

**General Topics :: The Tabernacle of David**

**The Tabernacle of David, on: 2010/10/5 23:15**

Almost two thousand years ago, the Lord Jesus Christ made this great declaration, "I will build My church." Down through the ages He has been building. Unfortunately, man has been building also. And the work of man is always detrimental to the work of God...even when it is done in His name.

In the first century the church was begun among the Jews. It wasn't until Peter preached to Cornelius that there were any Gentile converts. And it wasn't until some Greeks in Antioch believed, that a Gentile church came into being. When Jews from the church in Jerusalem visited Antioch, they began insisting that the Gentile believers in Christ also convert to Judaism in order to be legitimate. Well, the whole complicated issue had to be sorted out with the apostles and elders in Jerusalem, so Paul and Barnabas and others went up for the meeting - perhaps the most important meeting in church history.

At the end of the talk and debate, Peter recounted how the Gentiles were first saved, receiving the Holy Spirit by simply believing the word of the gospel. Their hearts were cleansed by faith without the benefit or the burden of the Mosaic law. Finally, James summed up what the Holy Spirit had been speaking during the meeting -- that the Gentiles who had been saved by faith needed nothing more than what had already been provided by Jesus Christ. When he rendered this judgment, James quoted the following Old Testament scriptures as bearing witness:

And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." Acts 15:15-18

In these amazing Scriptures, James and the Holy Spirit equate the tabernacle of David with the Gentile church. Why the tabernacle of David? Why not the tabernacle of Moses? Why not Solomon's temple?

Because in the tabernacle of David, God has given us a special foreshadowing of the church.

Why do you think the Holy Spirit equated the tabernacle of David with the Gentile church?

**Re: The Tabernacle of David - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/5 23:30**

Quote:

-----Because in the tabernacle of David, God has given us a special foreshadowing of the church.  
-----

"As the ark of the LORD came into the city of David"  
(2 Samuel 6:16.)

The City of David, which is Zion, is where the ark was placed, in a tent that David pitched for it. First he took Zion by force from the Jebusites."Nevertheless, David took the stronghold of Zion, that is, the city of David." (2 Samuel 5:7) This can be seen as Jesus binding the strongman and making a way to Zion. Paving the way of holiness. The way of the cross. Then David brought the ark to the tent he had prepared for it. And he did it with much joy, while others, like Michal scorned him. This can be seen as Jesus leading his Church to eternal glory in Zion. The joy set before him in the midst of scorn and persecution. For Jesus has prepared a place for us and leads us home. In my Father's house are many rooms. If it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you? (John 14:2). And the ransomed of the LORD shall return and come to Zion with singing; everlasting joy shall be upon their heads; they shall obtain gladness and joy, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.(Isaiah 35:10)

Praise God! Jesus made a way and leads us home! the world may hate us but he has overcome the world! God loves the Gates of Zion! His beloved children enter there with joy unspeakable. He endured the cross for the Joy set before him. How he delights in those who walk in the Way!

**Re: The Tabernacle of David - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/10/6 8:43**

There is a stark contrast between the tabernacle of Moses being the foundation of carnal ordinance under the law and the tabernacle of David built upon an understanding of the true desire of God to have mercy rather than sacrifice. I don't think it has anything to do with the physical buildings of course as they were practically identical in layout and in function although one was a tent and the other a stone building. David had an understanding of what it was the God truly desired. His was a tabernacle of praise as well. The 24/7 worship that went on there must have been fantastic. This was not required by law, but was instituted by David. David had great insight into God's desire to restore man to right relationship through mercy rather than through the sacrificial systems of the law which, by the way, could never restore man to right relationship as they could never make those offering the sacrifices perfect before God. David understood something more than this and had a glimpse of the new covenant.

**Re: The Tabernacle of David - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/6 9:01**

Quote:

-----  
In these amazing Scriptures, James and the Holy Spirit equate the tabernacle of David with the Gentile church  
-----

Actually, the tabernacle of David is not equated to the Church in these Scriptures. "The tabernacle of David," in the prophetic writings, of which Acts quoted, was specifically referring to the fallen throne of David. At the time of the deportation of the Jews from their land to Babylon, the "tabernacle of David" fell and ceased to exist. Jesus Christ, the Messiah, has restored the fallen theocratic throne, as the prophets had anticipated.

Naturally (or should I say, supernaturally), as the Church, we have been made partakers of David's house, Jew and Gentile alike. But the phrase, "tabernacle of David," is a label specific to the dynasty of the the kings of Judah, beginning with David.

We must be careful to not spiritualize prophecy. We need to be careful to read it in its historical and grammatical context.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/6 9:44**

And just an additional note: What we have in the restoration of the tabernacle of David, is the fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham, that through his seed (Christ) all the nations of the earth would be blessed. The raising up of the Messiah, on the throne of David, of the nation of Israel, is prophetically significant in the releasing of God's universal blessing to all of mankind in the earth.

**Re: , on: 2010/10/6 9:51**

Amen Pilgrim, amazing Scriptures indeed!

These Scriptures, in the context of Acts, were of course, referring to the Church. How amazing that the tabernacle of David would be raised up in Christ. Just a few short years after this meeting, the system and the Temple would cease to exist.

"Naturally (or should I say, supernaturally), as the Church, we have been made partakers of David's house, Jew and Gentile alike. But the phrase, "tabernacle of David," is a label specific to the dynasty of the the kings of Judah, beginning with David.

We must be careful to not spiritualize prophecy. We need to be careful to read it in its historical and grammatical context."

Spoken like a true textualist, very sad. We must have ears to hear what the Spirit says and not just ears to hear what the professors say.....brother Frank

**General Topics :: The Tabernacle of David**

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/6 10:21**

Quote:

-----  
Spoken like a true textualist, very sad.  
-----

I'm sorry you don't believe in being faithful to the literal interpretation of Scripture. The Spirit says what the text says, not imagined allegorizations. Don't get me wrong, there are places for allegorizations. I've used them and will use them, and the Biblical authors used them. But, based on what the text says, this isn't appropriate in this instance.

Scripture has so much rich meaning. Let's draw from "the plain meaning of the text" first, and secondary meanings, when appropriate. In this instance, Peter was being a "textualist" and meaning what the prophet spoke.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/6 11:25**

A great sermon, on this very topic by the way:

Art Katz - Restoring the Tabernacle of David.

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid=12166&commentView=itemComments>

A (short) complimentary essay by Art would also be:

On Interpreting the Scripture - <https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?view=article&aid=23557>

**Re: - posted by sojourner7 (), on: 2010/10/6 11:43**

Christ is foreshadowed in the tabernacle. Everything within the tabernacle points to the atoning work of the Savior!!

**Re: The Tabernacle of David - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/10/6 11:48**

Quote:

-----Because in the tabernacle of David, God has given us a special foreshadowing of the church.  
-----

Yes, of the church. But not specifically the churches of the Gentiles.

Quote:

-----Why do you think the Holy Spirit equated the tabernacle of David with the Gentile church?  
-----

The Holy Spirit equated not the Gentile church, but the bringing of the Gentiles INTO the church, with the tabernacle of David. And the reason is because the tabernacle of David had none of the ritual of the Law attending it. It was something new and prophetic that God inspired David to bring into being. There were no sacrifices offered there, nor any of the priestly ritual. And all it had in it was the Ark.

And so when the elders and apostles gathered to examine the controversial question of whether Gentiles who believed in Jesus were required to keep the Law, after much discussion, this is what happened:

--They all spoke their minds about this, and then the whole gathering came to a time of quietness (Acts 15.13).

--Then James spoke up and summed things up, saying that Peter (Simeon) had declared how God had begun to "take out of the Gentiles a people for His Name" (15.14).

--And the prophets agree with this, James said (15.15). James could have quoted any one dozens of passages from the prophets that speak of the bringing in of the Gentiles, but he chose this one from Amos 9.11,12 quoting from the Septuagint:

"After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down, and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue (or remnant) of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom My name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world" (15.16-18).

