

THRU THE BIBLE EXPOSITION

The Books Of Samuel: God's Shift Of Israel From Apostasy Under The Judges To David's Reign

II. 2 Samuel: The Reign Of David Over Israel

Q. Dealing Objectively With Past Sin For Current Blessing

(2 Samuel 13:1-14:33)

Introduction: (To show the need . . .)

A great tendency exists today for people to avoid objectively and responsibly facing and dealing with past sin:

(1) It happens at the level of state government: Chris Powell's June 2, 2017 column, "Fee shifts unrelated to reality" (Republican-American, p. 8a) claimed Connecticut Governor Malloy's recent "discretionary transfers" of moneys from "dedicated funds" to other funds because the government had run "short of money . . . is an evasion of the responsibility of legislators to make choices," and that because of this irresponsibility, in reality, "all taxes and fees already are 'dedicated' funds -- funds dedicated to the support of the whole government."

Thus, if elected officials promise to use certain collected fees for a specific project, the voters have reason to doubt that pledge simply because their elected officials have long failed to face and deal with past government sins!

(2) It happens locally: a member recently shared with me how a teen girl in a Christian family told a friend that if her parents learned she was failing a certain course, "They'll kill me!" in typical dramatic teen girl fashion!

This statement eventually made it to a public school official, and the official felt compelled to alert the police who showed up at the home, leaving that family at the possible risk of having the Department of Child and Youth Services threaten to take custody of their children. This all rose because a teen girl neglected to ask for academic help when she needed it followed by her making an unwise, overly dramatic statement in a politically correct world!

Need: *So we ask, "How can I responsibly face and handle past sin so it won't plague me in my current life?!"*

I. God's prediction that trials would afflict David's family came true, but since he did not responsibly deal with them due to failure objectively to handle his own past, it led to more trouble, 2 Samuel 13:1-14:33:

- A. When David's son Amnon raped his half-sister Tamar, his crime reminded David of his own immorality with Bathsheba, so he did not face Amnon's sin objectively, and he failed to punish Amnon, 2 Samuel 13:1-23a.
 - 1. In a reminder of his own sin, David 'son Amnon raped his half-sister Tamar, 2 Samuel 13:1-20:
 - 2. David was very angry at this crime, but he failed to punish Amnon since he himself had committed adultery with Bathsheba, so he failed to be objective in handling Amnon's immorality, 2 Sam. 13:21-23a.
- B. David's failure to punish Amnon led Tamar's full-brother Absalom to kill Amnon in revenge, making David recall his own murder of Uriah, so he did not punish Absalom, 2 Samuel 13:23b-14:33:
 - 1. The syntax of Tamar's 2 Samuel 13:16 words to Amnon after he raped her but then refused to marry her in line with the Law (Deut. 22:28-29) is broken, showing Tamar's hysteria and outrage (bible.org/netbible/), and her ensuing depression in Absalom's home as disqualified from marriage and having children is seen in the verb *shamem*, "desolated; appalled," B. D. B., A Heb. and Eng. Lex. of the O. T., p. 1030-1031.
 - 2. The rape of Tamar and her life in Absalom's home with the rape's traumatic effect on her deeply infuriated Absalom, and David's failure for years to punish Amnon led Absalom to kill Amnon, 2 Sam. 13:23b-29a.
 - 3. Absalom fled from David's punitive reach by returning to his maternal grandfather, the Gentile king of Geshur for asylum, and he stayed in Geshur for three years, 2 Samuel 13:29b-38 with 2 Samuel 3:2-3.
 - 4. David failed to pursue and punish Absalom, but longed to go to meet him (2 Sam. 13:39), so Joab arranged to use a wise woman to influence David to send Joab to Geshur to retrieve Absalom, 2 Samuel 14:1-23.
 - 5. Yet, when Absalom returned, David was unwilling fully to forgive him for what he had done to Amnon, so he did not let Absalom see him (2 Sam. 14:24; Ryrie Study Bible, KJV, 1978, ftn. to 2 Sam. 14:24).
 - 6. Such action by David only frustrated Absalom, for the 2 years that he then lived in Jerusalem without being able to see his father, he did not know if David would forgive or execute him, 2 Samuel 14:25-28.
 - 7. Finally, Absalom set Joab's barley field on fire, spurring Joab to get an appointment for him to see David (2 Samuel 14:29-33a), and David finally met and peacefully greeted Absalom, 2 Samuel 14:33b.
 - 8. However, Absalom was now so frustrated with his father that he was ready to create a lot more problems!

II. The answer to David's harmful subjectivity was God's call that he daily read Scripture for its influence:

- A. God's Deuteronomy 17:14-20 instruction to Israel's kings was designed to get them to heed Scripture so precisely that they would not veer in the slightest degree from obeying its directives, Deuteronomy 17:20b.
- B. That instruction prescribed that the king write a copy of the Law and daily read from it, Deut. 17:18-19a.

