

G Williams 1&2 of 3 Covenant of Redemption

20150306

Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.

Date: 06 March 2015

Preacher: Garry Williams

[0 : 00] Let's make a start then, and let's ask an opening question, what is the covenant of redemption?! I don't want to presume any particular degree of familiarity with Reformed Covenant theology on your part, and so let me just remind you that Reformed Covenant theology often speaks of there being a covenant of works or life or creation between God and Adam in the garden, a covenant of grace between God and his people in history, and the covenant of redemption denotes a covenant that is made between the persons of the Trinity in eternity for our redemption.

So we are thinking here about an intra-Trinitarian covenant between the Father and the Son, pause, and the Holy Spirit, question mark.

Because one of the debates in the covenant of redemption is whether the Holy Spirit is a party to this covenant or not. Now clearly the Holy Spirit is involved in the work of redemption, so nobody who says that he's, particularly negative, so I was going to say, nobody who says that he's not a party means that he's not involved in redemption.

The question is the precise question, is he a party, a covenanting party in this covenant? And there are quite a lot of Reformed people in history who will tell you he's not. And so they will define the covenant of redemption as a covenant between the Father and the Son.

And we'll come on to that question later. I, just to anticipate the answer, think it is a covenant between the three persons. So I would define the covenant of redemption as a covenant made between the persons of the Trinity for our redemption, made in eternity, and then worked out in history.

[1 : 50] Now, a lot of our time is going to be spent asking a very simple question, which is this, is there such a covenant? Because there are quite a lot of people who think there is no covenant of redemption.

And you can subscribe to the Westminster Standards without signing up to a covenant of redemption. It may be implicit, but it's not explicit. So there are plenty of Reformed Presbyterian folk who don't believe in it.

And one you would know would be Bob Leffin, for example, who argues against the existence of the covenant of redemption. And there would be many others who would agree. So we're going to ask this question, first of all, is there such a thing as the covenant of redemption?

And I don't want to keep on sort of stepping backwards further and further away from our topic, but I do want to pause before we plunge into asking that question, to ask, well, what would you have to do to prove that something is in the Bible?

Just in general terms. Not thinking now specifically about the covenant of redemption, but what would you have to do to demonstrate that something is biblical? Hodge, for example, Charles Hodge, makes this comment.

[2 : 59] In order to prove that there is a covenant between the Father and the Son formed in eternity and revealed in time, it is not necessary that we should adduce passages of the Scriptures in which this truth is expressly asserted.

So to prove that there is a covenant of redemption, you don't need to cite Bible verses which assert that there is a covenant of redemption. What does he mean?

Well, let's think about different levels of evidence. There are things which are plainly stated on the surface of the text of Scripture, aren't there? There might be things in a passage in Scripture which are presumed.

The passage only makes sense if certain things are presumed or supposed. And then there are other things, thirdly, which are implied by a passage, which follow from what is said on the surface of a passage.

That, I think, is what the confession means by a good and necessary consequence. Now, I might illustrate this in terms of the ocean. And if you like illustrations, well, then fine.

[4 : 06] There are not going to be many of them today, so make the most of this one. But if you imagine that this is the surface of the ocean, there is something lying on the surface of the text, plain to sea, stated by the verse quite plainly.

But we know that this is the bottom of the ocean. There might be a big rock here. And a coral reef here. And we know that what's going on on the bottom of the ocean affects what's going on in the currents of the ocean, and therefore on the surface of the ocean.

So there might be various things presumed by what lies on the surface of the text, underneath it, if you like, affecting it and shaping it. Then again, up here are the clouds, and this is the air.

And we know that this is at a certain temperature. And we know that air temperature changes are caused by the surface flow of the ocean here.

Such as the Gulf Stream, for example. So again, here's a plain statement on the surface of the text, and it's affecting, it's implying something. Here's a good and necessary consequence of the text.

[5 : 17] If that wasn't helpful and this confused you even more, forget about it. Three levels of evidence. Plainly stated, presumed, and implied. What I'm trying to argue here is that you mustn't approach any question, any theological question, this becomes particularly pertinent in discussions of covenant theology, by asking, where's the verse?

Or where's the word? Or the phrase? Or the label, covenant of redemption? That's what we might call terminological myopia, terminological short-sightedness.

All you can think about is terms and labels and things. But something can be thoroughly biblical without being there by name, and without even being there on the surface of a text.

Now, we might call that an account of different levels at which proof functions. So let's draw a line here, indicating the different levels.

And at this point, midway here is something on the surface of the text, something down here is presumed by the text, something up here is implied by the text.

[6 : 39] And if you were mathematical, you could call that the y-axis. Only it's not a graph. So that probably isn't quite accurate. But you'll see what I'm doing in a minute. Because when you're going to think about whether something is biblical or not, that's not the only question you need to ask.

You don't just need to ask, well, what are the different ways of proving that something is biblical? You also need to ask about the thing that you're thinking about. And you need to think about what that thing is in order to determine whether it's there or not.

And here I'm thinking not about depth or levels of proof, but about the breadth of evidence that you need to find. So what do you need to find to conclude, for instance, that there is a covenant of redemption?

In other words, what are the elements of the covenant of redemption that you would need to find to conclude that there is one? Let me give you an example here. O. Palmer Robertson, in his book on covenant theology, which is a very good book, doesn't believe that there's a covenant of redemption.

He denies it. And he denies it on the basis of his definition of what a covenant is. A covenant, he says, is, does anyone remember Palmer Robertson's little test? Anyone remember Palmer Robertson's?

[7 : 54] Palmer Robertson's? A bond in blood, sovereignly administered. Thank you. A bond in blood, sovereignly administered. Now, Palmer Robertson says, well, there can be no sovereign administration between the persons of the Trinity.

Yes? Because there's no sovereignty between the persons of the Trinity. Sovereignty is something that God exercises towards creatures. So therefore, he identifies elements of a definition of the covenant of redemption, and then says, well, they're not there.

Okay. So this is a crucial question. What do we need to find to think that there is a covenant, in general even, let alone specifically this covenant of redemption?

Because you very often find the same issue arising in discussion of whether God had a covenant with Adam or not. What do you need to find in Genesis 1 and 2 to find a covenant with Adam?

The word? That's what a lot of people want to find, and they work up this great lather of objection because you don't find the word used there.

[9 : 05] That's why the Hosea text becomes so much the focus of debate because people are preoccupied by the question of whether the word is there. But is that the defining element, or do you need other things to conclude that there's a covenant?

