

The background of the image is a close-up of an antique book cover. It features intricate gold-tooled patterns on a dark, possibly black or deep blue, leather or cloth surface. The patterns include floral motifs, scrolls, and geometric lines. The lighting is dramatic, highlighting the texture and the metallic sheen of the gold leaf.

The Covenant at

Sinai

(Part 1)

A
Ruín and Redemption.com
Teaching Series

© 2018 Ruín and Redemption. All rights reserved.

Permissions: You are permitted and encouraged to reproduce and distribute this material in any format provided that you do not alter the wording in any way and do not charge a fee beyond the cost of reproduction. For web posting, a link to our website is preferred. Any exceptions to the general rule given above must be approved by us here at Ruín and Redemption. Please also be sure to include the following statement on any distributed copy: “© 2018 Ruín and Redemption. All rights reserved.” Thank you so much!! And Enjoy.

The Mosaic Covenant (Part 1)

Table *of* Contents

I. The Background to the Mosaic Covenant

- | | |
|------------------------------|----|
| 1. The Story of Joseph, | p5 |
| 2. The Calling of Moses, | p7 |
| 3. The Redemption of Israel, | p9 |

II. An Overview of the Mosaic Covenant p11

III. An Introduction to the Mosaic Covenant

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. The Covenant of the Law, | p11 |
| 2. The Nature of the Law, | p12 |
| 3. The Essence of the Law, | p12 |
| 4. The Revelation of the Law, | p13 |
| 5. The Purposes (Uses) of the Law, | p14 |
| 6. The Categories of the Law, | p16 |
| 7. The Usage (Etymology) of the Law, | p18 |

IV. The Four Views of Sinai

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. View 1: Sinai was a Republication of the Covenant of Works, | p20 |
| 2. View 2: Sinai was a Mixed Covenant, | p23 |
| 3. View 3: Sinai was a Subserving Covenant, | p27 |
| 4. View 4: Sinai was part of the Covenant of Grace, | p31 |

V. Evidence the Mosaic Covenant is part of the Covenant of Grace

1. The Essence is the same, p32
2. The Privileges are the same, p33
3. The Context is the same, p33
4. The Requirement is the same, p34
5. The Provision is the same, p35
6. The Content is the same, p35
7. The Means of benefiting is the same, p36

The Mosaic Covenant (Part 1)

Understanding the Law of Sinai

I. The BACKGROUND to the Mosaic Covenant

1. The Story of JOSEPH: *Genesis 37-50*

A) Joseph the SON: The narrative of Joseph is one of the most beloved stories in all of Scripture. Most of us know it well. Joseph was one of twelve sons, but he was the favorite. This was mostly because he was one of only two sons that were born to Jacob's wife, Rachel. All the other sons were born to his other wife, Leah; and Rachel and Leah's maids. So Joseph was the favorite. And this was wrong. None of us should ever have any favorite children. Scripture tells us that this was actually the biggest reason Joseph's brothers were so jealous of him: "His brothers saw that their father loved him more than all his brothers; and so they hated him. . ." (37:4). Jacob's favoritism nearly destroyed his family. And as we read through the narrative, we discover that Joseph wasn't only Jacob's *favorite* child, Jacob had actually made him into an *idol*. Jacob loved his son Joseph so much that when he is taken away from him, his whole world falls apart. What do we learn from all this? We learn that even mature believers like Jacob continue to need the sanctifying work of the Spirit in their lives. And so, to heal Jacob of his idolatry, God takes Joseph away for a season—but only for a season. In due time, the Lord restores Joseph once again to his father.¹

As we meditate on these things, the Lord would ask us: What are the things in *our* life that we've come to love a little too much? What are the ways we've become like Jacob? What are *our* idols? What are the things—even the really good, God-given things—in our life that we've begun to love in *unhealthy* ways?

B) Joseph the MAN: It wouldn't have been a hard thing for Joseph to believe that God loved him and had a wonderful plan for his life. After all, he was from the line of *Abraham*. And not only that, he traced his lineage through Abraham's son *Isaac*, and then again through Isaac's son, *Jacob*. Which meant that Joseph was part of the chosen family—an heir of God's promises. He didn't come from Ishmael or Esau; he was the chosen stock of the Lord. Further, he wasn't just *any* son of Jacob; he was the son of Jacob's wife *Rachel*—the special and beloved wife. What's more, Joseph knew that his father saw him as special and set apart from his brothers, since it was he alone who was given that special, varicolored robe. To add to it all, God even started giving Joseph *dreams*, where all his brothers were coming and bowing down to him! There's no question Joseph believed God loved him and had a wonderful plan for his life.²

But the plan that God had for Joseph's life must have been very, very different than what he imagined it would be. The plan that God had for Joseph's life would involve being exiled from his home-land, the land of Canaan; it would involve his own brothers selling him away to foreigners; it would involve being bought off the slave-block at the market; being wrongly accused of horrible things; and being banished to a dark prison cell for years on end. I wonder what Joseph was thinking during those years of slavery and prison. The Lord had spoken to him; He had given him these dreams, telling him what was in store for him. But Joseph's outward circumstances seemed to run totally contrary to what God had said He would do. It's like his life was spinning out of control. The Lord had made some pretty amazing promises, but as he looked at his life, he would have had to wonder: Is it really true? Is God going to do what He said?

And yet, even in the midst of everything he's going through, isn't it amazing how Joseph responds? What does he do? He continues to trust in the Lord; he continues to cling to what God had said; he continues to believe that the Lord would prove faithful. One reason we know this is from what we read in Genesis

¹ And what a beautiful passage this is, in Genesis 45:25ff. Here we see the Lord reviving the heart of Jacob in his old age.

² The insights of these sections are gratefully gleaned from Rev. Sujoy Roy, in his sermon expositions on Genesis (in Bangla).

40. This is the account of the two other men that are thrown into prison with Joseph. These men served Pharaoh as his cupbearer and baker; and Joseph is put in charge of looking after them. In verses 6-7, we read, “When Joseph came to them in the morning and observed them, behold, they were dejected. He asked Pharaoh's officials who were with him in confinement in his master's house, ‘Why are your faces so sad today?’” In itself, this is actually quite an amazing thing. Why? Because if I were in Joseph's shoes, and I was suffering and in prison, and two other men in prison with me happened to look dejected in the morning, do you know how I would have probably responded? *“Who cares? I'm pretty sad myself; this is a pretty miserable place.”* Isn't it true that it's so hard for us to enter in to the sufferings of others when we're going through sufferings of our own? We tend to just focus on ourselves; feel sorry for ourselves. But that's not what Joseph does. Though he has plenty of suffering himself, he enters in to their sorrows.

Then look at the next verse. When Joseph asks them what's wrong, how do they respond? We read in verse 8, “Then they said to him, ‘We have had a dream and there is no one to interpret it.’” Think about Joseph's own story. Think about his own dreams God had given him in his youth. Really, those dreams were the biggest reason he was sitting in that prison. It was his dreams that started this whole thing. And what's more, it seemed that God had completely failed to do what He had said that He would. So again, if I were Joseph, do you know how I would have responded? *“I don't do dreams anymore, sorry.”* If I'm honest, I probably would have responded with a good bit of cynicism and bitterness. “God, what about *my* dreams?” But again, that's not how Joseph reacts. He says, “Do not interpretations belong to God? Tell it to me, please.” Joseph is faithful in the moment God gives him with these two men over breakfast. We might think: “Yeah, but God ended up doing some pretty amazing things for Joseph.” But here's the thing: Joseph didn't know that. *We* know the end of his story—but *he* didn't. He didn't know what was going to happen in Genesis 41 while he was living in Genesis 40. He didn't have that luxury. Joseph had to trust in the Lord for what he couldn't see with his eyes (just like we do). How was he able to do this? Because Joseph knew that *God's job* was to do what He had promised; and *his job* was to trust in Him.

There was once a sports-radio talk-show host who was expressing frustration at the fans who had voiced disagreement over a decision the coaches had made. This is what he said: *“You be fans, let [the coaches] be [coaches]. You're all for [coaches] making decisions until their decisions don't mesh with your own. . . Let the [coaches] be [coaches], when they do well, you scream really loud. That's your job. . .”* Joseph knew what his job was. He knew that *God's job* was to do what He said; and *his job* was simply to trust in Him. It's the same thing for us, friends. I don't know what you're going through right now, but here's what we all need to remember: God knows what He's doing. So, you let God do his job; and you do yours.

It must have seemed to Joseph like his life was completely spinning out of control. And it must have all seemed so meaningless: “Lord, what is going on? Lord, what in the world are You doing?” But the fact is, God *did* have a purpose behind all of it (a pretty amazing one). Think about it: If Joseph's brothers had never sold him into slavery, he would never have ended up in Egypt. Had Joseph never ended up in Egypt, he would never have gone to Potiphar's house. Had he never gone to Potiphar's house, he would never have ended up in prison. Had he never ended up in prison, he would never have been there to interpret those dreams. Had he never been there to interpret those dreams, he would never have stood before Pharaoh. Had he never stood before Pharaoh, there would have been no one to announce the warning about the famine. Had no one been there to warn them about the famine, Joseph's family and all of Egypt would have been swept away. So, it all *seemed* so meaningless. But it actually wasn't, was it?

At times we go through seasons of confusion in the Christian life. The way God is dealing with us doesn't make any sense; it doesn't seem to fit together with the promises He's made to us. Sometimes we don't understand what He's doing or why He's letting something happen. Sometimes it feels like our world is spinning out of control. What we need to remember in those times is that *our job is to trust in the Lord.*

C) Joseph the TYPE: Scripture sets forth Joseph as a Hebrew youth who proves faithful to the Lord. But Scripture also sets forth Joseph as *a type of Christ*. Think of it: He was the unique, beloved son of his father. Joseph was special, he was set apart; but his own kinsmen hated him for it, so much so that they sold him into the hands of Gentiles. He was falsely accused; and even though he was innocent, he suffered punishment. For Joseph, there was suffering before glory—there was a *cross* before a *crown*. But after his sufferings, he was highly exalted and given all authority by the King himself over all the land.

Indeed, behind it all, the Lord had a plan; He was weaving it all together for a greater purpose: It was through Joseph's sufferings and exaltation that the whole land would be preserved alive from death.³

Does it sound familiar? This is the story of the Savior. We see the life, death, and resurrection of Christ in the narrative of Joseph: Set apart by the Father, but betrayed by His own kinsmen. Falsely accused, but He uttered no threats in return. He suffered, though He was innocent. But after His sufferings, He was highly exalted, and given the name that is above every name; indeed, all authority has now been given to Him. And it was all for a single purpose: In order to preserve us, His people, alive from death.

Often, when we read through the story of Joseph, we tend to put ourselves in his shoes. This isn't a bad thing in itself. It helps us make sense of our own story as we go through seasons of confusion in our life as Christians. But really, in a lot of ways, we're actually much more like Joseph's *brothers* in this story than we are like Joseph. *Jesus* is like Joseph. We're the ones who rejected Him; we're the ones who caused Him to suffer. We're the ones who sinned against Him; and so we're the ones who come into His presence, bowing at His feet, pleading for His mercy. And the most wonderful part is, when we do this, we receive His forgiveness, just like Joseph's brothers did. Our Savior speaks to us now in the very same way that Joseph spoke to his brothers, when he said to them: "Do not be afraid. . .you meant evil against me, but God meant it for good in order to bring about this present result, to preserve many people alive. So therefore, do not be afraid; I will provide for you and your little ones." (Genesis 50:19-21).

2. The Calling of MOSES: *Exodus 1-3*

A) Moses the MAN: There's a lot that we could think about when it comes to Moses' life. But I think some of the most important lessons for us come from meditating on *Moses' time of preparation in the wilderness*. We're familiar, most of us, with the story: Moses was an Israelite child, but he grew up in Pharaoh's palace. And so, as we're told in the book of Acts: "Moses was educated in *all the learning of the Egyptians*. . ." (7:22); and, not only that, but living in the palace, Moses also would have had at his disposal *all the luxuries and pleasures of the Egyptians*. But even in this kind of environment, Moses never forgot who he was or where he came from. As Hebrews tells us: "Moses, when he had grown up, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to endure ill-treatment with the people of God than to enjoy the passing pleasures of sin. . ." (11:24-25). Well, when he was about forty years old, he went out to visit his people; and he saw an Egyptian beating an Israelite; so he stood up for him and killed the Egyptian. That's when everything changed. Someone saw him do it, and word starts spreading. Pharaoh hears about it and tries to kill Moses. He has to flee; and he ends up fleeing to the

³ Henry Law puts it this way in *The Gospel in Genesis*: "The Scripture before us is precious, because every view of Joseph exhibits Jesus! Who is the envied, and hated, and rejected of his brethren? Who is the sold for pieces of silver; the cast out into Egypt; the numbered with the transgressors; the apparent culprit between two offenders, of whom one is exalted, the other perishes? Who is raised from the prison to the right hand of majesty? In all these outlines, is not Jesus seen? He it is on whose shoulder the government is laid. He it is, who rescues His kindred from perishing. He it is, whose heart yearned over them, when they knew Him not. He it is, to whom the perishing must flee. He it is, who has the key of all supplies. The name is Joseph. The true image is Jesus." (*The Storehouses Opened*). Focusing on the two men with Joseph in prison and their two distinct outcomes, Law also says this: "But in the Egyptian dungeon we see more than a resemblance of the blameless Jesus bearing blame. Transactions are transacted there, which help to unclasp the records of the empire of grace. There are *two offenders* of no common note by Joseph's side. Human judgment looks in vain for difference between them. They are similar in outward calling—involved in like displeasure and degradation—expecting like ignominious end. But soon they are parted. One mounts the path of favor, and is crowned with honors—the other is left in bonds to die. Such is the relation. . .Behold the fulfillment. He is uplifted between two malefactors. . .We take our station at Calvary. The accursed trees are upraised. The three are transfixed thereon. Jesus hangs in the midst. (*Numbered with the Transgressors*). And Jonathan Edwards says: "This salvation of the house of Israel, by the hand of Joseph, was upon some accounts very much a resemblance of the salvation of Christ. The children of Israel were saved by Joseph their kinsman and brother, from perishing by famine; as he that saves the souls of the spiritual Israel from spiritual famine is their near kinsman, and one that is not ashamed to call them brethren. Joseph was a brother they had hated, sold, and as it were killed; for they had designed to kill him. So Christ is one that we naturally hate, and by our wicked lives, have sold for the vain things of the world, and by our sins have slain. Joseph was first in a state of humiliation; he was a servant, as Christ appeared in the form of a servant; and then was cast into a dungeon, as Christ descended into the grave. When he rose out of the dungeon, he was in a state of great exaltation, at the king's right hand as his deputy, to reign over all his kingdom, to provide food, to preserve life; and being in this state of exaltation, he dispenses food to his brethren, and so gives them life. So Christ was exalted at God's right hand to be a Prince and Savior to his brethren, received gifts for men, even for the rebellious, them that had hated and sold him." (*The History of Redemption, Works, VI, p545*. For more see also Edwards' *Types of the Messiah*, in his Works, pp651-53).

land of Midian, where he meets a man who has seven daughters. Well, Moses ends up marrying one of them, and for the next forty years, his vocation is to shepherd the sheep of his father-in-law (Exodus 3:1).

Just like with Joseph, *this must have been incredibly confusing* for Moses. The Lord had put him in this amazing position of power and authority; he had been properly trained; he felt God's inward call to this great task before him. Now, the stage was set. This was the *perfect moment*. But God lets the "perfect moment" pass. Instead of delivering God's people, he's completely driven away; he loses everything and ends up living in some random place shepherding sheep for the next forty years. We can almost hear him crying out in the wilderness: "Lord, why?? This doesn't make any sense!" And not only would this have been confusing for Moses—it was *incredibly humbling*. He went from living in a palace to living in the wilderness; from leading an entire nation to leading a small flock of sheep (and remember, the sheep weren't even his—they belonged to his father-in-law). Years later, David would go from being a shepherd to reigning as king. But for Moses, it's like he's going backwards. He left behind a life of significance and he entered into a life of obscurity; he went from being known and respected to being a nobody. And it's also noteworthy that in Genesis 46:34, we're told that, "every shepherd is loathsome to the Egyptians." In other words: Moses is now doing the very thing that all his Egyptian colleagues used to despise; Moses is now engaged in the one line of work that even the common people looked down upon. We might think of Moses as going from being in *Congress* to working at *McDonalds*. This was truly a humbling thing.

There are searching questions for all of us here: Most of us dream of serving Jesus in the context of a large and fruitful ministry. That's not bad, necessarily, but here's the question: Are you willing to die to your dreams of Christian ministry? It would feel great to be the pastor of a large church where everything is flourishing; or a successful church-planter where you're baptizing new believers almost every week. But what if that's not what the Lord wants? Could you die to a life of "greatness for Jesus"? Is *Christ plus nothing* really, truly enough for you? Are you willing to serve the Savior in the midst of the wilderness?

The story of Moses is similar to the story of Joseph in that both men were wronged. Joseph was wronged by his brothers. But it seems that *Moses was wronged too*. When he went out among the people, one of them accused him, saying: "Who made you a prince or a judge over us? Are you intending to kill me as you killed the Egyptian?" (2:14). It was because of this comment that Moses had to flee. And when Acts 7:25 summarizes for us what happened back in Egypt, it tells us that Moses "supposed that his brethren understood that God was granting them deliverance through him, but they did not understand." So, it seems he was wronged. But *Moses also had plenty of wrong of his own*. It was wrong of him to kill the Egyptian. And so, as Moses spent those forty long years in the wilderness, I wonder how often he turned these events over in his mind. Maybe he struggled with anger against those who made known what he had done. Maybe he was tempted to think these people had messed up God's plan and ruined his life. Or, on the other hand, maybe Moses was angry at himself for taking vengeance on that Egyptian. Maybe he thought he was the one who had messed everything up and ruined God's plan. Maybe he started thinking that this time in the wilderness was God punishing him for his past sins. Or maybe, at the least, he started thinking that though God had forgiven him, he had basically lost out on his chance to be used by God in mighty ways: Had God forgiven his sin? Sure. But now the glory days were dead and gone.

Friends, can you relate to any of this? Moses' story is here to encourage us! Others had wronged Moses, but they could never mess up God's plan. Nothing could ruin God's plan. Actually, every single thing that happened to Moses was part of God's plan from the beginning. None of this happened by accident. Nor was God punishing Moses for his sin. Sometimes when we go through seasons of wilderness, this is what we start thinking. But God was not *punishing Moses for past sin*—He was actually *preparing him for future work*. Moses didn't end up in the wilderness because he had somehow *missed* God's plan; his time in the wilderness was actually just *the next stage* of God's plan. And it was an important stage: God had already *gifted* Moses; and He had *trained and equipped* him; but now, here in the wilderness, the Lord was going to *purify* him; He was going to *refine* him; He was going to empty him and humble him. See, it was because the Lord was going to *use* Moses in extraordinary ways, that He had to first *humble* him in extraordinary ways. Moses had to be broken; this is why God brought him to the desert. But the desert was never the final destination. God wasn't taking him *to* the wilderness, but *through* it. The final goal was to bring him out humbled, refined, fit for use. I don't know what lies Moses was tempted to believe. But despite what he may have thought, the glory days weren't over—they were *still yet to come*.

B) Moses the TYPE: Just like with Joseph, Moses is set forth as a believing man we can deeply relate to—but he's also set forth as a type, or picture, of Christ.⁴ Just like the Savior, Moses was preserved from slaughter at the time of his birth. He was born into a poor family, yet he was the heir of a king; he was born the child of a slave, yet he was free from the slavery of his brothers. But though he came from a palace, he was willing to leave it all in order to come and deliver his people from their bondage. And yet, when he came to his brothers, he was scorned and rejected by them. Even so, he would yet lead God's people to freedom from their captivity. What's more, Moses' ministry was marked by miraculous signs and wonders in order to prove the truth of his message. And he acted as a mediator between God and the people. He also interceded for them when they committed sin. At one point after the people had sinned, Moses even asks God to condemn him instead of them—he offers up his own life in exchange for theirs, when he says: “But now, . . . forgive their sin—and if not, please blot *me* out from Your book which You have written!” (Exodus 32:32). In light of all this, it's no wonder that when Moses prophesied about the coming Savior, he described him in this way: “The Lord your God will raise up for you *a prophet like me* from among you, from your countrymen, you shall listen to him. . . .” (Deuteronomy 18:15ff).⁵

3. The Redemption of ISRAEL: *Exodus 1-14; 20; Leviticus 1-6*

And not only is Moses a type of Christ—but the whole deliverance with which God saves His people from their slavery in Egypt sets forth glorious truths about the redemption we have in and through the Savior:

A) Our NEED for Redemption: God's people were enslaved in Egypt. They had a master, which meant they couldn't just leave. Scripture says it's the same for us before we come to Christ: We are slaves to our sin. Jesus said: “Truly, truly, I say to you, everyone who commits sin is the slave of sin.” (John 8:34).

B) The POWER of Redemption: When Pharaoh wouldn't let the people go, the Lord began to send the plagues, and Scripture describes these plagues as the very *power of God*. The Lord told Pharaoh: “for this reason I have allowed you to remain, *in order to show you My power* and in order to proclaim My name through all the earth.” (Exodus 9:16). It was only in and through the power of God that Pharaoh was ultimately compelled to let the people go. In the same way, Paul refers to the message of the gospel as the very power of God that releases us from the dominion of sin. He declares: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel, *for it is the power of God* for salvation to everyone who believes. . . .” (Romans 1:16).

C) The MOTIVE of Redemption: Why did God save Israel? Was it because they were so wonderful; because they were such an obedient and submissive people? No. In fact, right before God told Moses to stretch out his staff over the Red Sea in order to divide it—and the Egyptians were pursuing them—what was Israel doing? They were saying this to Moses: “Is it because there were no graves in Egypt that you have taken us away to die in the wilderness? . . . Is this not the word that we spoke to you in Egypt, saying, ‘Leave us alone that we may serve the Egyptians?’” (Exodus 14:10-12). Israel was a *stubborn* people. Why did God save them? Psalm 106:8 says: “Nevertheless He saved them *for the sake of His name*. . . .” It's the same with us. God saved us in Christ for “the praise of the glory of His grace” (Ephesians 1:6). Just like with Israel, God didn't save us *because* we were beautiful—but in order *to make us* beautiful.

