

life with him, upon condition of perfect obedience, forbidding him to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil upon the pain of death.

According to this statement, (1) God entered into a covenant with Adam. (2) The promise annexed to that covenant was life. (3) The condition was perfect obedience. (4) its penalty was death.

God entered into Covenant with Adam. This statement does not rest upon any express declaration of the Scriptures. It is, however, a concise and correct mode of asserting a plain Scriptural fact, namely, that God made to Adam a promise suspended upon a condition, and attached to disobedience a certain penalty. This is what in Scriptural language is meant by a covenant, and this in all that is meant by the term as used here. Although the word covenant is not used in Genesis and does not elsewhere, in any clear passage, occur in reference to the transaction there recorded, yet inasmuch as the plan of salvation is constantly represented as a New Covenant, new, not merely in antithesis to that made at Sinai, but new in reference to all legal covenants whatever, it is plain that the Bible does represent the arrangement made with as a truly federal transaction. The Scriptures know nothing of any other than two methods of attaining eternal life: the one that which demands perfect obedience, and the other that which demands faith. If the latter is called a covenant, the former is declared to be of the same nature. . . .

God then did enter into a covenant with Adam. That covenant is sometimes called a covenant of life, because life was promised as the reward of obedience. Sometimes it is called the covenant of works, because works were the condition on which that promise was suspended, and because it is thus distinguished from the new covenant which promises life on condition of faith."

"THE COVENANT OF GRACE. The plan of salvation is presented under the form of a covenant. This evident, --

First, from the constant use of the words BERITH and DIATHEKE in reference to it. With regard to the former of these words . . . there can be no doubt that according to its prevailing usage in the Old Testament, it means a mutual contract between two or more parties. . . . There is . . . no room to doubt that the word BERITH when used of transactions between man and man means a mutual compact. We have no right to give it any other sense when used of transactions between God and man. Repeated mention is made of the covenant of God with Abraham, . . . and afterwards with Isaac and Jacob. Then with the Israelites at Mount Sinai. The Old Testament is founded on this idea of a covenant relation between God and the theocratic people.

The meaning of the word DIATHEKE in the Greek Scriptures is just as certain and uniform In the Scriptures it is almost uniformly used in the sense of a covenant. In the Septuagint it is the translation of BERITH in all the cases above referred to. It is the term always used in the New Testament to designate the covenant with Abraham, with the Israelites, and with believers If the word has this meaning when applied to the transaction with Abraham and with