

Dr. Robert Vannoy, Kings, Lecture 2

© 2012, Dr. Robert Vannoy, Dr. Perry Phillips and Ted Hildebrandt

Besides the commentary reading I have listed for today, I have that article on chronology in the *Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* by J. Barton Payne. My purpose in assigning that is not that you work through detail by detail--that is very complex material--but my purpose is to give you some idea of the kinds of principles that can be applied to these chronological data in order to resolve some of the apparent problems, particularly that section where he talks about accession-year dating or non-accession year dating, and co-regencies when the year begins whether it's a spring beginning or a fall beginning. Those kinds of things have gone a long way toward resolving most of the chronological problems.

The other thing I'd like you at least to get an idea of is how you even arrive at absolute dates. If you remember in the early part of that article Payne says that with Babylonian, Assyrian and Egyptian chronologies there are certain points where something that happens in Assyrian records can be tied into something that happens in the biblical material. That gives a fixed point because they can compare the Babylonian and the Assyrian records and be pretty certain that the dates that they have are accurate because Assyrian records go back and are tied into solar eclipses. With solar eclipses you can pinpoint years.

So you can get a fixed date at a given point in the biblical chronology as, for example, 841 B.C. when Jehu gives tribute to Shalmanesser III. That is mentioned in the Assyrian record. It's also mentioned in the biblical record. When you get a fixed point like that then, you can work forwards and back from it. Since you have the synchronous reigns, you can work back from Jehu's time earlier or you can go forward from Jehu's time, and relative to those fixed points you can establish the chronology for Israel. Another one is the battle of Karkar in 853 B.C. and Ahab's involvement in that. It gives another fixed point.

My purpose in these examples was just to get you some basic ideas of

chronology. You can spend a good part of your life if you want to master the details of the complexity of some of these problems.

Alright, what I want to do from here on is take that outline of 1 and 2 Kings and start working with the text itself. I'm not sure how long it's going to go but I'm going to emphasize in some detail the United Kingdom under Solomon, which is Roman numeral I. I think there are things in that section that can be noticed and that in principle really apply to much of the rest of the material in 1 and 2 Kings. I think that the material on Solomon is of particular importance. In fact, I will probably spend more time on Solomon and then more time on Elijah and Ahab than on any other one section. "A" is "Introductory Material." This is on your outline of 1 Kings. There are two sub-points there: "1" is "Solomon's Succession to the Throne, 1 Kings 1:1–2:12." That's our first section. Now some comments on that section. I'm not going to read through it. You've already done that and read the commentary on it, so I think you're familiar with the basic content that's from 1:1–2:12. In that section the basic question is who is going to be the successor to David. That's a question that appears in that section. It's a question that's not new to this section. It's a question that had been addressed earlier; in fact, it had been addressed even before the birth of Solomon. Even though David had numerous sons, the Lord told David that he would have another son (this was before Solomon's birth) who would be king after him and build the temple. 2 Samuel 7, verse 12, is almost the climax, I think you would say, of the book of 1 and 2 Samuel, which is really one book. Here the Lord establishes his covenant with David and says he will have a dynasty that will endure forever, but in the context of that promise in verse 12 he says, "When your days are over and you rest with your fathers, I will raise up your offspring to succeed you, who will come from our own body, and I will establish his kingdom. He is the one who will build a house for my Name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he will be my son." If you compare that with 1 Chronicles 22: 8 – 10 you read there, "You have shed much blood and have fought many wars. You

are not to build a house for my Name, because you have shed much blood on the earth in my sight. But you will have a son who will be a man of peace and rest, and I will give him rest from all his enemies on every side. His name will be Solomon and I will grant Israel peace and quiet during his reign. He is the one who will build a house for my Name.” So you see, it was made very clear by the announcement of the Lord to David long in advance of the events in 1 Kings 1 and 2 where you are really at the point of succession. It had been made very clear that Solomon was to be the one who was to succeed David and be the one who would build the temple.

Now when Solomon was born he was given the name Jedidiah; that’s in 2 Samuel 12: 24-25. This is after the incident of David and Bathsheba that Nathan had rebuked David for in chapter 12. You read in verse 24, “Then David comforted his wife Bathsheba, and he went to her and lay with her. She gave birth to a son, and they named him Solomon. 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.” So Solomon has that special place that is given to him. He is to succeed David. He is loved by the Lord. He is to build the temple. He is the designated successor to David.

