General Topics :: Thoughts on Ahithophel the Gilonite of 2Sam 15:12 ??

Thoughts on Ahithophel the Gilonite of 2Sam 15:12 ?? - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/21 9:23

Has anyone done a study of Ahithophel? If so I would sure appreciate some input and differing views concerning him an d the portions of scripture referring to him. These are the book/chapters I've found 2Sam 15,16,17,23 and 1Ch 27. Than ks for any input.

Re: Thoughts on Ahithophel the Gilonite of 2Sam 15:12 ?? - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/21 11:08

Ahithophel the Gilonite

to understand some of Ahithophel's motivation we need to relize whom his granddaughter was.

he was the father of Eliam

2 Samuel 23:34
Eliphelet the son of Ahasbai, the son of the Maachathite, ((Eliam) the son of Ahithophel the Gilonite))

who was Eliam??
2 Samuel 11:3
And David sent and enquired after the woman. And one said, Is not this Bathsheba, the daughter of Eliam, the wife of Ur iah the Hittite?

Eliam was the father of Bathsheba so hence Ahithophel the Gilonite was the grandfather of Bathsheba.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/22 6:48

You're quite right PP. It's interesting how so many things seem to come to light or make for better understanding when w e consider relationships, history and genealogy. Of course we have to be careful too when reading between the lines. Th anks for the input. There seems a lot to learn from Ahithophel when we look.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2013/2/22 7:36

QUOTE:
"It's interesting how so many things seem to come to light or make for better understanding when we consider relationsh ips, history and genealogy. Of course we have to be careful too when reading between the lines."

This is why I believe God had this info included in the WORD. The treasures that can be mined from serious study of the WORD are nothing short of awesome. When you find how these people were connected by relations you get the sense you might actually know these folks because they remind you of...and most of all these folks were ordinary like us with o rdinary difficulties - the ones we are confronted with are not new to the human experience. Many times we can take less ons by studying these characters....

Re: Thoughts on Ahithophel the Gilonite of 2Sam 15:12 ?? - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2013/2/22 7:50

Ahithophel was the grandfather of Bathsheba, as has been noted.

Some had suggested the fellow harbored severe resentment against David for the way he treated his granddaughter an d her husband. If this was the case, his actions would not surprise one.

I do understand Ahithophel's resentment of David. Imagine a king raping your granddaughter - that is what David did to Bathsheba - there is no record of this act being consensual. A king gets what he wants when he wants and how he want

s and woe on you if stand in his way - this is the way kings think and operate.

And then the king orders Uriah to be placed where he would get killed! Imagine a president doing that to your beloved gr anddaughter! To add insult to injury, he took this widow to be his wife...

As I consider the emotional dynamics of Bathsheba and her family I can see how God honored her anguish by giving he r a son who inherited the throne...

This is my perception of this story - I am looking at it from Bathsheba's view, how a female would think.

Re: - posted by turn, on: 2013/2/22 9:31

Ahithophel and Absalom, David's son, were both great betrayers of King David. Ahithophel had been characterized by g reat wisdom and by being a great counselor. When Ahithophel joined Absalom in the rebellion and conspiracy against K ing David, David prayed against Ahithophel.

As described in 1 Samuel 15:31...

And one told David, saying, Ahithophel is among the conspirators with Absalom. And David said, O LORD, I pray thee, t urn the counsel of Ahithophel into foolishness.

David's psalms contain many laments and some imprecations against the enemies of David.

In Psalm 55:12-14, David laments his betrayal by a friend. Some Bible commentators have speculated that this friend m ay have been Ahithophel (or Absalom or Hushai)

Psalm 55:12-14...

For it was not an enemy that reproached me; then I could have borne it: neither was it he that hated me that did magnify himself against me; then I would have hid myself from him: But it was thou, a man mine equal, my guide, and mine acqu aintance. We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company.

This was the Bible's testimony on the quality of Ahitophel's counsel as contained in 2 Samuel 16:23...

And the counsel ofÂ Ahithophel, which he counselled in those days, was as if a man had enquired at the oracle of God: so was all the counsel ofÂ AhithophelÂ both with David and with Absalom.

As the story progressed, Absalom heeded another counselor rather than Ahithophel and delayed the engagement of his armies with those of King David.

The death of Ahithophel was recorded in 2 Samuel 17:23.

Absalom was killed and defeated.

