

Old Wine is Better

Now if perfection had been attainable through the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need would there have been for another priest to arise after the order of Melchizedek, rather than one named after the order of Aaron? For when there is a change in the priesthood, there is necessarily a change in the law as well. (Heb 7:11–12)

1.

There is necessarily a change in the law—it is this necessary change in the law that causes difficulties within Sabbatarian Christendom, as many wannabe teachers of Israel drink the milk of Scripture from *sippy* cups for they would spill their milk if it were given to them in a glass ... the writer of Hebrews says to the Hebrews called by God, “For though by this time you ought to be teachers, you need someone to teach you again the basic principles of the oracles of God. You need milk, not solid food, for everyone who lives on milk is unskilled in the word of righteousness, since he is a child. But solid food is for the mature, for those who have their powers of discernment trained by constant practice to distinguish good from evil” (5:12–14). Solid food is for those Sabbatarian disciples able to discern that a change in the law has occurred, that those things added because of Israel’s unbelief (this includes the sons of Levi being ordained to serve the Lord — Ex 32:28–29; this includes the covering of animal sacrifices and not lighting a fire on the Sabbath and most of the 613 *mitzvos* or commandments found in the Torah) are suspended when a high priest after the order of Melchizedek serves in a heavenly sanctuary: those things that were added, including the Levitical priesthood, will return in the Millennium, but for now, Christians live in an era like that between Abraham and Moses, the era when Melchizedek served as priest of the Most High (Gen 14:18).

Luke records Jesus saying, “And no one puts new wine into old wineskins. If he does, the new wine will burst the skins and it will be spilled, and the skins will be destroyed. But new must be put into fresh wineskins. And no one after drinking old wine desires new, for he says, “The old is good”” (5:39) ... the assumption within Christendom has been that Jesus’ ministry is the new wine and grace is the new wineskin, but if this assumption were true, then the ministry of the Levitical priesthood would be better; would be good enough [χρηστός]. There would have been no need for a priest to arise after the order of Melchizedek rather than another priest to be called after the order of Aaron.

All of you spiritual infants that are now drinking milk, understand! the new wine is the Levitical priesthood that came because of Israel’s unbelief while this

physically circumcised nation was still in Egypt. When the elders of Israel came to inquire of the prophet Ezekiel, the Lord told Ezekiel that He would not be inquired of by Israel. He told Ezekiel to tell the elders:

Thus says the Lord God: On the day when I chose Israel, I swore to the offspring of the house of Jacob, *making myself known to them in the land of Egypt*; I swore to them, saying, I am the Lord your God. On that day I swore to them that I would bring them out of the land of Egypt into a land that I had searched out for them, a land flowing with milk and honey, the most glorious of all lands. And I said to them, Cast away the detestable things your eyes feast on, every one of you, and do not defile yourselves with the idols of Egypt; I am the Lord your God. *But they rebelled against me and were not willing to listen to me.* None of them cast away the detestable things their eyes feasted on, nor did they forsake the idols of Egypt.

Then I said I would pour out my wrath upon them and spend my anger against them in the midst of the land of Egypt. But I acted for the sake of my name, that it should not be profaned in the sight of the nations among whom they lived, in whose sight I made myself known to them in bringing them out of the land of Egypt. *So I led them out of the land of Egypt and brought them into the wilderness. I gave them my statutes and made known to them my rules, by which, if a person does them, he shall live. Moreover, I gave them my Sabbaths, as a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord who sanctifies them.* (20:5–12 emphasis added)

The Sabbaths of God were not given to Abraham, but to Israel after the nation left Egypt; for Abraham entered into the presence of the Lord as he would enter into the presence of a friend so that when the Lord came to visit Abraham (Gen chap 18), Abraham brought water to the Lord to wash His hands and feet, and Abraham served the Lord curds and milk and the just butchered and cooked calf (vv. 4–8). He talked with the Lord as he would with a friend, and he “reasoned” with the Lord concerning the destruction of Sodom. The testimony of the Lord was that He had chosen [known] Abraham that he, Abraham, might “command his children and his household after him to keep the way of the Lord by doing righteousness and justice, so that the Lord might bring to Abraham” (v. 19) the promises made to Abraham.