D) The BASIS of Redemption: God's judgment was coming down upon Egypt. And, in order for Israel to escape that judgment, a lamb had to be slain. If there was no blood on their door-posts, the Israelites would have experienced the same judgement that came upon the Egyptians. God made it clear that He would only “pass over” their houses if He saw the blood on the door. This blood not only saved Israel from God's judgment—but it was in and through the blood of the passover lamb that God set them free

⁴ As Jonathan Edwards notes: “The remarkable agreement between many things in the history of Moses, and the prophecies of the Messiah, argue the former to be a type of the latter.” (*Types of the Messiah, Works*, p653). Arthur Pink in his book, *Gleanings from Exodus*, lists no less than 75 ways in which Moses was a type of Christ. We will look at some specifics below.

⁵ Jonathan Edwards, referencing this prophecy in Deuteronomy 18, writes: “This is a plainer prophecy of Christ than any before. All the preceding prophecies were in figurative, mystical language. The first prophecy was so, that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. The promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that in their seed all the families of the earth should be blessed, were also mystical. . . . The prophecy of Jacob in blessing Judah (Genesis 49:8) is in mystical language; and so is that of Balaam, which speaks of Christ under the figurative expression of a star. But this is a plain prophecy, without being veiled at all in any mystical language.” (*A History of the Word of Redemption, Works*, p549).

from their slavery in Egypt. It's the same with us: It's only in and through Christ, our Passover lamb, that we are both saved from the wrath of God (justification) and set free from our slavery to sin (regeneration).

E) The PURPOSE of Redemption: Exodus also helps us understand that there was a particular purpose for which God saved His people Israel. The Lord told Moses to announce this message to Pharaoh: “Let My people go, *that they may serve Me.*” (Exodus 8:1; 4:23; 7:16; 8:20; 9:1,13; 10:3). This was the purpose for which God saved Israel—He set them free *that they might serve Him.* It's the same for us in Christ. Paul tells us in Romans 7:6 that the reason God set us free from the condemning power of the Law was “so that we [might] serve [Him] in newness of the Spirit. . .” We've been redeemed—but not to live however we please. We've been set free, so that, “being rescued from the hand of our enemies, [we] *might serve Him* without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him all our days.” (Luke 1:74-75).

F) God's PRECEPTS for the Redeemed: What did it look like to serve the Lord? How did God want Israel to serve Him? What was His will for them? What were the commands He wanted them to obey? These are the questions the Lord answered when He gave Israel the Ten Commandments. This was the expression of His will for them. This was the way that the Lord wanted His people, Israel, to serve Him. He redeemed them; and then after He had redeemed them, He gave them His Law in order to show them how He wanted them to live as His people. And it's the same for us. God's Law, as revealed in the Ten Commandments, is a summary of how God wants His redeemed people to live (Matthew 5:17).

G) God's PROVISION for the Redeemed: The Passover lamb had been sacrificed. And God's people had been redeemed. But what they quickly realized as they entered into the wilderness was that they still continued to struggle with sin. God had redeemed them, and had given them His Law. But every day they found themselves breaking the commands God had given them. So, what now? The Lord made provision for their sins through the Levitical sacrifices. Now, the purpose of these sacrifices wasn't for *unbelievers* to have their sins forgiven. Rather, these were sacrifices offered by God's people to receive forgiveness for the sins they continued to commit every day. So actually, these sacrifices weren't about *obtaining* favor with God—but *maintaining* favor with God. The blood of a lamb had saved them at the beginning, at the Passover; but the blood of a lamb was also what kept them saved as they continued to struggle with sin every day. In the same way: Jesus' blood doesn't just *save* us—it's what *keeps* us saved. The cross isn't just what *obtains* favor with God—it's what *maintains* our favor with God. Christ's blood doesn't just *make us right with God*—it's what continues to *keep us right with God* (Hebrews 10:14).

	ISRAEL'S DELIVERANCE FROM EGYPT	OUR DELIVERANCE IN CHRIST
OUR NEED FOR REDEMPTION	Israelites enslaved by Pharaoh (Ex. 1-6)	We are enslaved to our sin (Jn. 8:34)
THE POWER OF REDEMPTION	God's power seen in the plagues (Ex. 7-12)	God's power seen in the gospel (Rom. 1:16)
THE BASIS OF REDEMPTION	The blood of the Passover lamb (Ex. 12)	The atoning death of Christ (1 Cor. 5:7-8)
THE MOTIVES OF REDEMPTION	To show His power (Ex. 9:16)	For His own glory (Eph. 1:5-6)
THE PURPOSE OF REDEMPTION	To serve the One who saved them (Ex. 8:1)	To serve the One who saved us (Lk. 1:74-75)
GOD'S PRECEPTS FOR THE REDEEMED	To teach Israel whom He saved (Ex. 19-24)	To teach those whom He's saved (Ps. 119:4-5)
GOD'S PROVISION FOR THE REDEEMED	The tabernacle sacrifices (Ex. 25-40)	Christ's once for all sacrifice (Heb. 10:10-18)

One writer summarized all the things we've been speaking of in this way: “The central doctrine of the book of Exodus is redemption, but this is not formally expounded, rather is it strikingly illustrated. . .He instructed them, mainly, through His providential dealings and by means of types and symbols. . .The deliverance of Israel from Egypt furnishes a remarkably full and accurate typification of our redemption by Christ. . .Israel in Egypt illustrates the place we were in before Divine grace saved us. . .Pharaoh, who

knew not the Lord, who defied Him, who was the inveterate enemy of God's people, but who at the end was overthrown by God, shadows forth the great adversary, the Devil. The cruel bondage of the enslaved Hebrews pictures the tyrannical dominion of sin over its captives. The groaning of the Israelites under their burdens speaks of the painful exercises of conscience and heart when convicted of our lost condition. The deliverer raised up by God in the person of Moses, points to the greater Deliverer, even our Lord Jesus Christ. The Passover night tells of the security of the believer beneath the sheltering blood of God's Lamb. The Exodus from Egypt announces our deliverance from the yoke of bondage and our judicial separation from the world. The crossing of the Red Sea depicts our union with Christ in His death and resurrection. The journey through the wilderness—its trials and testings, with God's provision to meet every need—represent the experiences of our pilgrim course. The giving of the law to Israel teaches us the obedient submission which we owe to our new Master. [And] The tabernacle with its beautiful fittings and furnishings, shows us the varied excellencies and glories of Christ. . ."⁶

II. An OVERVIEW of the Mosaic Covenant

*The covenant with Israel at Sinai (the Mosaic Covenant) is *the next stage* in the Covenant of Grace:

- I. The Covenant of Works with Adam
- II. The Genesis 3:15 promise of a Redeemer:
 - A) The Noahic Covenant
 - B) The Abrahamic Covenant
 - C) *The Mosaic Covenant*
 - D) The Davidic Covenant
 - E) The New Covenant

*Among all the manifestations of the Covenant of Grace, the Mosaic Covenant is by far the most difficult to understand. There is a ton of controversy and debate surrounding this covenant at Sinai. And this debate doesn't have to do with smaller points—it has to do with *the very essence* of the covenant: *How do we understand the covenant at Sinai?* The debate especially revolves around the question of how God's grace fits together with the Law in the Mosaic Covenant. *How do you reconcile grace and Law?*

*This is an incredibly important question; and we need to be extremely careful here, because there are two different ways we can fall into error. One the one side are *Dispensationalists*, who tell us that though the covenant with Abraham was one of grace, the covenant at Sinai was something completely different. They say that when the Israelites accepted the terms of this covenant, they gave up grace and went back to works righteousness. *They take grace out of the Mosaic Covenant.* But on the other side is what has been called the "*Lordship controversy*"; a debate that started when a few men started teaching that since salvation is by grace alone, we don't need to obey God's Law. Basically, these men were saying that you can accept Christ as Savior without accepting Him as Lord. *They took Law out of the Mosaic Covenant.* In both cases, what's happened? There's been a misunderstanding about how grace and Law fit together.

*Basically, what we're going to see is that the Mosaic Covenant isn't *against* the Covenant of Grace; nor is it something that's even *different* from the Covenant of Grace. It's simply *part of the Covenant of Grace*, just like God's covenants with Noah and Abraham. Sinai is no different; and we're going to see how. But we're also going to see that in the Covenant of Grace, God calls His people to a live a life of obedience.⁷

III. An INTRODUCTION to the Mosaic Covenant

1. The COVENANT of the Law:

The Mosaic Covenant has often been called *the Covenant of Law*. This isn't just because the Law is what tends to characterize the covenant at Sinai, but because in Scripture, God himself associates the covenant that He made at Sinai with the Law. For example, Exodus 34:27-28 says: "Then the Lord said to Moses,

⁶ A.W. Pink, from his commentary, *Gleanings in Exodus*, p9.

⁷ Much of this section gleaned from Ligon Duncan's audio lecture course on *Covenant Theology*.

'Write down these words, for *in accordance with these words I have made a covenant* with you and with Israel.' So he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did not eat bread or drink water. And he wrote on the tablets *the words of the covenant, the Ten Commandments.*" And then again, in Deuteronomy 4:12-13, Moses recounts what had happened at Mount Sinai in this way: "Then the Lord spoke to you from the midst of the fire; you heard the sound of words, but you saw no form—only a voice. So He declared to you *His covenant* which He commanded you to perform, *that is, the Ten Commandments*; and He wrote them on two tablets of stone." And later in Deuteronomy, Moses says: "When I went up to the mountain to receive *the tablets of stone, the tablets of the covenant* which the Lord had made with you, then I remained on the mountain forty days and nights . . . It came about at the end of forty days and nights that the Lord gave me *the two tablets of stone, the tablets of the covenant.*" (9:9,11). What do we see in these passages? Primarily two things: 1) God's covenant at Sinai is intimately connected with God's Law; and, 2) God's Law is especially marked by the Ten Commandments.⁸

2. The NATURE of the Law:

So, the covenant at Sinai is the covenant of Law. But having said that, it's vital for us to not confuse the phrase "covenant of law" with the phrase "covenant of works." These are two very different things. The *Covenant of Works* was the arrangement God made with Adam in the garden before the fall, when He commanded him to not eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The *Covenant of Law* that God made with Israel at Sinai was something very different; indeed, we're going to see that the *Covenant of Law* is actually one of the manifestations of the *Covenant of Grace*. In the Covenant of Works, God entered into a covenant with *sinless* man, and that covenant was based entirely on *perfect obedience* to God's command. But in the Covenant at Sinai, God enters into a covenant with *fallen man*, and that covenant is actually rooted entirely *in the Lord's mercies*. We can see this even in the way that God gave Israel His Law. He doesn't come to them and say: "*If you keep these commandments, I will redeem you from Egypt.*" No, that's not what happened! God redeemed them by His sheer mercy and great power. It was only after He had redeemed them that He gave them commands to keep. This shows us that the Law was never given as a way to enter into a relationship with God. Rather, the Law is given to those who have already been redeemed; who have already entered into a relationship with the Lord by His grace.⁹

	WITH WHOM IT WAS MADE	IN WHAT STATE THEY WERE IN	WHAT IT WAS BASED ON
THE COVENANT OF WORKS	Adam	Sinless Man	Perfect Obedience
THE COVENANT OF LAW	Israel	Fallen Man	God's Mercies

3. The ESSENCE of the Law:

So again: The heart of the Law is the Ten Commandments. But how are we to understand them? In this way: Basically, they are *an external summary of the will of God*. Now, these Ten Commandments have, in a very real sense, been etched *inwardly* on the hearts of all men. This is what Paul is talking about in Romans 2:15, where he speaks of "the work of the Law written in [our] hearts". It was for this reason that the patriarchs had a general sense of God's will, even before the giving of the Law at Sinai. And, at times, God would come to them and give them *outward* instruction as to what His will was for them. God came to Abraham in Genesis 17:1, and said to him: "Walk before Me, and be blameless." But what exactly did this mean? What did this look like in particular? Again, though Abraham knew generally what this meant, since the Law had been written inwardly in his heart, still, God's will was never *fully summarized in outward form* until He wrote it in stone tablets at Sinai. So, with the giving of the Ten Commandments, God gives us not only a summary of His will, but a *full* and *external* summary.¹⁰

⁸ Much of this paragraph gleaned from O Palmer Robertson's audio lectures on the Mosaic Covenant.

⁹ Robertson says: "Not only did the covenant of law not disannul the covenant of promise; more specifically, it did not offer a temporary alternative to the covenant of promise. This particular perspective is often over-looked. It is sometimes assumed that the covenant of law temporarily replaced the covenant of promise, or somehow ran alongside it as an alternative method of man's salvation. The covenant of law often has been considered as a self-contained unit which served as another basis for determining the relation of Israel to God in the period between the Abrahamic covenant and the coming of Christ. In this scheme, the covenant of promise is treated as though it had been set aside or made secondary for a period, although not 'disannulled.'" (*Christ of the Covenants*, p174). Later we'll further clarify the relationship of Sinai to the Covenant of Works.

¹⁰ O Palmer Robertson, *Christ of the Covenants*, p172.

BEFORE THE 10 COMMANDMENTS WERE GIVEN	WITH THE GIVING OF THE 10 COMMANDMENTS
There was a summary of God's will written <i>Inwardly</i>	There is a summary of God's will written <i>Externally</i>
God's will for man was <i>Partially</i> revealed externally	God's will for man is <i>Fully</i> revealed externally

4. The REVELATION of the Law:

A) *The Covenant of Law is related ORGANICALLY to redemptive history:* We mentioned earlier that some people see the covenant at Sinai as something different than the Covenant of Grace. They see the *Abrahamic Covenant* as being rooted in grace; and they see God's dealings with us now in *the new covenant* as being rooted in grace, but the Mosaic Covenant they see as something different. It's almost as though they view the Law of Sinai as a parenthesis in the plan of God: *Before* the Law, God dealt with His people in grace; and *after* the Law God dealt with His people in grace; but that time at Mount Sinai? That was different. You wouldn't want to live in those days. Those were the days of works-righteousness. The reality though, is that there was Law *long before Moses*; and there was also Law *long after Moses*:¹¹

1) *There was Law BEFORE Moses.* We already mentioned God's words to Abraham in Genesis 17:1, where He tells him: "Walk before Me, and be blameless." What do we see here? We see *Law*. The fact is, there wasn't just Law in the Mosaic Covenant; *there was Law in the Abrahamic Covenant*. Law wasn't just limited to Mount Sinai. There was Law well before Mount Sinai. Now again, the Law wasn't summarized extensively in outward form until God wrote it on tablets of stone under Moses. But God's people were no less bound to God's Law before Sinai. Abraham wasn't free to live any way he pleased. Long before Moses, God was calling Abraham to live a holy life. Long before Sinai, there was Law.¹²

2) *There was Law AFTER Moses.* God's Law also continued to function as the rule of obedience for God's covenant people long after Sinai. Even after the Mosaic Covenant had faded into the background, the Law that God had given Moses at Sinai continued to function as the standard for God's people, even during *the Davidic Covenant*. David himself, as he was on his death-bed, called for his son Solomon and charged him with these words: "Keep the charge of the Lord your God, to walk in His ways, to keep His statutes, His commandments, His ordinances, and His testimonies, according to what is written in the Law of Moses, that you may succeed in all that you do and wherever you turn. . ." (2 Kings 2:3). Even in the final chapter of the last book of the Old Testament, Scripture calls us back to the Law. Malachi 4:4 tells us: "Remember the law of Moses My servant, even the statutes and ordinances which I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel." So, the Law continued to be the standard for God's people long *after* Sinai.

BEFORE MOSES	DURING MOSES	AFTER MOSES
<i>There was Grace</i>	There is Law	<i>There is Grace</i>
But there was also Law!	<i>But there is also Grace!</i>	But there is also Law!

Some people might object: Well, that's still the Old Testament. It's different now in the new covenant; everything changed in the New Testament. But did it? Didn't Jesus tell us: "Do not think that I came to abolish the Law or the Prophets. . .?" (Matthew 5:17). Actually, when we read the New Testament, what we see over and over again is the writers of the New Testament continuing to affirm the role of the Ten Commandments for new covenant believers. James 1:22 says: "But prove yourselves [to be] doers of the word, and not merely hearers. . ." What does it look like to be doers of the Word? Paul says, "He who steals must steal no longer. . ." (Ephesians 4:28). He writes, "Do not lie to one another, since you laid aside the old self with its evil practices. . ." (Colossians 3:9); and, "consider the members of your earthly body as dead to immorality. . ." (3:5). John admonishes us: "Little children, keep yourselves from idols." (1 John 5:21, ESV). All of these New Testament commands are rooted in the Ten Commandments. In fact, we can find each and every one of the Ten Commandments repeated in the New Testament letters.

¹¹ Most of the following material was gratefully gleaned from O Palmer Robertson, *Christ of the Covenants*, pp175-78.
¹² See Robertson, *Christ of the Covenants*, pp176-77. We might also think of God's words to Adam in Genesis 3:19; God's words to Noah in Genesis 9:6; and the Lord's original call to Abraham to leave everything and follow Him in Genesis 12:1.

B) The Covenant of Law is related PROGRESSIVELY to redemptive history: In our very first lesson, we learned that each successive stage in the Covenant of Grace builds on the one before. We can think of it this way: The promise God first made to *Adam* in Genesis 3:15 was like the first seed planted in the ground. With *Noah*, that seed became a sprout; with *Abraham*, the sprout became a sapling; and with *Moses*, it grew into a young tree; and then finally, with *David*, it became a full, mature tree. Well, here's the point: The tree didn't stop growing under Moses. The Mosaic Covenant was just like all the other manifestations of the Covenant of Grace: At Sinai, there wasn't *regression*—rather, there was actually real *progression*. Sometimes the covenant at Sinai is almost presented as if it would have actually been better for God's people if they had stayed under the Abrahamic Covenant. But that's simply not true. Scripture teaches us that the Mosaic Covenant was truly an *advancement* beyond everything that had preceded it:¹³

1) In its SCOPE. With Adam, Noah, and Abraham, we saw that in the Covenant of Grace, God is not only dealing with individuals but also with families. Well, here under Moses, God shows us that He is not only going to deal with families—He's going to form an entire nation. At Sinai, we see the scope of God's covenant grace extending *from a family to a nation*. Under Moses, we come to learn that God isn't just calling families to himself—but He's organizing all those families into a single nation, who would be, “a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession. . .” (1 Peter 2:9).

2) In its CONTENT. Before Sinai, God's people didn't have a full or clear knowledge of what God's will really was. They had to piece things together as best as they could. Just think about how much less you would know about God if all you had was the book of Genesis!¹⁴ But now, with this covenant God made at Sinai, we come to learn so much more about *who God is* and *what it is He requires*. We also learn so much more about our need of salvation and God's provision through the pictures and types that the Lord gave Israel at Sinai. Just think about how much the sacrifices of Leviticus 1-6 must have taught them.

3) In its EFFECT. Paul says in Romans 3:20, “through the Law comes the knowledge of sin”; and again, in Romans 7:7, he writes: “I would not have come to know sin except through the Law. . .” The Law teaches us so much more about what God requires, and as it does so, it also shows us just how far short that we really fall. And so, the Law humbles us. This is a hard thing; but it's also a very necessary thing.¹⁵

5. The PURPOSES of the Law:

This brings us to the next point: What we just learned is that the Law serves to expose our sin. Well, what we can add here is that the Law has this effect *because this was the way God intentionally designed it*. In other words, the fact that the Law shows us just how sinful we really are—this isn't just an accidental effect—this was actually one of the reasons God gave us the Law. Scripture teaches that there are *three main purposes* (or *uses*) for which God gave the Law, as it is summarized in the Ten Commandments:¹⁶

A) The FIRST use of the Law: The first use or purpose of the Law is *exposing sin*. The Law shows us what God demands, and it shows us how far short of those demands we truly fall. It exposes our true condition as guilty sinners before God. This is what Paul was referring to in those Scriptures we quoted above, where he tells us that “through the Law comes the knowledge of sin” (Romans 3:20), and “I would not have come to know sin except through the Law. . .” (Romans 7:7). It's also what Paul was speaking of

¹³ For more on the following three sections, see Robertson, *Christ of the Covenants*, pp185-89.

¹⁴ *An illustration here:* I remember one time driving from southern California up to Washington State with my wife and two small daughters. It was early morning, before dawn; and we were now pretty far north; it was the winter and there was snow on the roads. All of a sudden the headlights on our car went out on us. What a scary moment. There was a truck in front of us, and so we followed close behind the truck. If it weren't for the truck we wouldn't have even been able to see the road. Well, it was a bit like that before the Mosaic Covenant. The Abrahamic Covenant was like the truck. It gave enough help; it afforded enough light and direction, but it wasn't much. The inauguration of the Mosaic Covenant was like the soothing light of dawn.

¹⁵ I love how O Palmer Robertson puts it here: “It may be admitted quite readily that the arrival of the full delineation of God's will brought with it problems which had not previously existed. Ask any distraught parent of a modern teenager if he regards the state of teenage as an advancement over infancy. The parent may hesitate to respond immediately as he recalls the multiplication of problems involved in the abrupt arrival of teenaged years. But in the end it cannot be denied that the gangly youth stands much closer to the full realization of manhood than does the infant.” (*Christ of the Covenants*, pp188-89).

¹⁶ The *three uses of the Law* were developed by Calvin in his *Institutes* (2.7.6ff), but Melancthon may have first taught them.

in Galatians 3:24, where he tells us that “the Law has become our tutor to lead us to Christ, so that we may be justified by faith. . .” We might think of the Law like *a mirror*. What does a mirror do? Well, it doesn't make us more aged or overweight than we really are. But it shows us just how aged or overweight we've truly become. In other words: It confront us with reality; it confronts us with our true condition.¹⁷ That's exactly what the Law does. Or, we could think of the Law like *an X-ray or CT scan* for a patient with a chronic disease. It tells us there's something very wrong. Is it a good thing to get back bad results? It is if there's a cure. The Law exposes just how bad our condition is—but it does so to lead us to Christ.

