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There are several military terms contained in this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting on Interior Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fighting on Exterior Lines</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flying Column</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Klicks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Laws of Divine Establishment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Sense of Destiny</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pivot</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relaxed Mental Attitude</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spin-off</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Single Envelopment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supergrace</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of these definitions are taken from
http://www.bibledoctrinechurch.org/?subpages/GLOSSARY.shtml

An Introduction to 2Samuel 10

Introduction: 2Sam. 10 is quite fascinating. Whereas 2Sam. 8 described a few of the nations which Israel defeated in battle or allied themselves with, 2Sam. 10 will cover one conflict which became two; and this time, we study some of the strategy and tactics involved. Whereas, there was little detail in 2Sam. 8, there is a lot of detail in this chapter (which is still quite sparse, given the international and historical importance of the final 5 verses). What we have found in the Bible on other occasions is, we are given a bare bones coverage of an incident in one chapter, and then, the writer goes back and covers that same incident again, but in much greater detail. That is not what is happening here. David did defeat the Aramæans (= Syrians) in 2Sam. 8; however, 2Sam. 10 is not a revisiting of that war, but a new conflict. This will be made clear at the end of this chapter, when we summarize the two conflicts under the doctrine: A Summary of David’s Wars with Aram.

As a personal note, this is the first time I have gone back to compare my notes with those I took under the teaching of R. B. Thieme Jr. (I have, on occasion, consulted his books about certain doctrines). However, in the past, it should be clear that the basic Bible doctrine and my exegetical, isagogical and categorical approach come from 30 years under his teaching. Given my lack of experience with the subject matter herein contained (wars in the ancient world), I depended greatly upon Thieme’s teaching to fill in the many gaps which I had.

On the other hand, this will not be a rehash of Thieme’s teaching. In fact, I may even have some important tactics and explanations for what happened, which Bob overlooked (given the kind of schedule which he kept, it is not out of the question that he might miss something here or there).

There is a lot of introductory material, so be patient; it will all pay off.

An important characteristic to deal with is the general accuracy of the Old Testament itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Accurate Historical Nature of the Old Testament</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Because of the very nature of the Bible—it being God’s Word to man—it is attacked in every way possible. Books written by Moses are said, even by major theological seminaries, to be the work of several groups of men at various times, long after the time of Moses. The timeline of the Bible is disparaged. And the historicity of the Bible is under continual attack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There are other existing ancient histories. However, these mostly exist in a fragmented forms. Furthermore, the history of nations like Assyria or Egypt are often (and obviously) slanted in favor of these countries, where historical disasters are ignored, and victories and expansions are exaggerated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Bible is very different from this. We examine the historical events as well as the people, but the chief focus is man’s relationship to God and God’s plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Although the Bible in no way purports to be a full and accurate history of Israel, it is the most significant and extensive history of any ancient country in existence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Because of the religious nature of the Old Testament, the text was preserved with greater accuracy and in more volumes than any other ancient work of any sort. This has been preserved by various groups who have been, from time to time and in varying degrees, hostile toward one another (for instance Christians and Jews). Yet the text is just as reliable, whether preserved by Jewish scribes or by Christian churches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We find no attempt in the preservation of the Old Testament to misrepresent or exaggerate the events related to Israel. We know this, in part, because of the numerous manuscripts which are in existence. No one could make wholesale changes to the Bible in ancient times any more than someone could do so today and make it stick—there are just too many manuscripts in existence. Furthermore, the character of Israel’s kings and Israel’s people is never favored or exaggerated. King David, the greatest king of Israel, is presented here in all of his royalty as well as in all of his flaws (the next few chapters will make this clear). His flaws are not glossed over, edited out of the text; nor are the tenets of God changed in order to conform with David’s bad behavior. He is simply presented as God’s man, but a man with feet of clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. We have several simultaneous witnesses to the history of Israel. We have Samuel and Kings, which present a chronological history of Israel from about 1100 to 400 B.C., written very close to the time of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the book of Chronicles, written hundreds of years later, summarizing these events, using Samuel, Kings and other ancient historical books, no longer available to us. Chronicles supplies a second witness, so to speak. A man with a good historical perspective revisits Israel’s history, and again, there is no glossing over of negative events, or any exaggeration of what would be seen as the good portions of Israel’s history.

8. In addition to this, there are prophets who write, and they comment on the same historical events that we find in Kings and Chronicles. Their view of many kings is anything but complementary.

9. Then we have the history of Josephus, which incorporates Jewish traditions and probably other historical documents, as well as the Bible as a source, and his extensive histories, for the most part, confirm the history of the Bible.

10. I have mentioned other historical documents. None are as complete and as well preserved as the Old Testament. Furthermore, none are clearly written by eyewitnesses, and 1000’s of years stand between these manuscripts and the events which they describe. It does not mean that other historical documents are worthless; the point I am making is, if these historical documents can be trusted, then much more the Old Testament record.

11. There are some exceptions to this:
   a. There are the approximately 350 clay tablets known as the Amarna letters (or tablets), which are letters written between Egypt and Canaan and Amurru. These were written between 1388–1353 B.C. and provide us with a good historical background for that time period (which would have coincided with the early period of the Judges in Israel).
   b. There are various stelae, which are commemorative stones, which tell us about this or that event (or about a person who has died). One of the most famous stelae is the Mesha Stele, also known as the Moabite Stone, which commemorates King Mesha’s victories, including his rebellion against Israel, when Ahab was king.

12. There is continual archeological support for Biblical places and events. For several hundred years, the Bible was disparaged because ancient historians poo-pood the idea of the Hittites being some sort of great ancient empire. To them, at most, the Hittites were some small tribe from the Middle East. However, archeology has shown the Hittites to be every much the great empire as they are presented in the Bible.

13. Finally, we have the testimony of some ancient historians, like the famous ancient historian Will Durant, who wrote, The discoveries here summarized have restored considerable credit to those chapters of Genesis that record the early traditions of the Jews. In its outlines, and bring supernatural incidents, the story of the Jews as unfolded in the Old Testament has stood the test of criticism and archeology; every year adds corroboration from documents, monuments, or excavations...We must accept the Biblical account provisionally until it is disproved.¹

There is the problem of 2Sam. 8 and 10. Portions of 2Sam. 8 deal with Israel at war with Aram (Syria); and most of this chapter is about Israel being at war with Aram. Many theologians accept these as consecutive wars, in the order in which they are found. The most serious objection to this approach is, Aram appears to be so badly beaten in 2Sam. 8 that how could they be at war with David only 2 chapters later? The explanation is not difficult: 5–10 years passed between these 2 wars. There is nothing in the history of Samuel or Chronicles to suggest that little or no time intervened between these two wars. One of the biggest problems in 2Sam. 8 is v. 13, which the text reads Aram, but it should read Edom. So, after David decisively defeats the Aramaeans, there is an alliance with King Toi and an extensive war with Edom, as well as extensive administration which must be set up over the kingdoms conquered by David. Therefore, a passage of time between 2Sam. 8 and 10 would be expected. And since Aram is one of the greatest world powers of that era, it does not seem unusual that they would later test Israel, and an easy way to test them is by fighting a proxy war with Israel using mercenaries (2Sam. 10).

The 2nd theory is, 2Sam. 10 expands upon the war with Aram in 2Sam. 8. There are simply too many differences between these chapters to accept that theory. In fact, at the end of this chapter, I summarize the wars between Israel and Syria (Aram), and you may want to refer to that first in order to get these wars fixed in your mind as separate events. **A Summary of David's Wars with Aram**

Finally, the 3rd theory is, 2Sam. 10 occurs first in time. This is quite possible; however, the chapters in Samuel and Chronicles appear to be arranged in chronological order, for the most part.
2Sam. 10 begins innocently enough—an ally of David’s, King Nahash of Ammon, dies, and David sends ambassadors to Ammon to convey David’s sympathies Hanun, the son of Nahash and the new king of Ammon (2Sam. 10:1–2a). However, the state department of Ammon suggest to King Hanun that these men had only come into their city with the idea that they would spy it out for David, so that David could later come and overthrow Ammon (2Sam. 10:2b–3). Hanun then humiliated this delegation from David, shaving off a portion of their beards and cutting off a part of their clothes, humiliating them (2Sam. 10:4). David sends out men to meet them, upon hearing what had happened to them, and allowed them to remain in Jericho until their beards could grow back (2Sam. 10:5).

The Ammonites apparently did have spies out there, and when it became apparent that this really made David mad, they hired Syrian mercenaries to supplement their own army (2Sam. 1:6). David sends Joab and his elite forces to war with Ammon (2Sam. 10:7). The Ammonite army faced off Joab from their front gate, but the Syrian army came in behind Joab from the field (2Sam. 10:8–9a). Joab pealed off a portion of his men, and took them to fight against the Syrians, while his brother Abishai took the remainder of his forces and deployed them as a holding force against the Ammonites (2Sam. 10:9b–10). The strategy was, if either army lost ground, the other army would send reinforcements in the help (2Sam. 10:11). Joab told his brother to remain strong and courageous, and to allow Jehovah Elohim to do according to His plan (2Sam. 10:12).

Joab pushed back the mercenary army of the Syrians, and the Ammonites, seeing their paid army being defeated, retreated back into the city (2Sam. 10:13–14a). Interestingly enough, Joab then returns to Jerusalem (2Sam. 10:14b).

Even though the Syrians were a mercenary army who had turned tail and retreated, Hadadezer gathered a larger Syrian army and gathered to meet David on the opposite side of the Jordan so that any army deployed to go to Ammon would have to go through this Syrian army first (2Sam. 10:15–17a). David defeats the Syrians on the other side of the Jordan, killing thousands of their men (2Sam. 10:17–18). These Syrian forces make peace with Israel and do not ally themselves with Ammon anymore (2Sam. 10:19).
This map will give you a good idea as to what results from these wars which David is involved in. Saul was, at first, a great warrior; however, for the final decade or more of his rule, Saul spent all of that time chasing David, which did not increase the holdings of Israel.

However, David, as we have seen, has conquered country after country. In the blue area is what David controlled and where he had soldiers stationed in order to collect tribute.

This map is also helpful because it shows the geographical relationship between Israel, Aram and Ammon, the principle players in this chapter of 2Samuel.

Map taken from http://www.oneblood-onerace.org/images/Map7.jpg
There are 2 nations which we will deal with in this chapter, and it might be good that we get a background on these nations first.

Chapter Outline

At this point in time, we ought to examine The Doctrine of Aram (HTML) (PDF), which was originally covered back in the book of Deuteronomy (Deut. 26). The shortened version of this doctrine follows:

The Abbreviated Doctrine of Aram (Syria)

1. Aram is called Syria in the Greek, and there is no relationship between Syria and Assyria (other than they are both made up of Semitic peoples and were in conflict with one another on many occasions). Gen. 10:21–22
2. The Aramaeans are first cousins to the Jews (the Jews come through the line of Arpanchshad, Aram’s brother). Gen. 10:22 11:11–27
3. Like all nations, there is an ebb and flow when it comes to the borders. Aram, at its largest, was north of Israel and stretched from the Mediterranean Sea all the way to the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. However, like any other country, its boundaries varied dramatically over the centuries. Although modern-day Syria is located in roughly the same place, there is no relationship between modern and ancient Syrians.
4. In researching secular history, I found very few resources which treated Aram as an robust, independent power; and some simply treated Aram as a plot of land invaded, conquered and held by a series of peoples (which is essentially true of any plot of land). What I had a difficult time locating were timelines of ancient peoples which included the Aramaeans as a separate group or Aram as a separate country.
   1) There are several possible reasons for this. The Aramaeans seemed to function as separate city-states but with strong alliances.
   2) They may not have left much by way of records.
   3) Like all ancient countries, there were conflicts with outside powers and there were certainly times when Aram had been conquered or put down by other countries.
   4) I also believe in the Satanic influence on history. In this particular case, if Aram is portrayed as simply a plot of land through which other empires marched or which other empires conquered, then the Israeli-Aram wars are not seen as significant to human history.
   5) However, to see Aram as an insignificant nation is belied by the fact that Aramaic was spoken throughout the middle east between 700 B.C. and 700 A.D..

2 Cambridge Ancient History is an exception to this.
5. Important dates in Syrian history:

1) Unidentified people live in Syria before 4500 B.C.
2) Semites settle Syria circa 3500 B.C.
3) 2700–2200 B.C.: Ebla, an early city-state, established in Syria. All of these dates are probably compressed and closer to 2300–2000 B.C., as the flood ended approximately 2343 B.C.
5) Circa 2000 B.C.: Canaanites move into the southwest, Phœnicians settle along the Mediterranean coast and then carry aspects of Syrian culture throughout the Mediterranean world (I am assuming that this would have occurred through trade and/or war).
6) 1700 B.C. the Amorites had consolidated their control over Syria.
8) By 1200 B.C., Damascus became a prosperous Aramæan city.
9) During the late 1200's B.C., the Jews entered into this general territory, bringing with them the news of the One God, Jehovah Elohim.
10) King David has many conflicts with Aram around 1000 B.C., at which time the Aramæan empire appears to be composed of several city-states, closely allied, whose attempts at expansion are curtailed by King David. 2Sam. 8 10
11) 732 B.C.: The Assyrians conquer most of Syria.
12) 572 B.C.: The Chaldeans take control of the Assyrian empire, which includes Syria.
13) 538 B.C.: Syria becomes a part of the Persian Empire.
14) 333 B.C.: Alexander the Great gains control of Syria.
15) 64 B.C.: Syria falls to the Romans.
16) A.D. 300's: Christianity becomes the state religion of Syria.
17) A.D. 637: Muslim Arabs invade Syria and take control. Islam replaces Christianity and Arabic replaces Aramaic as the language of the land.

6. Ancient Syrian history in a nutshell: Ancient Syria was conquered by Egypt about 1500 B.C., and after that by Hebrews, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Persians, and Alexander the Great of Macedonia. From 64 B.C. until the Arab conquest in A.D. 636, it was part of the Roman Empire except during brief periods. This particular site listed nothing of Aram’s greatness.

7. At least two of the Patriarchs married Aramæan women; some of whom were fairly closely related to the patriarchs. Isaac and Rebekah (Gen. 24); Jacob and Rachel (and Leah—Gen. 28–29). Jacob and Rachel were also first cousins, which means that there was some intermarriage between the Aramæans and the line of Arpachshad.

8. Interestingly enough, one of the most ancient cities in the world is Damascus, the principle city of Aram, which is mentioned as early as Gen. 14:15 15:2. Perhaps nearly as ancient, the city of Hamath, mentioned in Num. 13:21 34:8.

---

3 Most of these points come from The World Book Encyclopedia; ©1983 by World Book, Inc.; Vol. 18, pp. 858–859.
4 Ibid.; this would take us into the antediluvian era, suggesting that this date may be incorrect.
5 Ibid.; this would also take us back into the antediluvian era, suggesting that this date may be incorrect.
6 2200 B.C. places us approximately 143 years after the flood.
7 This is according to the timeline http://www.irreligion.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/01/bible_timeline.gif (accessed January 8, 2010), and with which I most agree (although I have not given this a great deal of study).
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9. Also interesting: Israel, although a cohesive nation, was very much a confederation of tribes. The two nations most similar to Israel in this regard bordered Israel (Phoenicia and Aram, both of which were a confederation of city-states).
10. The name *Aram*, as applied to a country or state or city-state is first found in the 23rd century B.C. in a cuneiform inscription of the Akkadian King Naram-Sin. There is evidence of nomads in the area of Aram as far back as the 3rd millennium B.C. However, these nomads do not appear to be Aramæans.

11. When we think back to great empires, we often dwell upon Rome, Greece or Assyria, and see these as empires which controlled vast land masses at various times. However, Aram appears to be more a loose confederation of city-states, much like the Philistines.
   1) Therefore, we read about the Aramæans of Damascus coming to help King Hadadezer, the king of Zobah in 2Sam. 8:5; however, these are both Aramaic cities, as are Betah and Berothai, which are mentioned in 2Sam. 8:8.
   2) King David acts as a mediating factor with regards to the kingdom of Aram, keeping it from growing too large, and maintaining it both as a buffer country, and as a source of tribute. 2Sam. 8:3, 6–8

12. David’s conflicts with Aram defined both his enemies (e.g., Ammon—2Sam. 10) and his allies (e.g., King Toi—2Sam. 8:9–10).

13. Although David appears to have had an alliance with Ammon (which alliance is never fully developed or even explained in the Old Testament), this alliance was shattered by King Hanun, who embarrassed David’s ambassadors and resulted in a war between David and Ammon allied with Aram, which morphed into a war with Aram. R. B. Thieme, Jr. calls the battle between Israel and Aram (the Battle of Helam) one of the most important and decisive in Israel’s history. 2Sam. 10

14. According the ZPEB, Aram’s greatest political influence was in the 11th and 10th centuries and its decline would have coincided with David’s several victories over the Aramæans.

15. Because Syria borders the Northern Kingdom, there continued to be alliances and conflicts between Israel and Aram for many centuries.

16. Aram’s great lasting contribution to culture is its language. The book of Esther and portions of Daniel are written in Aramaic. The Jews apparently adopted their alphabet to their Hebrew. For reasons which are not completely clear, the use of Aramaic was found throughout the Middle East, and the Jews used this language, in part, for at least a couple hundred years; and much of the Old Testament was paraphrased and translated into Aramaic (e.g., the targum of Onkelos). The Midrash and a portion of the Talmud (Jewish commentaries on the Old Testament, as well as a codification of their doctrines) was written in Aramaic. However, both Jews and Christians alike view the Hebrew Old Testament as being the inspired Word of God. Some branches of Christianity give particular reverence to the Syriac translation of the Bible, which is one of the most ancient. Syriac is a form of Aramaic.

---


---

Since Ammon is going to play a prominent part in this chapter, we ought to examine the Doctrine of Ammon.

### The Abbreviated Doctrine of Ammon

1. Lot was Abraham’s nephew. Although Abram and Lot went to the Land of Promise together, they eventually split up. Lot ended up in Sodom and Gomorrah. He was rescued from there by Abraham before God rained down fire and brimstone, destroying this degenerate people. He moved to a cave with his two daughters (his wife turned to a *pillar of salt* when she looked back upon this city), and these women decided that their prospects for husbands were poor. They moved from a vibrant and degenerate pair of cities off to no man’s land, and they were concerned that they would never have children. Today, they would have gone to a fertility clinic. However, what they did was, on two consecutive nights, they got their father drunk and had sex with him, and each bore a son, one’s name was Moab and the other was Benammi (son of Ammi). These two became the progenitors of the nations of Moab and Ammon. Gen. 19:30–38
   1) It is important to recognize what is going on here. These women have either rejected the doctrine of right man/right woman or they do not know enough basic doctrine to even know this.

---

The Abbreviated Doctrine of Ammon

2) What these women did here was not only a degenerate mistake, but a complete rejection of what God is able to provide.

3) They looked at their situation—they used to live in this great and wonderful city with lots of men (this is from their viewpoint) and now they live in a cave with their father.

4) God is able to provide.

5) The focus of these women needs to be upon their own souls, not upon their immediate circumstances.

6) An example of such faith will be Ruth, a Moabite, whom we will study in this doctrine.

2. Fausset contrasts the people of Moab with the people of Ammon: *Moab was probably the more civilized half of Lot’s descendants; whence we read of the plentiful fields, hay, summer fruits, vineyards, presses, songs of those who tread grapes, of Moab (Isaiah 15 16 Jeremiah 48): Ammon the more fierce, plundering, predatory Bedouin–like half; whence we read of their threat of thrusting out the right eye of all in Jabesh Gilead (1Sam. 11:2), ripping up pregnant women in Gilead (Amos 1:13), treacherously murdering, as Ishmael, Baalis’ agent, did (Jer. 40:14 41:5–7), suspecting and insulting their ally David to their own ruin (2Sam. 10:1–5 12:31).*

3. Although Moab and Ammon had been kept from easily intermixing with the Jews for 10 generations (because of their treatment of the Jews when the Jews were going through the desert), this did not mean that a Moabite or an Ammonite could not come into Israel as a convert to worshiping Jesus Christ, the God of Israel. 

4. After the Israelites had spent nearly 40 years in the desert wilderness, the began to move north along the King’s Highway east of the Dead Sea. Part of this involved going through the territories of Moab and Ammon. Num. 21:11–24

1) The King of the Moabites, Balak, became quite concerned about the Israelites moving through his territory (particularly since they had just conquered the Amorites), and he hired Balaam, who apparently was a believer in Jesus Christ and a prophet, to curse the Israelites. Balaam ended up blessing the Israelites instead. Num. 22–24 Joshua 24:8–10

2) God said that the people of Moab and Ammon should have met Israel with bread and water instead of with hostility. For this reason, Moab and Ammon would not enjoy a spiritual relationship with God side-by-side with the Jews. Deut. 23:2–5

3) When the Jews marched northward along the east side of the Dead Sea, they fought against the enemies of Moab and Ammon, and this should have engendered some good will from Moab and Ammon. However, overall, it did not.

4) However, the real problem was when the Israelite men became interested in the daughters (women) of Moab, and got involved in idolatry because of their desire for these women. Num. 25:1–9

5) Although there were wars with Moab and Ammon, God did not want Israel to take from them their land. Deut. 2:9, 19, 37

6) Because they are first cousins, Moab and Ammon should have been natural allies of the Jews. Furthermore, since God gave them plots of land and forbade Israel to take it, there should have been mutual respect between Israel, Moab and Ammon, if not an alliance. However, from the very beginning, Moab and Ammon treated Israel with contempt.

5. There were hostilities between Israel and Moab and Ammon during the time of the Judges. The greatest problem of Israel was chasing after their gods. Judges 3 10–11

6. Saul developed a life-long fan club in Jabesh-Gilead by defeating Nahash the Ammonite, who threatened to not only enslave these people, but to gouge out their right eyes. 1Sam. 11

7. Saul faced many enemies early on, including wars with Ammon and Edom. He was a very successful warrior. 1Sam. 14:47–49

8. David and the Moabites and the Ammonites:

1) David apparently had a good relationship with Nahash, the King of Ammon, although the Bible gives us little by way of detail on this matter (2Sam. 10:1–2). As we have examined, this was probably the more gracious son of Nahash who was defeated by King Saul in 1Sam. 11.

2) David had an early run-in with the new King of Ammon, a son of Nahash, whose nobles turned him against David. Ammon brought in Syria (Aram) as an ally so that Israel would have to fight on two
The Abbreviated Doctrine of Ammon

fronts. David sent his two top generals to fight against Ammon and Syria and Israel was victorious. 2Sam. 10 1Chron. 19
3) While being disciplined for the Bathsheba incident (the wife of the soldier mentioned above), David’s army was still victorious over Ammon. The Ammonites were made slaves of David’s. 2Sam. 12:26–31 1Chron. 20:1–3
4) Interestingly enough, when David was on the run from Absalom (his son, as a part of the discipline for his affair with Bathsheba), Shobi, the son of Nahash the Ammonite (see 1Sam. 11), brought food and supplies to David and his army. 2Sam. 17:26–29
9. Some of the women who Solomon married or kept as mistresses were Moabite and Ammonite women. Such foreign women turned his heart away from God toward their heathen gods. Solomon build sanctuaries to Chemosh, a god of Moab and to Molech, a god of Ammon. Worship of these gods included human and even child sacrifice (although it is unclear whether it went that far with Solomon’s wives). 1Kings 11:1–3, 5–7
10. Solomon’s son Rehoboam, who reigned over the southern kingdom circa 931–913 B.C., was half-Ammonite. 1Kings 14:21, 31 2Chron. 12:13
12. After Zedekiah (597–586 B.C.) rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuchadnezzar put Gedeliah in charge as governor of the few people who remained in the land. Several Jews who ran for their lives began to return from places like Moab and Ammon. The King of the Ammonites successfully plotted against Gedeliah. Jer. 40–41
13. The Prophets and Moab and Ammon:
1) Amos prophesies against Moab and Ammon. Amos 1:13–15 2:1–2
2) Isaiah prophesies about the destruction of Moab. This apparently would be fulfilled by Nebuchadnezzar. Isa. 11:10–14 15–16 25:10
3) Zephaniah prophesies against Moab and Ammon, promising that they will be like Sodom and Gomorrah. Zeph. 2:8–9
4) Jeremiah prophesies against nations which have been against Israel, which includes Moab and Ammon. This appears to refer to the coming of Nebuchadnezzar as well as to the final judgment against Moab and Ammon in the end times (not to those nations in particular, but to nations which occupy those areas today and which nations display unrelenting hatred for Israel). Jer. 9:25–26 25:17–38 27:1–9 48 49:1–6
6) Daniel predicts the destruction of Moab and parts of Ammon. Dan. 11:41
14. A partial history of one Moabite King, Mesha, is found on what is called the Moabite Stone, which dates back to approximately 900 B.C.

The complete doctrine can be found at www.kukis.org/Doctrines/Moab_ammon.htm

1 Andrew Robert Fausset, Fausset’s Bible Dictionary; from e-Sword, topic: Ammon (some slight editing).
receiving cursing from God. As God promised Abraham, “I will bless those who bless you and curse those who curse you.” (Gen. 12:3).

Weapons change, uniforms change but these principles of war never change. Although I first heard these principles in church, they are attributable to J. F. C. Fuller and to Clausewitz and have been enshrined in the 1921 Army Field Manual.

The Principles of Warfare

1. The principle of the objective. The most fundamental principle of warfare is the destruction of your enemy’s forces and the removal of their will to fight. Each military operation needs to contribute to this ultimate objective. Each military operation will have its own objective(s), which is (are) both clearly defined and obtainable. In any military operation, there must be more going on that a general yelling charge and his army moving forward. The objective is the ultimate guide for the understanding and interpretation of orders, for the formulation of decisions, and for the use of the available assets.

   1) There are generally 2 sub-principles of the objective: the enemy’s military forces must be neutralized or destroyed. This objective is generally accomplished in battle and is the primary focus. Rather than seizing and holding geographical locations, the defeat of the enemy’s main force is the primary objective.

   2) It is certainly important to take and hold specific localities if this contributes to the overall objective of decisively defeating of the enemy.

   3) In this chapter, the objective of David’s army is the neutralization of both the Syrian army and the Ammonite army.

   4) David’s original objective was to capture Rabbah, the capital city of Ammon. In moving into position, Joab found himself trapped between two enemy forces: the Ammonites and the Aramaeans (Syrians). After walking into this trap (which we will study), Joab will quickly develop a plan. He will use his elite forces in an offensive against the Syrians, and employ a holding force against the Ammonites. Joab does not have the time or the need to confer with David (who is in Jerusalem) in order to determine what he needs to do. When it become apparent that Ammon has employed Syrian mercenaries, defeating them becomes another objective, which will contribute to the original objective.

2. The principle of the offensive. Offensive action concentrates force in a decisive direction. Going on the offensive is the only way of attaining the objective. Being on the offensive promotes a concentration of forces, greater freedom of movement and it raises morale. Offensive action can attain victory while defensive action can, at best, stave off a defeat. Defensive action is sometimes employed in order to assist offensive action. Defensive action should only be temporary.

3. Principle of mass: Mass is the concentration and synchronization of a subset of elements of combat power at a specific place and time, with the intent of having a decisive effect on the enemy force during this relatively short period of time. An illustration of mass, which I read is, hit the enemy with a closed fist as opposed to poking him with the fingers of an open hand. Mass must be sustained so that the effects are decisive and, if possible, crippling to enemy forces. Mass is the application of combat power—where men and equipment are placed—with respect to the enemy. Besides men and equipment, the application of mass must include consideration of the tactical skill, fighting ability, determination, discipline, and morale of one’s army, in addition to the leadership of that army. Success in war is the application of mass at the right time in the right place with the result that, the objective is gained.

4. The principle of economy of force: Economy of force is the judicious use of resources when mass is employed against the enemy. This is not skimping on resources, but the application of sufficient force in order to achieve a particular objective.

5. The principle of maneuver or movement. There are five forms of tactical maneuver: envelopment, turning movement, infiltration, penetration, and frontal attack (all of which I believe are found in the Bible). The selection of maneuvers depends upon the forces involved, as well as their location. These various movements are usually combined during a military effort, each maneuver having a different tactical objective (the ultimate objective being, of course, to neutralize the enemy army). Movement is more effective when concealed, because it brings in the element of surprise (which is the next principle).
The Principles of Warfare

6. The principle of surprise. Surprise means, you strike the enemy at a time, place or manner that is unexpected, and therefore, the enemy finds himself unprepared for such a strike. Surprise can compensate for the imbalance of combat power (1Sam. 14 is an illustration of this). Surprise can achieve success well out of proportion to the effort expended. Surprise can take the form of movement, speed, the size and maneuverability of force, weaponry used, direction or location of main effort, and timing. Surprise can result in the achievement of a set of objectives with an economy of force and a minimal loss.

1) Initially, the Syrians will appear to have the advantage here. The Ammonite army stands right outside the city walls of Rabbah as bait. Across from the Ammonite and hidden is the cavalry and chariots of the Syrians. Their strategy here is to maneuver against Joab’s army with the advantage of surprise. When Joab moves his army into place, he is going to find himself trapped between the Ammonite and Syrian armies.

2) Therefore, when it comes to the principle of movement and surprise, the Syrians will have the initial advantage (but Joab will turn it around on them).

7. The principle of security: Security is simply the protection of one’s own forces. The intent of security is to preserve the safety and integrity of one’s forces from hostile acts, influence or surprise during all phases of an operation. This requires a constant application of imagination to the situation; what is the enemy capable of doing and what might they do?

1) Lack of security will be one of Joab’s problems. He will place his men into position without considering that there might be additional forces behind him.

2) Joab should have sent out reconnaissance teams in all directions. Joab did not due to lack of imagination in this engagement.

8. The principle of simplicity: Orders and plans need to be clear, uncomplicated and concise so that their implementation up and down the chain of command is possible. Such orders and plans are more likely to be successful, as there is less likely to be misunderstanding and confusion among the troops. All other things being equal, the simplest plan is the best. Furthermore, because there is a wide range of intelligence within any military organization, a military operation is more likely to be successful when every person understands his place and objective in the operation. Also, war being what it is, simple plans are easier to execute under pressure.

9. Principle of cooperation. The component parts of a military operation must function as a united and cooperative force, which includes the sharing of risks, burdens, and opportunities in every aspect of warfare. Given the alpha-dog nature of most commanders, friction at the top can ruin any military operation.

10. Unity of Command: Whenever possible, there needs to be one commander guiding all the moving parts of a was theater.

11. The principle of sustainability: Logistical support must be available from entry to withdrawal.

References:
http://www.uc.edu/armyrotc/ms2text/msl_201_102b_intro_to_principles_of_war_and_operations.pdf
http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/3-0/ch7.htm
http://bibleprophecyfortoday.wordpress.com/the-art-of-spiritual-warfare/

These sites were accessed April 23–14, 2011.

http://www.thoughtstorm.com/2008/05/principles-of-war-military/

Accessed May 7, 2011.

See http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/2007/07/2807407 for a more updated set of military principles, including the greatest awareness possible of the environment, the enemy, his strengths and weaknesses; the principle of continuous, organic planning; the ability to adapt to changing circumstances (flexibility); and the principle of efficiency of command, so that there are no more layers of command than necessary.

1 See http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/3-0/ch7.htm for examples of each.
Because people in churches engage in little or no Bible study, very little is known about the Old Testament. Many churches become dramatically warped in their theology because they do not know what is in the Old Testament. In this chapter, there is a lot of war as well as war tactics; therefore, we ought to ask why God the Holy Spirit includes this in the Bible.

**Why all of this War and Tactics in the Bible?**

1. Satan is constantly at war with believers in Jesus Christ. He will distort Bible doctrine, he will distort the Word of God, and he will do everything possible to distort our thinking.

2. In our nation, there was a time when believers and skeptics alike knew the Bible and what was in it, almost cover to cover. I read through journals of my great grandfather, who was quite a skeptic of things religious in the Mormon family (I have no idea whether he was a believer or not; I don’t think that he was). What he did know was the Bible and he would make various arguments and statements based upon his own philosophy, reasoning and the Bible. I say this not to extol my great grandfather in any way, but to indicate that, at one time, we knew what was in the Bible in this nation. We had thoughts and ideas and opinions, and the Bible—the mind of Christ—was a part of this thinking.

3. As we drift further and further away from the Bible in our churches and schools (schools were originally established to teach the Bible, for the most part), our understanding of God, man, and history becomes more and more warped.

4. One of the best examples of this is the American Black church. At one time, they taught a reasonable amount of Bible doctrine. However, they became more and more emotional; then they became involved in social issues (the civil rights movement); and finally, today (2010), as many as a tenth of Black churches today teach hatred of America, hatred of whites, and they extol collectivism (socialism and/or communism) based upon a few Scriptures taken out of their context. See [Black Liberation Theology](#) (HTML) (PDF). The Catholic Church in Latin and South America have followed a similar route. Being a Catholic church, they did not teach much doctrine in the first place. Then church leaders became enamored of human suffering, and became more activist in the realm of dealing with human suffering; and finally, many of them today espouse Liberation Theology, which is communism made palatable to the religious masses.

5. Part of the teaching of Liberation Theology is that evil whites came and destroyed all of the pristine cultures here in the Americas and replaced them with evil capitalism, built upon the blood of those who originally lived here in peace and harmony.

6. When we study the Bible, we find out that the borders of nations do change, and this is done by means of warfare, and that warfare is a part of man’s existence. We find out that many nations lose out because they become very heathenistic and hedonistic (as was true of the Indians in the Americas).

7. The Bible shows the expansion of Israel under David and Solomon, through warfare (some aggressive and some defensive).

8. The Bible also teaches that slaves have rights and privileges, as given by God in the Law.

9. Throughout the Bible, it is clear that David brought in a large number of foreigners into his army, which indicates that, even when Israel conquered a nation, they did not necessarily go in and kill everyone in that nation, unless ordered to do so by God. Many times, that nation would be given some measure of sovereignty, which was maintained by bringing tribute to Israel. However, sometimes that nation was destroyed and all of its people.

10. In both the Old and New Testaments, members of the armed forces are treated with great respect. The Bible never disparages the military or soldiers.

11. The importance of having a military is found by the study of the Old Testament.

12. The inevitability of war is taught by Jesus in the New Testament. War will be a part of world history pretty much each and every year. If you pick some miscellaneous year, then you can find 5–50 wars which go on during that particular year.

13. The Bible *never* teaches that a nation ought to disband its military in the name of peace (along these same lines, we do not reduce our weapons capabilities; and particularly, unilaterally).

14. The United States, to some degree, paid attention to the Bible as it expanded westward. Some Indian
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tribes were wiped out, some were given land on which to live independently (although we make the mistake of subsidizing them; we ought to collect tribute from them) and many Indians were absorbed into our society (I had an uncle who was half American-Indian). Although the United States has not learned perfectly the doctrine of the Bible, it is clear that our founding fathers and those who pushed westward understood doctrine and tried to apply it as the United States expanded. This has resulted in one of the most diverse societies in the world, which, for many, has aimed for some homogenization (for decades, those who came to America became Americans and not hyphenated-Americans).

In any case, nations contract and expand; nations maintain their own borders, and nations raise up armies to deal with their enemies.

Just as the Jews always had enemies; the United States will always have enemies. You cannot have a nation where there are a number of born again believers and think that you can just continue merrily along without conflict. That is pure foolishness.

The Jews in modern-day Israel recognize that they are surrounded by enemies, and that, oft times, their friends are not much better (e.g., the United States). Therefore, all Israelis are drafted and remain soldiers for most of their lives. 2 years ago (I write this in 2010), many of our nation’s people thought that we could elect a smooth-talking president of color, and that, somehow, this will take the place of having a large, well-trained army. We believed that he could travel about and engage in tough diplomacy of carrots and sticks, and reduce war in the world. If we knew the Bible, we would understand the folly of that approach.

On the one hand, our President, Barrack Obama, speaks of a time when nuclear weapons can be removed from the face of the earth; and on the other hand, it is clear in the Bible that you cannot simply wish away warfare and hatred. Nor can you eliminate warfare and hatred through hard work and tough diplomacy. Do you recall David’s tough diplomacy against the Edomites? He laid their defeated army down and killed 2 out of every 3 men (2Sam. 8:2). The Muslim ties of our President mean nothing to Islamic radicals. They kill far more Muslims than westerners. They understand one thing: the increasing pile of dead radical Muslim bodies. We may have to kill almost every single radical Muslim in order to end this war of terror. To our President's credit, he has given the order to kill lots of radical Muslims.

Knowing the Old Testament allows a believer to properly understand and interpret both history and current events. As an example of this, R. B. Thieme, Jr., back in the 1970's, touted Israel, South Africa and Rhodesia as good and honorable nations. He said that the Shah of Iran was a leader which we ought to continue supporting and that things were fine in Rhodesia and South Africa. Almost every news source in the United States disagreed with him. President Carter, of that era, contributed what he could to the fall of the Shah of Iran, and Carter did what he could to end apartheid in South Africa and Rhodesia (which meant shifts in power in all of these 3 nations). The end result was a nation which would prove to be an enemy of the United States for the next several decades (Iran); and evil and despotic rulers in South Africa and Zimbabwe (formerly Rhodesia) which has made the lives of the people in all 3 of these nations much worse. Divine viewpoint would have sought to maintain the status quo of those nations and human viewpoint sought to change them. The key is knowing the Old Testament.

Four of our greatest generals (Robert E. Lee, Thomas Jonathon Jackson, George Patton and Douglas MacArthur) knew the Bible and knew Bible doctrine. MacArthur understood the importance of Christian missionaries in nation building, something which seems to have eluded former President George W. Bush (despite all of the history reading which he did).

God does not expect us to be Gandhi-types, although liberal theology portrays Jesus as a long-haired homeless hippy, wandering about advocating peace and love and spouting pacifism and anti-war slogans (and they have been very successful at selling this wrong-headed portrayal of Jesus).

If we understand what the Bible teaches, both Old and New Testaments, then we have a more well-rounded approach to our purpose on this earth.

If we understand Bible doctrine, we can properly evaluate historical events and current events.

Because war is an integral part of human existence, so are tactics, and the Bible presents warfare tactics on several occasions. Those who study the Bible—particularly military-types—learn from what the Bible teaches in this realm. Generals can actually learn military strategy and tactics from the Old Testament.

If we know and understand the Bible, we will not go about crying, “Peace, peace” when there is no peace.
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(Jer. 6:14b).

Always bear in mind that, every word of the Old and New Testaments are placed there by God the Holy Spirit. War is an integral part of human civilization, despite our best intentions.

I should make an admission at this point; there were portions of this chapter which confused me, primarily because I did not have a good grasp of all the isagogics related to it. Therefore, I returned to Bob Thieme, Jr.’s David series, much of which I heard already (30 years ago), and began to listen again. His knowledge of ancient history is encyclopedic. Interestingly enough, Bob taught much of this series during the administration of President Carter (one of our worst presidents, who made a mess of foreign and domestic policy), and I write this during the administration of Barack Obama, who appears as if he might emulate Jimmy Carter.

Also, those who have a history with Berachah know that R. B. Thieme, Jr. loved teaching Ephesians. He would teach it, and then, go back, and re-teach it, having discovered more things in it. In the Old Testament, I believe that this might have been Bob’s favorite passage. He got to deal with a myriad of ancient peoples, their military movements, language and motivation. Furthermore, he got to concentrate on the strategy and tactics of David’s army, under Joab’s leadership, and that is something which I believe that Bob thoroughly enjoyed as well. Furthermore, Bob taught this passage during the Carter administration, which provided Bob with numeral examples of stupidity, lack of honor, a president’s absolute inability to understand the time in which he found himself, and a series of the worst international policies which have affected us and the world in which we live for decades after. My guess is, Bob had to keep his emotions in check while teaching this chapter, because it was no doubt a great emotional experience for him.

The Background for David’s Era (the Short Version)

For 3 centuries, the 3 empires of Assyria, Egypt and the Hittites dominated the world stage. Egypt was south-southwest of Israel, Assyria was off to the east, and the Hittite empire was to the north. There were also the sea peoples, who were a composite of Mycenaeans, Lydians, Lykians, Dorians, Mycians, Phrygians, and Thracians. All of these nations and groups were at war with one another throughout the middle east. However, just as David came to the throne, the Assyrians had a set of weak kings and were driven out of the Mesopotamian area by the Syrians (the Aramaeans). The 20th dynasty in Egypt was made up of incompetent kings so that they were unable to challenge the Phoenician Navy. However, during all of this, even though Israel was smack dab in the middle of all these warring parties, their conflicts were, for the most part, with smaller nations.

---

10 I say this tongue-in-cheek.
The great sea peoples came in many waves; one swept through Palestine and were stopped by Rameses. One group settled in the Gaza strip and became the Philistines. The Phoenicians are the same people who went north and settled, and David was friendly with them. The Philistines were a very tough group, and David stopped them.

Then there were the Phrygians who were in Turkey (then called Anatolia). They did not cross the Taurus mountains. David had a very unusual period of history. Outside of the Aramaeans in the north, there were no empires to contend with. Philistines had reached their peaks and David could defeat them.

All of this shows that Jesus Christ controls history. Edom, Moab and Ammon were all strong, but David conquered them. David defeated the Philistines, even though they were at their peak. This illustrates that Jesus Christ controls history.

Chapter Outline

The Background for David’s Era (the Longer Version)

David’s reign in 2 Samuel takes place between 1004–960 B.C. is when this portion of 2 Samuel is occurring. About 200 years before David had come to the throne (circa 1004 B.C.), the great Hittite empire north of Israel, was suddenly destroyed because of the movement of the Great Sea Peoples who came out of Europe.
From Wikipedia: The Sea Peoples is the term used for a confederacy of seafaring raiders of the second millennium B.C. who sailed into the eastern Mediterranean, caused political unrest, and attempted to enter or control Egyptian territory during the late 19th dynasty and especially during Year 8 of Ramesses III of the 20th Dynasty. The Egyptian Pharaoh Merneptah explicitly refers to them by the term "the foreign-countries (or ‘peoples’) of the sea."¹¹

These Sea Peoples had crossed over the Hellespont (a peninsula which allowed the Greeks to cross over from Thrace into Asia Minor—see the map above). They took Troy and Bogaz-Keui. The latter city was the capital of the Hittite empire; and later known as Hattusas. It is also spelled Boğazköy or Boghazkeui.¹²

These people were apparently a part of the great Dorian thrust which caused the dark ages in Greece. They later became known as Phrygians, Lykians, Mycenaeans. These people were warriors who were often at war. They moved throughout Anatolia, which is ancient Turkey, but they did not cross over the Taurus mountains into the

¹² Some of this is from http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/history/A0808105.html
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plains of Syria [not on the map below, but obviously between Anatolia and Syria]. This kept them from having a continuous and direct effect upon Israel during the time of David.

These Greek people continued to moved about and they did make one excursion through Palestine while heading for Egypt. Ramses III stopped them in Egypt. The remnants of this attacking force moved into the Gaza strip and became the Philistines. The Philistines are an amalgamation of some Greek groups, including the Mycenaean (or Achaeans) and the various Dorian groups. Since these Greek peoples operated in the seas of the Mediterranean, they took places like Cypress and Crete and they would eventually become the Etruscans in Italy.

North of Israel is Tigrath Pileser, whose Assyrian empire went into a sudden decline. The Egyptians of the 20th dynasty also went into a mysterious decline. At this same time, the Hittite empire was broken down into various states, including the neo-Syrian states.

According to Wikipedia: The ends of several civilizations around 1175 BC have instigated a theory that the Sea Peoples may have caused the collapse of the Hittite, Mycenaean and Mitanni kingdoms.\(^ {13} \)

However, also at this time in history, the Aramaeans become prominent and well-known. They began as Semitic nomads wandering about in the east. They called themselves Aramæans while the Greeks called them Syrians. Abraham’s brother Nahor had a son, Aram, who is the source of the Aramæans (others trace the Aramæans back to Aram, the son of Shem—Gen. 10:22). They began to take over the area later called Aram. North of them was a Neo-Hittite empire which was fairly quiet at that time.

Next to that was a people known as the Phœnicians, who were part Greek, part Canaanite and part Semitic (historians recently discovered this). They became a great sea-faring empire. They probably learned how to function on the seas from the Great Sea peoples, and from the Achaeans.

Suddenly, there is this strange interlude during which all of the big empires become relatively quiet. The Philistines tried to increase their holdings, but David stopped them (there were many wars between Israel and the Philistines). The Edomites and the Ammonites also began to act up, and David stopped them as well (the details of David and the Ammonites is one of the focal points of this chapter).

The most active empire during this time is Aram, which is to the north and east of Israel. David himself will keep Aram in check (which is part of the subject of this chapter).

However, for most of the 80 years of Israel’s golden era—when David and Solomon ruled over Israel—most of these world empires became strangely quiet, resulting in an unusual peacefulness throughout the Middle East. This came about because Jesus Christ controls history. He stopped the expansion of the dominant empires during this time period. There is very little advancement on the part of Assyria for about 100 years. However, after the

death of Solomon, they will start to become more active. The Assyrian empire will then become the great neo-Assyrian empire, under the rulership of Tigrath Pileser III, Sargon II, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal.

During this same period, we see the decline of the Hittites and the Egyptian 20th dynasty. What normally happens is, when one country loses power, then another steps in, because of the power void. However, all of these great empires appeared to decline. Although ancient historians do not have a full explanation for this, we do: Jesus Christ controls history.

David’s great success is because God made all of this possible through this period of time where most great empires are static or go into decline. The Phrygian empire conquered the Anatolian high plateaus. However, they did not move down into Palestine to conquer there. The Phrygians would settle in around Turkey, with several great kings, including Midas; but their great expansion would come after David.

The Assyrians, who would eventually conquer the northern kingdom and place them under God’s discipline, were restrained in part, by the Aramaeans.

The Hurrians are also quiet at this time. The Hurrians developed the horse training systems in the ancient world. They also produced a fairly cumbersome chariot which would be later replaced by a sleeker war model.

The Aramaeans pushed back on the kingdom of Natani, invading them. The Hittites were a vassal state to the Aramaeans at this time.

Interestingly, around this time, the Jews are friendly with the Phœnicians. Very likely there was trading between them. It is the Phœnician alphabet which the Jews apparently adopted, which made it possible for us to speak phonetically and for us to have writing.

The Canaanite branch of the Phœnicians who took from the hieroglyphics the oxhead, and changed it into a word which stands for a letter, and then eventually changed into an aleph. The Phœnicians took their language about, and other people made a few changes to it. Every letter from our alphabet can be traced back to the Phœnicians. When the Greeks came in contact with the Phœnicians, and they showed their alphabet to these Barbaric Greeks, these barbaric Greeks learned how to use it. Virtually overnight, the Greeks developed their own written language and the golden era of 5th Century Greek was simply based upon taking this alphabet all over the world.

This great 5th century golden age of the Greeks all goes back to blessing by association with David and Solomon. They Greeks traveled all over the world, taking their alphabet with them.

At the time of 2Sam. 10, there is one great advancing empire, and that is Aram. The Aramaeans had conquered all of the lands above Israel. When Israel comes into contact with Aram, that could potentially end David’s Israel.

Some of this information comes from several entries in Wikipedia.

Chapter Outline

Charts, Maps and Short Doctrines

The briefest version of all this is: almost every great empire of this era—Assyria, Hatti (the Hittite empire) and Egypt—suddenly becomes quiet. This is an era when the greatest empire is Syria (Aram), so that David’s defeat of Aram in this chapter is quite remarkable.

I will admit to spending the past year struggling with 2Sam. 8 10 1Chron. 18–19 and Psalm 60. I do not yet feel comfortable coming down with a definite opinion as to the timing or exact nature of the historical events portrayed in this chapter.
### Theories as to the Relationship between 2Samuel 8 and 2Samuel 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theories</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Sam. 8 is an overview; 2Sam. 10 fills in some details:</td>
<td>Throughout the Bible, particularly in the Old Testament, we find events summarized, and then some of these events later expanded upon in subsequent verses and chapters. David’s successful military endeavors (all were successful) are summarized in 2Sam. 8. Mentioned here are wars with Moab, Hadadezer of Aram, and Edom. Tribute is said to be collected from the king of Hamath (via an alliance), Aram, Moab, Ammon, the Philistines, Amalek, and specifically from Hadadezer of Aram. Tribute from Edom is implied. The war with Ammon and with Aram, found in 2Sam. 10 simply gives some of the details of the conflicts alluded to above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with this view: There are a fair amount of details given in 2Sam. 8 about David’s conflict with Aram, including the casualty statistics and the name Hadadezer, who apparently is the one overseeing this war with Israel. There are differences which are quite pronounced between 2Sam. 8 and 10 concerning the war(s) with Aram which seem to preclude them being the same conflict.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sam. 8–10 describe consecutive events</td>
<td>At the end of this chapter, we will examine the differences between these two conflicts, and they are substantial. There is also enough detail about Israel’s war with Aram in 2Sam. 8 for this to be more than a simple summary of the war, which 2Sam. 10 then takes up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with this view: The biggest problem with this is, Hadadezer, in 2Sam. 8:3 tells us that Hadadezer went to restore his rule at the River, and that is when David made his move to stop him. In 1Chron. 19:6, some of the forces of Aram are coming from Mesopotamia, which would be the River. This would suggest that enough time passed for Aram to take this area again, but without any interference from David.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sam. 10 occurs before 2Sam. 8</td>
<td>This would be kind of an odd approach, but it may make sense when it comes to the details. 2Sam. 8 gives us more or less and overview, with some details. However, in 2Sam. 10 we go back to a previous conflict that David had with Ammon and with Aram. This would help to explain the verb <strong>restore</strong> which is used in 2Sam. 8:3. He had the power over that area in 2Sam. 10, but was beat so badly by David, that he lost it; and then we went to retake it in 2Sam. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with this view: The biggest problem with this is, we are no longer in chronological order. Now, that is not the end of the world, as there is no reason to assume every chapter is in chronological order relative to the chapters around it. However, there are verses like 2Sam. 13: and 15:1 which appear to place things into chronological order.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In any case, Aram included territory which extended beyond the Euphrates, which is confirmed in 2Sam. 10:16 and 1Chron. 19:16.

### Chapter Outline

I don’t want to spoil the narrative of this chapter for you, but brothers Joab and Abishai will go to war against the Aramaeans and the Ammonites and defeat them. The Bible gives us very little information at this point as to exactly what happens; however, there is enough information in this chapter in order to allow a more complete explanation as to how a smaller and less diverse army was able to defeat the Aramaean army, which seemingly had all of the advantages. All of the clues are there, and I will lay this out for you how this must have all gone down on the battlefield, and why Joab’s elite forces were able to defeat and demoralizes an Aramaean army of infantry, calvary and charioteers.
David's Sympathy to the New Ammonite King is Rebuffed

1Chronicles 19:1–5

After these things, it came to pass that the king of Ammon died and his son Hanun reigned instead of him.

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 translation; 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.

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.

**Latin Vulgate**

And it came to pass after this, that the king of the children of Ammon died, and Hanon his son reigned in his stead.

14 I have begun to doubt my e-sword Douay-Rheims version, so I now use www.latinvulgate.com.
And so he is after thus, and so dies king of sons of Ammon; and so reigns Hanun his son instead of him.

AFTER this the king of the Ammonites died, and Hanun his son reigned in his stead.

And it came to pass after this that the king of the children of Ammon died, and Hanun his son reigned in his place.

None.

Some time later, King Nahash of Ammon died, and his son Hanun became king.

Some time later, Nahash, the king of the *Ammonites, died. His son Hanun became king.

Later (Nahash) king of the Ammonites died. His son Hanun became the new king after him.

Sometime after this, the king of the Ammonites died and Hanun, his son, succeeded him as king.

Well, the king of the sons of AmMon died, and his son became the new king.

Later the king of Ammon died, and his son Hanun became king in his place.

Some time later the king of the Ammonites died, and his son Hanun succeeded him as king.

The king of Ammon died. His son Hanun became the next king after him.

After this, when the king of the Ammonites died and his son Hanun succeeded him,...

So afterwards, the king of the sons of Amman had died, and Hanun his son reigned instead.

Now after this, death came to the king of the children of Ammon, and Hanun, his son, became king in his place.

Later the king of the Ammonites died and his son Hanun succeeded him [Heb "reigned in his place."]]. When it comes to making an actual material change to the text, the NET Bible® is pretty good about indicating this. Since most of these corrections will be clear in the more literal translations below and within the Hebrew exegesis itself, I will not continue to list every NET Bible® footnote.

In the course of time, the king of the Ammonites died, and his son Hanun succeeded him as king.

And after this it came to be that the sovereign of the children of Ammon died, and Hanun his son reigned in his place.

DAVID DEFEATS THE SONS OF AMMON AND THE ARAMIY
And so be it, afterward,
the sovereign of the sons of Ammon dies
and Hanun his son reigns in his stead.

And it happened afterward, the king of the Ammonites died. And his son Hanun reigned in his place.
And it came to pass after this, {change of subject} {after David manufactures grace toward Jonathan's son} that the king { Nahash} of the people of Ammon died. And Hanun his son ruled in his place.

World English Bible
It happened after this, that the king of the children of Ammon died, and Hanun his son reigned in his place.

Young’s Updated LT
And it comes to pass afterwards, that the king of the Bene-Ammon dies, and Hanun his son reigns in his stead.

The gist of this verse:
Nahash, the king of the Ammonites, and a friend to David, dies, and his son, Hanun, reigns in his stead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Samuel 10:1a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew/Pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (i) [pronounced wah]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hâyâh (הָיָה) [pronounced haw-YAW]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’achărêy (אַחַרְּעִי) [pronounced ah-kuh-RAY]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kên (כֶּן) [pronounced kane]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two words together literally mean after so; however, they appear to mean afterward, afterwards, after these things, after this, [and] after that. See Gen. 15:14 23:19 25:26  Lev. 14:36  Deut. 21:13  1Sam. 10:5.

Translation: And so it is after this,... A phrase like this occurs periodically throughout most of the 2nd half of 2Samuel. This tells us that we are dealing with sets of events which are presented to us chronologically. It is interesting because, in the first 7 chapters, although these were clearly chronological events, this phrase is not found (perhaps because it was not needed).

It could be that God the Holy Spirit, realizing that we would struggle with the relationship between 2Sam. 8 and 10, to insert this simple phrase to end any question or debate on the matter. 2Sam. 8 occurred first and 2Sam. 10 occurred later.

Life is always in a state of flux.

“IT CAME TO PASS AFTER THIS”

1. Even in times of great prosperity, things never remain the same in this life. Things are always changing and we are always changing. Prosperity can only be perpetuated under the principle that Jesus Christ controls history. When a country has a significant pivot, that nation often enjoys increasing prosperity. As that pivot shrinks and as there is more spin-off, that nation goes into decline.

2. You, as a believer, are either worse today or better. When you spend a day without listening to Bible doctrine, then your spiritual life retrogresses (unless your mind is thinking doctrine and functioning under divine viewpoint on that day).

