel and Judah to you. And if this were too little, then I would have added even more blessings to these. Why have you despised and disobeyed the Word of Jehovah by doing this evil in His sight? You struck down Uriah the Hittite with a sword. You seized his wife for yourself and made her your wife. You killed him with the sword of the Ammonites. Now, therefore, the sword will not be turned away from your house forever because you have despised Me and you have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite as your own wife.' (2Sam. 12:7b–10). It is easy to read this and miss the structure of these sentences.

In the previous could verses, everything is doubled, so as to indicate great intensity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Literary Structure of 2Samuel 12:9–10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why have <strong>you</strong> despised the Word of Y'hovah to do evil in His eyes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You seized for yourself his wife to [be your] wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You killed him with the sword of the sons of Ammon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now, therefore, the sword will not depart from your house forever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because <strong>you</strong> have despised Me and you have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife.' (2Sam. 12:9–10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we add in the punishment, there will be some doubling up there as well. However, there is no poetry here; no nice pattern of couplets. This is disorganized, and without meter, as one might speak in anger. When we complete the punishment, and the continued doubling of these verses, we will then come back to this and try to determine what the doubling of everything means.

Application: Having power and authority demands honor, integrity and a sense of responsibility in order to properly wield this authority. Exercising authority without humility destroys the proper application of your authority. Arrogance destroys all correct leadership function. If you want a clear example of the exercise of authority from arrogance, look no further than our current president, Barack Obama. Despite all of the evidence that his approach to our economy has not helped, he seems to think that a little more government regulation and spending is going to solve everything.

Application: We have discovered that there are a great many trends which are often passed along genetically: there is a genetic predisposition toward alcoholism, drug addiction, criminality, and homosexuality; as well as other sexual sins. None of these genetic combinations are determinative. We all have free will. Homosexuals, for instance, have been cured. At one time, psychology regularly dealt with homosexuality (their success rate was not great; but no different than the success rate for curing alcoholism). So, you may succumb to these degeneracy trends of your sin nature and you may not. That takes volition from the very beginning; and if you choose not to start, you nip the problem in the bud. For instance, if there are many alcoholics in your family, you may recognize that, taking a drink of alcohol or getting drunk is a problem. If you choose never to drink more than one drink (or you choose not to drink at all), there is no problem. On the other hand, Solomon will follow out the
sexual trends of David’s old sin nature many times over, and yet will never achieve sexual and emotional satisfaction with any woman. Where sex is the most powerful and satisfying is when the souls and the bodies are united in love.

**Application:** A smart parent, aware of the sin nature trends in his family, will, when a child is old enough, explain these to the child. He will conclude explaining that, if you don’t take the first sip (of whatever sin is common in your family), then you will not fall prey to that particular trend.

**Application:** The most dangerous degeneracy sins which I have observed in my lifetime is the use of drugs. I have seen people changed dramatically; to the point where they are virtually unrecognizable. I have known people who have fried their brains with drug use. I have known groups of people who have all died quite early in life because of their involvement with drugs. Nearly as devastating is homosexuality and being drawn into that activity and culture.

The thought of v. 10 is continued into v. 11.

---

So has said Y’hovah, ‘Behold, I am raising up against you evil from your house and I have taken your women to your eyes and I have given to your associates and he has lain with your women in eyes of the sun the this.

2Samuel 12:11

Y’hovah now declares, ‘Listen, I am raising up against you evil from your house and I have taken your women in your sight and given [them] to your associates; and he has lain with your women in the sight of this sun.

Jehovah now declares, ‘Listen, I will raise up evil against you out of your own house against you: I will take your mistresses from before your eyes and I will give them to your associate and he will have sexual intercourse with your mistresses in broad daylight.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

*Latin Vulgate*

Thus says the Lord: Behold, I will raise up evil against you out of your own house, and I will take your wives before your eyes and give them to your neighbour, and he will lie with your wives in the sight of this sun.

*Masoretic Text (Hebrew)*

So has said Y’hovah, ‘Behold, I am raising up against you evil from your house and I have taken your women to your eyes and I have given to your associates and he has lain with your women in eyes of the sun the this.

*Peshitta (Syriac)*

Thus says the LORD, Behold, I will raise up evil against you out of your own house, and I will take your wives before your eyes and give them to your neighbor, and he shall lie with them in the broad daylight.

*Septuagint (Greek)*

Thus says the Lord: Behold, I will raise up evil against you out of your own house, and I will take your wives from before your eyes, and will give them to your neighbor, and he shall lie with your wives in broad daylight.

**Significant differences:** The biggest problem in this text is, *associate or neighbor* is in the plural in the Masoretic text; but it is singular in 2 early printed editions as well as in the Septuagint, Syriac and Vulgate above.

Like most English translations, the Greek uses the prophetic future rather than the aorist tense to express the verbs from the Hebrew. The final words in the Greek are *in this light*, but the *sun* is implied.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEV</td>
<td>Someone from your own family will cause you a lot of trouble, and I will take your wives and give them to another man before your very eyes. He will go to bed with them while everyone looks on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy English (Pocock)</td>
<td>I will make people in your family cause you trouble. You will see when I take your wives away from you. I will give them to one of your relatives. He will have sex with them in public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-Read Version</td>
<td>&quot;This is what the Lord says: 'I am bringing trouble against you. This trouble will come from your own family. I will take your wives from you and give them to a person who is very close to you. This person will sleep with your wives, and everyone will know it!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good News Bible (TEV)</td>
<td>I swear to you that I will cause someone from your own family to bring trouble on you. You will see it when I take your wives from you and give them to another man; and he will have intercourse with them in broad daylight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Message</td>
<td>This is GOD speaking, remember! I'll make trouble for you out of your own family. I'll take your wives from right out in front of you. I'll give them to some neighbor, and he'll go to bed with them openly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New Century Version             | "This is what the Lord says: 'I am bringing trouble to you from your own family. While you watch, I will take your wives from you and give them to someone who is very close to you. He will have sexual relations with your wives, and everyone will know it."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Living Translation</td>
<td>&quot;This is what the Lord says: Because of what you have done, I will cause your own household to rebel against you. I will give your wives to another man before your very eyes, and he will go to bed with them in public view.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| American English Bible          | "This is what Jehovah says: Look, I will cause evil things to awaken in your own house, and I will take your wives from before you and give them to your neighbor, and he will go to bed with them in the daylight."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ancient Roots Translinear       | "Thus says Yahweh, 'I raise evil over your house here, taking your women in your eyes and giving them to your neighbor. He will lie with your women in the eyes of this sun."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| God's Word™                     | "This is what the LORD says: I will stir up trouble against you within your own household, and before your own eyes I will take your wives and give them to someone close to you. He will go to bed with your wives in broad daylight."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New American Bible</td>
<td>Thus says the LORD: 'I will bring evil upon you out of your own house. I will take your wives while you live to see it, and will give them to your neighbor. He shall lie with your wives in broad daylight.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| NIRV                            | "The Lord also says, 'I am going to bring trouble on you. It will come from your own family. I will take your wives away. Your own eyes will see it. I will give your wives to a man who is close to you. He will have sex with them in the middle of the day."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Jerusalem Bible             | "Yahweh says this, "Out of your own household I shall raise misfortune for you. Before your very eyes I shall take your wives and give them to your neighbour, who will lie with your wives in broad daylight."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Simplified Bible            | »I swear to you that I will cause someone from your own family to bring trouble to you. You will see it when I take your wives from you and give them to another man. He will have intercourse with them in broad daylight."

**Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bible in Basic English</td>
<td>The Lord says, From those of your family I will send evil against you, and before your very eyes I will take your wives and give them to your neighbour, and he will take your wives to his bed by the light of this sun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here is what ADONAI says: 'I will generate evil against you out of your own household. I will take your wives before your very eyes and give them to your neighbor; he will go to bed with your wives, and everyone will know about it.'

This is what the LORD says, 'I am going to bring disaster on you from your own family: I will take your wives and give them to another before your very eyes, and he will sleep with them publicly.

This is what the LORD says: 'I am about to bring disaster on you [Heb "raise up against you disaster."]

from inside your own household [Heb "house" (so NAB, NRSV); NCV, TEV, CEV "family."] Right before your eyes I will take your wives and hand them over to your companion [Or "friend."]. He will have sexual relations with

[Heb "will lie with" (so NIV, NRSV); TEV "will have intercourse with"; CEV, NLT "will go to bed with."] your wives in broad daylight [Heb "in the eyes of this sun."]!

This is what the LORD says: 'Out of your own household I am going to bring calamity on you. Before your very eyes I will take your wives and give them to one who is close to you, and he will sleep with your wives in broad daylight.

This is what the LORD says: 'Out of your own household I am going to bring calamity upon you. Before your very eyes I will take your wives and give them to one who is close to you, and he will lie with your wives in broad daylight.

Thus says the Lord, Behold, I will raise up against you evil out of your house, and I will take your wives before your eyes, and will give them to your neighbor [Some codices have neighbor (2 early printed editions, Sept, Syriac and the Vulgate; the Masoretic text has neighbors], and he will lie with your wives in the sight of this sun.

Thus says Yah Veh, Behold, I raise evil against you from your own house and I take your women in front of your eyes and give them to your friend:
to lie down with your women in the eyes of this sun.

So says Jehovah, Behold, I shall raise up evil against you out of your house, and shall take your wives before your eyes and give them to your neighbor. And he shall lie with your wives in the sight of the sun.

So says Jehovah, Behold, I shall raise up evil against you out of your house, and shall take your wives before your eyes and give them to your neighbor. And he shall lie with your wives in the sight of the sun.

"Thus says the LORD, 'Behold, I will raise up evil against you from your own household; I will even take your wives before your eyes and give them to your companion, and he will lie with your wives in broad daylight [Deut 28:30; 2 Sam 16:21, 22]."

Thus said the Jehovah/God, "Behold, I will 'cause to rise up' {meaning God will permit the revolution to occur} evil to come into existence against you {a revolution} from/out of' your own house {David's son Absalom will fulfill this}. And publicly I will take/seize your women {'ishshah - referring to the royal harem}, and give them to your loved one {Absalom again}, and he 'will ravage'/will have sex with' {shakab} your women in 'broad daylight'/'the sight of this sun'.

Thus said Jehovah, Lo, I am raising up against you evil, out of your house, and have taken your wives before your eyes, and given to your neighbour, and he has lain with your wives before the eyes of this sun;...

God promises great unrest within David’s own family, and promises that his wives will be taken in rape in broad daylight.
God here is giving David a glance into the next 10 years of his life. He is going to face corrective discipline (also called restorative discipline). Not only is God going to put the hurt on David, but this hurt is going to turn him around. See also 2Samuel 16:20-23.

### 2Samuel 12:11a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kôh (כּ) [pronounced koh]</td>
<td>so, thus, here, hence; now; in the meantime</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Strong’s #3541 BDB #462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘âmar (אָמַר) [pronounced aw-MAHR]</td>
<td>to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #559 BDB #55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YHWH (יְהוָה) [pronunciation is possibly yhoh-WAH]</td>
<td>transliterated variously as Jehovah, Yahweh, Y’howah</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #3068 BDB #217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hinnêh (הנה) [pronounced hin-NAY]</td>
<td>lo, behold, or more freely, observe, look here, look, listen, note, take note; pay attention, get this, check this out</td>
<td>interjection, demonstrative particle with the 1st person singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #2009 (and #518, 2006) BDB #243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qûwm (קום) [pronounced koom]</td>
<td>raising up, causing to raise up [stand]; establishing; fulfilling; upholding; performing [a testimony, a vow, a commandment, a promise]</td>
<td>Hiphil participle</td>
<td>Strong’s #6965 BDB #877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘al (לָע) [pronounced ġahl]</td>
<td>upon, beyond, on, against, above, over, by, beside</td>
<td>preposition of proximity with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5921 BDB #752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>râ’âh (רָע) [pronounced raw-ḠAW]</td>
<td>evil, misery, distress, disaster, injury, iniquity, aberration, that which is morally reprehensible</td>
<td>feminine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #7451 BDB #949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min (מִן) [pronounced min]</td>
<td>from, off, out from, out of, away from, on account of, since, than, more than</td>
<td>preposition of separation</td>
<td>Strong’s #4480 BDB #577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bayith (בָּית) [pronounced BAH-yith]</td>
<td>house, residence; household, habitation as well as inward</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #1004 BDB #108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: Y’howah now declares, ‘Listen, I am raising up against you evil from your [own] house... Nathan now speaks as God; or, God makes this declaration through Nathan. This is seen in the 1st person singular suffix added to listen and a sudden use of a participle (which stands out from the other verbs previously used).

What God is raising up against David is evil, misery, distress, disaster and injury. Furthermore, this evil is going to come right out of David’s own house (palace).

David’s sin was plotted and hatched from within his own house in secret. However, virtually nothing done within the royal palace could remain secret; so God will bring evil against David from his own house.
2Samuel 12:11b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (ו, or ו) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple waw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâqach (לַעַך) [pronounced law-KAHKH]</td>
<td>to take, to take away, to take in marriage; to seize</td>
<td>1st person singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3947 BDB #542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’èth (אֵת) [pronounced ayt]</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’îshshâh (אִשׁשָּׁה) [pronounced eesh-SHAW]</td>
<td>woman, wife</td>
<td>feminine plural noun with the 2nd person singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #802 BDB #61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לֵּמָד) [pronounced l']</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’ayin (אָיִין) [pronounced GAH-yin]</td>
<td>spring, fountain; eye, spiritual eyes</td>
<td>feminine plural noun with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5869 (and #5871) BDB #744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lamed preposition + ’ayin mean, literally to [for] one’s eyes; before [one’s] eyes. The sense is before any one.

Translation: ...and I have taken your women in your sight... We look at prophecy from the view of the person to whom God is speaking, and would expect the verbs to be in the imperfect tense (in the future tense in English). Even the Greek translation uses their prophetic future tense. However, the Hebrew uses the perfect tense, which stands for an accomplished fact. The idea is, God has already decreed for this to happen, so, from His perspective, it has already occurred. God stands outside of time and is not subject to time. Therefore, His decrees, even if set for a million years in the future, have already come to pass insofar as God is concerned.

Back when David decided that he wanted to have Bathsheba, he sent men to fetch her. 2Sam. 11:4a reads: So David sent messengers and they seized her [Bathsheba]... God will seize David’s wives in his eyes. The latter phrase is not literal, but it indicates that David will not be able to do anything about this. When he realizes that this has taken place, David will see this in his mind’s eye. Now, we don’t get this from what is being said here, but in the fulfillment of this verse (2Sam. 16:20–23).

2Samuel 12:11c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (ו, or ו) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple waw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâthan (נַעֲתָן) [pronounced naw-THAHN]</td>
<td>to give, to grant, to place, to put, to set; to make</td>
<td>1st person singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5414 BDB #678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לֵּמָד) [pronounced l']</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2Samuel 12:11c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rêa˚ (רֶא) [pronounced RAY-ah̀]</td>
<td>associate, neighbor, colleague, fellow, acquaintance; fellow citizen; another person; one, another [in a reciprocal phrase]</td>
<td>masculine plural noun with a 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #7453 BDB #945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Masoretic text, this is actually a plural noun; it is singular in 2 early printed editions, and singular in the Septuagint, Syriac and Vulgate. This is not readable, apparently, in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

**Translation:** ...and given [them] to your associates;... God tells David, “I will give them to your associates.” The Masoretic text actually reads associates here; and, one of the rules of textual criticism is, the most difficult reading is the preferred reading. Therefore, despite almost every other manuscript reading the singular of associate here, we ought to at least explore what might be meant, if this is indeed in the plural. In the future, David will rape his wives and mistresses who remain. Given that David has about 10 of each, this is not something which one individual can do. Therefore, there will be a number of men involved in the raping of these women. Just as King David had sent several big soldiers over to fetch Bathsheba, several large soldiers under Absalom’s command will bring these women to the tent where Absalom will rape them. Therefore, giving the wives over to David’s associates refers to more than simply Absalom. There will be a number of men involved who were once loyal to David. However, only Absalom will actually do the raping. Therefore, the next phrase will be a masculine singular verb.

Now, God knows that it is David’s son Absalom who will do this, but does not say this specifically to David. When God prophesies, there are enough specifics to know that His words are being fulfilled. However, God cloaks a certain amount of prophecy with the language that He uses so that, in this case, David will not know who exactly will do this evil, but it will be clear to David, when it all comes to pass. This leads us to the question:

**Why Aren’t God’s Prophecies Precise?**

1. First of all, God’s prophecies are precise. All that God says will be fulfilled. "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all My pleasure" (Isa. 46:10): Let all the earth fear the LORD; let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him! For he spoke, and it came to be; he commanded, and it stood firm. The LORD brings the counsel of the nations to nothing; he frustrates the plans of the peoples. The counsel of the LORD stands forever, the plans of his heart to all generations (Psalm 33:8–11).
2. Our problem is, we see the fulfillment of the prophecy and think, “Well, God could have said, right here, that the one who would betray David is his son; or is his son, Absalom.”
3. There is no requirement anywhere that God has to tell us, “The one who will betray you, David, is Absalom; and he will wear his red shirt when he betrays you.”
4. All that is required is, there is enough information in the prophecy to clearly associate God’s words with what comes to pass.
5. Absalom is an associate of David’s; he is a neighbor (in terms of where he lives); he is a colleague of David and is probably given some responsibilities; he is an acquaintance of David’s and he is a fellow-citizen to David. So, all these things which the word rêa˚ (רֶא) [pronounced RAY-ah̀] conveys, Absalom is to David.
6. Furthermore, this is a plural noun, indicating that more than just Absalom will be involved in the rape of his wives.
7. This rape would have to involve several men, simply to hold and restrain the women. Therefore, it will not be Absalom alone who does this. The Masoretic text appears to take this into consideration, and speaks of several men, as associates is in the plural. So, in this way, the actual Masoretic Text is actually more accurate than the English translations which we use today.
8. We sometimes think of prophecies in the Hollywood sense that, “Here’s what’s going to happen; now,
Why Aren’t God’s Prophecies Precise?

Your job is to change that.” That is not how God prophecies. When God states something, He has brought it to pass already—He has decreed it. No one can change it. **The LORD of hosts has sworn:** "As I have planned, so shall it be, and as I have purposed, so shall it stand. For the LORD of hosts has purposed, and who will annul it? His hand is stretched out, and who will turn it back? (Isa. 14:24, 27).

9. David cannot change what God is saying to him. This would be a complete act of futility.

10. It is up to David to hear these words of God and to move through these prophecies as best he can, using whatever doctrine he can muster in order to make it through the circumstances.

11. It is not up to David to figure out exactly when this or that will happen, who will do it, and how he can get around it.

12. Therefore, the prophecies are always precise enough to vindicate God’s Word.

As an addendum, I believe that Christ’s death on the cross was clearly foretold, but that Satan, who knows the Bible better than anyone else, did not realize what was happening until it was too late. He used this opportunity to berate, slap, beat and humiliate the One Who decreed Satan’s eternal death; and then, when it was too late, Satan realized what was happening. That is, Satan had helped to orchestrate events which led to the cross, not realizing that it was the cross that would break his back (or, **crush his head**—Gen. 3:16).

### Chapter Outline

- **2Samuel 12:11d**

### Charts, Maps and Short Doctrines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wâw (or vâw) (וָאָו</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s #BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shâkab (שׂבָּאָב)</td>
<td>to lie down, to lie down [to sleep, to have sexual relations, to die; because of sickness or humiliation]; to relax</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7901BDB #1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘îm (עָמ)</td>
<td>with, at, by, near; like; from</td>
<td>preposition of nearness and vicinity</td>
<td>Strong’s #5973BDB #767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>îshshâh (אִשָּׁה)</td>
<td>woman, wife</td>
<td>feminine plural noun with the 2nd person singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #802 BDB #61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לְ)</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to</td>
<td>directional/reational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s #BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ayin (אַי)</td>
<td>spring, fountain; eye, spiritual eyes</td>
<td>feminine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #5869 (and #5871) BDB #744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lâmed preposition + ‘ayin mean, literally to [for] [one’s] eyes; before [one’s] eyes. The sense is before any one.

| shemesh (שֵׂמֶש) | sun | feminine singular noun with the definite article | Strong’s #8121BDB #1039 |
Translation: ...and he has lain with your women in the sight of this sun. Just as David seized Bathsheba—Uriah’s wife—and lay with her, so would David’s associate seize his wives and lay with them. Furthermore, this would be done in broad daylight for all to see. You may recall that, David rose up from a nap or from living it up the night before, and by the time he got Bathsheba to his palace, it was probably after dark. He sends her home in the dark as well. God will see that David’s associate—for his own house—would do the same thing to David, but in broad daylight instead. Whereas, David tried to hide what he did; this person (Absalom) will celebrate what he has done.

This final few words of this prophecy has caught my imagination, although I do not know if I can explain it. God the Holy Spirit uses the words, in the sight of this sun. Now, it is reasonable to assume that this is simply a colloquialism to refer to this prophecy being fulfilled in broad daylight.

David attempted to commit these sins in secret, but, as a public figure, this is almost impossible to do (as many politicians have found out in the United States of America). God will, therefore, punish David in public, so that all can see that God will deal with those who do wrong, no matter what position they hold. This public humiliation has to occur in order for the revolution to be permanently defeated and defused. Everyone must have some time to reflect upon this and to recognize that God has taken care of the discipline of the king. All Israel needs to know that David has gotten away with nothing.

Right at this moment, Nathan is speaking to David, and they are probably standing out in the sun, outside, where all of this dirty laundry of David’s will be aired. Therefore, God, through Nathan, will repeat, that this punishment will occur in the sight of the sun. David attempted to hide his sins; he attempted to be surreptitious. However, David is a public figure, and, as such, cannot keep very much of his life private. The sins of adultery and murder simply cannot be played out quietly and out of sight. As was discussed in great detail in the previous chapter, there are people in Jerusalem who know about David and Bathsheba. There are people out on the battlefield who know that Uriah the Hittite was sent back to Jerusalem for a few days, and, they know that he died in battle, fighting from a position that he should not have been placed in. That has to look wrong to a significant portion of Joab’s troops, because they understand strategy and tactics. You just don’t send men to fight at the strongest section of the city when there is no apparent reason to do so. When they return home, Bathsheba will be David’s wife—soldier-husbands will come home, knowing all about Uriah, and the suspicious circumstances of his death; and their wives will know all about David and Bathsheba. No matter how much David tried to hide all of this, it is not hidden. It is right there, out in the sun, just where he and Nathan are standing.

The entire verse reads: Y*hawah now declares, ‘Listen, I am raising up against you evil [or, misery, distress, disaster, injury] from your [own] house and I have taken your women [these will be 10 of David’s mistresses] in your sight and given [them] to your associates; and he has lain with your women in the sight of this sun. You will note that, in the Masoretic text, we go from associates (plural) to the masculine singular verb to lay with. Absalom will have sex with these women; however, they will be seized by former associates of David. David tried to sin and to keep that sin hidden; but God will punish him in the public eye, because David is a public figure. This will be fulfilled in 2Sam. 16:20–22.
Jamieson, Fausset and Brown observe: *David's loss of character by the discovery of his crimes, tended, in the natural course of things, to diminish the respect of his family, to weaken the authority of his government, and to encourage the prevalence of many disorders throughout his kingdom.*

Keil and Delitzsch give the basic fulfillment of this verse: *The fulfilment of this threat commenced with the murder of Amnon by Absalom (2Sam. 13:29); it was continued in the death of Absalom the rebel (2Sam. 18:14), and was consummated in the execution of Adonijah (1Kings 2:24–25).*

The Amplified Bible has this footnote: *This sentence was fulfilled in the agony brought on David by his lawless children: Amnon's scandalous behavior with his half sister Tamar (2Sam. 13:14) and his consequent murder by his brother Absalom (2Sam. 13:28, 29); Absalom's escape to a foreign land (2Sam. 13:38) and his return after three years; Absalom without recognition by David for two more years (2Sam. 14:28); Absalom's deliberate, rebellious attempt to win the hearts of the people and supplant his father (2Sam. 15:6); David's flight from Jerusalem, with the mass of the people against him (2Sam. 15:14), the terrible battle in the forest of Ephraim, won by David's forces, with Absalom killed in flight (2Sam. 18:6ff.). David's agony of heart is echoed repeatedly in the history of these tragedies 1Sam 13:1-19:8 and in some of his psalms. Even when the great king was dying, his son Adonijah was attempting to usurp the throne, and was later executed as a traitor (2Kings 1:5; 2:25).*

We will, of course, cover the judgments against David in great detail in the exegesis of the upcoming chapters. David has 3 sons, all of whom have great potential (had they been guided properly in their youth); and these 3 sons will die as a part of David's sin (Amnon, Absalom, and Adonijah).

Without covering this in great detail, let me simply lay out the kinds of things that David will face in installment discipline over the next 10 or so years.

### What David Will Face in the Next Decade

1. In the immediate future, this child born to Bathsheba will die. 2Sam. 12:15–23
2. David’s son Amnon will rape his half-sister Tamar. 2Sam. 13:1–21
3. Since David, the overindulgent father, does nothing about this, another of David’s sons, Absalom, plots to kill Amnon, and carries this plot out. 2Sam. 13:22–39
4. Absalom organizes revolution against his father David. He rapes the wives which David leaves behind to keep the castle; this represents an irreparable breach between David and Absalom. David and Joab defeat Absalom in war. Joab will kill Absalom, which marks the end of the revolution. 2Sam. 15:1–18:44
   1) As an aside, the revolution of Absalom is one of the most fascinating and least-covered areas of Biblical exegesis. As a result, you will understand a great deal about revolution, counterinsurgency, and war that you never understood before. Until R. B. Thieme, Jr., this is a field which lay fallow for most of 3 millennia.

This represents the fourfold discipline which David called for against the rich man (which is a pronouncement of judgment against himself).

### Chapter Outline

One of the great problems with commentary is, so many commentators do not distinguish between various sins and the state of the soul when committing these sins. We know that, in some instances—e.g., when David got out of God’s geographical will and suddenly found himself riding with Philistines to go attack Israel—that is one

---

25 Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset and David Brown; *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible*; from e-sword, 2Sam. 12:11.
26 Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*; from e-Sword; 2Sam. 12:10–12.
quality of sin. Here, what David has done is a whole different ball game. David is not in reversionism. He is not reverting to his old behavior as an unbeliever. Therefore, since David is not reverting, the way that God handles his sin is different. Most discipline has the pattern of warning discipline. Even though David is warned, God goes beyond this and continues to put pressure on David for the next 10 years, which is more than what a person usually endures for sin. David committed the one overt sin which God abhors—murder; and he shows little chance of turning around his own sexual behavior. Therefore, God, for 10 years, is going to put the pressure on David, using installment or restorative discipline. This will not just fulfill the requirements of the justice of God, but it will also restore David’s soul, which is eaten up with sexual lust. There is more to this than just the quality of David’s sin; there are things going on in David’s soul which require extremely harsh treatment.

What will happen in this and subsequent chapters has been misunderstood for years. Far too many people think, David has committed some very, very bad sins, and, therefore, God needs to treat David very, very harshly. This is a legalistic interpretation, and it ignores the fact that Jesus Christ has died for all of our sins. However, even you, after the cross and after believing in Jesus Christ, can come to a point in your life when, God just grinds you into the dust, and this continues, even long after that sin you committed. We need to understand what is going on. Jesus Christ died for all of David’s sins, including the sin of adultery and the sin of murder. David will name his sins to God and be restored to fellowship. However, God’s harsh treatment of David continues for a decade. Why?

**David’s Soul and the Harsh Discipline of God**

1. Most of the time, when we commit a sin, and are out of fellowship, God begins with warning discipline. If we do not respond, then God intensifies this discipline. If we persist, then we enter into dying discipline resulting in the sin unto death. This is the typical sin which could lead, eventually, to the sin unto death, if a believer chooses not to get back into fellowship by naming his sins to God.

2. In such a case, the believer often reverts back to his old nature; to the sins of the weakness of his sin nature; and he begins acting just like an unbeliever. R. B. Thieme, Jr. calls this reversionism.

3. David’s sin here is of a different quality; and his soul appears to be of a different quality. Therefore, the way that God deals with this will be different than simple discipline to get David back into fellowship.

4. David is about to confess his sin; that will put him back into fellowship. However, God will still deal with him harshly, even though David is back in fellowship and even though, while in fellowship, David will write some of the greatest psalms of his life. **Psalm 32 (HTML) (PDF)** Psalm 51 (HTML) (PDF).

5. David will be back in fellowship, and yet, God will pour on him all kinds of pressure and misery.

6. Legalism misunderstands what is taking place. To the legalist, David has committed a heinous sin, and now, he’s got to pay for that sin—big time.

7. When you spank your child, the idea is, you want to correct their behavior. For some things, you might be particularly harsh in spanking your child. You are trying to get it across to his soul that, whatever he did, was particularly egregious.

8. What God is doing is breaking David’s addictive behavior. What God is doing is, turning David’s addicted soul around.

9. R. B. Thieme, Jr. calls this installment discipline, which is a slight misnomer. David is back in fellowship (2Sam. 12:13 Psalm 51:4). We could call it *installment suffering for blessing*; but *installment discipline* sounds snappier.

10. David himself determined that he should pay for his sin fourfold; so these installments represent David paying for this sin (committing adultery and then having the woman’s husband killed). This is tricky, because David does not ultimately pay for any of his sins—Jesus Christ, the Son of God, does. However, David makes restitution, and installment discipline is, essentially, installment restitution.

11. However, there is more to this sin and restitution than David committing these sins and making restitution for these sins. David will name his sin to God, which places him back into fellowship. Jesus Christ will pay for his sins, so he cannot really make restitution for what he has done. Therefore, there is a reason for him to make restitution.

12. It may help to understand that, an important step in curing addiction is, going to those whom you have harmed and making restitution to them—either asking their forgiveness or actually paying them back for damage you have caused. Psychologically, the idea is, you mentally associate your addiction with the
13. David is suffering from a damaged soul. He is addicted to sex and he has begun to act upon this addiction in a most egregious way. God must cure the addiction of David’s soul.

14. David is a great man, and God has many plans for David. God cannot use David and God cannot bless David if his soul remains damaged.

15. **Application:** let’s say that you have committed what you believe to be an horrendous series of sins, and now you believe that God is just pouring on all kinds of discipline. Assuming that you are correct in your assessment (chances are, you are not), the previous two points are key. God pours on this suffering to David because God has great plans for David. It is because of David’s future as king of Israel that God pours on the suffering. Therefore, if you believe God is doing this to you and you are accurate in this belief, that simply indicates that God still has great plans for your life. These plans may simply be about you being a credible witness to one or two people, but that is extremely important.

16. This damaged soul is the soul of an addict—people who abuse drugs, alcohol or sex have this sort of damaged soul. Many homosexuals—I would guess an inordinate percentage of them—as they pursue sexual pleasure with other willing males, have damaged souls; the soul of an addict.

17. The steps of addiction:
   1) The pre-addict is introduced to something which he (or she) finds to be very pleasurable. There is often a genetic kink or a soul kink as a component of the addictive behavior.
   2) The addict begins to repeat this particular sin regularly (sex, drugs, alcohol, gambling). In some cases, this can be an habitual sin, although the person may continue with the rest of his life in a normal fashion. In such a case, a person may be called a functioning alcoholic. This person may carry on with their normal life, but, they go out several nights a week to engage in homosexual sex; or they may sit at home every night a smoke dope. The sin is simply repeated regularly, even though the rest of their lives may continue in a normal fashion.
   3) In most of these cases, the commission of the addictive sin begins to squeeze out more and more of that person’s life.
   4) In extreme cases, that person’s life begins to revolve around committing that sin (taking drugs, drinking alcohol, having sex or gambling).
   5) During this process, the soul changes, even to a point where the person will do things that, a few months (or years) previous, they would never do. This is the dog returning to its vomit. **As a dog goes back to its vomit, so a fool repeats his stupidity** (Prov. 26:11). Peter calls this being a slave to corruption in 2Peter 2:18–19.

18. If you have known an addict, you know how his addiction becomes more and more in control of that person’s life. The person that he or she used to be becomes a distant memory. What is left is the shell of a person in an eternal search for a fix (be it drugs, alcohol or sex).

19. If you have never taken drugs before, let me be clear: taking a drug is a pleasurable experience. This is why people want to repeat the experience again and again and again and again.

20. However, even though the original stimulation was quite dramatic, the subsequent pleasure becomes less and less. It is not unusual for an addict to reach a point where, taking this or that drug is required to make them feel “normal” (or, *even*) again. The big kick they got the first or the second time can no longer be found; but they have to have that drug anyway.

21. This is true for the pleasure found in drugs, drinking and sex. God allows drinking, but not drunkenness; God allows sex within the confines of marriage, where there is a soul commitment with the other person.

22. However, just as drugs can rule over a person’s life, so can alcohol; and so can the pursuit of sex, whether it be heterosexual or homosexual (or masturbation, which is just as addictive).

23. David loves heterosexual sex; but he has gone so far as to not even consider the souls of the women he has sex with. You will recall when listing David’s wives, mistresses and children—his mistresses are not named, and many of his children are not even associated with a wife or mistress. David did not care about the souls of these women.

24. Even when out of fellowship, David had some idea as to the damage he had done. He has Bathsheba’s husband killed, and then he brings Bathsheba into his fold of wives and mistresses. At some point, it had to strike David that he dramatically hurt the soul of this little woman by killing her husband.
David’s Soul and the Harsh Discipline of God

25. David was like any committed drug addict; he wanted sex, and it got to a point where, he did not care whose wife it was that he took.

26. God has to break this addictive behavior in David. God has to deal with David’s addiction.

27. For the next 10 years, David will be in and out of fellowship; he will make some excellent decisions, and he will make some lousy decisions. However, in his soul, he is an arrogant addict, who has gotten to the point where, everything else is second to his addiction to sex. Remember, his army went off to war, but David chose to remain behind; so he shirked his duty in order to chase skirt.

28. Therefore, God will put the screws to David on 4 occasions. David is not being disciplined, per se, because, most of the time, he will be in fellowship when these things occur. God has to show David again and again and again what his sin with Bathsheba has done to nation Israel. His little secret dalliance will destroy the lives of thousands of people and plunge his nation into a civil war.

29. For the next 10 years, David is going to have to clean up the mess that he made. David is going to have to pay back fourfold for the little ewe lamb that he stole from the poor man.

30. These 4 installments of “discipline” reflect what David must pay back for the sin that he has committed.

31. These 4 installments of “discipline” will turn David’s soul around.

32. One of the reasons that we know this installment restitution works is, David will be placed in bed with 2 hot women near the end of his life, and David will not have sex with them. This is how far his soul has been turned around.

1) An alcoholic, a few days off a binge, may be easily tempted back into the bottle. But, years later, after his addiction is lessened, he can go to a wedding and lift up a toast of Mountain Dew (or whatever), or he can be at a dinner party, where everyone is drinking wine, and he is not tempted to start drinking.

2) You may have quit taking drugs. A few days later, the smell of marijuana can be quite tempting; however, a decade later, the pull of the drug may not be as dramatic.

33. An addict, in recovery, as time goes on, is less and less tempted by his original sin of addiction. However, he carries within him the knowledge that, that one drink, that one puff of a join, that one illicit sex act, can lead him right back into deep addiction.

34. Finally, the phrase installment discipline is snappy and it communicates; but what is happening here is, David is paying back for the sins he committed; and God is turning David’s soul around, because this payback is clearly related to the sins that David did. Installment restitution or installment correction may be more accurate terminology. The purpose of the installment correction is to correct David’s addiction to sex.

You may think that, while studying this and the next 6 chapters, that I am beating some of these points into the ground; but God the Holy Spirit saw fit to give more time to this part of David’s life than to any other. Therefore, we need to know exactly what God the Holy Spirit wants us to know.

Narrative is often the most difficult thing in the Word of God to interpret, because God the Holy Spirit rarely stops and says, “And this thing that David did is evil” (although that was said in 2Sam. 11:27). And God the Holy Spirit rarely tells us, “Right here, David is out of God’s geographical will; right here, David is out of fellowship and he won’t get back into fellowship until the middle of the next chapter.” We have to carefully interpret this.

In this regard, a special salute to R. B. Thieme, Jr. ought to be made. These chapters sat as fallow, unplowed fields for 3000 years until Bob came along and properly exegeted (most of) them in his David series (which I highly recommend). I heard much of this series live, and, in retrospect, did not fully appreciate what Bob had done. His teaching was so on target for such things as counterinsurgency that, once, during the middle of a class, a woman got up and ran out, telling the usher, “Jesus doesn’t want me to hear this!” Bob broke ground in areas which have never been properly explained ever before (at least, not that was recorded). I only pray that in my own plodding way that I will be able to do half the job that he did. I do have the benefit of having listened to this series of his 1.5 times, so that his insights will be interwoven into this exegesis.

---

28 There were several chapters and portions of chapter which Bob did not complete.
There is one more related concept:

**The Law of Natural Consequences**

1. Many of the things which will occur over the next decade are a result of David’s sexual addiction.
2. When a person becomes involved in addictive behavior, this affects others.
3. Addictive behavior sets into motion a number of unpleasant circumstances.
4. I have known a number of alcoholics. Those who are particularly addicted will drink to the point that, they lose their family, their house and, finally, their car (and/or driving privileges). At some point in all of that, they hit their rock bottom.
5. All of these negative consequences take a long time to overcome. Someone may spend 10 years in jail because of their addictive behavior, and walk away from this addictive behavior; but it is a long, long road back to normalcy.
6. The recovery alcoholic may or may not get back their family, house and/or driving privileges.
7. These are natural consequences of allowing addictive behavior to establish such a foothold in your life.
8. What will follow are natural consequences of David’s sin.
9. We have already discussed how David tried to hide his sin, but he was no doubt unsuccessful in this endeavor. Thousands of people in his kingdom became aware of what he did, and many were shocked by this heinous behavior.
10. As a result, Israel will fall into a civil war. In fact, it will be the minority of people who back David.
11. Although we have very few details in the book of Samuel, common sense tells us that almost all of Israel was affected by this civil war, and possibly hundreds of thousands were hurt in some way; and many were killed in battle.
12. These are natural consequences.
13. God often allows the natural consequences of our actions to play out.
14. Once and awhile, God graciously prevents this from happening.
15. We do the same thing with our own children. We nag the kid night after night to do his homework in a subject that he dislikes under a teacher he despises. Sometimes, we back off on nagging, allow our child to fail, and make him pay some of the consequences of failing a class. We need for a child to connect his behavior with the consequences of his behavior.
16. Part of David’s rehabilitation is to, for the next 10 years, see the results of his act of adultery and his act of murder.
17. This is, in part, a way to curb addictive behavior.
18. Associating one’s behavior with the results of one’s behavior teaches a person that his actions have consequences.
19. God first approached David through Nathan, and got David to step back and to see his sin objectively, and to understand what the proper restitution is for the evil that he is guilty of.
20. David himself pronounced judgment over his own sin, prescribing what the restitution ought to be—to pay fourfold for his sin.
21. Part of this restitution is to be right in the middle of the consequences of his sin. Part of the correction of David’s soul will be to see and experience the harm which he himself has caused.

More is placed upon David than the simple consequences of his sin; but seeing this consequences is integral to changing the addictive behavior that is in his soul.

---

One of the aspects of sin is the harm that it causes. Every sin that we commit harms our own soul, often limits future options in life, and/or harms those around us.

As an addendum, human good can have the same sort of effect. A good example of this is Rachel Carson’s “Silent Spring” where DDT is proposed as a great evil. Where there is no doubt a reason not to over-spray; the outright banning of DDT has resulted in millions of Africans dying of malaria. Like most things, there is a happy medium somewhere in the middle of this.
For you, [even] you, have done in the secret and I, [even] I, will do the word the this in the sight of all Israel and in the sight of the sun.”

2Samuel 12:12

Because you, [even] you, have done [these things] secretly, I, [even] I, will do this thing before all Israel and before the sun.”

Because you did these things secretly, I will act publically, doing these things before all Israel in broad daylight.”

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

Latin Vulgate
For you did it secretly; but I will do this thing in the sight of all Israel, and in the sight of the sun.

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)
For you, [even] you, have done in the secret and I, [even] I, will do the word the this in the sight of all Israel and in the sight of the sun.”

Peshitta (Syriac)
For you did it secretly; but I will do this thing in the sight of all Israel, in the daytime.

Septuagint (Greek)
For you did [it] in secret, but I will do this thing in the sight of all Israel, and in the sun.

Significant differences:
There is no it in the first phrase of the Hebrew or Greek (despite the English translation above), I do not know about the original Latin or Syriac, but their English translations seem to require a direct object (as does the English). The English could be fixed by translating the first phrase, “Because you acted in secret...”

What cannot be seen in the Greek is, there is not a repetition of the same preposition at the end of this verse and the translators do not use the simple conjunction at the beginning of the 2nd phrase.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV
What you did was in secret, but I will do this in the open for everyone in Israel to see.”

Easy English (Pocock)
You did it in secret. But he will do this so that all the *Israelites will see." `

Good News Bible (TEV)
You sinned in secret, but I will make this happen in broad daylight for all Israel to see.' "

The Message
You did your deed in secret; I'm doing mine with the whole country watching!”

New Century Version
You had sexual relations with Bathsheba in secret, but I will do this so all the people of Israel can see it.' "

New Life Bible
You did it in secret. But I will do this in front of all Israel, and under the sun.' "

New Living Translation
You did it secretly, but I will make this happen to you openly in the sight of all Israel.”

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

Ancient Roots Translinear
For you did it in hiding, but I will do this word before all Israel, and before the sun."

God’s Word™
You did this secretly, but I will make this happen in broad daylight in front of all Israel.”

New American Bible
You have done this deed in secret, but I will bring it about in the presence of all Israel, and with the sun looking down."
NIRV You committed your sins in secret. But I will make sure that the sin the man commits with your wives will take place in the middle of the day. Everyone in Israel will see it.'

New Jerusalem Bible You have worked in secret, but I shall work this for all Israel to see, in broad daylight.'

New Simplified Bible »'You did this secretly. I will make this happen in broad daylight in front of all Israel.'«

Revised English Bible What you did was done in secret but I shall do this in broad daylight for all Israel to see.

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

Bible in Basic English You did it secretly; but I will do this thing before all Israel and in the light of the sun.

Judaica Press Complete T. For you have acted in secrecy, but I will do this thing before all Israel and before the sun."

NET Bible® Although you have acted in secret, I will do this thing before all Israel, and in broad daylight [Heb "and before the sun."].'"

NIV – UK You did it in secret, but I will do this thing in broad daylight before all Israel.'

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

The Amplified Bible For you did it secretly, but I will do this thing before all Israel and before the sun. [Fulfilled in II Sam. 16:21, 22.]

Heritage Bible Because you did it secretly, but I will do this word in front of all Israel, and in front of the sun.

LTHB For you acted in secret, but I will do this thing before all Israel and before the sun.

NASB 'Indeed [2 Sam 11:4-15] you did it secretly, but [2 Sam 16:22] I will do this thing before all Israel, and under the sun.'

Syndein Because you {David} have done/manufactured {`asah} it in secret I {Nathan speaking for the Integrity of God} will do this thing {the 'installment' divine discipline of the two previous verses} before all Israel . . . and 'in broad daylight'/before the sun'.

Young’s Updated LT ...for you have done it in secret, and I do this thing before all Israel, and before the sun."

The gist of this verse: God repeats that this would all be done in broad daylight.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kîy (וְ) [pronounced kee]</td>
<td>for, that, because; when, at that time, which, what time</td>
<td>explanatory conjunction; preposition</td>
<td>Strong’s #3588 BDB #471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’attâh (אַתָּה) [pronounced aht-TAW]</td>
<td>you (often, the verb to be is implied)</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, personal pronoun</td>
<td>Strong’s #859 BDB #61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’ásâh (שָׁה) [pronounced gaw-SAWH]</td>
<td>to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #6213 BDB #793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2Samuel 12:12a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b&quot; (ב) [pronounced b&quot;]</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>çêther (соедин) [pronounced SAY-ther]</td>
<td>a covering, a hiding place; a hiding; something secret [clandestine, hidden], secrecy, privately; a vail, a covering; protection, defense</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #5643 BDB #712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** Because you, [even] you, have done [these things] secretly,... In order to give the verb a consistent translation, our verb to do requires a direct object. However, this first half could be translated Because you have acted in secret,...

David only thought that he was acting in secret. At first, as we examined in 2Sam. 11, he did everything that he could to keep all of this on the down-low. However, as things progressed, David had to involve more and more people. At first, it was just a messenger; and then a couple of his bodyguards. Yet, people saw things, and wondered what was going on. All these things which David has done, slowly became fodder for the general population of Israel, some of whom, no doubt, began to connect the dots. The end result, logically, will be thousands of Israelites who will feel morally superior to David and rise up in revolt against him.

### 2Samuel 12:12b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wö (or vö) (ו, or ו) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple waw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’ânîy (אַניִי) [pronounced aw-NEE]</td>
<td>I, me; in answer to a question, it means I am, it is I</td>
<td>1st person singular, personal pronoun</td>
<td>Strong’s #589 BDB #58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’ásâh (אָשַׁה) [pronounced gaw-SAWH]</td>
<td>to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture</td>
<td>1st person singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #6213 BDB #793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’êth (אֵת) [pronounced ayt]</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dâbâr (דָּבָר) [pronounced daw'-VAWR]</td>
<td>word, saying, doctrine, thing, matter, command</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #1697 BDB #182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeh (זֶה) [pronounced zeh]</td>
<td>here, this, this one; thus; possibly another</td>
<td>demonstrative adjective with a definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #2088, 2090 (&amp; 2063) BDB #260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Translation:** ...I, [even] I, will do this thing before all Israel and before the sun.” God promises David that He will do all of these things in broad daylight. The idea is, David tried to hide his sin, and he was unsuccessful at doing this. God has to make certain that His punishment of David is more public and more obvious than David’s sins. Therefore, those who support David in the revolution will remain faithful to him.

Our passage reads: Jehovah now declares, ‘Listen, I will raise up evil from your own house against you: I will take your mistresses from before your eyes and I will give them to your associate and he will have sexual intercourse with your mistresses in broad daylight. Because you did these things secretly, I will act publically, doing these things before all Israel in broad daylight.”

**God Will Bring all that is Secret to Light**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Text/Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecc. 12:14</td>
<td>God will certainly judge everything that is done. This includes every secret thing, whether it is good or bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 12:1b–3</td>
<td>Jesus spoke to his disciples and said, &quot;Watch out for the yeast of the Pharisees. I'm talking about their hypocrisy. Nothing has been covered that will not be exposed. Whatever is secret will be made known. Whatever you have said in the dark will be heard in the daylight. Whatever you have whispered in private rooms will be shouted from the housetops.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scripture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Text/Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Cor. 4:5</td>
<td>Therefore, don’t judge anything before the appointed time. Wait until the Lord comes. He will also bring to light what is hidden in the dark and reveal people’s motives. Then each person will receive praise from God.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citations taken from *Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge*; by Canne, Browne, Blayney, Scott, and others about 1880, with introduction by R. A. Torrey; courtesy of E-sword, 2Sam. 12:12.

### Chapter Outline

Both the acts that David committed and the punishment that God placed upon David, were filled with a doubling of words and phrases, but in a rather complex pattern:

#### The Doubling of David’s Sins and Punishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Why have you despised the Word of Y’howah to do evil in His eyes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>You struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>You seized for yourself his wife to [be your] wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>You killed him with the sword of the sons of Ammon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first set of A’s is what was occurring in secret—in David’s heart. However, because David was king, he had a very public position, and the sins of his heart played out for all to see. Therefore, God punishment for David was done in broad daylight (the second set of A’s).

The first set of B’s is the sin of killing Uriah the Hittite. The second set of B’s is the punishment for this. David killed Uriah with the sword, so the sword would not depart from David’s household. In fact, it is evil in David’s own house that will rise up against him.

The first set of C’s is David’s sin of taking Uriah’s wife from him. The second set of C’s is the punishment and humiliation of having David’s wives publically fornicated with.

The messiness of the reading of David’s sins and the punishment associated with those sins indicates the messiness of these sins and God’s plan. God is able to work His plan around our sins and mistakes; however, my guess is, without this having been done, David’s life and mark upon history would have been even greater.

Although we do not have a nice, clean pattern here, we have a doubling of every thought throughout. Let me suggest that what David has done is twice as bad because of how God has blessed him and the public position which David has. Therefore, David’s punishment needs to be twice as harsh, and absolutely in the sight of all.

We may infer from this that, if you are a believer in a position of authority, and you do wrong, then expect double discipline for what you have done. If you are a pastor and you have done wrong before your sheep, how much discipline would you expect then?
Throughout the Bible, we find paragraphs and sections which have clear patterns or some sort of organizational lattice-work, which is sometimes very intricate.

### Chapter Outline

- Charts, Maps and Short Doctrines

Twice, God promises that this will be done before all Israel before the sun. Therefore, there must be a reason for this public discipline (more accurately, this public humiliation). In fact, there are several reasons for this, so we will break this down into mouth-sized bites, with a summary at the very end.

#### Why God Acts Publicly to Discipline David; Part I

1. David attempted to keep his sins secret, however, much of Israel had an idea what David had done.
2. As a result, much of Israel gossiped about David, which was a sin in itself, and put them out of fellowship.
3. A revolution will be launched against David. Now, people do not revolt for no reason. I believe that David’s sins, which the public figured out, are the foundation of the revolt of the people.
4. In order for David to have any supporters, they have to overlook what David has done.
5. It is very likely that most of the people of Israel knew what David had done. Many knew that he simply took Uriah’s wife and many knew that David issued the order to kill Uriah. A considerable number of people probably put these things together.
6. People have a natural tendency to be self-righteous. Therefore, it would have been natural for people to become very self-righteous with regards to all that David did.
7. David cannot lead an establishment army against the revolutionists while they are constantly seeing themselves as morally superior to David (as do David’s enemies).
8. Therefore, God’s punishment of David has to be very public.
9. Those who are establishment-oriented need to clearly see that God is handling David.
10. Every time a person thinks about the sins that David committed and begins to mentally judge David, they are to see how God is dealing with David and to decide, “You know, God has this all under control. In fact, God is beating David within an inch of his life. I think I am going to stay out of this altogether.”
11. If anything, God’s punishment of David engendered some sympathy from David’s supporters.
12. In any case, no spiritual person wants to stand between David and God through gossip or in judgment of David. Charlie Brown may have pretty well figured out all that David did and Charlie Brown may not like what David did; however, Charlie Brown can clearly see that God is punishing David.
13. When a matter is in the hands of God, then we ought to step back, step away; shut down our gossip and judgment, and allow God to function.
14. This is why many solid believers in the country of Israel took a long view of this situation. David did wrong; God is punishing David, so there is nothing for anyone else to do.
15. God’s public humiliation of David serves a myriad of purposes.
16. As already covered, this allowed people to remain faithful and loyal to David. He was the establishment government; therefore, in order to support the government which God instituted, people had to be loyal to David. God’s public punishment of David made that possible. If anything, much of the public probably felt even some measure of sympathy for David, because God unloaded both barrels on him.

In short, David was able to hold nation Israel together because he had been publically humiliated.

### Application

**Application:** I write this in 2011, and the politics in the United States has the ideals of the TEA party as promulgated by the Republican party and the liberal point of view, as presented by the Democratic party, most of the media, and in the classroom. One needs to look at the policies, goals and ideals of both sides and match these up with the Bible. The party and candidate which most closely parallels the **Laws of Divine Establishment (HTML) (PDF)** is the one to vote for (in a Republic, it is our civic duty to understand many of the issues and to make an informed choice when it comes to voting; just as paying taxes is required of the believer). Issues, such as truthfulness, personal character and common sense, are to be considered. Candidates who clearly favor an agenda different from what they proclaim ought to be rejected on the basis of honesty and personal integrity.
God’s public humiliation of David made it possible for his supporters to get behind him. David represented establishment government, and seeing God deal harshly with David allowed great men like Joab to overlook David’s failures, and to give him loyalty (and if anyone had a reason to desert David, it is Joab, who was drawn into David’s evil plot).

**Why God Acts Publically to Discipline David; Part II**

1. David was able to continue as a great king because God turned him around with severe punishment.
2. Early on in David’s life, he was a great soldier in Saul’s army. He had no choice but to go to war, when duty called. Being involved in many life and death struggles tends to keep a man’s mind off of sex.
3. Later, David was preoccupied with staying alive. King Saul was after him from time to time, and David had to worry about Saul killing him. Again, this gave David little time to indulge his strong sexual desires.
4. However, as David gained more and more power, he also began to collect women. At first, these were women of great character and women who were interesting; but, it becomes apparent, that David became more and more interested in women, simply because they were physically desirable to him. In the list of his wives, mistresses and children, it became apparent that David himself lost track of the names of all of his mistresses and which woman was the mother of which child.
5. His sexual assault of Bathsheba and the subsequent plot to kill her husband indicated that David had taken all of this too far. His sexual addiction had caused him to do things which, months or years before, he would not thought himself capable of doing such things.
6. Addictions, when fed, lead believers and unbelievers alike down a great downward spiral, where we do things we would never realize that we are capable of doing.
7. David had become so addicted to sexual sins, that, had he persisted, his entire reign would have fallen apart, due to his own lack of character.
8. God wants to use David and He cannot use David while he is spending all of his waking moments thinking about chasing skirt.
9. David wrote several psalms while being punished by God, and at least one of them related to the cross of Jesus Christ (Psalm 22). David’s tremendous suffering caused him to write down words that would describe our Lord going to the cross to pay for our sins.

David is of little use to God if he is to spend the rest of his life chasing after women.

**Why God Acts Publically to Discipline David; Part III**

1. People knew the sins that David was involved in. After awhile, this became common knowledge.
2. Many people suffer from these same temptations. Although the average person in Israel could not act upon all of his lusts, he could act upon them to some degree.
3. Knowing what David did and knowing how God clobbered David for what he did stands as a deterrent to others, of David’s generation, and for many generations to follow (even until today).
4. When I was a substitute teacher, I often had to, at the beginning of the day, deal harshly with the most belligerent child I came across in order to set him and his classmates straight. His classmates needed to see that there were consequences for their actions.
5. In many cases, God’s harsh treatment stands as an example of how swift and terrible His punishment can be. We have the example of David here; we have the example of Ananias and Sapphira in Acts 5.
6. As a young person, I was exposed to a number of drug addicts. No matter how cool they seemed and how cool they seemed to others, it was clear, there was a serious problem with drug addiction that I was observing with my own eyes.
   1) Obviously, this does not always work. I have one relative who observed this all of her life, and still, later in life, indulged in the use of drugs, despite all that she knew.
   2) However, that is the power of the sin nature and the magnetic draw of evil. We can see the sin, we can see the results, and yet, we still decide, “Hell, I might as well give it a try.”

The nation Israel was in a precarious place; knowing what David had done and seeing David publically disciplined helps the people of Israel to avoid addictive behavior.

Chapter Outline

David’s own soul has been corrupted by his desire for sex. In order for David to remain as a good leader to Israel, his soul must be cleansed.

Why God Acts Publically to Discipline David; Part IV

1. David’s own spiritual life is an issue here. In order for him to continue to be a great leader, in order for him to raise some of his sons up right, in order for him to become a good husband to Bathsheba, he had to be turned away from sexual arrogance. Therefore, God had to beat David and beat him again; and beat him after that; and beat him one more time, until this enforced humility became genuine humility.
2. David was able to properly raise up Solomon, a son by Bathsheba, because God had turned him around as a father. It will be clear that David, up until this point in time, was a horrible father. He had children and wives and mistresses whose names he did not even know.
3. Solomon will have to illustrate Jesus Christ in the Millennium. Therefore, Solomon has to be raised correctly. Solomon will need Bible doctrine in his soul in order to write all of the books that he wrote. Therefore, David has to be a good father to Solomon.