- C. This daily reading practice would produce objectivity in the king's thinking and actions, Deut. 17:19b-20a:
1. Scripture has a powerful effect on man, influencing his soul, his spirit and heart, Hebrews 4:12.
 2. Thus, reading powerful Scripture daily would influence the king to revere God Who authored His written Word, a reverence that would produce obedience to all of the words of God's Law, Deuteronomy 17:19b.
 3. This daily exposure to powerful Scripture would also cause the king to realize his accountability to the Lord so that he would not turn proud, but view himself humbly as God's subject, Deuteronomy 17:20a.
 4. This daily exposure to powerful Scripture would also keep him humbly heeding God's Word, not turning from obeying it to the right hand or the left, but influence him to think and act objectively, Deut. 17:20b.
 5. Accordingly, both the king and his sons after him would be blessed in his kingdom, Deuteronomy 17:20c.
- D. However, David was then failing to be blessed since he was not responding objectively toward the crimes of rape and murder in his sons, for these sins reminded him of his own past sins. All this occurred because David was not reading *powerful* Scripture daily that it might *influence* him to **punish** Amnon for rape and to **punish** Absalom for murder *regardless* of his own past similar sins! (Deuteronomy 22:25-29; Exodus 21:12)

Lesson: *By failing to heed God's initial Scriptural call that he daily keep exposing his mind and heart to powerful Scripture, David failed to think objectively and so deal responsibly with the sins of immorality and murder in his sons, and this irresponsibility only fomented greater problems for both David and all Israel.*

Application: *To avoid paralyzing subjectivity in dealing with our past sins, (1) may we trust in Christ to be saved and indwelt by the Holy Spirit, John 3:16; Romans 8:9. (2) Then, (a) relying on the Spirit for behavior control (Galatians 5:16), may we (b) daily read Scripture that the power of God's Word might keep us humbly accountable to Him (c) that we objectively obey Scripture precisely regardless of influences to the contrary for God's blessing.*

Conclusion: (To illustrate the message . . .)

To show how exposure to Scripture works to keep us objective in regards to evolution, consider the following: Jeffrey Tomkins, who earned a Ph. D. in genetics from Clemson University and who served on Clemson's genetics and biochemistry faculty, wrote the article, "The Untold Story Behind DNA Similarity" in the May-June 2017 issue of Answers, p. 34-36, and there he mentioned the claim by evolutionists that "The DNA of humans is 98% similar to chimpanzees," Ibid., p. 34. The evolutionist's argument then goes that if this DNA similarity is so high, it "indisputably" proves that humans and chimpanzees share a common evolutionary ancestor, Ibid.

Yet, if we turn to Scripture at Genesis 1:1-2:25, we read that God created both land animals and man directly from the ground on the same 24-hour solar day, that man and chimp thus did not evolve from a common ancestor.

So, instead of naively adopting the evolutionary claim about the alleged 98 % of DNA similarities between man and chimp so that both had to have evolved from a common ancestor, we note in Dr. Tomkins' article on the chimpanzee genome study that (1) the sequencing of this genome "lacked good genetic resources and funding," Ibid., p. 35. Also, (2) those who worked on the project "used the human genome as a framework" based "on the evolutionary presupposition that humans and chimps evolved from a common ancestor," so the "outcome . . . is that the chimp genome they constructed would be very human-like even if the actual genome is not," Ibid., p. 35-36.

(3) Dr. Tomkins added, "It is now well documented in the scientific literature that many DNA sequence databases contain significant levels of human DNA from lab workers. In fact, over half of the DNA sequence data sets used to construct the chimp genome appear to be much more similar to humans than the rest . . . Of course, having human DNA mixed in would make the final product more human-like as well." (Ibid., p. 36)

(4) In addition, Dr. Bolton Davidheiser's book, Evolution and the Christian Faith, 1976, p. 234, mentioned that notable Harvard University comparative anatomist, Dr. Alfred S. Romer, claimed, "(A) comparative anatomist might be forced into the absurd position of having to admit that gorillas and chimpanzees could have had separate lines of ancestry all the way back to ancestral fish, and thus be more closely related to fish than to each other."

(5) Davidheiser also told of blood tests that were performed to help evolutionists better discern the alleged evolutionary tree of life forms, but one such test showed "three families of monkeys" were "more closely related to human beings than to other monkeys of their own families! (Ibid., p. 273) This finding is of course absurd!

So, even if DNA similarities between chimps and man are as high as 85 %, what Dr. Tomkins claims his study so far shows (Ibid., Tompkins), the differences are too great to claim man and chimp came from a common ancestor!

Thus, by regularly viewing Scripture, we avoid being swayed by the false biases of evolutionary thought. May we trust in Christ to be saved. Then, may we daily read Scripture that God might use its power to produce objectivity in our thinking and actions so that might God bless us.