The testimony of the Lord to Isaac was that “Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws” (Gen 26:5); yet the statutes and rules of the Lord were not given until Moses led Israel from Egypt. So Abraham by nature showed that the work of the law was written on his heart (Rom 2:14–15) without needing a schoolmaster (Gal 3:24) to teach him what these works were.

The statutes and rules added in the wilderness were added because of Israel’s unbelief and rebellion. The Sabbaths of the Lord were codified so that Israel might know that the Lord sanctified them; for the Sabbaths are shadows of entering into God’s rest (Ps 95:10–11; Heb 3:16–4:11), a euphemistic expression

for entering into God's presence. Not keeping the Sabbaths of God now becomes rebellion against God; for Abraham didn't have the option of entering into the Lord's presence whenever he wanted, but when the Lord appeared to him. The same is still true today, a vein that will be explored in another paper.

The Law came under the priesthood of Aaron, spokesman for Moses—death reigned from Adam to Moses (Rom 5:14), for with the giving of the Law came the means to identify sin (i.e., unbelief), which lay dead until named by the Law. But again, Abraham served under the priesthood of Melchizedek, the king of peace, and Abraham believed God and had his belief counted to him as righteousness (Gen 15:6) ... believing God is the manifestation of faith in God, and no one can believe in Him of whom they have not heard (Rom 10:14). So with Moses came a revealing of the Lord to Israel, His firstborn natural son (Ex 4:22) that is to the Lord as Ishmael was to Abraham.

Eliezer of Damascus, a servant, was the heir apparent to Abram's household when Abram, then in old age, complained to the Lord that he was childless (Gen 15:2–3) ... Eliezer of Damascus was to Abram what angels (servants in the household of the Most High) are to the Lord God, thus establishing the following correspondences that Paul utilizes:

- Eliezer of Damascus corresponds to angels as Abram corresponds to *YHWH Elohim*;
- Ishmael corresponds to natural Israel as Abram corresponds to *Yah*;
- The addition of aspirated breath to Abram's name, changing his name to *Abraham*, corresponds to *Yah* entering His creation as His only Son and receiving a second breath of life, the breath of the Father [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] (Matt 3:16);
- Isaac corresponds to circumcised of heart Israel as Abraham corresponds to the glorified Christ Jesus;

Paul understood this series of correspondences and used them in his analogy that has Hagar as Mount Sinai corresponding to present day Jerusalem [present day Jerusalem in the 1st-Century as well as in the 21st-Century] (Gal 4:24–25), but all in Asia left Paul while he still lived (2 Tim 1:15) and those in Achaia were questioning whether Paul was even of God (1 Cor 4:3) and those in Judea sought his life (Acts 21:20–21, 24, 28, 30–31).

Death reigned over Abraham, over Lot, and over everyone who lived prior to Moses and the giving of the law. But because Abraham believed God and did by nature those things that God requires—loving God with all of one's heart and mind, and loving neighbor as self—Abraham, in the manner of believing the Lord about his offspring being as stars, had his faith counted to him as righteousness (Gen 15:6). And when Abraham's belief or faith was counted to him as righteousness, Abraham "slipped out" from under the shadow of death. He didn't drag others out with him, but his slipping away from death is seen when he offers up Isaac as a sacrifice—and Isaac was old enough at the time, old enough to resist, that we also see Isaac conditionally slip away. For it was Abraham's continued obedience by faith before he was circumcised (or made naked before God as Adam was naked in his whole body) that was his seal of righteousness so that he would be the father of all who believe, circumcised and uncircumcised (Rom 4:9–12). It was Isaac's circumcision that required Isaac to walk uprightly

before God; yet Isaac, like his father Abraham, called his wife his sister (Gen 26:7), a vein that needs further exploration:

- Abraham and Sarah were brother and half-sister *and* husband and wife, with Sarah taken by Pharaoh to be his wife (Gen 12:15) and with Sarah taken by Abimelech to be his wife (Gen 20:2);
- Abraham corresponds to the glorified Christ Jesus;
- The Church is both half-sister and wife to Christ Jesus;
- Thus, Israel in Egypt and Israel in the Promised Land correspond to Sarah, whereas the Church corresponds to Rebekah, wife of Isaac

The Lord appeared to Isaac and commanded him not to go down to Egypt (Gen 26:2), with Egypt serving as the geographical representation of sin as Canaan serves as the representation of life and Assyria serves as the representation of death.