B) The SECOND use of the Law: The second use or purpose of the Law is *instilling fear*. So, while the *first* use of the Law is to show men their true condition; the *second* use of the Law is to confront them with God's judgment. Often, this second use of the Law is spoken of in the context of *civil restraint*. In other words: The threat of the Law's punishment causes men to restrain their vices so they don't act out the sinful desires they would otherwise unleash against others in society. Now, this is *part* of what Calvin originally meant. He tells us that, “this constrained and forced righteousness is necessary for the public community of men”, and that without any threat of punishment, society would completely unravel.¹⁸ But along with this aspect of *civil restraint*, Calvin says that this second use of the Law *also serves to lead men to Christ*.¹⁹ How so? The *first use* of the Law, he says, is for *self-righteous Pharisees*; it shows them their sin so as to drive them to Christ. But the *second use* of the Law is for *unrighteous prodigals*; it confronts them with God's punishment of sin. And so, this fear of God's judgment not only serves to restrain men from acting upon certain sins they would have otherwise committed, but it also *serves to drive them to Christ for safety*, in a similar way to how the avenger of blood served to drive a man-slayer to the city of refuge (see Deuteronomy 19). So then, while the *first use* of the Law drives men to Christ by *exposing their sin*; the *second use* of the Law serves to drive men to Christ by *threatening God's judgement*.²⁰

¹⁷ “The law is like a mirror. In it we contemplate our weakness, then the iniquity arising from this, and finally the curse coming from both—just as a mirror shows us the spots on our face. For when the capacity to follow righteousness fails him, man must be mired in sins. After the sin forthwith comes the curse. Accordingly, the greater the transgression of which the law holds us guilty, the graver the judgment to which it makes us answerable. The apostle's statement is relevant here: ‘Through the law comes knowledge of sin’ (Rom.3:20). . .Related to this are these statements: ‘Law slipped in, to increase the trespass’ (Rom.5:20), and thus it is ‘the dispensation of death’ (2Cor.3:7) that ‘brings wrath’ (Rom.4:15), and slays. . .It remains, then, to the law to arm God's wrath for the sinner's downfall, for of itself the law can only accuse, condemn, and destroy. . .But when we say that, we neither dishonor the law, nor detract at all from its excellence. . .[As Augustine] writes. . .‘The usefulness of the law lies in convicting man of his infirmity and moving him to call upon the remedy of grace which is in Christ.’ . . .Again: ‘The law was given for this purpose: to make you, being great, little; to show that you do not have in yourself the strength to attain righteousness, and for you, thus helpless, unworthy, and destitute, to flee to grace.’” (Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.7.7-9).

¹⁸ We should clarify a few things here: The law Calvin was speaking of wasn't primarily *civil* law; it was *God's Law*. And the punishment that restrains sin wasn't primarily *civil* punishment (IE, jail or the death-penalty), but *divine* punishment. This is clear in Calvin when he says that “by the dread of *divine vengeance* they are restrained at least from outward wantonness. . .” (2.7.10). The vengeance these men fear is not primarily the vengeance of the state, but *divine* vengeance. Having said that, Paul does also say that the state is a minister of God for good and doesn't bear the sword for nothing. So I don't think it's wrong to draw *secondary* applications. But I do believe it's important to recognize that the *primary* application doesn't have to do with breaking civil laws and being subject to civil punishments—but breaking God's Law and being subject to His judgment.

¹⁹ Calvin writes: “What Paul says elsewhere, that ‘the law was for the Jews a tutor unto Christ’ (Gal. 3:24), may be applied to both functions of the law. There are two kinds of men whom the law leads by its tutelage to Christ.” (*Institutes*, 2.7.11).

²⁰ It's this aspect that the Westminster Larger Catechism seems to draw out most clearly. Question 96 asks, “*What particular use is there of the moral law to unregenerate men?*” The response reads, “The moral law is of use to unregenerate men, to awaken their consciences to flee from wrath to come, and to drive them to Christ; or, upon their continuance in the estate and way of sin, to leave them inexcusable, and under the curse thereof.” Nicholas Batzig picks up on this truth in his article, *The Third Use of the Law and the Finished Work of Christ*. He says: “Calvin then proceeded to categorize the second use of the Law as that of restraint. . .Here, an interesting historical matter arises. It has been common for scholars to appeal to Calvin's delineation of the second use of the law as referring to civil restraint. However, it is not civil restraint that Calvin seems to be speaking about; rather, Calvin subsumed the second use of the Law under the schoolmaster category—as he had done with the first use. . .the first use of the law is to lead the self-righteous to come off of trusting in his own righteousness and to trust in Christ for righteousness, and the second use of the Law is for the lawless to fear the inevitable outcome of their rebellion and so to flee to Christ for salvation. It is an important distinction that has seldom been observed in treatments on this subject. Calvin leaves no question that he believed that the first two uses of the law were ‘schoolmaster’ to bring legalist and lawless to saving faith in Christ. He introduced the second use by saying ‘there are two classes of persons, whom by its training it leads to Christ.’” (www.feedingonchrist.com/the-third-use-of-the-law-and-finished-work-of-christ). We agree with Batzig that Calvin isn't speaking of civil restraint *alone*, but civil restraint does seem to be the first aspect he describes. Colquhoun references both aspects in describing how the Law restrains sin: “By its. . .awful threatenings, it serves in some measure to keep [men] in awe, and to fright them from committing many external acts of sin; in which, they otherwise would freely indulge themselves. It is of use, by its terrible denunciations, to curb those, who. . .would rush forward to all manner of sin; and to deter them, through fear of punishment, from many gross enormities. . .It awakens their consciences, to a conviction of their guilt, and to a dread

C) *The THIRD use of the Law*: The first two uses of the Law serve to draw *unbelievers* to Jesus. Again, they do this in different ways: *The first use* is given more for *the self-righteous*, and it draws men to Christ by showing them how sinful they really are. *The second use* of the Law is given more for *prodigal sons*, and it draws men to Christ by threatening God's judgment against sin. The first use is for those who *don't see their sin*; the second use is for those who *don't care about their sin*. The first is for the *legalist*; the second is for the *lawless*. But in both cases, the Law serves to draw sinners to Christ. Well, *the third use* of the Law is *for Christians*. It serves as a rule of life; it tells us what God's will is for us as believers; and it teaches us how to live in such a way that brings glory and honor to our heavenly Father. Psalm 119 is the epitome of the third use of the Law. And Psalm 119:4 tells us: “You have ordained Your precepts, that we should keep them diligently.” Notice what the Psalmist *doesn't* say about the function of the Law here. He doesn't say: “You have ordained your precepts, that we would see we *can't* keep them.” No; he tells us God has given us His precepts “*that we should keep them. . .*” This is the third use of the Law.

The Westminster Larger Catechism, in describing this third use, tells us that the primary purpose of the Law for believers is: “*to show them how much they are bound to Christ for his fulfilling it, and enduring the curse thereof in their stead, and for their good; and thereby to provoke them to more thankfulness, and to express the same in their greater care to conform themselves thereunto as the rule of their obedience.*”²¹ In other words, when we read God's Law as Christians, we don't merely read it as a list of things God commands to do or not to do. When we read the Law, we let God truly search our hearts. We don't just say, “Well, I haven't committed murder or adultery; I guess I'm doing pretty good there.” We let God show us all the ways we've broken His Law with our actions, our words, and our thoughts; in the secret places of our lives and our hearts. We come to God honestly, as those who still struggle deeply with sin. And we let God expose our sin. But as He does, we remember the finished work of Jesus. So, we fully acknowledge the ways we've failed. But then we go back to the cross, and we remember all that Christ has done to redeem us from the curse of the Law. And what happens? We're stirred once again, we're renewed in the gospel. And we close our Bibles and go on our way, seeking to obey the Lord—not out of guilt; but with gladness and joy—seeking to obey Him because of all He has done for us in Jesus.²²

THE THREE DIFFERENT PURPOSES OF THE MORAL LAW

CATEGORY	FUNCTION	WHO IT HELPS	WHY IT'S NEEDED	HOW IT WORKS	EXAMPLE
The 1 st use of the Law	Exposes sin	Self-righteous Pharisees	They don't see their sin	Humbles men & drives them to Christ by exposing their sin	The Law acts like a Mirror or X-ray
The 2 nd use of the Law	Instills fear	Unrighteous Prodigals	They don't care about their sin	Restraints men & drives them to Christ by threatening punishment	The Law acts like a Whip or Cane
The 3 rd use of the Law	Stirs hearts	Recovering Believers	They need to again behold the Savior	Instructs believers & drives them again to Christ's finished work	The Law acts like a Fire-iron/stoker

6. The CATEGORIES of the Law:

Well, up until now, we've been talking about the Moral Law; that is, the Law of God as it is expressed in the Ten Commandments. But historically, the Law has actually been divided up into *three* distinct categories: 1) The Moral Law; but also, 2) The Ceremonial Law; and 3) The Judicial (or Civil) Law.

of everlasting punishment; and so, discovers to them their absolute need of Christ. . .” (*Treatise of Law and Gospel*, pp137-40).

²¹ This is Question #97 of the Westminster Larger Catechism.

²² Nicholas Batzig has a wonderful article on this aspect of the third use of the Law. Referencing WLC #97 quoted above, he says: “Note that the Puritans were insistent that our justification by faith alone in Christ alone is the fundamental first step in understanding the role of the moral Law in the life of the believer. They do not lay aside the implications of that justification. Rather, they root the third use of the Law firmly in the justification we have in Christ. . .the Puritans noted that the moral Law is useful in the life of the regenerate to remind them of the ongoing need they have for the finished work of Christ. It is not only the unbeliever [that] needs to know that Christ has fulfilled the Law for us and has taken the curse of it 'in our place and for our good.' Believers continue to need this to be pressed into their minds and hearts. . .the moral law is useful to believers in that it 'provoke[s] them to more thankfulness, and to express the same in their greater care to conform themselves thereunto as the rule of their obedience.' here an exceedingly important nuance must be observed. The first thing introduced in the moral obligations of the Law in the life of the believer is not the sheer obligatory character, rather it is the heart motivation for obedience. The language of 'thankfulness' is employed. It is not out of 'servile fear' that the believer presses on in obedience. . .It is the 'thankfulness'. . .that [is] the proper [motivation] for the believer to obey God. . .[But] When the Law is divested of the fulfillment it finds in the finished work of Christ it becomes an unbearable burden.” (see link noted above).

A) *The MORAL Law*: The Moral Law is what we have been talking about. It's the eternal summary of God's will for man as it is expressed in the Ten Commandments. One thing we could note here is that of those Ten Commandments, *the first four* deal with our love for God; while *the last six* deal with our love for our neighbor. So, when the Savior was asked what the greatest commandment was, and He replied by first saying that we are to love the Lord our God with all our hearts, mind, soul, and strength; and then He also added that we are to love our neighbor as ourself—He was actually giving us a summary of the Ten Commandments (see Matthew 22:34-40). So again, the Moral Law is summarized for us in the Ten Commandments; it is the eternal expression of God's will for mankind; and thus perpetually binding.

B) *The CEREMONIAL Law*: The Old Testament Ceremonial Laws had to do with *Israel's worship* in the Old Testament church. It included the instructions that God gave Israel about *the tabernacle* and its furnishings (Exodus 25-30; 36-40); instructions that related to *the sacrifices* the Lord had commanded (Leviticus 1-6; 16-17); instructions about *the priesthood* (Leviticus 7-9; 21-22); instructions that related to *clean and unclean foods* (Leviticus 11); instructions about *purification rituals* (Leviticus 12-15); and also instructions in the Law that related to *the yearly feasts* God had appointed (Leviticus 23,25). Now again, all these laws had to do with Israel's worship. They were almost *like an appendix to the first table of the Law* (the first four Commandments); they helped explain what it looked like for Israel to worship God.

C) *The JUDICIAL Law*: The Old Testament Judicial Laws, on the other hand, had to do with *Israel's civil state*. Israel was the people of God, but they had now also become a nation; and, as a nation, they needed laws by which society could properly function and be governed. These were the Judicial Laws. They dealt with perverting justice; domestic concerns; morality (murder, adultery, rape, and divorce); and other various kinds of disputes—even with what to do when you see your neighbor's ox wandering away. So again, these laws had to do with Israel's civil state. And as such, they were almost *like an appendix to the second table of the Law* (the last six Commandments); they helped to further explain and flesh-out what it really looked like to love your neighbor as yourself in that particular time and place and culture.

HOW THE CEREMONIAL AND JUDICIAL LAWS RELATED TO THE MORAL LAW

	THE TWO TABLES OF THE LAW	PRIMARILY DEALS WITH	ITS APPENDIX	INSTRUCTIONS FOR
THE MORAL LAW (10 COMMANDMENTS)	The first 4 Commandments	Worship of God	Ceremonial Laws	Israel's Worship
	The last 6 Commandments	Love for Neighbor	Judicial Laws	Israel's Civil State

Now, the question that arises here is: Are Christians bound to keep the Ceremonial and Judicial Laws as well as the Moral Law? The short answer is “No.” It's only the Moral Law that is perpetually binding. The Ceremonial and Judicial Laws are not. These laws were given to a *particular people* (the Jews) for a *particular time* (before the coming of Christ), and thus, they served a *temporary purpose*. How do we know this? Because Jesus declared all foods to be clean in the gospels (Mark 7:17-19); and because the New Testament letters refer to these kinds of laws as actually being a form of bondage that we've been set free from in the new covenant; a bondage it would be foolish for us to go back to (Galatians 3:23-4:11).

So now, in the new covenant, we've been set free from the bondage of the Ceremonial and Judicial Laws. But does that mean we just throw them out? Cut them out of our Bibles? No, it doesn't mean that. The *Ceremonial Laws* served to point us to Christ in so many different ways: They pointed us to the person of Jesus (in the furnishings of the tabernacle); the atoning work of Jesus (in the sacrifices); the priesthood of Jesus (in the laws for the priests); the sanctifying work of Jesus (in the purification rituals); and the overall redemption of Jesus (in the feasts). So, we don't just cut out the Ceremonial Laws. But what we do is we read them with all the significance they were originally meant to have, because we now have the key that unlocks the depths of their true meaning. So, we read them; and as we do, we see Jesus in them.

What about the Judicial Laws? We don't cut them out either. How do we apply them? Well, if we can think of the *Ceremonial Laws* as being *fulfilled by Christ*, then we can think of the *Judicial Laws* as being *transformed by Christ*. We don't apply them literally; but at the same time, we recognize that these Laws still express permanent principles. For instance, in 1 Corinthians 5:13, Paul quotes from the Judicial Law of the Old Testament when he writes: “Remove the wicked man from among yourselves.” Now, in the original context, this phrase actually meant administering the death penalty for crimes such as disobeying

authority, idolatry, and immorality. What does Paul do? He doesn't apply it literally; but he also doesn't throw it out completely. Rather, he takes the abiding principle and gives it a new application. In the Old Testament, immorality meant the death penalty (Deuteronomy 22:21); but Paul takes that same principle (“Remove the wicked man from among yourselves”) and gives it a new application; namely, the man who committed immorality should come under appropriate church discipline. Paul does the same thing in 1 Corinthians 9:8-14. He quotes from Deuteronomy: “You shall not muzzle the ox while he is threshing” (25:4); and he takes the abiding principle but gives it a new application; namely, “those who proclaim the gospel [should] get their living from the gospel.” (1 Corinthians 9:14). So, what we see is that in the New Testament, these laws aren't just thrown out or done away with. Rather, they take on new application.²³

UNDERSTANDING AND APPLYING THE OLD TESTAMENT JUDICIAL LAWS

PARTICULAR JUDICIAL LAW	PERMANENT PRINCIPLE	OT APPLICATION	NT APPLICATION
“Remove the wicked man from among you” (Deut.22:21)	Immorality among God's people is not to be tolerated	The Death Penalty	Appropriate church discipline for those living in sin (1 Cor. 5:13)
“Do not muzzle an ox while it is threshing” (Deut.25:4)	The thresher ought to thresh in hope of sharing the crops	Applied literally to Farming	Appropriate compensation for ministers of the gospel (1 Cor. 9:9)

THE THREE DIFFERENT KINDS OF OLD TESTAMENT LAW

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION OF LAW	OT FUNCTION	NT ROLE	JESUS AS
MORAL	A summary of God's will as revealed in the 10 Commandments	<i>Summarizes God's will:</i> A general summary of God's will for man	<i>Upheld by Christ</i>	<i>Our Prophet</i>
CEREMONIAL	Laws for things like sacrifices, feasts, cleanliness, and tabernacle regulations	<i>Guides Israel's worship:</i> Provides guidelines for OT church worship	<i>Fulfilled by Christ</i>	<i>Our Priest</i>
JUDICIAL	Laws for things like legal procedures, housing codes, and court sentences	<i>Governs Israel's society:</i> Applies principles of Moral Law to daily life	<i>Transformed by Christ</i>	<i>Our King</i>

7. The USAGE (or Etymology) of the Law:

We've mentioned that the heart of the Law is the Ten Commandments. And we've been talking about the differences between the Moral Law, the Ceremonial Law, and the Judicial Law. But it's going to be important for us to also briefly recognize that this word “Law” can actually be used in a variety of ways:²⁴

A) The Ten Commandments: When Scripture uses the term, “Law”, sometimes it's referring exclusively to the Ten Commandments. For example, in Romans 7:7, Paul writes: “I would not have come to know sin except through *the Law*; for I would not have known about coveting if *the Law* had not said, ‘You shall not covet.’” Paul is recalling here the 10th Commandment; so here, “Law” refers to the Decalogue.

B) The Pentateuch: Other times, when Scripture uses the term, “Law”, it's referring to the entire first five books of Moses (Genesis to Deuteronomy). For example, in Luke 24:44, Jesus explains to His disciples: “all things which are written about Me in *the Law of Moses* and the Prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled.” And in Romans 3:21, Paul tells us that the righteousness that comes through faith in Jesus was previously “witnessed by *the Law* and the Prophets. . .” So then, here “Law” refers to the Pentateuch.²⁵

²³ This is also true of the Ceremonial Laws. As Poythress explains: “Consider the laws that prohibit Israelites from touching unclean things and eating unclean foods. Such laws are generally classified as ceremonial because Christians are not bound to observe them literally (see Col. 2:20-21; 1 Tim. 4:3-5; Mk. 7:19). *Nevertheless, these laws still express permanent principles.* ‘Touch no unclean thing’ is quoted by Paul as a backing for his injunction not to be yoked together with unbelievers (2 Cor. 6:14, 17), because it embodies the general principle of separation from moral disorder. The dietary laws also express the general truth that God has created all orders of living things, that this order also has been corruption through the fall (see Gen. 3:17-18), that this order is redemptively restored through the renewal of the word of God, and that God's priests are to be radically separated from the corruptions of the fall. . . Hence, though the exact for of observance of the food laws has changed, they express a multitude of permanent principles. . . Thus it seems wisest to me not to draw a sharp distinction between ceremonial and moral law, but to study all of the law most carefully in the endeavor to appreciate its depth, the richness of its connections, and the unity of its purposes in foreshadowing Christ.” (see *Shadow of Christ in the Law of Moses*, pp102-103).

²⁴ Much of this section was gleaned from Robertson (*Christ of the Covenants*, pp179-80) and Colquhoun (*Treatise*, pp4-5).

²⁵ In this passage in Romans 3:21, “Law” is actually used in two very different ways. What does Paul mean when he begins the verse by saying: “But now *apart from the Law* the righteousness of God has been manifested. . .”? We'll get to that later.

C) *The Old Testament*: Still, at other times, when Scripture uses the term, “Law”, it’s actually referring to the entire Old Testament. This is how the Savior seems to be using it in John 8:34, where He asks the Jews: “Has it not been written *in your Law*, I said, you are gods’?” What Jesus is actually teaching here is another matter, but He’s quoting the Psalms (82:6). So, “Law” here refers to the entire Old Testament.

D) *A Works-Righteousness*: Sometimes, the term “Law” is used as a short-hand version for “trusting in the works of the Law” to make you right with God. For instance, in Galatians 4:21, Paul asks his hearers: “Tell me, you who want to be *under law*, do you not listen to the law?” Here, Paul isn’t speaking about the Ten Commandments in a general sense—but about trusting in the Law as a means of justification.

E) *The Gospel*: Finally, there are times in Scripture when the term, “Law” is actually used to refer to the gospel! For instance, in Isaiah 2:3, there is a beautiful prophecy of the last days: “And many peoples will come and say, ‘Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; that He may teach us concerning His ways and that we may walk in His paths.’ For *the law* will go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.” So here, “law” seems to actually refer to the gospel.

IV. An Introduction to the Four Views of Sinai

Now, one of the biggest areas of debate in the study of Covenant Theology revolves around the question of how we are to understand the Mosaic Covenant. In fact, there’s not only great debate relating to the Mosaic Covenant, there’s also a good amount of confusion. At least one early Reformed theologian, Edmund Calamy, in attempting to categorize the various positions on the Mosaic Covenant, seems to have himself actually misunderstood some of the views represented.²⁶ This shows “that even a member of the Westminster Assembly could hear and read his contemporaries on the topic of the covenants, with particular reference to Sinai, and not necessarily provide an altogether accurate or clear taxonomy of their respective positions.”²⁷ It’s no wonder that Anthony Burgess, another member of the Westminster Assembly, made the observation that he did “not find in any point of Divinity, learned men so confused and perplexed” as on the relationship between the Mosaic Covenant and the Covenant of Grace!²⁸

The song goes, “How do you solve a problem like Maria?” Well, we could write another musical, “How do you solve a problem like Moses?” How are we to understand the Mosaic Covenant? Is this covenant that God makes with Israel under Moses part of the Covenant of Grace? Or is it more like another Covenant of Works? Or is it both? Or neither? How are we to understand the Mosaic Covenant?