--And so James concluded that since the tabernacle of David was not associated with the ordinances and rituals of the Law, the Gentiles could be brought into this new work of God-- the New Covenant-- without keeping the Law of Moses. James did suggest that the Gentiles observe two or three things just by way of being inoffensive to Jews who were still observing the Law of Moses in their area (15.19-21).

And so, the tabernacle of David, I believe, is prophetic of the New Covenant-- and of the church-- in which "the residue of men," that is, men from both Judah and Israel, AS WELL AS the Gentiles upon whom God's name is called, might come together as one in a very unstructured kind of way-- in just a tent with the Presence of God-- the Ark-- being its one distinguishing characteristic. That's by and large what characterized the early churches. The early churches in their simplicity were the fulfillment of this beautiful order called the "tabernacle of David."

...Something from which church in our day, generally speaking, has sorely departed.

(What I've said above is a short summary of this. For more on it see From Tent to Temple at [www.georgewarnock.com](http://www.georgewarnock.com).)

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/6 12:23**

Quote:

-----  
Yes, of the church. But not specifically the churches of the Gentiles.  
-----

Indeed, we must be careful to guard ourselves against the tendency to equate the Church as simply a gentile phenomenon. I've seen some well meaning students of the word equate the two. But the two are not one in the same. The Church belongs to Jew and Gentile alike.

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/10/6 13:44**

If only we could learn to agree with the apostles of the New Covenant, and their interpretation of Scripture.

In Acts 15 James takes this passage from Amos about the restoration of the tabernacle of David and applies it to something that was happening right at that very moment. Amos' prophecy of God building again the tabernacle of David-- at least according to the apostle James-- was something that referred to the church.

Yet many teachers who, it seems, know better than James, disagree with him, and teach that God will yet restore the earthly order, and the tabernacle of David will be set up again in the earthly Zion in earthly Jerusalem... in the day God restores the kingdom to natural Israel.

That's bad exegesis. They will wait for that in vain. The tabernacle of David was originally set up on Mount Zion of old. It was an earthly hill in an earthly city. But its fulfillment, according to a New Covenant apostle, is in THE CHURCH... which is in the heavenly Zion in the heavenly Jerusalem, at least according to another apostle of the New Covenant, that is (Heb. 12.18-23).

...I think I will go with those guys. To spiritualize the Scriptures the way they did-- and it was not they who did it but the Holy Spirit that was in them, the Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ-- is the only way to interpret them aright.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/6 16:54**

I'm curious, do you believe Isaiah 53 was generally interpreted by the Lord and his apostles literally, or spiritually?

**Re: The Tabernacle of David - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/6 17:04**

After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." Acts 15:15-18

The cause:

Quote:

-----  
After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up  
-----

The resulting effect:

Quote:

-----  
That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things. Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world."  
-----

The cause: Jesus Christ raised up again the fallen house of David, and sat upon the empty throne.

The effect: Men amongst the Gentiles seeking the Lord

One does not need to "spiritualize" anything here. The apostle simply used a literal interpretation of the passage.

There are indeed passages the apostles quote in other instances that they use in a spiritualized context. But this isn't one of them.

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/10/6 17:13**

Quote:

-----  
There are indeed passages the apostles quote in other instances that they use in a spiritualized context. But this isn't one of them.  
-----

If this is to be interpreted strictly literally, how can the church be the fulfillment of the tabernacle of David (which it is)? For the church is not a literal tent on an earthly hill in an earthly city.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/6 17:25**

I'm not sure by your last post, but I think you misunderstood my point. The church isn't the tabernacle of David, Jesus is . David's throne was left empty with the exile, and even upon return to the land. Jesus in His Messianic role restored the fallen house (tabernacle) of David.

Clear???

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/10/6 17:34**

Quote:

-----I'm curious, do you believe Isaiah 53 was generally interpreted by the Lord and his apostles literally, or spiritually?  
-----

Jimmy, there are many Scriptures that Christ, when He came in the flesh, fulfilled literally. I do believe there is yet a greater fulfillment of a lot of them, but certainly He fulfilled many Scriptures literally.

I believe that He was literally born in Bethlehem. I believe Mary his mother was, literally, a virgin. I believe He died on a literal Cross... and was actually, physically raised from the dead.

Hope that satisfies your curiosity.

...But I'll just add this: I don't know why people get scared of talk about spiritualizing the Scriptures. The spiritual dimension is the realm of the true, the real. Spiritual reality is REAL. To spiritualize the Scriptures is not to theorize them, or to etherealize them... as though they now have no real substance and reality. There is an order God has established: first the natural, then the spiritual. "Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual" (1 Cor. 15.46).

And so, after the resurrection, Christ ascended to the Throne of David in the heavenly Zion, and sent forth His Holy Spirit into His waiting disciples. And His apostles by the Spirit of the ascended Christ now took many Old Testament passages and interpreted them in a new light. And... what can be said? It's just awesome, just awesome, these things they set forth! May our Lord in mercy anoint our eyes with eyesalve, and grace our eyes to see!

...I always go by the rule that the Old Testament Scriptures must be interpreted now, and seen now, in the Light of the New, always with the help of the Holy Spirit, of course.

If we can't acknowledge that, we are going to get very mixed up when it comes to interpreting Scripture. We will truly be out to sea without steerage... though not literally, of course. :)

**Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/6 17:49**

Quote:

-----The church isn't the tabernacle of David, Jesus is  
-----

Is the bride one with Jesus? Of course the bride that is walking in disobedience to the covenant is not one with the Lord but is married to another, for it is his image of the beast that she takes. Which bride are you? from the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks.

**General Topics :: The Tabernacle of David**

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/10/6 17:54**

Quote:  
-----I'm not sure by your last post, but I think you misunderstood my point. The church isn't the tabernacle of David, Jesus is. David's throne was left empty with the exile, and even upon return to the land. Jesus in His Messianic role restored the fallen house (tabernacle) of David.  
-----

I don't know where you get this, Jimmy. I don't see anywhere in Scripture that the tabernacle of David is the "fallen house of David."

The tabernacle of David was that tent that David set up on Mount Zion and into which he brought the ark of the Covenant instead of returning it to the old tabernacle which was set up at Gibeon.

Quote:  
-----The church isn't the tabernacle of David, Jesus is.  
-----

No, Jesus is the King who sits IN the tabernacle of David... on the Throne of David in the heavenly Zion, ruling and reigning over all. That has powerful implications.

For the tabernacle of David-- at least according to the apostle James' interpretation of Scripture-- is the church.

...I do think I understand why you don't want to acknowledge this. It's because of that teaching that when Jesus returns he'll set up the tabernacle of David in old Jerusalem and rule from there, from that earthly Zion hill in natural Israel. James didn't seem to know that teaching, apparently. In Acts 15, he related the prophecy of the tabernacle of David to the church.

**Re: , on: 2010/10/6 17:59**

But Christ as a son over his own house; WHOSE HOUSE ARE WE, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.  
Hebrews 3:6

**Re: The Tabernacle of David, on: 2010/10/6 20:36**

Hello all,

I have looked carefully, as I've read the Old Testament, for the historical journey of Jacob's children, and find promises of 'land' totally dependent on their obedience to God's voice. Through Moses, God told them that they would reject Him - which history proves they did. This did not mean GOD did not keep His word in sending His Son in fulfillment of many prophecies, but His appearing marked a shift in emphasis from the physical to the spiritual.

His coming as the last Adam, of an unearthly Father (but an earthly mother) is a pivotal point in history. Suddenly, the earthly patriarchy was moved aside. There is no avoiding this truth when discussing spiritual heredity.

The emphasis shifted from men looking for promises being fulfilled to themselves, to the Man fulfilling farther-reaching promises on their behalf - bringing spiritual victory to mankind.