No one leaves this life with a perfect soul. We all sin. However, this addictive behavior of David’s had to be turned around.

So, to sum up, there are 4 reasons why God punished David so severely and so publically:

Why God Acts Publically to Discipline David; a Summary

1. The people of Israel had to know that God was punishing David. They had to know that God was involved, that David did not get away with anything, and therefore, they could support David in the revolution, and David is God’s anointed. This allowed David to hold nation Israel together, which would have disintegrated into chaos apart from David’s public humiliation.
2. David needed to be under so much pain that he would write Psalm 22, which would speak of the pain and suffering of Jesus Christ before the cross and while on the cross. Much of David’s great writing came out of this pain which God put upon David.
3. David was a cautionary tale to others. As his sins became known, so also the discipline for these sins is known. This acts as a deterrent to others, even until today.
4. Finally, David needed to get away from sexual arrogance and become a good father. The character and spiritual growth of Solomon, his son by Bathsheba, would depend upon it.
Application: You may think that God has come down too hard on you for this or that sin. Perhaps you have only gossiped and perhaps you have a less-visible gift, like the gift of prayer, and yet, God punishes you dramatically for your sin. Your sins are not insignificant nor is your life insignificant. We all have a place in the plan of God; God has determined things for our lives, and He would like us to go along with His program. We will feel better about the whole thing. Sometimes this involves discipline and sometimes it involves a hefty amount of discipline. Always remember Paul—he spent much of his life suffering from some sort of eye disease, where he suffered both pain and visual problems because of this disease. God did this to keep Paul humble. How much do you want to suffer from a disease which pains you every single day of the year? Therefore, do not despise the discipline of the Lord, nor fall apart when you are rebuked by Him (Heb. 12:5b).

Divine discipline is a part of nearly every believer’s life. Therefore, we need to know as much about it as possible.

Some Additional Points on Divine Discipline

1. Jesus Christ died for every sin that David committed.
2. You may therefore ask, “Why is God going to discipline David for sins which Jesus died for?”
3. Actually, you are far more interested in, “What does God discipline me for sins that Jesus has died for?”
4. Temporal discipline is designed for our own good. "My son, do not regard lightly the discipline of the Lord, nor be weary when reproved by him. For the Lord disciplines the one he loves, and chastises every son whom he receives." It is for discipline that you have to endure. God is treating you as sons. For what son is there whom his father does not discipline? If you are left without discipline, in which all have participated, then you are illegitimate children and not sons. Besides this, we have had earthly fathers who disciplined us and we respected them. Shall we not much more be subject to the Father of spirits and live? For they disciplined us for a short time as it seemed best to them, but he disciplines us for our good, that we may share his holiness. For the moment all discipline seems painful rather than pleasant, but later it yields the peaceful fruit of righteousness to those who have been trained by it (Heb. 12:5b–11).
5. If you are reading this, you are probably a believer in Jesus Christ. If you have a son, you still discipline your son. No matter how weird or way out a parent is, they exercise some sort of discipline over their child, even if it is minor ("Shut the hell up, I’m trying to watch O’Reilly!").
6. For David, there were two things involved here. As a believer, he needed to be brought into line. His lust had led him far outside God’s will, and God, as a loving Father, disciplined David in order to bring him back into fellowship, and to bring his life back into line with God’s plan.
7. Secondly, David had responsibilities as a king. If he chose to indulge his life chasing skirt, he would not be able to keep up with his own personal responsibilities.
8. There is much more at stake here than David’s life and spiritual growth.
9. All of the nation Israel suffers because of the lousy decisions that David makes.
10. Therefore, God must take into consideration all of the people of Israel.
11. Both David’s personal integrity and his addictive sins affect all of those in Israel.
12. David must be corrected so that his kingship is good for his people, and so that he does not leave his kingdom in revolutionary shambles.
The divine discipline that David will face is different from divine discipline as a measure to get us back into fellowship. David will be in fellowship while much of his correctional discipline is going on.

### Chapter Outline

When we feel pleasure, endorphins are released into our brain. These can actually shut down pain in our system (physical or emotional pain). This can occur as a result of natural activity (like sex) or artificially, as through drugs or drinking. This stimulation is pleasurable, and some people become addicted to it.

### Types of Addiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Text/Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual addiction</td>
<td>This is most often found in men, and I have used the term <em>skirt chasing</em> throughout this chapter in order to describe this phenomenon. This was David’s problem. He saw beautiful women and he wanted to have them. As king, he was able to have most of the women he desired. This and the next several chapters are all about breaking this addiction in David. Men with this tendency have problems choosing between their right woman and their sexual addiction. They tend to treat women as sexual objects rather than as people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuality</td>
<td>There is still a lot more to be discovered scientifically about homosexuality. There is certainly a genetic component in homosexuality, as the identical twin of a homosexual is 50% or more likely to also be homosexual. Such studies which have determined this clearly indicate that there is a strong but not determinative genetic component to homosexuality. The Bible clearly teaches that homosexuality is a sin. Given the male soul as it is, a person who desires homosexual sex has a reasonable chance of finding it, as they are looking for other men with the same sort of soul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Addiction</td>
<td>Text/Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto-eroticism</strong></td>
<td>Here, there are almost no limits, as a person indulges himself as he so desires (in masturbation). This, like all the other sins in this category, is addictive and can take valuable time away from one’s participation in the plan of God. Like many of the other addictive sins listed, this addiction can also isolate you from mainstream society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcoholism</strong></td>
<td>Alcoholism is often compared to homosexuality, as they have many things in common. There is a strong, but not determinative genetic component. Indulgence can affect a person’s entire life and lifestyle. Both are likely to have shorter lives (if memory serves, homosexuals tend to have a lifespan shortened by 20 years on average). Both are curable, and both can fall into relapses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug addiction</strong></td>
<td>This activity has become much more a part of American society since the 1960’s, and most of us have a personal relationship with someone who has become addicted to drugs. Such a person often wraps his own life around acquiring and using the drug or drugs of choice. Their personality appears to be eaten up by the drug.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gambling addiction</strong></td>
<td>Being particularly parsimonious and realistic, this is an addiction I have very little experience with, either personally or with friends. However, this apparently exists, and also dramatically affects the lives of certain people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overeating</strong></td>
<td>The eating of food can be a very pleasurable experience, and because it seems to be a lot less sinful than the items named above, it is easy for a believer with problems to turn to food for comfort.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 2 passages in the Bible about the dog returning to his vomit. The idea is, there is something which a person clearly rejects (vomit, in the illustration). However, their norms and standards are so beaten down by their addiction (sexual, alcohol, or drug), that, they can return to this vomit at some point in their lives. You may be rich and famous and doing cocaine, and you think, “I would never be that poor, pitiful person scoring and taking drugs in filthy rooms or alleys.” And yet, given enough time, you find yourself doing just that. You have clear norms and standards at the beginning of your addiction; and these norms and standards break down the further you get into your addiction, so you become the dog returning to its vomit, or the pig who is clean, who returns to roll in the mud.

If we were able to easily cure alcoholism and drug addiction, that would nearly eliminate homelessness. Almost all that would remain are those who suffer from grave mental and emotional problems.

Part of the reason that God is dealing so harshly with David is, this will turn his addiction around by the end of the book of Samuel.

---

**Chapter Outline**

**Charts, Maps and Short Doctrines**

Here is what our passage reads so far: 

> Y*hovah now declares, ‘Listen, I am raising up against you evil from your [own] house and I have taken your women in your sight and given [them] to your associates; and he has lain with your women in the sight of this sun. Because you, [even] you, have done [these things] secretly, I, [even] I, will do this thing before all Israel and before the sun.”

**David, Absalom and Interlocking Systems of Arrogance**

1. God took David, a mature believer, and promised him to king over all Israel.
2. He had the ultimate human authority in Israel and his kingship was in line with laws of divine establishment.
David, Absalom and Interlocking Systems of Arrogance

3. Legitimate authority comes only through divine establishment. Thugs and criminal organizations lack legitimate authority.

4. All legitimate authority in life must a part of divine establishment. This does not mean that you will like those in authority, it does not mean that they act reasonably or justly, but they wield legitimate, establishment authority.

5. Any authority apart from the laws of divine establishment is tyranny.

6. The government which takes away your freedoms today in the name of common good or in the name of your safety and comfort is the tyrannical government of tomorrow. Politicians always promise far more than they can deliver, so that they must tax oppressively or regulate obsessively to keep things under control.

7. David began to move into interlocking systems of arrogance before Bathsheba, although we do not know when. I suspect when David found out that he, as king, was not to multiply wives to himself, and then continued to multiply wives to himself.

8. So, before David brought Bathsheba to the palace, he was inside the interlocking systems of arrogance.

9. God duplicated this theft of Bathsheba in discipline when He allowed David’s wives to be taken by Absalom.

10. Whereas, David thought that he had committed adultery privately, Absalom will do it publically. The key is, David’s acts became so very public, that this brought a revolution throughout Israel (presumably).

11. There is certainly a genetic component to the sin of sexual degeneracy; as both David and Solomon were riven by the same lusts.

12. Similarly, David and Absalom also entered into the arrogance complex by means of their volition.

13. Ahithophel had a very bitter soul and entered into interlocking systems of arrogance through conspiracy arrogance; from their, his soul interlocked with psychopathic arrogance.

14. The sins of the father are passed along to the son where the son’s volition goes in that direction. Genetics can produce an inherent weakness, but the volition must be engaged for such sins to be repeated. A father who knows his own weakness can counsel his son in the proper direction. So, the father can, for instance, have a serious bout with alcoholism, and begin to work on his son from an early age to never drink. If the son chooses not to drink, he cannot repeat that form of degeneracy. In that case, training and volition trump genetic predisposition.

Chapter Outline

Charts, Maps and Short Doctrines

David now clearly sees himself for the rat that he is, and he names his sins to God. As a result, he will not die the sin unto death, but he will still feel a lot of pain (as described in the many doctrines above)

And so says David unto Nathan, “I have sinned to Y’howah” And says Nathan unto David, “Also Y’howah has passed over your sin; you will not die.

Then David admitted to Nathan, “I have sinned against Jehovah.” Nathan then replied to David, “Indeed, Y’howah has passed over your sin; you will not die.

Then David said to Nathan, “I have sinned with regards to Y’howah.” Nathan replied to David, “Indeed, Y’howah has passed over your sin; you will not die.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

Latin Vulgate

And David said to Nathan: I have sinned against the Lord. And Nathan said to David: The Lord also hath taken away thy sin: thou shalt not die.
And so says David unto Nathan, “I have sinned to Y’howah” And says Nathan unto David, “Also Y’howah has passed over your sin; you will not die.

And David said to Nathan, I have sinned against the LORD. And Nathan said to David, The LORD also has put away your transgression; you shall not die.

And David said to Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord. And Nathan said to David, The Lord has put away your sin; you shall not die.

David sins regarding the Lord; not against the Lord (in this verse). The original Greek more closely approximates this meaning. The first verb that Nathan uses can be translated in a number of ways, several of which are used above.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV
David said, "I have disobeyed the LORD." "Yes, you have!" Nathan answered. "You showed you didn't care what the LORD wanted. He has forgiven you, and you won't die. But your newborn son will."

Good News Bible (TEV)
"I have sinned against the LORD," David said. Nathan replied, "The LORD forgives you; you will not die.

The Message
Then David confessed to Nathan, "I've sinned against GOD." Nathan pronounced, "Yes, but that's not the last word. GOD forgives your sin. You won't die for it.

New Living Translation
David Confesses His Guilt
Then David confessed to Nathan, "I have sinned against the Lord." Nathan replied, "Yes, but the Lord has forgiven you, and you won't die for this sin.

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

American English Bible
Then David said to Nathan, 'I have sinned against Jehovah.' And Nathan said to David, 'Well, Jehovah has forgiven your sin, so you're not going to die.

Ancient Roots Translinear
David said to Nathan, "I sinned to Yahweh." Nathan said to David, "Yahweh also passed your sin: You will not die.

God's Word™
Then David said to Nathan, "I have sinned against the LORD." Nathan replied, "The LORD has taken away your sin; you will not die.

New American Bible
Then David said to Nathan, "I have sinned against the LORD." Nathan answered David: "The LORD on his part has forgiven your sin: you shall not die.

NIRV
Then David said to Nathan, "I have sinned against the Lord." Nathan replied, "The Lord has taken away your sin. You aren't going to die.

New Jerusalem Bible
David said to Nathan, 'I have sinned against Yahweh.' Nathan then said to David, 'Yahweh, for his part, forgives your sin; you are not to die.

New Simplified Bible
David said to Nathan: »I have sinned against Jehovah.« Nathan replied: »Jehovah has taken away your sin. You will not die.

Revised English Bible
David said to Nathan, ‘I have sinned against the L ORD.’ Nathan answered, ‘The L ORD has laid on another the consequences of your sin; you will not die,...

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

Bible in Basic English
And David said to Nathan, Great is my sin against the Lord. And Nathan said to David, The Lord has put away your sin; death will not come on you.

HCSB
David responded to Nathan, "I have sinned against the LORD." Then Nathan replied to David, "The LORD has taken away your sin; you will not die.

JPS (Tanakh—1985)
David said to Nathan, "I stand guilty before the LORD!" And Nathan replied to David, "The L ORD has remitted your sin; you shall not die.

Judaica Press Complete T.
And David said to Nathan: "I have sinned against the Lord." And Nathan said to David, "Also the Lord has removed your sin; you shall not die.
Then David exclaimed to Nathan, "I have sinned against the LORD!" Nathan replied to David, "Yes, and the LORD has forgiven [Heb "removed."] your sin. You are not going to die.

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

Concordant Literal Version And David said unto Nathan, `I have sinned against Yahweh.' And Nathan said unto David, `Also—Yahweh has caused your sin to pass away; you do not die;'

Context Group Version And David said to Nathan, I have disgraced YHWH. And Nathan said to David, YHWH also has put away your disgrace; you shall not die..

English Standard Version David said to Nathan, "I have sinned against the LORD." And Nathan said to David, "The LORD also has put away your sin; you shall not die.

exeGeses companion Bible And David says to Nathan, I sinned against Yah Veh. And Nathan says to David, Yah Veh also passes over your sin that you not die.

Heritage Bible And David said to Nathan, I have sinned against Jehovah. And Nathan said to David, Jehovah also has crossed over your sin; you shall not die..

Syndein And David said {`amar - imperfect tense} unto Nathan, {imperfect tense means David said more, but only what is needed is recorded here} "I have sinned against the Jehovah/God {notice that David killed Uriah and others . . . but it is against God that he sinned - this is the rebound of David - see also I John 1:9}. And Nathan said unto David, "The Jehovah/God also has forgiven your sin { chatta'ah - singular} {RBT says that by being singular, this means that all the sin that David has committed are considered by God to be rolled into one and forgiven}. You shall not die {right now} {referring to the sin unto death. David rebounded and his sin was forgiven - he will have installment discipline over the next 10 years, because the more mature you are and the greater the length of time you remain out of fellowship and involved in evil, the longer and greater your discipline will be}.

Young’s Updated LT And David says unto Nathan, "I have sinned against Jehovah." And Nathan says unto David, "Also—Jehovah has caused your sin to pass away; you dost not die.

The gist of this verse: David recognizes his sin, and tells Nathan, “I have sinned against Jehovah.” Nathan tells David that his sins have been passed over by God and that he would not die.
Translation: Then David said to Nathan, “I have sinned with regards to Y’hovah.” Nathan first told David the parable, which caught David’s attention and got him involved.

How many political leaders would do this? Nathan has presented no evidence; Nathan has not said, “And here are those who have witnessed this behavior.” He simply laid out these sins of David’s and David reacts as few politicians have. “I have sinned with reference to Jehovah.” He admits to it; he admits to this straight out, publically, and without trying to minimize any of what he has done.

This indicates that David has rebounded (named his sins to God). So that we are not confused, David will write Psalm 51:1–4 Have mercy on me, O God, according to Your steadfast love; according to Your abundant mercy blot out my transgressions. Wash me thoroughly from my iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin! For I know my transgressions, and my sin is ever before me. Against You, You only, have I sinned and done what is evil in Your sight, so that you may be justified in Your words and blameless in Your judgment.

Restoration to Fellowship

1. David, here, returns to the plan of God when he is restored to fellowship through admitting his sins to God.
2. The exact mechanics of given in 1John 1:9: If we name our sins, He is faithful [God does this every time] and just [forgiving our sins does not compromise God’s righteousness] to forgive us our sins [those which we confessed] and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness [whatever sins we did not confess].
3. Rebound is the technical term for restoration to fellowship by naming one’s sins to God originated with R. B. Thieme, Jr.
4. The old sin nature produces human good, sin and evil. We only confess sins to God; we do not confess human good or evil. All of our sins were imputed to Christ and judged on the cross.
   1) Human good is the good that we do when we are out of fellowship. To the outside observer, it may look no different from divine good. People both in and out of fellowship can give money to a church, for instance. One is a act of human good, the other is an act of divine good. 1Cor. 3:6–14
   2) Human good is called dead works in the Bible (Heb. 6:1) and will be burned at the Judgment Seat of Christ (1Cor. 3:11–16).
   3) Some churches spend so much time in the production of human good and evil that they have no
Restoration to Fellowship

4) Sin is simply disobedience to God by wrongdoing; it can be a thought, a mental attitude, something you say or something that you do. Jesus Christ die for our sins on the cross and we are forgiven these sins by naming them to God.

5) Evil is the policy of Satan in this world. It can include sin, human good or simply thinking which goes against God and goes against the laws of divine establishment.

6) Our problems today all stem from evil. Evil is Satan’s policy and Satan’s policy is designed to go against God’s policy. Today, the hyper-environmental movement is Satanic. Those who are global warming enthusiasts are evil. Those who want to continue to give more and more money to the poor are evil. Those who want to level out income are evil.

5. Rebound is a private matter; you name your sin silently to God. There is no penance involved. 1John 1:9 Psalm 51:4

6. With rebound, in the Church Age, comes the restoration of fellowship and the filling of the Holy Spirit. Eph. 5:18 1John 1:7–10

7. You can go nowhere in the Christian life without the filling of the Spirit. You cannot produce divine good and you cannot grow spiritually apart from the filling of the Holy Spirit. 1Cor. 2:13 3:1 Eph. 3:16 Col. 1:9

8. Restoration to fellowship is related both to the imputations at birth and to the judicial imputations.

1) At birth, human life is imputed to the soul. At the same time, Adam’s original sin is imputed to us as sons of Adam. Therefore, at birth, we are spiritually dead and physically alive. We are born condemned on the basis of the imputation of Adam’s original sin. Our personal sins are not the basis for our condemnation.

2) On the cross, our sins are imputed to Jesus Christ, and He endures the penalty for sins which we deserve.

3) At salvation, God’s righteousness is imputed to us, so that God can love us personally without compromising His righteousness and justice.

4) After salvation, we move in and out of fellowship by sinning and then naming our sins to God.

5) Man’s point of reference is always the justice of God. Because we are indwelt by sin, and because we have Adam’s original sin, God’s justice judges us from birth. However, when we believe in Jesus Christ, perfect righteousness is imputed to us (we share the righteousness of Jesus Christ), and God can love us without compromising His essence.

6) This was revealed at the very beginning after the sins of Adam and the woman. An animal was killed and the skin of the animal covered Adam and the woman until Jesus Christ died for them in time.

7) We are forgiven in time because God is able to without compromising His justice, which forgiveness is based upon the imputations just discussed.

9. After most sins, we rebound and the suffering stops, or it is diminished or it continues at the same intensity after you rebound. However, with David, he is going to face 4 installments of suffering, while he goes in and out of fellowship; which installments are designed for blessing; and which installments are designed to restore his soul to a point where, sexual arrogance does not rule the day.

So, let’s look at this as a whole:

A Summary of Nathan and David’s Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Text/Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Mission</strong></td>
<td>What David did was evil in the sight of Jehovah. Therefore, Jehovah told Nathan to go to David, so Nathan went to him. David’s behavior, and, more importantly, his soul, had gotten to a place where God needed to step in and intervene.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# A Summary of Nathan and David’s Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Text/Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Parable</strong></td>
<td>Nathan said to David, &quot;There were two men in a certain city, the one rich and the other poor. The rich man had very many flocks and herds, but the poor man had nothing but one little ewe lamb, which he had bought. And he brought it up, and it grew up with him and with his children. It used to eat of his morsel and drink from his cup and lie in his arms, and it was like a daughter to him. Now there came a traveler to the rich man, and he was unwilling to take one of his own flock or herd to prepare for the guest who had come to him, but he took the poor man’s lamb and prepared it for the man who had come to him.&quot; (2Sam. 12:1b–4). You will note that this parable draws David in, gets him involved, and he sees the issues objectively. Had Nathan simply begun to tell David what he did wrong, David would have become quite defensive about everything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>David’s judgment</strong></td>
<td>Then David's anger was greatly kindled against the man, and he said to Nathan, &quot;As the LORD lives, the man who has done this deserves to die, and he shall restore the lamb fourfold, because he did this thing, and because he had no pity.&quot; (2Sam. 12:5–6). David has been emotionally drawn into this story, as Nathan knew he would be. He immediately took the side of the poor man, who was treated shamefully, and David pronounces judgment against the rich man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nathan indicts David</strong></td>
<td>&quot;You are the man! Thus says the LORD, the God of Israel, 'I anointed you king over Israel, and I delivered you out of the hand of Saul. And I gave you your master's house and your master's wives into your arms and gave you the house of Israel and of Judah. And if this were too little, I would add to you as much more. Why have you despised the word of the LORD, to do what is evil in his sight? You have struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword and have taken his wife to be your wife and have killed him with the sword of the Ammonites. Now therefore the sword shall never depart from your house, because you have despised me and have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife.'&quot; (2Sam. 12:7–10). Nathan explains to David exactly why he acted like the rich man in his story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God’s judgment against David</strong></td>
<td>Thus says the LORD, 'Behold, I will raise up evil against you out of your own house. And I will take your wives before your eyes and give them to your neighbor, and he shall lie with your wives in the sight of this sun. For you did it secretly, but I will do this thing before all Israel and before the sun.'&quot; (2Sam. 12:11–12). God’s judgment is based upon what David said about the rich man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>David names his sins to God.</strong></td>
<td>David said to Nathan, &quot;I have sinned against the LORD.&quot; (2Sam. 12:13a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

God uses Nathan to get David to view his own actions with some objectivity.

Because there is so much to be found within this narrative, it is sometimes helpful to step back and see it summarized, so that we do not lose the narrative aspect of it all.

---

### Chapter Outline

At this time, a study of **Psalm 51** ([HTML](#)) ([PDF](#)) would be apropos. At the end of this chapter, I will again, list all of the psalms related to this period of David’s life.

**Application:** Our sins are not forgiven or mitigated because of some great emotional catharsis that we go through. We may see a great movie, and it moves us, and we feel better about everything because we have seen this movie; but this has absolutely nothing to do with spiritual matters. There are many churches where the emotions
are titrated, sometimes legitimately, but often illegitimately, using a variety of psychological approaches. However, how we feel is not any sort of gauge for our spiritual lives. We may confess a series of sins before a congregation and feel a great weight lifted from us; or we might do it in a small group; but the emotional catharsis is not a spiritual experience. We might go to a revival, as a Christian, and be drawn to come forward, and, for whatever reason, become very emotional about it all. However, all of that is simply emotion; and you will have legitimate and illegitimate emotions as related to the spiritual life. However, the reason that God forgives us eternally and in time for the sins we commit is not based upon some great welling of emotion within us, but because Jesus Christ died for our sins in time, and that God can therefore impute His righteousness to us without compromising His Own justice (or any other aspect of God’s essence). We are forgiven in time based upon our Lord’s sacrifice on the cross and based upon the non-meritorious mechanics which God has laid out for us. Whether or not this invokes some set of emotions within us is beside the point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (i) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘âmar (אָמַר) [pronounced aw-MAHR]</td>
<td>to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #559 BDB #55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâthân (נַחַן) [pronounced naw-THAWN]</td>
<td>given; one who is given; transliterated Nathan</td>
<td>masculine singular, proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #5416 BDB #681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘el (אֵל) [pronounced ehl]</td>
<td>unto; into, among, in; toward, to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to</td>
<td>directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied)</td>
<td>Strong’s #413 BDB #39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid (דָּוִד); also Dâviyd (דָּוִיָּד) [pronounced daw-VEED]</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gam (גָּם) [pronounced gahm]</td>
<td>also, furthermore, in addition to, even, moreover</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Strong’s #1571 BDB #168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gam has five primary usages. 

1. It is used to denote in addition to or a continuation of or an adding to a previous thought or point. It is often rendered also. 
2. Gam can be used as an intensifier (even) and is sometimes used this way with a negative. 
3. Gam can be used to make a sentence emphatic (yea, indeed, truly) or it can simply be used to give considerable emphasis to the next word. 
4. It can be rendered even if when followed by an imperfect verb. 
5. Finally, it can be rendered as an adverb—however, but—but usually followed by a negative particle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YHWH (יְהֹוָה) [pronunciation is possibly yohh-WAHI]</td>
<td>transliterated variously as Jehovah, Yahweh, Y’howah</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #3068 BDB #217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘âbar (אָבָר) [pronounced gaw^]-VAHR</td>
<td>to cause [make] to pass over, to cause [allow] to pass through, to bring [over, to]; to transmit, to send over; to pass by sin; to cause to pass away, to cause to take away; to remit, to forgive</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Hiphil perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5674 BDB #716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because there are several Qal meanings, there are several corresponding Hiphil meanings. This word, in the Hiphil, can also mean to bring; to offer up [as a sacrifice]; to consecrate; to lead away, to take away, to remove; to avert.

chaṭṭā’îth (נֵחֲטַת) [pronounced khat-TAWTH]  
misstep, slip of the foot; sin; sinfulness; a sin-offering; penalty, calamity, misfortune

feminine singular noun with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix  
Strong's #2403  
BDB #308

This is also spelled chaṭṭā’âh (נֵחֲטַת) [pronounced khat-taw-AW].

**Translation**: Nathan replied to David, “Indeed, Y’howah has passed over your sin;... God, in the Old Testament, overlooked sin; covered over sin or passed over sin. God did not, strictly speaking, forgive sin in the Old Testament, because Jesus had not yet died for our sins.

It is also important to note that, God simply does not let this pass. He does not allow David to simply go on his merry way. “You rebounded? Good enough for Me.” That is not God’s attitude. God is going to deal with David’s acts during his lifetime. God will not punish David eternally for his sins; nor, is God’s discipline good enough to take this sin away from David. God’s discipline is designed for blessing for David; nothing more and nothing less. What David will endure will be better for David in the long term and will allow him to reorganize his life so that he simply does not throw it away over the next 10 years.

2Samuel 12:13c

According to Rotherham, 2 early printed editions have an and [therefore] right here.

lô’ (לֹא) or ḥîṣ  
not, no

negates the word or action that follows; the absolute negation  
Strong’s #3808  
BDB #518

mûwth (פָּתַה)  
to die; to perish, to be destroyed

2nd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect  
Strong’s #4191  
BDB #559

**Translation**: ...you will not die. Nathan delivers to David the only good news: “You will not die.” Nathan has to tell David this because David has pronounced the judgment himself. He just stated that the rich man was worthy of death, and if God was to fully apply David’s judgment on the rich man, that means David would die as punishment.

2Sam. 12:13 reads: Then David admitted to Nathan, “I have sinned against Jehovah.” Nathan then replied to David, “Jehovah has indeed removed your sin from you; you will not die.” There is a two-fold sense in which David would not die. Having committed adultery and murder, David is liable to criminal law, which prescribes death for him. Secondly, David had almost gotten to the point where God would have removed him from this world via the sin unto death. His confession of sin stopped the sin unto death.

---

29 Joseph Bryant Rotherham’s The Emphasized Bible; ©1971 by Kregel Publications; p. 332 (footnote).
Now, you may be studying all of this, and it occurs to you, David murdered; David committed adultery; and the penalty for those 2 sins is execution. So, how can God simply overlook His Own Law?

### Why Didn’t God Execute David?

1. From the very beginning, it is clear that man has the obligation to execute those who commit murder. Gen. 9:6: *“Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed, for God made man in his own image.”*
2. It is important to observe 2 things:
   1) God is the One making the law.
   2) There does not appear to be such a law in effect prior to Gen. 9:6. Despite killing Abel, Cain is not executed; and neither was Lamech. In his own song, he portrayed killing as revenge. Gen. 4:23–24.
3. God is the great Lawgiver. In the Law of Moses, execution is prescribed for the murderer. Ex. 21:14
4. However, God, as the Lawgiver, is also the final judge.
5. God as the Lawgiver is the Final Court of Appeals, the Supreme Court of Heaven.
6. Our sentence is eternal separation from God. We were born with a sin nature; we were born with Adam’s sin imputed to us, and we will commit sins throughout our lives. So we all deserve eternal death.
7. We appeal to the Great Lawgiver for mercy.
8. God can grant us mercy, but not on the basis of any sort of sentimentality, but because Jesus Christ died for our sins.
9. Our sins have been paid for in full, no matter what they are.
10. David’s sin of adultery and his sin of murder have been paid for; Jesus Christ died for those sins on the cross.
11. Therefore, it is God’s prerogative to set aside any verdict which could be pronounced against us.
12. David deserves to die for the sins that he committed; God, as the Court of Final Appeal, has set this verdict aside and has pardoned David.
13. We deserve eternal separation from God; but God, as the Court of Final Appeal, has set this verdict aside and has forgiven us.
14. What God’s righteousness demands, God’s justice executes.
15. God cannot violate His righteousness or His justice.
16. Because of the death of His Son on the cross, in which He took upon Himself the punishment for our sins, God’s righteousness and justice have been satisfied.
17. Therefore, it is God prerogative to pardon any sinner for the sins he has committed, both temporally and in eternity.
18. Quite obviously, God still had plans for David in this life. He needed time to raise up Solomon, who will be born to David and Bathsheba in v. 24. This will require an additional 10 or 20 years in order for David to properly raise Solomon.
19. Because of what he has done, the nation Israel is about to be split into two, and David must be kept alive in order to put all the pieces back together. Millions of lives will depend upon what David does here.
20. Finally, we will find out that, because of David’s neglect, many of his sons have grown to be worthless and shiftless young men, who have not an ounce of David’s character and ability—all because, David did not properly rear them.
21. So God needs to keep David around in order to raise up the next generation, which will be Solomon and Nathan. Furthermore, God will use Solomon to illustrate Jesus Christ as the Millennial King (David will illustrate Jesus in His 1st and 2nd Advents.
22. Finally, David’s punishment is going to be so severe and so public that everyone in Israel will see it; so that, when all is said and done, no one is going to think that David has gotten away with murder.

All of this expresses God’s grace without abandoning His justice and righteousness.
2Sam. 12:13 reads: Then David admitted to Nathan, “I have sinned against Jehovah.” Nathan then replied to David, “Jehovah has indeed removed your sin from you; you will not die.” David recognizes his sin. Nathan tells David that his sin is no longer the issue; and that David will not die the sin unto death. However, God is not through dealing with David. The restitution which Nathan will lay out (which restitution David himself had decreed) is designed to rehabilitate David’s soul.

**Application:** Throughout the Bible, there is the easy way and there is the hard way. David continued to indulge his sin until it took over his life, as addictions are wont to do. We can read about it and be forewarned—that’s the easy way—or we can continue to indulge these types of sins, and God will deal with us the hard way. The next 10 years of his life will be the hard way for David.

2Sam. 12:13 reads: Then David admitted to Nathan, “I have sinned against Jehovah.” Nathan then replied to David, “Jehovah has indeed removed your sin from you; you will not die.” One more thing: whatever emotion that David feels—regret, guilt, shame—is not pertinent. Given his soul in this condition, David may not feel anything. Intellectually and objectively, he has come to realize just how much he has sinned, but he may or may not have a flood of negative emotions because of this. How he feels is not an issue, and therefore, is not a part of this narrative. David is ultimately forgiven for his sin because Jesus Christ dies for that sin on the cross; temporally, David is forgiven for this sin because he names this sin to God. Emotions are not the issue.

Let’s go back and get an overall picture of what has just happened.

**A Summary of 2Samuel 12:1–13**

1. This passage reads:

   And so the thing which David did was evil in the eyes of Y*howah. Therefore, Y*howah sent Nathan unto David, so he went to him. Nathan [lit., he] said to David [lit., him],

   “[There are] two men in a certain city—one rich and the other poor.

   The rich man had a great many flocks and herds;

   but to the poor man [there is] nothing except a small ewe-lamb which he had acquired.

   He restored her [life] and she has grown up together with him and his sons.

   She ate from his bread [lit., morsel (of bread)] and drank from his cup, and she lays down in his bosom—she became like a daughter to him.

   A traveler came to the man of wealth, yet the rich man [lit., he] spared to take from his [own] flock or from his [own] herd [in order] to prepare [a meal] for the traveler, the one who came to him.

   Consequently, he took the ewe-lamb of the man—the one who is poor—and he prepared it for the man who came to him.”

   David’s anger against this man burned greatly. Therefore, he said to Nathan, “[As] Y*howah lives, because the man did this [thing], [he is] a son of death. Furthermore, he will recompense [the man for his] lamb fourfold as a consequence of having done this thing and because he showed no compassion.”

Then Nathan said to David, “You [are] that man! Thus says Y*howah, Elohim of Israel, ‘I anointed you as king over Israel and I delivered you from the hand of Saul. I gave you the house of your lord and the women of your lord into your care [lit., bosom]; and I gave you the nation [lit., house] of Israel and Judah. And, if [this was too] little, then I would have added to you even more [lit., these (blessings) as well as those (blessings)]. Why have you despised the Word of Y*howah to do evil in His eyes? You struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword. You seized for yourself his wife to [be your] wife. You killed him with the sword of the sons of Ammon. Now, therefore, the sword will not depart from your house forever because you have despised Me and you have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife.’
A Summary of 2Samuel 12:1–13

Yahweh now declares, ‘Listen, I am raising up against you evil from your [own] house and I have taken your women in your sight and given [them] to your associates; and he has lain with your women in the sight of this sun. Because you, [even] you, have done [these things] secretly, I, [even] I, will do this thing before all Israel and before the sun.”

Then David said to Nathan, “I have sinned with regards to Yahweh.”

Nathan replied to David, “Indeed, Yahweh has passed over your sin; you will not die.”

2. David’s sexual lust had become an addiction to David and had taken over his life.
3. David did not have the ability to see himself objectively, to fully realize what he had done.
4. God was disgusted with David’s sin, and He sent Nathan to straighten David out.
5. Nathan began telling David about a legal case, which case David assumed to be true.
6. This parable was all about a rich man who had many livestock animals and a poor man who had one little ewe-lamb which he had apparently nursec back to health; which lamb had become a part of his family.
7. When a visitor came to the rich man, he did not want to slaughter any of his own animals, so he took this ewe-lamb from the poor man and slaughtered it for a meal.
8. David became so caught up in this case that he pronounced judgment on the rich man (which is David). He told Nathan that this man is worthy of death and that he should restore the lamb fourfold.
9. This is in keeping with the Mosaic Law, which requires a fourfold restoration for that which has been stolen. Therefore, David was keeping up with his doctrine. He had residual doctrine in his soul, at the very least.
10. Nathan tells David, “You are the man.” David suddenly sees himself objectively, because he himself passed judgment on his own sin.
11. God, through Nathan, reminds David of all that He had done on his behalf, and how much evil David had done, through taking Bathsheba in adultery and then killing her husband. This is a blatant disregard for the Law of God (which law, David obviously knew).
12. David cannot plead ignorance on this one.
13. God begins to lay out what He will do to straighten out David—what his restorative discipline will be.
14. The sense in which this discipline is restorative is, it will restore David’s soul. His soul had been eaten away with his addiction to sex, and God will fix that. The cure will be painful.
15. However, God will not cause David to die the sin unto death.

The amount of material found in this narrative is mind-boggling.

Chapter Outline

God will come down on David in judgment for the next 10 years. David will take it like a man. He won’t whimper and cry (for the most part); he will not complain to others. David will take his discipline like a man. He knows that the punishment that he deserves for these crimes is death.

If you are a covenant theologian, and you think that God has gotten so mad at the Jews and has therefore taken all of their promises and given them to us, the church, take a good look at David. God made many promises to David—the Davidic Covenant, which we have already studied in 2Sam. 7 (HTML) (PDF) and Psalm 89 (HTML) (PDF). What does God do about this? Does God kill David and say, “I am going to transfer My covenant to you over to someone who is not such a sinner?” Of course not! God stands by His covenant. He does not modify the covenant that He made with David one iota. Every sin that David committed, God knew from eternity past. None of this caught God by surprise. He has never looked down on David and said, “This time, you have pushed Me too far with your sins; your covenant has been revoked!” Similarly, God did not look down on Israel and was suddenly shocked by their sins. God knew Israel from the very beginning. God laid out just exactly what He would do to Israel, as their sins increased (Lev. 26). He made clear to them the blessings and the cursings which would be a part of their nation’s history (Deut. 27:9–28:67  30:15–20  Joshua 8:34). Israel’s sins did not catch God off
guard. David’s sins did not catch God off guard. God simply deals appropriately with success and failure. But, what God does not do is, go back on His Word. **God remembers his covenant forever**, the word that He commanded, for a thousand generations, the covenant that He made with Abraham, His sworn promise to Isaac, which He confirmed to Jacob as a statute, to Israel as an everlasting covenant, saying, "To you I will give the land of Canaan as your portion for an inheritance." (Psalm 105:8–11). God’s covenant with David is forever; God’s covenant with Abraham is forever; God’s covenant with Israel is forever. The grass withers, the flower fades, but the Word of our God will stand forever (Isa. 40:8).

**Application:** From time to time, like many believers, I question my own eternal security. I commit a sin and then I wonder about my own salvation. God has made commitments to David, to Abraham and to the nation Israel. God will keep those commitments. God made a commitment to us, by assuring us that, **These things are written so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name** (John 20:31).

Certainly, you recall the words spoken as part of the vows of marriage: *for better or for worse*. Our relationship to God is eternal. Our time here on earth may be stellar and it may be embarrassing to God (if God could be embarrassed). However, God saves us on the basis of His justice and He keeps us on the basis of His integrity. However, as a part of all that, God sometimes needs to work with us, so to speak. For the next 10 years, God is going to work with David, who is party to God’s covenant, for better or for worse.

Nevertheless, because despising you have despised enemies of Y’hovah in the word the this, the son—the born to you—dying he will die.” 2Samuel 12:14

Nevertheless, because you have utterly despised Y’hovah in [doing] this thing, the son born to you will surely die.”

Nevertheless, because you have shown utter contempt toward Jehovah by doing this thing, the son who is born to you will certainly die.”

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

**Dead Sea Scrolls**

However, [because you have] despised the word of the LORD by [this] act, the child that has been born to you will surely die.”

**Latin Vulgate**

Nevertheless, because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, for this thing, the child that is born to thee, shall surely die.

**Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**

Nevertheless, because despising you have despised enemies of Y’hovah in the word the this, the son—the born to you—dying he will die.”

**Peshitta (Syriac)**

Nevertheless, because by this deed you have made the enemies of the LORD to boast, the son also that is born to you shall surely die.

**Septuagint (Greek)**

Only because you have given great occasion of provocation to the enemies of the Lord by this thing, your son also that is born to you shall surely die.

**Significant differences:**

There are some real problems with this text, and it appears as if the Massorites actually changed it so that David is not despising the Word of God or the Lord Himself. However, there is a note (an emendation) which indicates that the text of the Dead Sea Scrolls is the accurate text. Even in the MT, **enemies of Y’hovah** is precede by the sign of the direct object, so that all of the translations below which gives this phrase as a subject are incorrect, and that they are simply trying to make the best of a small mess. Most of the translations below which lack the words *the enemies of line up with the way that this text should read. The Greek, Syriac and Latin did their best to translate the MT before them. More information will be given**
within the Hebrew exegesis. What ought to be the accurate text is found in the nearly literal translation above.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

**CEV**
David said, "I have disobeyed the LORD." "Yes, you have!" Nathan answered. "You showed you didn't care what the LORD wanted. He has forgiven you, and you won't die. But your newborn son will." (Vv. 13–14)

**Easy English (Pocock)**
But your actions have caused the *Lord's enemies to speak evil words against the *Lord. Therefore, your son will die.'

**Easy-to-Read Version**
But you did things that made the Lord’s enemies lose their respect for him! So your new baby son will die.

**Good News Bible (TEV)**
But because you have shown such contempt for the LORD in doing this, your child will die.

**The Message**
But because of your blasphemous behavior, the son born to you will die."

**New Century Version**
But what you did caused the Lord's enemies to lose all respect for him. For this reason the son who was born to you will die."

**New Life Bible**
But by this act you have given those who hate the Lord a reason to speak against the Lord. The child that is born to you will die for sure."

**New Living Translation**
Nevertheless, because you have shown utter contempt for the Lord [As in Dead Sea Scrolls; Masoretic Text reads the Lord's enemies.] by doing this, your child will die."

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

**American English Bible**
However, in doing such an unrighteous thing, you even made the enemies of Jehovah angry; so the son that will be born to you will die.'

**Ancient Roots Translinear**

13 David said to Nathan, "I sinned to Yahweh." Nathan said to David, "Yahweh also passed your sin: You will not die 14 to vanquish the abuse of this word and the abuse from the enemies of Yahweh. Yes the son born to you will ||die||."

I have included vv. 13–14, because I do not quite follow how one flows to the other.

**God’s Word™**
But since you have shown total contempt for the LORD by this affair, the son that is born to you must die."

**New American Bible**
But since you have utterly spurned the LORD by this deed, the child born to you must surely die."

**NIRV**
But you have dared to make fun of the Lord. So the son who has been born to you will die."

**New Jerusalem Bible**
But, since you have outraged Yahweh by doing this, the child born to you will die.'

**New Simplified Bible**
»You have shown total contempt for Jehovah by this affair. Therefore the son that is born to you must die.«

**Today’s NIV**
But because by doing this you have shown utter contempt for [An ancient Hebrew scribal tradition; Masoretic Text for the enemies of] the LORD, the son born to you will die."

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

**Bible in Basic English**
But still, because you have had no respect for the Lord, death will certainly overtake the child who has newly come to birth.

**Complete Jewish Bible**
However, because by this act you have so greatly blasphemed ADONAI, the child born to you must die."

**JPS (Tanakh—1985)**
However, since you have spurned the enemies [The phrase is intended to avoid saying “spurned the LORD”; cf. Note at 1Sam. 25:22] of the LORD by this deed, even the child about to be born to you shall die.”

**Judaica Press Complete T.**
Nevertheless, because you have greatly blasphemed the enemies of the Lord by this thing, the child also that is born to you shall surely die."
NET Bible®

Nonetheless, because you have treated the LORD with such contempt [The MT has here "because you have caused the enemies of the Lord to treat the Lord with such contempt." This is one of the so-called tiqqune sopherim, or "emendations of the scribes." According to this ancient tradition, the scribes changed the text in order to soften somewhat the negative light in which David was presented. If that is the case, the MT reflects the altered text. The present translation departs from the MT here. Elsewhere the Piel stem of this verb means "treat with contempt," but never "cause someone to treat with contempt."] in this matter, the son who has been born to you will certainly die.

NIV, ©2010

But because by doing this you have shown utter contempt for [An ancient Hebrew scribal tradition; Masoretic Text for the enemies of] the LORD, the son born to you will die.

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

The Amplified Bible

Nevertheless, because by this deed you have utterly scorned the Lord and given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child that is born to you shall surely die.

Concordant Literal Version

...only, because you have caused the enemies of Yahweh greatly to despise by this thing, also the son who is born to you does surely die.

Context Group Version

Nevertheless, because by this deed you have shown utter contempt for YHWH, the son also that is born to you shall surely die.

English Standard Version

Nevertheless, because by this deed you have utterly scorned the LORD, the child who is born to you shall die."

exeGeses companion Bible

Only, because by this word you give the enemies of Yah Veh great occasion to scorn; and in dying, the son birthed to you dies.

Green’s Literal Translation

Only, because you have made the enemies of Jehovah to scorn derisively by this thing, also the son who shall be born to you dying shall die.

Heritage Bible

Also, since causing to scorn, you have caused those hating Jehovah to scorn by this word, the child also that is born to you, dying, shall die..

Syndein

However/Nevertheless (’ephec), because by doing this, {literally" you have given occasion to speak (evil)'} you have given the occasion/opportunity to the enemies of the Jehovah/God 'to demonstrate utter contempt'/'to blaspheme' {God}. The son also born to you {that you love so dearly} . . . {the product of the adultery with Bathsheba} ’will definitely die’/’dying . . . he shall surely die’ { muwth muwth -doubling is very strong}.

World English Bible

However, because by this deed you have given great occasion to Yahweh’s enemies to blaspheme, the child also who is born to you shall surely die."

Young’s Updated LT

Only, because you have caused the enemies of Jehovah greatly to despise by this thing, also the son who is born to you does surely die.".

The gist of this verse:

Because David has shown scorn for God by his actions, his first child by Bathsheba will die.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Samuel 12:14a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hebrew/Pronunciation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>’ephec (xøo)</code> [pronounced EH-fes]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2Samuel 12:14a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kîy (קִי)</td>
<td>when, that, for, because</td>
<td>explanatory conjunction; preposition</td>
<td>Strong's #3588 BDB #471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'epheç followed by the kîy conjunction mean only that, simply; however, nevertheless; nevertheless because; save that, however.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nā'ats (נָאָתָּס)</td>
<td>to abhor, to despise, to spurn, to reject, to condemn</td>
<td>Piel infinitive absolute</td>
<td>Strong's #5006 BDB #610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nā'ats (נָאָתָּס)</td>
<td>to abhor, to despise, to spurn, to reject, to condemn</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, Piel perfect</td>
<td>Strong's #5006 BDB #610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NET Bible contains the following footnote. The MT has here "because you have caused the enemies of the Lord to treat the Lord with such contempt." This is one of the so-called tiqqune sopherim, or "emendations of the scribes." According to this ancient tradition, the scribes changed the text in order to soften somewhat the negative light in which David was presented. If that is the case, the MT reflects the altered text. The present translation departs from the MT here. Elsewhere the Piel stem of this verb means "treat with contempt," but never "cause someone to treat with contempt."

You will note that many translations are in agreement with the NET Bible’s allegation here, several of them carrying a similar footnote.

What appears to be the case is, the Masorites, at some point, inserted enemies of so that David is not showing absolute and utter contempt for the Lord.

| 'èth (אֵת) | generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward | indicates that the following substantive is a direct object | Strong's #853 BDB #84 |
| ̀áyab (אֱיָב) | enemy, the one being at enmity with you; enmity, hostility | masculine plural Qal active participle; construct state | Strong's #340 & #341 BDB #33 |

As a singular substantive, this is spelled ̀byèb (בֵּית) [pronounced oh-YAYV]. As Strong’s #340, this is the Qal active participle of the verb; as Strong’s #341, this is the substantive. It is precisely the same word, despite the different Strong’s #’s.

| YHWH (יְהֹוָה) | transliterated variously as Jehovah, Yahweh, Y'howah | proper noun | Strong’s #3068 BDB #217 |
| bê (בֵּן) | in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within | a preposition of proximity | No Strong’s # BDB #88 |
| dābār (דָּבָר) | word, saying, doctrine, thing, matter, command | masculine singular noun with the definite article | Strong’s #1697 BDB #182 |
| zeh (זֶה) | here, this, this one; thus; possibly another | demonstrative adjective with a definite article | Strong’s #2088, 2090 (& 2063) BDB #260 |

---

Translation: Nevertheless, because you have utterly despised Yahweh in [doing] this thing,... If you read through the Hebrew exegesis above, you saw that there appears to have been an alteration made to this text; I do not have the Hebrew text of the Dead Sea Scrolls (just the translation from Abegg, Flint and Ulrich); but what appears to be the case is, the words the enemies of were inserted (actually, just one word in the Hebrew). We may reasonably assume that one generation of very prissy scribes just did not want to have David utterly despising God, or they did not want to write such a thing, so they inserted this word.

The way that this sentence is structured, enemies of the Lord cannot be taken to be the subject of anything. So, even those translations who try to make something of this text still have to alter it to make it make sense.

David has shown absolute contempt toward Jehovah God in doing what he did. He violated 3 of the Ten Commandments (at least)—he coveted the wife of Uriah, he committed adultery, and he murdered Uriah.

In this verse, we have 2 verbs repeated twice to indicate great emphasis upon the verb’s meaning. The first reads, despising, you have despised, which indicates that David showed utter contempt for God in doing what he did. The second of these verbs will be applied to David’s son: dying, he will die.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gam (גָּם) [pronounced gahm]</td>
<td>also, furthermore, in addition to, even, moreover</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Strong’s #1571 BDB #168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bèn (בֵּן) [pronounced bane]</td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yîlîwd (יִילְוָד) [pronounced yih-LOHD]</td>
<td>born</td>
<td>verbal adjective; masculine singular adjective with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #3209 BDB #409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לָמְד) [pronounced l]</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mùwth (מוּת) [pronounced mooth]</td>
<td>to die; to perish, to be destroyed</td>
<td>Qal infinitive absolute</td>
<td>Strong’s #4191 BDB #559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mùwth (מוּת) [pronounced mooth]</td>
<td>to die; to perish, to be destroyed</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #4191 BDB #559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accordingly, this is also spelled yâlîwd (יַילְוָד) [pronounced yaw-LOHD].

Translation: ...the son born to you will surely die.” The first installment of David’s 4 installments of discipline is, this son by Bathsheba would die. The doubling of the verb indicates that this is an absolute certainty.

Also, there is a different word used here for the child, rather than the word that we find most often in this chapter. The word we find here is bèn (בֵּן) [pronounced bane], which means son, descendant. Strong’s #1121 BDB #119. This is the common word that we find in genealogy listings. The genealogical relationship is what is emphasized here, and God is going to cut off this child from David. This boy would have been the man to follow David on the throne, had God let him live. We know little or nothing about him, as he dies in infancy in this chapter; but we are given a glimpse into what might have been. Here, the use of the word bèn suggests that this is the child who will
be next in line for David’s throne. A different word will be used later on, which will suggest that David will appeal to God on the basis of raising this child correctly, something which David had not done with his other sons.

One of the many things which is fascinating about Scripture is, the very individual words themselves are inspired. God the Holy Spirit did not inspire someone to just write a narrative and throw in any word here or there. And when we find one word used here, but a different word used there, and a third word used elsewhere, this ought to catch our attention. This ought to make us stop and think, “What is God the Holy Spirit telling us here?”

God the Holy Spirit does not have to tell us outright that this child, had he lived, will probably be the next man on the throne, and an important link in the line of David down to the cross. The death of this child changes everything in David’s line; and all of this is conveyed with one little word ḫên.

There is a lot which must be theologically digested here. David is going to be in and out of fellowship for the next decade or so, just like all believers. God needs to guide David out of degeneracy and out of interlocking systems of arrogance. Therefore, God will apply installment discipline upon David, which will be, at times, discipline, and, at other times, suffering for blessing. Therefore, we need to have an overall view of what God will be doing in David’s life and how installment discipline makes sense, even for a believer who is back in fellowship.

**David and the Divine Discipline He Will Endure**

1. David has both committed a set of heinous sins and then he has acknowledged these sins to God. 2Sam. 12:13  Psalm 51:4
2. When a believer is out of fellowship, God applies discipline in order to cause that believer to rebound (name his sins to God) and be restored to fellowship.
3. If the believer does not rebound, then God intensifies the discipline.
4. If the believer still does not rebound, then God places the believer under the sin unto death.
5. Here, David sins greatly, approximately a year goes by, and then God begins to deal with him. We know that nearly a year goes by because a portion of this chapter deals with the child born to David and Bathsheba, which was born 9 months after David first sinned with Bathsheba (2Sam. 12:14–15),
6. However, what happens when David has sinned grievously, then has rebounded, but has not fully recovered? That is, he is still trapped in the residual effects of degeneracy or still trapped in the interlocking systems of arrogance.
7. For David’s own good, God has to continue applying pressure, which we may call discipline, but it is pressure designed for David’s complete spiritual restoration.
8. David is back in fellowship. He recognizes his evil. He understands who he is and what he has done. However, he is still king over all Israel, and there is no guarantee that, next spring, he might just do the same thing again.
9. We find the same thing happened to Paul. Paul was stricken with some sort of eye disease, which pained him for most of the rest of his life, and this helped to keep Paul in line.
10. Both Paul and David had great blessing and great responsibility. What they have done comes down to us even to this day. The importance of David’s reign and Paul’s ministry cannot be overemphasized. Therefore, God put the screws to both of them, to keep them on the straight and narrow.
11. This does not mean that these men were robbed of blessing. This does not mean that their day-to-day activities were crap for the remainder of their lives.
12. Paul speaks of tremendous blessing which continued throughout the remainder of his life, despite this affliction.
13. How do we know that God turned David around? This will explain a passage which has confused and frustrated commentators for years. At the end of David’s life, he will be put into bed with two virgins in order to keep him warm, and he does not have sex with them. This is how much God turned David around.
14. Therefore, these installments of discipline were laid upon David, not so much to hurt him, and for God to be saying, “I am still so pissed off at you; take this, David!” These installments help to guide and keep David in line, because of his great responsibility.
David and the Divine Discipline He Will Endure

15. If you are in a place of great authority, do not be shocked if God treats you more harshly than He treats, say, the janitor of your building for some indiscretion. When you are in a position of great power and authority, then God deals with your indiscretions with greater force.

16. If 100 or 1000 or 10,000 people are under you, and look up to you as their authority; and many of them know that you are a believer in Jesus Christ, then God does not allow your public indiscretions to be simply excused with a simple naming of your sins to Him.

17. You are forgiven, but God does not let it go at that. Your position affects hundreds or thousands of other people. If they know that you are a believer—a mature believer—and you commit all of these public sins all over the place, that is problematic. God has to deal with this and deal with your free will. With power comes great responsibility; and when God gives you power, He may not remove that power, but He may see to it that you understand the importance of your power and position.

18. God also does this under certain circumstances to regular believers. When the early church was being established, there were those who took the communion while being out of fellowship. God actually let some of these people die the sin unto death. When Ananias and his wife, Sapphira, misrepresented in public their giving, God took them out via the sin unto death. So there are times when God’s discipline can be quite harsh.

19. David, for the next 10 years of his life, be subjected to some discipline residue or some installment discipline because of what he did in 2Sam. 11. When David is out of fellowship, this discipline is put upon him to get him back into fellowship; when David is in fellowship, this is, strictly speaking, not discipline, but suffering for blessing.

20. God is helping David to get out of his degeneracy; God is helping David to exit the interlocking systems of arrogance. This is all for God’s blessing.

21. The final 10 or more years of David’s life will be quite remarkable. He will begin to appreciate his new sons, and he will train them up in doctrinal principles.

22. Much of the Word of God was developed as a result of his teaching Solomon (the book of Proverbs).

23. As a result of all this, David is going to be far too busy for skirt-chasing; and God is going to move David to a place where, he actually overcomes this weakness in his personality. David will go from being a very honorable man to great sexual degeneracy; and then God will lead him out of this degeneracy by applying pressure to David in 4 instances.

24. Again, when a person is in fellowship, there are several things which may occur with regards to discipline:
   1) Divine discipline can stop.
   2) Divine discipline can continue at the same intensity, but designed to bless the recipient.
   3) Divine discipline can be intensified, against designed to bless the recipient. If you have a particularly hard-headed child that you have had to spank on many occasions, you may understand this.
   4) Divine discipline can be measured out in installments, to be a part of the recipient’s life while both in and out of fellowship.

