

EXPLANATORY NOTES WILL FOLLOW THIS CHAPTER, AFTERWARDS.

Chapters 1 & 2 are also available to read, here at Author's Den. chapter 1 is a PDF file (entitled: "God Created..."), which can be found on this book's main page (here at Author's Den – which can be easily accessed from my Author's Page by simply clicking onto my photo!]); and, chapter 2 is in my "Stories" section, and is called: "What is the Bible Really all About?" ... And, of course, this book is available for purchase at Amazon in both Paperback and Kindle Ebook. Simply type "In the Beginning it was spiritual from the very start Ted A. Roberts" into Amazon's search engine. If you have a Kindle Reader, this book is free to read on Amazon's Kindle Unlimited program.

Chapter 3

The Old Testament's Reliability, and the Vision of the Allegorical Tabernacle in the Wilderness

At this time, I feel that it's essential to discuss a modern scholastic problem (which a lot of folks are having these days) in that they are believing the Old Testament isn't really for a New Testament church. After all, it's only written for and meant for the Hebraic peoples of long, long ago – so, what possible use could it serve us in this modern age? I do believe that this is a necessary road to travel if we are to take any messages in the Old Testament seriously – especially if we can but consider any of them helpful for our salvation.

What we must realize is that there is really only ONE Testament of God and not two. It's simply the '*Testament of God*.' It is divided, however, into two separate camps of thoughts and lifestyles. One camp we will call "*natural understandings*" and "*natural prophetic fulfillment*." The second camp we will call "*spiritual understandings*" and "*spiritual prophetic fulfillment*." And yet, we will find the *natural* and *spiritual* explanations and understandings in *both* of what we call the New and the Old Testaments, simply because they really are one and the same. What is referred to as the New Testament today is merely a *flashlight* that shines onto the 'spiritual' understandings that are hidden within the Old. In fact, you won't find any *new* teachings within the New that wasn't already written and expressed in the Old: it's just that the New Testament digs up things that a lot of folks didn't (and, sometimes, still don't) know is there in the Old. Even some of the Old Testament folks themselves didn't always see them – such as in **Daniel 12:8-9** and **Colossians 1:26**.^{*19} And it took Jesus and His disciples (including Paul) to show the world the hidden messages that were locked away in the Old . . . So, to sum up this entire thought, I'll say this: The Old Testament, in definitive terms, is the observance (in seeing, understanding), in living (experiencing), and in worshiping (bodily) of God through *naturalistic* means; and, the New Testament, in definitive terms, is the observance (again, in seeing, understanding), and in living (experiencing) of God through *spiritual* means – which has no dealings with the fleshly world, at all, in either our *carnal senses*, or in the practice of worship rituals which deal with the natural body on any level whatever.^{*20}

I know that this reasoning may seem absurd to a lot of folks (even to those who have read their Bibles for many years), but when viewed with an open mind, we will be able to see that the *idea* of the Old Testament (in its natural interpretations, practices and

renderings), can be very *open* and *plain* for all the world to see and understand – similar, in fact, to the *showbread* that was laid upon the table in the first compartment of the *Tabernacle in the Wilderness* . . . And, yes, I am referring to that Tabernacle/Temple/Tent which, in the days of Moses and Aaron, was constructed during their wilderness sojourning before they ever arrived at the Promised Land, and that we can read extreme details of in *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, *Numbers*, and *Deuteronomy*, in which the actual Tabernacle was both being constructed and used. As we shall see, during this chapter, Paul actually compares this Tabernacle *allegorically* (and, specifically, concerning the two very important compartments [rooms] that were within this Tent), to the two *Testaments/ Covenants* of God with His people.

Again, the bread on the table, in the first compartment of the Tabernacle, was laid bare, to where any priest could come in and see it, and partake of it. Which bread, by the way, actually decayed after a week's time.*²¹ But, the *other* bread (the hidden understandings, *metaphorically speaking*) were placed within the second compartment – *called the Holy of Holies* – and inside the Ark of the Covenant, to where only the high priest alone, and only once a year, could come into that section. But, being hidden away inside the Ark, as that bread was, the priest, who entered thereunto once a year, never did see it or eat it – especially considering the fact that it wouldn't even be available to eat (*again, allegorically speaking*) until the New Testament would finally commence on the *Day of Pentecost* . . . That *hidden* bread – i.e. that '*hidden manna*' – which, as I've said, was inside of the Ark (inside the golden pot within*²²), actually represented the 'true' bread (the '*Living*' Word of God), which contains the effects of eternal life.

