

The Atonement

In Its Relations To

The Covenant,

The Priesthood,

The Intercession

Of Our Lord

(Volume 2)

by

Hugh Martin

THE ATONEMENT

IN ITS RELATION TO

THE COVENANT,

THE PRIESTHOOD,

THE INTERCESSION

OF OUR LORD
(VOLUME 2)

HUGH MARTIN

Compliments of:

Agape Chapel Ministries

P.O. Box 59084

Norwalk, CA 90652 USA

www.geocities.com/Athens/Academy/4721

the Covenant bears on spiritual life, as well as theological accuracy; how it touches the interests of spiritual life at every point; how it is absolutely indispensable to give validity—to give any real trustworthiness—to what, in modern phrase, is called the “Christian consciousness,” being indeed the Divine and perfect charter or standard to which “Christian consciousness” must perpetually refer itself, alike for its existence, and its verification, and its utterances, if it is to have any right to speak at all. But we must pause. May the doctrine of the Covenant of Grace—of the federal oneness of Christ and His people—long remain enshrined in the heart’s core of Scottish piety! In the noble *Vaterland*, too, may it soon become widely known and acceptable! “I will sing of the mercies of the Lord for ever: with my mouth will I make known thy faithfulness to all generations. For I have said, Mercy shall be built up for ever: thy faithfulness shalt thou establish in the very heavens. I have made a Covenant with my Chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations.”

CHAPTER II.

ATONEMENT AND THE FEDERAL THEOLOGY.

It is scarcely possible to exaggerate the advantages of grounding the exposition and defence of the Scriptural theory of the Atonement on a sound and comprehensive doctrine of the Covenant of Grace.

This is a doctrine—the doctrine of the Covenant—which even the best and safest of our German theologians entirely overlook. It is, of course, unnecessary to say that it is a doctrine wholly unknown to British writers of the type of Maurice and Jowett. And what between the attempt to answer the latter class of writers on their own ground, and the study of the German authors—on the part even of such as peruse them for the sake of what is valuable in their learned and laborious productions—it has come to pass, we fear, that the federal theology is at present suffering a measure of neglect which does not bode well for the immediate future of the Church amongst us. It is with the view, if we may, of counteracting this present tendency, that we would respectfully submit some considerations fitted to commend the study of the federal theology to our younger preachers, as well as to the members of the Church generally.

It is quite possible that, in attempting this, we may be met by the objection that the doctrine of the Covenant of Grace is *old-fashioned*.

Well; it can hardly be very old-fashioned yet. There are not many congregations of the Church that, if questioned on the subject, would as yet feel themselves driven to give an answer analogous to what Paul once got from "certain disciples" at Ephesus; "We have not so much as heard whether there be any" Covenant of Grace! On the contrary, the pious eldership, and the patriarchal piety of the Church generally, are familiar with the doctrine of the covenants, and are not insensible of the great extent to which their own vitality and vigour are bound up with the intelligent appreciation of it. We venture to say that, in very many districts of the Church, our probationers and younger ministers could not take a course more fitted to commend them to the love, esteem, and gratitude of our pious people, than just to expound to them—to use a well-remembered phrase of Dr CUNNINGHAM'S—"the provisions and arrangements of the Covenant of Grace." If there is a feeling abroad, to the effect that the standard of the preaching of the Disruption ministry is not being maintained by the race that is succeeding them, it might be well to inquire whether the explanation of this be not found in the direction we have indicated. The preaching of the Disruption ministers was largely leavened, or rather was pervadingly characterised, by the large place assigned in it to the covenants—those great schemes of the Divine dispensation with

spiritual postulate—they feel they must at all hazards conserve. And they are right. Any doctrine of Atonement or of justification that should impugn it, is thereby necessarily demonstrated to be false. But let Christ and His people be federally one, by the sovereign authority and love of the Father, and by the voluntary covenanted acceptance of the Son. In that case, legal fiction, make-believe, arbitrariness and caprice, are at the furthest possible remove from the Divine Covenant transaction of our redemption,—alike from the basis of it, and from all the fruits of it. "Christ bears the sins of many," because, in His covenanted identification with these "many," their sins are sinlessly and truly His sins. And unto the same "many sons and daughters" of the Covenant, the Father imputes the righteousness of the Son, because, in their covenant oneness with the Son, His righteousness is undeservedly but truly their own righteousness. And all throughout, "the judgment of God is according to truth."