Additional teaching on the doctrine of divine discipline (many of these are regurgitations of R. B. Thieme, Jr.’s teaching on divine discipline, which is okay):

http://www.versebyverse.org/doctrine/divinediscipline.html (very short and brief)

Special topics: a portion of this page is devoted to personal discipline and to the discipline of a nation
http://www.realtime.net/~wdoud/topics/othistry.html

The Benefits of Divine Discipline:
http://www.gracevalley.org/sermon_trans/2004/Benefits_of_Divine_Discipline.html (now, I did not see a reference to rebound here, but the rest of this looked to be pretty solid).

Christ’s Advocacy for us, post salvation:
http://www.chafer-cstn.org/BaseT/CHRIS/Advocate_Before_the_Throne.htm
Part of the parable delivered by Nathan involves the death of the innocent lamb. The forgiveness of David's horrible sins are based upon the death of the Lamb of God, Jesus Christ. He died for all of David's sins on the cross (as well as for ours—1John 2:2). Our Lord, Who is innocent, took upon Himself our sins, the innocent for the guilty (1Peter 3:18).

This is an example of God working all things out for good. What David did was a serious violation of his responsibility as king. He began to see the women of his kingdom not as women who ought to be protected, but women who could be plundered. God therefore will discipline David for this. However, hidden away in all of this sin and discipline is the gospel message. God takes this horrible situation and this awful sin of David's, and He uses this to illustrate the death of our Lord on the cross. Because a baby has committed no personal sin, not reaching an age of responsibility, we tend to think of babies as innocent. David has committed a great sin; and part of what will absolve David of this sin is the death of his son—his innocent son.

Parallel to this is the death of David's Greater Son for our sins. Jesus Christ is innocent and undeserving. We deserve the penalty for our sins and rebellion, and yet, we will live because God pours out our sins upon His Son.

Just as God took a very messy and sinful situation and worked all things out together for good (Rom. 8:28), so He takes this world—a world filled with sins and rebellion—and makes it possible for anyone to believe in Him and to thereby be saved. It is a perfect parallel, and here, as in numerous places throughout the Bible, we see the gospel message revealed.

What would make the most sense is, if this section ended with the sentence Then Nathan departed to his own home. The rest of 2Sam. 12:15 is properly the new section. Many different translations are formatted to reflect this.

Nathan, at least what is recorded, did not lay out all that David would face for his sin.

David Will Suffer Fourfold for His Sin

1. David’s innocent son, his and Bathsheba’s child, would die.
2. David’s daughter Tamar would be raped by his son Amnon, and David will have inadvertently been a party to this rape.
3. David’s son Absalom would kill his son Amnon.
4. Absalom would rebel against David, setting into motion several things. Because of Absalom’s rebellion, David would leave Jerusalem and his palace. Then Absalom would rape all of David’s wives in public. Absalom would then go to war against his own father. Finally, at the end of the civil war, Absalom, a son whom David emotionally love, would be killed. His death—again, a picture of Jesus dying for our sins—would end David’s discipline.

Heb. 12:5–13 And have you forgotten the exhortation that addresses you as sons? "My son, do not regard lightly the discipline of the Lord, nor be weary when reproved by him. For the Lord disciplines the one he loves, and chastises every son whom he receives." It is for discipline that you have to endure. God is treating you as sons. For what son is there whom his father does not discipline? If you are left without discipline, in which all have participated, then you are illegitimate children and not sons. Besides this, we have had earthly fathers who disciplined us and we respected them. Shall we not much more be subject to the Father of spirits and live? For they disciplined us for a short time as it seemed best to them, but he disciplines us for our good, that we may share his holiness. For the moment all discipline seems painful rather than pleasant, but later it yields the peaceful fruit of righteousness to those who have been trained by it. Therefore lift your drooping hands and strengthen your weak knees, and make straight paths for your feet, so that what is lame may not be put out of joint but rather be healed. (and Prov. 3:11–12).
So that there is no misunderstanding: David is not forgiven because of his personal suffering. He is forgiven these sins because Jesus Christ died for him on the cross.

David has rebounded—he has named his sins to God—however, the discipline continues as blessing to him.

I have no idea why v. 15a was placed with v. 15. It is a separate thought and a separate portion of this chapter. Therefore, I have separated it from the rest of v. 15. Many translators did the same thing.

**And so goes Nathan unto his home.**

*2 Samuel 12:15a* Then Nathan departed to his home.

**Then Nathan departed to go to his own home.**

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

Latin Vulgate And Nathan returned to his house.
Masoretic Text (Hebrew) And so goes Nathan unto his home.
Peshitta (Syria) Then Nathan went to his house.
Septuagint (Greek) And Nathan departed to his house.

**Significant differences:** None.

Several of the translations below conclude one section of this narrative with v. 15a and go on to another section.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

**CEV**
Then Nathan went back home.

**Easy English (Pocock)**
Then Nathan went home.

**The Message**
After Nathan went home, GOD afflicted the child that Uriah's wife bore to David, and he came down sick. This is all of v. 15, and one of the few translations who made it into one cohesive thought.

**New Living Translation**
After Nathan returned to his home, the Lord sent a deadly illness to the child of David and Uriah's wife. The NLT also connected these thoughts together.

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

**American English Bible**
Then Nathan left David's palace,...

**Ancient Roots Translinear**
Nathan went into his house.

**New American Bible**
Then Nathan returned to his house..

**NIRV**
Nathan went home.

**Today’s NIV**
After Nathan had gone home,...

**Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):**

**Bible in Basic English**
Then Nathan went back to his house.

**Judaica Press Complete T.**
And Nathan departed to his house.

**New Advent Bible**
And Nathan returned to his house.
Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

Concordant Literal Version: And Nathan goes unto his house,...
Context Group Version: And Nathan departed to his house.
Heritage Bible: And Nathan walked to his house.
LTHB: And Nathan went to his house,...
Syndein: After Nathan returned {yalak} to his home {means the ministry of Nathan is over - 1st Installment of discipline is administered now},...
World English Bible: Nathan departed to his house.
Young’s Updated LT: And Nathan goes unto his house.

The gist of this verse: After delivering the Word of God to David, Nathan returns to his home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Samuel 12:15a</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hebrew/Pronunciation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Common English Meanings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (י) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hâlak* (הלך) [pronounced haw-LAHK*]</td>
<td>to go, to come, to depart, to walk; to advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâthân (.Clamped naw-THAWN]</td>
<td>given; one who is given; transliterated Nathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>`el (אל) [pronounced ehl]</td>
<td>unto; into, among, in; toward, to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bayith (בית) [pronounced BAH-yith]</td>
<td>house, residence; household, habitation as well as inward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: Then Nathan departed to his home. Nathan’s job is done here. David confessed his sin; his future discipline was laid out, so Nathan returned home.

You will notice what Nathan does not do. He does not stick around and tell David each and everything that he has to do. He does not shadow David for the next 10 years and say, “Do this; don’t do that.”

Application: Although I never went to a church like this, it is my understanding that there are cults and church groups out there where some members of the congregation—even pastors and deacons—are encouraged to mind your business. In their wrong-headed notice of shepherding you or guiding you, they intrude on your privacy and attempt to bully you into some course of action. There is no call, in the Church Age, for anyone to monitor your behavior or for you to monitor anyone else’s who is not under your authority (your children are under your authority; at work, if you have some position of authority, then you have people under you). In the latter cases, it is your responsibility to properly exert your authority.

Application: You have to be careful about exerting your authority in the workplace. As a teacher, I resented a principal coming into my room to tell me how I should run my class and what kind of wall hangings I ought to have
(this principal had been a teacher for all of 2 years and a principal for a few months when he did this). Obviously, a principal, if required to do observations, has to do observations. If a principal is called into a room to observe, obviously, that is what he is to do. The point I am trying to make here is, you do not always get the best work out of your employees if you are forever standing over their shoulder and watching them work.

Application: There is always a balance between exercising your proper authority and allowing the volition of those under you to function. The good parent is forever making attempts to find that sweet spot, in between exercising authority and allowing some modicum of freedom in their children. As a child gets older, the parent gives more and more freedom to that child, so that they can go out into the world and be able to figure out how to make good and bad decisions on their own. You cannot follow a 25 year-old kid around and warn him about drunkenness, taking drugs, committing crimes, or have premarital sex. There is a point at which their training should kick in; and when they fall, it is between them and God.

Application: If you do not give your child some modicum of freedom, they will be unable to make decisions as they grow older.

———

Chapter Outline

The Death of David and Bathsheba's Child

And so strikes Y’hovah the child whom [the] woman of Uriah bore to David. And so he becomes [very] ill.

Consequently, Y’hovah strikes the child whom the wife of Uriah bore to David. As a result, the child [lit., he] became very ill.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

Latin Vulgate

The Lord also struck the child which the wife of Urias had borne to David, and his life was despaired of.

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)

And so strikes Y’howah the child whom [the] woman of Uriah bore to David. And so he becomes [very] ill.

Peshitta (Syriac)

And the LORD struck the child that the wife of Uriah the Hittite bore to David, and it was very sick.

Septuagint (Greek)

And the Lord struck the child, which the wife of Uriah the Hittite bore to David, and it was ill.

Significant differences: Both the Syriac and the Greek add the Hittite to Uriah’s name. The final verb in the Latin does not really match the final verb in the Hebrew (or, Greek or Syriac) (this is based upon the English translation from the Latin).

Several of the translations below conclude one section of this narrative with v. 15a and go on to another section.

31 On the other end of the spectrum, I have observed mothers actually making a child of 4 or 7 (or whatever) think that he is participating in the decision-making process. That strikes me as particularly goofy. Part of the training a young child ought to receive is authority orientation. Therefore, there are going to be many decisions which you will make for a child—particularly at a young age, and they will have to go along with these decisions. Now and again, you may sit the child down and explain why you did X instead of Y, but you do not owe your child an explanation for every decision that you make that involves him (or her).
Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV
The LORD made David's young son very sick.

Easy English (Pocock)
The child's death
The *Lord acted against David's child, whose mother was Uriah's wife. So, the child became ill.

Easy-to-Read Version
And the Lord caused the baby boy that was born to David and Uriah's wife to become very sick.

Good News Bible (TEV)
The LORD caused the child that Uriah's wife had borne to David to become very sick.

The Message
...GOD afflicted the child that Uriah's wife bore to David, and he came down sick.

New Century Version
And the Lord caused the son of David and Bathsheba, Uriah's widow, to be very sick.

New Life Bible
David's Son Dies
The Lord sent trouble upon the child of Uriah's wife and David, so that he was very sick.

New Living Translation
...the Lord sent a deadly illness to the child of David and Uriah's wife.

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

American English Bible
Then Nathan left David's palace, and Jehovah caused the child that was born to the wife of UriAh by David to be sickly and weak. I have included all of v. 15 here.

Ancient Roots Translinear
Yahweh mortally plagued the boy that Uriah's woman begot to David.

New American Bible
The LORD struck the baby that Uriah's wife had borne to David, and he became ill.

NIRV
Then the Lord made the child that Uriah's wife had borne to David very sick.

New Jerusalem Bible
Yahweh struck the child which Uriah's wife bore to David, and it became mortally ill.

New Simplified Bible
Jehovah struck the child that Uriah's wife had given birth to David. The child became sick.

Today's NIV
...the LORD struck the child that Uriah's wife had borne to David, and he became ill.

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

Bible in Basic English
And the hand of the Lord was on David's son, the child of Uriah's wife, and it became very ill.

HCSB
The LORD struck the baby that Uriah's wife had borne to David, and he became ill.

JPS (Tanakh—1985)
...and the L ORD afflicted the child that Uriah's wife had borne to David, and it became critically ill.

Judaica Press Complete T.
And the Lord struck the child that Uriah's wife bore to David, and it became mortally ill.

NET Bible®
The LORD struck the child that Uriah's wife had borne to David, and the child became very ill [Heb "and the Lord struck the child and he was ill." It is necessary to repeat "the child" in the translation to make clear who became ill, since "the Lord struck the child that Uriah's wife had borne to David, and he became very ill" could be understood to mean that David himself became ill.].

New Advent Bible
The Lord also struck the child which the wife of Urias had borne to David, and his life was despaired of.

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

The Amplified Bible
And the Lord struck the child that Uriah's widow bore to David, and he was very sick.
...and Yahweh smites the lad, whom the wife of Uriah has born to David, and it is incurable;"

And YHWH struck the child that Uriah’s woman { or wife } bore to David, and it was very sick.

And Jehovah struck the child whom Uriah’s wife bore to David, and it was very sick.

And Jehovah struck the boy whom the former wife of Uriah had borne to David.

And it became sick.

Bathsheba’s Child Dies

The Lord struck the child that Uriah’s wife bore to David, and it became very ill.

After Nathan returned {yalak} to his home {means the ministry of Nathan is over - 1st Installment of discipline is administered now}, the Jehovah/God struck the child that Uriah’s wife (Bathsheba) had born to David . . . and he {the child} became critically ill {slowing dying}. Bob connected v. 15a to the rest, so I have included the entire verse.

Yahweh struck the child that Uriah’s wife bore to David, and it was very sick.

And Jehovah strikes the child that Uriah’s wife bore to David, and it is incurable.

After Nathan leaves, God strikes David’s son with illness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and, so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāgaph (נָגָף)</td>
<td>to strike, to strike down, to hit</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5062 BDB #619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YHWH (יהוה)</td>
<td>transliterated variously as Jehovah, Yahweh, Y’hovah</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #3068 BDB #217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘èth (א)</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeled (ְיֶלֶד)</td>
<td>child, one born; son, boy, youth</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #3206 BDB #409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’āsher (אָשֶׁר)</td>
<td>that, which, when, who, whom</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
<td>Strong’s #834 BDB #81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yālad (יָלָד)</td>
<td>to give birth, to bear, to be born, to bear, to bring forth, to beget</td>
<td>3rd person feminine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3205 BDB #408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’êshshāh (אֶשֶׁשָׁה)</td>
<td>woman, wife</td>
<td>feminine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #802 BDB #61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Úwrîyyâhû (ואֲרִיָּהוּ)</td>
<td>flame of Yah; my light is Yah and is transliterated Uriah</td>
<td>masculine singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #223 BDB #22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also spelled ’Úwrîyyâhûw (ואֲרִיָּהוּ) [pronounced oo-re-YAW-hoo].
### 2Samuel 12:15b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לָMED) [pronounced ′l]</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid (דָוÎD); also Dâviyd (דָויַD) [pronounced daw-VEED]</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** Consequently, יהוה strikes the child whom the wife of Uriah bore to David. As God had promised through Nathan, He would strike the child with illness. This would be incurable, whatever the disease, and the child would eventually die. David’s discipline had been set in stone.

We find the word yeled (יֵLED) [pronounced YEH-led] used here, which means child, one born; son, boy, youth. Strong’s #3206 BDB #409. Many times, when a person dies, you think of that person and you envision that person at that point in his life. Marilyn Monroe will always be young a sexy; Jimi Hendrix will be eternally young and cool (except for the fact that he is in the Lake of Fire right now); and Ronald Reagan will always be seen as an elder statesman. This infant, this yeled, will always be seen as an infant. This is how David and Bathsheba will always remember him. David will not think of him as a young boy, or as a young man; but always as an infant. And so, throughout most of this chapter, we will find the word yeled used. To David and his wife, he will always be seen as an infant.

### 2Samuel 12:15c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wāw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>′ânash (אָNASH) [pronounced aw-NASH]</td>
<td>to be (become) very ill, to be (become) sick</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Niphal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #605 BDB #60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** As a result, the child [lit., he] became very ill. Because God struck the child with illness, he obviously became very ill.

**Application:** We have a limited time upon this earth. You do not have time to start taking heroin, find your bottom, kick the habit, and return to normal. That may take 5 or 10 or 20 years (assuming that you do not die). Some sins will have you treading water or slowing your growth to a crawl, in a day when we need the time. David does not have the time to fall back into the same behavior pattern, which results in him chasing both married and unmarried women. Therefore, God has to lay on the discipline long after David has confessed the sin. Think of this as aversion therapy. David commits a sin and, for the next 10 years, he is reminded of this sin and the horrendous mistake that he has committed. You see, there are not enough days left in David’s life to allow him to fall into this kind of sin again. God is teaching us, through David’s sin, not to do what David did. This is reasonably applied to any sort of addictive sin that we may want to participate in. Look at David and all that he will go through for the next 10 years. Do you want this in your own life?

**Application:** You must take into account that, David’s life, apart from the 10-year discipline for this sin, is going to be David’s life. He will be in fellowship and he will be out of fellowship. He will sin and he will name these sins
to God. He will take in doctrine and he will grow spiritually. He will have responsibilities and work to do, and he will sometimes attend to these things and sometimes not. However, in all of this living a normal life, God pours out 10 years worth of discipline on top of David. Assuming you are not in a degeneracy spiral or recovering from degeneracy sins, how would you like to supplement your life with 10 years of pressure, above and beyond what you have now? That is what David’s life will be. He will have his normal life—the pressures and problems included—and upon that will be this lattice of discipline that continues and continues and continues. For the next 10 years, we have David’s normal life overlain with intense discipline.

**Application:** Let’s look at this from a different angle. You know that, in your life, there are times when you are treading water, times when you are almost overwhelmed by the waves and the undercurrent, and times when you get to enjoy your life, apart from problems and difficulties (whether you want to picture yourself on a surfboard or laying on the beach, it doesn’t matter). We all have these periods of time in our lives which are pleasant, lacking in stress and pressure, when we can sit back, pour ourselves a cup of coffee or tea, and enjoy life, God periodically gives us so many days or hours of this sort of life. If you are recovering from a degeneracy sin spiral, then a significant portion of your life is spent with the discipline, after rebound, to help keep you in line. That means, these quiet, laid-back portions of your life—your times on the beach or on the surfboard—are going to be few and far between.

There are so many things for us to learn here, but you may be caught up thinking about David’s infant child and his death, and you may just think that is so unfair. This baby has done nothing and yet, he will die. The following is from *When Critics Ask.*

### Is it Right for David’s Infant Son to Die?

**2 Samuel 12:15–23—How could a loving God take the life of David’s child because of the sin of David?**

**PROBLEM:** As a result of David’s sin with Bathsheba, the life of the child that Bathsheba bore to David was taken. However, 2 Samuel 12:15 states that it was the Lord who struck the child with illness so that it died. How could a loving God commit such an act?

**SOLUTION:** The taking of the life of the child was not a judgment upon the child, but upon David. The Word of God assures us that death is not the end. This passage in particular indicates that David’s child was taken to heaven upon its death (see comments on 2 Sam. 12:23). Consequently, the child was probably spared a life of sorrow and trouble as the illegitimate offspring of the illicit relationship of David and Bathsheba. David’s faith in the all-loving God is clearly illustrated in verses 22–23. While the child was alive, David fasted and wept in hopes that God would graciously allow the child to live. However, when the child died, David trusted in the goodness of God to take the child to be with Him in heaven, and that one day David would be reunited with the child.

Let me add to this that, when we participate in degeneracy sins, we affect a myriad of other people. We may or may not know that we have, or we may not be willing to take responsibility for the harm that we have caused, but degeneracy sins can affect hundreds and even thousands of other people.

Let me give you a simple example: in order for a drug dealer to be successful, he must depend upon ruining the lives of thousands of people—in some cases, tens of thousands of people. Most of these will be addicted to the drugs, some will die from taking these drugs, and people in their periphery will suffer, because they will be robbed or even killed, because these addicts want their drugs so desperately. Obviously, this is an extreme example, but it conveys the extent of how degeneracy sins can impact innocent parties.

From *When Critics Ask* by Norman Geisler and Thomas Howe; Victor Books, a division of Scripture Press Publications Inc. 2Sam. 12:15. Taken from e-sword.
Deut. 32:39  See now that I, even I, am He, There is no god with Me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal; There is none who can deliver out of My hand.  Acts 12:20–23  Now Herod was very angry with the people of Tyre and Sidon. They came with one accord to him, and, having made Blastus, the king's chamberlain, their friend, they asked for peace, because their country depended on the king's country for food. On an appointed day, Herod dressed himself in royal clothing, sat on the throne, and gave a speech to them. The people shouted, "The voice of a god, and not of a man!" Immediately an angel of the Lord struck him, because he didn't give God the glory, and he was eaten by worms and died. If you are presently engaged in degeneracy sins, remember that there is a point at which God will suffer your sin, and then no more. God tolerated Herod for a time, and then Herod was taken out.

And so seeks David the Elohim because of the boy. And so fasts David a fast and he went in and he passed a night and he laid ground-ward.

Consequently, David continued seeking the Elohim on behalf of the boy, even fasting a fast [lit., and so he fasts a fast]. David [lit., he] went in and he stayed the night and he laid upon the ground.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

**Dead Sea Scrolls**  
So [David] prayed] to [literally sought from 4QSam; sought MT] God on behalf of the child.  [David fasted [and went in and] lay in sackcloth [4QSam LXX]. And spent the night sleeping MT LXX] on the ground. The abbreviations refer to different manuscripts.

**Latin Vulgate**  
And David besought the Lord for the child: and David kept a fast, and going in by himself lay upon the ground.

**Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**  
And so seeks David the Elohim because of the boy. And so fasts David a fast and he went in and he passed a night and he laid ground-ward.

**Peshitta (Syriac)**  
David therefore besought God for the child; and David fasted and went in and lay all night on the ground.

**Septuagint (Greek)**  
And David inquired of God concerning the child, and David fasted, and went in and lay all night in sackcloth upon the ground.  For whatever reason, the Complete Apostles' Bible and Brenton both leave out sackcloth, but it is found in the Greek of the LXX.

**Significant differences:**  
As you can read, there are many interpretations for the first verb. David prayed to God, despite what Nathan had said, on behalf of his young child.

In the final phrase, there are 3 verbs all held together with wâw conjunctions. Some of the translations treat the second verb not as a verb, but as a prepositional phrase, indicating how long David stayed. You will note that this second verb could refer to David wearing sackcloth, as per the Dead Sea Scrolls and one version of the LXX. The actual Greek does not have these 3 consecutive verbs, but this instead: ...and went in and lay in sackcloth all night upon the ground. The words all night may be a part of the verb in the Greek (as they are in the Hebrew).

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**
So David went without eating to show his sorrow, and he begged God to make the boy well. David would not sleep on his bed, but spent each night lying on the floor.

David prayed to God about the child. David would not eat anything. He stayed inside. He would lie on the floor all night.

David prayed to God for the baby. David refused to eat or drink. He went into his house and stayed there. He lay on the ground all night.

David prayed to God that the child would get well. He refused to eat anything, and every night he went into his room and spent the night lying on the floor.

David prayed desperately to God for the little boy. He fasted, wouldn't go out, and slept on the floor.

David begged God to make the child well. He went without food and lay all night on the ground.

David begged God to spare the child. He went without food and lay all night on the bare ground.

So, David [prayed to] God about the boy, and he fasted and slept on the ground. David pleaded with God for the child; he fasted and lay on the ground all night. David besought God for the child. He kept a fast, retiring for the night to lie on the ground clothed in sackcloth.

David pleaded with Yahweh for the child; he kept a strict fast and went home and spent the night lying on the ground, covered with sacking.

David made prayer to God for the child; and he took no food day after day, and went in and, stretching himself out on the earth, was there all night.

David prayed to God on behalf of the child; David fasted, then came and lay all night on the ground.

David pleaded with God for the boy. He fasted, went home, and spent the night lying on the ground.

David entreated God for the boy; David fasted, and he went in and spent the night lying [Some Septuagint manuscripts and 4QSam* add “in sackcloth”; cf. 1Kings 21:27] on the ground.

Then David prayed to [Heb "sought" or "searched for."] God for the child and fasted. [Heb “and David fasted.”] He would even [The three Hebrew verbs that follow in this verse are perfects with prefixed vav. They may describe repeated past actions or actions which accompanied David's praying and fasting.] go and spend the night lying on the ground.

David pleaded with God for the child. He fasted and spent the nights lying in sackcloth [Dead Sea Scrolls and Septuagint; Masoretic Text does not have in sackcloth.] on the ground.

David pleaded with God for the child. He fasted and went into his house and spent the nights lying on the ground.

David therefore besought God for the child; and David fasted and went in and lay all night [repeatedly] on the floor.

and David seeks Elohim for the youth, and David keeps a fast, and has gone in and lodged, and lain on the earth.
David therefore implored God for the child; and David fasted, and went in, and lay all night on the land { or earth }.

**Context Group Version**

David therefore sought God on behalf of the child. And David fasted and went in and lay all night on the ground.

**English Standard Version**

And David prayed to God for the child. And David fasted, and went in and lay all night upon the earth.

**Modern KJV**

David therefore inquired of God for the child; and David fasted [Neh 1:4] and went and lay [2 Sam 13:31] all night on the ground.

**NASB**

David therefore inquired of God for the child; and David fasted [Neh 1:4] and went and lay [2 Sam 13:31] all night on the ground.

**Synelein**

**Verses 16-17: David’s Objective Response to Divine Justice**

{David's Intercessory Prayer on behalf of His Son} 16~~Consequently, David pleaded/interceded/begged (baqash - Piel intensive stem) with 'Elohiym/Godhead on behalf of the boy {David went to his most powerful tool - he prayed on behalf of his beloved son who is now between 3 and 6 months old}. And David fasted a fast {tsuwm tsuwm - a fast means intense concentration - to be preoccupied with something so that your appetite is not as great as your concentration - here we have David replacing ALL normal activities like eating, drinking, ruling, social activity .. on and on with occupation with Christ - here in 'additional' prayer}. And went in {to the room where his son was}, and lay all night on the ground {David is in total humility - totally helpless before the Lord. David is King but he is still helpless.}. And David therefore begged God for the child; and David fasted, and went in, and lay all night on the earth.

**World English Bible**

David therefore begged God for the child; and David fasted, and went in, and lay all night on the earth.

**Young’s Updated LT**

And David seeks God for the youth, and David keeps a fast, and has gone in and lodged, and lain on the earth.

**The gist of this verse:** David prays for his child and keeps a fast. He lays on the ground overnight.

### 2Samuel 12:16a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and, so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently: because</td>
<td>waw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bâqash (בָּקָשָׁהּ)</td>
<td>to seek, to search, to desire, to strive after, to attempt to get, to require, to demand, to ask, to seek with desire and diligence</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Piel imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #1245 BDB #134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid (דָּבָד)</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾèth (אֵת) [pronounced ayth]</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾĒlôhîym (אֱלֹהִים)</td>
<td>God; gods, foreign gods, god; rulers, judges; superhuman ones, angels; transliterated Elohim</td>
<td>masculine plural noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #430 BDB #43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequently, David continued seeking the Elohim on behalf of the boy,... Even though Nathan made it clear what David was to expect, beginning with the taking of this son, David still went to God in prayer about this.

One thing which needs to be made clear, right up front is, even though David has named his sin to God, recognized the evil he has done, and judgment has been pronounced, he is not cured. It is going to take God another 10 years to whip David back into line, and David will make a great many mistakes along the way.

Don’t misunderstand me here; David was certainly moved by his emotions at this point, recognizing that this pain and early death for his newly born son was his fault—I am not saying that he should not have prayed at this point; he was, in fact, required to, by his own strong emotions. One might think that David first began a strong emotional attachment to one of his sons. On the other hand, as pointed out earlier, in some cases, David may barely know the sons from some mistresses.

The word used here to reference the child is na’ar (נָעַר) [pronounced NAH-gahr], which means boy, youth, young man, personal attendant. Strong’s #5288 & #5289  BDB #654. Through the rest of the chapter, a different word will be used, which emphasizes the child’s infancy. Using na’ar suggests that David’s prayers are focused on who this child would become. He was not yet a youth or a young man, but he would be. David is praying about the young man because David is promising God that he will now take responsibility for this boy; he will raise this young boy correctly, and teach him and guide him—things which David has not done yet with his previous children.

Don’t be too hard on David here. Recall his youth. When Samuel went to his home to crown him king, David’s father presented all of his older brothers to Samuel, but forget about David. David was a very young man out in the field caring for sheep, and his own father either forgot about him or did not see him as worthwhile; no reason to show him to Samuel (1Sam. 16). So, David’s treatment of his own sons is, in part, a reflection of how he was treated. However, at this point, David seems to realize what he ought to be doing; and, no doubt, in his prayers to God, he made promises as to how he would raise this new son, if given the chance.

As a result, David did a good job when it came to raising Solomon. He remembered the promises which he made to God. He realized what a lousy job that he had done with all of his other sons. So, because of David’s change in thinking, we get much of the book of Proverbs, which is, in part, David teaching his son Solomon.
2Samuel 12:16b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tsôwm (וָּמ) [pronounced zoom]</td>
<td>to abstain from food, to fast</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong's #6684 BDB #847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid (דָּוִית) (pronounced daw-VEED)</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong's #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsôwm (וָּמ) [pronounced tohm]</td>
<td>a fast, a fasting, fasting</td>
<td>masculine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong's #6685 BDB #847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...even fasting a fast [lit., and so he fasts a fast]. As always, we need to be aware of what the Bible implores us to do, versus what the Bible says that this or that person did. Here, David is fasting. That does not mean that we should or should not fast. It is important in studying the Bible that we distinguish between what has happened historically and what God has actually mandated us to do.

Let me give you an example of a non-spiritual fast, which most men and women participate in. When a woman is having a child, the male has recently been incorporated into this process, which involves the birth of his child, which may take 2 hours and may take 20 hours. Now, when the woman is cursing like a sailor, holding your hand and arm, digging her nails into your skin to help you feel what she is feeling, and going through some dramatic contractions, you don’t suddenly say, “You know, honey, I missed lunch, and my stomach is growling like you would not believe, so I am going to step out for just 20 minutes, grab a sandwich, and then come back. Kisses.” If you try that, I would be most interested in the woman’s reaction. In this example, what you are doing is, setting aside time for an activity which supercedes eating a meal. Eating food is legitimate for believers and unbelievers to do. It is legitimate to, when you are hungry, to prepare something and eat it. However, there will be times when you put eating on the back burner because you are involved in some other intense activity.

A Marathon runner fasts during the time that he runs. Few Marathon runners do half of the course, stop for a sandwich, and then get back into the race. For all intents and purposes, that is a secular fast.

Let’s take a very common occurrence for many people: they have a lot of work to do, and they skip lunch and stay in the office (or, wherever) in order to complete their work. A real estate agent is showing houses before lunch time, and her clients say, “We want to buy this house.” The agent might say, “Okay, come back after lunch;” but most agents would take them into the office (if necessary; some may have a laptop and printer with them), and do the paperwork and contracts right then and there (a process that usually takes an hour or two). Those are common examples of secular fasts—fasts which you personally may have been involved in. You have a scale of values, and there is something work-related which must be done, and that is more important than eating. If you have never done this, then, apparently, you must work for the county, state or federal government.

Now and again, there is going to be some spiritual activity in which you are involved, and you set aside time and normal activities in order to be involved in this spiritual activity. Let’s say, there is a Bible conference, and there are 2 back-to-back sessions, and you intended to arrive early, grab a burger, and then go in for the 2 sessions.

---

32 This is quoted almost verbatim from J.C.L. Gibson, Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar~Syntax; 4th Edition, © T&T Clark Ltd., 1994, pp. 83–84.
Well, if this does not work out, and you get there just in time, you have a simple choice to make—do you go out for the burger and miss the first session or do you attend both sessions and listen to your stomach growl? If you attend both sessions, then you are fasting—you are participating in a spiritual fast. Or, even simpler than that; there may be no time between your last hour at work and Bible class, so you drive directly to Bible class and listen instead of driving to a restaurant and getting some food. That is spiritual fasting.

These points below are taken directly from the **Doctrine of Fasting** ([HTML](#)) ([PDF](#)) where there is considerably more detail with more Scriptural references.

### Conclusions on Fasting

1. Fasting is nowhere prescribed for believers in the Old or New Testaments. It is not found in the Mosaic Law nor is it found in any of the epistles; it is not found as a command, nor even as a suggestion.

2. In the beginning, there are a few instances of fasting which were spontaneous and voluntary, and appropriate to the circumstances. Feasts were often times of celebration and the gathering of believers together. When under great pressure, fasting was more appropriate.

3. Fasting was institutionalized by Queen Esther, although it is not clear that this was given God’s stamp of approval.

4. Many of the times that fasting is mentioned in the New Testament, it is with a negative connotation and it is observed by an unbeliever who is observing the ceremonial fasting of his day.

5. There are at least three instances of believers fasting in the New Testament during the pre-canon period of the Church Age, which implies that there might be an occasion for a believer to fast. Therefore, when might it be appropriate to fast?
   1. Missionaries often endure great hardships and there is a great likelihood that missionaries will suffer hunger as a part of their ministry. It may occur once or twice and it may occur more often. Even though this is imposed fasting, Paul spoke of it twice in his second epistle to the Corinthians.
   2. Although this suggestion makes me positively grimace: there might be an important meeting of the congregation or of the deacons of a church which goes long, theoretically extending it into a meal time. The time spent in this meeting during meal time is a fast.
   3. It is reasonable that, the time between when you get off work and when Bible class begins is such a short interval that you must rush off to Bible class without eating. That is a fast.
   4. Personally, over the past seven years, I have gotten up at 4 in the morning almost every morning to study and to write, when, on many of those mornings, I would rather roll over and go back to sleep. That, for all intents and purposes, is a type of fasting. Now, I am not losing sleep nor am I possessed with great dedication. I have simply found that, at this time in the morning, I am least likely to be disturbed and I am wide-awake (I am a morning person); therefore, this is the most logical time for me to engage in this activity. Only on occasion do I go for any period of time without food (which has absolutely no spiritual connotation, as it is prior to going out for a morning jog); and most of the time I have enjoyed a reasonable amount of sleep. The voluntary setting aside of this time for spiritual things is equivalent, or at least analogous, to fasting in the Old Testament.
   5. In a marriage, there might be various points in time when a married couple attend Bible class when they would rather have marital relations. Such a situation is probably closer in spirit to the act of spiritual fasting, and it throws in the added bonus of two people acting as a married unit, as opposed to acting like two people who are simply legally bound to one another.
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6) Now, this would not be a spiritual fast: you want God to give you something, so you starve yourself and pray for this thing for a few hours. Might there be a time when you forgo a meal in order to pray? That is possible; however, the previous scenarios are more likely to occur with great frequency. Again, be aware of the actual difference between the preparation time involved for a meal in the ancient world and a meal now. When one went without dinner in the ancient world, this saved perhaps 5 or more man hours of preparation. That is a lot of time which could be devoted to spiritual things. However, today, passing on a meal might maybe one man hour (apart from the time spent consuming the meal).

7) What you should understand from all this is that, as a believer, God has not called you to periodically skip meals in order to pray for something. There certainly might be an occasion for sacrifice and an occasion to give up this or that, but typically you are not going to, once a month, skip your meals for a day in order to engage in some sort of spiritual activity. Nowhere can we derive this sort of ceremony or activity from the Old or New Testaments.

8) Just as important: you are not going to go without food for a day so that you can suffer as Christ suffered or so you can suffer for Christ. Don’t be a damned idiot! Our sufferings cannot be compared to those of Christ, whether they are self-imposed or not; and the Bible does not call for us to ceremonially suffer as believers. Obviously from the two passages in 2Corinthians already alluded to, Paul did indicate that there were many times that he suffered for Christ. However, he did not set apart some time each month or each year to inflict himself with pain, hunger or sleeplessness. Paul was on the front lines in the Angelic Conflict and, as such a one, he would suffer various problems, pains and deprivations. Paul did not impose these things upon himself nor did he look for these things—they were a natural result of his great spiritual impact.

9) If you are a new believer and you are pondering this, please understand that God is not calling on you to fast in any way. Do not think that, after a year or two that you, as a believer, will need to set aside time to fast. In the instances and examples mentioned, these things may occur. There is going to be less forethought and less planning than you might think. In fact, what is likely, is, in the midst of a fast (or activity which is analogous to fasting), you may suddenly think to yourself, “I’ll be damned; I’m fasting right now!” Given your spiritual growth at that time, it will be more natural than it will be forced. Often, whatever suffering or deprivation might be involved will be minimal.

6. Finally, nowhere in the Old or New Testaments is fasting ever required in any way. There are no laws which require us to fast; no regulations, no commands by Paul. There was a ceremonial fasting set up by Queen Esther.

These are only basic conclusions. Refer to the entire Doctrine of Fasting (HTML) (PDF) for documentation and more detail.

Now, if after reading this doctrine and even going back to the full treatment, you think, “Well, I still think God is calling me to fast;” your problem is, you think that this is a way that you can get points from God. God looks down on you fasting and says, “My my, that Charlie Brown is such a good Christian. I ought to give him something really nice.” God does not work that way. Now, God loves His righteousness and God loves His Word. His righteousness is in you by means of salvation—you believed in Jesus Christ and righteousness was imputed to you. Now, if you are building up the Word of God in your soul, then God must pour blessing upon you (bear in mind that, blessing is different from person to person).

In other words, God has clearly defined the ways in which He blesses you; you don’t get to make up your own path to gain God’s blessing, and you do not get blessed by presenting God with some legalistic proposition (“if I fast, then You need to bless me, God”).

33 Which is the preferred way.
### 2Samuel 12:16c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wê (or vê) (i, or i)</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ìwôn (‘ন) [pronounced loon]</td>
<td>to lodge, to pass the night, to spend the night, to lodge for the night, to abide</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3885 BDB #533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ìwôn (‘נ) [pronounced loon]</td>
<td>to lodge, to pass the night, to spend the night, to lodge for the night, to abide</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3885 BDB #533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shâkab (כָּכָב) [pronounced shaw-KAH\R]</td>
<td>to lie down, to lie down [to sleep, to have sexual relations, to die; because of sickness or humiliation]; to relax</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7901 BDB #1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ëdâmâh (אֱדָמָה) [pronounced uh-daw-MAWH]</td>
<td>ground, soil, dirt, earth, tillable earth, land, surface of the earth</td>
<td>feminine singular noun with the locative hê</td>
<td>Strong’s #127 BDB #9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** David [lit., he] went in and he stayed the night and he laid upon the ground. David going in meant that he went into the room where his son was and that he stayed upon the night there laying upon the ground. In the alternative, we went into the home where the child was (we do not know exactly where David’s wives lived, whether in separate homes or in a dorm-like setting); so David might be going into the home where the child is, and what follows may occur on the floor outside of the room of the child. However, given the power of David’s emotions, this suggests to me that all of this occurs on the floor of the room where the child is.

Barnes, Poole and the Geneva Bible notes suggest that David went into a private chamber, as per Matt. 6:6, and there, on the floor, he prayed for his son. If this is the case, then, where his son is, in relation to this room, is not stated.

There is an alternate reading that David was wearing sackcloth, and it appears as though that reading is found here instead of staying the night. This does not appear to be an error related to the letters, because sackcloth is the word saq (שָּׁק) [pronounced sahk] and the verb in question is ìwôn (‘נ) [pronounced loon]. There is really no way that these letters could be mistaken for one another, transposed, etc. My guess is, there was a blank at this point, due to a poor manuscript, and that someone—probably a legalist—began filling that hole with the words...
wearing sackcloth. The structure of this latter half of the sentence is very specific—it is 3 Qal perfect verbs held together by wâw conjunctions. I believe that was intentional on the part of the writer (who is probably David).

Because David chose to ḍâmâh (דָּמָה) [pronounced uh-daw-MAWH] with Bathsheba back in 2Sam. 11:4, he now finds himself ḍâmâh (דָּמָה) [pronounced uh-daw-MAWH] on the ground, next to his dying child.

In the next verse, it will be clear that David did not just do this one night, but for several nights.

Now, although I picture this as David going to where the child is, and laying on the ground there; he may have gone to an adjacent room, and he may have gone to where the Ark is being kept and prayed there, laying on the ground before the Ark. I doubt the latter scenario, since the Ark is not mentioned anywhere. Furthermore, later David will go to the House of the Lord (2Sam. 12:20), which is specifically named.

In any case, it is reasonable to suppose that David was extremely emotional at this time. Probably what held him to this fast of undetermined length, to remain on the floor praying, would be his strong emotion.

**Application:** I believe that it would be reasonable to suppose that David felt as much emotion as anyone else has in a similar situation, and that this emotion drove him during this crisis. Notice that God is not moved by David’s emotion. At no time does God look down at David, feel great compassion, and let this child live. Therefore, do not expect the depth or intensity of your emotion to move God. God is willing to be impressed and moved by many things,34 but your emotion is not one of them.

Poole suggests: *This excessive mourning did not proceed simply from the fear of the loss of the child; but from a deep sense of his sin, and from the Divine displeasure manifested herein; and particularly from a just apprehension of the injury which he had done to the child by his sin, which justice obliged him to do his utmost to repair by prayer or other mean.*35

In the alternative, the Hebrews were very demonstrative, and this could simply be David being very demonstrative while his son is ill. In any case, David appears to be taking much more interest in the life of this child than he has previously in his other children (we came to this conclusion simply based upon the way that his children are named in Scripture).

As an aside, you may recall that, when Abner was killed by Joab, David also fasted at his death, indicating his personal sorrow in this matter. 2Sam. 3:30–37. In that case, this was a matter of both protocol and sorrow. Even though this may have been simply demonstrative, David was clearly indicating that, the death of Abner was not viewed by David as the death of one of his enemies.

In any case, David believed that he could move God with his intense praying and fasting; by his singular focus upon this child. Despite the pronouncement of Nathan, who David recognized as speaking the Word of God, David believed that there was some wiggle room here. Lesson #1: there is no wiggle room with the justice of God. Every sin must be paid for. The innocent son must die for the sins of David. The death of the innocent on behalf of the guilty must be the first thing which David learns.

For all mankind, the justice of God demands the death of the Son of God on our behalf. There is no other way. There is no other religious leader or religious icon who can procure salvation for us. Only the death of Jesus Christ on the cross can pay for our sins. No religious leader has done or could do what Jesus did for us on the cross.

---

34 Here, I am attributing to God actions and feelings which He does not have.

35 Matthew Poole, *English Annotations on the Holy Bible; ©1685*; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:17 (Edited).
And so stand elders of his house above him to raise him up from the earth, but he was not willing and he would not eat with them bread.  

Then the elders of his palace stood above him to raise him up from off the ground, but he was unwilling [to be raised] and he would not eat food with them.

Then the elders of his palace stood over him, intending to raise him up from off the ground, but he was unwilling to get up and he did not eat with them.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

Latin Vulgate  
And the ancients of his house came, to make him rise from the ground: but he would not, neither did he eat meat with them.

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)  
And so stand elders of his house above him to raise him up from the earth, but he was not willing and he would not eat with them bread.

Peshitta (Syriac)  
And the elders of his household arose and tried to raise him up from the ground, but he would not, neither did he eat bread with them.

Septuagint (Greek)  
And the elders of his house arose and went to him to raise him up from the ground, but he would not rise, nor did he eat bread with them.

Significant differences: The first verb, to stand, also means to raise up (which may explain some of the translations above and below). It does not mean to come (as in the Latin). Many times, the problem is with the English translation. If you will notice the Greek above where it says and went to him. Those words are not found in the Greek (the English translation that I usually use is the Complete Apostles’ Bible; but Brenton is no more accurate at this point, apart from using italics on the words that are not there). The Greek, at this point, is equivalent to the Hebrew: And the elders of his palace [house] stood over him... The prepositional phrase over him is not found in the Syriac or the Latin (in their English translations).

In the English translation of the Latin, we have to make him rise and in the Syriac we have and tried to raise him. Both of these are reasonable interpretations from the use of the Hiphil verb at this point.

The Complete Apostles’ Bible again departs from the Greek, reading, but he would not rise; however, rise is not found in the Greek (nor in the Hebrew). What happened here is, Paul Esposito, who translated The Complete Apostles’ Bible, simply took Brenton’s work and updated it. Therefore, whenever Brenton chose to be give a loose translation from the LXX, Esposito follows suit.36

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV  
His officials stood beside him and tried to talk him into getting up. But he would not get up or eat with them.

Easy English (Pocock)  
The older servants in his house went to him. They tried to get him up from the ground. But David refused to get up. And he would not eat any food with them.

Easy-to-Read Version  
The leaders of David’s family came and tried to pull David up from the ground. But David refused to get up. He refused to eat food with these leaders.

Good News Bible (TEV)  
His court officials went to him and tried to make him get up, but he refused and would not eat anything with them.

---

36 This is based upon the e-sword information on this Bible, which reads A Modern English Translation of the Greek Septuagint Translated by Sir Lancelot C.L. Brenton. Revised and Edited by Paul W. Esposito. Surprisingly enough, I did not find this information on the internet.
The elders in his family came in and tried to get him off the floor, but he wouldn't budge. Nor could they get him to eat anything.

The elders of David's family came to him and tried to pull him up from the ground, but he refused to get up or to eat food with them.

The leaders of his family stood beside him to lift him up from the ground. But David was not willing. He would not eat food with them.

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

American English Bible  
And when the elders of his house went to lift him off the ground, he wouldn't get up and he wouldn't eat with them.

Ancient Roots Translinear  
The elders of his house rose over him to raise him from the ground, but he would not. He would not dine on bread with them.

God's Word™  
The older leaders in his palace stood beside him to raise him up from the ground, but he was unwilling. And he wouldn't eat with them.

New American Bible  
The elders of his house stood beside him urging him to rise from the ground; but he would not, nor would he take food with them.

NIRV  
His most trusted servants stood beside him. They wanted him to get up from the ground. But he refused to do it. And he wouldn't eat any food with them.

New Simplified Bible  
The elders in his palace stood beside him to raise him up from the ground. But he was unwilling and he would not eat with them.

Revised English Bible  
The elder men of his household tried to get him to rise, but he refused and would eat no food with them.

**Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):**

Bible in Basic English  
And the chief men of his house got up and went to his side to make him get up from the earth, but he would not; and he would not take food with them.

Complete Jewish Bible  
The court officials got up and stood next to him trying to get him off the ground, but he refused, and he wouldn't eat food with them.

Tanakh (1985)  
The senior servants of his household tried to induce him to get up from the ground; but he refused, nor would he partake of food with them.

NET Bible®  
The elders of his house stood over him and tried to lift him from the ground, but he was unwilling, and refused to eat food with them.

New Advent Bible  
And the ancients of his house came, to make him rise from the ground: but he would not, neither did he eat meat with them.

**Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:**

The Amplified Bible  
His older house servants arose [in the night] and went to him to raise him up from the floor, but he would not, nor did he eat food with them.

Context Group Version  
And the elders of his house arose, [ and stood ] beside him, to raise him up from the land { or earth }; but he would not, neither did he eat bread with them.

English Standard Version  
And the elders of his house stood beside him, to raise him up from the ground; but he would not, nor did he eat food with them.

Heritage Bible  
And the elders of his house rose, and walked to him to raise him up from the earth, and he did not breathe in agreement, and he did not cut food with them..

King James 2000 Version  
And the elders of his house arose, and went to him, to raise him up from the earth: but he would not, neither did he eat bread with them.

New King James Version  
So the elders of his house arose and went to him, to raise him up from the ground. But he would not, nor did he eat food with them.

Owen's Translation  
David therefore pleaded with God for the child; David fasted, and went in and lay all night on the ground.
Then 'his senior castle staff'/'the elders of his house' arose, and stood by him (David), to raise him up from off the ground. But he refused . . . neither did he eat food with them (David would stay right where he was for the next 7 days - praying, fasting, grieving, and thinking).

The elders of his house arose, and stood beside him, to raise him up from the earth: but he would not, neither did he eat bread with them.

And the elders of his house rise against him, to raise him up from the earth, and he was not willing, nor had he eaten with them bread.

The gist of this verse: The elders of David’s palace tried to get David to get up and eat something, but he was unwilling to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ı)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qûwm (חָוָם) [pronounced koom]</td>
<td>to stand, to rise up, to get up; to establish, to establish a vow, to cause a vow to stand, to confirm or to fulfill a vow</td>
<td>3rd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #6965 BDB #877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z̄qênîym (זֶּכֶנָיָם) [pronounced zê-kay-NEEM]</td>
<td>old men; elders; chiefs, respected ones</td>
<td>masculine plural adjective; used as a substantive; construct form</td>
<td>Strong’s #2205 BDB #278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bayith (בָּיִת) [pronounced BAH-yith]</td>
<td>house, residence; household, habitation as well as inward</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #1004 BDB #108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’al (עָלָ) [pronounced ǝl]</td>
<td>upon, beyond, on, against, above, over, by, beside</td>
<td>preposition of proximity with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5921 BDB #752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לָמְד) [pronounced r]</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by</td>
<td>directional/relation preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qûwm (חָוָם) [pronounced koom]</td>
<td>to cause to raise up, to cause to stand, to establish, to fulfill; to uphold, to perform [a testimony, a vow, a commandment, a promise]</td>
<td>Hiphil infinitive construct with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #6965 BDB #877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min (מִין) [pronounced min]</td>
<td>from, off, out from, out of, away from, on account of, since, than, more than</td>
<td>preposition of separation</td>
<td>Strong’s #4480 BDB #577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Translation:** Then the elders of his palace stood above him to raise him up from off the ground,... There is a lot of nitty gritty that we do not know about David and his life and the culture of that day—stuff that we get glimpses of. Here, we have a bunch of elders of his house. The Bible distinguishes between types of tents, but it does not have different words for different types of houses (after the time of David, a word for *palace* came into common usage and is found several times in the Bible). However, in David’s time, there is just this word *house*, and we may reasonably assume that it stands for a complex of houses and rooms which make up David’s palace (originally construct by Hiram).

In David’s palace were elders, which suggests that David kept on staff a group of older men (no idea how many) to whom he went for advice and to whom he delegated responsibilities (both of these are reasonable conjectures, but conjectures, nonetheless). As their name suggests, these are probably older men—elder statesmen, if you will—and probably retired military types. It is quite likely that Ahithophel, Bathsheba’s grandfather, would normally be among this group (he probably has some pretty negative feelings about David at this point in time, so it is doubtful that he is a part of this group at this time).

David has a group of men and women around him who have known him and have served him for years. Probably many of them go back to when David was an officer in the army of Saul. They know his integrity and they themselves have personal integrity. At this point, they may or may not realize all that David has gone through and all that he has done. However, they do not appear to judge him for this, and they recognize the grief he is going through.

**Application:** Close family members and close friends are going to sin and they are going to fail. This may or may not require some response from you. However, what response is never called for is self-righteous indignation. God does not call upon us to look down our noses at anyone.

What appears to be the case is, the child is very ill and is kept in a room in the palace, and David is there in that room, laying on the ground, praying to God. In the alternative, David is possibly in a nearby room—not in his normal bedroom or a room reserved for prayer and Bible study—laying on the ground, praying and fasting.

At first, it seemed reasonable to me that, if David is there for one night, he would probably have been left undisturbed. However, the verb used in the previous verse indicates a night’s stay. Therefore, David, probably in the morning or the afternoon, went to the room where the child was being kept, and he is laying next to the bed of this child for a period of perhaps 24 hours, which causes the elders to become concerned. Therefore, after discussing this amongst themselves, they come into the room where David is and they try to rouse him, primarily to get him to eat something.

When it comes to running the palace and running the country, these elders could probably handle that responsibility for several months, based upon the protocol which David had established (the routine and division of responsibilities among these men).

Now, notice who does not come in to try to rouse King David—Bathsheba (who barely knows him at this point), any of David’s other wives (many of whom were probably pissed over this entire situation—what they knew of it) or any of his sons (some of whom would have been young adults at this time). Joab does not come in, because he is probably a little upset with David, since David used him to have Uriah killed. Or, Joab is at war at this time.
(although we may be back to the winter time again). Nathan does not return, because he has already told David all that he needs to know at this time. So, it is the elders of the palace who try to speak to David.

### 2Samuel 12:17b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (1 or 1) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lô (‘êk or ‘êk) [pronounced low]</td>
<td>not, no</td>
<td>negates the word or action that follows; the absolute negation</td>
<td>Strong's #3808 BDB #518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'âbâh (אַבָּח) [pronounced aw²-VAWH]</td>
<td>to be willing, to consent</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong's #14 BDB #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...but he was unwilling [to be raised]...

At the end of the previous verse, there were 3 Qal perfects held together by wâw conjunctions. Here, we have 2 Qal perfects held together by wâw conjunctions and the particle of negation. So, at the end of v. 16, we have what David did do: he went in and he stayed the night and he laid upon the ground. At the end of this verse, we have what David would not do. These elders wanted to raise him up, but David was unwilling to be raised. He laid there, on the ground, next to the child (on whatever sort of bed the child would have been in). The Hebrew simply says that David was unwilling. So, whatever these men came in and said to him, he was unwilling.

### 2Samuel 12:17c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (1 or 1) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lô (‘êk or ‘êk) [pronounced low]</td>
<td>not, no</td>
<td>negates the word or action that follows; the absolute negation</td>
<td>Strong's #3808 BDB #518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bârâh (בָּרָה) [pronounced baw-RAW]</td>
<td>to cut, to cut apart; to eat; to choose [i.e., to cut and separate out]</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong's #1262 BDB #136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’êth (אֵת) [pronounced ayt]</td>
<td>with, at, near, by, among, directly from</td>
<td>preposition (which is identical to the sign of the direct object); with the 3rd person masculine plural suffix</td>
<td>Strong's #854 BDB #85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lechem (לֵךְם) [pronounced LEH-khem]</td>
<td>literally means bread; used more generally for food</td>
<td>masculine singular noun; pausal form</td>
<td>Strong's #3899 BDB #536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and he would not eat food with them. The men did not really expect to get David to end his vigil, nor did they really try for that. They simply wanted David to have a bite to eat, and David refused. In the previous
verse, we noted that David was fasting a fast, which indicated that he was too busy involved with spiritual activity in order to attend to normal daily functions like eating. He was praying to God for the life of this child.

We do not know how long this continued. The verb in the previous verse indicates that David did this at least one night. The next verse will indicate that the child was sick for 7 days and then he died. There are 3 reasonable explanations. (1) David was not in the same room with his child, but in an adjacent room, for much of 7 days, on the floor, fasting and praying. It is reasonable that he did eat some and drink some during that time period. (2) David, after a few days, did get up from time to time, perhaps to eat, perhaps for a drink, and perhaps even to do some delegation of his duties. (3) Or, David has remained mostly in the room with the child, he on the ground and the child elevated in some sort of a bed, so that David could not actually see the child from the floor. His servants and the palace elders would continue to come in and out, and they observe the child is dead, while David is yet in the room, on the ground.

What is clear is, David, for pretty much 24 hours, will not eat with the elders; nor did he even get up (at least not to eat with them). What the Bible does not say is, David fasts for 7 days. In this verse, he is fasting pretty much for one day; however, we will find out in the next verse that this vigil continues for 7 days. We may reasonably assume that David ate and drank very little, and did very little moving about. Most of his time was spent in prayer and supplication to God. We have to be careful and interpret these passages based only upon what we find here. It is clear that David fasts for about 24 hours; it is not clear that he fasted for a week.

Let's take a short look at David's staff and the way that they interact with David.