Generally, we could say that there are four major views of the Mosaic Covenant.²⁹ Francis Roberts

²⁶ Noted in Beeke, *A Puritan Theology*. See Edmund Calamy: *Two Solemn Covenants Made Between God and Man*.

²⁷ Quoted from Beeke, *A Puritan Theology*. So it shouldn’t surprise us that there continues to be a great amount of confusion. If members of the Westminster Assembly found themselves baffled in categorizing the specific views of the Mosaic Covenant as they interacted with *primary* sources, how much more baffled are we bound to be now as we interact with *secondary* sources, many of whom in turn misunderstand the primary sources they are seeking to represent.

²⁸ Quote is from Beeke. The full quote from Burgess has a bit more color to it: “I do not find in any point of divinity, learned men so confused and perplexed (being like Abraham’s ram, hung in a bush of briars and brambles by the head) as here.” (*A Vindication of the Moral Law*, p229). He wasn’t alone; other theologians had very similar things to say. Jonathan Edwards says, “There is perhaps no part of divinity attended with so much intricacy, and wherein orthodox divines do so much differ as stating the precise agreement and difference between the two dispensations of Moses and Christ.” (*Works*, VI, p160). John Ball says, “here at first we meet with great difficulty, how, and whether at all the Covenant of Grace, was manifested by Moses.” (*A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace*, p95). John Owen says, “this is a subject wrapped up in much obscurity, and attended with many difficulties.” (*Hebrews*, p60). Francis Roberts, in commencing the subject, begins with, “This particular is involved in much difficulty. . . One compares it to the land of Canaan. . . there are many giants, many great objections in the way. And as Abraham’s ram was entangled in the thicket by the head; so very many and learned writers are much entangled and perplexed in their notions and expressions about the nature of this Sinai Covenant, wherein they not only dissent oft-times from one another, but sometimes from themselves so far, that it is hard to discover their sense and meaning.” (p738).

²⁹ We say generally because most (perhaps all) of these views in turn also represent several distinct various sub-views (which we have also tried to describe to some degree). *Some have condensed the different opinions on the Mosaic Covenant into just two categories*: those who see the Mosaic Covenant as being part of the Covenant of Grace and those who see it as something totally separate. This basically entails singling out the Dichotomist View as the one view that sees a fundamental unity, and lumping all the other views together. But this creates confusion and isn’t precise enough to do justice to the various views represented. *On the other extreme, others have expanded the differing views of the Mosaic Covenant (in the Reformed*

summarizes them in this way: 1) “that the Law on Mount Sinai was given as a Covenant of Works, not of Grace; 2) That it was a mixed Covenant, partly of Works, partly of Grace; 3) That it was not purely and properly either a covenant of nature or of grace, but a covenant subservient to the Covenant of Grace, and preparing thereunto; [and,] 4) That it was a Covenant of Grace for substance, though propounded in an unusual way of terror and servile bondage, suitable to that people, time, and state of the Church under age.”³⁰ To chart these descriptions out a bit, we could think of these four views in the following way:

SUMMARY OF THE TRADITIONAL INTERPRETATIONS OF THE MOSAIC COVENANT

POSITION	DESCRIPTION OF VIEW	TAXONOMY	SUMMARY	EXAMPLE
Republication View	The Mosaic Covenant is a renewal (or republication) of the Covenant of Works	A Covenant of Works	Sinai is <i>contrary to</i> the Covenant of Grace	Water as it is contrary to oil ³¹
Mixed View	The Mosaic Covenant is a mix of both the Covenant of Works and Covenant of Grace	It was Both/And	Sinai is <i>partly made of</i> the Covenant of Grace	One shirt woven with two fabrics ³²
Subservient View	The Mosaic Covenant is neither part of nor opposed to but serves the Covenant of Grace	It was Neither/Nor	Sinai is <i>different than</i> the Covenant of Grace	The role of a wife to her husband ³³
Majority View	The Mosaic Covenant is simply another manifestation of the Covenant of Grace	A Covenant of Grace	Sinai is <i>part of</i> the Covenant of Grace	An instrument in a symphony ³⁴

Let's take some time to look with a little more depth at these views one by one:³⁵

1. The FIRST View: The Mosaic Covenant was given as a COVENANT OF WORKS

A) Summary of View: According to this view, the Mosaic Covenant was a dispensation of law—not grace. The covenant with Abraham was indeed a covenant of grace, but when Israel came to Sinai, they entered into a very different kind of covenant. Under the gospel of Abraham, the way to life was *simple faith in God's promise*; but now under Moses at Sinai, the way to life is *absolute obedience to God's law*. These two systems are irreconcilable. And since perfect obedience is the requirement of the Law, the Mosaic Covenant must be understood as a renewal (or republication) of the Covenant of Works. Most of those who hold this view affirm that no man was ever saved in any way other than by grace alone through faith alone in Christ. Indeed, the whole purpose of renewing the Covenant of Works was to drive men to

camp) into as many as 14 distinct categories (Brenton Ferry's thesis). Though this is helpful for highlighting the amount of underlying diversity of opinion about Sinai (though I've found personally that I need to take his findings with a grain of salt), I think most of the differences Ferry finds can naturally be classified as sub-views under one of the four main views we have listed here. We arrived at four views primarily because: *first*, the differing views on the Mosaic Covenant have often historically been classified into these four views; and *secondly*, each of these views seems to me distinct enough to merit an entirely separate category. We must acknowledge at the outset that it is not an easy thing to classify the Puritans' views of Sinai! In my personal study of the writings of the Puritans, I have found Patrick Ramsey's words to be extremely helpful: “The difficulty in classifying the various Puritans according to these four categories is that ‘many of them held several of the different views in varying combinations.’ [quoting Ernest Kevan, *The Grace of Law*, p113]. As a result, some divines seemed confused and contradictory. Other divines use the same terminology of the various classifications but in different senses [IE, the word *subservient*]. Moreover, many theologians within the same general category differ on the various details of the Mosaic Covenant [see discussion of the Mixed view]. Nonetheless, if we are careful to make the necessary distinctions, these four classifications are both necessary and useful. After all, the Puritans themselves employed them.” (*In Defense of Moses*, p7).

³⁰ Anthony Burgess employs the same four-fold classification in his *Vindiciae Legis*. He writes, “In expressing this Covenant there is difference among the Learned: some make the Law a Covenant of works, and upon that ground that it is abrogated; others call it a subservient covenant to the covenant of grace, and make it only occasionally, as it were, introduced, to put more luster and splendor upon grace; others call it a mixed covenant of works and grace; but that is hardly to be understood as possible, much less as true. I therefore think that opinion true. . .that the Law given by Moses was a Covenant of grace.” (p213; quoted from Kevan, *The Grace of Law*). See also John Ball in *A Treatise of the Covenant of Grace*, esp. pp92-102.

³¹ IE, as water is contrary to oil, being a completely different substance, so too Sinai was contrary to the Covenant of Grace.

³² IE, as with one shirt woven with two fabrics, Sinai was like one shirt made up of both the Covenant of Works and Grace.

³³ IE, as a wife is different than her husband yet also serves him, Sinai was different than but served the Covenant of Grace.

³⁴ IE, as any instrument adds to the symphony, Sinai was just another instrument in the symphony of the Covenant of Grace.

³⁵ Joel Beeke (following Mark Jones, *Drawn into Controversy*), cites John Owen, who helpfully reminds us that though there were indeed different views about Sinai, the Reformed orthodox agreed on at least the following: 1) “from the giving of the first promise none was ever justified or saved but by the new covenant, and Jesus Christ”; 2) “the Old Testament contains the doctrine of salvation in and through the person and work of Christ”; 3) the old covenant ‘separated from its figurative relation unto the covenant of grace’ could not save”; and 4) “all of the institutions in the old covenant typified Christ.” (ch.17).

Christ. But since this covenant was entirely conditional on Israel's obedience, it is to be understood as a renewal of the original Covenant of Works, and thus stands directly opposed to the Covenant of Grace.³⁶

Those who hold to this view argue that this interpretation is confirmed by all the things Paul says about the Law that stand against the essence of the gospel. They point to how Paul says that while, “the righteous man shall live [IE, be justified] by faith,” the Law operates on the principle, “He who practices them shall live [IE, be justified] by them.” (Galatians 3:12). And again in Romans 10:5, “Moses writes that the man who practices the righteousness which is based on law shall live [IE, be justified] by that righteousness.” Those who adhere to this view ask what else could Paul possibly be saying, but that the Law is a completely different system than the gospel? Whereas the gospel operates on the principle of: *Believe and live*; the Law operates on the principle of: *Obey/Work/Do and live*. Proponents of this view remind us that Paul even describes the Law as a letter that “kills,” (2 Corinthians 3:6), and as “a ministry of death,” (2 Corinthians 3:7). They conclude that the Mosaic Law could not have been part of the Covenant of Grace, but that it must have been given as a renewal of the original Covenant of Works.³⁷

³⁶ William Pemble describes the view this way: “By the covenant of works, we understand what we call in one word, ‘the law,’ namely, that means of bringing man to salvation, which is by perfect obedience unto the will of God. Hereof there are also two several administrations: the first is with Adam before his fall. . . The second administration of this covenant was the renewing thereof with the Israelites at Mount Sinai; where, after the light of nature began to grow darker, and corruption had in time worn out the characters of religion and virtue first graven in man’s heart, God revived the law by a compendious and full declaration of all duties required of man towards God or his neighbor, expressed in the decalogue; according to the tenor of which law God entered into covenant with the Israelites, promising to be their God in bestowing upon them all blessings of life and happiness, upon condition that they would be his people, obeying all things that he had commanded; which condition they accepted of, promising an absolute obedience, Ex.19:8, ‘All things which the Lord hath said we will do;’ and also submitting themselves to all punishment in case they disobeyed, saying, ‘Amen’ to the curse of the law, ‘Cursed be every one that confirmeth not all the words of the law. . .’” (From *The Marrow*, pp59-60). After quoting from Pemble, Fisher goes on to describe John Preston, a Mr. Polonus, and a Mr. Walker as adherents of this view. Ernest Kevan tentatively adds Vavasor Powell, Henry Burton (pp114-15) and Richard Sibbes (p127) as those who may have also held this view. Though this view was initially held by a few of the Puritans, it essentially came to characterize the views of Lutherans and Dispensationalists. Anthony Burgess notes of the *Lutheran view*: “It is true, the Lutheran Divines, they do expressly oppose the Calvinists herein, maintaining the Covenant given by *Moses*, to be a Covenant of works, and so directly contrary to the Covenant of grace. Indeed, they acknowledge that the Fathers were justified by Christ, and had the same way of salvation with us; only they make that Covenant of *Moses* to be a superadded thing to the Promise, holding forth a condition of perfect righteousness unto the Jews, that they might be convinced of their own folly in their self-righteousness. But, I think, it is already cleared, that *Moses* his Covenant, was a Covenant of grace.” (Burgess, *Vindiciae Legis*, 251). Owen, though agreeing that most Reformed divines understood the old and new covenants to be varying administrations of one Covenant of Grace, still himself sided with the contrasting view of the Lutherans that affirms “not a twofold administration of the same covenant, but that two covenants substantially distinct.” (cf. Beeke, ch17). Bavinck writes: “In Lutheranism the word ‘testament’ denotes the legalistic covenant established with Israel on Mount Sinai; and in this sense it essentially differs from, is opposed to, and is abolished by the New Testament.” (V3, p209). Richard Muller notes: “This difference between the Lutherans and the Reformed arises out of the dialectical relationship of law and gospel in Lutheranism as opposed to the simple distinction of law and gospel within the one *foedus gratiae* [covenant of grace] held among the Reformed.” (cf. Beeke). Berkhoff likewise notes of the *Dispensational view*: “present day dispensationalists. . .insist on [Sinai] that it was a different covenant, not only in form but in essence. Scofield speaks of it as a legal covenant, a ‘conditional Mosaic covenant of works,’ under which the point of testing was legal obedience as the condition of salvation.” (*Systematic Theology*). Ligon Duncan similarly notes: “for Dispensationalists, the Mosaic Covenant is basically a repetition of the Covenant of Works.” And again, “Classical Dispensationalism puts forth a dichotomy between the Abrahamic Covenant and the Mosaic Covenant. For them the Abrahamic Covenant is a covenant of Grace, but the Mosaic Covenant is a conditional Covenant of Works. . . Dispensationalists view Israel accepting the Mosaic Covenant as a major mistake; they should have said, we don’t want law, we want grace.” See also Fairbairn, *Revelation of Law*, pp158-159.

³⁷ Edward Fisher (*The Marrow of Modern Divinity*) in some places seems to hold this view; namely, that the Mosaic Covenant was a renewal of the original Covenant of Works: “*Evan*: [The 10 Commandments] were delivered to [Israel] as the covenant of works” (p53; cf. 53-65). But if we read him carefully, we discover that he is actually a proponent of the *Mixed View* (dealt with below). His assertion is *not* that the *Mosaic Covenant* was given as a covenant of works—but rather that the *Decalogue*, or 10 Commandments, were given as a covenant of works. Fisher later clearly differentiates his position from the Republication View, writing that after the giving of the Decalogue, “when the Lord had, by means of the covenant of works made with Adam, humbled them, and made them sigh for Christ the promised Seed, *he renewed the promise with them, yea, and the covenant of grace made with Abraham.*” (pp67ff). In other words, according to Fisher, the 10 Commandments were given as a covenant of works, but after the Israelites were laid low for their sin as exposed by the Decalogue; beginning with the book of the covenant (Exodus 20:22-23:33) and the ceremonial laws, God renews with them the Covenant of Grace. This is confirmed by what Fisher says later in *The Marrow*: “the old covenant, in respect of the outward form and manner of sealing, was temporary and changeable; and therefore the types ceased, and only the substance remains firm. . . And their covenant did at first and chiefly promise earthly blessings, and in and under these it did signify and promise all spiritual blessings and salvation; but our covenant promises Christ and his blessings in the first place, and after them earthly blessings. These, and some other circumstantial differences in regard to administration, there were betwixt their way of salvation, or covenant of grace, and ours; which moved the author to the Hebrews, Hebrews 8:8, to call theirs old, and ours new; but, in regard to

B) Synopsis of View: Each of the first three views we are going to examine have this in common: they do not take the Mosaic Covenant to be part of the Covenant of Grace. So, the Scriptures alluded to that seem to represent the Law in a negative way, or in a way that opposes the gospel, these same Scriptures are used in various ways to defend each of the first three views we'll be looking at.³⁸ For that reason, we'll wait until later to look at these Scriptures in detail. But for now, we can say the following about this view:

1) First of all, biblically speaking, the Covenant of Works isn't something that can be repeated: This is something that we talked about a little earlier in the lesson (we also dealt with this in more detail back in Lesson 2).³⁹ Once Adam violated the Covenant of Works, it was shattered in such a way that there's no putting it back together again.⁴⁰ So again, the Covenant of Works isn't something that can be repeated.⁴¹

And even if it was, it would be a very strange thing for God to do: “how absurd is it to imagine, that at the fall of Adam God should lay aside the Covenant of Works, and set up the Covenant of Faith [IE, of Grace] from Adam, till Moses; and at Sinai should again lay aside the Covenant of Faith, and erect the Covenant of Works from Moses, till Christ; and last of all at Christ's coming lay aside once more the Covenant of Works, and take up again the Covenant of Faith, till the end of the world?”⁴² It's *confusing*. And it's *backwards*; it regresses from the plan of redemption God has been carrying out since Genesis 3.

2) Secondly, this view can't account for the elements of grace in the Mosaic Covenant. There's no grace in the Covenant of Works. There's no atonement; there's no forgiveness. Perfect obedience is required; and there's no tender mercies to appeal to if and when you disobey. But that's not what it was like in the Mosaic Covenant. There *was* grace at Sinai. Just one example is in Leviticus 4:35, where we read of the outcome of the sin offering: “Thus the priest shall make *atonement* for him in regard to his sin which he has committed, and he will be *forgiven*.” What do we see? There was atonement and forgiveness of sins at Sinai. And there are passages like this throughout the Mosaic Covenant. Why do we see grace in the Mosaic Covenant? We would say it's because the Mosaic Covenant is part of the Covenant of Grace.

3) Further, this view can't make sense of several other passages of Scripture in the New Testament. Later we'll deal more extensively with the passages quoted above that seem to make the Law contrary to the gospel. But there are other passages that proponents of this view are hard-pressed to interpret according to their paradigm of Sinai. For instance, how do they explain what Jesus meant when He told the Jews, “if you believed Moses, you would believe Me, for he wrote about Me” (John 5:46)? Or how would they interpret what Paul says in 1 Corinthians 10:1-5, that Israel under Moses “all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink, for they were drinking from a spiritual rock which followed them; and the rock was Christ”? Or how can they explain Hebrews 4, where we're told twice that new covenant believers have the same good news [IE, gospel] preached to us that Israel did under Moses (vv2,6)?⁴³

WHAT THE NEW TESTAMENT SAYS ABOUT THE MINISTRY OF MOSES AT SINAI

THE EXPERIENCE UNDER MOSES' MINISTRY	1 Corinthians 10:1-5	CHRIST and the GOSPEL
THE CONTENT OF MOSES' WRITINGS	John 5:46	CHRIST and the GOSPEL
THE ESSENCE OF MOSES' PREACHING	Hebrews 4:2,6	CHRIST and the GOSPEL

substance, they were all one and the very same. . .in these covenants Jesus Christ is the subject matter of both, salvation the fruit of both, and faith the condition of both; therefore, I say, though they be called two, yet they are but one. . .” (pp71-72).

³⁸ Scriptures such as quoted above: Romans 10:5; Galatians 3:10-12; 4:21-27; and 2 Corinthians 3:6-7.

³⁹ Lesson 2; III.5.

⁴⁰ One reason for this is that when Adam violated the Covenant of Works, all of his posterity (including the Israelites under Moses) violated it in and through him. So, all Israel under Moses were already violators of the Covenant of Works. Roberts further explains: “For in the nature and tenor of it, it requires perfect and perpetual personal obedience; which cannot be after obedience is once interrupted by the least failure. Now in Adam's fall all his mere posterity in and with him brake the Covenant of Works; and therefore are forever rendered incapable of any Covenant of Works more.” (p744).

⁴¹ Francis Roberts puts in this way: “After the Covenant of Works was broken by Adam's fall, it cannot be proved that God did at any time after set on foot a covenant of works in the Church of God.” (Roberts, p739). And again: “As virginity once lost, can never be recovered; so the Covenant of works once violated, can never be repaired.” (Francis Roberts, p57).

⁴² Roberts, p744.

⁴³ Jack Collins insightfully comments on Hebrews 4:2: “The author of Hebrews did not doubt whether the OT people had received the gospel; he says in [Hebrews] 4:2 that it came to us just as it did to them. (How different from what we have to say! We usually have to clarify that it came to them just as it did to us!)” (cf. *Recurring Biblical-Theological Issues in OT studies*).

2. The SECOND View: The Mosaic Covenant was given as a MIXED COVENANT

A) Summary of View: This view seeks to do justice to the fact that there seems to be both law and grace in the Mosaic Covenant. The proponents of this view try to reconcile the strict requirements of the Mosaic Covenant with God's gracious dealings towards His people in the Mosaic Covenant by saying that the Mosaic Covenant was actually a mixture of both the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace.

*1) There are actually at least three sub-positions of the Mixed View. The first distinguishes the Covenant of Works from the Covenant of Grace in the Mosaic Covenant by the type of Law that was given. According to this position, the Moral Law (beginning in Exodus 20) contained the Covenant of Works; whereas the Ceremonial Law (beginning in Exodus 24),⁴⁴ contained the Covenant of Grace.⁴⁵ Edward Fisher seems to advocate this view in his book, *The Marrow of Modern Divinity*. He writes: “the moral law being delivered unto them with great terror, and under most dreadful penalties, they did find in themselves an impossibility of keeping it; and so were driven to seek help of a Mediator, even Jesus Christ, of whom Moses was to them a typical mediator; so that the moral law did drive them to the ceremonial law, which was their gospel, and their Christ in a figure; for that the ceremonies did prefigure Christ, direct unto him, and require faith in him, is a thing acknowledged and confessed by all men.”⁴⁶*

⁴⁴ Some holding to this view see the Covenant of Grace as beginning earlier, with Exodus 20:22. See following note.

⁴⁵ Vos (though not adhering to it) describes the Mixed View in this way: “[The Ten Commandments] are regarded as a form of a new covenant of works that God established with Israel. God did not establish it with the intent that by it Israel could earn life, for through sin that had become completely impossible. The aim was to allow them to attempt it in their own strength. In Egypt, they had lost the awareness of their impotence. This awareness had to be revived, and the new covenant of works served that end. They were puffed up as it were with an absurd confidence in themselves and said, “All that the Lord has said we will do.” God then gives them the law. But when they saw the terrifying display of the smoking and burning mountain, of the dark cloud and the lightening, they soon perceived that they could not live by this covenant of works and therefore asked for Moses to be their mediator. In connection with the consciousness of guilt awakened in this way, God renewed with Israel the Abrahamic covenant of grace, as recorded in Exodus 24, to which the Levitical laws also belonged. ‘The Book of the Covenant’ [Exodus 20:22-23:33] was thus the summary of the covenant of grace, not the Decalogue engraved on stone tablets. In the ceremonial laws that were added later, the gospel element was resident.” (Vos, *Reformed Dogmatics*, V2, pp133-34). Thus, in this view, whereas the Moral Law is given as a covenant of works, the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 20:22-23:33) as well as the subsequent Ceremonial Laws outlined in Exodus 24ff are to be understood as the renewing of the Covenant of Grace. It thus seems that proponents of this view may either see the Covenant of Grace as beginning with the book of the law (Exodus 20:22) or with Exodus 24:1. For though Fisher himself (whom Vos may be quoting in his description, on p64 of *The Marrow*), at one point speaks of the Covenant of Grace beginning in Exodus 24 (see below), he also affirms in another place that it was precisely after the giving of the Law in Exodus 20 that the Lord renewed with them the Covenant of Grace: “Thus you see, when the Lord had, by means of the covenant of works made with Adam, humbled them, and made them sigh for Christ the promised Seed, he renewed the promise with them, yea, and the covenant of grace made with Abraham.” (p67). Interestingly, this is the opposite view of Cocceius and his followers, who subscribed to a three-fold understanding of the Covenant of Grace (1. *Before the law*: Adam to Moses; 2. *Under the law*: Moses to Christ; and 3. *After the law*: Christ), and viewed the Moral Law as gracious and the Ceremonial Law as what was burdensome: “Cocceius taught that the Decalogue was a summary of the covenant of grace, made especially applicable to Israel. However, after the establishment of this gracious covenant upon the ten words, when Israel became unfaithful and fell into worship of the golden calf and broke the covenant, then as punishment the legal covenant of ceremonial institutions was established, that is, the covenant of grace as a much more rigorous and harsher administration. The servitude of the law first appears after the worship of the golden calf. And the element of servitude is found in the ceremonial law; that of grace, on the other hand, in the law of the Ten Commandments. . . [Fisher's view] is thus an opposite view from Cocceius and his school.” (Vos, *Reformed Dogmatics*).