Now it is interesting that that particular privilege you might say is given to Solomon because it is probably not what you might expect. Solomon is not the firstborn of David. You might expect in natural descent that the firstborn would have the right. But you remember that it’s a rather common kind of thing in Scripture. It was not Ishmael but Isaac that was the promised, or the line of promise, as far as the promised seed was concerned, and Ishmael was born before Isaac. It was not Esau who was the firstborn who would carry forth God’s promise but, it was Jacob. It wasn’t Jesse’s oldest son that Samuel anointed to be king. Remember when he went to Jesse’s house and he had all the sons of Jesse come before him, the older ones came forward, and they didn’t even think to bring David before Samuel because they didn’t think that he would count. Yet he was

precisely the one, the youngest one, that the Lord had chosen. So you have many examples of that sort of thing, and it seems to me that God desires to emphasize that the outworking of his plan of redemption is not to be attributed to human rights, powers, or abilities. It's nothing of that sort, but it's his work and it's his sovereign disposition that carries forward his work of redemption.

Now of course, God's choice is not always met with acceptance; remember Esau as well as Isaac worked against God's sovereign choice. Esau wanted that blessing, and Isaac was ready to give it to him, but in the midst of all that intrigue, you remember, that blessing that was intended for Jacob came to Jacob even though Isaac thought he was giving it to Esau.

In I Kings 1 you have a similar situation in the sense that the Lord had designated a successor, but Adonijah wasn't ready to accept it. So the question really in I Kings, in the first couple of chapters, is will God's will be followed in the matter of succession to David or will some other considerations prevail. Adonijah was the oldest remaining son of David, or at least it appears that that is the case. You remember that Absalom as well as Amnon were dead. Amnon had violated his sister Tamar and for that Absalom had had him killed. Later Absalom went into exile, and when he came back he instigated that rebellion against David. Eventually he was killed in the aftermath of that rebellion. So both Amnon and Absalom were dead.

Adonijah now makes his move to succeed David to the throne. He undoubtedly knew that Solomon was the designated successor, but you read in verse 5 of I Kings 1, "Now Adonijah, whose mother was Haggith, put himself forward and said, 'I will be king.'" He put himself forward. I think we could say that he was not satisfied with the place that God had given him, and he wanted to usurp the throne for himself. So what's he to do? He plans a revolution, in essence, and I think here you see a real contrast between Adonijah who puts himself forward and then lays all these plans to take the throne. You see a real contrast between him and David, who even though he had several opportunities

and had been designated by God to take the throne he refused to do it. He wanted to receive it from the hand of the Lord; he didn't want to kill Saul. He wouldn't lift up his hand against the Lord's anointed. I think you see Adonijah is ruled by a different spirit. He seeks the throne by intrigue and secret methods.

You read in verse 7, "Adonijah conferred with Joab son of Zeruiah and with Abiathar the priest." Joab was a military commander and, of course, Abiathar was a priest, and they gave Adonijah their support. "But Zadok the priest, Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, Nathan the prophet, Shimei, Rei, and David's special guard did not join Adonijah. Adonijah then sacrificed sheep, cattle, and fatted calves at the Stone of Zoheleth near En Rogel. He invited all his brothers, the king's sons, and all the men of Judah who were royal officials, but he did not invite Nathan the Prophet or Benaiah the special guard of his brother Solomon." So Adonijah carefully picked who he is going to involve in this plan--people that he, for whatever reason, was confident would not betray him but would support him. He gathers these people together to have himself proclaimed king. He seeks the assistance of Joab and Abiathar in verse 7, but he deliberately does not invite Nathan, Benaiah, or the special guard, or his brother Solomon. But notice that he invites a priest to give religious sanction to his revolution. He wants to cover this thing with some religious sanction. So he invites Abiathar the priest and (verse 9) "He sacrifices sheep, cattle, and fatted calves." He attempts to use that religious sanction to accomplish his own purposes, his own ends, and I think you could say that it comes to link the name of the Lord with his revolution even though it's a deliberate violation of the Lord's expressed will.

Chapter 1 from that point contains four conversations between two people. The first one is in verses 11-14 between Nathan and Bathsheba: "Then Nathan asked Bathsheba, Solomon's mother, 'Have you not heard that Adonijah, the son of Haggith, has become king without our lord David's knowing it? Now then, let me advise you how you can save your own life and the life of your son Solomon. Go into King David and say to him, 'My lord the king, did you not swear to me

your servant: “Surely Solomon, your son, shall be king after me, and he will sit on my throne?” Why then has Adonijah become king?’ While you are still there talking to the king, I will come in and confirm what you have said.” So Nathan is aware of what’s going on and he warns Bathsheba of the danger that Adonijah had for both her and for her son. That’s in verses 11-14.