### David’s Staff and Routine

1. As we examine David’s servants, I want you to think back on Hanun’s state department, and how they interacted with Hanun. David's staff had great integrity. These were great people; their loyalty was based on their integrity.
2. Hanun’s staff manipulated Hanun, not for the betterment of the country, but simply to exert or establish their own power. They showed no concern for the new king and no concern for their own country.
3. David’s staff, on the other hand, is very concerned about David and the emotional upheaval that he is experiencing, as his little son is dying.
4. When David’s staff interacts with David, it is for his benefit. What they want him to do is stated outright and there is no manipulation.
5. Bear in mind, if anyone knows of David’s weaknesses and deficiencies, it would be his staff. They knew something was going on with Bathsheba before anyone else did. However, this does not affect their loyalty to David.
6. David’s staff tried to coax him into a normal routine while David is preoccupied with his son, praying and grieving and concentrating on this little boy.
7. While being sensitive toward David’s emotional involvement, his staff is attempting to lure him into a normal routine again, of meals and sleeping and doctrine.

As believers in Jesus Christ, our lives should revolve around doctrine. We need about an hour of good solid Bible teaching a day, and we should determine the best way in which to get that into our routine. Everything else is secondary.
And so he is in the day the seventh and so dies the child. And so fear servants of David to tell to him that died the child for they said, “Behold, in is the child alive, we spoke unto him and he did not listen in our voice; and how [can] we say unto him, ‘Died the child.’ And he has done evil.”

2Samuel 12:18

The child finally died on the seventh day. David’s servants were afraid to tell him, saying to one another, “Look, when the child was alive, we tried to reason with David and he did not listen to us. How can we tell him, his child is dead? He may do harm to himself.”

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

- **Latin Vulgate**
  And it came to pass on the seventh day that the child died: and the servants of David feared to tell him, that the child was dead. For they said: Behold when the child was yet alive, we spoke to him, and he would not hearken to our voice: how much more will he afflict himself if we tell him that the child is dead?

- **Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**
  And so he is in the day the seventh and so dies the child. And so fear servants of David to tell to him that died the child for they said, “Behold, in is the child alive, we spoke unto him and he did not listen in our voice; and how [can] we say unto him, ‘Died the child.’ And he has done evil.”

- **Peshitta (Syriac)**
  And it came to pass on the seventh day that the child died. And the servants of David feared to tell him that the child was dead; for they said, Behold, while the child was yet alive we spoke to him, and he would not listen to us; how then shall we tell him now that the child is dead? He may react violently.

- **Septuagint (Greek)**
  And it came to pass on the seventh day that the child died. And the servants of David were afraid to tell him that the child was dead; for they said, Behold, while the child was yet alive we spoke to him, and he hearkened not to our voice; and should we tell him now that the child is dead?-- so would he do himself harm.

**Significant differences:**

One very minor difference, where the Hebrew says, “He would not listen to our voice” and the English translation for the Syriac has listen to us instead. This is, by the way, a perfectly valid way of translating our voice.

The final phrase in the Hebrew lacks with word himself, which is found in the English translation of the Latin (and most English translations). The English translation of the Syriac renders this react violently.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

- **CEV**
  After the child had been sick for seven days, he died, but the officials were afraid to tell David. They said to each other, "Even when the boy was alive, David wouldn't listen to us. How can we tell him his son is dead? He might do something terrible!"

- **Easy English (Pocock)**
  On the seventh day, the child died. David's servants were afraid to tell him that his child had died. The servants thought, 'We spoke to David while the child was still alive. But he would not listen to us. We are afraid to tell David that his child is dead. He may do something very bad.'

- **Easy-to-Read Version**
  On the seventh day, the baby died. David's servants were afraid to tell him that the baby was dead. They said, "Look, we tried to talk to David while the baby was alive.
But he refused to listen to us. If we tell David that the baby is dead, maybe he will do something bad to himself."

A week later the child died, and David's officials were afraid to tell him the news. They said, "While the child was living, David wouldn't answer us when we spoke to him. How can we tell him that his child is dead? He might do himself some harm!"

On the seventh day the child died. David's servants were afraid to tell him. They said, "What do we do now? While the child was living he wouldn't listen to a word we said. Now, with the child dead, if we speak to him there's no telling what he'll do."

Then on the seventh day the child died. David's advisers were afraid to tell him. "He wouldn't listen to reason while the child was ill," they said. "What drastic thing will he do when we tell him the child is dead?"

Well after seven days, the boy died. And then David's servants were afraid to tell him, for they said, 'Look, we spoke to him about the boy while he was still alive, but he wouldn't listen to us. So, how can we now tell [David] that he died, because he'll do bad things to us.'

It was on the seventh day, and the boy died. The servants of David feared to tell him the boy died, saying, "When the boy was living here, we spoke to him, and he never heard our voice. But saying to him that the boy died, he may do evil!"

On the seventh day the child died. But David's officials were afraid to tell him that the child was dead. They thought, "While the child was alive, we talked to him, and he wouldn't listen to us. How can we tell him the child is dead? He may harm himself."

On the seventh day the child died. David's servants were afraid to tell him the child was dead. They thought, "While the child was still alive, we spoke to David. But he wouldn't listen to us. So how can we tell him the child is dead? He might do something terrible to himself."

On the seventh day the child died. David's retinue were afraid to tell him that the child was dead. 'Even when the child was alive', they thought, 'we reasoned with him and he would not listen to us. How can we tell him that the child is dead? He will do something desperate.'

And then on the seventh day the child's death took place. And David's servants were in fear of giving him the news of the child's death: for they said, Truly, while the child was still living he gave no attention when we said anything to him: what will he do to himself if we give him word that the child is dead?

On the seventh day the child died. David's servants were afraid to tell David that the child was dead, for they said, "We spoke to him when the child was alive and he wouldn't listen to us; how can we tell him that the child is dead? He might do something terrible."

On the seventh day the child died. But the servants of David were afraid to inform him that the child had died, for they said, "While the child was still alive he would not listen to us [Heb "to our voice."] when we spoke to him. How can we tell him that the child is dead? He will do himself harm [Heb "he will do harm." The object is not stated in the Hebrew text. The statement may be intentionally vague, meaning that he might harm himself or them!]"

On the seventh day the child died. David's attendants were afraid to tell him that the child was dead, for they thought, "While the child was still living, he wouldn't listen
On the seventh day the child died. David's servants were afraid to tell him that the child was dead, for they thought, While the child was still living, we spoke to David but he would not listen to us. How can we tell him the child is dead? He may do something desperate.

**Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:**

**The Amplified Bible**
And on the seventh day the child died. David's servants feared to tell him that the child was dead, for they said, While the child was yet alive, we spoke to him and he would not listen to our voices; will he then harm himself if we tell him the child is dead?

**Context Group Version**
On the seventh day, the child died. And the slaves of David feared to tell him that the child was dead; for they said, Look, while the child was yet alive, we spoke to him, and he didn't listen to our voice: how he will then aggravate himself, if we tell him that the child is dead!

**English Standard Version**
On the seventh day the child died. And the servants of David were afraid to tell him that the child was dead, for they said, "Behold, while the child was yet alive, we spoke to him, and he did not listen to us. How then can we say to him the child is dead? He may do himself some harm."

**exeGeses companion Bible**
And so be it, on the seventh day, the child dies: and the servants of David awe to tell him the child died: for they say, Behold, while the child is yet alive, we worded to him and he hearkened not to our voice: how then works he himself evil if we say to him the child died?

**Heritage Bible**
And it was on the seventh day, and the child died. And the servants of David feared to cause it to stand out boldly to him that the child had died, because they said, Lo, while the child was alive, we spoke to him, and he would not hear attentively our voice; and how shall we say to him, The child is dead; and he will do badly?

**Modern KJV**
And it happened on the seventh day, the child died. And the servants of David feared to tell him that the child was dead. For they said, "Behold, while the child was alive, we spoke to him, and he would not listen to our voice. How then will he trouble himself if we tell him that the child is dead?"

**New King James Version**
Then on the seventh day it came to pass that the child died. And the servants of David were afraid to tell him that the child was dead. For they said, "Indeed, while the child was alive, we spoke to him, and he would not heed our voice. How can we tell him that the child is dead? He may do some harm!"

**Syndein**
And it came to pass {hajah - method of showing advance in sequence of action} on the seventh day {for 7 days David was on the floor - thinking, concentrating, praying and doing nothing else} that the child died {muwth} {the son had to die as a substitute for the father - either David, Bathsheba or the child was going to die - the innocent was taken- the Principal is the same as God's Son dying on the cross - the lamb without spot}. Now the servants of David were afraid {afraid in the sense of awe or respect - they did not want David to do something desperate} and were not motivated to tell him that the child had died . . . for {explanation} they reasoned, "Behold, while the child was still living, we spoke to him {David}, and he did not listen to 'our advice'/{us}. Alas, how can we tell him that the child is dead since he will 'do something desperate'/'do harm'/'manufacture evil' to himself'? {this is an idiom meaning they think he might commit suicide in his grief}. 

"to us when we spoke to him. How can we now tell him the child is dead? He may do something desperate."
World English Bible
It happened on the seventh day, that the child died. The servants of David feared to tell him that the child was dead; for they said, Behold, while the child was yet alive, we spoke to him, and he didn't listen to our voice: how will he then vex himself, if we tell him that the child is dead!

Young’s Updated LT
And it comes to pass on the seventh day, that the lad dies, and the servants of David fear to declare to him that the lad is dead, for they said, “Lo, in the lad being alive we spake unto him, and he did not hearken to our voice; and how do we say unto him, The lad is dead? —then he has done evil.”

The gist of this verse: The child dies on the 7th day, and David’s servants are afraid to tell him, because he is so upset over the child’s sickness. They talk among themselves about this problem, fearing that David may harm himself.

2Samuel 12:18a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hâyâh (הוה) [pronounced haw-YAW]</td>
<td>to be, is, was, are; to become, to come into being; to come to pass</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #1961 BDB #224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b̀ (ב) [pronounced b̄]</td>
<td>in, into, through; at, by, near, on, upon; with, before, against; by means of; among; within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yôwm (יום) [pronounced yohm]</td>
<td>day; time; today (with a definite article)</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #3117 BDB #398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together, these are literally translated in the day; however, we may understand it to mean in that day; in this very day; at once, presently; lately; by day; in the daytime; throughout the day; in this day, at this [that] time; now; before that. These interpretations often depend upon when the action of the verb takes place.

| sh̀bîŷŷy (שבעי) [pronounced sh̀-bee-EE] | seventh | masculine singular adjective; numeral ordinate with the definite article | Strong’s #7637 BDB #988 |

Translation: And so it is on the seventh day... It is 7 days since the child has taken ill, and probably 7 days since David has taken up his vigil. Now, we only looked at David during the first 24 hours of this illness, where he laid on the ground, fasting and praying, and refusing to listen to the elders of the palace. We do not know what happened in the subsequent 6 days. It is reasonable to suppose that David at minimal food, possibly ignored his servants, and spent much of the time on the floor praying to God.

The number 7 is used often in the Bible as a reference to God’s perfection. Here, we see His perfection tied to the death of this infant after 7 days. This is God’s perfect timing. There is a right time for this child to die, and it is on the 7th day.

There is one more consideration. Jewish boys are circumcised on the 8th day, so this infant was never circumcised. Yet, David will speak of this child as being with God (the inference of 2Sam. 12:28). So, we are being told that, the ritual circumcision has nothing to do with being saved—not even in the Old Testament.
child is saved because Jesus Christ died for his sins and because he died prior to the age of accountability. Therefore, even without being circumcised, this young boy will live forever as a Jew. It is absolutely amazing how each and every phrase in the Bible tells us something, even when that is not the specific topic of the context.

Translation: ...that the child died. Here, died is in the imperfect, indicating that this was a long process. The child was sick and he suffered for the period of a week, and then died. The imperfect takes in all of the time of suffering as a part of the child’s death.

God has a reason, in His plan, for infant death. We do not know what would have happened with this son. Would he have resisted doctrine? Would he have grown up as an unbeliever, despite David’s considerable influence? We do not know. Sometimes, God may do this to keep a family intact. That is, if this son is an unbeliever and reaches the age of accountability and he rejects Jehovah Elohim, then he will spend eternity in the Lake of Fire apart from his family. If he is taken early in life, then there is no issue in the Angelic Conflict with respect to his eternal destination. All children who die before reaching the age of accountability are automatically saved.

Grief is a normal thing, and we will grieve when a loved one dies. However, we do not sorrow as others who have no hope. We know our eternal destination; we know the eternal destination of our loved ones, in many cases. We have confidence that we will see them again.

David understands that he will spend eternity in heaven with this little child. Prior to this, he has been praying to God to keep this little boy alive—down to the very last breath of that little boy. However, when the child dies, David cannot affect anything else by prayer. There is no such thing as prayers for the dead.

Although we do not know exactly what would have happened, had this child been allowed to live, we do know that would have been outside the plan of God. Furthermore, his life could have made David’s life very difficult, depending upon how he turned out. His life could have impacted Israel in a very negative way. We do not know; we can only speculate; but it is clear that the death of this child is within the plan of God. Furthermore, David would see his son in heaven.
**Translation:** Therefore, the servants of David feared to tell him that the child died,... Quite obviously, if the palace servants are afraid to tell David that this child is dead, that means that David does not know. Recall that I have suggested a couple of scenarios by which this occurs. (1) David is laying below this child on the ground in the same room for most of the 7 days. (2) During the final few days, David gets up and attends to some normal functions. (3) David is not sleeping in the same room with the child, but in an adjacent room. (4) There is a specific room in David's residence where he would go to pray and study the Word of God.

Whatever, the case, the servants know that his child has died and that David is unaware of it. They are afraid to tell David, because of his strong emotions.

We do not know if the servants here refers back to he elders previously mentioned. It is unclear whether there is some overlap, or whether David's servants brought in elders to reason with David. Personally, I would see these as 2 separate groups of people, although there may be some overlap.
The castle staff is confused about what to do. David’s son has died, and David is laying on the floor in prayer. They do not know how he will react to the news that his son is dead, and they are afraid of what he might do. Because David has been falling deeper and deeper into interlocking systems of arrogance, his staff does not realize that he is able to handle this information. However, David is back in fellowship and he is beginning to turn his life around. A primary difference is, David is much more focused on his son than he has been on his own sexual desires. God will, in all of these pressures, continue to keep David focused on other pressing matters.

**Leaders Must Have all of the Facts**

1. David’s staff has noticed a lot of unusual behavior from David over the past several years, not all of it good. Despite their loyalty, they knew that David had made a few wrong turns over the past several years.
2. It is unlikely that they fully understood all the mechanics of what took David to where he is, they did understand that his behavior was not as honorable as it once was, and they suspected that, he might even be a danger to himself, when he finds out that his child has died.
3. David’s staff would have known about Saul and his mental illness, even if they did not personally witness any of it.
4. Therefore, David’s staff is very apprehensive about telling him that his child has died.
5. In fact, David’s staff is so concerned over what David might do, they hesitate to tell him that his son has died.
6. However, David is the man in authority; David is the head of their nation, and he must be given all of the facts in order to chart to correct course for himself and for Israel.
7. The more relevant facts a leader has, the better his decisions will be.
8. In a court case before a non-ideological judge, he is able to render the very best decision if he has all of the facts.
9. In any large organization, there needs to be one or more people who are willing to play it straight with the man in authority. They must be willing to give him the facts, and even guidance, when necessary.
10. A president is elected for many reasons, charisma being among them. However, he needs to have staffers who will tell him the truth, who will challenge him, who will make him face reality. If there is no one on staff who can do this, the president makes a lot of lousy decisions.
11. The same is true of any CEO or company head. Their decision affects the livelihood of thousands of people; therefore, they need accurate information upon which to base their decisions.
12. Management is no better than the accuracy and completeness of the information which they receive.
13. A wise man in authority will see to it that there are one of more men who have his ear who will give him outside information and opinions.
14. Not giving all the facts or bending the truth can be disastrous to a government, a business, a school, a church or any organization.
15. The year in which I write this, 2011, the President not only has his own warped economic ideology, but he is surrounded by men with the same ideology. Therefore, he believes that a government-controlled economy will be the best economy. So government has taken over the housing loan guarantee, student loans, a car company, the medical sector, etc. This is a White House where it is clear that no one understands that taxing too much retards an economy, and that they feel quite comfortable with confiscating 40% and more of a person’s wealth. It never occurs to them that this may be immoral, this may impact the economy negatively, and that this destroys jobs. There is probably not a single person who has the president’s ear who believes this or who can explain it to them. Most of them are academics and what they have learned about the economy as come from a book or a Marxist teacher (I exaggerate only slightly, here).
16. Good decisions cannot be based upon false or misleading information; furthermore, the more incomplete information is, the more difficult it is for a leader to make good decisions.
17. Concealing problematic or bad news from a person in authority guarantees a resultant bad decision. Those who have to make the big decisions need true facts in order to solve problems.
18. If there is no one on staff who will play it straight with a leader, then he has failed at staffing.
19. Furthermore, if those under a leader are afraid to give then facts, then that leader has failed at staffing
Leaders Must Have all of the Facts

and at setting the correct tone. A leader and his staff may walk out of a meeting appearing to be very unified around a singular purpose, but if there was not a lot of contention within the meeting, it is likely that leader will make bad decisions.

20. The policy in any organization is effective and fair only if based upon the truth.

21. In this case, truth is accurate information. David’s son had died and he did not know it. His servants are too afraid to tell him the truth (which gives us a clue that David had not been fostering the best leadership environment). David will have to figure this out for himself.

Chapter Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Samuel 12:18d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew/Pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kîy (וַיְהִ) [pronounced kee]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'âmar (אָמר) [pronounced aw-MAHR]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hinnêh (הִנָּה) [pronounced hin-NAY]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bê (בְּ) [pronounced bê]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hâyâh (הָיָה) [pronounced haw-YAW]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The infinitive construct, when combined with the bêyth preposition, can often take on a temporal meaning and may be rendered when [such and such happens]. It can serve as a temporal marker that denotes an event which occurs simultaneously with the action of the main verb.

| yeled (יְלָד) [pronounced YEH-led] | child, one born; son, boy, youth | masculine singular noun with the definite article | Strong's #3206 BDB #409 |
| chay (חי) [pronounced KHAH-ee] | living, alive, active, lively, vigorous [used of man or animals]; green [vegetation]; fresh [used of a plant]; flowing [water]; reviving [of the springtime]; raw [flesh] | masculine singular adjective | Strong's #2416 BDB #311 |
### 2Samuel 12:18d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dâbar (דָּבָר) [pronounced daw’-VAHR]</td>
<td>to speak, to talk [and back with action], to give an opinion, to expound, to make a formal speech, to speak out, to promise, to propose, to speak kindly of, to declare, to proclaim, to announce</td>
<td>1st person plural, Piel perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #1696 BDB #180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘el (אֵל) [pronounced ehl]</td>
<td>unto; into, among, in; toward, to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to</td>
<td>directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied); with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #413 BDB #39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wÔ (or v’) (וּ or ו) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lÔ (לֹ or לָ) [pronounced low]</td>
<td>not, no</td>
<td>negates the word or action that follows; the absolute negation</td>
<td>Strong’s #3808 BDB #518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shâma‘ (שָׁמָה) [pronounced shaw-MAHÇ]</td>
<td>to listen [intently], to hear, to listen and obey, [or, and act upon, give heed to, take note of], to hearken to, to be attentive to, to listen and be cognizant of</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #8085 BDB #1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bÔ (ב) [pronounced b”]</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qÔwl (קַול) [pronounced kohl]</td>
<td>sound, voice, noise; loud noise, thundering</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 1st person plural suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #6963 BDB #876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...for they said [to one another], “Look, when the child was alive, we spoke to David [lit., him] and he did not listen to our voice...” For much of 7 days, David’s servants tried to reason with him, to get him to eat more food. It is likely that David ate some, but very little food while this was going on.

### 2Samuel 12:18e

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wÔ (or v’) (וּ or ו) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘êyk (אֵיָק) [pronounced ayche]</td>
<td>how; where</td>
<td>interrogative adverb; also used as an exclamation</td>
<td>Strong’s #349 BDB #32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2Samuel 12:18e

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘âmar (אָמר) [pronounced aw-MAHR]</td>
<td>to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think</td>
<td>1st person plural, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #559 BDB #55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לָמֶד) [pronounced l’]</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mûwth (موت) [pronounced mooth]</td>
<td>to die; to perish, to be destroyed</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #4191 BDB #559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeled (יֵלֵד) [pronounced YEH-led]</td>
<td>child, one born; son, boy, youth</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #3206 BDB #409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...so how can we say to him, ‘The child has died.’? So they ask themselves, how can they tell David that his child is dead (the 3rd time these 2 words occur in this one verse). It is quite obvious that David, from his vantage point, cannot see that the child is dead. Now, although it is certainly possible that David is in the same room with the child, and on the floor beneath the child (which is how I originally pictured this), that exact scenario seems less likely. If you have a sick child, to the point that you are staying in the same room with him, you pay attention to his breathing, his sniffles, etc. You can hear every noise that child makes. Therefore, it appears more likely that David is in an adjacent room or in a private room in his own residence.

### 2Samuel 12:18f

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (וֹ or וָ) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘âsâh (אָסָה) [pronounced ġaw-SAWH]</td>
<td>to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #6213 BDB #793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>râ‘âh (רָעָה) [pronounced raw-GAW]</td>
<td>evil, misery, distress, disaster, injury, iniquity, aberration, that which is morally reprehensible</td>
<td>feminine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #7451 BDB #949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** He may do [himself] harm.” Literally, this reads, “And he has done evil.” Using the perfect to cover a future event indicates that this is a clearly expected outcome. They have no doubts about David acting out because of distress. Although many translations (including mine) suggest that they are afraid that David will do harm to himself, there is no *himself* in this verse. Therefore, they are concerned that he might do harm to the person who tells him about his son. Will he harm the physician? Will he harm those praying with him (if there are any)? Will he harm the person who tells him the bad news. His servants are extremely concerned over this.
And so sees David that his servants are whispering together, and so perceives David that died the child. And so says David unto his servants, “Is dead the child?” And so they say, “He has died.”

When David saw that his servants were whispering among themselves, he [lit., David] perceived that the child had died. Therefore, David said to his servants, “Is the child dead?” They answered, “He is dead.”

Here is how others have translated this verse:

### Ancient texts:

- **Latin Vulgate**: But when David saw his servants whispering, he understood that the child was dead: and he said to his servants: Is the child dead? They answered him He is dead.

- **Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**: And so sees David that his servants are whispering together, and so perceives David that died the child. And so says David unto his servants, “Is dead the child?” And so they say, “He has died.”

- **Peshitta (Syriac)**: But when David saw that his servants were whispering, David perceived that the child was dead; therefore he said to his servants, Is the child dead? And they said, He is dead.

- **Septuagint (Greek)**: And David knew that his servants were whispering, and David perceived that the child was dead. And David said to his servants, Is the child dead? And they said, He is dead.

### Significant differences:

The Greek has a different verb at the beginning of this verse. Although the stem of the verb in the Hebrew indicates that David’s servants were whispering *together*, this does not seem to have been carried into the other 3 ancient languages.

Although the proper noun *David* occurs thrice in this verse, it is only found once in the Latin.

### Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

- **CEV**: David noticed his servants whispering, and he knew the boy was dead. "Did my son die?" he asked his servants. "Yes, he did," they answered.

- **Easy English (Pocock)**: David noticed that his servants were whispering to each other. He realised that the child had died. So, David asked them, "Is the child dead?" They answered, "Yes, the child is dead."

- **Good News Bible (TEV)**: When David noticed them whispering to each other, he realized that the child had died. So he asked them, "Is the child dead?" "Yes, he is," they answered.

- **The Message**: David noticed that the servants were whispering behind his back, and realized that the boy must have died. He asked the servants, "Is the boy dead?" "Yes," they answered. "He's dead."

- **New Life Bible**: But when David saw his servants speaking together in secret, he understood that the child was dead. He asked his servants, "Is the child dead?" And they said, "He is dead."

- **New Living Translation**: When David saw them whispering, he realized what had happened. "Is the child dead?" he asked. "Yes," they replied, "he is dead."

### Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:
However, David noticed that his servants were whispering, and he suspected that the boy had died. So he asked his servants, 'Has the boy died?'
And they said, 'He has.'

But when David saw that his officials were whispering to one another, he realized that the child was dead. "Is the child dead?" David asked them. "Yes, he is dead," they answered.

David, however, noticed that his retinue were whispering among themselves, and realised that the child was dead. 'Is the child dead?' he asked the officers. They replied, 'He is dead.'

David saw that his servants were whispering to one another. He realized (discerned) that the child was dead. »Is the child dead?« David asked them. »Yes, he is dead.« They answered.

But when David saw that his servants were whispering to each other, he suspected that the child was dead. David asked his servants, "Is the child dead?" and they answered, "He is dead."

When David saw that his servants were whispering to each other, he guessed that the baby was dead. So he asked his servants, "Is the baby dead?" "He is dead," they replied.

But when David saw that his servants whispered together, David perceived that the child was dead; and David said unto his servants: 'Is the child dead?' and they said: 'He is dead.'

When David saw his servants talking is whispers, David understood that the child was dead; David asked his servants, "Is the child dead?" "Yes," they replied.

When David saw his servants talking together quietly, he was certain that the child was dead: and he said to his servants, Is the child dead? and they said, He is.

But when David saw that his servants were whispering to each other, he guessed that the child was dead. So he asked his servants, "Is the child dead?" "He is dead," they replied.

David noticed that his attendants were whispering among themselves, and he realized the child was dead. "Is the child dead?" he asked.
"Yes," they replied, "he is dead."

David noticed that his servants were whispering among themselves and he realised that the child was dead. Is the child dead? he asked. Yes, they replied, he is dead.

But when David saw that his servants whispered, he perceived that the child was dead. So he said to them, Is the child dead? And they said, He is.

And David sees his servants enchant, and David discerns that the child died: and David says to his servants, Has the child died? And they say, Died.

And David saw that his servants were whispering among themselves. And David understood that the boy was dead. And David said to his servants, Is the boy dead? And they said, He is dead.

But David saw that his servants whispered. And David understood that the child was dead. And David said to his servants, Is the boy dead? And they said, He is dead.
When David kept on seeing {alertness and objectivity are restored to David} that his staff/servants were whispering among themselves, David perceived/discerned {biyn - a verb of empiricism} that the child was dead {David is now leaving the systems of interlocking arrogance and is becoming alert and objective and is now observing}. Consequently David said unto his staff/servants, "Has the child died?" And they said, "He has died."

The gist of this verse: When David sees his servants whispering, he figures out that his child has died. When he asks them, they confirm this for him.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Samuel 12:19a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew/Pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>râ’ãh (ראה)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid (דוד)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kîy (כ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ebed (עבד)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâchash (לחש)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: When David saw that his servants were whispering among themselves,... For at least the first night, David lay on the ground, and I assumed that this was next to his child, who may have been elevated in some sort of a bed (the other options being, this could be an adjacent room or a room in the palace where David went to pray and study). The child’s sickness continues for 7 days, so David obviously got up from time to time; and, he did not go without food and water for 7 days, although he may have eaten and drunk very little.

Based upon what we have read, David may have fallen asleep on the floor that night, and, when he woke up, he looked up and saw his servants whispering. As many of us just out of a sleep, he may or may not have noticed that he could not hear his child making any noise.
It is often typical for each sentence—in fact, each thought—to begin with a wâw consecutive (or a wâw conjunction) in the Hebrew. However, it is not necessary in an English translation to include a connective at every such juncture, as our language does not necessarily require that for successive thoughts or actions.

Translation: ...he [lit., David] perceived that the child had died. Perhaps David is laying on the floor next to where the baby is sleeping, and, when he wakes up, he sees his servants whispering, and he figures out that the child has died. Perhaps he realized that he heard this whispering, but did not hear the breathing of his child.

There is, of course, the possibility that David slept on the floor outside of the room where the child was, and, at some point saw his servants whispering. However, in whatever way this came out, David noticed his servants whispering to one another, and he realizes, at that point, that the child has died.
### 2Samuel 12:19c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'el (אֵל) [pronounced ehl]</td>
<td>unto; into, among, in; toward, to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to</td>
<td>directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied)</td>
<td>Strong’s #413 BDB #39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ebed (עֶבֶד) [pronounced GE²-ved]</td>
<td>slave, servant</td>
<td>masculine plural noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5650 BDB #713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hà (ה) [pronounced heh]</td>
<td>interrogative particle which acts almost like a piece of punctuation, like the upside-down question mark which begins a Spanish sentence. The verb to be may be implied.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong’s #none BDB #209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>müwth (מוּת) [pronounced mooth]</td>
<td>to die; to perish, to be destroyed</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #4191 BDB #559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeled (יֶלֶד) [pronounced YEH-led]</td>
<td>child, one born; son, boy, youth</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article; pausal form</td>
<td>Strong’s #3206 BDB #409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: Therefore, David said to his servants, “Is the child dead?” David, who has not been very verbal with his servants during this time, says to them, “Is the child dead?” A term of respect is used here, when David speaks to them.

### 2Samuel 12:19d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘āmar (אָמַר) [pronounced aw-MAHRR]</td>
<td>to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think</td>
<td>3rd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #559 BDB #55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>müwth (מוּת) [pronounced mooth]</td>
<td>to die; to perish, to be destroyed</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #4191 BDB #559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: They answered, “He is dead.” The servants had been whispering to one another. They had been, for the past week, very concerned about David. The child had died, and they had no idea how they could tell him. However, when David asks them straight out, we have the 3rd person masculine plural Qal imperfect of the verb to say, which means that 2 or 3 of them answered, and, because the verb is in the imperfect tense, they probably talked for a minute or two, while this sunk into David’s soul. One may have said, “We have stayed awake with the child all night.” Another may have pointed out how sick the child was. Another may have said, “He has suffered for a very long time.” And, eventually, they said, “He is dead.”
3 times, the verb to die occurs in this verse, and 3 times, it occurs in the previous verse. There is another oddity in the Hebrew text—several different words are used to refer to the child in these verses, but, near the end, the same word is used over and over.

His servants were beside themselves. David has behaved so morosely over the past week, eating almost nothing and barely drinking enough to keep himself alive, and now that the child has died, his servants have no idea what David might do next. What David does do next will surprise his servants.

Our passage reads: When David saw that his servants were whispering among themselves, he [lit., David] perceived that the child had died. Therefore, David said to his servants, “Is the child dead?” They answered, “He is dead.”

Concluding Principles from 2Samuel 12:19

1. David needs information upon which to act, so he therefore asks a direct question.
2. Direct questions are used when a person seeks true and accurate information.
3. David rightly assumed that no one on his staff would lie to him when asked a direct question.
4. David has already concluded that his son is dead. He is simply confirming what he already suspects.
5. At this point in time, David is not in interlocking systems of arrogance; and God is going to keep him busy and out of interlocking systems of arrogance. Therefore, David is objective and observant.
6. It is impossibly to rightly wield authority when inside of the interlocking systems of arrogance.
7. Arrogant people are not observant because they are too preoccupied with themselves. David is free from arrogance at this moment because of the illness of his son. He will be able to take charge as of man of authority and return to routine. Before David can stray from this, God will command his attention with something else (the war with Ammon).
8. David, apart from arrogance, is able to recover his objectivity.
9. When the believer breaks free of arrogance, then he is more able to face reality. David directly inquires about reality.
10. You cannot face the pressures of life when you are inside of interlocking systems of arrogance.
11. David will actually face this tragedy with great poise, which will surprise even his staff. David is restoring both the equilibrium and the integrity of his soul.
12. This first installment of discipline—the death of David’s son—will be turned into blessing.
   1) As discussed earlier, this is not actually discipline; this is pressure designed to guide David permanently away from the interlocking systems of arrogance.
13. David will quickly return to normal routine. He will get up, take a bath, and then dress in clean clothes. Then he will “go to church” for spiritual food and return home for physical food.
14. True humility of soul will guide David away from pride and towards reality.
15. No matter what the circumstances are in life, they can always be met with doctrine in the soul. David’s next stop, after cleaning up, is to get doctrine into his soul.

And so rises up David from the earth; and so he washes [himself] and so he anoints [himself] and so he changes his clothes. And so he goes [to] a house of Y’hovah and so he worships. And so he goes unto his house and so he asks and so they place to him bread and so he eats.

David then got up off the ground and washed [himself] and anointed [himself] with oils. He also changed his clothing and went to the house of Y’hovah and worshiped [there]. Then he went to his house and requested [food to eat]. They placed food before him and he ate [it].
David then got up off the ground, washed himself and anointed himself with oils. He also changed his clothing and went to the house of Jehovah and worshiped there. Then he went to his house and requested a meal. His servants placed food before him and he ate it.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

- **Latin Vulgate**
  
  Then David arose from the ground, and washed and anointed himself: and when he had changed his apparel, he went into the house of the Lord: and worshipped, and then he came into his own house, and he called for bread, and ate.

- **Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**
  
  And so rises up David from the earth; and so he washes [himself] and so he anoints [himself] and so he changes his clothes. And so he goes [to] a house of Y"howah and so he worships. And so he goes unto his house and so he asks and so they place to him bread and so he eats.

- **Peshitta (Syriac)**
  
  Then David arose from the earth, and washed and anointed himself, and changed his garments and went into the house of the LORD and worshipped; then he came to his own house and asked for food, and they set it before him and he did eat.

- **Septuagint (Greek)**
  
  Then David rose up from the earth, and washed, and anointed himself, and changed his clothes, and went into the house of God, and worshipped Him; and he went into his own house, and called for bread to eat, and they set bread before him and he ate.

**Significant differences:**

- In the English translation from the Latin and Syriac, David is asking for bread. So it is in the Greek. In the English translation from the Latin, no mention is made of setting the bread before him. In the English translation from the Syriac, they set it before him; and bread is repeated in the Greek. These are all reasonable adjustments which are made to translate the Hebrew into other languages. I would not be surprised if bread should have been found twice in the original Hebrew.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

- **CEV**
  
  David got up off the floor; he took a bath, combed his hair, and dressed. He went into the LORD's tent and worshiped, then he went back home. David asked for something to eat, and when his servants brought him some food, he ate it.

- **Easy English (Pocock)**
  
  Then David got up from the ground. He washed himself and he rubbed himself with oils. He put on clean clothes. Then he went to "worship in the "house of the "Lord. After this, he went home and he asked for something to eat. His servants gave him some food and he ate it.

- **Easy-to-Read Version**
  
  Then David got up from the floor. He washed himself. He changed his clothes and got dressed. Then he went into the Lord’s house to worship. Then he went home and asked for something to eat. His servants gave him some food, and he ate.

- **Good News Bible (TEV)**
  
  David got up from the floor, took a bath, combed his hair, and changed his clothes. Then he went and worshiped in the house of the LORD. When he returned to the palace, he asked for food and ate it as soon as it was served.

- **The Message**
  
  David got up from the floor, washed his face and combed his hair, put on a fresh change of clothes, then went into the sanctuary and worshiped. Then he came home and asked for something to eat. They set it before him and he ate.

- **New Living Translation**
  
  Then David got up from the ground, washed himself, put on lotions [Hebrew anointed himself.], and changed his clothes. He went to the Tabernacle and worshiped the LORD. After that, he returned to the palace and was served food and ate.
Then David got up from the ground, took a bath, rubbed himself with oil, and changed his clothes. And then he went to the [Tent] of God and bowed before Him; and when he got back home, he asked for some bread to eat, which they brought to him, and he ate it.

David rose from the ground, washed and salved. He changed his raiment, and came to the house of Yahweh and bowed. He came to his house and asked, and they set bread for him. He ate.

So David got up from the ground, bathed, anointed himself, and changed his clothes. He went into the LORD’S house and worshiped. Then he went home and asked for food. They placed food in front of him, and he ate.

Then David got up from the ground. After he washed himself, he put on lotions. He changed his clothes. He went into the house of the Lord and worshiped him. Then he went to his own house. He asked for some food. They served it to him. And he ate it.

David got off the ground, bathed and anointed himself and put on fresh clothes. Then he went into Yahweh’s sanctuary and prostrated himself. On returning to his house, he asked to be served with food and ate it.

David then rose from the ground, bathed and anointed himself, and put on fresh clothes; he entered the house of the L ORD and prostrated himself there. Afterwards he returned him; he ordered food to be brought and, when it was set before him, he ate it.

Then David got up from the ground, and after washing and rubbing himself with oil and changing his clothing, he went into the house of the Lord and gave worship: then he went back to his house, and at his order they put food before him and he had a meal.

Then David got up off the ground, washed, anointed himself and changed his clothes. He went into the house of ADONAI and worshipped; then he went to his own palace; and when he asked for food, they served it to him; and he ate.

Then David got up from the ground. He washed, anointed himself, changed his clothes, went to the LORD’s house, and worshiped. Then he went home and requested something to eat. So they served him food, and he ate.

Thereupon David rose from the ground; he bathed and anointed himself, and he changed his clothes. He went into the House of the L ORD and prostrated himself. Then he went home and asked for food, which they set before him, and he ate.

And David got up from the ground, and washed, and anointed himself, and changed his clothes; and he came to the House of the Lord and kneeled; and he came to his house, and he asked and they set bread before him, and he ate.

So David got up from the ground, bathed, put on oil, and changed his clothes. He went to the house of the Lord and worshiped. Then, when he entered his palace, he requested that food be brought to him, and he ate.

Then David got up from the ground. After he had washed, put on lotions and changed his clothes, he went into the house of the LORD and worshipped. Then he went to his own house, and at his request they served him food, and he ate.

And David rises from the earth, and does bathe and anoint [himself], and changes his raiment, and comes in to the house of Yahweh, and bows himself, and comes unto his house, and asks and they place for him bread, and he eats.

And David rises from the earth and baptizes and anoints and passes his clothes;
and comes into the house of Yah Veh and prostrates:
and comes to his house;
and he asks:
and they set bread in front of him; and he eats.

King James 2000 Version
Then David arose from the earth, and washed, and anointed himself, and changed his apparel, and came into the house of the LORD, and worshiped: then he came to his own house; and when he asked, they set food before him, and he did eat.

Syndein
Now David got up from the floor and he both washed and put on lotions before he changed his clothes {good grooming is a part of thoughtfulness of others - if you don't have good clothes - fine; but if you do, then wearing clean and nice clothes for a worship service is a part of having good manners}, and went into the house of Jehovah/God {this is the tabernacle also on Mount Zion at this time}, and worshipped {motivation of worship is the filling of God the Holy Spirit in the Church Age - content is from thought - must have doctrine resident in your own soul to properly worship}. Then he {David} came to his own castle. And when he demanded service {shocking his servants}, they set food before him and he ate {first time in 7 days}.

A Voice in the Wilderness
So David rose up from the ground, washed and anointed himself, and changed his clothes; and he went into the house of Jehovah and prostrated himself. Then he went to his own house; and when he requested, they set food before him, and he ate.

World English Bible
Then David arose from the earth, and washed, and anointed himself, and changed his clothing; and he came into the house of Yahweh, and worshiped: then he came to his own house; and when he required, they set bread before him, and he ate.

Young’s Updated LT
And David rises from the earth, and bathes and anoints himself, and he changes his raiment, and comes in to the house of Jehovah, and bows himself, and comes unto his house, and asks and they place for him bread, and he eats.

The gist of this verse: David gets up off of the ground, washes and grooms himself, puts on fresh clothing, and goes to the house of God to worship. Then he returns to his home and asks for a meal, which he eats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qûwm (קדש) [pronounced koom]</td>
<td>to stand, to rise up, to get up; to establish, to establish a vow, to cause a vow to stand, to confirm or to fulfill a vow</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #6965 BDB #877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dàvid (דוד); also Dàvidy (דודי) [pronounced daw-VEED]</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min (مين) [pronounced mini]</td>
<td>from, off, out from, out of, away from, on account of, since, than, more than</td>
<td>preposition of separation</td>
<td>Strong’s #4480 BDB #577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel 12:20a

**Hebrew/Pronunciation**  
 '\erets (אֶרֶץ) [pronounced \textit{EH-rets}]

**Common English Meanings**  
 *earth (all or a portion thereof), land, territory, country, continent; ground, soil; under the ground [Sheol]*

**Notes/Morphology**  
 *feminine singular noun with the definite article*

**BDB and Strong’s Numbers**  
 *Strong’s #776, BDB #75*

**Translation:** David then got up off the ground... Whether David was in the same room with the deceased child or outside of that room where the child lay, he now gets up off the ground. We do not even know exactly where David is. Is he and the child in the main palace? Are his wives living separately nearby, and he is with Bathsheba at her place? Do his wives reside together in sort of a dorm situation? We really can only speculate, but it is reasonable to suppose that David spent most of the past 7 days on the ground, petitioning God for his son, refusing most food and drink. The body of his deceased son is likely very nearby.

There is no reason to assume that David spent the entire 7 days on the ground, or that he ate nothing whatsoever for 7 days. The Bible does not tell us this. However, we may reasonably assume, from the context, that David spent most of his time on the ground and that he ate very little.

David’s servants are bracing themselves. They just told David that his son had died. So David does something quite unusual—he gets up. His servants are afraid, and they simply stand off, observing what he does.

2Samuel 12:20b

**Hebrew/Pronunciation**  
 *wa (or va) (ו) [pronounced \textit{wah}]*

**Common English Meanings**  
 *and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because*

**Notes/Morphology**  
 *waw consecutive*

**BDB and Strong’s Numbers**  
 *No Strong’s # BDB #253*

**Hebrew/Pronunciation**  
 *râchats (רָחַט) [pronounced \textit{BAHTS}]*

**Common English Meanings**  
 *to wash, to bathe (oneself), to wash off (away); possibly to declare oneself innocent*

**Notes/Morphology**  
 *3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect*

**BDB and Strong’s Numbers**  
 *Strong’s #7364, BDB #934*

**Translation:** ...and washed [himself]... Whatever the plumbing arrangements were, in that day, David went to where there was water and washed himself. The primary structure of this verse is a waw consecutive followed by an imperfect verb, with little else. This verb can mean to \textit{wash oneself}, and that is what David did.

The last time that we saw this verb, was in the previous chapter. Bathsheba was washing herself, when David became, shall we say, interested in her, and called for her. Again this verb was used in 2Sam. 11 when David told Uriah, her husband, to go to his own home and wash his feet there. So this verb is first associated with David’s sin of adultery, then his sin of murder; and here, it represents a cleansing which is taking place. Although, we do not have the words here that, \textit{David confessed his sin to the Lord}; this washing alludes to a spiritual cleansing which took place (he admitted his sin back in 2Sam. 12:13 and he will confess this sin in Psalm 51). Whenever we name our sins to God, a spiritual cleansing occurs at that point as well, in our temporal lives. So, David really did wash himself; which is what he records here (the man-ward side of things); and God the Holy Spirit records this so that we know David is cleansed from sin at this time (the God-ward side of this text).
Translation: ...and anointed [himself] with oils. This is common, ancient world grooming. These are perfumed oils used in the ancient world, which moisturized the sin and provided a nice fragrance. Again, there is the man-ward side of this narrative—David had been laying in the dirt in the same clothing for 7 days now; so washing himself and anointing himself with oil is what a normal person would do. However, God the Holy Spirit is telling us that, because David named his sins to God (he got up off the ground), God cleansed him (David washed himself) and God returned the Old Testament endument ministry of God the Holy Spirit to David (he was anointed with oil). David now had the power of God the Holy Spirit with which to function.

You will notice that, after this first installment of discipline (now suffering turned to blessing), David is enduring this difficulty with great grace. He will not come out from under the other disciplinary installments with the same victory.

All that David does here, getting up, washing himself, and anointing himself with oil—all are actual, historical events. However, they all represent David moving forward in the spiritual life. He is cleansed, he is guided by the Spirit, and he is up off of the ground, indicating that he is able to be spiritually productive again.

Translation: He also changed his clothing... Again, this means that David really changed his clothing. He has been wearing the same clothes for the past week, without washing, and laying forlornly upon the ground. David now changes his clothing. New clothing can represent a spiritual advance or a spiritual reward (or both).
The repetition of the wâw consecutives followed by imperfect verbs, hurries the action along. From the God-ward side, this means that these things are all related. David’s recovery, his cleansing, his anointing and his new clothing, all have spiritual import and are all related spiritually.

To those around him, this is a sign that David has come out of his state of mourning. Bear in mind, this ought to strike his servants as odd, because the child has just died. They would have expected David’s mourning to increase for a week or 30 days, but David suddenly comes out of mourning.

### 2Samuel 12:20e

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) ([i])</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bôw (דּוּ) ([pronounced boh])</td>
<td>to come in, to come, to go in, to go, to enter</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #935 BDB #97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bayith (בָּיִת) ([pronounced BAH-yith])</td>
<td>house, residence; household, habitation as well as inward</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #1004 BDB #108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YHWH (יהוה) ([pronunciation is possibly yhoh-WAH])</td>
<td>transliterated variously as Jehovah, Yahweh, Y’howah</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #3068 BDB #217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and went to the house of Y’howah... What is David’s first thought? To go to the house of Y’howah. Now, this poses a superficial problem for us. We studied the Movement of the Ark and of the Tent of God back in 1Sam. 10 (HTML) (PDF). Solomon is said to go to Gibeon to retrieve the original Tabernacle of God and to bring it to be placed in the Temple of God in 2Chron. 1:3–4. There is no indication that David went off to Gibeon for a few days to worship God. Therefore, the tent which David erected in order to house the Ark of God also served as a place of worship (2Sam. 6:17). Whether this was a tent within a tent, a room within a tent, or whatever, the Ark of God was kept in a tent in Jerusalem. Although we would have thought David would fetch of Tabernacle, he did not.

Now, the actual options are these: (1) David erected a tent in which to keep the Ark of God and that has become a worship center in Jerusalem. Whether the worship takes place outside of the tent or whether the Ark of God is kept inside of a room inside this tent, we do not know. (2) David travels to Gibeon, where the Tabernacle was (2Chron. 1:3–4). (3) David brought the Tabernacle to Jerusalem, but, for whatever reason, it was returned to Gibeon before Solomon took the throne. #’s 2 and 3 are simply convoluted and make little sense. Therefore, David had to have instituted some place in Jerusalem—probably right where the Ark of God was—where people could worship Jehovah Elohim.

By the time of our Lord, the synagogue system had been established. A synagogue was a local place where Jewish believers (for the most part) gathered to hear the Scriptures read and explained. Something along these lines existed during David’s time. Although it is logical that this was where the Ark of God was, that does not have to be the case.

Why doesn’t the Bible explain this to us? There is no reason to. We have minds. We are capable of reason and logical deduction. I have given you the most reasonable explanation of the nuts and bolts of this narrative. The reason this is not important enough to explain it, because the focus is upon David, who is a type of Christ. The Ark, Tabernacle and soon-to-be-built Temple are all types of Christ. However, since there is but One Messiah and One Savior, the Bible concentrates on one type of Christ at a time. Throughout the life of David, the primary type of Christ is David, so we concentrate upon him.
David has fully prepared himself for worship, and he now goes to Jerusalem’s worship center in order to worship. Again, all of the spiritual steps have been taken, in order for this worship to be meaningful. He is cleansed, empowered by the Holy Spirit, spiritually functioning, and growing spiritually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (i)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wāw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shâcháh (ψηη)</td>
<td>to bow down, to prostrate oneself, to do obeisance to; to honor [with prayers]; to do homage to, to submit to</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Hithpael imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7812 BDB #1005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and worshiped [there]. David prepared himself spiritually to worship, and now he is in the house of God worshiping. What is reasonable is, the Ark of God is in this vicinity, but it is hidden from view, as was the case when kept at the Tabernacle. Whether it is in a room of a larger tent, in a tent within a tent, or in a tent next to the Tent of Worship, we don’t know. However, the Ark was given a wide berth in David’s time, as a great man had died from simply touching it. So, the Ark of God had to be kept from public view so that the public could not simply reach out and touch it.

Others see the spiritual significance to all of this as well. Gill comments: [David] went into the tabernacle he had built for the ark of God, and then in prayer submitted himself to the will of God, and acknowledged his justice in what he had done; gave thanks to God that he had brought him to a sense of his sin, and repentance for it, and had applied his pardoning grace to him, and given him satisfaction as to the eternal welfare and happiness of the child, as appears from 2Sam. 12:23.

There is, however, one minor problem.³⁹ Num. 19:14–22 reads: "This is the law when someone dies in a tent: everyone who comes into the tent and everyone who is in the tent shall be unclean seven days. And every open vessel that has no cover fastened on it is unclean. Whoever in the open field touches someone who was killed with a sword or who died naturally, or touches a human bone or a grave, shall be unclean seven days. For the unclean they shall take some ashes of the burnt sin offering, and fresh water shall be added in a vessel. Then a clean person shall take hyssop and dip it in the water and sprinkle it on the tent and on all the furnishings and on the persons who were there and on whoever touched the bone, or the slain or the dead or the grave. And the clean person shall sprinkle it on the unclean on the third day and on the seventh day. Thus on the seventh day he shall cleanse him, and he shall wash his clothes and bathe himself in water, and at evening he shall be clean. If the man who is unclean does not cleanse himself, that person shall be cut off from the midst of the assembly, since he has defiled the sanctuary of the LORD. Because the water for impurity has not been thrown on him, he is unclean. And it shall be a statute forever for them. The one who sprinkles the water for impurity shall wash his clothes, and the one who touches the water for impurity shall be unclean until evening. And whatever the unclean person touches shall be unclean, and anyone who touches it shall be unclean until evening." First of all, they are in a building and not a tent. Furthermore, there are rooms throughout this building, and, as has been said many times, David may not have been in the room with the infant who just died. Thirdly, there is no indication that these things did not occur. They are not mentioned, but just because something is not mentioned, does not mean it did not occur. Given the way that this all played out, I would suspect that David remained outside of the room where the child was. That simple interpretation allows for all of the things which we have read, without the additional requirement that David go through a cleansing ceremony.

---

³⁸ Dr. John Gill, *John Gill’s Exposition of the Entire Bible*; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:20.

³⁹ Poole brings our attention to this problem in Matthew Poole, *English Annotations on the Holy Bible*; ©1685; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:20.
So far, our verse reads: David then got up off the ground, washed himself and anointed himself with oils. He also changed his clothing and went to the house of Jehovah and worshiped there.

**David’s Return to Routine**

1. David is moving toward spiritual normalcy again. He has undergone the first installment of divine discipline—the first son he has loved and was ready to guide is now dead.
2. There are two directions that David could have gone in: he could have returned to sexual lusts to dull the pain or he can return to a kingly routine. He chooses the latter.
3. People, after a great tragedy, must get back into the routine of life so that they are not consumed with self-pity.
4. People who have a routine can focus upon the things which are most important. For awhile, David’s routine was seeking out pleasure; his life revolved around sexual pleasure. However, with this first pressure, God has guided him away from that set of values.
5. God has designed work to take up a great deal of the slack in our lives. Recall that work is a part of man’s life before and after the fall. Therefore, it is normal and legitimate to build a routine around work and doctrine. For the unbeliever, it is legitimate to organize one’s life around work. Such people can be very ambitious and even workaholics (when the media preaches against being a workaholic, then you know it is a good thing). There are some people who are very motivated in the realm of their vocation, and these are often the heads of companies or the rainmakers of their organization. To them, it is normal to work 12, 14 or 16 hours a day. Furthermore, in many cases, that is not sinful.
6. The illness of his son had distracted David from routine to the point where David desired to return to this routine.
7. Routine minimizes distractions and allows for legitimate focus.
8. Routine requires the setting of legitimate priorities.
9. You will note that David does not attend worship services in the dirty clothing that he has been mourning in. In fact, a nod to hygiene shows a return to routine as well as thoughtfulness for others.
10. If you go to a worship service where you are a distraction to others because of your lack of hygiene, that indicates self-centeredness.
11. After cleaning up, David will concentrate on the teaching of the Word of God.

---

**2Samuel 12:20g**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bôw (בּוֹ)</td>
<td>to come in, to come, to go in, to go, to enter</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #935 BDB #97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’el (אֵל)</td>
<td>unto; into, among, in; toward; to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to</td>
<td>directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied)</td>
<td>Strong’s #413 BDB #39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bayith (בַּיית)</td>
<td>house, residence; household, habitation as well as inward</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #1004 BDB #108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translation: Then he went to his house... As discussed before, we do not know where the child was and where David slept on the floor. If all of this took place in the palace, we might have expect to find the verb to return. However, this verb tells us very little, except that David did go to his own house.

What would seem likely is, there would have been a dorm situation or separate residences or some similar sort of arrangement for David’s wives. Perhaps, this was not unlike an apartment dwelling? This is possibly where David’s dying son would have been, which is not where David’s living quarters were. This is where David would have stayed the week, laying on the floor, praying and fasting to God.

David’s servants are going to move with David, partially as servants and partially as bodyguards. In this scenario, we would reasonably find the verb to go rather than to return.

What does God the Holy Spirit want to tell us here? David is back into his routine. Here is a lot of our life that is routine, and there is nothing wrong with that.

---

### 2Samuel 12:20h

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and, so, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shâ’al (שָׁאֵל)</td>
<td>to ask [petition, request, inquire]; to demand [require]; to question, to interrogate; to ask [for a loan]; to consult; to salute</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7592 BDB #981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and requested [food to eat]. David needs to be nourished, so he calls out to his servants, then they put together a meal for him.

The Holy Spirit suggests that this is feeding upon the Word of God regularly. David has returned to a routine, and that routine includes eating. We may understand that, even though David is chowing down on real food here; the idea is, he will need to be sustained by a regular intake of Bible doctrine.

So ends a series of 8 3rd person masculine singular, imperfect verbs strung together by wâw consecutives. David then got up off the ground and washed [himself] and anointed [himself] with oils. He also changed his clothing and went to the house of Y’hovah and worshiped [there]. Then he went to his house and requested [food to eat]. I have broken this up into several sentences and have used a variety of connectives and past-tense verbs, which do not really convey the information accurately. More accurately, the translation is And so rises up David from the earth; and so he washes [himself] and so he anoints [himself] and so he changes his clothes. And so he goes [to] a house of Y’hovah and so he worships. And so he goes unto his house and so he asks. Even separating these into sentences is artificial. All of these things are actual events, and all of them indicate David’s spiritual state, and that he is now moving forward in the spiritual life.

---

### 2Samuel 12:20i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and, so, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s #253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel Chapter 12

Hebrew/Pronunciation | Common English Meanings | Notes/Morphology | BDB and Strong’s Numbers
--- | --- | --- | ---
ṣīym (いか) [pronounced seem]; also spelled sūwm (ψιωμ) [pronounced soon] | to put, to place, to set; to make; to appoint | 3rd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect | Strong’s #7760 BDB #962
lâmêd (ךנֵד) [pronounced ‘m] | to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by | directional/relational preposition with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix | No Strong’s # BDB #510
lechem (ךנֵד) [pronounced LEH-khem] | literally means bread; used more generally for food | masculine singular noun | Strong’s #3899 BDB #536

Translation: They placed food before him... David’s servants place food before him, just as God the Father has made all of the arrangements for us to take in Bible doctrine. He has provided a temporal cleansing (the naming of our sins) followed by the endument of God the Holy Spirit.

David has now returned to a normal routine, which confuses his servants.

Hebrew/Pronunciation | Common English Meanings | Notes/Morphology | BDB and Strong’s Numbers
--- | --- | --- | ---
wa (or va) (ז) [pronounced wah] | and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because | wâw consecutive | No Strong’s # BDB #253
‘ākal (אכ) [pronounced aw-KAHL] | to eat; to devour, to consume, to destroy | 3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect | Strong’s #398 BDB #37

Translation: ...and he ate [it]. David partakes of this meal which his servants have prepared for him. He is physically nourished, and you will note, that took second place to being spiritually nourished.

Under the surface, David will now take in doctrine regularly, as he is back into a routine, just as he takes in food regularly.

David’s servants are perplexed by all of this. They would have expected for David’s mourning to intensify, and yet, David is suddenly back to a normal routine.

The entire verse reads: David then got up off the ground, washed himself and anointed himself with oils. He also changed his clothing and went to the house of Jehovah and worshiped there. Then he went to his house and requested a meal. His servants placed food before him and he ate it.