⁴⁶ Quote from *The Marrow*, p73. This is Fisher's view and Vos' description of the Mixed View (V2, pp133-34). Fisher writes: “the moral law did teach and show them what they should do, and so what they did not; and this made them go to the ceremonial law; and by that they were taught that Christ had done it for them; the which they believing, were made righteous by faith in him.” (pp73-75). The quotes *in and of themselves* are rich, beautiful and true; we would only disagree with where Fisher takes his conclusions. Fisher in fact does go on to declare that the old covenant at Sinai and the new covenant were indeed “in regard to substance. . . all one and the very same. . . [for] in these covenants Jesus Christ is the subject matter of both, salvation the fruit of both, and faith the condition of both.” (pp71-72). This immediately makes us think of Fisher as indeed a *Dichotomist*, viewing the Mosaic Covenant as in substance nothing different than the Covenant of Grace. But when Fisher declares that “in regard to substance, they were all one and the very same” (p71), it seems he is not speaking of the Mosaic Covenant as a whole (including also the Decalogue), but only of “their way of salvation, or covenant of grace, and ours;” that is, the portion of the mixed dispensation of the Mosaic Covenant that revealed the Covenant of Grace—not, it seems, the entire dispensation as a whole. This is so because it's quite clear reading pp53-65 of *The Marrow* that Fisher views the Decalogue to be given as a renewal of the Covenant of Works: “*Ant:* But whether were the ten commandments, as they were delivered to them on Mount Sinai, the covenant of works, or no? *Evau:* They were delivered to them as the covenant of works.” (p53). And again: “And in Deut. 4:13, Moses, in express terms, calls it a covenant, saying, ‘And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even the ten commandments, and he wrote them upon tables of stone.’”

UNDERSTANDING MIXED VIEW “A” (TYPE OF LAW)

SCRIPTURE	TYPE OF LAW	WHAT IT WAS
Exodus 20:1-17	The <i>Moral Law</i>	The Covenant of Works
Exodus 20:22 and following	The <i>Ceremonial Law</i>	The Covenant of Grace

2) *Other proponents of the Mixed View* have taught that the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace are distinguished in the Mosaic Covenant by *the two separate occasions* on which the Law is given.⁴⁷ *The first giving of the Law*, beginning in Exodus 20, and including both the Moral and Ceremonial laws, was given as a Covenant of Works, in that it came with thunder and lightening and threatenings, and required strict obedience. But even as Moses receives this Law on the mountain, the people break it (Exodus 32). When Moses saw what they had done, and shattered the two tables of the Law, it signified the breach of that Covenant. But *the second giving of the Law*, recorded in Exodus 34, is very different: this time the Law is given in the context of promises of pardon; no more terror or thunderings: “Now the Mediator Moses must prepare the tables, and bring them up to God, who would write therein the same words which were in the former. . . Now the Lord proclaims all his goodness before Moses, Exodus 34 for the support and encouragement of penitent sinners. Now Moses coming down, his face shined so gloriously, that he put a veil upon it to hide the curse of the law from the people. . . Thus [this time] the law was a Covenant of Grace, or subordinate to the Covenant of Grace.”⁴⁸

UNDERSTANDING MIXED VIEW “B” (GIVINGS OF THE LAW)

CATEGORY	SCRIPTURE	WHAT IT INCLUDED	WHAT IT WAS
<i>The 1st Giving</i> of the Law	Exodus 20ff	Both the Moral and Ceremonial Laws	The Covenant of Works
<i>The 2nd Giving</i> of the Law	Exodus 34ff		The Covenant of Grace

3) *Still others who have held to a Mixed View explain things differently* than the first two sub-positions articulated above. Instead of seeing the distinction between the Covenants of Works and Grace in the two separate *types* of the Law (Moral versus Ceremonial), or the two separate *givings* of the Law (Exodus 20 versus Exodus 34), they see the distinction as relating to the two separate *functions of the Law*.⁴⁹ In

Now, this was not the covenant of grace. . .” (p58). Further, when it is asked of Evangelist whether any godly and modern writers agree with him on this point, Fisher cites Mr. Pemble and Mr. Walker, both of whom, as we have referenced under the Republication View, clearly see Sinai as a Covenant of Works. Fisher quotes Walker as saying: “the first part of the covenant, which God made with Israel at Horeb, was nothing else but a renewing of the old covenant of works.” (p60). It was only then, after God had renewed the Covenant of Works with Israel through the Decalogue, and had humbled them, that the Lord “renewed the promises with them, yea, and the covenant of grace made with Abraham.” (p67). When it is asked, “I pray, sir, how doth it appear that the Lord renewed that covenant with them?” Evangelist answers: “It plainly appears in this, that the Lord gave them by Moses the Leviticus laws, and ordained the tabernacle, the ark, and the mercy-seat, which were all types of Christ. . .” (p67). This is also how Fairbairn understands Fisher (see *Revelation*, p156). Thus, it seems Fisher viewed the Mosaic Covenant as *mixed*—the Moral Law given as a Covenant of Works, the Ceremonial as the Covenant of Grace.

⁴⁷ This is the understanding of John Ball and Francis Roberts of the Mixed View (though not the view they adhere to). It’s also how the OPC Report on Republication understands the Mixed View (5.II.B), as they also quote from both Roberts and Ball. Thomas Boston clearly propounds the next sub-position of the Mixed View (the distinction being mainly not in the giving of the Law but in *the function of the Law*), but does also seem to commend this sub-position to some degree in *The Marrow*, pp56-57. For more on this view, see Roberts, pp745-48; who follows Ball, *A Treatise of the Covenant*, pp96-102.

⁴⁸ Roberts, p746. That Moses’ veil served to hide the *true intent* (not the curse) of the Law is more likely (see the *Synopsis*).

⁴⁹ Such as Thomas Boston, who eagerly endorsed Fisher’s book, yet himself distinguishes his view as somewhat separate from Fisher’s in his footnotes in *The Marrow*, saying: “The transaction at Sinai or Horeb (for they are but one mountain) was a mixed dispensation; there was the promise or covenant of grace, and also the law; *the one a covenant to be believed, the other a covenant to be done*, and thus the apostle states the difference betwixt these two, Gal. 3:12. . .” (pp58-59). “[From the preface to the Decalogue] it is evident to me, that the covenant of grace was delivered to the Israelites on Mount Sinai. . . But that the covenant of works was also, for special ends, repeated and delivered to the Israelites on Mount Sinai, I cannot refuse. . . Wherefore I conceive the two covenants to have been both delivered on Mount Sinai to the Israelites. *First, the covenant of grace* made with Abraham, contained in the preface, repeated and promulgate there unto Israel, *to be believed* and embraced by faith, that they might be saved; to which were annexed the ten commandments, given by the Mediator Christ, the head of the covenant, *as a rule of life* to his covenant people. *Secondly, the covenant of works* made with Adam, contained in the same ten commands, delivered with thunderings and lightnings, the measure of which was afterwards cleared by Moses, describing the righteousness of the law and sanction thereof, repeated and promulgate to the Israelites there, *as the original perfect rule of righteousness, to be obeyed*; and yet were they no more bound hereby to seek righteousness by the law

other words, they claim that the Covenant of Works and Covenant of Grace ran side by side in the Mosaic Covenant, much like a rail-road track. The difference didn't have to do with *what kind of Law was commanded*, or with *when the Law was delivered*—but rather with *how the Law functioned*. For *believers*, the Law functioned as a Covenant of Grace: it was given as the Law of Christ, to instruct God's redeemed people. In short, it said: *obey because you now live* (obey *from* life). But for *unbelievers*, the Law functioned as a Covenant of Works: it was given as a law of works, to convict those yet unrepentant of their sin and to drive them to Christ.⁵⁰ In short, it said: *obey in order to live* (obey *for* life).

UNDERSTANDING MIXED VIEW “C” (FUNCTION OF THE LAW)

FOR WHOM	CATEGORY	WHAT IT INCLUDED	WHAT IT WAS
<i>Believers</i>	Both the 1 st and the 2 nd Givings of the Law	Both the Moral and the Ceremonial Laws	The Covenant of Grace
<i>Unbelievers</i>			The Covenant of Works

B) Synopsis of View: There's a lot that's *commendable* about this view.⁵¹ Those who hold this view are believers who are honestly grappling with what the Scriptures teach about Moses and the Law: how is it that Paul can tell the Corinthians that the Law is a ministry of condemnation and death that kills (2 Corinthians 3) on the one hand, and yet write to the same church, teaching that all those who were in the wilderness with Moses “ate the same spiritual food; and drank the same spiritual drink, for they were drinking from a spiritual rock which followed them; and the rock was Christ” (1 Corinthians 10:3-4)? How is it that Scripture tells us in Galatians 3 that “the Law is not of faith” because it operates on a principle contrary to the gospel; namely, *the one who obeys will live*; and yet we read in Hebrews that those with Moses in the wilderness had *the gospel* preached to them?⁹ This isn't an easy thing to figure out. So, it's commendable that those holding this view are grappling with Scripture in an honest way.⁵²

And again, our purpose here is not to give an exhaustive critique. We'll interact with more of the particulars later under View 4. But for now, we could respond to this view by noting the following:

1) First, Scripture always uses the singular tense to refer to the covenant that God made at Mount Sinai. When Scripture speaks of the covenant God made with Israel at Sinai, it always refers to it as *covenant* (not *covenants*); it's always in the singular tense, not the plural: “The Lord our God made a covenant with us at Horeb.” (Deuteronomy 5:2).⁵³ So, the Mosaic Covenant can't be two separate covenants.

than the young man was by our Savior's saying to him, Matt.19:17-18, 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments - Thou shalt do no murder;' etc. The latter was a repetition of the former. . . Thus there is no confounding of the two covenants of grace and works; but the latter was added to the former as subservient unto it, to turn their eyes toward the promise, or covenant of grace. . . Hence it appears that the covenant of grace was, both in itself, and in God's intention, the principal part of the Sinai transaction; nevertheless, the covenant of works was the most conspicuous part of it, and lay most open to the view of the people. . . According to this account of the Sinai transaction, the ten commands there delivered, must come under a twofold notion or consideration; namely, as the law of Christ, and as the law of works. . .” (Notes on *The Marrow*, pp55-56).

⁵⁰ Boston doesn't explicitly say that the Covenant of Grace aspect was *for believers* and the Covenant of Works aspect was *for unbelievers*, but this is implied. He does say that the Covenant of Grace was indeed given “as a rule of life *to his covenant people*” (p56), which one can only assume means believers. And he says in the same place that the Covenant of Works was given “to the Israelites there,” likening the function of this aspect of the Law to Christ's dealings with the rich young ruler, explaining, “yet were they no more bound hereby to seek righteousness by the law than [that young man],” whom we deem yet unbelieving, for which reason our Savior sought to first show him his sin to bring him to repentance. Boston also states on the next page that God “repeated, or gave a new edition of the law, and that, as a Covenant of Works, for their humbling and conviction; and so do his ministers preach the law to unconverted sinners still, that they who 'desire to be under the law may hear what the law says,' Galatians 4:21.” (p57). And John Ball, in describing the Mixed View, says that those who hold this view assert that: “the first [Covenant of Works] is propounded *to all mankind*, this [Covenant of Grace] *to the Church*.” (p96).

⁵¹ Though we have, in accordance with the great majority of early taxonomies, separated the Mixed View from the Majority view, it is quite noteworthy that John Ball—so influential in formulating what the Westminster standards articulate about the relation of the old covenant to the new—actually classifies the Mixed View side by side with (or perhaps under) the Majority View, declaring both views to be acceptable ways of understanding Sinai as being “one in substance and kind, to differ only in degrees” from the Covenant of Grace (pp95-96ff). So, according to Ball, the divines who see the Mosaic Covenant as being one in substance with the Covenant of Grace, solve the evident differences between the old and new covenants *in two distinct ways*: the first way he propounds is the Majority view—but the second is the Mixed view (Version B; see Ball, pp95-96ff).

⁵² Indeed, to not grapple with this biblical tension is to not give due weight to everything the Scriptures teach about the Law.

⁵³ See also Exodus 19:5; 24:7-8; Leviticus 26:9, 15; 25, 44, 45; Deuteronomy 4:13, 23; 5:2-3; 17:2; 29:1, 21, 25; 31:16, 20; Jeremiah 11:3-5; 31:31-32; Hebrews 8:9. See Roberts, p746. Vos also notes this in his *Reformed Dogmatics*.

2) *Secondly, the two-fold time-table (articulated in the first two sub-views) doesn't quite work. First of all, it's not true to say that there was no grace until Exodus 34 (with the second giving of the Law), because:* a) the people were sprinkled with blood in Exodus 24, a type of Christ's sacrifice; and b) the Ceremonial Laws of Exodus 24-31 all foreshadowed gospel mercies that would be fulfilled in Christ. These were all given *before* Moses came down from the mountain and shattered the two tablets.⁵⁴ *Secondly, it's not true to say that there was no grace until Exodus 24 (with the giving of the Ceremonial Laws), because the Ceremonial Laws actually began before Exodus 24.*⁵⁵ *Third, even if it's claimed that the Covenant of Grace began right after the Israelites pled for mercy in Exodus 20:18, it doesn't work to say that the 10 Commandments were given as a Covenant of Works, because:* a) in the preface to the 10 Commandments, God both tells Israel that He is “the Lord *their* God,” (20:2); and recounts how He had redeemed them from Egypt, a picture of our redemption in Christ; and b) even within the 10 Commandments themselves, gospel mercies are promised: the 2nd commandment tells us that God is a God who shows “lovingkindness to thousands” (20:6);⁵⁶ and in Ephesians 6:2, Paul refers back to the promise of the 5th commandment (20:12) as a promise for Christians; that is, a *gospel* promise.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ In Exodus 32:19. Further, in addressing the Mixed View that distinguishes the Covenant of Works from the Covenant of Grace by the two separate occasions in which the Law was given (Exodus 20 versus Exodus 34), we might also point out that *it's not true that Moses' veil served to hide the curse of the Law.* This is how some have understood Moses' veil who take the Covenant of Grace as beginning in Exodus 34. But if we study Paul's words in 2 Corinthians 3, we find that the purpose of Moses' veil was actually *not* to hide the *curse* of the Law. The purpose of his veil was either, 1) to hide *the true intent* of the Law on the one hand, or, 2) to hide *the transient nature* of the Law on the other (v13). The **FIRST** way to interpret this verse takes “what was fading away” as Moses' ministry of Law and “the end” of what was fading away as Christ, who is the true end of the Law (Romans 10:4); making the verse read that *Moses' veil served to hide the true intent or scope of his ministry*, namely, Christ, the end of the Law. So, in this case, Paul says nothing about “veiling the *curse* of the Law from them, which would have been a mercy; but of veiling the *end and scope* of the Law from them, which was a great judgment upon them.” (Roberts, p748). Burgess says: “the carnal Israelites did not behold Christ in the ministry of Moses. . . as the veil upon Moses covered the glory of his face, so the veil of blindness and stupidity, upon the heart of the Jews does hinder them from the glory of the Law, which was Christ.” (*Vindication of the Law*, pp268-69). Pink explains, “Israel was unable to discern the deep significance of the ministry of Moses, the purpose of God behind it, that which all the types and shadows pointed forward to. The 'end' of 2 Corinthians 3:13: is parallel with Romans 10:4. 'For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.'” The **SECOND** way to interpret this verse is to likewise take “what was fading away” as Moses' ministry of Law but “the end” of what was fading away as the transient nature of that ministry; making the verse read that *Moses' veil served to hide the transitory nature of his ministry.* In this case, “the Jews misunderstood the nature of their own economy, regarding as ultimate and permanent what was in fact preparatory and temporary.” (Hodge, *2 Corinthians*). In other words, they failed to understand that the old covenant was fading away in order to make room for the new; that in the fullness of time, the husk of the old covenant would be peeled away in order to extract the true kernel; Christ. Either way, Moses veiling his face was not a good thing for Israel. Either it hid from them *the true scope of the old covenant*, which was Christ and the new covenant (Romans 10:4); or, it hid from them *the transitory nature of the old covenant*, which would make way for Christ and the new covenant. So in either interpretation, Moses' veil served to hide from Israel gospel realities: the veil did not hide from Israel *the curse of the Law*; but rather it hid from them *the mystery of Christ*; functioning, it seems, in a very similar way as did Christ's parables, “*so that while seeing, they may see and not perceive, and while hearing, they may hear and not understand, otherwise they might return and be forgiven.*” (Mark 4:12). For more on Moses' veil, see Ball's extended reasoning, pp98-100.

⁵⁵ Some of the first commands that God gives after the 10 Commands have to do with constructing a proper altar to offer sacrifices of atonement (Exodus 20:24-26; cf. Exodus 23:14-18). *We could also add a few other reasons* here for not seeing the Covenant of Grace as beginning in Exodus 24: *First*, just as we see grace *before* Exodus 24; we also see the legal strictness that many would attribute to a Covenant of Works principle *after* Exodus 24: Moses seems to deal just as strictly with Israel in smashing the two tablets as He does in first giving them the 10 Commandments. Yet, in this view, Moses smashing the two tablets of the Law (in Exodus 32:19) would actually fit into the time-table of the Covenant of Grace, which had begun back in Exodus 24. *Further*, according to the proponents of this view, the whole reason that God gave Israel the Law as a Covenant of Works the first time was that they were so puffed up with pride, thinking they could keep the Law. He gave them the Law therefore to break and humble them of their pride, and only after they were humbled did He renew the Covenant of Grace with them. But if the Covenant of Grace is renewed in Exodus 24, this theory doesn't fit at all, because the people do not only respond in Exodus 19:8 by telling God that they will indeed do all that He commanded them by keeping His Law (and so to humble them, God gives them the Law in Exodus 20); but they also respond in exactly the same way (actually, twice; vv3,7) in Exodus 24. So if the whole point of God giving them the Law as a Covenant of Works in Exodus 20 was to humble them for their arrogant response in Exodus 19, how can we say that God then renewed the Covenant of Grace in Exodus 24 with a now broken and humbled people, when in that very chapter the people respond to God in exactly the same way they did before?

⁵⁶ Lovingkindness is not something that God lavishes out in the Covenant of Works; otherwise work is no longer work.

⁵⁷ Further, the two-fold timetable for the first two sub-views doesn't quite work, because just as there is grace from the very beginning of the Mosaic Covenant, there is also the strictest demand for works until the very end. Remember, both of the first two positions of the Mixed View ultimately make the claim that there was at first a Covenant of Works given to Israel (whether it was limited to the Moral Law of the Decalogue, or up until the second giving of the Law), but after Israel was humbled for their sin, the rest of the Mosaic Covenant falls into the category of a Covenant of Grace. But when Paul quotes verses from the Law to show that the system of the Law (do and live) was a completely contrary system to that of the gospel (believe and live), the verses he quoted were from the end of Leviticus and Deuteronomy. In other words, the strongest Scriptural proof

3) Lastly, it might eliminate a lot of confusion to point out that declaring the requirements of God's Law isn't the same thing as bringing people under a Covenant of Works. Fisher (of Mixed View A) and Boston (of Mixed View C) both quote Jesus' interaction with the rich young ruler to defend their positions.⁵⁸ The man asks what he must do to inherit eternal life, and Jesus responds by quoting from the 10 Commandments. The reason Jesus did this was to expose to this man just how much of a law-breaker he really was, in order to drive him to seek salvation by grace alone. This is, indeed, one of the chief purposes of the Law, to expose our sin—to show us just how sinful we really are. So far, so good. But when Jesus used the Law this way, He wasn't putting anyone under the Covenant of Works. Jesus was exposing the sin of this man, yes; but that's not the same thing as saying that Jesus was putting this man temporarily under the/a Covenant of Works in order to bring him into the Covenant of Grace. Faithful pastors will preach on the 10 Commandments. But when they do so they're not putting their congregations temporarily under the Covenant of Works. They're merely expounding God's Law.⁵⁹

FINAL SUMMARY OF THE 3 SUB-POSITIONS OF THE MIXED VIEW

VIEWS	HOW DISTINGUISHED	THE COVENANT OF WORKS	THE COVENANT OF GRACE
MIXED VIEW A	The <i>Type</i> of Law	The Moral Law	The Ceremonial Law
MIXED VIEW B	The <i>Giving</i> of the Law	The 1 st Giving of the Law	The 2 nd Giving of the Law
MIXED VIEW C	The <i>Function</i> of the Law	Functioned in this way for unbelievers	Functioned in this way for believers

3. The THIRD View: The Mosaic Covenant was given as a SUBSERVIENT COVENANT

A) *Summary of View:* Another way of viewing God's dealings with Israel under Moses is by seeing them through the lens of what has been called a *subservient* covenant. According to this view, the Mosaic Covenant is neither a renewal of the Covenant of Works *nor* a manifestation of the Covenant of Grace. It is argued that when we compare the Mosaic Covenant with both the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace, we find that it is something that seems to be distinct from both of them. The Mosaic Covenant has similarities with both the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace, but there are also, it is said, irreconcilable differences.⁶⁰ The covenant under Moses at Sinai seems to be something

for taking the Law as, at least in part, given as a Covenant of Works, are not grounded in Scriptural quotations from the Moral Law (Mixed View A), nor in any Scripture references coming before Exodus 34 (Mixed View B), but rather from places in Scripture that would have been viewed by proponents of both Mixed Views A and B as being part of the Covenant of Grace. Later we'll deal with these Scriptures at length and how we might understand them; but this is surely a noteworthy observation.⁵⁸ Boston in *The Marrow* (p56); Fisher likewise in *The Marrow* describes God's dealings with Israel at Sinai in this way: "Therefore it was needful that the Lord should deal with them after such a manner to drive them out of themselves, and from all confidence in the works of the law; that so, by faith in Christ, they might obtain righteousness and life. And just so did our Savior also deal with that young expounder of the law, Matthew 19:16, who it seems, was sick of the same disease" (pp64-65). We might add that it wasn't only proponents of the Mixed View that cited the Lord's dealings with the rich young ruler as the pattern and purpose of the Law. Bolton, a proponent of the Subservient view cites the same passage in order to explain his view of the Law's function (p107). And proponents of the Majority View cite the same text as well (cf. Strong, pp28-29).