In the context of that time, and probably even almost any time, it’s not uncommon for throne usurpers to murder all other possible claimants to the throne in order to secure their position. So in a very real sense Bathsheba’s and Solomon’s lives were in danger. So Nathan advises Bathsheba to let David know about what’s going on. That’s the first conversation in verses 11-14.

The second one is in chapter 1, verses 15-21, between Bathsheba and David. You read: “So Bathsheba went to see the aged king in his room, where Abishag the Shunammite was attending him. Bathsheba bowed low and knelt before the king. ‘What is it you want?’ the king asked. She said to him, ‘My lord, you yourself swore to me your servant by the Lord your God, “Solomon your son shall be king after me, and he will sit on my throne.” But now Adonijah has become king, and you, my lord the king, do not know about it. He has sacrificed great numbers of cattle, fattened calves, and sheep, and has invited all the king’s sons, Abiathar the priest and Joab the commander of the army, but he has not invited Solomon your servant. My lord the king, the eyes of all Israel are on you, to learn from you who will sit on the throne of my lord the king after him. Otherwise, as soon as my lord the king is laid to rest with his fathers, I and my son Solomon will be treated as criminals.’” So she reminds David of the oath he had sworn that Solomon would succeed him. Then she tells him of Adonijah’s revolution and the support he had from particularly Joab and Abiathar.

Then the third conversation is between Nathan and David in verse 22-27:., “While she was still speaking with the king, Nathan the prophet arrived. And they told the king, ‘Nathan the prophet is here.’ So he went before the king and bowed with his face to the ground. Nathan said, ‘Have you, my lord the king, declared

that Adonijah shall be king after you, and that he will sit on your throne? Today he has gone down and sacrificed great numbers of cattle, fattened calves, and sheep. He has invited all the king's sons, the commanders of the army and Abiathar the priest. Right now they are eating and drinking with him and saying, "Long live King Adonijah!" But me your servant, and Zadok the priest, and Benaiah son of Jehoiada, and your servant Solomon he did not invite. Is this something my lord the king has done without letting his servants know who should sit on the throne of my lord the king after him?" Nathan comes in, and I think it's a rather diplomatic kind of way to approach the issue. With David he expresses surprise about Adonijah's being proclaimed king and, as it were, to ask David if he had authorized this.

The last conversation is verses 28-31 between David and Bathsheba, and there the issue is resolved, "Then King David said, 'Call in Bathsheba.' So she came into the king's presence and stood before him. The king then took an oath: 'As surely as the Lord lives, who has delivered me out of every trouble, I will surely carry out today what I swore to you by the Lord, the God of Israel: Solomon your son shall be king after me, and he will sit on my throne in my place.' Then Bathsheba bowed low with her face to the ground and, kneeling before the king, said, 'May my lord King David live forever!'" So David gives orders then in what follows for Solomon to be anointed as king and to reign in his place, and that is done. Zadok and Nathan anoint him and blow the trumpet and shout, "Long live King Solomon." It is announced to the people.

When news of that reaches Adonijah with that kind of strong support right from David himself, he realizes that his revolution is doomed and he goes and he seeks refuge at the altar--most likely the altar on Mount Moriah where the Ark was housed in a tent. You read that in verse 49: "At this, all Adonijah's guests rose in alarm and dispersed. But Adonijah, in fear of Solomon, went and took hold of the horns of the altar. Then Solomon was told, 'Adonijah is afraid of King Solomon and is clinging to the horns of the altar.' He says, 'Let King Solomon swear to me

today that he will not put his servant to death with the sword.’ Solomon replied, ‘If he shows himself to be a worthy man, not a hair of his head will fall to the ground; but if evil is found in him, he will die.’”

In the early part of the second chapter, the first 4 verses, you have part of David’s charge to Solomon that I think is quite significant, even though it isn’t lengthy. The first four verses, I think, you might call it a profile of the true covenantal king: “When the time drew near for David to die, he gave a charge to Solomon his son. ‘I am about to go the way of all the earth,’ he said. ‘So be strong, show yourself a man, and observe what the Lord your God requires: Walk in his ways, and keep his decrees and commands, his laws and requirements, as written in the Law of Moses, so that you may prosper in all you do and wherever you go, and that the Lord may keep his promise to me: “If your descendants watch how they live, and if they walk faithfully before me with all their heart and soul, you will never fail to have a man on the throne of Israel.””” I think you can call that a profile of the true covenantal king. As David hands over the reins of government to Solomon, he gives what you might say a political testament to Solomon. It is a description of the essence of what his responsibilities were, what the true covenantal king should be like.

