

Sonship
The First Covenant – Summary of The Sons of God, Part 2

Studio Session 73
Sam Soleyn
11/2004

How could you have priests of God in the Old Testament prior to the Torah and still have no covenant? It's as though we somehow think about it, but don't think about it. Whenever you have the existence of priests, you must have a covenant because priests are merely the administrators of a covenant. Just as you would not pay the price for an agreement if the agreement does not exist, no more would you have priests if there is no covenant that gives them legitimacy. These are basic things; these are the kinds of things when you hear [them] you say, "Well of course... of course that's true." "The Lamb was slain from the foundations of the world"... why? Because that was a price paid for a covenant. (Inserted – actual verse—**“All inhabitants of the earth will worship the beast—all whose names have not been written in the book of life belonging to the Lamb that was slain from the creation of the world.” – Revelation 13:8**)

God with God; God entered into a covenant with God and made Abraham the beneficiary of that covenant. Abraham was not a party to the covenant for the simple reason that he didn't exist at the time. This covenant was cut before the foundations of the world and once this covenant was established prior to the foundations of the world, it was what lays out the meets and bounds for the creation of human beings. Now that covenant has always been ongoing. That covenant was never broken. Why? Because it was a covenant made between God and God.

Here: this is from the book of **Hebrews**, the **6th chapter**. **Verse 13** says, **“When God made his promise to Abraham, since there was no one greater for him to swear by, he swore by himself, saying, ‘I will surely bless you and give you many descendants.’ And so after waiting patiently, Abraham received what was promised.”** (Inserted – **Hebrews 6:13-15**)

Now, the time of reference here is God making a promise to Abraham, but it references the price of this promise

being already paid. Abraham, in this statement, is not required to enter into a covenant in order to gain a promise. God simply makes the promise to Abraham. Abraham is going to be given many descendants—one of whom would be the foundation of this covenant that pre-exists. So, back in **Galatians**, the same reference comes when it says—this is **Galatians 3:15**—“**Brothers, let me take an example from everyday life. Just as no one can set aside or add to a human covenant that has been duly established, so it is in this case. The promises were spoken to Abraham and to his seed.**”

The Scripture does *not* say, “to his seeds”—meaning many people. So the promise was not made to the Jewish nation; those would be the *seeds* of Abraham, but to his *seed*—meaning one person, who is Christ. So Christ would come through the Jewish people but the promise of God would come through Christ. And then he explains, “**What I mean is this: The law, introduced 430 years later, does not set aside the covenant previously established by God ...**” (Inserted – **Galatians 3:15-17a**) So when you read the two scriptures together what do you have? You have that God has previously established a covenant with himself and in the fullness of time—in human time—God gives Abraham the promise that arises out of that covenant.

So the question is: when did God establish this covenant? Well the point at which the price was paid is the indication of when the covenant was established. When was the price paid? The first question then would be: what was the price that was paid in order for this promise to be enacted? The price was: the Lamb slain. John the Baptist puts it this way, “Behold the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world!” (Inserted – actual verse—“**The next day John saw Jesus coming toward him and said, ‘Look, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world!’**” – **John 1:29**) When was the Lamb slain? Well the question is... it depends on whether you are asking the question from an eternal point of view or a temporal one, because they are both points of view. If you are asking that question from a temporal point of view, the Lamb was slain at Calvary. If, however, you are asking that question from an eternal point of view—which would be God’s point of view—when would the Lamb have been slain? And the answer is: from the foundations of the world. (Inserted – **Revelation 13 :8**)

So both things are correct, it just depends on what is your time frame. What point of view are you asking from? If you are asking as a human—asking from the point of view of time—then the answer to the question, “When was the Lamb slain?” would be: at Calvary. If you are asking from the point of view of, “When was the covenant enacted that required the Lamb to be slain at Calvary?” The answer is: from the foundations of the world, because the Lamb was slain from the foundations of the world. And so we had previously said that if God has sworn to God, then what is the likelihood of the failure of this agreement? And the answer is: never...nunca.

God—when God swears—heaven and earth will pass away. So, when was the covenant established: God with God, of which Abraham is made the beneficiary because the promise of that covenant is given to Abraham? The answer is: the covenant was established from the foundations of the world and becomes the framework in which God creates man and relates to man. Now that changes everything because what that would tell us is that God created man with the specific intent of meeting the terms of a covenant that He has already sworn to himself. So the creation of man is not some thought as to how to finish off the six days of creation. The creation of man is “why” the six days of creation ensued.

