

A Man After God's Own Heart 1 Samuel 13:13, 14

I. David loved the Word of the Lord (Psa. 119:97).

- A. The Word protected (Psa. 119:11), revived (Psa. 119:50), and comforted (Psa. 119:165) him.
- B. Jesus loved the Word of God (Matt.4:4, 7, 10).
- C. How is our love for the Bible?

II. David loved to pray (Psa. 116:1, 2).

- A. Prayer brought David close to God (Psa. 145:18).
- B. Jesus was also given to prayer.
 - 1. He prayed in the garden (Matt. 26:36-44).
 - 2. He prayed on the cross (Lk. 23:34, 46).
- C. How is our prayer life?

III. David loved to praise God (Psa. 119:164).

- A. David was determined to sing praises as long as he lived (Psa. 104:33)
- B. Jesus loved to praise God (Matt. 26:30).
- C. Are we men or women after God's own heart in our praise?

IV. David loved unity (Psa. 133:1).

- A. Paul begged for unity (1 Cor. 1:10).
- B. Jesus prayed for unity (Jn. 17:20-23).
- C. Do we love unity? Do we make it a priority in this congregation?

V. David hated every false way (Psa. 119:104)

- A. His hatred for error affected his selection of activities and friends (Psa. 101:3-7).
- B. Jesus also opposed error.
- C. What is our attitude toward error?

ASELGELA

Jim E. Waldron

The above Greek word according to the highly respected lexicographer of the 19th century, H. J. Thayer, means "wanton (acts or) manners, as filthy words, indecent bodily movements, unchaste handling of males and females" (*Greek-English Lexicon of New Testament Words*, p. 79-80). It is translated as "lasciviousness" (KJV) and "licentiousness" (NKJV) and is listed along with adultery, fornication, (sexual) uncleanness and other things as a work of the flesh (Galatians 5:19). It certainly condemns sexually provocative dress, the reading of dirty books, watching lewd videos and salacious DVDs, the telling of filthy jokes, and the unchaste handling of males and females along with seductive bumping and grinding on the dance floor. Remember to provide an alternative for your child in place of the prom. Protect your beloved son or daughter from being pawed and/or seduced to the sound of a percussion and string band.

Often, lust in the dance and booze afterwards lead to one night stands. One night stands lead to a loss of virginity, genital herpes, AIDS, etc. An ounce of prevention is worth far more than a life of heartaches and continual visits to the doctor. Beloved, be bold enough to warn your child against things that are lascivious, and illicit sex, drugs, booze and such like.

“How can God describe David as a man ‘after my own heart’ (1 Sam. 13:14; Acts 13:22) when he did all of those wicked things that are recorded in the Bible about him?”

That David’s life was considerably flawed, as we view the matter from the lofty mountains of New Testament morality, admits of no doubt. But there are several issues that must be taken into consideration in assessing his life in a balanced way.

1. David’s life must be viewed, first of all, in its historical context. He lived in that “moonlight” period of the Mosaic dispensation. Those were rugged times, relatively primitive, especially compared to the greater revelation of the era of Jesus Christ. It is, therefore, unfair to judge him by the exalted standard of New Testament ethics.
2. The biblical record does not attempt to veneer his blunders. It honestly and openly throws the floodlight upon both his triumphs and his tragedies. This impartiality is clear evidence of the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures.
3. David had periods of egregious weakness (e.g., his sin with Bathsheba and the murder of Uriah). He was brutal at times - God forbade him to build the temple because of his violence. Certainly he was less than ideal as a father.

But one thing is certain - he had a soul that could be touched with truth. He was unafraid to admit his transgressions. He broke his own heart by his lapses of spirituality. One only has to read his psalms of penitence (e.g., Psa. 32; 51) to sample the tenderness that adorned his spirit

It was not so much, then, the nature of his sins (grievous as they were) that is significant; rather, it was what he *did* about those blemishes when confronted with the crude reality of them (cf. 2 Sam. 12:13ff).

4. David’s life is not to be judged exclusively in terms of its valleys of failure, but rather the whole landscape must be surveyed. Whatever may be said of some of his awful deeds, it is acknowledged by most that his deportment was one of progress. Even Thomas Carlyle, a bitter critic of organized Christianity, described David’s life in complimentary terms. Of the shepherd king’s psalms, Carlyle wrote:

“I consider [these] to be the truest emblem ever given us of a man’s moral progress and warfare here below. All earnest souls will ever discern in it [the book of Psalms] the faithful struggle of an earnest human soul towards what is good and best. Struggle often baffled - sore baffled - driven as into entire wreck; yet a struggle never ended, ever with tears, repentance, true unconquerable purpose begun anew” (**Heroes and Hero-Worship**, p. 72; as quoted in McClintock & Strong, **Cyclopedia**, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1968, II, p. 699)

5. In considering the matter of David’s legacy, it might be well for those critics, who negatively assess the great king’s character - 3,000 years removed from the events - to reflect upon how the Hebrews viewed the history of David. The common expressions “city of David,” “seed of David,” “throne of David,” and “house of David,” are testimonies to the stature of the man - in spite of his mistakes. The fact that Jesus acknowledged himself as the “son of David” is, in itself, a commentary on the greater status of the celebrated king (cf. Mt. 22:42ff; cf. 12:23; 21:9,15). *by Wayne Jackson/ Christian Courier: Questions / Tuesday, July 17, 2001 www.christiancourier.com*