Please understand, I am *highly* spiritualizing this bread for us today. The bread (in the Tabernacle in the Wilderness) that was both placed onto the table, in the first compartment, and the bread which was placed inside the golden pot (which, in turn, was placed into the Ark of the Covenant), in the second compartment, were actual, small loaves of bread. Of course, the bread on the table had to be replaced weekly, but the bread in the Ark never had to be replaced, because it never rotted. What has become of this bread now, God only knows! It may still be stuck inside the Ark for all we know, *wherever that's located*, or God may have already allowed it to decay since it had served its purpose all those years ago. At this day and time it really doesn't matter, because we are to focus, instead, on the 'spiritually understood' bread that these actual loaves merely represented. Therefore, the literal, natural loaves are now irrelevant; for, it's, again, the *understanding* of what they represented that should concern us now . . . Jesus *compared* Himself (that is, His *body*) to the bread inside the Ark – offering it for the people to actually *eat*. *²³ And, so, therefore, eating His body today, as we should know, is done by eating the Word of God – yet, *not literally*. That is, by allowing it to not only become a part of us (in taking over our minds through deep meditation upon the Word – which, in turn, should change us on how we live our everyday lives), but also by allowing the Holy Spirit to bring the Word to life for us [turning it into the *Living* Word] in clearer understandings of what God's trying to convey to His children as it instructs them on how to love one another in a much better way than what mere flesh (i.e. the mind and spirit of man) can demonstrate; which, then, brings upon them eternal life.

1 John 3:14

We know that **we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren**. He that loveth not *his* brother abideth in death.

Friends, that's what all this is about! This is why I begun this entire '*Seeking the Everlasting Gospel Teaching Series*,' in my first book, on explaining all the ins and outs of *brotherly love*, because it's the very Gospel of Jesus Christ; and, it's what will raise us from death unto life.

Proverbs 13:13

Whoso despiseth **the word** [i.e. the Word of God] shall be destroyed: but he that feareth **the commandment** [again, the Word of God] shall be rewarded.

John 12:50a

And I know that **his commandment** [again, the Word of God] is life everlasting...

John 15:12

This is **my commandment**, That ye love one another, as I have loved you.

Galatians 5:14

For all the law is fulfilled in **ONE WORD** [i.e. the Word of God], *even* in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

This is eating the *true* Bread of Life . . . Also, it shouldn't seem a strange thing that I'm making metaphorical comparisons to the Tabernacle in the Wilderness to the *Testaments/Covenants* of God, for Paul himself does the very same thing in Hebrews chapter 9. In fact, in the very last verse of chapter 8, Paul makes it clear as to why he is even going to be covering this Tabernacle in the next chapter:

Hebrews 8:13

In that he saith, **A new covenant** [Testament], he hath made the first old [i.e. Old Testament Covenant]. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old *is* ready to vanish away [making way for the New].

Then, *immediately*, in chapter 9 (the very next verse), and as a follow-up, he begins covering the Tabernacle:

Hebrews 9:1-3

Then verily the first *covenant* had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first [compartment; metaphorically the Old Covenant/Testament], wherein *was* the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle [the second compartment; metaphorically the New Covenant/ Testament] which is called the Holiest of all.

I do not believe that it was a coincidence that Paul was speaking on the Covenants (or, and much rather, the *Testaments*) when also speaking on the Tabernacle that Moses

pitched in the wilderness. Surely, we know that there has been two Covenants, just as there are two Testaments, right? Let's see when the first ceased:

Hebrews 9:16-17

For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.

Here, we are given the exact time of when the first Covenant (or, Testament) had ended. That is, Jesus, the Living Testator (i.e. the *Living Testament*), ended the first Covenant and Testament with His passing on the cross. We must realize, then, that the second had to come into play soon afterwards. In fact, our best candidate for the right day (as I've mentioned) would be the *Day of Pentecost*. But, if this is the case, then it raises more questions, such as: *If the first Covenant (or, Testament) ended with Jesus dying on the cross, then why do I say that there is no separation of Old and New Testaments? For, surely, His death made a separation of the Old and New.* I'm saying this because the relevant messages of the Old Testament – i.e. the messages which primarily concern and effect Christians since the *Day of Pentecost*, all the way down to us today – had actually changed into 'spiritually understood' messages, whereas it once was only 'naturally understood' for the Old Testament folks; because, that (i.e. the naturally understood passages) is what effected and concerned them in their day and time. Therefore, the scriptural words themselves were the exact same for them as it is for us! It's certainly separated on *that* score, but are still one and the same because the words, as I've said, are the same words. God had taken the very same text, and unearthed (if I may so say it that way) the hidden meanings that were buried within, and revealed them by revelation through His Son Jesus, and His Son's disciples – the Apostles – for a New Testament audience. Therefore, the separation, if we find one (*and, yes, I really do believe that there is one*), is demonstrated in this sense. That's what makes it *two-fold*, in the fact that from the same manual we can get both natural and spiritual meanings*²⁴ . . . Now, going back to **Hebrews 9:1-3**, we see a very good spiritual (or, rather *metaphorical*) picture of God's Covenants/ Testaments in play, and by Him using the Tabernacle for the illustration of them. The first compartment (which I am using, metaphorically, as the first Covenant – or, first Testament – had (amongst the candlestick and alter of incense) the table with the showbread lain upon. Now, let's think about that for a moment. Why was it called *Showbread*? Believe it or not, that's a subject that has much debate about it. A lot of scholars contend that the original meaning was that it simply meant "Bread of Presence," since it was out before the Lord, for God to see it. *Albert Barnes*, in his *Notes on the Bible* (1847-85, public domain), says this:

"The Hebrew phrase rendered "show-bread" means properly "bread of faces," or "bread of presence." The Septuagint renders it "artous enōpious" - foreplaced loaves. In the New Testament it is "hē prothesis toñ artoñ" - "the placing of bread;" and in Symmachus, "bread of proposition," or placing. Why it was called "bread of presence" has been a subject on which expositors have been much divided. Some have held that it was because it was "before," or in the presence of the symbol of the divine presence in the tabernacle, though in another department; some that it was because it was set there to be seen by people, rather than to be seen by God..."

As for what I see in the scriptures, I am more inclined to believe the *latter* thoughts on this; namely, that the bread was set there to be seen by the people, rather than by God – of whom the bread was in the continual presence of anyways. *But, why do I say this?* Well, as we can see in that this bread decayed once a week, it really represented what is temporal and natural, whereas the bread that was in the second compartment [the Holiest of all], and inside of the Ark of the Covenant (which, as we've seen, never did rot, nor decay), it therefore represented that which is eternal . . . For further study on the hidden manna, please read **Exodus 16:31-35**; but, especially in **16:32b**, where it says: "Fill an omer of it [manna/bread] to be kept for your generations; that they may see the bread wherewith I have fed you in the wilderness." The only way that they could see it, after all those years, is if it didn't decay . . . So, then, the bread in Covenant [or, Testament] number one was only *natural*, and did decay after a short time. It was the 'showbread' that could (and *still* can) be seen and understood by just about anybody; that is, *in metaphorical terms*, it's a comparing of that bread with the 'Written' Word of God. But, the bread which is in the second compartment cannot be seen but by those of whom God chooses to bring into the second Covenant, because the understanding of it is hidden to natural observances. That would make the second Covenant/Testament to be everlasting and eternal. That is, *in metaphorical terms*, a comparing of that bread with the 'Living' Word of God.

Now, I'd like to speak further on the words *Testament* and *Covenant* themselves, for it could seem to some that I may have been a bit cavalier in my usage of the terms. I am well aware of the controversy over the two words, in that a lot of scholars aren't convinced that the words really have the same meaning. As can be seen from my above statements, I certainly am using them as to meaning the same – despite the fact that the modern dictionary does give the words more than one meaning (well, at least the word *Testament*, anyway) . . . Let's quickly define the terms:

Covenant (Beriyth), H1285, from Strong's Hebrew Dictionary:

[From the Old Testament] From H1262 (in the sense of cutting (like H1254)); a compact (because made by passing between pieces of flesh): - confederacy, [con-]feder[-ate], covenant, league . . . AMG's Annotated Strong's Dictionaries, © 2009 A.D., adds this: "Covenant, Treaty, Alliance; an Agreement between persons; God making a Covenant with humankind." . . . [The English word 'Testament' cannot be found occupying any space in the KJV Old Testament according to the 2001's 'Strongest Strong's Exhaustive Concordance to the Bible.']

Covenant/Testament (Diatheke), G1242, from Strong's Greek Dictionary:

[From the New Testament (By the way, in the King James Version, both English words – covenant and testament – derive from the very same Greek word)] From G1303; properly a disposition, that is, (specifically) a contract (especially a devisory will): - covenant, testament . . . AMG's Annotated Strong's Dictionaries, © 2009 A.D., adds this: "A Covenant, i.e. a mutual Agreement or mutual Promises upon mutual conditions. In the NT [New Testament], spoken of God's Covenants with men; i.e. the divine promises conditioned on obedience; Of the Abrahamic Covenant; Of the Mosaic Covenant; Of the New Covenant promised of old, and sanctioned by the blood of Christ."

