

9405

SILVER STAR BIBLE SCHOOL 2000

DAVID-A MAN AFTER GOD'S OWN HEART

THE KING OF ALL ISRAEL

Speaker: Bro. John Knowles

Study #2: In Mercy Shall the Throne be Established

Readings: 2 Samuel 7, 22:51, Psalm 18

Dear brethren and sisters!

In our previous study we introduced this particular section of David's life, the time when David decides to make Jerusalem his capital and to establish there the centre of administration and of worship. And we considered briefly the location of Jerusalem and more particularly, why it was that David had a desire to establish Jerusalem as his capital. We ended with a brief reference to Psalm 132 and I said that we would, this afternoon, commence by just looking at that in a little more detail than what we did last night, in order to set the tone for our study this afternoon entitled, 'In mercy shall the throne be established'. And our theme in one word this afternoon, is going to be very much focused in this word 'mercy', which has been associated so very, very strongly with David and with the covenant that God made with David.

But in Psalm 132, we have a Psalm which has a particularly interesting structure, and the structure is set out in a form that is known as parallelism; in other words, the two ideas are set along side of each other. You might like to follow it in your bibles, or you may just like to read it direct from the transparency because we do have the complete text there. And so this Psalm 132 commences with verse one which says, 'Yahweh, remember David and all his afflictions'. Then what we find is, that verses 2 to 10 speak about what David has done, and what were David's desires, and then paralleled with this we have in verses 11 to 17, what Yahweh has said concerning those very things that were David's desires. And then verse 18 concludes with the words 'His enemies will I clothe with shame, but upon himself shall his ground flourish'. So, because the idea in these studies is more to get David's feelings rather than just the facts, I think that it's good that we start with this psalm and even though we look at it ever so briefly, just see what were David's feelings.

Verse 2 says (following the introduction of verse 1, 'remember David and all his afflictions'), 'How he swear unto Yahweh and vowed unto the mighty God of Jacob.

Surely I will not come into the tabernacle of my house, nor go up into my bed; I will not give sleep to mine eyes, or slumber to mine eyelids, Until I find out a place for Yahweh, a habitation for the mighty God of Jacob'. And so he said he wasn't going to give himself any rest until he could find that place. Let's just move across to the latter part of verse 11 and verse 12 where we're told 'that Yahweh has sworn in truth to David that He will not turn from it. Of the fruit of thy body, says Yahweh, will I sent up your throne. If thy children will keep my covenant and my testimony that I shall teach them, their children shall also sit upon thy throne for evermore'. So, there is Yahweh's assurance that He will fulfil His part of the covenant. So, we're going to be looking at a covenant, a covenant involving two people. Here is David's side of the story (notice verse 6 and verse 7 which could be well said in the terms of David's desire to bring up the ark from that area of Beth-shemesh, Kirjath-jearim here described as) 'Lo, we heard of it at Ephratah, we found it in the fields of the wood. We will go into His tabernacles: we will worship at His footstool'. To which Yahweh says, verse 13, 'For Yahweh hath chosen Zion; He hath desired it for His habitation'.

And then we get the beautiful words of verse 8, David says, 'Arise, O Yahweh, into thy rest, Thou, and the ark of thy strength'; so, it's very much the time of him bringing up the ark to Zion, to which Yahweh responses, verse 14, 'This is my rest for ever; here will I dwell; for I have desired it. I will abundantly bless her provision: I will satisfy her poor with bread'. So as David performs the work of bringing the ark up to Zion, he sees it as but an incipient fulfillment of the greater time to come when Yahweh will fulfil His part of the covenant, and establish it forever, as He says there in verse 14.

So David says, verse 9, 'Let thy priest be clothed with righteousness: and let thy saints shout for joy'. To which Yahweh responses, verse 16, 'I will clothe her priests with salvation, and her saints shall shout aloud for joy'. See how the parallelism goes across here! And finally in verse 10, 'For thy servant David's sake, turn not away the face of thine Anointed'. To which Yahweh responses, 'There will I make the horn of David to bud: I have ordained a lamp for mine Anointed'. And so there are a number of Psalms, we saw Psalm 68 last night, we saw Psalm 24, here we see Psalm 132, and there are a number of psalms that have been set in that period, when David desired to bring the ark up to Zion.

But this afternoon, we want to develop the theme a little further. We noted last night, that the only significant reference to Jerusalem prior to the time of David, that would have given him any encouragement whatsoever, to see the need to make Jerusalem his capital, was Genesis chapter 14 (we don't need to turn it up at this moment); but Genesis chapter 14 and particularly verses 18 through to 20, where we read that there was a man called Melchizedek, king of Salem, a priest of the most high God. And he was a man to whom Abram gave tithes, and that man in turn gave to Abram bread and wine. Now, apart from that reference, we don't know of any other recorded in the scripture which would have given David any indication of the significance of Zion. Now we say that because as we mentioned last night (perhaps for the sakes of those who may not have been here) that we just take it for granted that everybody knows that

Jerusalem is to be the throne of Yahweh. But putting ourselves back in David's day, it mightn't have been quite so obvious. Yes, there was the incident of Abraham offering up Isaac on mount Moriah, but that didn't really say anything about the kingdom, that was more to do with God's plan really, of salvation.