But we must bring this train of thought to a close.

We have proved that the doctrine of the Covenant is a directly Scriptural category: that it is the result of a large induction of particulars, conducted on the same canon as that to which all true science must be amenable: and that it is at once a most searching and indeed conclusively satisfactory instrument of investigation, and a most powerful instrument alike of exposition and defence. We should have been glad to show how the doctrine of

with them; He becomes their competent and acceptable substitute and surety,—His substitution in every light most justifiable in the eye of law most stringent and of righteousness inexpugnable. And the vindication of His vicarious sacrifice of Himself for their salvation, is set on high in the intelligent and joyful convictions of the poor and needy, beyond the possibility of any sinister and false philosophy endangering it.

While the Divine Head of the Church has, in His great goodness, long kept these views before men's minds in Scotland, we cannot but cherish a deep sympathy—we would say *pity*, but that the word might be considered invidious, while no such feeling is in our heart—towards many earnest and noble minds in Germany, evidently inquiring with the greatest ardour after the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, but baffled because the covenant oneness between Redeemer and redeemed has not yet come into their field of vision. It is the doctrine of the Covenant that they need. No wonder that, in ignorance of this great guiding principle, to a beautiful and so love-worthy spirit as that of ULLMANN, "substitution" should seem an arbitrary and capricious thing; and that to many others "imputation" should be obnoxious, as a mere make-believe and legal fiction, with which they cannot accredit the God of truth. Moral instinct, the dictates of pious feeling, and Holy Scripture all combine to convince them that "the judgment of God must be according to truth." That moral axiom—that sacred

mankind. And the consequence was, that the intelligent hearers acquired large views of Divine truth; could perceive the relations subsisting between different departments thereof; could refer a topic to its proper place in the system; and could accordingly realise themselves to be conscious of growing in knowledge—of acquiring real power to make attainments and advancement in spiritual things. But if the federal theology should fall into neglect, there is reason to fear that the materials of pulpit instruction will be destitute of that compactness and connexion, apart from which conscious advancement in knowledge on the part of the people is impossible. The topics handled will be disjointed and isolated. Progressive instruction will cease to be realised, and perhaps cease to be aimed at. The next step will be that it will cease to be desired. The production of evanescent, sentimental impression will be the object mainly in view on the preacher's part, and mainly desired by the people. The duty of the pulpit to nourish up an intelligent Christian people in "the words of knowledge and understanding" will be forgotten. And it will be quite true *then* that the federal theology will be "old-fashioned." It is not *yet* true. On the contrary, the doctrine of the Covenant is eminently acceptable with our pious and intelligent people,—with precisely the class of people whose voice is entitled to be heard, whose edification our ministry is bound very specially to seek, and whose tastes and wishes may most legitimately and most safely be considered. *These* are the people among whom a young

minister may expect to find loving, sympathising, personal friends, to encourage his heart and hold up his hands. These are they who will be ready to lighten his burdens, cheer him in his difficulties, countenance and help on his plans for usefulness, and be examples in his flock in every grace of godliness. To pretermit *their* edification—on the plea that what style of pulpit ministrations edified and nourished them in earlier days is “old-fashioned” now—were suicidal; and every sensible and kindly-hearted young pastor will instinctively feel it to be so. Certain forms and phrases may indeed become old-fashioned; and a brother is not to be held in bondage in that respect. By all means let them be remodelled, wherever that is necessary, to suit the literary tastes of the day, and to fall in fittingly with whatever is truly valuable in modern refinement. If the substance is scriptural the form may be altered to suit any age: the material being in that case as solid gold, it can always be minted in any really current coin of the realm of letters. The preacher, or writer who cannot trust his powers to do that much, has no right to refer to modern culture at all. Modern culture has evidently done little for him.