David’s Return to Leadership Function

1. You will note that David had to demand service before anyone would serve him a normal meal. The thinking of his staff is still back in v. 17 (And the elders of his house stood beside him, to raise him from the ground, but he would not, nor did he eat food with them).
2. The palace staff incorrectly assumed that David’s fasting and prayer would intensify after his son death.
David’s Return to Leadership Function

In their thinking, the death of his son is much worse than the son's illness; and therefore, David’s reaction should be intensified.

3. However, David is a mature believer with doctrine in his soul. This is how David’s recovery is different from a person in reversionism. In reversionism, we revert back to our pre-salvation lives, which includes a retrogression from spiritual growth. David, although he has been in interlocking systems of arrogance, he has maintained, to a reasonable degree, his spiritual growth. It was just buried underneath all of that arrogance.

4. Therefore, David can apply the rationales of a mature believer. He is able to immediately return to a normal routine.

5. Because of his status in life, David must go back to being a king. When we have some great tragedy in our lives, we return to our routine and to our vocation.

6. In order for a leader to be great, he must be well-organized and self-disciplined, and this is the life to which David will return.

7. Many kings have their reign destroyed because they are disorganized, poorly focused or cannot settle into a reasonable routine.

8. If David is going to return to being a great king, he must eat, exercise, and tend to his own spiritual growth. In other words, he must return to a legitimate routine.

9. It is nearly impossible for a disorganized person to function as a leader; simply because he is unable to adhere to a routine or to set up legitimate priorities.

10. Disorganized thinking leads to a disorganized life.

11. A leader is surrounded by advisors and underlings; he must be able to properly evaluate their input. If everyone around him is like-minded or unable to express their opinion, then a leader cannot lead.

12. People who are distracted (for instance, by their own lusts) tend to be disorganized as well. Disorganized people are unable to focus on the issues or problems of the day.

13. David is recovering his spiritual equilibrium and redeveloping a legitimate personal life. The cursing of his arrogance is being turned to blessing.

David Returns to Normal Thinking and to a Normal Life

1. Just because David was grieving and praying while on the floor for a week, does not mean that David had stopped thinking. While he was on the floor, David began to think doctrine and to apply the pertinent doctrine to his adversity. We know this because of what he says to his servants when they question his actions.

2. Therefore, in this adversity, David began to think in terms of doctrine; he began to think divine viewpoint.

3. After his son died, David gets up and he is thinking divine viewpoint. We know this because of his return to routine and because of what he tells his servants.

4. As he returned to a solitary routine of taking a bath and putting on clean clothes, David began to organize his thinking and planning.

5. He used the normal oils and lotions, which today would be shaving lotion and deodorant.

6. After David organized his appearance, all the while, thinking divine viewpoint, he went to the tent where the Ark of God was (the Tabernacle was elsewhere at this time).

7. Even though David was hungry he also recognized that spiritual food must come before physical food.

8. David has emerged from the interlocking systems of arrogance. We do not know exactly when this occurred, but it probably began when Nathan leveled with him, and when facing this grave personal crisis.

9. He is getting his thinking, his priorities and his routine straight.

10. Although he was out of the interlocking systems of arrogance, full recovery would take about 10 years.

11. When David returned to the castle, his staff assumed that David would have no appetite. Therefore,
David Returns to Normal Thinking and to a Normal Life

David must call for them to prepare a meal for him. David is starved.

12. Normalized thinking produces a normal appetite.
13. While David was dining, his servants were nonplused. They did not understand his radical change of behavior, so they will question him about it.
14. In any case, David’s servants continue to respect his authority, even though they are confused by his actions.

And so say his servants, “What is the word the this which you have done? While the child [was] alive you fasted and so you kept weeping. And, as that died the child, you got up and so you are eating bread?”

His servants then said to him, “What is this thing you have done? While the child [was] alive, you fasted and kept weeping; however, now that [lit., just as] the child died, you got up and you are [now] eating bread.”

David’s servants then asked him, “What is this that you are doing? When the child was alive, you fasted and you kept weeping; however, once the child died, you got up and you are even now eating a meal. We are confused.”

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

Latin Vulgate
And his servants said to him: What thing is this that you have done? you fasted and weep for the child, while it was alive, but when the child was dead, you rose up, and ate bread.

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)
And so say his servants, “What [is] the word the this which you have done? While the child [was] alive you fasted and so you kept weeping. And, as that died the child, you got up and so you are eating bread?”

Peshitta (Syriac)
Then his servants said to him, What is this that you have done? While the child was still alive, you were fasting and praying, but when he was dead, you did rise up and eat food.

Septuagint (Greek)
And his servants said to him, What is this thing that you have done concerning the child? While the child was yet living you fasted and wept, and kept watch; but when the child was dead you rose up and ate bread, and drank.

Significant differences: The Syriac has David fasting and praying rather than fasting a weeping. The Greeks adds that David kept watch. The Greek also adds that David was drinking as well. Of all the differences in translation, these are perhaps 2 of the most dramatic, as found in the Greek. It is quite rare for a translator or for a copyist to insert words like these 2 verbs. On the other hand, they do not seem to really add much to the verse. Neither additional verb is dramatically troublesome, as neither one changes the meaning dramatically. In fact, these 2 additional verbs are probably among the greatest problems in the text of Samuel in this chapter. However, even these differences have little to do with our doctrinal understanding of the passage.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:
His officials said, "What are you doing? You went without eating and cried for your son while he was alive! But now that he's dead, you're up and eating."

His servants said, 'We do not understand why you are behaving like this. When the child was still alive, you refused to eat. You cried. The child has died now. But you get up and eat.'

David's servants said to him, "Why are you doing this thing? When the baby was still living you refused to eat. You cried. But when the baby died you got up and ate food."

"We don't understand this," his officials said to him. "While the child was alive, you wept for him and would not eat; but as soon as he died, you got up and ate!"

"What's going on with you? While the child was alive you fasted and wept and stayed up all night. Now that he's dead, you get up and eat."

"We don't understand you," they told him. "While the child was still living, you wept and refused to eat. But now that the child is dead, you have stopped your mourning and are eating again."

"What is this you have done? While the child was alive, you fasted and wept; now that the child is dead, you rise and take food."

His advisers were amazed. "We don't understand you," they told him. "While the child was still living, you wept and refused to eat. But now that the child is dead, you have stopped your mourning and are eating again."

Then his servants asked him, 'What is this thing you have done? While the child was alive, you fasted and wept; but now that the child is dead, you rose and ate something.'

"What is this word you do? You fasted and wept for the living boy, but because the boy died, and you rise and eat bread!"

"What is this you are doing? While the child was living, you fasted and wept and kept vigil; now that the child is dead, you rise and take food."

"What is this? While the boy lived you fasted and wept for him, but now that he is dead you rise and eat."

Then his servants said to him, Why have you been acting in this way? you were weeping and going without food while the child was still living; but when the child was dead, you got up and had a meal.

He courtiers asked him, "Why have you acted in this manner? While the child was alive, you fasted and wept; but now that the child is dead, you rise and take food!"

His servants said to him: "What is this? While the child was living, you fasted and wept; but now that the child is dead, you rise and eat."

His servants asked him, 'What is this? While the child was alive, you fasted and wept; but now that the child is dead, you rise and eat food."

His attendants asked him, "Why are you acting this way? While the child was alive, you fasted and wept, but now that the child is dead, you get up and eat!"
Afterwards his staff/servants said to him {David}, "Why are you behaving this way? While the child was alive, you fasted and wept. But when the child had died, you got up and ate food?"

And his servants say unto him, “What is this thing you have done? because of the living lad you have fasted and you weep, and when the lad is dead you have risen and you eat bread.”

The gist of this verse: David’s servants are nonplused. They ask him what he is doing. When the child was alive, David was fasting and weeping; and suddenly, after the child has died, David is back to normal again, and this confuses them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘âmar (אמר)</td>
<td>to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think</td>
<td>3rd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #559 BDB #55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ebed (עבד)</td>
<td>slave, servant</td>
<td>masculine plural noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5650 BDB #713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘el (אֵל)</td>
<td>unto; into, among, in; toward, to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to</td>
<td>directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied); with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #413 BDB #39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mâh (מה)</td>
<td>what, how, why</td>
<td>interrogative; exclamatory particle</td>
<td>Strong’s #4100 BDB #552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dâbîr (דבר)</td>
<td>word, saying, doctrine, thing, matter, command</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #1697 BDB #182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeh (זה)</td>
<td>here, this, this one; thus; possibly another</td>
<td>demonstrative adjective with a definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #2088, 2090 (&amp; 2063) BDB #260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’âsher (אשר)</td>
<td>that, which, when, who, whom</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
<td>Strong’s #834 BDB #81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’âsâh (עשׁה)</td>
<td>to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #6213 BDB #793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: His servants then said to him, “What is this thing you have done? David’s servants were quite confused by his behavior. It made sense for awhile. His child was quite ill, and David wept and fasted because of the boy’s illness. However, now David has began a set of behaviors which have confused his servants.
Bear in mind, these are the same servants who were, not but a few hours ago, afraid to even tell David that his young son had died. They had no idea about what David might do. What he is doing before their eyes is the exact opposite of what they expected him to do. None of his servants would have predicted his reaction at this point.

So far, this is what we have studied: When David saw his servants whispering among themselves, he realized that his child had died. He therefore said to his servants, “Is the child dead?” They answered him, “Yes, he is dead.” David then got up off the ground, washed himself and anointed himself with oils. He also changed his clothing and went to the house of Jehovah and worshiped there. Then he went to his house and requested a meal. His servants placed food before him and he ate it. David’s servants then asked him, “What is this that you are doing?”

David’s Palace Staff and Their Questions

1. David’s staff was focused upon David. When on duty, even if it was 24 hours, their focus was on David.
2. David’s palace staff were not concerned with peripheral issues; they did not try to have inordinate control over David. They did not take this opportunity of David’s extreme grief to try to influence him in some particular direction (apart from returning to normalcy as king).
3. Menial service was not beneath them. Palace staff are in charge of taking care of the king and all that entails, including cleaning, details, etc. They were not embarrassed to hold this position and they understood their jobs to be important and necessary.
4. We know this because of their concern for David and his well-being. People who dislike their position in life often dislike their boss as well, as if he had something to do with putting them where they are.
5. They apparently had a fairly open and good relationship with David. They were able to talk with him, man-to-man. This would have been a tone set by David.
6. Whatever your job is in life, you are to do it as unto the Lord. If you find yourself doing menial labor, do not think of it as beneath you; do not simply endure it grudgingly; you do your job as unto God.
7. Sometimes they understood David and sometimes they did not. It will become apparent that, when they do not understand David, it will be within their freedom to ask him about it.
8. Sometimes they approved of what David did and sometimes they did not. Although you ought not to remain in a job where illegal activity is occurring, what your boss does or doesn’t do is not your concern unless he provides you that option.
9. Here, it is obvious that David’s actions have confused his staff. They expect him to sink into new depths of sorrow, but he instead returns to normalcy.
10. Because of the atmosphere of the palace—which atmosphere was set by David—they are comfortable with asking David about it.
11. Whether they understand David or not, they still serve him. It is honorable to give good service; it is honorable to do your job well.
12. Becoming a good employee can be a result of training and mental attitude. For the unbeliever, it is understanding the laws of divine establishment; and for the believer, it is understanding doctrine. Personal character motivates the believer or unbeliever.
13. When you are encouraged not to work or when you are encouraged to rebel against the concept of work, that is evil.
   1) Work is the second divine institution. Man was designed for work. Adam was designed to work both in and out of the garden.
   2) When I was young, part of the propaganda I was fed by my peer culture was against work. I recall corporate types as being disparaged. I recall their being an anti-authority approach to life. I recall riots where people destroyed private property of businesses and stole private property.
   3) I recall phrases like good little worker bee being used to disparage working hard.
   4) I recall friends of mine collecting welfare when they had the ability to work.
   5) Our president wrote, in his book Dreams of my Father: Eventually a consulting house to a multinational corporation agreed to hire me as a research assistant. Like a spy behind enemy lines, I arrived every day at my mid-Manhattan office and sat at my computer terminal. This is someone who bought into the idea that, there is some kind of legal employment which is not legitimate.
14. David’s staff was just the opposite; they focused upon David, they did their jobs with integrity.
David’s Palace Staff and Their Questions

15. It is very likely that, when David was chasing skirt, that he became very hard to work under. Because he was focused on sex, he used his servants and was possibly abusive toward those who did not go along with these acts. However, David’s servants remained loyal to him.

16. It is very likely hat David’s staff believed in Jehovah Elohim, and that they were willing to stand back and allow God to deal with David.

17. Arrogance makes a person think that he needs to step in and straighten everyone else out; humility is willing to let God work.

18. Although David’s staff had to understand his personal likes and dislikes to serve him; they did not need to understand his moods. How David felt this or that day is unrelated to their ability to render good service.

19. Because they worked closely with David, his palace staff had come to learn many intimate details about David. What was different this time is, David would be under installment discipline—that was new.

20. Because of the atmosphere engendered by David, the questions of his staff were reasonable and did not exceed their boundaries as staff. In fact, this reveals a sincere interest in David and his thinking.

21. It is reasonable to believe that David imparted divine viewpoint to his staff regularly (when he was taking in doctrine and in fellowship). Remember Joab and the messenger he sent to David to tell him Uriah was dead? This was all then related to a Biblical narrative, which all 3 men had to understand. Therefore, these questions could indicate positive volition toward doctrine; an interest in why David has returned to normalcy.

22. Now that David’s son was dead, they expected that David’s grief would become more intensive. However, he did everything a normal king on a normal day would do, including his order for food and drink. This sudden change interested his staff, and David’s answer would include a very important spiritual principle which is held to by many bereaved parents today.

23. All believers are servants of Jesus Christ. We are given His Word by which we may understand Him better. The more we understand the Word, the more we understand Jesus Christ.

Again our passage reads: When David saw his servants whispering among themselves, he realized that his child had died. He therefore said to his servants, “Is the child dead?” They answered him, “Yes, he is dead.”. David then got up off the ground, washed himself and anointed himself with oils. He also changed his clothing and went to the house of Jehovah and worshiped there. Then he went to his house and requested a meal. His servants placed food before him and he ate it. David’s servants then asked him, “What is this that you are doing?

The Application of Integrity to Servitude

1. Personal integrity is required in order to be a good servant; and personal integrity is required in order to be a good employee.

2. No legitimate job should be looked down upon, regardless of its menial nature or low pay.

3. No matter how you rate your own job in some sort of hierarchy of jobs, you are still to work your job as unto the Lord. You are not to goof off; you are not to read your Bible on the job; you are not to steal from your company; you are to put in a full day’s work, working to the best of your ability. This is personal integrity.

1) When I was younger, I had a small, one-man janitorial company. I can recall specific things which I did that showed a lack of integrity. I can recall, in some instances, not putting forth the amount of effort that I should have put forth. As a result, I lost two accounts, and rightfully so.

2) It is important that we exhibit integrity in all that we do. I can recall another instance where I chose to do the right thing (maintaining a mortgage of a house where I was losing money). The end result was, I was able to accumulate additional properties and I was able to refinance some other loans as well.
The Application of Integrity to Servitude

3) You ought to be able to look back at your own life and note where a lack of integrity worked against you and functioning under integrity resulted in blessing.

4. In many cases, confidentiality is an issue. These servants should keep David’s life confidential; they should keep his personal habits confidential.

5. In your job, there are often matters which should remain confidential. Apart from illegal activity, it is reasonable for you to maintain confidentiality.

6. David’s life is private, but his servants have a front row seat to observe him. When he does wrong, it is not up to his servants to discipline him or to go out and gossip all over Jerusalem about what David is doing. God can handle all the discipline.
   1) Similarly, an employee who gossips about the owner or the one in charge, is dishonorable. When you work for someone else, your job is to work on the basis of principle, which means no gossiping or maligning.
   2) It is not your job to report your boss to the IRS or to OSHA over your suspicions. It is your job to function with great integrity and loyalty.

7. David had a good rapport with his staff, and this was based upon his mental attitude and upon the integrity of the staff. Therefore, David would answer their questions, and his answer would be based upon doctrinal principles.

8. When David gave his staff a doctrinal answer, they would then recognize that David is back on track, and that God did all of the redirecting.
   1) The servants felt badly that David’s son died. They understood David’s grief while the child was ill.
   2) Those of his servants with doctrine recognized that God was probably dealing with David.
   3) Many members of his staff knew, to a limited degree, what David had been up to; however, they did not get involved, so that God could act directly.
   4) Do not get in God’s way when He rains down discipline on someone else. It is not your job to help God in this regard.

9. Most of David’s servants have been with David for a long time. Therefore, most of them had a reasonable understand of David and his thinking.

10. However, at this point, they are confused. They were not confused by David’s grief while his son was seriously ill. However, they were confused about David’s actions after his son died. Therefore, they will ask David about this, and David will teach them a point of doctrine.

---

2Samuel 12:21b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ba’āḇûwr</td>
<td>because of, for, that, for the sake of, on account of, in order that; while</td>
<td>preposition/conjunction; substantive always found combined with the bêyth preposition</td>
<td>Strong’s #5668 BDB #721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יֵלֵ֯ד</td>
<td>child, one born; son, boy, youth</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article; pausal form</td>
<td>Strong’s #3206 BDB #409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actually a combination of the bêyth preposition (in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before) and ‘āḇûwr (רֹצְע) [pronounced gaw-BOOR] which means a passing over, a transition; the cause of a crossing over; the price [of transferring ownership of something]; purpose, objective. Properly, it is the passive participle of Strong’s #5674 BDB #720. Strong’s #5668 BDB #721.
Translation: While the child [was] alive, you fasted and kept weeping;... Notice that there is a difference of tenses above. David’s fasting is in the Qal perfect. This indicates that he fasted for a period of time. Maybe afterwards, he ate a little, but very little. Or, perhaps he fasted for several long intervals—a day or two at a time. However, all during this time, David wept. He continued to cry, whether fasting or not. Qal imperfect. That indicates a future or a continuous action.

I have noticed that several words in this chapter are onomatopoetic, like to weep, which is bâkâh (בָּקָה) [pronounced baw-KAW]. The verb itself sounds like a person is crying.

As an aside, noticed how much God thought about all this weeping. David was fasting and he was praying, but notice that God did not respond to David’s emotions. God understands that human emotions are fleeting things. You may not like this, but, your emotions do not move God. You can cry and pitch a fit and just be filled with all kinds of emotions, and these do not move God one iota. No doubt, David’s emotions in this situation were intense, yet God told David that this son would die, and so the son died. You may know how to manipulate this or that person with your emotions, but you cannot move or manipulate God. His plan is perfect, and if you desire that which is outside of his plan, it just isn’t going to happen.

How many people, under great pressure, have promise so much to God, and, once the pressure was off, acted as if their words to God meant nothing at all. How many soldiers on the battlefield looked to God for help and made promises to Him, but did not keep these promises. How many people have been under tremendous pressure to a point that they broke down, and looked to God, also making promises if they could be removed from that pressure. And, a few days or weeks later, all of that is over with and done. What about their promises? What you promise that you will do and what you actually do means something to God. It does not matter if you make all of these promises to Him when under great emotional stress. If you promise something to God, then you need to stand by it.
2Samuel 12:21c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kaph or k (כ)</td>
<td>like, as, according to; about, approximately</td>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'āsher (אשֶר)</td>
<td>that, which, when, who, whom</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
<td>Strong’s #834 BDB #81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mûwth (موت)</td>
<td>to die; to perish, to be destroyed</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #4191 BDB #559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeled (יֵלֵד)</td>
<td>child, one born; son, boy, youth</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article; pausal form</td>
<td>Strong’s #3206 BDB #409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qûwm (קום)</td>
<td>to stand, to rise up, to get up; to establish, to establish a vow, to cause a vow to stand, to confirm or to fulfill a vow</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #6965 BDB #877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...however, now that [lit., just as] the child died, you got up... Once the child died, David had an abrupt change of behavior. He immediately got up off the ground. His servants expected David to lay there for another few days, in great sorrow.

David will explain the change of behavior to his men, and therein will be one of the most comforting doctrine that any parent could embrace.

2Samuel 12:21d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'âkal (אכָל)</td>
<td>to eat; to devour, to consume, to destroy</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #398 BDB #37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lechem (לחם)</td>
<td>literally means bread; used more generally for food</td>
<td>masculine singular noun; pausal form</td>
<td>Strong’s #3899 BDB #536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and you are [now] eating bread.” Note that to get up was in the perfect tense. It only takes a moment for David to get up off the ground. David did that in a point of time. However, eating is in the imperfect tense, indicating that David was probably eating while they were making these remarks. These servants are beside themselves with curiosity, and cannot wait until the end of the meal in order to ask David about his behavior.
2Samuel 12:22

And so he says, “While yet the child [is] alive, I fasted and so I kept weeping, for I said, ‘Who knows; is gracious [to] me Y’hovah and [is] living the child.’

David then answered, “While the child was still alive, I fasted and continued weeping, for I thought [to myself], ‘Who knows? Perhaps Y’hovah will be gracious [to] me and the child [will] live.’

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

- Latin Vulgate
  - And he said: While the child was yet alive, I fasted and wept for him: for I said: Who knows whether the Lord may not give him to me, and the child may live?

- Masoretic Text (Hebrew)
  - And so he says, “While yet the child [is] alive, I fasted and so I kept weeping, for I said, ‘Who knows; is gracious [to] me Y’hovah and [is] living the child.’

- Peshitta (Syriac)
  - David said to them, While the child was still alive, I fasted and prayed; for I said, Who knows whether God will be gracious to me, and let the child live?

- Septuagint (Greek)
  - And David said, While the child yet lived, I fasted and wept; for I said, Who knows if the Lord will pity me, and the child should live?

**Significant differences:**

The Syriac has *prayed* instead of *wept*. The Greek, Syriac and Latin insert *if* or *whether* in order to smooth out the translation (it is definitely found in the Greek; and in the English translations from the Latin and Syriac). The verb *pity* in the Greek is a legitimate translation of the Hebrew verb. However, *may not give him* in the Latin is an oddity because of the negative. *To give* is very close to the Hebrew verb found in our text.

One more note: there is an alternative reading on the final verb in the Hebrew, which will be seen in the Hebrew exegesis (the only difference is the stem and tense of the verb).

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

- **CEV**
  - David answered: While he was still alive, I went without food and cried because there was still hope. I said to myself, “Who knows? Maybe the LORD will have pity on me and let the child live.”

- Easy English (Pocock)
  - David said, ‘When the child was still alive, I refused to eat. I cried. I thought that the Lord might be kind to me. He might let the child live.’

- Easy-to-Read Version
  - David said, “While the baby was still living, I refused to eat and I cried because I thought, ‘Who knows? Maybe the Lord will feel sorry for me and let the baby live,’

- Good News Bible (TEV)
  - "Yes," David answered, "I did fast and weep while he was still alive. I thought that the LORD might be merciful to me and not let the child die.

- New Life Bible
  - David said, "I went without food and cried while the child was still alive, for I said, ‘Who knows? The Lord might be kind to me and let the child live.’

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

- **Ancient Roots Translinear**
  - He said, "As the boy lived, I fasted and wept. For I said, 'Who knows? Yahweh could grace me, and the boy would live.'

- **God’s Word™**
  - David answered, "As long as the child was alive, I fasted and cried. I thought, 'Who knows? The LORD may be gracious to me and let the child live.'
New American Bible

He replied: "While the child was living, I fasted and wept, thinking, 'Perhaps the LORD will grant me the child's life.'

NIRV

He answered, "While the child was still alive, I didn't eat anything. And I cried a lot. I thought, 'Who knows? The Lord might show favor to me. He might let the child live.'

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

Bible in Basic English

And he said, While the child was still alive, I fasted and wept, because I thought, 'Who can tell if God will be gracious to me so that the child may live?'

Complete Jewish Bible

He answered, "While the child was still alive, I fasted and wept; because I thought, 'Maybe ADONAI will show his grace to me and let the child live.'

NET Bible®

He replied, "While the child was still alive, I fasted and wept because I thought [Heb "said."]], 'Perhaps [Heb "Who knows?"] the LORD will show pity and the child will live.

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

exeGeses companion Bible

And he says, While the child is yet alive, I fast and weep: for I say, Who can tell if God will be gracious to me so that the child may live?

Green's Literal Translation

And he said, While the boy was alive, I fasted and wept. For I said, Who knows? Jehovah may be gracious to me and the boy may stay alive.

Heritage Bible

And he said, While the child was alive, I fasted and wept, because I said, Who can know by seeing - and Jehovah may stoop down in grace to me, and the child may live?

Modern KJV

And he said, While the child was still alive, I fasted and wept; for I said, Who can tell if God will be gracious to me so that the child may live?

New RSV

And he said, "While the child was alive, I fasted and wept; for I said, 'Who can tell whether the LORD[a] will be gracious to me, that the child may live?'

Syndein

Consequently, he {David} replied/said, "While the child was yet alive, I fasted and wept . . . for I thought to myself, 'Perhaps/Possibly . . . {idiom: literally 'Who can tell . . .'} Jehovah/God will be gracious to me . . . {actually this is an 'arrogance hangover' of David's year in the interlocking gates of arrogance. His idea of 'grace' here if for God to give him what HE wants - instead of what God's justice demands. It is only by the grace of God that David himself is still alive!] that the child may live?'

World English Bible

He said, While the child was yet alive, I fasted and wept: for I said, Who knows whether Yahweh will not be gracious to me, that the child may live?

Young's Updated LT

And he says, "While the lad is alive I have fasted, and weep, for I said, Who knows? —Jehovah does pity me, and the lad has lived.

The gist of this verse:

David tells his servants that he had hoped that God would be gracious toward him and allow the child to live.
2Samuel 12:22a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ᾀmar (אמר)</td>
<td>to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #559 BDB #65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b원 (ב)</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ᾀѡd (וד)</td>
<td>still, yet, again, besides, in addition to, even yet</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Strong’s #5750 BDB #728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the bêyth preposition, ᾀѡd means while, while yet, while [it is] still; while [it is] yet, in the time that; within.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yeled (יֵלֶד)</th>
<th>child, one born; son, boy, youth</th>
<th>masculine singular noun with the definite article</th>
<th>Strong’s #3206 BDB #409</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chay (חי)</td>
<td>living, alive, active, lively, vigorous [used of man or animals]; green [vegetation]; fresh [used of a plant]; flowing [water]; reviving [of the springtime]; raw [flesh]</td>
<td>masculine singular adjective</td>
<td>Strong’s #2416 BDB #311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsūwm (צוּם)</td>
<td>to abstain from food, to fast</td>
<td>1st person singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #6684 BDB #847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bâkâh (בַּקָּה)</td>
<td>to weep, to cry, to bewail</td>
<td>1st person singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #1058 BDB #113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** David [lit., he] then answered, “While the child was still alive, I fasted and continued weeping.... You will note that David uses the same tenses of these verbs as did his servants. To fast is in the perfect tense, indicating a punctiliar action or past event. However, to weep is in the imperfect tense, indicating that David continued to weep throughout his child’s illness. In fact, this suggests that David continues to weep for his child (which would not be out of the ordinary).

As an aside, the perfect tense of fasting versus the imperfect tense of weeping further suggests that David did not fast all 7 days. He wept all 7 days, but he certainly did not fast for that period of time.
### 2Samuel 12:22b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kîy (כִּי) [pronounced kee]</td>
<td>when, that, for, because</td>
<td>explanatory conjunction; preposition</td>
<td>Strong’s #3588 BDB #471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘āmar (אָמַר) [pronounced aw-MAHHR]</td>
<td>to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think</td>
<td>1st person singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #559 BDB #55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mîy (מִי) [pronounced mee]</td>
<td>who, whom; whose, whomever; what; occasionally rendered how, in what way</td>
<td>pronominal interrogative; the verb to be may be implied</td>
<td>Strong’s #4310 BDB #566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yâda’ (יָדָא) [pronounced yaw-DAHG]</td>
<td>knowing, knowing by experience [or practice]; skilled; seeing</td>
<td>Qal active participle</td>
<td>Strong’s #3045 BDB #393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chânân (חָנָן) [pronounced khaw-NAHN]</td>
<td>to make gracious [favorable]; to be gracious; to make acceptable</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Piel imperfect; with the 1st person singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #2603, #2589 BDB #335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Hebrew Bible, the scribes did not alter any text they felt had been copied incorrectly. Rather they noted in the margin what they thought the written text should be. The written variation is called a kethiv and the marginal note is called the qere.

The qere reading is the Qal perfect of the same verb:

| chânân (חָנָן) [pronounced khaw-NAHN] | to bend, to stoop over, to show grace [favor] [often as a superior would do on behalf of an inferior], to show mercy, to be gracious; to be favorably inclined [toward someone]; to give [someone something] out of grace | 3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect with the 1st person singular suffix | Strong’s #2603, #2589 BDB #335 |

| YHWH (יהוה) [pronunciation is possibly yhoh-WAH] | transliterated variously as Jehovah, Yahweh, Y’howah | proper noun | Strong’s #3068 BDB #217 |
| w (or v) (ו or ה) [pronounced weh] | and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though | simple wāw conjunction | No Strong’s # BDB #251 |
| chay (חי) [pronounced KHAH-ee] | living, alive, active, lively, vigorous [used of man or animals]; green [vegetation]; fresh [used of a plant]; flowing [water]; reviving [of the springtime]; raw [flesh] | masculine singular adjective | Strong’s #2416 BDB #311 |
| yeled (יֵלֵד) [pronounced YEH-led] | child, one born; son, boy, youth | masculine singular noun with the definite article; pausal form | Strong’s #3206 BDB #409 |
Translation: ...for I thought [to myself], ‘Who knows? [Perhaps] Y’hovah will be gracious [to] me and the child [will] live.’ David continued to have hope as long as the child was alive. He continued to pray that God would be gracious toward him and allow this child to live.

It ought to be clear in this passage that David prays to God about the child while the child is alive. However, once the child dies, this is out of David’s hands. He is no longer praying to God on behalf of this child.

What follows comes from When Critics Ask.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prayers for the Dead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Samuel 12:21–23 —Should we pray for the dead?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROBLEM:** Based on a verse in 2 Maccabees 12:46 (Douay), Roman Catholics believe it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins. However, David refused to pray for his dead son. Does the Bible teach that we should pray for the dead?

**SOLUTION:** There is nothing in inspired Scripture that supports the Roman Catholic doctrine of praying for the dead that they may be released from their sins. This conclusion is based on strong evidence from many passages. First, the only verse supporting prayers for the dead comes from the 2nd century B.C. apocryphal book of 2 Maccabees (see comments on 1 Cor. 3:13–15) which the Roman Catholic Church added to the Bible in A.D. 1546 in response to the Reformation that condemned such practices.

Second, the doctrine of prayers for the dead is connected with the unbiblical doctrine of purgatory. The prayers are for the purpose of releasing them from purgatory. But there is no basis for the belief in purgatory (see comments on 1 Cor. 3:13–15).

Third, nowhere in all of inspired Scripture is there a single example of any saint who prayed for the dead to be saved. Surely as passionately as many saints wished for their loved ones to be saved (cf. Rom. 9:1–3), there would be at least one example of a divinely approved prayer on behalf of the dead.

Fourth, the Bible makes it unmistakably clear that death is final and there is no hope beyond the grave. Hebrews declared, “it is appointed for men to die once, but after this the judgment” (Heb. 9:27). Jesus spoke of those who rejected Him as dying “in their sins” (John 8:21, 24), which implies that there is no hope for sins beyond the grave.

Fifth, Jesus set the example in John 11 by weeping for the dead and praying for the living. Upon coming to His friend Lazarus’ grave, “Jesus wept” (v. 35). Then He prayed for “the people who are standing by … that they may believe” (v. 42).

Sixth, the dead pray for the living (cf. Rev. 6:10), but there are no instances in the inspired Word of God where the living pray for the dead. The martyred saints in glory were praying for vengeance on the wicked (Rev. 6:9). And since there is rejoicing in heaven over one soul saved on earth (Luke 15:10), there is no doubt that there is prayer in heaven for the lost. But the Bible does not hold out even the slightest hope for anyone who dies in their sins (see comments on 2 Thess. 1:9).

There is no need for me to cover this doctrine, as Geisler and Howe did such a terrific job.

Norman Geisler and Thomas Howe, When Critics Ask; Victor Books; taken from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:21–23.

**Chapter Outline**

God knows best. I lost an uncle before I was born; a cousin; and a nephew (the latter two were miscarriages, I believe). God has His reasons when he takes life from us. He knows all of the facts, He knows every possible outcome and result of every volition, and He takes this into consideration. David will face a revolution, in part because he committed adultery with the wife of one of his soldiers and then he had that soldier killed. However,
as we have studied, although much of this could have been pieced together, very few people actually had any firsthand knowledge of what occurred (Joab knew about the murder; Bathsheba’s grandfather knew about the rape/adultery). Both men probably assumed the worst about David—that he committed the other sin as well. Had there been a child, conceived while Uriah was clearly at war, he would be a walking reminder to everyone in Jerusalem of what David had done. This could have changed the intensity of the rebellion as well as the timing, which, together, could have changed the outcome of the revolution. Perhaps this is why God took David’s son; perhaps there were other reasons; and perhaps, this is just discipline. In any case, this is God’s perfect plan.

And now he has died, for why this I keep fasting? Am I able to bring him back still? I am going unto him and he [even] he will not return unto me.”

And now he has died, so why should I continue fasting? Am I yet able to bring him back? I will go to him; but he [certainly] will not return to me.”

But now, the child has died, so there is no reason for me to continue fasting. Am I able to bring him back through fasting and weeping? Of course not! I will go to him, but he will certainly not return to me.”

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

Latin Vulgate

But now that he is dead, why should I fast? Shall I be able to bring him back any more? I shall go to him rather: but he shall not return to me.

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)

And now he has died, for why this I keep fasting? Am I able to bring him back still? I am going unto him and he [even] he will not return unto me.’

Peshitta (Syriac)

But now he is dead, why should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he cannot return to me.

Septuagint (Greek)

But now it is dead, why should I fast thus? Shall I be able to bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he cannot return to me.

Significant differences: It is legitimate to translate the first wâw conjunction as but. All translations agree on this verse.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

**CEV**

But now that he's dead, why should I go without eating? I can't bring him back! Someday I will join him in death, but he can't return to me.

**Easy English (Pocock)**

Now the child is dead. There is no reason for me to refuse food. I cannot make the child alive again. One day I will go to him. But he will not return to me.'

**Easy-to-Read Version**

But now the baby is dead. So why should I refuse to eat? Can I bring the baby back to life? No! Some day I will go to him, but he can't come back to me.”

**Good News Bible (TEV)**

But now that he is dead, why should I fast? Could I bring the child back to life? I will some day go to where he is, but he can never come back to me.”

**The Message**

But now that he's dead, why fast? Can I bring him back now? I can go to him, but he can't come to me.”

**New Century Version**

But now that the baby is dead, why should I fast? I can't bring him back to life. Someday I will go to him, but he cannot come back to me.”

**New Life Bible**

But now he has died. Why should I go without food? Can I bring him to life again? I will go to him, but he will not return to me.”

**New Living Translation**

But why should I fast when he is dead? Can I bring him back again? I will go to him one day, but he cannot return to me.”

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**
But now that he has died, why should I fast? I won't be able to go see him again or carry him to me, because I can't bring him back.'

But now he died. Why do I fast for this? Can I return him again? I will go to him, but he will never return to me."

But why should I fast now that he's dead? Can I bring him back? Someday I'll go to him, but he won't come back to me."

But now he's dead. So why should I go without eating? Can I bring him back to life again? Someday I'll go to him. But he won't return to me."

But now that he's dead, why should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I will go to him, but he will never return to me."

But now he is dead. Why should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I'll go to him, but he will never return to me." 

But now that he is dead, why should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me."

But now that he is dead, why should I fast? Shall I be able to bring him back any more? I shall go to him rather: but he shall not return to me.

But now that he is dead, why should I go on fasting? Can I bring him back again? I will go to him, but he will not return to me."

...and now, he has died, why [is] this--I fast? am I able to make him come back to life? I will go to him, but he will never come back to me.

But now he's dead, why should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I will go to him, but he will not return to me."

But now he is dead. Why should I fast? Am I able to bring him back? I will go to him, but he cannot return to me!"

But now that he is dead, why should I fast? I shall be able to bring him back again? I shall go to him rather: but he shall not return to me.

But now that he is dead, why should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I will go to him, but he will not return to me."

But now he has died; why should I fast? Am I able to bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me.

And now he has died. Why this, that I should fast? Am I able to bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me.

And now he has died; why should I fast? Am I able to bring him back again? I shall walk to him, and he shall not return to me.

And now he has died. Why this, that I should fast? Am I able to bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me."

But now he is dead; why should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me."

But now that he has died, why therefore should I fast? Can I 'resuscitate him'/'bring him back again'? I will be going to him {David will see his son in 19 years - after death at age 70 David does not mourn as those who have no hope . . . }, but he will not return to me."

And now, he has died, why is this— I fast? Am I able to bring him back again? I am going unto him, and he does not turn back unto me."

David says that he can accomplish nothing else by fasting. He cannot bring his son back by fasting. Therefore, David will go to his son (someday); his son will not return to him.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hebrew/Pronunciation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Common English Meanings</strong></th>
<th><strong>Notes/Morphology</strong></th>
<th><strong>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>w w</code> (or <code>v v</code>) (i, or i) [pronounced <code>weh</code>]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple <code>waw</code> conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>att</code> (ʔ英镑) [pronounced <code>gaht- TAWH</code>]</td>
<td>now, at this time, already</td>
<td>adverb of time</td>
<td>Strong’s #6258 BDB #773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When followed by an imperative or an interrogative, `w` + the adverb `att` mean and so, thus, things being so, therefore, now therefore. Sometimes, the concept of time is lost when this combination is used to incite another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hebrew/Pronunciation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Common English Meanings</strong></th>
<th><strong>Notes/Morphology</strong></th>
<th><strong>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>m</code> (pronounced <code>mooth</code>)</td>
<td>to die; to perish, to be destroyed</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #4191 BDB #559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>l</code> (pronounced <code>l</code>)</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by</td>
<td>directional/relation preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>m</code> (pronounced <code>maw</code>)</td>
<td>what, how, why</td>
<td>interrogative; exclamatory particle</td>
<td>Strong’s #4100 BDB #552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

`Lamed + mâh` can be rendered why, for what reason, to what purpose, for what purpose, indicating an interrogatory sentence. BDB also offers the rendering lest. Gesenius, perhaps for this passage alone (1Chron. 15:13), offers the rendering on account of [that] which, because that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hebrew/Pronunciation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Common English Meanings</strong></th>
<th><strong>Notes/Morphology</strong></th>
<th><strong>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>z</code> (י) [pronounced <code>zeh</code>]</td>
<td>here, this, this one; thus; possibly another</td>
<td>masculine singular demonstrative adjective</td>
<td>Strong’s #2088, 2090 (&amp; 2063) BDB #260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I suspect that all 3 particles above combine to mean something together. Gesenius suggests why then; various translators suggest why [should]; why [is] this; why.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hebrew/Pronunciation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Common English Meanings</strong></th>
<th><strong>Notes/Morphology</strong></th>
<th><strong>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>â</code> (י) [pronounced <code>aw-NEE</code>]</td>
<td>I, me; in answer to a question, it means I am, it is I</td>
<td>1st person singular, personal pronoun</td>
<td>Strong’s #589 BDB #58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ts</code> (ץ) [pronounced <code>zoom</code>]</td>
<td>to abstain from food, to fast</td>
<td>Qal active participle</td>
<td>Strong’s #6684 BDB #847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation**: And now he has died, so why should I continue fasting? David was fasting, weeping and praying. He will only explain why he is no longer fasting (as he eats his meal); however, this is also the explanation as to why he is no longer weeping and praying as well.

David now reasons with his servants. He explains himself.

**Application**: If you are in authority, then you ought to, now and again, explain yourself to those beneath you. Of course, you have to make quick decisions, and sometimes it seems like you are making them all of the time; however, now and again, those under you need some explanation as to why you zigged instead of zagged.

You will also notice that David is going to use some logic here. There is no reason for us to think that logic and the Christian life are somehow different roads on which to walk. God gave us a mind; He gave us a mind to consider ideas and to think things through, so we ought not to disregard that fact. David was fasting and weeping, because his son was still alive, and that meant, God may still choose to save the boy. However, now the child is dead. That is the end of that hope.
As an aside, when I begin a study like this, I often have questions from the outset, which questions I record as a hidden comment or bury in the document summary, so that I may go back from time to time, and figure out if the answer has become clear. The same is true for questions which occur while I exegete a chapter. As an example, in this chapter, I noticed that there were several different words for child which are used. That causes me to wonder why. The reasons became clear the second pass through of this chapter. In studying the Word of God, God does not want me to check my mind at the door; that would make little or no sense.

Application: Allow me this tangent—there is a false dichotomy set up today between faith and research, between religion and science. We are told, “Go ahead, believe whatever you want, but we, over here in science, have the real answers to scientific phenomenon.” What has happened, as science has become disengaged from faith, they have hooked up with politics, so that, science has not become more reasonable and more discerning, but they have become just another arm of liberalism, which is Satanic doctrine. A great example of this is global warming, and how global warming is going to destroy us. A scientist with faith knows that God is going to allow human history to play out on this earth, and that we are not going to destroy ourselves with global warming or with nuclear weapons or with anything else. And so, the hysteria comes from the godless left, who claim that science is their god and the final arbiter of all things; and those scientists who continue to have faith in God, end up being the most reasonable about this thing we call global warming. First of all, if you believe in global warming and that this is a man-made phenomenon which potentially could destroy us, then there are 2 things which you probably do not know: (1) what greenhouse gas is the most plentiful and has more of an effect upon global warming than all other greenhouse gases combined and multiplied by 100 (hint; it is not CO₂). (2) What percentage of greenhouse gases are produced by man and by the things which man does? You may be on either side of this controversy, and not know the answer to either of those questions, and yet still have a strong opinion on the matter. Because of our faith, we know human history will play out and that God will not allow the human race to be destroyed. However, because science has become so politicized, because it has departed from its spiritual roots, you rarely see either of those two questions addressed when dire warnings about global warming are being issued. My point in this is, God has given us a mind; God has given us the ability to reason, and God has not called the believer to ignore or turn off his mind. And the idea that there is some great divide between faith and science is simply a manufactured falsehood.

Application: The greatest minds in scientific history have been believers in Jesus Christ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḥā (ן) [pronounced heh]</td>
<td>interrogative particle which acts almost like a piece of punctuation, like the upside-down question mark which begins a Spanish sentence. The verb to be may be implied.</td>
<td>Strong’s #none BDB #209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yâkōl (יָכֹל) [also yâkōwl (יַכָּו)] [pronounced yaw-COAL]</td>
<td>to be able, can, to have the ability, to have the power to; to be able to bear; to be able to bring oneself [to do anything]; to be lawful, to be permitted; to be powerful, to prevail</td>
<td>1st person singular, Qal imperfect Strong’s #3201 BDB #407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לָמֶד) [pronounced lm']</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sometime, after you complete your Bible study, google or dogpile “global warming effects” and note that these 2 questions are probably not addressed on any of the web pages that you pull up.
Translation: Am I yet able to bring him back? David asks the simple question, “Is there some way I can bring my son back?” The answer, quite obviously, is no. There is nothing that David can do, at this point, to bring his child back to life. Again, this is simple logic.

Translation: I will go to him;... David’s choice of verb action is interesting. He does not use the simple Qal imperfect, which would indicate that, in the future, he will go to his son; but he uses the Qal active participle, which indicates that David is on a continual march to see his son. He is, every day, advancing toward his son. David has about 10 years of extended pressures before him (installment discipline) and perhaps 19 or 20 years left of his life. With each passing day, David is moving toward a reunion with this son in heaven.

Application: One of the things which occurs to me, from time to time is, my life is limited. I might live for another 10 or 20 years or even longer; but my body has an expiration date on it. Every single moment, I am advancing toward death; every single moment, I am moving toward death. There are things I would love to accomplish. At one time, I wanted to exegete the entire Old Testament. Well, that seems out of the question now, as it takes me 6 months to a year to complete the exegesis of one chapter of one book. However, I do want to complete Samuel, a few more psalms and the book of Genesis at least. The book of Judges as well. And Proverbs. All of that requires time. There are only so many hours in the day, and my brain is able to concentrate and work for 2 or
3 hours a day on this project (how R. B. Thieme, Jr. worked on exegeting the Bible for 8 and 10 hours a day, I will never know41).

So, David is not simply referring to some nebulous point off in the future—who knows when it is going to take place? He knows that with each step, he is moving toward the end of his life.

David also makes a remarkable statement here, that he would go to his son. There is every indication that this boy is an infant, and therefore, had no concept of Jehovah Elohim. We know that David has believe in Jehovah, so, logically, if David is going to his son, then, his son must be with Jehovah Elohim.

**Application:** This ought to provide great comfort for those who have lost a young child. Those who have believed in Jesus Christ will go to be with Jesus Christ at death, and they will be reunited with their young children who were taken in life.

Here is how this works, logically. We are born with a sin nature and with Adam’s original sin imputed to us. Therefore, as R. B. Thieme, Jr. concluded on many occasions, God does not like babies. Every child is born condemned from birth. Every child is born separated from God. However, because Jesus Christ died for that child’s sins (also cancelling out the rest of the debt against that child), all children are potentially saved and their names are in the Lamb’s book of life. A person remains there until they die, and have chosen not to believe in Jesus Christ. Then their name is removed from the Lamb’s book of life. Babies (or young children) who die prior to reaching the age of accountability never have this choice. Because they never reach the point in life of making this choice, they are automatically saved. A child’s sins are paid for by Jesus Christ on the cross. So, every child is potentially saved. All they have to do is believe in Jesus Christ. A child reaches God consciousness somewhere between age 3 and 20 (a point at which the child wonders about Who and What God is; or begins to think about the concept of God). At that point, they can go on positive or negative signals. That is, they can desire to know God or to know more about God; or they can decide, they just are not interested. If a child wants to know God, then it is God’s responsibility to bring the gospel to that child, which He always does. At the point of gospel hearing, the child becomes responsible for his choice. Prior to hearing the gospel, the child has no choice which is related to the Angelic Conflict. Every time a person believes in Jesus Christ, that is a tactical victory, so to speak, in the Angelic Conflict. A child who never gets to that point is not held responsible by God for his actions. We behave the same way toward our own children. For awhile, a child gets all of the slack in the world. They can do basically anything, and we let it go. However, somewhere around 1 or 2 (or earlier), we begin to use the word no in order to specify boundaries for that child. That is, we begin to help this child define his conscience, and the concept of right and wrong. However, prior to this, we let it go. That is, if a 3 month old child whines for his milk at 2 am, we do not go in there and reprimand him, saying, “Wait for breakfast; everyone is sleeping!” We feed the kid. However, when this child gets to be around 3 years old, we begin to teach him that he is not the center of the universe, and that, he does not get everything that he wants when he wants it. God treats children in much the same way. A child is born with a sin nature and with Adam’s original sin imputed to him, but God does not begin to impose penalties upon the child at the point of birth; God does not smite the child for its sins. The child stands judged or condemned at birth, but God does not carry out a judicial sentence at that point.

In this life, we are in the Angelic Conflict. We find ourselves in the midst of a conflict which began ages ago—maybe a hundred thousand years ago, maybe billions of years ago. God created Satan—the most beautiful creature to come from the hand of God—and Satan fell. Satan said, “I will be like the Most High.” Satan also took along with him a third of the angels. God judged and sentenced Satan and his angels (demons), but, prior to carrying out the sentence, throwing them all into the Lake of Fire, Satan appealed this sentence (which is a logical deduction, based upon the fact that God judged and sentenced Satan, but that he has not been yet thrown into the Lake of Fire). Satan, being a genius, probably laid out a large number of objections to his harsh sentence, all of which call God’s essence into question. “How can You be a God of love, and cast Your creatures into a Lake of Fire? We are creatures; You created us this way. How can we be held accountable for they way You created us?” What happened was, God allowed these objections to be heard, by all elect and fallen angels, and then He

41 It is not just me. There are doctrinal churches all over the United States, and most of them meet 3–4 times per week, which is a far cry from Bob’s one-time 10 lesson a week teaching schedule. Of those pastors that he inspired, no one is able to even do half of what Bob was able to do.
allowed His character and essence to be vindicated in human history. That is, God created man, and would reveal Satan’s character and God’s character in human history. God’s essence would be clearly obvious, throughout all human history, as would Satan’s. Satan’s actions in human history would show why his moment of egotism (“I will be like the Most High”) qualified him for eternal judgment. What we do on this earth, the choices that we make—particularly with regards to Jesus Christ—vindicate God’s character and heap condemnation upon Satan.

A child, who does not even have a concept of Who God is, is not yet on the playing field. He has not suited up and come onto the playing field yet. Therefore, he cannot be held accountable for the score of the game. And since Jesus Christ died for his sins, that child, prior to reaching the age of accountability, is saved.

See the doctrine of the Angelic Conflict (HTML) (PDF).

David explains all of this in this way: "While the child was still alive, I fasted and wept, for I said, 'Who knows whether the LORD will be gracious to me, that the child may live?' But now he is dead. Why should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he will not return to me." (2Sam. 12:22–23).

Geisler and Howe cover this in more detail in When Critics Ask. Their third position is the correct one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geisler and Howe on Do Infants Go to Heaven?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2Samuel 12:23</strong> —Do those who die in infancy go to heaven?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROBLEM:** The Scriptures teach that we are born in sin (Ps. 51:5) because we “all sinned [in Adam]” (Rom. 5:12). Yet David implies here that his baby, who died, will be in heaven, saying, “I shall go to him” (v. 23).

**SOLUTION:** There are three views regarding children who die before the age of accountability, that is, before they are old enough to be morally responsible for their own actions.

- **Only Elect Infants Go to Heaven.** Some strong Calvinists believe that only those babies that are predestined go to heaven (Eph. 1:4 Rom. 8:29). Those who are not elect go to hell. They see no greater problem with infant predestination than with adult predestination, insisting that everyone is deserving of hell and that it is only by God’s mercy that any are saved (Titus 3:5–6).

- **Only Infants Who Would Have Believed Go to Heaven.** Others claim that God knows the end from the beginning (Isa. 46:10) and the potential as well as the actual. Thus, God knows those infants and little children who would have believed in Christ had they lived long enough. Otherwise, they contend, there would be people in heaven who would not have believed in Christ, which is contrary to Scripture (John 3:36). All infants whom God knows would not have believed, had they lived long enough, will go to hell.

- **All Infants Go to Heaven.** Still others believe that all who die before the age of accountability will go to heaven. They base this on the following Scriptures. First, Isaiah 7:16 speaks of an age before a child is morally accountable, namely, “before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good.” Second, David believed in life after death and the resurrection (Psalm 16:10–11), so when he spoke of going to be with his son who died after birth (2Sam. 12:23), he implied that those who die in infancy go to heaven. Third, Psalm 139 speaks of an unborn baby as a creation of God whose name is written down in God’s “book” in heaven (vv. 14–16). Fourth, Jesus said, “Let the little children come to Me, and do not forbid them; for of such is the kingdom of God” (Mark 10:14), thus indicating that even little children will be in heaven. Fifth, some see support in Jesus’ affirmation that even “little ones” (i.e., children) have a guardian angel “in heaven” who watches over them (Matt. 18:10). Sixth, the fact that Christ’s death for all made little children savable, even before they believed (Rom. 5:18–19). Finally, Jesus’ indication that those who did not know were not morally responsible (John 9:41) is used to support the belief that there is heaven for those who cannot yet believe, even though there is no heaven for those who are old enough and refuse to believe (John 3:36).

Let's add that, David stated with a certainty that he was going to his son. Not all of David’s children are necessarily saved. David had no idea whether this child would have been saved or not; yet, he states with a certainty that he would go to him, and God the Holy Spirit recorded this in the Word of God, indicating that David is correct.
2Samuel 12:23d

Hebrew/Pronunciation | Common English Meanings | Notes/Morphology | BDB and Strong’s Numbers
---|---|---|---
\( \text{w} \) (or \( \nu \)) (\( \text{i} \) or \( \text{t} \)) [pronounced \( \text{weh} \)] | and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though | simple \( \text{w} \) \( \text{w} \) conjunction | No Strong’s # BDB #251
\( \text{hûw} \) (\( \text{ni} \) \( \text{x} \)) [pronounced \( \text{hoo} \)] | he, it; himself as a demonstrative pronoun: that, this | 3\text{rd} person masculine singular, personal pronoun | Strong’s #1931 BDB #214
\( \text{lô} \) (\( \text{î} \) \( \text{k} \) or \( \text{î} \) \( \text{ê} \)) [pronounced \( \text{low} \)] | not, no | negates the word or action that follows; the absolute negation | Strong’s #3808 BDB #518
\( \text{shûwb} \) (\( \text{ô} \) \( \text{ni} \)) [pronounced \( \text{shoo v} \)] | to return, to turn, to turn back, to reminisce, to restore something, to bring back something, to revive, to recover something, to make restitution | 3\text{rd} person masculine singular, Qal imperfect | Strong’s #7725 BDB #996
\( \text{êl} \) (\( \text{x} \) \( \text{ Ô} \)) [pronounced \( \text{ehl} \)] | unto; into, among, in; toward; to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to | directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied); with the 1\text{st} person singular suffix; pausla form | Strong’s #413 BDB #39

**Translation:** ...but he [certainly] will not return to me."  We have the emphatic use of the 3\text{rd} person masculine singular pronoun. It is not required, because it is a part of the verb. What David is saying here is emphatic. This child is not returning to him.  Game over, so to speak.  There will not be anything that David can do or say that will change that.  Death is final.

There are several psalms which are clearly associated with David’s great sin, and it is difficult to know when he wrote these psalms, and to what point in his life did they refer back to.  David, at different points in his life, endured great physical and emotional pain (Psalm 22:1–18 32:3–4). Personally, I would place Psalm 22 along side David’s life during the revolution, but Psalm 32 (HTML) (PDF) I believe is properly examined here.

---

The Birth of Solomon
And so comforts David Bathsheba his woman and so he goes unto her and so he lays down with her and so she bears a son. And so he calls his name Solomon and Y’howah loved him.

Soon thereafter, David comforted his wife, Bathsheba, and he went to her and lay with her, and she bore him a son. David called the boy’s name Solomon and Jehovah loved Solomon.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

**Latin Vulgate**
And David comforted Bethsabee his wife, and went in unto her, and slept with her: and she bore a son, and he called his name Solomon, and the Lord loved him.

**Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**
And so comforts David Bathsheba his woman and so he goes unto her and so he lays down with her and so she bears a son. And so he calls his name Solomon and Y’howah loved him.

**Peshitta (Syriac)**
And David comforted Bathsheba his wife, and he went in to her and lay with her; and she bore a son, and she called his name Solomon; and the LORD loved the child.

**Septuagint (Greek)**
And David comforted Bathsheba his wife, and he went in to her, and lay with her; and she conceived and bore a son, and he called his named Solomon, and the Lord loved him.

**Significant differences:** The Syriac has she naming Solomon, rather than he. The Greek adds the additional phrase and she conceived. If you look over the translations below, those with this additional phrase may be assumed to be following the LXX.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

**CEV**
David comforted his wife Bathsheba and slept with her. Later on, she gave birth to another son and named him Solomon. The LORD loved Solomon...

**Easy English (Pocock)**
The birth of Solomon
Then David comforted his wife Bathsheba. He slept with her and he had sex with her. Then she had another baby. David called him Solomon. The *Lord loved Solomon.