And so, what we want to do today is to develop the theme further and to consider particularly, the tabernacle that David built in Jerusalem. The tabernacle he built in Jerusalem, as distinct from the tabernacle of Moses which was at Gibeon. So, going back to the chart that we used last evening to show the movement of the ark from the time that Israel came into the Land until David took it up to Jerusalem; we remember it started here at Shittim over to Gilgal up to Shiloh and Shechem and back to Shiloh and back to Shechem and finally taken into battle at Ebenezer; captured by the Philistines, taken down to Ashdod, they found it too hard to keep this so they sent it over to Gath, then up to Ekron and then finally returned it to the Israelites over here at Beth-shemesh, and then from Kirjath-jearim David said, 'I'm going to take the ark up to Jerusalem'. But you see, the tabernacle was at Gibeon; the tabernacle of Moses was still at Gibeon. David therefore, built another tabernacle or tent in Jerusalem; and so there were 2 tabernacles. The tabernacle of Moses which was being officiated over by the priests of the Aaronic priesthood, and another seemingly innocuous tent here in Jerusalem, which came to be known as the tabernacle of David.

Now some of you may be very familiar with the study of the tabernacle of David, putting myself in your place as I might have been (I won't say how long ago) but say a very long time ago, I might have said 'the tabernacle of David' I don't know much about the tabernacle of David, what was that? Oh, I suppose he built it in Jerusalem?' But you know, the tabernacle of David is a very, very significant theme in the scriptures. And this afternoon we want to see how it fits into this period of David's life and how it comes right down, of course, into New Testament times as well. Let's turn to 1 Chronicles chapter 16, where the record is going to show to us about these two separate situations. 1 Chronicles 16 and in the first instance we'll read verses 1 through 3, and we're going to contrast that with verses 37 to 40. Verse 1, 'So they brought the ark of Yahweh (it says God there, but I've got it coloured which indicates it's Yahweh, so be it) and they set it in the midst of the tent that David had pitched for it; and they offered burnt sacrifices and peace offerings before Yahweh. And when David had made an end of offering the burnt offerings and the peace offerings, he blessed the people in the name of Yahweh. And he dealt to every one of Israel, both man and woman, to every one a loaf of bread and a good piece of flesh, and a flagon of wine'. And so here again we've got this bread and wine! So, what is styled in verse 1, 'a tent which David pitched for it', comes to be known in the scriptures as 'the tabernacle of David'. So, there in Jerusalem was the tabernacle of David and all it had in it was the ark.

Now, come down to verse 37, 'So he left there before the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, Asaph and his brethren, to minister before the ark continually, as every day's work required.' (So, he's talking about this same place.) 'And Obed-edom, (a very significant man in this whole story, don't lose sight of this Obed-edom, so Obed-edom)

with their brethren, threescore and eight; Obed-edom also the son of Jeduthan and Hosah to be porters' (but what about these next ones?) 'Zadok the priest' (Zadok was very important, wasn't he?) 'and his brethren the priests, before the tabernacle of Yahweh, in the high place that was at Gibeon'. Now, I started reading that verse which was probably halfway through a sentence, so it probably didn't sound quite right, but you can see what he's saying. He's saying now by contrast, Zadok and his brethren they were set to minister as priests (and I'm going to suggest priests, well, not suggest because it's a fact) but priests under the Mosaic dispensation ministering in the tabernacle of Yahweh (which we'll call the tabernacle of Moses, in order to contrast it with the tabernacle of David) and this was at Gibeon. So, of course, this is up here, not all that far from Jerusalem but certainly two quite distinctly different places. And it was their job, says verse 40, to offer the burnt offerings unto Yahweh upon the altar; the burnt offering continually; the Talmud, the morning and the evening sacrifice and to do according to all that is written in the law of Yahweh, which He commanded Israel'.

Now, let's keep our balance because it's very difficult to keep our balance when we're talking about the Law. I for one, and I think others, find it difficult at times: you say, 'well, the Law couldn't give life, the Law magnified sin, the Law condemned', and you end up making the Law sound something bad. And then you go to Romans, and Paul says, 'the Law was holy, just and good' and there were certain very important moral issues involved in the commandments. But we've got to get the Law in its right place. Yes, it was the law of Yahweh, but there's a very definite contrast being made here, between the ark in the tabernacle of David in Jerusalem, and the tabernacle of Yahweh or the tabernacle of Moses, identified with the Mosaic order of things up in Gibeon. Now, this is going to be very important in our understanding of one simple thing for example, how was it that David was able to act the part of a king-priest? In bringing that ark up to Zion as we read in our reading yesterday, from 2 Samuel 6, David danced before the ark as a king-priest; but Uzziah a few years later was smitten with leprosy when he dared to go into the temple and offer incense. How come Uzziah is smitten and yet David could do something even more, and dress himself up as a priest, and act the part of a priest, and Yahweh's happy with it? Why the difference?