- Melchizedek, the king of peace, did not dwell in either Egypt or Assyria (the land of Haran), but in the land of Canaan;
- The glorified Christ now serves as high priest of Israel as Melchizedek served as priest to Abraham;
- The glorified Jesus does not dwell in sin or in death, but in life and is life; He cannot be found in sin, the transgression of the law.
- The glorified Jesus serving as high priest of Israel also corresponds to Aaron serving as high priest of Israel, and these correspondences have turned and begun to descend in hierarchal ranking.

It wasn't as Melchizedek that the Lord appeared to Isaac and declared Himself "the God of Abraham, your father" (Gen 26:24); so a change occurred that did not see Rebekah taken to be the wife of another as Sarah had been and did not see the Lord appear to Isaac as Melchizedek had appeared to Abraham, who certainly recognized the Lord by sight when He came to Abraham there under the oaks of Mamre (Gen chap 18) ... the first words of Abraham were, *My Lord*. And after the Lord wrestles with Jacob (Gen 32:22–32), He doesn't again permit mortal men to come near unto Him until He is born as His only Son, the man Jesus of Nazareth: at the time of the burning bush, He tells Moses, "Do not come near; take the sandals off your feet, for the place on which you are standing is holy ground" (Ex 3:5).

The person who looks for constancy in Scripture looks amiss if the person doesn't recognize that a change occurred in the Garden when Adam was driven from the presence of the Lord, that another change occurred in the days of Noah, that another change occurred in the days of Abraham, that another change occurred in the days of Moses, that another change occurred in the days of Jesus, and still another change will occur in the seven endtime years of tribulation—and with each change, more of the mystery of God is revealed as well as more of what the Lord expects from humankind.

Paul understood the preceding correspondences and used them when writing to the Galatians (4:21–31). Thus, Paul wrote, "And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring [seed], heirs according to the promise" (3:29).

Angels do not inherit everlasting life; they have life in the timeless heavenly realm, and because the moment doesn't become the next moment but is

everlasting, the life they have is everlasting for as long as they remain in the heavenly realm. But when cast into time as Satan and his angels will be (Rev 12:9–10), they become subject to death just as everything within the creation has been subjected to decay. Thus, as servants in the household of God, angels inherit neither the household nor everlasting life as Eliezer of Damascus did not inherit what went to Isaac. Natural Israel (Ishmael in type), upon demonstrated obedience by faith (Deut 30:1–2; 6; Rom 9:31–32), inherits eternal life, but *Christians* as the sons of promise, the firstfruits of the harvest of the earth (with Christ Jesus being the First of these firstfruits), receive eternal life (Rom 6:23) upon birth by receipt of the breath of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ].

The above is where much milk is spilt: Christians do not inherit eternal life. They already have eternal life indwelling within them from receiving the spirit [πνεῦμα—*breath*] of God, which is a second breath of life. Thus, those Sabbatarian disciples who deny that they have been born of spirit [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] really haven't been. Don't argue with them; believe them, for they are truly without spiritual understanding.

Christians are “created” not by baptism or by a profession of faith or by being humanly born into a family or household of believers. Christians are *created* by receiving a second breath of life, the breath of the Father that gives “life” to the nature or inner self that animates the flesh as the breath of *Elohim* [singular in usage] gave physical life to the corpse of mud on the day when the heavens and the earth were created (Gen 2:7).

A person can say the so-called *sinner's prayer*, can invite Jesus into his or her heart, can be baptized and confirmed in a faith, yet not be a Christian, and not even understand what it means to be Christian ... unless God the Father makes an overture to the person by drawing the person from this world through giving the person a second breath of life, His breath [πνεῦμα θεοῦ], the person is as the crowds were that followed Jesus and physically ate the bread He gave them. The person remains inwardly dead; for it is receipt of the breath of God [πνεῦμα θεοῦ] that transforms previously “dead” but physically living human beings into living sons of God. They, now, inherit the household of the Father, for they are heirs not servants. They do not inherit eternal life as was promised to natural Israel upon demonstration of faith that leads to obedience.