God made man with the specific purpose of having sons, and swears to himself that He will have sons out of this race that He is about to create. All of the promise that God makes to Abraham then, is the grace of God. So what is it, exactly, that issues from the covenant that God made with himself? What is the promise? What is the sum and substance of the promise? It is everything that we call “grace”. Would that not explain then, why God creates Adam as the son of God? (Inserted – actual verse—**“the son of Enosh, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God.” – Luke 3:38**) Of course it would because it clearly delineates the purpose for the creation of man.

Adam was not a sinner when God created him, so he had not fallen from the position of being a son of God. God created Adam, as **Luke, the 3rd chapter** says, “as a son of God.” It is only when man sinned that he fell from the state of sonship, but—being initially created without sin—he was created as a son of God. The sum and substance of the promises that come out of this covenant... you see because the covenant is the background for the creation of man, the covenant itself gives rise to certain benefits. The only reason you would enter into a covenant is so that there would be benefits.

But the human is the beneficiary of these benefits. So the human then, would be the heir of God’s covenant with himself. “Heir” in the sense that the covenant with himself produced benefits. Because of the nature of the covenanters—God, and God—the benefits, the promises, are immutable; they cannot change. There is, in the Scripture, the distinction between discretions of the will of God and things that are considered immutable (things that cannot change). Everything that is discretionary has to do with the performance of man. Everything that is immutable—that cannot change, that goes with the line, “I am God and I change not.”—goes with the covenant that God swears to himself.

So, for example, when man had increased in number and in wickedness, God could have obliterated him (in theory, but not in practicality). Why? Because God was stuck with the promise that God had made with God. God didn’t fail to destroy man in the days of Noah. He waited patiently in the days of Noah until there was a righteous man so

He would not have to destroy the earth, but could save it for the sake even of one righteous. God had started creation with one man; He could start over with another man—with one man. And the new creation was started with the last Adam.

So starting with one man is historic for God. Now, all the sons of God in the Old Testament therefore, are humans... they are human beings. They are not—as some would suppose—angelic beings who cohabitated with human females to produce a race of aberrant creatures. The sons of God are human beings. They are human beings who are the priests of God Most High. Why? Because there is an existing covenant. Why else would you have priests if you had no covenant? Before the law and the priesthood of Levi, here is a priest: this is the book of **Genesis**, the **14th chapter**, here is a priest before... more than 400 years before the law here is a priest of God. How could you have a priest without an existing covenant by which a priesthood is lawfully constituted? You couldn't, quite simply. You could not.

This is the story of Lot being rescued by Abraham and the encounter between Abraham and Melchizedek. **Verse 18, of Genesis 14** says, **“Then Melchizedek king of Salem brought out bread and wine. He”** (Melchizedek king of Salem) **“was priest of God Most High, and he blessed Abram”** (in those days he was called Abram) **“saying, ‘Blessed be Abram by God Most High, Creator of heaven and earth. And blessed be God Most High, who delivered your enemies into your hand.’ Then Abram gave him a tenth of everything.”** (Inserted – **Genesis 14:18-20**)

Now here is how we have viewed this: commentators on Scripture, and especially secular commentators would view the reference to Melchizedek as priest of God Most High as being just an evolutionary process that “there were people who believed in a hidden god or an unseen god and a religion was developed around this unseen god and people, such as Melchizedek, would actually be administrators of the religious beliefs associated with the belief in an unseen god. That’s rubbish. That’s nonsense because what that would do is say that these Scriptures are not divinely inspired. It is God who is saying... it is the Living God who is saying that Melchizedek is a priest of God Most High who blesses Abram.

In the New Testament we find the same person in the book of Hebrews, and there he is amplified upon. He is not diminished. To call him a theophany is to simply not understand. There was an existing covenant. It’s the covenant of God with God that created and justified a priesthood. So it says, **“This Melchizedek was king of Salem and priest of God Most High.”** This is **Hebrews 7:1**. Two references in the Scripture to the same person, front and finish... Old and New Testaments, calling him a priest of God Most High.

How could you have a priest—really, other than this foolishness about how religious thought simply evolved, and evolved into a religion requiring priests, and so in this religion of unspecified beliefs (except generally in the god of the heavens) that you would have someone then as a priest of God? That’s just human secular thinking, which—in the process—disannuls and disallows the Scriptures as the inspired word of God. Because it is God who is saying that Melchizedek was a priest of God Most High, both in the Old and in the New. It is God who is saying that. This is not some evolved religion and historical references to evolving deities.