Well, let's look at a simple chart which certainly has a bearing on our study here, but I think there is also, very important, our understanding of the whole of the scriptures, and particularly, the relationships between the covenants of promise. Now, it's a very simple chart and we all know the facts on here, so there's nothing we need to learn from this. What I've done is, I've made a horizontal line here (which we'll try and describe for those who can't see the transparency) which starts off at BC. 4000, which we're taking as a nominal date for creation (we don't know the exact date), and we're working backwards, 3, 2, 1 until we come to the year BC/AD.(approximately when Christ was born). We go forward to the year 1,000 up here, to the year 2,000 and we're assuming that the return of the Lord is going to be very close to that date, and therefore, we've got the 1,000 year millennium on the right hand end. So, we've got this vertical line covering 7,000 years. In Genesis 3:15, we know the promise there; the seed of the woman will bruise the seed of the serpent, or bruise the serpent in the head, and there will be that contest between

the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent, which will go on for 7,000 years. And that promise in Eden was the promise of personal salvation.

Alright, we need say no more about that, whilst of course, it's very significant, it doesn't have a direct bearing on our study this afternoon. It's the other two covenants that we want to talk about. Now, we've got the next one here as the Abrahamic covenant, and we're showing it starting somewhere just a bit before BC.2000. Now, bear in mind that the Abrahamic covenant, as we well know, is a covenant particularly associated with the Land: 'Look north, south, east, and west, all the land that you see, I'm going to give to you, says God, and to your seed after you'; and, don't forget one other important thing: 'In thee, Abraham, shall all families of the earth be blessed' (Abraham, the father of the Jewish race, but Abraham, in you shall all families of the earth be blessed). All nations be blessed, all the Gentiles, just remember that! that's going to figure very significantly then in this study. We might sometimes wonder, if it was so important, why didn't it start earlier? Well, bear in mind, we've got the flood through here, haven't we? It was only a few hundred years, a matter of a couple of hundred years basically beforehand, that God had wiped out the whole of the human race, except 8 people; and, He had established a new order of things after they came out of the ark. There was Noah! Now Noah at that stage was king of the world, he only reigned over 7 people, admittedly, but we're quite serious in saying that he was king of the world. As the population grew, Noah was still king. What happened when Noah died? Well, when Noah died, that position was passed onto the one who inherited the title of 'firstborn'. So, Noah had three sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth. Shem was not the oldest, but he inherited the title of firstborn, because the other two, Ham and Japheth proved themselves unworthy of it, and there was an incident recorded there in Genesis 9, which shows them as unworthy.

Now, it is obvious from an allusion made in the times when God gave the Law to Moses, that prior to the giving of the Law, the role of priesthood was vested in the firstborn son. So, Shem then, as Noah's firstborn, inherits the rite of priesthood, but on the death of his father, he also is a king. So, there was Shem, Arphaxad, Salah, Eber, Peleg, and out of all those there's only a comment made about one of them, and that's Peleg. And of Peleg it says 'in his days was the earth divided (Gen.10:25). And after Peleg you've got, Reu, Serug, Nahor, Terah, Abram. Now, that's the chronological order, Peleg, Reu, Serug, Nahor, Terah, all died before, Shem, Arphaxad, Salah and Eber. So, when Abram in Genesis chapter 14, comes to Salem, he finds there somebody who's more important than him. Now we think, who could be more important than Abram? well, don't forget we're looking in retrospect. We hear a lot about the father of the faithful and all that sort of thing. Now just because there's a lot said about Abram doesn't make him necessarily more important than somebody else who was already there. And of course, at this stage, Shem was still alive, so the circumstantial evidence is quite strong to the effect that there was a king-priest ruling in Salem to whom Abram gave a 1/10th of all that he possessed, and who in turn administered to Abram, what? bread and wine! So, when we look at the promise made to Abram, you know, although there's only one verse in the bible (perhaps I may say two, and we won't go back to it) from in Genesis chapter

9:26, that refers to Shem; it says, 'Blessed be Yahweh Elohim of Shem, right? and Japheth shall be his servant and Ham will be his servant'. The fact is that the Abrahamic covenant, in many respects, starts earlier, immediately after the flood. So, the covenant with Abraham really goes from the time when the world started all over again, after the time of the flood, with a king-priest in Jerusalem and Abram recognizing him as an important man.

Now, that priesthood, therefore, is identified with what we would call the Abrahamic covenant. Now you notice on this chart I've put Abrahamic/Davidic because the covenant made with David was but an extension of the one made to Abram; we would say when teaching our young people the truth, that the covenant made to Abraham had to do with the Land, the covenant made to David had to do with the throne; but, of course, the two are connected. But the one word that's so important in all of this, it was an (everlasting) covenant! and even in the book of Hebrews it says, 'that the Lord Jesus Christ came forth from the grave through the blood of the everlasting covenant', which of course, was His own blood. So, in that blue section there, we're looking at something that starts immediately after the flood, with a priesthood which is identified with an everlasting covenant, starting with Melchizedek and going right through to the Lord Jesus Christ. And in the early period of that time, we do get Abram being given a promise, a promise which is identified with, of course, that everlasting priesthood, that everlasting kingship.