The better promises added to the second covenant [Deut chaps 29–32] when its mediator goes from being Moses to being the glorified Jesus do not abrogate this eternal covenant, but changes it so that it pertains to the inner new self or creature that has been born of the breath of God as His firstborn son, who isn't just Christ Jesus but is all of Christ, Head and Body ... Paul writes, “Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it” (1 Cor 12:27). In a declaration that will seem blasphemous to milk drinkers, disciples are *Christ*, the anointed one, with Jesus forming the substance of the Body of Christ and with every disciple being a fractal image of Jesus or not being a part of the Body. It is just that simple: disciples will look like Jesus, will walk as Jesus walked, and will respond as Jesus responded to persecution and accusations, or they will not be glorified as Jesus was glorified, having the glory He had before returned to Him by the Father (John 7:5). They will, instead, perish in the lake of fire, the second

death, the death of the inner new creature born from receiving a second breath of life.

As endtime disciples bear fruit [figs] before it is the season for fruit, with much of this harvest of early figs laying on the ground, unripe, windshaken and bruised, spoiled fruit rotting away, the loss of brothers and sisters in Christ to unbelief can seem overwhelming: yes, they were born of spirit, and yes, they grew for a while, but they were seed sown in rocky soil and were without root (Matt 13:5–6, 20–21) or seed sown among thorns and choked by the cares of this world (vv. 7, 22). They bore no fruit and no longer have life, but the tent of flesh with its conscious mind in which they dwelt doesn't know that they are dead. Everything seems as it was, other than the pressure they felt is off once they returned to Christian orthodoxy or climbed out on some theological twig where they waver in the wind.

What if that twig has solid scriptural support like the Circumcision Faction of the 1st-Century had? Does Scripture change, or is Scripture a closed canon? ... Well, answer the question yourself? Are the visions of Daniel part of Scripture? They were not when a remnant of Israel left Babylon to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem. And for four centuries after the Book of Daniel was accepted as Scripture, the canon was closed: for rabbinical Judaism, the Great Assembly's inclusion of Daniel and certain Minor Prophets permanently closed the canon. But early on, the Church of God accepted the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and the fourteen epistles of Paul as part of a new canon that would later see the inclusion of Peter's epistles, James' epistle, John's writings, and finally Jude's epistle—this new canon was still subject to revision as late as the end of the 4th-Century CE. It is, however, now considered closed as Judaism's canon was closed centuries earlier. But is it really closed, or is it closed only to those Christians who are as spiritually dead as Judaism has been?

If the law in the 1st-Century was changed (Heb 7:12) but not abolished (Matt 5:17), how was it changed, the question that must be asked by those who would walk as Jesus walked (1 John 2:6; 1 Cor 4:16; 11:1; Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 1:6); for in walking as Jesus walked, the law was kept and not transgressed.

Christians tend to be shortsighted, knowing the story of Abraham but not thinking of Abraham as Paul did or as the first disciples did. The two millennia since Calvary, the razing of the earthly temple at Jerusalem, the anti-Semitism inherit in the Christianity of the Interregnum—all have helped minimize Abraham's importance to endtime disciples. All have contributed to the lawlessness of Christendom; for to walk as Jesus walked when passing grain fields and His disciples hungering on the Sabbath, doing what was “not lawful to do on the Sabbath” (Luke 6:2) saw no negation of the Sabbath or change of the Sabbath to the 8th-day, but saw Jesus' disciples gathering grain that they would immediately eat on the Sabbath for the Sabbath existed to serve man, and not man to serve the Sabbath (Mark 2:27). Jesus said that the Son of Man was lord of the Sabbath (Luke 6:5; Mark 2:28; Matt 12:8).

The Sabbaths of God were given to Israel when this nation rebelled against the Lord while this nation was still in Egypt (again, Ezek 20:12). They were given when Israel could no longer enter into the Lord's presence because of its unbelief as Abraham entered into the Lord's presence because of his belief by faith ... the

Sabbaths of God were given to Israel as a sign that the Lord sanctified the nation when the Lord wanted to pour out His wrath on the nation because of its unbelief. By keeping the Sabbaths of God, Israel disclosed to man and angel whether Israel wanted to enter into the Lord's presence, or whether the Lord was an unwelcome intruder as He was a welcomed visitor by Abraham.