3. Even in times of prosperity for a nation, things never remain the same. Calvin Coolidge, on 4December,
“It Came to Pass After This”

1928, summed up his state of the union address with, “The country is in the midst of an era of prosperity more extensive and of peace more permanent than it has ever before experienced. But, having reached this position, we should not fail to comprehend that it can easily be lost.” President Coolidge did not realize how soon his prophetic words would come to pass. Less than a year later, in October of 1929, the stock market crashed, and continued to falter for the next 20 years (the stock market did not continue to go down; but it was erratic and undependable for more than 20 years). 10 years later, most of the world would be involved in the Great War; soon thereafter, we would join in.

4. Life never stand still. Your life becomes better or it becomes worse.
5. The only solution to crisis or disaster is the ability to think. The Greeks were some of the most barbarous people who have lived. The Dorians, Lykians, Thracians, Ionians, etc. all were barbaric. Once they were given words and an alphabet which was phonetic, and then they became the brilliant people that they were. This allowed them to express their thinking in writing and to pass down their thoughts from generation to generation. They were able to think, which requires words and new words and concepts.
6. In our culture, the ability to think is being destroy by drugs. Drugs actually destroy the mechanism of the brain, so that drug-addled people bring our society down by their inability to think clearly. Much of their thinking and motivation revolves around getting high.
7. We lose our greatness as a nation when we lose the ability to think. Today, millions of people have become hooked on drugs, and have compromised or even lost their ability to think objectively.
8. The only chance for such a person is to give up drugs and to reinvigorate the thinking with Bible doctrine. Bible doctrine will give such a one a capacity for life because they are able to think again. That person’s mind will open up to new thoughts and new subjects and books.
9. Even though life is a continuum changing circumstances, the mature believer develops the capacity for thinking and for change. Furthermore, he may develop a great enthusiasm for many subjects.
10. Science, when it is not politicized, has a capacity to deal with an ever-changing world.
   1) Our science is based upon faulty notions, like global warming, and the decreasing ozone layer, and, in particular, the evils of DDT. Science has become politicized, and, wherever science is politicized, that area of science goes on the decline. When science become politicized, people lose their objectivity. It is no longer a matter of experimentation leading to this or that conclusion, but data which is collected with a political goal in mind.
   2) One example which comes to mind is the treatment of homosexuality by psychology. It is statistically demonstrable that there are a myriad of negative psychological and physiological aspects related to the homosexual lifestyle. Actual diseases and physiological syndromes are directly associated with male homosexual activity, as well as a dramatic reduction of life expectancy (a person who regularly engages in homosexual activity will see his life shortened even more than a smoker or a drinker). However, as the science of psychology began to make greater inroads in altering the behavior of homosexuals, psychology found itself under political attack, until it finally relented and removed homosexuality from its list of psychological disorders. None of this came about as a result of experimentation and research; it came about as a result of political pressure. As a result, research which even implies defect in relation to homosexuality is shouted down or denied funding.
   3) In Africa, millions of people have died because DDT was not used to control mosquitoes. Again, politics trumps science. DDT, the most effective poison to use against mosquitoes, should have been used, at least initially, and then replaced as the mosquito population was reduced.
11. As believers with doctrine, we must be able to recognize change when it occurs, properly analyze that change and orient to it. We develop our stability on the inside, with Bible doctrine in the soul.
12. The unchanging world is Bible doctrine; the chancing world is all around us. As we become more filled with the unchanging truth of Bible doctrine, the easier it is for us to cope with changing circumstances.
   1) As an example, I know from the Bible that homosexuality is a degenerate sin. Therefore, I understand that the practice of homosexuality is bad for the individual and bad for society.
   2) However, when I see changes in our society with regards to homosexuality, I know from Bible doctrine that this is simply the advancement of evil in our society.
   3) The lack of advancement in psychology with regards to homosexuality does not perturb me,
“It Came to Pass After This”

because Bible doctrine teaches that Satan will attempt to pervert all divine principles.

4) The solution is spiritual advancement of the individual believers, not a political restructuring of the United States.

13. What is true of the believer is also true of the client nation. A client nation is called of God to have laws of divine establishment operate so well that freedom is prioritized. We are a client nation with maximum freedom. We are free to accept or to reject Jesus Christ. Our government does not yet persecute believers for gathering or evangelists for spreading the gospel. Our client nation is also a haven for the Jews.

1) One of the great heresies to seep into the Republican party was anti-Semitism. This, in part, destroyed the Republican party. Far-left liberal Lyndon Johnson, one of the worst presidents in our history, soundly defeated a Jewish Barry Goldwater.

2) Goldwater understood conservatism and articulated it well. He understood communism and how evil it was, and opposed making treaties with the Communists.

3) A lot of doctrine in the souls of believers would have allowed them to clearly see the difference between Johnson and Goldwater. However, because Johnson was elected, not only did we lose the war in Vietnam, but he put into place policies that threaten to destroy the economy of the United States.

4) So we, as a client nation, will never stand still. However, the key to our prosperity is doctrine in the souls of the resident believers, and an expansion of the spiritual base (more evangelism).

The believer and human history never stand still. We may yearn for the good old days, but our memories of those times are often softened by time. In the good old days, we lived in the devil’s world; in the good old days, depending upon our spiritual status and that of our parents, we may or may not have been under demonic attack. Being able to enjoy your memories of the past, and yet also enjoy this day in your life ought to be the attitude of every believer. We live one day at a time. As an aside, even though human history moves forward that does not mean that we accept new norms and standards nor does that mean that all moving forward is wrong. In our society, skin color has become less and less of an issue in my lifetime, which is a good thing; but, at the same time, homosexuality has become more and more accepted, which is evil.
Translation: ...that the king of the sons of Ammon die... This is Nahash, with whom David appeared to have had a good relationship. We discussed him a little in the previous chapter, when examining the tribute which David was paid from Ammon. However, we actually know very little about Nahash and about his relationship to David.

<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>màlak* (מלך)</td>
<td>to reign, to become king or queen</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #4427 BDB #573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chânûwn (חנון)</td>
<td>favored, gracious, graciously given; transliterated Hanun, Chanun</td>
<td>masculine singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #2586 BDB #337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bên (ב) [pronounced bane]</td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tachath (תחת)</td>
<td>underneath, below, under, beneath; instead of, in lieu of; in the place [in which one stands]; in exchange for; on the basis of</td>
<td>preposition of location or foundation with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #8478 BDB #1065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and his son Hanun reigned in his place. Sometimes, the name of a son tells us more about the parents than it tells us about the son. Nahash named his son gracious, graciously given. He recognized what a gift his son was to him—and, perhaps for many years, Hanun was a nice child.

However, despite Nahash’s correct orientation to life, he was unable to impart this to his son. It will become clear that Hanun is unqualified to reign over Ammon.

And so says David, “I will do grace with Hanun, son of Nahash as which did his father with me grace.” And so sends David to comfort him by a hand of his servants unto his father. And so come in servants of David [to] a land of sons of Ammon.

And so, David said, “I will manufacture grace toward Hanun, the son of Nahash just as his father manufactured grace toward me.” Therefore, David sent [an envoy] of his servants to comfort Hanun [lit., sent to comfort him by means of his servants] concerning his father. And the servants entered the land of the sons of Ammon.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:
And David said: I will shew kindness to Hanon the son of Daas, as his father showed kindness to me. So David sent his servants to comfort him for the death of his father. But when the servants of David were come into the land of the children of Ammon.

And so says David, "I will do grace with Hanun, son of Nahash as which did his father with me grace." And so sends David to comfort him by a hand of his servants unto his father. And so come in servants of David [to] a land of sons of Ammon.

Then said David, I will show kindness to Hanun the son of Nahash, as his father showed kindness to me. So David sent by his servants to comfort him for his father. And David's servants came to the land of the Ammonites.

And David said, I will show mercy to Hanun the son of Nahash, as his father dealt mercifully with me. And David sent to comfort him concerning his father by the hand of his servants; and the servants of David came into the land of the children of Ammon.

to show is an okay translation of the 2nd verb (although to do, to manufacture are better choices). The directional preposition in the Hebrew is an interesting choice, which is reflected in the Greek (however, not in most English translations). One would expect to find a direct object after sends in the second sentence (as we have in the English translation from the Latin; and in many English translations); however the Hebrew, Greek and Latin all have a prepositional phrase as the object of the verb (more or less). So, the only significant difference is between the direct object of the Hebrew and the English translation from the Latin.

There is nothing magical about the separation of the Bible into chapters and verses. For the most part, the people who did this (who were not the original writers of Scripture), did a good job. However, in the translations below, it will become apparent that half of v. 2 really belongs with v. 3.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

David said, "Nahash was kind to me, and I will be kind to his son." So he sent some officials to the country of Ammon to tell Hanun how sorry he was that his father had died.

David thought, 'I will be kind to Hanun because his father Nahash was kind to me.' So, David sent some of his servants to Hanun. David wanted to show sympathy to Hanun after his father's death.

David said, "Nahash was kind to me. So I will be kind to his son Hanun." So David sent his officers to comfort Hanun about his father's death.

David said, "I must show loyal friendship to Hanun, as his father Nahash did to me." So David sent messengers to express his sympathy. When they arrived in Ammon,...

David said, "I'd like to show some kindness to Hanun, the son of Nahash--treat him as well and as kindly as his father treated me." So David sent Hanun condolences regarding his father. But when David's servants got to the land of the Ammonites,...

David said, "Nahash was loyal to me, so I will be loyal to his son Hanun." So David sent his messengers to comfort Hanun about his father's death.

David's officers went to the land of the Ammonites.

Then David said, "I will show kindness to Nahash's son Hanun, just as his father showed kindness to me." So David sent some of his servants to comfort him in the loss of his father. But when David's servants came to the land of the Ammonites,...

David said, "I am going to show loyalty to Hanun just as his father, Nahash, was always loyal to me." So David sent ambassadors to express sympathy to Hanun about his father's death.
**American English Bible**

Then David said: "I'll do something nice for AnNon, the son of NaAs, because his father was so kind to me." So David sent his servants to the land of the sons of AmMon to comfort him over his father.

**Ancient Roots Translinear**

David said, "I will do mercy with Hanun the son of Nahash, as his father did mercy with me." David sent the hand of comfort from his servants to his father. And David's servants came from the land to the sons of Amman.

**God's Word™**

David thought, "I will show kindness to Hanun as his father Nahash showed me kindness." So David sent his servants to comfort Hanun after his father's death. But when David's servants entered Ammonite territory,...

**New American Bible**

David thought, "I will be kind to Hanun, son of Nahash, as his father was kind to me." So David sent his servants with condolences to Hanun for the loss of his father. But when David's servants entered the country of the Ammonites,...

**NIRV**

David thought, "I'm going to be kind to Hanun. His father Nahash was kind to me." So David sent messengers to Hanun. He wanted them to tell Hanun how sad he was that Hanun's father had died.

David's messengers went to the land of Ammon.

**New Jerusalem Bible**

David thought, 'I shall show Hanun son of Nahash the same faithful love as his father showed me.' And David sent his representatives to offer him condolences over his father. But, when David's representatives reached the Ammonites' country,...

**New Simplified Bible**

David thought: »I will show kindness to Hanun since his father Nahash showed me kindness.« David sent his servants to comfort Hanun after his father's death. When David's servants entered Ammonite territory,...

**Revised English Bible**

David said, "I must keep up the same loyal friendship with Hanun son of Nahash as his father showed me,' and he sent a mission to console him on the death of his father.

When David's envoys entered the country of the Ammonites,...

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

**Bible in Basic English**

And David said, I will be a friend to Hanun, the son of Nahash, as his father was a friend to me. So David sent his servants, to give him words of comfort on account of his father. And David's servants came into the land of the children of Ammon.

**Context Group Version**

And David said, I will show family allegiance {Hebrew: hesed} to Hanun the son of Nahash, as his father showed family allegiance {Hebrew: hesed} to me. So David sent by his slaves to comfort him concerning his father. And David's slaves came into the land of the sons of Ammon.

**HCSB**

Then David said, "I'll show kindness to Hanun son of Nahash, just as his father showed kindness to me." So David sent his emissaries to console Hanun concerning his father. However, when they arrived in the land of the Ammonites,...

**JPS (Tanakh)**

David said, "I will keep faith with Hanun son of Nahash, just as his father kept faith with me." He sent his courtiers with a message of condolence to him over his father. But when David's courtiers came to the land of Ammon,...

**NET Bible®**

David said, "I will express my loyalty2 to Hanun son of Nahash just as his father was loyal [Heb "did loyalty."] to me." So David sent his servants with a message expressing sympathy over his father's death [Heb "and David sent to console him by the hand of his servants concerning his father."]. When David's servants entered the land of the Ammonites,...

But when David's ambassadors arrived in the land of Ammon,...
David thought, "I will show kindness to Hanun son of Nahash, just as his father showed kindness to me." So David sent a delegation to express his sympathy to Hanun concerning his father.

When David's men came to the land of the Ammonites,...

Lit. almost word-for-word, renderings:

English Standard Version

And David said, "I will deal loyally with Hanun the son of Nahash, as his father dealt loyally with me." So David sent by his servants to console him concerning his father.

And David's servants came into the land of the Ammonites.

exeGeses companion Bible

And David says,

I work mercy to Hanun the son of Nachash
as his father worked mercy to me.

And David sends to sigh over him
by the hand of his servants concerning his father:
and the servants of David
come into the land of the sons of Ammon.

NRSV

David said, 'I will deal loyally with Hanun son of Nahash, just as his father dealt loyally with me.' So David sent envoys to console him concerning his father. When David's envoys came into the land of the Ammonites,...

Syndein

Consequently, {as a result of the death} David said {both his thought and the follow-through action of his grace thought}, "I will manufacture {`asah - out of doctrine resident in his soul} grace {checed} to Hanun, the son of Nahash {grace here includes the attributes of: courtesy, respect, thoughtfulness, kindness} as his father manufacture {`asah - out of doctrine resident in his soul} grace {checed} to me. And David sent to comfort him concerning his father by the hand of his ambassadors. {these would have been high nobles in David's court acting as his ambassador}

And David's ambassadors came into the land of the people of Ammon... {Hanun will assume they are spies because that is what HE would do if he sent men to Jerusalem}.

Young’s Updated LT

And David says, "I do kindness with Hanun son of Nahash, as his father did with me kindness;" and David sends to comfort him by the hand of his servants concerning his father, and the servants of David come in to the land of the Bene-Ammon.

The gist of this verse:

David sends and envoy to Ammon to convey to Hanun sympathy for the loss of his father and to continue a relationship of friendship with Hanun.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Samuel 10:2a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<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 (כָּמָר) [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>Dâvid (דָּוִד); also Dâviyd (דָּוִיד) [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>
### 2Samuel 10:2a

<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>'ásâh (יָסָה) [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>cheçed (נִצֵד) [pronounced KHEH-sed]</td>
<td>grace, benevolence, mercy, kindness</td>
<td>masculine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #2617 BDB #338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘îm (עִם) [pronounced geem]</td>
<td>with, at, by near; like; from; against; toward; as long as; beside, except; in spite of</td>
<td>preposition of nearness and vicinity</td>
<td>Strong’s #5973 BDB #767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chânûwn (נַעְוֶן) [pronounced khaw-NOON]</td>
<td>favored, gracious, graciously given; transliterated Hanun, Chanun</td>
<td>masculine singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #2586 BDB #337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bên (בֵּן) [pronounced bane]</td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâchâsh (נַחַשׁ) [pronounced naw-KHAWSH]</td>
<td>serpent and is transliterated Nahash</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #5176 BDB #638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** And so, David said, “I will manufacture grace toward Hanun, the son of Nahash...” You may recall that the previous chapter was David during his downtime (when he was not at war). This chapter begins the same way—David is not at war and he receives word that his ally Nahash, King of Ammon, has died, and David wants to show sympathy toward Nahash’s son.

### 2Samuel 10:2b

<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&quot; (כ&quot;) [pronounced k’]</td>
<td>like, as, according to; about, approximately</td>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ăsher (אָשֶׁר) [pronounced ash-ER]</td>
<td>that, which, when, who, whom</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
<td>Strong’s #834 BDB #81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together, ka’âsher (אָשֶׁר) [pronounced kah-uh-SHER] means as which, as one who, as, like as, just as; because; according to what manner. Back in 1Sam. 12:8, I rendered this for example.

| 'ásâh (יָסָה) [pronounced gaw-SAWH] | to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture | 3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect | Strong’s #6213 BDB #793 |
| 'âb (אב) [pronounced awb] | father, both as the head of a household, clan or tribe; founder, civil leader, military leader | masculine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix | Strong’s #1 BDB #3 |
| ‘îm (עִם) [pronounced geem] | with, at, by near; like; from; against; toward; as long as; beside, except; in spite of | preposition of nearness and vicinity with the 1st person singular suffix | Strong’s #5973 BDB #767 |
**2Samuel 10:2b**

<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>cheçed (נַחַש)</td>
<td>grace, benevolence, mercy, kindness</td>
<td>masculine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #2617 BDB #338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...just as his father manufactured grace toward me.” This is another of the great untold stories of the Bible—David’s relationship to Nahash, the King of Ammon. This leads us to:

Although we are going to try to piece the relationship of David and Nahash together, this is one of the great untold stories of Scripture.

### The Doctrine of (David’s Friend) Nahash

1. First of all, there are 3 Nahash’s in the Bible:
   1) There is the Nahash, King of Ammon, during the time of Saul (during his early years), who gave the citizens of Jabesh-Gilead the choice between all being killed or all having one eye gouged out. Saul rescued this city and despite Saul’s failings, these citizens never forgot what he did. 1Sam. 11
   2) There is his son, Nahash, King of Ammon, a contemporary of David’s (perhaps a little older) who befriended David. Some treat #1 and 2 as identical. 2Sam. 10:2
   3) There is another Nahash who is the father of David’s sister, which is rather confusing, as David’s father is Jesse and not Nahash. We will discuss this more when we come to it (however, the common explanation is, this Nahash was the original husband of David’s mother, and he sired Abigail and Zeruiah, making them David’s half-sisters). 2Sam. 17:25
2. There is the possibility that the Nahash of 1Sam. 11 and 2Sam. 10 are one and the same. Nahash in 1Sam. 11 was a bloodthirsty monster. If that is the case, (1) there would have been a radical personality change and (2) he would have lived a long time, his career spanning the entire kingship of Saul and the first 10+ years of David’s reign..
3. The second possibility is, there is Nahash, the King of Ammon, the enemy of Saul; and he had a son, Nahash, who became a friend of David’s. If the first Nahash was, say, 20+ years older than Saul when their paths crossed (Saul was a young man and Nahash was an established king at this time), the time frame for 2 Nahash’s would have made sense. Given the character of the first Nahash, naming his son after him would have been apropos to his own egotistical character. Furthermore, the time frame here would make perfect sense.
4. There is an elapse of about 50 years between 1Sam. 11 and 2Sam. 10. If Nahash, the enemy of Israel, was older than Saul, then we have more than enough time for him to die, for his son (who is perhaps 20 years younger) to reign and to die as well.
5. Do you think that God would have allowed such a cruel man—an enemy of Israel—to live so long? Also, would God have allowed such a one to preside over a prospering Ammon?
6. Furthermore, what a sweet and grand irony it would be for such an enemy of Israel and of God (i.e., Nahash Sr.) to be replaced by a man who is a friend to David Nahash Jr.). God does appear to enjoy irony, as there is so much of it in the world.
7. So, taking into consideration the time frame, the personalities of Nahash the elder and Nahash the younger, and the history presented (the first Nahash is a cruel enemy of Israel and the second apparently has a close relationship with David), it is most likely that are two men named Nahash, father and son, and that these are not the same man.
8. According to Josephus, Saul killed Nahash the elder (Antiquities VI, v, 3). This would also support there being a Nahash I and Nahash II.
9. Somehow, David crossed paths with Nahash Jr. and they became friends and allies. David, for awhile, had a good relationship with the king of Moab, entrusting his parents to him during David’s time on the run (which relationship changed dramatically as we saw in 2Sam. 8:2). Very likely, this was a result of
The Doctrine of (David’s Friend) Nahash

a regime change, not unlike the one we are studying in this chapter.

1) ZPEB suggests¹ that David’s treatment of Moab in 2Sam. 8 caused Nahash to befriend David, but that strikes me as unlikely because of the time frame. We are probably not even 10 years removed from that war. Such an act of David might have gained quick respect from the Ammonites, but not necessarily a friendship as we have here. Although this relationship is possible based upon David’s cruel treatment of the Moabites, it is unlikely in my opinion.

2) Others have suggested that, because Nahash was an enemy of Saul and Saul made David his enemy, that was the basis of their friendship (in other words, Nahash I = Nahash II). However, Nahash’s potentially cruel treatment of the people of Jabesh-Gilead would not have endeared Nahash I to David, whereas, Saul’s action in that situation would have garnered respect from David (David would have been a very young man when this occurred).

3) My theory is this: at some point during David’s run from Saul, Nahash II and David crossed paths, and they became friends (Nahash brought David and his army food or something along these lines). Nahash II may have felt badly about what his father had done, and was looking for the opportunity to patch things up with Israel. Whatever it was that happened, David did not forget this and an alliance was formed. I suspect that after Israel’s war with Moab, Nahash II began to send tribute to David without being asked for it (which is a common ancient world custom).

4) R. B. Thieme, Jr. suggests that David developed a friendship with Nahash when he was on the run from Saul, and that David never forgot a kindness done to him.²

10. We are told in 2Sam. 8:12 that David received tribute from the Ammonites, and this could be understood in two ways—this was either a gloss, which took place in time after most of the incidents in 2Sam. 8 (as a result of David defeating Ammon in this chapter); or this could represent tribute paid by Nahash II to David, as was typical in those days. Weaker nations paid tribute to stronger nations with whom they are allied or before whom they have fallen in battle. This happened all of the time in the ancient world; it was a common practice.

11. However, there is no historical narrative giving us any information about David and Nahash II, apart from this chapter. So we know that Nahash II manufactured grace toward David (2Sam. 10:2), but nothing by way of specifics besides that.

12. Hanun, the son of Nahash the Younger, will respond to David’s graciousness with arrogance and hostility, which will result in a war which will devastate Ammon’s army. 2Sam. 10

13. Several years down the road, another son of Nahash the Younger will treat David with graciousness, (1) out of respect for his own father and his father’s relationship to David when his father was alive; and (2) to try to correct the lousy treatment of his brother toward David’s ambassadors (2Sam. 10:3–4). When David is on the run from his son, Absalom, Shobi ben Nahash will personally bring food and supplies to David and his men. 2Sam. 17:27–29

14. Nahash the Younger apparently learned from his father to befriend the Jews. His father made the Jews his enemies and probably died when fighting them. Nahash the Younger, rather than respond to this incident with anger and revenge, appeared to learn from it—he looked at the facts objectively, and befriendied David.

15. Similarly, Shobi, the son of Nahash, learned from Hanun his brother. Hanun treated David’s ambassadors despicably and Ammon, as a country, paid the price; so Shobi chose to go another route, and to treat David with grace.

16. Like Mephibosheth of the previous chapter, Nahash and his sons will enter into David’s life throughout are various points, and we will learn solid spiritual lessons from these interactions.

17. This continues to fulfill God’s promise to Abraham: “I will bless those who bless you and curse those who despise you.” (Gen. 12:3a), a promise which holds true even today.

Application: So we have 2 Nahash’s and 2 different results. One Nahash cursed Israel and was filled with cruelty; and God took him down (along with the nation). His son, whom I have called Nahash II (or, Nahash, Jr.), apparently had a good relationship with David and the nation Israel, and therefore, Ammon, under him, was prosperous and lived in peace. There will be another change now; Hanun will turn against Israel, and his nation will then go into an economic spiral and be defeated militarily. So, it should be obvious that, the smart move is to befriend Israel. These are events which took place 3000 years ago, and they tell us all about how we ought to function today. The Bible is an amazing book! A study of this chapter also helps to confirm that we need to examine the Old Testament as well as the New.

Application: Most Bibles (depending upon the typeface) are around 1200–1400 pages. God did not give us a 10 page theological pamphlet upon which we are to base our entire spiritual lives. A baby believer might be able to boil down what he ought to know to about 10 pages, but God gave us a book thick with meaning, which ought to be the focus of every day of our lives. God does not necessarily expect you to spend hours buried in His Word day after day. That is the job of the pastor-teacher. However, you need about an hour’s worth of teaching every day, and it needs to come out of the Old and New Testaments.

---

### 2Samuel 10:2c

<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>shâlach (שָלָךְ)</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>Dâvid (דָּוִד); also Dâviyd (דָּוִיָּד)</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לָמֵד)</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâcham (נַחַם)</td>
<td>to comfort, to console, to have compassion, to show compassion</td>
<td>Piel infinitive construct with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5162 BDB #636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b° (בֹּד)</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>

This combination of the bêyth preposition and hand literally means in [the] hand of; and can be rendered in the power of; by the power of; with; through, by, by means of; before, in the sight of.

| ‘ôbêd (עֹבֵד) [pronounced ‘oh-BADE] | a slave, a servant | masculine plural noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix | Strong’s #5660 BDB #713 |
| ‘el (אֵל) [pronounced ehl] | unto; into, among, in; toward, to; against; concerning, regarding; besides, together with; as to | directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied) | Strong’s #413 BDB #39 |
Translation: Therefore David sent [an envoy] of his servants to comfort Hanun [lit., sent to comfort him by means of his servants] concerning his father. As previously discussed, David had a very good relationship with Nahash II, Hanun’s father, and was doing here what most normal people would do—convey sympathy for the loss of a loved one. David has no ulterior motive beyond this.

It is reasonable to ask, why did David send ambassadors and not go himself? There is a balance to be struck here. Because we know almost nothing about why David and Nahash II are allies. It is possible that they have not met in person but 1 or 2 times, and that much of their interaction as of late has been by ambassadors bringing David tribute. So David’s response here is proper. Our president will not attend every funeral of every world leader; however, in many cases, our president will send the secretary of state and/or the vice president to the funeral to convey the sympathy of the United States. So what we find here is a reasonable protocol.

Translation: And the servants entered the land of the sons of Ammon. The word for servant here is ‘ôbêd (עָבֶד) [pronounced goh-BADE], which generally means slave, servant. However, it ought to be clear that David is sending some of his top-level ambassadors to Ammon. Therefore, we need to expand the understanding of this word to include men who are simply under David’s authority.
I have always found it easier to understand what is going on if you understand the geography. Ammon is east of central Israel, and their capital city, Rabbah, where David’s emissaries are going, is on the other side of the Jordan from Jerusalem, roughly the same distance from the Jordan.

This is about a 40 mile trip.


---

And so say chiefs of Bene-Ammon unto Hanun, their lords, “[Is] honoring David your father in your eyes because he sent to you comforters? [Has] not in a passing over search out the city, and to explore her and to overthrow her, sent David his servants unto you?”

And the officials of the sons of Ammon said unto Hanun, their lord, “Is David honoring your father in your eyes [simply] because he sent comforters to you? Has he not [done this] in order to [thoroughly] search out the city, to explore it [as a spy], and to overthrow it—[and this is why] David sent his ambassadors to you?”

And the state department of Ammon said to Hanun their sovereign, “Is David really honoring your father in your opinion simply because he sent comforters to you? Did not David send his ambassadors to you in order to thoroughly search out the city, for them to scope out the city as spies, and to later overthrow it?”

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

**Latin Vulgate**

The princes of the children of Ammon said to Hanon their lord: “Do you think that for the honour of thy father, David sent comforters to you, and hasn’t David rather sent his servants to you to search, and spy into the city, and overthrow it?

And so say chiefs of Bene-Ammon unto Hanun, their lords, ‘[Is] honoring David your father in your eyes because he sent to you comforters? [Has] not in a passing over

---

**Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**

And so say chiefs of Bene-Ammon unto Hanun, their lords, “[Is] honoring David your father in your eyes because he sent to you comforters? [Has] not in a passing over search out the city, and to explore her and to overthrow her, sent David his servants unto you?”
search out the city, and to explore her and to overthrow her, sent David his servants unto you?

Peshitta (Syriac)
And the princes of the Ammonites said to Hanun their lord, Do you think that David is honoring your father, that he has sent comforters to you? Has not David rather sent his servants to you to spy out the city and to explore it and to overthrow it?

Septuagint (Greek)
And the princes of the children of Ammon said to Hanun their lord, Is it to honor your father before you that David has sent comforters to you? Has not David rather sent his servants to you that they should search the city, and spy it out and examine it?

Significant differences: In an oddity of the Hebrew, lord is in the plural, which is common. The (English translation from the) Latin moves into the city to another phrase, which is not really a problem in the translation. The moving of the phrase David sent his servants (in the Latin, Syriac and Greek) simply makes the translation sound better to our English ears.

According to Rotherham, one early printed edition has the land rather than the city; and then references 1Chron. 19:3, which also as the land.¹⁵

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV But Hanun's officials told him, "Do you really believe David is honoring your father by sending these people to comfort you? He probably sent them to spy on our city, so he can destroy it."

Easy English (Pocock) The leaders in Ammon said to the king, 'Do not imagine that David really feels sympathy for you. He does not really want to give honour to your father. No! David has sent his servants to explore our city. They will see everything. Then David's army will be able to overcome us.'

Easy-to-Read Version But the Ammonite leaders said to Hanun, their lord, "Do you think that David is trying to honor your father by sending some men to comfort you? No! David sent these men to secretly study and learn things about your city. They plan to make war against you."

Good News Bible (TEV) ...the Ammonite leaders said to the king, "Do you think that it is in your father's honor that David has sent these men to express sympathy to you? Of course not! He has sent them here as spies to explore the city, so that he can conquer us!"

The Message ...the Ammonite leaders warned Hanun, their head delegate, "Do you for a minute suppose that David is honoring your father by sending you comforters? Don't you think it's because he wants to snoop around the city and size it up that David has sent his emissaries to you?"

New Century Version But the Ammonite leaders said to Hanun, their master, "Do you think David wants to honor your father by sending men to comfort you? No! David sent them to study the city and spy it out and capture it!"

New Living Translation ...the Ammonite commanders said to Hanun, their master, "Do you really think these men are coming here to honor your father? No! David has sent them to spy out the city so they can come in and conquer it!"

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

American English Bible However, the governors of the sons of AmMon went to their lord and asked, `Is David really sending you comforters to glorify your father, or has he really sent them as spies to look at [our fortifications]?'

¹⁵ Joseph Bryant Rotherham's The Emphasized Bible; ©1971 by Kregel Publications; p. 330 (footnote).
The leaders of the sons of Ammon said to Hanun their lord, "In your eye, does David honor your father by sending comforters to you? Is not David sending his servants to you because he questions and spies the city to transform it?"

The Ammonite princes said to their lord Hanun: "Do you think that David is honoring your father by sending men with condolences? Is it not rather to explore the city, to spy on it, and to overthrow it, that David has sent his messengers to you?"

The Ammonites nobles spoke to their master Hanun. They said, "David has sent messengers to tell you he is sad. They say he wants to honor your father. But the real reason they've come is to look the city over. They want to destroy it."

The Ammonite princes said to Hanun their master, 'Do you really think David means to honor your father when he sends you messengers with sympathy? On the contrary, the reason why David has sent his representatives to you is to explore the city, to reconnoitre and so overthrow it."

The Ammonite princes said to Hanun their lord, 'Do you suppose David means to do honor to your father when he sends envoys to condole ith you? These men of his are spies whom he has sent in to find out how to overthrow the city.'

...the Ammonite commanders said to Hanun their lord, "Do you think David is honoring your father by sending envoys to you to express sympathy? Hasn't David sent them to you only to explore the city and spy it out and overthrow it?"

But the chiefs of the children of Ammon said to Hanun their lord, Does it seem to you that David is honouring your father by sending comforters to you? has he not sent his servants to go through the town and make secret observation of it, and overcome it?

...the Ammonite leaders said to Hanun their lord, "Just because David has sent men with condolences for you, do you really believe he's showing respect for your father? Instead, hasn't David sent his emissaries in order to scout out the city, spy it out, and overthrow it?"

...the Ammonite officials said to their lord Hanun, "Do you think David is really honoring your father just because he sent you men with condolences? Why, David has sent his courtiers to you to explore and spy out the city, and to overthrow [Emendation yields “reconnoiter”; cf. Deut. 1:22 Joshua 2:2–3] it."

And the princes of the children of Ammon said to Hanun their lord: "Do you think that David honors your father that he sent you comforters? Is it not in order to investigate the city and to spy it out, and to search it that David has sent his servants to you?"

...the Ammonite officials said to their lord Hanun, "Do you really think David is trying to honor your father by sending these messengers to express his sympathy? [Heb "Is David honoring your father in your eyes when he sends to you ones consoling?"] No, David has sent his servants to you to get information about the city and spy on it so they can overthrow it!" [Heb "Is it not to explore the city and to spy on it and to overthrow it [that] David has sent his servants to you?"]
is it because David honors your father, that he sends to sigh over you? Sends not David his servants to you to probe the city and to spy it out and to overturn it?

Fred Miller's Revised KJV

And the princes of the children of Ammon said to Hanun their lord, Do you think that David honors your father, because he has sent comforts to you? has not David rather sent his servants to you, to search the city and to spy it out and to overthrow it?

Syndein

Consequently, the chief ministers of the sons/people of Ammon said to Hanun . . . their lord, {the authority resides with Hanun but soon these men will use Hanun to take the power to themselves - doomed the nation in the process} "In your thinking/'In your viewpoint/'From your standpoint' is David honoring your father, because he has sent comforters unto you? {putting doubt in the thoughts of the young king and appeals to his pride} Is it not for the purpose of making a recognizance of the city, both by spying it out . . . and overthrowing it that David has sent his embassy to you?" {Chain of Violence from Young King with Power Hungry Advisors}.

Young’s Updated LT

And the heads of the Bene-Ammon say unto Hanun their lord, “Is David honoring your father in your eyes because he has sent to you comforters? For to search the city, and to spy it, and to overthrow it, has not David sent his servants unto you?”

The gist of this verse:

Hanun’s ruling staff reason with Hanun, suggesting that David was not honoring him or his father, but that he was sending spies in to reconnoiter the city so that they can return and overthrow it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Samuel 10:3a</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew/Pronunciation</td>
<td>Common English Meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו) [pronounced wah]</td>
<td>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘âmar (ואמר) [pronounced aw-MAHR]</td>
<td>to say, to speak, to utter; to say [to oneself], to think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sar (שר) [pronounced sar]</td>
<td>chieftain, chief, ruler, official, captain, prince, leader, commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bèn (בן) [pronounced bane]</td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ămmōwn (암몬) [pronounced ˈgahm-MOHN]</td>
<td>hidden; transliterated Ammon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>̇ ˈel (אל) [pronounced əl]</td>
<td>unto, in, into, toward, to, regarding, against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chănûwn (קאון) [pronounced ˈkhaw-NOON]</td>
<td>favored, gracious, graciously given; transliterated Hanun, Chanun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is often transliterated Bene-Ammon and is a common designation for this country.
### 2Samuel 10:3a

<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>ꞌâdônây (אֶדֹ֣נָ֑י)</td>
<td>Lord, Master, my Lord, Sovereign; can refer to the Trinity or to an intensification of the noun; transliterated Adonai</td>
<td>masculine plural noun with the 3rd person masculine plural suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #113 &amp; #136 BDB #10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** And the officials of the sons of Ammon said unto Hanun, their lord,... Hanun inherited a state department from his father. Unlike an election in the United States, when a president will come in with his own cabinet (with some exceptions), when a son took over his father’s place as king, much of the state department remains intact. The new king may bring in some additional personal advisors whom he trusts, but, for the most part, he inherits his fathers state department. The exception to this would be, if the son kills his father in order to wrest power from him. Then he may retain some of the members of the state department, if they were in on the conspiracy (and kill or imprison the others).

As we have studied, Hanun’s father, Nahash, has a warm and friendly relationship with David. Ammon was more or less a protectorate (so we have hypothesized) and they regularly sent tribute to David (the other option being that, because of this chapter, they sent tribute to David).

Power is an incredible drug, and some people have this great desire to exert their authority over others. Here, the state department comes in to speak to Hanun about David having sent comforters to him, and he is called their lord, which is in the intensive plural. However, they seek to exert their influence over him; they seek to tell him what to do. Even though they will not have the office of ruler, they will exert their authority over their lord, which is almost as good to them.

Also, in this mix, is their opinion of David and of Israel. These are men who are very antisemitic. They are suspicious of David and of the Jews in general. They believe that David is sneaky and underhanded, much like they are. They believe that David desires greater power, much as they do. They view David through the prism of their own eyes, and their own shortcomings and naked power ambitions, they attribute to him.

Some of these men in Hanun’s state department could be very sincere. They could have honest concern about David sending spies into their country. However, the emphasis here is upon getting Hanun, their king, to do what they want him ot do. They do not sit around and discuss the likelihood of David sending in men to spy out his country and review their history with David; they are going to make a power play here, to exercise control over their own king, and for these men, this trumps everything, including the truth.

**Application:** You need to always have a healthy suspicion of those who are in power. Some of them are there for the power alone, and they desire to exert more and more of it. Even more disturbing is when ideologues come into power. They make choices and do things according to their ideology—many even with the thinking that this will make things better—and they are unable to change course, despite all that they see around them. They have the power and they have the ideology, and so they put these 2 to work. This is Hanun’s state department—their ideology teaches them that Jews in general, and David in particular, are sneaky, underhanded people. This ideology permeates all that they do and overrides any evidence to the contrary. They have the power to influence the ruler of Ammon to see things as they do. Notice that this combination of power and ideology is going to be the downfall of Ammon.

**Application:** We have the same thing going on today (2009) in the United States. We have an executive branch filled with amateur ideologues and a legislative branch filled with a variety of ideologues, and none of them seem to understand the founding principles of our country or what made our country great. They see rich and powerful men as their enemies; they see large corporations as evil (unless these corporations agree with them), and just as Hanun here influenced by his state department slandering David, so has our government and nation been
colored by our politicians slandering big business, Wall Street, insurance companies and even doctors. They, like Hanun’s state department, are filled with anger and ideology and power lust; and now they are exerting this over our nation. It is a most amazing thing to watch.

**Application:** We ought to have a healthy suspicion of anyone in power, even if we think that they agree with us. Having a position of power does not make a person evil; but, particularly in a democracy (actually, a democratic republic), it is best for us to keep our eyes on those in power and to consider their actions.

The more that you understand about the Bible, the more you see that it has application to today.

**Application:** Our founding fathers understood the Bible, the nature of man and the lure of power. This is why they set up a constitution with checks and balances in who holds power, and a system with is, in some people’s opinion, unwieldy when it comes to getting things done. This was by design. You may personally believe that Barrack Obama is the most kind and benevolent man in human history to occupy the presidency (or whomever is in power when you read this), and you may want everyone to stop opposing him and let him get his agenda through. That was not how our constitution was designed. Our founding fathers understood the heart of man, that it is evil and desperately wicked (Jer. 17:6), and that this power needs to be kept in check by a Congress, some of whom will be voted out of office after only 2 years; and that this power needs to be kept in check by a Supreme Court, who rules on the constitutionality of the law passed; and that this power needs to be kept in check by both the states and the people who are governed. So, even though our Commander-in-Chief may be a wonderful man with great ideas and plans, he may also be a wolf in sheep’s clothing; or an ideologue with no understanding of the truth; and his power is kept in check by the other power spheres.

**Application:** We learn much of this in the Old and New Testaments. We learn about the heart of man throughout Scripture. We learned about the spiritual life in the epistles. We learn about government and world rulers in Rom. 9, in portions of the book of Acts and in Samuel and Kings and Chronicles. We learn about changing political circumstances throughout these same books and chapters. Since these things change dramatically, we must also be able, as believers in Jesus Christ, to adapt to these changes. In the United States, we have been moving closer and closer to a welfare state with a guaranteed safety net for all citizens of the United States. Despite the fact that this is evil, we must know how to deal with it, and what our lives ought to be as believers in this system. We learn all of this through the Word of God.

<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>hà (נ) [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>kâbêd (כָּבֵד) [pronounced kaw-VADE]</td>
<td>to make heavy, to make insensible; to honor, to do honor to</td>
<td>Piel participle</td>
<td>Strong’s #3513 BDB #457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvîyd (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>’ëth (קַח) [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 10:3b**

<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>‘āb (אָב) [pronounced aw⁹v]</td>
<td><em>father,</em> both as the head of a household, clan or tribe; <em>founder,</em> civil leader, military leader</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #1 BDB #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bê (ב) [pronounced bê]</td>
<td><em>in,</em> into, <em>at,</em> by, <em>near,</em> 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 (עין) [pronounced ġay-nah-YIM]</td>
<td><em>eyes,</em> two eyes, literal eye(s), spiritual eyes; face, appearance, form; surface</td>
<td>feminine plural noun with the 2nd person singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5869 (and #5871) BDB #744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kîy (כי) [pronounced kee]</td>
<td><em>for,</em> that, <em>because;</em> <em>when,</em> at that time, which, what time</td>
<td>explanatory or temporal conjunction; preposition</td>
<td>Strong’s #3588 BDB #471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shâlach (שלח) [pronounced shaw-LAKH]</td>
<td><em>to send,</em> <em>to send for</em> [forth, away], <em>to dismiss,</em> <em>to deploy,</em> <em>to put forth,</em> <em>to stretch out,</em> <em>to reach out</em></td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7971 BDB #1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לָמֶד) [pronounced l']</td>
<td><em>to,</em> <em>for,</em> <em>towards,</em> in regards to</td>
<td>directional/reational preposition with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâcham (נחם) [pronounced naw-KHAHM]</td>
<td><em>comforters,</em> <em>consolers,</em> <em>those having</em> [showing] compassion</td>
<td>masculine plural, Piel participle</td>
<td>Strong’s #5162 BDB #636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This phrase is literally *in your eyes,* but it can be translated *in your opinion,* *in your estimation,* *to your way of thinking,* *as you see* [it]. The dual and plural forms of this word appear to be identical.

**Translation:**...*Is David honoring your father in your eyes [simply] because he sent comforters to you?* The first thing which Hanun’s state department does is question David’s motives, but, you will notice, they state this in such a way as to make it sound as if Hanun, by his own perception, recognizes this. They use the phrase *in your eyes,* which means *in your opinion,* *as you see it,* *in your estimation.* So even though this is their opinion which they will give to Hanun, they will make it sound as if he himself thought this through and figured out that David’s comforters were there as a ruse. Hanun’s state department is thinking circles around him.

Hanun’s state department see this act by David as a sign of weakness. They treat this act of grace as if David is no longer strong and powerful. If they are paying tribute to Israel, they make the determination that, David is unable to enforce that, because he is weak. However, courtesy and grace should never be mistaken for weakness or cowardice.

Lying, dishonesty and deception take many forms. Here, these men misrepresent David’s intentions to their king—intentions which they do not know—and there is no discussion. No one says, *let’s think about this for a moment; David had a good relationship with your father, Nahash, for decades; and David is known throughout the world as a man of honor.*

**Application:** Have you every heard the phrase *the debate is over;* or, *there is no need for us to debate this any more.* That is what has happened here. Enough of these state department types have convinced Hanun of David’s insincerity, so that is not up for debate. I write this in 2009, and at this time, man-caused global warming...
is a big issue, despite all the evidence to the contrary. Those who believe in this keep saying, *this is settled science; the debate is over*. However, it is coming out that much of this *science* is based up the tree rings of only 3 trees. Much of the original data has been destroyed and all that remains is data which has been manipulated (ideally, it has been manipulated scientifically; but now there are great doubts about that). The end result is, we have great dishonesty in this branch of the scientific community, which bleeds into all other areas (people today are suspicious of the H1N1 flu virus shot in numbers never seen before). What we have in this movement are those who desire power, and they are willing to use a false science based upon corrupted data in order to advance their policies.

**Application:** The use of this phrase *the debate is over* is designed to take over control of this or that; once someone has proclaimed that the debate is settled, then they want to go about with laws and regulations which will bring about their own desires (oft times, the end result ends up filling up their pockets with gold). We have a former vice president who has become incredibly rich as a result of global warming; and I suspect, of all members of any administration, that he has increased his wealth by a greater factor than anyone in the past.

**Application:** Power over truth is the oldest connection in the realm of corruption; if you will recall, Satan sought power over the first man and the first woman through deception. Today, we have the same thing with the global warming movement. And, what are supposed to be purveyors of truth—our newspapers—walk in lock-step with this movement. During the Climate Change conference in Copenhagen a month ago, there were demonstrators in favor of doing something about climate change. However, many of them carried Communists signs and banners, and our news organizations here all but ignored this. In fact, one week, I went looking for pictures of these demonstrators carrying Communist signs, and I could not find any. Apparently, no newspaper thought that this was important or newsworthy. Or, more likely, they realized that if Americans see how closely allied the Climate Change Fanatics were with Communism, it might give them pause. Therefore, there is very little news on this alliance.¹⁶ Again, this is a manipulation of the truth, by those who are supposed to be telling us the truth; and their desire is to have control over us.

### 2Samuel 10:3c

<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>hà (ḥ) [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 <em>to be</em> may be implied.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong’s #none BDB #209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lô‘ (lô‘) [pronounced low]</td>
<td><em>not, no</em></td>
<td>negates the word or action that follows; the absolute negation</td>
<td>Strong’s #3808 BDB #518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba’âḇûwr (boor) [pronounced bah-’ûr-VOOR]</td>
<td><em>because of, for, that, for the sake of, on account of, in order that; while</em></td>
<td>preposition/conjunction; substantive always found combined with the bêyth preposition</td>
<td>Strong’s #5668 BDB #721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hà lô‘ together expect an affirmative answer. In fact, these two words together present a question with an obvious, self-evident answer.

¹⁶ Can you imagine the fascinating interview which might come out of, say, NPR interviewing several young men and women carrying Communist signs in Copenhagen? However, they do not do this, even though they are aware of it.
2Samuel 10:3c

<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>châqar (ךָֽקַר) [pronounced khaw-KAHR]</td>
<td>to search out, to search for, to investigate, to thoroughly investigate</td>
<td>Qal infinitive construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #2713 BDB #350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'èth (אֵֽת) [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>̀îyr (יֵֽיר) [pronounced ãeer]</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>

1Chron. 19:3 and one early printed edition has the land here instead of the city.17 Ordinarily, if this were one errant manuscript, comment would not be necessary; however, this is in the parallel passage, which prompts us to ask, which did they say? It may seem like a minor point, but we cannot have one passage of the Bible saying one thing and another passage saying something entirely different. What makes the most sense to me is, Hanun has several underlings talking to him, and one says, “They’re here to spy out the city” and another says, “They are here to spy out the land.”

Translation: Has he not [done this] in order to [thoroughly] search out the city,... I have split the rest of this up into phrases, and, in order to preserve the separation of these phrases, I will have to insert a few extra words. However, by moving the final phrase up to here, these extra words are not needed (we will see this at the end of v. 3).

David has sent some men to Hanun to express his own sympathy concerning the death of Hanun’s father, Nahash. Hanun’s state department suggest they have been sent to thoroughly search out the city.

2Samuel 10:3d

<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>w° (or v°) (וֹ or ה) [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>lâmed (לָ֖מֶד) [pronounced l’m]</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>râgal (רָגוֹל) [pronounced raw-GAHL]</td>
<td>to move the feet, to foot it, to tread, to go about, to go about as an explorer, to go about as a spy, to go on foot to scope something out; to slander</td>
<td>Piel infinitive construct with the 3rd person feminine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #7270 BDB #920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...to explore it [as a spy],... As these comforters of David walk through Rabbah, the capitol city of Ammon, these advisors to Hanun believe that they are mapping out the city and determining how and where they ought to attack.

---

Now, it is unclear as to whether this is what Hanun’s state department really believes. The treatment of David’s ambassadors will belie these words.

### 2Samuel 10:3e

<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>wâw (or vâw) (ו, or ו)</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lámed (ל)</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hâphak (חפָק)</td>
<td>to turn [as a cake, a dish, one’s hand or side], to turn oneself; to turn back, to flee; to overturn, to overthrow [e.g., cities]; to convert, to change; to pervert, to be perverse</td>
<td>Qal infinitive construct with the 3rd person feminine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #2015 BDB #245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shâlach (שלח)</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 perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7971 BDB #1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid (דוד) also Dâviyd (דוד)</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1732 BDB #187</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>’òbêd (עבד)</td>
<td>a slave, a servant</td>
<td>masculine plural noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5660 BDB #713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’el (אל)</td>
<td>unto, in, into, toward, to, regarding, against</td>
<td>directional preposition (respect or deference may be implied); with the 2nd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #413 BDB #39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and to overthrow it... Hanun’s advisors suggest to him that these men are there to search out the city, to map it out, so that David can return with an army to overthrow it. Exactly what they are warning against, they will cause.

Again, we don’t know if this is what these men really believe or not. The actions which Hanun will take is not how one ought to deal with spies entering into one’s country. Whether this is Hanun’s complete incompetence or the insincerity of his cabinet, we do not know.
**Translation**: ...—[and this is why] David sent his ambassadors to you?” Hanun’s advisors claim that this is why David sent these men—they are not here to comfort Hanun, but to walk through their city and to take mental notes, so that David can come back and destroy the city.

You will notice that, in order to maintain the word order, I have to insert several words: And the officials of the sons of Ammon said unto Hanun, their lord, “Is David honoring your father in your eyes simply because he sent comforters to you? Has he not [done this] in order to [thoroughly] search out the city, to explore it [as a spy], and to overthrow it—[and this is why] David sent his ambassadors to you?” However, we can make this all come out nice and easy to understand, simply by moving this final phrase up to the beginning of this particular question (which most English translations do): And the state department of Ammon said to Hanun their sovereign, “Is David really honoring your father in your opinion simply because he sent comforters to you? Did not David send his ambassadors to you in order to thoroughly search out the city, for them to scope out the city as spies, and to later overthrow it? This can be understood in either translation; but the second requires fewer additions to make this sound good in English.

So far, our passage reads: After these things, it came to pass that the king of Ammon died and his son Hanun reigned instead of him. And so, David said, “I will manufacture grace toward Hanun, the son of Nahash, just as his father manufactured grace toward me.” Therefore, David sent his ambassadors to comfort Hanun concerning his father. And the ambassadors entered into the land of the Ammonites. And the state department of Ammon said to Hanun their sovereign, “Is David really honoring your father in your opinion simply because he sent comforters to you? Did not David send his ambassadors to you in order to thoroughly search out the city, for them to scope out the city as spies, and to later overthrow it?” (2Sam. 10:1–3).

### The Pettiness of Hanun and his State Department

1. What David does here is an act of grace. Petty people do not understand grace because they never act in grace. Hanun’s state department assumes that David is up to something or is attempting to manipulate them in some way.
The Pettiness of Hanun and his State Department

2. Petty people are unable to understand honorable motivation and gracious acts. They look at everything as it relates to them, and grace and honor are outside of their own modus operandi.

3. Hanun’s state department is petty, and they are unable to understand the thinking or actions of a great man.

4. Hanun’s state department is jealous of Israel and their prosperity (probably because they are paying them tribute) and the Ammonite people have developed hatred for the people of Israel.
   1) We see much of this today in class warfare.
   2) We have overpaid teachers, police and firefighters all over the United States; however, because they see someone who is much richer, and contributes to their salary, they believe that they are entitled to even more wealth.
   3) Public unions have ginned up a great deal of anger, and we find huge numbers of state workers marching about, causing damage to capitol buildings, and screaming slogans (I write this in 2011).
   4) These are people who are involved in what are traditionally honorable professions, but they have become jealous of riches, and want more, no matter what the effect this has upon their own state treasury.

5. Hanun’s state department is going to egg Hanun on to treat this gracious envoy from David shamefully, with the result that it will destroy the very nation that they head. Even though these are leaders, they have no ability to see the big picture.

6. We live in a time of budgetary madness, where our debt threatens to undo us, and politicians are only able to see as far as the next election cycle.

7. Let me give you a contemporary example from the Republican side. Many Republicans think that they must agree to raise the debt ceiling, even though they are calling for balancing the budget. At the time that I write this (1May 2011) this is being debated. The simplest approach would be to simply vote against raising the debt ceiling. That would result in a defacto balanced budget amendment. That would force the president to fund only those things for which he has the income to fund. Our country would do fine for weeks or even months with such a defacto balanced budget. However, my fear is, too many Republicans will vote to raise the debt ceiling and they will get very little in exchange for it.

8) Just as the state department of Ammon is short-sighted about the welfare of their own country, the same is true of most of our politicians.

5. Whatever treaty was in place between David and Ammon would have been up for review because Ammon is now under this new administration.

6. It is clear that this state department is rejecting their alliance with David.

7. Pettiness of soul often results in sins of the tongue. Ammon’s state department begins to malign David. They incorrectly evaluate his motivation and then they malign him.

8. Petty people reveal their own petty thinking when they malign the genuine motivation of others. They reveal what is in their own minds. They accuse David of the sort of thing that they would do.
   1) We have observed this in American politics. Democrats have accused the TEA party (a grassroots movement which wants to see a reduction of government and government spending) of racism. They impute their own thinking to others.
   2) Any group which wants to see racial preferences of any sort is racist. They see the racial group that is favored as inferior and unable to advance in life without their help.
   3) Democrats accused FoxNews of receiving faxes of talking points from the Republican White House each day; and it turns out that, there was a large group of journalists who participated in a conference call each morning to receive liberal talking points (in a story which was almost completely ignored by the traditional media).
   4) So, when these administrators of Ammon observe David doing something gracious, it is outside of their realm of experience, so they assigned to David evil motivation and ulterior motives.

9. Because petty people are envious of others, they impugn the motivations of David in order to make themselves look good by comparison. However, it is these men in the state department who have all of the hidden motivations of evil.

10. Petty people often employ strawman arguments. A strawman is a position or a motivation that someone
else doesn’t really have, but petty people portray them as having this position or motivation. Then they attack he straw man and tear it down.

1) Politics is rife with such strawman arguments. President Obama used strawman arguments continually in his run for the presidency: "There seems to be a set of folks who -- I don’t doubt their sincerity -- who just believe that we should do nothing."

2) Other Obama examples: he said that America’s economic difficulties resulted when “regulations were gutted for the sake of a quick profit at the expense of a healthy market.” Here, he both imputes evil motivation to an implied perpetrator of such a gutting.

3) He has also said: "I reject the view that . . . says government has no role in laying the foundation for our common prosperity." Something which no one has ever said.

4) Hanun’s state department is intentionally giving a false impression of who David is and what his true motivation is. Therefore, they end up looking pretty good, by comparison. However, they are not really comparing themselves to David, but to their lying portrayal of him.

11. Like many politicians, Hanun’s state department does not look into the future to see the harsh consequences of this bad advice. They either suffered a failure of imagination or they misjudged David terrible. It did not occur to them that David would bring his army into Ammon and take down Rabbah, their capitol city.