Now, by contrast, (and this is something too, that I always have to keep reminding myself), by contrast, about 430 years later, the descendants of Abraham having gone down into Egypt, and God desiring to deliver them from Egypt, finds there some people that have been in the land of Egypt for about 2 or 300 years, we don't know exactly how long. Now, just imagine how they deteriorated in that time. They had completely lost sight of this wonderful Abrahamic everlasting covenant based upon the principles of faith, and here they were in the land of sin and death. So God delivers them under the hand of Moses, and God, in His infinite wisdom, sees fit to give to that nation or people called Israelites, Jews if you like, a law; a law which of itself was never intended to offer them eternal life. If it had of, then there would have been two ways to life, (and by the way, if you get around to read that little booklet, 'The Mystery of the Covenant of the Holy Land explained' and I don't think there's been a school that I haven't quoted that book, you'll find on page 1 of that book, that bro. Thomas commented on the fact that there never intended to be two covenants giving life) in other words, that chart would have been wrong, if we'd taken that red section and slotted it down inside there, as much as to say, well, the covenant to Abraham worked there; then there came the Mosaic one, and then with the death of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem in AD.70, the Mosaic passes away and we're back with the Abrahamic. NO! that's very, very wrong! The Abrahamic was there all of the time. The Law was simply a schoolmaster pointing outside of itself, the pedagogue, the tutor-slave in the family, that slave that took the child to school, disciplined it and did all of those things, and which Galatians 4 tells us could never offer that child any inheritance, it was always pointing outside of itself, and saying, 'look outside of me at this other one!'

Now can you see where we're heading? David brings the ark up to Zion, and in Jerusalem he was going to establish, even if only for a little while, an incipient way, something that was to be identified with this everlasting covenant. But up in Gibeon, there were all of the other things identified with the Mosaic covenant. And so, that's why we've got the tabernacle of Moses up in Gibeon, and this simple tent in Jerusalem called 'the tabernacle of David'. Did the tabernacle of Moses and the worship associated with it, offer life to anybody other than Jews? And the answer is NO! Oh, you could become a proselyte and all those sort of things, but it was for Jews! it was for their Land, it was to make them a holy people, in a holy land, and so there were holy days, and there were holy feasts and there were holy utensils; and there's a book called, *The Mystery of the Holy Land Explained*, but they were only holy in the sense that God had separated them. And as page 1 of that named book says, by and large they were morally, generally, quite unholy people.

But what about this other covenant? what about this covenant that God made to Abram? Well, every young person knows that in Genesis chapter 12 it says, 'And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed'. And Paul picks it up in Galatians chapter 3 and says, And God, foreseeing that He would justify the heathen (the Gentiles) through faith (not through law) preached before the gospel unto Abraham saying, 'in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. Now, what did David envisage when he took the ark up to Zion? He envisaged first of all, that he was going to be identifying Jerusalem with what would be the throne of that everlasting priesthood and kingship when the Lord Jesus Christ returned. And not only that, but it was going to involve Gentiles as well. How do we know? Ah, well, we'll let the bible show us that, but just remember that little comment we made about Obed-edom before! People discuss, was Obed-edom a Gentile? was he a Jew? was there more than one of them? Doesn't particularly matter in this context, but certainly 'Edom' and even if you worked the word 'Adam' it's identified with something more than Jewishness. And so, in the bringing of the ark up to Zion, it is not an exaggeration to say that David was enacting first of all there, the role of a king-priest, which under the Law of Moses, a king of the tribe of Judah could not become a priest because they were of the tribe of Levi; but on the other hand, under the Melchizedek priesthood, it didn't matter who your father was, who your mother was, how old you were when you started, or how old you were when you finished. And does that give anybody a clue as to the next quote we're going to go to?

Well, it's Hebrews chapter 7, and we're just making this as our final point of the significant contrast of these two places, Gibeon and Jerusalem, but of the very deep significance it has, in relation to God's plan of salvation and how it affects you and me as Gentiles. So, we go to Hebrews chapter 7 (and it's in that general context which goes from Hebrews 5 through to Hebrews 10: and, I always say this when I deal with Hebrews, and I think we should always do this when we come to the book, everything in Hebrews is a contrast, isn't it? Hebrews chapters 1 verses 1 to 4, Christ is greater than the prophets; Hebrews chapter 1, the remainder of that chapter through to the end of chapter 2, Christ is greater than the angels; Hebrews chapter 3, Christ is greater than

Moses; Hebrews chapter 4; Christ is greater than Joshua; Hebrews chapters 5 to 10, Christ is greater than Aaron and in this section, Christ's priesthood because it's a priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, is a greater priest than a priest after the order of Aaron). Now, let's read these first 3 verses of Hebrews 7 noting the contrast: 'For this Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him. To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is King of peace'. (Stop there for a moment. This is one of the reasons why last night I said, this man was called 'Melchizedek'; was it a name or was it a title? You see, Paul says that Melchizedek has an interpretation! it means 'king of righteousness' (4428+6664), and because he was king of Salem, then he was king of Shalom, king of peace. And of course, he points out that it must be first righteousness, and then peace, but that aside, this man represented an everlasting covenant, and the priesthood and the kingship identified with it. Now verse 3 (which is often seen as a bible difficulty) is really very simple when we recognize that what is being contrasted here is two priesthoods; not so much two men as personal, mortal individuals, but two priesthoods.