It cannot be a 'spiritualisation' of prophecy, to give it spiritual meaning. It had a spiritual meaning all along - which is why God was so adamantly against idolatry, the main reason for the downfall of the majority of Jacob's descendants. God looks on the hearts.

The disciples were still so far removed from understanding the scriptures after three years with the Son of God Himself,

that He had to expound them again after His resurrection. But still - Acts 1:6 When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? - they hadn't understood what 'the kingdom of God is within you', would mean once they had received the Holy Spirit. (John 17, also.)

And surely we do not find one time when any of those who were filled with the Spirit asked each other about the restoration of the outward kingdom of Israel thereafter? Rather, we find Peter in Acts 3 saying 'to you first', just as Paul would echo after his conversion, preaching on being delivered from SIN, through faith in Jesus Christ.

Who is rejoicing in this verse?

Luke 15:10 Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.

It's not the angels.

Psalm 22:22 I will declare thy name unto my brethren: in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee.

23 Ye that fear the LORD, praise him; all ye the seed of Jacob, glorify him; and fear him, all ye the seed of Israel.

The natural man Jacob went through a spiritual process before God gave him the new name of Israel (God prevails), and so must we - whether natural descendants of Jacob, or Gentiles - go through a spiritual process before we can be accounted as a member of Israel. Israel has always been spiritual: the peculiar treasure, the kingdom of priests, the holy NAtion (BORN separated unto God).

Romans 2:29 But he a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter; whose praise not of men, but of God.

I have a little book about the spread of the gospel, reading from accounts in the 1st century, and one of the pictures which struck me most, was of everyone in their tents, where people were living, being able easily to hear the worship in those tents where the name of Jesus Christ was being lifted up, every morning as they were waking.

John 4:21 Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.

Paul's concluding reference to 'the Israel of God' at the end of Gal 6, is a natural progression from his reference first to himself, then to those individuals ruled by the same principle, then to the whole body of believers.

Peter does the same sort of thing in his first epistle ch 2, when he gathers all who are not in the church under the term 'Gentiles'. I believe he is also including those Jews who had chanted 'We have no king but Caesar!'

The 'earthly' 'kingdom' of 'Israel' in reality, is the tabernacle of the body being wholly given over to God, no more dominated by sin and death, so that, as Adam was made of the dust of the ground, his descendants can say 'The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof', with joy!

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/10/6 22:35**

Good word, Linn.

Quote:

-----It cannot be a 'spiritualisation' of prophecy, to give it spiritual meaning. It had a spiritual meaning all along  
-----



Amen.

Quote:  
-----The disciples were still so far removed from understanding the scriptures after three years with the Son of God Himself, that He had to expound them again after His resurrection. But still - Acts 1:6 When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? - they hadn't understood what 'the kingdom of God is within you', would mean once they had received the Holy Spirit. (John 17, also.)  
-----

Quote:  
-----And surely we do not find one time when any of those who were filled with the Spirit asked each other about the restoration of the outward kingdom of Israel thereafter  
-----

Amen. They had started to see the spiritual reality God had in mind all along.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/6 22:51**

Quote:  
-----  
...But I'll just add this: I don't know why people get scared of talk about spiritualizing the Scriptures.  
-----

I have no fear in doing it. Indeed, I don't know how one can read the Scriptures and not spiritualize their meaning. Indeed, personal application is often found in such a way, especially when one reads narratives. However, when doing such, I think one needs to do so carefully, and only secondary to the plain and literal meaning of a text.

Likewise, when reading the New testament, and coming across a citation from the Old Testament, one needs to carefully investigate the nature of the authors citation usage. It's a really delicate and difficult task to do, but in my opinion, such a detailed study is worth its weight in gold. I've discovered in my studying that the New Testament authors can cite passages in a number of different ways.

Quote:  
-----  
...I always go by the rule that the Old Testament Scriptures must be interpreted now, and seen now, in the Light of the New, always with the help of the Holy Spirit, of course.  
-----

I know such is a common rule people often employ, and I see the merit in it, but I would caution one in using such a rule, depending of course, on what you mean by that. While of course, one cannot avoid reading the Old Testament without thinking about it in light of the New Testament, and of course, through the aid of the Holy Spirit, at the same time, one should be careful that they don't read something from the New Testament into a passage in the Old Testament, and make the Old Testament mean something that the Old Testament never meant.

Indeed, we should avoid changing Old Testament passages to read how we would like them to read, because frankly, the New Testament never does. While the New Testament can help "fill in the blanks" in regard to areas the Old Testament was not clear on, as such is the nature of progressive revelation, never can nor does the New Testament ever change the meaning of a passage, to mean something other than what it meant. New Testament revelation is built upon what is revealed in the Old Testament. Yes, we read in the Old Testament in light of Christ, but in the light of Christ does not mean we distort passages in the light of Christ to mean something they never could have meant to begin with.

This is my general framework of what I do when I'm studying a New Testament passage citing an Old Testament passage:

- 1) Read NT passage in it's historical & grammatical context, and examine how the passage cited furthers the argument of the author.
- 2) Examine the OT passage cited in it's historical & grammatical context, without reference to how it was used in the NT.
- 3) Determine in what way, if any, the NT author used the OT passage, in light of the fruit of step #2. Was he specifically declaring what the literal interpretation of an OT passage was? Was he just borrowing a theme? Is he employing deliberate typology? etc. etc.
- 4) How does the NT author's methodology relate back to step #1, and what further conclusions can be made?

Every citation is unique, and the same author can use a literal interpretation in one breath, and then employ allegory in the next. Whatever the case, one must go through this sort of "hermeneutical spiral" that takes one full circle in their study.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/6 23:12**

Quote:

-----  
I don't know where you get this, Jimmy. I don't see anywhere in Scripture that the tabernacle of David is the "fallen house of David."  
-----

My argument is that the phrase from Amos 9, "the tabernacle of David" is akin to phrases such as "the house of so and so" and "the tent of so and so." Such is a common Old Testament way referring to a family in a dynastic fashion. Thus, Amos is prophesying of when the Messiah is raised up, restoring the corrupt and fallen throne of David, there will be many gentiles who turn unto the Lord as a result. Such, is a common Old Testament theme, repeated many times throughout the Scripture. This is the "plain and literal" meaning of the passage, and I see no evidence in the New Testament that it was being cited or interpreted in any other way.

I will grant you, the exact phrase "the tabernacle of David" is a rare one, and such can make this passage from Amos 9 a little tricky to interpret. But the phrase does have one other use in the Old Testament, coming from Isaiah 16:5:

"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 hastening righteousness."

And in this passage, the rare phrase, "the tabernacle of David" is again attached to the idea of the theocratic monarchy. Such, in my eyes, only reinforces my interpretation.

I've yet to see any evidence to suggest the phrase, "the tabernacle of David" is a phrase that calls back the idea of the "Davidic worship" that went on in the Jerusalem tabernacle that was erected.

**Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/10/7 9:10**

Quote:  
-----My argument is that the phrase from Amos 9, "the tabernacle of David" is akin to phrases such as "the house of so and so" and "the tent of so and so." Such is a common Old Testament way referring to a family in a dynastic fashion.  
-----

Jimmy: I think the problem I would have with this statement is that the tabernacle was not dynastic as the throne might be. The tabernacle was all about worship. Interestingly enough, there are scriptures that talk of the kings that would come from David occupying a throne prophetically. Even those are questionable as to whether they deal with Christ, who is the king of a heavenly kingdom perpetually and of the tribe of Judah, or with an actual dynasty. Some, such as those

who believe that this dynasty is continued through Great Britain, have really gone to seed on this I think. The point is that if the scriptures dealing with the throne of David are debatable as to whether they speak of something earthly or something spiritual, where then does that leave the scriptures that speak plainly of a tabernacle (house of God) which is a picture of the Holy Spirit dwelling in us, the fleshly, human tabernacle?