Covenant, from Webster's Dictionary

(published 1828; public domain):

To come; a coming together; a meeting or agreement of minds... 1) A mutual consent or agreement of two or more persons, to do or to forbear some act or thing; a contract; stipulation. A covenant is created by deed in writing, sealed and executed; or it may be implied in the contract. 2) A writing containing the terms of agreement or contract between parties; or the clause of agreement in a deed containing the covenant. 3) In theology, the covenant of works, is that implied in the commands, prohibitions, and promises of God; the promise of God to man.

Testament, from Webster's Dictionary:

*1) A solemn authentic instrument in writing, by which a person declares his will as to the disposal of his estate and effects after his death. This is otherwise called a will. A testament, to be valid, must be made when the testator is of sound mind, and it must be subscribed, witnessed and published in such manner as the law prescribes. 2) The name of each general division of the canonical books of the sacred Scriptures; as the Old Testament; the New Testament. **The name is equivalent to covenant**, and in our use of it, we apply it to the books which contain the old and new dispensations; that of Moses, and that of Jesus Christ.*

Firstly, let's again consider that, in the King James Version, both English words *Covenant* and *Testament* come from only one Greek word: *Diatheke*. So, what does that tell us? That it's extremely possible that this was no mere coincidence on the part of the Translators, and that the words must surely have been very similar, if not the very same meaning.

Testament, from Easton's Bible Dictionary^{*25}

[The word 'Testament'] occurs twelve times in the New Testament (Hebrews 9:15, etc.) as the rendering of the Greek diatheke, which is twenty times rendered "covenant" in the Authorized Version, and always so in the Revised Version.

It would seem, however, that most modern commentators today, which I read from, insists that the word Testament is mainly in usage with a dying person's *last will and testament* toward their beneficiaries, and therefore does not have the same meaning as Covenant. I believe that this is due, in part, to some misunderstanding about a couple of passages in Hebrews . . . Let's once again quote this passage, that I had quoted earlier, to see what I am meaning:

Hebrews 9:16-17

For where a testament [*diatheke*] is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.

These passages are implying, simply, that the Old Covenant itself ceased to exist when Jesus died upon the cross; and had, also at that time, made available the New Covenant to commence: which actually didn't do so until the *Day of Pentecost* . . . However, both Covenants/Testaments certainly did contain benefits and promises; so, and with that in

mind, if one wanted to argue the fact that just like a dying person's *last will and testament* (and also considering the fact that Covenants commence with death, and with the shedding of blood), that the word *Testament* certainly can fit in with that tradition – that is, with a *last will and testament* – then I'd say *fine* to that comparison, of which I certainly have no problem with! But, even so (and just as the KJV, Authorized Bible Version, shows – which, unlike some Biblical commentators insist on, I believe was no mistake on the Translators' part), I believe that both words are still one and the same.*²⁶ Especially since The Old Testament/ Covenant was commenced with death and the shedding of blood – since we must consider the animal sacrifices (and especially with the shedding of a *lamb's* blood) which commenced the Old Covenant – just like it did, later, the New – considering that Jesus is likened to the Lamb that was sacrificed for the New Testament . . . If nothing else, we should at least be able to see that both the New Covenant and New Testament actually commenced during the same time period! *And, that should tell us something...*

Now, summarizing on the manna, just like the natural example before it, which literally was nestled inside the golden pot (way back in that day and time), this *spiritual* bread (which that bread merely represented) never decays, nor rots; and, Jesus (as I had already said) compared Himself to that bread that had come down from Heaven (and, in turn, was placed into the Ark – *and, not on the table in the first compartment!*), comparing it to His own *body* – which He had offered for folks to eat; for, again, it does not decay . . . The folks of the Old Testament ate bread that was only on the show-table; that is – *allegorically speaking* – of what could be seen out in the open by the whole world; though, it had lasted but for a week, and was temporal. It was the only bread that they *could* eat, not having access to the hidden manna in the other compartment; but, it wasn't enough to sustain them for eternity,*²⁷ because that temporal bread wasn't capable (*and, neither is it now capable for us*), as the other is, to give them eternal life. But, again, that was the only thing available to them at that day and time. So, if we can but eat of the bread *inside* the Ark (*that hidden manna; that heavenly bread; that angel food – which IS available to us in our day and time*), then we will never die! As was said, that hidden bread represents the *Living* Word of God (which is more powerful than the *Written* Word – because, it's what brings the Written Word to life); that is, the spiritually understood Word will raise us from death unto life, causing our '*inward man Jesus*' to *quicken* (i.e. to come to life). Can the 'naturally' understood – the natural bread – do this for us? Let's watch how this works:

Hebrews 4:12

For the word of God *is* quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and *is* a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.