Because the priesthood meant your father and your mother were both of the tribe of Levi and of the family of Aaron, you had to be a certain age to start and a certain age to finish. So, under the Aaronic priesthood, everything about it was terminable, everything about the Law was terminable. It had a beginning here about 1600 years before Christ, and it terminated after the death of Christ, and certainly with the destruction of Jerusalem. Everything about the Law of Moses and the Aaronic priesthood was terminable, it was only intended, at the very best, to give them length of days in the Land.

But the Melchizedek priesthood is independent of; it doesn't matter who your father is, who your mother is, it doesn't say that you can start at a certain age and have to give up at a certain age. It's totally independent of that, so can we see then, the vision of this man David? When David in a very simple way, brings that ark up to Zion, and he acts the part of a king-priest (and I'm sure there are some of us here at least, who have thought, well, how was David able to do that, and get away with it?). Well, you see, he realized that whilst the Law existed, the Law never ever replaced the Abrahamic covenant, and there was a sense in which one could be living above that Law whilst not, of course, necessarily disobeying it. And the Lord Jesus Christ did such things, and He often argued with the people: 'they said, why are you doing miracles on the Sabbath day, you're breaking the Sabbath?' and He pointed out that it was right to do good on the Sabbath or you could eat the ears of corn on the Sabbath! You see, David was acting the part of a king-priest identified with an everlasting priesthood.

Now, as a result of this then, we've got a contrast. The Mosaic order of things was terminable and only had relationship to Jews. Therefore, the tabernacle up in Gibeon had a role to play; but David was looking for something far greater and he was looking for the time when not merely a wooden box with some gold on it, would be taken up and

put in a simple tent in Jerusalem, taken out of the house of Obed-edom (the servant of Edom). And if you put that in its worst form, the Edomites were the descendants of Esau; the Edomites were the closest relations to Israel of any of the nations, because the Edomites had Isaac for their father, Abraham for their grandfather, and Jacob was their brother. There was no closer relations to Israel than the Edomites, and yet they were the greatest haters of the Edomites. And here's a man called the servant of Edom and it's out of his house that the ark is taken; now I know some will want to soften that down and say, 'well, he wasn't that bad!' I'm taking the worst case scenario just in his name. David certainly saw it as signifying that one day the greater King-priest would come, and He would save not just Jews but Gentiles as well. And so that brings us to the point then, where we want to talk about this tabernacle of David, because although it doesn't get referred to many times in the scripture, it gets referred to with very great significance.

And here on our transparency, we've got a quotation from Amos chapter 9 verses 11 and 12, and Acts chapter 15 verses 14 to 17. Now, let's just see what we're being told here. We've come to the point where we've decided that there's a lot said in the bible about the Law of Moses (and might I just for a moment go back to this chart). On that chart, you notice that although that red section of the Mosaic Law isn't very long, it really covers the whole period when the Old Testament was written, and consequently, because it was in vogue at that time, and because it was given to Israel as a Law, and because the Old Testament was largely written to Israelites (not entirely, there were some exceptions) Obviously, there's a lot said about the Law. Now, the fact that there's a lot said about it doesn't make it more important than the Abrahamic covenant. That's something we've got to realize! So, whilst we may hear a lot about the tabernacle of Moses and almost nothing about the tabernacle of David, doesn't make the tabernacle of Moses more important.

So, this term then, 'the tabernacle of David', which some of us may not have been very familiar with, is dealt with in great significance when, in Acts chapter 15, at the Jerusalem conference, James says 'that Simeon (or Simon Peter) had declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name. And to this agree the words of the prophets', and the words of the prophets are these, Amos chapter 9 verse 11 and 12, 'In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen'. Now, whatever you might want to do with that as a prophecy at the moment, let's not worry about that! The tabernacle of David, how many times do you find 'the tabernacle of David' referred to in the Old Testament? I haven't counted them up, but I think it's less than (you don't even need one hand for the term itself). But the prophet says God will raise up the tabernacle of David, I'll close up the breaches I'll raise up his ruins, I'll build it as in the days of old, that they may possess the remnant of Edom and of all the heathen which are called by My name, saith Yahweh that doeth this'. Now, we might say, that's a passage that's a little bit difficult to understand. Well, let Peter interpreted for us, bearing in mind that the context is David building this tent in Jerusalem, that's the tabernacle of David. Simeon says this (the 'in that day' of Amos becomes 'after this I will return') 'I will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen

down' which is basically what Amos says. 'I'll build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up', which is basically what Amos says.