**Easy-to-Read Version**
Then David comforted Bathsheba his wife. He slept with her and had sexual relations with her. Bathsheba became pregnant again. She had another son. David named the boy Solomon. The Lord loved Solomon.

**Good News Bible (TEV)**
Then David comforted his wife Bathsheba. He had intercourse with her, and she bore a son, whom David named Solomon. The LORD loved the boy...

**The Message**
David went and comforted his wife Bathsheba. And when he slept with her, they conceived a son. When he was born they named him Solomon. GOD had a special love for him...

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

**American English Bible**
Then David went to comfort his wife BathSheba. Well, he went to bed with her again, and she got pregnant and gave birth to a son who she named Solomon, and Jehovah loved him.

**Ancient Roots Translinear**
David comforted Bathsheba his woman, and came into her and lay with her. She begot a son, and called his name Solomon (peace). Yahweh loved him...

**God’s Word™**
Then David comforted his wife Bathsheba. He went to bed with her, and she later gave birth to a son. David named him Solomon. The LORD loved the child...
Then David comforted his wife Bathsheba. He went to her and made love to her. Some time later she had a son. He was given the name Solomon...

David comforted his wife Bathsheba. He went to bed with her, and she later gave birth to a son. David named him Solomon. Jehovah loved the child.

Then David comforted his wife Bathsheba, and he went to her and made love to her. She gave birth to a son, and they named him Solomon. The LORD loved him;

 Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

And David gave comfort to his wife Bath-sheba, and he went in to her and had connection with her; and she had a son to whom she gave the name Solomon. And he was dear to the Lord.

David comforted his wife Bat-Sheva, came to her and went to bed with her; she gave birth to a son and named him Shlomo. ADONAI loved him...

David comforted his wife Bathsheba; he went to her and lay with her. She bore a son and she named him Solomon. The LORD favored him,...

And David comforted Bath-sheba his wife, and he came to her, and he lay with her; and she bore a son, and she called his name Solomon; and the Lord loved him.

So David comforted his wife Bathsheba. He went to her and had marital relations with her [Heb "and he lay with her."]. She gave birth to a son, and David [Heb "he"; the referent (David) has been specified in the translation for clarity. While some translations render the pronoun as third person plural ("they"), implying that both David and Bathsheba together named the child, it is likely that the name "Solomon," which is related to the Hebrew word for "peace" (and may be derived from it) had special significance for David, who would have regarded the birth of a second child to Bathsheba as a confirming sign that God had forgiven his sin and was at peace with him.] named him Solomon. Now the LORD loved the child [Heb "him," referring to the child].

Then David comforted his wife Bathsheba, and he went to her and made love to her. She gave birth to a son, and they named him Solomon. The LORD loved him;...

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

David comforted Bathsheba his wife, and went to her and lay with her; and she bore a son, and she called his name Solomon. And the Lord loved him;...

And David comforted Bathsheba his woman { or wife }, and went in to her, and lay with her: and she bore a son, and he named him Solomon. And YHWH gave allegiance to him;...

And David comforted Bath-sheba his wife, and went to her, and lay with her,—and she bare a son, and called his name, Solomon, and Yahweh loved him.

THE BIRTH OF SHELOMOH
And David sighs over Bath Sheba his woman and goes in to her and lies down with her; and she births a son and he calls his name Shelomoh: and Yah Veh loves him:

David comforted Bat-Sheva his wife, and went in to her, and lay with her: and she bore a son, and he called his name Shlomo. The LORD loved him;...

And David comforted his wife Bathsheba. And he went in to her, and lay with her. And she bore a son, and he called his name Solomon. And Jehovah loved him;...

And David comforted {nachim - Piel intensive stem} Bathsheba his wife, and approached her, and copulated/"had sexual relations' with her (shakab) with the result that she bore a son. And he {David} called his name Solomon {Sh@lomoh - peace, prosperity} and this anticipated the fact that Jehovah/God would him.
And David comforts Bath-sheba his wife, and goes in unto her, and lies with her, and she bears a son, and he calls his name Solomon; and Jehovah has loved him.

The gist of this verse: Because their son died, David comforted Bathsheba, who is called here, his wife, and he goes unto her, lays with her (i.e., has sex with her) and she has a son. David names the son Solomon, and God is said to love him.

2Samuel 12:24a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (i)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chief function of the wâw consecutive is to mark the continuation of a piece of narrative or discourse over at least one but more often several stages. The sequence they establish is essentially chronological, though not necessarily one of strict succession. This sequence of frequently logical as well. When dealing with a narrative of chronological succession, it may be reasonable to translate the wâw consecutive later, afterward, subsequently.

This verse with have 5 wâw consecutives followed by 5 imperfect verbs (4 of them are Qal imperfect verbs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nâcham (מָנַח)</td>
<td>to comfort, to console, to have compassion, to show compassion</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Piel imperfect</td>
<td>Strong's #5162 BDB #636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid (דָּוִד)</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong's #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'èth (אֵת)</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong's #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathsheba (בַּת-שֵׁבָה)</td>
<td>daughter of an oath; transliterated Bathsheba</td>
<td>feminine singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong's #1339 BDB #124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'îshshâh (אִשְׁשָׁה)</td>
<td>woman, wife</td>
<td>feminine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong's #802 BDB #61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: Soon thereafter [lit., and so], David comforted Bathsheba, his wife,... The death of their son was devastating to both David and Bathsheba. David was most affected prior to the child’s death. However, no doubt, Bathsheba was still very sad about it. Part of this comfort would be David explaining to her that the child was with God and that they would go to the child at some point in the future.

Bathsheba is called David’s woman in this passage, meaning that it is clear that, David was back in fellowship, as was Bathsheba, and God recognizes their union as husband and wife. She is no longer being called the wife of Uriah.

---

42 This is quoted almost verbatim from J.C.L. Gibson, Davidson’s Introductory Hebrew Grammar~Syntax; 4th Edition, © T&T Clark Ltd., 1994, pp. 83–84.
All of their sons are named in 2Sam. 5:14 1Chron. 3:5 14:4. Back in 2Sam. 5:14 (HTML) (PDF), we discussed how it is possible for all of David’s sons to be named so early in the narrative.

**2Samuel 12:24b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (i)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bôw (אָּבּ) [pronounced boh]</td>
<td>to come in, to come, to go in, to go, to enter</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #935 BDB #97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘el (אֶל) [pronounced ehl]</td>
<td>unto; into, among, in; toward, to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to</td>
<td>directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied); with the 3rd person feminine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #413 BDB #39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and he went unto her... What appears to be the case is, we have two euphemisms here for sex. David goes in unto her is one way of indicating that two people are having sex (Gen. 29:23 30:4 38:2). We have the imperfect tense here. The sense may be that we are logically following the action here, from comfort to having sex; however, the imperfect tense can also suggest continuous action, and it is possible that this was a continuous state of affairs—that is, David continued to go in unto Bathsheba.

The sense may be that, Bathsheba has her own room (as is probably the case for most of David’s wives), and that what is occurring here is, David is going into that room with the intention of having sex with her. This would mean that we are taking this verb in the literal sense (going into a room where Bathsheba is) and in its metaphorical sense (having sex with Bathsheba) both.

Although it is not stated directly here, there is the inference that David may have become monogamous at this point. That is, all of his sexual desires were fulfilled with Bathsheba.

I do not want you to get the wrong application here. The Bible is not telling you that it was okay for David to keep on marrying women until he found someone that he could be faithful to. Similarly, God is not telling you to go out and have sex with dozens of females until you can find someone that you can be faithful to. That God allowed David to meet and stay with his right woman, despite all that he has done, is extremely gracious. However, God will not do that for Solomon, David’s son. Solomon will have even more wives and mistresses, and he will still be chasing women (that is what the Song of Solomon is all about).

David’s fourfold discipline has just begun, which discipline is going to affect virtually every person in Israel, because of David’s great authority. So God chooses to bless David at this point; and David makes the wise decision to concentrate upon Bathsheba.

**2Samuel 12:24c**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (i)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2Samuel 12:24c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šâkab (שָׁקָב)</td>
<td>to lie down, to lie down [to sleep, to have sexual relations, to die; because of sickness or humiliation]; to relax</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7901 BDB #1011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘îm (אֵמ)</td>
<td>with, at, by, near; like; from</td>
<td>preposition of nearness and vicinity; with the 3rd person feminine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5973 BDB #767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and he lay with her,... We have a second euphemism for sex here (Gen. 19:33 30:16 34:2 2Sam. 11:11). This same verb was used when David first had sex with Bathsheba before (2Sam. 11:4) but it is certainly not used exclusively for this purpose (2Sam. 11:13).

I believe that there are several things being conveyed by the use of these two verbs in the imperfect tense. Although, in the narrative, this simply moves along the narrative (David comforts Bathsheba, going into her and laying down with her), this verse has the slight problem that we have two euphemisms for sex, and that each one is reasonably interpreted in that way. Therefore, we may reasonably assume that, these two uses in the imperfect tense indicate an ongoing (and legitimate) sexual relationship between David and his wife, Bathsheba. Now, our minds might be back in 2Sam. 11, how David took Bathsheba in adultery and possibly in rape, and then killed her husband; but this passage brings us up to date, where Bathsheba is David’s wife and this sexual union will produce a wonderful set of sons, two of whom are in the line of Christ. Even though the intent of this passage is to lead us to the birth of Solomon, the implication is, an ongoing sexual relationship between David and Bathsheba, one which may indicate monogamy on David’s part (I don’t believe that we will hear anything more about other sons being born to David by other wives after this point).

### 2Samuel 12:24d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wāw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yâlad (יָלָד)</td>
<td>to give birth, to bear, to be born, to bear, to bring forth, to beget</td>
<td>3rd person feminine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3205 BDB #408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bên (בֵּן)</td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
<td>masculine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and she bore [him] a son. What is occurring here is a marvelous event. David’s firstborn son by Bathsheba, will be Solomon, who wrote much of the Old Testament (Proverbs, Song of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, and possibly some psalms and some of the book of Kings). He will be a type of Jesus Christ, representing our Lord in His second advent, as King over all the earth. His reign will mark the high point of the history of the nation Israel.
2Samuel 12:24

Hebrew/Pronunciation | Common English Meanings | Notes/Morphology | BDB and Strong’s Numbers
--- | --- | --- | ---
wa (or va) (i) [pronounced wah] | and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because | wâw consecutive | No Strong’s # BDB #253
qârâ’ (רָאָ) [pronounced kaw-RAW] | to call, to proclaim, to read, to call to, to call out to, to assemble, to summon; to call, to name [when followed by a lamed] | 3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect | Strong’s #7121 BDB #894
‘êth (אָ) [pronounced ayth] | generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward | indicates that the following substantive is a direct object | Strong’s #853 BDB #84
shêm (שֵׁם) [pronounced shame] | name, reputation, character | masculine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix | Strong’s #8034 BDB #1027
Shlômôh (שְׁלֹמֹה) [pronounced shl-oh-MOH or shloh-MOH] | peace, peaceful; transliterated Solomon | masculine singular, proper noun | Strong’s #8010 BDB #1024

Translation: David [lit. he] called his name Solomon... I have no idea how the English Solomon was transliterated from the Hebrew Shlo-moe, but it certainly sounds a lot better to my English-speaking ears. This boy will grow up to be the great king who succeeds David.

If you are strongly legalistic, this would be a very difficult thing to grasp. David has taken this woman and possibly even raped her. Then he kills her husband. And now, he takes her as his wife, has sex with her, and the result is one of Israel’s greatest kings. That is God’s grace. That is God taking all things, mixing them together and making them come out good (Rom. 8:28).

Application: We all fail, but God’s grace remains (Heb. 4:16 1John 1:8, 10). We make a mess of things, and God mixes together all things to result in divine good (Rom. 8:28).

Solomon’s name means peace, peaceful; and this is our first hint that Solomon represents Jesus reigning over all the earth during the Millennium, which will be a time of peace and perfect environment. David represents the Lord Jesus Christ in His 1st and 2nd advents, but Solomon represents Him in His millennial reign. This is why Solomon, not David, builds the Temple.

God originally named Solomon: “Behold, a son shall be born to you who shall be a man of rest. I will give him rest from all his surrounding enemies. For his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quiet to Israel in his days.” (1Chron. 22:9). David then followed through by naming this boy Solomon.

The timing of this is quite fascinating. You will recall that David got it in his head to build a permanent dwelling for God—the Temple—after he had moved the Ark of God into Jerusalem (2Sam. 6–7). This resulted in the
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Davidic Covenant. However, at the same time, God also laid out the time that a Temple would be built. 1Chron. 22:1–16 Then David said, "Here shall be the house of the LORD God and here the altar of burnt offering for Israel." David commanded to gather together the resident aliens who were in the land of Israel, and he set stonemasons to prepare dressed stones for building the house of God. David also provided great quantities of iron for nails for the doors of the gates and for clamps, as well as bronze in quantities beyond weighing, and cedar timbers without number, for the Sidonians and Tyrians brought great quantities of cedar to David. For David said, "Solomon my son is young and inexperienced, and the house that is to be built for the LORD must be exceedingly magnificent, of fame and glory throughout all lands. I will therefore make preparation for it." So David provided materials in great quantity before his death. Then he called for Solomon his son and charged him to build a house for the LORD, the God of Israel. David said to Solomon, "My son, I had it in my heart to build a house to the name of the LORD my God. But the word of the LORD came to me, saying, 'You have shed much blood and have waged great wars. You shall not build a house to my name, because you have shed so much blood before me on the earth. Behold, a son shall be born to you who shall be a man of rest. I will give him rest from all his surrounding enemies. For his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quiet to Israel in his days. He shall build a house for My name. He shall be My son, and I will be his father, and I will establish his royal throne in Israel forever.' "Now, my son, the LORD be with you, so that you may succeed in building the house of the LORD your God, as he has spoken concerning you. Only, may the LORD grant you discretion and understanding, that when he gives you charge over Israel you may keep the law of the LORD your God. Then you will prosper if you are careful to observe the statutes and the rules that the LORD commanded Moses for Israel. Be strong and courageous. Fear not; do not be dismayed. With great pains I have provided for the house of the LORD 100,000 talents of gold, a million talents of silver, and bronze and iron beyond weighing, for there is so much of it; timber and stone, too, I have provided. To these you must add. You have an abundance of workmen: stonemasons, masons, carpenters, and all kinds of craftsmen without number, skilled in working gold, silver, bronze, and iron. Arise and work! The LORD be with you!"

So, quite awhile ago, God spoke to David through Nathan, telling him that he would have a son, Solomon, and that Solomon would be the one to build this Temple, which David had planned. We don’t hear about this until sometime later, because the thrust of 2Sam. 7 was the Davidic Covenant. There was no need to confuse the issue with the Temple and Solomon, who would build the Temple.

Solomon, like David, is a type of Christ. Solomon’s name means peace and Jesus is the Prince of Peace (Isa. 9:6). Jesus, in the Millennium, will rule over the earth, during a time of peace, just as Solomon will rule over Israel during a time of peace.

Speaking through Nathan, God told David about Solomon, after David had proposed to build a Temple to God: “When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your fathers, I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for My name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be to him a father, and he shall be to Me a son. When he commits iniquity, I will discipline him with the rod of men, with the stripes of the sons of men, but My steadfast love will not depart from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you. And your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before Me. Your throne shall be established forever.” (2Sam. 7:12–16). This little child is the man God promised to David. His kingdom being established forever, takes us into the Millennium, where Jesus Christ will rule over the earth for 1000 years.

Given David’s weakness, we may reasonably assume that, in between 2Sam. 7 and 2Sam. 12, David had sex with a number of women, and many of these encounters probably resulted in children. We know that David had at least 10 mistresses, and it is reasonable to assume that he had children by them during this time (we know that he did have children by mistresses). During this time period, despite his being jazzed about building a Temple and despite the Davidic Covenant, David did not name any of those children Solomon (insofar as we know).

Somehow, David knew that this was the son. We will examine this in more detail in the next verse.
**Translation:** ...and Y*howah loved him. We have had a series of wâw consecutives followed by imperfect verbs (future or continuous action), and suddenly, here, we have a wâw conjunction followed by the subject of the verb and then by a Qal perfect verb. This short phrase was designed to grab your attention. We know the history of David and Bathsheba. Because of how this relationship began, this should be the doomed relationship of that century, and yet, they have a child, and God loves that child.

The perfect tense indicates a point of time or a past action. God loves this child and he has done nothing, as of yet. He has simply been born, and God loves him. And, didn’t I just go off on a tangent about how, God hates babies? God knows the future. God knows that Solomon will believe in Him and that Solomon will go astray, and that Solomon will write a great many books of the Bible, about his going astray. He is the primary reason we men ought to think about marriage, and recognize that, it is not the quantity of wives that we are able to accumulate, but the quality of one woman. Solomon will have a 1000 wives and mistresses. He will be able to afford all of these wives and mistresses. He will be able to afford all of these wives and mistresses. And yet, he is not satisfied sexually or emotionally by all of these women; and he even pines after the woman in Song of Solomon.

The way God’s plan is devised, He is not going to allow we men to accumulate a bevy of wives, mistresses and girlfriends in order to prove to us that God has designed us to be with one woman. We may, from time to time, think we need to have a dozen or two dozen different women, but God allows Solomon to go through this very frustrating aspect of his life, and we are to learn from it. In fact, we learn a lot of things from Solomon, particularly in the book of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, two fairly antithetical books. The former appears to be what David taught Solomon and the latter appears to be Solomon going off on his own, finding out that there is no lasting satisfaction in the things of this world, apart from spiritual growth.

However, the reason that God really loves Solomon is, Solomon will believe in Jesus Christ (Jehovah Elohim) and therefore, have the righteousness of God in him, by imputation (Gen. 15:6), making God’s love for him legitimate, inasmuch as it does not violate God’s character to do so. Furthermore, Solomon will pursue wisdom (the knowledge of God and the proper application of the doctrines of God), and God is able to love Solomon because Solomon has the Word of God in his soul.

Let’s assume for just a moment that David is the author of this, and he writes the words ...and Y*howah loved him. How did David know this? Did he look down at the baby and decide that he was just too cute not to love? Of course not! Did he finally have love for this child and figured God must feel the same way? Of course not. There are times we will hear statements made in the Bible and we can speculate as to why they are made. There are
other times when the Bible tells us why a statement is made. When David penned the words ...and Y*howah loved him, he knew this for a fact, because God told him (next verse).

God loves His Own righteousness, and, when Solomon believes in Jehovah God (probably at a very young age), he will then possess God’s imputed righteousness. God relationship to us is not linear, and many of us are blessed because of that. That is, through all of those years that you were not a believer, God was not in heaven fuming over you, wanting to smite you. God knew that you would believe in His Son; God knew that righteousness would be imputed to you; God knew that you would grow spiritually. Our lives are linear; we are born, we live for awhile, we believe in Jesus Christ, and then we begin to grow spiritually. God is with us in time, but his relationship to us is defined by our salvation and by our spiritual growth. We know this because Y*howah loved Solomon (perfect tense).

God’s love is much different than we think it is. He does not fall in love, He does not grow to love us, and He does not love us more on the day that we do such great things for Him as opposed to the days that we are out of fellowship for most of the day.

Links to the Doctrine of Love


The Doctrine of Love: [http://gracebiblechurchwichita.org/?page_id=274](http://gracebiblechurchwichita.org/?page_id=274) (which are possibly from R. B. Thieme, Jr.’s notes)


The key to God’s love for us is His indwelling righteousness in us. God loves us when we are out of fellowship (during which time we can receive great discipline—Heb. 12:5–6) and God loves us when we are in fellowship.

Chapter Outline
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**And so He [Jehovah] sends in a hand of Nathan the prophet and so he [David] calls his name Jedidiah because of Y*howah.** 2Samuel 12:25

**And God [lit., He] sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet [a message]; as a result [lit., and so], David [lit., he] called his name Jedidiah, because of Y*howah.**

God also sent a message with Nathan the prophet, and, as a result, David called the child’s name Jedidiah, as per Jehovah’s instructions.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

Latin Vulgate  
And he sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet, and called his name, Amiable to the Lord, because the Lord loved him.

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)  
And so He sends in a hand of Nathan the prophet and so he calls his name Jedidiah because of Y*howah.
Then he sent for Nathan the prophet; and he named the child Jedidah because the LORD loved him.

And he sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet, and called his name Jedidiah, for the Lord's sake.

The English translation of the Syriac leaves out by the hand of. The English translation of the Latin adds he words loved him. Although one English translation below says that the Greek reads, at the end, as the Lord instructed, my Greek Bible says what the Hebrew does at the end (although there is a preposition there at the end which I do not recognize).

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV  
...and sent Nathan the prophet to tell David, "The LORD will call him Jedidiah."

Easy English (Pocock)  
The *Lord sent a message by Nathan the *prophet to call the baby Jedidiah. This was because the *Lord loved the baby.

Easy-to-Read Version  
The Lord sent word through Nathan the prophet. Nathan gave Solomon the name, Jedidiah [This name means "loved by the Lord."] Nathan did this for the Lord.

Good News Bible (TEV)  
...and commanded the prophet Nathan to name the boy Jedidiah, because the LORD loved him.

The Message  
...and sent word by Nathan the prophet that GOD wanted him named Jedidiah (God's Beloved).

New Living Translation  
...and sent word through Nathan the prophet that they should name him Jedidiah (which means "beloved of the Lord"), as the Lord had commanded [As in Greek version; Hebrew reads because of the Lord.].

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

American English Bible  
So He sent Nathan the Prophet, who renamed him Jedidiah (Beloved of Jehovah), following the Lord's instructions.

Ancient Roots Translinear  
...and sent the hand of Nathan the prophet to call his name Jedidiah (well-beloved of Yah), because of Yahweh.

God's Word™  
...and sent a message through the prophet Nathan to name the baby Jedidiah [The LORD'S Beloved].

New American Bible  
...and sent the prophet Nathan to name him Jedidiah, on behalf of the LORD.  

NIRV  
So the Lord sent a message through the prophet Nathan. It said, "Name the boy Jedidiah."

New Jerusalem Bible  
...and made this known by means of the prophet Nathan, who named him Jedidiah, as Yahweh had instructed.

New Simplified Bible  
He sent a message through the prophet Nathan to name the baby Jedidiah (Jehovah's Beloved).

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

Bible in Basic English  
And he sent word by Nathan the prophet, who gave him the name Jedidiah, by the word of the Lord.

Complete Jewish Bible  
...and sent through Natan the prophet to have him named Y'didyah [loved by God], for ADONAI's sake.

HCSB  
...and He sent a message through Nathan the prophet, who named him Jedidiah, because of the LORD.

JPS (Tanakh—1985)  
...and He sent a message through the prophet Nathan; and he was named Jedidiah [i.e., "Beloved of the LORD."] at the instance of the LORD.

New Advent Bible  
And he sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet, and called his name, Amiable to the Lord, because the Lord loved him.
...and because the LORD loved him, he sent word through Nathan the prophet to name him Jedidiah [Jedidiah means loved by the LORD.]

**Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:**

- **He Amplified Bible**
  
  He sent [a message] by the hand of Nathan the prophet, and [Nathan] called the boy’s [special] name Jedidiah [beloved of the Lord], because the Lord [loved the child].

- **English Standard Version**
  
  ...and sent a message by Nathan the prophet. So he called his name Jedidiah, because of the LORD.

- **Heritage Bible**
  
  And he sent by the hand of Nathan, the prophet, and he called his name Jedidiah, because of Jehovah.

- **Modern KJV**
  
  And he sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet, and he called his name Jedidiah, because of Jehovah.

- **Syndein**
  
  Therefore He {God} sent a message by the hand of Nathan the prophet {the office of prophet - David had the gift of prophecy but not the office of prophet}; and so that he called his name {Solomon’s nickname} Jedidiah {name means 'beloved of Jehovah/God' or 'darling of the Lord'}, {see Psalm 127:2 where Solomon refers to his nickname in a Psalm} because of Jehovah/God.

- **Young’s Updated LT**
  
  And He [God] sends by the hand of Nathan the prophet, and calls his name Jedidiah, because of Jehovah.

**The gist of this verse:**

God gives Solomon another name, which is Jedidiah. He tells Nathan to do this to David.

Often, when I read a verse in the English and began to look at the various translations, I begin to ask myself, *why is this here? Why did God the Holy Spirit record this verse?* However, it is this verse which explains the previous verse. We know that God loves Solomon (v. 24) because of this verse.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shâlach (שָלָח)</td>
<td>to send, to send for [forth, away], to dismiss, to deploy, to put forth, to stretch out, to reach out</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7971 BDB #1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b° (ב)</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yâd (יָד)</td>
<td>generally translated hand</td>
<td>feminine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #3027 BDB #388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel 12:25a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נַּחַן (נַחַן) [pronounced naw-THAWN]</td>
<td>given; one who is given; transliterated Nathan</td>
<td>masculine singular, proper noun</td>
<td>Strong's #5416 BDB #681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâḇîy’ (אֱוֹבִי) [pronounced naw-VEE]</td>
<td>spokesman, speaker, prophet</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong's #5030 BDB #611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: And God [lit., He] sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet [a message];... David is going to get some crushing discipline (which, while he is in fellowship, is suffering for blessing). So, God needs to contact David, guide him and encourage him.

Certainly, those of you who have sons, you recognize that they can do some pretty bad stuff, and sometimes, you have to come down on them like a ton of bricks. However, there are times, even in the midst of your own crushing discipline, you need to reach out to them and offer them some guidance, love and encouragement. God is doing all of these things to David through Nathan. Nathan has warned David about his coming pressures, because of David’s great sin; and now, God will assure David of His love through Nathan.

2Samuel 12:25b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בָּאָבְעַפֶּר [pronounced bah-ḡú-VOOR]</td>
<td>because of, for, that, for the sake of, on account of, in order that; while</td>
<td>preposition/conjunction; substantive always found combined with the bêyth preposition</td>
<td>Strong's #5668 BDB #721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שֶׁמֶה (שֶׁמֶה) [pronounced shem]</td>
<td>name, reputation, character</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong's #8034 BDB #1027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָדִיְדָה (יָדִיְדָה) [pronounced yed-ee-deh-YAW]</td>
<td>beloved of Yah; transliterated Jedidiah</td>
<td>masculine singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong's #3041 BDB #392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>†ט (†ט) [pronounced ayth]</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong's #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>קָרָא (קָרָא) [pronounced kaw-RAW]</td>
<td>to call, to proclaim, to read, to call to, to call out to, to assemble, to summon; to call, to name [when followed by a lâmed]</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong's #7121 BDB #894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וָ (וָ) [pronounced waw]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: And God sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet [a message];... David is going to get some crushing discipline (which, while he is in fellowship, is suffering for blessing). So, God needs to contact David, guide him and encourage him.
2Samuel 12:25b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בֵּית (bêyth) [pronounced <strong>gaw’-BOOR</strong>] which means a passing over, a transition; the cause of a crossing over; the price [of transferring ownership of something]; purpose, objective. Properly, it is the passive participle of Strong’s #5674 BDB #720. Strong’s #5668 BDB #721.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YHWH (יהוה) [pronunciation is possibly <strong>yhoah-WAH</strong>]</td>
<td>transliterated variously as Jehovah, Yahweh, Y’howah</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #3068 BDB #217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...as a result [lit., and so], David [lit., he] called his name Jedidiah, because of Y’howah. After reading this several times, I have interpreted this to mean that David names his son here, based upon the message given him from Nathan. This would be a nickname or a second name. In the previous verse, we are told and God loved him. It is reasonable to suppose that was the content of Nathan’s message. Therefore, David gives Solomon a second name or a nickname which means beloved of Yah, which is short for beloved of Y’howah. This explains several things, e.g., why do we never come across this name again? It is a second name, a nickname, an informal name; but a name which indicates how God feels about Solomon (to be accurate, it is how God thinks about Solomon).

### Chapter Outline

Our passage reads: Soon thereafter [lit., and so], David comforted Bathsheba, his wife, and he went unto her and he lay with her, and she bore [him] a son. David [lit. he] called his name Solomon and Y’howah loved him. And God [lit., He] sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet [a message]; as a result [lit., and so], David [lit., he] called his name Jedidiah, because of Y’howah.

Here is the problem—a few years previous (maybe even a decade or more previous)—God told David that he would have a son, Solomon, who would build the Temple. Here, David names his son Solomon and God sends a message to David to name this son Jedidiah (2Sam. 12:24–25); or David, because of this message, nicknames his son Jedidiah. Therefore, we need to figure out, **what gives?** Who has named who and at what time?

### When Was Solomon Named What?

1. **There are several passages which we need to weave together into a logical narrative:**
   1) **Looking forward in 2Sam. 7:12–16** *“When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your fathers, I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for My name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be to him a father, and he shall be to Me a son. When he commits iniquity, I will discipline him with the rod of men, with the stripes of the sons of men, but My steadfast love will not depart from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you. And your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before Me. Your throne shall be established forever.”***
   2) **Our passage, which fits into the historical narrative, 2Sam. 12:24–25** *Soon thereafter [lit., and so], David comforted Bathsheba, his wife, and he went unto her and he lay with her, and she bore [him] a son. David [lit. he] called his name Solomon and Y’howah loved him. And God [lit., He] sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet [a message]; as a result [lit., and so], David [lit., he] called his name Jedidiah, because of Y’howah.*
   3) **Looking backwards in 1Chron. 22:9** *“Behold, a son shall be born to you who shall be a man of rest. I will give him rest from all his surrounding enemies. For his name shall be Solomon, and I will give...***
When Was Solomon Named What?

2. We know that David would have a son who would build the Temple of God that David wanted to build, and that his name and mission was known back when David told Nathan of this plan. 2Sam. 7:1–7
1Chron. 22:1–16

3. David had 11 sons born to him in Jerusalem, including Solomon and Nathan (his son Nathan). 4 of these sons were by Bathsheba. 2Sam. 5:14–16 1Chron. 3:5 14:4

4. So portions of 2Sam. 5 break out of the narrative, looking at things which would occur in the future (e.g., in 2Sam. 12).

5. Similarly, 1Chron. 22 looks backward, adding some information which took place in 2Sam. 7.

6. So there is no confusion, there is Nathan the prophet and Nathan, David’s son.
   1) Nathan the prophet is speaking to David before David is even aware of Bathsheba. 2Sam. 7:3–4
   2) David has a son, Nathan, by Bathsheba. 2Sam. 5:14
   3) Nathan is distinguished from this family also in 1Kings 1:11
   4) Therefore, Nathan the prophet is often so designated, so that he is not confused with Nathan, David’s son, who obviously named his son after Nathan the prophet. 1Kings 1:22–24
   5) Nathan the son will be in the line of the humanity of Jesus Christ. Luke 3:31

7. The name Jedidiah is found only here in 2Sam. 12:25.

8. Throughout the Bible, there are situations where someone is called by 2 different names: Jacob was also called Israel; Saul of Tarsus was renamed Paul. Therefore, we ought not to be disturbed if Solomon, one of the key figures in the Old Testament, has 2 names.

9. Therefore, David was told about a son who would build the Temple a decade or so previous to all of this, and that this son would be named Solomon.

10. When this child is born, David names him Solomon.

11. God sends a message to David. The content of that message appears to be that “This is the child that I love.”

12. Therefore, David gives his child an additional name—a nickname—Jedidiah, which indicates God’s love for this child.

13. My educated guess is, God said, “This is the beloved of Yah.” David therefore recognizes that this is the son who will build the Temple of God, and so David names him Solomon, the name of the son who would build a Temple for God.

14. In other words, David puts 2 and 2 together, recognizing that this is the child, and appropriately names him.

15. He also promises Bathsheba, at some point in time, that Solomon would be king after David. 1Kings 1:13, 17, 30

16. Therefore, 2Sam. 12:25 precedes v. 24 in time.

17. In the alternative, God confirms to David, with the name Jedidiah, that this is indeed the son spoken of back when David first desired to build the Temple. By that theory, 2Sam. 12:25 follows v. 24 in time.

18. There will be some subsequent political intrigue, which is common when there is a changing of kings, which is recorded in 1Kings 1:5–53.

So that there is no misunderstanding here, I may or may not be able to determine certain things unless the Word of God lays them out. All I have to do is provide a reasonable theory which takes into consideration all of the relevant passages, which is what I did (I offered up 2 theories). The first theory fits exactly with the text that is here: Soon thereafter [lit., and so], David comforted Bathsheba, his wife, and he went unto her and he lay with her, and she bore [him] a son. David [lit. he] called his name Solomon and Y*howah loved him. And God [lit., He] sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet [a message]; as a result [lit., and so], David [lit., he] called his name Jedidiah, because of Y*howah.

I realize that I may have spent way more time on this than you think it deserves. However, I have a reasonably logical and linear mind. I like to see that there is a reasonable and logical order to all of this. God told David about this son that he would sire; that this son would build a Temple that David wanted to build; and that this reign would be a peaceful and prosperous reign. At that time, God told David, this name would be Solomon. Flash forward
a decade or so, and David sires a son by Bathsheba, his wife. It is possible that the child is not named for 8 days (Luke 1:59 2:21). During this time, Nathan comes to David and tells him, “This is the child beloved of Y’hovah” Hence, David gives him the name Jedidiah as a nickname, recognizing that this is the son; and he names him Solomon, the name which God had told David some time ago (1Chron. 22:9). I may or may not have the details correct, but this is a fairly easy, straightforward way of understanding these various passages when taken together.

There are several passages throughout the Bible about Solomon becoming the king to follow David and that Solomon would build the Temple. Let’s put these together here and offer a reasonable timeline as well.

### Solomon Would be the King to Build the Temple

1. At some point in time, David promised Bathsheba that this son would rule after him. 1Kings 1:13, 17
2. Near the end of his life, David will call his wife Bathsheba to come before him to reiterate this promise. When it was reported that Adonijah was parading about calling himself king, we read: Then King David answered, "Call Bathsheba to me." So she came into the king's presence and stood before the king. And the king swore, saying, "As the LORD lives, who has redeemed my soul out of every adversity, as I swore to you by the LORD, the God of Israel, saying, "Solomon your son shall reign after me, and he shall sit on my throne in my place," even so will I do this day." Then Bathsheba bowed with her face to the ground and paid homage to the king and said, "May my lord King David live forever!" (1Kings 1:28–31).
3. This promise is not recorded when it actually occurred in the Bible.
4. When David first suggested building a Temple on earth for God, God told David that he would not do such a thing, but, his son would build a house for God’s name. 2Sam. 7:12–14
5. God also promised, “My steadfast love will not depart from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before you.” (2Sam. 7:17).
6. Here, God calls Solomon, beloved of the Lord, which identifies Solomon as this son.
7. 3 times, there are references to God telling David, “You will not build a house for Me because you have shed so much blood.” 1Kings 5:3 1Chron. 22:8 28:3
8. These references are all given as something which God had said earlier. For instance, 1Chron. :22:7–11 read: David said to Solomon, "My son, I had it in my heart to build a house to the name of the LORD my God. But the word of the LORD came to me, saying, "You have shed much blood and have waged great wars. You shall not build a house to my name, because you have shed so much blood before me on the earth. Behold, a son shall be born to you who shall be a man of rest. I will give him rest from all his surrounding enemies. For his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quiet to Israel in his days. He shall build a house for my name. He shall be my son, and I will be his father, and I will establish his royal throne in Israel forever." "Now, my son, the LORD be with you, so that you may succeed in building the house of the LORD your God, as he has spoken concerning you.”
9. Logically, it makes sense that all of this was said back in 2Sam. 7, even though it is not recorded in that chapter.
10. David, a man of war, would not build God’s Temple. His Son, a man of peace, whose name would be Solomon, would build this Temple.
11. Therefore, when Nathan contacts David and says, “This son God names Jedidiah (beloved of Y’hovah)” David knows that this is the son to name Solomon, or peace, peaceful.
12. Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that David knew about Solomon as far back as 2Sam. 7; that Nathan confirmed to him that this was the son of whom God spoke; and David therefore named him Solomon and nicknamed him Jedidiah.
13. Knowing that this is the son who would succeed him, David—probably at this time—promises to Bathsheba that this would be the son who would be king over all Israel.

If you think that Solomon will build the Temple because he is a greater man than David, because he was a man of peace, you would be wrong. David, by defeating all of Israel’s enemies, would make it possible for his son to be a man of peace.
The key to this is, David, represents Jesus Christ in His 1st and 2nd advents, when Jesus returns and wipes out all of Israel’s enemies (which will be quite bloody—Rev. 14:20). Solomon will represent Jesus on the throne of Israel during the Millennium.

Chapter Outline

David and Joab Take the Ammonite City of Rabbah

At this point, we focus in on some coterminous action. You will recall that David and his nephew Joab were involved in a war with the Ammonites, which morphed into a war with the Aramæans (a war that David and all Israel joined Joab to fight). Now, Joab has gone back to Rabbah, the capitol city of Ammon, and he is about to complete the siege of Rabbah. Joab will call David in to lead the final besieging of the city. All of this, including the historical prelude, will be covered in great detail below.

And so wages war Joab in Rabbah of sons of Ammon. And so he captures a city of the royalty.

Meanwhile, Joab waged war against Rabbah of the sons of Ammon. Consequently, he captured their royal city.

At this same time, Joab was waging war against the sons of Ammon at Rabbah, their capital city. In due time, he captured their royal city.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

Latin Vulgate

And Joab fought against Rabbath of the children of Ammon, and laid close siege to the royal city.

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)

And so wages war Joab in Rabbah of sons of Ammon. And so he captures a city of the royalty.

Peshitta (Syriac)

And Joab fought against Rabbath of the children of Ammon, and took the royal city.

Septuagint (Greek)

And Joab fought against Rabbath of the children of Ammon, and took the royal city.

Significant differences: None.

43 At some point in time, I will lay out all of the ways that David and Solomon foretell, in the lives, of the Lord to come.
Meanwhile, Joab had been in the country of Ammon, attacking the city of Rabbah. He captured the royal fortress.

David defeats Rabbah

Meanwhile, Joab fought against the Ammonite city of Rabbah. He defeated this royal city.

Rabbah was the capital city of the Ammonites. Joab fought against Rabbah and captured it.

Joab, at war in Rabbah against the Ammonites, captured the royal city.

Joab fought against Rabbah, a royal city of the Ammonites, and he was about to capture it.

Now Joab fought against Rabbah of the sons of Ammon, and took the king's city.

Joab fought against Rabbah, the capital of Ammon, and he captured the royal fortifications [Or the royal city.]

Then Joab went to war with Rabbath of the sons of Ammon, and he subdued that kingdom's capital city.

Joab fought Rabbah and the sons of Amman, and claimed the kingdom city.

Meanwhile, Joab fought against the Ammonite city of Rabbah and captured its royal fortress.

During that time, Joab fought against Rabbah. It was the royal city of the Ammonites. It had high walls around it. Joab was about to capture it.

Joab attacked the Ammonite city of Rabbah and took the King's Pool.

Now Joab was fighting against Rabbah, in the land of the children of Ammon, and he took the water-town.

[Here the narrative resumes the battle story that began in 11:1 (see 11:25). The author has interrupted that story to give the related account of David's sin with Bathsheba and the murder of Uriah. He now returns to the earlier story and brings it to a conclusion.]

So Joab fought against Rabbah of the Ammonites and captured the royal city.

And Joab fought against Rabbath of the children of Ammon, and laid close siege to the royal city.

Meanwhile Joab fought against Rabbah of the Ammonites and captured the royal citadel.

Now Joab fought against Rabbah of the sons of Ammon, and took the royal city.

And Joab devoured against Rabbah of the children of Ammon, and captured the royal city.


Now Joab fought against Rabbah of the people of Ammon, and took the royal city.
Meanwhile Joab besieged Rabbah ... belonging to the citizens/children of Ammon, with the result that he captured the Royal City {the siege has lasted over 2 years and now only took the 1st part of Rabbah}.

**The gist of this verse:** While all of this is going on in Jerusalem, Joab is still fighting against the sons of Ammon. He takes their royal city of Rabbah.

### 2Samuel 12:26a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wāw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâcham (לָךָם) [pronounced law-KHAHM]</td>
<td>to engage in battle, to engage in war, to wage war; to fight, to battle</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Niphal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3898 BDB #535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yôwâb (יְוָב) [pronounced YOH-aw'v]</td>
<td>Yah is father and is transliterated Joab</td>
<td>masculine singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #3097 BDB #222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b° (ב) [pronounced b°]</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbâh (רַבָּה) [pronounced rhab-BAW]</td>
<td>many, much, great (in the sense of large or significant, not acclaimed); transliterated Rabbah, Rabba</td>
<td>a proper, locative noun; construct state</td>
<td>Strong’s #7237 BDB #913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bànîym (בָּנִים) [pronounced baw-NEEM]</td>
<td>sons, descendants; children; people; sometimes rendered men</td>
<td>masculine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ammîwn (אַמְמִים) [pronounced gahm-MOHN]</td>
<td>hidden; transliterated Ammon</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #5983 BDB #769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is often transliterated *Bene-Ammon* and is a common designation for this country.

**Translation:** Meanwhile, Joab waged war against Rabbah of the sons of Ammon. All of this time, while David is dallying about in Jerusalem, and then put under great discipline, Joab is busy fighting the Ammonites at their capitol city of Rabbah.

To give you a quick background of Rabbah:

**Rabbah, According to Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge and Smith**

Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge: Rabbah, or Rabbath-Ammon, is also called Philadelphia, from Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt. Rabbah was situated east of Jordan, and, according to Eusebius, ten miles east from Jazer. It is sometimes mentioned as belonging to Arabia, sometimes to Coelo-Syria; and was one of the
Rabbah, According to Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge and Smith

cities of the Decapolis east of Jordan. Josephus extends the region of Perea as far as Philadelphia.

It is now, says Burckhardt, called Amman, distant about 19 miles to the southeast by east of Szalt, and lies along the banks of a river called Moiet Amman, which has its source in a pond, at a few hundred paces from the south-western end of the town, and empties itself in the Zerka, or Jabbok, about four hours to the northward. This river runs in a valley bordered on both sides by barren hills of flint, which advance on the south side close to the edge of the stream. The edifices which still remain, though in a decaying state, from being built of a calcareous stone of moderate hardness, sufficiently attest the former greatness and splendour of this metropolis of the children of Ammon.

Smith writes: Rabbah is a very strong place on the east of the Jordan, and the chief city of the Ammonites. In five passages — Deut. 3:11  2Sam. 12:26  17:27  Jer. 49:2  Ezek. 21:20 — it is styled at length, Rabbath of the Ammonites, or the children of Ammon; but elsewhere—Joshua 13:25  2Sam. 11:1  2Sam. 12:27  2Sam. 12:29  1Chron. 20:1  Jer. 49:3—simply Rabbah. When first named, it is mentioned as containing the bed or sarcophagus of the giant Og (Deut. 3:11).

David sent Joab to besiege Rabbah (2Sam. 11:1, 17). Joab succeeded in capturing a portion of the place—the "city of waters," that is, the lower town, so called from its containing the perennial stream, which rises in and still flows through it. The citadel still remained to be taken, but this was secured shortly after David's arrival (2Sam. 12:26–31). Long after, at the date of the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. 49:2–3), it had walls and palaces. It is named in such terms as to imply that it was of equal importance with Jerusalem (Ezek. 21:20).

From Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.) it received the name of Philadelphia. It was one of the cities of the Decapolis, and became the seat of a Christian bishop. Its ruins, which are considerable are found at Ammon about 22 miles from the Jordan. It lies in a valley, which is a branch, or perhaps the main course, of the Wady Zerka usually identified with the Jabbok. The public buildings are said to be Roman, except the citadel, which is described as of large square stones put together without cement, and which is probably more ancient than the rest.

Taken from Treasury of Scriptural Knowledge; by Canne, Browne, Blayney, Scott, and others about 1880, with introduction by R. A. Torrey; courtesy of E-sword, 2Sam. 12:26 (some minor editing). Also, Dr. William Smith, Smith’s Bible Dictionary; 1894; from e-Sword, topic: Rabbah (slightly edited).

Chapter Outline

Since this is a narrative that we have stopped and started with, let's summarize...

### Joab’s Siege of Rabbah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Sam. 10:1–5</td>
<td>This was all began after David sent an emissary to arrogant King Hanun, to indicate David’s sympathy at the loss of his father. However, Hanun, apparently egged on by his state department, who hated Jews, humiliated these men and sent them back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sam. 10:6–8</td>
<td>Hanun realizes that he screwed up and made David mad, so he hires mercenaries, rather than to go to David with sincere heartfelt apologies. The strategy was, to lure David’s army (led by Joab) to the open area before the city of Rabbah, and the mercenaries, who were hiding with their chariots in the forest behind Joab, would come out suddenly and destroy Joab’s army.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Joab’s Siege of Rabbah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Sam. 10:9–14</td>
<td>Joab did the unexpected. Instead of his troops freezing on the open ground, caught between the 2 armies, he advanced against the Syrians before they could get their chariots and horses out onto the open field. This left the Syrians with no advantage in the war; their dependence upon horsemen and chariots became their downfall. In the thick forest, their chariots and horses became impediments to them. Joab put the Syrian mercenaries to flight, while the Ammonites moved back into their walled city, expecting to be attacked at any time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sam. 10:15–19</td>
<td>Joab knew that he could not just continue fighting against the Ammonites. There were grave consequences in defeating the Syrian mercenary force, so Joab had to convince David to gather all Israel and go to war again the Syrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sam. 11:1</td>
<td>Joab returns the next spring to besiege Rabbah. It is unclear just exactly how long the Aramæan war took (2, 3 or 4 seasons?). However, during this time, David hooked up with Bathsheba, had one child who died 7 days after being born; and then they have another child, who is Solomon. I would guesstimate that this entire war, from start to finish, took at least 3 or 4 seasons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To explain the time frame, a season was spent on initiating the war with Ammon. This morphed into a war with Aram, which would have completed that season and possible lasted another season. During a part of this time (possibly during the second siege of Rabbah), David is chasing after Bathsheba, and they have a child. That is another full year. Joab here is about to take the city and David and Bathsheba are having a 2nd child. Therefore, I see this as a minimum of 3 years, and would not be surprised if start to finish took even 5 or 6 years. There is nothing in Scripture to indicate that we are told about each and every year of David's life.

| 2Sam. 11:25     | There are two separate events occurring simultaneously—David is chasing after Bathsheba and Joab is at war against the fortified city of Rabbah. During this time, David will send for Uriah, one of Joab’s greatest soldiers; and then David will send Uriah back with a note to Joab telling Joab to see that Uriah dies in battle. When David is debriefed on the war, he throws a fit when he hears how Joab screwed things up tactically, and then he finds out that Uriah the Hittite was killed in the battle, and, suddenly, this is no longer an issue to David. |
|                 | All the while, Joab is doggedly making war against the Ammonites, destroying their capitol city. Several Bible encyclopedias suggest that Joab first took the lower section of Rabbah (known as the city of waters) and called in David to take the royal section of the city (which appears to be backed up by the text that follows in this chapter). |
| 2Sam. 12:26–31  | At this time, we return to the war against the Ammonites, begun 2 chapters and maybe 3 or 4 years ago.                                                                                                          |

This is quite the amazing war which has been taking place and a study of 2Sam. 10 (HTML) (PDF) is highly recommended. Maps and photos of Rabbah may be found there as well.

### Chapter Outline

Matthew Henry suggests, but without offering any support: We have here an account of the conquest of Rabbah, and other cities of the Ammonites. Though this comes in here after the birth of David’s child, yet it is most probable that it was effected a good while before, and soon after the death of
Uriah, perhaps during the days of Bath-sheba’s mourning for him. The Bible does tend to keep things together topically in roughly a chronological order.

Ordering all of these events is a difficult thing to do. In Jerusalem, you have David chasing after women, after the armies leave town, which has possibly been going on for awhile. Then he goes so far as to take the wife of Uriah, impregnate her, and then bring him back from the field, to subsequently have Uriah killed on the battlefield. David brings Bathsheba into his palace as his wife. Bathsheba gives birth, the child dies. David impregnates her again, and they have a child, Solomon.

Outside of Jerusalem, we have the initial attack of Rabbah, the surprise attack of the Aramaeans, and the calling up of David and all their reserve forces to beat down the people of Aram. David returns to Jerusalem; Joab returns to besieging Rabbah. Joab takes a portion of Rabbah and then calls for David to come in and help complete the job (which is very much a public relations move on Joab’s part).

What occurs inside Jerusalem is simultaneous to what is occurring outside of Jerusalem. Scholars may disagree as to how these things are ordered when put together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>waived (va) (ı)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâkad (לַכָּד)</td>
<td>to capture, to seize, to take, to choose [by lot]</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3920 BDB #539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾeth (אֶת)</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾîyr (עִיר)</td>
<td>encampment, city, town</td>
<td>feminine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #5892 BDB #746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mîlûwkâh (מילוּקָה)</td>
<td>kingdom, kingship, kingly office, royal; monarchy, royalty</td>
<td>feminine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #4410 BDB #574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: Consequently, he captured their royal city. This would have been a long and drawn out war. Bear in mind that Joab needed to take down this walled city, and he needed to do it without a great loss, because, once the city was unprotected, then they would attack and capture the city.

Again, we have a glimpse into God’s grace. God allows Joab to take Rabbah, even though Joab was, in part, complicit in the killing of Uriah. God will allow David to be the front man in the taking of Rabbah. All of this falls within the perfect plan of God.

V. 26 give us the big picture: Meanwhile, Joab waged war against Rabbah of the sons of Ammon. Consequently, he captured their royal city. In point in fact, the city has not been captured in v. 27. V. 26 encompasses vv. 27–29; the next 3 verses will give us a more expanded narrative.

Although most commentators separate Rabbah into 2 sections, R. B. Thieme, Jr. suggests that there are 3 sections. The river Jabbok runs through the middle of the city in the valley, and this section is

---

Matthew Henry, Commentary on the Whole Bible; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:26.
called the Water City. South of the Water City is the Royal City, which is well-fortified. This would have been where Joab originally laid siege against the city. To the north of the Water city is a well-fortified section built into the high steep mountains, which is called the Citadel (or, the Acropolis). There would have been fortified bridges, walls and forts here. Again, according to Thieme, all 3 compartments were self-sustaining and could be defended individually. Each part of the city would have been difficult to defeat.\(^{45}\)

If this is the correct layout (and R. B. Thieme, Jr. is well-versed in ancient history), then Joab had taken the southern section (the Royal City) and the middle section (the City of Waters—see the next verse). He will call David in to lead the assault on the final section of the city, the northern section, also called the Acropolis.

\[\text{And so sends Joab messengers unto David.}
\text{And so he says, “I have fought against Rabbah; furthermore, I have taken the city of waters.}\]

Then Joab sent messengers to David, saying, “I have waged war against Rabbah; moreover, I have taken this River City.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

- **Latin Vulgate**
  
  And Joab sent messengers to David, saying: I have fought against Rabbath, and the city of waters is about to be taken.

- **Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**
  
  And so sends Joab messengers unto David. And so he says, “I have fought against Rabbah; furthermore, I have taken the city of waters.

- **Peshitta (Syriac)**
  
  And Joab sent messengers to David and said, I have fought against Rabbath and I have also taken the royal city.

- **Septuagint (Greek)**
  
  And Joab sent messengers to David, and said, I have fought against Rabbah, and taken the City of Waters.

**Significant differences:**

The only serious problem is the Syriac, where it reads the royal city rather than city of waters. Let me suggest that the Aramæans had limited manuscripts and that some of them may have been damaged or difficult to read. It would not be out of the question for this word of description to have fallen out of the text, and for the translators to go back to the descriptor royal, which is found in the previous verse. The English translation of the Latin says that this city is about to be taken, and that may be more the sense of what is going on here. The Syriac has an additional conjunction here for the final phrase.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**

- **CEV**
  
  ...and sent a messenger to tell David: I have attacked Rabbah and captured the fortress guarding the city water supply.

- **Easy English (Pocock)**
  
  Joab sent a message to David. The message said, ‘I have fought against Rabbah. I have taken its water supply.

- **Good News Bible (TEV)**
  
  He sent messengers to David to report: “I have attacked Rabbah and have captured its water supply.

He sent messengers to David saying, "I'm fighting at Rabbah, and I've just captured the city's water supply.

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

**American English Bible**
So he sent messengers to David, and said, `I have fought against Rabbah and subdued the City of Waters.

**Ancient Roots Translinear**
Joab sent messengers to David, and said, "I fought for Amman and also claimed the waters of the city.

**God's Word™**
So he sent messengers to tell David, "I fought against Rabbah and captured the fortress guarding its water supply.

**NIRV**
He sent messengers to David. He told them to say, "I have fought against Rabbah. I've taken control of its water supply.

**New Jerusalem Bible**
He then sent messengers to tell David, 'I have assaulted Rabbah and captured the water supply.

**New Simplified Bible**
He sent messengers to tell David: »I fought against Rabbah and captured the fortress guarding its water supply.

**Revised English Bible**
He sent this report to David: 'I have attacked Rabbah and have taken the pool.

**Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):**

**Bible in Basic English**
And Joab sent men to David, saying, I have made war against Rabbah and have taken the water-town.

**JPS (Tanakh—1985)**
Joab sent messengers to David and said, "I have attacked Rabbah and I have already captured the water city [Meaning of Hebrew is uncertain; perhaps the source of the water supply].

**NET Bible®**
Joab then sent messengers to David, saying, "I have fought against Rabbah and have captured the water supply of the city [The expression translated the water supply of the city (Heb "the city of the waters") apparently refers to that part of the fortified city that guarded the water supply of the entire city. Joab had already captured this part of the city, but he now defers to King David for the capture of the rest of the city. In this way the king will receive the credit for this achievement.].

**New Advent Bible**
And Joab sent messengers to David, saying: I have fought against Rabbah, and the city of waters is about to be taken.

**Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:**

**English Standard Version**
And Joab sent messengers to David and said, "I have fought against Rabbah; moreover, I have taken the city of waters.

**exeGeses companion Bible**
...and Yah Ab sends angels to David and says, I fight Rabbah and capture the city of waters:.

**Heritage Bible**
And Joab sent messengers to David, and said, I have devoured against Rabbah, and have captured the city of waters..

**New King James Version**
And Joab sent messengers to David, and said, "I have fought against Rabbah, and I have taken the city's water supply.

**New RSV**
Joab sent messengers to David, and said, 'I have fought against Rabbah; moreover, I have taken the water city.

**Syndein**
And Joab sent 'a staff officer' to David, who reported, "I have attacked Rabbah, and I have now taken the City of Waters {now Joab has taken the middle area - only the Citadel, the toughest, remains to be taken}. {Note: Joab to this point was a very spiritually mature believer. He was humble and not arrogant at all. He is contacting David out of the grace in his soul.}.

**Third Millennium Bible**
And Joab sent messengers to David and said, "I have fought against Rabbah and have taken from the city its waters."
And Joab sends messengers unto David, and says, “I have fought against Rabbah—also I have captured the city of waters.

The gist of this verse: Joab is about to commit the final assault upon the city of Rabbah, and he orders David to gather an army and take the lead.

Translation: Then Joab sent messengers to David,... This is one of the rare times where the verb to send actually has an object. Most of the time, the object of this verb is understood. What is going to happen will reveal the character of Joab. You may recall from 1Samuel that Saul became very jealous and distrustful of David because he was so successful in his military missions. Women would sing, “Saul has killed his thousands and David has killed his tens of thousands.” The performance of this particular tune went viral on YouTube at that time. Joab is not going to let that happen. He will not allow his fame to supercede David’s. When this city is officially taken, David is going to be at the lead. This indicates great humility on the part of Joab.