⁵⁹ Thomas Blake's words are especially helpful in light of Boston's position: "What this [Mosaic] covenant is to any, that it is to all, whether it be of works or of grace; *what it is itself in the tender and terms of it, that is the denomination* [IE, nature] *of it*. This is plain. Mens faith or unbelief, mens obedience or transgression, cannot diversify the nature of that which God does tender; and what God spoke to the people, he spoke to all the people, the same to all, that he spoke to any (Exodus 19:25 with 20:18), *and therefore that is a mistake in some that say, that the Law is doubtless a pure Covenant of Works to some men, but not to all;* [that] it is a Covenant of Works *occasionally and accidentally*. . . [For] The Covenant of Grace and the Covenant of Works are two distinct and opposite species. . . Therefore as an ox can by no occasion or accident, be a horse, or a horse a sheep, or a sheep a lion, or a lion a man, so a Covenant of Grace, can by no occasion or accident be a Covenant of Works; one and the same thing intended for one end, may occasionally and accidentally have another event [IE, effect]. . . *but no occasion or accident can change the nature of any thing, into that which is of a kind opposite to it, and different from it*" (Blake, p213). We must remember though, that Boston was an earlier pioneer and didn't have the luxury of reading carefully constructed taxonomies of Sinai and selecting the one he liked the best—he was a lone soldier on the front lines, doing his best to sort through these issues as best he could. Besides—and this is of note—semantics alone may indeed account for much of the reason we've put him in with the Mixed View rather than the Majority View. This is all the more true of Fisher, who wrote *The Marrow* in 1645, just as many other writings started appearing on the covenants. Especially for Fisher, it could well have been that his terminology simply wasn't as nuanced yet. I love Boston and Fisher and read them both with absolute pleasure.

⁶⁰ *This view holds that the Mosaic Covenant differs from the Covenant of Works in the following ways:* a) the covenant of nature [IE, works] was made with all men, the subservient covenant with the Israelites alone; b) the covenant of nature brings us to Christ, not directly but indirectly. . . But God ordained the subservient for no other end than that man, being convinced

that doesn't quite belong either to the Covenant of Works *or* the Covenant of Grace, and, in the words of Samuel Bolton, “If it be neither a covenant of works, nor a covenant of grace, then must it of necessity be a third kind of covenant. . . Hence it is called a subservient covenant.”⁶¹ It's something distinct from both of them; a third covenant, that is both *subservient to* and *preparatory for* the Covenant of Grace.⁶²

This view is also called the *Trichotomist* view because its proponents have a *three-fold understanding* of God's covenant dealings. According to John Cameron, who is credited with first articulating this view, “there is one covenant of nature [IE, works], one of grace, and one subservient to the covenant of grace (which in Scripture is called the 'old covenant'). . .”⁶³ This contrasts the *Dichotomist* view, which sees God's covenant dealings as simply two-fold: 1) the Covenant of Works and 2) the Covenant of Grace.

According to this view, the *requirement* of the covenant under Moses was essentially the same as that of the Covenant of Works; namely, *Do this and live*: “God required obedience from the Israelites. . . Blessings in the possession of Canaan were promised to obedience, and curses and miseries to those who broke the covenant. . .”⁶⁴ So then, what God required of Israel under Moses was *not* a gospel obedience (the obedience of faith), but *rather* a perfect legal obedience (as with the Covenant of Works). This is significant. In the Covenant of Grace, God requires faith apart from works, but in this covenant God was requiring *works apart from faith*: “Sincere, gospel obedience was not acceptable in this covenant.”⁶⁵

However, this view has a unique understanding of the *promises and threatenings* that God declared to Israel in case of obedience or disobedience. Adherents of the Subservient View argue that the blessings and curses proclaimed at Sinai had nothing to do with the eternal state—they actually referred solely to temporal blessings and curses that Israel would incur in the land of Canaan: “it was temporary, and had respect to Canaan and God's blessing there, if and as Israel obeyed. It had no relation to heaven. . .”⁶⁶

of his weakness and impotency, might fly to Christ; c) the covenant of nature was to be eternal, but this subservient covenant was but temporary; d) the covenant of nature was engraved in the heart, but the other was written on tables of stone; e) the covenant of nature was made with Adam in Paradise, but the subservient covenant at Mount Sinai; f) the covenant of nature had no mediator; the subservient covenant had Moses for a mediator; g) the covenant of nature obliged only to obedience due by the law of nature; the other bound also to ceremonies; h) the one covenant was made with man created and perfect, the other with a part of mankind sinful and fallen (see Bolton, pp95-96; Roberts, p749; Ball, pp93-94). *Further, this view holds that the Mosaic Covenant differs from the Covenant of Grace in the following ways:* a) in this covenant, God merely reproves sin and approves righteousness, but the in the Covenant of Grace, He pardons sin and renews man in righteousness; b) this covenant says “Do this and live” but the Covenant of Grace “Believe and live”; c) this covenant was added after God had established the Covenant of Grace; d) this covenant merely restrains from sin, but the Covenant of Grace inclines the sinner; e) this covenant brings sinners to Christ indirectly, but the Covenant of Grace does so directly; f) this covenant is a symbol of the Jewish church, the Covenant of Grace of the universal Church; g) this covenant's mediator was Moses, the mediator of the Covenant of Grace is Christ; h) this covenant contained the spirit of bondage, the Covenant of Grace the spirit of adoption; i) this covenant was a means to an end, the Covenant of Grace was the end itself; j) this covenant terrified the conscience, the Covenant of Grace comforts it; k) this covenant addressed to sleeping sinners; the Covenant of Grace to awakened sinners; l) this covenant merely shows the way to worship, the Covenant of Grace ushers in worship; m) this covenant contained decrees against us, the Covenant of Grace an easy yoke; n) this covenant was given from Mt. Sinai, the Covenant of Grace from Mt. Zion; o) This covenant excluded Gentiles, the Covenant of Grace includes them; p) This covenant looks to life in Canaan, the Covenant of Grace to life in eternal glory (see Bolton, p97; cf. Roberts, pp749-50 and Ball, pp94-95 who do not hold to view).

⁶¹ *The True Bounds of Christian Freedom*, p99. Samuel Bolton was a main proponent of the Subservient View.

⁶² As we noted earlier, this is in some ways the opposite of the Mixed Covenant View. According to that view, the Mosaic Covenant comprised both the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace (it was *both/and*). Here it is *neither/nor*.

⁶³ Quote from Beeke, *Puritan Theology*. Roberts follows this understanding in his description of this view, dividing it between 1) a covenant of nature [works] with man in innocence; 2) a covenant of grace with man lapsed; and 3) a subservient covenant which is called in Scripture the Old Covenant (p748). This is a separate view than the view of Cocceius, which is also at times referred to as Trichotomist. Vos calls Cocceius' view a trichotomy, describing his 3-fold view in this way: 1) From Adam to Moses: *before the law*; 2) from Moses to Christ: *under the law*; and 3) after Christ: *after the law* (V2, pp132-33). Witsius refers to the same view, also calling it a trichotomy: “*First: Under the Promise* and before the law, which they contend to have been a promise of mere grace and liberty, without any yoke, or burden of an accusing law; *Secondly: Under the law*, where they will have the Old Testament begin; *Thirdly: Under the gospel*, where the New begins.” (V1, p317). The difference is that the Subservient view has a 3-fold understanding of *God's covenant dealings in general*, whereas Cocceius' view has a 3-fold understanding of *the Covenant of Grace in particular*. They are thus both trichotomist (3-fold), but in different respects.

⁶⁴ Samuel Bolton, *True Bounds*, p95.

⁶⁵ Patrick Ramsey, p9. He goes on: “Israel was to obey for the blessings and 'not trust and obey. . .” He quotes Samuel Annesley who says: “their legal covenant neither admitted of faith in the Redeemer, nor repentance of sin. . . But to speak of the legal promises as legal, so they are of temporal good things; and they were made to works, not to faith.” (p9, cf. pp4,10). As Bolton says: “the old covenant runs, 'Do this and live'. . . the new, 'Believe, and thou shalt be saved.’” (*True Bounds*, p97).

⁶⁶ *True Bounds*, p99, cf. also p95.

In other words, God related to His people under Moses differently in spiritual matters than He did in temporal ones. While God dealt with His people Israel according to grace when it came to their eternal salvation, He dealt with them according to their works when it came to their temporal life in the land of promise. Spiritual blessings or curses were based on God's grace, but temporal blessings or curses in Canaan were based on Israel's obedience. Though keeping the Law could never be the basis of Israel's inheriting eternal blessing, it was in fact the sole basis of their maintaining temporal blessing.⁶⁷

UNDERSTANDING THE SUBSERVIENT COVENANT

COVENANT	WHAT WAS REQUIRED	WHAT WAS PROMISED
THE COVENANT OF GRACE	Faith alone apart from works	Eternal and temporal blessings
THE SUBSERVIENT COVENANT	Works alone apart from faith	Only temporal blessings in Canaan

According to this view, the reason the subservient covenant was given to Israel was to make them long for the gospel freedom that would be ushered in with the New Covenant. Because such strict obedience was required of Israel, and because no strength was provided under the Law to meet those requirements, this covenant functioned to expose their sin and their inability to keep God's Law. And indeed, this was its very purpose. As one put it: "God made this Covenant with the people Israel at Mount Sinai, to prepare them unto the faith, and to inflame them with desire of the promise and evangelical covenant (which otherwise had languished in their minds) and to restrain them from sin as with a bridle, till the time that he should send the Spirit of adoption into [their] hearts, and should govern them by the Law of liberty."⁶⁸

⁶⁷ For more, see Ramsey, *In Defense of Moses*, pp3, 6-10. A question arises here: "If retaining temporal blessings in Canaan was contingent on perfect obedience, and Israel in truth began breaking this covenant from the day of its conception, then why was it that they were not immediately cast out of the land?" According to Ramsey, this question was answered by proponents of the Subservient view in two ways: 1) Bolton answered in this way: "When [Israel] had broken [the Subservient Covenant], they were not to think the case hopeless, but had liberty of appeal from the law to the Gospel, from God's justice offended to God's mercy pardoning and covering their sin, as we find the people frequently doing when they implored mercy and pardon for His Name's sake: 'For thy name's sake forgive, and for thy name's sake cover our transgressions'; under which expressions Christ was darkly foreshadowed" (*True Bounds*, p98). 2) John Owen wrote that "God reserved the right not to pour out the full measure of the curses upon Israel until His great end was accomplished." (Ramsey, p9; cf. Owen from his *Works*, 22:84).

⁶⁸ Quote from Roberts, p748; see also Ball, p93; both are describing Bolton, *The True Bounds of Christian Freedom*, p95. It seems necessary here to add a brief *Addendum* about the views of Meredith Kline and his followers: **I. THE KLINIAN VIEW.** A modern hybrid of the Subservient view is the view set forth by Meredith Kline, articulated also by Michael Horton, Mark Karlberg, and others. We'll classify it as the "Klinian" view here. It is a bit tricky to classify since it doesn't fit exactly into any of the classical four positions on the Mosaic Covenant. It is often simply referred to as "Republication," but it does not in fact align much with traditional Republication, most notably since many of its proponents claim that the Mosaic Covenant was indeed also part of the Covenant of Grace, which traditional Republication never affirmed. It could also be confused with the Mixed view, since most proponents affirm that the Mosaic Covenant was, in a real sense, part of the Covenant of Grace, but "in some sense" also a renewal of the Covenant of Works. But Patrick Ramsey in his article, *In Defense of Moses*, argues convincingly that Kline's view coincides most closely with the traditional Subservient view, articulated by John Cameron and Samuel Bolton. In particular, he points out that the traditional Subservient View agrees with the present views of Kline and Karlberg in at least six ways: "1) The way of eternal salvation has been the same throughout the history of redemption, that is, by means of the Covenant of Grace. 2) The blessings and curses of the Mosaic Covenant refer to temporal blessings in the land of Canaan. 3) The Mosaic Covenant is distinct from the Abrahamic and New Covenants. 4) The Mosaic Covenant is distinct from the Covenant of Works and Covenant of Grace. 5) The condition of the Mosaic Covenant is works apart from faith in Christ. 6) The Mosaic Covenant was designed to lead people to Christ by exposing their sin." Most notably, for Kline, the Mosaic Covenant is divided into two distinct spheres, just as it is in the Subservient view: *eternal blessing* was obtained only by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone, but *temporal blessing* in the land was retained by merited legal obedience. Thus, Kline's view closely parallels the Subservient view in its understanding of both: 1) *the NATURE of the Mosaic Covenant* (that it's gracious as it relates to eternal blessings but meritorious as it relates to temporal blessings); and 2) *the REQUIREMENTS of the Mosaic Covenant* (faith for the eternal but works for the temporal). Kline also follows the idea in the Subservient view that the obedience which God required of His people to retain the temporal blessings was a legal obedience (as opposed to gospel obedience: IE, to obey rather than to trust and obey). Though very similar, the Klinian view does also part with the traditional Subservient view in two notable ways: 1) in the Klinian view, *imperfect* legal obedience is acceptable to merit temporal blessings in the land, whereas in the traditional Subservient view *perfect* obedience was necessary; and 2) for Kline, one major reason why God dealt with Israel according to a system of merit was in order to fore-picture the merit Christ would earn on behalf of His people. **II. THE SCRIPTURAL SUPPORT FOR KLINIAN VIEW.** Ramsey summarizes the biblical support given for the Klinian view in the following way: "1) Leviticus 18:5 (see also Ezek. 20:11; Luke 10:28; Rom. 10:5; Gal. 3:12) teaches that the blessings of God are obtained on the basis of obedience (IE, the works-inheritance principle). 2) The Babylonian exile is evidence that Israel was under a works-inheritance principle. 3) 2 Corinthians 3 can only be explained by the works-inheritance principle. 4) Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 26-28 set forth the blessings and curses of the Mosaic Covenant, which indicate that Israel was under a works-

B) Synopsis of View: As we begin a synopsis, let's remember that there have been godly men who have held to this view for commendable reasons.⁶⁹ That isn't to say we believe it's right (or even compatible with the Westminster standards).⁷⁰ But it is to say that we don't have the right to demonize a particular view or those who held to it simply because we don't agree with it.⁷¹ Remember, there were many good men within the Reformed tradition who differed in their views on the Mosaic Covenant. Having said that, we respectfully disagree with those who hold to a Subservient covenant for the following reasons:

1) *First, the idea of the Subservient covenant doesn't fit with Scripture.* It obscures the biblical simplicity of God's dealings with man: that the Lord first entered into a *Covenant of Works* with *man perfect*; but when Adam failed, He entered into *the Covenant of Grace* with *man lapsed*, under which, in turn, each stage in the Covenant of Grace (including Sinai) builds upon the former in perfect unity.⁷² It's also baffling why a covenant besides these two is so necessary. To insist there was a need for a Subservient covenant makes it seem as if there is something inherently defective in the Covenant of Grace.

2) *Secondly, the condition of the Subservient covenant doesn't fit with Scripture.* Several passages of Scripture make it very clear that the obedience God required of Israel was gospel (not legal) obedience. As just one example among many, Moses exhorts the people in Deuteronomy 10:16: "So circumcise your heart, and stiffen your neck no longer." This is *gospel* (not legal) obedience. Further, it can't be true that God gave separate requirements for Israel based on whether the blessings promised were

inheritance principle." (cf. p6). **III. THE HISTORY BEHIND KLINIAN VIEW.** The recent publication entitled *Merit and Moses* has given us a very helpful background to the formulation of the Klinian view. In many ways it was a reaction to the views of Norman Shepherd, who has come to be aligned with the Federal Vision movement. Shepherd took over after John Murray and taught at WTS Philadelphia from 1963-1982. Controversy arose over Shepherd's teaching, and he was dismissed as a result in 1982. In short, Shepherd: 1) rejected the "works" principle of the Covenant of Works, thus denying the essential distinction between the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace as outlined in the Westminster standards; leading to his next distinctive, that he 2) embraced *covenant faithfulness* as the condition God required in every covenant (both the Covenant of Works and Grace), blending the obedience required in the Covenant of Works with the faith required in the Covenant of Grace into a single condition (which, incidentally, was probably a result of confusing the requirement of the covenant head with the requirement of the covenant members), leading to the doctrine that fallen covenant-keeping was the way to inherit eternal life; which in turn, led to his third distinctive, that he 3) denied the imputation of the active obedience of Christ, a doctrine so foundational to the Reformed understanding of justification. Kline overlapped with Shepherd at WTS, and it was in fierce reaction to Shepherd's views, and in earnest desire to preserve the distinctives Shepherd had rejected, that Kline began to formulate a particular view of Scripture that not only preserved a works-merit principle of the Covenant of Works, but further solidified that principle by seeing it reaffirmed and renewed once again at Sinai in the Mosaic Covenant.

⁶⁹ Remember: Samuel Bolton, Jeremiah Burroughs, Thomas Goodwin, and John Owen all held to this view in some degree.

⁷⁰ The question boils down to: *Is the covenant at Sinai simply another administration of the Covenant of Grace?* The Westminster standards answer this question in the affirmative: "There are not therefore two covenants of grace, differing in substance, but one and the same, under various dispensations." (WCF 7:6). But proponents of the Subservient view often answer in the negative, speaking of the covenant at Sinai as something being "different in substance" from the Covenant of Grace. Owen says it was "a distinct covenant, and not a mere administration of the covenant of grace." (Works, 22:17; cited from Ramsey, p11). It's also noteworthy what John Ball had to say. B.B. Warfield wrote of Ball that "no one was probably more highly esteemed as a judicious divine by the fathers of the [Westminster] Assembly" (cf. Ramsey, p12). With that in mind, it's significant what Ball writes of the Subservient view: "by this explication it appears, the Divines of this opinion [IE, the Subservient view], *make the old Covenant differ from the new in substance, and kind, and not in degree of manifestation*, as also did the former [IE, the Republication view]. [Whereas] Most Divines hold the old and new Covenant to be one in substance and kind, to differ only in degrees" (Ball, p95). Even the adherents of the Subservient view themselves made it clear that they don't see Sinai as being one in substance with the Covenant of Grace. Samuel Bolton clearly contrasts his view with the view that sees Sinai as "the same covenant in respect of its nature and design under which we stand under the Gospel. . . [which] differed not in substance from the covenant of grace, but in degree. . . [so that] the new and old covenants. . . are both of them really covenants of grace, only differing in their administrations." (*True Bounds*, pp99-100). For this reason the OPC Report states: "It seems clear that proponents of the subservient covenant view did not view themselves as advocating a version of View 4 outlined below (i.e., that the Mosaic covenant is in substance a covenant of grace with a unique administration). . . Assembly member Samuel Bolton distinguishes the subservient covenant view from the idea that the Mosaic covenant was in substance a covenant of grace. . . Bolton saw the idea that the Mosaic covenant was in substance a covenant of grace (which he elsewhere identifies as the majority view) as categorically and taxonomically distinct from his own." (see Chapter 5, II, C).

⁷¹ Though there were disagreements among the Puritans about the nature of the Mosaic Covenant, the early proponents of these views held respect for one another. In speaking of differing views—views they would go on to critique—the early Puritans often began by referring to them as other views held by "orthodox divines" (Boston) or "the learned" (Burgess). Today some of us are far too quick to brand as heretical views that were actually associated with the early Reformed tradition.

⁷² Roberts puts it this way: "But this opinion setting forth, first the Covenant of Nature with perfect man, then the Covenant of Grace with lapsed man, then the Covenant Subservient as a Covenant of Works, and last of all the Covenant of Grace again in these latter days; obscures the Lord's dispensations which are clear, and disorders them that are orderly, as if the Lord did do, and undo, went backward and forward, in his federal administrations." (*The Mystery and Marrow of Modern Divinity*, p751).

eternal (IE, by faith) or temporal (IE, by merit), because there are passages in the Law that promise *both* eternal *and* temporal blessings and require *the same thing* for obtaining them both.⁷³ Besides, these two principles of grace received (on the one hand) and merit achieved (on the other) are so opposed to one another that Jesus' words seem likewise fitting here: A house divided against itself cannot stand.⁷⁴

3) *Thirdly, the evidence for the Subservient covenant doesn't fit with Scripture.* Some of the classical proofs put forward by Samuel Bolton and others for the Subservient view simply don't hold up to close biblical scrutiny. For example: 1) It's said that God in this Subservient Covenant only *reproves* sin and *approves* righteousness, whereas in the Covenant of Grace He actually *pardons* sin and *renews* man in righteousness. But when we examine Scripture, we find that this simply isn't true. We see God explicitly pardoning sins throughout His dealings with Israel under Moses, both through the provision of the sacrifices, as well as in the declaration of Exodus 34:6-7, that He “forgives iniquity, transgression and sin. . .” Again: 2) It's said that the covenant at Sinai only terrified the conscience while the Covenant of Grace comforts it; but Scripture teaches us that there is both comfort at Sinai as well as terror in the Covenant of Grace. On the one hand, Deuteronomy is full of gospel comforts like 7:6: “For you are a holy people to the Lord your God; the Lord your God has chosen you to be a people for His own possession”, and on the other hand, the teaching of the New Testament (including that of Christ himself) is filled with sober warnings of failing to enter the kingdom of God (Hebrews 6:4-8; 10:26-31; 12:25).⁷⁵

4. The FOURTH View: The Mosaic Covenant was given as part of the COVENANT OF GRACE

Summary of View: The final way of understanding God's dealings with Israel under Moses is that it was simply another manifestation of the Covenant of Grace. This is the way that the majority of the Puritans understood the Mosaic Covenant,⁷⁶ and the view articulated in the Westminster Confession of Faith.⁷⁷

⁷³ See for example Deuteronomy 30:15-20, where both “life” (the eternal) and “prosperity” (the temporal) as well as death (the eternal) and adversity (the temporal) are set before Israel. Notice that there are not separate requirements given to obtain eternal blessings on the one hand (IE, by faith) or temporal blessings on the other (IE, by merit). Rather, God gives Israel the same command; namely, to love Him and walk in His ways and keep His commandments; which would in turn result in *both* eternal blessing (“that you may live...”) *and* temporal blessing (“...and multiply, and that the Lord your God may bless you in the land where you are entering to possess,” v16). Deuteronomy 7:12-16 is even clearer, where Israel's listening and doing what the Lord says results in both 1) the Lord keeping with them His lovingkindness which He swore to their fathers, *as well as* 2) all manner of physical and temporal blessings. So then, at times Scripture binds together *both* the eternal *and* temporal blessings and annexes to them *the very same requirement* (rather than separating them and annexing opposing requirements).