12. Because they are arrogant, they are unable to see the consequences of their actions.

1) When I write this in 2011, it is abundantly clear that we have a president who is arrogant in the extreme. Because he has never run a business, had to make payroll, or lay anyone off, he has no idea as to the consequences of his actions. He sees himself as always being right; he is unable to see the other side of the argument, and has assumed that his programs and policies will have good results. His arrogance blinds him to the unintended consequences of liberalism.

2) This president has been quite effective in moving our country far to the left; far more than any president in my lifetime.

13. Ammon’s state department knows what David did to the Philistines and to the Edomites. They are familiar with David as an army commander. David conquered the Moabites, the Jebusites, the Edomites, and he could conquer them just as well. They view David as being weak because he sends this envoy of grace.

14. An arrogant person often tries to gain power by being the advisor. If he is not a leader, then he wants to be the 2nd best thing—he wants to have the ear of the leader. The person who has the ear of the president is very powerful indeed.

15. The advice of Hanun’s state department is offered up only to gain more power for themselves; however, they are taking their own country in a terrible and even suicidal direction.

1) There is a very close coterie of advisors to President Barrack Obama, most of whom are ideologues and in far over their heads.

2) Nahash kept the arrogance of his state department in check. If they offered up a goofy idea, he would shoot it down and give the reason why.

3) However, it is obvious that, if this was Nahash’s state department, that he was clearly able to hear opposing points of view.

4) On the other hand, Nahash’s son, Hanun, does not have the intelligence and the common sense to understand what he is doing here. He is manipulated into a course of action which will destroy his country.

5) Let’s use the example of, say, these 3 kids bully another kid, and they egg each other on in this bullying. It may not occur to them that this little kid has a big brother, or perhaps, 2 or 3 big brothers, who will step in and kick their asses.

16. These ministers of state wanted to send our their own ambassadors to Israel, in order to spy out the country, so that they might defeat the Jewish army. They are judging David by their own ideas; by their own motivation. This is what they would do. When you judge others, your opinion of their motivations reveals your own inner thinking.

17. The members of this state department are arrogant and jealous; and so they impute this thinking onto David.

18. Furthermore, because they are arrogant, they lack imagination and they are very short-sighted.
The Pettiness of Hanun and his State Department

19. Their arrogance, pettiness and short-sightedness will result in the bankruptcy of Ammon. Does this remind you of any other country that we know?


The Mental Attitude Sins of Hanun’s State Department

1. The new king apparently has no frame of reference with which to understand David. Furthermore, he has no imagination—he does not consider the mess that he is going to get himself into.
2. Hanun talks to his ministers about what to do about David’s graciousness. They do not understand or relate to grace. They all perceive David’s graciousness as weakness.
3. Grace can only be understood by people who have a framework for grace in their own souls. Neither Hanun nor those in his state department see David’s act as gracious; they appear to perceive it as being obsequious, and therefore weak.
4. Hanun’s state department have a lust for power and for recognition. They want to go home and tell their friends and loved ones, “King Hanun is a good man, but he does not quite see the big picture yet. However, we explained it to him. As a result, we aren’t going to be paying any more tribute to Israel.”
5. People who lack honor are confused by honorable motivation; their own arrogance blinds them.
6. A desire for greater power, a lack of personal integrity, along with a resentment of Israel (a mental attitude sin) will cause Hanun and his state department to make decisions which will result in the ruin of Ammon.
7. Wherever we find jealousy, we often find pettiness as well. The ministers of Ammon are both petty and jealous. As a consequence, these ministers of Ammon impugn David’s motivation and speak malevolently about him.
8. Furthermore—and this is something which we see in the Middle East all the time—these ministers of Hanun have a hatred toward the Jews. They may believe that it has a solid basis—like the Jews collecting tribute from them—but they are only looking to justify mental attitude sins. Today, those in the Middle East hate Israel for some perceived maltreatment of the Palestinians or because they believe Jews to be descended from dogs, pigs and monkeys (really; here too) (or vice versa; also here).
9. Because Hanun’s state department is filled with jealousy and hatred, they have a deep desire to humiliate David and to conquer the Jews.
10. Furthermore, they make judgments on the thinking of David based upon how they think. Therefore, because this state department would desire to send their own ambassadors into Israel to do reconnaissance, they assume that is what David is doing here.
11. When we judge others, we reveal our own thinking and motivation.
   1) A few years ago, Democrats accused Fox News of getting their talking points from the Republican White House (see here, here, here and here).
   2) Since then, it was discovered that literally hundreds of journalists were receiving talking points nearly every day from the left (here, here and here).
12. Because of their hatred, their arrogance, their pettiness and their jealousy, Hanun and his state department work each other up to formulate a conspiracy against David and against Israel.
The Mental Attitude Sins of Hanun’s State Department

13. The end result would be, these evil and arrogant men would die horrible deaths when at war with Israel or they will end up as slaves for the rest of their lives. This would also be the fate of their own subjects.

Application: We have had numerous examples of this over these past few years in American politics (from 2008–2010). Media types, who are, for all intents and purposes, shills for the Democratic party, accuse FoxNews for being a shill for the Republican party. Many of them have accused FoxNews commentators (like Bill O’Reilly) of getting their news from talking points faxed to them from Republican leaders. It has since come out that there are Democratic talking points sent out to media types regularly (and it has been going on for a long time). So when someone you barely know accuses you of something outlandish, recognize that they are likely guilty of exactly what they accuse you of (or, in the very least, they want to do what they accuse you of doing).

One commentator writes, It’s hard to explain why these advisers to Hanun said this to the king of Ammon. It’s possible that they genuinely suspected David, or they may have just used this as a way to appear wise and cunning to King Hanun. It is common for liars to always suspect others of lying. Another suggests that David’s harsh treatment of Moab in 2Sam. 8:2 may have caused Hanun’s state department to react in this way. I believe that both of these commentators miss the boat here.

Power lust is not a lust which all people have, and, sometimes if you do not have a particular lust, it is hard to relate to those who have it. These are probably Nahash’s state department, inherited by his son, and there is going to be a tug of war for power and control. They know he is king and none of them will be king; but, they can always be a part of the shadow government—the ones who make the big decisions. Here is the test for them; the new king is grieving over his father, and this state department attempts to influence his decision. They try to lead him by the nose.

Furthermore, do not underestimate the power of negative volition. Even though Nahash was friendly with David, this does not mean that his state department was. Nahash was probably a believer in Jehovah Elohim; whereas those in his state department were not. However, they did not reveal their unbelief or disagree with Nahash, when they found out that was futile. I had a situation like this in a department where I taught. A new department head had taken over and some of those below her began to gossip and malign me, as they had always done in the past. This new department head set them straight that this was not going to occur any more, and apparently embarrassed them in front of other members of the department. These women did not curb their mental attitude sins toward me, but they kept their verbal sins under control, just waiting for the opportunity to act on their mental attitude sins in the future. We may reasonably suppose this was the state department under David. David was the representative of Jehovah Elohim to them, and they hated God, and therefore, they ran down David, until Nahash told them, in no uncertain terms, “Shut the hell up.” So they held their peace for years. Now, they can let it all out. They hate God; they hate David. However, rather than come out expressing their hatred clearly, they attack David a different way. “Don’t you think these might be spies? Don’t you think David is sending these men to spy out Ammon to later destroy it?” I can testify to such a scenario, because this played out in one of the department’s where I worked. Evil conspirators were told to shut the hell up, but once they got into a position of power, they let out all of their anger and frustration.

When you combine power lust with mental attitude sins and negative volition toward God, you have a potent mix. It is going to become clear, as we continue in this chapter, that Ammon will go from being a prosperous nation to being a nation which is financially devastated and militarily defeated—all because of these men who hate God, who hate David and who desire power.

---

18 David Guzik’s Commentary on the Old Testament; courtesy of e-sword; ©2006; 2Sam. 10:1–19.
19 Albert Barnes, Barnes’ Notes on the Old Testament; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 8:3.
Application: I write this in 2010 and one of the most arrogant politicians I have known in my lifetime is our president. A thoughtful man like him had no business even running for president, because he lacked any real world experience; and yet he ran, in arrogance, desirous of the power. He has no understanding of the free enterprise system, and no one in his cabinet does either (just as no one in Hanun’s state department understood Israel’s place in history or David’s graciousness). President Obama has never had to run a business before; he has never had to make a payroll before; he has never really faced difficult decisions before. Suddenly, this man without a clear understanding of reality, without any leadership skills or experience, is the most powerful man in the world. The results of his decisions are going to be very destructive to America, just as these decisions made by Hanun, encouraged by his state department, will be very destructive to his country Ammon. In 5 years, Ammon will be transformed from a peaceful and prosperous nation to a nation devastated by war and economic crisis.

Application: What is the key? What is the solution? Believers are the solution in the United States. This does not call for political action, although some believers will be moved to be politically active. This does not call for a new political movement, even though, in a Democracy, part of our responsibility as believers is to be reasonably knowledgeable and vote according to principle. But the true key is Bible doctrine in the souls of as many believers as possible. Why are we not cast into hell? My personal sins condemn me to hell, along with my sin nature and my position in Adam. There is no good thing in me. But, God looks on me and sees His Son, because I am in Christ. Because I have believed in Jesus Christ, I stand justified and righteous before God. So, at the Judgment Seat of Christ, I will not be thrown into the Lake of Fire. Similarly, if we have God’s truth in our souls, God will vindicate this truth. God loves the other members of the Trinity and He loves truth. Our deliverance in time is based upon the truth in our souls. If there are a significant number of mature believers in a national entity, God will not allow that national entity to go down.

Application: When you have doctrine in your soul, it is not difficult to choose the best candidate, even if there is no D or R by their name. You simply listen to the candidates. If they demonize this or that group or promise to take money from this or that set of people, you know they are lying, power-hungry politicians. If they promise to give you something of nothing, as long as you vote for them, you know they are lying, power-hungry politicians. If they promise to take money and resources from those who work for it and give it to those who do not, you know they are lying, power-hungry politicians. Bible doctrine in the soul tells you who these people are, without doing extensive research. Many of them, you can hear one time, and that is enough to tell you who they are. They might fool 60% of the electorate, but their lies and empty promises are apparent to those who know the Word of God and who know what man is like.

Application: Chapters like this in the Bible are fantastic. We will never be able to go behind the scenes and by a fly on the wall for meetings between Barrack Obama, Robert Gibbs, Rahm Emanuel and Eric Holder, but we are behind the scenes here in a meeting between Hanun and his state department, and this meeting tells us what we need to know about politicians and their state departments today. Here, we observe David being wrongfully demonized. In today’s political scene, we hear bankers and Wall Street workers being castigated and demonized. It is all the same thing. It is a lust for power. It is a set of mental attitude sins (jealousy, negative volition toward God, anger, implacability, self righteousness).

And so seizes Hanun servants of David and so he shaves off half of their beard and so he cuts off their garments in the middle as far as their buttocks and so he sends them away. 2Samuel 10:4

Therefore, Hanun seized the ambassadors of David and shaved off half of their beard and cut off their garments in the middle up to their buttocks and then dismissed them.
Therefore, Hanun seized David's ambassadors and shaved off half of each man's beard and cut off their garments in the middle up to their waist, and then he threw them out of his palace.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

- **Latin Vulgate**
  
  Wherefore Hanon took the servants of David, and shaved off the one half of their beards, and cut away half of their garments even to the buttocks, and sent them away.

- **Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**
  
  And so seizes Hanun servants of David and so he shaves off half of their beard and so he cuts off their garments in the middle as far as their buttocks and so he sends them away.

- **Peshitta (Syriac)**
  
  Wherefore Hanun took David's servants and shaved off the one-half of their beards and cut off their garments in the middle as far as their buttocks, and sent them away.

- **Septuagint (Greek)**
  
  And Hanun took the servants of David, and shaved their beards, and cut off their garments in the midst as far as their haunches, and sent them away.

**Significant differences:**

The Greek does not indicate that only half of their beards are shaved off. No other differences are noted.

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

- **CEV**
  
  Hanun arrested David's officials and had their beards shaved off on one side of their faces. He had their robes cut off just below the waist, and then he sent them away.

- **Easy English (Pocock)**
  
  So Hanun took David's servants. He shaved off half of each man's beard. He cut off their clothes level with their bottoms. Then Hanun sent them away. They were ashamed.

- **Good News Bible (TEV)**
  
  Hanun seized David's messengers, shaved off one side of their beards, cut off their clothes at the hips, and sent them away.

- **The Message**
  
  So Hanun seized David's men, shaved off half their beards, cut off their robes halfway up their buttocks, and sent them packing.

- **New Century Version**
  
  So Hanun arrested David's officers. To shame them he shaved off half their beards and cut off their clothes at the hips. Then he sent them away.

- **New Life Bible**
  
  So Hanun took David's servants and cut off half the hair from their faces. Then he cut off half their clothing, almost up to the belt, and sent them away.

- **New Living Translation**
  
  So Hanun seized David's ambassadors and shaved off half of each man's beard, cut off their robes at the buttocks, and sent them back to David in shame.

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

- **American English Bible**
  
  So then, AnNon took David's servants, shaved their beards, cut off their uniforms to their hips, and sent them away.

- **od's Word™**
  
  So Hanun took David's men, shaved off half of each man's beard, cut off their clothes from the waist down, and sent them away.

- **New American Bible**
  
  Hanun, therefore, seized David's servants and, after shaving off half their beards and cutting away the lower halves of their garments at the buttocks, sent them away.

- **NIRV**
  
  So Hanun grabbed hold of David's men. He shaved off half of each man's beard. He cut their clothes off just below the waist and left them half naked. Then he sent them away.
Whereupon Hanun seized David’s representatives, shaved off half their beards, cut their clothes off halfway up, at their buttocks, and sent them away.

So Hanun took David’s servants, shaved off half their beards and cut off half their garments up to the buttocks, and then dismissed them.

So Hanun took David’s servants, and after cutting off half the hair on their chins, and cutting off the skirts of their robes up to the middle, he sent them away.

So Hanun seized David’s courtiers, clipped off one side of their beards and cut away half of their garments at the buttocks, and sent them off.

So Hanun seized David’s servants and shaved off half of each one’s beard. He cut the lower part of their robes off so that their buttocks were exposed [Heb "and he cut their robes in the middle unto their buttocks."], and then sent them away.

So Hanun took David’s servants and shaved off half the beard of each and cut off their garments in the middle, at their hips, and sent them away.

And Hanun took David’s servants and shaved off half of their beards, and cut off their long robes in the middle, to their buttocks; and he sent them away.

Therefore Hanun violently seized David's embassy/ambassadors, and shaved off the one half of their beards, (a great insult in this day - like branding someone) and cut off their upper garments in the middle above their buttocks (meaning that they were naked from the waist down and had to walk back to Jerusalem in this state - a great indignity), and sent them away.

And Hanun takes the servants of David, and shaves off the half of their beard, and cuts off their long robes in the midst—unto their buttocks, and sends them away.

Hanun humiliates the delegation sent by David to comfort him. He shaves off half of their beards and cuts off their garments so that they look ridiculous.

<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>𐤐𐤈𐤄𐤄Often pronounced law- KAHKH</td>
<td>to take, to take from, to take away, to take in marriage; to seize, to take possession of; to send after, to fetch, to bring; to receive</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3947 BDB #542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chânûwn (ןַע) [pronounced kha- NOON]</td>
<td>favored, gracious, graciously given; transliterated Hanun, Chanun</td>
<td>masculine singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #2586 BDB #337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>𐤇𐤃𐤄 [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 10:4a

<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>'ôbêd (עֹבֵד) [pronounced goh-BADE]</td>
<td>a slave, a servant</td>
<td>masculine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #5660 BDB #713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid (דָּוִד); also Dâviyd (דַּוִּיד) [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: Therefore, Hanun seized the ambassadors of David... We do not know how many ambassadors David sent. Since this is in the plural and not the dual, we may assume 3 or more. This is a perfect example of a metonym. Hanun does not personally seize one ambassador and then seize the next and then seize the next. He gives the orders, and his royal guards grab these men, probably 2 or 3 guards for each of David’s men. Hanun gives the orders, but as influenced by his state department. Since he gives the orders and since he is in charge, he is the one responsible.

Application: In your job, you may have pressure from above or below to get you to do this or that thing; but, at the point at which you make the decision to do that thing, and carry it out, it is all on you. Hanun’s state department cannot, apart from Hanun, treat these men like dirt. Hanun has to give the order, and he did. Therefore, this is all on him. Hanun, most likely, does absolutely nothing in this verse, except give the orders. However, the responsibility for what is done here is on him. Down the road in time, Hanun’s brother will meet David with supplies when David is in need, an act which required him to order some men around, and an act which was probably criticized and objected to. However, it was the right thing to do. Here, Hanun makes the wrong decision, gives orders which are wrong-headed, and so, the Bible assigned the blame to him, as he is in charge.

Application: Hanun’s responsibility in this matter is recorded for all time in the eternal Word of God. If you have any authority at all, you have to be careful as to the exercise of your authority.

2Samuel 10:4b

<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>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>gâlach (גָּלָךְ) [pronounced gaw-LAKH]</td>
<td>to shave [one’s beard or head], to shave off, to cut off; to shave oneself; metaphorically to shave [a land by fire and sword], to devastate</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Piel imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #1548 BDB #164</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>chátsîy (ךָצִי) [pronounced khuh-TSEE]</td>
<td>half, middle</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #2677 BDB #345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel 10:4b

<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>zâqân (זָקָן) [pronounced zaw-KAWN]</td>
<td>chin, beard, the bearded chin [of a man]</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine plural suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #2206 BDB #278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and shaved off half of their beard... Again, although the verbs are in the 3rd person masculine singular, all referring back to Hanun, he may or may not have actually taken part in the shaving of these men’s beards. However, he gave the order, and, therefore, the blame is on his shoulders.

The masculine singular construct is in the singular, as is beard. However, affixed to beards is the 3rd person masculine plural suffix. This means that each man had half of his beard shaved off.

Throughout the Bible are cultural references which have particular meaning for that period of time, and ought to be interpreted in accordance with that time. At this period of time (as others), the beard was a symbol of manhood, virility, and, in some places, freedom (as slaves were often compelled to shave their beards as a token of servitude). Hanun was treating these ambassadors with contempt and intentionally exposing them to great ridicule.²⁰

20 *Manners and Customs of the Bible;* James M. Freeman; reprinted in 1972 by Logos International; p. 144. Freedman also offers a parallel situation which occurred in 1764, when Kerim Kahn sent ambassadors to Mir Mahenna, the prince of a small, independent territory on the Persian Gulf; and he demanded to be paid tribute. Mahenna treated these ambassadors with contempt and cut off their beards, which resulted in Kahn sending in an army to subdue this territory.
### 2Samuel 10:4c

<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>‘ad (עַד) [pronounced ąd]</td>
<td>as far as, even to, up to, until</td>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>Strong’s #5704 BDB #723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shēth (שֶׁת) [pronounced Shayth]</td>
<td>seat, buttocks</td>
<td>masculine plural noun with the 3rd person masculine plural suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #8357 BDB #1059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and cut off their garments in the middle up to their buttocks... Unlike the singular *beard* in v. 4c, *garment* is in the plural, because these men wore more than one garment each, and what were cut off below the waist. How I envision this is, their garments were cut off so that these men were wearing something a bit more racy than hot pants or mini-skirts, which is a great insult and humiliation, even more so in the ancient world.

Hanun’s approach here is interesting. Even though his cabinet got him going by suggesting that these men were there to spy out the land, this is not how a king would treat a spy. He might interrogate him or jail him, but Hanun chose instead to humiliate these men. This suggests that Hanun was, to some extent, a real ass here, using the influence of his advisors to guide him, but then not really dealing with this situation appropriately. How do I explain this? Because Hanun is in charge, he can do whatever he wants with these men. He does not choose to treat them as enemy combatants or as spies. He simply chooses to humiliate them. Now, either this man does not really believe that these ambassadors are spies, or, he is so arrogant, as to treat them this way and then cut them loose, so as to tell David, “So, how do you like me now, David?”

**Application:** North Korea is a modern-day example. 2 media reporters wandered over into North Korean territory and were seized and accused of being spies. Now, whether these young women did this on purpose or not is not at issue, but the mentality of the North Korean government is. They did not torture these women, per se; they did not physically harm them in order to gain intelligence from them. The North Korean administration knew that, at most, these were just nosey western reporters, and that they could be used. Whether money exchanged hands or not, we will never know, but the leader of North Korea got a sit-down with President Bill Clinton in order to release these women, who posed absolutely no threat to the North Koreans (which the North Korean administration knew).

So here is Hanun. He is not really worried that these men are spies. He is not concerned about David planning an attack on Ammon. He is having some fun, and no doubt being egged on by his state department. He is gaining points with those advisors around him, but at the expense of David’s sincere ambassadors; and, as he will find out, at the expense of his own country.

**Application:** Any position of authority is important, and if you are a believer with any kind of authority, even if it is only over a 3 year-old and a 5 year-old, then you have to take your position of authority seriously. You do not do things to gain the favor of this 3 or 5 year-old, if these things are the wrong thing to do, all authority is given by God, and we need to recognize the serious nature of our positions of authority. This does not mean that you cannot have fun and kid around, in some circumstances and under certain conditions, but the scope and responsibility of your authority comes first.

**Application:** I see this through the eyes of a teacher, since I taught school for 29 years. Now, there were many times when I could kid around with my students and laugh with them. However, what was first and foremost was teaching them the subject which was at hand and making certain that they were disciplined enough as a classroom for me to teach them. That meant, there were limits as to how far I could go. For instance, I could not belittle a child who had person confidence problems or social problems to begin with (i.e., I could not pick on a kid who was picked on by others). However, I could gently give a hard time to kids with stronger egos, as long as this kicking
did not degenerate into personal insults or some sort of degrading comment, and as long as it did not detract from my responsibilities as a teacher.

Application: As a teacher of high school children, I recognized that these students needed to have some modicum of freedom as well as a good response to my authority; and I tried to walk a line where they had both personal freedom and personal responsibility. This was much easier to do in the environment in which I taught, because I worked at a school that, for many years, had very good overall discipline. This also took place during a time when most parents took their responsibilities as parents quite seriously; whereas, the generation of parents which came up after them, were quite the opposite, and many of them saw no reason to have high expectations for their own children nor did they see any reason to every view their own children with objectivity. During the final years that I taught, there were more and more parents who had abandoned their authority positions, and spent their time trying to run interference for their children; and their children were always right, and those who disagreed (counselors, principals and teachers) were wrong.

What we observe here, in 2Sam. 10:4, is Hanun doing everything exactly wrong. He is in charge and he chooses to do exactly the wrong things. As the man in authority, his decision here will negatively impact almost every citizen of Ammon. David offers him a sincere gesture of sympathy, which is also meant as offering a hand of friendship to Hanun as a new king. Hanun responds from the arrogance in his soul and does exactly the wrong thing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Samuel 10:4d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew/Pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (ו)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shâlach (שָלָךְ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and then dismissed them. These men are in Hanun’s royal palace. They have just been humiliated, and now Hanun throws them out of the palace. They are thrown out onto the street, so to speak, and all of the people on the street see these men and laugh at them. Each has half of his beard shaved off; each is walking around in a miniskirt or worse, and they are absolutely humiliated, having to travel miles in this condition, being the laughingstock of anyone who sees them.

2Sam. 10:1–4 reads: After these things, it came to pass that the king of Ammon died and his son Hanun reigned instead of him. And so, David said, “I will manufacture grace toward Hanun, the son of Nahash, just as his father manufactured grace toward me.” Therefore, David sent his ambassadors to comfort Hanun concerning his father. And the ambassadors entered into the land of the Ammonites. And the state department of Ammon said to Hanun their sovereign, “Is David really honoring your father in your opinion simply because he sent comforters to you? Did not David send his ambassadors to you in order to thoroughly search out the city, for them to scope out the city as spies, and to later overthrow it?” Therefore, Hanun seized David’s ambassadors and shaved off half of each man’s beard and cut off their garments in the middle up to their waist, and then he threw them out of his palace.

Summary Points for 2Samuel 10:1–4

1. David’s character is revealed by his aggressive use of grace here. Sometimes grace is active and aggressive (as in, David sending an envoy of men to express his sorrow) and sometimes grace is passive
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(when we avoid sticking our nose into someone else’s business).
2. It is the understanding of doctrine which helps believers to determine when their grace ought to be active and when it ought to be passive.
3. In this situation, David did that which was honorable. Sending an envoy of men indicated that David wanted peace to continue between Israel and Ammon.
   1) We do not know the exact terms of peace which existed between David and Nahash.
   2) It is likely that Nahash paid David tribute.
   3) Nevertheless, we are going to find that Ammon was very prosperous. That is, what David required did not impoverish the people of Ammon.
   4) Again, assuming this suzerain-vassal arrangement between the two countries also indicates that David did not kill the goose that laid the golden eggs.
4. As a military type, David much preferred peace over war, because those in the military understand the horrors of war far more than the average person.
5. David’s aggressive approach of grace here indicates that David had both a desire and an expectation of peace between the two countries.
6. Arrogance on the part of Hanun’s cabinet will turn to implacability and they will see David’s envoy as weakness. This would be particularly true if they were paying David tribute.
7. No matter what the relationship between Israel and Ammon, these Jewish ambassadors should have been treated with courtesy and dignity, in the same spirit of grace in which they were sent.
8. However, arrogance, because it is unstable, is impetuous and rash. Hanun and his state department do not seem to even consider treating this envoy graciously. They will horrible demean these Jewish ambassadors.
9. The Bible does not always provide a full context for every incident, but the nation of Ammon worships Molech, which involves the phallic cult and child sacrifice.
10. Despite their association with Israel and the true God of Israel, Ammon worships that which is evil.
11. Therefore, God will allow David to sound defeat Ammon, which defeat will involve the killing of thousands of their soldiers, as well as their wives and children.
12. Ammon is a nation which could have enjoyed tremendous prosperity, had they only chosen to worship the God of Israel. They enjoy considerable prosperity simply in their association with Israel. However, with their rebellion, the die is cast. David will have to take down this city.
13. To get a modern-day example, just think of any middle eastern nation today. If one of their own believes in Jesus Christ, they will persecute this individual and even have him executed.
14. Modern middle eastern nations practice child sacrifice as well, but in a different way. They raise their children to hate Jews—to believe that they have been descended from dogs and pigs—and even at age 3, some of their children already, through cartoons and cultural propaganda, have a desire to kill Jews and Christians.
15. This helps to explain the arrogance of the Ammonites and their modern-day counterparts: they love a lie more than they love the truth.
16. The relationship between Nahash and David very likely included the truth. Nahash was probably a believer in Jehovah Elohim. However, Hanun and his state department, in their arrogance, worshiped Molech.
17. Choosing to worship that which is not God is an arrogant choice.
18. Hanun’s state department—most of whom remained intact from Nahash’s regime—were arrogant. They had a little power, and they had influence over their king.
   1) The arrogance of power lust is fascinating.
   2) Often, such men are terribly deluded. They have no real answers for the problems which their country faces (all countries face problems). Yet, in their arrogance, they feel as if they are the best-suited to solve these problems.
   3) Hanun’s state department, hoping to become popular with the people and to exercise control over Hanun, completely misread David’s aggressive use of grace, and they conclude that David as weak.
   4) David, as a professional soldier, is not weak. He has developed a great army in Israel and reserves which can be gathered at a moment’s notice (which we will observe in this chapter).
Summary Points for 2Samuel 10:1–4

5) Therefore, Hanun’s state department is wrong about David, wrong about worshiping Molech, and wrong about the popularity and admiration they would receive from the people. They will bring their country down with their arrogance.

19. Although Hanun is given the option to continue a beneficial relationship with a supergrace believer, he rejects that for personal and national destruction instead.

Return to Chapter Outline  Return to Charts, Maps and Short Doctrines

How should Hanun have handled this? Ideally speaking, Hanun should have known something about his father’s relationship to David. If the Ammonites were paying tribute to David, then he certainly knew about that. If, as the king’s son, he was no privy to all that went on, Hanun certainly could have found others with a different viewpoint and asked them their opinion. Hanun has specifically limited the input which he receives. He wants to impress this state department and he wants to seem like he is one of the guys, so he goes along with their prodding—exactly the wrong thing for him to do.

Application: We saw a similar situation with our President this past week. Let’s just assume for a moment that President Obama is seriously concerned about the economy and about job creation—he just held a jobs summit, but he did not invite the Chamber of Commerce or any organization which represents businesses from the D.C. area. Small business creates 3 out of 4 jobs in the United States and unions create a handful of jobs (union bosses and officials); but our president invited all kinds of union representatives to a jobs summit and almost no representatives from those who actually create jobs. Just like Hanun, the president has intentionally limited the input he would receive. So, whatever advice he receives is limited right from the beginning. Whatever the President’s motivation and thinking, the end results of this summit and the advice he will receive will do nothing to increase the number of jobs.

Let me offer some deep points: sometimes it is true, like father, like son; but sometimes, there are dramatic differences between a parent and their offspring. David and Solomon are great men. R. B. Thieme Jr. pointed out Philip of Macedon and his son Alexander the Great, as two great men of history. In our passage, Hanun acts like a complete ass and completely disrespects David. He does things here which his father would never consider doing, and he allows himself to be overly influenced by his state department.

At this point, Hanun reveals himself to be incredibly arrogant. He has ignored David’s graciousness and treated it with contempt. He has assumed that David’s sympathy indicates that David is weak. Much to his chagrin, Hanun will discover that David is one of the toughest and most powerful man in that part of the world. Hanun and all that he knows will be destroyed in a war with David. Whatever intelligence that Hanun has, has been compromised by his arrogance. The choices he makes will destroy his beloved city and send every person he knows into slavery or death in battle.

Again, 2Sam. 10:1–4 reads: After these things, it came to pass that the king of Ammon died and his son Hanun reigned instead of him. And so, David said, “I will manufacture grace toward Hanun, the son of Nahash, just as his father manufactured grace toward me.” Therefore, David sent his ambassadors to comfort Hanun concerning his father. And the ambassadors entered into the land of the Ammonites. And the state department of Ammon said to Hanun their sovereign, “Is David really honoring your father in your opinion simply because he sent comforters to you? Did not David send his ambassadors to you in order to thoroughly search out the city, for them to scope out the city as spies, and to later overthrow it?” Therefore, Hanun seized David’s ambassadors and shaved off half of each man’s beard and cut off their garments in the middle up to their waist, and then he threw them out of his palace.

Impressing the Leaders and Citizens of Heathen Countries

1. Hanun, the new king of Ammon, has no appreciation for courtesy or thoughtfulness of others. This will
Impressing the Leaders and Citizens of Heathen Countries

not just be a problem for him, but for the entire country of Ammon. A person in a position of leadership affects nearly all of those beneath him.

2. Hanun was being offered friendship and grace from David and the nation Israel. Hanun will choose the alternative, which will be war against a powerful client nation of God enjoying great prosperity and military power.

3. Since graciousness has not effect upon King Hanun, then a strong military will have to make an impression on him.
   1) Let’s look at a modern-day example. Just this week, as I am working on the revision of this chapter, Osama bin Laden has been killed by a special forces military action in Pakistan.
   2) For awhile, the President was trying to determine whether photos of Laden’s dead body ought to be released.
   3) These people could enjoy prosperous and amiable relations with the United States.
   4) These people in the Middle East could enjoy peace with Israel.
   5) This would result in great blessing to these nations.
   6) However, many of the people are just like Hanun and his state department.
   7) They do not understand graciousness and peace; they understand force.
   8) Our President has made great attempts to reach out to the Muslim world, so much so that he offends his own citizens. However, the Muslims have not responded in kind.
   9) One of our allies is Pakistan, and yet, it appears that many of their high-ranking officials were complicit in the hiding of Osama bin Laden in a well-fortified compound.
   10) They have a choice—cooperate with the United States in putting down the terrorists within their own borders or continue to suffer drone attacks.
   11) On the one hand, they can choose grace and peace from the United States; or they can choose an uneasy relationship which may involve the killing of some of their citizenry.
   12) What Muslims have learned in Iraq and Afghanistan is, they can enjoy relative peace as being allied with the United States; or they can face our military.

4. Because Israel functions under the laws of divine establishment, because they are a client nation to God, and because there is a pivot of believers in Israel, Israel will subdue Ammon.

5. There are some people who can only be impressed with force and violence. They do not relate to graciousness. They relate well to stacks of dead bodies all around them.
   1) The concept here is the relationship between genuine and enforced humility.
   2) The state department in Ammon has no genuine humility.
   3) They do not possess grace and they do not recognize grace.
   4) Therefore, they treat the ambassadors from David cruelly.
   5) David’s alternative approach is to put them under enforced humility.
   6) They will understand a military invasion. They will understand superior military force. They will understand death and/or slavery.

6. Having no concept of grace and not being gracious, is often characteristic of are criminal.
   1) A criminal only understands his own wants and desires.
   2) When someone is gracious to a criminal, the criminal sees that as weakness.
   3) When someone gives the criminal a break, the criminal sees this as putting something over on the other person.
   4) Such people can only be deterred by force. Since a criminal has no concept of humility or discipline, then this must be enforced.
   5) Criminals understand a stronger force; they understand pain, incarceration and death.

7. In some instances, only warfare will restrain an arrogant nation. When Ammon is totally defeated, this will restrain their arrogance.
Another doctrine from my notes.

The Arrogance of Hanun and his State Department

1. David’s personal integrity is revealed by his aggressiveness in grace. As an honorable king, David makes the first move to express sympathy toward Hanun at the loss of his father.
2. Assuming that Nahash paid tribute to David, David could have taken two approaches with the new king. David could have sent his army to Ammon and beat them down, and laid down the law with the new king Hanun. Or, David could have expressed sympathy toward Hanun at the loss of his father. David, as a man of grace, chose to do that latter.
3. Military men love peace. Since they understand war, they are even more appreciative of peace than others.
4. When a nation is at war, the innocent suffer with the guilty. When a nation is under attack, it has an effect upon all the citizens of that nation.
5. A smart professional soldier remains in a state of readiness for war. This dissuades others from their aggressive use of force. This preparedness for war often maintains the peace.
6. The arrogance of Hanun and his state department led to implacability and implacability rejected David’s aggressive use of grace.
7. The ambassadors sent by David should have been treated with respect and dignity. Their coming to Ammon should have been recognized as an act of graciousness.
8. Instead, Hanun and his state department maltreated David’s ambassadors, demonstrating impulsive arrogance.
9. Where does this come from in Ammon? They Molech, which both involves the phallic cult and child sacrifice. These two acts are very anti-establishment. They are destructive to marriage and, obviously, to family. If a parent does not have a normal affection for his own child, that parent is in deep degeneracy. Therefore, such a people cannot understand gracious and honorable motivation. A people who institutionalize adultery and the killing of their own children are incapable of understanding graciousness.
   a. A modern-day example. Muslim nations which train their children, from age 3 on up, through the use of cartoons and propaganda, to hate Jews, they are sacrificing their children to Allah.
   b. The ancient-world child sacrifice finds its duplication in the propagandizing of pre-school children.
   c. People who would do this to their own children cannot be reasoned with. There is no frame of reference that we share; there are no basic fundamental principles upon which we can agree.
   d. Therefore, graciousness and kindness are misunderstood as weakness, and such acts only encourage military retribution.

Also apropos to this passage:

The Arrogance of Leadership and the Plan of God

1. Men who are arrogant tend to underestimate others; this is more pronounced when these arrogant men have any sort of power and authority.
2. Arrogance tends to keep people from properly evaluating their life; in many ways, they are divorced from reality. Rulers like Saddam Hussein, Iran’s President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Kim Jong II and Hanunall quickly come to mind.
3. Hanun believed that David was a man he could bully or tweak. His state department, a group of arrogant men, led him and encouraged him in this arrogance.
4. However, David, a man Hanun sorely underestimated, would both defeat Ammon but the great world power Aram, and David would do this while involved in great sinfulness (God is obviously faithful).
5. David ruled over a nation of great military types and God blessed his nation militarily. This is because David was growing spiritually and the people of Israel were growing spiritually. God blessed David in this
The Arrogance of Leadership and the Plan of God

way despite his great sin with Bathsheba and Uriah.

6. Hanun’s state department was ignorance of divine establishment, of Bible doctrine, and they did not realistically grasp their place in the world. Again, arrogance distorted their understanding of reality. They could not simply hate David and hate Israel, but then, recognize that, David’s army could make their lives miserable.

7. The Ammonites will recognize that their actions have consequences, so they will take a great deal of their money and pay for Aramaean (Syrian) mercenaries to help back them up.

8. However, in their arrogance, they did not consider the God of Israel. No multi-national alliance can stand before God.

9. Jesus Christ controls history. What God has determined for Israel, God will bring to pass. God is going to give David’s son, Solomon, 40 years of peace and prosperity; therefore, God is going to guide historical events which will bring that to pass. That means, no major nation is going to threaten Israel; they will all recognize Israel’s might and stand down. David however, is going to face war for the rest of his kingship.

10. All the great empires around Israel have been neutralized or, for whatever reason, they are quiet at this point in time. Only Aram is aggressively expanding her borders and influence.

11. Coming up in this chapter, General Joab will be caught between the army of Ammon and a mercenary army from Aram (one of the natural resources which Aram sold was mercenaries). This all came to pass by divine design.

12. Although this may spoil for you some of the chapter coming up, Joab will defeat the Aramaean mercenaries. He will send them running in defeat.

13. Hanun, because of his arrogance, and his state department, because of their arrogance, underestimate David, and their humiliating David’s ambassadors is going to result in the defeat of both Aram and Ammon. Jesus Christ controls history and He is setting things up in such a way that, Israel will enjoy 40 years of great peace and prosperity under Solomon.

14. Arrogant men cannot hinder the plan of God. God uses the arrogance of Hanun and his state department in such a way as to result in great blessing for Israel.

15. Powerful armies cannot hinder the plan of God. God will cause David’s army to soundly defeat Aram, one of the greatest world powers (if not the greatest).

16. Since cannot hinder the plan of God. David is in the midst of receiving discipline for his great sin with Bathsheba and Uriah, and yet, David will retain his throne and Israel, as a nation, will be advanced among the nations of the world.

17. We cannot hinder, slow, or derail the plan of God—not with our sins, our arrogance, our power or our good works.

The proper response of Aram and Ammon would be to recognize that the God of Israel was the God of the Universe. Establishing an alliance with Israel would have resulted in blessing by association for these nations. However, they chose, instead, cursing. As God told Abraham, “I will bless those who bless you and I will curse those who curse you.” (Gen. 12:3).

2Sam. 10: Therefore, Hanun seized David’s ambassadors and shaved off half of each man’s beard and cut off their garments in the middle up to their waist, and then he threw them out of his palace. These men sent by David, would have made a trek through the streets of Ammon, and it is very likely that the arrogant people of Ammon pointed and laughed and found great humor in these Jews being treated in this manner. There is no reason why Hanun would have gone to any trouble to try to give David’s ambassadors some sort of cover or discretion when leaving his palace. My point here is, the people of Ammon participate in this act of humiliation. Don’t think for a moment that Hanun and the state department are the only culprits here. A nation gets the leadership it deserves. These men were treated shabbily by Hanun and his state department, and, it is reasonable to assume that their leaving Rabbah became somewhat of an impromptu parade, with many people of Rabbah making fun of them as they left.
I mention this because Joab will attack all of Ammon. Joab will not come to the gates of Ammon and call for Hanun and his state department to come out. All Ammon would be punished for this (which represents negative volition toward God).

And so they made known to David and so he sends to meet them for were the men ashamed greatly. And so says the king “Remain in Jericho until growing your beard and you have returned.”

After this was made known to David, he sent servants to meet them, because these men were greatly ashamed. Therefore, the king told them, “Just stay here in Jericho until your beards have grown back; then you may return to Jerusalem.”

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Vulgate</th>
<th>When this was told David, he sent to meet them: for the men were <strong>sadly put to confusion</strong>, and David <strong>commanded</strong> them, saying: Stay at Jericho, till your beards be grown, and then <strong>return</strong>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masoretic Text (Hebrew)</td>
<td>And so they made known to David and so he sends to meet them for were the men ashamed greatly. And so says the king “Remain in Jericho until growing your beard and you have returned.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshitta (Syriac)</td>
<td>When they told it to David, he sent to meet them, because the men were greatly ashamed; and the king said to them, Tarry at Jericho until your beards have grown and then <strong>return</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septuagint (Greek)</td>
<td>And they announced to David concerning the men; and he sent to meet them, for the men were greatly dishonored. And the king said, Remain in Jericho till your beards have grown, and then you shall return.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences:** The wâw consecutive, when followed by a kîy conjunction can be translated *if...then; when...then; when...that; when...*. I am not sure if that precisely applied to this verse, but that would explain the English translation of the Latin and Syriac.

The Greek adds the phrase *concerning the men*, which does not do damage to the overall meaning, but is not found in the Hebrew.

*Confusion* is one possible rendering of the verb most translate *ashamed*. Given the context of this verse, these men could have been as much *confused* as they were *ashamed*.

The English translation of the Latin adds one additional verb before *to say*, which does not compromise the meaning of this verse.

Logically, the final verb would seem to be an imperative; and so, we find this in the Latin and Syriac. However, it is a simple Qal perfect in the Hebrew. The Latin and Syriac do not violate the text here.

**Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEV</td>
<td>They were terribly ashamed. When David found out what had happened to his officials, he sent a message and told them, &quot;Stay in Jericho until your beards grow back. Then you can come home.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy English (Pocock)</td>
<td>David heard what had happened. He sent a message to the men because they were so ashamed. David said, &quot;Stay in the town of Jericho until your beards have grown again. Then come home.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-Read Version</td>
<td>When the people told David, he sent messengers to meet his officers. He did this because these men were very ashamed. King David said, &quot;Wait at Jericho until your beards grow again. Then come back to Jerusalem.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good News Bible (TEV)</td>
<td>They were too ashamed to return home. When David heard about what had happened, he sent word for them to stay in Jericho and not return until their beards had grown again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Message</td>
<td>When all this was reported to David, he sent someone to meet them, for they were seriously humiliated. The king told them, &quot;Stay in Jericho until your beards grow out. Only then come back.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Century Version</td>
<td>When the people told David, he sent messengers to meet his officers because they were very ashamed. King David said, &quot;Stay in Jericho until your beards have grown back. Then come home.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Living Translation</td>
<td>When David heard what had happened, he sent messengers to tell the men, &quot;Stay at Jericho until your beards grow out, and then come back.&quot; For they felt deep shame because of their appearance.</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, when this was reported to David, he sent men to meet them, because they had been so extremely dishonored. And the king told them to stay in Jericho until their beards grew back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Roots Translinear</td>
<td>They told David, and he sent to greet them, for the men were greatly shamed: and the king said, Go to Jericho till your hair is long again, and then come back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s Word™</td>
<td>After David was told what had happened, he sent someone to meet them because they were deeply humiliated. The king said to them, &quot;Stay in Jericho until your beards have grown back, and then return to Jerusalem.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRV</td>
<td>David was told about it. So he sent messengers to his men because they were filled with shame. King David said to them, &quot;Stay at Jericho until your beards grow out again. Then come back here.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised English Bible</td>
<td>Hearing how they had been treated, David ordered them to be met, for they were deeply humiliated; he told them to wait in Jericho and not return until their beards had grown back.</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>When David had news of it, he sent men out with the purpose of meeting them on their way, for the men were greatly shamed: and the king said, Go to Jericho till your hair is long again, and then come back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Group Version</td>
<td>When they told it to David, he sent to meet them; for the men were greatly ashamed. And the king said, Wait at Jericho until your { pl } beards are grown, and then return.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCSB</td>
<td>When this was reported to David, he sent someone to meet them, since they were deeply humiliated. The king said, &quot;Stay in Jericho until your beards grow back; then return.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPS (Tanakh)</td>
<td>When David was told of it, he dispatched men to meet them, for the men were greatly embarrassed. And the king gave orders: “Stop in Jericho until your beards grow back; then you can return.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And they told it to David; and he sent to meet them; for the men were very much ashamed. And the king said: 'Remain seated in Jericho until your beards grow, and then you shall return.'

NET Bible®
Messengers8 told David what had happened [The words "what had happened" are supplied in the translation for stylistic reasons], so he summoned them, for the men were thoroughly humiliated. The king said, "Stay in Jericho10 until your beards have grown again; then you may come back."

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

English Standard Version
When it was told David, he sent to meet them, for the men were greatly ashamed. And the king said, "Remain at Jericho until your beards have grown and then return."

exeGeses companion Bible
And they tell David; and he sends to meet them; because the men shame mightily. And the sovereign says, Settle at Yericho until your beards sprout and return.

Syndein
When they announced it to David, then he went out to see/meet them {personally} {he went out to meet them personally - personal touch to remove some of the shame}, because the men {the ambassadors} were extremely humiliated/embarrassed. So the king said, "Remain/Tarry {yashab} at Jericho until your beards have grown, and then return."

World English Bible
When they told it to David, he sent to meet them; for the men were greatly ashamed. The king said, Wait at Jericho until your beards be grown, and then return.

Young’s Updated LT
And they declare it to David, and he sends to meet them, for the men have been greatly ashamed, and the king says, “Abide in Jericho till your beard does spring up—then You have returned.”

The gist of this verse:
The difficulties that these men endured were made known to David, so he sends a delegation to them (it is possible that David goes himself). Because these men are ashamed, David tells them to remain in Jericho before returning to Jerusalem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Samuel 10:5a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew/Pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (i) [pronounced wah]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When a wâw consecutive is followed by a kîy conjunction, the result is often a conditional or a causal sentence, and can be reasonably rendered if...then; when...then; when...that; when…

The wâw consecutive can also be rendered so, that, yet, therefore. There are times when the wâw consecutive simply carries the action along and we do not need an English translation in order to indicate that.

Wâw consecutives can be used before causal sentences like › to mean because, for, in that; and a wâw consecutive can be used before conclusive or inferential sentences, and mean so that, therefore, wherefore.21

---

2Samuel 10:5a

Hebrew/Pronunciation | Common English Meanings | Notes/Morphology | BDB and Strong's Numbers
--- | --- | --- | ---
nâgād (ןגָּד) [pronounced naw-GAHD] | to make conspicuous, to make known, to expound, to explain, to declare, to inform, to confess, to make it pitifully obvious that | 3rd person masculine plural, Hiphil imperfect | Strong's #5046, BDB #616
lâmêd (לָמֶד) [pronounced lêm] | to, for, towards, in regards to | directional/relational preposition | No Strong's #, BDB #510
Dâvīd (דָּוִד); also Dâvîyd (דָּוִיָּד) [pronounced daw-VEED] | beloved and is transliterated David | masculine proper noun | Strong's #1732, BDB #187

Translation: When this was made known [lit., and so they made known] to David,... These ambassadors which David had sent to Ammon had been terrifically embarrassed. Their beards were half-shaved, their clothes cut off into sort of a miniskirt and they had to walk from Ammon to Jericho, the first Jewish city on the other side of the Jordan, and that is where they stopped. They sent word to David of what had occurred.

I translated the wâw consecutive as when, because there is a kîy conjunction which follows. However, structurally, we really have one wâw consecutive followed by another wâw consecutive. Several translators, including Owen, Thieme, the ESV and the WEB, render the wâw consecutive as when, which makes perfect sense. However, I am having a difficult time justifying that in Gesenius or BDB. Holding all of this together with some and so’s is not problematic in any way. The concept of the use of several wâw consecutives is to set up a series of logical and/or chronological events, but which do not always conform to an exact chronology. Or, as Davidson better states it, [The] chief function [or a series of wâw consecutives] 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, but it is also frequently logical as well. I am probably over-obsessing over this, but if I offer up a translation either slightly different than others have or slightly different than what is found in the standard set of definitions, then I like to offer some sort of explanation. Most of you could have probably skipped over this paragraph and lived an excellent life and not missed anything.

David will have to make several important decisions here, decisions which will involve the lives of his soldiers; therefore, he must have accurate information upon which to base his decisions.

Accurate Information is Required in Order to Make Good Decisions

1. Good leaders need honest and forthright underlings. A leader surrounded by “yes men” will never hear the truth.
2. We observe this very thing today (2011) in the United States where almost everything is politicized and almost every act has a political end.
3. President Obama’s men, apart from many of his military advisors, are yes-men who calculate everything in terms or reelecting President Obama in the coming election.
   1) This is why our president, on occasion, makes some good military decisions, but, at the same time, makes the absolute worst domestic policy.
   2) The President has a few military advisors who tell him the truth, who operate in an area where the President has absolutely no expertise.
   3) Therefore, no matter what goofy philosophy the President has when it comes to Islam or United States power, strong military types are obviously able to reason with the President. I would not be

---

Accurate Information is Required in Order to Make Good Decisions

shocked if these military advisors sometimes explained conditions on the ground in terms of the President’s reelection. For instance, “If you pull out of Iraq, and this nation is invaded and taken over by Iran within a few months, you will no survive as president, and Democrats, who are historically weak, will be voted out of office in such numbers, that it would make your head swim.”

4) Arrogant leaders often underestimate the intelligence and capabilities of the military. The Democrats for years have portrayed military men as the dregs of society, of those who cannot get a real job, and the military is their only hope.

5) Therefore, it is reasonable for the President’s military advisors to think circles around the President.

4. A great leader needs to have accurate facts as his disposal in order to make good decisions. The President needs honest men to explain to him why his economic policies are no good. Hanun needs his state department to tell him, “Look, we all hate King David, but, he can kick our butts militarily. However, right now, David is giving us a great deal of freedom at a very low cost. So let’s hold our tongues, accept his sympathy, so that we may live and prosper.”

5. However, a leader cannot be guided by arrogant advisors and a leader cannot be guided by yes men.

6. Bad policy is a result of arrogance, of believing that which is false, and/or having bad advisors.

7. Hanun has an arrogant state department who lust after power.

8. The President has a state department all of whom believe that which is false (they believe that government is the solution to every problem).

9. David, despite his sin, will be able to make good decisions with regards to Ammon, because he will be given good information. What happened will not be sugar-coated or interpreted in some goofy way.

1) A great example of this is the Stimulus Bill, which was the first great act of President Obama when coming into office. He needs an honest economist to tell him, “Look, this did not work; in every recession which has ever occurred prior to now, our country came out of that recession much faster and with greater vigor. Your Stimulus Bill, if anything, prolonged the agony of our economy.”

2) Instead, all the effort has been made on spinning the economic numbers, to the point of actually proclaiming a recovery summer, when here was none.

3) Either the President has a warped view of things from the bubble of the White House, or, his arrogance is so great that, despite the facts, he moves ahead with his big government politicizes.

10. David’s state department tells David exactly what happened. The information is not spun in any way. There I a problem in Ammon, and David must deal with this problem.

11. Many times a delusional leader builds up a false view of what is going on all around him and, too often, his subordinates either spin the news which comes in or avoid giving him bad news. In the United States, this is known as the White House bubble. A president can become so detached—particularly with sycophantic underlings—that he has no clue as to what is going on in the outside world.

12. All leaders require facts in order to make good decisions. All leaders need reliable and honest subordinates who will tell them the truth.

1) In the past few days, Osama bin Laden was killed on the orders of President Obama. The actual killing of Osama was brilliantly done because decisions were made based upon good intelligence.

2) However, when it came to making decisions after the fact—what to say about the operation, how to portray it, what information to share, and what decisions to make—this was bungled.

3) Post-operation decisions were made which political considerations by a very indecisive leader.

4) So, good intelligence led to a tremendously competent military operation; and bad advice led to an incompetent follow up.

13. No leader can act and appear competent if he is relying upon lousy information.

1) Bad information can lead to the bombing of an aspirin factory.

2) Bad information can lead to the greatest waste of taxpayer money in the history of the United States, also known as the Stimulus Bill.

3) Prior to the Stimulus Bill, some underling should have sat President Obama down and explained to him the following information:

(1) FDR’s big government approach did not work. The United States was the only nation to suffer a Great Depression at that time. The stock market did not fully recover until Eisenhower. All of FDR’s big government solutions prolonged the depression.
Accurate Information is Required in Order to Make Good Decisions

(2) Several recessions quickly were solved by government doing nothing or by government reducing taxes.

(3) Japan recently tried to spend its way out of a recession, and that is not working.

4) Good and accurate information can lead to good decisions by leadership.

14. Hanun had a state department who were arrogant and who desired to usurp his power through their bad advice. It was more important to them to influence Hanun’s decision than it was to do that which was right for Ammon.

15. We see a great contrast between David and Hanun. David has good and accurate information; it may not be what he wants to hear, but it is accurate, nonetheless. Therefore, what David will decide will be the best route for Israel.

Translation: ...he sent [servants] to meet them,... David sent men to speak with them and to carry a personal message. Although David could have gone himself, it appears as though he send additional staff to speak with them. Although we are not told in this passage, they either received additional clothing in Jericho or David sent appropriate garb to these men.
### 2Samuel 10:5c

<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>hâyâh (הָיָה) [pronounced haw-YAW]</td>
<td>to be, is, was; 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>
<tr>
<td>’ânâsîyîm (אַנָסִים) [pronounced uh-NAW-seem]; also spelled iyshiym (יִשִּים) [pronounced ee-SHEEM]</td>
<td>men; inhabitants, citizens; companions; soldiers, followers</td>
<td>masculine plural noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #376 BDB #35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kâlam (כָּלָם) [pronounced kaw-LAHM]</td>
<td>to be ashamed, to be put to shame, to be disgraced</td>
<td>masculine plural, Niphal participle</td>
<td>Strong’s #3637 BDB #483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m<em>ôd (מָכָד) [pronounced m</em>ODE]</td>
<td>exceedingly, extremely, greatly, very</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Strong’s #3966 BDB #547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...for the men were greatly ashamed. Sometimes this word is translated confused, which is somewhat apt here (although, I am sure they figured out what had happened, and why the Ammonite king’s son acted so abrasively to them). In any case, they were very ashamed, having to make that long trek half-naked. I am sure that you have had that dream where you are naked in an inappropriate place, and you felt some shame (I hope you did, anyway); they endured this for real, and were very upset about it.

### 2Samuel 10:5d

<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>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>’âmar (אָמָר) [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>melek* (מלך) [pronounced MEH-lek]</td>
<td>king, ruler, prince</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #4428 BDB #572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yâshab (בָּשָׂב) [pronounced yaw-SHAH*V]</td>
<td>to remain, to stay; to dwell, to live, to inhabit; to sit</td>
<td>2nd person masculine plural, Qal imperative</td>
<td>Strong’s #3427 BDB #442</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>ysrēchôw (ירמיח) [pronounced y’sray-KHOH]</td>
<td>city of the moon; transliterated Jericho</td>
<td>proper singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #3405 BDB #437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 2 other very similar spellings as well.