In the alternative, this could have been done as per David’s orders, which would have made him seem like somewhat of a small man. So, on the one hand, this reveals the great character of Joab; or, on the other hand, this reveals more of David’s fallen self. I personally believe that this is the former. I believe that David was far too preoccupied with his dalliance with Bathsheba to become overly concerned about what Joab is doing. Given what we read in this chapter, it sounds as if all of this is thought out be Joab, but that David has given it very little thought himself.

Also on Joab’s mind could be the rumors that he has heard from Jerusalem. He is fully aware of the order which David sent to him; and he is possibly aware of David and Bathsheba. Although he may or may not have figured
out all that happened, Joab certain figured out that this was a great public relations problem, and he did what he could to help David in this regard.

We know that Joab had to call in David and all of the reserves to defeat Aram. See 2Sam. 10 (HTML) (PDF). This was absolutely necessary and one of the greatest and most consequential wars of ancient history. However, at this point, it is very likely that Joab could have finished this job on his own. However, he calls David to come out, so that David gets the credit. The idea is, David had to go to fight in Aram. Ideally speaking, many of the people of Jerusalem and throughout Israel will believe that David had to go to fight in Rabbah.

### 2Samuel 12:27b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (י)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wāw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‍המ (ר) [pronounced aw-MAHR]</td>
<td>to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #559 BDB #55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‍לָכָם (רָכ) [pronounced law-KHAHM]</td>
<td>to engage in battle, to engage in war, to wage war; to fight, to battle</td>
<td>1st person singular, Niphal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3898 BDB #535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b° (ב) [pronounced b°]</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbâh (רַב) [pronounced rahb-BAW]</td>
<td>many, much, great (in the sense of large or significant, not acclaimed); transliterated Rabbah, Rabba</td>
<td>a proper, locative noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #7237 BDB #913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and he said, “I have fought against Rabbah;... The idea here is, Joab is speaking to David; however, this is not Joab speaking directly to David, but Joab speaking through the messengers to David.

More than one messenger is sent because this is quite important.

We do not know how many field reports that David received. Obviously, his men needed to be supplied with food and equipment. Although this is not mentioned in connection with this war, this has to be occurring. Whether supplies are collected at Jerusalem and sent to them; or soldiers are sent to David to get the supplies (and to file a report with David), or whether families simply supply their sons and fathers on their own (as in 1Sam. 17:20–22); we don’t know. However, logistics is key in warfare, and may mean the difference between success and failure. Given the great success of David’s army (under Joab), we may reasonably assume that there was a very well-run line of logistics to take care of the army (obviously, the success of David’s army depends, ultimately upon God; however, that does not mean that they were sloppy in any aspect of the military).

It would be good to see what is said about Rabbah. According to Fausset, it means greatness of size or numbers. Hitchcock says it means great, powerful, contentious. 46

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Text/Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>“Rabbath of the children of Ammon,” the chief city of the Ammonites, among the eastern hills, some 20 miles east of the Jordan, on the southern of the two streams which united with the Jabbok. Here the bedstead of Og was preserved (Deut. 3:11), perhaps as a trophy of some victory gained by the Ammonites over the king of Bashan. After David had subdued all their allies in a great war, he sent Joab with a strong force to take their city. For two years it held out against its assailants. It was while his army was engaged in this protracted siege that David was guilty of that deed of shame which left a blot on his character and cast a gloom over the rest of his life. At length, having taken the “royal city” (or the “city of waters,” 2Sam. 12:27, i.e., the lower city on the river, as distinguished from the citadel). Joab sent for David to direct the final assault (2Sam. 11:1 12:26–31). The city was given up to plunder, and the people were ruthlessly put to death, and “thus did he with all the cities of the children of Ammon.” The destruction of Rabbath was the last of David’s conquests. His kingdom now reached its farthest limits (2Sam. 8:1–15 1Chron. 18:1–15). The capture of this city is referred to by Amos (Amo. 1:14), Jeremiah (Jer. 49:2–3), and Ezekiel (Ezek. 21:20 25:5).⁴⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fausset</td>
<td>Ammon’s chief city, its only city named in Scripture, in contrast to the more civilized Moab’s numerous cities (Deut. 3:11 2Sam. 12:26 17:27 Jer. 49:2 Ezek. 21:20). (See AMMON.) Conjectured to be the Ham of the Zuzim (Gen. 14:5). After Hanun’s insult Abishai and Joab defeated the allies Ammon and the Syrians of Bethrehob, Zoba, Ishtob, and Maachah (2 Samuel 10). The following year David in person defeated the Syrians at Helam. Next, Joab with the whole army and the king’s bodyguard (including Uriah: 2Sam. 23:39) besieged Ammon (2 Samuel 11 1 Chronicles 19 20). The ark apparently accompanied the camp (2Sam. 11:11), a rare occurrence (1Sam. 4:3–6); but perhaps what is meant is only that the ark at Jerusalem was &quot;in a tent&quot; (2Sam. 7:2, 6) as was the army at Rabbah under Jehovah the Lord of the ark, therefore Uriah would not go home to his house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fausset</td>
<td>The siege lasted nearly two years, from David’s first connection with Bathsheba to the birth of Solomon. The Ammonites made unsuccessful sallies (2Sam. 11:17). Joab finally took the lower town, which, from the stream rising in it and flowing through it perennially, is called &quot;the city of waters,&quot; and from the king’s palace &quot;the royal city.&quot; Then in a characteristic speech, half jest half earnest (2Sam. 12:28, compare 2Sam. 19:6–7), which shows the power he had gained over David through David's secret and wicked commission (2Sam. 11:14–15), he invited David to crown the capture by taking the citadel lest if he (Joab) took it, it should be called after his name. Josephus (Ant. 7:7, section 5) says the fortress had but one well, inadequate to supply the wants of its crowded occupants. (On its capture by David, and his putting the people under saws and harrows to cut them in pieces in retaliation for their cruelties, see DAVID, also Judges 1:7 1Sam. 11:2.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fausset</td>
<td>Amos (Amos 1:14) speaks of its &quot;wall&quot; and &quot;palaces&quot; and &quot;king&quot; (perhaps Moloch) about to be judged by God. So also Jer. 49:2–3. Nebuchadnezzar attacked Ammon because of Baals their king having instigated Ishmael to slay Gedaliah the Chaldaean governor (Jer. 40:14). See 1Ma. 5:6 as to subsequent judgments on Ammon. Ezekiel (Ezek. 21:20) depicts Nebuchadnezzar’s divination to decide whether he should attack Jerusalem or Rabbah the first. Jerusalem’s fall should be followed by that of Rabbah (compare Josephus, Ant. 10:9, section 7). Under the Ptolemies Rabbah still continued of importance as supplying water for the journey across the desert, and was made a garrison for repelling the Bedouins of that quarter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴⁷ M.G. Easton M.A., D.D., Illustrated Bible Dictionary; 1897; from e-Sword, topic: Rabbah (slightly edited).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Text/Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fausset</strong></td>
<td>Ptolemy Philadelphus named it Philadelphia. Josephus (B. J. 3:3, section 3) includes Rabbah in Decapolis. Now Amman, on a tributary (Moiet Amman) of the Zerka river (Jabbok), 19 miles S.E. of Es Salt (&quot;Ramoth Gilead&quot;), 22 E. of Jordan. Its temple, theater, and forum are remarkable ruins. Eight Corinthian columns of the theater (the largest known in Syria) remain. It has become as foretold &quot;a stable for camels, a couching place for flocks a desolate heap&quot; (Eze. 25:5). Its coins bear the image of Astarte, and the word Heracleion from Hercules the idol which succeeded Moloch. The large square stones of the citadel are put together without cement, the massive walls are evidently very ancient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISBE</strong></td>
<td>(רַבָּה, Rabbâh; P’αββα, Rhabbâ, P’αββαθ, Rhabbath, P’αββαν, Rhabban. The full name is יְבִרְבָּא בֶּן עַמְּמֹן; η’ α’ κρα τυ’ω υ’ω’ν Α’ μμων, he’ α’κρα το’ν θυιο’ν Αμμο’ν, P’αββαθ υ’ω’ν Α’μμων, Rhabbath huio’ν Αμμο’ν, “Rabbah of the children of Ammon”): This alone of the cities of the Ammonites is mentioned in Scripture, so we may take it as the most important. It is first named in connection with the “bed” or sarcophagus of Og, king of Bashan, which was said to be found here (Deut. 3:11). It lay East of the territory assigned to Gad (Joshua 13:25). Whatever may have been its history in the interval, it does not appear again in Scripture till the time of David. This monarch sent an embassy of sympathy to King Hanun when his father Nahash died. The kindness was met by wanton insult, which led to the outbreak of war. The Ammonites, strengthened by Aramean allies, were defeated by the Israelites under Joab, and took refuge in Rabbah. After David's defeat of the Arameans at Helam a year later, the Ammonites were exposed alone to the full-force of Israel, the ark of the covenant being carried with the troops. The country was ravaged and siege was laid to Rabbah. It was during this siege that Uriah the Hittite by David's orders was exposed “in the forefront of the hottest battle” (2Sam. 11:15), where, treacherously deserted by his comrades, he was slain. How long the siege lasted we do not know; probably some years; but the end was in sight when Joab captured “the city of waters” (2Sam. 12:27). This may mean that he had secured control of the water supply. In the preceding verse he calls it the “royal city.” By the chivalry of his general, David was enabled in person to enjoy the honor of taking the city. Among the booty secured was the crown of Melcom, the god of the Ammonites. Such of the inhabitants as survived he treated with great severity (2Sam. 12:26–31; 1Chron. 20:1 ff).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISBE</strong></td>
<td>In the utterances of the prophets against Ammon, Rabbah stands for the people, as their most important, or perhaps their only important, city (Jer. 49:2, Jer. 49:3; Eze. 21:20; Eze. 25:5; Amo. 1:14). Jer. 49:4 speaks of the “flowing valley” – a reference perhaps to the abundance of water and fruitfulness – and the treasures in which she gloried. Eze. 21:21 represents the king of Babylon at “the head of the two ways” deciding by means of the divining arrows whether he should march against Jerusalem or against Rabbah. Amos seems to have been impressed with the palaces of Rabbah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISBE</strong></td>
<td>The city retained its importance in later times. It was captured by Ptolemy Philadelphus (285–247 BC), who called it Philadelphia. It was a member of the league of ten cities. Antiochus the Great captured it by means of treachery (Polyb. v. 71). Josephus (BJ, III, iii, 3) names it as lying East of Peraea. In the 4th century AD, it ranked with Bostra and Gerasa as one of the great fortified cities of Coele–Syria (Ritter, Erdkunde, XV, ii, 1154 f). It became the seat of a bishop. Abulfeda (1321 AD) says that Rabbah was in ruins at the time of the Moslem conquest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

48 Andrew Robert Fausset, *Fausset's Bible Dictionary*; from e-Sword, topic: Rabbah (slightly edited).
Easton, Fausset and ISBE on the City of Rabbah

Scripture

Rabbah is represented by the modern 'Ammán, a ruined site with extensive remains, chiefly from Roman times, some 14 miles Northeast of Heshbon, and about 22 miles East of the Jordan. It lies on the northern bank of Wády 'Ammán, a tributary of the upper Jabbok, in a well-watered and fruitful valley. Possibly the stream which rises here may be "the waters" referred to in 2Sam. 12:27. Ancient Rabbah may have stood on the hill now occupied by the citadel, a position easy of defense because of its precipitous sides. The outer walls of the citadel appear to be very old; but it is quite impossible to say that anything Ammonite is now above ground. The citadel is connected by means of an underground passage with a large cistern or tank to the North, whence probably it drew its watersupply. This may be the passage mentioned in the account of the capture of the city by Antiochus. "It is," says Conder (Heth and Moab, 158), "one of the finest Roman towns in Syria, with baths, a theater, and an odeum, as well as several large private masonry tombs built in the valley probably in the 2nd century. The fortress on the hill, now surrounding a considerable temple, is also probably of this same date. The church with two chapels farther North, and perhaps some of the tombs, must belong to a later age, perhaps the 4th century. The fine mosque and the fine Moslem building on the citadel hill cannot be earlier than the 7th, and are perhaps as late as the 11th century; and we have thus relics of every building epoch except the Crusading, of which there appears to be no indication."

ISBE

The place is now occupied by Arabs and Circassians who profit by the riches of the soil. It is brought into contact with the outside world by means of the Damascus-Hejaz Railway, which has a station here. 49

Between these 2 sections on Rabbah, you probably know more than you desired to.
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2Samuel 12:27c

Hebrew/Pronunciation | Common English Meanings | Notes/Morphology | BDB and Strong's Numbers
--- | --- | --- | ---
According to Rotherham, 50 4 early printed editions, the Aramaic and Syriac have an additional conjunction here.
gam (אַמ) [pronounced gahm] | also, furthermore, in addition to, even, moreover | adverb | Strong's #1571 BDB #168
lákad (לְקָד) [pronounced law-KAHD] | to capture, to seize, to take, to choose [by lot] | 1st person singular, Qal perfect | Strong's #3920 BDB #539
'ĕth (אֵת) [pronounced aith] | generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward | indicates that the following substantive is a direct object | Strong's #853 BDB #84
îyr (יָיר) [pronounced ĕer] | encampment, city, town | feminine singular construct | Strong's #5892 BDB #746

49 The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia; James Orr, Editor; ©1956 Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.; © by Hendrickson Publishers; from E-Sword; Topic: Rabbah (slightly edited).
50 Joseph Bryant Rotherham’s The Emphasized Bible; ©1971 by Kregel Publications; p. 333 (footnote).
2Samuel 12:27c

Hebrew/Pronunciation | Common English Meanings | Notes/Morphology | BDB and Strong’s Numbers
--- | --- | --- | ---
mayim (מַיִם) [pronounced MAH-yim] | water, waters | masculine plural noun with the definite article | Strong’s #4325 BDB #565

**Translation:** ...moreover, I have taken the city of waters. You may think that your city is cleverly nicknamed the River City, but here we have this designation applied to a city 3000 years ago. City of the Waters is equivalent to River City.

Joab is ready to march into Rabbah and accept their unconditional surrender. He will want David to take the lead.

Smith, without explaining, claims that this is the lower portion of Rabbah: Joab succeeded in capturing a portion of the place -- the "city of waters," that is, the lower town, so called from its containing the perennial stream, which rises in and still flows through it. The citadel still remained to be taken, but this was secured shortly after David's arrival. Smith's view is, Joab had actually captured a portion of the city—the lower portion—but called upon David to come in to complete the job.

Barnes agrees: The lower town of Rabbah (the modern Ammam), so called from a stream which rises within it and flows through it. The upper town with the citadel lay on a hill to the north of the stream, and was probably not tenable for any length of time after the supply of water was cut off.

Keil and Delitzsch give us a similar description: Rabbah was situated, as the ruins of Ammân show, on both banks of the river (Moiet) Ammân (the upper Jabbok), in a valley which is shut in upon the north and south by two bare ranges of hills of moderate height, and is not more than 200 paces in breadth. "The northern height is crowned by the castle, the ancient acropolis, which stands on the north-western side of the city, and commands the whole city" (see Burckhardt, Syria ii. pp. 612ff., and Ritter, Erdkunde xv. pp. 1145ff.).

Gill takes sort of a middle ground, suggesting maybe that the river flowed around the city, or that there were fountains of water (Gill does quote some ancient sources for his opinion). Gill then refers to another siege of this city, hundreds of years later, by Antiochus. Gill writes: the siege by him [Antiochus] lasted long, and they could not prevail, because of the multitude of men it, until one of the prisoners showed them a subterraneous passage, through which they came and fetched water; which they stopped up with stones and such like things, and then through want of water yielded. What was possibly the case was, some of the water from the River was rerouted into the city.

The perfect tense of to capture, to seize certainly indicates that Joab had already taken a part of Rabbah. Fausset agrees with Smith, that there are 2 sections to this city—that which included the river which ran through the city, known as River City (or, the city of waters), seized by Joab. However, there still remained the king’s portion of the city—the royal city. Now, whether Joab was able to cut off the water to the royal city—as Antiochus did—or not is not mentioned here.

---

51 Dr. William Smith, *Smith’s Bible Dictionary*; 1894; from e-Sword, topic: Rabbah.
52 Albert Barnes, *Barnes’ Notes on the Old Testament*; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:27. This interpretation is not universal. The Geneva Bible has: ...the chief city and where all the water pipes are, is as good as taken. From Dr. John Gill, *John Gill’s Exposition of the Entire Bible*; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:27.
54 Dr. John Gill, *John Gill’s Exposition of the Entire Bible*; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:27. Gill actually gives 3 historical sources for his opinion here. Poole also agrees with this approach. Matthew Poole, *English Annotations on the Holy Bible*; *1685; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:27.*
So, what appears to be the case is, there are 2 or 3 sections to the city, all of them well fortified. One is located over or around a great source of water (probably a wadi which flowed through) and that portion of the city provided water for the king’s city, which was further up a hill, and also well-fortified. We do not know if these are 2 separate sections or whether the king’s city is a city within a city or whether these sections are side-by-side one another. As previously noted, R. B. Thieme, Jr. believes these to be 3 sections of the city, all individually defensible. However, it is reasonable and logical to assume that we have at least 2 separate sections, but that the river city provided water for the king’s section; and it is also reasonable and logical, based upon history, that Joab had cut off the water flow from the lower city to the upper city.\(^{55}\)

It is noteworthy that David, despite the fact that he has just committed 2 great acts of sin, and yet, God has still given him Joab; and God has still given him victory in the field (he is not quite victorious yet, but that is coming). It should not take a genius for you to recognize that David is a louse and that God is still treating him graciously. Bathsheba is with him, they are having a child who will be David’s successor Joab remains his faithful commander, and Joab and his army are about to take Rabbah, and yet, David will get the credit for it.

**Application:** The next time that you are discipline for some lame sin or sins that you have committed, look around and realize that God has not totally stomped you into the ground. If you think it is bad, you do not know the half of it. Job had it bad (and he didn’t even sin!).

**Application:** If you have a child who has done wrong, and you come down on him like a ton of bricks, that is good. Now, have you locked him into a room for a year with only bread and water? Did you kick him out of the house? In most cases, no matter how bad he screwed up, you have both disciplined him, but there are things which you have not done. For instance, you have not removed your love from this child. My point is, even under great discipline, God still treats you graciously and in love. Most believers can testify to this.

**Application:** When you believe that you are getting into Job territory with God’s discipline, then you ought to consider: is this intensive discipline? Are you dying the sin unto death? When it gets that bad, you will know it. Until then, if you can see the discipline of God in your life with the grace of God, then you simply need to name your sin (s) to God and move forward.

We have already alluded to the **Doctrine of Divine Discipline**.

---

And now gather a remainder of the people and encamp against the city and take her, lest I take [even] I the city and is named my name upon her.”

2Samuel 12:28

Now, therefore, gather the rest of the people and encamp against the city and take it, so that I don’t take the city and my name is given to it.”

2Samuel 12:28

Now, therefore, gather the rest of the people together, and besiege the city and take it: lest when the city shall be wasted by me, the victory be ascribed to my name.

Ancient texts:  

Latin Vulgate  

Now therefore gather the rest of the people together, and besiege the city and take it: lest when the city shall be wasted by me, the victory be ascribed to my name.

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)  

And now gather a remainder of the people and encamp against the city and take her, lest I take [even] I the city and is named my name upon her.”

---

\(^{55}\) Ancient technology was far more impressive than you have been led to believe. You think that these are barely out-of-the-cave grunting heathen, who often comment, “Fire bad, water good.” See The Technological Accomplishments of the Hamitic Peoples  
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Now therefore gather the rest of the people together, and come and encamp against the city and take it; lest I take the city, and it shall be called after my name.

And now gather the rest of the people, and encamp against the city, and take it beforehand; lest I take the city first, and it be called by my name.

The Syriac seems to have an extra couple words in the second phrase. In the second to the last phrase, the Greek has the extra word first; this appears to be part of the verb (it is a verb that I do not recognize).

The English translation of the Latin has a verb near the end and the word victory which is not in the Masoretic text. There does not seem to be any changing of the overall sense of this verse.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV Call the rest of the army together. Then surround the city, and capture it yourself. If you don't, everyone will remember that I captured the city.

Easy English (Pocock) Now gather the rest of the army. Surround the city with your soldiers and defeat it. If I defeat it myself, they will call it my city.'

Easy-to-Read Version Now bring the other people together and attack this city (Rabbah). Capture this city before I capture it. If I capture this city, it will be called by my name."

Good News Bible (TEV) Now gather the rest of your forces, attack the city and take it yourself. I don't want to get the credit for capturing it."

The Message Hurry and get the rest of the troops together and set up camp here at the city and complete the capture yourself. Otherwise, I'll capture it and get all the credit instead of you."

New Century Version Now bring the other soldiers together and attack this city. Capture it before I capture it myself and it is called by my name!"

New Life Bible So gather the rest of the people together. Go against the city and take it, or I will take the city myself and it will be called by my name." 

New Living Translation Now bring the rest of the army and capture the city. Otherwise, I will capture it and get credit for the victory." 

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

American English Bible Now, gather your men and come to our camp, so you can be the first to take it. I don't want to be the first to take the city, for I don't wish to have it called by my name.

Ancient Roots Translinear Now gather the balance of the people, and camp by the city. Claim it, otherwise I will claim the city and call my name over it!'

God's Word™ Gather the rest of the troops, surround the city, and capture it. Otherwise, I will capture the city, and it will be named after me." 

New American Bible Therefore, assemble the rest of the soldiers, join the siege against the city and capture it, lest it be I that capture the city and it be credited to me." 

NIRV So bring the rest of the troops together. Surround the city and get ready to attack it. Then capture it. If you don't, I'll capture it myself. Then it will be named after me."

New Jerusalem Bible So now muster the rest of the army, lay siege to the town and take it, or I will take it and the town will be called after me!'

Revised English Bible Now muster the rest of the army, besiege the city, and take it; otherwise I myself shall take the city and the name to be proclaimed over it will be mine.'

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):
So now, get the rest of the people together, and put them in position against the town and take it, for if I take it, it will be named after my name.

Therefore, assemble the rest of the people; lay siege to the city; and capture it. Otherwise, I will capture the city; and it will be named after me!"

Now therefore, assemble the rest of the troops, lay siege to the city, and capture it. Otherwise I will be the one to capture the city, and it will be named after me.

Now muster the rest of the troops and besiege the city and capture it; otherwise I will capture the city myself, and my name will be connected with it."

So now assemble the rest of the army [Heb "people." So also in vv. 29, 31.] and besiege the city and capture it. Otherwise I will capture the city and it will be named for me."

Now therefore assemble the rest of the army that you {Joab} may besiege the city and capture it {imperative of strong assurance - Joab is sure it will happen} . . . lest/otherwise {an unfavorable alternative in Joab's opinion} I {Joab} will capture the city, and 'I will get the credit'." {idiom: literally: 'it will be called after my name' - integrity + loyalty = honor . . . the honorable intention of Joab is for David to get the credit} {Note: Joab wants the credit of the taking of the Ammonites to go to David and the entire army. This is great wisdom. This stops malcontents from wanting to use Joab to overthrow David. Also, military officers should not usually have political aspirations. It is a combination for disaster. Joab was humble and very content with his position in life. He had no arrogance and no approbation lust.}.

Now therefore gather the rest of the people together, and besiege the city and take it: lest when the city shall be wasted by me, the victory be ascribed to my name.

Now muster the rest of the troops and besiege the city and capture it. Otherwise I shall take the city, and it will be named after me.

Now therefore gather the rest of the people together, and encamp against the city, and take it; or else I will take the city, and it will be called after my name.

Nowmastherestofthepeopleandencampagainstthecityandtakeit,lestItakethecityanditbecalledbymyname."

And at this time gather what is left of the people together, and pitch against the city, and take it, lest I capture the city, and it be called after my name.

Now then gather the rest of the people together and encamp against the city and take it, lest I take the city and it be called by my name."

And now gather the rest of the people, and encamp against the city, and take it; that I not take the city, and my name be called over it.

Now therefore I {Joab} strongly suggest that you mobilize the entire army that you {king David} may besiege the city and capture it {imperative of strong assurance - Joab is sure it will happen} . . . lest/otherwise {an unfavorable alternative in Joab's opinion} I {Joab} will capture the city, and 'I will get the credit'." {idiom: literally: 'it will be called after my name' - integrity + loyalty = honor . . . the honorable intention of Joab is for David to get the credit} {Note: Joab wants the credit of the taking of the Ammonites to go to David and the entire army. This is great wisdom. This stops malcontents from wanting to use Joab to overthrow David. Also, military officers should not usually have political aspirations. It is a combination for disaster. Joab was humble and very content with his position in life. He had no arrogance and no approbation lust.}.

And now, gather the rest of the people, and encamp against the city, and capture it, so that, when I capture the city, my name is not called upon it.".

Joab requires that David put together an army of those who remain, and go in and capture Rabbah, so that Joab’s name is not forever associated with this city.

2Samuel 12:28a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wâ (or vî) (I, or I) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘attâh (ũnŷ) [pronounced ġaht-TAWH]</td>
<td>now, at this time, already</td>
<td>adverb of time</td>
<td>Strong’s #6258 BDB #773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel 12:28a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ℓåçåp (אַפָּ)</td>
<td>relocate, transfer, transport, gather, to gather and remove, to remove</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, Qal imperative</td>
<td>Strong's #622 BDB #62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ℓëth (אָט)</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong's #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yether (יֵת)</td>
<td>residue, remainder, [the] rest [of]</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>#3499 (#3498) BDB #451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘am (אָמ)</td>
<td>people; race, tribe; family, relatives; citizens, common people; companions, servants; entire human race; herd [of animals]</td>
<td>masculine singular collective noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong's #5971 BDB #766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: Now, therefore, gather the rest of the people... Joab, on several occasions, orders David. He uses the imperative with his commander-in-chief on several occasions. There are few people who could have gotten away with doing this.

Joab is not calling for David to raise a huge army out from among the people as he did when he and David fought against the Aramæans.\(^{56}\) David needs to gather a sufficient army so that, it looks like a real army, and not just a show; and this army will take the lead in taking down the city of Rabbah.

As previously discussed, there is probably an upper and lower portion of Rabbah, and that Joab has taken out the lower portion of the city and cut off the water to the upper portion. Although Job could have simply done this himself, he chose to let David take the lead.

David will understand what Joab is asking him to do. In hearing the entire message, David will follow these instructions out, just as Joab has laid them out.

2Samuel 12:28b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (ו or ו)</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple waw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{56}\) In this passage, David is called upon to gather a residue of the people. I would interpret this to be their active reserve force (they are armed and ready, but not in battle in Ammon). Back in 2Sam. 10:17, David gathered all Israel, which would have been both his active reserve force and those who were retired reserves. The primary difference in these two passages is one modifying verb.
### 2Samuel 12:28b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chânah (חָנָה)</td>
<td>to bivouac, to camp, to encamp in [or, against], to set up camp; to lay siege to; to incline, to decline, to bend down</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, Qal imperative</td>
<td>Strong's #2583 BDB #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘al (אל)</td>
<td>upon, beyond, on, against, above, over, by, beside</td>
<td>preposition of proximity</td>
<td>Strong’s #5921 BDB #752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘îyr (עיר)</td>
<td>encampment, city, town</td>
<td>feminine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #5892 BDB #746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w (or v)</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple waw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâkad (לָקָד)</td>
<td>to capture, to seize, to take, to choose [by lot]</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, Qal imperative; with the 3rd person feminine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #3920 BDB #539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and encamp against the city and take it,... Joab has taken the city to the point where, one final invasion will take them out. This does not mean that there will not be any casualties on his side, but they are down to, say, the final week of the campaign against Rabbah.

Joab certainly has an inkling of what has happened back in Jerusalem. David has, out of the blue, asked Joab to set up one of his own generals, Uriah, to be killed. Joab will be sending messengers to David throughout the war, in order to give him a report from the front. These messengers will also gather information and bring this back to Joab (and Joab would carefully ask questions in this regard). Recall that David has a personal guard which is at the entry of the palace, and these knew Uriah; they were aware the Bathsheba had been called to the palace; and they were aware the David married Bathsheba. If Joab, miles away and on the battlefield, put all of this together, he knew that many people back in Jerusalem had done the same thing. Therefore, Joab wants David to have a great victory under his belt, following this great scandal. Joab clearly understands that he, as the commanding general, could rule in David’s stead by means of a revolution, given David’s atrocious behavior. However, Joab is not the sort of man to take advantage of such circumstances (much like David was in his younger years). So, when the army returns victoriously to Jerusalem, it will be led by David, the king.

### 2Samuel 12:28c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pen (פֶּן)</td>
<td>lest, peradventure, or else, in order to prevent, or, so that [plus a negative]</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>Strong’s #6435 BDB #814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâkad (לָקָד)</td>
<td>to capture, to seize, to take, to choose [by lot]</td>
<td>1st person singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3920 BDB #539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ânîy (אני)</td>
<td>I, me; in answer to a question, it means I am, it is I</td>
<td>1st person singular, personal pronoun</td>
<td>Strong’s #589 BDB #58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2Samuel 12:28c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td> () [pronounced ayth]</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> () [pronounced r]</td>
<td>encampment, city, town</td>
<td>feminine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #5892 BDB #746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...so that I don’t take the city... So that David understands what is being requested, Joab does not want to take this city and for him to be thought of as greater than David in the military realm. It is even possible that Joab is greater than David in this realm, but he has great humility and he does not mind that David will get the credit for taking this city. That is what Joab wants.

**Application:** So, did you come up with a new, great idea, and your company or school or organization decided to use it, but you did not get the proper credit for it? This is exactly what Joab wants to have happen. This is a campaign which has gone on for at least 2 years, and possibly 3. Joab has been front and center in this campaign the whole time, while David was being a dog in Jerusalem and chasing skirt. Who less deserves the credit for this victory than David? And yet, Joab, in his great humility, wants David to be seen by his country as taking Rabbah. Therefore, when you come up with some great idea, and this idea moves your company, organization or school in a positive direction, don’t fall apart or be filled with mental attitude sins because you do not get the proper credit.

**Application:** I can think back at an approach which I took with my students when I was a teacher, which changed our school in a positive way. It was a simple thing—I just chose to begin staying after school every single day for my students. I had kids who came in every single day, and other teachers began to do the same thing; and, for several years, this changed the lives of perhaps a 100 or so kids with respect to mathematics. There were some teachers who actually resented that I did this; however, the end result was, for several years, our students achieved the highest scores on the standardized tests in the history of the school. There were other factors, no doubt; but, when dealing with a school and standardized tests, you change the test scores of 50 to 100 kids, and that changes everything.

**Application:** At this point, I have developed a state plan, one that is quite simple, for education, which will dramatically improve standardized test scores, graduation rates, and cost much less money. At some point, I will share this simple plan with those in the proper place to implement these plans. Whether this will come to pass or not; I have no idea. Whether I will be hailed as some great innovator in education or not, is unimportant. If it is a part of God’s plan, then it will go forward; if not, nothing will happen.

### 2Samuel 12:28d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (1, or 1) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qârâ (qâr) [pronounced kaw-RAW]</td>
<td>to be named; to be called, to be proclaimed; to be called together [assembled, [summoned]; to be read aloud, to be recited</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Niphal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7121 BDB #894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel 12:28d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shêm (ṣêm) [pronounced shame]</td>
<td>name, reputation, character</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 1st person singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #8034 BDB #1027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'al (āl) [pronounced āl]</td>
<td>upon, beyond, on, against, above, over, by, beside</td>
<td>preposition of proximity with the 3rd person feminine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5921 BDB #752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and my name is given to it.” Although the Hebrew is a little difficult to translate into a word-for-word English phrase, the idea is fairly simple. Joab does not want to take this city, have all of the fame and recognition for taking the city heaped upon him, and this city be named after him.

There is also a very important thing that we ought to note here with regards to the boundaries of Israel and other ancient nations. They were very fluid. We are talking about the capital city of the Ammonites, and Joab is talking about naming the city after him. This suggests that the land controlled by David included most of Ammon, to the point where, it was expected that their capital city be given an Israeli name. This is significant, because you may look at your Bible maps, and how neatly the border of this and that country is drawn; but realize that, from generation to generation, these borders could change dramatically. Entire countries could be swallowed up by Israel, and, 2 generations, gain their independence again.

I have seen this in my own lifetime. I have a set of encyclopedias from the 1980’s and a modern atlas from 1980. Do you realize that some of the countries in the maps no longer exist and that the boundaries of this or that country have expanded or been changed dramatically. The most dramatic change, to be sure, is the Soviet Union; this was once a huge, singular country, and now it has become a dozen or so independent nations.

The Bible downplays strategy and tactics, barely suggesting that maybe there were 2 or 3 portions of this city and maybe Joab cut off the water to the royal city. Instead, the Bible focuses upon Joab and David’s relative fame and how Joab looked out for the public relations side of things. We all like being recognized. Here, Joab could have certainly and legitimately taken all of Rabbah and received all of the credit for doing so. He probably would have had this city named after him. However, he chooses not to do this. He chooses to not simply share the credit, but to see to it that David takes the credit for this great victory in Ammon.

I have already given 2 possibilities: David previously ordered Joab to tell him when victory was nigh, and he would come in and put the finishing touches on it. However, given what is said here and given what David is involved in back in Jerusalem, it is the case that Joab, thinking this through for himself, decided to handle things this way. Joab’s calling upon David and giving this reason seems to indicate that this is all Joab’s idea. “Now, therefore, gather the rest of the people and encamp against the city and take it, so that I don’t take the city and my name is given to it.” Like Alexandria or Constantinople (places which most of us know by name, and which received the name of their conqueror).

Joab is a very intelligent man, and he understands, to some degree, what has happened with David. He may not know all of the details, but he knows his men, he knew Uriah, whom David had him sacrifice; and he knows that David is now living with Uriah’s wife. Joab knows how such a thing could foment a revolution, and the logical person to be chosen in David’s stead is Joab himself. Therefore, calling David in to take full and complete credit for this attack, is Joab’s way to head this off at the pass. Joab is an honorable man, and he knows his place, and he is not going to take advantage of what has happened to advance his own career.

57 R. B. Thieme, Jr. suggests that this is idiomatic, and simply indicates that Joab would receive all of the credit for taking this city. From http://syndein.com/ii_samuel_12a.html accessed April 22, 2011.
I hope you recognize the real human dynamics at play here. Joab simply needs to do his job here, and he will be glorified. As knowledge of David’s sin become more widespread, a few great military victories by Joab, and, without him doing anything more than his job, Joab’s popularity will continue to rise while David’s will continue to fall. This is Joab’s opportunity. Without half trying, he can both take down his uncle and promote himself, with the result that he could be king. Look at how easy he could justify this: “I am out here faithfully year after year, defeating the enemy, and preserving Israel’s freedom. David takes this opportunity to chase women; and he apparently is even chasing the wives of some of my soldiers. He has simply gone too far. He has made his own bed; now let him lie down in it.” Do you see how easy it would be for Joab to simply do his job, keep his head slightly up, so he is recognized, and just nature take its course? Joab would not have to actively do anything at all, but allow his nation to eventually look to him instead of to David or leadership. And, in the very end, even as he has David executed, Joab could say, “I have no choice at this point, Uncle David; you did this to yourself.”

However, Joab does exactly the opposite. He does his job and he recognizes the authority of David. He does nothing to take David down. He does not do this actively and he does not just let it happen to David. Joab does everything in his power to support King David.

**Application:** Staff is designed to make their commander (president, CEO, department head, principal) look good. Joab could have taken the credit for taking all of Rabbah, but he chose not to.

**Application:** If you ever run a business or have authority over this or that organization, you are greatly blessed if God gives you a Joab to be your right-hand man. Joab was willing to do the lion’s share of the work, and yet he gives the glory to David. Simply having an assistant, a helper, a person with great competence who can do that which you are unable to do, is a tremendous blessing from God. I can personally attest to that.

**Application:** If you are the competent assistant, then look to Joab as an example of how to behave. You may want the credit for what you have done or thought of; and yet, your boss gets that. Joab’s approach is exactly antithetical to that. He wants David to have the credit. If you are the underling, look to Joab for guidance when it comes to your actions.

**Application:** Joab is an example of what true loyalty looks like. David will get the credit for what Joab has done, which is right and good, and Joab’s choice.

---

**And so gathers David all the people and so he goes Rabbah-ward and so he fights against her and so he takes her.**  
2Samuel 12:29

*Therefore, David gathered together all of the people and he went to Rabbah. He fought against the city [lit., her] and took it.*

**Therefore, David gathered together an army and led them to Rabbah. He fought against the city of Rabbah and defeated it.**

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

**Latin Vulgate**  
Then David gathered all the people together, and went out against Rabbath: and after fighting, he took it.

**Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**  
And so gathers David all the people and so he goes Rabbah-ward and so he fights against her and so he takes her.

**Peshitta (Syriac)**  
So David gathered all the people together and went against Rabbath, and fought against it and took it.

**Septuagint (Greek)**  
And David gathered all the people, and went to Rabbah, and fought against it, and took it.
Significant differences: The English translation of the Latin changes the tense form somewhat.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEV</td>
<td>David called the rest of the army together and attacked Rabbah. He captured the city...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy English (Pocock)</td>
<td>So David gathered his army and he went to Rabbah. He fought against the city and he defeated it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-Read Version</td>
<td>So David gathered all of the people and went to Rabbah. He fought against Rabbah and captured the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good News Bible (TEV)</td>
<td>So David gathered his forces, went to Rabbah, attacked it, and conquered it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Message</td>
<td>So David marshaled all the troops, went to Rabbah, and fought and captured it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American English Bible</td>
<td>As the result, David gathered his men, went to RabBath, and conquered it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Roots Translinear God's Word™</td>
<td>David gathered all the people and went to Amman and fought for it, and claimed it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Bible</td>
<td>So David assembled the rest of the soldiers and went to Rabbah. When he had fought against it and captured it,...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jerusalem Bible</td>
<td>So David mustered the whole army and marched on Rabbah; he assaulted the town and captured it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Simplified Bible</td>
<td>David assembled the rest of the army and attacked Rabbah. He captured the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised English Bible</td>
<td>David accordingly mustered his whole force, marched on Rabbah, and attacked and captured it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bible in Basic English</td>
<td>Then David got all the people together and went to Rabbah and made war on it and took it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCSB</td>
<td>So David assembled all the troops and went to Rabbah; he fought against it and captured it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET Bible®</td>
<td>So David assembled all the army and went to Rabbah and fought against it and captured it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Advent Bible</td>
<td>Then David gathered all the people together, and went out against Rabbath: and after fighting, he took it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIV – UK</td>
<td>So David mustered the entire army and went to Rabbah, and attacked and captured it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Bible</td>
<td>And David gathered all the people together, and walked to Rabbah, and devoured against it, and captured it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndein</td>
<td>Consequently, David mobilized the entire army, and marched to Rabbah, so that he both besieged it (the Acropolis) (the remaining 1/3 - the Acropolis - the great hilltop fortress), and 'captured it bit by bit' (lakad - imperfect tense).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World English Bible</td>
<td>David gathered all the people together, and went to Rabbah, and fought against it, and took it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young’s Updated LT</td>
<td>And David gathers all the people, and goes to Rabbah, and fights against it, and captures it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
David gathers up an army and takes it to Rabbah. He completes the attack upon this city, taking it down.

Translation: Therefore, David gathered together all of the people... David gathers together an army here. This is going to be different than his war against the Aramæans. That battle required an entire army. This final assault will require a real army; however, there is not a requirement that David gather up all of the people from Israel. Therefore, we need to understand this phrase all the people to be defined by the rest of the people (v. 28). David had a standing army. Most of this standing army was at war against the Ammonites under Joab. David certainly retained an army in Jerusalem and elsewhere (he would not leave his palace or capital city unprotected). So, David is going to gather up all of the active troops who are in Jerusalem (and possibly some from Judæa). However, there will be no concerted effort to gather all of the reserve troops, as was done previously.

For all intents and purposes, Rabbah has been defeated by Joab (v. 26). He has apparently taken out their lower city and probably cut off the water supply to the royal section. However, this does not mean that the final assault will be a cakewalk. This has to be a real assault where David contributes meaningfully; otherwise, all of Joab’s army would see this as just a show.
2Samuel 12:29b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hâlak* (הָלָך) [pronounced haw-LAHK*]</td>
<td>to go, to come, to depart, to walk; to advance</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong's #1980 (and #3212) BDB #229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbâh (רַבָּה) [pronounced rahb-BAW]</td>
<td>many, much, great (in the sense of large or significant, not acclaimed); transliterated Rabbah, Rabba</td>
<td>a proper, locative noun; with the directional hê</td>
<td>Strong's #7237 BDB #913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and he went to Rabbah. All of these verbs will be 3rd person masculine singular verbs, which refers to David. However, David is a metonym for the army that he is leading. Joab has his entire army acting as a holding force in front of Rabbah. Many of the walls and entryways have been compromised.

2Samuel 12:29c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâcham (לָחָם) [pronounced law-KHAHM]</td>
<td>to engage in battle, to engage in war, to wage war; to fight, to battle</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Niphal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong's #3898 BDB #535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b* (ב) [pronounced b*]</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity with the 3rd person feminine singular suffix</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: He fought against the city [lit., her]... David leads an army against Rabbah. The 3rd person feminine singular is used to refer back to the noun city, which is a feminine singular noun. The imperfect tense indicates that this was a real battle. Joab may have done the heavy lifting, but the final assault was not simply perfunctory. This was a real battle.

2Samuel 12:29d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>làkad (לָכָד) [pronounced law-KAHD]</td>
<td>to capture, to seize, to take, to choose [by lot]</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect; with the 3rd person feminine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong's #3920 BDB #539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and took it. Again, this verb is in the imperfect, indicating that this final assault was a process. We do not know how long it took—a few hours or a few weeks. The latter seems to be far more likely.
Then entire verse reads: Therefore, David gathered together all of the people and he went to Rabbah. He fought against the city [lit., her] and took it. These are the exact same verbs used of Joab in v. 26 (Now Joab fought against Rabbah of the Ammonites and took the royal city). However, there, these verbs were in the perfect tense, indicating a completed action. The idea is, tactically, Joab set everything up. This is like a chess game, where, 5 or 10 moves in advance, the game has been determined—the game has been won—and there is nothing that the losing player can do about it. This is where Joab is, tactically speaking. Now, David shows up, as requested by Joab, and the process is completed.

Joab knows what he is doing. David does not show up with a small army and make the final assault, and that is the end of it. Imperfect tense means that this took awhile. Furthermore, Joab does not want this to be simply a perfunctory assault by David and a small army. This has to involve real blood and guts. Even his army has to recognize David’s ability as a commanding general.

Then he took the crown of their king from over his head—and her weight a talent of gold and a stone precious—and so she is over a head of David. And plunder of the city he brought out—increasing exceedingly.

And so he takes a crown of their king from over his head—and her weight a talent of gold and a stone precious—and so she is over a head of David. And plunder of the city he brought out—increasing exceedingly.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

Latin Vulgate

And he took the crown of their king from his head, the weight of which was a talent of gold, set with most precious stones, and it was put upon David's head, and the spoils of the city which were very great he carried away.

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)

And so he takes a crown of their king from over his head—and her weight a talent of gold and [it has] a precious gem—and it is [held] over David's head. Also he brought out exceedingly great [amount of] plunder [from] the city.

Peshitta (Syriac)

And he took their king's crown from off his head; the weight of it was a talent of gold, and in it were precious stones; and it was set on David's head. And he brought forth the spoil of the city in great abundance.

Septuagint (Greek)

And he took the crown of Molchom their king from off his head, and the weight of it was a talent of gold, with a precious stone, and it was upon the head of David; and he carried forth very much spoil of the city.

**Significant differences:**

The biggest change in the text is, the Greek inserts the proper noun Molchom. However, it will become clear, in the Hebrew exegesis, that there really is not a problem with differences in the texts at this point. The Hebrew can be understood in either way.

*Precious stone* in the Greek and Hebrew is in the singular. In the English translation of the Latin and Syriac, as well as almost all English translations, this is treated as a plural noun.

The English translation of the Syriac and Latin have that this crown is *placed over* David’s head. The Greek and Hebrew simply have the verb *to be.*
Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV  
...and took the crown from the statue of their god Milcom. The crown was made of seventy-five pounds of gold, and there was a valuable jewel on it. David put the jewel on his own crown. He also carried off everything else of value.

Easy English (Pocock)  
David took the crown off the king's head and the *Israelites put it on David's head. The gold crown weighed about 30 kilos (about 70 pounds). It had precious stones like diamonds in it too. David took many valuable things from the city.

Easy-to-Read Version  
David took the crown off their king's head [Or, "Milcom's head." Milcom was a false god that the Ammonite people worshiped.] The crown was gold and weighed about 75 pounds [Literally, "one talent."]. This crown had precious stones in it. They put the crown on David's head. David took many valuable things out of the city.

Good News Bible (TEV)  
From the head of the idol of the Ammonite god Molech David took a gold crown which weighed about seventy-five pounds and had a jewel in it. David took the jewel and put it in his own crown. He also took a large amount of loot from the city.

The Message  
He took the crown from their king's head--very heavy with gold, and with a precious stone in it. It ended up on David's head. And they plundered the city, carrying off a great quantity of loot.

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

American English Bible  
And he took the crown of MolChom their king from his head (which was made of gold and precious gems) and had it placed on his own head. They also looted the city and brought back a tremendous amount of goods.

Ancient Roots Translinear  
He took their king's laurels from over his head. The weight was a talent of gold with valuable stones. It was over David's head. He proceeded the spoil of the city multiplied a hundredfold.

God's Word™  
He took the gold crown from the head of Rabbah's king and put it on his own head. (The crown weighed 75 pounds and contained a precious stone.) David also took a lot of goods from the city.

New American Bible  
...he took the crown of Milcom's head. It weighed a talent, of gold and precious stones; it was placed on David's head. He brought out immense booty from the city,... Weighed a talent: since this would be more than 75 pounds, some commentators picture the idol's crown as displaying a single precious stone of large size, which David took to wear; but the text does not say this.

NIRV  
He took the gold crown off the head of the king of Ammon. The crown weighed 75 pounds. It had jewels in it. It was placed on David's head. He took a huge amount of plunder from the city.

New Jerusalem Bible  
He took the crown off Milcom's head; it weighed one talent of gold, and in it was set a precious stone which went on David's head instead. He carried off great quantities of booty from the town.'

New Simplified Bible  
He removed the crown of their god Milcom from off the head of their king. The crown was made of seventy-five pounds of gold. There was a valuable jewel on it. David put the jewel on his own crown. He also carried off everything else of value.

Revised English Bible  
The crown, which weighed a talent of gold and was set with a precious stone, was taken from the head of Milcom and placed on David's head. David also removed a vast quantity of booty from the city.

Today's NIV  
David took the crown from their king's [Or from Milkom's (that is, Molek's)] head, and it was placed on his own head. It weighed a talent [That is, about 75 pounds or about 34 kilograms] of gold, and it was set with precious stones. David took a great quantity of plunder from the city.

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):
And he took the crown of Milcom from his head; the weight of it was a talent of gold, and in it were stones of great price; and it was put on David's head. And he took a great store of goods from the town.

He took the crown off Malkam's head; it weighed sixty-six pounds, with its gold and precious stones; and it was placed on David's head. He carried off great quantities of spoil from the city.

He took the crown from the head of their king, and it was placed on David's head. The crown weighed 75 pounds of gold, and it had a precious stone in it. In addition, David took away a large quantity of plunder from the city.

The crown was taken from the head of their king [Hebrew is “malkam,” which is perhaps equivalent to “Milcom,” the Ammonite deity; cf. 1Kings 11:5] and it was placed on David's head—it weighed a talent of gold, and [on it] [So reads the Targum and 1Chron. 20:2] were precious stones. He also carried off a vast amount of booty from the city.

He took the crown of their king [Part of the Greek tradition wrongly understands Hebrew מַלְכָּם (mal′kām, "their king") as a proper name ("Milcom"). Some English versions follow the Greek here, rendering the phrase "the crown of Milcom" (so NRSV; cf. also NAB, CEV). TEV takes this as a reference not to the Ammonite king but to "the idol of the Ammonite god Molech."] from his head — it was gold, weighed about seventy-five pounds [Heb "and its weight [was] a talent of gold." The weight of this ornamental crown was approximately 75 lbs (34 kg). See P. K. McCarter, II Samuel (AB), 313.], and held a precious stone — and it was placed on David's head. He also took from the city a great deal of plunder.

He took the crown from the head of their king- its weight was a talent of gold, and it was set with precious stones- and it was placed on David's head. He took a great quantity of plunder from the city...

And he took the crown of Milcom from his head; the weight of it was a talent of gold, and in it were stones of great price; and it was put on David's head. And he took a great store of goods from the town.

He took the crown off Malkam's head; it weighed sixty-six pounds, with its gold and precious stones; and it was placed on David's head. He carried off great quantities of spoil from the city.

He took the crown from the head of their king, and it was placed on David's head. The crown weighed 75 pounds of gold, and it had a precious stone in it. In addition, David took away a large quantity of plunder from the city.

The crown was taken from the head of their king [Hebrew is “malkam,” which is perhaps equivalent to “Milcom,” the Ammonite deity; cf. 1Kings 11:5] and it was placed on David's head—it weighed a talent of gold, and [on it] [So reads the Targum and 1Chron. 20:2] were precious stones. He also carried off a vast amount of booty from the city.

He took the crown of their king [Part of the Greek tradition wrongly understands Hebrew מַלְכָּם (mal′kām, "their king") as a proper name ("Milcom"). Some English versions follow the Greek here, rendering the phrase "the crown of Milcom" (so NRSV; cf. also NAB, CEV). TEV takes this as a reference not to the Ammonite king but to "the idol of the Ammonite god Molech."] from his head — it was gold, weighed about seventy-five pounds [Heb "and its weight [was] a talent of gold." The weight of this ornamental crown was approximately 75 lbs (34 kg). See P. K. McCarter, II Samuel (AB), 313.], and held a precious stone — and it was placed on David's head. He also took from the city a great deal of plunder.

He took the crown from the head of their king- its weight was a talent of gold, and it was set with precious stones- and it was placed on David's head. He took a great quantity of plunder from the city...
placed on David's head. He also brought forth the spoil of the city, a very great amount.

Syndein

Then he {David} seized the crown of their king from over his head. Now the weight thereof . . . was a talent of gold . . . including the precious stones - {this is the reason it was not on his head but suspended over his head - a talent of gold weighs 93lbs and 12 oz - the king probably had two slaves holding the crown suspended over his head - it is too big for most humans to really wear on his head - the king is probably lying in a pool of his own blood right now - Per principals of Deuteronomy 20:10 and following. Og the king of Bashan (see Deuteronomy 3:11). He was a giant - from a race the Ammonites called the Zamzummims (see Deuteronomy 2:20) . Og held this area before the Ammonites conquered him. This was most likely his crown originally.) And it was suspended above David's head {the slaves were men so they were also killed - it was two of David's men who now suspended the crown}. Furthermore, he {David} took a great amount of plunder from the city {as is the biblically correct reward for taking a city - per Deuteronomy 20 shares would be given to David and to each of his men . . . with special rewards for acts of great courage}.

Young's Updated LT

And he takes the crown of their king from off his head, and its weight is a talent of gold, and precious stones, and it is on the head of David; and the spoil of the city he has brought out, very much.

The gist of this verse:

David takes the crown of the king with him, along with a great abundance of plunder from the city of Rabbah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong's Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (י)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore, consequently; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâqach (לָקַח)</td>
<td>to take, to take away, to take in marriage; to seize</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong's #3947 BDB #542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ěth (אֵת)</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a direct object</td>
<td>Strong's #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āṯārāh (אָתָרָה)</td>
<td>crown, a diadem, a wreath; an ornament of dignity</td>
<td>feminine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong's #5850 BDB #742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melek° (מֶלֶךְ)</td>
<td>king, ruler, prince</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine plural suffix</td>
<td>Strong's #4428 BDB #572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Greek text has this word instead:

Melchol (μελχολ) [pronounced MEHL-khoth] | proper noun | Strong's #none |
### 2Samuel 12:30a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בדידן (רֹפְשַׁנ) [pronounced rophshan]</td>
<td>head [of a man, city, state, nation, place, family, priest], top [of a mountain]; chief, prince, officer; front, choicest, best; height [of stars]; sum</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #7218 BDB #910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִינ (מִין) [pronounced mihn]</td>
<td>from, away from, out from, out of, off, on account of, since, above, than, so that not, above, beyond, more than</td>
<td>preposition of separation</td>
<td>Strong’s #4480 BDB #577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘אל (אלי) [pronounced aliy]</td>
<td>upon, beyond, on, against, above, over, by, beside</td>
<td>preposition of proximity</td>
<td>Strong’s #5920, #5921 BDB #752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Hebrew, the actual text is **מַלְכָּם** (malkām) [pronounced mahl–KAWM], which some have taken to refer to their *king–idol Milcom*. The Hebrew word for Milcom is **מִלְכָּוָם** (mîlêkāwām) [pronounced mihl–KOHM], which means *king; great king; and is transliterated Milcom. He is god of the Ammonites. Strong’s #4445 BDB #575.*

The difference, obviously, is in the vowels. However, there is an alternate spelling in the Hebrew: **מַלְכָּה** (malkāh), which is what we have here. See also 1Kings 11:5, 33 2Kings 23:13 (where the word is *Milcom*) and 1Chron. 8:9 Zep. 1:5, where the word is *Malcham (Malêkām).*

In other words, both *their king* and *Milcom* are correct understandings from the Hebrew.

**Translation:** Then he took the crown of *Malcam* [or, *their king*] from above his head... The Greek and the Hebrew appear to be quite different here, but they actually are not. In the Greek, David is taking the crown of Melchol, which is assumed to be equivalent to Molech, who is the fire-god of the Ammonites. If this is the case, then David went into their holy temple (actually, his soldiers would have done this) and they took out a crown which was upon the head of Molech, an image probably made of bronze, with its hands outstretched. Often babies would be sacrificed to Molech and placed into his fiery hot arms (made so with a fire, I would assume); and the baby would writhe and burn and die in Molech’s arms. Essentially, David would be going over the head of the worthless new king, to Molech, and taking Molech’s crown.

If you read through the Hebrew exegesis above, *their king* is equivalent to *Malcam*, which is *Milcom*, the god-king of the Ammonites. The only difference is in the vowels, and the original text of the Hebrew lacked vowels. Furthermore, there is at least one other passage which the vowels are the same (1Chron. 8:9 Zep. 1:5). Because the king has a specific name (Hanun), which we know (2Sam. 10:1), if the crown came from him, we would expect him to be named (obviously, he could be dead at this time). However, given the weight of this crown, I would lean toward it coming from the head a bronze idol rather than from over the head of the king of Ammon. Furthermore, this would have had a much greater psychological impact upon the survivors in Rabbah. They all recognize that great gold crown with the singular jewel setting, and their true protection (as they see it)—the god Molech—has been defeated and his crown taken from him.

---

58 Zeph. 1:4–6 reads: "I will stretch out my hand against Judah and against all the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and I will cut off from this place the remnant of Baal and the name of the idolatrous priests along with the priests, those who bow down on the roofs to the host of the heavens, those who bow down and swear to the LORD and yet swear by Milcom, those who have turned back from following the LORD, who do not seek the LORD or inquire of him." The spelling is identical in the Hebrew. See also Jer. 49:1, 3.
It is reasonable to suppose that Joab, or someone on his staff, knew all about the Ammonite idol, just as we know about some of the tenets of other religions and cults. The gods of these various nations would have often been front and center in their worship and in their wars. One of the themes of the Old Testament, which is often downplayed, is the superiority of the Jewish God Jehovah Elohim, as He is not simply a national God to the Hebrews but the Creator of the Universe.