But listen to the next change! Amos says, 'that they may possess the remnant of Edom' and Simeon says, 'that the residue of men might seek after the LORD, and all the Gentiles upon whom My name is called'. Now James is telling us that Simeon declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take out a people for His name. When did God first visit the Gentiles to take out a people for His name? Not here in the book of Acts, it was always there, if Gentiles (given whatever chance they might have had) were able to see (dare I go back to our other chronology chart again, that blue line as being there). Abraham knew that all families of the earth would be blessed, and of course, because the Old Testament has so much to say about the Law of Moses and because the Jews sort of got tunnel vision, they got the idea that the whole of the bible is only about Jews; and it's not at all! Ah, yes, God has a very important part for the Jews to play; you know that I know that as well, very important indeed! But you see, David, in bringing the ark up to Zion, and putting the tabernacle there, and taking it out of the house of Obed-edom, and appointing Obed-edom (you remember that in Chronicles), appointing Obed-edom to perform a very important work in the ministrations of that tabernacle of David, David was telling Yahweh, that he knew that one day Jerusalem would be the capital of the whole world, and that all nations would be blessed in Abraham's seed, even in the Lord Jesus Christ, who would be that great King-priest after the order of Melchizedek.

So, what we've done is we've picked up Genesis 14, we've taken a little incident from the life of David, which we could easily teach in Sunday School, and maybe miss the whole point of what it was all about, and we've seen that David recognized that God's purpose was that the Jews and Gentiles together have an equal hope of salvation as, of course, the epistles in the New Testament tell us. Now, if we were to leave our study at that for today, some might say that that was interesting. Some might say that I've learnt something new and some might say, I haven't learnt anything new. But it's very important that somehow or other, there's got to be a message in that for us. And it's not just a doctrinal message, but as I indicated in my opening remarks and as the title of address is this afternoon, all of this becomes the background of what must be (well I guess depending on what talk you're giving as to what's the most important word in the bible?). This afternoon, between half past one and half past two, the most important word in the bible is going to be, a word which we'll find as we turn now to 2 Samuel chapter 7. Now, 2 Samuel chapter 7 (and the statement I was going to make was a very profound one) follows 2 Samuel chapter 6. Now, that wasn't just meant to be a mathematical calculation, it was meant to tell us, that in 2 Samuel 6 we read about David bringing the ark up to Zion. In 2 Samuel chapter 7 he says, that tent isn't good enough. And in simple terms, Yahweh's going to tell him, 'David, I'm not worried about the quality of that tent; David I'm delighted with what you did; David you showed a faith that there's virtually nobody else around that could have done what you did. You saw the significance of bringing that ark up to Zion; the fact that it's in a tent, I've never complained about that, David, have I? I've never complained about it, I've never asked

for a temple of cedar (because we know that's the background in 2 Samuel 7). And furthermore, David, you want to build me a house, fine! but I'm going to build you a house, David'.

We all know this, don't we? the promises to David! Well, what's the important word? Well, we come down for example to verse 13 concerning this seed, 'He shall build a house for My name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever' (so it's going to be under this everlasting priesthood and kingship). But coming down to verse 15, 'But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee'. Now, notice that word there, that word 'mercy'; turn over to Isaiah chapter 16 and verse 5, it's the very verse from which we've taken our title for this afternoon's talk. Isaiah chapter 16 and verse 5, now here's one of those rare occasions where we've got the term 'the tabernacle of David', but look at the word that's connected with it, and this is not just a coincidence, nor is it rare. Verse 5, 'And in mercy shall the throne be established, and he shall sit upon it in truth, in the tabernacle of David, judging and seeking judgment and hasting righteousness'. Now there's the tabernacle of David, a very simple tent, it's not telling us that when the Lord Jesus Christ returns, He going to just dwell in a simple tent. But the tabernacle of David identifies it with the great covenant made to Abraham and with David, and it involves Gentiles, but above all of that, it is based upon the greatest of all of Yahweh's attributes (at least for this one hour this afternoon and I think we could almost be prepared to argue it outside of this hour) that word 'cheched' (2617), His mercy, His lovingkindness, it's a word which everybody who tries to expound it, extols the virtues of that word as highly as they can and then say, 'we just don't know what word we can use, by which we can translate this word 'cheched'. We're going to talk a little bit about it in a moment, but notice it says here, that when that throne is established it's going to be in MERCY, and that's why we hear so much about 'the sure mercies of David'. In fact, when we come in a moment to the New Testament to look at a term which is used of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that's all we're going to say for the moment, we're going to see another very significant connection. Just while we're there, in Isaiah chapter 55 and verse 3, so for the remainder of our talk now, we want to see the connection of this word 'mercy' with all of those things that we've just been talking about.

Isaiah 55 and verse 3, (verses 1 and 2 are also important but we'll save them for our final hymn. 'O ye that thirst approach the spring, where living waters flow', that's verse 1 and 2. Verse 3 we pick up from there), 'Incline your ear, and come unto Me; hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David'. So, it's this word 'mercy' then that we're going to spend the rest of our time talking about, and unfortunately it won't be very long, but I think enough for all of us to see it's importance. And whilst we needn't turn it up, in Acts chapter 13 and verse 34, we get that same thing quoted about 'the sure mercies of David'. Well, then, let's take this word 'mercy', and I'll read out the definition which one authority (and of course, all authorities are fickle and they're bad; they're good some times and they're not at others), this one is Vine's, (who did his expository dictionary of New Testament words and made a bit of an attempt to do one on the Old Testament, but not very extensive.