While it is true that Israel was recently returned to the land as a nation, and while it is true that this is a fulfillment of much prophecy, there is a unique problem with making the prophecy about Israel and a Davidic dynasty in Amos 9 that Luke refers to here in Acts. The return of the nation of Israel to the land has not occurred for the salvation of the Gentiles. Rather the salvation of the Gentiles is yet to provoke Israel to jealousy so that many may turn to Christ as Messiah.

I think this is definitely referring to something spiritual rather than to something carnal.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/7 9:45**

Quote:

-----  
I think the problem I would have with this statement is that the tabernacle was not dynastic as the throne might be.  
-----

But it would appear based off the brief word study I conducted, that the phrase "the tabernacle of David" being used in Isaiah was not in reference to the literal tent David setup in Jerusalem as a house of worship, but in reference to the royal lineage. Though of course, I can see how one understands it as you argue, because David did erect a tabernacle. But the actual grammatical usage of this rare phrase is in keeping with the interpretation I've set forth.

Quote:

-----  
The point is that if the scriptures dealing with the throne of David are debatable as to whether they speak of something earthly or something spiritual, where then does that leave the scriptures that speak plainly of a tabernacle (house of God) which is a picture of the Holy Spirit dwelling in us, the fleshly, human tabernacle?  
-----

Remember, Jesus is declared "both Lord and Christ." The theocratic throne He occupies through the lineage of David makes Him king of everything. Spiritual or earthly throne? The answer in Scripture is: yes. Though, we are presently waiting for all things to be subjected to Him, but of course, that won't happen until He returns. But this physical v. spiritual dichotomy is one that is often foreign to the mind of the Scriptures. Indeed, in a detailed study of prophecy, I would argue that there is no such line.

I personally am still anticipating a rebuilding of the temple in the age to come. So while things like Ezekiel's temple might have spiritually rich meaning, meaning applicable to now, I believe in the age to come we can still expect a literal fulfillment of those things, just as we can expect Christ to literally come back to the earth and to literally be reigning from the new global capitol of Jerusalem.

I won't say much more about that, because well, that is a subject that is probably beyond the scope of this thread and a bit off topic. Additionally, I'm in the process of writing a rather long essay on God's overall plan of redemption, etc.

But to get back to the main subject, reading "the tabernacle of David" to be a metaphor for God raising up the Church in Amos 9, and that such was the argument in the book of Acts, in my opinion, simply does not add up when one looks at the passage in the original context, and does a little word study. The prophets had long anticipated a restored "dynasty" through the Messiah, whose rising would give birth to a movement in which the Gentiles would be ushered into the newly raised Messianic kingdom.

Of course, that is not to take away from the fact that through faith we have become a "tabernacle" of God in a very real spiritual sense, one that God has raised up through the work of Christ. Indeed, as Hebrews points out, He is the builder of a house, whose house we are and whose house we have been brought into if we but have faith. But if one were to argue such from Amos 9, I think such could be considered a classic example of "right doctrine, wrong text."

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/10/7 10:44

Quote:  
-----"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 hastening righteousness."  
-----

Quote:  
-----And in this passage, the rare phrase, "the tabernacle of David" is again attached to the idea of the theocratic monarchy. Such, in my eyes, only reinforces my interpretation.  
-----

The theocratic monarchy? You think, then, that James was wrong in his interpretation of the tabernacle of David? (For in Acts 15 James applies that passage from Amos about the tabernacle of David directly to the church.)

This verse you quoted from Isa. 16.5 is a beautiful prophecy that I would say-- and I'm looking at it with the new light the New Covenant apostle James has shed on the passage-- speaks of Christ who is now seated on the Throne of David at the right hand of God in the heavenlies. Now-- he that hath an ear let him hear-- in the sending of the Holy Spirit, that same One is ruling and reigning in the church, the tabernacle of David. He sits in the "tabernacle of David, judging, and seeking judgment, and hastening righteousness." That reign is much resisted, as we see in our day. But nevertheless it is there, and will continue to be there, "until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool" (Ps. 110).

"...And hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things TO THE CHURCH, Which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all" (Eph. 1.22,23).

Wow. Awesome. Sometimes you just rub your eyes and... can it actually be true I am reading such awesome things, such wonder?

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/7 11:59

Quote:  
-----  
(For in Acts 15 James applies that passage from Amos about the tabernacle of David directly to the church.)  
-----

I know you keep insisting this is the case, but James, who I also agree with, does no such thing. I have a moment, so let's look at what James says, in context, line by line.

Quote:  
-----  
Acts 15:13 After they had stopped speaking, James answered, saying, "Brethren, listen to me. 14 "Simeon has related how God first concerned Himself about taking from among the Gentiles a people for His name. 15 "With this the words of the Prophets agree, just as it is written, 16 'AFTER THESE THINGS I will return, AND I WILL REBUILD THE TABERNACLE OF DAVID WHICH HAS FALLEN, AND I WILL REBUILD ITS RUINS, AND I WILL RESTORE IT, 17 SO THAT THE REST OF MANKIND MAY SEEK THE LORD, AND ALL THE GENTILES WHO ARE CALLED BY MY NAME,' 18 SAYS THE LORD, WHO MAKES THESE THINGS KNOWN FROM LONG AGO. 19 "Therefore it is my judgment that we do not trouble those who are turning to God from among the Gentiles...

-----  
Forgive me for the caps. I just copied and pasted it from an online Bible, which automatically capitalized OT citations.

vv. 13-14: James talks about how God moving amongst the Gentiles and bringing about their salvation.

vv. 15: James says their turning unto the Lord is in agreement with what the prophets anticipated.

vv. 16-18: Citing the prophets, James talks about how God would one day rebuild the fallen tabernacle of David, and that through the restoration of this tabernacle, all of mankind amongst the Gentiles would be able to seek the Lord, and experience His salvation.

vv. 19: Therefore, since the Gentiles are turning to the Lord as the prophets said they would, when the tabernacle was rebuilt, the Gentiles should not be troubled with regard questions over observing the Law of Moses (since the Lord had brought them unto a saving knowledge of Him apart from observing the Law, saving them on the basis of faith alone).

Now, where here does in all this does James talk about the tabernacle being the Church? He doesn't. He simply says when the fallen tabernacle was restored, the Gentiles would experience salvation, just as the prophets anticipated. If the tabernacle of David was the Church, then employing your interpretation (if I correctly understand you), then James is saying that the fallen Church was restored, therefore, the Gentiles can be saved.

Which in my opinion, makes no Biblical sense whatsoever. What does makes Biblical sense, however, is that the prophets had anticipated a revival of David's throne, which had fallen through corruption and exile. And by the reviving of David's throne via the anticipated Messiah, this would be such a tremendous event that it would make it possible for the Gentiles to come to the Lord in mass.

And in fact, that is historically what has happened. David's throne fell through corruption and exile, and lacked a man to sit upon it for centuries. But then the Messiah was sent, who has since restored it, and currently reigns upon it from the right hand of the Father in heaven. And this has resulted in the mass conversion of many amongst the Gentiles.

And with this, James and the prophets agree.

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/10/7 14:26**

All I am saying, Jimmy, is that what was happening RIGHT THEN when the apostles and elders gathered in Jerusalem to discuss the question of Gentile converts having to keep the Law of Moses... this was the fulfillment of that prophecy in Amos about the tabernacle of David. For James used the Amos prophecy of the tabernacle of David to conclude that the Gentiles could come into the salvation of Christ without having to keep the Law of Moses.

If you agree with that, we are on the same page.

The prophecy of God building again the tabernacle of David that had fallen... this was happening right then. That's the thing I'm trying to emphasize. It's not something that pertains to another day when God, according to certain teachers, sets up the tabernacle of David and the throne of David again in an earthly hill in old Jerusalem.