King David returned to Jerusalem.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/22 9:57

ginnyrose on 2013/2/22 "This is why I believe God had this info included in the WORD. The treasures that can be mine d from serious study of the WORD are nothing short of awesome. When you find how these people were connected by r elations you get the sense you might actually know these folks because they remind you of...and most of all these folks were ordinary like us with ordinary difficulties - the ones we are confronted with are not new to the human experience. M any times we can take lessons by studying these characters...."

You are so right Ginnyrose. In mining God's Word, we begin to find those nuggets which can become so valuable when applied or taken into consideration during events of our and others' daily lives. As you say when we soak up the informat ion we have been given, Bible characters become much more than just names in a book and we realize the Lord used th e same type people then as He does today. Isn't that reassuring?

I'm still undecided about the "rape issue" with David and Bathsheba but there is certainly more to the story than adultry a nd murder nor am I convinced "rape" can at all be ruled out.

Re: - posted by turn, on: 2013/2/22 10:30

After the suicide of Ahithophel (2 Samuel 17:23) and defeat of Absalom and Absalom's rebellion, this is recorded:

And Bathsheba bowed and did homage to the king prostrating hereself. Then king said, "What can I do for you?" (1 Kin gs 1:16).

Bathsheeba spoke at that time concerning the threat of another rebellious son of David, Adonijah, usurping and becomin g king after David.

Instead, Solomon, son of both David and Bathsheeba, became king.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/22 10:52

turn - Thanks for the post.

QUOTE "Ahithophel and Absalom, David's son, were both great betrayers of King David. " END QUOTE

Ahithophel's position to and betrayal of King David is what drew me back to him. Do you have a view concerning his sta nding with the Lord? How do you interpret 2 Sam 16:23 and was his counsel to Absalom one of grace?

Re: Thoughts on Ahithophel the Gilonite of 2Sam 15:12 ?? - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/22 10:59

Hi Jimur this was a wounderful idea of a topic for a thread.

also wounderful input by ginnyrose and turn.

Re: Thoughts on Ahithophel the Gilonite of 2Sam 15:12 ??, on: 2013/2/22 11:16

Quote:
----------I'm still undecided about the "rape issue" with David and Bathsheba but there is certainly more to the story than adultry and murder nor am I convinced "rape" can at all be ruled out.

Its very fashionable these days to apply modern psychology and political perceptions to biblical men and women. Perso nally when I read this post about David raping Bathsheba I was grieved. Hence this response in defence of King David, whoÂ's throne Christ will inherit.

Having read the account of David asking for and then Â“takingÂ” Bathsheba very carefully I agree that David clearly did exercise an authoritative influence in enquiring after UriahÂ's wife. He also send for her and Â“layÂ” with her.

Â“David sent messengers and took her, and when she came to him, he lay with her; and when she had purified herself fr om her uncleanness, she returned to her house. 2 Samuel 11:4.

In this verse the Â“takingÂ” is having authority to send for someone, as one in authority. In this instance it was with a mi nd to lay with another mans wife which is adultery. But the taking is not rape it is sending for Â“as a kingÂ”. It denotes a uthority and therefore influence, but this is not rape either. The intention is adultery and the actual description of the act i s Â“he lay with herÂ”. As the term took her" is clearly separated from "and lay with her" we would do well to leave their meaning separate as well.

All of this proceeded an encounter in which Bathsheba bathed in complete view of the Kings terrace, at night when the only possible visibility could be inward. Does any woman ordinarily bath in their chamber in the night in full view of some ones terrace? To do it in eyeshot of the Kings terrace could hardly have escaped BathshebaÂ' understanding. The acco unt does not mention David raping Bathsheba, claiming otherwise amounts to saying that Bathsheba had no power to sa y no! Can that really be true? All Â"naturalÂ" men with authority comprehend that expressed desire of a woman physicall y, in the first instance is a provocation of flattery to a Â"naturalÂ" woman, unless she is restrained by decency and a fear of God. Yet there is nothing sinful in desire of itself. It is, as with all good things given by God, a matter of self restraint a nd lawfulness before God whether to deny such a desire or else to obey it. Authority to send for and the subsequent effe ct of seduction by reason of physical admiration does not amount to rape. It is either lawful union by reason of intentional marriage or it is fornication by reason of itself with no intention of permanency, or else it is adultery, being an intention as well as a taking of another mans wife. No doubt in feminist literature it does amount to rape, but in the real world of sexu al desire and ambition it is not rape, it is straight forward lust and fleshy conquest.