The real question is this: Is the theology of the covenantants a real and natural category of Divine truth? Is it Scriptural? And is it comprehensive, and permanently valuable? If not: if, as some would seem to think, it were merely a temporary development, adopted by theologians in their transition to something better, larger,

tion and entire accomplishment of the work given Him to do. And still further, it were to overlook the splendid evidence of *love* as the great originating principle and motive of His redemption. There is a certain aspect of coldness about a mere decree. Practically, in the mind's view, it comes too closely to be identified, in point of impression, with the idea of cold, dead, impersonal fate. Unitarianism is ever doomed to have this practical outgoing. It is in Trinity that provision is seen for the vivid warmth of personality and personal love; and especially in the covenant of Trinity for man's redemption. There are distinct personal actings of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Spirit, in the Covenant. There are distinct actings of the will of the Father, and of the will of the Son in that oneness that is constituted between Christ and His people, and which justifies and bears up all that is achieved for their salvation. And these actings of will are actings of love. Hear the overflowings of love from Christ's heart, as His achievements for His people are by Himself referred back upon the loving deed by which the Father made them over to Him to be His own:—“O righteous Father, Thine they were, and Thou gavest them Me, and I have kept them.” He means to say: *Therefore*, for that reason, have I kept them; even as I would keep that love-gift of Thine, which I did so willingly and lovingly receive. Identified, by loving covenant between Himself and the Father, with the people given unto Him; truly representing them, because identified in covenanted oneness

specially and expressly covenanted: not merely as decreed by the sovereign authority of the Godhead, but covenanted between the eternal Father and the eternal Son.

To trace the oneness between Christ and His people to a Divine decree may honour the Godhead: but does it honour the Trinity in Godhead? On the contrary, it refuses recognition of the Trinity, precisely in that grand manifestation in which the doctrine of the Trinity—the truth of the distinct personalities of the Divine persons—is most especially to be recognised. There is no revelation of the Trinity in Godhead comparable to that which is afforded by the Covenant of Grace. To “us men, and” in “our salvation,” the doctrine of the Trinity is commended, as at once revealed and precious, as placed in clearest evidence in the distinct actings of the persons of the Godhead in that Divine compact which is the spring and fountainhead of our eternal hopes. And even “to the principalities and powers in heavenly places,” it is probable, “there is made known by the Church” and her covenanted salvation, in the most eminent possible demonstration, the subsistence of three persons in the one Divine Being. To be satisfied, therefore, with regarding Christ’s oneness with His people as simply decreed and not covenanted, would be a very grave mistake; a mistake for which indeed there can be no excuse, as there can surely be no intelligible temptation. Moreover, it were to pretermit the due recognition of the voluntariness of Christ’s suscep-

more vital, and more powerful: if it be “old-fashioned” in the sense of being antiquated and effete: by all means let it take its course to oblivion. There can be no great wisdom, in such a case, and there can be as little success, in attempting to arrest it. Those, however, who entertain that opinion are bound to show that the progress of theological science has really replaced the federal theology with something better, something more satisfactory and scientific. And it is because we believe it impossible to show this, that we would earnestly advocate its continued culture and promulgation.

It will not be supposed that we would advocate the use, from age to age, of any stereotyped phraseology. On the contrary, we believe the federal theology to be a scheme of thought so instinct with vitality as to be independent of particular phrases and formulas, and thoroughly adaptable to the utmost of variety and elasticity that truly free Christian thought can demand. Had we not this deep conviction, we would not think it worth our while to detain on it the attention of our readers or ourselves. The key-note of the federal theology, as we take it, is UNION WITH CHRIST. Though it took shape, as a formal scheme of doctrine or exposition, later than the days of Calvin, it is virtually—through the great predominance and ruling power in the “Institutes” of the idea of “union with Christ”—the leading thought in Calvin’s theology; far more so than any or even all of the “five” celebrated “points.” And if this is true; if the heart and soul of this theology is

found in the union and communion of Christ and His people; then is it so full of vital power that it will adopt into its service all fresh forms of literary effort and all valid products of literary culture, and will go on to create more for itself when these are done. We advocate no tame reproduction of old and worn-out forms of speech. It is the solid riches of Divine truth we would conserve, and the highest attainments of the Church of God as the heir and expositor thereof. And we are very sure that one of these very highest attainments has been the great scheme of thought which is known as the doctrine of the Covenant of Grace.

Part First.

Doctrine of the Covenant directly Scriptural.