Not according to James. According to the apostle James, it was happening RIGHT THEN.

At the time of Acts 15 the tabernacle of David had long since fallen, and was in ruins. But God was setting it up again, building it again, in something called The Church.

The Church is the fulfillment of the tabernacle of David.

**Re: , on: 2010/10/7 14:35**

Jesus Christ is the tabernacle of David and we are His Body.

**Re: More Hints on the Tabernacle of David, on: 2010/10/7 15:15**

Ok, some great answers. Continuing on...

When James was speaking to the gathering of Saints in the early Church, he indicated that the Gentiles were coming to the Lord as a result of what David's tabernacle represented.

What did David's Tabernacle represent?

It represented the grace of God and a way OPEN into the very Holiest of ALL.

Heb 8:1 Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand and of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens;

Heb 8:2 A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, WHICH THE LORD PITCHED, and not man.

David's tabernacle was similar to Moses in that it was tent, also. And it was pitched to serve as a place of worship. That is where the similarities end, though. Moses tabernacle remained at Gibeon and had all kinds of articles of furniture. And, not to be overlooked, there was one more similarity, they both had the Ark of the Covenant. But regarding the Ark, there are big differences regarding the posture of the people towards the Ark. Keep reading.

The Tabernacle of David resided on Mt. Zion. It only had the Ark inside it. No other furniture and especially no veil. It also did not have the 3 separate rooms that Moses' Tabernacle had - the Outer Court, the Holy Place and the Holiest of All.

David's Tabernacle only had one room, the Holiest of ALL.

People could not come into the Holiest of All in Moses Tabernacle, only the High Priest and only once per year and he did not stay very long.

In David's Tabernacle, people flowed in and out around the clock to worship before the Lord.

1Ch 13:8 And David and all Israel played before God with all their might, and with singing, and with harps, and with psalteries, and with timbrels, and with cymbals, and with trumpets.

2Sa 6:5 And David and all the house of Israel played before the LORD on all manner of instruments made of fir wood, even on harps, and on psalteries, and on timbrels, and on cornets, and on cymbals.

James talks about the Tabernacle of David, because it is very important to the Church. It is absolutely a picture of the Church. In David's Tabernacle is the Ark of the Covenant (presence of God in their midst), accessible by all of Israel, and likewise the Church, through Jesus Christ has open access to the presence of God. The Church is the tabernacle "housing" if you will, the glory of God.

2Co 6:16 And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

2Co 4:7 But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us.

Again, there was no "Vail" in David's Tabernacle as there was in Moses'. And today, spiritually speaking when we turn to the Lord, the "Vail" is taken away.

2Co 3:14 But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which vail is done away in Christ.

2Co 3:15 But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart.

2Co 3:16 Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away.

2Co 3:16 Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away.

2Co 3:17 Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

Moses' Tabernacle - A Vail

David's Tabernacle - No Vail

David's Tabernacle - Presence of God open to All

Mose's Tabernacle - Only the High Priest

David's Tabernacle - Praise and Worship - 24 hours a day with every musical instrument (Psalm 150). A "recorder" was needed because many of the songs were coming with such spontaneity. (In most gatherings today, you cannot have spontaneity)

David's Tabernacle - Unity was the experience of "All Israel". All Israel brought the Ark back.

David's Tabernacle - There was great joy in the congregation.

So, what James said in Acts 15 is extremely significant for the Church. God is indeed rebuilding the "Tabernacle of David" -

Act 15:17 That the residue (remnant) of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, WHO DOETH ALL THESE THINGS;

Question 1:

Why did David fail in his first attempt to bring the Ark back? And how does this apply to the Church today?

Question 2:

1Ch 13:12 And David was afraid of God that day, saying, How shall I bring the ark of God home to me?

Regarding David's 2nd try at bringing the Ark back, what was the correct way and what did he learn? What should we learn today regarding this?

Question 3:

2Sa 6:14 And David danced before the LORD with all his might; and David was girded with a linen ephod.

This verse obviously shows us that David shed his kingly clothes and just wore the "linen" clothes (ephod) of a priest.

What does this say to us in the Church, today?

Question 4:

2Sa 6:16 And as the ark of the LORD came into the city of David, Michal Saul's daughter looked through a window, and saw king David leaping and dancing before the LORD; and she despised him in her heart.

2Sa 6:23 Therefore Michal the daughter of Saul had no child unto the day of her death.

Why is Michal a warning to us today and what is she a picture of?

**Re: , on: 2010/10/7 15:17**

Adisciple

Quote:

-----The Church is the fulfillment of the tabernacle of David.  
-----

That is what I think the Scriptures are saying, too. The Tabernacle of David pictures the Church in the Book of Acts and continuing, today.

**Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/7 15:32**

Quote:

-----That is what I think the Scriptures are saying, too. The Tabernacle of David pictures the Church in the Acts and continuing, today.  
-----

Bless you brother! There is much treasure to be gleaned from the scriptures on the topic of David's tabernacle. It is a beautiful picture of Christ and his Bride. What joy to have our veil removed so we can see our Bridegroom. May the holy kiss of Christ and his Bride shine throughout Eternity as a testimony of God's gracious covenant with his people. He is perfect and precious to us. Amen.

**Re: , on: 2010/10/7 15:41**

Quote:

-----Bless you brother! There is much treasure to be gleaned from the scriptures on the topic of David's tabernacle. It is a beautiful picture of Christ and his Bride. What joy to have our veil removed so we can see our Bridegroom. May the holy kiss of Christ and his Bride shine throughout Eternity as a testimony of God's gracious covenant with his people. He is perfect and precious to us. Amen.  
-----

Heb 8:2 A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, WHICH THE LORD PITCHED, and not man.

Yes, the Lord pitched this tent (tabernacle) that He is pleased to dwell in, not man. Wow! The Word is actually emphasizing that man did not pitch this tabernacle.

The Lord will not dwell in anything that man pitches. This should put the fear of God in us.

And we are the Church (Tabernacle of David) with the Ark (Jesus - Presence of God) in the World (Wilderness).

Question: Michal did raise some children. Who gave them to her and were they her own?

**Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/7 15:51**

Quote:

-----Question: Michal did raise some children. Who gave them to her and were they her own?  
-----

I don't know the answer. There is much I do not know. But I will search the scripture! Bless you!



**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/10/7 16:09**

Hi Pilgrim.

Great post. I was wondering when you were going to set forth your own thoughts on all this. :)

I agree with you that the tabernacle of David represented the realm of the Holiest of all, which in the old tabernacle housed the ark of the covenant. That's all that was in the tabernacle of David as well: the ark.

The writer of Hebrews relates that realm (the Holy of holies) to the New Covenant (Heb. Chapter 9). And that's what the church is supposed to be all about. That's the kind of simplicity the church is supposed to have: just the ARK of His Presence, and Jesus Christ reigning there, and governing all.

Without answering all your questions at the end of your post at the moment, I'll just comment on one thing for now.

Quote:

-----In David's Tabernacle, people flowed in and out around the clock to worship before the Lord.  
-----

I'm not clear that this was actually the case (not that I can find, anyway), but even so, King David certainly enjoyed access into this tabernacle. And that's clearly prophetic. As a member of the tribe of Judah, and not of Levi, David had no access into the earlier tabernacle Moses had built. That was only for the Levitical priests. But David the king is a type of the new covenant order, the new covenant priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, who was both a king and a priest. And so he entered right into this "tabernacle of David," right into the Presence of the Lord.

Whereas King Uzzah, when he so much as tried to offer incense in the temple-- alone a priestly prerogative-- he was smitten with leprosy. But David functioned as both king and priest, as we see on another occasion when he brought the ark to Zion, and was clothed with a priestly linen ephod.

And this is what the church is all about, or ought to be: "a kingdom of priests" who worship and serve God in His very Presence, in a little "tabernacle" which is the Holy of holies... and their ministrations are that of a Great High Priest seated on the Throne between the cherubim there.

**Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/7 20:29**

Quote:

-----Question: Michal did raise some children. Who gave them to her and were they her own?  
-----

After David took the throne he requested her because he had paid a 1000 foreskins to the philistines for her. Would she have raised David's other children? Maybe the rebellious ones?

Still searching the scriptures.

**Re: The Tabernacle of David, on: 2010/10/7 20:41**

Regarding the priesthood, there is another thread of revelation which began way back in Exodus, when God first separated Levi instead of the firstborn from every family.

As the narrative progresses, the priestly function is defined and instigated, and continually it is mentioned that Levi will have no inheritance of the land, because their inheritance is the Lord and his service.

In Heb 12, we are the church of the firstborn ones. We are included in Christ, the Elect servant, the Father's only Son (according to Paul Washer, meaning in a class of His own), who was the firstborn (begotten) from the dead. In Him we have victory over sin (kingship) and through the Holy Spirit are able to worship Him in Spirit and in truth (priesthood).

I believe Exodus is where the scriptural revelation of the separation between the spiritual and the temporal begins. Always though, as in we all died in Adam, so, all the tribes remain 'in' Jacob, naturally speaking.

Nevertheless, the singling out of a tribe to represent a member from every single family in Israel, is just as significant as the angel of death taking every firstborn in Egypt who was not covered by the blood of a lamb.

This study has greatly affected my understanding of God's insistence on total worship from His people. It is the way we show Him we have no other gods.

The fact that Jesus mentioned worship to a Samaritan woman (probably a descendant of one of the ten tribes, by the comfortable way she spoke of 'Messiah'), is also interesting, as He didn't mention worship very often, even though His life style and teachings described it.

**Re: - posted by NewCovWinDor (), on: 2010/10/7 20:46**

This forum has had a very sweet spirit about it.

Keep up the good work, brethren!

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/7 21:48**

Quote:  
-----  
All I am saying, Jimmy, is that what was happening RIGHT THEN when the apostles and elders gathered in Jerusalem to discuss the question of Gentile converts having to keep the Law of Moses... this was the fulfillment of that prophecy in Amos about the tabernacle of David. For James used the Amos prophecy of the tabernacle of David to conclude that the Gentiles could come into the salvation of Christ without having to keep the Law of Moses.

If you agree with that, we are on the same page.

-----  
Well no doubt, all these happenings were definitely the fulfillment of Amos prophecy, or I don't think they would've bothered bringing it up :-)

Quote:  
-----  
It's not something that pertains to another day when God,

-----  
I'm not saying that this particular word is looking for future fulfillment. The tabernacle of David has already been restored, and the Gentiles have already started making their way into the kingdom in mass, just as was foretold.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/7 21:50**

Quote:  
-----  
This forum has had a very sweet spirit about it.

-----  
Many of us have been on here a long time, and are probably as tight-knit as an online community will be. We love the L

ord and try to make sure He fills every post, even when we disagree. Of course, we aren't always perfect in this endeavor, and sometimes things get a little ugly, like in any family. But we usually are pretty good and making peace over it all. Not always. But I doubt you'll find a better place of online fellowship anywhere else on the web. We're a pretty like minded bunch.

Weclome :-)

**Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2010/10/7 22:49**

Quote:  
-----I'm not saying that this particular word is looking for future fulfillment. The tabernacle of David has already been restored, and the Gentiles have already started making their way into the kingdom in mass, just as was foretold.  
-----

Thanks for clarifying that. I thought you held to that other teaching I mentioned earlier...

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/10/7 22:53**

Quote:  
-----  
Thanks for clarifying that. I thought you held to that other teaching I mentioned earlier...  
-----

Don't get me wrong, and if you might remember, I do hold to an "Art Katzian" theology regarding Israel and the last days. I do believe in a literal millennial reign of Christ at the end of the present age, and all the trimmings that go with such a reign. But I don't believe the specific verse in question is teaching such a thing.

**Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/8 0:23**

Quote:  
-----Regarding the priesthood, there is another thread of revelation which began way back in Exodus, when God first separated Levi instead of the firstborn from every family.  
-----

The Levites were presented as a wave offering before the Lord. The Holy Spirit had me look up the definition of the Hebrew word for wave and it means to shake. The Holy Spirit shook the room the disciple were praying in. They were praying for boldness, God's healing hand, and sign and wonders to confirm their word. This to me seems like our priestly service as disciples of Christ. To preach the word with boldness! To minister to the people in love and compassion as God stretches out his healing hand. We are a consecrated peculiar people!! A kingdom of priests! Praise God our names are written in heaven!

**Re: , on: 2010/10/8 1:07**

Do you have a fulfilled priesthood?

<http://www.audiosancto.org/sermon/20100401-The-Sacredness-of-the-Priesthood.html>

Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/8 2:57

Quote:

-----Do you have a fulfilled priesthood?  
-----

Do you have Jesus Christ?

Re: The Tabernacle of David, on: 2010/10/8 6:37

Here are three of the early verses where the inheritance of Levi INSTEAD OF LAND is defined.

Joshua 13:14 Only unto the tribe of Levi he gave none inheritance; the sacrifices of the LORD God of Israel made by fire their inheritance, as he said unto them.

Joshua 13:33 But unto the tribe of Levi Moses gave not inheritance: the LORD God of Israel their inheritance, as he said unto them.

Joshua 18:7 But the Levites have no part among you; for the priesthood of the LORD their inheritance: and Gad, and Reuben, and half the tribe of Manasseh, have received their inheritance beyond Jordan on the east, which Moses the servant of the LORD gave them.

the LORD'S. {set...: Heb. cause to pass over}

Exodus 13:15 And it came to pass, when Pharaoh would hardly let us go, that the LORD slew all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both the firstborn of man, and the firstborn of beast: therefore I sacrifice to the LORD all that openeth the matrix, being males; but all the firstborn of my children I redeem.

Exodus 34:19 All that openeth the matrix mine; and every firstling among thy cattle, ox or sheep, . {sheep: or, kid}

Numbers 3:12 And I, behold, I have taken the Levites from among the children of Israel instead of all the firstborn that openeth the matrix among the children of Israel: therefore the Levites shall be mine;

Numbers 18:15 Every thing that openeth the matrix in all flesh, which they bring unto the LORD, of men or beasts, shall be thine: nevertheless the firstborn of man shalt thou surely redeem, and the firstling of unclean beasts shalt thou redeem.

EDIT: I was thinking since I posted the above, about the fact the Jesus was from Judah. But apposite to His human descent being from Mary, is that she was related to Elisabeth, whose son John the Baptist, His cousin, was therefore, from Levi.

Luke 1:5 There was in the days of Herod, the king of Judaea, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abia: and his wife of the daughters of Aaron, and her name Elisabeth.

In other words, Jesus' legitimate descent from David, was by Joseph (who may himself have been adopted), adopting Him (naturally speaking), into Judah.

Thus, Paul in Romans 9:4 puts 'adoption' (into sonship of God) at the top of his list of reasons he desires his kinsmen to come into their inheritance in Christ.

**Re: , on: 2010/10/8 18:07**

I have not forgotten about the Tabernacle of David, just could not get to it today. I have much to share and am excited that we are going to see more of Jesus Christ and His purposes for us. Hope everyone has a Jesus filled weekend. I will post soon.

**Re: , on: 2010/10/8 22:34**

Question 1:

Why did David fail in his first attempt to bring the Ark back? And how does this apply to the Church today?

David did not have a revelation of God's will in this matter, however he was convinced as to what he thought was the right thing to do (this is where we always get into trouble). He used 30,000 "choice men" of Israel and they set the Ark on a "brand new" ox drawn cart and all Israel played music using all kinds of instruments, leading a great worship service before the Ark. This is an example of man's attempt to impress God and gain His approval their own way and by their own methods.