Now let’s reflect just a bit on Israel’s concept of kingship. I’ve talked to that in connection with the Old Testament History course on the rise of kingship in 1 Samuel 8-12; but I think that’s important as well here in the book of Kings because Israel had a distinct concept of kingship. If you remember when Israel initially entered Canaan, they didn’t have a human king. There was no royal palace; there was no royal throne, but rather there was a tent in which was housed the ark of the covenant. In reality, I think you would say, the ark of the covenant was the throne seat of Yahweh. He’s enthroned between the cherubim’s on top of the ark, which at that time was housed in the tabernacle. In reality, the ark was the throne seat of Yahweh who was Israel’s divine king and this was so different from any of the surrounding nations. There wasn’t a royal palace; there wasn’t a royal

court, but there was this tent with an ark in it, and the king of Israel was the Lord. The idea behind that arrangement was the people would assume individual responsibility to follow the Lord and obey his commands; that is, to be obedient to the commands of the covenant and all that was spelled out in Mosaic Law. The assumption was here you have Yahweh as the divine king. The people individually will take the responsibility upon themselves to be obedient to their covenant obligations, and that would provide for order and unity among the people and for order in society generally. They were to recognize the kingship of Yahweh--that was their responsibility.

Israel didn't live up to that responsibility; they didn't follow the covenantal obligations. They turned away from them, and they repeatedly denied the kingship of Yahweh and turned and worshipped other gods. We find that already in the book of Judges repeatedly. And the nation went through that cycle in the period of Judges of oppression, repentance, and deliverance.

But when you come to the book of Samuel, they're being oppressed in the early chapters of the book by the Philistines and also the Ammonites are threatening. Nahash, the king of the Ammonites, is threatening and they blame their situation on the fact that they don't have a king like the nations around them to lead and fight their battles. That's what the elders say when they come to Samuel in 1 Samuel chapter 8. So they request Samuel to give them a human king. Samuel protests to them that to do that is to deny the kingship of Yahweh but the Lord says to Samuel to give them a king. So Samuel obeys the Lord's command; he gives them a king, but when he does it he carefully defines the role of the king in Israel so that it in no way detracts from the continued kingship of Yahweh. So I think what you say in Israel is that when human kingship was established, it was God's desire to use the human king as an instrument of his own rule over the people. It's not a king over against the Lord; it's a king as a vice-regent. It's a king who is to be an instrument of the Lord's rule over his people. So it was important for every king in Israel that Yahweh is the true king and that the human

king is subject to God's law and needs to obey those covenantal requirements of the law of the Lord. So David says to Solomon to walk in his ways and keep his decrees and commands as written in the laws of Moses.

Now, with the first king Saul it quickly appears that he is not willing to listen to the word of the prophet, particularly Samuel. He is not willing to be subject to the law of the Lord. There are a couple of incidents: there was the question of offering sacrifices before Samuel arrived in chapter 13. Then was the question of not following the Lord's instructions concerning wiping out the Amalekites in chapter 15. So Saul was rejected from being king.

Saul is followed by David, and David, of course, is pictured as we discussed last week as a true representative of the ideals of a covenantal king but he's not perfect. Even David had times when he placed his own interests, his own kingship, above his responsibilities of being that true covenantal king, and there are incidents in his life where that is quite clear. I think the point with David is that he did not persist in his ways; he always returned to a readiness to be an instrument in God's rule. He repented when he deviated from that. So I don't think he ever lost the vision, you might say, of kingship as God intended it to be. He wasn't perfect, but he kept that ideal, and I think he had clear insight into the true nature of the kingship as it was supposed to be in Israel. What you find here in chapter 2 of 1 Kings is that on his deathbed he transmits that insight to Solomon, in these verses, and you have something of that in 1 Chronicles 29:10 and following.