It was said that, Â"A king gets what he wants when he wants and how he wants and woe on you if stand in his way - this is the way kings think and operate.Â" This is how men often think and operate let alone kings. The difference may be tha t when some men covet that which is openly presented to them in the visibility of an internally lit room at night,, they do i n fact go after it with violence and therein do they rape. Some men comprehend easily that what is Â"seenÂ" forms a ba sis for agreement if it amounts to a presentation, and in that, Â"actus reusÂ" is proven out of Â"mens reaÂ" as these thin gs are defined in law. In short if rape is defined by action and as David having reasonable reason to believe that Bathsh eba was either too young to understand her own actions of bathing in the visibility of the King, or was by reason of her st ate of mind incapable of saying Â"noÂ" then David raped Bathsheba at the point at which he acted against her both in hi s intention of sending for her (mens rea) and in his laying with her (actus reus). There is no country in the world even tod ay which would convict David of rape because Bathsheba is a capable and intelligent woman and does not herself claim it. Given that we have a great length of DavidÂ' life from this point on even up to his death to make a judgement as to th eir continued relationship its not unreasonable to believe that they he had a respectful and balanced relationship. As I sa id it is a feminist perspective which is formed with only one consideration in mind, Â"all men are rapistsÂ" if it is claimed or else shown that the women herself does not initiate, facilitate and determine her sexual conduct and the functions of h er own body. In this extreme definition women have learned to rape men. What madness.

Read 2 Samuel chapter thirteen which gives some interesting light on both DavidÂ' attitude to rape and the real meaning of what rape is.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/22 14:11

amrkelly - As always, valid statements and excellent perspective. While we are not told Bathsheba offered resistance or she even suggested King David reconsider his actions I can understand why some would consider the idea of rape. E specially if we consider the possible young age of Bathsheba and his high rank when the event took place. Although it w ould all seem based as you say on modern psychology and political perceptions as well as reading between the lines. P ersonally, I am no more grieved by the suggestion of rape than by an act of adultery and murder. Perhaps that stems fro m a male's obvious lack of feminine perspective.

My present interest is not so much in this event or it's details, as in the effect if any, it may have had on Ahithophel's deci sion to betray David. Of course this too is in essence speculatory. I'm not sure you would agree, but speculation, properl y applied, is not necessarily a bad thing.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/22 14:14

Quote:
----------I'm still undecided about the "rape issue" with David and Bathsheba but there is certainly more to the story than adultry and murder nor am I convinced "rape" can at all be ruled out.

I have to agree with amrkelly that their is no indication of a forceable rape case as was with Amnon and Tamar.

amrkelly wrote ///All of this proceeded an encounter in which Bathsheba bathed in complete view of the Kings terrace, a t night when the only possible visibility could be inward. Does any woman ordinarily bath in their chamber in the night in f

ull view of someones terrace? To do it in eyeshot of the Kings terrace could hardly have escaped BathshebaÂ' understanding.///

I have heard sermons in which this point was made but I do not find from what I am reading in the text that we can make this accusation either. The king's house I would assume would be much taller than all the surrounding homes but regardless, we need to take note that David did not see her from his bedroom window, As far as I am aware we have no indication from the text that Bathsheba was aware that she was bathing in visability, It was David that the text indicates got out of bed for what ever reason and decided to go for a walk on the roof.

I do not seem to find much of a will of any kind, being revealed of Bathsheba concerning the event,
nor do I find the scripture potraying her as intentionally being seductive, I used to have a portrayal of Bathsheba as being a seductive adulterous but I can not find from looking at the text that it reveales that idea.
I do not find God rebuking her or punishing her other than the loss of the child which the text reveales was more of a punishment for David. I am not finding any text that seems to indicate a deceptive seductive spirit as what we find revealled of delilah and Jezebel.

We acctually find Her being blessed by her son being made king and being part of the linage of Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

Yesterday while studying and meditating on this subject this verse stuck out to me

2 Samuel 11
26 And when the wife of Uriah heard that Uriah her husband was dead , she mourned for her husband.

most seductive adulterous's have destroyed their own soul to much to mourn over such an incident.