Let's think about this . . . We learn, from **Ephesians 6:17**, that the Word of God is compared to a sword – which is true, and is what most folks are already familiar with. Yet here, Paul (the same author from the Ephesians letter) says that the Word of God is *sharper* than a two-edged sword. How can that be, if the Word *is* that sword? We must realize that Paul is here, rather than from the Ephesians letter, making reference to the *Living* Word of God, whilst Ephesians makes reference to the *Written* Word of God, which

has two edges; that is, the Written Word (as referenced in Ephesians) has two edges: the *Old* and *New* Testaments. Therefore, we see (from Hebrews) that not only is the Living Word more powerful than the Written Word, but, too, it's strong enough (as Paul also says therein) **to separate the soul from the spirit** – meaning, specifically, the *inward man* from the *outward man* – as one is the creature of the Old Covenant, and the other is the creature of the New Covenant . . . Let's see just exactly how this works...

1 Corinthians 2:14

But the natural man [outward man] receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know *them*, because they are spiritually discerned.

So, if there is a *natural* man who can only understand things of a fleshly nature, is there, then, a *spiritual* man who understands things of a spiritual nature?

1 Corinthians 15:40

There are also celestial [heavenly/spiritual] bodies, and bodies terrestrial [earthly/fleshly]: but the glory of the celestial *is* one, and the *glory* of the terrestrial *is* another.

Let's define this deeper:

1 Corinthians 15:45-50

And so it is written, The first man Adam [of the Old Testament] was made a **living soul**; the last Adam [Jesus, of the New Testament] *was made* a **quickening spirit** [remember **Hebrews 4:12**, and of the separation of the soul and spirit!]. Howbeit that *was* not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural [Adam wasn't spiritual, but natural]; and afterward that which is spiritual [Jesus, however, was spiritual]. The first man *is* of the earth, earthy [fleshly, carnal]: the second man *is* the Lord from heaven [spiritual]. As *is* the earthy, such *are* they also that are earthy [Old Testament creatures, who are nothing more than 'outward man,' are only fleshly, and can see only fleshly things]: and as *is* the heavenly, such *are* they also that are heavenly [New Testament folks, who are 'inward man,' observes things of a spiritual nature]. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly [This can and will happen to us, just as it did Adam and Jesus, our first examples]. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God [an old minded creature, along with his carnal ordinances, cannot enter into the second compartment in a spiritually understood Tabernacle in the Wilderness]; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.

This is what the *Living* Word will do for us as opposed to what the Written Word has done. And, this tells us how the Living Word can separate a *soul* from a *spirit*; or, and much rather, it shows us the difference between a *living soul* and a *quickening spirit* . . . Yes, my friends, there is definitely a huge difference!

As I will certainly cover more on these two creatures in some upcoming books (and, especially since I don't want the topic of it to overshadow our present one), I will leave the matter for now . . . But, I will say this in summary before doing so, that the Old Testament

is for an old creature, an old man, an outward man, who will observe things only with a carnal, fleshly mind, and does not understand things of a spiritual nature, and can only worship fleshly, too; whereas the New Testament is for the new creature, a new man, an inward man, who observes the spiritual understandings of the Word of God, applies them to his life as God meant for him to understand them in His *Mystery*. He observes them spiritually, and understands them with the Mind of Christ; and, therefore, worships God in spirit and in truth, without the institutions of outward rituals, called *carnal ordinances*. Hence, and from another angle, we have our separation of the Old and New Testaments; for, and again, it's not to be seen or understood merely as old books, but it is to be seen as either living a lifestyle carnally and naturally, or – and much better – as spiritual and heavenly . . . It takes time, and with the Spirit of God training us, for us to be able to cross that line from the Old to the New...

Again, to sum up what we've been saying thus far (in this present chapter), there are two separate books, called the Old and New Testaments. And, within *both* of them, we can view natural and spiritual interpretations . . . However, that's not what *defines* the Old and New Testaments, since they are two separate covenants for two different time periods – because, within each, folks lived different kinds of existences: namely, one had a natural existence whilst the other has a spiritual existence; one was a natural Kingdom, and the other is a Spiritual Kingdom. Therefore, our separation of the two Testaments are found within the confines of one being stuck in the natural, and the other aspiring to the spiritual. However, since they both tell of the same story (a progressive story, which begins at the bottom, then elevates to the top), we see both Testaments as to being one big, single Testament – especially since all that was needed to be said was already defined in the book called the Old, and was merely *enlightened*, by extremely gifted teachers sent by God, in what we call the New . . . This assessment will not only be continued to be defined within this present book, but will also filter throughout my other upcoming books, too.