1 Chronicles 29:10 and following is a beautiful passage. It begins with David; the context here is different, although you notice that it comes just before he acknowledges Solomon as king. That's 29:21. The death of David is in 29:26. Verse 10: "David prays to the Lord in the presence of the whole assembly saying, 'Praise be to you, O Lord, God of our father Israel, from everlasting to everlasting. Yours, O Lord, is the greatness and power and glory and the majesty and the splendor, for everything in heaven and earth is yours. Yours, O Lord, is the

kingdom; you are exalted as head overall. Wealth and honor come from you; you are the ruler of all things. In your hands are strength and power to exalt and give strength to all. Now, our God, we give you thanks, and praise your glorious name. But who am I, and who are my people, that we should be able to give as generously as this? Everything comes from you, and we have given you only what comes from your hand. We are aliens and strangers in your sight, as were all our forefathers. Our days on earth are like a shadow, without hope. O Lord our God, as for all this abundance that we have provided for building you a temple for your Holy Name, it comes from your hand, and all of it belongs to you. I know, my God, that you test the heart and are pleased with integrity. All these things have I given willingly and with honest intent. And now I have seen with joy how willingly your people who are here have given to you. O Lord, God of our fathers Abraham, Isaac and Israel, keep this desire in the hearts of your people forever, and keep their hearts loyal to you. And give my son Solomon the wholehearted devotion to keep your commands, requirements and decrees and to do everything to build the palatial structure for which I have provided.” So I think you see the concept that David has of the rule of God as king, the rule of the human king as subordinate to the kingship of the Lord, and the necessity for the human king to have a heart dedicated to the Lord.

He says in verse 19, “Give my son Solomon the wholehearted devotion to keep your commands.” We go back to where we are looking in 1 Kings 2 where David says to Solomon, “Observe what the Lord your God requires, walk in his ways, keep his decrees and his commands, his laws and his requirements.” So in those first 4 verses you have this political testament, you might say, of David as the kingship is transferred from David to Solomon.

Now you can ask the question of when is the king in Israel a good king? I would say it’s only when he subordinates himself to the kingship of Yahweh and places himself in the service of the kingship of Yahweh. How can he do that? He can do that only by walking in obedience to God’s law. I think you can see at this

point that in the last analysis there is only one king who will ever conform completely to David's profile for the true king and that points forward to Christ. Solomon wasn't going to do it, and David didn't do it himself. Ultimately, it's only as God himself comes and sits on the throne of David you will have someone who can fulfill the ideals of the covenantal kingship. So all of the kings of Israel fall short of the ideal. All of them, even though David and Solomon are at the top of the list, you might say of the good kings, but they all fall short of the ideal. In so doing they point forward to the one who eventually will come and sit on the throne of David and rule in fullness and completeness of righteousness and justice as the true covenantal king was intended to do.

Just kind of as a side comment you can ask questions many times: What's the relevance of this material? What I am trying to get at here is this redemptive historical perspective. When you look at it, when you put what's going on in the context, you see God's program of redemption, and the institution of kingship is certainly utilizing the program of redemption. Ultimately, Christ comes as king, and these kings are pointing forward to that. But then you can go a bit further: What is the significance of this profile of Israel's kings for us? Perhaps you can say there is a parallel between the kings of Israel and us in this sense: Just as the kings of Israel were to reflect Yahweh's kingship in their rule, so we are to reflect Christ's kingship in our lives to the world around us. He is the one who is to be ruling our lives, and it's only as we subject ourselves to all that God's word requires all the commands of Scripture and live a life of obedience that we can reflect that kingship of Christ in our own lives and reflect that to those around us in many different ways. Now that's just a side comment.

Let's go back to our text, which is now verses 5-12 of chapter 2. It seems to me that you could say that just as the kings of Israel were to reflect Yahweh's kingship in their rule, so are we to reflect Christ's kingship to the world around us as he rules in our lives. But that's only possible for us, as for the kings in Ancient Israel, as we subject ourselves to all that God's word requires of us. As we are

obedient to his commands, then we can reflect some of that to those around us in the way that we live. I'm saying that apart from that, it seems to me that there is a redemptive, historical perspective that is very important and you might say in a certain sense that all of these kings point forward to Christ in the sense that they fall short of the ideal. Only Christ will fulfill the ideal, but it still seems to me that there is a principle involved that the rule of Christ is the rule of Yahweh that was to be reflected in those kings. The rule of Christ is to be reflected in our lives.

What I am saying is that when you look at the Old Testament foreshadowing's of Christ you have the offices in Ancient Israel that point forward to him. You have prophet, priest, and king. In Deuteronomy 18 we read that the Lord will raise up a prophet like Moses, and that's picked up in the New Testament, ultimately as indicating the coming of Christ who was a prophet like unto Moses. But he is greater than Moses. So certainly the line of prophets points forward to Christ.