And, I don't want to gloss over something else very important and illustrative of man and his ways.

In the days when the Ark of God was being restored to Israel there was a man named Uzzah and he was attending the Ark. He was one of the 30,000 choice men (son of Abinadab the Priest) that were picked. As the ark was being carried on the ox-cart, the oxen stumbled and caused the cart to tilt. There arose an urgent need for the ark to be grasped and steadied lest it fall in to the filth of the road. If there ever was a need that demanded a response, it was at that moment for the safety of the ark. With his ignorance to excuse him, Uzzah, with the best of motives and intentions, reached out and took hold of the ark. He met the urgent need. And the Living God struck him dead. The hand of man, the work of man - is never under any circumstances, regardless of the urgency of the need, acceptable to perform anything for God or His kingdom.

David called the place Perez Uzzah (Break or Breach of Uzzah) because of the Lord's outbreak against Uzzah.

This story about poor Uzzah is meant for us so that we can gain wisdom and insight into what is pleasing to the Lord.

Question 2:

1Ch 13:12 And David was afraid of God that day, saying, How shall I bring the ark of God home to me?

Regarding David's 2nd try at bringing the Ark back, what was the correct way and what did he learn? What should we learn today regarding this?

When David saw that a priest was killed by the Lord for such a seeming small infraction of the law, it put the fear of the Lord in the heart of David, so David took the ark to the house of Obed Edom the Gittite.

This time David inquired of the Lord and the Lord had given David a revelation of Jerusalem, that Jerusalem was the place in all Israel where His name should dwell. Most of Israel had taken for granted that the ark would be brought back to Moses tabernacle which had moved from Shiloh to its present location - the high place in Gibeon.

When David heard that Obed Edom was being blessed because of the Ark, he was emboldened to once again desire to bring the Ark to the location David had prepared for it.

However, David had learned his lesson, and this time he obeyed the Lord's instructions for transportation of the Ark.

This time the Priests were carrying the Ark as prescribed by the Lord.

David humbled himself and offered sacrifices of oxen and fatted sheep.

David danced before the Lord with all his might wearing a linen ephod.

David and all Israel brought up the Ark with shouting and with the sound of the trumpet.

When it comes to learning God's ways and ceasing from our ways, mistakes are made, and sometimes costly mistakes are made. But mistakes can be corrected, if the heart is willing. But that's the potential problem, the heart.

Question 3:

2Sa 6:14 And David danced before the LORD with all his might; and David was girded with a linen ephod.

This verse obviously shows us that David shed his kingly clothes and just wore the "linen" clothes (ephod) of a priest.

What does this say to us in the Church, today? Consider David, who spent perhaps a decade living in caves and being hunted like an animal. This took place between the time of his anointing (his calling) and his coming to the throne (his sending). Or consider Moses, who spent forty years following sheep in preparation for being the shepherd of Israel. If we truly love the Lord, let us lay aside all spiritual ambition and all desire to serve the Lord, and let us lay our lives before Him and humbly ask Him to prepare us according to His way and His standards. The God eventually does through your life may be small, but the gold, silver and precious stone that can be hidden in a man's pocket is worth much more than a mountain of wood, hay and stubble. Contrast these thoughts with what we see today.

Question 4:

2Sa 6:16 And as the ark of the LORD came into the city of David, Michal Saul's daughter looked through a window, and saw king David leaping and dancing before the LORD; and she despised him in her heart.

2Sa 6:23 Therefore Michal the daughter of Saul had no child unto the day of her death.

Why is Michal a warning to us today and what is she a picture of? Michal despised the work of God, thinking that David was not being dignified as befitting his Kingship. She had an arrogant attitude of kingly royalty and looked upon the people as subjects and thought David should, also.

Michal, the daughter of Saul, came out and rebuked David for his disgraceful behavior in front of the subjects of his kingdom.

So David said to Michal, "It was before the Lord, who chose me instead of your father and all his house, to appoint me ruler over the people of the Lord, over Israel. Therefore I will play music before the Lord. And I will be even more undignified than this, and will be humble in my own sight. But as for the maidservants of whom you have spoken, by them I will be held in honor."

Therefore Michal the daughter of Saul had no children to the day of her death.

Michal had no children by David her first and last husband. She had 5 step-sons whom she brought up for Adriel the son of Barzillai the Meholathite to whom Saul had given her after David fled and became a fugitive.

The face of the earth is covered with vast, magnificent religious works that are a testimony of man's Adamic nature building FOR God. There is a place reserved in the man-made Christian religious system for anyone who wants to become a slave to it.

On the other hand, our Lord desires to restore the tabernacle of David in order that the rest of mankind may seek the Lord and in order that His throne might be established there. Some can go no other way than to seek the headship of Jesus Christ and to give their lives that His eternal purpose might be accomplished.

**Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/9 1:40**

Quote:  
-----Michal had no children by David her first and last husband. She had 5 step-sons whom she brought up for Adriel the son of Barzillai the Meholathite to whom Saul had given her after David fled and became a fugitive.  
-----

and their end was to die. A hard lesson here indeed.

"And he delivered them into the hands of the Gibeonites, and they hanged them in the hill before the LORD: and they fell seven together, and were put to death in the days of harvest, in the first , in the beginning of barley harvest." 2 Samuel 21:9

**Re: , on: 2010/10/9 1:45**

Quote:

-----and their end was to die. A hard lesson here indeed.

"And he delivered them into the hands of the Gibeonites, and they hanged them in the hill before the LORD: and they fell seven together, and were put to death in the days of harvest, in the first , in the beginning of barley harvest." 2 Samuel 21:9

-----

Thanks MyVeryHeart.

And that is exactly what happens with things "birthed" by man, rather than the Spirit of God.

**Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/9 2:02**

Quote:

-----And that is exactly what happens with things "birthed" by man, rather than the Spirit of God.

-----

This phrase, "Yet once more," indicates the removal of things that are shaken--that is, things that have been made--in order that the things that cannot be shaken may remain. Hebrews 12:27

I keep having a vision of whole parking lots of cars being shaken and incinerated as our God, the consuming fire, burns all of mans creations into dust. Not only will the cars go, but the church buildings, the houses, every thing men of the world base their whole life upon. And I realized the insanity of the devotion to these things of the world and man. Let us continue to store our treasure in heaven and be always in worship and awe to the God from whom we are receiving the kingdom which cannot be shaken.

**Re: , on: 2010/10/9 2:35**

I have always viewed that verse as God shaking everything in our lives so that which cannot be shaken remains.

And what cannot be shaken is what is of His doing in our lives. God is faithful to purge us of everything that is not of Him , by His "shakings".

The "things that are made", are obviously of man and not the Lord.

**Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/9 2:41**

The words of the LORD are pure words, like silver refined in a furnace on the ground, purified seven times. Psalm 12:6

I see those things that are "shaken" as dross, and that I am like a piece of metal being formed into the image of Christ as my Father purges the impurity.

**Re: - posted by Lesserlight, on: 2010/10/10 17:43**

Greetings

Maybe I am missing something here but if there was only one room in the tabernacle of David where did Zadok get the oil from in this verse?

1King 1: 39 And Zadok the priest took an horn of oil out of the tabernacle, and anointed Solomon. And they blew the trumpet; and all the people said, God save king Solomon.

David studied the law and delighted in it day and night so why would he not build a tabernacle like Moses did who built the first one as God said for it to be built?

After all the temple had multiple rooms and David was the one who gave the design of it to Solomon

Anyway..... since we are temples and Paul was a tentmaker making other tents as in people that would have the Ark (Jesus) in them why shouldn't the Tabernacle of David be a reference to David himself?