<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>‘ad (אָד) [pronounced ‘ahd]</td>
<td>as far as, even to, up to, until</td>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>Strong’s #5704 BDB #723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew/Pronunciation</td>
<td>Common English Meanings</td>
<td>Notes/Morphology</td>
<td>BDB and Strong’s Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsâmach (ץמخاص)</td>
<td>to grow; to sprout, to spring up, to spring forth [often used of a man’s hair and beard in the Piel]</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Piel imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #6779 BDB #855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zâqân (צָקָן)</td>
<td>chin, beard, the bearded chin [of a man]</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 2nd person masculine plural suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #2206 BDB #278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wî (or vî) (וִי or וְי)</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>shûwb (שׁוּב)</td>
<td>to return, to turn, to turn back, to reminisce, to restore something, to bring back something, to revive, to recover something, to make restitution</td>
<td>2nd person masculine plural, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7725 BDB #996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: Therefore, the king said, “Remain in Jericho until your beards have grown, then you [may] return.”

Quite obviously, beards were a big cultural thing for the Jews, as it is today for some Muslim groups. One of the things which we need to be mindful of—and this will be difficult for some—is that there is a cultural context in which the various narratives of the Bible take place. There may be absolutes associated with the cultural norms of that day, and those absolutes may even find some sort of an application today (e.g., applying some of the laws of slavery to voluntary labor today), but without carrying over the cultural norm of that time (again, slavery is a good example of this). In that day and time, beards were the norm, very much like a clean-shaven face is the norm in the United States circa 2000 A.D. We do not need to read this passage and rediscover the beard, and decide that we all ought to be growing beards. However, what had happened to these men, apart from the partial nakedness, was a great cultural embarrassment. It is as if some Ammonites down the street from you jumped you and shaved your head so that you had a Mohawk. For most people, this would be embarrassing.

Jericho is more or less in a straight line between Rabbah and Jerusalem. There are likely roads between Jerusalem, Jordan, Gilgal and Rabbah (see A Map of Rabbah in Ammon, back in v. 2). A road to Rabbah would have been established as a trade route and for the times that Ammon paid tribute to Israel. Even though there were populations of Ammonites throughout their territory, we primarily associate them with their capital city of Rabbah.

Because of what these emissaries endured, there is certainly great embarrassment on their parts. What happened has probably been broadcast throughout Jerusalem, so they are embarrassed about the beards and their walking around half-naked for a day or two. Therefore, David insists that they spend a month or two at Jericho, allowing their beards to grow, and allowing their embarrassment to subside.

It is interesting that David uses a Qal perfect rather than a Qal imperative for return. This is the gentlest of imperatives that David could possibly give—so gentle that it carries with it no imperative force. Obviously, these men have to get back to work under David, but by using a Qal perfect, David is indicating that for certain, they would return (the perfect tense indicates an accomplished event); but David is giving them a reasonable amount of time to recover from their embarrassment.

Guzik makes a good point here: David could have used these men in order to rouse up Israel’s anger against Ammon, but he did not. He could have paraded these men to a few cities and gotten his army frenetic about this.

---

23 David Guzik’s Commentary on the Old Testament; courtesy of e-sword; ©2006; 2Sam. 10:1–19. .
whole situation. However, an army needs to profession and well-trained. It does no good to whip up an army into an emotional frenzy. Often, the end result is they become less professional and therefore less effective.

**Application:** There are few if any gains when the emotion is appealed to in every realm of life. You are faithful to your wife not because you love her and you feel great about her, but you are faithful because it is a principle of honor and integrity. One sports team defeats another because they play better and smarter; not because they are old-time rivals and everyone is emotionally worked up.

Although *Jericho* is mentioned extensively throughout the Old Testament, this is its only mention in the book of Samuel. For this reason, we will discuss this city in more detail at another time. I have covered this city in some detail back in *Joshua 6* (HTML) (PDF), when Israel invaded it.

---
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**Ammon Lures Joab’s Army into a Trap**

1Chronicles 19:6–8

And so sees Bene-Ammon that made themselves odious in David and so send Bene-Ammon and so they hire Aram of Beth-Rehob and Aram of Zobah 20,000 footmen and king of Maacah a thousand of man and Ishtob 12,000 a man.

When the sons of Ammon saw that they had made themselves odious before David, they [lit., Bene-Ammon] sent and hired 20,000 infantry [from] Aram of Beth-Rehob and Aram of Zobah, 1000 men [from] the king of Maacah and 12,000 men [from] Ishtob.

When the sons of Ammon recognized that they had made themselves odious before David, they sent and hired 20,000 infantry from Aram of Beth-Rehob and Aram of Zobah, 1000 men from the king of Maacah and 12,000 men from Ishtob.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

- **Latin Vulgate**
  
  And the children of Ammon seeing that they had done an injury to David, sent and hired the Syrians of Rohob, and the Syrians of Soba, twenty thousand footmen, and of the king of Maacha a thousand men, and of Istob twelve thousand men.

- **Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**
  
  And so sees Bene-Ammon that made themselves odious in David and so send Bene-Ammon and so they hire Aram of Beth-Rehob and Aram of Zobah 20,000 footmen and king of Maacah a thousand of man and Ishtob 12,000 a man.

- **Peshitta (Syriac)**

- **Septuagint (Greek)**

- **Significant differences:**

  What the Ammonites saw that they did varies greatly in the ancient languages. Neither the Latin nor Syriac see themselves as doing something to themselves. In the Greek, they observe what the people of David felt, which is completely different in the Hebrew.
The Syriac has son of Rehob instead of Beth [house of] Rehob. They insert son of before Zoba as well.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV
The Ammonites realized that they had made David very angry, so they hired more foreign soldiers. Twenty thousand of them were foot soldiers from the Aramean cities of Beth-Rehob and Zobah, one thousand were from the king of Maacah, and twelve thousand were from the region of Tob.

Easy English (Pocock)
The *Ammonites realised that they had greatly offended David. So they hired 20,000 *Aramean soldiers. The soldiers came from Beth Rehob and Zobah. They also hired 1000 men from the king of Maacah. And 12,000 men came from Tob.

Easy-to-Read Version
The Ammonites saw that they had become David’s enemies. So the Ammonites hired Arameans from Beth Rehob and Zobah. There were 20,000 Aramean foot soldiers. The Ammonites also hired the king of Maacah with 1,000 men and 12,000 men from Tob.

Good News Bible (TEV)
The Ammonites realized that they had made David their enemy, so they hired twenty thousand Syrian soldiers from Bethrehob and Zobah, twelve thousand men from Tob, and the king of Maacah with a thousand men.

The Message
When it dawned on the Ammonites that as far as David was concerned they stunk to high heaven, they hired Aramean soldiers from Beth-Rehob and Zobah--twenty thousand infantry--and a thousand men from the king of Maacah, and twelve thousand men from Tob.

New Century Version
The Ammonites knew that they had insulted David. So they hired twenty thousand Aramean foot soldiers from Beth Rehob and Zobah. They also hired the king of Maacah with a thousand men and twelve thousand men from Tob.

New Living Translation
When the people of Ammon realized how seriously they had angered David, they sent and hired 20,000 Aramean foot soldiers from the lands of Beth-rehob and Zobah, 1,000 from the king of Maacah, and 12,000 from the land of Tob.

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

American English Bible
And when the sons of AmMon saw how David had been disgraced, they hired and sent twenty thousand Syrians from BaithRaAm, Souba, and RoOb, a thousand infantrymen from the king of Amalech, and twelve thousand men from IshTob. 7 And when David heard about this, he sent JoAb and all his best soldiers there.

Ancient Roots Translinear
The sons of Amman saw that they fouled David. The sons of Amman sent and hired 20,000 on-foot from the Syrians in Beth-Rehob and the Syrians in Zobah; 1,000 men from King Maacah, and 12,000 men of the men of Tob.

God’s Word™
The Ammonites realized that they had made themselves offensive to David. So they hired the Arameans from Beth Rehob and Zobah (20,000 foot soldiers), the army of the king of Maacah (1,000 men), and the men of Tob (12,000 men).

New American Bible
In view of the offense they had given to David, the Ammonites sent for and hired twenty thousand Aramean foot soldiers from Beth-rehob and Zobah, as well as the king of Maacah with one thousand men, and twelve thousand men from Tob. [6-9] A Hebrew text from Qumran (4Q Sam * ) comes closer in these verses to what is given in 1 Chron 19:6-9. The scene of the conflict is more likely Rabbath-Ammon, with Josephus (Ant.,vii,123), than Madeba, as in 1 Chron; compare ch. 11.

NIRV
The Ammonites realized that what they had done had made David very angry with them. So they hired 20,000 Aramean soldiers who were on foot. The soldiers came from Beth Rehob and Zobah. The Ammonites also hired the king of Maacah and 1,000 men. And they hired 12,000 men from Tob.

New Jerusalem Bible
When the Ammonites realised that they had antagonised David, they sent agents to hire twenty thousand foot soldiers from the Aramaeans of Beth-Rehob and the
Aramaeans of Zobah, one thousand men from the king of Maacah and twelve thousand men from the prince of Tob.

Today's NIV
When the Ammonites realized that they had become obnoxious to David, they hired twenty thousand Aramean foot soldiers from Beth Rehob and Zobah, as well as the king of Maakah with a thousand men, and also twelve thousand men from Tob.

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

Bible in Basic English
And when the children of Ammon saw that they had made themselves hated by David, they sent to the Aramaeans of Beth-rehob and Zobah, and got for payment twenty thousand footmen, and they got from the king of Maacah a thousand men, and from Tob twelve thousand.

HCSB
When the Ammonites realized that they had become repulsive to David, they hired 20,000 foot soldiers from the Arameans of Beth-rehob and Zobah, 1,000 men from the king of Maacah, and 12,000 men from Tob.

JPS (Tanakh)
The Ammonites realized that they had incurred the wrath of David; so the Ammonites sent agents and hired Arameans of Beth-rehob and Arameans of Zobah—20,000 foot soldiers—the king of Maacah [with] 1000 men, and 12,000 men from Tob.

Judaica Press Complete T.
And the children of Ammon saw that they had become odious to David; and the children of Ammon sent and hired of the Arameans of Beth-rehob, and the Arameans of Zobah, twenty thousand footsoldiers, and of the king of Maacah, a thousand men, and of Ish-tov, twelve thousand men.

NET Bible®
When the Ammonites realized that David was disgusted with them [Heb "that they were a stench [i.e., disgusting] with David."], they [Heb "the Ammonites."] sent and hired 20,000 foot soldiers from Aram Beth Rehob and Aram Zobah [Or "Arameans of Beth Rehob and Arameans of Zobah."], in addition to 1,000 men from the king of Maacah and 12,000 men from Ish-tob [Or perhaps "the men of Tob." The ancient versions (the LXX, the Syriac Peshitta, and Vulgate) understand the name to be "Ish-tob." It is possible that "Ish" is dittographic and that we should read simply "Tob," a reading adopted by a number of recent English versions.].

NIV – UK
When the Ammonites realised that they had become an offence to David's nostrils, they hired twenty thousand Aramean foot soldiers from Beth Rehob and Zobah, as well as the king of Maacah with a thousand men, and also twelve thousand men from Tob.

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

The Amplified Bible
And when the Ammonites saw that they had made themselves obnoxious and disgusting to David, they sent and hired the Syrians of Beth-rehob and of Zobah, 20,000 foot soldiers, and of the king of Maacah 1,000 men, and of Tob 12,000 men.

English Standard Version
When the Ammonites saw that they had become a stench to David, the Ammonites sent and hired the Syrians of Beth-rehob, and the Syrians of Zobah, 20,000 foot soldiers, and the king of Maacah with 1,000 men, and the men of Tob, 12,000 men.

eexeGeses companion Bible
And the sons of Ammon see that they stink to David; and the sons of Ammon send and hire the Aramiy of Beth Rechob and the Aramiy of Sobah twenty thousand on foot; and of sovereign Maachah a thousand men; and of Ish Tob twelve thousand men:...

Fred Miller’s Revised KJV
And when the children of Ammon saw that they reeked before David, the children of Ammon sent and hired the Syrians of Bethrehob and the Syrians of Zoba, twenty thousand footmen and a thousand men of king Maacah and twelve thousand men of Ishtob.
When the children of Ammon saw that they were become odious to David, the children of Ammon sent and hired the Syrians of Beht-Rechov, and the Syrians of Tzovah, twenty thousand footmen, and the king of Ma`akhah with one thousand men, and the men of Tov twelve thousand men.

When the people of Ammon saw that they had made themselves repulsive to David, the people of Ammon sent and hired the Syrians of Beth Rehob and the Syrians of Zoba, twenty thousand foot soldiers; and from the king of Maacah one thousand men, and from Ish-Tob twelve thousand men.

And when the people/citizens of Ammon saw that they 'had become malodorous'/stank before David, then as a result, the people of Ammon sent and hired {mercenaries} the Syrians/'Aram of Bethrehob/'Beyth R@chowb', and the Syrians/'Aram of Zoba . . . totally twenty thousand infantry/footmen . . . and also of king Maacah . . . a thousand men, {one of the smaller Syrian city-states} and of 'Iysh-Towb . . . twelve thousand men. {name means 'people of prosperity/good' - this is another Syrian city - a very wealthy and prosperous people} {Note: From the parallel passage at I Chronicles 19:6-8, we see the Ammonites and Syrians concentrated their 33,000 plus army at Medeba. But Joab and part of his army are going to Rabbah and hit them in the rear.} {Note: The timing of this is about 990BC.}

And when the children of Ammon saw that they were a stench before David, the children of Ammon sent and hired the Syrians of Bethrehob and the Syrians of Zoba, twenty thousand footmen, and of King Maacah a thousand men, and of Ishtob twelve thousand men.

When the children of Ammon saw that they were become odious to David, the children of Ammon sent and hired the Syrians of Beth Rehob, and the Syrians of Zobah, twenty thousand footmen, and the king of Maacah with one thousand men, and the men of Tob twelve thousand men.

And the Bene-Ammon see that they have been abhorred by David, and the Bene-Ammon send and hire Aram of Beth-Rehob, and Aram of Zoba, 20,000 footmen, and the king of Maacah with a thousand men, and Ish-Tob with 12,000 men.

The sons of Ammon realized that they had made a terrible mistake in offending David the way that they did, so they went and hired a number of mercenaries from Aram and elsewhere.

---

### 2Samuel 10:6a

<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>râ`ah (רָ֣עָה) [pronounced raw-AWH]</td>
<td>to see, to look, to look at, to view, to behold; to perceive, to understand, to learn, to know</td>
<td>3rd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7200 BDB #906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bên (בֵּן) [pronounced bane]</td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
<td>masculine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>`Ammôn (עַמּוֹן) [pronounced ỹahm-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.
2Samuel 10:6a

<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 ([kāy]) [pronounced kee]</td>
<td>for, that, because; when, at that time, which, what time</td>
<td>explanatory or temporal conjunction; preposition</td>
<td>Strong's #3588 BDB #471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bâ’ash (wawṣ) [pronounced baw-AHSH]</td>
<td>to make oneself odious, to become odious, to cause to stink, to become malodorous</td>
<td>3rd person plural, Niphal perfect</td>
<td>Strong's #887 BDB #92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b° ([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>Dâvid (p̄īȳ); also Dâviyd (p̄īȳd) [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: When the sons of Ammon saw that they had made themselves odious before David,... As we examined earlier, I have translated and so as when, which does not receive any support from my Hebrew grammar books, but is in line with many of the good translations (ACV, AKJV, BBE, ESV, HCSB, JPS, KJV, NET, NJB, RV, VW, WEB, among others).

This is an interesting statement, and we do not have any details here. Did the Ammonites have spies in Jerusalem and they figured out that David was preparing for war? Although the verb here can refer to cognition, it is also possible that this was observed visually, which is the primary meaning of this verb. Remember, what occurred in the previous couple of verses would have taken place over a month or two. Given all that we find in the Old Testament, it is likely they know this as a result of gathering intelligence, which would have come from the observation of spies. The Ammonites quickly figured out that this was a very bad move.

Now, how to deal with this situation? The quick and honorable solution would be for the state department to tell Hanun, “I believe we were wrong; we messed up here.” Then for Hanun to say, “I believe you are right; let me put together a set of emissaries with gifts for David and for the men we humiliated, and dispatch them immediately to Israel, in addition to a $500,000 tribute payment.” However, that would involve admitting blame; that would involve admitting to a mistake. They are too arrogant to do that.

Application: In the United States, the Community Reinvestment Act was passed, with the idea of providing more and more houses to the poor and disadvantaged. This was legislatively ramped up under Clinton, and put into effect under Bush (much of our government functions separately from the direct actions of the president). In place was the secondary mortgage market, known as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. These entities both made home loans possible and they stabilized the housing market. A mortgage company does not lend out $100,000 for a home and then hold on to that loan until it is paid up, and then loan it out again. They loan the money and then sell the loan to the secondary mortgage market, which then sells it to FNMA or FHLMC. FNMA and FHLMC set the standards for the mortgages which they will accept. A mortgage company is not going to make a mortgage to those who do not meet these standards because they could not sell their loan, and therefore, could not make a new loan (a mortgage company makes money on the initial fees of the loans it makes). All of a sudden, FNMA and FHLMC lowered their standards dramatically, as a result of the Community Reinvestment Act, and then various entities, supported by the government (like ACORN) began demanding that mortgage loans with these lesser qualifications be made. All of a sudden, millions of people who did not qualify for a mortgage before now qualified for a mortgage; they were being loaned money for houses that they could not afford (based upon the new governmental regulations), and this drove up housing prices dramatically. When these millions of new loans were not paid back, what was once the gold standard in investments—mortgage loans—took a nose dive, which infected pretty much every investment anyone had, including investments of banks, insurance companies, mutual
funds, etc., sending our economic system into a tailspin. None of this information is disputed. So, when was the last time you heard a government official stand up and say, “We screwed up. We thought that giving loans to the underprivileged would be a good thing, and we sent our economy into a tailspin because of this.” It is 2010, years after this has occurred, and I have not heard a single politician admit to this. So, Hanun does not admit to his error. His state department does not admit to its error. These fools screwed up their country, and some humility and some quick groveling action could solve their problem; and they refuse to do it. Just like politicians today, who forced banks and mortgage companies to take risky loans by their policies at FNMA and FHLMC.

2Sam. 10:6: When the sons of Ammon recognized that they had made themselves odious before David, they sent and hired 20,000 infantry from Aram of Beth-Rehob and Aram of Zobah, 1000 men from the king of Maacah and 12,000 men from Ishtob. Arrogant people act arrogantly and impulsively. Because they act out of arrogance, they do not think their actions through. As a result, they are unable to undo the stupid things that they do because they are still arrogant after doing the stupid things which result in their new predicament. Most of the time, they are unable to admit they have made a mistake because of their great arrogance.

The Results of Arrogant and Impulsive Actions

1. At best, arrogance can recognize that, after an impulsive act, they are in worse shape than they were originally. However, even with hindsight, arrogant people are still arrogant.
2. Therefore, many of the things which they do subsequently reflect this arrogance.
   1) The modern-day example of President Obama and his Stimulus Bill has been given. This was a great act of arrogance.
   2) The results of the Stimulus Act were not stimulative to the economy.
   3) In order to “solve” this problem, the administration began a propaganda campaign that the Stimulus Bill was now working.
3. Hanun and his state department realized that, David would not let this go. David would not simply say, “La de dah; obviously I should not send ambassadors to Ammon.”
4. If Ammon was paying tribute to David, and if that was part of the problem, now they are going to take a much higher percentage of the GNP and spend it on Aramean mercenaries.
5. Their arrogance caused them to do a stupid thing. They are still arrogant; therefore, they cannot easily turn around and fix what they messed up.
   1) President Obama, out of great arrogance, has made many economic decisions, all of which have turned out badly.
   2) As long as the President remains arrogant, he will not be able to solve the financial mess that we are in, which mess is exacerbated by his arrogance and incompetence.
   3) Similarly, because Hanun’s state department is still arrogant, they unable to come up with a plan which will solve their dilemma.
6. There is an actual solution here. The state department, when they came to their senses, should have realized, “We will all be killed, and so will our families and all of our friends and everyone in Ammon will be killed or enslaved.” Then, the correct solution would be to, resign as Hanun’s state department, and then to present themselves to David as his loyal slaves. In this way, they would have taken responsibility for their stupid decision to humiliate David’s ambassadors, and David would not have attacked Ammon. Such a solution would have been inexpensive, honorable and it would have saved their families and friends. However, when arrogance makes a bad decision, arrogance is unable to fix the results of that bad decision.
7. The arrogance of Hanun’s state department led to the impulsive act of abusing these ambassadors from Israel. This action is not related to reality. As a songwriter once wrote, “You don’t spit into the wind and you don’t step on Superman’s cape.”
8. Arrogance distorts reality. If Hanun and his state department refuse to view the world theater in a realistic way, then they cannot make good decisions.
9. It is much better to start out by making good decisions. The time to act out of humility and with good information is now, not after making a lot of stupid decisions.
   1) This is very true of the believer.
   2) God gives us the filling of the Holy Spirit and Bible doctrine so that we can make intelligent,
### The Results of Arrogant and Impulsive Actions

3) Humility and teachability are a result of the inculcation of Bible doctrine. We cannot make good decisions apart from Bible doctrine.

4) Most believers do stupid things today—not unlike what Hanun did—out of ignorance of doctrine or because they reject the authority of doctrine.

10. There is plenty of arrogance to go around in Ammon. The Ammonite population are also stimulated by their own arrogance. The sight of David’s ambassadors being paraded through the streets humiliated was probably a great source of amusement to them. It is likely that they talked about this for days.

11. At some point in time, the power and ferocity of Israel’s army would have come into their sphere of reality. At some point, they would think, “Hmmmm, maybe we ought to think about David’s army invading Ammon.”

12. In his great arrogance, Hanun, or members of the state department, probably figured, “We will just employ some Aramean mercs; they will help us defeat David’s army.” Arrogance continues to blind them to the cold, hard reality of David’s army being led by the Living God.

13. At some point, possibly in the midst of war with Israel, the king of Ammon will realize that he has bitten off more than he can chew; that his arrogant act will result in being a war that they cannot win.

14. These men should have recognized, “Even though David is collecting tribute [an assumption I have made], we are still quite prosperous. Why rock the boat?”

1) The poor in the United States have a great life. The biggest problem of the poor in America is obesity. They have no idea what the life of the poor outside of the United States is like.

2) The poor in America, if they act in arrogance, will vote more and more in opposition to big and small business, with the eventual result that, they will destroy the economy of the United States.

3) The poor who vote arrogantly, see the successful as their enemies.

4) Poor people who understand some modicum of truth, recognize that, when business does well, they do well.

5) Only a stupid person could think that, [here is a very contemporary issue] it is a good idea to raise taxes on oil companies because they make too much money. Such a person is not voting to reduce profits to oil companies, but to increase their own cost at the pump. It is like saying, “I am upset because gas costs nearly $5/gallon; I want to tax the oil companies so severely that they will have to charge me $7/gallon.”

15. The Ammonites were enjoying an extremely prosperous time in their history. Given Israel’s power but willingness to be at peace, it would make sense for Ammon to maintain a good relationship with Israel. Why screw up a good thing?

16. If you plan to commit violence, then you need to consider what you are doing first. You must be motivated by thought and not by emotion; you must know the facts and you need imagination to understand what could happen as a result. You need to think with divine viewpoint if you are a believer; and you need to function within the laws of divine establishment if you are an unbeliever. King Hanun needed one advisor to tell him, “Look, David is powerful; he is decisive. The decision of humiliating his ambassadors could result in the destruction of our capitol city, Rabbah. Do we want to take that chance?”

17. It is nearly impossible to back away from an impulsive act motivated by arrogance. When you want to push or push back, think about where this can lead and be willing to accept the consequences of your actions.

---

**Application:** When you screw things up because of arrogance, you need to fix things by approaching the solution with humility.
### 2Samuel 10:6b

<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>wa (or va) (א)</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>[pronounced wah]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 plural, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7971 BDB #1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced shaw-LAKH]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bên (בֵּן) [pronounced bane]</td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
<td>masculine plural</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʼAmmôwn (עָםִמּוֹן)</td>
<td>hidden; transliterated Ammon</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #5983 BDB #769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced ʼahm-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.

| wa (or va) (א)        | and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because | wâw consecutive | No Strong’s # BDB #253 |
| [pronounced wah]      |                         |                  |                          |
| sâkar (םָכָר) [pronounced saw-KAHR] | to hire; to recompense; to bribe | 3rd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect | Strong’s #7936 BDB #968 |
| [pronounced saw-KAHR] |                        |                  |                          |
| ʼèth (אָד) [pronounced ayth] | generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward | indicates that the following substantive is a direct object | Strong’s #853 BDB #84 |
| [pronounced ayth]     |                         |                  |                          |
| ʼĀram (אָרָם) [pronounced uh-RAHM] | the highland, high region; exalted; and is transliterated Aram; sometimes rendered Syria, Mesopotamia | proper noun, singular  | Strong’s #758 BDB #74 |
| [pronounced uh-RAHM] |                        | construct form   |                          |
| Bêyth Rechôwb (בֵּית רְכֹב) [pronounced beyth-reh-KHOHB'] | place [house] of street [market?]; house of Rehob; region of breadth; transliterated Beth-Rehob | proper singular noun/location | Strong’s #1050 BDB #112 |
| [pronounced beyth-reh-KHOHB'] |                       |                  |                          |
| w (or v) (ו)          | and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though | simple wâw conjunction | No Strong’s # BDB #251 |
| [pronounced weh]      |                         |                  |                          |
| ʼèth (אָד) [pronounced ayth] | generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward | indicates that the following substantive is a direct object | Strong’s #853 BDB #84 |
| [pronounced ayth]     |                         |                  |                          |
| ʼĀram (אָרָם) [pronounced uh-RAHM] | the highland, high region; exalted; and is transliterated Aram; sometimes rendered Syria, Mesopotamia | proper noun, singular  | Strong’s #758 BDB #74 |
| [pronounced uh-RAHM] |                        | construct        |                          |
| Tsôwbâh (תָּם) [pronounced tzohb-VAW] | transliterated Zobah | Proper noun, territory | Strong’s #6678 BDB #844 |
| [pronounced tzohb-VAW] |                        |                  |                          |
Translation: ...they [lit., Bene-Ammon] sent and hired 20,000 infantry [from] Aram of Beth-Rehob and Aram of Zobah,...  First off, I want you to notice the word hired.  The Hebrew verb here is the Qal imperfect of sâkar (עָכָר) [pronounced saw-KAHR], which means to hire; to recompense; to bribe.  Strong’s #7936  BDB #968.  As I have already suggested, the Ammonites were probably already paying some sort of tribute to David, and this had been set up between David and Nahash, and this was a friendly agreement.  David did not squeeze Nahash, as they had a good relationship.  This would have been standard operating procedure for this time period.  However, Nahash’s arrogant son, Hanun, an ass of a man, most certainly broke off this arrangement in his treatment of David’s ambassadors.  Now, it is going to cost the country of Ammon a lot more money to hire mercenaries from Aram and elsewhere, so this arrogant move did not save them any money.

Now, why does God the Holy Spirit not mention the money?  The key issue here is the way Hanun treated David’s ambassadors.  As I suggested, there was tribute paid to Israel from Ammon (2Sam. 8:11–12).  Whether this is a gloss, and comes about because of 2Sam. 10 or whether it simply indicates that Nahash was paying tribute to David (which is what I believe to be the case), the money is not the issue to David.  The money is not the issue to God the Holy Spirit.  The issue is, David is God’s man.  His ambassadors represent him.  They came into Ammon on a goodwill mission.  They were doing nothing untoward.  And Hanun, in his great arrogance, treats them deplorably.  This will cost Ammon a lot.  What they pay for in mercenary soldiers is only a part of what this will cost them.

Application: What you do when motivated by arrogance has long-term effects; your initial losses may not be all that you lose.

It is doubtful that Hanun or anyone in his state department suddenly said, “We really screwed up.  What can we do to fix this?”  Had they been able to admit to their stupid, arrogant act, they might have been able to repair the damage.  Hanun should have gathered up every dime in his kingdom, put someone else in charge, and rode to Israel as quickly as possible with this money, bringing with him his state department, with the provision that David could do to them whatever he wanted, which would include execution if necessary.  This would have saved his country.  But, as already discussed, arrogance is unable to see things clearly.  Arrogance is unable to own up to its mistakes, arrogance is unable to be humble.

Option #2: make an alliance with the greatest army in the world at that time.  Well, not an alliance exactly; Hanun purchases mercenaries from the greatest army in the world.  The imperfect tense of the verb to hire indicates that this was a process.  They did not go to one king in Syria and say, “Here’s the money; how many soldiers can we purchase with this?”  They went throughout the Syrian empire, talking to various kings, purchasing a 1000 soldiers from here, 10,000 from there.  I once worked as a realtor, and when a commission was paid, I got half of it and my broker got half of it.  As a new agent, I did not think that was fair; and as I learned more and more about the business, the more I appreciated my broker.  What probably happened here is, Hanun’s ambassadors would work out a deal with an individual king.  The king would then send in some of his men, who might or might not be paid at that time.  Once the job had been completed, then the soldiers or their families would be paid (their families
would possibly be paid if the soldier died in battle). However, the king probably kept half of the money. That was his cut as the broker. You may think that is unfair, but who paid to train these men? Who kept the Aramæan army organized? The king had his expenses and his own risks, so half the money was probably his share.

According to R. B. Thieme, Jr., the only people who were as tough as the Syrians were the Dorians, who are described in history as *tall blonde blue-eyed ox-eating Greeks*. They would be organized under Alexander the Great and conquer the world.²⁴

Ammon went to the largest empire near to them—Aram (called Syria by the Greeks).

This map shows us where Rehob and Maacah are, the general direction of Zobah and the location of Damascus in Syria. This map does not take in all of Aram, which stretches almost to the Euphrates River (see 2Sam. 8:3).

Hiring these mercenaries was not an easy thing. It is not clear whether the Ammonites made all of the stops themselves or whether this was negotiated in Damascus. Since all of these places are cited in our passage, I suspect that initial negotiations take place in Damascus, but that Ammon’s delegation made separate agreements with these other states (which is why they are listed separately in our text).

Chapter Outline

We know very little about Beth-Rehob

Aram of Beth-Rehob

1. The Syrian empire, at this time, appears to be broken down into a number of city-states, not unlike the Philistines, which we have dealt with in more detail.

²⁴ These notes are taken from R. B. Thieme Jr.’s 1972 David series #631 Lesson #219. This is not necessarily an exact quotation. Bob has used that description of the Dorians several times in the past, so that is probably pulled from some ancient document which he studied.
Aram of Beth-Rehob

2. The name Beth-Rehob means house of streets.
3. When the original Jewish spies checked out the land, it appears that they went as far north as Rehob (Num. 13:21). Some have suggested that this is the same place.
4. When the tribe of Dan decided that they inherited land that was too difficult for them to control, they moved north and wiped out of peaceful people in Laish, a city north of Israel and apparently not too far from Beth-Rehob. Judges 18:28
5. The site of the town is unknown. It has been conjecturally identified with Hunin, West of Banias, and, more plausibly, with Banias itself (Thomson, The Land and the Book (2), 218; Buhl, Geog., 240; Moore, ICC, Jgs, 399).¹
6. Clarke places them at the extremity of the valley between the Lebanon and Antilebanon mountains.²
7. It seems very unlike that this is identical to Mesopotamia, which is named in 1Chron. 19:6 (the parallel passage, which reads: And when the children of Ammon saw that they had made themselves odious to David, Hanun and the children of Ammon sent a thousand talents of silver to hire them chariots and horsemen out of Mesopotamia, and out of Aram-Maachah, and out of Zobah). ¹) Mesopotamia is quite a distance east from there, which would have required a northerly and then easterly route for the Ammonites, in order to avoid the desert. ²) Furthermore, in 2Sam. 8, David kept Aram from expanding in that direction.

¹ The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia; James Orr, Editor; ©1956 Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.; © by Hendrickson Publishers; from E-Sword; Topic: Beth-Rehob.
² Adam Clarke, Commentary on the Bible; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 10:6.

The Doctrine of Zobah was taken from 1Chron. 18 (PDF document)

Zobah, as a kingdom, was a significant enemy of Israel’s during the monarchy of the unified kingdom. It is located northeast of Israel, although its exact location is disputed (see geography under the ISBE reference).

The Doctrine of Zobah

1. Zobah appears to have been an independent country northeast of Israel, which eventually allied itself with Aram (Syria) or was conquered by the Syrians. Smith suggests that this was an independent portion of the Syrian kingdom during the reigns of Saul, David and Solomon.
2. Easton describes it as a Syrian province or kingdom to the south of Coele-Syria, and extending from the eastern slopes of Lebanon north and east toward the Euphrates.
3. We first hear of Zobah when Saul’s military victories are spoken of in 1Sam. 14:47. These were victories over Moab, Ammon, Edom, Zobah, and Philistia.
4. Zobah is not mentioned again until our passage (and the parallel passage in 2Sam. 8:3–6) where David defeats Hadadezer, king of Zobah, which expanded Israel’s borders as far as the Euphrates River. David decimated Hadadezer’s army, wiping out its armor division along with 10’s of 1000’s of soldiers. 1Chron. 18:3–4
5. Syrians from Damascus joined in the fray, and David defeated them as well. 2Sam. 8:5–6 1Chron. 18:5–6
6. In this war, David scored big time against Hadadezer, carrying away shields of gold, and other articles of silver, gold and bronze. 2Sam. 8:7–8, 11–12 1Chron. 18:7–8, 10–11
7. David became allied with Toi, King of Hamath, because David defeated Hadadezer, King of Zobah. 2Sam. 8:9–10 1Chron. 18:9–10
8. When we get to 2Sam. 10, the writer speaks of the Syrians of Zobah. My first impression was, the Syrians took over this area after David defeated Hadadezer. However, Hadadezer is mentioned by name in 1Kings 11:23. This suggests that Zobah is a region, and that, at some point in time, the Syrians had control over a portion of that region so as to be identified with it. It could be that Zobah was always an
The Doctrine of Zobah

Aramæan kingdom, but not specifically identified until 2Sam. 10. In any case, David defeats a large coalition of enemy forces (Aram, Zobah, Ammon, along with enemies from Bethrehob, Ishtob and Maacah). ISBE nicely describes this war: During David's Ammonite war, the enemy was strengthened by alliance with Zobah, Maacah and Beth-rehob, and Israel was attacked from both North and South at the same time. The northern confederation was defeated by Joab, but Hadadezer again gathered an army, including levies from beyond the Euphrates. These, under Shobach the captain of the host, were met by David in person at Helam, and a great slaughter ensued, Shobach himself being among the slain (2Sa_10:6-19, the King James Version "Zoba"; 1 Ch 19:3-19). 2Sam. 10 1Chron. 19

ISBE adds: The kingdom of Zobah in addition to its mineral wealth must have been rich in vineyards and fruitful fields, and its conquest must have added greatly to the wealth and power of Israel's king.

Psalm 60 appears to have been composed after David defeated Aram-zobah (2Sam. 10) and Edom (2Sam. 8). Psalm 60 inscription

During the time of Solomon, Rezon, a fugitive from Hadadezer, established himself as king of Damascus and was a problem for Solomon, David's son,. He was a man who loathed Israel. 1Kings 11:23–25

In 2Chron. 8, Solomon goes up ot Hamath-zobah and takes it (this is the only time it is called by this name in the Bible). He also rebuilds cities given to him by Hiram; so, under Solomon, there is a northward expansion; however, it does not appear as though this area was conquered by warfare (except, indirectly by David’s wars). Zobah is never mentioned again after this passage. ISBE suggests that, by the time of the writing of Chronicles, the distinction between Hamath and Zobah had faded, so that this reference simply refers to the northern territory taken in by Solomon. See the map below:

Smith: 2Chron. 8:3...is the last that we hear of Zobah in Scripture. The name however, is found at a later date in the inscriptions of Assyria, where the kingdom of Zobah seems to intervene between Hamath and Damascus

Some additional material culled from:
M.G. Easton M.A., D.D., Illustrated Bible Dictionary; 1897; from e-Sword, topic: Zobah.
The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia; James Orr, Editor; ©1956 Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.; © by Hendrickson Publishers; from E-Sword; Topics: Hamath-zobah, Zobah.
Dr. William Smith, Smith’s Bible Dictionary; 1894; from e-Sword, topic: Zobah.
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Map of the Kingdoms of Saul, David and Solomon

To help explain that final point in the doctrine of Zobah, the pinkish area at the top is Hamath-zobah, an area taken over by Solomon in 2Chron. 8.

You will see that Edom, Moab and Ammon are separate territories enclosed in purple (David's kingdom), which indicates that David gave them some autonomy, but collected tribute (taxes) from them.

Also placed in 1Chron. 18 (PDF document)

Graphic from: http://biblenews1.com/maps/DavidKingdom.gif
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Charts, Maps and Short Doctrines

So, because of Hanun’s dumb-ass move, Ammon went north to Syria and purchased 20,000 mercenaries from Aram of Beth-Rehob and Aram of Zobah.

<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>w̄ (or v̄) (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>ʾeth (אית)</td>
<td>generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward</td>
<td>indicates that the following substantive is a</td>
<td>Strong’s #853 BDB #84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melek (מלך)</td>
<td>king, ruler, prince</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #4428 BDB #572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maʿakāh (מאתakah)</td>
<td>depression; oppression, pressed [lit., she has pressed]; and is transliterated Maacah</td>
<td>feminine singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #4601 BDB #590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2Samuel 10:6c

<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>'eleph (אֵלֶף) [pronounced EH-lef]</td>
<td>thousand, family, (500?); military unit</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #505 (and #504) BDB #48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>îysh (יִשָּׁה) [pronounced eesh]</td>
<td>a man; a husband; one of virile age; an inhabitant of, a citizen of [when followed by a genitive of a place]; companion of, soldier of, follower of [when followed by a genitive of king, leader, etc.]; anyone, someone, a certain one, each, each one, everyone</td>
<td>masculine singular noun (sometimes found where we would use a plural)</td>
<td>Strong’s #376 BDB #35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...1000 men [from] the king of Maacah... Although Maacah was a piece or property which was once under the control of Manasseh, it fell into the hands of the Syrians, although we do not know how. In any case, when the Jews conquered the land, and Reuben, Gad and Manasseh took the land east of the Jordan, they apparently allowed the people of that area (the Maachathites) to live (Deut. 3:13–14  Joshua 12:5  13:11).

Fausset probably gives us the best description of Maacah: *Abel–beth–Maacah was not in it, but in Israel; in the direction of Maacah, and somehow connected with it (2Sam. 20:14–16). A small kingdom outside Argob (Deut. 3:14), and Bashan (Joshua 12:5). Between Bashan and the kingdom of Damascus, on the skirts of Mount Hermon, east of the Lejah. The mention of Maacah with the Geshurites points to a connection between them; probably by affinity, as the Geshurite Talmai's daughter bears the name Maacah. Both were connected with Syria (1Chron. 19:6–7; 2Sam. 10:6; 2Sam. 10:8). The king of Maacah was Ammon's ally against David; his small contingent, 1,000 men, shows the pettiness of the region.25*

Maacah is on the other side of the Jordan, near the territory of Gilead (Deut. 3:14). They were allowed to remain in this area for many years, since Israel conquered that territory (Joshua 13:13). Since they are functioning as a separate military unit here, they have obviously broken away from Israel and allied with or under the control of Aram.

There is an odd connection found in 1Chron. 4:19: *The sons of the wife of Hodiah, the sister of Naham, were the fathers of Keilah the Garmite and Eshtemoa the Maacathite.* 1Chron. 4 deals with the line of Judah, but this particular portion of the line (1Chron. 4:8–20) is not exactly clear as to how it is tied to Judah (see *the Sons of Judah*, a chart in 1chron. 4). The Jews conquered the land about 400 years after Judah. This suggests either some intermarriage or that the Maacathites were 2nd cousins to the Jews.

In any case, the Ammonites were able to hire 1000 mercenaries from Maacah.

### 2Samuel 10:6d

<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 (ו commande) (1, 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 10:6d

<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>יִשָּׁשׁ ([pronounced eesh])</td>
<td>a man; a husband; one of virile age; an inhabitant of, a citizen of [when followed by a genitive of a place]; companion of, soldier of, follower of [when followed by a genitive of king, leader, etc.]; anyone, someone, a certain one, each, each one, everyone</td>
<td>masculine singular construct (sometimes found where we would use a plural)</td>
<td>Strong’s #376 BDB #35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְהוּב ([pronounced tohv])</td>
<td>pleasant, pleasing, agreeable, good, better; approved</td>
<td>masculine feminine singular adjective which can act like a substantive</td>
<td>Strong’s #2896 BDB #373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two previous words are joined together by a māqqēf, which is a high, short horizontal stroke which connects two words together, making them function as one. Therefore, this should be taken as one word, standing for one place (city, state or country), which gives us the following word:

| יִשָּׁשׁ-יְהוּב ([pronounced eesh-TOHv]) | man of Tob and is transliterated Ishtob | masculine singular proper noun: | Strong’s #382 BDB #36 |
| השנְּאָם ([pronounced sh-ANAM]) | two, two of, a pair of, a duo of | dual numeral construct | Strong’s #8147 BDB #1040 |

This is followed by a māqqēf, ([pronounced mahk-KAHF], which is a high, short, horizontal stroke which connects two words together, making them function as one, and they are, therefore, pronounced as one word.

| יָאָשׁ ([pronounced gaw-SAWR]) | ten; –teen [resulting in numbers 11–19] | masculine/feminine singular noun | Strong’s #6240 BDB #797 |
| יֵלֶלֶף ([pronounced EL-lef]) | thousand, family, (500?); military unit | masculine singular construct | Strong’s #505 (and #504) BDB #48 |

| יִשָּׁשׁ ([pronounced eesh]) | a man; a husband; one of virile age; an inhabitant of, a citizen of [when followed by a genitive of a place]; companion of, soldier of, follower of [when followed by a genitive of king, leader, etc.]; anyone, someone, a certain one, each, each one, everyone | masculine singular noun (sometimes found where we would use a plural) | Strong’s #376 BDB #35 |

**Translation:** ...and 12,000 men [from] Ishtob. Another 12,000 soldiers were hired from Ishtob (or, from the men of Tob).

*Ish-Tob simply means men of Tob.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>Ishtob was probably equivalent to Tob, which is where Jephthah fled from the cruelty of his brothers. It was situated in the land of Gilead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>A district on the east of Jordan, about 13 miles south–east of the Sea of Galilee, to which Jephthah fled from his brethren (Judges 11:3, Judges 11:5). It was on the northern boundary of Perea, between Syria and the land of Ammon (2Sam. 10:6, 2Sam. 10:8). Its modern name is Taiyibeh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fausset</td>
<td>Tob means &quot;good&quot;. Where Jephthah was expelled by his stepbrothers; here he gathered to him a band of freebooters; from Tob the elders of Gilead brought him to oppose Ammon. Toward the desert E. of Gilead. Ish-tob, i.e. the men of Tob, supported the Ammonites against David (2Sam. 10:6; 2Sam. 10:8). Ptolemy (Geogr. v. 19) mentions a Thauba S.W. of Zobah, probably N.E. of Ammon. There is a Tell Dobbe or Dibbe, a ruined site south of the Lejah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBE</td>
<td>It was to Tob that Jephthah escaped from his brethren after his father's death (Judges 11:3), and perfected himself in the art of war, making forays with “the vain fellows” who joined him. Here the elders of Gilead found him, when, reduced to dire straits by the children of Ammon, they desired him to take command of their army (Judges 11:5 ff). This country contributed 12,000 men to the forces of the allies, who with the Ammonites were defeated by Israel (2Sam. 10:8). In 1Macc 5:13 we read of the land of Tubins where the Jews, about 1,000 men, were slain by the Gentiles, their wives and children being carried into captivity. The Tubieni, “men of Tobit” of 2Macc 12:17, were probably from this place. Ptolemy (v. 19) speaks of Thauba, a place to the Southwest of Zobah, which may possibly be Tobit. The Talmud (Neubauer, Geog. du Talmud, 239) identifies the land of Tobit with the district of Hippene. Tobit would then be represented by Hippos, modern Susi-yeh, to the Southwest of Fik on the plateau East of the Sea of Galilee. Perhaps the most likely identification is that supported by G. A. Smith (HGHL, 587), with et–Taiyibeh, 10 miles South of Umm Keis (Gadara). The name is the same in meaning as Tobit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>A place in which Jephthah took refuge, when expelled from home, by his half–brother, Judges 11:3, and where he remained, at the head of a band of freebooters, till he was brought back, by the sheikhs of Gilead. Judges 11:5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hanun went all over in order to contract mercenaries.

**Chapter Outline**

Hanun of Ammon was able to hire 12,000 mercenaries from Tob. Altogether, this is a 33,000 man Aramaean army to supplement their own army. This is not a huge army. David had already captured 20,000 infantrymen from

---
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Hadaezer in 2Sam. 8:3–4 and when the Syrians sent backup to help David, he killed 22,000 of them (2Sam. 8:5), so even if you know little or nothing about military movements, we know that Ammon has purchased an army which is small. Every country has an upper limit of what they can spend. We may reasonably assume that the Ammonites did not spend every last dime on an army. However, based upon their own G2, they determined that this is a force which should be able to withstand the Jewish army and yet not completely destroy their economy.

In 1Chron. 19:6, we find that a 1000 talents of silver was spent in order to hire an army from Naharaim, Maacah and Zobah, city-states of Syria. According to the CEV Bible, this is 30 tons of silver (the ERV version has this as 75,000 pounds, which is about 37.5 tons; the GNB has nearly 40 tons of silver). Let’s go with the 75,000 pounds of silver and look at it from a 2010 perspective: today’s spot price of silver is $17/ounce. The value of silver is relative to an economy, so in our day and time, this would be $20.4 million dollars for 75,000 lbs. of silver. This tells us 2 things: hiring a mercenary at that time was relatively cheap (although, bear in mind, this will be essentially for one battle) and Ammon was reasonably wealthy. Essentially, they were paying these mercenaries about $600 each for going to war for a month or two. As Americans, this may seem to be ridiculously low; however, in many countries, where people make $100–600/year (over half the world in 2000 lived on $2 or less per day), $600 for a month or two of work is quite reasonable. No doubt, this was split with the nation of Aram, so each soldier probably pocketed half that.

As I have mentioned earlier, the choices which the Ammonites make here are very short-sighted. They were probably paying tribute to David for probably much less than this Aramaean army cost, and they lived in peace. It is also worth noting that, the Ammonites, despite paying tribute to David, were financially well off, since they are able to afford to pay $20 million to Aram for an army. This is blessing by association, that they could amass this wealth; they were blessed in their association with David. However, this will turn into be cursing by association because they have turned against the Jews and will now associate themselves with Aram.

**Application:** We in the United States are in a precarious economic situation, and we are here because of our own personal greed and because of the failure of our leaders to guide us toward responsible stewardship. I write this in 2010, and we are presently going through a mild recession (although, the leadership of our country has proclaimed this the greatest economic disaster since the Great Depression). The solutions to our recession are quite simple: Cut government spending by a third (except for the military), reimpose taxes on those who are not paying taxes, and reduce the taxes on the those who are paying the most. We have leaders who are too arrogant to know what to do. They have their own economic theories and their own predispositions, and fiscal responsibility and a shared tax revenue (to be taken from the poor as well as from the rich) is anathema to them.

**Application:** One historical question which haunted me for decades was the cause of the Great Depression. I wondered, *what exactly took us to this place where our nation suffered such a great depression?* The mistake in my thinking was my initial question. I had been led to believe, in all of my schooling, that somehow, we fell into this great depression, and that Franklin Delano Roosevelt saved us. It never occurred to me that the Great Depression was directly related to the government instituting a bunch of programs which did not make things better, but made things worse. There were not this handful of things which caused the Great Depression; what happened was, we went into an economic tailspin and government policies managed to keep us in an economic tailspin.

Do you see the price of arrogance here to Ammon? Hanun’s state department is arrogant, so they push to get Hanun to listen to them, to heed their advice. Hanun wants to be a popular king and to arrogantly show off his strength, so he goes along with his state department. The end result is, he will pay out far more money for mercenaries that will do Ammon no good; and, within a few years, his people will be defeated in battle and poor, because of how much they paid to Aram.

**Application:** One of the worst mental attitudes that a national leader can possess is arrogance. As I write this, the two national leaders of North Korea and Iran are quite odious in this regard. It is very likely that Iran will wake up one morning to a pummeling of aircraft bombing, which will kill hundreds of thousands of people, and all because of one arrogant little man. However, we need not look that far out into the world; the President of the
United States seems to be extremely arrogant, thinking that he knows about things with which he has absolutely no experience (like the free market). When a leader is arrogant, there is a price to be paid.

**Application:** The Bible tells us that we get the leaders that we deserve. In the United States, it is even more apparent, as we elect our president. We as a country looked at this self-righteous, arrogant man, and chose him over a man of much greater humility; so we deserve the leader we have. We heard promises which, had we given them any thought, would have been obviously illogical, but we chose to believe them. The actions of King Hanun and President Barrack Obama are quite different, but they proceed from a mental attitude of arrogance; and we will pay, just as the Ammonite people paid. As arrogant people, we deserve the arrogant leader that we have.

Do not disassociate the people of Ammon from their leader, King Hanun. He is a reflection of his people. He cannot take the approach that he takes if his people do not support him. However, these people do not respond with, “Fight the Jews? But the Jews are a good and righteous people; and they have a brilliant general as their king.” They go along with their king, many of them having the same opinion which is shared by Hanun’s state department. Hanun’s arrogant state department said just the opposite, and this seemed right and good to Hanun himself, and the people joined with them (you cannot man an army without people).

There are some differences between the Samuel and the Chronicles passages. Bear in mind that the writer of Chronicles had the Samuel passage and other historical material before him when writing Chronicles. Therefore, in the mind of the chronicler, there is no contradiction between the text of Samuel which he had and the facts.

There is always the option that the Samuel text which we have is faulty, which is not out of the question.

### Explaining the Differences between 2Samuel 10:6 and 1Chronicles 19:6–7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Sam. 10:6</th>
<th>1Chron. 19:6–7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And the sons of Ammon saw that they were odious to David. And the sons of Ammon sent and hired Syrians from Beth-rehob, and Syrians from Zobah, 20,000 footmen; and the king of Maacah with a 1000 men; and the men of Tob with 12,000 men.</td>
<td>And the Ammonites saw that they had made themselves odious to David; and Hanun and the Ammonites sent a 1000 talents of silver [≈ 75,000 lbs.] in order to hire to themselves chariots and horsemen from Syria of Naharaim [= Mesopotamia] and Syria of Maachah and from Zobah. And they hired 32,000 chariots to themselves, and the king of Maachah and his people. And they came in and pitched before Medeba; and the Ammonites had gathered out of their cities and had come to the battle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The numbers and types of soldiers</td>
<td>The numbers and types of soldiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 footmen; and the king of Maacah with a 1000 men; and the men of Tob with 12,000 men.</td>
<td>And they hired 32,000 chariots to themselves, and the king of Maachah and his people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fact that 20,000 + 12,000 = 32,000 means nothing. Both foot soldiers and chariots were hired.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities, areas</td>
<td>Cities, areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth-rehob, Zobah, Maacah, and Ishtob.</td>
<td>Mesopotamia, Maacah and Zobah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesopotamia is also translated Aram-Naharaim (Aram of the 2 rivers), and could simply refer to eastern Aram. Aram appears to be a loose confederation of city-states, not unlike the Philistine empire. The difference of the cities and areas named has to do with what was hired from them. Foot soldiers were hired from the cities named in 2Sam. 10:6 and chariots (and the commanding general) were hired from the cities named in 1Chron. 19:6–7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1Chron. 19:7 gives us an interesting additional fact. When hiring so many mercenaries who are going to function as a separate unit from the Ammonites, you need a commanding officer; so it appears as though the king of Maacah was hired in order to perform this function.

And so hears David and so he sends Joab and a whole the army the mighty ones. 

When David heard, he dispatched Joab and the whole army—the elite force [lit., the mighty ones].

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>And when David heard this, he sent Joab and the whole army of warriors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masoretic Text (Hebrew)</td>
<td>And so hears David and so he sends Joab and a whole the army the mighty ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshitta (Syriac)</td>
<td>And when David heard of it, he sent Joab and all the host of the mighty men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septuagint (Greek)</td>
<td>And David heard, and sent Joab and all of his army, [even] the mighty men.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences:** Both the English translation and the Syriac add pronouns after heard, which could just reflect the translation rather than the original (most of the English translations add something along these same lines).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEV</td>
<td>David heard what they had done, and he sent out Joab with all of his well-trained soldiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy English (Pocock)</td>
<td>David heard about this. So he sent Joab and the whole *Israelite army to fight them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-Read Version</td>
<td>David heard about this. So he sent Joab and the whole army of powerful men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good News Bible (TEV)</td>
<td>David heard of it and sent Joab against them with the whole army.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Message</td>
<td>When David heard of this, he dispatched Joab with his strongest fighters in full force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life Bible</td>
<td>When David heard about it, he sent Joab and all the army of the powerful men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Living Translation</td>
<td>When David heard about this, he sent Joab and all his warriors to fight them.</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>And when David heard about this, he sent Joab and all his best soldiers there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God’s Word™</td>
<td>After David heard about this, he sent Joab and all the elite troops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New American Bible</td>
<td>On learning this, David sent out Joab with the entire levy of trained soldiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRV</td>
<td>David heard about it. So he sent Joab out with the entire army of Israel's fighting men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jerusalem Bible</td>
<td>When David heard this, he sent Joab with the whole army, the champions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised English Bible</td>
<td>When this was reported to David, he sent Joab out with all the fighting men.</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>And hearing of this, David sent Joab and all the army and the best fighting-men.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On learning this, David sent out Joab and the whole army—including the professional fighters.

And David heard of it, and he sent Joab, and the entire host of the mighty warriors.

When David heard the news, he sent Joab and the entire army to meet them [The words "the news" and "to meet them" are supplied in the translation for stylistic reasons and for clarification.].

On hearing this, David sent Joab out with the entire army of fighting men.

When David heard of it, he sent Joab and all the army of heroes,...

...and David hears and sends Yah Ab and all the host of the mighty:.

And David heard, and he sent Joab and all the army, the mighty men.

Consequently when David heard of it {a G2 summary report - on Rabah concentration}, he dispatched Joab, and all the army/host {means the new recruits} {sent the new recruits to give them experience, with the elite ranger battalions} including the mighty men {the elite forces}. {from I Chronicles 19:8 we see this is Joab leading all the recruits plus the 'most experienced troops' - like the Army rangers today}.

And David hears, and he sends Joab and all the host [= army]—the mighty men.

When David found out through his military intelligence that the Ammonites were hiring soldiers from Aram, he sent Joab with the Israeli army, along with the elite troops.