So what we can do is we can plot across here, and this is why it looks like a graph, but technically I'm pretty sure it's not a graph, is an x-axis, let's call it that. And onto this axis we can then plot all the different elements that we think we need to find to find the covenant of redemption, or indeed anything else that we're looking for in scripture.

So for instance, Palmer Robertson is going to be plotting his x-axis, and he's going to be saying we need to find sovereign administration. We need to find bonded blood in order to find a covenant.

Okay? Now, and here's the graphic idea. Combine the two axes, and what you discover is that you could find sovereign administration, one of these elements in terms of breadth, at different levels.

So you might find a statement about sovereign administration lying on the surface of a verse. Yes, so you might find, so think about the covenant with Adam, for example, a verse which tells you that God sovereignly administers his relationship with Adam.

[10 : 25] Then you might find it, however, presumed by a verse, in which case it's going down here. Or you might think, well this is not what the verse says, but the verse implies this, in which case you're finding it up here.

And each of the elements of a covenant, you could find in different ways, so that you could end up with a picture that goes like this. And you can say, okay, well by the end of doing all of that, we've got the whole thing.

There's a covenant. It's obvious, isn't it, that the more extensive that your x-axis is, the fewer covenants you will find.

Does that make sense? So let's redo our x-axis. And let's now have a minimal x-axis. So actually, in the breadth of my definition of covenant, I need to find only two things now, let's say.

Well, I'm going to find lots of covenants, probably, if I only need to find two things to find a covenant. But if I have a fairly tightly specified definition of covenant with lots of elements, needing to be present in order to conclude that there's a covenant, well then there can be fewer of them, aren't there?

[11 : 36] Does that make sense? The bigger your definition, the fewer there will be. Now, my view on that question that I put to you today is that actually the Bible uses the term covenant pretty readily with not much at all needing to be present to conclude that you have a covenant.

covenant. Here's to I own. The word is used in great variety and what is intended by it must be learned by the subject matter treated of.

In other words, how are we going to work out what should be on the sex axis? Well, let's go and read the Bible and find out how many things need to be present in the Bible for the Bible to use the word covenant.

Let's not, in other words, come with our own constructed definition which we've got from somewhere else and say, ah, these are the things you need to find to find a covenant.

For instance, I don't think we should go trawling around the ancient Near East to work out what a covenant is and then come to the Bible and say, okay, well, this is what the Bible means by a covenant.

[12 : 46] Now, that could be true. It could be true. Certainly, it's very illuminating to look at the use of covenant terminology and practice in the ancient Near East but to let it define what a covenant is in such a way as to tell a Christian whether or not he may speak of something as a covenant is just to appeal to an authority outside the scriptures if you build it on ancient Near Eastern definitions.

So, what I'm suggesting is that, of course, you come to the text with some idea of what a covenant is. We don't come to the text of presuppositionless, do we? But we have always for them to be testing and retesting and spiraling around on our definition of covenant, saying, well, is this what the Bible calls a covenant?

Is my understanding of what you have to have what the Bible thinks you have to have to have a covenant? Now, Owen distinguishes what he labels a large sense of covenant from a covenant properly so called.

And I'm not too sure about that distinction. In other words, he's saying, look, let's come and see what the Bible calls a covenant. When we do that, we find lots of things, and I think he means really this, quite loosely termed covenant.

And then we find things more properly called covenant. Now, this is a difficult one, isn't it? At what point are you going to conclude that this particular use of covenant terminology that you're looking at is a strict one, a proper one, whereas this one is a poetical one or a metaphorical one or a simile or it's sort of like it, it's covenant-ish, but it's not really, strictly speaking, a covenant.

[14:27] I'm not entirely convinced that that's the right way to go about it. I'm more inclined to think that you should understand that anything the Bible calls a covenant can rightly be called a covenant.

Unless you've got particular reasons to think that in the context you can tell that this is a poetic or sort of exaggerated use of the term. Now, let's start with the wide sense then or the large sense as Owen calls it.

And often you find in the Bible that a covenant is actually just an ordinance or a precept or a command. John Gill, just to prove that I'm not only citing Owen in these sessions, there's going to be some other people we're going to meet as well, points out that the law of contributions for priests is called a covenant in Numbers 18.

The law of seven yearly release for slaves a covenant. The ten commandments a covenant. So commandments seem to be labelled covenants sometimes.

Now, is this an example of using the label for the whole of a part? But there's more. It's not just commandments that can be called covenants.

[15:42] And perhaps this is more interesting. Unilateral promises are called covenants in the Bible. Unilateral promises. What do you mean by unilateral promise? I mean a promise made absolutely and one-sidedly.

I am going to do this or I am not going to do this regardless of what you do. The promise that there will not be a repeat of the flood for example.

A covenant. Gill says a covenant when ascribed to God is often nothing more than a mere promise. Even and here it gets a little more interesting things are called covenant in the Bible which are unilateral promises or unilateral commitments if you like involving only one sentient party.

What do I mean by that? Any one conscious being. For example God's relationship to the day and the night is turned a covenant. Jeremiah 33 Thus says the Lord If you can break my covenant with the day and my covenant with the night so that day and night will not come at their appointed time then also my covenant with David my servant may be broken so that he shall not have a son to reign on his throne and my covenant with the Levitical priests my ministers.

So there's a covenant with the day and night. Now the day and the night are not animate thinking sentient beings who could in any way enter into a covenant with God. This is a really really one sided thing.

[17:22] And it's almost not a promise. It's not verbally expressed as a promise is it? This is referring presumably to something creational and it's part of the creational fixing of things.

The fixed order of things that God makes which he pledges himself to though seemingly without words saying as much. Now you might say this is a poetical use but I'm not really sure this is an interesting one I think in Jeremiah 33 because I'm not really sure you can say that.

It seems to me that the force of the argument that the Lord uses here depends on there being an actual commonality between the way he relates to David and the way he relates to day and night. But if there isn't that commonality that both can be classified as covenants then you lose the substance of the comparison. We find in Job 5 talk about a covenant with the stones of the field for Job.

We talk about Job making a covenant with his eyes don't we? Job 31 verse 1 Well there's a covenant made with my eyes a one-sided covenant with an inanimate object.

[18:39] We find in Hosea as part of Israel's restoration that God will make a covenant with the creatures that have formerly been hostile to Israel. I will make for them a covenant on that day with the beasts of the field, the birds of the heavens and the creeping things of the ground.

Again a one-sided only one sentient party covenant. McComiskey comments on this verse this use of the word covenant cannot involve mutual agreement.

The word bereaved covenant sometimes designates a unilateral stricture imposed on unresponsive entities. He says a unilateral stricture imposed on unresponsive entities.