It may seem unnecessary to say that this is a doctrine which has express verbal warrant in Holy Scripture. We have been led to this topic in connexion with the doctrine of the Atonement; and, it may be in point, therefore, to call to mind the significant phrase, "The blood of the everlasting covenant" (Heb. xiii. 20). Surely that single Divine form of speech is sufficient to set forth an organic connexion between the Covenant of Grace and the sacrifice of Jesus. Take again the memorable promise: "As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water" (Zech. ix. 11); and our Lord's

inquiry is here. And we can attain no satisfaction on this point, no sufficient answer to this question, and therefore no satisfactory conclusion to our whole line of investigation, till the doctrine of the everlasting Covenant oneness comes into view. That is the great underlying relation. That is the grand primary conjunction between the Redeemer and the redeemed, which alone bears up, and justifies, and accounts for all else in respect of relation which can be predicated as true concerning them. "Both He that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are ALL OF ONE: for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren" (Heb. ii. 11). His substitution is a good reason for His suretyship. Covenant oneness is, if possible, a still better reason for His substitution. For now is the *vicariousness* of His sacrifice not merely brought to light, but vindicated. It is not merely true that He suffers for us; it is also true that we suffer in Him. And the latter of these propositions justifies the truth and righteousness of the former. He is substituted *for us*, because He is one *with us*—identified with us, and we with Him.

Moreover, the especial aspect of this oneness as a *Covenant* oneness must be apprehended and kept in view. In contemplating the oneness, we must contemplate it as covenanted. For, in order to complete our exclusion of unsatisfactory solutions of the problem, we must observe,—

(4.) In the *fourth* place, that it is not enough to consider this oneness as decreed; we must consider it as

should for them become incarnate in order to accomplish it?

(3.) Nor is it sufficient to say, in the *third* place, that the relation is that of suretyship and substitution. This undoubtedly is a great step in advance. Only let the ground thus taken up be secured. Let the inquiry be pressed to the uttermost; let it be exhausted. All truly scientific investigation searches on and on, till it arrives at somewhat of which no further explanation can be given or is required. Theology as a science meets this canon, and then claims a right to rest. Let us then still inquire.

Christ undertakes the work of Calvary, the death of the cross, for His people, because He stands towards them in the relation of a surety—a surety on their behalf to the offended Lawgiver and Judge. Be it so: but what shall justify His occupying that relation? What renders it fit, proper, righteous, that He should be accepted as standing in that relation towards them, and in that relation suffering for them? To this also it is not difficult to reply. He is their surety, because He is their substitute. He acts *on their behalf*, because He stands *in their room*. One only question now remains; and there can be no possibility, as there should be no inducement, to evade it. The relation of a substitute justifies the suretyship; what shall justify the substitution?

It is to this at last that the question must really be narrowed. The exact hinge and whole stress of the

own affecting utterance in instituting the sacrament of the Supper: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood." Surely these Divine expressions are very express; and they are sufficient to show that no man discusses the doctrine of Christ's death who severs it from the considerations presented by the Covenant of Grace. It is the "blood" that maketh "atonement;" but in this case the "blood" is the "blood of the Covenant." Men may therefore discuss as long as they please an abstract theory, of an abstract atonement; but if they give not heed to *this* atonement which the Covenant of Grace conditions and explains, they are not any more dealing with true theology, than men should deal with real astronomy who should speculate on central forces in the abstract and pretermit the actual law of gravitation—the law of the inverse square of the distance—which rules in the starry heavens.

It is scarcely necessary to refer to the express assertion of the covenant between the Father and the Son in the proposition: "The counsel of peace shall be between them both" (Zech. vi. 13). Our Lord is designated at once the "Mediator of the Covenant" (Heb. viii. 6; xii. 24), and the "Surety of the Covenant" (Heb. vii. 22). Nay, He is represented as the *substance* of the Covenant: "I the Lord have called Thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep Thee, and give Thee for a covenant of the people, for a light to the Gentiles" (Isa. xlii. 6; xlix. 8). The work of Christ is thus in express terms affirmed to be a covenant work—