Now, to end this chapter, let's learn about *pivoting* scriptures. *Pivoting scriptures?* Yes, *pivoting* . . . As we've been learning that we have both natural and spiritual understandings within the Written Word of God, a lot of times we can find this situation in the very same passages! That is, a passage that we can read naturally, we can turn right around and read that very same passage spiritually. This new thought is actually setting us up for the next upcoming chapter, where we shall discuss seeing examples of this in the very first chapter of Genesis . . . Now, that I have said all this, I will be able to introduce my readers to the *spiritual beginning*, which is cloaked in mystery and dark sayings...

EXPLANATORY NOTES BEGIN ON NEXT PAGE...

EXPLANATORY NOTES for Chapter 3
*The Old Testament's Reliability,
and the Vision of the Allegorical Tabernacle in the Wilderness*

***19. Such as in Daniel 12:8-9 and Colossians 1:26...**

Daniel 12:8-9

And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what *shall be* the end of these *things*? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel: for the words *are* closed up and sealed till the time of the end.

Colossians 1:26

Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints.

And, let's again consider Matthew's words (*especially at the end of verse 35*):

Matthew 13:34-35

All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; **I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.**

***20. Which has no dealings with ... the practice of worship rituals which deal with the natural body on any level whatever...**

I will deal with this bold statement of mine, and in detail, in my upcoming book, entitled: '*Carnal Ordinances: The Naturalistic World That Had Come To An End.*'

***21. Which bread, by the way, actually decayed after a week's time...**

As we read in Exodus chapter 16, the manna that fell down from the sky with the morning dew, and of which substance the children of Israel in the wilderness made small cakes or loaves of bread with, was a very *natural* substance, and was very delicate, for it not only became rancid with the strong afternoon sun, which came out strongly later in the day, but the manna also became worm infested and stunk heavily. Neither could any extra of it be stored overnight (even away from the sun) to where it could be worked with the following day. Not only so, but all the people had to eat what they had gathered that day, and retrieve fresh batches each morning. We cannot imagine that even when they baked the stuff, and made cakes and loaves of bread out of it, that it would last very long before it rotted, as well. Neither can we be certain of how long it lasted once cooked; but, we do know that several baked loaves of it lasted an entire week upon the table in the first compartment of the Tabernacle for worship purposes. Now, whether that bread was just sturdy enough to last that long on its own, or whether God simply blessed it to have this longevity, we cannot say for sure. But, we can ascertain, from Leviticus, that God wished for the priests to actually eat the week old bread before placing fresh loaves thereon.

Leviticus 24:5-9

And thou shalt take fine flour, and bake twelve cakes thereof: two tenth deals shall be in one cake. And thou shalt set them in two rows, six on a row, upon the pure table before the LORD. And thou shalt put pure frankincense upon *each* row, that it may be on the bread for a memorial, *even* an offering made by fire unto the LORD. Every sabbath [after one week] he shall set it in order before the LORD continually, *being taken* from the children of Israel by an everlasting covenant. And it shall be Aaron's and his sons'; and

they shall eat it in the holy place: for it is most holy unto him of the offerings of the LORD made by fire by a perpetual statute.

***22. Inside the golden pot within...**

Of the things that we've been speaking, the Apostle Paul maps all of this out for us in Hebrews chapter 9 – *please read the whole chapter for a better understanding*. But, specifically, concerning the manna inside the golden pot, we read:

Hebrews 9:3-4

And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all [i.e. the second compartment in the Tabernacle]; Which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, **wherein was the golden pot that had manna**, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant.

***23. Jesus compared His body to the bread ... offering it for the people to actually eat...**

We see how this works by comparing these scriptures:

John 6:48

I am that bread of life.

John 6:51

I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and **the bread that I will give is my flesh**, which I will give for the life of the world.

John 1:1

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and **the Word was God**.

John 1:14a

And **the Word was made flesh**, and dwelt among us...

John 6:53

Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, **Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man**, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.

By putting all of these verses together, we will begin forming a picture. A picture that, in this present book, I will try and be vague about. Not that I'm trying to hide anything, or that I don't have an understanding as to what they're implying, it's just that I am saving the full thrust, and the deep kernel of the matter, for my future book (as I've mentioned in an earlier *End Note*), entitled: '*Carnal Ordinances: The Naturalistic World That Had Come To An End*.' Once revealed there, it'll be seen clearly why I had chose to wait to explain the details therein; for it – *truly* – takes a while to explain, and I certainly don't want that topic to overshadow this present one. So, for now, I will simply point out the obvious connection of *Bread*, *Word*, and *Flesh* – which all three paint a picture of the body of Christ; i.e. the *Living Word* ... I'm sure that a lot of folks already know where I'm going with this; but, again, I want to be very careful not to expound any further, for I'm already saying too much about the *Carnal Ordinances* in here, and I really don't want to spoil the fun of my upcoming book!