<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>shâma (ψϯ)</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 imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #8085 BDB #1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid (David)</td>
<td>beloved and is transliterated David</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1732 BDB #187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ammonites did not send David a telegram saying, “We just hired a small Syrian army; what are you going to do about it?” It is clear that David had a G2 (intelligence) force functioning in and around Ammon, particularly because of the absolutely boorish behavior of the Ammonites. David probably has a rough headcount of the Syrian army which the Ammonites hired; however, his G2 will not know the exact movement of this army.
### 2Samuel 10:7b

<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>wa (or va) (י) [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>šâlach (שָלָךְ) [pronounced shaw-LAKH]</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>’êth (אֶת) [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>Yôwâb (יֹוָב) [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>w (or v) (י 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>’êth (אֶת) [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>kôl (קֹל) [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>tsâbâ (תֶבָא) [pronounced tsaw’-VAW]</td>
<td>army, war, or warfare</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #6635 DB #838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gibbôwr (גִּבּוֹר) [pronounced gib-BOAR]</td>
<td>strong man, mighty man, soldier, warrior, combatant, veteran</td>
<td>masculine plural noun/adjective; with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #1368 BDB #150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...he dispatched Joab and the whole army—the elite force [lit., the mighty ones]. We have to read the entirely of this verse to understand what is being done. David has not summoned every single man from his army and sent them to Ammon under Joab. David has an elite force (like the Army Rangers or the Navy Seals) and he puts them under Joab’s command and sends them to Ammon.

This is the first mention of David’s elite force. The way that this is written seems to indicate that Joab is not commanding the entire army of Israel, but a particular branch of the army, called the elite force. It was certainly larger than those named in 1Chron. 11, but it was not all of Israel. In 2Sam. 10:17, we will have a gathering of almost all the men of Israel. Right here, we have a subset of the army; possibly most or all of the active servicemen; but in v. 17, David will call in the reserves, going to war against Aram is a whole new level of war.

These men may have been David’s lifers or those who had distinguished themselves above and beyond the others. There was, apparently, universal military service in Israel, and there were those who remained in the armed forces for much of their lives and those who were in the reserves and were called out for great wars (as they will be when David takes on the entire Aramæan army). In any case, it is clear that this is not a small force, because they will go up against the Aramæan mercenaries. Incidentally, Bob Thieme Jr. had a lot of interesting things to say about elite forces and how we misuse our elite forces in the United States (this is lesson #220 of the David series, if you are interested).
At this point, we ought to take a look at 1Chron. 11:10–47, where God the Holy Spirit gives us a list of David’s mighty men, his elite corps (there is a similar listing in 2Sam. 23:8–39). Throughout Israel’s history, there were probably thousands of men who involved themselves in social good. They may have helped little old ladies harvest the corners of the grain fields, in order to make sure they had enough to eat. They may have helped out the new resident to Israel, from a foreign land, and got him a job and helped him find a place to live. But, what names are recorded in the Bible? The names of David’s greatest warriors; the men who bravely went out and killed the enemies of Israel. God the Holy Spirit inspired the writers of Scripture to write these men’s names down in the Word of God, where they will stand forever.

Our passage reads: *When David heard, he dispatched Joab and the whole army—the elite force* [lit., *the mighty ones*]. Now, you may think that this is overreacting. You may think that Israel needs to have a more humble response, or, at the very least, an equivalent response.

### Why Not a More Measured Response to Ammon?

1. In this time of political correctness and diplomacy, we look at David’s response here, and ask ourselves, *why not a more measured response to Hanun? Why an all-out war against Ammon?*
2. Previously, David was allied with Ammon, as he was with Moab.
3. It is possible that Israel received some tribute from either or both of these nations.
4. When Hanun ben Nahash humiliates David’s messengers, that is equivalent to declaring was upon Israel.
5. The state department Ammon was fully aware of this and, therefore, they contracted mercenaries from Aram to assist them.
6. David’s not burning bridges here or overreacting.
7. We know this by 2Sam. 17:27–29. David has been forced out of Jerusalem by Absalom so he and those who are loyal to him are now east of the Jordan in a forced march. Now, keeping in mind that this is not but a few years later, 2Sam. 17:27–29 reads: *When David came to Mahanaim, Shobi the son of Nahash from Rabbah of the Ammonites,* and Machir the son of Ammiel from Lo-debar, and Barzillai the Gileadite from Rogelim, brought beds, basins, and earthen vessels, wheat, barley, flour, parched grain, beans and lentils, honey and curds and sheep and cheese from the herd, for David and the people with him to eat, for they said, “The people are hungry and weary and thirsty in the wilderness.”
8. At least this son of Nahash understood David’s relationship to his father and, despite David’s full-on attack in this chapter and the next against Rabbah, Shobi ben Nahash comes to provide David’s people with food, water and necessities.
9. Most enemies respect strength and power; they do not respect diplomacy.
10. We have had a recent example of this: Israel, on September 6, 2007, made a surprise attack on Syria’s al-Kibar nuclear facility. It was believed that this was a nuclear facility which was related to North Korea. As a result, Syria and North Korea are not making deals and exchanging information on the building of nuclear plants. We have been in negotiations with Iran for the past half decade or so, without any good results. Iran continues to build several nuclear sites. My point being, David’s response to Hanun is reasonable, and not just for his time. David took the measure of this man and acted appropriately.
11. David and his people and his army are nearly helpless here in the Transjordanian desert. Ammon could have mounted up a revenge attack. However, David, both because of his relationship to Nahash and his tough-as-nails response to Hanun’s disrespect, has the respect of Shobi, another of Nahash’s sons.

As we ought to expect, the Word of God has application which continues even into our time.
And so go out Bene-Ammon and so they arrange in order a battle [at] an opening of the gate. And Aram of Zobah and Rehob and Ishtob and Maacah to themselves in the field.  

Then Bene-Ammon comes out and they arrange [themselves] in battle array at the entrance of the [city] gate. Meanwhile [lit., and], Aram of Zobah and [Aram] of Rehob, Ishtob and Maacah [were] by themselves in the field.

Then the soldiers of Ammon came out and deployed in battle array at the city gate entrance. Meanwhile, the Aramaean soldiers from Zobah, Rehob, Ishtob and Maacah were stationed by themselves hidden in the field [south of Joab's men].

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

- **Latin Vulgate**
  And the children of Ammon came out, and set their men in array at the entering in of the gate: but the Syrians of Soba, and of Rohob, and of Istob, and of Maacha were by themselves in the field.

- **Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**
  And so go out Bene-Ammon and so they arrange in order a battle [at] an opening of the gate. And Aram of Zobah and Rehob and Ishtob and Maacah to themselves in the field.

- **Peshitta (Syriac)**
  And the Ammonites came out and set their men in battle array at the entrance of the gate of Edom the son of Rehob; and the forces of Aram the son of Zobah and Ish-tob and Maacah were by themselves in the field.

- **Septuagint (Greek)**
  And the children of Ammon went forth, and set the battle in array by the door of the gate. [Those of] Syria — Zobah, Rehob, Ish-Tob, and Amelek, [being] by themselves in the field.

**Significant differences:** The English translation from the Syriac adds son of to Zobah.

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

- **CEV**
  The Ammonite troops came out and got ready to fight in front of the gate to their city. The Arameans from Zobah and Rehob and the soldiers from Tob and Maacah formed a separate group in the nearby fields.

- **Easy English (Pocock)**
  The *Ammonites came out. They prepared to fight at the entrance of their city. The *Arameans from Zobah and Rehob and the men from Tob and Maacah formed another army in the open country.

- **Easy-to-Read Version**
  The Ammonites came out and got ready for the battle. They stood at the city gate. The Arameans from Zobah and Rehob, and the men from Tob and Maacah did not stand together with the Ammonites in the field.

- **Good News Bible (TEV)**
  The Ammonites marched out and took up their position at the entrance to Rabbah, their capital city, while the others, both the Syrians and the men from Tob and Maacah, took up their position in the open countryside.

- **The Message**
  The Ammonites marched out and arranged themselves in battle formation at the city gate. The Arameans of Zobah and Rehob and the men of Tob and Maacah took up a position out in the open fields.

- **New Century Version**
  The Ammonites came out and prepared for battle at the city gate. The Arameans from Zobah and Rehob and the men from Tob and Maacah were out in the field by themselves.

- **New Living Translation**
  The Ammonite troops came out and drew up their battle lines at the entrance of the city gate, while the Arameans from Zobah and Rehob and the men from Tob and Maacah positioned themselves to fight in the open fields.
Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

American English Bible  Well, the sons of AmMon gathered for war at the city gate, leaving the Syrians from Souba, RoOb, and [the men of] IshTob and MaAcha alone in the field..

Ancient Roots Translinear  The sons of Amman proceeded and ranked for war in the gate opening, including the Syrians of Zobah in the streets, and the men of Tob and Maachah in the field.

God’s Word™  The Ammonites formed a battle line at the entrance of the city gate, while the Arameans from Zobah and Rehob and the men from Tob and Maacah remained by themselves in the open country.

NIRV  The Ammonites marched out. They took up their battle positions at the entrance of their city gate. The Arameans of Zobah and Rehob gathered their troops together in the open country. So did the men of Tob and Maacah.

New Jerusalem Bible  The Ammonites marched out and drew up their line of battle at the city gate, while the Aramaeans of Zobah and of Rehob and the men of Tob and Maakah kept their distance in the open country.

Today’s NIV  The Ammonites came out and drew up in battle formation at the entrance of their city gate, while the Arameans of Zobah and Rehob and the men of Tob and Maakah were by themselves in the open country.

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

Bible in Basic English  And the children of Ammon came out and put their forces in position at the way into the town: and the Aramaeans of Zobah and of Rehob, with the men of Tob and Maacah, were by themselves in the field.

HCSB  The Ammonites marched out and lined up in battle formation at the entrance to the city gate while the Arameans of Zobah and Rehob and the men of Tob and Maacah were in the field by themselves.

JPS (Tanakh)  The Ammonites marched out and took up their battle position at the entrance of the gate, while the Arameans of Zobah and Rehob and the men of Tob and Maacah took their stand separately in the open.

Judaica Press Complete T.  And the children of Ammon came out, and they prepared the battle at the entrance of the gate; and the Arameans of Zobah, and Rehob, and Ish-tov, and Maacah, were by themselves in the field.

NET Bible®  The Ammonites marched out and were deployed for battle at the entrance of the city gate, while the men from Aram Zobah, Rehob, Ish-tob, and Maakah were by themselves in the field.

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

The Amplified Bible  And the Ammonites came out and put the battle in array at the entrance of the gate, but the Syrians of Zobah and of Rehob and the men of Tob and Maacah were stationed by themselves in the open country.

English Standard Version  And the Ammonites came out and drew up in battle array at the entrance of the gate, and the Syrians of Zobah and of Rehob and the men of Tob and Maacah were by themselves in the open country.

exeGeses companion Bible  ...and the sons of Ammon come and line up for war at the opening of the portal: and the Aramiy of Sobah and of Rechob and Ish Tob and Maachah are alone in the field.

LTHB  And the sons of Ammon came out and set the battle in order at the opening of the gate. And the Syrians of Zobah, and Rehob, and the men of Tob, and Maacah were by themselves in the field.

Syndein  Now the army of Ammon came out (of Rabbah), and deployed/“put the battle in array” in front of the gate. While the Syrians of Zoba (’Aram Tsowba’) and of
The children of Ammon came out, and put the battle in array at the entrance of the gate: and the Syrians of Zobah and of Rehob, and the men of Tob and Maacah, were by themselves in the field.

The gist of this verse: The Ammonites took a holding position immediately outside the gate of Rabbah; the hired mercenaries took up battle positions out away from the city gate, so that they could close in on Joab’s troops.
**2Samuel 10:8b**

<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>mil*châmâh (מִלְכָּחָה) [pronounced mil-khaw-MAW]</td>
<td>battle, war, fight, fighting; victory; fortune of war</td>
<td>feminine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #4421 BDB #536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pethach (פֶּתַח) [pronounced PEH-thakkh]</td>
<td>opening, doorway, entrance, gate [for a tent, house, or city]; metaphorically, gate [of hope, of the mouth]</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #6607 BDB #835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sha’ar (שָׁעָר) [pronounced SHAH-ɣahr]</td>
<td>gate [control of city can be implied]; area inside front gate; entrance</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article; pausal form</td>
<td>Strong’s #8179 BDB #1044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and they arrange [themselves] in battle array at the entrance of the [city] gate. More than likely, when Joab arrived with his army, the Ammonite army was set up right outside the city wall, near the entrance, deployed to do battle against them. This would have been obvious. The Jews would have seen them immediately. The idea here is to catch Joab’s attention, and for him to make plans based upon these men outside the walls of Rabbah. They are the bait. They are arranged in such a way as to catch the attention of Joab and his army.

**2Samuel 10:8c**

<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>w* (or v*) (1, 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>'Āram (ארם) [pronounced uh-RAHM]</td>
<td>the highland, high region; exalted; and is transliterated Aram; sometimes rendered Syria, Mesopotamia</td>
<td>proper noun, singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #758 BDB #74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsōwbâh (תִּזְוְבָה) [pronounced tzoh'-VAW]</td>
<td>transliterated Zobah</td>
<td>Proper noun, territory</td>
<td>Strong’s #6678 BDB #844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w* (or v*) (1, 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>Hebrew/Pronunciation</td>
<td>Common English Meanings</td>
<td>Notes/Morphology</td>
<td>BDB and Strong's Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רָכֹב (רָכֹב)  (pronounced r'kh-ÔH)</td>
<td>broad, open place and is transliterated Rechob, Rehob</td>
<td>masculine singular proper noun; location</td>
<td>Strong's #7340 BDB #932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also spelled רָכֹב (רָכֹב)  (pronounced r'kh-ÔH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w^ (or v^) (ו, or v)  (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>‘יָשָׁה (אֶש)  (pronounced eesh)</td>
<td>a man; a husband; one of virile age; an inhabitant of, a citizen of [when followed by a genitive of a place]; companion of, soldier of, follower of [when followed by a genitive of king, leader, etc.]; anyone, someone, a certain one, each, each one, everyone</td>
<td>masculine singular construct (sometimes found where we would use a plural)</td>
<td>Strong’s #376 BDB #35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דַּב (דַּב)  (pronounced toh^v)</td>
<td>pleasant, pleasing, agreeable, good, better; approved</td>
<td>masculine feminine singular adjective which can act like a substantive</td>
<td>Strong’s #2896 BDB #373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two previous words are joined together by a măqqēf, which is a high, short horizontal stroke which connects two words together, making them function as one. Therefore, this should be taken as one word, standing for one place (city, state or country), which gives us the following word:

| w^ (or v^) (ו, or v)  (pronounced weh) | and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though | simple waw conjunction | No Strong’s # BDB #251 |
| מַאֲקָך (מַאֲקָך)  (pronounced maw-ghuh-KAW) | depression; oppression, pressed [lit., she has pressed]; and is transliterated Maacah | feminine singular proper noun | Strong’s #4601 BDB #590 |
| lâmed (ל)  (pronounced l') | to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to, belonging to; by | directional/relation preposition with the 3rd person masculine plural suffix | No Strong’s # BDB #510 |
| b^ (ב)  (pronounced b^v) | in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within | a preposition of proximity | No Strong’s # BDB #88 |
| sâdeh (סָדֶה)  (pronounced saw-DEH) | field, land, country, open field, open country | masculine singular noun with the definite article | Strong’s #7704 BDB #961 |
2Samuel 10:8c

<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>BDB’s exact definition of this word is important here: 1) field, land; 1a) cultivated field; 1b) of home of wild beasts; 1c) plain (opposed to mountain); 1d) land (opposed to sea). Rabbah is on a mountain. Below the mountain is a valley and flatland. However, this is not necessarily barren land. This can refer to land which is flatland as opposed to mountainous area. This can still be sâdeh without being barren and without vegetation. This could be cultivated land and this could be a field of bushes and trees. As a home of wild beasts, as BDB says, there must be grasses, bushes and trees, so that these animals can function normally. For the most part, unless they are migrating, animals do not like to hang out in a barren, wide open field, because that leaves them unprotected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: Meanwhile [lit., and], Aram of Zobah and [Aram] of Rehob, Ishtob and Maacah [were] by themselves in the field. I am going to assume the compass directions which R. B. Thieme Jr. uses, that Rabbah (also called Rabbath) is opposite Bethel or opposite Jericho across the Jordan River from these cities. Jerusalem is southwest of Rabbah. The gate to Rabbah apparently opens to the south, and the army which was purchased hid themselves due south of the entrance of Rabbah. Here, the Aramaean army is functioning independently of the Ammonite army, which is to be expected.

Now, if you normally skip over the Hebrew exegesis (and I set up these tables in such a way to allow you to do that), I want you to go back and read the last paragraph in the Hebrew exegesis. Sometimes when we visualize a field, we see an open area of low grasses, but that is not always what this word means. The Hebrew word sâdeh can refer to land as opposed to mountainous terrain; it can refer to an area where animals live. This does not preclude the land from having ample vegetation (trees and bushes and such). This is important to the context of this narrative. The Aramaean army is hidden from the Israelites. The Israelites do not simply meander out in the middle of two armies, where they can clearly see both armies. That would be dumb. Just as you look both ways before crossing a street, Israel has scouts out looking about, in all directions around their own army, and the soldiers themselves are hyper-aware of their surroundings. When this might be the day that you die, your senses are pulling in as much information as your brain can handle.

These two armies have developed a strategy here. The strategy of the Aramaean army is known as a strategic single envelopment. This is when you hit an army at a weaker point and attempt to surround the army at its flank (side) and/or rear. When an army advances, its strength is generally in front; an envelopment looks to hit an army at the side or from the rear. We might call this an ambush. Also involved in an envelopment is surrounding the opposing army as much as possible. Joab’s forces are to be drawn toward the entrance of the city of Rabbah. As the Jewish army advances on Rabbah (which is technically called a fixing force), they would be exposed from behind, probably in an open area; and the Aramaean troops would come in behind them, and they would be trapped between these two armies in a pincher movement. My thinking is, the Aramaeans have their calvary and charioteers right at the edge of the forest, ready to advance. Obviously, they must remain hidden from Joab’s troops until the very last moment in order to function under the principle of surprise. In reserve behind the Aramean armored division would be its infantry.

According to 1Chron. 19:7, the Aramaeans are in Medina, which, according to Edersheim, is 15 miles southwest of Rabbah (Keil and Delitzsch claim that it is 4 miles south of Rabbah). R. B. Thieme Jr. puts this at 40 klicks (40 km). In any case, they were probably encamped there, perhaps partying, and waiting to hear of any movement of the Israeli army. When their G2 forces tell them that Joab’s army is advancing, they move into place nearer the palace at Rabbah, where they will camp and wait on Joab’s army.

32 Keil and Delitzsch, Commentary on the Old Testament; from e-Sword; 2Sam. 10:7–14.
33 R. B. Thieme, Jr., The 1972 David Series; ©1980 by R. B. Thieme, Jr. ministries; Series #631; Lesson #220.
R. B. Thieme Jr. estimates that, when Joab moves his flying column into position, there are about 30,000+ Aramaean troops south of them. Joab looks to the south and sees the Aramaean army moving toward him, just a couple klicks away.

All 3 armies are on red alert, every man preparing to fight, and possibly to die.

Having this picture in your mind—where these 3 armies are, and what their strategy is—is important. This will explain just exactly how Joab is able to defeat these two armies, even though he begins at a tactical disadvantage.

Chapter Outline

Joab Defeats Ammon and Aram

Quite obviously, the heading gives away what is going to happen in this narrative, but we will determine exactly how this all went down. How does an inferior army defeat two larger forces, when that inferior army has just stepped into a trap?

And so sees Joab that is against him faces of the battle from faces and from behind; and so he chooses from all chosen ones in Israel and so he arranges in order to meet Aram.

2Samuel 10:9

When Joab saw that the face of the battle was against him from in front and behind, he then chose from the elite men [lit., chosen ones of] of Israel and he deployed [them] against [lit., he arrayed (them) in an order to meet] Aram.

When Joab observed that he was fighting on two fronts, he chose his elite forces (his Rangers and Navy SEALs) out of Israel and he deployed them against Aram.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

Latin Vulgate

Then Joab seeing that the battle was prepared against him, both before and behind, chose of all the choice men of Israel, and put them in array against the Syrians:

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)

And so sees Joab that is against him faces of the battle from faces and from behind; and so he chooses from all chosen ones in Israel and so he arranges in order to meet Aram.

Peshitta (Syriac)

When Joab saw that the battle was set against him both in the front and in the rear, he selected the choice men of Israel and put them in array against Aram.

Septuagint (Greek)

And Joab saw that the front of the battle was against him from that which was opposed in front and from behind, and he chose out some of all the young men of Israel, and they set themselves in array against Syria.

Significant differences: The English translation of the Latin and Syriac leave out the face of [the battle]. The Greek simply has Joab choosing young men rather than elite forces (chosen men). The Greek, Latin and Syriac all translate to meet as against (as do several English translations).

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV

Joab saw that he had to fight in front and behind at the same time, and he picked some of the best Israeliite soldiers to fight the Arameans.
Joab saw that his enemies were in front of him and behind him. So he chose some of the best Israelite soldiers to fight with him against the Arameans.

Joab saw that there were enemies in front of him and behind him. So Joab chose some of the best Israelite soldiers and lined them up for battle against the Arameans.

Joab saw that the enemy troops would attack him in front and from the rear, so he chose the best of Israel's soldiers and put them in position facing the Syrians.

When Joab saw that he had two fronts to fight, before and behind, he took his pick of the best of Israel and deployed them to confront the Arameans.

When Joab saw that he would have to fight on both the front and the rear, he chose some of Israel's elite troops and placed them under his personal command to fight the Arameans in the fields.

And when Joab saw what he was facing, with armies on either side, he took the younger men of Israel and deployed opposite the Syrians,...

Joab saw the war was at his face, in front and from behind. He chose all the chosen of Israel and ranked them to greet the Syrians.

When Joab saw he was under attack in front and behind, he took the select troops of Israel and organized them for combat against the Arameans.

When Joab saw the battle lines drawn up against him, both front and rear, he made a selection from all the picked troops of Israel and arrayed them against the Arameans.

Joab saw that there were lines of soldiers in front of him and behind him. So he chose some of the best troops in Israel. He sent them to march out against the Arameans.

Joab, seeing that he had to fight on two fronts, to his front and to his rear, chose the best of Israel's picked men and drew them up in line facing the Aramaeans.

When Joab saw that he was threatened from both front and rear, he detailed some picked Israelite troops and drew them up facing the Arameans.

Now when Joab saw that their forces were in position against him in front and at his back, he took the best of the men of Israel and put them in line against the Arameans;...

When Joab saw that there was a battle line in front of him and another behind him, he chose some men out of all the elite troops of Israel and lined up in battle formation to engage the Arameans.

When Joab saw that the battle would be fought on two fronts, he chose some of Israel's best men and deployed them against the Arameans [Heb "and Joab saw that the face of the battle was to him before and behind and he chose from all the best in Israel and arranged to meet Aram.”].

Joab saw that there were battle lines in front of him and behind him; so he selected some of the best troops in Israel and deployed them against the Arameans.
When Joab saw that the battle was set against him both in front and in the rear, he chose some of the best men of Israel and arrayed them against the Syrians.

When Joab saw that the front of the battle was against him before and behind. And he chose from all the chosen in Israel, and set them in order to meet the Syrians.

When Joab ‘was caused/forced to see’ {from recognizance} {indicates this is ‘his motivation’ - he saw he was in a trap and moved on} that the face of the battle was toward him from the front and toward him from the rear {in other words he was trapped between two armies - his answer will be ‘to attack!’ and he is doing the unexpected - he will attack the strongest army first (at their weakest point) - leaving the lessor army for last - He will hit with his crack troops - leaving the recruits to hold off the lessor army for a short time}, he selected from all the elite men of Israel, and deployed/put them in array against the Syrians.

Now when Joab saw that the battle was set against him before and behind, he chose of all the choice men of Israel, and put them in array against the Syrians: ...

And Joab sees that the front of the battle has been unto him before and behind, and he chooses of all the chosen in Israel, and sets in array to meet Aram,...

The gist of this verse: Joab realized that he had enemies coming at him from in front and behind, so he pulled out an elite force from his army and deployed them against Aram.

There are two military doctrines which are important at this time: the Principle of Offensive Action and the Principle of Mass. These two principles were alluded to earlier in The Principles of Warfare, covered in the introduction to this chapter.

### The Principle of Offensive Action

1. Offensive is the only means by which a decision is gained in warfare.
2. When successful, offensive action brings about victory; defensive action, at best, avoids defeat.
3. Offensive action increases the effectiveness of the force that adopts it because it raises morale, permits concentration of effort, and allows freedom of action.
4. Defensive action should be used to assist offensive action elsewhere, to gain time and to utilize the advantage of terrain in order to compensate for some weakness.
5. The only effective way to conduct a campaign is to act on the offensive. The primary objective is to destroy the opposing army. You do not win a war by capturing the cities of your enemy, but by destroying his army.
6. Offensive action should be employed whenever there is any reasonable chance for success and sometimes when there isn’t.
7. It will appear as if King Hanun has trapped Joab and his army in a trap, which Aramæan mercs will close. However, Joab will function under the principle of offensive action and scare a tremendous upset.


### The Principle of Mass

1. Mass is a military term for the concentration of combat power at a decisive place and time.
2. Because an army does not always enjoy superior combat power, the judicious use of mass is important.
The Principle of Mass

An historic example of this is General Douglas MacArthur’s island hopping approach in the Philippines in World War II. Rather than take one island and then move to the next and take that, he bypassed Japanese island strongholds and isolated them with air and naval power, thus allowing him to use his available forces to strike the Japanese elsewhere, which kept them off balance.

3. Therefore, the principle of mass requires concentration of combat power where it is most effective.
4. Mass includes numbers, weapons, tactical skill, morale, fighting ability, determination, motivation, leadership, and discipline.
5. Success on the battlefield is attained by the correct deployment of mass in an offensive action. An attack must be at the proper time and at the proper place in order to accomplish a specific purpose.
6. The proper application of the principle of mass, in conjunction with the other principles of war, may permit numerically inferior forces to achieve decisive combat superiority.


Joab Applies the Principles of Warfare

1. In front of Joab is the Ammonite army, which is taking a defensive position outside of the gates of Rabbah.
2. Behind him, probably hidden in thick forested areas (remember, this is in a valley, where there is a river running through it) is the Aramaean army, with their horses and chariots.
3. Around the city of Rabbah, the land has probably been cleared, so that enemies cannot hide right outside of the gates. Joab and his army find themselves in this clearing, squeezed between the Ammonite army at the gates of Rabbah and the Syrian mercenaries positioned out in the thick forested wilderness.
4. The idea is, the Aramaean army will close in on Joab from behind.
5. Joab, amazingly, will go on the offensive. Offensive action is the only means by which a victory can be achieved.
6. Joab will employ the principle of mass perfectly. He is outnumbered and find himself and his army in a bad position, strategically speaking.
7. Joab’s immediate response will involve economy of force, which is the means by which mass is employed in the main effort. Joab will turn around and attack the Assyrian army at their weakest point.
8. Joab instantly determines the time and place of his attack, and, when this is done correctly, men and weaponry are conserved. Joab, by concentrating his army at a point of weakness of the enemy, will reduce casualties and attain a great victory.
9. Joab utilized the principle of movement, which is the maneuvering of combat elements. He moved his forces where there were no Syrians—where there were holes in the Syrian line—thus causing confusion in the Syrian ranks.
10. In Joab’s offensive, he brings mass into contact with the Syrians to assure victory, even though his is outnumbered. Movement is determine the best place to attack the Syrian mercenaries. Joab deploys his elite force—his shock troops—at the weakest point in the Assyrian line. All of this involved excellent training, excellent discipline, and great respect for authority. Without these things, Joab’s army would have fallen apart.
To understand all of this, it is best to visualize the battlefield and the position of the Ammonites, the Jews and the Aramaeans. There is the walled city of Rabbah which is built over or next to a river. The Ammonite army is in the city, on the walls, and in front. They are the bait. Around the city, most of the area would be cleared so that no army could sneak up on the city or have easy cover close to the city. Joab’s army would be in this mostly open area. Further out, in the thick forested wilderness would be the Aramaean mercenaries with their horses and chariots. They have to be in an area which gives them cover.
2Samuel 10:9a

<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>pânîym (ֵךָנִי)</td>
<td>face, faces, countenance; presence</td>
<td>masculine plural noun (plural acts like English singular)</td>
<td>Strong’s #6440 BDB #815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together, min and pânîym mean from before a face, out from before a face, from the presence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>w  (or v)  (î, or i)</th>
<th>and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though</th>
<th>simple wâw conjunction</th>
<th>No Strong’s # BDB #251</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>min (מינ)</td>
<td>from, away from, out from, out of from, 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>‘âchôwr (אַחֹּוֲרָ)</td>
<td>the hinder side, the back part; back, backwards [generally found in poetry]</td>
<td>masculine singular substantive; adverb</td>
<td>Strong’s #268 BDB #30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two words pânîym (ֵךָנִי) [pronounced paw-NEEM] and ‘âchôwr (אַחֹּוֲרָ) [pronounced aw-KHOHR] mean before and behind, in front and behind; within and without.

Translation: When Joab saw that the face of the battle was against him from in front and behind,... The Ammonite forces were bait. They stood their ground 1 klick out from the entrance of Rabbah in order to draw Joab and his fighting men in. As Joab and his men advanced, the Aramæan army advanced from the field behind them, trapping Joab’s army in a pincher movement.

Here is the general scenario. Rabbah is on a mountain, and, about 1 klick out from the front of the city walls are the Ammonites, possibly hangover from the night before. They would be reasonably protected by trees, being at a higher level; but they could certainly be seen, as they are the bait to draw Joab’s forces in. Joab moves his forces into formation, coming from a flying single column, which allows for maximum speed, but little protection at the flank. They would be moving into a relatively flat open area, ideal for the maneuvering of horses and chariots. A few klicks to the south of Joab’s army would be the Syrians, well-hidden by trees and bushes. The Syrian plan is, Joab moves his army into place, to move against Rabbah, and from behind, the Syrian cavalry and armored forces (chariots) would come. However—and this is a very important detail—in order for these chariots and horses to be hidden, they have to be in trees and brush, which does not allow for easy movement at first. These horses and chariots need to be brought out into the open in order for their function in war to be maximized. In reserve, behind the chariots and horses, is the Syrian infantry, who are going to hold that position until they are needed (and, they probably do not expect to be needed as a reserve force). This Aramæan infantry’s primary objective is going to be in clean up; when Joab’s forces being to run, the infantry is to catch them and kill them. There might be another reserve/clean up infantry force to the east, in case Joab’s men try to escape that way. They might even be bring a reserve/clean up force to position themselves behind Joab’s flying column.

Here is the Aramæan strategy. Joab moves his forces into place, facing the city of Rabbah and the Ammonite forces. Then Aram brings her horses and chariots out from hiding and charge Joab (once they clear the trees and brush where they are hiding). Joab’s army is suppose to be frozen in fear, with an army before them and an army behind them, and possibly small reserve infantry forces scattered.

Now recall some of the military principles we have studied. The Syrian army is probably a superior force in size, so they can place their mass in various places; they have more options than does Joab. They have the initial element of surprise, and a lesser man leading such an army might have been ready to meet his Lord on that day.
The Syr[ians] have a well-defined objective: to destroy Joab’s army. They have the tactical advantage, with troops in front of Joab (the Ammonites) and behind him (the Aramaeans); and possible to the east (a reserve Aramæan force).

There are two areas where the Aramaeans may have miscalculated: they might have made their movements too complex, if their reserve forces are too scattered (we really don’t know about that); and they have made the assumption that Joab’s men would be frozen in fear and dig in where they stood. Oh, and one more thing: they forgot that Jesus Christ controls history.

The reason that I set this all up is, the war is not going to go as the Syrians expect. However, there will be reasons for that, and it is all related to where the components of these armies are.

Application: When a believer is in a jam, he needs to face reality—you need to recognize who you are and Who God is. The believer needs to gather the facts, remain in fellowship, and think—preferably, think divine viewpoint. There are times when you cannot talk your way out of a jam; charm your way out of a jam, or depend upon some human asset (or set of assets) which you possess to get you out of this jam. This does not mean that you do not act; but you do turn to God for guidance. This means, you turn to the doctrine in your soul. You think doctrine. You don’t haul out the Bible, close your eyes, open it, and drop your finger on a verse. Quite obviously, in order to think doctrine, you must have doctrine in your soul; in order to have doctrine in your soul, you must be going to Bible class or get it through MP3 files (I’m referring to Bible lessons, not music). An hour a day is about right for spiritual growth.

Application: You face your difficulties from a position of humility, not from a position of arrogance. Joab is probably kicking himself right now, thinking, “You arrogant SOB, you just walked right into this. You did not give enough thought to reconnaissance, you simply figured that you could march in and take down the Ammonites and their mercenary force.” However, Joab does not spend any time dwelling upon this. He quickly formulates a plan.

There are times when you stand back and watch the deliverance of the Lord; and there are times when you act. Doctrine in the soul tells you when you do which one of these.

### Joab’s Thinking and Strategy

1. Joab immediately makes a quick and accurate appraisal of the situation in which he finds himself.
2. For a general to make good decisions, he needs accurate information. In front of him is the city of Rabbah defended by Ammonite soldiers. Joab recognizes that this was the bait to move him into position.
3. Behind him, and hidden, are Aramæan mercenaries. Although Joab did not see this at first, it is now apparent to him that this is an army with horses and chariots. He may or may not know that these are Syrian soldiers (although this may be obvious to him simply because of the horses and chariots).
4. Joab recognizes that he has stepped into a trap.
5. When you make a mistake, you still have to move forward. You cannot dwell on this mistake. Joab does not have the time to think about, *what if I did this?* He has to act immediately.
6. Joab recognizes that the Ammonites are bait and are not going to advance (for the most part). He notes that he and his army are standing out in an open area, which, if attacked by an army on horseback and in chariots, places them at a distinct disadvantage.
7. Joab has to act quickly. Once the Aramaean army steps out into the open area with their horses and chariots, it is all over for Joab. At best, he can retreat, under that scenario.
8. It is clear that Joab and his army are outnumbered; the Aramaeans have superior means, and, once the battle begins, the enemy will have Joab’s army in a precarious tactical situation.
9. Joab will use the principle of surprise. He will attack the Syrians to his rear.
10. The Syrians expect Joab to freeze in fear, or, perhaps attack the Ammonite forces, as they are the weakest link in this chain. However, this would do nothing but trap Joab’s army between the walls of Rabbah and the Syrians.
11. As long as Joab’s army is more or less in the open, an attack by an opposing army on horseback and in chariots will destroy them.
Joab’s Thinking and Strategy

12. Therefore, Joab will do that which is gutsy and unexpected: Joab will attack the strongest army behind him with his elite troops; and he uses his new troops as his screening force, to keep the weak army at bay.

13. Joab has the advantage of great discipline in his army as well as fighting on interior lines.

14. Joab will instantly formulate a battle plan by which he can concentrate his forces quickly so that he uses offensive action, mass and surprise.

The Bible has enough information in it, by direct statements and inference, of exactly what is happening, and why Joab is able to be successful against the Aramæan troops.

---

2Samuel 10:9b

<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>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>bâchar (בֶּחָר)</td>
<td>to choose; Gesenius also lists to prove, to try, to examine, to approve, to choose, to select; to love, to delight in [something], to desire</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #977 BDB #103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min (مين)</td>
<td>from, away from, out from, off, on account of, since, above, than, so that not, above, beyond, more than, greater than</td>
<td>preposition of separation</td>
<td>Strong’s #4480 BDB #577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kôl (כֹּל)</td>
<td>with a plural noun, it is rendered all of, all; any of</td>
<td>masculine singular construct with a masculine plural noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #3605 BDB #481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bâchar (בֶּחָר)</td>
<td>a chosen one; one who has been chosen; one who has been examined and approved</td>
<td>masculine plural construct, Qal passive participle</td>
<td>Strong’s #977 BDB #103</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Literally, they mean from all... However, together, various literal translations give the following renderings: about all, of all. These are taken from over a half-dozen literal translations for 1Sam. 23:23.

According to Rotherham, this is written in, but read of. 5 early printed editions write and read this as of.34

34 Joseph Bryant Rotherham’s The Emphasized Bible; ©1971 by Kregel Publications; p. 330 (footnote).
Translation: ...he then chose from the elite men [lit., chosen ones of] of Israel...  Joab has to think fast. He has nearly been drawn into a trap and completely outmaneuvered here. He chooses his elite forces. Bear in mind, we are dealing with a very small window of time here, so that his elite forces had to be well-known from the beginning. That is, Joab did not, on the very day, go through his army man by man and select his best men. More than likely, there were men already chosen from his army who were special forces; Joab knew who they were and they knew who they were. There are sometimes an army needs a small, elite striking force; and Joab had to be able to, at a moment's notice, pull these troops out for a special job.

In the alternative—and this I doubt occurred—Joab went down the chain of command to his lowest officers and they chose out their best men. This could have been done quickly; but it makes more sense to me that Joab had a pre-determined mobile strike force.

Joab's ability here to think under pressure is key. It is normal, in war for a person to experience fear and apprehension. However, what distinguishes a man under fire is his ability to think when under great pressure; and/or, how much he is able to function within the parameters of his training when under pressure.

<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>wāw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong's # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ărak (וָראַק) [pronounced ‘aw-RAK]</td>
<td>to arrange, to set in order, to place in a row, to place in a particular arrangement or order; to organize</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong's #6186 BDB #789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לָמְד) [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>qârâ’ (טָכַר) [pronounced kaw-RAW]</td>
<td>to encounter, to befall, to meet; to assemble [for the purpose of encountering God or exegeting His Word]; to come, to assemble</td>
<td>Qal infinitive construct</td>
<td>Strong's #7122 &amp; #7125 BDB #896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Āram (אָרָם) [pronounced uh-RAHM]</td>
<td>the highland, high region; exalted; and is transliterated Aram; sometimes rendered Syria, Mesopotamia</td>
<td>proper noun singular</td>
<td>Strong's #758 BDB #74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and he deployed [them] against [lit., he arrayed (them) in an order to meet] Aram. Joab took his elite troops and deployed them as a flying column against the Syrians, fighting on interior lines.

Elite troops are the best of the best, like Navy SEALs or Rangers. They are going to be the most motivated and the best trained men in Joab’s army. Their bravery is a function of their motivation and training, and not of an emotional surge which hits them in battle. When a doctor is operating on you, you want him to be in complete control of his faculties, applying all of the training that he has amassed up until that point. You do not want your doctor going through some sort of emotional experience in the midst of an operation. The same is true of an elite military force. They should not be motivated on the basis of some great emotional high, with Joab along side of them yelling, “Go, go, go!”
A flying column is a small, independent land forces unit capable of rapid mobility and usually composed of all arms. It is often an ad hoc unit, formed during the course of operations. The key is speed, mobility and flexibility. They do not take a piece of ground and hold it against all comers. They deploy aggressively against the enemy, moving quickly, killing as many of the enemy as possible, and sometimes moving from a variety of directions.

Interior Lines and Exterior Lines in Battle

You know that Bob Thieme Jr. loved teaching this chapter, and that this may have been one of his favorite Old Testament passages. However, he filled his lessons with a cacophony of technical military terms. The battle, at first, had Joab fighting from interior lines.

Fighting from interior lines means that your army starts from a point and expands to attack several points; fighting from exterior lines means you begin from several different places and converge upon a point.

The plan devised by Aram and Ammon was to trap Israel in a pincher movement, where they are trapped on a particular piece of ground, with the city walls of Rabbah before them, along with the Ammonite army, with the Syrian army closing in behind them. This would force Joab to fight on interior lines. That is, Joab’s smaller army would have to start from one point and strike out in several directions. The Aramaeans and the Ammonites were fully prepared to fight this kind of battle. This was drilled into them in their training for this battle.

However, what Joab is going to do is to set up 2 armies; his brother Abiathar will use one army as a holding force against the Ammonites. Their intention is to keep the Ammonite army in one place, against the wall of their city, but not to advance on them. They will fight just enough to hold them in place, which is essentially a defensive position (it is what an army might do, temporarily, when dealing with a larger opposing force. They may attempt to hold this larger force at bay while waiting for reinforcements.

Meanwhile, Joab will have his elite army move aggressively against the Syrian army, probably functioning in small groups, and turning the tables on the Syrians, as Joab’s force will probably fight from exterior lines (since they are small and mobile and elite). The Syrian army is going to be flummoxed by this move, as they expect to slowly move in, as a group, against Israel’s army, closing the trap on them. However, suddenly, they are being hit here and there and over there by small, fast-moving, deadly troops with a high kill ratio. The Syrian army does not have a contingency plan for this. They have one plan and that plan will work in a specific way, and their army is ready to move in that one way, slowly closing in on the Israeliite army.

We will find out in v. 18 that the Syrian army was made up of many chariots and horses. If these are out in the open, then Joab sees them from miles away and does not step into the trap. Therefore, the chariots and horses have to be hidden in the thick forest, in order for Joab and his army to be moved into position. Horses and chariots

are not any good in the high brush and forest. They are good in the open area. So the Aramaeans expect to bring these resources out against Israel, while Israel either freezes in between the two armies or tries to retreat. Nothing would be better for the Syrian army than for Israel to either freeze or retreat.

**Application:** Have you ever had a day where you planned this day out in your mind, exactly what you are going to do and the order in which you are going to do it, and things are thrown out of whack from the very beginning? I used to be a teacher, and, although planning was not my strong suit, I would occasionally map out my classes mentally in my head as I drove to school. However, when I arrived at school, there might be a fire alarm in 2nd period; there might be a special schedule which I forgot about; the electricity might go out. There are a myriad of things which could change, and I had to be flexible enough to change my approach for that day. I recall one time when I was being observed (we were paid merit pay, and our salary was dependent upon these observations). Most teachers planned out a dog and pony show, trying to give their best lecture with the most stuff going on. I did not do that. And, in the midst of one class, a student asked a question, which took the lesson in a completely different direction (mathematics is very ordered, logical and directional; but you can go off in several different directions from the same point). Life requires some flexibility. I could have told the kid, “That is next week’s lesson, and I will answer your question then” or I could have pivoted on his question into that particular direction, which is what I did.

The Syrian and Ammonite armies have a plan. They know that they have a good plan, and they set up a trap that Joab walks right into. Everything is going just exactly as expected. Completing that plan is what the Syrian army faces right here. They are prepared to close the trap on a stationary army which has no place to go and must fight from interior lines in a defensive position. Or, even better, Joab’s army panics and begins to run. Now, who has the advantage? The panicked soldiers or trained Syrian horsemen chasing after them?

Suddenly, Joab turns the tables on them completely, and they have no set of tactics set up in order to deal with Joab. Aram and Ammon are not flexible; they have a plan A (Joab’s army scatters); they have a plan B (Joab’s army freezes right on the spot, in fear; but they do not have a plan C. Joab is supposed to be fighting from interior lines with a holding force which is trapped between two armies; Joab, instead, uses his elite forces to advance against the Syrians, suddenly fighting from exterior lines, doing exactly the opposite of what the Syrian army expects. The Syrian army does not have a contingency plan for this in their field orders. They have two plans, and Joab, in probably less than an hour, has turned the Syrian offensive on its head. Joab attacks before the Syrians can go on the offensive.

**Application:** Joab knows his enemy, and he recognizes immediately where his enemy is weak. In order to hide its cavalry and armored forces, the Syrians have these groups in the trees and the bushes, wherein they cannot maneuver. Joab immediately assesses this situation; he knows the Syrians and he knows how they love to use their cavalry and chariots. By his quick thinking and with steel nerve, Joab will take his elite infantry and attack Syrian before they can get out of the brush. As has been said, you cannot attack a bee with a needle or with a sword. Joab will take thousands of bees and attack the Syrians (I am obviously speaking metaphorically about the bees).

I have suggested that Aram’s plan may involve unnecessary complexity—that is a theory, and there may be several Aramaean infantry forces spread throughout with their individual instructions. However, what is key here, and not really explained, is the arrogance of Aram and Ammon. They believe that they have come up with this great plan and they have no contingency plan. They are so proud of what they have come up with, it never occurs to them to think, what if Joab does not do what you expect Joab to do? There is a failure of imagination.

**Application:** Their arrogance leads them to inflexibility. They need to adjust to a changing situation. If you are a believer with a relaxed mental attitude, then you ought to be able to turn on a dime when circumstances change. You cannot simply charge full-speed ahead with your great plans, if things have suddenly changed. The believer must remain flexible.

**Application:** I have no idea if Bob Thieme said this before, but, believers must be inflexible with regards to the essentials; and flexible with regards to the nonessentials. It sounds just like something he would say. We have
Bible doctrine in our souls; and we have norms and standards which are a result of learning Bible doctrine. These are the essentials. The believer does not get to practice circumstantial morality or relative morality. We have a set system of mechanics and norms and standards to which we adhere. The believer cannot be flexible with regards to Bible doctrine and what is in our souls as a result of Bible doctrine. However, there are strategies, ideas, plans, preferences and things of that nature which are not essentials—we need to be flexible with regards to these nonessentials. You may be involved in a great business deal, and you walk into that meeting, and you have a set of things which you want to accomplish and you have, in your mind, how you will interact with (not manipulate) those you are about to enter into a deal with. Now, they may throw you a curve ball; they may propose something which surprises you; they may come at this from a different angle than what you expect. You have to be flexible with regards to what you may have in your mind to do. You cannot be flexible with regards to morality and honesty and good business practices; that is, they may offer you an illegal kickback, and you need to be flexible enough to figure out how to deal with that. Obviously, you cannot accept an illegal kickback. However, your flexibility comes into play when you figure how to deal with that offer. Do you ignore it or shoot it down; do you report it to whatever regulatory agency is over you. You are inflexible with regards to honesty, integrity and lawfulness; however, you are flexible with how you handle the situation.

Application: I personally have to negotiate deals now and again, and I always have to keep in mind what is reasonable and fair; and I have to see the negotiations from the view of the person I am negotiating with. I may have in my mind that I want X, Y and Z. In figuring out in advance what I expect in a deal, there are things which I may not take into consideration, which come to the forefront during negotiations. Flexibility is key, and that depends upon knowing Bible doctrine and having a relaxed mental attitude.

Application: Part of an RMA is not having mental attitude sins toward the person you are negotiating with. You are negotiating with Charlie Brown in a deal, and he throws a monkey wrench into the deal by saying or doing something which you do not expect. Here, I am not necessarily referring to unethical behavior or suggesting that you subvert the law; but he may come up with something that you do not expect. You need to see things from his side; you need to not get angry at him; and you should not be implacable. You roll with the punches. You remain flexible and you maintain an RMA (and if you find yourself getting angry or out of sorts, you quickly rebound and continue the negotiations).

Application: Quite frankly, I was asked to leave on several occasions from a job where I worked. I politely and firmly refused. Years later, a similar situation came up, and this time, I left (although I could have certainly challenged it legally). In retrospect, I believe that I made the correct decision each time, even though the final decision was different from the previous 3 or 4 times. That is being flexible with regards to the nonessentials.

Joab is showing tremendous leadership ability here, and therefore, this doctrine is apropos.

The Doctrine of Leadership

1. There are certainly some people who, early on, seem to be on a leadership track. However, most leadership skills must be learned.
2. Someone who has been a leader all of their lives is probably not a very good leader. Such a leader is often operating from a natural charisma and personal charm but has limited other leadership skills. President Barack Obama is a man like this, who won the presidential election in part by having considerable charisma and charm.
3. A good leader needs to be under authority in order to learn how to correctly exercise authority.
   1) We saw this with King David. God had Samuel anoint David king over Israel when he was 14 (or 16 or whatever).
   2) David was not made king over Israel until 15–20 years later.
   3) David was not just under authority; he was under lousy authority. He was under King Saul for much of that time. King Saul was erratic, unfair, and, at times, psychotic.
   4) David both had a modicum of authority, but, all of that time, he was under authority which was very unfair.
   5) David had to learn how to exercise his authority and he needed to see what it was like to be under
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6) **David** was flexible with respect to the nonessentials and he was inflexible with respect to the essentials.

4. **Saul** eventually forced **David** to leave Israel. Then **David** had to quickly adjust. Everyone looked to him for the final decision. Much of the latter chapters of 1Samuel is all about **David** learning leadership skills.

5. The best leader learns authority orientation from the bottom. What was **David**’s first job? Tending the sheep for an unappreciative father.

6. Ideally speaking, a good leader should experience unfair authority. No one can exercise authority unless they are able to understand how lousy decisions impact those under authority.

7. A good leader needs to function out of an easily definable set of core beliefs—ideally speaking, Bible doctrine or divine establishment beliefs.
   1) In the alternative, many of those under him must view his values as being theirs, or, better than theirs.

8. A good leader must see his role as the man with the greatest responsibility. In an army, an infantryman is responsible to those on both sides of him and his commanding officer (s). However, the commanding officer is responsible for everyone in his unit.

9. A lousy leader simply wants to be in charge; a lousy leader thinks, they know the best way to do something, so that is why they ought to be in charge—in order to implement their superior policies.
   1) A good contemporary example of this is our current president, **Barack Obama**. He is a man who has seen very little authority over him. For a short time, he had one job when he was under the authority to someone, and he wrote that it was like being behind enemy lines.
   2) When he became president, he believed that he knew what was best, and that was the direction of the country under his leadership. The view of the people was unimportant. The actual results of his policies were unimportant. He simply knew what was best for everyone, and that is what a leader does, in his mind, is to implement his superior policies.

10. Having no authority orientation explains why some husbands are lousy husband and why some people are bad teachers, coaches and bosses. They have no concept of authority. They like the power, but they take absolutely no responsibility for what they do.
   1) Again, our present President is an excellent example. Have you seen him even once admit that what he was trying was what he thought would work, but now he sees that it doesn’t? Of course not. He is not humble enough to do that.
   2) We are in President Obama’s 3rd year, and I have yet to see him take responsibility for anything. He has not blamed his predecessor as often, any more (which he did incessantly for nearly 2 full years), but he does not admit publically that higher taxes, taxing the rich, redistributing wealth, excessive taxes on corporations, excessive debt, and excessive regulations will destroy job growth.
   3) Either he is not smart enough to pick up on this (he has a very limited understanding of history, unlike his predecessor, who read incessantly) or he is unable to admit it.
   4) In any case, he is not flexible enough to change policies.

11. A good leader needs to be organized. He must be organized in his life and in his thinking. A leader is in control of a large organization. If he cannot organize his own life, how does he organize a much larger organization? His life has a limited number of moving parts. If a leader cannot organize those moving parts, then how can he organize dozens or hundreds of people, who all have the same moving parts?

12. In the alternative, a good leader needs someone under him—an excellent secretary or assistant—who is organized and can step in when needed.

13. A leader needs to be self-disciplined. He cannot give in to his various lusts; not even to power lust. His own body must be under his control, so that he sleeps and eats when it is time to do so; not when he feels like it.
   1) In the armed forces, the commanding officer looks after his men first. They eat first. Their needs are seen to first. When a CO’s men are taken care of, then he can eat.
   2) A good leader must be able to exercise self-discipline when with his men. He cannot be give to flights of fancy, become easily shaken, fatigued or angry.
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3) Often, there is a lack of self-discipline among the lower classes. In fact, this is why they are lower class. They refuse to recognize authority, and therefore, have not advanced in their lives as they should have (they rebel against their parents and teachers). They use every instance to complain. They refuse to work hard. When it is necessary, they do not like having to work two jobs or working in a position which is below their own exalted view of themselves.

4) It is much more like to find arrogance among subordinates and those in the lower class than among the rich, the successful and those in power.

5) Whenever a person will take money from the government instead of work, they are arrogant. They believe that it is up to others to work and up to them to take from the labor of others. It is arrogant to think that others ought to work so that you can eat.

6) Making an issue out of a race, economic class or one’s position in an organization is arrogant. Arrogant people love to dwell on unimportant, petty issues. They also love to entangle others over them in their petty concerns.

7) Many think that they are owed a position, higher salary or simply free money simply because they breathe and/or vote for someone who promises them a free ride. Such people are arrogant and self-centered to think how they impact society with their attitudes.

8) Arrogance often can result in mob behavior. We have observed it in riots in the 1960's and 1970's; we see it today in the United States in marches and demonstrations by organized labor (who refuse to recognize how they destroy everything that they touch). In their arrogance, self-centeredness and frustration, they lash out, not caring one whit whose property they destroy.

14. A good leader, as a part of self-discipline, needs to have a relaxed mental attitude. You cannot spend your time being angry toward your subordinates. You cannot be jealous of them or wish them harm; you cannot gossip about them. Often, an RMA results in a good sense of humor.

15. It is ideal if a leader has a real spiritual life—that is, they are born again and they utilize the filling of the Holy Spirit. 6 great leaders immediately come to mind: Moses, David, Stonewall Jackson, Robert E. Lee, General George Patton and Douglas MacArthur. As a leader, one must properly function within one’s spiritual life as well.

16. A good leader must know his subject, whether he is the CEO of Godfather’s Pizza, the manager of a Starbucks, a teacher, a coach or a military commander. In whatever field you lead, you must understand that field or you must have trusted people in positions of leadership below you who take up the slack in some areas.

17. A leader must project leadership. What he says and does and his demeanor must carry with it an air of authority.

18. A good leader must have a true sense humility. They cannot lead in arrogance.
   1) Poise, confidence and a commanding presence are not arrogance.
   2) True humility does not mean you keep your head down and you say, “Aw shucks, it wasn’t nothing.” Again, you must project confidence and leadership.
   3) There are always detractors. When you are a good or a lousy leader, there will be those under you who think you are lousy at what you do, and often, they will share this feeling. These detractors are the arrogant ones.
      (1) This is where poise and self-control come into play. As a leader, you are going to run across people like this, and, some of them, you can squash like bugs. You cannot act out of arrogance to destroy those who simply do not like you or are having problems with authority.
      (2) Here is where a leader has to make a careful, calculated decision. One malcontent can destroy your organization, and, obviously, a good leader cannot allow that to happen.
      (3) On the other hand, sometimes nipping such a problem in the bud is a frank, one-on-one talk, where there is no rank and no repercussions.
   4) Arrogance destroys potential in any subordinate and it destroys leadership.

19. A good leader must know how to deal with insubordination, and not every person can be dealt with the same way. You cannot throw every trouble-maker out of your unit, out of your classroom, and certain, not out of your home.
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1) Again, you must be able to assess the situation and act accordingly.
2) There are times when you cannot tolerate insubordination and times when you tolerate it to a limited degree.

20. Good leadership can distinguish between that which is essential and that which is nonessential. Stubborn, arrogant and petty people will spend their time in leadership harping on the nonessentials.

21. Not only does a leader need to know his own profession, but they must be involved in a lifetime of study. This could be termed professional diligence.