Wounderful thoughts, guys

Re: , on: 2013/2/23 9:04

Quote:
----------Although it would all seem based as you say on modern psychology and political perceptions as well as reading between the lines. Personally, I am no more grieved by the suggestion of rape than by an act of adultery and murder. Perhaps that stems from a male's obvious lack of feminine perspective. Jimur.

I agree that most of what could be said about this account of David and Bathsheba could be said to be speculative. When thoughts are Â“meditativeÂ” however, and thereby limited to what is known, either by form of words or else clear revelation and intra-biblical interpretation then it is possible to arrive at a fuller understanding without speculating at all. (Psalm 119:99). What is really dangerous however, is to have a teleological view of scriptures. There has been a great deal of effort over the course of the last two decades to uncover the cultural traditions of the ancient world, especially Israel in an attempt to contextualise events and happenings so that we can Â“learnÂ”. Nothing has occupied the church more than the question of male and female relationships and roles in the church as well as society. And nothing more fully expresses the sentiments of this enquiry than the word Â“sexistÂ”.

Well if we take the word sexist and analyse its meaning for example we will find that it equates in meaning to a fundamental conflict by the man against the woman, in which the woman has been the undoubted looser. Similar to MarxÂ' conflict theory of labour, the principle theory of sexism is a conflict theory of the male against the female. Both these theories have at their heart a reality which is evident in life, but there real power lies in the fall of mankind into sin. Eve was clearly emotionally changed by her experience of being deceived in the garden (Genesis 3:13-16), whereas Adam was not changed emotionally, but was thereafter in conflict with the earth itself (Genesis 3:17-19). History of the church has almost

universally taught that the male and the female are themselves in conflict and so feminism has its power from this idea o utworked in the reality of societies and the way women are treated by men, and informed by the direct words of God spo ken in the garden itself. The one, that of GodÂ' pronouncements, underlies the outworking, that of Â"how men treat wom enÂ", and the other, the injustice of labouring for another man, i.e. how men must work in order to eat in conflict with the man who wants to Â"profit from other menÂ' need to labourÂ". The two ways which the world has in finality answered thi s constraining reality of God, is feminism and socialism. To remedy this injustice naturally speaking is to simply claim tha t men and women are in fact the same creature, gender neutral. This is socialism as it is actually taught theoretically and historically, but it is also feminism. It is also fuelled by a view of the Â"protagonist maleÂ" and evidenced by the Â"caring femaleÂ".

The best thing men can do in this circumstance is to learn to love their wives soundly and reasonably and to provide for t heir families with gratitude.

If we take biblical men and women and explain them in this Â"modernÂ" way we will end up with no true context for unde rstanding God ways or how he deals with men. How for example, that David is not accused of rape by taking advantage of Bathsheba in the scripture. Or How NathanÂ' picture of it involved a ewe lamb being loved like a daughter (2 Samuel 12:3). To the feminist this sounds like a description of a pervert, neglecting that the injured party in this account is not pr esented as Bathsheba at all, but Uriah (2 Samuel 12:4). To David it sounded like an injustice worthy of death. Which wo uld be the more severe reaction. The one of the feminist would be not only misleading, but would end up accusing the w rong man. David on the other hand would have the right man make fourfold restitution. If we apply a teleological method ology to interpreting scripture we will never understand the justice of God.

In fact if the truth is told, by practising these ideas of feminism and socialism we are headed towards SatanÂ' real ambiti on which is homosexuality not as a coequal union, comparable with marriage, but a homosexual mind of governance thr oughout society. This full and most blasphemous presentation of homosexuality is not a male to male or female to femal e attraction, but a male to female to male, and a female to male to female to self attraction. It ought to be noted that the whole city came out to LotÂ' house, both male and female to participate in what was intended (Genesis 19:4). In such a world of sexual degeneracy where the issue is not male or female but unrestrained lust, both men and women are equal parties yet as far as the women were concerned they are not openly identified nor do they have the lead.

Homosexuality is not a gender spirit it is a satanic spirit of lust.