Today, this same comparison holds: disciples who keep the Sabbaths of God tell the Most High and His Christ that they want to enter into the house of God and enter into the presence of the Father and Son, and that they welcome the Lord as a guest in their house; whereas those disciples who do not keep the Sabbaths of God would be put off if the Lord came to visit them and they had to stop what they were doing to prepare bread and meat for Him as Abraham did.

Note the difference in mindsets: the person who is busy shopping on the Sabbath or golfing or going to a high school football game would be offended if the Lord showed up without invitation to interrupt their activities in this world. Yet the person who keeps the Sabbath desires to enter into the Lord's presence, and the Sabbath serves as the weekly occasion when this person sets aside the things of this world so that thoughts and desires of the heart are fully on entering into the Lord's presence.

The Sabbaths of God serve the disciple by clearing the disciple's calendar of events so that the disciple is not caught unaware when the Lord comes at the end of the age ... disciples as the Body of Christ are also the Body of the Son of Man and as such, they too are lord to the Sabbath, making the Sabbath their servant as Eliezer of Damascus served in the household of Abraham. The Sabbaths of God are to disciples as angels are to the Most High.

Understand the above: if the Sabbath (the 7th day of the seven day week) is to disciples as angels are to God, then changing the day on which the Sabbath is observed from the 7th day to the 8th day corresponds to angels rebelling against the Most High when iniquity was found in an anointed cherub (Ezek 28:14–15).

Sunday observance is for "Christians" what rebellion was for angels; thus keeping the Sabbath in the Tribulation (the first 1260 days of the seven endtime years of tribulation) will mark those who are of God or who believe God as Sunday observance will characterize those disciples who do not love the truth but participate in the Rebellion or great falling away (2 Thess 2:3), with the cross serving as the iconic symbol of rebellion against God.

The mark of the beast [$\chi\xi s'$ — *chi xi stigma*] (Rev 13:18) is understood as the tattoo [*stigma*] of Christ's [*chi*] cross [*xi*], the mark of death/Death, the fourth horseman (Rev 6:7–8), the fourth beast of Daniel chapter 7, the beast that is dealt a mortal wound (Dan 7:11; Rev 13:3) when the two witnesses are publicly resurrected from death, thereby establishing the *death* of Death ... a matter is not established by one witness even though this witness is Christ Jesus, but by the testimony of two or three: the two witnesses and Christ Jesus.

The cross is a murder weapon; it is the weapon the prince of this world used to kill Christ Jesus. And through the cross, tattooed in the mind by belief and on the hand with ink, the fallen prince of this world will mark for the second death all who rebel against God (Rev 20:4) ... the cross has become such an iconic symbol of Sunday Christendom that Sunday observance and the cross are inseparable in the same way that rebellion against God and death are

inseparable, with Sunday observance corresponding to rebellion and the cross corresponding to death.

Until recently there has been an ongoing scandal in China over dairies watering down the milk they sold and attempting to hide their deceit (their thief) by adding melamine, a nitrogen compound used in plastics and fertilizers, to make the adulterated milk appear to have more protein than it actually does. Melamine causes or can cause kidney failure, and melamine added to milk is responsible for many infant deaths in China and throughout Asia ... visible Christendom has watered down the milk of God's word, adding to Scripture an unhealthy amount of Greek paganism, thereby poisoning generations of disciples and causing these infant sons of God to perish in unbelief. So much paganism was added to Scripture that when disciples actually encounter unadulterated "milk," they think this *milk* (that is food for those unskilled in discerning good from evil) is spiritual meat, and they fancy themselves as able teachers of Israel, mature in the faith, when they are still carnal men and women (1 Cor 3:1–4); when they are still able only to ingest milk.