   1) Joab, in the midst of battle, walking into what looked to be a terrible situation was able to evaluate not only the best course of action, but a winning course of action.
   2) Despite his overconfident entry onto the battlefield, Joab quickly evaluated the situation.
   3) He probably both recognizes the Aramaeans and knows their battlefield capabilities.
   4) In order to formulate a plan so quickly, Joab needed to know his enemies, their strengths and weaknesses.
   5) He had to recognize that the Ammonites functioned as bait and would probably not advance against them.
   6) He had to recognize that, he cannot take his army against Rabbah anyway; it cannot be conquered that quickly.
   7) He knew enough about the Aramaeans to know that they had horses and chariots; he also determined nearly instantly that their horses and chariots would hinder them, if they were kept in the forested wilderness, where they could not maneuver.

22. This leads us to another aspect of leadership: a good leader must be able to think on his feet and to make instantaneous decisions when they are called for.

23. A good leader must be able to be fair and just in dealing with those under him. The good leader must be able to use a variety of personality types without ever appearing to favor one person over another (apart from their own positions relative to one another). You cannot have your obvious favorites or special friends in an organization. You do not have to like those who are over you and those who are under you. A subordinate’s personality may rub you the wrong way; a superior may be too curt, overbearing or mealy-mouthed, in your opinion. Human personality differences should not be an issue in fairness; neither should friendship.

24. Therefore, a good leader must, therefore, understand all kinds of people—their weaknesses, strengths and capabilities—and be willing to work with all kinds of people. Being able to deal with all kinds of people fairly—including those with personalities that you do not like—is good leadership.

   1) This is an area where women often have trouble with leadership—they want to have subordinates that they like; because it is their nature to respond. If a subordinate has a personality type which rubs them the wrong way, they will punish that person or treat them more harshly. Many women in positions of authority would never have the idea to put someone in a place of responsibility if they did not like them. That this person rubs them the wrong way would always be a part of the relationship.

25. A good leader knows that they cannot do it all. Therefore, a good leader must be able to delegate responsibility. This involves taking the personnel that you have and matching them to the responsibilities and duties which must be done.

   1) A good leader places people in positions of authority and responsibility based upon their fitness to that position. A department head may not like Charlie Brown, but if Charlie Brown is suited for a particular position, then that is where he ought to be. A good leader must be able to delegate responsibility without subjectivity entering in to the picture.

26. Related to this is, a good leader must remain objective. He functions in his position of leadership for the benefit of his organization, not for the benefit of his own feelings.

   1) Therefore, a leader should be seen by most as being fair and just.
   2) A leader should not play favorites; if a leader is friendly with any of those under him, then he must take care to treat that person fairly, and no better than anyone else. Some say “it is lonely at the top.” This is because some leaders choose to limit their fraternizing, so as not to appear unfair.
3) There are many times when a leader needs time to think. Often, this requires some sort of isolation in order to make good decisions.

4) When a leader delegates responsibility, handing out high positions, he needs to match the right person with the right position; their personality should not be a major factor. His like or dislike for such a person should not be a factor.

5) No doubt that David faced this with his nephew Joab. Joab was perhaps the most powerful person in Israel besides David. David recognized that Joab was the right man for the job.

27. There are times that a leader ought to explain himself and times when he should not. Those under you do not need to have a full and complete explanation for every single thing that you do. There are not enough hours in the day. However, now and again, when there is time and when the situation warrants it, you may choose to explain your reasoning for doing this or that; for choosing Charlie Brown to head the marketing department.

1) Now and again, a situation will warrant a private explanation. Let’s say that Lucy was up for the same position as Charlie Brown. When publically commending Charlie Brown, you explain why you chose him, but not why your chose him instead of someone else.

2) However, at the proper time, you may pull Lucy aside and explain why she did not get the promotion.

28. In order for a good leader to properly assign authority to those under him, he must be a good judge of character. A leader must hire and fire people, advance and—once and awhile—demote people, and deal with friction within the organization. A good leader has to remain objective and fairly and accurately evaluate those under him. If a leader is unable to fairly evaluate those under him, they cannot place people into the proper positions; nor can they hand out specific assignments.

1) I have been under 3 different female bosses in succession. One did not like me, but grudgingly, used my skills and abilities. One liked me, and used my skills and abilities. The third did not like me, and attempted to mismatch me with my responsibilities in order to get rid of me.

2) I worked hard under all 3 bosses, but recognized that I was intentionally being misplaced by the 3rd.

3) Under the first 2 bosses, our department flourished and advanced. Under the 3rd boss, that department eventually took the biggest loss in standardized scores in the history of our school (after I was gone). It was so bad, the head principal was fired over it.

29. A good leader knows that his organization is a team effort. A sales department is not great because there is one good salesman. A restaurant is not excellent because there is one good cook there. A football team is not great simply because they have the best quarterback in the nation or because they have a coach who has gone to a dozen superbowls. A leader oversees a number of moving parts, and the success of his organization is dependent upon allowing these moving parts to have some modicum of freedom, initiative, creativity, responsibility and recognition. Charlie Brown may be a great blocker, but he has an attitude. You cannot bench Charlie Brown in every game until his attitude changes. A good coach works with him, a good coach lays some discipline on him, and sometimes the coach benches him. But, the coach is responsible for the entire organization, so part of his job is to bring Charlie around, attitude and all.

30. A good leader must be intelligent. Many of the skills listed herein require the leader to be people-smart. Keeping up with the advances and changes in your discipline means that you must be teachable, as a leader. Like it or not, a person with limited intelligence will have limited authority in life.

31. Finally, leadership respects the chain of command. The leader does not go all the way down through 3 levels of leadership, to dress down the person who screws up; a good leader speaks to the person under him, and this observed problem finds its way down the chain of command.

1) All sorts of people want to destroy the chain of command principle. They may be arrogant, they may be well-meaning, they may not understand authority at all. However, often a person bypasses authority because they are arrogant and they demand immediate attention. A leader can screw up his own authority by allowing the chain of command to be violated.

2) With regards to the chain of command—there are times when you go up the chain of command, but you do it person by person, in the order of their authority.
He placed the rest of the people in the hand of Abishai, his brother; and he deployed [them] against Bene-Ammon.

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>And the rest of the people he delivered to Abisai his brother, who set them in array against the children of Ammon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masoretic Text (Hebrew)</td>
<td>And rest of the people he put in a hand of Abishai his brother and so he arranges in order to meet Bene-Ammon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshitta (Syriac)</td>
<td>And the rest of the people he placed in the charge of Abishai his brother, and he put them in array against the Ammonites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septuagint (Greek)</td>
<td>And the rest of the people he gave into the hand of Abishai his brother, and they set the battle in array opposite to the children of Ammon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant differences:** Although the English translation of the Syriac has *the Ammonites* rather than *the sons of Ammon*, this could be simply a matter of their choice of translation (that is, they had Bene [sons of]-Ammon before them in the Hebrew manuscripts, and just decided to translate this Ammonites).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEV</td>
<td>He put his brother Abishai in command of the rest of the army and had them fight the Ammonites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy English (Pocock)</td>
<td>Joab made his brother Abishai the leader of the rest of the army. They fought against the <em>Ammonites</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy-to-Read Version</td>
<td>Then Joab gave the other men to his brother Abishai to lead against the Ammonites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good News Bible (TEV)</td>
<td>He placed the rest of his troops under the command of his brother Abishai, who put them in position facing the Ammonites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Message</td>
<td>The rest of the army he put under the command of Abishai, his brother, and deployed them to confront the Ammonites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life Bible</td>
<td>He put the rest of the people under the rule of his brother Abishai. He dressed them for battle against the sons of Ammon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Living Translation</td>
<td>He left the rest of the army under the command of his brother Abishai, who was to attack the Ammonites.</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>...then he put the rest of his army into the hands of his brother AbiShai, and they deployed opposite the sons of AmMon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Roots Translinear</td>
<td>He gave the balance of the people in the hand of Abishai his brother to rank to greet the sons of Amman.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He put his brother Abishai in charge of the rest of the troops. Abishai organized them for combat against the Ammonites.

And the rest of the people he put in position against the children of Ammon, with Abishai, his brother, at their head.

He entrusted the rest of the army to his brother Abishai, and drew them up in line facing the Ammonites.

He put his brother Abishai in command of the rest of the army and had them fight the Ammonites.

The rest of his troops he put under his brother Abishai, who took up a position facing the Ammonites.

And the rest of the people he gave over to Abishai his brother, and he set (them) against the children of Ammon.

He put the rest of the men under the command of Abishai his brother and deployed them against the Ammonites.

And the rest of the people he has given into the hand of Abishai his brother, and sets in array to meet the Bene-Ammon.

The rest of his men he put in the charge of Abishai his brother, and he arrayed them against the Ammonites.

And the rest of the people he gave over to Abishai his brother, and he set (them) against the children of Ammon.

He placed the rest of the forces under the command of his brother Abishai who lined up in battle formation to engage the Ammonites.

He put his brother Abishai in charge of the rest of the army [Heb "people."] and they were deployed [Heb "he arranged."] against the Ammonites.

He put the rest of the army/people he {Joab} 'gave authority' into the hand of Abishai his brother, that he might deploy/"put them in array" against the army/sons/citizens of Ammon.  {Note: Joab had to delegate the authority of one part of his army to his brother Abishai. This requires much trust on both ends. Abishai is another great general and Joab trusts him.}.

He put the rest of the men under the command of Abishai his brother and deployed them against the Ammonites.

...and he gives the rest of the people into the hand of Abi Shai his brother, to line them up to meet the sons of Ammon.

And the rest of the army/people he delivered into the hand of Abishai his brother, that he might put them in array against the children of Ammon.

And the rest of the people he put into the hand of Abishai his brother, that he might set them in battle array to meet the sons of Ammon.

And the rest of the people he put under his command of Abishai, who took up a position facing the Ammonites.

Joab had the rest of the troops fight under the command of his brother Abishai. They would act as a holding force, to hold the Ammonites against the wall of Rabbah, while Joab went full-force against the Aramaeans behind them.
Translation: He placed the rest of the people in the hand of Abishai, his brother;... Joab had to make some quick decisions. He took the elite forces out of the Israelite army and left behind the citizen soldiers, whom he put under the leadership of his brother Abishai. It is not clear where Abishai was on the hierarchy of leadership, but he probably ranked right below Joab (since Joab seems to be calling the shots here). Joab needed someone that he could implicitly trust and whose every move he could anticipate. The strategy, as previously described, of taking his elite corps and turning them into a flying column, striking the Syrians at multiple points while his brother holds the Ammonites at bay. Joab almost needs to be in two places at once—to see what is happening with the Syrians and to see what is happening with the Ammonites. The closest that Joab can get to being in two places at once is to have his brother deploy a holding force against Ammon.
### 2Samuel 10:10b

<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><strong>wa (or va) (י) [pronounced wah]</strong></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><strong>‘arak (ארך) [pronounced ġaw-RAK]</strong></td>
<td>to arrange, to set in order, to place in a row, to place in a particular arrangement or order; to organize</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #6186 BDB #789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>lâmed (ל) [pronounced ℓ]</strong></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><strong>qârâ (קרא) [pronounced kaw-RAW]</strong></td>
<td>to encounter, to befall, to meet; to assemble [for the purpose of encountering God or exegeting His Word]; to come, to assemble</td>
<td>Qal infinitive construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #7122 &amp; #7125 BDB #896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bên (בני) [pronounced bane]</strong></td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
<td>masculine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ammôwn (עמון) [pronounced ġahm-MOHN]</strong></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:** ...and he deployed [them] against Bene-Ammon. He refers back to Abishai, the closest proper noun. Abishai took a rather weak force, in terms of discipline and training, and set them against the Ammonites, but as a holding force. Now, here is the brilliance in that approach: the Ammonites at the wall of Rabbah were bait and to function as a holding force against Israel. They were not given a set of alternate instructions. They were to draw the Israelites soldiers in toward them, and the Syrians were supposed to strike from behind. They cannot see what is happening behind the Jewish army, and they have no alternative orders. Draw the Israelites in, hold them there; and let the Syrians come in behind them. So, essentially, we have 2 holding forces holding their ground against one another—neither force is supposed to advance on the other. The key is, what is happening behind Abishai’s army. The Ammonites cannot see that, and they appear to have no contingency orders. So they stand their ground and the Israelite citizen-army stands theirs.

---

**Ancient texts:**

And so he says, “If is strong Aram from me, and you have been to me to deliverance; and if Bene-Ammon are strong from you, and I have come to deliver to you.

And Job said, “If Aram is too strong for me, then you will come to my aid; and if the sons of Ammon are too strong for you, then I will come and deliver you.

Here is how others have translated this verse:
And Joab said: If the Syrians are too strong for me, then You will help me, but if the children of Ammon are too strong for you, then I will help you.

And so he says, "If is strong Aram from me, and you have been to me to deliverance; and if Bene-Ammon are strong from you, and I have come to deliver to you.

And he said to Abishai his brother, If the Arameans prove too strong for me, then you shall help me; but if the Ammonites prove too strong for you, then I will come and help you.

And he said, If Syria is too strong for me, then shall you help me: and if the children of Ammon are too strong for you, then will we be [ready] to help you.

The Latin translation has Joab instead of he; probably for clarity (you notice that several English translations do this). The verb to be strong combined with the min preposition appears to mean too strong for. This would explain the differences in the ancient translations as well as the way modern translators treat this verb/preposition combination.

The second-to-the-last verb is to come in the Hebrew; it is to be in the Greek (which is like the first half of this verse); and that appears to be the case for the Latin. The Syriac backs up the Hebrew here. You will notice that many English translations treat these two halves of v. 11 as being almost identical, which they are not. I mention that simply to explain why the Greek does not agree with the Hebrew here.

As usual, even though there are a few slight differences in the ancient translations, there is no real difference in the general understanding of this verse.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV  Joab told his brother, "If the Arameans are too much for me to handle, you can come and help me. If the Ammonites are too strong for you, I'll come and help you.

Easy-to-Read Version  Joab said {to Abishai}, "If the Arameans are too strong for me, you will help me. If the Ammonites are too strong for you, I will help you.

Good News Bible (TEV)  Joab said to him, "If you see that the Syrians are defeating me, come and help me, and if the Ammonites are defeating you, I will go and help you.

The Message  Then he said, "If the Arameans are too much for me, you help me. And if the Ammonites prove too much for you, I'll come and help you.

New Century Version  Joab said to Abishai, "If the Arameans are too strong for me, you must help me. Or, if the Ammonites are too strong for you, I will help you.

New Living Translation  "If the Arameans are too strong for me, then come over and help me," Joab told his brother. "And if the Ammonites are too strong for you, I will come and help you.

Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:

American English Bible  And he said, 'If Syria starts to beat me, you come to help me; but if the sons of AmMon start to beat you, I'll come to help you.

Ancient Roots Translinear  He said, "If the Syrians fortify on me, be my salvation. But if the sons of Amman fortify to you, I will go to save you.

God’s Word™  Joab said, "If the Arameans are too strong for my troops, be ready to help me. And if the Ammonites are too strong for your troops, I'll come to help you.

NIRV  He said, "Suppose the Arameans are too strong for me. Then you must come and help me. But suppose the Ammonites are too strong for you. Then I'll come and help you.

New Jerusalem Bible  'If the Aramaeans prove too strong for me,' he said, 'you must come to my help; if the Ammonites prove too strong for you, I shall come to yours.
Joab told his brother: »If the Arameans are too much for me to handle, you can come and help me. If the Ammonites are too strong for you, I will come and help you.

'If the Aramaeans prove too strong for me,' he said, 'you must come to my relief; and if the Ammonites prove too strong for you, I shall come to yours.'

The gist of this verse: Joab sets up 2 contingency plans. If he begins to lose to the Aramaeans, then part of Abishai’s army is to back him up; if Abishai runs into trouble, then Joab will back him up.
### 2Samuel 10:11a

<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><strong>wa (or va)</strong> ((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></td>
<td>[pronounced wah]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘āmar (אמר)</strong></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>[pronounced aw-MAHR]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘îm (אימ)</strong></td>
<td>if, though; lo, behold; oh that, if only; when, since, though when (or, if followed by a perfect tense which refers to a past event)</td>
<td>primarily used as an hypothetical particle</td>
<td>Strong’s #518 BDB #49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced eem]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>châzaq (חזק)</strong></td>
<td>to tie up, to bind; to hold fast, to adhere to, to be stuck to; to be strong, to be firm, to increase in prosperity, to strengthen</td>
<td>3rd person feminine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #2388 BDB #304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced khaw-ZAHK]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Āram (ארם)</strong></td>
<td>the highland, high region; exalted; and is transliterated Aram; sometimes rendered Syria, Mesopotamia</td>
<td>proper noun singular</td>
<td>Strong’s #758 BDB #74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced uh-RAHM]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>min (מנ)</strong></td>
<td>from, off, away from, out from, out of, from off; on account of, since, above, than, so that not, above, beyond, more than, greater than</td>
<td>preposition of separation with the 1st person singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #4480 BDB #577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced mihn]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What appears to be the case is, the verb châzaq combines with the min preposition to mean *to be too strong for*. It is the min preposition which seems to add the concept of *greater than* or *more than*, which is not found in the verb alone.

| **w** ((pronounced weh)) | and, even, then; namely; when; since, that; though | simple wâw conjunction | No Strong’s # BDB #251 |
| (or)**v** ((i or i))     |             |                  |                          |
| [pronounced wah]         |             |                  |                          |
| **hâyâh (יהוה)**       | to be, is, was, are; to become, to come into being; to come to pass | 2nd person masculine singular, Qal perfect | Strong’s #1961 BDB #224 |
| [pronounced haw-YAW]    |             |                  |                          |
| **lâmed (לאימד)**      | to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by | directional/reational preposition with the 1st person singular suffix | No Strong’s # BDB #510 |
| [pronounced lem]        |             |                  |                          |
| **lâmed (לאימד)**      | to, for, towards, in regards to, with reference to, as to, with regards to; belonging to; by | directional/reational preposition | No Strong’s # BDB #510 |
| [pronounced lem]        |             |                  |                          |
| **y’shûw’âh (ישועה)**  | deliverance, salvation | feminine singular noun | Strong’s #3444 BDB #447 |
| [pronounced y’shoo-GAW] |             |                  |                          |

**Translation:** And Joab [lit., he] said, “If Aram is too strong for me, then you will be to me deliverance;...” Joab has probably correctly understood the Ammonite-Syriac strategy here. He probably figured that the Ammonites were
to be a holding force, and that Syria was to be the primary advancing army. What he does here—something which
the Syrians and Ammon neglected to do—is, set up 2 contingency plans.

His elite forces are going to attack the Syrian army at several points; they will move quickly, pierce the Syrian line,
and then move quickly to another place to fight. The Syrian army was planning to fight on exterior lines—to start
from several places and converge on and envelop the Israelite forces. Joab turns this against the Syrians, and
strikes them in several different points with a mobile elite fighting force. However, Joab realizes that his elite
forces may not be enough to take down the Syrian army, which is a larger army and probably better trained.
Therefore, contingency plan #1 is, if these Aramaeans begin to advance against Israel, then Abishai is to peel off
as many men as he can to help Joab’s elite troops.

Application: Not only does God approve of war here, but He is making clear what the strategy and tactics are
for this battle, indicating clearly that, we do what we ought to reasonably do in war. Just because God is on our
side (e.g., against the Germans and Japanese in World War II; or against the communists in Korea and Vietnam),
this does not excuse sloppy strategy and tactics. We lost in Vietnam, not because we did not have the stronger
army, but for 2 reasons: (1) LBJ was an idiot and did not allow the generals to fight this war as they saw fit (which
means, poor strategy and tactics); and (2) the people of the United States did not understand our righteous cause
before God. Then, as now, it was clear to those who understand historical events as they occur, that godless
communism is a cancerous evil which ought to be stopped. We lacked the will as a people to do this; and our
world became much more dangerous because of this lack of spiritual understanding and resolve.

Application: We ought to have the same resolve against rogue Islamic forces today, as well as against
communism. We ought to have a coherent foreign policy which takes their evil into account.

<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) (ו or 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>ìm (יִם) [pronounced</td>
<td>if, though; lo, behold; oh that, if only; when, since, though when (or, if followed by a perfect tense which refers to a past event)</td>
<td>primarily used as an hypothetical particle</td>
<td>Strong’s #518 BDB #49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bên (בֵּן) [pronounced</td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
<td>masculine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ammôn (עַמּוֹן)</td>
<td>hidden; transliterated Ammon</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #5983 BDB #769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is often transliterated Bene-Ammon and is a common designation for this country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>châzaq (נָצַק) [pronounced khaw-ZAHK]</td>
<td>to tie up, to bind; to hold fast, to adhere to, to be stuck to; to be strong, to be firm, to increase in prosperity, to strengthen</td>
<td>3rd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #2388 BDB #304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmed (לֶֽמַד) [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>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2Samuel 10:11b

<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, ו)</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>hâlak (הלך)</td>
<td>to go, to come, to depart, to walk; to advance</td>
<td>1st person singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #1980 (and #3212) BDB #229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmêd (לָמֶד)</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>yâsha (יָשָׁה)</td>
<td>to deliver, to save; to set free, to preserve; to aid, to give relief</td>
<td>Hiphil infinitive construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #3467 BDB #446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and if Bene-Ammon is too strong for you, then I will come to deliver you.  
Contingency plan #2: let’s say that the Ammonites were not strictly bait, but an advancing force. Joab knew that Abishai had a weaker force—he may have been more numerous, but these men would not have had the same elite training and resolve as the men he commanded. Therefore, if the Ammonite army began to advance, and Abishai’s army could not hold them, then Joab will peel off his men to stop the advancing Ammonites.

Obviously, there is a 3rd possibility here: the Ammonite army may have begun to advance against Israel and, simultaneously, the Syrian army may prove to be too powerful for the Joab’s elite forces. Joab did not speak of this possibility, although he certainly knew that it could have occurred. He is not going to offer up a 3rd contingency plan, “If the Ammonites advance and if the Syrians are too strong, then we are going to run like hell.” Joab will depend upon the justice of God, as we have done in much of our history. The Ammonites and the Syrians are both on the wrong side of history, and Joab recognizes that they are on God’s side.

Joab offers up 2 simple contingency plans. The Ammonites and the Aramaeans had 1 plan, and nowhere to go if that plan folded. Despite the fact that this looked like a sure thing to them, it was not, and they had no backup plan to depend upon.

This is simple, old fashioned teamwork. Joab is in charge and he calls the shots; however, it is clear that he and Abishai will be dependent upon one another.

**Application:** Today, the spiritual life of 90% or more of believers takes place as a result of being in the local church, and a local church is a team effort. It takes more than a charismatic pastor in order to make a church function. Without an effort spearheaded by a number of believers, a church will not work, and no one will grow because of this church. Rom. 15:1–2: *We who are strong have an obligation to bear with the failings of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let each of us please his neighbor for his good, to build him up.* Luke 22:31–32: *"Simon, Simon, behold, Satan demanded to have you, that he might sift you like wheat, but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail. And when you have turned again, strengthen your brothers."

**Application:** The Old Testament is filled with a variety of scenarios which the client nation Israel finds itself. There are times, like this, when they are to resist the evil. There are other times, when the Greeks and Romans were far too powerful for Israel, and when their spiritual state was weak, that they were to allow themselves to be
dominated by the Greeks and then by the Romans. The more we know about Israel in the Old Testament, the better informed our own opinions are with regards to our own place in history.

**Application:** Right now, the United States is the supreme military power of the world; and this is only because of our technology and our vast weaponry. Remove our nuclear capabilities and scale back on our technology, and we do not have a large enough army to fight a full-out war. Our spiritual state is mixed; there are doctrinal churches teaching the Word of God, but the pivot (mature believers within the United States) is small.

**Application:** We are at a serious crossroads in this nation. Politically, there is a powerful minority in this country which is pushing us toward socialism, and they are even using the Bible in order to do this. There are also a tremendous number of Christians who are falling for this. At one time, even heathen in this nation were well-versed in the Bible. These heathen of the past, I daresay, know more about the Bible than Christians today. Quite frankly, most believers today could reduce their Bible (what they know of it) to a 3 or 8 page pamphlet. Knowledge of the Word of God is key; and if a socialist knows the Bible better than we do, they can destroy this nation from within. When a socialist can go to the Bible and point out a few verses which appear to teach socialism, and a typical believer just goes along with that, that is a sad commentary on the spiritual state of believers today.

Be strong and we will be strong for our people and for the cities of our Elohim; and Y’hovah does the good in His eyes.”

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

- **Latin Vulgate**
  Be of good courage, and let us fight for our people, and for the city of our God: and the Lord will do what is good in his sight.

- **Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**
  Be strong and we will be strong for our people and for cities of our Elohim; and Y’hovah does the good in His eyes.”

- **Peshitta (Syriac)**
  Be of good courage, and let us fight for the sake of our people and for the sake of the cities of our God: and the LORD will do what is good in his sight.

- **Septuagint (Greek)**
  Be courageous, and let us be strong for our people, and for the sake of the cities of our God, and the Lord shall do that which is good in His eyes.

**Significant differences:** The second verb does not mean to fight, as we find the English translation of the Latin and Syriac.

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

- **CEV**
  Be brave and fight hard to protect our people and the cities of our God. I pray that the LORD will do whatever pleases him."

- **Easy English (Pocock)**
  Be strong. Fight bravely to save our people and the cities of God. The *Lord will do what is right.*

- **Easy-to-Read Version**
  Be strong, and let us fight bravely for our people and for the cities of our God. The Lord will do what he decides is right.”

- **Good News Bible (TEV)**
  Be strong and courageous! Let’s fight hard for our people and for the cities of our God. And may the LORD’s will be done!”
Courage! We'll fight with might and main for our people and for the cities of our God. And GOD will do whatever he sees needs doing!"

New Century Version
Be strong. We must fight bravely for our people and the cities of our God. The Lord will do what he thinks is right."

New Living Translation
Be courageous! Let us fight bravely for our people and the cities of our God. May the Lord's will be done."
Be of good courage, and let us play the men for our people and for the cities of our God. And may Jehovah do that which seems good to Him.

Syndein
Be of good courage {chazaq - Qal stem} {order 1: Battle courage - moral courage - to be able to think under pressure think instead of emoting - do your job calmly} and let us 'guarantee freedom and integrity'/ 'play the man' {chazaq - Hithpael stem} for our people . . . and for the cities of our 'Elohim/Godhead. {order 2: Motivation for Battle - what are you fighting for? you fight to preserve that which you hold dear - if you are not a man, then at least act like one!} And Jehovah/God manufacture/do {`asah - manufacture victory out of battle . . . out of His Perfect Essence} the 'inherent good' {victory} . . . in His own eyes. (3rd order - remember Jesus Christ controls history - if HE wants us to win, no one can defeat us and if the plan of God is for us to lose, then so be it).

Third Millennium Bible
Be of good courage, and let us play the man for our people and for the cities of our God; and the LORD do that which seemeth to Him good."

A Voice in the Wilderness
Be strong, and let us be courageous for our people and for the cities of our God. And may Jehovah do what is good in His eyes.

World English Bible
Be of good courage, and let us play the man for our people, and for the cities of our God: and Yahweh do that which is good in His eyes.

Young’s Updated LT
Be strong and strengthen yourself for our people, and for the cities of our God, and Jehovah does that which is good in His eyes."

The gist of this verse: Joab encourages his brother Abishai to be strong and promises that they will be strong together, on behalf of all Israel. Then Joab puts it into God’s hands.

<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>châzaq (נָחַזְק)</td>
<td>be of good courage, be strong</td>
<td>2nd person masculine singular, Qal imperative</td>
<td>Strong’s #2388 BDB #304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wâ (וָ) (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>châzaq (נָחַזְק)</td>
<td>to be confirmed, to be established; to strengthen oneself, to take courage; to show oneself to be strong or energetic; to aid, to assist</td>
<td>1st person plural, Hithpael imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #2388 BDB #304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba’ad (בָּאת) (pronounced BAH-gad)</td>
<td>by, near; because of; behind, after; about, round about; between [two things], through; into, among; pro, for; away from, behind; on behalf of</td>
<td>generally a preposition of separation or nearness</td>
<td>Strong's #1157 BDB #126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘am (אָמ) (pronounced ḡahm)</td>
<td>people; race, tribe; family, relatives; citizens, common people; companions, servants; entire human race; herd [of animals]</td>
<td>masculine singular noun; collective noun; with the 1st person plural suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #5971 BDB #766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translation: Be strong and we will strengthen ourselves on behalf of our people and on behalf of the cities of our Elohim... In v. 11, we have a verb used twice, and then Joab uses this same verb again twice in this verse, but with a different morphology. First he encourages his brother Abishai to be strong—it is clear that Joab is speaking directly to Abishai; and then Joab uses the same verb again, but this time as a 1st person plural, Hithpael, which means to be confirmed, to be established; to strengthen oneself, to take courage; to show oneself to be strong or energetic; to aid, to assist. In this plan, they will establish one another; they will strengthen one another; they will give one another courage. The Hithpael is the intensive reflexive. This is an intense situation; they have been outmaneuvered by the Ammonites and the Syrians, and Joab is encouraging Abishai to be strong. I have no doubt that the thought of their imminent deaths was in their thoughts at this time.

Application: Châzaq means courage. Courage in battle is being able to apply military training and military doctrine to the abnormal circumstances of war. Believers and unbelievers alike are able to draw upon their training which was designed to prepare them for things that they could barely imagine in civilian life. Soldiers are motivated by a number of things: their family, loved ones, the preservation of freedom. However, what is key for a soldier is to be able to think when under pressure; in a life and death situation, a soldier cannot freeze up or go blank. He has to know his job and he must adhere to the mission, and that requires thinking. What is not called for in battle is great emotional outbursts but the calculated application of military training to the situation.

Joab then tells why they must be strong and take courage in one another: this is on behalf of their people and the cities of God. They are the defense for their own people. If their army goes down, undoubtedly, the Ammonites and the Syrians would invade Israel and wreak havoc before taking away their freedom. Their women would be raped and their children put into slavery. When Joab says this, he puts everything into perspective. They are the last line of defense for the freedom of their people and for the preservation of their cities.

Joab recognizes that these cities they are defending are the cities of God; the cities which God has established and preserved for Himself. This tells us that, despite his shortcomings, Joab is a believer in Jesus Christ and he recognizes his place in history—he has a personal sense of destiny—something many men go a lifetime without grasping.

Gill: In these words, Joab gives Abishai the rationale for their place and time in history: [We fight against these heathen, so] that the people of Israel might not be carried captive, and their cities spoiled and plundered; and instead of being cities where the people of God dwelt, and He was
worshipped, would, if taken, become the habitations of idolatrous heathen, and where temples would be erected to idols, and the worship of them; these were the arguments he used to engage them to fight manfully for their country, the liberties and religion of it.\textsuperscript{36}

The cities of Israel are rightly called, \textit{the cities of our God} here. God created this earth and it is His to distribute and to govern at will. God chose for the Israelites to inhabit this plot of land and He gave it to them; but ultimately, these are God’s cities.

And Joab said, “Be strong and we will strengthen ourselves on behalf our people and on behalf of the cities of our Elohim.” There is no question that Joab understood fully that what he did on the battlefield directly impacted the freedom and the lives of the Israelites for his generation and the next as well. The mercenaries out in the field are there for money, and if they are killed, they will not personally benefit from this money (their families might). However, success or failure will not impact the freedom of their own people. Therefore, Joab’s army has the strongest motivation for battle, and Joab clearly articulates this. There is no substitute for victory.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Hebrew/Pronunciation} & \textbf{Common English Meanings} & \textbf{Notes/Morphology} & \textbf{BDB and Strong’s Numbers} \\
\hline
\textit{wa} (or \textit{va}) (י) [pronounced \textit{wah}] & and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because & \textit{wàw} consecutive & No Strong’s # BDB #253 \\
\hline
\textit{YHWH} (יְהוָה) [pronunciation is possibly \textit{yeho-H-WAH}] & transliterated variously as Jehovah, Yahweh, \textit{Y`howah} & proper noun & Strong’s #3068 BDB #217 \\
\hline
\textit{`asåh} (אָסָּה) [pronounced \textit{gaw-SAWH}] & to do, to make, to construct, to fashion, to form, to prepare, to manufacture & 3\textsuperscript{rd} person masculine singular, Qal imperfect & Strong's #6213 BDB #793 \\
\hline
\textit{ţòwb} (טוּב) [pronounced \textit{toh-v}] & pleasant, pleasing, agreeable, good, better; approved & masculine feminine singular adjective which can act like a substantive; with the definite article & Strong’s #2896 BDB #373 \\
\hline
\textit{bô} (ב) [pronounced \textit{bô}] & in, into, at, by, near, on, with, before, against, by means of, among, within & a preposition of proximity & No Strong’s # BDB #88 \\
\hline
\textit{`èynayim} (יִנְיָיִם) [pronounced \textit{gây-nah-YIM}] & eyes, two eyes, literal eye(s), spiritual eyes; face, appearance, form; surface & feminine dual noun with the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person masculine singular suffix & Strong’s #5869 (and #5871) BDB #744 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{2Samuel 10:12b}
\end{table}

As a noun, this can mean \textit{the good thing, that which is good} [pleasing, approved, kind, upright, right]; goodness, uprightness, kindness, right; that which is fair [beautiful].

\textit{Translation: ...and Y`howah will do [what is] good in His eyes.”} Joab and Abishai face an almost impossible situation. They have been outmaneuvered by the Syrians. They have been trapped in a pincher movement, between a holding force and an army ready to fight from exterior lines. Their army is probably equal to that of the

\textsuperscript{36} Dr. John Gill, \textit{John Gill’s Exposition of the Entire Bible}; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 10:12 (slightly edited).
Ammonites, but it is inferior to that of the Syrians. Joab is going to take all of the elite forces out of Abishai’s command and he will take this small army and attack a huge Syrian army. And in all of this, Joab recognizes that Jesus Christ controls history and that He will do that which is divine good (divine good = that which is good in God’s eyes). God, Who knows the end from the beginning, Who has a plan greater than we can imagine, controls history, and He will do that which is righteous and just.

What is amazing is how quickly this situation is going to be turned around. For you to understand what is going on, picture the city of Rabbah with much of their army outside in front of the city walls, fighting, but not advancing (they would probably be shoot arrows, for the most part). Due south from the front of the city walls are the Aramaeans—charioteers, horsemen and infantrymen set up in a particular order, hidden from the Israelites at first, but now they can be seen. Trapped in between them—probably out in an open area—is the Israeli army—sitting ducks, in most people’s opinions. The Israelites have done exactly what the Aramaeans and the Ammonites wanted them to; they are exactly where they wanted them to be. The Israeli army has walked right into a trap and they have been totally outmaneuvered. Visualize this, and ask yourself, how can God accomplish divine good in this situation?

Application: If God is able to take this mess and somehow, through Joab and Abishai and their army, turn it into divine good, then surely, God can take any problem or difficulty that you have and turn it into divine good.

Throughout the Bible, there are several passages where one believer encourages another, or encourages his generals or his armies to fight courageously in battle. For the most part, these are not emotional-laden messages, but doctrinal messages of encouragement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Text/Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut. 32:2–6</td>
<td>And Moses said to his people, “I am 120 years old today. I am no longer able to go out and come in. The LORD has said to me, ‘You shall not go over this Jordan.’ The LORD your God himself will go over before you. He will destroy these nations before you, so that you shall dispossess them, and Joshua will go over at your head, as the LORD has spoken. And the LORD will do to them as he did to Sihon and Og, the kings of the Amorites, and to their land, when he destroyed them. And the LORD will give them over to you, and you shall do to them according to the whole commandment that I have commanded you. Be strong and courageous. Do not fear or be in dread of them, for it is the LORD your God who goes with you. He will not leave you or forsake you.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua 1:2–9</td>
<td>[God is speaking to Joshua]: “Moses my servant is dead. Now therefore arise, go over this Jordan, you and all this people, into the land that I am giving to them, to the people of Israel. Every place that the sole of your foot will tread upon I have given to you, just as I promised to Moses. From the wilderness and this Lebanon as far as the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites to the Great Sea toward the going down of the sun shall be your territory. No man shall be able to stand before you all the days of your life. Just as I was with Moses, so I will be with you. I will not leave you or forsake you. Be strong and courageous, for you shall cause this people to inherit the land that I swore to their fathers to give them. Only be strong and very courageous, being careful to do according to all the law that Moses my servant commanded you. Do not turn from it to the right hand or to the left, that you may have good success wherever you go. This Book of the Law shall not depart from your mouth, but you shall meditate on it day and night, so that you may be careful to do according to all that is written in it. For then you will make your way prosperous, and then you will have good success. Have I not commanded you? Be strong and courageous. Do not be frightened, and do not be dismayed, for the LORD your God is with you wherever you go.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
God’s Promises and Encouragement in War

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Text/Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Sam. 14:6</td>
<td>Jonathan said to the young man who carried his armor, “Come, let us go over to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the garrison of these uncircumcised. It may be that the LORD will work for us,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for nothing can hinder the LORD from saving by many or by few.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Sam. 17:37a</td>
<td>And David said [to Saul], “The LORD who delivered me from the paw of the lion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and from the paw of the bear will deliver me from the hand of this Philistine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Goliath].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Sam. 10:12</td>
<td>“Be of good courage, and let us be courageous for our people, and for the cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of our God, and may the LORD do what seems good to him.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Chron. 32:7–8a</td>
<td>[King Hezekiah to his people at the wall]: “Be strong and courageous. Do not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be afraid or dismayed before the king of Assyria and all the horde that is with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>him, for there are more with us than with him. With him is an arm of flesh, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with us is the LORD our God, to help us and to fight our battles.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh. 4:14</td>
<td>And I [Nehemiah] looked and arose and said to the nobles and to the officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and to the rest of the people, “Do not be afraid of them. Remember the Lord,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>who is great and awesome, and fight for your brothers, your sons, your daughters,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>your wives, and your homes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb. 13:5–6</td>
<td>Keep your life free from love of money, and be content with what you have, for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He has said, “I will never leave you nor forsake you.” So we can confidently say,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Lord is my helper; I will not fear; what can man do to me?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I took these verses 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. 10:12. I used the ESV, which I slightly modified.

**Chapter Outline**

Despite the brevity of Scripture at this point, I am confident that I will be able to give you a clear understanding of just what happened on the battlefield and how Joab was able to defeat a numerically superior force when starting at a tactical disadvantage. I simply want you to visualize where everyone is. The Ammonites are outside of city Rabbah, in front of the city wall. Opposite them, to the south, a mile or two away, is the Aramaean army, hidden from view. Coming in between these two armies—probably in an open plain—were Joab and Abishai and the army of Israel, the army of God. Here is the key to the battle which will ensue, the details of which are not found except by inference, in the Bible. It is important to understand who is poised to advance first in the army of Aram: it would be the horsemen and the charioteers of Aram. At the very front of the Aramaean army are the charioteers and the horsemen, but they are hidden from view in the forested area south of the mountain upon which Rabbah sits. The Aramaean infantry is behind and spread out (there is a reason for this). There is much more to the Aram-Ammon trap than, “We are gonna go get these guys.” There is a strategy which would indicate where everyone is and why they are there. See this in your mind’s eye as we proceed to v. 13.

And so comes near Joab and the people who [are] with him to the battle against Aram; and so they flee from his faces.

Then Joab and the people who [are] with him advanced to war against Aram, and they fled from him.

Then Joab and the people who are with him advanced to war against the Aramaic army, and they fled from him.
Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

- **Latin Vulgate**
  And Joab and the people that were with him, began to fight against the Syrians: and they immediately fled before him.

- **Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**
  And so comes near Joab and the people who [are] with him to the battle against Aram; and so they flee from his faces.

- **Peshitta (Syriac)**
  And Joab and the people who were with him drew near to battle against the Arameans, and they fled before him.

- **Septuagint (Greek)**
  And Joab and his people with him advanced to battle against Syria, and they fled from before him.

**Significant differences:** The English translation of the Latin differs in the first verb, making it *began to fight* rather than *draw near to battle*.

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

- **CEV**
  Joab and his soldiers attacked the Arameans, and the Arameans ran from them.

- **Easy-to-Read Version**
  Then Joab and his men attacked the Arameans. The Arameans ran away from Joab and his men.

- **The Message**
  But when Joab and his soldiers moved in to fight the Arameans, they ran off in full retreat.

- **New Living Translation**
  When Joab and his troops attacked, the Arameans began to run away.

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

- **Ancient Roots Translinear**
  Joab and the people with him approached to war with the Syrarians. They fled from his face.

- **God’s Word™**
  Then Joab and his troops advanced to fight the Arameans, and the Arameans fled. They ran away from him.

- **NIRV**
  Then Joab and the troops who were with him marched out to attack the Arameans. They fled from him.

- **New Jerusalem Bible**
  Joab and the force with him joined battle with the Aramaeans, who fled at his onslaught.

- **New Simplified Bible**
  Joab and his men advanced to attack the Syrians. The Syrians retreated.

- **Revised English Bible**
  Joab and his men engaged the Aramaeans closely and put them to flight,

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

- **Bible in Basic English**
  Then Joab and the people with him went forward to the fight against the Aramaeans, and they went in flight before him.

- **JPS (Tanakh)**
  Joab and the troops with him marched in battle against the Arameans, who fled before him.

- **NET Bible®**
  So Joab and his men [Heb "and the army which was with him."] marched out to do battle with the Arameans, and they fled before him.

- **NIV – UK**
  Then Joab and the troops with him advanced to fight the Arameans, and they fled before him.

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

- **English Standard Version**
  So Joab and the people who were with him drew near to battle against the Syrians, and they fled before him.

- **NRSV**
  So Joab and the people who were with him moved forward into battle against the Arameans; and they fled before him.
Syndein
And Joab advanced near . . . and the army that was with him, unto the battle against the Syrians/Aram and they ‘panicked and ran away/fled before him.
And Joab draws near—and the people who are with him—to battle against Aram, and they flee from his presence.

The gist of this verse:
Joab’s flying column was not what the Syrians expected. Joab’s forces were so strong and resolute that Aram retreated.

### 2Samuel 10:13a

<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>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâgash (נש) [pronounced naw-GASH]</td>
<td>to come near, to draw near, to approach, to come hither</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong's #5066 BDB #620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yôwâb (יواب) [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>w (or v) (י, or א) [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>‘am (עם) [pronounced ǧahm]</td>
<td>people; race, tribe; family, relatives; citizens, common people; companions, servants; entire human race; herd [of animals]</td>
<td>masculine singular noun; collective noun; with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #5971 BDB #766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘âsher (אשר) [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>‘îm (עם) [pronounced ǧeem]</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>lâmed (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</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mil’châmâh (מיל'חמא) [pronounced mil-khaw-MAW]</td>
<td>battle, war, fight, fighting; victory; fortune of war</td>
<td>feminine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #4421 BDB #536</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>‘Ăram (ארמ) [pronounced uh-RAHM]</td>
<td>the highland, high region; exalted; and is transliterated Aram; sometimes rendered Syria, Mesopotamia</td>
<td>proper noun singular</td>
<td>Strong’s #758 BDB #74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translation: Then Joab and the people who [are] with him advanced to war against Aram,... Joab did exactly what the Syrians did not expect him to do. They expect some of Joab’s soldiers to dig in and fight defensively; they expected some of Joab’s soldiers to desert and run from their lives. The last thing the Syrians expected was for Joab to go on the offensive and attack them. The Syrians had cavalry and chariots, and they expected Joab and his men, facing soldier on both sides, to take a position and hold it defensively, while they sent in fast moving chariots and horsemen to destroy them.

They may have expected Joab to dig in and send for reinforcements, and there may have been Aramaean infantry out there to deal with this.

Joab was fighting with his elite force, and they were able to function almost independently of one another. Joab gave them the overall strategy, to poke holes in the Syrian line, to attack at many points along the Syrian line, not moving in concert, not taking land and holding it, but moving as several small forces, moving, killing, and continuing to stay on the move. Each small group would kill a dozen or a hundred men, and then advance this way or that way. Their bravery and courage against such odds is amazing.

In order to be hidden, the Aramean army had to be in a forested area, in which chariots and calvary were impotent. These forces cannot be out in the open, while the Aramaean army crosses its fingers, hoping that Joab never looks to his right. These forces have to be well hidden. However, in order for these mobile forces to be effective, they need an open area on which to fight. The idea here was to trap Joab’s army in an open area, where his soldiers were supposed to remain on the defensive, and Aram’s mobile forces could strike at will. But, Joab confused them by advancing on their position in the forested area, where infantrymen have the advantage over calvary and chariots. If you are in a position where you cannot move out of—such as, a chariot rider in his chariot in a forest—you are automatically on the defensive, and at a disadvantage, as elite forces are better trained to fight under these circumstances than a chariot rider.

Charioteers and horsemen are designed to move quickly, strike and move out of there. The whole key to their effectiveness is their mobility. A horseman does not sit on his horse and have a sword fight with some fellow below. Nor does he park his horse, climb down, engage in a little hand-to-hand combat, and then get back on his horse and ride over to a new conflict. He speeds by an enemy soldier, swings his sword, and keeps moving. This is how a horseman is trained. Charioteers are trained to do essentially the same thing. They might even use their horses as weapons, to trample their enemies. But, what these men are not trained to do, is to stay in one spot and fight mano a mano (i.e., hand to hand combat). Joab has the elite forces, and they are trained to fight under a variety of circumstances. But, you know what they are not going to do? They are not going to park their butts out there in the open, in between the two armies, and allow the Aramaeans to strike at will.

<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>nûwç (יֵא) [pronounced noose]</td>
<td>to flee, to flee from, to escape, to depart, to hasten quickly [away]</td>
<td>3rd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong's #5127 BDB #630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min (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>
</tbody>
</table>
2Samuel 10:13b

<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>pâñîym (אֶפִּיָּם)</td>
<td>face, faces, countenance; presence</td>
<td>masculine plural noun (plural acts like English singular); with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #6440 BDB #815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together, min pâñîym and a suffix mean from before his face, out from before his face, from him, from one’s presence. However, together, they can also be a reference to the cause, whether near or remote, and can therefore be rendered because of him, by him.

Translation: ...and they fled from him. The Syrians were completely unprepared for Joab’s aggressive action. Here is how it went down:

The chariot riders and calvary would have been in the forefront in the forest, ready to charge out of the forest onto the open ground, which is where Joab and his army were. In an open field where foot soldiers dig in or freeze, calvary and charioteers have a great advantage. This is what the Aramæan mercenaries expected. However, when Joab advanced against them instead, these normally mobile forces were essentially stuck at the edge of this forest, and at a terrific disadvantage against elite fighting men. Here is their problem: horsemen and charioteers were not trained to stand and fight; they are trained to move, strike, and move out. The whole point of cavalry and armored forces is movement. But they are stuck in a heavily forested area, where they cannot move; and Joab’s army, instead of digging in and becoming sitting ducks, is advancing against them.

This completely throws off the overall strategy of the Aram-Ammon coalition. Ammon was to hold fast, the Israeli army was to be surprised from behind and frozen in place, and the Aramæan mobile forces were supposed to then charge. However, Joab turned the tables, advanced instead, being able to take out the forces which Aram believed to be their strongest. These mobile forces, now being immobile, found themselves at a sudden tactical disadvantage, as Joab and company began to slaughter them. The infantry was probably further back, and they were probably positioned to either do mop up or to spread themselves out to keep Israeli soldiers from retreating and getting away alive. They were not mentally poised for a full-frontal assault. They were not expecting to be the initial or aggressive force here, so when they observed the first line of troops being slaughtered—the calvary and the charioteers—those who were supposed to carry this battle—the Aramæan infantry panicked and fled.

Furthermore, these Aramaeans are mercenaries. They are not fighting for their families or to protect their country; they are fighting for money—and not a lot of it. As the bodies began to stack up in front of them, the cost was far too great for them to stay and continue fighting. Therefore, this infantry, probably spread out over a large area, with no alternative orders, with no military flexibility, fled from before Joab’s men, even though they were probably a larger force and might have defeated Joab had they advanced as well.

The problem here for the Aramaeans is, they lacked any true motivation. They were not fighting for their loved ones or for freedom, but simply because they were being paid. This is true in every level of war—particularly when it comes to CIA agents. Their minds have to be focused on the big picture and being properly motivated. Otherwise, their loyalty is for sale to the highest bidder.
And Bene-Ammon saw that Aram and so they fled from faces of Abishai. And so, Joab returns from against Bene-Ammon and so he enters Jerusalem.

When Bene-Ammon saw that Aram retreated, they retreated from the presence of Abishai and entered into the city. Then, Joab returned from [his war with] Bene-Ammon and he entered Jerusalem.

When the sons of Ammon saw that Aram, their ally, was retreating, they ran from Abishai and entered into their city, Rabbah. Consequently, Joab returned from this war with the sons of Ammon and went back to Jerusalem.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

- Latin Vulgate: And the children of Ammon seeing that the Syrains were fled, they fled also before Abisai, and entered into the city: and Joab returned from the children of Ammon, and came to Jerusalem.
- Masoretic Text (Hebrew): And Bene-Ammon saw that fled Aram and so they flee from faces of Abishai. And so they enter the city. And so, Joab returns from against Bene-Ammon and so he enters Jerusalem.
- Peshitta (Syriac): And when the Ammonites saw that the Arameans had fled, then they fled also before Abishai and entered into the city. So Joab returned from fighting against the Ammonites and came to Jerusalem.
- Septuagint (Greek): And the children of Ammon saw that the Syrians had fled, and they fled from before Abishai, and entered into the city. And Joab returned from the children of Ammon, and came to Jerusalem.

**Significant differences:** The final verb can be rendered to enter or to come to; so there is no difference in the translations in this regard.

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

- CEV: When the Ammonite soldiers saw that the Arameans had run away, they ran from Abishai's soldiers and went back into their own city. Joab stopped fighting the Ammonites and returned to Jerusalem.
- Easy English (Pocock): The *Ammonites saw that the *Arameans were running away. So the *Ammonites ran away from Abishai. They went back into their city. After the battle had finished, Joab returned to Jerusalem.
- Easy-to-Read Version: The Ammonites saw that the Arameans were running away, so they ran away from Abishai and went back to their city.
- The Message: Then the Ammonites, seeing the Arameans run for dear life, took to their heels from Abishai and went into the city. So Joab left off fighting the Ammonites and returned to Jerusalem.
- New Century Version: When the Ammonites saw that the Arameans were running away, they also ran away from Abishai and went back to their city. So Joab returned from the battle with the Ammonites and came to Jerusalem.

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

- American English Bible: And when the sons of AmMon saw the Syrians running, they turned and ran from AbiShai, back into their city. So, JoAb left the land of AmMon and returned to Jerusalem.
When the Ammonites saw that the Arameans had fled, they too fled before Abishai and entered the city. So Joab returned from fighting against the Ammonites and came to Jerusalem.

God’s Word™

The Ammonites saw that the Arameans were running away. So they ran away from Abishai. They went inside the city. After Joab had fought against the Ammonites, he went back to Jerusalem.

NIRV

When the Ammonites saw that the Aramaeans had fled, they too fled before Abishai and withdrew into the city. Hence, Joab broke off his campaign against the Ammonites and returned to Jerusalem.

New Jerusalem Bible

The Ammonites saw the Syrians (Arameans) running away. They fled from Abishai and retreated into the city. Then Joab turned back from fighting the Ammonites and went back to Jerusalem.

New Simplified Bible

The Ammonites saw the Syr. (Arameans) running away. They fled from Abishai and withdrew into the city.

Revised English Bible

...and when the Ammonites saw them in flight, they too fled before Abishai and withdrew into the city.

Today’s NIV

When the Ammonites realized that the Arameans were fleeing, they fled before Abishai and went inside the city. So Joab returned from fighting the Ammonites and came to Jerusalem.

Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

Bible in Basic English

And when the children of Ammon saw the flight of the Aramaeans, they themselves went in flight from Abishai, and came into the town. So Joab went back from fighting the children of Ammon and came to Jerusalem.

HCSB

When the Ammonites saw that the Arameans had fled, they too fled before Abishai and entered the city. So Joab withdrew from the attack against the Ammonites and went to Jerusalem.

JPS (Tanakh)

And when the Ammonites saw that the Arameans had fled, they fled before Abishai and withdrew into the city.

Judaica Press Complete T.

And when the children of Ammon saw that the Arameans had fled, then they likewise fled before Abishai, and they came to the city. And Joab returned from the children of Ammon and came to Jerusalem.

NET Bible®

When the Ammonites saw the Arameans flee, they fled before his brother Abishai and went into the city. Joab withdrew from fighting the Ammonites and returned to [Heb “and Joab returned from against the sons of Ammon and entered.”] Jerusalem.

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

Englighted Revised Version

And when the children of Ammon saw that the Syrians were fled, they likewise fled before Abishai, and entered into the city. Then Joab returned from the children of Ammon, and came to Jerusalem.

English Standard Version

And when the Ammonites saw that the Syrians fled, they likewise fled before Abishai and entered the city. Then Joab returned from fighting against the Ammonites and came to Jerusalem.

Fred Miller’s Revised KJV

And when the children of Ammon saw that the Syrians had fled, then they also fled before Abishai and entered into the city. So Joab returned from the children of Ammon and came to Jerusalem.

Syndein

And when the army/sons of Ammon saw that the Syrians had ‘fled in panic’, then they also retreated/fled before Abishai, and entered into the city {Rabah - city of Amman in trans-Jordania today}. So Joab returned from the army/sons of Ammon, and came to Jerusalem.

World English Bible

When the children of Ammon saw that the Syrians were fled, they likewise fled before Abishai, and entered into the city. Then Joab returned from the children of Ammon, and came to Jerusalem.
And the Bene-Ammon have seen that Aram has fled, and they flee from the presence of Abishai, and go in to the city; and Joab turns back from the Bene-Ammon, and comes in to Jerusalem.

The Ammonites see that the Aramaeans were retreated, so they withdrew their troops back into the city walls of Rabbah.

2Samuel 10:14a

<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>`w (or v) (ı, 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>bēn (בֶּן) [pronounced bane]</td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
<td>masculine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ `Ammōwn (ʾאַמְמוֹן) [pronounced gahm-MOHN]</td>
<td>hidden; transliterated Ammon</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #5983 BDB #769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rā’āh (רָאָה) [pronounced raw-AWH]</td>
<td>to see, to look, to look at, to view, to behold; to perceive, to understand, to learn, to know</td>
<td>3rd person plural, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7200 BDB #906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kîy (כָּי) [pronounced kee]</td>
<td>for, that, because; when, at that time, which, what time</td>
<td>explanatory or temporal conjunction; preposition</td>
<td>Strong’s #3588 BDB #471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nūwç (נּוּץ) [pronounced noose]</td>
<td>to flee, to flee from, to escape, to depart, to hasten quickly [away]</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5127 BDB #630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾ `Āram (אֶרְאָם) [pronounced uh-RAHM]</td>
<td>the highland, high region; exalted; and is transliterated Aram; sometimes rendered Syria, Mesopotamia</td>
<td>proper noun singular</td>
<td>Strong’s #758 BDB #74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Translation: When Bene-Ammon saw that Aram retreated,... The literary structure of this chapter is interesting. I mentioned that we have the verb to be strong, to be strengthened used 4 times in this chapter. This is applied to Joab and Abishai. The verb applied 3 times to their enemies is this verb to flee, to retreat. We also had this verb to see already. V. 9 reads: When Joab saw that the battle was set against him both in front and in the rear, he chose some of the best men of Israel and arrayed them against the Syrians. So, Joab looks over the situation that he is in, while minutes away from direct engagement, and he makes some decisions. The Ammonites do the same thing—the look around and observe what is happening, and they make some decisions.