So then you put all of those examples together and you might conclude that a covenant is simply a unilateral commitment to act in a certain way towards someone or something.

That's what the Bible seems happy to call a covenant. covenant. On the other hand you can find covenants with a whole lot more in them than that in the Bible.

[19 : 56] So let's look at the opposite end of the scale now. If that's the sort of minimal thing here let's now populate the x-axis with as many elements as we can find when we find something called a covenant in Scripture.

Owen puts it like this an absolutely complete covenant is, here we go, a voluntary convention pact or agreement between distinct persons about the ordering and disposal of things in their power unto their mutual concern and advantage.

A voluntary convention between distinct persons about the ordering and disposable things in their power unto their mutual concern and advantage.

So, Chris Roberts laptop. I have a very fine pencil here. Okay. This is going to be voluntary.

I'm not going to force this on you. It's going to be to your advantage because you'll learn the ancient art of writing with a pencil. It's going to be to my advantage because I'll get a fine laptop to do my work on.

[21 : 18] So, mutual advantage. Is that yours? Yeah. Okay. So, it's in your power. This is mine. It's in my power. We could now make a covenant. We could enter into an agreement, shall we?

At the end of this session, in return to my hard work teaching today, you will give me that and I will give you this.

This class, my teaching, equals the value of your laptop, is the idea. So, do you see all the elements there? It's voluntary, we're not forcing each other.

We own the stuff we're talking about and we're entering into an agreement about what we can do with it to our mutual advantage. That's what Owen means there by that definition.

Now, he then says the kind of covenant that we're thinking about and thinking about the covenant of redemption is one where a party makes an undertaking to accomplish something. So, one of the parties says I'll do something.

[22 : 18] And this, he says, for this kind of covenant you need a few things. You need a proposal of service. You need a promise of reward. And you need an acceptance of the proposal.

So, one party says to the other, will you do this? The other party, sorry, and then says, if you do, I will give you this. And then the second party says, I will do it.

So, we were redecorating our bedroom recently. I was steaming wallpaper off the walls and discovered that our ten-year-old boy could steam wallpaper by getting him to have a go.

And so I proposed to him some service, which was that the next day he would steam the rest of the bedroom. And he would be rewarded with ten pounds for spending his day steaming the walls of the bedroom, allowing me to do lots of other things that I needed to do and try to recover the chaos the house was in at the time.

And so he said, I accept your proposal. He didn't actually say that. So, in effect, we'd covenanted it.

[23 : 35] I'd proposed a service, I'd promised a reward, and he'd attempted it. Now, then, you can see in that kind of definition of a covenant, actually conditionality is now part of a covenant.

None of your antenna are twitching at this feature, look, blank. Yes, conditionality, part of the definition of, the full definition of a covenant. Patrick Gillespie wrote one of the big books on the covenant of redemption in the 17th century.

The Ark of the Covenant opened. He says, conditionality is necessary for finding a formal explicit covenant. Unless you have conditionality, you haven't got a real covenant.

Now, I don't agree with that, because as I've already said, I think actually, you find all sorts of things fairly freely called covenant in the Bible. But for this maximal all elements on the table definition of a covenant, you might say, yep, yep, normally, conditionality is going to be there.

And that, of course, has huge consequences. Why did I make a strange noise and think you might be suspicious when I used the word conditionality? Anyone? Anyone? Okay, conditionality could equal synergistic salvation.

[25 : 00] It could be saying, it's not only God's work, it's also our work, but there's some great condition that we have to contribute to this, yes? So, you know in England, as you know, and those

of you who come from the States will know this, that we live in a, generally speaking in an atmosphere in which there's very little theological suspicion.

We have a sort of opposite problem. Generally speaking, there are pockets of suspicion, but in parts of America, if you use the word conditionality in the context of covenant theology, then the guns are being drawn.

Because conditionality is something suspect because it entails synergism. And it's a denial of the gospel and justification by faith alone. And then, of course, immediately you think, hold on, hold on a minute, hold on a minute, what kind of condition are we talking about?

Are we talking about a meritorious condition? So if I said to you, are there any conditions in the gospel, in the Christian life, is the new covenant conditional?

What would you say? And the viewer's shaking his head. No conditions in the new covenant?

Nothing to do? Repent and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ?

[26 : 15] Conditions? Stick a hand up. This is not a decision. I know it's a presbytery meeting. This is not a decision. This is not theology by voting. Stick a hand up if you want to call those things conditions. Repentance and faith.

Stick a hand up if you're uneasy about that. Okay, now the reason some of you are uneasy about that is because you're thinking condition. You probably think condition means something contributory and meritorious.

And those of you who are relaxed about putting your hands up and thinking, you know, there's a category of condition that is absolutely not that. Okay. So largely speaking, I think that among Reformed brothers that is actually often a terminological dispute, really, a definitional dispute, not an actual substantive dispute.

Clearly there are theologies which really believe in meritorious conditionality. that when you've departed from Reformed and even Protestant convictions.

So, now some people, when we start mapping out these elements and saying, well, we need, you know, voluntary convention, we need distinct persons, we need stuff they own, we need agreement to dispose of it according to their mutual advantage, we need a proposal of service, a proposal of reward and acceptance of service.

[27 : 31] When we start unpacking all of that, some people say, oh, I don't like all of this technical dissecting of the covenant. It takes you back to those frogs at school and all the unpleasant smells and the chemistry labs and things.

And it's just, ooh, let's not be too scholastic about our theology here. So Herman Herxema, who has a very particular kind of covenant theology, as you may know if you know much about the disputes among the Dutch Reformed, says that this is a mechanical definition which goes with much scholastic reasoning and subtle hair splitting in the development of the covenant of redemption. He doesn't like it. But actually I don't think it is. I think when we start getting down to the nitty gritty of all of these elements that we might put on our covenant table or on our axis for consideration, it seems to me you'd get them in the Old Testament, don't you?

They're laid out plainly in the Pentateuch. You've got parties clearly described, God and the Hebrews, you've got a proposal, the law, you've got promise of blessings and curse laid out, and you've got acts of acceptance and undertaking by the Israelites, by the Hebrews, repeated acts of it and renewal of it.

So I don't think this is the sort of fruit of scholastic hair splitting, let alone reformed scholastic hair splitting in the 17th century, boo, betraying the 16th century heritage of Calvin.

[28 : 53] This is actually just people reading the Bible and saying, hey look, here's a lot of covenants and here's a load of stuff that often happens in covenants. So enough preamble of definition and thinking through what we would need to find to prove it.