***24. From the same manual we can get both natural and spiritual meanings...**

My dad used to warn me not to *over-spiritualize* the Bible away. In fact, I remember one man, that got up to speak in a house-meeting I attended years ago, who said that Jesus

Himself was only a parable, and that He never actually existed in the flesh! There are some Creation Scientists who are extremely leery of anybody 'spiritualizing' the Bible at all – especially in the first chapters of Genesis – and are warning folks not to listen to anybody who does this, for many of them do say, admittedly, that Genesis is nothing more than a moral lesson, which holds no historic value. Therefore, they continue to say, the stories in them, though inspired by God, are mere parables [i.e. *fables*, in their estimation] that do not reflect any actual events of any historical personages. Much the same, as many of them continue to think, of when Jesus told His parables, telling only simple stories which conveyed moralistic lessons only; even though His parables, as they apparently are unaware, *did* contain historic truths. Without doubt, such thoughts can certainly open the door for complete evolutionist thinking – seeing the need for scientific explanations for our natural beginnings if those folks believe that the Bible fails in that area. In such a predicament, it is therefore easy to rely upon secular scientists (who were *not* directed by God – nor who had the Bible in mind to explain their theories by) to start explaining this planet's origins. But, there's a problem with that, because, just as *Phillip E. Johnson*, in his wonderful book '*Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds*,' [1997 InterVarsity Press], points out to us that modern mainstream scientific views of a Deity demand that evolutionist processes did *not* have God in mind. He then, in chapter 1, on page 15, begins to amply quote the 1995 official position statement of the American National Association of Biology Teachers (NABT); which, even though giving the routine example about how life evolved, added that the process was '**unsupervised,**' and '**impersonal.**' Which certainly shows us that mainstream evolutionary science does not comply with Genesis chapter one, or that they anywhere near believe that God had anything to do with this planet's origins. And, even though many Christians think that there's perfect harmony between evolutionary science and the Bible, the mainstream evolutionists, however, completely disagrees. And, not only did these secular scientists *not* have God in mind whilst making their views known, but many of them even began their premise that He, along with His Bible, should be left out of the equation at all costs! Therefore, if examined closely, their conclusions are the complete opposite to what we read in God's Written Word – especially when we carefully analyze the compared data between the two views ... But, and even though that were the case, after some consideration to Mr. Johnson's concerns, the NABT, after a few bouts amongst themselves, had finally decided to drop the words '*unsupervised*' and '*impersonal*' from their initial statement; though, not all of them wanted to. This crusade, to drop the words was, *surprisingly*, championed by Dr Eugenie C. Scott, one of the biggest opponents to the Creationist world scientific view. You can read her own words, and to her reasons why she campaigned the idea, at this website: ncse.com/library-resource/science-religion-methodology-humanism. However, and even though they've reluctantly dropped the two words, it does not change the fact that they still see it the same way that they always have! ... Even though I certainly do not agree with the American National Association of Biology Teachers' initial assessment, this is not the book to produce the cons of such an idea. However, I will certainly recommend for my readers Phillip E. Johnson's well written book, which I have just mentioned, along with another of his that I found most intriguing, called '*Reason in the Balance: The Case Against Naturalism in Science, Law and Education*,' [1995 InterVarsity Press] ... On another note, I want to prove, in this present book, that there is a satisfactory middle ground for both the spiritualizing of the scriptures and the naturalizing. I also feel that just like somebody can over-spiritualize them, one can also

over simplify by naturalizing them too much, as well. This is why, as I've said earlier, that God wishes for us to *rightly divide* the Bible into its natural and spiritual camps. I feel that I've given sufficient proof, by quoting the Written Word, that there are scriptures therein that *have* to be spiritualized, to where there can be no other way of getting around them. But, too, I certainly feel that if one were to take away the natural, historical interpretations, then one can miss out on truths, also. *Both* are equally important to the salvation of man, because one of them (the natural) is a step toward the other (the spiritual); though, as I've stated in an earlier chapter, it's the spiritual implications which actually lead to eternal life – such as obtaining pure, agape, Godly love (which – *again, as I've explained in my first book* – is a *spiritual* love): of which, the natural cannot obtain, nor produce. Not only so, but we must also remember that without any natural implications, the spiritual road could never even be reached to begin with. Therefore, one without the other is completely impossible. In most cases, before there can ever be any spiritual interpretations, the natural examples have to exist first so that we can obtain the proper understanding. This is why the *natural interpretations* are also termed as '*similitude's*,' in that one is *similar* to the other; and, they *belong* to one another. This mirrors perfectly the balance of God, in that there are '*two's*' of things in nature, such as two eyes, two legs, two arms, male and female, hot and cold, left and right, forward and backward, up and down, north and south, east and west, good and evil, night and day, happy and sad, sane and insane, love and hate, hard and soft, etc ... just as there is natural and spiritual, old and new Testaments, old and new Covenants...