Another instance of this issue of unrestrained homosexuality can be seen in the tribe of Benjamin where a Levite as a gu est at another manÂ' house was himself the first object of this spirit of lust in two men, yet these two men are said, as in LotÂ' day, to have Â"surroundedÂ" the house. In the end the poor concubine of the Levite was thrust by her husband int o their menace as a compulsion to preserve the priest and the sanctity of the sacrifice which he represented. The poor w oman was raped to death, by men whose first intention was the flesh of other men. (Judges 19:22-27). In both instances virgin daughters were offered, a fact which ought to sober us indeed. If any of these men had been a homosexual after t he manner of the lie which is presented today, then offering women rather than seeing priests or else angels raped, woul d not have been possible. We can live in the Â"mysteryÂ" of this age if we insist on it, and we can learn all the tricks of p olitics and equality. Or we can be separate in our thinking and learn the wisdom of God and how it was that He pressed humanity to the governance and gender distinct visibility every nation has comprehended until now. In the finality of this age it is being eroded and rejected. By that means is a more dreadful reality coming about.

Well Jimur that brings me to why I was grieved by the idea that David actually raped Bathsheba by simply demanding as a king and not asking as a man, having sent for her Â"as a kingÂ".

From being a little child I was drawn into occult thinking. Most believers, indeed most people generally do not understan d the difference between occult thinking and paganism, or new ageism, or witchcraft, or demonic activity or even what is generally called, direct Satanism. All of these things exists and they come in almost numberless varieties of expressions. All of them in some way or other reveal the mind of Satan in their outworking, yet occult thinking is in reality none of the m. In fact of all of these things occult thinking is by far the most insidious and dangerous mind for a man or woman to ha ve.

At its heart occult thinking is now finding its fullest outworking in an emergent theology amongst GodÂ' very elect. At the heart of this emergent theology lies a rational and undeniable reality which is so seductive that it makes of its adherents a tangible realisation of god like understanding and ambitions which resists rebuke because at the heart of it lies the nat

ural hearts and minds of men and women and has little if anything to do with demonic activity as was historically underst ood even thirty years ago. There are many ancient threads of understanding which inform this mind including philosophy , mathematics, astrology, immanent reason as well as transcendental reason. The most rational and ordered presentatio n of these things comes to us through the writings of ancient greek philosophers, but ironically have their most orderly ro ots in the oratory traditions of Pythagorus. Plato is often cited as a father of intellect and reason, through his writings, but Plato himself was grounded and rooted in the orations of Pythagorus. Yet long before the rational adept Pythagorus, we have Assyria and Babylon, Chaldea as well as other nations and political systems, and before these we have individual men and before men we have Satan and his ambitions.

The occult therefore whilst it takes on many outward and visible inclinations of men and demons, it is most Â“perfectlyÂ” expressed both at the dawn of time, when the promise of Satan came Â“ye shall be as GodÂ” and is once again being s o expressed as to make of it in finality no mere promise, but a reality of behaviour and societal outworking. It ought to be remembered that the reason why God confused the languages of men in Genesis was because Â“there will be no limit t o what man shall doÂ”. Today in the bursting open of the hidden world of quantum knowledge and otherwise hidden mat erial science, men are once again on the threshold of acknowledging the reality of God by reason, yet not according to God Himself, but despite Him. This was Nimrod, it was all of the ancient world, including the western philosophers, and it is today become an eclectic reality in an emergent apostate church which despite all of its seeming intelligence still crav es that Â“mysticalÂ” union with God, despising the mystery of Christ Himself Who is already revealed in the hearts of tho se who truly love Him. In order to Â“proveÂ” this occult mystery of Satan and men, increasing numbers of evangelical be lievers are being drawn into self and the dominion of the soul, whilst slowly yielding up the true knowledge of God which can only be comprehended by the new man in Christ, expressed in the renewing of the mind.

There are many more threads to this agreement made in Eden innocently by our forefather Adam, but the essentials are become so visible that it is now possible to put a name to the men and women who are the head of it and most reflect its outworking in the apostate church. As regards to how it is possible therefore to claim that David raped Bathsheba and w hy this is a grievous thing to claim we need look no further than the man Pythagorus and his contemplative religious thin king, mixed with a natural desire to comprehend the material world and to uncover the evidence of GodÂ’ hand in the Ko smos, both immanent and transcendental. Yet not with a view to knowing or indeed even believing in Â“one true GodÂ”, but in order to discover the god that is the man of the promise Â“ye shall be as GodÂ”.