So let's now actually try to do that and let's turn to think about the biblical evidence of the covenant of redemption. You can see here what we're looking for.

We're thinking we might find plain statements, we might find things presumed, we might find things implied, but what we still got a bit more work on the x-axis, saying what am I proposing we need to find to find the covenant of redemption.

The previous question I've asked with you just now is what do we need to find to find a covenant in general terms? And I've said well not very much. The Bible uses the term quite freely. Now we're asking a more specific question, a narrower question.

What do we need to find to find this covenant, the covenant of redemption? And for that we're going to have to put more on here because when we use the label covenant of redemption we're describing a fairly full package.

[30 : 03] So what are the key elements of the covenant of redemption that we would need to find to conclude that it is biblical? Well, we're looking for roughly speaking parties, promises and conditions.

And this sort of picks up on the early material. We're looking for parties. Minimally, God the Father and God the Son. We're looking for promises of things from the Father to the Son.

We're looking for conditions, if you, then. So we're looking for a work set before the Son, a proposal of service to the Son. And we'll be looking for the Son undertaking it.

Now, what we're going to do now is we're going to look at a range of biblical texts in which we find these different elements.

But we don't find them in all of the texts. So let me just state clearly what I don't think is happening here. I'm going to divide you up and get you looking at texts, just so the whole guy's not me talking. And when you look at these texts, I don't think you're finding the whole covenant of redemption in these passages, okay?

[31 : 17] But I think you're finding some aspects of it in these passages. So you may be finding two parties in these passages. You may be finding a work being given to the Son by the Father in these passages.

You may be finding the Son saying something to the Father. You may be finding the Father promising something to the Son. And you may be finding things, let me alert you to this.

But sometimes if you were to draw the three columns and say, well, we're looking for parties, and we're looking for work, and we're looking for promise.

Okay, three columns. And you try to map these texts onto those three columns. You might actually find it difficult particularly to distinguish between these two, between work and promise.

Because in a lot of the passages you're going to look at, the work seems to be the thing promised.

You will do this. Now you can take that as a charge to do it, you can also take it as a promise that it will be accomplished.

[32 : 29] And you're going to find it difficult, I think, to assign some of what's said in these passages to just one of those two columns. And that's fine, just write it across both columns. So what I think we'll do is I'll give you a little while to have a look at some of the following passages.

And I suggest roughly speaking that we group you like this. Anyone on Chris's row and in front on both sides here? You're half the room.

From Stuart back you're the other half. This side and this side. We've got four groups. So why don't those of you here, front left, my as I'm looking at it, look at Psalms 2 and 16.

Those of you at the back, Psalms 89 and 110. Back right over there, the seventh Psalms, Isaiah 42, 1-9, 49, 1-6.

Those of you at the front here, look at Isaiah 50, 49, and 52, 53. And ask these three questions.

Who are the parties here? What work is given to Christ?

[33 : 41] What promises are given to him? Now some of you will have to rummage around. There's not a lot in Psalm 16. I'd say there's a particular bit in Psalm 89 that you're interested in. If you finish your texts and other people are still going, we'll then move on and look at their texts as well.

So in total we've got Psalms 2, 16, 89, 110, and the seven Psalms in Isaiah. And ask those three questions. Take some notes and then we'll get some feedback from the group so somebody be ready to give us a summary of what you've found.

Off you go. Just move the chairs around, I wouldn't rearrange, leave the room. Feel free to move the chairs. Break it down more. If there are too many of you, probably there's too many of you in the back groups, so chop in half within the back groups as well.

Or even smaller if you want to. And if you're particularly antisocial, you can just sit on your own and do it. OK, if those of you at the back could call people in, that would be great.

We'll make a start. Let's make a start.

[35 : 03] Those of you who do call people in at the back, please. Right. Let's resume and let some pick up.

Let's sum two with this group here, I believe. Who is appointed spokesman? man with a laptop.

OK, Chris, could you stand up and proclaim what you found in Psalm 2 so everyone can hear it, please. In terms of parties, work, and promises, what did you find in Psalm 2?

Do come and join us everyone. In you come at the back, in you come at the back, come and sit down, we're started. Chris Roberts is telling us what they found in Psalm 2.

So, the Lord is speaking and he talks about his king, so there are two parties, which in the psalm we thought was David, but it's a sort of type of Christ, the son, so, one of the kind of proposals was in verse 8, where the Lord says to his son, ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage.

[36 : 38] So there was that proposal of a job for the son to ask, and almost a promise and a work in verse 9 as well for him to break God's enemies and rather lie and dash them in pieces like the cross vessel.

So you found the ambiguity there that I mentioned, did you? Is this a promise or a work? yes, there's a bit of place in verse 9 I think, work and promise. That's great, that's a good start I think.

So we have clearly here God the Father and God the Son, and we have a work and an invitation to ask for the nations, very striking verse isn't it?

We might sue God for his promises in our prayers, well here's a promise not made to us, it's a promise made to the Son, and we can sue the Father for the promises made to the Son, would you keep your promise, would you have invited your Son to ask for the nations, and would you give him healing as you go out to proclaim the Gospel or something like that.

So here's an instruction to him and an assurance of his success and of the inviolability of his reign as king. Okay, let's come on to 16.

[38 : 17] Chris? Yeah, so again, relationship between David the king and God. And this one we found a little bit harder to sort of work out where the proposal was coming from.

There was more of a sort of mutual thing going on. So verse one, it all seems to be the outworkings of a covenant that's already been made.

So David says to God, preserve me for in you I take refuge. So there seems to have been a promise already made from God to his son saying if you take refuge in me I will preserve you.

So there's a sort of promise God.

Speak there. We're just in verse six. There's a beautiful inheritance. And the resurrection.

[39 : 35] Verse ten. the promise of life to the son. As it's understood in the New Testament.

So here, yes, I think you're right. I think essentially this is the king pledging himself to his God, isn't it? This is the son pledging himself to the father and describing his relationship to the father and how he relates to him and has him before him and how he's his chosen portion and that kind of thing.

But then there is also the confident hope that he will not be abandoned to Sheol. Does change the mode in verse of God is a voluntary acceptance?

Hmm. Interesting. I mean, the whole thing looks voluntary, doesn't it, really? Do you know that? In that, here he is expressing who the Lord is for him and how he will relate to the Lord.

The whole thing is a statement of his, and when I say voluntary, again, some of you may be getting nervous. I mean voluntary in the etymological sense, in the sense of the original term voluntas in Latin, meaning will.