Joab and Abishai were strong (a word used 4 times) before their attack; so that, the Syrians and the Ammonites retreated (a word used 3 times) from them.

The Ammonites are the bait, the holding force. There are reasons to believe that they were not a very tough army. They were not really expected to do much but man the fort and shoot out a few arrows now and then, and allow the Syrians to do all the heavy work. However, it is clear (probably from atop the city wall) that the Syrians are retreating as an army. They can be seen to fall back; there are pockets of dead bodies which can be seen from the wall. Large groups of Syrians can be seen running or fleeing on horseback or in their chariots (assuming that these items were brought with them into war).
2Samuel 10:14b

<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>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nûwç (닐ו)</td>
<td>to flee, to flee from, to escape, to depart, to hasten quickly [away]</td>
<td>3rd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5127 BDB #630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min (מיני)</td>
<td>from, away from, out from, out of from, 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>pânîym (פאנים)</td>
<td>face, faces, countenance; presence</td>
<td>masculine plural construct (plural acts like English singular)</td>
<td>Strong’s #6440 BDB #815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together, min pânîym mean from before the face of; out from before the face, from the presence of. However, together, they can also be a reference to the cause, whether near or remote, and can therefore be rendered because of, because that; by.

Translation: ...they retreated from the presence of Abishai... Now the ones retreating are the Ammonites. They are a weak force at the wall of the city Rabbah and suddenly, things are not looking too good. They needed to run for cover, and the city was right behind them.

2Samuel 10:14c

<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>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bôw (בוא)</td>
<td>to come in, to come, to go in, to go, to enter</td>
<td>3rd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #935 BDB #97</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and entered into the city. The Ammonites realize how perilous their situation has become, and they retreat back into the city. Interestingly enough, Abishai will not continue this assault—that is, he will not attempt to break through the city walls and wipe out the Ammonites.

There were probably several reasons for this: (1) the Jewish army under Abishai had not been ordered to attack the city; this was not a part of any of Joab’s plans. (2) the Jews many not have had the fighting force to take down the wall of Rabbah; (3) winter may have been approaching, which would effectively end the battle; but, most likely, (4) Joab recognized that this defeat of Aram on the battlefield changed the chessboard dramatically. No longer
is Ammon the main concern of the Jews. The response of Aram, which would be soon, was of far greater importance to Joab and Abishai.

### 2Samuel 10:14d

<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>shōwb (שֹׁב)</td>
<td>to return, to turn, to turn back, to reminisce, to restore something, to bring back something, to revive, to recover something, to make restitution</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7725 BDB #996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yōwâb (יֹוָא)</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>min (מ)</td>
<td>from, away from, out from, out of from, 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>‘al (ע)</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>bēn (בֵּן)</td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
<td>masculine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ammōwn (עמוֹן)</td>
<td>hidden; transliterated Ammon</td>
<td>masculine proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #5983 BDB #769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together, they mean from upon, from over, from by, from beside, from attachment to, from companionship with, from accompanying [in a protective manner], from adhesion to, from. Some translators rendered this away from.

Translation: Then, Joab returned from [his war with] Bene-Ammon... I find this final sentence fascinating. Joab and Abishai are not said to move against Rabbah. Whether they did anything at this time or not is not told to us here, but the implications are, they allowed the Ammonites goes back into Rabbah, and then they left. They did not complete their fighting with Ammon, nor did they advance and take the city. This will occur later on in 2Sam. 12:26–31 and 1Chron. 20:1–3. Furthermore, they did not pursue Aram for any great distance.

At first glance, I would have expected Joab and Abishai to take down Rabbah, which is what they originally went into Ammon to do. Bear in mind, the king of Ammon gravely insulted David; he did not, however, enter into Israel and conduct raiding parties. So, what occurred here—pushing back on Aram and sending them back north in retreat, and then causing the Ammonite army to retreat back into Rabbah, may have been good enough for that period of time. They had temporarily answered the insult which King Hanun had done to David’s delegation.

Joab’s forces decisively defeated the Aramæan army, and send them packing; and when the Ammonites observed this, they retreated back into Rabbah. Then Joab stopped, and returned to Jerusalem. This is not Joab wondering, okay, what do I do next? He will return to Jerusalem for a specific reason. However, this left the...
Ammonites essentially quaking within their city walls, knowing that, at any time, Israel may strike them down. Furthermore they had spend much of their wealth on hiring this Syrian mercenary force, which did them no good.

Barnes suggests that the Syrians were not defeated enough to allow for a safe assault on Rabbah. Both Gill and Keil and Delitzsch suggest that it is winter, and the end of the warring season. All of these men may be correct to some degree, but I think there is a more pressing matter for Joab to consider, which will involve David.

Joab is a career military man, and his thinking appears to be in line with David’s much of the time—for good and for evil (as we will find out in the next chapter). So, Joab is not confused at this point; he does not return to Jerusalem for more direction from David. He is not going back to David to ask, “What I do now, boss?” If that were the case, Joab would be in the wrong position.

So, Joab returns from this war. Did Abishai remain there to keep an eye on the Ammonites? We are not told. I would guess that Abishai kept a small force there, and kept the soldiers of Ammon in the city walls, but without making a full-on attack. If this was done, then Abishai could withdraw at any time, and the Ammonites will think that they may still be out there, ready to attack.

Was Joab going back for more reinforcements in order to attack the Ammonite city of Rabbah? I don’t think so. My educated guess is this: Joab realized what a problem this was, that he had defeated the mercenary army of Aramaeans, and that this was a much greater concern to Israel than these Ammonites, whose only contribution to this battle was, they allowed themselves to be used as bait. Therefore, Ammon could be dealt with at any time. They were left in their city, soundly defeated, and they waited there in fear, knowing that, any day, Joab may show up with the armies of Israel and destroy their entire city. The Ammonites do not think like Joab thinks; therefore, it is all about them. They knew what David had done to Moab (2Sam. 8:2). And they have become weak and indolent; so they hid within their city, dying a thousands deaths, knowing that, at any moment, the Israeli army may tear down their walls and kill them all.

Abishai might have kept an army outside the city walls for a week or two, and then quietly left. However, Joab needed to go back and give David a report and to warn him about Syria. I believe that the circumstances here are so serious that Joab does not want to simply send a messenger.

Joab has thought this through—he knows the Aramaeans are not going to let this defeat go; he knows that they are by far the greatest threat to Israel’s freedom. Therefore, he returns to Israel to consult with David about an assault on Aram, the greatest military power and empire of that day.

Joab has 2 forces, each involved in different functions. Those at the wall of Rabbah are a holding force. They are not to take Rabbah, they are not to move against the city, they are to simply hold the Ammonite forces back. Some time in the future—perhaps as soon as the following spring—Joab will return and take Rabbah, but, for right now, they are a simple holding force. His elite forces, on the other hand, move quickly and aggressively against the Aramaean mercenaries. There is no time to waste. They must be attacked and killed when caught up in the heavy forested area which hid them from view. Joab cannot allow these chariots and horsemen to come out to battle in an open area.

So, the Aramaean mercenaries return to Syria, which is going to cause the Syrians to put together their largest army to attack Israel. Joab returns to Jerusalem so that he and David can gather together a nation-wide army to face the Aramaean army; and Abishai is probably left with a small holding force outside the city walls of Rabbah, which will keep the Ammonites in check. It is possible that this holding force will at some point, return to Israel to join in the fight against the Aramaeans.

---

37 Albert Barnes, *Barnes’ Notes on the Old Testament*; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 10:14.
38 Dr. John Gill, *John Gill’s Exposition of the Entire Bible*; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 10:14.
39 Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*; from e-Sword; 2Sam. 10:13–14.
Although David and Joab no doubt have intelligence teams out there, watching the Aramaeans, they will both recognize that this war is inevitable. Therefore, David and Joab will be gathering and preparing an army, and getting it ready to make, if necessary, a preemptive strike.

**Application:** A nation needs to be prepared for war and a nation needs to have a sensible and realistic foreign policy. Joab and David correctly evaluate the situation and they know that a war is imminent. Would that our own state department recognized where we stand today in the world.

<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>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>Yרְוֹשֶׁלְעָיָים (רְוֹשֶׁלְעָיָם)</td>
<td>possibly means founded upon peace or city of the Jebusites (or both); it is transliterated Jerusalem</td>
<td>proper singular noun, location</td>
<td>Strong's #3389 BDB #436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and he entered Jerusalem. Again, we have a parallel. The Ammonites entered into their city in retreat; Joab enters into Jerusalem as a hero.

Again, the Ammonites are a weak, cowardly group of men hiding within their city walls; but Aram is a great empire whose threat to Israel's freedom is of far greater import. Joab needs to confer with David; however, given the circumstances, he and David are probably both of the same mind: raise up a huge national army and soundly defeat the Aramaean army.

---

**Chapter Outline**

**Charts, Maps and Short Doctrines**

**David's War with Aram at Helam**

*1Chronicles 19:18–19*

The Aramaean mercenary force was a great money-making commodity for Aram. It could be rented out for great sums of money, and this force would, no doubt, collect their fees up front, and then whatever spoil they take in battle. This works as long as their mercenaries are undefeated. However, Joab just defeated Aram's mercenary army, and this information would be spread across the land of the Middle East. If a mercenary force cannot be depended upon to win a few battles, then that force is worthless. This puts thousands of men out of work, and reduces the GNP (gross national production) for Aram considerably. The nation of Aram cannot let this go. They cannot take the attitude, “Oh, well, win some, lose some.” Joab understood this and certainly, David would get it as well, despite his sitting out the war against Ammon.

According to R. B. Thieme, Jr., this is one of the most important wars in the ancient world, and one which affected the course of ancient history. He attributes the dissemination of the modern alphabet, the rise of the Greek sea peoples (who disseminated this alphabet) to the results of this war. Because of dissemination of both the modern alphabet and the Greek peoples throughout the world, that gave rise to the golden age of Greece in the 5th century B.C. The emergence of this alphabet would have increased the literacy of the Greeks, as well as their
literary output, transforming these barbarian Greeks into philosophers, writers and thinkers (although, they did maintain a rugged army).

And so see Aram that he was struck down to faces of Israel; and so they have assembled together.

When Aram saw that they had been struck down before Israel, they gathered themselves together.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

Latin Vulgate  
Then the Syrians seeing that they had fallen before Israel, gathered themselves together.

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)  
And so see Aram that he was struck down to faces of Israel; and so they have assembled together.

Peshitta (Syriac)  
And when the Arameans saw that they were defeated before Israel, they gathered themselves together.

Septuagint (Greek)  
And the Syrians saw that they were defeated before Israel, and they gathered themselves together.

Significant differences: None. To fall is a reasonable translation of the first verb.

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

CEV  
The Arameans realized they had lost the battle, so they brought all their troops together again.

Easy English (Pocock)  
The *Arameans realised that the *Israelites had defeated them. So the *Arameans gathered together again.

Easy-to-Read Version  
The Arameans saw that the Israelites had defeated them. So they came together {into one big army}.

Good News Bible (TEV)  
The Syrians realized that they had been defeated by the Israelites, and so they called all their troops together.

The Message  
When the Arameans saw how badly they'd been beaten by Israel, they picked up the pieces and regrouped.

New Living Translation  
The Arameans now realized that they were no match for Israel. So when they regrouped,...

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

American English Bible  
Well, after the Syrians found that they had lost before Israel, they gathered to the same place again.

Ancient Roots Translinear  
The Syrians saw their plague in front of Israel, and they gathered together.

God's Word™  
Realizing that Israel had defeated them, the Arameans reassembled their troops;...

New American Bible  
Then the Arameans responded to their defeat by Israel with a full mustering of troops;...

NIRV  
The Arameans saw that they had been driven away by Israel. So they brought their troops together.

New Jerusalem Bible  
The Aramaeans, realising that Israel had got the better of them, concentrated their forces.

New Simplified Bible  
The Syrians knew they had been defeated by the Israelites. They called all their troops together.

Revised English Bible  
The Aramaeans, reviewing their defeat by Israel, rallied their forces,...
Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

Bible in Basic English  And when the Aramaeans saw that Israel had overcome them, they got themselves together.

Complete Apostles' Bible  And the Syrians saw that they were defeated before Israel, and they gathered themselves together.

HCSB  When the Arameans saw that they had been defeated by Israel, they regrouped.

JPS (Tanakh)  When the Arameans saw that they ha been routed by Israel, they regrouped their forces.

NET Bible®  When the Arameans realized that they had been defeated by Israel, they consolidated their forces [Heb "were gathered together."].

NIV – UK  After the Arameans saw that they had been routed by Israel, they regrouped.

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

English Standard Version  But when the Syrians saw that they had been defeated by Israel, they gathered themselves together.

LTHB  And Syria saw that it was stricken before Israel. And they assembled.

MKJV  And the Syrians saw that they were beaten before Israel, and they gathered together.

World English Bible  When the Syrians saw that they were put to the worse before Israel, they gathered themselves together.

Young’s Updated LT  And Aram sees that it is struck down before Israel, and they are gathered together.

The gist of this verse:  The Aramaeans, in recognizing their defeat before Israel, began to gather up their armed forces to go to war with Israel.

<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 waw]</td>
<td>and, so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</td>
<td>waw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>râ’âh (רָאָה) [pronounced raw-AWH]</td>
<td>to see, to look, to look at, to view, to behold; to perceive, to understand, to learn, to know</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7200 BDB #906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Âram (אָרָם) [pronounced uh-RAHM]</td>
<td>the highland, high region; exalted; and is transliterated Aram; sometimes rendered Syria, Mesopotamia</td>
<td>singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #758 BDB #74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kîy (כָּיָּה) [pronounced kee]</td>
<td>for, that, because; when, at that time, which, what time</td>
<td>explanatory or temporal conjunction; preposition</td>
<td>Strong’s #3588 BDB #471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâgaph (נָגָף) [pronounced naw-GAHF]</td>
<td>to be struck down, to be smitten, to be hit; [possibly] beaten, wounded</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Niphal perfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5062 BDB #619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmêd (לַמְדּ) [pronounced l’]</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to</td>
<td>directional/reational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout this chapter, the repeated waw consecutive seems to naturally fit a when....[then]... sentence.
**Translation:** When Aram saw that they [lit., he] had been struck down before Israel,... This becomes deadly serious. The Aramaean army is possibly the greatest army in the world at this time. They even exported men as mercenaries as a part of their economy. Suddenly, for whatever reason, this mercenary army did not fare well before Israel. They were out-maneuvered at the end, and out-fought. This is problematic, for their reputation and for their #1 export (mercenary forces). So Aram cannot just let this defeat at Rabbah go. Aram certainly has power over a number of other nations, and this defeat is going to change that dramatically as well. It was common in that era for a nation to exert dominance over a number of other nations. These defeated nations would bring tribute to the conquering nation, and often, in return, they received some modicum of protection. At the very least, Aram would not come in and destroy them. Now, if Aram has been defeated by this upstart nation Israel, then all of these tributary nations may decide to stop paying tribute to Aram. They may decide to rise up against Aram. If one nation does this, it is not a big deal; Aram can go in and crush them. However, if 3 or 4 tributary nations rise up against them, then Aram is in trouble. So, this defeat cannot be ignored.

**Translation:** ...they gathered [themselves] together. This gathering together means that the Syrians put together a great fighting force, because they cannot let this defeat go unanswered. They are renown throughout the ancient world as one of the toughest armies in the world, if not the toughest. They are the dominant power in the ancient world, and probably a great deal of their economy depends upon tribute being paid to them from a half-dozen other nations (or more). And they have just been given a beat down by a second-rate nation (in their opinion; and probably in the opinion of the world). It was clear that Israel was a formidable foe, having defeated...
many of its neighbors; but with Syria, we are talking an incredible army; and nation which specializes in the destruction of other armies.

The great Syrian export was their mercenary army. They were an intimidating and aggressive army of horsemen and chariots, which gave them the edge over nearly every other army of their day. If this army is defeated, then this cuts off one of their greatest exports. Why hire a mercenary force that is going to lose? Losing to Israel would be a great stain upon the Aramaean army. This cannot stand. King Hadadezer, as a matter of pride and to save his own economy, must defeat the Jews.

And so sends Hadadezer and he brings Aram which [is] from beyond the river. And so they enter Helam and Shobach a captain of an army of Hadadezer to their faces.

2 Samuel 10:16

Hadadezer sent [messengers] and brought Aram which [is] on the other side of the river [Euphrates]. Then they came into Helam with Shobach, the commander of Hadadezer's army [riding] in front of them.

Hadadezer then sent messengers and brought the Syrian army from the other side of the River Euphrates. This army came to Helam with Shobach, the commander of Hadadezer’s army, riding in front of them.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

Latin Vulgate
And Adarezer sent and fetched the Syrians, that were beyond the river, and brought over their army: and Sobach, the captain of the host of Adarezer, was their general.

Masoretic Text (Hebrew)
And so sends Hadadezer and he brings Aram which [is] from beyond the river. And so. they enter Helam and Shobach a captain of an army of Hadadezer to their faces.

Peshitta (Syriac)
And Hadarezer sent and brought out the Arameans that were beyond the river Euphrates; and they came to Helam; and Shobach the general of Hadarezer's army went before them.

Septuagint (Greek)
And Hadadezer sent and gathered the Syrians from the other side of the River Halamak, and they came to Helam; and Shobach the captain of the army of Hadadezer was at their head.

Significant differences: The insertion of the verb to be (as found in the Latin and Syriac) is reasonable. The final phrase, to their faces, means in front of them, and therefore, is reasonably translated at their head (as we see in the Greek). The Latin lacks this final phrase.

Thought-for-thought translations; paraphrases:

CEV
Hadadezer sent messengers to call in the Arameans who were on the other side of the Euphrates River. Then Shobach, the commander of Hadadezer's army, led them to the town of Helam.

Easy English (Pocock)
Some *Aramean soldiers were on the east side of the river Euphrates. King Hadadezer sent a message to them. They came to the city of Helam. Their leader was Shobach. He was the leader of Hadadezer's army.

Easy-to-Read Version
Hadadezer [61] sent messengers to bring the Arameans that lived on the other side of the Euphrates River. These Arameans came to Helam. Their leader was Shobach, the captain of Hadadezer's army.

Good News Bible (TEV)
King Hadadezer sent for the Syrians who were on the east side of the Euphrates River, and they came to Helam under the command of Shobach, commander of the army of King Hadadezer of Zobah.
Hadadezer sent men and brought out the Syrians who were on the other side of the Euphrates River, and they came to Helam. They were led by Shobach, the captain of Hadadezer's army.

...they were joined by additional Aramean troops summoned by Hadadezer from the other side of the Euphrates River. These troops arrived at Helam under the command of Shobach, the commander of Hadadezer's forces.

Hadadezer sent messengers to get Arameans from beyond the Euphrates River. The Arameans came to Helam with Shobach, the commander of Hadadezer's army, leading them.

King Hadadezer sent for the Syrians (Arameans) who were on the east side of the Euphrates River. They went to Helam under the command of Shobach. He was the commander of Hadadezer's army.

Hadadezer sent messengers and mobilised the Aramaeans living on the other side of the river; and these arrived at Helam, with Shobach the commander of Hadadezer's army, at their head.

King Hadadezer sent for the Syrians (Arameans) who were on the east side of the Euphrates River. They came to Helam under the command of Shobach, commander of the army of King Hadadezer of Zobah.

Hadadezer sent for and brought out the Arameans from across the river. As the armies came, Shobach the leader of the host of Hadarezer faced them.

Hadadezer sent for and brought out Aram which [is] beyond the Euphrates River; and they came to Helam, led by Shobach, Hadadezer's army commander.

And Hadadezer sent for the Aramaeans who were on the other side of the River: and they came to Helam, with Shobach, the captain of Hadadezer's army, at their head.

Hadadezer had some Arameans brought from east of the Euphrates River. They went to Helam under the command of Shobach. He was the commander of Hadadezer's army.
And Hadadezer sent and brought out the Syrians who were beyond the Euphrates. They came to Helam, with Shobach the commander of the army of Hadadezer at their head.

Hadadezer realized that he could not have it noised abroad that some semi-professional army, like that of Israel, defeated his army. So he sends for the Aramaic army from the other side of the Jordan, and they come to Helam with General Shobach at their head.

2 Samuel 10:16a

<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; because</td>
<td>wâw consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šâlach (שלח)</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>Hādād’ezēr (Hadad-ezer)</td>
<td>Hadad is a helper; transliterated Hadadezer</td>
<td>masculine singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #1909 BDB #212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 early printed editions have Hadarezer instead. Recall that there it is easy to confound the d (ד) and the r (ר) in the Hebrew.

Joseph Bryant Rotherham’s The Emphasized Bible; ©1971 by Kregel Publications; p. 330 (footnote).
Translation: Hadadezer sent [messengers]... As we have seen many times in the Hebrew, the verb to send is given without a direct object, although it cries out for a direct object in the English. I have inserted the word messengers, which many other translations have done. However, there is nothing to prevent Hadadezer from going himself (although he probably did not).

Israel’s pretty good army just defeated Syria’s (Aram’s) world-class army on the battlefield. Even though Israel began from a position of weakness, they turned this around to their favor and defeated the Syrian army.

<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 vâ) (ı̂, or ı̂) [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>yâtsâ (yâTSAWH)</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 imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3318 BDB #422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’éth (aTh) [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>’Ăram (uh-RAHM)</td>
<td>the highland, high region; exalted; and is transliterated Aram; sometimes rendered Syria, Mesopotamia</td>
<td>singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #758 BDB #74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’âsher (aSH) [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>min (mîn) [pronounced mihn]</td>
<td>from, away from, out from, out of from, 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>’èber (GAY-ver) [pronounced GAY-ver]</td>
<td>region beyond [across]; region on the other side [of a valley, stream, sea]; the opposite region [side]; beyond, side</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #5676 BDB #719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâhâr (nah-HAWR)</td>
<td>stream, river</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #5104 BDB #625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and brought Aram which [is] on the other side of the river [Euphrates]. What Hadadezer is doing is bringing out the big guns. He is not going to take any chances. He is bringing his army from the east side of the Euphrates River (most of the time when we read the words the river, it refers to the Euphrates River).

Aram is north and northeast of Israel. Their influence stretches out to Mesopotamia. If this chapter occurs after 2Sam. 8, then we may reasonably assume that perhaps a decade or more has passed, and that Aram has gone...
further east and has conquered much of Mesopotamia. However, given the circumstances, the Aramæan army will be brought back from this area to go to war against Israel.

It may be helpful to see some maps of this general area, so you can see where Israel, Syria (Aram) and the Euphrates all are.

Syria was the dominant world power at this time, and their empire stretched from modern-day Syria to modern-day Iraq.
The second map is a modern-day map of the same portion of the Middle East. If you examine both maps, the Syrians (the Aramaeans) were quite obviously the dominant force in the Middle East. And they were just given a beat-down by a second-rate army from a second-rate country (in their opinion, of course).


I think that R. B. Thieme Jr. would have been in second heaven, had he been able to show maps like these as he was teaching the Old Testament. He had a picture of all of this in his head, along with the movements of the great armies of the great nations of the ancient world, but I don’t believe that he was ever able to fully teach all that he knew since he was unable to show these maps and the great armies which went from region to region.

| 2Samuel 10:16c |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Hebrew/Pronunciation** | **Common English Meanings** | **Notes/Morphology** | **BDB and Strong’s Numbers** |
| wa (or va) (ו) [pronounced wah] | and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because | wâw consecutive | No Strong’s # BDB #253 |
| bôw (בּוֹ) [pronounced boh] | to come in, to come, to go in, to go, to enter | 3rd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect | Strong’s #935 BDB #97 |
| Chêylâm ( GridView ) [pronounced khay-LAWM] | stronghold, fortress; transliterated Helam, Chelam | singular proper noun/location | Strong’s #2431 BDB #298 |
Translation: Then they came into Helam... There is a lot of movement going on here. The Syrian army is bolstered with troops from the other side of the Euphrates (see the Map of the Ancient Middle East); and a huge Syrian army is brought down to the Transjordanian region, across from Geshur.

This map will give you a much better idea as to the movement of these various armies.

At the bottom of the page, you see the locations of Jerusalem and Rabbath. Joab was squeezed between the armies of Ammon and Aram at the entrance to the city of Rabbath-bene-Ammon (Rabbah). He returns to Jerusalem.

Meanwhile, the Aramaean army, after retreating and getting out of Ammon, go back to Aram, and a larger army is gathered, and they come to Helam (found roughly in the middle of this map).

Taken from The MacMillan Bible Atlas; 3rd Edition; Aharoni, Avi-Yonah, Rainey, and Safrai; MacMillan; ©1993 by Carta; p. 78. Although this particular Atlas is short on color, it covers almost every incident in the Bible which involves going from point A to point B.
The Doctrine of Helam

1. We know next to nothing about this famous battleground. The NIV Study Bible and the Open Bible both place it near the northern border of the territory of Gilead, east of the Jordan River. This location makes sense, that would be south of Damascus, which is a primary Syrian city.

2. The sum-total of Smith’s reading of this is, Helam means stronghold and it is east of the Jordan and west of the Euphrates.

3. This city is only named in 2Sam. 10:16–17; it is not even named in the parallel passage in 1Chron. 19, which suggests that, maybe 400 or 500 years later (when Chronicles was written), this city was unknown to them.

4. In Ezek. 37:16, we have the city Ebrameliam, which some identify as Helam, which, according to ZPEB, is north of Damascus, which does not make sense. Why would an army of Aram gather to fight David and then go in the opposite direction?

5. ZPEB also suggests that the city of Elema, which is modern `Alma, found in 1Maccabees 5:26 (and in the Egyptian Exrcation texts, circa 1850 B.C.) is identical to Helam, which is south of Damascus.

6. Easton tells us that Helam means place of abundance and tells us that some would identify it with Alamatta, near Nicephorium.

It is fascinating that this, the site of one of the most important battles of ancient history, is virtually unknown, apart from this passage.

---

1 The Open Bible; the New Living Translation; Thomas Nelson Publishers, Nashville, TN; ©1996, p. 417 (footnote).
2 Dr. William Smith, Smith’s Bible Dictionary; 1894; from e-Sword, topic: Helam.
4 Ibid.
5 M.G. Easton M.A., D.D., Illustrated Bible Dictionary; 1897; from e-Sword, topic: Helam.
Translation: ...with Shobach, the commander of Hadadezer’s army [riding] in front of them. Shobach is the great general of Hadadezer’s army, and he leads his forces into Helam. Some have suggested that he was commanding the eastern forces of Aram, and possibly the general leading them further and further east. However, now he has been called upon to bring Syria’s fiercest and most successful warriors to go against Israel, to teach them a lesson and to restore Aram’s standing in the world. Before, Joab fought against a smaller army of mercenaries; now he is going to feel to the brunt of the Syrian army.

General Shobak was the greatest general of the Aramæan army. Up until that time, he was probably undefeated in battle. King Hadadezer could not afford to be defeated a second time by Israel.

Shobach has absolute confidence in this endeavor. He is riding out in front of his fighting forces. This is consummate confidence on his part. In his own mind, he is going to lead his troops into Israel and destroy David’s little army.

And so is made known [to] David and so he gathers all Israel and so he crosses over the Jordan and so he enters Helam-ward. And so arrange in order Aram to meet David and they wage war with him.

When [this] is made known to David, he gathers all Israel, crosses over the Jordan, and enters into Helam. Aram [meanwhile] positioned [themselves] to meet David and to wage war with him.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

Ancient texts:

Latin Vulgate

And when this was told David, he gathered all Israel together, and passed over the Jordan, and came to Helam: and the Syrians set themselves in array against David, and fought against him.

41 Joseph Bryant Rotherham’s The Emphasized Bible; ©1971 by Kregel Publications; p. 330 (footnote).
And so is made known [to] David and so he gathers all Israel and so he crosses over the Jordan and so he enters Helam-ward. And so arrange in order Aram to meet David and they wage war with him.

And when it was told David, he gathered all Israel together and crossed the Jordan and came to Helam. And the Arameans set themselves in array against David, and David fought against them.

And it was reported to David, and he gathered all Israel and went over the Jordan, and came to Helam; and the Syrians set the battle in array against David, and fought with him.

As we have already seen, against is a reasonable rendering of to meet, given the overall structure of the Hebrew here.

David found out what the Arameans were doing, and he brought Israel's whole army together. They crossed the Jordan River and went to Helam, where the Arameans were ready to meet them.

When David heard about this, he gathered all the *Israelites together. They crossed over the river Jordan and they went to Helam. The *Arameans prepared for battle. Then they attacked David and his army.

When David heard of it, he gathered the Israelite troops, crossed the Jordan River, and marched to Helam, where the Syrians took up their position facing him. The fighting began,...

All this was reported to David. So David mustered Israel, crossed the Jordan, and came to Helam. The Arameans went into battle formation, ready for David, and the fight was on.

When David heard about this, he gathered all the Israelites together. They crossed over the Jordan River and went to Helam. There the Arameans prepared for battle and attacked him.

When David heard what was happening, he mobilized all Israel, crossed the Jordan River, and led the army to Helam. The Arameans positioned themselves in battle formation and fought against David.

When David was told about this, he assembled Israel's army, crossed the Jordan River, and came to Helam. The Arameans formed a battle line against David's troops and fought him.

On receiving this news, David assembled all Israel, crossed the Jordan, and went to Helam. The Arameans drew up in formation against David and fought with him.

David was told about it. So he gathered the whole army of Israel together. They went across the Jordan River to Helam. The Arameans lined up their soldiers to go to war against David. They began to fight against him.

David, being informed of this, mustered all Israel, crossed the Jordan and arrived at Helam. The Aramaeans drew up in line facing David and engaged him.

David heard of it. So he gathered the Israelite troops and crossed the Jordan River. They marched to Helam, where the Syrians took up their position facing him. The fighting began,...

Their movement was reported to David, who immediately mustered all the forces of Israel, crossed the Jordan, and advanced to Helam. The Aramaeans took up positions facing David and engaged him.
Mostly literal renderings (with some occasional paraphrasing):

Bible in Basic English
And word of this was given to David: and he got all Israel together and went over Jordan and came to Helam. And the Aramaeans put their forces in position against David, and made an attack on him.

HCSB
When this was reported to David, he gathered all Israel, crossed the Jordan, and went to Helam. Then the Arameans lined up in formation to engage David in battle and fought against him.

JPS (Tanakh)
David was informed of it; he assembled all Israel, crossed the Jordan, and came to Helam. The Arameans drew up their forces against David and attacked him;

NET Bible®
When David was informed, he gathered all Israel, crossed the Jordan River [The word "River" is not in the Hebrew text, but has been supplied in the translation for clarity.], and came to Helam. The Arameans deployed their forces against David and fought against him.

NIV – UK
When David was told of this, he gathered all Israel, crossed the Jordan and went to Helam. The Arameans formed their battle lines to meet David and fought against him.

Literal, almost word-for-word, renderings:

English Standard Version
And when it was told David, he gathered all Israel together and crossed the Jordan and came to Helam. The Syrians arrayed themselves against David and fought with him.

exeGeses companion Bible
And they tell David, and he gathers all Yisra El and passes over Yarden and comes to Helam. And the Aramiy line up to meet David and fight him:

LTHB
And it was told to David. And he gathered all Israel, and passed over the Jordan, and came to Helam. And the Syrians set themselves in order to meet David. And they fought with him.

Syndein
Now when 'it was reported'/'G2 briefed' David, he mobilized all Israel {entire Jewish army}, and passed over the Jordan {River} {this is David's Northern most advance base in the valley of Succoth}, and came to Helam. Now the Syrians deployed/set themselves in array' against David, and fought against him.

A Voice in the Wilderness
And when it was reported to David, he gathered all Israel, crossed over the Jordan, and came to Helam. And the Syrians set themselves in battle array to meet David and fought with him.

Young’s Updated LT
And it is declared to David, and he gathers all Israel, and passes over the Jordan, and comes in to Helam, and Aram sets itself in array to meet David, and they fight with him.

The gist of this verse:
David gathered up an army out of all Israel, crossed over the Jordan, and advanced to Helam, where Aram had placed itself in battle formation to meet David.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2Samuel 10:17a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hebrew/Pronunciation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa (or va) (i) [pronounced wah]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Samuel 10:17a

<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>nāgad ( נָגָד ) [pronounced naw-GAHHD]</td>
<td>to be made conspicuous, to be made known, to be expounded, to be explained, to be declared, to be informed</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Hophal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5046 BDB #616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hophal is the passive of the Hiphil (causative stem) and the rarest of the seven stems. There is never a hint of reflexive in this stem and the agent of the verb is often not given in the immediate context. Most grammar books call it simply the causative passive stem.

| David ( דָּוִדּ ) ( pronounced daw-VEED ) | beloved and is transliterated David | masculine proper noun | Strong’s #1732 BDB #187 |

2 Samuel 10:17b

<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>wa (or va) ( וַ ) [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>

| ’âçaph (וִּסַפ) [pronounced aw-SAHF] | relocate, transfer, transport, gather, to gather and remove, to remove | 3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect | Strong’s #622 BDB #62 |

| ’èth ( עֵת ) [pronounced ayth] | generally untranslated; occasionally to, toward | indicates that the following substantive is a direct object | Strong’s #853 BDB #84 |

Translation: When [this] is made known to David,... David knows what is going on. Joab has come to him from the battlefield and told him that Syria had aligned themselves with Ammon, and that they fought against Joab’s army; and that Joab defeated them. This information is extremely important, because both David and Joab recognize the impact of Joab defeating Syria (Aram). Ammon is not that big of a deal; but Syria is the reigning power of that day in the Middle East, and defeating the army of the greatest power of that day requires new strategy from Jerusalem.

To make known is in the imperfect tense, indicating continuous action. Joab tells David what has occurred. David has G2 forces throughout Israel and along their borders and even outside of Israel’s borders, so that they know what is going on. As soon as Joab tells David about this, David has his G2 concentrate on the reaction of Syria and to determine exactly what they plan to do. An invasion by Syria is certain, as is a beefed-up army. Both David and Joab know that Syria is not going to just let this go; and they both expect Syria to muster up a much larger army with the intent of destroying Israel and David’s army. The information which David continues to get simply confirms what he would expect.

Application: One key to a successful war is information. Joab and David know what Syria is probably going to do; nevertheless, they have their spies out there reporting to them regularly (the imperfect tense). Whether you are at war or not, information is crucial. God gave us His Word and it takes a lifetime to learn what God has for us to know. However, what God is willing to do is to make this known to us.
### 2Samuel 10:17b

<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>kôl (ך)</td>
<td>every, each, all of, all; any of, any</td>
<td>masculine singular construct not followed by a definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #3605 BDB #481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yis’hâq (יִשְׁחַק)</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:** ...he gathers all Israel,...  
David sent a small, semi-professional army with Joab to fight against Ammon. It was composed of elite soldiers and draftees. It was not all of Israel’s army as they were simply going to fight Ammon, which had become fat and lazy and arrogant. However, this war with Aram is quite different.

We are far removed from these times, and for some of us, the names Aram and Ammon are almost interchangeable; these are just different groups of people who hate Israel. It is far more than that. Let’s say that there was a skirmish between Costa Rica and Honduras, and the United States stepped in to help Costa Rica. If Honduras soundly defeated American armed forces, that would be similar to what has happened here (except that the U.S. president, depending upon who he is, might not care one way or the other).

The Syrians care about what just happened. David knows this. He will muster the largest possible army that he can from all Israel. This will essentially be universal military service, which is what the nation Israel has today. Modern-day Israel understands the precariousness of its situation; whereas we here in the United States do not. Israel today has universal military service (except for Arabs) and even women are a part of this. Men continue to be in the reserves into their 40’s.

### 2Samuel 10:17c

<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>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>ʿâbar (אָבָר)</td>
<td>to pass over, to pass through, to pass on, to go over [beyond], to cross, to cross over; to go away, to depart; to violate [a law]</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5674 BDB #716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿeth (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>Yâr’dên (יָרֵדֶן)</td>
<td>transliterated Jordan</td>
<td>proper noun with the definite article</td>
<td>Strong’s #3383 BDB #434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...crosses over the Jordan,...  
David does one more thing. He does not gather this army and then sit and wait at Israel’s border, just in case Syria decides to invade. Israel is aggressive. They move toward Syria. Part of what a good leader and a good army does is keep war from coming into their country. David is going to
make the battlefield as far from Israel as he can (this will actually be fought within Israel, but on the far east portion of Israel).

At that time period in history, the civilized world was ruled over by the various Semitic races. The Syrians and the Jews were first cousins (Gen. 10:22; Aram is the father of the Syrians = Aramaeans). Even though the Syrians dramatically outnumbered the Jews, the Jews will defeat them. The primary difference here is, the Jews had God on their side.

David’s aggression is important here. He does not quickly send ambassadors to Aram to iron out a peace treaty. He does not stop at Israel’s borders, thinking, *maybe they will not attack us*. David reacts decisively and aggressively and realistically.

**Application:** This is a problem that we face today, in the year 2010, in our war on terror. Our current president is trying to deal with this war as if the enemy combatants are criminals. Our previous president was only slightly more aggressive. Furthermore, one of the greatest issues we face today as a nation is treason, and no president has addressed that problem for decades. We have people selling military secrets to the Chinese and, when they are caught, they are given 5 or 10 or 15 years in prison. It is as if our leaders and our justice departments have lost their minds. Selling secrets to the enemy is treason and needs to be treated as such. A military execution—a firing squad broadcast publically—would be apropos here. We are idiots to treat these actions as anything less than treasonous.

David does not wait for the Aramaeans. David moves aggressively against them. He takes the battle out to an area where there are fewer civilians. He does not hide in castle Zion. The Jews control much of the region east of the Jordan (which area today is known as Jordan and Syria). Someone high up in David’s army is probably very familiar with this area (where Reuben, Gad and the half-tribe of Manasseh all live), and David is quickly moving his army into position to stop the Syrian onslaught. The Jewish population in the area is primarily cattlemen and sheep herders.

Even though this is one of the great battles of the ancient world which will affect history for hundreds of years, we have very few details. So far, we know the motivation of the Aramaean and Jewish armies; we know that the Jews are heavily outnumbered, and we know that the battle will take place east of the Jordan. We know that David takes this war so seriously that he is directly involved, and that the Jews have called out all of the reserves.

---

<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><strong>wa (or va) (i)</strong></td>
<td><em>and so, and then, then, and; so, that, yet, therefore; because</em></td>
<td><strong>wâw</strong> consecutive</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bôw’ (אֹב) [pronounced boh]</strong></td>
<td><em>to come in, to come, to go in, to go, to enter</em></td>
<td><strong>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</strong></td>
<td>Strong’s #935 BDB #97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chêylâm (ךֹלָם) [pronounced khay-LAWM]</strong></td>
<td><em>stronghold, fortress; transliterated Helam, Chelam</em></td>
<td><strong>singular proper noun/location; with the directional hê</strong></td>
<td>Strong’s #2431 BDB #298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...*and enters into Helam*. The United States has entered into war and has handled the results of war unlike any other country. When you defeat a country in battle, that country is yours, to do with what you please. When our citizens and soldiers moved west when settling America, we took this land by force, which is what pretty much every group of people has done. David intends not just to defeat Syria, but to take a lot of his land holdings as well. So he pushes off to the northeast, so that he can both defeat the Syrian army and then take whatever land that he can, expanding Israel’s borders as per the promise of God.
Translation: Aram [meanwhile] positioned [themselves] to meet David... We continue with the wâw consecutive, but we change to a 3rd person masculine plural verb, so we are now looking at this from the perspective of Aram. Aram, as we have already seen, usually takes a masculine singular verb; but it has taken a feminine singular in this chapter and here is takes a masculine plural verb. They also have a G2 force. It is unclear exactly how Helam was set up as the battlefield, but that is how things came out. Whether this is a result of David and Aram’s G2 information; or whether this is somehow predetermined, we do not know. However, this is a point roughly between Jerusalem and some of the major cities of Aram. In any case, rather than continue an advance, Aram digs in, setting themselves in position, arraying their soldiers for battle, as David moves toward them. The Syrian army is assuming a defensive position, and David is the aggressor here. If necessary, go back and reexamine the principle of offensive action.

There is an assumption that I am going to make here: David knows this land where Aram is. He knows the mountains, the hills, the brush, the water sources and the roads. Now, he may not have firsthand knowledge of this area, but this is some of the information which he gathers. David is a serious and well-trained military man with a lifetime of experience.

When Aram advances into Israel and then digs in, I suspect that David has a reasonable idea as to how they will position themselves and he probably has some reasonable guesses as to their strategy. Knowing the layout of the land, knowing where the Syrian army is, and how their forces are divided up; knowing their potential supply lines will all be a part of the information which David processes in order to develop strategy and tactics for this battle.

I suspect what worked for Joab would be what works for David. He concentrates his army against Syria’s mobile forces. He wants to neutralize the cavalry, their chariots and he wants to take out their military leader, Shobach.
He does not simply direct his army by pointing them in the direction of the Syrian army, and cries out, “Go get ‘em.” David defines specific military objectives. He knows the thinking of the peoples and nations around him. He has to attack this army in such a way as to demoralize them and put them at a disadvantage as quickly as possible.

**2Samuel 10:17f**

<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^w (or v^v) (1, 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>lâcham (חָמ) [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 plural, Niphal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3898 BDB #535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘îm (יו) [pronounced ġeem]</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation: ...and to wage war with him. This is the only place in this verse where we have a wâw conjunction. This closely ties together this and the previous phrase. Aram positions its army to meet David and to do battle with him.

Bear in mind that David has a psychological advantage against the Syrian army. When he was not there, his generals routed the Syrian army with an elite force. No doubt, this was discussed with survivors of Joab’s attack, and one might conclude, “So, there you were, with Joab’s army trapped between you and Ammon; and you have a superior military force and you have your cavalry and your armored forces ready to close in on him, and he attacks you and sends you packing? Do I understand that correctly?” They knew about David, who had been defeating every country in his periphery. He was undefeated. The Israeli army was well-respected throughout the world, as were his two top generals, Joab and Abishai.

We have a similar situation today. The current Israeli army (I write this in 2011) is one of the greatest in the world. They are surrounded by nations which hate them, who have attacked them on several occasions, and have been pushed back and defeated. In 1973, Egypt and Syria attack Israel on Yom Kippur (the Day of Atonement). It was a surprise attack, with Egypt and Syria taking the initial advantage, as much of Israel’s army was participating in the holy day. Not only did Israel, after a few days, push them back, but advanced on the capitols of Egypt and Syria, getting within 85 miles of Cairo and 35 miles from Damascus. Although the UN stepped in and arranged a cease-fire, this primarily saved these two great nations from being terrifically humiliated. As a result, Egypt maintained a peace with Israel for decades, realizing just how tough the Israeli army was (I think that memory has faded from Egyptian thinking today).

Something else was known about the Hebrews—foreigners knew their God. Aramaeans knew about Jehovah Elohim. How much they knew is debatable, but the God of a country was closely associated with the economic prosperity and the military of that country. At that point in history, Israel, although somewhat of a new nation in the world power realm, had made a significant impact in a very short time. Under King Saul, the nation originally showed some great progress (until Saul went nut-soid) and under David, Israel had defeated every nation in its periphery (2Sam. 8). So, no matter what their numbers were, every Syrian soldier had to consider the God of Israel in their thinking. Israel could not be divorced from Jehovah Elohim; these could not be seen as more or less independent entities which intersected from time to time. So, even a religious heathen in the Syrian army had to have some concern about the power of Jehovah Elohim, the God of Israel.
And so flees Aram from faces of Israel; and so kills David from Aram seven hundreds chariot riders and forty thousands horsemen. And Shobach, commander of his army, he struck down; and so he dies.

Then Aram fled from before Israel while David killed 700 chariot riders from Aram and 40,000 horsemen. Also, he struck down Shobach, commander of his army, and he died.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

**Latin Vulgate**

And the Syrians fled before Israel, and David slew of the Syrians the men of seven hundred chariots, and forty thousand horsemen: and smote Sobach the captain of the army, who presently died.

**Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**

And so flees Aram from faces of Israel; and so kills David from Aram seven hundreds chariot riders and forty thousands horsemen. And Shobach, commander of his army, he struck down; and so he dies.

**Peshitta (Syriac)**

And the Arameans fled before Israel; and David destroyed one thousand and seven hundred chariots of the Arameans and slew four thousand horsemen and a great many of the people, and he smote Shobach the general of their army, who died there.

**Septuagint (Greek)**

And Syria fled from before Israel, and David destroyed of the Syrians seven hundred chariots, and forty thousand horsemen, and he struck Shobach the captain of his army, and he died there.

**Significant differences:** The Syriac has David killing 1700 chariot riders (recall that the word can stand for the chariots, the chariot horses or the chariot riders) instead of 700; and 4000 horsemen instead of 40,000.

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

**CEV**

The Arameans attacked, but then they ran from Israel. David killed seven hundred chariot drivers and forty thousand cavalry. He also killed Shobach, their commander.

**Easy English (Pocock)**

But the *Arameans ran away from the *Israelites. David’s army killed 700 men who drove *chariots. His army killed 40,000 men who rode horses. And David’s men also killed Shobach, who was the leader of the *Aramean army.

**Easy-to-Read Version**

But {David defeated the Arameans, and} the Arameans ran away from the Israelites. David killed 700 chariot drivers and 40,000 horse soldiers. David also killed Shobach the captain of the Aramean army.

**Good News Bible (TEV)**

...and the Israelites drove the Syrian army back. David and his men killed seven hundred Syrian chariot drivers and forty thousand cavalry, and they wounded Shobach, the enemy commander, who died on the battlefield.

**The Message**

But the Arameans again scattered before Israel. David killed seven hundred chariot drivers and forty thousand cavalry. And he mortally wounded Shobach, the army commander, who died on the battlefield.

**New Century Version**

But the Arameans ran away from the Israelites. David killed seven hundred Aramean chariot drivers and forty thousand Aramean horsemen. He also killed Shobach, the commander of the Aramean army.
Now, when this was reported to David, he gathered the whole army Israel, crossed the Jordan, and marched on AiLam. Then the Syrians set up battle lines against David, and the battle began,...

The Arameans fled from Israel, and David killed 700 chariot drivers and 40,000 horsemen. David struck Shobach dead.

But then they ran away from Israel. David killed 700 of their chariot riders. He killed 40,000 of their soldiers who were on foot. He also struck down Shobach, the commander of their army. Shobach died there.

...and the Israelites drove the Syrian army back. David and his men killed seven hundred Syrian chariot drivers and forty thousand cavalry. They wounded Shobach, the enemy commander, who died on the battlefield.

...but were put to flight by Israel. David slew seven hundred Arameans in chariots and forty thousand horsemen, mortally wounding Shobach, who died on the field.

The Aramaeans went in flight before Israel; and David put to the sword the men of seven hundred Aramaean war-carriages and forty thousand footmen, and Shobach, the captain of the army, was wounded, and came to his death there.

But the Arameans fled before Israel, and David killed 700 of their charioteers and 40,000 foot soldiers. He also struck down Shobach commander of their army, who died there.

...but the Arameans were put to flight by Israel. David killed 700 Aramean charioteers and 40,000 horsemen [1Chron. 19:18 reads “foot soldiers”]; he also struck down Shobach, Hadadezer’s army commander, who died there.

And the Syrians fled before Israel. David killed 700 Aramean charioteers and 40,000 foot soldiers [Heb "horsemen" (so KJV, NASB, NCV, NRSV, NLT) but the Lucianic recension of the LXX reads "foot soldiers," as does the parallel text in 1 Chr 19:18. Cf. NAB, NIV.]. He also struck down Shobach, the general in command of the army, who died there.

...and Aram flees from the presence of Israel, and David slays of Aram seven hundred charioteers, and forty thousand horsemen, and Shobach head of its host he has smitten, and he dies there.

And the Syrians fled before Israel; and David slew of the Syrians [the men of] seven hundred chariots, and forty thousand horsemen, and smote Shobach the captain of their host, that he died there.

And the Syrians fled before Israel, and David killed of the Syrians the men of 700 chariots, and 40,000 horsemen, and wounded Shobach the commander of their army, so that he died there.

...and the Aramiy flee the face of Yisra El; and David slaughters seven hundred chariots and forty thousand cavalry of the Aramiy; and smites Shobach the governor of their host who dies there.

And the Syrians/’Aram ’panicked and fled’/retreated {nuwc} ‘from the face of’/’from before’ {paniym} Israel. And David slaughtered from the Syrians seven thousand
The gist of this verse: David's advance caused the Aramaean army to retreat. His army killed 700 (or, possibly, 7000) charioteers and 40,000 horsemen.

<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>לוי (noo) [pronounced noose]</td>
<td>to flee, to flee from, to escape, to depart, to hasten quickly [away]</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #5127 BDB #630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ארמ (uh-RAHM)</td>
<td>the highland, high region; exalted; and is transliterated Aram; sometimes rendered Syria, Mesopotamia</td>
<td>singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #758 BDB #74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לוי (mihn) [pronounced mihn]</td>
<td>from, away from, out from, out of from, 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>דָּפִּים (paw-NEEM)</td>
<td>face, faces, countenance; presence</td>
<td>masculine plural construct (plural acts like English singular)</td>
<td>Strong’s #6440 BDB #815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together, min דָּפִּים mean from before the face of; out from before the face, from the presence of. However, together, they can also be a reference to the cause, whether near or remote, and can therefore be rendered because of, because that; by.

Yisʿרָעָל (yis-raw-ALE) | God prevails; contender; soldier of God; transliterated Israel | masculine proper noun | Strong’s #3478 & #3479 BDB #975 |

Translation: Then Aram fled from before Israel... We get nothing this time by way of strategy and tactics. The Syrians set themselves up to war against David, and, next verse, they are fleeing from David. However, the motivation is still quite different. The motivation of David’s army was the preservation of the freedom of Israel; the motivation of the Syrians was to expand their empire. The Jews are fighting for their own freedom; if they are defeated here, the Syrians may walk into their land and kill their wives and families. The Syrians are fighting to maintain the reputation of their mercenary force. The Jews have, by far, the most compelling motivation. An army with great motivation is often able to defeat an army with limited motivation.

According to R. B. Thieme, Jr., Cambridge Ancient History thought it only reasonable to suppose that the Jews allied themselves with the Assyrians in order to defeat the Syrians, but this is not what the Word of God says. Such a supposition must be based upon the perceived relative might of Aram and Israel in this era. Again, this

---

42 R. B. Thieme, Jr., The 1972 David Series; ©1980 (approximately) by R. B. Thieme, Jr. ministries; Series #631; Lesson #228.
is an era-changing war. The greatest military power of that day is beat down by Israel. This defeat is so significant that even Cambridge Ancient History cannot believe that the Jews accomplished this on their own.

This phrase is followed by war stats, which explain why the army of Aram retreated.

### 2Samuel 10:18b

<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>hârag (לָרָג) [pronounced haw-RAHG]</td>
<td>to kill, to slay, to execute; to destroy, to ruin</td>
<td>3rd person masculine singular, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong's #2026 BDB #246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâvid (דָּוִד); also Dâvîyd (דָּוִיד) [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 (מִּן) [pronounced mihn]</td>
<td>from, away from, out from, out of from, 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>’Ăram (אֲרָם) [pronounced uh-RAHM]</td>
<td>the highland, high region; exalted; and is transliterated Aram; sometimes rendered Syria, Mesopotamia</td>
<td>singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #758 BDB #74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sheba’ (שֶׁבַע) [pronounced sheb’-VAHG]</td>
<td>seven</td>
<td>numeral masculine construct</td>
<td>Strong's #7651 BDB #987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mē’ōth (מֵעֲוָת) [pronounced may-OHTH]</td>
<td>hundreds</td>
<td>feminine plural construct numeral</td>
<td>Strong’s #3967 BDB #547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Chron. 19:18 reads 7000 instead. This will be discussed below.

The translation: ...while David kills 700 chariot riders from Aram... It reads here that David killed 700 chariot riders. First of all, it is highly unlikely that David killed 700 men here; David is a metonym for his entire army. His army killed 700 chariot riders. Secondly, we have had this word rekeb before, and recall, this can refer to the chariot, the horse or the chariot rider. Thirdly, this could be as many as 7000, as will be discussed below.

In the Hebrew, 2Sam. 10:18b reads: ...while David kills 700 chariot riders from Aram... However, the parallel passage reads, in part: ...and David slew of the Syrians 7000 riders in chariots... (1Chron. 19:18b). Here are the explanations of some.
## 700 or 7000 Killed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentator</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barnes</strong></td>
<td>Barnes writes: More probable than the “seven thousand” of 1Chron. 19:18. The frequent errors in numbers arise from the practice of expressing numerals by letters, with one or more dots or dashes to indicate hundreds, thousands, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarke</strong></td>
<td>In the parallel place, 1Chron. 19:18, it is said, David slew of the Syrians Seven Thousand men, which fought in chariots. It is difficult to ascertain the right number in this and similar places. It is very probable that, in former times, the Jews expressed, as they often do now, their numbers, not by words at full length, but by numeral letters; and, as many of the letters bear a great similarity to each other, mistakes might easily creep in when the numeral letters came to be expressed by words at full length. This alone will account for the many mistakes which we find in the numbers in these books, and renders a mistake here very probable. The letter æ zain, with a dot above, stands for seven thousand, ð nun for seven hundred: the great similarity of these letters might easily cause the one to be mistaken for the other, and so produce an error in this place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gill</strong></td>
<td>Gill suggests that there were 10 men per chariot, which accounts for the different numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaiser, Davids, Bruce, Brauch</strong></td>
<td>They point out the false claim that the man who compiled Chronicles liked to exaggerate David’s accomplishment, but that explanation obviously denies the inspiration of the Scriptures (God is not going to record a lie or an exaggeration which is presented as fact). They also present the false theory that Samuel and Chronicles dealt with 2 different sets of men: the men of the chariots (7000) and the men of the chariot divisions (700). There is no textual evidence for this distinction. They further note that some LXX texts have 7000. They also note that the book of Samuel is one of the most poor preserved books of the Old Testament, as is shown by the Dead Sea Scrolls; and that the translators of the LXX were probably using a better manuscript than the one which we have. Therefore, they chalk this up to a transcription error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R. B. Thieme Jr.</strong></td>
<td>Bob does not attempt to reconcile these verses; he simply states that this verse was probably altered by a scribe who just figured that there could not have been this many chariots, so that he tried to fix the verse. Although this is certainly a possibility, scribes rarely made changes to the text that was already laid down.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion is, Samuel reflects a transmission error. Samuel is one of the weakest books in the Bible when it comes to the transmission of its text.