Nevertheless, I think his comment in regard to this word, is very helpful indeed. And I'll read out to you what he says about this word 'cheched'). This word 'mercy': 'In general', (he says), 'one may identify three basic meanings of the word, which always interact'. So, what he's trying to say is you've got to have all three of these, leave any one of them out, and it's not quite 'mercy'. He says, 'Strength, steadfastness and love'. I'll just repeat those because you might want to write those down. These three things must all be embodied in it, take any one of them out and it's not necessarily 'cheched', it's got to be 'strength, steadfastness and love'; 'any understanding of the word that fails to suggest all three, inevitably loses some of its richness. Love by itself easily becomes sentimentalized or universalized apart from the covenant. Yet strength or steadfastness suggests only the fulfillment of a legal or other obligation. But put all of those together, and you've got this one word 'cheched". So how are you going to translate into English all of those things in one word?

Mercy is one way it's translated (not every time that you get the word 'mercy' is it necessarily 'cheched'. Generally, people like the idea of lovingkindness. Does lovingkindness always have the idea of strength or steadfastness? maybe it does and maybe it doesn't. So, perhaps we'll just stay with the word 'cheched' itself, in fact I've got another 1-1/2 to 2-1/2 pages of close type here of the definition of the word 'cheched' which you might like to read later on. I'm certainly not going to read it out now! In other words, I've delved into it as best as we can come up with in regard to the Hebrew meaning; and really that summary of Vine's was as good as we could get. There is another transparency I've got here, which is also taken from Vine and another authority called Gerdlestein. Gerdlestein wrote a book called 'Old Testament Synonyms' and Vine did, of course, his expository dictionary; this of itself may not be a bad summary. He says 'The word 'mercy' seems to be used with peculiar significance in relation to God's promise to David and his seed. And it is constantly introduced in connection with God's faithfulness and truth'. Now, I think it's Psalm 89, (and when you go through it, the number of times you've got the word 'mercy' and I think it's faithfulness or truth, and sometimes they're translated differently). They always seem to go together, but this is the one I like as a sort of more practical wind down or wind up to our section, because it really means something to us; and this is what distinguishes mercy from other words like, kindness, generosity or anything else that sounds a bit like that. The Greek word is 'leos' (1656) it is the outward manifestation of pity. Now here comes the significant part: he says, 'It assumes a need on the part of him who receives it'. (Let's just stop for a moment) I need mercy, alright, you do too, but I do at the moment, I need mercy whatever that might be; who in the audience can extend that mercy to me? Let's take a practical example, it may be a silly one; say I fell over and fainted now. How many of you could come up and help me? If I was one of you, I wouldn't know what to do! Okay, there's two or three people here who can, probably everyone would feel sorry for me (I hope they would) but you see, feeling sorry for me isn't mercy. Mercy says, this person up here's got a need, but it means also that you've got the ability to satisfy that need. Ah! so there's an obligation on your part to help me, so Vine goes on to say, 'it assumes a need on the part of him who receives it, and resources adequate to meet the need, on the part of him who shows it'. So, you see, it goes a lot farther than just feeling

sympathetic, and you know that word 'cheched' is much the same sort of thing. Who is the only person (dare we call Deity a person), who is the only being in the universe who can save us? and the greatest problem that all of us have got, is our mortality! Isn't it? The greatest problem we've got! therefore the word 'mercy' becomes, certainly in the context of our discussion this afternoon, the most important word in the bible for us, because we need mercy and Yahweh will extend that mercy to us.

Now, how's He going to do it? He's going to do it through the covenant which He gave to David, which was an extension of the Abrahamic, which is identified with Melchizedek and the everlasting covenant. The covenant that brought the Lord Jesus Christ from the grave, the blood of that covenant, and will likewise bring us from the grave. Hence it is called the sure mercies of David. Now what about the Lord Jesus Christ? Well, of course, He is the One through whom Yahweh will save. How is the Lord Jesus Christ addressed when He was upon the earth? Well, He was called 'Son of God'. When did they call Him Son of God? Well, you'll find that Son of God is identified with the power that was vested in Him, it was the Son of God that performed miracles. John in his gospel tells us that the hour is coming when those that are in the grave shall hear the voice of the Son of God; so, the Son of God is the One who has the power to perform miracles and to raise the dead. John goes on to say, 'and God has given Him authority also to execute judgment because He is the Son of man'; so, the Son of man was a description of the fact that He's a representative of our race, but more than that, He's the one that's overcome the flesh. He's the One that He's given the authority to execute judgment also, because He conquered the flesh, 'what is man that thou are mindful of him, and the Son of man that Thou visiteth Him; Thou madest Him to have dominion'. So, the Son of man then is the representative One, who had the dominion over the flesh.

But what about the other title? The title Son of David? I'll use this transparency, just taken from Matthew's gospel where the title Son of David is the most significant title. Every time either in the sentence itself or else very close to it, what's the word that we see connected with Son of David?

