

## WHY DAVID WAS NOT SLAIN OVER HIS ADULTERY & MURDER

And David's anger was greatly kindled against the man; and he said to Nathan, As the LORD liveth, the man that hath done this *thing* shall surely die: (II Sam. 12:5)

Literally "he is a son of death", but the law did not sentence a sheep stealer to death (II Sam.12:6, cp. Exo. 22:1). Enraged, David over-reacted.

First, there were not two or more witnesses willing to come forward and testify as required by the Law in order to invoke the death penalty upon David (Deu.17:6-7). Only David and Nathan *knew* of the deed, but Nathan was not an eyewitness – case dismissed (Joab knew concerning Uriah, but not of the adultery).

Still, it must not be thought that David was let off without any retribution. Afterward, David lost 4 sons, a daughter was raped, and 10 of his wives were publicly defiled by his own son. For a warrior such as David, death would have been much easier to endure.

But there is more. God's law had been violated; thus, God alone could alter the sentence (Lev.20:10) – but **only** if it were done legally. Yet the penalty itself *must* remain death!

Law was **Amended!** (precedent – Ten Commandments were **added** to the Covenant, Gal.3:19)

- (1) First – as King, David represented "The" King – and the Throne must continue forever (II Sam.7:11-17). However, Solomon was not yet conceived or born.
- (2) Remember, already well established via the animal sacrifice system was the principle that the legal punishment for sin could be justly transferred to a *sinless innocent substitute* provided there would **also** be "identification" with the substitute. That is, they would become **one** with each other – usually by the laying of hands on the offering (as a pen in a book illustrates being "in" Christ – Eph.5:30-32).

But no amoral animal could so be selected in this case, as those sacrifices were for "sins of ignorance" etc. Amoral animals could never be accepted to atone for "willful" or "presumptuous" sins/crimes such as adultery, murder, kidnapping, blasphemy, rape, etc. (cp. Lev. Chs. 4-5; Num. 15:22-36; Heb. 10:26-29). Such rebellious acts as these were punishable by death.

Moreover, the justice of God absolutely demanded that the penalty be meted out. A life must be forfeited!

Now God adds the *exception clause* to the above principle – or upon a **worthy** substitute (innocent, sinless, moral, and *human*, etc.) with whom there also existed a total "identification" relationship whereby the two were one (as "of one flesh"). And with regard to sins such as these, only *the King's* son could so qualify and be accepted!!! (like Jesus, Eph.5:30).

Indeed, the exception clause could not be given **until** there existed a **Monarchy!** No Monarchy, no King's son. Moreover, the Monarchy had to be through Judah (Gen.49:10 – the scepter belonged to **Judah** – not to Saul of Benjamin) and also through **David** of the tribe of Judah (II Sam.7). That is – **only** a "son" (direct descendant) of King David would so be accepted.

Further, the substitute had to offer **no objection!** – be willing. Hence, this "bastard" son of David and Bathsheba's becomes a type of David's Greater Son — the Messiah, the Lord Jesus Christ! (in man's view, both were conceived with no legal father after the flesh – "out of wedlock")