***25. Easton's Bible Dictionary...**

'E-Sword, the Sword of the Lord with an electronic edge,' says: "Easton's Bible Dictionary [published in 1897, public domain] provides informative explanations of histories, people and customs of the Bible. It is an excellent and readily understandable source of information for the student and layperson and one of Matthew George Easton's most significant literary achievements."

***26. Both words are still one and the same...**

William Tyndale also translates *diatheke* as 'Testament' in his translation of the book of Hebrews; however, J.P. Green Sr., in his Literal Translation, does not. He translates the word as 'Covenant' instead. In fact, Easton's Bible Dictionary further has this to say about the matter:

Covenant, from Easton's Bible Dictionary:

A contract or agreement between two parties. In the Old Testament the Hebrew word berith is always thus translated ... The corresponding word in the New Testament Greek is diatheke, which is, however, rendered "testament" generally in the Authorized Version. It ought to be rendered, just as the word berith of the Old Testament, "covenant."

This should not cause us any problems, for I think the argument is just splitting hairs! Frankly, I cannot see why we cannot see both *Testament* and *Covenant* as to being the same word. God made a Covenant with Moses on Sinai, and it became the 'official' commencement of the *Testament* of God, which we now call the Old Testament – especially when blood was spilt by sacrificing a lamb offering to commence that Covenant [**Hebrews 9:18** – Whereupon neither the first *testament* was dedicated without blood]. Then, in the same manner, when the Lamb of God (Jesus) was sacrificed on the cross,

with the spilling of that Lamb's blood, it allowed the New Testament/Covenant to commence on the *Day of Pentecost*, as the *last will and testament* of Jesus Christ, who did, indeed, die ... Praise be to God, though, that He rose again! ... Too, we do *not* have technical difficulties in also recognizing that the book of Genesis was enveloped within that Old Testament/Covenant, just as we shouldn't have any problems in including the Four Gospels into our New Testament *books* ... First of all, and just like Paul points out in **Romans 5:14**, death had reigned from Adam to Moses (for this was before the actual *Written Law*, and its official commencement); but, it certainly doesn't mean that God wasn't still working with those folks prior to Moses within the confines of that particular Covenant and Law. In fact, we see traces of that Law as far back as Adam, when God told him not to eat of the forbidden fruit [**Genesis 2:16-17**]. Indeed, the basic sense of what God told him is certainly found in the Ten Commandments, since that forbidden fruit wasn't actual, literal fruit; but, that fruit was none other than the *fruit of the flesh*, which we read about in **Galatians 5:19-21** – which is the exact opposite, and is in opposition to the *fruits of the Spirit*: **Galatians 5:22-23**. And, as far as including the Four Gospels in the New Testament/Covenant, we *can* do so (despite me saying that it officially commenced when Jesus died on the cross and with the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the *Day of Pentecost*) because Christ came to not only fulfill (*bring to a close*) the Old Testament/Covenant, but also to teach the ways of the New – just as John the Baptist prepared folks for the New, because all those people were right at the doorstep of the next Testament ... On a side note, and as we will see in an upcoming *End Note* for chapter 10 of this present book, Jesus was already in the 2nd Covenant prior to his death on the cross ... *Really?* Yes; but, He was the only one there at that particular time. I'll give you a hint: Jesus said so Himself in **John 3:13c** ... *Let that whet your appetite!*

***27. It wasn't enough to sustain them for eternity...**

John 6:48-51 (Jesus speaking)

I am that bread of life. **Your fathers did eat manna** [natural bread] **in the wilderness, and are dead.** [However,] This [i.e. Jesus, Himself] is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread [i.e. the Living Word] which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

END OF CHAPTER 3...

Again, Chapters 1 & 2 are also available to read, here at Author's Den. chapter 1 is a PDF file (entitled: "God Created..."), which can be found on this book's main page (here at Author's Den – which can be easily accessed from my Author's Page by simply clicking onto my photo!)); and, chapter 2 is in my "Stories" section, and is called: "What is the Bible Really all About?" ... And, of course, this book is available for purchase at Amazon in both Paperback and Kindle Ebook. Simply type "In the Beginning it was spiritual from the very start Ted A. Roberts" into Amazon's search engine. If you have a Kindle Reader, this book is free to read on Amazon's Kindle Unlimited program.