If the law was changed but not abolished, the Sabbath remains in effect but how the Sabbath was to be observed changed with return to the Melchizedek priesthood ... again, the Sabbath represents entering into God's rest as represented by the geography of the Promised Land (Ps 95:10–11), with entering into God's rest being a euphemistic expression for entering into God's presence (Ex 33:14) — the nation of Israel that left Egypt could not enter into God's rest because of its unbelief, but Moses entered into God's rest when he entered into God's presence atop Mount Sinai. Thus observing the Sabbath becomes a type of entering into God's presence.

What Abraham actually does when entering into the presence of the Lord needs to be cited so there is no doubt about how the Lord is served:

And the Lord appeared to him [Abraham] by the oaks of Mamre, as he sat at the door of his tent in the heat of the day. He lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold, three men were standing in front of him. When he saw them, he ran from the tent door to meet them and bowed himself to the earth and said, "O Lord, if I have found favor in your sight, do not pass by your servant. Let a little water be brought, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree, while I bring a morsel of bread, that you may refresh yourselves, and after that you may pass on—since you have come to your servant." So they said, "Do as you have said." And Abraham went quickly into the tent to Sarah and said, "Quick! Three seahs of fine flour! Knead it, and make cakes." And Abraham ran to the herd and took a calf, tender and good, and gave it to a young man, who prepared it quickly. Then he took curds and milk and the calf that he had prepared, and set it before them. And he stood by them under the tree while they ate. (Gen 18:1–8)

When Moses entered into the presence of the Lord atop Mount Sinai, he fasted (Ex 34:28), but Moses went up to the Lord rather than the Lord coming down to him as the Lord did when coming to Abraham and as the Lord did when coming to His people as His only Son (John 1:11, 14).

When disciples enter into the presence of the Lord, they do not fast (Matt 9:14–15; Mark 2:18–20; Luke 5:33–35) — and if the breath of Christ [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ] does not dwell in the disciple the person doesn't belong to the Lord (Rom 8:9), but if Christ [Χριστὸς] is in the disciple (v. 10), then the disciple is with the Bridegroom and does not fast even though Moses fasted when on Sinai. Thus, the determiner for how a person responds to entering into God's presence as represented by Sabbath observance is the presence or absence of the breath of Christ [πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ]: if it is present, the disciple will respond as Abraham responded and as Jesus' disciples responded when hungering on the Sabbath, but if it is absent, the person is not of Christ and remains under either Moses or under the prince of this world.

Those disciples who are of the Sabbatarian churches of God and who regularly fast to *get close to God* have no idea just how far away from God they are. Christ is not with them: they know that which is why they fast. So not only do they fast, but they return to those things that were added because of Israel's unbelief, such as not kindling a fire on the Sabbath (Ex 35:3) as they attempt to hypercorrect what they perceive to be profaning the Sabbath ... did Abraham tell Sarah to make cakes when the Lord suddenly appeared? Did Abraham tell his servants to kill a calf? Was Abraham a priest—under the Levitical priesthood, the sons of Levi butchered livestock every Sabbath day and no fault was found in what they did. Jesus reminded the Pharisees that they would circumcise a man (eight day old infant) on the Sabbath (John 7:22) so as not to break what was given to Abraham, thereby placing what Abraham received from the Lord ahead of what Moses received when Israel left Egypt. That is the hierarchy evident in what Jesus said and did not condemn when He compared healing a man to circumcision (v. 23).

The disciple responds to the Lord as Abraham responded to Melchizedek, who brought out bread and wine when Abram returned from defeating the four kings (Gen 14:18), and as Abraham responded when the Lord appeared to him before Sodom was destroyed by fire raining down from heaven. The person is free to serve the Lord, even to baking bread and cooking meat, just as the priests under Aaron served the Lord daily as well as on the Sabbaths of God.

Is there a distinction between the Sabbaths of God and every other day of the year? Yes, there is a distinction, but this distinction doesn't mean that the disciple, the inner new self, doesn't serve in the temple on the Sabbaths of God. It actually means that disciples are to do more as the Levitical priesthood did more; for *the daily* did not cease on the Sabbaths of God. But this does not mean that disciples are to busy themselves with the things of this world.

Disciples are today, individually and collectively, the temple of God (1 Cor 3:16–17; 2 Cor 6:16), the Body of Christ (1 Cor 12:27) in which the inner new creatures serve as the Levitical priesthood served on the Sabbath—and again, the Levitical priests served in the temple, making sacrifices on the Sabbath, without their work being counted to them as transgressions of the Law.