---

43 Albert Barnes, *Barnes' Notes on the Old Testament*; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 10:18.
44 Adam Clarke, *Commentary on the Bible*; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 10:18.
45 Dr. John Gill, *John Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible*; from e-Sword, 2Sam. 10:18.
### 2Samuel 10:18c

<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 vâ) (î, or i)</td>
<td>and, even, then; namely; when;</td>
<td>simple wâw conjunction</td>
<td>No Strong’s #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced weh]</td>
<td>since, that; though</td>
<td></td>
<td>BDB #251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'årâbûyım (םשבריא)</td>
<td>forty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong’s #705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced ar'-BAW-GEEM]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BDB #917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'alâpîhûyım (אלפיים)</td>
<td>thousands, families, [military] units</td>
<td>masculine plural noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #505 (and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced uh-law-FEEM]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#504) BDB #48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pârâsh (-peer)</td>
<td>horse, steed; horseman</td>
<td>masculine singular noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #6571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronounced paw-RASH]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BDB #832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Chron. 19:18 reads foot soldiers instead; this will be discussed below.

**Translation:** ...and 40,000 horsemen. Along with the 700 (or, 7000) charioteers which were killed, David’s army also took out 40,000 of their horsemen. Again, we have another problem; 1Chron. 19:18c reads: ,,and forty thousand infantry men,,. The difference here could simply be a scribal error. It is far more likely that there are 40,000 infantrymen rather than 40,000 horsemen. This is also in agreement with Josephus (Antiquities l. 7. c. 6. sect. 3).

Another possible solution to this dilemma is, David’s army took out 40,000 horsemen and 40,000 infantry. After all, the Aramaeans certainly fought with infantry, cavalry and chariots in both conflicts. There is nothing to suggest that, for some reason, one of these forces did not participate. Now, with regards to strategy and tactics, there may have been an initial assault of cavalry and chariots, followed by infantrymen; we don’t know exactly who participated and at what time. However, no doubt, all 3 branches of their military were involved in both conflicts. The problem with this solution is, R. B. Thieme, Jr., whose knowledge of ancient history was encyclopedic, said that no army in that day had 40,000 cavalry.

A third solution, but less likely, is 40,000 soldiers who were either infantry or horsemen.

Why the writer of Samuel chose to emphasize the cavalry and the editor of Chronicles chose emphasize the infantry, I do not know, but let me venture a guess: the stats we read in 2Sam. 10 were recorded very close to the time of the battle itself. I believe that these stats relate most directly to David’s strategy and tactics. Joab told David, “What worked for me is, I took out their chariots and horsemen, and they fell apart after that, and retreated.” (I am making an hypothetical supposition here). David concurs, and his military objectives are Syria’s cavalry, its armored forces (its chariots) and General Shobach. This is what David, presumably, determined that his army would go after.

Somehow, these war stats had to be compiled, and immediately after the war. One group of soldiers probably recorded infantry deaths, another cavalry deaths; and another, chariots which were neutralized. There has to be some sort of organization in all this, otherwise, why do it? This easily explains why we have different sets of stats, but why they are not recorded in full in either Samuel or Chronicles is not clear.

Personally, what this did for me was, I had to think about the Syrian army as separate forces—as cavalry, charioteers and infantrymen. That made me think about the initial conflict in this chapter, outside of the Ammonite city of Rabbah, and it made me question, just how was Joab able to defeat this Aramaean mercenary force? In

---

considering these various components of the Aramaean army, that was the key to explaining how Joab’s elite force could defeat them. Obviously, the Aramaeans had a strategy, and that strategy involved their 3 component forces, and each component part had a part to play, in the mind of their general. Recognizing what their strategy must have been was then instrumental in determining how all of this went down.

Was this the reason for separating these stats, giving one in Samuel and another in Chronicles? Probably not, but for me, it actually was the key to understanding the first conflict in this chapter, and it suggested David’s strategy to me in the second.

### 2Samuel 10:18d

<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>w w (or v w) (l or l)</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>‘eth (κη) [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>Shōwbâk (שֹוֲבַֽק) [pronounced show-BAWK]</td>
<td>your bonds, your chains; expansion; transliterated Shobach</td>
<td>masculine singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #7731 &amp; #7780 BDB #1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sar (שָֽר) [pronounced sar]</td>
<td>chieftain, chief, ruler, official, captain, prince, leader, commander</td>
<td>masculine singular construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #8269 BDB #978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsâbâ (תְּבָא) [pronounced tsaw-VAW]</td>
<td>army, war, or warfare</td>
<td>masculine singular noun with the 3rd person masculine singular suffix</td>
<td>Strong’s #6635 DB #838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nâkâh (נָכָֽה) [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>3rd person masculine singular, Hiphil perfect</td>
<td>Strong #5221 BDB #645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong’s #7780 is an alternate spelling. There is little agreement on the meaning of Shobach’s name; most sources do not reference a meaning.

**Translation:** Also, he struck down Shobach, commander of his army... Either David, or one of his men, struck down Shobach. I would not be surprised that this time, this is actually David who takes him down. Although this verb can be used to mean to defeat, to conquer, to subjugate; here, it refers to David (or one of his men) actually taking Shobach out. One reason to understand the verb in this way is, his army flees. They retreat, so that is not quite the same as subjugation. It is reasonable to ask, how was David (or one of his soldiers) able to get that close to Shobach? Shobach led his army (v. 16). He was over-confident, and David’s approach was, kill their leader. This was probably the key to David’s success (and the fact that Jesus Christ controls history).

It is not unusual for ancient kings and generals to be seen as have extraordinary powers, making them super-human in the eyes of their people. Whether led or guided by the gods or even being a god himself (in the eyes of the Syrian army), seeing that he is killed in battle is terrifically destructive to their will. If the army of Israel is able to strike down their leading general, then who is safe from the advancing Israeli troops. Therefore, their morale and discipline suddenly crumbled as news that their commanded was killed spread.
**2Samuel 10:18e**

<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>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>mûwth (nu) [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>
<tr>
<td>shâm (wp) [pronounced shawm]</td>
<td>there; at that time, then; therein, in that thing</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Strong’s #8033 BDB #1027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:** ...and he died. Shobach was struck down in v. 18d, and he dies in this verse. Interestingly enough, his being struck down is in the perfect tense, meaning that is happened all at once. There was no protracted fight scene, like in *From Russian with Love;* David struck him down with a sword or an arrow. However, when Shobach dies, that is in the imperfect tense, indicating that it took him awhile to die. David did not knock him off his horse and then pounce on him to kill him; Shobach took some time dying. There are a number of scenarios which come to mind; Shobach was in back or somewhat removed from the battle, and an arrow hit him and took him down, where he died behind the battle line. Or, in the midst of battle, he was struck down, but there was simply not enough time to go back and to make certain that he was dead, so that he died on the battlefield. Or David could have intentionally struck him, but not to kill him, in order to gain more information about Aram and future plans that Aram might have.

In any case, Shobach being struck down and killed gave a considerable psychological advantage to Israel. Foreigners associated Jehovah Elohim with Israel; but they also tended to think of their own leaders as gods. Israel was not confused about this. There was King Saul, there was King David, there was General Joab, and there was Jehovah Elohim; Israel did not mix these people up with God in their minds. They knew that David was a Godly man, a man after God’s Own heart, but they knew that David was just a man, yet a separate entity from God. However, this is not how most ancient people saw their own leaders. We know this to be true of ancient Egyptian pharaohs, some tracing heir lineage back to particular gods or goddesses. The same is true of Roman emperors, centuries later. Although I cannot find evidence of this for Syria (our knowledge of ancient Aram is quite incomplete), we may reasonably assume that, even if General Shobach was not deified, he, at the very least, was closely associated with Aramaean deities. When he was struck down, that was devastating to the morale of Aram’s army. Therefore, they fled. Thousands of dead bodies which kept being piled up around them would also give them reason to make a run for it.

This one victory will expand Israel borders further than any other victory in Israel’s history. See again the map of Saul, David and Solomon’s Israel. The greatest increase of the Davidic kingdom is based upon this war.

At the time of this battle, circa 964 B.C., the Aramaeans had the greatest military machine of that era. As an empire, the Syrians may have been as great as Alexander he Great’s empire. They could have controlled all the Middle East, if it were not for Israel. However, there is positive volition in the world, and God therefore requires that there be a client nation to God. Israel would be required to evangelize the world; and their God had to be seen as preeminent in all the world. This is how Jonah, many generations later, could go to the Assyrians, and speak of Jehovah Elohim and for them to respond positively. The Jews were respected; their God was respected, and when a representative of the God of the Jews spoke to this or that city, they listened.

According to R. B. Thieme Jr., this victory would result in the Greek peoples colonizing the world, which is the beginning of western civilization.\(^48\) We in America are the result of western civilization, and the Jewish and

---

\(^48\) R. B. Thieme, Jr., *The 1972 David Series*; ©1980 (approximately) by R. B. Thieme, Jr. ministries; Series #631; Lesson #224.
Christian heritage which became a part of western civilization. This all came about because Jesus Christ controls history.

*And so see the kings, servants of Hadadezer, that they were struck down to faces of Israel and so they make peace [with] Israel; and so, they serve them. And so fears Aram to help again Bene-Ammon.*

2Samuel 10:19

Because [lit., and so] the kings—the servants of Hadadezer—saw that they had been struck down before Israel, they [therefore] made peace with Israel and [now] they serve them. Furthermore [lit., and so], Aram feared to help Bene-Ammon [ever] again.

Because the kings who were servants of Hadadezer saw that they had been defeated in battle before the Israelites, they therefore made peace with Israel and now they serve them. Furthermore, Aram now fears to even help the sons of Ammon ever again.

Here is how others have translated this verse:

**Ancient texts:**

**Latin Vulgate**

And all the kings that were auxiliaries of Adarezer, seeing themselves overcome by Israel, were afraid and fled away, eight and fifty thousand men before Israel. And they made peace with Israel: and served them, and all the Syrians were afraid to help the children of Ammon any more.

**Masoretic Text (Hebrew)**

And so see the kings, servants of Hadadezer, that they were struck down to faces of Israel and so they make peace [with] Israel; and so, they serve them. And so fears Aram to help again Bene-Ammon.

**Peshitta (Syriac)**

And when all the kings who were servants of Hadarezer saw that they were defeated before Israel, they made peace with Israel and served them. So the Arameans feared to help the Ammonites any more.

**Septuagint (Greek)**

And the servants of Hadadezer saw that they were defeated before Israel, and they made peace with David and served them. And Syria was afraid to help the children of Ammon any more.

**Significant differences:**

There are a several interesting differences here. First of all, the Greek lacks the kings. This is found in the Latin, Hebrew and Syriac. The words who were in the English translation from the Syriac were probably added to smooth out the translation.

The Hebrew and Greek both have Hadadezer; the Latin and Syriac both have Hadarezer.

The Latin then has a fairly long phrase not found in any of the other translations: were afraid and fled away, eight and fifty thousand men before Israel.

Although the Hebrew then says, and they made peace with Israel; the Greek says they made peace with David.

In short, this is the most messed up verse in this entire chapter. However, if, for whatever reason, you chose one of the translations over the original Hebrew, it would not make any difference at all (except, perhaps, for that entire additional phrase found in the Latin).
Interestingly enough, the parallel verse in 1Chron. 19:19 is almost exactly the same as the Hebrew found here: *And the servants of Hadarezer see that they have been struck down before Israel, and they make peace with David and serve him, and Aram was not been willing to help the sons of Ammon any more.* I have underlined the places where this is different from our text in Samuel.

I go through these other translations painstakingly for several reasons. Once in a great while, there may be some additional understanding to be gained from the way that they translate a verse or a particular word; and sometimes, there might be some clarity given to a poorly preserved Hebrew verse. However, as you have no doubt observed, 98% of the differences are fairly uninteresting and 99% have no real effect on the overall text or upon the overall meaning. For instance, you are not going to read a chapter in the Hebrew and then look at that same chapter in the Latin, and remark, “Well, that really changes our concept of divine essence” or, “Hmm, now I see that perhaps someone tried to keep the concept of reincarnation out of the Bible.” In this case, had you read quickly through the Hebrew and then the translations into other ancient languages, you may have not even noticed the differences (apart from the extra line in the Latin, which is a dramatic difference, to say the least).

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

**CEV**
When the kings who had been under Hadadezer’s rule saw that Israel had defeated them, they made peace with David and accepted him as their new ruler. The Syrians never helped the Ammonites again.

**Easy English (Pocock)**
Hadadezer had controlled the kings of several countries. These kings saw that the *Israelites had defeated the *Arameans. The kings wanted peace with the *Israelites. So they agreed to serve the *Israelites. And the *Arameans were afraid to help the *Ammonites again.

**Easy-to-Read Version**
When Hadadezer’s officers saw that Israel had defeated them, they made peace with David. They became David’s servants. So the Arameans refused to help the Ammonites again.

**Good News Bible (TEV)**
When the kings who were subject to Hadadezer realized that they had been defeated by Israel, they made peace with David and became his subjects. (19:20) The Syrians were never again willing to help the Ammonites.

**The Message**
When all the kings who were vassals of Hadadezer saw that they had been routed by Israel, they made peace with David and served him. The Arameans were afraid to help the Ammonites ever again.

**New Living Translation**
When all the kings allied with Hadadezer saw that they had been defeated by Israel, they surrendered to Israel and became their subjects. After that, the Arameans were afraid to help the Ammonites.

**Partially literal and partially paraphrased translations:**

**American English Bible**
And when the servants of AdraAzar saw that they had lost to Israel, they surrendered and became their servants. And from that time on, the Syrians were afraid to come to the aid of the sons of AmMon.

**Ancient Roots Translinear**
All the servants to King Hadarezer saw their plague in front of Israel. They repaid Israel, and served them. The Syrians feared to save the sons of Amman again.

**New American Bible**
All of Hadadezer's vassal kings, in view of their defeat by Israel, then made peace with the Israelites and became their subjects. And the Arameans were afraid to give further aid to the Ammonites.
### All of the kings who were under the rule of Hadadezer saw that Israel had won the battle over them. So they made a peace treaty with the Israelites. They were brought under Israel's rule.

After that, the Arameans were afraid to help the Ammonites anymore.

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

**Bible in Basic English**
And when the servants of Hadadezer saw that they were overcome by Israel, they made peace with David and became his servants: and the Aramaeans would give no more help to the children of Ammon.

**JPS (Tanakh)**
And when all the vassal kings of Hadadezer saw that they had been routed by Israel, they submitted to Israel and became their vassals. And the Aramaeans were afraid to help the Ammonites any more.

**NET Bible®**
When all the kings who were subject to Hadadezer \[Heb "the servants of Hadadezer."\] saw they were defeated by Israel, they made peace with Israel and became subjects of Israel \[In Heb "and they served them."\]. The Arameans were no longer willing to help the Ammonites.

**NIV – UK**
When all the kings who were vassals of Hadadezer saw that they had been routed by Israel, they made peace with the Israelites and became subject to them. So the Arameans were afraid to help the Ammonites any more.

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

**The Amplified Bible**
And when all the kings serving Hadadezer saw that they were defeated by Israel, they made peace with Israel and served them. So the Syrians were afraid to help the Ammonites any more.

**English Standard Version**
And when the servants of Hadadezer saw that they had been defeated by Israel, they made peace with David and became subject to him. So the Syrians were not willing to save the Ammonites anymore.

**Green’s Literal Translation**
And all the kings, the servants of Hadarezer, saw that they had been stricken before Israel. And they made peace with Israel, and served them. And Syria feared to help the sons of Ammon any more.

**Modern KJV**
And the servants of Hadarezer saw that they were beaten before Israel, and they made peace with David and became his servants. And Syria was not willing to help the sons of Ammon any more.

**Syndein**
Now when all the kings \{Syrian federation\} . . . the subjects/servants of Hadadezer/ Hadadezer saw that they were 'decisively defeated' before Israel, \{the rest of the Syrian's surrendered without firing another shot - decisive military successes SAVES causalities - recent example: the atomic bomb dropped on Japan saved many American lives\} they made peace with Israel, and served them. Therefore, the Syrians feared \{because of respect for the Jewish Military strength\} to give aid to the sons/people of Ammon ever again.

**Third Millennium Bible**
And when all the kings who were servants to Hadadezer saw that they were smitten before Israel, they made peace with Israel and served them. So the Syrians feared to help the children of Ammon any more.
When the servants of Hadarezer saw that they were put to the worse before Israel, they made peace with David, and served him: neither would the Syrians help the children of Ammon any more.

And the servants of Hadarezer see that they have been struck down before Israel, and they make peace with David and serve him, and Aram has not been willing to help the sons of Ammon any more.

The Aramaeans realized that siding with Israel’s enemies (in this case, Ammon) was a lost cause, so they decided not to do it anymore.
### 2Samuel 10:19a

<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>יִרְאָה (יִרְאָה) [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:** Because [lit., and so] the kings—the servants of Hadadezer—saw that they had been struck down before Israel,... Hadadezer is the big dog in the Aramaic world, and the other city-kings come under his control. These other kings observe this battle between their huge army and Israel, and that their men began to retreat, being whipped on the battlefield. Israel clearly dominates the battlefield.

### 2Samuel 10:19b

<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>וַא (וָא) (ע) [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>שָלָם (שָלָם) [pronounced shaw-LAHM]</td>
<td>to complete, to execute, to make an end [to a thing]; to make peace [with anyone]; to consent to a treaty; to make one a friend</td>
<td>3rd person masculine plural, Hiphil imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #7999 BDB #1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ֵא (אֵ) [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>יִרְאָה (יִרְאָה) [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:** ...they [therefore] made peace with Israel... Generally speaking, when peace is made, the loser also promises to pay a tribute to the winner. The idea is simple—this way, Israel does not take their army into the cities of Syria, rape their women, burn down their fields and houses, and take whatever they want. Syria gets to keep their homeland secure; they just have to begin making payments (tribute) to Israel.

Recall what Joab said to Abishai: “Be strong, and let us be strong for our people, and for the cities of our God.” This victory, first against the Syrians outside of Rabbah, and now in Helam, is all about freedom.

### Principles of Freedom

1. Because Jesus Christ control history, the nation Israel was preserved by God and Aram was clearly defeated at the battle of Helam.
2. The key to this victory appears to be the killing of Shobach, the commanding general of the Syrian forces.
3. The outcome of this war will perpetuate the freedom of Israel.
4. The laws of divine establishment are based upon human freedom and upon the spiritual freedom to be able to choose the God of Israel.
5. The most important aspect of a national entity is spiritual freedom. Evangelism must be possible; and believers must be allowed to grow spiritually.
6. In a national entity sitting in the midst of a number of other national entities, freedom includes the principle...
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of live and let live. In a modern-day example, we are much more powerful than Canada, but, because we believe in freedom and self-determination, we respect the sovereignty of Canada.

7. God designed the volition of the human soul. It is our freedom and self-determination which are fundamental to the Angelic Conflict.

8. The United States was founded on the concept of self-determination and limitations placed upon government. Similarly, our nation is based upon hard work, right man/right woman (marriage), family, and nationalism, which are the fundamental components of divine establishment.

9. Freedom is both the privilege and the franchise of the human race.

10. The idea is, legitimate self determination and self-fulfillment through the use of one’s own volition leads to spiritual enlightenment (faith in Jesus Christ) and, ideally speaking, in spiritual growth.

11. Freedom must operate apart from arbitrary control. Currently, there is the battle over the Obama-driven healthcare law, which robs Americans of their freedom, and gives us a false sense of security.

   1) The argument is, if government can force you to buy medical insurance, because this is good for the entire country, what is it that they cannot force you to do? Can we be forced to buy and eat broccoli because it is good for us? Can we be forced to have a health club membership and an individual trainer, if this is good for us and for society as a whole?

   2) The false security here is believing that the state can take care of us; the state can see to all of our needs, which is simply false. We face a crushing debt today which could, at worst, destroy the United States; and, at best, destroy the government safety net.

   3) What we have done is, we have traded in our freedom for some security; we have decided to opt out of personal responsibility, and let someone else carry us.

12. Freedom is not anarchy. Anarchy destroys freedom just as coercive government destroys freedom. There is a happy medium between these two states of being, which is, ideally speaking, in spiritual growth.

13. Freedom requires privacy, property, personal responsibility and the umbrella of authority. Remove any of these 4 components, and freedom is eroded.

   1) Privacy is the environment for freedom. We must be able to make our own decisions without coercion of the government. It is the authority of government which keeps our free will decisions from intruding upon the freedom of others.

   2) The Ten Commandments are a framework within which our freedom can operate.

   3) Private property is protected by the Ten Commandments. We are told not to covet the things which belong to our neighbor and not to steal—these fundamental laws protect our private property.

   4) Our government has decided to supercede these laws. Our government regularly steals from the rich and gives to the poor, taking a giant share of this wealth transfer for themselves and their allies. This has been a struggle in our government for centuries—a struggle which was lost under Woodrow Wilson and FDR. Prior to this, some of the greatest decisions of freedom have been made by our government.

   (1) In February 1887, President Grover Cleveland, upon vetoing a bill appropriating money to aid drought-stricken farmers in Texas, said, "I find no warrant for such an appropriation in the Constitution, and I do not believe that the power and the duty of the General Government ought to be extended to the relief of individual suffering which is in no manner properly related to the public service or benefit."

   (2) President Cleveland added, "The friendliness and charity of our countrymen can always be relied upon to relieve their fellow citizens in misfortune. This has been repeatedly and quite lately demonstrated. Federal aid in such cases encourages the expectation of paternal care on the part of the Government and weakens the sturdiness of our national character, while it prevents the indulgence among our people of that kindly sentiment and conduct which strengthens the bonds of a common brotherhood."

   (3) President Cleveland vetoed hundreds of congressional spending measures during his two-term presidency, often saying, "I can find no warrant for such an appropriation in the Constitution." But Cleveland wasn't the only president who failed to see charity as a function
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of the federal government. In 1854, after vetoing a popular appropriation to assist the mentally ill, President Franklin Pierce said, "I cannot find any authority in the Constitution for public charity." To approve such spending, argued Pierce, "would be contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution and subversive to the whole theory upon which the Union of these States is founded."

(4) In 1796, Rep. William Giles of Virginia condemned a relief measure for fire victims, saying that Congress didn't have a right to "attend to what generosity and humanity require, but to what the Constitution and their duty require." A couple of years earlier, James Madison, the father of our constitution, irate over a $15,000 congressional appropriation to assist some French refugees, said, "I cannot undertake to lay my finger on that article of the Constitution which granted a right to Congress of expending, on objects of benevolence, the money of their constituents."

(5) Here's my [Walter E. Williams'] question: Were the nation's founders, and some of their successors, callous and indifferent to human tragedy? Or, were they stupid and couldn't find the passages in the Constitution that authorized spending "on the objects of benevolence"?

5) Quite obviously, if you do not depend upon the government to take care of you, then you must exercise some personal responsibility to take care of yourself. Freedom cannot exist without people taking responsibility for themselves.

6) Freedom requires authority. There must be some governing body, some set of rules, or some guidance to insure that my exercise of freedom does not impinge upon your personal exercise of freedom. Freedom without authority is anarchy and authority without freedom is tyranny.

7) Ideally speaking, the government should protect our property and our privacy. Therefore, the Ten Commandments define freedom rather than sin.

8) Socialism is antagonistic to freedom; it opposes privacy, property and personal responsibility. The state is given control of these things, along with much of your freedom.

14. In the spiritual realm, freedom without authority is antinomianism and authority without freedom is legalism. In all spheres of life, freedom is mated with authority.

15. All forms of socialism are an attack upon freedom.

16. Equality is an unattainable goal. Even in the spiritual realm, we are unequal—because we all use our freedom differently with regards to spiritual things.

17. Freedom and equality are in opposition to one another. When freedom is increased, then there is less equality; when the government attempts to enforced equality, then it must remove some freedoms in order to do so.

Considering what is going on in our nation as I write this (an attempt by President Obama and the Democratic Congress to pass legislation to equalize medical care), these points are very pertinent in the time that I write (and no doubt will have great application in the future).

1 From http://www.liberalinstitute.com/CharityNotProperGovernmentFunction.html which is an excellent article by Walter E. Williams; accessed May 12, 2011.

Related to this are the concepts of freedom and equality.

Freedom Versus Equality

1. Equality is impossible in any society. Although inequities can be reduced, there will always be those with far more than the hoi polloi. In North Korea, as an example, there is a very small political class, and they have much more than do the citizens of North Korea.

2. There is no means by which inequity can be removed in society; a reduction of freedom can reduce
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3. The Bible nowhere favors the removal of inequities. The Ten Commandments mandate that we not steal and that we not look at the possessions of our neighbors with the desire to have them.

4. When freedom is exercised in a society, then there is a resultant inequity. If I choose one career path and someone else chooses a different career path, our job requirements and salary are going to be different.

5. The greater the freedom, the greater the inequalities. Equality is not the result of greater freedom, but the result of a greater suppression of freedom.

6. People use their human freedom to different ends. Some may spend 8 or 9 years in school learning the medical profession; some may leave high school and step into a job right away; some may try to figure out some way to sit around on their butts and receive money for nothing.

7. Therefore, true human freedom is a double-edged sword. Some people use their freedom to become successful, some use their freedom to be failures, and many end up succeeding and failing a number of times, as a result of using their freedom.

8. With respect to the laws of divine establishment, freedom is real and to be desired; equality is a myth and ought not to be the aim of any society.

9. The call for equality is used by those seeking power and those seeking to disrupt the current system. In many cases, these people do not even believe the things which they espouse. Some men have a desire for power, and they will use many things—pretend to agree with many ideologies, in order to gain power. When a person gains a position of power, they often seek to have greater power. A good example of that is Barack Obama, who, as President of the United States, became the most powerful man on earth. However, he has sought, through legislation and executive order, to have even greater power as a president (he has place all student loans, most medical care, and nearly all home loans under the power of the federal government—unprecedented moves in American history). He has a vision for America, which includes the reduction of inequality, which can only be achieved by the reduction of freedom and the imposition of his will on the people of the United States.

10. The call for equality is simply the means for one to gain power. A person who takes power with such a policy is not equal to those over whom he rules. By espousing equality, he appeals to the arrogant and the unmotivated. He appeals to those who want something for nothing. However, all such a leader desires is power for himself; calling for equality is the means by which he gains this power.

1) Application: In the 2008 presidential election, one of the Democratic candidates kept speaking of two Americas; the rich and successful America as over against the poor and exploited America. Now, this candidate could care less. He would step out of his own home, which was a huge, huge mansion, and look upon all of the little people who lived around him, and from this, he developed his so-called vision. Now, he was not going to take away from his riches and give them to the people around him. He was not calling for himself to divest himself of his riches and prosperity. This was simply a political theme in order for him to gain power. Although he did not win his party’s nomination, had he become president, I can guarantee you that he would be no more equal to those he lived around at the end of his presidency. Equality is never for the political elite or for their allies; equality is a club that they use against their enemies, if they gain power.

2) Equality and freedom cannot coexist. We are born unequal; we live in environments which are not equal, and we die unequal. Those with political power, at best, bring those with money and power down; but they do not lift those in poverty up. Congressmen may march some oil executives into a public hearing, and disparage them; but, the end result will not be a better life for the so-called little people; the end result will be, if this is executed properly, more power for the politician.

3) These politicians may be able to punish their enemies—for instance, hurt the oil companies which they do not like. However, the end result is not going to be a better America for the little people; it will be more power in the hands of this skilled politician. The way this works is, if he destroys or takes down say, this or that particular oil company, then the other oil companies become more willing to support that politician. They become more willing to support that politician, lest they be brought down as well. Again, this does not mean a better life for the little people; this means more
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power in the hands of that politician.

11. God has designed the human race to have freedom as a part of the Angelic Conflict. We are made by God to resolve the Angelic Conflict through the use of our freedom.

12. The attempt to enforce equality is the policy of tyranny, dictatorship, and/or bureaucratic governments.

13. Forced equality is also the basis of Satan’s cosmic system. Recall that his first desire was to be like the Most High (equality). Satan desires to bring in a pseudo-millennium where he controls and restricts our free will, he determines what we can and cannot have, and he determines what is fair and what is not.

14. One of the greatest evils today in the United States is the rise of the welfare nation. We are paying people not to work. After human freedom, the next divine institution is work, which is fundamental to the human race. God designed Adam to work both in perfect environment and after the fall.

15. The more welfare that is given out, the more people who take welfare. When you tax something, you get less of it; when you subsidize something, you get more of it. So, when we pay people not to work, we get more people who want that deal.

16. Human freedom is the policy of God; human freedom is a necessary ingredient of God’s plan and God’s will. God allows us to resolve the Angelic Conflict using the freedom He has given us.

17. Freedom requires thinking, and thinking requires content. That is, we must have something to think about which is related to freedom.

1) We must understand the importance of the 5 divine institutions: human freedom, work, marriage, family and nation.

2) We must understand the systems of authority found in these institutions.

3) We need to be cognizant of the Ten Commandments, which are laws that preserve freedom in a national entity.

4) We must be able to understand the concept of live and let live.

5) We need to understand the heritage of a client nation. This means, we need to understand the importance of believing in Jesus Christ and growing spiritually in the years that we have remaining on this earth. This is all a part of the preservation of a client nation to God.

6) Freedom is not absolute. My freedom ends where your freedom begins. When the freedom of someone is taken, then the criminal involved must experience a loss of freedom. This is not an option or a nicety; this is necessary for the preservation of any nation.

7) God also designed the various cycles of discipline to preserve a client nation and, at time, to remove those who have become a cancer in our society.

18. In short, freedom is a reasonable orientation to reality where one has a respect for the privacy and property of others. Furthermore, freedom requires one to understand the importance of and to respect the authority which preserves freedom.
Translation: ...and [now] they serve them. We do not know any of the details here. Whether this included actual human slaves, we are not told. At the minimum, this included a great deal of money to be transferred from he National Bank of Aram to the First Bank of Israel.

In other words, his was not simply a standoff. Israel did not just stand her ground and Aram backed away. This was an unquestionable defeat for Aram. Aram served Israel.

In any case, this is one of the greatest upsets in world history, a game-changer of the world stage. Only a couple of years previous, no one could have imagined Aram paying tribute to Israel; no one could imagine Aramaean men and women serving as slaves to Israel.

**2Samuel 10:19d**

<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) (י)</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>yârê (יָרֵא)</td>
<td>to fear, to be afraid; to fear-respect, to reverence, to have a reverential respect</td>
<td>3rd person masculine plural, Qal imperfect</td>
<td>Strong’s #3372 BDB #431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Áram (אֲרָם)</td>
<td>the highland, high region; exalted; and is transliterated Aram; sometimes rendered Syria, Mesopotamia</td>
<td>singular proper noun</td>
<td>Strong’s #758 BDB #74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lâmêd (לָמֶד)</td>
<td>to, for, towards, in regards to</td>
<td>directional/relational preposition</td>
<td>No Strong’s # BDB #510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yâsha (יָשָׁה)</td>
<td>to deliver, to save; to set free, to preserve; to aid, to give relief</td>
<td>Hiphil infinitive construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #3467 BDB #446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ôwd (עֹז)</td>
<td>still, yet, again, again and again, repeatedly, in addition to; more, farther, besides; as yet, yet, still, even yet</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>Strong’s #5750 BDB #728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'êth (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>bên (בֶּן)</td>
<td>son, descendant</td>
<td>masculine plural construct</td>
<td>Strong’s #1121 BDB #119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ammôwn (אָמוֹן)</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: Furthermore [lit., and so], Aram feared to help Bene-Ammon [ever] again. The Ammonites came to Aram and asked to buy an army, and this is what got all of this started. Given that they were defeated twice on the battlefield against Israel, Aram was fearful to ally themselves with Ammon again. One may reasonably presume that they would not ally themselves with any of Israel’s enemies again.
There is one thing that an evil empire understands: force and power which is greater than their own. When they begin to see dead bodies heaped up in piles, that will cause them to reconsider their evil intent. The key here is fear/respect. This was not a result of sanctions being placed upon Aram; David did not practice tough diplomacy; David did not negotiate a peace treaty with Aram; he defeated them in battle, and that ended whatever problems David had with them.

This is confirmed by Cambridge Ancient History Volume II part 2 of the 3rd edition, p. 536: *The climax of Aramaean political domination in Mesopotamia may be dated between 950–900 B.C.* Its climax in Syria did not come until the 9th century owing partly to the lag caused by the triumph of David over Hadarezer. And from p. 534: *The outcome was decisive. Israelite garrisons were placed in Hadarezer’s territory, especially Damascus. Great booty was seized, gold, silver and especially copper. Thenceforth, until the death of Solomon, the further rise of the Aramaeans in Syria was effectively checked but their growth in Mesopotamia became correspondingly accelerated.*

---

**Addendum**
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One of the difficult questions of Scripture is, *what is the relationship* between 2Sam. 8:3–8 and 2Sam. 10:15–19? Are these 2 wars between Israel and Syria (Aram); or are they the same war presented in a different way? Is the Battle of Helam one battle of this war? Although I have leanings in this matter (that these are separate wars), I certainly do not have this settled in my mind.

First thing is, I would like to go back to Josephus and see his account of these conflicts, in part because he is going to have both tradition, the ancient Scriptures, and probably other historical documents upon which he bases this record:

**Josephus on Israel’s Wars with Aram**

From Josephus *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book VII, chapter 5 (which parallels 2Sam. 8):

1. A LITTLE while after this, he [David] considered that he ought to make war against the Philistines, and not to see any idleness or laziness permitted in his management, that so it might prove, as God had foretold to him, that when he had overthrown his enemies, he should leave his posterity to reign in peace afterward: so he called together his army again, and when he had charged them to be ready and prepared for war, and when he thought that all things in his army were in a good state, he removed from Jerusalem, and came against the Philistines; and when he had overcome them in battle, and had cut off a great part of their country, and adjoined it to the country of the Hebrews, he transferred the war to the Moabites; and when he had overcome two parts of their army in battle, he took the remaining part captive, and imposed tribute upon them, to be paid annually. He then made war against Hadadezer, the son of Rehob, king of Sophene [*Whether Syria Zobah, 2Samuel 3:8; 1Chronicles 18:3-8, be Sophene, as Josephus here supposes; which yet Ptolemy places beyond Euphrates, as Dr. Hudson observes here, whereas Zobah was on this side; or whether Josephus was not here guilty of a mistake in his geography; I cannot certainly determine.]; and when he had joined battle with him at the river Euphrates, he destroyed twenty thousand of his footmen, and about seven thousand of his horsemen. He also took a thousand of his chariots, and destroyed the greatest part of them, and ordered that no more than one hundred should be kept [*David's reserving only one hundred chariots for himself out of one thousand he had taken from Hadadezer, was most probably in compliance with the law of Moses, which forbade a king of Israel*].

---

50 These quotes actually were taken from R. B. Thieme, Jr., *The 1972 David Series*; ©1980 (approximately) by R. B. Thieme, Jr. ministries; Series #631; Lesson #231. He located the quotes and read them in class.
2. Now when Hadad, king of Damascus and of Syria, heard that David fought against Hadadezer, who was his friend, he came to his assistance with a powerful army, in hopes to rescue him; and when he had joined battle with David at the river Euphrates, he failed of his purpose, and lost in the battle a great number of his soldiers; for there were slain of the army of Hadad twenty thousand, and all the rest fled. Nicelens also [of Damascus] makes mention of this king in the fourth book of his histories; where he speaks thus: "A great while after these things had happened, there was one of that country whose name was Hadad, who was become very potent; he reigned over Damascus, and, the other parts of Syria, excepting Phoenicia. He made war against David, the king of Judea, and tried his fortune in many battles, and particularly in the last battle at Euphrates, wherein he was beaten. He seemed to have been the most excellent of all their kings in strength and manhood," Nay, besides this, he says of his posterity, that "they succeeded one another in his kingdom, and in his name;" where he thus speaks: "When Hadad was dead, his posterity reigned for ten generations, each of his successors receiving from his father that his dominion, and this his name; as did the Ptolemies in Egypt. But the third was the most powerful of them all, and was willing to avenge the defeat his forefather had received; so he made an expedition against the Jews, and laid waste the city which is now called Samaria." Nor did he err from the truth; for this is that Hadad who made the expedition against Samaria, in the reign of Ahab, king of Israel, concerning whom we shall speak in due place hereafter.

3. Now when David had made an expedition against Damascus, and the other parts of Syria, and had brought it all into subjection, and had placed garrisons in the country, and appointed that they should pay tribute, he returned home. He also dedicated to God at Jerusalem the golden quivers, the entire armor which the guards of Hadad used to wear; which Shishak, the king of Egypt, took away when he fought with David’s grandson, Rehoboam, with a great deal of other wealth which he carried out of Jerusalem. However, these things will come to be explained in their proper places hereafter. Now as for the king of the Hebrews, he was assisted by God, who gave him great success in his wars, and he made all expedition against the best cities of Hadadezer, Betah and Machen; so he took them by force, and laid them waste. Therein was found a very great quantity of gold and silver, besides that sort of brass which is said to be more valuable than gold; of which brass Solomon made that large vessel which was called The [Brazen] Sea, and those most curious lavers, when he built the temple for God.

I include this next paragraph to show that Josephus does not have the same takeaway from these historical events as I do. I see the King of Hamath not as a frightened opportunist but as one was able to see what the right side of history is, and chose to be on that side. The Bible does not delve into his personal motivation.

4. But when the king of Hamath was informed of the ill success of Hadadezer, and had heard of the ruin of his army, he was afraid on his own account, and resolved to make a league of friendship and fidelity with David before he should come against him; so he sent to him his son Joram, and professed that he owed him thanks for fighting against Hadadezer, who was his enemy, and made a league with him of mutual assistance and friendship. He also sent him presents, vessels of ancient workmanship, both of gold, of silver, and of brass. So
When David had made this league of mutual assistance with Toi, (for that was the name of the king of Hamath,) and had received the presents he sent him, he dismissed his son with that respect which was due on both sides; but then David brought those presents that were sent by him, as also the rest of the gold and silver which he had taken of the cities whom he had conquered, and dedicated them to God. Nor did God give victory and success to him only when he went to the battle himself, and led his own army, but he gave victory to Abishai, the brother of Joab, general of his forces, over the Idumeans [By this great victory over the Idumeans or Edomites, the posterity of Esau, and by the consequent tribute paid by that nation to the Jews, were the prophecies delivered to Rebecca before Jacob and Esau were born, and by old Isaac before his death, that the elder, Esau, (or the Edomites,) should serve and the younger, Jacob, (or the Israelites,) and Jacob (or the Israelites) should be Esau's (or the Edomites') lord, remarkably fulfilled. See Antiq. B. VIII. ch 7. sect. 6; Genesis 25:9,3; and the notes on Antiq. B. I. ch. 18. sect. 5, 6.] and by him to David, when he sent him with an army into Idumea: for Abishai destroyed eighteen thousand of them in the battle; whereupon the king [of Israel] placed garrisons through all Idumea, and received the tribute of the country, and of every head among them. Now David was in his nature just, and made his determination with regard to truth. He had for the general of his whole army Joab; and he made Jehoshaphat, the son of Ahilud, recorder. He also appointed Zadok, of the family of Phinehas, to be high priest, together with Abiathar, for he was his friend. He also made Seisan the scribe, and committed the command over the guards of his body to Benaiah; the son of Jehoiada. His elder sons were near his body, and had the care of it also.

From Josephus Antiquities of the Jews, Book VII, chapter 6 (which parallels 2Sam. 10):

1. This were the honors that such as were left of Saul's and Jonathan's lineage received from David. About this time died Nahash, the king of the Ammonites, who was a friend of David's; and when his son had succeeded his father in the kingdom, David sent ambassadors to him to comfort him; and exhorted him to take his father's death patiently, and to expect that he would continue the same kindness to himself which he had shown to his father. But the princes of the Ammonites took this message in evil part, and not as David's kind dispositions gave reason to take it; and they excited the king to resent it; and said that David had sent men to spy out the country, and what strength it had, under the pretense of humanity and kindness. They further advised him to have a care, and not to give heed to David's words, lest he should be deluded by him, and so fall into an insupportable calamity. Accordingly Nahash's [son], the king of the Ammonites, thought these princes spake what was more probable than the truth would admit, and so abused the ambassadors after a very harsh manner; for he shaved the one half of their beards, and cut off one half of their garments, and sent his answer, not in words, but in deeds. When the king of Israel saw this, he had indignation at it, and showed openly that he would not overlook this injurious and contumelious treatment, but would make war with the Ammonites, and would avenge this wicked treatment of his ambassadors on their king. So that king's intimate friends and commanders, understanding that they had violated their league, and were liable to be punished for the same, made preparations for war; they also sent a thousand talents to the Syrian king of Mesopotamia, and endeavored to prevail with him to assist them for that pay, and Shobach. Now these kings had twenty thousand footmen. They also hired the king of the country called Maacah, and a fourth king, by name Ishtob; which last had twelve thousand armed men.

2. But David was under no consternation at this confederacy, nor at the forces of the Ammonites; and putting his trust in God, because he was going to war in a just cause, on account of the injurious treatment he had met with, he immediately sent Joab, the captain of his host, against them, and gave him the flower of his army, who pitched his camp by Rabbah, the metropolis of the Ammonites; whereupon the enemy came out, and set themselves in array, not all of them together, but in two bodies; for the auxiliaries were set in array in the plain by themselves, but the army of the Ammonites at the gates over against the Hebrews. When Joab saw this, he opposed one stratagem against another, and chose out the most hardy part of his men, and set them in opposition to the king of Syria, and the kings that were with him, and gave the other part to his brother Abishai, and bid him set them in opposition to the Ammonites; and said to him, that in case he should see that the Syrians distressed him, and were too hard for him, he should order his troops to turn about and assist him; and he said that he himself would do the same to him, if he saw him in the like distress from the Ammonites. So he
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sent his brother before, and encouraged him to do every thing courageously and with alacrity, which would teach them to be afraid of disgrace, and to fight manfully; and so he dismissed him to fight with the Ammonites, while he fell upon the Syrians. And though they made a strong opposition for a while, Joab slew many of them, but compelled the rest to betake themselves to flight; which, when the Ammonites saw, and were withal afraid of Abishai and his army, they staid no longer, but imitated their auxiliaries, and fled to the city. So Joab, when he had thus overcome the enemy, returned with great joy to Jerusalem to the king.

3. This defeat did not still induce the Ammonites to be quiet, nor to own those that were superior to them to be so, and be still, but they sent to Chalaman, the king of the Syrians, beyond Euphrates, and hired him for an auxiliary. He had Shobach for the captain of his host, with eighty thousand footmen, and ten thousand horsemen. Now when the king of the Hebrews understood that the Ammonites had again gathered so great an army together, he determined to make war with them no longer by his generals, but he passed over the river Jordan himself with all his army; and when he met them he joined battle with them, and overcame them, and slew forty thousand of their footmen, and seven thousand of their horsemen. He also wounded Shobach, the general of Chalaman's forces, who died of that stroke; but the people of Mesopotamia, upon such a conclusion of the battle, delivered themselves up to David, and sent him presents, who at winter time returned to Jerusalem. But at the beginning of the spring he sent Joab, the captain of his host, to fight against the Ammonites, who overran all their country, and laid it waste, and shut them up in their metropolis Rabbah, and besieged them therein.

Obviously, Josephus treats these as different battles occurring at different times.

These quotations are from http://sacred-texts.com/jud/josephus/index.htm translated by William Whist on 1737. I am assuming that the footnotes, inserted here in italicized brackets, are from Whist's hand. I have also inserted a few notes in brackets, just to clear up the text when I thought necessary. I have also updated the text slightly, taking words like exactest and replacing them with most exact; etc.

Edersheim mistakenly writes If the reader will attentively compared the brief notices in 2Sam. 8:3–4 and 1Chron. 18:3–4 with those in 2Sam. 10:15–18 and 1Chron. 19:16–18, no doubt will be left on his mind that they refer to one and the same event, vix., not to the beginning of the war with Hadad-Ezer, but to its second stage after his precipitate flight from the battle of Medea. 51 Although I like Edersheim, he is simply flat out wrong here. Other expositors, like Gnana Robinson, portray 2Sam. 10 as just more detail from 2Sam. 8. 52

Some have tried to combine these 2 accounts into one war, but there is no way that they are. The motivation leading up to the wars are different, the details of the wars are different—including the number killed, and the final results are somewhat different.

A Summary of David’s Wars with Aram

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Points</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


52 From Gnana Robinson, 1 & 2 Samuel; Let Us Be Like the Nations; International Theological Commentary; Eerdmans’s Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, ©1993; p. 201. Since I disagree with almost everything that Robinson writes, it is not a surprise that I disagree with him (her?) here.
A Summary of David’s Wars with Aram

Summary Points

1. David first goes to war against Hadadezer the King of Zobah (and further out to Hamath) when Hadadezer went to expand his kingdom eastward all the way to the Euphrates.
2. David captures or kills 7000 horsemen and 20,000 infantrymen. He also takes 1000 of his chariots, from which he only saves 100.
3. Hadad of Damascus sends troops to help Hadadezer and David kills 22,000 of them.
4. David establishes garrisons in Damascus and the Syrians (Aramaean) bring him tribute.
5. David also carries away shields of gold which were carried by Aramaean soldiers back to Jerusalem. These would be later used by Solomon for the building of the Temple.
6. Toi, king of Hamath, an enemy of Hadadezer, sends his son along with a great deal of tribute to David in appreciation and to form an alliance with David.

Sources

2Sam. 8:3–12
1Chron. 18:3–11
Josephus Antiquities of the Jews, Book VII, chapter 5 paragraphs 1–4

The Second War Between David and the Aramaeans

1. David’s second recorded war against Aram begins as a war against Ammon. David has a friendship with the king of Ammon (Nahash), the details of which we know nothing. When Nahash dies, David sends a delegation to Nahash’s son, who is prodded into humiliating this delegation, under the premise that these men are spies (however, they are not treated as spies would be treated).
2. When the new king of Ammon (Hanun) realizes that he has just insulted David and that he may end up in a war over this, he purchases some mercenaries from Aram.
3. Joab and Abishai are sent to Ammon to exact some justice. The Ammonites station themselves outside of the Ammonite capital of Rabbah as bait. As Joab and Abishai lead their men in close, the Aramaean mercenaries advance in a pincher movement against Joab’s army. Joab quickly sets Abishai over a holding force against Ammon while he leads a mobile force against Aram.
4. Aram retreats and Abishai enters into Rabbah. Then Joab returns to Jerusalem.
5. Hadadezer becomes concerned over this defeat, so he gathers an Aramaean army to go to war against David. They go to meet David in Helam; Shobach is the commander of this army.
6. David’s army again defeats the Syrians, killing 7000 charioteers and 40,000 horsemen, as well as Shobach himself. The Syrians retreat. Hadadezer makes peace with David and the Aramaeans serve Israel (this would mean that the Aramaeans pay tribute to Israel). The Syrians decide no to help Ammon anymore.
7. It should be obvious that these conflicts are quite different.

Sources

2Sam. 10:1–19
1Chron. 19:1–19

Quite obviously, these are the recorded wars between David and Aram. There certainly may have been more.

Chapter Outline
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What follows are the recorded wars that King David engaged in.

The Wars of King David

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enemy</th>
<th>Scripture/Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ish-bosheth</td>
<td>Ish-bosheth was a son of Saul who began to rule in [northern] Israel while David was king in Judah (southern Israel). 2Sam. 2–4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The Wars of King David

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enemy</th>
<th>Scripture/Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jebusites</td>
<td>David took Jerusalem, a city held for many years by the Jebusites. 2Sam. 5:6–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>There were two wars with the Philistines which took place in the valley of Rephaim. 2Sam. 5:17–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>It is unclear whether the addition mention of the Philistines in 2Sam. 8:1 is a third war with them. That appears to be the case, and he takes from them their capitol city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moabites</td>
<td>David, who once clearly had a good relationship with the Moabites, killed two-thirds of their soldiers. The Moabites bring David tribute. 2Sam. 8:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aramaeans (Hadadezer)</td>
<td>There appears to be missing information at this point. Hadadezer goes to restore his power at the Euphrates River, but why David chose to get involved at this time is unknown. David soundly defeats several groups of Syrians and they pay him tribute. 2Sam. 8:3–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammon, Amalek</td>
<td>No war is specifically mentioned in 2Sam. 1–8, but both of these countries send David tribute. It is normal and reasonable in the ancient world for these countries to pay tribute without being defeated in battle. 2Sam. 8:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edomites</td>
<td>David defeats the Edomites and they bring him tribute. 2Sam. 8:13–14 (there is an error in the Hebrew of Samuel text in v. 13; Aram ought to read Edom instead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonites</td>
<td>When there is a power change in Ammon, the Ammonites turn against David. Although they are beaten in battle, General Joab does not complete his victory until later. 2Sam. 10:1–14 11:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aramaeans</td>
<td>General Joab leads David’s army first against a coalition of Ammon and Aram, and then David gathers up a citizen army and goes to war against Aram in eastern Israel. 2Sam. 10:6–19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This war between David, Ammon and Aram is probably the most detailed war that God the Holy Spirit recorded that David has been involved in.

### Chapter Outline

- It may be helpful to see this chapter as a contiguous whole:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Complete Translation of 2Samuel 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Reasonably Literal Translation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sends Ambassadors to Ammon, Who are Rebuffed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And so it is after this, that the king of the sons of Ammon died and his son Hanun reigned in his place. And so, David said, “I will manufacture grace toward Hanun, the son of Nahash just as his father manufactued grace toward me.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therefore, David sent his ambassadors to comfort Hanun concerning his father. And the ambassadors entered into the land of the Ammonites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Reasonably Literal Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And the officials of the sons of Ammon said unto Hanun, their lord, “Is David honoring your father in your eyes [simply] because he sent comforters to you? Has he not [done this] in order to [thoroughly] search out the city, to explore it [as a spy], and to overthrow it—[and this is why] David sent his ambassadors to you?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therefore, Hanun seized the ambassadors of David and shaved off half of their beard and cut off their garments in the middle up to their buttocks and then dismissed them. When this was made known [lit., and so they made known] to David, he sent [servants] to meet them, for the men were greatly ashamed. Therefore, the king said, “Remain in Jericho until your beards have grown, then you [may] return.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ammon Hires Mercenaries to Oppose David

| When the sons of Ammon saw that they had made themselves odious before David, they [lit., Bene-Ammon] sent and hired 20,000 infantry [from] Aram of Beth-Rehob and Aram of Zobah, 1000 men [from] the king of Maacah and 12,000 men [from] Ishtob. | When the sons of Ammon recognized that they had made themselves odious before David, they sent and hired 20,000 infantry from Aram of Beth-Rehob and Aram of Zobah, 1000 men from the king of Maacah and 12,000 men from Ishtob. |
| When David heard, he dispatched Joab and the whole army—the elite force [lit., the mighty ones]. Then Bene-Ammon comes out and they arrange [themselves] in battle array at the entrance of the [city] gate. Meanwhile [lit., and], Aram of Zobah and [Aram] of Rehob, Ishtob and Maacah [were] by themselves in the field. | When David heard this, he dispatched Joab and his entire elite army. Then the soldiers of Ammon came out and deployed in battle array at the city gate entrance. Meanwhile, the Aramaean soldiers from Zobah, Rehob, Ishtob and Maacah were stationed by themselves hidden in the field [south of Joab’s men]. |

Joab Employs a Winning Strategy Against Aram and Ammon

<p>| When Joab saw that the face of the battle was against him from in front and behind, he then chose from the elite men [lit., chosen ones of] of Israel and he deployed [them] against [lit., he arrayed (them) in an order to meet] Aram. He placed the rest of the people in the hand of Abishai, his brother; and he deployed [them] against Bene-Ammon. | When Joab observed that he was fighting on two fronts, he chose his elite forces (his Rangers and Navy SEALS) out of Israel and he deployed them against Aram. He placed the rest of his soldiers in the control of Abishai, his brother; and Abishair deployed them against the sons of Ammon. |
| And Joab [lit., he] said, “If Aram is too strong for me, then you will be to me deliverance; and if Bene-Ammon is too strong for you, then I will come to deliver you. Be strong and we will strengthen ourselves on behalf our people and on behalf of the cities of our Elohim; and Y’hovah will do [what is] the good in His eyes.” | And Job said, “If Aram is too strong for me, then you will come to my aid; and if the sons of Ammon are too strong for you, then I will come and deliver you. Be strong, dear Abishai and together, we will give one another strength for both our people and for the cities of our God; and Jehovah will then do that which is divine good.” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Then Joab and the people who [are] with him advanced to war against Aram, and they fled from him. When Bene-Ammon saw that Aram retreated, they retreated from the presence of Abishai and entered into the city.</th>
<th>Then Joab and the people who are with him advanced to war against the Aramaic army, and they fled from him. When the sons of Ammon saw that Aram, their ally, was retreating, they ran from Abishai and entered into their city, Rabbah.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Then, Joab returned from [his war with] Bene-Ammon and he entered Jerusalem.</td>
<td>Consequently, Joab returned from this war with the sons of Ammon and went back to Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When Aram saw that they [lit., he] had been struck down before Israel, they gathered [themselves] together. Hadadezer sent [messengers] and brought Aram which [is] on the other side of the river [Euphrates]. Then they came into Helam with Shobach, the commander of Hadadezer’s army [riding] in front of them.</td>
<td>When Aram saw that they had been struck down before Israel, they gathered themselves together. Hadadezer then sent messengers and brought the Syrian army from the other side of the Euphrates River. This army came to Helam with Shobach, the commander of Hadadezer’s army, riding in front of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When [this] is made known to David, he gathers all Israel, crosses over the Jordan, and enters into Helam. Aram [meanwhile] positioned [themselves] to meet David and to wage war with him.</td>
<td>When David hears of this, he mobilizes a citizen army from all Israel and they cross over the Jordan and enter into Helam. The Aramaeans, meanwhile, position themselves against David and to engage in battle with him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then Aram fled from before Israel while David kills 700 chariot riders from Aram and 40,000 horsemen. Also, he struck down Shobach, commander of his army, and he died.</td>
<td>Then Aram fled from before Israel while David killed 700 Aramaic chariot riders and 40,000 of their horsemen. Furthermore, David struck down Shobach, the commander of Hadadezer’s army, and he died.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because [lit., and so] the kings—the servants of Hadadezer—saw that they had been struck down before Israel, they [therefore] made peace with Israel and [now] they serve them. Furthermore [lit., and so], Aram feared to help Bene-Ammon [ever] again.</td>
<td>Because the kings who were servants of Hadadezer saw that they had been defeated in battle before the Israelites, they therefore made peace with Israel and now they serve them. Furthermore, Aram now fears to even help the sons of Ammon ever again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parallel to this chapter is 1Chron. 19. Some suggest that Psalm 44 is a good parallel Psalm to examine with this chapter as well. R. B. Thieme suggests that this narrative is related to Psalms 57, 60 and 108. After these chapters, we would then move on to 2Samuel 11 (HTML) (PDF).