1. 'Thou Son of David have mercy on us' - chapter 9 verse 27
2. Chapter 12 and verse 23 of Matthew - 'is this not the Son of David?' and in the context back in verse 7, the Lord had already said I will have mercy and not sacrifice.
3. Chapter 15 and verse 22 and Chapter 20 and verse 30 and 31, they say, 'Have mercy upon me, O Lord, thou Son of David'. What do you think, for example, what those blind men thought? Were they just looking at that man and saying, 'He's got power and He can give me my sight!' Well, if they believed that, they would have said, 'Have mercy upon us, Thou Son of God', but the very fact of them called Him, Son of David, the Lord was having a look at them (even though they couldn't look at Him and say, 'they know what they're talking about. They haven't called Me, Son of man, they haven't called Me Jesus of Nazareth, they haven't called Me, Lord, they haven't called Me Christ, they

haven't called Me, Son of Man or Son of God, it's been son of David. Because they knew that this One was bringing the sure mercies of David. What did they want? Oh, yes, we know that they wanted their sight, but they wanted more than that, they wanted to see the sure mercies of David fulfilled in their lives as part of the kingdom. You know the old story, personal salvation or God manifestation? were they just saying, 'give me my sight so that I can see? NO, the very fact of addressing Him as son of David, I believe, and I hope our study this afternoon, has helped us to agree with this, that they had seen that this man, is bringing the sure mercies of David; and the sure mercies of David are, that God will set up again the tabernacle of David which has been broken down, and that all the Gentiles will be participants in that wonderful hope. And of course, the preaching of the gospel in the New Testament has been a testimony to the fact, that that is the work of God.

So, a summary therefore, of the title (and I've called it on this particular one, THE SEED OF DAVID, and I'll just read it out). It's a general one, I've used it in some other studies before, not specially just for this one on David. So it's a general comment!

The title, SEED OR SON OF DAVID, does not merely imply His fleshly descent. Certainly, he was a descendant of David, but it is also related to the great promises otherwise styled, the sure mercies of David. The title Son of David, as distinct from either Son of God representing His power, or the Son of man representing His authority, because He's had the dominion over the flesh; the title Son of David is associated with His right to the throne of David, this right is not merely legal, due to genealogical inheritance, but it is also moral because of the qualities of character He manifested. The title is virtually always associated with mercy in Matthew's gospel record, and is doubtless connected with a list of Old Testament passages there. And you'll notice that there's a whole lot of them from Psalm 89. (And we've got a note down the bottom which we've already read before, that the word 'mercy' is the outward manifestation of pity; it assumes need on the part of him who receives it, and resources adequate to meet the need on the part of him who shows it.)

Well, b&s, that sort of brings to an end, the study part of it, and it's so much the end of the talk too! We've come from a simple story of David bringing the ark up to Zion and acting the part of a king-priest. Perhaps for some of us before, that was a little bit of a bible difficulty, I hope for those who were in that position, that we can see now, that David was acting above the Law and he had deliberately at this stage, left the tabernacle of Moses up in Gibeah, and great men like Zadok ministering up there, but there was a greater one down in Jerusalem. And he was acting the part of a king-priest and he was identified with a servant of Edom, the name indicating involvement with the Gentiles, and he was bringing a wooden box with some gold on it, into a very simple tent, into a very unimpressive city, as it was in those days. I mean, you couldn't have gotten anything humbler, but David with the eye of faith, saw that he was looking for something which was eternal. And so God said, 'I'm going to make a covenant with you, David, and that covenant is going to be based upon My mercy; it's not legal, it's moral!' And some of you here might see connotations in that as far as problems that some

parts of the Christadelphian world have in regard to seeing the covenant with David being purely legal; it's, of course, not, it's a moral thing! it's based upon Yahweh's mercy. GOD WAS NOT UNDER AN OBLIGATION TO RAISE JESUS CHRIST FROM THE DEAD JUST BECAUSE HE WAS THE SON OF DAVID. GOD RAISED JESUS CHRIST FROM THE DEAD AND HE HIGHLY EXALTED HIM, BECAUSE HERE WAS A MAN WHO HAD SHOWED THE MORAL QUALITIES IN HIS LIFE. And the greatest of all of those qualities was MERCY!

Brethren and sisters, we're going to go away thinking about the mercy that God has extended to us, we're going to think about the way that Jesus Christ showed it in His life, and what's the third of the three points? How can you and I go away and show that mercy to others? The only way we can do it, is by constantly and continually trying to develop the mind of that one, who was called a man after God's own heart. The mind of that One, who was indeed, the One who could say, I and My Father are One! If we just take one thought away from this series of talks, and perhaps this is the best thought to take away, I'm going to go away from this school and I'm going to develop more and more of those attributes which will enable me to show MERCY to people. NO! NO! not just unlimited kindness and you overlook sin and all those things; NO!. Those three things, STRENGTH, STEADFASTNESS AND LOVE! I will show it to the Gentiles out there, I'll show them my strength, I'll show them my steadfastness and I'll show them my love by preaching to them the gospel. I will certainly do it to my brethren and sisters! And brethren and sisters, those are the ones who are going to be in the kingdom. And so whilst it might seem at times, when someone gets up and talks about mercy, that it's a bit of a simplistic talk jumping across the surface, that's far from the truth, isn't it? So might it be, that each one of us will in the day of Christ's return, experience those true mercies of David and be there to witness the fact, that IN MERCY SHALL THE THRONE BE ESTABLISHED.