[40 : 47] When I say something's voluntary, all I mean is you will it. I'm not telling you how you will it. I'm not telling you if you will it with libertarian freedom such as an Arminian believes in, or you will it because your will has been moved by a sovereign God with his irresistible grace.

The use of the word voluntary by itself doesn't tell you that. I mean it in that reformed sense. So I find a voluntary relationship here. As in he wills it.

Yeah, he chooses it. Let's come to Psalm 89 then at the back, please. What did you find here?

Probably took you a while to read through it and find it.

Did you get anything? Did you get there? What about group A, the nearer the front group? Stuart, are you a spokesman? I am now, Kerry. Thank you.

Voluntarily, of course. Yes, yes, yes. Yeah, absolutely. So there's the parties, there's the Lord and David, yes, verse 3, that's one to David and his servant.

[42 : 01] And then, in terms of the promises that are made, there are a lot of promises. Verse 4, just how it's thrown his offspring forever, built the throne for generations. It's kingship, isn't it?

It's kingship, yeah. And as that goes on, this is 36, 37, his offspring, so this king will ensure throughout his throne before the sun, there's almost some formative, it's eternal kingship with

promise.

In terms of the work given, there's lots of work into the verses, where are we?

30 onwards, or 28, 29 onwards, about the need from David's offspring not to the same law, but to walk according to the Lord's words. It's seem to involve the conditions to do that.

Tell me how everyone else. No, I think that's right. And also the promise as well, isn't there? The whole thing's promise. Yes, yes.

[43 : 06] It's all framing promises. Step by self, being care for his covenant term. So here, if you are suffering from terminological myopia, here we've got the actual language of covenant between whom?

Well, it's between the law and David, and then the ultimate promise is made to offspring. But the thing we struggle with slightly is, we're not standing, we think we are united on this, we have this to covenant made within time.

Yes. To eternal eternity. Good, good, good point. So here we have, presuming that you accept a Christological reading of this, which you must, you here have a covenant between the father and the son.

But this seems to be a covenant in time that is mediated to the son through David. It comes down to him as an inheritor of this covenantal promise.

So this is why I say, I don't think any one of these texts proves the whole thing. We're constructing a composite picture here. So we've sketched out lots of elements of kingship, we've sketched out elements of work, we've got the parties clearly stated, but what we don't have yet is the eternity of the covenant.

[44 : 20] We have already, quite clearly, a covenant that predates the incarnation here. A covenant that Christ is born into as the son of David. That's not the same as saying a covenant made in eternity.

So we're still waiting for that evidence. We've not got that yet. At the back. There's another element here in that verse 38 on, he will be, prior to this, he will be glorified, but then also he will be cast down.

Yes. But also it is implied in verse 48, who can deliver his soul from the power of Sheol, it's implied that the father will do that because he's already promised that he will not get his covenant.

And when will he be cast down or why will he be cast down? Or why will the offspring be cast down? We were not, sometimes we're sometimes you had to spend some time with the verse, but the father is pouring out his wrath on the son.

You have cast father, rejected and poured wrath against your anointed. It would appear in verse 38 that the father was pouring out his wrath yes, and this is for covenant violation, isn't it?

[45 : 41] This is for verse 30, if his children forsake my law and do not walk the law into my rules. So there's the possibility here of a Davidic king sinning against this covenant and being punished for it.

Now, Christologically, how do you understand that? And at that point, of course, there's a parting of the ways, isn't there? Because some people will say, well, when you come to Psalms about sin and punishment and things, you have to say, well, that's not a Christological bit.

But anything negative in that sense can't be read as being about Christ. Whereas I think, in history anyway, most people would say, no, the Psalms are Christological. And therefore, when you find the language of punishment for a king, you understand it substitutionally.

So you understand that this is fulfilled in Christ, who, as the king, stands in the place of the sinful people and bears their sins. You get the question, how could Psalm 51 be? It could be Christological.

How can Christ confess sins? If he takes our sins upon him. So I would argue for a fully Christological reading of the Psalms, but I'm aware that people disagree with that.

[46 : 46] So that issue is going to come in at some point. Just how much of the language between the father and the king can you think applies to Christ? What you actually have to say, well, no, only some of it does. Thank you.

Thank you. I'm not going to the issue about it. It's only the thing you say just now, that the these things about the covenant with David, this could all be read as being a very covenant with the incarnate son, that's made in time with him as a son who is in Cuban flat.

So the issue that we're looking for, or we have yet found, is text will say that this current arrangement is there with the son before he comes in time.

Or texts that are presuming or implying, not necessarily texts that are saying that, but yes, yes, yes, yes. Exactly. So what I think we've not done, we're sketching a lot of the elements so far, but we've not yet got anything.

We have a pre-incarnational covenant here, but not a pre-temporal covenant. So far, yes. Or not even pre-incarnation or how regards Christ, as in it could be a deity comes to inheritance once he's incarnate.

[47 : 58] Yes, although it is a covenant in Psalm 89, for example, made with the offspring, that you're born into this covenant. Sure. Granted, but in dead, what is his access to conception?

Yeah. Is there a bit more that he continues out, but, 27, though, how they being the firstborn, the highest of the kings of the earth, and Christ being the firstborn, and king of kings, the firstborn in the new creation, so there's a lot of the stage in that term firstborn.

What does firstborn mean? Well, firstborn, I think, refers principally to pre-eminence, and I think that goes with being the highest of the kings of the earth. But, yeah, exactly, I think there's a vision of a great kingly office here, which we will continue with in Psalm 110.

Did you do 110 in the back, that? Can we? what do you find in Psalm 110? The parties and work and promises?

Well, it's, you know, the first of the old in verse, it's the Lord's age, the Bible, it's the covenant within God himself, you know, when you thought that that shows the time, nature of God, you know, it's the same verse, Jesus, that the Pharisees also, you know, what the Bible you might say, he draws it to the Bible.

[49 : 31] So, that, just a bit, uh, promises, would be, about, you know, the city of Pariah's hand, which also implies the word.

Yeah, again, there's the ambiguity there, I think, isn't it? It's a promise work, or a promise of success in his work. Uh, being a priest, the order of Matthew. Yeah, so it's not only the kingly office, it's also the priestly, yeah.

And also that is giving judgment as well, again, work and the promise, isn't it? Yeah. Okay. Okay. I think, um, I'm just aware of the time.

Let's, let's go straight to the, to Isaiah 52, three, shall we, and just pick up some points from here. Um, and skip over the other servant songs. Um, there's lots of interesting and important material in them, but I'm, I have way more material here than we're going to get through today anyway, so, um, just so we can get a bit more in.