a work having immediate respect to a covenant. The work of the Spirit is spoken of in similar connexion with a covenant: "As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My Spirit that is upon thee, and my words that are in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever" (Isa. lix. 21). When the Lord invites lost sinners to Himself, it is in terms like these: "Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your souls shall live; and I will make with you an everlasting covenant, even the sure mercies of David" (Isa. lv. 3). When, moved by such entreaties, sinners ask the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward, it is with the mutual exhortation: "Come, and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten" (Jer. i. 5). When, after entering on this blessed relation with God, they would express their full satisfaction with it in the midst of all life's troubles and afflictions, they are wont to say: "Though my house be not so with God; yet He hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure: this is all my salvation, and all my desire" (2 Sam. xxiii. 5). For in the midst of all troubles by which their sins are chastised and their spirit chastened, the Lord sustains their faith by the gracious declaration: "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the word that hath gone out of my mouth" (Ps. lxxxix. 34). And when grieved in the view of the "cruelty" that obtains in the "dark

of Abraham." He took the seed of "Abraham,"—not of Adam. In His own person He is to be regarded as "the Seed of the woman,"—not the seed of the man. And in His work—in the whole work of which His Incarnation is the foundation and commencement—"He taketh hold," not of Adam's, but Abraham's seed. There is, therefore, a conjunction between Him and His people, which His possession, along with them, of a common nature does not exhaust nor express. There must be some other relation, anterior even to the Incarnation, constituting, indeed, a ground and reason even for it also.

For we are in search of a relation that shall constitute a justifying ground for Christ's whole work. But His Incarnation is part of His work. That He should "humble Himself, and take upon Him the form of a servant, and be found in fashion as a man,"—this is a part, and a great part, of what the Son of God undertook on our behalf. To assign *this*, therefore, as that conjunction between Christ and His people which we are in search of, is to assign a part of Christ's work as a ground or justifying reason of the rest of it, or rather of the whole of it. And that obviously overthrows the initial terms of our inquiry. For if the Incarnation is part of the work He undertook on His people's behalf, the question returns, What relation or conjunction subsists between Christ and His people which renders it fit and congruous and righteous that He should accomplish for them the work for which He became incarnate, and

a relation anterior to the actual, personal, spiritual conjunction that is established in regeneration.

(2.) Nor, in the *second* place, are the necessities of the case met by a reference to the Incarnation. No doubt this also is an invaluable relation—an indispensable element of conjunction—between the Redeemer and the redeemed. That a union should subsist between Christ and His people, such as is implied in their possession of a common nature, is of vital moment. “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also himself likewise took part in the same, that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. . . . In all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that He himself hath suffered, being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted” (Heb. ii. 14–18). Yet, vitally important as this is, unless we are to be satisfied with a relation which Christ holds alike to the saved and the unsaved, we cannot rest satisfied with the Incarnation as fully answering the kind of conjunction which we are seeking between those who are actually redeemed and Christ as specifically their Redeemer. Even in the very heart of the passage last quoted a very significant phrase occurs, as if expressly designed to guide us past so erroneous an idea. “For verily He took the seed

places of the earth,” the Church’s strongest appeal to God on their behalf is this: “Have respect unto Thy covenant” (Ps. lxxiv. 20).

These are some of the more express verbal assertions of the reality and fact of a Covenant of Grace. Intelligent piety is familiar with them as with household words; and we quote them simply to show that the federal theology is no product of mere human ingenuity—no merely artificial structure—but a Scriptural theme, the terminology of which is directly furnished by Scripture itself. It is no roundabout result of mere theologising, but one of the immediate *data* of Divine inspiration.

Part Second.

Doctrine of the Covenant Scriptural by Large Induction.

But apart even from such direct verbal sanction from the Divine word, the federal theology may be justified as the inevitable result of a large and complete induction of particulars from Scripture. It is impossible to systematise accurately concerning the work of Christ and of His Spirit, in the redemption and salvation of men, without landing in substantially the doctrine of the Covenant of Grace. Even although Holy Scripture did not lead the way so expressly and verbally as we have seen that it does, scientific or Baconian induction of particulars would bring us substantially to the great

scheme of the federal theology. The many instances which Scripture gives of intercommunion between the Father and the Son, are found, when combined, to carry in them all the elements and characteristics of a covenant.