Psychology more perfectly represents the ordinary manÂ’ portion, along with socialism and feminism, being a more palat able and accessible reality, yet which of itself leads even many christians to believe they have acquired some deep kno wledge. Psychology, socialism and feminism are just the poisonous sweets given to children by a cruel and wicked fathe r of rebellion. In eating them they produce a mind which asserts that all the restraints which God saw fit in His mercy to p ut into place in order to keep men from their own evil, are removed slowly and insidiously until the man is suddenly left n aked once again yet not ashamed. Moreover, because the cry has gone up Â“I am clothed in ChristÂ”, by some who tho ugh they ought to be hated by the world, are rather loved by the world, even the world itself is learning from the church h ow to rebel with more reference to God Himself than one would have thought possible. In so desiring the affection of the world, we the saints have taught the world that there is no shame in nakedness, little realising that whilst we are clothed in Christ, they are not, and are learning to take pride in their condition once again as they did in the days of old when the whole earth was filled with blasphemy and perversity. When the most noble societies were held together not by reason a lone, but by slavery and cruelty and contempt for True God. Where man himself is the object

As to how this answers why I was grieved I will leave that to your own understanding.

The periodic time line of Philosophy of the western world is very clear and fits perfectly with both the ancient apostate ch urch as well as emergent church theology.

*Pre-Socratic Philosophy, including mythology, the Pythagoreans and Parmenides
*The Great Century of Athens, including the Sophists and Socrates
*Plato, including The Republic, The Symposium and The Timaeus
*Aristotle, including The Physics, The Metaphysics and The Poetics
*Hellenistic Philosophy, including the Sceptics, the Stoics, the Epicureans and Cicero
*Late Antiquity, including Neoplatonism, Origen and St Augustine.

Whilst I was in prison in the early 1980Â’s Satan put many of these philosophies directly into my hands along with Empe docles and works of the known occult, as well as tools of divination along the lines of the Urim and Thummim as well as

other works all of which drew together in my understanding a belief that it is lawful and necessary for every man to comp letely reject the cross, as I understood it as an unbeliever, and find Â“selfÂ”. This became for a short time the only true r eligion which amounts to no more than self realisation and the dominion of others. Precisely at the point in time, God rev ealed Himself and I found Christ. The years before this wonderful deliverance were the most dangerous time of my life a nd had I gone on in those things I would have undoubtably become a monster. Today believers fiddle at the edges of the se things and donÂ't even realise the reality of where the things they put so much confidence in come from. Or why it to ok from mid 7th century BC to the mid 19th century AD for the fundamental changes in the thinking of men which has sin ce produced in just 150 years more change in societies than in all the previous centuries put together. The link between science and self realisation, is almost rejected out of hand because science as an empirical endeavour is claimed to be spiritually neutral. Even a brief look at Pythagoras will put that claim to bed. The same can be said of psychology as well . They all have there roots in this one man whose aesthetic experiential life of living science were all geared to self realis ation.

Pythagoras was a unique man in history for many reasons. He wrote almost nothing down. He established a monastic st yle school of learning, which included not just three years of learning, by listening, but after having learned to listen and being allowed to ask childish questions, was followed by five years of silence where the student was not allowed to spea k at all. It included almost every branch of foundational science which we know today as well as almost every fundament al perception and dichotomy of the psyche (soul) which still informs our understanding today as well as the most insidiou s ambition of pantheism, that of the self realisation of the individual. In this sense even the godÂ's give way to the man w ho may join them if he is able. Long before Pythagoras began his oratory discourse of learning, which he termed logos, and which literally meant the communication by speech of the state of godhood, he studied in Egypt under the priests of that place for twenty three years and travelled to other places learning the ancient ways of knowledge which were practi sed, as well, by the Chaldeans. All of this information can be found in The Biographies of Pythagoras which belong to a very early date not long after his death.

In contrast to this complex and somewhat unattainable quest for knowledge, God has given us the Law and the Prophet s by Israel and in finality Christ Himself the true Logos of God, by which we are able to share in the divine nature of God by possessing His life through Christ Himself. In view of this profound reality the efforts of all men everywhere and at all t imes are but chaff. Yet today the church itself is once more presenting a view of understanding which makes reference t o and upholds Platonic pythagorean philosophy, which includes in its parts, psychological enquiry and reason, as well sc ience and mysticism; yes and all of its sons and daughters as well. If by asking a question concerning the grand father of Bathsheba we end up answering it by reason of a manÂ's offence, not only is this speculative but it is actually dangerou s because his actions were essentially rebellious and drew aside even a son of the king in its effect. Rebellion cannot be understood through reason or else it will be sided with and excused. If we press that way of thinking too far we will end u p reasoning with the most rebellious spirit to have ever lived, even Satan. Then we will find that we are also drawn aside and ought not to be surprised if we ourselves are found in rebellion also.