What did you find front here from Isaiah, from this servant song, 52, three? Who is your spokesman?

[50 : 48] They're trying to propose that a man should be spokesman who wasn't even here when it was discussed.

Someone who was here? I think 15 and 52 53 are certain similarities in terms of the pattern of the Sermon Songs fairly clear parties, the Sermon Lord and the Sermon and the Father and the Son and various elements so it begins there at 52.13 with work promise and my Sermon shall act wisely and shall be lifted up and exalted and then along with the previous passage as well the work of suffering despise and rejected and so on and the reward?

did you find a reward there? I think you're right by that I think again it's another ambiguity of work and promise isn't it? and actually the ambiguity of work and promise is a lovely thing because what it tells you is that the Father sets before the Son a work to do and undertakes for him in it so often when people unpack the covenant of redemption and classic treatments of it in the 17th century they say look here is the work that's promised and here is the undertaking that you will succeed in the work that's promised as well so the Father is with the Son in his work in that sense there's a huge amount in 53.1-12 about the promise of the effectiveness of the atonement yes yes shall be made to be counted righteous yes resurrection in Lebanon yes resurrection and people and his wealth all of these things promised ok let me just highlight a few things from those passages across a number of them the first of them is the presence of my God or my Father language in a number of them which is very significant because that's typically covenantal language to have God as your God to have him as your Father to be his people or his child is all this is classic covenantal language and recurs in Psalm 16 elsewhere as well

Psalm 89 Isaiah 49 and continues into the New Testament especially in John's Gospel as we know that's one thing to note another thing to note I think is the significance of Psalm 89 in particular that and I mentioned this when we were there but that David becomes king how does he become king by means of a covenant ok he becomes king by covenant and that's very important because when we then think about how the father relates to the son and we think that the son has a kingly office well where does he get his kingly office from how does his kingly office come to him we'll see more of that in a moment also interesting to see that there's conditionality here in the father son relationship especially in Isaiah 53 I will divide him a portion with the many and he shall divide the spoil with the strong because he poured out his soul to death but because there is strongly causal and this little phrase here reminds us I think of Philippians 2 doesn't it therefore in Philippians 2 because he does this because he becomes obedient to death therefore he is exalted so on the grounds of his obedience in going to death therefore he receives his reward so there's a strong conditionality here in the father son relationship and it's worth asking yourself the question what kind of conditionality is this because if there's a kind of conditionality which you think we shouldn't believe in with regard to the covenant of grace conditions that we can't a kind of condition that we can't keep and then there's a kind of conditionality which is safe to think of us keeping in the covenant of grace a non-meritorious condition but which is this and this I think is a condition with a capital C that the son merits his reward that his obedience in going to the cross merits his reward it's like John 10 isn't it that the reason the father loves me is because I lay down my life now of course you need to be thinking carefully about the picture you have here in your mind it's not that there is the grudging father who is persuaded by this overwhelming merit of the son that he should give the son what he doesn't want to give him the father delights in pouring out glory and blessing on his son but it's still merited in a strong sense and can be merited because the son is the God-man so his obedience his obedience in his human nature

I'm not going to be a Nestorian here and talk about the obedience of the man or the human nature human nature doesn't exist on its own we're going to talk about his obedience the obedience of the son in his human nature receives an infinite value because it's the obedience of the divine son in his human nature and therefore the son is actually rewardable in a way that we could never be and therefore his obedience is genuinely meritorious and conditional with a capital C hence those texts in Isaiah 53 hence the the Tachach Asher and the Dio in Isaiah 53 and Philippians 2 now um sorry hello can I ask a question I'm not yes to you alright um so Christ fulfills the conditionality of the covenant uh he merits that um which covenant uh is it the conditionality of the covenant of works or is it the conditionality of the covenant of grace so the

[57 : 06] Nevitic covenant has built into a conditionality and uh David was to walk in the ways of God he's the law he was to keep the law Christ comes as a fulfillment of the Nevitic covenant so were those conditions meritorious a small a small question that you asked yes well ok let's say let's put one marker down whatever conditionality there is in God's covenant with his people Israel or David people corporately or king that conditionality cannot be this kind of conditionality ok ok um I don't think that the covenant with Israel holds out to Israel and let's think of it in its mosaic administration here I don't think it holds out to Israel a requirement um of a conditional requirement of perfect obedience for them to be in or remain in that covenant it describes perfect obedience yes so the law describes a perfectly obedient man so it sets forth a standard in that sense but because the covenant comes with a ceremonial law um it contains within itself a provision for forgiveness so I don't think that that covenant with with

Israel at Sinai or with David contains any kind of absolute conditionality and of perfect merit however and then now going back to the covenant of works that's different for Adam now what is Christ entering into well I mean that this conditionality is a conditionality in the covenant of redemption so this is a condition set before the son in eternity which he comes and fulfills in time but because the covenant of redemption stands behind all of the historical covenants the covenant of works describes a perfect obedience for Adam which he's got to maintain to stay in it the Sinai covenant describes a perfect describes but does not require of Israel but describes a perfect obedience and that's where it's important to distinguish the way that Christ relates to the Sinai covenant from the way that Israel relates to the Sinai covenant

I don't think that we can ever think that the Sinai covenant is setting forth for Israel a standard of perfect obedience which she fails to keep and therefore she's exiled because the covenant itself entails provision for forgiveness I don't think that's how the law functions Israel is saved and

maintained by repentance and faith like we are and the reason she's exiled is she doesn't do that but Christ who is as Paul tells us born under the law relates to that law differently from the way that we relate to it and Israel related to it and David related to it so where there is provision for forgiveness there because of what the covenant of redemption says to Christ he then comes under this obligation by being born under the law the law the moral law describes the obligations on Adam so I don't think that the Sinai covenant is republishing the covenant of works not a covenant of works it's a covenant of grace but I do believe that the law describes the perfect obedience that was required of Adam and so there's this continuity of the law and it's of the moral law running from God's covenant with

Adam re-described in the Sinai covenant but related to differently by Israel who can't possibly keep it and aren't told to keep it perfect or don't have to keep it perfectly to stay in the covenant that statement of the moral law then carries through and Christ is born under it and he he now does because he's the last Adam and so he relates to it Adamically in that sense but that has been set up in the covenant of redemption is that answering your yeah if you're interested in all of those questions about the Sinai covenant the next John Owen Center study day by the way this is slightly cheeky you're getting a kind of John Owen Center study day for free because this is material from the study day but you're only getting about half of it because I'm taking too long over it but this is the kind of stuff we do at John Owen Center study days doctrine study days and the next one is on the Sinai covenant so if all of that interests you and you're thinking what is it with the law do they have to keep it perfectly is it a requirement of absolute obedience is it like a covenant of works is it just like us to be in his right how is it different from being like us why does Paul talk about the end of the law why does he seem to think the law is burdensome but there are other passages which say the law is wonderful how do you put all that together our next study day is on that so if you want to think more about that that will launch probably in June