Considering the life of David and what he went through I see the tabernacle of David being restored being as individual people chosen while not yet perfect (David sinned grievously after being anointed king yet God restored him after he repented) being made perfect

Just my .02

Doug

**Re: , on: 2010/10/10 21:29**

It was just a tent filled with the glory of God. It was just a tent, a regular old tent that had nothing but the manifest presence of God. It was just a regular old tent with no brazen altar, no laver, no table of showbread, and no sacrifices (except for the sacrifice of praise). This tent that sat high atop Mt. Zion had nothing in it but the ark of God. Just the ark! Just the glory! That's the tent that God is rebuilding in this hour. He wants a tabernacle free from pomp and ceremony; free from all the trappings of our modern church services filled with empty ritual and religious jargon. He wants a tabernacle for His glory, where He is the beginning middle and end. He wants to be in charge of our worship services for a change (He being the head of the church), and He wants a place for His glory to abide! He wants a tent dedicated to ministry to God in His presence, not a tent dedicated to ministry to man.

Here is a reference for you for more on David's Tabernacle. I think this bro gets it.

<http://www.buildinghishouse.org/prophecy/david.shtml>

And this is cool. Yeah, he really gets it.

<http://www.buildinghishouse.org/prophecy/pitchtent.shtml>

**Re: - posted by Lesserlight, on: 2010/10/10 22:32**

Peace to you and thank you for your reply

I read the links you provided but neither of them had anything scriptural to back up the theory that David went against God's decree on how the tabernacle was to be set up

Anyway

First off there was no oil kept in the the Holiest and for Zadok to have gone into the tabernacle to get the oil he would have gone into the holy room that was the only place where oil was used. Also according to the OT the way into the Holiest was only by blood preceded by incense (although in the NT the golden altar is already in the Holiest).

Secondly David was still offering up sacrifices on an altar that was always located in the outer court

Also David appointed Levites and a High Priest so all the evidence points to David doing just what the Bible said he did..



..... David delighted in the law and obeyed God that was also given evidence in his concern on how to move the Ark.

The law that David studied requires 2-3 witnesses to establish truth and I do not see any scriptural witnesses supporting David not building a tabernacle in accordance to how God.

Unless I have missed something in the Bible (that is possible) but with the witness of the oil, the levites and then the High Priest going into the tabernacle to get oil that was only used in the Holy room and not the Holiest, scriptural evidence points to a two room tabernacle with an altar outside of it

With all the evidence in the Bible that are against the links and no evidence supporting them (to my knowledge) I have to dismiss the links as wishful thinking on the part of the author..... Not that the author does not mean well but that is why we were given the laws for determining the truth ..... and David was adamant about following the law.

Blessings

Doug

**Re: - posted by Lesserlight, on: 2010/10/10 22:32**

Peace to you and thank you for your reply

I read the links you provided but neither of them had anything scriptural to back up the theory that David went against God's decree on how the tabernacle was to be set up

Anyway

First off there was no oil kept in the the Holiest and for Zadok to have gone into the tabernacle to get the oil he would have gone into the holy room that was the only place where oil was used. Also according to the OT the way into the Holiest was only by blood preceded by incense (although in the NT the golden altar is already in the Holiest).

Secondly David was still offering up sacrifices on an altar that was always located in the outer court

Also David appointed Levites and a High Priest so all the evidence points to David doing just what the Bible said he did.. ..... David delighted in the law and obeyed God that was also given evidence in his concern on how to move the Ark.

The law that David studied requires 2-3 witnesses to establish truth and I do not see any scriptural witnesses supporting David not building a tabernacle in accordance to how God.

Unless I have missed something in the Bible (that is possible) but with the witness of the oil, the levites and then the High Priest going into the tabernacle to get oil that was only used in the Holy room and not the Holiest, scriptural evidence points to a two room tabernacle with an altar outside of it

With all the evidence in the Bible that are against the links and no evidence supporting them (to my knowledge) I have to dismiss the links as wishful thinking on the part of the author..... Not that the author does not mean well but that is why we were given the laws for determining the truth ..... and David was adamant about following the law.

Blessings

Doug

EDIT: Somehow I got two replies posted instead of one..... sorry

**Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/10 22:49**

1Ki 1:38

So Zadok the priest, Nathan the prophet, Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, the Cherethites, and the Pelethites went down and had Solomon ride on King David's mule, and brought him to Gihon.

Quote:

-----First off there was no oil kept in the the Holiest and for Zadok to have gone into the tabernacle..  
-----

The tent they got the oil from was in Gihon. I thought the tabernacle of David was on Mount Zion?

1Ch 15:1 Now David built houses for himself in the city of David; and he prepared a place for the ark of God and pitched a tent for it.

2Ch 5:2 Then Solomon assembled to Jerusalem the elders of Israel and all the heads of the tribes, the leaders of the fathers' households of the sons of Israel, to bring up the ark of the covenant of the LORD out of the city of David, which is Zion.

It looks like Gihon is in a valley.

2Ch 33:14 Now after this he built the outer wall of the city of David on the west side of Gihon, in the valley, even to the entrance of the Fish Gate; and he encircled the Ophel with it and made it very high. Then he put army commanders in all the fortified cities of Judah.

Maybe the tabernacle of David was at the bottom of the holy hill?

**Re: , on: 2010/10/11 1:12**

I explained that David's first attempt to bring up the Ark, failed. After seeing the house of Obed-Edom blessed he had great motivation to fetch it. David was given revelation by God as to what the acceptable way was to bring up the Ark.

Obviously, David could read God's frowns in Uzzah's death, and conversely he could read God's favor in Obed-Edom's blessing and prosperity.

So, the second time he brought the Ark up, he did not bring it on a cart, or use 30,000 "choice" men, but it was carried on the shoulders of priests (that would be us, today). Implied in 2 Sam 6:13 and expressed in 1 Ch 15:15.

David was given revelation by God to put the Ark in a Tent. This is borne out by Isaiah 16:5, Amos 9:11 and Acts 15:16.

There is never mentioned any rooms in the tent. Just a tent with the Ark in the midst of it. 2 Sam 6:17.

David's Tabernacle was meant to be different than Moses' Tabernacle and no, David was not being rebellious, otherwise God would have shown His displeasure, manifestly so.

**Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/11 1:22**

Quote:

-----David's Tabernacle was meant to be different than Moses' Tabernacle and no, David was not being rebellious, otherwise God would have shown His displeasure, manifestly so.  
-----

2 Chronicles 1:3-4 (New American Standard Bible)

3Then Solomon and all the assembly with him went to the high place which was at Gibeon, for God's tent of meeting was there, which Moses the servant of the LORD had made in the wilderness.

4However, David had brought up the ark of God from Kiriath-jearim to the place he had prepared for it, for he had pitched a tent for it in Jerusalem.

There were two tabernacles and it seems as if David's was in a low place by the spring of Gihon at the base of Mt. Zion and Moses' was on a high place but devoid of the ark. God does not seem pleased with what was happening in the high places.

1Ki 3:3

Now Solomon loved the LORD, walking in the statutes of his father David, except he sacrificed and burned incense on the high places.

There seems to be two forms of religion here. One that exalts itself and one that humbles itself.

**Re: , on: 2010/10/11 7:47**

That's right. Man is very "showy". The Lord is humble and does not need a big production. If you are willing to bear His reproach, you will always find Jesus "outside the camp" in the lowly (regular) places in life. Heb 13:13.

**Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/10/11 16:53**

1Ki 3:4 "The king went to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for that was the great high place; Solomon offered a thousand burnt offerings on that altar."

Then the LORD appeared to Solomon in a dream and asked him what he wanted. Solomon asked for wisdom and the LORD gave it to him. But after his encounter with the LORD he does not resume his sacrifices at Gibeon.

1Ki 3:15 "Then Solomon awoke, and behold, it was a dream. And he came to Jerusalem and stood before the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and offered burnt offerings and made peace offerings, and made a feast for all his servants."

Solomon humbled himself, and became like a little child.

1Ki 3:7 "Now, O LORD my God, You have made Your servant king in place of my father David, yet I am but a little child; I do not know how to go out or come in."