My apologies for the length of this post. I will line myself up against the wall to be shot immediately.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2013/2/23 22:20

What does God say about this incident?

2Samuel 1:26-27:

26 Now when the wife of Uriah heard that Uriah her husband was dead, she mourned for her husband.

27 When the time of mourning was over, David sent and brought her to his house and she became his wife; then she bo re him a son. But the thing that David had done was evil in the sight of the LORD.

2Samuel 12:1-15:

1 Then the LORD sent Nathan to David. And he came to him and said,
Â“There were two men in one city, the one rich and the other poor.

2 Â“The rich man had a great many flocks and herds.

3 Â“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 Â“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 manÂ’s ewe lamb and prepared it for the man who had come to him.Â”

5 Then DavidÂ’s anger burned greatly against the man, and he said to Nathan, Â“As the LORD lives, surely the man who has done this deserves to die.

6 Â“He must make restitution for the lamb fourfold, because he did this thing and had no compassion.Â”

7 Nathan then said to David, Â“You are the man! Thus says the LORD God of Israel, Â‘It is I who anointed you king over Israel and it is I who delivered you from the hand of Saul.

8 Â‘I also gave you your masterÂ’s house and your masterÂ’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!

9 Â‘Why have you despised the word of the LORD by doing evil in His sight? You have struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword, have taken his wife to be your wife, and have killed him with the sword of the sons of Ammon.

10 Â‘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.Â’

11 Â“Thus says the LORD, Â‘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.

12Â‘Indeed you did it secretly, but I will do this thing before all Israel, and under the sun.Â’Â”

13 Then David said to Nathan, Â“I have sinned against the LORD.Â” And Nathan said to David, Â“The LORD also has taken away your sin; you shall not die.

14 Â“However, because by this deed you have given occasion to the enemies of the LORD to blaspheme, the child also that is born to you shall surely die.Â”

15 So Nathan went to his house. NASB

We see in these verses God never held Bathsheba responsible for her role in this act - God placed ALL the blame on David.

The OT law stipulated that a couple who engaged in adultery would be killed: Lev 20:10 And the man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbour's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death. KJV

This is why I would say this was rape, not simple adultery.

Re: - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/23 22:47

amrkelly - hi!

In one sense the scriptures, I suppose in contextual nature, could be considered teleological in that they inherently purpose a final result and/or cause. Just a passing thought as I am not familiar with the intricacies of a pure teleology school of thought. While I think a knowledge or understanding of the behaviors, manners, customs, etc. of ancient middle eastern cultures are beneficial to today's bible student I feel it should be used for the most as a base guideline or a place of beginning. Although it helps one to relate more easily perhaps to the characters, historically, peoples veer from tradition frequently and to conclude anything based too heavily or merely on tradition or cultural behavior would

IMO be foolish. Like many methods these are, when properly applied , simply tools for the enhancement of study. Certainly as you indicate, any tool can be misused and even lead to harm. Just as one should be very careful with one's presumptions, we should also always attempt to allow scripture to interpret scripture via the guidance of the Holy Spirit and remain ever focused on our Lord Jesus.

To perhaps better clarify my interest, it does not lie in the sexual escapades of David and Bathsheba. I have not concerned myself with the question of rape nor do I intend to do so. I see in the story for whatever reason, a King decided to not be with his armies but rather to stay home. While at home he looked upon a woman whom he obviously grew to desire. He was told her name and her marital status. He sent for her and together they committed sin. These are facts given in scripture. We can apply any method of choice to promote what ever end we may seek. One might say David did sin by looking upon her. Some say she was intentionally exposing herself. One cries "rape" while one says consensual sex, and yet another claims it's all allegory. At any rate the woman conceived via David and to cover the act of adultery David committed what is now deemed murder. Regardless of details these behaviors were displeasing to God and therefore constituted sin for which the two must answer.

My interest, for now, remains with Ahithophel and any thought, idea, or opinion one might offer as to an effect this event and the death of Uriah may or may not have had on him as it might relate to his relationship toward King David. I am als o curious of the possible thoughts of others concerning why Ahithophel killed himself. I shall pray I am able to discern th ought, idea, and opinion from what is offered in scripture.