⁷⁴ Scripture at times beckons us to think of our heavenly father by comparing the best of earthly fathers. To have an earthly father who in the same sentence tells his son he loves him no matter what, and yet threatens to throw him out of his house (removing all temporal care) for the slightest mistake, seems not a fitting picture of our heavenly father's care for His children.

⁷⁵ A few more: C) *The covenant at Sinai excluded Gentiles while the Covenant of Grace includes them:* But it's not true to say that the covenant at Sinai excluded Gentiles, for among other passages, Numbers 15:14-16 makes it undeniably clear that believing Gentiles were no less included in the covenant: “There is to be one law and one ordinance for you and for the alien who sojourns with you.” (cf. 15:29; Exodus 12:48-49). D) *This covenant looks to life in Canaan, the Covenant of Grace in eternal glory:* But how can it be explained or proven that Canaan pointed to eternal glory in the Abrahamic Covenant, but only to earthly and temporal things in the Mosaic Covenant? There is great inconsistency here. For more, see Roberts, pp752-53. For more on refuting the view as a whole, see especially Turretin, who deals with this in depth in his *Institutes*, V2, pp262-267. Most notably we could also add to these the same objection we raised in the second critique of the Republication View.

⁷⁶ See Ball, p95; Kevan, p117; Beeke, ch.17.

⁷⁷ The *Republican View* is clearly not in accord with the Westminster Confession, in that the Confession sees the Mosaic Covenant as an administration of the Covenant of Grace (cf. WCF 7.5 below). See the second footnote under Synopsis of the *Subservient View* for why we concluded that this view is not compatible with the Confession. It is debatable whether or not the Mixed View is in line with the Westminster Standards. Ball seemed to think so (see first footnote under synopsis of the Mixed View); more accurately, he seems to classify it as an acceptable sub-view under the Majority View. Ramsey argues in his article, *In Defense of Moses* (pp27-31) that a) Fisher's Mixed renewal view could perhaps comply with the standards, along with b) the view that the the Covenant of Works, though not renewed, was indeed restated at Sinai; and c) the view that the Law as abstracted or strictly taken does indeed in and of itself considered contain the content of the Covenant of Works. We should note that these latter two views I have placed as sub-views under the heading of View 4 (to be addressed in detail later). The OPC Report on Republication found that View 4 is the only view that is aligned with the Westminster Standards: “there are two forms of republication, substantial and administrative. Views 1-3 fall into the designation of substantial, since they place the republication of the Adamic covenant works in the substance of the Mosaic covenant in some fashion (e.g., in terms of its principle or constitutive condition). Whereas, View 4 is seen as administrative. . .” (Chapter 5, I). The Report goes on: “We have seen how views 1-3 outlined above all articulate a form of 'republication.' In spite of their differences, they all have common cause in placing this 'republication' of the Adamic covenant within the substance of the Mosaic covenant. That is why this report refers to them as versions of 'substantial' republication. With views 1 and 3 [same numbering as ours here], this republication composed the sole essence of the covenant. In view 2, it was but part of the essence. View 4 can speak of

According to this view, there are only two covenants revealed in Scripture:⁷⁸ the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace; and the Mosaic Covenant is simply one of the Old Testament manifestations of the Covenant of Grace. Those who adhere to this view recognize that there are differences between the Old Testament manifestations of the Covenant of Grace (the *old covenant*)⁷⁹ and the inauguration of the *new covenant* in Christ—and that these differences are perhaps most pronounced at Sinai⁸⁰—but they are nonetheless to be considered differences in *administration* rather than differences in *substance*.⁸¹ In other words, the difference between Sinai and Calvary isn't one of *essence*—but simply of *external form*; the two are not different in regard to *what they are* (matter) but rather in *how they are set forth* (manner).⁸² In short, the Mosaic Covenant is simply another manifestation of the Covenant of Grace.

V. Evidence that the Mosaic Covenant is part of the Covenant of Grace

1. This view has the greatest biblical support.⁸³ First, Scripture tells us that the ESSENCE of the Mosaic Covenant is the same as the Covenant of Grace: Moses tells Israel in Deuteronomy 7:12, “Then it shall come about, because you listen to these judgments and keep and do them, that *the Lord your God will keep with you His covenant and His lovingkindness which He swore to your forefathers.*” Notice that Moses is *not* saying: If you listen to these judgments, then the Lord will keep with you the covenant He is making today *with you*. Rather, Moses is saying: If you listen to these judgments, the Lord will keep with you the covenant He had made *with the patriarchs*. God *isn't* saying: If you embrace the terms of

the Mosaic covenant containing some form of a republication of the covenant of works. For this reason, this report refers to it as holding to an 'administrative' or 'accidental' republication of the covenant of works in the Mosaic covenant. . .” And again: “In broadest terms, there are really only two basic options in formulating a doctrine of 'republication.' The republication of the covenant of works is either part of the substance of the Mosaic covenant (as is the case with Views 1-3, in varying degrees), or it is simply part of the administration of that covenant (as is the case with some variants of View 4).” (Chapter 5, III). And finally: “The fourth view maintains that the Sinaitic covenant is in substance a covenant of grace. As noted above, this is the position affirmed in our standards.” (OPC Report, Chapter 6, IV). We'll deal more with “administrative republication” later.

⁷⁸ This, of course, isn't taking into consideration the Covenant of Redemption, which is the basis of the Covenant of Grace.

⁷⁹ As Kevan writes: “The adjective 'old' refers to that part of the Covenant of Grace that belonged to the times of the history of Israel (including its Abrahamic and Mosaic forms), and 'new' indicates that part which was promised in Jeremiah and which came to realization in the times of the Gospel. . .The Old Covenant is called old, not in opposition to the Covenant of Grace as made in Genesis, but in opposition to the Covenant of Grace as it is in the Gospel. They are called 'old' and 'new', not because they differed in substance, but on account of their different ways of administration. The Church of Israel and the Church of Christ are both under the same Covenant of Grace in substance. They are distinguished as being first under a legal, then under an evangelical administration. The Old Covenant speaks of Christ to come; the New Covenant of Christ already come.” (pp120-21). *On the Old Covenant*: As with Kevan, we are predominately using the phrase “old covenant” to refer to all the Old Testament manifestations of the Covenant of Grace. This understanding is biblically warranted, since, as we saw in the first Lesson, our English word “Testament” actually comes from the Hebrew word for “Covenant”, so that we can refer to the entire Old Testament Scriptures as “The Old Covenant” as much as we can “The Old Testament.” It's a helpful way to briefly refer to all the Old Testament manifestations of the Covenant of Grace, and it's often been used in this way (as Kevan above). However, we should note that in Hebrews 8, this phrase, “old covenant” is used specifically for the Mosaic Covenant, where it's contrasted with the new covenant. But though it's the Mosaic Covenant in particular that is here contrasted with the new covenant, still, it is the Mosaic Covenant being set forth as the epitome and fulfillment of all the other Old Testament manifestations of the Covenant of Grace. For the same reason, the Mosaic Covenant is also described in that same passage in Hebrews as the “first” covenant (8:7,13; 9:1). Roberts explains: “It's evident, that [Hebrews 8:8] calls that Sinai Covenant the First Covenant, and the New Covenant, the Second. But how can we understand this; seeing the Sinai Covenant was not the First Covenant; God's covenants with Adam, Noah and Abram going before it; nor is the New Covenant the Second after the Sinai Covenant; God's [covenant] with David. . .coming between them? . . .These were tendered to the greatest number of people: The Old Covenant to the whole national church of Israel, the New Covenant to the whole Ecumenical or General church gathered out of all nations in the world Jewish and Gentile. Whereas the covenants with Adam, Noah, Abram, David, were directed but to their particular persons, families and their seed. . .So that. . .these two Covenants may be called the First; and the Second Covenant; because they are the First and Second most illustrious Covenants; although in regard of time, and order of discovery, the old covenant was not precisely the First; nor this New, the Second.” (*Mystery and Marrow*, p1263).

⁸⁰ As Kevan notes: “Because of its rigorous form, the Mosaic Covenant was recognized as occupying a distinctive place of its own”, for, “Although the Mosaic Covenant is not different in species or kind from the Covenant of Grace, it is nevertheless 'distinct.’” (pp122,128). This distinctiveness was perhaps due to its *requirement*, which we'll deal with later in more detail.

⁸¹ WCF 7:5. “This covenant was differently administered in the time of the law, and in the time of the gospel: under the law it was administered by promises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, the paschal lamb, and other types and ordinances delivered to the people of the Jews, all foreshadowing Christ to come. . .” (cf. Roberts, p753,769; Bridge, p48; Vos, V2 #43, etc).

⁸² We'll explain and unpack these differences more in detail later.

⁸³ Most of the following evidences were gleaned from the writings of Puritans such as John Ball (pp102-143); Francis Roberts (pp757-764); Anthony Burgess (pp234-237); and Thomas Blake (pp202-219). Cf. also Colquhoun, *Law and Gospel*, pp54-62.

the Mosaic Covenant, I will give you the blessings of the Mosaic Covenant. Rather, He's saying: If you embrace the terms of the *Mosaic* Covenant, I will give you the blessings of the *Abrahamic* Covenant. This is because the covenant that God was renewing with Israel at Sinai was the same covenant He had made with Abraham. The Mosaic Covenant was simply a continuation of the Abrahamic Covenant. This is all the more explicit in Deuteronomy 29:10-13, where Moses tells Israel, "You stand today. . .that you may enter into the covenant with the Lord your God. . .in order that He may establish you today as His people and that He may be your God, just as He spoke to you *and as He swore to your fathers, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.*"⁸⁴ In other words, what God is doing here at Sinai for Israel under Moses is the very thing He had promised to do in His covenant with Abraham. What God would do *for Israel* in His covenant *with them* was the very same thing that He had promised to do *for the patriarchs* in His covenant *with them*. So then, if the Abrahamic Covenant belongs to the Covenant of Grace, and the Mosaic Covenant is the same in essence, it follows that it must belong to the Covenant of Grace as well.⁸⁵

2. Scripture tells us that the PRIVILEGES of the Mosaic Covenant are the same as the Covenant of Grace. The passage from Deuteronomy 29 quoted above doesn't just teach us about the essence of the Mosaic Covenant, but also about the privileges contained in the Mosaic Covenant. We read again: "You stand today. . .that you may enter into the covenant with the Lord your God. . .*in order that He may establish you today as His people and that He may be your God. . .*" This is God's promise to Israel at Sinai: "I will. . .be your God, and you shall be My people" (Leviticus 26:12). We've shown earlier that this is the very heartbeat of God's promise to His people in the Covenant of Grace.⁸⁶ God further tells Israel in Exodus 19:5-6 that if they will listen to His voice and keep His covenant, "then you shall be My own possession among all the peoples. . .and you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." These are also the same privileges given in the Covenant of Grace, for we read of the very same gospel privileges in 1 Peter 2:9-10, where Peter quotes this same verse, applying it to Gentile believers and telling them: "But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession. . ." Further, God freely bestows the land of Canaan to His people Israel as an inheritance, which He had previously sworn on oath to give to the patriarchs and their descendants. This was also a gospel privilege, since the land of Canaan was a picture of the eternal inheritance God has sworn to freely give to His people in Christ.⁸⁷ So then, all the privileges given at Sinai were truly *gospel* privileges.⁸⁸

3. The CONTEXT of the Mosaic Covenant is the same as the Covenant of Grace: The Lord begins the Ten Commandments by reminding Israel *why* it was that they were to obey the Law they were about to receive: "I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery." (Exodus 20:2).⁸⁹ In Israel's slavery in Egypt they were confronted with their desperate *need* for

⁸⁴ See also Luke 1:54-55, where Mary declares the same truth: "He has given help to Israel His servant, in remembrance of His mercy, as He spoke to our fathers, to Abraham and his descendants forever."

⁸⁵ "This speaks clearly and fully to the point, that by this covenant He would be their God, and they should be His people, as He had sworn to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that is, according to the tenor of His covenant with Abraham, etc. So that this confirms God's former covenant with Abraham, and the same covenant interest betwixt God and Abraham with his seed, and in the same way, as he had sworn to Abraham, etc; therefore these covenants were one and the same for substance." (Roberts, p758). Of Deuteronomy 7:12, Roberts says, "Their keeping of this Sinai-Covenant, has the promise of God's keeping to them, and performing to them his covenant and mercy sworn to their fathers; therefore this Sinai-Covenant, and that covenant made with their fathers, held forth. . .unto them the same mercy, and are, for substance, the same kind of covenant." (p757).

⁸⁶ See also Deuteronomy 29:12-13. As Roberts puts it: "How can the Lord be a covenant-God to sinners; or sinners be a covenant-people to God, but only in Christ by faith? . . .Therefore this evangelical covenant relation betwixt God and Israel. . . proves this covenant to be a covenant of faith." (p759). Ball says, "faith in the promised Messiah. . .is implied in the promise, 'I will be thy God', and commanded in the precept built upon it, 'Thou shalt have me to be thy God.' For God is not the God of Israel, but in and through the Mediator, neither can Israel take God to be their God, but by faith in the Messiah." (p134).

⁸⁷ As Calvin says, "the Lord of old willed that his people direct and elevate their minds to the heavenly heritage; yet, to nourish them better in this hope, he displayed it for them to see and, so to speak, taste, under earthly benefits. But now that the gospel has more plainly and clearly revealed the grace of the future life, the Lord leads our minds to meditate upon it directly, laying aside the lower mode of training that he used with the Israelites. . .[others] teach that the Israelites deemed the possession of the Land of Canaan their highest and ultimate blessedness, and that after the revelation of Christ it typified for us the heavenly inheritance. We contend, on the contrary, that, in the earthly possession they enjoyed, they looked, as in a mirror, upon the future inheritance they believed to have been prepared for them in heaven." (*Institutes*, 2.11.1).

⁸⁸ "these pure gospel-blessings in Christ do necessarily infer a pure gospel-covenant at Sinai promising them" (Roberts p758).

⁸⁹ As John Ball says, "When God then says to Israel, I am your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt; does he not propound himself as their King, Judge, Savior, and Redeemer: Spiritual Redeemer from the bondage of sin and Satan, whereof that temporal deliverance was a type [?] . . .The reason from all this is plain, that Covenant wherein the Lord promises, or proclaims himself to be the God of Israel, is the Covenant of Grace, which God made with Israel." (p105).

redemption; but in their deliverance we behold God's gracious *provision* of redemption. They had been enslaved, but now they were set free through the power of God (Exodus 9:16; Psalm 106:8), having been marked with the blood of the Passover lamb (Exodus 12:22). The Law, then, is only given to Israel in the context of redemption. Israel is not to obey God's Law in order to be set free from their slavery in Egypt—but because they had been set free; they are not to obey God's voice *in order to be redeemed*—but as those who *already had been redeemed*. We see the same pattern throughout the Law. Leviticus 11:45 says, “For I am the Lord who brought you up from the land of Egypt to be your God; thus you shall be holy, for I am holy.” Deuteronomy constantly invokes God's redeeming of Israel from Egypt as the grounds and reason for their obedience.⁹⁰ Over and over again we read in the Law Scriptures such as Deuteronomy 27:9-10, where Moses says to Israel: “This day you have become a people for the Lord your God. You shall therefore obey the Lord your God, and do His commandments. . .” God doesn't give Israel the Law in order that they *might become* His people; He gives them the Law as those who *had become* His people. Isn't this exactly how God calls us to obedience in the Covenant of Grace?⁹¹ Just like Israel, we were enslaved to our sin (John 8:34); but Christ, our Passover lamb was sacrificed; and through faith in Him we are now set free by the power of God (Romans 1:16). Having been set free, God gives us His Law to obey. But like Israel, we do so, *not in order to be redeemed*, but rather because *we've already been redeemed*. So then, Israel was to obey for the same reason we do now in the gospel.

4. The REQUIREMENT of the Mosaic Covenant is the same as the Covenant of Grace: When Jesus was asked what was the greatest commandment, He replied that the whole Law could be condensed into this: “You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might.” Our Savior chose to quote Deuteronomy 6:5, but the Law is full of Scriptures like these. We read in Deuteronomy 10:12, “Now, Israel, what does the Lord your God require from you, but to fear the Lord your God, to walk in all His ways and love Him, and to serve the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. . .?” Deuteronomy 11:18 says, “You shall therefore impress these words of mine on your heart and on your soul.” What we see is that the obedience God required of Israel reached far beyond externals to the very depth of their being. The Law was never fulfilled by merely keeping a set of rules; it always goes beyond actions to the deepest longings of our hearts. God was not just commanding Israel to obey Him in a perfect but mechanical, robotic way. He was commanding them to *love* Him, to belong wholly to Him, to know and cherish and walk with Him, to cling to Him; to follow Him and serve Him *with all their hearts*. When Jesus expounded the Law in the gospels, He wasn't teaching anything new; He was merely showing what the Law had required all along. This is why Paul says in Romans 7:14 that “the Law is *spiritual*”; it requires far more than just external obedience; it extends to our thoughts, motives, and the deepest longings of our hearts.⁹² So then, what God required of Israel under Moses is what He requires of us still in the Covenant of Grace. This is perhaps most

⁹⁰ Deuteronomy 1:30; 4:30, 34, 37; 5:6, 15; 6:12, 21-23; 7:8, 18; 8:14; 10:19; 13:5, 10; 15:15; 16:1, 12; 20:1; 24:18, 22; 26:8.

⁹¹ Theologians call these the “indicatives” (*what is true*) and “imperatives” (*what to do*) of Scripture. The imperatives are always grounded in the indicatives. A few New Testament examples of this are the doctrines of Romans 1-11 (indicatives) grounding the exhortations of Romans 12-15; or the indicatives of Ephesians 1-3 grounding the exhortations of Ephesians 4-6.

⁹² Luther puts it beautifully: “But God judges according to what is at the bottom of the heart, and for this reason, His law makes its demands on the inmost heart and cannot be satisfied with works, but rather punishes works that are done otherwise than from the bottom of the heart, as hypocrisy and lies. Hence all men are called liars, in Psalm 116, for the reason that no one keeps or can keep God's law from the bottom of the heart, for everyone finds in himself displeasure in what is good and pleasure in what is bad. If, then, there is no willing pleasure in the good, then the inmost heart is not set on the law of God, then there is surely sin, and God's wrath is deserved, even though outwardly there seem to be many good works and an honorable life...For even though you keep the law outwardly, with works, from fear of punishment or love of reward, nevertheless, you do all this without willingness and pleasure, and without love for the law, but rather with unwillingness, under compulsion; and you would rather do otherwise, if the law were not there. The conclusion is that at the bottom of your heart you hate the law. To fulfill the law, however, is to do its works with pleasure and love, and to live a godly and good life of one's own accord, without the compulsion of the law.” (from Luther's commentary on *Galatians*). Colquhoun says: “The laws then, which Jehovah prescribed to the Israelites. . .required internal, as well as external, obedience; the obedience of the heart, as well as of the life; they directed and bound every Israelite, in the inward man, as much as in the outward. The sum of the duty required in the moral law, is love: ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thine heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might’ . . .” (p74). And again: “The Law is also spiritual. The Lawgiver is a spirit, the God of the spirits of all flesh; and he beholds all the inclinations and affections of the soul, as well as all the deeds of the body. His Law therefore is spiritual (Romans 7:14), requiring internal, as well as external obedience. It reaches the understanding, will, and affections, with all the other faculties of the soul, as well as all the gestures, words, and actions of the body. It extends, not only to external appearances, words, and works, but to the dispositions, thoughts, principles, motives, and designs of the heart; and requires the spiritual performance, both of internal and external obedience (Hebrews 4:12; Matthew 22:37-39).” (p88). And finally: “every Divine precept requires spiritual obedience, the service of the whole heart, as well as of the whole life.” (p244).

clear in Deuteronomy 10:16, where God commands His people to *circumcise their hearts*. This shows us that all the obedience God requires in the Law is a *gospel* obedience. God isn't just commanding Israel to obey Him, but to obey Him in a *gospel way*. He's not commanding a robotic, *legal* obedience; He's commanding a true and living *evangelical* obedience. Not just to obey Him, but to obey Him with hearts that have been circumcised by the gospel. What God required at Sinai was *gospel* obedience.⁹³

5. The PROVISION of the Mosaic Covenant is the same as the Covenant of Grace: God required Israel to love Him with all their being, but in doing this, He actually required the impossible. Adam's fall has made it impossible for man to love God. Jesus tells us in John 3:19 that all of us are born with hearts that love the darkness rather than the Light. To say that all of us fall short of loving God with all our heart and soul is a massive understatement. As fallen sinners, we're naturally both *enslaved* to our sin (John 8:34) and *in love* with our sin (John 8:44). We're not only slaves, but *willing* slaves. We're neither *able* nor *willing* to love God. But as we've learned, God provides all that He asks in the Covenant of Grace. God would provide for all the miserable imperfections of His people *through the blood of atonement*. Christ was fore-pictured and proclaimed in the sacrifices of Leviticus. The believing Israelite would bring an animal to the tabernacle "to make atonement on his behalf" (Leviticus 1:4). The man would lay his hand on the head of the animal, picturing the truth that his sin was being imputed to the animal on his behalf; then he would slay the animal to symbolize the truth that God's wrath must be satisfied—and yet that it might be borne by a substitute. So then, there was *forgiveness* in the Mosaic Covenant (Exodus 34:6-7).⁹⁴ Transgression was atoned for; sins were forgiven. There was grace under Moses because Moses was part of the Covenant of Grace. Of course, the blood of goats and bulls can never take away sins. But they pointed to the One who would. God would one day send to His people the Lamb of God, who would live a life of perfect obedience and submission to the Father and then take upon himself on the cross the punishment that every one of us deserves for our sin.⁹⁵ Further, we read in Deuteronomy 30:6, "Moreover the Lord your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your descendants, to love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul, so that you may live." God wouldn't just atone for the sins of His people; He would also take away their hearts of stone and give them circumcised hearts; radically new hearts. So that the Lord would not only provide forgiveness for His people, but also make them *willing* and *able* to love the Lord—not perfectly—but no less truly. So then, the way that God provided for His people at Sinai is no different than how He still does today.