The closing chapters of the "Gospel according to Isaiah" are peculiarly rich in passages which cannot be intelligently appreciated without leading to this conclusion. The authority of the Father appoints certain duties to the Son: the Father's love and faithfulness guarantee to the Son certain promises of support, countenance, comfort, victory. The Son undertakes the duties assigned, and appeals to the promises relating to them. The Father re-stipulates to bestow certain rewards in return for the obedient and faithful discharge of the duties enjoined: and "for the joy therein set before Him, the Son endures the cross, despising the shame." What could be more definite in this light than the closing verses of the memorable fifty-third chapter of Isaiah? "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."

our search cannot terminate satisfactorily till we reach and recognise the covenant oneness. The same reason that demands *a* relation, remains unsatisfied till it meets with *this* relation.

(1.) For, in the *first* place, it will not meet the necessities of the case to refer to the union between Christ and His people which is effected in their regeneration by the agency of the Holy Spirit and the instrumentality of that faith which is His gift. This, no doubt, is all-important in its own place. The Divine scheme is, that all fulness dwells in Christ: that all the treasures of knowledge and of wisdom are hid in Him: that all spiritual blessings for the Church of God are treasured up in Him: that no saving gift or grace or blessing is given, so to speak, *past* Him, or out of Him: all are given *in* Him. Hence an actual conjunction with Him, by the indwelling of His own Spirit and the embracing action of our faith, is indispensable to our enjoying "the redemption which is *in* Christ," or any of the blessings of His purchase.

But the question is not, What conjunction between Christ and a sinner is requisite in order to that sinner obtaining the benefits of His redeeming work? The question is, What conjunction between Christ and the sinner is requisite in order to that redeeming work being undertaken and achieved by Christ on his behalf? We are not in search of a relation that shall justify the *application* of Christ's redemption, but of one that shall justify the *impetration* of it. And *that* evidently must be

Grace attributes to it; and the defenders of the truth should learn from this the lesson, to decline, as a matter which in no respect concerns them, the defence of any doctrine of atonement, save the Atonement of the Son's Covenant with the Father. The presentation of it in this, its own true light, will carry it clear, without a conflict, of the greater number of the assaults that are made upon it, and will immediately reveal, without an argument, the hollowness and shallowness of the many pitiful theories of Christ's death which *litterateurs* would substitute in its room.

Part Third.

Doctrine of the Covenant necessary if we would Formulate the Relation between Christ and His People.

How are we to formulate and establish the relation subsisting between Christ and His people, as Redeemer and redeemed, unless we fall back upon the doctrine of the Covenant? *Some* relation, it is evident, must be acknowledged as subsisting between Christ and those on whose behalf He dies, else we do not even come within sight of the idea of a vicarious sacrifice. The possibility of real atonement absolutely postulates and demands a conjunction between Him who atones and those for whom His atonement is available. This is beyond the need of proof. And as there is an absolute and obvious necessity for *some* conjunction or relation, so in searching for *the* conjunction or relation which actually subsists,

It is not possible to read passages like these without seeing that there are far more abundant Scriptural elements from which to conclude the existence of a Covenant of Grace between the Father and the Son, than even of a covenant of works between God and Adam. In fact it is more from what is partly the analogy and partly the antithesis of the two covenants, when set forth in the mutual light which they reflect on each other, that the covenant of works becomes manifest, than in any very express or abundant evidence of its own alone. So certain is this, that it will uniformly be found that the theology which is meagre in reference to the Covenant of Grace, is still more so as to the covenant of works. The first Adam was but "the type of him that was to come," the shadow of the "last Adam." And where the "last Adam" is little recognised as a covenant head, there can be little reason or inducement to recognise the "first" in that light either. It is in Christ pre-eminently that the doctrine of covenant takes fullest shape; and apart even from express verbal affirmations of it, we find that it is continually subsumed in Holy Scripture's descriptions of His work in the days of His flesh, and of His reward in His risen glory.

On no scheme whatever that shall be true to the leading contents of Scripture, concerning the work of the incarnate Redeemer, can we possibly avoid coming to the conclusion that He acts according to a covenant with the Father. Whatever Christ did, He designed to do; and whatever He designed to do, He designed because