July and run into the autumn and if you're from somewhere else in the country and you'd like to get a group of people together I can come to you and do it there advert over but there are big questions in the Sinai covenant but that would be my understanding of it briefly David if you don't think Sinai covenant is a republication of the covenant of works do you think is there such traits of valid distinction between Sinai it's not that but it's a republication of the works principle in the covenant of works of the one who does these things well Leviticus 18.5 yes but that principle is not functioning for Israel I don't think in that the way that that text is understood in Galatians and in Romans Paul seems to isolate it from its covenantal context and contrast it with the way of faith

[63:10] I think in Romans 10 for example and I think you've got two options there you either say that he's viewing that verse as it was isolated by the Jews so he's talking there about a wrong way of relating to the law and that his negative statement about the law there is a statement about the law as the Jews have treated it and as the Jewish Christians are going back to the law and treating it or you say it is that but it is also possible just to sit down and think isolate the law the moral law from its covenantal framework and what's it like well isolate it from its covenantal framework and the moral law indeed embodies that principle do this and you live Christ comes and fulfills that principle Israel can't and we can't but my point is that I don't think that the Sinai covenant publishes that principle as the way that God relates to Israel in the sense of isolate this from its covenantal framework from forgiveness of sins from the ceremonial law

I think that in a sense it's either Paul is speaking the language of his opponents or he's speaking a sort of theoretical language well if you abstract the law from the covenantal framework this is how it would work so in that sense I think you could say there's a republication of the principle yes but the principle is not the functioning way that God relates to Israel I think does that make sense yes but that's the big puzzle that's the great difficulty what that what Leviticus 18.5 means and how you're to understand it is the big question and some people think Leviticus 18.5 is how this covenant works but I'm unpersuaded by that there's too much gracious framing for the Sinai covenant I think to think that it is a works covenant whether it's Paul talking the language of his opponents or Paul talking a theoretical abstraction of the law or Paul talking both is I think slightly harder

I suspect it's probably both I mean we know from intertestamental literature that Leviticus 18.5 was being abstracted by the Jews and that they were viewing their obedience in that way yeah so are you interested you're saying that you wouldn't want to understand the exile as the consequence of breaking the covenant is that the no no no I would understand the exile as the consequence of breaking the covenant absolutely I wouldn't understand the exile as the consequence of failing

perfectly to keep the law in its fullness and its detail okay the exile can't be the result of failing perfectly to keep the law because the law itself provides for the forgiveness of failing to keep the law Israel is guilty of idolatry idolatry is a fundamental breach of the covenant relationship with God exactly yes yes and not a consequence of just not keeping the ten commandments perfectly yeah can you repeat that sorry yes the exile is a consequence of breaking the covenant of grace in its mosaic administration not a consequence of breaking the covenant of works which is equivalent to apostasy to that exactly exactly yes yes now that's this is hugely significant isn't it yes I hope you've not switched off here because if you're a preacher this is hugely significant what do you do when you preach the law and the exile what is the primary application of the fact that God exiles his people it is don't break your covenant with God it's not look you can't keep the law perfectly Jesus did so we're okay and we'll never be exiled think of it this way if you're preaching Hosea and you're preaching all the stuff in Hosea about God divorcing his people this kind of thing what do you say about these curses in Hosea do you say to the people you're preaching to don't worry Jesus has born this covenantal curse for us so this could never happen to us or do you say to them what this warns us this warns us what happens if you break your covenant with God and it could happen to you now it's interesting that in the letters in Revelation when the language of Hosea is used it's used in that second way be careful or you're out it is of course true that Jesus bears the curse of the law for us and deals with our failure to keep the law perfectly but the exile is not about a failure to keep the law perfect it's not a failure to maintain your to remain covenant with God the sin of the Israelites is a sin of rejecting the gospel of repentance and faith so it has huge consequences for how you preach the law how you preach the exile what the equivalent typologically of the exile is today in the church all that kind of thing that's why this is when you start using all this kind of funny Presbyterian language some of you are probably born and bred Presbyterian so it trips off your tongue but for those of you who aren't and you've got all these covenants confused in your head covenant of works covenant of grace administration of the covenant of grace Sinai covenant of redemption and you think this is getting a bit weird and abstract isn't it it's not this actually fundamentally alters the way you preach huge swathes of the bible how you construct your covenant theology on these questions so do you think there is any towards typology in the covenant of works you have law and if you know with Adam there was blessing for keeping it there was curse for not keeping it it seems to be in [69 : 26] Deuteronomy that that same kind of free work is set up to them here's a law and if you keep it you leave less material and stay in the land you don't you'll be cursed and you go to exile so I agree with you about the works of the covenant of grace extension but is there an Adamic typology that's the right word or an Adamic pattern repeating itself in the covenant of grace with Israel so as Adam went into exile out of a promised land a special place so Israel would end and why because they don't keep the law of covenant so whilst it's still not a works covenant is some of the pattern of the Adamic covenant sort of flowing over into this covenant grade I think my is that the pattern of the

Adamic covenant is a pattern of perfect obedience to the law and the pattern of the Sinai covenant is not that that's why I think fundamentally they're different look at it this way generalize it like this Adam is given a way of relating to God and he breaks it Israel is given a way of relating to God and breaks it and goes into Israel but the point is that those ways of relating are different but if you abstract it to that very general level then yeah yeah they break their covenant but the covenant is structured fundamentally differently yeah John isn't that because one is a bit of the other the covenant works is what the covenant of redemption in eternity looks like for Adam and Christ in time that's different it's patterned on it's different from saying it is what it looks like in time so I of course the

Adamic typology is fundamental but what Christ receives and how he gets to it in the covenant of redemption is quite different from what is promised to Adam and how he gets to it there's no sin bearing in the covenant of works so what what so Christ comes to do a whole load of things and his promised things which are not described in the covenant of works there's a similarity he gets them by perfect obedience which is what Adam would have done to receive his inheritance so what I mean is this absolutely the covenant of works teaches us a whole lot about Christ as the last Adam but it doesn't use everything because it provides the curse when Adam breaks the covenant of works that creates the debt of curse but the covenant of works has no mediator it has no substitute in it it's just God and Adam the covenant of redemption identifies Christ as the mediator who then

takes that curse that comes from the covenant of works so all

I'm saying is yes of course there's a very similar pattern there that you obey and you inherit that was what it was for Adam for Christ he obeys and he inherits but the substance of his obedience is different from the substance of Adam's obedience although it has in common obedience to the moral law of God but Christ has to do a lot more than just obey the moral law of God he has to obey the mediatorial law that he's given to become the mediator and the substitute!