The same with the priests, of course, Christ is a priest of a different order. He's not of the Aaronic line, he is a priest of the order of Melchizedek who doesn't have the lineage through Aaron, but he performs the function of the priest in interceding and representing us before God. So Christ sort of combines all of those offices: prophet, priest, and king. Here we are just talking about the one.

Let me quickly make a few comments on verses 5 through 12 of chapter 2. In those verses David instructs Solomon to deal with three people. They are Joab, Barzillai, and Shimei. Of those three people, Barzillai is to be rewarded for loyalty when he helped David in a time of need, the time David was fleeing from Absalom. But Joab and Shimei are to be punished for serious offenses against David. I think we would say that David gave these instructions to Solomon not for personal revenge, but out of concern for Solomon's kingship, that it would begin on good foundations.

So first, of Joab you read in verse 5, "Now you yourself know what Joab son of Zeruiah did to me – what he did to the two commanders of Israel's armies,

Abner son of Ner and Amasa son of Jether. He killed them, shedding their blood in peacetime as if in battle, and with that blood stained the belt around his waist and the sandals on his feet. Deal with him according to your wisdom, but do not let his gray head go down to the grave in peace.” It’s pretty clear what he’s saying. Joab had killed two commanders of Israel’s armies, Abner and Amasa, and he’d done that not in the context of battle. He’d done it; he’d really murdered them.

Later he killed Absalom against David’s command. David didn’t want Absalom killed after Absalom’s revolution, but Joab killed him. So David’s instruction here is to take Joab’s life. That might strike us as harsh but I think it’s rooted in Numbers 35:30-34 that says, “Anyone who kills a person is to be put to death as a murderer only on the testimony of witnesses. But no one is to be put to death on the testimony of only one witness. Do not accept a ransom for the life of a murderer who deserves to die. He must surely be put to death. Do not accept a ransom for anyone who has fled to a city of refuge and so allow him to go back and live on his own land before the death of the high priest. Do not pollute the land where you are. Bloodshed pollutes the land, and atonement cannot be made for the land on which blood has been shed, except by the blood of the one who shed it. Do not defile the land where you live and where I dwell, for I, the Lord, dwell among the Israelites.” Numbers tells us bloodshed pollutes the land.

In fact, if you look generally in the Old Testament, there are three things that are said to pollute the land of Canaan: 1) Bloodshed is one, the shedding of innocent blood. There is lawful and unlawful taking of life. I’m talking about the unlawful taking of life. 2) Sexual immorality is another. Look at Leviticus 18; the whole chapter of Leviticus 18 is on unlawful sexual relations and perversions, and if you go down to verse 25 you read, “Even the land was defiled.” Verse 24 says, “Do not defile yourselves in any of these ways because this is how the nations that I am going to drive out before you became defiled. Even the land was defiled; so I punished it for its sin, and the land vomited out its inhabitants.” Verse 27, “For all

these things were done by the people who lived in the land before you, and the land became defiled. And if you defile the land, it will vomit you out as it vomited out the nations that were before you.” So bloodshed pollutes the land along with sexual immorality.

The third one is idolatry. Jeremiah 3:9: ““Because Israel’s immorality mattered so little to her, she defiled the land and committed adultery with stone and wood. In spite of all this, her unfaithful sister Judah did not return to me with all her heart, but only in pretense,’ declares the Lord.” They defiled the land and committed adultery with stone and wood, and Ezekiel 36:17-18 says something similar. So that’s somewhat of a digression, but the point here is shedding of innocent blood would defile the land, and I think what David is saying is that Joab’s blood-guiltiness needed to be addressed because if it wasn’t it could damage Solomon’s reign.

I think you see an example of that during David’s time in 2 Samuel 21. In 2 Samuel 21 there was a famine for three years because Saul had put Gibeonites to death in violation to the treaty that Joshua had made when they came into the promised land. There was a peace treaty with the Gibeonites, and that peace treaty with the Gibeonites was violated. Gibeonites were put to death in a way that was an unlawful putting to death, and that resulted in a famine for three years. So it seems to me that that’s what’s involved in this command concerning Joab.

Let’s take a ten minute break.

Transcribed by Jeff Brown
Rough edited by Ted Hildebrandt
Final edit by Dr. Perry Phillips
Re-narrated by Dr. Perry Phillips