Disciples are not seen in type as generic Israelites, but as spiritual Levites, “a royal priesthood” (1 Pet 2:9) that serves Christ, Head and Body, as Abraham served the Lord—and as no fault was found by Levites serving in the temple of the Sabbaths of God, no fault will be found with disciples by them serving in the

temple on the Sabbaths of God, with this “service” including satisfying hunger even if this means gathering grain or killing the fattened calf that will be consumed on the Sabbath (in the presence of the Lord).

Certainly serving on the Sabbaths of God means much more than satisfying one’s own hunger, but in the mundane the rule is established: disciples are free to serve in any manner that relieves restrictions placed on inner selves born of God by these new creatures dwelling in tents of flesh. Where is the difference between a disciple eating to satisfy hunger and pulling an ox out of a ditch?

Hungry students are not good students, nor are overfed students.

The writer of Hebrews says,

For when there is a change in the priesthood, there is necessarily a change in the law as well. For the one of whom these things are spoken belonged to another tribe, from which no one has ever served at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah, and in connection with that tribe Moses said nothing about priests.

This becomes even more evident when another priest arises in the likeness of Melchizedek, who has become a priest, not on the basis of a legal requirement concerning bodily descent, but by the power of an indestructible life. For it is witnessed of him,

“You are a priest forever,

after the order of Melchizedek.” [citation from Ps 110:4]

(7:12–17)

Jesus’ authority to be high priest over Israel stems from Him being glorified, having had returned to Him the glory He had before He entered His creation as His only Son. It does not come from the law, or from men, but from an oath that the Lord proclaimed after the law was given:

For on the one hand, a former commandment is set aside because of its weakness and uselessness (for the law made nothing perfect); but on the other hand, a better hope is introduced, through which we draw near to God.

And it was not without an oath. For those who formerly became priests were made such without an oath, but this one was made a priest with an oath by the one who said to him:

“The Lord has sworn

and will not change his mind,

‘You are a priest forever.’” [again Ps 110:4]

This makes Jesus the guarantor of a better covenant. (7:18–22 emphasis added)

Again, the oath comes after the law, but the priesthood of Melchizedek precedes the law, thereby creating a scenario that has the period from Abraham to Moses (the era of the Melchizedek priesthood) corresponding to the period from Calvary to the beginning of the Millennium, when the Levitical priesthood in the form of the sons of Zadok will return to minister to the Lord (Ezek 44:10–16).

Zadok was priest under King David (2 Sam chap 15; 1 Kings chap 1), and priest to Solomon, whose reign forms the shadow and type of Christ Jesus' millennial reign.

A pattern emerges:

- Abram paying tithes to Melchizedek and being blessed by this king of peace forms the shadow and type of the Christian Church paying tithes to Christ Jesus and being blessed by Christ, whose priesthood is after the order of Melchizedek.
- Moses serving as god to Aaron (Ex 4:16) forms the shadow and type of Christ Jesus coming as the prophet like Moses (Deut 18:15) who would be God to the sons of Aaron.
- Israel's rebellion against the Lord at Sinai when Aaron made for the people gods of gold serves as the shadow and type of the sons of Aaron's rebellion against the Lord when they rejected Christ Jesus as the Son of God

The problem of addressing infants able only to ingest milk is that their attention spans are short. Many words put them to sleep—they do not understand why so much has been said when they understand so little of it. Surely, they say, the message could have been delivered in far fewer words. And the message they received could, indeed, have been delivered in fewer words for they are not able to receive more than the most basic of concepts.

Thus, this message can be reduced to: *the law was changed at Calvary, but not abolished. The law was made to serve disciples as natural Israel (the chiral image of Christians) served the law under Moses—and served the law because of the nation's unbelief. And with the change in the law, disciples now serve faith unto obedience as faith will serve the disciples once the Tribulation begins ...* the concept of disciples now serving "faith" will be addressed in the next installment of the message.

*

"Scripture quotations are from The Holy Bible, English Standard Version, copyright © 2001 by Crossway Bibles, a division of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved."

* * * * *

[\[Home\]](#)