Yes Yes and more than that so he for example he keeps the moral law perfectly and he lives as an obedient Israelite so he keeps the Sinai administration of the covenant of grace but he does more than that he keeps the law of a mediator which only comes to him in the covenant of redemption we're going to move on because some of you are looking deeply intrigued and some of you are looking a little like what are these people talking about pursue that with me afterwards if you want to we have however quite conveniently just touch on a question there which is this how does this are we right in talking about a covenant of grace and the covenant of redemption as two distinct things this is a big question

[75 : 01] Christ and the father and the covenant of redemption and the spirit God and his people in the covenant of grace God and Christ as the head of his people in the covenant of grace is it right to articulate two different covenants say for some people Thomas Foster for example roll them all into one and they just say the covenant of grace contains all this stuff we can't go into this in any depth today but my initial reaction to it is simply to say it just gets too complicated if you roll them all into one because there are so many different relations going on within this very large covenant then that you've got the father giving to the son a work to do which he doesn't give to the people a work to do but you've got the son and the people it's better to distinguish it and say here is the relationship between the persons of the trinity and here is the relationship between God and his people and I think there are texts and we've seen this in Isaiah 53 that distinguish it when you get this very marked thing of contrasting the Messiah and his people in Isaiah 53 yes he did this for us he's in our place it's not us doing it there's a contrast there if you look at who the people are in these texts for example in Psalm 2 it's between the father and the son and where are the people there well the people are actually the promised gift in Psalm 2 they're the inheritance given to the son so they're there in that covenant between the father and the son but there's something given to the son in it they're not a party with the son under the son in that covenant they're the promised gift to the son in that covenant so I think we should distinguish the covenant of redemption and eternity and the covenant of grace that God makes with his people okay but we've not really got there yet we haven't yet found that there is a covenant of redemption so this may all be very presumptuous because you've been pressing me on the issue of timing and we've not got there so let's keep going and let's go to Luke 22 and this may be the last thing we do before we break for lunch this is a very interesting passage in

Luke 22 and I would argue if you want something on the surface of the ocean that you find it here in Luke 22 that you find in other words here the language of covenant for the father son relation which I think we've already got to via Psalm 89 but I think we find it here more clearly Luke 22 29 let's pick up a little earlier 28 you are those who've stayed with me in my trials and I assign to you as my father assigned to me a kingdom that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on the thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel Deityphim I you mean I assign to you now J.C.

Ryle comments the Greek word so rendered seems to bear a stronger sense than our translators have put upon it and he suggests that we should translate to this I appoint unto you by covenant Jonathan Edwards translates it I by covenant dispose or make over unto you as my father by covenant hath disposed unto me a covenant and you may think well these are covenantally inclined people of course they're going to say that well GB cared comments in his commentary around Luke the word translated appoint is really a verbal form of the word for covenant as God has made a covenant with Jesus entrusting the kingdom to his keeping that he might make it real to men in his life of redemptive service so Jesus in turn makes a covenant with the twelve and through them with the church that is to be if you look at the other occurrences of the verb in the New Testament it is used with covenantal overtones Acts 325 for example you can look these up later Hebrews 8 10 Hebrews 9 16 17 but most importantly ask yourself the question by the time you get to Luke 22 verse 29 and you find a verb which elsewhere in the New Testament has covenantal connotations are you to think that it has covenantal connotations here anything in the context suggest covenantal thinking maybe ever so slightly verse 20 this cup that is poured out for you is

the new covenant in my blood and then in that context he talks about the father covenanting him a kingdom now what's the significance of this well also let's just note the background here I think see what he's connecting here in verse 29 he's connecting covenanting and the kingdom he's saying the kingdom is given by covenant so is there biblical precedent for expecting a connection between kingdom and covenant oh yes psalm 89 David became king in the covenant so we know we come to the New

Testament knowing that a Davidic king might well be in a covenant with God that makes him king and then we come to this verse there you go few observations notice again that the father doesn't make the covenant with the son as the head of his people rather it establishes his headship it brings about his kingship of the people so this covenant brings about the kingship notice perhaps a puzzle about Jesus becoming king you might think that Jesus is always king he's the eternal son of God you must distinguish mustn't you the kingship that Jesus has as the eternal son of God from the kingship that he comes into as the God-man mediator in history in his resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of God so that's how he can become a king and then also perhaps most significantly for our times notice that the father covenants with the son to make him king of the kingdom and so if you come to covenant theology with a background kingdom theology and you've been raised on a diet of Graham

[81 : 23] Goldsworthy and Australian style kingdom theology and you think the kingdom is the thing that holds the bible together as a theme very interesting to come to Luke 22 kingdom of I'm not diminishing the significance of kingdom kingdom is a major bible thing and it is true that the vocabulary of kingdom predominates in the new testament there's a shift there though it's rather significant that at the lord's supper the last supper Jesus uses the language of covenant that does put it at the centre of the new testament doesn't it but nonetheless there's a lot of kingdom language so we mustn't diminish that but we do see here don't we that here is kingdom language and Jesus explains behind it is covenant language that the kingdom comes to Jesus by a covenant the kingdom theology is framed by covenant theology therefore you're doing a bible over you you can talk about kingdom at great length but you can't stop with kingdom you have to step behind it to say the kingship comes by covenant

Jesus is prophet priest and king by covenant by the covenant of redemption the covenant of redemption is his appointment as the king and so kingdom theology nestles within covenant theology why is there a shift to kingdom language in the new testament why well there's no tension there I think fundamentally I'd say it's not a question of either or is it if kingdom theology nestles within covenant theology because Jesus became king by covenant then you've got covenant here and you've got kingdom here inside it it's not one against the other so it's just wrong to think that the use of one kind of language contrasts with or excludes the priority of the other kind of language when this passage tells us that one nestles within the other but why why the focus here in the new testament well it's obvious isn't it he's the king yes the new testament is the arrival of the king the god man mediator the lord jesus christ the son of david so no wonder you're going to talk about king a lot because here's the king and here's the great explosion of his kingdom in the world so I think that explains why there's a predominance of kingdom language but it's theologically and here exegetically undergated by covenant language and arises within that context slunchy shall we pray again