As I am not so willing to line myself against the wall, I shall end here and remain appreciative to further discourse of your thoughts. lol

jim

2Samuel 12:1-15 - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/23 23:00

2 Samuel 12:1-15

12 And the Lord sent Nathan unto David. And he came unto him, and said unto him, There were two men in one city; the one rich, and the other poor.

2 The rich man had exceeding many flocks and herds:

3 But the poor man had nothing, save one little ewe lamb, which he had bought and nourished up: and it grew up togeth er with him, and with his children; it did eat of his own meat, and drank of his own cup, and lay in his bosom, and was un to him as a daughter.

4 And there came a traveller unto the rich man, and he spared to take of his own flock and of his own herd, to dress for t he wayfaring man that was come unto him; but took the poor man's lamb, and dressed it for the man that was come to hi m.

5 And David's anger was greatly kindled against the man; and he said to Nathan, As the Lord liveth, the man that hath d one this thing shall surely die:

I have been meditating on whom the traveller the wayfaring man of the analogy represents.

What is your thoughts of what or of whom does the traveller represent??

jimur - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/23 23:19

Hi jimur

jimur wrote ///My interest, for now, remains with Ahithophel and any thought, idea, or opinion one might offer as to an effect this event and the death of Uriah may or may not have had on him as it might relate to his relationship toward King David. I am also curious of the possible thoughts of others concerning why Ahithophel killed himself. I shall pray I am able to discern thought, idea, and opinion from what is offered in scripture.///

I find it interesting that in Nathans encounter with David in 2 Sam 12 that part of The Lords chastening toward David included v 11 "Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own house, and I will take thy wives before thine eyes, and give them unto thy neighbour, and he shall lie with thy wives in the sight of this sun.12 For thou didst it secretly: but I will do this thing before all Israel, and before the sun"

I find it interesting that it was Ahithophel's advise by which this came true 2 Sam 16 v 20 "Then said Absalom to Ahithophel, Give counsel among you what we shall do.
21 And Ahithophel said unto Absalom, Go in unto thy father's concubines, which he hath left to keep the house; and all Israel shall hear that thou art abhorred of thy father: then shall the hands of all that are with thee be strong.
22 So they spread Absalom a tent upon the top of the house; and Absalom went in unto his father's concubines in the sight of all Israel.
23 And the counsel of Ahithophel, which he counselled in those days, was as if a man had enquired at the oracle of God: so was all the counsel of Ahithophel both with David and with Absalom."

I am also finding the incident with David's friend Hushai the Archite interesting, and worth some meditation.

Re: 2Samuel 12:1-15 - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2013/2/24 8:50

QUOTE:
"What is your thoughts of what or of whom does the traveller represent??"

Hmmmm...dunno - never thought about that. I always focused on the rich man who had plenty but stole from the poor man instead. That idea alone is enough to make a sensible person choke.

Just thinking about it... perhaps it could mean be symbolic of lust? Just thinking....

Re: jimur - posted by jimur, on: 2013/2/24 9:15

pp -

quote "What is your thoughts of what or of whom does the traveller represent??" end quote

I have to admit while I'm familiar with the events of the discussion I certainly have neglected a true study. In my shallow understanding of Nathan's parable the traveler represents temptation, sin, the flesh, etc. Scripture teaches that God forgives, yet we can not be truly blessed if sin rules us.

Matthew 6:24 (KJV)
24 No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

pp stated > "I am also finding the incident with David's friend Hushai the Archite interesting, and worth some meditation".

There is so much to consider from this series of events. Enter Hushai, the double agent in a tale of espionage, brings wit h him additional questions. Such as why did Absalom decide to listen to his counsel opposed to that of Ahithophel? Our Lord certainly used Hushai to restore or secure David's throne.

Re: - posted by lylewise, on: 2013/2/24 11:21

Great discussion. It would seem the traveler in the story is but an agent necessary to expose the mindset and heart. of t he rich man. The traveler was going to be fed but with no intention does the rich man want to disturb from the plenty G od has given him. Whether son, daughter, relative, friend, acquaintance, or even a stranger, the rich man's hospitality re veals an unthankful heart and one whose eyes are on the riches of the world and not the beauty of God from whom all bl essings flow (they do not honor Me, or give Me thanks)) The only source of unending satisfaction does not have its root s in the material. It is the meet from God, not the meat of lambs.