6. The CONTENT of the Mosaic Covenant is the same as the Covenant of Grace: Simply put, the Mosaic Covenant points us to Jesus and the gospel over and over again. Through pictures, promises, and prophecies, we see His fingerprints on every page of His covenant at Sinai. This is why the Savior plainly told the Jews, "if you believed Moses, you would believe Me, for he wrote about Me." (John 5:46). That's an amazing statement. Here, Jesus himself is giving us His own interpretation of the Mosaic Covenant. And what we learn is that, at the end of the day, *the Law of Moses is ultimately about Christ*. What did Moses write about? He wrote about Christ. In the same way, the author of Hebrews tells us that all those who were listening to Moses had the "good news" preached to them—the same good news that is preached to us (4:2,6). In other words, *it was the gospel that was preached to Israel under Moses*.

⁹³ Bavinck puts it this way: "The entire law, which the covenant of grace at Mount Sinai took into its service, is intended to prompt Israel as a people to 'walk' in the way of the covenant. It is but an explication of the one statement to Abraham: 'Walk before me, and be blameless' [Gen. 17:1], and therefore no more a cancelation of the covenant of grace and the foundation of a covenant of works than this word spoken to Abraham." (*Reformed Dogmatics*, V3, p222). Ball sums up much of what we've seen, saying: "the covenant that God made with Abraham was the Covenant of Grace, as it is acknowledged; but the covenant made with Abraham is for substance the same with the covenant made with Israel upon Mount Sinai: the promise is the same, and the things required the same. For in that [covenant] God promised that he would be God all-sufficient to Abraham, to bless him with all necessary blessings for this life, and the life to come. In this he promises freely and of his own mere grace and favor to be their God, and make them a kingdom of priests and a holy nation unto himself. In that he requires of Abraham, that he walk with or before him in integrity; in this he covenants, that they should obey his voice, and keep his commandments. And what is it to walk with God or before God, but to walk in his Law?" (pp108-09). Kevan notes: "The Covenant at Sinai is but the working out of the Covenant with Abraham, both in its promises and its requirements." (p123).

⁹⁴ See also Leviticus 1-6; Deuteronomy 4:30-31; 30:1-5; etc. As Ball notes: "The legal covenant or Covenant of Works cannot be renewed after it is once broken, seeing it admits not repentance of sin past, but exacts perfect and perpetual obedience. But this covenant made with the Israelites might be renewed after transgression, [and] did admit repentance. . . And if the Covenant after transgression may be renewed, it is of grace." (Ball, p107). And again, "The frequent and earnest exhortations of the prophets made to backsliding and rebellious Israel, that she should acknowledge her wickedness, and return unto the Lord, is a full commentary of that which God required of them in this covenant." (Ball, p133).

⁹⁵ Actually, even more: not only would our sin be imputed to Christ, but His righteousness would be imputed to us.

So then, Moses' ministry was actually an evangelical ministry—a gospel ministry. How so? We might give just a few examples here: 1) *Moses* himself points to the greater Prophet like him who was yet to come, of whom God said: “I will put My words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command him. . . whoever will not listen to My words which he shall speak in My name, I Myself will require it of him.” (Deuteronomy 18:15-19).⁹⁶ 2) *The Passover and sacrifices of atonement* point to Jesus, “the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world!” (John 1:29), as we've seen. 3) *The Tabernacle* points us to Jesus, who became flesh “and tabernacled among us” (John 1:14).⁹⁷ 4) *The Priesthood* points to Jesus, our greater high priest who offered himself once for all and ever lives to intercede for us (Hebrews 7:23-28). 5) *The Manna* points to Jesus, the true bread that has come down out of heaven to give life to the world (John 6:30-33, 49-51). 6) *The bronze serpent* points us to Christ, who was lifted up just as the serpent in the wilderness, that “whoever believes will in Him have eternal life.” (John 3:14-15). 7) *The Rock* that Moses struck in the wilderness points to Jesus, for Paul tells us that Israel was “drinking from a spiritual rock which followed them; and the rock was Christ” (1Cor.10:1-4).⁹⁸ And whatever else we might find in the Law, Scripture sets forth as shadows of the good things to come (Hebrews 10:1); all serving to point us to Christ and his gospel.⁹⁹ Christ and His redemption are either pictured or promised on every page of the Law of Moses. The Scriptures themselves testify that ultimately, the ministry of Moses at Sinai was *all about Christ*. And surely it is no different for us now in the Covenant of Grace.

7. Lastly, the MEANS of benefiting from the Mosaic Covenant is the same as the Covenant of Grace. Everything in the Law pointed to Christ. We see Jesus everywhere. But just like us, Israel was called upon to embrace this message of life in Christ from the heart, *by faith*. Israel had to respond in faith. This is most evident from one particular passage of Scripture. In Romans 10:5-9, Paul says the following:

⁵For Moses writes that the man who practices the righteousness which is based on law shall live by that righteousness. ⁶But the righteousness based on faith speaks as follows: 'Do not say in your heart, "who will ascend into heaven?" (that is, to bring Christ down), ⁷or "Who will descend into the abyss?" (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead).' ⁸But what does it say? 'The word is near you, in your mouth and in your heart' — that is, the word of faith which we are preaching, ⁹that if you confess with your mouth Jesus as lord, and believe in your heart that God raised Him from the dead, you will be saved. . .

Here Paul seems to contrast two ways of life, two ways of righteousness; the righteousness that is based on

⁹⁶ Moses is set forth as a type of Christ in many ways: 1) *In his commission*: Just as Moses was commissioned by God with the task of delivering God's people and bringing them back with him to the place from which God had sent him, so too Christ was commissioned by the Father to deliver God's people and bring them back with Him to glory (Ex.3:12). 2) *In his coming*: Moses reflects Christ's incarnation in his refusal to stay comfortable in the king's palace; for the sake of his brothers he gave up the royal robes and the king's house. 3) *In his birth*: Just as the Savior, Moses was preserved from slaughter (Ex.1:15-22 with Matt.2:13-16) at the time of his birth; he was born into a poor family yet was the heir of a king; he was born into poverty but had access to unlimited wealth; born the child of a slave but he himself was free from the slavery of his brothers. 4) *In his wilderness preparation*: Just as God was preparing Moses in the wilderness 40 years for the great work of delivering God's people, so it was for 40 days of testing for Jesus in the wilderness. 5) *In his offices*: Christ is said to be our prophet, priest, and king; and though Moses is never called a king, he is called a prince (Ex.2:14; Ezek.34:24); and a priest (Ps.99:6), for he served as the mediator between God and the people; but perhaps most of all a shepherd-prophet, for in speaking the very words of God, he typified the greater Prophet yet to come (Deut.18:18; Jn.10:11). 6) *In his supernatural signs and wonders*: For Moses' rod could be turned into a snake and his hand made leprous, and it was for the express purpose that the people might believe that God had sent him (Ex.4:5); so it was with Christ, for His signs and wonders testified about him, that the Father had sent him (Jn.5:36). 7) *In his being rejected*: At first, the Israelites rejected his leadership, just as Christ was rejected by his own kinsmen during the course of his earthly ministry (Acts 7:25). 8) *Lastly, in his sacrificial love for sinners*: For God's people broke His Law before He was even finished giving it to Moses, and incurred God's wrath for their sin; but Moses pleaded for forgiveness on their behalf, even if it meant his own name being blotted out from the book of life. Moses offers up his own life in exchange for theirs, which is exactly what Jesus did—giving up paradise for our sake and taking all hell upon himself.

⁹⁷ a) *The Table of Showbread*: “I am the bread of life;” b) *The Golden Lamp-stand*: “I am the Light of the world;” c) *The Veil of Christ's flesh* was torn for us (Heb.10:20); d) *The Mercy Seat* points us to justification through Christ's blood; e) *The Laver for Washing* points us to the washing of regeneration by the Spirit (Tit.3:5). Or, in the words of Francis Roberts, “Christ was the true *ark*, having the covenant and Law of God fully in his heart and bowels; Christ was the true *mercy-seat*, covering the curse of the Law; Christ was the true *sacrifice*, purging away sin, and making atonement by his own blood; Christ was the true *table of show-bread*, whereon all his Israel are daily presented as acceptable before the Lord. Christ was the true *veil*, by which, rent, we have open entrance made into the Holy of Holies, heaven itself. . .” (Roberts, *Marrow*, p767).

⁹⁸ This makes the story in Exodus 17 take on new meaning: God's people disobeyed. But instead of striking them, God told Moses to get his staff and strike *the rock* (17:6); a foreshadowing of the atonement. Christ was punished in our place.

⁹⁹ Roberts puts it this way: “The ceremonies [IE, ceremonial laws] are Christ veiled; Christ wrapped in swaddling clothes; Christ, the son of righteousness, shining through a cloud; Christ was implicitly revealed in them all.” And again he says: “Jesus Christ was the very principal scope and soul of the Law, or Sinai Covenant, in all the doctrines, commands, and promises thereof. . .so that in this whole Sinai Covenant Jesus Christ was primarily intended.” (Roberts, p765).

Law and the righteousness that is based on faith. Later we'll deal in detail with the nature of the contrast, but for now I want us to just notice one thing: the Scripture that Paul here quotes in order to describe the righteousness that is based on faith *actually comes from a passage in the Law*. Let's say it again. Paul is quoting Deuteronomy 30:11-14, a passage in the Law, to describe the righteousness that is based on faith. Isn't that amazing? *Paul here quotes from the Law to teach us about the righteousness that is by faith.*¹⁰⁰ And the reason is simple: the Law required faith.¹⁰¹ *Just as the Law pointed to Christ in so many ways—it also required Israel to put their faith and hope in that Messiah it was so often prefiguring.*¹⁰²

Likewise, Scripture helps us understand that the reason most of the first generation of Israel under Moses never made it into the promised land was not because of a lack of *works*—but because of a lack of *faith*. The author of Hebrews had told us that the word which was preached to Israel under Moses in the wilderness was the same “good news” that is preached to us—that is, the gospel (4:2,6). Nevertheless, he goes on, “the word they heard did not profit them, *because it was not united by faith* in those who heard” (4:2; cf. 3:19). In other words, the very place that Israel went wrong was that *they failed to believe* in the same gospel that's preached to us. And this isn't something we only learn about in the book of Hebrews; the same truth is recorded in the Old Testament Scriptures themselves. For, when Moses recounts why Israel was made to wander 40 years in the wilderness, he declares to them the reason was: “*you did not trust* the Lord your God. . .” (Deuteronomy 1:32). This is also echoed in the Psalms. Reflecting on why God entered into judgment with Israel under Moses in the wilderness, the psalmist declares: “Therefore the Lord heard and was full of wrath; and a fire was kindled against Jacob and anger also mounted against Israel, *because they did not believe in God and did not trust in His salvation,*” (78:21-22), and again, because they “*did not believe in His wonderful works* (v32). So then, the reason that many under Moses missed out on the blessing was not because of a lack of legal obedience—but rather *a lack of faith.*¹⁰³

So then, the question that we would put to any who would hold to a different view of Sinai is this: If the *essence* of the Mosaic Covenant is the same as the Covenant of Grace, and if the *privileges* of the Mosaic Covenant are the same as the Covenant of Grace, and if the *context*, and the *requirement*, and the *provision*, and the *content*, and the *means of entering into the blessing* in the Mosaic Covenant are all

¹⁰⁰ Calvin says of this passage in Deuteronomy 30, “the apostle, our sure interpreter, removes our every doubt when he declares that Moses here spoke of the teaching of the gospel [Romans 10:8]. . . It is perfectly clear then that by these words Moses meant the covenant of mercy that he had promulgated along with the requirements of the law.” (*Institutes*, 2.5.12). Roberts speaks of the significance of Romans 10, saying, “Paul himself derives and proves the righteousness of faith from this Sinai-Covenant; as contained therein, and revealed thereby. . . From where did this description [in Romans 10:6-11] of the righteousness of faith come from; but from Moses describing the Law or Sinai-Covenant? And Paul excellently expounds the words of Moses, as peculiarly intending to set forth the righteousness of faith. We cannot wish a better commentator.” (p767). Samuel Rutherford likewise notes here: “This covenant has the promise of a circumcised heart, Deuteronomy 30:6, and of the word of faith that is near in the mouth, and of the righteousness of faith clearly differentiated from the righteousness of the Law by doing. For so Paul, Romans 10:5,6,7, etc, expounds Moses, Deuteronomy 30:11,12,13,14.” (Rutherford, p61). And Turretin, noting the passage quoted in Romans 10:6-8, asks, “Now how could Paul have said this unless he had recognized that covenant, by virtue of which such promises were given, to be not so much legal as evangelical?” (*Institutes*, V2, p266).

¹⁰¹ Noting Romans 3:21-22, Roberts states simply: “The Law itself testifies that the righteousness of God (viz, which God has ordained, revealed, and will accept), is without [IE, apart from] the Law; that is, by faith without the deeds of the Law.” (p787).

¹⁰² Roberts says, “Faith in Jesus Christ and justification by faith in him, must be necessarily implied in the same covenant. For these, Christ and saving faith; Christ and justification by faith; have inseparable connection and dependance one upon the other; as the act and object, as the cause and effect. Where Christ is revealed for life and justification, there faith in him is implicitly required; and where Christ is received by faith, there justification by faith must infallibly ensue.” (pp765-66). Ball puts it this way: “the Law requires faith as well as love and obedience, and does build these upon it as a foundation. It prescribes faith in the first place, and throughout, namely that we acknowledge God the Law-giver, to be the Lord our God, the only true God, and testifies that faith unto him, by an universal and uniform obedience to that whole Law and every title thereof. . . Certainly, 'whatsoever is not of faith is sin', even all works, though good in show, and for substance seeming agreeable to the rule of the Law, if they issue not from faith, they are vain and hypocritical, if they be not quickened and enlivened by faith, they are but the carcass of a good work. . . Therefore the Lord in Covenant commanding the observation of his Law, exacts faith also, without which the Law cannot be obeyed in an acceptable manner. For when the Law is spiritual, and commands true worship and invocation, how can it be observed without faith?” (pp105-106). And again, “the Law requires faith as well as love and obedience, and does build these upon it as a foundation. . . that love which the Law requires, either towards God or towards man, must flow from a pure heart, and faith it is that purifies the heart.” (Ball, p109). And finally, “The condition of this covenant [at Sinai]. . . is faith in the promised Messiah, which is implied in the promise, 'I will be thy God', and commanded in the precept built upon it, 'thou shalt have me to be thy God.' For God is not the God of Israel, but in and through the Mediator, neither can Israel take God to be their God, but by faith in the Messiah.” (Ball, p134).

¹⁰³ This is also given as the reason for the exile of Israel, which was outlined in the Mosaic Covenant. We read in 2 Kings 17:14: “However, they did not listen, but stiffened their neck like their fathers, *who did not believe in the Lord their God.*”

the same as the Covenant of Grace—then how can it be said that the covenant God made at Sinai with Israel was anything other than simply one of the manifestations of the Covenant of Grace?¹⁰⁴

It's hard to deny the fact that the Mosaic Covenant belongs to the Covenant of Grace. But there are also important objections that we need to deal with. There are certain Scriptures that seem to contradict the things we've been affirming. *Some passages of Scripture seem to speak quite negatively about the Mosaic Covenant, making Sinai appear to be something entirely different than the Covenant of Grace.* We read for instance in John 1:17: "For the Law was given through Moses; grace and truth were realized through Jesus Christ." And in 2 Corinthians 3, Paul refers to the Law as a letter that kills, a ministry of death, and a ministry of condemnation; where in contrast, the Spirit gives life and is a ministry of righteousness. And in Galatians 3:23, Paul writes that "before faith came, we were kept in custody under the law, being shut up to the faith which was later to be revealed." If Sinai truly belongs to the Covenant of Grace, how do you explain what Scripture says about the NATURE of the Mosaic Covenant? *Further, Scripture seems to tell us that what God requires under Moses is something very different than what He requires of us now in the gospel.* Paul says in Romans 10:5: "For Moses writes that the man who practices the righteousness which is based on law shall live by that righteousness. But the righteousness based on faith speaks as follows. . ." And again, in Galatians 3:11-12, Paul says: "Now that no one is justified by the Law before God is evident, for, 'The righteous man shall live by faith.' However, the Law is not of faith; on the contrary, 'He who practices them shall live by them.'" If Sinai truly belongs to the Covenant of Grace, how do you explain what Scripture says about the REQUIREMENT of the Mosaic Covenant? *There are also certain Scriptures that seem to teach that the Law is now null and void for us as Christians.* For instance, Paul says in Romans 6:14, "For sin shall not be master over you, for you are not under law but under grace." And he writes again a chapter later in Romans 7:4 that we "were made to die to the Law through the body of Christ" and that "we have been released from the Law, having died to that by which we were bound" (v6). Paul also testifies of himself in Galatians 2:19: "For through the Law I died to the Law, so that I might live to God." If Sinai truly belongs to the Covenant of Grace, how do you explain what Scripture says about the AUTHORITY of the Mosaic Covenant as it relates to us now as believers?

These are important questions that require thoughtful explanation. In fact, they're so important that we are actually going to devote the entirety of the next lesson to answering these questions in detail: *First*, if Sinai truly belongs to the Covenant of Grace, how do you explain what Scripture says about the *nature* of the Mosaic Covenant? *Secondly*, if Sinai truly belongs to the Covenant of Grace, how do you explain what Scripture says about the *requirement* of the Mosaic Covenant? *Lastly*, if Sinai truly belongs to the Covenant of Grace, how do you explain what Scripture says about the *authority* of the Mosaic Covenant?

¹⁰⁴ We might also note: *H) The BESTOWER of the Mosaic Covenant is the same as the Covenant of Grace:* For Acts 7:38 tells us that it was actually the angel of the Lord who spoke to Moses on Mount Sinai, the same angel that appears throughout the Old Testament, and is understood by most to be the pre-incarnate Christ (see Gen.22:12,15ff; Exod.3:2-6; Jud.2:1-3; 13:15-22); so that the One who gave the Law at Sinai was none other than Christ himself. This was a commonly held view by the Puritans and others (cf. John Colquhoun, *A Treatise of the Law and Gospel*, p52). *I) The FOUNDATION of the Mosaic Covenant is the same as the Covenant of Grace:* For the ratification ceremony recorded in Exodus 24:3-8, and Moses sprinkling the people with the blood of the covenant, did also show forth Christ, whose blood is the only foundation of hope we have in the new covenant. Ainsworth says, "Thus the first covenant was not dedicated without blood, and the patterns of heavenly things were purified by the blood of these sacrifices; signifying that Christ by his death should sanctify himself for his people, and them unto himself, by the blood of a better covenant, John 17:19; Heb.9:13,14; 1Pet.1:2." Fisher also says that by Moses' sprinkling of blood, "they were taught that by virtue of blood, this covenant betwixt God and them was confirmed, and that Christ, by his blood shed, should satisfy for their sins; for, indeed, the Covenant of Grace was, before the coming of Christ, sealed by his blood in types and figures." (p68). And Burgess, "the visible seal to ratify this covenant which you heard, was by sacrifices, and sprinkling the people with blood: And this did signify Christ. . ." (p236). *J) The SACRAMENTS of the Mosaic Covenant are the same as the Covenant of Grace:* As Blake says, "the Jews had Christ in their sacraments (1 Cor.10:4; 5:7), and we have no more in ours. . .The initiating sacrament of the Jews. . .was that painful *circumcision* in the flesh, yet, those that would be the Lord's did, and must submit unto it. . .he that was not circumcised in the flesh, might not eat of the Passover (Exod.12:48). A full text against all that plead for unbaptized persons admission to the Lord's table, God will not suffer that disorder, that the leading sacrament should come after. The initiating sacrament with Christians is that of baptism, no sooner was a man brought into covenant, but he was straight baptized; as soon as he made profession, he had this sealing engaging sign. . .The following sacrament in the old covenant was that of the *Passover*, a lamb without blemish to be eaten in the place and way that God prescribed. That in the New Testament, is the Supper of the Lord, in ordinary, common, useful, and necessary elements, bread and wine, which are of a strengthening and cheering nature. . ." (pp209-210). And Roberts says, "this Sinai-Covenant, being confirmed and ratified by these seals and tokens of the Covenant of Faith it must needs be a Covenant of Faith in Christ; for it were most improper and absurd to add the seals of the Covenant of Faith, to a Covenant of Works, a Mixed Covenant, a Subservient Covenant, or to any other sort of Covenant but the Covenant of Faith." (p764).