The other understanding, which comes from the Hebrew, is that the king had a marvelous crown. The prepositions in this verse allow for this crown to be suspended over the head of the king, probably held there by 2 or more servants.

Although it is certainly possible that, David takes the royal city and, upon his entry into the palace, the king is just sitting there below his crown, with 2 servants holding it over his head. However, it seems more likely to me that this man has been slaughtered, along with his evil state department, and David goes into their religious temple in order to show those who remain, that their cause and their freedom are lost.

Translation: ...—its weight [is] a talent of gold and [it has] a precious gem—...  I have seen many different estimates on the weight of this crown. Vine has 114 lbs., Easton has 94 3/7 lbs. (but 82 ¼ lbs in the New Testament). Most of the English translations seemed to settle on 75 lbs, for some reason. In any case, the weight
of this crown would have been too great to be placed on the head of any one. However, the Hebrew here allows for the crown to be held aloft, over the head (if on the statue of Molech, then it could certainly sit there as well).

There is some debate out there as to this weight referring to the value of the crown or to its weight; and that weight is disputed. One of the problems is, many commentators were concerned that David could not simply put a crown of this weight on his own head. However, the text which follows will allow for the crown to be suspended above David’s head.

The Greek and Hebrew both have precious gem here, rather than precious stones. There is a common plural form of this word. This is not taking away from this crown if there is only one stone at the front of it. One would assume that, if this is the case, it would be a huge and precious gem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ħâyâh (הָיָה) [pronounced haw-YAW]</td>
<td>to be, is, was, are; to become, to come into being; to come to pass</td>
<td>3rd person feminine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #1961 BDB #224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘al (עָלָי) [pronounced ălah]</td>
<td>upon, beyond, on, against, above, over, by, beside</td>
<td>preposition of proximity</td>
<td>Strong’s #5920, #5921 BDB #752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rō’š (רֹאשׁ or רָאשׁ) [pronounced rosh]</td>
<td>head [of a man, city, state, nation, place, family, priest], top [of a mountain]; chief, prince, officer; front, choicest, best; height [of stars]; sum</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #7218 BDB #910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāvîd (דָּוִד) [pronounced daw-VEED]</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and it is [held] over David’s head. So far, this reads: Then he took the crown of Malcham [or, their king] from above his head—its weight [is] a talent of gold and [it has] a precious gem—and it is [held] over David’s head. The way that I picture this is, when David rides through the city, he leads a procession of Jewish soldier-heroes—perhaps he is in a chariot of sorts (perhaps one appropriated from the Aramaeans, the former allies of the Ammonites)—and two men are holding this crown over his head as he rides out of Rabbah, victorious. Every remaining soul in Rabbah would recognize this crown as either from the king or from their god Molech. This clearly shows David as being victorious over Ammon and their king. It paints a picture in their minds. All around them is death and destruction and David with the great crown of their god over his head, riding about in victory. The idea is, the people who are still alive, see this. The fighting has stopped and there are man who remain alive, and they see David riding through their streets and their holy crown above him. When they see this, they know that all is lost. Further resistance is death.

A number of Israeli soldiers will be left behind to administer their subjugation. And, perhaps even in the end, they will see David riding off into the sunset, having soundly defeated them.

---

59 See Dr. John Gill, John Gill’s Exposition of the Entire Bible; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:30. Also, Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset and David Brown; Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible; from e-sword, 2Sam. 12:30.
**2Samuel 12:30d**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (ו or ו)</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple waw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shâlal (שַׁלַל)</td>
<td>booty, spoil, plunder, recompense, reward</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #7998 BDB #1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘îyr (אֵירת)</td>
<td>encampment, city, town</td>
<td>feminine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #5892 BDB #746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yâtsâ (יַצָּה)</td>
<td>to cause to go out, to lead out, to bring out, to carry out, to draw out, to take out; [of money:] to put forth, to lay out, to exact; to promulgate; to produce</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Hiphil perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3318 BDB #422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>râbâh (רָבָה)</td>
<td>to make [do] much; to multiply, to increase; to give much; to lay much; to have much; to make great; many [as a Hiphil infinitive construct]</td>
<td>3rd person feminine singular, Hiphil imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7235 BDB #915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the Hiphil is followed by an infinitive and gerund—or by a finite verb—it can mean much.

The Hiphil infinitive absolute is often used as an adverb: *in doing much, very much, exceedingly great* (the latter two with the adverb *m*<sup>3</sup>-'ôd*).

| m<sup>3</sup>-'ôd (מִּזְדַּד) | exceedingly, extremely, greatly, very | adverb | Strong’s #3966 BDB #547 |

Together, they are translated *exceedingly much, a tremendous (incredible) amount; a [staggeringly] large quantity, in great abundance.*

Translation: Also he brought out exceedingly great [amount of] plunder [from] the city. Now, you may wonder, if they spent all of their money on mercenaries, and that caused the inhabitants of Rabbah to be flat broke, where is all of this plunder coming from? This does not mean that the nation was completely without riches. For instance, right now, one of the great middle eastern nations of history, Egypt, is in great turmoil. Their people make, on average, $2/day, and they are suffering from an horrendous national upheaval, in part due to their economy. Their king of 30 years, Mubarak, has, if I recall correctly, $80 billion stashed away. So, it would not be out of the question for the people to be flat broke in Rabbah, but for the king to have a huge amount of wealth. Nor is it out of the question that some people held back a portion of their personal treasure. Furthermore, there would be a huge amount of wealth associated with their religious practices.

There have been times in history where there have been, for instance, spectacular Catholic churches sitting in the midst of great poverty. My point here is, all of the treasury could have been spent on mercenary troops and the public could be without money. However, there will always be a lot of money in the temple and in the king’s pocket (so to speak).

Listen, God told Abraham: "I will bless those who bless you, and him who dishonors you I will curse, and in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed." (Gen. 12:3). At one time, Ammon had a wonderful relationship with the Jews. David, when their king died, send his sincere regards to his ruling son (2Sam. 10:1–2). Now, whether or not David was collecting a tribute from them (he probably was), these people were still rich. They had enough...
money to pay for a mercenary army and still have money remaining. So, they should have been content with what they had. Their relationship with David resulted in great blessing to them. However, they chose to curse the Jews, and God here curses them. All that remains, the Jews take for themselves.

**Application:** The reasons for what the Ammonites did boils down to personal greed and arrogance. For awhile, in the news, we had protesting public sector unions. These unions already made much more money than the people who were paying their salaries, and yet, when it seemed like this fountain would be shut off (at least temporarily), these unions, in their arrogance and greed, protested throughout the United States. The rest of the United States had been going through a great recession, and these public workers were receiving raise after raise after raise. Union heads figured out, when you organize public workers, you can turn on the spigot of money, and almost no politician will ever turn it off. The next time you are called upon to demonstrate, make certain that you are not filled with greed and arrogance. Make certain that your cause is just, and not simply a matter of lining your own pockets with gold at the expense of others.

**Application:** Gen. 12:3 continues to be a factor even until today. The relationship of the United States with the Jewish people and the nation of Israel is extremely important. We face so many different things which could destroy our nation nearly overnight, and yet, God has blessed us far more than we deserve. God has shed His grace upon us because of our relationship with the Jewish people.

**Application:** Do not think that Jews have to exhibit perfect behavior in order for you to support them. Here, we have been studying the destruction of Ammon superimposed upon the sin of David. David has done some horrible stuff. Yet, God treats Ammon as He does, because they have become antisemitic. It does not matter if the King of Israel has great personal failings. God, throughout all time, is with the Jewish people. They are His people. We may be in a different dispensation and God no longer works specifically through the nation Israel; but never be confused—the Jews are His people and God will use them and bless them once again.

**Application:** There have been times in our history where we are somewhat confused—usually because of a lack of doctrine—as to what we ought to support and who our allies ought to be. We simply look at the associations of all those involved. Recently, for instance, there have been many organizations sending flotillas to the Gaza strip, where the Palestinians are. A significant number of Palestinians are antisemitic (it was not always this way). But now, these people, for the most part, are acting like the Ammonites. You may reasonably assume that pretty much all of the organizations who are associated with and who sponsor this flotilla are evil.

**Application:** Here is something else with associations which ought to clear things up for us: when there are two groups of people at war, is either side clearly evil and the other side clearly good? If we cannot make that call, then we ought not to support either side. If one side is antisemitic and the other side is Christian (or Jewish), then who we support ought to be obvious.

**Application:** Now let’s go back to Mubarak (by the time that you read this, all of this has already been decided). Mubarak has supported and maintain a treaty with Israel. Egypt, as one of the most influential nations in the Middle East, has a great deal of sway over the other nations. This in itself suggests that our support ought to be for Mubarak or that we ought to remain neutral.

**Application:** One area where the people of the United States are confused is, with respect to a revolution. We have been brainwashed to think that, *when the people revolt, that is a good thing*. Revolution is not a good thing. Revolution destroys the order of things. Most revolutions result in a worse situation, not a better one. Therefore, our first instinct to support this or that revolution is the wrong instinct.

See the Doctrine of Revolution ([HTML](#)) ([PDF](#)) (it is in the Addendum of the doctrine linked to).

This verse reads: *Then he took the crown of Malcham [or, their king] from above his head—its weight [is] a talent of gold and [it has] a precious gem—and it is [held] over David’s head. Also he brought out exceedingly great [amount of] plunder [from] the city.* Here was once a great city, blessed by God with so much. They were friends of Israel’s. David had a warm relationship with their king. Therefore, even if they paid tribute to David, they were
still a wealthy country. Arrogance and greed have led them to this point, and now they have nothing. Their wealth is all gone and they are being taken into slavery.

And the people who [were] in her, he brought out. And so he places [them] in the saw and in picks of the iron and in axes of the iron; and he brought them in the brick kiln. And thus he does to all cities of sons of Ammon. And so returns David and all the people [to] Jerusalem.

David led out all of the people who were in the city of Rabbah and placed them into slave labor. They worked with saws, iron picks and iron axes; also they worked in the brick kilns, making bricks. This became David’s policy with all of the Ammonite cities. Once all of these things were set into motion, David returned to Jerusalem with his army.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

Latin Vulgate
And bringing forth the people thereof he sawed them, and drove over them chariots armed with iron: and divided them with knives, and made them pass through brickkilns: so did he to all the cities of the children of Ammon: and David returned, with all the army to Jerusalem.

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)
And the people who [were] in her, he brought out. And so he places [them] in the saw and in picks of the iron and in axes of the iron; and he brought them in the brick kiln. And thus he does to all cities of sons of Ammon. And so returns David and all the people [to] Jerusalem.

Peshitta (Syriac)
And he brought forth the people who were in it, and put them under the saw, and under iron harrows, and axes of iron, and made them pass through the brick-kiln: and thus did he to all the cities of the Ammonites. Then David and all the people returned to Jerusalem.

Septuagint (Greek)
And he brought forth the people that were in it, and put them under the saw, and under iron harrows, and axes of iron, and made them pass through the brick-kiln: and thus did he to all the cities of the children of Ammon. And David and all the people returned to Jerusalem.

Significant differences: What exactly David did with the people of Rabbah is unclear in the Latin. It sounds as if David tortured them to death. The Syriac took this as placing the people of Ammon into iron bands and chains. The Hebrew and Greek seem to be in perfect agreement.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV
David made the people of Rabbah tear down the city walls with iron picks and axes, and then he put them to work making bricks. He did the same thing with all the other Ammonite cities. David went back to Jerusalem, and the people of Israel returned to their homes.

Easy English (Pocock)
He also took all the people out of the city. He made them work hard with saws, iron picks (a type of tool) and axes. He forced them to make bricks. David did the same to all the other Ammonite towns. Then David and his whole army returned to Jerusalem.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-Read Version</td>
<td>David also brought out the people of the city Rabbah and made them work with saws, iron picks, and axes. He also forced them to build things with bricks. David did the same thing to all of the Ammonite cities. Then David and all of his army went back to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good News Bible (TEV)</td>
<td>...and put its people to work with saws, iron hoes, and iron axes, and forced them to work at making bricks. He did the same to the people of all the other towns of Ammon. Then he and his men returned to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Message</td>
<td>David emptied the city of its people and put them to slave labor using saws, picks, and axes, and making bricks. He did this to all the Ammonite cities. Then David and the whole army returned to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life Bible</td>
<td>He brought out the people who were in it also. He made them work with saws, sharp iron tools, and iron axes. And he made them work in the heat making building stones. He did this to all the cities of the sons of Ammon. Then David and all the people returned to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Living Translation</td>
<td>He also made slaves of the people of Rabbah and forced them to labor with saws, iron picks, and iron axes, and to work in the brick kilns. That is how he dealt with the people of all the Ammonite towns. Then David and all the army returned to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American English Bible</td>
<td>Then he took the [city's] people away and put them to work as carpenters, farm laborers, iron smelters, blacksmiths, and brick makers. And that's what he did in all the cities of the sons of AmMon. Then David and his men returned to JeruSalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Roots Translinear</td>
<td>He proceeded the people in it, and set their chisels, wedges of iron, and iron parts passed in the brickkiln. So he did he in all the cities of the sons of Amman. David and all the people returned to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God's Word™</td>
<td>He brought out the troops who were there and put them to work with saws, hoes, and axes. He did the same to all the Ammonite cities. Then David and all the troops returned to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Bible</td>
<td>...and also led away the inhabitants, whom he assigned to work with saws, iron picks, and iron axes, or put to work at the brickmold. This is what he did to all the Ammonite cities. David and all the soldiers then returned to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRV</td>
<td>He brought out the people who were there. He made them work with saws and iron picks and axes. He forced them to make bricks. He did that to all of the towns in Ammon. Then he and his entire army returned to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jerusalem Bible</td>
<td>And he expelled its inhabitants, setting them to work with saws, iron picks and iron axes, employing them at brickmaking. He treated all the Ammonite towns in the same way. David and the whole army returned to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Simplified Bible</td>
<td>David made the people of Rabbah tear down the city walls with iron picks and axes. He also put them to work making bricks. He did the same thing with all the other Ammonite cities. David went back to Jerusalem. The people of Israel returned to their homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised English Bible</td>
<td>He brought out the inhabitants and set them to work with saws and other iron tools, sharp and toothed, and made them labour at the brick-kilns. David did this to all the Ammonites towns; then he and all his army returned to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today’s NIV</td>
<td>...and brought out the people who were there, consigning them to labor with saws and with iron picks and axes, and he made them work at brick making [The meaning of the Hebrew for this clause is uncertain.] David did this to all the Ammonite towns. Then he and his entire army returned to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):**
And he took the people out of the town and put them to work with wood-cutting instruments, and iron grain-crushers, and iron axes, and at brick-making: this he did to all the towns of the children of Ammon. Then David and all the people went back to Jerusalem.

In addition, he expelled the people who were in it and set them to work with saws, iron harrows and iron axes, or had them cross over to work in the brick factory. This is what he did to all the cities of the people of 'Amon. Then David and all the people returned to Yerushalayim.

He removed the people who were in the city and put them to work with saws, iron picks, and iron axes, and to labor at brickmaking. He did the same to all the Ammonite cities. Then he and all his troops returned to Jerusalem.

He led out the people who lived there and set them to work with saws, iron threshing boards, and iron axes, or assigned them to brick making; David did this to all the towns of Ammon. Then David and all the troops returned to Jerusalem.

He removed [Heb "brought out."] the people who were in it and made them do hard labor with saws, iron picks, and iron axes, putting them to work at the brick kiln. This was his policy [Heb "and so he would do."] with all the Ammonite cities. Then David and all the army returned to Jerusalem.

And bringing forth the people thereof he sawed them, and drove over them chariots armed with iron: and divided them with knives, and made them pass through brickkilns: so did he to all the cities of the children of Ammon: and David returned, with all the army to Jerusalem.

...and brought out the people who were there, consigning them to labor with saws and with iron picks and axes, and he made them work at brick making [The meaning of the Hebrew for this clause is uncertain]. David did this to all the Ammonite towns. Then he and his entire army returned to Jerusalem.

...and brought out the people who were there, consigning them to labour with saws and with iron picks and axes, and he made them work at brickmaking. He did this to all the Ammonite towns. Then David and his entire army returned to Jerusalem.

And he brought out the people who were in it, and set them to the saw and to sharp instruments of iron and to axes of iron, and made them pass over to the brick works. And so he did with all the cities of the children of Ammon. And Dawid? and all the people returned to Yerushalayim.

And he brought forth the people who were there, and put them to [work with] saws and iron threshing sledges and axes, and made them labor at the brick kiln. And he did this to all the Ammonite cities. Then [he] and all the men returned to Jerusalem.

And he brought out the people that were in it, and put them under saws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them pass through the brickkiln: and thus did he to all the cities of the sons of Ammon. And David and all the people returned to Jerusalem.

And he brought out the people who were in it and set them to labor with saws and iron picks and iron axes and made them toil at the brick kilns. And thus he did to all the cities of the Ammonites. Then David and all the people returned to Jerusalem.

...and he brings the people therein and sets them under saws and under slicers of iron and under axes of iron and passes them through the brickkiln: and thus he works to all the cities of the sons of Ammon: and David and all the people return to Yerushalayim.
..."and he obliged the people that were in it to go out, and put them to the saw", to cut stones; "and to the iron mines", to dig there; "and to the axes of iron", to cut wood, with; "after he had made them to pass with their king" out of the city.

King James 2000 Version
And he brought forth the people that were therein, and put them to work with saws, and with picks of iron, and with axes of iron, and made them toil at the brick kilns: and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon. So David and all the people returned unto Jerusalem.

King James Version
And he brought forth the people that were therein, and put them under saws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them pass through the brickkiln: and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon. So David and all the people returned unto Jerusalem.

Modern KJV
And he brought forth the people that were in it, and put them to the saw, and to sharp tools of iron, and to axes of iron. And he made them go over into the brick-kiln. And so he did to all the cities of the sons of Ammon. And David and all the people returned to Jerusalem.

NASB
He also brought out the people who were in it, and [1 Chr 20:3; Heb 11:37] set them under saws, sharp iron instruments, and iron axes, and made them pass through the brickkiln. And thus he did to all the cities of the sons of Ammon. Then David and all the people returned to Jerusalem.

Syndein
And he [David] caused the males who were in it [Rabah] to be brought out and he forced them against the saw [Per Deuteronomy 20, all the men were to be killed in a contested siege so David is now cutting these men in pieces] and with iron 'farming tools'/plows, and with axes of iron [terrible ways for these men to die - thousands died this way the message is to others - don't mess with Israel - and it was a great deterrent]. And caused them {others - VIP's} to pass through the brick-kiln/brick mold' {malben} . . . {the Ammonites worshiped their chief god Moloch/Melek with human sacrifice in furnaces - so here they probably threw in the priests of Moloch - 'it was their turn' type thing}. And so he [David] did to all the cities of the children of Ammon. Afterward, David and his entire army returned unto Jerusalem. {Note: Amos Chapter 1:13-15 explains some of the activities of the Ammonites against the Jews. Their harsh judgement was ordained by God and therefore was perfect justice for all they did. Had they been permitted to live, they would have destroyed the entire human race. Also Jeremiah prophesized about the downfall of the Ammonites in Jeremiah 49:1-5.}.

Third Millennium Bible
And he brought forth the people that were therein, and put them under saws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them pass through the brickkiln; and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon. So David and all the people returned unto Jerusalem.

Young’s Updated LT
And the people who are in it he has brought out, and sets to the saw, and to cutting instruments of iron, and to axes of iron, and has caused them to pass over into the brick-kiln; and so he does to all the cities of the Bene-Ammon; and David turns back, and all the people, to Jerusalem.

The gist of this verse:
David puts the people of Rabbah into slave labor, and this is his policy throughout all of Ammon. Once all of this is set into motion, David returns to Jerusalem with his army.
Even though David is under installment discipline, he still functions as the king of all Israel. Therefore, throughout the next 10 years, David is going to do normal things as a king should. What we find in this chapter is David functioning just as he ought to function. It does not mean that his discipline is over; nor does it mean that David is recovered completely from the arrogance complex.

**2Samuel 12:31a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (1, or 1) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wāw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘am (עָמ) [pronounced gahm]</td>
<td>people; race, tribe; family, relatives; citizens, common people; companions, servants; entire human race; herd [of animals]</td>
<td>masculine singular collective noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #5971 BDB #766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘āsher (אָשֶׁר) [pronounced ash-ER]</td>
<td>that, which, when, who, whom</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
<td>Strong’s #834 BDB #81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b (ב) [pronounced bv]</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity with the 3rd person feminine singular suffix</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yātsā (יַצָּה) [pronounced yaw-TZAWH]</td>
<td>to cause to go out, to lead out, to bring out, to carry out, to draw out, to take out; [of money:] to put forth, to lay out, to exact; to promulgate; to produce</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Hiphil perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3318 BDB #422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** And David led out all of the people who [were] in the city of Rabbah [lit., her]. In the ancient world, it was very common for one nation, after conquering another, to take the people out of their land and subjugate them to slavery. Part of the reason is, people will fight and die on the land of their birth. However, being hauled 200 miles away to a distant soil does not inspire them to rebellion.

There are certainly two approaches here—if the people seem willing, often they can be left where they are and a tribute collected periodically, the administration being done by a contingent of soldiers left behind. However, in this situation, the people have shown themselves to be extremely hardheaded. They have probably rebelled against a Suzerain-vassal treaty (this is an assumption I am making); and therefore, not worth the trouble of trying to collect since they are clearly a rebellious people. Therefore, the alternative is to subjugate them to slavery.

Let me talk about David here and draw a distinction. The installment discipline which David faces is not, strictly speaking, discipline. God is going to put pressure upon David for his spiritual growth as well. David will fail, get up again; and fail several times in the future. At times, what God does will be discipline towards David; and, at times, what God does will be difficulties that He throws David’s way for David’s spiritual blessing. Now, the actual things which occur may appear to be the exact same thing—discipline for correction and difficulties place upon David for growth—however, the first turns David around and causes him to get back into fellowship and rethink his actions; the second accelerates David’s spiritual growth.

David, as ruler over all Israel, has a great responsibility toward the citizens of Israel. When he is out alley-catting around, this is just bad form. He influences the people in a terrible way. God cannot allow this to continue. Now, 60

---

60 A tribute can be collected by means of a Suzerain-vassal treaty as well, enforced by a contingent of soldiers.
bear in mind, this is addictive, degenerate behavior on David’s part. Therefore, stopping what he is doing is much different than stopping just some miscellaneous sin. God is going to, for 10 years, put pressure upon David, to turn him around. As a result of installment discipline (which is a convenient term, but not altogether accurate), David will be turned around and he will be even a greater leader than he was before. You see, this pressure is going to sit upon David in 4 installments, and sometimes, David will be in fellowship and, at other times, he will be out of fellowship. However, he needs to go through this fourfold administration of discipline (external press). The end result will be a much-improved David. So, as we continue to study David, bear in mind, this is the overlying lattice of reality in his life—fourfold discipline (pressure). David is going to face this whether he is in fellowship and advancing (as we see in this victory over Ammon) or whether he is retrogressing, as we will see him do in the Absalom revolution.

**Application:** One of the things which used to confuse me about some Biblical narratives is, prophets and disciples talking to political leaders about their sins—like divorcing and remarrying. Here is the deal: those who are human celebrities—in the time of David down to the time of the Apostles—the celebrities of that day were political figures. Today, celebrities are athletes, movie and television people, musical performers, and political figures. What they do has an effect upon the entire nation. People may have a well-defined sense of morality, but when they know that King David, a man after God’s Own heart, is alley-cattering around, that affects their own morality. They use this as an excuse, which plunges much of the country into immorality. Therefore, God let some rulers know that, what they are doing is unacceptable. A client nation is held together by morality. Morality is not simply for believers; it is for the entire human race. When the citizens of a nation become more and more immoral, that nation will rot from within (the same thing is true when a nation becomes more and more religious—in the negative sense). So, God, in His dealings with David, must make certain that everyone in this nation recognizes that David is under discipline and that the things which he has chosen to do are very wrong. When David clearly cannot get away with anything, then it ought to be clear that, no one can.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (י)</td>
<td>and, and, then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sîym (שִׂימ)</td>
<td>to put, to place, to set; to make; to appoint</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7760 BDB #962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b° (ב)</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>môgêrâh (מִּגְרַח)</td>
<td>saw [for stone cutting]</td>
<td>feminine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #4050 BDB #176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w° (or v°) (ו)</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b° (ב)</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chârîyts (חרִיתֵצ)</td>
<td>a cutting, a piece (thing) cut (off); a cut; a sharp instrument; sharpened</td>
<td>masculine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #2757 BDB #358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2Samuel 12:31b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>barasterel (בָּרָּתֶל) [pronounced baraster-ZEL]</td>
<td>iron [ore, implements, utensils, furniture]; metaphorically to denote <strong>hardness, firmness; obstinance</strong></td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #1270 BDB #137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wâ (וּ) (וּ or וָ) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bê (בֶּ) [pronounced bê]</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magzêrâh (מָגַזְרָּה) [pronounced mahg-zay-RAW]</td>
<td>cutting instrument, axe</td>
<td>feminine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #4037 BDB #160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barasterel (בָּרָּתֶל) [pronounced baraster-ZEL]</td>
<td>iron [ore, implements, utensils, furniture]; metaphorically to denote <strong>hardness, firmness; obstinance</strong></td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #1270 BDB #137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** He placed [them] [into slave labor] with saws, iron picks and iron axes;... There is a portion of this verse that we must reasonably determine its meaning. We do not have the words *slave labor* here; however, the words uses here cannot be all understood to refer to putting the Ammonites into chains and bands. So, all of the words taken together suggest hard labor for the Ammonites.

What this is known as is, enforced discipline. The Ammonites approved of what their king did and stood behind him, even though he was completely and totally wrong. Therefore, they respond to Israel and to David in arrogance. Many of them laughed and howled as David’s emissaries are led through the streets of Rabbah, subject to ridicule. Their only chance, at this point, is enforced humility. David cannot allow this people to just go on living in their independence. The end result would have been, they would have eventually attacked Israel. David is nipping all of this in the bud.

We have 2 offensive wars here by David. David first attacks Rabbah for their insulting of his emissaries (which President Carter should have done to Iran); and then, when the Aramaeans became involved, David attacked them. The Ammonites have not invaded Israel; the Syrians (Aramaeans) have not invaded Israel. These are preemptive strikes by David, and they are the right thing to do.

**Application:** The Bible tells us a lot about warfare, and it is clear in this passage and in previous chapters that, there is a time for a preemptive strike. It is evil to wait until we are struck first.

The saws would have been used to cut rock; and the iron picks and axes would have been used to mine rock and to give it a rough shape to begin with. These people, because of their hard-heartedness, will spend the rest of their days in slavery.
### 2Samuel 12:31c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wָנָ (or vָנָ) (I, or i) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wāw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʼâbar (בָּר) [pronounced gaw²-VAHR]</td>
<td>to cause [make] to pass over, to cause [allow] to pass through, to bring [over, to]; to transmit, to send over; to pass by sin, to cause to pass away, to cause to take away; to remit, to forgive</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Hiphil perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5674 BDB #716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʼëth (אֵת) [pronounced ayth]</td>
<td>untranslated mark of a direct object; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>affixed to a 3rd person masculine plural suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bָּ (בָּ) [pronounced b²]</td>
<td>in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within</td>
<td>a preposition of proximity</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malḇēn (מַלְבֶּן) [pronounced mahl-BANE]</td>
<td>a brick kiln; brick-mold; quadrangle; rectangular object</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #4404 BDB #527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because there are several Qal meanings, there are several corresponding Hiphil meanings. This word, in the Hiphil, can also mean to bring; to offer up [as a sacrifice]; to consecrate; to lead away, to take away, to remove; to avert.

| ʼëth (אֵת) [pronounced ayth] | untranslated mark of a direct object; occasionally to, toward | affixed to a 3rd person masculine plural suffix | Strong’s #853 BDB #84 |
| bָּ (בָּ) [pronounced b²] | in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within | a preposition of proximity | No Strong’s # BDB #88 |
| malḇēn (מַלְבֶּן) [pronounced mahl-BANE] | a brick kiln; brick-mold; quadrangle; rectangular object | masculine singular noun with the definite article | Strong’s #4404 BDB #527 |

Both the NIV Study Bible and Rotherham suggest that there is a problem with this word. Owen⁶¹ suggests that this possibly may occur without the definite article (this is what is known as a Qere, where a scribe believes there to be a problem with the text, but it is a problem which he would not simply change or fix).⁶² Lacking the definite article means that this could possibly be a verb and mean making bricks. Rotherham⁶³ says that this is a word of doubtful meaning. On the other hand, this same word is said to occur also in Jer. 43:9 and Nahum 3:14. Whatever the problem is exactly, it appears to be quite minor to me. Given the other two passages, this seems to be related to the making of bricks, and such work is often assigned to slaves in the ancient world (Ex. 1:13–14).

**Translation:** ...and he brought them to the brick kiln. The most menial jobs are assigned to these Ammonites. More enforced humility.⁶⁴ They are brought in to make bricks, one of the most repetitive and tiring jobs that can be done.

This tells us, quite obviously, that cities and buildings in Israel were, therefore, made out of bricks.

The King James Version suggests that what David did to these people was much more dramatic than mere slavery. This suggests that David may have tortured the Ammonites.

---


⁶³ Joseph Bryant Rotherham’s The Emphasized Bible; ©1971 by Kregel Publications; p. 333 (footnote).

⁶⁴ Enforced humility means that, they do not have a choice here. They obey the authorities over them or they die.
What About the King James Version of 2Samuel 12:31

1. The KJV makes it sound as if David tortured these people of Ammon. It reads: And he brought forth the people that were therein, and put them under saws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them pass through the brickkiln: and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon. So David and all the people returned unto Jerusalem.

2. The translation of the KJV is reasonably accurate. So, it is possible that David inflicted great pain and suffering upon these people.

3. Even Matthew Henry commented: [David] seems to have been too harsh with his prisoners of war (2Sam. 12:31). Taking the city by storm, after it had obstinately held out against a long and expensive siege, if he had put all whom he found in arms to the sword in the heat of battle, it would have been severe enough; but to kill them afterwards in cold blood, and by cruel tortures, with saws and harrows, tearing them to pieces, did not become him who, when he entered upon the government, promised to sing of mercy as well as judgment (Psalm 101:1). Had he made examples of those only who had abused his ambassadors, or advised or assisted in it, that being a violation of the law of nations, it might have been looked upon as a piece of necessary justice for terror to other nations; but to be thus severe with all the cities of the children of Ammon (that is, the garrisons or soldiers of the cities) was extremely rigorous, and a sign that David's heart was not yet made soft by repentance, else the bowels of his compassion would not have been thus shut up — a sign that he had not yet found mercy, else he would have been more ready to show mercy.¹

4. On Syndein's page, this is explained this way: And he {David} caused the males who were in it {Rabah} to be brought out and he forced them against the saw {Per Deuteronomy 20, all the men were to be killed in a contested siege so David is now cutting these men in pieces} and with iron 'farming tools'/plows, and with axes of iron {terrible ways for these men to die - thousands died this way the message is to others - don't mess with Israel - and it was a great deterrent}. And caused them {others - VIP's} to pass through the brick-kiln/brick mold {malben} . . . {the Ammonites worshiped their chief god Moloch/Melek with human sacrifice in furnaces - so here they probably threw in the priests of Moloch - 'it was their turn' type thing}. And so he {David} did to all the cities of the children of Ammon. Afterward, David and his entire army returned unto Jerusalem. {Note: Amos Chapter 1:13-15 explains some of the activities of the Ammonites against the Jews. Their harsh judgement was ordained by God and therefore was perfect justice for all they did. Had they been permitted to live, they would have destroyed the entire human race. Also Jeremiah prophesied about the downfall of the Ammonites in Jeremiah 49:1-5.}.²

5. These parents actually sacrificed their own children to Moloch, placing their little bodies into the heated arms of Moloch, so that they would die in excruciating pain.

6. Now, I believe that there is enough here to suggest that these people were enslaved rather than tortured; however, that could simply be my genteel nature.

7. On the other hand, we already know how David dealt with the rebellious Moabites. He caused their soldiers to lay down and he killed 2 out of 3 men, so that blood splattered all over the men who remained. 2Sam. 8:2

8. When Critics Ask ³ gives a 3-pronged explanation:

1) Several things should be observed in response to this criticism. First, the KJV translation is open to this misinterpretation here. More recent translations clear up the difficulty. The NKJV correctly renders it, David “put them to work with saws and iron picks and iron axes, and made them cross over to the brick works.” Likewise, the NIV says, David “brought out the people who were there, consigning them to labor with saws and with iron picks and axes, and he made them work at brick-making.” Their first explanation is what I believe to be the case; however, I am not 100% convinced (which is why this doctrine has been inserted here).

2) Second, the writer is merely relating these events here—he is not necessarily placing his stamp of approval on them. As noted earlier (see Introduction), not everything recorded in the Bible is condoned by the Bible. The second approach is also reasonable; the Bible simply records what happened; it does not condone these actions.

3) Third, the punishment of forced labor given to these vicious enemies of God's people is not
What About the King James Version of 2Samuel 12:31

extreme. Considering the cruelties they unleashed on the children of Israel (cf. 1Sam. 11:2 Amos 1:13), by comparison, their treatment was humane. This is a weak explanation. 1Sam. 11:2 is not worse behavior, although it is certainly egregiously cruel (this is where a general agreed to let the people of a city of Israel live, if all their right eyes were cut out). Furthermore, you do not condone bad behavior by pointing to other bad behavior.

9. Our most reasonable conclusion is, these men were placed into slavery, as all of the tools described are tools of agriculture and brick-making; no clear mention is made of weaponry.

10. That David and Joab determined that torture of their enemies was the correct way to go, just seems unlikely to me, given the vocabulary of this verse. It seems like a lot of trouble, as killing 2 of 3 men in Moab worked with the Moabite soldiers—it was quick and effective. Furthermore, this would have been a waste of good slave labor (those who rebelled would be killed in front of everyone else). It would certainly be the prudent thing to do to make use of this manpower.

11. If you think that even slavery was far too harsh, I will deal with that question/opinion/problem at the end of this chapter.

I am not rejecting the idea of David and Joab killing a massive number of Ammonite males simply because I don’t like that idea. David obviously killed a lot of Moabites after defeating their army. I simply believe that the vocabulary here lends itself to slavery rather than to a torturous death.

---

1 Matthew Henry, Commentary on the Whole Bible; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 19:26–31.
3 Norman Geisler and Thomas Howe, When Critics Ask; Victor Books; taken from e-Sword, 2Sam. 12:31.
2Samuel 12:31d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bâînîym (בָּנִים)</td>
<td>sons, descendants; children; people; sometimes rendered men</td>
<td>masculine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced baw-NEEM]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ammôwn (עֲמֹנֶה)</td>
<td>hidden; transliterated Ammon</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #5983 BDB #769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced gahm-MOHN]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is often transliterated Bene-Ammon and is a common designation for this country.

Translation: So David [lit., he] did to all of the Ammonite cities [lit., cities of the sons of Ammon]. This became David’s policy throughout all of Ammon. We do not know if he attacked these other cities as he did Rabbah; however, this became the eventual fate of the larger Ammonite cities. One would expect that this policy would have taken several years to implement and it would have been carried out simultaneous to the action of the next few chapters.

Now, you might think to yourself, the king of Ammon did an unbelievably stupid thing (2Sam. 10:1–5), and that how does this make sense, to discipline all of Ammon for his arrogance?

Why Does God Allow David to Discipline All the People of Ammon?

1. People get the ruler that they deserve.
   1) God puts all authorities in power, and does this according to the people over which that person will have authority. The ruler of any people is appropriate to his people. This helps to explain why most of the Middle East is ruled by harsh, despotic dictators today.
   2) We have a great example in contemporary politics in the United States. A democracy/republic requires that the people have integrity and that they make decisions based upon good information which they have studied. In the 2008 election of Barrack Obama, there was great information out there all about who he was and who is opponent was (John McCain), despite all of the propaganda put out by the alphabet media. If a person is so arrogant as to think his vote is meaningful, even if he knows very little about the candidates except that one is very handsome and cool and the other is old and gnarly, then he or she deserves the candidate that they elect.

2. That people get the ruler they deserve is true, even in a monarchy. God deals with people individually and collectively (as institutions, like marriages, families and nations).

3. The people of Ammon saw what their king did, because he marched David’s ambassadors through the streets, humiliating them. If they did not know all that was happening, they were soon filled in.

4. 2Sam. 10:6a reveals the culpability of the people of Ammon: And the sons of Ammon saw that they were odious to David. And the sons of Ammon [hired mercenaries]. The money to hire mercenaries did not just appear out of the blue. There would have been a special taxation done immediately to raise money (we find out in this chapter that the king and the heathen temple had a lot of money stashed away).

5. Anyone at any time could have left Rabbah and defected to Israel. They could have gone to Jerusalem, asked for an audience with the king, and offered up the information which they knew about the hiring of mercenaries. No one did this, because the presence of the mercenaries was a surprise to Joab.

6. David’s army was filled with foreigners (2Sam. 23); and, therefore, Israel would have been filled with foreigners. There was clearly a time period during which any Ammonite could have quietly gathered together his family and possessions and made a run for it, whether to Israel or to anywhere else. They chose to go with the king’s evil program of hiring mercenaries to fight David’s army.

7. Application: We in the United States are in a similar position with some of the stupid things politicians have done over the years. President George W. Bush sought to make reforms in Social Security, which
Why Does God Allow David to Discipline All the People of Ammon?

would have made this program more fiscally responsible and put the responsibility in the hands of the people, rather than in the hands of the politicians. Politicians demagoged this issue, and the people sided with the politicians, thinking that government has an unlimited supply of money that will be given to them, no matter what. A truly free people would have jumped at the chance to have more freedom and responsibility.

8. **Application:** Don’t get me wrong here: I am not saying, George W. Bush is great and wonderful (although he was a good president) and that Barrack Obama is a bad guy. Bush did many things well; Obama is an amateur; but I write this during the 3rd year of Obama’s presidency, and some men rise to the occasion of this office. There is one great area when Bush got it wrong, and that was in Iraq and in Afghanistan. He understood that freedom and democracy are great things, and that, if we could somehow transform a middle eastern nation into a democracy, this could change the middle east. That part he got right. However, his big mistake was not recognizing the importance of Christian evangelism. If you make a stew with the ingredients of goat turds, no matter how many spices you add, it is still a stew of goat turds. The key to what happened in South Korea and Japan (to a lesser extent)—and President Bush obviously did not get this—was evangelization. General Douglas MacArthur called for missionaries, and this was agreed to at the highest levels. What has happened in Iraq and Afghanistan is, the brass of the military is trying to make certain that our armed forces remain politically correct and pro-Islam. Therefore, actual steps have been taken to curb Christian witnessing in those nations. Whereas, when we began to guide this nations in setting up a government, #1 on our list of things to do would have been, **there must be a bill of rights, or we are taking our army out of here**; instead, we have tried to adapt to their ways of evil, and this will blow up in our faces. We might get a decade or two—at best—of a reasonable relationship with Iraq and Afghanistan, and then they will go the way of Iran. As I write this, a Muslim who converted to Christianity in Afghanistan is being threatened with the death penalty. We have a chance right now, today, to set true freedom in motion. “If you do not allow religious freedom and if you execute this man, then we are pulling all of our forces out of here...” should be our promise. However, there are probably not even 1 in 10 Americans who realize that Christian evangelism is the key to the problems in the Middle East.

9. **Application:** The key to a good government is not a political system or even democracy; the key is the relationship of the people to God.

10. Back to the context of this verse: the people of Ammon know what is going on. They know what is in their future. They know in their heart that their king has done a very wrong thing. If they do not make the right choice to leave Rabbah and desert to Israel, then they deserve all that David subjects them to.

11. The people of Ammon also worshiped a false god, Molech (2Sam. 12:30), and, for that reason, would spend eternity in the Lake of Fire.

1) There are not a whole host of ways to God. Not all roads lead to Rome. **Narrow is the gate and few there are who find it** (Matt. 7:14).

2) We are only saved by faith in Jesus Christ. Having faith in some local god (which probably stands for a demon) does not save anyone.

3) Therefore, all of the inhabitants of Ammon were destined to die forever in the Lake of Fire.

4) There are some people of Ammon who will be brought into slavery under the Jews, and it is reasonable to suppose that some of them will find Jesus Christ as their Savior (known as Jehovah Elohim in that time).

5) In slavery, they will be under enforced humility; and, in a state of enforced humility, they will have to consider who the God of Israel is.

6) All of these people have seen David with the crown of Molech held over his head. That clearly indicates that the God of Israel has defeated the god of the Ammonites.

7) We have an analogous situation to this today. Millions of Blacks found Jesus Christ as Savior because either they or their ancestors were brought to America in chains. They were placed under enforced humility, and many believed in Jesus Christ. Even though we may look back upon slavery as being one of the most evil institutions ever devised by man (it isn’t), it led to the salvation of many millions of people, and we might reasonably attribute much of the blessing of the United States to be a result of our Black brothers and sisters believing in Jesus Christ and some of them advancing
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to spiritual maturity.

12. Working in the ovens for the rest of their lives, making bricks, was apropos—particularly for those men who placed their own children into the arms of the Moloch idol to die. Every day, they got a feel of what it was like to spend a day in hell. The idea is, they would, after a long period of time, believe in the God of the Jews, Jehovah Elohim. Who knows what else went on? Did God call a prophet to speak to them every day as they entered into the kiln and exited the kiln? Obviously, there is nothing in the Bible which speaks to this, but God did send Jonah to the Assyrians. Therefore, we may reasonably assume that, if any of these broken men would be open to the gospel, that Jesus Christ would have given it to them.

13. Application: There are times that we will see this or that city; this or that nation, endure great hardship and trouble. All the time, bear in mind that this is a part of God’s plan. This does not mean that we ignore what is happening outside of our own country, nor does it mean that we act dispassionately toward them. Human suffering is human suffering, and it is reasonable for us to attempt to alleviate their suffering and to bring them the gospel to avoid eternal suffering.

1) Buddhism and Islam view the suffering of others dispassionately. This is why, when the communists began to kill millions of people in Cambodia and Vietnam, that refugees were not greeted with open arms in Thailand. There were many Christian groups who went to their aid, from all over the world (principally from the United States); but Buddhist organizations did not respond to their human suffering.

2) Many of those dedicated to Islam will kill hundreds of innocents in order to make some vague political point, and they view the carnage of these innocents (which are often Muslims) as God’s will. They believe that God wants these people to suffer and die, and so be it.

14. Application: Very few of us have any desire to go to this or that Islamic country. We see riots in some of these countries over the most trivial of things—cartoons or the burning of a Koran on the other side of the world. The riots in Afghanistan were actually caused, in part, by Hamad Karzai, who is supposed to be an ally of ours. Christians and Jews are persecuted regularly throughout the Mid East and some believers are even executed for their faith. These are very much like the Ammonites, and there may come a time when God will decree for a great many of them to die or to be enslaved.

This doctrine explains why God allows all of Ammon to be disciplined and turned into slaves. Bear in mind that David is not a perfect person. Not only has David sinned, but he sinned while Rabbah was being taken and his sin was so horrendous that God is not yet done with his discipline. However, God’s plan takes into consideration the sin that men do.
### 2Samuel 12:31e

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew/Pronunciation</th>
<th>Common English Meanings</th>
<th>Notes/Morphology</th>
<th>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David (דָּוִד); also Davyd (דַּוְיָד) [pronounced daw-VEED]</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w (or v) (ו or ו) [pronounced weh]</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple waw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kol (כֹּל) [pronounced kohl]</td>
<td>the whole, all of, the entirety of, all; can also be rendered any of</td>
<td>masculine singular construct followed by a definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #3605 BDB #481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am (אָמ) [pronounced gahm]</td>
<td>people; race, tribe; family, relatives; citizens, common people; companions, servants; entire human race; herd [of animals]</td>
<td>masculine singular collective noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #5971 BDB #766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y*rwshšlayim (יָרְוָשְׁלָיִם) [pronounced y’roo-shaw-LAH-yim]</td>
<td>possibly means founded upon peace or city of the Jebusites (or both); it is transliterated Jerusalem</td>
<td>proper singular noun, location; pausal form</td>
<td>Strong’s #3389 BDB #436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** Then David and all of the people returned [to] Jerusalem. The people here refers to the army which David marched out of Jerusalem with. He was called in by Joab to take the credit for taking down Rabbah (which was a smart move on Joab’s part).

2Sam. 12:31 reads: David led out all of the people who were in the city of Rabbah and placed them into slave labor. They worked with saws, iron picks and iron axes; also they worked in the brick kilns, making bricks. This became David’s policy with all of the Ammonite cities. Once all of these things were set into motion, David returned to Jerusalem with his army. At that time, or in the very near future, Joab leads the army against the other cities of Ammon.
It may be helpful to see this chapter as a contiguous whole:

| A Complete Translation of 2Samuel 12 |  
|-------------------------------------|---|
| **A Reasonably Literal Translation** | **A Reasonably Literal Paraphrase** |
| **God’s Opinion of David’s Sin** |  
| And so the thing which David did was evil in the eyes of Jehovah. | What David did was evil in the sight of Jehovah. |
| **Nathan Speaks to David; David Pronounces Judgment upon Himself** |  
| Therefore, Jehovah sent Nathan unto David, so he went to him. | Therefore, Jehovah told Nathan to go to David, so Nathan went to him. |
| Nathan [lit., he] said to David [lit., him], “[There are] two men in a certain city—one rich and the other poor. The rich man had a great many flocks and herds; but to the poor man [there is] nothing except a small ewe-lamb which he had acquired. He restored her life and she has grown up together with him and his sons. She ate from his bread [lit., morsel (of bread)] and drank from his cup, and she lays down in his bosom—she became like a daughter to him.” | Nathan said to David, “There were two men in a certain city—one rich and one poor. The rich man owned a great many flocks of sheep and herds of cattle; but the poor man had nothing except for a small female lamb which he had purchased. He restored her life and she grew up together with him and his children. She ate from his bread, she drank from his cup, and she laid down next to his bosom—she became like a daughter to him.” |
| A traveler came to the man of wealth, yet the rich man [lit., he] spared to take from his [own] flock or from his [own] herd [in order] to prepare [a meal] for the traveler, the one who came to him. Consequently, he took the ewe-lamb of the man—the one who is poor—and he prepared it for the man who came to him.” | An out-of-town guest came to the rich man, yet the rich man decided not to take an animal from his own flock or herd in order to prepare a meal for his guest. Consequently, he took the female lamb from the poor man and he prepared it for his out-of-town guest.” |
| David’s anger against this man burned greatly. Therefore, he said to Nathan, “[As] Jehovah lives, because the man did this [thing], [he is] a son of death. Furthermore, he will recompense [the man for his] lamb fourfold as a consequence of having done this thing and because he showed no compassion.” | David’s anger greatly burned against this man. Therefore, he said to Nathan, “As Jehovah lives, because this man did this evil thing, he deserves to die!” Furthermore, he will recompense this man for his lamb fourfold because he did this awful thing and because he showed absolutely no compassion.” |
| **God’s judgment of David** |  
| Then Nathan said to David, “You [are] that man!” | Then Nathan said to David, “You are that man!” |
| Thus says Jehovah, the God of Israel: ‘I anointed you as king over all Israel and I delivered you out of the hand of Saul. I gave you the house of your lord and the women of your lord into your care [lit., bosom]; and I gave you the nation [lit., house] of Israel and Judah. And, if [this was too] little, then I would have added to you even more [lit., these (blessings) as well as those (blessings)]. | Thus says Jehovah, Elohim of Israel, ‘I anointed you as king over Israel and I delivered you from the hand of Saul. I gave you the house of your lord and I delivered you out of the hand of Saul. I gave you the palace of your lord and placed his women into your care. Furthermore, I gave the nation of Israel and Judah to you. And if this were too little, then I would have added even more blessings to these.” |
### A Complete Translation of 2Samuel 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Reasonably Literal Translation</th>
<th>A Reasonably Literal Paraphrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why have you despised the Word of Y’hayah to do evil in His eyes? You struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword. You seized for yourself his wife to [be your] wife. You killed him with the sword of the sons of Ammon. Now, therefore, the sword will not depart from your house forever because you have despised Me and you have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife.’</td>
<td>Why have you despised and disobeyed the Word of Jehovah by doing this evil in His sight? You struck down Uriah the Hittite with a sword. You seized his wife for yourself and made her your wife. You killed him with the sword of the Ammonites. Now, therefore, the sword will not be turned away from your house forever because you have despised Me and you have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite as your own wife.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y’hayah now declares, ‘Listen, I am raising up against you evil from your [own] house and I have taken your women in your sight and given [them] to your associates; and he has lain with your women in the sight of this sun. Because you, [even] you, have done [these things] secretly, I, [even] I, will do this thing before all Israel and before the sun.’</td>
<td>Jehovah now declares, ‘Listen, I will raise up evil from your own house against you: I will take your mistresses from before your eyes and I will give them to your associate and he will have sexual intercourse with your mistresses in broad daylight. Because you did these things secretly, I will act publically, doing these things before all Israel in broad daylight.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then David said to Nathan, “I have sinned with regards to Y’hayah.”</td>
<td>Then David admitted to Nathan, “I have sinned against Jehovah.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan replied to David, “Indeed, Y’hayah has passed over your sin; you will not die. Nevertheless, because you have utterly despised Y’hayah in [doing] this thing, the son born to you will surely die.”</td>
<td>Nathan then replied to David, “Jehovah has indeed removed your sin from you; you will not die. Nevertheless, because you have shown utter contempt toward Jehovah by doing this thing, the son who is born to you will certainly die.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then Nathan departed to his home.</td>
<td>Then Nathan departed to go to his own home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine Discipline Installment #1: The Death of David’s Child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequently, Y’hayah strikes the child whom the wife of Uriah bore to David. As a result, the child [lit., he] became very ill. Consequently, David continued seeking the Elohim on behalf of the boy, even fasting a fast [lit., and so he fasts a fast]. David [lit., he] went in and he stayed the night and he laid upon the ground.</td>
<td>Consequently, Jehovah struck the child that Bathsheba bore to David. As a result, the child became very ill. Consequently, David continued seeking after the God on behalf of his son, even fasting before God. David went in beside the boy and stayed the night, laying upon the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then the elders of his palace stood above him to raise him up from off the ground, but he was unwilling [to be raised] and he would not eat food with them.</td>
<td>Then the elders of his palace stood over him, intending to raise him up from off the ground, but he was unwilling to get up and he did not eat with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And so it is on the seventh day that the child died. Therefore, the servants of David feared to tell him that the child died, for they said [to one another], “Look, when the child was alive, we spoke to David [lit., him] and he did not listen to our voice; so how can we say to him, ‘The child has died.’? He may do [himself] harm.”</td>
<td>The child finally died on the seventh day. David’s servants were afraid to tell him, saying to one another, “Look, when the child was alive, we tried to reason with David and he did not listen to us. How can we tell him, his child is dead? He may do harm to himself.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**A Complete Translation of 2Samuel 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A Reasonably Literal Translation</strong></th>
<th><strong>A Reasonably Literal Paraphrase</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When David saw that his servants were whispering among themselves, he [lit., David] perceived that the child had died. Therefore, David said to his servants, “Is the child dead?”</td>
<td>When David saw his servants whispering among themselves, he realized that his child had died. He therefore said to his servants, “Is the child dead?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They answered, “He is dead.” David then got up off the ground and washed [himself] and anointed [himself] with oils. He also changed his clothing and went to the house of Y<em>howah</em> and worshiped [there]. Then he went to his house and requested [food to eat]. They placed food before him and he ate [it].</td>
<td>They answered him, “Yes, he is dead.”. David then got up off the ground, washed himself and anointed himself with oils. He also changed his clothing and went to the house of Jehovah and worshiped there. Then he went to his house and requested a meal. His servants placed food before him and he ate it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His servants then said to him, “What is this thing you have done? While the child [was] alive, you fasted and kept weeping; however, now that [lit., just as] the child died, you got up and you are [now] eating bread.”</td>
<td>David’s servants then asked him, “What is this that you are doing? When the child was alive, you fasted and you kept weeping; however, once the child died, you got up and you are even now eating a meal. We are confused.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David [lit., he] then answered, “While the child was still alive, I fasted and continued weeping, for I thought [to myself], ‘Who knows? [Perhaps] Y<em>howah</em> will be gracious to me and the child [will] live.’ And now he has died, so why should I continue fasting? Am I yet able to bring him back? I will go to him; but he [certainly] will not return to me.”</td>
<td>David then answered, “While the child was still alive, I continued to fast and weep, because I thought to myself, ‘Who knows? Perhaps Jehovah will be gracious to me and let the child live.’ But now, the child has died, so there is no reason for me to continue fasting. Am I able to bring him back through fasting and weeping? Of course not! I will go to him, but he will certainly not return to me.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Birth of Solomon**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soon thereafter [lit., and so]. David comforted Bathsheba, his wife, and he went unto her and he lay with her, and she bore [him] a son. David [lit. he] called his name Solomon and Y<em>howah</em> loved him.</td>
<td>Soon thereafter, David comforted his wife, Bathsheba, and he went to her and lay with her, and she bore him a son. David called the boy’s name Solomon and Jehovah loved Solomon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And God [lit., He] sent by the hand of Nathan the prophet [a message]; as a result [lit., and so], David [lit., he] called his name Jedidiah, because of Y<em>howah</em>.</td>
<td>God also sent a message with Nathan the prophet, and, as a result, David called the child’s name Jedidiah, as per Jehovah’s instructions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Completion of the Defeat and Subjugation of the Ammonites**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meanwhile, Joab waged war against Rabbah of the sons of Ammon. Consequently, he captured their royal city.</td>
<td>At this same time, Joab was waging war against the sons of Ammon at Rabbah, their capital city. In due time, he captured their royal city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then Joab sent messengers to David, and he said, “I have fought against Rabbah; moreover, I have taken the city of waters. Now, therefore, gather the rest of the people and encamp against the city and take it, so that I don’t take the city and my name is given to it.”</td>
<td>Then Joab sent messengers to David, saying, “I have waged war against Rabbah; moreover, I have taken this River City. Now, therefore, gather a small army and encamp against this city and take it, so that my name is not given to it when I take the city.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, David gathered together all of the people and he went to Rabbah. He fought against the city [lit., her] and took it. Then he took the crown of Malcham [or, their king] from above his head—its weight [is] a talent of gold and [it has] a precious gem—and it is [held] over David’s head. Also he brought out exceedingly great [amount of] plunder [from] the city. And David led out all of the people who [were] in the city of Rabbah [lit., her]. He placed [them] [into slave labor] with saws, iron picks and iron axes; and he brought them to the brick kiln.

So David [lit., he] did to all of the Ammonite cities [lit., cities of the sons of Ammon]. Then David and all of the people returned [to] Jerusalem.

This became David’s policy with all of the Ammonite cities. Once all of these things were set into motion, David returned to Jerusalem with his army.

The following psalms are appropriately studied at this time: Psalm 32 (HTML) (PDF) Psalm 38 (HTML) (PDF) Psalm 51 (HTML) (PDF). Both of these psalms were named within this chapter at times where a direct study would be most appropriate. Others list Psalm 6 22 38 as properly exegeted here. I will suggest that they be studied at different times.

Also, 1Chron. 20 (HTML) (PDF) is related to this chapter (the first 3 verses are nearly identical to portions of the end of this chapter). It lists additional wars with the Philistines.