If you believe that these words are inspired by the Most High, then Melchizedek is said to be (by the Most High, the One True and Living God, in Old and New Testaments) “priest of God Most High.” That takes it to a whole different plane. If you have a priest of God, then God has to have an existing covenant, which allows for, and duly consecrates priests. But if you think that this is just an evolved religion, then here is the problem: Jesus is high priest of just an evolved religious thought... not the high priest appointed by God Most High over this order that is called “the order of Melchizedek”. And God swore on oath, recorded at the end of **Hebrews** where it says, in **verse 20**, **“where Jesus, who went before us,”** to fulfill this covenant, by the way, in the earth where the Lamb would be slain, He went before us into heaven itself and, **“entered on our behalf. He has become a high priest forever, in the order of Melchizedek.”** (Inserted – **Hebrews 6:20**)

But let me—before time runs out—show you other priests. First, let’s look at the **28th chapter of Genesis** and see the implication of priests. In **Genesis 28, verse 20**, it says, **“Then Jacob made a vow, saying, ‘If God will be with me and will watch over me on this journey I am taking and will give me food to eat and clothes to wear so that I return safely to my father’s house, then the Lord will be my God”** (so a reference to a relationship to God) **“and this stone that I have set up as a pillar will be God’s house,”** (so a reference to a sacred meeting place) **“and of all that you give me I will give you a tenth.”** (a reference to the tithe) (Inserted – **Genesis 28:20-22**)

Well here is the question: More than 500 years before the creation of the law of Moses—the Torah from Mt. Sinai, together with priests of Aaron and the Levitical order—500 years before that. Where exactly did Jacob—who is not known for his generosity—where did he intend to deliver the tithe? Abraham had given the tithe to Melchizedek, a priest of God Most High. Before temple, before the Levitical order—more than 500 years before—where did Jacob intend to deliver the tithe? Not Abraham, but his grandson, Jacob. Where did he intend to deliver the tithe? I would submit to you that there was an existing order of priests known as the sons of God, because there was a covenant that existed with the specific purpose of creating sons of God.

But here is the capstone, and this is from the book of **Exodus**, the **19th chapter**. The reference in **Exodus 19** is significant because, of course, it's before **Exodus 20**. **Exodus 20** is the place of the record of the creation of the law. Now, let's look at it. **Exodus 19**, let's look at **verse 22**. The Lord said to Moses to tell the people, **“Even the priests, who approach the Lord, must consecrate themselves, or the Lord will break out against them.”** (Inserted – **Exodus 19:22**) Even the priests. What priests? The Levitical order has not been enacted, therefore there can't be any priests because you can only have priests pursuant to the establishment of an order. And yet He is not saying, “When there will be priests, let them not come up.” He's saying, “Don't let the priests and the people come up.”

And then He repeats it in **verse 24**. **“The Lord replied, ‘Go down and bring Aaron up with you. But the priests and the people must not force their way through ...’** (Inserted – **Exodus 19:24**) God was about to enact a covenant with them.

This is seen from the same chapter—**chapter 19**—at **verse 5**, **“Now if you obey me fully and keep my covenant...”** What covenant? This was a covenant to produce, of all the nations of the earth he goes on to say, **“‘you will be for me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.’”** (Inserted – actual verse—**“Now if you obey me fully and keep my covenant, then out of all nations you will be my treasured possession. Although the whole earth is mine, you will be for me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.’** These are the words you are to speak to the Israelites.” – **Exodus 19:5,6**)

That covenant that existed would have produced a royal priesthood—a kingdom of priests—and a holy nation. By the way, that is the same covenant into which we have entered. This was not the covenant of Sinai. God brought them to Sinai to have them enter into the covenant that He had previously established with himself, had made the promise of it to Abraham—these, after all were the descendents of Abraham and were included in the promise that God had made when He said, **“And I will make of you a great nation, and then of your seed I will bless the nations of the world.”** (Inserted – actual verse—**“I will surely bless you and make your descendants as numerous as the stars in the sky and as the sand on the seashore. Your descendants will take possession of the cities of their enemies, and through your offspring all nations on earth will be blessed, because you have obeyed me.”** – **Genesis 22:17,18**)

So God approaches the Israelites to ratify the covenant that He had made with himself to give them the promises that He had previously made to their forefathers. When they rejected that promise there was no place for them.

That was the promise of entering into His rest. That was the promise of entering into the promises that God had made to them based upon an oath that He had sworn to himself. This was *not* the promise of Sinai. They failed to enter into the rest, which is guaranteed when God promises something to God. That was the first covenant. The second covenant functioned to preserve Israel, and we'll talk about that in some greater detail. But this first covenant was a covenant sworn between God and God that gave rise to promises that were unshakeable, creating a relationship between God and man in which God would be our Father and man would be the sons of God. I'm Sam Soleyn. God bless you.

Scripture References:

Revelation 13:8

Hebrews 6:13-15

Galatians 3:15-17a

John 1:29

Luke 3:38

Genesis 14:18-20

Hebrews 7:1

Hebrews 6:20

Genesis 28:20-22

Exodus 19:22,24

Exodus 19:5,6

Genesis 22:17,18